

Calculating work in weakly driving quantum master equations: backward and forward equations

Fei Liu^{1, *}

¹*School of Physics and Nuclear Energy Engineering, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*
(Dated: February 15, 2019)

We present a technical report that the two methods of calculating characteristic functions for the work distribution in the weakly driven quantum master equations are equivalent. One is obtained by the notion of quantum jump trajectory [Phys. Rev. E 89, 042122 (2014)], while the other is based on the two time energy measurements on the combined system and reservoir [Silaev, et al., Phys. Rev. E 90, 022103 (2014)]. They are indeed the backward and forward methods, respectively, which is very similar to the case of the Kolmogorov backward and forward equations in classical stochastic theory. The microscopic basis of the former method is also clarified.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 05.30.-d

arXiv:1506.08343v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 28 Jun 2015

* Email address: feiliu@buaa.edu.cn

Introduction. Recently, there is growing interest in heat and work in nonequilibrium quantum processes [1–29]. These studies were mainly motivated by extending the important classical fluctuation relations into quantum regime, e.g., the celebrated Bochkov-Kuzovlev equality [1] and Jarzynski equality [30].

Because of the stochastic character of work, calculating its probability density functions (PDFs) in concrete quantum systems is very challenging [13]. Very recently, in a specific type of master equations that describes a damped quantum open system driven by weakly classical force, a characteristic function (CF) method was developed by us [23] on the basis of notion of quantum jump trajectory (QJT). This method not only provides an alternative way besides directly simulating QJTs [21], but also is straightforward to obtain closed forms for different moments of work. Interestingly, after the publication of our article, Silaev et al. [25] proposed another CF method to calculate work for the same quantum system. However, contrary to the our definition, their work is defined on composite system consisting of bare system and reservoir by the two-energy measurements (TEM) scheme [12, 13]. Therefore, it shall be interesting to check whether these two CF methods reveal the same PDF for these two seemly very different work. We will show that the answer is true.

Overview of two CF methods. Let us suppose the Hamiltonian of a bare system to be H_0 . Initially, the system is in the thermal state $\rho_0 = \exp(-\beta H_0) / \text{Tr}[\exp(-\beta H_0)]$, where β is the inverse temperature of surrounding heat reservoir. An external field is applied from time 0 up to final time t_f . During the process, the evolution equation of the reduced density matrix of the system $\rho(t)$ is ($\hbar=1$)

$$\partial_t \rho(t) = \mathcal{L}_t \rho(t) = -i[H_0 + H_1(t), \rho(t)] + D[\rho(t)], \quad (1)$$

where $H_1(t)$ is the interaction of the system and the field. The D -term denotes dissipation due to weakly coupling between the system and the reservoir:

$$D[A] = \sum_{\omega} \gamma(\omega) \left[S(\omega) A S^\dagger(\omega) - \frac{1}{2} \{ S^\dagger(\omega) S(\omega), A \} \right]. \quad (2)$$

We assume that the interaction Hamiltonian of the system and reservoir is $V = S \otimes R$, and the system's operator S can be decomposed into a sum of the eigen-operators of H_0 , i.e., $S = \sum_{\omega} S(\omega) = \sum_{\omega} S^\dagger(\omega)$, $[H_0, S(\omega)] = -\omega S(\omega)$, and $S(-\omega) = S^\dagger(\omega)$. Here these sums are extended over all energy difference ω of the eigenvalues of H_0 [31]. The form V is not the most general. However, it is adequate to illustrate our results. The rate $\gamma(\omega)$ satisfies the detailed balance condition: $\gamma(-\omega) = \gamma(\omega) \exp(-\beta\omega)$. This condition plays key role in the validity of the work equalities [23, 32] and in the following discussions. The master equation is widely utilized in quantum optics, e.g., describing the resonance fluorescence [31].

