

On the non-integrability of driven-dissipative one-dimensional hard-core Bosons

M. Zündel^{1,2,*}

¹Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, LPMMC, 38000 Grenoble, France

²Kirchhoff-Institut für Physik, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, INF 227, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany

In one dimension, in a closed system, the Tonks-Girardeau gas is integrable even for finite temperatures and time-evolving systems. We address the question if it remains integrable once the system is no longer closed. We consider its lattice version under incoherent local pump and loss and show by using random matrix theory that the statistics of the complex spatial ratio indicates that the system is chaotic. Further, we show that the model belongs in the AI^\dagger universality class of random matrices. In addition to this analysis, we investigate an emergent stripe-pattern in the spectrum and relate it to the dissipative parameters of the model.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Lieb–Liniger model [1] is a paradigmatic example of an integrable many-body system in one dimension [2]. In the limit of infinitely strong interactions, it reduces to the Tonks–Girardeau gas, which enjoys an exact solution obtained through the Bose-Fermi mapping [3]. This even holds at finite temperatures and under real-time evolution [4–6]. A natural followup question then arises when the system is rendered *open*—that is, coupled to an external environment or reservoirs. Does such coupling preserve the integrable structure, or does it introduce effective interactions and decoherence that spoil integrability?

Open quantum systems can be realized in various ways [7–11], such as through coupling to a thermal bath, measurement-induced decoherence, or engineered dissipation channels. One rigorous method for describing the dynamics of the open subsystem is the Lindblad – Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan master equation [12, 13]: This approach ensures that the time evolution is completely positive and trace-preserving [13], meaning that the density matrix remains physically valid at all times. As a result, the Lindblad framework is widely used to model dissipative processes in quantum mechanics, providing a consistent and microscopic description of open system dynamics [10].

A straightforward way to test whether a closed quantum system is integrable or chaotic is to examine the spectrum of the relevant time-evolution operator, such as the Hamiltonian. Random matrix theory (RMT) predicts that the energy levels follow a Poissonian distribution for uncorrelated level spacings, indicating that the systems is integrable, while chaotic closed systems exhibit level repulsion characterized by Wigner–Dyson statistics. The more convenient ratios of energy level spacings in closed systems have been introduced in [14, 15]. Furthermore, it has been conjectured [16] that for chaotic systems, the spectral statistics of the Hamiltonian is determined by its symmetry class.

An analogous approach to assess the integrability of open quantum systems involves analyzing the complex level spacings of the non-Hermitian operators that describe their dynamics. A suggestion of analyzing the distributions of complex spacing ratios (CSR) has been put forward in [17, 18].

Their analysis suggests, that if the distribution is Poisson-like then the system is integrable - given all symmetries of the system were taken into account. Whereas, if the distribution follows a Ginibre ensemble, i.e. given the polar coordinates of the CSR, if one can observe cubic level repulsion in the marginal distribution of the radial coordinate for small radii and a non-isotropic angular distribution, then the system is not integrable. As there exists no exact formula for the surmise of the Ginibre ensembles in the large- N limit, the comparison to a two-dimensional tori ensemble (TUE) has been put forward [17]. Recently [19], there has been given an approximation formula for the CSR of the Ginibre universality class.

However, the classification of non-Hermitian systems [18, 20–24] goes beyond this. It has been shown [22], that non-Hermitian systems follow one of three distinct universality classes of random matrices AI , AI^\dagger , AII^\dagger . Further effort of distinguishing the 38 non-Hermitian point-gap spectra and 10 Lindbladian classes without unitary symmetries are ongoing.

In this work, we aim at inferring the integrability of strongly interacting bosons in a Markovian environment using the concept of CSR. In order to numerically investigate the spectrum, it is advantageous to consider systems of finite sized Hilbert space. The Tonks–Girardeau gas is a continuum version of hard-core bosons (HCB) on a one-dimensional lattice, where the constraint of at most one boson per site mirrors the infinite repulsion. In contrast to the Bose-Hubbard model at finite interaction in one-dimension, the HCB model at infinite interaction is integrable; see for recent progress in calculating the spectral function see [25–27]. Through the Holstein–Primakoff transformation [28], we map HCB to the XX spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ -chain. This spin model is integrable and can be mapped with the Jordan-Wigner transformation [29] to free Fermions. Here, the Pauli exclusion principle takes care of the hard-core constraint. The equivalence of the Jordan-Wigner transformation and the Bose-Fermi mapping by Girardeau can be shown explicitly on a lattice [30].

