Identifying and harnessing dynamical phase transitions for quantum-enhanced sensing
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We propose the quantum Fisher information (QFI) as a tool to characterize dynamical phase transitions in closed quantum systems, which are usually defined in terms of non-analytic behaviour of a time-averaged order parameter. Employing the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model as an illustrative example, we predict that DPTs correlate with a divergent peak in the QFI that indicates the presence of correlations and entanglement useful for quantum metrology. We discuss a simple analytic model that connects the scaling of the QFI to the behaviour of the order parameter and propose a robust interferometric protocol that can enable DPTs to be harnessed as the basis of quantum-enhanced sensors.

Introduction: The isolation and control of quantum systems at the single-particle level in atomic, molecular and optical platforms has driven a surge of experimental interest in studying fundamental non-equilibrium phenomena. As a consequence, it is now becoming clear that non-equilibrium quantum systems, particularly those that feature coherence, entanglement and correlations, can be important platforms for the development of next-generation quantum technologies [1][2].

From the fundamental perspective, one area of intense interest has been dynamical phase transitions (DPTs) [3–14] as part of the quest to develop an overarching framework to understand and classify non-equilibrium quantum matter. Here, we specifically focus on DPTs in a closed system [15–24] that are defined as a critical point separating distinct dynamical behaviours (i.e., dynamical phases) of a quantum system that emerge after a quench of system parameters. Although this definition is not unique in the literature [25], it was developed in analogy to equilibrium phase transitions by defining a time-averaged order parameter that serves to distinguish dynamical phases of matter and features non-analytic behaviour at the critical point. An important current question is to understand the role of entanglement and coherence in DPTs [8][26][28] and how these might be harnessed for applications in quantum science.

In this manuscript, we theoretically demonstrate that DPTs can be characterized using the quantum Fisher information (QFI) [29], which intrinsically captures metrologically useful entanglement and correlations in a quantum state [30][32]. Our method shares analogies with studies of the related fidelity susceptibility [33][35] for ground-state quantum phase transitions (QPTs), but is importantly distinguished by the addition of time as a relevant variable. By mapping out the dynamical phase diagram of the paradigmatic Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model, we demonstrate that the DPT is starkly identifiable by a sharp peak in the QFI, and use a semi-analytic model to establish a quantitative connection between the scaling of the QFI and the order parameter based on general arguments. Further, while the QFI can be difficult to rigorously access for many platforms we demonstrate that the quantum signatures of the DPT can also be accessed through a related many-body echo combined with simple global measurements. This latter result, in particular, opens a realistic path for the harnessing of DPTs for quantum-enhanced sensing [36].

Signatures of DPTs in QFI: To outline our arguments most generally, we introduce a many-body Hamiltonian,

\[ \hat{H}(\lambda) = \hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{H}_1, \]

where \[ |\hat{H}_0, \hat{H}_1 \rangle \neq 0 \] and \( \lambda \) is a driving parameter that allows us to probe different dynamical phases. For a closed system we consider the evolution of an initial state \( |\psi_0\rangle \) under the Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}(\lambda) \), e.g., \( |\psi(\lambda, t)\rangle = e^{-i\hat{H}(\lambda)t}|\psi_0\rangle \). A time-averaged order parameter \( \bar{O} = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \langle \hat{O}(t) \rangle dt \) coarsely distinguishes ordered (\( \bar{O} \neq 0 \)) and disordered (\( \bar{O} = 0 \)) dynamical phases, and a DPT is signaled by non-analytic behaviour in \( \bar{O} \) at a critical point \( \lambda_{\text{cr}} \) separating the phases [21][24].

We propose a complementary characterization of the dynamical phase boundary by probing how the dynamical quantum state \( |\psi(\lambda, t)\rangle \) abruptly changes as the system is quenched through \( \lambda_{\text{cr}} \). This approach mirrors early work studying QPTs using the fidelity susceptibility to quantify the abrupt transformation of the ground-state wavefunction at an equilibrium critical point [33][35][37][39]. Here, we similarly define the QFI [29][32][10],

\[ F_Q(\lambda, t) = -4 \frac{\partial^2 F(\lambda, \delta \lambda, t)}{\partial (\delta \lambda)^2} \bigg|_{\delta \lambda \to 0}, \]

where \( F(\lambda, \delta \lambda) = |\langle \psi(\lambda, t) | \psi(\lambda + \delta \lambda, t) \rangle| \) is the overlap between two dynamical states that differ by a small change \( \delta \lambda \) in the driving parameter, or equivalently the Loschmidt echo [41][43] \( F(\lambda, \delta \lambda, t) = |\langle \psi_0 | e^{i\hat{H}(\lambda)t} e^{-i\hat{H}(\lambda+\delta \lambda)t} | \psi_0 \rangle| \). Near the critical point \( \lambda \approx \lambda_{\text{cr}} \) we expect the overlap \( F \) to abruptly decrease as the dynamical states become rapidly orthogonal in the distinct non-equilibrium phases. As a consequence, we pre-
dict that a DPT is correspondingly signaled by a sharp peak in the QFI at the critical point $\lambda_{cr}$.

**Example LMG Model:** We demonstrate the validity of our prediction using the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) model \[44, 45\] as a paradigmatic example of a dynamical phase transition \[29\]. Our choice is motivated by the collective nature of the model, which describes an ensemble of $N$ mutually interacting spin-1/2 particles subject to transverse and longitudinal fields, as this facilitates a tractable analysis of the dynamics across a range of parameter regimes and system sizes. Moreover, the LMG model is relevant as variants have been studied in the context of trapped ions \[7, 8\], cavity-QED \[13\] and cold atoms \[16\]–\[19\]. The model is defined by the Hamiltonian \[14\],

$$\hat{H}_{\text{LMG}} = -\frac{X}{N} \hat{S}_z^2 - \Omega \hat{S}_x - \omega \hat{S}_z,$$

(3)

where we have introduced collective spin operators $\hat{S}_x = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{\sigma}_{x,i}/2$ for $x, y, z$ and $\sigma_{x,i}$ are Pauli matrices for the $i$th spin-1/2 particle. The Hamiltonian conserves the total spin $S^2 = S_x^2 + S_y^2 + S_z^2$ and so for simplicity we focus on the maximally collective sector, i.e., states with $S^z = N(N/2 + 1)/2$.

