Many-body localization in waveguide QED
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At the quantum many-body level, atom-light interfaces generally remain challenging to solve for or understand in a non-perturbative fashion. Here, we consider a waveguide quantum electrodynamics model, where two-level atoms interact with and via propagating photons in a one-dimensional waveguide, and specifically investigate the interplay of atomic position disorder, multiple scattering of light, and quantum nonlinear interactions. We develop qualitative arguments and present numerical evidence that such a system exhibits a many-body localized phase, provided that atoms are less than half excited. This phase exists in spite of the system being intrinsically open, and can be feasibly realized in state-of-the-art experimental setups.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum light-matter interfaces are being actively investigated, for their many possibilities for fundamental science and applications. However, the full quantum many-body problem of interacting atoms and photons remains highly challenging to understand, not only due to the large Hilbert space, but also its out-of-equilibrium and open nature. Most of our theoretical knowledge is thus restricted to certain regimes. For example, much of our quantum theory, such as to model applications, treats the atomic medium as being a smooth quantum field [1], thus ignoring the potential complexities associated with granularity, disorder averaging, and multiple scattering of light. On the other hand, there has been significant work to deal with granularity and multiple scattering [2–9], but largely restricted to classical or mean-field limits, where potentially strong non-linear optical interactions and the buildup of quantum correlations are ignored.

However, it would be interesting to develop insights into what many-body quantum phenomena and opportunities might arise from the combination of multiple scattering and nonlinear interactions between atoms and light. For example, it has been suggested that multiple scattering can be enhanced using ordered atomic arrays and become an important resource for applications, which can lead to spin squeezing interactions [10], or prolonged interrogation times for optical lattice clocks through the suppression of spontaneous emission [11, 12]. Separately, in the regime of dilute, disordered media, perturbative diagrammatic techniques to account for atom-induced nonlinearities and frequency mixing have only recently been developed [13].

Here, we propose the existence of and theoretically investigate a non-perturbative, many-body phenomenon in a minimal “waveguide quantum electrodynamics (QED)” model, consisting of disordered two-level atoms or qubits interacting with photons in a one-dimensional (1D) waveguide. In particular, we provide qualitative arguments and quantitative numerical simulations to argue that the system can support a many-body localized phase. The topic of many-body localization (MBL) has generated intense interest recently within condensed matter physics [14–18]. Interestingly, a simple phenomenological Hamiltonian is hypothesized to capture the novel MBL phase [19, 20], which allows for predictions of exotic many-body properties such as the failure of a system to thermalize, the absence of transport, and the slow growth of entanglement entropy following a quench. Given the general challenge of realizing experimental platforms where MBL can be observed and measured [21–24], the possibility of achieving MBL within waveguide QED is also timely. In particular, a number of systems including superconducting quantum bits coupled to microwave transmission lines [25–27] or structured waveguides [28, 29], or cold atoms coupled to nanophotonic interfaces [30–33], have emerged in recent years, with demonstrated large coherent interaction rates compared to unwanted residual dissipation, exquisite measurement capabilities, and a steadily increasing number of controlled qubits. Similar systems can also be realized in two dimensions [32], where theoretical and numerical efforts to understand MBL are more challenging. Indeed, superconducting qubits have already begun to be utilized to study MBL [24, 33, 34], albeit in regimes where photons are not a real degree of freedom, as we explore here. Compared to typical MBL systems, our waveguide QED model is unique on a number of fronts. First, it involves two distinct degrees of freedom, “spins” comprising atomic excitations and a continuum of photonic modes. In addition, while typical MBL systems are ideally closed, our waveguide QED model is intrinsically open. The physics by which
effectively “closed” MBL-like features can become encoded in such a system, or how initial dissipation may even facilitate the onset of MBL, appears particularly rich.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. First, in Sec. [II] we introduce the waveguide QED Hamiltonian and present a qualitative argument that an MBL phase should exist in the thermodynamic limit, provided that the atoms are less than half excited. Given the large Hilbert space of the system, consisting of the exponentially large space associated with the atoms and the infinite space associated with the continuum of photon modes, we then restrict ourselves to the regime of near-resonant photon interactions. Then, in Sec. [III] we show how the photonic modes can be integrated out, reducing the system to an open, interacting “spin model” describing photon-mediated interactions between the atomic degrees of freedom. Before going to MBL, and to gain intuition, we show how Anderson localization manifests itself in the spin model formalism, within the linear optics (single-excitation) limit. A key point is that although the system is formally open, localization implies that dynamics of the system is increasingly well-described just by the Hermitian Hamiltonian component of the spin model. We briefly introduce the phenomenology of MBL phases in Sec. [IV] As MBL is typically studied with respect to closed systems, and given the observation above regarding the connection between localization and Hermitianity, in Sec. [V] we present numerical evidence of MBL for the Hermitian Hamiltonian, including the absence of transport and logarithmic growth of entanglement entropy. Importantly, despite this mathematical trick, in Sec. [VI] we then propose and numerically investigate a number of realistic observables for MBL, which we find to be robust even for the physical, open system. Finally, in Sec. [VII] we provide an extended outlook of possible future interesting directions to explore.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SYSTEM

Our system of interest is represented in Fig. [1a]. It consists of a one-dimensional, bi-directional waveguide, whose photons couple to the ground-excited \((|g\rangle - |e\rangle)\) transitions of \(N\) two-level atoms located at random positions \(z_i\). The atomic transition frequency is given by \(\omega_0\). A minimal model for such a system is given by the following Hamiltonian

![Figure 1](image1.png)

(a) Schematic illustration of a spatially disordered atomic chain coupled to photons in a one-dimensional, bi-directional waveguide. The magnitude of atom-light interactions is set by the rate \(\Gamma_{1D}\) by which a single, isolated excited atom irreversibly emits a photon into the waveguide. With multiple atoms and excitations, the system dynamics becomes complex and interacting due to the following possibilities. First, a photon can be reflected or transmitted with non-trivial, frequency-dependent amplitudes \(r(\omega)\), \(t(\omega)\) upon scattering off of an atom, which then leads to multiple scattering in the presence of multiple atoms. Second, multiple photons (e.g., two photons with frequencies \(\omega_1, \omega_2\) illustrated) scattering off of the same atom can lead to the generation of entangled, frequency-mixed photons \((\omega_3 + \omega_4 = \omega_1 + \omega_2)\), which also become multiply scattered. (b) Our proposed phase diagram in the thermodynamic limit of large atom number \(N \to \infty\), versus amount of disorder and fraction of atoms excited, \(n_{\text{exc}}/N\). For a single excitation, \(n_{\text{exc}}/N = 1/N\), the system is non-interacting, and arbitrarily small disorder gives rise to Anderson localization. Beyond a single excitation, the system becomes interacting due to the nonlinearity of two-level atoms. Up to \(n_{\text{exc}}/N = 1/2\), we hypothesize that the system exhibits MBL. For \(n_{\text{exc}}/N > 1/2\), photon transport is allowed and leads to delocalization. (c) Schematic illustration of a spatially disordered atomic chain coupled to photons in a one-dimensional, “half” waveguide, with one end closed by a mirror at \(z = 0\). The atomic system can thus only lose excitations by emitting from one side of the chain, which aids numerical studies of MBL.
\[
\mathcal{H} = \omega_0 \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^{\dagger} \hat{\sigma}_i + \sum_{\nu = \pm} \int dk \omega_k \hat{b}_{\nu,k}^{\dagger} \hat{b}_{\nu,k} + g \sum_{\nu, i} \int dk \left( \hat{b}_{\nu,k} \hat{\sigma}_i \hat{e}^{i\nu k z_i} + \text{h.c.} \right).
\]