The paper is organized as follows: In section II, we define the model of hard-core bosons with local Markovian pump and loss and discuss its symmetries. In section III, the main results of this paper is shown: We present and analyze the CSR of an irreducible block of the Lindbladian, indicating that the model is not integrable after [17]. We classify the marginal distributions over angle and radius by comparison to RMT results. Section IV is independent of the discussion on integra-

* martina.zuendel@lpmmc.cnrs.fr




FIG. 1. Analysis of the CSR (12) of the spectrum of the driven-dissipative XX spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ model (4): (a) Distribution $\rho(z)$, (b) marginal distribution $\rho(\theta)$ over the angle θ , (c) marginal distribution $\rho(r)$ over the radius r . In violet (dashed), the surmise for the TUE with $N = 5$ is shown, this is an approximation for the GinUE, compare with App. A. In dark green (solid), the sampled surmise for the symmetry class AI^\dagger is displayed. Data of 104468 eigenvalues, for $L = 12$, $M = 1$, at $\gamma_l = J = 1$, $\gamma_p = 0.8$.

bility: We present features of the spectrum and compare them with perturbative calculations in the dissipative parameters.

II. MODEL

We consider a periodic chain of hard-core bosons

$$H_{HCB} = -J \sum_{j=1}^L (b_j^\dagger b_{j+1} + h.c.), \quad (1)$$

with the hard-core constraint given by the two-dimensional local Hilbert space, such that $b_i^2|\Psi\rangle = 0 = b_i^{\dagger 2}|\Psi\rangle \forall \Psi$. This can be mapped by the transformation due to Holstein and Primakoff [28] with

$$\sigma_j^+ = b_j^\dagger \sqrt{1 - n_j}, \quad \sigma_j^- = \sqrt{1 - n_j} b_j, \quad (2)$$

to the XX spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ -chain model given by the Hamiltonian

$$H_{XX} = -2J \sum_{j=1}^L (\sigma_j^x \sigma_{j+1}^x + \sigma_j^y \sigma_{j+1}^y), \quad (3)$$

with the physical spin $S^\mu = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^\mu$, where $\{\sigma^\mu\}_{\mu=x,y,z}$ are represented by the Pauli matrices. We define $\sigma^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma^x \pm i\sigma^y)$, which act as spin-flip operators and it follows that the operator $n_i = \sigma_i^+ \sigma_i^-$ returns the local number of excited states.

The pump and loss of hard-core bosons hence corresponds to spin flips in the XX-model. The most straightforward way of modeling an open system with a Lindbladian, is by local gains and losses. Further, due to the hard-core nature, at most one particle can be placed or taken out in one position. Therefore, the resulting Lindbladian is of the form

$$\mathcal{L}\rho = -i[H_{XX}, \rho] + \gamma_p \sum_{j=1}^L \mathcal{D}[\sigma_j^+] \rho + \gamma_l \sum_{j=1}^L \mathcal{D}[\sigma_j^-] \rho, \quad (4)$$

and acts on the doubled Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$, dubbed Liouville space. The dissipator \mathcal{D} is defined below and describes the spin-flip up (down) - pump (loss) of a boson - at rate γ_p (γ_l).

A. Vectorization

In order to implement the the time evolution operator \mathcal{L} as a matrix operator and extract its eigenvalues, we vectorize the operators as $A\rho B \mapsto (A \otimes B^\top)\rho$. Then, the von Neumann equation reads

$$\partial_t \rho = -i[H, \rho] \quad (5)$$

$$\mapsto -i(H \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes H^\top)\rho, \quad (6)$$

and the dissipator \mathcal{D} of the jump operator L

$$\mathcal{D}[L]\rho = L\rho L^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}L^\dagger L\rho - \frac{1}{2}\rho L^\dagger L \quad (7)$$

$$\mapsto \left(L \otimes L^* - \frac{1}{2}L^\dagger L \otimes \mathbb{1} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1} \otimes L^\top L^* \right)\rho, \quad (8)$$

with the asterisk $*$ denoting complex conjugation. If the Lindbladian possesses symmetries or further structure, we need to first block-diagonalize it and find spectra *per* sector. Only in a symmetry reduced basis, we can distinguish an integrable from a chaotic system.

