

Friction due to inhomogeneous driving of coupled spins in a quantum heat engine

George Thomas* and Ramandeep S. Johal†

*Department of Physical Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Mohali,
Knowledge city, Sector 81, P.O. Manauli 140306, Ajit Garh, India.*

We consider two spin-1/2 particles with isotropic Heisenberg interaction, as the working substance of a quantum heat engine. We observe a frictional effect on the adiabatic branches of the heat cycle, which arises due to an inhomogeneous driving at a finite rate of the external magnetic field. The frictional effect is characterized by entropy production in the system and reduction in the work extracted. Corresponding to a sudden and a very slow driving, we find expressions for the lower and upper bounds of work that can be extracted on the adiabatic branches. These bounds are also confirmed with numerical simulations of the corresponding Liouville-von Neumann equation.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 07.20.Pe, 03.65.Yz, 05.30.-d

I. INTRODUCTION

The interplay between thermodynamic properties and quantum behavior has been studied through several models of quantum heat engines [1–17]. Even though quantum systems show non-classical features like entanglement, coherence and so on, these models are often found to be consistent with thermodynamic interpretations [6, 14, 18]. On the other hand, some models of these thermal machines have been reported to show an unexpected behavior such as extraction of work from a single heat bath [6], exceeding Carnot efficiency [12] and cooling to absolute zero [19]. In this paper, we focus on the interesting phenomenon of intrinsic friction in quantum engines [4, 5, 20, 21]. This effect arises due to non-commutativity of the internal and the external part of the Hamiltonian leading to non-commutativity of the Hamiltonians at different times. Further to reduce friction, an effect called quantum lubrication has also been proposed [8]. In order to better understand intrinsic friction and its relevance for analysis of dissipation in quantum systems, it seems interesting to look for this effect in other similar models.

In the quantum heat engine that we discuss below, the working medium (system) consists of two spin-half particles with Heisenberg interaction, kept in an external magnetic field. The system is driven by selectively changing the external field in finite time, such that the field on either spin is different (inhomogeneous). In this case, we observe the frictional effect. But if the field on both spins remains homogeneous, then friction is absent. As expected, we find that if the driving that creates inhomogeneity of fields on the spins, is performed very slowly, the friction effect is again absent. An analogous system under an inhomogeneous magnetic field plays important role in quantum computing [22]. Thermal entanglement of such spin system [23] and similar models [24] have also been studied.

We consider a heat cycle analogous to Otto cycle, con-

sisting of two adiabatic branches and two thermalization branches. On the thermalization branches, the magnetic fields on both spins are kept constant. To simplify our model, we consider the latter branches to take sufficiently long time so that the system attains equilibrium with the bath at the end of the process. Then the system is decoupled from the bath and a thermodynamically adiabatic process is carried out on the system. So the initial state of the system before the adiabatic process is a thermal state, diagonal in the eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian. This will help us to understand the coherence developed in the system during the adiabatic process [5]. The development of coherence leads to an increase in the entropy of the system which is a signature of the friction observed in our model.

The paper is organised as follows. In section II, we introduce the model of the quantum heat engine. Entropy production in the adiabatic branches of the cycle is discussed in section III. Section IV is devoted for understanding the work extraction in our model. Here we discuss lower and upper bound of the work that can be extracted. Section V is devoted to discussion. We analyse the cycle using numerical simulations by allotting finite time to the adiabatic branches and conclude with a summary and future directions.

II. MODEL

We consider two spin-half particles with isotropic exchange interaction, as the working substance for a quantum Otto cycle. In general, the Hamiltonian is written as $H = H_{\text{int}} + H_{\text{ext}}$, where H_{ext} is the external Hamiltonian which can be controlled and H_{int} is the internal Hamiltonian. In our model, we control in time, the magnetic field applied to particle labeled 2. So we have

$$H_{\text{int}} = J(\sigma^{(1)} \cdot \sigma^{(2)} + \sigma^{(2)} \cdot \sigma^{(1)}), \quad (1)$$

$$H_{\text{ext}} = B_1 \sigma_z^{(1)} + B_2(t) \sigma_z^{(2)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\sigma^{(i)} = (\sigma_x^{(i)}, \sigma_y^{(i)}, \sigma_z^{(i)})$ are the Pauli matrices, J is the isotropic exchange constant and $B_1, B_2(t)$ are the

*electronic address: george@iisermohali.ac.in

†electronic address: rsjohal@iisermohali.ac.in

magnetic fields applied along z -axis to the first and the second spin respectively. So the magnetic field applied to the individual spins are not always equal during the adiabatic branch which results in $[H_{\text{ext}}, H_{\text{int}}] \neq 0$. This non-commutativity of the external and the internal Hamiltonian when leading to non-commutativity of the Hamiltonian at different times, is the cause of internal friction in our model [4, 5].

