Topological mode switches in NV centers using exceptional points

A. Pick,1,2,* S. Silberstein,3 N. Moiseyev,1,4 and N. Bar–Gill5,5

1Faculty of Chemistry, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel.
2Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel.
3Department of Physics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 9190401, Israel
4Department of Physics, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel.
5Faculty of Applied Physics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 9190401, Israel

We show that microwave-driven NV centers can function as topological mode switches by utilizing a special degeneracy called an exceptional point (EP). By tuning the intensities and frequencies of the driving fields, we find an EP—where two normal modes of the system coalesce—and, then, use it to simulate the dynamics and demonstrate topological and non-reciprocal mode switching. By comparing density matrices of the input and output states, we find that the quantum correlations decrease by three orders of magnitude at room temperature, and discuss ways for improving this result. This work extends the theory of topological mode switches (originally derived for pure states) to mixed states and is, therefore, applicable to general open quantum systems. Our theory enables exploring new phenomena (e.g., high-order EPs in low-dimensional systems) and presents a crucial step towards incorporating topological mode switches in quantum-information applications.

Topological operations can produce outcomes that are resilient to noise in the operational details [1–3]. An important example is a topological mode switch (TMS) [4, 5], which converts between normal modes of open systems that possess a special degeneracy called an exceptional point (EP)—where multiple modes of the system coalesce [6–8]. TMSs were experimentally realized in optical waveguides [9] and optomechanical membranes [10] and theoretically proposed for several additional systems [11–15]. Here, we propose realizing a TMS in nitrogen-vacancy (NV) centers—defects in diamond whose excellent optical properties (long coherence lifetimes and established mechanisms for initialization, manipulation and readout) make them leading platforms for quantum-information applications [16–19]. The electrons of the NV center interact with the host lattice and, therefore, can be treated as an open quantum system which, typically, evolves into mixed states—statistical ensembles of different quantum (pure) states [20, 21]. In this work, we extend the theory of non-Hermitian TMSs (originally derived for pure states) to include mixed states; thus, making it applicable to atomic, molecular and atom-like open quantum systems. Our theory enables exploring new phenomena (e.g., high-order EPs in low-dimensional systems) and presents a crucial step towards incorporating TMSs in quantum-information applications.

Topological mode switches are based on the adiabatic theorem, which describes the evolution of slowly varying closed systems. The theorem states that when preparing a system in a particular eigenmode, it remains in that mode during the evolution (given the conditions specified in Refs. 22, 23). Dynamic closed systems are described by Hermitian Hamiltonians that depend on a set of “control parameters.” When changing the parameters slowly along closed loops in parameter space, the theorem implies that the initial and final states are the same (up to a phase [24–26]). The insight that the final state depends only on whether the loop is closed or not (and is independent of the details of the path) has lead to important discoveries in multiple areas of physics [27–30].

However, most physical systems are not isolated. Open systems can be described by effective non-Hermitian operators, and their adiabatic transport properties are drastically different from closed ones. First, unlike Hermitian operators, non-Hermitian operators may have EPs, where multiple eigenmodes have the same eigenvalue and eigenvector [6–8]. EPs are branch points in the eigenvalue spectrum of the operator. Consequently, when changing the control parameters along any closed loop that encircles an EP, the eigenvalue trajectories necessarily cross a branch cut and the eigenmodes at the initial and final points may differ [31]. For example, when the EP is formed by the coalescence of two modes (hereafter called an EP2), the eigenmodes swap; i.e., |1⟩→|2⟩ and |2⟩→|1⟩. Secondly, in non-Hermitian systems, the adiabatic theorem holds only for “least decaying states” [32–34], which are eigenmodes ℓ with eigenvalues λℓ whose accumulated decay rate is positive:

$$\Gamma_\ell(t) \equiv \int_0^t \text{Re} [\lambda_\ell(t') - \lambda_j(t')] \, dt' > 0, \quad \forall j \neq \ell, \quad (1)$$

