arXiv:1602.02502v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 8 Feb 2016

Collective couplings: rectification and supertransmittance

Gernot Schaller,^{1,*} Giulio Giuseppe Giusteri,^{2,3,4} and Giuseppe Luca Celardo^{3,4}

¹Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Universität Berlin, Hardenbergstraße 36, D-10623 Berlin, Germany

²Mathematical Soft Matter Unit, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University,

1919-1 Tancha, Onna, Okinawa, 904-0495, Japan

³Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica and ILAMP,

Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, I-25121, Brescia, Italy

⁴Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, sez. Pavia, via Bassi 6, I-27100, Pavia, Italy

We investigate N identical two-level systems that are collectively coupled to two thermal reservoirs and therefore behave as a single large spin. The coupling with one reservoir implements the usual Dicke superradiance setup. By contrast, the coupling with the other reservoir is of the pure dephasing type. To describe also the strong-coupling limit with the dephasing reservoir, we apply a reactioncoordinate mapping, which leads to a decomposition of the dephasing reservoir into a single collective degree of freedom, and residual oscillators. After the mapping, the large spin is coupled to the reaction coordinate with the original pure-dephasing interaction, but the reaction coordinate is dissipatively coupled to the residual oscillators. We first derive the quantum-optical master equation for the large spin and the reaction coordinate. To obtain a convenient representation as a rate equation, we switch to the energy eigenbasis of the large spin and the reaction coordinate by using a polaron transformation. Assuming fast relaxation of the reaction coordinate, we then derive a coarse-grained rate equation for the large spin only and discuss how the original Dicke superradiance is affected by the presence of the additional reservoir. Our main finding is a cooperatively enhanced rectification effect due to the interplay of supertransmittant heat currents (scaling quadratically with N) and the asymmetric coupling to both reservoirs. For large N, the system can thus significantly amplify current asymmetries under bias reversal, functioning as a heat diode.

PACS numbers: 05.30.-d, 44.10.+i, 03.65.Yz, 03.65.Aa

I. MOTIVATION

The study of radiative effects in two-level systems has a long history. Here, the spin-boson model [1] takes a very prominent role. Originating from the interaction of a two-level atom with the electromagnetic field [2], it is often used as a toy model in many other contexts. Not surprisingly, it has become a canonical model to explore fundamental methods of open systems [3–5] and effectively arises in a rather large number of physical systems and effects, including e.g. the dynamics of light-harvesting complexes [6], detectors [7], and the interaction of quantum dots with generalized environments [8].

Ideally, one aims at a reduced description taking only the finite-dimensional spin dynamics into account. However, when the number of spins is increased, the curse of dimensionality – the exponential growth of the system Hilbert space with its size – usually inhibits investigations of large spin-boson models. When additional symmetries come into play – e.g. when the spins have the same splitting and couple collectively to all other components – simplified descriptions are applicable. Collective effects may for example dramatically influence the dephasing behavior of the environment, leading to phenomena such as super- and sub-decoherence [9, 10]. Furthermore, they play a significant role in the modelling of light-harvesting complexes [11–14]. Perhaps one of the clearest manifestations of collective behaviour is Dicke superradiance [15]. Here, the collectivity of the coupling between N two-level atoms and a low-temperature bosonic reservoir induces an unusually fast relaxation. When the atoms couple independently, the time needed for relaxation does not depend on N. For a collective coupling however, the relaxation time scales as 1/N and the maximum radiation intensity scales as N^2 [16]. A setup in which the collective coupling approximation is well justified can be obtained by confining the two-level atoms in a region much smaller than the wavelength of the electromagnetic field, but such collective couplings may also be engineered for instance using trapped ions [17] or opto-mechanical setups [18].

Transient superradiant phenomena have been investigated from many perspectives both theoretically [8, 19, 20] and experimentally [21, 22]. Our present study is motivated by the fact that in certain regimes the transient superradiance can be turned into a stationary supertransmittance – a stationary current scaling with N^2 – when two collective weakly-coupled reservoirs [23] or a combination of weak collective dissipation and driving [24, 25] are considered.

Naturally, when the reservoirs are coupled with the same operators to the system [23, 26], general symmetry arguments suggest that, under reversal of the thermal bias, the heat current will simply revert its sign. By contrast, when the reservoirs are coupled with different operators to the system, one may notice asymmetries in the heat currents under bias reversal. Typically, these are not very pronounced [27] and are often expected to average out when multiple systems are used in paral-

^{*} gernot.schaller@tu-berlin.de

lel. When the absolute value of the current is significant in one non-equilibrium configuration but is strongly suppressed under temperature exchange, one effectively implements a heat diode [28–31]. The ideal heat diode would display a very large heat conductivity in one bias configuration and a complete suppression in the opposite. We show that by implementing distinct collective couplings to source and drain reservoirs, asymmetries in the heat conductance can be strongly amplified in the large-N regime. This heat diode effect does not exist in similar models with symmetric couplings [23].

We present the model in Sec. II below and also briefly recall the main features of superradiance. Then, we derive the quantum-optical master equation and discuss its thermodynamic properties in Sec. III. We obtain a coarse-grained description for the large spin dynamics and investigate the modification of Dicke superradiance in Sec. IV A and the resulting heat currents between the reservoirs in Sec. IV B, before closing with a summary in Sec. V.

II. MODEL

A. Hamiltonian

Our model is described by the total Hamiltonian $H = \tilde{H}_S + H_I^t + \tilde{H}_I^\ell + H_B^t + \tilde{H}_B^\ell$. The first contribution consists of N identical two-level systems with level splitting ω_0

$$\tilde{H}_S = \frac{\omega_0}{2} \sum_i \sigma_i^z = \frac{\omega_0}{2} J_z \,, \tag{1}$$

where $J_{\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma_{i}^{\alpha}$ is a large spin (with Pauli matrices σ_{i}^{z} acting only on the *i*-th two-level system), which is coupled

$$H_I^t = J_x \sum_k \left(h_{kt} b_{kt} + h_{kt}^* b_{kt}^\dagger \right) \,, \tag{2}$$

$$\tilde{H}_{I}^{\ell} = J_{z} \sum_{k} \left(\tilde{h}_{k\ell} \tilde{b}_{k\ell} + \tilde{h}_{k\ell}^{*} \tilde{b}_{k\ell}^{\dagger} \right)$$
(3)

in a collective (i.e., via large spin interactions) way to a transversal (t) and a longitudinal (ℓ) bosonic reservoir

$$H_B^t = \sum_k \omega_{kt} b_{kt}^{\dagger} b_{kt} ,$$

$$\tilde{H}_B^{\ell} = \sum_k \tilde{\omega}_{k\ell} \tilde{b}_{k\ell}^{\dagger} \tilde{b}_{k\ell} .$$
(4)

Here, the amplitudes $h_{k,t/\ell}$ are the bare emission and absorbtion amplitudes for bosons in the reservoirs.

We note that, since the interaction Hamiltonian of the longitudinal reservoir commutes with the system Hamiltonian $[\tilde{H}_S, \tilde{H}_I^\ell] = \mathbf{0}$, the longitudinal reservoir and the large spin system will not directly exchange energy.

Naively, one might then be tempted to believe that the model cannot support stationary heat currents from one reservoir to the other. However, we remind the reader that a direct exchange of energy between the reservoirs is nevertheless possible as the individual interaction Hamiltonians do not commute $[\tilde{H}_{I}^{\ell}, H_{I}^{t}] \neq \mathbf{0}$. Generally, an interaction that appears to be locally of the pure-dephasing type need no longer preserve the energy of the system when further interactions are added. We also note that if both reservoirs couple symmetrically to the large spin, heat diode effects will not occur [23], as one may already expect from simple symmetry arguments.

B. Reaction Coordinate

A naive master equation approach treating the large spin as the system would fail to predict any stationary current, since this is a higher-order effect. To take possible higher-order corrections into account, we identify a collective degree of freedom in the coupling to the longitudinal reservoir. Formally, this corresponds to the introduction of new annihilation and creation operators. The first of these – commonly known as reaction coordinate – is defined via the relation

$$\left(\lambda a + \lambda^* a^{\dagger}\right) = \sum_{k} \left(\tilde{h}_{k\ell} \tilde{b}_{k\ell} + \tilde{h}_{k\ell}^* \tilde{b}_{k\ell}^{\dagger}\right) \,. \tag{5}$$

This is the first of many equations defining new operators a (the reaction coordinate or longitudinal mode) and $\{b_{k\ell}\}$ (the residual oscillators) from the previous $\tilde{b}_{k\ell}$ operators. The whole transformation is unitary, such that for K original oscillator modes $\tilde{b}_{k\ell}$ one will obtain (K-1)residual oscillator modes $b_{k\ell}$. Later-on, we will consider the continuum limit $K \to \infty$ anyway. Demanding that the new operators still satisfy the bosonic commutation relations and that after the transformation, the Hamiltonian describing the residual oscillators is diagonal, eventually fixes the transformation matrix (for details regarding the method see e.g. Refs. [32–35]).

After the transformation, we can again decompose the Hamiltonian as $H = H_S + H_I^t + H_I^\ell + H_B^t + H_B^\ell$. Now however, we treat the reaction coordinate as part of the system

$$H_S = \frac{\omega_0}{2} J_z + J_z \left(\lambda a + \lambda^* a^\dagger \right) + \Omega a^\dagger a \,, \tag{6}$$

where Ω is its frequency. The coupling to the longitudinal reservoir is now no longer of the pure-dephasing type but can generally be parametrized as a dissipative interaction

$$H_I^{\ell} = \left(e^{+\mathrm{i}\phi}a + e^{-\mathrm{i}\phi}a^{\dagger}\right)\sum_k \left(h_{k\ell}b_{k\ell} + h_{k\ell}^*b_{k\ell}^{\dagger}\right), \quad (7)$$

where $h_{k\ell}$ describes the interaction between longitudinal mode and the residual oscillator reservoir (subscript ℓ), and ϕ is a real phase. For completeness, we furthermore



FIG. 1. (Color Online) Sketch of the considered setup. The transformed system, composed of large spin and longitudinal boson mode (yellow), is dissipatively coupled to two bosonic reservoirs held at inverse temperatures β_{ℓ} and β_t , respectively. The couplings described by the rates Γ_{ℓ} and Γ_t have to be treated perturbatively, while the coupling λ may be strong. The original division of the model is sketched with dashed lines.

note that the energies of the longitudinal reservoir will also be transformed and

$$H_B^{\ell} = \sum_k \omega_{k\ell} b_{k\ell}^{\dagger} b_{k\ell} \,. \tag{8}$$

The new energies Ω and $\omega_{k\ell}$ as well as the new coupling constants $h_{k\ell}$, ϕ , and λ are fixed by the parameters in the original Hamiltonian, and this also transfers to continuum quantities such as the transformed spectral coupling density. In what follows, we assume that the reaction-coordinate mapping has been performed and we will therefore consider already the transformed system and longitudinal reservoir as the starting point of our considerations. Fig. 1 illustrates the effect of the reaction-coordinate mapping.

