Observation of a Dynamical Phase Transition in the Collective Heisenberg Model
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Ultracold atoms, benefiting from long-lived coherence and controllable interactions, offer an ideal system to shed light on the organizing principles of out-of-equilibrium quantum systems. Here, we investigate a dynamical phase transition from a state with ferromagnetic order to a demagnetized state in a quantum simulator of the collective Heisenberg model with an inhomogeneous axial field. Two hyperfine states of fermionic potassium atoms encode the spin degrees of freedom, while single-particle oscillator modes serve as lattice sites. We benchmark the simulator using detailed comparisons to theory and by testing the reversibility of the collective dynamics. Our observations open a route for applications of large controllable fermionic ensembles to enhanced
metrology and quantum technologies.

Out-of-equilibrium many-body systems can display a plethora of intriguing phenomena including synchronization \[1, 2, 3, 4\], self-organization \[5, 6, 7, 8\], quantum chaos \[9\], dynamical phase transitions \[10, 11\], and new types of phases prohibited to exist at equilibrium conditions, such as time crystals \[12, 13\]. The challenge faced in understanding out-of-equilibrium systems is that the powerful formalism of statistical physics, which has allowed a classification of quantum phases of matter based on simple principles such as minimization of free energy, does not apply. Testing conjectured universal behaviors and new organizing principles of dynamical quantum matter is therefore in high demand. One emerging paradigm is the dynamical phase transition (DPT) \[14, 15, 16, 17\], in which a long-time-average order parameter distinguishes two non-equilibrium phases in an interacting quantum many-body system. At the critical line separating phases, observables exhibit a scaling behavior reminiscent of conventional quantum phase transitions. The presence of an order parameter differentiates this notion of a DPT from an alternative use of the same term \[18, 10, 19\].

In this work we report the experimental observation of a DPT in the out-of-equilibrium dynamics of the collective Heisenberg model (CHM), between a ferromagnetic gapped phase featuring long-lived magnetization and an ungapped phase in which magnetization decays quickly. In terms of spin-1/2 operators acting on the \(i\)th atom, \(\hat{s}_i = \frac{1}{2} \{\hat{\sigma}^X_i, \hat{\sigma}^Y_i, \hat{\sigma}^Z_i\}\), the CHM can be written as

\[
\hat{H} / \hbar = \sum_i h_i \hat{s}_i^Z - \sum_{i,j} J_{ij} \hat{s}_i \cdot \hat{s}_j, \tag{1}
\]

where capital letters to denote orientation in Bloch space. In this model, the non-local spin-spin couplings \(J_{ij}\) compete with an inhomogeneous axial field, \(h_i\) \[20, 21, 22\]. The CHM is a celebrated model for magnetism \[23\], and is closely related to the Richardson-Gaudin models for superconductivity \[24, 25, 26, 27\] based on the Anderson pseudo-spin mapping \[28\].
Using total magnetization as the order parameter, we explore the dynamical phase diagram by tuning $J_{ij}$ and $h_i$. The DPT is a consequence of the opening of an interaction-energy gap between the manifold of fully symmetric spins and the remainder of the Hilbert space. The gap is manifested in a stabilization of a finite transverse magnetization and in transient oscillations of the magnetization around its time-average value. In the ungapped phase, exchange interactions are not strong enough to prevent demagnetization, rendering the system prone to dephasing induced by inhomogeneous $h_i$. We benchmark this quantum simulator by observing excellent agreement with calculations of the mean-field dynamics of the CHM. The range of interaction strengths in which quantum dynamics are described by the CHM is established by a test of microscopic reversibility, using a many-body echo sequence.

Our quantum simulation encodes spin information in the $m_F = -9/2 (|\downarrow\rangle)$ and $-7/2 (|\uparrow\rangle)$ states of the $F = 9/2$ hyperfine manifold of fermionic $^{40}\text{K}$. The atoms are confined to an optical trap with harmonic oscillator frequencies $\omega = \{\omega_x, \omega_y, \omega_z\} = 2\pi \times \{395, 1140, 950\}$ Hz. The ansatz central to this work is a mapping of the single-particle motional eigenstates labeled by $n_i = \{n_{ix}, n_{iy}, n_{iz}\}$ to a conceptual lattice in mode space (see Fig. 1). Spin-dependent curvature in the trapping potential produces a small shift $\pm \Delta \omega$ in the trapping frequency for the $|\downarrow\rangle$ and $|\uparrow\rangle$ states (see Supplementary Material, SM). Since the resultant energy shift depends linearly on $n_i$, it constitutes an axial field gradient in mode space, $h_i = 2n_i \cdot \Delta \omega = 2(n_{ix}\Delta \omega_x + n_{iy}\Delta \omega_y + n_{iz}\Delta \omega_z)$. The strength of the inhomogeneity across the occupied modes is tuned in two ways: using the polarization of one of the laser beams forming the optical trap to change $\Delta \omega$, and using temperature to change the average mode index $\bar{n}$.