The dynamical phase diagram in the classical limit ($N \rightarrow \infty$) is shown in Fig. 1(a) assuming an initial state of all spins polarized along $-\hat{z}$. A pair of distinct dynamical phases are defined in terms of a time-averaged order parameter $\bar{S}_z$ and most easily described in the limit $\omega \ll \chi$: For $\Omega \ll \chi$ the dynamics is dominated by single-particle Rabi flopping of each spin-1/2 about the $+\hat{z}$-axis and thus $\bar{S}_z = 0$. A critical point separates the phases at $\Omega_{cr}/\chi = 1/2$. Similar analysis holds for $\omega \neq 0$, although the DPT smooths out to a crossover for $\omega/\chi \lesssim 1/\sqrt{2}$ \[43, 50\]. We note that the dynamical phase diagram is symmetric for $\Omega \rightarrow -\Omega$ in this case.

In Figs. 1(b)-(f) we use an efficient Chebyshev expansion algorithm to integrate the dynamics of a system with $N = 10^3$ \[50, 51\] and investigate the DPT using the QFI. We consider independent perturbations of the longitudinal $\delta \omega \hat{S}_z$ [F$_{Q,z}(\Omega, \omega, t)$] and transverse $\delta \Omega \hat{S}_x$ [F$_{Q,x}(\Omega, \omega, t)$] fields, and use an equivalent initial state to (a), i.e., $|\psi_0\rangle = |(-N/2)\rangle$ where $\bar{S}_z|m_z\rangle = m_z|m_z\rangle$. Panel (b) shows typical dynamical behaviour of $F_{Q,x}/Nt^2$ as $\Omega/\chi$ is varied and $\omega/\chi = 0$. The normalisation is chosen to absorb the expected long-time growth of $F_{Q,x} \propto t^2$. Around the critical point $\Omega_{cr}/\chi = 1/2$ we observe a pronounced increase in the QFI both in the transient and long time ($\chi t \gg 1$) regimes, such that $F_{Q,x}/Nt^2 \gg 1$. The QFI also distinguishes the different dynamical phases. In the ordered phase we observe $F_{Q,x}/Nt^2 \rightarrow 0$ while in the disordered phase $F_{Q,z}/Nt^2 \approx 1$.

Panels (c) and (d) shows our key result: The DPT as a function of $\Omega$ and $\omega$ is identified by demonstrable peaks in the QFI (both $F_{Q,x}$ and $F_{Q,z}$) at long times $\chi t \gg 1$. Moreover, we observe that the change of the transition to a crossover for $\omega/\chi < -1/\sqrt{2}$ is indicated very clearly by a broadened and diminishing peak of the QFI that eventually vanishes. Panel (e) compares the critical value $\Omega_{cr}$ determined from the peak positions of $F_{Q,x}$ and $F_{Q,z}$ relative to $\Omega_{cr}$ determined from $\bar{S}_x$ in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit. We observe excellent agreement between all three metrics, with small deviations attributable to finite-size effects (see inset).

Similarly, panel (f) demonstrates that the QFI reproduces the signature dependence of the DPT on the initial state of the system. We compare $\Omega_{cr}$ and $\Omega_{tr}$ as a function of the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = |\theta, \phi\rangle$ where $\theta$ is the tipping angle of the collective spin with respect to the north pole ($\hat{z}$) of the collective Bloch sphere and $\phi$ is the azimuthal angle, fixed to $\phi = 0.2\pi$. We note that for these initial states the phase diagram is no longer symmetric for
\( \Omega \to -\Omega \) and thus we plot both relevant values of the critical transverse field (fixing \( \omega/\chi = 0 \)).

**Critical scaling of the QFI:** The scaling of the QFI with system size near the DPT is of interest in the context of identifying how correlations and entanglement are generated that can be useful for quantum sensing. Specifically, the QFI provides a lower bound for the accuracy to which the classical driving parameter \( \lambda \) can be determined, \( \Delta \lambda \geq 1/\sqrt{F_Q(\lambda, t)} \) \([29]\). In the context of the LMG model, the standard quantum limit, e.g., the sensitivity that can be attained with quasi-classical uncorrelated states, sets a bound \( (\Delta \lambda)^2_{\text{SQL}} \geq 1/(Nt^2) \) or equivalently \( F_{Q,x,z}^1 \) to which the classical driving parameter \( \lambda \) can be determined, \( \Delta \lambda \geq 1/\sqrt{F_Q(\lambda, t)} \) \([29]\). In the context of the LMG model, the standard quantum limit, e.g., the sensitivity that can be attained with quasi-classical uncorrelated states, sets a bound \( (\Delta \lambda)^2_{\text{SQL}} \geq 1/(Nt^2) \) or equivalently \( F_{Q,x,z}^1 \).

A supralinear scaling of the QFI with system size near the critical point indicates opportunities to harness DPTs for quantum-enhanced sensing.

From our numerical calculations we empirically fit the maximum of \( F_Q(t) \) over \( \Omega \) for fixed \( \omega/\chi = 10^{-4} \) and \( \chi t \gg 1 \), i.e., \( F_Q(\Omega^*) = aN^b \). A finite \( \omega \) is chosen to purposely break a parity symmetry \([54]\) of the Hamiltonian. In Fig. 2(a) we plot the exponent \( b \) as a function of the tipping angle \( \theta \) of the initial state \( | \theta, \phi \rangle \) with fixed \( \phi = 0 \). Excluding a region near the equator (\( \theta \approx \pi/2 \)) we observe approximately constant values of \( b = 3/2 \) and \( 7/4 \) for \( F_{Q,x} \) and \( F_{Q,z} \), respectively. This indicates the presence of metrologically useful correlations and entanglement near the DPT that could be used for sub-SQL sensing, e.g., \( (\Delta \lambda)^2 = F_Q < (\Delta \lambda)^2_{\text{SQL}} \) for large \( N \).

To understand the scaling of the QFI, we derive an approximate analytic expression for \( F_Q(\lambda, t) \). For the generic case, \( \hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{H}_1 \), and assuming the spectrum of \( \hat{H} \) is non-degenerate we find that at long-times the secular contribution to the QFI is given by

\[
F_Q^{\text{sec}}(\lambda, t) \approx 4t^2 \left[ \sum_n |c_n|^2 (H_1^n)^2 - \left( \sum_n |c_n|^2 H_1^n \right)^2 \right].
\]

(4)

Here, \( |n\rangle \) are the eigenstates of \( \hat{H} \), \( c_n = \langle n | \psi_0 \rangle \) is the projection of the initial state into the eigenbasis \( H_1^n = \langle n | \hat{H}_1 | n \rangle \). Numerical evaluation of Eq. (4) for the LMG model \( (\hat{H}_1 = \hat{S}_z \text{ or } \hat{S}_x) \) agrees well with our full numerical simulations of the dynamics for \( \theta \) away from the equatorial plane. Note we chose a small \( \omega/\chi = 10^{-4} \) to break degeneracies in the energy spectrum that would make \( F_{Q,z}^{\text{sec}} \) inapplicable. Minor disagreement between \( F_{Q,z}^{\text{sec}} \) and \( F_{Q,z} \), and similarly for \( F_{Q,x}^{\text{sec}} \) and \( F_{Q,x} \) near the equator (\( \theta \approx \pi/2 \)), is due to corrections from transient terms ignored in Eq. (4).

