Fluctuation dynamics of an open dye microcavity photon Bose-Einstein condensate
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Bosonic gases coupled to a particle reservoir have proven to support a regime of operation where Bose-Einstein condensation coexists with unusually large particle-number fluctuations. Experimentally, this situation has been realized with two-dimensional photon gases in a dye-filled optical microcavity. Here, we investigate theoretically and experimentally the open-system dynamics of a grand canonical Bose-Einstein condensate of photons. The particle reservoir is realized by the coupling of the cavity photons to the photo-excitable dye molecules. We identify a regime with temporal oscillations between photon bunching and antibunching, even though the energy spectrum closely matches the predictions for an equilibrium Bose-Einstein distribution and the system is operated deeply in the regime of weak light-matter coupling, where Rabi oscillations do not occur. The observed temporal oscillations of the second-order coherence function \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \) are attributed to the nonlinear, weakly driven-dissipative nature of the system which leads to time-reversal symmetry breaking.

I. INTRODUCTION

Bose-Einstein condensates are the experimental basis of a variety of observed collective quantum phenomena [1, 2]. Generally, Bose-Einstein condensation is a phenomenon in thermodynamic equilibrium for Bose systems, usually described for a fixed total particle number, which leads to a macroscopic ground-state occupation. In ultracold atomic gases [3, 4] and exciton-polariton systems [5, 6], condensation has been observed following thermalization by interparticle collisions, a process that leaves the total particle number constant. Photons usually do not exhibit condensation, with the chemical potential vanishing at all temperatures in the well-known example of a (three-dimensional) blackbody radiator. Two-dimensional photon gases under harmonic confinement can, however, reach condensation, as was experimentally demonstrated in dye-filled optical microcavities [7–9]. In this system, thermalization is reached by absorption and re-emission processes on the dye molecules, which leaves the average particle number constant but allows for fluctuations around this average value. This situation is described well by the grand canonical statistical ensemble [10–13]. Lasers are long-known physical systems that also have macroscopic population of excited states, but which operate far from thermal equilibrium [14, 15]. The crossover from lasing to condensation, characterized by a varying degree of thermalization of the gas, has been investigated by observing deviations from a thermalized distribution, both in polariton and in photon gases [8, 16–20]. Particle-number conserving condensates as well as lasers are characterized by vanishing particle-number fluctuations in the thermodynamic limit, i.e., by a value of the second-order coherence function \( g^{(2)}(\tau) = 1 \) at all delay times \( \tau \).

Experimentally, evidence for Bose-Einstein condensation in the grand canonical statistical regime with unusually large statistical number fluctuations has been observed with photons in the dye microcavity system [21]. The coupling of photons to the photo-excitable dye molecules implies that the dye does not only act as a heat bath but also as a particle reservoir due to the possible interconversion of photons and dye electronic excitations. For a large relative size of the dye reservoir, this leads to strikingly enhanced statistical number fluctuations and a zero-delay second-order correlation \( g^{(2)}(0) = 2 \), i.e., the same as in a thermal source. Notably, these fluctuations, which can be as large as the average value, occur deep in the condensed phase. On the other hand, with a smaller effective relative size of the dye reservoir, the dye microcavity photon condensate can also be operated in the (usual) canonical statistical regime, with much smaller number fluctuations and a zero-delay intensity correlation \( g^{(2)}(0) = 1 \). Due to frequent collisions of solvent molecules with the dye on a timescale of \( 10^{-14} \) s [22], the dye microcavity condensate operates in the weakly coupled regime of matter and light [23, 24], i.e., the trapped particles are photons (not polaritons) and the system can be well described by a rate equation model, with, e.g., no Rabi oscillations occurring.

In the present work, we examine the temporal dynamics of a photon Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) in the strongly fluctuating regime, where a steady driven-dissipative state is induced by a balance of continuous dye pumping and cavity losses. We observe distinct tempo-
eral oscillations of the photon number correlations $g^{(2)}(\tau)$, even though the spectral photon distribution is, within experimental uncertainties, indistinguishable from predictions for thermodynamic equilibrium (Bose-Einstein distribution). Temporal oscillations of density fluctuations have been observed, e.g., in oscillatory relaxation dynamics in lasers [25] and in density fluctuations of trapped atomic BECs [26]. In a related manner, damped, oscillatory displacement dynamics have been observed in colloids suspended in liquids upon driving out of equilibrium [27], see also theoretical work proposing corresponding experiments with laser-driven quantum dots [28]. In all those systems, however, the (temporally averaged) spectrum clearly differs from the thermodynamic equilibrium distribution.

