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We present a peculiar dynamical transition triggered by infinitesimal dissipation in the interpolating Dicke-Tavis-Cummings model. The model describes a ubiquitous light-matter setting using a collection of two-level systems interacting with quantum light trapped in an optical cavity. Harnessing Keldysh’s action formalism to compute the response function of the light, we show that the dissipation-induced transition occurs solely in the dynamical fluctuations atop an empty cavity, through stabilization of an excited state of the closed system. Consequently, we reveal that fluctuations flip from being particle-like to hole-like across this transition. This inversion is also accompanied by the behaviour of the Liouvillian eigenvalues akin to exceptional points. Our work forges the way to discovering dynamical transitions in a wide variety of driven dissipative systems and is highly pertinent for current experiments.

Driven-dissipative many-body systems provide a rich arena to explore many-body out-of-equilibrium phases of matter [3]. Within this realm, light-matter systems are prototypical representatives, as they are unavoidably coupled to a bath and in general also subject to external drives [2][10]. Light-matter systems additionally offer a high-degree of experimental control, thus, enabling tunable realizations of complex configurations, and the concomitant observation of exotic phenomena, e.g., polariton condensates [11], superradiant lasing [12][14], supersolid formation [15][16], and light-induced superconductivity [17].

Dissipation channels play a crucial role in dictating the behavior of light-matter systems. Most commonly, they act as a sink to the energy provided by the various drives, and stabilize the system’s dynamics. Interestingly, dissipation can also give rise to new dissipative phase-transitions [1][19][23], complex dynamics [24][25], the emergence of new universality classes [26][28], topological effects [29], and non-Hermitian phases governed by exceptional points (EPs) [30][31]. Crucial to this Letter, is the exploration of dissipation as a tool to generate new dynamical phases inaccessible in closed systems.

The open interpolating Dicke-Tavis-Cummings (IDTC) model is a paradigmatic driven-dissipative model that provides an ideal example of the dramatic impact of dissipation on many-body phenomena [1][32]. It effectively simulates the physics of a variety of light-matter models [33][34], and encapsulates in its phase diagram normal phases (NPs), Z_2 and U(1) symmetry-breaking superradiant phases (SPs), and transitions between them with multicritical points. In a recent work [1], we have shown that dissipation profoundly alters the phase diagram of this model. Specifically, it stabilizes and extends the NP into a new parameter regime, as well as leads to coexistence of phases. Despite the completely different setting in the new region, no static phase transition links the original NP and the dissipation-generated NP.

In this work, we show that a new kind of dynamical transition, where dynamical correlation functions act as order parameters, distinguishes between the two phases. We analyze this open system physics using a combination of analytical methods, including Keldysh action formalism [30][35], normal mode symplectic structures [2][39][40] as well as third quantization [12][13]. We identify the new dissipation-stabilized NP as an excited state (dubbed e-NP) in the corresponding closed system. The e-NP exhibits a negative frequency instability [44] that manifests as an inversion in the soft-mode fluctuations, i.e., the original NP exhibits standard fluctuations corresponding to paired frequencies (arrows indicate unresolved small peaks). In the NP, positive (negative) frequencies correspond to positive (negative) peaks. In the e-NP, the low frequency peaks correspond to positive (negative) frequencies. The non-Lorentzian shape of the peaks and the dissipation-induced transition occurs solely in the dynamical fluctuations atop an empty cavity, through stabilization of an excited state of the closed system. Consequently, we reveal that fluctuations flip from being particle-like to hole-like across this transition. This inversion is also accompanied by the behaviour of the Liouvillian eigenvalues akin to exceptional points. Our work forges the way to discovering dynamical transitions in a wide variety of driven dissipative systems and is highly pertinent for current experiments.
whereas the inversion makes the e-NP exhibit what appears to be hole-like fluctuations in a bosonic system. In the open system, the dissipation incoherently drives a population inversion in the system, thus stabilizing the e-NP. As the e-NP corresponds to an empty cavity, this scenario resembles dark lasing, i.e., the system absorbs photons in order to decay to the superradiant ground state. Furthermore, using third quantization [43], we show that this many-body dynamical behavior is reminiscent of the physics of exceptional points. Our results can explain the dynamics of a variety of driven-dissipative systems [6, 7, 10, 19].

**Model** — We consider a leaky bosonic cavity mode coupled to $N$ two-level systems [1, 33], described by the master equation $\frac{d \rho_{\text{sys}}}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H(t), \rho_{\text{sys}}] + \mathcal{L}[\rho_{\text{sys}}]$, where

$$H = \hbar \omega_c a^\dagger a + \hbar \omega_S S_z + \frac{2 \hbar \lambda_x}{\sqrt{N}} S_x (a + a^\dagger) + \frac{2 \hbar \lambda_y}{\sqrt{N}} i S_y (a - a^\dagger),$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

