

Quantum thermodynamics of nonequilibrium processes in lattice gauge theories

Zohreh Davoudi,^{1,2,3,4,*} Christopher Jarzynski,^{5,6,1,4,†} Niklas Mueller,^{7,‡}
Greeshma Oruganti,^{6,4,§} Connor Powers,^{1,2,3,4,¶} and Nicole Yunger Halpern^{3,6,4,**}

¹*Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 USA*

²*Maryland Center for Fundamental Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA*

³*Joint Center for Quantum Information and Computer Science,
NIST and University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 USA*

⁴*The NSF Institute for Robust Quantum Simulation,
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA*

⁵*Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 USA*

⁶*Institute for Physical Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA*

⁷*InQubator for Quantum Simulation (IQuS), Department of Physics,
University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA*

A key objective in nuclear and high-energy physics is to describe nonequilibrium dynamics of matter, e.g., in the early universe and in particle colliders, starting from the Standard Model. Classical-computing methods, via the framework of lattice gauge theory, have experienced limited success in this mission. Quantum simulation of lattice gauge theories holds promise for overcoming computational limitations. Because of local constraints (Gauss’s laws), lattice gauge theories have an intricate Hilbert-space structure. This structure complicates the definition of thermodynamic properties of systems coupled to reservoirs during equilibrium and nonequilibrium processes. We show how to define thermodynamic quantities such as work and heat using strong-coupling thermodynamics, a framework that has recently burgeoned within the field of quantum thermodynamics. Our definitions suit instantaneous quenches, simple nonequilibrium processes undertaken in quantum simulators. To illustrate our framework, we compute the work and heat exchanged during a quench in a Z_2 lattice gauge theory coupled to matter in 1+1 dimensions. The thermodynamic quantities, as functions of the quench parameter, evidence an expected phase transition. For general thermal states, we derive a simple relation between a quantum many-body system’s entanglement Hamiltonian, measurable with quantum-information-processing tools, and the Hamiltonian of mean force, used to define strong-coupling thermodynamic quantities.

Introduction.—Gauge theories are ubiquitous descriptions of fundamental interactions in the Standard Model in particle physics [1–5], of emergent low-energy phenomena in condensed-matter and synthetic quantum systems [6–9], and of diverse fault-tolerant quantum-computing codes [10–14]. An overarching goal is to simulate strongly interacting matter starting from gauge theories. Key focuses include nonequilibrium phenomena described by quantum chromodynamics (QCD), the theory of the strong force. Such phenomena arise in ultra-relativistic particle collisions [15, 16] and in the early universe [17, 18]. Theoretical studies [19–23] of in- and out-of-equilibrium phases of QCD, and of its thermalization mechanisms, are often restricted to extreme parameter regimes, to facilitate perturbation theory. Alternatively, such studies feature simpler (often lower-dimensional) models to capture qualitative features of QCD.

Studying QCD and other strongly interacting gauge theories requires nonperturbative tools, as are enabled by lattice gauge theory (LGT) [24–28]. In a LGT, quantum fields are defined on a discrete spacetime of finite extent. Within the path-integral formulation of LGTs, Monte-Carlo simulations are viable if Euclidean (imaginary) time replaces Minkowski (real) time. The scheme permits parallels with statistical mechanics: Euclidean time stands in for inverse temperature, and vacuum ex-

pectation values serve as thermal averages. LGT has enabled thermodynamic studies of gauge theories, including the QCD equation of state at small chemical potentials [29–40]. Nonetheless, the sampling weight in Monte-Carlo computations can become nonreal—a sign problem can occur—demanding infeasibly many samples to resolve the signal [41]. This problem occurs at finite fermionic densities (prevalent in LGTs, condensed-matter, and nuclear many-body systems) and in out-of-equilibrium processes [40, 42–44]. These limitations do not inhibit Hamiltonian-based approaches, such as tensor-network methods [45–47] and quantum simulation [48–51]. These approaches, hence, suit thermodynamic studies of gauge theories, in and out of equilibrium. Still, a modern description of LGTs in the language of quantum thermodynamics needs to be developed.

The field of quantum thermodynamics extends conventional thermodynamics to small and quantum systems that exchange heat and work [52–54]. A typical set-up features a subsystem of interest (called the *system*) interacting with a *reservoir* of inaccessible degrees of freedom (DOFs) [55, 56]. The coupling is often weak because a system and reservoir typically interact only at their shared boundary. This boundary is of lower dimensionality than the system, whose volume is proportional to its internal energy. Hence, the interaction energy is

much smaller than the system's internal energy, as well as the reservoir's. Yet quantum systems and reservoirs can be small while behaving thermodynamically [57–59], and their interactions need not be negligible. Hence the subfield of strong-coupling (quantum) thermodynamics has burgeoned recently [60–69]. Strong coupling blurs the system-reservoir boundary, complicating the definition of the system's internal energy, work, and heat. Nonetheless, definitions have been developed and shown to obey thermodynamic laws [64, 66, 67, 70–72].

These considerations raise the question *can LGTs obey weak-coupling thermodynamics?* Local constraints, or Gauss's laws, constitute the defining feature of (lattice) gauge theories. Electrodynamics—a U(1) gauge theory—offers a familiar example: the electric charge at a site balances the electric-field flux emanating from the site. A gauge theory's Hilbert space is restricted to a subspace that satisfies Gauss's laws. This restriction complicates the partitioning of the system into subsystems: the fields' values on one side of the partition depend on the values on the other side. Yet such a partitioning is used to define quantities such as the bipartite entanglement entropy [73–79]. The system-reservoir partitioning in LGTs, we posit, resembles that in strong-coupling thermodynamics. Hence, we use strong-coupling thermodynamics to define thermodynamic quantities for LGTs.

Motivated by quantum simulators' capabilities [80, 81], we answer the following questions: what are the work and heat exchanged during instantaneous quenches [82]—simple nonequilibrium processes created in quantum simulations? Can these quantities signal different phases and phase transitions [83]? Can such quantities be measured efficiently with quantum-information-processing tools?

Capitalizing on our upcoming work [70], we describe how to compute changes in internal energies. We show how to divide these changes into work and heat consistently with the first and second laws of thermodynamics. A simple model illustrates this framework: a Z_2 LGT coupled to hardcore bosonic matter in 1+1 dimensions (D). We observe that thermodynamic quantities, as functions of chemical potential, signal an expected phase transition. Furthermore, our work bridges the fields of quantum information theory and strong-coupling quantum thermodynamics: we show that the entanglement Hamiltonian [84, 85], which can often be efficiently measured experimentally [86–89], is related to the Hamiltonian of mean force [64], which underpins strong-coupling quantum thermodynamics.

Overview of strong-coupling quantum thermodynamics.—Consider a system S and a reservoir R . The composite $S \cup R$ evolves under the Hamiltonian

$$H_{S \cup R} := H_S + H_R + V_{S \cup R}. \quad (1)$$

H_S and H_R denote system's and reservoir's Hamiltonians, respectively; and $V_{S \cup R}$ denotes the interaction. Dur-

ing a thermodynamic process, S can absorb heat Q and work W , quantities we aim to compute.

In weak-coupling quantum thermodynamics, the interaction Hamiltonian, $V_{S \cup R}$, contributes negligibly to the total internal energy, $U_{S \cup R} := \langle H_{S \cup R} \rangle$. Hence, the system's internal energy is the expectation value of the Hamiltonian H_S that acts nontrivially on the system alone: $U_S := \langle H_S \rangle$ [71]. Thus, one can measure the system's internal energy by accessing only system DOFs. In contrast, when $\langle V_{S \cup R} \rangle$ is comparable to $\langle H_S \rangle$, one must use strong-coupling thermodynamics.

