

Spin-boson models for quantum decoherence of electronic excitations of biomolecules and quantum dots in a solvent

Joel Gilmore and Ross H. McKenzie

Department of Physics, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Qld 4072, Australia

(Dated: June 22, 2019)

Abstract

We give a theoretical treatment of the interaction of electronic excitations (excitons) in biomolecules and quantum dots with the surrounding polar solvent. Significant quantum decoherence occurs due to the interaction of the electric dipole moment of the solute with the fluctuating electric dipole moments of the individual molecules in the solvent. We introduce spin boson models which could be used to describe the effects of decoherence on the quantum dynamics of biomolecules which undergo light-induced conformational change and on biomolecules or quantum dots which are coupled by Förster resonant energy transfer.

Biomolecular systems contain a diverse range of optically active molecules that are crucial to biological function [1]. Important examples include retinal in rhodopsin which plays a role in vision, porphyrins and chlorophylls which play roles in photosynthesis [2], photoactive yellow protein, blue copper proteins, and the green fluorescent protein (GFP) [3] which has become a powerful tool in molecular and cell biology. The different chromophores couple very differently to their environment which consists of the surrounding proteins and the solvent (water or aqueous electrolytes) leading to very different quantum dynamics [4]. Related questions arise concerning the spatial extent of the quantum coherence of excitations in spatially extended structures such as α -helices and β -sheets in proteins and rings of porphyrin molecules in light harvesting complexes [5]. Thus, it is important to understand the coupling of electronic excitations in chromophores to the environment. This is not just of interest for understanding biological function, but also because these biomolecular systems could potentially be model systems to understand quantum decoherence at the nanoscale. This is because they have a complexity that cannot be fabricated even with the most advanced nanotechnology, but they can be modified and tuned using sophisticated biochemical techniques [6]. We also note that there are potential applications in biosensors with biomolecules coupling to quantum dots via resonant energy transfer [7], and with biomolecules acting as optically controllable elements in molecular electronics [8, 9] or as qubits in a quantum computer [10].

We first consider the problem of the interaction of an electronic excitation (exciton) in a biomolecule (or a quantum dot) with the surrounding polar solvent. We show that this can be described by a spin boson model where the environment is modelled as an infinite collection of harmonic oscillators with ohmic response. Spin boson models have been studied extensively in order to understand environment induced decoherence in other quantum systems [11]. In the model we derive, the strength of the coupling to the environment is determined by the frequency dependent dielectric function of the polar solvent and by the difference between the electric dipole moments of the molecule in the ground and excited states. The relaxation rate of the polar molecules within the solvent determines the cutoff frequency for the ohmic response. Leggett et al. [11] defined a dimensionless coupling constant α which determines the extent of the quantum coherence. For realistic biomolecules solvated in water this parameter will typically have values of order unity, which would prevent coherent Bloch oscillations for degenerate electronic levels. Such large values are in stark

contrast to the Josephson junction qubits for which the effect of the Johnson noise in the electronic circuit is described by a spin boson model with values of η that are typically many orders of magnitude smaller [12]. We also introduce minimal models which can describe the effect of the solvent on the quantum dynamics associated with conformational changes at conical intersections [13, 14, 15], and on excitations which are coupled via a mechanism such as Förster resonant energy transfer. The latter is important in photosynthesis [2], is the basis of FRET spectroscopy which is used to determine distances between chromophores in biomolecules [16, 17], and is the basis of new biosensors [7].

