

Fate of entanglement in magnetism under Lindbladian or non-Markovian dynamics and conditions for transition to Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert classical dynamics

Federico Garcia-Gaitan and Branislav K. Nikolić*

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716, USA

It is commonly assumed in spintronics and magnonics that localized spins within antiferromagnets are in the Néel ground state (GS), as well as that such state evolves, when pushed out of equilibrium by current or external fields, according to the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert (LLG) equation viewing localized spins as classical vectors of fixed length. On the other hand, the true GS of antiferromagnets is highly entangled, as confirmed by very recent neutron scattering experiments witnessing their entanglement. Although GS of ferromagnets is always unentangled, their magnonic low-energy excitation are superpositions of many-body spin states and, therefore, entangled. In this study, we initialize quantum Heisenberg ferro- or antiferromagnetic chains housing localized spins $S = 1/2$, $S = 1$ or $S = 5/2$ into unentangled pure state and then evolve them by quantum master equations (QMEs) of Lindblad or non-Markovian type, derived by coupling localized spins to a bosonic bath (such as due to phonons) or by using additional “reaction coordinate” in the latter case. The time evolution is initiated by applying an external magnetic field, and entanglement of time-evolving *mixed* quantum states is monitored by computing its logarithmic negativity. We find that non-Markovian dynamics maintains some degree of entanglement, which shrinks the length of the vector of spin expectation values thereby making the LLG equation inapplicable. Conversely, Lindbladian (i.e., Markovian) dynamics ensures that entanglement goes to zero, thereby enabling quantum-to-classical (i.e., to LLG) transition in all cases— $S = 1/2$, $S = 1$ and $S = 5/2$ ferromagnet or $S = 5/2$ antiferromagnet—*except* for $S = 1/2$ and $S = 1$ antiferromagnet. We also investigate the stability of entangled antiferromagnetic GS upon suddenly coupling it to the bosonic bath.

Introduction.—It is well-known that ground state (GS) of antiferromagnetic insulators (AFIs) are highly entangled [1–3], i.e., they cannot be expressed as the direct product of multiple single-spin states in any basis. For example, quantum spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ AFI chain modeled by the standard Heisenberg Hamiltonian [4], $\hat{H}_H = J \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i+1}$, has GS which can be explicitly written for small number of sites (such as $N = 4$), $|\text{GS}\rangle_{\text{AFI}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}}(2|\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + 2|\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle - |\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle - |\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle)$. Its energy, ${}_{\text{AFI}}\langle\text{GS}|\hat{H}|\text{GS}\rangle_{\text{AFI}} = -2J$, is lower than the energy, $\langle\text{Néel}|\hat{H}|\text{Néel}\rangle = -J$ of unentangled Néel state $|\text{Néel}\rangle = |\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$. Here $\hat{S}_i^\alpha = \hat{I}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes S\hat{\sigma}_i^\alpha \otimes \dots \otimes \hat{I}_{N_{\text{AFI}}}$ acts nontrivially, as the Pauli matrix $\hat{\sigma}^\alpha$, in the Hilbert space of spin at site i ; \hat{I}_i is the unit operator; $S = 1/2$; and $J > 0$ is AF exchange interaction. The expectation value of spin at site i vanishes, $\langle\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i\rangle = \langle\text{GS}|\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i|\text{GS}\rangle \equiv 0$, which is related to non-zero entanglement entropy [3, 5] of GS. Furthermore, the entanglement in the GS of a materials realization [2, 6] of AFI chain has been confirmed experimentally by very recent neutron scattering experiments [2] extracting quantum Fisher information as a witness [7, 8] of multipartite entanglement below $T \lesssim 200$ K.

In the case of ferromagnetic insulators (FIs), quantum spin fluctuations [9] are absent [10] and both classical $\uparrow\uparrow \dots \uparrow\uparrow$ and its unentangled quantum counterpart $|\uparrow\uparrow \dots \uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ are GS of the respective classical and quantum Hamiltonians. However, one magnon Fock state [11, 12], recently detected with qubit sensor [13], as the low energy excitation of FI chain

$$|1_q\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} e^{iqx_n} \underbrace{|\uparrow \dots \uparrow\rangle}_n \downarrow \underbrace{|\uparrow \dots \uparrow\rangle}_{N-n-1},$$

where q is the wavevector and $x_n = na$ is the x -coordinate along the chain (with the lattice constant a), is macroscopically entangled [14], as is the case of multi-magnon states [15]. The robustness of entanglement of such states has been studied, even in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, in quantum computing (using analogous states of qubits known as W states) [16, 17], or more recently in quantum magnonics [12] using quantum master equations (QMEs) formulated in second-quantization formalism [18, 19].