Eq. (1) can be unraveled into QJT for state vector [31, 33, 34]. With this notion one may intuitively define work W_{QJT} along each individual trajectory [18, 21, 23]; also see a description in Fig.(1). We shown that, the PDF of the work can be calculated through its CF [23]

$$\Phi_{QJT}(\mu) = \text{Tr}_0[K_0(0; \mu) \rho_0]. \quad (3)$$

The operator $K_0(t'; u)$ ($0 \leq t' \leq t_f$) therein satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{t'} K_0(t'; \mu) &= -\mathcal{L}_{t'}^* K_0(t'; \mu) - K_0(t'; \mu) i[H_1(t'), e^{i\mu H_0}] e^{-i\mu H_0}, \\ &= -i[H_0 + H_1(t'), K_0(t'; \mu)] - D^*[K_0(t'; \mu)] - K_0(t'; \mu) i[H_1(t'), e^{i\mu H_0}] e^{-i\mu H_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $K_0(t_f; \mu) = I$ the identity operator, $\mathcal{L}_{t'}^*$ is the dual of $\mathcal{L}_{t'}$, and

$$D^*[A] = \sum_{\omega} \gamma(\omega) \left[S^\dagger(\omega) A S(\omega) - \frac{1}{2} \{ S^\dagger(\omega) S(\omega), A \} \right]. \quad (5)$$

Eq. (4) is about the *backward* time t' . Hence, we call it the backward equation. This is a terminal value problem rather than common initial value problem. On the other hand, for the same master equation, Silaev et al. [25] presented another CF for another work W_{TEM} :

$$\Phi_{TEM}(\mu) = \text{Tr}_0[e^{i\mu H_0} \hat{\rho}(t_f; \mu)], \quad (6)$$

where they introduced a *modified* reduced density matrix $\hat{\rho}(t_f; \mu)$ that satisfies [12]

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \hat{\rho}(t; \mu) &= \check{\mathcal{L}}_t(\mu) \hat{\rho}(t; \mu) \\ &= -i[H_0 + H_1(t), \hat{\rho}(t; \mu)] + \sum_{\omega} \gamma(\omega) \left[e^{i\mu\omega} S(\omega) \hat{\rho}(t; \mu) S^\dagger(\omega) - \frac{1}{2} \{ S^\dagger(\omega) S(\omega), \hat{\rho}(t; \mu) \} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$




FIG. 1. A schematic diagram of two work definitions respectively based on the QJT (a) [23] and TEM scheme on the combined system and reservoir (b) [13]. The blue circle and the big red square represent the system and reservoir, respectively. The gray bar with letter “D” is the detector that is continuously monitoring the energy of the reservoir. The green arrows on the right-hand side denote the projection measurements of energy at the final time t_f . In (a), the Hamiltonian H_0 of the system has discrete eigenvector and eigenvalue: $H_0|\varepsilon_n\rangle = \varepsilon_n|\varepsilon_n\rangle$. The dash lines denote the Schrödinger-like evolution of the wave vector $\psi_0(t)$ of the system under a non-Hermite Hamiltonian, while thin lines represent occasional collapses of the state vector due to energy emission (ωN_+) or absorption (ωN_-) recorded by the detector [31]. The projection is done on the system only. In (b) the Hamiltonian H_r of the reservoir has eigenvector and eigenvalues: $H_r|\zeta_r^k\rangle = \zeta_r^k|\zeta_r^k\rangle$. The evolution of the wave vector $\Psi(t)$ of the composite system is unitary under the whole Hamiltonian. Contrary to the previous case, the measurement here is done on both the bare system and reservoir.

and its initial condition is $e^{-i\mu H_0}\rho_0$. To distinguish it from Eq. (4), we call it the forward equation since the forward time t is involved. The forms of Eqs. (3) and (6), and Eqs. (4) and (7) appears very distinct. Particularly, the latter work is defined on the composite system by the TEM scheme [12, 13], in which no continuous monitoring of the reservoir is required. Fig. (1) schematically explains the difference of these two types of work.