The spin-boson model has been widely used to model systems coupled to a dissipative bath [11, 18], such as the coupling between electron transfer and protein motion or a solvent [18, 19]. It describes a two level system (TLS) coupled to a bath of independent harmonic oscillators. The general spin-boson Hamiltonian is

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\sigma_z - \frac{1}{2}\Delta\sigma_x + \sum_{\alpha} \omega_{\alpha} a_{\alpha}^{\dagger} a_{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_z \sum_{\alpha} C_{\alpha}(a_{\alpha} + a_{\alpha}^{\dagger}), \quad (1)$$

where σ_z, σ_x are Pauli matrices describing the TLS, ϵ is the energy separation of the two levels, Δ is the tunneling matrix element, and the bath is modelled by boson operators $a_{\alpha}, a_{\alpha}^{\dagger}$ with frequencies ω_{α} and couplings C_{α} to the TLS. This model is particularly useful because there is only one environmental parameter that contributes to the system dynamics, which is the *spectral density* $J(\omega)$ [11, 18], defined as

$$J(\omega) = 4\pi \sum_{\alpha} C_{\alpha}^2 \delta(\omega - \omega_{\alpha}). \quad (2)$$

As long as one can approximate $J(\omega)$ by a continuous function, it can often be simply related to classical, experimentally obtainable properties of the system [11, 20]; in particular, for the case of Ohmic (linear) dissipation, $J(\omega) = \eta\omega$, where η is the classical coefficient of friction and is related to the coupling constant α by $\eta = 2\pi\hbar\alpha$.

We now show how the spin-boson model may be derived for an electronic excitation in a biomolecule or quantum dot coupled to a solvent bath. We model the exciton as a TLS with only a single active transition, with an energy gap ϵ . This is typically the HOMO-LUMO gap (Highest Occupied to Lowest Unoccupied Molecular Orbitals). The entire procedure described below can be easily repeated for all other electronic transitions. We assume the solute molecule has a permanent dipole moment in both the ground and excited state, given by $\vec{\mu}_g$ and $\vec{\mu}_e$ respectively. The electronic ground and excited states are described by

fermion creation operators c_g^\dagger and c_e^\dagger respectively, and the solute part of the total Hamiltonian operator can be written as

$$H_{TLS} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(c_e^\dagger c_e - c_g^\dagger c_g). \quad (3)$$

We describe the solvation process by the well-known Onsager model [21, 22]. The solute is treated as a point dipole which is surrounded by a spherical cage of polar solvent molecules with Onsager radius a , which is typically the size of the solute molecule [21, 22, 23]. One choice is to use a value proportional to the van der Waals radius, with the proportionality depending both on the solute and, more weakly, on the solvent [23]. The cavity is assumed to be a vacuum, i.e., it has a dielectric constant $\epsilon_r = 1$.

The central dipole polarises the cage, which in turn produces an electric field inside the cavity, called the *reaction field* $\vec{R}(t)$. As will be described below, for the case of a uniform spherical cavity the reaction field is constant everywhere inside. This field acts back on the dipole, with interaction energy $E = -\vec{\mu}(t) \cdot \vec{R}(t)$, typically lowering the total energy and hence forming a stable structure. The corresponding interaction Hamiltonian can be written

$$H_{int} = c_g^\dagger c_g \vec{\mu}_g \cdot \vec{R} + c_e^\dagger c_e \vec{\mu}_e \cdot \vec{R}. \quad (4)$$

Prior to the electronic transition, we assume the system to be in thermal equilibrium, and the reaction field will be parallel to the dipole $\vec{\mu}_g$. For simplicity, we assume that the direction of the dipole moment of the solute molecule in the ground and excited states points in the same direction.

We may rewrite these Hamiltonians by defining $\sigma_z \equiv c_e^\dagger c_e - c_g^\dagger c_g$, and identifying $c_e^\dagger c_e + c_g^\dagger c_g$ with the 2×2 identity so that

$$H_{solute} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\sigma_z \quad (5)$$

$$H_{int} = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_z(\Delta\mu)R + \frac{1}{2}(\mu_e + \mu_g)R. \quad (6)$$

where $\Delta\mu = \mu_e - \mu_g$.

