

Chaos controlled and disorder driven phase transitions by breaking permutation symmetry

Manju C,^{1,*} Arul Lakshminarayan,^{2,†} and Uma Divakaran^{1,‡}

¹*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Palakkad, Kerala, 678623.*

²*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai 600036.*

(Dated: June 4, 2024)

Introducing disorder in a system typically breaks symmetries and can introduce dramatic changes in its properties such as localization. At the same time, the clean system can have distinct many-body features depending on how chaotic it is. In this work the effect of permutation symmetry breaking by disorder is studied in a system which has a controllable and deterministic regular to chaotic transition. Results indicate a continuous phase transition from an area-law to a volume-law entangled phase irrespective of whether there is chaos or not, as the strength of the disorder is increased. The critical disorder strength obtained by finite size scaling, indicate a strong dependence on whether the clean system is regular or chaotic to begin with. In the process, we also obtain the critical exponents associated with this phase transition. Additionally, we find that a relatively small disorder is seen to be sufficient to delocalize a chaotic system.

Deterministic chaos, originating in the lack of sufficient number of conserved quantities, gives rise to ergodic and mixing dynamics with a positive Lyapunov exponent in the classical case [1–3], and in the quantum case results in states with random matrix properties, thermalization and volume law entanglement [4–11]. Disorder, depending on its relative strength on the other hand, can lead to Griffiths phases [12], Anderson [13] or many-body localization [14, 15], and can also result in thermalization and delocalization via breaking symmetries. For example, the Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev (SYK) model is one where randomized all-to-all couplings results in maximal quantum chaos, maximizing a temperature dependent quantum Lyapunov exponent. [16–18].

Arrays of superconducting Josephson junction based transmons, which are nonlinear oscillators, are currently the most successful implementations of quantum computers [19–21]. Disorder in the energies of the individual qubit transmons is a necessary evil in the presence of inter-transmon couplings. A detailed study of the consequences for these devices comes with a warning of being “dangerously close to a phase of uncontrollable chaotic fluctuations” [22].

On the other hand, it has long been appreciated that dynamical chaos has serious effects on practical implementation of quantum many-body systems, as it can increase entanglement to random state values, and small subsystems face effective decoherence, thus questioning the reliability of quantum information processing [23, 24]. Several related aspects have been addressed in Refs. [22, 25–35], for example it has been discussed in Ref. [29] that the presence of random individual qubit energies along with residual short range interactions can make the system chaotic under certain limits that compromises the quantum computer. In another work, it is shown that the error in quantum computation may increase exponentially with system size in the chaotic regime in the presence of imperfections [28]. Thus, it is important to

understand the interplay between disorder and dynamical chaos. We therefore, in this work, bring together the clearly connected, yet disparate, fields of chaos and disorder, and study the effect of disorder on regular or chaotic quantum dynamics.

In particular, we investigate the dynamics of N particles originally restricted to the small $O(N)$ permutation symmetric subspace (PSS), but that can have various dynamical regimes, from near-integrable to intermediate and fully chaotic. The disorder breaks the permutation symmetry and results in a phase transition into the full $O(\exp(N))$ Hilbert space. Interestingly, the extent of chaos in the “clean” symmetric space is found to dictate the critical strength of the disorder that ensures the dynamics has penetrated to the full Hilbert space, in the large N limit. The transition has many possible order parameters. The block entanglement changes from area law $\sim \ln N$, characteristic of permutation symmetric states [36] to volume law $\sim N$. Collective observables such as the total angular momentum changes from $\sim N$ to $\sim \sqrt{N}$. This transition shows similarities to a transition from the superradiant to the radiant phases of collective atomic states in a cavity [37–39]. A recent work studied the dynamics when the system does not start from a permutation symmetric subspace of an otherwise permutation symmetric Hamiltonian [40]. They find non-generic effects of the deep Hilbert space by studying growth of out-of-time order correlator and entanglement. Another work studied the effect of introducing non-uniform initial states on the permutation symmetry of the Hamiltonian [41]. However, we wish to study the case when the disorder free system starting from PSS has a controlled transition to deterministic chaos, so that its interplay with disorder becomes transparent.

