

# Universal Anomaly of Dynamics at Phase Transition Points Induced by Pancharatnam-Berry Phase

Jia-Yuan Zhang,<sup>1</sup> Xia Yin,<sup>2</sup> Ming-Yu Liu,<sup>1</sup> Jize Zhao,<sup>3,4</sup> Yang Ding<sup>2</sup> and Jun Chang<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Physics and Information Technology,  
Shaanxi Normal University, Xi'an 710119, China

<sup>2</sup>Center for High-Pressure Science and Technology Advanced Research, Beijing 100094, China

<sup>3</sup>School of Physical Science and Technology & Key Laboratory for Magnetism and Magnetic Materials of the MoE, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China

<sup>4</sup>Lanzhou Center for Theoretical Physics and Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics of Gansu Province, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China

(Dated: October 11, 2022)

Recently, dynamical anomalies are often observed near both the continuous and first-order phase transition points. We propose that the universal anomalies could originate from the geometric phase effects. A Pancharatnam-Berry phase is accumulated continuously in quantum states with the variation of tuning parameters. Phase transitions are supposed to induce an abrupt shift of the geometric phase. In our multi-level quantum model, the quantum interference induced by the geometric phase could prolong or shorten the relaxation times of excited states at phase transition points, which agrees with the experiments, models under sudden quenches and our semi-classical model. Furthermore, we find that by setting a phase shift of  $\pi$ , the excited state could be decoupled from the ground state by quantum cancellation so that the relaxation time even could diverge to infinity. Our work introduces the geometric phase to the study of conventional phase transitions and quantum phase transition, and could substantially extend the dephasing time of qubits for quantum computing.

*Introduction.* Phase transitions are of crucial importance in physics since a variety of static and dynamic properties of systems change qualitatively [1–5]. In a long history, the study of phase transition focuses on the static thermodynamic properties in equilibrium states. Recently, it was shown that dynamics could provide a direct insight into the investigation of the complex transitions [6–14]. Remarkably, the slowing-down dynamics near the phase transition point have been observed in solids [8, 14–16], glasses [17] and even microbial systems [18]. In the symmetry-breaking phase transition, the critical slowing down under perturbation could clearly be observed in both experiments and theoretical models at critical points [15, 19–22]. The divergence of the relaxation time is attributed to the divergent correlation length according to the renormalization group theory [23]. However, near the first-order phase transition, the ultrafast relaxation time from the photoexcited state to the equilibrium state also increases by orders of magnitude in charge-ordered LaSrFeO [8]. Similarly, a dynamical slowing-down was observed near a first-order Mott Transition and structural phase transition [14, 16]. More surprisingly, in the superconducting and antiferromagnetic phase transitions, the lifetimes of the fast decay are even shortened at the critical point [11, 13]. Moreover, in some 1D short-range spin models under sudden quenches, the fastest relaxation is unexpectedly found at the critical point, in contrast to the critical slowing down [5, 24–26]. Therefore, the dynamical anomalies near phase transition points are expected to be universal phenomena in a vast number of systems.

In this letter, we propose that the universal anomaly

of ultrafast dynamics near phase transition point could originate from the effect of the geometric phase, which has been ignored in the literature. Date back to 1956, Pancharatnam proposed that the relative geometric phase between two polarized light beams determines the intensity of the interferogram [27]. Later in 1984, Berry realized that a geometric phase is acquired in the quantum state in addition to a dynamical phase in an adiabatic and cyclic evolution of a time-dependent Hamiltonian [28]. This phase is then generalized by loosening the constraint of adiabaticity, cyclicity and unity [29, 30] and applied in many fields ranging from high-energy physics [31] to condensed matter [32], statistics [33, 34], molecular [35, 36], ultracold atoms [37], optics [38, 39] and quantum computation [40].