As a special case, we show in Section V that the non-commutative property of external and the internal Hamiltonian by itself is not a sufficient condition for friction.

Now we analyse the system with inhomogeneous magnetic field in more detail. In this case the eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian is $\{|\psi_i\rangle; i = 1, \dots, 4\} \equiv \{|\psi_1\rangle, |00\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle, |11\rangle\}$, where $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_3\rangle$ are given by $b|10\rangle - a|01\rangle$ and $a|10\rangle + b|01\rangle$ respectively and $\{|00\rangle, |10\rangle, |01\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ forms the computational basis. Here $a = (y + \sqrt{1+y^2})/N$ and $b = 1/N$, where $N = \sqrt{1 + (y + \sqrt{1+y^2})^2}$ and $y = (B_1 - B_2(t))/4J$. The corresponding eigenvalues are $\{-2J - K, 2J - B_1 - B_2(t), -2J + K, 2J + B_1 + B_2(t)\}$, where $K = 4J(\sqrt{1+y^2})$. The equilibrium density matrix when the system is attached to a bath at temperature T_e , is given by $\rho = \exp(-H/T_e)/Z$, where $Z = \text{Tr}(\exp(-H/T_e))$ is partition function of the system, and we have set Boltzmann's constant to unity. The eigenvalues of ρ , or the occupation probabilities of the energy levels, are given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= e^{-(2J-K)/T_e} / Z, \\ P_2 &= e^{-(2J-B_1-B_2(t))/T_e} / Z, \\ P_3 &= e^{-(2J+K)/T_e} / Z, \\ P_4 &= e^{-(2J+B_1+B_2(t))/T_e} / Z. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Now we are ready to discuss the quantum heat cycle, which consists of the following four stages:

Stage 1: The coupled-spins system is attached to a cold bath with temperature T_1 . The system attains equilibrium with the bath. The magnetic field applied to the first and second spins are identical ($B_1 = B_2$). The density matrix is diagonal in the Hamiltonian's eigenbasis. Because of the homogeneous magnetic field, the eigenstates $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_3\rangle$ are maximally entangled Bell states, with $a = b = 1/\sqrt{2}$. The occupation probability $\{p_j\}$ for the state with energy eigenvalue $\{E_j\}$ is calculated from Eq. (3) by setting $T_e = T_1$ and $B_2 = B_1$. So the mean energy at the end of the first stage is $\text{Tr}(\rho H) = \sum_j E_j p_j$.

Stage 2: In this stage, the system is isolated from the bath and it can exchange only work with the surroundings. The magnetic field applied to the second spin is changed from $B_2(0) = B_1$ to $B_2(t) = B_3$ in finite time and the system may undergo a non-adiabatic evolution. By non-adiabatic evolution, we mean that the system may be driven fast enough so that the quantum adiabatic theorem does not hold [25, 26]. The density matrix undergoes a unitary evolution. The eigenstates of $H(t)$ are also time dependent. In general, the eigenstates of

$\rho(t)$ are not the same as $H(t)$. In the infinitely slow limit ($t \rightarrow \infty$), the adiabatic theorem holds and eigenstates of the density matrix are identical to the eigenvectors of the instantaneous Hamiltonian.

So in case of fast driving, the final state of the system may not be diagonal in the eigenbasis of the final Hamiltonian. When we project the final density matrix onto the eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian, the corresponding occupation probability of the eigenstate of the Hamiltonian with eigenvalue E'_j is given as $p'_j = \text{Tr}(|j\rangle\langle j|\rho(t))$, where $|j\rangle$ is the eigenvector of the final Hamiltonian. A pictorial representation is shown in Fig. 1. At the end of the second stage, the mean energy can be written as $\text{Tr}(\rho(t)H(t)) = \sum_j E'_j p'_j$. The difference of the initial and the final mean energy during the adiabatic process is equal to the work performed: $W_I = \sum_j E_j p_j - \sum_j E'_j p'_j$.

