## arXiv:2403.08476v1 [quant-ph] 13 Mar 2024

## Emergent Continuous Time Crystal in Dissipative Quantum Spin System without Driving

Shu Yang,<sup>1</sup> Zeqing Wang,<sup>3,2</sup> Libin Fu,<sup>1,\*</sup> and Jianwen Jie<sup>2,4,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Graduate School of China Academy of Engineering Physics, Beijing 100193, China

<sup>2</sup>Shenzhen Key Laboratory of Ultraintense Laser and Advanced Material Technology,

Center for Intense Laser Application Technology, and College of Engineering Physics,

<sup>3</sup>Department of Physics, Renmin University of China, Beijing 100872, China

<sup>4</sup> Quantum Science Center of Guangdong-Hongkong-Macao Greater Bay Area (Guangdong), Shenzhen 518045, China

(Dated: March 14, 2024)

Time crystal, a nonequilibrium phenomenon extending spontaneous symmetry breaking into the temporal dimension, holds fundamental significance in understanding quantum many-body physics. In this work, we explore the nonequilibrium phase diagram of a two-dimensional dissipative Heisenberg spin system in the absence of explicit driving. We numerically identify the emergence of novel nonstationary oscillatory states by analyzing the spin dynamics. These states are categorized as limit cycle and chaos based on the Lyapunov exponent. Remarkably, the observed limit cycle behavior represents a continuous time crystal (CTC), spontaneously breaking the continuous time translation symmetry of the system. We further confirm those oscillatory behaviors by studying the stability against local perturbations applied to the system. Finally, we investigate the robustness of the emergent CTC by introducing isotropic Gaussian-type white noise into the interactions. This study provides many insights into the intricate interplay between dissipation-induced decay processes and interaction-induced spin precession, deepening our understanding of dissipative quantum many-body systems.

Introduction. — Time crystal (TC) is originally proposed by Frank Wilczek to spontaneously break the time translation symmetry (TTS) in ground state or equilibrium state [1-4]. Although this idea were negated by a series of rigorous no-go theorems [5-7], ruling out TC in closed quantum systems with only short-range interactions [8], the introduction of time-dependent periodic driving has enabled the realization of discrete TTS breaking [9–11]. This phenomenon, known as Floquet TC or discrete time crystal (DTC) [12–20], is characterized by subharmonic responses to the driving frequency and has been experimentally demonstrated in various systems [21-23] such as trapped-ions [24, 25] and superconducting qubits [26]. Its key challenge remains the heatinginduced limited lifetime, despite mechanisms [25, 27–30] such as many-body localization [26, 31], prethermalization [25, 27–30], and dissipation [19, 27] were proposed to slow down the thermalization.

Dissipation has been demonstrated to serve as a resource for performing quantum tasks [32–38]. For instance, by competently designing dissipation to compete with coherent driving, one can achieve dissipative TCs [39, 40]. This driven-dissipation setup can spontaneously break discrete TTS, resulting in dissipative DTC [40–44]. Eliminating the time-dependent aspect of the driving in a suitable rotating frame leads to the spontaneously breaking of continuous TTS, yielding continuous TC (CTC) [45–52]. These dissipative TCs have been experimentally observed in various systems [53–61]. Perfect TC should exhibit infinite lifetime [62–65], representing with a robust neverending oscillatory (OSC) state. This mathematically corresponds to a stable closed trajectory in phase space, defined as limit cycle (LC), a core element in nonlinear dynamical phenomenons [66], such as grid power [67], circadian clocks [68], and quantum synchronization [69–76]. The quest for novel nonequilibrium states and phases [77–102] that include OSC phases [93– 102] is a fundamentally important task in physics predating TCs.

External driving not only adds complexity to the real system but also raises concerns about heating, posing a challenge in finding methods to prevent the system from heating to infinite temperatures as the driving strength increases. Moreover, the presence of driving makes it difficult to discern the contributions of other factors, such as interaction and dissipation, to the OSC behavior. However, nearly all the systems exhibiting LC or TC behavior so far are subjected to external driving, whether it be Floquet-driven or driven-dissipation scenarios 9–19, 21– 31, 39–61]. Therefore, a fundamental question arises: Can a purely dissipative quantum system, namely one without external driving, exhibits OSC behaviors? If so, would these oscillations be considered TCs? Affirmative answers to these questions would open possibilities in realizing dissipation-induced, heating-immunity TCs.

We address this question by theoretically uncovering the nonequilibrium steady-state phase diagram of a dissipative Heisenberg spin system, specifically one without external driving. We showcase the emergent of LC and chaotic steady-states, supported by spin dynamics and linear stability analysis under local perturbations. The LC is qualified as a CTC by examining its rigidity against noises applied to interactions in the thermodynamic limit.

Shenzhen Technology University, Shenzhen 518118, China



FIG. 1. (a) Illustrating a single spin's dissipation-induced decay process and the interaction-induced precession along the effective local magnetic field. (b) The periodic oscillation, i.e., CTC, one possible competing result in (a). (c) Dividing the system into clusters of size  $3 \times 3$ , each spin is indexed with number  $n \in [1, 9]$ .

System. — We consider a dissipative interacting system described by the Lindblad master equation  $(\hbar = 1)$ ,

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}(t)}{dt} = -i\left[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}(t)\right] + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n}\mathcal{D}_{n}[\hat{\rho}(t)], \qquad (1)$$

where  $\hat{H}$  is the Hamiltonian governing system's unitary evolution. Dissipation breaks system's time reversibility and leads it to the inevitable fate characterized by the steady state  $\hat{\rho}_{ss} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \hat{\rho}(t)$  [78].