On the other hand, it is commonly assumed in antiferromagnetic spintronics [20–24] that GS of its AFI layers is the Néel state, as well as that dynamics of their excited states due to, e.g., absorption of injected current [24, 25] or electromagnetic radiation [26–28] is *classical and governed* [25] by the celebrated Landau-Lifshitz (LL) [29] or Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert (LLG) equation [30] when the damping term of the LL equation is re-written in Gilbert form [31]. It is also common in spintronics and magnonics to study magnons [32] by solving coupled system of LLG equations [33, 34]. In either of these two cases, it is believed that large spin value S [35] and room temperature are sufficient to ensure validity of the LLG equation. This notion is motivated by, e.g., the eigenvalue of \hat{S}_i^2 being $S^2(1 + 1/S)$, instead of S^2 , which suggests that quantum effects become progressively less important for $S > 1$. However, even for single quantum spin the required value of S to match quantum and classical (i.e., LLG) dynamics can be unrealistically large [36] in the presence of anisotropies. Also, quantum corrections persist for all $S < \infty$ [2], vanishing as $(2S)^{-1}$ in the classical




FIG. 1. Time-dependence of quantum expectation values $\langle \hat{S}_1^\alpha \rangle(t)$ vs. classical-LLG-computed $S_1^\alpha(t)$ of localized spins (a),(b) $S = 1/2$ or (c),(d) $S = 5/2$ on site $i = 1$ of FI chain of $N = 4$ sites. (e)–(h) Time dependence of logarithmic negativity $E_N(t)$ measuring entanglement between two halves of FI chain in the case of quantum dynamics (circles) in panels (a)–(d). The FI spins are evolved (circles) as an open quantum system by using either Lindblad (i.e., Markovian) or “reaction coordinate” (i.e., non-Markovian) QME.

limit [37]. Most of standard magnetic materials actually host localized spins with rather small $S \leq 5/2$ [38].

The key prerequisite for the LLG equation to apply to many-body spin systems is *absence of entanglement* [35, 39], i.e., the underlying quantum state of many localized spins must remain unentangled pure, $|\sigma_1(t)\rangle \otimes |\sigma_2(t)\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\sigma_N(t)\rangle$, or unentangled mixed [40–42]

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = \sum_n p_n \hat{\rho}_n^{(1)}(t) \otimes \hat{\rho}_n^{(2)}(t) \dots \hat{\rho}_n^{(N)}(t), \quad (1)$$

at all times t in order for the solutions of the LLG equation \mathbf{S}_i to be able [43] to mimic time evolution of the expectation values $\langle \hat{S}_i \rangle$, i.e., enable quantum-to-classical transition, $\langle \hat{S}_i \rangle(t) \mapsto \mathbf{S}_i(t)$. In Eq. (1), $\rho_n^{(i)}$ is the density matrix describing quantum state of localized spin at site (i). Otherwise, for entangled states the length of vectors $\langle \hat{S}_i \rangle(t)$ is changing in time [44] which cannot be mimicked by $\mathbf{S}_i(t)$ of fixed length [we assume usage of the LLG equation in the context of atomistic spin dynamics (ASD) [30] where each atom of the lattice hosts one vector \mathbf{S}_i].

We also note that it is common in quantum many-body calculations for spins systems to introduce external staggered magnetic field which alternates in sign on atomic length scales [45] in order to select the unentangled Néel state as the GS. However, its microscopic justification is missing. Attempts to introduce more realistic decoherence mechanisms, such as repeated local measurements [46–48], that would disrupt superposition in the GS and replace the need for contrived staggered field are

also difficult to justify in the context of spintronic and magnonic devices. A handful of recent studies have examined time evolution of entangled GS of AFIs [49, 50] upon coupling their spins to a dissipative environment modelled as a bosonic bath, but with conflicting conclusions. For example, Ref. [49] finds that non-Markovian QME does not destroy entanglement of $S = 1/2$ AFI chain, while in Ref. [50] AFI chain transitions toward unentangled FI GS under the Lindblad QME [51, 52]. Attempts to derive LLG dynamics from the Lindblad QME have been made [43], but under the constraint of a magnet remaining in unentangled state [Eq. (1)].

Thus, how quantum states of many localized spins loose their entanglement and *possibly transition* to LLG classical dynamics, widely used in spintronics [25, 34] and magnonics [33], is an *outstanding problem*. In this study, we view AFI and FI as open quantum systems by coupling them either: (i) weakly to a bosonic bath, assumed to arise due to bosonic quasiparticles in solids such as phonons, whose tracing out allows us to derive Lindblad QME [Eq. (2)]; or (ii) strongly to a single bosonic mode which, in turn, interacts weakly with the bosonic bath, so that tracing over both allows us to derive non-Markovian QME within the so-called “reaction coordinate” method [53]. We monitor presence of entanglement in the density matrix of all localized spins $\hat{\rho}(t)$ via its logarithmic negativity $E_N(t)$ [40–42], and we concurrently compare quantum $\langle \hat{S}_i \rangle(t)$ vs. classical (i.e., LLG) $\mathbf{S}_i(t)$ trajectories in Figs. 1–3. Prior to delving into these principal results, we introduce useful concepts and notation.

