Dynamical quantum phase transitions and non-Markovian dynamics
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In the context of closed quantum systems, when a system prepared in its ground state undergoes a sudden quench, the resulting Loschmidt echo can exhibit zeros, resembling the Fisher zeros in the theory of classical equilibrium phase transitions. These zeros lead to nonanalytical behavior of the corresponding rate function, which is referred to as dynamical quantum phase transitions (DQPTs). In this work, we investigate DQPTs in the context of open quantum systems that are coupled to both Markovian and non-Markovian dephasing baths via a conserved quantity. The general framework is corroborated by studying the non-equilibrium dynamics of a transverse-field Ising ring. We show the robustness of DQPT signatures under the action of both engineered dephasing baths no matter how strongly they couple to the quantum system. Our theory may be considered as a paradigmatic framework for quantum systems that experience DQPTs under the action of non-Markovian baths.

I. INTRODUCTION

The theory of equilibrium phase transitions is well-studied in statistical mechanics and thermodynamics, and it provides us with an excellent framework to understand and characterize phases of matter at zero temperature [1, 2]. In the theory of classical phase transitions, nonanalytical behavior can appear in thermodynamic potentials during a phase transition. This is related to Lee-Yang zeros for the grand canonical potential [3, 4] or Fisher zeros of the canonical one [5], even with a perfectly well-defined microscopic Hamiltonian without any singular interactions. To illustrate the origin of the aforementioned nonanalytical behavior, let us consider the free energy density denoted by \( f = -\lim_{N \to \infty} (\beta N)^{-1} \log[Z(\beta)] \), where \( N \) is the number of particles, \( \beta \) is the inverse temperature and \( Z(\beta) = \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H}) \) is the canonical partition function. From this, one can see that non-analyticity in macroscopic quantities such as the free energy density occurs whenever the partition function \( Z(\beta) \) becomes zero.

In recent years, there have been many attempts to generalize the concept of Lee-Yang zeros to nonequilibrium quantum dynamics [6]. M. Heyl et. al. [7], suggested there exists a dynamical counterpart of equilibrium quantum phase transitions (QPTs), referred to as dynamical quantum phase transitions (DQPTs). In fact, the concept of DQPTs is intimately related to quantum quenches in many-body systems. Let us consider a quantum many-body Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}(\lambda) \) with a quantum critical point at \( \lambda = \lambda_c \). Here, \( \lambda \) is an external control parameter. DQPTs may be observed when a quantum system undergoes a sudden quench from \( \hat{H}(\lambda_i) \) to \( \hat{H}(\lambda_f) \), where \( \lambda_i \) and \( \lambda_f \) are the initial and final control parameters. Depending on nature of the quench, there are two classes of DQPTs [8]. The first class, DPT-I [9–17], describes a type of dynamical phase transition in which time-averaged order parameter \( \mathcal{O}(t) \) at long-time limit, is non-zero for quenches \( \lambda_f < \lambda_c \), but vanishes for quenches across the critical point \( \lambda_c \), i.e., \( \lambda_f > \lambda_c > \lambda_0 \). The second class, DPT-II [7, 18–22], generalizes the notion of nonanalyticity in the free energy density to the nonequilibrium dynamics, based on the complex Loschmidt amplitude (set \( \hbar = 1 \))

\[
\mathcal{G}(t) = \langle \psi(0)|e^{-\mathcal{H}(\lambda_f)t}|\psi(0) \rangle. \tag{1}
\]

Here, the initial state \( |\psi(0)\rangle = |E_0(\lambda_i)\rangle \) is the ground state of the initial Hamiltonian, i.e., \( \hat{H}(\lambda_i)|E_0(\lambda_i)\rangle = E_0(\lambda_i)|E_0(\lambda_i)\rangle \). Such a ground state can represent a quantum phase of matter. To investigate DQPTs, we let the system evolve under a new Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}(\lambda_f) \) and study the dynamics of the return probability. The function \( \mathcal{G}(t) \) resembles the partition function \( Z(\beta) \) in statistical mechanics. The return rate associated to the Loschmidt amplitude \( \mathcal{G}(t) \) is defined as

\[
\zeta(t) = -\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log[\mathcal{G}(t)]. \tag{2}
\]

that resembles the free energy in the context of classical phase transitions. In analogy to the Fisher zeros in the equilibrium case, one can study the zeros of the Loschmidt echo \( L(t) = |\mathcal{G}(t)|^2 \) in imaginary time formalism. Therefore, zeros of the Loschmidt echo \( L(t) \) lead to singular behavior of the function \( \zeta(t) \). The return rate has been extensively studied in the context of nonequilibrium quantum phase transitions [23–29]. In the case of the one-dimensional quantum Ising model, it has been shown that Fisher zeros of \( L(t) \) form lines in the complex plane, touching the real axis only for a quench across the equilibrium critical point [7]. Thus, the zeros in \( \zeta(t) \) at critical times \( t_c \) correspond to non-analyticity in \( \zeta(t) \) [7, 18–22, 30], whenever the evolved state \( |\psi(t)\rangle \) becomes orthogonal to the initial one \( |\psi(0)\rangle \). Although DPT-I and DPT-II seem to come from two different origins, numeri-
Symmetry plays a fundamental role in quantum phase transitions. For example, in the thermodynamic limit, the ground state of a many-body system exhibits less symmetries than the system Hamiltonian, a phenomenon known as the spontaneous symmetry breaking. In the case of DPT-II, we can observe a similar symmetry breaking mechanism that can be captured by the Loschmidt amplitude. In particular, let us consider $M$-fold degenerate ground states $|\psi_j\rangle = |E_0^{(j)}(\lambda_0)\rangle$ where $j = 1, \ldots , M$. This degeneracy appears due to the $Z_M$ symmetry of the underlying Hamiltonian. By initializing the system in one of the ground states $|\psi(0)\rangle = |E_0^{(j)}(\lambda_0)\rangle$, the proper generalization of the Loschmidt amplitude is to define the probability to remain in the degenerate ground state manifold [8, 20-]