Equation (4) gives a simple interpretation of the long-time limit of the QFI in terms of the characteristic fluctuations of \( H_1^n \) for a given initial state: A peak in the QFI is a result of enhanced fluctuations in \( H_1^n \) attributable to either a sharp change in the properties of the eigenstates or the projection of the initial state into the eigenstates, both of which can be correlated with the emergence of a DPT \([55, 56]\). For the LMG model, the DPT is intrinsically linked to an excited-state quantum phase transition (EQPT) that leads to non-analytic features in \( S_{x}^{nn} \) and \( S_{z}^{nn} \) \([54, 57]\), as shown in Fig. 2(b) and (c) for a representative calculation with \( N = 1000 \). A sharp cusp (kink) is observed in \( S_{x}^{nn} \) (\( S_{z}^{nn} \)) at a critical energy \( E_{cr}/N = -\Omega/2 \) for \( \Omega/\chi < 1 \). This is precisely the average energy of the initial state, \( E_0 = \langle \psi_0 | \hat{H} | \psi_0 \rangle \), as \( \Omega/\chi \) (or also \( \omega/\chi \) in general) is tuned through the DPT at \( \Omega_{cr}/\chi \approx 1/2 \). Thus, the non-analytic behaviour of the DPT corresponds closely with that of \( S_{x}^{nn} \) via the relation \( \Delta \theta \approx \sum_n |c_n|^2 S_{z}^{nn} \) at long times \([56]\).

By examining the projection of the initial state \( |c_n\rangle \) for \( \Omega \approx \Omega_{cr} \) in Figs. 2(b) and (c), we conclude that the distribution of relevant \( S_{x}^{nn} \) (\( S_{z}^{nn} \)) in Eq. (4) straddles the cusp (kink) and leads to the sudden increase of the QFI at the DPT. Moreover, Eq. (4) combined with the approximations: i) \( S_{x}^{nn}/N \approx A_{x,z} + B_{x,z} (E/N - E_{cr}/N)^{\gamma_{x,z}} \) near \( E \approx E_{cr} \) \([58]\), and ii) the energy fluctuations of an initial coherent spin state typically scale as \( \Delta E \sim \sqrt{N} \), allows us to qualitatively predict the scaling of the QFI as \( F_Q/t^2 \sim N^{2-\gamma_{x,z}} \) \([59]\). From numerical diagonalization of the LMG Hamiltonian we obtain \( \gamma_{x,z} \approx 0.5 \) and

![FIG. 2. (a) Scaling exponent of \( F_Q(\Omega^*) \) at fixed \( \omega/\chi = 10^{-4} \). We fit \( F_Q(\Omega^*) \sim aN^b \) across a window of \( N \in [100, 2000] \) for different initial states parameterized by \( \theta \) and \( \phi = 0 \). Data from numerical integration of the dynamics to \( Nt = 1000 \). A sharp cusp (kink) and leads to the sudden increase of the QFI at \( \Omega = \Omega^* \) and \( \omega = 10^{-4} \) for \( N = 10^3 \). Shaded background indicates the distribution \( |c_n|^2 \) of the initial state in the eigenbasis. ](image)
\[ \gamma_z \simeq 0.25 \] which is consistent with the approximate scaling of \( F_{Q,z} \sim N^{3/2} \) and \( F_{Q,z} \sim N^{7/4} \). The scaling of \( F_{Q,z} \) is intimately related to the scaling of the order parameter \( S_z \sim (\Omega - \Omega_c) \gamma_z^2 \) (care of approximation (i)) for a finite size system. Thus the QFI, which is a detailed measure of how rapidly the dynamical state changes across the DPT, is intuitively governed by the sharpness of the DPT in terms of the coarser time-averaged order parameter.

Lastly, our analysis further supports that the QFI correctly diagnoses the DPT. For \( N \to \infty \) the relative energy fluctuations \( \Delta E/E \) of the initial state vanish and \( F_{Q,z}^{\text{sec}}(F_{Q,x}) \) will have large contributions from \( S_z^2 \) (\( S_z^2 \)) at \( E_0 \to E_{cr} \) (\( E_0 \to E_{cr}^* \)) [consistent with observations in Fig. 3(c) that show \( \Omega_s \) computed from the QFI approaching \( \Omega_s \) from below (above)].

**Practical experimental implementation:** The QFI can be efficiently measured by implementing a Loschmidt echo that also serves as an optimal metrological protocol. The ideal sequence is [Fig. 3(a)]: i) prepare \( |\psi_0\rangle \), ii) evolve with \( \hat{H}(\lambda) \) for time \( t \), iii) evolve with \(-\hat{H}(\lambda+\delta\lambda)\) for time \( t \), and iv) obtain \( F \) by measuring the overlap \( \langle |\psi_0\rangle |\psi_f\rangle \) where \( \langle |\psi_f\rangle \rangle = e^{iH(\lambda+\delta\lambda)t}e^{-iH(\lambda)t}|\psi_0\rangle \). From \( F \) one can readily compute the QFI, or from a sensing perspective \( F \) can be used as an optimal observable to infer \( \delta\lambda \). The capability to invert the sign of a Hamiltonian has been demonstrated or proposed in a range of AMO quantum simulators. On the other hand, while measuring the final state overlap can be simplified by the fact that DPTs are typically studied with simple uncorrelated initial states, technical challenges, such as the detection resolution required to adequately discriminate states, can still pose a practical hurdle for many platforms.

We overcome these issues by noting that for a simple (e.g., Gaussian) initial state we typically expect the relative energy fluctuations \( \Delta E/E \) of the initial state to vanish and \( F_{Q,x}^{\text{sec}}(F_{Q,x}) \) will have large contributions from \( S_z^2 \) (\( S_z^2 \)) at \( E_0 \to E_{cr} \) (\( E_0 \to E_{cr}^* \)). We also include the QFI \( F_{Q,z} \) for the same parameters and \( \Gamma/\chi = 0 \) and a range of decoherence rates \( \Gamma/\chi \). We also include the QFI \( F_{Q,z} \) for the same parameters and \( \Gamma/\chi = 0 \). (c) Maximum of the normalized inverse sensitivity \( \max_{\Omega_s}|(|\hat{\Delta}\hat{\omega})|Nt^2|/(Nt^2)\) optimized over time, as a function of \( \omega/\chi \) and other parameters as per (b). We also plot the maximum of the normalized QFI, \( \max_{\Omega_s}|(|\hat{\Delta}\hat{\omega})|Nt^2|/(Nt^2)\), as an indicator of the DPT. In both (b) and (c) the grey shaded region indicates the regime bounded by the normalized SQL, \( (\hat{\Delta}\hat{\omega})|Nt^2|/(Nt^2) = 1 \). All calculations are for \( N = 100 \).