The spin-spin interactions are proportional to the $s$-wave scattering length $a$ of the colliding atoms, which can be tuned via a Feshbach resonance [29]. This can be seen by factoring $J_{ij}$ as $U J_{ij}$, where $U = 4\pi a \sqrt{m \omega_x \omega_y \omega_z / \hbar}$ sets an overall scale, and $J_{ij}$ is a mode-dependent coupling factor proportional to the density-density overlap of the single-particle eigenmodes of
the \(i\)th and \(j\)th particles. Due to the extended nature of the motional wave functions, the \(J_{ij}\) are long-ranged, \(\sim 1/\sqrt{|n_i - n_j|}\) in each direction. The DPT is observed in a weak-scattering regime (near the zero-crossing field \(B_{zc} = 20.907(1)\) mT at which \(a = 0\), see SM), where atoms remain frozen in their initial modes, and dynamics involve only spin degrees of freedom [30].

Similar treatments of fermionic systems using a spin model have been employed successfully in strontium optical lattice clocks [20, 31, 32, 33, 34] in the microkelvin regime with \(N \lesssim 50\). Here we instead employ macroscopic ultracold samples of \(N \simeq 3 \times 10^4\) alkali atoms in the nanokelvin regime.

Our experiment operates with a temperature \(T \sim 0.3–0.5\) \(E_F/k_B\), where \(E_F = (6N)^{1/3}\hbar \bar{\omega}\) is the Fermi energy, such that \(\bar{n} \sim 20–30\). After preparing a fully polarized non-interacting sample, which ensures that no site in the mode lattice is doubly occupied, a fast radio-frequency (rf) \(\pi/2\) pulse initiates dynamics with a spin rotation to the \(X-Y\) plane, i.e. maximal collective transverse magnetization. Magnetization is probed using a Ramsey pulse sequence: following the initial \(\pi/2\)-pulse, atoms evolve for a variable time \(t\), after which a second \(\pi/2\) pulse is applied, and the total populations in the \(|\downarrow\rangle, |\uparrow\rangle\) states are measured with a Stern-Gerlach technique. Shot-to-shot field drifts on the microtesla scale prevent a reproducible accumulated phase in the Ramsey sequence, so that transverse coherence is found by repeating the sequence ten to forty times, with a maximum-likelihood estimator that assumes a randomized interferometric phase (SM). This procedure measures the total transverse magnetization \(2\sqrt{(S^X)^2 + (S^Y)^2}/N\), where \(S^X,Y,Z = \langle \hat{S}^X,Y,Z \rangle\) with \(\hat{S}^X,Y,Z = \sum_i \hat{s}_i^X,Y,Z\) collective spin operators. However, since \(S^Z\) is a constant of motion in our simulation, and set to zero by the first \(\pi/2\)-pulse, we can simply interpret the signal as \(2S/N\), with \(S = \sqrt{\sum_{p=X,Y,Z} (S^p)^2}\) the total magnetization.

Figure 2 shows the dynamical phase diagram mapped through \(S(t = 100\) ms), as a function of axial field inhomogeneity \(\tilde{h} = \sqrt{\sum_i \hbar_i^2/N - (\sum_i \hbar_i/N)^2}\) and mean interaction strength \(J = \sum_{i,j} J_{ij}/N^2\). As shown in three horizontal cuts (Fig. 2A-C) and three vertical cuts (Fig. 2E-G),
several distinct regions appear: a high persistent $S$ at large positive and negative $NJ$, bracketing a low-$S$ region at small $NJ$. Measurements are compared to a mean-field treatment of Eq. [1] where the $j$th atom experiences an effective magnetic field, $B_j$ that depends only on the local field and the average magnetization of the other atoms in the ensemble,

$$\dot{H}_{\text{mf}}/\hbar = \sum_j \hat{s}_j \cdot B_j \quad \text{where} \quad B_j = h_j Z - \sum_i 2J_{ij} \langle \hat{s}_i \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

