

# Mott polaritons in cavity-coupled quantum materials

Martin Kiffner<sup>1,2</sup>, Jonathan Coulthard<sup>2</sup>, Frank Schlawin<sup>2</sup>, Arzhang Ardavan<sup>2</sup>, and Dieter Jaksch<sup>2,1</sup>  
*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543<sup>1</sup> and  
 Clarendon Laboratory, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, United Kingdom<sup>2</sup>*

We show that strong electron-electron interactions in cavity-coupled quantum materials can enable collectively enhanced light-matter interactions with ultrastrong effective coupling strengths. As a paradigmatic example we consider a Fermi-Hubbard model coupled to a single-mode cavity and find that resonant electron-cavity interactions result in the formation of a quasi-continuum of polariton branches. The vacuum Rabi splitting of the two outermost branches is collectively enhanced and scales with  $g_{\text{eff}} \propto \sqrt{2L}$ , where  $L$  is the number of electronic sites, and the maximal achievable value for  $g_{\text{eff}}$  is determined by the volume of the unit cell of the crystal. We find that  $g_{\text{eff}}$  for existing quantum materials can by far exceed the width of the first excited Hubbard band. This effect can be experimentally observed via measurements of the optical conductivity and does not require ultrastrong coupling on the single-electron level. Quantum correlations in the electronic ground state as well as the microscopic nature of the light-matter interaction enhance the collective light-matter interaction compared to an ensemble of independent two-level atoms interacting with a cavity mode.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Collective phenomena in light-matter interactions are of tremendous interest in quantum physics. The characteristic feature of these phenomena is that observable quantities increase with the number of emitters, and thus intrinsically small quantum effects can be elevated to a macroscopic level. One of the first studied examples is superradiance within the Dicke model [1, 2], which comprises an ensemble of independent two-level atoms interacting with a single mode of the radiation field.

Collective light-matter interactions are conveniently described within the framework of polaritons, which are combined excitations of light and matter. A prominent example is given by dark-state polaritons in laser-driven atomic gases [3] and more recently, polaritons have been investigated in various solid state systems coupled to cavities [4–20]. For example, Bose-Einstein condensation of exciton polaritons in semiconductor materials attracted considerable attention [4, 5], and molecular systems [6–8] coupled to cavities can exhibit giant Rabi splittings between polariton branches. The strong coupling of magnetic excitations to microwave cavities was investigated in [9–14], and two-dimensional electron gases coupled to THz cavities were studied in [15–20]. In all these systems [4–20], Coulomb interactions between electrons play a minor role and are not directly involved in the formation of polaritons.

A particularly intriguing yet challenging platform for investigating light-matter interactions are quantum materials [21–24]. In these systems strong electron-electron interactions give rise a plethora of physical effects that are difficult to describe due to their intrinsically quantum many-body nature. An example is given by the Mott metal-insulator transition [25, 26] which can be modelled within the Fermi-Hubbard model [27].

First steps investigating how quantum materials couple to classical and quantum light have been undertaken recently. The interaction of quantum materials with strong, classical light fields was investigated in [28–31],




FIG. 1. (Color online) (a) The system of interest comprises an electronic system that is weakly coupled to a single-mode cavity with resonance frequency  $\omega_c$  and photon energy  $\Omega = \hbar\omega_c$ . We consider a one-dimensional Fermi-Hubbard model with on-site interaction  $U$  and hopping amplitude  $t$  for the electronic system. (b) Schematic illustration of the resonant electron-photon coupling with coupling strength  $g$  between the electronic ground state and a doublon-holon pair state with energy  $U$ .

and superradiance of quantum materials coupled to a cavity field was predicted in [32]. The possibility of inducing superconductivity by coupling electron systems to terahertz and microwave cavities was explored in [33–36]. Furthermore, it was shown in [37, 38] that second-order electron-cavity interactions reduce the magnetic exchange energy in cavity-coupled quantum materials and lead to a collectively enhanced momentum-space pairing effect for electrons.

Here we show that strong electron-electron interactions in cavity-coupled quantum materials can enable collectively enhanced light-matter interactions that change the

macroscopic properties of the quantum material. In particular, we consider a one-dimensional Hubbard model coupled to a single-mode cavity as shown in Fig. 1(a). We find that the optical conductivity of the quantum material features two peaks that are separated in energy by the collectively enhanced vacuum Rabi frequency  $g_{\text{eff}} \propto \sqrt{2L}$ , where  $L$  is the number of electronic sites. Macroscopically large energy splittings are thus even possible for weakly coupled electron-photon systems. The largest possible value of  $g_{\text{eff}}$  is attained if the material fills the entire cavity. In this case, the effective coupling constant becomes independent of  $L$  and  $g_{\text{eff}} \propto 1/\sqrt{v_{\text{uc}}}$ , where  $v_{\text{uc}}$  is the volume of the unit cell of the crystal. As an example, for the quantum material ET-F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ, which is well described by a one-dimensional Hubbard model,  $g_{\text{eff}}$  can exceed 250meV. This is several orders of magnitude larger than collective energy shifts in atomic systems [39–41] and comparable to the extremely large energy splittings achieved in cavity-coupled molecular materials [6–8].

The resonant light-matter interactions considered here are schematically shown in Fig. 1(b). An electronic state at half filling and with no electronic excitation is resonantly coupled via a cavity photon to an electronic state with one doubly occupied state (doublon) and an empty site (holon) next to it. These states differ in energy by the on-site Coulomb interaction  $U$ , which corresponds to the Mott gap of the quantum material. The transition dipole moment between these two states is of the order of  $de$  ( $d$ : lattice spacing,  $e$  elementary charge), which is comparable to strong transitions in alkali metal atoms [42]. A single-mode cavity is tuned in resonance with this transition between electronic states.

We find that this resonant electron-photon interaction leads to a quasi-continuum of polariton states. The two branches with the largest energy splitting  $g_{\text{eff}}$  can be constructed from the electronic ground state. The collective energy splitting  $g_{\text{eff}} \propto \sqrt{2L}$  of these branches gives rise to the two peaks in the optical conductivity. A comparison of our results with the Dicke model [1, 2, 43, 44] reveals two important differences between the two systems. First, the quantum correlations in the ground state of the electronic system lead to an enhancement of  $g_{\text{eff}}$  by  $\approx 18\%$ . Second,  $g_{\text{eff}}$  for the electronic system is larger by a factor of  $\sqrt{2}$  than in the Dicke model. We show that this difference is caused by the different microscopic nature of the light-matter coupling in these systems.

This paper is organized as follows. The theoretical model describing the system shown in Fig. 1(a) is introduced in Sec. II. Our results are presented in Sec. III, and the derivation of the Mott polaritons in the manifold with one excitation is outlined in Sec. III A. We then show in Sec. III B that a direct signature of the light-matter hybridisation appears in the optical conductivity. The discussion in Sec. IV gives an intuitive explanation for the collective enhancement of the polariton splitting and illustrates similarities and differences of our system with the Dicke model. The experimental observation of the predicted effects is discussed in Sec. V, and a summary

of our results is provided in Sec. VI.