In Fig. 3(b) we directly compare \( (\hat{\Delta}\hat{\omega})|Nt^2| \) to the QFI for a perturbation \( \delta\omega \) and a moderate system size \( N = 100 \) (pertinent for, e.g., trapped ion quantum simulators and tailored to our later discussion of decoherence). We observe that \( S_y \) is sufficient to qualitatively replicate the transient features and long-time growth \( \propto t^2 \) of the QFI. Further, in panel (c) we plot the maximum of \( (\hat{\Delta}\hat{\omega})|Nt^2| \) as a function of \( \omega/\chi \) and demonstrate that it qualitatively reproduces the peak in the transient maximum of the QFI (i.e., maximum of \( F_{Q,z} \)) near \( \omega \approx 0 \) that identifies the DPT. In fact, near the DPT we find \( (\hat{\Delta}\hat{\omega})|Nt^2| \sim (\hat{\Delta}\hat{\omega})|Nt^2| \sim N^{1.4} \), which closely follow the scaling of the QFI. Combined with the observation that near the DPT \( (\hat{\Delta}\hat{\omega})|Nt^2|/(Nt^2) \), our results demonstrate that DPTs can be realistically harnessed for quantum-enhanced sensing by combining dynamical echoes with simple collective measurement observables.

For completeness, we also probe the robustness of our results to typical sources of single-particle decoherence. Using the permutation symmetry of the LMG Hamiltonian we are able to efficiently simulate the dynamics of \( N = 100 \) qubits subject to single-particle dephasing at rate \( \Gamma/\chi \). We find that for weak decoherence \( \Gamma/\chi \lesssim 10^{-2} \) (within reach of, e.g., current state-of-the-art trapped ion quantum simulators) strong signatures of the DPT remain in \( (\hat{\Delta}\hat{\omega})|Nt^2| \), even though we become limited to transient time-scales. Moreover, the sub-SQL sensitivity near the DPT remains robust in the
Conclusion: We have theoretically demonstrated that the QFI can be used to robustly diagnose dynamical phase transitions. While our numerical study focused on the LMG model that can be realized in a range of experimental platforms, our results should be widely applicable to models featuring a DPT [12, 26, 73, 74]. Moreover, we developed a simple interferometric protocol combining dynamical echoes and measurement of simple observables that demonstrates DPTs can be a powerful resource for sub-QL sensing in non-equilibrium many-body systems [15, 75].
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Supplemental Material: Identifying and harnessing dynamical phase transitions for quantum-enhanced sensing

QUANTUM FISHER INFORMATION

In this section we give several useful expressions for the QFI in the context of general Hamiltonian dynamics. Our discussion includes relevant details connecting the scaling of the QFI to features of the energy spectrum and we also provide an illustrative proof of the upper bound of the QFI for uncorrelated spin states.

Exact expression for QFI and secular contributions

We study the QFI defined as the susceptibility with respect to a small perturbation $\delta \lambda$ of the Hamiltonian $H = H_0 + \lambda H_1$ [29 32 107 79],

$$F_Q(\lambda, t) = -4 \frac{\partial^2 F(\lambda, \delta \lambda, t)}{\partial (\delta \lambda)^2} \bigg|_{\delta \lambda = 0}, \quad (S1)$$

where $F(\lambda, \delta \lambda, t) = |\langle \psi(\lambda, t)|\psi(\lambda + \delta \lambda, t)\rangle|$. Alternatively, we can re-express the QFI as

$$F_Q(\lambda, t) = 4 \left( \left| \frac{d\langle \psi(t, \lambda + \delta \lambda)|\psi(t, \lambda + \delta \lambda)\rangle}{d\delta \lambda} \right|^2 \right) \bigg|_{\delta \lambda = 0}, \quad (S2)$$

which, after invoking the identity [32]

$$\exp\left[i\hat{H}(\lambda)t\right] \frac{d}{d\lambda} \exp\left[-i\hat{H}(\lambda)t\right] = -i \int_0^t dt' \exp\left[i\hat{H}(\lambda)t'\right] \frac{d\hat{H}(\lambda)}{d\lambda} \exp\left[-i\hat{H}(\lambda)t'\right], \quad (S3)$$

leads to an expression for the QFI in terms of the variance of a time-averaged generator $\langle \hat{H}_1 \rangle_t = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \hat{H}_1(t')dt'$ [32 33],

$$F_Q(\lambda, t) = 4t^2 \left| \langle (\hat{H}_1)^2 \rangle_t - \langle (\hat{H}_1) \rangle_t^2 \right|. \quad (S4)$$

It is possible to extract a useful expression for the long-time secular behaviour of the QFI by evaluating the expectations in Eq. (S4) using an expansion of the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle$ of the system over the eigenbasis $|n\rangle$ of $\hat{H}$. Specifically, we plug $|\psi_0\rangle = \sum_n c_n |n\rangle$ with $c_n \equiv \langle n|\psi_0\rangle$ into Eq. (S4) to find

$$F_Q(\lambda, t) = t^2 \left[ \sum_{n,k,m} c_n^* c_m e^{i\Delta_{nm} t} H_1^{nk} H_1^{km} \sin \left( \frac{\Delta_{nk} t}{2} \right) \right] \times \quad (S5)$$

$$\sin \left( \frac{\Delta_{km} t}{2} \right) - \left[ \sum_{n,m} c_n^* c_m H_1^{mn} e^{i\Delta_{nm} t} \sin \left( \frac{\Delta_{nm} t}{2} \right) \right]^2 \right] \quad (S6)$$

where $\Delta_{nm} = E_{nn} - E_{mm}$ for $E_{nn} = \langle n|\hat{H}|n\rangle$.

In the limit of $t \to \infty$, the sinc function enforces that only terms with $\Delta_{nk} = \Delta_{km} = 0$ survive in Eq. (S5), leading to

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} F_Q(\lambda, t) = 4t^2 \left[ \sum_{E_m = E_n} c_n^* c_m H_1^{nk} H_1^{mn} \right] \quad (S7)$$

In the absence of degeneracies Eq. (S6) can be reduced to a single sum,

$$F_Q^\text{sec}(\lambda, t) \approx 4t^2 \left[ \sum_n |c_n|^2 |H_1^{nn}|^2 - \left( \sum_n |c_n|^2 H_1^{nn} \right)^2 \right], \quad (S7)$$

in which we have neglected all the sub-leading order terms due to finite time. As a result, an obvious but important condition for the validity of Eq. (S7) is thus that the coefficient of the $t^2$ term is non-vanishing, such that at sufficiently long times we can justifiably ignore those transient contributions of Eq. (S6).

