

Identification of gap closing with dissipative dynamics

Jian-Song Pan^{1,2,*} and Fan Wu^{3,†}

¹*College of Physics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China*

²*Key Laboratory of High Energy Density Physics and Technology of Ministry of Education, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China*

³*Fujian Key Laboratory of Quantum Information and Quantum Optics, College of Physics and Information Engineering, Fuzhou University, Fuzhou, Fujian, 350108, China*

(Dated: January 26, 2023)

Dissipation in a quantum system can have dramatic impact on its phases and phase transitions, but often with detrimental outcomes. Here we demonstrate a scheme where gap-closing transitions in an Hermitian quantum system can be identified with dynamical evolution in presence of dissipation. Inspired by the recent experimental progress in non-Hermitian systems, we show that a purely lossy perturbation gives rise to an imaginary spectral bubble at around the small gap regime of underlying Hamiltonian. A Landau-Zener-Stückelberg-like evolution process passing the spectral bubble arose from the gap-closing point shows equal projection probabilities, which can be employed to distinguish gap closing and anticrossing points in the original Hamiltonian. The fine tuning of parameters to the critical point and the precise preparation of initial state are dispensable in this scheme. Our work provides an interesting example where key features of a closed quantum system can be revealed through non-Hermitian perturbations.

I. INTRODUCTION

Many interesting physical processes, such as first-order quantum phase transitions, are signaled by the closing of the energy gap between the ground and the first excited states [1]. Identifying gap-closing points, which are easily mixed up with anticrossing points in measurement, is a necessary step in establishing distinct phases and critical regimes in many situations. On the other hand, while the gap closing under study emerges in a closed quantum system, the system is inevitably coupled to its environment or the measuring device during detection. Naturally, a full description of the measurement process necessitates an open-system treatment where dissipative processes arise. Previous studies have shown that dissipation can be engineered to induce interesting phases or phase transitions in the resulting dynamics [2–9]. In this context, a complementary question, whether dissipation can be introduced to probing energy gap closing in closed quantum systems, has rarely been addressed.

On the other hand, past decades witness the quick growth of research interest on non-Hermitian systems with parity-time ($\mathcal{PT}$) symmetry [10–34]. These systems possess real (conjugate complex) spectra in the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric (breaking) phases [10–12]. The spontaneous breaking of $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry by state-dependent dissipation (or gain and loss in optics) leads to the emergence of exceptional point (EP) with the coalescence of eigenstates, which has been experimentally checked in different platforms [13–26]. The singular character of EPs is not only useful for sensing [35–37], but has profound impact on the system dynamics, exemplified by the phenomenon

of chiral state transfer [28, 31–34, 38]. Furthermore, in a recent study, it is shown that when crossing the EP, information of the initial state may be completely lost, leading to an equal population of the eigenstates [39].

In this work, we demonstrate that gap-closing transitions in Hermitian systems can in principle be identified with dynamical method by introducing a dissipative perturbation. We consider a purely dissipative process, under which the original Hermitian Hamiltonian is dressed by an additional imaginary term. Importantly, we design the dissipative process such that the resulting dissipative perturbation possesses the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry. As a result, at around the gap-closing or anticrossing point of a $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian, the imaginary term opens up a purely imaginary spectral gap, and a pair of EPs emerge on either side of the transition, forming a bubble-like structure which we refer to as the $\mathcal{PT}$ -breaking bubble (PTBB). Based on the bubble-like spectral structure and the unique dynamic consequence of EPs, we propose to detect the gap-closing transition through a Landau-Zener-Stückelberg-like process: the system parameters are ramped across the bubble and then back to the original values. The final state subsequently features an equal population of the two eigenstates when the original Hermitian Hamiltonian has gap closing, regardless of the initial state. The applicability of this proposal is owing to that such a phenomenon is absent when the original Hamiltonian carries anticrossing points, no matter whether it possesses $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry and then PTBB emerges or not, which goes beyond the previous study [39]. It implies that this phenomenon is indeed can be employed as a unique signature for energy gap closing. It is worth to emphasize that, this phenomenon is in sharp contrast to the Landau-Zener-Stückelberg interference in a common Hermitian system, where the final state sensitively depends on the initial condition. This

* panjsong@scu.edu.cn

† T21060@fzu.edu.cn

scheme also does not require the fine tuning of parameters to the critical point. Our predictions should be able to be verified with current experimental techniques.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we present the perturbation analysis on the spectral response to a dissipative perturbation in a generic $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric system with small energy gap. In Sec. III, we discuss the breaking of $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry under the two-level approximation. We discuss how to identify gap closing with dynamical evolution in Sec. IV. The impacts of different initial states are discussed in Sec. V. Some discussions and a brief summary are given in Sec. VI.

