

# Dissipative prethermal discrete time crystal

DinhDuy Vu<sup>1</sup> and Sankar Das Sarma<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Condensed Matter Theory Center and Joint Quantum Institute,  
Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA*

An ergodic system subjected to an external periodic drive will be generically heated to infinite temperature. However, if the applied frequency is larger than the typical energy scale of the local Hamiltonian, this heating stops during a prethermal period that extends exponentially with the frequency. During this prethermal period, the system may manifest an emergent symmetry that, if spontaneously broken, will produce sub-harmonic oscillation of the discrete time crystal (DTC). We study the role of dissipation on the survival time of the prethermal DTC. On one hand, a bath coupling increases the prethermal period by slowing down the accumulation of errors that eventually destroy prethermalization. On the other hand, the spontaneous symmetry breaking is destabilized by interaction with environment. The result of this competition is a non-monotonic variation, i.e. the survival time of the prethermal DTC first increases and then decreases as the environment coupling gets stronger.

*Introduction* - For static systems, the spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) is paradigm dividing matter into phases, most notably through the Landau-Ginzburg theory. It is important to ask whether SSB can manifest in dynamic systems, in particular those with time translation symmetry. Spontaneous symmetry breaking, despite not being directly applicable to continuous time translation symmetry because of the no-go theorem [1, 2], may emerge under discrete time translation symmetry (in Floquet systems) [3–5], producing an exotic phase called the discrete time crystal (DTC). The signature of this phase is the many-body collective response exhibiting a longer periodicity than that of the drive, usually an integer multiple. Several experiments have successfully created DTC in atomic systems or quantum simulators [6–10].

One of the main problem in realizing DTC is the heating to infinite temperature by the periodic driving field. Therefore, it is crucial to prevent thermalization or at least delay it by a sufficiently long time. The first discovered strategy for this task is to utilize many-body localization (MBL) by introducing disorder to the Hamiltonian [3–5]. Since MBL violates the Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis, the information of the initial state still persists in the long-time dynamics [11, 12], thus we can expect the DTC, if protected by MBL, to survive to infinite time. However, disorder-induced MBL requires tuning and might be difficult to engineer, not to mention that the validity of MBL in the thermodynamic limit is still not settled [13–15]. Another approach - prethermalization, on the other hand, only requires the applied frequency to be larger than the smallest energy scale of the Hamiltonian [16–21]. During the prethermal regime, the dynamics manifests an emergent symmetry with exponentially small error even though it is not an exact symmetry of the Hamiltonian. If the symmetry is represented by a  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  group and is spontaneously broken, the sub-harmonic response will emerge in some collective degree of freedom with periodicity  $nT$ . Unlike the MBL

proposal, the prethermal DTC survives only a finite time before being eventually thermalized, but this time can be exponentially extended by simply increasing the driving frequency. This characteristic has been observed [8]. The key point is that prethermal DTC should exist independent of whether MBL exists or not.

The above strategies were initially developed for close systems which may not reflect the realistic situation as a system is always coupled to the environment not only in terms of heat bath but also noise. In the presence of a bath, MBL is most likely destroyed, while the fate of prethermal DTC is less straightforward. For example, a cold bath can potentially preserve the DTC to infinite time as it absorbs excessive heat generated by the drive [18]. We first generalize the derivation of prethermalization to open systems. We then study weak onsite dephasing noise, focusing on its effect on the lifetime of DTC.

The emergence of prethermal DTC is based on two conditions: the prethermal regime and the SSB of the emergent symmetry. We note that a true SSB has infinite lifetime by definition, but in a finite system, we can only achieve quasi-SSB whose large fluctuations of the order parameter must eventually vanish to recover the symmetry. The shorter lifetime between the prethermalization and quasi-SSB thus determines the survival time of DTC. Our result is summarized in Fig. 1. We show that as the environment coupling gets stronger, the prethermal regime is extended, while the quasi-SSB lifetime is reduced, leading to a non-monotonic behavior of the DTC. Additionally, in the early increasing phase, the exponential dependence on the applied frequency is prominent; while in the later decreasing phase, the frequency becomes irrelevant. This statement is demonstrated numerically in the main text and argued analytically in the Supplemental Material [22]. We mention that for some specific forms of noise operators, the decreasing trend may start at a very weak noise amplitude, making the first increasing phase almost

invisible. Before proceeding to the details, we contrast our study with the dissipative time crystal that does not require emergent symmetry or MBL [23–25]. This proposal, on the other hand, requires the steady states to be degenerate or quasi-degenerate. As such, DTC only emerges near the critical point of a phase transition and is protected by the dissipative gap between the quasi-degenerate manifold and the rest of the spectrum, necessitating a finetuned engineering of the Lindbladian.

*Prethermalization in open systems* - We first translate the derivation of prethermal DTC from the unitary evolution in close systems to the Liouvillian evolution of open systems. The dynamics is driven by a time-periodic Liouvillian  $\mathcal{L}(t) = \mathcal{L}(t+T)$  with  $T = 2\pi/\omega$  being a fixed applied period. We assume that the Liouvillian contains both unitary and dissipative parts and is described by the Lindblad equation

$$\mathcal{L}[\rho] = -i[H, \rho] + \sum_j \lambda_j \left( L_j \rho L_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_j^\dagger L_j, \rho\} \right) \quad (1)$$

In our work, the environmental coupling manifests as local dephasing noise so the channel index  $j$  in the dissipative part is also the site index and we choose  $\lambda_j = \lambda$ . To make connection with the unitary evolution, we promote the density matrix to a supervector  $\|\rho\rangle\rangle$  ( $4^L$ -vector) and the Liouvillian  $\mathcal{L}$  to a superoperator  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$  ( $4^L \times 4^L$ -matrix). As a result, the density matrix at a time  $t$  is given by an evolution similar to the unitary case  $\|\rho(t)\rangle\rangle = \tau e^{\int_0^t \hat{\mathcal{L}}(s) ds} \|\rho(0)\rangle\rangle$ . The expectation value of an operator is also brought into a Schrödinger-like form  $\langle O(t) \rangle = \langle\langle \mathbb{1} | O | \rho(t) \rangle\rangle$  with  $\langle\langle \mathbb{1} |$  corresponding to the identity operator. Here, we use the normal definition of vector inner product. The derivation of the slow heating is similar to the unitary case except for  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$  being non-Hermitian. Due to the assumption that the dissipative dynamics is much weaker than the coherent one, the emergent symmetry is given by  $X = \tau e^{-i \int_0^T H_0(s) ds}$  satisfying  $X^N = \mathbb{1}$  so that in the DTC phase, the system repeats itself after  $N$  cycles. Here,  $H_0(t)$  is the dominant part of the driving Hamiltonian, in particular the energy scale  $J_{\text{res}}$  of the residue  $H - H_0$  is much less than  $1/T$ . By applying similar iterative optimization as for close systems [17, 18, 20], we arrive

$$e^{\hat{A}} \hat{U}(0, T) e^{-\hat{A}} = \hat{X} \tau e^{\int_0^T [\hat{D} + \hat{V}(s)] ds} \quad (2)$$

where  $e^{\hat{A}}$  is a time-independent trace-preserving map,  $[\hat{X}, \hat{D}] = 0$ , and  $\hat{X} = X \otimes X^*$ . Importantly, the norm of residue term  $\hat{V}$  is exponentially suppressed by the driving frequency. Because  $\hat{D}$  is a complete positive trace preserving (CPT) map generator and has a much larger norm than the other terms, the “rotated”  $e^{\hat{A}} \hat{U}(0, T) e^{-\hat{A}}$  is also a CPT map. Within a time period  $\sim e^{\omega/J_{\text{res}}}$  only  $\hat{D}$  is relevant to the dynamics and  $\hat{X}$  becomes the emergent symmetry of the system. If  $\hat{X}$  is spontaneously broken,