Here, \( \mathcal{H}_a \) describes the excited-state energy of the atoms, and we adopt the notation \( \hat{\sigma}_i^{\dagger} = |\alpha_i\rangle \langle \beta_i| \) with \( \{\alpha, \beta\} \in \{g, e\} \) for the operators of atom \( i \). \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{ph}} \) describes the energy of the photons, characterized by a continuum of modes with two possible propagation directions (labeled \( \nu = \pm \)) and wavevector \( k \). We assume that within the bandwidth of modes to which the atoms significantly couple, the dispersion relation for the guided modes can be linearized as \( \omega_k = c|k| \). The interactions, as given by \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} \), describe the processes by which an excited atom can emit a photon, or a ground-state atom can absorb a photon, with a coupling constant \( g \) assumed to be identical for all atoms, and an interaction phase \( e^{i\nu k z_i} \) encoding the photon propagation. In the following, we consider disorder in the positions of the atoms: \( z_i = (i + \epsilon_i)d \), with \( d \) the average distance between two neighboring atoms and \( \epsilon_i \) a random variable. For numerics, we will focus on the regime of full disorder, where \( \epsilon_i \) is drawn between \(-1/2\) and \(1/2\), in order to minimize the effective localization length of the system and the number of atoms needed in simulations, although we believe our conclusions are general for any amount of disorder (see below). The Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) can be an excellent approximation for a number of systems such as superconducting qubits coupled to a transmission line [25–27], or atoms coupled to a photonic crystal waveguide [30, 31], where additional sources of dissipation (not included in this model) can potentially be much smaller than the coherent atom-waveguide interactions.

To gain some basic insight into Eq. (1), we begin by relating it to well-known results regarding Anderson localization of light in 1D, in the linear optical or single-excitation limit with disorder in the position of the atoms. The single-photon, single-atom scattering dynamics of Eq. (1) can be exactly solved [35, 36]. In particular, the response of a ground-state atom to an incoming photon of well-defined frequency \( \omega \) is characterized by the reflection and transmission coefficients \( r(\omega) = -\Gamma_{1D}/(\Gamma_{1D} - 2i\Delta) \) and \( t(\omega) = 1 + r(\omega) \) (Fig. 1b), with \( \Delta = \omega - \omega_0 \) being the detuning between the photon and the atomic transition, and \( \Gamma_{1D} = 4\gamma^2/c \) being the spontaneous emission rate of a single, isolated excited atom into the waveguide. When many atoms are coupled together via the waveguide, the multiple scattering arising from the succession of transmission and reflection events (Fig. 1b) by different atoms can be solved by the transfer matrix formalism [37]. Performing a disorder average over the position fluctuations \( \epsilon_i \) of the \( N \) atoms, the 1D waveguide is always Anderson localized for arbitrarily small disorder (arbitrarily narrow distributions of \( \epsilon_i \), see Fig. 1b) [38–40]. The transmittance exhibits exponential attenuation with large fluctuations \( \log(T_{\text{tot}}) = -N/N_{\text{loc}} \) and \( \text{var}(\log(T_{\text{tot}})) = 2N/N_{\text{loc}} \), with \( \langle ... \rangle \) the average value over the different disorder realizations and var(...) the variance of the random variable. \( N_{\text{loc}} \) is the localization length (expressed in terms of number of atoms), and is related to the single-atom linear transmittance \( T(\Delta) = |t(\Delta)|^2 \) by \( N_{\text{loc}}(\Delta) = 1/\langle \log(T(\Delta)) \rangle = |\log(4\Delta^2/\Gamma_{1D}^2 + 4\Delta^2)|^{-1} \) in the dilute regime \( d > \lambda = 2\pi c/\omega \) and for large disorder [37]. This quantity goes to zero at resonance, and increases with increasing detuning \( |\Delta| \) as the atomic response becomes weaker away from resonance. For systems larger than the localization length \( N > N_{\text{loc}} \), strong destructive interference suppresses the propagation of light through the medium.

While rigorously establishing an MBL transition beyond the single-excitation limit is more complicated, we can nonetheless make a qualitative argument, by calculating a nonlinear single-atom transmittance \( T(\omega, \rho_{ee}) \) that depends on the excited state population \( \rho_{ee} \), and then substituting into the Anderson localization result \( N_{\text{loc}}(\Delta, \rho_{ee}) \sim 1/|\log(T(\Delta, \rho_{ee})| \) to estimate a length scale over which transport becomes prohibited. As discussed in the Appendix, this transmittance can be exactly calculated for an incident coherent state field of arbitrary amplitude, with corresponding Rabi frequency \( \Omega \). One finds the relations \( \rho_{ee} = \frac{\Omega^2}{\Gamma_{1D}^2 + 4\Delta^2 + 2\Omega^2} \) and \( T = \frac{4\Delta^2 + 8\Omega^2}{\Gamma_{1D}^2 + 4\Delta^2 + 8\Omega^2} \). Notably, for large photon input (\( \Omega \rightarrow \infty \), one finds that \( \rho_{ee} \rightarrow 1/2 \) and \( T \rightarrow 1 \). This expresses the well-known result that an atom becomes saturated at very high intensities and is no longer able to respond to light. In turn, reflection and multiple scattering are suppressed, and the localization length \( N_{\text{loc}}(\Delta, \rho_{ee} \rightarrow 1/2) \rightarrow \infty \) diverges. We thus hypothesize that an atomic excitation density of \( n_{\text{exc}}/N = 1/2 \) sets the MBL-delocalization transition, as illustrated in Fig 1(b).

III. SPIN MODEL

From the previous section, a number of challenges to quantitatively investigate MBL in our system now become apparent. First, directly simulating Eq. (1) is difficult due to the infinite Hilbert space associated with the continuum
of photonic modes. Furthermore, the localization length \( N_{\text{loc}}(\Delta, \rho_{ee}) \) increases both with increasing detuning and atomic population, and can rapidly exceed numerically tractable system sizes.

