

Quantum asymptotic phase reveals signatures of quantum synchronization

Yuzuru Kato^{1,*} and Hiroya Nakao¹

¹*Department of Systems and Control Engineering,
Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo 152-8552, Japan*

(Dated: June 2, 2020)

We propose a fully quantum-mechanical definition of the asymptotic phase for quantum nonlinear oscillators. The asymptotic phase function of the system is introduced in terms of the eigenoperator of the adjoint Liouville superoperator associated with the fundamental frequency. This *quantum asymptotic phase* yields appropriate phase values of the system even in the strong quantum regime, while reproducing the conventional asymptotic phase in the semiclassical regime. We analyze a quantum van der Pol oscillator with Kerr effect and show that several dominant eigenoperators with different fundamental frequencies exist in the strong quantum regime. Using the quantum asymptotic phase functions with respective fundamental frequencies, we reveal that the multiple phase locking of the system with a harmonic drive at several different frequencies, an explicit quantum signature observed only in the strong quantum regime, can be interpreted as synchronization on a torus rather than a simple limit cycle.

arXiv:2006.00760v1 [nlin.AO] 1 Jun 2020

* Corresponding author: kato.y.bg@m.titech.ac.jp

Introduction.- Synchronization of spontaneous rhythmic oscillations are widely observed in nature [1–6]. Recently, rapid progress has been made in the experimental realization of synchronization in micro- and nanoscale devices [7–10] and theoretical investigations have been performed to reveal quantum signatures in synchronization [11–24]. In the strong quantum regime where only a small number of energy states participate in the system dynamics, the discrete nature of the energy spectrum can give rise to explicit quantum signatures, such as multiple phase locking at different frequencies [11] and synchronization blockade [12]. Several measures of the system’s phase values for characterizing quantum synchronization have also been proposed [11, 13–16].

In the classical case, rhythmic oscillations are typically modeled by nonlinear dynamical systems possessing a stable limit-cycle solution. In analyzing synchronization properties of such nonlinear oscillators, the *asymptotic phase* [1–5], defined by the oscillator’s vector field and increasing with a constant frequency in the basin of the limit-cycle attractor, plays a central role. It provides the basis for *phase reduction* [1–6], a standard method for deriving phase equations of weakly-coupled oscillators by dimensionality reduction. Derivation of phase equations for quantum nonlinear oscillators in the semiclassical regime has also been performed, where the system is described by a stochastic differential equation for the phase-space state fluctuating along a deterministic classical trajectory due to small quantum noise [17, 18, 25]. However, this method is not applicable in the strong quantum regime where such a description is not allowed. In particular, we cannot define the asymptotic phase of the system by using the classical deterministic trajectory.

In this study, we propose a fully quantum-mechanical definition of the asymptotic phase for quantum nonlinear oscillators. Our idea is inspired by the definition of the asymptotic phase for classical stochastic oscillators in terms of the eigenfunction of the backward Kolmogorov operator by Thomas and Lindner [26], which is natural from the Koopman-operator viewpoint (see Supplemental Material (SM) [27]). We introduce asymptotic phase functions in terms of the eigenoperators of the system’s adjoint Liouville superoperator and show that they can reveal the structure of multiple phase locking of the quantum van der Pol oscillator with a harmonic drive at several different frequencies [11], which is observed only in the strong quantum regime.

Asymptotic phase for quantum nonlinear oscillators.- We consider quantum dissipative oscillatory systems with a single degree of freedom. Assuming that interactions of the system with the reservoirs are instantaneous and Markovian approximation can be employed, the evolution of the system’s density matrix ρ is described by a quantum Master equation

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}\rho = -i[H, \rho] + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{D}[C_j]\rho \quad (1)$$

in the Schrödinger picture, where \mathcal{L} is a Liouville superoperator representing the evolution of ρ , H is a system Hamiltonian, C_j is a coupling operator between the system and j th reservoir ($j = 1, \dots, n$), $\mathcal{D}[C]\rho = C\rho C^\dagger - (\rho C^\dagger C + C^\dagger C\rho)/2$ is the Lindblad form (\dagger denotes Hermitian conjugate), and Planck’s constant is set as $\hbar = 1$.

We introduce an inner product $\langle X, Y \rangle_{tr} = \text{Tr}(X^\dagger Y)$ of linear operators X and Y and define the adjoint superoperator \mathcal{L}^* of \mathcal{L} satisfying $\langle \mathcal{L}^* X, Y \rangle_{tr} = \langle X, \mathcal{L} Y \rangle_{tr}$,

$$\mathcal{L}^* X = i[H, X] + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{D}^*[C_j]X, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{D}^*[C]X = C^\dagger X C - (X C^\dagger C + C^\dagger C X)/2$. This \mathcal{L}^* describes the evolution of an observable F as $\dot{F} = \mathcal{L}^* F$ in the Heisenberg picture, in which the density matrix ρ does not vary with time while the expectation value $\langle F \rangle = \text{Tr}(\rho F) = \langle \rho, F \rangle_{tr}$ of F with respect to ρ is kept the same as in the Schrödinger picture (note that ρ and F are self-adjoint).

We assume that the superoperators \mathcal{L} has a set of eigensystem (an eigenvalue and right and left eigenoperators) $\{\lambda_k, U_k, V_k\}$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}U_k = \lambda_k U_k, \quad \mathcal{L}^* V_k = \overline{\lambda_k} V_k, \quad \langle V_k, U_l \rangle_{tr} = \delta_{kl}, \quad (3)$$

for $k, l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where the overline indicates complex conjugate [28]. Among $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \geq 0}$, one eigenvalue is always 0, which is associated with the stationary state ρ_0 of the system satisfying $\mathcal{L}\rho_0 = 0$, and all other eigenvalues have negative real parts. We assume that the eigenvalues with the largest non-vanishing real part (the slowest decay rate) are given by a complex-conjugate pair, reflecting the system’s oscillatory dynamics, and denote them as Λ_1 and $\overline{\Lambda}_1$, where $\Omega_1 = \text{Im } \overline{\Lambda}_1$ (with the sign to be determined later) gives the fundamental frequency [29]. There may also exist other complex eigenvalues with different fundamental frequencies that are dominant in the sense explained later; we denote such eigenvalues by $\Lambda_2, \Lambda_3, \dots$ and their imaginary parts by $\Omega_j = \text{Im } \overline{\Lambda}_j$ ($j \geq 2$), and call $\{\Lambda_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ the *principal eigenvalues*.