We consider Hamiltonian as a paradigmatic spin-1/2 Heisenberg XYZ model,

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\langle mn \rangle} \hat{V}_{mn} = \sum_{\langle mn \rangle} \frac{1}{2d} \sum_{\alpha = x, y, z} J_{\alpha} \hat{\sigma}_{m}^{\alpha} \hat{\sigma}_{n}^{\alpha}, \qquad (2)$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_n^{\alpha}$  is the Pauli operator for *n*th spin and all the spins are localized in a *d*-dimensional cubic lattice. The nearest-neighbor spin pairs, denoting by  $\langle mn \rangle$ , are anisotropic interacting with strength  $J_{\alpha}$ . Each spin is subject to spontaneous decay process governed by

$$\mathcal{D}_n[\hat{\rho}] = \Gamma\left(\hat{\sigma}_n^- \hat{\rho}\hat{\sigma}_n^+ - \{\hat{\sigma}_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_n^-, \hat{\rho}\}/2\right),\tag{3}$$

that flips the spin down at strength  $\Gamma$  with  $\hat{\sigma}_n^{\pm} = (\hat{\sigma}_n^x \pm i\hat{\sigma}_n^y)/2$ . These considered single-site dissipations break the relevant symmetries of system which results in the uniqueness of steady state [103–107].

The Hamiltonian in Eq. (2) indicates that *n*th spin experiences an effective magnetic field, defined as  $\vec{B}_n^{\text{eff}} = \sum_{\langle mn \rangle} (J_x \langle \hat{\sigma}_m^x \rangle, J_y \langle \hat{\sigma}_m^y \rangle, J_z \langle \hat{\sigma}_m^z \rangle)$ , originating from interactions with surrounding spins, as shown in Fig. 1(a). The spin precession around this magnetic field competes with the decay process described in Eq. (3), leading to the emergent of various ordered nonequilibrium steady states. If one state supports a local observable  $\hat{O}$  to exhibit infinitely long-lived robust periodic oscillation in the thermodynamic limit, denoted by  $\lim_{N\to\infty} \langle \hat{O}\hat{\rho}_{ss}(t \gg 1) \rangle = O(t)$  with the system size N, which means that the continuous TTS of system is spontaneously broken, giving rise to a CTC [7, 11, 52, 108], as illustrated in Fig. 1(b). To explore the rich nonequilibrium phases under fully thermodynamic limit [83], we work at mean-field level in this study.

Mean-field phase diagram.— To maintain generality and account for the inaccuracies of mean-field theory in one dimension [82, 83], we explore ordered phases in two dimension by using a  $3 \times 3$  sublattices, namely cluster with size  $N_C = 9$ , as illustrated in Fig. 1(c). In other words, we rewrite density matrix as  $\hat{\rho} \approx \hat{\rho}_C \otimes \hat{\rho}_C \otimes \hat{\rho}_C \cdots$ with  $\hat{\rho}_C = \bigotimes_{n=1}^{N_c} \hat{\rho}_n$ , and therefore Eq. (1) is transformed into a set of  $3N_C$  coupled nonlinear Bloch equations,

$$\frac{d\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{x}\rangle}{dt} = -\frac{\Gamma}{2}\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{x}\rangle + \sum_{m} \frac{J_{y}\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{z}\rangle\langle\hat{\sigma}_{m}^{y}\rangle - J_{z}\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{y}\rangle\langle\hat{\sigma}_{m}^{z}\rangle}{d},$$

$$\frac{d\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{y}\rangle}{dt} = -\frac{\Gamma}{2}\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{y}\rangle + \sum_{m} \frac{J_{z}\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{x}\rangle\langle\hat{\sigma}_{m}^{z}\rangle - J_{x}\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{z}\rangle\langle\hat{\sigma}_{m}^{x}\rangle}{d}, \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{d\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{z}\rangle}{dt} = -\Gamma(\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{z}\rangle + 1) + \sum_{m} \frac{J_{x}\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{y}\rangle\langle\hat{\sigma}_{m}^{x}\rangle - J_{y}\langle\hat{\sigma}_{n}^{x}\rangle\langle\hat{\sigma}_{m}^{y}\rangle}{d}$$

where n is took within one cluster C and the sum over m encompasses the nearest neighbors of nth spin.

The phase diagram is shown in Fig. 2(a), in addition to stationary ordered phases like paramagnetic (PM), ferromagnetic (FM), and spin-density-wave (SDW) phase found in [83], a novel nonstationary ordered OSC phase appears. The boundaries of these phases are numerically determined by spin dynamics. PM phase aligns all spins down, namely  $\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^{x(y)} \rangle = 0$ ,  $\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^z \rangle = -1$ , holding system's  $Z_2$  symmetry  $\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^x \to -\hat{\sigma}_n^x, \hat{\sigma}_n^y \to -\hat{\sigma}_n^y \rangle$ . A loyal supporter of PM is XXZ model, where the system has isotropic interactions in x-y plane, i.e.,  $J_x = J_y$ , that conserve magnetization, resulting nothing to counteract the dissipation induced spin downwards. When the applied interaction is sufficiently anisotropic for producing strong enough spin precession to balance the decay process, the  $Z_2$  symmetry of system is spontaneously broken, indicating a ferromagnetic (FM) phase with  $\langle \hat{\sigma}_n^{x(y)} \rangle \neq 0$ .