for all t along the loop (see appendix). The dynamical evolution of the eigenmodes around an EP2 is dictated by the signs of Γ1(t) and Γ2(t). By definition, they have opposite signs, which implies that while one of the states can evolve adiabatically, the other one cannot. (Typically, either |1⟩→|2⟩ and |2⟩→|1⟩, or |1⟩→|2⟩ and |1⟩→|1⟩ [4, 5].) When reversing the direction of the path, Γ1,2(t) change sign [since the order of integration limits in Eq. (1) is exchanged] and, therefore, “least-decaying states” become “most-decaying” and vice versa. This is the “non-reciprocal property” of the TMS [9, 10].

The performance of the TMS is robust since its output depends only on the input and on whether or not the loop in parameter space encircles an EP. Typically, small
perturbations in the operational details only slightly distort the loop or move the location of the EP, but do not lift the degeneracy. The possibility of creating a non-reciprocal TMS between pure states has attracted considerable attention [9–13] and, here, we generalize this concept for mixed states. Our protocol includes (i) finding an isolated EP in the eigenvalue spectrum of the NV center (Fig. 1), (ii) initializing the system in special superposition states (Fig. 2), and (iii) changing the control parameters in a loop around the EP (Fig. 3).

Figure 1(a) shows the electronic ground-state manifold of the negatively charged NV center (also called NV−). It consists of three spin-triplet states, \(|{^3}{A}_2,m_s\rangle\), where \(m_s = 0, \pm 1\) denotes the spin projection along the NV axis and \(A_2\) marks the orbital symmetry [35, 36]. In the absence of external magnetic fields, the energy levels of \(|{^3}{A}_2,0\rangle\) and \(|{^3}{A}_2,\pm1\rangle\) are split by 2.87 GHz. We introduce right- and left-circularly polarized transverse microwave fields to selectively drive the \(|{^3}{A}_2,0\rangle \leftrightarrow |{^3}{A}_2,\pm1\rangle\) transitions [38–40] (solid arrows). Using a semiclassical description [42] (where the electrons are treated quantum mechanically and the fields are treated classically) and employing the rotating-wave approximation [21] (which is valid when the driving fields are nearly resonant and relatively weak), the Hamiltonian of the driven NV center in the ground-state manifold is [21]

\[
\hat{H} = \Delta_1 |1\rangle \langle 1 | + \Delta_2 | -1\rangle \langle -1 | + \hbar \Omega_1 (|1\rangle \langle 0 | + |0\rangle \langle 1 |) - \hbar \Omega_2 (| -1\rangle \langle 0 | + |0\rangle \langle -1 |),
\]

(2)

The first term represents Hamiltonian evolution and the remaining terms describe incoherent processes due to the interaction with the environment. We consider two types of processes [20, 41]: (i) pure dephasing at a rate \(\gamma^{(1,2)}\) (straight dashed arrows) and (ii) downwards or upwards jumps at rates \(\kappa_d^{(1,2)}\) or \(\kappa_u^{(1,2)}\) respectively (wiggly dashed arrows). In thermal equilibrium, the ratio of upwards and downwards transitions is given by the Boltzmann factor \(\kappa_u^{(1,2)}/\kappa_d^{(1,2)} = \exp(\hbar \omega_{1,2}/k_B T)\), where \(k_B T\) is the thermal energy [41]. We assume that the system is at room temperature (\(\approx 300 K\)), where upwards and downwards transition rates are almost equal, and comment on the cold-temperature regime in the concluding paragraph2.

1 Alternatively, by applying a longitudinal magnetic field to lift the degeneracy of the \(|{^3}{A}_2,\pm1\rangle\) states [57], one can excite these states selectively with a linearly polarized microwave field.

