

Correlated and Critical Phenomena in Multipartite Quantum Non-Markovianity

Ignacio González^{1,*} and Ángel Rivas^{1,2,†}

¹*Departamento de Física Teórica, Facultad de Ciencias Físicas, Universidad Complutense, 28040 Madrid, Spain.*

²*CCS-Center for Computational Simulation, Campus de Montegancedo UPM, 28660 Boadilla del Monte, Madrid, Spain.*

(Dated: June 24, 2024)

We consider the problem of the general assessment of non-Markovianity in multipartite open quantum systems. To this end, we elaborate on a previously introduced non-Markovian measure to formulate a finite and additive quantifier with appropriate asymptotic behavior. We then study the dynamics of two two-level atoms in a resonant cavity as a function of their interatomic distance using an exact treatment. We observe a critical behavior in the non-Markovianity in the form of a Markovian to non-Markovian transition at a finite distance and a discontinuity in the limit of infinitely close atoms. Additionally, in this limit of highly correlated dynamics, non-Markovianity can emerge when the size of the system exceeds a critical threshold.

Introduction.— Although Markovian master equations provide suitable approximations for the dynamics of open quantum systems in many situations of interest [1–3], all open quantum systems present, to some extent, non-Markovian features. These features are very prominent in the presence of strongly coupled and/or complex, structured environments. However, understanding non-Markovian quantum systems is challenging. Questions such as the formulation of dynamical models in this regime that can be solved with analytical and/or numerical techniques represent one of the most formidable problems in the study of quantum dynamics. Even the proper definition of quantum non-Markovianity as well as its quantification with suitable figures of merit have been subject to intense research, e.g. [4–15]. Notably, most of the studies about characterizations of non-Markovian dynamics deal with relatively simple open systems, such as a qubit or an harmonic oscillator subject to the presence of a non-Markovian bath (see [16–18] and references therein). The behavior of e.g. divisibility conditions or other non-Markovian characterizations has been addressed in very few multipartite cases [19–25]. Still, the dynamical properties of multipartite quantum systems present a series of features with respect to the one-part case that may affect their potential non-Markovian character in a non-trivial way. Particularly, besides time-correlation leading to memory effects, multipartite dynamics can be correlated among their parts [26, 27], and the interplay between these two kind of correlations is a topic almost unexplored.

In this work, we advance in this direction by considering non-Markovian dynamics in correlated multipartite open quantum systems. Specifically,

i) We study the applicability of a previously proposed non-Markovian quantifier to multipartite open systems, addressing additivity properties and modifying it to impose asymptotic vanishing in the case of relaxing evolutions, i.e., once the system remains very close to a steady state. Additivity allows us to isolate the potential non-Markovian effect of correlations among each dynamical part in a multipartite scenario. In addition, we intro-

duce regularized versions of this quantifier to accommodate situations with singular decay rates while keeping additivity.

ii) We solve the dynamics of two atoms separated by an interatomic distance d in a numerically exact way, and find that two independent Markovian systems can become non-Markovian once their separation is below some critical value d_c .

iii) Moreover, for a given and finite time interval $[0, t_{\text{end}}]$, the amount of non-Markovianity is maximized for a certain finite value of the distance d_{max} ; which can be so used in experiments to tailor the amount of non-Markovianity without requiring control on bath properties. Interestingly, if $t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty$ we find a critical behavior in the form of a discontinuity in the amount of non-Markovianity as a function of the interatomic distance.

iv) Finally, in the limit where d is much smaller than the atomic transition wavelength, we find that the dynamics always becomes non-Markovian as the number of system atoms is sufficiently increased.

All of these properties show the richness of non-Markovian multipartite dynamics with respect to the one-part case.

Non-Markovian measures for the multisystem case.— A number of different non-Markovianity measures have been proposed [16–18]. One such measure [7] is given in terms of the trace norm of the Choi matrix of the intermediate dynamics:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{RHP}}(t) := \int_0^t g(s) ds, \quad g(t) := \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{\|\Upsilon_{(t+\epsilon, t)}\|_1 - 1}{\epsilon}. \quad (1)$$

Here, $\Upsilon_{(t,s)} := [\mathcal{E}_{(t,s)} \otimes \mathbb{I}] |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|$, where $\mathcal{E}_{(t,s)}$ is given by the composition law $\mathcal{E}_{(t,0)} = \mathcal{E}_{(t,s)}\mathcal{E}_{(s,0)}$ with $t > s > 0$, and $t = 0$ is taken to be the initial time of the open system dynamics so that $\mathcal{E}_{(t,0)}$ is a completely positive and trace preserving map for any $t \geq 0$. In addition, $|\Phi\rangle$ is the maximally entangled state between two copies of the reduced system $|\Phi\rangle = N^{-1/2} \sum_{n=1}^N |n\rangle|n\rangle$ with N the dimension of its Hilbert space, and $\|A\|_1 = \text{Tr}\sqrt{A^\dagger A}$.

For the multipartite case, and as a difference with other quantifiers, \mathcal{N}_{RHP} has the advantage of being stable under tensor products [20, 23], i.e. if $\{\mathcal{E}_{(t,0)}^{(n)}\}_{n=1,2,\dots}$ is a family of Markovian maps according to \mathcal{N}_{RHP} , so it is $\bigotimes_n \mathcal{E}_{(t,0)}^{(n)}$. In fact, \mathcal{N}_{RHP} is additive, a property which to our knowledge has not been highlighted before for \mathcal{N}_{RHP} . To prove it, just note that $\log(x) \simeq x - 1$ for $x \simeq 1$, so we can alternatively write $g(t) = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \log \|\Upsilon_{(t+\epsilon,t)}\|_1 / \epsilon$, and, since the trace norm of the Choi matrix is multiplicative under tensor products (i.e. under independent dynamics),

$$\mathcal{E}_{(t,t_0)} = \bigotimes_n \mathcal{E}_{(t,t_0)}^{(n)} \Rightarrow \|\Upsilon_{(t+\epsilon,t)}\|_1 = \prod_n \|\Upsilon_{(t+\epsilon,t)}^{(n)}\|_1. \quad (2)$$