B. Symmetries

In open systems, there are two types of possible symmetries - weak and strong symmetries [31].¹ A symmetry is called *strong*, if the Hamiltonian H and each jump operator L_i separately commute with the associated operator A of the symmetry

$$[H, A] = 0 \quad \wedge \quad [L_i, A] = 0, \forall i. \quad (9)$$

Whereas the symmetry is called *weak* if

$$\mathcal{L}(A\rho A^\dagger) = A(\mathcal{L}\rho)A^\dagger. \quad (10)$$

¹ Similar considerations have been made within the Keldysh formalism [7], calling them respectively *classical* and *quantum* symmetries.

Strong symmetry implies weak symmetry. Finally, we can *block-diagonalize* \mathcal{L} if a superoperator $\mathcal{A} \equiv [A, \cdot] = A \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes A^\top$ commutes with the Lindbladian

$$[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{A}] = 0. \quad (11)$$

It can be easily shown that the model in Eq. (4) does not allow for strong conservation of total magnetization. Nevertheless, the particle number is weakly conserved and the entire Lindbladian commutes with the corresponding super operator $[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{N}] = 0$, which in the language of the hard core bosons is a super particle number operator $\mathcal{N} = n \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes n^\top$, with $n = \sum_i n_i$. Its eigenvalues $M \in \{-L, \dots, L\}$ depend on the difference of particles $M = N_m - N_n$ in the bra $\langle N_m|$ and ket state $|N_n\rangle$ describing the density matrix $\Phi_{m,n} = |N_m\rangle \langle N_n|$.

Further, the momentum operator is conserved in a strong way, manifesting that the system is translational invariant. Additionally, the system displays a discrete strong spatial parity symmetry ($\sigma_i^\mu \mapsto \sigma_{L-i+1}^\mu$), when in momentum sector 0 or π . Finally, we note, that in the particular case of $\gamma_p = \gamma_l$, the particle number sector $M = 0$ has additional spin flip symmetry.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE LEVEL RATIO

The CSR z_i for the complex eigenvalue $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$ is defined as the ratio of the distances to the nearest $\lambda_i^{(NN)}$ and next-nearest eigenvalue $\lambda_i^{(NNN)}$,

$$z_i = \frac{\lambda_i - \lambda_i^{(NN)}}{\lambda_i - \lambda_i^{(NNN)}}. \quad (12)$$

Representing the ratio z in polar coordinates $z = r e^{i\theta}$, we can analyze the marginal distributions over the angle $\rho(\theta) = \int_0^1 dr r \rho(r, \theta)$ and radius $\rho(r) = \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta r \rho(r, \theta)$.

For non-Hermitian systems, the CSR z for chaotic systems are expected to follow the Ginibre surmise [22]. Interestingly, the for small radii, all three Ginibre ensembles (GinUE, GinOE, GinSE), show cubic level repulsion, hence they are indistinguishable by what is known as Dyson index β in closed systems.

Since the low- N Ginibre ensembles do not well describe the large- N limit, we make use of two-dimensional tori ensemble introduced in [17]. The idea is to equally distribute the eigenvalues over a torus, parametrized by the angles $\vartheta \in (-\pi, \pi]$, $\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi]$,

$$P_{TUE}^{(N)}(\vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_N; \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N) \quad (13)$$

$$\propto \prod_{j < k} \left(2 - \cos(\vartheta_j - \vartheta_k) - \cos(\varphi_j - \varphi_k) \right), \quad (14)$$

in order to take into account the strong finite size boundary effects. The surmise of the TUE, the analog of the Wigner surmise can be found the App. A and is converges fast for low N .