is the Hamiltonian of the interpolating Dicke-Tavis-Cummings (IDTC) model with $\omega_c$ and $a^\dagger$ the cavity’s frequency and creation operator; $\omega_S$ and $S_\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sigma_\alpha^j$ the two-level spacing and collective spin operators describing $N$ identical two-level systems, where $\alpha = x, y, z$ and $\sigma_\alpha^j$ are Pauli-spin operators. The collective spin couples to both quadratures of the cavity field with couplings $\lambda_x$ and $\lambda_y$, allowing for the interpolation between the Dicke ($\lambda_x \neq \lambda_y$) [45] and Tavis-Cummings ($\lambda_x = \lambda_y$) [46] models. In both models, above the critical coupling $\lambda_c = (\sqrt{\omega_c} \omega_S)/2$, the system transitions from a normal phase (NP), where the cavity is empty and all two-level spins are oriented along the $z$-axis, to a superradiant phase (SP), where the cavity features a finite mean population and the two-level spins acquire a finite mean magnetization along the $x$ and/or $y$ axes. The transition involves both a $Z_2$ and a $U(1)$ symmetry breaking in the Dicke and Tavis-Cummings cases, respectively.

The Lindblad dissipator $\mathcal{L}[\rho] = \kappa [2 \alpha \rho_{\text{sys}} a^\dagger - \{a^\dagger a, \rho_{\text{sys}}\}]$ describes photon loss with rate $\kappa$. The closed system [1] phase diagram is profoundly altered by dissipation, cf., the steady-state mean-field phase diagram of the open system in Fig. 1(a) with that of the closed system in Refs. [1, 33]. While the Dicke-like $Z_2$ symmetry-breaking transitions survive, the $U(1)$ symmetry breaking along the diagonal Tavis-Cummings line vanishes; instead a NP appears as the steady-state above criticality including regions of co-stability with SP states and tricriticality [1]. We denote the latter normal phase, excited-NP or e-NP, as it is an excited state of the closed system.

The stability of these phases to quantum fluctuations can be studied by employing Holstein-Primakoff’s representation for the spins, $S_+ = b^\dagger \sqrt{N} - b^\dagger b$ and $S_- = -\frac{N}{2} + b^\dagger b$, and expanding around the respective mean-field solutions, $a = \alpha \sqrt{N} + c$ and $b = \beta \sqrt{N} + d$, where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are complex numbers describing the bosonic coherent states [47, 48]. This leads to a typical fluctuation Hamiltonian describing two coupled bosonic fluctuation modes of the form:

$$H_{\text{fl}} = \hbar \omega_c c^\dagger c + h (\omega_a + \delta \omega_1) d^\dagger d + \delta \omega_2 d^\dagger d + \frac{\delta \omega_2^2}{2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where the coefficients $\delta \omega_1, \delta \omega_2, \lambda_1, \lambda_2$ depend on the mean-field solution, $\alpha$ and $\beta$ [1, 39]. For the mean field solutions $\alpha = \beta = 0$, equal-time fluctuations indicate that the NP and e-NP are equivalent, leading to the ostensible conclusion that one can continuously deform from one to the other without a phase transition [1].

**Dynamical response** — To challenge this premise, we consider here dynamical observables. In particular, we focus on the cavity response function $A(\omega) = -2 \text{Im} \left[ G_R(\omega) \right]$, where the retarded Green’s function is defined as $G_R(t-t') = -i \delta(t-t') \langle [a(t), a^\dagger(t')] \rangle$. The Keldysh action formalism [37, 38] can be used to calculate the dynamical response of the dissipative IDTC. The response manifests a fundamental difference between the two NPs thus unveiling a new kind of dynamical phase transition in this system.

The frequency-domain Keldysh action for the fluctuations of the open IDTC model is described by two bosonic modes [cf., Eq. (2)], and takes the generic form

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int \omega \Phi^\dagger(\omega) \left( \begin{array}{cccc} 0 & [G_R^{4 \times 4}]^{-1} & [G_A^{4 \times 4}]^{-1} \\ [G_A^{4 \times 4}]^{-1} & 0 & [G_R^{4 \times 4}]^{-1} \\ [G_R^{4 \times 4}]^{-1} & [G_A^{4 \times 4}]^{-1} & 0 \end{array} \right) \Phi(\omega),$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $\Phi(\omega) = [\Phi_c(\omega), \Phi_{qu}(\omega)]$ is the cavity-spin Nambu 8-spinor composed of the concatenated classical and quantum 4-spinors embodying the classical and quantum Keldysh contour superpositions: $\Phi_c(\omega) = (c_i(\omega), c_i^*(-\omega), d_i(\omega), d_i^*(-\omega))^T$ with $i = \text{cl, qu}$, respectively. The corresponding cavity and spin fluctuation operators are denoted by $c_i$ and $d_i$. The matrices $G_A^{4 \times 4}, G_R^{4 \times 4}$, and $D_R^{4 \times 4}$ are the advanced, retarded, and inverse Keldysh Green’s functions, respectively. Note that we treat dissipation in the Lindblad form detailed earlier. Correspondingly, the Green’s function matrices are determined by the underlying steady state mean-field solutions of the open system. Since our focus is on the two NP phases, in the following, we consider the mean-field solutions, $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = 0$ [1, 49].