For the correlation dynamics of the photon BEC, we find quantitative agreement with a theoretical analysis in terms of nonlinear rate equations. We are thus able to trace back the origin of the correlation oscillations to the nonlinear coupling of the dye reservoir and the photon BEC, combined with time-reversal symmetry breaking in the (weakly) driven-dissipative state.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II provides some details of the experimental setup and mode of operation. In Section III we derive the rate equations for the nonequilibrium dynamics of the average numbers of photons and of dye-molecule excitations as well as for the autocorrelation functions of these quantities. In Section IV we present and discuss the experimental results, along with the comparison to the theory. We conclude in Section V with an outlook to further studies.

II. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND MODE OF OPERATION

Our experimental setup for trapping a two-dimensional photon gas in a dye-filled optical microcavity is similar to that described in earlier work [7, 29], as shown in Fig. 1. The cavity is composed of two highly reflecting mirrors (reflectivity > 99.998%) of 1 m curvature radius spaced by $\approx 2 \mu m$ distance and is filled with rhodamine dye dissolved in ethylene glycol (1 mmol/L). Due to the small mirror spacing, the cavity has a longitudinal mode spacing comparable to the emission width of the dye. In this regime, we observe that only photons of a fixed longitudinal mode number $q$ populate the cavity, with $q = 7$ in our setup. This imposes an upper limit on the optical wavelength and a restriction of energies to a minimum cutoff of $h\nu_c \approx 2.1 eV$ for photons in the cavity, where $\nu_c$ is the cutoff frequency of the cavity with transverse momentum $k = 0$. The optical dispersion becomes quadratic and the mirror curvature induces a trapping potential for the photons (see Fig. 1). One can show that the system is formally equivalent to a harmonically trapped two-dimensional gas of massive particles for which – other than for (three-dimensional) blackbody radiation – Bose-Einstein condensation is possible for a thermalized ensemble [7]. To initially populate the cavity and compensate for losses from, e.g., mirror transmission, the dye is pumped to a stationary state with an external laser beam.

To record the statistics as well as the number correlations of the photon condensate, the microcavity emission is directed through an optical telescope and a mode filter consisting of a 10.6 mm diameter iris to separate the condensate mode from the higher-mode (thermal cloud) photons. The transmitted radiation is sent through a polarizer to remove the polarization degeneracy and then imaged onto a fast (5 GHz bandwidth) photomultiplier. The electronic output signal of the photomultiplier is analyzed employing a 3.5 GHz bandwidth oscilloscope. To suppress the influence of electronic noise of the high-bandwidth electronic analysis system (which is mainly attributed to the oscilloscope’s analog-digital converters), the photomultiplier output is simultaneously recorded by two oscilloscope channels, with the cross-correlation used for further data analysis of the fluctuations. Calibration of the photomultiplier signal is performed via the measured spectra, which relate the photon number in the condensate peak to the known photon number in the thermal photon cloud of $N_e = \pi^2 / 3 (k_B T / h\Omega)^2 = 80660$ for the used experimental parameters ($T = 300 K$, trap frequency $\Omega = 2\pi \cdot 40 GHz$).

Since the dephasing time $\tau_\phi$ of dye excitations (given by the collision time of solvent molecules with the dye on a scale of $10^{-14} s$ [23, 24]), is much shorter than the photon lifetime in the cavity ($\tau_p \approx 0.5 ns$, determined by cavity losses), $\tau_\phi \ll \tau_p$, coherence between dye excitations and photons cannot be established, see also Section III. That is, our experiment operates in the weakly coupled regime of matter and light, and the trapped particles are photons, not polaritons. The photon lifetime, in turn, is much shorter than the nonradiative decay time...
III. THEORETICAL DESCRIPTION

A. Model and master equation

The thermalization dynamics of the dye-filled microcavity has been studied [19, 31, 32] employing a Frank-Condon model for the dye molecules: The two-level system of the electronic ground and excited states, between which the optical transitions occur, is coupled to a molecular vibrational degree of freedom (phonon) because the rest position of the ionic molecular oscillator depends on whether the molecule is in its electronic ground or excited state. The total number of dye molecules is \( M = M_\uparrow + M_\downarrow \), where \( M_\uparrow \) and \( M_\downarrow \) are the number of molecules in the electronically excited or ground state, respectively. The Hamiltonian for the dye-filled microcavity reads thus [33]

\[
H = \sum_k \omega_k a_k^\dagger a_k + \sum_{m=1}^M \left[ \frac{\delta}{2} \sigma_m^z + \Omega b_m^\dagger b_m \right] + \Omega \sqrt{S} \sigma_m^x (b_m + b_m^\dagger) + g \sum_k \left( a_k \sigma_m^+ + a_k^\dagger \sigma_m^- \right),
\]

