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We investigate the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model coupled to a thermal bath. Since the isolated model itself exhibits a quantum phase transition, we explore the critical signatures of the open system. Starting from a system-reservoir interaction written in positive definite form, we find that the position of the critical point remains unchanged, in contrast to the popular mean-field prediction. Technically, we employ the polaron transform to be able to study the full crossover regime from the normal to the symmetry-broken phase, which allows us to investigate the fate of quantum-critical points subject to dissipative environments. The signatures of the phase transition are reflected in observables like stationary mode occupation or waiting-time distributions.

I. INTRODUCTION

In closed systems, Quantum Phase Transitions (QPTs) are defined as non-analytic changes of the ground state energy when a control parameter other than temperature is varied across a critical point \[1\]. They are accompanied by non-analytic changes in observables or correlation functions \[2–4\] and form a fascinating research area on their own.

Nowadays, it is possible to study such QPTs in experimental setups with cold atoms \[5–9\], which provide high degree of control and allow to test theoretical predictions. However, each experimental set-up is an open system, such that the impact of the reservoir on the QPT should not be neglected. To the contrary, the presence of a reservoir can fundamentally change the nature of the QPT. For example, in the famous Dicke phase transition, it is the presence of the reservoir that actually creates a QPT via the environmental coupling of a collective spin \[10\].

With the renewed interest in quantum thermodynamics, it has become a relevant question whether QPTs can be put to use e.g. as working fluids of quantum heat engines \[11–14\]. This opens another broad research area of dissipative QPTs in non-equilibrium setups. Here, the non-equilibrium configuration can be implemented in different ways, e.g. by periodic driving \[15–17\], by quenching \[18–20\], by coupling to reservoirs \[21–23\] or by a combination of these approaches \[24, 25\]. One has even considered feedback control of such quantum-critical systems \[26, 29\].

All these extensions should however be applied in combination with a reliable microscopic description of the system-reservoir interaction. For example, in the usual derivation of Lindblad master equations one assumes that the system-reservoir interaction is weak compared to the splitting of the system energy levels \[21, 31\]. In particular in the vicinity of a QPT – where the energy gap above the ground state vanishes – this condition cannot be maintained. Therefore, while in particular the application of the secular approximation leads to a Lindblad-type master equation preserving the density matrix properties, it has the disadvantage that its range of validity is typically limited to non-critical points or to finite-size scaling investigations \[22, 33\]. In principle, the weak-coupling restriction can be overcome with different methods such as e.g. reaction-coordinate mappings \[34, 35\]. These however come at the price of increasing the dimension of the system, which renders analytic treatments of already complex systems difficult.

In this paper, we are going to study at the example of the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) model how a QPT is turned dissipative by coupling the LMG system \[37\] to a large environment. To avoid the aforementioned problems, we use a polaron \[38, 42\] method, which allows to address the strong coupling regime \[37, 43, 44\] without increasing the number of degrees of freedom that need explicit treatment. In particular, we show that for our model the position of the QPT is robust in presence of dissipation. We emphasize that the absence of a reservoir-induced shift – in contrast to mean-field-predictions \[22, 50–55\] – is connected with starting from a Hamiltonian with a lower spectral bound and holds without additional approximation. Our work is structured as follows. In Sec. \[II\] we introduce the dissipative LMG model, in Sec. \[III\] we show how to diagonalize it globally using the Holstein-Primakoff transformation. There, we also derive a master equation in both, original and polaron, frames and show that the QPT cannot be modeled within the first and that the QPT position is not shifted within the latter approach. Finally, we discuss the effects near the QPT by investigating the excitations in the LMG system and the waiting time distribution of emitted bosons in Sec. \[IV\].