The new reservoirs will be assumed to remain at (possibly different) thermal equilibrium states throughout and we will investigate the dynamics of the system subject to these two environments. Now, a master equation treatment may cover the effects of a strong coupling λ and may therefore also predict stationary currents between the two reservoirs. By contrast, for a vanishing coupling $\lambda = 0$ the model is split into two independent components, where the large spin coupled to the transversal reservoir represents the usual Dicke model with its well-known superradiant behaviour. We will use this Dicke regime as a benchmark test for our model.

C. Implementations

Especially when the two reservoirs are held at different equilibrium states, it is clear that the longitudinal and transversal couplings with the large spin have to be implemented by generally different physical mechanisms. Furthermore, collectivity of the couplings requires that the distances between the two-level systems are significantly smaller than the typical length-scale of the corresponding reservoir.

For example, when the two-level systems are represented by identical ions in an optical trap, the photons in the surrounding cavity would assume the role of the transversal reservoir, and collectivity of the transversal coupling could be achieved when the physical distance between the ions is much smaller than the diameter of the cavity. We also point out that the original Dicke model can be implemented by different simulators [18, 36–38], such that only the interaction with a dephasing reservoir needs to be added.

In the case of an ion trap, the interaction with the single longitudinal mode could model the interaction of the ions with their collective motion, and the residual longitudinal reservoir would consist in bulk phonons of the surrounding. The original partition would treat the collective motion of the ions and the bulk phonons as part of the same longitudinal reservoir. In reality, we also note that phonons can be expected to couple not only along the longitudinal direction, but the dephasing resulting from the longitudinal component of their coupling is expected to dominate the dynamics [9] at least for short time-scales.

D. Superradiance for $\lambda = 0$

The original Dicke Hamiltonian

$$H_D = \hat{H}_S + H_I^t + H_B^t \tag{9}$$

is recovered as an isolated part of the total system when $\lambda \to 0$. For H_D it is known that, when all spins are prepared in the most excited state and the temperature of the reservoir is small $\beta_t \omega_0 \gg 1$, the two-level systems will decay collectively, resulting in a sharply localized flash of radiation with a maximum intensity scaling as N^2 and a width scaling as 1/N [15, 16].

At finite temperatures, the master equation for the spin system is given by [23, 39]

$$\dot{\rho} = -i \left[\frac{\omega_0}{2} J_z, \rho \right] + \Gamma_t n_t \left[J_+ \rho J_- - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ J_- J_+, \rho \right\} \right] + \Gamma_t (1+n_t) \left[J_- \rho J_+ - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ J_+ J_-, \rho \right\} \right], \quad (10)$$

where $\Gamma_t = 2\pi \sum_k |h_{kt}|^2 \delta(\omega_0 - \omega_{kt})$ denotes the bare absorbtion and emission rate and $n_t = (e^{\beta_t \omega_0} - 1)^{-1}$ the Bose-Einstein distribution of the transversal boson reservoir with inverse temperature β_t , evaluated at the system transition frequency ω_0 . Furthermore, we have used the collective ladder operators $J_{\pm} = (J_x \pm iJ_y)/2$. We can clearly identify the terms accounting for the closed spin evolution (commutator) and for the emission $[\propto \Gamma_t(1+n_t)]$ or absorbtion $[\propto \Gamma_t n_t]$ of bosons by the large spin. The ratio of these rates yields the simple Boltzmann factor since $n_t/(1+n_t) = e^{-\beta_t \omega_0}$, such that this master equation obeys the usual detailed balance relation, which leads to thermalization at finite reservoir temperatures. In particular, in the standard Dicke limit $(n_t \to 0)$ it predicts the collective decay from the most excited state m = +N/2 into the ground state m = -N/2.

To diagonalize the spin part of the Hamiltonian we recall the angular momentum eigenstates (the length of the angular momentum is fixed j = N/2 and will be omitted)

$$J_z \left| m \right\rangle = 2m \left| m \right\rangle \,, \tag{11}$$

where $m \in \{-\frac{N}{2}, -\frac{N}{2}+1, \ldots, +\frac{N}{2}-1, +\frac{N}{2}\}$. On these eigenstates, the J_{\pm} operators act as

$$J_{\pm} |m\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{N}{2} \left(\frac{N}{2} + 1\right) - m(m \pm 1)} |m \pm 1\rangle . (12)$$

We can use these relations to represent the master equation (10) as a simple rate equation in the spin energy eigenbasis $|m\rangle$ (with $P_m = \langle m | \rho | m \rangle$)

$$\dot{P}_{m} = -\left[\Gamma_{t}n_{t}M_{m}^{+} + \Gamma_{t}(1+n_{t})M_{m}^{-}\right]P_{m} + \Gamma_{t}n_{t}M_{m}^{-}P_{m-1} + \Gamma_{t}(1+n_{t})M_{m}^{+}P_{m+1}, \\ M_{m}^{\pm} = \frac{N}{2}\left(\frac{N}{2}+1\right) - m(m\pm1).$$
(13)

The coherences between different energy eigenstates will (if initially present at all) evolve independently and simply decay (as is often the case for the standard quantumoptical master equation). However, we note that the matrix elements M_m^{\pm} entering the transition rates scale quadratically with the number of two-level systems N, which is the formal reason for the superradiant decay into the vacuum state.

III. MASTER EQUATION

In this section, we will now consider the case of finite coupling $(\lambda \neq 0)$ between large spin and longitudinal boson.

A. Transition Rates

We treat the large spin and the longitudinal boson mode as the system, defined by the parameters ω_0 , λ , and Ω in Eq. (6). Provided that the spectrum of the system is non-degenerate (at least between admitted transitions), the quantum-optical master equation [16, 40] becomes a rate equation connecting only the populations in the system energy eigenbasis $H_S |a\rangle = E_a |a\rangle$. For an interaction Hamiltonian of the form $H_I = \sum_{\alpha} A_{\alpha} \otimes B_{\alpha}$ with system operators A_{α} and reservoir operators B_{α} , respectively, the rates from eigenstate b to eigenstate a are formally given by [40]

$$\gamma_{ab,ab} = \sum_{\alpha\beta} \gamma_{\alpha\beta} (E_b - E_a) \langle a | A_\beta | b \rangle \langle a | A_\alpha^{\dagger} | b \rangle^* , (14)$$

where

$$\gamma_{\alpha\beta}(\omega) = \int e^{+\mathrm{i}\omega\tau} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{B}} \left\{ \boldsymbol{B}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\tau) B_{\beta} \rho_B \right\} d\tau \qquad (15)$$

are Fourier transforms of the reservoir correlation functions (bold symbols denote the interaction picture throughout). Since the reservoir state

$$\rho_B = \frac{e^{-\beta_\ell (H_\ell - \mu_\ell N_\ell)}}{Z_\ell} \otimes \frac{e^{-\beta_t (H_t - \mu_t N_t)}}{Z_t} \tag{16}$$

is a tensor product of the thermal individual reservoir states, the temperatures enter the reservoir correlation functions $\gamma_{\alpha\beta}(\omega)$, whereas the collective coupling properties enter the matrix elements of the system coupling operators A_{α} .

Specifically, we can identify in our model Hamiltonian the (Hermitian) coupling operators $A_1 = J_x$, $A_2 = e^{+i\phi}a + e^{-i\phi}a^{\dagger}$, $B_1 = \sum_k \left(h_{kt}b_{kt} + h_{kt}^*b_{kt}^{\dagger}\right)$, and $B_2 = \sum_k \left(h_{k\ell}b_{k\ell} + h_{k\ell}^*b_{k\ell}^{\dagger}\right)$. Consequently, the Fourier transforms of the non-vanishing correlation functions become

$$\gamma_{11}(\omega) = \Theta(+\omega)\Gamma_t(+\omega)[1 + n_t(+\omega)] +\Theta(-\omega)\Gamma_t(-\omega)n_t(-\omega), \gamma_{22}(\omega) = \Theta(+\omega)\Gamma_\ell(+\omega)[1 + n_\ell(+\omega)] +\Theta(-\omega)\Gamma_\ell(-\omega)n_\ell(-\omega),$$
(17)

where $\Gamma_{t/\ell}(\omega) = 2\pi \sum_k |h_{kt/\ell}|^2 \delta(\omega - \omega_{kt/\ell})$ denotes the spectral coupling density of transversal and longitudinal reservoirs, $\Theta(\omega)$ the Heaviside step function, and

$$n_{\nu}(\omega) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta_{\nu}(\omega - \mu_{\nu})} - 1}$$
(18)

the Bose distribution of reservoir $\nu \in \{t, \ell\}$ with inverse temperature β_{ν} and chemical potential $\mu_{\nu} \leq 0$. In this paper, we will consider the case of vanishing chemical potentials $\mu_{\alpha} = 0$, but results expressed in terms of $n_{\alpha}(\omega)$ will also hold for finite chemical potentials (used to effectively model interactions between bosons).