For a quantum mechanical model, we must quantize the reaction field in terms of boson creation and annihilation operators. We write the time dependent (Heisenberg picture) reaction field $R(t)$ in its Fourier transform modes,

$$R(t) = \sum_{\alpha} e_{\alpha} [a_{\alpha} e^{-i\omega_{\alpha} t} + a_{\alpha}^{\dagger} e^{i\omega_{\alpha} t}], \quad (7)$$

or for the Schrödinger picture,

$$\hat{R} = \sum_{\alpha} e_{\alpha}(a_{\alpha}^{\dagger} + a_{\alpha}), \quad (8)$$

and quantise the coefficients so that a_{α} and a_{α}^{\dagger} obey the boson commutation relations

$$[a_{\alpha}, a_{\beta}^{\dagger}] = \delta_{\alpha,\beta}. \quad (9)$$

We are therefore modelling the environment (solvent) as a bath of independent harmonic oscillators, as per the spin-boson model [11, 18]. The energy stored in the solvent cage is now easily expressed as

$$H_{\text{solvent}} = \sum_{\alpha} \omega_{\alpha} a_{\alpha}^{\dagger} a_{\alpha} \quad (10)$$

and the full Hamiltonian can then be written as

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\sigma_z + \sum_{\alpha} \omega_{\alpha} a_{\alpha}^{\dagger} a_{\alpha} + \sigma_z \sum_{\alpha} M_{\alpha}(a_{\alpha}^{\dagger} + a_{\alpha}) + \sum_{\alpha} \widetilde{M}_{\alpha}(a_{\alpha}^{\dagger} + a_{\alpha}), \quad (11a)$$

where we have defined coupling constants

$$M_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2}e_{\alpha}\Delta\mu, \quad (11b)$$

$$\widetilde{M}_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2}e_{\alpha}(\mu_e + \mu_g). \quad (11c)$$

By comparing these expressions to (1), we see that the solute-solvent Hamiltonian is nearly the spin-boson model. It differs in that there is no direct tunneling (a $\Delta\sigma_x$ term) between the states. For many electronic excitations we have assumed that the energy gap ϵ (typically of order of 1eV) is significantly larger than the tunneling matrix element and we defer discussion of it until below when we consider ϵ becoming small near a conformational transition. We also have the additional term involving \widetilde{M}_{α} , proportional to the TLS identity. Leggett et al. [11] disregard this term as it is irrelevant to the Bloch oscillations associated with quantum tunneling.

To complete the model we must specify the environmental coupling, i.e., the spectral function $J(\omega)$ from (2). Following an approach similar to Caldeira and Leggett [24] who considered a Josephson junction coupled to an electronic circuit, we relate $J(\omega)$ to the zero-temperature fluctuations in the uncoupled environment. Noting that with no solute-solvent

interaction $\langle R(t) \rangle = 0$, we now examine the reaction field fluctuation correlation function $S(t)$ [25] defined as

$$S(t) = i \langle R(t)R(0) \rangle \theta(t) \equiv i \langle 0 | e^{iHt} R e^{-iHt} R | 0 \rangle \theta(t), \quad (12)$$

where $|0\rangle$ is the ground state of the solvent harmonic oscillators, and $H \equiv H_{\text{solvent}} = \sum_{\alpha} \omega_{\alpha} a_{\alpha}^{\dagger} a_{\alpha}$. We shall see that it is the imaginary part of the corresponding Fourier transform,

$$\mathcal{E}(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\omega t} S(t) \quad (13)$$

that is relevant. By inserting an identity of energy eigenstates into (12), this can be written as a sum over energy eigenstates [25] as

$$\text{Im } \mathcal{E}(\omega) = \pi \sum_n \delta(\omega - E_n) |\langle 0 | R | n \rangle|^2. \quad (14)$$