$$L_{\text{Sym}}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} |\langle \psi_j | e^{-i\hat{H}t} | \psi(0) \rangle|^2,$$  

where the individual term is exponentially decaying with the system size $N$, i.e., $|\langle \psi_j | e^{-i\hat{H}t} | \psi(0) \rangle|^2 = \exp(-N(\zeta_j(t) + \xi_j^2(t)))$. In the thermodynamic limit, only one of them dominates such that $L_{\text{Sym}}(t) = \exp(-NS(t))$ where $S(t) = \min \zeta_j(t)$. In this way, the $Z_M$ symmetry, broken by the initial configuration, is restored at the critical times [8], when all $\zeta_j$ are equal leading to a cusp in $S(t)$ [19, 21]. In this case, one can interpret DQPTs as the dynamical restoration of symmetry [20], rather than orthogonality between the initial state and the time-evolved state.

Strictly speaking non-analyticity of the return rate occurs when the initial state becomes orthogonal to the evolved state after the sudden quench. In addition, it is not yet settled under which general circumstances such condition occurs [21, 31]. However, one necessary condition seems to be the existence of a sufficiently strong quench, which is achieved when a system parameter $\lambda$ is quenched across an underlying equilibrium critical point $\lambda_c$. Recent experiments in trapped ions [17, 21], ultracold atoms in optical lattices [32] and quantum simulation in a superconducting qubit [33] seem to support this feature. Nevertheless, it is also interesting to note that there is no one-to-one correspondence between dynamical and equilibrium QPTs. It is possible to have non-analytical behavior in the return rate without crossing an equilibrium critical point $\lambda_c$ in the quench, and one can cross a critical point during a quench without divergencies in the return rate [34]. Surprisingly, there is one recent attempt to connect the dynamical and equilibrium QPTs near the vicinity of DQPT for the transverse-field Ising chain [35].

In general, a quantum system is in a statistical ensemble and is described in terms of a density matrix describing a mixed state. Therefore, generalization of the Loschmidt amplitude, Eq. (1), to the density matrix formalism is indispensable. There are two ways to achieve this. Firstly, the interferometric Loschmidt amplitude [31, 36, 37] reads

$$\mathcal{G}_I(t) = \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}(0)\hat{U}(t,0)],$$  

which is a direct extension of Eq. (1), where $\hat{\rho}(0)$ is the density matrix at initial time, and $\hat{U}(t,0)$ is the unitary evolution operator from the initial time to later time $t$. This method is useful when a system, initially prepared in a statistical ensemble, undergoes a sudden quench without interacting with an external environment. However, $\mathcal{G}_I(t)$ involves the unitary operator which, in general, is not the case for open quantum systems. Secondly, the fidelity Loschmidt amplitude [37-39] is defined as

$$\mathcal{G}_F(t) = \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\hat{\rho}(0)}\hat{\rho}(t)\sqrt{\hat{\rho}(0)} \right],$$  

which is a metric, measuring the distance between the time-evolved density matrix $\hat{\rho}(t)$ and the initial one $\hat{\rho}(0)$. The advantage of this formulation is that $\hat{\rho}(t)$ can now evolve under both unitary and non-unitary dynamics. In the present work, we adopt the latter quantifier extensively.

This work is inspired by the recent direct experimental observation of DQPTs with six trapped ions [21] that shows indirect signatures [20] of DQPTs. Our aim is to understand how dephasing channels acting upon quantum systems affect the fidelity Loschmidt amplitude and signatures of DQPTs. In particular, we consider quenches in the context of open quantum systems that are described by Lindblad-type master equations. And, we investigate the effect of non-Markovian environments with structured baths [40] on signatures of DQPTs experienced by an Ising chain. We show that signatures of DQPT are robust under the action of both Markovian and non-Markovian dephasing channels; no matter how strongly they couple to the quantum system. Our framework can be applied in other systems experiencing DQPTs. To the best of our knowledge, there are no previous works describing the effect of a non-Markovian environment on DQPTs. Based on an open quantum system approach, we obtain an exact master equation that is valid for any coupling strength between the spin chain and the dephasing bath.

This article is organized as follows. First, we introduce a framework to couple a quantum system to both Markovian and non-Markovian baths in Sec. II, and then we move on to apply the general framework to the paradigmatic transverse Ising model with periodic boundary conditions in Sec. II A. In addition, we discuss numerical signatures of DQPTs and its responses under Markovian, non-Markovian and both Markovian and non-Markovian dynamical evolutions in Secs. II B & II C. Lastly, in Sec. III, we provide concluding remark and future outlook.

II. OPEN SYSTEM APPROACH TO DYNAMICAL QUANTUM PHASE TRANSITIONS

It is experimentally challenging, in general, to observe signatures of quantum criticality. One of the reasons is the existence of finite temperature effects that does not allow us to strictly investigate quantum phases of matter at the absolute zero temperature [1]. Similarly, it is difficult to resolve signatures of DQPTs in experiments. We have seen that the Loschmidt echo has the expression $L(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} |\langle \psi_j | e^{-i\hat{H}t} | \psi(0) \rangle|^2$ which is a direct extension of Eq. (1), where $\hat{\rho}(0)$ is the density matrix at initial time, and $\hat{U}(t,0)$ is the unitary evolution operator from the initial time to later time $t$. This method is useful when a system, initially prepared in a statistical ensemble, undergoes a sudden quench without interacting with an external environment. However, $\mathcal{G}_I(t)$ involves the unitary operator which, in general, is not the case for open quantum systems. Secondly, the fidelity Loschmidt amplitude [37-39] is defined as

$$\mathcal{G}_F(t) = \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\hat{\rho}(0)}\hat{\rho}(t)\sqrt{\hat{\rho}(0)} \right],$$  

which is a metric, measuring the distance between the time-evolved density matrix $\hat{\rho}(t)$ and the initial one $\hat{\rho}(0)$. The advantage of this formulation is that $\hat{\rho}(t)$ can now evolve under both unitary and non-unitary dynamics. In the present work, we adopt the latter quantifier extensively.

