

Zeno is pro Darwin: Quantum Zeno Effect Suppresses the Dependence of Radical-Ion-Pair Reaction Yields on Exchange and Dipolar Interactions

I. K. Kominis

*Department of Physics, University of Crete, Heraklion 71103, Greece and
Institute of Electronic Structure and Laser, Foundation for Research and Technology, Heraklion 71110, Greece*
(Dated: January 23, 2019)

A biochemical quantum sensor of magnetic fields, namely magnetic-sensitive radical-ion-pair reactions, is understood to underlie avian magnetic navigation. It has been recently postulated [O. Efimova and P. J. Hore, *Biophys. J.* **94**, 1565 (2008)] that a fine-tuned cancelation of exchange and dipolar interactions is necessary for this magnetic sensor to function at earth's field. We here show that if the basic parameters of the radical-ion-pair are such that the quantum Zeno effect is manifested, the dependence of the magnetic-sensitive reaction yields on molecule-specific exchange and dipolar interactions is almost entirely suppressed. A fundamental quantum effect is thus shown to provide for the robustness of this biochemical sensor.

PACS numbers:

Significant experimental [1] and theoretical [2] progress has been made on identifying biological processes exhibiting non-trivial quantum effects, ordinarily thought to be suppressed in the decoherence-prone biological environment [3]. Radical-ion pairs, in particular, have been recently shown [4] to exhibit the full machinery of effects familiar from quantum information science. Radical-ion pairs play a fundamental role in a series of biologically relevant chemical reactions, ranging from charge transfer initiated reactions in photosynthetic reaction centers [5] to magnetic sensitive reactions abounding in the field of spin-chemistry [6], and in particular in the biochemical mechanism understood to underlie the biological magnetic compass used by avian species to navigate in earth's magnetic field [7, 8]. In Fig. 1 we depict a generic model for radical-ion-pair reactions, which essentially form a magnetic sensor since the reaction product yields depend on the external magnetic field. Moreover, anisotropic hyperfine interactions within the radical-ion-pair render the reaction yields dependent on the inclination of the external magnetic field with respect to a molecule-fixed coordinate frame. The avian magnetoreception mechanism exactly rests on both aforementioned aspects, the magnetic sensitivity and the angular sensitivity of the radical-ion-pair reaction yields. Interestingly, intra-molecule magnetic interactions are more complicated. Both spin-exchange and long-range dipolar interactions affect reaction dynamics, to an extent dependent on the particular molecular structure. In this respect, it has been recently shown [9] that the presence of exchange and dipolar interactions significantly suppresses the magnetic and angular sensitivity of the reaction yields, thus severely degrading the mechanism's functionality. Along the same lines, it was concluded [9] that only when the molecular parameters are such that the effects of these two interactions cancel each other is the magnetic and angular sensitivity of the reaction restored. Although a remarkable result, it is hard to




FIG. 1: Radical-ion-pair reaction dynamics: Photoexcitation of a donor-acceptor molecule DA followed by charge-transfer creates a radical-ion-pair, i.e. two molecular ions and two unpaired electrons (two dots), usually considered to start out in the singlet spin state $(D^+A^-)^S$. The Zeeman interaction of the two unpaired electrons with the external magnetic field and hyperfine interactions with the molecule's magnetic nuclei bring about a coherent singlet-triplet conversion, while charge recombination into singlet and triplet products, with respective rates k_S and k_T , removes molecular population from the radical-ion-pair space into the neutral chemical products space.

imagine that Nature has conjured up such a fortuitous cancelation for a functionally important biological sensor.

As it turns out, however, a large body of the qualitative and quantitative understanding of radical-ion-pair reactions that has emerged during the last few decades was based on a phenomenological description of the reaction dynamics (reviewed in [10]). It was recently shown [4] that the fundamental quantum dynamic description of radical-ion-pair recombination reactions following from quantum measurement theory reveals the actual existence of non-trivial quantum effects, such as the quantum Zeno effect [11]. We will here show that when the quantum Zeno effect is manifested, the dependence of the reaction's magnetic and angular sensitivity on exchange and dipolar interactions is almost entirely suppressed. This realization has profound implications for the robustness of this biological sensor, i.e. a non-trivial quantum effect renders the sensor insensitive to molecule-specific parameters, such as donor-acceptor distance (affecting

the exchange coupling and the long-range dipolar coupling) and the inter-radical medium and the particular electronic structure (affecting the exchange coupling) [9].