The density matrix ρ can also be described by a quasiprobability distribution in the phase space [30–32]. We use the P -representation and write ρ as

$$\rho = \int p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha| d\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \quad (4)$$

where $|\alpha\rangle$ is a coherent state specified by a complex value $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, or equivalently by a complex vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha, \bar{\alpha})^T \in \mathbb{C}^2$, $p(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is a quasiprobability distribution of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, $d\boldsymbol{\alpha} = d\alpha d\bar{\alpha}$, and the integral is taken over \mathbb{C} . Defining the P -representation of an observable F as

$$f(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \langle \alpha | F | \alpha \rangle, \quad (5)$$

where the operator F is in the normal order [30–32], the expectation value of F is expressed as $\langle F \rangle = \text{Tr}(\rho F) = \int d\boldsymbol{\alpha} p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) f(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \langle p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), f(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, where we defined the L^2 inner product $\langle g(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \int \overline{g(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) d\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ of two functions $g(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ and $h(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$.

The time evolution of $p(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ corresponding to Eq. (1) obeys a partial differential equation

$$\partial_t p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = L p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \quad (6)$$

where the differential operator L satisfies $\mathcal{L}\rho = \int L p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha| d\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and can be explicitly calculated from Eq. (1) by using the standard calculus for the phase-space representation [30–32]. The corresponding evolution of $f(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ in the Heisenberg picture is given by

$$\partial_t f(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = L^+ f(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \quad (7)$$

where the differential operator L^+ is the adjoint of L with respect to the L^2 inner product, i.e., $\langle L^+ g(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \langle g(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), L h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, satisfying $L^+ f(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \langle \alpha | \mathcal{L}^* F | \alpha \rangle$.

The differential operator L also has a set of eigensystem (an eigenvalue and right and left eigenfunctions) $\{\lambda_k, u_k(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), v_k(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\}$ satisfying

$$L u_k = \lambda_k u_k, \quad L^+ v_k = \bar{\lambda}_k v_k, \quad \langle v_k, u_l \rangle_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \delta_{kl}, \quad (8)$$

which has one-to-one correspondence with Eq. (3); the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ are the same as those of \mathcal{L} , and the eigenfunctions u_k, v_k of L are related to the eigenoperators U_k, V_k of \mathcal{L} as

$$U_k = \int u_k(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha| d\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \quad v_k(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \langle \alpha | V_k | \alpha \rangle, \quad (9)$$

which follow from $\mathcal{L} U_k = \int u_k(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \{\mathcal{L} |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha|\} d\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \int \{L u_k(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\} |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha| d\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \lambda_k U_k$ and $L^+ v_k = L^+ \langle \alpha | V_k | \alpha \rangle = \langle \alpha | \mathcal{L}^* V_k | \alpha \rangle = \bar{\lambda}_k \langle \alpha | V_k | \alpha \rangle = \bar{\lambda}_k v_k$.

Now we introduce the quantum asymptotic phase function Φ_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots$) of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ as the argument (polar angle) of the P -representation of the eigenoperator V_j associated with the principal eigenvalue Λ_j satisfying $\mathcal{L} V_j = \bar{\Lambda}_j V_j$, namely,

$$\Phi_j(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \arg v_j(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \arg \langle \alpha | V_j | \alpha \rangle. \quad (10)$$

In particular, the phase function Φ_1 associated with Λ_1 corresponds to the asymptotic phase in the classical limit (see SM [27]). In the classical limit, Φ_j ($j \geq 2$) is not independent from Φ_1 and does not provide additional information, because Ω_j ($j \neq 1$) is equal to Ω_1 . However, as we will see, this relation breaks down in the strong quantum regime and the phase function Φ_j yields independent information of the system from Φ_1 .

Quantum van der Pol oscillator with Kerr effect.- As an example, we consider a quantum van der Pol oscillator with Kerr effect. The master equation is given by [11, 18]

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}_0 \rho, \quad \mathcal{L}_0 \rho = -i[H, \rho] + \gamma_1 \mathcal{D}[a^\dagger] \rho + \gamma_2 \mathcal{D}[a^2] \rho, \quad (11)$$

where $H = \omega_0 a^\dagger a + K a^{\dagger 2} a^2$, ω_0 is the natural frequency of the oscillator, K is the Kerr parameter, and γ_1 and γ_2 are the decay rates for negative damping and nonlinear damping, respectively.

We first consider the semiclassical regime where γ_2 and K are small. In this case, we can approximate Eq. (6) by a Fokker-Planck equation for $p(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ (see SM [27]), whose drift term gives the following deterministic equation:

$$\dot{\alpha} = \left(\frac{\gamma_1}{2} - i\omega_0 \right) \alpha - (\gamma_2 + 2Ki) \bar{\alpha} \alpha^2. \quad (12)$$




FIG. 1. Eigenvalues of the Liouville superoperator and the quantum and classical asymptotic phase functions. (a-c): Semiclassical regime. The parameters are $\gamma_1 = 1$ and $(\omega_0, \gamma_2, K)/\gamma_1 = (-1, 0.05, 0.025)$. (a): Eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_0 near the imaginary axis. The red dot represents the principal eigenvalue Λ_1 with the slowest decay rate. (b): Quantum asymptotic phase function Φ_1 with $\Omega_1 = 0.495$. (c): Classical asymptotic phase function Φ_C with $\Omega_C = 0.5$. (d-f): Strong quantum regime. The parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$ and $(\omega_0, \gamma_2, K)/\gamma_1 = (300, 4, 100)$. (d): Eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_0 . The red dots represent the principal eigenvalues Λ_j ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$ from the right) with the fundamental frequencies in individual branches, and the dotted lines indicate $\tilde{\lambda}_m$ ($m = 0, 1, 2, 3$) in Eq. (15). (e): Φ_1 with $\Omega_1 = -30$. (f): Φ_C with $\Omega_C = -32.5$. In (a) and (d), individual branches of eigenvalues are shown with different colors. In (b), (c), (e) and (f), $(x, p) = (2.5, 0)$ is chosen as the phase origin. In (c) and (f), the red-thin lines represent limit cycles in the classical limit given by Eq. (13).

This equation describes the Stuart-Landau oscillator (Hopf normal form) [2] and possesses a stable limit cycle

$$\alpha_0(\phi) = R (e^{i\phi}, e^{-i\phi})^T, \quad (13)$$

which is represented as a function of the phase $\phi = \Omega_C t$ with natural frequency $\Omega_C = -\omega_0 - K\gamma_1/\gamma_2$ and radius $R = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_1}{2\gamma_2}}$. The basin B of this limit cycle is the whole complex plane except the origin. Introducing a real representation $(x, p) = (\text{Re } \alpha, \text{Im } \alpha)$, the classical asymptotic phase function Φ_C of this deterministic system is expressed as

$$\Phi_C(\alpha) = \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{p}{x} \right) - \frac{2K}{\gamma_2} \ln \frac{\sqrt{x^2 + p^2}}{R} + \text{const.}, \quad (14)$$

where the constant determines the phase origin [4]. This phase function satisfies $\dot{\Phi}_C(\alpha) = \Omega_c$ for all α in B . In Ref. [17], we used this Φ_C for the phase reduction analysis of quantum synchronization in the semiclassical regime with weak quantum noise.