Expanding R into its normal modes again, we see that all terms $\langle 0 | R | n \rangle$ vanish except for when a single oscillator is singly occupied. These states have energy $E_n = \omega_{\alpha}$, and $\langle 0 | R | \alpha \rangle = e_{\alpha}$. Therefore, we see

$$\text{Im } \mathcal{E}(\omega) = \pi \sum_{\alpha} e_{\alpha}^2 \delta(\omega - \omega_{\alpha}), \quad (15)$$

which is directly related to $J(\omega)$ by (2) and (11b):

$$J(\omega) = (\Delta\mu)^2 \text{Im } \mathcal{E}(\omega). \quad (16)$$

We must still, however, calculate the fluctuations in the reaction field. In the Onsager model [21, 26], the reaction field $R(t)$ and the central dipole $\mu(t)$ are related by a linear response function $\chi(t - t')$

$$\vec{R}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt' \chi(t - t') \vec{\mu}(t'). \quad (17)$$

In general $\chi(t)$ is a tensor, but reduces to a scalar function for a spherically symmetrical cavity. It satisfies the causality requirement $\chi(t < 0) = 0$. The static limit, where the solvent cage adjusts instantaneously to changes in the dipole so that $R(t) = \chi_s \mu(t)$, is well known [21, 27] and the static susceptibility is given by

$$\chi_s = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0 a^3} \frac{2(\epsilon_s - 1)}{2\epsilon_s + 1}, \quad (18)$$

where ϵ_s is the (relative) static dielectric constant of the solvent. In reality, the solvent cage will lag behind a changing dipole due to dielectric friction [28, 29], resulting in the generalised Langevin equation (17) [30]. However, Fourier transforming (17),

$$\vec{R}(\omega) = \chi(\omega)\vec{\mu}(\omega), \quad (19)$$

yields the same equations as the static case [26], and we obtain the frequency dependent response function

$$\chi(\omega) = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0 a^3} \frac{2(\epsilon(\omega) - 1)}{2\epsilon(\omega) + 1}. \quad (20)$$

We use the Debye formula [20, 31] to describe the frequency dependent dielectric constant of the solvent

$$\epsilon(\omega) = \epsilon_\infty + \frac{\epsilon_s - \epsilon_\infty}{1 - i\omega\tau_D}. \quad (21)$$

ϵ_∞ and ϵ_s are the high and low (static) frequency limits respectively, and τ_D is the Debye relaxation time, the bulk reorientational relaxation time of the solvent dipoles [32, 33]. For water, these are given by $\epsilon_s = 78.3$, $\epsilon_\infty = 4.21$ and $\tau_D = 8.2\text{ps}$ [34].

We can make use of the quantum fluctuation-dissipation relation [30, 35] to relate the susceptibility $\chi(\omega)$ to the fluctuations in the reaction field

$$\chi''(\omega) = -\frac{i}{2} (1 - e^{-\beta\hbar\omega}) \mathcal{E}(\omega). \quad (22)$$

This reduces at zero temperature to

$$\mathcal{E}(\omega) = 2i\chi''(\omega). \quad (23)$$

Note that this limit is well defined, even for $\omega = 0$. Using (21),

$$\text{Im } \mathcal{E}(\omega) = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0 a^3} \frac{6\hbar(\epsilon_s - \epsilon_\infty)}{(2\epsilon_s + 1)(2\epsilon_\infty + 1)} \frac{\omega\tau_E}{\omega^2\tau_E^2 + 1}, \quad (24)$$

where $\tau_E = \frac{2\epsilon_\infty + 1}{2\epsilon_s + 1}\tau_D$. Finally, from (16), the spectral density is

$$J(\omega) = \frac{(\Delta\mu)^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 a^3} \frac{6(\epsilon_s - \epsilon_\infty)}{(2\epsilon_s + 1)(2\epsilon_\infty + 1)} \frac{\omega\tau_E}{\omega^2\tau_E^2 + 1}. \quad (25)$$

This form for $J(\omega)$, which has a specific microscopic basis, could be used as an input into more phenomenological models such as the quantum Brownian model [36]. In specific situations the magnitude of the $J(\omega)$ introduced here should also be compared to the $J(\omega)$ due to slow protein motion, as introduced in [19].