II. DISSIPATIVE PERTURBATION

Gap closing or anticrossing typically involves two states, the ground state $|\Psi_g\rangle$ and the excited state $|\Psi_e\rangle$, which approach and leave away each other when tuning a coupling strength η . We assume the original Hamiltonian $H_0(\eta)$ is perturbed by a dissipative perturbation $H_p = i\lambda V_p$ with Hermitian Hamiltonian V_p and small parameter λ , which generally can be implemented with state-dependent loss in experiment [34, 40]. We assume H_0 , H_p and then total Hamiltonian $H = H_0 + H_p$ possess the product of parity ($\mathcal{P}$) and time-reversal ($\mathcal{T}$) symmetries, i.e., the so-called $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry: $\mathcal{PT}H_0(\mathcal{PT})^{-1} = H_0$, $\mathcal{PT}H_p(\mathcal{PT})^{-1} = H_p$ and $\mathcal{PT}H(\mathcal{PT})^{-1} = H$. Without loss of generality, we also assume H_0 is not commuting with H_p and thus H_p perturbatively mix the eigenstates of H_0 .

Let us employ the perturbation theory to analyze the impact of H_p on the spectra of H_0 . Specifically, for the zero-order eigenstates $|\Psi_\xi\rangle$ and eigenvalues E_ξ , which satisfy $H_0|\Psi_\xi\rangle = E_\xi|\Psi_\xi\rangle$, the perturbation expansion of Schrodinger equation is given by

$$(H_0 + i\lambda V_p)(|\Psi_\xi\rangle + |\Psi_\xi^{(1)}\rangle + \dots) = (E_\xi + E_\xi^{(1)} + \dots)(|\Psi_\xi\rangle + |\Psi_\xi^{(1)}\rangle + \dots), \quad (1)$$

where $|\Psi_\xi^{(n)}\rangle$ and $E_\xi^{(n)}$ are the n -th order corrections of the eigenstates and eigenenergies. By matching order by order, we derive

$$\begin{aligned} H_0|\Psi_\xi\rangle &= E_\xi|\Psi_\xi\rangle, \\ H_0|\Psi_\xi^{(1)}\rangle + i\lambda V_p|\Psi_\xi\rangle &= E_\xi|\Psi_\xi^{(1)}\rangle + E_\xi^{(1)}|\Psi_\xi\rangle, \\ \dots \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Multiplying $\langle\Psi_\xi|$ from left, we derive $E_\xi^{(1)} = i\lambda\langle\Psi_\xi|V_p|\Psi_\xi\rangle$, as $\langle\Psi_\xi|\Psi_\xi^{(1)}\rangle = 0$.

By noting that $\mathcal{PT}iV_p(\mathcal{PT})^{-1} = -i\mathcal{PT}V_p(\mathcal{PT})^{-1} = iV_p$, then we derive $\mathcal{PT}V_p(\mathcal{PT})^{-1} = -1$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{PT}H_0(\mathcal{PT})^{-1} = H_0$, and thus $\mathcal{PT}H_0|\Psi_\xi\rangle = H_0(\mathcal{PT}|\Psi_\xi\rangle) = E(\mathcal{PT}|\Psi_\xi\rangle)$. It follows that $\mathcal{PT}|\Psi_\xi\rangle = e^{i\phi}|\Psi_\xi\rangle$ with certain a phase ϕ , and $E_\xi^{(1)} =$




FIG. 1. Illustration of $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry breaking in single-spin system H_0 . (a)(b): The spectra (a) and spin structure (b) of a single-spin system with $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry breaking. The red solid (blue dash-dotted) curves in (a) denote the real (imaginary) parts of the spectra. The variation of bubble size (horizontal diameter) with γ is shown in the inset of (a).