The additivity and computational simplicity of \mathcal{N}_{RHP} makes it an appealing choice to quantify non-Markovianity. However, its use also has some disadvantages. For instance, even if the dynamics is relaxing, i.e. the limit $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_{(t,0)} = \mathcal{E}_\infty$ exists, $\mathcal{N}_{\text{RHP}}(t)$ might become arbitrarily large as t increases. Such is the case in the known example of eternal non-Markovianity of [11]. For relaxing dynamics, it is natural to require that the non-Markovianity \mathcal{N} approaches some limiting value because no new memory effect can be observed in a system once its evolution is essentially stopped when very close to its relaxed state. This effect can be accommodated in (1) by changing the measure in the integral, introducing some weight function $w_{\mathcal{E}}(t) \geq 0$,

$$\mathcal{N} = \int_0^\infty g(s) w_{\mathcal{E}}(s) ds, \quad (3)$$

that satisfies $\int_0^\infty w_{\mathcal{E}}(s) ds = 1$, with $w_{\mathcal{E}}(t)$ approaching $w_{\mathcal{E}}(\infty) = 0$ at a similar rate as $\mathcal{E}_{(t,0)}$ approaches \mathcal{E}_∞ . However, in order to preserve additivity, $w_{\mathcal{E}}(t)$ should be independent of the dynamics. A compromise solution is to require additivity of \mathcal{N} just under copies of the same dynamics, i.e. $w_{(\mathcal{E} \otimes_n)}(t) = w_{\mathcal{E}}(t)$. A sensible choice which fulfills these requirements is

$$w_{\mathcal{E}}(t) = \frac{\log F(t)}{\int_0^\infty \log F(s) ds}, \quad (4)$$

where $F(t) := \|\sqrt{\Upsilon_{(t,0)}} \sqrt{\Upsilon_\infty}\|_1^2$ is the fidelity between the Choi matrix at time t and its ergodic average, $\Upsilon_\infty := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \Upsilon_{(t,0)} dt = \Upsilon_{(\infty,0)}$ where the second equality is valid for relaxing dynamics. Of course, in physical terms, the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$ means the maximum time t_{end} that can be observed in a particular experimental situation provided that $\|\Upsilon_{(t_{\text{end}},0)} - \Upsilon_\infty\|_1 \ll 1$, i.e. the experimental capability to distinguish both long time dynamics is negligible. Note that the introduction of the weight function gives \mathcal{N} dimensions of $[\text{time}]^{-1}$. Since $-\int_0^\infty \log F(s) ds$ is a logarithmic estimate of the relaxing time of the dynamics, \mathcal{N} in (3) becomes a quantifier of non-Markovianity per unit of time during which there is significant evolution.

Another issue with the quantifier (1) has to do with the fact that $g(t)$ can be unbounded and non-integrable even in finite intervals. Such is the case of the damped Jaynes-Cummings model for a two-level atom in a resonant QED cavity, modelled by a continuum of bosonic modes with a Lorentzian spectral density

$$J(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\gamma_0^2 \lambda}{(\omega - \omega_0)^2 + \lambda^2}. \quad (5)$$

Here, ω_0 is the energy splitting of the atom (we shall take units of $\hbar = c = 1$ from now on), and γ_0 and λ account for the strength and the frequency width of the coupling with the bosonic reservoir respectively. This model can be solved exactly for ω_0/λ large enough to extend the frequency range to negative values without introducing significant errors [2, 28], obtaining the following differential equation for the dynamics of the two-level atom

$$\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = -i[H_S, \rho(t)] + \gamma(t) [\sigma_- \rho \sigma_+ - \frac{1}{2} \{\sigma_+ \sigma_-, \rho(t)\}]. \quad (6)$$

Here, $H_S = \omega_0 \sigma_z / 2$ is the free Hamiltonian of the atom with ground and excited states, $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively, $\sigma_z = [\sigma_+, \sigma_-]$, $\sigma_+ = |1\rangle\langle 0| = \sigma_-^\dagger$, and the single decay rate is

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{2\gamma_0^2}{\lambda + \Omega_1 \coth\left(\frac{\Omega_1 t}{2}\right)}, \quad (7)$$

with $\Omega_1 = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 2\gamma_0^2}$. The function $g(t)$ can be easily computed in terms of this decay rate, resulting in the negative part of $\gamma(t)$,

$$g_{\text{atom}}(t) = \gamma^-(t) := \frac{1}{2} [|\gamma(t)| - \gamma(t)]. \quad (8)$$

It is clear then that the dynamics is non-Markovian only if $\lambda < \sqrt{2}\gamma_0$, in which case $g(t)$ is a periodic function with simple poles at $t_n = \frac{2}{|\Omega_1|} [\pi n - \cot^{-1}(\frac{\lambda}{|\Omega_1|})]$, with $n = 1, 2, \dots$. In order to regularize the integral (3) if $t > t_{n=0}$, while preserving the additive property, we can apply a ‘‘square root-power’’ procedure

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}} = \left[\int_0^\infty \sqrt{g(s)} w_{\mathcal{E}}(s) ds \right]^2. \quad (9)$$

Accordingly, for some $g(t)$ with a pole of order α , we can take the $(\alpha + 1)$ th root followed by an $(\alpha + 1)$ th power to regularize (3) keeping additivity under copies of the same dynamics. Note that other regularizations valid for any kind of pole [16] e.g. $\bar{g}(t) \propto \tanh[\eta_0 g(t)]$ (with $\eta_0 > 0$ a constant with units of time) come at the prize of the additivity of the measure.

Two atoms in a resonant QED cavity.— Consider now a pair of two-level atoms with free Hamiltonian $H_S = \frac{\omega_0}{2} (\sigma_z^{(1)} + \sigma_z^{(2)})$ inside a resonant QED (see Fig. 1) cavity modelled by the Hamiltonian $H_B = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \omega_{\mathbf{k}} a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}}$,

with $\omega_k = |\mathbf{k}|$ and $a_{\mathbf{k}}$ the annihilation field operator for a photon with wavevector \mathbf{k} . The interaction Hamiltonian under the rotating wave approximation in the interaction picture is given by

$$H_I(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} g(\omega_k) \left[\sum_{n=1,2} \sigma_+^{(n)} a_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_n} e^{-i\Delta_k t} + \text{H.c.} \right], \quad (10)$$

where \mathbf{r}_n is the position of the n th atom, $\sigma_+^{(n)} = |1\rangle_n \langle 0|$, and $\Delta_k = \omega_k - \omega_0$. If we assume that the cavity remains initially in the vacuum, since $H_I(t)$ preserves the total number of excitations, by restricting the dynamics to the (0 and) 1-excitation subspace, the system+cavity state at a time t will be of the form

