

12-13-2010

## Identifying the quantum correlations in light-harvesting complexes

Kamil Brádler  
*Université McGill*

Mark M. Wilde  
*Université McGill*

Sai Vinjanampathy  
*Louisiana State University*

Dmitry B. Uskov  
*Tulane University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/physics\\_astronomy\\_pubs](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/physics_astronomy_pubs)

---

### Recommended Citation

Brádler, K., Wilde, M., Vinjanampathy, S., & Uskov, D. (2010). Identifying the quantum correlations in light-harvesting complexes. *Physical Review A - Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics*, 82 (6) <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.82.062310>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Physics & Astronomy at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [ir@lsu.edu](mailto:ir@lsu.edu).

# Identifying the quantum correlations in light-harvesting complexes

Kamil Brádler and Mark M. Wilde

*School of Computer Science, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2A7*

Sai Vinjanampathy

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA 70803*

Dmitry B. Uskov

*Department of Physics and Engineering Physics,  
Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA 70118*

(Dated: August 23, 2018)

One of the major efforts in the quantum biological program is to subject biological systems to standard tests or measures of quantumness. These tests and measures should elucidate if non-trivial quantum effects may be present in biological systems. Two such measures of quantum correlations are the quantum discord and the relative entropy of entanglement. Here, we show that the relative entropy of entanglement admits a simple analytic form when dynamics and accessible degrees of freedom are restricted to a zero- and single-excitation subspace. We also simulate and calculate the amount of quantum discord that is present in the Fenna-Matthews-Olson protein complex during the transfer of an excitation from a chlorosome antenna to a reaction center. We find that the single-excitation quantum discord and relative entropy of entanglement are equal for all of our numerical simulations, but a proof of their general equality for this setting evades us for now. Also, some of our simulations demonstrate that the relative entropy of entanglement without the single-excitation restriction is much lower than the quantum discord. The first picosecond of dynamics is the relevant timescale for the transfer of the excitation, according to some sources in the literature. Our simulation results indicate that quantum correlations contribute a significant fraction of the total correlation during this first picosecond in many cases, at both cryogenic and physiological temperature.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Yz, 82.39.Jn

Keywords: light-harvesting complexes, quantum biology, quantum discord, relative entropy of entanglement, quantum mutual information

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum biology aims to understand if, how, and why biological systems exploit quantum-mechanical effects for their functionality or for an evolutionary advantage [1–4]. Exemplary biological systems that may exploit quantum effects vary from photosynthetic light-harvesting complexes [5], to the avian compass for bird navigation [6], to the olfactory system [7]. Ongoing theoretical research indicates that light-harvesting complexes exploit an environment-assisted quantum-walk like effect to enhance energy transport [8–11], the avian compass exploits a radical ion-pair mechanism for increased sensitivity of the earth’s geomagnetic field [12–14], and the olfactory system may exploit phonon-assisted tunneling for enhanced detection of smell [7].

Light-harvesting complexes seem particularly suitable as biological systems to harness quantum-mechanical effects. Their lengthscales and energyscales are on the order where we would expect quantum-mechanical laws to apply [15], but what remains less clear is if they can still harness quantum effects such as entanglement even at physiological temperature. A recent numerical study addresses this question by showing that light-harvesting complexes could demonstrate stronger-than-classical *temporal* correlations, even at physiological temperature [16]. However, it remains an open task to devise and conduct a realistic experimental protocol that demonstrates an irrevocable test of non-classical temporal correlations for light-harvesting complexes.

The aim of the study in Ref. [16], as well as that in Refs. [17, 18], is to address one of the important “quantum biological questions”: *Does the biological system exhibit “quantumness” according to a standard test or measure?* Theoretical machinery from quantum information science [19], developed specifically for understanding quantum computational and communication devices, should be of immense utility in answering this question. Several articles have already begun exploiting such tools. Ref. [16] exploits the Leggett-Garg test of non-classicality [20] to suggest that light-harvesting complexes might exhibit stronger-than-classical temporal correlations, while Refs. [17, 18] utilize standard entanglement-based measures of quantum correlations [21–23] to suggest that they might exhibit stronger-than-classical spatial correlations. Such standard measures of quantum behavior are more convincing than, say, a claim that wavelike motion in population elements of a density matrix is a signature of quantumness [24].

The studies in Refs. [17, 18] both suggest that it might be possible to observe spatial quantum correlations in

arXiv:0912.5112v2 [quant-ph] 21 Jul 2010

the Fenna-Matthews-Olson (FMO) light-harvesting protein complex, but the quantum correlation measures exploited there, such as concurrence [25], the measure based on the global relative entropy of entanglement [23], and logarithmic negativity [26], might not capture all of the spatial quantum correlations that are present in a given quantum system. For example, consider a bipartite quantum system in the state:

$$\frac{1}{2} |0\rangle \langle 0|^A \otimes |+\rangle \langle +|^B + \frac{1}{2} |-\rangle \langle -|^A \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1|^B, \quad (1)$$

where  $|\pm\rangle \equiv (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  and Alice possesses the system  $A$  and Bob possesses the system  $B$ . The state in (1) is a separable state [27], meaning that Alice and Bob can prepare it by means of local quantum operations and classical communication. Yet, it is fundamentally non-classical because the states  $|0\rangle$  and  $|-\rangle$  on Alice’s local system or  $|1\rangle$  and  $|+\rangle$  on Bob’s local system are indistinguishable from one another (they are non-orthogonal). It could be possible for two bacteriochlorophyll sites of a light-harvesting complex to admit a state of the above class or a mixture of such states, but the quantum correlation measures mentioned above all vanish for such a separable state, despite its status as a fundamentally non-classical state. Thus, these measures might not capture the full “quantumness” that might be present in a light-harvesting complex.

A different measure of quantum correlations, known as the quantum discord [28, 29], captures all correlations in a quantum state that are non-classical. The discord is a measure of the total correlations present in a shared quantum state, reduced by the classical correlations obtainable when one party performs a local measurement. For example, the state in (1) registers a non-vanishing quantum discord and therefore possesses non-classical correlations according to this measure, even though it does not violate a Bell inequality [30] due to it being a separable state. Other examples demonstrate that the quantum discord in a quantum system can remain positive even if the entanglement vanishes after a finite time [31]. States that register non-vanishing discord can lead to exponential speedups [32, 33] in a quantum computational model known as the “one-clean qubit model” [34], where the only requirement for a speedup is access to a single qubit in a pure state. Although it is unlikely that a light-harvesting complex could be performing exotic quantum computational speedups of the aforementioned nature or in the standard way [35], one cannot rule out the possibility that a light-harvesting complex exhibiting non-vanishing discord could be exploiting “quantumness” of this form for enhanced energy transport.