How much $V_{S \cup R}$ contributes to U_S is ambiguous. To resolve the ambiguity, one can define the global Gibbs state, the thermal-equilibrium state with respect to $H_{S \cup R}$ and an inverse temperature β : $\pi_{S \cup R} := e^{-\beta H_{S \cup R}} / Z_{S \cup R}$. The partition function is $Z_{S \cup R} := \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_{S \cup R}})$. Throughout this work, we denote Gibbs states by π and general density matrices by ρ . Tr_X denotes the trace over the Hilbert space of subsystem X . Consider tracing out the reservoir DOFs from the global Gibbs state $\pi_{S \cup R}$. The system's reduced density matrix, π_S , is a Gibbs state with respect to an effective Hamiltonian H_S^* , the *Hamiltonian of mean force* [64]: $\pi_S := \text{Tr}_R(\pi_{S \cup R}) \equiv e^{-\beta H_S^*} / Z_S^*$, wherein

$$H_S^* := -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \frac{\text{Tr}_R(e^{-\beta H_{S \cup R}})}{Z_R}, \quad (2)$$

$Z_R := \text{Tr}_R(e^{-\beta H_R})$, and $Z_S^* := \text{Tr}_S(e^{-\beta H_S^*}) = Z_{S \cup R} / Z_R$. Equation (2) underlies an intuitive definition for the system's free energy [64, 90, 91],

$$F_S \equiv U_S - \frac{\mathcal{S}}{\beta} := -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln(Z_S^*). \quad (3)$$

$\mathcal{S} := -\text{Tr}(\rho_S \ln \rho_S)$ denotes the von Neumann entropy, and ρ_S denotes the system's reduced state [92].

It is natural to associate the effective Hamiltonian's expectation value, $\langle H_S^* \rangle$, with the system's internal energy, U_S . Consequently, one need not access reservoir DOFs to compute U_S . Any change in U_S comes from work and heat, by the first law of thermodynamics: $\Delta U_S = W + Q$. By the second law, $\Delta F_S \leq W$, or $Q \leq \Delta \mathcal{S} / \beta$. Here, ΔU_S , ΔF_S and $\Delta \mathcal{S}$ denote, respectively, net changes in the system's internal energy, free energy and entropy, during a thermodynamic process. Intuition guides the separation of ΔU_S into W and Q : work is associated with changes in the system's Hamiltonian; and heat, with changes in its state [53]. To define work and heat concretely, we now specify a thermodynamic process.

Instantaneous quenches within strong-coupling quantum thermodynamics.—During a *quench*, the system's Hamiltonian changes rapidly. Quenches generate nonequilibrium conditions and are studied in diverse quantum-simulation experiments [89, 93–103]. Figure 1 depicts the quench studied here. The system-reservoir composite begins in a Gibbs state:




FIG. 1. Overview of this work’s quench protocol. The system starts in a global Gibbs state. At $t = 0$, the system Hamiltonian H_S is quenched instantaneously. Under the new total Hamiltonian, the system-reservoir composite equilibrates to a global Gibbs state with the same temperature as the initial state.

$\rho_{SUR}^i := \rho_{SUR}(t=0^-) = \pi_{SUR}^i := e^{-\beta H_{SUR}^i} / \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_{SUR}^i})$, wherein the initial composite Hamiltonian $H_{SUR}^i := H_{SUR}(t=0^-)$. Equation (1), with a time-dependent $H_S(t)$, specifies H_{SUR} . At time $t = 0$, $H_S(t)$ is instantaneously quenched from $H_S(t=0^-) := H_S^i$ to $H_S(t=0^+) := H_S^f$. The system-reservoir composite then equilibrates to a global Gibbs state under the final total Hamiltonian $H_{SUR}(t=0^+) := H_{SUR}^f$. The initial and final global Gibbs states have the same temperature, β^{-1} , by assumption. Justifications include the possibility that $S \cup R$ couples weakly to a larger reservoir, at a temperature β^{-1} , in the distant past and future [70].

Practical work and heat definitions depend on system DOFs alone. We present such definitions, for quenches of the type in Fig. 1, in Ref. [70]; see also Refs. [61, 64, 90]. The system’s internal energy is

$$U_S(t) := \langle H_S^*(t) \rangle = \text{Tr}(\rho_S(t) H_S^*(t)), \quad (4)$$

for arbitrary states $\rho_S(t)$. H_S^* acquires time dependence under the replacement $\text{Tr}_R(e^{-\beta H_{SUR}}) \mapsto \text{Tr}_R(e^{-\beta H_{SUR}(t)})$ in Eq. (2). During the quench, the internal energy changes by an amount ΔU_S equal to the work absorbed by S :

$$W := \text{Tr}_S(\rho_S^i H_S^*(t=0^+)) - \text{Tr}_S(\rho_S^i H_S^*(t=0^-)). \quad (5)$$

During the subsequent equilibration, the internal-energy change equals the heat absorbed by S :

$$Q := \text{Tr}_S(\rho_S^f H_S^*(t=0^+)) - \text{Tr}_S(\rho_S^i H_S^*(t=0^+)). \quad (6)$$

These definitions are intuitive and obey the first and second laws of thermodynamics [70]. Thus, upon identifying a Hamiltonian of the form in Eq. (1), one calculates work and heat by measuring the system’s internal energy, $\langle H_S^* \rangle$. We show next how to measure this quantity.

Measuring thermodynamic quantities in quantum simulations.—We aim to derive a relation between strong-coupling thermodynamic quantities and a quantity called

the entanglement Hamiltonian. Every density matrix ρ can be expressed as $\rho = \sum_k p_k |k\rangle\langle k|$. The $|k\rangle$ denote eigenstates; and the $p_k \in [0, 1]$, probabilities. One can define $p_k := e^{-\lambda_k}$ for some $\lambda_k \geq 0$: $\rho = \sum_k e^{-\lambda_k} |k\rangle\langle k|$. This expansion has the form of an un-normalized thermal state, at unit temperature, with respect to a Hamiltonian with eigenenergies λ_k and eigenstates $|k\rangle$. For $\rho = \rho_S := \text{Tr}_R(\rho_{SUR})$, this Hamiltonian is the (*bipartite*) *entanglement Hamiltonian* [84, 85],

$$H_S^{\text{ent}} := -\ln(\rho_S). \quad (7)$$

This operator contains more information than the bipartite entanglement entropy. It has spawned numerous studies in quantum information theory and many-body physics [104]. Parameterized ansätze for entanglement Hamiltonians [85], with random-measurement protocols [105–108], enable tomography of ground and nonequilibrium states [86–88, 109, 110], including of LGTs [89, 111, 112].

To leverage entanglement-Hamiltonian-tomography tools, we prove a relation between H_S^{ent} and H_S^* for thermal states. We rewrite the Hamiltonian of mean force as

$$H_S^* = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \left(\frac{\text{Tr}_R(e^{-\beta H_{SUR}})}{\text{Tr}_R(e^{-\beta H_R})} \right) \quad (8a)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \left(\rho_S \frac{Z_{SUR}}{Z_R} \right). \quad (8b)$$

The system’s reduced state is $\rho_S = \pi_S := \text{Tr}_R(e^{-\beta H_{SUR}}) / Z_{SUR}$. Using Eqs. (7) and (3) yields the relation between the entanglement Hamiltonian and the Hamiltonian of mean force:

$$H_S^* = \frac{1}{\beta} H_S^{\text{ent}} + F_S. \quad (9)$$

\mathbb{I}_S denotes the identity operator defined on the system’s Hilbert space.




FIG. 2. (a) Partitioning of DOFs into system (S) and reservoir (R) DOFs. Partitioning of total Hamiltonian's (b) hopping terms, (c) electric-field terms, and (d) mass and chemical-potential terms into $H_S(t)$ (teal), H_R (light red), and V_{SUR} (purple). Each row shows the total system. Matter (gauge-field) DOFs reside on lattice sites (links). The last link wraps around to indicate the lattice's periodicity.

One can measure the first term in Eq. (9) using the aforementioned tomography tools. To calculate F_S , one must calculate partition functions (classically or via quantum simulation), which can be costly [113–116], demanding access to DOFs outside S . To avoid computing the second term in Eq. (9), we study the average dissipated work, $W_{\text{diss}} := W - \Delta F_S$, a measure of entropy production [117, 118]. For our quench protocol,

$$W_{\text{diss}} = \frac{1}{\beta} \text{Tr}_S(\rho_S^i [H_S^{\text{ent}}(t=0^+) - H_S^{\text{ent}}(t=0^-)]). \quad (10)$$

Hence, one can compute W_{diss} upon measuring the entanglement Hamiltonian alone.