$i\lambda\langle\Psi_\xi|(\mathcal{PT})^{-1}(\mathcal{PT})V_p(\mathcal{PT})^{-1}(\mathcal{PT})|\Psi_\xi\rangle = -E_\xi^{(1)}$, provided $|\Psi_\xi\rangle$ is not degenerate. It implies $E_\xi^{(1)} = 0$.

The second-order corrections of energy, $E_\xi^{(2)} = -\lambda^2 \sum_{\bar{\xi} \neq \xi} |\langle\Psi_\xi|V_p|\Psi_{\bar{\xi}}\rangle|^2 / (E_\xi - E_{\bar{\xi}})$, thus becomes dominant. We assume that the energy gap between the two states $|\Psi_{\xi=e,g}\rangle$ becomes small (anti-crossing) and even close when tuning η . In the regime where the energy gap is small, we can assume other levels are relatively far from $|\Psi_g\rangle$ and $|\Psi_e\rangle$. The above expression of $E_\xi^{(2)}$ implies the dissipative perturbation leads to the higher eigenvalue E_e tend to be decreased and lower one E_g is increased. Then an energy gap tends to be closed by an dissipative perturbation, in contrast to the case of Hermitian perturbation, which usually opens an energy gap or enhances the anti-crossing effect. Assuming the two levels whose energy gap is to be considered are $|\Psi_g\rangle$ and $|\Psi_e\rangle$ with $E_e > E_g$, when the perturbation strength $\lambda \ll \Delta E \equiv (E_e - E_g)$, the energy gap becomes small but is still real and finite. The spectra are still real and the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry is unbroken. When $\Delta E \ll \lambda$, the dissipative perturbation becomes dominant, and degenerate perturbation can be approximately applicable. Since the perturbation matrix,

$$M = i\lambda \begin{pmatrix} \langle\Psi_e|V_p|\Psi_e\rangle & \langle\Psi_e|V_p|\Psi_g\rangle \\ \langle\Psi_g|V_p|\Psi_e\rangle & \langle\Psi_g|V_p|\Psi_g\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

is a skew-Hermitian matrix satisfying $M^\dagger = -M$ and thus has purely imaginary spectra. The $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry is broken in this regime.

Although the critical value of λ corresponding to the EPs that connect the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry broken and unbroken regimes can not be fixed in the perturbation analysis, the form of $E_\xi^{(2)}$ indicates it should occur when λ is comparable with the zero-order energy gap ΔE . Since λ is small, the breaking of $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry will only happen in the small gap regime of H_0 . Therefore, a PTBB, with imaginary spectra inside and two EPs at the ends, will emerge when tuning the coupling strength η across the

gap-closing points or anticrossing points with small minimum gap of H_0 .

III. $\mathcal{PT}$ -BREAKING BUBBLES UNDER TWO-LEVEL APPROXIMATION

When the considered energy gap is small enough, a two-level model can be employed to approximately characterize the effect of dissipative perturbation. Hence we take the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric single-spin model, which has been densely discussed [41], as the example to elaborate our theory. A general Hermitian single-spin model is given by $H_0 = \eta\sigma_z + \delta_x\sigma_x + \delta_y\sigma_y$, where η , δ_x and δ_y are real numbers. One model with gap-closing transition can be described with $H_0 = \eta\sigma^z$, where the energy gap is closed at $\eta = 0$. The model shows anticrossing as long as δ_x or δ_y is not vanishing. We take the imaginary perturbation as $H_p = i\gamma\sigma^x$. With the spin rotation around axis y : $\sigma_x \rightarrow \sigma_z$, such a perturbation can be implemented with state-dependent loss, which has been realized on different platforms [34, 40–42]. The $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry is defined as the product of parity symmetry $\mathcal{P} = \sigma^x$ and time-reversal symmetry $\mathcal{T} = i\mathcal{K}\sigma^y$ with Hermitian conjugate operator $\mathcal{K}$, i.e., $\mathcal{PT} = \mathcal{K}\sigma^z$. H_0 thus possesses $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry so long as $\delta_x = 0$. Then the case with gap closing typically possesses $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry. These properties are summarized in Tab. I.

