





String breaking dynamics in Ising chain with local vibrations

Arindam Mallick ¹, Maciej Lewenstein ^{2,3}, Jakub Zakrzewski ^{1,4} and Marcin Płodzień ²

¹*Instytut Fizyki Teoretycznej, Wydział Fizyki, Astronomii i Informatyki Stosowanej, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Łojasiewicza 11, PL-30-348 Kraków, Poland*

²*ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fotoniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain*

³*ICREA, Passeig Lluis Companys 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain*

⁴*Mark Kac Complex Systems Research Center, Jagiellonian University in Kraków, PL-30-348 Kraków, Poland*
(Dated: January 3, 2025)

We consider the dynamics in the one-dimensional quantum Ising model in which each spin coherently interacts with its phononic mode. The model is motivated by quantum simulators based on Rydberg atoms in tweezers or trapped ions. The configuration of two domain walls simulates the particle-antiparticle connecting string. We concentrate on the effect the local vibrations have on the dynamics of this initial state. Our study supplements recent investigations of string breaking, traditionally studied within quantum chromodynamics (QCD), to quantum many-body systems. Two regimes are identified depending on the strength of the coupling with local vibrations. For weak coupling, the string breaking is slowed down as compared to the dynamics in an isolated Ising string. The strong coupling leads to complicated dynamics in which the domain wall character of excitation is dissolved among many coupled states.

1. INTRODUCTION

Quantum chromodynamics (QCD) is a non-Abelian gauge theory formulated on the $SU(3)$ symmetry group, describing the strong interaction, which is a fundamental force responsible for the binding of quarks and gluons into protons, neutrons, and other hadrons [1–3]. The theory’s complexity is attributed to features such as asymptotic freedom [4, 5] and color confinement [6–9], which lead to a variety of phenomena observable in high-energy particle collisions and the detailed structure of atomic nuclei. In particular, quark confinement occurs due to the squeezing of the chromoelectric flux into a string-like structure known as the QCD string, a consequence of nonperturbative vacuum effects [10–14]. The string breaks beyond a critical separation distance due to the creation of quark-antiquark pairs.

One of the most important avenues in high-energy physics is the real-time dynamics of QCD phenomena. In the last few years the studies of Lattice Gauge Theory (LGT) models have been tackled from the point of view of quantum simulators [15–21]. Quantum Simulators are anticipated to have the capability to directly investigate the real-time dynamics of quantum field theories [22–34]. Recent advancements in quantum hardware have prompted research into the implementation of LGT simulations on quantum computers. The initial quantum simulations of pure non-Abelian LGT’s have been conducted in low dimensions using quantum hardware [35–37].

In recent years, the problem of string breaking dynamics has been studied from the quantum simulator perspective in the paradigmatic quantum Ising chains [38–43]. In this context, the elementary excitations are domain walls that can experience confining potentials due to either symmetry-breaking fields or long-range interactions. The gauge flux or string that connects elementary exci-




FIG. 1. Top: Exemplary initial state as defined in Eq. (3). Brown circles indicate the mean positions of lattice sites that are trapped inside quadratic wells (indicated by parabolas), and the sites can vibrate like quantum harmonic oscillators with respect to their mean position. Each site carries \uparrow or \downarrow spin. Two-domain walls are associated with a particle-antiparticle pair shown in blue and red circles, while the pair connecting string (analogous to electric gauge-flux) is shown as a yellow-shaded ribbon. Bottom: String-broken state: the creation of additional two domain walls inside the initial string.

tations in LGT corresponds to the magnetic domain of spin-down states between the domain walls in the quantum Ising chain. This broadens the concept of string breaking to quantum many-body theory and makes it accessible to experimental studies using quantum simulators, such as Rydberg atoms [44, 45], trapped ions [46], superconducting qubits [47] or optical lattices [48]. This could help to solve the existing puzzle of nonperturbative QCD.

In this work, we focus on a rather exotic scenario from the point of view of LGT, but plausible from the quantum simulator perspective. We focus on string-breaking dynamics in the presence of phonons. Namely, we study the domain wall dynamics in the one-dimensional quantum Ising model where each spin interacts with local vibra-

tions, i.e., non-dispersive phonons. Such local vibrations can be successfully engineered in modern analog quantum simulators based on trapped long-range interacting ultracold atoms or ions [49–59]. We show numerically that the string-breaking mechanism is suppressed due to the energy being exchanged with phonons i.e., excitations of the vibrational fields.

The manuscript is organized as follows: in Section 2 we introduce the system Hamiltonian, and we define the studied quantities indicating the dynamics of the string breaking. In Section 3 we present numerical findings for the string-breaking dynamics in the short-range interacting one-dimensional Ising models. We discuss the results and conclude in Section 4.