The implementation is explained in App. B and the results are displayed in Fig. 1(a). The CSR over the complex plane

shows clearly a donut-like shape, as compared to a flat Poisson distribution, hinting at level repulsion, hence chaotic behavior of the system. The asymmetry in the angle distribution underlines this further. For more quantitative results the marginal distributions over the angle and radius are shown in Fig. 1(b),(c), and compared to the afore mentioned tori ensemble in violet. The qualitative comparison is matching - hence, we conclude that the system is not integrable.

In order to understand the slight quantitative mismatch, we take into account the different symmetry classes the generator of the open system dynamics can fall into [22]. Following their nomenclature, we see that the surmise of the symmetry class AII † would increase the discrepancy to the model data further. This can be seen for instance in the lowered minimum of $\rho(\theta)$. However, the opposite behaviour is found the class AI † .

Therefore, we compare our data additional to the surmise of the symmetry class AI † . For this symmetry class there exists no analytical expression for the distribution or surmise, contrary to the class AI. For this reason, we sample $2^{12} \times 2^{12}$ random matrices under the constraint of their class, calculate their CSR and average over 2^{10} realizations, to obtain the surmise marked in dark green. The surmise well describes the CSR of the model.

IV. PROPERTIES OF THE SPECTRUM

In this section, we investigate the Lindbladian spectrum of the model Eq. (4) further.

A. Numerical observations




FIG. 2. Spectrum of the Lindbladian, for system size $L = 10$, in the super particle number (magnetization) sector $M = 4$, with varying pump rate $\gamma_p = 0.1, 0.5, 1.0, 5.0$ from (a)-(d). Remaining parameters as in Fig. 1.

Change of the pump rate

We find that varying the pump rate γ_p in the model separates different parts of the spectrum, compare Fig. 2. Setting the pump rate equal to the loss rate leads to Fig. 2 (c). The lines of the real axis and of the imaginary axis, shifted by the trace of the Lindbladian, are still pronounced. For smaller and larger pumping rate, chunks of the spectrum start to separate, leading to an apparent stripe pattern. The stripes are separated by a uniform distance.

Apparent stripes

We observe in Fig. 3, that the number of these visible stripes depends on the chosen super particle number sector M to diagonalize the matrix. This number seems to be given by $L - |M| + 1$. We cross-checked this with other system sizes. Of course, for fewer eigenvalues, the stripe shape eventually vanishes. However, the number of clusters (stripes) stays the same. For instance for the case $L = 10$ and $M = 9$, where there exists only two states whose separation can be tuned with the pump rate γ_p , and $M = 10$ with exactly one state in it.




FIG. 3. Spectrum of the Lindbladian, for system size $L = 10$, in different super particle number (magnetization) sectors $M = 6, 5, 4, 3$ from (a)-(d). Model parameters $\gamma_p = 5$, remaining parameters as in Fig. 1.

B. Perturbative prediction

Assuming that the dissipative parameters are small $\gamma_p, \gamma_l \ll 1$, we can split the Lindblad superoperator

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \gamma \mathcal{L}_1, \quad (15)$$




FIG. 4. Spectrum of the Lindbladian for system size $L = 10$ and super particle number (magnetization) sector $M = 3$. Model parameters: $J = 1$, $\gamma_p = 0.01$, $\gamma_l = 0.1$. Perturbative prediction IV B of the position of the stripes in gray. To first order in perturbation theory: Separation of the stripes $\delta = |\gamma_p - \gamma_l|$, distance to the origin $\Delta = -\gamma_p L + \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_p - \gamma_l)M$.

into an unperturbed part \mathcal{L}_0 , consisting of the coherent, von Neumann evolution

$$\mathcal{L}_0 \rho = -i[H_{XX}, \rho], \quad (16)$$

and treat the dissipative part as a small perturbation

$$\gamma \mathcal{L}_1 = \gamma_p \sum_{j=1}^L \mathcal{D}[\sigma_j^+] \rho + \gamma_l \sum_{j=1}^L \mathcal{D}[\sigma_j^-] \rho. \quad (17)$$

We will calculate the first-order corrections $\lambda_{mn}^{(1)}$ to the unperturbed eigenvalues $\lambda_{mn}^{(0)}$.

