The nature of non-equilibrium steady state formation in driven-dissipative systems is a fundamental open question in modern physics [1, 2]. In the case of isolated systems, thermodynamics foresees that all evolutions lead to an equilibrium state [3]. However, this notion was recently challenged by the demonstration of many-body localization [4, 5]. This is a quantum phase of matter that arises due to the interplay of disorder-induced localization and many-body interactions [6, 7]. This violation of equilibrium statistical mechanics invites the question: can a robust localized phase exist in driven-dissipative systems? We take a first step in this direction, by providing an experimental signature of the localization of interacting microcavity polaritons, dissipative light-matter quasiparticles driven by an external laser. We reveal a controllable degree of localization by tuning the disorder of a quasi-periodic potential in a microcavity. Microcavity polaritons are a versatile quantum model system and their localization could be used as a resource in quantum information [8, 9].

Quantum macroscopic systems facilitate the study of novel non-equilibrium thermodynamic phases. One important example of them is many-body localization (MBL), where the dynamics of an interacting many-body system are ‘frozen’ in a non-thermal state, due to the interference from multiple scatterings with a random disorder potential [6, 7]. It provides a counter example to the expectations from statistical mechanics that all closed physical systems maximize their entropy and tend to an equilibrium thermal state known as a Gibbs ensemble, regardless of their initial state [3]. Instead, it preserves information about the systems’ initial conditions in local observables. It is for this reason that MBL could be used as a resource for quantum memory and quantum information processing schemes [8, 9]. A rigorous verification of the MBL phase is challenging as it requires measurements that confirm a logarithmic spreading of phase entanglement governed by an area law dependence, whilst all many-body eigenstates are localized [10, 11].

So far, the most convincing demonstrations of MBL in two-dimensions have taken place in isolated systems of optically-trapped atoms in a lattice [4, 5]. This was possible due to the ability to create and detect atomic states with single-site resolution. The signature of MBL is seen in the ‘imbalance’ of particle number distributions between lattice sites. A logarithmic spreading of entanglement has been measured only in small one-dimensional chains of atoms, where the thermodynamic limit could not be considered [12, 13]. There have also been some preliminary investigations of MBL in open systems coupled to a thermal bath [14, 15]. Here thermalization always prevails, though MBL acts to slow the process.

In general, very little is known about the rules governing steady state formation, the solutions that arise from the balance of flows from driving and dissipation. Nevertheless, the principle of maximal entropy is often considered to dictate the outcome [3, 16, 17]. This has been studied with regards to the quantum integrability of systems. For example, in non-integrable systems...
this principle leads to Gibbs ensembles with a thermal distribution [3]. Whereas for integrable systems, whilst thermalization is not possible, the steady states are described in terms of generalized Gibbs ensembles which also maximize the entropy subject to their multiple conserved quantities [17–19]. Verifying whether a quantum system is integrable or not is challenging, especially for complex open systems, as the formalisms are difficult to apply in practice. On the other hand, localization is a more general phenomenon that occurs in disordered systems of both types. It prevents the system from reaching the equilibrium state of the corresponding non-disordered system. We propose to gain insight into the formation of steady states in driven-dissipative systems by examining the role of a disorder-induced localization.

Microcavity polaritons are an ideal testbed for exploring this regime. They are hybrid bosonic quasiparticles that arise due to the strong interaction between microcavity photons and quantum well excitons. They boast nonlinear interactions [20], even in the single particle limit [21], which makes them a promising candidate for next-generation quantum optoelectronics [22]. Microcavity polaritons have lifetimes on the order of picoseconds that under a continuous-wave non-resonant pumping reach a non-equilibrium steady state and thus, never thermalize. Polaron localization has been reported in a few different contexts such as: nonlinear-induced localization when resonantly driving one micropillar of an interacting dimer [23, 24]; gain-induced localization in finite width excitation spots [25], a consequence of a finite polariton lifetime; and localization in flat bands where the polaritons have an infinite effective mass [26]. However, to date, no systematic study of the effect of disorder-induced localization has been performed.