We suppose that Pancharatnam-Berry phases appear in quantum states and change continuously with a tunable parameter such as external fields in the Hamiltonian. In particular, such a geometric phase abruptly changes at phase transition points. Using the dissipative Schrödinger equation, we study the dynamical evolution of a multi-level system near the phase transition point based on the generalized spin-boson model. Near the phase transition points, the quantum interference of the states belonging to neighboring phases leads to the universal anomalies of the dynamics. The dynamical anomalies could be applied to probe the phase transition in experiments. We also use a semi-classical model to study the effects of the geometric phase on the relaxation of the excited states and reach a similar result. The relaxation time at phase transition points could become longer or shorter, which is in agreement with the experiments. Fur-




FIG. 1. The Schematic of the state coupling in Phase I , II and at the phase transition points in a multi-level system. In Phase I and II, only one excited state and one ground state are considered. At the phase transition point, all the four states are coupled to each other due to the phase fluctuation. We assume that the quantum state  $|ig\rangle$  in the  $i$ th phase acquires a continuous Pancharatnam-Berry phase  $\theta_i(\xi)$  with the change of the control parameters  $\xi$ . The phase transition induces a geometric phase difference  $\delta$  between the two ground states with  $e^{i\delta} = e^{i(\theta_2 - \theta_1)} = \langle 1g|2g\rangle / |\langle 1g|2g\rangle|$  at  $\xi_c$ . Here, we have ignored the dynamical phase.

thermore, we show that the relaxation time even could go to infinity at some peculiar coupling parameters. Our work could contribute to the study of phase transition and the design of qubits with long dephasing time.

*Quantum model.* We set up a quantum model to study the relaxation process around phase transition points as shown in Fig. 1. To elucidate the dynamical process, we introduce a system with the Hamiltonian  $H_s(\xi)$  under a phase transition from phase I to phase II driven by the control parameter  $\xi$ , e.g. temperature, pressure, magnetic field and interaction constants. For simplicity and generality, we consider a multi-level system coupled to a bosonic bath, i.e., a generalized spin-boson model. The model is first mapped to another model with the electronic states coupled to a single harmonic mode damped by an Ohmic bath [41–43]. The Hamiltonian of the system is then written as

$$H_s = \sum_i E_i c_i^\dagger c_i + \sum_{ij} V_{ij} (c_i^\dagger c_j + \text{h.c.}) + \sum_i \lambda_i c_i^\dagger c_i (a^\dagger + a) + \hbar\omega a^\dagger a, \quad (1)$$

where  $E_i$  is the energy level and  $n_i = c_i^\dagger c_i$  gives the occupation in the state  $i$ ,  $V_{ij}$  is the coupling (hybridization) constant between states  $j$  and  $i$ .  $a^\dagger$  is the creation operator for the bosonic mode with frequency  $\omega$ . We further define the electron-boson self-energy  $\varepsilon_i = \lambda_i^2 / \hbar\omega$ , and the self-energy difference  $\varepsilon_{ij} = (\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2 / \hbar\omega$  as well as the energy gap  $\Delta_{ij} = (E_i - \varepsilon_i) - (E_j - \varepsilon_j)$  between two states.  $E_i$ ,  $V_{ij}$ ,  $\omega$  and  $\lambda_i$  are the functions of the tuning

parameter  $\xi$ .

The Ohmic bath damping is introduced by a dissipative Schrödinger equation, in which a dissipative operator  $iD$  is added to the Hamiltonian to describe the bath induced dissipation on the system,

$$i\hbar \frac{d|\psi(t)\rangle}{dt} = (H_0 + iD)|\psi(t)\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where  $H_0$  is the Fröhlich transformation of  $H_s$ . This equation effectively incorporates both the strong electron-boson coupling and environment memory effects by introducing the bosonic mode in the system, which were described previously [44]. Details of the dissipative Schrödinger equation are provided in the Supplemental Materials (SM) [45].

*Dynamics at phase transition point.* The cascade decay in a multi-level system could be effectively described by a two-level system. One of them is the excited state and the other is the ground state [41]. Therefore, in this paper, we only consider the relaxation process in such a two-level system. We assume that the Ohmic bath is the same in two different phases. The ground states are represented by  $|1g\rangle$  and  $|2g\rangle$ , and the excited states  $|1e\rangle$  and  $|2e\rangle$  in phase I and II, respectively. At the phase transition point, we assume the four states in phase I and II coexist due to phase fluctuation. There are inter couplings between the states in phase I and II, such as  $V_{igje}$ ,  $V_{igjg}$  and  $V_{iejg}$  with  $i \neq j$ . Importantly, we assume that the quantum state acquires a Pancharatnam-Berry phase  $\theta_i(\xi)$  with the change of the control parameters  $\xi$  in the  $i$ th phase. The phase transition induces a geometric phase difference between the two ground states with  $e^{i\delta} = e^{i(\theta_2 - \theta_1)} = \langle 1g|2g\rangle / |\langle 1g|2g\rangle|$  at  $\xi_c$ . The total probability  $P = P_e + P_g$  is normalized to 1 with  $P_e = P_{1e} + P_{2e}$  for the excited states and  $P_g = P_{1g} + P_{2g}$  for the ground states. To study the relaxation of excited states, we assume the initial state is  $|1e\rangle$  or  $|2e\rangle$  adiabatically excited from  $|1g\rangle$  or  $|2g\rangle$  in phase I or phase II, or the superposition of  $|1e\rangle$  and  $|2e\rangle$  at the phase transition point. Solving the dissipative Schrödinger equation numerically, the evolution of all the states as a function of time clearly reflects the dynamic processes in phase I, II and at the phase transition point. In this paper, we set  $\hbar\omega$  of the single harmonic boson mode as the energy unit, and  $\tau = 2\pi/\omega$  as the unit of time.