Unlike PM and FM, which are spatially uniform phases and can exist without dissipation [83, 109], SDW and OSC are spatially non-uniform state and alive only under nonequilibrium circumstances. For instance, SDW is a spatially modulated stationary state with a period greater than two lattice sites in at least one direction. The nonstationary OSC phase spontaneously breaks TTS and emerges inside SDW phase region, remarked with red color in Fig. 2(a). Those OSC phases can be further classified using Lyapunov exponent  $\lambda$  [110]. For example, as shown in Fig. 2(b), we present a detailed phase diagram of OSC phases with fixed  $J_y = 1.1$ , where the LC and chaos are respectively corresponding to  $\lambda = 0$ and  $\lambda > 0$  (find more details in [111]). In Fig. 2(c-e), we



FIG. 2. (a) Nonequilibrium phase diagram with  $J_z = \gamma = 1$ (b) Two OSC phases, limit-cycle (LC) and chaos, are distinguished by Lyapunov exponent  $\lambda$ , with  $J_y = 1.1$ . (c-e) The magnetization dynamic trajectories on y-z plane for spins with n = 1, 4, 7. As arrowed in (b), the demonstrated SDW (c), LC (d), and chaos (e) phases correspond to  $J_x = 5, 10$ and 15, respectively. The fixed-point fate of SDW is marked with square blocks.

demonstate the different dynamical behaviors of SDW, LC, and chaos phases by projecting the dynamic trajectories of magnetization onto the y-z plane of the Bloch sphere. The highlighted circle blocks correspond to the initial states  $|\psi_n(t=0)\rangle = (|\uparrow\rangle + e^{in\pi/9} |\downarrow\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  for the spins with n = 1, 4, 7 as labeled in Fig. 1(c). The dynamical behaviors of magnetization  $\langle \hat{\sigma}_{n=1,4,7}^{\alpha=y,z} \rangle$  illustrates that the stationary SDW phase corresponds to fixed-points, while either LC attractor or chaotic behavior are observed in the nonstationary OSC phase. The emergent LCs in the thermodynamic limit represent stable periodic oscillations that spontaneously break the continuous TTS, fulfilling the aforementioned definition of CTC.

We summarize the main reasons for the emergence of CTC: (1) Generally, achieving nonstataionary steady states requires mechanism about energy gain and loss to sustain nonconservative OSC behavior. In the drivendissipation setup, the driven and dissipation can respectively serve as energy gain and loss. Without driving, if the applied dissipation solely reduces the system's energy, such as photon leakage from a cavity causing irreversible energy loss, the system would decay to a trivial steady state [53–58, 77]. In our scenario, the dissipation is an incoherent spin flip-down process, playing both roles of energy gain and loss. For instance, in SDW states, the system absorbs (releases) energy when flipping down the spins that should be oriented upwards (downwards); (2) Uncovering spatially uniform phases such as PM and FM



FIG. 3. (a-b) The real and imaginary parts of the first two eigenvalues  $\lambda_1$  (triangles) and  $\lambda_2$  (circles) of the Jacobian  $\mathcal{M}$  with fixed  $J_x = 5.9, J_z = \gamma = 1$ . (c-d) The dynamics of  $\langle \hat{\sigma}^y \rangle$ . The dashed lines highlight zero values. (a-b) share the same *x*-axis and (c-d) share the same *y*-axis.

actually only requires  $N_C = 1$  in solving Eq. (4). However, for SDW and OSC, the number of spin greater than two is required in at least one direction within a cluster. Thus assuming a sufficiently large cluster size is crucial for obtaining a broader range of possible states; (3) Nontrivial ordered states are achievable only with sufficiently strong anisotropic interaction, allowing spin precession to resist decay process. Therefore, the considered parameter range must be large enough.

Linear stability analysis. — To further confirm the time-dependent nonequilibrium phase, we introduce the small local perturbations  $\delta \hat{\rho}_C$  to the fixed-point solution  $\hat{\rho}_{C}^{(0)}$  of Eq. (4), which is numerically obtained by setting the left side of Eq. (4) to zero. The characteristic motion equation for  $\delta \hat{\rho}_C$  is derived by linearizing the system and denoted as  $\partial_t \delta \hat{\rho}_C = \mathcal{M}[\delta \hat{\rho}_C]$ , where the superoperator  $\mathcal{M}$  is referred as Jacobian. Therefore, the dynamical behavior of local perturbations can be expressed as  $\delta \hat{\rho}_C = \sum_j c_j e^{\lambda_j t} \delta \hat{\rho}_{C,j}$ , where  $c_j$  and  $\lambda_j$  are respectively the superposition coefficient and eigenvalue corresponding to the *j*-th eigenmode  $\delta \hat{\rho}_{C,j}$  of Jacobian. Here eigenvalues are indexed in descending order of their real parts as  $\operatorname{Re}[\lambda_1] \geq \operatorname{Re}[\lambda_2] \geq \cdots$ . Therefore, when all eigenvalues have negative real parts,  $\delta \hat{\rho}_C$  would decay to zero over the system's relaxation time, indicating that the fixedpoint solution  $\hat{\rho}_C^{(0)}$  is the steady state. The appearance of eigenvalues with positive real parts results in the exponentially growth of the local perturbations  $\delta \hat{\rho}_C$ , reveals that the fixed-point solution  $\hat{\rho}_C^{(0)}$  is a metastable state. Interestingly, the system will evolve to a time-dependent steady state if the imaginary parts are nonzero.