B. Energy Eigenbasis

To obtain the eigenbasis of (6), we find it useful to employ the polaron transformation [41]

$$U = e^{J_z B}, \qquad B = \frac{\lambda^*}{\Omega} a^{\dagger} - \frac{\lambda}{\Omega} a, \qquad (19)$$

which – since $B^{\dagger} = -B$ is anti-Hermitian – acts unitarily on the operators. It is straightforward to show the following relations

$$UaU^{\dagger} = a - \frac{\lambda^*}{\Omega} J_z , \qquad Ua^{\dagger}U^{\dagger} = a^{\dagger} - \frac{\lambda}{\Omega} J_z ,$$
$$UJ_+U^{\dagger} = J_+e^{+2B} , \qquad UJ_-U^{\dagger} = J_-e^{-2B} . \tag{20}$$

Consequently, the polaron transformation can be used to effectively decouple spin and polaron mode

$$\tilde{H}_S = U H_S U^{\dagger} = \frac{\omega_0}{2} J_z - \frac{\left|\lambda\right|^2}{\Omega} J_z^2 + \Omega a^{\dagger} a \,. \tag{21}$$

The eigenstates $\widetilde{|n,m\rangle} = \widetilde{|n\rangle} \otimes \widetilde{|m\rangle}$ of \widetilde{H}_S are tensor products of the conventional angular momentum eigenstates (11) and the Fock states $\widetilde{|n\rangle}$, where we note that the conventional relations for creation and annihilation operators hold in the polaron-basis, e.g. $a^{\dagger}\widetilde{|n\rangle} = \sqrt{n+1}\widetilde{|n+1\rangle}$. Consequently, the eigenstates $|n,m\rangle$ of H_S can also be labeled by the spin quantum number $m \in \{-N/2, \ldots, +N/2\}$ and the occupation number of the longitudinal boson mode $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and have energies

$$E_{nm} = \Omega n + \omega_0 m - 4 \frac{|\lambda|^2}{\Omega} m^2.$$
 (22)

C. Matrix Elements

The matrix elements in the transition rates (14) can also be conveniently evaluated using the polaron transformation. For example, the collective spin flip operator – recalling that $J_x = J_+ + J_-$ – becomes

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle n,m|A_{1}|n'm'\rangle|^{2} &= \left|\widetilde{\langle n,m|}UJ_{x}U^{\dagger}|\widetilde{n',m'}\rangle\right|^{2} \\ &= \left|\langle\widetilde{n,m}|\left(J_{+}e^{+2B}+J_{-}e^{-2B}\right)\left|\widetilde{n',m'}\right\rangle\right|^{2} \\ &= \delta_{m',m-1}M_{m}^{-}\left|\widetilde{\langle n|}e^{+2B}|\widetilde{n'}\rangle\right|^{2} \\ &+ \delta_{m',m+1}M_{m}^{+}\left|\widetilde{\langle n|}e^{-2B}|\widetilde{n'}\rangle\right|^{2}, \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

and it is visible from the definition of B in Eq. (19) that for finite λ this reservoir triggers transitions between any n and n' but only between neighboring mand $m' = m \pm 1$. Furthermore, it is straightforward to see that $\sum_{n} \left| \widetilde{\langle n |} e^{\pm 2B} \widetilde{|n'\rangle} \right|^2 = \sum_{n'} \left| \widetilde{\langle n |} e^{\pm 2B} \widetilde{|n'\rangle} \right|^2 = 1.$ Therefore, the absolute value of this matrix element can be interpreted as a conditional probability distribution spreading the original rate (for $\lambda = 0$, admitting only n' = n) over different occupation eigenstates n', see also Fig. 2. Whereas for small λ the matrix element is centered around n' = n, it becomes for large λ more likely that also the bosonic occupation number changes. We furthermore note the asymmetry of the distribution, which however is reduced when $\Delta n \ll n$. The fact that for stronger couplings the there is a dip at the origin can be qualitatively understood by realizing that $e^{\pm 2B}$ is a displacement operator [2].

By contrast, the other coupling operator only allows for the creation or annihilation of one quantum of the



FIG. 2. (Color Online) Matrix element $\left| \langle \widetilde{n} | e^{\pm 2B} | \widetilde{n + \Delta n} \rangle \right|^2$ for different coupling strengths (vertically shifted for clarity). For small λ (top, black and grey), mainly transitions changing only the spin angular momentum quantum number are allowed. As λ increases (middle, red and orange and bottom, dark and light green), the matrix element also allows for transitions between distant occupation states. All distributions are normalized to one, such that the plotted quantity can be interpreted as a conditional probability distribution. Tick marks on the vertical axis correspond to steps of 0.1. Other parameters: n = 10.

longitudinal boson mode

$$\left| \langle n,m | A_2 | n'm' \rangle \right|^2 = \left| \widetilde{\langle n,m |} \left(e^{+i\phi}a + e^{-i\phi}a^{\dagger} \right) \widetilde{|n'm'\rangle} \right|^2 + \frac{4m^2}{\Omega^2} \left(\lambda e^{-i\phi} + \lambda^* e^{+i\phi} \right)^2 \delta_{nn'} \delta_{mm'} \\ = \delta_{mm'} \left[\delta_{n',n+1}(n+1) + \delta_{n',n-1}n \right] \\ + \frac{4m^2}{\Omega^2} \left(\lambda e^{-i\phi} + \lambda^* e^{+i\phi} \right)^2 \delta_{nn'} \delta_{mm'} .$$

$$(24)$$

Here, λ and ϕ only enter the diagonal contribution, which is irrelevant as it does not change the dynamics of the rate equation.

In total, the resulting rate equation

$$\dot{P}_{nm} = \sum_{n'm'} W_{nm,n'm'} P_{n'm'}$$
(25)

is of standard form, namely additive in the dissipators $W_{nm,n'm'} = W_{nm,n'm'}^{(t)} + W_{nm,n'm'}^{(\ell)}$, where for $(n,m) \neq (n',m')$ we have for the (positive) transition rates from (n',m') to (n,m) the expressions

$$W_{nm,n'm'}^{(t)} = \gamma_{11}(E_{n'm'} - E_{nm}) |\langle nm| A_1 | n'm' \rangle|^2,$$

$$W_{nm,n'm'}^{(\ell)} = \gamma_{22}(E_{n'm'} - E_{nm}) |\langle nm| A_2 | n'm' \rangle|^2. (26)$$

The diagonal entries $W_{nm,nm} = -\sum_{(n'm')\neq (nm)} W_{n'm',nm}$ follow from trace conservation. We see that



FIG. 3. (Color Online) Graph representation of allowed transitions between the n, m-parametrized eigenstates (green circles) of H_S for N = 2. Black arrows represent transitions triggered by the longitudinal reservoir, compare Eq. (24). Red lines represent transitions triggered by the transversal reservoir, compare Eq. (23). For finite λ , these also admit diagonal transitions changing both m and n (dashed red, background), whereas for $\lambda \to 0$, only the vertical transitions (solid red) remain. The basic idea of coarse-graining is to obtain effective rates (bold arrows) between meso-states (shaded regions) formed by lumping together the different Fock states for a given spin quantum number, physically motivated by fast horizontal equilibration $\Gamma_{\ell} \gg \Gamma_t$. Whereas the transition rates in the original system obey local detailed balance relations (27), the coarse-grained rates will not, cf. Eq. (34) and the discussion in Sec. III F.

 $|\langle n,m|A_{\alpha}|n'm'\rangle|^2 = |\langle n',m'|A_{\alpha}|nm\rangle|^2$, such that Eqns. (17) imply the usual local-detailed balance relations

$$\frac{W_{nm,n'm'}^{(t)}}{W_{n'm',nm}^{(t)}} = e^{\beta_t (E_{n'm'} - E_{nm})},$$

$$\frac{W_{nm,n'm'}^{(\ell)}}{W_{n'm',nm}^{(\ell)}} = e^{\beta_\ell (E_{n'm'} - E_{nm})}.$$
(27)

We note that this property enables one to formulate a consistent thermodynamic picture of these rate equations, including positivity of the entropy production rate in a far-from-equilibrium regime ($\beta_t \neq \beta_\ell$) and the existence of a heat exchange fluctuation theorem [42].

The general structure of the rate equation is depicted in Fig. 3. Any numerical simulation of the resulting rate equation [43] will have to cut the bosonic Hilbert space of the system, such that the total dimension required by the rate equation scales as $NN_{\rm cut}$. In particular for higher temperatures we note that the required $N_{\rm cut}$ for the bosons may be large, making full-scale simulations in this regime for large N difficult.

D. Energy Currents

When the rate matrix is additively decomposable into the reservoirs ν , i.e., when the transition rates from energy eigenstate j to energy eigenstate i are decomposable as $W_{ij} = \sum_{\nu} W_{ij}^{(\nu)}$, we can directly infer the (time-dependent) energy currents from the system into reservoir ν by multiplying the occupation P_j with the reservoir-specific transition rate $W_{ij}^{(\nu)}$ and the corresponding energy difference $(E_j - E_i)$. Summing over all initial states and all allowed transitions then yields the energy current into reservoir ν

$$I_{E}^{(\nu)}(t) = \sum_{i,j} (E_{j} - E_{i}) W_{ij}^{(\nu)} P_{j}(t)$$

$$\stackrel{t \to \infty}{\to} \sum_{i,j} (E_{j} - E_{i}) W_{ij}^{(\nu)} \bar{P}_{j}.$$
(28)

Here, we have deliberately chosen the convention that the current counts positive when the system injects net energy into the reservoir, and negative otherwise.

E. Coarse-Graining

We can define the reduced probability of being in spin eigenstate m by summing over the different occupation configurations

$$P_m = \sum_n P_{nm} \,. \tag{29}$$

Then, we can formally write its time derivative as

$$\dot{P}_{m} = \sum_{m'} \left[\sum_{nn'} W_{nm,n'm'} \frac{P_{n'm'}}{P_{m'}} \right] P_{m'}, \qquad (30)$$

where we see that the set of P_m does not obey a closed Markovian evolution equation, since to obtain the timedependent prefactors in square brackets one first has to solve the full rate equation for the P_{nm} probabilities. However, in certain limits an approximate Markovian description is possible. To motivate this approximation we identify in the time-dependent prefactors in brackets the – in general time-dependent – conditional probability $P_{n'm'|m'}$ of the system being in state n'm' provided that the spin is in state m'. When parameters are now adjusted such that the longitudinal mode equilibrates much faster than the large spin, we can replace the time-dependent conditional probability by its stationary equilibrated value [44]

$$\frac{P_{n'm'}}{P_{m'}} \to \bar{P}_{n'm'|m'} , \qquad (31)$$

which in general depends on both states n' and m'. In general, the resulting coarse-grained rates

$$W_{mm'} = \sum_{nn'} W_{nm,n'm'} \bar{P}_{n'm'|m'}$$
(32)

between mesostates m' and m will implicitly depend on the coupling constants and temperatures of all reservoirs through the conditional steady-state probability $\bar{P}_{n'm'|m'}$. This also holds for an additive decomposition of the total rate matrix $W_{nm,n'm'} = \sum_{\nu} W_{nm,n'm'}^{(\nu)}$. Therefore, in a coarse-grained description, the reservoirs will not simply enter as independent additive contributions, and furthermore, the coarse-grained rates need not obey detailed balance by construction $\frac{W_{mm'}}{W_{m'm}} \neq e^{\beta(E_{m'}-E_m)}$.