To underscore the dynamical anomaly at the phase transition points, firstly, we set the parameters  $E_i$ ,  $\lambda_i$  and  $V_{ij}$  to ensure that the decay processes are the same in both phases. We assume  $E_i$ ,  $V_{ij}$  and  $\omega$  are independent of the control parameter  $\xi$ , and only  $\lambda_i$  may change with  $\xi$ . The energies of the ground states  $E_{1g}$  and  $E_{2g}$  are set to be zero in both phases, and the energies of the excited states  $E_{1e} = E_{2e}$ . The coupling constants between the ground state and excited state are the same  $V_{1g1e} = V_{2g2e}$ . For the electron-boson coupling, we take  $\lambda_{1g} = -\lambda_{2g}$  and  $\lambda_{1e} = -\lambda_{2e}$ , and hence




FIG. 2. The time evolution of state probabilities.  $P_e$  and  $P_g$  are the probabilities of the excited states and ground states, respectively. The starting state  $|e\rangle$  is excited from  $|g\rangle$  adiabatically. At the phase transition point, the starting state is the hybridization of  $|1e\rangle$  and  $|2e\rangle$  with the same probability.  $\hbar\omega = 0.06$  eV of the single harmonic boson mode is set as the unit of energy, and  $\tau = 2\pi/\omega \approx 69$  femtosecond (fs) as the unit of time (more details can be found in the SM). (a) the probability evolution in phase I or II,  $\Delta_{1g1e} = \Delta_{2g2e} = 5$ , the coupling between the ground state and excited state  $V_{1g1e} = V_{2g2e} = 1/2$ . The electron-boson coupling constants  $\lambda_{1g} = -\lambda_{2g} = 1/\sqrt{2}$  and  $\lambda_{1e} = -\lambda_{2e} = \sqrt{5}$ . (b) at the phase transition point with  $\delta = 0$ , the interstate coupling  $V_{1g2e} = V_{2g1e} = 1/4$  and the hybridization  $V_{1g2g} = V_{1e2e} = 0.1$ . (c) at the phase transition point with  $\delta = \pi$ , other parameters are the same as (b). (d)  $\delta = \pi$  and  $V_{1g2e} = V_{2g1e} = V_{1g1e} = V_{2g2e} = 1/2$ ,  $\lambda_{1g} = \lambda_{2g} = 1/\sqrt{2}$  and  $\lambda_{1e} = \lambda_{2e} = \sqrt{5}$  and other parameters are the same as (b) and (c).

$\varepsilon_{1g} = \varepsilon_{2g}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{1e} = \varepsilon_{2e}$  and  $\Delta_{1g1e} = \Delta_{2g2e}$ . Therefore, the excited states in the both phases decay in the same way, as shown in Fig. 2(a). On the other hand, at the phase transition point, we assume that the four states coexist due to the fluctuation. The intercoupling constants between the ground states and excited states are supposed to be the same  $V_{1g2e} = V_{2g1e} = V_{1g1e}/2$ . Furthermore, there are fluctuations within the ground and excited states with  $V_{1g2g} = V_{1e2e}$ . The starting states are excited adiabatically

from the ground states  $|1g\rangle$ ,  $|2g\rangle$  or the mixture. We assume that there is a Pancharatnam-Berry phase difference  $\delta$  between the ground state  $|1g\rangle$  and  $|2g\rangle$  of phase I and II. It is expected that the relaxation time at the phase transition point should be quite close to that in phase I and II. However, we find that the relaxation strongly depends on the relative phase  $\delta$  due to quantum interference effects. When there is no phase difference or  $\delta = 0$ , the relaxation time at the phase transition point is even slightly shorter than that in phase I or II as shown in Fig. 2(b), which is in agreement with the reduction of relaxation time observed in the experiment at the critical point [11, 13]. On the other hand, in Fig. 2(c) for  $\delta = \pi$ , the decay time at the phase transition point could be much longer than that in phase I or II, as the slowing down observed in many experiments [8, 15, 20, 46, 47].

