

Time Evolution and Thermodynamics for the Nonequilibrium System in Phase-Space

Chen-Huan Wu *

College of Physics and Electronic Engineering, Northwest Normal University, Lanzhou 730070, China

November 10, 2017

The integrable system is constrained strictly by the conservation law during the time evolution, and the nearly integrable system or nonintegrable system is also constrained by the conserved parameters (like the constants of motion) with corresponding generalized Gibbs ensemble (GGE) which is indubitably a powerful tool in the prediction of the relaxation dynamics. For stochastic evolution dynamic with considerable noise, the obviously quantum or thermal correlations which don't exhibit the thermal behavior, (like the density of kinks or transverse magnetization correlators), display an asymptotic nonthermalization, and in fact it's an asymptotic quasisteady state with an infinite temperature, therefore the required distance to the nonthermal steady state is in an infinite time average. In this paper, we unambiguously investigate the relaxation of a nonequilibrium system in a canonical ensemble for an integrable system or nonintegrable system, and the temporal behavior of many-body quantum system and the macroscopic system, as well as the corresponding linear-coupling between harmonic oscillators. Matrix-method in entropy ensemble is also utilized to discuss the boundary and the important diagonalization, the approximation by the perturbation theory is also obtained.

1 Introduction

The investigation of evolution of nonequilibrium system is important to the particle physics or condensed matter physics and even the cosmology (like the entropy of Bekenstein-Hawking black hole¹⁾), especially in the many-body theory prediction which by, e.g., the trapped ultracold atomic gases which have weak energy interaction with the environment and therefore allow the observation of unitary time evolution²⁾. For nonequilibrium system, the usual form of glass can be blocked by the pinning field³⁾ and produce a glass transition like the process of ergodic to non-ergodic. In replica theory, since the homogeneous liquid given by replica symmetry has an inhibitory effect for entropy production, whereas the replica symmetry broken results in the increase of overlap of replicas. With the increase of degree of overlap which can be realized by enlarging the system size, the number of metastable states (or the hidden one) grows exponentially, and furthermore, the entropy grows logarithmically.

We already know that the observable chaotic classical system requires the processing resource which increases exponentially with time and Kolmogorov entropy h ⁴⁾ due to its exponential sensitivity in initial state⁵⁾, while the integrable one, which is solvable by the Bethe ansatz⁶⁾, increases polynomially. The time evolution of quantum entangled state may cause decoherence effect which is widely found in condensate system and it takes an important role in quantum information processing, quantum computation and metrology, quantum teleportation, quantum

*chenhuanwu1@gmail.com

key agreement^{7,8)}, and even the decoherence in neural network⁹⁾. The entanglement is mostly produced by the dynamical evolution with nonlinear interaction¹⁰⁾ and the non-destructive measurement. like the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction^{11,12)}, and in extreme case, e.g., through the axion field^{13,14)}. Usually the quantum entanglement is studied by the two-qubit or qutrit^{11,15)} system, in some case the tripartite system^{12,16)} or even more one is consider. In nonequilibrium and nonstationary open system, the coarse graining which connecting numerous subsystems' degrees of freedom make more possible to realize this process¹⁷⁾, and the thermal entropy is a good measurement for the effect of coarse graining. The quantum spaces' dimension increases exponentially with particle number due to the tensor-product⁵⁾, similarly, the number of metastable which as the subsystems of the spin glasses system is increase exponentially with size in high temperature¹⁸⁾, phase transition and critical fluctuation occur when it from one kind of subsystem into another and the broken and restoration of symmetry is also affect the properties of materials¹⁹⁾, like the dielectric constant, etc.

In solid-state quantum system, the spin is the best candidate among various microscopic atom intrinsic degrees of freedom in thermal entanglement which has higher stability compared to other entanglements due to the spins' relatively long decoherence time²⁰⁾ and it's in close connection with the local free energy. The long coherence time in many-body systems is useful to detecting the unitary dynamics, e.g., the Hubbard-type model, and it's important to the coherent nonequilibrium dynamics for the multiple phases transition. Since the models that can be mapped to a spinless free fermions through Wigner-Jordan transformation and show a in-phase fermion liquid state²¹⁾, have show a stationary behavior in such a equilibrium integrability model which consider as a powerful tool to obtain the exactly solution of model²²⁾. A numerical method as time-dependent density matrix renormalization group (t-DMRG) have show that the matrix produce operator $D(t)$ is simulation-inefficiently for nonintegrable model which is similar to the tensor-product, but it's efficient for integrable and local disordered case²³⁾. Except that, the method of matrix produce wave function is also a good tool to deal with this time-evolving one-dimension quantum system²⁴⁾. The time evolution on free fermions or bosons, when the time scale to infinity the thermal average of z-component spin S^z is zero and the spin states is half-filled²¹⁾, in this case the interaction between particles is strongest due to the zero-polarization²³⁾, and the entanglement entropy is also increase and becomes more extensive²⁵⁾. The first implementation of using the density matrices in prediction of many-body system (equilibrium or nonequilibrium) is the Ref.²⁶⁾. It discuss the situation similar to the quantum irreversible process in a energy- and information-lossy system.

A fact that the many-body quantum system will tend to equilibrium has been verified by many recently experiments, like the trapped ultracold atoms in optical lattices or the interactions with optical resonance. Whereas for the nonequilibrium system, the relaxation and thermal entanglement and the stochastic force also attract a lot of attention^{27,28)}. Furthermore, the system may relax to analogue of thermal state if the initial state is ground state²⁷⁾. The method of fluctuation-dissipation relation (FDR) and quantum state diffusion (QSD) is utilized for the evolution to steady states in integrable system whose final states are constrained by the conserved law (indeed, it's the scattering process of particles which constrained by conserved law) and with a finite speed of algebraically relaxation and information transfer under the thermodynamic limit (the large-N limit). Note that the speed here will not bounded by the speed of light like the relativistic quantum theory, but bounded by a well known Lieb-Robinson group velocity²⁹⁾. The integrable system of quantum Newton's cradle with groundbreaking is a example³⁰⁾. The classical system also have found the same result, like the Fermi-Pasta-Ulam (FPU) theorem³¹⁾ and Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser (KAM) theorem³²⁾. While for some nonintegrable system, the constant of motion can be expressed by second quantized operator³³⁾ (see below).

The collection variables are applied to investigate the evolution in studied system, except

this, we also applied the method of density matrix and complex tensor grid to make this paper self-contained. For local observable system the stationary and linear value may exist (like thermal state), but for integrable system whose time evolution found no thermalization and it may tends to a distribution of GGE with a important fundamental hypothesis for statistical ensemble that has maximized entropy which is constrained by local conservation law³⁴⁾, (e.g., the conservation quantity of momentum occupation number), hence restrict the ergodicity and can't reach the thermal state. For a framework of macroscopic system in finite dimension is important to introduce the quantum field theory for both the equilibrium and nonequilibrium state in open system¹⁷⁾ to investigate its time-dependent nature and coupling (or interaction) in local and nonlocal case as well as the dynamical fluctuation in short distance. It's also necessary to consider a quantum field when the Hilbert space is too large to implement a well numerical simulation³⁵⁾. While the importance of entangled states for quantum computation is well understand, to reduce the confusion from decoherence, there is a topology way that storing the quantum information non-localized³⁶⁾ or through the non-Abelian braiding statistics which support the Majorana fermions^{37,38)} by Majorana modes in finite wire³⁹⁾, and it can better solve the problem of infinity dilution of the stored information in local area²⁷⁾.

Since for nearly integrable system, the behavior of relaxation is under the crossover effect of prethermalization and thermalization, which is associate with the thermal correlation and the speed of information transfer, and the prethermalized state can be well described by the GGE⁴⁰⁾, i.e., may be view as a integrable system. Like the Ref.⁴¹⁾ which also using the method of t-DMRG and show the nonthermalization in soft-bosons model, have perform the off-diagonal correlation in the two-dimension square model, and the relaxation with some fluctuation is presented in short time evolution. The suppressed thermalization can be freed by enough perturbation to break the integrability. This crossover effect affect both the nonintegrable system and open system. Through the study of this paper, we know that the recurrence will appear for large time evolution. In the configuration which considered in this paper, part of mixed system which is of interest is coupling with the environment (not isolated), and hence the degrees of freedom of environment system (i.e., the counterpart of the target one) can be traced out in the canonical ensemble³²⁾, i.e., tracing over the variables outside the target region. This provide the support on the matrix method in Sect.10. A large number of degrees of freedom is also a important precondition to implement global relaxation with the thermodynamic limit⁴²⁾. For nonlocal operators in equilibrium state, the dynamical parameters display a effective asymptotic thermal behavior (follow the Gibbs distribution)⁴³⁾ during equilibrium time evolution with determined temperature and decay with a asymptotic exponent law, while the model what we focus on is towards the asymptotic quasisteady state with a infinite temperature, which decay with a asymptotic power law⁶⁾ acted by a diffusion term (see Sect.11). The prethermalization will shares the same properties of nonthermal steady state due to the dynamical parameters, which makes the model after quench close to the integrable points (or superintegrable point). But in fact, for integrable quenches, the stationary behavior for both the local and nonlocal observables can be well described by the corresponding GGE, and the particles scattering which constrained by conserved law is purely diagonal^{44,45)}.

This paper is organized as follows. We introduce the model of two-coupled subsystem in Sect.2, and the bare coupling is further discussed in Appendix.A. The evolutions in non-dissipation system is discussed in Sect.3, and the quenching for many-body system is discussed in Sect.4. A system-environment partition is mentioned in these two section. In Sect.5, we discuss the dissipation for nonlocal model. In Sect.6, the time evolution and thermal entanglement of Heisenberg XXZ model is investigated. In Sect.7, the correlation and transfer speed of information in quantum system is discuss where we take the one-dimension chain model as the explicit example. The relations between thermal behavior and the integrability is also discussed in this Section. We discuss the nonequilibrium dynamics with strong and weak in-

interaction in Hubbard model in Sect.8. In this section, we investigate the phase transition of nonintegrable Hubbard model, and the relaxation of double occupation and the kinetic energy. We also use the method of nonequilibrium dynamical mean-field theory (DMFT) to detect the evolution by mapping the lattice model to the self-consistent single-site problem which can be solved numerically. In Sect.9, we discuss the relaxation to a Gaussian state. In Sect.10, we resort to the matrix method, and the propertice of the boundary and the transfer speed are also discussed. In Sect.11, we discuss the relaxation of nonequilibrium system with stochastic dynamical variables in a free energy surface, the quantum dissipation in the damp-out process is also discussed. The diagonal contribution to symplectic spectrum of covariance matrix is further detected in Appendix.B. The bulk-edge-coupling type materials which is related to the spectrum gap is presented in Sect.10 and Appendix.C, and the perturbation theory and diagonalized Hamiltonian is also discussed in Appendix.C.

2 Model Introduction and the Coupling in Feild Theory

We begin with the perturbation theory with space-time dimension, which is important to consider in the strong coupling case³²⁾, weak-perturbation limit of nonintegrable system, and even the breaking of ergodicity³⁾. In dimension of $(d+1)$ in sapce-time, since the particles obtain mass from the broken of non-Abelian gauged symmetry, the coupling constant g is dimension-dependent, except the bare coupling g^b which vanish in $d + 1 = 4$ limit⁴⁶⁾. the broken translational symmetry also make the spin liquid state rapidly solidified and turn into the crystalline sturcture^{19,47)}. Then we define two d -dimension system ψ_i and ψ_j with potential ϕ_i and ϕ_j , respectively. In weak coupling condition which suitable for the perturbative calculation¹⁹⁾, there is exist a spin density wave (SDW) which in a Fourier expression is $\psi_i = L^{-d} \sum_i e^{-iqr_i} \phi(x - r_i)$, and ψ_j is as the same form. Although the L here is constrained by the model dimension d , but L itself could be dimensionless and with dimensionless length scale and time scale (see Ref.⁴⁸⁾). The ϕ here describe the fluctuation as a function in arbitrary dimension, and it's also useful for quantum fluctuation or even the vacuum fluctuation. The dimension of ϕ may even up to ten according to D-branes of string theory⁴⁹⁾. In the space dimension of $d = 3$, the kitaev model despict a triangular parameter space with different degrees of coupling in three direction x y and z, and the small triangular area which connecting the three midpoints of three side is gapless phase region⁵⁰⁾. In this model, I set coupling in these three direction in a range of 0 to n, for which the top value n is $n = 2^{d/2}N$ in $SO(d) \times SU(N)$ system⁵¹⁾. So a continuous phase transition with weak coupling pertubative RG under the time evolution can be expressed by $S = \int d^d x \mathcal{L}$ which is a exponent appear in the imaginary-time path integral $Z = \int D\psi_i^\dagger D\psi_i D\psi_j^\dagger D\psi_j e^{-S}$ ⁵²⁾.

The nonrelativistic Lagrange \mathcal{L} is^{46,49)}

$$\mathcal{L} = \int_{\tau'}^{\tau} d\tau [(i\psi_i^\dagger \partial_\tau \psi_i + \frac{1}{2\mu} \psi_i^\dagger \nabla \psi_i - \mu \psi_i^\dagger \psi_i) + (i\psi_j^\dagger \partial_t \psi_j + \frac{1}{2\mu} \psi_j^\dagger \nabla \psi_j - \eta \psi_j^\dagger \psi_j)], \quad (1)$$

where τ and τ' is initial and final time, ∇ is the Laplace operator, and η is the chemical potential. This time evolution Lagrange ignore the interactions, e.g., the impurity induced long range order^{49,53)}. Since the half integer spin correponding to the gapless area which mentioned above, the fermion system in this area can be written as $H = \sum_{a=x,y,z} J_a \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle_a} \psi_i \psi_i^a \psi_j \psi_j^a$, ($a = x, y, z$), with $\psi_i \psi_i^a = s_i/i$ and $\psi_j \psi_j^a = s_j/i$, then we have $H = - \sum_{a=x,y,z} J_a \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle_a} s_i s_j$. In Eq.(1) we take the imaginary time approach which the quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) method is utilized⁵⁴⁾, the differential symbol ∂_τ has the below relation according to the definition of Bernoulli number⁵⁵⁾

$$n\partial_\tau\left(\frac{\tau^{1-z}}{1-z}\right) = \frac{\tau^{1-z}}{1-z} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n \frac{(-\partial_\tau)^n}{n!}, \quad (2)$$

and the differential symbol for mass is as the same form

$$n\partial_\mu\left(\frac{\mu^{1-z}}{1-z}\right) = \frac{\mu^{1-z}}{1-z} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n \frac{(-\partial_\mu)^n}{n!}. \quad (3)$$

The Gardner transition which the critical dimension $d_c = 3$ is a important object in study of properties of amorphous solids⁵⁶⁾. In (3+1) space-time dimension using the renormalized coupling, since the bare coupling is absent in the dimension $d+1 = 4$, the resulting dimensionless bare action with unbroken Quantum electrodynamics (QED) symmetry is

$$S = \int dx \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y=0}^n [(\partial_\mu \phi_{xy})^2 + r\phi_{xy}^2] - \frac{1}{3!} (g_i^b \sum_{x,y=0}^n \phi_{xy}^3 + g_j^b \sum_{x,y,z=0}^n \phi_{xy}\phi_{xz}\phi_{yz}) \right\}, \quad (4)$$

and the action of Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson (LGW) Hamiltonian with N-component O(N) symmetry and noncollinear order is⁵⁷⁾

$$S = \int d^d x \int_\tau^{\tau'} d\tau \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y=0}^n [(\partial_\mu \phi_{xy})^2 + r\phi_{xy}^2] + \frac{1}{4!} [g_i \left(\sum_{x,y=0}^n \phi_{xy}^2 \right)^2 + g_j \sum_{x,y,z=0}^n \overline{[(\phi_{xy}\phi_z)^2 - \phi_{xy}^2\phi_z^2]}] \right\} \quad (5)$$

The summation index xyz range from zero to $n-1$ corresponding to the parameter space setted above, and the average term $\sum_{x,y,z=0}^n \overline{[(\phi_{xy}\phi_z)^2 - \phi_{xy}^2\phi_z^2]}$ exhibit the correlation between these two fluctuation functions. Using the method of time dependent density matrix RG which have been proved valid for particles at a fixed evolution time²³⁾, this fermion system shown as $T_{ij}\delta_{ij} = \text{Tr}\{\sigma^i\sigma^j\}$ where T_{ij} is the interaction tensor, the σ^i and σ^j are the matrices of ψ_i and ψ_j respectively and $\delta_{ij} = \{c_i c_j^\dagger\}$. This expression is indeed take the diagonal part of T_{ij} . Ref.⁴⁶⁾ put forward a valuable view that connecting the bare coupling to the renormalized coupling by a infinte cutoff, and then the mass-independent bare coupling can be shown as⁴⁶⁾

$$g^b = \mu^{3-d} \left\{ g + \delta_{11} \frac{g^3}{3-d} + \delta_{21} \frac{g^5}{3-d} + \delta_{22} \frac{g^5}{(3-d)^2} + \delta_{31} \frac{g^7}{3-d} + \delta_{32} \frac{g^7}{(3-d)^2} + \delta_{33} \frac{g^7}{(3-d)^3} + O(g^9) \right\}, \quad (6)$$

which is satisfactory consistent with the series expansion of β function given in Ref.⁵⁸⁾

$$\beta(g) = -\beta_0 \frac{g^3}{16\pi^2} - \beta_1 \frac{g^5}{(16\pi^2)^2} - \beta_2 \frac{g^7}{(16\pi^2)^3} - O(g^9). \quad (7)$$

This β -function is series expand to the seven-order of coupling, i.e., the three-loop level for the gauge field. The specific quantitative analysis of β -function is presented in the Appendix A. Fig.1 show the $\beta(g)$ as a function of g in SU(3) system (i.e. $C_{ij}^{(2)} = 3$ (see Appendix.A) with different number of fermion multiplets m , We set the m from 0 to 20. It's obvious to see that the curves shows a drastic non-linear change, and the m -dependent interaction tensor T_{ij} also played a decisive role in the relation between $\beta(g)$ and g .