Specifically, we note that in our case the conditional probabilities $\bar{P}_{n'm'|m'} = e^{-n'\beta_\ell\Omega} \left[1 - e^{-\beta_\ell\Omega}\right]$ are just the thermalized probabilities of the longitudinal oscillator mode in contact with its own reservoir. They are well approached when $\Gamma_\ell \gg \Gamma_t$. The approximate coarse-grained rates only describe transitions between the large spin eigenstates

$$W_{mm'} = \sum_{nn'} W_{nm,n'm'} e^{-n'\beta_{\ell}\Omega} \left[1 - e^{-\beta_{\ell}\Omega}\right] . \quad (33)$$

We note that the rates due to A_2 will not contribute to the coarse-grained ones $W_{mm'}^{(\ell)} = 0$, since they do not induce transitions between different mesostates m and m', see Eq. (24) and Fig. 3. For the other rates however, a contribution remains, such that we can write

$$W_{mm'} = \delta_{m',m-1} M_m^- \sum_{nn'} \gamma_{11} (E_{n'm'} - E_{nm}) \times \\ \times \left| \langle \widetilde{n} | e^{+2B} \widetilde{|n'\rangle} \right|^2 e^{-n'\beta_\ell \Omega} \left[1 - e^{-\beta_\ell \Omega} \right] \\ + \delta_{m',m+1} M_m^+ \sum_{nn'} \gamma_{11} (E_{n'm'} - E_{nm}) \times \\ \times \left| \langle \widetilde{n} | e^{-2B} \widetilde{|n'\rangle} \right|^2 e^{-n'\beta_\ell \Omega} \left[1 - e^{-\beta_\ell \Omega} \right], \quad (34)$$

where we have used Eq. (23). We stress again that, unless the temperatures of both reservoirs are equal, the coarse-grained rates will not obey a conventional detailed balance relation. Instead, we find a more general relation, see Sec. III F. With introducing the net number of bosons exchanged with the longitudinal boson reservoir $\bar{n} = n - n'$ (we will in the following use the overbar to indicate that \bar{n} can assume negative values) and defining the coarse-grained spin energy as

$$E_m = \omega_0 m - 4 \frac{|\lambda|^2}{\Omega} m^2 , \qquad (35)$$

we can rewrite the approximate coarse-grained rates as

$$W_{mm'} = \delta_{m',m-1} M_m^- \sum_{\bar{n}=-\infty}^{+\infty} \gamma_{11} (E_{m-1} - E_m - \Omega \bar{n}) \alpha_{\bar{n}} (36) + \delta_{m',m+1} M_m^+ \sum_{\bar{n}=-\infty}^{+\infty} \gamma_{11} (E_{m+1} - E_m - \Omega \bar{n}) \alpha_{\bar{n}} .$$



FIG. 4. Level spectrum (35) for N = 8. For finite coupling strength, the level spectrum (symbols) is no longer equidistant. Since a transition from the m = +N/2 state (rightmost) to the ground state m = -N/2 (left-most) is only allowed along the connected states (dotted lines), the level renormalization may seriously affect the Dicke superradiance and even block the process. Other parameters: $\omega_0 = \Omega$.

Above, we have introduced a normalized distribution with $\sum_{\bar{n}=-\infty}^{+\infty} \alpha_{\bar{n}} = 1$ by using

$$\alpha_{\bar{n}} = \sum_{nn'=0}^{\infty} \delta_{\bar{n},n-n'} \left| \langle \widetilde{n} | e^{\pm 2B} | \widetilde{n'} \rangle \right|^2 e^{-n'\beta_{\ell}\Omega} \left[1 - e^{-\beta_{\ell}\Omega} \right]$$
$$= e^{-\frac{4|\lambda|^2}{\Omega^2}(1+2n_{\ell})} \left(\frac{1+n_{\ell}}{n_{\ell}} \right)^{\bar{n}/2} \times \mathcal{J}_{\bar{n}} \left(\frac{8|\lambda|^2}{\Omega^2} \sqrt{n_{\ell}(1+n_{\ell})} \right), \qquad (37)$$

where $\mathcal{J}_{\bar{n}}(x)$ denotes the modified Bessel function of the first kind. In the second line, we have explicitly evaluated the matrix element and performed the summation.

The coarse-grained rates depend on both β_{ℓ} (through $\alpha_{\bar{n}}$) and β_t (through $\gamma_{11}(\omega)$). Despite these sophisticated rates, the structure of the approximate coarse-grained rate equation now has a simple tri-diagonal form

$$\dot{P}_{m} = -\left[\gamma(E_{m} - E_{m-1})M_{m}^{-} + \gamma(E_{m} - E_{m+1})M_{m}^{+}\right]P_{m} + \gamma(E_{m+1} - E_{m})M_{m}^{+}P_{m+1} + \gamma(E_{m-1} - E_{m})M_{m}^{-}P_{m-1},$$
$$\gamma(\omega) = \sum_{\bar{n}=-\infty}^{+\infty} \gamma_{\bar{n}}(\omega) = \sum_{\bar{n}=-\infty}^{+\infty} \gamma_{11}(\omega - \Omega\bar{n})\alpha_{\bar{n}}$$
(38)

with dimension N + 1. We see that in contrast to the original superradiance master equation (13), the level spectrum (35) is no longer equidistant, but the scaling of the matrix elements with the spin length N will persist. This also implies that the most excited spin state is not necessarily the one with m = +N/2, see Fig.4.

F. Non-equilibrium dynamics

The temperatures of transversal and longitudinal reservoirs may be different, giving rise to non-equilibrium stationary energy currents between the reservoirs. To evaluate the total energy exchanged with both reservoirs one could of course numerically evaluate the high-dimensional rate equation with a suitable cutoff of the longitudinal boson mode. Especially at large longitudinal temperatures, however, this may be computationally difficult.

To obtain the thermodynamics of the coarse-grained rate equation, it is helpful to note that the standard Kubo-Martin-Schwinger (KMS) relations of transversal and longitudinal correlation functions imply a nonstandard [45, 46] KMS-type relation between the different terms in the sum

$$\frac{\gamma_{+\bar{n}}(-\omega)}{\gamma_{-\bar{n}}(+\omega)} = \frac{\alpha_{+\bar{n}}}{\alpha_{-\bar{n}}} \frac{\gamma_{11}(-\omega - \Omega\bar{n})}{\gamma_{11}(+\omega + \Omega\bar{n})} = e^{+\beta_{\ell}\bar{n}\Omega} e^{-\beta_{t}(\omega + \bar{n}\Omega)}.$$
(39)

Naturally, at equilibrium $\beta_{\ell} = \beta_t$ we recover the usual KMS relation, the coarse-grained rates obey detailed balance, and the stationary state of the coarse-grained rate equation (38) is just the canonical equilibrium one.

For different temperatures, relation (39) is consistent with the interpretation that processes described by the term $\gamma_{\bar{n}}(\omega)$ – representing a net change of $-\omega$ in the system's energy via the exchange of \bar{n} bosons with the longitudinal mode – must be accompanied with an energy transfer of $\bar{n}\Omega$ into the longitudinal reservoir and a transfer of $\omega - \bar{n}\Omega$ into the the transversal reservoir. We can quantify for each process the fractions of the system's energy change that are transferred into longitudinal and transversal reservoirs, respectively. Formally, we can then compute for a rate equation of the form $\dot{P}_i = \sum_j \sum_{\bar{n}} W_{ij}^{(\bar{n})} P_j$ the stationary energy currents into both reservoirs via

$$I_E^{(\ell/t)} = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\bar{n}} \Delta E_{ij}^{(\bar{n},\ell/t)} W_{ij}^{(\bar{n})} \bar{P}_j \,. \tag{40}$$

Specifically, we do this for each transition term in the rate equation (38)

$$P_{m} = -\left[\gamma(E_{m} - E_{m-1})M_{m}^{-} + \gamma(E_{m} - E_{m+1})M_{m}^{+}\right]P_{m} + \sum_{\bar{n}}\gamma_{\bar{n}}(E_{m+1} - E_{m})M_{m}^{+}P_{m+1} + \sum_{\bar{n}}\gamma_{\bar{n}}(E_{m-1} - E_{m})M_{m}^{-}P_{m-1}, \qquad (41)$$

to calculate the currents into reservoirs ℓ and t via

$$I_{E}^{\ell}(t) = \sum_{m} \sum_{\bar{n}} \bar{n} \Omega \gamma_{\bar{n}} (E_{m+1} - E_{m}) M_{m}^{+} P_{m+1}(t) + \sum_{m} \sum_{\bar{n}} \bar{n} \Omega \gamma_{\bar{n}} (E_{m-1} - E_{m}) M_{m}^{-} P_{m-1}(t) I_{E}^{t}(t) = \sum_{m} \sum_{\bar{n}} (E_{m+1} - E_{m} - \bar{n}\Omega) \times \times \gamma_{\bar{n}} (E_{m+1} - E_{m}) M_{m}^{+} P_{m+1}(t) + \sum_{m} \sum_{\bar{n}} (E_{m-1} - E_{m} - \bar{n}\Omega) \times \times \gamma_{\bar{n}} (E_{m-1} - E_{m}) M_{m}^{-} P_{m-1}(t) .$$
(42)

Before proceeding, we mention a few properties of the steady-state currents $I_E^{\ell/t} = \lim_{t \to \infty} I_E^{\ell/t}(t)$, obtained by letting $P_m(t) \to \bar{P}_m$. Firstly, in equilibrium $(\beta_\ell = \beta_t = \beta)$, both currents must vanish individually. Formally, this is enforced by the KMS relation (39). Secondly, the steady-state currents must compensate as the total energy is conserved $I_E^\ell = -I_E^t$. Thirdly, the second law of thermodynamics actually implies that $(\beta_\ell - \beta_t)I_E^\ell \ge 0$ in all parameter regimes (heat always flows from hot to cold). Finally, we also stress that a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for a finite current is that all stationary probabilities must be strictly smaller than one (if only one state is occupied $P_{\bar{m}} = 1$, there are no transitions between two states and thus no stationary current).