A convenient model for this study is provided by the kicked top which is a textbook example of quantum chaos [42–44], of one large spin of angular momentum $S = N/2$, that can be considered as the collective dynamics of N

spin 1/2 particles within the permutation symmetric subspace [45, 46]. Several experiments have fruitfully implemented this to understand the effects of chaos on entanglement [47–49]. A disordered version of the kicked top can be used to investigate the effects of breaking permutation symmetry. The specific Hamiltonian that we study is given by

$$H = \frac{k}{\tau 2N} \sum_{\ell < \ell' = 1}^N (1 + \epsilon_{\ell\ell'}) \sigma_{\ell}^x \sigma_{\ell'}^x + \frac{p}{2} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \sigma_{\ell}^y \delta(t - n\tau), \quad (1)$$

where, σ_{ℓ}^{ν} with $\nu = x, y, z$ are the Pauli matrices at site ℓ , and k is the interaction strength that can be tuned such that there is a transition from regular to deterministic chaotic dynamics in the disorder free Hamiltonian, τ is the time period of delta kicks that is set to unity, and p is fixed to $\pi/2$ to compare with the known results. Here, $\epsilon_{\ell\ell'}$ are the random (quenched disorder) part of the spin interactions taken from a normal distribution with zero mean and standard deviation w , also referred to as disorder strength. The corresponding unitary Floquet operator U_w that evolves states infinitesimally before consecutive kicks separated by the period τ , is given by

$$\exp\left(-i \frac{k}{2N} \sum_{\ell < \ell' = 1}^N (1 + \epsilon_{\ell\ell'}) \sigma_{\ell}^x \sigma_{\ell'}^x\right) \exp\left(-i \frac{\pi}{4} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \sigma_{\ell}^y\right), \quad (2)$$

where we have set $\hbar = 1$.

The disorder free version U_0 , with all $\epsilon_{\ell\ell'} = 0$, is the quantum kicked top [7, 35, 42, 44, 50–62] where the Hamiltonian is purely a function of the collective spin operators $J_{\alpha} = \sum_{\ell}^N \sigma_{\ell}^{\alpha}/2$ where $\alpha = x, y, z$. The total angular momentum $J^2 = J_x^2 + J_y^2 + J_z^2$ defined in terms of these collective spins is a constant of motion in the quantum kicked top [44, 45, 63]. The large N limit of U_0 is studied as a symplectic classical map on the unit sphere $(X, Y, Z) \mapsto (X', Y', Z')$ where $X = J_x/J$, $Y = J_y/J$ and $Z = J_z/J$. This map shows regular dynamics for small values of k , typically < 2 , and fully chaotic dynamics for large values of k ($k > 6$), where the Lyapunov exponent may be approximated as $(\ln k - 1)$ [64, 65]. Various aspects of long range interacting systems such as given above are discussed in Ref. [66].

If the initial state is an unentangled spin coherent state given by [67–69]

$$|\psi_0\rangle = |\theta, \phi\rangle = \left(\cos \frac{\theta}{2} |0\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} |1\rangle\right)^{\otimes N}, \quad (3)$$

then the state after n Floquet periods is $|\psi_n\rangle = U_0^n |\psi_0\rangle$. The states at all times n are restricted to the $N + 1$ dimensional PSS and conserve the total angular momentum $J^2 = (N/2)(N/2 + 1)$. It has also been shown that the chaotic phase can be described using a random matrix theory (RMT) in $N + 1$ dimensions [44]. For small

values of $N (\leq 4)$, the kicked top is exactly solvable and does yield interesting insights already into the large N cases [70–72].