3 Evolution Behavior in Non-Dissipation System

Since the long time scales exist in the metastable states which the quantity grows exponentially with system size¹⁹⁾, e.g., the single positive charge state in p-type material⁵⁹⁾ or the p-spin model⁶⁰⁾. the imaginary-time path integral can be expressed by the trace of time evolution operator $Z = \text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H})$ with the evolution propagator $U = e^{-\beta H} = \text{Tr}(\sigma_1^i \sigma_2^i \cdots \sigma_n^i \sigma_1^j \sigma_2^j \cdots \sigma_n^j)$, where β is inverse temperature $1/T$ which we use the unit of Boltzmann constant $k = 1$. Note that the spin pauli matrix here is contain all the component in finite dimension of Hilbert space and H_{ij} is the nearest neighbor Hamiltonian and can be decomposed using the Trotter-Suzuki method which mapping the one dimension quantum system into two dimension⁶¹⁾ and the path integral is becomes $Z = \text{Tr}(\prod_{i,j} e^{-\beta H_{ij}})$, In this way, the long range interaction can be treated locally as a nearest-neighbor pair in this spin isotropic system through a single two-qubit exchange gate $U_{i,i+1} = e^{-H_{i,i+1}\delta\tau}$ due to the iterative nature and acting on two adjacent site with single time step $\delta\tau$ evolution, it is also meets with the realignment criterion¹⁵⁾, that is, the local field effect. Then we have

$$e^{-\beta H_{i,i+1}} = \prod_i U_{i,i+1}. \quad (8)$$

Except the Anderson localization, the local length may strongly increase obey the logarithmic law⁶²⁾. The Hamiltonian here was divided by the partition function Z through the temperature interval or the external magnetic field h ⁵¹⁾. By investigate the asymptotic behavior of Z , when $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., the temperature decrease with the imaginary time evolution, the $Z \rightarrow 0$, and the system tends to the ground state which is $|\psi(0)\rangle = |\psi_1^i\rangle \otimes |\psi_2^i\rangle \cdots \otimes |\psi_n^i\rangle \otimes |\psi_1^j\rangle \otimes |\psi_2^j\rangle \cdots \otimes |\psi_n^j\rangle$, and denote the $\varepsilon_{n'}$ is the energy of the n' th level ($n' < n$) in this system above the ground state, $\varepsilon_{n'} = E_{n'} - E_{n'-1}$. Then the pauli operator $\sigma_{n'}^{i/j}$ within the evolution propagator U is $\sigma_{n'}^{i/j} = \sigma^{0 \otimes n'} \otimes \sigma_{n'}^{i/j} \times \sigma^{0 \otimes (n-n')}$ ⁵⁾ Before that happen, the entanglement between particles which depending on time rapidly reaches the maximum value, which make the method of time dependent density matrix RG invalid due to the too large growth speed of entanglement entropy. The evolution by the evolution propagator U is

$$|\psi(\beta)\rangle = U|\psi(0)\rangle, \quad (9)$$

and specifically, in the form with imaginary-time analogue $e^{\tau H(\tau)}$ it has^{24,63)}

$$|\psi(\tau)\rangle = \frac{e^{\tau H(\tau)}|\psi(0)\rangle}{\|e^{\tau H(\tau)}|\psi(0)\rangle\|}, \quad (10)$$

where we define the imaginary-time as $\tau = t + i0^+$, while for the evolution Hamiltonian is $H(\tau) = e^{\alpha H} H e^{-\alpha H}$ where $\alpha = \beta + i0^+$. Since $\partial_\beta \psi(\beta) = H\psi(\beta)$, we have $\beta \propto (\partial_\tau)^n$, which is also shown in the Eq.(2). For thermal average of a imaginary-time-dependent quantity \mathcal{F} , its expectation value which describe the ensemble average can be written as

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_\tau \rangle = \frac{\langle \psi(\tau) | \mathcal{F} | \psi(\tau) \rangle}{\langle \psi(\tau) | \psi(\tau) \rangle}, \quad (11)$$

where $\langle \psi(\tau) | \psi(\tau) \rangle$ is the partition function here, and the accurate value of $\langle \psi(\tau) | \psi(\tau) \rangle$ and $\langle \psi(\tau) | \mathcal{F} | \psi(\tau) \rangle$ can be determined by the method of tensor RG. The cumulative effect is efficiently in this averaging process²⁷⁾ and often do a cumulant expansion at the expectation value for simplified result whose truncation depends on the detail of dissipation⁶⁴⁾. Through this, a world-line tensor grid RG can be formed by taking coordinate as the horizontal axis, and the time (or temperature) as vertical axis, i.e., form a tensor network. The tensor network separated by the inverse temperature β have the spacing $\zeta = \beta/M$ where M is the total number of lattices

in the network (also called the Trotter number⁶¹). Such a method which utilize the evolution of time and phase also called Trotterization⁶⁵. Through the theory of t-DMRG, the \mathcal{F} can be treated as a matrix product operator which depends on the time-evolution, $\mathcal{F}_\tau = U(\tau)\mathcal{F}U^\dagger(\tau)$, here \mathcal{F}_τ and \mathcal{F} base on different basis. With the nonequilibrium time evolution, the integrable system which has the important feature of localization will relax to the stationary state after quantum quenches, i.e., the suddenly change of interaction strength²⁷, and the density matrices which constraint by the expectation value will leads to a maximum entropy ensemble²⁵. Usually we model the integrable (superintegrable) model by choosing the special initial state, typically, like the XY spin model, and it can be affected deeply by the constants of motion in the integrable (superintegrable) points like reach the nonthermal steady state and so on. The density matrices here is depends exponentially on conserved quantity and the Hamiltonians which related to the initial state. For the matrix-product operators which describe the quantum states, the minimal rank D is required to the maximal one of the the reduced density matrix of bipartition system⁵) (i.e., bipartition of the target one and its environment) and it needed to truncated by the method of singular values decomposing to keep the size of D polynomial increase which is local and time-computable, and we keep only the largest singular values after the truncation, i.e., only keep the basis states⁶⁶). In fact, for dissipation system, the linear or nonlinear dissipation coupling accompanied by the phase noise⁶⁷ (like the Wiener noise (see Sect.11)) as well as the white noise or colored one⁶⁸ also have inhibition on the exponential increase.

In Schrödinger picture, the observables of thermal states are achieved by carry the integrable system into the nonintegrable one (by perturbations) and in the mean time the energy-level spacing distribution is evolves from the Poisson distribution with diagonal matrices to the Gaussian one (i.e., the wigner-Dyson type one) with level repulsion and random symmetric matrices⁶⁹ (there are also symmetrically ordered operators in quantum dynamics by Wigner representation⁴⁸). It's possible to back to the Poisson distribution by applying a series of single gate which prevent the exponential increase of rank D but introduces the norm error²³)

$$\eta = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(1 - \sum_{j=0}^{D-1} \lambda_j^2(U_i)\right), \quad (12)$$

where U_i is a single gate and $\lambda_j(U_i)$ is the decreasing ordered singular values after removing the maximum one, and the maximum entropy is accessible through the local relaxation and the same as the entanglement. Although for nonintegrable system the growth of D is founded to be exponential, there exist methods like the diagonalization which keep the size of matrix always proportional to the time (or the system size), like Bogoliubov rotation (see Appendix.C). The procedure of eliminating the small singular values result in a low-rank matrix, and this is also to keep the local free energy

$$E_{\text{free}} = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln\left(\sum_i \lambda_i^2\right) \quad (13)$$

smallest (λ_i is the singular values), and also to enhance the equilibrium characteristics which treated as a thermodynamics anomaly in glass system⁷⁰). This equation also explicitly show the measurement of energies in units of (inverse) temperature. To solve the problem of density matrix in the t-DMRG, one introduce a way to solve the rank minimization problem which make this method valid even for the low rank matrices (see Ref.⁷¹), and it's help to reducing the error and keep computational cost low at the same time. On the other hand, that also provide the convenience that make the matrix nondecreasing and so that the maximum rank is always appear in the final step of the algorithm.

Since we have implement the system-environment partition, in a full quantum dynamics, we can yield a well approximation in the weak-coupling regime by the low-order truncation, e.g.,

the wigner truncation approximation which truncate in the power of one-order⁴⁸). In such a phase space, the coupled two subsystem have the relation $\sum_{k_i, k_j} (-k_i!/A^{k_i})g^{k_i}(-k_j!/A^{k_j})g^{k_j} = \sum_k (-k!/A^k)g^{2k}$ ¹⁹, where k is the number of powers of truncation in phase space (e.g., $k = 1$ when truncate in the first-order) and A is the angles which dominate the series expansion of the dimensionless coupling g (see Sect.2).

From the discussion on this Section, we can see that the imaginary-time propagation has the similar behavior with the real-time one, it will provide us another way to detect the decaying progress including the die out of excitations, and it's available for similar real-time setups⁵⁴, or application to the nonequilibrium problem with stochastic series expansion in integrable system without the constraint of local conservation law. Therefore it's more feasible to detect the asymptotics phenomenon in time evolution, especially for the low-order perturbation theory with extended potential.

4 Quenching in Many-Body Local System

For integrable open system, we imagine the bipartition of the Hilbert space and into the two formulated finite-dimension linear space (two associated configuration) V_i and V_j which assumed have same spectrum and their reduced density matrices are

$$\mathcal{J}_i = \sum_{R=1}^R \lambda_R |\psi_R^i\rangle \langle \psi_R^i|, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{J}_j = \sum_{R=1}^R \lambda_R |\psi_R^j\rangle \langle \psi_R^j|, \quad (15)$$

where λ_R is the Schmidt coefficients (the decreasing singular values). The bipartite state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{d_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_j}$ which realized through the Schmidt decomposition via singular value decomposition, and the Schmidt rank is $\min[d_i, d_j]$ ⁷². For inseparable case, the reduced density matrix \mathcal{J}_i' (if it's pure state density matrix with feature of unitarily invariant) can be obtained by tracing over the the pure state in its extended subsystem (i.e., \mathbb{C}^{d_j}), and the product space which form by two subsystem is $V_i \otimes V_j$. This bipartition can be used in most of the quantum many-body model, like the Ising transverse field model, XXZ model, and kitaev model, ect.

Integrability is usually relies on the localization, especially the superintegrable one (like the XY spin model) which are fully relies on the localization³⁴). For a concrete example, we consider a XY spin two-chain model without the magnetic field, which the bulk Hamiltonian is⁷³

$$H_{i,i+1} = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x + \sigma_i^y \sigma_{i+1}^y) \cdot \exp\left[\frac{J}{4} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (\sigma_{i+\Theta(j-i)}^{2x} + \sigma_{i+\Theta(j-i)}^{2y})\right], \quad (16)$$

where J is the coupling, i, j stands for the different chains, and $\Theta(j-i)$ is a step function. The correlation in such a system is¹⁸

$$\langle s_i, s_j \rangle = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{ij} s_i s_j = \frac{1}{2} q_{ij} (N-1), \quad (17)$$

where q_{ij} is the overlap between these two spin configuration. The local quantum integrability in the bounded bulk model can be deriving by the explicit form of the quantum R-matrix as well as the boundary transfer matrices, e.g, see Ref.^{34,73,74}).

For quench behavior due to the perturbation from local operators, which for the out-of-equilibrium protocol is striking, the amplitude from initial state to instantaneous n state is⁷⁵

$$A_n(t) = - \int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt \langle n | \partial_t | 0 \rangle \exp[i(\varphi_n(t) - \varphi_0(t))] \quad (0 \leq i \leq n), \quad (18)$$

where $\varphi(t)$ is the dynamics phase. Such a amplitude is also the eigthvalue of density matrices in entropy ensemble with the specific heat $\sum_n [E_n - E_0 |A_n(t)|^2$. The sum of square of amplitudes is the excitation probability $P_{ex} = \sum_n |A_n(t)|^2$ for electrons, particles, or holes, i.e., quenched away from initial (ground state) to new state. Here we suppose the quench is very fast that the initial state ψ_0 and the quenched state ψ_n are amlost exist at the same time t_i . Then using the evolution propagator $U(t)$, we obtain the amplitude⁷⁶⁾

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n | U(t) | 0 \rangle &= -i \langle n | \int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt H(t) | 0 \rangle \\ &= -i \langle i | H_{\text{int}} | 0 \rangle \int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt' \exp[i(E_n - E_0)t'] \\ &= -\langle i | H_{\text{int}} | 0 \rangle \frac{\exp[i(E_n - E_0)t] - 1}{E_n - E_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where E_0 is the energy in the initial state ψ_0 . Through the fermi golden rule, where H_{int} is the interaction Hamiltonian with scattering amplitude A_i , which is

$$H_{\text{int}} = \frac{U(t)(E_n - E_0)}{\sqrt{2 - 2\cos[(E_n - E_0)t]}}. \quad (20)$$

For further detect the perturbation from local operators, we present in Fig.2 (a) the energy difference between the excited state and initial one with different staggered magnetic field h_s in different dimension D of a quantum lattice model, and (b) the excitation probability as a function of the temperature, it's clearly that the probability distribution obey a Gaussian form. Since the quantum noise comes from the random initial state, we define a Gaussian in the initial state white noise which have a zero mean and therefore the initial probability distribution is Gaussian. Then the probability distribution in the process of relaxation is⁷⁷⁾

$$P = \sum_{m,n} \delta[\Delta E - (E_m(t') - E_n(t_i))] |\langle \psi_m(t') | U(t) | \psi_n(t_i) \rangle|^2 |\langle \psi_n(t_i) | \psi_0(t_i) \rangle|, \quad (21)$$

where δ is the amplitude of the Gaussian (see Sect.11) and ΔE is the energy-difference between the initial and final state of relaxation. In phase space, such a relaxation can be expressed by the density matrix

$$\mathcal{J}(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} \exp[-\phi(\mathbf{k})t] \mathcal{J}(0) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} \exp[-(E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - E_{\mathbf{k}})t] \mathcal{J}(0), \quad (22)$$

where \mathbf{k} and $\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}$ are two spectral parameters. For slow quench which the time scale to infinity, the non-diagonal contribution to $\mathcal{J}(t)$ (i.e., the part of $\mathbf{q} \neq 0$) is vanish due to the fast oscillation of Fourier kernel $\exp[-(E_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}} - E_{\mathbf{k}})t]$.

In fact, the non-diagonal contribution to the mean-field-representation (or the second moments of the disturbution of momentum²⁷⁾ $\langle c_i c_{i+1}^\dagger \rangle = \int d^n k f(k) \cos(\varphi(k)t)$ is asymptotically to a fixed value with the time evolution⁴¹⁾. When a external perturbing field is considered in the free energy landscape, a perturbing term should be added to the local free energy, and since the perturbation is bad for the conservation of energy, the quantum system under the influence of noise variables will not completely isolated even for the closed quantum system. The coupling between this perturbing field and the Hamiltonian is beneficial to enhance the system ergodicity

by increase the coupling of metastates. For closed system which have total energy conservation, the ergodicity for observables under the long-time limit can be large enough to expect the time average to the thermal average³³⁾, but there are restriction on the observables like the bound of the von Neumann entropy, and hence prevent it closing the thermal state. (Note that here the correlation between each distinguishable particle and the environment is still localized.) The entropy of pinning field is increase with the overlap in a metastate, can associate with the hidden glass states, and it's confirmed equal to the mean field potential of glass system⁷⁸⁾. Both the entropy S_{hidden} (not the diagonal one) and its free energy as well as the non-diagonal contribution vanish in the final of the process of relaxation to steady equilibrium state, e.g., the commensurate superfluid state.

Since for the integrable system, most solvable Hamiltonian can be mapped to the effective noninteracting Hamiltonian³²⁾

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \sum_i^{N-1} \epsilon_i P_i \quad (23)$$

with the eigenenergy ϵ_i and conserved quantity P_i , and the maximum entropy ensemble after quench with local conserve-law can be written using the density matrix as

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{quenched}} = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\left(-\sum_i P_i Y_i\right), \quad (24)$$

where the conserved observable quantity P_i has the form $P_i = a_i^\dagger a_i$ where a_i is the annihilation operator of bosons or fermions and has commute relation $[H, P_i] = [P_i, P_i'] = 0$, the Y_i is a initial state-dependent quantity. The partition function $Z = \text{Tr}[\exp(-\sum_i P_i Y_i)]$. This is in fact only a local steady state but not canonical steady states for the full system²⁵⁾. For integrable system begin with the maximal entropy in GGE, the Y_i here can be replaced by a Lagrange multiplier set $\{\lambda_i\}$ ^{32,34,79,80)}, (which is⁸¹⁾ $\lambda_i = \ln[(1 - \langle\psi(0)|P_i|\psi(0)\rangle)/\langle\psi(0)|P_i|\psi(0)\rangle]$ and constrained by $\langle n \rangle_{GGE} = \langle\psi(0)|c^\dagger c|\psi(0)\rangle = \text{Tr}(\rho n)$ where n is the conserved number of particles). For integrable systems which are exact solvable (i.e., all the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions can be obtained), since the ϵ_i is linear eigenenergy, for a simplest conserved quantity, the number of particles n_i , the number eigenstate can be treated as the energy eigenstate $E = \sum_i \epsilon_i n_i$ which on the eightbasis of $\{n_i\}$ ⁴⁸⁾.

Within the scheme of adiabatic perturbatic $\langle \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{p} \rangle$ theory, the asymptotic behavior be manipulated by the velocity and acceleration of tuning parameter in quench dynamic⁷⁵⁾. The tuning-dependent Hamiltonian $\psi(\lambda(t))$ ($\lambda(t)$ is the time-dependent tuning parameter) can also take effect in the adiabatic excitation of system in ground state which is similar to $\psi(t)$, and recover due to the asymptotic effect of time evolution⁵⁴⁾. The asymptotic freedom of system will preserved until the number of fermion species is too large⁵⁸⁾, so this asymptotic state with the scaling theory is depend only on the configuration, e.g., the fluctuation of system^{18,54,82)}, and scales show a collection of the effects from fluctuation and tend to Gibbs value when the momentum vector $\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0$ ⁸²⁾. One of the reflection is the equilibrium Gibbs free energy as below³⁾ (without restrictions)

$$E_{\text{Gibbs}} = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \int dt e^{-\beta H(t)}, \quad (25)$$

and since the Hamiltonian here is often the potential field-characterized, the free energy also treated as a potential function with determined weigh (probability distribution).

5 Dissipation in Nonlocal Model

For nonlocal model, there is a large different compare to the local one. The nonequilibrium long-range force is also usually unobservable in localiaed interaction models⁸³). Consider the Yang-Mills theory, the action of field can be expressed as

$$S = \frac{1}{4} \int d^d x \int_t^{t'} dt F_i^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}^i, \quad (26)$$

where $F_i^{\mu\nu}$ is the field strength tensor (see Appendix.A), $F_i^{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu^i - \partial_\nu A_\mu^i - g C_{iab} A_\mu^a A_\nu^b$ ⁸⁴), where A_μ^a and A_ν^b are the vector potential of the field and here C_{iab} is for intruduce a SU(3) structure factor which is $C_{iab} = \gamma^{iab} F^a F^b$, where γ^{iab} is the SU(3) structure constant and F^a is the group generator. The relation between the Lie group structure constant C and quadratic Casimir operator is $\sum_{ab} C_{iab} C_{jab} = C_{ij}^{(2)} \delta_{ij}$ ⁸⁵).