Panels (a) and (b) of Fig. S1 show typical time-traces of the normalized QFI $F_Q, x/(Nt^2)$ and $F_Q, z/(Nt^2)$ for an initial state with all spins polarized along $-\hat{z}$. In the long time limit, $F_Q, x/(Nt^2)$ approaches a constant for all parameters, consistent with the form of Eq. (S7). On the other hand, we find that $F_Q, z$ does not demonstrate $t^2$ scaling for certain parameter regimes. For example, in the limit of large $\Omega \gg \chi, \omega$ the Hamiltonian is dominated by the contribution of the transverse field, $\hat{H} \approx -\Omega \hat{S}_z$, and we expect the energy eigenbasis to be close to the eigenstates of $\hat{S}_z$. Hence, to leading order the diagonal matrix elements $S_z^{nn}$ vanish for all $n$. As shown in Fig. S1(b), we only observe $F_Q, z \propto t^2$ when $\Omega \lesssim \Omega_\text{cr}$ (red dotted and orange solid lines in Fig. S1(b)). For $\Omega \gg \Omega_\text{cr}$ (blue dashed line in Fig. S1(b)), the behaviour of $F_Q, z$ is dominated by transient corrections ignored in Eq. (S7) at the time-scales we can probe.

Consistent with this discussion, Eq. (S7) captures the dynamical phase diagram at long-times in almost perfect agreement with $F_Q, x$ (obtained via numerical calculation of the full dynamics). Conversely, while Eq. (S7) does not completely match $F_Q, z$ at long times for $\Omega \gtrsim \Omega_\text{cr}$, it nevertheless still captures the signatures of the DPT in $F_Q, z$. In both cases, we find the scaling of the QFI with system size near the DPT, $\Omega \approx \Omega_\text{cr}$, is well captured. Specifically, by directly computing Eq. (S7) in a window of $N \in [100, 2000]$ we obtain $F_Q^\text{sec, x} \sim N^{1.2}$ and $F_Q^\text{sec, z} \sim N^{1.4}$.
where we have used that the energy $E$ and $S_{x/z}(E)$ are extensive observables and thus can be normalized to remove any dependence of $A_{x/z}$, $B_{x/z}$ and $\gamma_{x/z}$ on system size $N$. Substituting Eq. (S9) into Eq. (S8), evaluating the derivative at $E = E_{cr} \pm \Delta E$, and using that $\Delta E \sim \sqrt{N}$ for a coherent spin state, we obtain

$$F_{Q,x/z}^{sec} \sim 4t^2 \gamma_{x,z} B_{x/z} N^{2 - \gamma_{x,z}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S10)

We then numerically diagonalize the Hamiltonian for a large system ($N = 1000$) and fit $S_{x/z}(E)$ using Eq. (S9) near $E_{cr}$ to obtain $\gamma_x = 1/2$ and $\gamma_z = 1/4$, respectively. To be concrete, we fit $S_{x/z}(E)$ in the energy window of $[E_{cr}, E_{cr} + n \Delta E]$ and $[E_{cr} - n \Delta E, E_{cr}]$ where $n$ is a constant that we tuned through $n = (1, ..., 5)$ to confirm the estimated scaling parameters $\gamma_{x,z}$ are stable.

As commented in the main text, for the case of the LMG model the sharp features in $S_{x/z}(E)$ are related to a known excited-state quantum phase transition (although these are typically fundamentally distinct phenomena [26]). Thus, we highlight that in fact we expect the divergence of $S_z(E)$ near $E_{cr}$ is logarithmic in the thermodynamic limit, identical to the order parameter $\bar{S}_z$. However, our numerical calculations are limited to system sizes where finite size contributions will dominate and it is not possible to distinguish signatures of the logarithmic divergence.

Bounds on the QFI

The standard quantum limit for sensing can be recast in terms of the QFI as $F_Q^cl \leq Nt^2$. This bound is conventionally obtained by considering only quasiclassical initial states that feature no quantum correlations or entanglement and are then subject to evolution under only the driving term of $\hat{H}_{LMG}$, e.g., $\Omega \bar{S}_z$ or $\omega \bar{S}_z$. Restricting to spin-1/2 systems, coherent spin states satisfy the former condition and a straightforward calculation demonstrates that for suitable choice of the tipping ($\theta$) and azimuthal ($\phi$) angles they saturate $F_Q^cl \leq Nt^2$ where $N$ is the number of spin-1/2 particles.

In the main text we demonstrate that the interplay of interactions $\propto \bar{S}_z^2$ with the driving terms enables one to surpass the SQL near a DPT. Here, we emphasize that this result is a consequence of strong correlations and entanglement in the dynamically generated quantum states, rather than the nonlinearity of the dynamics at the classical level, by explicitly proving that the QFI remains bounded $F_Q \leq Nt^2$ in the mean-field limit.

Our proof is based upon the form of the QFI given in Eq. (S4). $F_Q(\lambda, t) = 4t^2 (|\Delta(\bar{H})|^2)$. For evolution under any generic Hamiltonian (e.g., $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{H}_1$) we can expand $\bar{H}_1(t)$ in terms of products of single-body

**Approximate model for scaling with system size**

The scaling of the QFI can be directly traced to the emergence a non-analyticity in the energy spectrum of the LMG model. Here, we present a supporting calculation for this discussion.

Consider Eq. (S7) in the limit of large $N$ such that one can make a continuum approximation $H^{nn}_1 \rightarrow H_1(E)$ for $E \equiv E_{nn}$. Then, by recognizing that the QFI according to Eq. (S7) is proportional to the characteristic variance of $H_1(E)$, we argue that for an initial state with well defined mean-energy $E$ and energy fluctuations $\Delta E \ll E$ the QFI can be approximated as

$$F_Q = 4t^2 \left| \frac{\partial H_1(E)}{\partial E} \right|^2 \Delta E^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S8)

In the case of the LMG model, the divergence of the QFI arises due to a sharp cusp in $S_z(E)$ or kink in $S_z(E)$ at a critical energy $E_{cr} = N/2$ [see Figs. 2(b) and (c) in the main text]. Near the critical energy we find both observables are well described by $\frac{S_{x/z}(E)}{N} = A_{x/z} + B_{x/z} \left( \frac{E}{N} - \frac{E_{cr}}{N} \right)^{\gamma_{x/z}}$.  \hspace{1cm} (S9)
operators $\hat{h}_j^\alpha$,
\[
\hat{H}_1(t) = \sum_{i,\alpha} a_i^\alpha(t) \hat{h}_i^\alpha + \sum_{i,j,\alpha,\beta} \hat{h}_j^\beta(t) \hat{h}_i^\alpha \hat{h}_j^\beta + \cdots \quad (S11)
\]
where the index $j$ runs over all particles (sites) and $\alpha$ is the set of single-body operators for each particle. For example, $\hat{h}_j^\alpha = \sigma_j^\alpha / 2$ with $\alpha \in \{x, y, z\}$ for an ensemble of $N$ spin-1/2 particles indexed by $j = 1, \ldots, N$.