FIG. 4. (a-b) The quiet CTC built without noise (stage I) is pertubated with the segmented weak (stage II) and strong nosises (stage III) at  $\Gamma t = 200$  and 400 respectively. The noise strengths  $\beta_I = 0$ ,  $\beta_{II} = 0.04$ ,  $\beta_{III} = 0.2$  are indicated in (d). (c) shows the Fouerier spectrum of the selected arrowed regions in (b), with the zoom-in inset. (d) Relative crystalline fraction  $\Omega$  for varying noise strength  $\beta$ . Here the initial state is same as the one used in Fig. 2(c-e), and the undisturbed interaction strengths are  $J_x = 7$ ,  $J_y = 1.5$ ,  $J_z = 1$ . (a) and (b) share the *x*-axis.

Figure 3(a-b) respectively shows the real and imaginary parts of the first two eigenvalues  $\lambda_1$  (triangles) and  $\lambda_2$  (circles) of the Jacobian  $\mathcal{M}$ . The phase boundaries of the SDW-OSC phases,  $J_y = 1.098$  and  $J_y = 1.366$ , corresponding to the points when the real parts of eigenvalues switch signs, agrees to that in Fig. 2(a). The imaginary parts consistently manifest as non-zero conjugate pairs, suggesting that by selecting an appropriate initial state, the system will: 1) undergo evolution into the time-independent steady state with oscillatory decay behavior in the SDW phase; 2) potentially pass through a metastable state before transitioning into a limit cycle state in the OSC phase. Those behaviors are respectively illustrated in Fig. 3(c-d) by the average magnetization of one cluster,  $\langle \hat{\sigma}^{\alpha=x,y,z} \rangle =$  $\sum_{n \in C} \langle \hat{\sigma}_n^{\alpha=x,y,z} \rangle / N_C \text{ with initial state } |\psi_n(t=0)\rangle =$  $(|\uparrow\rangle + \sqrt{99}e^{i(\operatorname{row}[n] + \operatorname{column}[n])\pi/3} |\downarrow\rangle)/10$ .

Rigidity of continuous time crystal. — The rigidity of a CTC requirs its periodic OSC behavior exhibits strong robustness against fluctuations of system parameters. Without loss of generality, we consider noisy interactions given by  $\tilde{J}_{\alpha}(t) = J_{\alpha} + \xi_{\beta}(t)$ , where  $\xi_{\beta}(t)$  represents isotropic Gaussian-type white noise and its standard deviation  $\beta$  acts as intensity [111]. In Fig. 4(a), we design three stages of time-dependent interactions for showing the robustness of a CTC, the corresponding dy-

namical behaviors is displayed in Fig. 4(b) with  $\langle \hat{\sigma}^x \rangle$ , whose Fourier spectrums  $\langle \hat{\sigma}^x \rangle(\omega)$  for the selected regions that away from relaxing processes are shown in Fig. 4(c). Without noise (stage I), the system relaxes to a LC-type oscillation, the Fourier spectrum of which features a discernible sharp dominant peak at  $\omega = \omega_p = 0.18$  and a tiny peak at  $\omega \approx 3\omega_p$ , indicating the emergent of a prototypical CTC. Then we perturb the CTC by the weak noise with strength  $\beta = 0.04$  at stage II. This perturbation has nearly no effect on the main peak and it only introduces some weak higher-frequency components in Fourier spectrum as illustrated in the inset of Fig. 4(c), indicating that the CTC is still thriving. Finally, we quench the system to a much stronger white noise with strength  $\beta = 0.2$  at stage III. The regular periodic oscillations are significantly altered and the  $\omega_p$  component is no longer the prominent principal peak, and numerous other frequency components appear. Consequently, the CTC is softened under this strong noise.

Furthermore, we define the relative crystalline fraction (RCF),  $\Omega_{\rm RCF} = \Omega_{\rm noise}/\Omega_{\rm quite}$ , to quantify the rigidity of CTC, where the crystalline fraction is defined as  $\Omega = \sum_{\omega \in [\omega_p - \delta \omega, \omega_p + \delta \omega]} \langle \hat{\sigma}^x \rangle (\omega) / \sum_{\omega \in [0, \Delta \omega]} \langle \hat{\sigma}^x_{\rm quiet} \rangle (\omega)$ , with the principal frequency  $\omega_p$  for quiet case. We take  $\delta \omega = 0.08$  and  $\Delta \omega = 0.6$  in our calculations. The RCFs for three stages are respectively  $\Omega_{\rm I} = 1$ ,  $\Omega_{\rm II} = 0.89$ , and  $\Omega_{\rm III} = 0.53$  as remarked in Fig. 4(d), where illustrates how the CTC melts as noise strength increases. The CTC's RCF decreases with increasing noise and stabilizes at the dashed gray line, indicating that even in the presence of strong noise, the system's OSC behavior still may retain some information about the CTC.

Discussions.— We have proposed a CTC mechanism resulting from the competition between dissipationinduced decay and interaction-induced spin precession. In the past, the general understanding of CTCs mainly focused on the interaction of dissipation-induced decay and driving-induced quantum coherence, but paid less attention to the role of interaction. Thus, this is a completely new ergodic-breaking mechanism in which interactions play a crucial role. Since there is no external drive, the realized CTC is not subject to heating, so its lifetime can be as long as the system's lifetime.