Directly proving equivalence of two methods. We first introduce an alternative operator

$$\tilde{K}_0(s; \mu) = \Theta K_0(t'; \mu) e^{i\mu H_0} \Theta^\dagger, \quad (8)$$

where Θ is the time-reversal operator and $s = t_f - t'$. Substituting it into Eq. (4), we convert the equation into an initial value problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s \tilde{K}_0(s; \mu) &= \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_s(\mu) \tilde{K}_0(s; \mu) \\ &= -i[H_0 + \tilde{H}_1(s), \tilde{K}_0(s; \mu)] + \sum_\omega \gamma(\omega) \left[e^{-i\mu\omega} S^\dagger(\omega) \tilde{K}_0(s; \mu) S(\omega) - \frac{1}{2} \{ S^\dagger(\omega) S(\omega), \tilde{K}_0(s; \mu) \} \right], \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{H}_1(s) = \Theta H_1(t_f - s) \Theta^\dagger$, and the initial condition $\tilde{K}_0(0; \mu)$ equals $e^{-i\mu H_0}$. We have used the detail balance

condition and assumed that these eigenoperators $S(\omega)$ are time-reversible. Eq. (9) has a formal solution

$$\tilde{K}_0(s; \mu) = \tilde{G}(s, 0; \mu)[\tilde{K}_0(0; \mu)], \quad (10)$$

where $\tilde{G}(s, 0; \mu) = T_- \exp \left[\int_0^s \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{s'}(\mu) ds' \right]$ is a super-propagator and T_- denotes the chronological time-ordering operator.

The superoperator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_s(\mu)$ possesses an important property:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_s(\mu)A = \Theta \check{\mathcal{L}}_{t_f-s}^*(-\nu)(\Theta^\dagger A \Theta) \Theta^\dagger, \quad (11)$$

where the parameter $\nu = i\beta - \mu$, and

$$\check{\mathcal{L}}_t^*(\mu)A = i[H_0 + H_1(t), A] + \sum_{\omega} \gamma(\omega) \left[e^{-i\mu\omega} S(\omega) A S^\dagger(\omega) - \frac{1}{2} \{S^\dagger(\omega) S(\omega), A\} \right]. \quad (12)$$

The verification is straightforward. Using these operators and the property, we can rewrite the CF (3) as

$$\Phi_{QJT}(\mu) = \text{Tr}[\Theta^\dagger \tilde{K}_0(t_f; \mu) \Theta e^{-i\mu H_0} \rho_0] \quad (13)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\Theta^\dagger \tilde{G}(t_f, 0; \mu) [\tilde{K}_0(0; \mu)] \Theta e^{-i\mu H_0} \rho_0] \quad (14)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[\check{G}^*(0, t_f; -\nu) [\Theta^\dagger \tilde{K}_0(0; \mu) \Theta] e^{-i\mu H_0} \rho_0] \quad (15)$$

$$= \text{Tr}[e^{i\mu H_0} \check{G}(t_f, 0; -\nu) [e^{-i\mu H_0} \rho_0]], \quad (16)$$

where $\check{G}(t_f, 0; -\nu)$ is the adjoint super-operator of $\check{G}^*(0, t_f; -\nu) = T_+ \exp \left[\int_0^{t_f} \check{\mathcal{L}}_\tau^*(-\nu) d\tau \right]$, and T_+ denotes the antichronological time-ordering operator. We see that $\check{G}(t_f, 0; -\nu)$ is nothing else but the super-propagator of Eq. (7). Therefore, we complete the proof of the equivalence of these two CF methods. Since the backward and forward time parameters are involved in, the current situation is very similar to the case of the Kolmogorov backward and forward equations in classical stochastic theory [35].

