

Stability of Floquet sidebands and quantum coherence in 1D strongly interacting spinless fermions

Karun Gadge and Salvatore R. Manmana
*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Georg-August-University Göttingen,
 Friedrich-Hund-Platz 1, D-37077 Göttingen, Germany*

For strongly correlated quantum systems, fundamental questions about the formation and stability of Floquet-Bloch sidebands (FBs) upon periodic driving remain unresolved. Here, we investigate the impact of electron-electron interactions and perturbations in the coherence of the driving on the lifetime of FBs by directly addressing these questions in time-dependent single-particle spectral functions. Using exact diagonalization (ED) and matrix product states (MPS), we find for a chain of interacting spinless fermions that high-frequency driving leads to long-lived FBs of the full many-body excitation continuum, accompanied by in-gap modes related to mobile domain walls. Conversely, in the low-frequency regime and in the presence of noise, heating dominates, resulting in a significant loss of quantum coherence. This is further elucidated by the behavior of real-space single-particle propagators, of the energy gain, and of the momentum distribution function, which is related to a quantum Fisher information that is directly accessible by spectroscopic measurements.

Introduction.— A promising direction of research for realizing interesting quantum states of matter is Floquet engineering, where the interaction of the light field with electrons in materials [1–7] is used to tailor the band structure. For example, such periodically driven systems are predicted to offer a tunable platform to realize Fractional Chern insulators (FCIs) [8, 9], engineered topological states [10–15], and coherent excitations in experiments with ultracold gases [9, 16–19] (for a review see Ref. 20). A hallmark of such periodically driven crystalline lattice structures is the emergence of Floquet-Bloch sidebands (FBs). Such FBs can directly be detected in pump-probe experiments by using time- and angle-resolved photoemission spectroscopy (trARPES) [21–30], which gives insight into the time-dependent single-particle spectral function. The direct observation of FBs has been reported, e.g., for the topological insulator Bi_2Se_3 [22, 23], for the semiconductor material WSe_2 [26], and recently for mono-layer graphene [27, 28] and for the topological antiferromagnet MnBi_2Te_4 [29]. These experimental findings are for weakly interacting systems. Model calculations and experimental work shows that it is non-trivial to understand the Floquet physics even for weak interactions [26, 31, 32]. This raises the question, whether for strongly interacting systems the same picture holds, or if the interplay of Floquet driving and many-body effects in the spectral function can modify the properties and stability of FBs [26].

Periodic driving leads to the dressing of electrons [33], energy absorption from photons [34–36], light-induced gaps [37, 38], and avoided crossings near the Fermi energy in the quasi-energy spectrum [15]. These effects have been explored using methods like Floquet dynamical mean-field theory (Floquet-DMFT) [39], which investigates non-equilibrium steady states. One finds band narrowing under strong fields, charge localization, and the coexistence of Wannier-Stark features with Floquet sidebands. Out-of-equilibrium DMFT [35, 36] and clus-




FIG. 1. Overview of the main findings of this Letter. (a) Sketch of model (1) and its phase diagram at half filling, with a quantum phase transition from a Luttinger liquid (LL) to a correlated charge density wave (CDW) insulator at $V/t_h = 2$. (b) Typical result for the retarded spectral function $A_k^{\text{ret}}(\omega)$ deep in the CDW insulating phase at $V/t_h = 5$ at equilibrium. (c) and (d) Time evolution of the single particle propagator Eq. (4) in real space in the CDW phase for driving frequencies $\Omega = 3.0$ and $\Omega = 20.0$, respectively, at waiting time $t = 0$, indicating the stability of quantum coherence in both regimes. (e) and (f) Time dependent spectral function $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$ [Eq. (3)] in the CDW state at low and high frequency driving, $\Omega = 3.0$ (no FBs visible) and $\Omega = 20$ (FBs visible), respectively, at waiting time $t = 10$.

ter perturbation theory [40] have also revealed photo-induced insulator-metal transitions. In strongly correlated systems with symmetry broken ground states, periodic driving can also induce in-gap features, such as Villain-type modes [41]. A major challenge in the presence of interactions in Floquet systems is the significant heating [42–51], due to which a simple infinite-temperature state competes with Floquet engineering; due to this heating, one expects Floquet effects to play a role on some transient time scale, before the heating wins [43].

All these aspects highlight how the choice of driving

parameters can significantly alter the Floquet electronic structure of the system. The scope of this Letter is to investigate how for strongly correlated electron systems the interactions, the driving parameters, and noise influence the Floquet physics. We do so by directly studying the time evolution of the retarded time-dependent spectral function $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$, of real space correlations, and of the momentum distribution function $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$. The latter relates to a Quantum Fisher Information (QFI), which can give insights into multipartite entanglement [52]. All results are obtained with time-dependent matrix product states (MPS) [53, 54] and exact diagonalization (ED) [55–57] techniques. We work on one-dimensional systems (1D), since MPS work best for these. This allows us to perform an unbiased study with high accuracy for the formation and stability of FBs and further Floquet effects in a typical strongly correlated system of 1D spinless fermions with nearest-neighbor interactions (tV -chain). Since in 1D correlation effects are strongest, this will help us in understanding the effect of interactions on the stability of FBs in correlated systems in general. Recent inelastic neutron scattering studies on quantum magnetic materials show that it is insightful to complement the analysis of the spectral function by also studying the real-space time evolution of correlation functions and quantum information measures to probe quantum mechanical entanglement [58, 59]. While typically studied in linear response, similar approaches apply to non-equilibrium settings [60]. This enables us to address the question, how coherence aspects of correlations in real space, and quantum information measures behave in strongly interacting Floquet-driven systems.

A summary of our main results at high and low frequency driving is sketched in Fig. 1. We find in the high frequency regime that the FBs are stable for long times even in the presence of strong interactions, and are only suppressed when adding noise to the drive.

Model.— We consider a system of periodically driven one-dimensional interacting spinless fermions (tV -chain),

$$H(t) = -t_h \sum_j \left(e^{iA_V(t)} c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + \text{H.c.} \right) + V(n_j n_{j+1}). \quad (1)$$

Here, $c_j^{(\dagger)}$ is the annihilation (creation) operator for a spinless fermion at site j , $n_j = c_j^\dagger c_j$ is the operator of the local density on site j , t_h the hopping strength between nearest neighboring lattice sites, and V the strength of the interaction between particles sitting on neighboring sites. The periodic driving is realized as Peierls' substitution [61] via a time-dependent vector potential $A_V(t) = A_0 \sin(\Omega t)$, which is activated at time $t = 0$. Unless stated otherwise, we use open boundary conditions (OBC) and the hopping parameter is set to $t_h \equiv 1$ throughout, as well as $\hbar \equiv 1$.