Models and methods.—We consider FI ($J < 0$) or AFI




FIG. 2. Panels (a)–(h) are counterparts of Fig. 1(a)–(h), but using AFI chain composed of $N = 4$ sites.

($J > 0$) chain modelled by the Heisenberg Hamiltonian \hat{H}_H , which can include interaction with a homogeneous external magnetic field switching on for $t \geq 0$, $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_H - \sum_i g \mu_B \mathbf{B}_{\text{ext}}(t \geq 0) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i$, where g is the gyromagnetic ratio and μ_B is the Bohr magneton. We set $\hbar = 1$ and $k_B = 1$. These models of realistic magnetic materials [2] are made open quantum systems by coupling them to a bosonic bath, so that total Hamiltonian becomes $\hat{H}_{\text{tot}} = \hat{H} + \hat{H}_{\text{bath}} + \hat{V}$. Here \hat{H}_{bath} is the Hamiltonian of the bath modelled as a set of harmonic oscillators, $\hat{H}_{\text{bath}} = \sum_{ik} \omega_{ik} \hat{a}_{ik}^\dagger \hat{a}_{ik}$, using operator $\hat{a}_{ik}(\hat{a}_{ik}^\dagger)$ which annihilates(creates) a boson in mode k interacting with spin operator at site i [54] via $\hat{V} = \sum_k g_k \sum_i \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i (\hat{a}_{ik} + \hat{a}_{ik}^\dagger)$ where g_k are the coupling constants. We assume that each spin interacts with the bosonic bath independently of other spins. Furthermore, if we assume small g_k , QME of the Lindblad type [51, 52] can be derived by tracing out the bosonic bath and by expanding resulting equation to second order. Rather than relying on traditional approaches for the derivation of the Lindblad QME—such as using Born, Markov and secular approximations [43, 52, 53]—we follow the procedure of Ref. [55] for universal Lindblad QME which evades difficulties of the secular approximation [56]. For example, for systems with (nearly) degenerate eigenstates, as is the case of FI and AFI models considered, secular approximation leads to improperly derived [43] Lindblad QME for localized spins because of assuming that energy splitting is much bigger than fluctuations due to the bath. The same problem was addressed in a number of recent studies [57, 58], besides the resolution offered in Ref. [55].

The universal Lindblad QME [55] considers a single Lindblad operator \hat{L}_i for each spin, so that only N such

operators are needed to obtain

$$d\hat{\rho}/dt = -i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] + \sum_i^N \hat{L}_i \hat{\rho} \hat{L}_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{L}_i^\dagger \hat{L}_i, \hat{\rho} \}, \quad (2)$$

where we also ignore typically negligible Lamb-shift corrections [53] to the Hamiltonian. The Lindblad QME is time-local due to the assumption that bath-induced changes to the system dynamics are slow relative to the typical correlation time of the bath. We compute \hat{L}_i operators as a power series

$$\hat{L}_i = \sum_n c_n (\text{ad}_{\hat{H}})^n [\hat{\mathbf{S}}_i], \quad c_n = \frac{(-i)^n}{n!} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt g(t) t^n, \quad (3)$$

thereby evading the need for exact diagonalization of the FI or AFI Hamiltonians. Here $\text{ad}_{\hat{H}}[X] = [\hat{H}, X]$ and the jump correlator function is defined via the Fourier transform of the spectral function of the bath, $J(\omega) = 2\pi \sum \delta(\omega - \omega_k)$, as

$$g(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \sqrt{J(\omega)} e^{-i\omega t}. \quad (4)$$

For numerical calculations, we considered an Ohmic spectral function with a rigid ultraviolet cutoff

$$J(\omega) = \Gamma \omega / \omega_m \Theta(\omega_m - \omega) n_{\text{BE}}(\omega), \quad (5)$$

where Γ is the reorganization energy representing the magnitude of fluctuations and dissipation; ω_m characterizes how quickly the bath relaxes towards equilibrium; $n_{\text{BE}}(\omega)$ the Bose-Einstein distribution; and Θ is the Heaviside step function.