II. MODEL

A. Starting Hamiltonian

The isolated LMG model describes the collective interaction of \(N\) two-level systems with an external field and among themselves. In terms of the collective spin
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\begin{equation}
J_{+} = \sqrt{N - b\dagger b}\ , \quad J_{-} = b\dagger \sqrt{N - b\dagger b}, \quad (5)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
J_{y} = J_{x} = J, \quad J_{z} = J_{x} \pm i \cdot J_{y}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\gamma_{x} = \frac{\gamma_{x}}{N} \approx \frac{\gamma_{x}}{N}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
H_{\text{LMG}}(h, \gamma_{x}) = -\hbar J - \frac{\gamma_{x}}{N} J_{x}^{2}, \quad (2)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
H_{\text{LMG}}(h, \gamma_{x}) = \gamma_{x} h_{x} + \left(\frac{N}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{\gamma_{x}}{N} \gamma_{x}^{2} + \frac{1}{N} \gamma_{x}^{2}.
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
H_{0}^{\text{HP}} = \begin{cases}
-\frac{\hbar}{2} & : \gamma_{x} < \gamma_{x}^{\text{cr}} \\
-\left(\frac{h^{2}}{4\gamma_{x}} + \frac{\gamma_{x}^{2}}{2}\right) & : \gamma_{x} > \gamma_{x}^{\text{cr}}
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
H_{1}^{\text{HP}} = \begin{cases}
0 & : \gamma_{x} < \gamma_{x}^{\text{cr}} \\
\frac{1}{\gamma_{x}} & : \gamma_{x} > \gamma_{x}^{\text{cr}}
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
H_{2}^{\text{HP}} = \begin{cases}
\left(h - \frac{5\gamma_{x}}{2}\right) a^{\dagger} a - \frac{3\gamma_{x}}{4} (a^{2} + \alpha a^{2}) - \frac{1}{4} & : \gamma_{x} < \gamma_{x}^{\text{cr}} \\
\left(\gamma_{x}^{2} + \frac{2\gamma_{x} b^{\dagger} b}{\gamma_{x}^{2}} + \frac{\gamma_{x}^{2}}{8} \right) + \frac{2\gamma_{x} - 3\hbar}{8} (a^{2} + \alpha a^{2}) & : \gamma_{x} > \gamma_{x}^{\text{cr}}
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\alpha(h, \gamma_{x}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{h}{\gamma_{x}}\right)} \Theta(\gamma_{x} - h),
\end{equation}

which indeed leads to a shift of the critical point within
a naive treatment.
TABLE I. Parameters of the diagonalization procedure of the LMG model $H_{LMG}(h, \gamma_x)$ for the normal phase ($\gamma_x < h$, second column) and for the symmetry-broken phase ($\gamma_x > h$, last column). In both phases, the $d$ operators correspond to fluctuations around the mean-field value $\alpha$, which is zero only in the normal phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>normal: $\gamma_x &lt; h$</th>
<th>symmetry-broken: $\gamma_x &gt; h$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \ln (\frac{h}{h - \gamma_x}) + \frac{1}{2} \ln (\frac{\sqrt{\gamma_x^2 + h^2}}{\sqrt{\gamma_x^2 + h^2} - h})$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} \ln (\frac{h}{h - \gamma_x}) + \frac{1}{2} \ln (\frac{\gamma_x^2 + h^2}{\gamma_x^2 + h^2} - h)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi(h, \gamma_x)$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} \ln (\frac{h}{h - \gamma_x}) + \frac{1}{2} \ln (\frac{\gamma_x^2 + h^2}{\gamma_x^2 + h^2} - h)$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} \ln (\frac{h}{h - \gamma_x}) + \frac{1}{2} \ln (\frac{\gamma_x^2 + h^2}{\gamma_x^2 + h^2} - h)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha(h, \gamma_x)$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} \ln (\frac{h}{h - \gamma_x})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega(h, \gamma_x)$</td>
<td>$\sqrt{\gamma_x^2 - h^2}$</td>
<td>$\frac{\gamma_x^2 + h^2}{\gamma_x^2 + h^2} - h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1(h, \gamma_x)$</td>
<td>$\frac{h}{2}$</td>
<td>$\frac{h}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2(h, \gamma_x)$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} \left( \sqrt{h(h - \gamma_x)} - h \right)$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} \left( \sqrt{\gamma_x^2 - h^2} - \gamma_x \right)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 1. Lower part of the isolated LMG model spectrum for finite-size numerical diagonalization of Eq. (2) (thin curves) and using the bosonic representation (bold curves) based on Eq. (3) for the three lowest energies. For large $N$, the spectra are nearly indistinguishable. In the symmetry-broken phase (right), two numerical eigenvalue approaches the same oscillator solution. These correspond to the two different parity sectors, formally represented by two possible displacement solutions $\pm \alpha(h, \gamma_x)$ in Eq. (8).

The actual values of the excitation energies $\omega(h, \gamma_x)$ and the constants $C_i(h, \gamma_x)$ are summarized in table I. Fig. 1 confirms that the thus obtained spectra from the bosonic representation agree well with finite-size numerical diagonalization when $N$ is large enough.