Microscopic basis of backward equation. Eq. (7) has a microscopic basis. Namely, it was obtained by reducing an equation about the CF of the work W_{TEM} defined on the composite system [12, 13, 25] into the degrees of freedom of the system. The above proof implies that Eq. (4) might be derived in analogous way even though we obtained it solely by the notion of QJT [23]. After all, the quantum master equation and its unraveling are effective theories. Let us recall a CF method for computing the PDF of the work W_{TEM} in the composite system. Given the whole Hamiltonian of the closed quantum system to be $H(t) = H_0 + H_1(t) + H_r + V$, where H_r is the Hamiltonian of the reservoir and the interaction V is very weak, and the meaning of $H_1(t')$ and V are the same as before. There exists an evolution equation about operator $K(t'; \mu)$ [32],

$$\partial_{t'} K(t'; \mu) = -i[H(t'), K(t'; \mu)] - K(t'; \mu) i[H(t'), e^{i\mu(H_0 + H_r)}] e^{-i\mu(H_0 + H_r)} \quad (17)$$

with a terminal condition $K(0; \mu) = I$. The CF $\Phi_{TEM}(\mu)$ equals $\text{Tr}[K(0; \mu) \rho_0 \otimes \rho_r]$, where $\rho_r = \exp(-\beta H_r) / \text{Tr}[\exp(-\beta H_r)]$ is canonical density matrix of the reservoir. A brief explanation about Eq.(17) is reserved in the Appendix I. This equation looks very similar to Eq. (4). Particularly, because of $\Phi_{TEM}(\mu) = \text{Tr}_0[\text{Tr}_r[K(0; \mu) \rho_r] \rho_0]$, we may naturally think that the latter shall be the reduced effective equation of the former, while the term $\text{Tr}_r[\dots]$ (the trace over the reservoir) shall be the previous $K_0(0; \mu)$. In the following, we want to confirm these two conjectures.

Let us introduce the time evolution operator $U_{0r}(t') = e^{-i(H_0 + H_r)t'}$ and rewrite Eq. (17) in the interaction picture,

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{t'} K_I(t'; \mu) + i[H_1^I(t'), K_I(t'; \mu)] + iK_I(t'; \mu) e^{i\mu H_0} [e^{-i\mu H_0}, H_1^I(t')] \\ & = -i[V_I(t') K_I(t'; \mu) - K_I(t'; \mu) V_{I\mu}(t')], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the letters “ I ” in these operators denote that they are the interaction picture operators, and especially $V_{I\mu}(t') = U_{0r}^\dagger(t') e^{i\mu(H_0 + H_r)} V e^{-i\mu(H_0 + H_r)} U_{0r}(t')$. Notice that we have moved all terms that do not involve the interaction term V to the left-hand side (LHS) of the equation. This is prepared for the perturbation calculation below. Eq. (18) has an integral form:

$$\begin{aligned} K_I(t'; \mu) & = I + i \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau [V_I(\tau) K_I(\tau; \mu) - K_I(\tau; \mu) V_{I\mu}(\tau)] \\ & \quad + i \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau [H_1^I(t'), K_I(t'; \mu)] + i \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau K_I(\tau; \mu) e^{i\mu H_0} [e^{-i\mu H_0}, H_1^I(\tau)]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We substitute Eq. (19) into the right-hand side (RHS) of Eq. (18) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_{t'} K_I(t'; \mu) + i[H_1^I(t'), K_I(t'; \mu)] + iK_I(t'; \mu)e^{i\mu H_0}[e^{-i\mu H_0}, H_1^I(t')] \\
&= \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau V_I(t')[V_I(\tau)K_I(\tau; \mu) - K_I(\tau; \mu)V_{I\mu}(\tau)] - \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau [V_I(\tau)K_I(\tau; \mu) - K_I(\tau; \mu)V_{I\mu}(\tau)]V_{I\mu}(t') \\
& \quad - i[V_I(t') - V_{I\mu}(t')] + \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau V_I(t')[H_1^I(t'), K_I(t'; \mu)] - \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau [H_1^I(t'), K_I(t'; \mu)]V_{I\mu}(t') \\
& \quad + \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau V(t')K_I(\tau; \mu)e^{i\mu H_0}[e^{-i\mu H_0}, H_1^I(\tau)] - \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau K_I(\tau; \mu)e^{i\mu H_0}[e^{-i\mu H_0}, H_1^I(\tau)]V_{I\mu}(t'). \tag{20}
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides by ρ_r and taking a trace over the reservoir, we transform the LHS of the above equation into