The Lindblad QME [Eq. (2)] is only valid for a weak system-bath coupling as it assumes a second order truncation in g_k . Since this is not always the case, several approaches exist to treat strong system-bath coupling, such

as polaron, star-to-chain and thermofield transformations reviewed in Ref. [59], as well as the “reaction coordinate” method [56]. The “reaction coordinate” method is based on the Bogoliubov transformation, and it allows one to construct a new bosonic mode \hat{b} called the “reaction coordinate”. This mode is coupled strongly to the system, but weakly to a residual bosonic bath while conserving the bosonic commutation relations. The new Hamiltonian of the system then becomes

$$\hat{H}_{\text{tot}} = \hat{H} + \lambda \sum_i \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i (\hat{b} + \hat{b}^\dagger) + \Omega \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{b} + \hat{H}_{\text{RC-B}} + \hat{H}_{\text{bath}}, \quad (6)$$

where λ is the strength of the coupling between the “reac-

tion coordinate” and the system; Ω is the frequency of the “reaction coordinate”; $\hat{H}_{\text{RC-B}} = \sum_{k>1} \tilde{g}_k (\hat{b} + \hat{b}^\dagger) (\hat{c}_k + \hat{c}_k^\dagger)$ is the reaction coordinate-bath coupling Hamiltonian; and \hat{H}_{bath} is the bosonic bath Hamiltonian considered to be identical to the case used in derivation of Eq. (2), but with one less bosonic mode and with properly transformed coupling coefficients. Thus, the parameters λ and Ω are expressed [60] in terms of the parameters in Eq. (5), $\lambda^2 = \frac{1}{6\pi} \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}} \Gamma \omega_m$ and $\Omega = \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}} \omega_m$, while the spectral function of the residual bath

$$J'(\omega) = \frac{2\sqrt{5/3} \pi \omega \omega_m^2 n_{\text{BE}}(\omega)}{3[\pi^2 \omega^2 + 4\omega \operatorname{arctanh}(\omega/\omega_m)(\omega \operatorname{arctanh}(\omega/\omega_m) - 2\omega_m) + 4\omega_m^2]}, \quad (7)$$

is independent of the original coupling strength Γ . This allows us to derive QME which has the same form as Eq. (2), but it uses $\hat{H} \mapsto \hat{H} + \lambda \sum_i \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i (\hat{b} + \hat{b}^\dagger) + \Omega \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{b}$. Since $\lambda \propto \sqrt{\Gamma}$, the coupling of the system to the “reaction coordinate” can be arbitrarily strong without affecting coupling to the residual bath. Despite being time-local, this Lindblad QME including “reaction coordinate” can actually capture non-Markovian effects [61]. They, otherwise, require integro-differential QMEs with time-retarded kernel [62]. In order to reduce computational complexity for many localized spins, an effective Hamiltonian was built by considering [61] only the lowest energy states of the “reaction coordinate”, i.e., the matrix representation of \hat{b} is truncated to finite size 15×15 .

For comparison, classical dynamics of localized spins \mathbf{S}_i is computed by widely used in spintronics and magnonics phenomenological LLG equation [29–31]

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{S}_i}{\partial t} = -g \mathbf{S}_i \times \mathbf{B}_i^{\text{eff}} + \lambda \mathbf{S}_i \times \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}_i}{\partial t}, \quad (8)$$

where λ is the phenomenological Gilbert parameter [31], and $\mathbf{B}_i^{\text{eff}} = -(1/\mu_M) \partial \mathcal{H} / \partial \mathbf{S}_i$ is the effective magnetic field obtained from the classical Heisenberg Hamiltonian, $\mathcal{H} = J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j - \sum_i g \mu_B \mathbf{B}_{\text{ext}}(t \geq 0) \cdot \mathbf{S}_i$ with μ_M being the magnitude of classical localized spins [30]. The LLG equation is solved using the Heun method [30], which is equivalent to second order Runge-Kutta method, while the Gilbert damping parameter is obtained by minimizing the root mean square of the difference between quantum and classical trajectories of localized spins when the later is computed using $\lambda = 0$. This procedure yields as the typical value $\lambda = 0.02$, employed in Figs. 1 and 2.

Results and discussion.—We solve Eq. (2) for Lindbladian dynamics, as well as for non-Markovian dynamics when the “reaction coordinate” is included in the

Hamiltonian, for FI and AFI chains composed of $N = 4$ spins with periodic boundary conditions. We consider $S = 1/2$, $S = 1$ in the Supplemental Material (SM) [63], and $S = 5/2$ spin operators at each site. The two QMEs are solved using the fourth order Runge-Kutta method, where $|J| = 1$ sets the unit of energy. For Lindbladian dynamics we use $\Gamma = 0.01|J|$, while for non-Markovian dynamics we used stronger coupling $\Gamma = 0.1|J|$. In both calculations, temperature is set to $T = |J|$ and the cutoff frequency is chosen as $\omega_m = 3|J|$. Note that choosing too large ω_m brings entanglement of localized spins to zero on a very short time scale. The initial condition for FI is unentangled pure state $\hat{\rho}(0) = |\Sigma\rangle\langle\Sigma|$, where $|\Sigma\rangle = |\rightarrow\rightarrow\rightarrow\rightarrow\rangle$ with all spins pointing along the x -axis. The magnetic field applied for $t \geq 0$, $g\mu_B B_z = 0.8|J|$, is along the z -axis. The initial condition for AFI is unentangled pure state $\hat{\rho}(0) = |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|$, where $|\Omega\rangle = |\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_1\sigma_2\rangle$ with $\langle\sigma_{1(2)}|\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{1(2)}|\sigma_{1(2)}\rangle$ pointing along $\theta_1 = 1/8$ or $\theta_2 = \pi - 1/8$ and $\phi_{1(2)} = 0$ in spherical coordinates.