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{i+j<2} c_{ij}(t) |i, j, 0\rangle + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{00\mathbf{k}}(t) |0, 0, 1_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle, \quad (11)$$

where $|i, j, m_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle$ indicates the first and second atom in the states $|i\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$, respectively, and m photons with wavevector \mathbf{k} in the bath, $i, j, m \in \{0, 1\}$. The first component is clearly invariant, $\dot{c}_{00}(t) = 0$, so we shall not consider it in the following. The Schrödinger equation on the state (11) gives

$$\begin{cases} i\dot{c}_{jl}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} g(\omega_k) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_1+t} e^{-i\Delta_k t} c_{00\mathbf{k}}(t), \\ i\dot{c}_{00\mathbf{k}}(t) = g(\omega_k) e^{i\Delta_k t} [e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_1} c_{10}(t) + e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_2} c_{01}(t)]. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Since we consider the bath initially in the vacuum, $c_{00\mathbf{k}}(0) = 0$, so we can formally integrate the last equation in this system. Introducing the result in the first one, we obtain

$$\dot{c}_{jl}(t) = - \int_0^t dt' [f_1(t-t') c_{jl}(t') + f_2(t-t') c_{ij}(t')], \quad (13)$$

where we have defined the correlation functions, after taking the continuum limit in the bath modes $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow \lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} V/(4\pi^3) \int d^3k$ (with V the quantization volume), by

$$f_1(t-t') := \int_0^\infty d\omega J(\omega) e^{-i\Delta(t-t')}, \quad (14)$$

$$f_2(t-t') := \int_0^\infty d\omega J(\omega) \frac{\sin(\omega d)}{\omega d} e^{-i\Delta(t-t')}, \quad (15)$$

with $\Delta = \omega - \omega_0$, $d = |\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|$ and $J(\omega) := \frac{\omega^2}{\pi^2} \lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} g^2(\omega) V$ the spectral density. As usual for modeling resonant QED, we consider the Lorentzian spectral density as in the previous section (5), with ω_0/λ large enough to extend the integrals in (14)-(15) to negative frequencies. In this case one obtains

$$f_1(t) = \frac{\gamma_0^2}{2} e^{-\lambda t}, \quad (16)$$




FIG. 1. Non-Markovianity measure (9) as a function of the interatomic distance d for different values of λ . We have taken $\gamma_0 = 0.01$ and $t \in [0, 350]$. All quantities are in units of $\omega_0 = 1$. The insert illustrates the system setup.

$$f_2(t) = \frac{\gamma_0^2}{4d} \left\{ \left[\frac{\theta(t-d) e^{(\lambda+i\omega_0)d} - e^{-(\lambda+i\omega_0)d}}{\lambda + i\omega_0} \right] e^{-\lambda t} - \theta(d-t) \left[\frac{e^{-(\lambda-i\omega_0)d}}{\lambda - i\omega_0} e^{\lambda t} - \frac{2\lambda}{\omega_0^2 + \lambda^2} e^{i\omega_0 t} \right] \right\}. \quad (17)$$

Exact master equation for the reduced system.— If we write the atomic part of the state (11) in terms of the vectors $|\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle \pm |01\rangle)$, and trace out the bath degrees of freedom, after time differentiation we obtain the atomic dynamics satisfies the master equation [29]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_S(t)}{dt} = & -i \sum_{m=1,2} \frac{S_m(t)}{2} [L_m^\dagger L_m, \rho_S(t)] \\ & + \sum_{m=1,2} \gamma_m(t) \left[L_m \rho_S(t) L_m^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_m^\dagger L_m, \rho_S(t)\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

with the jump operators $L_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\sigma_-^{(1)} - (-1)^m \sigma_-^{(2)}]$, and Lamb shifts and decay rates given by

$$S_m(t) := -2 \text{Im} \left[\frac{\dot{r}_m(t)}{r_m(t)} \right], \quad \gamma_m(t) = -2 \text{Re} \left[\frac{\dot{r}_m(t)}{r_m(t)} \right], \quad (19)$$

where $r_m(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[c_{10}(t) - (-1)^m c_{01}(t)]$ which, according to (13), satisfy

$$\dot{r}_m(t) = - \int_0^t dt' K_m(t-t') r_m(t'), \quad (20)$$

with $K_m(t) := f_1(t) - (-1)^m f_2(t)$.

Non-Markovianity as a function of interatomic distance.— The function $g(t)$ can be calculated from the master equation (18) [11, 16] and yields

$$g(t) = \frac{2}{3} [\gamma_1^-(t) + \gamma_2^-(t)]. \quad (21)$$

To obtain the decay rates we need to solve (20). This is difficult because of the intricate time dependence of $f_2(t)$ for finite distance d (17). However, when $d \rightarrow \infty$, we have $f_2(t) = 0$, hence $K_1(t) = K_2(t) = f_1(t)$. The system (20) reduces to that found in the one-atom damped Jaynes-Cummings model, and we obtain $\gamma_1(t) = \gamma_2(t) = \gamma(t)$,

$$g_\infty(t) = \frac{4}{3}\gamma^-(t) = \frac{4}{3}g_{\text{atom}}(t), \quad (22)$$

where $\gamma(t)$ and $g_{\text{atom}}(t)$ are given by (7) and (8), respectively. One should notice that, despite in the limit $d \rightarrow \infty$ the dynamics of both atoms is independent, as we have restricted our study to the (0 and) 1 excitation subspace, the additivity factor of 2 is here reduced to $4/3$. On the other hand, if we take $d = 0$, $f_1(t) = f_2(t)$, so that $K_1(t) = 2f_1(t)$ and $K_2(t) = 0$. The equations (20) can be solved by differentiation leading to

$$r_1(t) = e^{-\frac{\lambda t}{2}} \left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Omega_2 t}{2}\right) + \frac{\lambda}{\Omega_2} \sinh\left(\frac{\Omega_2 t}{2}\right) \right], \quad (23)$$

and $r_2(t) = r_2(0)$, with $\Omega_2 = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 4\gamma_0^2}$. Therefore $|\rightarrow\rangle$ becomes a dark state and jointly with $|0,0\rangle$ forms a decoherence-free subspace (DFS) [30, 31]. In this case $\gamma_2(t) = 0$ and $\gamma_1(t)$ is twice the same function as (7) with Ω_2 in the role of Ω_1 , so that

$$g_0(t) = \frac{2}{3}\gamma_1^-(t) = \frac{8\gamma_0^2}{3} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda + \Omega_2 \coth\left(\frac{\Omega_2 t}{2}\right)} \right]^-. \quad (24)$$

Therefore, when $d = 0$ the dynamics is non-Markovian if only and if Ω_2 has a nonzero imaginary part, i.e. $\lambda < 2\gamma_0$. In the opposite limit $d \rightarrow \infty$, being $g_\infty(t)$ proportional to that of the one-atom case (22), the dynamics is non-Markovian when $\lambda < \sqrt{2}\gamma_0$. Consequently, there exists a region in the spectral density parameter space given by $2\gamma_0 > \lambda > \sqrt{2}\gamma_0$ in which the dynamics is Markovian when the atoms are far from each other, but non-Markovian when they are at the same position, which suggests that non-Markovianity can be created by bringing the atoms together. The question is then whether there exists a finite critical distance d_c splitting the non-Markovian ($d < d_c$) from the Markovian phase ($d > d_c$).

