

Insensitivity of bulk properties to the twisted boundary condition

Haruki Watanabe^{1,*}

¹*Department of Applied Physics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan.*

The symmetry and the locality are the two major sources of various nontrivial statements in quantum many-body systems. We demonstrate that, in gapped phases of a U(1) symmetric Hamiltonian with finite-range interactions, the bulk properties such as the expectation value of local operators, the ground state energy and the excitation gap, and the static and low-frequency dynamical responses in general, do not depend on the U(1) phase of the twisted boundary condition in the limit of the large system size. Specifically, their dependence on the twisted angle is exponentially suppressed with the linear dimension of the system. The argument is based on the exponential decay of various types of equal-time correlation functions.

I. INTRODUCTION

The bulk properties do not depend on the choice of the boundary condition. Equivalently, the thermodynamic limit should be unique. This highly nontrivial *assumption* is usually taken as one of physical principles. It underlies the standard theoretical treatment of thermodynamically large systems, in which one starts with a finite-size system by imposing a boundary condition and then takes the large volume limit at the end. There are several commonly-used choices, such as the open boundary condition and the (anti-)periodic boundary condition. The assumption of the insensitivity towards the boundary condition allows us to choose the most convenient one given the specific problem at work.

Among the several possible choices, the *twisted* boundary condition has several important applications in non-perturbative approaches to quantum many-body systems. Under the boundary condition, one multiplies a phase $e^{i\theta}$ to one end before identifying it with the other. This is a generalization of the (anti-)periodic boundary condition in the sense that $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \pi$, respectively, correspond to the periodic and the anti-periodic boundary condition. When the Hamiltonian has a U(1) symmetry, the twisted angle θ can also be viewed as the flux piercing through the ‘ring’ formed by the system subjected to the periodic boundary condition.

The twisted boundary condition played the key role in the formulation of the earliest quantized topological invariants in quantum many-body systems in 1980’s. When the Hamiltonian has an adiabatic and periodic time dependence, the phenomenon so-called Thouless pump takes place [1, 2], in which a certain amount of charge is transported through the system in one cycle of the time evolution. Niu and Thouless uncovered the connection of the pumped charge to the Chern number [see Eq. (16)] and thereby proved its quantization [1, 2]. As we review later, the fact that the amount of the pumped charge is independent of θ was essential in the proof of the quantization. However, they only sketched the proof assuming a specific form of the Hamiltonian.

Another closely related quantity in two dimensions is the many-body Hall conductance [3], formulated in terms of the twisted angles θ_i of the boundary condition in the i -th direction ($i = 1, 2$). The Hall conductance is given by the Berry

curvature [see Eq. (17)] computed with respect to (θ_1, θ_2) instead of the crystal momentum (k_1, k_2) well-defined only for periodic noninteracting systems. One needs the integration by θ_1 and θ_2 in order to prove the quantization by identifying it as a Chern number. To justify averaging over all possible values of the twisted angles, one has to show the independence of the Hall conductance from (θ_1, θ_2) . Since these points are left incomplete, there are several recent follow-up papers rigorously proving the quantization of the Hall conductance [4–6].

More recently, Oshikawa [7] presented the first proof of the Lieb-Schultz-Mattis theorem [8–12] in dimensions greater than one, assuming that the excitation gap under the periodic boundary condition ($\theta = 0$) does not close in the process of continuously changing θ from 0 to 2π . Later, Hastings gave an improved proof without such an assumption [13, 14], but instead assuming a ‘reality condition’ [15].

In all of these pioneering works, the insensitivity of bulk properties to the twisted angle θ was an indispensable assumption. This work presents its simple and general proof, assuming (i) the locality and the U(1) symmetry of the Hamiltonian and (ii) a non-zero excitation gap and the uniqueness of the ground state. Our argument coherently applies to expectation values, static susceptibilities, the Thouless pump and the Hall conductance, and many other bulk response properties. As a by-product, we prove the exponential decay of several new types of correlation functions.

II. EXPONENTIAL DECAY OF CORRELATION FUNCTIONS

Consider a quantum system in d spatial dimensions. To discuss a finite-size system without a boundary, we impose the periodic boundary condition with the linear dimension L_i in i -th direction ($i = 1, 2, \dots, d$). Suppose that the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ of the system is given as the sum of *local* terms $\hat{H} = \sum_{\vec{x}} \hat{H}_{\vec{x}}$ (or the integral $\hat{H} = \int d^d \vec{x} \hat{H}_{\vec{x}}$). Namely, the support of the operator $\hat{H}_{\vec{x}}$ is within a finite distance from $\vec{x}$.

Throughout the paper, we assume that the ground state $|0\rangle$ of $\hat{H}$ is unique and that the excitation gap Δ does not vanish in the limit of large system size. We will comment on the case with a finite ground-state degeneracy at the end. We focus on zero temperature $T = 0$ and $\langle \hat{O} \rangle$ denotes the expectation value $\langle 0 | \hat{O} | 0 \rangle$ with respect to the ground state. Furthermore,

* haruki.watanabe@ap.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

$\delta\hat{O}$ represents the fluctuation $\hat{O} - \langle\hat{O}\rangle$ and the time-evolution of an operator is defined by $\hat{O}(t) \equiv e^{i\hat{H}t}\hat{O}(t)e^{-i\hat{H}t}$.

Let $\hat{O}$ and $\hat{V}$ be local operators and let $R \equiv \text{dist}(\hat{O}, \hat{V})$ be the distance between their support [Fig. 1 (a)]. In gapped phases, it is well known, and is also rigorously proven [16, 17] by means of the Lieb-Robinson bound [18, 19], that the equal-time (connected) correlation function decays exponentially with the distance:

$$F_0 \equiv \langle\delta\hat{O}\delta\hat{V}\rangle, \quad |F_0| \leq C_0 e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}}. \quad (1)$$

In fact, a similar argument proves that the correlation function of the following form also decays exponentially

$$F_n \equiv \langle\delta\hat{O}(\hat{H} - E)^{-n}\delta\hat{V}\rangle, \quad |F_n| \leq C_n R^{\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}}. \quad (2)$$

Here, $n = 1, 2, \dots$ is an arbitrary natural number and E is the ground state energy. The proof for F_2 can be found in Ref. [5], although it is buried in a long mathematically-elaborated paper. In Appendix A, we present the simplest version of the proof in a way applicable to all n . The correlation length ξ in Eqs. (1) and (2) is given by $\xi \equiv \xi_0 + \frac{2v}{\Delta}$, where the constants ξ_0 and v are those appearing in the Lieb-Robinson bound $\|[\hat{O}, \hat{V}(t)]\| \leq C e^{-\frac{R}{\xi_0}} (e^{\frac{v|t|}{\xi_0}} - 1)$ and depend only on the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ [18, 19]. Here $\|\hat{O}\| \equiv \sup_{|\psi\rangle, \langle\psi|\psi\rangle=1} \|\hat{O}|\psi\rangle\|$ denotes the norm of the operator $\hat{O}$. When the gap Δ becomes small, ξ is dominated by $\frac{2v}{\Delta}$ and diverges in the limit of $\Delta \rightarrow +0$ as expected.

The correlation functions in Eqs. (1) and (2) are about two operators at a distance. Let us now consider correlations involving more operators, e.g., $G_{00} \equiv \langle\delta\hat{O}\delta\hat{O}'\delta\hat{V}\rangle$. We assume that the support of $\hat{V}$ is well separated from that of $\hat{O}$ and $\hat{O}'$, while assuming nothing about the distance between the support of $\hat{O}$ and $\hat{O}'$ [Fig. 1 (a)]. In this case, one can simply regard the product $\hat{O}\hat{O}'$ as a single operator and apply Eq. (1) to get a bound $|G_{00}| \leq C_{00} e^{-\frac{R'}{\xi}}$, where R' is either the smaller one of $\text{dist}(\hat{O}, \hat{V})$ and $\text{dist}(\hat{O}', \hat{V})$. In contrast, the following correlations cannot be evaluated directly through Eqs. (1) or (2),

$$G_{mn} \equiv \langle\delta\hat{O}(\hat{H} - E)^{-m}\delta\hat{O}'(\hat{H} - E)^{-n}\delta\hat{V}\rangle, \quad (3)$$

$$G'_{mn} \equiv \langle\delta\hat{O}(\hat{H} - E)^{-m}\delta\hat{V}(\hat{H} - E)^{-n}\delta\hat{O}'\rangle, \quad (4)$$

because the product $\hat{O}(\hat{H} - E)^{-m}\hat{O}'$ ($m = 1, 2, \dots$) is not necessarily local even when $\hat{O}$ and $\hat{O}'$ are. Nevertheless, we can prove (see Appendix B)

$$|G_{mn}| \leq C_{mn} R'^{\frac{n+m}{2}} e^{-\frac{R'}{\xi'}}, \quad (5)$$

$$|G'_{mn}| \leq C'_{mn} R'^{\frac{n+m+1}{2}} e^{-\frac{R'}{\xi'}}, \quad (6)$$

where $\xi' \equiv \xi_0 + \frac{4v}{\Delta}$ and R' is defined above Eq. (3).