The dissipative effect which derived from the macroscopic entangled system give arise the reservoir problem and accompanied by a process of coarse-graining by the isometry that integrating the degrees of freedom of subsystems²⁸) and with a dimension smaller than the maximum dimension of Hilbert space⁸⁶). The nonlocal correlation between the nearest neighbors can be treated locally by using the matrix product operator with determined rank and the unitary transformation with time-evolution operator (see below). For the localized interaction with nearest neighbor spin accompanied by the local field effect, since the relatively large coupling constant and long time configuration, it's priority to use the nonperturbative method⁶⁴), but the quantum dissipation which is nolinear is more acceptable to use the perturbative RG, and the reservoir interaction is also perturbed, The Gaussian probability disturbution which exist in the linear case is not exist in the nolinear case anymore, and the dimension of density matrices is also grows non-linearly with time⁵). But there still exist some linear relation, e.g., the entanglement entropy is change linearly with the evolution of time with a straggered magnetic field in the disorded case²³).

In a open quantum system, the thermal average of observable \mathcal{F} can be written as (here τ is the complex-time for propagators)

$$\langle \mathcal{F} \rangle_\tau = \frac{\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H} e^{-H\tau} \mathcal{F} e^{H\tau})}{\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta H})}. \quad (27)$$

For integrable system, this equation which describe the thermal average in Gibbs ensemble²²) is equal to the energy of inital state of relaxation process after quench which evolution with time τ . Such thermal average is also meaningful in thermodynamics description for quasi-equilibrium state⁷⁰). Base on the Eq.(8) and using the second order Trotte-Suzuki formation, the evolution propagator can be decomposed as $e^{-\beta H} = e^{-\beta H_x} e^{-\beta H_y} e^{-\beta H_z} + O(\tau^2)$ ⁶⁶), and the Eq.(8) can be rewritten as

$$e^{-\beta H_{ij}} = \prod_{i=0, j=0}^n U_{i, i+a; j, j+a} \quad (a = x, y, z). \quad (28)$$

To study the dissipation of the remaining degrees of freedom in subsystems after coarse granulation in such a no-spacing-interaction macroscopic model, the reservoir is very important. To introducing FDR to the steady state, we rewrite the Eq.(27) by the method of path integral as

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_\tau \rangle = \int D\psi(\tau) e^{\tau H} \frac{\langle \psi(0 + \varepsilon^+) | \mathcal{F}(0) | \psi(0 + \varepsilon^-) \rangle}{\langle \psi(\tau + \varepsilon^+) | \mathcal{F}(\tau) | \psi(\tau + \varepsilon^-) \rangle}, \quad (29)$$

with $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and $\psi(\tau) = U\psi(0)$ where U the time-evolution operator $U = T_\tau \exp(-\int_\tau^{\tau'} d\tau H(\tau))$. For statistical linear dissipation system, the correlation between reservoirs $\langle R_i R_j \rangle \neq 0$, the

method of unperturbed linear dissipation is also suitable for perturbed macroscopic model if the perturbation Hamiltonian is linear with reservoir $H_p = \sum_i f(i)R_i$ where $f(i)$ is a linear term and therefore the collective response to perturbation is mostly linear⁶⁴). This form of H_p is suitable for all the integrable or nonintegrable linear dissipation model. While for the non-linear dissipation case, since the reservoirs in different subsystems is independent with each other, so we constraint the reservoir states in the Liouville spaces, and have $\langle R(0)|H_{SR}|R(\tau)\rangle = 0$ ¹⁷), where H_{SR} is the interaction term between system and reservoirs and there exist shared influence function for all constituent²⁸).

For non-dissipation system, the propagation along time scale can be expressed by the initial Hamiltonian and the observable conserved quantity (i.e., Eq.(24)), whereas for linear dissipation, since it need a stochastic term to compensate the lost energy, and it has a history-independent potential term $\partial_\tau\psi(\tau) = H_0(\tau)\psi(\tau) - \sum_i f(i)q(i)\psi(\tau)$, where $q(i)$ is the stochastic force or the noise. For nonlinear-dissipation system, the state of reservoir variables is span only in the Liouville space¹⁷). Both the linear-dissipation and nonlinear-dissipation contain a friction force term but the nonlinear-dissipation have a complex memory which it's obvious from the feature of history-dependent⁸⁷) in evolution while the linear one haven't.

6 Time Evolution and Thermal Entanglement in Integrable Heisenberg XXZ Model

We already know that for non-dissipation system the antiferromagnetic Ising chain⁵), XY spin chain^{5,73}) and the bulk model⁷³) is integrable and can be exactly solved. The Heisenberg XXZ model is also suggested integrable and own the local conserved quantity, e.g., the observable microscopic quantity like the S^z or the observable macroscopic one like energy or number of particles. To investigate the imaginary-time evolution in Heisenberg XXZ model, we firstly need to use a c-number representation which depict a shift of $-i\hbar\alpha$ in the axis of $\text{Im}\tau$ (see, e.g., Ref.⁶⁴). Then we introduce the Heisenberg XXZ model with spin 1/2 antiferromagnetic free fermions interaction, the n-component anisotropy Heisenberg Hamiltonian of this system contain a homogeneous external field h is

$$H = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} (JS_i^x S_{i+1}^x + JS_i^y S_{i+1}^y + J_z S_i^z S_{i+1}^z) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (h_i S_i^z), \quad (30)$$

where J and J_z are the coupling, and $S_i^\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \sigma_i^\alpha$ ($\alpha = x, y, z$) is the total spin in the α -component. The important coupling ratio can be defined as

$$\frac{J_z}{J} = \begin{cases} \cos \gamma, & J_z \leq J \\ \cosh \mu, & J_z > J, \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

where the tilted angle γ and μ is enlarge with the increase of degrees of anisotropy. We focus on the $J_z/J = \cos \gamma$ case. In the case of $J_z = 0$, i.e., becomes the noninteracting spinless fermion system with strongly correlated electronic characteristics under the Wigner-Jordan (WJ) transformation which turns the regular integrable system terms into the chaotic one⁵). In this case, the fermion representation of the gapless bilinear fermionic system is

$$H_{\text{bf}} = \sum_i (c_i c_{i+1}^\dagger + c_i^\dagger c_{i+1} + h_i n_i), \quad (32)$$

with $\Delta_i = \langle c_i c_{i+1}^\dagger \rangle$ stands for a mean-field and also represent the covalent bonding of WJ fermions²¹), and this is also the tight-binding fermionic model with dispersion relation $\kappa = \pm 2\cos k$ ²⁵) in π -phase (the phase difference between neighbor site is π). In this case, this

Heisenberg Hamiltonian becomes a strongly correlated electronic system with a finite entropy (will saturation)^{23,73}. The operator of number of the spinless particles is $n_i = c_i^\dagger c_i$, and the electron correlation is $J_z n_i n_{i+1}$. To investigate the nonlinear-dissipation in this spinless fermions chain model, we need to introduce the master equation with system density matrix \mathcal{J} ³⁵,

$$\partial_t \mathcal{J} = -i[H, \mathcal{J}] + \mathcal{K} \sum_i [O_i \mathcal{J} O_i^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}(O_i^\dagger O_i \mathcal{J} + \mathcal{J} O_i^\dagger O_i)] \equiv \mathcal{L}\mathcal{J}, \quad (33)$$

where \mathcal{J} corresponds to the pure state or mixed state and O_i is the Lindblad operator describing the bath coupling. The right-hand side of this equation contain two terms, the first one is the unitary part of the Liouvillean, while the second one is the dissipative term and \mathcal{K} is the coupling strengths within the dissipation scenario. We consider the damping here due to the nonlinear-dissipation. The Gaussian area arrived in time evolution have $\partial_t \mathcal{J} = 0$, in this case \mathcal{K} is almost vanish and produce a zero dissipative area, that suggest that the observables exponential fast approach to the steady state³⁹, while the entries of the density matrix is close to the main diagonal.

To introduce the thermal entanglement in the evolution, we define the generate and annihilate operator for i sites as

$$c_i^\dagger = e^{i\varphi_i} S_i^+, \quad c_i = e^{-i\varphi_i} S_i^-. \quad (34)$$

The operators obey commutation relation $[c_i, c_j^\dagger]_\alpha = \delta_{ij}$ (boson operator and fermion operator for $\alpha = 1$ and -1 , respectively), and $c_i^\dagger c_j + c_j c_i^\dagger = \delta_{ij}$ ($\alpha = -1$) under the WJ transformation that treat c_i as operator field⁸⁸. The time-involve phase φ_i have

$$\varphi_{i+1} - \varphi_i = c n_i, \quad (35)$$

where c is a c-number-correlated factor which defined as the imaginary part of $\text{In}(\tau' - \tau)$, i.e., the scale of imaginary-time, and the phase function $\varphi_i = \sum_i c_i^\dagger c_i c$. Then the Hamiltonian (Eq.(30)) can be represented as

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} J_z/2 + h & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -J_z/2 & J & 0 \\ 0 & J & -J_z/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & J_z/2 - h \end{bmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

when $|J| < h - J_z$, the ground state is disentangled state $|0, 0\rangle$ which have the eightvalue $J_z/2 - h$; when $|J| > h - J_z$, the ground state is entangled state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0, 1\rangle - |1, 0\rangle)$ for $J > 0$ or $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0, 1\rangle + |1, 0\rangle)$ for $J < 0$ which have the eightvalue $-J_z/2 - |J|$, and this entangled state will goes to maximal with time-evolution. Thus, the entanglement increase with the enhancement of coupling J and J_z no matter they are both greater than zero (ferromagnetic) or both less than zero (antiferromagnetic), but it's always symmetry compare to the case of inhomogeneous magnetic field. We can obtain the relaxations in long-time scale after the sudden quench of J and J_z , and regulate the entanglement by the quench of magnetic field h . In equilibrium case, the density matrix of this thermal state can be written as⁸⁹)

$$\mathcal{J} = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-\beta H) = \frac{1}{Z} \begin{bmatrix} e^{-(J_z/2+h)/T} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{J_z/2T} \cosh(|J|/T) & -s & 0 \\ 0 & -s & e^{J_z/2T} \cosh(|J|/T) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-(J_z/2-h)/T} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (37)$$

where $Z = e^{-(J_z/2+h)/T} (1 + e^{2h/T}) + 2e^{(J_z+h)/T} \cosh(|J|/T)$ and $s = J e^{J_z/2T} \sinh(|J|/T) / |J|$. Usually, we can creating strong entanglement by raising the ratio of J_z/J , or raising the degree

of inhomogeneity of magnetic field h , or properly lower the temperature through the previous study^{20,89,90}. Sometimes the lower temperature which can be implemented by increase the system size⁹⁰ can decrease the eigenvalue of density matrix (Eq.(37)).

7 Correlation and Transfer Speed in One-dimension Chain Model

In this section, we focus on the two-point spin correlation in $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg chain and $S = 1$ Ising chain, and define that the J_1 and J_2 as the nearest neighbor coupling and next-nearest neighbor coupling in the chain, respectively. The β (inverse temperature)-dependent magnetic susceptibility can be written as $\chi(\beta, t, i) = \beta 2^{-n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle S_0^z S_i^z \rangle$ for a n -qubit chain, the latter term in this expression is the spin-spin correlation function for the Heisenberg model²³). The Fig.3 shows the spin correlation C and inverse correlation length ξ^{-1} for (a) $S = 1$ Ising spin chain and (b) $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg chain with different J_2 at different site i . We show that the nonlocal order parameter decay exponentially due to the perturbations from long-range spin-spin interaction which break the integrability and therefore exhibit an effectively asymptotic thermal behavior, though the latter one is exactly solvable (i.e., all eigenvalues can be obtained by the method of Bethe ansatz in thermodynamic Bethe ansatz (TBA)⁹¹) before the perturbation. Such an exponential decay for the nonlocal operators in nonintegrable model has been widely observed, e.g., the order parameter in transverse field Ising chain for ferromagnetic state or paramagnetic state⁹²) or the number of quasiparticles in the time evolution in a quantum spin chain⁹³), etc. We also can see that the ξ^{-1} tends to saturate with the increase of distance which obeys the equilibrium law, and in fact it's equivalent to the coherent state with coherent amplitude in terms of an exponential form, and therefore the phase coherence rate will display a similar behavior with the correlation length. Fig.4 shows the spin correlation for $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg chain as a function of temperature with different J_2 . We can see that, with the increase of J_2 , the spin correlation increases. We also make a comparison for the spin correlation C at different temperatures for $S = 1$ Ising chain and $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg chain in Fig.5. It's obvious that the $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg chain is earlier becoming saturated compared to the Ising one. Furthermore, we present the correlation (a) for $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg chain which is obtained by the method of Bethe ansatz and make a comparison on the results of correlation in low-temperature for $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg chain between the methods of Bethe ansatz and renormalization group (b) in Fig.6.

Since the equal time spin correlation C has the relation

$$C(r, t) = \langle S(0, t) S(r, t) \rangle \propto \exp(-r/\xi), \quad (38)$$

which is consistent with the expression of correlation length $\xi^{-1} = -\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \ln \langle S_i S_{i+L} \rangle$ in Ref.⁶¹), here the distance r can be quantified as i which stands for the number of position in spin chains and ξ is the correlation length. Note that this expression for equal time two-point correlation is well conform to the ordered phase in the long-time limit, while for disordered phase the ξ has a more complicated form⁹²). Now that this spin correlation function displays an effective asymptotic thermal behavior as introduced in Sect.1, and correlation length ξ is related to the quantum quench protocol⁴⁰), the thermal behavior for a nondissipation system after quench can also have the relation which is mentioned above (Eq.(38)), but note that although this spin correlation here is in an exponential form, the correlation length does not follow the thermal distribution but a nonthermal distribution⁴⁰) and is guided by GGE. This is because the correlation length is a local quantity which behaves nonthermally. Similar behavior appears in correlators like the transverse magnetization and so on. We still need to note that though for an infinite system which follows the effective thermal distribution is mostly nonintegrable, but the initial state of an integrable system which is dictated by the noninteracting Hamiltonian may still follow the thermal distribution⁹⁴) since without the effect of interactional quench Hamiltonian.

Further, if we mapping to the Fourier space, the equal time correlation (Eq.(38)) for the spin-1/2 square lattice model has a more specific form⁹⁵⁾

$$\langle S_i(0)S_j(r) \rangle e^{ikr} \propto \frac{e^{-r/\xi}}{r^4} \left(1 + \frac{r}{\xi}\right) \delta_{ij}, \quad (39)$$

which follow the power law decay when $r \ll \xi$ and exponentially decay when $r \gg \xi$.

Since the pinning field play a important role in the process of ergodic to non-ergodic transition which plug the correlation between subsystems and even the velocity of spin wave v_s ⁹⁶⁾, which associate with the slope of the dispersion relations in momentum space. For the case of $J_z/J = \cos \gamma$, v_s can be written as⁹⁶⁾

$$v_s = \frac{J\pi \sin \gamma}{2 \gamma} \quad (40)$$

which is consistent with slope of dispersion relation $\partial_k \kappa = \mp \sin k$. Then a question is arisen that if the speed of information transfer which govern the relaxation time of a post-quench state relate to the speed of spin wave in a spin sysytem? The answer is yes. A direct evidence is the Lieb-Robinson type boundary (the details in a Bose-Hubbard model is presented in the next section). In fact the spin wave is also related to the momentum transfer⁹⁷⁾ and even the damping of oscillation of superfluid regime (see Sect.8 and Ref.⁹⁸⁾). We know that the missing of symmetry is related to the influence of initial states, and the collapse of physical phenomenas like the interference pattern⁴¹⁾ or the collective excitation^{99,100)} by inhomogeneous oscillation in condensate with a density wave order which act like a single phase wave or standing wave¹⁰¹⁾, is revives in the latter time of relaxation. the transfer of correlation with a finite velocity also construct a line-cone which well describe the relaxation behavior.

8 Double Occupation and The Interaction Quench in Nonintegrable Hubbard Model Near The Phase Transition Point

Since the time evolution operator is dependents on the Hamiltonian (like Eq.(8)), we next construct the Bose-Hubbard lattice model as a explicit example

$$H = -\mathcal{P} \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} (b_i^\dagger b_{i+1} + H.c.) + U \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{n_i(n_i - 1)}{2} - \mu_i \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} n_i \quad (41)$$

where \mathcal{P} is the hopping constant, U is the chemical potential and μ_i is the local potential of each particles. The interaction between the next-nearest nerghbor is assumed zero in this model, and so that this model is integrable, i.e., the second term of above equation can be replaced as $U \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} n_i n_{i+1}$. A dimensionless reduced couplping is defined as

$$g_{\text{red}} = \frac{UN}{\mathcal{P}} \quad (42)$$

where N is the number of interactional particles. We can implement the phase transition from Mott-insulator to the condensed state or the superfluid by modulating g_{red} , and it has been implemented experimentally¹⁰²⁻¹⁰⁴⁾. Even for systems which without hopping at all (i.e., $\mathcal{P} = 0$), the phase transition of metallic state and the Mott insulator are also realizable by the interaction quench of U , and in this case the osillations with the collapse-and revival are periodic with period $2\pi U/\hbar$ ⁴²⁾ (The Table.A shows the time scale of relaxation and the period of collapse and revival for several models). In fact, most mang-body system can exhibit different quantum phase with different entanglement structure in the complex mixed dynamical, and it's

usually realizable by tuning the strength of this competing interaction¹⁰⁾. The fluctuation of correlation amplitude due to the fast oscillation of phase factor are related to the distribution of initial state, and the short-range correlation also shows distinguishable differences for different configuration of initial states.

In this model we next define the hopping-determined operator $\mathcal{R} := it\mathcal{P}$, this periodic-time-dependent evolution operator for a single-site can be expanded as²⁷⁾

$$e^{\mathcal{R}} := e^{it\mathcal{P}} = \sum_{k \geq d_r} \frac{(it\mathcal{P})^k}{k!} \leq \sum_{k \geq d_r} \frac{(6\mathcal{P}t)^k}{k^k} \quad (43)$$

where k denotes the unit vector in phase space and d_r is the distance between site i and $i+r$. There exist a upper bound for d_r as $d_r < 6\mathcal{P}t/e$ where e is the natural constant, since it's a insurmountable maximum speed for information transfer in this model. The summation of all the other places which beyond the distance d_r have the above relation. Thus we also have

$$e^{\mathcal{R}} \leq \frac{(6\mathcal{P}t)^d}{d^d - 6\mathcal{P}t \cdot d^{d-1}}, \quad (44)$$

which requires $d_r > 6\mathcal{P}t$ while the critical distance d_c which corresponds to the upper bound is nearly equals to $6\mathcal{P}t$. If we relate the conserved particles-number \mathcal{P} to a matrix, then it has operator norm $\|\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}^*\|_{\text{op}} = 1$ and $\mathcal{P}^\dagger\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}^\dagger = \mathbf{I}$ where \mathbf{I} is a identity operator. This is related to the case mentioned in the Ref.⁴²⁾ that n_i only have the two eightvalues 0 and 1, and here the maximal eightvalue 1 is nondegenerate for our scenario, while other eightvalues approaches to 1 smoothly in the long-time limit.