FIG. 1. Variation of the time window of the prethermalization, quasi-SSB and DTC with respect to the dephasing noise strength. The survival time of DTC is the shorter one between the prethermal and the SSB lifetime.

the prethermal DTC is observable. Up to this point, it appears that DTC in open systems must behave similar to its close system counterpart. In the following, we point out two key distinctions in the residual error and the stability of SSB.

Approximating the exact Lindbladian by that only the symmetric time-independent  $\hat{D}$  incurs errors which accumulate with time and eventually suppress the prethermal period, thermalizing the system. For a local observable  $O$ , the accumulated error bound is given by [22]

$$\delta(t) = \int_0^t \left\| V(t-s) e^{D^\dagger s} [O] \right\| ds \quad (3)$$

at stroboscopic time  $t = kT$  with  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . The operator norm can be bounded by the standard Lieb-Robinson bound in open systems [26, 27] depending on the short-range or long-range nature of the interaction. In general, the prethermal range can be obtained by solving the equation

$$\int_0^{\tau_{\text{prethermal}}} f(vs) ds \propto e^{\omega/J_{\text{res}}} \quad (4)$$

with  $f$  being the appropriate Lieb-Robinson bound and  $v$  being the Lieb-Robinson velocity. The factor  $e^{\omega/J_{\text{res}}}$  offsets the exponential suppression of  $\omega$  on  $\hat{V}$ , so typically  $\tau_{\text{prethermal}}$  scales exponentially with the driving frequency. It is easy to see that decreasing Lieb-Robinson velocity necessarily increases  $\tau_{\text{prethermal}}$ . However, since our noise model is strictly onsite, it is not obvious how  $\lambda$  can enter the expression of  $v$  which is responsible for the inter-site information propagation, not to mention that the noise magnitude is seemingly irrelevant compared to the other scales. On the other hand, if the bath coupling results in a unique steady state then information of the initial state must be lost eventually. From this long-time limit, Ref. [28] suggests that  $v$  may decay exponentially in the presence of environment coupling.

In our case, the onsite noise induces a decay rate so that  $v \rightarrow ve^{-\lambda t/3}$ , leading  $vs \rightarrow vs(1 - \lambda s/6)$ . As a result, we can relate the dissipative prethermal period with that in the dissipationless limit

$$\tau_{\text{prethermal}}^\lambda = \tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0 (1 - \gamma \lambda \tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0)^{-1} \quad (5)$$

with  $\gamma$  being an  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  constant [22]. Therefore, even though  $\lambda$  is the smallest scale by our assumption, it can still result in visible effects on the DTC lifetime when accompanying the exponentially long  $\tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0$ .

The second aspect where the dissipative nature of the system becomes relevant is the survival time of the quasi-SSB. In a close system, energy is conserved so a single excitation, e.g. spin flip, is not favorable. On the other hand, the creation of multiple excitations so that the ground state is mapped to its degenerate partner requires higher orders of perturbation and hence is suppressed exponentially. Therefore, even for finite system where the ground state must be symmetric, the energy splitting can be exponentially small. Unsurprisingly, the lifetime of the quasi-SSB scales exponentially with system size and is usually taken to be infinity even for systems with moderate size. In an open system, however, energy can be exchanged with the environment to stabilize the excitation, thus destabilizing the quasi-SSB. In fact, the finite-size effect is much more severe in open systems through the fact that  $\tau_{\text{SSB}} \sim L^{1/2}$  in open 1D chains [29]. This necessitates a careful analysis on the survival time of the quasi-SSB. In the Supplemental Material [22], we show that the decay rate of the quasi-SSB increases monotonically with the bath coupling strength. Unlike the effect of noise on the prethermalization, different operational forms of noise  $L_j$  may lead to vastly different decay rates. Under some form of dephasing noise, the decreasing slope (see Fig. 1) becomes much more prominent so that the increasing slope is most likely unobservable.

*Numerical model* - As a demonstration, we study the driven Heisenberg chain subjected to dephasing noise. Referring to Eq. (1)

$$H(t) = \sum_i \frac{\mathbf{h}(t)}{2} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^i + \frac{J_{xx}}{4} \sigma_x^i \sigma_x^{i+1} + \sum_{j>i} \frac{J}{4|j-i|^\alpha} \sigma_z^i \sigma_z^j \quad (6)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^i = \{\sigma_x^i, \sigma_y^i, \sigma_z^i\}$  is the collection of Pauli matrices at site  $i$ . The periodic Zeemann field  $\mathbf{h}$  is given by

$$\mathbf{h}(t)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^i = \begin{cases} \mathbf{h}_s \boldsymbol{\sigma}^i & \text{for } nT < t \leq (n+1)T - t_p \\ \pi t_p^{-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^i & \text{for } (n+1)T - t_p < t \leq (n+1)T \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

with finite but small constant  $\mathbf{h}_s$  and in the limit  $t_p \rightarrow 0$ . With this set up, the emerging symmetry arises from the dominant  $\pi$ -pulse sequence and is given by  $X = \prod_j \sigma_x^j$ . Since  $X^2 = \mathbb{1}$ , the DTC oscillation features doubled periodicity of  $2T$ . The long-range  $zz$  interaction with  $1 \leq$




FIG. 2.  $2T$ -DTC oscillation sampled at  $t = 2kT$ . (a) Dependence of DTC survival time on noise strength showing a non-monotonic variation at  $\omega = 5$ . (b) In the increasing phase, the DTC survival time is enhanced exponentially by increasing the applied frequency. (c) In the decreasing phase, the applied frequency is almost irrelevant.

$\alpha \leq 2$  is vital to drive the transition to the spontaneous Ising symmetry breaking phase [30]. Lastly, the term  $J_{xx}$  breaks integrability so that the symmetrized  $\hat{D}$  is not trivially diagonal.

For the bath coupling, we use two representative cases of dephasing noise: (i)  $L_j = s_z^j$  and (ii)  $L_j = s_x^j$  where the quantum channel index  $j$  is also the site index. Physically, these quantum channel describes the coupling between the spin and an isolated harmonic oscillator reservoir sitting on the same site. In their respective basis, the dephasing noise keeps the diagonal entries of the density matrix while suppressing off-diagonal ones. In both cases, we set  $\lambda_j = \lambda$  thus the system does not have any spatial disorder. We simulate the Lindblad equation using the tensor network ansatz and the time-dependent variational principle [22]. Because of long-range interaction, simulating larger systems at longer times takes more resources. In this work, we simulate the 1D chain of 12 sites, which needs 24 computational sites to describe the density matrix, up to the time  $\sim 10^3 J^{-1}$ , so the moderate size is ideal to keep the computational errors acceptable. However, we check that a close analog of this rather small lattice is already sufficient to demonstrate all the signatures of the DTC [22].