The properties of correlation functions summarized above have many valuable implications which do not seem fully explored or appreciated. As an example, let us show that any perturbation at a long distance never affects the expectation value of a local operator. We consider a Hamiltonian




FIG. 1. (a) The spatial configuration of local operators $\hat{O}$, $\hat{O}'$ and $\hat{V}$. The red shades represent their support. (b) The flux θ theta piercing the ring. After the gauge transformation in Eq. (12) the flux θ maps to the U(1) phase $e^{i\theta}$ of the boundary condition at y .

$\hat{H}(h)$ with a parameter h and let $|h\rangle$ be the unique ground state. Then, differentiating the defining equation $\hat{H}(h)|h\rangle = E(h)|h\rangle$, one gets

$$\hat{Q}(h)\partial_h|h\rangle = -[\hat{H}(h) - E(h)]^{-1}\delta\hat{H}'(h)|h\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{Q}(h) \equiv 1 - |h\rangle\langle h|$ is the projection onto excited states and $\hat{H}'(h) \equiv \partial_h \hat{H}(h)$. For the expectation value $O(h) \equiv \langle h|\hat{O}|h\rangle$ of a Hermitian operator $\hat{O}$, the derivative $\partial_h O(h)$ is thus given in the form of F_1 :

$$\partial_h O(h) = -\langle h|\delta\hat{O}[\hat{H}(h) - E(h)]^{-1}\delta\hat{H}'(h)|h\rangle + \text{c.c.}, \quad (8)$$

which is exponentially small when $\hat{O}$ and $\hat{H}'(h)$ are well-separated, as suggested by Eq. (2).

III. INSENSITIVITY OF EXPECTATION VALUES

As a more nontrivial application, let us demonstrate the θ -independence of the expectation value of a wide class operators. To simplify the notation here we focus on 1D systems (and thus drop the subscript “1”) but exactly the same derivation applies to higher dimensions.

Suppose that the Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \int_0^L dx \hat{H}_x$ is written in terms of the creation (annihilation) operator $\hat{c}_x^\dagger$ ($\hat{c}_x$) and is invariant under the global U(1) phase rotation $e^{i\phi\hat{N}}$ for all ϕ with $\hat{N} \equiv \int_0^L dx \hat{n}_x$ and $\hat{n}_x \equiv \hat{c}_x^\dagger \hat{c}_x$. The unitary operator $\hat{U}_\chi \equiv e^{i\int_0^L dx \chi(x)\hat{n}_x}$ multiplies a position-dependent phase $e^{-i\chi(x)}$ to $\hat{c}_x$. (The Hamiltonian is not necessarily invariant under such a local phase rotation.) We introduce a *non-dynamical* gauge field $A(x)$ in such a way that $\hat{H}[A] = \int_0^L dx \hat{H}_x[A]$ transforms as

$$\hat{U}_\chi \hat{H}_x[A] \hat{U}_\chi^\dagger = \hat{H}_x[A'], \quad A'(x) \equiv A(x) - \partial_x \chi(x). \quad (9)$$

The simplest example of $\hat{H}_x[A]$ may be $\hat{H}_x[A] = \hat{c}_x^\dagger [-\frac{1}{2m}(\partial_x + iA(x))^2 + U(x)] \hat{c}_x + \hat{H}_x^{\text{int}}$, or its lattice version, $\hat{H}_x[A] = t\hat{c}_{x+a}^\dagger e^{-i\int_x^{x+a} dz A(z)} \hat{c}_x + \text{h.c.} + \hat{H}_x^{\text{int}}$, where $U(x)$ is the single particle potential and $\hat{H}_x^{\text{int}}$ represents terms describing many-body interactions. In contrast, the BCS Hamiltonian, for example, is not qualified as $\hat{H}_x[A]$ as it lacks the required U(1) symmetry. In fact, several statements below do not hold in the Kitaev chain [20].

Let us consider a charge-neutral operator $\hat{O}[A]$ that commutes with $\hat{N}$. We assume the form $\hat{O}[A] = \int_0^L dx \hat{O}_x[A]$ where $\hat{O}_x[A]$ is local and transforms in the same way as Eq. (9). The operator $\hat{O}$ can be the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ itself, but it may also be, for example, the polarization operator $\hat{P} = \int_0^L dx x \hat{n}_x$ or the current operator.

We introduce the flux $\theta \equiv \int_0^L dx A(x)$ by choosing a position-independent vector potential $A(x) = \frac{\theta}{L}$. We denote the unique ground state of $\hat{H}[\frac{\theta}{L}]$ by $|\theta\rangle$. Our claim is that the θ -dependence of the expectation value

$$O(\theta) \equiv \langle \theta | \hat{O}[\frac{\theta}{L}] | \theta \rangle = \int_0^L dx \langle \theta | \hat{O}_x[\frac{\theta}{L}] | \theta \rangle \quad (10)$$

is suppressed for a large L by a factor $L^{3/2} e^{-\frac{L}{2\xi}}$. When $\hat{O} = \hat{H}$, the statement is the flatness of the ground state energy E_θ as a function of θ , which was numerically observed before, e.g., in Ref. [21]. Later we will also argue that the excitation gap is independent of θ in the limit of large L .

To prove the claim, let us define a function of x labeled by $y \in [0, L]$

$$\chi_y(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\theta}{L} x & (0 \leq x < y) \\ \frac{\theta}{L} (x - L) & (y \leq x < L), \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

and introduce the corresponding unitary operator $\hat{U}_{\chi_y} = e^{i \int_0^L dx \chi_y(x) \hat{n}_x}$. It induces the gauge transformation

$$A(x) = \frac{\theta}{L} \rightarrow A_y(x) \equiv \theta \delta(x - y). \quad (12)$$

In this gauge, the natural interpretation of θ is the U(1) phase of the twisted boundary condition at the boundary (or the ‘seam’) $x = y$.

The key observation is that, thanks to the assumed locality, $\hat{O}_x[A_y]$ is independent of θ and thus is identical to $\hat{O}_x[0]$ when y is out of the range of $\hat{O}_x$. For example, in the case of $\hat{O}_x[A] = t \hat{c}_{x+a}^\dagger e^{-i \int_x^{x+a} dz A(z)} \hat{c}_x$ whose range is a , $\hat{O}_x[A_y] = t \hat{c}_{x+a}^\dagger e^{-i \theta \int_x^{x+a} dz \delta(z-y)} \hat{c}_x = t \hat{c}_{x+a}^\dagger \hat{c}_x$ is independent of θ when $|x - y| > a$. It follows that the local terms of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_x[A_y]$ do not depend on θ either unless x is close enough to y .

Inserting $\hat{U}_{\chi_y}^\dagger \hat{U}_{\chi_y} = 1$ to the last expression in Eq. (10) and writing $|\theta_y\rangle \equiv \hat{U}_{\chi_y} |\theta\rangle$, we get

$$O(\theta) = \int_0^L dx \langle \theta_y | \hat{O}_x[A_y] | \theta_y \rangle. \quad (13)$$

Note that the value of y here is arbitrary and can be chosen depending on x . Thus we can freely set y to be far away from x so that $\hat{O}_x[A_y] = \hat{O}_x[0]$ [Fig. 1 (b)]. For example, take the opposite point of x on the ring with $|x - y| = \frac{L}{2}$. Then, it is intuitive that the twisted boundary condition $e^{i\theta}$ does not affect the expectation value $\langle \theta_y | \hat{O}_x[0] | \theta_y \rangle$ since $|\theta_y\rangle$ is the ground state of $\hat{H}[A_y]$ twisted only near y [22]. In fact, using Eq. (7)

for $h = \theta$, we can express $\partial_\theta O(\theta)$ in the form of F_1 :

$$- \int_0^L dx \left(\langle \theta_y | \delta \hat{O}_x[0] (\hat{H}[A_y] - E_\theta)^{-1} \delta \hat{J}[A_y] | \theta_y \rangle + \langle \theta_y | \delta \hat{J}[A_y] (\hat{H}[A_y] - E_\theta)^{-1} \delta \hat{O}_x[0] | \theta_y \rangle \right) \quad (14)$$

Here, $\hat{J}[A_y] \equiv \partial_\theta \hat{H}[A_y]$ is the local current operator at y . Therefore, one can apply Eq. (2) for $R = \frac{L}{2}$ to the integrand and get the desired bound.