## II. MODEL

In this section we present the theoretical model established in [37, 38] for the quantum hybrid system shown in Fig. 1(a). The electronic system is described by the one-dimensional Fermi-Hubbard model [27] with on-site energy  $U$  and hopping amplitude  $t$ . The electrons are weakly coupled to a single-mode cavity with resonance frequency  $\omega_c$ , and  $\Omega = \hbar\omega_c$  is the photon energy.

The gross energy structure of our system in the parameter regime of interest ( $U, \Omega \gg t$ ) is determined by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_0 = \hat{P} + \hat{D}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$\hat{P} = \Omega \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \quad (2)$$

describes the cavity photons and  $\hat{a}^\dagger$  ( $\hat{a}$ ) is the bosonic photon creation (annihilation) operator. The operator  $\hat{D}$  in Eq. (1) accounts for the on-site Coulomb repulsion between electrons,

$$\hat{D} = U \sum_{k=0}^L k \hat{\mathcal{P}}_k^D, \quad (3)$$

where  $U$  is the interaction energy and  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_k^D$  is the projector onto the manifold with  $k$  doubly-occupied sites [37]. In the following we refer to these excitations as doublons. The eigenstates of  $\hat{H}_0$  are tensor products of photon number states  $|j_P\rangle$  with  $j$  photons and Wannier states [27] with  $k$  doublons. The associated eigenvalues  $j\Omega + kU$  are generally highly degenerate and form manifolds as shown in Fig. 2. We denote the projector onto a manifold with  $j$  photons and  $k = n - j$  doublons by

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n^{(j)} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{n-j}^D \otimes \hat{\mathcal{P}}_j^P, \quad (4)$$

where  $n$  is the total number of excitations,  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_j^P = |j_P\rangle\langle j_P|$  projects onto the subspace with  $j$  photons and

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n = \sum_{j=0}^n \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n^{(j)} \quad (5)$$

projects onto all sub-manifolds with  $n$  excitations.

Modifications to the simple energy structure shown in Fig. 1 arise from the electron hopping and the electron-photon interaction. The hopping operator is

$$\hat{T} = -t \sum_{\langle jk \rangle \sigma} (\hat{c}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k,\sigma} + \text{h.c.}), \quad (6)$$

where  $\langle jk \rangle$  denotes neighbouring sites with  $j < k$  and  $\hat{c}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger$  ( $\hat{c}_{j,\sigma}$ ) creates (annihilates) an electron at site  $j$  in spin state  $\sigma \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ .




FIG. 2. Schematic drawing of the spectrum of  $\hat{H}_0 = \hat{D} + \hat{P}$  for  $U = \Omega$ .  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n^{(j)}$  projects onto a sub-manifold with  $j$  photons and  $n-j$  doublons, and  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$  is the projector onto the manifold with  $n$  excitations. Only manifolds with  $n \leq 2$  excitations are shown. The resonant cavity coupling  $g$  between sub-manifolds is indicated by arrows. Higher-order couplings induced by  $\hat{V}$  are not shown.

The electron-photon interaction was derived in [37, 38] via the Peierls substitution [27] and by expanding the resulting interaction Hamiltonian up to second order in the electron-cavity coupling,

$$\hat{V} = g(\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger)\hat{\mathcal{J}} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{g^2}{t^2} (\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger)^2 \hat{T}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{J}} = -i \sum_{\langle jk \rangle \sigma} (\hat{c}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k,\sigma} - \hat{c}_{k,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j,\sigma}) \quad (8)$$

is the dimensionless current operator. The parameter  $g = t\eta$  in  $\hat{V}$  determines the coupling strength between the electrons and photons, and

$$\eta = \frac{de}{\sqrt{2\hbar\varepsilon_0\omega_c v}} \quad (9)$$

is a dimensionless parameter that depends on the lattice constant  $d$  and the cavity mode volume  $v$  ( $e$ : elementary charge,  $\varepsilon_0$ : vacuum permittivity,  $\hbar$ : reduced Planck's constant). The derivation of  $\hat{V}$  assumes  $\eta \ll 1$ , and this condition is also required to grant the validity of the single-mode cavity approximation [45].

With the preceding definitions we arrive at the total Hamiltonian for the quantum hybrid system in Fig. 1,

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_1, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\hat{H}_1 = \hat{T} + \hat{V}, \quad (11a)$$

$$= \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{g^2}{t^2} (\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger)^2 \right] \hat{T} + g(\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger)\hat{\mathcal{J}}. \quad (11b)$$

For the parameters of interest ( $U, \Omega \gg t \gg g$ ),  $H_1$  can be treated as a perturbation to the gross energy structure dictated by  $H_0$ .

In the following Sec. III we investigate the formation of Mott polaritons through resonant electron-photon interactions in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$ . To set the stage for this we recall how the cavity modifies the physics in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0$ , which was investigated in [37, 38] using second-order perturbation theory. For the special case of  $\Omega = U$  and an electronic system at half filling, the effective Hamiltonian in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0$  is given by [37, 38]

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(0)} = \hat{H}_S \otimes \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^P, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\hat{H}_S = -J_c \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^D \left( \sum_{\langle kl \rangle} \hat{b}_{kl}^\dagger \hat{b}_{kl} \right) \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^D \quad (13)$$

and

$$\hat{b}_{kl}^\dagger = (\hat{c}_{k,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{l,\downarrow}^\dagger - \hat{c}_{k,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{l,\uparrow}^\dagger) / \sqrt{2} \quad (14)$$

creates a singlet pair at sites  $k$  and  $l$ .  $\hat{H}_S$  acts only on the electronic system and is an isotropic Heisenberg model [see Appendix A] with coupling

$$J_c = \mathcal{R}_c \frac{4t^2}{U}, \quad (15)$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_c = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{g^2}{t^2} \quad (16)$$

is a dimensionless scaling factor. Note that  $R_c$  is equal to unity for  $g = 0$  and  $R_c < 1$  for  $g > 0$ , and thus the cavity reduces the magnetic exchange interaction. In addition, we have  $J_c > 0$  for all permitted values of  $g \ll t$  and thus the ground state  $|G\rangle$  of  $\hat{H}_S$  is an antiferromagnetic state [27].

### III. RESULTS

Throughout this section we consider an electronic system at half filling and  $\Omega = U$ . In Sec. III A we show that resonant electron-photon interactions result in the formation of polaritons, and the energy splitting of the two outermost polariton branches is collectively enhanced. Evidence for this light-matter hybridisation can be found in the optical conductivity as shown in Sec. III B.