This work is inspired by the recent direct experimental observation of DQPTs with six trapped ions [21] that shows indirect signatures [20] of DQPTs. Our aim is to understand how dephasing channels acting upon quantum systems affect the fidelity Loschmidt amplitude and signatures of DQPTs. In particular, we consider quenches in the context of open quantum systems that are described by Lindblad-type master equations. And, we investigate the effect of non-Markovian environments with structured baths [40] on signatures of DQPTs experienced by an Ising chain. We show that signatures of DQPT are robust under the action of both Markovian and non-Markovian dephasing channels; no matter how strongly they couple to the quantum system. Our framework can be applied in other systems experiencing DQPTs. To the best of our knowledge, there are no previous works describing the effect of a non-Markovian environment on DQPTs. Based on an open quantum system approach, we obtain an exact master equation that is valid for any coupling strength between the spin chain and the dephasing bath.

This article is organized as follows. First, we introduce a framework to couple a quantum system to both Markovian and non-Markovian baths in Sec. II, and then we move on to apply the general framework to the paradigmatic transverse Ising model with periodic boundary conditions in Sec. II A. In addition, we discuss numerical signatures of DQPTs and its responses under Markovian, non-Markovian and both Markovian and non-Markovian dynamical evolutions in Secs. II B & II C. Lastly, in Sec. III, we provide concluding remark and future outlook.
exp\([-N(\zeta(t) + \zeta^*(t))]\), which implies that the return rate is hard to be resolved when the system size increases, especially in the thermodynamic limit \(N \to \infty\), where DQPTs are supposed to occur. However, thanks to the minimization principle introduced in Refs. [19, 20], indirect measurement of DQPTs is possible for a finite-size quantum system with broken-symmetry phases, by observing cusps in the rate function \(\tau(t)\), which will be defined below. The cusps occur whenever the system transits from one symmetry to another as we have discussed in Sec. I, in relation to Eq. (3). At the critical times \(t_c\), the cusps indirectly indicate zeros in the Loeschmidt amplitude. They become pronounced in the thermodynamic limit [20].

\[ \langle \hat{J}_A(0) \rangle = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \hat{J}_B(0) \rangle \neq 0 \]

A. The setup

The system we consider is the Ising ring composed of two transverse Ising chains \(A\) and \(B\) as it can be seen in Fig. 1. The

FIG. 1. A quantum spin ring model composed of two transverse Ising chains denoted by a chain of red arrows for the subsystem \(A\) and a chain of blue arrows for the subsystem \(B\). The former is initialized in one of the ground states of the ferromagnetic phase without current, while the latter is initialized in a ground state associated with energy current source. We refer to the main text for detailed information about how one creates a quantum state with non-vanishing current inside the ring. The entire ring is coupled to bath via the conserved quantity, the energy current.

\[
\hat{H}^S = -\tau \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^x - H \sum_{j=1}^{N} \hat{\sigma}_j^z, \tag{6}
\]

where \(\hat{\sigma}_j^{x/z}\) are the Pauli matrices and \(N = N_A + N_B\) is the sum of the total spins from the two subsystems. In the following, the sites \(j = 1, \ldots, N_A\) labels the Ising chain \(A\) and \(j = N_A + 1, \ldots, N\) the Ising chain \(B\). For easy referencing, we introduce the following notations \(\hat{H}^{S_A} = -\tau \sum_j \hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^x\) and \(\hat{H}^{S_B} = -H \sum_j \hat{\sigma}_j^z\). This model has been extensively studied [1] and can be solved analytically even for its sudden quench dynamics in certain limits (see Ref. [2] and references therein).

The transverse Ising model has a quantum critical point \(\tau = H[1]\) at 0 K temperature. Furthermore, if the Ising chain is put into a ring geometry with the periodic boundary condition, \(\hat{\sigma}_{N+1} = \hat{\sigma}_1\), as shown in Fig. 1, a conserved quantity known as the global current \(\hat{J}\) naturally arises [41, 42], i.e., \(\{\hat{H}^S, \hat{J}\} = 0\) (see Appendix A for its derivation). The expression for the conserved current is

\[ J = \frac{H \tau}{2} \sum_j \hat{\sigma}_j^x (\hat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z - \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z). \tag{7} \]

One can define local currents \(\hat{J}_A\) and \(\hat{J}_B\) for the Ising chains \(A\) and \(B\), respectively. In contrast to the global current \(\hat{J}\), the local currents are not conserved quantities. One can obtain its explicit expressions by using Eq. (7) with \(j = 1, \ldots, N_A\) for the Ising chain \(A\) and \(j = N_A + 1, \ldots, N\) for the Ising chain \(B\). As we have mentioned earlier, DQPT is observed when a quantum system undergoes a sudden quench across equilibrium critical point. In order to apply the minimization principle [20, 21] together with the open quantum systems framework we proposed [40] (see Appendix B), we treat the Ising chain \(A\) as a drain and \(B\) as a current source, which will be clarified below. Then, we consider a particular quench protocol, which involves three steps. First, we initialize the Ising chain \(A\) in its one of the degenerate ground states of \(\hat{H}^{S_A}\), since it