Here the indices $i, j$ run over a set of $N$ populated modes drawn from a finite-temperature Fermi-Dirac distribution, and $Z$ is a unit vector. Numerical solutions of the corresponding $3N$ non-linear Bloch equations (SM) show that above some critical value of $J_c(\tilde{h})$, the dynamics become gapped and ferromagnetic order stabilizes, while below $J_c(\tilde{h})$, the gas partially demagnetizes. The white solid line in (Fig. 2D) shows the DPT steady-state phase boundary which sets $J_c(\tilde{h})$. In contrast to thermodynamic ferromagnetism, which occurs only for $J > 0$, the dynamical ferromagnet is a spin-locked state that can be stabilized by either repulsive or attractive exchange interactions.

The red lines in Fig. 2 show $S$ calculated by this model, using ab-initio determination of $J$, a set of field curvatures that match all observations in this manuscript (SM), and a decay envelope, $e^{-\Gamma(a)t}$, discussed further below. The agreement between the quantum simulation and the theoretical model provides supporting evidence that the expected DPT at $J_c(\tilde{h})$ is visible at $t = 100 \text{ ms} \approx 250 \omega_x^{-1}$.

To gain understanding of the scaling expected near the DPT one can use a simplified “all-to-all” model, in which coupling constants are replaced by a uniform value, $J_{ij} \rightarrow J$. In this limit, Eq. [2] becomes integrable and maps to the BCS Hamiltonian for fermionic superconductors expressed in terms of Anderson pseudospin [28]. Borrowing the methodology developed for dealing with dynamical phases in BCS superconductors [35, 36, 26], one can obtain the frequency spectrum ruling the non-equilibrium dynamics from the roots of $L^2(u)$, with $L(u)$ the
**Lax vector** of the auxiliary variable \( u \). The roots can be found using the property that \( L^2(u) \) is an integral of motion of the dynamics, and can be evaluated for convenience at time \( t = 0 \). When the roots compress in the neighbourhood of the real axis, the long-time limit of \( S(t) \) relaxes to a zero. This corresponds to the normal phase or “phase I” in the language of superconductors [26]. On the other hand, the appearance of a pair of complex conjugate roots determines the DPT critical point and the emergence of a phase characterized by a non-zero steady-state order parameter, \( S(\infty) > 0 \), i.e. “phase II”. While the precise scaling of the order parameter near the DPT can be non-trivial, since it is determined by the spectrum of the \( h_i \), we find that in our system it can be approximated by the analytic expression

\[
S(\infty) \approx \frac{\sqrt{3} \alpha \tilde{h}}{2 J_{\text{eff}}} \cot \left( \frac{\sqrt{3} \alpha \tilde{h}}{N J_{\text{eff}}} \right). \tag{3}
\]

This formula is exact (with \( \alpha = 1 \) and \( J_{\text{eff}} = J \)) for the case of a one-dimensional system \( \Delta \omega_{y,z} = 0 \) at zero temperature. To account for non-collective interactions, higher dimensions, and finite temperature, we introduce renormalization parameters \( \alpha \) and \( J_{\text{eff}} = \beta J \). The critical interaction strength is \( J_c(\tilde{h}) = 2 \sqrt{3} \alpha \tilde{h} / (\beta N \pi) \). An alternate order parameter in the dynamical ferromagnetic phase is the gap frequency:

\[
\Omega = 2 |J_{\text{eff}}| S(\infty) \approx \sqrt{3} \alpha \tilde{h} \cot \left( \frac{\sqrt{3} \alpha \tilde{h}}{N J_{\text{eff}}} \right). \tag{4}
\]

In the ferromagnetic phase, \( S(t) \) exhibits transient oscillations at the gap frequency \( \Omega \), which slowly damp as it reaches \( S(\infty) \). The gap frequency goes to zero at \( J_c(\tilde{h}) \) in a non-analytic manner. As discussed below, we observe each of these signatures in the quantum simulation.