Lattice gauge theories and strong-coupling quantum thermodynamics.—We use the Hamiltonian formulation of LGTs [26], which suits quantum simulation. As matter and gauge fields undergo local symmetry-group transformations, the observables remain invariant. The symmetry restricts the states to a *physical subspace*: for each site n , a *Gauss-law* operator G_n acts on n and commutes with the Hamiltonian. The full Hilbert space (spanned by eigenbases of electric and matter fields) decomposes into G_n eigenspaces, for each n . The eigenspace labeled by some eigenvalue g , and shared by all the G_n , is the physical subspace. In the Standard Model of particle physics, nature sets the value of g . That is, for any physical state $|\Psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle$,

$$G_n |\Psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle = g |\Psi_{\text{phys}}\rangle, \quad \forall n. \quad (11)$$

In electrodynamics, $G_n = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{E}_n - \rho_n$. \mathbf{E}_n denotes the electric field, and ρ_n denotes the (dynamical) electric-charge density, both at site n . Gauss's law follows from setting $g = 0$ ($g \neq 0$) in Eq. (11) in the absence (presence) of a background static electric charge.

One may impose Gauss's laws by manually removing the unphysical states from the full Hilbert space [119, 120]. Alternatively, the Hamiltonian H_{SUR} may be replaced with

$$H'_{SUR} = H_{SUR} + \sum_n f(G_n). \quad (12)$$

$f(G_n)$ denotes a function of Gauss-law operators. Chosen properly, it penalizes transitions to unphysical states [121–128]. Consider partitioning a lattice into a system S and a reservoir R . Some Gauss-law penalty terms act on both S and R : Gauss-law operators are multibody operators consisting of gauge and matter fields. Such penalty terms, thus, contribute to the V_{SUR} in Eq. (1). Their contribution must be large to constrain the state to the physical subspace. Therefore, one cannot neglect the internal energy's dependence on V_{SUR} when computing thermodynamic quantities; see the SM. Consequently, systems described by LGTs call for strong-coupling quantum thermodynamics.

Example of Z_2 LGT coupled to matter in $(1+1)D$.—We aim to numerically compute the thermodynamic quantities exchanged during our quench protocol in a LGT, using strong-coupling quantum thermodynamics. Consider Z_2 gauge fields (spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ hardcore bosons) coupled to matter fields (chosen to be spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ hardcore bosons). The initial state evolves under the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H &= H_h + H_e + H_m + H_\mu + H_c \\ &\equiv -t \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (\sigma_n^+ \tilde{\sigma}_n^z \sigma_{n+1}^- + \text{h.c.}) - \epsilon \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \tilde{\sigma}_n^x \\ &\quad + m \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (-1)^n \sigma_n^+ \sigma_n^- - \mu \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sigma_n^+ \sigma_n^- + c \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{I}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

on a one-dimensional N -site spatial lattice with periodic boundary conditions ($\sigma_N = \sigma_0$). H_h , H_e , H_m , and H_μ represent the matter-hopping, electric-field, matter-mass, and matter-chemical-potential terms, respectively [129]. The constant term H_c is added such that $H_S(t)$, H_R , and $H_{SUR}(t)$ have non-negative eigenvalues. t , ϵ , m , and μ denote the hopping strength, electric-field strength, matter mass, and matter chemical potential, respectively. Each Pauli operator σ_n acts on the Hilbert space of the site- n matter field. Each Pauli operator $\tilde{\sigma}_n$ acts on the Hilbert space of the gauge field rightward of

n . Specifically, $\tilde{\sigma}_n^x$ ($\tilde{\sigma}_n^z$) denotes the electric-field (gauge-link) operator [130].

The \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge transformation is generated by the Gauss-law operator [131]

$$G_n = \tilde{\sigma}_n^x \tilde{\sigma}_{n-1}^x \exp\left(i\pi \left[\sigma_n^+ \sigma_n^- + \frac{(-1)^n - 1}{2}\right]\right). \quad (14)$$

The physical states obey Eq. (11) with $g = 1$ [132]. One can realize the gauge-invariant dynamics by adding $\sum_n f(G_n) = \kappa \sum_n (1 - G_n)$ to H , then taking the limit $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ [133].

The lattice can be partitioned into a system S and a reservoir R , as in Fig. 2(a). Also, the Hamiltonian (13) decomposes as in Eq. (1). Some hopping terms act only on sites in S (R) and so belong in H_S (H_R). Other terms describe hopping between a site in S and a site in R . These interaction terms belong in V_{SUR} ; see Fig. 2(b). The electric-field Hamiltonian can be partitioned as follows; see Figure 2(c). Terms acting on links in S belong in $H_S(t)$. Terms acting on links in R , but touching the S - R boundary, belong in V_{SUR} . Terms acting on links elsewhere in R belong in H_R . The interaction terms are consistent with the interrelation, by Gauss's law, of system DOFs with the link DOFs on the reservoir side of a boundary. Terms in H_m and H_μ belong in $H_S(t)$ and H_R , depending on whether they act on a site in S or R ; see Fig. 2(d). Finally, if penalty terms enforcing Gauss's law act at the boundary, they belong in V_{SUR} . Otherwise, they belong in H_S or H_R .

We consider quenching the system's chemical potential from $\mu_i = 0$ to $\mu_f \neq 0$. We further define the system's *chiral condensate* [134],

$$\Sigma := \frac{1}{N_S} \sum_{n=0}^{N_S-1} (-1)^n \langle \sigma_n^+ \sigma_n^- \rangle. \quad (15)$$

N_S denotes the system size. The expectation value is computed in the final thermal state, whose $\mu = \mu_f$. If $\mu_f \gg \epsilon, m$, the system's thermal state is dominated by the matter fields' all-spin-up state, yielding $\Sigma = 0$. At other μ_f values, Σ could be nonvanishing. In fact, Σ suddenly changes from finite to vanishing values as μ_f increases, indicating a phase transition, as Fig. 3(a) shows. This phase transition does not look perfectly sharp, due to finite-temperature (see the SM) and finite-size effects. We regard the phase transition as occurring at the critical value $\mu_f = \mu_f^c$, where $\Sigma' := d\Sigma/d\mu_f$ is maximized.

Figure 3 displays thermodynamic quantities, calculated as functions of μ_f : W_{diss} , W , Q , ΔF_S , and ΔS . As μ_f grows, $W_{\text{diss}} := W - \Delta F_S$ remains near zero until around the μ_f value where the phase transition occurs. Afterward, W_{diss} increases. Hence W_{diss} indicates the phase transition clearly. Similarly, W (βQ) begins deviating from ΔF_S (ΔS) around the phase transition. Nonetheless, to calculate work or heat, one must compute partition-function ratios dependent on all the DOFs




FIG. 3. Thermodynamic quantities as functions of the final chemical potential, μ_f , during the instantaneous quench from $\mu_i = 0$: (a) Dissipated work W_{diss} (solid, black) and chiral condensate Σ (dot-dashed, teal). (b) Work W (solid, black) and change ΔF_S in the system's free energy (dotted, black). (c) Normalized heat βQ (solid, black) and change ΔS in the system's entropy (dotted, black). In all subfigures, we plot μ_f^c , the μ_f value where Σ' is maximized (dashed, gray). For these plots, $N = 6$, $N_S = 4$, $t = -1/2$, $\epsilon = 1/2$, $m = 1/2$, $\mu_i = 0$, and $\beta = 10$.

in $S \cup R$; see Eq. (8b). In contrast, determining the dissipated work requires only measurements of the system's entanglement Hamiltonian; see Eq. (10). Measuring the dissipated work, using quantum simulators, is therefore more feasible.

In the SM, we apply weak-coupling quantum-thermodynamics definitions, despite the couplings being strong. As a result, we obtain different work and heat values, which behave qualitatively differently.