The quantum dynamic evolution of the radical-ion-pair spin density matrix ρ is given by the equations [4]

$$d\rho/dt = -i[\mathcal{H}, \rho] - (k_S + k_T)(Q_S\rho + \rho Q_S - 2Q_S\rho Q_S) \quad (1)$$

$$p_S = 2k_S\langle Q_S \rangle dt, \quad p_T = 2k_T\langle Q_T \rangle dt, \quad (2)$$

where Q_S and Q_T are the singlet and triplet state projection operators, respectively. The first term in (1) is the unitary evolution due to the magnetic interactions, whereas the second term describes the measurement-induced evolution due to the singlet (rate k_S) and triplet (rate k_T) recombination channel. The master equation (1) directly embodies the fact that the charge-recombination process itself is a continuous quantum measurement of the radical-ion-pair's spin state, and due to the completeness relation $Q_S + Q_T = 1$, both channels effectively "measure" the observable Q_S with a total measurement rate $k = k_S + k_T$. The unconditional evolution described by (1) is interrupted by charge-recombining quantum jumps [12] described by equations (2) which give the probability of the singlet and triplet recombination taking place within the time interval between t and $t + dt$. The phenomenological theory used until now and based on

$$d\rho/dt = -i[\mathcal{H}, \rho] - k_S(Q_S\rho + \rho Q_S) - k_T(Q_T\rho + \rho Q_T) \quad (3)$$

agrees *qualitatively* with the quantum measurement description of (1) and (2) in the regime of low recombination rates $k_S, k_T \ll h$, where h is the typical frequency scale of \mathcal{H} , the magnetic Hamiltonian. However, if the recombination rates are asymmetric, e.g. $k_T \gg k_S$ and the pair starts out in the singlet state, the quantum Zeno effect surfaces, leading to a physical behavior in stark contrast with the predictions of the phenomenological master equation (3) used so far. In fact, such was the case with recent experimental data [13] that have been explained with the new theory [4].

The magnetic Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_Z + \mathcal{H}_{\text{hf}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{ex}}$ is composed of \mathcal{H}_Z , the Zeeman interaction of the two unpaired electrons (nuclear Zeeman interaction is negligible) with the external magnetic field, \mathcal{H}_{hf} , the hyperfine couplings of the electrons with the surrounding nuclear spins, and finally the spin-exchange interaction, \mathcal{H}_{ex} . For the transparency of the following discussion we will ignore the dipolar interaction as its inclusion leads to exactly the same conclusions. The Zeeman interaction Hamiltonian that will be used for the study of the magnetic sensitivity is $\mathcal{H}_{Z, \text{magn}} = \omega(s_{1z} + s_{2z})$, where the magnetic field of magnitude B is assumed to be in the z-axis ($\omega = \gamma B$, with $\gamma = 1.4 \text{ MHz/G}$). For the study of the angular sensitivity we take the magnetic field, again of magnitude B ,




FIG. 2: Triplet yield as a function of the external magnetic field. For all calculations the hyperfine coupling is $a = 5 \text{ G}$, while the recombination rates are shown in the plots. We plot the magnetic sensitivity of the reaction yield for three values of the exchange coupling $J = 0, 5, 10 \text{ G}$ at (A) the "traditional" regime of small k_S and k_T and (B) the quantum Zeno regime $k_T \gg k_S$. It is seen that in (A) the magnetic sensitivity (slope) at earth's field of 0.5 G drops dramatically from $7.1\%/G$ to $2.9\%/G$ to 0.3% (25 times drop) when turning on the exchange interaction, whereas in the quantum Zeno regime (B) the change is minimal, from $3.0\%/G$ to $1.5\%/G$ when $J = 10 \text{ G}$. The corresponding magnetic precision δB is explained in the text. The predictions of the phenomenological theory (3) are in quantitative disagreement (500%) with our calculations in case (A) with the corresponding slopes resulting from (3) being $1.6\%/G$, $0.6\%/G$ and $0.05\%/G$. In case (B) the disagreement (increasing with J) is qualitative and quantitative, since the slopes for $J = 0, 5$ and 10 G resulting from (3) are $1.4\%/G$, $1.3\%/G$ and $0.18\%/G$ respectively, that is, a discrepancy up to 800% from the actual values. Hence the actual and significant magnetic sensitivity in the quantum Zeno regime was never an option according to the previous theory.