More surprisingly, when we set  $\delta = \pi$ ,  $V_{1g2e} = V_{2g1e} = V_{1g1e} = V_{2g2e}$ ,  $\lambda_{1g} = \lambda_{2g}$ ,  $\lambda_{1e} = \lambda_{2e}$  and keep the rest of the parameters the same as in Fig 2(c), the relaxation time of the excited states at the transition point even could stretch into infinity as shown in Fig. 2(d), which is similar to the critical slowing down in the continuous phase transitions but it is independent of the divergent correlation length. As a contrast, for  $\delta = 0$ , the relaxation time of the excited states is close to that in phase I or II (not shown). Actually, it has been realized in experiments since several decades ago that the superconducting qubits composed by Josephson junctions with  $\pi$  phase shifters could be efficiently decoupled from environments and extend the phase coherence time [48–50]. To apprehend this puzzling result, we consider a four-level system without a bath. We assume that  $|1g, 2g\rangle$  are the wave vectors for the ground states and  $|1e, 2e\rangle$  the wave vectors for the excited states. The time-dependent Schrödinger equation of the four states is written as

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} |1e\rangle \\ |2e\rangle \\ |1g\rangle \\ |2g\rangle \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} E_e & v & V & V \\ v & E_e & V & V \\ V & V & E_g & v \\ V & V & v & E_g \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} |1e\rangle \\ |2e\rangle \\ |1g\rangle \\ |2g\rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where  $E_{e,g}$  are the energies of the four states,  $v$  and  $V$  are the state coupling constants. One has

$$i\hbar \frac{d|1g\rangle}{dt} = E_g |1g\rangle + v |2g\rangle + V |1e\rangle + V |2e\rangle. \quad (4)$$

When  $|1e\rangle$  has a  $\pi$  phase difference with respect to  $|2e\rangle$ , i.e.  $|1e\rangle = e^{i\pi} |2e\rangle$ , then the two last terms in Eq. (4) cancel each other and the ground states are decoupled from the two excited states. Interestingly, Fig. 2(d) indicates that even the environmental dissipation is involved, the excited states and ground states still could be decoupled from each other by canceling. Consequently, the quantum cancellation induced by the  $\pi$  phase shifter is the key to extending the phase coherence time in the experiments [48–50].

*Semiclassical relaxation model.* To qualitatively understand the time relaxation in the quantum model, we appeal to a semiclassical model. A general phenomenological model is proposed to study the time evolution of the excited states near the phase transition points. We assume that  $|1e, 2e\rangle$  are the wave vectors of the excited states in the neighboring phase I and phase II. At the phase transition point, two excited states coexist and are weakly coupled to each other due to phase fluctuation. The quantum coherence is also set up between the two excited states. We study the time evolution of the two excited states by mimicking the method in the Feynman's phenomenological model of the Josephson junction [45].

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial |1e\rangle}{\partial t} = (E_{1e} - i\Gamma_1) |1e\rangle + (K - iK') |2e\rangle, \quad (5)$$

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial |2e\rangle}{\partial t} = (E_{2e} - i\Gamma_2) |2e\rangle + (K - iK') |1e\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where  $E_{1e}, E_{2e}$  are the energies,  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$  are the relaxation rates of the two excited states, respectively. While  $K$  is the state coupling constant and  $K'$  is relaxation rate constant. If  $K$  and  $K'$  are zero, then the two Schrödinger equations describe the two excited states in the phase I and II, respectively. Near the critical point, the coupling or fluctuation between the two states may induce tunneling from one state to the other. Defining the total excited quasiparticle density  $P_e = P_{1e} + P_{2e}$  with  $P_{1e} = \langle 1e | 1e \rangle$  and  $P_{2e} = \langle 2e | 2e \rangle$ , and the phase difference  $e^{i\delta} = \langle 1e | 2e \rangle / |\langle 1e | 2e \rangle|$ , then one has