First, one observes for consistency that the trivial spectrum deeply in the normal phase ($\gamma_x \approx 0$) or deeply in the symmetry-broken phase ($h \approx 0$) are reproduced. In addition, we see that at the QPT $\gamma_x = \gamma_x^{\text{cr}} = h$, the excitation frequency $\omega$ vanishes as expected, which is also reflected e.g., in the dashed curve in Fig. 2(a). For consistency, we also mention that all oscillator energies $E_n$ are continuous at the critical point $\gamma = h$. Furthermore, the second derivative with respect to $\gamma_x$ of the continuum ground state energy per spin $\lim_{N \to \infty} E_n/N$ is discontinuous at the critical point, classifying the phase transition as second order. Finally, we note that this treatment does not capture the excited state quantum phase transitions present in the LMG model as we are only concerned with the lower part of the spectrum.

III. MASTER EQUATION

We first perform the derivation of the conventional Born-Markov-secular (BMS) master equation in the usual way, starting directly with Eq. (9). Afterwards, we show that a polaron transform also allows to treat regions near the critical point.

A. Conventional BMS master equation

The conventional BMS master equation is derived in the energy eigenbasis of the system, i.e., the LMG model with renormalized spin-spin interaction $\tilde{\gamma}_x$, in order to facilitate the secular approximation. In this eigenbasis the master equation has a particularly simple form.

Applying the very same transformations (that diagonalize the closed LMG model) to its open version (6), we arrive at the generic form

$$H_{tot}^{\text{HP}} = H_{LMG}^{\text{HP}}(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x) + \sum_k \nu_k c_k^\dagger c_k + \left[A(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x)(d + d^\dagger) + \sqrt{N}Q(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x)\right] \times \sum_k q_k (c_k + c_k^\dagger) ,$$

where we note that the LMG Hamiltonian is now evaluated at the shifted interaction (6). The phase-dependent numbers $A$ and $Q$ are defined in Table I. In particular, in the normal phase we have $Q = 0$, and we recover the standard problem of a harmonic oscillator weakly coupled to a thermal reservoir. In the symmetry-broken phase we have $Q \neq 0$, such that the shift term in the interaction Hamiltonian formally diverges as $N \to \infty$, and a naive perturbative treatment does not apply. Some thought however shows, that this term can be transformed away by applying yet another displacement for both system and reservoir modes $\sigma \to \sigma + \sigma_k$ and $c_k \to c_k + \sigma_k$ with $\sigma, \sigma_k \in \mathbb{C}$ chosen such that all terms linear in creation and annihilation operators vanish in the total Hamiltonian. This procedure does not change the energies of neither system nor bath operators, such that eventually,
the master equation in the superradiant phase is formally equivalent to the one in the normal phase, and the interaction proportional to $Q$ is not problematic.

Still, when one approaches the critical point from either side, the system spacing $\omega$ closes in the thermodynamic limit, which makes the interaction Hamiltonian at some point equivalent or even stronger than the system Hamiltonian. Even worse, one can see that simultaneously, the factor $A \sim e^{+\varphi}$ in the interaction Hamiltonian diverges at the critical point. Therefore, one should consider the results of the naive master equation in the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$ with caution.

Ignoring these problems, one obtains a master equation having the standard form for a harmonic oscillator coupled to a thermal reservoir

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = -i[H_{\text{LMG}}(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x), \rho] + F_e D(d) \rho + F_a D(d^\dagger) \rho,$$

$$F_e = A^2(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x) \Gamma(\omega(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x))[1 + n_B(\omega(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x))],$$

$$F_a = A^2(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x) \Gamma(\omega(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x)) n_B(\omega(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x)).$$

(11)

Here, we have used the superoperator notation $D(O) \rho \equiv \rho O^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} O O^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} O^\dagger O \rho$ for any operator $O$ and

$$\Gamma(\omega) = 2\pi \sum_k g_k^2 \delta(\omega - \nu_k)$$

(12)

is the original spectral density of the reservoir and $n_B(\omega) = [e^{\beta \omega} - 1]^{-1}$ is the Bose distribution with inverse reservoir temperature $\beta$. These functions are evaluated at the system transition frequency $\omega(h, \tilde{\gamma}_x)$. The master equation has the spontaneous and stimulated emission terms in $F_e$ and the absorption term in $F_a$, and due to the balanced Bose-Einstein function these will at steady state just thermalize the system at the reservoir temperature, as is generically found for such BMS master equations. Note that $H_{\text{LMG}}$ from Eq. (11) is evaluated at the rescaled coupling $\tilde{\gamma}_x$. Therefore, the position of the QPT is at $\tilde{\gamma}_x^{\text{cr}} = \hbar$ and shifted to higher $\gamma_x$ couplings, see [41]. Similar shifts of the QPT position in dissipative quantum optical models are known e.g. from mean-field treatments [50, 71]. However, here we emphasize that we observe them as a direct consequence of ignoring the divergence of interaction around the phase transition in combination with positive-definite form of the initial total Hamiltonian Eq. (4).