In this paper, we systematically study the presence of quantum correlations in the FMO light-harvesting complex, both at cryogenic and physiological temperature. Our first contribution is a simple formula for computing the relative entropy of entanglement [36] when a light-harvesting complex evolves according to the open quantum system model well studied in the quantum biological literature [9, 11]. This formula assumes that dynamics are restricted to a zero- and single-excitation subspace, and it reduces the *a priori* computationally intensive optimization task for computing the single-excitation relative entropy of entanglement to a simple calculation with quantum entropies. These results for the single-excitation relative entropy of entanglement generalize those of Sarovar *et al.* in Ref. [17] for the global relative entropy of entanglement. We then calculate the quantum discord for several phenomenologically motivated “bipartite cuts” of the FMO protein complex and find that it is equivalent to the single-excitation relative entropy of entanglement in all cases presented here. These results demonstrate that quantum correlations contribute a significant fraction of the total correlation during the highly relevant first picosecond of dynamics in many cases (some sources in the literature [10, 11] indicate that the average time it takes for an excitation to trap to the reaction center is one picosecond after it arrives from the chlorosome antenna). In other cases, these quantities are equivalent and contribute a non-negligible fraction of the total correlation during the first picosecond. This contribution indicates that non-classical spatial correlations may be playing a role in the efficient transfer of an excitation from the chlorosome antenna to the reaction center. Our final contribution is to study the relative entropy of entanglement without its optimization restricted to the single-excitation subspace, and we find that it can be significantly less than the restricted relative entropy of entanglement while only using just a small fraction of doubly-excited states in the optimization.

We structure this paper as follows. We first briefly review both the dynamical model of the FMO protein complex, the definition of the quantum discord, the definition of the relative entropy of entanglement, and we then discuss how to compute these quantities in the FMO protein complex model. Our analytic result states that the relative entropy of entanglement, when restricted to the zero- and single-excitation subspace, is equal to a simple formula that is a difference of entropies. Appendix A provides a proof of this theorem. Section IV presents the results of our numerical simulations under various initial configurations and temperatures, and Section V discusses the unrestricted optimization of the relative entropy of entanglement. We then conclude with observations and open questions for future research.

## II. REVIEW

### A. FMO Complex Dynamics

The FMO protein complex is the crucial, light-harvesting component of the green sulfur bacteria *prosthecochloris aestuarii*, that develop in dimly-lit, anoxic environments such as stratified lakes or sulfur springs [37]. It is a trimer, consisting of three identical subunits. We study one unit of the trimer, consisting of seven bacteriochlorophyll sites that act as a “molecular wire,” transferring energetic excitations from a photon-receiving antenna to a reaction center. A photon impinges on the antenna, producing an electronic excitation, dubbed an exciton, that then proceeds to the unit with seven sites. While traversing the seven sites, the exciton can either recombine, corresponding to an energetic loss, or it can trap to the reaction center for energy storage.

We characterize the quantum state of the exciton as a density operator in the site basis:

$$\rho \equiv \sum_{m,n \in \{G,1,\dots,7,S\}} \rho_{m,n} |m\rangle \langle n|,$$

where the state  $|m\rangle$  indicates that the exciton is present at site  $m$ . The sites can be any of the seven sites in the protein complex  $m \in \{1, \dots, 7\}$ , a ground state  $|G\rangle$  that represents the loss or recombination of the exciton, or a sink state  $|S\rangle$  that implies that the exciton has trapped to the reaction center. We adopt the following “qubit” convention in this work (as adopted in previous works [17, 38, 39]), by assigning site states to tensor-product states:

$$\begin{aligned} |G\rangle &\equiv |g\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 |g\rangle_4 |g\rangle_5 |g\rangle_6 |g\rangle_7 |g\rangle_S, \\ |1\rangle &\equiv |e\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 |g\rangle_4 |g\rangle_5 |g\rangle_6 |g\rangle_7 |g\rangle_S, \\ &\vdots \\ |7\rangle &\equiv |g\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 |g\rangle_4 |g\rangle_5 |g\rangle_6 |e\rangle_7 |g\rangle_S, \\ |S\rangle &\equiv |g\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 |g\rangle_3 |g\rangle_4 |g\rangle_5 |g\rangle_6 |g\rangle_7 |e\rangle_S, \end{aligned}$$

where  $g$  indicates the absence of an excitation and  $e$  indicates the presence of an excitation at a particular site. The excitation number is a conserved quantity in the absence of light-matter interaction events [40], and this observation restricts the protein dynamics to a zero- and single-excitation subspace. Thus, the above nine states are the only states that we consider for the exciton while it traverses the seven sites.

Observe that “tracing over any site” in this qubit representation has the effect of placing the population term for that site into the population of the ground state. For example, suppose that we trace over all sites except for the first one. The resulting density matrix has the form:

$$(\rho_{GG} + \rho_{22} + \dots + \rho_{77} + \rho_{SS}) |G\rangle \langle G| + \rho_{11} |1\rangle \langle 1| + \rho_{1G} |1\rangle \langle G| + \rho_{G1} |G\rangle \langle 1|.$$

Such manipulations are important for computing correlation measures for any bipartite cut of the sites in the FMO complex.

Evolution of the density matrix occurs according to a combination of both coherent and incoherent dynamics. A tight-binding Hamiltonian of the following form governs coherent evolution across the seven site states  $|1\rangle, \dots, |7\rangle$ :

$$H \equiv \sum_m E_m |m\rangle \langle m| + \sum_{n < m} V_{nm} (|n\rangle \langle m| + |m\rangle \langle n|),$$

where  $E_m$  is the relative energy at site  $m$  and  $V_{nm}$  represents a coupling between sites  $n$  and  $m$  (see Refs. [10, 15, 16] for the Hamiltonian that governs evolution). The third site has the lowest energy of all seven sites and is closest to the reaction center, and it is for these reasons that researchers suggest that the objective of the molecular wire is to transmit the excitation as quickly as possible to the third site [8–11]. The off-diagonal terms lead to coherent couplings between sites—the strongest couplings are between the first and second sites, the fourth and fifth sites, and the fifth and sixth sites. Recent work determines the energy landscape of the FMO complex that reveals coherent pathways the excitation may traverse to get to the third site [24, 41].

A set of three Lindblad superoperators governs incoherent evolution of the FMO complex, and each superoperator has a phenomenological justification for its presence in the evolution [8–10, 16]. The first incoherent mechanism  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{diss}}$  is due to recombination or loss of the exciton, acting like an amplitude damping mechanism. The second incoherent mechanism  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{sink}}$  is due to trapping of the excitation from the third site to the reaction center. The final decoherence mechanism  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{deph}}$  is a local dephasing at each site, due to unavoidable interaction with the surrounding protein

environment. Ref. [9] shows how to relate the dephasing rate to the temperature of the system, under a particular decoherence model (we employ this relation in our numerical study in this paper). Refs. [8–10, 16] describe in detail the decoherence mechanisms in the FMO complex. Despite the Markovian nature of the evolution, it describes the dynamics reasonably accurately [9] (though see the recent work on non-Markovian evolution in the FMO complex [18, 42]).

Putting everything together, the following master equation gives the full evolution of the density matrix  $\rho$ :

$$\dot{\rho} = -i[H, \rho] + \mathcal{L}_{\text{diss}}(\rho) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{sink}}(\rho) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{deph}}(\rho). \quad (2)$$

Note that the above evolution induces coherences only between sites in the FMO complex, so that any off-diagonal element of the density matrix of the form  $\rho_{i,G}$  or  $\rho_{i,S}$ , where  $i \in \{1, \dots, 7\}$ , vanishes. Various sources in the literature [9] and recent experimental evidence [43] suggest that the initial state of the FMO complex is a pure excitation at site one, a pure excitation at site six, or a mixture of these two states because sites one and six are closest to the antenna. We incorporate each of these cases in our simulations.

