

Quantum operator growth bounds for kicked tops and semiclassical spin chains

Chao Yin^{1,*} and Andrew Lucas^{1,†}

¹*Department of Physics and Center for Theory of Quantum Matter,
University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, USA*

(Dated: October 15, 2020)

We prove bounds on infinite temperature out-of-time-ordered correlation functions in semiclassical spin models, where each site contains a large- S spin degree of freedom. Focusing on the dynamics of a single spin, we prove the finiteness of the Lyapunov exponent in the large- S limit, and numerically find our upper bound on Lyapunov exponents can be within an order of magnitude of numerically computed values in classical and quantum kicked top models. Generalizing our results to coupled large- S spins on lattices, we prove that the butterfly velocity, which characterizes the spatial speed of quantum information scrambling, is finite as $S \rightarrow \infty$. Our work demonstrates how to derive rigorous constraints on quantum dynamics in a large class of models where conventional Lieb-Robinson bounds are not useful. We emphasize qualitative differences between semiclassical large-spin models, and quantum holographic systems including the Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev model.

Introduction.— Quantum systems with a natural semiclassical limit are the canonical setting for understanding quantum chaos, and its connections with classical physics [1–6]. Several years ago, this subject was revived by the study of out-of-time-ordered correlators (OTOC) in *many-body* systems [7–13]. These OTOCs grow exponentially in various large- N quantum systems with non-local interactions, mimicking the rapid deviation of trajectories in a classically chaotic system:

$$-\langle [\mathcal{O}_1(t), \mathcal{O}_2]^2 \rangle \sim N^{-1} e^{\lambda t}. \quad (1)$$

Here $\mathcal{O}_{1,2}$ correspond to “small” local operators. This exponential growth of OTOCs can, in some circumstances, be deeply related to holographic quantum gravity [14–19]: the growth of an “operator size distribution” has been conjectured to probe the emergent holographic dimension of quantum gravity.

Motivated by this holographic connection, a significant literature has arisen [20–28], aiming to construct experimentally simulatable models of many-body quantum chaos and quantum gravity. Some of this theoretical literature focuses on large- S spin models [29, 30], because the $1/S$ expansion behaves much like the \hbar expansion [1], and so classically chaotic Hamiltonian systems should become quantum chaotic ones. However, it is, as of yet, unclear how operators grow in such models, and even whether questions of operator growth are well defined, let alone related to quantum gravity.

In this letter, we present the necessary mathematical framework to make precise statements about operator growth and OTOC dynamics in large- S spin models. We provide a natural definition of operator size and operator growth in such a model, despite the lack of a genuinely many-body Hilbert space. We then use recently developed “operator quantum walk” methods [31–34] to prove that the growth exponent λ of the OTOC does

not depend on S . In large- S spin chains and lattices, a straightforward generalization of our framework proves that the butterfly velocity v_B , characterizing the spatial growth of the OTOC, is also independent of S .

The Lieb-Robinson theorem [35, 36] has long been the canonical method of choice for proving locality and constraining quantum information dynamics. However, the large local Hilbert space dimension of the large- S models renders these methods ineffective: for example, they predict $v_B \leq O(S)$. Our methods overcome this limitation and provide rather strong constraints on quantum information propagation. For example, our universal bounds on λ are within an order of magnitude of numerically calculated exponents in semiclassical kicked top models.

Our framework also gives a more rigorous perspective on subtle, but important, differences in OTOC growth and scrambling between many-body chaotic models with and without a semiclassical limit. While in a holographic model the operators which grow rapidly and dominate the OTOC are exponentially rare (among large operators) [31], typical operators in semiclassical models can grow rapidly. Our techniques thus help provide sharp constraints on which experimentally realizable models genuinely mimic scrambling in quantum holographic models, and which ones do not.