Stage 3: The system under inhomogeneous magnetic field is attached to a hot bath with temperature T_2 and it attains equilibrium by absorbing heat from the bath. The occupation probabilities (q_j) are calculated from Eq. (3) by putting $B_2 = B_3$ and $T_e = T_2$. At the end of the third stage, the system is in a thermal state with mean energy $\sum_j E'_j q_j$.

Stage 4: The system again undergoes a unitary evolution by a change of the magnetic field of the second spin from B_3 to B_1 , whereby the energy levels change from E'_j back to E_j . The occupation probabilities q'_j in the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian are calculated by projecting the density matrix onto the eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian. So the mean energy at the end of the process is $\sum_j E_j q'_j$. The difference in the mean energy due to this process is $W_{II} = \sum_j E'_j q_j - \sum_j E_j q'_j$.

To close the cycle, the system is again brought in contact with cold bath. The system releases on average an amount of heat to cold bath. As we show below, W_I and W_{II} are the work done *by* and *on* the system, respectively.

III. DYNAMICS ON ADIABATIC BRANCH AND ENTROPY

Now we analyse the irreversibility associated with the adiabatic branch by quantifying the entropy production. The adiabatic process is represented by a unitary process so that after time t , the system-state evolves to $\rho(t) = U(t, 0)\rho(0)U^\dagger(t, 0)$, where $U = \mathcal{T} \exp(-i \int_0^t H(t') dt')$. The von Neumann entropy S_v remains constant throughout the process. But energy-entropy S_e , defined with the occupational probabilities of the energy levels, changes. S_e in the initial state is given by $-\sum_i p_i \ln p_i$, where $p_i = \text{Tr}(|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|\rho(0))$. Since the initial state is a thermal state, we have $S_e = S_v$. But after the finite-time adiabatic step, S_e increases where as S_v remains unchanged. Initially, we have $[H(0), \rho(0)] = 0$. Two of the eigenvectors $|00\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$ of the Hamiltonian are not functions of the applied magnetic field and hence are independent of time. So if the system is in any of these *two* eigenstates,

$2J + B_1 + B_3$	$\frac{(p_4)}{\quad}$	$ 11\rangle$
$-2J + K$	$\frac{(p'_3)}{\quad}$	$a 10\rangle + b 01\rangle$
$-2J - K$	$\frac{(p'_1)}{\quad}$	$b 10\rangle - a 01\rangle$
$2J - B_1 - B_3$	$\frac{(p_2)}{\quad}$	$ 00\rangle$

FIG. 1: A pictorial representation of eigenvalues and eigenstates of the Hamiltonian at the end of first adiabatic process (stage 2). The $\{p'_i\}$ represent the populations in the energy eigenbasis $\{|\psi'_i\rangle\}$. In the infinite time limit, we get $p'_i = p_i$ and the eigenstates of the density matrix are same as that of the Hamiltonian.

it will remain there during the process. Thus the initial population in these states remains constant throughout the adiabatic process.

But the eigenvectors $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_3\rangle$ of hamiltonian depend on the magnetic field and hence are time dependent. So if the system is initially in one of these states, then changing the Hamiltonian with a finite rate results in a non-adiabatic evolution. In other words, the final state of the system is then not an eigenstate of the final Hamiltonian. Let the eigenvectors of the final Hamiltonian be given as $\{|\psi'_1\rangle, |00\rangle, |\psi'_3\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ and the set of the eigenvectors of the final density matrix is $\{|\phi'_1\rangle, |00\rangle, |\phi'_3\rangle, |11\rangle\}$. Since $|\phi'_1\rangle$ and $|\phi'_3\rangle$ are orthogonal to each other as well as to $|00\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$, we can express the kets $|\phi'_1\rangle$ and $|\phi'_3\rangle$ as linear combinations of $|\psi'_1\rangle$ and $|\psi'_3\rangle$ as