The collective nature of these phenomena is emphasized by an alternative interpretation of the gap. The initial \( \pi/2 \)-pulse can be said to create a superposition of \( |S = N/2, m_S \rangle \) Dicke states, where \( S \) and \( m_S \) are eigenvalues of the collective operators \( \hat{S}^2 = \sum_{p=x,y,z} (\hat{S}^p)^2 \) and \( \hat{S}^Z \) respectively. All \( m_S \) states have the same energy in the rotating frame of the rf pulse. A finite energy gap \( \hbar \Omega \) inhibits the production of spin waves (generated by the inhomogeneous \( h_i \)) and
keeps the dynamics within the collective Dicke manifold: flipping a single spin would reduce $S$ to $(N/2 - 1)$, and change the exchange energy, proportional to $JS^2$, by $NJ$.

Figure 3 shows the qualitative change in dynamical behavior as $J$ crosses $J_c$. Below the DPT, $S(t)$ decays monotonically in time (Fig. 3A), but above the DPT, $S(t)$ oscillates around a non-zero magnetization (Fig. 3C,D,E). All observations can be reproduced by the same theoretical model shown in Fig. 2 (red lines), if $J_{ij}$ are scaled by 0.8 from their ab-initio values, perhaps due to an increased sampling of trap anharmonicity due to the higher temperature used in this data set to increase $\tilde{h}$, or due to a renormalization of coupling constants due to resonant mode-changing processes [21, 22]. The DPT is seen in three observables (Figs. 3F,G,H): first, by a departure from ungapped dynamics; second, by looking for a jump in $S$ at 100 ms; and third, by a finite value of $\Omega$. The $\chi^2$ measure in Fig. 3F compares both data and calculations to $S_{J=0}(t)$, the calculated time evolution for $J = 0$. The gap frequency $\Omega$ in Fig. 3H is found from a fitting function that uses a damped sinusoid for later times, and $S_{J=0}$ for early times (SM). The excellent agreement of all three measures with theory based on Eq. 1 confirms that our quantum simulator probes the DPT in the collective Heisenberg model.

The significance of the observation is further clarified by comparison to various approximation levels, in Figs. 3G,H. Finite-time effects and thermal averaging play a minor role, validating our interpretation of $S$ at sufficiently large $t$ as the steady-state order parameter. Inhomogeneous coupling ($J_{ij} \neq J$) plays a significant role for $S$, but less so for $\Omega$. Comparisons to the exact Lax vector analysis (insets to Fig. 3G,H) show the close similarity of the observed DPT to the canonical phase-I-to-phase-II transition in dynamical superconductors.

A third series of experiments probes the limits of validity in which our system is described by a spin lattice model. Figure 4B shows that $S(t = 100 \text{ ms})$ decreases at sufficiently large $a$, despite a larger gap. This is accompanied by a breakdown in microscopic reversibility, as seen by comparing to a sequence with a many-body reversal of the spin model (Fig. 4C), in which
\[ \dot{H} \Psi \rightarrow -\dot{H} \Psi \] Signatures of time reversibility within the window \( |a| \lesssim 20a_0 \) are seen from the nearly \( J \)-independent dynamics of \( S \) in both the gapped and ungapped phases.

The reversibility of demagnetization in our system in this regime is a significant validation of Eq. [1] since the many-body echo sequence does not reverse all terms (e.g., the spin independent harmonic oscillator term) in the full Hamiltonian.

Two processes prevent full reversibility in our simulation: stray magnetic field gradients and collisional processes (SM). These are quantified by introducing an empirical dephasing rate \( \Gamma(a) = \Gamma_0 + (a/a_0)^2 \gamma \) to the transverse magnetization, such that \( S^{X,Y}(t) \rightarrow S^{X,Y}(t)e^{-\Gamma(a)t} \).

Figures 4B,C compare data with calculations using a best-fit \( \Gamma_0^{-1} = 0.57 \) s without echo and \( \Gamma_0^{-1} = 0.25 \) s with echo, and \( \gamma^{-1} = 600 \) s. Here \( \Gamma_0 \) accounts for the single-particle mode-changing processes generated by magnetic field gradients, which are enhanced by a spin-reversal [1, 21]. \( \gamma \) parametrizes mode-changing collisions that take place at a rate that increases quadratically with \( a \), and takes a value anticipated by kinetic theory for our experimental density, temperature, and polarization. At larger \( |a| \), coherence is lost, and a quantum picture becomes unnecessary, as shown by the success of a semi-classical picture to describe diffusive transverse demagnetization [39, 3, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44]. Figure 4A shows an extended phase diagram, where it can be seen that trapped fermions simulate the CHM in a restricted parameter window of many-body quantum coherence.