#### A. Mott polaritons

The first excited manifold  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$  contains all states with either one doublon or one photon. The effective Hamiltonian in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$  and in first order in  $H_1$  is [see Appendix B]

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} = U \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 + \mathcal{R}_c \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} \hat{T} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} + \hat{H}_{D-P}. \quad (17)$$

Higher-order terms in  $H_1$  are neglected in Eq. (17) and become negligible in the limit  $U \gg t, g$ . The first term in Eq. (17) is a constant energy offset of the states in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$ . The second term describes the dynamics of the doublon and holon in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$  and gives rise to the first excited Hubbard band. At  $g = 0$ , the width of this band is  $8t$  [46, 47], and the scaling factor  $\mathcal{R}_c$  reduces this width slightly for  $g > 0$ . The last term in Eq. (17) accounts for the resonant doublon-photon interaction and is given by [see Appendix C],

$$\hat{H}_{D-P} = g(\hat{\mathcal{D}}^\dagger \otimes \hat{A} + \hat{\mathcal{D}} \otimes \hat{A}^\dagger), \quad (18)$$

where

$$\hat{A} = |0_P\rangle\langle 1_P| \quad (19)$$

is a transition operator between the vacuum and the one-photon state and

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^D \hat{\mathcal{J}} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^D \quad (20)$$

mediates a transition between one and zero doublon states. We note that the definition of  $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$  allows us to write  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  as

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}} = -i(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_R - \hat{\mathcal{D}}_L), \quad (21)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_R = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^D \left( \sum_{\langle jk \rangle \sigma} \hat{c}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{k,\sigma} \right) \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^D \quad (22a)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_L = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^D \left( \sum_{\langle jk \rangle \sigma} \hat{c}_{k,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j,\sigma} \right) \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^D. \quad (22b)$$

Since  $j < k$  in  $\langle jk \rangle$ , this means that  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_R$  ( $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_L$ ) annihilates (creates) a doublon-holon pair where the doublon is to the right of the holon. Similarly,  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_L$  ( $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_R$ ) annihilates (creates) a doublon-holon pair where the doublon is to the left of the holon.

We emphasize that  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  is of first order in the electron-photon coupling since it is proportional to the coupling strength  $g$ . This is in contrast to the ground-state manifold where the leading term is of second order in the electron-photon coupling [37, 38]. We thus expect that the electron-cavity coupling has a much stronger effect in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$  than in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0$  for a fixed value of  $g$ .

The resonant electron-photon coupling described by  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  in Eq. (18) results in the formation of doublon-photon polaritons. All eigenstates of  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  with non-zero eigenvalues can be constructed from the eigenstates of  $\hat{H}_S$  with non-zero eigenvalues [see Appendix C]. For each eigenstate  $|g_j\rangle$  with

$$\hat{H}_S |g_j\rangle = \mathcal{E}_j |g_j\rangle \quad (23)$$

and  $\mathcal{E}_j < 0$  the corresponding pair of polariton states is

$$|\psi_{D-P}^j\rangle_\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ |g_j\rangle \otimes |1_P\rangle \pm \frac{1}{2\epsilon_j} (\hat{\mathcal{D}}^\dagger |g_j\rangle) \otimes |0_P\rangle \right], \quad (24)$$

where

$$\epsilon_j = \sqrt{-\mathcal{E}_j/J_c} \quad (25)$$

and

$$\hat{H}_{D-P} |\psi_{D-P}^j\rangle_\pm = \pm 2g\epsilon_j |\psi_{D-P}^j\rangle_\pm. \quad (26)$$

Each polariton state in Eq. (24) is a maximally entangled superposition of a state with one doublon and no photon, and a state with no doublon and one photon. The largest value  $\epsilon_{\max}$  corresponds to the ground state  $|G\rangle$  of  $\hat{H}_S$  in Eq. (12) with energy  $\mathcal{E}_G$ , and thus

$$\epsilon_{\max} = \sqrt{-\mathcal{E}_G/J_c} \approx \sqrt{L \log 2} \quad (27)$$

for  $L \gg 1$  [48]. The energy difference between the corresponding polariton states  $|\psi_{D-P}^{\max}\rangle_\pm$  is

$$g_{\text{eff}} = 4g\sqrt{L \log 2} \approx 3.33g\sqrt{L}, \quad (28)$$

and carries a direct signature of the collective doublon-photon coupling. If the material fills the mode volume  $v$  of the cavity we have  $v = Lv_{\text{uc}}$ , where  $v_{\text{uc}}$  is the volume per lattice site. Since  $g = \eta t \propto 1/\sqrt{v}$  [see Eq. (9)], the value of  $g_{\text{eff}}$  is independent of  $L$  and just depends on  $v_{\text{uc}}$ . This shows that nanoplasmonic cavities are not required to achieve large values of  $g_{\text{eff}}$ .

The values of  $\epsilon_j$  for a system with  $L = 12$  sites are shown in Fig. 4(a), and the corresponding density of states is shown in Fig. 4(b). Even a relatively small system with  $L = 12$  sites exhibits a quasi-continuum of polariton states, with the largest density of states for intermediate values of  $\epsilon_j$ .

Note that the states  $|\psi_{D-P}^j\rangle_\pm$  in Eq. (24) are not eigenstates of the full effective Hamiltonian in Eq. (17) due to the kinetic energy term  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} \hat{T} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)}$ . However, we show in Appendix C that the states  $|\psi_{D-P}^j\rangle_\pm$  are approximate eigenstates of  $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}$  if their energy splitting is much larger than  $t$ . In this case,  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} \hat{T} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)}$  only leads to a broadening of the polariton states by coupling them off-resonantly to the quasi-continuum of the first Hubbard band.

## B. Optical conductivity

A direct signature of the collective doublon-photon coupling in the first excited manifold can be found in the optical conductivity [27],

$$\sigma(\omega) = \frac{\pi e^2 t^2}{d\hbar^3} \sum_{m>0} \frac{|\langle \psi_m | \hat{\mathcal{J}} | \psi_0 \rangle|^2}{\omega_m - \omega_0} \delta[\omega - (\omega_m - \omega_0)], \quad (29)$$

where  $|\psi_m\rangle$  are the eigenstates of the full Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  with energies  $E_m = \hbar\omega_m$  and  $E_0 = \hbar\omega_0$  is the energy of the ground state  $|\psi_0\rangle$ . We calculate the optical conductivity with the full system Hamiltonian using Krylov subspace methods [49] for a half-filled electronic system




FIG. 3. (Color online) (a) All values of  $\epsilon_j$  for a system with  $L = 12$  sites at half filling and total spin  $S = 0$ . (b) Density of states of the  $\epsilon_j$  values shown in (a). (c) Density plot of  $\omega\sigma(\omega)$  for  $L = 12$  sites at half filling, zero temperature and  $U = \Omega = 20t$ , where  $\sigma(\omega)$  is the optical conductivity and  $s_0 = te^2/(\hbar^2 d)$ .  $g_{\text{eff}} = 3.33g\sqrt{L}$  is the collective coupling strength, and the red dashed lines indicate the energies  $\pm 0.5g_{\text{eff}}$  of  $|\psi_{D-P}^{\text{max}}\rangle_{\pm}$ . Each term of the sum in Eq. (29) was artificially broadened with a Lorentzian of width  $0.5t$ .

with  $L = 12$  sites. Figure 4(c) shows a density plot of the optical conductivity spectrum as a function of  $g_{\text{eff}}$  and  $\omega$ . At  $g_{\text{eff}} = 0$  the optical conductivity maps out the first excited Hubbard band of width  $8t$  that describes the kinematic excitations of a single doublon. At  $g_{\text{eff}}/t \approx 3$  the optical conductivity splits into two branches that become narrower with increasing  $g_{\text{eff}}$ . The peaks of the optical conductivity signal approximately follow the energies of the polariton branches  $|\psi_{D-P}^{\text{max}}\rangle_{\pm}$ .