$$\hbar \frac{\partial P_e}{\partial t} = -2\Gamma' P_e, \quad (7)$$

with the effective relaxation rate

$$\Gamma' = \frac{\Gamma_1 P_{1e} + \Gamma_2 P_{2e}}{P_e} + \alpha K' \cos \delta, \quad (8)$$

where  $\alpha = 2|\langle 1e | 2e \rangle|/P_e$  and  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ . Since  $\max(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) > (\Gamma_1 P_{1e} + \Gamma_2 P_{2e})/P_e > \min(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ , the relaxation rate should change smoothly from one phase to the other if the quantum coherence in the last term of Eq. (8) is ignored. However, the quantum coherence could strongly affect the relaxation rate. For example, if we further assume  $K' = \Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 = \Gamma$ , then, the effective relaxation rate reads,

$$\Gamma' = (1 + \alpha \cos \delta) \Gamma. \quad (9)$$

$\cos \delta$  could be zero, positive or negative. One has  $0 \leq \Gamma' \leq 2\Gamma$ . When  $\delta = 0$ ,  $\Gamma'$  is larger than  $\Gamma$ . While  $\Gamma' = 0$  signifies the relaxation time  $\tau' = 1/\Gamma'$  approaching infinity, similar to the critical slowing down.

In order to compare the quantum and semiclassical models, we study the influence of the relative phase  $\delta$  on




FIG. 3. The time  $t_{90\%}$  for the ground state reaching its 90% population as a function of the geometric phase difference  $\delta$  at phase transition points. The relaxation times at the critical point could be longer or shorter than that in a single phase, in agreement with the experiments. The model parameters are the same as Fig. 2(c). The triangles collected by solid red line denote the calculating results by the dissipative Schrödinger equation. With the change of the relative phase  $\delta$ , the decay times of the excited states vary roughly from  $4\tau$  to  $13\tau$ . The dashed blue curve is given by the semiclassical model at phase transition point with  $t_{90\%} = -\hbar \ln 0.1 / 2\Gamma'$ , where  $\Gamma' = (1 + \alpha \cos \delta) \Gamma$  according to Eq. (9) with  $\alpha = 0.7$ . In the semiclassical model,  $\Gamma$  is calculated by Fermi's golden rule in Eq. (10) using the parameters in the quantum model. In the phase I or II,  $t_{90\%} = -\hbar \ln 0.1 / 2\Gamma \approx 4.16\tau$  is a constant denoted by the horizontal dashed black line.

the relaxation time quantitatively in both models. We define  $t_{90\%}$  as the time for the ground state reaching 90 percent of the total population. As shown in Fig. 3, the dependence of  $t_{90\%}$  on  $\delta$  in the quantum model agrees well with that in the semiclassical model. With  $\delta$  varying from 0 to  $\pi$ , the decay rate decreases gradually and the value of  $t_{90\%}$  is strongly enhanced. For instance, when there is no phase difference or  $\delta=0$ ,  $t_{90\%}$  at the phase transition point is even slightly shorter than that in phase I or II. On the other hand, for  $\delta = \pi$ ,  $t_{90\%}$  at the phase transition point is much longer than that in phase I or II. In the semiclassical model, using the parameters in the quantum model,  $\Gamma$  of the excited states is calculated by Fermi's golden rule [41]

$$\Gamma = \frac{\pi F_n V_{ge}^2}{\hbar \omega} \quad (10)$$

where  $V_{ge}$  is the coupling strength between the ground state and excited state and  $F_n = e^{-g} g^n / n!$  is the Franck-Condon factor with  $n \approx \Delta_{ge} / \hbar \omega$  with energy gap  $\Delta_{ge} = (E_e - \lambda_e^2 / \hbar \omega) - (E_g - \lambda_g^2 / \hbar \omega)$ , and  $g = \varepsilon_{ge} / \hbar \omega$  is the Huang-Rhys factor with the electron-phonon selfenergy difference  $\varepsilon_{ge} = (\lambda_e - \lambda_g)^2 / \hbar \omega$ . At phase transition

point, the decay time  $t_{90\%} = -\hbar \ln 0.1 / 2\Gamma'$  with  $\Gamma' = (1 + \alpha \cos \delta)\Gamma$ . In the phase I or II,  $t_{90\%} = -\hbar \ln 0.1 / 2\Gamma$  is a constant around  $4.16\tau$ .