$$LHS = \partial_{t'} K_{0I}(t'; \mu) + i[H_1^I(t'), K_{0I}(t'; \mu)] + iK_{0I}(t'; \mu)e^{i\mu H_0}[e^{-i\mu H_0}, H_1^I(t')], \tag{21}$$

where $K_{0I}(t'; \mu) = \text{Tr}_r[K(t'; \mu)\rho_r]$. Notice that $H_1^I(t')$ is now the interaction picture operator of the system due to $[H_1(t'), H_r] = 0$. We remind the reader that so far all the derivations are exact. In order to deal with the complicated RHS of Eq. (20), however, we have to resort some approximations. Following the standard idea in the dynamics of the open systems [31], we make an important assumption $K_I(\tau; \mu) \approx K_{0I}(\tau; \mu) \otimes I_r$ for all K_I -terms on the RHS. This shall be justified if the field term $H_1(t)$ and the coupling term V are very weak. By imposing the conventional condition $\text{Tr}[R_I(t')\rho_r] = 0$ and performing the Markov approximation, we immediately have

$$\begin{aligned}
RHS &= \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau S_I(t')S_I(\tau)K_{0I}(t'; \mu)\langle R_I(t')R_I(\tau) \rangle_r - \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau S_I(t')K_{0I}(t'; \mu)S_{I\mu}(\tau)\langle R_I(t')R_{I\mu}(\tau) \rangle_r \\
& \quad - \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau S_I(\tau)K_{0I}(t'; \mu)S_{I\mu}(t')\langle R_I(\tau)R_{I\mu}(t') \rangle_r + \int_{t'}^{t_f} d\tau K_{0I}(t'; \mu)S_{I\mu}(\tau)S_{I\mu}(t')\langle R_{I\mu}(\tau)R_{I\mu}(t') \rangle_r, \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \dots \rangle_r = \text{Tr}_r[\dots \rho_r]$ is the reservoir correlation functions. If we further carry out the rotation wave approximation, the integrals in above equation may be eliminated and we arrive at a final form:

$$RHS = -i[H_{LS}, K_{0I}(t'; \mu)] - D^*[K_{0I}(t'; \mu)], \tag{23}$$

where H_{LS} represents the Lamb shift [31]. Considering that this procedure is standard in textbook, we only show the key steps in the Appendix II. If we transform the Eqs. (21) and (23) back into the Schrödinger picture and neglect the smaller Lamb shift, we reproduce Eq. (4).

Conclusion. In this paper, we have proved the equivalence of the two CF methods for calculating work in the weakly driven quantum open system. Hence, for the current circumstance, the PDF of the work defined on QJT is the same with the PDF of the work defined on the combined system and reservoir by TEM scheme. Our conclusion would be relevant in practice. Compared to the practical difficulty of measuring the work by the TEM scheme on both the system and reservoir, measuring the work defined on QJTs might be relatively easy. Recording QJTs has been realized in recent experiments [36].

Acknowledgment. We appreciate Xin Wang for his helpful discussions. The work was supported by the National Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11174025.

APPENDIX I: AN EXPLANATION OF EQ. (17)