### B. Polaron master equation

The master equation derived in the previous section is invalid in the vicinity of the QPT. In this section, we therefore apply a polaron transform to the complete model, which allows us to investigate the strong coupling regime [72] and thereby also admits to explore the systems behaviour at the QPT position.

#### 1. Polaron transform

We choose the following polaron transform $U_p$

$$U_p = e^{-J_z \hat{B}}, \quad \hat{B} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_k \frac{g_k}{\nu_k} \left( c_k^\dagger + c_k \right).$$

(13)

The total Hamiltonian $[3]$ in the polaron frame then becomes

$$\tilde{H}_{\text{tot}} = U_p^\dagger H_{\text{tot}} U_p$$

$$= -hD \cdot J_z \cdot \tilde{\gamma}_x \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_x}{N} P^2 + \sum_k \nu_k c_k^\dagger c_k$$

$$- \hbar \cdot \left[ J_z \cdot \left( \cosh(\tilde{B}) - D \right) - i J_y \sinh(\tilde{B}) \right].$$

Here, $\tilde{\gamma}_x$ is the original interaction of the local LMG model, and the renormalization of the external field $D$ is defined via

$$D = \left( \cosh(\tilde{B}) \right) = \text{Tr} \left\{ \cosh(\tilde{B}) - e^{-\beta \sum_k \nu_k c_k^\dagger c_k} \frac{e^{-\beta \sum_k \nu_k c_k^\dagger c_k}}{\text{Tr}\left\{ e^{-\beta \sum_k \nu_k c_k^\dagger c_k} \right\}} \right\}$$

$$= \exp \left\{ - \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \left( \frac{g_k}{\nu_k} \right)^2 \left( n_k + \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\} > 0,$$

$$n_k = \frac{1}{e^{\beta \nu_k} - 1}. \quad (15)$$

It has been introduced to enforce that the expectation value of the system-bath coupling vanishes for the thermal reservoir state. More details on the derivation of Eq. (14) are presented in App B.

The operator $\hat{B} \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ decays in the thermodynamic limit, such that for these studies, only the first few terms in the expansions of the $\sinh(\tilde{B})$ and $\cosh(\tilde{B})$ terms need to be considered.

Accordingly, the position of the QPT in the polaron frame is now found at the QPT of the closed model

$$\tilde{\gamma}_x^{\text{cr}} = hD \frac{N \to \infty}{\to} h.$$  

(16)

We emphasize that we observe the absence of a QPT shift as a result of a proper system-reservoir interaction with a lower spectral bound. Without such an initial Hamiltonian, the reservoir back-action would shift the dissipative QPT position. However such effects are not covered by mean-field treatments [50, 71].
For the study of strong coupling regimes, polaron transforms have also been applied e.g. to single spin systems [22] and collective non-critical spin systems [23]. Treatments without a polaron transformation should be possible in our case too, by rewriting Eq. (1) in terms of reaction coordinates [35, 36, 74], leading to an open Dicke-type model.

In the thermodynamic limit, we can use that the spin operators $J_y$ scale at worst linearly in $N$ to expand the interaction and $D$, yielding

$$H_{\text{tot}} \approx -\hbar \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{N} \delta \right] \cdot J_z - \gamma_x \frac{J_y^2}{N} \sum_k \gamma_k c_k \bar{c}_k$$

$$= -\hbar J_z - \gamma_x \frac{J_y^2}{N} \sum_k \gamma_k c_k \bar{c}_k$$

$$- \hbar \cdot \left[ \frac{J_y}{N} \left( \frac{1}{2} \bar{B}^2 + \delta \right) - i \frac{J_y}{\sqrt{N}} \bar{B} \right] - \hbar \cdot \left[ \frac{J_y}{N} \frac{1}{2} \bar{B}^2 - i \frac{J_y}{\sqrt{N}} \bar{B} \right] \ , \quad (17)$$

where $\bar{B} = \sqrt{N} \bar{B}$ and $D \equiv e^{-\frac{\delta}{\hbar}}$ has been used. As in the thermodynamic limit, $J_y/N$ just yields a constant, the first term in the last row can be seen as an all-to-all interaction between the environmental oscillators, which only depends in a bounded fashion on the LMG parameters $h$ and $\gamma_x$. Since it is quadratic, it can be formally transformed away by a suitable global Bogoliubov transform $c_k = \sum_q (u_k \hat{b}_q + v_k \hat{b}_q^\dagger)$ of all reservoir oscillators, which results in