These results suggest that the optical conductivity signal is mostly dominated by the two outermost polariton branches  $|\psi_{D-P}^{\text{max}}\rangle_{\pm}$  for  $g_{\text{eff}}/t \geq 3$  which can be understood as follows. States which are split strongly by the cavity's light field are also expected to couple strongly to an externally applied light field, and thus they show a strong signal in the optical conductivity. This can also be confirmed by noting that  $|\psi_m\rangle = |\psi_{D-P}^{\text{max}}\rangle_{\pm}$  are the only polariton states contributing to the sum in Eq. (29) if we approximate the ground state by  $|\psi_0\rangle \approx |G\rangle \otimes |0_P\rangle$ . The finite width of the optical conductivity signal is caused by the coupling of polariton states to the first Hubbard band via  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)}\hat{T}\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)}$ , and this coupling becomes less effective with increasing energy splitting  $\propto g_{\text{eff}}$  [see Appendix C]. The slight asymmetry in the intensity and position of the

two conductivity branches as well as the slight increase of the energy splitting compared with the analytical result is a consequence of the higher order terms that are neglected in Eq. (17) but taken into account in the numerical evaluation of  $\sigma(\omega)$ .

#### IV. DISCUSSION

In Sec. III we have shown that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the polariton branches in the manifold  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$  and the eigenstates of  $\hat{H}_S$  in Eq. (13) with zero excitations. The two branches with the largest splitting  $g_{\text{eff}}$  contribute significantly to the optical conductivity signal and correspond to the electronic ground state  $|G\rangle$  of  $\hat{H}_S$ . A rigorous derivation of the results presented in Sec. III is provided in Appendix C. Here we give an alternative and approximate derivation of the two polariton branches with the largest energy splitting  $g_{\text{eff}}$ . This more intuitive picture allows us to gain further insights into our system and highlights similarities and differences with other polariton systems.

Our elementary derivation of  $g_{\text{eff}}$  starts by approximating the electronic ground state  $|G\rangle$  of  $\hat{H}_S$  by  $|G\rangle \approx |G_{\text{Néel}}\rangle$ , where

$$|G_{\text{Néel}}\rangle = |\uparrow_1, \downarrow_2, \uparrow_3, \dots\rangle \quad (30)$$

is the antiferromagnetic Néel state. Note that we also employed this state for  $L = 5$  to illustrate the electronic ground state in Fig. 1(b). Applying the doublon-holon creation operator  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^\dagger$  [see Eq. (20)] to this state results in a state with one doublon excitation,

$$|E_{\text{Néel}}\rangle = i\mathcal{C}(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_R^\dagger - \hat{\mathcal{D}}_L^\dagger)|G_{\text{Néel}}\rangle, \quad (31)$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  is a normalisation constant. Assuming open boundary conditions, the operators  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_L^\dagger$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_R^\dagger$  each create  $L - 1$  states with a holon-doublon pair. Since all these states are orthonormal, we have  $\mathcal{C} = 1/\sqrt{2(L-1)} \approx 1/\sqrt{2L}$  for  $L \gg 1$ . Ignoring boundary effects the matrix element of  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  between the states  $|G_{\text{Néel}}\rangle \otimes |1_P\rangle$  and  $|E_{\text{Néel}}\rangle \otimes |0_P\rangle$  is thus

$$[\langle E_{\text{Néel}} | \otimes \langle 0_P |] \hat{H}_{D-P} [|G_{\text{Néel}}\rangle \otimes |1_P\rangle] \approx g\sqrt{2L}. \quad (32)$$

Diagonalisation of  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  in the two-dimensional subspace spanned by  $|G_{\text{Néel}}\rangle \otimes |1_P\rangle$  and  $|E_{\text{Néel}}\rangle \otimes |0_P\rangle$  results in two polariton states with energy splitting

$$g_{\text{eff}}[\text{Néel}] = 2g\sqrt{2L}. \quad (33)$$

This value needs to be compared to  $g_{\text{eff}}$  in Eq. (28). We find that  $g_{\text{eff}}$  is larger than  $g_{\text{eff}}[\text{Néel}]$  by a factor of  $\sqrt{2\log 2} \approx 1.18$ , i.e.,  $g_{\text{eff}}/g_{\text{Néel}}[\text{Néel}] = \sqrt{2\log 2}$ . The reason for this is that  $|G_{\text{Néel}}\rangle$  is not the true ground state of the electronic system, which is an entangled superposition of Wannier states. It follows that the correlations

in the true ground state of the electronic system enhance the polariton splitting by about 18%.

Next we compare our results to those obtained for  $L$  independent two-level atoms with transition energy  $U$  that interact resonantly with a single cavity mode. This model is a special case of the so-called Tavis-Cummings [43, 44] or Dicke [1] model, and in the following we refer to it as the Dicke model. A brief description of the Dicke Hamiltonian is given in Appendix D. The manifold with zero excitations has only one non-degenerate ground state where the cavity is in the vacuum state and all atoms are in the ground state. The manifold with one excitation contains two states that are split by [see Appendix D]

$$g_{\text{eff}}[\text{Dicke}] = 2g\sqrt{L}, \quad (34)$$

which is smaller than  $g_{\text{eff}}[\text{Néel}]$  in Eq. (33) by a factor of  $\sqrt{2}$ . This difference can be attributed to the different nature of the light-matter interaction for atoms and electrons: The cavity field couples to the atomic density in the Dicke model, whereas the light-matter coupling in the electronic system is proportional to the current operator. Starting from  $|G_{\text{Néel}}\rangle$  the operator  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  can create a doublon with the holon either to the left or to the right, giving rise to  $2L$  possible states as discussed above. On the contrary, the corresponding Hamiltonian for the atoms can only locally excite one atom at site  $k$ , and there are only  $L$  different states. Taking into account the normalisation of the corresponding states gives rise to collective coupling strengths proportional to  $\sqrt{2L}$  and  $\sqrt{L}$  in the case of electrons and atoms, respectively.

## V. EXPERIMENTAL REALIZATION

To discuss the experimental observation of the collectively enhanced light-matter coupling in our system we consider ET-F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ [50–53], which is a generic example of a one-dimensional Mott insulator where  $U \gg t$ . In order to observe the splitting of the optical conductivity spectrum shown in Fig. 4 we require  $g_{\text{eff}}/t \gtrsim 3$ . In addition, the photon-doublon coupling must be much faster than the cavity decay rate  $\kappa$ , i.e.,  $g_{\text{eff}} \gg \hbar\kappa$ . In the case of ET-F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ [50] we find  $g_{\text{eff}}/t \approx 6.4$ . It follows that the two branches in the optical conductivity should be clearly visible, and their energy splitting can be as large as  $g_{\text{eff}} \approx 250\text{meV}$ . Even larger values of  $g_{\text{eff}}/t$  are possible in materials with a smaller Mott gap or smaller unit cells. The condition  $g_{\text{eff}} \gg \hbar\kappa$  is also fulfilled in ET-F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ where  $t/\hbar \approx 2\pi \times 10\text{THz}$  [50, 51], which is at least two orders of magnitude larger than cavity decay rates of lossy microcavities with frequencies in the low THz regime [54].