2. MODEL AND OBSERVABLES

We consider the one-dimensional spin-1/2 chain of length L interacting with dispersionless local vibrations. The total Hamiltonian reads

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_{\text{ph}} + \hat{H}_{\text{int}}, \quad (1)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_0 &= - \sum_{j=1}^{L-1} \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z - h^x \sum_{j=1}^L \hat{\sigma}_j^x - h^z \sum_{j=1}^L \hat{\sigma}_j^z, \\ \hat{H}_{\text{ph}} &= \omega_0 \sum_j \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_j, \\ \hat{H}_{\text{int}} &= g \sum_{j=1}^L (\hat{a}_j^\dagger + \hat{a}_j) \hat{\sigma}_j^z, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_i^\beta$, $\beta = x, y, z$ are Pauli operators while \hat{a}_j (\hat{a}_j^\dagger) are bosonic annihilation (creation) operators representing local vibrations, fulfilling bosonic commutation relations $[\hat{a}_j, \hat{a}_i^\dagger] = \delta_{i,j}$. The term \hat{H}_0 describes the quantum Ising model with the longitudinal and transverse magnetic fields (with amplitudes h^z , and h^x , respectively) in the open boundary conditions geometry, while the spin-spin interaction is short-ranged. The \hat{H}_{ph} is a local vibrational Hamiltonian with energy scales set by ω_0 which controls the depth of the trapping potential around each lattice site, see Fig. 1. \hat{H}_{int} is the spin-phonon interaction Hamiltonian, where each z -spin component interacts with local vibrations with amplitude g . Larger displacement $\equiv (\hat{a}_j^\dagger + \hat{a}_j)$ of vibrating lattice site j induces larger interaction energy for a fixed interaction strength g , which in turn modifies the effect of the longitudinal magnetic field h^z . $\hat{H}_{\text{ph}} + \hat{H}_{\text{int}}$ resembles a Hamiltonian of displaced quantum harmonic oscillator where the displacement depends on the orientation of z -spin. According to the mapping between \mathbb{Z}_2 LGT and quantum Ising chain, the mass of the matter particle is related to the ZZ-interaction strength, h^x controls the gauge-field induced interaction between particles/antiparticles and responsible for particle creation and annihilation, finally h^z is the

string-tension strength which controls the energy of the gauge flux [60].

As the initial state, we consider the product state of spins, with the leftmost l spins pointing up, followed by w spins pointing down, eventually containing $L - (l + w)$ spin pointing up, see Fig. 1 top panel. String length is equivalent to w . In the presence of phonons, the initial state is formally expressed as

$$|\Psi_{\text{ini}}\rangle = \prod_{j=1}^l |n_j, \uparrow_j\rangle \otimes \prod_{j=l+1}^{l+w} |n_j, \downarrow_j\rangle \otimes \prod_{j=l+w+1}^L |n_j, \uparrow_j\rangle, \quad (3)$$

i.e., all spin states from the leftmost site $j = 1$ up to the site $j = l$ and from $j = l + w + 1$ to the right end $j = L$ are in $|\uparrow\rangle$. The phonon number state at location j is denoted as n_j , the eigenvalue of the operator $\hat{n}_j = \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_j$.

Our goal is to provide a quantitative analysis of the string-breaking dynamics in the presence of phonons during the time evolution

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{-it\hat{H}} |\Psi_{\text{ini}}\rangle. \quad (4)$$

All expectation values $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ are taken in the time evolved state $|\Psi(t)\rangle$.




FIG. 2. Exemplary states representing schematically: (a) string-contraction, (b) string-expansion, and (c) displaced undistorted string in the same chain as in Fig. 1.

In the absence of the spin-phonon coupling ($g = 0$), $n_j = 0$, the presence of magnetic transverse field h^x breaks the string, and additional two domain walls are formed in the middle of the original string [38, 60], see Fig. 1 bottom panel. Stronger h^x results in a faster string breaking, compare Fig. 7 in Ref. [38]. The example shown in Fig. 1 bottom panel is a special case of string-breaking where the lengths of broken strings are the same, the central $w = 4$ string $|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ maps to $|\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$. But there are two other possibilities where the lengths of strings are different: $|\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ maps to $|\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ or $|\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$. The number

of different string-breaking configurations will grow with the increase of w . Besides the string-breaking there are other three possible mechanisms as visualized in Fig. 2: string-contraction, string-expansion, and displacement of string without changing its length. They conserve the number of domain walls, but result in coordinate change of the domain walls. Figure 2(a) shows for $w = 4$ only one string-contracted configuration $|\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$, other possible configurations are $|\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$, $|\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ etc. Starting from an initial state, in general, the quantum evolution under Ising Hamiltonian is expected to result in a linear superposition of all outcome states from these mechanisms.

The average number of domain walls at Bond- j between lattice sites j and $j + 1$ is defined as

$$D_j(t) = \langle \hat{D}_j \rangle, \quad \hat{D}_j = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z \quad (5)$$

measuring a nearest-neighbor correlation function in the z -spin component. To characterize the string-breaking mechanism we consider the average number of domain walls in two regions: (i) inside the initial string,

$$D_{\text{in}}(t) = \sum_{j=l+1}^{l+w-1} D_j(t), \quad (6)$$

and (ii) at the boundaries where the initial domain walls existed

$$D_{\text{bd}}(t) = D_l(t) + D_{l+w}(t). \quad (7)$$

In principle, in the initial product state, the total number of domain walls inside the bulk of the system should change by even numbers only as a single spin-flip always changes the domain wall number by two. The example presented in top panel of Fig. 1 the $D_{\text{in}}(t=0) = 0$ and $D_{\text{bd}}(t=0) = 2$. Therefore string breaking would be defined as the time $t = \tau$ when $D_{\text{in}} = 2$ for the first time, compare bottom panel Fig. 1 where $D_{\text{in}} = 2$, $D_{\text{bd}} = 2$. However, when the initial state is evolved under the Hamiltonian [Eq. (1)], the number of domain walls can change by “any real value ≤ 2 ”. Therefore one way to define the String-Breaking Time (SBT) τ which fulfills the following two criteria simultaneously: $D_{\text{in}}(\tau) \geq D_{\text{bd}}(\tau)$, and $D_{\text{in}}(0 < t < \tau) < D_{\text{bd}}(0 < t < \tau)$.