To obtain the cavity response, we first integrate out the spin fluctuation operators to obtain a pure cavity Keldysh action described by a 4-component field. The resulting retarded Green’s function determines the cavity response function $A(\omega)$ in the open system setting, see Fig. 1(b) [49]. In the NP, the response is conventional: two positive amplitude peaks at positive frequencies describing the two polariton excitations appear, balanced by as many negative peaks at negative frequencies. The
NP is not the ground state in all the symmetry-broken continuous equipotential circle [1, 33]. We remark that the breaking line, the potential is a minimum along a con-
tinuous cavity dissipation (decay channel).

On the other hand, the response displays a striking qual-
itative change as one crosses over into the e-NP: a peak inversion of the softer polaritonic mode occurs. This sig-
Nificant hints at a fundamental difference between the two

To obtain the cavity response of the closed system, we rewrite Eq. (2) in terms of its normal modes using the Bogolyubov matrix $T$

$\phi = T \psi$, \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $\phi = (c \ d \ e^\dagger \ d^\dagger)^T$ and $\psi = (A_1 \ A_2 \ A_1^\dagger \ A_2^\dagger)^T$ is the normal-mode operator vector [32, 33]. Two key

The closed system cavity response can be straightfor-
dwardly evaluated in the normal mode basis:

$$A(\omega) = \sum_{i,\sigma} \frac{|t_{i,j}'(\omega_{i\sigma})|^2}{ds^2_{i\sigma}} \delta(\omega - \omega_{i\sigma}). \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

As in the open system [cf. Fig. 1(b)], the NP response is characterized by positive (negative) weights at frequen-
cies $\omega_1, \omega_2$ ($-\omega_1, -\omega_2$). Importantly, due to the afore-

latter is an outcome of the bosonic statistics of the cavity
via the normalization condition $\int d^4 a \ A(\omega) = \langle \{ a, a^\dagger \} \rangle = 1$. On the other hand, the response displays a striking qual-
itative change as one crosses over into the e-NP: a peak inversion of the softer polaritonic mode occurs. This sig-
}

Closed system interlude — To understand the origin and significance of the peak inversion, it is useful to investi-
gate the mean-field energy landscape of the closed sys-
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The extracted FWHM of the positive peak. (e) Dynamical phase diagram of the dissipative IDTC for $\epsilon/\omega = 0.1$. Region I,III correspond to the NP and e-NP, respectively. Region II is the region where the imaginary parts of the soft mode coalesce to zero. The normal phase separates the two superradiant phases, gray regions.

mentioned soft mode inversion, the e-NP response is characterized by positive weights at frequencies $(-\omega_1, -\omega_2)$ and negative weights at $(\omega_1, \omega_2)$. This is a key observability of our work, namely, the symplectic norm associated with a normal mode frequency determines whether the response at that frequency is positive or negative. Modes with a positive weight $d_{\sigma h} > 0$, describe the creation of excitations at the resonance frequency, while a negative weight $d_{\sigma h} < 0$, signifies annihilation of excitations. Note that, in the response, negative dips at positive frequencies were recently connected with excited states of the system [52].

We would like to emphasize: the sign of the norm $d_{\sigma h}$ encapsulates an important physical meaning, i.e., it determines whether the dominant processes at the resonance frequency are particle or anti-particle-like. These two types of processes can be regarded as the light-matter analogues of particles and holes in condensed matter systems. Stressing this analogy further, the peak swap between the two NPs above threshold signals a transition from particle-like to bosonic-hole-like physics at positive frequencies and vice-versa for negative frequencies. The e-NP can now be understood as a population inverted state [52], whose response in the closed system favors the creation of cavity excitations to lower its energy and eventually decay to the SP [53]. Consequently, the NP→e-NP dynamical transition does not survive in the closed system.

Open system dynamics — Infinitesimal dissipation stabilizes the e-NP, thereby enabling the aforementioned dynamical transition. In the e-NP, the system absorbs photons in order to decay to the superradiant ground state [see Fig. 3(a), red arrows] and dissipation acts as an incoherent drive realizing a population inverted state into an empty cavity [see Fig. 3(a), orange arrows]. To further understand the nature of this dynamical transition, we use third-quantization to obtain the open-system counterparts of $\omega_1, \omega_2$, namely, the Liouvillian eigenvalues, $\epsilon_{1,2}$ - complex numbers whose imaginary (real) parts describes the frequencies (lifetimes) of the excitations [43]. Convergence to the steady state necessitates $\text{Re} (\epsilon_{1,2}) < 0$, as the the Liouvillian eigensolutions evolve according to $e^{\epsilon_{1,2} t}$.