Results.— We now introduce the models of interest. Let the spin operators for a spin- S degree of freedom be $\mathbf{S} = (S^x, S^y, S^z) = (X, Y, Z)$, namely $[S^\alpha, S^\beta] = i\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} S^\gamma$, $\mathbf{S}^2 = \sum_\alpha (S^\alpha)^2 = S(S+1)$. We first consider a general time-dependent Hamiltonian

$$H(t) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} h(\mathbf{n}; t) S^{1-n_x-n_y-n_z} X^{n_x} Y^{n_y} Z^{n_z}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{n} \equiv (n_x, n_y, n_z)$. The terms are normalized by powers of S to have a well-defined semiclassical limit, while $h(\mathbf{n}; t)$ is independent of S . We define a canonical infinite temperature OTOC for an initial operator \mathcal{O} :

$$F(\mathcal{O}(t)) = -\frac{1}{2S+1} \sum_{\alpha} \text{tr}[S^\alpha, \mathcal{O}(t)]^2, \quad (3)$$

* chao.yin@colorado.edu

† andrew.j.lucas@colorado.edu

which can grow exponentially in a chaotic model: $F(\mathcal{O}(t)) \sim \exp[\lambda_{\text{OTOC}}t]$ for times $t \lesssim \log S$. Our first main result is that this is, in fact, the *fastest* possible OTOC growth:

Theorem 1. *For Hamiltonian (2), with $h(\mathbf{n}, t) \neq 0$ only when $n_x + n_y + n_z \leq n_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$, if $|h(\mathbf{n}, t)| \leq 1$ whenever $n_x + n_y + n_z > 1$, and λ_{OTOC} is defined as*

$$\lambda_{\text{OTOC}} = \sup_t \frac{1}{t} \log \frac{F(t) + c}{F(0) + c}, \quad (4)$$

for constant $c = \frac{1}{2}$ when $\text{tr}(\mathcal{O}^\dagger \mathcal{O}) = 2S + 1$, then

$$\lambda_{\text{OTOC}} < 3^n n^3. \quad (5)$$

This constant is not tight, but for any finite n , it is independent of S . A slightly stronger version of this theorem is proved in Appendix A.

A well-studied chaotic semiclassical spin model is the kicked top [1]:

$$H(t) = \frac{\kappa}{2S+1} Z^2 + hXT \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta(t - nT). \quad (6)$$

Here we can improve on Theorem 1, and we predict that $\lambda_{\text{OTOC}} \leq \kappa$. By studying the dynamics numerically, we show that the actual exponent is $\lambda_{\text{OTOC}} \leq 0.46\kappa$, which is only a factor of 2 smaller than our rigorous constraint.

We then turn to models with spatial structure. Consider an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, with a large- S spin on each vertex. Assume that each vertex has a finite degree (number of neighbors) k . Define

$$H = \frac{1}{2S+1} \left(\sum_{i \in V} \kappa_i^{\alpha\beta} S_i^\alpha S_i^\beta + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle \in E} \kappa_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} S_i^\alpha S_j^\beta \right) + \sum_{i \in V} h_i^\alpha S_i^\alpha. \quad (7)$$

Our second main result is:

Theorem 2. *Let $A \subset V$ be a subset of vertices with shortest path length D to v : i.e. $\text{dist}(v, A) = D$. If H is given by (7), $|\kappa_i^{\alpha\beta}| \leq 1$ and $|\kappa_{ij}^{\alpha\beta}| \leq \kappa$, then for any operator \mathcal{O}_A supported in A ,*

$$\frac{|\text{tr}([\mathcal{O}_A, S_v^\beta(t)]^2)|}{\sqrt{\text{tr}(\mathcal{O}_A^2) \text{tr}((S_v^\beta)^2)}} \leq e^{\lambda_{\text{OTOC}}(t-D/v_B)}, \quad (8)$$

with constants

$$\lambda_{\text{OTOC}} = v_B \leq 6 + 9k\kappa. \quad (9)$$

As before, we prove a stronger result in Appendix A. An immediate consequence of Theorem 2 is that the butterfly velocity which characterizes the spatial spread of OTOCs in lattice models [9, 37–39] is independent of the local Hilbert space dimension $2S+1$, even though the operators in the Hamiltonian have norms of order S . This

finiteness result is a parametric improvement over the best known Lieb-Robinson bounds for such systems.