The dynamical model in (2) implies that the FMO complex exhibits both classical and quantum random walk behavior, but does not exhibit exotic “quantum stochastic walk” behavior according to Table I of Ref. [44]. The classical and quantum random walk behavior then suggests that this evolution should establish both classical and quantum correlation between sites in the complex. It is these correlations that we measure in this paper.

## B. Quantum Discord

We first recall various informational measures of a quantum state before briefly reviewing the motivation for the quantum discord as a measure of quantum correlations. Suppose that two parties Alice and Bob share a quantum state  $\rho^{AB}$ . The von Neumann entropy of this state is as follows:

$$H(AB)_\rho \equiv -\text{tr} \{ \rho^{AB} \log \rho^{AB} \},$$

where the logarithm is base two. The entropy  $H(AB)_\rho$  measures the uncertainty about the total quantum state  $\rho^{AB}$  in units of bits, whenever the logarithm is base two [45]. Similarly, we can compute the marginal entropies  $H(A)$  and  $H(B)$ —these entropies are with respect to the respective reduced states  $\rho^A$  and  $\rho^B$ , obtained by a respective partial trace over Bob or Alice’s share of the state  $\rho^{AB}$ .

The quantum mutual information  $I(A; B)$  is a measure of the total correlations, both classical and quantum, shared between two parties, where

$$I(A; B)_\rho \equiv H(A)_\rho + H(B)_\rho - H(AB)_\rho. \quad (3)$$

The quantum mutual information admits a natural operational interpretation as the amount of noise necessary to destroy all correlations present in a bipartite state [46]. Its other operational interpretations are as the maximum amount of secret information that one party can send to another if they use a shared state as the basis for a one-time pad cryptosystem [47], the entanglement-assisted classical capacity of a quantum channel [48–50], and more recently the amount of private quantum information that a sender can transmit to a receiver while being eavesdropped on by a uniformly accelerating third party [51]. All of these operational interpretations justify the notion of the quantum mutual information measuring correlations between two parties in units of bits.

Suppose now that Alice would like to extract classical information from the quantum state  $\rho^{AB}$ . She performs a von Neumann measurement  $\{|x\rangle\langle x|\}$  on her share of the state, where the states  $\{|x\rangle\}$  form an orthonormal basis. If Alice obtains classical result  $x$  from the measurement, the resulting conditional quantum state of the whole system is

$$|x\rangle\langle x|^X \otimes \rho_x^B,$$

where

$$\rho_x^B \equiv \frac{1}{p(x)} \text{Tr}_X \left\{ (|x\rangle\langle x|^X \otimes I^B) \rho^{AB} (|x\rangle\langle x|^X \otimes I^B) \right\}, \quad (4)$$

$$p(x) \equiv \text{Tr} \left\{ |x\rangle\langle x|^X \rho^A \right\}, \quad (5)$$

and we now label Alice’s system with  $X$  because it is classical. If we then take the expectation over all of Alice’s outcomes, the description of the system is a classical-quantum state:

$$\sigma^{XB} \equiv \sum_x p(x) |x\rangle\langle x|^X \otimes \rho_x^B. \quad (6)$$

We might think that a natural measure of the classical correlations present in a bipartite state is the amount of correlations in the resulting classical-quantum state:

$$I_c(A; B)_\rho \equiv \max_{\{\Lambda^A\}} I(X; B)_\sigma, \quad (7)$$

The above expression features a maximization over all of the von Neumann measurements  $\Lambda^A$  that Alice could perform. These measurements result in a state of the form  $\sigma$  in (6), and the quantum mutual information  $I(X; B)_\sigma$  is with respect to such a state. In fact, Henderson and Vedral proposed such a measure [28], and Devetak and Winter later justified this measure by providing an operational interpretation of it as the maximum amount of common randomness (perfect classical correlations) that two parties can extract from a bipartite quantum state [52].

The two correlation measures in (3) and (7), the first a measure of total correlations and the second a measure of classical correlations, suggests that a measure of the quantum correlations should be the difference of these two quantities. The *quantum discord*  $D(A; B)_\rho$  is such a measure [29, 53], defined as the difference of total and classical correlations:

$$D(A; B)_\rho \equiv I(A; B)_\rho - I_c(A; B)_\rho. \quad (8)$$

The discord is always non-negative, by the quantum data processing inequality of quantum information theory [54], and it is generally not symmetric with respect to the parties  $A$  and  $B$ :

$$\exists \rho : D(A; B)_\rho \neq D(B; A)_\rho.$$

It captures all of the quantum correlations, including entanglement, but also the quantumness in separable states of the form in (1). Zurek has suggested a physical interpretation of the discord as the difference in efficiency between quantum and classical Maxwell's demons [55], but it still lacks a clear operational interpretation in the sense of Refs. [46–52]. Nevertheless, we still employ the discord as a measure of the quantum correlations in the FMO complex.

We can rewrite the quantum discord as the following expression:

$$D(A; B)_\rho = I(B|A)_\rho + \min_{\{\Pi_x\}} \sum_x p(x) H(\rho_x^B), \quad (9)$$

by performing straightforward manipulations of the entropies in (8). In the above,  $I(A|B)$  is the coherent information [54], equal to the negative of a conditional entropy:

$$I(B|A)_\rho = -H(B|A)_\rho = H(A)_\rho - H(AB)_\rho,$$

and the probabilities  $p(x)$  and conditional density operators are as they appear respectively in (4) and (5).

### C. Relative Entropy of Entanglement

The relative entropy of entanglement is an entanglement measure from quantum information theory [36], and we briefly review its definition. The relative entropy  $D(\rho^{AB}||\omega^{AB})$  of two bipartite states  $\rho^{AB}$  and  $\omega^{AB}$  is as follows [54]:

$$D(\rho^{AB}||\omega^{AB}) \equiv \text{Tr} \{ \rho^{AB} \log \rho^{AB} \} - \text{Tr} \{ \rho^{AB} \log \omega^{AB} \}. \quad (10)$$

This measure, in some sense, quantifies the “distance” between two bipartite states, but it is not a distance measure in the strict mathematical sense because it fails to be symmetric. Though, this intuition is useful for constructing an entanglement measure. We might naturally expect a good measure of entanglement to be the distance of a given bipartite state to the closest separable state  $\sigma^{AB} \equiv \sum_i p(i) \sigma_i^A \otimes \sigma_i^B$ . The relative entropy of entanglement  $R(\rho^{AB})$  is such a measure, defined as the minimization of the relative entropy over all separable states:

$$R(\rho^{AB}) \equiv \min_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}} D(\rho^{AB}||\sigma^{AB}),$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the class of separable states. This measure satisfies the properties of an entanglement measure and appears extensively in the quantum information theory literature [36]. We mention that Ref. [17] employed this entanglement measure for determining quantum correlations in the FMO complex, but they considered the global relative entropy of entanglement rather than a bipartite version of it as we consider in this work.