Finally we address the finite lifetime  $\tau_D$  of doublon excitations which increases exponentially with  $U/t$  [55]. The experimentally measured value for ET-F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ at ambient pressure is  $\tau_D \approx 0.5\text{ps}$  [53], which corresponds to a decay rate of  $\kappa_D \approx 0.2t/\hbar$ . This decay rate is smaller than the artificial broadening introduced in the numerical evaluation of Eq. (29), where each term of the sum

was broadened with a Lorentzian of width  $0.5t/\hbar$ . We thus conclude that the finite lifetime of doublons does not hinder the observation of the two peaks in the optical conductivity.

## VI. SUMMARY

We have shown that the resonant coupling between strongly correlated electrons and a single-mode cavity results in the formation of Mott polaritons. The manifold with one excitation exhibits a dense spectrum of polariton branches which can be derived from the eigenstates in the zero excitation manifold. At half filling the effective Hamiltonian in the manifold with zero excitations is an isotropic Heisenberg chain. Each eigenstate with non-zero eigenvalue  $\mathcal{E}_j < 0$  gives rise to two polariton branches, and the magnitude of their energy splitting is proportional to  $\sqrt{-\mathcal{E}_j}$ . The two branches with the largest energy splitting are thus associated with the ground state of the isotropic Heisenberg chain, and their energy splitting  $g_{\text{eff}}$  is proportional to  $\sqrt{2L}$ , where  $L$  is the number of electronic sites.

An approximate derivation for  $g_{\text{eff}}$  in Sec. IV illustrates that quantum correlations in the ground state result in an enhancement of the polariton splitting by 18%. Furthermore,  $g_{\text{eff}} \propto \sqrt{2L}$  is a direct consequence of the fact that the electron-photon interaction is mediated by the current operator. The absorption of a photon is associated with an electronic hopping process creating a holon-doublon pair where the doublon is either to the right or the left of the holon. This two-fold excitation pathway is in contrast to atomic systems where the atomic density couples to the cavity field, allowing only for one local excitation when absorbing a photon. The collective polariton splitting for  $L$  independent two-level atoms and in the manifold with one excitation is consequently smaller by a factor of  $\sqrt{2}$  compared to our electronic system.

We find that the collectively enhanced polariton splitting is directly observable in the optical conductivity, which features two peaks separated by  $g_{\text{eff}} \propto \sqrt{2L}$ . If the material fills the whole mode volume of the cavity, the magnitude of the splitting is independent of the mode volume and just depends on  $1/\sqrt{v_{\text{uc}}}$ , where  $v_{\text{uc}}$  is the volume of the unit cell of the crystal. As a generic example of a one-dimensional Mott insulator we consider ET-F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ, and find that its unit cell is small enough such that the splitting of the optical conductivity signal exceeds the width of the first Hubbard band. The optical conductivity thus carries a clear signature of the collective electron-photon coupling.

We emphasise that  $g_{\text{eff}} \propto 1/\sqrt{v_{\text{uc}}}$  together with the small unit cells in solid state materials can result in macroscopically large polariton splittings  $g_{\text{eff}}$ . In the case of ET-F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ, we find  $g_{\text{eff}} \approx 250\text{meV}$ , which is several orders of magnitude larger than what has been achieved in atomic systems [39–41]. In addition, we note that the near-resonant electron-photon coupling described in this

work is much larger than the effects described in [37, 38], which are mediated by virtual, second-order electron-photon interactions.

In this paper we focussed on the resonant electron-photon coupling in the manifold with one excitation. An intriguing prospect for future studies is to investigate higher-excited manifolds where different sub-manifolds are resonantly coupled via the electron-photon interaction as indicated in Fig. 2. Since the electron-photon interaction increases with the number of photons  $j$  as  $\sqrt{j}$ , the energy spectrum is anharmonic. Like in atomic systems [56] this feature results in giant photon nonlinearities and further amplifies the intrinsically large optical nonlinearity of Mott insulators [57]. Furthermore, the physics in manifolds with a large number of excitations will be fundamentally different from the Dicke model. The reason is that the maximal number of atomic excitations within the Dicke model is  $L$ , but at most  $L/2$  doublons can be created in the electronic system.

A further intriguing avenue for future studies is the investigation of higher-dimensional systems. For example, the electron-cavity interaction in higher-dimensional systems can be tuned via the relative orientation between the crystal and the cavity polarization vector [37, 38]. In  $k$ -dimensional systems where the cavity couples to all spatial directions one expects  $g_{\text{eff}} \propto \sqrt{2k}$  due to the additional excitation pathways to nearest-neighbour sites, and thus a further enhancement of the effective coupling strength.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

MK and DJ acknowledge financial support from the National Research Foundation, Prime Ministers Office, Singapore, and the Ministry of Education, Singapore, under the Research Centres of Excellence program. DJ, FS and JC acknowledge funding from the European Research Council under the European Unions Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC Grant Agreement no. 319286, Q-MAC. DJ acknowledges funding from EPSRC grant no. EP/P009565/1. MK, AA and DJ thank Andrea Cavalleri for discussions.

### Appendix A: Isotropic Heisenberg model

The effective Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_S$  in Eq. (13) can be cast into the form [27]

$$\hat{H}_S = J_c \sum_{\langle jk \rangle} \left( \hat{\mathbf{S}}_j \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_k - \frac{\hat{n}_j \hat{n}_k}{4} \right) \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^D, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $\hat{n}_j = \hat{c}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j,\uparrow} + \hat{c}_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j,\downarrow}$  is the number operator at site  $j$  and the components of the local spin operator  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_j =$

$(\hat{S}_x^j, \hat{S}_y^j, \hat{S}_z^j)$  are defined as

$$\hat{S}_x^j = \frac{1}{2} (\hat{c}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j,\downarrow} + \hat{c}_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j,\uparrow}), \quad (\text{A2a})$$

$$\hat{S}_y^j = \frac{i}{2} (\hat{c}_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j,\uparrow} - \hat{c}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j,\downarrow}), \quad (\text{A2b})$$

$$\hat{S}_z^j = \frac{1}{2} (\hat{c}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j,\uparrow} - \hat{c}_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{c}_{j,\downarrow}). \quad (\text{A2c})$$

At half filling every site is occupied precisely by one electron, and thus

$$\hat{H}_S = J_c \sum_{\langle jk \rangle} \left( \hat{\mathbf{S}}_j \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_k - \frac{1}{4} \right) \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^D \quad (\text{A3})$$

is an isotropic spin-1/2 Heisenberg chain with exchange coupling  $J_c$ .