$$H_{\text{tot}} \approx -\hbar J_z - \gamma_x \frac{J_y^2}{N} \sum_k \bar{\gamma}_k \hat{b}_k \hat{b}_k^\dagger$$

$$+ \hbar \cdot \left[ \frac{J_y}{N} \frac{1}{2} \bar{B}^2 - i \frac{J_y}{\sqrt{N}} \bar{B} \right] \ , \quad (18)$$

and where $\gamma_k \in \mathbb{C}$ are the transformed reservoir couplings and the $\bar{\gamma}_k$ the transformed reservoir energies. In case of weak coupling to the reservoir which is assumed here however, we will simply neglect the $\bar{B}^2$-term since it is then much smaller than the linear $\bar{B}$ term.

2. System Hamiltonian diagonalization

To proceed, we first consider the normal phase $\gamma_x < h$. Applying the Holstein-Primakoff transformation to the total Hamiltonian, compare appendix [A] yields as due to the vanishing displacement we have $a = b$

$$H_{\text{tot}, N}^{(\text{HP})} = -\frac{\hbar}{2} N + \left( h - \frac{\gamma_x}{2} \right) a^\dagger a - \frac{\gamma_x}{4} \left( a^2 + a^2 + 1 \right)$$

$$+ \hbar \left[ a^\dagger (a - a^\dagger) \sum_k \left( h_k b_k - h_k^\dagger b_k^\dagger \right) \right] \ . \quad (19)$$

Here, the main difference is that the system-reservoir interaction now couples to the momentum of the LMG oscillator mode and not the position. Applying yet another Bogoliubov transform $a = \cosh(\varphi(h, \gamma_x)) a + \sinh(\varphi(h, \gamma_x)) d^\dagger$ with the same parameters as in table [I] eventually yields a Hamiltonian of a single diagonalized oscillator coupled via its momentum to a reservoir.

Analogously, the symmetry-broken phase $\gamma_x > h$ is treated with a finite displacement as outlined in App. [X]. The requirement, that in the system Hamiltonian all terms proportional to $\sqrt{N}$ should vanish, yields the same known displacement [8]. One arrives at a Hamiltonian of the form

$$\tilde{H}_{\text{tot}, S}^{(\text{HP})} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{4} + \frac{\gamma_x}{N} + \frac{5\gamma_x - 3h}{4} a a^\dagger$$

$$+ \frac{3\gamma_x - 5h}{8} (a^2 + a^2) + \frac{\gamma_x - 3h}{8} + \sum_k \bar{\gamma}_k \hat{b}_k \hat{b}_k^\dagger$$

$$+ \frac{h}{2} \sqrt{1 - |\alpha(h, \gamma_x)|^2} \left( a - a^\dagger \right) \sum_k \left( h_k b_k - h_k^\dagger b_k^\dagger \right) \ . \quad (20)$$

Using a Bogoliubov transformation to new bosonic operators $d$ the system part in the above equation can be diagonalized again.

Thus, in both phases the Hamiltonian acquires the generic form

$$\tilde{H}_{\text{tot}, N}^{(\text{HP})} = \omega(h, \gamma_x) d d^\dagger - N C_1(h, \gamma_x) + C_2(h, \gamma_x)$$

$$+ A(h, \gamma_x) (d - d^\dagger) \sum_k \left( h_k b_k - h_k^\dagger b_k^\dagger \right)$$

$$+ \sum_k \bar{\gamma}_k \hat{b}_k \hat{b}_k^\dagger \ , \quad (21)$$

where the system-reservoir coupling modification $\tilde{A}(h, \gamma_x)$ is found in Tab. [III].

To this form, we can directly apply the derivation of the standard quantum-optical master equation.

3. Master Equation

In the polaron-transformed interaction Hamiltonian, we do now observe the factor $\tilde{A}(h, \gamma_x)$, which depends on $h$ and $\gamma_x$, see tables [III] and [I]. This factor is suppressed as one approaches the shifted critical point, it vanishes there identically. Near the shifted QPT, its square $\tilde{A}^2(h, \gamma_x)$ shows the same scaling behaviour as the
system gap \( \omega(h, \gamma_x) \), such that in the polaron frame, the system-reservoir interaction strength is adaptively scaled down with the system Hamiltonian, and a naive master equation approach can be applied in this frame.