IV. INSENSITIVITY OF BULK RESPONSES

Many response properties of quantum systems can be captured by the correlation function of the form

$$G_n(\theta) = \langle \theta | \delta \hat{O}[\frac{\theta}{L}] (\hat{H}[\frac{\theta}{L}] - E_\theta)^{-n} \delta \hat{O}'[\frac{\theta}{L}] | \theta \rangle. \quad (15)$$

For example, the *static* susceptibility, in general, takes the form $G_1(\theta)$ as in Eq. (8). As we discuss shortly, the correlation $G_2(\theta)$ is related to transport properties. Later in this paper we prove that the θ -dependence of $G_n(\theta)$ is also exponentially suppressed for a large system by a factor $L^{2+\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\frac{L}{4\xi}}$ with $\xi \equiv \xi_0 + \frac{4v}{\Delta}$. Before moving on to the proof, let us explain the topological aspect of the reason why this is an important problem to address.

According to Niu and Thouless [2], the pumped charge of a weakly time-dependent Hamiltonian over one cycle T is given by

$$\Delta Q(\theta) = i \int_0^T dt (\partial_t \langle \theta | \partial_\theta | \theta \rangle - \partial_\theta \langle \theta | \partial_t | \theta \rangle). \quad (16)$$

Here $|\theta\rangle$ is the ground state of the snapshot Hamiltonian $\hat{H}[\frac{\theta}{L}]$. Using Eq. (7) for $h = t$ and θ , one can express $\Delta Q(\theta)$ in terms of $G_2(\theta)$ with $\hat{O} = \partial_t \hat{H}$ and $\hat{O}' = \partial_\theta \hat{H} = \hat{J}$. Clearly, one needs an additional θ -integral to identify the combination in the right-hand side of Eq. (16) as a Chern number.

Similar problem arises in the discussion of the Hall conductance. Following Niu, Thouless, and Wu [3], we introduce the constant vector potential $\vec{A}(x, y) = (\frac{\theta_1}{L_1}, \frac{\theta_2}{L_2})$. For each $\vec{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2)$, we denote by $|\vec{\theta}\rangle$ the ground state of $\hat{H}[\frac{\theta_1}{L_1}, \frac{\theta_2}{L_2}]$. Then the Hall conductance in the unit of e^2/h is given by [3]

$$\sigma_{12}(\vec{\theta}) = i (\partial_{\theta_2} \langle \vec{\theta} | \partial_{\theta_1} | \vec{\theta} \rangle - \partial_{\theta_1} \langle \vec{\theta} | \partial_{\theta_2} | \vec{\theta} \rangle), \quad (17)$$

which can be written in the form of $G_2(\vec{\theta})$ with $\hat{O} = \partial_{\theta_2} \hat{H} = \hat{J}_2$ and $\hat{O}' = \partial_{\theta_1} \hat{H} = \hat{J}_1$. Again, one needs to show that $\sigma_{12}(\vec{\theta})$ is independent of $\vec{\theta}$ to justify averaging over all θ_i 's. However, in the appendix of Ref. [3], they proposed a wrong scaling $\partial_{\theta_1} \sigma_{12}(\vec{\theta}) \sim \frac{\xi}{L_1}$ rather than $(\frac{L_1}{\xi})^n e^{-\frac{L_1}{\xi}}$.

To summarize, the very fact that the θ -dependence of $\Delta Q(\theta)$ and $\sigma_{12}(\vec{\theta})$ are negligible is the key underlying their quantization. In particular, it implies that $\Delta Q(\theta)$ and $2\pi\sigma_{12}(\vec{\theta})$ are already quantized to an integer with

exponentially-small finite-size correction even without integrations by θ , which is consistent with the numerical studies in Refs. [23, 24]. However, the argument in the original works [2, 3] is not entirely satisfactory as explained above.

Our proof of the θ -independence of $G_n(\theta)$ proceeds in the same way as that for $O(\theta)$. Focusing on one dimension, we write $G_n(\theta)$ in terms of the integral of local operators and then insert $\hat{U}_{xy}^\dagger \hat{U}_{xy} = 1$:

$$G_n(\theta) = \int dx dx' \langle \theta_y | \delta \hat{O}_x[0] (\hat{H}[\frac{\theta}{L}] - E_\theta)^{-n} \delta \hat{O}_{x'}[0] | \theta_y \rangle. \quad (18)$$

We have chosen $y \in [0, L]$ to be out of the range of $\hat{O}_x, \hat{O}_{x'}$ as illustrated in Fig. 1 (b). In fact, for every $x, x' \in [0, L]$, we can always find y on the ring such that $|x - y| \geq \frac{L}{4}$ and $|x' - y| \geq \frac{L}{4}$. Again using Eq. (7), we can express $\partial_\theta G_n(\theta)$ in terms of $G_{m,\ell}$ and $G'_{m,\ell}$ with $m + \ell = n + 1$ (Appendix C). Thus one can use Eqs. (5) and (6) with $R' = \frac{L}{4}$ to get the stated bound.

V. EXCITATION ENERGY OF VARIATIONAL STATES

So far we have only investigated the ground state properties. Here let us discuss what we can say about excitations.

For a given operator $\hat{O}$, consider a variational state $|O\rangle = \delta \hat{O}|0\rangle$, which is orthogonal to the ground state by definition. Its energy expectation value measured from the ground state energy is given by

$$\Delta_O \equiv \frac{\langle O | \hat{H} | O \rangle}{\langle O | O \rangle} - E = \frac{\langle \delta \hat{O}^\dagger [\hat{H}, \delta \hat{O}] \rangle}{\langle \delta \hat{O}^\dagger \delta \hat{O} \rangle}. \quad (19)$$

First, let us assume the form $\hat{O} = \int d^d \vec{x} \hat{O}_{\vec{x}}$ with local operators $\hat{O}_{\vec{x}}$. We can in general expect that the denominator $\langle \delta \hat{O}^\dagger \delta \hat{O} \rangle = \int d^d \vec{x} d^d \vec{y} \langle \delta \hat{O}_{\vec{x}}^\dagger \delta \hat{O}_{\vec{y}} \rangle$ is proportional to the system size $V = L_1 L_2 \dots L_d$ because of the exponential decay of the correlation function. Similarly, in the numerator, $[\hat{H}, \delta \hat{O}]$ is also an integral of local terms owing to the locality of the Hamiltonian, meaning that Δ_O can be at most $O(V^0)$. In order to achieve higher energy states whose excitation energy grows as $O(V^\epsilon)$ with $\epsilon > 0$, one needs a non-local operation rather than simply superposing local perturbations. In fact, when $\hat{O} = \hat{O}_1 \hat{O}_2$ is a product of two well-separated local operators, we have $\Delta_O \simeq \Delta_{O_1} + \Delta_{O_2}$ and the correction decays exponentially with their distance. This implies that one can get a higher-energy state by creating many local excitations simultaneously.

Next, let us show that the excitation energy of locally excited states is almost independent of the flux θ . To this end, suppose that the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}[A]$ has a U(1) symmetry satisfying Eq. (9). Assume further that $\hat{O}[A] = \int d^d \vec{x} \hat{O}_{\vec{x}}[A]$ and local operators $\hat{O}_{\vec{x}}[A]$ obey the transformation rule in Eq. (9). We introduce a flux θ by setting $A(x) = \frac{\theta}{L}$ and construct a variational state $|O[\frac{\theta}{L}]\rangle = \delta \hat{O}[\frac{\theta}{L}]|\theta\rangle$. In this setting, the θ -dependence of the excitation energy $\Delta_{O[\frac{\theta}{L}]}$ is exponentially

small with the system size. To see this, observe that the last expression of Eq. (19) can be written in terms of the expectation value of local operators after expressing $\hat{O}[\frac{\theta}{L}]$ as the integral of local terms. Hence, the derivative $\partial_\theta \Delta_{O[\frac{\theta}{L}]}$ is bounded by F_1 in Eq. (2) with $R = \frac{L}{4}$.