Similar to Fig. 2(b), the high-energy mode $\epsilon_1$ (corresponding to $\pm\omega_1$ in the closed system), is represented by two complex conjugated eigenvalues pair that does not show any significant feature (not plotted). In stark contrast, the soft mode pair, $\epsilon_2$ (corresponding to $\pm\omega_2$ in the closed system), is much richer, see Fig. 3(b). In the NP, $\epsilon_2$ exhibits a complex pair of conjugated eigenvalues with degenerate negative real parts. An increase in the couplings leads to the emergence of a dissipation stabilized exceptional point at $\lambda_3^c$, where the imaginary parts coalesce to zero while the real parts split. This exceptional point is responsible for the soft peak merger in the dynamical response, see Fig. 3(c). The situation evolves specularly until $\lambda_3^c$ where the system reaches the stable e-NP phase. $\lambda_2^c$ and $\lambda_3^c$ coincide with the locations where instabilities to the SP occur in the closed system, cf. Fig. 2(b). Dissipation lifts this instability by preventing the real part of the eigenvalues from becoming positive.

We cannot associate a norm [cf. Eq. (6)] to the open system modes. Luckily, the norm dictates the signs in the dynamical response [cf. Eq. (6)]. Hence, we can fully characterize the particle/hole-like nature of the excitations, by studying the signs and full-widths at half-maxima (FWHM) of the peaks (positive peaks correspond to particle-like frequencies). The real part of the Liouvillian eigenvalues dictates the width of the peaks.

FIG. 3. Dark laser and its response. (a) Schematic energy potentials of particle- and hole- fluctuations of the normal modes in the NP (left) and e-NP (right) [cf. Eqs. (2), (4), and (5)]. Blue (red) wiggly lines refer to blue (red) detuned response processes. Solid (dashed) parabolic potentials with companying ladders of levels indicate normal mode fluctuations around NP with a positive (negative) norm [cf. Eq. (4)]. Solid arrows mark the associated process, i.e., upward blue (downward red) correspond to creation of positive (negative) excitations while downward blue (upward red) to annihilation of such excitations. Orange arrows mark the effect of dissipation in reducing the populations of the modes. (b) Real (dashed lines) and imaginary (solid lines) parts of the soft mode Liouvillian eigenvalues for parameters along the dashed (white) line in (e). (c) Calculated dynamical response along the NP→e-NP transition. The positive and negative soft mode peaks invert alongside a region where they overlap. (d) The extracted FWHM of the positive peak. (e) Dynamical phase diagram of the dissipative IDTC for $\epsilon/\omega = 0.1$. Region I,III correspond to the NP and e-NP, respectively. Region II is the region where the imaginary parts of the soft mode coalesce to zero. The normal phase separates the two superradiant phases, gray regions.
in $\mathcal{A}(\omega)$, showing that one peak is overwhelmed with respect to the other, see Fig. 3(b-c). Focusing on the positive peak (particle-like) associated with the radial mode [Fig. 3(d)], we see that its FWHM first decreases towards the exceptional point $\lambda_2^c$, signaling that the peak becomes sharper, in accord with a reduced life-time of the state. Above $\lambda_2^c$, the FWHM increases due to the longer lifetime of the stable e-NP. This allows us to unambiguously assign the particle/hole-like labels to the open system eigenfrequencies even beyond the EP, $\lambda_2^c$ of Fig. 3(b-c).

Our results are summarized in the new dynamical phase diagram shown in Fig. 3(d). Region I is characterized by the standard NP where the soft mode’s ($c_2$) particle-like excitations appear at positive frequencies, while region III is associated with the steady state e-NP hosting particle-like excitations at negative frequencies. The transition between these two regions encompasses through a new region II, via a scenario reminiscent of exceptional points.

We find that dissipation can introduce dynamical phase transitions unveiling a particle to hole inversion in a bosonic system. Dissipation acts as an incoherent drive that induces a population inversion into a dark cavity. This scenario is akin to lasing of antiparticles, which we find that dissipation can introduce dynamical phase transitions unveiling a particle to hole inversion in a bosonic system. Dissipation acts as an incoherent drive that induces a population inversion into a dark cavity. This scenario is akin to lasing of antiparticles, which we
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I. HOLSTEIN-PRIMAKOFF’S REPRESENTATION

The Holstein-Primakoff’s representation for the spins is $S_+ = b^\dagger \sqrt{N} - b \dagger b$ and $S_z = -\frac{N}{2} + b^\dagger b$. We start from the Hamiltonian [identical to Eq. (1) main text]

$$H = \hbar \omega_c a^\dagger a + \hbar \omega_s S_z + \frac{2\hbar \lambda_x}{\sqrt{N}} S_x (a + a^\dagger) + \frac{2\hbar \lambda_y}{\sqrt{N}} i S_y (a - a^\dagger),$$

(I.1)

and expand around the respective mean-field solutions, $a = \alpha \sqrt{2N} + c$ and $b = \beta \sqrt{2N} + d$, where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are complex numbers defining coherent states. This leads to a fluctuation Hamiltonian describing two coupled bosonic modes of the form [identical to Eq. (2) main text]:

$$H_{fl} = \omega_c c^\dagger c + (\omega_a + \delta \omega_1) d^\dagger d + \lambda_1^* e^\dagger e + \lambda_1 c d^\dagger + \lambda_2^* c^\dagger d + \frac{\delta \omega_2}{2} d^\dagger d + \frac{\delta \omega_2}{2} d d,$$