### Appendix B: Effective Hamiltonian in $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$

An approximate effective Hamiltonian in the manifold  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$  that only takes into account the perturbation  $\hat{H}_1$  in first order and for  $\Omega = U$  is [27, 58]

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} = U \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 + \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 \hat{H}_1 \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1. \quad (\text{B1})$$

The eigenvalues of  $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}$  will coincide with the eigenvalues of the full Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$  in the limit  $U \gg g, t$  where higher-order terms in  $\hat{H}_1$  are negligible. The first term in Eq. (B1) represents the unperturbed energy of the manifold with one excitation, which can be either a photon with energy  $\Omega = U$  or a doublon. The second term in Eq. (B1) can be written as

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 \hat{H}_1 \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 = \mathcal{R}_c \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} \hat{T} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} + g \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 [(\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger) \hat{\mathcal{J}}] \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1, \quad (\text{B2})$$

where we used  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(1)} \hat{T} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(1)} = 0$  at half filling. The second term in Eq. (B2) is

$$g \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 [(\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger) \hat{\mathcal{J}}] \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 = \hat{H}_{D-P}, \quad (\text{B3})$$

where  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  is defined in Eq. (18). Combining Eqs. (B2), (B3) and Eq. (B1) shows that the expression for  $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}$  in Eq. (B1) is the same as Eq. (17).

A comparison of the eigenvalues of the effective Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}$  and the system Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  is shown in Fig. 4 for a system with  $L = 4$  sites at half filling and as a function of the cavity coupling  $g$ . The eigenvalues are in very good agreement for large values of  $U = \Omega$ , and their differences are of the order of higher-order corrections  $\mathcal{O}(g^2/U, t^2/U, gt/U)$  that are neglected in Eq. (B1).

### Appendix C: Spectrum of $\hat{H}_{D-P}$

Here we investigate the spectrum of the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  in Eq. (18). To this end we consider matrix elements of  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  between states in the  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$  manifold. Note




FIG. 4. (Color online) Comparison of the eigenenergies  $E$  of the system Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  in the manifold with one excitation and  $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}$  defined in Eq. (17). We consider a system with  $L = 4$  sites at half filling and show  $E$  as a function of the cavity coupling  $g$ . The eigenvalues corresponding to  $\hat{H}$  ( $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}$ ) are shown by red solid (black dotted) lines. The exact diagonalization calculations take into account photon states  $|j_P\rangle$  with  $j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , and we set  $U = \Omega = 200t$ .

that  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  can only couple states with one photon and no doublon to states with no photon and one doublon. In a first step, we construct electronic states  $|e_j\rangle$  with exactly one doublon from the eigenstates  $|g_j\rangle$  of  $\hat{H}_S$  with non-zero eigenvalue  $\mathcal{E}_j < 0$ ,

$$|e_j\rangle = \frac{1}{2\epsilon_j} \hat{\mathcal{D}}^\dagger |g_j\rangle, \quad (\text{C1})$$

where  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$  and  $\epsilon_j$  are defined in Eqs. (20) and (25), respectively. At half filling it is straightforward to prove the operator identity

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}}\hat{\mathcal{D}}^\dagger = -\frac{4}{J_c} \hat{H}_S \quad (\text{C2a})$$

$$= 4\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^D \left( \sum_{\langle kl \rangle} \hat{b}_{kl}^\dagger \hat{b}_{kl} \right) \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^D, \quad (\text{C2b})$$

and hence the states  $|e_j\rangle$  are orthonormal,

$$\langle e_i | e_j \rangle = \frac{1}{4\epsilon_i \epsilon_j} \langle g_i | \hat{\mathcal{D}}\hat{\mathcal{D}}^\dagger | g_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

Next we define the following states in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$ ,

$$|\psi_P^{(j)}\rangle = |g_j\rangle \otimes |1_P\rangle, \quad (\text{C4a})$$

$$|\psi_D^{(j)}\rangle = |e_j\rangle \otimes |0_P\rangle. \quad (\text{C4b})$$

The matrix elements of  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  with respect to these states can be found via Eq. (C3) and are given by

$$\langle \psi_D^{(i)} | \hat{H}_{D-P} | \psi_P^{(j)} \rangle = 2g\epsilon_i \delta_{ij}. \quad (\text{C5})$$

It follows that the matrix representation of  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  reduces to a simple  $2 \times 2$  block diagonal form in the states defined in Eq. (C4), and diagonalizing these blocks leads to the polariton states in Eq. (24).

It remains to show that the matrix elements in Eq. (C5) and their complex conjugates are the only non-zero matrix elements of  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$ . This can be understood as follows. First, we consider states  $|\psi_D^{(k)}\rangle_\perp$  that complement the states  $|\psi_D^{(j)}\rangle$  to an orthonormal basis in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)}$ . Since

$$\hat{H}_{D-P} |\psi_P^{(j)}\rangle \propto |\psi_D^{(j)}\rangle \quad (\text{C6})$$

according to Eqs. (18) and (C1), we find

$${}_\perp \langle \psi_D^{(k)} | \hat{H}_{D-P} | \psi_P^{(j)} \rangle = 0 \quad (\text{C7})$$

for all values of  $j$  and  $k$ . Second, we consider the eigenstates  $|g_l^0\rangle$  of  $\hat{H}_S$  with eigenvalue zero. The states

$$|\psi_P^{(l)}\rangle_\perp = |g_l^0\rangle \otimes |1_P\rangle \quad (\text{C8})$$

complement the states  $|\psi_P^{(l)}\rangle$  to a basis in  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(1)}$ . According to Eq. (C2) we have

$$\langle g_l^0 | \hat{\mathcal{D}}\hat{\mathcal{D}}^\dagger | g_l^0 \rangle = 0, \quad (\text{C9})$$

and thus  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^\dagger |g_l^0\rangle = 0$ . It follows that all matrix elements of  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$  involving  $|\psi_P^{(l)}\rangle_\perp$  vanish,

$$\langle \psi_D^{(j)} | \hat{H}_{D-P} | \psi_P^{(l)} \rangle_\perp = 0, \quad (\text{C10a})$$

$${}_\perp \langle \psi_D^{(k)} | \hat{H}_{D-P} | \psi_P^{(l)} \rangle_\perp = 0, \quad (\text{C10b})$$

which concludes our proof of the spectrum of  $\hat{H}_{D-P}$ .

Finally, we note that the polariton states  $|\psi_{D-P}^{(j)}\rangle_\pm$  are not coupled by the kinetic energy term  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} \hat{T} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)}$ ,

$$\langle \psi_{D-P}^{(i)} |_\pm \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} \hat{T} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} | \psi_{D-P}^{(j)} \rangle_\pm \propto \langle e_i | \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} \hat{T} | e_j \rangle = 0. \quad (\text{C11})$$

The second equality in Eq. (C11) follows from the fact that in  $|e_i\rangle$ , the doubly occupied site has an adjacent empty site to its right or left. On the other hand,  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} \hat{T} |e_j\rangle$  is either zero or describes a state where the doublon and the holon are separated by a singly occupied site, and hence this state is orthogonal to  $|e_i\rangle$ .