Here we theoretically and experimentally demonstrate a signature of the localization of interacting exciton-polaritons in two-dimensions. The polaritons are subjected to an array of potential traps, which are initially arranged in a periodic arrangement, and subsequently given a random shift of their positions. As a function of the disorder strength (the amplitude of the shift) we observe an increase in a measure of the localization. This is witnessed by the inverse-participation ratio (IPR) [27–29], which is functionally similar to imbalance measures used in cold atom experiments [4, 5], although it is not a site specific measure.

Let us consider a microcavity patterned with a hexagonal array of mesas, local circular elongations of the cavity spacer which provide the trapping potential [30–32]. An off-diagonal disorder is introduced by imposing a random shift of these mesas. We excite the microcavity non-resonantly with a continuous-wave laser. This creates a reservoir of excitons that relax to multiple exciton-polariton states with a broad range of momenta and energies. We can model these dynamics with a generalised Gross-Pitaevskii equation [33]. The mesa positions are \( R_n = n_1 a_1 + n_2 a_2 + d R \), where \( a_1 = a(0, 1) \) and \( a_2 = (a/2)(1, \sqrt{3}) \) are the lattice vectors, \( a \) is the lattice constant, and \( n \) labels the integers \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \). Here, \( R \) is a random vector whose coordinates are uniform random variables sampled in the range \([-1, 1]\), and \( d \) parametrises the maximum displacement in each direction. We model the evolution of the polariton wavefunction \( \psi(r, t) \) as

\[
\frac{i\hbar}{\partial t} \psi = \left[ -\frac{\hbar^2 \nabla^2}{2m} + \frac{i\hbar}{2} (R n_R - \gamma) + \hbar g |\psi|^2 + V \right] \psi, \\
(1)
\]

where \( m \) and \( \gamma \) are the effective mass and decay rate of the polaritons, \( g \) is the strength of polariton-polariton interactions, \( R \) is the reservoir-polariton exchange rate, and \( V(r) \) is the potential landscape defined by the mesas. The reservoir \( n_R(r, t) \) is described by the rate equation

\[
\frac{\partial n_R}{\partial t} = - (\gamma_R + R |\psi|^2) n_R + P, \\
(2)
\]
Figure 1: Signature of localization: theoretical results. Figures a-b show the distribution of polaritons after reaching a steady state, normalized to account for the Gaussian pump distribution. In the absence of disorder (a, $d = 0$ nm) we see a homogeneous distribution among the mesas, whereas a disorder (b, $d = 0.25$ nm) induces the onset of patches of localization. Figure c reveals how the IPR increases with disorder. The simulation parameters are $m = 5 \times 10^{-5}$ me$^{-}$, $\hbar R = 0.4$ meV$\mu$m$^{2}$, $\hbar \gamma = 0.5$ meV, $\hbar g = 2.4 \times 10^{-3}$ meV$\mu$m$^{2}$, $V_{0} = 2$ meV, $\hbar \gamma R = 2$ meV, $P_{0} = 2 \gamma R \gamma / R$, and $L = 88 \mu$m. Here, $V_{0}$ is the maxima of the trapping potential, which we model as a radially symmetric sigmoid function for each mesa.

where $\gamma_{R}$ is the decay rate of the reservoir. The reservoir is populated by the continuous-wave pump $P(r)$ which we model as a Gaussian with amplitude $P_{0}$. We use the Runga-Kutta method of fourth order [34] to evolve the dynamics until a stationary solution is achieved (approximately 50 ps). In figures 1(a-b) we show the results of these simulations for a periodic and disordered array. We can see the onset of patches of localization when a disorder is introduced.

To obtain a quantitative measure of the amount of localization we calculate the IPR (see Methods for details on the numerics and data processing). First we normalise the data to account for the Gaussian background, and then calculate the average occupation $I_{n} = \int_{\text{mesa}_n} |\psi|^2 \, dr$ of each mesa (labelled by $n$). We then obtain the IPR as

$$I = N \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N} I_{n}^2 \right) / \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N} I_{n} \right)^2 . \tag{3}$$

In figure 1(c) we observe that the IPR increases monotonically with the disorder $d$, which signals the onset of localization. Note also the increase in the error bars, which are calculated as the standard error from repeating the simulations with 20 different samples for each disorder strength. This further evidences the onset of localization and the breaking of ergodicity as the difference between the ensemble mean (the average of the samples) and the time-averaged mean (a single sample) diverge. We note that the same behaviour is also predicted by a model of discrete coupled modes which we investigate in the SI.