Operator Growth.— Let us now sketch the proof of Theorem 1. While details for the general case are in Appendix A, here we focus on the key conceptual insight, together with a proof of a bound for kicked top Hamiltonians (6). The first step is a suitable definition of operator size, the average of which relates to the OTOC. Observe that if we start with a single spin S Hilbert space, which transforms in the representation S of $\text{SU}(2)$, that the operator Hilbert space will contain representations

$$S \otimes S = 0 \oplus 1 \oplus \dots \oplus 2S. \quad (10)$$

The “spherical-harmonic tensor operators” $\{\mathcal{Y}_l^m : m = -l, \dots, l; l = 0, \dots, 2S\}$ [40] are irreducible tensors transforming in representation l :

$$[Z, \mathcal{Y}_l^m] = m\mathcal{Y}_l^m, \quad (11a)$$

$$[X \pm iY, \mathcal{Y}_l^m] = \sqrt{(l \mp m)(l \pm m + 1)} \mathcal{Y}_l^{m \pm 1}. \quad (11b)$$

They are, intuitively, the operator generalizations of the well-known spherical harmonics. The operators \mathcal{Y}_l^m can be found by writing $r^l Y_l^m(\theta, \phi)$ in rectangular coordinates, and subsequently replacing products such as xy with $\frac{1}{2}\{X, Y\}$, etc. More algebraically, we start with

$$\mathcal{Y}_l^{\pm l} = \frac{(\mp 1)^l}{2^l l!} \sqrt{\frac{(2l+1)!}{4\pi}} (X \pm iY)^l, \quad (12)$$

from which we can use the $\text{su}(2)$ algebra (11) to find all \mathcal{Y}_l^m . All \mathcal{Y}_l^m are orthogonal to each other.

The linearity of quantum mechanics implies that operators themselves live in a “Hilbert space”. We often write an operator \mathcal{O} in the bra-ket-like notation $|\mathcal{O}\rangle$ to emphasize this fact. Defining the operator inner product

$$\langle A|B\rangle = \frac{1}{2S+1} \text{tr}(A^\dagger B), \quad (13)$$

we find that

$$\langle \mathcal{Y}_l^m | \mathcal{Y}_l^m \rangle = \frac{1}{4\pi} \prod_{k=1}^l \left[\left(S + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{4}k^2 \right]. \quad (14)$$

We define the normalized basis $T^{lm} = \mathcal{Y}_l^m / \|\mathcal{Y}_l^m\|$. Each operator can be expanded in this basis:

$$\mathcal{O}(t) = \sum_{l,m} \mathcal{O}_{lm}(t) T^{lm}. \quad (15)$$

Lastly, we define the following projection operators: $\mathbb{Q}_{l'l'}(T^{lm}) = \delta_{ll'} |T^{lm}\rangle$.

By unitarity,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{l,m} |\mathcal{O}_{lm}|^2 = 0. \quad (16)$$

Hence we can define a probability distribution of “operator size”: an operator has size l with probability ϕ_l^2 :

$$\phi_l^2 = \sum_{m=-l}^l \frac{|\mathcal{O}_{lm}|^2}{|\mathcal{O}|^2} \quad (17)$$

Normalizing $\langle \mathcal{O} | \mathcal{O} \rangle = 1$ and using (11), the OTOC (3) is

$$F(\mathcal{O}) = \sum_{l=0}^{2S} l(l+1)\phi_l^2. \quad (18)$$

Rather than bound the OTOC directly a la Lieb-Robinson, we now bound OTOCs by constraining the “stochastic process” governing the time evolution of the operator size distribution. Because operators evolve in time according to

$$\frac{d}{dt}|\mathcal{O}(t)\rangle = \mathcal{L}|\mathcal{O}(t)\rangle = |i[H, \mathcal{O}(t)]\rangle, \quad (19)$$

we can formally write down a set of linear equations for the probability amplitudes ϕ_l : [31–34]

$$\frac{d\phi_l}{dt} = K_{l-1}(t)\phi_{l-1}(t) - K_l(t)\phi_{l+1}(t), \quad (20)$$

where the coefficients $K_l(t)$ obey

$$K_l(t) \leq \|\mathcal{Q}_l \mathcal{L} \mathcal{Q}_{l+1}\| \equiv \mathcal{K}_l, \quad (21)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the conventional operator norm, acting on the space of superoperators.