According to this definition, Fig. 3 implies $\tau \approx 80$ where the exact crossing between two curves D_{in} and D_{bd} occurred. But around $t \approx 40$ these two curves are very close to each other almost touching one another. Therefore for practical purposes, especially in quantum simulation experiments, measuring only the average quantities $D_{\text{in}}, D_{\text{bd}}$ may mislead. The $t \approx 40$ appears to be a better choice for the string-breaking time. We will consider the error in the domain wall measurements to avoid this inconsistency and capture a more realistic situation. The standard deviation as a measure of error for the domain




FIG. 3. (a) Time dynamics for D_j [Eq. (5)] without spin-phonon coupling, (b) comparison of average domain walls inside the initial string = D_{in} and at its boundary = D_{bd} , (c) longitudinal magnetization $\langle \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ as a function of time, (d) dynamics of magnetization [calculated according to Eq. (11)] at the edges S_{ed} and core S_{cr} of the initial string. System size $L = 24$ with open boundary condition, initial string width $w = 4$. $h^z = 1$, $h^x = 0.2$.

walls inside the initial string reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{in}}(t) &= \left[\langle \hat{D}_{\text{in}}^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{D}_{\text{in}} \rangle^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left[\sum_{i,j=l+1}^{l+w-1} \langle \hat{D}_i \hat{D}_j \rangle - \langle \hat{D}_i \rangle \langle \hat{D}_j \rangle \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i,j=l+1}^{l+w-1} \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{i+1}^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z \rangle - \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{i+1}^z \rangle \langle \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z \rangle \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

which involves four-body correlation functions in the z -spin component. A similar definition follows for the standard deviation $\Delta_{\text{bd}}(t)$ at the boundaries where the initial domain wall existed.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{bd}}(t) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[2 + 2 \langle \hat{\sigma}_l^z \hat{\sigma}_{l+1}^z \hat{\sigma}_{l+w}^z \hat{\sigma}_{l+w+1}^z \rangle - \langle \hat{\sigma}_l^z \hat{\sigma}_{l+1}^z \rangle^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2 \langle \hat{\sigma}_l^z \hat{\sigma}_{l+1}^z \rangle \langle \hat{\sigma}_{l+w}^z \hat{\sigma}_{l+w+1}^z \rangle - \langle \hat{\sigma}_{l+w}^z \hat{\sigma}_{l+w+1}^z \rangle^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The last Eq. (9) is in simplified form by the identity $(\hat{\sigma}_j^z)^2 = 1$ use. Therefore we define the String-Breaking Time (SBT) τ which fulfills the following two criteria simultaneously

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{in}}^+(\tau) &\geq D_{\text{bd}}^-(\tau), \\ D_{\text{in}}^+(0 < t < \tau) &< D_{\text{bd}}^-(0 < t < \tau). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

For convenience we used the short notations $D_{\text{in}}^{\pm} = D_{\text{in}} \pm \lambda \Delta_{\text{in}}$ and $D_{\text{bd}}^{\pm} = D_{\text{bd}} \pm \lambda \Delta_{\text{bd}}$. The parameter λ limits the error or controls the confidence level in the estimation of τ . While the value of λ is a matter of the investigator's preference, it is expected that the choice of larger λ will result in shorter string-breaking time τ . In the next section, we will report the results for the choice $\lambda = 0.25$. It is also possible that for a longer time $t \gg \tau$ the number of domain walls inside D_{in}^{\pm} becomes smaller than D_{bd}^{\pm} , and for a further longer time the system again satisfies $D_{\text{in}}^{\pm} \geq D_{\text{bd}}^{\pm}$. To avoid confusion we stress that SBT τ is the first time when the condition $D_{\text{in}}^+ \geq D_{\text{bd}}^-$ satisfies.

The time dynamics do not necessarily lead to pure string-like states. In particular, a superposition of string-contracted and initial string-unbroken configurations and a superposition of string-breaking and initial string-unbroken configurations are hardly distinguishable based only on the number of domain wall comparison (10). In Section 3 we will see the string-expansion or string-displacement—which corresponds to a creation of extra domain walls outside of the initial string—appear only negligibly at the short time of evolution. Therefore, we will be concerned about the string-breaking and string-contraction, and will look for a way to distinguish them. The local magnetization (spin profile) as a function of time distinguishes the string-breaking from string-contraction, and it complements the string-breaking criterion based on the domain walls (10). To be definite, we will extract the following two measures from the spin profile: total magnetization at the core of the string S_{cr} , and at the edges of the string S_{ed} , defined as

$$S_{\text{ed}} = \langle \hat{\sigma}_{l+1}^z \rangle + \langle \hat{\sigma}_{l+w}^z \rangle, \quad S_{\text{cr}} = \sum_{j=l+2}^{l+w-1} \langle \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle. \quad (11)$$

If the initial state (top panel of Fig. 1) for $w = 4$ fully transforms into a string-breaking state, the pair $(S_{\text{cr}}, S_{\text{ed}}) = (-2, -2)$ maps to $(2, -2)$ or $(0, -2)$. On the other hand, if the initial state completely transforms into a string-contracted state, the pair $(S_{\text{cr}}, S_{\text{ed}}) = (-2, -2)$ maps to any pair from the set $\{(-2, 2), (-2, 0), (0, 0), (2, 0), (0, 2)\}$. Figure 3(c)-(d) confirms the change in spin orientations at the core of the initial string at $t \approx 40$, which matches more with string-breaking configuration rather than string-contraction. Therefore, in the absence of phonons, the measured time τ according to (10) indeed corresponds to string-breaking. We will see below that this is not always the case.