Figure 1(a) shows the eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_0 near the imaginary axis obtained numerically, where the principal eigenvalue $\Lambda_1 = -\mu_1 + i\Omega_1$ is shown by a red dot ($\mu_1 > 0$). Here, we adopt a positive value for Ω_1 so that the resulting phase function Φ_1 increases in the counterclockwise direction from 0 to 2π , i.e., Φ_1 satisfies $\oint_C \nabla \Phi_1(\mathbf{x}) \cdot d\mathbf{x} = 2\pi$ where $\mathbf{x} = (x, p)$ and C is a circle around 0. The rightmost branch of the eigenvalues, approximately given by a parabola $\hat{\lambda}_n = i\Omega_1 n - \mu_1 n^2$ ($n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$) passing through $\overline{\Lambda_1}$, is isolated from other branches of eigenvalues with faster




FIG. 2. Evolution of the expectation values of a and V_j ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$) and their arguments from a pure coherent state in the strong quantum regime. The parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$ and $(\omega_0, \gamma_2, K)/\gamma_1 = (300, 4, 100)$. (a), (c,e,g,i): $\langle V_j \rangle$, (b): $\arg\langle a \rangle$, (d,f,h,j): $\arg\langle V_j \rangle$.

decay rates. Also, the fundamental frequencies of the other branches, defined as the smallest absolute imaginary part of the eigenvalues, are approximately equal to Ω_1 . Thus, it is sufficient to consider only Λ_1 and introduce a single phase function Φ_1 in this case.

Figures 1(b) and 1(c) compare the quantum-mechanical phase function Φ_1 with the corresponding classical phase function Φ_C . As the quantum noise is small, the two phase functions closely resemble each other and their frequencies Ω_1 and Ω_C are also close to each other. Indeed, in the limit of vanishing quantum noise, the eigenfunction v_1 of L coincides with the Koopman eigenfunction of Eq. (12) with eigenvalue $i\Omega_C$ and therefore Φ_1 reproduces the classical phase function Φ_C (see SM [27]). Thus, in the semiclassical regime, we can use Φ_C for analyzing the system [17].

Next, we consider a strong quantum regime with large γ_2 and K , where only a small number of energy states participates in the system dynamics and the semiclassical description is not valid. The eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_0 are shown in Fig. 1(d). In contrast to Fig. 1(a), we can identify several branches of eigenvalues near the imaginary axis characterized




FIG. 3. Dependence of the order parameters on the frequency detuning Δ (divided by K) and driving strength E (divided by γ_1). (a): $|S_a|$. (b-e): $|S_j|$ ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$). The parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$ and $(\gamma_2, K)/\gamma_1 = (4, 100)$.

by the principal eigenvalues $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2, \Lambda_3, \dots$ whose fundamental frequencies $\Omega_1 = \text{Im } \bar{\Lambda}_1, \Omega_2 = \text{Im } \bar{\Lambda}_2, \Omega_3 = \text{Im } \bar{\Lambda}_3, \dots$ are different from each other. It is discussed in Ref. [11] that $|m+1\rangle\langle m|$ is an approximate eigenoperator of \mathcal{L}_0 with eigenvalue

$$\tilde{\lambda}_m = i[\Delta - 2mK] - \frac{1}{2}\{\gamma_1(2m+3) + 2\gamma_2 m^2\} \quad (15)$$

for $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. As shown in Fig. 1(d), these eigenvalues correspond to the principal eigenvalues, i.e., $\Lambda_j \approx \tilde{\lambda}_{j-1}$ and thus $V_j \approx |j\rangle\langle j-1|$ ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$). The existence of several different fundamental frequencies suggests that the system behaves like a torus rather than a limit cycle with a single fundamental frequency and that we need to consider phase functions Φ_2, Φ_3, \dots associated with $\Lambda_2, \Lambda_3, \dots$ in addition to Φ_1 and Λ_1 . Here, we take negative value for each Ω_j so that the corresponding Φ_j increases from 0 to 2π in the counterclockwise direction.

Figures 1(e) and 1(f) show the quantum-mechanical phase function Φ_1 and the corresponding classical phase function Φ_C . Because the system is in the strong quantum regime, Φ_C is distinctly different from Φ_1 and the classical frequency Ω_C also differs from the true quantum frequency Ω_1 . The other asymptotic phase functions Φ_j ($j = 2, 3, 4$) are shown in SM [27]. Though these phase functions look similar to each other, they characterize oscillatory dynamics of the system at different frequencies.

To demonstrate that the quantum asymptotic phase functions yield appropriate phase values even in this strong quantum regime, we consider free oscillatory relaxation of ρ from a coherent initial state $\rho = |\alpha_0\rangle\langle\alpha_0|$ with $\alpha_0 = 1$ at $t = 0$ and measured the evolution of the expectation values of V_j and their arguments $\arg\langle V_j \rangle$ ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$), as well as those of the annihilation operator a for comparison. Note that $\langle V_j \rangle$ at t can be expressed as $\text{Tr}[V_j \rho(t)] = \langle \alpha_0 | V_j(t) | \alpha_0 \rangle = \langle \delta(\alpha - \alpha_0) v_j(\alpha, t) \rangle_\alpha = v_j(\alpha_0, t) = e^{\bar{\Lambda}_j t} v_j(\alpha_0, 0)$ with $\alpha_0 = (\alpha_0, \alpha_0^*)$, so its argument should give the asymptotic phase of the system, i.e., $\arg\langle V_j \rangle(t) = \Phi_j(\alpha_0) + \Omega_j t$, where we explicitly denoted the time dependence. It is remarkable that each $\arg\langle V_j \rangle$ appropriately gives constantly varying phase values with frequency Ω_j as shown in Fig. 2, verifying the validity of the quantum asymptotic phase Φ_j . In contrast, $\arg\langle a \rangle$ does not vary constantly with time.

Revealing multiple phase-locking structure.- We now consider quantum synchronization of the oscillator with a harmonic drive. The master equation in the rotating frame of the frequency ω_d of the harmonic drive is

$$\dot{\rho} = (\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_1)\rho, \quad (16)$$

where the \mathcal{L}_0 is now given by Eq. (11) with $H = -\Delta a^\dagger a + K a^{\dagger 2} a^2$, $\mathcal{L}_1 \rho = -i[iE(a - a^\dagger), \rho]$, $\Delta = \omega_d - \omega_0$ is the frequency detuning of the harmonic drive from the oscillator, and E is the strength of the harmonic drive [11, 18].




FIG. 4. Power spectra. The parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$ and $(\Delta, \gamma_2, K, E)/\gamma_1 = (0, 4, 100, 1)$. (a): P_a . (b-e): P_j ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$).