In the course of time evolution, $\hat{\rho}(t)$ can become entangled which is quantified by computing logarithmic negativity [40–42] between the left half (LH) and the right half (RH) of the chain $E_N[\hat{\rho}(t)] = \ln \|\hat{\rho}^{\text{TRH}}\|_1 = \ln \sum_n |\lambda_n|$, where $\|\hat{A}\|_1 = \operatorname{Tr} \sqrt{\hat{A}^\dagger \hat{A}}$ is the trace norm of operator \hat{A} ; λ_n are the eigenvalues of $\hat{\rho}^{\text{TRH}}$; and the matrix elements of the partial transpose with respect to RH of the chain are given by $(\hat{\rho}^{\text{TRH}})_{i\alpha;j\beta} = (\hat{\rho})_{j\alpha;i\beta}$. While the standard von Neumann entanglement entropy \mathcal{S}_{LH} of half of the chain [8] can be non-zero even for unentangled mixed state in Eq. (1), non-zero E_N necessarily implies entanglement between the two parts [17, 40–42], as well as genuine quantum correlations between them.

Initially, both FI and AFI exhibit dynamical build-up of entanglement signified by $E_N > 0$ in Figs. 1 and 2,




FIG. 3. Time dependence of: (a),(b) spin expectation values at sites $i = 1, 2$; (c) logarithmic negativity $E_N(t)$ [40–42] between two halves of AFI chain; and (d) overlap between the chain density matrix $\hat{\rho}(t)$ and pure states in the Néel subspace. The AFI chain has $N = 4$ sites, as well as an impurity introducing the z -axis anisotropy at site $i = 1$ [Eq. (9)]. The Lindblad Eq. (2) evolves $\hat{\rho}(t)$ upon coupling AFI chain to the bosonic bath at $t = 0$, starting from pure entangled GS but exhibiting Néel checkerboard order $\langle \hat{S}_i^z \rangle = -\langle \hat{S}_{i+1}^z \rangle \neq 0$ [5].

respectively, as well as in Fig. S1 in the SM [63]. However, Lindbladian dynamics quickly brings $E_N \rightarrow 0$ in the FI hosting $S = 1/2$ [Fig. 1(e)], $S = 1$ (Fig. S1(g) in the SM [63]), and $S = 5/2$ [Fig. 1(g)] spins; as well as in the AFI hosting $S = 5/2$ [Fig. 2(e)] spins. Establishing $E_N \rightarrow 0$ also makes it possible for LLG classical trajectories $\mathbf{S}_i(t)$ to track $\langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \rangle(t)$ in Figs. 1, 2 and S1 in the SM [63]. Nevertheless, in the AFI case with $S = 1/2$ [Fig. 2(e)] or $S = 1$ (Fig. S1(c) in the SM [63]) entanglement *never* vanishes, $E_N(t) > 0$, even in the long-time limit, thereby maintaining $\langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \rangle(t) \neq \mathbf{S}_i(t)$. Thus, *we conclude that usage [20–23, 25] of the LLG equation in spintronics with AFI layers hosting spins $S = 1/2$ or $S = 1$ cannot be justified microscopically.* In the case of non-Markovian dynamics, $E_N(t)$ remains non-zero [Figs. 1, 2 and S1 in the SM[63]] in FI and AFI at all times and for all spin values $S = 1/2$, $S = 1$ and $S = 5/2$, so that quantum-to-classical transition $\langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \rangle(t) \mapsto \mathbf{S}_i(t)$ is *never* achieved.

Finally, we examine the fate of entangled GS of AFI upon suddenly coupling it to a bosonic bath and evolving it by the Lindblad Eq. (2). Since checkerboard pattern of expectation values of $\langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \rangle$ in the Néel order is often seen experimentally [24], we induce it as the initial condition at $t = 0$ by using GS of slightly different Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{\text{imp}} = \hat{H}_H - 0.2|J|\hat{S}_1^z, \quad (9)$$