in units such that \( \hbar = 1 \). The cavity-photon modes with transverse dispersion \( \omega_k \) are represented by the bosonic operators \( a_k, a_k^\dagger \), the vibronic states of dye molecule \( m \) with oscillator frequency \( \Omega \) by \( b_m, b_m^\dagger \), and the electronic two-level system of molecule \( m \) by the Pauli matrix \( \sigma_m^x, \sigma_m^y, \sigma_m^z \) and and raising/lowering operators \( \sigma_m^+, \sigma_m^- \), with the electronic transition frequency \( \delta \). The Frank-Condon electron-phonon coupling is parametrized by \( S \), where the phonon position operator is \( \hat{x} \sim (b_m + b_m^\dagger) \). The last term in Eq. (1) describes photon emission or absorption with the optical transition matrix element \( g \), the smallest energy scale in the system. Since we consider photon gases which have already reached a stationary, thermal distribution, and since in the experiment the transverse cavity ground-state mode (condensate mode) is singled out, the analysis may be restricted to the photon correlations in the condensate, i.e., we will collapse the sum over cavity modes in Eq. (1) to \( k = 0 \), where \( \omega_0 \equiv \omega_\text{c} \) is the cavity-cutoff frequency (see also Fig. 1). The cutoff is chosen such that the cavity detuning is \( \Delta = \omega_0 - \delta < 0 \). From here on, we will drop the cavity-mode subscript on the photon operators and write \( a \equiv a_0 \).

The molecular part of the Hamiltonian can be diagonalized by a polaron transformation [33]. This leads to an effective, nonlinear electron-phonon coupling, mediated by the phonon excitations of the dye. Due to fast collisions of the dye molecules with solvent molecules, the phonon excitations may be considered to be in thermal equilibrium at ambient temperature. After treating the phonon excitations as a Markovian thermal bath, this coupling can be parametrized by a coherent part \( g_\text{r} \) [34], and incoherent, phonon-assisted couplings \( B_\text{abs} \) for photon absorption and \( B_\text{em} \) for photon emission (see Fig. 1).
For the density matrix $\rho$, one obtains in this way the master equation

$$\dot{\rho} = i[\rho, H_0] + \kappa \mathcal{L}[a] \rho + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \mathcal{L}_m \rho,$$  

(2)

where $H_0 = \Delta a^\dagger a + \sum_{m=1}^{M} g_\beta (a^\dagger \sigma_m^- + a \sigma_m^+)$ is the Hamiltonian generating the coherent part of the evolution in the rotated frame. The parameter $\kappa$ in Eq. (2) describes the cavity loss to the environment, where the Lindblad operator acting on the density matrix $\rho$ is defined as $\mathcal{L}[X] \rho = \frac{1}{2} \{ [X \rho, X^\dagger] + [X, \rho X^\dagger] \}$. The molecule-induced superoperator $\mathcal{L}_m$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_m = \Gamma_\uparrow \mathcal{L}[\sigma_m^+] + \Gamma_\downarrow \mathcal{L}[\sigma_m^-] + B_{\text{abs}} \mathcal{L}[a \sigma_m^+] + B_{\text{em}} \mathcal{L}[a^\dagger \sigma_m^-].$$  

(3)

The four terms in $\mathcal{L}_m$ describe, in order of appearance, pumping by an external laser source ($\Gamma_\uparrow$), nonradiative decay of dye excitations ($\Gamma_\downarrow \ll \Gamma_\uparrow$), and photon absorption ($B_{\text{abs}}$) and emission ($B_{\text{em}}$) by the dye molecules, respectively.

Since the experiment operates in the regime $g_\beta/g \ll 1$ [34], and the detuning is very large compared to the renormalized coherent coupling, $|\Delta| \gg g_\beta$, the cavity mode effectively couples to the molecules only incoherently via the Lindblad terms proportional to $B_{\text{abs}}$ or $B_{\text{em}}$. Therefore, the contribution of $H_0$ to the master equation (2) can be neglected for the present setup [19]. In addition, one should note that $B_{\text{em}} > B_{\text{abs}}$ because of the red detuning of the cavity cutoff $\omega_c$ with respect to the electronic dye excitation energy $\delta$.