Given the time-dependent Hamiltonian of a closed quantum system, $H(t) = H_s + H_1(t)$. The Hamiltonian of the system H_s is assumed to have discrete eigenstates and eigenvalues: $H_s|n\rangle = \epsilon_n|n\rangle$. According to the TEM scheme [13], one may define the exclusive work $W = \epsilon_n - \epsilon_m$, where ϵ_i , $i = m, n$ denotes the energy eigenvalues of H_s that are measured at the beginning and the ending of the nonequilibrium process. It is not difficult to see that the CF of the PDF of the work is $\Phi(\mu) = \text{Tr}[K_{t_f}(\mu)\rho_s]$, where $K_t(\mu) = U^\dagger(t)e^{i\mu H_s}U(t)e^{-i\mu H_s}$, $U(t)$ is the time-evolution operator of $H(t)$, and ρ_s is the canonical density matrix of the bare system H_s . One way to calculate $\Phi(\mu)$ is to directly solve $U(t)$. An alternative way is to find an evolution equation about $K_t(\mu)$. However, there is no such a closed equation about $K_t(\mu)$ with respect to the time t . This problem may be circumvented by introducing $K(t'; \mu) = U(t')U^\dagger(t_f)e^{i\mu H_s}U(t_f)U^\dagger(t')e^{-i\mu H_s}$.

Obviously, $K(0; \mu) = K_{t_f}(\mu)$ and $K(t_f; \mu) = I$. Interestingly, this new operator satisfies a closed evolution equation about the backward time t' , i.e.,

$$\partial_{t'} K(t'; \mu) = -i[H(t'), K(t'; \mu)] - K(t'; \mu)i[H(t'), e^{i\mu H_s}]e^{-i\mu H_s}. \quad (24)$$

If the bare system is just the combined system and reservoir that we mentioned before, and we assume that the interaction term V is negligible, we will arrive at Eq. (17).

APPENDIX: SEVERAL KEY FORMULAS IN DERIVING EQ. (23)

The decomposition of the operator S implies that $S_{I\mu}(t) = \sum_{\omega} S(\omega)e^{-i\omega(t+\mu)} = \sum_{\omega} S^{\dagger}(\omega)e^{i\omega(t+\mu)}$. Substituting them into Eq. (22) and performing RWA, we have

$$\begin{aligned} RHS = & \sum_{\omega} S(\omega)S^{\dagger}(\omega)K_{0I}(t'; \mu) \int_0^{t_f-t'} ds e^{i\omega s} \langle R_I(0)R_I(-s) \rangle_r - \sum_{\omega} S(\omega)K_{0I}(t'; \mu)S^{\dagger}(\omega)e^{i\mu\omega} \int_0^{t_f-t'} ds e^{i\omega s} \langle R_I(0)R_{I\mu}(s) \rangle_r \\ & - \sum_{\omega} S(\omega)K_{0I}(t'; \mu)S^{\dagger}(\omega)e^{i\mu\omega} \int_0^{t_f-t'} ds e^{-i\omega s} \langle R_I(0)R_{I\mu}(-s) \rangle_r + \sum_{\omega} K_{0I}(t'; \mu)S(\omega)S^{\dagger}(\omega) \int_0^{t_f-t'} ds e^{-i\omega s} \langle R_{I\mu}(0)R_{I\mu}(-s) \rangle_r \end{aligned}$$

If the correlation functions decay very fast, these integrals can be approximated by the one-side Fourier transforms by replacing the upper limit $t_f - t'$ by infinity. Furthermore, it shall be useful to rewrite these one-side Fourier transforms by the positive double-side Fourier transforms $\gamma(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\omega s} \langle R_I(0)R_I(-s) \rangle_r$ [31]:

$$\int_0^{\infty} ds e^{i\omega s} \langle R_I(0)R_I(-s) \rangle_r = \frac{1}{2}\gamma(\omega) + \frac{i}{2\pi}\mathcal{P} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{\gamma(\Omega)}{\omega - \Omega} d\Omega, \quad (25)$$

$$\int_0^{\infty} ds e^{i\omega s} \langle R_I(0)R_{I\mu}(-s) \rangle_r = \frac{1}{2}\gamma(\omega)e^{i\omega\mu} + \frac{i}{2\pi}\mathcal{P} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{\gamma(\Omega)}{\omega - \Omega} e^{i\Omega\mu} d\Omega, \quad (26)$$

where \mathcal{P} denotes the Cauchy principal value of the integral. After a simple arrangement, we obtain Eq. (23), where the Lamb shift term H_{LS} equals $\sum_{\omega} S^{\dagger}(\omega)S(\omega)(1/2\pi)\mathcal{P} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \gamma(\Omega)/(\omega - \Omega)d\Omega$.