Let $|E_m\rangle = |\{m_j\}_{j=1, \dots, L}\rangle$ be the Fock basis, which is an eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian H_{XX} with $H_{XX}|E_m\rangle = E_m|E_m\rangle$. We call the right eigenoperator of the unperturbed Lindbladian \mathcal{L}_0

$$\Phi_{m,n} = |E_m\rangle \langle E_n|, \quad (18)$$

and find its unperturbed eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{m,n}^{(0)} = -i(E_m - E_n), \quad (19)$$

are purely imaginary as expected. The first-order shift in that eigenvalue, for a non-degenerate case, is given by

$$\lambda_{m,n}^{(1)} = \frac{\langle\langle \tilde{\Phi}_{m,n}, \mathcal{L}_1(\Phi_{m,n}) \rangle\rangle}{\langle\langle \tilde{\Phi}_{m,n}, \Phi_{m,n} \rangle\rangle}, \quad (20)$$

where $\langle\langle A, B \rangle\rangle = \text{Tr}(A^\dagger B)$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product in operator space, and $\tilde{\Phi}_{m,n}$ is the left eigenoperator of \mathcal{L}_0 corresponding to $\Phi_{m,n}$. The eigenoperators are normed $\langle\langle \tilde{\Phi}_{m,n}, \Phi_{m,n} \rangle\rangle = 1$.

Evaluating the numerator of Eq. (20), we see that only the second and third term in the dissipator $\frac{1}{2}\{L^\dagger L, \rho\}$ give a contribution to the diagonal elements of the operator and hence

to the first order correction in the eigenvalues. Summing over the lattice sites, we denote $N_m = \sum_i \langle E_m | n_i | E_m \rangle$ as the total number of excitations in state $|E_m\rangle$. Similarly N_n for $|E_n\rangle$. Then the first order correction to the eigenvalues are given by

$$\lambda_{m,n}^{(1)} = -\gamma_p L + \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_p - \gamma_l)(N_m + N_n). \quad (21)$$

This corresponds to a negative shift of the imaginary unperturbed eigenvalues $\lambda_{m,n}^{(0)}$ along the real axis. This shift depends on the number of excited states in the bra N_m and ket N_n of $\Phi_{m,n}$.

We show the theoretical prediction together with the data of the model for small pump and loss rate in Fig. 4. Due to the fixed super particle number sector $M = N_m - N_n = \text{const}$, the smallest difference δ of two distinct shifts is given by $\delta = |\gamma_p - \gamma_l|$, explaining the regularly spaced stripes, observed in the numerical calculations and described in the previous section.

The number of stripes is equally determined by the particle number sector M within a system of size L . There can be 0 particles in $|E_m\rangle$, follows M particles in $|E_n\rangle$, or 1 and $M+1$, etc., up to $L-M$ and L particles. In total $L - |M| + 1$ possibilities, which gives the number of stripes conjectured in the previous section. We conclude that the decay, i.e. the negative real part of the eigenvalues, is extensive in the number of excitations $N_n + N_m$.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we showed that a system of hard-core bosons loses its integrable structure if losses and gains of the system are implemented with Lindbladian one-body jump operators. We did so by considering the CSRs of the spectrum of the generator of the dynamics. These showed clearly a level repulsion (donut-shape in the complex plane) and anisotropic angular distribution, as expected for a chaotic system [17]. Further, we find our system to be in the universality class AI^\dagger [21] of random matrices. In a separate part, we analyzed emergent features of the Lindbladian spectrum of this model. At large difference of pump and loss rate, we found a number of $L - |M| + 1$ regularly spaced stripes. For small dissi-

pative parameters, our perturbative calculation confirmed and explained these patterns.

In summary, we provide with our analysis a clear answer to the question of integrability of a driven-dissipative system of strongly interacting bosons coupled to an environment by local loss and gains.