B. Average particle numbers

The coupled rate equations for the average photon number $\langle n \rangle$ and the number of dye molecules in excited states $\langle M_\uparrow \rangle$ can now be derived from the master equation, where $\langle \cdot \rangle = \text{Tr}[\rho(t)]$ denotes the thermal and quantum mechanical average. Inserting $\dot{\rho}$ from Eqs. (2) and (3), using cyclic permutation under the trace, and $\sigma_m^+ \sigma_m^- = (1 + \sigma_m^z)/2$, leads to operator products of $M_\uparrow = \sum_m (1 + \sigma_m^z)/2$ and $n = a^\dagger a$. Again because of the fast dye-solvent collisions, coherent propagation of excitations of different dye molecules ($m' \neq m$) is negligible. This means that the sum over a large number of molecules amounts to an average, $\langle M_\uparrow \rangle = \sum_m (1 + \langle \sigma_m^z \rangle)/2 = M (1 + \langle \sigma_m^z \rangle)/2$, and expectation values of higher-order operator products factorize, $\langle n M_\uparrow \rangle \approx \langle n \rangle \langle M_\uparrow \rangle$. In this way, one obtains the nonlinear, coupled rate equations

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle n \rangle = - \kappa \langle n \rangle - B_{\text{abs}} \langle M_\downarrow \rangle \langle M_\uparrow \rangle + B_{\text{em}} (\langle n \rangle + 1) \langle M_\uparrow \rangle,$$

(4a)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle M_\uparrow \rangle = \Gamma_\uparrow \langle M_\uparrow \rangle - \Gamma_\downarrow \langle M_\downarrow \rangle + B_{\text{abs}} (\langle M_\downarrow \rangle - \langle M_\uparrow \rangle) + B_{\text{em}} (\langle n \rangle + 1) - B_{\text{em}} (\langle n \rangle + 1) \langle M_\uparrow \rangle.$$

(4b)

These agree, in fact, with the semiclassical rate equations expected phenomenologically from pumping and nonradiative decay of molecule excitations as well as stimulated and spontaneous photon emission into the cavity. Alternatively, one may solve the untruncated rate equations for $\langle n \rangle$ and $\langle M_\uparrow \rangle$ together with three equations for the second moments [31]. This is discussed in detail in the Appendix. For large $M$, both solution methods give the same results for $\langle n \rangle$ and $\langle M_\uparrow \rangle$ in the long-time limit.

To calculate the steady-state second-order photon correlations in the next section, it will be necessary to have the average numbers of photons and excited molecules in the steady state which is reached in the long-time limit, $\langle n \rangle_\infty$ and $\langle M_\uparrow \rangle_\infty$. This amounts to setting the time derivatives in Eqs. (4) to zero, and one obtains for large molecule number $M \gg 1$,

$$\langle n \rangle_\infty = \frac{M (B_{\text{em}} \Gamma_\uparrow - B_{\text{abs}} \Gamma_\downarrow)}{\kappa (B_{\text{em}} + B_{\text{abs}})} + O(1),$$

(5)

$$\langle M_\uparrow \rangle_\infty = \frac{MB_{\text{abs}} + \kappa}{B_{\text{abs}} + B_{\text{em}}} + O(1/M).$$

(6)

In our experiments, the pump rate strongly exceeds the nonradiative decay, $\Gamma_\uparrow \gg \Gamma_\downarrow$, and $B_{\text{em}} + B_{\text{abs}} \approx B_{\text{em}}$. The ratio of emission and absorption is given by $B_{\text{em}}/B_{\text{abs}} = \exp(-\hbar \Delta/k_B T)$, where $T$ is the phonon temperature (Kennard-Stepanov relation). With these simplifications, the steady-state photon number becomes approximately

$$\langle n \rangle_\infty \approx \frac{M \Gamma_\uparrow}{\kappa}. $$

(7)

This expression is useful for converting $\langle n \rangle_\infty$, which is measured in the experiments, into the pump parameter $\Gamma_\uparrow$ of the theoretical model and vice versa. When comparing to experimental data, however, a full numerical solution for the steady state of Eqs. (4) and (20) is used.

C. Second-order correlation function

The time-dependent photon density-density or second-order correlation function measured in the experiment is defined as

$$g^{(2)}(\tau) = \frac{\langle n(t + \tau) n(t) \rangle}{\langle n(t) \rangle^2} \bigg|_{t \to \infty} = \frac{\text{Tr} \left[ a^\dagger a e^{i \hat{\mathcal{L}}_m} \rho_\infty \right]}{\text{Tr} \left[ a^\dagger a \rho_\infty \right]^2},$$