### III. FORMULA FOR THE SINGLE-EXCITATION RELATIVE ENTROPY OF ENTANGLEMENT

The restriction of dynamics to the zero- and single-excitation subspace allows for significant simplifications to the theory of energetic transfer in the FMO complex. We can also apply this restriction to the relative entropy of entanglement, by restricting the optimization over separable states to the zero- and single-excitation subspace. Let  $R_e(\rho^{AB})$  denote the relative entropy of entanglement with this restriction applied to its optimization. Theorem 1 below states that  $R_e(\rho^{AB})$  is equal to a simple formula that is a difference of entropies. Thus, the theorem significantly simplifies the computation of this quantity.

**Theorem 1** Consider a density operator  $\rho^{AB}$  restricted to the zero- and single-excitation subspace. Let

$$\bar{\Delta}(\rho^{AB}) \equiv \alpha |G\rangle\langle G| + \rho_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B + |G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \rho_e^B,$$

where  $\alpha$  is the population of the ground state,  $\rho_e^A$  is the projection of Alice's part of  $\rho^{AB}$  into the single-excitation subspace, and  $\rho_e^B$  is defined in a similar way. Suppose that the dynamics for this density operator never induce any coherences between the zero- and single-excitation subspaces (as in the dynamics in (2)). Then the single-excitation relative entropy of entanglement  $R_e(\rho)$  is equal to the difference of the entropy of  $\bar{\Delta}(\rho^{AB})$  and  $\rho^{AB}$ :

$$R_e(\rho^{AB}) = H(\bar{\Delta}(\rho^{AB})) - H(\rho^{AB}).$$

The full proof appears in Appendix A. It exploits standard properties of the von Neumann entropy and a perturbative argument.

### IV. SIMULATION RESULTS

We conducted several simulations at both cryogenic temperature (77°K) and physiological temperature (300°K) and for the initial state being a pure state at site one, six, and the mixture of the previous two. These simulations calculate both the quantum mutual information, quantum discord, and single-excitation relative entropy of entanglement with respect to several ‘‘bipartite cuts’’ of the sites in the FMO complex. Throughout this section, we refer to quantum discord, but all our simulations indicated that the single-excitation relative entropy of entanglement is equal to the quantum discord. These results provide strong evidence that the quantum discord is equal to the formula in Theorem 1 for these cases, but a general proof of this conjecture eludes us for now. Our different simulation cases are as follows:

1. We first considered the cut where system  $A$  consists of site three and system  $B$  consists of sites one and six. We picked this cut because the initial state of the complex is at site one, six, or the mixture, and the objective of the FMO ‘‘molecular wire’’ is to transfer the excitation from these initial sites to site three. If spatial quantum correlations play a role in the transfer of the excitation, one would expect a state with this bipartite cut to register a non-negligible amount of quantum discord.
2. The next bipartite cut that we considered is with the  $A$  system consisting of sites one and two and the  $B$  system consisting of site three. We picked such a cut because recent analysis of the FMO Hamiltonian [41] suggests that a superposition state of sites one and two gives an efficient energetic pathway for the excitation to transfer to site three. The energy of the superposed state is closer to the energy of site three than it is to the energy of either site one or site two. We would again expect such a cut would register a non-negligible amount of quantum discord if quantum correlations play a role in the transfer of the excitation.
3. Finally, after conducting the above simulations, we conducted simulations with respect to the cut where system  $A$  consists of site three and system  $B$  consists of all other sites. The quantum mutual information for this case should be larger than for the case of the other cuts, by the quantum data processing inequality.

Figure 1 plots the results of the first simulation for cryogenic temperature and for each initial state. The figure indicates that the quantum discord contributes a significant fraction of the total correlation for short timescales (less than one picosecond). This contribution of the quantum discord to total correlation is significant, considering that the average transfer time of the excitation to site three occurs around the order of one picosecond in our model. For longer timescales (greater than one picosecond), the total correlation between  $A$  (sites one and six) and  $B$  (site three) increases to its maximum at around 2-4 ps, and the quantum discord no longer contributes any significant amount to the total correlation. Even though the total correlation rises so much higher for longer timescales than it is for shorter timescales, the increase and peak are not relevant for excitation transfer, i.e., ‘‘they arrive too late’’ given that this




FIG. 1: (Color online) Mutual information  $I(A; B)$  and quantum discord  $D(A; B)$  with system  $A$  as site three and system  $B$  as sites one and six. The figure plots these quantities at cryogenic temperature ( $77^\circ\text{K}$ ) as a function of time when the initial state is (a) a pure state at the first site, (b) a pure state at the sixth state, (c) an equal mixture of the two previous states. In each of the above plots, the quantum discord is a significant fraction of the total correlations during the first picosecond.




FIG. 2: (Color online) Mutual information  $I(A; B)$  and quantum discord  $D(A; B)$  with system  $A$  as site three and system  $B$  as sites one and six. The figure plots these quantities at physiological temperature ( $300^\circ\text{K}$ ) as a function of time when the initial state is (a) a pure state at the first site, (b) a pure state at the sixth state, (c) an equal mixture of the two previous states. In each of the above figures, the quantum discord is a non-negligible fraction of the total correlation during the first picosecond.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Mutual information  $I(A; B)$  and quantum discord  $D(A; B)$  with system  $A$  as site three and system  $B$  as sites one and two. The figure plots these quantities at cryogenic temperature ( $77^\circ\text{K}$ ) as a function of time when the initial state is (a) a pure state at the first site, (b) a pure state at the sixth state, (c) an equal mixture of the two previous states. In each of the above cases, the quantum discord is a significant fraction of the total correlation during the first picosecond. In fact, for the second case, the quantum discord contributes nearly all of the total correlation during the first picosecond.






FIG. 4: (Color online) Mutual information  $I(A; B)$  and quantum discord  $D(A; B)$  with system  $A$  as site three and system  $B$  as sites one and two. The figure plots these quantities at physiological temperature (300°K) as a function of time when the initial state is (a) a pure state at the first site, (b) a pure state at the sixth state, (c) an equal mixture of the two previous states. In each of the above cases, the quantum discord contributes a fraction of the total correlation during the first picosecond. In the second case, it again contributes nearly all of the total correlation during the first picosecond.

transfer occurs on the order of 1 ps. The total correlation then washes away as time increases beyond 10 ps, and it should nearly vanish for times around 1 ns because this time is the average recombination time of the exciton, and no correlations should persist after a recombination.

Figure 2 plots the results of the first simulation for physiological temperature. The difference between cryogenic and physiological temperature is a qualitative shrinking by a factor of two, but the fraction of quantum discord that contributes to total correlation for short timescales is lower than it is for cryogenic temperatures. The local dephasing at each site acts to destroy both total and quantum correlation, but it appears to have a more harmful effect on quantum correlation. Despite the low amount of quantum discord registered at physiological temperature, it could still be that a light-harvesting complex is harnessing this small amount of quantumness (that is a significant fraction of total correlation) on this short timescale to enhance excitation transfer.

Figures 3 and 4 plot the results of the second simulation for both respective temperatures and for each initial state. These results are qualitatively similar to the previous bipartite cut, but the most striking difference is that the quantum discord contributes all of the correlation (it is equal to the quantum mutual information) for short timescales when the initial state is at site six for both cryogenic and physiological temperatures (see Figures 3(b) and 4(b)).