Introducing disorder in the system will break the permutation symmetry of the Hamiltonian, and the state $|\psi_n\rangle$ after n kicks given by $U_w^n |\psi_0\rangle$ will now span the full 2^N dimensional Hilbert space where J^2 is no longer a constant of motion.




FIG. 1. Schematic of the dynamics: Top row corresponds to disorder free system where interactions connecting different spins have same magnitude as depicted by connecting arrows of black color. The second term of the Hamiltonian is the periodic kicks along y -direction. Bottom row corresponds to a disordered system as shown by connecting arrows of different colors. For times $n\tau < t < (n+1)\tau - \Delta\tau$, the interactions are dominant whereas for $(n+1)\tau - \Delta\tau < t < (n+1)\tau$, it is the field term which is dominant. Here, we use delta kicks which correspond to $\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0$ limit. If the radius of the sphere on the right is proportional to N , then $\langle J \rangle$ for the disorder free system is restricted on the surface of this sphere, whereas for the disordered system it is pushed inside the sphere where $\langle J \rangle \sim \sqrt{N}$, as also shown in the figure above.

The state $|\psi_n\rangle$ in presence of disorder tends to a random state on the full Hilbert space, denoted as $|\psi_{\text{RMT}}\rangle$, in which the expectation value of J_z^2 can be estimated by:

$$\langle J_z^2 \rangle_{\text{RMT}} = \sum_{j=1}^{2^N} \lambda_j^2 |\langle \psi_{\text{RMT}} | \phi_j \rangle|^2 = N/4, \quad (4)$$

where $|\phi_j\rangle = |j_1 \cdots j_N\rangle$, $j_i = \pm 1$, are eigenvectors of J_z with eigenvalues $\lambda_j = (\sum_{\ell} j_{\ell})/2$. The ensemble average over random states $|\langle \psi_{\text{RMT}} | \phi_j \rangle|^2 = 1/2^N$ is used above along with the fact that $\text{Tr} J_z^2 = N2^{N-1}/2$. Similarly $\langle J_x^2 \rangle_{\text{RMT}} = \langle J_y^2 \rangle_{\text{RMT}} = N/4$, and hence $\langle J^2 \rangle_{\text{RMT}} = 3N/4$. Clearly, $\langle J^2 \rangle$ exhibit a change in the scaling when the dynamics shifts from the permutation symmetric subspace where $\langle J^2 \rangle \sim N^2$ to the full Hilbert space where the state being close to random has a $\sim N$ scaling. It is this transition of the dynamics to the “full” Hilbert space that we shall focus in the current work. A schematic diagram

of the Hamiltonian studied highlighting the difference in the dynamics of disorder free as well as the disordered system is shown in Fig. 1.

One can also capture this change in the dynamics by studying von Neumann entropy $S_Q(A)$ of the subsystem A consisting of Q - spins or qubits. The von Neumann entropy is given by $S_Q(A) = -\text{tr}(\rho_A \log_2 \rho_A)$, where ρ_A is the reduced density matrix of subsystem A . The expression for $S_Q(A)$ using ensemble averaging over random permutation symmetric states is approximated by [36]

$$\langle S_Q(A) \rangle_{PSS} \approx \log_2(Q+1) - \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{Q+1}{N-Q+1} \right). \quad (5)$$

We have checked numerically that $S_Q(A)$ even in the regular regime of small k within permutation symmetric subspace is proportional to $\log_2(Q+1)$ dependence. A related work calculating the von Neumann entropy in PSS is given in Ref.[73]. On the other hand, when the dynamics traverse the full Hilbert space, $S_Q(A)$ is given by the Page value [36, 74, 75]:

$$\langle S_Q(A) \rangle_{2^Q} \approx Q - \frac{1}{\ln 2} \left(\frac{2^Q}{2^{2^N - Q + 1}} \right). \quad (6)$$