To partially mitigate these challenges, we will restrict ourselves to the regime in which the photons involved in the dynamics are near resonance with the atoms. As discussed in Ref. [11], as the field part of the Hamiltonian [1] is quadratic, it can be formally integrated out, resulting in photon-mediated interactions between atoms. Furthermore, near resonance, the delay time of these interactions due to the speed of light can be ignored to good approximation. This is because the atoms in typical situations have very large ratios of resonance frequencies to linewidths, \( \omega_0 \gg \Gamma_{1D} \). Thus, the atoms are very dispersive, for example, as characterized by the large, frequency-dependent phase shifts in \( r(\omega), t(\omega) \), and this causes the propagation delay of near-resonant photons to be dominated by interaction with the atoms, rather than the speed of light itself. Ignoring retardation, one finally obtains a reduced master equation describing instantaneous photon-mediated interactions, between only the atomic “spin” degrees of freedom [11-15],

\[
\dot{\rho} = -i \left[ \mathcal{H}_{1D} \rho - \rho \mathcal{H}_{1D}^\dagger \right] + \sum_{i,j} \Gamma_{1D} \sigma_i \sigma_j \rho \sigma_i \sigma_j,
\]

with

\[
\mathcal{H}_{1D} = -i \frac{\Gamma_{1D}}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \exp(-ik_{1D}|z_i - z_j|) \hat{\sigma}_i \hat{\sigma}_j \rho
\]

and \( \Gamma_{1D} = \Gamma_{1D} \cos(k_{1D}|z_i - z_j|) \) and \( k_{1D} = \omega_0/c \). Here, we have transformed to a rotating frame, so that the trivial phase evolution associated with \( \mathcal{H}_0 \) can be ignored. We note that in one dimension, the photon-mediated interactions between atoms are infinite in range. Furthermore, integrating out the photons results in a dissipative (open) system, as atoms can physically emit a photon that goes beyond the atomic system boundaries, resulting in irreversible loss of excited population.

If loss is indeed associated with the system boundaries, then conceptually its effects can be reduced by considering progressively larger system sizes, where the ratio of “boundary” (e.g., atoms within a distance \( \sim N_{\text{loc}} \) of an edge) to “bulk” regions decreases. While the maximum number of atoms in numerics is constrained, we can nonetheless decrease this ratio by introducing a closely related “half-waveguide” model, as illustrated in Fig. 1c. Here, one end of the waveguide (say at \( z = 0 \)) is terminated by a perfect mirror, which results in only one open boundary where photons can escape. Applying similar considerations as the derivation of Eq. (2), it is straightforward to show that the master equation is

\[
\dot{\rho} = -i \left[ \mathcal{H}_{\text{half}} \rho - \rho \mathcal{H}_{\text{half}}^\dagger \right] + \sum_{i,j} \Gamma_{i,j} \sigma_i \rho \sigma_j
\]

with

\[
\mathcal{H}_{\text{half}} = -i \frac{\Gamma_{1D}}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \left[ \exp(-ik_{1D}|z_i - z_j|) - \exp(-ik_{1D}|z_i + z_j|) \right] \hat{\sigma}_i \sigma_j \rho
\]

and \( \Gamma_{i,j} = \Gamma_{1D} \cos(k_{1D}|z_j - z_i|) - \cos(k_{1D}|z_j + z_i|) \).

While Eqs. (2) and (4) have now eliminated the infinite Hilbert space of photons, an interesting new feature emerges: dissipation. In particular, MBL is usually formulated with respect to closed systems. Furthermore, in experimental platforms to investigate MBL thus far, any degree of dissipation is viewed as an unwanted imperfection on top of an idealized closed system. Here, in contrast, the dissipative part of the master equation a priori has the same strength (\( \sim \Gamma_{1D} \)) as the coherent interactions. A key idea that we aim to establish is that within an MBL regime, the bulk region of a many-body system behaves as if it is increasingly closed, as it becomes farther in distance from a boundary. These ideas can be better clarified by returning to the simpler problem of Anderson localization, but now studied from the spin model perspective.

**A. Disorder in the single-photon limit**

The non-interacting or linear optical regime of Eq. (2) is obtained in the limit of just a single excitation. The key properties of this regime are encoded in the \( N \) single-excitation eigenmodes and eigenvalues of the non-Hermitian
FIG. 2. Spatial profile of the single-excitation eigenmodes of the effective Hamiltonian $H_{1D}$, ordered with respect to the real part of their eigenvalue, for two different system sizes: $N = 50$ (a) and $N = 200$ (b). These eigenmodes have been calculated for a single disorder realization, and are indexed from lowest ($\xi = 1$) to highest ($\xi = N$) frequency. (c) Average value over a large number of disorder realizations of $\omega_\xi/\Gamma_{1D}$ (blue) as a function of $\xi$, together with the associated Anderson localization length $N_{\text{loc}}(\omega_\xi)$ (orange) in units of atoms. (d) Average value over a large number of disorder realizations of the normalized decay rate $\Gamma_\xi/\Gamma_{1D}$ of eigenmodes, as a function of $\xi/N$, for two different system sizes $N = 50$ (blue) and $N = 200$ (orange). A large fraction of modes have a decay rate smaller than $\Gamma_{1D}/2$ (dashed green line). Numerically, the number of such states decreases approximately as $\sim 1/\sqrt{N}$ (inset).

Hamiltonian $H_{1D}$, whose properties we now examine more closely. The eigenvalues themselves are complex, with the real and imaginary parts accounting for the shift in resonance frequency $\omega_\xi$ of the collective mode with respect to the bare atomic frequency, and half of the collective decay rate $\Gamma_\xi$, respectively.

As a concrete example, we first take one single realization of disorder, and sort the eigenstates in increasing order of their resonance frequencies, labeled by $1 \leq \xi \leq N$. Denoting the wave functions by $|\psi_\xi\rangle = \sum_j c_\xi^j \hat{\sigma}_j^e |g\rangle \otimes N$, in Figs. 2(a,b) we plot $|c_\xi^j|^2$, the square root of the probability for atom $j$ to be excited, for the atom numbers of $N = 50$ and $N = 200$, respectively. For all numerical calculations, we take an average atomic spacing of $d = 2.7\pi/k_{1D}$ (to be in the dilute regime) and full disorder. We see that states in the middle of the spectrum ($\xi \sim N/2$) are localized, while states at the edges of the spectrum ($\xi \sim 1$ and $\xi \sim N$) are extended. Furthermore, in Fig. 2(c), we now fix the atom number $N = 50$, and plot the average value of the resonance frequency $\omega_\xi/\Gamma_{1D}$ versus $\xi$ over a large number of disorder realizations (blue curve). We simultaneously plot (orange curve) the previously established Anderson localization length $N_{\text{loc}}(\omega_\xi)$ corresponding to these frequencies. Comparing with Fig. 2(a), we see that the transition from localized to extended eigenstates occurs when $|\omega_\xi|$ is detuned enough that the localization length $N_{\text{loc}}(\omega_\xi) > N$ exceeds the number of atoms inside the chain. In particular, the existence of extended states of the spin model (such as found in Refs. [46–48]) does not contradict the fact that Anderson localization always exists in the 1D disordered system. Indeed, this latter statement refers to the thermodynamic limit: i.e., for any detuning $\Delta$ there is always some sufficiently large $N$ where one will eventually observe Anderson localization.