In our results section, we explicitly confirm that the currents obtained from the coarse-grained rate equation (41) and from the high-dimensional rate equation (25) coincide in the appropriate limit $\Gamma_{\ell} \gg \Gamma_t$.

Finally, to perform calculations, we will parametrize the spectral coupling density in Eq. (17) with an ohmic form and exponential cutoff ω_c [8]

$$\Gamma_t(\omega) = \Gamma_t \omega e^{-\omega/\omega_c} \,. \tag{43}$$

Here, Γ_t regulates the coupling strength to the transversal reservoir and the cutoff expresses the fact that for any realistic model the spectral coupling density should decay in the ultraviolet regime.

G. Weak-Coupling limit

The observation that the two reservoirs no longer enter additively in the coarse-grained description does not come unexpected, as an additive decomposition typically requires the weak-coupling limit between system and reservoir. By contrast, in our setup the large spin may be strongly coupled to the longitudinal boson mode. To check for consistency, we will therefore briefly discuss the limit of small λ . We can use the fact that near the origin we have $\mathcal{J}_{\bar{n}}(x) = \frac{x^{|\bar{n}|}}{2^{|\bar{n}||\bar{n}|!}} + \mathcal{O}\{x^{|\bar{n}|+2}\}$ to expand the correlation function in the dissipator as

$$\gamma(\omega) = \gamma_{11}(\omega) + \frac{4|\lambda|^2}{\Omega^2} \Big[\gamma_{11}(\omega + \Omega)n_\ell + \gamma_{11}(\omega - \Omega)(1 + n_\ell) - \gamma_{11}(\omega)(1 + 2n_\ell) \Big] + \mathcal{O}\{|\lambda|^4\}.$$
(44)

Clearly, the original Dicke superradiance model is consistently recovered at $\lambda \to 0$. As expected, we obtain an additional dissipator of order $|\lambda|^2$. What at first sight comes a bit unexpected is that the additional dissipator does not solely depend on the thermal properties of reservoir ℓ but also on reservoir t (through γ_{11}). It is also proportional to the product of $\Gamma_t(\omega)$ and $|\lambda|^2$. This however is fully consistent with our initial model, since the interaction mediated by the λ -coupling is of puredephasing type for the large spin. Therefore, if applied alone ($\Gamma_t(\omega) \to 0$), it should not affect the dynamics of the angular momentum eigenstates at all but can only induce dephasing of coherences between different angular momentum eigenstates.

IV. RESULTS

A. Equilibrium: Superradiant decay

For vanishing coupling $\lambda = 0$, it is well-known that at zero temperature, the quadratic scaling of the matrix elements leads to superradiant decay toward the ground state with a maximum intensity scaling as N^2 and consequently a width of the peak scaling as 1/N. We can reproduce these findings in the appropriate limits (not shown). In this section, we want to investigate how the decay dynamics is influenced by the presence of the longitudinal mode and therefore consider the case that both reservoirs are at zero temperature, or at least temperatures sufficiently low that excitations entering the system from the reservoir can be safely neglected, $n_{\ell} = n_t = 0$.

The scaling of Dicke superradiance also reflects in the passage time towards the ground state. At zero temperature, the probability distribution for the passage time to the ground state is defined by

$$P(t) = \frac{d}{dt} P_{-N/2}(t) \,. \tag{45}$$

Provided the ground state is the stationary state associated with a given initial state, it is straightforward to check that it is normalized $\int_0^\infty P(t)dt = 1$ and positive $P(t) \ge 0$. We will be interested in the mean passage time and its width, which requires us to evaluate

$$\langle \tau^n \rangle = \int_0^\infty \tau^n P(\tau) d\tau \tag{46}$$

for n = 1 and n = 2. For a rate matrix of the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & L_{12} & & \\ 0 & -L_{12} & L_{23} & \\ & & -L_{23} & \ddots \\ & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (47)$$

the first and second cumulants of the passage time distribution assume the simple form

$$\langle \tau \rangle = \frac{1}{L_{12}} + \frac{1}{L_{23}} + \dots ,$$

 $\langle \tau^2 \rangle - \langle \tau \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{L_{12}^2} + \frac{1}{L_{23}^2} + \dots .$ (48)

Without longitudinal boson coupling $\lambda = 0$, we have $L_{12} = \Gamma_t(\omega_0) M^+_{-N/2}$, $L_{23} = \Gamma_t(\omega_0) M^+_{-N/2+1}$ and so on – cf. Eq. (13) – such that we can obtain the mean passage time and its width for the original Dicke limit analytically

$$\langle \tau \rangle = \frac{2 \left(\gamma + \Psi_0(N+1) \right)}{\Gamma_t(\omega_0)(N+1)} ,$$

$$\langle \tau^2 \rangle - \langle \tau \rangle^2 = \left[12\gamma + \pi^2(N+1) + 12\Psi_0(N+1) - (49) \right]$$

$$- 6(N+1)\Psi_1(N+1) \left] / \left[3\Gamma_t^2(\omega_0)(N+1)^3 \right] ,$$

where $\gamma \approx 0.577216$ denotes the Euler constant and $\Psi_n(x)$ the Polygamma function. We see that for large N the mean passage time roughly scales as $\langle \tau \rangle \approx (2\gamma + \ln N)/(\Gamma_t(\omega_0)N)$ and the width as $\sqrt{\langle \tau^2 \rangle - \langle \tau \rangle^2} \approx \pi/(\sqrt{3}N\Gamma_t(\omega_0))$. That means that to obtain a sharply determined passage time one requires very large N, e.g. to obtain a width ten times smaller than the mean one requires $N = \mathcal{O}\{10^7\}$ two-level systems. For infinite N, the passage time is very well determined and – despite the stochastic nature of the rate equation – the system relaxes nearly deterministically towards the ground state with a negligible temporal error.

These findings would be qualitatively similar if we start from the middle of the spectrum (e.g. at $m \approx 0$) instead. In fact, to investigate how the additional boson mode influences the relaxation behaviour to the ground state at low temperatures we have to take the level distortion in Fig. 4 into account. When preparing the system in the state m = +N/2 we may not see any relaxation toward the ground state as a trivial effect of the level renormalization. To ensure that we only observe unidirectional relaxation we therefore constrain ourselves to odd N and prepare the system initially in the state m = -1/2. The results are displayed in Fig. 5. One can see that at first finite couplings λ aid the relaxation process, since the passage time becomes shorter. However, above a critical coupling strength the passage time increases again for larger system sizes N. This is due to the finite bandwidth $\omega_{\rm c}$ of the spectral coupling density (43): The excitation energy above the ground state $\Delta E = \omega_0 + 4 \frac{|\lambda|^2}{\Omega} (N-1)$ becomes so large $|\Delta E| \gg \omega_c$ that the bosonic correlation function has no support and the last steps above the



FIG. 5. (Color Online) Plot of the dimensionless mean passage time versus system size N for different coupling strengths when both reservoirs are at the same low temperature $\beta =$ $\beta_{\ell} = \beta_t$. The dynamics of the original superradiance scenario (dashed brown) is hardly changed when instead from starting at m = +N/2 we do initially prepare the system at m = -1/2(solid black) – apart from an obvious speedup by a factor two. When the coupling strength λ is increased, the presence of additional decay channels (compare the dashed lines in Fig. 3) first increases the relaxation speed (red). However, beyond a critical system size N an exponential slowdown of relaxation (increase of the passage time) occurs. This is due to the renormalization-induced increase of the excitation energies above the ground state (compare e.g. the orange curve in Fig. 4), which due to the finite bandwidth ω_c finds no support in the correlation function. Other parameters: $\omega_0 = \Omega$, $\beta\Omega=10,\,\omega_c=10\Omega.$

ground state occur extremely slow, with the visible effect on the passage time.

B. Non-Equilibrium steady state heat current

When we consider different temperatures in both reservoirs, this will induce a steady state heat current from hot to cold across the system. This simply means that trajectories where the system absorbs energy from the hot reservoir and afterwards emits energy into the cold reservoir become more likely than trajectories where the net flow of energy is opposed. The total energy is conserved, which at steady state implies that we need to consider only the energy current into the longitudinal boson reservoir $I_E = I_E^{\ell} = -I_E^{\ell}$ (we have of course confirmed this equality). Eqns. (28) and (42) imply that to calculate a current, we first have to evaluate the stationary probabilities, which can for large matrices be numerically unstable. Therefore, we provide an analytical formula for tri-diagonal rate matrices in Appendix A.

1. Weak-coupling Current

We parametrize the inverse temperatures as

$$\beta_{\ell} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\bar{\beta} + \Delta\beta + \sqrt{\bar{\beta}^2 + \Delta\beta^2} \right],$$

$$\beta_t = \frac{1}{2} \left[\bar{\beta} - \Delta\beta + \sqrt{\bar{\beta}^2 + \Delta\beta^2} \right]$$
(50)

and plot the energy current through the system versus $\Delta\beta$ for a fixed inverse average temperature $\bar{\beta}$. Trivially, as a consequence of the second law we expect for $\Delta\beta > 0$ (implying for the temperatures $T_{\ell} < T_t$) that the current entering the longitudinal reservoir is positive $I_E > 0$ and for $\Delta\beta < 0$ we consequently expect $I_E < 0$.