*$S_z$ -dephasing noise* - With the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  Ising symmetry as the emergent symmetry, an observable associated

with an extensive degree of freedom in the DTC phase should repeat itself after  $2T$ . A typical choice is the magnetization or magnetization density. In this work, we compute the normalized magnetization, following Ref. [20]

$$C(t) = L^{-1} \sum_j \langle \sigma_z^j(t) \rangle \langle \sigma_z^j(0) \rangle. \quad (8)$$

By definition,  $C(0)$  is always normalized to unity. In Fig. 2(a), we show the stroboscopic  $C(t)$  at even cycles ( $C(t)$  at odd cycles is the reflection through zero). Here, we can see that initially the survival time of the DTC increases with the bath coupling strength. It is remarkable that this extension is significant even when  $\lambda$  is much smaller than any energy scales of the Hamiltonian. This is the result of Eq. 5, specifically  $\lambda \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$  but when accompanied by  $\tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0 \sim \mathcal{O}(10^3)$  can yield visible effect on the DTC lifetime. As shown in Fig. 1, in the increasing phase,  $\tau_{\text{DTC}} = \tau_{\text{prethermal}}$  so we expect an exponential scaling with respect to the applied frequency. This expectation is verified in Fig. 2(b) with a remarkable extension (in logarithmic scale) as  $\omega$  increases from 5 to 6 and 7.

As we further increase the noise amplitude, the DTC survival time begins to decrease at  $\lambda = 0.01$ . Unlike the previous increasing phase, in this phase, there is no protection by the driving frequency, showing that  $\tau_{\text{DTC}}$  is now bounded by a different time scale - the survival time of the quasi-SSB. This seems puzzling because the maximally magnetized states (all spins pointing up or down) are steady state of the  $s_z$ -quantum jumps. However, if there exists even one weak spin-flipping term, the  $s_z$ -dephasing noise can compensate the energy cost of the spin-flip excitation, thus destabilizing the SSB state. We estimate that if the spin-flipping strength is given by  $J_{\text{flip}}$  and the energy cost is  $U$ , the decay rate induced by the  $s_z$ -dephasing noise is [22]

$$\Gamma_{Dz} \sim \lambda \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{J_{\text{flip}}^2}{U^2} \right). \quad (9)$$

Generally  $J_{\text{flip}} \ll U$  as we are interested in the SSB phase so  $\Gamma_{Dz}$  is strongly suppressed by the smallness of both  $\lambda$  and  $J_{\text{flip}}/U$ . This explains why the stabilizing effect of noise can be observed in a rather wide range of  $\lambda$  until it reverts to destabilization when  $\tau_{\text{SSB}} < \tau_{\text{prethermal}}$ .

*$s_x$ -dephasing noise* - Compared to the previous case of noise along the  $z$ -direction, the decreasing trend is much more visible while the increasing one is negligible [see Fig.3(a)]. In Fig. 3(b), we show the scaling with respect to frequency. The invariance against the applied frequency proves that  $\tau_{\text{DTC}} = \tau_{\text{SSB}}$ , consistent with our general result. The counterpart of Eq. (9), the SSB decay rate induced by  $s_x$ -dephasing noise, is

$$\Gamma_{Dx} \sim \lambda \left[ \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{J_{\text{flip}}^2}{U^2} \right) \right]. \quad (10)$$




FIG. 3. Similar to Fig. 2 but for  $s_x$ -dephasing noise. In this case, the increasing phase is almost invisible.

Because the  $s_z$ -dephasing noise can operationally flip the spin,  $\Gamma_{Dx} \gg \Gamma_{Dz}$  and remains finite in the limit  $J_{\text{flip}} \rightarrow 0$ . As such,  $\tau_{\text{SSB}} < \tau_{\text{prethermal}}$  for much weaker  $\lambda$ , so the observed variation of  $\tau_{\text{DTC}}$  with respect to  $\lambda$  is heavily biased toward the decreasing case.

*Conclusion* - We establish the general trends of the dissipative prethermal DTC in the presence of an environmental coupling. The physics can be divided into two phases. The first increasing phase where the DTC lifetime increases with the environmental coupling, accompanied by an exponential dependence on the frequency. The second decreasing phase, by contrast, has the DTC lifetime shortened with increasing noise strength and has no frequency dependence. We expect our conclusion to hold for local short-range (not necessarily onsite) dissipation operators. We emphasize that local quantum channels may not be effective in cooling the system, e.g. to produce an infinite lifetime DTC, because the dominant part of the Hamiltonian is from long-range spin interaction. To serve as a cold bath, the dissipation must consist of long-range many-body operators. Therefore, enhanced prethermalization is likely the most viable mechanism in Lindbladian with short-range dissipative operators.

We note that in most of the DTC literature in the presence of bath, the instability from bath coupling is emphasized [31, 32]. The stabilizing effect reported in our work is surprising, but can be hard to observe if the form of dissipation is chosen incorrectly. One situation where

the environmental coupling is beneficial is the classical DTC where the bath manifests as a damping force and noise [33]. In our case, the mechanism underlying the stable branch is also the damping of nonsymmetric error accumulation manifesting in the decreasing Lieb-Robinson velocity. It is therefore interesting to draw some connection between the classical and quantum DTC.

*Acknowledgments* - This work is supported by and Laboratory for Physical Sciences. This work is also supported by the High Performance Computing Center (HPCC) at the University of Maryland. The authors are grateful to Minh Tran for helpful discussions.