FIG. 2. The same Ising spin ring seen in Fig. 1, is globally coupled with both Markovian and non-Markovian dephasing channels. The baths degree of freedom are captured via quantum bosonic modes. Here, the two baths do not interact with each other.
has broken $Z_2$ symmetry. In particular, $|\psi_\pm\rangle = |\cdots \cdots \rangle \& |\psi_-\rangle = |\cdots \cdots \rangle$, where $\sigma_1^z|\psi_+\rangle = |\psi_+\rangle$, as well as $\sigma_1^z|\psi_-\rangle = -|\psi_-\rangle$, $\forall \in A$. We take $|\psi_\pm\rangle$ as the initial state for the chain $A$. Secondly, we take the chain $B$ initial state as the ground state $|\psi_G\rangle$ of the following Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_B = -\tau \sum_{j=1}^{N_B} \sigma_{j,B}^x \sigma_{j+1,B}^x - H \sum_{j=1}^{N_B} \sigma_{j,B}^x - \nu \tilde{J}_B.$$  

(8)

Here, the expression of $\tilde{J}_B$ differs from the global current operator since it only applies to the chain $B$ with open boundary condition. Its boundary terms consist only of $-\sigma_{1,B}^x \sigma_{2,B}^x$ and $\sigma_{N_B,B}^x \sigma_{N_B+1,B}^x$. The subscript $B$ refers to the subsystem $B$. The parameter $\nu$ controls the amount of energy current present inside the ring. In this way, we induce the energy current inside the subsystem of the total system shown in Fig. 2, as soon as the state initialization has been completed. We quench the entire chain with the Hamiltonian of the total system

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_A + \tilde{J} \sum_l \hat{X}_l + \hat{H}_R.$$  

(9)

In this expression, the global coupling between the spin chain and the reservoir is defined in terms of the operator $\hat{X}_l = \hat{X}_{lMB} + \hat{X}_{lNMB}$, where $\hat{X}_{lMB} = g_l \left( \hat{b}_l^+ + \hat{b}_l \right)$ and $\hat{X}_{lNMB} = \hat{g}_l \left( \hat{\xi}_l^+ + \hat{\xi}_l \right)$ are the quadratures of the Markovian (MB) and non-Markovian (NMB) baths, respectively. Similarly, $\hat{H}_R = \hat{H}_{MB} + \hat{H}_{NMB}$ is the Hamiltonian of the reservoir, where $\hat{H}_{MB} = \sum_l \omega l \hat{\xi}_l^+ \hat{\xi}_l$ and $\hat{H}_{NMB} = \sum_l \omega l \hat{\xi}_l^+ \hat{\xi}_l$. Note that the coupling to the dephasing baths is via a current operator $\tilde{J}$ resembling the Dzyaloshinski-Moriya interaction in spin systems [43, 44]. In this manuscript, we consider the non-Markovian coupling strength $g_l = (h/\sqrt{2}) e^{-\omega l / 2}$, where $\omega > 0$ is a positive number, and the modes of the non-Markovian bath have frequencies $\omega = \Omega l (l = 1, 2, \ldots, M)$, where $\Omega$ is the fundamental frequency. Notice that the choice of units for $g_j$ is consistent with units of the energy current $\tilde{J}$, so that the Ising ring-bath coupling has frequency in units $(\hbar = 1)$

According to the above description, the Ising ring evolves under the Lindblad-type master equation

$$d\rho(t)/dt = -i[H^{\dagger}(t),\rho(t)] + \gamma(t)\hat{O}[\rho(t)],$$

where $d\rho(t)/dt = \dot{\rho}_+(t)J\rho_+(t) - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{F}_+^\dagger\rho_+(t) + \rho_+(t)\hat{F}_+) + \frac{1}{\tau}\rho_+(t)$ and $\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H} - \lambda(t)\hat{F}$, where there is a Lamb shift term proportional to

$$\lambda(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{M} \frac{g_l^2}{\omega_l} [1 - \cos(\omega_l t)].$$  

(10)

Also, the dephasing rate reads

$$\gamma(t) = 2\gamma_0 + 2\gamma_1(t),$$  

(11)

where $\gamma_0$ is the dephasing rate associated with the Markovian bath and $\gamma_1(t) = \sum_{l=1}^{M} \frac{g_l^2}{\omega_l} \sin(\omega_l t) \coth(\Omega l \omega_l / 2)$ is that of non-Markovian one, with $\beta_{NMB}$ defines the non-Markovian bath temperature. Note that in the previous equations, $\Omega$ denotes the number of modes of the non-Markovian bath.

It is worth mentioning that a crucial point in obtaining the above Lindblad equation is that both baths couple to a conserved quantity of the system, in our case, $\{\hat{H}(t), \hat{\xi}\}$ = 0. Thus, our theory may apply to any quantum system experiencing DQPT that couple to dephasing baths via global or local conserved quantities. See Appendix B and Ref. [40] for a detailed explanation of our quantum system theory.

During the quench, the indirect signatures of the DQPTs for a finite system size [21] can be obtained by measuring the two probabilities [20] to return to the same initial ground state or the other (c.f. Eq. (5)) $\mathfrak{F}_{F,d} = \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\rho_d} \rho_A(t) \sqrt{\rho_d} \right]$, where

$$d \in \{\pm, \}, \rho_+ = |\psi_+\rangle\langle\psi_+|, \rho_- = |\psi_-\rangle\langle\psi_-| \text{ and } \rho_A(t) = \text{Tr}_B[\rho_S(t)].$$

Inspired from the recent ions trapped experiment [21], we define the time-dependent rate function as

$$\mathfrak{F}(t) \equiv \min_{d \in \{\pm, \}} \left[ -N^{-1} \log[\mathfrak{F}_{F,d}(t)] \right].$$  

(12)

First, we look at the simplest scenario where the system $A + B$ is completely isolated from environment. We numerically plot the return rate, expectation of the average magnetization along $x$-direction, $M_x = \langle . \hat{X}_x \rangle = \langle N^{-1} \sum \hat{X}_x \rangle$, the order parameter for the Ising chain $A$ and the probabilities to return to $\rho_+$ and $\rho_-$. $P_{\pm}(t) = \text{Tr}[\rho_{\pm} \rho_A(t)]/P$, where $P = \text{Tr}[\rho_{\pm} \rho_A(t)] + \text{Tr}[\rho_- \rho_A(t)]$. 