As predicted by our above perturbation analysis, by fixing γ and tuning η , the transitions of $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry in the eigenstates are observed once H_0 also possesses the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry, reflected in the transitions between real and imaginary spectra as exemplified in Fig. 1(a) with $\delta_x = \delta_y = 0$. As discussion in following section, the spectral transition also emerges in another case with $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry: $\delta_x = 0$ and $\delta_y \neq 0$, but which gives rise to anticrossing rather than gap closing.

As shown in Fig. 1(a), a PTBB is observed at around $\eta = 0$ in the case where $\delta_x = \delta_y = 0$ (also in the case with $\delta_x = 0$ and $\delta_y \neq 0$). The expectations of Pauli matrix σ^z (σ^x) are vanishing when $\gamma < |\eta|$ ($\gamma > |\eta|$), accompanying the closing of real spectra, although that of σ^y is always finite across the phase transition [Fig. 1(b)]. It implies the threshold for triggering the $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetry breaking should be determined by the comparison between the energy gap between two eigenstates with opposite spin polarizations of H_0 (associated with $\langle\sigma_z\rangle$) and the imaginary perturbation (associated with $\langle\sigma_x\rangle$). This point is consistent with the linear dependence of bubble size with γ , as shown in the inset of Fig. 1(a). The emergence of the PTBB can be formally understood with the perturbation theory discussed in the above section. The total Hamiltonian $H = H_0 + H_p$ possesses the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry $\mathcal{PT} = \mathcal{K}\sigma^z$. For the Hermitian single-spin system H_0 , if we set the imaginary σ^x term as a perturbation when $\gamma \ll \eta$, it leads to a second-order correction $\gamma^2/(2\eta)$ [$-\gamma^2/(2\eta)$] for the lower (upper) non-perturbation eigenvalues of H_0 , as we discussed in the above section.

On the other hand, when $\eta \ll \gamma$, a second-order correction $i\eta^2/(2\gamma)$ [$-i\eta^2/(2\gamma)$] is added to the lower (upper) non-perturbation imaginary eigenvalues of H_p by the real σ^z term, as a perturbation instead. Approaching the EP points, the energy gap monotonously decreases, and finally close at the EP points in order to smoothly connect the real and imaginary spectra, although the perturbation conditions gradually becomes invalid. We would like to note that again, this is completely different from the conventional Hermitian systems, where a perturbation coupling between two energy levels usually opens/enlarges a gap rather than leads to gap closing.

IV. DYNAMICAL IDENTIFICATION OF ENERGY GAP CLOSING

We propose to identify the PTBB associated with the gap closing through a dynamical method. In general, the dynamical evolution in non-Hermitian systems shows distinct features with respect to Hermitian systems [44]. It was argued that, due to the loss of the information of initial state when the system is adiabatically tuned across two consecutive EPs, the projection probabilities of final state onto the two branches of states coalescing at the EPs have equal values [39]. Here, we find this equal-probability behaviour is absent when the original Hamiltonian H_0 has no gap closing, even when the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry and thus EPs are still present. By employing these unique properties, we propose to identify the PTBB linked with energy gap closing with a cyclic time evolution covering the PTBB, as a mimic of Landau-Zener-Stückelberg interference [44]. Specifically, we propose to start from a parametric point, e.g., $\eta = -1$, and tune η across the PTBB at around $\eta = 0$ and back to the start point $\eta = -1$. By observing the projection probabilities of final state for the instantaneous ground and excited states, which are connected with the states that coalesces at the EPs, we can gain the signature of gap closing. So long as the tuning speed is slow enough and adiabatic limit is approached, we can observe almost equal projection probabilities when H_0 indeed experiences a gap-closing transition.