2 It is also possible to enhance the rate of downward transitions using green light [55]. This flexibility allows searching a wider parameter range, as will be explored in future work.
These processes are described by [43]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pure dephasing:} & \quad \hat{L}_{1,2} = |\pm1\rangle\langle\pm1| - |0\rangle\langle0| \quad (4a) \\
\text{up/down jumps:} & \quad \hat{L}_{3,4} = |\pm1\rangle\langle0|, \quad \hat{L}_{5,6} = |0\rangle\langle\pm1| \quad (4b)
\end{align*}
\]

with \(\Gamma^{(1,2)} = \gamma^{(1,2)}\), \(\Gamma^{(3,4)} = \kappa^{(1,2)}\), and \(\Gamma^{(5,6)} = \kappa^{(1,2)}\).

In order to find EPs in the eigenvalue spectrum of \(\hat{L}\), we rewrite the superoperator equation [Eq. (3)] in a form that is more convenient for theoretical investigation [43, 44]. We introduce a basis of traceless orthogonal matrices, which spans the space of density matrices [45–47]. Specifically, we choose the eight Gell–Mann matrices \((\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_8\), defined in the appendix\), which generalize Pauli matrices for three-level systems [48]. By applying Eq. (3) to each Gell–Mann matrix \((\sigma_i)\) and taking the expectation value of the resulting equation, we obtain

\(\tilde{S} = \hat{M}\tilde{S} + \tilde{b}\).

Here, \(\tilde{S}\) is an eight-dimensional vector, whose entries are \(S_i = \text{Tr}[\hat{\rho} \cdot \sigma_i]\) and \(\hat{\rho}\) is the density matrix. The real parts of the eigenvalues of \(\hat{M}\) are the relaxation rates of the eigenmodes, while \(\tilde{b}\) determines the steady state solution. Explicit expressions for \(\hat{M}\) and \(\tilde{b}\) are given in the appendix [Eq. (B2) and Eq. (B4) respectively]. We consider high room temperatures, where the steady state is \(\tilde{b} \approx 0\), since the rates of incoherent upwards and downwards transitions are equal. Left and right eigenvectors and eigenvalues of \(\hat{M}\) satisfy

\[
\hat{M}\tilde{S}_i^R = \lambda_i\tilde{S}_i^R, \quad \hat{M}^T\tilde{S}_i^L = \lambda_i\tilde{S}_i^L, \quad (6)
\]

where the superscript \(T\) denotes matrix transposition. The matrix \(\hat{M}\) is non-Hermitian and, hence, can have EPs. At an EP, the left and right eigenvectors of the degenerate eigenmode are orthogonal [49] (i.e., \(\tilde{S}_i^L \cdot \tilde{S}_i^R = 0\)). Therefore, the condition number, defined as the secant of the angle between left and right eigenvectors [50],

\[
N(\lambda_i) \equiv \frac{1}{|\cos(\theta_i)|} = \frac{|\tilde{S}_i^L||\tilde{S}_i^R|}{|\tilde{S}_i^L \cdot \tilde{S}_i^R|}, \quad (7)
\]

diverges at the EP.

Figure 1(b) reveals the location of EPs in the eigenvalue spectrum of \(\hat{L}\). We scan the parameters of the right-circularly polarized field (\(\Omega_1\) and \(\Delta_1\)) while holding all other parameters fixed (see caption). At each point in parameter space, we compute the condition numbers of the eigenvalues of \(\hat{M}\) and, then, plot the maximal condition number attained. The dark regions in the figure mark the location of the EPs. We determine the order of the degeneracy by plotting the eigenvectors at selected points along the dark lines. We find three lines of EP2s, which intersect at two points of EP3s (similar to Refs. 41, 51) and an isolated EP2 at \((\Delta_1^\text{EP}, \Omega_1^\text{EP}) \approx (-80, 225)\) kHz. The same system can be used for finding fourth- and fifth-order EPs, as we show in the appendix.