Figures 5 and 6 plot the results of our final simulation, where the bipartite cut has system  $B$  as site three and system  $A$  as all other sites. The results for quantum discord are again qualitatively similar to previous results, but the quantum mutual information is significantly higher than for the previous cases (this is expected because the quantum data processing inequality states that correlations can only decrease when discarding subsystems). The quantum discord again contributes a significant fraction of the total correlation for short timescales and contributes only a small fraction for later timescales. Again, physiological temperature decoherence mitigates the presence of quantumness.

## V. COMPARISON OF THE QUANTUM DISCORD WITH THE STANDARD RELATIVE ENTROPY OF ENTANGLEMENT

In this section, we focus on computing the relative entropy of entanglement in (10) without the assumption that the set of separable states  $\sigma^{AB}$  involved in the minimization of  $D(\rho^{AB}||\sigma^{AB})$  is limited to the single-excitation subspace. This implies that  $\sigma^{AB}$  may include multiply-excited states (for example, states for which both systems  $A$  and  $B$  carry an exciton).

A question may arise as to why such multiply-excited states are relevant for the optimization of the relative entropy of entanglement. After all, the Hamiltonian of the system commutes with the operator corresponding to the total number of excitations in the system, and the dissipation operators in (2) only decrease the number of excitations by dumping them to the sink or to the reaction center. There are two different ways to answer this question. The first one is simple yet somewhat formal—Vedral established the relative entropy of entanglement in the context of quantum information theory as a measure of entanglement for a general set of states with no subspace limitations imposed. Therefore, even though the form of specific Hamiltonian and dissipation terms in (2) leads to the absence of




FIG. 5: (Color online) Mutual information  $I(A; B)$  and quantum discord  $D(A; B)$  with system  $A$  as site three and system  $B$  as all other sites (1-2, 4-7). The figure plots these quantities at cryogenic temperature ( $77^\circ\text{K}$ ) as a function of time when the initial state is (a) a pure state at the first site, (b) a pure state at the sixth state, (c) an equal mixture of the two previous states. The quantum discord contributes a significant fraction of the total correlation during the first picosecond.




FIG. 6: (Color online) Mutual information  $I(A; B)$  and quantum discord  $D(A; B)$  with system  $A$  as site three and system  $B$  as all other sites (1-2, 4-7). The figure plots these quantities at physiological temperature ( $300^\circ\text{K}$ ) as a function of time when the initial state is (a) a pure state at the first site, (b) a pure state at the sixth state, (c) an equal mixture of the two previous states. The quantum discord does not contribute a large fraction of the total correlation here.

multiply-excited states in the density operator, there is no particular reason to consider that multiply-excited states and the mode of preparation of a state are irrelevant in this setting. From this perspective, entanglement is determined solely by the state rather than by the history and mode of state evolution. The relative entropy of entanglement is a measure of the “distance” of a state to the closest separable state and excluding multiply-excited states from the set of separable states introduces a distortion to the original concept. Actually, the measure of such a distortion may be rather large, as we found out performing optimization of  $D(\rho^{AB}||\sigma^{AB})$  in the full space (see Figure 7(a)).

Our second answer is more physically motivated. In general, while analyzing the exciton dynamics in a light harvesting system, one assumes that the intensity of light, which determines the photon flux, is quite small. Then it follows that the probability of simultaneous creation of two excitations is negligible. By performing the optimization of the  $D(\rho^{AB}||\sigma^{AB})$  in the full space, which includes multiply-excited states that can have the form  $|E\rangle^A |E\rangle^B$ , and computing the amount of multiply-excited state population in the closest separable state  $\sigma^{AB}$ , we can set up a limit for the light intensity when the single-excitation assumption will become meaningless even in the context of excitation-preserving dynamics. In accordance with Caratheodory’s theorem, we generated the generic separable state  $\sigma^{AB}$  as a sum of  $2^6 = 64$  arbitrary pure separable states  $\sum_{n=1}^{64} c_n |\psi_n\rangle \langle \psi_n|$ . Here, we limited our computation to a simple example when site  $A = 1, 6$  and site  $B = 3$ , such that

$$|\psi_n\rangle = (\alpha_o |g\rangle_1 |g\rangle_6 + \alpha_1 |e\rangle_1 |g\rangle_6 + \alpha_2 |g\rangle_1 |e\rangle_6 + \alpha_3 |e\rangle_1 |e\rangle_6) \otimes (\beta_1 |g\rangle_3 + \beta_2 |e\rangle_3).$$




FIG. 7: (a) This figure simulates the dynamics of the FMO complex at  $77^\circ\text{K}$  and calculates both the single-excitation relative entropy of entanglement and the full relative entropy of entanglement for  $A = 1, 6$  and  $B = 3$ . (b) The ratio of the number of doubly-excited states to the number of singly-excited states in the optimal separable state for the relative entropy of entanglement is rather small.

The optimization is performed by the gradient method in the space of coefficients  $c_n$ ,  $\alpha_i$ , and  $\beta_j$ . Figure 7(a) shows results of the computation for  $T = 77^\circ\text{K}$ . We note that relative entropy of entanglement for the single-excitation-subspace case has a similar shape to the full-space relative entropy of entanglement, but it is approximately five times smaller. Figure 7(b) demonstrates that the population of doubly-excited states in the optimal separable state is negligibly small—it is three to five orders of magnitude smaller than the population of singly-excited states. We find it remarkable that such a negligible admixture of doubly-excited states changes the relative entropy of entanglement by more than a factor of five.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

We presented results quantifying the quantum correlations present in a biological system at cryogenic and physiological temperature. Theorem 1 proves that the single-excitation relative entropy of entanglement admits a simple form. We then simulated the dynamics of the FMO complex and calculated the quantum discord and the quantum mutual information for various phenomenologically motivated bipartite cuts of the sites in the FMO protein complex. It is surprising that the quantum discord and the single-excitation relative entropy of entanglement are equivalent for these simulations, but we have not been able to find a general proof that the quantum discord of this system is equivalent to the formula in Theorem 1. The results of our simulations indicate that quantum correlations contribute a significant fraction of the total correlation during the first picosecond of dynamics in many cases. Our last contribution was to study the relative entropy of entanglement with an unrestricted optimization, and we found that a small fraction of doubly-excited states contribute significantly to reducing the relative entropy of entanglement.

Open questions remain for this line of research. Our last contribution above suggests an intriguing open question of whether optimizing the relative entropy of entanglement over a single-excitation subspace, as done here and in Ref. [17], is operationally justified. We should also compute the correlation of the quantum discord with the measure of transfer time in Ref. [9] of the excitation from the antenna to the reaction center. This correlation might indicate how relevant “quantumness” is for the transfer of the excitation. Finally, it might be interesting to determine how efficiency or transfer time is affected by differing amounts of quantum discord, if there can be efficient energy transfer without quantum discord, and how discord compares with entanglement in the general case.

### Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge useful discussions with Mohan Sarovar and thank the anonymous referees for useful comments. K. B. acknowledges support from the Office of Naval Research under grant No. N000140811249. M. M. W. acknowledges support from the MDEIE (Québec) PSR-SIIRI international collaboration grant. D. B. U. acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation under grant No. PHY-0545390.