Without the driving (i.e., for $A_0 = 0$), the model exhibits a Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless-like (BKT)

phase transition from a Luttinger liquid (LL) [62] to a strongly correlated charge density wave (CDW) insulator at $V/t_h = 2$, as obtained from Bethe ansatz after mapping to an XXZ spin-chain via Jorgan-Wigner transform [63]. Here, we focus on the CDW phase. In order to suppress artifacts due to the OBC, we apply a pinning-field $H_{\text{pin}} = \mu n_j$ at one of the edge sites, which enforces the numerics to converge to one of the two possible CDW ground states [41, 64]. We compute the non-equilibrium generalization of the spectral function by performing a Fourier transform of the single-particle Green's function,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{ret}}(t, t') &= \theta(t - t') \left(G_{\alpha\beta}^>(t, t') - G_{\alpha\beta}^<(t, t') \right) \\ &= -i\theta(t - t') \left(\left\langle c_\alpha(t) c_\beta^\dagger(t') \right\rangle + \left\langle c_\beta^\dagger(t') c_\alpha(t) \right\rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In non-equilibrium scenarios, one has to treat both time variables in Eq. (2) explicitly, which leads to a non-uniqueness of the Fourier transform (FT) to frequency space ω [65]. Typical choices are so-called Wigner coordinates, or relative time coordinates. The qualitative behavior typically does not depend on the particular choice of these coordinates [65–67]. In the following we choose a relative time coordinate $\tau = t - t'$ for the FT, which simplifies the numerical approach by reducing the number of MPS states that need to be stored in the course of the calculation. In this way, we can interpret the evolution time t as a waiting time, after which the spectral function is obtained under the influence of the periodic drive [41, 64]. The retarded single-particle spectral function then is computed via

$$A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega) = -\text{Im} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau e^{i\omega\tau} W(\tau) G_{kk}^{\text{ret}}(t, \tau), \quad (3)$$

where $W(\tau)$ is a windowing function. Typically, we use an adapted Tukey-window [68], since we find that for the weak signals of the Floquet side bands this gives the best resolution. The retarded spectral function Eq. (3) can then be interpreted as the spectral function measured at waiting time t , with the driving being turned on at $t = 0$. In contrast to the equilibrium case, $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$ can have negative values, see, e.g., Refs. 69 and 70, which, however, in strongly interacting systems tend to be absent at later times [41, 70]. Here, in the context of the existence of FBs, we focus our discussion on the absolute value $|A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)|$. Note that even at waiting time $t = 0$ the results differ from the ground state behavior, since the Fourier-transform to ω -space is done with the time-dependent Hamiltonian (1). For details of the MPS calculations and an error estimate, see the supplemental material.

Results.— We define the spectral width W for the ground state spectral function as the width of the interval $[\omega_{\text{min}}, \omega_{\text{max}}]$ in which $A_k^{\text{ret}}(\omega) \neq 0$, see Fig. 2(a).




FIG. 2. Retarded single-particle spectral function $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$ [Eq. (3)] for the tV -chain (1) with $L = 32$, $V/t_h = 5$, and OBC at half filling obtained with MPS. (a) Results at equilibrium. W denotes the spectral width, in which $A_k^{\text{ret}}(\omega) \neq 0$. (b) Driven case with $\Omega = 3$ and $A_0 = 1.0$ at waiting time $t = 0$. (c) The same driven case at waiting time $t = 20$. The inset in (c) shows the result when keeping $k = \pi/2$ fixed.

We identify $\Omega/t_h < W$ as a low-frequency drive and $\Omega/t_h > W$ as a high-frequency drive. In Fig. 2(a) we present MPS results for $A_k^{\text{ret}}(\omega)$ at equilibrium deep in the CDW-regime for $L = 32$ at half filling for $V/t_h = 5$. Two continua of holon excitations, separated by a gap, are observed within the energy range $\omega \in [-10, 10]$, consistent with previous studies [41]. The gap size Δ can be calculated using the Bethe ansatz, which for $V/t_h = 5$ obtains $\Delta/t_h \approx 1.576$ [63]. This is in agreement with the gap size seen in Fig. 2(a), which is affected by finite-size effects and the limited spectral resolution of our methods. Fig. 2(a) serves as the starting point for our investigation. A key aspect to consider is the potential overlap of the FBs with the original GS spectral function: If the excitation-continua of the replica and of the original spectral function overlap, interference or scattering events seem likely, so that the dynamics (in particular at later times) should be very different from the one in the high-frequency regime, where this overlap is not happening. This can be contrasted to non-interacting systems, where even in the presence of a complicated band structure (e.g., multiple bands), the absence of scattering terms should not lead to heating.

Low frequency drive.— Floquet theory predicts that the FBs should be separated by integer(\pm) multiples of the driving frequency Ω . Additionally, periodic driving results in the dressing of electrons, which reduces the hopping strength to $t_h^{\text{eff}} = t_h J_0(A_0)$, with J_0 the 0th Bessel function, and where A_0 represents the amplitude of the drive [33, 34]. This expectation is clearly demonstrated in the non-interacting case [43]. To highlight the challenges associated with the formation of FBs in the presence of interactions, we fix the driving amplitude at $A_0 = 1.0$ and first choose a driving frequency $\Omega/t_h = 3.0 < W$ (low frequency drive). The results at waiting time $t = 0$ are shown in Fig. 2(b). One would expect replicas of the entire equilibrium spectral function,

which, due to the small value of Ω/t_h , would significantly overlap with the original signal and with each other. In Fig. 2(b) we observe a significant spectral weight within the gap region, but no signature for FBs. The in-gap feature at $t = 0$ exhibits a rich structure, which is reminiscent to the avoided-crossing scenario expected in non-interacting two-band models [15, 31, 35, 36, 71]. However, as shown in Fig. 2(c) for $t = 20.0$, these features vanish at later times, and a broad continuum is obtained, with a stronger weight inside the original gap region. This melting of the gap features hints towards strong heating effects due to the chosen drive parameters, see further below. This indicates that once the replicas overlap in this strongly interacting system, the spectral function does not show FBs. Instead, strong heating is realized, which presumably is due to enhanced scattering of the particles caused by the overlapping FBs.

High frequency drive.— In Fig. 3 we present results for the same set up, but with $A_0 = 1.6$ and $\Omega/t_h = 20 > W$. At waiting time $t = 0.0$ in Fig. 3(a), we observe clear FBs at integer multiples of $\pm\Omega$. These FBs exhibit the full excitation continuum with renormalized bandwidth




FIG. 3. The same as in Fig. 2 but at high-frequency driving $\Omega = 20$ and driving amplitude $A_0 = 1.6$. (a) and (b) show MPS results for $L = 32$ and OBC, while the long-time results in (c) and (d) are obtained using Lanczos time evolution with $L = 18$ sites and PBC. The inset in (a) shows the result when keeping $k = \pi/2$ fixed; the green highlighted region indicates the spectral function in the 0th Floquet sector, the blue shaded regions indicate the 1st FBs, and the magenta shaded regions indicate the 2nd FBs.

(since $t_h^{\text{eff}} = J_0(A_0)t_h$) and the emergence of an in-gap band, which was discussed in Ref. 41. This shows that also in the strongly interacting case the FBs are replicas of the full spectral function of the 0th Floquet sector, including additional features like the renormalization of the spectral width due to the dressed hopping t_h^{eff} and the in-gap signal caused by the driving. The question arises, if these FBs are stable in time, or if scattering between the particles eventually will destroy coherence, leading to a suppression of the FBs in $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$ at later times. If scattering should be the reason for such a suppression, then one would naively expect that this should happen on a time-scale $\sim 1/V$, which for our strongly interacting case would be for waiting times $t \lesssim 1$. However, in Fig. 3(b), our results indicate that also at waiting time $t = 20$, where for the low frequency drive all coherence was lost due to heating, the FBs remain stable, along with the in-gap band. This shows that the time scale on which the FBs are stable is not naively given by the interaction strength between the particles. We therefore numerically further test for the stability of the FBs in this strongly correlated case for much longer times, which are still amenable to numerical approaches. In order to increase the possible time scales, we employ the Lanczos time evolution method, but have to restrict to smaller system sizes of $L = 18$ and use periodic boundary conditions (PBC). Figs 3(c) and (d) show results for $t = 100$ and $t = 200$. Even at these substantially longer times, we can still resolve the FBs alongside the in-gap band. This demonstrates that high-frequency driving can yield FBs even in strongly interacting quantum many-body systems, exhibiting stability over the extended timescales we examined.