- 
- [1] P. Bruno, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 070402 (2013).
- [2] H. Watanabe and M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 251603 (2015).
- [3] V. Khemani, A. Lazarides, R. Moessner, and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 250401 (2016).
- [4] D. V. Else, B. Bauer, and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 090402 (2016).
- [5] R. Moessner and S. L. Sondhi, Nat. Phys. **13**, 424 (2017).
- [6] J. Zhang, P. W. Hess, A. Kyprianidis, P. Becker, A. Lee, J. Smith, G. Pagano, I.-D. Potirniche, A. C. Potter, A. Vishwanath, N. Y. Yao, and C. Monroe, Nature **543**, 217 (2017), arXiv:1609.08684.
- [7] S. Choi, J. Choi, R. Landig, G. Kucsko, H. Zhou, J. Isoya, F. Jelezko, S. Onoda, H. Sumiya, V. Khemani, C. von Keyserlingk, N. Y. Yao, E. Demler, and M. D. Lukin, Nature **543**, 221 (2017).
- [8] A. Kyprianidis, F. Machado, W. Morong, P. Becker, K. S. Collins, D. V. Else, L. Feng, P. W. Hess, C. Nayak, G. Pagano, N. Y. Yao, and C. Monroe, Science (80-. ). **372**, 1192 (2021).
- [9] M. Ippoliti, K. Kechedzhi, R. Moessner, S. Sondhi, and V. Khemani, PRX Quantum **2**, 030346 (2021).
- [10] X. Mi, M. Ippoliti, C. Quintana, A. Greene, Z. Chen, J. Gross, F. Arute, K. Arya, J. Atalaya, R. Babbush, *et al.*, Nature **601**, 531 (2022).
- [11] R. Nandkishore and D. A. Huse, Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics **6**, 15 (2015).
- [12] D. A. Abanin, E. Altman, I. Bloch, and M. Serbyn, Rev. Mod. Phys. **91**, 021001 (2019).
- [13] J. Šuntajs, J. Bonča, T. c. v. Prosen, and L. Vidmar, Phys. Rev. E **102**, 062144 (2020).
- [14] P. Sierant and J. Zakrzewski, Phys. Rev. B **105**, 224203 (2022).
- [15] Y.-T. Tu, D. Vu, and S. D. Sarma, Existence or not of many body localization in interacting quasiperiodic systems (2022).
- [16] D. A. Abanin, W. De Roeck, W. W. Ho, and F. m. c. Huveneers, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 014112 (2017).
- [17] D. Abanin, W. De Roeck, W. W. Ho, and F. Huveneers, Commun. Math. Phys. **354**, 809 (2017).
- [18] D. V. Else, B. Bauer, and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. X **7**, 10.1103/PhysRevX.7.011026 (2017).
- [19] T.-S. S. Zeng and D. N. Sheng, Phys. Rev. B **96**, 094202 (2017).
- [20] F. Machado, D. V. Else, G. D. Kahanamoku-Meyer, C. Nayak, and N. Y. Yao, Phys. Rev. X **10**, 10.1103/PhysRevX.10.011043 (2020).
- [21] M. Natsheh, A. Gambassi, and A. Mitra, Phys. Rev. B **103**, 224311 (2021).
- [22] See Supplemental Material for Prethermalization in open systems, Effect of dissipation on the prethermal period, Effect of dissipation on the quasi-spontaneous symmetry breaking, and Numerical simulation on tensor network with additional references [34–38].
- [23] F. M. Gambetta, F. Carollo, M. Marcuzzi, J. P. Garrahan, and I. Lesanovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 015701 (2019).
- [24] C. M. Dai, Z. C. Gu, and X. X. Yi, New J. Phys. **22**, 023026 (2020).
- [25] A. Sakurai, V. M. Bastidas, M. P. Estarellas, W. J. Munro, and K. Nemoto, Phys. Rev. B **104**, 054304 (2021).
- [26] R. Sweke, J. Eisert, and M. Kastner, J. Phys. A Math. Theor. **52**, 424003 (2019).
- [27] A. Y. Guo, S. Lieu, M. C. Tran, and A. V. Gorshkov, (2021), arXiv:2110.15368.
- [28] B. Descamps, J. Math. Phys. **54**, 092202 (2013).
- [29] H. Wilming, M. J. Kastoryano, A. H. Werner, and J. Eisert, J. Math. Phys. **58**, 033302 (2017).
- [30] F. J. Dyson, Commun. Math. Phys. **12**, 91 (1969).
- [31] A. Lazarides and R. Moessner, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 195135 (2017).
- [32] A. Lazarides, S. Roy, F. Piazza, and R. Moessner, Phys. Rev. Res. **2**, 022002 (2020).
- [33] N. Y. Yao, C. Nayak, L. Balents, and M. P. Zaletel, Nature Physics **16**, 438 (2020).
- [34] D. Jaschke, S. Montangero, and L. D. Carr, Quantum Sci. Technol. **4**, 013001 (2018).
- [35] H. Nakano, T. Shirai, and T. Mori, Phys. Rev. E **103**, L040102 (2021).
- [36] J. Haegeman, J. I. Cirac, T. J. Osborne, I. Pižorn, H. Verschelde, and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 070601 (2011).
- [37] M. Fishman, S. R. White, and E. M. Stoudenmire, The ITensor software library for tensor network calculations (2020), arXiv:2007.14822.
- [38] M. Yang and S. R. White, Phys. Rev. B **102**, 094315 (2020).

# Supplemental Materials for “Dissipative prethermal discrete time crystal”

## I. Prethermalization in dissipative systems

### A. Supervector and superoperator formalism

In this section, we translate the formalism from the density matrix/ quantum channel language to the supervector/ superoperator

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &\rightarrow \|\rho\rangle\rangle \\ \rho' = D[\rho] = A\rho B &\rightarrow \|\rho'\rangle\rangle = \hat{D}\|\rho\rangle\rangle \text{ with } \hat{D} = A \otimes B^T \\ \text{Tr}(\rho.\nu) &\rightarrow \langle\langle \rho | \nu \rangle\rangle\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

Within this formalism, we can obtain several identities

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{D}^\dagger \|\mathbb{1}\rangle\rangle = 0 &\leftrightarrow \langle\langle \mathbb{1} | e^{\hat{D}} \|\rho\rangle\rangle = \langle\langle \mathbb{1} | \rho \rangle\rangle \leftrightarrow e^{\hat{D}} \text{ is a trace-preserving map} \\ X \text{ is a completely positive trace preserving map} &\rightarrow X[\mathbb{1}] = \sum_i V_i \mathbb{1} V_i^\dagger = \mathbb{1} \leftrightarrow \hat{X} \|\mathbb{1}\rangle\rangle = \|\mathbb{1}\rangle\rangle\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

We mention that if  $e^{D_1}$  and  $e^{D_2}$  are CPT, then  $e^{D_1+D_2}$  is also CPT (because of the positivity this is not true generally for  $e^{D_1-D_2}$ ). We also introduce the norm of the superoperator to quantify the action of that operator.

$$\|\hat{A}\| = \sup_{\|\rho\rangle\rangle} \frac{|\hat{A}\|\rho\rangle\rangle|}{\|\rho\rangle\rangle} = \sup_{\rho} \frac{\sqrt{\text{Tr}(A[\rho]^\dagger A[\rho])}}{\sqrt{\text{Tr}(\rho^\dagger \rho)}}.\quad (3)$$

For  $\hat{A} = \sum_Z \hat{A}_Z$  where  $Z$  is the superoperator support

$$\|\hat{A}\|_n = \sup_j \sum_{Z \ni j} e^{\kappa_n |Z|} \|\hat{A}_Z\| \text{ with } \kappa_n \equiv \frac{\kappa_1}{1 + \log n}\quad (4)$$

For long-range Lindbladian, the support  $Z$  of an operator string  $\hat{A}_{Z,R}$  contains extra information of disconnected clusters separated by at most  $R$ . To keep track of this separation, we can use the two-parameter norm as in Ref.<sup>1</sup>

$$\|\hat{A}\|_{\gamma,n} = \sup_j \sum_R R^\gamma \sum_{Z \ni j} e^{\kappa_n |Z|} \|\hat{A}_{Z,R}\|\quad (5)$$

### B. Iterative optimization

We prove Eq. (2) in the main text by iterative method, following closely Refs.<sup>1-3</sup>. In close systems, the derivation of prethermalization for long-range Hamiltonians resembles that for short-range Hamiltonians except for minor modifications to accommodate the two-parameter norm. By mapping the Lindbladian dynamics to the evolution of the superoperator, we can prove the prethermalization in open systems exactly in the same manner as close systems. Therefore, we only demonstrate here the short-range Lindbladian case, focusing on proving that the symmetric superoperator  $\hat{D}$  after iterative optimization generates a legitimate complete positive trace preserving map (CPT).