The fact that the θ -dependence of the excitation energy $\Delta_{O[\frac{\theta}{L}]}$ is exponentially small suggests so is the true excitation gap Δ_θ . More precisely, Δ_θ denotes the gap to the first excited state $|1\rangle_\theta$ in the same sector of the conserved U(1) charge. We assume that there exists a local operator $\hat{O}_0$ such that the state $\hat{O}_0|0\rangle$ has a nonzero overlap with $|1\rangle$, i.e., $|\langle 1 | \hat{O}_0 | 0 \rangle|^2 = w > 0$. (The weight w can be proportional to $L^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha \geq 0$. The excitation energy $\Delta_{O'}$ can be much larger than Δ .) Then, by applying the energy filter [25], one can construct a local operator $\hat{O}$ such that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, (i) the excitation energy Δ_O satisfies $\Delta \leq \Delta_O \leq \Delta(1 + \epsilon) + \delta$, where $\delta = \frac{\tilde{C}}{w} (\tilde{R}/\xi_0)^\ell e^{-\epsilon \tilde{R}/\tilde{\xi}}$ is an exponentially small correction with some power ℓ and $\tilde{\xi} \equiv \frac{\sqrt{2}v}{\Delta} + \epsilon \xi_0$ and (ii) the support Ω of $\hat{O}$ is finite and includes the support of $\hat{O}_0$ inside. Here, $\tilde{R} = \text{dist}(\partial\Omega, \hat{O}_0)$ denotes the minimum distance between the boundary of Ω and the support of $\hat{O}$ [5, 25]. We reproduce the derivation in Appendix D.

Now, suppose that the gap becomes smaller $\Delta_{\theta_0} = \xi \Delta_0$ ($0 < \xi < 1$) at $\theta = \theta_0 \in (0, 2\pi)$ than the value Δ_0 at $\theta = 0$. By setting $\epsilon = \frac{1-\xi}{2}$ and $\tilde{R} = \frac{L}{2}$, for example, we can construct a local operator $\hat{O}[\frac{\theta_0}{L}]$ such that $\xi \Delta_0 \leq \Delta_{O[\frac{\theta_0}{L}]} \leq \frac{1+\xi}{2} \Delta_0 + \delta$. Since $\Delta_{O[\frac{\theta}{L}]}$ does not depend much on θ as proven above, it in turn implies that $\Delta_{O[0]}$ at $\theta = 0$ is bounded above by $\frac{1+\xi}{2} \Delta_0 + \delta + \delta'$ with another exponentially small correction δ' . We can make $\delta + \delta' < \frac{1-\xi}{2} \Delta_0$ for a sufficiently large L so that $\Delta_{O[0]} < \Delta_0$. This indicates the existence of an excitation with energy smaller than Δ_0 and hence contradicts with the definition of Δ_0 . Therefore, the excitation gap Δ can depend on θ at most by an exponentially small amount. This completes the proof of the higher-dimensional Lieb-Schultz-Mattis theorem in Ref. [7] with no assumption on the reality of the Hamiltonian unlike Refs. [13, 14].

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We demonstrated the θ -independence of static responses among other things. In fact, one can replace $\hat{H} - E$ in Eqs. (2)–(4) by $\hat{H} - E - \omega$ as long as $\omega < \Delta$, which simply gives the “effective gap” $\Delta - \omega$. Therefore, the dynamical susceptibility with a frequency lower than Δ can be covered by the method developed in this work.

The θ -dependence of the ground state energy is associated with the transport properties: the first derivative $\partial_\theta E_\theta$ represents the persistent current and the second derivative gives the Drude weight via the Kohn formula $D = \frac{\pi L^2}{V} \partial_\theta^2 E_\theta$ [26–28]. Our argument for expectation values and response properties proves that both of them are exponentially small with the system size in U(1) symmetric gapped phases.

In the derivation we assumed the uniqueness of the ground

state. However, similar statements should hold even when a finite (quasi-)degeneracy originates from spontaneous breaking of discrete symmetries or the presence of topological orders [5]. Let us denote by $\{|0_\alpha\rangle\}_{\alpha=1}^q$ the q -fold (quasi-)degenerate ground states. In general, off-diagonal matrix elements $\langle 0_\alpha|\hat{O}|0_\beta\rangle$ ($\alpha \neq \beta$) are expected to be exponentially small with the system size as long as the operator $\hat{O} = \sum_{\vec{x}} \hat{O}_{\vec{x}}$ is a sum (or integral) of local operators. They should be proportional to $e^{-\frac{L}{\xi^d}}$ in phases with discrete symmetry break-

ing and $e^{-\frac{L}{\xi}}$ for topologically ordered phases. Assuming this scaling, the degenerate case does not seem fundamentally different, but we will leave the concrete analysis to future work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

H. W. thanks Tohru Koma for fruitful discussions and for explaining Ref. [5] in detail. This work is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP17K17678.

-
- [1] D. J. Thouless, *Phys. Rev. B* **27**, 6083 (1983).
 - [2] Q. Niu and D. J. Thouless, *J. Phys. A* **17**, 2453 (1984).
 - [3] Q. Niu, D. J. Thouless, and Y.-S. Wu, *Phys. Rev. B* **31**, 3372 (1985).
 - [4] M. B. Hastings and S. Michalakis, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **334**, 433 (2015).
 - [5] T. Koma, [arXiv:1504.01243](#).
 - [6] S. Bachmann, A. Bols, W. De Roeck, and M. Fraas, [arXiv:1707.06491](#).
 - [7] M. Oshikawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1535 (2000).
 - [8] E. Lieb, T. Schultz, and D. Mattis, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **16**, 407 (1961).
 - [9] I. Affleck and E. H. Lieb, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **12**, 57 (1986).
 - [10] I. Affleck, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 5186 (1988).
 - [11] M. Oshikawa, M. Yamanaka, and I. Affleck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 1984 (1997).
 - [12] M. Yamanaka, M. Oshikawa, and I. Affleck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 1110 (1997).
 - [13] M. B. Hastings, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 104431 (2004).
 - [14] B. Nachtergaele and R. Sims, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **276**, 437 (2007).
 - [15] See *Condition LSM6* in Sec. 1.2 of Ref. [14] that corresponds to the footnote [19] in Ref [13].
 - [16] M. B. Hastings, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 140402 (2004).
 - [17] M. B. Hastings and T. Koma, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **265**, 781 (2006).
 - [18] E. H. Lieb and D. W. Robinson, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **28**, 251 (1972).
 - [19] M. B. Hastings, [arXiv:1008.5137](#).
 - [20] K. Kawabata, R. Kobayashi, N. Wu, and H. Katsura, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 195140 (2017).
 - [21] G. Misguich, C. Lhuillier, M. Mambrini, and P. Sindzingre, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **26**, 167 (2002).
 - [22] H. Watanabe, H. C. Po, A. Vishwanath, and M. P. Zaletel, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **112**, 14551 (2015).
 - [23] R. Li and M. Fleischhauer, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 085444 (2017).
 - [24] K. Kudo, H. Watanabe, T. Kariyado, and Y. Hatsugai, in preparation.
 - [25] J. Haegeman, S. Michalakis, B. Nachtergaele, T. J. Osborne, N. Schuch, and F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 080401 (2013).
 - [26] W. Kohn, *Phys. Rev.* **133**, A171 (1964).
 - [27] D. J. Scalapino, S. R. White, and S. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. B* **47**, 7995 (1993).
 - [28] M. Oshikawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 236401 (2003).