Stability of the FBs against noise— The results so far indicate that in the high frequency regime stable FBs are obtained, as long as we have a coherent driving frequency. We now test this aspect by explicitly breaking the coherence by adding incoherent noise to the drive and ask for the stability of the FBs as a function of time. In order to reach longer times, we again apply the Lanczos time evolution method for $L = 18$ (PBC) at half-filling, $V/t_h = 5.0$, $A_0 = 1.6$, and a frequency $\Omega = 20 \pm \Omega_{\text{noise}}$, where $\Omega_{\text{noise}} \in [0, 0.1]$ represents the random time-dependent noise in the driving frequency, such that $A_V(t) = A_0 \sin((\Omega \pm \Omega_{\text{noise}})t)$. More precisely, we discretize the time variable such that $t = ndt$, with $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and then compute $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$ when applying $A_V(t) = A_0 \sin((\Omega \pm \Omega_{\text{noise}})ndt)$. Note that the results depend on the value of dt , as discussed in the supplemental material. Here, we present results for $dt = 0.005$ in Fig. 4. In particular, Figs. 4(a), (b) and (d) demonstrate that, at small to intermediate waiting times, despite the introduction of noise, FBs are stable. However, at $t = 20$ in Fig. 4(b), we observe a noticeable suppression of the second-order FBs. In Fig. 4(c), for waiting time $t = 100$, this suppression becomes even more pronounced, with

the cross-section at $k = \pi/2$ shown in Fig. 4(e) clearly showing the suppression of all FBs. Additionally, we notice a higher intensity in the in-gap band, as we found for the low frequency drive.

Real space correlations, heating, and Quantum Fisher Information.— Our results so far have established that—in the absence of noise—the FBs are a stable feature in our strongly interacting system up to longer times. The question arises, how other observables behave when driving this strongly interacting system. Here, we study the time evolution of correlation functions in real space and of the momentum distribution function $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$, accompanied by the behavior of the energy as a function of time. This helps us to monitor the heating, which is intrinsic to driven interacting systems [45, 47–51].

We apply our low and high frequency driving protocols in Figs. 5(a)-(c) to the imaginary part of the real-space single-particle propagator

$$G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau) = \langle \psi(t) | [c_r^\dagger(\tau), c_{L/2}] | \psi(t) \rangle. \quad (4)$$

Figure 5(a) shows the typical light-cone-like behavior expected for gapped ground states [72–79]. In addition, one observes as a function of time and position a ‘checkerboard-like’ pattern, which is similar to the one observed for spinons in neutron scattering experiments in spin correlation functions [58]. Here, we expect this should translate to the presence of holon excitations.

In stark contrast to the equilibrium results shown in Fig. 5(a), we see in Fig. 5(b) that for low frequency driving already at $t = 0$ the correlation function is quickly




FIG. 4. The same as in Fig. 3, but in the presence of time-dependent noise in the driving, where $\Omega = 20 \pm \Omega_{\text{noise}}$ and $\Omega_{\text{noise}} \in [0, 0.1]$. The results are obtained using Lanczos time evolution with $L = 18$ and PBC. Panels (a)-(c) show $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$ at waiting times $t = 0$, $t = 20$, and $t = 100$, respectively. Panels (d) and (e) show results at fixed $k = \pi/2$ at waiting times $t = 0$ and $t = 100$, respectively. All results show an average over 8 realizations of the random noise.

suppressed as a function of time. This demonstrates that in this case coherence is quickly lost, which suggests the absence of FBs in $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$. However, for the high-frequency driving case shown in Fig. 5(c), again a light-cone is visible. Clearly, it is more narrow, which is due to the reduced hopping $t_h^{\text{eff}} = J_0(A_0)t_h$, which leads to a lower propagation velocity of the perturbations in the system. In the equilibrium case one observes ‘wakes’ [58], which are created inside the light cone. In the driven case, they are more pronounced at later times, and every second one seems to be suppressed. Also, the checkerboard pattern is very similar to the one at equilibrium, but with slightly slower oscillation frequency in time. This is also obtained at later waiting times, see supplemental material. This illustrates that coherence is maintained, suggesting that here long-lived FBs are possible, as indeed found in the time-dependent spectral functions discussed above.

In addition to the real space correlations, coherence effects can also be studied by investigation the momentum distribution function $\langle n_k \rangle(t) = \langle c_k^\dagger c_k \rangle(t)$, with $c_k^{(\dagger)} = 1/\sqrt{L} \sum_{r=1}^L e^{(-)ik \cdot r} c_r^{(\dagger)}$. This quantity is accessible via time-of-flight experiments in cold-gases setups [16]. In Fig. 5(d) we show several snapshots in time for $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ for $\Omega = 3.0$ and $\Omega = 20.0$ with and without noise obtained with ED for $L = 18$ and $V/t_h = 5$. At equilibrium, we obtain the typical result for a strongly correlated insulator, which is a smooth function without particular features. This behavior persists in the high frequency regime (without noise) up to the longest times studied by us, here $t = 100$. However, when turning on the noise, or in the low frequency regime, $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ at later times is essentially featureless and $\langle n_k \rangle \approx \text{const}$ for all values of k . In the low frequency case, this happens already at short times $t \sim 5$, while in the case with noise it happens only at later times $t \gtrsim 30$. This featureless result for $\langle n_k \rangle$ is expected at very high or infinite temperatures, further showing that in these cases coherence gets lost.

Note that it is possible to relate $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ to the Quantum Fisher Information (QFI) $F_Q(k, t)$ [52] for the entanglement witness operator $\hat{O} = \sum_i (a_i c_i^\dagger + h.c.)$, as we can directly write $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega) = \text{Im} \int dt' e^{i\omega t'} i \left\langle \left[\hat{O}(k, t'), \hat{O}(k, t) \right] \right\rangle$, and at zero temperatures

$$F_Q(k, t) = \int d\omega A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega) = \langle n_k \rangle(t). \quad (5)$$

The QFI has recently been studied in inelastic neutron scattering (INS) experiments on quantum magnets [59, 80], and also out-of-equilibrium [60, 81]. Further studies treat similar QFI to the one in Eq. (5) using INS experiments and Quantum Monte Carlo simulations for the heavy-Fermion material $\text{Ce}_3\text{Pa}_{20}\text{Si}_6$, indicating how this quantum information measure is suppressed as a function of temperature in this material [82]. Here, our

nonequilibrium results for $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ indicate how the QFI for the simplest possible witness operator that can be related to $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$ is suppressed in the low-frequency case and in the presence of noise, while it is stable in the high-frequency regime. In current developments, attempts for introducing further witness operators related to $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$ are made [83], which would help experimental investigations to gain further insights into how the entanglement in the studied systems evolves in time.