In Fig. 2(d), we plot the average value over a large number of disorder realizations of the decay rate $\Gamma_\xi/\Gamma_{1D}$, normalized by the single-atom decay rate, as a function of $\xi/N$ for two different system sizes $N = 50$ and $N = 200$. We see that the extended modes in the edges of the spectrum have a large decay rate, while the localized modes in the middle have an exponentially small decay rate. Importantly, this shows that localized modes, with populations
away from the boundaries, cannot efficiently decay by spontaneous emission. Furthermore, as \(N\) increases, we find that the percentage of delocalized modes [here quantified by the percentage of modes with a decay rate greater than \(\Gamma_{1D}/2\), above the green line in Fig. 2(d)] decreases approximately as \(\sim 1/\sqrt{N}\), as shown in the inset.

While this analysis was restricted to the single-excitation manifold, it naturally also follows that for our particular model, the existence of MBL cannot be inferred purely by looking for the localized nature of eigenstates of the spin model with large number of excitations. In particular, a study along those lines would have to determine whether an apparently delocalized state might become localized as the system size is increased. As that is difficult within numerical capabilities, we will attempt to demonstrate the existence of MBL using carefully selected measures. Separately, we note that while localized and extended eigenstates are located at the center and edges of the spectrum, respectively, for single excitations, this is not necessarily true for more excitations. For example, assuming that interactions can be considered as a perturbation, two single-excitation extended eigenstates with energies \(\pm \omega\) could combine to give an extended two-excitation eigenstate with approximately zero energy. Observing MBL should thus require that \(N_{\text{loc}}(\Delta, \rho_{ee}) < N\) over the entire bandwidth of the system dynamics.

**B. Localization as a transition to Hermitianity**

The previous section suggests that Anderson (or many-body) localized states should experience exponentially small decay rates versus distance of excitations from the boundaries. Therefore, the dissipative component of Eq. (2) should have negligible effect, and such states should essentially be governed only by the Hermitian component \(\mathcal{H}_{\text{hermi}} = (\mathcal{H}_{1D} + \mathcal{H}_{1D}^\dagger)/2\) of the effective Hamiltonian. This Hermitian component reads:

\[
\mathcal{H}_{\text{hermi}} = \frac{\Gamma_{1D}}{2} \sum_{i,j} \sin (k_{1D} |z_i - z_j|) \hat{\sigma}_i^{ge} \hat{\sigma}_j^{ge}.
\]

(6)

We can again easily visualize this in the single-excitation limit. Specifically, for a single disorder realization and \(N = 150\), we calculate the eigenstate amplitudes \(c_j^\xi\) for the non-Hermitian and Hermitian Hamiltonians, which we plot in Figs. 3(a,b), respectively. Then, in Fig. 3(c), we plot the overlap \(S(\xi, \xi') = |\langle \psi_{\xi}^{(1D)} | \psi_{\xi'}^{(\text{hermi})} \rangle|\) between the non-Hermitian and Hermitian eigenstates. We find that this matrix is nearly the identity, particularly in the middle of the spectrum where the modes are well-localized [49].

This suggests that we can search for the existence of MBL in two different ways. First, we can take the closed system Hamiltonian \(\mathcal{H}_{\text{hermi}}\), and look for well-established mathematical signatures such as logarithmic growth of entanglement entropy following a quench. Then, assuming that the existence of MBL is not affected by losses for the reasons above, we can simultaneously look for realistic observables in the physical, open system.

![FIG. 3. Spatial profile of the single-excitation eigenmodes of the effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian \(\mathcal{H}_{1D}\) (a) and its Hermitian component \(\mathcal{H}_{\text{hermi}}\) (b) as a function of eigenmode index \(\xi\). (c) Magnitude of the dot product between the eigenmodes of the two Hamiltonians. Here, we have taken \(N = 150\) atoms.](image-url)
IV. INTRODUCTION TO CONVENTIONAL MBL

The key properties of MBL can be understood from a “canonical” Hamiltonian hypothesized for all MBL systems \[19, 20\]. For spin systems like ours, it reads

\[
H_{\text{LIOM}} = \sum_i \omega_i \hat{\sigma}_i^z + \sum_{i,j} J_{i,j} \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z + \sum_{i,j,k} G_{i,j,k} \hat{\sigma}_i^+ \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_k^- + \ldots
\]  

(7)

Here, the \(\hat{\sigma}_i^z\) operators are the so-called local integrals of motion, pseudo \(\hat{\sigma}_z\) operators that are quasi-local in space.

Because \(H_{\text{LIOM}}\) only involves products of \(\hat{\sigma}_z\) operators, each \(\hat{\sigma}_i^z\) commutes with the Hamiltonian and thus their occupations are conserved quantities. Furthermore, as these operators only have support on a few sites, there will be no transport of energy, and an MBL system prepared initially out of equilibrium will never thermalize.

The interacting terms (e.g., \(J_{i,j}\) for two-body interactions) have exponentially decreasing amplitude with the distance between modes \[24\]. The interactions differentiate MBL from Anderson localization, and cause each local integral of motion \(\hat{\sigma}_i^z\) to acquire different phases in evolution depending on the occupancy of other \(\hat{\sigma}_i^z\). For closed systems, this results in a dephasing for any local subsystem, due to the gradual entanglement of these degrees of freedom with others further away. Likewise, after a quench, these interactions cause a subsystem \(\hat{\rho}_A\) consisting of half the entire system to exhibit a logarithmic growth of entanglement entropy in time in the MBL phase \[50\]. As a comparison, systems that do not exhibit MBL experience a ballistic growth of entanglement entropy (linear with time).

V. MANY-BODY LOCALIZATION IN THE CLOSED WAVEGUIDE

In this section, we study the Hermitian component \(H_{\text{hermi}}\) of the effective Hamiltonian, looking at transport and entanglement entropy. Specifically, we consider initial states consisting of product states of \(n_{\text{exc}}\) excitations, \(|\psi_{\text{init}}\rangle = \prod_{j \in S_{\text{init}}} \hat{\sigma}_j^+ |g\rangle^\otimes N\) with \(S_{\text{init}}\) being the set of indices of the initially excited atoms. Enforcing a fixed number of excitations enables us to study modestly larger system sizes, by throwing out the Hilbert subspace with higher excitation numbers.

We first consider transport, in a system of \(N = 30\) atoms. In Fig. 4(a), we show the time-dependent excited-state population \(|\hat{\sigma}_{ee}^i(t)\rangle\) per site, averaged over ~ \(20 - 100\) disordered configurations, for \(n_{\text{exc}} = \{1, 3, 5\}\) roughly equidistantly spaced excited states. In comparison, in Fig. 4(b), we show the evolution for the same initial states, but in an ordered chain of lattice constant \(d = 2.7\pi / k_{\text{1D}}\). In Fig. 4(c) we plot the site-dependent population \(|\hat{\sigma}_{ee}^i(t_{\text{max}})\rangle\) for the final time of the simulation, \(t_{\text{max}} = 100 / T_{\text{1D}}\), both for the disordered (blue) and ordered cases (red). In the ordered system, the population rapidly becomes distributed evenly among all the spins, so that \(|\hat{\sigma}_{ee}^i(t_{\text{max}})\rangle \approx n_{\text{exc}} / N\) (dotted black line). (The only exception is for \(n_{\text{exc}} = 1\), where the single excitation evolves according to a well-defined band dispersion relation.) In contrast, in the presence of disorder, the system retains a clear memory.