We use the same parameters as in Fig. 2(d)-2(f) and vary the detuning parameter Δ by varying ω_d while keeping the natural frequency ω_0 fixed. Lörch *et al.* [11] showed that this system under strong Kerr effect exhibits phase locking to the harmonic drive at several detuning frequencies $\Delta = 2mK$ ($m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) observed as multiple sharp Arnold tongues, while the corresponding classical system exhibits only a single broad Arnold tongue. In Ref. [11], the following order parameter S_a and power spectrum P_a defined using the annihilation operator a are used to analyze the system:

$$S_a = |S_a|e^{i\theta_a} = \frac{\langle a \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle a^\dagger a \rangle}}, \quad (17)$$

$$P_a(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau e^{i\omega\tau} \langle a^\dagger(\tau)a(0) \rangle - \langle a^\dagger(\tau) \rangle \langle a(0) \rangle, \quad (18)$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the steady-state density matrix obtained from the master equation (16). Here, instead of these quantities, we use the order parameters and the power spectra based on the quantum asymptotic phase, which are defined in terms of the eigenoperators V_j of \mathcal{L}_0 as

$$S_j = |S_j|e^{i\theta_j} = \frac{\langle V_j \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle V_j^\dagger V_j \rangle}}, \quad (19)$$

$$P_j(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau e^{i\omega\tau} \left(\langle V_j^\dagger(\tau)V_j(0) \rangle - \langle V_j^\dagger(\tau) \rangle \langle V_j(0) \rangle \right), \quad (20)$$

where $V_j^\dagger(\tau) = e^{\Lambda_j\tau}V_j(0)$ and $j = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Note that $|S_a|$ and $|S_j|$ quantify the phase coherence of the system, while θ_a and θ_j characterize the averaged phase of the system relative to the harmonic drive.

Figure 3 shows the dependence of the order parameters $|S_a|$ and $|S_j|$ on the detuning Δ and strength E of the harmonic drive. In Fig. 3(a) for $|S_a|$, several Arnold tongues representing phase locking of the oscillator at different frequencies are observed [11]. Remarkably, these Arnold tongues are clearly decomposed into individual Arnold tongues around $\Delta = 2(j-1)K$ in Figs. 3(b)-3(e) for $|S_j|$ ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$). Similarly, Fig. 4 shows the power spectra P_a and P_j . Multiple peaks of P_a in Fig. 4(a), which indicate phase-locking frequencies of the oscillator, are clearly

decomposed into individual peaks around $\omega = \Delta - 2(j - 1)K$ in Figs. 4(b)-4(e) for P_j ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$). The Arnold tongue and power spectrum are sharper when the decay rate characterized by $\text{Re } \Lambda_j$ is smaller. Though not shown, we can also detect even smaller tongues and peaks with $j \geq 5$.

The above results reveal that, in the strong quantum regime, the system behaves like a torus with several fundamental frequencies and each of the associated oscillating mode individually exhibits phase locking to the harmonic drive at the respective frequency [33], resulting in the multiple Arnold tongues and spectral peaks. The quantum asymptotic phase proposed in this study reveals the structure of such mode-wise dynamics of the system in the strong quantum regime.

Conclusion.- We proposed a definition of the asymptotic phase for quantum nonlinear oscillators in terms of the eigenoperator of the adjoint Liouville superoperator, which is fully quantum-mechanical and valid in the strong quantum regime. By using the order parameters and power spectra based on the quantum asymptotic phase, the structure of the multiple phase locking, an explicit quantum signature in synchronization, was successfully characterized. The proposed quantum asymptotic phase will serve as a fundamental quantity for analyzing quantum effects in synchronization [11, 12] and be useful for future applications of quantum synchronization in the growing fields of quantum technologies.

Acknowledgments.- Numerical simulations are performed by using QuTiP numerical toolbox [34]. We acknowledge JSPS KAKENHI JP17H03279, JP18H03287, JPJSBP120202201, JP20J13778, and JST CREST JP-MJCR1913 for financial support.

-
- [1] A. T. Winfree, *The geometry of biological time* (Springer, New York, 2001).
- [2] Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical oscillations, waves, and turbulence* (Springer, Berlin, 1984).
- [3] A. Pikovsky, M. Rosenblum, and J. Kurths, *Synchronization: a universal concept in nonlinear sciences* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001).
- [4] H. Nakao, *Contemporary Physics* **57**, 188 (2016).
- [5] G. B. Ermentrout and D. H. Terman, *Mathematical foundations of neuroscience* (Springer, New York, 2010).
- [6] S. Strogatz, *Nonlinear dynamics and chaos* (Westview Press, 1994).
- [7] M. H. Matheny, J. Emenheiser, W. Fon, A. Chapman, A. Salova, M. Rohden, J. Li, M. H. de Badyn, M. Pósfai, L. Duenas-Osorio, *et al.*, *Science* **363**, eaav7932 (2019).
- [8] S. Kreinberg, X. Porte, D. Schicke, B. Lingnau, C. Schneider, S. Höfling, I. Kanter, K. Lüdge, and S. Reitzenstein, *Nature communications* **10**, 1539 (2019).
- [9] H. Singh, S. Bhuktare, A. Bose, A. Fukushima, K. Yakushiji, S. Yuasa, H. Kubota, and A. A. Tulapurkar, *Physical Review Applied* **11**, 054028 (2019).
- [10] M. Colombano, G. Arregui, N. Capuj, A. Pitanti, J. Maire, A. Griol, B. Garrido, A. Martinez, C. Sotomayor-Torres, and D. Navarro-Urrios, *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 017402 (2019).
- [11] N. Lörch, E. Amitai, A. Nunnenkamp, and C. Bruder, *Physical Review Letters* **117**, 073601 (2016).
- [12] N. Lörch, S. E. Nigg, A. Nunnenkamp, R. P. Tiwari, and C. Bruder, *Physical Review Letters* **118**, 243602 (2017).
- [13] T. Weiss, A. Kronwald, and F. Marquardt, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 013043 (2016).
- [14] M. R. Hush, W. Li, S. Genway, I. Lesanovsky, and A. D. Armour, *Physical Review A* **91**, 061401 (2015).
- [15] T. Weiss, S. Walter, and F. Marquardt, *Physical Review A* **95**, 041802 (2017).
- [16] A. Mari, A. Farace, N. Didier, V. Giovannetti, and R. Fazio, *Physical Review Letters* **111**, 103605 (2013).
- [17] Y. Kato, N. Yamamoto, and H. Nakao, *Phys. Rev. Research* **1**, 033012 (2019).
- [18] Y. Kato and H. Nakao, *Physical Review E* **101**, 012210 (2020).
- [19] T. E. Lee and H. Sadehghpour, *Physical Review Letters* **111**, 234101 (2013).
- [20] S. Walter, A. Nunnenkamp, and C. Bruder, *Physical Review Letters* **112**, 094102 (2014).
- [21] S. Sonar, M. Hajdušek, M. Mukherjee, R. Fazio, V. Vedral, S. Vinjanampathy, and L.-C. Kwek, *Physical Review Letters* **120**, 163601 (2018).
- [22] M. Xu, D. A. Tieri, E. Fine, J. K. Thompson, and M. J. Holland, *Physical Review Letters* **113**, 154101 (2014).
- [23] A. Roulet and C. Bruder, *Physical Review Letters* **121**, 053601 (2018).
- [24] T. E. Lee, C.-K. Chan, and S. Wang, *Physical Review E* **89**, 022913 (2014).
- [25] R. Hamerly and H. Mabuchi, *Physical Review Applied* **4**, 024016 (2015).
- [26] P. J. Thomas and B. Lindner, *Physical Review Letters* **113**, 254101 (2014).
- [27] See Supplemental Material for relation between the quantum asymptotic phase and conventional classical asymptotic phase from the Koopman-operator viewpoint, semiclassical equations for a quantum van der Pol oscillator with Kerr effect, asymptotic phase functions with fundamental frequencies Ω_{2-4} in the strong quantum regime, and asymptotic phase of a damped harmonic oscillator.
- [28] A. C. Li, F. Petruccione, and J. Koch, *Scientific reports* **4**, 4887 (2014).
- [29] One may also choose $\Omega_1 = \text{Im } \Lambda_1$, which reverses the direction of the asymptotic phase.
- [30] H. J. Carmichael, *Statistical Methods in Quantum Optics 1, 2* (Springer, New York, 2007).
- [31] C. W. Gardiner, *Quantum Noise* (Springer, New York, 1991).