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi'_1\rangle &= \cos(\delta/2)|\psi'_1\rangle + \sin(\delta/2)|\psi'_3\rangle, \\ |\phi'_3\rangle &= \sin(\delta/2)|\psi'_1\rangle - \cos(\delta/2)|\psi'_3\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $0 \leq \delta \leq \pi$. Now consider a projection of the system-state on the eigenbasis of Hamiltonian. Two of the populations remain unchanged such that $p'_2 = p_2$ and $p'_4 = p_4$. The occupation probabilities for the eigenstates $|\phi'_1\rangle$ and $|\phi'_3\rangle$ are p_1 and p_3 respectively. Now project the density matrix onto the eigenbasis $\{|\psi'_i\rangle\}$ of the final Hamiltonian. From Eq. (4), we get the occupation probabilities corresponding to $|\psi'_1\rangle$ and $|\psi'_3\rangle$ as

$$\begin{aligned} p'_1 &= p_1 \cos^2(\delta/2) + p_3 \sin^2(\delta/2), \\ p'_3 &= p_1 \sin^2(\delta/2) + p_3 \cos^2(\delta/2). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Due to $p_1 > p_3$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 &\geq p'_1 \geq p_3, \\ p_1 &\geq p'_3 \geq p_3. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

As the difference between p'_1 and p'_3 gets reduced as compared to the one between p_1 and p_3 , and recalling that

$p'_2 = p_2$ and $p'_4 = p_4$, the distribution $\{p'_i\}$ is more uniform than $\{p_i\}$, we have

$$-\sum_i p'_i \ln p'_i \geq -\sum_i p_i \ln p_i, \quad (7)$$

which signifies that the energy-entropy S_e increases in the finite-time adiabatic process. In the infinite time process ($t \rightarrow \infty$), the system undergoes quantum adiabatic evolution and in this limit S_e remains unchanged. The total entropy production versus the total time allocated to adiabatic branch will be discussed in Section V.

IV. WORK

The work is performed by or on the system only during the adiabatic branches i.e. in stages 2 and 4, when the evolution of the system is governed by Liouville-von Neumann equation (with $\hbar = 1$)

$$\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = -i[H(t), \rho(t)]. \quad (8)$$

The instantaneous mean energy of the system is given by $\text{Tr}(\rho(t)H(t))$. Differentiating with respect to time we get

$$\text{Tr}\left(\frac{d(H(t)\rho(t))}{dt}\right) = \text{Tr}\left(H(t)\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt}\right) + \text{Tr}\left(\frac{dH(t)}{dt}\rho(t)\right), \quad (9)$$

In general, comparing with the first law of thermodynamics, we identify [2] the first term on the right hand side as the rate of heat flow (\dot{Q}) and the second term as the power (\wp).

For an adiabatic process, the first term above on the right hand side vanishes due to Eq. (8).

Upon integrating the power, we get the expression for work as

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \int_0^t \wp dt = \int_0^t \text{Tr}\left(\frac{dH(t')}{dt'}\rho(t')\right) dt', \\ &= \int_0^t \text{Tr}\left(\frac{d(H(t')\rho(t'))}{dt'}\right) dt'. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Thus the work performed during the adiabatic process lasting for a time interval t , is equal to the change in the mean energy of the system, upto time t .

Furthermore, it can be shown that the work done in an infinitely slow process is always higher than the work done in a finite-time process. Thus the lower bound for work extracted is obtained for an extremely fast process ($t \rightarrow 0$). To evaluate the lower bound, we assume that the density matrix of the system remains unchanged. In case of equilibrium with the cold bath, the initial density matrix is given as

$$\rho = p_1|\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1| + p_2|00\rangle\langle 00| + p_3|\phi_3\rangle\langle\phi_3| + p_4|11\rangle\langle 11|, \quad (11)$$

where $|\phi_1\rangle = (|10\rangle - |01\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\phi_3\rangle = (|10\rangle + |01\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Since the system is in thermal state, the initial Hamiltonian commutes with the density matrix and

both have the same set of eigenvectors. In the sudden limit ($t \rightarrow 0$), the density matrix remains the same as the initial, because $U(0,0) = I$. But the Hamiltonian is changed to

$$H = - (2J + K)|\psi'_1\rangle\langle\psi'_1| + (2J - B_1 - B_3)|00\rangle\langle 00| \\ + (-2J + K)|\psi'_3\rangle\langle\psi'_3| + (2J + B_1 + B_3)|11\rangle\langle 11|, \quad (12)$$

where $|\psi'_1\rangle = b|10\rangle - a|01\rangle$ and $|\psi'_3\rangle = a|10\rangle + b|01\rangle$. Now we find the population of the corresponding eigenstates of the Hamiltonian by projecting the density matrix onto the eigenbasis of Hamiltonian as

$$p'_1 = \langle\psi'_1|\rho|\psi'_1\rangle = \frac{(p_1 + p_3)}{2} - ab(p_3 - p_1), \quad (13)$$