Plugging Eq. (S11) into the definition of $F_Q(\lambda, t)$ [Eq. (S4)] we obtain
\[
F_Q = 4t^2 \left[ \sum_{i,\alpha} (a_i^\alpha)^2 \text{Var}(\hat{h}_i^\alpha) + \sum_{i\neq j,\alpha,\beta} a_i^\alpha a_j^\beta \text{Cov}(\hat{h}_i^\alpha, \hat{h}_j^\beta) \right. \\
\left. + \sum_{i,j,k,\alpha,\beta,\gamma} a_i^\alpha b_{jk}^\beta \gamma \text{Cov}(\hat{h}_i^\alpha, \hat{h}_j^\beta \hat{h}_k^\gamma) + \cdots \right] \quad (S12)
\]
where $\text{Var}(\hat{O}) = \langle \hat{O}^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{O} \rangle^2$ and $\text{Cov}(\hat{O}, \hat{O}') = \langle \hat{O}\hat{O}' \rangle - \langle \hat{O} \rangle \langle \hat{O}' \rangle$. Correspondingly, $\text{Var}(\hat{\sigma}_x, \hat{\sigma}_y, \hat{\sigma}_z)$ can still have non-zero contributions (e.g., for $i = j$, $i = k$, or $j = k$). Nevertheless, if we combine an uncorrelated initial state with the assumption that the Hamiltonian is single-body, i.e., can be decomposed as $\hat{H} \equiv \sum_{i,\alpha} \hat{h}_i^\alpha$, then only the linear terms in Eq. (S11) survive (e.g., $b_{jk}^\gamma(t) = 0$ strictly).

Consequently, $F_Q = 4t^2 \sum_{i,\alpha} (a_i^\alpha)^2 \text{Var}(\hat{h}_i^\alpha)$. In general, the coefficients and the single-particle variance are bounded by $\sum_{\alpha} (a_i^\alpha)^2 \leq 1$ and $\text{Var}(\hat{h}_i^\alpha) \leq \Delta h_{\text{max}}^2 / 4$ where $\Delta h_{\text{max}}$ is the difference between the largest and smallest eigenvalues of $\hat{h}$. This leads to $F_Q \leq Nt^2 \Delta h_{\text{max}}$ [1].

For a spin-1/2 system, we have $\hat{h}_i^\alpha = a_i^\alpha / 2$ and thus $\Delta h_{\text{max}} = 1$, leading to the result $F_Q \leq Nt^2$.

This discussion is illustrated by using the specific example of the LMG model. We assume an initial (uncorrelated) coherent spin state of $N$ spin-1/2 particles and consider the dynamics generated by the mean-field Hamiltonian
\[
\hat{H}_{\text{MF}} = a(t) \hat{S}_x + b(t) \hat{S}_y + c(t) \hat{S}_z \quad (S13)
\]

with time-dependent coefficients $(a, b, c) = [-\Omega, 0, -2\langle S_z(t) \rangle / N - \omega]$. Rigorously, $\hat{H}_{\text{MF}}$ is the effective Hamiltonian consistent with the equations of motion obtained from $\hat{H}_{\text{LMG}}$ and invoking a mean-field approximation.

We then compute the QFI for a generic single-body perturbation, $F_{Q,\alpha} = 4t^2 [\langle \Delta(S_\alpha) \rangle^2]$. Formally,
\[
\hat{S}_\alpha(t) = t \exp \left( i \int_0^t \hat{H}_{\text{MF}}(t') dt' \right) \hat{S}_\alpha \\
\times t \exp \left( -i \int_0^t \hat{H}_{\text{MF}}(t') dt' \right), \quad (S14)
\]
where $T$ is the usual time-ordering operator. However, the form of $\hat{H}_{\text{MF}}$ means that Eq. (S14) can always be expressed as a simple sum over collective spin operators
\[
\hat{S}_\alpha(t) = A_\alpha(t) \hat{S}_x + B_\alpha(t) \hat{S}_y + C_\alpha(t) \hat{S}_z, \quad (S15)
\]
where $A_\alpha(t)$, $B_\alpha(t)$, and $C_\alpha(t)$ are real numbers that satisfy
\[
A_\alpha^2(t) + B_\alpha^2(t) + C_\alpha^2(t) = 1. \quad (S16)
\]

Using Eq. (S15) we can thus express the time-average $\langle \hat{S}_\alpha \rangle_t$ as
\[
\int_0^t dt' \hat{S}_\alpha(t') = N_\alpha (n_\alpha \cdot \hat{S}) \quad (S17)
\]
where the normalization factor $N_\alpha$ is
\[
N_\alpha^2 = \left[ \left( \int_0^t dt' A_\alpha(t') \right)^2 + \left( \int_0^t dt' B_\alpha(t') \right)^2 \right] \\
+ \left( \int_0^t dt' C_\alpha(t') \right)^2 \\
\leq \left( \int_0^t dt' \right) \left( \int_0^t \left[ A_\alpha^2(t') + B_\alpha^2(t') + C_\alpha^2(t') \right] dt' \right) \quad (S18)
\]
\[
= t^2. \quad (S19)
\]
Here, $n_\alpha$ is a unit vector aligned along the axis of the perturbation $\hat{S}_\alpha$, and we have used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to obtain the second last line. Plugging Eq. (S17) into Eq. (S1) we finally obtain
\[
F_Q = N_\alpha^2 \left[ \langle n_\alpha \cdot \hat{S} \rangle^2 - \langle n_\alpha \cdot \hat{S} \rangle^2 \right] \\
\leq N_\alpha^2 \left[ 1 - (n_\alpha \cdot n_\phi)^2 \right] N \\
\leq Nt^2
\]
where the average is taken with respect to an arbitrary coherent spin state polarized in the direction of the unit vector $n_\phi$. This result emphasizes that the nonlinear dynamics demonstrated by the classical model are not sufficient to generate the large QFI we observe in the full quantum dynamics, and instead this arises because of complex features that are generated in the quantum noise (see, e.g., Fig. 3(a) of the main text).
FIG. S2. (a) Time-averaged order parameter $\bar{S}_z$ and (b)-(c) scaled inverse sensitivities $(\Delta \omega)_{\bar{S}_y}^{-2}/Nt^2$ and $(\Delta \Omega)_{\bar{S}_y}^{-2}/Nt^2$ as a function of time and longitudinal/transverse field strengths $\omega/\chi$ and $\Omega/\chi$ including decoherence at rate $\Gamma/\chi$ (indicated in panels). Calculations are performed using an efficient exact numerical solution of the master equation (see text) with parameters $N = 100$ and $\Omega/\chi = 1/2$. Note the $z$-value of Panel (h) is multiplied by a factor of 10 to make it visible.