Microcavity polaritons constitute a highly tunable system where we can investigate localization in different regimes. For example, simply by tuning the detuning of the cavity via the spacer width we can vary e.g. the polariton lifetime. As we see in figure 2(a), decreasing the lifetime of the polaritons results in an enhanced localization. As another example we can modify the reservoir-polariton coupling, which could be accomplished e.g. by enhancing phonon mediated relaxation of excitons into polariton states. In this way we can suppress the localization by effectively increasing the driving of the polaritons, as shown in figure 2(b). In the SI we provide...
Figure 2: Tuning the localization through system parameters. Dependence of the IPR on a the polariton lifetime, and b the polariton-reservoir exchange rate. In both figures $d = 0.25\text{nm}$. The other simulation parameters are the same as in figure 1.

We experimentally verify this prediction that a robust signature of localization can be evidenced in the steady states of microcavity polaritons. To do so, we employ a GaAs/AlAs $\lambda$-microcavity with an embedded InGaAs quantum well (see Methods for details). We fabricate circular mesas with a radius of $r = 1\mu\text{m}$ by a 6nm local elongation of the cavity spacer, which provides a trapping potential of 9meV for the polaritons, leading to confined quantised modes in the individual mesas [30]. We arrange the mesas into a hexagonal array with lattice constant $a = 2.5\mu\text{m}$ which is sufficient for wavefunction overlap between neighbouring mesas, giving rise to new hybridised modes [35]. To introduce an off-diagonal disorder to the system the $x$ and $y$ coordinates of the mesas are offset by a random value in the range $[-d, d]$. We consider 8 different disorder levels from $d = 0\text{nm}$ to $d = 250\text{nm}$ in evenly spaced steps.

In Figure 3(a) we display the photoluminescence spectra along the $k_x = 0$ axis, for the array without disorder. Crucially, we see that the polaritons behave as collective excitations that inherit their character from the lattice structure, rather than isolated mesa ‘islands’ with discrete flat energy bands. We extract a mesa-mesa interaction energy of $\bar{h}J = 0.11\text{meV}$ by fitting the standard tight-binding dispersion $E(k) = -hJ f_q$, where $f_q = 2 \cos(aq_y) + 4 \cos(aq_y/2) \cos(\sqrt{3}aq_x/2)$ encodes the hexagonal geometry. For comparison we show the dispersion of a planar cavity in Figure 3(b) with the same spacer thickness as the mesas. It should be noted that the samples were positively detuned which resulted in confined upper-polariton states and a delocalized background of lower-polaritons which was removed for the analysis.

The corresponding real-space intensity distribution is shown in Figure 4(a), normalised to the pump distribution. We see the confinement of polaritons predominantly within the mesas and an approximately homogeneous distribution among them. The introduction of a positional disorder modifies the eigenstates of the system from Bloch states towards spatially separated patches of localization. This onset of localization can be evidenced in Figure 4(b) in the inhomogeneous distribution of intensities. We calculate the IPR in a similar manner to that explained for the theoretical model (see Methods for details). For each disorder level, the experiment is repeated for 12 different regions sampled from a larger lattice. These results have been confirmed for several different laser powers and sample detunings (see SI). In general, we observe a convincing qualitative agreement between experiment and theory. In both cases the IPR increases monotonically and by a similar magnitude. The difference between the initial IPR and rate of increase is attributed to intrinsic disorder of the experimental samples, as well as slightly different data processing algorithms.
Figure 3: Dispersion of microcavity. a, Dispersion of non-disordered hexagonal array of mesas at a detuning of 2 meV. A tight-binding spectrum is fitted to the first upper-polariton branch (red curve), from which we extract a mesa-mesa coupling energy of $hJ = 0.11$ meV. The reciprocal lattice vectors are $b_1 = (2\pi/\sqrt{3}a)(0, 2)$ and $b_2 = (2\pi/\sqrt{3}a)(-\sqrt{3}, 1)$. b, Dispersion of a planar cavity containing one mesa. A parabolic dispersion is fitted to the upper polariton. In addition we observe emission from two discrete states (upper and lower polariton ground state) coming from the single mesa.