We have thus shown that solute-solvent interaction in the Onsager picture can be modeled by a spin-boson model with spectral density (25). We note that $J(\omega)$ has an implicit high frequency cut-off at $\omega_c = \frac{1}{\tau_E}$, related to the finite relaxation time of the solvent dipoles. Below this cut-off, $J(\omega)$ is approximately linear in ω :

$$J(\omega) = \eta\omega, \quad \omega < \omega_c, \quad (26a)$$

where

$$\eta = \frac{(\Delta\mu)^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 a^3} \frac{6(\epsilon_s - \epsilon_\infty)}{(2\epsilon_s + 1)^2} \tau_D. \quad (26b)$$

Thus, our model falls into the class of models defined in Ref. [11] which below some high frequency cutoff have Ohmic dissipation. η should correspond to the classical frictional coefficient. Indeed, η is identical to the Nee-Zwanzig prediction of dielectric friction [28, 29, 37].

We can also use this model to derive an expression for the absorption lineshape $\sigma(\omega)$ of the solute molecule in the presence of the solvent. In the gas phase, i.e., without the solvent, we would expect a sharp peak in the absorption spectrum at $\omega = \epsilon$. In the presence of the solvent, however, this peak is shifted and broadened [22, 38, 39] by the solute-solvent dipole-dipole interactions.

We use the results obtained for the *independent boson model* [40]. The resulting spectrum is

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\omega) &= \frac{A}{\omega} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \exp \left\{ it \left[\omega - \epsilon + \tilde{\Delta} - g(t) \right] \right\}, \\ g(t) &= 4 \sum_{\alpha} \frac{M_{\alpha}^2}{\omega_{\alpha}^2} [(N_{\alpha} + 1) (1 - e^{i\omega_{\alpha}t}) + N_{\alpha} (1 - e^{-i\omega_{\alpha}t})], \\ \tilde{\Delta} &= 4 \sum_{\alpha} \frac{M_{\alpha} \tilde{M}_{\alpha}}{\omega_{\alpha}}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

A is a normalisation factor (which we are not concerned with), and N_{α} are the harmonic oscillator occupations, given by the Bose-Einstein distribution $N_{\alpha} = (e^{\omega_{\alpha}/k_B T} - 1)^{-1}$. $g(t)$ is the factor responsible for broadening the lineshape [36]. We can express it in a simpler form [11, 36] by using the definition of the spectral density (2) and rewriting $g(t)$ as

$$g(t) = \int d\omega \frac{J(\omega)}{\pi\omega^2} \left[\coth \left(\frac{\beta\omega}{2} \right) (1 - \cos(\omega t)) + i \sin(\omega t) \right]. \quad (28)$$

Since $J(\omega) \cong 0$ for $\omega \gg \omega_c$, we can restrict the integral to $\omega < \omega_c$, and note that for water at room temperature (300K, $\tau_D \approx 8$ ps [34]) $\beta\omega < \beta\omega_c \ll 1$. We also make the short-time

approximation [36] and Taylor approximate the trigonometric functions to give

$$g(t) = \frac{1}{2}k_B T \lambda_0 t^2 + \frac{i}{2} \lambda_0 t, \quad (29)$$

where we have defined the reorganisation energy

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{2}{\pi} \int \frac{J(\omega)}{\omega} d\omega. \quad (30)$$

We note also that because $\widetilde{M}_\alpha = \frac{\mu_e + \mu_g}{\Delta\mu}$, we can also express $\widetilde{\Delta}$ in terms of $J(\omega)$,

$$\widetilde{\Delta} = \frac{\mu_e + \mu_g}{\pi(\Delta\mu)} \int \frac{J(\omega)}{\omega} d\omega = \frac{\mu_e + \mu_g}{2(\Delta\mu)} \lambda_0. \quad (31)$$

