Review Article

Quantum Effects at the Nanoscale: A Comparative Study of Jaynes-Cummings-Hubbard and Bose-Hubbard Models

Narmin A. Azizli[1] **and Mubariz B. Huseynzada**[2]

[1, 2]Department of Mechanics and Mathematics, School of Advanced Technologies and Innovation Engineering, Western Caspian University, 17A Ahmad Rajabli Street, III Parallel, AZ1001 Baku, Azerbaijan

Received: 06.11.2025 Accepted: 17.11.2025 Published: 19.11.2025

https://doi.org/10.54414/OTDJ9129

Abstract

As the characteristic dimensions of a physical system shrink to the nanometer scale, its behavior is governed primarily by quantum mechanics rather than by classical laws. In this regime, effects such as barrier tunnelling, energy quantization, and quantum coherence play a central role in how nanoscale devices function. These phenomena are particularly prominent in platforms such as graphene and semiconductor quantum dots, where they have a pronounced impact on transport properties, optical behavior, and overall device performance. In parallel, lattice-based many-body models offer a concise theoretical framework for describing collective quantum states in engineered structures. The present work provides a conceptually oriented survey that links quantum phenomena at the nanoscale to two benchmark lattice Hamiltonians, namely the Jaynes-Cummings-Hubbard (JCH) and Bose-Hubbard (BH) models. The approach is qualitative and literature-based: results from quantum optics, cold-atom physics, and condensed-matter research are combined to interpret how the parameters of these models relate to experimentally tunable quantities, such as coupling strengths, confinement scales, and interaction energies. The main outcome of the review is threefold. First, tunnelling, graphene, and quantum dots can be viewed as natural settings where effective Hubbard-type descriptions arise. Second, despite describing different degrees of freedom-hybrid light-matter polaritons in the JCH case and interacting bosons in the BH case, both models display analogous phase structures with insulating and superfluid-like regimes. Third, reliable implementation of these phases in nanotechnological devices requires a careful mapping between abstract Hamiltonian parameters and specific design variables. The discussion indicates that JCH- and BH-type models should be regarded not only as abstract theoretical constructs but also as practical tools for guiding the design of future quantum technologies. Extensions to driven-dissipative dynamics and topological band structures are identified as promising directions for next-generation quantum simulators and nanoscale sensors.

Keywords: quantum tunnelling, graphene, quantum dots, Jaynes-Cummings-Hubbard model, Bose-Hubbard model, quantum simulators

1. Introduction

Nanotechnology deals with the control and manipulation of matter at length scales where the behavior of individual atoms and molecules becomes relevant. At these dimensions, the usual classical approximation breaks down, and features such as superposition, quantized energy spectra, and interference must be explicitly included in the description. As a consequence, the behavior of nanostructures is governed by quantum mechanics, and quantum effects turn from subtle corrections into dominant features of device operation.

Several quantum phenomena are particularly relevant for engineering at the nanoscale. Quantum tunnelling allows particles to traverse potential barriers that would be impenetrable in a classical picture. Confinement gives rise to discrete spectra and size-dependent optical properties. Long-lived coherence enables interference and entanglement between spatially separated degrees of freedom. These effects play central roles in systems such as graphene-based conductors, tunnelling devices, and semiconductor quantum dots, which already underpin parts of modern electronics, photonics, and quantum information technology.

In parallel with advances in materials and fabrication, theoretical physics has produced a family of relatively simple but powerful lattice models that describe interacting quantum particles or quasiparticles. Among these, two frameworks are especially important for the present discussion. The Jaynes-Cummings-Hubbard (JCH) model extends cavity quantum electrodynamics to arrays of coupled light-matter sites, while the Bose-Hubbard (BH) model captures the competition between tunnelling and on-site interactions for bosons on a lattice. Both have been realized experimentally, for example, in cold-atom optical lattices and in photonic or superconducting circuits.

2. Quantum tunnelling

In quantum theory, a particle can still be detected on the far side of an energy barrier that would completely block it in classical mechanics; this counterintuitive process is known as quantum tunnelling. In the semiclassical (WKB) approximation, the tunnelling probability P through a one-dimensional barrier between the classical turning points x_1 and x_2 can be expressed as

$$P \propto \exp\left(-2\int_{x_1}^{x_2}\sqrt{\frac{2m}{\hbar^2}}\,[V(x)-E]\,dx\right) \quad (1)$$

where m is the particle mass, E is its energy, and V(x) denotes the potential profile. The exponential dependence on barrier width and height explains why tunnelling effects become prominent when characteristic dimensions approach the nanometer scale. Scanning tunnelling microscopy (STM) is a key technological application of this principle, exploiting electron tunnelling between a sharp tip and a sample surface to probe topography and local electronic structure with atomic resolution.