(I.2)

with the coefficients defined as [1]

$$\delta \omega_1 = -\frac{4}{\sqrt{1-|\beta|^2}} \left( 1 + \frac{|\beta|^2}{4(1-|\beta|^2)} \right) \left[ \beta \Re(\alpha \Re \lambda_x + \beta \Im(\alpha \Im \lambda_y) \right],$$

(I.3)

$$\delta \omega_2 = -\frac{2\beta^*}{\sqrt{1-|\beta|^2}} \left[ \alpha \Re \left( 1 + \frac{\beta \Re}{2(1-|\beta|^2)} \beta^* \right) \lambda_x - i \alpha \Im \left( 1 + \frac{\beta \Im}{2(1-|\beta|^2)} \beta^* \right) \lambda_y \right],$$

(I.4)

$$\lambda_1 = (\lambda_x + \lambda_y) \sqrt{1-|\beta|^2} - \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{1-|\beta|^2}} (\lambda_x \beta \Re - i \lambda_y \beta \Im),$$

(I.5)

$$\lambda_2 = (\lambda_x - \lambda_y) \sqrt{1-|\beta|^2} - \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{1-|\beta|^2}} (\lambda_x \beta \Re + i \lambda_y \beta \Im).$$

(I.6)

II. MEAN-FIELD SOLUTION

The master equation governing the evolution of the density matrix of the system is

$$\frac{d \rho_{sys}}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H(t), \rho_{sys}] + \kappa [2a \rho_{sys} a^\dagger - \{a^\dagger a, \rho_{sys}\}],$$

(II.1)

with $H$ the Hamiltonian, Eq. (I.1), and $\kappa$ the cavity decay rate. The equation of motion governing the mean-field order parameters are

$$\omega_c \alpha_{\Im} - \kappa \alpha_{\Re} - 2\lambda_y Y = 0,$$

(II.2)

$$\omega_c \alpha_{\Re} + \kappa \alpha_{\Im} + 2\lambda_x X = 0,$$

(II.3)

$$\omega_a Y + 4\lambda_y \alpha_{\Im} Z = 0,$$

(II.4)

$$\omega_a X - 4\lambda_x \alpha_{\Re} Z = 0,$$

(II.5)

where we defined $\langle a \rangle = \sqrt{N} \alpha$, $\langle S_x \rangle = NX$, $\langle S_y \rangle = NY$ and $\langle S_z \rangle = NZ$ and have taken the steady-state limit. We are interested in the description of the normal phase that coincide with the trivial solution of this system, i.e., $\alpha_{\Re} = \alpha_{\Im} = 0, X = Y = 0$ and $Z = -1/2$. The superradiant phase can be also analytical obtained [1]. The closed system evolution can be recovered by taking $\kappa = 0$. 

III. NORMAL MODE TRANSFORMATION

We start from the Holstein-Primakoff fluctuation Hamiltonian Eq. (I.2) and recast it in the following matrix form in the operator basis \((c\ d\ c^\dagger\ d^\dagger)^T\)

\[
H_{ff} = \begin{pmatrix}
\omega_c & \bar{\lambda}_1^* & 0 & \bar{\lambda}_2 \\
\lambda_1 & \Omega & \bar{\lambda}_2 & \delta\bar{\omega}_2 \\
0 & \bar{\lambda}_1 & \lambda_1 & 0 \\
\bar{\lambda}_2^* & \delta\bar{\omega}_2 & \bar{\lambda}_1 & \Omega
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{III.1}
\]

where for brevity we define \(\Omega = \omega_a + \delta\bar{\omega}_1\). The associated dynamical matrix to be diagonalized [2]

\[
D = \begin{pmatrix}
\omega_c & \bar{\lambda}_1^* & 0 & \bar{\lambda}_2 \\
\lambda_1 & \Omega & \bar{\lambda}_2 & \delta\bar{\omega}_2 \\
0 & \bar{\lambda}_1 & \lambda_1 & 0 \\
-\bar{\lambda}_2^* & -\delta\bar{\omega}_2 & -\bar{\lambda}_1 & -\Omega
\end{pmatrix}. \tag{III.2}
\]

We need to ensure that after diagonalization the newly found operators, i.e., the normal modes, are true bosonic operators, namely that they satisfy bosonic commutation relations. To achieve that, we need to impose some constraints on the actual form of the eigenvectors. This is done by imposing constraints on their normalization and on the structure of the transformation matrix, \(T\), that diagonalizes \(D\). Solving the eigenvalue problem

\[
DT = \omega T, \tag{III.3}
\]

for the eigenvector \(T\) we find that the eigenvalues of \(D\) are

\[
\omega_{\pm}^2 = -m \pm \sqrt{m^2 - 4n}/2, \tag{III.4}
\]

with

\[
m = -\omega_c^2 - \Omega^2 - 2|\bar{\lambda}_1|^2 + 2|\bar{\lambda}_2|^2 + |\delta\bar{\omega}_2|^2, \tag{III.5}
\]

\[
n = \left(\bar{\lambda}_1^2 - |\bar{\lambda}_2|^2\right)^2 + \omega_c^2 \left(\Omega^2 - |\delta\bar{\omega}_2|^2\right) + 4\omega_c \text{Re} [\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 \delta\bar{\omega}_2] - 2\omega_c \Omega \left(|\bar{\lambda}_1|^2 + |\bar{\lambda}_2|^2\right). \tag{III.6}
\]