The findings for $G_{r, L/2}(t, \tau)$ and for $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ can be related to heating effects by comparing with the behavior of the energy gain as a function of time $\Delta E(t) = \langle H(t) \rangle - E_{\text{GS}}$ (with E_{GS} the ground state energy), see Fig. 5(e). (Further results for $G_{r, L/2}(t, \tau)$, $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$, $E(t)$ for longer times and at later waiting times, as well as a discussion of the numerical errors, can be found in the supplemental material.) This has been discussed extensively in the literature [45, 47–51]. When comparing the results for coherent driving with $\Omega = 3$ and $\Omega = 20$, we see a clear difference in the long time behavior. While for $\Omega = 20$ (for all times treated by us) the energy oscillates around a value, which is very different from the one at infinite temperature, the case with $\Omega = 3$ approaches this limit quickly. This seems in agreement with the expected suppression of heating at high driving frequencies [47]. When adding noise, we find intermediate behavior: while at times $t \lesssim 25$ the results for the coherent driving are reproduced, at later times the result at infinite temperatures is approached. This is in agreement with the findings of Ref. 84. It is interesting that in the presence of noise a clean transient time window exists, in which the behavior is essentially the one of the coherent driving, as can also be seen in Figs. 4(a) and (b).

Conclusions and Outlook.— We report the formation of long-lived FBs in the time-dependent spectral function of strongly interacting fermions under high-frequency driving. All features, including the many-body excitation continuum and a Villain-type in-gap mode, are replicated by the FBs. These, however, are suppressed in the presence of incoherent driving (noise) or for low-frequency driving, due to heating and loss of coherence. This is further corroborated by the behavior of the single-particle propagator $G_{r, L/2}(t, \tau)$ and the momentum distribution function $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$, which is related to a QFI.

Our results indicate that Floquet engineering is possible also in strongly correlated materials, e.g., cuprates [85], as long as the coherent driving frequency is larger than the typical many-body bandwidth W , and noise is suppressed. To further confirm this, the effect of finite temperatures and of phonons should be studied. The developments of Refs. 60, 80–82 show that spectroscopic quantities like $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$ can be used to gain insights into the entanglement in the materials studied, both at equilibrium and out-of-equilibrium. To further elaborate on this, it will be necessary to extend the QFI of Eq. (5) to more useful entanglement witness opera-




FIG. 5. (a)-(c) MPS results for $L = 32$ (OBC) for the imaginary part of $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau)$ [Eq. (4)] for the equilibrium case, and for the parameters of Figs. 2 and 3 at waiting time $t = 0$. (d) shows $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$, for low-frequency driving at $\Omega = 3$, and for high-frequency driving at $\Omega = 20$ with and without noise for $L = 18$ and PBC. (e) shows the time evolution of the energy gain compared to the initial state (ground state energy E_{GS}), $\Delta E(t) = \langle H(t) \rangle - E_{GS}$ for different driving frequencies for $L = 14$ and PBC.

tors, which allow one to phrase $F_Q(k, t)$ as a function of $A_k^{\text{ret}}(t, \omega)$. These developments will path the way for Floquet engineering in strongly correlated materials.

Acknowledgements.— We acknowledge helpful discussions with Manuel Buriks, Theo Costi, Fabian Heidrich-Meisner, Michael Schüler, Michael A. Sentef, Maksymilian Środa, Alan Tennant, and the Journal Club of the Stefan Mathias group (in particular Marco Merboldt, Marcel Reutzler, and Stefan Mathias). The calculations were performed on the goegrid cluster in Göttingen. We acknowledge financial support by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) Grants No. 436382789, and No. 493420525, via large equipment grants (GOEGrid), and by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) - 217133147/SFB 1073, project B03.

[1] D. N. Basov, R. D. Averitt, and D. Hsieh, *Nature Materials* **16**, 1077–1088 (2017).
 [2] T. Oka and S. Kitamura, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **10**, 387–408 (2019).
 [3] A. de la Torre, D. M. Kennes, M. Claassen, S. Gerber, J. W. McIver, and M. A. Sentef, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **93**, 10.1103/revmodphys.93.041002 (2021).
 [4] C. Bao, P. Tang, D. Sun, and S. Zhou, *Nature Reviews Physics* **4**, 33–48 (2021).

[5] V. N. Valmispild, E. Gorelov, M. Eckstein, A. I. Lichtenstein, H. Aoki, M. I. Katsnelson, M. Y. Ivanov, and O. Smirnova, *Nature Photonics* **18**, 432 (2024).
 [6] J. Li and M. Eckstein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 217402 (2020).
 [7] Y. Murakami, D. Golež, M. Eckstein, and P. Werner, *Photo-induced nonequilibrium states in mott insulators* (2023), arXiv:2310.05201 [cond-mat.str-el].
 [8] A. G. Grushin, A. Gómez-León, and T. Neupert, *Physical Review Letters* **112**, 10.1103/physrevlett.112.156801 (2014).
 [9] G. Jotzu, M. Messer, R. Desbuquois, M. Lebrat, T. Uehlinger, D. Greif, and T. Esslinger, *Nature* **515**, 237–240 (2014).
 [10] T. Mikami, S. Kitamura, K. Yasuda, N. Tsuji, T. Oka, and H. Aoki, *Physical Review B* **93**, 10.1103/physrevb.93.144307 (2016).
 [11] N. H. Lindner, G. Refael, and V. Galitski, *Nature Physics* **7**, 490–495 (2011).
 [12] J. W. McIver, B. Schulte, F.-U. Stein, T. Matsuyama, G. Jotzu, G. Meier, and A. Cavalleri, *Nature Physics* **16**, 38–41 (2019).
 [13] H. Dehghani, T. Oka, and A. Mitra, *Physical Review B* **91**, 10.1103/physrevb.91.155422 (2015).
 [14] H. Dehghani and A. Mitra, *Physical Review B* **92**, 10.1103/physrevb.92.165111 (2015).
 [15] T. Oka and H. Aoki, *Physical Review B* **79**, 10.1103/physrevb.79.081406 (2009).
 [16] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 885 (2008).
 [17] K. Wintersperger, M. Bukov, J. Näger, S. Lellouch, E. Demler, U. Schneider, I. Bloch, N. Goldman, and M. Aidelsburger, *Physical Review X* **10**, 10.1103/physrevx.10.011030 (2020).
 [18] C. Weitenberg and J. Simonet, *Nature Physics* **17**, 1342–1348 (2021).
 [19] M. Lei, R. Fukumori, C.-J. Wu, E. Barnes, S. Economou, J. Choi, and A. Faraon, *Quantum thermalization and floquet engineering in a spin ensemble with a clock transition* (2024), arXiv:2408.00252 [quant-ph].
 [20] A. Eckardt, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **89**, 10.1103/revmodphys.89.011004 (2017).
 [21] M. Sentef, M. Claassen, A. Kemper, B. Moritz, T. Oka, J. Freericks, and T. Devereaux, *Nature Communications* **6**, 10.1038/ncomms8047 (2015).
 [22] Y. H. Wang, H. Steinberg, P. Jarillo-Herrero, and N. Gedik, *Science* **342**, 453–457 (2013).
 [23] F. Mahmood, C.-K. Chan, Z. Alpichshev, D. Gardner, Y. Lee, P. A. Lee, and N. Gedik, *Nature Physics* **12**, 306–310 (2016).
 [24] U. De Giovannini, H. Hübener, and A. Rubio, *Nano Letters* **16**, 7993–7998 (2016).
 [25] Y. H. Wang, H. Steinberg, P. Jarillo-Herrero, and N. Gedik, *Science* **342**, 453 (2013), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.1239834>.
 [26] S. Aeschlimann, S. A. Sato, R. Krause, M. Chávez-Cervantes, U. De Giovannini, H. Hübener, S. Forti, C. Coletti, K. Hanff, K. Rossnagel, A. Rubio, and I. Gierz, *Nano Letters* **21**, 5028–5035 (2021).
 [27] M. Merboldt, M. Schüler, D. Schmitt, J. P. Bange, W. Bennecke, K. Gadge, K. Pierz, H. W. Schumacher, D. Momeni, D. Steil, S. R. Manmana, M. Sentef, M. Reutzler, and S. Mathias, arXiv:2404.12791 10.48550/ARXIV.2404.12791 (2024).