We stress, that this seems to us the most straightforward and experimentally relevant way of implementing an *open* bosonic system within the Lindbladian framework. Such a bosonic lattice with local pump and loss can be realized in exciton-polariton condensates in semiconductor microcavities [32], in optomechanical systems with local feedback control [33], in superconducting circuit QED arrays of qubits and resonators [34, 35], or in ultracold-atom optical lattices with site-selective addressing [36]. We note, however, that other prominent examples with non-local two-body losses exist, specifically nearest neighbor hopping terms, among which there exist integrable models. For instance in [37], Yang-Baxter integrable open systems are constructed. Within this construction, they find the known integrable case of the XX model with dephasing noise [38], as well as the totally antisymmetric and symmetric simple exclusion process, and discuss the generalizations thereof. A recent publication [24] puts this in context with the non-Hermitian symmetry classifications.

The question of the existence of further integrable and experimentally relevant solutions for open bosonic systems remains open.

Acknowledgments—The author warmly thanks Anna Minguzzi for discussions on related topics, Tomaž Prosen for helpful advice and Lucas Sà for correspondence. Further, the author thanks Léonie Canet and Sebastian Diehl for their encouragement to publish the results and Anna Minguzzi, Anton Khvalyuk, Félix Helluin and Sébastien Lucas for proof-reading. This work is supported in parts by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 2181/1- 390900948 (the Heidelberg STRUCTURES Excellence Cluster).

Appendix A: Details on the analytical distributions

The surmise of the TUE are given by [39]

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{TUE}^{(N)}(x, y) &\propto \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} ds dt \prod_{j=1}^{N-3} \left(\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} da_j \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} db_j \right) \Theta((a_j^2 + b_j^2) - (s^2 + t^2)) (s^2 + t^2)^2 [2 - \cos s - \cos t] \\ &\times [2 - \cos(sx - ty) - \cos(tx + sy)] [2 - \cos(s(x-1) - ty) - \cos(t(x-1) + sy)] \\ &\times \prod_{j=1}^{N-3} [2 - \cos a_j - \cos b_j] [2 - \cos(s - a_j) - \cos(t - b_j)] \\ &\times [2 - \cos(sx - ty - a_j) - \cos(tx + sy - b_j)] \prod_{j < k} [2 - \cos(a_j - a_k) - \cos(b_j - b_k)]. \end{aligned}$$

We evaluate the integrals numerically with Monte Carlo sampling and show the marginal distributions $\rho(r)$ and $\rho(\theta)$

of the TUE's surmise for $N = 3, 4, 5$ in Fig. 5.




FIG. 5. Marginal distributions $\rho(r)$ and $\rho(\theta)$ in (a), (b), of the TUE's surmise at $N = 3, 4, 5$. Together with the data of Fig. 1.

Appendix B: Construction of the Lindbladian in the symmetry reduced basis

The Lindbladian matrix was constructed in a symmetry reduced basis, analogous to Hamiltonian in closed systems. Due to commutator of the super particle number \mathcal{N} with the gen-

erator of the dynamics \mathcal{L} , first, all basis elements of a fixed sector M were selected. Further, we constrain the matrix to the basis of semi-momentum states as we choose the zeroth momentum sector $P = 0$ and the positive parity sector. Compare [40] for an implementation of semi-momentum states in closed system dynamics.

We chose the system size reasonable large $L = 12$ and picked the sector $M = 1$ to obtain good statistics with 104468 eigenvalues.

Further, we performed two checks: First, performing the calculation in the momentum sector $P = 0$, but not in the semi-momentum states, leads to a distribution that resembles the Poisson distribution. This is indicating integrability or the disregard of a symmetry, as expected since the parity symmetry was not taken into account. Second, we choose the sector $M = 0$ (in a slightly smaller system $L = 11$), which leads to an additional spin flip parity symmetry. This sector is interesting, as it contains the steady state of the dynamics. Again, as expected not correctly taking the symmetry into leads to something rather close to the Poisson distribution.