In sum, we have used a new approach to quantum simulation, relying upon Feshbach suppression of collisional processes, to explore a DPT in the non-equilibrium dynamics of the collective Heisenberg model, with a system size increased by hundred-fold over prior observations of similar engineered spin models. The demonstrated reversibility of dynamics opens the possibility to measure out-of-time order correlations and scrambling of quantum information [45] in macroscopic arrays.
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Figure 1: **Collective Heisenberg model with local inhomogeneous axial field in mode space.** Each site in mode space (left) has an occupancy of 0 or 1 and experiences a local field $h_i$ that causes single spin precession at a rate that depends on the mode (top right). Atoms experience long-range spin-exchange interactions $J_{ij}$ (middle right). Mode-changing collisions would move atoms between sites in mode space (bottom right), but are not included in the spin model.
Figure 2: **Dynamical phase diagram.** (A–C,E–G) show magnetization $S$ at $t = 100$ ms versus interaction strength $J$ and inhomogeneity $\tilde{h}$. Blue circles are experimental data, and red lines are theory calculations re-scaled by $e^{-\Gamma(a)t}$ at $t = 100$ ms (see Fig. 4). These are cuts through a dynamical phase diagram (D), calculated using magnetization as the order parameter. The dashed white line shows a cut at the inhomogeneity used in Fig. 3. The solid white lines show the dynamical phase boundary with $\alpha/\beta = 0.15$. Error bars on data points are statistical; bands in theory correspond to uncertainty in $B_{zc}$. 
Figure 3: **Dynamical Phase Transition.** (A–E) Time-dependent magnetization $S(t)$ for fixed $\tilde{h} = 2\pi \times 18.1(1)$ Hz. As interaction strength increases, data (blue points, with statistical error bars) and theory (red lines, with error bands due to bias field uncertainty) deviate from non-interacting dynamics (dashed black curve) after some time. (F) Experiment and theory are compared via $\chi^2$ distance to non-interacting dynamics, both significantly deviating for $NJ/2\pi \gtrsim 10$ Hz. (G) The magnetization at 100 ms agrees well with numerical solutions of the mean-field dynamics with thermal averaging at finite time (red band) and without thermal averaging in steady state (solid black line), but only qualitatively with the analytic approximation of Eq. 3 (dotted black line). (H) The gap frequency $\Omega$ shows good agreement between data and all three levels of theory. Excluding the data with $NJ/2\pi < 10$ Hz, we fit the frequency to the analytic formula of Eq. 4 to find $NJ_c/2\pi = 7.8(1.1)$ Hz, indicated by the green arrows. Insets in G,H compare the analytic approximation of Eq. 3 and Eq. 4 using $\alpha = 0.16$ and $\beta = 0.59$ (dotted black line) with the exact all-to-all solution from the Lax vector approach (orange line) and from the corresponding mean-field numerical solution (green circles). Apart from insets, theory curves are re-scaled by $e^{-\Gamma(a)t}$ to account for beyond-spin-model processes (see Fig. 4).
Figure 4: **Reversibility and break-down of the CHM simulation.** (A) Spin-model mean-field dynamical phase diagram across a wider range than Fig. 2D, showing significant dephasing. (B) $S$ decreases for small and large interactions. This behavior is well reproduced by multiplying the spin model dynamics by a phenomenological dephasing term (red lines). (C) Magnetization can be recovered for $|NJ|/2\pi \lesssim 100$ Hz (the inset shows this region) through a many-body echo sequence that reverses the sign of $\hat{H}\Psi$ at $t/2$. (D,E) Time sequences for each of these measurements, in which a bias field provides dynamical control of the scattering length. For C, the field is held at $B_1$ in the first half of the evolution time, yielding scattering length $a_1$ and collective interaction strength $NJ_1$, while in the second half, $B_2$ is chosen such that $a_2 = -a_1$, and $NJ_2 = -NJ_1$. The initialization, spin-reversal, and readout pulses are performed at $B_{zc}$. In these data, a small systematic error $\Delta B_{zc} \sim 2\mu$T leads to a shift $\Delta a \sim 0.3a_0$ in $a_{zc}, a_1, a_2$, included in the theory band.