to be in the x-y plane, hence the Zeeman interaction term will be $\mathcal{H}_{Z, \text{ang}} = \omega \cos \phi (s_{1x} + s_{2x}) + \omega \sin \phi (s_{1y} + s_{2y})$. All the calculations to be presented in the following concern the simplest physically realizable radical-ion-pair containing just one spin-1/2 nucleus (in which case $\dim(\rho) = 8$), hence the hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian is $\mathcal{H}_{\text{hf}} = \mathbf{s}_1 \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{I}$, where \mathbf{A} is the hyperfine coupling tensor of the single nuclear spin \mathbf{I} existing in e.g. the donor molecule with the donor's unpaired electron. We

will consider the simplest case where the hyperfine tensor is diagonal with one non-zero component $A_{xx} = a$, to provide for the angular sensitivity on the x-y plane. Thus $\mathcal{H}_{hf} = as_{1x}I_x$. Finally the spin-exchange Hamiltonian is $\mathcal{H}_{se} = Js_1 \cdot s_2$.

In the following we will calculate the magnetic and angular sensitivity of the reaction for two regimes: (A) the "traditional" regime where both recombination rates k_S and k_T are equal and small compared to the magnetic frequency scale h (set by a and ω), i.e. $k_S, k_T \ll \omega, a$. It is in this regime that most of the previous calculations have been performed based on the phenomenological theory (3). We then study the regime (B) where $k_T \gg k_S$ and $k_T \sim \omega$, i.e. when the quantum Zeno effect is manifested, since the total measurement rate $k = k_S + k_T$ is dominated by the triplet recombination channel, strongly reprojecting the spin state in the singlet state, from which it starts out (i.e. the initial condition is $\rho_0 = Q_S/2$, satisfying $\text{Tr}\{\rho_0\} = 1$ and $\langle Q_S \rangle_0 = \text{Tr}\{Q_S \rho_0\} = 1$). In this regime the phenomenological theory (3) fails to predict the actual and significant magnetic sensitivity of the reaction. We will show that in the regime (A) the inclusion of the spin exchange interaction indeed degrades the magnetic and angular sensitivity of the reaction, as has been analyzed in [9]. However, regime (B) exhibits a significant magnetic and angular sensitivity with their dependence on the exchange coupling J being almost entirely suppressed.

In Figs. 2 and 3 we plot the triplet yield Y_T of the reaction as a function of the external magnetic field (using $\mathcal{H}_{Z,\text{magn}}$) and the field's angle (using $\mathcal{H}_{Z,\text{ang}}$), respectively, as calculated from (1) and (2). The triplet yield is calculated from

$$Y_T[\%] = (100/N_0) \sum_j p_T N_j, \quad (4)$$

where N_0 the initial number of radical-ion pairs (starting out in the singlet state) and N_j the remaining number of radical-ion pairs at time jdt (with $j = 1, 2, \dots$), evolving as $N_j = N_{j-1}(1 - p_S - p_T)$ [4]. That is, in the j -th time interval between $(j-1)dt$ and jdt , the number of created triplet products will be the number of radical-ion-pairs existing up to that time, N_{j-1} , times the probability p_T for triplet-channel recombination calculated from (2). This is summed in (4) for all time intervals until all molecules have recombined one way or another. The magnetic sensitivity of the reaction at earth's field of interest for the avian compass is just the slope dY_T/dB calculated at $B = 0.5$ G. The smallest measurable change of the magnetic field (magnetic precision), δB , and the precision $\delta\phi$ of the determination of the magnetic field angle with respect to the molecule's x-axis both follow from the previous calculations if the smallest measurable reaction yield change, δY_T , is known. It thus follows that

$$\delta B = \delta Y_T / (dY_T/dB)_{B=0.5 \text{ G}}, \quad (5)$$




FIG. 3: Angular sensitivity of the triplet yield. For all calculations the hyperfine coupling is $a = 5$ G, the magnetic field magnitude was $B = 0.5$ G, while the recombination rates are shown in the plots. We plot the angular sensitivity of the reaction yield for three values of the exchange coupling $J = 0, 5, 10$ G at (A) the "traditional" regime of small k_S and k_T and (B) the quantum Zeno regime $k_T \gg k_S$. It is seen that in the traditional regime the angular sensitivity drops dramatically from 20% to 1% to 0.1% by turning on the exchange interaction up to $J = 10$ G, whereas in the quantum Zeno regime the change with J is minimal, from 1.3% to 1.0% to 0.5% for the highest J . The corresponding angular precision $\delta\phi$ is explained in the text.