To answer such a question we need to solve the dynamics for any distance d . The intricate time dependence of $f_2(t)$ in (15) prevents an analytical solution as well as the application of non-Markovian numerical methods such as [32–37] efficient on bath correlation functions well approximated by linear combinations of exponential terms and/or with short correlation time (i.e. large λ). Nevertheless, the Eq. (20) defines a pair of uncoupled integro-differential equations of Volterra type with a continuous kernel, which can be numerically solved by quadrature rules [38, 39]. The numerical result for the decay rates $\gamma_{1,2}(t)$ is plotted in Fig. 2 for several interatomic distances confirming the existence of a finite critical d_c




FIG. 2. Decay rates $\gamma_1(t)$ (left) and $\gamma_2(t)$ (right) for different values of the interatomic distance d . All quantities are in units of $\omega_0 = 1$. For $d = 2.1$ both decay rates are always positive. As d is decreased, $\gamma_1(t)$ begins to dip below the x axis. We have taken $\gamma_0 = 0.01$, and $\lambda = 1.65\gamma_0$.

where the minimum of $\gamma_1(t)$ becomes negative. More specifically, as illustrated in Fig. 1, the dynamics remains Markovian at any finite distance in the region of parameter space $\lambda > 2\gamma_0$ where both limits $d = 0$ and $d \rightarrow \infty$ are divisible. In the region $2\gamma_0 > \lambda > \sqrt{2}\gamma_0$ where $d \rightarrow \infty$ is divisible but $d = 0$ is not, we see non-Markovianity being created at d_c as was pointed out earlier. Finally, with $\lambda < \sqrt{2}\gamma_0$ where both limits are non-divisible, we find that the dynamics is non-Markovian at any distance d , $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}|_d > 0$.

Maximum non-Markovianity.— Interestingly, besides the existence of a critical distance, the amount of non-Markovianity as measured by (9) presents a non-monotonic behaviour with a maximum at an intermediate d_{max} distance as show in Fig. 1. This peak can be understood as a result of the slowing down of the dynamics due to the DFS existing at $d = 0$. Specifically, as the atoms get closer to each other, the relaxation time τ_2 of the singlet component $r_2(t)$ increases, approaching infinity as $d \rightarrow 0$. Consequently, we can consider three different regimes for the non-Markovianity $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(t_{\text{end}})$, with t_{end} any finite value for the upper limit in the integral (9). If $\tau_2 \ll t_{\text{end}}$, the weight function is negligible in $(\tau_2, t_{\text{end}}]$ and these times do not contribute to the integral (9). For small enough d , $\tau_2 \sim t_{\text{end}}$ and the non-Markovianity increases because the weight function is non-negligible over the total integration interval $[0, t_{\text{end}}]$, and the $g(t)$ function grows as the negative part of $\gamma_1(t)$ increases. For even smaller interatomic distances $\tau_2 \gg t_{\text{end}}$, the singlet component decays so slowly that it remains approximately constant $r_2(t) \simeq r_2(0) \simeq r_2(t_{\text{end}})$, and so the system effectively relaxes in the same time scale τ_1 as $r_1(t)$. This, in turn, results in the weight function falling to 0 at an earlier time $\tau_1 (< \tau_2)$, leading to a decreasing value of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(t_{\text{end}})$ that continuously approaches $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(t_{\text{end}})|_{d=0}$. This illustrates the convenience of using the weight function in the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$; on the same time interval, the slower the dynamics, the less the non-Markovianity.

The values of d which lead to an approximately constant singlet component for $t \in [0, t_{\text{end}}]$ are smaller as




FIG. 3. Non-Markovianity measure (9) as a function of the interatomic distance d for different values of the final time t_{end} . The plot on the right shows the neighborhood of $d = 0$. All quantities are in units of $\omega_0 = 1$. We have taken the same values of γ_0 and λ as in Fig. 2. The line $t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty$ is an extrapolation from the exact value at $d \downarrow 0$ and $t_{\text{end}} = 1.2 \times 10^4$. Note the discontinuity of the green line for $d = 0$.

t_{end} increases. Therefore, the peak's maximum value moves to the left and becomes higher as t_{end} grows due to the broader integration range. In the limit $t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty$, $g(t)$ approaches the periodic function $g_0(t)$ and it can be shown [29] that $\lim_{d \downarrow 0} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}|_{d(t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty)} \equiv \lim_{d \downarrow 0} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}|_d = \frac{1}{3}(2\gamma_0 - \lambda)$. However, since at $d = 0$, $r_2(t)$ remains constant for all times, $|\rightarrow$ becomes a steady state, and the system relaxes after a time τ_1 , when $r_1(t)$ does. So, the weight function changes discontinuously and decays in a time τ_1 , as a difference with the limiting case $d \downarrow 0$ where it takes an infinite time to decay. Therefore the non-Markovianity is suddenly modified at $d = 0$ compared to the limiting case $d \downarrow 0$, $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}|_{d=0} \neq \lim_{d \downarrow 0} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}|_d$. This discontinuity at $d = 0$ is a critical behaviour in the non-Markovianity caused by the breaking of the symmetry $\mathbf{r}_1 \leftrightarrow \mathbf{r}_2$ in $H_I(t)$ that leads to the formation of the DFS.

Non-Markovianity of N atoms at $d = 0$.— Non-Markovianity can be influenced not only by varying the interatomic distance but also by modifying the number of atoms. More specifically, consider the previous situation with N atoms at $d = 0$. The interaction Hamiltonian (10) now becomes

$$H_I(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} g(\omega_{\mathbf{k}}) \sum_{n=1}^N \left[\sigma_+^{(n)} a_{\mathbf{k}} e^{-i\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}t} + \text{H.c.} \right]. \quad (25)$$

By restricting again to the (0 and) 1 excitation subspace, and generalizing the previous arguments for $N = 2$ to an arbitrary N [29] we obtain the following master equation for the atoms

$$\frac{d\rho_S(t)}{dt} = \gamma_N(t) \left(J_- \rho_S(t) J_+ - \frac{1}{2} \{J_+ J_-, \rho_S(t)\} \right), \quad (26)$$

with the jump operator $J_- = J_+^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=1}^N \sigma_-^{(n)}$, and the decay rate

$$\gamma_N(t) = \frac{2N\gamma_0^2}{\lambda + \Omega_N \coth\left(\frac{\Omega_N t}{2}\right)}, \quad (27)$$

where $\Omega_N = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 2N\gamma_0^2}$. In this case, we obtain

$$g_{(N)}(t) = \frac{2}{N+1} \gamma_N^-(t). \quad (28)$$

It is immediate to check that in order to have non-Markovianity the condition $\lambda < \sqrt{2N}\gamma_0$ must be satisfied. In consequence, if we are in a situation with N atoms in $d = 0$ with divisible dynamics, we can turn it non-Markovian just by increasing the number of atoms beyond $N_c = \lceil \frac{\lambda^2}{2\gamma_0^2} \rceil$. In particular in the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ the dynamics becomes non-Markovian for any finite λ and γ_0 .