Performing the resulting Gaussian integral, we obtain the absorption spectrum

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{A}{\omega \sqrt{k_B T \lambda_0}} \exp \left\{ - \left[\frac{\omega - (\epsilon - (\mu_g/\Delta\mu)\lambda_0)}{\sqrt{2k_B T \lambda_0}} \right]^2 \right\}, \quad (32)$$

where we have renormalised A to simplify the expression and

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{(\Delta\mu)^2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 a^3} \frac{6(\epsilon_s - \epsilon_\infty)}{(2\epsilon_s + 1)(2\epsilon_\infty + 1)}. \quad (33)$$

If we set $\epsilon_\infty = 1$ then the resulting lineshape is precisely that of [22], where the absorption spectrum was obtained classically by assuming a Boltzmann distribution of the environment. Thus, our quantum model gives the correct classical limit.

This model of solvent interactions can be extended to other situations. A number of important photochemical reactions in biomolecules involve a conformational change that initiates a signal. Examples include the *cis/trans* isomerisation of retinal [14] and the photoactive yellow protein (PYP) [41]. The former drives the proton pumping (in rhodopsin) against an external pH gradient that leads to the signal responsible for vision. The latter causes a conformational transition of the surrounding PYP protein. Only recently has it been shown [14, 42] that these isomerisations occur through a ‘‘conical intersection’’ [13], between the potential energy surfaces of the ground and excited states. A minimal model for this requires two nuclear co-ordinates (degrees of freedom) [42]. Hahn and Stock [15] recently studied such a minimal model for retinal in rhodopsin but did not include the effect of the solvent. If we include the interaction with the solvent, a minimal Hamiltonian is the following generalisation of (11)

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon \sigma_z + \Delta \sigma_x + \sigma_z \sum_\alpha M_\alpha (a_\alpha^\dagger + a_\alpha) + \sum_\alpha \omega_\alpha a_\alpha^\dagger a_\alpha + \omega_a a^\dagger a + \omega_b b^\dagger b + g_a \sigma_z (a + a^\dagger) + g_b \sigma_x (b + b^\dagger) \quad (34)$$




FIG. 1: Schematic representation of Förster resonant energy transfer [2] between molecule a and molecule b

where a^\dagger and b^\dagger are creation operators for the vibrations for the two degrees of freedom associated with the conical intersection. Δ is the matrix element responsible for the non-adiabatic mixing of the ground and excited states. Note that at the conical intersection, because the two electronic states become degenerate the effects of the solvent will be most pronounced.

What can we say about decoherence near the conical intersection? In the case of Ohmic dissipation, we can define a dimensionless coupling $\alpha = \eta/2\pi\hbar$. For the spin-boson model (1), if $\alpha > 1$ and $\epsilon = 0$ there will always be incoherent relaxation [11], even if the tunneling matrix element Δ becomes large. We can make an estimate for α in water, using the constants given earlier which completely describe the solvent. The two solute unknowns are the cavity size and change in dipole moment. If we measure these in angstroms and Debye respectively ($1D = 3.3 \times 10^{-30} C \cdot m$) then

$$\alpha = 22 \frac{(\Delta\mu)^2}{a^3}. \quad (35)$$

For a typical organic molecule of size between $2.5 - 8\text{\AA}$, a dipole moment change of between just $1 - 5D$ is sufficient to make $\alpha > 1$, and this condition seems likely to be met for most small molecules [43, Ch. 6]. The solvent is therefore a large potential source of decoherence which destroys any quantum coherent oscillations of the electronic excitation.

Another important process in biomolecules is coherent transfer of excitons. An example is Förster resonance energy transfer (FRET). This occurs in photosynthesis [2] and is the basis of FRET spectroscopy [16, 17] and a proposal for quantum computing based on biomolecules [10]. This is depicted schematically in Figure 1. If a and b denote the two molecules, the corresponding operator is

$$c_{2a}^\dagger c_{1a}^\dagger c_{2b}^\dagger c_{1b}^\dagger \equiv 4\sigma_a^- \sigma_b^+. \quad (36)$$

where $\sigma^\pm = \sigma_x \pm i\sigma_y$.