- [28] D. Choi, M. Mogi, U. De Giovannini, D. Azoury, B. Lv, Y. Su, H. Hübener, A. Rubio, and N. Gedik, [arXiv:2404.14392](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14392) (2024).
- [29] N. Bielinski, R. Chari, J. May-Mann, S. Kim, J. Zwettler, Y. Deng, A. Aishwarya, S. Roychowdhury, C. Shekhar, M. Hashimoto, D. Lu, J. Yan, C. Felser, V. Madhavan, Z.-X. Shen, T. L. Hughes, and F. Mahmood, *Nature Physics* **10.1038/s41567-024-02769-6** (2025).
- [30] S. Fragkos, B. Fabre, O. Tkach, S. Petit, D. Descamps, G. Schönhense, Y. Mairesse, M. Schüler, and S. Beaulieu, *Floquet-bloch valleytronics* (2024), [arXiv:2412.03935](https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.03935) [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [31] M. Schüler, U. De Giovannini, H. Hübener, A. Rubio, M. A. Sentef, T. P. Devereaux, and P. Werner, *Physical Review X* **10**, [10.1103/physrevx.10.041013](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevx.10.041013) (2020).
- [32] M. Schüler and S. Beaulieu, *Communications Physics* **5**, [10.1038/s42005-022-00944-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s42005-022-00944-w) (2022).
- [33] D. H. Dunlap and V. M. Kenkre, *Physical Review B* **34**, 3625–3633 (1986).
- [34] D. Kennes, A. de la Torre, A. Ron, D. Hsieh, and A. Millis, *Physical Review Letters* **120**, [10.1103/physrevlett.120.127601](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.120.127601) (2018).
- [35] N. Tsuji, T. Oka, and H. Aoki, *Physical Review B* **78**, [10.1103/physrevb.78.235124](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.78.235124) (2008).
- [36] H. Aoki, N. Tsuji, M. Eckstein, M. Kollar, T. Oka, and P. Werner, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **86**, 779–837 (2014).
- [37] L. Broers and L. Mathey, *Communications Physics* **4**, [10.1038/s42005-021-00746-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s42005-021-00746-6) (2021).
- [38] L. Broers and L. Mathey, *Physical Review Research* **4**, [10.1103/physrevresearch.4.013057](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevresearch.4.013057) (2022).
- [39] Y. Murakami and P. Werner, *Physical Review B* **98**, [10.1103/physrevb.98.075102](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.98.075102) (2018).
- [40] M. Puviani and F. Manghi, *Physical Review B* **94**, [10.1103/physrevb.94.161111](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.94.161111) (2016).
- [41] A. Osterkorn, C. Meyer, and S. R. Manmana, *Communications Physics* **6**, [10.1038/s42005-023-01346-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s42005-023-01346-2) (2023).
- [42] K. S. C. Decker, C. Karrasch, J. Eisert, and D. M. Kennes, *Physical Review Letters* **124**, [10.1103/physrevlett.124.190601](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.124.190601) (2020).
- [43] N. Tsuji, *Encyclopedia of Condensed Matter Physics* (Elsevier, 2024) p. 967–980.
- [44] C. Fleckenstein and M. Bukov, *Physical Review B* **103**, [10.1103/physrevb.103.1140302](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.103.1140302) (2021).
- [45] M. Bukov, M. Heyl, D. A. Huse, and A. Polkovnikov, *Physical Review B* **93**, [10.1103/physrevb.93.155132](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.93.155132) (2016).
- [46] H. Zhao, J. Knolle, R. Moessner, and F. Mintert, *Physical Review Letters* **129**, [10.1103/physrevlett.129.120605](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.129.120605) (2022).
- [47] D. A. Abanin, W. De Roeck, and F. Huveneers, *Physical Review Letters* **115**, [10.1103/physrevlett.115.256803](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.115.256803) (2015).
- [48] A. Haldar, R. Moessner, and A. Das, *Physical Review B* **97**, [10.1103/physrevb.97.245122](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.97.245122) (2018).
- [49] C. Fleckenstein and M. Bukov, *Physical Review B* **103**, [10.1103/physrevb.103.1140302](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.103.1140302) (2021).
- [50] F. Peronaci, M. Schiró, and O. Parcollet, *Physical Review Letters* **120**, [10.1103/physrevlett.120.197601](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.120.197601) (2018).
- [51] F. Machado, G. D. Kahanamoku-Meyer, D. V. Else, C. Nayak, and N. Y. Yao, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **1**, 033202 (2019).
- [52] P. Hauke, M. Heyl, L. Tagliacozzo, and P. Zoller, *Nature Physics* **12**, 778–782 (2016).
- [53] U. Schollwöck, *Annals of Physics* **326**, 96–192 (2011).
- [54] S. Paeckel, T. Köhler, A. Swoboda, S. R. Manmana, U. Schollwöck, and C. Hubig, *Annals of Physics* **411**, 167998 (2019).
- [55] R. M. Noack and S. R. Manmana, *AIP Conference Proceedings* **789**, 93 (2005), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/acp/article-pdf/789/1/93/11444794/93_1_online.pdf.
- [56] A. W. Sandvik, *AIP Conference Proceedings* **1297**, 135 (2010), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/acp/article-pdf/1297/1/135/11407753/135_1_online.pdf.
- [57] P. Weinberg and M. Bukov, *SciPost Physics* **7**, [10.21468/scipostphys.7.2.020](https://doi.org/10.21468/scipostphys.7.2.020) (2019).
- [58] A. Scheie, P. Laurell, B. Lake, S. E. Nagler, M. B. Stone, J.-S. Caux, and D. A. Tennant, *Nature Communications* **13**, [10.1038/s41467-022-33571-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-33571-8) (2022).
- [59] A. Scheie, P. Laurell, A. M. Samarakoon, B. Lake, S. E. Nagler, G. E. Granroth, S. Okamoto, G. Alvarez, and D. A. Tennant, *Physical Review B* **103**, [10.1103/physrevb.103.224434](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.103.224434) (2021).
- [60] J. Hales, U. Bajpai, T. Liu, D. R. Baykusheva, M. Li, M. Mitran, and Y. Wang, *Nature Communications* **14**, [10.1038/s41467-023-38540-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-38540-3) (2023).
- [61] R. Peierls, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **80**, 763–791 (1933).
- [62] T. Giamarchi, *Quantum Physics in One Dimension*, International Series of Monographs on Physics (Clarendon Press, 2004).
- [63] J. D. Cloizeaux and M. Gaudin, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **7**, 1384 (1966).
- [64] C. Meyer, *Matrix Product State Approaches to Non-equilibrium Spectral Quantities of Strongly Correlated Fermions in One Dimension* (University of Göttingen, 2022).
- [65] M. H. Kalthoff, G. S. Uhrig, and J. K. Freericks, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 035138 (2018).
- [66] H. T. M. Nghiem and T. A. Costi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 156601 (2017).
- [67] H. T. M. Nghiem, H. T. Dang, and T. A. Costi, *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 115117 (2020).
- [68] P. Bloomfield, *Fourier analysis of time series*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics (John Wiley and Sons, Nashville, TN, 2000).
- [69] G. S. Uhrig, M. H. Kalthoff, and J. K. Freericks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 130604 (2019).
- [70] T. Blum, R. M. Noack, and S. R. Manmana, *Phys. Rev. B* **111**, 035152 (2025).
- [71] S. T. Park, *Physical Review A* **90**, [10.1103/physreva.90.013420](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.90.013420) (2014).
- [72] E. H. Lieb and D. W. Robinson, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **28**, 251–257 (1972).
- [73] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 136801 (2006).
- [74] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2007**, P06008–P06008 (2007).
- [75] S. Bravyi, M. B. Hastings, and F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 050401 (2006).
- [76] A. M. Läuchli and C. Kollath, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2008**, P05018 (2008).
- [77] S. R. Manmana, S. Wessel, R. M. Noack, and A. Muramatsu, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 155104 (2009).
- [78] M. Cheneau, P. Barmettler, D. Poletti, M. Endres, P. Schauf, T. Fukuhara, C. Gross, I. Bloch, C. Kollath, and S. Kuhr, *Nature* **481**, 484–487 (2012).