Summary and outlook.—This work shows how strong-coupling quantum thermodynamics applies to lattice gauge theories in and out of equilibrium. The work further shows how entanglement Hamiltonians can be leveraged to measure certain thermodynamic quantities in quantum simulations. Our framework motivates explorations of further questions in the quantum thermodynamics of gauge theories. Examples in-

clude whether thermodynamic quantities signal topological [8–10, 84, 135–139] or dynamical [140] phase transitions. Non-Abelian and higher-dimensional gauge theories merit studying in our framework, too. While quench protocols in LGTs have been commonly implemented in experiments [89, 99–101, 103, 122, 141–150], a longer-term vision is simulating particle collisions relevant to nuclear and high-energy physics. Work has begun on quantum simulations of scattering processes [151–156], and their quantum-thermodynamic properties merit studying. Generally, developing quantum-simulation protocols for studying gauge-theory thermodynamics is an active frontier, and this work furthers this goal.

Acknowledgments.—Z. D., C. J., G. O., C. P., and N. Y. H. were supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) Quantum Leap Challenge Institutes (QLCI) (award no. OMA-2120757). Z.D. further acknowledges funding by the Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Science, Early Career Award (award no. DESC0020271), and by the Department of Physics, Maryland Center for Fundamental Physics, and the College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences at the University of Maryland, College Park. She is grateful for the hospitality of Perimeter Institute where part of this work was carried out. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science, and Economic Development, and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. Z.D. was also supported in part by the Simons Foundation through the Simons Foundation Emmy Noether Fellows Program at Perimeter Institute. C. J. and N. Y. H. further acknowledge support from John Templeton Foundation (award no. 62422). N. M. acknowledges funding by the DOE, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics, **Inqubator for Quantum Simulation** (award no. DE-SC0020970). C. P. is grateful for discussions on thermal gauge theories with Robert Pisarski, and for the hospitality of Brookhaven National Laboratory which hosted C. P. as part of an Office of Science Graduate Student Research Fellowship. G. O. further acknowledges support from the American Association of University Women through an International Fellowship. Finally, N. M., G. O., C. P., and N. Y. H. thank the participants of the InQubator for Quantum Simulation (IQUS) workshop “**Thermalization, from Cold Atoms to Hot Quantum Chromodynamics**” at the University of Washington in September 2023 for many valuable discussions.

* davoudi@umd.edu

† cjarzyns@umd.edu

‡ niklasmu@uw.edu

§ gshivali@umd.edu

¶ cdpowers@umd.edu; corresponding author.

** nicoleyh@umd.edu

- [1] J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich, and B. R. Holstein, *Dynamics of the standard model* (Cambridge university press, 2014).
- [2] M. D. Schwartz, *Quantum field theory and the standard model* (Cambridge university press, 2014).
- [3] F. Gross, E. Klempt, S. J. Brodsky, A. J. Buras, V. D. Burkert, G. Heinrich, K. Jakobs, C. A. Meyer, K. Orginos, M. Strickland, *et al.*, 50 years of quantum chromodynamics: Introduction and review, *The European Physical Journal C* **83**, 1125 (2023).
- [4] A. Pich, The standard model of electroweak interactions, arXiv preprint arXiv:1201.0537 (2012).
- [5] R. L. Workman and Others (Particle Data Group), Review of Particle Physics, **PTEP** **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [6] E. Fradkin, *Field theories of condensed matter physics* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- [7] H. Kleinert, *Gauge Fields in Condensed Matter: Vol. 1: Superflow and Vortex Lines (Disorder Fields, Phase Transitions) Vol. 2: Stresses and Defects (Differential Geometry, Crystal Melting)* (World Scientific, 1989).
- [8] X.-G. Wen, Topological orders in rigid states, *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **4**, 239 (1990).
- [9] M. A. Levin and X.-G. Wen, String-net condensation: A physical mechanism for topological phases, *Physical Review B* **71**, 045110 (2005).
- [10] A. Y. Kitaev, Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons, *Annals of physics* **303**, 2 (2003).
- [11] A. Kitaev, Anyons in an exactly solved model and beyond, **Annals of Physics** **321**, 2 (2006).
- [12] S. Das Sarma, M. Freedman, and C. Nayak, Topological quantum computation, **Physics Today** **59**, 32 (2006).
- [13] C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman, and S. Das Sarma, Non-abelian anyons and topological quantum computation, **Rev. Mod. Phys.** **80**, 1083 (2008).
- [14] V. Lahtinen and J. K. Pachos, A Short Introduction to Topological Quantum Computation, **SciPost Phys.** **3**, 021 (2017).
- [15] R. Vogt, *Ultrarelativistic heavy-ion collisions* (Elsevier, 2007).
- [16] W. Florkowski, *Phenomenology of ultra-relativistic heavy-ion collisions* (World Scientific Publishing Company, 2010).
- [17] P. J. E. Peebles, *Principles of physical cosmology*, Vol. 27 (Princeton university press, 1993).
- [18] E. Kolb, *The early universe* (CRC press, 2018).
- [19] J. B. Kogut and M. A. Stephanov, *The phases of quantum chromodynamics: From confinement to extreme environments*, Vol. 21 (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- [20] J. Ghiglieri, A. Kurkela, M. Strickland, and A. Vuorinen, Perturbative thermal qcd: formalism and applications, *Physics Reports* **880**, 1 (2020).
- [21] J. Berges, M. P. Heller, A. Mazeliauskas, and R. Venugopalan, QCD thermalization: Ab initio approaches and interdisciplinary connections, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **93**, 035003 (2021).
- [22] A. Lovato, T. Dore, R. D. Pisarski, B. Schenke, K. Chatziioannou, J. S. Read, P. Landry, P. Danielewicz, D. Lee, S. Pratt, *et al.*, Long range plan: Dense matter theory for heavy-ion collisions and neutron stars, arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.02224 (2022).
- [23] P. Achenbach, D. Adhikari, A. Afanasev, F. Afzal, C. Aidala, A. Al-Bataineh, D. Almaalol, M. Amaryan,