$$p'_3 = \langle\psi'_3|\rho|\psi'_3\rangle = \frac{(p_1 + p_3)}{2} + ab(p_3 - p_1), \quad (14)$$

while $p'_2 = p_2$ and $p'_4 = p_4$. Similarly for the second adiabatic process where the Hamiltonian is returned to its initial stage with eigenbasis $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$, we obtain upon projecting the density matrix $\tilde{\rho}$ for this process, as

$$q'_1 = \langle\psi_1|\tilde{\rho}|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{(q_1 + q_3)}{2} - ab(q_3 - q_1), \quad (15)$$

$$q'_3 = \langle\psi_3|\tilde{\rho}|\psi_3\rangle = \frac{(q_1 + q_3)}{2} + ab(q_3 - q_1), \quad (16)$$

and $q'_2 = q_2$ and $q'_4 = q_4$.

Now the work extracted in complete cycle ($W = W_I + W_{II}$) with fast adiabatic processes is given by

$$W^{\text{fast}} = \sum_i p_i E_i - \sum_i p'_i E'_i + \sum_i q_i E'_i - \sum_i q'_i E_i. \quad (17)$$

Using the probabilities calculated above for extremely fast (sudden) processes, we get the lower bound of work

$$W_{\text{lb}} = (B_3 - B_1)(q_4 - q_2 + p_2 - p_4) \\ + (q_3 - q_1)(K - 8Jab). \quad (18)$$

The upper bound for work is obtained for the slow process ($t \rightarrow \infty$). According to quantum adiabatic theorem the system remains in the instantaneous eigenstate of the Hamiltonian. The work expression is in general written as

$$W^{\text{slow}} = \sum_i p_i E_i - \sum_i p_i E'_i + \sum_i q_i E'_i - \sum_i q_i E_i, \quad (19)$$

yields the upper bound for the extractable work,

$$W_{\text{ub}} = (B_3 - B_1)(q_4 - q_2 + p_2 - p_4) \\ + (q_3 - q_1 + p_1 - p_3)(K - 4J). \quad (20)$$

These bounds are compared with the finite-time work in Fig. (2).

V. DISCUSSION

Analytic expressions for work can be derived both in the case of a very slow driving and a sudden one. To estimate the finite-time evolution of the system on the adiabatic branch, we have to integrate the Liouville-von Neumann equation, Eq. (8). We accomplish this using the fourth-order Runge-Kutta method [27]. In the first adiabatic process, $B(t)$ changes from $B_2(0)$ to B_3 . This is modeled by applying a pulse $B_2(t) = B_2(0) + (B_3 - B_2(0))\sin(\pi t/\tau)$ for a time $t = \tau/2$, where τ is half of the time period. Similarly the second adiabatic process is done by applying a pulse $B_2(t) = B_3 + (B_2(0) - B_3)\sin(\pi t/\tau)$ for the same time interval. Thus we allot equal time intervals to both the adiabatic branches. The total work performed and the total entropy production due to the finite time process are plotted in Fig. (2). As discussed in the previous section, the work extracted decreases monotonically with a finite rate of driving. This is also reflected in the corresponding increase of entropy production in the finite-time case.




FIG. 2: Work obtained in a cycle versus the total time (τ) allocated for both the adiabatic processes. Here we use $B_1 = B_2(0) = 3$, $B_3 = 4$, $J = 0.1$, $T_2 = 2$ and $T_1 = 1$. The work is bounded above by W_{ub} (Eq. (20), dashed line). The thick horizontal line depicts the lower bound W_{lb} , Eq. (18), obtained for a sudden adiabatic process ($\tau \rightarrow 0$). The inset shows total entropy production on the adiabatic branches versus total time (τ). As τ is increased, the total entropy production reduces monotonically to zero and the frictional effect vanishes.

Let us consider a cycle in which the magnetic fields applied to the first and second spins in stage 1 have different values, $B_1(0)$ and $B_2(0)$ respectively. In this case the internal and external part of the hamiltonian do not commute with each other. Now suppose that during the first adiabatic process, B_1 and B_2 vary at equal rates so that the difference ($\Delta B = B_1(t) - B_2(t)$) keeps constant during the process. As we have seen in section II, the parameters a and b appearing in the eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian, are functions of J and ΔB . Since ΔB remains constant during the adiabatic process, the energy eigenstates of the Hamiltonian become time in-

dependent which implies that Hamiltonians at different times commute with each other and so friction is absent in this case. Using the similar argument, no friction is expected on the second adiabatic process, when the magnetic fields are restored to their initial values ($B_1(0)$ and $B_2(0)$). This serves as an example to appreciate that the non-commutative property of the internal and external Hamiltonian caused by the inhomogeneous magnetic fields may not always lead to non commutativity of Hamiltonian at different times to cause friction. Rather the inhomogeneous driving in which ΔB changes with time leads to the non commutative property of the Hamiltonian at different times and thereby to frictional effect.