### Appendix A

We first establish some notation before proving Theorem 1. Let our zero- and single-excitation space be spanned by the following states:

$$\begin{aligned} |G\rangle^{AB} &\equiv |g\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 \cdots |g\rangle_n, \\ |1\rangle^{AB} &\equiv |e\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 \cdots |g\rangle_n, \\ &\vdots \\ |n\rangle^{AB} &\equiv |g\rangle_1 |g\rangle_2 \cdots |e\rangle_n. \end{aligned}$$

The number of states is thus  $n + 1$ . We introduce a bipartite splitting of the above states so that the corresponding subsystems  $A$  and  $B$  are spanned by  $\{|G\rangle^A, |1\rangle^A, \dots, |n_a\rangle^A\}$  and  $\{|G\rangle^B, |1\rangle^B, \dots, |n_b\rangle^B\}$ , respectively, using the same convention as above. Note that  $n_a + n_b + 1 = n$ , and the original basis written in terms of the split bases reads

$$\{|G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B, |k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B, |G\rangle^A |j\rangle^B\},$$

where  $k = 1, \dots, n_a$  and  $j = 1, \dots, n_b$ . Let  $\Pi_e^A$  and  $\Pi_e^B$  denote the projectors onto the excited subspaces of the individual subsystems of  $A$  and  $B$ :

$$\Pi_e^A \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{n_a} |k\rangle\langle k|^A, \quad \Pi_e^B \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{n_b} |j\rangle\langle j|^B. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The projector onto the full bipartite single-excitation subspace is as follows:

$$\Pi_e^{AB} \equiv |G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B + \Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Let  $\Pi_g^{AB} \equiv |G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B$ . Then  $\Pi_g^{AB} + \Pi_e^{AB}$  is a projector onto the zero- and single-excitation subspace. We have that  $\langle G|^A \rho^{AB} |k\rangle^A \rangle^{AB} = 0$  because the dynamics in (2) do not induce any correlations between the ground state and the single-excitation subspace of the density matrix  $\rho^{AB}$ . The following chain of inequalities then gives another way to write the density matrix  $\rho^{AB}$  that is more useful to us:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{AB} &= (\Pi_g^{AB} + \Pi_e^{AB}) \rho^{AB} (\Pi_g^{AB} + \Pi_e^{AB}) \\ &= \alpha \Pi_g^{AB} + \Pi_e^{AB} \rho^{AB} \Pi_g^{AB} + \Pi_g^{AB} \rho^{AB} \Pi_e^{AB} + \Pi_e^{AB} \rho^{AB} \Pi_e^{AB} \\ &= \alpha \Pi_g^{AB} + \Pi_e^{AB} \rho^{AB} \Pi_e^{AB} \\ &= \alpha \Pi_g^{AB} + (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B + \Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \rho^{AB} (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B + \Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \\ &= \alpha \Pi_g + (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) \rho^{AB} (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) + (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) \rho^{AB} (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \\ &\quad + (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \rho^{AB} (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) + (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \rho^{AB} (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \\ &= \alpha \Pi_g + \rho_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B + |G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \rho_e^B + \tau^{AB}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

The first equality follows because  $\rho^{AB}$  lives in the zero- and single-excitation subspace. The second equality follows by expanding. The third equality follows because the density operator  $\rho^{AB}$  does not have any correlations between the ground state  $|G\rangle$  and any excited state. The fourth equality follows from the relation in (A2). The fifth equality follows by expanding, and the last follows from the following definitions:

$$\rho_e^A \equiv (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \rho^{AB} (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B), \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$\rho_e^B \equiv (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) \rho^{AB} (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B), \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^{AB} &\equiv (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \rho^{AB} (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) \\ &\quad + (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) \rho^{AB} (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

The matrix  $\rho_e^A$  is the projection of  $\rho^{AB}$  into Alice's single-excitation subspace,  $\rho_e^B$  is similarly defined, and  $\tau^{AB}$  is the block-off-diagonal part of  $\rho^{AB}$  living in the single-excitation subspace.

### 1. Proof that $R_e(\rho^{AB}) = H(\bar{\Delta}(\rho^{AB})) - H(\rho^{AB})$

**Proof.** Our first candidate to maximize the relative entropy of entanglement is a state of the following form

$$\sigma_0 = \beta \Pi_g + \sigma_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B + |G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \sigma_e^B, \quad (\text{A7})$$

because it is in the most general form of a single-excitation separable state with no correlation between the ground state and the other states. The operators  $\sigma_e^A$  and  $\sigma_e^B$  are some positive operators that live in the single-excitation subspaces with respective projectors  $\Pi_e^A$  and  $\Pi_e^B$ . So for now, we restrict the minimization in the relative entropy of entanglement to states of the above form, leading to the following minimization:

$$\tilde{R}_e(\rho^{AB}) \equiv \min_{\sigma_0} \text{Tr} \{ \rho^{AB} \log \rho^{AB} \} - \text{Tr} \{ \rho^{AB} \log \sigma_0 \}. \quad (\text{A8})$$

We first determine a spectral decomposition of  $\sigma_e^A$  and  $\sigma_e^B$  as follows:

$$\sigma_e^A = \sum_{k=1}^{n_a} a_k |\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k|^A, \quad \sigma_e^B = \sum_{k=1}^{n_b} b_k |\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k|^B. \quad (\text{A9})$$

Let  $\omega^A \equiv \log(\sigma_e^A)$  and  $\omega^B \equiv \log(\sigma_e^B)$ . The following equalities then hold

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^{AB} \log \sigma_0 &= [(\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \rho^{AB} (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) + (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) \rho^{AB} (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B)] \\ &\quad \log(\alpha \Pi_g + \sigma_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B + |G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \sigma_e^B) \\ &= (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \rho^{AB} (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \omega^B) + (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) \rho^{AB} (\omega^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows by definition, and the second follows by considering the overlapping support of the different subspaces. We then find that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \{ \tau^{AB} \log \sigma_0 \} &= \text{Tr} \{ (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \rho^{AB} (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \omega^B) + (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) \rho^{AB} (\omega^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \} \\ &= \text{Tr} \{ (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \omega^B) (\Pi_e^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) \rho^{AB} \} + \text{Tr} \{ (\omega^A \otimes |G\rangle\langle G|^B) (|G\rangle\langle G|^A \otimes \Pi_e^B) \rho^{AB} \} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from cyclicity of the trace, and the last equality follows because the zero- and single-excitation subspaces are orthogonal. Therefore,

$$\text{Tr} \{ \rho^{AB} \log \sigma_0 \} = \text{Tr} \{ (\rho^{AB} - \tau^{AB}) \log \sigma_0 \}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Observe that  $\rho^{AB} - \tau^{AB}$  is a state of the form  $\sigma_0$  with  $\beta = \alpha$ ,  $\sigma_e^A = \rho_e^A$ , and  $\sigma_e^B = \rho_e^B$ . Consider that

$$\text{Tr} \{ (\rho^{AB} - \tau^{AB}) \log(\rho^{AB} - \tau^{AB}) \} \geq \text{Tr} \{ (\rho^{AB} - \tau^{AB}) \log \sigma_0 \},$$

because the relative entropy  $D((\rho^{AB} - \tau^{AB}) || \sigma_0) \geq 0$  [54]. We conclude that  $\tilde{R}_e(\rho^{AB})$  in (A8) attains its global minimum at  $\rho - \tau^{AB}$ . Thus,

$$\tilde{R}_e(\rho^{AB}) = H(\bar{\Delta}(\rho^{AB})) - H(\rho^{AB}).$$

The expression in (A7) is not the most general single-excitation separable state because it does not include coherence elements between the ground state and the single-excitation subspace. That is, matrix elements of the following form could be nonzero:

$$|G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \langle\phi_k|^A \langle G|^B + \text{H.C.} \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$|G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \langle G|^A \langle\phi_k|^B + \text{H.C.} \quad (\text{A12})$$