(8)
where $\hat{L}$ is the total Liouvillian superoperator belonging to the master equation (2), $\rho_{\infty} = \lim_{t \to \infty} \rho(t)$ denotes the steady-state density matrix, and we define $\tilde{\rho}_{\infty} := a^\dagger a \rho_{\infty}$. Note in passing that, for the normal-ordered second-order correlation function, one would need to set $\tilde{\rho}_{\infty} = a^\dagger a \rho_{\infty}$. Defining also an effective average $X := \text{Tr} \hat{X} e^{\tau \hat{L}} \tilde{\rho}$, one has $g^{(2)}(\tau) = \pi/(\langle n \rangle^{2}_{\infty})$. Formally, $\pi$ and $\tilde{M}$ obey almost the same definitions as $\langle n \rangle$ and $\langle M \rangle$, however with $\rho(t)$ replaced by $e^{\tau \hat{L}} \tilde{\rho}$ and $\text{Tr} \tilde{\rho} = \langle n \rangle_{\infty}$. Thus, one finds equations of motion analogous to Eqs. (4a) and (4b),

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \pi = -\kappa \pi - B_{\text{abs}} (M - \tilde{M}) \langle n \rangle_{\infty}$$

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \tilde{M} = \Gamma_{\uparrow} (\langle n \rangle_{\infty} M - \tilde{M}) - \Gamma_{\downarrow} \tilde{M}$$

The averages of the higher-order operator products $\tilde{n}\tilde{M}$ are truncated under the same conditions as discussed in the previous section ($M \gg 1$, incoherent propagation of excitations of different molecules). This amounts to letting $\tilde{n}\tilde{M} = \langle n \rangle_{\infty} M + \langle n \rangle_{\infty} \langle M \rangle_{\infty} + \langle M \rangle_{\infty} \pi - 2\langle n \rangle^{2}_{\infty} \langle M \rangle_{\infty}$. By computing the steady-state density matrix numerically exactly for different molecule numbers of order $M \sim 10^{2}$, we have checked that this relation is fulfilled quite well already for intermediate system sizes. In terms of the deviations of the second-order correlation functions from their relaxed values (attained for $\tau \to \infty$),

$$g = \frac{\Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M}}{\Delta g^{(2)}_{\infty,M_{\infty}}} = \left( \frac{\pi - \langle n \rangle^{2}_{\infty}}{\tilde{M} - \langle n \rangle_{\infty} \langle M \rangle_{\infty}} \right),$$

Eqs. (9) then become

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M} = \langle n \rangle_{\infty} \left[ -\kappa \langle n \rangle_{\infty} - B_{\text{abs}} (M - \langle M \rangle_{\infty}) \langle n \rangle_{\infty} \right.$$  

$$+ B_{\text{em}} (\langle n \rangle_{\infty} + 1) \langle M \rangle_{\infty} - \kappa \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M}$$

$$- B_{\text{abs}} \left( M - \langle M \rangle_{\infty} \right) \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M} + B_{\text{em}} \left( \langle n \rangle_{\infty} + 1 \right) \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M} + \langle M \rangle_{\infty} \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M} \right],$$

(11a)

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M_{\infty}} = \langle n \rangle_{\infty} \left[ \Gamma_{\uparrow} \left( M - \langle M \rangle_{\infty} \right) - \Gamma_{\downarrow} \langle M \rangle_{\infty} \right.$$  

$$+ B_{\text{abs}} \left( M - \langle M \rangle_{\infty} \right) \langle n \rangle_{\infty}$$

$$- B_{\text{em}} (\langle n \rangle_{\infty} + 1) \langle M \rangle_{\infty} - \Gamma_{\uparrow} + \Gamma_{\downarrow} \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M_{\infty}}$$

$$+ B_{\text{abs}} \left( M - \langle M \rangle_{\infty} \right) \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M_{\infty}} - \langle n \rangle_{\infty} \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M_{\infty}}$$

$$- B_{\text{em}} \left( \langle n \rangle_{\infty} + 1 \right) \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M_{\infty}} + \langle M \rangle_{\infty} \Delta g^{(2)}_{n,M_{\infty}} \right].$$

(11b)

Using the steady-state solution of Eqs. (4), one eventually finds a system of two coupled linear equations

$$\partial_{\tau} \mathbf{g} = \left( \begin{array}{c}
-\kappa - \tilde{\Gamma}_{M} \\
\tilde{\Gamma}_{M} - (\Gamma_{\uparrow} + \Gamma_{\downarrow}) - \tilde{\Gamma}_{n}
\end{array} \right) \mathbf{g}.$$  

(12)

The matrix elements are given by

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{M} = B_{\text{abs}} (M - \langle M \rangle_{\infty}) - B_{\text{em}} \langle M \rangle_{\infty},$$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{n} = B_{\text{abs}} \langle n \rangle_{\infty} + B_{\text{em}} (\langle n \rangle_{\infty} + 1).$$

(13)

The coupling constant $\tilde{\Gamma}_{M}$ is composed of an absorption term proportional to the number of ground-state molecules in the steady state $(M - \langle M \rangle_{\infty})$, and a corresponding emission term with the number of excited molecules. The coupling constant $\tilde{\Gamma}_{n}$ is given by an absorption term, and the terms corresponding to stimulated and spontaneous emission.