Next, we demonstrate swapping of the instantaneous eigenvalues along loops that encircle the isolated EP2. Figure 2 shows surfaces of the real and imaginary parts of the eigenvalues of \(\hat{M}\) [Eq. (B2)] as a function of \(\Delta_1\) and \(\Omega_1\). In the shown parameter regime, \(\hat{M}\) has four simple eigenvalues \((\lambda_{3,4,5,6})\) and two complex-conjugate pairs of eigenvalues \((\lambda_{1,2} \text{ and } \lambda_{7,8})\) that coalesce at the isolated EP2. We choose a loop that encircles the EP2 and, then, compute the eigenvalues at each point along...
The initial state $\hat{\rho}_{\text{in}}^{(1)}$ is adiabatically transported into $\hat{\rho}_{\text{out}}^{(1)}$ only after a clockwise loop around the EP [panels (d–e)]. More details about the dynamics are given in the appendix (Fig. 5). Panels (c,f) show the projections of the initial and final Gell–Mann vectors on the eigenvectors at the beginning of the loop, reaffirming that $S_{\text{in}}^{(1)} \rightarrow S_{\text{out}}^{(1)}$ after a clockwise loop while $S_{\text{in}}^{(2)} \rightarrow S_{\text{out}}^{(2)}$ after a counterclockwise loop.

In order for the system to evolve adiabatically, the sweep rates of $\Delta_1$ and $\Omega_1$ need to be small compared to the “energy gap” [52] (i.e., the distance between the complex eigenvalues). It implies that the cycle needs to be long compared to the dephasing time (e.g., we chose $T = 15/\gamma^{(1)}$). Consequently, the final states, $S_{\text{out}}^{(1,2)}$, approach zero [which is the steady state of Eq. (5) when $\tilde{b} = 0$]. From Eq. (8), one learns that when $|S_1| \ll 1$, $\tilde{\rho}$ is nearly diagonal, and it is hard to distinguish the final states from diagonal matrices. Therefore, in Fig. 3, we set the diagonal elements of $\tilde{\rho}$ to zero, and show only the moduli of the off-diagonal elements. Since these terms are very small [$O(10^{-4})$], it is challenging to distinguish between the final states. Possible approaches for increasing the coherence are discussed in the concluding paragraph.

Another challenge arises from the fact that the input states, $\rho_{\text{in}}^{(1,2)}$, are mixed. Experimentally, preparing pure states is a standard procedure [35] but the preparation of mixed states is more challenging. One approach for overcoming this problem is to prepare the system in pure states in the vicinity of $\rho_{\text{in}}^{(1,2)}$. The problem of finding the nearest pure state to a given density matrix is equivalent to finding the best rank-one approximation for that matrix, which can be solved by exploiting the singular value decomposition [53, 54]. Unfortunately, when applying this algorithm to $\rho_{\text{in}}^{(1,2)}$, one obtains pure states that have significant population in undesired states$^4$, which deteriorate the performance of the switch. Alternatively, one could use quantum control to find protocols for preparing arbitrary mixed states [55–58]. However, experimental implementation of such protocols may be very difficult. These directions will be explored in future work.

To summarize, we presented a proposal for creating a TMS in NV centers. By using a combination of microwave fields, we found an isolated EP in the Lindbladian operator and, then, used it to demonstrate non-

$^3$ Since $\int_0^t \text{Re} [\lambda_1(t') - \lambda_2(t')] \, dt' > 0$ for all $t \in [0,T]$.