Since the in long-time limit the relaxation will removing the non-diagonal part of the density matrix, the difference between the density matrices and its diagonal one is $\Delta\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(t) - \mathcal{J}_G$, thus for the hopping matrix which mentioned above, its trace norm has

$$\frac{(6\mathcal{P}t)^{d_c}}{d_c^{d_c} - 6\mathcal{P}t \cdot d_c^{d_c-1}} > \|\Delta\mathcal{J}\|. \quad (45)$$

Note that here the critical value d_c is independent of the size of system.

We have present the upper bound of of speed of information transfer by a form of suppressed exponent. Since the nondiagonal contribution won't vanish until $t \rightarrow \infty$ (which corresponds to $\Delta\mathcal{J} = 0$), and it's decay in a time scale as $1/t^{25,33}$, i.e., the dephasing process, (note the for large-size system, the inequality of Eq.(45) will becomes more obvious, and the vanished nondiagonal contribution will reappear if the size is large enough, which called "rephasing"), the phase can be expressed as $\varphi(\mathbf{k}) = \varphi(0) + \mathbf{q}^\ell + O(\mathbf{q}^{\ell+1})^{25)}$ where ℓ is a tunable parameter in phase space. The contribution in such a dephasing with scale $1/t$ in phase space is

$$\mathbf{k}^\ell = \int d\mathbf{k}^\ell e^{i\varphi(\mathbf{k})} \frac{\mathbf{k}^{1-\ell}}{\ell} \int d^{d-1}\mathbf{k} f(k), \quad (46)$$

where $\varphi(k) = \varphi_0 + \mathbf{k}^\ell$.

Next we form the the Bessel formula to show the reducing property of the evolution operator $e^{i\mathcal{P}t}$ which with large size N and can be viewed as the Riemann sum approximation of the following function with phase number α ²⁷⁾,

$$\begin{aligned} J_\alpha(x) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i^\alpha} \int_0^{2\pi} \exp[i(\alpha\varphi + x \cos\varphi)] d\varphi \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \exp[i(\alpha\varphi - x \sin\varphi)] d\varphi, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

which is shown in the Fig.7. Through this, the maximum rate for the system to relaxation to the Gaussian state is obtained as $(2\mathcal{P}t)^{-N/3}$ for a N -site system.

For this one dimension bosonic system what we are discussing, the Mott gap $U - U_c$ is allowed to exist during the relaxation process⁴²⁾, (for a experiment, see Ref.¹⁰⁵⁾). For coupled bose-lattice model, one forms the time-dependent continuous variable $n(t)$ to describe the quasiperiodic decaying¹⁰⁶⁾, the semiclassical motion equation which in a continuum bath of harmonic potential and additively applied a confining parabolic potential, is

$$\frac{d^2n}{dt^2} + 4n + 4g_{\text{red}}n \left[\cos(\varphi(0)) + \frac{g_{\text{red}}n^2}{2} \right] = 0, \quad (48)$$

where $\varphi(0)$ is the initial phase. Thus the double occupation $\langle n^2(t) \rangle$ (also the double momenta occupation number in momentum space) under the quenches from different Mott insulator initial state (with different initial phase) to weak interaction one (with weak g_{red}) is¹⁰⁶⁾ (ignore the influence of high-order U)

$$\langle n^2(t) \rangle \approx n^2(0) - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \sin^2\varphi(0) \cos[4t\sqrt{1 + g_{\text{red}}\cos\varphi(0)}] d\varphi(0), \quad (49)$$

where $n^2(0) = 1/4$ here as a effective approximation for two uncoupling system in semiclassical theory. The $n^2(t)$ with weak $g_{\text{red}} (< 1)$ according to Eq.(49) is shown in the fig.8, note that since the critical value of interaction for superfluid-to-Mott insulator phase transition in the Bose-Hubbard lattice model requires $U/\mathcal{P} \approx 16.7$ ¹⁰⁷⁾, and the reduced coupling $g_{\text{red}} \sim N^2$, so the ground state of this system will keep this superfluid regime in a large range of g_{red} if without excitation like the quench behavior. But this expression doesn't works for the region of $g_{\text{red}} > 1$, e.g., see (d) and (e) in Fig.8. The long-time behavior with very weak g_{red} , the asymptotic behavior of Eq.(49) is

$$\langle n^2(t) \rangle \approx n^2(0) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{16\pi g_{\text{red}}t}} \left[\cos\left(4t\sqrt{g_{\text{red}} + 1} + \frac{\pi}{4}\right) + \cos\left(4t\sqrt{1 - g_{\text{red}}} - \frac{\pi}{4}\right) \right], \quad (50)$$

which is presented in Fig.9. We can see that the amplitude fluctuation is increase with the reduction g_{red} , and in long-time limit the undulate of oscillation becomes more flat but no completely governed by the time-independent Hamiltonian. This corresponds to the superfluid regime with obvious amplitude fluctuation and the recurrences and interference pattern will occur (not shown). For the case of initial $g_{\text{red}} = N$, when the quenched $g_{\text{red}} \gtrsim 7N$, this nonequilibrium system will into the nonthermal steady state though it's a nonintegrable system according to the results shown in Ref.⁴¹⁾.

For one-dimension nonintegrable case of hard-core bosons (which generalized eigenstate thermalization occurs¹⁰⁸⁾), a typical model of $1/r$ Hubbard chain also have the feature of collapse-and-revival oscillations³²⁾ like the nonintegrable one, but it's dispersion-linear, i.e., it can be effectively solved by Eq.(23) while the nonintegrable one can not. Now we consider the large g_{red} into strong-coupling perturbation in a two-dimension version of $1/r$ Hubbard model, the lattice fermions Hubbard model, the double occupation $d(t) = \langle n_\uparrow n_\downarrow \rangle / N$ can be written as¹⁰⁹⁾

$$d(t) = d(0) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{g_{\text{red}}} \langle c_i^\dagger c_{i+1} (n_i - n_{i+1})^2 \rangle + O\left(\frac{V^2}{U^2}\right). \quad (51)$$

whose graphs have been presented in the Fig.2 of Ref.¹⁰⁹⁾. This is corresponds to the state of Mott insulator with strong interaction and have

$$\mathcal{P} \langle c_i^\dagger c_{i+1} (n_i(0) - n_{i+1}(U))^2 \rangle = 2 \sum_i [\kappa_i (n_i(0) - n_{i+1}(U))], \quad (52)$$

where κ_i is the dispersion relation related to the kinetic energy T_{kin} . The prethermalization regime is also exist in this case for one-dimension or two-dimension Bose-Hubbard model⁴¹⁾, but this prethermalization regime as well as the general collapse-and-revival oscillations vanish in a little range before the critical value U_c which origin from the discontinuity momentum distribution in Fermi surface under the quenching.

We show the bandwidth-dependent kinetic energy of $1/r$ Hubbard chain in Fig.10. with different bandwidth: $W = 1$, $W = 4$, and $W = 1/2$ which have been obtained by the method of local density approximation (LDA)¹¹⁰⁾. It's obviously to see that the amplitude of hopping is increases as the bandwidth W increases (inset), and the T_{kin} decay rapilly with the increase of distance along the chain. When quenches to large U , the oscillations of Eq.(51) makes a difference¹⁰⁹⁾ $\Delta d = \mathcal{P}\pi(1 - 2n/3)/U$ which is halved for Falicov-Kimball model in nonequilibrium dynamical mean-field theory (DMFT) due to the vanishing of \mathcal{P} for one of its two spin species and therefore only one spin specie contributes to kinetic energy. In DMFT, this kinetic function due to the considerable noise (see Setc.10, Appendix.C) yields a single-site Green's function

$$G(t, t') = i\langle c(t)c^\dagger(t') \rangle, \quad (53)$$

where the contour-order correlation $\langle c(t)c^\dagger(t') \rangle$ has

$$\langle c(t)c^\dagger(t') \rangle = \frac{\text{Tr}[e^{\beta H_G} T_{\mathcal{C}} e^S c(t)c^\dagger(t')]}{\text{Tr}[e^{\beta H_G} T_{\mathcal{C}} e^S]}, \quad (54)$$

where $T_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the contour-order temperature, and the single-site action¹¹¹⁾

$$S = \int_{\mathcal{C}} dt dt' c^\dagger(t) \Lambda(t, t') c(t') + \int_{\mathcal{C}} dt V(t), \quad (55)$$

where $\Lambda(t, t')$ is a hybridization of site with fermion operators and the rest of the lattice,

By the nonequilibrium DMFT, which well describe the time evolution of an interacting many-body system (fermions lattice Hubbard model here), we can map the lattice model to the single-site impurity model as shown in above. Unlike the Eq.(51), the method of DMFT is nonperturbative, but since we consider the perturbation from noise into the Green's function, the resulting Green's function is

$$G(t, t') = G_0(t, t') + G_0(t, t_i) \Sigma_{ij} G(t_j, t'), \quad (56)$$

where G_0 is the unperturbed Green's function, and it has¹¹²⁾

$$\frac{e^V - 1}{e^V - iG_0(e^V - 1)} * G_0(t, t') = \Sigma * G(t, t'), \quad (57)$$

where $V = H - H_G$ is the non-Gaussian part of the Hamiltonian, i.e., the interaction term $U(t)n_\uparrow n_\downarrow$ which is noncommuting¹¹³⁾. So to linearize the rest part of the Hamiltonian, we need to tend the partial function which is the denominator of Eq.(54) into interaction representation with decomposed Boltzmann operator using the method of Hubbard-Stratanovich transformation which require the convergency of the gaussian integrals¹¹⁴⁾. Since this partial function select all the possible configuration of single-site along the contour \mathcal{C} , which make it possible to be decouped by a auxiliary-field quantum Monte Carlo methods^{111,113)}, (Note that the integrable lattice model for soft-core bosons, the nonGaussian disturbance is origin from the off-site hopping¹¹⁵⁾ term unlike the case what we are talking). the single-energy variables s_i along the contour \mathcal{C} have¹¹³⁾ $e_\sigma^V = \text{diag}(e^{\gamma\sigma s_1}, e^{\gamma\sigma s_2}, \dots, e^{\gamma\sigma s_i})$ where σ denote the spin order $\sigma = \pm 1$ and γ here is a temperature- and interaction-dependent parameter. This equation means that eighvalues (which can be specificized as the band energy ϵ_k in Hubbard model) of

hopping matrix V can be diagonalized by the diagonal matrices which shown in the bracket of this equation.

Since the total Hamiltonian must be conserved in the evolution, the kinetic energy of $1/r$ Hubbard chain is suppressed by the term $E_{\text{pot}} = Ud(t)$. For half-filling Hubbard Hamiltonian ($n_{\uparrow} = n_{\downarrow} = 1/2$) with a semielliptic density of state $\rho_{hf} = \sqrt{4\mathcal{P}^2 - \epsilon_k^2}/(2\pi\mathcal{P}^2)$, the kinetic energy per lattice site¹⁰⁹⁾ is $T_{\text{kin}} = 2 \int d\epsilon_k \rho_{hf}(\epsilon_k) n(\epsilon_k, t) \epsilon_k$, where the band energy ϵ_k here which obey the Dyson equation in lattice model with Green's function $G_k(t, t')$

$$G_k(t, t')(i\partial_t + \mu - \epsilon_k - \Sigma) = 1, \quad t = t' \quad (58)$$

where the convolution product of local self-energy Σ with G_k yields the equal time double occupation in the homogeneity phase and the self-consistency local Green function has¹¹⁶⁾ $G_k(t, t') = \int d\epsilon_k \rho(\epsilon_k) G_k(t, t')$, where $G_k(t, t')$ is diagonal. The approximation of Hartree-Fock which works well for the single-particle problem, affect the chemical potential μ which have a zero mean, by the particle number in canonical ensemble

$$\overline{\langle n_{\uparrow} n_{\downarrow} \rangle} = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{k, k'} \langle n_{k\uparrow} n_{k'\downarrow} \rangle = \frac{n^2}{4}, \quad (59)$$

and it contribute to the self-energy by the diagonalized Hartree-Fock Hamiltonian and provide the precise result in half-filling case, but since the Hartree-Fock is sensitive to the spin-correlations¹¹⁷⁾, it fails when the spin degrees of freedom disappear. In this case, one gives the second-order contribution to the self-energy by the form of¹¹¹⁾

$$\Sigma(t, t') = -U(t)U(t')G_{0\sigma}(t, t')G_{0,\bar{\sigma}}(t', t)G_{0,\bar{\sigma}}(t, t'), \quad (60)$$

here the unperturbed Green's function $G_{0\sigma}$ can be replaced by the full interacting one G_{σ} , and the interaction U can be viewed as a evolution propagator here.

Since the fact¹¹⁷⁾ that the phase transition of metal-to-insulator in half-filling $1/r$ Hubbard chain occurs when the $U = W$, which we set the bandwidth $W = 4$ here, i.e., $U_c = 4$. Note that the band energy ϵ_k is closely related to the continuity of momentum distribution, e.g., it's discontinuity when $\epsilon_k = 0^-$ and 0^+ in the each side of critical value U_c . When quench approaches to critical value U_c , $d(0) = 1/8$, and since we set the $n = 1$ and the critical value is $U_c = 4$, the one-dimension half-filling $1/r$ Hubbard model have the double occupation as

$$\begin{aligned} d_{hf}(t) &= \frac{1}{8} - \frac{(4-U)^2}{16U} - \frac{(16-U^2)^2}{16U^2} \ln \left| \frac{4-U}{4+U} \right| - \frac{\cos(Ut)\cos(4t)}{2Ut^2}, \quad \text{for quench from } 0 \text{ to } U; \\ d_{hf}(t) &= \frac{1}{8U} + \frac{(4-U)^2}{16U^2} + \frac{(16-U^2)^2}{16U^3} \ln \left| \frac{4-U}{4+U} \right| + \frac{\cos(Ut)\cos(4t)}{2U^2t^2}, \quad \text{for quench from } \infty \text{ to } U, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

while for the quench to reach U_c , the behavior of double occupation is described by

$$\begin{aligned} d_c(t) &= \frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{512} \left[\frac{48\sin(8t)}{t^3} + \left(\frac{6-32t^2}{t^4} \right) (\cos(8t) - 1) \right] - \frac{3}{32t^2}, \quad \text{for quench from } 0 \text{ to } U; \\ d_c(t) &= \frac{1}{32} + \frac{1}{2048} \left[\frac{48\sin(8t)}{t^3} + \left(\frac{6-32t^2}{t^4} \right) (\cos(8t) - 1) \right] + \frac{3}{128t^2}. \quad \text{for quench from } \infty \text{ to } U. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Fig.11 shows the graphs of $d_{hf}(t)$ of Mott insulator for quenches from 0 to U and from ∞ to U (according to Eq.(61)), we can see that the later one is roughly the inverse version of the former one, and a significant features is the fast-saturation. The larger the interaction U , the faster the curve tends to saturated. Note that the double occupation here is indeed related to the realistic physical quantity of global correlation for bosons system, and the discussion above is for

a prediction for the behavior of long-time limit, i.e., the stationary result, which consistent with the thermal values⁴²⁾ :1/4 for interaction quenches from 0 to ∞ , 1/6 for interaction quenches from ∞ to 0, 1/8 for interaction quenches from 0 or ∞ to U_c , (we set $n = 1$ here). The collapse of oscillations are scale as $1/\sqrt{g_{\text{red}}}$, i.e., the amplitude are continually decaying along the long-time scale limit cover the phase transition, and $d(t)$ will shows strictly periodic behavior in the noninteracting regime with $g_{\text{red}} = 0$ (not shown in the Fig.11). For quenches from 0 to finite U , the prethermalization regime also shows large agreement with the stationary values of $d(t)$ in long-time limit. The effect of damping on the amplitude of collapse-and-revival oscillations is always exist in the long-time scale, and has important influence on the relaxation. It produce the “overdamp” in the regime of sufficiently large U , which nearly reduce the amplitude to 0 after instantly tends to saturate. The process of damping is related to the velocity of spin wave in Goldstone model that for zero frequency Goldstone mode is followed by a additional standing spin waves^{97,106)}. By setting a list of interaction in Fig.11, we found that, for quench from 0 to a infinite interaction U , the closer the quenches to critical value U_c , the closer the $d_{hf}(t)$ to quasistationary value which is obtained from the Fig.12 as 0.125 (see the bottom inset of Fig.12(a)): the U which close to U_c in Fig.11(a) is setted as 3.299, and the long-time result for quench to this U is 0.12499, which is very close to the stationary prediction 1/8, and it’s reasonably differ from the thermal prediction of 0.098 by the equilibrium result¹¹⁸⁾. While for the quench from ∞ to U , we obtain the same conclusion: the result of quench to $U = 3.299$ is 0.032 which is very close to the stationary value 0.0312 which is shown in the bottom inset of Fig.12(b). That is the long-time behavior of nonequilibrium system which show agreement with the result of quasistationary value in phase transition point (this conclusion will always exist in the time scale of $1/|\mathcal{P}| \ll t \ll U/\mathcal{P}^2$),

While for the anharmonicity case, the coupling g_{red} is still usable by the form of a symmetrical anharmonic term (see Setc.10), the bare action of quantum system with N -component bosonic field ϕ_α in ϕ^4 field theory, when the g_{red} close to the critical value with U_c , is^{106,119)}

$$S = \int d^d r d\tau \frac{1}{2} [(\nabla_r \phi_\alpha)^2 + \frac{(\partial_\tau \phi_\alpha)^2}{c^2} - (r_c + r)\phi_\alpha^2 + \frac{\lambda r^4}{N} \phi_\alpha^4], \quad (63)$$

where $\alpha = 1 \cdots N$, c is the velocity, λr^4 is the quartic nonlinear coupling term, and the critical r_c is reach in the $r = 0$. For the case of quenches from large U to a small one which is close to zero, i.e., from the Mott insulator initial state to the superfluid or metallic state, we introduce the vectors $k_1 = 2\pi n_1/N$ and $k_2 = 2\pi n_2/N$ which obey periodic boundary condition (see Appendix.C) and have $n_1 \neq n_2 < N$, then when the coupling is close to zero, the time-dependent nearest-neighbor correlation in the bath with harmonic potential is given as¹⁰⁶⁾

$$\langle n_r(t) n_{r+1}(t) \rangle = \frac{2g_{\text{red}}}{N} \sum_r^{N-1} \frac{\sin^2 \mathcal{G}t}{\mathcal{G}}, \quad (64)$$

where the periodic correlator $\mathcal{G} = 1 + \cos k_1 - \cos k_2 - \cos(k_1 - k_2)$. This utilize the periodicity of harmonic oscillators in superfluid regime and exclude the high-frequency part due to the periodic boundary condition, i.e., keep the stable low-frequency only.