The instantaneous projection probabilities and spectra (insets) of a cyclic time evolution ($\eta(t) = -1 + \alpha t$ when $t < t_f$ and $\eta(t) = 1 - \alpha t$ when $t > t_f$ with $\alpha = 1/15$) are shown in Fig. 2 for different parameters (all with arbitrary units in this paper). The upper and lower rows of subfigures show the cases without and with dissipative perturbations. The three sub-figures from left to right correspond to the Hamiltonians $H_0 = \eta(t)\sigma_z$, $\eta(t)\sigma_z + \delta_x\sigma_x$ and $\eta(t)\sigma_z + \delta_y\sigma_y$ (i.e., $H = \eta(t)\sigma_z + i\gamma\sigma_x$, $\eta(t)\sigma_z + \delta_x\sigma_x + i\gamma\sigma_x$ and $\eta(t)\sigma_z + \delta_y\sigma_y + i\gamma\sigma_x$), respectively. The initial state is prepared as an arbitrary superposition of the eigenstates of the lower and higher levels at $t = 0$. As shown in Fig. 2(a), where $H = H_0 = \eta(t)\sigma_z$, the instantaneous state has invariant projection probabilities for the eigenstates, although the spectra show a gap

	$\delta_x = \delta_y = 0$	$\delta_x = 0, \delta_y \neq 0$	$\delta_x \neq 0, \delta_y = 0$	$\delta_x \neq 0, \delta_y \neq 0$
$\mathcal{PT}$	Yes	Yes	No	No
evolution of energy gap	gap closing	anticrossing	anticrossing	anticrossing

TABLE I. The $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry and the evolution of energy gap when tuning the parameter η of the single-spin Hamiltonian under different parametric setting.




FIG. 2. The illustration of instantaneous spectra (upper row) and projection properties (lower row) for different perturbation parameters in a cyclic time evolution, where $\eta(t) = -1 + \alpha t$ when $t < t_f$ and $\eta(t) = 1 - \alpha t$ when $t > t_f$ with the one-way evolution time $t_f = 15$ and tuning speed $\alpha = 0.025$. The initial states are taken as $|\Psi(0)\rangle = \cos(\theta)|\Psi_g(0)\rangle + e^{i\varphi} \sin(\theta)|\Psi_e(0)\rangle$ with $\theta = \pi/3$ and $\varphi = \pi/6$, where $|\Psi_{g,e}(0)\rangle$ are the instantaneous eigenstates at moment $t = 0$. The spectra of real-time Hamiltonian $H = \eta(t)\sigma_z + \delta_x\sigma_x + \delta_y\sigma_y + i\gamma\sigma_x$ (insets) and the projection probabilities of instantaneous states when $\gamma = \delta_x = \delta_y = 0$ (a) [$\delta_y = \delta_x = 0, \gamma = 0.2$ (d)], $\gamma = \delta_y = 0, \delta_x = 0.15$ (b) [$\delta_y = 0, \delta_x = 0.15, \gamma = 0.2$ (e)], and $\gamma = \delta_x = 0, \delta_y = 0.15$ (c) [$\delta_x = 0, \delta_y = 0.15, \gamma = 0.2$ (e)], are shown. The solid (dotted) curves in the sub-figures show the projection probabilities for the corresponding levels in the insets. The projection probabilities $|C_{\xi=e,g}|^2$ are defined as $C_{e,g} = \langle \tilde{\Psi}_{e,g}(t) | \Psi(t) \rangle / |\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{e,g} | \Psi_{e,g} \rangle|$ with the instantaneous state $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ and the instantaneous right (left) eigenstates $|\Psi_{e,g}(t)\rangle$ ($|\tilde{\Psi}_{e,g}(t)\rangle$) [43].

closing. It is because there is no any coupling between the ground and excited states. When the imaginary perturbation is present, i.e., $H = H_0 + H_p = \eta(t)\sigma_z + i\gamma H_p$, where a PTBB emerges at around the gap-closing point [see the inset of Fig. 2(d)], the instantaneous projection probabilities for the two levels take almost the same instantaneous values after passing the EPs [see Fig. 2(d)]. This is a good signature for probing the gap-closing transition in the original Hamiltonian H_0 .

Let us further discuss the cases where the gap closing in H_0 is absent. Upon (a) and (d), a real spin term $\delta_x\sigma^x$ is introduced to (b) and (e). This real spin term prevents the gap closing at $\eta = 0$ and leads to anticrossing at around $\eta = 0$. Besides, it also breaks the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry, because $\mathcal{K}\sigma^z\sigma^x\sigma^z\mathcal{K}^\dagger = -\sigma^x$ as discussed above. In Fig. 2 (b), where the imaginary perturbation is not turned on, it is shown the spectra indeed has a finite gap when $\eta = 0$ [see the inset]. The finite real energy gap allows the Landau-Zener tunneling from lower level to the higher level and the instantaneous projection proba-

bilities unequally distributes. When the time evolution tends to the adiabatic limit $\delta_x^2/\alpha \gg 1$ (here $\delta_x^2/\alpha \sim 0.34$), the projection probabilities should keep constant as the energy gap completely suppresses the tunneling. Due to the absence of $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry, the spectra in the case with imaginary perturbation [see inset of (e)] always have imaginary parts, and the instantaneous projection probability of the level with positive imaginary spectra is amplified after long-time evolution and becomes dominant.