$^4$ The pure states have significant population in $S_{\text{out}}^{(2)}$, which is the steady state since $\text{Re}[\lambda_5] < |\text{Re}[\lambda_j]|$ for all $j \neq 5$ [see Fig. 2(a)]. Since the cycle is much longer than the coherence lifetime, the final state is almost precisely $S_{\text{out}}^{(2)}$, and the swapping of the partial populations of $S_{\text{in}}^{(1)}$ and $S_{\text{in}}^{(2)}$ becomes unmeasurable.
reciprocal switching behavior. The main obstacle in measuring this effect is the degradation of the signal during the evolution. Quite generally, there is an incompatibility between the adiabaticity requirement (which implies slow evolution) and the relaxation of the signal (which requires, in turn, fast evolution) [34]. Qualitatively, in order to maximize the fidelity of the switch, one should choose closed paths for which the gap between the eigenstates is large enough to produce small non-adiabatic jumps for cycle times that are comparable to the dephasing time. The degradation of the signal can be reduced by cooling the system. Not only that the lifetime of the states increases at low temperatures, but one could potentially also use the selectively addressable excited states of the NV center to cycle the electronic population and retrieve lost coherence [37]. These effects are expected to significantly improve the performance of the switch, and will be addressed in future work.
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I. APPENDIX

A. Adiabatic theorem for non-Hermitian systems

In this appendix, we sketch the proof of the adiabatic theorem for non-Hermitian systems following Ref. 32. Let us investigate the conditions for adiabatic evolution of the normal modes of a non-Hermitian time-dependent operator, \( \hat{M}(\varepsilon t) \) (with \( \varepsilon > 0 \)). We introduce a new variable, \( s = \varepsilon t \), and consider the limit of \( \varepsilon \to 0 \) while \( s \) is held fixed and finite. By invoking the normal-mode expansion of \( \hat{M}(s) \), one can write

\[
\hat{M}(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j(s)|\psi_j^R(s)\rangle\langle\psi_j^L(s)|,
\]

where the time-dependent right- and left-eigenvectors and corresponding eigenvalues are defined in Eq. (6) in the main text. The normal modes satisfy the biorthogonality condition \( \langle \psi_j^L(s)|\psi_j^R(s)\rangle = \delta_{jj} \). Let \( |\psi(s)\rangle \) be a solution of the differential equation

\[
\varepsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial s} |\psi(s)\rangle = \hat{M}(s)|\psi(s)\rangle.
\]

Substituting the following ansatz

\[
|\psi(s)\rangle = \sum_j a_j(s) \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{s_0}^{s} \lambda_j(u) du \right)
\]

into Eq. (A2) and using the biorthogonality condition, one obtains

\[
\partial_s a_\ell(s) + \langle \psi^L_\ell(s)|\partial_s \psi^R_\ell(s)\rangle a_\ell(s) =
- \sum_{j \neq \ell} \langle \psi^L_\ell(s)|\partial_s \psi^R_j(s)\rangle a_j(s) \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{s_0}^{s} [\lambda_j(u) - \lambda_\ell(u)] du \right)
\]

From Eq. (A4), one can easily read the conditions for adiabatic evolution. For Hermitian systems [where \( \hat{M}(s) = M^\dagger(s) \)], the eigenvalues \( [\lambda_j(s)] \) are real and the right-hand side of Eq. (A4) contains only rapidly oscillating terms, which average to zero in the limit of \( \varepsilon \to 0 \). Conversely, when \( \hat{M}(s) \) is non-Hermitian, the right-hand side of Eq. (A4) can be neglected only when

\[
\Gamma_{\ell j}(s) = \int_{s_0}^{s} \text{Re} [\lambda_j(u) - \lambda_\ell(u)] du > 0
\]

for all \( j \neq \ell \). To summarize, the condition for adiabatic evolution comes from requiring that the probability to jump from state \( \ell \) to \( j \) is small. In contrast to Hermitian systems, where the probability for quantum jumps oscillates in time, in non-Hermitian systems, it also contains exponentially growing or decaying factors, and can be small only if \( \Gamma_{\ell j}(t) > 0 \) for all \( j \neq \ell \).