For many-body system, the dispersion relation κ of this bosonic model is oscillate as a function of k with the period π (see Fig.13). From Fig.14, it’s obvious to see that the periodic dispersion relation resulting in the degeneracy of energy. In the process of relaxation of correlation, the relevant parameter is assumed change linearly. By setting the dispersion relations κ before and after quench, the corresponding relaxation of correlations between the bosons is shown in the Fig.14, we see that the oscillations approach to quasisteady state with small (non-zero) frequency, and with the increasing of dispersion relation, the amplitude of correlation is decreased and the required-relaxation time is shorter. In fact this conclusion is always exist for all the many-body system in phase-space.

9 Investigation of Relaxation of Chain Model to Gaussian State By the Transfer Matrices

We then define the transfer matrix

$$t(x) = \text{Tr}\left(\prod_l^a T_l(x)\right), \quad (65)$$

where $T_l(x) = R_{n-1}^l(x)R_{n-2}^l(x) \cdots R_0^l(x)$ is the monodromy matrix with n -site R-matrices and x is the spectral parameter. Employing this transfer matrix representation, the initial state can be written as

$$\mathcal{F}_0(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \langle \psi(0) | t(x) t^\dagger(x) | \psi(0) \rangle \quad (66)$$

where the total number of particles N is a integer multiple of number of transfer matrices $\text{num}(t_1(x))$. Based on this, the localized free energy of per spin (or grid point in the network) is

$$E_{\text{free}} = -\frac{\text{num}(t_1(x))}{N} \frac{1}{\beta} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \ln \lambda_{\text{max}} \quad (67)$$

where M is the number depends on how many parts temperature divided into (i.e., the Trotter number), and λ_{max} is the maximum eigenvalue of transfer matrix and in the limit of $N \rightarrow \infty$, it has

$$\lambda_{\text{max}}^N = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} t_1^{\text{num}(t_1(x))}(x), \quad (68)$$

i.e., in the case of infinity-system-size the maximum eigenvalue is equal to the trace of transfer matrices. Further, we deduce that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(\lambda_{\text{max}}^N)}{N} = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \lambda_{\text{max}}}{N} \cdot \text{num}(t_1(x)), \quad (69)$$

which can be easily confirmed by numerical methods. In the framework of auxiliary space which established in above, one can define the matrix A_i which acting on the auxiliary space²²⁾, then the wave function of ground state can be redefined as

$$|\psi(0)\rangle = \sum_{s_i} \text{Tr}\left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} A_i\right) \left| \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} s_i \right\rangle \quad (70)$$

where $\left| \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} s_i \right\rangle$ denotes a normalized computational basis state²³⁾, while the set of unnormalized part form a projective space \mathbb{P} with dimension $d_i d_j - 1$ ⁷²⁾.

Since in normalization case the expectation value of initial state is $\langle \psi(0) | \mathcal{J}_i | \psi(0) \rangle$ with $\langle \psi(0) | \psi(0) \rangle = 1$, the transfer matrices in two subspaces can be obtained by the algebraic Bethe ansatz⁸⁰⁾

$$\begin{aligned} t(i + \mathcal{R}) &= \text{Tr}(A_{n-1}(\mathcal{R})A_{n-2}(\mathcal{R}) \cdots A_0(\mathcal{R})), \\ t^\dagger(i + \mathcal{R}) &= \text{Tr}(A_{n-1}^\dagger(\mathcal{R})A_{n-2}^\dagger(\mathcal{R}) \cdots A_0^\dagger(\mathcal{R})), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where \mathcal{R} is a constants of motion and the matrices A and A^\dagger are isomorphic with the bipartite space of $\mathbb{C}^{d_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_j}$. In convex hull construction for nuclear norm, a direction of subgradient is consist of the orthogonal set $\{s_i\}$ and $\{s_i\}_\perp$ ¹²⁰⁾, and it's well know that the Schmidt rank R is invariant by local operations and classical communication (LOCC) when the but variable when bipartite state is mixed^{72,121)}. For localized quantum communication, Eqs.(43,44) give the exponential suppression for transfer which reflected as the the exponentially fast quantum propagation in branched tree graph and the exponentially slow down of latter-time motion

in the quantum graph¹²²⁾ for which the information flow toward the random path in local relaxation process.

In the above Bose-Hubbard model, using the Wigner representation which is generally negative definite⁴⁸⁾ we also have the characteristic function of density matrix \mathcal{J}_i as²⁷⁾

$$\text{Tr}[\mathcal{J}_i e^{\alpha b_i^\dagger - \alpha^* b_i}] = e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{2}} \prod_{d_r} L_m(|\alpha|^2 e^{2it\mathcal{P}}(d_r)), \quad (72)$$

where the translation operator $e^{\alpha b_i^\dagger - \alpha^* b_i} = e^{\alpha b_i^\dagger} e^{-\alpha^* b_i} e^{-|\alpha|^2/2}$ where the state of c-number variable $|\alpha\rangle = e^{-|\alpha|^2/2}(\alpha b_i^\dagger - \alpha^* b_i)^{35)}$, and L_m is the Laguerre polynomial, which is noniterative and utilized to express the boundary conditions of parameter space. Here the density matrix $\mathcal{J}_i = \text{Tr}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$ and $b_i^\dagger b_i = -(\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha} + \frac{\alpha^*}{2})(\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha^*} + \frac{\alpha}{2})$, $b_i b_i^\dagger = (\frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha^*})(\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha} - \frac{\alpha^*}{2})$. After the local relaxation (dephasing) to a steady state ensemble with stationary state $\bar{\rho}_i$, the Eq.(72) tends to the Gaussian form with $e^{-(\bar{p}_i+1/2)\alpha^\dagger\alpha}$ ²⁷⁾ where \bar{p}_i is the average of initial states for finite system and reach the maximum entanglement related to the second moments. The Hamiltonian has $\lim_{t\rightarrow\infty}\langle\psi(0)|e^{\tau H}H_\tau e^{-\tau H}|\psi(0)\rangle = \text{Tr}(\bar{\rho}H_\tau)$. For integrable homogeneous system (like the one we present in the Sect.6), the translation invariance in transition states and it's also meaningful in the investigation of relaxation of degrees of freedom, the small displacement of coordinates due to the local potential produce a negative Hessian eigenvalue¹²³⁾, and since the site-shift invariance has been broken by the local conservation law³⁴⁾, The result of Ref.²⁷⁾ shows that the local relaxation is always preserves the full information of initial state, which shows that the information of initial state is not or at least not only be recorded by the factors of Lagrange multipliers³⁴⁾, and this is consistent with the above result in Gaussian form which contain the term about initial states. While for inhomogeneous case (like most of the damped or polarized model), since the translation invariance is broken, the thermal behaviors and scattering is very different compare to the homogeneous one, and the prediction of GGE to the final state is also inadequate¹²⁴⁾. Further, the relaxed result for nonequilibrium system can be constructed as the sum of Gaussians which is associated to the related collective variables¹²⁵⁾ or canonical variables which can be utilized to diagonalize the inhomogeneous model¹²⁶⁾. Note that this Gaussian state is quasifree and contains only second moments, i.e., the redistribution by the scattering. We will further represent this process by matrix method in the next section. When the system have already relax to the equilibrium distribution, the dynamic is well described by a stochastic partial differential equation, e.g., the quantum Langevin equation¹²⁷⁾. For this equilibrium state under large time evolution, the diffusion have a non-negligible influence to system and produce the recurrences which occur in a time scale larger than the relaxation time (i.e., the diffusion time is larger than the relaxation time), and the recurrences period is also depends on the transfer velocity of information.

10 Matrices Processing

The density matrices of Eqs.(14,15) can be represented by the Schmidt decomposition of bipartite state

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_R \sqrt{\lambda_R} |\mathcal{J}_{iR}\rangle \otimes |\mathcal{J}_{jR}\rangle \quad (73)$$

where λ_R is the maximum eigenvalues of density matrix for each R . If we set the the maximum rank is \mathbb{R} , then it have $\sum_R \lambda_R = 1$ and $(\sum_R \sqrt{\lambda_R})^2 \leq \mathbb{R}$, Definition¹²¹⁾ shows that the Schmidt rank is just \mathbb{R} under the condition $\mathbb{R} - 1 < (\sum_R \sqrt{\lambda_R})^2 \leq \mathbb{R}$. In the case of $(\sum_R \sqrt{\lambda_R})^2 < \mathbb{R}$, only the eighnvector which has maximum rank \mathbb{R} is needed, that also explain why the singular values decomposition reserved only the largest singular value (Eq.(12)). The set spaces \mathbb{S}

with convex construction always have $\mathbb{S}_R \subset \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{R}}$. In the zero-entanglement case, the square root of eightvalue of $\mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}^*$ have $\sqrt{\lambda_R} = (V\mathcal{J}V^\dagger)_{ij}$ with another index j when $(V\mathcal{J}V^\dagger)_{ij}$ is diagonal, and in another expretation is $\langle A_i | \sigma_y A_j^* \rangle = \lambda_R \delta_{ij}$, where $\sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and A is the matrix-product state. Here we consider the spin flip in the term $\sigma_y A_j^*$, and it also have $\langle A_i | \sigma_y A_j^* \rangle = \text{Tr}[(\sigma_y A_j^*)^\dagger A_i] = \text{Tr}[(A_j^T \sigma_y) A_i]$ (not the scalar product). In such a flip in tilted state scheme²²⁾ we let the eightvalue $\lambda_i = e^{S_i^z}$, and $A = e^{i\theta \sum_i S_i^z}$, i.e., spin flip when the $\theta = \pi$. It's found that $\sum_i e^{2i\theta} \lambda_i = 0$ in the zero-entanglement case¹²⁸⁾.

A prerequisite to satisfy this formula is zero-entanglement, i.e., the two subsystem i and j is separable (or distillable). The density matrix \mathcal{J} here is assume have the eightvalue λ_R and it diagonalized by matrix V when \mathcal{J} is symmetry, and in this case, the eightvalues of $\mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}^*$ is non-negative. Assuming V is a $m \times n$ matrix with n orthonormal columns and $m < n$, thus V acts periodic with period of square of number of column n . Let Σ is the $m \times m$ diagonal matrix which made up of singular values of \mathcal{J} , then its nuclear norm can be expressed as $\|\mathcal{J}\|_* = \text{Tr}(V\Sigma V^T)$.

If here V is the matrix A which appear in Eq.(71), then the trace norm of A which equals the sum of square root of eightvalues $\sum_i \sqrt{\lambda_i}$ have $\|A\|_{\text{Tr}} = \text{Tr}\sqrt{AA^\dagger}$ and $\|A \otimes A^\dagger\|_{\text{Tr}} = \|A\|_{\text{Tr}} \cdot \|A^\dagger\|_{\text{Tr}} = \|A\|_{\text{Tr}}^2$. In normalized case with $\langle \psi | \psi \rangle = 1$, the operator norm of A has the similar property with Hermitian conjugate matrices: $\|A^* \otimes A\|_{\text{op}} = \|A\|_{\text{op}}^2 = 1$. This corresponds to a absolute value of the maximal eightvalue which is normalized and it's found nondegenerate for $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg model⁶¹⁾. For separable case, $\sum_R \lambda_R \leq 1$ due to the convertibility and the decomposition of entangled state into unentangled pure states in the case that the maximum eightvalue is smaller than the sum of rest eightvalues¹²⁸⁾, i.e., $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \dots + \lambda_n$ (here set the $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$). For pure state we have

$$\frac{n-1}{n} \geq 1 - \sum_i \lambda_i^2 \geq \frac{4}{n(n-1)} \left(\sum_{i < j} \sqrt{\lambda_i \lambda_j} \right). \quad (74)$$

A general bound of dimension of subspace is that the largest dimension of space is almost $d_i \times d_j$ and the smallest one is $(d_i - \mathbb{R} + 1)(d_j - \mathbb{R} + 1)$, and these subspaces which dimension within this range, i.e., the rank $R < \mathbb{R}$ can be represented by the affine variety⁷²⁾. Since a precondition of increase of the Schmidt rank is increasing the dimension of subspace, and the degree of entanglement is also reaches maximally when it grows into the largest subspace, we can obtain that in most case the largest subsystem which almost is full rank have the almost maximal entanglement, except somecase for the pure state which is unmixed¹²¹⁾. The largest subspace form the largest-probability set with the constants of motion which proportional to the dimension of corresponding Hilbert space or projector onto its eightvalues, or its integer powers of Hamiltonian⁷⁹⁾.

Without losing general, for distillable state, the upper bound of entanglement entropy formed by the logarithmic negativity¹²⁹⁾ $S_N = \ln \|\mathcal{J}^\Gamma\|_{\text{Tr}}$, where \mathcal{J}^Γ is the partial transpose of density matrix \mathcal{J} and the corresponds covariance matrix is $\gamma^\Gamma = P\gamma P$ where γ is covariance matrix and the diagonal matrix $P = (-\mathbf{I}_i) \oplus \mathbf{I}_j$ with the diagonal identities matrices \mathbf{I} . Let V is the nonsingular and skew-symmetric column vector, and it's real. Then we have $V^T \mathcal{J} V = \mathcal{J}$, (i.e., \mathcal{J} is diagonal) so the nonincreasing ordered symplectic eightvalues λ^Γ with symplectic matrix $\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{I}_d \\ -\mathbf{I}_d & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ which describe the reduced Gaussian state^{129,130)} have

$$\ln \|\mathcal{J}^\Gamma\|_{\text{Tr}} = \sum_i \ln(\max[1, (\lambda_i^\Gamma)^{-2}]) \leq \sum_i ((\lambda_i^\Gamma)^{-2} - 1), \quad (75)$$

while the normal eightvalue of \mathcal{J} is λ_i which equal to $(\lambda_i^\Gamma)^2$ (see Appendix.B for the detail).

11 Relaxation of Nonequilibrium System With Stochastic Dynamical Variables

Since for mixed system, if the initial state is homogeneous, the second moments is conserved and it prevent the system to relax to the thermal state²⁷⁾, so the effective disentanglement is impossible in this case, and therefore some microstates are inaccessible since the final state is onstrained by the conserved constans of motion no matter the system is integrable or not. Like the integrable system which guided by the corresponding GGE with maximal entropy $S_{ij} = -\text{Tr}(\rho_{ij}\ln\rho_{ij})$, will reach nonthermal steady states and share the similar propertice with the prethermalization plateaus in the long time limit³²⁾, which also called the prerelaxation in the time evolution of GGE, and this has been founded in the isolated or open quantum system^{40,131)}, while for the nonintegrable system it's thermalize directly⁷⁹⁾. In the inhomogeneous case like the most damping model, the conserved law is no more exist and then the thermal state is achievable directly. The local minima free energy which separated by barriers in free energy surface is connected by along the steepest descent path in the scenario of discretized evolution⁸⁷⁾ and therefore update the collective coordinates. This is a powerful way to obtain the symmetric tensor in the flattened space macroscopically, and even the supersymmetry system with gloabal minimal potential energy. In these special points, the gradient of free energy as well as the potential energy vanish, and the energy is rised by the little displacement of coordinates¹²³⁾.

Defining \mathcal{Z} as a collective rariable with the coordinate x , then for harmonic oscillators with mass m , in the free energy surface, the disturbution of Gaussians can be described by the biasing potential which is guided by the diffeence of free energy $E(\mathcal{Z}) - E_G(\mathcal{Z}, \tau)$ ¹³²⁾

$$V_{\text{bias}} = w \sum_{\text{Gaussians}} \exp(-[\mathcal{Z}(x) - \mathcal{Z}(x_G)]^2/2(\delta\mathcal{Z})^2), \quad (76)$$

where w and $\delta\mathcal{Z}$ are the height (amplitude) and width of the Gaussians and x_G is the positon of Gaussians, and in the limit of $w \rightarrow 0$, it have $\int d\mathcal{Z} e^{-\beta E(\mathcal{Z})} = e^{-\beta E_G(\mathcal{Z}, \tau)}$. Such a biasing potential is indeed a history-dependent term which is appear in the non-Markovian dynamics equation and as a biased estimator for the free energy, and while the unbiased estimate require a Markovian one¹²⁵⁾. A experiment done recently¹³³⁾ of one-dimension Tomonage-Luttinger liquid model that the Gaussians propagation, which are adjusted by microwave, are along the one-dimension trajectory (‘‘tubes’’) and accompanied by a negative perturbation in the time evolution of w and $\delta\mathcal{Z}$ which shows stability in the chaotic scenario. This biasing potential is indeed a bias estimator for the quantum states with multiple phases, and we can see that it follows the Gaussian decay. Here the summation symbols is used due to the discretized evolution. Note that this expression is for harmonic oscillators, i.e., the system is linear response. While for anharmonicity oscillators, which produced by, .eg., the detuned Gauussian laser^{134,135)} (blue-shift or red-shift) or the (two-photon) Raman detuning¹³⁶⁾, this potential need to modified by adding some variational parameter describing the asymmetry (three-order term) or symmetry (quartic term) anharmonic^{99,137)} to the exponent part of Eq.(76). The coupling in this case is nonlinear, like the scenario in FPU theorem. The free energy $E_{\text{free}} = -V_{\text{bias}}$, and it's govern by the force $F = -\partial_G E_{\text{free}}$ ⁸⁷⁾. After the flattening process on free energy surface (for a intuitive schematic view, see, e.g., the Ref.⁷⁰⁾), the change of the distribution makes the new Gaussians which goven by new Hamiltonians, and hence the new equilibrium states, that can only happen in the inhomogeneous situation. After the local minimums of diffeence of free energy were mostly eliminated, then the probability distribution is nearly uniform, and the remaining corrugations are independents of the $E(\mathcal{Z}) - E_G(\mathcal{Z}, \tau)$. The action describing this dynamic of evolution in complex time scale is (τ is the complex time here)

$$S(\mathcal{Z}) = \frac{m}{2} \int_{\tau}^{\tau'} d\tau [\dot{\mathcal{Z}}(\tau)]^2 - \mu^2 \mathcal{Z}^2(\tau), \quad (77)$$

where μ here is the natural frequency. Note that for macroscopic model, the actions of harmonic oscillators which are viewed as matter fields coupled with the reservoir or the external electric field is not stationary and therefore belongs to the nonequilibrium dynamic, and the corresponding kernel functions are also in a nonequilibrium form, (see Ref.¹¹¹).