To conclude, we have studied a model of quantum heat engine where the inhomogeneous driving at a finite rate, of the components of the quantum working medium leads to a frictional effect. This effect is characterized by increase in the entropy of the system. As expected of a thermodynamic system, the entropy production leads to decrease in the work obtained from a cycle. The work is plotted versus the time allotted for the adia-

batic branches. The amount of work that can be obtained from our model is bounded from both above and below. The upper bound is obtained for a slow process where the frictional effect vanishes and quantum adiabatic theorem holds, while the lower bound is obtained for a sudden process. Some interesting future problems include the study of frictional effect on models with anisotropic interactions and with systems using higher number of spins. The possibility of quantum lubrication [8] to reduce the intrinsic friction can also be studied.

Acknowledgements

GT acknowledges financial support from IISER Mohali. RSJ gratefully acknowledges research grant from the Department of Science and Technology, India, under project No. SR/S2/CMP-0047/2010(G) titled, *Quantum heat engines: work, entropy and information at nanoscale*.

-
- [1] H.E.D. Scovil and E.O. Schulz-Dubois, Phys. Rev. Lett. **2**, 262 (1959); J.E. Geusic, E.O. Schulz-Dubois, and H.E.D. Scovil, Phys. Rev. **156**, 343 (1967).
- [2] R. Alicki, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **12**, L103 (1979).
- [3] E. Geva and R. Kosloff, J. Chem. Phys. **96**, 3054 (1992).
- [4] R. Kosloff and T. Feldmann, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 055102 (2002).
- [5] T. Feldmann and R. Kosloff, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 016101 (2003).
- [6] M.O. Scully, M.S. Zubairy, G.S. Agarwal, and H. Walther, Science **299**, 862 (2003).
- [7] J. Gemmer, M. Michel, and G. Mahler, *Quantum Thermodynamics*, Springer, Berlin (2004).
- [8] T. Feldmann and R. Kosloff, Phys. Rev. E **73**, 025107 (2006).
- [9] T.D. Kieu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 140403 (2004); Eur. Phys. J. D **39**, 115 (2006).
- [10] T. Zhang, W.-T. Liu, P.-X. Chen, and C.-Z. Li, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 062102 (2007).
- [11] A. E. Allahverdyan, R. S. Johal, and G. Mahler, Phys. Rev. E **77**, 041118 (2008).
- [12] R. Dillenschneider and E. Lutz, Europhys.Lett. **88**, 5003 (2009).
- [13] Noah Linden, Sandu Popescu, and Paul Skrzypczyk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 130401 (2010).
- [14] G. Thomas and R. S. Johal Phys. Rev. E **83**, 031135 (2011).
- [15] S. Abe, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 041117 (2011).
- [16] T. Feldmann and R. Kosloff, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 051114 (2012).
- [17] X. L. Huang, L. C. Wang, and X. X. Yi, Phys. Rev. E **87**, 012144 (2013).
- [18] *Maxwell's Demon 2: Entropy, Classical and Quantum Information, Computing*, edited by H.S. Leff and A.F. Rex (Institute of Physics, Bristol, 2003).
- [19] M. Kolar, D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, R. Alicki, and G. Kurizki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 090601 (2012).
- [20] R. Kosloff, Entropy **15**, 2100 (2013).
- [21] Y. Rezek, Entropy **12**, 1885 (2010).
- [22] X. Hu, R. de Sousa and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett **86**, 918 (2001).
- [23] M. Asoudeh and V. Karimipour, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 022308 (2005).
- [24] E. Albayrak, The European Physical Journal B, **72**, 491 (2009).
- [25] M. Born and V. Fock, Z. Phys. **51**, 165 (1928).
- [26] T. Kato, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **5**, 435 (1950).
- [27] M. J. Henrich, M. Michel, and G. Mahler, Europhys. Lett. **76**, 1057 (2006).