To bound \mathcal{K}_l , notice that the only size changing terms arise from $i[Z^2, T^{lm}] = im\{T^{10}, T^{lm}\}$. Now observe that

$$\mathcal{Y}^{10} T^{lm} = \sum_{l'=l-1}^{l+1} c(l, l') \langle 10lm | l'm \rangle T^{l'm}, \quad (22)$$

where $Z = 2\sqrt{\pi/3}\mathcal{Y}^{10}$, $\langle 1m'l'm | l'(m+m') \rangle$ is the Clebsch-Gordan coefficient, and $c(l, l')$ is a constant independent of m, m' related to normalization of T^{lm} . An explicit calculation gives

$$c(l, l+1) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{3(l+1)}{\pi(2l+3)}} \sqrt{\left(S + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{4}(l+1)^2}. \quad (23)$$

We can similarly evaluate $T^{lm}\mathcal{Y}^{10}$, and eventually find

$$\mathcal{Q}_l \mathcal{L} T^{l-1, m} = i\kappa m \sqrt{\frac{[l^2 - m^2][(2S+1)^2 - l^2]}{(2l-1)(2l+1)(2S+1)^2}} T^{lm} \quad (24)$$

A crucial observation is that, $\mathcal{Q}_{l+1} \mathcal{L} T^{lm}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{l+1} \mathcal{L} T^{lm'}$ are orthogonal if $m \neq m'$. Hence \mathcal{K}_l can be upper bounded by the maximal value of the coefficient in (24):

$$\mathcal{K}_l \leq \frac{\kappa(l+1)^2}{2\sqrt{(2l+1)(2l+3)}}. \quad (25)$$

We then explicitly find that [31]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dF}{dt} &= 2 \sum_{l=0}^{2S} l(l+1)\phi_l \frac{d\phi_l}{dt} \leq \sum_{l=0}^{2S} 2(l+1)\mathcal{K}_l (\phi_l^2 + \phi_{l+1}^2) \\ &\leq \kappa \sum_{l=0}^{2S} (l(l+1) + 2)\phi_l^2 = \kappa(F+2). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Thus for kicked top models,

$$\lambda_{\text{OTOC}} \leq \kappa. \quad (27)$$

Our bound (27) is not saturated without the “kicks”. If $h=0$ in (6), $H \propto Z^2$, $T^{11}(t)$ only hops on sites $\{T^{11}\}$, and $|K_l(t)| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. As a result, $F(t) \leq O(t^2)$. Although this is expected because (6) is integrable when $h=0$, our formalism crisply captures how this integrability prevents the operator from growing rapidly. Kicks, which move us from operators with $m \sim 1$ to $m \sim l$, are required to come close to saturating our bound.

Classical and Quantum Kicked Top.— We now compare (27) to the actual value of λ_{OTOC} in the semiclassical kicked top. When comparing to the standard definition of Lyapunov exponent (LE), we must replace $2\lambda_L = \lambda_{\text{OTOC}}$. When κT is large, [41]

$$\lambda_L T = \log(\kappa T |\sin hT|) - 1 \quad (28)$$

At finite κT , we have numerically calculated the classical LE by the tangent map matrix method [41], evolving for $0 < t < 10^6 T$. We set $hT = \frac{\pi}{2}$ to optimize operator growth. The result is shown in Fig. 1, in comparison to our fully quantum mechanical bound.

We have also, for smaller system sizes, calculated the quantum OTOCs of a kicked top: by calculating $F(\mathcal{O}(t))$ numerically, we extract the quantum LE by fitting an exponential growth in time at $S=500$, while averaging the exponents over initial operator $\mathcal{O} = X, Y, Z$. One finds the quantum LE is indeed larger than the classical one, and at large κT the difference goes to a constant ≈ 0.4 , which qualitatively agrees with that in the kicked rotor [42]. The largest $\lambda_{\text{OTOC}}/(2\kappa)$ is 0.22 at $\kappa T \approx 4.5$, while the largest λ_L/κ is 0.18 at $\kappa T \approx 3.7$, as shown in the inset. These are smaller than our bound, but are within an order of magnitude. At large κT the LEs $\propto \log(\kappa T)/T$ are parametrically smaller than our bound, which is consistent with the fact that λ_{OTOC} is always smaller than the exponent $(\log F(\mathcal{O}(T)) - \log F(\mathcal{O}))/T$ in the first period: see Appendix B for additional numerics. The operator growth during that first time period is induced solely from the Z^2 term in H , where $F(\mathcal{O}(t)) - F(\mathcal{O}) \sim c_1(\kappa t)^2 + c_2 \kappa t$ with constant c_1, c_2 . This leads to $\lambda_{\text{OTOC}}/2 \leq \log(\kappa T)/T$ at large κT , although this behavior is not captured by (27) which allows for arbitrarily strong kicking.