![FIG. 3. Rate function, magnetization, and probabilities are plotted for one period $T$. The system is completely isolated from the baths. Black dash lines represent critical times where the dynamical quantum phase transitions occur. We have 6 spins for the subsystem $A$ and 2 spins for the subsystem $B$. The interspin coupling is $\tau = 0.42\Omega$ and the transverse magnetic field $H = \Omega$, $\nu = 5\Omega$ and $\gamma(t) = 0$.](image-url)
For proper comparison, in all the numerics, we set \( v = 5\Omega \), and we quench with the Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}^3 \), Eq. (6), with \( \tau = 0.42\Omega \) and \( H = \Omega \). The results are shown in Fig. 3, which is in agreement with existing literature [20, 21]. The sign of magnetization \( M_r \) changes at the critical times \( t_c \), where the two probabilities \( P_+ \) and \( P_- \) cross, eventually leading to an oscillatory decay of the expectation value \( \langle \hat{M}_z \rangle \). This is the clear evidence of the DPT-II [8, 20].

**B. Numerical signatures of the DQPTs in open quantum system treatment**

Before we discuss the numerical evidence of DQPTs in the open quantum system, we would like to remark why we introduce the energy current inside the system via Eq. (8). The main reason is that our system couples to baths via the conserved quantity called the energy current density \( \dot{f} \) (7), as prescribed above. As a consequence, if there is no current present inside the Ising ring, the dephasing channels plays no role, independent of how strongly the system couples to the baths. For simplicity, let us consider the Ising ring coupled to a Markovian bath. Numerical evidence from Fig. 4, where we plot the rate function \( \dot{\gamma} \) for three different decay rates \( \gamma_0 \), clearly supports our discussion. To overcome this, we introduce the current inside the subsystem \( B \) at the start of the quench.

Furthermore, our open quantum system approach (see Appendix B) allows for tuning the system-bath interactions for different scenarios involving: i) only a Markovian environment, ii) only non-Markovian bath & iii) the combined effect of both Markovian and non-Markovian baths. In this way, we can study the effect of system-bath coupling on the dynamics of DQPTs. While tuning the parameters \( \gamma_0 \) and \( \gamma(t) \), we compare the two variables by taking \( \gamma_0 = \max(\gamma(t)) \), since \( \gamma(t) \) is the oscillatory function, whose average is zero in one period, as seen in Fig. 5 (a). The dephasing rate \( \gamma_0 \) controls the overall sign of the dephasing rate \( \gamma(t) \), since it acts like a dc signal. As we have a single dephasing channel, \( \gamma_0 \) allows us to control if the dynamics is Markovian (\( \gamma(t) \geq 0 \) for all times \( t > 0 \)) or non-Markovian when the rate becomes negative at certain time intervals. The time-dependence of the dephasing rate is depicted in Fig. 5 (b). For a more detailed explanation, we refer the reader to Ref. [40]. In all our numerical calculations we set all frequency parameters in term of the fundamental frequency \( \Omega \).

In Fig. 6, we show numerical evidence of the DQPTs for various Markovian dephasing rates, in terms of the time-dependent rate function \( \dot{\gamma}(t) \). We show the enlarged regions of the four particular critical times seen in Fig. 6 (a) in the order of appearance in Fig. 6 (b-e). It is evident that when the dephasing rate increases, we see the shift in the dynamical critical times towards the left as compared to the close system case (the black solid line), in particular (c) and (d).

Unlike the Markovian dynamics, the DQPTs signatures in non-Markovian dynamics behave differently. For the non-Markovian cases, we choose the coupling parameter \( h \) in such a way that its maximum value will correspond to the Markovian ones. To be explicit, \( \max(\gamma(t)) = \gamma_0 \), with which we plotted in Fig. 6. For instance, the phase shift towards the left can still be seen in the non-Markovian ones for the second and third critical times. However, we observe the right shift at the last peak with the increase in the system-bath coupling strengths. The results are shown in Fig. 7 (a-e).
FIG. 6. (a) Time-dependent rate function in one period $T$ is plotted for various decay rates associated with different Markovian decay rates $\gamma_0$. Black line stands for $\gamma_0 = 0$, red line $\gamma_0 = 0.1018\Omega$, blue line $\gamma_0 = 0.2827\Omega$, and green line $\gamma_0 = 0.5542\Omega$. (b-e) shows enlarged regions of four different critical times seen in (a). We have 6 spins for the subsystem $A$ and 2 spins for the subsystem $B$. The interspin coupling is $\tau = 0.42\Omega$, the transverse magnetic field $H = \Omega$ and $\nu = 5\Omega$. $h = 0$ for all the plots and $z = 0.1$. The number of bosonic modes in the non-Markovian bath is $M = 60$.

C. Interplay between non-Markovian and Markovian environments

As seen in both Figs. 6 and 7, the different effects of both Markovian and non-Markovian baths on the DQPTs signatures is not hugely obvious as we look at the rate function $\sigma(t)$. However, when the order parameter $M_z$, the average magnetization, is compared for the two different cases (see Fig. 8), we observe the usual oscillatory decay of the order parameter is present for both cases, but non-zero oscillations are present in the non-Markovian case.