$$\delta\phi = \Delta\phi[(Y_{T,\text{max}} - Y_{T,\text{min}})/\delta Y_T]^{-1} \quad (6)$$

where $Y_{T,\text{max}}$ and $Y_{T,\text{min}}$ are the maximum and minimum values of the yield $Y_T(\phi)$ and $\Delta\phi = 180^\circ$ is the angular width of the full swing between $Y_{T,\text{min}}$ and $Y_{T,\text{max}}$. On general thermodynamic grounds it has been shown [14] that in realistic biological/biochemical realizations, the yield change precision is $\delta Y_T \approx 0.1\%$, leading to the following conclusions: it is clearly seen (Fig. 2a) that in the regime (A) the magnetic precision plunges from $\delta B = 0.01$ G at $J = 0$ to $\delta B = 0.3$ G (at which the earth's field change is unmeasurable) at $J = 10$ G, whereas in regime (B) shown in Fig. 2b the magnetic precision is roughly constant and drops only to $\delta B = 0.06$ G at the highest value of the exchange coupling. Similarly, the angular precision in the traditional low-k regime (Fig. 3a) drops dramatically (at the highest J) to $\delta\phi = 180^\circ$, which basically means there is no heading information. In con-

trast, in the quantum Zeno regime (Fig.3b) the angular precision of about $\delta\phi \approx 20^\circ$ is actually at the level of experimental observations of the heading error of the avian compass [15], and at the same time practically unaffected by the presence or not of exchange and dipolar interactions, varying between $\delta\phi = 14^\circ$ and $\delta\phi = 36^\circ$ in the full span of the exchange coupling J . In other words, in the regime of small recombination rates and in the unrealistic absence of exchange and dipolar interactions, the angular precision of the reaction is outstanding, but extremely sensitive on the deleterious and expected presence of these interactions, necessitating their fine-tuned mutual cancelation. On the other hand, the quantum Zeno regime offers a moderate but robust angular precision. Whether Nature has engineered molecules realizing the cancelation of the adverse effects of exchange and dipolar interactions as suggested in [9], or on the other hand, has chosen to operate the avian compass in the quantum Zeno regime, leading to a robust performance, remains to be discovered.

We will now explain the independence of the reaction's magnetic and angular sensitivity on the exchange interaction in the quantum Zeno regime. This follows by considering the behavior of the eigenvalues of the master equation (1), compactly written as $d\rho/dt = \mathcal{L}(\rho)$, which are obtained by diagonalizing the matrix M (of dimension $\dim(\rho)^2$) that satisfies $d\tilde{\rho}/dt = \mathcal{L}(\rho) = M\tilde{\rho}$, where $\tilde{\rho}$ is a column matrix containing all matrix elements of ρ . The resulting eigenvalues are of the form $-\lambda + i\Omega$, with $\lambda \geq 0$ being the decay rate and Ω the oscillation frequency of the particular eigenmode. As is in general the case with the quantum Zeno effect [16], some of the eigenvalues have decay rates increasing with the measurement rate $k = k_S + k_T$ as $\lambda \sim k$, while the others (responsible for the quantum Zeno effect) decrease with k as $\lambda \sim h^2/k$, where h is the characteristic frequency scale of the system here determined by the magnetic Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} . Now, the exchange Hamiltonian can be written (up to an additive constant) as $\mathcal{H}_{se} = -JQ_S$. Furthermore, as is known from quantum measurement theory [17], the deterministic evolution of the system's quantum state (due to the unitary Hamiltonian evolution and the measurement of Q_S with rate k) is generated by the non-hermitian operator $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H} - ikQ_S$. It is easily seen that if \mathcal{H}' is the magnetic Hamiltonian without the exchange interaction \mathcal{H}_{se} , then $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H}' - i(k - iJ)Q_S$, i.e. the inclusion of the exchange interaction is equivalent to replacing k with with an imaginary measurement rate $k - iJ$. We can now complete the argument as follows: the eigenvalues with a real part that scales as $\lambda \sim k$ pick up an oscillation frequency (in addition to Ω) of $-J$, the effect of which roughly averages out. On the other hand, the eigenvalues with the quantum Zeno scaling $\lambda \sim h^2/k$ suffer a change in their real part which becomes (since in our case $k/J \ll 1$) $\lambda' \approx h^2(k/J^2) \ll \lambda$. Thus the evolution is slowed down, the radical-ion-pair is projected