Appendix A: Bound of two-point correlation functions

In this appendix we prove the exponential decay of correlation functions in Eqs. (1) and (2) of the main text. The proof involves a few math formulas. For example, for $x \geq 0$, we have

$$0 \leq \int_0^x \frac{dy}{2\pi} \frac{e^y - 1}{y} < \frac{e^x}{x}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$0 < \text{erfc}(x) \equiv \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_x^\infty dy e^{-y^2} \leq e^{-x^2}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

We will also use

$$|\langle \hat{O} \hat{O}' \rangle| \leq \sqrt{\langle \hat{O} \hat{O}^\dagger \rangle \langle \hat{O}'^\dagger \hat{O}' \rangle} \leq \|\hat{O}\| \|\hat{O}'\|, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\langle \hat{O}^\dagger f(\hat{H}) \hat{O} \rangle \leq \langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{O} \rangle f(\Delta) \quad \text{for a positive and monotonically decreasing function } f(\mathcal{E}), \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{O} \hat{O}'(\tau) \rangle &= e^{-\alpha t^2} \left[\langle \hat{O} \hat{O}'(\tau) \rangle (e^{\alpha t^2} - e^{-\alpha \tau^2}) + \langle \hat{O} \hat{O}'(\tau) \rangle e^{-\alpha \tau^2} \right] \\ &= e^{-\alpha t^2} \left[\langle \hat{O} \hat{O}'(\tau) \rangle (e^{\alpha t^2} - e^{-\alpha \tau^2}) + \langle \hat{O}'(\tau) \hat{O} \rangle e^{-\alpha \tau^2} + \langle [\hat{O}, \hat{O}'(\tau)] \rangle e^{-\alpha \tau^2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Here, Eq. (A3) is the Schwartz inequality and Eq. (A5) follows just by the definition of the commutation relation.

The following mathematical identities are valid for arbitrary $\mathcal{E}, \alpha, t > 0$:

$$F_+(\mathcal{E}) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{e^{+i\mathcal{E}\tau}}{\tau - it} (e^{\alpha t^2} - e^{-\alpha \tau^2}) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi\alpha}} \int_0^\infty d\omega e^{+\omega t - \frac{(\mathcal{E}+\omega)^2}{4\alpha}} = \frac{1}{2} e^{\alpha t^2 - t\mathcal{E}} \text{erfc}\left(\frac{\mathcal{E} - 2\alpha t}{2\sqrt{\alpha}}\right) > 0, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$F_-(\mathcal{E}) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{e^{-i\mathcal{E}\tau}}{\tau - it} e^{-\alpha \tau^2} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi\alpha}} \int_0^\infty d\omega e^{-\omega t - \frac{(\mathcal{E}+\omega)^2}{4\alpha}} = \frac{1}{2} e^{\alpha t^2 + t\mathcal{E}} \text{erfc}\left(\frac{\mathcal{E} + 2\alpha t}{2\sqrt{\alpha}}\right) > 0. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Using the property Eq. (A2), we have

$$0 < F_\pm(\mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{E}^2}{4\alpha}} \quad \text{when} \quad 0 < t \leq \frac{\mathcal{E}}{2\alpha}. \quad (\text{A8})$$

Finally, the Lieb-Robinson bound will be used to derive an upper bound of commutation relations:

$$\|[\hat{O}, \hat{V}(t)]\| \leq C_{OV} e^{-\frac{R}{\xi_0}} (e^{\frac{v|t|}{\xi_0}} - 1). \quad (\text{A9})$$

Here, ξ_0 and v are constants, independent of the choice of $\hat{O}$ and $\hat{V}$.

1. Correlation function F_0

Let us start with $F_0 \equiv \langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{V} \rangle$. Instead of directly dealing with F_0 , here we evaluate

$$F_0(t) \equiv \langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{V}(it) \rangle = \langle \delta \hat{O} e^{-t(\hat{H}-E)} \delta \hat{V} \rangle. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Using the complex analysis, we can express $\langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{V}(it) \rangle$ in the form of the integral

$$F_0(t) = \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{V}(z) \rangle}{z - it} = \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-S}^S \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{V}(\tau) \rangle}{\tau - it} + \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\pi \frac{d\phi}{2\pi} S e^{i\phi} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{V}(S e^{i\phi}) \rangle}{S e^{i\phi} - it}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

The second integral in the right-hand side of Eq. (A11) vanishes in the limit of $S \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\int_0^\pi \frac{d\phi}{2\pi} \left| \frac{\langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{V}(S e^{i\phi}) \rangle}{1 - i e^{-i\phi} t/S} \right| \leq \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| \int_0^\pi \frac{d\phi}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-S\Delta \sin \phi}}{\sqrt{(1 - \frac{t}{S} \sin \phi)^2 + (\frac{t}{S} \cos \phi)^2}} \leq \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| \frac{1 - e^{-S\Delta}}{2(S-t)\Delta} \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A12})$$

We used Eqs. (A3) and (A4) in the first step.

The remaining integral in Eq. (A11) can be split into four using Eq. (A5):

$$F_0(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{V}(\tau) \rangle}{\tau - it} = e^{-\alpha t^2} (I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4), \quad (\text{A13})$$

where

$$I_1 \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{V}(\tau) \rangle}{\tau - it} (e^{\alpha t^2} - e^{-\alpha \tau^2}), \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$I_2 \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{V}(\tau) \delta \hat{O} \rangle}{\tau - it} e^{-\alpha \tau^2}, \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$I_3 \equiv \int_{|\tau|>T} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle [\hat{O}, \hat{V}(\tau)] \rangle}{\tau - it} e^{-\alpha \tau^2}, \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$I_4 \equiv \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle [\hat{O}, \hat{V}(\tau)] \rangle}{\tau - it} e^{-\alpha \tau^2}. \quad (\text{A17})$$

The parameters T and α are chosen as

$$T \equiv \frac{2R}{\xi \Delta}, \quad \alpha \equiv \frac{\Delta^2 \xi}{4R}, \quad R \equiv \text{dist}(\hat{O}, \hat{V}), \quad (\text{A18})$$

so that $\frac{\Delta^2}{4\alpha} = \alpha T^2 = \frac{R}{\xi} \gg 1$.

Integrals I_1 and I_2 can be performed with the help of the identities in Eq. (A6) and (A7):

$$I_1 = \langle \delta \hat{O} F_+(\hat{H} - E) \delta \hat{V} \rangle, \quad (\text{A19})$$

$$I_2 = \langle \delta \hat{V} F_-(\hat{H} - E) \delta \hat{O} \rangle. \quad (\text{A20})$$

Then, assuming $0 < t \leq \frac{\Delta}{2\alpha}$ and using Eqs. (A3) and (A4), we get

$$|I_1| \leq \sqrt{\langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{O}^\dagger \rangle \langle \delta \hat{V}^\dagger F_+(\hat{H} - E)^2 \delta \hat{V} \rangle} \leq \sqrt{\langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{O}^\dagger \rangle \langle \delta \hat{V}^\dagger e^{-\frac{(\hat{H}-E)^2}{2\alpha}} \delta \hat{V} \rangle} \leq \frac{\|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\|}{2} e^{-\frac{\Delta^2}{4\alpha}}, \quad (\text{A21})$$

$$|I_2| \leq \sqrt{\langle \delta \hat{V} \delta \hat{V}^\dagger \rangle \langle \delta \hat{O}^\dagger F_-(\hat{H} - E)^2 \delta \hat{O} \rangle} \leq \sqrt{\langle \delta \hat{V} \delta \hat{V}^\dagger \rangle \langle \delta \hat{O}^\dagger e^{-\frac{(\hat{H}-E)^2}{2\alpha}} \delta \hat{O} \rangle} \leq \frac{\|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\|}{2} e^{-\frac{\Delta^2}{4\alpha}}. \quad (\text{A22})$$

The integral I_3 can be bounded by Eqs. (A3) and (A2):

$$|I_3| \leq \int_{|\tau|>T} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi} \frac{|\langle [\delta \hat{O}, \delta \hat{V}(\tau)] \rangle|}{\sqrt{\tau^2 + t^2}} e^{-\alpha \tau^2} \leq 4 \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| \int_T^\infty \frac{d\tau}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-\alpha \tau^2}}{T} \leq \frac{\|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\|}{\sqrt{\pi \alpha T^2}} e^{-\alpha T^2}. \quad (\text{A23})$$

Finally, the integral I_4 can be bounded by Lieb-Robinson bound Eq. (A9) and the inequality in Eq. (A1):

$$|I_4| \leq \int_{|\tau|<T} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi} \frac{|\langle [\hat{O}, \hat{V}(\tau)] \rangle|}{\sqrt{\tau^2 + t^2}} e^{-\alpha \tau^2} \leq 2C_{OV} e^{-\frac{R}{\xi_0}} \int_0^T \frac{d\tau}{2\pi} \frac{e^{\frac{v\tau}{\xi_0}} - 1}{\tau} \leq 2C_{OV} \frac{e^{\frac{vT-R}{\xi_0}}}{\frac{vT}{\xi_0}} = \frac{\xi_0 \Delta}{v} \frac{C_{OV}}{R/\xi} e^{-\frac{\xi - 2v}{\xi_0} \frac{R}{\xi}}, \quad (\text{A24})$$