This work paves the future explorations of CTCs that is immune to heating in other systems, including Hubbard model [94, 95] and Rydberg model [93, 98, 112, 113] using the methods introduced here and other numerical methods [82, 114–117] involving quantum fluctuations and correlations. The proposed CTC can be experimentally realized in various platforms such as trapped ions [24, 75, 76, 118–120], providing further motivation to employ dissipations as resources for exploring nonequilibrium quantum dynamics, like quantum synchronization. The existence of LC and chaotic phases opens a pathway to investigate reversible to irreversible transitions [121] in dissipative quantum systems. We thank Ran Qi, Qingze Guan, Zhiyuan Sun, Jiansong Pan, Jin Zhang and Weidong Li for valuable discussions. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12104210, 12088101 and U2330401) and the Natural Science Foundation of Top Talent of SZTU (GDRC202202, GDRC202312).

- \* lbfu@gscaep.ac.cn
- <sup>†</sup> Jianwen.Jie1990@gmail.com
- A. Shapere and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 160402 (2012).
- [2] F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 160401 (2012).
- [3] T. Li, Z.-X. Gong, Z.-Q. Yin, H. T. Quan, X. Yin, P. Zhang, L.-M. Duan, and X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 163001 (2012).
- [4] J. Zakrzewski, Physics **116** (2012).
- [5] P. Bruno, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 070402 (2013).
- [6] P. Nozières, Europhysics Letters 103, 57008 (2013).
- [7] H. Watanabe and M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114, 251603 (2015).
- [8] V. K. Kozin and O. Kyriienko, Phys. Rev. Lett. 123, 210602 (2019).
- [9] K. Sacha, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 033617 (2015).
- [10] V. Khemani, A. Lazarides, R. Moessner, and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 250401 (2016).
- [11] C. W. von Keyserlingk, V. Khemani, and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. B 94, 085112 (2016).
- [12] D. V. Else, B. Bauer, and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 090402 (2016).
- [13] N. Y. Yao, A. C. Potter, I.-D. Potirniche, and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. Lett. 118, 030401 (2017).
- [14] P. Richerme, Physics **10** (2017).
- [15] A. Russomanno, F. Iemini, M. Dalmonte, and R. Fazio, Phys. Rev. B 95, 214307 (2017).
- [16] F. M. Surace, A. Russomanno, M. Dalmonte, A. Silva, R. Fazio, and F. Iemini, Phys. Rev. B 99, 104303 (2019).
- [17] A. Sakurai, V. M. Bastidas, W. J. Munro, and K. Nemoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 120606 (2021).
- [18] S. Pal, N. Nishad, T. S. Mahesh, and G. J. Sreejith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 180602 (2018).
- [19] D. V. Else, C. Monroe, C. Nayak, and N. Y. Yao, Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics 11, 467 (2020).
- [20] P. Xu and T.-S. Deng, Phys. Rev. B 107, 104301 (2023).
- [21] J. Rovny, R. L. Blum, and S. E. Barrett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 180603 (2018).
- [22] J. Rovny, R. L. Blum, and S. E. Barrett, Phys. Rev. B 97, 184301 (2018).
- [23] S. Choi, J. Choi, R. Landig, G. Kucsko, H. Zhou, J. Isoya, F. Jelezko, S. Onoda, H. Sumiya, V. Khemani, *et al.*, Nature **543**, 221 (2017).
- [24] J. Zhang, P. W. Hess, A. Kyprianidis, P. Becker, A. Lee, J. Smith, G. Pagano, I.-D. Potirniche, A. C. Potter, A. Vishwanath, et al., Nature 543, 217 (2017).
- [25] 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 372,

1192 (2021).

- [26] 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).
- [27] D. V. Else, B. Bauer, and C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. X 7, 011026 (2017).
- [28] T. Mori, Phys. Rev. B 98, 104303 (2018).
- [29] B. Ye, F. Machado, and N. Y. Yao, Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 140603 (2021).
- [30] A. Pizzi, A. Nunnenkamp, and J. Knolle, Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 140602 (2021).
- [31] J. Randall, C. E. Bradley, F. V. van der Gronden, A. Galicia, M. H. Abobeih, M. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, F. Machado, N. Y. Yao, and T. H. Taminiau, Science **374**, 1474 (2021).
- [32] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. Ignacio Cirac, Nature physics 5, 633 (2009).
- [33] J. F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 4728 (1996).
- [34] J. Preskill, arXiv:2208.08064.
- [35] Y. Lin, J. Gaebler, F. Reiter, T. R. Tan, R. Bowler, A. Sørensen, D. Leibfried, and D. J. Wineland, Nature 504, 415 (2013).
- [36] S. Shankar, M. Hatridge, Z. Leghtas, K. Sliwa, A. Narla, U. Vool, S. M. Girvin, L. Frunzio, M. Mirrahimi, and M. H. Devoret, Nature 504, 419 (2013).
- [37] P. Magnard, P. Kurpiers, B. Royer, T. Walter, J.-C. Besse, S. Gasparinetti, M. Pechal, J. Heinsoo, S. Storz, A. Blais, and A. Wallraff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 060502 (2018).
- [38] M. Malinowski, C. Zhang, V. Negnevitsky, I. Rojkov, F. Reiter, T.-L. Nguyen, M. Stadler, D. Kienzler, K. K. Mehta, and J. P. Home, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 080503 (2022).
- [39] Z. Gong and M. Ueda, Physics 14 (2021).
- [40] Z. Gong, R. Hamazaki, and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, 040404 (2018).
- [41] B. Zhu, J. Marino, N. Y. Yao, M. D. Lukin, and E. A. Demler, New Journal of Physics 21, 073028 (2019).
- [42] A. Lazarides, S. Roy, F. Piazza, and R. Moessner, Phys. Rev. Res. 2, 022002(R) (2020).
- [43] A. Riera-Campeny, M. Moreno-Cardoner, and A. Sanpera, Quantum 4, 270 (2020).
- [44] A. Sakurai, V. M. Bastidas, M. P. Estarellas, W. J. Munro, and K. Nemoto, Phys. Rev. B 104, 054304 (2021).
- [45] M. Hajdušek, P. Solanki, R. Fazio, and S. Vinjanampathy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 128, 080603 (2022).
- [46] M. Krishna, P. Solanki, M. Hajdušek, and S. Vinjanampathy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 130, 150401 (2023).
- [47] H. Keßler, J. G. Cosme, M. Hemmerling, L. Mathey, and A. Hemmerich, Phys. Rev. A 99, 053605 (2019).
- [48] K. Tucker, B. Zhu, R. J. Lewis-Swan, J. Marino, F. Jimenez, J. G. Restrepo, and A. M. Rey, New Journal of Physics 20, 123003 (2018).
- [49] C. Lledó, T. K. Mavrogordatos, and M. H. Szymańska, Phys. Rev. B 100, 054303 (2019).
- [50] K. Seibold, R. Rota, and V. Savona, Phys. Rev. A 101, 033839 (2020).
- [51] L. F. d. Prazeres, L. d. S. Souza, and F. Iemini, Phys. Rev. B 103, 184308 (2021).
- [52] F. Iemini, A. Russomanno, J. Keeling, M. Schirò, M. Dalmonte, and R. Fazio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 035301 (2018).