- [32] K. E. Cahill and R. J. Glauber, *Physical Review* **177**, 1882 (1969).
- [33] P. Grindrod and E. L. Patel, *IMA Journal of Applied Mathematics* **81**, 152 (2016).
- [34] J. Johansson, P. Nation, and F. Nori, *Computer Physics Communications* **183**, 1760 (2012); **184**, 1234 (2013).

Supplemental Material

Quantum asymptotic phase reveals signatures of quantum synchronization

I. ASYMPTOTIC PHASE OF CLASSICAL NONLINEAR OSCILLATORS

A. Background

In analyzing synchronization properties of limit-cycle oscillators in the deterministic framework, the *asymptotic phase* [1–5] of the oscillator plays a central role, which is defined by the vector field of the oscillator and increases with a constant frequency in the basin of the limit-cycle attractor. By defining the asymptotic phase, one can approximately reduce the dynamics of a weakly perturbed limit-cycle oscillator to a simple one-dimensional phase equation, which can be analyzed much more easily than the original multidimensional nonlinear dynamical equation. This method, called the *phase reduction* [1–5], has been successfully used to analyze a large variety of synchronization phenomena in coupled-oscillator systems, including nonlinear wave propagation in self-oscillatory media and collective synchronization in populations of coupled oscillators. The method can be used for limit-cycle oscillators subjected to sufficiently weak noise, and also for quantum nonlinear oscillators in the semiclassical regime described by a quantum Fokker-Planck equation [6, 7].

However, there also exist strongly stochastic oscillatory systems in which the noise plays essentially important roles in generating the oscillatory dynamics. A representative example is the noise-induced oscillations in excitable systems [8]. In this case, the deterministic vector field of the system does not possess a limit-cycle solution, yet approximately regular oscillations are evoked due to continuous excitation of the system by noise. The conventional phase reduction theory cannot be applied to such strongly stochastic dynamical systems. In particular, we cannot rely on the deterministic limit cycle in defining the asymptotic phase.

To cope with this problem, Schwabedal and Pikovsky [9] introduced a definition of the phase in terms of the mean first return time, and Thomas and Lindner [10] proposed a definition of the asymptotic phase in terms of the slowest decaying eigenfunction of the backward Kolmogorov (Fokker-Planck) operator describing the mean first passage time, both of which yield phase values that increase with a constant frequency on average for stochastic oscillations, in a similar way to the ordinary asymptotic phase for deterministic oscillators.

B. Deterministic case

We first explain the asymptotic phase for classical nonlinear oscillators briefly. We consider a deterministic dynamical system $\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X})$ with a state $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, which has an exponentially stable limit-cycle solution $\mathbf{X}_0(t)$ with a natural period T and frequency $\omega = 2\pi/T$. The asymptotic phase function $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) : B \subset \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow [0, 2\pi)$ is then defined such that $\nabla\Phi(\mathbf{X}) \cdot \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \omega$ is satisfied for all system states \mathbf{X} in the basin B of the limit cycle, where $\nabla = \partial/\partial\mathbf{X}$ is the gradient with respect to \mathbf{X} . It then follows that the phase $\phi = \Phi(\mathbf{X})$ of the system obeys $\dot{\phi} = \dot{\Phi}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) \cdot \nabla\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \omega$, i.e., ϕ always increases at a constant frequency ω with the evolution of \mathbf{X} in B . When the system is weakly perturbed as $\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) + \epsilon\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{X})$ with $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$, the phase approximately obeys $\dot{\phi} = \omega + \epsilon\mathbf{Z}(\phi) \cdot \mathbf{p}(t)$, where $\mathbf{Z}(\phi) = \nabla\Phi(\mathbf{X})|_{\mathbf{X}=\mathbf{X}_0(\phi/\omega)}$ is the gradient of the phase function $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ evaluated at phase ϕ on the limit cycle. The simplicity of this phase equation has facilitated extensive studies on synchronization of coupled-oscillator systems [1–5].

Here, we point out that the operator $A = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) \cdot \nabla$ can be interpreted as an infinitesimal generator of the *Koopman operator* describing evolution of general observables in nonlinear dynamical systems [11–14]. The Koopman operator U^τ is defined by $(U^\tau g)(\mathbf{X}) = g(S^\tau \mathbf{X})$, where g is a smooth observable and S^τ is a flow of the system, i.e., $\mathbf{X}(t + \tau) = S^\tau \mathbf{X}(t)$. Using $S^\tau \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X} + \tau\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) + O(\tau^2)$ and $g(S^\tau \mathbf{X}) = g(\mathbf{X}) + \tau\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) \cdot \nabla g(\mathbf{X}) + O(\tau^2)$ for small τ , the infinitesimal generator A of U^τ is obtained as

$$\frac{d}{dt}g(\mathbf{X}) = Ag(\mathbf{X}) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{U^\tau g(\mathbf{X}) - g(\mathbf{X})}{\tau} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{g(S^\tau \mathbf{X}) - g(\mathbf{X})}{\tau} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) \cdot \nabla g(\mathbf{X}). \quad (21)$$

It can easily be seen from the definition of the asymptotic phase $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ that the exponential $\Psi(\mathbf{X}) = e^{i\Phi(\mathbf{X})}$ of the phase function $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ gives an eigenfunction of this linear operator A with an eigenvalue $i\omega$, satisfying $A\Psi(\mathbf{X}) = i\omega\Psi(\mathbf{X})$. Thus, the asymptotic phase function has a natural operator-theoretic interpretation as an argument

$$\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \arg \Psi(\mathbf{X}) \quad (22)$$

of the eigenfunction $\Psi(\mathbf{X})$ of the Koopman operator A [11–14].