All in all, when $\frac{2R}{\xi} \geq t\Delta > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |F_0(t)| &\leq e^{-\alpha t^2} (|I_1| + |I_2| + |I_3| + |I_4|) \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{4\xi}{R}(t\Delta)^2} \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| \left(e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi R/\xi}} e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}} + \frac{\xi_0 \Delta}{v} \frac{C_{OV}}{\|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| R/\xi} e^{-\frac{\xi - 2v}{\xi_0} \frac{R}{\xi}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A25})$$

If we set $\xi = \xi_0 + \frac{2v}{\Delta}$, all terms have a factor $e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}}$. When $t\Delta \geq \frac{2R}{\xi}$, we can directly evaluate $F_0(t)$ in Eq. (A10) using Eqs. (A3) and (A4). At the end, we have

$$|F_0(t)| \leq \begin{cases} \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi R/\xi}} + \frac{2\xi_0}{\xi - \xi_0} \frac{C_{OV}}{\|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| R/\xi} \right) e^{-\frac{4\xi}{R}(t\Delta)^2} e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}} & \left(\frac{2R}{\xi} \geq t\Delta > 0 \right) \\ \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| e^{-\frac{2R}{\xi}} & \left(t\Delta \geq \frac{2R}{\xi} \right). \end{cases} \quad (\text{A26})$$

The equal-time correlation $F_0 = \langle \delta \hat{O} \delta \hat{V} \rangle$ is the limit of $t \rightarrow +0$.

2. Correlation function F_n

Next let us discuss the correlation function with $(\hat{H} - E)^{-n}$:

$$F_n \equiv \langle \delta \hat{O} \frac{1}{(\hat{H} - E)^n} \delta \hat{V} \rangle = \int_0^\infty dt \frac{t^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \langle \delta \hat{O} e^{-t(\hat{H}-E)} \delta \hat{V} \rangle = \int_0^\infty dt \frac{t^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} F_0(t) = I_4 + I_5, \quad (\text{A27})$$

$$I_4 \equiv \int_T^\infty dt \frac{t^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \langle \delta \hat{O} e^{-t(\hat{H}-E)} \delta \hat{V} \rangle, \quad (\text{A28})$$

$$I_5 \equiv \int_0^T dt \frac{t^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} f_0(t). \quad (\text{A29})$$

The integral I_4 can be estimated by Eqs. (A3) and (A4):

$$|I_4| \leq \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| \int_T^\infty dt \frac{t^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-t\Delta} = \frac{\|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\|}{\Delta^n} \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \frac{(T\Delta)^m}{m!} e^{-T\Delta} = \frac{\|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\|}{\Delta^n} \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{m!} \left(\frac{2R}{\xi} \right)^m e^{-\frac{2R}{\xi}} \quad (\text{A30})$$

For the integral I_5 , we can use the first line of Eq. (A26). Writing $c_n \equiv \int_0^\infty dx \frac{x^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-x^2}$, we have $\int_0^T dt \frac{t^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-\frac{4\xi}{R}(t\Delta)^2} \leq \frac{c_n}{\Delta^n} \left(\frac{4R}{\xi} \right)^{n/2}$ and

$$|I_5| \leq \frac{c_n}{\Delta^n} \left(\frac{4R}{\xi} \right)^{n/2} \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi R/\xi}} + \frac{2\xi_0}{\xi - \xi_0} \frac{C_{OV}}{\|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{V}\| R/\xi} \right) e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}}. \quad (\text{A31})$$

Therefore, $|F_n| \leq |I_4| + |I_5|$ is exponentially suppressed. For a sufficiently large $R/\xi \gg 1$, the dominant contribution to F_n comes from the first term in $|I_5|$.

Appendix B: Three point correlation functions

Here we derive the bound in Eqs. (5) and (6) in the main text. To this end, we evaluate the correlation function of the following form:

$$G(s, t) \equiv \langle \delta \hat{a} e^{-s(\hat{H}-E)} \delta \hat{b} e^{-t(\hat{H}-E)} \delta \hat{c} \rangle = \langle \delta \hat{a} e^{-s(\hat{H}-E)} \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(it) \rangle. \quad (\text{B1})$$

for $s, t \in (0, T)$ with $T = \frac{2R}{\xi\Delta}$. Later we will set “ $\hat{a} = \hat{V}$, $\hat{b} = \hat{O}$, and $\hat{c} = \hat{O}'$ ” or “ $\hat{a} = \hat{O}$, $\hat{b} = \hat{V}$, and $\hat{c} = \hat{O}'$ ” with $R \equiv \min(\text{dist}(\hat{O}, \hat{V}), \text{dist}(\hat{O}', \hat{V})) \gg \xi$. Once $|G(s, t)|$ is bounded, then the correlation functions in Eqs. (3) and (4) in the main text can be evaluated by performing the integral $\int ds s^{m-1} \int dt t^{n-1} G(s, t)$ as we did in Sec. A 2.

As before, we split the integral into those pieces which we know how to estimate:

$$G(s, t) = \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{a} e^{-s(\hat{H}-E)} \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(\tau) \rangle}{\tau - it} = e^{-\alpha t^2} (I_1 + I_2 + I_3), \quad (\text{B2})$$

where $\alpha = \frac{\Delta^2 \xi}{4R}$ and

$$I_1 \equiv \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{a} e^{-s(\hat{H}-E)} \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(\tau) \rangle}{\tau - it} (e^{\alpha t^2} - e^{-\alpha \tau^2}), \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$I_2 \equiv \int_{|\tau| > T} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{a} e^{-s(\hat{H}-E)} \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(\tau) \rangle}{\tau - it} e^{-\alpha \tau^2}, \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\equiv \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{a} e^{-s(\hat{H}-E)} \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(\tau) \rangle}{\tau - it} e^{-\alpha \tau^2} = \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{e^{-\alpha \tau^2}}{\tau - it} \langle \delta \hat{a}(-is) \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(\tau) \rangle \\ &= \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{e^{-\alpha \tau^2}}{\tau - it} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{a}(\sigma) \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(\tau) \rangle}{\sigma + is} \\ &= \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{e^{-\alpha \tau^2}}{\tau - it} e^{-\alpha s^2} (I_{31} + I_{32} + I_{33} + I_{34}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B5})$$

and

$$I_{31} \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{a}(\sigma) \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(\tau) \rangle}{\sigma + is} (e^{\alpha s^2} - e^{-\alpha \sigma^2}), \quad (\text{B6})$$

$$I_{32} \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(\tau) \delta \hat{a}(\sigma) \rangle}{\sigma + is} e^{-\alpha \sigma^2}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

$$I_{33} \equiv \int_{|\tau|>T} \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle [\delta \hat{a}(\sigma), \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(\tau)] \rangle}{\sigma + is} e^{-\alpha \sigma^2}, \quad (\text{B8})$$

$$I_{34} \equiv \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle [\delta \hat{a}(\sigma), \delta \hat{b} \delta \hat{c}(\tau)] \rangle}{\sigma + is} e^{-\alpha \sigma^2}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

In the same way as Eqs. (A21) and (A22), we have

$$|I_1|, |I_{31}|, |I_{32}| \leq \frac{\|\delta \hat{a}\| \|\delta \hat{b}\| \|\delta \hat{c}\|}{2} e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}}. \quad (\text{B10})$$

Following Eq. (A23), we get

$$|I_2|, |I_{33}| \leq \frac{\|\delta \hat{a}\| \|\delta \hat{b}\| \|\delta \hat{c}\|}{\sqrt{\pi R/\xi}} e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}}. \quad (\text{B11})$$

Therefore it remains to estimate I_{34} :

$$I_{34} = \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{b} [\hat{a}(\sigma), \hat{c}(\tau)] \rangle + \langle [\hat{a}(\sigma), \hat{b}] \delta \hat{c}(\tau) \rangle}{\sigma + is} e^{-\alpha \sigma^2}. \quad (\text{B12})$$