which can be interpreted as the quantum Heisenberg

Hamiltonian with an additional impurity at site $i = 1$. The impurity breaks rotational invariance of \hat{H}_H to generate Néel order, $\langle \hat{S}_i^z \rangle = -\langle \hat{S}_{i+1}^z \rangle \neq 0$, but not the Néel state $|\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ because entanglement entropy of such GS remains nonzero [5] leading to $\langle \hat{S}_i^z \rangle/S < 1$. The Lindbladian time evolution [Fig. 3] maintains entanglement $E_N(t) > 0$ at low temperature $T_1 = 0.01|J|$ and, therefore, *nonclassical* dynamics of $\langle \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \rangle(t)$, while at high temperatures $E_N \rightarrow 0$ is reached on short time scales. The overlap $\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}(t)\hat{P}_{\text{Néel}}]$ with states in the Néel subspace, whose projector is $\hat{P}_{\text{Néel}} = |\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow| + |\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow|$, never reaches 1 in the low temperature regime [black curve in Fig. 3(d)]. In the high temperature limit, the overlap becomes negligible [red curve in Fig. 3(d)] as the system goes [50] into *static ferrimagnetic* ordering [blue and orange flat lines in Figs. 3(a) and 3(b)].

In conclusion, we solve nearly a century old [29] problem—unreasonable effectiveness of the phenomenological LLG equation in describing dynamics of localized spins within magnetic materials—by showing that it can be justified microscopically only if Lindblad open quantum system dynamics is generated by environment in the case of any ferromagnet, as well as for antiferromagnets with sufficiently large value of their spin $S > 1$. Thus, our solution excludes antiferromagnets with $S = 1/2$ or $S = 1$ from the realm of classical micromagnetics or classical ASD modeling [30, 33].

This research was primarily supported by the US National Science Foundation through the University of Delaware Materials Research Science and Engineering Center, DMR-2011824.

* bnikolic@udel.edu

- [1] N. B. Christensen, H. M. Rønnow, D. F. McMorrow, A. Harrison, T. G. Perring, M. Enderle, R. Coldea, L. P. Regnault, and G. Aeppli, Quantum dynamics and entanglement of spins on a square lattice, *PNAS* **104**, 15264 (2007).
- [2] A. Scheie, P. Laurell, A. M. Samarakoon, B. Lake, S. E. Nagler, G. E. Granroth, S. Okamoto, G. Alvarez, and D. A. Tennant, Witnessing entanglement in quantum magnets using neutron scattering, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 224434 (2021).
- [3] H. F. Song, N. Laflorencie, S. Rachel, and K. Le Hur, Entanglement entropy of the two-dimensional Heisenberg antiferromagnet, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 224410 (2011).
- [4] F. H. L. Essler, H. Frahm, F. Göhmann, A. Klümper, and V. E. Korepin, *The One-Dimensional Hubbard Model* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- [5] M. D. Petrović, P. Mondal, A. E. Feiguin, and B. K. Nikolić, Quantum spin torque driven transmutation of an antiferromagnetic Mott insulator, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 197202 (2021).
- [6] S. Sahling, G. Remenyi, C. Paulsen, P. Monceau, V. Saligrama, C. Marin, A. Revcolevschi, L. P. Regnault, S. Raymond, and J. E. Lorenzo, Experimental realiza-