As w , the standard deviation of the disorder distribution or the disorder strength is increased, various expectation values will potentially shift from their values within the permutation symmetric subspace to the RMT values relevant to the full Hilbert space. This is because increasing the strength of the disorder w will not only take the system out of the permutation symmetric subspace but will also make it more chaotic since increasing w is equivalent to increasing k as can be seen from Eq. 1. Thus as $w \rightarrow 0$ or small when the dynamics is predominantly within the permutation symmetric subspace, the scaling of long time limit of various quantities will follow the PSS scaling, *i.e.*, $\langle J^2 \rangle \sim N^2$ and $\langle S_Q(A) \rangle \sim \log_2(Q+1)$. In the other extreme limit, when $w \rightarrow \infty$ and the dynamics is described by RMT in the full 2^N -dimensions, $\langle J^2 \rangle = 3N/4$ and $\langle S_Q(A) \rangle \sim Q$.

We present the results of numerical calculations which are performed with an initial state as given in Eq. 3 with $\theta = 2.25$, $\phi = 1.1$ and is evolved using the Floquet operator U_w given in Eq. 2. We use the fast Walsh Hadamard transform to go to system sizes upto $N = 16$. The evolution of $\langle J^2 \rangle$ and $S_{N/2}$ as a function of number of kicks, or time n , is shown in Fig. 2 for $k = 1$. We find that for small values of w , $\langle J^2 \rangle$ remains a constant till $n \sim N+1$ corresponding to the Heisenberg time relevant to the PSS beyond which the system is taken out of PSS so that its value starts decreasing. It is around $n \sim 2^N$, the Heisenberg time relevant to the full Hilbert space that $\langle J^2 \rangle$ again starts saturating, which implies that the system has realized the presence of full Hilbert space around this time. For all further calculations, we perform time averaging from $n = 10^5$ to $n = 3 \times 10^5$ when a thermalization has set in for $N = 16$, the maximum system size




FIG. 2. (a) $\langle J^2 \rangle$ with respect to time or number of kicks n for different disorder strengths w with $k = 1$, $N = 12$ qubits, averaged over 100 disorder realizations. Inset shows the entanglement $S_{N/2}$ as a function of n for the same parameters as in the main figure.

considered in this work. The change in scaling of J^2 and $S_{N/2}(A)$ as discussed in the text is presented in Fig. 3(a) and (b), respectively, for different w .




FIG. 3. (a) Change in scaling of $\langle J^2 \rangle$ from $N^2/4 + N/2$ to $3N/4$ as w is increased where the chaos parameter k is set to 1. (b) Same for $S_{N/2}(A)$ as a function of N at $k = 1$ as discussed in the text. The red dashed line in Fig. (a) corresponds to $N^2/4 + N/2$ whereas the black dotted line corresponds to the RMT result $3N/4$. Similarly, red dashed line in Fig. (b) corresponds to fitted line $0.41 + 0.54 \log_2(N/2 + 1)$ and the black dotted line is the RMT expression given by $N/2 - 1/2 \ln 2$.

It is tempting to associate this change in the scaling of $\langle J^2 \rangle$ and $S_{N/2}$ with a second order phase transition. Therefore, we now investigate the possible existence of a critical w_c below which the dynamics is predominantly within the permutation symmetric subspace and above which the dynamics captures the properties of the full Hilbert space described by RMT, and obtain relevant critical exponents of the associated phase transition, if any. We therefore propose a finite size scaling of the




FIG. 4. $\langle J^2 \rangle / N^{\zeta/\nu}$ as a function of disorder strength w for $k = 1$ and different system sizes. These curves cross each other at $w = w_c \approx 2.4$. The inset shows the collapse of the data with $\zeta = 0.59$ and $\nu = 0.59$ consistent with the scaling proposed in Eq. 7.

form [75–79]

$$\langle J^2 \rangle = N^{\zeta/\nu} F((w - w_c)N^{1/\nu}), \quad (7)$$

where ν is the correlation length exponent. Fig. 4 (main) shows the crossing of the data around $w_c = 2.4$ when $k = 1$ whereas the collapse of the data with $\nu = 0.59$ and $\zeta = 0.59$ is shown in the inset of Fig. 4. In order to confirm this phase transition further, we repeat the calculations for other values of k , the results of which are shown in Figure 5. It is to be noted that $k = 4$ is a mixed phase space with considerable chaos already present in the system.