We first assume that at some step  $n$ , the evolution over a driving period can be written in this form

$$\hat{U}(0, T) = \hat{X} \tau e^{\int_0^T \mathcal{L}(s) ds}\quad (6)$$

We define  $\hat{F} = T^{-1} \int_0^T \mathcal{L}(s) ds$ ,  $\hat{F}$  is a CPT generator because  $\mathcal{L}(s)$  is one at any  $0 \leq s \leq T$ . We can then symmetrize this superoperator

$$\hat{D}_n = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \hat{X}^k \hat{F} \hat{X}^{-k}\quad (7)$$

This symmetrized  $\hat{D}_n$  is also a CPT generator. The residue  $\hat{E}_n$  if we assume to a CPT, then  $-\hat{E}_n = N^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \hat{X}^k \hat{E}_n \hat{X}^{-k}$  is also a CPT generator. That means  $\hat{E}_n$  only have purely imaginary eigenvalues. The time dependent superoperator is denoted at  $\hat{V}$  satisfying  $\int_0^T \hat{V}(s) ds = 0$ . We now apply the transformation

$$\hat{U}' = e^{-\hat{A}} \hat{U} e^{\hat{A}} = \hat{X} \tau (\hat{X}^\dagger e^{-\hat{A}} \hat{X}) e^{\int_0^T \mathcal{L}(s) ds} e^{\hat{A}} = \hat{X} \tau e^{\int_0^T \mathcal{L}'(s) ds} \quad (8)$$

with

$$\mathcal{L}'(s) = \begin{cases} a^{-1}(\hat{A}) & s \leq a \\ (1-2a)^{-1} \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{s-a}{1-2a}\right) & a < s \leq 1-a \\ a^{-1}(-\hat{X}^\dagger \hat{A} \hat{X}) & s > 1-a \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

We want to choose the map  $\hat{A}$  such that  $\hat{D}'_n = \hat{D}_n$  and  $\hat{E}'_n = 0$ . It easy to see that with the choice

$$\hat{A}_n = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \sum_{p=0}^k \hat{X}^{-p} \hat{E}_n \hat{X}^p, \quad (10)$$

then  $\hat{E}_n - \hat{X}^\dagger \hat{A}_n \hat{X} + \hat{A}_n = 0$ . We also note that if  $\text{Tr}(E_n[\rho]) = 0$  for all density matrices  $\rho$  then  $\text{Tr}(A[\rho]) = 0$  and  $e^{\hat{A}}$  is a trace-preserving map. The time-dependent superoperator is given by

$$\hat{V}'_n(s) = \begin{cases} a^{-1}(\hat{A}_n) - \hat{D}_n & s \leq a \\ (1-2a)^{-1} [2a\hat{D}_n + \hat{E}_n + \hat{V}_n\left(\frac{s-a}{1-2a}\right)] & a < s \leq 1-a \\ a^{-1}(-\hat{X}^\dagger \hat{A}_n \hat{X}) - \hat{D}_n & s > 1-a \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

By this procedure, even though  $\hat{E}_n$  is eliminated,  $\hat{V}'_n$  is large by the virtue of  $\hat{D}_n$ . We now find an alternative  $\mathcal{L}_{n+1}$  that produces the same evolution over one period  $T$  as  $\mathcal{L}'_n$  so that  $\hat{V}_{n+1}$  is reduced. We assume the form

$$\tau e^{\int_0^t \mathcal{L}_{n+1}(s) ds} = e^{-\hat{K}_n(t)} \tau e^{\int_0^t \mathcal{L}'_n(s') ds'} \quad (12)$$

Our condition is satisfied if  $\hat{K}_n(0) = \hat{K}_n(T) = 0$ . Within this construction

$$\mathcal{L}_{n+1}(t) = e^{-\hat{K}_n(t)} \mathcal{L}'_n(t) e^{\hat{K}_n(t)} - e^{-\hat{K}_n(t)} \partial_t e^{\hat{K}_n(t)} \quad (13)$$

If we choose  $\hat{K}$  such that  $\partial_t \hat{K}_n(t) = \hat{V}_n(t)$ , then  $\hat{K}_n(0) = \hat{K}_n(T) = 0$  because  $\int_0^T \hat{V}(s) ds = 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}_{n+1} + \hat{E}_{n+1} - \hat{D}_n &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T [e^{-\hat{K}_n(s)} \hat{D}_n e^{\hat{K}_n(s)} - \hat{D}_n] ds + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T [e^{-\hat{K}_n(s)} \hat{V}_n(s) e^{\hat{K}_n(s)} - \hat{V}_n(s)] ds \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_0^1 [e^{-s' \hat{K}_n(s)} \hat{V}_n(s) e^{s' \hat{K}_n(s)} - \hat{V}_n(s)] ds' ds \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Here, we make use of a bound<sup>2</sup>

$$\|e^{-K} A e^K - A\|_{n+1} \leq \frac{18}{\delta \kappa_n \kappa_{n+1}} \|A\|_n \|K\|_n \quad (15)$$

that is valid for both Hermitian and non-Hermitian matrices as long as  $3\|K\|_n \leq \delta \kappa_n \equiv \kappa_n - \kappa_{n+1}$ . We remind that  $\|\sum_j A_j\|_n \leq \sum_j \|A_j\|_n$ . As a result,

$$\|\hat{D}_{n+1} + \hat{E}_{n+1} - \hat{D}_n\|_{n+1} \leq \frac{18}{\delta \kappa_n \kappa_{n+1}} \|K\|_n (\|D_n\|_n + \|V_n\|/2) \quad (16)$$

Also

$$\hat{V}_{n+1}(t) = e^{-\hat{K}_n(t)} \hat{D}_n e^{\hat{K}_n(t)} - (\hat{D}_{n+1} + \hat{E}_{n+1}) + e^{-\hat{K}_n(t)} \hat{V}_n(t) e^{\hat{K}_n(t)} - \int_0^1 ds e^{-s \hat{K}_n(t)} \hat{V}_n(t) e^{s \hat{K}_n(t)} \quad (17)$$

leading to the norm

$$\|\hat{V}_{n+1}\|_{n+1} \leq \frac{18}{\delta \kappa_n \kappa_{n+1}} \|K\|_n (\|D_n\|_n + \|V_n\|) \quad (18)$$