- tion of long-distance entanglement between spins in antiferromagnetic quantum spin chains, *Nat. Phys.* **11**, 255 (2015).
- [7] N. Friis, G. Vitagliano, M. Malik, and M. Huber, Entanglement certification from theory to experiment, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **1**, 72 (2018).
- [8] G. D. Chiara and A. Sanpera, Genuine quantum correlations in quantum many-body systems: a review of recent progress, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **81**, 074002 (2018).
- [9] A. Singh and Z. Tešanović, Quantum spin fluctuations in an itinerant antiferromagnet, *Phys. Rev. B* **41**, 11457 (1990).
- [10] J. S. Pratt, Universality in the entanglement structure of ferromagnets, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 237205 (2004).
- [11] U. Bajpai, A. Suresh, and B. K. Nikolić, Quantum many-body states and Green's functions of nonequilibrium electron-magnon systems: Localized spin operators versus their mapping to Holstein-Primakoff bosons, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 184425 (2021).
- [12] H. Yuan, Y. Cao, A. Kamra, R. A. Duine, and P. Yan, Quantum magnonics: When magnon spintronics meets quantum information science, *Phys. Rep.* **965**, 1 (2022).
- [13] D. Lachance-Quirion, S. P. Wolski, Y. Tabuchi, S. Kono, K. Usami, and Y. Nakamura, Entanglement-based single-shot detection of a single magnon with a superconducting qubit, *Science* **367**, 425 (2020).
- [14] T. Morimae, A. Sugita, and A. Shimizu, Macroscopic entanglement of many-magnon states, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 032317 (2005).
- [15] J. S. Pratt, Qubit entanglement in multimagnon states, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 184413 (2006).
- [16] A. R. R. Carvalho, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner, Decoherence and multipartite entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 230501 (2004).
- [17] L. Aolita, F. de Melo, and L. Davidovich, Open-system dynamics of entanglement: a key issues review, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **78**, 042001 (2015).
- [18] H. Y. Yuan, W. P. Sterk, A. Kamra, and R. A. Duine, Master equation approach to magnon relaxation and dephasing, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 224422 (2022).
- [19] H. Y. Yuan, W. P. Sterk, A. Kamra, and R. A. Duine, Pure dephasing of magnonic quantum states, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, L100403 (2022).
- [20] V. Baltz, A. Manchon, M. Tsoi, T. Moriyama, T. Ono, and Y. Tserkovnyak, Antiferromagnetic spintronics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 015005 (2018).
- [21] T. Jungwirth, X. Marti, P. Wadley, and J. Wunderlich, Antiferromagnetic spintronics, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **11**, 231 (2016).
- [22] J. Zelezny, P. Wadley, K. Olejnik, A. Hoffmann, and H. Ohno, Spin transport and spin torque in antiferromagnetic devices, *Nat. Phys.* **14**, 10.1038/s41567-018-0062-7 (2018).
- [23] M. B. Jungfleisch, W. Zhang, and A. Hoffmann, Perspectives of antiferromagnetic spintronics, *Phys. Lett. A* **382**, 865 (2018).
- [24] I. Gray, T. Moriyama, N. Sivadas, G. M. Stiehl, J. T. Heron, R. Need, B. J. Kirby, D. H. Low, K. C. Nowack, D. G. Schlom, D. C. Ralph, T. Ono, and G. D. Fuchs, Spin Seebeck imaging of spin-torque switching in antiferromagnetic Pt/NiO heterostructures, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041016 (2019).
- [25] R. Cheng, J. Xiao, Q. Niu, and A. Brataas, Spin pumping and spin-transfer torques in antiferromagnets, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 057601 (2014).
- [26] P. Vaidya, S. A. Morley, J. van Tol, Y. Liu, R. Cheng, A. Brataas, D. Lederman, and E. del Barco, Subterahertz spin pumping from an insulating antiferromagnet, *Science* **368**, 160 (2020).
- [27] J. Li, C. Wilson, R. Cheng, M. Lohmann, M. Kavand, W. Yuan, M. Aldosary, N. Agladze, P. Wei, M. Sherwin, and J. Shi, Spin current from sub-terahertz-generated antiferromagnetic magnons, *Nature* **578**, 1 (2020).
- [28] H. Qiu, L. Zhou, C. Zhang, J. Wu, Y. Tian, S. Cheng, S. Mi, H. Zhao, Q. Zhang, D. Wu, B. Jin, J. Chen, and P. Wu, Ultrafast spin current generated from an antiferromagnet, *Nat. Phys.* **17**, 1 (2021).
- [29] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, On the theory of the dispersion of magnetic permeability in ferromagnetic bodies, *Phys. Z. Sowjetunion* **8**, 153 (1935).
- [30] R. F. L. Evans, W. J. Fan, P. Chureemart, T. A. Ostler, M. O. A. Ellis, and R. W. Chantrell, Atomistic spin model simulations of magnetic nanomaterials, *J. Phys. Condens.* **26**, 103202 (2014).
- [31] W. M. Saslow, Landau-Lifshitz or Gilbert damping? that is the question, *J. Appl. Phys.* **105**, 07D315 (2009).
- [32] U. Ritzmann, P. Baláz, P. Maldonado, K. Carva, and P. M. Oppeneer, High-frequency magnon excitation due to femtosecond spin-transfer torques, *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 174427 (2020).
- [33] S.-K. Kim, Micromagnetic computer simulations of spin waves in nanometre-scale patterned magnetic elements, *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* **43**, 264004 (2010).
- [34] A. Suresh, U. Bajpai, M. D. Petrović, H. Yang, and B. K. Nikolić, Magnon- versus electron-mediated spin-transfer torque exerted by spin current across an antiferromagnetic insulator to switch the magnetization of an adjacent ferromagnetic metal, *Phys. Rev. Applied* **15**, 034089 (2021).
- [35] R. Wieser, Description of a dissipative quantum spin dynamics with a Landau-Lifshitz/Gilbert like damping and complete derivation of the classical Landau-Lifshitz equation, *EPJ B* **88**, 77 (2015).
- [36] J. Gauyacq and N. Lorente, Classical limit of a quantum nano-magnet in an anisotropic environment, *Surf. Sci.* **630**, 325 (2014).
- [37] J. B. Parkinson, J. C. Bonner, G. Müller, M. P. Nightingale, and H. W. J. Blöte, Heisenberg spin chains: Quantum-classical crossover and the haldane conjecture, *J. Appl. Phys.* **57**, 3319 (1985).
- [38] E. Kaxiras and J. D. Joannopoulos, *Quantum theory of materials* (Cambridge University Press, 2019).
- [39] P. Mondal, A. Suresh, and B. K. Nikolić, When can localized spins interacting with conduction electrons in ferro- or antiferromagnets be described classically via the Landau-Lifshitz equation: Transition from quantum many-body entangled to quantum-classical nonequilibrium states, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 214401 (2021).
- [40] K.-H. Wu, T.-C. Lu, C.-M. Chung, Y.-J. Kao, and T. Grover, Entanglement Renyi negativity across a finite temperature transition: A Monte Carlo study, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 140603 (2020).
- [41] A. Elben, R. Kueng, H.-Y. Huang, R. van Bijnen, C. Kokail, M. Dalmonte, P. Calabrese, B. Kraus, J. Preskill, P. Zoller, and B. Vermersch, Mixed-state entanglement from local randomized measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 200501 (2020).
- [42] S. Sang, Y. Li, T. Zhou, X. Chen, T. H. Hsieh, and