The above definition of the asymptotic phase for deterministic systems is based on the existence of a limit-cycle solution, which is still applicable if the system is subjected to sufficiently weak noise. However, it is no longer valid for strongly stochastic oscillators where the noise plays essential roles.

C. Stochastic case

For strongly stochastic oscillators, Thomas and Lindner [10] proposed a definition of the asymptotic phase in terms of the slowest decaying eigenfunction of the backward Fokker-Planck operator, based on the consideration of the mean first passage time. Consider a stochastic system obeying a Fokker-Planck equation (FPE)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}p(\mathbf{X}, t) = L_{\mathbf{X}}p(\mathbf{X}, t) = \left[-\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{X}}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mathbf{X}^2}\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X}) \right] p(\mathbf{X}, t), \quad (23)$$

where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the system state, $p(\mathbf{X}, t)$ is the probability density function of \mathbf{X} at time t , $L_{\mathbf{X}}$ is a Fokker-Planck operator representing the time evolution of $p(\mathbf{X}, t)$, $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ represent the drift vector and diffusion matrix of the FPE, respectively. The transition probability density $p(\mathbf{X}, t|\mathbf{Y}, s)$ satisfying $p(\mathbf{X}, t) = p(\mathbf{X}, t|\mathbf{Y}, s)p(\mathbf{Y}, s)$ ($t \geq s$) obeys the forward FPE

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}p(\mathbf{X}, t|\mathbf{Y}, s) = L_{\mathbf{X}}p(\mathbf{X}, t|\mathbf{Y}, s). \quad (24)$$

The corresponding backward FPE is given by [15]

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s}p(\mathbf{X}, t|\mathbf{Y}, s) = -L_{\mathbf{Y}}^+p(\mathbf{X}, t|\mathbf{Y}, s) = -\left[\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{Y})\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{Y}} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{Y})\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mathbf{Y}^2} \right] p(\mathbf{X}, t|\mathbf{Y}, s), \quad (25)$$

where

$$L_{\mathbf{X}}^+ = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X})\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{X}} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X})\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mathbf{X}^2} \quad (26)$$

is the adjoint linear operator of $L_{\mathbf{X}}$ with respect to the L^2 inner product $\langle G(\mathbf{X}), H(\mathbf{X}) \rangle_{\mathbf{X}} = \int \overline{G(\mathbf{X})}H(\mathbf{X})d\mathbf{X}$ of two functions $G(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{C}$ and $H(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{C}$, i.e., $\langle L_{\mathbf{X}}^+G(\mathbf{X}), H(\mathbf{X}) \rangle_{\mathbf{X}} = \langle G(\mathbf{X}), L_{\mathbf{X}}H(\mathbf{X}) \rangle_{\mathbf{X}}$, with the overline indicating complex conjugate.

The linear differential operators $L_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $L_{\mathbf{X}}^+$ have the eigensystem $\{\lambda_k, P_k, Q_k\}$ of the eigenvalue λ_k , the right eigenfunction $P_k(\mathbf{X})$, and the left eigenfunction $Q_k(\mathbf{X})$, satisfying

$$L_{\mathbf{X}}P_k(\mathbf{X}) = \lambda_k P_k(\mathbf{X}), \quad L_{\mathbf{X}}^+Q_k(\mathbf{X}) = \overline{\lambda_k} Q_k(\mathbf{X}), \quad \langle Q_k(\mathbf{X}), P_l(\mathbf{X}) \rangle_{\mathbf{X}} = \delta_{kl}, \quad (27)$$

where $k, l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. One of the eigenvalues is $\lambda_0 = 0$ due to the conservation of probability, and all other eigenvalues have negative real parts. Considering that the system exhibits stochastic oscillations, it is assumed that the eigenvalues with the largest non-negative real part (the slowest decay rate) are given by a complex-conjugate pair. These eigenvalues are denoted as $\lambda_1 = \mu + i\omega$ and $\overline{\lambda}_1 = \mu - i\omega$, where $\mu < 0$ represents the decay rate and ω represents the fundamental oscillation frequency of the associated eigenfunction.

Thomas and Lindner defined a *stochastic asymptotic phase function* for stochastic oscillators as the argument of the left eigenfunction $\overline{Q_1(\mathbf{X})}$ associated with λ_1 , i.e., $L_{\mathbf{X}}^+\overline{Q_1(\mathbf{X})} = \lambda_1 \overline{Q_1(\mathbf{X})}$, as

$$\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \arg \overline{Q_1(\mathbf{X})}, \quad (28)$$

and showed that this $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ gives a phase value that varies with a constant frequency ω with the evolution of \mathbf{X} on average. This definition of the asymptotic phase for stochastic oscillations is consistent with the definition of the asymptotic phase in the noiseless limit when the deterministic system described by the vector field $\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X})$ has a limit-cycle solution [10].

Here we additionally point out that the above definition is also natural from the Koopman operator viewpoint. First, in the limit of vanishing noise, we obtain the forward and backward (classical) Liouville equations instead of FPEs, where the forward Liouville operator is given by

$$L_{\mathbf{X}} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{X}}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}). \quad (29)$$

The corresponding backward Liouville operator is given by

$$L_{\mathbf{X}}^+ = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) \cdot \nabla = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{X}}, \quad (30)$$

which is nothing but the Koopman operator A in the deterministic case. Thus, the eigenfunction $Q_1(\mathbf{X})$ of $L_{\mathbf{X}}^+$ with eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = i\omega$ (note that $\mu \rightarrow 0$ in this limit) coincides with the Koopman eigenfunction $\Psi(\mathbf{X})$ of A with eigenvalue $i\omega$, and therefore the definition of the asymptotic phase in Eq. (28) is equivalent to the definition of the asymptotic phase Eq. (22) in the deterministic case.