3. Graphene

Graphene is formed by a single sheet of carbon atoms organised in a two-dimensional honeycomb lattice. Owing to the symmetry of this lattice, the electronic band structure exhibits touching points between the valence and conduction bands, the so-called Dirac points, at which low-energy charge carriers behave effectively as massless fermions. As a result, charge carriers in graphene can move over micrometer distances with very little scattering, and the material exhibits high mobility and unconventional quantum Hall effects. Quantum phenomena such as Klein-type tunnelling through electrostatic barriers and robust coherence make graphene attractive for high-frequency electronics, precision metrology, and hybrid superconducting–graphene devices. Patterning graphene into nanoribbons or quantum dot structures further enhances confinement and makes it possible to approximate lattice models with tunable hopping and interaction parameters.

4. Quantum dots

Semiconductor quantum dots are nanoscale structures in which electrons and holes experience confinement along all three spatial directions. Confinement energies become comparable to or larger than thermal energy, so the system exhibits discrete energy levels reminiscent of atomic spectra. By adjusting dot size, composition, or shape during fabrication, one can shift level spacings and thus tune optical emission and absorption over a wide range. Quantum dots are exploited in light-emitting devices, display technologies, biological imaging, high-efficiency solar cells, and as single-photon sources. When coupled to optical cavities or waveguides, quantum-dot excitons can interact strongly with confined modes, forming polaritons that fit naturally within JCH-type descriptions. In arrays of coupled dots, the collective dynamics can emulate either Bose-Hubbard or Fermi-Hubbard physics, depending on the carriers and interactions involved.

5. Jaynes-Cummings-Hubbard model

In the Jaynes-Cummings description, a single two-level emitter (for example, an atom or qubit) exchanges excitations coherently with one quantized mode of the electromagnetic field confined in a cavity. Within the rotating-wave approximation, the corresponding Hamiltonian takes the form

$$H_{JC} = \hbar\omega a^{\dagger}a + \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_0\sigma_z + \hbar g(a\sigma_+ + a^{\dagger}\sigma_-) \quad (2)$$

where ω_C is the cavity frequency, ω_0 is the transition frequency of the two-level system, g is the light-matter coupling strength, $a^{\dagger}a$ are photon creation and annihilation operators, and $\sigma_z\sigma_{\pm}\sigma_-$ are Pauli operators acting on the two-level system. This model captures key features of cavity quantum electrodynamics, including coherent Rabi oscillations and vacuum Rabi splitting.

The Jaynes-Cummings-Hubbard model takes the single-cavity Jaynes-Cummings setting and replicates it across many sites, allowing photons to tunnel between neighbouring cavities while each two-level system interacts only with its local field mode. A commonly used form of the JCH Hamiltonian is:

$$\widehat{H}_{JCH} = \sum_i (\hbar\omega_C\, a^{\dagger}{}_i a_i + \frac{\hbar\omega_0}{2}\, \sigma_i{}^z + \hbar g(a^{\dagger}\sigma_i{}^- + a\sigma_i{}^+)) - J\sum_{(I,j)} a_i^{\dagger} a_j \quad (3)$$

where J is the photon hopping amplitude between nearest-neighbor sites (i, j). The elementary excitations are hybrid light-matter polaritons whose spatial behavior depends on the balance between on-site interaction effects and inter-site tunnelling.

6. Bose-Hubbard model

The Bose-Hubbard framework describes bosonic particles residing on a lattice of discrete sites, where they are subject to local interactions and are able to tunnel between neighboring positions. One commonly employed form of the Bose–Hubbard Hamiltonian can be written as follows:

$$\widehat{H}_{BH} = -J\sum_{(I,j)}(b_i^{\dagger}b_j + b_j^{\dagger}b_i) + \frac{U}{2}\sum_i n_i(n_i - 1) - \mu\sum_i n_i \quad (4)$$

Where $b_i^{\dagger}$ and b_I create and annihilate bosons at site i, $n_i = b_i^{\dagger}b_i$ is the number operator, J is the hopping amplitude, U is the on-site interaction strength, and μ is the chemical potential. Within the Bose-Hubbard description, bosons are allowed to hop from site to site while simultaneously feeling a repulsive cost when several particles accumulate on the same site. The competition between J and U gives rise to distinct phases, including Mott-insulating states and superfluid states.