Conclusions.— We have introduced an approach to study quantum non-Markovianity in multipartite quantum systems based on an additive generalization of a previously proposed non-Markovianity quantifier. With this tool, we have analyzed the non-Markovian properties of the dynamics of two two-level atoms in a resonant cavity as a function of their spatial separation. For an appropriate parameter regime, we have found that there exists a critical distance d_c where dynamics ceases to be Markovian and becomes non-Markovian, being the non-Markovianity maximum $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\text{max}}$ at some intermediate distance d_{max} for any finite final time. In the limit of an infinite final time, the non-Markovianity becomes a discontinuous function for $d_{\text{max}} \rightarrow 0$, splitting two dynamical phases, one with a 2-dimensional DFS and the other with a 1-dimensional one. If all atoms are joined at $d = 0$, the strong dynamical correlations among them enable non-Markovianity to emerge as the size of the system increases. Regardless of the strength and width of the spectral density, there always exists a critical number of atoms that makes the dynamics non-Markovian.

These results indicate the important role that correlations among the dynamics of parties of multipartite systems may play on its non-Markovian features. They can be very sensitive to specific values of system parameters, such as the distance between subsystems or their number. These parameters can be used to drive Markovian-non-Markovian transitions and control the amount of non-Markovianity in e.g. platforms of atomic or ionic trapping, avoiding the need for microscopic tuning of complex environmental features, which are usually beyond control in real quantum experiments.

The authors acknowledge support from Spanish MICIN grant PID2021-122547NB-I00 and from the ‘‘MADQuantum-CM’’ project funded by Comunidad de Madrid and by the Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan – Funded by the European Union - NextGenerationEU. I.G. acknowledges support from the MICIN contract PRE2022-101824 (MICIN/AEI/FSE,UE).

* ignago10@ucm.es

† anrivas@ucm.es

- [1] R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications* (Springer, Berlin, 1987).
- [2] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).
- [3] A. Rivas and S. F. Huelga, *Open Quantum Systems. An Introduction* (Springer, Heidelberg, 2011).
- [4] G. Lindblad, *Non-Markovian quantum stochastic processes and their entropy*, Commun. Math. Phys. **65**, 281 (1979).
- [5] L. Accardi, A. Frigerio and J.T. Lewis, *Quantum Stochastic Processes*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **18**, 97 (1982).
- [6] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, and J. Piilo, *Measure for the Degree of Non-Markovian Behavior of Quantum Processes in Open Systems*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210401 (2009).
- [7] A. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, *Entanglement and Non-Markovianity of Quantum Evolutions*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050403 (2010).
- [8] D. Chruściński and A. Kossakowski, *Non-Markovian Quantum Dynamics: Local versus Nonlocal*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 070406 (2010).
- [9] D. Chruściński and A. Kossakowski and A. Rivas, *Measures of non-Markovianity: Divisibility versus backflow of information*, Phys. Rev. A **83** 052128 (2011).
- [10] G. Guarnieri, A. Smirne, and B. Vacchini, *Quantum regression theorem and non-Markovianity of quantum dynamics*, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 022110 (2014).
- [11] M. J. W. Hall, J. D. Cresser, L. Li and E. Andersson, *Canonical form of master equations and characterization of non-Markovianity*, Phys. Rev. A **89** 042120 (2014).
- [12] D. Chruściński and S. Maniscalco, *Degree of Non-Markovianity of Quantum Evolution*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 120404 (2014).
- [13] F. A. Pollock, C. Rodríguez-Rosario, T. Frauenheim, M. Paternostro, and K. Modi, *Operational Markov Condition for Quantum Processes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 040405 (2018).
- [14] J. Kolodyński, S. Rana, and A. Streltsov, *Entanglement negativity as a universal non-Markovianity witness*, Phys. Rev. A **101**, 020303(R) (2020).
- [15] C. Bäcker, K. Beyer, and W. T. Strunz, *Local Disclosure of Quantum Memory in Non-Markovian Dynamics*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, 060402 (2024).
- [16] A. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, *Quantum non-Markovianity: Characterization, quantification and detection*, Rep. Prog. Phys. **77**, 094001 (2014).
- [17] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and B. Vacchini, *Colloquium: Non-Markovian dynamics in open quantum systems*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 021002 (2016).
- [18] L. Li, M. J. W. Hall, and H. M. Wiseman, *Concepts of quantum non-Markovianity: A hierarchy*, Phys. Rep. **759**, 1 (2018).
- [19] C. Addis, G. Karpat, C. Macchiavello, and S. Maniscalco, *Dynamical memory effects in correlated quantum channels*, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 032121 (2016).
- [20] F. Benatti, D. Chruściński, and S. Filippov, *Tensor power of dynamical maps and positive versus completely positive divisibility*, Phys. Rev. A **95**, 012112 (2017).
- [21] J. Zou, S. Bosco, D. Loss, *Spatially correlated classical and quantum noise in driven qubits*, npj Quantum Inf. **10**, 46 (2024).
- [22] T. M. D. Azevedo, C. Duarte, and N. K. Bernardes, *Distillation of quantum non-Markovianity*, Phys. Lett. A **512**, 129582 (2024).
- [23] F. Benatti and G. Nichele, *Open Quantum Dynamics: Memory Effects and Superactivation of Backflow of Information*, Mathematics **12**, 37 (2024).
- [24] V. B. Sabale, N. R. Dash, A. Kumar, and S. Banerjee, *Facets of correlated non-Markovian channels*, arXiv:2401.05499.
- [25] A. Keefe, N. Agarwal, and A. Kamal, *Quantifying spectral signatures of non-Markovianity beyond Born-Redfield master equation*, arXiv:2405.01722.
- [26] A. Rivas and M. Müller, *Quantifying spatial correlations of general quantum dynamics*, New J. Phys. **17**, 062001 (2015).
- [27] L. Postler, A. Rivas, P. Schindler¹, A. Erhard, R. Stricker, D. Nigg, T. Monz, R. Blatt, and M. Müller, *Experimental quantification of spatial correlations in quantum dynamics*, Quantum **2**, 90 (2018).
- [28] B. M. Garraway, *Nonperturbative decay of an atomic system in a cavity*, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 2290 (1997).
- [29] See Supplemental Material for a detailed derivation of the exact master equation for two atoms, for N atoms at $d = 0$, and for the calculation of the limit $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}|_{d=0}$.
- [30] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, *Noiseless Quantum Codes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3306 (1997).
- [31] A. Beige, D. Braun, and P. L. Knight, *Driving atoms into decoherent free states*, New J. Phys. **2**, 22 (2000).
- [32] Y. Tanimura and R. Kubo, *Time evolution of a quantum system in contact with a nearly Gaussian-Markoffian noise bath*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **58**, 101 (1989).
- [33] Y. Tanimura, *Numerically “exact” approach to open quantum dynamics: The hierarchical equations of motion (HEOM)*, J. Chem. Phys. **153**, 020901 (2020).
- [34] D. Tamascelli, A. Smirne, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, *Nonperturbative Treatment of non-Markovian Dynamics of Open Quantum Systems*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 030402 (2018).
- [35] N. Lambert, S. Ahmed, M. Cirio, and F. Nori, *Modelling the ultra-strongly coupled spin-boson model with unphysical modes*, Nat. Commun. **10**, 3721 (2019).
- [36] G. Pleasance, B. M. Garraway, and F. Petruccione, *Generalized theory of pseudomodes for exact descriptions of non-Markovian quantum processes*, Phys. Rev. Research **2**, 043058 (2020).
- [37] A. Strathearn, P. Kirton, D. Kilda, J. Keeling, and B. W. Lovett, *Efficient non-Markovian quantum dynamics using time-evolving matrix product operators*, Nat. Commun. **9**, 3322 (2018).
- [38] P. Linz, *Analytical and Numerical Methods for Volterra Equations* (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 1985).
- [39] L. M. Delves and J. L. Mohamed, *Computational Methods for Integral Equations* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1985).
- [40] A. Müller-Hermes and D. Reeb, *Monotonicity of the Quantum Relative Entropy Under Positive Maps*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **18**, 1777 (2017).
- [41] S. Bhattacharya, A. Misra, C. Mukhopadhyay, and A. K. Pati, *Exact master equation for a spin interacting with a spin bath: Non-Markovianity and negative entropy pro-*