The correlation matrix Γ_G which obey the Gaussian disturbance is

$$\Gamma_G(\tau) = \langle \mathcal{Z}(\tau') \mathcal{Z}(\tau) \rangle_G = \frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{2} \langle R_i(\tau') R_j(\tau) \rangle, \quad (78)$$

where R is the coupling operators between the states with dissipation scenario (e.g., the reservoir), and the evolution is $\Gamma_G(\tau) = e^{-\tau H_G} \Gamma(0)$. The coupling is fadeout in damping system through this evolution. Then we have the action function

$$S(\mathcal{Z}) = \int_{\tau}^{\tau'} d\tau g(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}(\tau)), \quad (79)$$

which contain the non-Markovian kernel $g(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}(\tau))$. In the classical limit approximately, the harmonic motion can be described by

$$M \ddot{\mathcal{Z}} + s \dot{\mathcal{Z}} = -\frac{d}{d\mathcal{Z}} V(\mathcal{Z}) + F_n(\tau), \quad (80)$$

where s is a friction parameter and $s = M \int_{\tau}^{\tau'} d\tau \mathcal{S}(\tau' - \tau)$ where \mathcal{S} is the friction kernel, F_n is the noise force. Since for Markovian noise which obey the Markovian evolution and can be well fitted to the master equation Eq.(33), we then need to replace the history-independent potential term which mentioned above by the form of Eq.(78), i.e., taking the bath coupling R as the noise source which are real and Gaussian, and then it have $\langle R_i(t') R_j(t) \rangle = \delta_{ij} \delta_{t'-t}$. Here is because that for the harmonic oscillator, using Wick theorem, the density matrix can be diagonalized with a quadratic Gaussian potential (see Ref.⁶), and then the Green's function with infinite imaginary-time becomes¹³⁸)

$$G(\mathcal{Z}_i, \mathcal{Z}_j; \tau) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}(\tau)}^{\mathcal{Z}(\tau')} Ds(t) \exp(-S_{\text{eff}}(\mathcal{Z}(t))/\hbar), \quad (81)$$

where the Euclidean effective action

$$S_{\text{eff}}(\mathcal{Z}(t)) = \int_{\tau}^{\tau'} \left(\frac{1}{2} M \dot{\mathcal{Z}}(t) + V(\mathcal{Z}) \right) dt - \int_{\tau}^{\tau'} dt \delta(\mathcal{Z} - \mathcal{Z}(t)) + V_0 \quad (82)$$

where V_0 is the time-independent potential. In this expression, the state in next time step is only depends on the state in this time, i.e., variables satisfy the Markovian evolution, and more important, the contributions of noise in the imaginary axis is vanish, that's also match the real noise source, so we only need to consider the noise in real part. Then the time derivative of \mathcal{Z} has the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{Z} = A(t) + B(t) F_n(t), \quad (83)$$

with the $2d \times 2d$ positive definite diffusion matrix $D = BB^T$ which is symmetry in Wigner representation and both A and B are positive and real matrix. By the way, in this case, the quantum Fisher information matrix satisfy its saturation condition¹³⁹). This Markovian

stochastic evolution can be expressed by the second-order Fokker-Planck equation in a stochastic description

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} E = \left[- \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{Z}} A(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{Z}_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathcal{Z}_j} D_{ij} \right] E \quad (84)$$

where E is the free energy of the system influenced by the noise variables. Indeed this expression for the anharmonic case is due to the truncation which discard the asymmetry or symmetry anharmonic terms (see above). While in a probabilistic description, a Laplacian operator equal to the second time-derivative of non-Markovian kernel which is negative definite is contained in the Markovian form Fokker-Planck equation (see Ref. ¹²⁵).

Now that in macroscopic system the observables are usually represented by thermal states directly since the error of statistical prediction is negligible³²). We then investigate the rate of variance of the statistical prediction of observable P_i which belong to the canonical ensemble, i.e., the relate to the decay rate of Liouvillean relaxation¹⁴⁰). Writting its statistical prediction as $\text{Tr}(\rho P_i)$ where ρ is the canonical ensemble. As we discussed above, the damp-out process is associate with the decoupling with the dissipation, and therefore we also can define the Hamiltonian here as the damping spectrum of the observable, which classified discussion here for bosons and fermions, i.e., decompose the P_i into real part and imaginary part. Consider a bath with space $\mathbb{C}^{2d} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2d}$, then for bosons, the communication relation is $[b_i, b_j^\dagger] = \delta_{ij}$ and for linear bath Hamiltonian which is in a quadratic form (even sector) is $H = u^T H_b u$ where H_b is symmetry, and for fermions $[f_i, f_j^\dagger]_{-1} = \{f_i, f_j^\dagger\} = \delta_{ij}$ with Hamiltonian $H = w^T H_f w$ where H_f is antisymmetry, where u and w are real vectors. Since the real part of prediction can be represented by the covariance matrix¹³⁰) $(\gamma_b)_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \rho P_b$ where $P_b = \{u_i, u_j\}$ and the imaginary part $(\gamma_f)_{ij} = \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \rho P_f$ where $P_f = [w_i, w_j]$, and here always have $\gamma_b \geq \sigma_y$. Writting the bath matrix as $M = \sum_i l_i \otimes l_i^\dagger$ with l_i the vector with dimension $2d$ describing the bath coupling, then we have^{39,130})

$$\partial_t \gamma = X^T \gamma + \gamma X - Y \quad (85)$$

where for fermions $X = 2\text{Re}M$ and $Y = 4\text{Im}M$ while for bosons $X = 2\text{Im}M$ and $Y = 4\text{Re}M$, This Sylvester matrix equation also clarify the FDR.

Through this, the materials of bulk-edge-coupling type like the topological insulators or topological superconductors with the quantum spin Hall effect, have the full pairing gap inside the bulk and the gapless state which protected by the time-reversal invariance in the edge³⁷) can decoupling with the bulk part, i.e., without dissipation at the sample boundary¹⁴¹) and the subspaces of edge and bulk will separate throught the long-enough time evolution (The closing of gap is due to the effect of off-diagonal term here and often leads to the phase transition, e.g., which follow the power law decay with system size N in the a spinor condensate system¹⁴²). For example, the chiral superconductor with $d + id'$ pairing phase¹⁴³) which break the time-reversal symmetry (it's realizable by, e.g., applying a strong magnetic field¹⁴⁴), or the non-Abelian statistical in the Majorana zero model¹⁴⁵). For most the bulk-edge-coupling type model which is the spinless fermions model, the time evolution is presented in the Appendix.C.

We already know that the integrable system in the homogeneous phase can only relaxes to the nonthermal steady state, but there are some models which can't find the thermalization (e.g., can only to the generalized canonical), like the soft-core bosons model (e.g., the Mott insulator⁴¹), spinless fermions model, integrable Luttinger model⁹⁴), etc. This kind of model can't be effectively predicted by the form of Eq.(24). While for the models which nearly integrable (like the Hubbard model) or nonintegrable, the expectation will relax to thermal equilibrium finally, the resulting quasistationary state of this kinds of model is nonthermal³³). The final state which not be thermalized is quasisteady due to the off-diagonal contribution.

But there are still some integrable system which have the features of thermalization for some specific variables whose final state is described by the Gibbs ensemble, like the hard-core bosons system^{33,146)}, so the integrability is not the only criterion of the thermodynamic behavior, the varied or conservative observables which have nonnegligible effect and their off-diagonal contribution as well as the integrability broken (broken of integrals of motion¹⁴⁷⁾(see Appendix.C) are also important to consider. The required distance to the nonthermal steady state is in a infinite time average, and the required distance away from integrable point for thermalization occur is infinitesimal³²⁾, while for a nonintegrable system, the thermalization will gradually (“smoothly”) broken when approaches to an integrable point¹⁴⁸⁾ with a infinite time scale.

12 Conclusion

This work mainly investigate time evolution of quantum many-body system as well as the thermodynamics of macroscopical system with the non-Markovian processes in the free-energy surface for which the steepest descent is used to find the minimal coupling (similar to the method of covariant derivatives). The condition of the presence of thermalization in a relaxation process of quantum many-body system is discussed in this work as well as the entropy and entanglement in the harmonic and anharmonic system. The main model of our investigation is the nonisolated system and so that the degrees of freedom can be traced out from the discussed canonical ensembles (or the microcanonical one), and therefore the ergodic is suppressed which the detail investigation is presented in the above. Although the integrable system which governed by the corresponding GGE keeps the expectation value of observables in initial state while the chaotic one keeps the initial memory little and it helps to understand the quenches towards the stationary state in the ordered phase or disordered phase in thermodynamic limit or scaling limit respectively, the required numerical computation is more demanding and the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis is failure¹⁴⁸⁾. We also obtain that, the integrability is not only affected by the constants of motion, but some other important considerable factors which constitute the integrability breaking term (see Appendix.C).

To investigate the approaching to Gaussian state with maximum local entropy within the relaxation, a estimator in terms of trace norm is presented in the Sect.8 which related to the matrix method. The open quantum system is discussed in depth in the above sections, while for a closed quantum system which begin with a pure state with $\text{Tr}\rho^2 = 1$ (ρ is the square root of eigenvalue of the density matrix), will never relax to the thermal state with $\text{Tr}\rho^2 < 1$ which corresponds to $\sum_R^{\mathbb{R}} \lambda_R \leq 1$ which is discussed in Sect.9. For the diagonal Hamiltonian which make the observables tend to diagonal form with the infinite time average can be implemented by the methods like Bogoliubov transformation and a fast relaxation to diagonal ensemble (reach a quasisteady state) required the system spectrum is nondegenerate¹⁴⁸⁾ where we exclude the accidental degeneracies of diagonal ensemble. In this case, the eightenergies is linear like the one which mentioned in Sect.4, and the globally observable follows the relation Eq.(126) in long-time limit. Note that such a nondegenerate will not long-live since the irregular dispersion in boundaries or the nonlinear waveguide will generate the degeneracies.

13 Appendix A : Deduction of β -function and the coupling in perturbed system

The β -function can be defined as $\beta = \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} g = \frac{d}{d(\ln \lambda)} g$, where $\ln \lambda = \frac{1}{2} \mu^2$. When $\lambda \rightarrow +\infty$, the $g \rightarrow 0$ ¹⁴⁹⁾. Since the bare coupling g^b is independent of the mass, so $\frac{d}{d\mu} g^b = 0$, according to the relation given in the Ref.⁴⁶⁾

$$\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} g^b = \left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \mu \frac{d}{d\mu} g \frac{\partial}{\partial g} \right) g^b. \quad (86)$$

We can deduce that $-\partial_\mu g^b = \frac{d}{d\mu} g \frac{\partial}{\partial g} g^b \neq 0$, according to the asymptotic series expansion which given in the Ref.⁴⁶⁾

$$\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} g^b = \varepsilon g^b - \varepsilon g \frac{\partial}{\partial g} g^b + (b_3 g^2 + b_5 g^4 + b_7 g^6 + O(g^8)) g \frac{\partial}{\partial g} g^b, \quad (87)$$

when the $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, i.e., dimension $n \rightarrow n_c$,

$$\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} g^b \rightarrow \mu \frac{d}{d\mu} g \frac{\partial}{\partial g} g^b. \quad (88)$$

The coefficient of Eq.(7) is^{58,149)}

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0 &= \frac{11}{3} C_{ij}^{(2)} - \frac{4}{3} T_{ij} \\ \beta_1 &= \frac{34}{3} (C_{ij}^{(2)})^2 - \frac{20}{3} C_{ij}^{(2)} T_{ij} - 4 C_F^{(2)} T_{ij} \\ \beta_2 &= \frac{2857}{54} (C_{ij}^{(2)})^3 - \frac{5033}{162} C_{ij}^{(2)} T_{ij} + \frac{2925}{864} C_F^{(2)} T_{ij}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

where $C_{ij}^{(2)}$ is the quadratic Casimir operator acting on the adjacent nodes, which equal to N for SU(N) system¹⁴⁹⁾, $C_F^{(2)}$ is the quadratic Casimir operator acting on fermions, and has the relation with mass as $\frac{1}{4} C_{ij}^{(2)} \dim(T_{ij}) = m$ ^{58,149)}, where m is the number of fermion multiplets⁸⁴⁾. With the increase of m , there will be a lot of novel nature in fermion stand model which we don't discuss here, for a reference can see the Ref.¹⁵⁰⁾.

According to the supersymmetry SU(3) Yang-Mills theory in Ref.^{151,152)}, the quadratic Casimir operator which have $C_{ij}^{(2)} = F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$ where $F^{\mu\nu}$ is the field strength tensor or the SU(N) generate meta (here is the group generator of SU(3)) which have the below relation with the coupling g

$$\frac{\beta(g)}{g} F \tilde{F} = -\frac{11}{4} \partial_\mu (\psi^\dagger(x) \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \psi(x)), \quad (90)$$

where $F \tilde{F} = \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F^{\mu\nu} F^{\rho\sigma}$, $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is the Levi-Civita symbol. Note that this relation is correct for l -loop order where $l \geq 2$ since it's gauge-independent for $\beta(g)$ in one-loop order. It's easy to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} F \tilde{F} &= -\frac{11}{4} \frac{g}{\beta(g)} \partial_\mu (\psi^\dagger(x) \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \psi(x)), \\ C_{ij}^{(2)} &= \frac{16\pi^2}{g} \left[-\frac{8}{33} \left(\frac{\beta(g)}{g} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{3} \frac{\beta(g)}{g} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

where $\frac{\beta(g)}{g}$ in SU(3) system obeys¹⁵¹⁾.

$$\frac{\beta(g)}{g} = \frac{-3C_{ij}^{(2)}}{16\pi^2 - 2C_{ij}^{(2)}} = \frac{-9}{16\pi^2 - 6}, \quad (92)$$

here utilize the virtue of invariance of γ_5 as $\Lambda_{\frac{1}{2}} \gamma_5 \Lambda_{\frac{1}{2}}^{-1} = \gamma_5$.

14 Appendix B : The Supplement of Covariance Matrix

Firstly we consider the Minkowski space function¹⁵³⁾

$$Z = \text{Tr}e^{-iHt} = \int DP_i e^{-iS(t)}, \quad (93)$$

where A is the vector potential, and the partition function $Z(\beta) = Z(-i\beta) = \text{Tr}e^{-\beta H}$. Consider the canonical ensemble

$$\rho(\beta) = \frac{e^{-\beta H}}{Z(\beta)}. \quad (94)$$

We take the Hamiltonian of components of decomposed covariance matrix $\gamma = (H_1 \oplus H_2)/2$, where $H_1 = V^{-1/2}$ and $H_2 = V^{1/2}$ and V is the potential matrix, into the blocks of $1/\beta$. Then the free energy in entropy ensemble is¹⁵⁴⁾

$$\begin{aligned} E(\beta) &= \text{Tr}H_2(\beta) \\ &= \sum \ln \gamma(\beta) \\ &= \sum \ln \frac{H_1(\beta) \oplus H_2(\beta)}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

where $H_1(\beta) = V^{-1/2}[\mathbf{I}_d + 2(\exp(\beta H_2) - \mathbf{I}_d)^{-1}]$ and $H_2(\beta) = V^{1/2}[\mathbf{I}_d + 2(\exp(\beta H_2) - \mathbf{I}_d)^{-1}]$. Then the Eq.(75) can be represented as

$$\ln \|\mathcal{J}^\Gamma\|_{\text{Tr}} = \sum_i \ln(\max[1, \lambda_i^{-1}]) \leq \|\lambda_i^{-1} - 1\|_{\text{Tr}} \leq 2(e^{\beta H_2} - \mathbf{I}_d)^{-1} \quad (96)$$

here $e^{\beta H_2} = -\Omega^{-1/2} \gamma^\Gamma \sigma_y \gamma^\Gamma (-\Omega)^{1/2}$ is the blocks of H_2 and indeed it play a key role in the coupling between the target region with the rest. The maximal l_1 -norm¹⁵⁵⁾ of $(e^{\beta H_2} - \mathbf{I}_d)$ is linear bounded¹²⁹⁾ by the size of target region, (linear with the number of degrees of freedom of boundary of ρ), but it's independent of size of the total size (contain the nontarget-region).

Then we take the equation of stochastic-description dynamics (Eq.(83)) into consider and let the A, B, F be the matrices. For quantitative analysis, we form a new potential matrix $Q = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B & A \end{pmatrix}$. Through the mathematical method, we have¹⁵⁴⁾

$$S^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ B & A \end{pmatrix} S = (A + BF) \oplus (A - BF) \quad (97)$$

where $S = (P + F)/\sqrt{2}$ and $S^{-1} = S$, and we have $A + BF = (A - BF)^{-1}$. The Hamiltonian which describe the conserved observable becomes

$$H = \text{Tr}(F \ln Q) = \text{Tr}(\ln \frac{A + BF}{A - BF}), \quad (98)$$

then the determinant $\det[A + BF] = \exp(-p \text{Tr}(F \ln Q))$, where p is the probability within the canonical ensemble $\rho = \sum p |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$. Through Jacobi's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \det[A + BF] &= \text{Tr}(\text{adj}[A + BF] \cdot \partial_t [A + BF]) \\ &= \exp(-p \text{Tr}(F \ln Q)) \cdot \partial_t Q, \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

where $\text{adj}[\cdot]$ denotes the adjoint matrix.

15 Appendix C : The Perturbation Theory Applied to Diagonalized Ising Chain Hamiltonian and The Discuss of Off-Diagonal Contribution Term

We next taking the Ising chain model $H = -J \sum_{i=0}^{N-2} \sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^y - gJ \sum_{i=0}^{N-2} \sigma_i^z$ with $g < 1$ as an example to detect the effect of perturbation theory in diagonalization. For fermion quasiparticles with quasimomentum¹⁵⁶⁾ which have even parity, have even fermion number N_{even} and obey the antiperiodic boundary conditions $\psi(r+N) = -\psi(r)$ with essential vectors $k = \pi(2n-1)/N$ (n is an integer), while for the odd parity one which have an odd fermion number N_{odd} is obey the periodic boundary conditions $\psi(r+N) = \psi(r)$ with essential vectors $k' = 2\pi n/N$. Note that these two sectors can well describe the stationary phase-space probability distribution by the WKB spectrum^{106,157)}. Then the WJ fermions c_r^\dagger satisfy

$$\sigma_r^+ = \frac{\sigma_{r'}^x + i\sigma_r^y}{2} = c_r^\dagger e^{i\pi N}, \quad (100)$$

$$\sigma_r^- = \frac{\sigma_{r'}^x - i\sigma_r^y}{2} = c_r^\dagger e^{i\pi N}, \quad (101)$$

with r and r' satisfy the anticommuter relation $\{c_r, c_{r'}\} = \delta_{r,r'}$ ¹⁵⁸⁾. We introduce the Gaussian white noise to this in this model, then the conserved observables follow the Gaussian distribution after the quench, which with the Gaussian amplitude $\omega = 1/(\delta\mathcal{Z}\sqrt{2\pi})$ (see Eq.(76)).