From either the normal phase or the symmetry-broken phase we arrive at the following generic form of the system density matrix master equation

\[
\dot{\rho}(t) = -i \left[ H_{\text{LMG}}(h, \gamma_x), \rho \right] + \dot{F}_e \mathcal{D}(d) \rho + \dot{F}_a \mathcal{D}(d^\dagger) \rho,
\]

\[
\dot{F}_e = \bar{A}^2(h, \gamma_x) \bar{\Gamma}(\omega(h, \gamma_x)) \left[ 1 + n_B(\omega(h, \gamma_x)) \right],
\]

\[
\dot{F}_a = \bar{A}^2(h, \gamma_x) \bar{\Gamma}(\omega(h, \gamma_x)) n_B(\omega(h, \gamma_x)).
\]

Here, \( \bar{\Gamma}(\omega) = 2\pi \sum_k |h_k|^2 \delta(\omega - \tilde{\nu}_k) \) denotes the transformed spectral density, which is related to the original spectral density via the Bogoliubov transform that expresses the \( c_k \) operators in terms of the \( b_k \) operators, and \( n_B(\omega) \) again denotes the Bose distribution. The mapping from the reservoir modes \( c_k \) to the new reservoir modes \( b_k \) has been represented in an implicit form, but in general it will be a general multi-mode Bogoliubov transformation \([\text{73}] [\text{74}]\) with a sophisticated solution.

However, if \( h \omega_k / \nu_k \) is small in comparison to the reservoir frequencies \( \nu_k \), the Bogoliubov transform will hardly change the reservoir oscillators and thereby be close to the identity. Then, one will approximately recover \( \bar{\Gamma}(\omega) \approx \Gamma(\omega) \). Even if this assumption is not fulfilled, we note from the general form of the master equation that the steady state will just be the thermalized system - with renormalized parameters depending on \( \Gamma(\omega) \), \( h \), and \( \gamma_x \). Therefore, it will not depend on the structure of \( \Gamma(\omega) \) - although transient observables may depend on this transformed spectral density as well. In our results, we will therefore concentrate on a particular form of \( \Gamma(\omega) \) only and neglect the implications for \( \bar{\Gamma}(\omega) \).

IV. RESULTS

In this section, we compare the prediction of the master equation with and without polaron transformation.

To evaluate \( \gamma_x \), we assume a special spectral density of the form

\[
\Gamma(\omega) = \eta \omega^3 / \omega_c^3 \exp(-\omega/\omega_c),
\]

where \( \omega_c \) is a cutoff frequency and \( \eta \) is a dimensionless coupling strength. With this choice, the renormalized all-to-all interaction \([\text{11}]\) can be evaluated

\[
\tilde{\gamma}_x = \gamma_x - \eta \omega_c / \pi,
\]

such that the QPT position Eq. \([\text{1}]\) is shifted to \( \gamma_x^* \rightarrow h + 2 \omega_c / \pi \).

We emphasize again that both derived master equations Eq. \([\text{11}]\) and \([\text{22}]\) let the system evolve towards the respective thermal state

\[
\rho = \exp(-\beta H_{\text{LMG}}(h, \gamma_x)) / Z, \quad \tilde{\rho} = \exp(-\beta H_{\text{LMG}}(h, \gamma_x)) / Z,
\]

in the original and polaron frame, respectively, where \( \beta \) is the inverse temperature of the bath and \( Z \) are the respective normalization constants. The main difference however is that the BMS treatment \([\text{11}]\) leads to divergent rates.

A. Mode Occupation

The master equations appear simple only in a displaced and rotated frame. When transformed back, the steady-state populations \( \langle d^\dagger d \rangle = \text{Tr} \{ d^\dagger d \rho \} \) and \( \langle d d^\dagger \rangle = \text{Tr} \{ d d^\dagger \rho \} \) actually measure displacements around the mean-field. Fig. 2 compares the occupation number and system frequency with (solid) and without (dashed) polaron transform. Panel (a) demonstrates that the LMG energy gap is in the BMS treatment strongly modified by dissipation, such that in the vicinity of the closed QPT the non-polaron and polaron treatments lead to very different results. Panel (b) shows the fluctuations in the diagonal basis \( \langle d^\dagger d \rangle \) (\( \langle d^\dagger d \rangle \)) around the mean-field \( \alpha(h, \gamma_x) \) (or \( \alpha(h, \gamma_x) \)) in the polaron (or non-polaron) frame. Finally, panel (c) shows the mode occupation \( \langle a^\dagger a \rangle = \sinh^2(\varphi(h, \gamma_x)) + 2 \cosh^2(\varphi(h, \gamma_x)) \langle a^\dagger a \rangle \) (and analogous in the symmetry-broken phase) in the non-diagonal basis. These are directly related to the deviations of the \( J_z \)-expectation value from its mean-field solution, compare App. A. Since the frequency \( \omega(h, \gamma_x) \) (Tab. 1) vanishes at \( \gamma_x = h + \frac{1}{\omega_c} \) in the non-polaron frame, the BMS approximations break down around the original QPT position, see dashed line in Fig. 2(a). Mode occupations in both the diagonal and non-diagonal bases diverge at the QPT point, see the dashed lines in Fig. 2(b-c). In particular, in the polaron frame the fluctuation divergence occurs around the original quantum critical point at \( \gamma_x = h \), see the solid lines in Fig. 2.