1. When $\hat{a} = \hat{V}$, $\hat{b} = \hat{O}$, and $\hat{c} = \hat{O}'$

In this case we can simply apply the Lieb-Robinson bound Eq. (A9):

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{34}| &\leq \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-\alpha \sigma^2}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + s^2}} (|\langle \delta \hat{O} [\hat{V}(\sigma), \hat{O}'(\tau)] \rangle| + |\langle [\hat{V}(\sigma), \hat{O}] \delta \hat{O}'(\tau) \rangle|) \\ &\leq \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-\alpha \sigma^2}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + s^2}} (\|\delta \hat{O}\| C_{VO'} e^{\frac{v(|\sigma|+|\tau|)-|\vec{x}_c-\vec{x}_a|}{\xi_0}} + \|\delta \hat{O}'\| C_{VO} e^{\frac{v|\tau|-|\vec{x}_b-\vec{x}_a|}{\xi_0}}) \\ &\leq \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-\alpha \sigma^2}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + s^2}} (\|\delta \hat{O}\| C_{VO'} + \|\delta \hat{O}'\| C_{VO}) e^{\frac{2vT-R}{\xi_0}} \\ &\leq F(s) (\|\delta \hat{O}\| C_{VO'} + \|\delta \hat{O}'\| C_{VO}) e^{\frac{2vT-R}{\xi_0}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B13})$$

where

$$F(x) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dy}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-\alpha y^2}}{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}. \quad (\text{B14})$$

Collecting all terms and setting $\xi' = \xi_0 + \frac{4v}{\Delta}$, we get

$$\frac{|G(s, t)|}{\|\delta \hat{V}\| \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{O}'\|} \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi R/\xi}} \right) e^{-\alpha t^2 - \frac{R}{\xi}} + F(t) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi R/\xi}} + F(s) \frac{\|\delta \hat{O}\| C_{VO'} + \|\delta \hat{O}'\| C_{VO}}{\|\delta \hat{V}\| \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{O}'\|} \right) e^{-\alpha(s^2+t^2) - \frac{R}{\xi}}. \quad (\text{B15})$$

The function $F(x)$ itself may diverge at $x = 0$, but it only appears in the following integral at the end:

$$\int_0^{\infty} dx \frac{x^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-\alpha x^2} F(x) = \int_0^{\infty} dx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dy}{2\pi} \frac{x^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \frac{e^{-\alpha(x^2+y^2)}}{\sqrt{x^2+y^2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\infty} dr \frac{r^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-\alpha r^2} = \frac{c_n}{2\alpha^{n/2}}. \quad (\text{B16})$$

2. When $\hat{a} = \hat{O}$, $\hat{b} = \hat{V}$, and $\hat{c} = \hat{O}'$

This case requires a new relation:

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \delta \hat{O}(\sigma_1) \delta \hat{O}'(\sigma_2) \delta \hat{V} \rangle| &\leq \|\delta \hat{V}\| \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{O}'\| \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi R/\xi}} + \frac{\|\delta \hat{O}\|_{C_{O',[H,V]}} + \|\delta \hat{O}'\|_{C_{O,[H,V]}}}{\|\delta \hat{V}\| \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{O}'\| \Delta} \sqrt{\frac{R}{\pi \xi}} \right) e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}} \\ &\equiv B(R/\xi) e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B17})$$

for $|\sigma_1|, |\sigma_2| \leq T$. Given this, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{34}| &\leq \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-\alpha\sigma^2}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + s^2}} (|\langle \delta \hat{V} [\hat{O}(\sigma), \hat{O}'(\tau)] \rangle| + |\langle [\hat{O}(\sigma), \hat{V}] \delta \hat{O}'(\tau) \rangle|) \\ &\leq \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\sigma}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-\alpha\sigma^2}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + s^2}} \left[2B(R/\xi) e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}} + \|\delta \hat{O}'\|_{C_{OV}} e^{\frac{vT-R}{\xi_0}} \right] \\ &\leq F(s) \left[2B(R/\xi) + \|\delta \hat{O}'\|_{C_{OV}} \right] e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B18})$$

The bound Eq. (B17) can be verified in the following way. Again using Eq. (A5), we have

$$\langle \delta \hat{O}(\sigma_1) \delta \hat{O}'(\sigma_2) \delta \hat{V} \rangle = \lim_{t \rightarrow +0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{O}(\sigma_1) \delta \hat{O}'(\sigma_2) \delta \hat{V}(\tau) \rangle}{\tau - it} = I'_1 + I'_2 + I'_3 + I'_4, \quad (\text{B19})$$

where

$$I'_1 = \lim_{t \rightarrow +0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{O}(\sigma_1) \delta \hat{O}'(\sigma_2) \delta \hat{V}(\tau) \rangle}{\tau - it} (e^{\alpha t^2} - e^{-\alpha \tau^2}), \quad (\text{B20})$$

$$I'_2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow +0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle \delta \hat{V}(\tau) \delta \hat{O}(\sigma_1) \delta \hat{O}'(\sigma_2) \rangle}{\tau - it} e^{-\alpha \tau^2}, \quad (\text{B21})$$

$$I'_3 = \lim_{t \rightarrow +0} \int_{|\tau| > T} \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle [\delta \hat{O}(\sigma_1) \delta \hat{O}'(\sigma_2), \delta \hat{V}(\tau)] \rangle}{\tau - it} e^{-\alpha \tau^2}, \quad (\text{B22})$$

$$I'_4 = \lim_{t \rightarrow +0} \int_{-T}^T \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{\langle [\delta \hat{O}(\sigma_1) \delta \hat{O}'(\sigma_2), \delta \hat{V}(\tau)] \rangle}{\tau - it} e^{-\alpha \tau^2} = \int_0^T \frac{d\tau}{2\pi i} \frac{e^{-\alpha \tau^2}}{\tau} \int_{-\tau}^{\tau} du \langle [\delta \hat{O}(\sigma_1) \delta \hat{O}'(\sigma_2), \partial_u \hat{V}(u)] \rangle. \quad (\text{B23})$$

I'_1, I'_2, I'_3 can be bounded in the same way as in Eqs. (A21), (A22) and (A23):

$$|I_1|, |I_2| \leq \frac{\|\delta \hat{V}\| \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{O}'\|}{2} e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}}, \quad |I_3| \leq \frac{\|\delta \hat{V}\| \|\delta \hat{O}\| \|\delta \hat{O}'\|}{\sqrt{\pi R/\xi}} e^{-\frac{R}{\xi}}. \quad (\text{B24})$$

For I'_4 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I'_4| &\leq \int_0^T \frac{d\tau}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-\alpha \tau^2}}{\tau} \int_{-\tau}^{\tau} du (|\langle \delta \hat{O}(\sigma_1) [\hat{O}'(\sigma_2), [\hat{H}, \hat{V}(u)]] \rangle| + |\langle [\hat{O}(\sigma_1), [\hat{H}, \hat{V}(u)]] \delta \hat{O}'(\sigma_2) \rangle|) \\ &\leq \int_0^T \frac{d\tau}{2\pi} \frac{e^{-\alpha \tau^2}}{\tau} \int_{-\tau}^{\tau} du (\|\delta \hat{O}\|_{C_{O',[H,V]}} + \|\delta \hat{O}'\|_{C_{O,[H,V]}}) e^{\frac{2vT-R}{\xi_0}} \\ &= \frac{\|\delta \hat{O}\|_{C_{O',[H,O]}} + \|\delta \hat{O}'\|_{C_{O,[H,V]}}}{\Delta} \sqrt{\frac{R}{\pi \xi}} e^{\frac{2vT-R}{\xi_0}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B25})$$

In the derivation, we used the Lieb-Robinson bound Eq. (A9) and $|u - \sigma_i| \leq 2T$.

Appendix C: The expression for $\partial_\theta G_n(\theta)$

Here we provide the explicit equation for $\partial_\theta G_n(\theta)$, where $G_n(\theta)$ is given in Eq. (18) in the main text.

