Good Afternoon

Current Trends in Condensed Matter Physics @ NISER, Bhubaneswar

Coherences, Photosynthesis and Quantum Biology?

K L Sebastian Department of Inorganic and Physical Chemistry Indian Institute of Science Bangalore 560012

Do biological systems use Quantum Coherences?

Green sulphur bacteria

atleast these do!

Outline

- 1. The Problem
- 2. Coherences
- 3. Environment decoherence
- 4. The FMO Photosystem
- 5. Coherences experimental observations
- 6. The Hamiltonian
- 7. The time evolution
- 8. Approach based on adiabatic basis
- 9. Decoherence and population relaxation
- **10. Summary and Conclusions**

The problem



http://www.bio.ku.dk/nuf/research/chlorosome.htm



The FMO Complex (green sulphur bacteria)







Idea from N. Singh



Coherences

Coherences are responsible for wave like motion!





Thundering typhoons!



$$|\psi_{12}|^{2} = |\psi_{1}|^{2} + |\psi_{2}|^{2} + \psi_{1}^{*}\psi_{2} + \psi_{1}\psi_{2}^{*}$$

$$\bigvee$$
Coherence

Superposing two electronic states

 \boldsymbol{S}





Electronic Coherence



Effect of environment





Hydrated Electron



http://www.nature.com/nchem/journal/v2/n4/fig_tab/nchem.604_F1.html



The description is inaccurate!

Oscillations die down - effect of the environment



Interaction with the environment





Spherically symmetric

non-spherical

Electric field in the environment







Decoherence and Relaxation

Decoherence is different from relaxation!



Decoherence times

Species	Decoherence time
Hydrated electron	4.5 fs
Styryl dye in methanol	6.8 fs
Betaine-30 in acetonitrile	49 fs



Prezhdo and Rossky: PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS, 81, 5294 (1998)

The Photosystem

The FMO Complex



http://www.bio.ku.dk/nuf/research/chlorosome.htm



Experimental results

G. Fleming et. al. Nature, 2007



Quantum Coherences play a key role in photosynthesis!



Evolution has used quantum mechanics to make photosynthesis efficient! Bacteria have been quantum computing for hundreds of millions of years!

Non-trivial quantum effects seen in biology!

Dawn of QUANTUM BIOLOGY!

I would like to believe this! But is this true?

D-Wave - Quantum Chip



Size of a thumbnail

Quantum Computer?



The molecules, energy levels and couplings







(from the internet)


The Hamiltonian





Why (distance) $^{-3}$?





 $\psi_{De}^{*}(\mathbf{r}_{1})\psi_{Dg}(\mathbf{r}_{1}) \checkmark \psi_{Ag}^{*}(\mathbf{r}_{2})\psi_{Ae}(\mathbf{r}_{2})$ Electrostatic interaction





a same		240	-87.7	5.5	-5.9	6.7	-13.7	-9.9
	$\frac{H_{closed}}{cm^{-1}} =$		315	30.8	8.2	0.7	11.8	4.3
				0	-53.5	-2.2	-9.6	6.0
					130	-70.7	-17.0	-63.3
						285	81.1	-1.3
							435	39.7
5		L						245
Jeiter A								

The Environment



Coupling with environment





Initial Conditions



The time evolution

Previous Work $(\rightarrow \infty)$ $H_{el-ph}(\mathbf{Q}) = \sum_{j} Q_{j} |j\rangle \langle j|$



Decoherence and population relaxation caused by the this term - NO small parameter!

 $\lambda, V_{ij} and \Delta \epsilon : comparable$ Ishizaki and Fleming, PNAS (eq. for density matrix, trunated)

Nalbach et al Physical Review E (2011) (numerical, exact)

The adiabatic basis

Pallavi Bhattacharyya and KLS: PHYSICAL REVIEW E 87, 062712 (2013) P. Bhattacharyya and KLS: J. Phys. Chem. A (2013)

Hamiltonian in the adiabatic basis $H_{ad}(\mathbf{Q})$ $= \sum_{j} (\epsilon_{j} + Q_{j}) |j\rangle \langle j| + \sum_{i,j} V_{ij} |i\rangle \langle j| + h.c.$

 $H_{ad}(\mathbf{Q})|m(\mathbf{Q})\rangle = \varepsilon_m(\mathbf{Q})|m(\mathbf{Q})\rangle.$

 $H = \sum \varepsilon_m(\mathbf{Q}) |m(\mathbf{Q})| > < m(\mathbf{Q})| + H_{ph}$ m







Time Evolution



$$J_{j}(\omega) = \sum_{k} \frac{m_{jk} \nu_{jk}^{2}}{2\omega_{jk}} \delta(\omega - \omega_{jk}).$$
 Spectral density
$$J(\omega) = \frac{2\lambda}{\pi} \frac{\omega \omega_{c}}{\omega^{2} + \omega_{c}^{2}},$$

 $\lambda = \int_{0}^{\infty} d\omega J(\omega)/\omega.$ Reorganization energy $\lambda = 35 \ cm^{-1} \ and \ \omega_{c}^{-1} = 50 \ fs$ From Fleming et al.





FIG. 1: Initial excitation on site 1 at 77 K; Comparison of our results with those of Nalbach *et al.* for chromophores 1,2 and 3.













With Environment



FIG. 2: Initial excitation on 1 at 77 K; Decoherence due to environment







FIG. 3: Initial excitation on site 1 at 77 K; Decoherence and population relaxation due to environment





300K: Results similar to 77K, but decay faster



FIG. 11: Initial excitation on site 6 at 77 K; Decoherence and population relaxation due to environment; comparison of population evolution on site 3 for correlated and uncorrelated bath



Correlation between baths for different sites makes transfer less efficient!

With spectral density from simulations

Spectral density by Olbrich and Kleinekathofer (from MD simulations)



 $\omega \tau_c$

$$J_{j}\left(\omega\right) = \frac{2}{\pi} \tanh\left(\frac{\beta\hbar\omega}{2}\right) \times \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_{e}} \frac{\eta_{ji}\gamma_{ji}}{\gamma_{ji}^{2} + \omega^{2}} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N_{o}} \frac{\tilde{\eta}_{ji}\tilde{\gamma}_{ji}}{\tilde{\gamma}_{ji}^{2} + \left(\omega - \tilde{\omega}_{ji}\right)^{2}}\right]$$


Why this difference?



Figure 6. Spectral densities for the FMO trimer determined in the present study compared to those of previous studies by Ishizaki and Fleming,¹¹ Cho et al.,³⁴ Adolphs and Renger,³³ as well as Nalbach et al.¹⁹ The inset shows an enlarged energy and spectral density range.



Acknowledgements

DST, India (J C Bose Fellowship)

Indian Institute of Science

Pallavi Bhattacharyya