Note that  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} \hat{T} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)}$  has non-zero matrix elements between the states  $|\psi_D^{(k)}\rangle_\perp$  that form the quasi-continuum of the first Hubbard band. Furthermore,  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)} \hat{T} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{(0)}$  couples  $|\psi_D^{(k)}\rangle_\perp$  to the polariton states  $|\psi_{D-P}^{(j)}\rangle_\pm$  via the states  $|\psi_D^{(j)}\rangle$ . This coupling leads to a broadening of the polariton states but becomes less effective if the polariton splitting exceeds the tunneling amplitude  $t$ . We thus expect the resonances in the optical conductivity to become sharper when the collective coupling increases.

### Appendix D: Dicke model

The Tavis-Cummings or Dicke Hamiltonian for a system of  $L$  independent two-level atoms interacting with a single cavity mode and in rotating-wave approximation is given by [1, 2, 43, 44]

$$H_{\text{Dicke}} = \Omega \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} + U S_z + g (a^\dagger S_- + a S_+), \quad (\text{D1})$$

where  $g$  is the light-matter coupling constant. The collective atomic operators are defined as

$$S_z = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^L (|e_k\rangle\langle e_k| - |g_k\rangle\langle g_k|), \quad (\text{D2a})$$

$$S_+ = \sum_{k=1}^L |e_k\rangle\langle g_k|, \quad (\text{D2b})$$

$$S_- = S_+^\dagger = \sum_{k=1}^L |g_k\rangle\langle e_k|, \quad (\text{D2c})$$

where  $|g_k\rangle$  ( $|e_k\rangle$ ) denotes the ground (excited) state for the  $k$ th atom. There are two eigenstates of  $H_{\text{Dicke}}$  in the subspace of one excitation, and their energy difference for  $\Omega = U$  is  $g_{\text{eff}}[\text{Dicke}]$  defined in Eq. (34).

- 
- [1] R. H. Dicke, “Coherence in spontaneous radiation processes,” *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
- [2] B. M. Garraway, “The dicke model in quantum optics: Dicke model revisited,” *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **369**, 1137 (2011).
- [3] M. Fleischhauer, A. Imamoglu, and J. P. Marangos, “Electromagnetically induced transparency: Optics in coherent media,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 633 (2005).
- [4] Hui Deng, Hartmut Haug, and Yoshihisa Yamamoto, “Exciton-polariton Bose-Einstein condensation,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 1489 (2010).
- [5] I. Carusotto and C. Ciuti, “Quantum fluids of light,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 299 (2013).
- [6] E. Orgiu, J. George, J. A. Hutchison, E. Devaux, J. F. Dayen, B. Doudin, F. Stellacci, C. Genet, J. Schachenmayer, C. Genes, G. Pupillo, P. Samorí, and T. W. Ebbesen, “Conductivity in organic semiconductors hybridized with the vacuum field,” *Nature Mat.* **14**, 1123 (2015).
- [7] T. Schwartz, J. A. Hutchison, C. Genet, and T. W. Ebbesen, “Reversible switching of ultrastrong light-molecule coupling,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 196405 (2011).
- [8] Stéphane Kèna-Cohen, Stefan A. Maier, and Donal D. C. Bradley, “Ultrastrongly coupled excitonpolaritons in metal-clad organic semiconductor microcavities,” *Advanced Optical Materials* **1**, 827 (2013).
- [9] X. Zhang, C.-L. Zou, L. Jiang, and H. X. Tang, “Strongly coupled magnons and cavity microwave photons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 156401 (2014).
- [10] Y. Tabuchi, S. Ishino, T. Ishikawa, R. Yamazaki, K. Usami, and Y. Nakamura, “Hybridizing ferromagnetic magnons and microwave photons in the quantum limit,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 083603 (2014).
- [11] B. M. Yao, Y. S. Gui, Y. Xiao, H. Guo, X. S. Chen, W. Lu, C. L. Chien, and C.-M. Hu, “Theory and experiment on cavity magnon-polariton in the one-dimensional configuration,” *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 184407 (2015).
- [12] P. Sivarajah and J. Lu and M. Xiang and S. Kamba and S. Cao and K. Nelson, *Terahertz-frequency magnon-phonon-polaritons in the strong coupling regime*, arXiv:1611.01814v3 .
- [13] L. V. Abdurakhimov, S. Khan, N. A. Panjwani, J. D. Breeze, S. Seki, Y. Tokura, J. J. L. Morton, and H. Kurebayashi, *Strong coupling between magnons in a chiral magnetic insulator Cu<sub>2</sub>OSeO<sub>3</sub> and microwave cavity photons*, arXiv:1802.07113v1.
- [14] M. Mergenthaler, J. Liu, J. J. Le Roy, N. Ares, A. L. Thompson, L. Bogani, F. Luis, S. J. Blundell, T. Lancaster, A. Ardavan, G. A. Briggs, P. J. Leek, and E. A. Laird, “Strong coupling of microwave photons to antiferromagnetic fluctuations in an organic magnet,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 147701 (2017).
- [15] D. Hagenmüller, S. De Liberato, and C. Ciuti, “Ultrastrong coupling between a cavity resonator and the cyclotron transition of a two-dimensional electron gas in the case of an integer filling factor,” *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 235303 (2010).
- [16] G. Scalari, C. Maissen, D. Turčinková, D. Hagenmüller, S. De Liberato, C. Ciuti, C. Reichl, D. Schuh, W. Wegscheider, M. Beck, and J. Faist, “Ultrastrong coupling of the cyclotron transition of a 2D electron gas to a THz metamaterial,” *Science* **335**, 1323 (2012).
- [17] Q. Zhang, M. Lou, X. Li, J. L. Reno, W. Pan, J. D. Watson, M. J. Manfra, and J. Kono, “Collective non-perturbative coupling of 2D electrons with high-quality-factor terahertz cavity photons,” *Nat. Phys.* **12**, 1005 (2016).
- [18] X. Li, M. Bamba, Q. Zhang, S. Fallahi, G. C. Gardner, W. Gao, M. Lou, K. Yoshioka, M. J. Manfra, and J. Kono, “Vacuum Bloch-Siegert shift in Landau polaritons with ultra-high cooperativity,” *Nat. Photon.* **12**, 324 (2018).
- [19] G. L. Paravicini-Bagliani, F. Appugliese, E. Richter, F. Valmorra, J. Keller, M. Beck, C. Rössler, T. Ihn, K. Ensslin, G. Scalari, and J. Faist, “Magneto-transport controlled by Landau polariton states,” *Nat. Phys.* **15**, 186 (2019).