This can be quantified by defining an observable that captures the memory of the initial state:

\[
\mathcal{M}(t) = \left( \frac{\sum_{i \in S_{\text{init}}} |\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^+ (t) \rangle|}{n_{\text{exc}}} - \frac{n_{\text{exc}}}{N} \right) / \left( 1 - \frac{n_{\text{exc}}}{N} \right).
\]  

(8)

This quantity would be equal to 1 in the case of an initial population distribution conserved through time, and to 0 in the case of an equally shared population between all atoms. In Fig. 4(d), we plot the disorder-averaged \(\mathcal{M}(t)\) and observe a clear memory of the initial state (or, equivalently, an absence of transport at long times) in all the cases with disorder.

In Fig. 5 we study the evolution of half chain entanglement entropy in time, for the same disordered system and initial conditions. A clear region of logarithmic growth is observed when the number of excitations is large enough (up to the largest number \(n_{\text{exc}} = 5\) we can simulate in a system of \(N = 30\) atoms), before saturating due to the limited system size. Figures 4 and 5 provide evidence that the closed waveguide, as defined by \(H_{\text{hermi}}\), exhibits a many-body localized phase up to an excitation density of ~ \(1/6\).
FIG. 4. Transport properties of $N = 30$ atoms in a closed waveguide, averaged over disorder configurations. Each column corresponds to a different number of excitations ($n_{\text{exc}} = 1, 3, 5$), initialized in a product state. In (a) and (b), we plot the time-dependent, site-resolved excited state population $\langle \hat{c}_{\text{ee}}^\dagger i(t) \rangle$, for disordered and ordered systems, respectively. (c) Site-resolved population $\langle \hat{c}_{\text{ee}}^\dagger i(t_{\text{max}}) \rangle$ evaluated at the final simulation time $t_{\text{max}} = 100/\Gamma_{1D}$, for both disordered and ordered systems. As a guide to the eye, we plot $n_{\text{exc}}/N$ (dashed line), the population if the initial excitations were to become uniformly distributed. (d) Time-dependent memory parameter $\bar{M}(t)$ for both disordered and ordered systems.

FIG. 5. Disorder-averaged half-chain entanglement entropy as a function of time, for different number of atomic excitations initially prepared in a product state, in the closed waveguide. Here, we take an excitation number $1 \leq n_{\text{exc}} \leq 5$ and $N = 30$ atoms, and average between 20-100 configurations. Logarithmic scalings (dashed lines) are shown as a guide to the eye.
A. Delocalization transition

As discussed in Sec. II, based on qualitative arguments, we expect a disordered waveguide QED system to exhibit an MBL phase up to an excitation density of $\rho_{ee} = n_{exc}/N = 1/2$ in the thermodynamic limit. However, we also expect that the localization length $N_{loc}(\Delta, \rho_{ee})$ should gradually increase as the excitation density increases, eventually diverging as $\rho_{ee} \to 1/2$. Thus, for a finite system of moderate size as can be simulated, this would lead to a smooth crossover to delocalization as $n_{exc}$ is increased.

To observe this, we consider a smaller chain of $N = 20$, and repeat the same calculations as before, but now for $1 \leq n_{exc} \leq 7$ to reach a higher excitation density. In Fig. 6(a) we plot the transport properties for $n_{exc} = 1, 3, 5$ and 7 excitations. It can be seen that the memory of the initial state becomes negligible already for $n_{exc} = 5$, and essentially vanishes for $n_{exc} = 7$, as the initial population is eventually equally shared among all atoms in the waveguide. In Fig. 6(b) we plot the half chain entanglement entropy, and see a smooth transition toward ballistic growth as the number of excitations exceeds $n_{exc} \gtrsim 4 - 5$.

While a delocalization transition that occurs at a lower density of excitations, $n_{exc}/N \sim 1/4$, cannot be ruled out from these numerics, the results are nonetheless consistent with our previous hypothesis of a smooth crossover.

FIG. 6. Transport properties of $N = 20$ atoms in a closed waveguide, averaged over disorder configurations. Each column corresponds to a different number of excitations ($n_{exc} = 1, 3, 5, 7$), initialized in a product state. (a) Time-dependent, site-resolved excited state population $\langle \hat{\sigma}_{i}^{+} \rangle$. (b) Site-resolved excited state population at the final simulation time, $t_{max} = 100/\Gamma_{1D}$. As a guide to the eye, we plot $n_{exc}/N$ (dashed line) to indicate the population if the excitations become equally distributed. (c) Time-dependent memory parameter $\tilde{M}(t)$. (d) Disorder-averaged half-chain entanglement entropy as a function of time, for different number of atomic excitations initially prepared in a product state, in the closed waveguide. Linear and logarithmic scalings (dashed lines) are shown as a guide to the eye.
In particular, assuming that the dynamics have a characteristic bandwidth of $\sim \Gamma_{1D}$, one finds a heuristic many-body localization length $N_{loc}(\Delta = \Gamma_{1D}, \rho_{ee})$ that exceeds the system size of $N = 20$ for $n_{exc} \gtrsim 4$. Separately, returning to the physical, open waveguide described by Eq. (2), exact diagonalization of the Liouvillian for small systems reveals the absence of any highly subradiant modes once $n_{exc}/N \sim 1/2$, i.e. atomic excitations are rapidly transported to the system boundaries and lost via radiation. This strong dissipation by itself makes the notion of MBL inapplicable, but is consistent with the heuristic picture that a half-excited atomic system cannot suppress transport.

VI. MBL IN THE OPEN SYSTEM

While looking for signatures of MBL in the closed system described by $\mathcal{H}_{\text{hermi}}$ is a well-defined mathematical problem, it is also important to find practical signatures that have meaning even in the physical, open system. Anticipating that regions within the excitation density-dependent localization length $\sim N_{loc}(\rho_{ee})$ are strongly affected by dissipation, our goal in numerics is to reduce the relative size of such regions, compared to the remaining “bulk”. To that end, in the following, we present results for the open half-waveguide, as described by Eq. (4), which only has one radiating boundary.

We begin by studying transport in the open system. Again, based on the intuition that the system will resemble a closed system (and thus exhibit stronger features of MBL) provided that excitations remain far from the boundary,

![Graphs showing time-dependent population imbalance and total population for the open half-waveguide with different initial excitations and system sizes.](image_url)

**FIG. 7.** Time-dependent population imbalance $\mathcal{M}_{\text{half}}(t)$ (left panel) and total population $P_e(t)$ (right panel) for the open half-waveguide, for $n_{exc} = 1$ (a), $n_{exc} = 2$ (b), and $n_{exc} = 4$ (c) initial excitations, for various system sizes $N$ (indicated by different colors). We plot these quantities both for the disordered (solid curves) and ordered (dashed) systems. The observables are averaged over a minimum of 25 disorder realizations, and the mean spacing between atoms is $d = 2.7\pi/k_{1D}$. 
we slightly alter the initial conditions compared to Sec. V and start with a product state $|\psi_{\text{init}}\rangle = \bigotimes_{n_{\text{exc}}} |e_i\rangle$ where all $n_{\text{exc}}$ initial excitations are located on the left half of the chain. We then define the imbalance $\mathcal{M}_{\text{half}}$ between the left and right halves,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{half}}(t) = \frac{1}{n_{\text{exc}}} \left( \sum_{i<N/2+1} \langle \hat{\sigma}^i_{ee}(t) \rangle - \sum_{i>N/2} \langle \hat{\sigma}^i_{ee}(t) \rangle \right). \quad (9)$$