3. RESULTS

We numerically study the dynamics resulting from the Hamiltonian Eq. (1) with the help of the time-dependent variational principle (TDVP) technique representing the

wavefunction as a Matrix Product state [61]. We introduce the cut-off for the maximal number of phonons allowed at any lattice site j equal to n_{max} . The value of this cutoff is taken to be much higher than the number of phonons n_j at each site. In fact, we take n_{max} greater than the maximal $n_j + 2\Delta_j$ where Δ_j is the standard deviation of n_j . This quite conservative criterion assures that our results are converged with respect to n_{max} . This is confirmed further by comparing the evolution for different n_{max} values.

We consider $L = 24$ spins in the open boundary conditions geometry, and the initial string width is set to $w = 4$. Throughout our study, we set $h^z = 1$. The vacuum/ground state is set as the initial state of the phonons. Interestingly for this parameter choice, the two configurations in Fig. 1: initial state (top) and string-broken state (bottom) have the same energy expectation value for the spin part of the Hamiltonian $\langle \hat{H}_0 \rangle$. Therefore in the absence of phonon this string-breaking is nothing but a resonant transition induced by the transverse magnetic field h^x .

In the following sections, we present studies on string-breaking dynamics for both shallow, and deep trapping wells, in the case of weak, intermediate, and strong spin-phonon couplings.

3.1. Shallow trapping wells, weak interaction

We consider first shallow trapping potential wells setting $\omega_0 = 0.2$, and weak interaction regime $g \ll 1$.

Figure 4 shows domain wall dynamics at spin-phonon interaction strengths $g = 0.04, 0.08$ (we set the cutoff $n_{\text{max}} = 4$). Comparing Figs. 3 and 4 we see that increasing g increases the gap between the average D_{bd} and the first maximum of average D_{in} . At smaller $g = 0, 0.04$ the close encounter between D_{bd} and D_{in} is observed after a short time of evolution, also around the same time the spin magnetization profiles evolve to spin-up states at the core, which is the sign of string-breaking—compare Fig. 4 with Fig. 1. For larger $g = 0.08$, up to the time-scale of study, the gap between D_{bd} and D_{in} is so large that it is unreasonable to consider any string-breaking.

Interaction excites the phonons in the system as shown in Fig. 5 while initially, no phonon exists. The phonon number outside the initial string maintains its oscillation with time having a frequency of approximately $2\pi/\omega_0 = 2\pi/0.2 = 31$. But inside the initial string region where the dynamics significantly change the spin states, we see distortions of the oscillating phonon number profiles.

Figure 6 shows the increase of string breaking time upon increasing spin-phonon coupling parameter g at $\omega_0 = 0.2$. Therefore the presence of the phonon enhances the string stabilization [62].




FIG. 4. Time dynamics in presence of spin-phonon couplings for $g = 0.04$ (left column) and $g = 0.08$ (right column). Panels (a) and (b) show dynamics of D_j [Eq. (5)], (c)–(d) comparison of domain walls inside the initial string $= D_{in}$ and at its boundary $= D_{bd}$, (e)–(f) local magnetization as a function of time, (g)–(h) magnetizations at the core and edges of the initial string. $\omega_0 = 0.2$, $n_{\max} = 4$. Other parameters are the same as in Fig. 3.

3.2. Shallow trapping wells, strong interaction

For stronger spin-phonon interactions g the number of generated phonons increases. While keeping the same $\omega_0 = 0.2$, we observe a significant difference in the dynamics. As shown below, the string-contraction dominates over string-breaking in that case.

Figure 7 shows the domain wall and spin profile dynamics as functions of time for interaction strength $g = 0.23, 0.28$. The domain walls D_{in}, D_{bd} cross or nearly touch at a certain time associated with string-breaking or contraction. The spin profiles imply the flipping of spin-down states (with a certain probability) at the edges of




FIG. 5. Time dynamics in presence of spin-phonon couplings for $g = 0.04$ (left column) and $g = 0.08$ (right column). Panels (a) and (b) show dynamics of average phonon number $\langle \hat{n}_j \rangle$, (c) and (d) correspond to the standard deviation of the phonon number. Other parameters are the same as in Fig. 4.




FIG. 6. String-breaking time (SBT), denoted as τ , vs g for $\omega_0 = 0.2$ and maximum allowed phonon number per site $n_{\max} = 3, 4$ for (a) $\lambda = 0$ and (b) $\lambda = 0.25$ during the SBT measurement (10). All other parameters are the same as in Fig. 4.

the initial string while spins at the core remain more negatively magnetized compared to the edges. That suggests the string-contraction prevails over other possible mechanisms e.g. string-breaking—compare S_{cr} (green) and S_{ed} (black) curves in Fig. 4 with those in Fig. 7.