B. Vectorizing the Lindblad master equation

In this appendix we derive Eq. (5) from the main text and present explicit expressions for the dynamical matrix \( \hat{M} \) and the steady-state Gell–Mann vector \( \vec{\eta} \). To this end, we introduce the set of Gell–Mann matrices [48]:

\[
\hat{\sigma}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\hat{\sigma}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\hat{\sigma}_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\hat{\sigma}_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_8 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{(B1)}
\]
We apply the Lindblad master equation [Eq. (3)] to each Gell-Mann operator ($\sigma_i$) and compute the expectation value, obtaining Eq. (5) from the main text, with

$$M = \begin{pmatrix}
-\gamma_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Omega_2 & 0 \\
-\gamma_2 & -2\Omega_1 & 0 & 0 & \Omega_2 & 0 & 0 \\
2\Omega_1 & -\gamma_3 & 0 & \Omega_2 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_8 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\Omega_2 & -\Delta_2 & -\gamma_1 \\
0 & 0 & -\Omega_2 & -\Delta_2 & 0 & -\Omega_1 & -\sqrt{3}\Omega_2 \\
-\Omega_2 & 0 & 0 & -\Omega_1 & -\gamma_6 & 0 & -\gamma_7 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_3 & 0 & \sqrt{3}\Omega_2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \gamma_8 & 0 & \sqrt{3}\Omega_2 & 0 & 0 & -\gamma_8
\end{pmatrix},$$

(B2)

where we introduced the notation

$$\gamma_{11} = \gamma_{22} \equiv \left(\frac{\kappa_1}{\pi} + \frac{\kappa_1 + \kappa_d^{(1)} + \kappa_u^{(1)} + \kappa_u^{(2)}}{2}\right),$$

(B3a)

$$\gamma_{33} = \frac{\kappa_d^{(2)}}{2} + \kappa_d^{(1)} + \kappa_u^{(1)}$$

(B3b)

$$\gamma_{38} = \left(\kappa_d^{(1)} - \kappa_u^{(2)} - \kappa_u^{(1)} - \frac{\kappa_u^{(2)}}{2}\right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$$

(B3c)

$$\gamma_{44} = \gamma_{55} \equiv \frac{\gamma_{11}}{8} + \frac{\gamma_{22} + \gamma_{33} + \gamma_{38} + \gamma_{44} + \gamma_{55} + \gamma_{66} + \gamma_{66} + \gamma_{66} + \gamma_{66}}{2}$$

(B3d)

$$\gamma_{66} = \gamma_{77} \equiv \frac{\gamma_{11} + \gamma_{22} + \gamma_{33} + \gamma_{38} + \gamma_{44} + \gamma_{55} + \gamma_{66} + \gamma_{66} + \gamma_{66} + \gamma_{66}}{2}$$

(B3e)

$$\gamma_{83} = -\frac{\gamma_{22}}{2} \kappa_u^{(2)}$$

(B3f)

$$\gamma_{88} = \frac{\kappa_d^{(2)}}{2} + \kappa_d^{(2)}$$

(B3g)

The steady-state vector is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}^T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \Delta \kappa_1 & \frac{2\Delta \kappa_1}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\Delta \kappa_2}{\sqrt{3}} \end{pmatrix},$$

where we define the difference between upwards and downwards jumps as

$$\Delta \kappa_i \equiv \kappa_d^{(i)} - \kappa_u^{(i)}.$$

(B5)

When the upwards and downwards rates are equal (i.e., in the high-temperature limit), the steady-state vector vanishes and the Gell–Mann vector will approach the origin at asymptotically large evolution times. [give reference to STIRAP paper.]

C. High-order EPs in a three-level system

In the main text, we show the existence of second- and third-order EPs in the ground-state manifold of the NV center. Here, we show that it is also possible to find high-order EPs in this system. For example, by searching the four-dimensional parameter space spanned by the two Rabi frequencies $\Omega_1$ and $\Omega_2$ (see text), one can induce fourth- and fifth-order EPs, as shown in Fig. 4. More generally, the density matrix of an $N$-level system has $N^2 - 1$ real degrees of freedom. So one could potentially find eighth-order EPs in this system, but that would require searching a higher-dimensional parameter space. In order to find a real degenerate eigenvalue of degree $M$, one needs $M - 1$ real parameters [to satisfy $\lambda_1(\tilde{p}) = \ldots = \lambda_M(\tilde{p})$]. In order to find a complex degenerate eigenvalue of degree $M$, one needs $2(M - 1)$ real parameters. We find high-order EPs by using the algorithm from Ref. 59, which exploits versal deformation theory for finding EPs of a given order.