- M. P. Fisher, Entanglement negativity at measurement-induced criticality, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030313 (2021).
- [43] A. Norambuena, A. Franco, and R. Coto, From the open generalized Heisenberg model to the Landau–Lifshitz equation, *New J. Phys.* **22**, 103029 (2020).
- [44] M. D. Petrović, P. Mondal, A. E. Feiguin, P. Plecháč, and B. K. Nikolić, Spintronics meets density matrix renormalization group: Quantum spin-torque-driven nonclassical magnetization reversal and dynamical buildup of long-range entanglement, *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 021062 (2021).
- [45] E. Stoudenmire and S. R. White, Studying two-dimensional systems with the density matrix renormalization group, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **3**, 111 (2012).
- [46] M. I. Katsnelson, V. V. Dobrovitski, and B. N. Harmon, Néel state of an antiferromagnet as a result of a local measurement in the distributed quantum system, *Phys. Rev. B* **63**, 212404 (2001).
- [47] H. C. Donker, H. De Raedt, and M. I. Katsnelson, Decoherence wave in magnetic systems and creation of Néel antiferromagnetic state by measurement, *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 184426 (2016).
- [48] H. C. Donker, H. De Raedt, and M. I. Katsnelson, Antiferromagnetic order without recourse to staggered fields, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 014416 (2018).
- [49] M. Weber, D. J. Luitz, and F. F. Assaad, Dissipation-induced order: The $s = 1/2$ quantum spin chain coupled to an Ohmic bath, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 056402 (2022).
- [50] G. Schaller, F. Queisser, N. Szpak, J. König, and R. Schützhold, Environment-induced decay dynamics of antiferromagnetic order in Mott-Hubbard systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 115139 (2022).
- [51] G. Lindblad, On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **48**, 119 (1976).
- [52] D. Manzano, A short introduction to the Lindblad master equation, *AIP Adv.* **10**, 025106 (2020).
- [53] G. Schaller, *Open Quantum Systems Far from Equilibrium* (Springer International Publishing, 2014).
- [54] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press/Oxford, 2007).
- [55] F. Nathan and M. S. Rudner, Universal Lindblad equation for open quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 115109 (2020).
- [56] G. B. Cuetara, M. Esposito, and G. Schaller, Quantum thermodynamics with degenerate eigenstate coherences, *Entropy* **18**, 447 (2016).
- [57] E. Mozgunov and D. Lidar, Completely positive master equation for arbitrary driving and small level spacing, *Quantum* **4**, 227 (2020).
- [58] G. McCauley, B. Cruikshank, D. I. Bondar, and K. Jacobs, Accurate Lindblad-form master equation for weakly damped quantum systems across all regimes, *Npj Quantum Inf.* **6**, 74 (2020).
- [59] G. T. Landi, D. Poletti, and G. Schaller, Nonequilibrium boundary-driven quantum systems: Models, methods, and properties, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **94**, 045006 (2022).
- [60] A. Nazir and G. Schaller, The reaction coordinate mapping in quantum thermodynamics, in *Thermodynamics in the Quantum Regime: Fundamental Aspects and New Directions*, edited by F. Binder, L. A. Correa, C. Gogolin, J. Anders, and G. Adesso (Springer International Publishing, 2018) pp. 551–577.
- [61] N. Anto-Sztrikacs and D. Segal, Strong coupling effects in quantum thermal transport with the reaction coordinate method, *New J. Phys.* **23**, 063036 (2021).
- [62] I. de Vega and D. Alonso, Dynamics of non-Markovian open quantum systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 015001 (2017).
- [63] See Supplemental Material at <https://wiki.physics.udel.edu/qttg/Publications> for counterpart of Figs. 1 and 2 but considering spin $S = 1$ localized moments within either FI or AFI.
- [64] N. Friis, G. Vitagliano, M. Malik, and M. Huber, Entanglement certification from theory to experiment, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **1**, 72 (2018).