Although we aim to discuss the string-breaking in this work, it is interesting to see how this string-contraction mechanism changes with spin-phonon interaction. The definition of string-breaking time at Eq. (10) also works for finding the string-contraction time. Figure 8 shows decreasing string-contraction time τ with interaction strength g . It may be tempting to associate such opposite behavior with the possible resonance between $\hat{H}_{ph} = \omega_0 \sum_j \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_j$ and the longitudinal magnetic potential term in \hat{H}_0 which might happen because of the presence of allowed phonon numbers $n_j = 5, 10, 15$ when $n_{\max} \geq 15$. But a slight change of ω_0 from 0.2 to $0.1\sqrt{5}$ does not alter the qualitative behavior of the decreasing τ with increasing g as shown in Fig. 8.




FIG. 7. Time dynamics in the presence of strong spin-phonon coupling for $g = 0.23$ (left column) and $g = 0.28$ (right column). Panels (a) and (b) show dynamics of D_j , (c)–(d) comparison of domain walls inside the initial string $= D_{in}$ and at its boundary $= D_{bd}$, (e)–(f) local magnetization as a function of time, (g)–(h) magnetizations at the core and edges of the initial strings. $\omega_0 = 0.2$, $n_{\max} = 20$. Other parameters are the same as in Fig. 3.

3.3. Shallow trapping wells, intermediate interaction

At the intermediate interaction regime: $0.08 < g < 0.21$ no significant sign of either string-breaking or string-contraction is observed up to the time scales of numerical runs, as domain wall curves D_{in} and D_{bd} always maintain a large gap. The results are shown in Fig. 9 for $g = 0.18$ with $n_{\max} = 14$. The initial domain walls remain relatively stable despite the coupling to phonons as indicated by $D_{db}(t) \approx 2$. The dynamics of D_{in} indicates that many possible intermediate quantum states participate in it as it is also signaled by magnetization profiles.




FIG. 8. String-contraction time vs g for $\omega_0 = 0.2$ (blue circles connected by a line) at stronger interaction strength g , and the maximum allowed phonon number per site $n_{\max} = 16, 20$ for $\lambda = 0.25$ during the SBT measurement (10). Green crosses connected by a dashed line are for an incommensurate $\omega_0 = 0.1\sqrt{5}$. All other parameters are the same as in Fig. 4.




FIG. 9. (a) Time dynamics for D_j [Eq. (5)], (b) comparison of average domain walls inside the initial string $= D_{in}$ and at its boundary $= D_{bd}$, (c) longitudinal magnetization $\langle \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ as a function of time, (d) dynamics of magnetization [calculated according to Eq. (11)] at the edges S_{ed} and core S_{cr} of the initial string. $g = 0.18$, $\omega_0 = 0.2$, $n_{\max} = 14$, $h^z = 1$, $h^x = 0.2$.

3.4. Deep trapping wells

Consider now deep trapping potentials at each lattice site. Let us set $\omega_0 = 1$. The domain wall and local spin dynamics are shown in Fig. 10. From the magnetization profiles [Fig. 10(e)–(h)] increasing g results in a transition from “string-breaking” to “string-contraction” regimes.

The corresponding dynamics of phonon numbers n_j and their standard deviations are shown in Fig. 11. Ob-




FIG. 10. The dynamics for $\omega_0 = 1$ and $g = 0.2$ (left column) and $g = 0.3$ (right column). $n_{\max} = 8$, $\lambda = 0.25$ during the SBT measurement (10). All other parameters are the same as in Fig. 4. (a)–(b) Comparison of domain walls inside the initial string = D_{in} and at its boundary = D_{bd} , (c)–(d) Domain wall dynamics, (e)–(f) longitudinal magnetization dynamics, (g)–(h) time evolution of magnetizations at the edges and core of the initial string.

serve significant photonic excitations occurring at the positions of the original domain walls. For the time range studied the energy is transferred from the spins to the (initially empty) photonic modes at the walls while at other positions weak oscillations with frequency ω_0 are observed only. The number of generated phonons is much smaller than for shallow wells for the same g (as expected since each phonon carries now a bigger energy).

The string-breaking or string-contraction times as a function of g are shown in Fig. 12. While for shallow potential wells the weak coupling to phonons slowed




FIG. 11. The phonon dynamics for results in Fig. 10. Left [(a), (c)] and right panels [(b), (d)] are at $g = 0.2$ and $g = 0.3$, respectively. The first row [(a), (b)] shows the average phonon number while the second row [(c), (d)] shows its standard deviation. All the results are at $n_{\max} = 8$.




FIG. 12. String-breaking/contraction time as a function of g for longer range of values at $\omega_0 = 1$. Other setups are the same as in Fig. 10. The results for $n_{\max} = 4, 8$ match well indicating the convergence w.r.t. n_{\max} .

down the dynamics (increasing the SBT) here, for $\omega_0 = 1$ the weak spin-phonon interactions $g \leq 0.1$ do not affect the string-breaking time τ . For stronger interactions, a monotonic decrease of τ with g is observed which, for $g > 0.25$ corresponds to a faster string-contraction. Flipping the orientation of the longitudinal magnetic field ($h^z = -1$) is expected to induce string-expansion instead of string-contraction at strong g —see Fig. 13.