Thus, we need to add a term in the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}
H_0 &= \frac{J_{ab}}{2} (\sigma_a^+ \sigma_b^- + \sigma_a^- \sigma_b^+) \\
&= J_{ab} (\sigma_x^a \sigma_x^b + \sigma_y^a \sigma_y^b).
\end{aligned}
\tag{37}$$

What about the effect of the solvent? We assume that the molecules are sufficiently far apart that the reaction fields acting on the two biomolecules are uncorrelated. This assumption can be tested by looking at $\epsilon(\omega, \vec{q})$. The wavevector dependence will be weak. We anticipate that the corresponding length scale is of the order of the separation of the polar molecules in the solvent which in turn is much larger than the separation of the biomolecules. Thus, we model the reaction fields by two independent collections of harmonic oscillators. The relevant Hamiltonian is then

$$\begin{aligned}
H &= \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_a \sigma_a^z + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_b \sigma_b^z + J_{ab} (\sigma_a^x \sigma_b^x + \sigma_a^y \sigma_b^y) + \\
&\quad \sum_{\alpha} \omega_{\alpha} a_{\alpha}^{\dagger} a_{\alpha} + \sum_{\beta} \omega_{\beta} b_{\beta}^{\dagger} b_{\beta} + \\
&\quad \sigma_a^z \sum_{\alpha} g_{\alpha} (a_{\alpha} + a_{\alpha}^{\dagger}) + \sigma_b^z \sum_{\beta} \tilde{g}_{\beta} (b_{\beta} + b_{\beta}^{\dagger}),
\end{aligned}
\tag{38}$$

and $J(\omega)$, $\tilde{J}(\omega)$ are as before. In the Ohmic regime, this will have similarities to two Kondo impurities coupled by an XX interaction and in an external magnetic field [40]. The above Hamiltonian has a natural generalisation to many coupled biomolecules, such as the rings of chlorophyll molecules in a photoharvesting light complex in purple bacteria [2] or in a segment of double stranded DNA. It will allow calculation of the localisation (the extent of spatial) of excitons in such extended systems.

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council. We thank P.C.W. Davies, B.L. Hu, T. Martinez, P. Meredith, G.J. Milburn and K. Schulten for helpful discussions.

-
- [1] V. Helms, *Curr. Opinion Struct. Bio.* **12**, 169 (2002).
 - [2] X. Hu and K. Schulten, *Physics Today* **50**, 28 (1997).
 - [3] K. Sullivan and S. Kay, eds., *Green Fluorescent Proteins* (Academic Press, San Diego, 1999).
 - [4] For example, retinal undergoes non-radiative decay to a specific conformational change within 200 fs. In contrast, the excited state of GFP has a lifetime that is more than four orders of magnitude longer and undergoes radiative decay with a very high quantum efficiency.