The result of Eq. (12) is equivalent to what one would obtain from linearizing Eqs. (4) around the steady state and then applying the regression theorem.

Figure 3: Typical results for the time dependence of the second-order correlation function for two different photon numbers in the condensate, as indicated. The solid lines are plots of the model function, Eq. (14), with parameters obtained from fitting the theoretical results for $\lambda$ to the data in Fig. 4. The $g^{(2)}(0)$ values of the model function are then scaled to compensate for the imperfect mode filtering, where photons from $\approx 5$ higher modes of the thermal cloud reaching the photomultiplier resulted in a drop of the correlations.
IV. RESULTS

The matrix in Eq. (12) is non-Hermitian because of time-reversal symmetry breaking in the driven-dissipative system. As a result, its eigenvalues are found to be complex, $\lambda = \lambda' \pm i \lambda''$, where $\lambda', \lambda'' \in \mathbb{R}$. For the deviation of the second-order correlation from its long-time limit, $\Delta g_n^{(2)}(\tau) = \langle n \rangle_\infty^2 (g^{(2)}(\tau) - 1)$, one hence finds a solution of the form

$$\Delta g_n^{(2)}(\tau) = e^{\lambda' \tau} [c_1 \cos(\lambda'' \tau) + c_2 \sin(\lambda'' \tau)], \quad (14)$$

with the real part $\lambda' < 0$. The initial values for the dynamics of the second-order correlation functions are found from the steady-state solutions for the second moments, $\langle n^2 \rangle_\infty$ and $\langle n M_1 \rangle_\infty$. Typical experimental data for the temporal variation of the second-order coherence function are given in Fig. 3 for average photon numbers $\langle n \rangle_\infty \approx 4620$ and $\langle n \rangle_\infty \approx 17100$, respectively, showing damped, oscillatory behavior, as expected from the theoretical analysis.

The experimental values of the second-order coherence time $\tau_c = 1/|\lambda'|$ and the oscillation frequency $\omega^{(2)} = \lambda''$ of the $g^{(2)}$ correlations are determined by fitting the theoretical model function Eq. (14) to the data shown in Fig. 3. In this way, we have recorded the variation of the oscillation frequency $\omega^{(2)}$ upon the change of the average photon number $\langle n \rangle_\infty$, as shown in Fig. 4 (dots). We observe an increase of the oscillation frequency of the second-order coherence function with the average photon number. The solid line in Fig. 4 is obtained using a fit of the theoretical eigenvalues $\lambda', \lambda''$ of Eq. (12) to the experimental data, where the model parameters $\kappa$, $\Gamma_1$, and $B_{em}$ were used as fit parameters, and the nonradiative decay rate $\Gamma_1$ was set to zero. The experimental data are fitted to good precision for all different $\langle n \rangle_\infty$ by three parameters which are consistent with experimentally estimated values. We interpret this (as well as the comparison shown in Fig. 3) as evidence that the origin of the $g^{(2)}$ oscillations can be traced back to the effects incorporated in our rate equation model, namely time-reversal symmetry breaking due to nonequilibrium pumping and dissipation, and the coupling between the subsystems of dye-molecule excitations and cavity photons. Note that Rabi oscillations between the photon and the dye subsystems do not occur because of the strongly incoherent dynamics of the dye excitations [22]. Remarkably, despite the clear nonequilibrium signatures in $g^{(2)}(\tau)$, a near-equilibrium spectral distribution is attained (see Fig. 2), presumably due to the thermalization time being faster than the oscillation period. We note that analogous behavior can be observed in the hot-electron regime of electronic quantum wires at large bias voltage, where nonequilibrium current noise, albeit not oscillatory, coexists with a thermal Fermi distribution, attained by electron-electron interactions [35].

Figure 4: Oscillation frequency $\omega^{(2)}$ of the second order correlation function $g^{(2)}(\tau)$ as a function of the average photon number $\langle n \rangle_\infty$ in the condensate, as measured in the experiment (dots) and predicted by a nonlinear rate equation model (solid line). See text for details. The parameter values are $M = 5.17 \cdot 10^9$, $\kappa = 2.33$ GHz, $B_{em} = 2.50 \cdot 10^{-2}$ GHz, $B_{em}/B_{abs} \approx 57$ (Kennard-Stepanov relation), $\Gamma_1 = 0$.

V. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, we observed an oscillatory behavior of grand canonical Bose-Einstein condensates by studying the second-order coherence of the emission of a dye microcavity. Its origin is traced back to the remnant driven-dissipative character of the light condensate. Our results show that even when the energy distribution of particles to good accuracy follows the predictions for thermal equilibrium, fluctuation dynamics depend sensitively on the openness of the system. The experimental results are in good agreement with our theoretical model. Our findings open up new avenues for further investigations of the open-system dynamics of grand canonical photon condensates. In the future, the experiments may be extended to further study the regime with stronger dissipation and drive. In addition, the second-order correlations can be used as a tool to sensitively characterize the system parameters. In a lattice with several coupled grand canonical photon condensates, a variety of new dynamical phases may be expected.
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APPENDIX: TRUNCATION OF HIERARCHY

In this Appendix, we present details on the hierarchy of the equations of motion for the expectation values of successively increasing order. These will be calculated from the master equation \[19\]

\[
\dot{\rho} = \frac{\kappa}{2} \mathcal{L}[a] \rho + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \left\{ \Gamma_{1} \mathcal{L}[\sigma_{m}^{+}] + \Gamma_{1} \mathcal{L}[\sigma_{m}^{-}] + B_{\text{em}} \mathcal{L}[a \sigma_{m}^{\dagger}] \right\} \rho.
\]

(15)

Assuming that the molecules are all identical, one can replace the sum over the \(M\) molecules in the equation for the photon occupation \(\langle a^\dagger a \rangle\) by a factor of \(M\) and find

\[
\partial_{t} \langle a^\dagger a \rangle = -\kappa \langle a^\dagger a \rangle - \frac{M}{2} B_{\text{abs}} \langle a^\dagger a (1 - \sigma^{z}) \rangle
\]

\[
+ \frac{M}{2} B_{\text{em}} \langle aa^\dagger (1 + \sigma^{z}) \rangle,
\]

\[
\partial_{t} \langle \sigma^{+} \rangle = \Gamma_{1} (1 - \langle \sigma^{z} \rangle) - \Gamma_{1} (1 + \langle \sigma^{z} \rangle)
\]

\[
+ B_{\text{abs}} \langle a^\dagger a (1 - \sigma^{z}) \rangle - B_{\text{em}} \langle aa^\dagger (1 + \sigma^{z}) \rangle,
\]

(16a)

(16b)

where we have dropped the molecule index \(m\). Multiplying Eq. (16b) by \(M/2\) and using \(M \partial_{t} \langle \sigma^{+} \rangle /2 = \partial_{t} \langle M_{t} \rangle\), \(\langle \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle = (1 + \sigma^{z})/2 = \langle m \rangle /M\), \(\langle \sigma^{-} \sigma^{+} \rangle = (1 - \sigma^{z})/2 = \langle M - m \rangle /M\), and \(\langle n_{M_{t}} \rangle \approx \langle n \rangle \langle M_{t} \rangle\), we arrive at Eqs. (4).

Accordingly, the equations of motion of the next-order expectation values in Eqs. (16) are given by

\[
\partial_{t} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \rangle = -2\kappa \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \rangle - 2MB_{\text{abs}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{z} \sigma^{+} \rangle + 2MB_{\text{em}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{z} \sigma^{-} \rangle + 2\langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle,
\]

\[
\partial_{t} \langle a^\dagger a \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle = -\kappa \langle a^\dagger a \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle + \Gamma_{1} \langle a^\dagger a \sigma^{+} \sigma^{+} \rangle - \Gamma_{1} \langle a^\dagger a \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle
\]

\[
+ B_{\text{abs}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{z} \sigma^{+} \rangle + B_{\text{abs}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle + 2\langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle
\]

\[
- (M - 1)B_{\text{em}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{z} \sigma^{+} \rangle - (M - 1)B_{\text{em}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{+} \sigma^{+} \rangle - (M - 1)B_{\text{em}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{+} \sigma^{+} \rangle - (M - 1)B_{\text{em}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{+} \sigma^{+} \rangle,
\]

\[
\partial_{t} \langle \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle = \Gamma_{1} (\langle \sigma^{+} \sigma^{+} \rangle + \langle \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle) - 2\Gamma_{1} \langle \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle
\]

\[
+ B_{\text{abs}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle + B_{\text{abs}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle - 2B_{\text{em}} \langle a^\dagger a^\dagger aa \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle.
\]

(17a)

(17b)

(17c)