We now show that it is not necessary to consider states of this more general form by appealing to a perturbation theory argument [56]. Consider a solution  $\omega \equiv \rho - \tau^{AB}$  of (A8). Let us take a small shift of this solution:

$$\omega \rightarrow \omega + \epsilon(|G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \langle \phi_k|^A \langle G|^B + \text{H.C.}). \quad (\text{A13})$$

Consider that

$$\omega |\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B = a_k |\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B, \quad (\text{A14})$$

and

$$\omega |G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B = \alpha |G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B. \quad (\text{A15})$$

Since  $\omega$  is Hermitian, we can apply perturbation theory to compute the new states and energies. Brillouin-Wigner perturbation theory states that if such a Schrödinger-like equation above is perturbed via

$$\omega \rightarrow \omega + \epsilon d\omega. \quad (\text{A16})$$

where  $d\omega = |G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \langle \phi_k|^A \langle G|^B + \text{H.C.}$ , then the new states are given by

$$|\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \rightarrow |\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B + \epsilon \sum_{|\phi_m\rangle \neq |\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B} |\phi_m\rangle \frac{1}{a_k - E_m} \langle \phi_m | d\omega | \phi_k \rangle^A |G\rangle^B + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Here  $E_m$  refers to the eigenvalue of the state  $|\phi_m\rangle$ . Substituting for  $d\omega$ , we obtain

$$|\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \rightarrow |\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B + \frac{\epsilon}{a_k - \alpha} |G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Similarly, applying BWPT to the second Schrödinger like equation above yields

$$|G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \rightarrow |G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B + \epsilon \sum_{|\phi_m\rangle \neq |G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B} |\phi_m\rangle \frac{1}{\alpha - E_m} \langle \phi_m | d\omega | G \rangle^A |G\rangle^B + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Again, substituting for  $d\omega$  gives

$$|G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \rightarrow |G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha - a_k} |\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Within BWPT, the eigenvalues are calculated as

$$a_k \rightarrow a_k + \epsilon \langle \phi_k |^A \langle G |^B d\omega | \phi_k \rangle^A |G\rangle^B + \sum_{|\phi_m\rangle \neq |\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B} \frac{\epsilon^2}{a_k - E_m} |\langle \phi_m | d\omega | \phi_k \rangle^A |G\rangle^B|^2$$

and similarly

$$\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + \epsilon \langle G |^A \langle G |^B d\omega | G \rangle^A |G\rangle^B + \sum_{|\phi_m\rangle \neq |G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B} \frac{\epsilon^2}{\alpha - E_m} |\langle \phi_m | d\omega | G \rangle^A |G\rangle^B|^2$$

Using the above, we find that the eigenvectors transform up to first order as follows:

$$|\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \rightarrow |\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B + \epsilon \frac{|G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B}{a_k - \alpha} + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$|G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \rightarrow |G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B + \epsilon \frac{|\phi_k\rangle^A |G\rangle^B}{\alpha - a_k} + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (\text{A18})$$

Correspondingly, the eigenvalues change up to second order as follows:

$$a_k \rightarrow a_k + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (\text{A19})$$

$$\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + O(\epsilon^2), \quad (\text{A20})$$

and so

$$\omega \rightarrow \omega + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha - a_k} \log \left( \frac{\alpha}{a_k} \right) \left[ |G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \langle \phi_k|^A \langle G|^B + \text{H.C.} \right] + O(\epsilon^2).$$

Using

$$\text{Tr} [\rho (|G\rangle^A |G\rangle^B \langle \phi_k|^A \langle G|^B + \text{H.C.})] = 0 \quad (\text{A21})$$

we conclude that  $\omega = \rho - \tau^{AB}$  is the state where the relative entropy attains its global minimum. ■

- [1] Markus Arndt, Thomas Juffmann, and Vlatko Vedral. Quantum physics meets biology. *Advanced Online Publication Articles for HFSP Journal*, 1(1):118, 2009.
- [2] Seth Lloyd. A quantum of natural selection. *Nature Physics*, 5(3):164–166, March 2009.
- [3] Derek Abbott, Julio Gea-Banacloche, Paul C. W. Davies, Stuart Hameroff, Anton Zeilinger, Jens Eisert, Howard Wiseman, and Sergey M. Bezrukov. Plenary debate: Quantum effects in biology: Trivial or not? *Fluctuation and Noise Letters*, 8(1):C5–C26, 2008.
- [4] Derek Abbott, Paul C. W. Davies, and Arun K. Pati, editors. *Quantum Aspects of Life*. Imperial College Press, 2008.
- [5] Yuan-Chung Cheng and Graham R. Fleming. Dynamics of light harvesting in photosynthesis. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry*, 60(1):241–262, 2009. PMID: 18999996.
- [6] Thorsten Ritz, Peter Thalau, John B. Phillips, Roswitha Wiltschko, and Wolfgang Wiltschko. Resonance effects indicate a radical-pair mechanism for avian magnetic compass. *Nature*, 429:177–180, 2004.
- [7] Jennifer C. Brookes, Filio Hartoutsiou, A. P. Horsfield, and A. M. Stoneham. Could humans recognize odor by phonon assisted tunneling? *Physical Review Letters*, 98(3):038101, 2007.
- [8] Masoud Mohseni, Patrick Rebentrost, Seth Lloyd, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Environment-assisted quantum walks in photosynthetic energy transfer. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 129(17):174106, 2008.
- [9] Patrick Rebentrost, Masoud Mohseni, Ivan Kassal, Seth Lloyd, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Environment-assisted quantum transport. *New Journal of Physics*, 11(3):033003 (12pp), 2009.
- [10] F. Caruso, A. W. Chin, A. Datta, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio. Highly efficient energy excitation transfer in light-harvesting complexes: The fundamental role of noise-assisted transport. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 131(10):105106, 2009.
- [11] Martin B. Plenio and Susana F. Huelga. Dephasing-assisted transport: quantum networks and biomolecules. *New Journal of Physics*, 10(11):113019, 2008.
- [12] Kiminori Maeda, Kevin B. Henbest, Filippo Cintolesi, Ilya Kuprov, Christopher T. Rodgers, Paul A. Liddell, Devens Gust, Christiane R. Timmel, and P. J. Hore. Chemical compass model of avian magnetoreception. *Nature*, 453:387–390, 2008.
- [13] Iannis K. Kominis. Quantum Zeno effect underpinning the radical-ion-pair mechanism of avian magnetoreception. 2008. arXiv:0804.2646.
- [14] Jianming Cai, Gian Giacomo Guerreschi, and Hans J. Briegel. Quantum control and entanglement in a chemical compass. *Physical Review Letters*, 104(22):220502, June 2010.
- [15] Julia Adolphs and Thomas Renger. How proteins trigger excitation energy transfer in the FMO complex of green sulfur bacteria. *Biophysical Journal*, 91(8):2778–2797, 2006.
- [16] Mark M. Wilde, James M. McCracken, and Ari Mizel. Could light harvesting complexes exhibit non-classical effects at room temperature? *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, 466(2117):1347–1363, May 2010.
- [17] Mohan Sarovar, Akihito Ishizaki, Graham R. Fleming, and K. Birgitta Whaley. Quantum entanglement in photosynthetic light harvesting complexes. *Nature Physics*, 6:462–467, April 2010.
- [18] Filippo Caruso, Alex W. Chin, Animesh Datta, Susana F. Huelga, and Martin B. Plenio. Entanglement and entangling power of the dynamics in light-harvesting complexes. *Physical Review A*, 81(6):062346, June 2010.
- [19] Ryszard Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, Michał Horodecki, and Karol Horodecki. Quantum entanglement. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 81(2):865, 2009.
- [20] Anthony J. Leggett and Anupam Garg. Quantum mechanics versus macroscopic realism: Is the flux there when nobody looks? *Physical Review Letters*, 54:857, 1985.
- [21] Michał Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, and Ryszard Horodecki. Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions. *Physics Letters A*, 223:1–8, 1996.
- [22] Asher Peres. Separability criterion for density matrices. *Physical Review Letters*, 77(8):1413–1415, August 1996.
- [23] Vlatko Vedral and Martin B. Plenio. Entanglement measures and purification procedures. *Physical Review A*, 57(3):1619–1633, March 1998.
- [24] Akihito Ishizaki and Graham R. Fleming. Theoretical examination of quantum coherence in a photosynthetic system at physiological temperature. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(41):17255–17260, 2009.
- [25] Scott Hill and William K. Wootters. Entanglement of a pair of quantum bits. *Physical Review Letters*, 78(26):5022–5025, June 1997.