For better comparison, in Fig. 9 we plot the rate function $\sigma(t)$ for both Markovian and non-Markovian dephasing baths. Also, in Fig. 10 we show the rate function for different amplitudes of the initial current in the Ising ring, which is controlled by the parameter $\nu$ in Eq. (8). It is clear that no matter how strong the initial current in the ring is, the position of the first critical point showing signatures of DQPTs remains invariant. This a remarkable result, that is, DQPT in our Ising ring scheme is robust under the action of both Markovian and non-Markovian dephasing baths.

III. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In summary, we have presented a theoretical framework for dealing with quantum systems experiencing dynamical quantum phase transitions under the action of Markovian and non-Markovian dephasing baths. We have shown that with the help of the Floquet stroboscopic dynamics (see Appendix B), one can tune around the Markovian and non-Markovian dynamics to observe their effects on the DQPTs signatures. In particular, we have studied the paradigmatic transverse field Ising model with periodic boundary condition. In this situation, the energy current is a conserved quantity which we use to couple the Ising ring to Markovian and non-Markovian dephasing...
baths. We have demonstrated that no matter how intense the initial current in the ring is, the positions of critical points showing signatures of DQPTs remain invariant. In this case, signatures of DQPT in our Ising ring scheme is robust under the action of both dephasing baths. We believe our result would open up a new window of opportunities in the direction of non-equilibrium quantum phase transitions in the open quantum systems with the strong system-bath coupling.

FIG. 8. The average magnetization in two periods \((2T)\) is plotted for purely Markovian dynamics (black solid line) and non-Markovian one (red solid line). The usual oscillatory decay of the order parameter is present for both cases, but non-zero oscillations are present in non-Markovian case while near zero order parameter is observed in the Markovian dynamics. In this simulation we have used the same interspin coupling, transverse magnetic field, and number of bosonic modes as in Fig. 7.

FIG. 9. Time-dependent rate function in one period \(T\) is plotted for various decay rates associated with different Markovian and non-Markovian dephasing rates, \(\gamma_0\) and \(h\). In this simulation we have used the same interspin coupling, transverse magnetic field, and number of bosonic modes as in Fig. 7.

FIG. 10. Time-dependent rate function in one period \(T\) is plotted for various intensities of the initial current which is controlled by the parameter \(\nu\) in Eq. (8). In this case, we consider the action of non-Markovian dephasing bath with parameters \(h = 0.5 \Omega, z = 0.1\), and 60 modes, and for the Markovian bath with use \(\gamma_0 = 0.2827 \Omega\). The parameters for the Ising ring are \(H = \Omega\) and \(\tau = 0.42 \Omega\).
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Appendix A: Derivation of the conserved quantity: the global current

A general flux (current) operator may be obtained by assuming that there exists an operator continuity equation in one dimension \([42]\)

\[
\frac{\partial \hat{h}(x,t)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \hat{j}(x,t)}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (A1)
\]

where \(\hat{h}(x,t)\) and \(\hat{j}(x,t)\) are the energy density and the energy flux operators respectively. For an \(N\)-site chain with \(m\) states at each site, one can write down the energy density operator as such

\[
\hat{h}(x,t) = \sum_s \hat{h}_s \delta(x-x_s), \quad (A2)
\]

with \(\hat{h}_s\) being the discrete energy operator at the site \(s\), and \(\delta(x-x_s)\) is the Dirac delta function, so that the system Hamiltonian reads \(\hat{H} = \int dx \hat{h}(x,t) = \sum_s \hat{h}_s\). Similarly, the energy flux operator is

\[
\hat{j}(x,t) = \sum_s \hat{j}_s \delta(x-x_s), \quad (A3)
\]
where \( \hat{j}_s \) is the current operator at the \( s \)th site. Under these definitions, the continuity equation adopts the following discrete form
\[
\frac{d\hat{h}(x,t)}{dt} = \sum_s \frac{d\hat{h}_s}{dt} \delta(x-x_s),
\]
and
\[
\frac{d\hat{j}(x,t)}{dx} = \sum_s \left( \frac{\hat{j}_{s-1}\hat{j}_s}{a} \right) \delta(x-x_s),
\]
where \( a \) is the spacing between any \( j+1 \)th and \( j \)th sites. The time evolution of the operator \( \hat{h}_s \) in the Heisenberg picture reads
\[
\frac{d\hat{h}_s}{dt} = i[\hat{H}, \hat{h}_s].
\]
To proceed further, one may consider a generic 1D Hamiltonian with up to two-body nearest-neighbor interactions,
\[
\hat{H} = \sum_s (\hat{h}_s^0 + \hat{V}(s,s+1)),
\]
where \( \hat{h}_s^0 \) is the local Hamiltonian at site \( s \), and \( \hat{V}(s,s+1) \) is the site-dependent two-body interaction terms. When we invoke this discretisation formalism to the Ising ring model (see Fig. 1), we arrive at the global current operator \[41\]
\[
\hat{J} = \frac{H \sigma}{2} \sum_j \hat{\sigma}_j^z (\hat{\sigma}^z_{j-1} - \hat{\sigma}^z_{j+1}).
\]
We note that the terms inside the above summation is the Dzyaloshinsky-Moriya interaction in the theory of weak ferromagnetism \[43, 44\]. One direct consequence is that we have a conserved quantity \( \hat{J} \) such that \([\hat{H}_S, \hat{J}] = 0\) when we have a close boundary condition, i.e., \( \hat{\sigma}_{N+1} = \hat{\sigma}_1 \).