B. Waiting times

The coupling to the reservoir does not only modify the system properties but may also lead to the emission or absorption of reservoir excitations (i.e., photons or phonons depending on the model implementation), which can in principle be measured independently. Classifying these events into classes \( \nu \) describing e.g. emissions or absorptions, the waiting-time distribution between two such system-bath exchange processes of type \( \mu \) after \( \nu \) is characterized by

\[
w_{\mu\nu}(\tau) = \frac{\text{Tr} (\mathcal{J}_\mu \mathcal{L}_0 \mathcal{J}_\nu \rho)}{\text{Tr} (\mathcal{J}_\nu \rho)}. \quad (26)
\]

Here \( \mathcal{J}_\mu, \mathcal{L}_0 \) are super operators describing the jump \( \mu \) and the no-jump evolution \( \mathcal{L}_0 \). For example, in master equation \([\text{11}]\), there are only two distinct types of jumps, emission ‘e’ and absorption ‘a’. Their correspond-
Let the Liouvillian be decomposable as $L = L_0 + \xi_0 + \xi_a$, we will consider the polaron frame just with the corresponding overbar on the function of $\gamma$. The same equations are valid in the polaron frame. We hope that the polaron treatment allowed us to address the vicinity of the QPT, the results from both approaches agree, therefore, we expect that the polaron-master equation remains valid also near the QPT. This shows that the choice of the starting Hamiltonian significantly affects the presence of a QPT shift, such that this issue should be discussed with care. The critical behaviour (and its possible renormalization) can be detected with system observables like mode occupations but is also visible in reservoir observables like waiting-time distributions, which remain finite in the polaron frame. We hope that our study of the LMG model paves the way for further quantitative investigations of dissipative quantum-critical systems.
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Appendix A: Thermodynamic limit of large spin operators

Without any displacement, the Holstein-Primakoff representation leads to a simple large-\(N\) expansion

\[
J_- \approx \sqrt{\alpha^* b^i}, \quad J_+ \approx \sqrt{\alpha b}, \\
J_z = \frac{N}{2} - b'^i b,
\]

where we have neglected terms that vanish in the thermodynamic limit. Insertion of these approximations lead to the Hamiltonians for the normal phase, and in effect, no term of order \(\sqrt{\alpha}\) occurs in the Hamiltonian.

In the symmetry-broken phase, one allows for a displacement \(b = a + \alpha \sqrt{\alpha}\) with bosonic operators \(a\) and in general complex number \(\alpha\). Then, the large-\(N\) expansion of the large spin operators is more complicated

\[
J_- \approx N\alpha^* \sqrt{1 - |\alpha|^2} \left[ a^i - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\alpha^*)^2 a + |\alpha|^2 a^i}{1 - |\alpha|^2} \right] \\
J_+ \approx N\alpha \sqrt{1 - |\alpha|^2} \left[ a - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\alpha^2 a^i + |\alpha|^2 a}{1 - |\alpha|^2} \right] \\
J_z = N \left( \frac{1}{2} - |\alpha|^2 \right) - \sqrt{\alpha} (\alpha^* a + a a^i) - a^i a.
\]

Appendix B: Polaron transform

Here we provide more details how to derive Eq. (14) in the main text. Using the Hadamard lemma

\[
e^{+XY}e^{-X} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!} [X,Y]_m,
\]

one can see that the polaron transform \((13)\) leads to

\[
U_p c_k U_p = c_k - J_x \frac{g_k}{\sqrt{\alpha} \nu_k},
\]

and analogous for the transformation of the creation operator. Furthermore, it is trivial to see that \(U_p J_y U_p = J_x\). From this, it directly follows that the polaron-transform of the interaction and reservoir Hamiltonian becomes

\[
U_p \left( c_k + \frac{g_k}{\sqrt{\alpha} \nu_k} J_x \right) \left( c_k + \frac{g_k}{\sqrt{\alpha} \nu_k} J_x \right) U_p = c_k c_k.
\]

In addition, the polaron transform of \(J_z\) has to be calculated, which yields via the commutation relations \([J_x,J_y] = iJ_z\) the relation

\[
U_p J_z U_p = J_z \cosh(\tilde{B}) - iJ_y \sinh(\tilde{B}),
\]

where \(\tilde{B}\) is defined in \(13\) in the main text.