- D. Androić, W. Armstrong, *et al.*, The present and future of qcd, arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02579 (2023).
- [24] K. G. Wilson, Confinement of quarks, *Physical review D* **10**, 2445 (1974).
- [25] J. Kogut and L. Susskind, Hamiltonian formulation of wilson's lattice gauge theories, *Physical Review D* **11**, 395 (1975).
- [26] J. B. Kogut, An introduction to lattice gauge theory and spin systems, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **51**, 659 (1979).
- [27] M. Creutz, *Quarks, gluons and lattices* (Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- [28] M. Creutz, L. Jacobs, and C. Rebbi, Monte carlo computations in lattice gauge theories, *Physics Reports* **95**, 201 (1983).
- [29] Y. Aoki, G. Endrődi, Z. Fodor, S. D. Katz, and K. K. Szabó, The order of the quantum chromodynamics transition predicted by the standard model of particle physics, *Nature* **443**, 675 (2006).
- [30] Y. Aoki, Z. Fodor, S. Katz, and K. Szabo, The qcd transition temperature: Results with physical masses in the continuum limit, *Physics Letters B* **643**, 46 (2006).
- [31] Y. Aoki, S. Borsanyi, S. Dürr, Z. Fodor, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, and K. Szabo, The qcd transition temperature: results with physical masses in the continuum limit ii, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2009**, 088 (2009).
- [32] S. Borsanyi, Z. Fodor, C. Hoelbling, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, C. Ratti, and K. K. Szabo, Is there still any t c mystery in lattice qcd? results with physical masses in the continuum limit iii, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2010**, 1 (2010).
- [33] T. Bhattacharya, M. I. Buchoff, N. H. Christ, H.-T. Ding, R. Gupta, C. Jung, F. Karsch, Z. Lin, R. Mawhinney, G. McGlynn, *et al.*, The qcd phase transition with physical-mass, chiral quarks, arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.5175 (2014).
- [34] A. Bazavov, T. Bhattacharya, M. Cheng, C. DeTar, H.-T. Ding, S. Gottlieb, R. Gupta, P. Hegde, U. M. Heller, F. Karsch, *et al.*, Chiral and deconfinement aspects of the qcd transition, *Physical Review D* **85**, 054503 (2012).
- [35] H.-T. Ding, F. Karsch, and S. Mukherjee, Thermodynamics of strong-interaction matter from Lattice QCD, *International Journal of Modern Physics E* **24**, 1530007 (2015).
- [36] C. Ratti, Lattice QCD and heavy ion collisions: a review of recent progress, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **81**, 084301 (2018).
- [37] A. Bazavov, F. Karsch, S. Mukherjee, and P. Petreczky, Hot-dense lattice QCD, *The European Physical Journal A* **55**, 1 (2019).
- [38] O. Philipsen, Constraining the qcd phase diagram at finite temperature and density, arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04827 (2019).
- [39] J. N. Guenther, Overview of the QCD phase diagram, *The European Physical Journal A* **57**, 1 (2021).
- [40] K. Nagata, Finite-density lattice qcd and sign problem: Current status and open problems, *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics* , 103991 (2022).
- [41] M. Troyer and U.-J. Wiese, Computational complexity and fundamental limitations to fermionic quantum monte carlo simulations, *Physical review letters* **94**, 170201 (2005).
- [42] C. Gattringer and K. Langfeld, Approaches to the sign problem in lattice field theory, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **31**, 1643007 (2016).
- [43] A. Alexandru, G. Başar, P. F. Bedaque, and N. C. Warrington, Complex paths around the sign problem, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **94**, 015006 (2022).
- [44] G. Pan and Z. Y. Meng, Sign problem in quantum monte carlo simulation, arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.08777 (2022).
- [45] M. C. Banuls, K. Cichy, J. I. Cirac, K. Jansen, and S. Kühn, Tensor networks and their use for lattice gauge theories, arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12838 (2018).
- [46] M. C. Banuls and K. Cichy, Review on novel methods for lattice gauge theories, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **83**, 024401 (2020).
- [47] Y. Meurice, R. Sakai, and J. Unmuth-Yockey, Tensor lattice field theory for renormalization and quantum computing, *Reviews of modern physics* **94**, 025005 (2022).
- [48] M. C. Banuls, R. Blatt, J. Catani, A. Celi, J. I. Cirac, M. Dalmonte, L. Fallani, K. Jansen, M. Lewenstein, S. Montangero, *et al.*, Simulating lattice gauge theories within quantum technologies, *The European physical journal D* **74**, 1 (2020).
- [49] N. Klco, A. Roggero, and M. J. Savage, Standard model physics and the digital quantum revolution: thoughts about the interface, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **85**, 064301 (2022).
- [50] C. W. Bauer, Z. Davoudi, A. B. Balantekin, T. Bhattacharya, M. Carena, W. A. de Jong, P. Draper, A. El-Khadra, N. Gemelke, M. Hanada, *et al.*, Quantum simulation for high-energy physics, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 027001 (2023).
- [51] C. W. Bauer, Z. Davoudi, N. Klco, and M. J. Savage, Quantum simulation of fundamental particles and forces, *Nature Rev. Phys.* **5**, 420 (2023).
- [52] J. Goold, M. Huber, A. Riera, L. Del Rio, and P. Skrzypczyk, The role of quantum information in thermodynamics—a topical review, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **49**, 143001 (2016).
- [53] S. Vinjanampathy and J. Anders, Quantum thermodynamics, *Contemporary Physics* **57**, 545 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1080/00107514.2016.1201896>.
- [54] N. Y. Halpern, *Quantum Steampunk: The Physics of Yesterday's Tomorrow* (JHU Press, 2022).
- [55] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford U. Press, Oxford, 2007).
- [56] S. Deffner and S. Campbell, The principles of modern thermodynamics, in *Quantum Thermodynamics*, 2053-2571 (Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2019) pp. 1–1 to 2–37.
- [57] L. D'Alessio, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, From quantum chaos and eigenstate thermalization to statistical mechanics and thermodynamics, *Advances in Physics* **65**, 239 (2016).
- [58] A. M. Kaufman, M. E. Tai, A. Lukin, M. Rispoli, R. Schittko, P. M. Preiss, and M. Greiner, Quantum thermalization through entanglement in an isolated many-body system, *Science* **353**, 794 (2016).
- [59] A. Polkovnikov and D. Sels, Thermalization in small quantum systems, *Science* **353**, 752 (2016).
- [60] F. Binder, S. Vinjanampathy, K. Modi, and J. Goold, Quantum thermodynamics of general quantum processes, *Physical Review E* **91**, 032119 (2015).
- [61] U. Seifert, First and second law of thermodynamics at

- strong coupling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 020601 (2016).
- [62] P. Strasberg, G. Schaller, N. Lambert, and T. Brandes, Nonequilibrium thermodynamics in the strong coupling and non-markovian regime based on a reaction coordinate mapping, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 073007 (2016).
- [63] C. Jarzynski, Stochastic and macroscopic thermodynamics of strongly coupled systems, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 011008 (2017).
- [64] H. J. D. Miller, Hamiltonian of mean force for strongly-coupled systems, 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, Cham, 2018) pp. 531–549.
- [65] M. Perarnau-Llobet, H. Wilming, A. Riera, R. Gallego, and J. Eisert, Strong coupling corrections in quantum thermodynamics, *Physical review letters* **120**, 120602 (2018).
- [66] P. Strasberg and M. Esposito, Non-markovianity and negative entropy production rates, *Phys. Rev. E* **99**, 012120 (2019).
- [67] A. Rivas, Strong coupling thermodynamics of open quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 160601 (2020).
- [68] P. Strasberg, Thermodynamics of quantum causal models: An inclusive, hamiltonian approach, *Quantum* **4**, 240 (2020).
- [69] Y.-Y. Xu, J. Gong, and W.-M. Liu, Quantum thermodynamics with strong system-bath coupling: A mapping approach, arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08268 (2023).
- [70] Z. Davoudi, C. Jarzynski, N. Mueller, G. Oruganti, C. Powers, and N. Yunger Halpern, How to define quantum work and heat in strongly coupled systems (in prep), in prep.
- [71] Á. Rivas, Quantum thermodynamics in the refined weak coupling limit, *Entropy* **21**, 10.3390/e21080725 (2019).
- [72] M. Campisi, P. Talkner, and P. Hänggi, Thermodynamics and fluctuation theorems for a strongly coupled open quantum system: an exactly solvable case, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **42**, 392002 (2009).
- [73] P. Buividovich and M. Polikarpov, Entanglement entropy in gauge theories and the holographic principle for electric strings, *Physics Letters B* **670**, 141 (2008).
- [74] W. Donnelly, Decomposition of entanglement entropy in lattice gauge theory, *Physical Review D* **85**, 085004 (2012).
- [75] H. Casini, M. Huerta, and J. A. Rosabal, Remarks on entanglement entropy for gauge fields, *Physical Review D* **89**, 085012 (2014).
- [76] D. Radicevic, Notes on entanglement in abelian gauge theories, arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.1391 (2014).
- [77] S. Aoki, T. Iritani, M. Nozaki, T. Numasawa, N. Shiba, and H. Tasaki, On the definition of entanglement entropy in lattice gauge theories, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2015**, 1 (2015).
- [78] R. M. Soni and S. P. Trivedi, Aspects of entanglement entropy for gauge theories, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2016**, 1 (2016).
- [79] K. Van Acoleyen, N. Bultinck, J. Haegeman, M. Marien, V. B. Scholz, and F. Verstraete, Entanglement of distillation for lattice gauge theories, *Physical review letters* **117**, 131602 (2016).
- [80] E. Altman, K. R. Brown, G. Carleo, L. D. Carr, E. Demler, C. Chin, B. DeMarco, S. E. Economou, M. A. Eriksson, K.-M. C. Fu, M. Greiner, K. R. Hazzard, R. G. Hulet, A. J. Kollár, B. L. Lev, M. D. Lukin, R. Ma, X. Mi, S. Misra, C. Monroe, K. Murch, Z. Nazario, K.-K. Ni, A. C. Potter, P. Roushan, M. Saffman, M. Schleier-Smith, I. Siddiqi, R. Simmonds, M. Singh, I. Spielman, K. Temme, D. S. Weiss, J. Vučković, V. Vuletić, J. Ye, and M. Zwierlein, Quantum simulators: Architectures and opportunities, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 017003 (2021).
- [81] A. J. Daley, I. Bloch, C. Kokail, S. Flannigan, N. Pearson, M. Troyer, and P. Zoller, Practical quantum advantage in quantum simulation, *Nature* **607**, 667 (2022).
- [82] A. Mitra, Quantum quench dynamics, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **9**, 245 (2018).
- [83] Relationships between work distributions and phase transitions have been explored recently in the context of spin systems [157–164].
- [84] H. Li and F. D. M. Haldane, Entanglement spectrum as a generalization of entanglement entropy: Identification of topological order in non-abelian fractional quantum hall effect states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 010504 (2008).
- [85] M. Dalmonte, V. Eisler, M. Falconi, and B. Vermersch, Entanglement hamiltonians: from field theory to lattice models and experiments, *Annalen der Physik* **534**, 2200064 (2022).
- [86] C. Kokail, R. van Bijnen, A. Elben, B. Vermersch, and P. Zoller, Entanglement hamiltonian tomography in quantum simulation, *Nature Physics* **17**, 936 (2021).
- [87] C. Kokail, B. Sundar, T. V. Zache, A. Elben, B. Vermersch, M. Dalmonte, R. van Bijnen, and P. Zoller, Quantum variational learning of the entanglement hamiltonian, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 170501 (2021).
- [88] M. K. Joshi, C. Kokail, R. van Bijnen, F. Kranzl, T. V. Zache, R. Blatt, C. F. Roos, and P. Zoller, Exploring large-scale entanglement in quantum simulation, *Nature*, 1 (2023).
- [89] N. Mueller, J. A. Carolan, A. Connelly, Z. Davoudi, E. F. Dumitrescu, and K. Yeter-Aydeniz, Quantum computation of dynamical quantum phase transitions and entanglement tomography in a lattice gauge theory, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 030323 (2023).
- [90] C. Jarzynski, Nonequilibrium work theorem for a system strongly coupled to a thermal environment, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2004**, P09005 (2004).
- [91] P. Talkner and P. Hänggi, Colloquium: Statistical mechanics and thermodynamics at strong coupling: Quantum and classical, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **92**, 041002 (2020).
- [92] Boltzmann’s constant is set to one throughout.
- [93] J. Eisert, M. Friesdorf, and C. Gogolin, Quantum many-body systems out of equilibrium, *Nature Physics* **11**, 124 (2015).
- [94] H. Bernien, S. Schwartz, A. Keesling, H. Levine, A. Omran, H. Pichler, S. Choi, A. S. Zibrov, M. Endres, M. Greiner, *et al.*, Probing many-body dynamics on a 51-atom quantum simulator, *Nature* **551**, 579 (2017).
- [95] J. Zhang, G. Pagano, P. W. Hess, A. Kyprianidis, P. Becker, H. Kaplan, A. V. Gorshkov, Z.-X. Gong, and C. Monroe, Observation of a many-body dynamical phase transition with a 53-qubit quantum simulator, *Nature* **551**, 601 (2017).