In Fig. 2 (c) and (f), another kind of real term $\delta_y\sigma^y$ is introduced into H_0 to break the gap closing. This perturbation also opens a finite gap at $\eta = 0$ and thus leads to anticrossing as well. But unlike (b) and (e), the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry is still preserved in this case, since $\mathcal{K}\sigma^z\sigma^y\sigma^z\mathcal{K}^\dagger = \sigma^y$. The behaviours of the time evolution in the case without imaginary perturbation look like the case with δ_x term [see (c)]. When the time evolution tends to the adiabatic limit $\delta_y^2/\alpha \gg 1$, the projection probabilities should also keep constant, while it is not in this limit here because $\delta_y^2/\alpha \sim 0.34$. The fluctua-




FIG. 3. The difference between the probability amplitudes $|\Delta|C|| = ||C_2| - |C_1||$ for different initial states in cyclic evolution. The initial states are taken as $|\Psi(0)\rangle = \cos(\theta)|\Psi_g(0)\rangle + e^{i\varphi}\sin(\theta)|\Psi_e(0)\rangle$, where φ is arbitrarily fixed at $\pi/6$ and θ is scanned. These sub-figures have the same parameters as the corresponding sub-figures in Fig. 2.

tions in the projection probabilities in the figure is due to the Landau-Zener tunneling for non-adiabatic evolution. What we want to emphasize is that, although the energy gap closes and a PTBB emerges when the imaginary perturbation is tuned on and is large enough, i.e., $\gamma > \delta_y$ [see the inset of (f); note that the gap is still open when $\gamma < \delta_y$], owing to the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry is preserved in both H_0 and H , the projection probabilities do not show the equality like the case with gap closing like (d). This observation has not been reported previously, since only the cases without σ_y term has been discussed [39]. Therefore, the equality of instantaneous projection probabilities only can be observed in the case where H_0 has a gap-closing transition when the dissipative perturbation is turned on, and can be employed as a unique signature of gap closing in H_0 .

Although, the analysis in Ref. [39] shows that the equality of projection probabilities survive under the adiabatic condition $\gamma^2/\alpha \gg 1$ for model $H = \eta\sigma_z + i\gamma\sigma_x$, where α is the tuning speed of η , the same with our model in Fig. 2 (d). In order to mimic the realistic situation, where the adiabaticity may be hard to be satisfied, we take $t_f = 15$ and thus $\gamma^2/\alpha \sim 0.6$ here. We would like to note that, even in this case, as shown in Fig. 2, it shows almost perfect coincidence in the projection probabilities of the final instantaneous states for the two levels. It implies this phenomenon is not strongly dependent on the adiabatic condition. Another point needs to be denoted is that, our models actually have neglected the background loss term which usually exist in experiment and thus the probabilities become larger than one. The background loss term is proportional to γ and leads to a scaling of $\exp(-2\gamma t_f) \sim 1/400$ in the final probabilities. It means the effective final probabilities is about $20/400 = 5\%$ in

Fig. 2 (d). We will lose about 95% of particles in the experiment.

V. VARIATION OF INITIAL STATES

The presence of equal redistribution is also independent on the preparation of initial state. In Fig. 3, the differences between the instantaneous projection amplitudes are shown for different initial states. From this figure, we can find the differences between the instantaneous projection probabilities are almost absent for any initial states in the case with gap closing. In contrast, the final probability differences are not vanishing and varies for different initial states in all other cases (including the case with both anticrossing and $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry and that with anticrossing but without $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry) as discussed in Fig. 2. This implies we do not need to elaborate a special initial state to identify the gap-closing transition in the experiment.