When $\kappa T \geq 2$, following [43], we can also argue for a lower bound (see Appendix B)

$$\lambda_{\text{OTOC}} \geq \lambda_{\text{saddle}} = \frac{1}{T} \log \left(\frac{\kappa T}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{\kappa^2 T^2}{4} - 1} \right) \quad (29)$$




FIG. 1. Classical and quantum LE for kicked top at $hT = \pi/2$. The main plot: The magenta line is the quantum LE $\lambda_{\text{OTOC}}/2$. The red line is classical LE averaged for 100 initial states, with the standard deviation as errorbar. The cyan scattered points are for each initial points. The blue dashed line is the analytical result $\lambda_L T = \log(\kappa T |\sin hT|) - 1$. The black dashed line is $\lambda_{\text{saddle}} T/2 = \frac{1}{2} \log\left(\frac{\kappa T}{2} + \sqrt{\kappa^2 T^2/4 - 1}\right)$. The green dashed line is our bound $\lambda_{\text{bound}}/2 = \kappa/2$. The inset is of the same data for λ_{OTOC} and numerical λ_L in the main plot, with axes modified.

Here λ_{saddle} refers to the growth rate of OTOCs arising from an unstable point in the semiclassical “phase space”. We find this saddle point physics is as important as semiclassical chaos to our bound, since λ_{saddle} is comparable to λ_L in the region around $\kappa T \approx 3$, where our bound is tightest.

Semiclassical Spin Chains.— Next, let us discuss N spin- S degrees of freedom on a lattice with on-site and nearest-neighbor simple couplings. As a simple example, consider a chain of coupled (kicked) tops

$$H = \sum_{n=1}^L \left[h_i(t) X_i + \frac{\kappa}{2S+1} (Z_i^2 + Z_i Z_{i+1}) \right] \quad (30)$$

where L is arbitrarily large and denotes the size of the system. For this system, Theorem 2 proves that $v_B \leq 24\kappa$. The proof of this theorem uses similar methods to our earlier discussion. While this bound is certainly not tight, it does confirm that despite the large Hilbert space dimension (and large operator norm of $Z_i Z_{i+1}$), the speed at which operators grow remains finite as $S \rightarrow \infty$.

One might naively think that it is not possible to send signals or entanglement with a velocity too much faster than the butterfly velocity that characterizes chaos. However, it appears possible to generate entanglement between two adjacent spins in this spin chain at speeds comparable to a Lieb-Robinson velocity: $v_{\text{LR}} = O(S)$. Following [32, 44], consider the two site Hamiltonian $H = S^{-1}(S + Z_1)Z_2$, and consider preparing an initial quantum state $|\psi(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|S\rangle + |-S\rangle) \otimes (|S\rangle + |-S\rangle)$.

Evolving for time $\tau = \pi/4S$, we find the entangled state $|\psi(\tau)\rangle = |S\rangle(|S\rangle + |-S\rangle)/2 - i|-S\rangle(|S\rangle - |-S\rangle)/2$. Clearly, these two bits share one bit of entanglement. This is the best possible transmission rate of entanglement, via the Lieb-Robinson bound. Whether or not one can send entanglement larger distances with a velocity of order S is an interesting open question. If this is possible, it represents a new paradigm for the “hierarchy of light cones” emphasized in [32], wherein there are multiple notions of locality in many-body quantum systems.