- [26] Martin B. Plenio. Logarithmic negativity: A full entanglement monotone that is not convex. *Physical Review Letters*, 95(9):090503, August 2005.
- [27] Reinhard F. Werner. Quantum states with einstein-podolsky-rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model. *Physical Review A*, 40(8):4277–4281, October 1989.
- [28] L. Henderson and V. Vedral. Classical, quantum and total correlations. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 34(35):6899–6905, 2001.
- [29] Harold Ollivier and Wojciech H. Zurek. Quantum discord: A measure of the quantumness of correlations. *Physical Review Letters*, 88(1):017901, December 2001.
- [30] John S. Bell. On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox. *Physics*, 1:195–200, 1964.
- [31] T. Werlang, S. Souza, F. F. Fanchini, and C. J. Villas Boas. Robustness of quantum discord to sudden death. *Physical Review A*, 80(2):024103, 2009.
- [32] Animesh Datta, Anil Shaji, and Carlton M. Caves. Quantum discord and the power of one qubit. *Physical Review Letters*, 100(5):050502, 2008.
- [33] B. P. Lanyon, M. Barbieri, M. P. Almeida, and A. G. White. Experimental quantum computing without entanglement. *Physical Review Letters*, 101(20):200501, 2008.
- [34] Peter W. Shor and Stephen Jordan. Estimating Jones polynomials is a complete problem for one clean qubit. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 8:681–714, 2008.
- [35] Stephan Hoyer, Mohan Sarovar, and K Birgitta Whaley. Limits of quantum speedup in photosynthetic light harvesting. *New Journal of Physics*, 12(6):065041, 2010.
- [36] Vlatko Vedral. The role of relative entropy in quantum information theory. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 74(1):197–234, March 2002.
- [37] R. E. Fenna and B. W. Matthews. Chlorophyll arrangement in a bacteriochlorophyll protein from chlorobium limicola. *Nature*, 258(5536):573–577, December 1975.
- [38] F. L. Semiao, K. Furuya, and G. J. Milburn. Vibration enhanced quantum transport. 2009. arXiv:0909.1846.
- [39] Alexandra Olaya-Castro, Chiu Fan Lee, Francesca Fassioli Olsen, and Neil F. Johnson. Efficiency of energy transfer in a light-harvesting system under quantum coherence. *Physical Review B*, 78(8):085115, 2008.
- [40] T. G. Owens, S. P. Webb, L. Mets, R. S. Alberte, and G. R. Fleming. Antenna size dependence of fluorescence decay in the core antenna of photosystem I: estimates of charge separation and energy transfer rates. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 84(6):1532–1536, 1987.
- [41] A. W. Chin, A. Datta, F. Caruso, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio. Noise-assisted energy transfer in quantum networks and light-harvesting complexes. *New Journal of Physics*, 12(6):065002, 2010.
- [42] Patrick Rebentrost, Rupak Chakraborty, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Non-Markovian quantum jumps in excitonic energy transfer. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 131(18):184102, 2009.
- [43] Jianzhong Wen, Hao Zhang, Michael L. Gross, and Robert E. Blankenship. Membrane orientation of the FMO antenna protein from *Chlorobaculum tepidum* as determined by mass spectrometry-based footprinting. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(15):6134–6139, 2009.
- [44] James D. Whitfield, César A. Rodríguez-Rosario, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Quantum stochastic walks: A generalization of classical random walks and quantum walks. *Physical Review A*, 81(2):022323, February 2010.
- [45] Benjamin Schumacher. Quantum coding. *Physical Review A*, 51(4):2738–2747, April 1995.
- [46] Berry Groisman, Sandu Popescu, and Andreas Winter. Quantum, classical, and total amount of correlations in a quantum state. *Physical Review A*, 72(3):032317, September 2005.
- [47] Benjamin Schumacher and Michael D. Westmoreland. Quantum mutual information and the one-time pad. *Physical Review A*, 74(4):042305, 2006.
- [48] Charles H. Bennett, Peter W. Shor, John A. Smolin, and Ashish V. Thapliyal. Entanglement-assisted classical capacity of noisy quantum channels. *Physical Review Letters*, 83(15):3081–3084, October 1999.
- [49] Charles H. Bennett, Peter W. Shor, John A. Smolin, and Ashish V. Thapliyal. Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse Shannon theorem. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 48:2637, 2002.
- [50] Peter W. Shor. *Quantum Information, Statistics, Probability (Dedicated to A. S. Holevo on the occasion of his 60th birthday)*, chapter “The classical capacity achievable by a quantum channel assisted by limited entanglement”, pages 144–152. Rinton Press, Inc., 2004. arXiv:quant-ph/0402129.
- [51] Kamil Bradler, Patrick Hayden, and Prakash Panangaden. Private information via the Unruh effect. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2009(08):074, 2009.
- [52] Igor Devetak and Andreas Winter. Distilling common randomness from bipartite quantum states. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 50:3138–3151, 2003.
- [53] Animesh Datta. *Studies on the Role of Entanglement in Mixed-state Quantum Computation*. PhD thesis, University of New Mexico, 2008.
- [54] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [55] Wojciech Hubert Zurek. Quantum discord and Maxwell’s demons. *Physical Review A*, 67(1):012320, January 2003.
- [56] Tosio Kato. *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*. Springer, 1995.