D. Dynamically encircling an isolated EP

In this appendix, we provide additional information about the evolution of the system during the loop in parameter space when encircling the EP in both directions (i.e., clockwise and counterclockwise). We choose an el-
FIG. 5. Dynamically encircling an isolated EP. The middle panels (a−d) show the evolution of the adiabatic coefficients, $|a_i(t)|^2 = |\vec{S}_i(t) \cdot \vec{S}(t)|^2$ [Eq. (E2)] during the loop. The side panels in (a−d) show the normalized projections of the initial and final states onto the instantaneous states at the beginning of the loop, $|\vec{S}_i(t) \cdot \vec{S}_{in/out}(1,2)|^2$. (a) When initialized in state $\vec{S}_{in}^{(1)}$ and evolved in a clockwise manner, the coefficients $a_1$ and $a_8$ are predominant throughout the evolution, which implies that the state evolves adiabatically, hence the final state is the coalescing partner state, $\vec{S}_{in}^{(2)}$. (b) When reversing the direction of the loop, the system does not evolve adiabatically and the final state is $\vec{S}_R^b$. Plots (c−d) show the situation when the system is initialized in $\vec{S}_{in}^{(2)}$, where only a counterclockwise loop enables adiabatic mode swapping. The parameters are the same as in Fig. 3 from the main text.

The elliptic path of the form
\[
\Delta_1(t) = \Delta_{EP} + R_\Delta \cos(2\pi t/T + \phi),
\]
\[
\Omega_1(t) = \Omega_{EP} + R_{\Omega} \sin(2\pi t/T + \phi).
\]
(E1)

In Fig. 2, we use $\Delta_{EP} = -80, \Omega_{EP} = 295, R_\Delta = 100,$ and $R_{\Omega} = 30 \text{ (all in kHz), while in Fig. 3, the radii are } R_\Delta = 200 \text{ and } R_{\Omega} = 125.$ The phase is $\phi = 0.39\pi$ and the period is $T = 15/\gamma(1)^{(1)}.$

When initialized in $\vec{S}_{in}^{(1)},$ the system evolves adiabatically only when the EP is encircled in a clockwise manner; the opposite is true for the second initial state, $\vec{S}_{in}^{(2)}.$ At each moment along the evolution, the instantaneous normal modes form a complete basis of the Hilbert space. That is, the state vector at time $t$ can be written in the form
\[
\vec{S}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{8} a_i(t) \vec{S}_i^{(R)}(t)
\]
(E2)

where $a_i(t)$ are called “the adiabatic coefficients”. We compute them by projecting the state vector, $\vec{S}(t)$, onto the instantaneous basis states, $\vec{S}_i^{(R)}(t).$ The system evolves adiabatically if it stays in the same instantaneous eigenstates throughout its evolution. It is important to emphasize that the instantaneous eigenstates themselves swap at the end of the loop; that is, if the system starts and ends with predominant coefficients $a_1$ and $a_8$, it means that the state swapped because $\vec{S}_i^{(R)}(t = T) = \vec{S}_R^b(t = 0)$ and $\vec{S}_R^b(t = T) = \vec{S}_R^b(t = 0).$ Figure 5 shows the evolution of the adiabatic coefficients during the loop [middle panels in (a−d)] and the projections of the input and output states on the instantaneous eigenstates (i.e., the normal modes) at the beginning of the evolution. More details are given in the caption.

[52] D. Bohm, Quantum Theory (Courier Corporation, 2012).