Appendix B: A roadmap to open quantum systems

Let us denote a system Hamiltonian as \( \hat{H}_S \), where it can, in principle, be quantum Ising chain, atom-atom interaction in ultracold atoms lattices, Bose-Hubbard model, etc. The environment degrees of freedom are captured by bosonic harmonic oscillators. We denote it as \( \hat{H}_B \), which is composed of \( \hat{H}_{NMB} = \sum_j \omega_j \hat{b}_j \hat{b}^\dagger_j \) and \( \hat{H}_{MB} = \sum_j \omega_j \hat{c}_j \hat{c}^\dagger_j \) are bosonic annihilation (creation) operators for non-Markovian bath, while \( \hat{c} \) (\( \hat{c}^\dagger \)) are bosonic annihilation (creation) operators for Markovian one. The setup is that the system described by \( \hat{H}_S \) couples globally to the environment \( \hat{H}_B \) via a conserved quantity as depicted in Fig. 11. A microscopic derivation of the reduced system dynamics is obtained by considering the following total Hamiltonian
\[
\hat{H} = \hat{H}_S + \hat{V}_S \sum_l \hat{X}_l^I + \hat{H}_R,
\]
where \( \hat{V}_S \) is the system operator and \( \hat{X}_l^I = \hat{X}_{NMB}^I + \hat{X}_{MB}^I \). For simplicity, we choose \( \hat{X}_{NMB}^I \) and \( \hat{X}_{MB}^I \) to be of the form
\[
\kappa_l (\hat{\Theta}_l^I + \hat{\Theta}_l^J).
\]
We remark that \( \kappa_l = g_l \) represents the coupling between the system operator and the bosonic mode \( \omega_j \) of the non-Markovian \( (\hat{\Theta} = \hat{b}) \) and \( \kappa_l = \tilde{g}_l \) is the Markovian coupling with \( \tilde{\omega}_l \) bosonic modes \( (\hat{\Theta} = \hat{c}) \). \( M \) is the total number of modes inside each reservoir. Although the system-bath coupling is treated globally, it is noteworthy that our previous work \[40\] also applies to the local system-bath coupling. The only constraint we impose to derive our microscopic master equation reads
\[
[\hat{H}_S, \hat{V}_S] = 0.
\]
Whenever the above constraint, Eq. (B2), is satisfied, we can always find the reduced density matrix of the system analytically \[40\], and it is found to be
\[
\hat{\rho}_S(t) = Tr_B[\hat{\rho}(t)] = \sum_{\alpha \beta} c_{\alpha \beta}^t \hat{E}_{\alpha} e^{-i\{E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta}\}t} F_{\alpha \beta}(t)|\hat{E}_{\alpha}\rangle\langle \hat{E}_{\beta}|.
\]
where \( c_{\alpha \beta} \) are complex coefficients in the system eigenbases \( |\hat{E}_{\alpha}\rangle \) with eigenenergies \( E_{\alpha} \). We have assumed that the combined system and bath are initialized in a product state \( \hat{\rho}(0) = \hat{\rho}_S(0) \otimes \hat{\rho}_B(0) \), where \( \hat{\rho}_S(0) = \sum_{\alpha \beta} c_{\alpha \beta}^0 |\hat{E}_{\alpha}\rangle\langle \hat{E}_{\beta}| \) and \( \hat{\rho}_B(0) \) are the system and bath initial density matrices. In addition, we assume the two baths initially to be \( \hat{\rho}_B(0) = \hat{\rho}_{MB}(0) \otimes \hat{\rho}_{NMB}(0) \) a product of thermal states with inverse temperatures \( \beta_{MB} \) and \( \beta_{NMB} \), respectively. This means that \( \hat{\rho}_S(t) = e^{-\beta_{MB} \hat{H}_S}/Z_a \), where \( Z_a = Tr[e^{-\beta_{MB} \hat{H}_S}] \) with \( a \in \{MB,NMB\} \).

Moreover,
\[
F_{\alpha \beta}(t) = e^{-\hat{\rho}_S(0) t} \{\hat{E}_{\alpha} \hat{E}_{\beta} e^{-i\{E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta}\}t}\}
\]
\[
= e^{-\Gamma(t)} \{\hat{E}_{\alpha} \hat{E}_{\beta} e^{-i\{E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta}\}t}\}
\]
\[
\{\hat{E}_{\alpha} \hat{E}_{\beta} e^{-i\{E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta}\}t}\} = e^{-\Gamma(t)} \{\hat{E}_{\alpha} \hat{E}_{\beta} e^{-i\{E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta}\}t}\}
\]
is the time-dependent influence functional that dictates the incoherent processes of the reduced system dynamics, with the functions
\[
\Lambda(t) = \sum_{\alpha \beta} \left( \frac{g_{\alpha \beta}}{\omega_{\alpha \beta}} \right)^2 [\omega_{\alpha \beta} t - \sin(\omega_{\alpha \beta} t)],
\]
\[
\Gamma(t) = \gamma_0 t + \sum_{\alpha \beta} \left( \frac{g_{\alpha \beta}}{\omega_{\alpha \beta}} \right)^2 [1 - \cos(\omega_{\alpha \beta} t)] \coth\left( \frac{\beta_{MB} \omega_{\alpha \beta}}{2} \right).
\]

The dephasing rate \( \gamma_0 \) is due to the coupling to the Markovian bath. With the constraint Eq. (B2), \( \hat{H}_S \) and \( \hat{V}_S \) can be simultaneously diagonalised in the same bases, i.e., \( \hat{V}_S |\hat{E}_{\alpha}\rangle = =
\(V_s^{(a)}|E_a\rangle\), where \(V_s^{(a)}\) denotes the eigenvalue of the operator \(\hat{V}_s\), and \(|E_a\rangle\) are eigenvectors of the Hamiltonian \(\hat{H}_s\).