We define the bare eigenfrequencies as the positive ones

\[
\omega_1 = +|\omega_+|, \tag{III.7}
\]

\[
\omega_2 = +|\omega_-|. \tag{III.8}
\]

Before writing the Bogoliubov transformation matrix that maps to the normal modes, we introduce some useful functions

\[
t_c^\dagger(\omega) = \frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\omega - \omega_c} t_d^\dagger(\omega) + \frac{\bar{\lambda}_2}{\omega - \omega_c}, \tag{III.9}
\]

\[
t_d^\dagger(\omega) = -\frac{2\omega_c \bar{\lambda}_1 \lambda_1 + \delta\bar{\omega}_2}{|\bar{\lambda}_1|^2 (\omega + \omega_c) - |\bar{\lambda}_2|^2 (\omega - \omega_c) + (\Omega - \omega) (\omega^2 - \omega_c^2)}, \tag{III.10}
\]

\[
t_c(\omega) = -\frac{\lambda_2}{\omega + \omega_c} t_d(\omega) - \frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\omega + \omega_c}, \tag{III.11}
\]

\[
t_d(\omega) = 1. \tag{III.12}
\]

Additionally we define a key ingredient of the transformation, the symplectic norm, according to [cf. Eq. (5) main text]

\[
ds_{\sigma\sigma'}^2 = |t_c^\dagger(\sigma\omega_i)|^2 + |t_d^\dagger(\sigma\omega_i)|^2 - |t_c(\sigma\omega_i)|^2 - |t_d(\sigma\omega_i)|^2 \equiv \sum_{j=[c,d],\sigma'} \sigma'|t_j^\dagger(\sigma\omega_i)|^2, \tag{III.13}
\]

with \(\sigma, \sigma' = \pm; i = 1, 2\).
The transformation matrix $T$ is then found according to the following construction

$$
T = \begin{bmatrix}
    T_1 & T_2 & T_3 & T_4
\end{bmatrix} = 
\begin{bmatrix}
    T(s_{1+\omega_i}) & T(s_{2+\omega_2}) & T(s_{1-\omega_1}) & T(s_{2-\omega_2}) \\
    T^+(s_{1+\omega_i}) & T^+(s_{2+\omega_2}) & T^+(s_{1-\omega_1}) & T^+(s_{2-\omega_2}) \\
    T^-(s_{1+\omega_i}) & T^-(s_{2+\omega_2}) & T^-(s_{1-\omega_1}) & T^-(s_{2-\omega_2}) \\
    T(t_{1+\omega_i}) & T(t_{2+\omega_2}) & T(t_{1-\omega_1}) & T(t_{2-\omega_2})
\end{bmatrix},
$$

(III.14)

where the $T$ are vectors constructed as follows

$$
T(s_{i\sigma\omega_i}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} \begin{pmatrix} t^+_d(s_{i\sigma\omega_i}) & t^+_c(s_{i\sigma\omega_i}) & t^-_c(s_{i\sigma\omega_i}) & t^-_d(s_{i\sigma\omega_i}) \end{pmatrix}^T,
$$

(III.15)

with $s_{i\sigma} = \text{sign}(d\omega_i)$ and $i = 1, 2, \sigma = \pm$. The argument $(s_{i\sigma\omega_i})$ ensures that the $T$ components are evaluated at the eigenfrequencies with positive symplectic norm. For completeness, we highlight that the $T$ vectors are pairwise related via

$$
T(-\omega) = \Sigma_x T(\omega)^*,
$$

(III.16)

$$
\Sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix},
$$

(III.17)

with $I$ the $2 \times 2$ identity matrix. This allows us to simplify the notation in Eq. (6) in the main text. The $T$ vectors are normalized according to

$$
T_{1,2}^+ I_- T_{1,2} = T(s_{1+\omega_i}) I_- T(s_{1+\omega_i}) + 1, 
$$

(III.18)

$$
T_{3,4}^+ I_- T_{3,4} = T(s_{1-\omega_1}) I_- T(s_{1-\omega_1}) = -1, 
$$

(III.19)

$$
I_- = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{pmatrix},
$$

(III.20)

with $i = 1, 2$. These normalization conditions imply that the ordering of the vectors in $T$ is: such that the first two vector columns, $T_{1,2}$, are always normalized to 1 while the last two, $T_{3,4}$, are normalized to $-1$, thus ensuring canonical commutation relations for the new eigenmodes. The frequencies at which the vectors element are evaluated change throughout the parameter region, $(\lambda_x, \lambda_y)$. In particular, as highlighted in the main text, carrying out the normal mode transformation throughout the parameter space, we obtain that in the NP and SP phases $T_1, T_3$ are associated with the frequencies $\omega_1, -\omega_1$, respectively, and $T_2, T_4$ are associated with the frequencies $\omega_2, -\omega_2$. In the e-NP nothing changes for $T_1, T_3$ but we have a frequency inversion for $T_2, T_4$, namely $T_2$ is now associated with $-\omega_2$ and $T_4$ to $\omega_2$.