In Fig. 7 (left panel) we plot the disorder averaged, time-dependent imbalance for various initial excitation numbers $n_{\text{exc}} = 1, 2, 4$ and for different system sizes. Alongside the imbalance, we also plot the total excited population $P_e(t) = \sum_i \langle \hat{\sigma}^i_{ee}(t) \rangle$ for the open system in the right panel. We plot the results for the disordered system (solid lines, with at least 25 disorder realizations) and for the ordered system (dotted) for comparison. We choose the initial states to be $|e_1\rangle$ for one excitation, $|e_1, e_5\rangle$ for two and $|e_1, e_3, e_5, e_7\rangle$ for four excitations. Furthermore, the simulations are performed by directly solving the master equation, i.e., Eq. (4), for $n_{\text{exc}} \leq 2$, and by a quantum jump approach for $n_{\text{exc}} = 4$ (with minimum of 100 trajectories for each configuration). Examining the imbalance first, we observe that the disordered system generally retains a memory for long times, while the memory is rapidly lost for the ordered case. In addition, for fixed $n_{\text{exc}}$, we see that the degree of imbalance in the disordered system at long times increases as the system size $N$ increases, as does the amount of total excited population at long times. This supports the assertion that the system becomes increasingly closed. Finally, it should be noted that the total population in the ordered system also decays slowly for long times, albeit faster than the disordered case. This can be attributed to the large number of single and multi-excitation subradiant states in a 1D waveguide [15]. In the case of a full waveguide (dissipation at both boundaries) and sufficient number of excitations, it has previously been shown that this leads to a power-law decay for ordered systems at long times [11].

The interesting role played by the open nature of the system is further elucidated in Fig. 8, where we fix the system size to $N = (8, 16)$ in (a,b), respectively, and study the imbalance and population for the disordered system as the number of initial excitations in the left part of the system is increased. Here, the initial states are $|e_1\rangle, |e_1, e_4\rangle, |e_1, e_2, e_4\rangle$ and $|e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\rangle$ for $N = 8$ and $|e_1\rangle, |e_1, e_8\rangle, |e_1, e_4, e_8\rangle$ and $|e_1, e_3, e_6, e_8\rangle$ for $N = 16$. First, looking at the total populations (right panel), we see that for the smaller system $N = 8$, a higher initial number of excitations does not necessarily imply a higher excited population at long times. This can be clearly seen, for example, for $n_{\text{exc}} = 4$ (purple curve), where the total population rapidly decays and becomes smaller than the case of $n_{\text{exc}} = 1$ by the final simulation time. For $n_{\text{exc}} = 4$, the large density of initial excitations facilitates rapid transport to the boundary and dissipation. Then, once the excitation density becomes small enough (in this case, $P_e(t) < 1$ at long times), the onset of localization can occur, and the systems retains a small but non-zero imbalance at long times. For the larger system ($N = 16$) and lower initial density, the roles of dissipation and delocalization are less pronounced, as we only observe a crossing of curves of the total population for the initial state $n_{\text{exc}} = 4$ with $n_{\text{exc}} = 3$, and the imbalance remains fairly large for all $n_{\text{exc}} \leq 4$.

![FIG. 8. Time-dependent population imbalance $\mathcal{M}_{\text{half}}(t)$ (left panel) and total population $P_e(t)$ (right panel) for the disordered open half-waveguide, for a fixed system size of $N = 8$ (a) and $N = 16$ (b) and varying number of initial excitations $n_{\text{exc}}$ (indicated by different colors). The observables are averaged over a minimum of 50 disorder realizations, and the mean spacing between atoms is $d = 2.7\pi/k_{1D}$.](image-url)
FIG. 9. (a) Scheme of the quantum revival experiment to measure the interacting degrees of freedom in the open waveguide. An additional ancilla \( A \) is introduced, which does not couple or radiate into the waveguide, but couples to and can exchange excitations with the waveguide atom \( n_c \). The time-dependent excited population of the ancilla is monitored to record the number of revivals \( N_{\text{rev}} \) within a certain time window \([0, t]\). (b,c) Ancilla population versus time, for three typical disorder realizations for a closed waveguide. Here, initially the ancilla is excited, while the waveguide atoms contain no excitations (b) and 2 excitations (c). The total system size (ancilla + atoms) is \( N = 14 \). (d,e) Disorder-averaged revival rate \( \bar{R}(t) \) of the ancilla in the closed waveguide (solid lines) and open half waveguide (dashed lines), for \( N = (10, 14) \) total atoms, respectively, and for different number of initial excitations (indicated by different colors). The observables are averaged over a minimum of 50 disorder realizations, and the mean spacing between atoms is \( d = 2.7\pi/k_{1D} \).

A. Experimentally accessible measure of interactions: Quantum revival

As entanglement entropy is difficult to measure in a closed system of large size, and has no immediate analogue in an open system, capturing some essence of the slow entanglement entropy growth is generally one of the most challenging aspects to experimentally study MBL [23]. When the local integral of motion closely resembles the physical spin, it has been theoretically proposed that the slow growth of entanglement can be probed by generalized spin echo techniques [51]. In our system, however, we find that this technique is ineffective, as localized modes have a non-negligible extent over at least a few sites (see the single-excitation dynamics in Fig. 4, for example). Physically, this is because suppressing the emission of light by one excited atom arises from the excitation of at least the neighboring atoms and their destructive interference in radiation.

We thus adopt an alternative proposal by Vasseur et al. [52], which is readily implementable within waveguide QED. In particular, we consider the addition of an extra ancilla atom \( A \) that does not directly couple or radiate into the waveguide, but is allowed to coherently exchange excitations with the waveguide atom \( n_c \) [see Fig. 9(a)]. The waveguide atoms thus serve as an exotic bath for the ancilla. The corresponding Hamiltonian for this system (studied for the half-waveguide) is

\[
H = H_{\text{half}} + H_c,
\]

with \( H_{\text{half}} \) given in Eq. 5 and \( H_c = C (\hat{\sigma}_A \hat{\sigma}_n^c + h.c) \) coupling the ancilla to atom \( n_c \) in the chain. In the following we use \( C = \Gamma_{1D}/2 \) and we couple the ancilla to the atom number \( n_c = 5 \) in the chain of \( N = 1 \) atoms.