Figure 4: Signature of localization: experimental results. a-b Real-space photoluminescence images under weak ($P = 100 \mu$W) nonresonant excitation are shown for a lattice without (a, $d = 0$nm) and with (b, $d = 250$nm) positional disorder. The intensities have been normalised to the pump beam profile. c Measured IPR as a function of disorder. In all figures $P = 100\mu$W and the cavity-exciton detuning is 2 meV.
In conclusion, we have demonstrated a robust signature of the localization of microcavity polaritons. We are able to control the degree of localization by tuning the positional disorder strength. Both polaritons and localization are foreseen to have a high potential for applications, in optoelectronic devices and quantum information respectively [8, 9, 22, 36]. Thus it could be interesting to merge and develop these two capabilities. New theoretical tools are needed for characterising and quantifying localization in polaritonic systems and driven-dissipative systems in general. Taking a step back, we remark that even for cold atoms the most stringent criteria for identifying MBL have remained unsatisfied. In fact, an analysis of the formation of steady states even in the absence of localization could provide a useful basis for further exploration. From the experimental perspective, it would be interesting to investigate the preparation of initially imbalanced population distributions, with a highly inhomogeneous pumping, and then switching on a homogeneous pumping to see if a signature of the initial state perseveres.
Methods

Experimental Methods

We study a GaAs $\lambda$-microcavity made of 24/20 pairs of GaAs/AlAs, with embedded 8nm, In$_{0.04}$Ga$_{0.96}$As quantum well (with an exciton energy of 1.482 eV) which gives a Rabi splitting of 3.1meV. We excite the system non-resonantly with a 660nm continuous wave laser. We measure the photoluminescence of the sample with a collection lens of numerical aperture 0.42NA, and image the real-space integrated energy emission in a CCD.

We are interested in the onset of localization phenomena as evidenced by the increase in the IPR. Thus we renormalise the experimentally obtained signal by the pump beam profile to eliminate its effect on the IPR. Thus we fit a Gaussian to the image after filtering out higher frequencies, which leaves us with the overall shape of the pump profile, after relaxing from the higher nonresonant energy. We then crop the image to a region within the central pumping region where the signal-to-noise ratio is sufficient. Then we use a peak-finding algorithm to determine the location of the mesas. We then calculate the average intensity $I_n$ of each mesa (labelled by the integer $n$) in a region around these peaks of the same width as the mesas. The IPR can then be calculated from equation (3).

Numerical methods

We use the Runge-Kutta method of fourth order to solve equation (1). We take the zero-energy to be $E_0$, the bottom of the polariton band. So the wavefunction $\psi$ is technically the slowly oscillating envelope of the real wavefunction $\Psi = \psi \exp(-iE_0t/\hbar)$. This is done to minimise numerical errors that can accumulate with fast oscillations. Throughout the paper, we take $\sigma = L/6$ where $L$ is the length (and width) of the cavity we simulate.

We seed the process with a weak initial state $\psi(t = 0) = P_0/10$ and then allow the system to evolve until the stationary solution is achieved (approximately 50ps). We use the Runge-Kutta method of fourth-order. To obtain the IPR of the solution we process the data in an analogous way to that done experimentally. First we normalise the wavefunction by that solution $\psi_{\text{back}}$ which is obtained by simulating the system without any mesas, in other words the effective ‘background’ of the polaritons. Then we calculate the average density $\rho_n$ of polaritons in the vicinity of each mesa (labelled by $n$). We then discard those mesas located outside the pumping area, i.e. those mesas with positions $|R_n| > 2\sigma$. Finally, we calculate the IPR as per equation (3) in the main text. Schematically the process looks like

1. Obtain density normalised to background: $\rho(r) = |\psi(r)|^2/|\psi_{\text{back}}(r)|^2$
2. Calculate average density at each mesa: $\rho_n = \langle \rho(r) \rangle_{|r - R_n| < a}$
3. Discard mesas outside the pumping area: $S = \{ n \in \mathbb{N} | |R_n| \leq 2\sigma \}$
4. Calculate IPR for the array of mesas: $I = N (\sum_{n \in S} \rho_n^2) / (\sum_{n \in S} \rho_n)^2$