It is straight forward to see that  $\mathcal{L}_{n+1}$  is a trace preserving map generator, but we do not have a rigorous way to show it is a CPT generator. However, by sending  $a \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\|\hat{K}_n\| \sim \|\hat{D}_n\|$ ,  $\|\hat{E}_n\| \ll 1/T$ , to the first order of  $\hat{K}_n$

$$\mathcal{L}_{n+1}(s) = \hat{D}_n + [\hat{D}_n, \hat{K}_n(s)]. \quad (19)$$

The commutator is suppressed by the smallness of  $\hat{K}_n$ , and  $\hat{D}_n$  is a CPT generator, so  $\mathcal{L}_{n+1}(s)$  is most likely also a CPT generator. Iterating the procedure, for any  $n$ ,  $e^{\hat{A}n}$  is always a trace preserving map and  $\mathcal{L}_n(s), \hat{D}_n$  are always CPT generator. By applying the same induction method, we obtain similar results to the unitary case. Here, we only quote the final result

$$e^{\hat{A}\hat{U}(0,T)}e^{-\hat{A}} = \hat{X}\tau e^{\int_0^T [\hat{D}_n + \hat{E}_n + \hat{V}(s)] ds} \quad (20)$$

with  $\hat{U}(0,T) = \hat{X}\tau e^{\int_0^T [\hat{D}_n + \hat{V}_0(s)] ds}$ ,  $e^{\hat{A}}$  is a trace-preserving map and  $e^{\hat{A}\hat{U}(0,T)}e^{-\hat{A}}$  is a CPT map. The residue terms are exponentially suppressed by

$$\|\hat{E}\|_n, \|\hat{V}\|_{n^*} \leq \eta 2^{-n^*} \quad (21)$$

where

$$\eta = \|\hat{V}_0\|_1, \quad n^* = \frac{\eta_0/\eta}{[1 + \log(\eta_0/\eta)]^3}, \quad \eta_0 = \frac{\omega(\kappa_1)^2}{72(N+3)(N+4)} \quad (22)$$

## II. Effect of dissipation on the prethermal period

### A. Slow heating and approximation error

We show the error by approximating the full dynamic by only the time-independent symmetric Liouvillian  $\hat{D}$

$$\delta(t) = \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \parallel \hat{O} e^{\hat{A}\hat{U}(0,t)} e^{-\hat{A}} - \hat{O} e^{\hat{D}t} \parallel \psi \rangle\rangle \quad (23)$$

We use the Duhamel's formula if  $\partial_t U(t) = [A + B(t)]U(t)$

$$U(t) = e^{At} + \int_0^t e^{As} B(t-s) U(t-s) ds \quad (24)$$

As a result,

$$\delta(t) = \int_0^t \langle\langle \mathbb{1} \parallel O e^{s\hat{D}} \hat{V}(t-s) \parallel \rho(t-s) \rangle\rangle ds \quad (25)$$

By assuming  $\hat{V} = V \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes V^T$ , i.e.  $\hat{V}$  only contains the coherent part, we can translate the error bound to a more familiar form (we drop the argument  $t-s$  from  $\hat{V}$  and  $\rho$  for conciseness)

$$\delta(t) = \int_0^t \text{Tr}(O e^{Ds} [V\rho - \rho V]) ds = \int_0^t \text{Tr}([V, e^{D^\dagger s} [O]] \rho) ds \quad (26)$$

which is reminiscent of the Lieb-Robinson bound in dissipative system.

### B. Noise-dampened Lieb-Robinson velocity

From Eq. (26), we can derive the prethermal period in several occasion. Generally, the form of Lieb-Robinson bound does not change between close and open systems and only depends on the the range of interaction. For a Liouvillian  $\hat{V}(Y)$  with support on  $Y$  and an operator  $O(X)$  with support on  $X$  such that  $X \cap Y = \emptyset$  and  $d = d(X, Y)$  is the distance between the two supports defined in some metric, the Lieb-Robinson is given by

$$\|\hat{V}(Y) e^{D^\dagger t} [O(X)]\| \leq C \|\hat{V}\| \|O\| |X| |Y| e^{\mu(vt-d)} \quad (27)$$

for short-range Lindbladian and

$$\|\hat{V}(Y)e^{D^\dagger t}[O(X)]\| \leq C\|\hat{V}\|\|O\|\|X\|\|Y\|\frac{e^{vt}-1}{(1+d)^\alpha} \quad (28)$$

for long-range Lindbladian with interaction  $\sim 1/r^{\alpha 4,5}$ . Here,  $C$ ,  $\mu$  and  $v$  are constant with the third one called Lieb-Robinson velocity. The noise we use in the main text is strictly onsite, so at the first sight, it should not affect the propagating velocity  $v$ . However, Ref.<sup>6</sup> suggests that a scenario where propagation speed is damped exponentially with time by the virtue of the bath dissipation. We expect that this effect slows down the growth of  $\delta(t)$  in Eq. (26), effectively prolonging the prethermal period. However, in Ref.<sup>6</sup>, the role of the bath coupling is not shown explicitly. By perturbative method, we show that the damping rate of the Lieb-Robinson bound in the dephasing noise case is proportional to the noise strength.

Here, we are interested in the decelerating effect of the bath rather than the inter-site interaction, so we first simplify our long-range  $\hat{D}$  into a short-range one with only nearest interaction  $J\sigma^i\sigma^{i+1}$ . For a sufficiently short time interval,  $\Delta t$ , we can approximate

$$e^{D^\dagger \Delta t} \approx e^{B\Delta t} e^{U\Delta t} \quad (29)$$

where  $U[\rho] = i[H_s, \rho]$  is purely unitary and  $B$  is purely dissipative  $B[\rho] = \lambda/4(\sum_j \sigma_z^j \rho \sigma_z^j - \rho)$  ( $\sigma_z$  can be exchanged with  $\sigma_{x,y}$  without changing the result). Our observable operator is  $s_z^k$  with  $k$  being the index of a particular site. After a multiple applications of  $e^{D^\dagger \delta t}$ , the initial onsite operator  $s_z^k$  grows into a collection of operator strings. Because of the symmetric exchange  $\sigma_x \leftrightarrow \sigma_y \leftrightarrow \sigma_z$ , we expect on average, a string of length  $l$  should contain  $l/3$  of each operator species. The application of  $e^{B\Delta t}$  on an operator string damps its amplitude by  $(1 - m\lambda\Delta t/2)$  with  $m \approx 2l/3$  being the total number of  $\sigma_x$  and  $\sigma_y$  in the string. As time passes, operator strings grow longer and thus become more susceptible to the suppression. This generates the decelerating effect induced by local dissipations. The support  $X$  of  $e^{\mathcal{L}^\dagger t}[O]$  can be estimated by

$$\partial_t X = v - \lambda X/3 \Rightarrow v(t) = \partial_t X = ve^{-\lambda t/3} \quad (30)$$

with  $v$  being the Lieb-Robinson in the dissipationless limit. This result is consistent with the general form proven rigorously in Ref.<sup>6</sup>  $v(t) = A + Be^{-\beta t}$ . The same result can be obtained in the case  $s_x$ -dephasing noise, which suppresses every  $\sigma_y$  and  $\sigma_z$  in the string.