Therefore, the full polaron-transformed Hamiltonian \(H_{tot}\) becomes

\[
U_p H_{tot} U_p = -hD J_z + \frac{\gamma_x}{\alpha} J_x^2 + \sum_k \nu_k b_k^i b_k \\
- h \cdot \left[ J_z \cdot \left( \cosh(\tilde{B}) - D \right) - iJ_y \sinh(\tilde{B}) \right],
\]

such that there is no rescaling of the spin-spin interaction \(\gamma_x\). We have also already inserted the temperature-dependent shift \(D\), which is necessary in order to ensure that the first order expectation values of the system-reservoir coupling operators vanish, eventually yielding Eq. (14) in the main text. For the sinh-term this is not necessary as its expectation value vanishes anyhow.

Appendix C: Waiting time distribution

Starting from the spectral decomposition of a thermal state in terms of Fock states

\[
\rho = \frac{e^{-\beta \omega d^i d}}{\text{Tr} e^{-\beta \omega d^i d}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n |n\rangle \langle n|
\]

\[
P_n = \left( \frac{n_B}{1 + n_B} \right)^n \frac{1}{1 + n_B},
\]
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with the shorthand notation $n_B = [e^{3\omega} - 1]^{-1}$, it is straightforward to compute the action of the emission or absorption jump superoperators

$$
\begin{align*}
    g_e \rho &= F_e \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P_{n+1}(n + 1) |n\rangle \langle n|,
    \\
    g_a \rho &= F_a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_{n-1}n |n\rangle \langle n|,
\end{align*}
$$

which also implies

$$
\text{Tr} \{g_e \rho\} = \text{Tr} \{g_a \rho\} = \Gamma n_B (1 + n_B),
$$

where $\Gamma = A^2(h, \gamma_x) \Gamma(\omega(h, \gamma_x))$ or $\Gamma = \tilde{A}^2(h, \gamma_x) \Gamma(\omega(h, \gamma_x))$ in the main text. Since $\mathcal{L}_0$ does not induce transitions between different Fock states, its action on a diagonal density matrix can be computed via

$$
e^{\mathcal{L}_0} |n\rangle \langle n| = e^{-(1+n_B)n+n_B(1+n)n} e^{\Gamma \tau} |n\rangle \langle n|,
$$

which implies for the relevant terms

$$
\begin{align*}
    \omega_{ee}(\tau) &= \frac{2\Gamma n_B (1 + n_B) e^{(2+3n_B)\Gamma \tau}}{\left[ (1 + n_B) e^{(1+2n_B)\Gamma \tau} - n_B \right]^3},
    \\
    \omega_{ae}(\tau) &= \frac{\Gamma n_B e^{(2+3n_B)\Gamma \tau} \left[ n_B + (1 + n_B) e^{(1+2n_B)\Gamma \tau} \right]}{\left[ (1 + n_B) e^{(1+2n_B)\Gamma \tau} - n_B \right]^3},
    \\
    \omega_{ea}(\tau) &= \frac{\Gamma (1 + n_B) e^{(1+2n_B)\Gamma \tau} \left[ n_B + (1 + n_B) e^{(1+2n_B)\Gamma \tau} \right]}{\left[ (1 + n_B) e^{(1+2n_B)\Gamma \tau} - n_B \right]^3},
    \\
    \omega_{aa}(\tau) &= \frac{2\Gamma n_B (1 + n_B) e^{(2+3n_B)\Gamma \tau}}{\left[ (1 + n_B) e^{(1+2n_B)\Gamma \tau} - n_B \right]^3}.
\end{align*}
$$

For consistency, we note that the normalization conditions $\int (\omega_{ee}(\tau) + \omega_{ec}(\tau)) \, d\tau = 1$ and $\int (\omega_{aa}(\tau) + \omega_{ea}(\tau)) \, d\tau = 1$ always hold, which simply reflects the fact that only emission or absorption processes can occur. Furthermore, in the low-temperature limit $n_B \to 0$, only the conditional waiting time distribution for emission after absorption can survive $\omega_{ea} \to \Gamma e^{-\Gamma \tau}$. Once a photon has been absorbed from the reservoir, it must be emitted again since no further absorption is likely to occur. For $\tau \gg 1$ all waiting time distributions $\tilde{w}_{\mu\nu}$ decay to zero.