duction rate, Phys. Rev. A **95**, 012122 (2017).

- [42] S. Marcantoni, S. Alipour, F. Benatti, R. Floreani, A. T. Rezakhani, *Entropy production and non-Markovian dynamical maps*, Sci. Rep. **7**, 12447 (2017).
 [43] S. Maniscalco, F. Francica, R. L. Zaffino, N. Lo Gullo, and F. Plastina, *Protecting Entanglement via the Quantum Zeno Effect*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 090503 (2008).

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

1. Exact master equation for two atoms at different positions

The total system+environment state at an arbitrary time t ,

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = c_{00}|0, 0, 0\rangle + c_{10}(t)|1, 0, 0\rangle + c_{01}(t)|0, 1, 0\rangle + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{00\mathbf{k}}(t)|0, 0, \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle, \quad (\text{S1})$$

is rewritten in the basis $\{|00\rangle, |\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle \pm |01\rangle)\}$ as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = c_{00}|0, 0, 0\rangle + r_1(t)|+\rangle|0\rangle + r_2(t)|-\rangle|0\rangle + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{00\mathbf{k}}(t)|0, 0, \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle, \quad (\text{S2})$$

with

$$\begin{cases} r_1(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [c_{10}(t) + c_{01}(t)], \\ r_2(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [c_{10}(t) - c_{01}(t)]. \end{cases} \quad (\text{S3})$$

The reduced system density matrix can then be easily calculated, resulting in

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_S(t) &= \text{Tr}_B [|\psi(t)\rangle\langle\psi(t)|] \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} |r_1(t)|^2 & r_1(t)r_2^*(t) & r_1(t)c_{00}^* \\ r_1^*(t)r_2(t) & |r_2(t)|^2 & r_2(t)c_{00}^* \\ r_1^*(t)c_{00} & r_2^*(t)c_{00} & 1 - |r_1(t)|^2 - |r_2(t)|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S4})$$

After taking time-derivative, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_S(t)}{dt} &= -i \text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{r}_1(t) \\ r_1(t) \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -r_1(t)r_2^*(t) & -r_1(t)c_{00}^* \\ r_1^*(t)r_2(t) & 0 & 0 \\ r_1^*(t)c_{00} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - i \text{Im} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{r}_2(t) \\ r_2(t) \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & r_1(t)r_2^*(t) & 0 \\ -r_1^*(t)r_2(t) & 0 & -r_2(t)c_{00}^* \\ 0 & r_2^*(t)c_{00} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \text{Re} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{r}_1(t) \\ r_1(t) \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2|r_1(t)|^2 & r_1(t)r_2^*(t) & r_1(t)c_{00}^* \\ r_1^*(t)r_2(t) & 0 & 0 \\ r_1^*(t)c_{00} & 0 & -2|r_1(t)|^2 \end{pmatrix} + \text{Re} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{r}_2(t) \\ r_2(t) \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & r_1(t)r_2^*(t) & 0 \\ r_1^*(t)r_2(t) & 2|r_2(t)|^2 & r_2(t)c_{00}^* \\ 0 & r_2^*(t)c_{00} & -2|r_2(t)|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5})$$

Note that the fractions $\dot{r}_m(t)/r_m(t)$ are independent of the initial system state. Indeed, as $r_m(t)$ satisfy a homogeneous integro-differential equation (see main text)

$$\dot{r}_m(t) = - \int_0^t dt' K_m(t-t') r_m(t'), \quad (\text{S6})$$

if $\tilde{r}_m(t)$ is the solution for the initial condition $\tilde{r}_m(t) = 1$, the solution for an arbitrary initial condition $r_m(0)$ is clearly $r_m(t) = \tilde{r}_m(t)r_m(0)$, so the $\dot{r}_m(t)/r_m(t)$ are independent of $r_m(0)$.