The operator \(\hat{H}_{SB}^{(a)}\) appearing in Eq. (B4) reads \(\hat{H}_{SB}^{(a)} = V_s^{(a)} \sum \epsilon_l (\hat{b}_l^+ \hat{b}_l)\). We note that for each eigenstate \(|E_a\rangle\), the Hamiltonian \(\hat{H}_{SB}^{(a)}\) describes a set of displaced bosonic harmonic oscillators whose displacement is proportional to the quantity \(g_l V_s^{(a)} / \omega_l\) [40].

When we take the time derivative of the exact solution for \(\hat{\rho}_S(t)\) in Eq. (B3), we arrive at

\[
\frac{d\hat{\rho}_S(t)}{dt} = \hat{\mathcal{L}}(t)\hat{\rho}_S(t) = -i[\hat{H}_S(t), \hat{\rho}_S(t)] + \gamma(t)\hat{\mathcal{L}}[\hat{V}_S]\hat{\rho}_S(t),
\]

where the Lindblad superoperator is

\[
\hat{\mathcal{L}}[\hat{V}_S] = \hat{V}_S\hat{\rho}_S(t)\hat{V}_S^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} (\hat{V}_S^\dagger\hat{V}_S\hat{\rho}_S(t) + \hat{\rho}_S(t)\hat{V}_S^\dagger\hat{V}_S),
\]

and \(\hat{\mathcal{L}}(t)\hat{\rho}_S(t)\) describes a set of displaced bosonic harmonic oscillators whose displacement is proportional to the quantity \(g_l V_s^{(a)} / \omega_l\) [40]. In particular, we have

\[
\frac{d\hat{\rho}_S(t)}{dt} = \hat{\mathcal{L}}(t)\hat{\rho}_S(t) = -i[\hat{H}_S(t), \hat{\rho}_S(t)] + \gamma(t)\hat{\mathcal{L}}[\hat{V}_S]\hat{\rho}_S(t),
\]

where the Lindblad superoperator is \(\hat{\mathcal{L}}[\hat{V}_S] = \hat{V}_S\hat{\rho}_S(t)\hat{V}_S^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} (\hat{V}_S^\dagger\hat{V}_S\hat{\rho}_S(t) + \hat{\rho}_S(t)\hat{V}_S^\dagger\hat{V}_S)\), and \(\hat{\mathcal{L}}(t)\hat{\rho}_S(t)\) is the time derivative of \(\hat{\mathcal{L}}[\hat{V}_S]\hat{\rho}_S(t)\).

We have so far derived a time-local Lindblad master equation, Eq. (B7), with time-dependent rates \(\gamma(t)\), composed of \(\gamma_0\) (the Markovian contribution) and \(\gamma_1(t)\) (the non-Markovian one comes from the second term in the summation (B9)). It is commonly accepted that when one of the dissipation rates \(\gamma(t)\) becomes negative at certain time interval, the dynamics is referred to as non-Markovian [45–47]. In contrast, if the rates are positive at all times the evolution is considered Markovian. In the non-Markovian regime, there is back-flow of information between the system and environment [45–47]. This means that when the rates are positive, the bath destroys coherent properties of the system. Contrary to this, when the rates are negative, the bath restores the lost information partially.

In order to involve the floquet stroboscopic divisibility, we impose periodicity \(\mathcal{L}(t + T) = \mathcal{L}(t)\) in the time-local master equation we obtain above \(\frac{d\hat{\rho}_S(t)}{dt} = \hat{\mathcal{L}}(t)\hat{\rho}_S(t)\), where \(\hat{\mathcal{L}}\) is a time-periodic Liouvillian operator (LO). This is possible if we choose the frequencies of the non-Markovian bath to be \(\omega_j = j\Omega\) with \(j\) being the integer multiples. The fundamental frequency \(\Omega\) determines the period \(T = 2\pi / \Omega\) of the Liouvillian. Therefore, all the interesting properties of the Floquet theory can be directly applied [40]. For instance, one can define a propagator \(\Phi(t;0)\), or dynamical map, such that \(\hat{\rho}_S(t) = \Phi(t;0)\hat{\rho}_S(0)\). Due to the periodic nature of the LO, the dynamical map is divisible at stroboscopic times and we have \(\Phi(mT;0) = \Phi(T;0)^m\). Thus, one can focus the system dynamics just for one time period, due to the periodic nature of the master equation. Furthermore, we assume that the non-Markovian bath is prepared initially at near zero temperature, i.e., \(\langle \hat{B}_{NM} \rangle \to 0\) and consider couplings \(g_j = (\hbar/\Omega)^{1/2}e^{-j^2/2}\), where \(z > 0\) is a positive number. In this way, one can couple an arbitrary quantum system with both Markovian and non-Markovian environments. Furthermore, one is able to tune the system-bath couplings explicitly, which is useful for the quantum bath engineering. In the main text, we have corroborated the general idea developed here with a standard example of quantum Ising spin chain in a periodic boundary condition, and look for the DQPTs signatures via the fidelity Loschmidt amplitude.

### Appendix C: Quench protocol

Our quench protocol for open quantum system simulation is summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Subsystem A</th>
<th>Subsystem B</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>System-bath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before quench</td>
<td>one of the ground states((\hat{H}_A^{S_1}))</td>
<td>ground state((\hat{H}_B^{S_1} + \hat{H}_B^{S_2} - v\hat{J}_B))</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quench with</td>
<td>(\hat{H}_A^{S_1} + \hat{H}_A^{S_2})</td>
<td>(\hat{H}_B^{S_1} + \hat{H}_B^{S_2})</td>
<td>(\hat{H}_R)</td>
<td>(\hat{J}_L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