- [79] M. H. Kalthoff, D. M. Kennes, and M. A. Sentef, *Physical Review B* **100**, [10.1103/physrevb.100.165125](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.100.165125) (2019).
- [80] A. Scheie, P. Laurell, W. Simeth, E. Dagotto, and D. A. Tennant, *Materials Today Quantum* **5**, 100020 (2025).
- [81] D. R. Baykusheva, M. H. Kalthoff, D. Hofmann, M. Claassen, D. M. Kennes, M. A. Sentef, and M. Mitrano, *Physical Review Letters* **130**, [10.1103/physrevlett.130.106902](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevlett.130.106902) (2023).
- [82] F. Mazza *et al.*, arXiv **2403**, 12779 (2024), preprint, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.12779>, [arXiv:2403.12779](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.12779) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [83] R. K. Malla, A. Weichselbaum, T.-C. Wei, and R. M. Konik, *Detecting multipartite entanglement patterns using single particle green's functions* (2024), [arXiv:2310.05870](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.05870) [quant-ph].
- [84] C. Fleckenstein and M. Bukov, *Physical Review B* **103**, [10.1103/physrevb.103.144307](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.103.144307) (2021).
- [85] E. Dagotto, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 763 (1994).

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL: Stability of Floquet sidebands and quantum coherence in 1D strongly interacting spinless fermions

Karun Gadge and Salvatore R. Manmana
*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Georg-August-University Göttingen,
 Friedrich-Hund-Platz 1, D-37077 Göttingen, Germany*

DETAILS OF THE CALCULATIONS

We compute

$$G_{kk}^{\text{ret}}(t, \tau) := -i\theta(\tau) \left\langle \left\{ c_k(t + \tau), c_k^\dagger(t) \right\} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{S1})$$

which is the retarded Green's function. For the real-to- k -space transform, in the case of PBC we apply a standard Fourier transform, $c_k^{(\dagger)} = 1/\sqrt{L} \sum_j e^{(-)ijk} c_j^{(\dagger)}$ with momenta $k = 2\pi/L \cdot \{-L/2, \dots, L/2 - 1\}$. For OBC, we apply the sine transform with quasi-momenta $k \in \pi/L + 1 \cdot \{1, \dots, L\}$ [1–4],

$$c_k = \sqrt{\frac{2}{L+1}} \sum_i \sin(k \cdot i) c_i. \quad (\text{S2})$$

This leads for OBC to a nontrivial time dependence of $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ even for noninteracting systems, as can be seen as follows. Consider the noninteracting Hamiltonian with Peierls' substitution,

$$H(t) = -t_h \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \left(e^{iA_V(t)} c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + \text{H.c.} \right). \quad (\text{S3})$$

Using the sine transform, the Hamiltonian is diagonalized, but has time-dependent eigenvalues,

$$H(t) = -t_h \sum_k [\cos(k + A_V(t)) + \cos(k - A_V(t))] c_k^\dagger c_k, \quad (\text{S4})$$

which implies that $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ is time-dependent. (At $t = 0$, this simplifies to the usual expression $H(t = 0) = -2t_h \sum_k \cos(k) c_k^\dagger c_k$.)

The MPS calculations have been carried out using the SymMPS toolkit (developed by Sebastian Paeckel and Thomas Köhler), which is freely available at [5]. For comprehensive reviews we refer to the literature [6, 7]. We follow the steps:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(t)\rangle &= U_{\text{TDVP}}(t, 0) |\psi_0\rangle, \\ |\psi_l(t)\rangle &= c_l |\psi(t)\rangle, \\ |\psi_l(t + \tau)\rangle &= U_{\text{TDVP}}(t + \tau, t) |\psi_l(t)\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5})$$

with the time-dependent time evolution operator $U_{\text{TDVP}}(t, t')$, which is implemented using a 2-site time-dependent variational principle (TDVP) [6]. For time-dependent Hamiltonians, there are better approximations (e.g., commutator free expansions, see Ref. 8); however, if the value of dt is chosen small enough, we obtain a good accuracy also with this simpler approach. We repeat similar calculations for the operator c_l^\dagger . Using the states (S5) we calculate the quantities

$$C_{ml}(t, \tau) = \langle \psi(t + \tau) | c_m^\dagger | \psi_l(t + \tau) \rangle. \quad (\text{S6})$$

We work in units of the energy in which the hopping parameter $t_h \equiv 1$, and $\hbar \equiv 1$ throughout the simulations, which leads to discrete time steps dt in these units. Typically, we set $dt = 0.005$, which is chosen to be one order of magnitude smaller than the highest frequency scale $\sim 1/\Omega$ (with $\Omega = 20$ for the high frequency drive). We vary the bond dimension between 400 and 800. For $\Omega = 20$ for $dt = 0.005$ without noise we observe that the typical discarded weight at the end of the time evolutions is $\lesssim 10^{-8}$, which is a rather small value, indicating a high precision of the results. This is further corroborated by comparing the results for the time evolution of the energy with different

values of dt as shown in Fig. S3, where excellent agreement is found (see also the discussion further below). In other cases, in particular for $\Omega = 3$, the discarded weight grows much faster, and we reach rather large maximal values $\lesssim 10^{-4}$ at the end of the time evolutions treated. It is very expensive to perform the calculations at substantially higher bond-dimension, so that we refrain from doing so. However, we check for the time-evolution of the energy when varying dt , and find that also in these cases the results for different values of dt are in excellent agreement, see Fig. S3 and the discussion further below.

We also analyzed the errors in the time-evolution of the real-space correlations, where we obtain similar trends (high accuracy for $\Omega = 20$, lower accuracy in the low frequency case). However, at waiting time $t = 0$ in all cases the errors are smaller than the signal size at small times, and for $\Omega = 3$ of comparable value with the value of the correlation functions, which is close to zero there. This confirms the statement about fast loss of coherence in the low frequency case, as discussed in the main text. For a more detailed discussion of the error in the correlation functions, see below.