This article aims to assemble these ingredients into a coherent picture: to show how basic quantum effects at the nanoscale and material platforms such as graphene and quantum dots can be understood in relation to JCH- and BH-type Hamiltonians, and how this viewpoint may assist the design of future quantum devices.

7. Materials and Methods

The study is organised as a narrative, theory-focused review rather than an original experimental investigation. It does not report new experimental measurements or simulations; instead, it synthesizes and organizes existing results from the literature. The methodological steps are as follows:

1. Studies on tunnelling, confinement, and coherence at the nanoscale are used to illustrate generic quantum effects relevant for device operation.
2. Experimental and theoretical work on graphene and semiconductor quantum dots is reviewed to identify how their properties can be described using effective lattice models.
3. Key parameters of the JCH and BH Hamiltonians, such as coupling strengths, detuning, hopping amplitudes, and interaction energies, are related qualitatively to experimentally tunable quantities in nanostructures, including geometry, material composition, cavity design, and external fields.
4. Parameter regimes associated with insulating versus superfluid-like phases are discussed in terms of how they might be approached in realistic nanotechnological platforms.

Because the goal is conceptual clarity rather than quantitative benchmarking, results are presented descriptively, with representative examples drawn from published work rather than from new datasets.

8. Results

The literature-based analysis allows several concise results to be formulated concerning the relationship between nanoscale quantum phenomena and lattice model descriptions.

First, tunnelling, confinement, and coherence emerge as common threads linking different nanoscale systems. Graphene, quantum dots, and related structures provide concrete environments in which these phenomena strongly influence electronic and optical behavior. In each case, the relevant quantum states can be viewed as occupying effective “sites” with well-defined energies and couplings, making the use of JCH or BH-type Hamiltonians natural.

Second, the Jaynes-Cummings-Hubbard and Bose-Hubbard models, although they act on different degrees of freedom, display structurally similar Hamiltonians and phase diagrams. Both incorporate local interaction terms and inter-site tunnelling, and both support regimes analogous to Mott insulators and superfluids. In JCH systems, the excitations are polaritons formed from light and matter; in BH systems, they are bosons such as atoms or exciton-polaritons. This structural similarity means that analytical and numerical methods developed for one model can often be adapted to the other.

Third, the correspondence between model parameters and experimental control knobs can be described systematically. In optical lattice experiments, laser intensities and magnetic fields fix tunnelling rates and interaction strengths. In cavity and circuit QED realizations, resonator geometry, detuning, and coupling strengths play a similar role. In graphene-based and quantum-dot devices, lithographic patterning, gate voltages, and material composition govern level spacing, overlap integrals, and interaction energies. These relationships demonstrate that the abstract parameter space of JCH and BH models can be mapped onto a space of practical design choices in nanotechnology.

9. Discussion

The results indicate that lattice models traditionally associated with cold-atom and quantum-optics experiments can also be interpreted from a nanotechnology perspective. Thinking in terms of JCH and BH Hamiltonians encourages a shift from viewing nanostructures as isolated components toward seeing them as parts of larger, interacting networks of quantum degrees of freedom. This is particularly relevant for quantum simulators, where the goal is to emulate complex many-body behavior in a controllable device.

Another implication is methodological. Because the JCH and BH models share a common structure, theoretical advances in one area can inform progress in the other. For example, techniques used to study the superfluid–Mott-insulator transition in BH systems can be adapted to explore polaritonic phase transitions in JCH arrays. Conversely, progress in engineering strong light-matter coupling in cavity and circuit QED systems suggests strategies for enhancing effective interactions in solid-state nanodevices based on quantum dots or two-dimensional materials.

Realistic nanostructures, however, are subject to losses, disorder, and environmental noise. This motivates extending both models to open quantum systems where dissipation and external driving are treated explicitly.

Driven-dissipative analogues of JCH and BH Hamiltonians are already being explored theoretically and experimentally, and they are expected to be central for practical implementations of quantum simulators, sensors, and information-processing devices that must operate under non-ideal conditions.