To drive the system into a regime where the stationary current is mainly carried by large matrix elements M_m^{\pm} and thus scales quadratically with the size N, we essentially have to populate the states with $m \approx 0$ as these contribute most to the current, compare Eq. (42). For our model, such a configuration is best approached when all populations are approximately equally occupied: For weak coupling strengths λ we can approximate $E_{m+1} - E_m \approx \omega_0$ such that the summation in the current from the equipartition assumption simply yields a quadratic factor $\sum_m M_m^{\pm} \bar{P}_{m\pm 1} = N(N+2)/6$. From Eq.(42) we then obtain that the current will scale quadratically with N in this regime

$$I_E \to \sum_{\bar{n}} (\bar{n}\Omega) \left[\gamma_{\bar{n}}(+\omega_0) + \gamma_{\bar{n}}(-\omega_0) \right] \frac{N(N+2)}{6} . (51)$$

Such an equipartition regime can be expected at large average temperatures, and to see a significant current we do at the same time require a large temperature difference. Transferred to our variables in Eq. (50) this means we have to consider small $\bar{\beta}$ and large $\Delta\beta$. Fig. 6 indeed shows a quadratic scaling of the current with Nin the regime where the populations are approximately equal (positive $\Delta\beta$). The thin dotted line for N = 64also demonstrates the quality of the analytic approximation (51). Most interesting however, we observe that for large temperature differences, under temperature inversion $(\Delta\beta \rightarrow -\Delta\beta)$ the populations are no longer equally occupied and simultaneously the absolute value of the current drops drastically. Thus, at large temperature differences the system effectively implements a heat diode [28, 29, 47] with a rectification efficiency that is controllable by N. Since for $\Delta\beta \gg 0$ the current scales quadratically and for $\Delta\beta \ll 0$ it does not, this effect can be controlled by increasing the number of two-level systems N. For a small negative thermal bias the occupations of higher levels drop only mildly (implying a finite current) whereas for $\Delta\beta \ll 0$ essentially just the ground state is occupied (inset). This also results in a negative differential thermo-conductance [30, 48–50].

Finally, we would like to stress that we can compare the current from the coarse-grained rate equation (42)with the one computed from the exact master equation



FIG. 6. (Color Online) Plot of the dimensionless steady state energy current versus dimensionless inverse temperature difference for weak coupling $\lambda = 0.1\Omega$ and large average temperatures $\bar{\beta}\Omega = 0.01$. The top horizontal axis converts into dimensionless temperature differences $\bar{\beta}\Delta T = \bar{\beta}(T_t - T_\ell)$. The top left inset shows the stationary occupation of the energy levels for N = 64, where the top curve denotes the ground state and the bottom curve the most excited state (at $\Delta\beta/\beta = 0$ we have the Gibbs distribution at β). Finally, the two density plots (white corresponds to zero, red to respective maximum) display the stationary state occupation \bar{P}_{nm} of the full rate equation (25) for $N=16, N_{\rm c}=40,$ and $\Gamma_\ell=10^{\rm b}\Gamma_t$ at $\Delta\beta/\bar{\beta} = -100$ (left) and $\Delta\beta/\bar{\beta} = +100$ (right). For the density plots, m ranges from -N/2 (top) to +N/2 (bottom), n ranges from 0 (left) to $N_{\rm c}$ (right). When the levels are approximately equally occupied $(\Delta \beta / \bar{\beta} \approx 0)$, and right density plot), the quadratic scaling of the matrix elements around m = 0carries over to the stationary current as predicted in Eq. (51)(thin dotted line for N = 64). In contrast, for $\Delta \beta / \bar{\beta} \ll 0$, the system dominantly resides in the lowest mesostate (inset and left density plot), and the current is consequently strongly suppressed. In total, the system may therefore be used as a heat diode. In contrast, the current for N = 1(dashed grey, scaled by 10^3 for visibility) is also asymmetric but does not display significant rectification. The symbols (for N = 32 only) indicate currents derived using the full rate equation (25) with a maximum occupation of the longitudinal boson mode $N_{\rm cut} \in \{5, 10, 20, 40, 80, 160, 320\}$ (orange arrows) and $\Gamma_{\ell} = 10^6 \Gamma_t$. For large longitudinal temperatures T_{ℓ} (left), 320 bosonic modes barely suffice to ensure convergence, whereas for small temperatures T_{ℓ} (right), roughly 10 modes suffice. Other parameters: $\bar{\beta}\Gamma_t = 0.01, \, \omega_0 = \Omega, \, \lambda = 0.1\Omega$, $\omega_{\rm c} = 10\Omega.$

when $\Gamma_{\ell} \gg \Gamma_t$. This requires to take a sufficient number of maximum bosonic occupations into account, requiring potentially large computational resources. The symbols in Fig. 6 demonstrate that convergence for the current is reached in either regime (also demonstrating validity of the coarse-graining approximation), but it is significantly slower when the temperature of the longitudinal boson reservoir is large (negative $\Delta\beta$). This is somewhat expected, since for large temperatures many longitudinal



FIG. 7. (Color Online) Similar as Fig. 6, but for a lower average temperature $\bar{\beta}\Omega = 0.1$. An equipartition of levels is not reached, and the current does not scale quadratically with N. Nevertheless, rectification is still present. Color codes and other parameters have been chosen as in Fig. 6.

boson mode excitations have to be taken into account.

The maximum bosonic cutoff can be reduced when one lowers the average temperature. Indeed, we see in Fig. 7 that for N = 16 (left density plot) fewer bosonic modes are occupied. However, the reduction of the average temperature (increase of $\bar{\beta}$) also has the effect that the levels in the conducting direction are no longer equipartitioned, such that the current is reduced and does no longer scale quadratically in N.

When we further decrease the average temperature, compare Fig. 8, the currents are further reduced. Furthermore, in the conducting direction it does not even rise monotonically with N.

2. Strong-coupling Current

An ideal heat diode should have a large current in the conducting direction and should faithfully block the current when the direction is reversed. It is therefore reasonable to probe the strong-coupling regime, as increasing λ should naively also increase the current. However, we note that for our model this is only partially true, as the increased level renormalization will also reduce the energy current. In fact, previous investigations have found a suppression of transient superradiance in the strong-coupling-limit [51]. We also find an analogous behaviour in the stationary regime.

For stronger couplings, the heat-diode capability is in principle even enhanced and also present for smaller temperature differences, since the stationary state becomes rapidly pure for $\Delta\beta\Omega < 0$ and thus effectively inhibits transport, see the inset of Fig. 9. However, we also observe that for $\Delta\beta\Omega > 0$ the quadratic scaling of the current does not hold over the complete range of N.



FIG. 8. (Color Online) Similar as Figs. 6 and 7, but for an even lower average temperature $\bar{\beta}\Omega = 1.0$. No quadratic scaling is observed, the current is significantly suppressed. Furthermore, the current for $\Delta\beta/\bar{\beta} \gg 0$ does not even rise monotonically with N, but rectification is still present. Color codes and other parameters have been chosen as in Fig. 6.

In fact, the current is for large N (in the Figure for N = 32 and N = 64) even further suppressed, which limits the throughput capability of the heat diode. This is a consequence of the level renormalization, which destroys the previously observed equipartition of all energy levels (see inset). We note that in the strong-coupling limit, the current in conductance direction is carried by two non-communicating regions in phase-space (compare right density plot). The mesostates with $m \approx 0$ are hardly occupied and do not contribute to the current. Instead, the system is rather concentrated close to the ground state. Nevertheless, due to the strong coupling a significant current is produced for finite N.

When we lower the average temperature (increase β) as in the weak-coupling regime, the total current is strongly suppressed without substantial changes in heat rectification properties (not shown). These regimes are therefore less useful for heat diode application purposes.

We note that the diode effect requires $\Gamma_{\ell} \gg \Gamma_t$ (as one may have expected from the violation of the detailed balance relation due to coarse-graining) and that one of the temperatures is small in comparison to the system energy scales (to concentrate the populations at the boundaries of the phase space).

V. CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

We have studied non-equilibrium physics in an ensemble of N identical two-level systems asymmetrically coupled with two different thermal reservoir. The coupling with one reservoir is dissipative (transversal coupling) while the coupling with the other reservoir is assumed to be of pure dephasing (longitudinal coupling). For large



FIG. 9. (Color Online) Plot of the dimensionless energy current between the reservoirs versus dimensionless temperature difference for strong coupling $\lambda = 0.8\Omega$ and large average temperature $\bar{\beta}\Omega = 0.01$. The level renormalization prohibits for large N the equipartition of levels (inset for N = 64) for all non-equilibrium regimes and thus destroys the quadratic scaling of the current. For small N and $\Delta\beta\Omega \gg 0$ it grows approximately linearly with N but for larger N it is even reduced and above N = 64 suppressed completely. Nevertheless, for finite N the quality of heat rectification is improved in comparison to the weak-coupling limit as for negative $\Delta\beta$ all but the ground state are exponentially suppressed, which directly affects the current. Color coding and other parameters chosen as in Fig. 6.

coherence lengths in the reservoirs, the coupling is collective and the ensemble of two-level systems behave as a single large spin. The case of strong coupling with the dephasing reservoir can be modelled by considering the coupling of the large single spin with a single bosonic mode which is further coupled to its own reservoir. First, we derived a rate equation in the energy eigenbasis of the large spin and the longitudinal boson mode, valid beyond the weak-coupling limit between spins and longitudinal mode. The resulting rate equation obeys the usual thermodynamic local detailed balance relations. The dimension of the rate equation system scales as $(N_c+1)(N+1)$ for a large spin of dimension N and a cutoff of a maximum occupation number $N_{\rm c}$ for the longitudinal mode. In particular for high temperatures of the longitudinal mode reservoirs, many modes have to be taken into account, $N_{\rm c} \gg 1$, and the numerical computation of observables may become difficult.

When the coupling between the longitudinal boson mode and its reservoir is much larger than couplings of the large spin, we can coarse-grain the dynamics by collecting large spin eigenstates with different realizations of the longitudinal mode occupations into mesostates. The coarse-grained rate equation is of simple tri-diagonal form and only contains the (N + 1) angular momentum eigenstates. We have obtained its modified detailed balance relations, and investigated their effect on heat conductance. From the technical perspective, we have learned that one should be cautious in investigating the combined behaviour of pure-dephasing and dissipative reservoirs. Introducing part of the reservoir in the system may lead to rather non-trivial rate equations. However, coarse-graining may greatly simplify the topology of such rate equations and their numerical and analytical treatment. Coarse-grained rates need no longer be additive in the number of reservoirs and need not obey the usual thermodynamic detailed balance relations, leading to the observed rectification effects. Note that the coarsegrained rate equation can also be alternatively derived by performing the Born approximation in the polarontransformed basis, see Appendix B.

Our main results can be thus summarized as follows: Superradiance. For an equilibrium low-temperature environment, we observed that the presence of the longitudinal reservoir affects superradiance in multiple ways. First, the originally equidistant level spectrum is, for strong longitudinal spin-boson coupling, distorted. This requires some changes in the setting, as the state with all spins pointing upwards is not necessarily the energetically most excited state. When one initially prepares the large spin system slightly below the most excited state, superradiance in the sense of an ultra-fast relaxation is in general still observed and may even be enhanced due to the presence of an additional low-temperature reservoir. However, for strong couplings λ and/or large system sizes N, the final relaxation steps require the emission of large amounts of energy and may therefore be hampered by the finite support of the spectral coupling density. This effect is not present in the original Dicke superradiance, since there the spectral coupling density is only evaluated at a fixed frequency.