VI. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

From the above discussions, the proposed scheme can be expanded into following steps. In order to identify the gap closing in a system, we first need to introduce a dissipative perturbation that is noncommutative with the original (zeroth-order) Hermitian Hamiltonian. Second, we need to tune the parameter which may lead to gap closing or anticrossing along a cyclic trajectory covering the possible critical point and observe the projection probabilities of the final states to check if the equal redistribution occurs. If the system always has a small

gap, i.e., shows the anticrossing behaviour, rather than true gap closing, the equal redistribution will be broken. With these steps, we can identify the information if the system indeed has a gap-closing transition. We do not need to tune the parameter precisely to the gap-closing point, and elaborate the initial states, which are usually required in a conventional scheme. This provides us a paradigm for using dissipation in metrology.

In summary, we propose to identify gap closing with dissipative dynamics in Hermitian systems. It is shown that $\mathcal{PT}$ -breaking bubbles (PTBB) with imaginary spectra emerge at around a gap-closing or anticrossing point in presence of dissipative perturbation. We further propose to identify the PTBB associated with gap closing with a cyclic time evolution across the PTBB. Our proposal should be able to be checked with techniques shown in current experiments [34, 40–42]. It is crucial to confirm if a system indeed has gap closing in many situations. Conventionally, one need tune the parameter to

the critical point and measure the energy gap with scattering strength to identify if the energy gap is indeed close. Our proposal does not require the fine tuning of parameter to the critical point and special preparation of initial states, and thus may be of special interest in some situations.

Acknowledgements.—The authors wish to thank Profs. Wei Yi, Zhen-Biao Yang and Shi-Biao Zheng for very helpful discussions (also for the suggestions of Prof. Wei Yi on writing). J.-S. P. is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11904228) and the Science Specialty Program of Sichuan University (Grand No. 2020SCUNL210), F. W. is supported by National Youth Science Foundation of China (CN) (Grand No. 12204105), Educational Research Project for Young and Middle-Aged Teachers of Fujian Province (CN) (Grand No. JAT210041) and Natural Science Foundation of Fujian Province (CN) (Grand No. 2022J05116).