FIG. 5. (a) The main figure shows the data corresponding to different system sizes for $k = 2$ crossing each other at $w = w_c \sim 0.41$ whereas the inset shows the collapse of the data with $\nu = 0.40$ and $\zeta = 0.49$. (b) Same as (a) but for $k = 4$ with $w = w_c \sim 0.17$ and $\nu = 0.3$.

Table I lists the critical disorder strength w_c along with the critical exponent ν for different values of the interaction strength or chaos parameter k . Intuitively, the

k	w_c	ν	ζ
0.5	3.17 ± 0.13	0.59 ± 0.04	0.63 ± 0.07
1.0	2.41 ± 0.06	0.59 ± 0.01	0.59 ± 0.04
2.0	0.41 ± 0.01	0.40 ± 0.01	0.49 ± 0.09
3.0	0.31 ± 0.03	0.62 ± 0.06	0.87 ± 0.05
4.0	0.17 ± 0.02	0.30 ± 0.05	0.32 ± 0.05

TABLE I. Critical disorder strength and exponents ν , ζ for different chaos parameter, k . We have used $\langle J^2 \rangle$ with $N = 12, 14$ and 16 to identify the critical points with time averaging ranging from $n = 10^5$ to 3×10^5 for 100 different realizations.

chaotic dynamics at larger k values will require smaller disorder to take the dynamics to the full Hilbert space, which is also what we observe. Interestingly, we also find a weak parameter dependence on the critical exponent ν for this phase transition. The exponent ν lies within a range of 0.6 to 0.3 for the parameters studied. Such a variation seems to be a characteristic of a disordered system such as the well studied many-body-localization one [80]. We also find that in most cases, $\nu \sim \zeta$. The quality of the data collapse for different values of k confirm the presence of a second order phase transition. At the same time, we do observe that identifying correct w_c values for larger k is difficult since w_c then is very small and a single crossing point for all system sizes is difficult to obtain. On the other hand when $k \rightarrow 0$, the dynamics can get highly non-ergodic and these parameters need more careful examinations. We have further confirmed this phase transition using the entanglement entropy $S_{N/2}(A)$ with a similar finite size scaling as in Eq. 7 giving $\nu = 0.6$, $w_c = 1.8$ when $k = 1$, as shown in Fig. 6.

It is also observed that the collapse is relatively good when the clean system is either predominantly chaotic or predominantly regular. For a mixed phase space, say at $k = 3$, the quality of the scaling seems to depend on the initial state. The value in the table I for $k = 3$ and $k = 4$ corresponds to chaotic regions. For regular regions in these cases, we could not observe scaling behaviour. This may be attributed to the small values of angular quantum number j , that we are forced to restrict ourselves to, as well as the complexity of mixed phase space (see for example [81] for cases when the initial state in a kicked top is at the border between chaos and regular regions) and the influence of phenomena such as chaos assisted tunneling [82–84], that warrants a detailed separate study.

In summary, this work has shown the existence of a critical strength of permutation symmetry breaking, beyond which there is a second order phase transition from area law entangled states with total angular momentum scaling as N , to volume law entangled states with total angular momentum scaling as \sqrt{N} . The critical disorder




FIG. 6. (a) Plot of $\langle S_{N/2}(A) \rangle / N^{\zeta/\nu}$ vs w for $k = 1$ corresponding to different system sizes cross each other at $w = w_c \sim 1.8$. Inset shows the collapse of the data with $\nu = 0.67$ and $\zeta = 0.76$.

strength shows clear dependence on the dynamics being regular or chaotic in the disorder-free permutation symmetric space. The exponents on the other hand seem to show a weaker dependence. Results not shown indicate that the criticality is robust on changing the the initial state except when it is in the regular region of the mixed phase space.