If the system was governed purely by \( H_c \), an ancilla initially excited would indefinitely and reversibly exchange its excitation with atom \( n_c \). In the Anderson localized regime, where the waveguide interactions are turned on but all waveguide atoms are initially unexcited, the ancilla couples to a few localized modes (those whose support contain atom \( n_c \)). This leads to a more complex structure of collapse and revival dynamics in the ancilla population over time, as illustrated in Fig. 9(b) (for the closed half-waveguide, with no dissipation). Although the details of the revivals depend on the disorder configuration, since the number of localized modes to which the ancilla couples is discrete and fixed, the revivals would continue with the same frequency and amplitude indefinitely in the absence of dissipation, and for an increasingly long time with increasing system size in the presence of dissipation. In contrast,
in the MBL phase where multiple waveguide atoms are initially excited:

\[ |\psi_{\text{init}}\rangle = |e_A\rangle \otimes |\psi_{\text{wg}}\rangle, \]

with \( |\psi_{\text{wg}}\rangle = |e_1, \ldots, e_l\rangle \), interactions between excitations effectively cause the ancilla to couple to an increasing number of degrees of freedom in time, which makes revivals less likely. This is illustrated in Fig. 9(c), for the case of \( n_{\text{exc}} = 1 \) excitations initialized in the waveguide as well, at positions \( |e_3, e_7\rangle \).

In principle, for closed systems, the revival rate should be inversely proportional to the effective size of the Hilbert space to which the ancilla is coupled. We can thus numerically study the revival rate \( R(t) = N_{\text{rev}}(t)/t \) (see Appendix B for how the number of revivals \( N_{\text{rev}}(t) \) in the time window \([0, t]\) is determined) solving directly the master equation. In Fig. 9(d,e), we plot the disorder-averaged revival rate \( \overline{R}(t) = N_{\text{rev}}(t)/t \) for a smaller \((N = 10)\) and larger \((N = 14)\) system, respectively, and for both open (dashed lines) and closed (solid lines) systems. In addition to the excited ancilla, we considered the following initial states for the waveguide atoms:

\[ |\psi_{\text{wg}}\rangle = |g\rangle \]

for the unloaded case, and

\[ |\psi_{\text{wg}}\rangle = |e_3\rangle, |\psi_{\text{wg}}\rangle = |e_3, e_7\rangle, |\psi_{\text{wg}}\rangle = |e_2, e_4, e_7\rangle, |\psi_{\text{wg}}\rangle = |e_2, e_4, e_8, e_9\rangle \]

for a total number of excitations \( n_{\text{exc}} \) from 1 to 5.

Several clear trends can be seen. First, investigating the closed system, we see that for sufficiently large \( n_{\text{exc}} \geq 3 \), the revival rate indeed decreases in time, indicating an increasing number of interacting degrees of freedom, before saturating to a fixed value based on the finite Hilbert space size. Second, the open system results better follow those of the closed system as the system size is increased, which reflects our previous observation that a larger open system appears increasingly closed, if the system is localized. Interestingly, however, the effect of dissipation does not necessarily lead to a smaller revival rate. Similar to the case of transport in an open system, it appears that dissipation can cause some number of excitations (particularly those far from the ancilla and close to the boundary) to disappear at early times, which can slightly increase the revival rate with the fewer, remaining degrees of freedom.

To quantify the evolution of the average number of degrees of freedom \( \overline{N}(t) \) to which the ancilla is coupled by interactions, we take the ansatz that

\[ \overline{R}(t) = \frac{1}{\overline{N}(t)} \]

where \( \alpha \) is a proportionality constant. We further split \( \overline{N}(t) = \overline{N}_0(t) + \overline{N}_{\text{int}}(t) \) with \( \overline{N}_0(t) \) the average number of degrees of freedom that interacts with the ancilla without interactions inside the waveguide and \( \overline{N}_{\text{int}}(t) \) the average number of degrees of freedom that comes from interactions between the different qubits. \( \overline{N}_{\text{int}}(t) \) should grow logarithmically in time in MBL systems and linearly in time for delocalized systems, while \( \overline{N}_0(t) \) saturates to a constant value that depends on the localization length \( N_{\text{loc}} \).

Thus, using the unloaded waveguide as a reference, we can extract from the revival rates the average number of interacting degrees of freedom by considering the quantity:

\[ \overline{O}(t) = 1/\overline{R}(t) - 1/\overline{R}_0(t) = \frac{\overline{N}_0(t) + \overline{N}_{\text{int}}(t)}{\alpha} - \frac{\overline{N}_0(t)}{\alpha} = \frac{\overline{N}_{\text{int}}(t)}{\alpha}. \]

In Eq. 13, \( \overline{R}_0(t) \) is the average revival rate without any additional excitations inside the waveguide (black curves in Figs. 9(d,e)] and \( \overline{R}(t) \) the average revival rate in the presence of extra excitations in the waveguide (colored curves in Figs. 9(d,e)].

We plot \( \overline{O}(t) \) as a function of \( t \) for a system size of \( N = 14 \) in Fig. 10. In Figs. 10(a-d) we study the closed system with an increasing number of excitations loading the waveguide (one to four). For each curve we associate a fitting function that assumes either a logarithmic form (slow growth of number of degrees of freedom) or linear form (fast growth). We observe that the number of interacting degrees of freedom goes from a slow growth (\( n_{\text{exc}} \leq 3 \)) to a fast and linear growth with time when \( n_{\text{exc}} = 5 \). This indicates both the existence of a MBL phase up to a photon density of at least \( \sim 1/5 \) and that the localization length exceeds the system size once \( n_{\text{exc}} \geq 4 \).

In Figs. 10(e-g) we extract the interacting degrees of freedom for the open system with one to three extra excitations loading the waveguide and observe their slow growth with time. Figure 10(h) clarifies the role of loss in this scheme, comparing \( \overline{O}(t) \) for an increasing number of excitations loading the closed (solid lines) and the open system (dashed lines). Good agreement can be seen between the closed and the open system for low number of excitations, while differences appear for higher excitation numbers where the effect of loss is more prominent. Interestingly, for \( n_{\text{exc}} = 4 \) the closed system is seen to exhibit a linear growth in the number of interacting degrees of freedom [Fig. 10(c)], while a logarithmic growth is seen for the same number of excitations in the open system [Fig. 10(g)]. Similar to the case of transport studied earlier, this suggests that high densities of excitations first facilitate rapid transfer of some excitations to the boundaries where they are dissipated, while MBL-like dynamics then continues for the remaining excitations in the system.
In summary, we have proposed and presented numerical evidence that a system of disordered atoms coupled to a waveguide exhibits an MBL phase, provided that the density of atomic excitations is less than $1/2$. Compared with many other MBL systems already studied, this system appears particularly rich. In particular, the system contains two types of particles (atomic spins, and a continuum of photons), and furthermore, the continuum nature of the photon modes intrinsically causes the atomic dynamics to appear open, with a dissipation strength that a priori is equal to the coherent interaction strength (Eq. 2). Thus, beyond typical MBL systems where dissipation is simply an unwanted effect, our system presents interesting opportunities to study the apparent transition toward Hermitianity [49] when the system is localized, and potential subtleties associated with that transition, such as the role of delocalization in facilitating dissipation, or a localization transition induced by loss.