- [53] H. Keßler, P. Kongkhambut, C. Georges, L. Mathey, J. G. Cosme, and A. Hemmerich, Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 043602 (2021).
- [54] P. Kongkhambut, H. Keßler, J. Skulte, L. Mathey, J. G. Cosme, and A. Hemmerich, Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 253601 (2021).
- [55] P. Kongkhambut, J. Skulte, L. Mathey, J. G. Cosme, A. Hemmerich, and H. Keßler, Science **377**, 670 (2022).
- [56] N. Dogra, M. Landini, K. Kroeger, L. Hruby, T. Donner, and T. Esslinger, Science 366, 1496 (2019).
- [57] P. Zupancic, D. Dreon, X. Li, A. Baumgärtner, A. Morales, W. Zheng, N. R. Cooper, T. Esslinger, and T. Donner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 233601 (2019).
- [58] D. Dreon, A. Baumgärtner, X. Li, S. Hertlein, T. Esslinger, and T. Donner, Nature 608, 494 (2022).
- [59] H. Taheri, A. B. Matsko, L. Maleki, and K. Sacha, Nature communications 13, 848 (2022).
- [60] S. Autti, V. B. Eltsov, and G. E. Volovik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 215301 (2018).
- [61] A. J. E. Kreil, H. Y. Musiienko-Shmarova, S. Eggert, A. A. Serga, B. Hillebrands, D. A. Bozhko, A. Pomyalov, and V. S. L'vov, Phys. Rev. B 100, 020406(R) (2019).
- [62] K. Sacha and J. Zakrzewski, Reports on Progress in Physics 81, 016401 (2017).
- [63] V. Khemani, R. Moessner, and S. L. Sondhi, arXiv:1910.10745 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [64] L. Guo and P. Liang, New Journal of Physics 22, 075003 (2020).
- [65] M. P. Zaletel, M. Lukin, C. Monroe, C. Nayak, F. Wilczek, and N. Y. Yao, Rev. Mod. Phys. 95, 031001 (2023).
- [66] S. Strogatz, Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos: With Applications to Physics, Biology, Chemistry, and Engineering (CRC Press, 2018).
- [67] A. Kasis, N. Monshizadeh, and I. Lestas, Automatica 131, 109736 (2021).
- [68] D. Gonze, Open Life Sciences 6, 712 (2011).
- [69] N. Lörch, S. E. Nigg, A. Nunnenkamp, R. P. Tiwari, and C. Bruder, Phys. Rev. Lett. 118, 243602 (2017).
- [70] S. E. Nigg, Phys. Rev. A 97, 013811 (2018).
- [71] A. Roulet and C. Bruder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 053601 (2018).
- [72] M. Koppenhöfer and A. Roulet, Phys. Rev. A 99, 043804 (2019).
- [73] A. W. Laskar, P. Adhikary, S. Mondal, P. Katiyar, S. Vinjanampathy, and S. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. Lett. 125, 013601 (2020).
- [74] A. Parra-López and J. Bergli, Phys. Rev. A 101, 062104 (2020).
- [75] L. Zhang, Z. Wang, Y. Wang, J. Zhang, Z. Wu, J. Jie, and Y. Lu, Phys. Rev. Res. 5, 033209 (2023).
- [76] Z. Wang, R. Qi, Y. Lu, Z. Wu, and J. Jie, arXiv:2302.00976.
- [77] X. Nie and W. Zheng, Phys. Rev. A 107, 033311 (2023).
- [78] H. Breuer, F. Petruccione, and S. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002).
- [79] Á. Rivas and S. Huelga, *Open Quantum Systems: An Introduction*, SpringerBriefs in Physics (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011).
- [80] I. de Vega and D. Alonso, Rev. Mod. Phys. 89, 015001 (2017).