NUMERICAL METHODS

Closed system

We numerically simulate the dynamics of the closed system governed by the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{LMG}$ [Eq. (3) of the main text] using an efficient Chebyshev scheme. In this method, an arbitrary time-evolved state, $|\psi(t)\rangle = \hat{U}(t)|\psi_0\rangle$ where $\hat{U}(t) = e^{-i\hat{H}_{LMG}t}$, is obtained by expanding the time propagator into a superposition of Chebyshev polynomials $\phi_n$ for a single time step [51]:

$$\hat{U}(t) \approx e^{-i(E_{\text{max}} - E_{\text{min}})t/2} \sum_{n=0}^{N_{\text{cut}}} a_n(t)\phi_n(-i\hat{H}_{\text{norm}}).$$  \hfill (S20)

Here, we have introduced the normalized Hamiltonian,

$$\hat{H}_{\text{norm}} = \frac{\hat{H} - (E_{\text{max}} + E_{\text{min}})/2}{E_{\text{max}} - E_{\text{min}}},$$  \hfill (S21)

and the expansion coefficients $a_n(t)$ are given by

$$a_n(t) = \begin{cases} 2J_n \left(\frac{E_{\text{max}} - E_{\text{min}}}{2}\right) & \text{for } n > 0, \\ J_0 \left(\frac{E_{\text{max}} - E_{\text{min}}}{2}\right) & \text{for } n = 0, \end{cases}$$  \hfill (S22)

where $J_n$ is the $n$th Bessel function. The free parameters $E_{\text{min}}$ and $E_{\text{max}}$ are chosen such that the spectrum of $\hat{H}$ is appropriately encompassed by the energy window $[E_{\text{min}}, E_{\text{max}}]$. Throughout the manuscript we choose $E_{\text{max}} = N(\chi + |\omega|)$ and $E_{\text{min}} = -N(\chi + |\omega|)$.

To efficiently construct the complex Chebyshev polynomial $\phi_n(-i\hat{H}_{\text{norm}}) = (-i)^n T_n(\hat{H}_{\text{norm}})$ where $T_n(x)$ is the Chebyshev polynomial of the first kind, we use the recursion relation

$$\phi_{n+1}(-i\hat{H}_{\text{norm}}) = -2i\hat{H}_{\text{norm}}\phi_n(-i\hat{H}_{\text{norm}}) + \phi_{n-1}(-i\hat{H}_{\text{norm}}),$$  \hfill (S23)

with the initial condition $\phi_0 = 1$ and $\phi_1 = -i\hat{H}_{\text{norm}}$.

The Chebyshev expansion is expected to converge exponentially with increasing $N_{\text{cut}}$ provided the $N_{\text{cut}}$ is not less than $(E_{\text{max}} - E_{\text{min}})t/2$. To safely satisfy this requirement we also choose $N_{\text{cut}}$ to exceed this theoretical value by 30%. We check convergence by computing the normalization of the wavefunction $|\langle \psi(t)|\psi(t)\rangle|^2$ and ensure that it deviates from unity by less than $10^{-10}$ for all runs. Importantly, this deviation is much smaller than...
any perturbation to the wavefunction introduced by $\delta \Omega$ or $\delta \omega$ when computing the QFI.

**Open system with decoherence**

The dynamics of the LMG model in the presence of single-particle decoherence can be efficiently simulated by exploiting the permutation symmetry of the model, combined with the fact that the initial states we probe are fully collective (i.e., $\langle S^2 \rangle = \frac{N}{2}(\frac{N}{2} + 1)$ for our chosen initial states). In generality, the dynamics of the open system are described by a master equation for the density matrix $\hat{\rho}$ of the spin ensemble [80],

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}}{dt} = -i [\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] + \frac{\Gamma}{4} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (\hat{\sigma}^j_+ \hat{\sigma}^j_- - \hat{\rho})$$  \hspace{1cm} (S24)

where $\hat{H}$ is the LMG Hamiltonian [see Eq. 3 of the main text]. To efficiently solve Eq. (S24) we exploit the permutation symmetry of both the Hamiltonian and dissipative terms to reduce the scaling of problem from $4^N$ to $O(N^3)$. This enables us to exactly (up to numerical precision) compute the dissipative dynamics of systems up to $N \sim O(100)$ with relative ease, enabling meaningful comparisons with current state-of-the-art AMO quantum simulators. A full analysis and discussion of this method can be found in Refs. [72] [81] and citations therein.

In Fig. [S2] we compare the behaviour of the time-averaged order parameter $\bar{S}_z$ and scaled inverse sensitivity $\langle \Delta \omega \rangle^{-2}/Nt^2$ across a range of longitudinal field strengths $\omega/\chi$ and decoherence rates $\Gamma/\chi$. We observe that $\bar{S}_z$ is relatively robust to $\Gamma$, as the primary effect of dephasing is to damp out oscillations in the disordered phase, consistent with recent experimental observations [13]. The sensitivity is more noticeably degraded by decoherence, particularly beyond short time scales ($\gamma t \ll 1$). Nevertheless, we observe that the transient peak of $\langle \Delta \omega \rangle^{-2}/Nt^2$ is preserved, albeit shifted towards earlier time scales and gradually smeared out around the transition. For large $\Gamma/\chi \sim 0.1$ we observe that the peak becomes systematically shifted away from the ideal DPT at $\omega/\chi = 0$ (consistent with the behaviour of $\bar{S}_z$), but it remains clearly centered near $\omega/\chi = 0$ for weaker decoherence. This last comparison is not unexpected, as the most noticable features of the DPT in the QFI arise for $\gamma t \gtrsim 10$ and thus the naive requirement $\gamma t \ll 1$ for decoherence to be perturbative translates to the condition $\gamma/\chi \ll 0.1$ for the QFI to display robust transient signatures.