stronger in the singlet state leading to an increased singlet yield, or equivalently a decreased triplet yield. This is what is observed in Figs. 2 and 3. The dependence on the magnetic field ω , however, encoded in h^2 , is the same, hence the magnetic and angular sensitivity is not affected. In contrast, in the traditional low-k regime, the magnetic field effect is mostly determined [6, 8] by the amplitudes (weights) of the master equation's eigenmodes, which are heavily affected by the presence of the exchange interaction.

In conclusion, we have identified a concrete biological system in which fundamental quantum effects have a profound effect on the system's performance, alluding to the possibility that this biological quantum sensor has evolved to a robust device by taking advantage of non-trivial aspects of quantum physics.

-
- [1] G. S. Engel *et al.*, Nature **446**, 782 (2007); H. Lee, Y. C. Cheng and G. R. Fleming, Science **316**, 1462 (2007).
 - [2] M. Mohseni, P. Rebentrost, S. Lloyd and A. Aspuru-Guzik, J. Chem. Phys. **129**, 174106 (2008); M.B. Plenio and S.F. Huelga, New. J. Phys. **10**, 113019 (2008).
 - [3] P. C. W. Davies, Biosystems **78**, 69 (2004); D. Abbott *et al.*, Fluctuations and Noise Letters **8**, C5 (2008).
 - [4] I. K. Kominis, arXiv:0806.0739.
 - [5] S. G. Boxer, C. E. D. Chidsey and M. G. Roelofs, Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem. **34**, 389 (1983).
 - [6] C. R. Timmel, U. Till, B. Brocklehurst, K. A. McLauchlan and P. J. Hore, Molec. Phys. **95**, 71 (1998); C. R. Timmel, F. Cintolesi, B. Brocklehurst and P. J. Hore, Chem. Phys. Lett. **334**, 387 (2001); C. R. Timmel and K. B. Henbest, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A **362**, 2573 (2004);
 - [7] K. Schulten, Adv. Solid State Phys. **22**, 61 (1982).
 - [8] T. Ritz, S. Adem and K. Schulten, Biophys. J. **78**, 707 (2000); T. Ritz, P. Thalau, J. B. Phillips, R. Wiltchko and W. Wiltchko, Nature **429**, 177 (2004); T. Ritz *et al.*, Biophys. J. **96**, 3451 (2009).
 - [9] O. Efimova and P. J. Hore, Biophys. J. **94**, 1565 (2008).
 - [10] U. Steiner and T. Ulrich, Chem. Rev. **89**, 51 (1989).
 - [11] B. Misra and E. C. G. Sudarshan, J. Math. Phys. **18**, 756 (1977); W. M. Itano *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **41**, 2295 (1990); P. Facchi and S. Pascazio, Fortschr. Phys. **49**, 941 (2001); K. Koshino and A. Shimizu, Phys. Rep. **412**, 191 (2005); A. G. Kofman and G. Kurizki, Nature **405**, 546 (2000).
 - [12] H. M. Wiseman, Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **8**, 205 (1996); M. B. Plenio and P. L. Knight, Rev. Mod. Phys. **70**, 101 (1998)
 - [13] K. Maeda *et al.*, Nature **453**, 387 (2008).
 - [14] J. C. Weaver, T. E. Vaughan and E. R. Astumian, Nature **405**, 707 (2000).
 - [15] W. Wiltchko, R. Wiltchko, J. Exp. Biol. **199**, 29 (1996); W. W. Cochran, H. Mouritsen and M. Wikelski, Science **304**, 405 (2004).
 - [16] E. W. Streed *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 260402 (2006).
 - [17] H. -P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The theory of open quantum systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002).