FIG. 13. The left [(a), (c)] and right [(b), (d)] columns represent the dynamics for $h^z = 1$ and $h^z = -1$ respectively, at $\omega_0 = 1$, strong interaction regime $g = 0.6$. (a)–(b) Domain wall dynamics, and (c)–(d) local spin dynamics. All the results are at $n_{\max} = 8$ with closed boundary conditions (to avoid significant effects coming from open boundaries when $h^z = -1$). String-contraction dominates the dynamics for $h^z = 1$, while string expansion occurs for $h^z = -1$.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We have considered the dynamics of the initial string in a modified Ising chain. We assume that each site vibrates with a specific frequency. The dynamics of the initial string is significantly modified by the coupling of sites to photonic modes. Such a model mimics a realistic quantum simulation platform, where each spin vibrates with respect to its mean position. To make the model as simple as possible we consider identical harmonic potentials for the trapping wells.

The quantum Ising chain is known to capture the properties of particle creation-annihilation and dynamics of gauge-flux relevant for lattice-gauge-theories, e.g. \mathbb{Z}_2 LGT. Initially prepared string eventually breaks. The presence of vibrations (and spin-phonon coupling) significantly modifies this simple picture. We have considered different possible regimes. The first one corresponds to the case when the frequency of vibrations is much lower than the longitudinal magnetic field strength. Here the weak coupling to phonons seems to slow down the spin dynamics due to the creation of phonons. In effect the string breaking time increases with the spin-phonon coupling strength, g . A further increase of g modifies significantly the dynamics, the domain walls seem to freeze, while at still larger g one may identify other than string-breaking mechanisms. In particular, for a strong g we observe the string contraction instead of the string-breaking.

For larger vibration frequency, of the order of the transverse field a weak coupling to phonons practically does not affect the dynamics and the observed string breaking time is similar to that without phononic background. Beyond some critical g value the observed characteristic time starts to decrease, and spin dynamics become faster. Depending on the sign of the longitudinal field one observes either string expansion or string contraction.

Our study of the spin-phonon coupling effect provides a realistic scenario in quantum simulation setups in tweezers or trapped ions physics. Moreover, it could motivate the study of many-body confinement effects in mesoscopic or macroscopic condensed matter systems, in the presence of environmental influence.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work of A.M. and J.Z. was funded by the National Science Centre, Poland, project 2021/03/Y/ST2/00186 within the QuantERA II Programme (DYNAMITE) that has received funding from the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant agreement No 101017733. We gratefully acknowledge Polish high-performance computing infrastructure PLGrid (HPC Center: ACK Cyfronet AGH) for providing computer facilities and support within computational grant no. PLG/2024/017289. The research has been also supported by a grant from the Priority Research Area (DigiWorld) under the Strategic Programme Excellence Initiative at Jagiellonian University (J.Z.). M.L. and M.P. acknowledge support from ERC AdG NO-QIA; MCIN/AEI (PGC2018-0910.13039/501100011033, CEX2019-000910-S/10.13039/50110 0011033, Plan National FIDEUA PID2019-106901GB-I00, Plan National STAMEENA PID2022-139099NB-I00 project funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by the “European Union NextGenerationEU/PRTR” (PRTR-C17.I1), FPI); QUANTERA MAQS PCI2019-111828-2); QUANTERA DYNAMITE PCI2022-132919 (QuantERA II Programme co-funded by European Union’s Horizon 2020 program under Grant Agreement No 101017733), Ministry of Economic Affairs and Digital Transformation of the Spanish Government through the QUANTUM ENIA project call - Quantum Spain project, and by the European Union through the Recovery, Transformation, and Resilience Plan - NextGenerationEU within the framework of the Digital Spain 2026 Agenda; Fundació Cellex; Fundació Mir-Puig; Generalitat de Catalunya (European Social Fund FEDER and CERCA program, AGAUR Grant No. 2021 SGR 01452, QuantumCAT U16-011424, co-funded by ERDF Operational Program of Catalonia 2014-2020); Barcelona Supercomputing Center MareNostrum (FI-2024-1-0043); EU Quantum Flagship (PASQuanS2.1, 101113690); EU Horizon 2020 FET-OPEN OPTologic (Grant No 899794); EU Horizon Europe Program (Grant Agreement 101080086 - NeQST), ICFO Internal “QuantumGaudi” project;

European Union’s Horizon 2020 program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 847648; “La Caixa” Junior Leaders fellowships, “La Caixa” Foundation (ID 100010434): CF/BQ/PR23/11980043. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the au-

thor(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union, European Commission, European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA), or any other granting authority. Neither the European Union nor any granting authority can be held responsible for them.