*Conclusions.* To conclude, we have proposed that the conventional phase transition and quantum phase transition could be featured by the Pancharatnam-Berry phase factor. We assumed that with the change of the control parameter in the Hamiltonian, the quantum state accumulates a geometric phase and there is abrupt shift of the phase factor at phase transition points. Applying the dissipative Schrödinger equation, we studied the dynamical evolution of the generalized spin-boson model. At the phase transition point, the geometric phase difference between the states belonging neighboring phases results in the universal anomalies of dynamics via quantum interference. Since the geometric phase strongly affect the dynamical relaxation near phase transition points, experimental measurements of the dynamical anomalies could be applied to probe the phase transition. The effects of the geometric phase on the relaxation times in the quantum model qualitatively agrees with our semiclassical model. The geometric phase can increase or decrease the relaxation time at phase transition points, which coincides with the experiments and existing models. Furthermore, by adjusting some parameters and setting a  $\pi$  phase shift, we found that the relaxation time of the excited states even could be divergent, which agrees well with experiments of the superconducting  $\pi$ -junction. Our work presented theoretical evidences for studying the phase transition by introducing the geometric phase, which is benefited for the design of qubits with a long dephasing time for quantum computation and communications.

*Acknowledgments.*— This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No.12274187, No.11874188, No.12047501, No.11874075), Science Challenge Project No. U1930401, and National Key Research and Development Program of China 2018YFA0305703.

---

\* Email address: junchang@snnu.edu.cn

- [1] H. E. Stanley, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71**, S358 (1999).
- [2] L. P. Kadanoff, W. Götze, D. Hamblen, R. Hecht, E. Lewis, V. V. Palciauskas, M. Rayl, J. Swift, D. Aspnes, and J. Kane, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **39**, 395 (1967).
- [3] P. C. Hohenberg and B. I. Halperin, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **49**, 435 (1977).
- [4] M. Heyl, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **81**, 054001 (2018).
- [5] J. Dziarmaga, *Adv.Phys.* **59**, 1063 (2010).
- [6] F. Pressacco, D. Sangalli, V. Uhlíř, D. Kutnyakhov, J. A. Arregi, S. Y. Agustsson, G. Brenner, H. Redlin, M. Heber, D. Vasilyev, *et al.*, *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 1 (2021).
- [7] T. C. Hu, Q. Wu, Z. X. Wang, L. Y. Shi, Q. M. Liu, L. Yue, S. J. Zhang, R. S. Li, X. Y. Zhou, S. X. Xu, D. Wu, T. Dong, and N. L. Wang, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 075113 (2022).
- [8] Y. Zhu, J. Hoffman, C. E. Rowland, H. Park, D. A. Walko, J. W. Freeland, P. J. Ryan, R. D. Schaller, A. Bhattacharya, and H. Wen, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1 (2018).
- [9] B. Hartmann, D. Zielke, J. Polzin, T. Sasaki, and J. Müller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 216403 (2015).
- [10] D. Hsieh, F. Mahmood, D. H. Torchinsky, G. Cao, and N. Gedik, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 035128 (2012).
- [11] Y. C. Tian, W. H. Zhang, F. S. Li, Y. L. Wu, Q. Wu, F. Sun, G. Y. Zhou, L. Wang, X. Ma, Q.-K. Xue, and J. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 107001 (2016).
- [12] M. Mitrano, G. Cotugno, S. R. Clark, R. Singla, S. Kaiser, J. Stähler, R. Beyer, M. Dressel, L. Baldassarre, D. Nicoletti, A. Perucchi, T. Hasegawa, H. Okamoto, D. Jaksch, and A. Cavalleri, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 117801 (2014).
- [13] Y. Q. An, A. J. Taylor, S. D. Conradson, S. A. Trugman, T. Durakiewicz, and G. Rodriguez, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 207402 (2011).
- [14] S. Kundu, T. Bar, R. K. Nayak, and B. Bansal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 095703 (2020).
- [15] A. Zong, P. E. Dolgirev, A. Kogar, E. Ergeçen, M. B. Yilmaz, Y.-Q. Bie, T. Rohwer, I.-C. Tung, J. Straquadine, X. Wang, Y. Yang, X. Shen, R. Li, J. Yang, S. Park, M. C. Hoffmann, B. K. Ofori-Okai, M. E. Kozina, H. Wen, X. Wang, I. R. Fisher, P. Jarillo-Herrero, and N. Gedik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 097601 (2019).
- [16] Y. Horie, T. Fukami, and S. Mase, *Solid State Commun.* **62**, 471 (1987).
- [17] J. C. Lasjaunias, K. Biljaković, F. Nad', P. Monceau, and K. Bechgaard, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 1283 (1994).
- [18] A. J. Verhaar, E. J. Faassen, V. Dakos, E. H. van Nes, M. Lüring, and M. Scheffer, *Nature* **481**, 357 (2012).
- [19] C. Djurberg, P. Svedlindh, P. Nordblad, M. F. Hansen, F. Bødker, and S. Mørup, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 5154 (1997).
- [20] D. Niermann, C. P. Grams, P. Becker, L. Bohatý, H. Schenck, and J. Hemberger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 037204 (2015).
- [21] F. Vicentini, F. Minganti, R. Rota, G. Orso, and C. Ciuti, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 013853 (2018).
- [22] B. Palmieri and S. A. Safran, *Phys. Rev. E* **88**, 032708 (2013).
- [23] D. S. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 416 (1986).
- [24] C. B. Dağ and K. Sun, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 214402 (2021).
- [25] M. Eckstein, M. Kollar, and P. Werner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 056403 (2009).
- [26] P. Barmettler, M. Punk, V. Gritsev, E. Demler, and E. Altman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 130603 (2009).
- [27] S. Pancharatnam, *Proceedings of the Indian Academy of Sciences-Section A*, **44**, 398 (1956).
- [28] M. V. Berry, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **392**, 45 (1984).
- [29] Y. Aharonov and J. Anandan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 1593 (1987).
- [30] J. Samuel and R. Bhandari, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 2339 (1988).
- [31] A. J. Niemi and G. W. Semenoff, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 927 (1985).
- [32] Y. Lyanda-Geller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 657 (1993).
- [33] D. Arovas, J. R. Schrieffer, and F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 722 (1984).
- [34] F. D. M. Haldane and Y.-S. Wu,

- Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2887 (1985).
- [35] S. K. Min, A. Abedi, K. S. Kim, and E. K. U. Gross, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 263004 (2014).
- [36] X. Zhu, P. Lu, and M. Lein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 030401 (2022).
- [37] J. Dalibard, F. Gerbier, G. Juzeliūnas, and P. Öhberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 1523 (2011).
- [38] R. Y. Chiao and Y.-S. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 933 (1986).
- [39] A. Tomita and R. Y. Chiao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 937 (1986).
- [40] A. Ekert, M. Ericsson, P. Hayden, H. Inamori, J. A. Jones, D. K. Oi, and V. Vedral, J. mod. optic. **47**, 2501 (2000).
- [41] J. Chang, A. J. Fedro, and M. van Veenendaal, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 075124 (2010).
- [42] M. van Veenendaal, J. Chang, and A. J. Fedro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 067401 (2010).
- [43] J. Chang, A. J. Fedro, and M. van Veenendaal, Chem. Phys. **407**, 65 (2012).
- [44] J. Chang, I. Eremin, and J. Zhao, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 104305 (2014).
- [45] URL\_will\_be\_inserted\_by\_publisher.
- [46] B. T. Walker, H. J. Hesten, H. S. Dhar, R. A. Nyman, and F. Mintert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 203602 (2019).
- [47] D.-W. Fu, H.-L. Cai, S.-H. Li, Q. Ye, L. Zhou, W. Zhang, Y. Zhang, F. Deng, and R.-G. Xiong, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 257601 (2013).
- [48] L. B. Ioffe, V. B. Geshkenbein, M. V. Feigel'man, A. L. Fauchãšre, and G. Blatter, Nature **398**, 679 (1999).
- [49] T. Yamashita, K. Tanikawa, S. Takahashi, and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 097001 (2005).
- [50] A. K. Feofanov, V. A. Oboznov, V. V. Bol'ginov, J. Lisenfeld, S. Poletto, V. V. Ryazanov, A. N. Rossolenko, M. Khabipov, D. Balashov, A. B. Zorin, P. N. Dmitriev, V. P. Koshelets, and A. V. Ustinov, Nat. Phys. **6**, 593 (2010).