- [81] H. Weimer, A. Kshetrimayum, and R. Orús, Rev. Mod. Phys. 93, 015008 (2021).
- [82] J. Jin, A. Biella, O. Viyuela, L. Mazza, J. Keeling, R. Fazio, and D. Rossini, Phys. Rev. X 6, 031011 (2016).
- [83] T. E. Lee, S. Gopalakrishnan, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 257204 (2013).
- [84] J. Jin, D. Rossini, R. Fazio, M. Leib, and M. J. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 163605 (2013).
- [85] A. Le Boité, G. Orso, and C. Ciuti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 233601 (2013).
- [86] M. Fitzpatrick, N. M. Sundaresan, A. C. Y. Li, J. Koch, and A. A. Houck, Phys. Rev. X 7, 011016 (2017).
- [87] L. Song and J. Jin, Phys. Rev. B **108**, 054302 (2023).
- [88] Y. Zhang and T. Barthel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 129, 120401 (2022).
- [89] Z. Li, F. Claude, T. Boulier, E. Giacobino, Q. Glorieux, A. Bramati, and C. Ciuti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 128, 093601 (2022).
- [90] J. Kazemi and H. Weimer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 130, 163601 (2023).
- [91] Y. Li, X. Li, and J. Jin, Phys. Rev. A 107, 042205 (2023).
- [92] T. Haga, Phys. Rev. A 107, 052208 (2023).
- [93] T. E. Lee, H. Häffner, and M. C. Cross, Phys. Rev. A 84, 031402(R) (2011).
- [94] R. M. Wilson, K. W. Mahmud, A. Hu, A. V. Gorshkov, M. Hafezi, and M. Foss-Feig, Phys. Rev. A 94, 033801 (2016).
- [95] M. Schiró, C. Joshi, M. Bordyuh, R. Fazio, J. Keeling, and H. E. Türeci, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 143603 (2016).
- [96] C. D. Parmee and N. R. Cooper, Phys. Rev. A 97, 053616 (2018).
- [97] C. D. Parmee and N. R. Cooper, Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics 53, 135302 (2020).
- [98] J. Qian, G. Dong, L. Zhou, and W. Zhang, Phys. Rev. A 85, 065401 (2012).
- [99] E. T. Owen, J. Jin, D. Rossini, R. Fazio, and M. J. Hartmann, New Journal of Physics 20, 045004 (2018).
- [100] C.-K. Chan, T. E. Lee, and S. Gopalakrishnan, Phys. Rev. A 91, 051601(R) (2015).
- [101] X. Li, Y. Li, and J. Jin, Phys. Rev. A 107, 032219 (2023).
- [102] G. Passarelli, P. Lucignano, R. Fazio, and A. Russomanno, Phys. Rev. B 106, 224308 (2022).
- [103] D. E. Evans, Commun.Math. Phys. 54, 293 (1977).
- [104] A. Frigerio, Communications in Mathematical Physics 63, 269 (1978).
- [105] T. Prosen, Physica Scripta 86, 058511 (2012).
- [106] T. Prosen, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical 48, 373001 (2015).
- [107] S. G. Schirmer and X. Wang, Phys. Rev. A 81, 062306 (2010).
- [108] V. Khemani, C. W. von Keyserlingk, and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. B 96, 115127 (2017).
- [109] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- [110] I. I. Yusipov, O. S. Vershinina, S. Denisov, S. P. Kuznetsov, and M. V. Ivanchenko, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 29, 063130 (2019).
- [111] See Supplemental Material for details on (I) Calculation of Lyapunov exponent; (II) The robustness of CTC un-

der 1/f noise. The Supplemental Materials includes the references [110].

- [112] C. Nill, K. Brandner, B. Olmos, F. Carollo, and I. Lesanovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 243202 (2022).
- [113] J. Kazemi and H. Weimer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 130, 163601 (2023).
- [114] U. Schollwöck, Rev. Mod. Phys. 77, 259 (2005).
- [115] J. Cui, J. I. Cirac, and M. C. Bañuls, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114, 220601 (2015).
- [116] R. Rota, F. Minganti, C. Ciuti, and V. Savona, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 110405 (2019).
- [117] S. Finazzi, A. Le Boité, F. Storme, A. Baksic, and C. Ciuti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115, 080604 (2015).

- [118] S. Debnath, N. M. Linke, C. Figgatt, K. A. Landsman, K. Wright, and C. Monroe, Nature 536, 63 (2016).
- [119] F. Kranzl, S. Birnkammer, M. K. Joshi, A. Bastianello, R. Blatt, M. Knap, and C. F. Roos, Phys. Rev. X 13, 031017 (2023).
- [120] Y. Lu, S. Zhang, K. Zhang, W. Chen, Y. Shen, J. Zhang, J.-N. Zhang, and K. Kim, Nature 572, 363 (2019).
- [121] C. Reichhardt, I. Regev, K. Dahmen, S. Okuma, and C. J. O. Reichhardt, "Perspective on reversible to irreversible transitions in periodic driven many body systems and future directions for classical and quantum systems," arXiv:2211.03775.



FIG. S1. (color online) Time evolution of the distance  $\Delta(t)$  between the fiducial trajectory and auxiliary trajectory for chaotic phase. The black dashed horizontal line denotes the given threshold  $\Delta_{\text{max}} = 0.1$  for resetting the auxiliary trajectory (red dot-dashed vertical lines). Here  $J_x = 13$ ,  $J_y = 1.1$ ,  $J_z = \gamma = 1.0$ .