- [20] N. Bartolo and C. Ciuti, “Vacuum-dressed cavity magnetotransport of a 2d electron gas,” *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 205301 (2018).
- [21] Editorial, “The rise of quantum materials,” *Nat. Phys.* **12**, 105 (2016).
- [22] B. J. Powell and R. H. McKenzie, “Strong electronic correlations in superconducting organic charge transfer salts,” *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **18**, R827 (2006).
- [23] B. J. Powell and R. H. McKenzie, “Quantum frustration in organic Mott insulators: from spin liquids to unconventional superconductors,” *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **74**, 056501 (2011).
- [24] R. Kato, “Conducting metal dithiolene complexes: Structural and electronic properties,” *Chem. Rev.* **104**, 5319 (2004).
- [25] N. F. Mott, “The basis of the electron theory of metals, with special reference to the transition metals,” *Proceedings of the Physical Society. Section A* **62**, 416 (1949).
- [26] Masatoshi Imada, Atsushi Fujimori, and Yoshinori Tokura, “Metal-insulator transitions,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70**, 1039 (1998).
- [27] F.H.L. Essler, H. Frahm, F. Göhmann, A. Klümper, and V.E. Korepin, *The One-Dimensional Hubbard Model* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- [28] J. Mentink, K. Balzer, and M. Eckstein, “Ultrafast and reversible control of the exchange interaction in Mott insulators,” *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 6708 (2015).
- [29] J. R. Coulthard, S. R. Clark, S. Al-Assam, A. Cavalleri, and D. Jaksch, “Enhancement of superexchange pairing in the periodically driven Hubbard model,” *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 085104 (2017).
- [30] F. Görg, M. Messer, K. Sandholzer, G. Jotzu, R. Desbuquois, and T. Esslinger, “Enhancement and sign change of magnetic correlations in a driven quantum many-body system,” *Nature* **553**, 481 (2018).
- [31] E. A. Stepanov, C. Dutreix, and M. I. Katsnelson, “Dynamical and reversible control of topological spin textures,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 157201 (2017).
- [32] G. Mazza and A. Georges, “Superradiant quantum materials,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 017401 (2019).
- [33] Y. Laplace, S. Fernandez-Pena, S. Gariglio, J. M. Triscone, and A. Cavalleri, “Proposed cavity Josephson plasmonics with complex-oxide heterostructures,” *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 075152 (2016).
- [34] F. Schlawin, A. Cavalleri, and D. Jaksch, “Cavity-mediated electron-photon superconductivity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 133602 (2019).
- [35] Jonathan B. Curtis, Zachary M. Raines, Andrew A. Allocca, Mohammad Hafezi, and Victor M. Galitski, “Cavity quantum eliashberg enhancement of superconductivity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 167002 (2019).
- [36] M. A. Sentef, M. Ruggenthaler, and A. Rubio, “Cavity quantum-electrodynamical polaritonically enhanced electron-phonon coupling and its influence on superconductivity,” *Science Advances* **4**, eaau6969 (2018).
- [37] M. Kiffner, J. R. Coulthard, F. Schlawin, A. Ardavan, and D. Jaksch, “Manipulating quantum materials with quantum light,” *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 085116 (2019).
- [38] M. Kiffner, J. R. Coulthard, F. Schlawin, A. Ardavan, and D. Jaksch, “Erratum: Manipulating quantum materials with quantum light,” *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 085116 (2019).
- [39] M. G. Raizen, R. J. Thompson, R. J. Brecha, H. J. Kimble, and H. J. Carmichael, “Normal-mode splitting and linewidth averaging for two-state atoms in an optical cavity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 240 (1989).
- [40] R. J. Thompson, G. Rempe, and H. J. Kimble, “Observation of normal-mode splitting for an atom in an optical cavity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 1132 (1992).
- [41] K. Baumann, C. Guerlin, F. Brennecke, and T. Esslinger, “Dicke quantum phase transition with a superfluid gas in an optical cavity,” *Nature* **464**, 1301 (2010).
- [42] See, e.g., <http://steck.us/alkalidata>.
- [43] M. Tavis and F. W. Cummings, “Exact solution for an  $n$ -molecule—radiation-field hamiltonian,” *Phys. Rev.* **170**, 379 (1968).
- [44] M. Tavis and F. W. Cummings, “Approximate solutions for an  $n$ -molecule-radiation-field hamiltonian,” *Phys. Rev.* **188**, 692 (1969).
- [45] C. S. Muñoz, F. Nori, and S. De Liberato, “Resolution of superluminal signalling in non-perturbative cavity quantum electrodynamics,” *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1924 (2018).
- [46] F. B. Gallagher and S. Mazumdar, “Excitons and optical absorption in one-dimensional extended Hubbard models with short- and long-range interactions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 15025 (1997).
- [47] E. Jeckelmann, “Optical excitations in a one-dimensional Mott insulator,” *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 075106 (2003).
- [48] J. Mossel, *Dynamics of the antiferromagnetic Heisenberg spin1/2 chain*, Master’s Thesis, University of Amsterdam (2008).
- [49] M. Hochbruck and C. Lubich, “On Krylov subspace approximations to the matrix exponential operator,” *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **34**, 1911 (1997).
- [50] T. Hasegawa, S. Kagoshima, T. Mochida, S. Sugiura, and Y. Iwasa, “Electronic states and antiferromagnetic order in mixed-stack charge-transfer compound (BEDT-TTF)(F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ),” *Solid State Commun.* **103**, 489 (1997).
- [51] T. Hasegawa, T. Mochida, R. Kondo, S. Kagoshima, Y. Iwasa, T. Akutagawa, T. Nakamura, and G. Saito, “Mixed-stack organic charge-transfer complexes with intercolumnar networks,” *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 10059 (2000).
- [52] S. Wall, D. Brida, S. R. Clark, H. P. Ehrke, D. Jaksch, A. Ardavan, S. Bonora, H. Uemura, Y. Takahashi, T. Hasegawa, H. Okamoto, G. Cerullo, and A. Cavalleri, “Quantum interference between charge excitation paths in a solid-state mott insulator,” *Nat. Phys.* **7**, 114 (2011).
- [53] M. Mitrano, G. Cotugno, S. R. Clark, R. Singla, S. Kaiser, J. Stähler, R. Beyer, M. Dressel, L. Baldassarre, D. Nicoletti, A. Perucchi, T. Hasegawa, H. Okamoto, D. Jaksch, and A. Cavalleri, “Pressure-dependent relaxation in the photoexcited Mott insulator ET-F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ: Influence of hopping and correlations on quasiparticle recombination rates,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 117801 (2014).
- [54] J. Keller, G. Scalari, S. Cibella, C. Maissen, F. Apugliese, E. Giovine, R. Leoni, M. Beck, and J. Faist, “Few-electron ultrastrong light-matter coupling at 300 GHz with nanogap hybrid LC microcavities,” *Nano Lett.* **17**, 7410 (2017).
- [55] N. Strohmaier, D. Greif, R. Jördens, L. Tarruell, H. Moritz, T. Esslinger, R. Sensarma, D. Pekker, E. Altman, and E. Demler, “Observation of elastic doublon decay in the fermi-hubbard model,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 080401 (2010).

- [56] I. Schuster, A. Kubanek, A. Fuhrmanek, T. Puppe, P. W. H. Pinkse, K. Murr, and G. Rempe, “Nonlinear spectroscopy of photons bound to one atom,” *Nat. Phys.* **4**, 382 (2008).
- [57] H. Kishida, H. Matsuzaki, H. Okamoto, T. Manabe, M. Yamashita, Y. Taguchi, and Y. Tokura, “Gigantic optical nonlinearity in one-dimensional MottHubbard insulators,” *Nature* **405**, 929 (2000).
- [58] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc, and G. Grynberg, *Atom-Photon Interactions* (1998).