To reach longer times we use the Lanczos time evolution method where the computation of one time step is achieved by projecting the time-evolution operator onto a Lanczos basis for which $|\psi(t)\rangle$ is the initial state of the iteration procedure. In this way, also for time-dependent Hamiltonians, we compute [9]

$$e^{-idt\hat{H}(t)}|\psi(t)\rangle \approx \mathbf{V}_n(t)e^{-idt\mathbf{T}_n(t)}\mathbf{V}_n^+(t)|\psi(t)\rangle, \quad (\text{S7})$$

where the matrix $\mathbf{V}_n(t)$ contains the Lanczos vectors after n iterations, and $\mathbf{T}_n(t)$ is the tridiagonal matrix representation of $H(t)$ in this basis. As for the MPS calculation, for time-dependent Hamiltonians there are better approximations (see, e.g., Ref. 8); however, if the value of dt is chosen small enough, we obtain a good accuracy also with this simpler approach. The Lanczos simulations were done using the QuSpin package, see Ref. 10.

ENERGY $E(t)$ AND MOMENTUM DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$

In Fig. S1, we present the expectation value $E(t) = \langle H(t) \rangle$ for the driven system with and without noise, comparing the energy gain by plotting the energy for $L = 18$, periodic boundary conditions (PBC), and $V/t_h = 5$ at half filling. We consider driving frequencies $\Omega = 3$, and 20 (both with and without noise) and illustrate the resulting energy gain over time. The insets of Fig. S1 display the momentum distribution function $\langle n_k \rangle(t) = \langle c_k^\dagger c_k \rangle(t)$, with $c_k^{(\dagger)} = 1/\sqrt{L} \sum_{r=1}^L e^{(-)ik \cdot r} c_r^{(\dagger)}$ at the times indicated by the markers. Note that, as we also mention in the main text, $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ can be related to the Quantum Fisher Information (QFI) $F_Q(k, t)$ for the chosen witness operator $\hat{O} = \sum_i (a_i c_i^\dagger + a_i^* c_i)$. We use $F_Q(k, t) = \int d\omega A(\omega, k, t)$, at temperature $T = 0$ where $A(\omega, k, t) = \text{Im} \int dt' e^{i\omega t'} i \langle [\hat{O}(k, t'), \hat{O}(k, 0)] \rangle$, and integrating over ω results in the momentum distribution function $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ [11–13]. In Fig. S1, the insets show loss of coherence as the system gains energy and the effective temperature increases over time. In the following, we use matrix product states (MPS) [6, 7] to compute systems with open boundary conditions (OBC) and pinning field $\mu = V/t_h$ (see main text) for $L = 32$. We employ Lanczos time evolution [9] for systems with $L = 18$ and PBC to achieve longer simulation times than accessible with MPS. In Fig. S2 (a) we show MPS results for $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ for $\Omega = 3.0$ and 20.0 at various waiting times obtained with OBC (note that in the main text and in Fig. S1 we show results obtained with PBC; in Fig. S2(a), we have only positive k -values due to the sine-transform). For $\Omega = 3.0$, we observe a strong flattening of the momentum distribution function, consistent with the insets of Fig. S1. Further, in Fig. S2 (b) we check $E(t)$ for $L = 32$ using MPS for different values of Ω , which shows that the energy gain decreases with increase of the driving frequency. For the case of incoherent noise in the driving frequency, we consider a driving field with vector potential $A_V(t) = A_0 \sin((\Omega \pm \Omega_{\text{noise}})t)$, where the frequency is given by $\Omega = 20 \pm \Omega_{\text{noise}}$, $\Omega_{\text{noise}} \in [0, 0.1]$. We discretize the time as $t = n dt$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and apply $A_V(n dt) = A_0 \sin((\Omega \pm \Omega_{\text{noise}})n dt)$. Therefore, at each time step of the simulation, we have a different value of Ω_{noise} . Hence, the frequency, with which the value of Ω_{noise} is changed, depends on the value of dt , so that we can expect different time-dependent behavior of the observables for different values of dt in the presence of noise. In Fig. S3(a), we show the energy gain $E(t)$ for discrete time steps $dt = 0.05$ and $dt = 0.005$ for $L = 14$ PBC. We observe that the choice of dt affects the energy gain over time in the presence of noise, as mentioned above.

Furthermore, we check the dependence of our results on the size of dt also without noise in the driving. This is important, since we are treating a time-dependent Hamiltonian, and in addition to the usual MPS errors, we have an additional source of errors due to the discretization of t in $H(t)$ [8]. In Fig. S3(a) we show Lanczos results for the different cases treated in the main text, but with values of $dt = 0.05$ or $dt = 0.005$, respectively, in order to estimate the error due to the discretization of $H(t)$. As can be seen, in all cases the values of the energy $E(t)$ lie on top of each other, so that this discretization error seems to play a minor role. In Fig. S3(b) we turn to MPS results




FIG. S1. Time-dependent Lanczos results for systems with $L = 18$ and PBC for the time evolution of the energy $E(t) = \langle H(t) \rangle$ (main figure) for the indicated different driven cases for $dt = 0.005$, and $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ (insets) for the indicated markers on the energy curves.

for $L = 32$ (OBC) for $\Omega = 3.0$ and in Fig. S3(c) for $\Omega = 20.0$, with discrete time steps $dt = 0.04$, $dt = 0.005$, and $dt = 0.0025$. In these plots, the MPS results all carry the accumulated error due to (i) discretization of time in $H(t)$; (ii) error of the TDVP-ansatz due to the finite value of dt [6]; (iii) accumulated MPS-errors due to the finite bond dimension [7]. Hence, by comparing the time evolution of observables with different values of dt , we get an estimate for the accumulated errors of our numerical calculations, which can be used to estimate the overall accuracy of our results. As can be seen, only the values with the largest chosen value of $dt = 0.04$ for $\Omega = 3$ show a clear discrepancy at later times, indicating that the results obtained with $dt = 0.005$ shown in the main text have a high numerical accuracy. In Fig. S3(d) this is further quantified by showing the relative difference (in percentage) for the energy $E(t)$ with the choice of $dt = 0.005$, and $dt = 0.0025$. For the coherent drive case, the maximal difference of these results at the end of the time evolutions shown is $\approx 2\%$ for $\Omega = 3$ and $\approx 0.25\%$ for $\Omega = 20$. The smaller error in the high frequency case can be understood by having less heating and less growth of entanglement in this case (this can be seen in the growth of the discarded weight with time, which is much faster in the low frequency case, see further below). We, therefore, stick to the discrete time steps of $dt = 0.005$ for all our calculations presented in the main text.

REAL SPACE CORRELATIONS

We show the real and imaginary parts of the real-space correlation function

$$G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau) = \langle \psi(t) | [c_r^\dagger(\tau), c_{L/2}] | \psi(t) \rangle$$

in Fig. S4 for $L = 32$ with OBC for $V/t_h = 5.0$ at waiting time $t = 5.0$ for $\Omega = 3.0$ and at waiting time $t = 20.0$ for $\Omega = 20.0$. The results are presented at equilibrium in panels (a) and (d), for $\Omega = 3.0$ in panels (b) and (e), and for $\Omega = 20.0$ in panels (c) and (f). In equilibrium, we observe a light-cone-like spread of correlations as the system is perturbed at the central site. This behavior changes for $\Omega = 3.0$, as also pointed out in the main text. Already at $t = 0$, we observed a suppression of correlation propagation as from the main text Fig. 5; here, at $t = 5.0$ we observe even stronger suppression. For $\Omega = 20.0$, even at $t = 20.0$, the light-cone-like spread is clearly visible, exhibiting coherence features also at later waiting times.