Here, $N$ is the number of mesas used in the calculation (length of set $S$).
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Supplementary Material

1 Coupled mode model

To compliment the Gross-Pitaevskii model, we also investigated a model of coupled modes. In this case we assign a single nonlinear polariton mode to each mesa, and include nearest-neighbour interactions. The Hamiltonian of the system is

$$H = \hbar \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left[ \omega_n a_n^\dagger a_n + ga_n^\dagger a_m a_n - \sum_{m=0}^{6} J_{mn} \left( a_n^\dagger a_{mn} + a_m^\dagger a_n \right) \right]$$

(4)

where $a_n^\dagger$ is the bosonic creation operator for the polariton mode of the $n$th mesa, and $a_{mn}^\dagger$ that for its $m$th nearest-neighbour. The polariton-polariton interaction strength is parametrised by $g$ and the wavefunction overlap integral is modelled by

$$J_{mn} = J_0 \exp \left( \frac{1 - s^2}{\tau} \right),$$

(5)

where

$$s = \frac{|R_m - R_n| - 2r}{a - 2r}.$$  

(6)

To simulate the dynamics of the system, we obtain the equations of motion from equation (4) and introduce a phenomenological damping rate $\gamma_\alpha$, and gain rate $R_\rho$ from the reservoir created by the nonresonant excitation

$$i\hbar \frac{d\alpha_n}{dt} = \hbar \left[ g |\alpha_n|^2 + \frac{i\hbar}{2} \left( R_\rho - \gamma_\alpha \right) \right] \alpha_n + \hbar \sum_{m=1}^{6} J_{mn} \alpha_m.$$

(7)

The equation of motion for the reservoir density is

$$\frac{d\rho_n}{dt} = P_0 - \rho_n \left( \gamma_\rho + R|\alpha_n|^2 \right),$$

(8)

where $\gamma_\rho$ is the decay rate of the reservoir. The equations were simulated for 1000ps which is much greater than the lifetime of a single polariton, so as to reach a steady state, and then the IPR was calculated as per equation (1) in the main text. The equations were solved numerically using the fourth-order Runge-Kutta method. Note that we assumed a homogeneous pumping here so we did not apply any data processing.
2 Variation of IPR with parameters of Gross-Pitaevskii model

Figure 5: Variation of IPR with parameters of Gross-Pitaevskii model. (a) The same as figure (1) in the main text: IPR as a function of disorder. The simulation parameters are $m = m_A = 5 \times 10^{-5} m_e$, $\hbar R = \hbar R_A = 0.4 \text{meV.\mu m}^2$, $\hbar \gamma = \hbar \gamma_A = 0.5 \text{meV}$, $h g = h g_A = 2.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{meV.\mu m}^2$, $V_0 = V_A = 2 \text{meV}$, $h \gamma R = h \gamma R_A = 2 \text{meV}$, $P_0 = P_A = 2 \gamma R \gamma / R$, $d = 0.25 \text{nm}$, and $L = 88 \mu \text{m}$. In the remaining figures (b-h) we tune each of the parameters from 60\% to 140\% of that value just given in figure (a).
3 IPR as a function of disorder for several powers and detunings

We provide plots similar to figure 4(c) of the main text, for several powers and detunings. Crucially we recover the same monotonic increase in IPR with positional disorder. The data for the other detunings not presented in the main text is noticeably noisier due to a physical degradation of those samples.

**Figure 6:** IPR plots for a cavity-exciton detuning of 2meV. Error bars are the Standard Error of the Mean (SEM). A straight line is fitted with the least errors method, weighted by $1/(SEM)^2$

**Figure 7:** IPR plots for a cavity-exciton detuning of 2.8meV.
Figure 8: IPR plots for a cavity-exciton detuning of 3.8meV.

Figure 9: IPR plots for a cavity-exciton detuning of 4.6meV.
4 IPR as a function of detuning

The experimental data indicates that the IPR decreases with increasing detuning, see figure 10.

Figure 10: IPR as a function of detuning for several powers.