-
- [1] S. Sachdev, *Handbook of Magnetism and Advanced Magnetic Materials* (2007).
 - [2] S. Yao and Z. Wang, *Physical Review Letters* **121**, 086803 (2018).
 - [3] X.-W. Luo and C. Zhang, *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 073601 (2019).
 - [4] L. Li, C. H. Lee, S. Mu, and J. Gong, *Nature Communications* **11**, 1 (2020).
 - [5] J.-S. Pan, L. Li, and J. Gong, *Physical Review B* **103**, 205425 (2021).
 - [6] J.-S. Pan, W. Yi, and J. Gong, *Communications Physics* **4**, 1 (2021).
 - [7] S. Longhi, *Physical Review Letters* **128**, 157601 (2022).
 - [8] T. Li, Y.-S. Zhang, and W. Yi, *Physical Review B* **105**, 125111 (2022).
 - [9] W. Yi, *Nature Physics* **18**, 370 (2022).
 - [10] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, *Physical Review Letters* **80**, 5243 (1998).
 - [11] R. El-Ganainy, K. G. Makris, M. Khajavikhan, Z. H. Musslimani, S. Rotter, and D. N. Christodoulides, *Nature Physics* **14**, 11 (2018).
 - [12] C. M. Bender, R. Tateo, P. E. Dorey, T. C. Dunning, G. Levai, S. Kuzhel, H. F. Jones, A. Fring, and D. W. Hook, *PT symmetry: In quantum and classical physics* (World Scientific Publishing, 2018).
 - [13] N. Moiseyev, *Non-Hermitian quantum mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
 - [14] L. Feng, R. El-Ganainy, and L. Ge, *Nature Photonics* **11**, 752 (2017).
 - [15] F. P. D. Pile, *Nature Photonics* **11**, 742 (2017).
 - [16] M. F. Limonov, M. V. Rybin, A. N. Poddubny, and Y. S. Kivshar, *Nature Photonics* **11**, 543 (2017).
 - [17] N. Horiuchi, *Nature Photonics* **11**, 271 (2017).
 - [18] L. Xiao, K. Wang, X. Zhan, Z. Bian, K. Kawabata, M. Ueda, W. Yi, and P. Xue, *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 230401 (2019).
 - [19] F. Klauck, L. Teuber, M. Ornigotti, M. Heinrich, S. Scheel, and A. Szameit, *Nature Photonics* **13**, 883 (2019).
 - [20] A. Szameit, M. C. Rechtsman, O. Bahat-Treidel, and M. Segev, *Physical Review A* **84**, 021806 (2011).
 - [21] A. Regensburger, C. Bersch, M.-A. Miri, G. Onishchukov, D. N. Christodoulides, and U. Peschel, *Nature* **488**, 167 (2012).
 - [22] B. Zhen, C. W. Hsu, Y. Igarashi, L. Lu, I. Kaminer, A. Pick, S.-L. Chua, J. D. Joannopoulos, and M. Soljačić, *Nature* **525**, 354 (2015).
 - [23] S. Weimann, M. Kremer, Y. Plotnik, Y. Lumer, S. Nolte, K. G. Makris, M. Segev, M. C. Rechtsman, and A. Szameit, *Nature Materials* **16**, 433 (2017).
 - [24] K.-H. Kim, M.-S. Hwang, H.-R. Kim, J.-H. Choi, Y.-S. No, and H.-G. Park, *Nature Communications* **7**, 1 (2016).
 - [25] A. Cerjan, A. Raman, and S. Fan, *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 203902 (2016).
 - [26] A. Poshakinskiy, A. Poddubny, and A. Fainstein, *Physical Review Letters* **117**, 224302 (2016).
 - [27] C. Dembowski, H.-D. Gräf, H. Harney, A. Heine, W. Heiss, H. Rehfeld, and A. Richter, *Physical Review Letters* **86**, 787 (2001).
 - [28] C. Dembowski, B. Dietz, H.-D. Gräf, H. Harney, A. Heine, W. Heiss, and A. Richter, *Physical Review E* **69**, 056216 (2004).
 - [29] A. A. Mailybaev, O. N. Kirillov, and A. P. Seyranian, *Physical Review A* **72**, 014104 (2005).
 - [30] J. Doppler, A. A. Mailybaev, J. Böhm, U. Kuhl, A. Girschik, F. Libisch, T. J. Milburn, P. Rabl, N. Moiseyev, and S. Rotter, *Nature* **537**, 76 (2016).
 - [31] A. U. Hassan, G. L. Galmiche, G. Harari, P. LiKamWa, M. Khajavikhan, M. Segev, and D. N. Christodoulides, *Physical Review A* **96**, 052129 (2017).
 - [32] A. U. Hassan, B. Zhen, M. Soljačić, M. Khajavikhan, and D. N. Christodoulides, *Physical Review Letters* **118**, 093002 (2017).
 - [33] X.-L. Zhang, S. Wang, B. Hou, and C. T. Chan, *Physical Review X* **8**, 021066 (2018).
 - [34] Z. Ren, D. Liu, E. Zhao, C. He, K. K. Pak, J. Li, and G.-B. Jo, *Nature Physics* **18**, 385 (2022).

- [35] J. Wiersig, *Physical Review A* **93**, 033809 (2016).
- [36] J. Wiersig, *Physical Review Letters* **112**, 203901 (2014).
- [37] J. Wiersig, *Photonics Research* **8**, 1457 (2020).
- [38] H. Wang, L.-J. Lang, and Y. D. Chong, *Physical Review A* **98**, 012119 (2018).
- [39] B. Longstaff and E.-M. Graefe, *Physical Review A* **100**, 052119 (2019).
- [40] J. Li, A. K. Harter, J. Liu, L. de Melo, Y. N. Joglekar, and L. Luo, *Nature Communications* **10**, 1 (2019).
- [41] Y. Wu, W. Liu, J. Geng, X. Song, X. Ye, C.-K. Duan, X. Rong, and J. Du, *Science* **364**, 878 (2019).
- [42] M. Naghiloo, M. Abbasi, Y. N. Joglekar, and K. Murch, *Nature Physics* **15**, 1232 (2019).
- [43] D. C. Brody, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **47**, 035305 (2013).
- [44] X. Shen, F. Wang, Z. Li, and Z. Wu, *Physical Review A* **100**, 062514 (2019).