In the case with finite noise, the (negative of the) backward Fokker-Planck operator $L_{\mathbf{X}}^+$ can also be considered a Koopman operator of the stochastic system described by the Fokker-Planck operator $L_{\mathbf{X}}$. For a smooth observable f , the stochastic Koopman operator is defined by [16]

$$U^\tau f(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{E}[f(S^\tau \mathbf{X})] = \int p(\mathbf{Y}, s + \tau | \mathbf{X}, s) f(\mathbf{Y}) d\mathbf{Y}, \quad (31)$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ represents expectation over realizations of S^t and s is the initial time. The infinitesimal generator A of the stochastic Koopman operator U^τ is then calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} Af(\mathbf{X}) &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{U^\tau f(\mathbf{X}) - f(\mathbf{X})}{\tau} = \int \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{p(\mathbf{Y}, s + \tau | \mathbf{X}, s) - p(\mathbf{Y}, s | \mathbf{X}, s)}{\tau} f(\mathbf{Y}) d\mathbf{Y} \\ &= \int \left. \frac{\partial p(\mathbf{Y}, s + \tau | \mathbf{X}, s)}{\partial \tau} \right|_{\tau=0} f(\mathbf{Y}) d\mathbf{Y} = \int L_{\mathbf{Y}} p(\mathbf{Y}, s | \mathbf{X}, s) f(\mathbf{Y}) d\mathbf{Y} \\ &= \int p(\mathbf{Y}, s | \mathbf{X}, s) L_{\mathbf{Y}}^+ f(\mathbf{Y}) d\mathbf{Y} = L_{\mathbf{X}}^+ f(\mathbf{X}), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $L_{\mathbf{X}}^+$ is the adjoint operator of $L_{\mathbf{X}}$ given in Eq. (26), namely, the (negative of the) backward Fokker-Planck operator. Thus, the eigenfunction $\overline{Q_1(\mathbf{X})}$ of $L_{\mathbf{X}}^+$ with eigenvalue λ_1 coincides with the Koopman eigenfunction $\Psi(\mathbf{X})$ of A with the eigenvalue λ_1 also in this case, and the definition of the asymptotic phase by Eq. (28) is a natural extension of the definition for deterministic systems.

We note that the relation between the evolution of the probability density function and the evolution of the observable discussed above is parallel to the relation between Schrödinger and Heisenberg pictures in the main text. The quantum master equation, the adjoint superoperator \mathcal{L}^* (or the adjoint linear differential operator L^+ in the P -representation), and the eigenoperator V_1 (or the eigenfunction v_1 in the P -representation) with eigenvalue $\overline{\Lambda_1}$ correspond to the forward Fokker-Planck equation, the backward Fokker-Planck operator $L_{\mathbf{X}}^+$ (or the Koopman operator A), and the eigenfunction $\overline{Q_1(\mathbf{X})}$ (or the Koopman eigenfunction $\Psi(\mathbf{X})$) with eigenvalue λ_1 in the classical stochastic system discussed here, respectively. In the main text, the theory is further generalized to other principal eigenvalues $\{\Lambda_j\}_{j \geq 2}$.

II. QUANTUM VAN DER POL OSCILLATOR WITH KERR EFFECT IN THE SEMICLASSICAL REGIME

In the semiclassical regime, the linear operator L of the partial differential equation $\partial_t p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = Lp(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ in the main text, which describes the evolution of the quasiprobability distribution in the P -representation of the quantum van der Pol oscillator with Kerr effect, is explicitly given by a quantum Fokker-Planck operator

$$L = \left[- \sum_{j=1}^2 \partial_j \{A_j(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \sum_{k=1}^2 \partial_j \partial_k \{D_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\} \right], \quad (33)$$

where $\partial_1 = \partial/\partial\alpha$, $\partial_2 = \partial/\partial\bar{\alpha}$. The drift vector $\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = (A_1(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), A_2(\boldsymbol{\alpha})) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and the matrix $\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = (D_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})) \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$ are given by

$$\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \left(\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{\gamma_1}{2} - i\omega_0 \right) \alpha - (\gamma_2 + 2Ki)\bar{\alpha}\alpha^2 \\ &\left(\frac{\gamma_1}{2} + i\omega_0 \right) \bar{\alpha} - (\gamma_2 - 2Ki)\alpha\bar{\alpha}^2 \end{aligned} \right), \quad (34)$$

$$\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \begin{pmatrix} -(\gamma_2 + 2Ki)\alpha^2 & \gamma_1 \\ \gamma_1 & -(\gamma_2 - 2Ki)\bar{\alpha}^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (35)$$

The corresponding stochastic differential equation is then given by

$$d \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{\gamma_1}{2} - i\omega_0\right) \alpha - (\gamma_2 + 2Ki)\bar{\alpha}\alpha^2 \\ \left(\frac{\gamma_1}{2} + i\omega_0\right) \bar{\alpha} - (\gamma_2 - 2Ki)\alpha\bar{\alpha}^2 \end{pmatrix} dt + \beta(\alpha) \begin{pmatrix} dW_1 \\ dW_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

where W_1 and W_2 are independent Wiener processes and the matrix $\beta(\alpha)$ is given by

$$\beta(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{(\gamma_1 + R_{11}(\alpha))}{2}} e^{i\chi(\alpha)/2} & -i\sqrt{\frac{(\gamma_1 - R_{11}(\alpha))}{2}} e^{i\chi(\alpha)/2} \\ \sqrt{\frac{(\gamma_1 + R_{11}(\alpha))}{2}} e^{-i\chi(\alpha)/2} & i\sqrt{\frac{(\gamma_1 - R_{11}(\alpha))}{2}} e^{-i\chi(\alpha)/2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (37)$$

where $R_{11}(\alpha)e^{i\chi(\alpha)} = -(\gamma_2 + 2Ki)\alpha^2$.

In the classical limit, the deterministic part of Eq. (36) gives the Stuart-Landau equation (normal form of the supercritical Hopf bifurcation) [2] for the complex variable α in the main text, which can also be expressed by using a real vector $\mathbf{X} = (x, p) = (\text{Re } \alpha, \text{Im } \alpha)$ as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{p} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\gamma_1}{2}x + \omega_0 p - (x^2 + p^2)(\gamma_2 x - 2Kp) \\ -\omega_0 x + \frac{\gamma_1}{2}p - (x^2 + p^2)(2Kx + \gamma_2 p) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (38)$$

This equation is analytically solvable and the asymptotic phase function $\Phi_C(x, p)$ can be explicitly obtained as given in the main text [4]. From the discussion in Sec. I of this Supplemental Material, this $\Phi_C(x, p)$ can be expressed as the argument of the Koopman operator $\Psi(\mathbf{X})$ with the eigenvalue $i\Omega_C$ of this dynamical system.

III. CLASSICAL LIMIT OF THE QUANTUM ASYMPTOTIC PHASE FUNCTION

We here explain that the definition of the quantum asymptotic phase given in the main text reproduces the deterministic asymptotic phase in the classical limit in general. The linear operator L of the partial differential equation $\partial_t p(\alpha) = Lp(\alpha)$ in the main text, describing the quasiprobability distribution $p(\alpha)$ in the P -representation, can be approximated by a Fokker-Planck operator of the form Eq. (33) in the semiclassical regime. By introducing a real vector $\mathbf{X} = (\text{Re } \alpha, \text{Im } \alpha)$ and the corresponding distribution function $p(\mathbf{X})$, the Fokker-Planck operator L for $p(\alpha)$ can be cast into a real Fokker-Planck operator $L_{\mathbf{X}}$ for $p(\mathbf{X})$ given by Eq. (23). From the corresponding backward Fokker-Planck operator $L_{\mathbf{X}}^+$ in Eq. (26), we obtain the quantum asymptotic phase function as the argument of the eigenfunction of $L_{\mathbf{X}}^+$ associated with the eigenvalue $\Lambda_1 = -\mu + i\Omega$ with the slowest decay rate μ and the fundamental frequency Ω . Now, in the classical limit, the diffusion operator in the Fokker-Planck operator $L_{\mathbf{X}}$ asymptotically vanish and $L_{\mathbf{X}}$ converges to a classical Liouville operator given by Eq. (29). Also, the decay rate μ converges to 0 and the eigenvalue Λ_1 approaches $i\Omega$. Thus, from the corresponding backward Liouville operator (or the deterministic Koopman operator) $L_{\mathbf{X}}^+$ given by Eq. (30), we obtain the classical asymptotic phase function Φ_1 in the deterministic limit as the argument of the eigenfunction Ψ_1 associated with $\Lambda_1 = i\Omega$. Thus, the quantum asymptotic phase function defined in the main text reproduces the deterministic asymptotic phase function in the classical limit without quantum noise.