From an applications perspective, our results show that for disorder less than the critical strength, permutation symmetric systems are likely to be reliably used for their intended application, being at least not volume law entangled in the full Hilbert space. It is possible that the proposed phase transition be experimentally observed by extending few qubit experimental kicked top studies [47–49], wherein disorder is anyway present. In fact, a disordered all-to-all interacting system, simulating the SYK model, has been recently experimentally studied using a combination of atomic cloud in a cavity and controllable light shift in the large detuning limit [85].

Among future directions, it is interesting to explore if breaking permutation symmetry through other methods, say by introducing a power law interaction such as in [86], will also exhibit a similar phase transition as induced by disorder.

Acknowledgements: MC and UD acknowledge the HPC facility Chandra at IIT Palakkad where the computations were carried out. AL thanks Sylvia Pappalardi for discussions at an early stage of this work, at the program “Dynamical Foundations of Many-Body Chaos”, Institut Pascal, Université Paris-Saclay, during March-April 2023.

* 222004003@smail.iitpkd.ac.in

† arul@physics.iitm.ac.in

‡ uma@iitpkd.ac.in

- [1] M. Tabor, *Chaos and Integrability in Nonlinear Dynamics: An Introduction* (1989).
- [2] A. Lichtenberg and M. Leiberman, *Regular and Chaotic Dynamics*, Applied Mathematical Sciences (Springer New York, 2013).
- [3] E. Ott, *Chaos in Dynamical Systems*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- [4] M. Gutzwiller, *Chaos in Classical and Quantum Mechanics*, Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics (Springer New York, 1991).
- [5] H.-J. Stöckmann, *Quantum Chaos: An Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- [6] M. Mehta, *Random Matrices*, Pure and applied mathematics No. v. 142 (Elsevier/Academic Press, 2004).
- [7] S. Wimberger, *Non Linear dynamics and Quantum Chaos - An Introduction* (Springer International Publishing Switzerland, 2014).
- [8] L. D’Alessio, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, *Advances in Physics* **65**, 239 (2016).
- [9] A. M. Kaufman, M. E. Tai, A. Lukin, M. Rispoli, R. Schittko, P. M. Preiss, and M. Greiner, *Science* **353**, 794 (2016).
- [10] O. Bohigas, M. J. Giannoni, and C. Schmit, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 1 (1984).
- [11] M. Srednicki, *Physical review e* **50**, 888 (1994).
- [12] R. B. Griffiths, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23**, 17 (1969).
- [13] P. W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* **109**, 1492 (1958).
- [14] D. Basko, I. Aleiner, and B. Altshuler, *Annals of Physics* **321**, 1126 (2006).
- [15] V. Oganesyan and D. A. Huse, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 155111 (2007).
- [16] S. Sachdev and J. Ye, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 3339 (1993).
- [17] A. Kitaev, “A simple model of quantum holography (part 2), 2015,” .
- [18] J. Maldacena and D. Stanford, *Physical Review D* **94**, 106002 (2016).
- [19] J. Koch, T. M. Yu, J. Gambetta, A. A. Houck, D. I. Schuster, J. Majer, A. Blais, M. H. Devoret, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 042319 (2007).
- [20] R. Barends, J. Kelly, A. Megrant, D. Sank, E. Jeffrey, Y. Chen, Y. Yin, B. Chiaro, J. Mutus, C. Neill, P. O’Malley, P. Roushan, J. Wenner, T. C. White, A. N. Cleland, and J. M. Martinis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 080502 (2013).
- [21] C. Wang, X. Li, H. Xu, Z. Li, J. Wang, Z. Yang, Z. Mi, X. Liang, T. Su, C. Yang, *et al.*, *npj Quantum Information* **8**, 3 (2022).
- [22] C. Berke, E. Varvelis, S. Trebst, A. Altland, and D. P. DiVincenzo, *Nature Communications* **13**, 2495 (2022).
- [23] W. Zurek, in *Time And Matter* (World Scientific, 2006) pp. 132–132.
- [24] P. Hauke, F. M. Cucchietti, L. Tagliacozzo, I. Deutsch, and M. Lewenstein, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **75**, 082401 (2012).
- [25] J. N. Bandyopadhyay and A. Lakshminarayan, *Physical Review Letters* **89**, 060402 (2002).
- [26] J. Gong and P. Brumer, *Physical Review A* **68**, 022101 (2003).