On the other hand, if we define the jump operators

$$\begin{cases} L_1 = |0, 0\rangle\langle +| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\sigma_-^{(1)} + \sigma_-^{(2)}), \\ L_2 = |0, 0\rangle\langle -| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\sigma_-^{(1)} - \sigma_-^{(2)}), \end{cases} \quad (\text{S7})$$

it is straightforwardly shown that

$$\begin{aligned}
& -i \sum_{m=1,2} \frac{S_m(t)}{2} [L_m^\dagger L_m, \rho_S(t)] + \sum_{m=1,2} \gamma_m(t) \left[L_m \rho_S(t) L_m^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_m^\dagger L_m, \rho_S(t)\} \right] \\
& = -i \frac{S_1(t)}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & r_1(t)r_2^*(t) & r_1(t)c_{00}^* \\ -r_1^*(t)r_2(t) & 0 & 0 \\ -r_1^*(t)c_{00} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} - i \frac{S_2(t)}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -r_1(t)r_2^*(t) & 0 \\ r_1^*(t)r_2(t) & 0 & r_2(t)c_{00}^* \\ 0 & -r_2^*(t)c_{00} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
& - \gamma_1(t) \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & |r_1(t)|^2 \end{pmatrix} - \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2|r_1(t)|^2 & r_1(t)r_2^*(t) & r_1(t)c_{00}^* \\ r_1^*(t)r_2(t) & 0 & 0 \\ r_1^*(t)c_{00} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right] \\
& - \gamma_2(t) \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & |r_2(t)|^2 \end{pmatrix} - \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & r_1(t)r_2^*(t) & 0 \\ r_1^*(t)r_2(t) & 2|r_2(t)|^2 & r_2(t)c_{00}^* \\ 0 & r_2^*(t)c_{00} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right]. \tag{S8}
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing (S5) and (S8), it follows that the reduced system dynamics satisfies the master equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\rho_S(t)}{dt} & = -i \sum_{m=1,2} \frac{S_m(t)}{2} [L_m^\dagger L_m, \rho_S(t)] \\
& + \sum_{m=1,2} \gamma_m(t) \left[L_m \rho_S(t) L_m^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_m^\dagger L_m, \rho_S(t)\} \right], \tag{S9}
\end{aligned}$$

with the Lamb shifts and decay rates

$$\begin{cases} S_1(t) = -2 \operatorname{Im} \left[\frac{\dot{r}_1(t)}{r_1(t)} \right], \\ S_2(t) = -2 \operatorname{Im} \left[\frac{\dot{r}_2(t)}{r_2(t)} \right], \end{cases} \tag{S10}$$

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_1(t) = -2 \operatorname{Re} \left[\frac{\dot{r}_1(t)}{r_1(t)} \right], \\ \gamma_2(t) = -2 \operatorname{Re} \left[\frac{\dot{r}_2(t)}{r_2(t)} \right]. \end{cases} \tag{S11}$$

2. Exact dynamics of N atoms at $d = 0$

We consider now the previous model for N identical two-level atoms located at $d = 0$. The interaction Hamiltonian is given by

$$H_I(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} g(\omega_{\mathbf{k}}) \sum_{n=1}^N \left[\sigma_+^{(n)} a_{\mathbf{k}} e^{-i(\omega_{\mathbf{k}} - \omega_0)t} + \text{H.c.} \right]. \tag{S12}$$

This preserves the number of initial excitations. We restrict ourselves to the (0 and) 1 initial excitation subspace, so we have a state at time t of the form

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = c_0 |0_N\rangle |0\rangle + \sum_{n=1}^N c_n(t) |1_n\rangle |0\rangle + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}}(t) |0_N\rangle |1_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle, \tag{S13}$$

where $|0_N\rangle$ denotes all atoms in the ground state, and $|1_n\rangle$ the n th atom in the excited state with the others in the ground. As $|0_N\rangle|0\rangle$ remains invariant, we do not consider it in the following. For the rest, the Schrödinger equation gives

$$\begin{cases} i \dot{c}_n(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} g(\omega_{\mathbf{k}}) e^{-i\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}t} c_{\mathbf{k}}(t), \\ i \dot{c}_{\mathbf{k}}(t) = g(\omega_{\mathbf{k}}) \sum_{n=1}^N e^{i\Delta_{\mathbf{k}}t} c_n(t). \end{cases} \tag{S14}$$

Since we consider the field initially in the vacuum, following the same procedure as in the case of two atoms, this can be reduced to

$$\dot{c}_n(t) = -\frac{\gamma_0^2}{2} \int_0^t dt' e^{-\lambda(t-t')} \sum_{m=1}^N c_m(t'), \tag{S15}$$

in the continuum limit. In order to solve these equations it is convenient to work in the following basis:

$$\begin{cases} |+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=1}^N |1_n\rangle, \\ |-, n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n(n-1)}} \left[\left(\sum_{m=1}^{n-1} |1_m\rangle \right) - (n-1) |1_n\rangle \right], \end{cases} \tag{S16}$$

where $n = 2, 3, \dots, N$. In this new basis, state (S13) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi(t)\rangle & = c_0 |0_N\rangle |0\rangle + c_+(t) |+\rangle |0\rangle \\
& + \sum_{n=2}^N c_{0,n}(t) |-, n\rangle |0\rangle + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}}(t) |0_N\rangle |1_{\mathbf{k}}\rangle, \tag{S17}
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{cases} c_+(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=1}^N c_n(t), \\ c_{-,n}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n(n-1)}} \left[\sum_{m=1}^{n-1} c_m(t) - (n-1) c_n(t) \right]. \end{cases} \tag{S18}$$

Taking $1/\sqrt{N}\sum_n$ in (S15) we obtain

$$\dot{c}_+(t) = -\frac{N\gamma_0^2}{2} \int_0^t dt' e^{-\lambda(t-t')} c_+(t'). \quad (\text{S19})$$

This equation can be easily solved by taking time-derivative or by Laplace transformation, resulting in

$$c_+(t) = c_+(0)e^{-\frac{\lambda t}{2}} \left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Omega_N t}{2}\right) + \frac{\lambda}{\Omega_N} \sinh\left(\frac{\Omega_N t}{2}\right) \right], \quad (\text{S20})$$

where $\Omega_N = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 2N\gamma_0^2}$. For the remaining coefficients, it can be easily seen from (S15) that $\dot{c}_{-,n}(t) = 0$, so the $|-,n\rangle$ states are invariant. Consequently, there is an N dimensional DFS consisting of the states $\{|0_N\rangle, |-,n\rangle\}$ with $n = 2, 3, \dots, N$.

3. Exact master equation for N atoms at $d = 0$

The same procedure as in the case of two atoms can now be used to obtain an exact master equation of the system. From (S17) it follows that the reduced density matrix is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_S(t) &= \text{Tr}_R[|\psi(t)\rangle\langle\psi(t)|] \\ &= |c_+(t)|^2 |+\rangle\langle +| + \sum_{n=2}^N c_+(t)c_{-,n}^* |+\rangle\langle -,n| \\ &\quad + c_+(t)c_0^* |+\rangle\langle 0_N| + \sum_{n=2}^N c_{-,n}c_+^* |-,n\rangle\langle +| \\ &\quad + \sum_{m,n=2}^N c_{-,n}c_{-,m}^* |-,n\rangle\langle -,m| \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=2}^N c_0^* c_{-,n} |-,n\rangle\langle 0_N| + c_0 c_+^* |0_N\rangle\langle +| \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=2}^N c_0 c_{-,n}^* |0_N\rangle\langle -,n| \\ &\quad + \left(1 - |c_+(t)|^2 - \sum_{n=2}^N |c_{0,n}|^2\right) |0_N\rangle\langle 0_N|, \quad (\text{S21}) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the condition $\text{Tr}[\rho_S(t)] = 1$ to remove the dependency on \mathbf{k} . After taking time-derivative we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_S(t)}{dt} &= 2 \left[\frac{\dot{c}_+(t)}{c_+(t)} \right] \left[|c_+(t)|^2 (|+\rangle\langle +| - |0_N\rangle\langle 0_N|) \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=2}^N c_+(t)c_{-,n}^* |+\rangle\langle -,n| + \frac{1}{2} c_+(t)c_0^* |+\rangle\langle 0_N| \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=2}^N c_{-,n}c_+^* |-,n\rangle\langle +| + \frac{1}{2} c_0 c_+^* |0_N\rangle\langle +| \right], \quad (\text{S22}) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\dot{c}_+(t)/c_+(t) \in \mathbb{R}$, as can be seen immediately from (S20). Let us introduce now the collective raising and lowering operators