We first apply the damped Lieb-Robinson velocity to Eq. (26) in the short-range Lindbladian. In the presence of bath coupling, the size of the support is modified to  $|O| = s_0 + 3v(1 - e^{-\lambda t/3})/\lambda$  with  $s_0$  being the initial size of the support at  $t = 0$ . Consequently, Eq. (26) yields

$$\delta(t) \approx \eta 2^{-n^*} \int_0^t \left[ s_0 + \frac{3}{\lambda} (1 - e^{-\lambda s/3}) \right] ds = \eta 2^{-n^*} \frac{3v(3e^{-\lambda t/3} + \lambda t - 3)}{\lambda^2} \quad (31)$$

In the dissipationless limit  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ , it is easy to see that  $\tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0 \propto 2^{n^*/2} \sim e^{\omega/(2\|\hat{V}_0\|)}$ . From our numerical simulation,  $\tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0 \sim \mathcal{O}(10^2) - \mathcal{O}(10^3)$  so  $\lambda\tau_{\text{prethermal}}$  is not a negligible number even though  $\lambda \ll J \ll \omega$ . To the first order of  $\lambda$ , the prethermal period in the presence of bath can be estimated by

$$\tau_{\text{prethermal}}^\lambda = \tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0 \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda\tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0}{9} \right)^{-1}, \quad (32)$$

explaining the visible effect of the bath coupling even though its magnitude is much smaller than any other energy scales.

In the case of close long-range interacting system, the accumulated error is more complex due to the two-parameter norm and given by

$$\delta(t) \propto 2^{-n^*} t [K_3(1 + \tau^{d/(1-\xi)}) + K_4(\tau + \tau^\beta)] \quad (33)$$

with  $\tau = vt$  and other constants defined in Ref.<sup>1</sup>. It is difficult to obtain explicitly the prethermal range from this equation. However, it is easier to estimate the relation similar to Eq. (32). In general, including the long-range case, the prethermalization lifetime in close system can be obtained by solving

$$\int_0^{\tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0} f(vs) ds \sim 2^{n^*}. \quad (34)$$




FIG. 1. Evolution of  $\langle s_z \rangle$  obtained from numerical simulation with  $J = 1, U = 5$ . The solid (dashed) lines represent the system coupled to  $s_x$  ( $s_z$ )-dephasing noise.

Here  $f$  is the corresponding Lieb-Robinson bound and  $v$  is the Lieb-Robinson velocity. A rescaling  $v \rightarrow va$  leads to  $\tau_{\text{prethermal}} \rightarrow a^{-1}\tau_{\text{prethermal}}(2^{n^*}a^{-1})$ . The decelerating effect generated by the environment modifies  $vs \rightarrow 3v(1 - e^{\lambda s/3})/\lambda \approx vs(1 - \lambda s/6)$ . As a result, we can generalize Eq. (32) as  $\tau_{\text{prethermal}}^\lambda = \tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0 (1 - \gamma\lambda\tau_{\text{prethermal}}^0)^{-1}$  with  $\gamma$  being an  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  constant.

### III. Effect of dissipation on the quasi-spontaneous symmetry breaking

In a close system, a spontaneous symmetry breaking is protected by energy conservation, i.e. a spin-flip excitation costs energy and thus is short-lived while simultaneous spin-flipping throughout the system is exponentially suppressed. For an open system, energy can be exchanged with the bath to facilitate a single excitation. In addition, the spontaneous symmetry breaking is stabilized by the long-range interaction in 1D, while the dissipation we use is strictly on-site and thus tends to disrupt long-range correlation. Therefore, we expect that the lifetime of a quasi-SSB state to decrease with stronger bath coupling. In fact, in a close system, the ground state energy splitting  $\sim e^{-\beta L}$  with  $L$  being the system size, leading to the  $\tau_{\text{SSB}}^{\text{close}} \sim e^{\beta L}$ . On the other hand, in a close system with local dissipation, the lifetime of the quasi-SSB state is bounded from below by  $\sim L^{d/(d+1)} = L^{1/2}$  in 1D<sup>7</sup>. As such, the finite-size effect is much more severe in the open system and should be taken into account.

The power-law scaling of  $\tau_{\text{SSB}}$  derived in Ref.<sup>7</sup> is also based on the Lieb-Robinson bound of perturbation propagation. However, the dependence on the strength and form of the dissipation is not transparent in their results. Our numerical results in the main text show that the dephasing noises along the  $z$ - and  $x$ - directions show deviating effect. For this reason, we analytically study a model of a single spin in the presence of a Zeeman field (representing correlation effect with neighboring spins)

$$\mathcal{L}[\rho] = -i \left[ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & J \\ J & U \end{pmatrix}, \rho \right] + \lambda (\sigma_{x,z} \rho \sigma_{x,z} - \rho). \quad (35)$$

Here,  $\rho$  is in the  $\{|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle\}$ ,  $J$  is spin-flipping magnitude,  $U$  is energy cost of the spin-flip excitation and  $\sigma_{x,z}$  are Pauli matrices. We assume  $J \ll \lambda \ll U$ , so that the dissipation is much slower than the coherent evolution of the spin. We initialize the density matrix at  $\rho(0) = |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|$  and measure the evolution of the spin along the  $z$ -direction  $\langle s_z(t) \rangle = \text{Tr}(s_z e^{\mathcal{L}t}[\rho])$ . In the limit  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ , the system sustains undamped oscillations so that  $1 \geq \langle s_z(t) \rangle \geq 1 - 8J^2/(4J^2 + U^2)$ .

We now study the role of dissipation perturbatively, it is more convenient to write the Lindbladian in superoperator form  $\hat{\mathcal{L}} = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{Dz, Dx}$  and perform time-dependent perturbation theory

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & iJ & -iJ & 0 \\ iJ & iU & 0 & -iJ \\ -iJ & 0 & -iU & iJ \\ 0 & -iJ & iJ & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{Dx} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{Dz} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (36)$$




FIG. 2. (a) DTC oscillations in close system the upper (lower) branch representing the stroboscopic normalized magnetization at even (odd) cycles. (b) Conservation of  $D$  through the ratio  $\langle D(t) \rangle / \langle D(0) \rangle$  at  $t = NT$ . The plateau at unity showing that the stroboscopic dynamic can be described by the time-independent Hamiltonian  $D$ .




FIG. 3. DTC oscillation  $C(t)$  (upper row) and  $\langle D(t) \rangle / \langle D(0) \rangle$  (lower row). (a-b)  $s_z$ -dephasing noise,  $\omega = 5$ . (c-d)  $s_z$ -dephasing noise,  $\lambda = 0.001$ . (e-f)  $s_x$ -dephasing noise,  $\omega = 5$ .