State-of-the-art waveguide QED systems involving superconducting qubits coupled to transmission lines should already be capable of studying the proposed phenomena. In particular, it has been demonstrated that systems consisting of at least $N = 7$ controllable, individually measurable, and identical qubits can be realized [27], with ratios of atom-waveguide interaction strengths to additional, unwanted dissipation of $\Gamma_{1D}/\Gamma' \sim 10^2$-$10^3$ [27, 53] that enable the predicted dynamics to be observed before additional effects set in. Furthermore, since our proposed scheme relies on disorder, the use of identical qubits is not necessary, and up to $N = 72$ qubits have been realized in such an instance in similar systems [54]. Coupling between superconducting qubits and microwave photons can also be realized in two dimensions [32]. Taken together, circuit QED systems consequently offer promising opportunities to investigate MBL [24, 33, 34], including in regimes beyond what can be studied directly with numerics. Although still in their infancy, systems consisting of atoms coupled to photonic crystal waveguides can also potentially reach the desired combinations of large atom-waveguide interaction strengths [55, 56] and large atom number to investigate MBL.

Beyond our initial theoretical investigations, our work also stimulates other theoretical questions to explore. First, while we have focused solely on position disorder (and full disorder in the numerics, to minimize the localization length), our qualitative arguments about the existence of MBL seem quite general. We thus envision future efforts to confirm a thermodynamic phase diagram similar to Fig. 1(b), for arbitrary amounts and types of disorder (e.g., in resonance frequencies). Furthermore, thus far, we have reduced the complexity of our system by integrating out the photons and focusing on the atomic “spin” degrees of freedom. While this is an excellent approximation near
resonance, it would be interesting to more fully explore the system from the photonics standpoint. For example, we anticipate the generation of interesting quantum correlations of light in the MBL phase, either through the excited atoms themselves, or explicitly via quantum transport by sending in optical pulses. Including the photons might also provide an avenue to develop diagrammatic techniques \cite{13, 57, 58} to understand MBL and the delocalization transition, and in a way that is not as limited by system size as with pure numerics. Finally, while we have considered the most basic continuum of photon modes here, consisting of a linear dispersion and infinite bandwidth, current waveguide QED systems also offer excellent potential for dispersion engineering, such as through the introduction of band edges and gaps \cite{19} or even its global shape \cite{32} \cite{60}, and other features such as realizing some degree of chirality in interactions \cite{61}. These can dramatically alter the nature and the range of the photon-mediated interactions, and result in non-trivial boundaries between MBL and delocalized phases.
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Appendix A: Estimation of the energy density dependent localization length

In this appendix, we derive the energy density dependent localization length of the 1D disordered and open waveguide. To do so, let us consider a single two level atom driven by an incoming coherent state of Rabi frequency $\Omega$ and a detuning $\Delta = \omega_0 - \omega_{eg}$. In the rotating frame, the Hamiltonian that drives the interaction between the light and the two level atom is:

$$H = -\Delta \sigma_{ee} + \Omega(\sigma_{eg} + \sigma_{ge}).$$  \hfill (A1)

Inserting this Hamiltonian into the master equation for the two level atom,

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -i[H, \rho] + \frac{\Gamma_{1D}}{2} L[\rho]$$  \hfill (A2)

with $L[\rho] = 2\sigma_{ge}\rho\sigma_{eg} - \sigma_{ee}\rho - \rho\sigma_{ee}$, one obtains the optical Bloch equations whose steady state solutions are:

$$\rho_{ee} = \frac{\Omega^2}{4\Delta^2 + \Gamma_{1D}^2 + 2\Omega^2}$$  \hfill (A3)

and

$$\rho_{eg} = i\Omega \frac{\Gamma_{1D} + 2i\Delta}{4\Delta^2 + \Gamma_{1D}^2 + 2\Omega^2}.$$  \hfill (A4)

The input-output equation for a waveguide \cite{41} allows one to express the transmitted field as

$$\hat{E} = \hat{E}_{in} + i\sqrt{\frac{\Gamma_{1D}}{2}} \hat{\sigma}_{ge}$$  \hfill (A5)

where $\hat{E}_{in}$ represents the (coherent state) input field. This leads to the expression of the transmittance $T = \langle \hat{E}^\dagger \hat{E} \rangle / \langle \hat{E}_{in}^\dagger \hat{E}_{in} \rangle$:

$$T = \frac{4\Delta^2 + 8\Omega^2}{\Gamma_{1D}^2 + 4\Delta^2 + 8\Omega^2}$$  \hfill (A6)
From this single atom transmission, one can extract the saturation and frequency dependent localization length using:

$$N_{\text{loc}}(\Delta, \rho_{ee}) = \frac{1}{|\log(T)|}, \quad (A7)$$

with $N_{\text{loc}}$ being the localization length in units of number of atoms. In the equation above, the excited-state population $\rho_{ee}$ parametrically depends on the Rabi frequency via Eq. (A3).

FIG. 11. (a) Excited-state population $\rho_{ee}$ and transmittance $T$ of a single atom as a function of driving Rabi amplitude $\Omega$, and at a detuning $\Delta = \Gamma_{1D}$. (b) The estimated MBL localization length $N_{\text{loc}}(\Delta = \Gamma_{1D}, \rho_{ee})$ as a function of atomic population.

In a waveguide QED system, one can estimate that the characteristic bandwidth of MBL dynamics is given by $\Gamma_{1D}$. One can then evaluate the excited-state population $\rho_{ee}$ and transmittance $T$ at a detuning $\Delta = \Gamma_{1D}$ (illustrated in Fig. 11b), as a function of $\Omega$, and subsequently calculate the excited state population dependent MBL localization length $\sim N_{\text{loc}}(\Delta = \Gamma_{1D}, \rho_{ee})$, which we plot in Fig. 11c. Note that the localization length exceeds the maximum system sizes we can numerically study $N \sim 20-30$ for excitation densities of $n_{\text{exc}}/N \sim 0.3$.

Appendix B:
Revival counting

In the quantum revival simulations, one has to count the revival rates of the ancilla in order to extract the number of interacting degrees of freedom in the waveguide. For each realization of the disorder, we obtain the population of the ancilla $\langle \hat{\sigma}_{ee}^A(t) \rangle$ as a function of time from which we extract all the times $t_n$ corresponding to an extremum of the $\langle \hat{\sigma}_{ee}^A(t) \rangle$. Then for each maximum of the population, we compute $Q = \frac{\langle \hat{\sigma}_{ee}^A(t_n) \rangle - \langle \hat{\sigma}_{ee}^A(t_{n-1}) \rangle}{\langle \hat{\sigma}_{ee}^A(t_{n-1}) \rangle}$ that compares the value at the position of the maximum with the one at the minimum just before. We count this maximum as a revival if this value exceeds a given quantity $Q_{\text{min}}$. For each disorder realization, we thus obtain $N_{\text{rev}}(t)$ which counts the number of revivals of the population in the time window $[0, t]$. Then we average $N_{\text{rev}}(t)$ over the disorder in order to obtain $\overline{R}(t) = N_{\text{rev}}(t)/t$ (note that the details of the revival dynamics vary for each configuration, so one cannot obtain $\overline{R}(t)$ from the disorder-averaged population of the ancilla $\langle \hat{\sigma}_{ee}^A(t) \rangle$). All the curves presented in this work have been obtained with $Q_{\text{min}} = 0.4$. 