$$J_- = J_+^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=1}^N \sigma_-^{(n)}, \quad (\text{S23})$$

which satisfy

$$J_- |0_N\rangle = J_- |-,n\rangle = 0, \quad (\text{S24})$$

$$J_- |+\rangle = |0_N\rangle, \quad (\text{S25})$$

$$J_+ |0_N\rangle = |+\rangle. \quad (\text{S26})$$

We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_N(t) &\left(J_- \rho_S(t) J_+ - \frac{1}{2} \{J_+ J_-, \rho_S(t)\} \right) \\ &= \gamma_N(t) \left(|c_+(t)|^2 |0_N\rangle\langle 0_N| - |c_+(t)|^2 |+\rangle\langle +| \right. \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=2}^N c_+(t)c_{-,n}^* |+\rangle\langle -,n| - \frac{1}{2} c_+(t)c_0^* |+\rangle\langle 0_N| \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=2}^N c_{-,n}c_+^* |-,n\rangle\langle +| - \frac{1}{2} c_0 c_+^* |0_N\rangle\langle +| \right). \quad (\text{S27}) \end{aligned}$$

By comparing (S22) and (S27), it follows that the reduced system dynamics satisfies the master equation

$$\frac{d\rho_S(t)}{dt} = \gamma_N(t) \left(J_- \rho_S(t) J_+ - \frac{1}{2} \{J_+ J_-, \rho_S(t)\} \right), \quad (\text{S28})$$

with the decay rate

$$\gamma_N(t) = -2 \left[\frac{\dot{c}_+(t)}{c_+(t)} \right] = \frac{2N\gamma_0^2}{\lambda + \Omega_N \coth\left(\frac{\Omega_N t}{2}\right)}. \quad (\text{S29})$$

4. The limit $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}|_{d \downarrow 0}$

Since $g(t)$ depends continuously on the interatomic distance d , we can use its exact expression for $d = 0$ in the small distance limit $d \downarrow 0$ in the non-Markovianity measure $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$. The fidelity, however, is discontinuous at $d = 0$ when considering $t \rightarrow \infty$, since

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r_2(t) = 0, \quad \text{for } d > 0, \quad (\text{S30})$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r_2(t) = 1, \quad \text{for } d = 0. \quad (\text{S31})$$

Specifically, at $d = 0$ the fidelity approaches 1 when $r_1(t)$ approaches 0, as $r_2(t)$ is trivially in its steady state value for any t . On the other hand, when considering an arbitrarily small distance d , the fidelity will remain at an

approximately constant non-vanishing value for all times greater than the time τ_1 that $r_1(t)$ takes to relax. After these considerations, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{d \downarrow 0} \lim_{t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{t_{\text{end}}} \log F(s) ds \\
&= \lim_{d \downarrow 0} \lim_{t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\tau_1} \log F(s) ds + \int_{\tau_1}^{t_{\text{end}}} \log F(s) ds \\
&= \lim_{d \downarrow 0} \lim_{t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\tau_1} \log F(s) ds + \log F(\tau_1)(t_{\text{end}} - \tau_1),
\end{aligned} \tag{S32}$$

and similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{d \downarrow 0} \lim_{t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \sqrt{g(s)} \log F(s) ds \\
&= \lim_{d \downarrow 0} \lim_{t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\tau_1} \sqrt{g_0(s)} \log F(s) ds \\
&\quad + \int_{\tau_1}^{t_{\text{end}}} \sqrt{g_0(s)} \log F(s) ds \\
&= \lim_{d \downarrow 0} \lim_{t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\tau_1} \sqrt{g_0(s)} \log F(s) ds \\
&\quad + \log F(\tau_1) \int_{\tau_1}^{t_{\text{end}}} \sqrt{g_0(s)} ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{S33}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{N}}|_{d \downarrow 0} &= \lim_{d \downarrow 0} \lim_{t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\int_0^t \log F(s) \sqrt{g_0(s)} ds}{\int_0^t \log F(s) ds} \right]^2 \\
&= \left[\lim_{t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{\tau_1}^{t_{\text{end}}} \sqrt{g_0(s)} ds}{t - \tau_1} \right]^2 \\
&= \left[\lim_{t_{\text{end}} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^{t_{\text{end}}} \sqrt{g_0(s)} ds}{t_{\text{end}}} \right]^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{S34}$$

where we have used the fact that $\sqrt{g_0(t)}$ is a periodic integrable function of t . Given that in the non-Markovian case

$$g_0(t) = \frac{8\gamma_0^2}{3} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda + |\Omega_2| \cot\left(\frac{|\Omega_2|t}{2}\right)} \right]^{-}, \tag{S35}$$

we can see that $\sqrt{g_0(t)}$ is zero everywhere except inside the intervals $[\tau_i^n, \tau_f^n]$ with $\tau_i^n = T[n - \frac{1}{\pi} \cot^{-1}(\frac{\lambda}{|\Omega_2|})]$ and $\tau_f^n = nT$, where $T = \frac{2\pi}{|\Omega_2|}$ is the period of the function and $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Thus, we can rewrite the limit as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{N}}|_{d \downarrow 0} &= \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^{\tau_f^n} \sqrt{g_0(s)} ds}{\tau_f^n} \right]^2 \\
&= \left[\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{nI_0}{nT} \right]^2 = \left[\frac{I_0}{T} \right]^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{S36}$$

where we have defined $I_0 = \int_{\tau_i^1}^{\tau_f^1} \sqrt{g_0(s)} ds$. This can be calculated exactly, yielding

$$I_0 = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{6\gamma_0 + 3\lambda}}. \tag{S37}$$

Therefore, inserting this result and the expression for $|\Omega_2|$ in the limit, we find

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}|_{d \downarrow 0} = \frac{1}{3}(2\gamma_0 - \lambda). \tag{S38}$$