-
- [1] G. Bochkov and Y. E. Kuzovlev, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz **72**, 238 (1977).
 - [2] J. Kurchan, arXiv preprint cond-mat/0007360 (2000).
 - [3] H. Tasaki, arXiv preprint cond-mat/0009244 (2000).
 - [4] S. Yukawa, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **69**, 2367 (2000).
 - [5] S. Mukamel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 170604 (2003).
 - [6] W. De Roeck and C. Maes, Phys. Rev. E **69**, 026115 (2004).
 - [7] A. E. Allahverdyan and T. M. Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 066102 (2005).
 - [8] P. Talkner, E. Lutz, and P. Hänggi, Phys. Rev. E **75**, 050102 (2007).
 - [9] W. De Roeck, C. R. Phys. **8**, 674 (2007).
 - [10] D. Andrieux and P. Gaspard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 230404 (2008).
 - [11] P. Talkner, M. Campisi, and P. Hänggi, J. Stat. Mech.: Theor. Exp. **2009**, P02025 (2009).
 - [12] M. Esposito, U. Harbola, and S. Mukamel, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1665 (2009).
 - [13] M. Campisi, P. Hänggi, and P. Talkner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 771 (2011).
 - [14] Y. Subaşı and B. L. Hu, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 011112 (2012).
 - [15] J. M. Horowitz and J. M. Parrondo, New J. Phys. **15**, 085028 (2013).
 - [16] M. Esposito and S. Mukamel, Phys. Rev. E **73**, 046129 (2006).
 - [17] G. E. Crooks, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 034101 (2008).
 - [18] J. M. Horowitz, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 031110 (2012).
 - [19] F. Liu, Phys. Rev. E **86**, 010103 (2012).
 - [20] R. Chetrite and K. Mallick, J. Stat. Phys. **148**, 480 (2012).
 - [21] F. W. J. Hekking and J. P. Pekola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 093602 (2013).
 - [22] B. Leggio, A. Napoli, A. Messina, and H.-P. Breuer, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 042111 (2013).
 - [23] F. Liu, Phys. Rev. E **89**, 042122 (2014).
 - [24] F. Liu, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 032121 (2014).
 - [25] M. Silaev, T. T. Heikkilä, and P. Virtanen, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 022103 (2014).
 - [26] S. Suomela, P. Solinas, J. P. Pekola, J. Ankerhold, and T. Ala-Nissila, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 094304 (2014).

- [27] S. Suomela, J. Salmilehto, I. G. Savenko, T. Ala-Nissila, and M. Möttönen, *Phys. Rev. E* **91**, 022126 (2015).
- [28] T. B. Batalhão, A. M. Souza, L. Mazzola, R. Auccaise, R. S. Sarthour, I. S. Oliveira, J. Goold, G. De Chiara, M. Paternostro, and R. M. Serra, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 140601 (2014).
- [29] S.-M. An, J.-N. Zhang, M. Um, D.-S. Lv, Y. Lu, J.-H. Zhang, Z.-Q. Yi, H.-T. Quan, and K. Kim, *Nat. Phys.* **11**, 193 (2015).
- [30] C. Jarzynski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2690 (1997).
- [31] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The theory of open quantum systems* (Oxford university press, 2002).
- [32] F. Liu and Z.-C. Ouyang, *Chin. Phys. B* **23**, 070512 (2014).
- [33] H. Carmichael, *An open systems approach to Quantum Optics: lectures presented at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, October 28 to November 4, 1991*, Vol. 18 (Springer, 1993).
- [34] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum measurement and control* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [35] H. H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck equation : methods of solution and applications* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1984).
- [36] K. Murch, S. Weber, C. Macklin, and I. Siddiqi, *Nature* **502**, 211 (2013).