FIG. S2. MPS results for $L = 32$ and $V/t_h = 5.0$ at half filling and with OBC: (a) momentum distribution function $\langle n_k \rangle(t)$ at different waiting times for low $\Omega = 3.0$ and high frequency $\Omega = 20.0$. (b) energy $E(t) = \langle H(t) \rangle$ as a function of time for the driven case with the different frequencies as indicated.




FIG. S3. Energy $E(t) = \langle H(t) \rangle$ as a function of time. (a) Lanczos results for the time evolution of $E(t)$ for the driven case for different values of Ω for $L = 14$ (PBC) when using $dt = 0.05$, or $dt = 0.005$, respectively. The inset is a zoom into the interval $t = [99, 100.0]$. MPS results for $E(t)$ in (b) for the driven case of $\Omega = 3.0$ and in (c) for the driven case of $\Omega = 20.0$ using $dt = 0.04$, $dt = 0.005$, and $dt = 0.0025$. The insets in (b) and (c) zoom into the interval $t = [17, 20.0]$. (d) relative difference for the energy for the choice of $dt = 0.005$ and $dt = 0.0025$, respectively.




FIG. S4. MPS results for $L = 32$, $V/t_h = 5.0$ at half filling and OBC for the real part (a)-(c) and for imaginary part (e)-(f) of real-space correlation function $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau) = \langle \psi(t) | [c_r^\dagger(\tau), c_{L/2}] | \psi(t) \rangle$ at equilibrium and for the driven case for later waiting times $t = 5.0$ and 20.0 than the ones shown in the main text.

Furthermore, we compare the imaginary part of $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau)$ for cases with and without noise in Fig. S5 at longer waiting times. In Fig. S5, we show results for $L = 18$ (PBC), $V/t_h = 5.0$ at half filling. Panels (a) and (b) correspond to the case without noise, while panels (c) and (d) represent the noise case at waiting times $t = 0$ and $t = 100$, respectively. As is evident from the noise case, at longer waiting times the system loses coherence, as seen in the vanishing imaginary part of the correlation $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau)$ in Fig. S5(d).

In order to estimate the errors in the MPS results for the real time correlation function, we compared results for the coherent drive with $dt = 0.04$ and $dt = 0.005$. For $\Omega = 20$, we find in all cases that the difference between both calculations is substantially smaller than the magnitude of $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau)$; the difference is (in the case of small values) of the order of a few percent. For $\Omega = 3$, the situation is more complicated, because at later times the value of $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau)$ becomes very small, so that even small numerical errors lead to a larger relative deviation of the results. However, we find for waiting time $t = 0$ that at short times the difference is $\lesssim 0.015$, while the maximal value of $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau) \sim 0.16$. At later times, the maximal value of $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau) \sim 10^{-3}$, and the difference between both runs is of comparable magnitude. Therefore, it is difficult to make quantitative statements at the longer times; however, it is clear that $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau)$ decayed to a value much smaller than the one at the beginning of the time evolution, clearly indicating the loss of coherence in this case. This is further confirmed by Fig. S6, in which Lanczos results for $\Omega = 3$ for $L = 18$ (PBC) clearly show the loss of coherence at waiting time $t = 0$. At later waiting times, the errors in the MPS calculations for $\Omega = 20$ are similar to the ones at $t = 0$, but larger for $\Omega = 3$ due to the higher entanglement in the system; see Fig. S4 for results at equilibrium and at waiting times $t = 5$ and $t = 20$. However, the results are qualitatively very similar to the ones at waiting time $t = 0$ shown in the main text (see also the discussion above).

WINDOW FUNCTION

The retarded single-particle spectral function is computed via

$$A_k^{\text{ret, eq}}(\omega) = -\text{Im} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau e^{i\omega\tau} W(\tau) G_{kk}^{\text{ret, eq}}(t, \tau) \quad (\text{S8})$$




FIG. S5. Lanczos results for $L = 18$ and PBC for the imaginary part of the real-space correlation function $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau) = \langle \psi(t) | [c_r^\dagger(\tau), c_{L/2}] | \psi(t) \rangle$, with $A_0 = 1.6$ and $\Omega = 20.0$. (a) and (c) show results for waiting time $t = 0$ and $t = 100$ without noise. (b) and (d) show results for waiting time $t = 0$ and $t = 100$ with noise.

where $W(\tau)$ is a windowing function. Typically, we use an adapted Tukey-window [14] with the parameter $\alpha = 0.7$, where

$$W(\tau) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \cos \left(\frac{2\pi\tau}{\alpha N} \right) \right], \text{ for } 0 \leq n < \frac{\alpha N}{2}. \quad (\text{S9})$$

In Fig. S7, we show an example of the window function in Eq. (S9) for $\alpha = 0.7$. We find that with this choice even weak FBs can be resolved in the spectral functions shown in the main text.

-
- [1] H. Benthien, F. Gebhard, and E. Jeckelmann, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 256401 (2004).
 - [2] A. C. Tiegel, *Finite-temperature dynamics of low-dimensional quantum systems with DMRG methods*, Ph.D. thesis, University Goettingen Repository (2016).
 - [3] A. Osterkorn, C. Meyer, and S. R. Manmana, *Communications Physics* **6**, 10.1038/s42005-023-01346-2 (2023).
 - [4] T. Köhler, S. Paeckel, C. Meyer, and S. R. Manmana, *Physical Review B* **102**, 10.1103/physrevb.102.235166 (2020).
 - [5] S. Paeckel and T. Köhler, Symmps toolkit — symmps.eu, <https://www.symmps.eu>, [Accessed 23-07-2024].
 - [6] S. Paeckel, T. Köhler, A. Swoboda, S. R. Manmana, U. Schollwöck, and C. Hubig, *Annals of Physics* **411**, 167998 (2019).
 - [7] U. Schollwöck, *Annals of Physics* **326**, 96–192 (2011).
 - [8] A. Alvermann and H. Fehske, *Journal of Computational Physics* **230**, 5930 (2011).
 - [9] S. R. Manmana, A. Muramatsu, and R. M. Noack, *AIP Conference Proceedings* **789**, 269 (2005), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/acp/article-pdf/789/1/269/11444782/269_1_online.pdf.
 - [10] P. Weinberg and M. Bukov, *SciPost Physics* **7**, 10.21468/scipostphys.7.2.020 (2019).
 - [11] P. Hauke, M. Heyl, L. Tagliacozzo, and P. Zoller, *Nature Physics* **12**, 778–782 (2016).




FIG. S6. Lanczos results for $L = 18$ (PBC) for the real-space correlation function $G_{r,L/2}(t, \tau) = \langle \psi(t) | [c_r^\dagger(\tau), c_{L/2}] | \psi(t) \rangle$ at waiting time $t = 0$, with $A_0 = 1.0$ and $\Omega = 3.0$. (a) real part and (b) imaginary part.




FIG. S7. Damping of the data when applying the adapted Tukey window (S9). The main Figure shows the amplitude of the windowing function for $\alpha = 0.7$ and the impact on the raw data is shown in the inset.

- [12] D. R. Baykusheva, M. H. Kalthoff, D. Hofmann, M. Claassen, D. M. Kennes, M. A. Sentef, and M. Mitrano, *Physical Review Letters* **130**, 10.1103/physrevlett.130.106902 (2023).
- [13] F. Mazza *et al.*, arXiv **2403**, 12779 (2024), preprint, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.12779>, arXiv:2403.12779 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [14] P. Bloomfield, *Fourier analysis of time series*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics (John Wiley and Sons, Nashville, TN, 2000).