With the normal mode transformation $T$

$$
\phi = T \psi,
$$

(III.21)

where $\phi = (c \ d \ c^\dagger \ d^\dagger)^T$ and $\psi = (A_1 \ A_2 \ A_1^\dagger \ A_2^\dagger)^T$, we can express cavity and spin operators in terms of the normal modes, $A_{1,2}$, or vice-versa

$$
c = \frac{t^+_d(s_{1+\omega_i})}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_1 + \frac{t^+_d(s_{2+\omega_2})}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_2 + \frac{t^+_c(s_{1-\omega_1})}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_1^\dagger + \frac{t^+_c(s_{2-\omega_2})}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_2^\dagger = \frac{t^+_d(s_{1+\omega_i})}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_1 + \frac{t^+_c(s_{2+\omega_2})}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_2 + \frac{t^-_d(s_{1+\omega_i})^\dagger}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_1^\dagger + \frac{t^-_c(s_{2+\omega_2})^\dagger}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_2^\dagger,
$$

$$
c^\dagger = \frac{t^-_d(s_{1+\omega_i})}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_1 + \frac{t^-_d(s_{2+\omega_2})}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_2 + \frac{t^-_c(s_{1-\omega_1})^\dagger}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_1^\dagger + \frac{t^-_c(s_{2-\omega_2})^\dagger}{\sqrt{|d\omega_i|}} A_2^\dagger, 
$$

(III.22)

where in the first line we used the relation $T(-\omega) = \Sigma_x T(\omega)^*$.
IV. RESPONSE FUNCTION

To ease the notation we define $\tilde{\omega}_i = s_i + \omega_i$ and with the above normal mode transformation $T$ we have

$$[c(t), c'(t')] = \left[ \frac{|\delta t^2(\tilde{\omega}_i)|^2}{|ds_+^2_{2+i}|} A_1(t), A'_1(t') \right] + 2i\tilde{\omega}_i \left| \frac{|\delta t^2(\tilde{\omega}_i)|^2}{|ds_+^2_{2+i}|} A_1(t), A'_1(t) \right| + \left| \frac{|\delta t^2(\tilde{\omega}_i)|^2}{|ds_+^2_{2+i}|} A_2(t), A'_2(t) \right| \right.$$  \hspace{1cm} (IV.1)

From the definition of the retarded Green's function $G^R(t - t') = -i\delta(t - t)'\langle [c(t), c'(t')] \rangle$, the integral representation of the Heaviside function $\theta(\tau) = \lim_{x\to0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{i\tau x} dx$, and by plugging in the above transformation we obtain

$$G^R(t, t') = -i \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x - \varepsilon \omega} e^{i\omega t} dx \times$$

$$\times \left\{ \frac{1}{|ds_+^2_{2+i}|} \left( \right) \right\} (IV.2)$$

Fourier transforming with respect to $\tau = t - t'$ we obtain

$$G^R(\omega) = \left[ \begin{array}{c} 1 \end{array} \right]_{|ds_+^2_{2+i}|} \left( \right) + 1 \left| \frac{|\delta t^2(\tilde{\omega}_i)|^2}{|ds_+^2_{2+i}|} A_2(t), A'_2(t) \right| \right.$$  \hspace{1cm} (IV.3)

here we used that the Fourier transform, $\mathcal{F}$, of a complex exponential is a delta function, i.e., $\mathcal{F}[e^{i\tau x} e^{\pm i\omega_1 t}] = 2\pi \delta(x + \omega \mp \tilde{\omega}_i)$. Using Sokhotski–Plemelj theorem for the representation of the delta function we can write

$$G^R(\omega) = -i \pi \left\{ \right\} (IV.4)$$

We note here that due to the relation $\mathcal{T}(\omega) = \Sigma_x \mathcal{T}(\omega)^*$, we have $|t_{c}^- (\omega_2)|^2 = |t_{c}^+ (-\omega_2)|^2$, which was used to compactify the notation in Eq. (6) of the main text. From this derivation, we see how terms proportional to $|t_{c}^+ (\tilde{\omega}_i)|^2$ arise from the commutator $[A_i(t), A'_i(t')$, i.e., from a scenario where a quasi-particle is first created and then annihilated at a later time $t > t'$. Therefore this process is associated with particle-like physics while terms proportional to $|t_{c}^- (\tilde{\omega}_i)|^2$ arising from the commutator $[A_i(t'), A'_i(t)]$ can be associated to hole-like physics. Moreover by direct inspection we see that the $|t_{c}^+ (\tilde{\omega}_i)|^2$ terms are responsible for the positive peaks in the response and the $|t_{c}^- (\tilde{\omega}_i)|^2$ are responsible for the negative ones.