- [96] W. L. Tan, P. Becker, F. Liu, G. Pagano, K. Collins, A. De, L. Feng, H. Kaplan, A. Kyprianidis, R. Lundgren, *et al.*, Domain-wall confinement and dynamics in a quantum simulator, *Nature Physics* **17**, 742 (2021).
- [97] S. Ebadi, T. T. Wang, H. Levine, A. Keesling, G. Semeghini, A. Omran, D. Bluvstein, R. Samajdar, H. Pichler, W. W. Ho, *et al.*, Quantum phases of matter on a 256-atom programmable quantum simulator, *Nature* **595**, 227 (2021).
- [98] A. De, P. Cook, K. Collins, W. Morong, D. Paz, P. Titum, G. Pagano, A. Gorshkov, M. Maghrebi, and C. Monroe, Non-equilibrium critical scaling and universality in a quantum simulator, arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10856 (2023).
- [99] E. A. Martinez, C. A. Muschik, P. Schindler, D. Nigg, A. Erhard, M. Heyl, P. Hauke, M. Dalmonte, T. Monz, P. Zoller, *et al.*, Real-time dynamics of lattice gauge theories with a few-qubit quantum computer, *Nature* **534**, 516 (2016).
- [100] N. Klco, E. F. Dumitrescu, A. J. McCaskey, T. D. Morris, R. C. Pooser, M. Sanz, E. Solano, P. Lougovski, and M. J. Savage, Quantum-classical computation of Schwinger model dynamics using quantum computers, *Physical Review A* **98**, 032331 (2018).
- [101] N. H. Nguyen, M. C. Tran, Y. Zhu, A. M. Green, C. H. Alderete, Z. Davoudi, and N. M. Linke, Digital quantum simulation of the schwinger model and symmetry protection with trapped ions, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 020324 (2022).
- [102] D. E. Kharzeev and Y. Kikuchi, Real-time chiral dynamics from a digital quantum simulation, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 023342 (2020).
- [103] Z.-Y. Zhou, G.-X. Su, J. C. Halimeh, R. Ott, H. Sun, P. Hauke, B. Yang, Z.-S. Yuan, J. Berges, and J.-W. Pan, Thermalization dynamics of a gauge theory on a quantum simulator, *Science* **377**, 311 (2022).
- [104] For instance, the λ_k statistics imply whether a system behaves ergodically [165–169]. (Ergodicity is necessary for thermalization.) Also, a gap in the H_S^{ent} spectrum may signal a topologically ordered phase [84, 169, 170].
- [105] A. Elben, B. Vermersch, C. F. Roos, and P. Zoller, Statistical correlations between locally randomized measurements: A toolbox for probing entanglement in many-body quantum states, *Physical Review A* **99**, 052323 (2019).
- [106] H.-Y. Huang, R. Kueng, and J. Preskill, Predicting many properties of a quantum system from very few measurements, *Nature Physics* **16**, 1050 (2020).
- [107] H.-Y. Huang, M. Broughton, J. Cotler, S. Chen, J. Li, M. Mohseni, H. Neven, R. Babbush, R. Kueng, J. Preskill, *et al.*, Quantum advantage in learning from experiments, *Science* **376**, 1182 (2022).
- [108] A. Elben, S. T. Flammia, H.-Y. Huang, R. Kueng, J. Preskill, B. Vermersch, and P. Zoller, The randomized measurement toolbox, *Nature Reviews Physics* **5**, 9 (2023).
- [109] H. Pichler, G. Zhu, A. Seif, P. Zoller, and M. Hafezi, Measurement protocol for the entanglement spectrum of cold atoms, *Physical Review X* **6**, 041033 (2016).
- [110] M. Dalmonte, B. Vermersch, and P. Zoller, Quantum simulation and spectroscopy of entanglement hamiltonians, *Nature Physics* **14**, 827 (2018).
- [111] J. Bringewatt, J. Kunjummen, and N. Mueller, Randomized measurement protocols for lattice gauge theories, arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15519 (2023).
- [112] N. Mueller (2024), unpublished notes.
- [113] K. Matsumoto, Y. Shingu, S. Endo, S. Kawabata, S. Watabe, T. Nikuni, H. Hakoshima, and Y. Matsuzaki, Calculation of gibbs partition function with imaginary time evolution on near-term quantum computers, *Japanese Journal of Applied Physics* **61**, 042002 (2022).
- [114] Y. Wu and J. B. Wang, Estimating gibbs partition function with quantum clifford sampling, *Quantum Science and Technology* **7**, 025006 (2022).
- [115] S. Arunachalam, V. Havlicek, G. Nannicini, K. Temme, and P. Wocjan, Simpler (classical) and faster (quantum) algorithms for gibbs partition functions, *Quantum* **6**, 789 (2022).
- [116] S. Bravyi, A. Chowdhury, D. Gosset, and P. Wocjan, On the complexity of quantum partition functions, arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.15466 (2021).
- [117] R. Kawai, J. M. R. Parrondo, and C. V. den Broeck, Dissipation: The phase-space perspective, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 080602 (2007).
- [118] C. Jarzynski, Equalities and inequalities: irreversibility and the second law of thermodynamics at the nanoscale, *Annu. Rev. Cond. Matt. Phys.* **2**, 329 (2011).
- [119] J. R. Stryker, Oracles for gauss’s law on digital quantum computers, *Physical Review A* **99**, 042301 (2019).
- [120] I. Raychowdhury and J. R. Stryker, Solving gauss’s law on digital quantum computers with loop-string-hadron digitization, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 033039 (2020).
- [121] E. Zohar and B. Reznik, Confinement and lattice quantum-electrodynamics electric flux tubes simulated with ultracold atoms, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 275301 (2011).
- [122] D. Banerjee, M. Dalmonte, M. Müller, E. Rico, P. Stebler, U.-J. Wiese, and P. Zoller, Atomic quantum simulation of dynamical gauge fields coupled to fermionic matter: From string breaking to evolution after a quench, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 175302 (2012).
- [123] E. Zohar, J. I. Cirac, and B. Reznik, Simulating (2+1)-Dimensional Lattice QED with Dynamical Matter Using Ultracold Atoms, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 055302 (2013).
- [124] L. Tagliacozzo, A. Celi, P. Orland, M. Mitchell, and M. Lewenstein, Simulation of non-abelian gauge theories with optical lattices, *Nature communications* **4**, 2615 (2013).
- [125] P. Hauke, D. Marcos, M. Dalmonte, and P. Zoller, Quantum simulation of a lattice schwinger model in a chain of trapped ions, *Phys. Rev. X* **3**, 041018 (2013).
- [126] Z. Davoudi, N. Mueller, and C. Powers, Towards quantum computing phase diagrams of gauge theories with thermal pure quantum states, *Physical Review Letters* **131**, 081901 (2023).
- [127] J. C. Halimeh, H. Lang, J. Mildenerger, Z. Jiang, and P. Hauke, Gauge-symmetry protection using single-body terms, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040311 (2021).
- [128] J. C. Halimeh and P. Hauke, Stabilizing gauge theories in quantum simulators: A brief review (2022), arXiv:2204.13709 [cond-mat.quant-gas].
- [129] The mass term’s sign alternates between even-index and odd-index sites, consistently with the staggering of fermionic matter [25]. Despite working with a bosonic theory, we keep the staggering convention.