Supertransmittance. We also investigated the nonequilibrium dynamics by keeping the reservoirs at different temperatures, giving rise to a stationary heat current. In the appropriate parameter regimes (in particular when the eigenstates are equally occupied), the stationary current displays interesting features such as a quadratic scaling with the number N of two-level systems (supertrans*Rectification.* One of the main results obtained by our analysis is the cooperatively enhanced rectification. For large temperature differences between the reservoirs we observe a heat-diode effect: the stationary heat current from a hot transversal reservoir to a cold longitudinal reservoir is much larger than the stationary current flowing from a hot longitudinal reservoir to a cold transversal reservoir. The rectification factor of this heat diode can be significantly enhanced by the quadratic scaling of the current due to supertransmittance.

Our setup constitutes a proof of principle of how extremely large rectification factors can be achieved by exploiting collective couplings with thermal reservoirs. We have argued that our model could be used to describe trapped ions collectively coupled to a thermal photon field and a phonon field. Since rectification allows energy transfer from the hot photon field (transverse) to the cold phonon field (longitudinal), these findings could inspire the design of a device able to efficiently absorb energy from sunlight (that corresponds to a black-body radiator with high temperature of ≈ 6000 K) and convert it efficiently (due to supertransmittance) into heat stored in a phonon reservoir. In the absence of sunlight, the inverse process would be strongly suppressed, such that the total device would be a very suitable energy harvester. The design of such devices is an appealing avenue of further research.

VI. ACKNOWLEDMENTS

Financial support by the DFG (grant SCHA 1646/3-1) and helpful discussions with T. Brandes and P. Strasberg are gratefully acknowledged. G.G. gratefully acknowledges the support of the Mathematical Soft Matter Unit of the Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology.

- A. J. Leggett, S. Chakravarty, A. T. Dorsey, M. P. A. Fisher, A. Garg, and W. Zwerger. Dynamics of the dissipative two-state system. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 59:1–85, 1987.
- [2] Marlan O. Scully and M. Suhail Zubairy. Quantum Optics. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [3] F.K. Wilhelm, S. Kleff, and J. von Delft. The spin-boson model with a structured environment: a comparison of approaches. *Chemical Physics*, 296:345, 2004.
- [4] F.Nesi, E. Paladino, M. Thorwart, and M. Grifoni. Spinboson dynamics beyond conventional perturbation theories. *Physical Review B*, 76:155323, 2007.
- [5] Chen Wang, Jie Ren, and Jianshu Cao. Nonequilibrium energy transfer at nanoscale: A unified theory from weak to strong coupling. *Scientific Reports*, 5:11787, 2015.

- [6] Yuan-Chung Cheng and Graham R. Fleming. Dynamics of light harvesting in photosynthesis. Annual Review of Physical Chemistry, 60:241, 2009.
- [7] Gerhard C. Hegerfeldt, Jens Timo Neumann, and Lawrence S. Schulman. Passage-time distributions from a spin-boson detector model. *Phys. Rev. A*, 75:012108, Jan 2007.
- [8] T. Brandes. Coherent and collective quantum optical effects in mesoscopic systems. *Physics Reports*, 408:315– 474, 2005.
- [9] G. Massimo Palma, Kalle-Antti Suominen, and Artur K. Ekert. Quantum computers and dissipation. *Proceedings* of the Royal Society of London Series A, 452:567, 1996.
- [10] W. G. Unruh. Maintaining coherence in quantum computers. *Physical Review A*, 51:992–997, 1995.

- [11] Giuseppe L. Celardo, Fausto Borgonovi, Marco Merkli, Vladimir I. Tsifrinovich, and Gennady P. Berman. Superradiance transition in photosynthetic light-harvesting complexes. *The Journal of Chemical Physics C*, 116:22105, 2012.
- [12] D. Ferrari, G.L. Celardo, G.P. Berman, R.T. Sayre, and F. Borgonovi. Quantum biological switch based on superradiance transitions. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry* C, 118:20, 2014.
- [13] G. Luca Celardo, Paolo Poli, Luca Lussardi, and Fausto Borgonovi. Cooperative robustness to dephasing: Singleexciton superradiance in a nanoscale ring to model natural light-harvesting systems. *Phys. Rev. B*, 90:085142, Aug 2014.
- [14] G. Luca Celardo, Giulio G. Giusteri, and Fausto Borgonovi. Cooperative robustness to static disorder: Superradiance and localization in a nanoscale ring to model light-harvesting systems found in nature. *Phys. Rev. B*, 90:075113, Aug 2014.
- [15] R. H. Dicke. Coherence in spontaneous radiation processes. *Physical Review*, 93:99 – 110, 1954.
- [16] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione. The Theory of Open Quantum Systems. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
- [17] Cecilia Cormick, Alejandro Bermudez, Susana F. Huelga, and Martin B. Plenio. Dissipative ground-state preparation of a spin chain by a structured environment. New Journal of Physics, 15:073027, 2013.
- [18] Jesse Mumford, D. H. J. O'Dell, and Jonas Larson. Dicke-type phase transition in a multimode optomechanical system. *Annalen der Physik*, 527:115, 2015.
- [19] Anatolii V. Andreev, Vladimir I. Emel'yanov, and Yu A. Il'inskii. Collective spontaneous emission (dicke superradiance). Soviet Physics Uspekhi, 23:493, 1980.
- [20] M. Gross and S. Haroche. Superradiance: An essay on the theory of collective spontaneous emission. *Physics Reports*, 93:301–396, 1982.
- [21] A. Flusberg, T. Mossberg, and S.R. Hartmann. Observation of dicke superradiance at 1.30 μ m in atomic tl vapor. *Physics Letters A*, 58:373, 1976.
- [22] J. A. Mlynek, A. A. Abdumalikov, C. Eichler, and A. Wallraff. Observation of dicke superradiance for two artificial atoms in a cavity with high decay rate. *Nature Communications*, 5:5186, 2014.
- [23] M. Vogl, G. Schaller, and T. Brandes. Counting statistics of collective photon transmissions. *Annals of Physics*, 326:2827, 2011.
- [24] D. Meiser and M. J. Holland. Steady-state superradiance with alkaline-earth-metal atoms. *Physical Review* A, 81(3):033847, 2010.
- [25] D. Meiser, Jun Ye, D. R. Carlson, and M. J. Holland. Prospects for a millihertz-linewidth laser. *Physical Review Letters*, 102(16):163601, 2009.
- [26] Chen Wang and Ke-Wei Sun. Nonequilibrium steady state transport of collective-qubit system in strong coupling regime. Annals of Physics, 362:703, 2015.
- [27] G. Schaller, G. Kießlich, and T. Brandes. Transport statistics of interacting double dot systems: Coherent and non-markovian effects. *Physical Review B*, 80:245107, 2009.
- [28] Dvira Segal. Single mode heat rectifier: Controlling energy flow between electronic conductors. *Physical Review Letters*, 100(10):105901, 2008.

- [29] Tomi Ruokola and Teemu Ojanen. Single-electron heat diode: Asymmetric heat transport between electronic reservoirs through coulomb islands. *Phys. Rev. B*, 83:241404, Jun 2011.
- [30] Jie Ren and Jian-Xin Zhu. Heat diode effect and negative differential thermal conductance across nanoscale metaldielectric interfaces. *Phys. Rev. B*, 87:241412, Jun 2013.
- [31] Ying Li, Xiangying Shen, Zuhui Wu, Junying Huang, Yixuan Chen, Yushan Ni, and Jiping Huang. Temperature-dependent transformation thermotics: From switchable thermal cloaks to macroscopic thermal diodes. *Physical Review Letters*, 115:195503, 2015.
- [32] Anupam Garg, Jos Nelson Onuchic, and Vinay Ambegaokar. Effect of friction on electron transfer in biomolecules. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 83:4491, 1985.
- [33] R. Martinazzo, B. Vacchini, K. H. Hughes, and I. Burghardt. Universal markovian reduction of brownian particle dynamics. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 134:011101, 2011.
- [34] Jake Iles-Smith, Neill Lambert, and Ahsan Nazir. Environmental dynamics, correlations, and the emergence of noncanonical equilibrium states in open quantum systems. *Phys. Rev. A*, 90:032114, Sep 2014.
- [35] Philipp Strasberg, Gernot Schaller, Neill Lambert, and Tobias Brandes. Nonequilibrium thermodynamics in the strong coupling and non-markovian regime based on a reaction coordinate mapping. *arXiv*, 1602.01340, 2016.
- [36] F. Dimer, B. Estienne, A. S. Parkins, and H. J. Carmichael. Proposed realization of the dicke-model quantum phase transition in an optical cavity qed system. *Phys. Rev. A*, 75:013804, Jan 2007.
- [37] D. Nagy, G. Kónya, G. Szirmai, and P. Domokos. Dickemodel phase transition in the quantum motion of a boseeinstein condensate in an optical cavity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 104:130401, Apr 2010.
- [38] Pietro Rotondo, Marco Cosentino Lagomarsino, and Giovanni Viola. Dicke simulators with emergent collective quantum computational abilities. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 114:143601, Apr 2015.
- [39] G. S. Agarwal. Open quantum markovian systems and the microreversibility. *Zeitschrift fr Physik A: Hadrons* and Nuclei, 258:409, 1973.
- [40] G. Schaller. Open Quantum Systems Far from Equilibrium, volume 881 of Lecture Notes in Physics. Springer, 2014.
- [41] G. D. Mahan. Many-Particle Physics. Springer Netherlands, 2000.
- [42] Massimiliano Esposito, Upendra Harbola, and Shaul Mukamel. Entropy fluctuation theorems in driven open systems: Application to electron counting statistics. *Physical Review E*, 76(3):031132, 2007.
- [43] J. Koch and F. von Oppen. Franck-condon blockade and giant fano factors in transport through single molecules. *Physical Review Letters*, 94:206804, 2005.
- [44] Massimiliano Esposito. Stochastic thermodynamics under coarse graining. Phys. Rev. E, 85:041125, Apr 2012.
- [45] G. Schaller, T. Krause, T. Brandes, and M. Esposito. Single-electron transistor strongly coupled to vibrations: counting statistics and fluctuation theorem. *New Journal* of *Physics*, 15:033032, 2013.
- [46] T. Krause, T. Brandes, M. Esposito, and G. Schaller. Thermodynamics of the polaron master equation at finite bias. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 142:134106, 2015.