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\theta G_n(\theta) = & - \int_0^L dx \int_0^L dx' \left(\sum_{m=1}^n \langle \theta_y | \delta \hat{O}_x[0] \frac{1}{(\hat{H}[A_y] - E_\theta)^m} \delta \hat{J}[A_y] \frac{1}{(\hat{H}[A_y] - E_\theta)^{n-m+1}} \delta \hat{O}'_{x'}[0] | \theta_z \rangle \right. \\ & + \langle \theta_y | \delta \hat{O}_x[0] \frac{1}{(\hat{H}[A_y] - E_\theta)^n} \delta \hat{O}'_{x'}[0] \frac{1}{\hat{H}[A_y] - E_\theta} \delta \hat{J}[A_y] | \theta_y \rangle \\ & \left. + \langle \theta_y | \delta \hat{J}[A_z] \frac{1}{\hat{H}[A_y] - E_\theta} \delta \hat{O}_x[0] \frac{1}{(\hat{H}[A_y] - E_\theta)^n} \delta \hat{O}'_{x'}[0] | \theta_y \rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (C1)$$

Appendix D: Construction of the local operator approximately creating $|1\rangle$

Here we discuss the construction of $\hat{O}$ starting from $\hat{O}_0$ defined in the main text. Let $|1\rangle$ be the first excited state with the energy $\Delta = E_1 - E_0$. Suppose that the state $\hat{O}_0|0\rangle$ has a nonzero overlap with $|1\rangle$, i.e., $|\langle 1 | \hat{O}_0 | 0 \rangle|^2 = w > 0$. In order to extract only the $|1\rangle$ -component, let us apply the energy filter

$$\hat{O} = \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt \hat{O}_0(t) e^{-it\Delta - \beta t^2} = \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt e^{it\hat{H}} \hat{O}_0 e^{-it(\hat{H} + \Delta) - \beta t^2}. \quad (D1)$$

with $\beta = \epsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^2 \xi_\epsilon}{2R}$. Let us define two projection operators $\hat{Q}_{\text{low}}$ and $\hat{Q}_{\text{high}}$ onto energy windows $E_{\text{low}} \in [E_1, E_1 + \epsilon\Delta]$ and $E_{\text{high}} \in (E_1 + \epsilon\Delta, +\infty)$, respectively. We have

$$\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{high}} \hat{O} \rangle = \langle \hat{O}_0^\dagger e^{-\frac{1}{4\beta}(\hat{H} - E_1)^2} \hat{Q}_{\text{high}} e^{-\frac{1}{4\beta}(\hat{H} - E_1)^2} \hat{O}_0 \rangle \leq \|\hat{O}_0\|^2 e^{-\epsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^2}{2\beta}} = \|\hat{O}_0\|^2 e^{-\frac{R}{\xi_\epsilon}}, \quad (D2)$$

$$\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{low}} \hat{O} \rangle \geq \langle \hat{O}^\dagger | 1 \rangle \langle 1 | \hat{O} \rangle = \langle \hat{O}_0^\dagger | 1 \rangle \langle 1 | \hat{O}_0 \rangle = w. \quad (D3)$$

Next, we want to approximate $\hat{O}$ by a local operator

$$\hat{O} = \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\pi}} \int_{-S}^{+S} dt e^{it\hat{H}_\Omega} \hat{O}_0 e^{-it(\hat{H}_\Omega + \Delta) - \beta t^2}. \quad (D4)$$

Here, Ω is a region including the support of $\hat{O}_0$, and $\hat{H}_\Omega$ denotes the Hamiltonian restricted onto the region. Let us denote by R the distance between $\partial\Omega$ and the support of $\hat{O}_0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{O} - \hat{O} &= \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\pi}} \int_{|t|>S} dt e^{it\hat{H}} \hat{O}_0 e^{-it(\hat{H} + \Delta) - \beta t^2} + \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\pi}} \int_{-S}^S dt \int_0^t ds \frac{d}{ds} (e^{is\hat{H} + i(t-s)\hat{H}_\Omega} \hat{O}_0 e^{-i(t-s)\hat{H}_\Omega - is\hat{H} - it\Delta - \beta t^2}) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\pi}} \int_{|t|>S} dt e^{it\hat{H}} \hat{O}_0 e^{-it(\hat{H} + \Delta) - \beta t^2} + \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\pi}} \int_{-S}^S dt \int_0^t ds e^{is\hat{H}} [\hat{H} - \hat{H}_\Omega, e^{i(t-s)\hat{H}_\Omega} \hat{O}_0 e^{-i(t-s)\hat{H}_\Omega}] e^{-is\hat{H} - it\Delta - \beta t^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (D5)$$

Using the Lieb-Robinson bound and setting $S = \frac{\sqrt{2}R}{\epsilon\xi_\epsilon\Delta}$, $\beta = \epsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^2 \xi_\epsilon}{2R}$, $\xi_\epsilon = \xi_0 + \frac{\sqrt{2}v}{\epsilon\Delta}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{O} - \hat{O}\| &\leq \|\hat{O}_0\| \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\pi}} \int_{|t|>S} dt e^{-\beta t^2} + C_{H_{\partial\Omega}O_0} S e^{\frac{vS-R}{\xi_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\pi}} \int_{-S}^{+S} dt e^{-\beta t^2} \leq \|\hat{O}_0\| e^{-\beta S^2} + C_{H_{\partial\Omega}O_0} S e^{\frac{vS-R}{\xi_0}} \\ &\leq \left(\|\hat{O}_0\| + C_{H_{\partial\Omega}O_0} \frac{\sqrt{2}R}{\epsilon\Delta\xi_\epsilon} \right) e^{-\frac{R}{\xi_\epsilon}}. \end{aligned} \quad (D6)$$

Using

$$\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{high}} [\hat{H}, \hat{O}] \rangle \leq \sqrt{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{high}} \hat{O} \rangle \langle [\hat{H}_{\partial\Omega}, \hat{O}]^\dagger [\hat{H}_{\partial\Omega}, \hat{O}] \rangle} \leq 2 \|\hat{H}_{\partial\Omega}\| \|\hat{O}_0\| \sqrt{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{high}} \hat{O} \rangle}, \quad (D7)$$

$$\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{low}} [\hat{H}, \hat{O}] \rangle \leq \langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{low}} \hat{O} \rangle (1 + \epsilon)\Delta, \quad (D8)$$

and

$$\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q} \hat{O} \rangle = \langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q} \hat{O} \rangle + \langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q} (\hat{O} - \hat{O}) \rangle + \langle (\hat{O} - \hat{O})^\dagger \hat{Q} \hat{O} \rangle, \quad (D9)$$

$$\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q} \hat{O} \rangle - 2 \|\hat{O}_0\| \|\hat{O} - \hat{O}\| = \langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q} \hat{O} \rangle \leq \langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q} \hat{O} \rangle + 2 \|\hat{O}_0\| \|\hat{O} - \hat{O}\|, \quad (D10)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}[\hat{H}, \hat{O}] \rangle}{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q} \hat{O} \rangle} &= \frac{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{low}}[\hat{H}, \hat{O}] \rangle + \langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{high}}[\hat{H}, \hat{O}] \rangle}{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{low}} \hat{O} \rangle + \langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{high}} \hat{O} \rangle} \\
&\leq \frac{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{low}} \hat{O} \rangle (1 + \epsilon) \Delta + 2 \|\hat{H}_{\partial\Omega}\| \|\hat{O}_0\| \sqrt{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{high}} \hat{O} \rangle}}{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{low}} \hat{O} \rangle} \\
&\leq (1 + \epsilon) \Delta + 2 \|\hat{H}_{\partial\Omega}\| \|\hat{O}_0\| \frac{\sqrt{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{high}} \hat{O} \rangle + 2 \|\hat{O}_0\| \|\hat{O} - \hat{O}_0\|}}{\langle \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{Q}_{\text{low}} \hat{O} \rangle - 2 \|\hat{O}_0\| \|\hat{O} - \hat{O}_0\|} \\
&\leq (1 + \epsilon) \Delta + 2 \|\hat{H}_{\partial\Omega}\| e^{-\frac{R}{2\xi_\epsilon}} \frac{\sqrt{\|\hat{O}_0\| + 2 \left(\|\hat{O}_0\| + C_{H_{\partial\Omega} O_0} \frac{\sqrt{2}R}{\epsilon \xi_\epsilon \Delta} \right)}}{w - 2 \left(\|\hat{O}_0\| + L_{H_{\partial\Omega} a_0} \frac{\sqrt{2}R}{\epsilon \xi_\epsilon \Delta} \right)} e^{-\frac{R}{\xi_\epsilon}}. \tag{D11}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\hat{O}$ has the property stated in the main text.