- [27] V. V. Flambaum, *Australian Journal of Physics* **53**, 489 (2000).
- [28] P. H. Song and D. L. Shepelyansky, *Physical Review Letters* **86**, 2162 (2001).
- [29] B. Georgeot and D. L. Shepelyansky, *Physical Review E* **62**, 6366 (2000).
- [30] D. Braun, *Physical Review A* **65**, 042317 (2002).
- [31] V. Madhok, S. Dogra, and A. Lakshminarayan, *Optics Communications* **420**, 189 (2018).
- [32] D. Shepelyansky, *Physica Scripta* **2001**, 112 (2001).
- [33] A. Piga, M. Lewenstein, and J. Q. Quach, *Physical Review E* **99**, 032213 (2019).
- [34] K. Chinni, P. M. Poggi, and I. H. Deutsch, *Physical Review Research* **3**, 033145 (2021).
- [35] A. Lerose and S. Pappalardi, *Physical Review A* **102**, 032404 (2020).
- [36] A. Seshadri, V. Madhok, and A. Lakshminarayan, *Physical Review E* **98**, 052205 (2018).
- [37] M. O. Scully, *Physical Review Letters* **115**, 243602 (2015).
- [38] M. Gegg, A. Carmele, A. Knorr, and M. Richter, *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 013006 (2018).
- [39] O. Rubies-Bigorda and S. F. Yelin, *Physical Review A* **106**, 053717 (2022).
- [40] Z. Qi, T. Scaffidi, and X. Cao, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 054301 (2023).
- [41] F. Iemini, D. Chang, and J. Marino, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, 032204 (2024).
- [42] F. Haake, M. Kuś, and R. Scharf, *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter* **65**, 381 (1987).
- [43] G. M. D'Ariano, L. R. Evangelista, and M. Saraceno, *Phys. Rev. A* **45**, 3646 (1992).
- [44] F. Haake, *Quantum signatures of chaos* (volume 54. Springer Science and Business, 2013).
- [45] X. Wang, S. Ghose, B. C. Sanders, and B. Hu, *Physical Review E* **70**, 016217 (2004).
- [46] V. Madhok, V. Gupta, D.-A. Trottier, and S. Ghose, *Physical Review E* **91**, 032906 (2015).
- [47] S. Chaudhury, A. Smith, B. Anderson, S. Ghose, and P. S. Jessen, *Nature* **461**, 768 (2009).
- [48] C. Neill, P. Roushan, M. Fang, Y. Chen, M. Kolodrubetz, Z. Chen, A. Megrant, R. Barends, B. Campbell, B. Chiaro, A. Dunsworth, E. Jeffrey, J. Kelly, J. Mutus, P. J. J. O'Malley, C. Quintana, D. Sank, A. Vainsencher, J. Wenner, T. C. White, A. Polkovnikov, and J. M. Martinis, *Nature Physics* **12**, 1037 (2016).
- [49] V. Krithika, V. Anjusha, U. T. Bhosale, and T. Mahesh, *Physical Review E* **99**, 032219 (2019).
- [50] K. Zyczkowski, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **23**, 4427 (1990).
- [51] B. Sanders and G. Milburn, *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter* **77**, 497 (1989).
- [52] U. T. Bhosale and M. Santhanam, *Physical Review E* **98**, 052228 (2018).
- [53] R. F. Fox and T. C. Elston, *Physical Review E* **50**, 2553 (1994).
- [54] X. Wang, J. Ma, L. Song, X. Zhang, and X. Wang, *Physical Review E* **82**, 056205 (2010).
- [55] Z. Zou and J. Wang, *Entropy* **24**, 1092 (2022).