For the currents which is proportional to the diagonalization¹²⁶⁾, the antiperiodic boundary conditions which also called the Neveu-Schwarz sector⁹²⁾ corresponds to the left current J_L^c , and the periodic boundary conditions corresponds to the right current J_R^c , which are

$$J_R^c(k) = \sum_k \psi_R^\dagger(k+k')\psi_R(k') + \psi_R^\dagger(k+k')\psi_R^\dagger(k') + \text{H.c.} \quad (102)$$

$$J_L^c(k') = \sum_{k'} \psi_L^\dagger(k+k')\psi_L(k) + \psi_L^\dagger(k+k')\psi_L^\dagger(k) + \text{H.c.} \quad (103)$$

The largest current is appear in the ground state, i.e., the $J^c(0)$, and the net current $J_{\text{net}} = N_R - N_L$ which is conserved. The observable A in long-time limit has

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \psi(t) | A | \psi(t) \rangle = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle \psi_R(t) | A | \psi_R(t) \rangle + \langle \psi_L(t) | A | \psi_L(t) \rangle}{2}, \quad (104)$$

and

$$\frac{\langle \psi_R(t) | \psi_R(t) \rangle}{\langle \psi_L(t) | \psi_L(t) \rangle} = 1 + O(e^{-nt}), \quad (105)$$

where n is a constant associate with the J_{net} , i.e., the wave function in the pictures of left current and right current are nearly equivalence if J_{net} is small enough.

Mapping the fermi field into the Fourier space for simplicity through the transformation $\sigma_r^z = 1 - 2c_r^\dagger c_r$ and $\sigma_r^x = -\prod_{r'=0}^{r-1} (1 - 2c_{r'}^\dagger c_{r'}) (c_r + c_r^\dagger)$, we have $\psi_r(k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_k \psi_k e^{ikr}$ for even parity, and $\psi_r(k') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k'} \psi_{k'} e^{ik'r}$ for odd parity, we obtain the quadratic Hamiltonian (but no diagonalized)

$$H = 2 \sum_{k>0} \mathbf{c}_k^\dagger \mathbf{H}_k \mathbf{c}_k, \quad (106)$$

where Nambu vector $\mathbf{c}_k^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} c_k^\dagger \\ c_{-k} \end{pmatrix}$, and $\mathbf{H}_k = \mathbf{H}_0 + R(t, k)\sigma_z$ where $R(t, k)\sigma_z$ is the term associate to the noise and \mathbf{H}_0 is the Hamiltonian without the noise which is

$$\mathbf{H}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 2J(g - \cos k) & -2Ji\sin k \\ 2Ji\sin k & -2J(g - \cos k) \end{pmatrix} \quad (107)$$

To make the Hamiltonian diagonal in a nonperturbative treatment, we use the Bogoliubov transformation (rotation) to obtain the expression of Bogoliubov quasiparticles with Bogoliubov angle $\theta(k)$ (assuming the lattice spacing $\bar{a} = 1$)

$$c(k) = \cos\theta(k)c_0(k) + i\sin\theta(k)c_0^\dagger(-k), \quad (108)$$

$$c^\dagger(k) = i\sin\theta(k)c_0(-k) + \cos\theta(k)c_0^\dagger(k), \quad (109)$$

with the gap is $\Delta = \epsilon_0 = 2J|1 - g|$ which vanish in the phase transition point (quantum critical point $k_c=1$) where the interactions of quasiparticle become more effective. The excitation probability of quasiparticles becomes $\langle\psi(0)|c^\dagger(k)c(k)|\psi(0)\rangle = \tan^2[(\theta(k) - \theta(0))/2]$ and obey the nonthermal distribution. When $g \gg 1$, the ground state is strictly a paramagnetic, while when $g \ll 1$, the ground states are two degenerate ferromagnetic. If we ignore the noise term, the diagonalized Hamiltonian after the transformation is

$$H_0 = 2 \sum_k \epsilon_k (c_0^\dagger(k)c_0(k) - c_0(-k)c_0^\dagger(-k) - 1), \quad (110)$$

where the linear dispersion ϵ_k which depends on \mathbf{H}_0 , and $\epsilon_k = \sqrt{|\mathbf{H}_0|} = 2J\sqrt{g^2 - 2g\cos k + 1}$. This is a noninteracting Hamiltonian and has the accidental degeneracies due to the periodic dispersion which has been mentioned above. This procedure is also available for the phonon field operators, which the Hamiltonian can be exactly diagonalized in harmonic-oscillator^{94,159}. If we consider the noise term, the density matrix of diagonalized Hamiltonian which satisfies the master equation (Eq.(33)) can be written as

$$\mathcal{J}(k) = \begin{pmatrix} c_0^\dagger(k)c_0(k) & c_0^\dagger(k)c_0^\dagger(-k) \\ c_0(-k)c_0(k) & c_0(-k)c_0^\dagger(-k) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (111)$$

where the two elements in the main diagonal stand for the number of levels in momentum space which is invariant under the time evolution, and the two elements in the vice diagonal describe the coherence which will decay exponentially under time evolution and finally lead the system to the mixed state with decoherence superposition. For example, we denote the element $c_0(-k)c_0(k)$ as c_{10} , then $c_{10}(t) = e^{-\mathcal{K}t}c_{10}(0)$, i.e., it vanishes when $t \gg 1/\mathcal{K}$, this result obeys the thermal Glauber dynamics⁴⁰. So it has $\partial_t \mathcal{J}(k) \neq 0$. Based on the Bogoliubov transformation introduced above, the initial state before the quench can be written as⁷⁷)

$$|\psi(g_0)\rangle = N \prod_{k,k'>0} [1 + i\tan\Delta\theta c^\dagger(k)c^\dagger(-k)]|\psi(g)\rangle, \quad (112)$$

where the difference of Bogoliubov angle $\Delta\theta(k) = \theta(k; g) - \theta(k; g_0)$ for the left current regime or $\Delta\theta(k) = \theta(k'; g) - \theta(k'; g_0)$ for the right current regime, and $N = \exp[-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,k'>0} \ln(1 + \Delta\theta(k))]$. More parameterized, the difference of Bogoliubov angle $\Delta\theta(k)$ has⁹²)

$$\cos\Delta\theta(k) = \frac{\epsilon_k^2(g_0g)}{\epsilon_k(g_0)\epsilon_k(g)}, \quad (113)$$

where $\epsilon_k(g_0g) = 2J\sqrt{g_0g - (g_0 + g)\cos k + 1}$.

Since the WJ fermions exist here, it's spinless and therefore the thermalization can't be found in this model, which is similar to the one mentioned in the Ref.³³). For the setups of the model mentioned in Sect.10 which have a damping model with a damping spectrum, the result is different from what discussed above. In the integrable case for this Majorana fermions setup, the Hamiltonian can be simplified as $H = -i\mathcal{P}_f(i\gamma_L + \gamma_R)$ where γ are the Majorana models and

\mathcal{P}_f is the hopping of nearest-neighbor fermions. The Majorana model in the edge of sample is nonlocal and decoherence, the total edge localized model is

$$c_M(k) = \frac{1}{2}(i\gamma_L(k) + \gamma_R(k)), \quad (114)$$

i.e., the conserved currents coupling to the Majorana models. This combination process cost energy $2\mathcal{P}_f$ and form a dissipative gap with the bulk (this gap requires that the on-site interaction $U < 2\mathcal{P}_f$ ³⁸). Since the damping feature, the bulk part of density matrix (not the Eq.(111)) is decay with time evolution, and its time derivative have the same form with Eq.(85), while the edge part is not, i.e., the both the main diagonal and vice diagonal are decay with time exponentially, so the final state is become a pure state ($\mathcal{J} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$) with coherence superposition (in a similar way to Eq.(112)).

In perturbation theory, with the variables driven by time-dependent white noise, the correlation matrix becomes $\Gamma(t) = \frac{\mathcal{K}}{2}\langle R_i(t')R_j(t) \rangle = \frac{\mathcal{K}}{2}\delta_{ij}\delta_{t'-t}$, i.e., the coupling strength \mathcal{K} is associate with the dephasing effect of noise which accelerate the relaxation in a time scale of order $1/\mathcal{K}$ ⁴⁰ while the diverging length scale is $1/\Delta$. We take the approximation $H = H_0 + gH_1$, where $H_0 = \sum_k \epsilon_k c^\dagger(k)c(k)$ and $H_1 = \sum_k \frac{\delta_k}{2} c^\dagger(k)c^\dagger(k)c(k)c(k)$ where H_1 is second quantized and δ_k is a nonlinear two-body interaction potential unlike the linear eigenenergy ϵ_k . Then we introduce the anti-Hermitian operator s as $s = gs_1 + \frac{1}{2}g^2s_2 + O(g^3)$ where g is time-dependent parameter and diagonalize the Hamiltonian through canonical transformation have been presented in the Ref.³²)

$$\begin{aligned} H_d &= H_0 + gH_d^{(1)} + g^2H_d^{(2)} + O(g^3) \\ &= H_0 + g(H_1 + [s_1, H_0]) + g^2\left(\frac{1}{2}[s_2, H_0] + [s_1, H_1] + \frac{1}{2}[s_1, [s_1, H_0]]\right) + O(g^3) \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

then the conserved observable P_i have $[H_d, P_i] = O(g^3)$. In this way, the diagonalized quasi-particles are $c^\dagger(k, t) = e^{iH_d t} c^\dagger(k) e^{-iH_d t}$ and $c(k, t) = e^{iH_d t} c(k) e^{-iH_d t}$. In the range of $1/|g| \ll$ time scale $\ll 1/g^2$ ³²), the pure state have the same expectation value with the mixed state, i.e., the main diagonal and vice diagonal of diagonalized Hamiltonians' density matrix have the same degree of decaying.

In the case of $g^2 \ll 1$, the s can be viewed as gs_1 , then since $H_d(t) = e^{gs_1} H e^{-gs_1}$, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dg} H_d(t) = e^{gs_1} [s_1, H] e^{-gs_1}, \quad (116)$$

$$\frac{d^2}{dg^2} H_d(t) = e^{gs_1} [s_1, [s_1, H]] e^{-gs_1}, \quad (117)$$

...

, then we further obtain

$$\frac{d}{dg} H_d(t) = e^s \left[\frac{s}{g}, H \right] e^{-s}, \quad (118)$$

$$\frac{d^2}{dg^2} H_d(t) = e^s \left[\frac{s}{g}, \left[\frac{s}{g}, H \right] \right] e^{-s}, \quad (119)$$

...

. For a globally conserved observable $A = \prod_i P_{\alpha_i}$, apply H_d to it with the GGE average, we have⁴²)

$$\langle A \rangle_{GGE} = \sum_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} \tilde{A}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n} \prod_{i=1}^n \langle P_{\alpha_i} \rangle_{GGE}, \quad (120)$$

where $\tilde{A}_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n}$ is the perturbation-averaged matrix elements which is utilized to diagonalize the P_{α_i} here and it have the property of

$$\langle A \rangle_{GGE} = \langle \prod_{i=1}^n P_{\alpha_i} \rangle_{GGE} = \prod_{i=1}^n \langle P_{\alpha_i} \rangle_{GGE} = \langle \prod_{i=1}^n P_{\alpha_i} \rangle_0 = \prod_{i=1}^n \langle P_{\alpha_i} \rangle_0 + O(g^3) \quad (121)$$

we have³²⁾

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A(t) \rangle &= \langle \psi(0) | e^{iHt} \mathcal{F} e^{-iHt} | \psi(0) \rangle \\ &= \langle \psi(0) | e^{-s} e^{iH_d t} e^s \mathcal{F} e^{-s} e^{-iH_d t} e^s | \psi(0) \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

which is diagonalized, and with $s(t) = e^{iH_d t} s e^{-iH_d t}$. This transformation use the formula $e^{iHt} = e^{-s} e^{iH_d t} e^s$, we define the $e^{-s} e^{iH_d t} e^s = e^{e^{R-s}} e^{iH_d t}$ where the real linear map $R_{-s} := ad_{-s}$ ¹⁶⁰⁾, and have¹⁶¹⁾

$$-s \cdot (iH_d t) = -s + \frac{R_{-s}(iH_d t)}{1 - e^{R-s}}, \quad (123)$$

then it's easy to obtain

$$\text{In}(e^{-s} e^{iH_d t}) \approx -s + \frac{s^{-1} e^{R-s} s}{e^{R-s} - 1}. \quad (124)$$

A estimator for the integrability breaking is given by the Ref.¹⁴⁷⁾ that add the integrability broken term to the expression of observable

$$A(t) \approx \mu A_{\text{initial}} + (1 - \mu) A_{\text{thermal}}, \quad (125)$$

for which the system in a completely integrable case when $\mu = 1$, the system expectation value is the same as the initial one in this case, and it's different from the thermal expectation value of microcanonical ensemble in the completely chaotic case (nonintegrable) which can be well described by the standard statistical mechanics¹⁴⁸⁾. The later case appear in the case $\mu \ll 1$ and average over the initial states which equal to the thermal one, as $\langle \psi(0) | A_{\text{thermal}} | \psi(0) \rangle = \langle \psi(t) | A_{\text{thermal}} | \psi(t) \rangle$, and all these eightstate are within the relevant energy windows with different weights⁸¹⁾. That allow the precise prediction for thermal state in long-time limit with the energy close to the initial one. So the thermalization require a large number of coarse-grained observables⁴²⁾. As predicted in the classical system by KAM theorem, it's a crossover of regular and chaotic regime¹⁴⁷⁾, and the achievement of thermalization require enough integrability breaking (otherwise the ergodicity is ineffective and the thermalization is suppressed) and a long-time process ($\sim 1/g^3$ in our limit) or as a infinite time average to the diagonal ensemble and fluctuate around it in the latter time¹⁴⁸⁾, which shown as (not consider the possible degeneracies here)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A(t) \rangle &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t dt \text{Tr}(A \rho(t)) = \langle \psi(t) | A | \psi(t) \rangle_{\text{diag}} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha} |\langle \alpha | \psi(0) \rangle|^2 \langle \alpha | A | \alpha \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (126)$$

where $|\alpha\rangle = \sum_b [(|b\rangle \langle b| g H_1 | \alpha \rangle) / (E_{\alpha} - E_b)]$. This equation gives the long-time average, and keeps the diagonal term only. This long-time average will equal to the GGE expectation value or not which dominated by the conserved P_i . For Eq.(122), when the state ρ which can be described by the Hamiltonian $H = H_0 + g H_1$ is nondiagonal while the observable A is diagonal (i.e., $[A, H_d] = 0$), it becomes³²⁾

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A(t) \rangle &= -\langle \psi(0) | (s(t) - s) A (s(t) - s) | \psi(0) \rangle + O(g^3) \\ &= -2(\langle \psi(0) | s A s | \psi(0) \rangle - \text{Re} \langle \psi(0) | s A s(t) | \psi(0) \rangle), \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

where the term $-\text{Re}\langle\psi(0)|sAs(t)|\psi(0)\rangle$ is due to the off-diagonal contribution as

$$-\text{Re}\langle a|sAs(t)|a\rangle = \text{Re}\sum_b \frac{|\langle a|gH_1|b\rangle|}{(E_a - E_b)^2} \langle b|A|b\rangle e^{-i(E_a - E_b)t} + O(g^3), \quad (128)$$

where we simplify the initial state $\psi(0)$ as a and the quenched state $\psi(t)$ ($t > 0$) as b . But in the case of both ρ and A are off-diagonal, this off-diagonal contribution term becoms

$$-2\text{Re}\sum_b \frac{(|\langle a|gH_1|a\rangle| - |\langle a|gH_1|b\rangle| - |\langle b|gH_1|b\rangle|)^2}{(E_a - E_b)^2} \langle a|A|b\rangle e^{-i(E_a - E_b)t} + O(g^3). \quad (129)$$

While the diagonalized state is

$$\rho_{\text{diag}}(|b\rangle) = \sum_a P_a \rho_0 P_a, \quad (130)$$

where the projector $P_a = |a\rangle\langle a|$ which project onto the subspace of initial state $|a\rangle$.