We employ the largest Lyapunov exponent (LE), a metric introduced in [110], to make discrimination between a limit cycle and chaos behavior. In analogy to the classical definition, we use two quantum trajectories, fiducial trajectory and auxiliary trajectory, to simulate the evolution of the system. Here the auxiliary trajectory is initialized as a normalized state but with a perturbation on the normalized initial fiducial state  $\psi_f^{\text{ini.}}$ , namely  $\psi_a^{\text{ini.}} = \psi_f^{\text{ini.}} + \varepsilon \psi_{\text{ran.}}$ with the random perturbative state  $\psi_{\text{ran.}}$  and  $\varepsilon \ll 1$ . The definition of the largest LE is based on the distance of these two trajectories and the distance is defined as difference between observables of these two trajectories. Here we choose the magnetization along y direction  $\overline{\sigma}^y(t) = \frac{1}{N_C} \sum_{n \in C} \langle \psi_n(t) | \hat{\sigma}^y(t) | \psi_n(t) \rangle$  as the observable. The initial distance  $\Delta(t=0) = |\overline{\sigma}_f^y(t=0) - \overline{\sigma}_a^y(t=0)|$  plays the reference during the time evolution. When the time-dependent distance  $\Delta(t) = |\overline{\sigma}_f^y(t) - \overline{\sigma}_a^y(t)|$  exceeds a given threshold  $\Delta_{\max}$  at a time  $t_k$ ,  $\Delta(t_k)$  is reset to the initial distance  $\Delta(t=0)$  through renormalizing the auxiliary trajectory close to the fiducial trajectory. Finally, the largest LE is given by

$$\lambda = \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k} \ln d_k, \tag{S1}$$

where k indexes each time point that the threshold  $\Delta_{\max}$  is touched and  $d_k = \Delta(t_k)/\Delta_0$ . The fact that auxiliary trajectory respectively tends to being attracted to the fiducial state in the limit cycle case and tends to away from the fiducial state in the chaos behavior, results in vanished LE  $\lambda = 0$  and nonezero LE  $\lambda \neq 0$  for limit cycle and chaos behavior respectively.

As shown in Fig. S1, here we consider the parameters as  $J_x = 13$ ,  $J_y = 1.1$ ,  $J_z = \gamma = 1.0$ , corresponding to the chaotic phase in the Figure 2(b) of the main text. It can be observed that the dynamical distance  $\Delta$  frequently touches the set threshold distance  $\Delta_{\text{max}}$  during the evolution, indicating the non-zero LE  $\lambda = 0.1$  for the corresponding chaotic scenario.



FIG. S2. (color online) The robustness against 1/f noise in interactions. (a-b) The CTC built without noise (stage I) is pertubated with the segmented weak (stage II) and strong noises (stage III) at  $\Gamma t = 200$  and 400 respectively. The noise strengths  $\beta_I = 0$ ,  $\beta_{II} = 0.04$ ,  $\beta_{III} = 0.2$  are indicated in (d). (c) shows the Fouerier spectrum of the selected arrowed regions in (b), with the zoom-in inset. (d) Relative crystalline fraction  $\Omega$  for varying noise strength  $\beta$ . Here the initial state is same as the one used in Fig. 2(c-e), and the undisturbed interaction strengths are  $J_x = 7$ ,  $J_y = 1.5$ ,  $J_z = 1$ . (a) and (b) share the *x*-axis.

1/f noise, often referred to as flicker noise or pink noise, represents a specific type of noise marked by a frequency spectrum that diminishes with increasing frequency. To clarify, the power spectral density of 1/f noise follows an inverse proportionality to the frequency, resulting in a higher concentration of power at lower frequencies. Here we consider the robustness of CTC under 1/f noise. The noisy interaction is given by  $\tilde{J}_{\alpha}(t) = J_{\alpha} + \xi_{\beta}(t)$ , where  $\xi_{\beta}(t)$ represents 1/f noise and its standard deviation  $\beta$  acts as intensity.

Similar to the consideration of isotropic Gaussian-type white noise shown in Fig. 4 in the main text, here we show the results in Fig. S2. Three stages of time-dependent interactions with 1/f noise are shown in Fig. S2(a) and the corresponding dynamical behaviors is displayed in Fig. S2(b) with  $\langle \hat{\sigma}^x \rangle$ , whose Fourier spectrums for the selected regions that away from relaxing processes are shown in Fig. S2(c). Without noise (stage I), the system relaxes to a LC-type oscillation, the Fourier spectrum of which features a discernible sharp dominant peak at  $\omega = \omega_p = 0.18$  and a tiny peak at  $\omega \approx 3\omega_p$ , indicating the emergent of a prototypical CTC. Then we perturb the CTC by introducing the weak 1/f noise with strength  $\beta = 0.04$  at  $\Gamma t = 200$  (stage II), this perturbation slightly shift the dominant peak to the low frequency regime and introduces some weak higher-frequency components into the OSC behavior as illustrated in the inset of Fig. S2(c), indicating that the CTC is still well alived. Finally, we quench the 1/f noise to a much stronger one with strength  $\beta = 0.2$  at  $\Gamma t = 400$  (stage III), which significantly alters the regular periodic oscillations. Interestingly, Although the amplitudes of the oscillating is changed significantly, but the prominent principal peak of frequency spectrum is not shifted a lot. Figure S2(d) shows the relative crystalline fraction (RCF). The RCFs for three stages are respectively  $\Omega_{I} = 1$ ,  $\Omega_{II} = 0.94$ , and  $\Omega_{III} = 0.68$  as remarked in Fig. S2(d), where illustrates how the CTC melts as noise strength increases. The CTC's RCF decreases with increasing noise and stabilizes at the dashed gray line, indicating that even in the presence of strong noise, the system's OSC behavior still may retain some information about the CTC.