- [56] M. H. Muñoz-Arias, P. M. Poggi, and I. H. Deutsch, *Physical Review E* **103**, 052212 (2021).
- [57] L. J. Fiderer and D. Braun, *Nature communications* **9**, 1351 (2018).
- [58] U. T. Bhosale and M. Santhanam, *Physical Review E* **95**, 012216 (2017).
- [59] L. M. Sieberer, T. Olsacher, A. Elben, M. Heyl, P. Hauke, F. Haake, and P. Zoller, *npj Quantum Information* **5**, 78 (2019).
- [60] M. Kumari and S. Ghose, *Phys. Rev. E* **97**, 052209 (2018).
- [61] M. Lombardi and A. Matzkin, *Physical Review E* **83**, 016207 (2011).
- [62] A. Anand, J. Davis, and S. Ghose, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 023120 (2024).
- [63] S. Ghose, R. Stock, P. Jessen, R. Lal, and A. Silberfarb, *Physical Review A* **78**, 042318 (2008).
- [64] V. Constantoudis and N. Theodorakopoulos, *Physical Review E* **56**, 5189 (1997).
- [65] Q. Wang and M. Robnik, *Entropy* **23**, 1347 (2021).
- [66] N. Defenu, A. Lerose, and S. Pappalardi, *Physics Reports* **1074**, 1 (2024).
- [67] R. J. Glauber and F. Haake, *Physical Review A* **13**, 357 (1976).
- [68] Y. Lee Loh and M. Kim, *American Journal of Physics* **83**, 30 (2015).
- [69] R. Puri, *Mathematical methods of quantum optics* (Springer Berlin, 2001).
- [70] J. B. Ruebeck, J. Lin, and A. K. Pattanayak, *Physical Review E* **95**, 062222 (2017).
- [71] S. Dogra, V. Madhok, and A. Lakshminarayan, *Physical Review E* **99**, 062217 (2019).
- [72] P. Sreeram, V. Madhok, and A. Lakshminarayan, *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics* **54**, 274004 (2021).
- [73] O. A. Castro-Alvaredo and B. Doyon, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2013**, P02016 (2013).
- [74] D. N. Page, *Physical Review Letters* **71**, 1291 (1993).
- [75] M. Lee, T. R. Look, S. P. Lim, and D. N. Sheng, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 075146 (2017).
- [76] R. Botet and R. Jullien, *Phys. Rev. B* **28**, 3955 (1983).
- [77] B. Skinner, J. Ruhman, and A. Nahum, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 031009 (2019).
- [78] Y. Li, X. Chen, and M. P. A. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 205136 (2018).
- [79] J. Cardy, *Finite-size Scaling*, Current physics (North-Holland, 1988).
- [80] Y. Wang, C. Cheng, X.-J. Liu, and D. Yu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 080602 (2021).
- [81] V. Madhok, *Phys. Rev. E* **92**, 036901 (2015).
- [82] S. Tomsovic and D. Ullmo, *Phys. Rev. E* **50**, 145 (1994).
- [83] S. Keshavamurthy and P. Schlagheck, *Dynamical Tunneling: Theory and Experiment* (CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2011).
- [84] V. R. Krithika, M. S. Santhanam, and T. S. Mahesh, *Phys. Rev. A* **108**, 032207 (2023).
- [85] N. Sauerwein, F. Orsi, P. Uhrich, S. Bandyopadhyay, F. Mattiotti, T. Cantat-Moltrecht, G. Pupillo, P. Hauke, and J.-P. Brantut, *Nature Physics* **19**, 1128 (2023).
- [86] A. Russomanno, M. Fava, and M. Heyl, *Physical Review B* **104**, 094309 (2021).