-
- [1] E. H. Lieb and W. Liniger, *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 1605 (1963).
[2] T. Kinoshita, T. Wenger, and D. S. Weiss, *Nature* **440**, 900 (2006).
[3] M. Girardeau, *J. Math. Phys.* **1**, 516 (1960).
[4] A. Lenard, *J. Math. Phys.* **7**, 1268 (1966).
[5] M. D. Girardeau, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 040401 (2003).
[6] V. I. Yukalov and M. D. Girardeau, *Laser Phys. Lett.* **2**, 375 (2005).
[7] L. M. Sieberer, M. Buchhold, J. Marino, and S. Diehl, *Universality in driven open quantum matter* (2023), 2312.03073 [cond-mat].
[8] C. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise: A Handbook of Markovian and Non-Markovian Quantum Stochastic Methods with Applications to Quantum Optics* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2004).
[9] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2006).
[10] A. Rivas and S. F. Huelga, *Open Quantum Systems: An Introduction*, SpringerBriefs in Physics (Springer, 2012).
[11] I. de Vega and D. Alonso, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 015001 (2017).
[12] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **17**, 821 (1976), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jmp/article-pdf/17/5/821/19090720/821_1_online.pdf.
[13] G. Lindblad, *Commun.Math. Phys.* **48**, 119 (1976).
[14] V. Oganessian and D. A. Huse, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 155111 (2007).
[15] Y. Y. Atas, E. Bogomolny, O. Giraud, and G. Roux, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 084101 (2013).
[16] O. Bohigas, M. J. Giannoni, and C. Schmit, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 1 (1984).
[17] L. Sá, P. Ribeiro, and T. Prosen, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 021019 (2020).
[18] L. Sá, P. Ribeiro, and T. Prosen, *Physical Review X* **13**, 10.1103/PhysRevX.13.031019 (2023).
[19] I. G. Dusa and T. Wettig, *Phys. Rev. E* **105**, 044144 (2022).
[20] D. Bernard and A. LeClair, in *Statistical Field Theories*, edited by A. Cappelli and G. Mussardo (Springer Netherlands, 2002) pp. 207–214.
[21] K. Kawabata, K. Shiozaki, M. Ueda, and M. Sato, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041015 (2019).
[22] R. Hamazaki, K. Kawabata, N. Kura, and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 023286 (2020).
[23] K. Kawabata, A. Kulkarni, J. Li, T. Numasawa, and S. Ryu, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 030328 (2023).
[24] L. Sá, P. Ribeiro, T. Prosen, and D. Bernard, *Symmetry classes of classical stochastic processes* (2020), 2406.17955 [cond-mat].
[25] M. Rigol and A. Muramatsu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 230404 (2004).
[26] J. Settimo, N. Lo Gullo, F. Plastina, and A. Minguzzi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 065301 (2021).
[27] O. I. Pâțu, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 053306 (2022).
[28] T. Holstein and H. Primakoff, *Phys. Rev.* **58**, 1098 (1940).
[29] P. Jordan and E. Wigner, *Z. Physik* **47**, 631 (1928).
[30] M. A. Cazalilla, R. Citro, T. Giamarchi, E. Orignac, and M. Rigol, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 1405 (2011).
[31] B. Buča and T. Prosen, *New J. Phys.* **14**, 073007 (2012).
[32] J. Kasprzak, M. Richard, S. Kundermann, A. Baas, P. Jeambrun, J. M. J. Keeling, F. M. Marchetti, M. H. Szymańska, R. André, J. L. Staehli, V. Savona, P. B. Littlewood, B. Deveaud, and L. S. Dang, *Nature* **443**, 409 (2006).
[33] M. Ludwig and F. Marquardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 073603 (2013).
[34] J. Raftery, D. Sadri, S. Schmidt, H. E. Türeci, and A. A. Houck, *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 031043 (2014).
[35] S. Hacothen-Gourgy, L. S. Martin, E. Flurin, V. V. Ramasesh, K. B. Whaley, and I. Siddiqi, *Nature* **538**, 491 (2016).
[36] G. Barontini, R. Labouvie, F. Stubenrauch, A. Vogler, V. Guarnera, and H. Ott, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 035302 (2013).
[37] M. de Leeuw, C. Paletta, and B. Pozsgay, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 240403 (2021).
[38] M. V. Medvedyeva, F. H. Essler, and T. Prosen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 137202 (2016).
[39] L. Sà, *Dissipation and decoherence for generic open quantum systems: Spectral and steady-state properties of random Liouvillean operators*, Master's thesis, Instituto Superior Técnico,

Lisboa (2019).

[40] A. W. Sandvik, *AIP Conference Proceedings* **1297**, 135 (2010).