Towards Holographic Models.— One of the motivations for this work was also to understand the similarities and differences between operator growth in holographic models like the Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev (SYK) model, and large- S coupled spin dynamics. A “hybrid” model is

$$H = \frac{\kappa}{S} Z_i Z_i + \frac{1}{S\sqrt{N}} J_{ij} S_i^\alpha S_j^\alpha, \quad (31)$$

with J_{ij} standard Gaussian random variables. See [29] for qualitatively similar models. We have used Einstein summation convention on indices. A rigorous OTOC bound for such a model would be quite involved [31] as the disorder average is highly non-trivial. We postulate that a rigorous bound on λ_{OTOC} will reveal two contributions to the LE: one from on-site growth ($Z_i \rightarrow X_i^2$) and one from inter-site growth ($Z_i \rightarrow X_i X_j$). More practically, we expect that the inter-site dynamics is rather similar to operator growth in the SYK model [15, 31], while the on-site dynamics could disrupt the constructive interference patterns which lead to exponential operator growth in SYK. Unlike in the large- S Hilbert space, typical operators of size s in SYK grow at a rate \sqrt{s} rather than s . We are not sure whether or not this qualitative difference in operator growth is of much practical consequence, e.g. for experimentalists aiming to study quantum gravity via many-body chaos in the lab.

Outlook.— We have proven reasonably sharp bounds on quantum OTOCs and operator growth in semiclassical spin chains and kicked top models. Our results qualitatively improve upon Lieb-Robinson bounds and provide a powerful new mathematical framework for the study quantum information dynamics and quantum chaos in a semiclassical limit. We hope that similar methods will also be useful in constraining quantum dynamics with bosonic degrees of freedom, another hard problem with large (infinite) dimensional Hilbert spaces where very few results are known [45, 46]. Our methods may also lead to sharp answers to the question of which experimentally-realizable microscopic models can faithfully mimic the dynamics of holographic quantum gravity.

The semiclassical spin models we have studied here can also be interpreted in terms of many-body quantum mechanical models with S spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ degrees of freedom, with $SU(2)$ -symmetric Hamiltonian. When restricted to the Dicke manifold (total angular momentum $S(S+1)$), our bounds describe the resulting dynamics. Remarkably, OTOC growth *speeds up* quite substantially in the Dicke manifold, relative to in typical states in Hilbert space,

where with the normalization (2), $\lambda_{\text{OTOC}} = 0$ can be proved [33]. This is a fascinating counterexample to the generic expectation that quantum dynamics should slow down in constrained subspaces [47, 48]. We hope that our methods can be used to help understand the robustness

of certain spin squeezed states to generic perturbations [49], which has recently been observed numerically and has broad applications to quantum metrology.

Acknowledgements.— We thank Brian Swingle for useful discussions. AL was supported by a Research Fellowship from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

Appendix A: Proofs of slightly stronger theorems

Theorem 1. *Consider the Hamiltonian (2). Suppose that if $h(n_x, n_y, n_z) \neq 0$, then $n_x + n_y + n_z \leq n_0$. Then, if $|h(\mathbf{n}, t)| \leq h(\mathbf{n})$, and $\lambda(t)$ is defined by (5), then*

$$\lambda_{\text{OTOC}} \leq 2(n_0 - 1) \sum_{\mathbf{n}} h(\mathbf{n}) \sqrt{\sum_{\alpha} n_{\alpha} - 1} \sum_{\alpha} \frac{\sqrt{n_{\alpha}(n_{\alpha} + 1)!}}{([n_{\alpha}/3]!)^3}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Proof. Since $[H, T^{lm}]$ contains components of size $l' = l - n_0 + 1, \dots, l + n_0 - 1$, the corresponding quantum walk equation is

$$\frac{d\phi_l}{dt} = \sum_{l' < l} K_{ll'}(t)\phi_{l'}(t) - \sum_{l' < l} K_{l'l}(t)\phi_{l'}(t), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $|K_{l'l}| \leq \mathcal{K}_{l'l} = \|\mathbb{Q}_{l'}\mathcal{L}\mathbb{Q}_l\|$. We group neighboring $n_0 - 1$ sizes as a block labeled by L . Namely, block L corresponds to a set R_L of size, where

$$R_L := \begin{cases} \{1\} & L = 1 \\ \{l \in \mathbb{Z} : 2 + (n_0 - 1)(L - 2) \leq l \leq \min\{1 + (n_0 - 1)(L - 1), 2S\}\} & 2 \leq L \leq L_m := \left\lceil \frac{2S-1}{n_0-1} \right\rceil + 1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A3})$$