References

- [1] Eling C, Guedens R, Jacobson T. Phys. Rev. Lett. 96(12): 121301(2006)
- [2] Calabrese P, Essler F H L, Fagotti M. Phys. Rev. Lett. 106(22): 227203(2011)
- [3] Monasson R. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1995, 75(15): 2847.
- [4] For quantum chaotic non-integrable system, the Kolmogorov entropy $S_k = 1.1$ and it's independent of n and error⁵⁾. Since the Kolmogorov entropy can be written as
$$S_k = -\sum_{i+1} \lambda_{i+1} \ln \lambda_{i+1} + \sum_i \lambda_i \ln \lambda_i \quad (131)$$
- So we can obtain that for the non-integrable chaotic system, the eightvalue $\lambda_i = 1.82632$ with $i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ here.
- [5] Prosen T, Žnidarič M. Phys. Rev. E, 75(1): 015202(2007)
- [6] Karrasch C, Rentrop J, Schuricht D, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2012, 109(12): 126406.
- [7] Zhou N, Zeng G, Xiong J. Electronics Letters, 2004, 40(18): 1149-1150.
- [8] Liu B, Xiao D, Jia H Y, et al. Quantum Information Processing, 2016, 15(5): 2113-2124.
- [9] Tegmark M. Phys. Rev. E. 2000, 61(4): 4194.
- [10] Luo X Y, Zou Y Q, Wu L N, et al. Science, 2017, 355(6325): 620-623.
- [11] Sharma K K, Pandey S N. Quantum Information Processing, 2016, 15(4): 1539-1551.
- [12] Qiang Z, Qi-Jun Z, Xiao-Ping Z, et al. Chinese physics C, 2011, 35(2): 135.
- [13] Li R, Wang J, Qi X, et al. arXiv preprint arXiv:0908.1537, 2009.
- [14] Qi X L, Li R, Zang J, et al. Science, 2009, 323(5918): 1184-1187.
- [15] Zhang C J, Zhang Y S, Zhang S, et al. Phys. Rev. A. 2008, 77(6): 060301.
- [16] Horodecki M, Horodecki P, Horodecki R. Open Systems & Information Dynamics, 2006, 13(01): 103-111.
- [17] Arimitsu T, Umezawa H, Progress of theoretical physics, 74(2): 429-432(1985)
- [18] Franz S, Parisi G. Journal de Physique I, 1995, 5(11): 1401-1415.
- [19] Charbonneau P, Yaida S. Phys. Rev. Lett. 118(21): 215701(2017)

- [20] Liu J, Du X H. International Journal of Theoretical Physics, 2013, 52(8): 2623-2630.
- [21] Wang Y R. Phys. Rev. B.1992, 46(1): 151.
- [22] Fagotti M, Collura M, Essler F H L, et al. Phys. Rev. B.2014, 89(12): 125101.
- [23] Žnidarič M, Prosen T, Prelovšek P. Phys. Rev. B.2008, 77(6): 064426.
- [24] Vidal G. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2007, 98(7): 070201.
- [25] Barthel T, Schollwöck U. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2008, 100(10): 100601.
- [26] Jaynes E T. Physical review, 1957, 106(4): 620.
- [27] Cramer M, Dawson C M, Eisert J, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2008, 100(3): 030602.
- [28] Behunin R O, Hu B L. Phys. Rev. A.2011, 84(1): 012902.
- [29] Lieb E H, Robinson D W. //Statistical Mechanics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1972: 425-431.
- [30] Kinoshita T, Wenger T, Weiss D S. Nature, 2006, 440(7086): 900.
- [31] Berman G P, Izrailev F M. Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science, 2005, 15(1): 015104.
- [32] Kollar M, Wolf F A, Eckstein M. Phys. Rev. B.2011, 84(5): 054304.
- [33] Manmana S R, Wessel S, Noack R M, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2007, 98(21): 210405.
- [34] Fagotti M. Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, 2014, 2014(3): P03016.
- [35] Steel M J, Olsen M K, Plimak L I, et al. Phys. Rev. A.1998, 58(6): 4824.
- [36] Storni M L. Non-Abelian braiding statistics in the fractional quantum Hall state at filling factor $\nu = 5/2$? [J]. 2011.
- [37] Chung S B, Zhang S C. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2009, 103(23): 235301.
- [38] Alicea J, Oreg Y, Refael G, et al. arXiv preprint arXiv:1006.4395, 2010.
- [39] Diehl S, Rico E, Baranov M A, et al. Nature Physics, 2011, 7(12).
- [40] Marino J, Silva A. Phys. Rev. B.2012, 86(6): 060408.
- [41] Kollath C, Läuchli A M, Altman E. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2007, 98(18): 180601.
- [42] Kollar M, Eckstein M. Phys. Rev. A.2008, 78(1): 013626.
- [43] Rossini D, Suzuki S, Mussardo G, et al. Phys. Rev. B. 2010, 82(14): 144302.
- [44] Calabrese P, Essler F H L, Fagotti M. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2011, 106(22): 227203.
- [45] De Grandi C, Gritsev V, Polkovnikov A. Phys. Rev. B. 2010, 81(22): 224301.
- [46] Elias V, McKeon D G C. International Journal of Modern Physics A, 2003, 18(13): 2395-2401.
- [47] Elcoro L, Etzebarria I, Perez-Mato J M. Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter, 12(6): 841(2000)
- [48] Drummond P D, Opanchuk B. Phys. Rev. A. 2017, 96(4): 043616.
- [49] Hořava P. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2005, 95(1): 016405.
- [50] Baskaran G, Mandal S, Shankar R. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2007, 98(24): 247201.
- [51] Pelissetto A, Rossi P, Vicari E. Phys. Rev. B.2001, 65(2): 020403.
- [52] Machida M, Koyama T. Phys. Rev. A.2006, 74(3): 033603.
- [53] Matsumoto M, Yasuda C, Todo S, et al. Phys. Rev. B.2001, 65(1): 014407.
- [54] De Grandi C, Polkovnikov A, Sandvik A W. Phys. Rev. B.2011, 84(22): 224303.

- [55] Bender C M, Brody D C, Müller M P. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2017, 118(13): 130201.
- [56] Berthier L, Charbonneau P, Jin Y, et al. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2016: 201607730.
- [57] Kawamura H. Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter, 1998, 10(22): 4707.
- [58] Banks T, Zaks A. Nuclear Physics B, 1982, 196(2): 189-204.
- [59] Paudel T R, Lambrecht W R L. Phys. Rev. B.2008, 77(20): 205202.
- [60] Kirkpatrick T R, Thirumalai D. Phys. Rev. B.1987, 36(10): 5388.
- [61] Xiang T. Phys. Rev. B.1998, 58(14): 9142.
- [62] Shepelyansky D L. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1994, 73(19): 2607.
- [63] Jordan J, Orús R, Vidal G, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2008, 101(25): 250602.
- [64] Stockburger J T, Grabert H. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2002, 88(17): 170407.
- [65] Babbush R, McClean J, Wecker D, et al. Phys. Rev. A.2015, 91(2): 022311.
- [66] Jiang H C, Weng Z Y, Xiang T. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2008, 101(9): 090603.
- [67] Demir A, Mehrotra A, Roychowdhury J. IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications, 2000, 47(5): 655-674.
- [68] Jumarie G. Application to fractional BlackScholes equations[J]. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 2008, 42(1): 271-287.
- [69] Hsu T C, Angles dAuriac J C. Phys. Rev. B. 1993, 47(21): 14291.
- [70] Odagaki T. J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 2017, 86(8): 082001.
- [71] Cai J F, Candès E J, Shen Z. SIAM Journal on Optimization, 2010, 20(4): 1956-1982.
- [72] Cubitt T, Montanaro A, Winter A. Journal of Mathematical Physics, 2008, 49(2): 022107.
- [73] Bracken A J, Ge X Y, Zhang Y Z, et al. Nuclear Physics B, 1998, 516(3): 603-622.
- [74] Zhou H Q, Tong D M. Physics Letters A, 1997, 232(5): 377-383.
- [75] De Grandi C, Gritsev V, Polkovnikov A. Phys. Rev. B.2010, 81(1): 012303.
- [76] Tong D. Quantum Field Theory, University of Cambridge Part III Mathematical Tripos[J]. Quantum Field Theory. University of Cambridge, 2012. P.71.
- [77] Marino J, Silva A. Phys. Rev. B. 2014, 89(2): 024303.
- [78] Kagan D M, Feigelman M V. arXiv preprint cond-mat/9506056, 1995.
- [79] Rigol M, Dunjko V, olshanii M. Nature, 2008, 452(7189): 854-858.
- [80] Fagotti M, Essler F H L. Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, 2013, 2013(07): P07012.
- [81] Cassidy A C, Clark C W, Rigol M. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2011, 106(14): 140405.
- [82] Tissier M, Delamotte B, Mouhanna D. Phys. Rev. B.2003, 67(13): 134422.
- [83] Dmitrašinović V. Physics Letters B, 2001, 499(1): 135-140.
- [84] Gross D J, Wilczek F. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1973, 30(26): 1343.
- [85] The quadratic Casimir operator $C_{ij}^{(2)}$ here is the first-order one, i.e., the bilinear relation and fit for the two-body model. For the three- or more-body model we need to introduce the second Casimir operator $C_{ijk}^{(3)} = \gamma_{abc} F^a F^b F^c$ (see, for example, Ref. ⁸³)

- [86] Vidal G. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2007, 99(22): 220405.
- [87] Laio A, Parrinello M. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 2002, 99(20): 12562-12566.
- [88] t Hooft G. The cellular automaton interpretation of quantum mechanics[M]. Springer, 2016. P.148.
- [89] Zhang G F, Li S S. Phys. Rev. A.2005, 72(3): 034302.
- [90] Feiguin A E, White S R. Phys. Rev. B.2005, 72(22): 220401.
- [91] Klümper A, Johnston D C. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2000, 84(20): 4701.
- [92] Calabrese P, Essler F H L, Fagotti M. Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, 2012, 2012(07): P07016.
- [93] Maruzzi M, Marino J, Gambassi A, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2013, 111(19): 197203.
- [94] Cazalilla M A. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2006, 97(15): 156403.
- [95] Ghaemi P, Senthil T. Phys. Rev. B.2006, 73(5): 054415.
- [96] Eggert S, Affleck I, Takahashi M. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1994, 73(2): 332.
- [97] Plihal M, Mills D L, Kirschner J. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1999, 82(12): 2579.
- [98] Halperin B I, Hohenberg P C. Physical Review, 1969, 188(2): 898.
- [99] Li G Q, Fu L B, Xue J K, et al. Phys. Rev. A.2006, 74(5): 055601.
- [100] Jin D S, Ensher J R, Matthews M R, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1996, 77(3): 420.
- [101] Chiquillo E. Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical, 2017, 50(10): 105001.
- [102] Greiner M, Mandel O, Esslinger T, et al. nature, 2002, 415(6867): 39-44.
- [103] Greiner M, Mandel O, H?nsch T W, et al. arXiv preprint cond-mat/0207196, 2002.
- [104] Cramer M, Bernard A, Fabbri N, et al. arXiv preprint arXiv:1302.4897, 2013.
- [105] Jördens R, Strohmaier N, Günter K, et al. Nature, 2008, 455: 204-207.
- [106] Polkovnikov A, Sachdev S, Girvin S M. Phys. Rev. A.2002, 66(5): 053607.
- [107] Elstner N, Monien H. Phys. Rev. B.1999, 59(19): 12184.
- [108] Vidmar L, Rigol M. Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, 2016, 2016(6): 064007.
- [109] Eckstein M, Kollar M, Werner P. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2009, 103(5): 056403.
- [110] Mattheiss L F. Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter, 1994, 6(32): 6477.
- [111] Eckstein M, Kollar M, Werner P. Phys. Rev. B. 2010, 81(11): 115131.
- [112] Gull E, Werner P, Parcollet O, et al. EPL (Europhysics Letters), 2008, 82(5): 57003.
- [113] Rombouts S M A, Heyde K, Jachowicz N. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1999, 82(21): 4155.
- [114] Fyodorov Y V. Nuclear Physics B, 2002, 621(3): 643-674.
- [115] Fisher, Matthew PA, et al. Phys. Rev. B. 40.1 (1989): 546.
- [116] Eckstein M, Kollar M. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2008, 100(12): 120404.
- [117] Gebhard F, Girndt A. Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter, 1994, 93(4): 455-463.
- [118] Eckstein M, Hackl A, Kehrein S, et al. The European Physical Journal-Special Topics, 2009, 180(1): 217-235.
- [119] Sachdev S. Phys. Rev. B.1999, 59(21): 14054.

- [120] For finite dimension symplectic space, the searching of orthogonal set of state $|s_i\rangle$ often use the Darboux basis $\omega_n = |\partial_n|S_i\rangle + |s_i\rangle\langle\partial_n s_i|s_i\rangle$ which have $\langle s_i|\omega_n\rangle = \partial_n\langle s_i|s_i\rangle = 0$ in the Gram-Schmidt process which presented in the Ref.¹³⁹.
- [121] Terhal B M, Horodecki P. Phys. Rev. A.2000, 61(4): 040301.
- [122] Keating J P, Linden N, Matthews J C F, et al. Phys. Rev. A.2007, 76(1): 012315.
- [123] Morgan J W R, Mehta D, Wales D J. Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics, 2017.
- [124] Lancaster J, Mitra A. Phys. Rev. E. 2010, 81(6): 061134.
- [125] Bussi G, Laio A, Parrinello M. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2006, 96(9): 090601.
- [126] Suttorp L G, Van Wonderen A J. EPL (Europhysics Letters), 2004, 67(5): 766.
- [127] Gardiner C W, Collett M J. Phys. Rev. A.1985, 31(6): 3761.
- [128] Wootters W K. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1998, 80(10): 2245.
- [129] Plenio M B, Eisert J, Dreissig J, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2005, 94(6): 060503.
- [130] Eisert J, Prosen T. arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.5013, 2010.
- [131] Gring M, Kuhnert M, Langen T, et al. Science, 2012, 337(6100): 1318-1322.
- [132] Laio A, Rodriguez-Fortea A, Gervasio F L, et al. The journal of physical chemistry B, 2005, 109(14): 6714-6721.
- [133] Yang B, Chen Y Y, Zheng Y G, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2017, 119(16): 165701.
- [134] Arlt J, Hitomi T, Dholakia K. Applied Physics B: Lasers and Optics, 2000, 71(4): 549-554.
- [135] Bretin V, Stock S, Seurin Y, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2004, 92(5): 050403.
- [136] Zhang J Y, Ji S C, Chen Z, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2012, 109(11): 115301.
- [137] Hou J X. Physics Letters A, 2007, 368(5): 366-370.
- [138] Caldeira A O, Leggett A J. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1981, 46(4): 211.
- [139] Pezzè L, Ciampini M A, Spagnolo N, et al. arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.03687, 2017.
- [140] Prosen T. Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, 2010, 2010(07): P07020.
- [141] Liu C C, Feng W, Yao Y. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2011, 107(7): 076802.
- [142] Zhang Z, Duan L M. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2013, 111(18): 180401.
- [143] Liu F, Liu C C, Wu K, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2013, 111(6): 066804.
- [144] Brandner K, Hanazato T, Saito K. arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.04928, 2017.
- [145] Sun H H, Zhang K W, Hu L H, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2016, 116(25): 257003.
- [146] Rigol M, Dunjko V, Yurovsky V, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2007, 98(5): 050405.
- [147] Yurovsky V A, Olshanii M. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2011, 106(2): 025303.
- [148] Rigol M. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2009, 103(10): 100403.
- [149] Caswell W E. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1974, 33(4): 244.
- [150] Picek I, Radovčić B. Physics Letters B, 2010, 687(4): 338-341.
- [151] Elias V. Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics, 2001, 27(2): 217.
- [152] Jones D R T. Physics Letters B, 1983, 123(1-2): 45-46.
- [153] Rahi S J, Emig T, Graham N, et al. Phys. Rev. D. 2009, 80(8): 085021.

- [154] Audenaert K, Eisert J, Plenio M B, et al. Phys. Rev. A.2002, 66(4): 042327.
- [155] Yu L W, Ge M L. Physics Letters A, 2017, 381(11): 958-963.
- [156] Gebhard F, Ruckenstein A E. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1992, 68(2): 244.
- [157] Bloch I, Dalibard J, Zwirger W. Rev. Mod. Phys. 2008, 80(3): 885.
- [158] Dziarmaga J. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2005, 95(24): 245701.
- [159] Mattis D C, Lieb E H. Journal of Mathematical Physics, 1965, 6(2): 304-312.
- [160] Hall B. Lie groups, Lie algebras, and representations: an elementary introduction[M]. Springer, 2015. P.64.
- [161] Hall B. Lie groups, Lie algebras, and representations: an elementary introduction[M]. Springer, 2015. P.148.
- [162] Lundgren L, Svedlindh P, Nordblad P, et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1983, 51(10): 911.
- [163] Binder K, Young A P. Reviews of Modern physics, 1986, 58(4): 801.
- [164] Moeckel M, Kehrein S. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2008, 100(17): 175702.

16 Figure captions

Fig.1:(Color online) $\beta(g)$ as a function of g in SU(3) system (i.e. $C_{ij}^{(2)} = 3$ (see Appendix.A) with the number of fermion multiplets $m = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 15, 20$, i.e., the 0-plet, 1-plet, \dots , 20-plet fermion configuration.

Fig.2:(Color online) (a) Energy difference between the excited state and initial state as a function of staggered magnetic field h_s for different dimension of matrices. (b) Probability of excitation P_{ex} as a function of temperature for different dimension.

Fig.3:(Color online)(a)Inverse spin correlation length (square) and spin correlation (triangle) for $S = 1$ Ising spin chain at different site i . (b)Inverse spin correlation length and spin correlation for $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg spin chain at different site i for different J_2 . The J_1 here is setted as 0.7.

Fig.4:(Color online)Spin correlation for $S = 1/2$ spin chain as a function of temperature for different next-nearest neighbor coupling J_2 .

Fig.5:Spin correlation for $S = 1$ Ising spin chain and $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg chain as a function of temperature.

Fig.6:(left) Spin correlation as a function of temperature by the method of Bethe ansatz; (right) Comparison of the results of spin correlation under low temperature between Bethe ansatz and renormalization group (RG).

Fig.7:(Color online)Graph of Eq.(47) with phase $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$. It's obviously to see that the contours is bounded by a power function.

Fig.8:The graphs of $\langle n^2(t) \rangle$ as a function of t (Eq.(49)). The reduced coupling $g_{red} = 0.01, 0.1, 1, 1.5, 2$ from (a) to (e), respectively.

Fig.9:The large time behavior of $\langle n^2(t) \rangle$ with coupling $g_{red} = 0.1, 0.05, 0.01, 0.001$ from left to right (Eq.50).

Fig.10:(Color online) Double occupation for half-filling Mott insulator $d_{hf}(t)$ quenches from $U = 0$ to U (a) and from ∞ to U (b). The insets show the enlarged views of the $d_{hf}(t)$ for quenches to $U = 1$.

Fig.11:Double occupation for quenches from 0 to critical value U_c (a) and from ∞ to U_c . The top insets show the enlarge views on short-time scale, and the bottom insets show the large-time behavior in more detail.

Fig.12:Kinetic energy of $1/r$ Hubbard chain as a function of U with different n and bandwidth $W = 1/2, 1, 4$. The bandwidth-dependent hopping constants of $1/r$ Hubbard chain as a function of distance is shown in the inset.

Fig.13:(left)The dispersion relation in k space with different regulatory paramater (0 to 1 from bottom of graph to the upper); (right)The upper, lowest, and ground state energy in a same space according to Ref.⁶¹).

Fig.14:(Color online) Correlations as a function of distance r for different quench of dispersion relation are shown, the curves with different colors from outside to inside corresponds to κ_1 to κ_2, κ_2 to κ_3, κ_4 to κ_5, κ_6 to κ_7 , and κ_7 to κ_8 , respectively. The dispersion relations are $\kappa_1 = 0.191820018, \kappa_2 = 0.331662479, \kappa_3 = 0.45825757, \kappa_4 = 0.5, \kappa_5 = 0.619656837, \kappa_6 = 0.866025404, \kappa_7 = 1.118033989, \kappa_8 = 1.322875656$.

17 Tables

Table.A:

Model	Time scale of relaxation	Period of collapse and revival	Ref(s).
Falicov-Kimball	$\hbar/\text{bandwidth}$	\hbar/U^\S	116)
Bose-Hubbard	$1/\mathcal{P}$	\hbar/U	41)
Spin glasses	macroscopical and with a very broad range	-	162), 163)
Tomonaga-Luttinger	2~3 orders of time	\hbar/J (J is the coupling of nearest-neighbor)	6)*33)
Hubbard	$\rho_F^{-1}U^{-2} \sim \rho_F^{-3}U^{-4}\dagger$	-	164)
One-dimension hard core bosons	$1/\mathcal{P}_\ddagger$	\hbar/U	148), 33)

* Here taking the decaying of time derivative of initial Hamiltonian as the criterion of relaxation.

§ \hbar is the Planck constant and U is the strength of nearest interaction (The belows are also follow this).

† ρ_F is the density of states at the Fermi level.

‡ \mathcal{P}_\ddagger is the hopping of final state after quench.

18 Figures

Fig.1




Fig.2





Fig.3





Fig.4




Fig.5




Fig.6




Fig.7




Fig.8




Fig.9




Fig.10




Fig.11





Fig.12





Fig.13




Fig.14