- [47] Teemu Ojanen. Selection-rule blockade and rectification in quantum heat transport. *Phys. Rev. B*, 80:180301, Nov 2009.
- [48] Zhi-Gang Shao and Lei Yang. Relationship between negative differential thermal resistance and ballistic transport. *Europhysics Letters*, 94:34004, 2011.
- [49] Jiuning Hu, Yan Wang, Ajit Vallabhaneni, Xiulin Ruan, and Yong P. Chen. Nonlinear thermal transport and negative differential thermal conductance in graphene nanoribbons. *Applied Physics Letters*, 99:113101, 2011.
- [50] Miguel A. Sierra and David Sánchez. Strongly nonlinear thermovoltage and heat dissipation in interacting quantum dots. *Phys. Rev. B*, 90:115313, Sep 2014.
- [51] Till Vorrath and Tobias Brandes. Dynamics of a large spin with strong dissipation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 95:070402, Aug 2005.

Appendix A: Stationary State

To calculate the heat current, we first need to calculate the steady state of the rate equation. Numerically, we have found that the determination of the null space is not always stable. Therefore, we determined the null space of a rate matrix by computing the adjugate matrix via the transpose of the cofactor matrix. In case of a tri-diagonal rate matrix

$$(\mathcal{M})_{ij} = \delta_{j,i+1} m_{i,i+1} + \delta_{j,i-1} m_{i,i-1} -\delta_{ij} (m_{i-1,i} + m_{i+1,i})$$
(A1)

with dimension $(N+1) \times (N+1)$ this calculation simplifies considerably. One can then check that the steady state is given by (we use M = N + 1 for generality)

$$\bar{P}_{k} = \frac{\left[\prod_{i=2}^{k} m_{i,i-1}\right] \left[\prod_{j=k}^{M-1} m_{j,j+1}\right]}{\sum_{k} \left[\prod_{i=2}^{k} m_{i,i-1}\right] \left[\prod_{j=k}^{M-1} m_{j,j+1}\right]}, \qquad (A2)$$

where $k \in \{1, ..., M\}$.

Appendix B: Alternative derivation of the coarse-grained rate equation

Here, we will show that we can also obtain the coarsegrained rate equation (38) from a model where the longitudinal boson is not coupled to an independent reservoir, i.e., where the total Hamiltonian simply reads

$$H = \frac{\omega_0}{2} J_z + J_z (\lambda a + \lambda^* a^{\dagger}) + \Omega a^{\dagger} a$$
$$+ J_x \sum_k \left(h_k b_k + h_k^* b_k^{\dagger} \right) + \sum_k \omega_k b_k^{\dagger} b_k . \quad (B1)$$

To treat the model within a master equation approach, we consider only the large spin as the system, and to treat the strong-coupling limit, too, we use the polaron transformation (19). With Eq. (20), we conclude that



FIG. 10. (Color Online) Putting the longitudinal boson mode in a thermal state in the polaron frame (right, appendix) leads to the same evolution equation as coupling it to a separate continuous bosonic reservoir (left, main manuscript) and then assuming that the longitudinal boson degrees of freedom relax to their equilibrium state much faster than the large spin, such that a reduced coarse-grained Markovian description only in terms of the large spin eigenstates applies.

under a polaron transformation, the Hamiltonian transforms according to

$$UHU^{\dagger} = \frac{\omega_0}{2} J_z - \frac{|\lambda|^2}{\Omega} J_z^2 + \Omega a^{\dagger} a + \sum_k \omega_k b_k^{\dagger} b_k \qquad (B2) + (J_+ e^{+2B} + J_- e^{-2B}) \sum_k \left(h_k b_k + h_k^* b_k^{\dagger} \right).$$

Thus, the coupling between spin and longitudinal mode goes away at the expense of a dressed spin-boson coupling.

We note that we can derive a master equation with standard methods that is perturbative in h_k but nonperturbative in λ . In doing so, we will put both the longitudinal boson mode and the bosons in thermal equilibrium states with inverse temperatures β_{ℓ} and β_t , respectively [45, 46]. Since the polaron transformation is nonlocal between large spin and longitudinal mode, simply placing the boson mode in a thermal state does not correspond to a simple thermal state in the original frame. Instead, its state becomes conditioned on the large spin state [40]. Here, we will show that the resulting rate equation is identical to the one obtained in the main paper via coarse-graining (38), see also Fig. 10.

Evidently, the eigenenergies of the system Hamiltonian in Eq. (B2) are given by (35), and with identifying the coupling operators as $A_1 = J_+$, $B_1 = e^{+2B} \sum_k (h_k b_k + h_k^* b_k^{\dagger})$, $A_2 = J_-$, and $B_2 = e^{-2B} \sum_k (h_k b_k + h_k^* b_k^{\dagger})$, we can set up a rate equation for the evolution of populations in the spin energy eigenstates. To do so, we have to evaluate the matrix elements of the system coupling operators – using Eqns. (12) – which imply that only two reservoir correlation functions have to be found to evaluate the rate from energy eigenstate b to energy eigenstate a

$$\gamma_{ab,ab} = \gamma_{12}(E_b - E_a) |\langle a| J_- |b\rangle|^2 + \gamma_{21}(E_b - E_a) |\langle a| J_+ |b\rangle|^2.$$
(B3)

Consequently, we calculate the reservoir correlation

function for the reservoir coupling operators

$$\mathcal{B}^{\pm} = e^{\pm 2B} \sum_{k} \left(h_k b_k + h_k^* b_k^{\dagger} \right) \,, \tag{B4}$$

which enter the correlation functions in the form (bold symbols indicate the interaction picture)

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}^{\pm}(\tau) \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}^{\mp} \rangle = C_{\ell}^{\pm}(\tau) C_{t}(\tau) , C_{\ell}^{\pm}(\tau) = \left\langle e^{\pm 2\boldsymbol{B}(\tau)} e^{\mp 2B} \right\rangle , C_{t}(\tau) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{0} \Gamma_{t}(-\omega) n_{t}(-\omega) e^{-\mathrm{i}\omega\tau} d\omega \qquad (B5) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{+\infty} \Gamma_{t}(+\omega) [1 + n_{t}(+\omega)] e^{-\mathrm{i}\omega\tau} d\omega .$$

At this state it is already evident that the resulting rates will not be additive in the two reservoirs.

The longitudinal contributions can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\ell}^{+}(\tau) &= e^{-\frac{4|\lambda|^2}{\Omega^2} \left[(1 - \cos(\Omega \tau)) \coth\left(\frac{\beta_{\ell} \Omega}{2}\right) + i \sin(\Omega \tau) \right]}, \\ C_{\ell}^{-}(\tau) &= C_{\ell}^{+}(\tau) \equiv C_{\ell}(\tau), \end{aligned} \tag{B6}$$

and it is visible that these do not decay to zero at infinity. One might be tempted to consider this as problematic with regard to the Markovian approximation. However, the longitudinal correlation function always enters in product form with the transversal correlation functions, such that the total correlation function always decays. To interpret their action in a more physical way we rewrite the correlation functions as

$$C_{\ell}(\tau) = e^{-\frac{4|\lambda|^2}{\Omega^2} \left[(1+2n_{\ell}) - n_{\ell} e^{+i\Omega\tau} - (1+n_{\ell})e^{-i\Omega\tau} \right]}, \quad (B7)$$

where $n_{\ell} = [e^{\beta_{\ell}\Omega} - 1]^{-1}$. We can easily check their KMS relations $C_{\ell}(\tau) = C_{\ell}(-\tau - i\beta_{\ell})$. We can compute the Fourier transform of the longitudinal mode correlation

function by formally expanding in powers of $e^{\pm i\Omega\tau}$

$$\gamma_{\ell}(\omega) = \int C_{\ell}(\tau) e^{+\mathrm{i}\omega\tau} d\tau$$

$$= 2\pi e^{-\frac{4|\lambda|^2}{\Omega^2}(1+2n_{\ell})} \sum_{m,m'=0}^{\infty} \left[\frac{4|\lambda|^2}{\Omega^2}\right]^{m+m'} \times$$

$$\times \frac{n_{\ell}^m [1+n_{\ell}]^{m'}}{m!m'!} \delta(\omega - (m'-m)\Omega) \qquad (B8)$$

$$= 2\pi e^{-\frac{4|\lambda|^2}{\Omega^2}(1+2n_{\ell})} \sum_{\bar{n}=-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta(\omega - \bar{n}\Omega) \times$$

$$\times \left(\frac{1+n_{\ell}}{n_{\ell}}\right)^{\bar{n}/2} \mathcal{J}_{\bar{n}}\left(\frac{8|\lambda|^2}{\Omega^2}\sqrt{n_{\ell}(1+n_{\ell})}\right),$$

where $\mathcal{J}_n(x)$ denotes the modified Bessel function of the first kind.

The bosonic contribution has standard form and also obeys a KMS condition of the form $C_t(\tau) = C_t(-\tau - i\beta_t)$.

The full Fourier transform of the correlation function is given by

$$\gamma(+\omega) = \int C_{\ell}(\tau) C_t(\tau) e^{+i\omega\tau} d\tau , \qquad (B9)$$

and we note that we can represent these also by convolution integrals of the separate Fourier transforms

$$\gamma(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \gamma_{\ell}(\omega - \bar{\omega}) \gamma_t(\bar{\omega}) d\bar{\omega} \,. \tag{B10}$$

Inserting Eq. (B8) eventually yields

$$\gamma(\omega) = \sum_{\bar{n}=-\infty}^{+\infty} \gamma_{\bar{n}}(\omega) , \qquad (B11)$$
$$\gamma_{\bar{n}}(\omega) = \alpha_{\bar{n}}\gamma_{11}(\omega - \bar{n}\Omega) ,$$

where $\gamma_{11}(\omega)$ is defined in Eq. (17) in the main manuscript.

Inserting these results in Eq. (B3), we find that the resulting rate equation is identical with Eq. (38) in the main manuscript.

Independent calculations have shown that coarsegraining approaches also exist for previously treated electron-phonon models [35, 45, 46] (not shown).