V. KELDYSH ACTION

We introduce the combined Nambu–Keldysh spinor in the rotated classical and quantum basis

$$\delta \Phi(\omega) = (\delta a_c(\omega) \delta a_s^*(-\omega) \delta b_c(-\omega) \delta b_s^*(-\omega) \delta a_q(\omega) \delta a_q^*(-\omega) \delta b_q(-\omega) \delta b_q^*(-\omega))^T,$$

$$\delta \Phi^1(\omega) = (\delta a_s^*(\omega) \delta a_c(-\omega) \delta b_s^*(\omega) \delta b_c(-\omega) \delta a_q(-\omega) \delta a_s^*(-\omega) \delta b_q(-\omega) \delta b_q^*(-\omega))^,$$

and we can write the quadratic action expressed in the Keldysh contour in frequency domain as

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\omega} \delta \Phi^1(\omega) \left[ \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \right]_{|G^R_{4x4}|}^{-1} \left[ G^K_{4x4} \right]^{-1} \delta \Phi(\omega),$$  \hspace{1cm} (V.2)

with the inverse Green's functions

$$\left[ G^R_{4x4} \right]^{-1} = \left( \begin{array}{cccc} \omega - \omega_c + i\kappa & 0 & -\lambda_1^* & -\lambda_2^* \\ 0 & -\omega - \omega_c - i\kappa & -\lambda_1^* & -\lambda_2^* \\ -\lambda_1 & -\lambda_2 & \omega - \omega_a - \delta \omega_1 & -\delta \omega_2 \\ -\lambda_1^* & -\lambda_2^* & -\delta \omega_2 & \omega - \omega_a - \delta \omega_1^* \end{array} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (V.3)
Supplementary Material Figure 1. Cavity dynamical response function over the SP, $\lambda_{SP} = (0.7, 0.2)$. The response presents four peaks appearing at paired frequencies (arrow indicates unresolved small peak). Positive (negative) frequencies correspond to positive (negative) peaks, as in the NP [cf. Fig. 1(b) main text]. $\omega_c = \omega_a, \kappa/\omega_c = 0.1$

$$[G_{4\times4}^A]^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega - \omega_c - i\kappa & 0 & -\lambda_1^* & -\lambda_2^* \\ 0 & -\omega - \omega_c + i\kappa & -\lambda_2^* & -\lambda_1^* \\ -\lambda_1 & -\lambda_2 & \omega - \omega_a - \delta\omega_1^* & -\delta\omega_2^* \\ -\lambda_2^* & -\lambda_1^* & -\delta\omega_2 & -\omega - \omega_a - \delta\omega_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and the Keldysh self-energy

$$D^K_{4 \times 4} = 2i \text{diag}(\kappa, \kappa, 0, 0).$$

The action $S$ is quadratic in both the cavity and the bosonized spin fields. This allows us to integrate out the spin degrees of freedom, $d$ operators, and obtain a photon only action. We do this according to standard Gaussian integration

$$\int D[\psi, \psi^\dagger] e^{i \int d^4q (\psi^\dagger(q)D(q)\psi(q) + i\int d^4q (\phi^\dagger(q)\psi(q) + \psi^\dagger(q)\chi(q))} = (\det D)^{-1} e^{i \int d^4q \phi^\dagger(q)D^{-1}(q)\chi(q)}$$

to obtain

$$S_{\text{photon}}[\delta a^*, \delta a] = \int_0^{\omega} \delta A_4^\dagger(\omega) \left[ \begin{array}{l} 0 \\ \left[ G_{4\times2}^{R,p} \right]^{-1}(\omega) \\ \left[ G_{4\times2}^{A,p} \right]^{-1}(\omega) \end{array} \right] \delta A_4(\omega).$$

The various terms correspond to the photon four-vector that collects the classical and quantum field components

$$\delta A_4(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \delta a_c(\omega) \\ \delta a_c^*(-\omega) \\ \delta a_q(\omega) \\ \delta a_q^*(-\omega) \end{pmatrix},$$

and the block entries are $2 \times 2$ inverse photon Green’s functions.

$$\left[ G_{2\times2}^{R,p} \right]^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \omega - \omega_c + i\kappa + \Sigma_1^{R,p}(\omega) & \Sigma_2^{R,p}(\omega) \\ \Sigma_2^{R,p}(\omega) & -\omega - \omega_c - i\kappa + \Sigma_1^{R,p}(\omega) \end{pmatrix}.$$ (V.9)

where the $\Sigma_i$ are self-energies originating from the integration. As always $\left[ G_{2\times2}^{A,p} \right]^{-1} = \left( \left[ G_{2\times2}^{R,p} \right]^{-1} \right)^\dagger$. The Keldysh component of the photon action is

$$D^K = 2i\kappa \mathcal{I}.$$ (V.10)

VI. SUPERRADIANT PHASE

The cavity response of the superradiant phase can be readily calculated from Eq. (V.9), using the coefficients Eqs. (I.3)-(I.6) with the superradiant mean-field solution in [1]. As can be seen from Fig. 1, the SP does not present any peak inversion or extraordinary features.