10. Conclusion

Once device dimensions reach the nanometer regime, quantum effects cease to be small corrections and instead dominate the overall behavior of the system. Materials such as graphene and semiconductor quantum dots show how tunnelling, confinement, and coherence can be exploited to obtain novel transport and optical properties. At the same time, the Jaynes-Cummings-Hubbard and Bose-Hubbard models offer compact descriptions of interacting quantum excitations on lattices and provide a common language for discussing insulating and superfluid-like phases across different platforms.

By relating the parameters of these models to experimentally controllable quantities in real nanostructures, this review argues that JCH- and BH-type Hamiltonians can function as practical guides for the design of quantum devices. Ongoing advances in fabrication techniques, coherent-control methods, and theoretical modelling are expected to generalise these frameworks to more complex situations, such as driven–dissipative dynamics and topological band structures, further tightening the connection between many-body quantum theory and practical nanotechnological implementations.

Author Contributions

Both authors contributed equally to the conception, design, data analysis, and interpretation of the study. Both authors participated in drafting and revising the manuscript and approved the final version.

Funding

No funding was received for this research.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. Durdana Rustamova for her valuable support and guidance during the preparation of this work.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article and its list of references. This article is a review based on previously published literature and does not report any new experimental data.

Abbreviations

Jaynes-Cummings-Hubbard (JCH), Bose-Hubbard (BH), Wentzel-Kramers-Brillouin (WKB), Scanning Tunnelling Microscopy (STM), Quantum Electrodynamics (QED).

References

1. Bera, D., Qian, L., Tseng, T. K., & Holloway, P. H. (2010). Quantum dots and their multimodal applications: a review. *Materials*, *3*(4), 2260-2345. https://doi.org/10.3390/ma3042260
2. Binnig, G., Rohrer, H., Gerber, C., & Weibel, E. (1982). Surface studies by scanning tunneling microscopy. *Physical review letters*, *49*(1), 57. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.49.57
3. Greentree, A. D., Tahan, C., Cole, J. H., & Hollenberg, L. C. (2006). Quantum phase transitions of light. *Nature Physics*, *2*(12), 856-861. https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys466
4. Greiner, M., Mandel, O., Esslinger, T., Hänsch, T. W., & Bloch, I. (2002). Quantum phase transition from a superfluid to a Mott insulator in a gas of ultracold atoms. *nature*, *415*(6867), 39-44. https://doi.org/10.1038/415039a
5. Hartmann, M. J., Brandao, F. G., & Plenio, M. B. (2006). Strongly interacting polaritons in coupled arrays of cavities. *Nature Physics*, *2*(12), 849-855. https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys462
6. Hensgens, T., Fujita, T., Janssen, L., Li, X., Van Diepen, C. J., Reichl, C., & Vandersypen, L. M. (2017). Quantum simulation of a Fermi–Hubbard model using a semiconductor quantum dot array. *Nature*, *548*(7665), 70-73. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature23022
7. Imamog, A., Awschalom, D. D., Burkard, G., DiVincenzo, D. P., Loss, D., Sherwin, M., & Small, A. (1999). Quantum information processing using quantum dot spins and cavity QED. *Physical review letters*, *83*(20), 4204. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.83.4204
8. Jaksch, D., Bruder, C., Cirac, J. I., Gardiner, C. W., & Zoller, P. (1998). Cold bosonic atoms in optical lattices. *Physical Review Letters*, *81*(15), 3108. https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.81.3108
9. Michler, P., Imamoğlu, A., Mason, M. D., Carson, P. J., Strouse, G. F., & Buratto, S. K. (2000). Quantum correlation among photons from a single quantum dot at room temperature. *Nature*, *406*(6799), 968-970. https://doi.org/10.1038/35023100
10. Novoselov, K. S., Geim, A. K., Morozov, S. V., Jiang, D. E., Zhang, Y., Dubonos, S. V., & Firsov, A. A. (2004). Electric field effect in atomically thin carbon films. *science*, *306*(5696), 666-669. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1102896
11. Wallraff, A., Schuster, D. I., Blais, A., Frunzio, L., Huang, R. S., Majer, J., & Schoelkopf, R. J. (2004). Strong coupling of a single photon to a superconducting qubit using circuit quantum electrodynamics. *Nature*, *431*(7005), 162-167. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02851