- [5] A. Damjanovic, I. Kosztin, U. Kleinekathfer, and K. Schulten, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 031919 (2002).
- [6] C. Niemeyer, *Curr. Opin. Struct. Bio.* **4**, 609 (2000).
- [7] I. Medintz, A. Clapp, H. Mattoussi, E. Goldman, B. Fisher, and J. Mauro, *Nature Materials* **2**, 630 (2003).
- [8] R. R. Birge, N. B. Gillespie, E. W. Izaguirre, A. F. L. A. Kusnetzow, D. Singh, Q. W. Song, E. Schmidt, J. A. Stuart, S. Seetharaman, and K. J. Wise, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **103**, 10746 (1999).
- [9] R. A. G. Cinelli, V. Pellegrini, A. Ferrari, P. Faraci, R. Nifos, M. Tyagi, M. Giacca, and F. Beltram, *Applied Physics Letters* **79**, 3353 (2001).
- [10] B. W. Lovett, J. Reina, A. Nazir, and G. Briggs, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 205319 (2003).
- [11] A. Leggett, S. Chakravarty, A. Dorsey, M. Fisher, A. Garg, and W. Zwerger, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **59**, 1 (1987).
- [12] Y. Makhlin, G. Schön, and A. Shnirman, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 357 (2001).
- [13] D. Yarkony, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 9851013 (1996).
- [14] F. Molnar, M. Ben-Nun, T. Martinez, and K. Schulten, *J. Mol. Struct. (THEOCHEM)* **506**, 169 (2000).
- [15] S. Hahn and G. Stock, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **104**, 1146 (2000).
- [16] P. Wu and L. Brand, *Analytical Biochemistry* **218**, 1 (1994).
- [17] T. Ha, *Curr. Opin. Struct. Bio.* **11**, 287 (2001).
- [18] U. Weiss, *Quantum dissipative systems* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1999), 2nd ed.
- [19] D. Xu and K. Schulten, *Chem. Phys* **182**, 91 (1994).
- [20] X. Song and R. Marcus, *J. Chem. Phys.* **99**, 7768 (1993).
- [21] L. Onsager, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **58**, 1486 (1936).
- [22] N. A. Nemkovich, A. Rubinov, and V. I. Tomin, in *Topics in fluorescence spectroscopy*, edited by J. Lakowicz (Plenum Press, New York, 1991), vol. 2, chap. 8, pp. 367–425.
- [23] J. Tomasi and M. Persico, *Chem. Rev.* **94**, 2027 (1994).
- [24] A. Caldeira and A. Leggett, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **149**, 374 (1983).
- [25] G. Rickayzen, *Green's functions and condensed matter* (Academic Press, London, 1980).
- [26] C. Hsu, H. Song, and R. Marcus, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **101**, 2546 (1997).
- [27] C. Bottcher, *Theory of electric polarization*, vol. v.1 (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1973).
- [28] T. W. Nee and R. Zwanzig, *J. Chem. Phys.* **42**, 6353 (1970).

- [29] M. Maroncelli, J. Chem. Phys. **106**, 1545 (1997).
- [30] R. Kubo, Rep. Prog. Phys **29**, 255 (1966).
- [31] Note that the sign of the Fourier transform variable used in [26] is opposite to ours (e.g., equation (13)), so we have inverted the sign of ω in (21); otherwise, an incorrect negative sign is introduced.
- [32] J. T. Kindt and C. A. Schmuttenmaer, J. Phys. Chem. **100**, 10373 (1996).
- [33] J. Barthel and R. Buchner, Pure Appl. Chem. **63**, 1473 (1991).
- [34] M. N. Afsar and J. B. Hasted, Infrared Phys. **18**, 835 (1978).
- [35] P. Chaikin and T. Lubensky, *Principles of condensed matter physics* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- [36] S. Mukamel, *Principles of Nonlinear Optical Spectroscopy* (Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford, 1995).
- [37] A. Papazyan and M. Maroncelli, J. Chem. Phys **102**, 2888 (1995).
- [38] N. Bayliss and E. McRae, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **58**, 1002 (1954).
- [39] A. B. Myers, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **49**, 267 (1998).
- [40] G. D. Mahan, *Many-Particle Physics* (Plenum Press, New York and London, 1990), 2nd ed.
- [41] M. Yoda, H. Houjou, Y. Inoue, and M. Sakurai, J. Phys. Chem. B **105**, 9887 (2001).
- [42] M. Ben-Nun, F. Molnar, K. Schulten, and T. J. Martinez, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. (USA) **99**, 1769 (2002).
- [43] C. Reichardt, *Solvents and solvent effects in organic chemistry* (VCH, 1988), 2nd ed.