-
- [1] M. Gell-Mann, A schematic model of baryons and mesons, *Physics Letters* **8**, 214–215 (1964).
- [2] W. Marciano and H. Pagels, Quantum chromodynamics, *Nature* **279**, 479–483 (1979).
- [3] A. Bazavov, D. Toussaint, C. Bernard, J. Laiho, C. Detar, L. Levkova, M. B. Oktay, S. Gottlieb, U. M. Heller, J. E. Hetrick, P. B. Mackenzie, R. Sugar, and R. S. Van de Water, Nonperturbative qcd simulations with $2 + 1$ flavors of improved staggered quarks, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 1349 (2010).
- [4] D. J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Ultraviolet behavior of non-abelian gauge theories, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30**, 1343 (1973).
- [5] H. D. Politzer, Reliable perturbative results for strong interactions?, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30**, 1346 (1973).
- [6] A. Polyakov, Quark confinement and topology of gauge theories, *Nuclear Physics B* **120**, 429 (1977).
- [7] K. G. Wilson, Confinement of quarks, *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 2445 (1974).
- [8] G. ’t Hooft, On the phase transition towards permanent quark confinement, *Nuclear Physics B* **138**, 1 (1978).
- [9] C. G. Allan, R. Dashen, and D. J. Gross, A mechanism for quark confinement, *Physics Letters B* **66**, 375 (1977).
- [10] O. Philipsen and H. Wittig, String breaking in non-abelian gauge theories with fundamental matter fields, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 4056 (1998).
- [11] F. Knechtli, String breaking and lines of constant physics in the $su(2)$ higgs model, *Nuclear Physics B - Proceedings Supplements* **83-84**, 673 (2000), proceedings of the XVIIth International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory.
- [12] D. Antonov, L. D. Debbio, and A. D. Giacomo, A model for string-breaking in qcd, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2003**, 011 (2003).
- [13] Y. A. Simonov, Relativistic theory of string breaking in qcd, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 065013 (2011).
- [14] J. Greensite, *An Introduction to the Confinement Problem* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011).
- [15] 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, *Physical review letters* **109**, 175302 (2012).
- [16] U.-J. Wiese, Towards quantum simulating qcd, *Nuclear Physics A* **931**, 246 (2014), qUARK MATTER 2014.
- [17] 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).
- [18] M. Aidelsburger, L. Barbiero, A. Bermudez, T. Chanda, A. Dauphin, D. González-Cuadra, P. R. Grzybowski, S. Hands, F. Jendrzejewski, J. Jünemann, G. Juzeliūnas, V. Kasper, A. Piga, S.-J. Ran, M. Rizzi, G. Sierra, L. Tagliacozzo, E. Tirrito, T. V. Zache, J. Zakrzewski, E. Zohar, and M. Lewenstein, Cold atoms meet lattice gauge theory, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **380**, 10.1098/rsta.2021.0064 (2021).
- [19] Y. Y. Atas, J. F. Haase, J. Zhang, V. Wei, S. M.-L. Pfaendler, R. Lewis, and C. A. Muschik, Simulating one-dimensional quantum chromodynamics on a quantum computer: Real-time evolutions of tetra- and pentaquarks, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 033184 (2023).
- [20] A. N. Ciavarella, Quantum simulation of lattice qcd with improved hamiltonians, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 094513 (2023).
- [21] J. Argüello-Luengo, U. Bhattacharya, A. Celi, R. W. Chhajlany, T. Grass, M. Płodzień, D. Rakshit, T. Salamon, P. Stornati, L. Tarruell, and M. Lewenstein, Synthetic dimensions for topological and quantum phases, *Communications Physics* **7**, 10.1038/s42005-024-01636-3 (2024).
- [22] J. C. Halimeh and P. Hauke, Reliability of lattice gauge theories, *Physical Review Letters* **125**, 10.1103/physrevlett.125.030503 (2020).
- [23] 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).
- [24] J. C. Halimeh and P. Hauke, *Stabilizing gauge theories in quantum simulators: A brief review* (2022).
- [25] J. Osborne, I. P. McCulloch, B. Yang, P. Hauke, and J. C. Halimeh, *Large-scale $2 + 1d$ $U(1)$ gauge theory with dynamical matter in a cold-atom quantum simulator* (2022).
- [26] J. C. Halimeh, M. Aidelsburger, F. Grusdt, P. Hauke, and B. Yang, *Cold-atom quantum simulators of gauge theories* (2023).
- [27] H. A. Chawdhry and M. Pellen, Quantum simulation of colour in perturbative quantum chromodynamics, *SciPost Phys.* **15**, 205 (2023).
- [28] P. P. Popov, M. Meth, M. Lewenstein, P. Hauke, M. Ringbauer, E. Zohar, and V. Kasper, Variational quantum simulation of $u(1)$ lattice gauge theories with qudit systems, *Physical Review Research* **6**, 10.1103/physrevresearch.6.013202 (2024).
- [29] 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, H. Sun, B. Yang, P. Hauke, W. Zheng, J. C. Halimeh, Z.-S. Yuan, and J.-W. Pan, Observation of microscopic confinement dynamics by a tunable topological θ -angle, *Nature Physics* 10.1038/s41567-024-02702-x (2024).
- [30] G. Calajó, G. Magnifico, C. Edmunds, M. Ringbauer, S. Montangero, and P. Silvi, Digital quantum simulation of a $(1+1)d$ $su(2)$ lattice gauge theory with ion qudits, *PRX Quantum* **5**, 10.1103/prxquantum.5.040309 (2024).