- [130] The gauge link and electric field are two conjugate operators in a gauge theory, similarly to position and momentum in quantum mechanics.
- [131] For a pure gauge theory, which lacks matter fields, the operator reduces to $G_n := \tilde{\sigma}_n^x \tilde{\sigma}_{n-1}^x$. This is the familiar generator of a local \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry.
- [132] G_n has only two eigenvalues, ± 1 . Physically, when $g = 1$, if no matter (or antimatter) occupies site n , the electric field on the left equals that on the right. If site n contains matter (or antimatter), the electric-field eigenvalues on the left and right have opposite signs.
- [133] Numerical computations of this work are performed by manually restricting to the physical Hilbert space.
- [134] Σ has the form that the chiral condensate would have if the LGT were coupled to staggered fermions (a Jordan-Wigner transformation maps the fermion operators to Pauli operators). Then, the chiral condensate serves as an order parameter for chiral phase transitions. Σ is not technically a chiral condensate in our model, however. The reason is that the gauge fields couple directly to spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ DOFs, not to fermions. Nonetheless, inspired by theories with staggered fermions, we call Σ the chiral condensate.
- [135] B. A. Bernevig, *Topological insulators and topological superconductors* (Princeton university press, 2013).
- [136] K. Seo, C. Zhang, and S. Tewari, Thermodynamic signatures for topological phase transitions to majorana and weyl superfluids in ultracold fermi gases, *Physical Review A* **87**, 063618 (2013).
- [137] S. Kempkes, A. Quelle, and C. M. Smith, Universalities of thermodynamic signatures in topological phases, *Scientific reports* **6**, 38530 (2016).
- [138] D. Caputo, D. Ballarini, G. Dagvadorj, C. Sánchez Muñoz, M. De Giorgi, L. Dominici, K. West, L. N. Pfeiffer, G. Gigli, F. P. Laussy, *et al.*, Topological order and thermal equilibrium in polariton condensates, *Nature materials* **17**, 145 (2018).
- [139] A. Carollo, D. Valenti, and B. Spagnolo, Geometry of quantum phase transitions, *Physics Reports* **838**, 1 (2020).
- [140] M. Heyl, Dynamical quantum phase transitions: a review, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **81**, 054001 (2018).
- [141] W. A. de Jong, K. Lee, J. Mulligan, M. Płoskoń, F. Ringer, and X. Yao, Quantum simulation of nonequilibrium dynamics and thermalization in the schwinger model, *Physical Review D* **106**, 054508 (2022).
- [142] N. Klco, M. J. Savage, and J. R. Stryker, SU(2) non-Abelian gauge field theory in one dimension on digital quantum computers, *Physical Review D* **101**, 074512 (2020).
- [143] A. Ciavarella, N. Klco, and M. J. Savage, Trailhead for quantum simulation of SU(3) Yang-Mills lattice gauge theory in the local multiplet basis, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 094501 (2021).
- [144] J. Mildenerger, W. Mruczkiewicz, J. C. Halimeh, Z. Jiang, and P. Hauke, Probing confinement in a \mathbb{Z}_2 lattice gauge theory on a quantum computer, arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.08905 (2022).
- [145] J. C. Halimeh, I. P. McCulloch, B. Yang, and P. Hauke, Tuning the topological θ -angle in cold-atom quantum simulators of gauge theories, *Prx Quantum* **3**, 040316 (2022).
- [146] W.-Y. Zhang, Y. Liu, Y. Cheng, M.-G. He, H.-Y. Wang, T.-Y. Wang, Z.-H. Zhu, G.-X. Su, Z.-Y. Zhou, Y.-G. Zheng, *et al.*, Observation of microscopic confinement dynamics by a tunable topological θ -angle, arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11794 (2023).
- [147] B. Yang, H. Sun, R. Ott, H.-Y. Wang, T. V. Zache, J. C. Halimeh, Z.-S. Yuan, P. Hauke, and J.-W. Pan, Observation of gauge invariance in a 71-site bose-hubbard quantum simulator, *Nature* **587**, 392 (2020).
- [148] S. Notarnicola, M. Collura, and S. Montangero, Real-time-dynamics quantum simulation of (1+ 1)-dimensional lattice qed with rydberg atoms, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 013288 (2020).
- [149] F. M. Surace, P. P. Mazza, G. Giudici, A. Lerose, A. Gambassi, and M. Dalmonte, Lattice gauge theories and string dynamics in Rydberg atom quantum simulators, *Physical Review X* **10**, 021041 (2020).
- [150] C. Schweizer, F. Grusdt, M. Berngruber, L. Barbiero, E. Demler, N. Goldman, I. Bloch, and M. Aidelsburger, Floquet approach to z2 lattice gauge theories with ultracold atoms in optical lattices, *Nature Physics* **15**, 1168 (2019).
- [151] F. M. Surace and A. Lerose, Scattering of mesons in quantum simulators, *New Journal of Physics* **23**, 062001 (2021).
- [152] R. Belyansky, S. Whitsitt, N. Mueller, A. Fahimniya, E. R. Bennewitz, Z. Davoudi, and A. V. Gorshkov, High-energy collision of quarks and hadrons in the schwinger model: From tensor networks to circuit qed, arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02522 (2023).
- [153] Y. Chai, A. Crippa, K. Jansen, S. Kühn, V. R. Pascuzzi, F. Tacchino, and I. Tavernelli, Entanglement production from scattering of fermionic wave packets: a quantum computing approach, arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02272 (2023).
- [154] G.-X. Su, J. Osborne, and J. C. Halimeh, A cold-atom particle collider, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05489 (2024).
- [155] R. C. Farrell, M. Illa, A. N. Ciavarella, and M. J. Savage, Quantum Simulations of Hadron Dynamics in the Schwinger Model using 112 Qubits, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08044 (2024).
- [156] Z. Davoudi, C.-C. Hsieh, and S. V. Kadam, Scattering wave packets of hadrons in gauge theories: Preparation on a quantum computer, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00840 (2024).
- [157] F.-L. Lin and C.-Y. Huang, Work statistics for quantum spin chains: characterizing quantum phase transitions, benchmarking time evolution, and examining passivity of quantum states, arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.13366 (2023).
- [158] A. Kiely, E. O'Connor, T. Fogarty, G. T. Landi, and S. Campbell, Entropy of the quantum work distribution, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, L022010 (2023).
- [159] H. Zhang, Y. Qian, Z.-X. Niu, and Q. Wang, Excited stated quantum phase transitions and the entropy of the work distribution in the anharmonic lipkin-meshkov-glick model, arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14285 (2023).
- [160] K. Zawadzki, R. M. Serra, and I. D'Amico, Work-distribution quantumness and irreversibility when crossing a quantum phase transition in finite time, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 033167 (2020).
- [161] Q. Wang and H. Quan, Probing the excited-state quantum phase transition through statistics of loschmidt echo and quantum work, *Physical Review E* **96**, 032142 (2017).