In the interaction picture,  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_D^I(t) = e^{-\hat{\mathcal{L}}_0 t} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_D e^{\hat{\mathcal{L}}_0 t}$ . The unitary part  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_0$  induces oscillations with period  $2\pi/\sqrt{4J^2 + U^2} \ll 1/\lambda$ , so we can approximate the time-dependent  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_D^I(t)$  by its average over one period. Finally, by diagonalizing this matrix and selecting the eigenvalues with the second largest real part, we can estimate the lower bound of the decay rate for  $\langle s_z(t) \rangle$ . Specifically, we obtain

$$\Gamma_{Dz} = \lambda \frac{8J^2}{4J^2 + U^2}, \quad \Gamma_{Dx} = \lambda \frac{8J^2 + U^2}{4J^2 + U^2} \quad (37)$$

for dephasing noise along the  $z$  and  $x$  direction respectively. It is easy to see that  $\Gamma_{Dz} \ll \Gamma_{Dx}$  because  $J \ll U$ ; and in the limit  $J \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\Gamma_{Dz} \rightarrow 0$  while  $\Gamma_{Dx} \rightarrow \gamma$ . Physically, the  $s_z$ -noise can only provide extra energy to stabilize the spin-flip fluctuation while the  $s_x$ -noise can operationally flip the spin. In Fig. 1, we demonstrate all the previous arguments: dephasing noise suppresses the  $\langle s_z \rangle$  eventually, the decay rate is proportional to the environment coupling strength, the dephasing noise along the  $x$ -direction has much stronger effect than that along the  $z$ -direction.

#### IV. Numerical simulation by tensor network

To obtain the numerical results, we simulate the Lindbladian dynamic on a tensor network with two times the number of sites in the physical lattice<sup>8,9</sup>. We choose the first half of the tensor network to represent the ket states, and the second half to represent to bra states. Suppose the Hamiltonian is given by  $H = \sum_{j < k} H_{jk} \sigma^j \sigma^k$ , where

$\sigma^j \in \{\sigma_{x,y,z}^j, \mathbb{1}^j\}$ , the superoperator is thus

$$\hat{L} = -i \sum_{j < k \leq N} H_{jk} [\sigma^j \sigma^k - (\sigma^{j+N})^T (\sigma^{k+N})^T] + \lambda \sum_{j \leq N} L^j (L^{j+N})^* - \frac{1}{2} (L^j)^\dagger L^j - \frac{1}{2} (L^{j+N})^* (L^{j+N})^T. \quad (38)$$

For our purpose,  $L = \sigma_x (\sigma_z)$  for the  $s_x$  ( $s_z$ )-dephasing noise. The evolution  $e^{\hat{L}t} \|\rho\rangle\rangle$  is performed by the time-dependent variational principle<sup>10</sup>. To compute an expectation value of an observable  $O$  with respect to  $\|\rho(t)\rangle\rangle$ , we first apply  $O$  to either side of tensor network, then contract the physical indices on the left half with the corresponding indices on the right half. We keep the bond dimension up to 450 to maintain convergence at long time and choose the time step to be  $0.25T$ . We remind the reader the Hamiltonian of the spin chain

$$H(t) = \sum_i \frac{1}{2} [h_x + \pi\delta(t - nT)] \sigma_x^i + h_y \sigma_y^i + h_z \sigma_z^i + \frac{J_{xx}}{4} \sigma_x^i \sigma_x^{i+1} + \sum_{j>i} \frac{J}{4|j-i|^\alpha} \sigma_z^i \sigma_z^j \quad (39)$$

Throughout the paper, we fix  $J = 1$ ,  $h_s^x = 0.1$ ,  $h_s^y = h_s^z = 0.06$ ,  $J_{xx} = 0.5$  and  $\alpha = 1.1$ . It is important to initialize the system with a highly magnetized state. This is equivalent to set the temperature to be lower than the critical point so the SSB is stable. For our simulation, at  $t = 0$ , all the spins point up except the spin at site 6 which points down. We also use the open-boundary chain with 12 sites. The numerical algorithm is implemented using the ITensor library<sup>11,12</sup>.

In Fig. 2, we show the simulation for close systems ( $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ ). As shown in Fig. 2(a), the normalized magnetization switches its sign every  $T$  and repeat itself every  $2T$ , showing signature of the DTC oscillations. The exponential expansion of the DTC lifetime with respect to driving frequency is also observed. During the prethermal period, the stroboscopic dynamics is effectively described by a time-dependent Hamiltonian  $D$  which means the expectation value  $\langle D \rangle$  should stay constant. In principle,  $D$  has complex expression and dependence on the driving frequency, but it can be well approximated by taking the symmetric part of the Hamiltonian after factored out  $X$ .

$$D = \sum_i \frac{h_x}{2} \sigma_x^i + \frac{J_{xx}}{4} \sigma_x^i \sigma_x^{i+1} + \sum_{j>i} \frac{J}{4|j-i|^\alpha} \sigma_z^i \sigma_z^j \quad (40)$$

The ratio  $\langle D(t) \rangle / \langle D(0) \rangle$  being close to unity thus signalizes the conservation of  $D$ . In Fig. 2(b), we plot this quantity for different driving frequency, showing the same exponential dependence as in  $C(t)$ .

We now move to the case of open system shown in Fig. 3. Because of the environment coupling,  $D$  is not conserved even in the prethermal period. However, we know that in case  $\tau_{\text{SSB}} < \tau_{\text{prethermal}}$ , the SSB quickly vanishes because the energy conservation that protects the SSB in close systems is relaxed by the bath. As such,  $\langle D(t) \rangle / \langle D(0) \rangle$  can still compliments  $C(t)$ . In particularly, as shown in Fig. 3(e-f) for the  $s_x$ -dephasing noise, the DTC decays continuously without any apparent plateau region as in other panels, consistent with the strong suppressing effect of  $s_x$ -dephasing noise shown in Fig. 1.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> F. Machado, D. V. Else, G. D. Kahanamoku-Meyer, C. Nayak, and N. Y. Yao, Phys. Rev. X **10**, 10.1103/PhysRevX.10.011043 (2020).
- <sup>2</sup> D. Abanin, W. De Roeck, W. W. Ho, and F. Huveneers, Commun. Math. Phys. **354**, 809 (2017).
- <sup>3</sup> D. V. Else, B. Bauer, and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. X **7**, 10.1103/PhysRevX.7.011026 (2017).
- <sup>4</sup> R. Sweke, J. Eisert, and M. Kastner, J. Phys. A Math. Theor. **52**, 424003 (2019).
- <sup>5</sup> A. Y. Guo, S. Lieu, M. C. Tran, and A. V. Gorshkov, (2021), arXiv:2110.15368.
- <sup>6</sup> B. Descamps, J. Math. Phys. **54**, 092202 (2013).
- <sup>7</sup> H. Wilming, M. J. Kastoryano, A. H. Werner, and J. Eisert, J. Math. Phys. **58**, 033302 (2017).
- <sup>8</sup> D. Jaschke, S. Montangero, and L. D. Carr, Quantum Sci. Technol. **4**, 013001 (2018).
- <sup>9</sup> H. Nakano, T. Shirai, and T. Mori, Phys. Rev. E **103**, L040102 (2021).
- <sup>10</sup> J. Haegeman, J. I. Cirac, T. J. Osborne, I. Pižorn, H. Verschelde, and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 070601 (2011).
- <sup>11</sup> M. Fishman, S. R. White, and E. M. Stoudenmire, The ITensor software library for tensor network calculations (2020), arXiv:2007.14822.
- <sup>12</sup> M. Yang and S. R. White, Phys. Rev. B **102**, 094315 (2020).