IV. ASYMPTOTIC PHASE FUNCTIONS IN THE STRONG QUANTUM REGIME

Figure 5 shows the asymptotic phase function Φ_j given by the argument of the eigenoperator V_j with the principal eigenvalue Λ_j , $\Phi_j(\alpha) = \arg\langle \alpha | V_j | \alpha \rangle$, for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and 4 on the $(x = \text{Re } \alpha, p = \text{Im } \alpha)$ plane. The parameters are the same as in Fig. 1(d)-(f) in the main text. These asymptotic phase functions look similar to each other, but they are associated with different fundamental frequencies and also they are slightly different from each other near the origin. Thus, they capture different oscillation modes of the system as demonstrated in the main text.

V. ASYMPTOTIC PHASE FUNCTION FOR A DAMPED HARMONIC OSCILLATOR

We here consider a simple damped harmonic oscillator and formally calculate the quantum asymptotic phase. Though this system is completely linear and does not exhibit synchronization phenomena in the classical sense, the eigenoperator V_1 of the adjoint Liouville operator can be analytically obtained and we can gain physical intuition on the definition of the asymptotic phase function. In Ref. [17], Thomas and Lindner considered the stochastic asymptotic




FIG. 5. Asymptotic phase functions of the quantum van der Pol oscillator with Kerr effect in the strong quantum regime. (a): Φ_1 , (b): Φ_2 , (c): Φ_3 , (d): Φ_4 . The parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$ and $(\omega_0, \gamma_2, K)/\gamma_1 = (300, 4, 100)$. Figures in the bottom panel show enlargements of the regions near the origin in the corresponding figures in the top panel. In all figures, $(x, p) = (2.5, 0)$ is chosen as the phase origin, $\Phi_j = 0$ ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$).

phase for a classical linear damped harmonic oscillator described by a multi-dimensional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, and the following result can be considered a quantum-mechanical version of their result.

The time evolution of a damped harmonic oscillator is given by a master equation

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}\rho = -i[-\omega a^\dagger a, \rho] + \gamma \mathcal{D}[a]\rho, \quad (39)$$

where $\omega > 0$ is the natural frequency of the system, γ denotes the decay rate for the linear damping, and \mathcal{D} is the Lindblad form as defined in the main text [18]. The eigenoperator associated with the slowest non-vanishing decay rate of the adjoint Liouville superoperator \mathcal{L}^* of \mathcal{L} is simply given by $V_1 = a$, i.e., $\mathcal{L}^* a = \bar{\Lambda}_1 a$, where $\bar{\Lambda}_1 = -\gamma/2 + i\omega$ [19, 20]. Therefore, the asymptotic phase function is obtained as

$$\arg\langle a | \alpha \rangle = \arg \alpha = \arg(re^{i\theta}) = \theta, \quad (40)$$

where $\alpha = re^{i\theta}$. Thus, the asymptotic phase simply gives the geometric angle on the phase plane of the P representation. For the initial condition $\rho = |\alpha_0\rangle\langle\alpha_0|$ with $\alpha_0 = r_0 e^{i\theta_0}$, it is easy to show that the expectation of a is given by

$$\langle a \rangle(t) = \text{Tr}[a\rho(t)] = \langle \alpha_0 | a(t) | \alpha_0 \rangle = e^{\bar{\Lambda}_1 t} \langle \alpha_0 | a(0) | \alpha_0 \rangle = e^{(-\gamma/2 + i\omega)t} \alpha_0. \quad (41)$$

If we take the phase origin on the positive x axis, the angle θ is given by

$$\theta = \arg e^{(-\gamma/2 + i\omega)t} \alpha_0 = \omega t + \theta_0, \quad (42)$$

which increases with a constant frequency ω .

[1] A. T. Winfree, *The geometry of biological time* (Springer, New York, 2001).

[2] Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical oscillations, waves, and turbulence* (Springer, Berlin, 1984).

[3] A. Pikovsky, M. Rosenblum, and J. Kurths, *Synchronization: a universal concept in nonlinear sciences* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001).

- [4] H. Nakao, *Contemporary Physics* **57**, 188 (2016).
- [5] G. B. Ermentrout and D. H. Terman, *Mathematical foundations of neuroscience* (Springer, New York, 2010).
- [6] Y. Kato, N. Yamamoto, and H. Nakao, *Phys. Rev. Research* **1**, 033012 (2019).
- [7] Y. Kato and H. Nakao, *Physical Review E* **101**, 012210 (2020).
- [8] B. Lindner, J. Garcia-Ojalvo, A. Neiman, and L. Schimansky-Geier, “Effects of noise in excitable systems,” *Physics Reports* **392**, 321–424 (2004).
- [9] J. T. Schwabedal and A. Pikovsky, *Physical Review Letters* **110**, 204102 (2013).
- [10] P. J. Thomas and B. Lindner, *Physical Review Letters* **113**, 254101 (2014).
- [11] A. Mauroy, I. Mezić, and J. Moehlis, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **261**, 19 (2013).
- [12] A. Mauroy, Y. Susuki, and I. Mezić, *The Koopman Operator in Systems and Control* (Springer, Cham, 2020).
- [13] S. Shirasaka, W. Kurebayashi, and H. Nakao, *Chaos* **27**, 023119 (2017).
- [14] Y. Kuramoto and H. Nakao, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* **377**, 20190041 (2019).
- [15] C. Gardiner, *Stochastic methods*, Vol. 4 (Springer Berlin, 2009).
- [16] I. Mezić, *Nonlinear Dynamics* **41**, 309 (2005).
- [17] P. J. Thomas and B. Lindner, *Physical Review E* **99**, 062221 (2019).
- [18] H. J. Carmichael, *Statistical Methods in Quantum Optics 1, 2* (Springer, New York, 2007).
- [19] S. M. Barnett and S. Stenholm, *Journal of Modern Optics* **47**, 2869 (2000).
- [20] H.-J. Briegel and B.-G. Englert, *Physical Review A* **47**, 3311 (1993).