Calculations for a perturbation of the transverse field yields similar results. As shown in Fig. [S3] we again observe that the final state after the echo is well distinguished by measurements of $\bar{S}_y$. Panel (a) illustrates the Wigner distribution $W_\psi(r, \phi)$ [67], which shows qualitatively similar features to Fig. 3 of the main text although the final state is instead typically displaced along the $+y$-direction. Similarly, the inverse sensitivity tracks the dynamics of the QFI [panel (b)]. However, we also note that in this case we always find the maximum (transient) sensitivity is at least as good as the SQL [panel (c)], $\max_i[(\Delta \Omega)_{\bar{S}_y}^{-2}/Nt^2] \geq 1$, as for $\chi t \rightarrow 0$ the perturbation results merely in a rotation of a simple coherent spin state, which is precisely the operational definition of the SQL. Nevertheless, a pronounced peak of $\max_i[(\Delta \Omega)_{\bar{S}_y}^{-2}/Nt^2]$ still reflects the underlying DPT for weak decoherence, while the dynamical phases are still delineated by $\max_i[(\Delta \Omega)_{\bar{S}_y}^{-2}/Nt^2] = 1$ (ordered) and $\max_i[(\Delta \Omega)_{\bar{S}_y}^{-2}/Nt^2] > 1$ (disordered), respectively. A complete examination of the inverse sensitivity $\langle \Delta \Omega \rangle^{-2}$ for varied $\Omega$ and $\chi t$ is also shown in Fig. [S2].

**Scaling of the sensitivity with system size**

To verify a robust correspondence between the QFI and the sensitivities obtained via the echo, $\langle \Delta \Omega \rangle_{\bar{S}_z}$ and $\langle \Delta \omega \rangle_{\bar{S}_y}$, we compute the scaling of both quantities as a function of system size. At a fixed long time $\chi t = 10^3$ we fit the computed inverse sensitivity to the function $aN^b$ and obtain $\langle \Delta \omega \rangle_{\bar{S}_y}^{-2} \sim N^{1.4}$ and $\langle \Delta \omega \rangle_{\bar{S}_z}^{-2} \sim N^{1.78}$ across a window of $N \in [100, 2000]$. These results closely follow the scaling of the QFI obtained via integrating the full quantum dynamics, $F_{Q,x} \sim N^{1.5}$ and $F_{Q,z} \sim N^{1.78}$, extracted with the same procedure. We note that $\langle \Delta \omega \rangle_{\bar{S}_y}^{-2}$ has the same system size scaling compared to $F_{Q,z}$ but with a smaller prefactor. As for $\langle \Delta \omega \rangle_{\bar{S}_z}^{-2}$, both the prefactor and the system size scaling are less than those for $F_{Q,x}$.

**CLASSICAL DYNAMICAL PHASE DIAGRAM**

The dynamical phase diagram of the LMG model can be solved analytically in the classical $(N \rightarrow \infty)$ limit (see, e.g., Refs. [13] [28] [29]). Briefly, the classical limit is equivalent to solving the equations of motion for expectation values $\langle \hat{S}_{x,y,z} \rangle$ under a mean-field approximation wherein all higher-order correlations are expressed as the product of single-body terms, e.g., $\langle \hat{O}_1 \hat{O}_2 \rangle = \langle \hat{O}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{O}_2 \rangle$. Assuming an initial state where all the spins are fully polarized along an arbitrary axis, i.e., $\textbf{S} \equiv \langle \hat{S}_x(t), \hat{S}_y(t), \hat{S}_z(t) \rangle = (\frac{N}{2} \sin(\theta) \cos(\phi), \frac{N}{2} \sin(\theta) \sin(\phi), \frac{N}{2} \cos(\theta)), \hat{S}_x(t)$, the dynamics of the mean-field observable $S_x(t) = \langle \hat{S}_x(t) \rangle$ can be reduced to an equivalent model of a classical particle in a potential, described by the differential equation:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{dS_x(t)}{dt} \right)^2 + V_{\text{eff}}(S_x) = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S25)
Here, the effective potential $V_{\text{eff}}$ is

$$V_{\text{eff}}(S_z) = \frac{1}{2} \left( E + \frac{\chi}{N} S_z^2 + \omega S_z \right)^2 + \frac{\Omega^2 S_z^2}{2} - \frac{\Omega^2 N^2}{8}, \quad (S26)$$

and the total energy

$$E = -\frac{N}{2} \left[ \frac{\chi}{2} \cos^2(\theta) + \Omega \sin(\theta) \cos(\phi) + \omega \cos(\theta) \right], \quad (S27)$$

is a conserved quantity.

Figure S4 shows various cuts of $V_{\text{eff}}(S_z)/\chi^2 N^2$ for selected parameter combinations of $\theta, \phi, \Omega/\chi$, and $\omega/\chi$. For all the cases shown in Fig. S4 a transition from a double well to a single well can be seen. In the double-well regime, a local potential barrier exists between the two wells, which supports a local maximum at $S_z^*$. The relation of the total mechanical energy of the initial state in comparison to the magnitude of the potential barrier controls the dynamical phase: The ordered phase corresponds to the case where the particle has sufficient energy to traverse the barrier and oscillate between both wells. For an initial state with $S_z \neq 0$ the transition between different dynamical phases can be obtained as the condition for which the classical turning point of the particle coincides with $S_z^*$, i.e., $V_{\text{eff}}(S_z^*) = 0$.

In general, obtaining an analytic solution for the phase boundary is non-trivial, due to the quartic nature of $V_{\text{eff}}(S_z)$. However, analytical expressions can be obtained in two special cases. First, for $\omega = 0$ the local maximum occurs at $S_z^* = 0$ due to a parity symmetry of the model (i.e., the dynamics is unchanged upon the transformation $S_z \rightarrow -S_z$ and $S_x \rightarrow S_x$), enabling a straightforward solution of the critical transverse field [20].

$$\Omega_{\text{ct}} = \pm \frac{0.5 \cos^2(\theta)}{\sqrt{\sin(\theta) \cos(\phi)}}. \quad (S28)$$

Second, for $\theta = \pi$ or $\theta = 0$ the dependence on the azimuthal angle $\phi$ is eliminated and we obtain an expression for the critical transverse field as a function of the longitudinal field [13].

$$\Omega_{\text{ct}} = \frac{\chi}{2} \left[ 2 \left( 1 - \frac{\omega}{\chi} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{2\omega}{\chi} \right) - \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{8\omega}{\chi} + 1 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{8\omega}{\chi} \right)^{3/2} \right]^{1/2}. \quad (S29)$$