- [162] E. Mascarenhas, H. Bragança, R. Dorner, M. F. Santos, V. Vedral, K. Modi, and J. Goold, Work and quantum phase transitions: Quantum latency, *Physical Review E* **89**, 062103 (2014).
- [163] Z. Mzaouali, R. Puebla, J. Goold, M. El Baz, and S. Campbell, Work statistics and symmetry breaking in an excited-state quantum phase transition, *Physical Review E* **103**, 032145 (2021).
- [164] Z. Fei, N. Freitas, V. Cavina, H. T. Quan, and M. Esposito, Work statistics across a quantum phase transition, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 170603 (2020).
- [165] S. D. Geraedts, R. Nandkishore, and N. Regnault, Many-body localization and thermalization: Insights from the entanglement spectrum, *Physical Review B* **93**, 174202 (2016).
- [166] Z.-C. Yang, A. Hamma, S. M. Giampaolo, E. R. Mucciolo, and C. Chamon, Entanglement complexity in quantum many-body dynamics, thermalization, and localization, *Physical Review B* **96**, 020408 (2017).
- [167] P.-Y. Chang, X. Chen, S. Gopalakrishnan, and J. Pixley, Evolution of entanglement spectra under generic quantum dynamics, *Physical review letters* **123**, 190602 (2019).
- [168] T. Rakovszky, S. Gopalakrishnan, S. Parameswaran, and F. Pollmann, Signatures of information scrambling in the dynamics of the entanglement spectrum, *Physical Review B* **100**, 125115 (2019).
- [169] N. Mueller, T. V. Zache, and R. Ott, Thermalization of gauge theories from their entanglement spectrum, *Physical Review Letters* **129**, 011601 (2022).
- [170] T. V. Zache, C. Kokail, B. Sundar, and P. Zoller, Entanglement spectroscopy and probing the li-haldane conjecture in topological quantum matter, *Quantum* **6**, 702 (2022).
- [171] C. De Sa, Low-precision arithmetic, CS4787 Lecture 21, Cornell University (2020).

Supplemental Material:
“Quantum thermodynamics of nonequilibrium processes in lattice gauge theories”

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE I:
CONVERGENCE OF THERMODYNAMIC QUANTITIES WITH β
IN THE LATTICE-GAUGE-THEORY EXAMPLE

Matrix exponentiations of the form $e^{-\beta H}$ can have very large or very small eigenvalue magnitudes, especially at large β . This can lead to instabilities in the numerical evaluation of $e^{-\beta H}$. Numerical instabilities can arise also when a matrix logarithm is calculated. However, absolute errors in floating-point representations increase with the magnitude of the represented value [171]. So, we add constant shifts to the Hamiltonians $H_{S\cup R}(t = 0^-)$ and $H_{S\cup R}(t = 0^+)$ in the form of uniform on-site energy densities; see Eq. (13). The magnitude of the energy density, given by c in Eq. (13), is chosen such that $H_S(t)$, H_R , and $H_{S\cup R}(t)$ have non-negative eigenvalues for the system sizes studied. The energy density terms are partitioned between the sub-Hamiltonians according to Eq. (1) in the same manner as other on-site terms shown in Fig. 2. Such constant shifts to the Hamiltonians do not change physical observables’ qualitative behaviors.

Numerical errors may still occur when Hamiltonians have large positive eigenvalues. Thus, we aim to test the numerical stability of the results shown in Fig. 3. To this end, we investigate whether thermodynamic quantities, as well as the chiral condensate, behave smoothly as functions of β . Figures 4 and 5 display these quantities. They exhibit smooth behaviors as β varies, indicating the absence of instabilities. Evidence of the phase transition becomes sharper at smaller temperatures (larger β values). The main-text plots correspond to $\beta = 10$.




FIG. 4. Convergence of thermodynamic quantities with increasing β for the quench of $\mu_i = 0$ to $\mu_f > 0$ as in the main text.

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE II:
WEAK-COUPLING QUANTUM THERMODYNAMICS APPLIED TO
THE LATTICE-GAUGE-THEORY EXAMPLE

Strong-coupling quantum thermodynamics becomes relevant when the system-reservoir interaction contributes non-negligibly to the system’s internal energy. The penalty terms in LGTs, introduced in Eq. (12) to impose Gauss’s laws, act at all sites. Therefore, the boundary penalty terms’ contribution may not appear significant, compared to the contribution of the terms acting on the system’s bulk, particularly if the number of system DOFs exceeds the number of DOFs at the boundary. A deeper perspective, however, is that local constraints imposed at all sites lead




FIG. 5. Convergence of Σ with increasing β for the quench of $\mu_i = 0$ to $\mu_f > 0$, as in the main text.

to highly nonlocal structure in the states. Hence, if the reservoir's size is comparable to or larger than the system's, the system's internal energy cannot be defined separately from the reservoir.

We now confirm that the example in the main text is in the strong-coupling regime. The example is a Z_2 LGT coupled to spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ bosonic matter in (1+1)D with $N = 6$ sites in $S \cup R$ and $N_S = 2$ sites in S . We evaluate $|\langle V_{S \cup R} \rangle / \langle H_S(t) \rangle|$ in our quench protocol's initial and final (equilibrium) states. In both cases, the ratio is non-negligible ($\gtrsim 0.1$) at all the μ_f values used in our numerical study.

Which values do thermodynamic quantities assume in this LGT if one nevertheless applies weak-coupling thermodynamics? We plot in Fig. 6 the same quantities as in Fig. 3 of the main text, but computed with weak-coupling quantum-thermodynamics definitions: the system's internal energy is equated with the expectation value of its Hamiltonian, H_S , as opposed to the Hamiltonian of mean force, H_S^* . Furthermore, the system states $\rho_S = e^{-\beta H_S^*} / \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_S^*})$ become $\rho_S \approx e^{-\beta H_S} / \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_S})$. This approximation affects computations of not only expectation values, but also equilibrium properties such as free energy and entropy.

Figure 6 shows that thermodynamic quantities' values differ from their strong-coupling counterparts. The weak-coupling quantities' behaviors near the expected phase transition are rather smooth, exhibiting diminished abilities to signal the transition. The chiral condensate (dashed green) is calculated from the system's true reduced state, as in the main text.

In summary, our observations motivate the use of the strong-coupling framework to describe the open-quantum-system thermodynamics of LGTs.




FIG. 6. Computing thermodynamic quantities using weak-coupling assumptions: For illustrative purposes, we make the approximations (argued to be incorrect here) $e^{-\beta H_S^*(t)}/\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_S^*(t)}) \approx e^{-\beta H_S(t)}/\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H_S(t)})$ and $U_S(t) \approx \langle H_S(t) \rangle$. Thermodynamic quantities are plotted as functions of the final chemical potential, μ_f , during the instantaneous quench from $\mu_i = 0$: (a) Dissipated work W_{diss} (solid, black) and chiral condensate Σ (dot-dashed, teal). (b) Work W (solid, black) and change ΔF_S in the system's free energy (dotted, black). (c) Normalized heat βQ (solid, black) and change ΔS in the system's entropy (dotted, black). In all subfigures, we plot μ_f^c , the μ_f value where Σ' is maximized (dashed, gray). For these plots, $N = 6$, $N_S = 4$, $t = -1/2$, $\epsilon = 1/2$, $m = 1/2$, $\mu_i = 0$, and $\beta = 10$, as in Fig. 3.