- [31] J. Feldmeier, N. Maskara, N. U. Köylüoğlu, and M. D. Lukin, [Quantum simulation of dynamical gauge theories in periodically driven rydberg atom arrays](#) (2024), [arXiv:2408.02733 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [32] A. N. Ciavarella and C. W. Bauer, Quantum simulation of $su(3)$ lattice yang-mills theory at leading order in large- N_c expansion, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 111901 (2024).
- [33] A. N. Ciavarella and C. W. Bauer, [Quantum simulation of large \$n\$ lattice gauge theories](#) (2024), [arXiv:2411.16704 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [34] D. M. Grabowska, C. F. Kane, and C. W. Bauer, [A fully gauge-fixed \$su\(2\)\$ hamiltonian for quantum simulations](#) (2024), [arXiv:2409.10610 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [35] 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).
- [36] 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).
- [37] R. C. Farrell, M. Illa, A. N. Ciavarella, and M. J. Savage, Scalable circuits for preparing ground states on digital quantum computers: The schwinger model vacuum on 100 qubits, *PRX Quantum* **5**, 020315 (2024).
- [38] R. Verdel, F. Liu, S. Whitsitt, A. V. Gorshkov, and M. Heyl, Real-time dynamics of string breaking in quantum spin chains, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 014308 (2020).
- [39] 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).
- [40] R. Verdel, G.-Y. Zhu, and M. Heyl, Dynamical localization transition of string breaking in quantum spin chains, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 230402 (2023).
- [41] K. Lee, J. Mulligan, F. Ringer, and X. Yao, Liouvillian dynamics of the open schwinger model: String breaking and kinetic dissipation in a thermal medium, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 094518 (2023).
- [42] F. M. Surace, A. Lerose, O. Katz, E. R. Bennewitz, A. Schuckert, D. Luo, A. De, B. Ware, W. Morong, K. Collins, C. Monroe, Z. Davoudi, and A. V. Gorshkov, [String-breaking dynamics in quantum adiabatic and diabatic processes](#) (2024), [arXiv:2411.10652 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [43] F. M. Surace, A. Lerose, O. Katz, E. R. Bennewitz, A. Schuckert, D. Luo, A. De, B. Ware, W. Morong, K. Collins, C. Monroe, Z. Davoudi, and A. V. Gorshkov, [String-breaking dynamics in quantum adiabatic and diabatic processes](#) (2024).
- [44] A. De, A. Lerose, D. Luo, F. M. Surace, A. Schuckert, E. R. Bennewitz, B. Ware, W. Morong, K. S. Collins, Z. Davoudi, A. V. Gorshkov, O. Katz, and C. Monroe, [Observation of string-breaking dynamics in a quantum simulator](#) (2024).
- [45] 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, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 021041 (2020).
- [46] A. Crippa, K. Jansen, and E. Rinaldi, [Analysis of the confinement string in \$\(2 + 1\)\$ -dimensional quantum electrodynamics with a trapped-ion quantum computer](#) (2024).
- [47] A. N. Ciavarella, [String breaking in the heavy quark limit with scalable circuits](#) (2024), [arXiv:2411.05915 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [48] Y. Liu, W.-Y. Zhang, Z.-H. Zhu, M.-G. He, Z.-S. Yuan, and J.-W. Pan, [String breaking mechanism in a lattice schwinger model simulator](#) (2024), [arXiv:2411.15443 \[cond-mat.quant-gas\]](#).
- [49] S. Wüster, C. Ates, A. Eisfeld, and J. M. Rost, Excitation transport through rydberg dressing, *New Journal of Physics* **13**, 073044 (2011).
- [50] J. P. Hague and C. MacCormick, Quantum simulation of electron-phonon interactions in strongly deformable materials, *New Journal of Physics* **14**, 033019 (2012).
- [51] D. Barredo, H. Labuhn, S. Ravets, T. Lahaye, A. Browaeys, and C. S. Adams, Coherent excitation transfer in a spin chain of three rydberg atoms, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 113002 (2015).
- [52] M. Płodzień, T. Sowiński, and S. Kokkelmans, Simulating polaron biophysics with rydberg atoms, *Scientific Reports* **8**, [10.1038/s41598-018-27232-4](#) (2018).
- [53] K. Jachymski and A. Negretti, Quantum simulation of extended polaron models using compound atom-ion systems, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 033326 (2020).
- [54] M. Magoni, P. Mazza, and I. Lesanovsky, Phonon dressing of a facilitated one-dimensional rydberg lattice gas, *SciPost Physics Core* **5**, [10.21468/scipost-physicscore.5.3.041](#) (2022).
- [55] M. Di Liberto, A. Kruckenhauser, P. Zoller, and M. A. Baranov, Topological phonons in arrays of ultracold dipolar particles, *Quantum* **6**, 731 (2022).
- [56] M. Magoni, R. Joshi, and I. Lesanovsky, Molecular dynamics in rydberg tweezer arrays: Spin-phonon entanglement and jahn-teller effect, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 093002 (2023).
- [57] A. Kosior, S. Kokkelmans, M. Lewenstein, J. Zakrzewski, and M. Płodzień, Phonon-assisted coherent transport of excitations in rydberg-dressed atom arrays, *Physical Review A* **108**, [10.1103/physreva.108.043308](#) (2023).
- [58] J. a. P. Mendonça and K. Jachymski, Quantum simulation of extended electron-phonon-coupling models in a hybrid rydberg atom setup, *Phys. Rev. A* **107**, 032808 (2023).
- [59] M. Magoni, C. Nill, and I. Lesanovsky, Coherent spin-phonon scattering in facilitated rydberg lattices, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 133401 (2024).
- [60] F. M. Surace, [Lattice gauge theories and constrained systems: from quantum simulation to non-equilibrium dynamics](#) (SISSA, PhD thesis, 2021).
- [61] We use the two-site time evolution scheme as described in Ref. [? ?]. For time evolution we use ITensor Julia library [? ?], and “TimeEvoMPS.jl” sub-library provided in <https://github.com/orialb/TimeEvoMPS.jl>.
- [62] As described in the definition of the string-breaking time, Eq. (10), larger error $\lambda = 0.25$ reduces the time τ compared to the $\lambda = 0$ case. We assume $\lambda = 0.25$ from now on (the results do not change significantly for $\lambda \in [0.2, 0.3]$).