The Pauli matrices \(\sigma^{\pm}\) describe any molecule that is not identical to \(\sigma^{\pm}\). Under the assumption that the total density matrix of the molecules is an incoherent mixture of all states corresponding to an excitation number of \(M_{t}\) \[31\], which will be the case for the steady-state density matrix of the master equation (15), one can show that the expectation values of four Pauli matrices decompose as

\[
M(M - 1) \langle \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle = \langle M_{t}^{2} \rangle - \langle M_{t} \rangle,
\]

\[
M(M - 1) \langle \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle = \langle M_{t}^{2} \rangle - \langle M_{t} \rangle.
\]

(18)

Then the truncation of Eqs. (17) can be performed rigorously by expanding the highest-order expectation values according to

\[
M(M - 1) \langle aa^\dagger \sigma^{+} \sigma^{-} \rangle
\]

\[
= \langle (n + 1)(M_{t}^{2} - M_{t}) \rangle
\]

\[
= \langle nM_{t}^{2} \rangle - \langle nM_{t} \rangle + \langle M_{t}^{2} \rangle - \langle M_{t} \rangle,
\]

and using the relation

\[
\langle nM_{t}^{2} \rangle = 2\langle M_{t} \rangle \langle nM_{t} \rangle + \langle n \rangle \langle M_{t}^{2} \rangle - 2\langle n \rangle \langle M_{t} \rangle^{2}.
\]

(19)
In this context, after multiplying Eq. (17b) by a factor of $M$ and Eq. (17c) by $M(M - 1)$, one obtains [31]

$$\partial_t \langle n^2 \rangle = \partial_t \langle a^\dagger a a^\dagger a \rangle + \partial_t \langle a^\dagger a \rangle$$

$$= \kappa(n - 2\langle n \rangle) - B_{abs} [2\langle n^2 \rangle (M - \langle M_{t} \rangle) + 4\langle M_{t} \rangle \langle n^2 \rangle - 4\langle n \rangle \langle n M_{t} \rangle - \langle n(M - M_{t}) \rangle]$$

$$+ B_{em} [4\langle n \rangle \langle n M_{t} \rangle + 2\langle M_{t} \rangle \langle n^2 \rangle - 4\langle M_{t} \rangle \langle n^2 \rangle + \langle 3n + 1 \rangle \langle M_{t} \rangle],$$

(20a)

$$\partial_t \langle n M_{t} \rangle = M \partial_t \langle a^\dagger a \sigma^\dagger \sigma^- \rangle$$

$$= -\kappa \langle n M_{t} \rangle + \Gamma_n \langle (n - M_{t}) \rangle - \Gamma_{M_{t}} \langle n M_{t} \rangle$$

$$+ B_{abs} [2\langle M_{t} \rangle \langle n \rangle \langle n(M - M_{t}) \rangle - M(n + \langle n M_{t} \rangle) + \langle n \rangle \langle M_{t} \rangle^2 + 2\langle M_{t} \rangle - \langle n \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle n M_{t} \rangle + (M - \langle M_{t} \rangle) \langle n^2 \rangle]$$

$$+ B_{em} [2\langle M_{t} \rangle \langle n \rangle \langle n(M - M_{t}) \rangle - \langle M_{t} \rangle + \langle n + 1 \rangle \langle M_{t} \rangle^2 + 2\langle M_{t} \rangle - \langle n + 1 \rangle \langle M_{t} \rangle \rangle \langle n M_{t} \rangle - \langle n \rangle \langle n M_{t} \rangle \rangle. (20b)$$

$$\partial_t \langle M_{t}^2 \rangle = M(M - 1) \partial_t \langle \sigma^+ \sigma^- \sigma + 1 \rangle + \partial_t \langle M_{t} \rangle$$

$$= 2\Gamma_n (M \langle M_{t} \rangle + M - \langle M_{t} \rangle - \langle M_{t} \rangle^2) + \Gamma_{M_{t}} \langle \langle M_{t} \rangle - 2\langle M_{t} \rangle \rangle$$

$$+ B_{abs} [2\langle M_{t} \rangle - (M - 1) \langle n M_{t} \rangle + M \langle n \rangle - 4\langle M_{t} \rangle \langle n M_{t} \rangle] - 2\langle n \rangle \langle \langle M_{t} \rangle + 4\langle n \rangle \langle M_{t} \rangle \rangle$$

$$- B_{em} [4\langle M_{t} \rangle \langle n M_{t} \rangle + 2\langle n \rangle \langle M_{t} \rangle^2 - 4\langle n \rangle \langle M_{t} \rangle \rangle^2 + 2\langle M_{t} \rangle - \langle n + 1 \rangle \langle M_{t} \rangle \rangle.$$  

(20c)

As mentioned in the main text, the steady-state solution of these equations is required for the initial values of the dynamics of the second-order correlation functions.