Define

$$\mathbb{Q}_L := \sum_{l \in R_L} \mathbb{Q}_l \quad (\text{A4})$$

and

$$\phi_L(t) := \|\mathbb{Q}_L|\mathcal{O}(t)\|. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Similar to (20),

$$\frac{d\phi_L}{dt} = K_{L-1}(t)\phi_{L-1}(t) - K_L(t)\phi_{L+1}(t), \quad (\text{A6})$$

where

$$|K_L| \leq \mathcal{K}_L := \|\mathbb{Q}_{L+1}\mathcal{L}\mathbb{Q}_L\| = \max \left(\max_{l \in R_L} \sum_{l' \in R_{L+1}} \mathcal{K}_{l'l}, \max_{l' \in R_{L+1}} \sum_{l \in R_L} \mathcal{K}_{l'l} \right). \quad (\text{A7})$$

Define $\tilde{F} := \sum_L L(L+1)\phi_L^2$ so that $F \leq (n_0 - 1)^2 \tilde{F}$. If we can show that $\mathcal{K}_L \leq \eta(L+1)$ with η independent of L, S , then

$$\frac{d\tilde{F}}{dt} = 2 \sum_L L(L+1)\phi_L \frac{d\phi_L}{dt} \leq \sum_L 2(L+1)\mathcal{K}_L (\phi_L^2 + \phi_{L+1}^2) \leq 4\eta \sum_L [L(L+1) + \frac{1}{2}]\phi_L^2 = 4\eta\tilde{F} + 2\eta, \quad (\text{A8})$$

which leads to $\lambda_{\text{OTOC}} \leq 4\eta$.

Now, we find a bound for η . We write the Hamiltonian as $H = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} H_{\mathbf{n}}$. Correspondingly, $\mathcal{L} = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\mathcal{K}_L = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \mathcal{K}_{L,\mathbf{n}}$. For a given \mathbf{n} , $[X^{n_x}Y^{n_y}Z^{n_z}, \mathcal{O}] = X^{n_x}Y^{n_y}[Z^{n_z}, \mathcal{O}] + X^{n_x}[Y^{n_y}, \mathcal{O}]Z^{n_z} + [X^{n_x}, \mathcal{O}]Y^{n_y}Z^{n_z}$. For the first term, because the maximal absolute eigenvalue of X and Y is S , we have

$$\|X^{n_x}Y^{n_y}[Z^{n_z}, \mathcal{O}^l]\| \leq S^{n_x+n_y} \|[Z^{n_z}, \mathcal{O}^l]\| \leq S^{n_x+n_y} \max_m \|[Z^{n_z}, T^{lm}]\|, \quad (\text{A9})$$

where \mathcal{O}^l is an arbitrary operator of size l , and we used the fact that $[Z^{n_z}, T^{lm}]$ are orthogonal for different m . Assume $m > 0$ and let $n = n_z$ for a moment for simplicity. Let

$$C_m(l, l') = 2\sqrt{\pi/3}c(l, l')\langle 10lm|l'm \rangle = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{(l+1)^2 - m^2}{(2l+1)(2l+3)}} \sqrt{(S + \frac{1}{2})^2 - \frac{1}{4}(l+1)^2} & l' = l+1 \\ m/2 & l' = l \\ \sqrt{\frac{l^2 - m^2}{(2l-1)(2l+1)}} \sqrt{(S + \frac{1}{2})^2 - \frac{1}{4}l^2} & l' = l-1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A10})$$

which makes $ZT^{lm} = \sum_{l'} C_m(l, l')T^{l'm}$ and $T^{lm}Z = \sum_{l'} (-)^{l'-l+1} C_m(l, l')T^{l'm}$. Furthermore, $C_m(l, l \pm 1) \leq (2S + 1)/\sqrt{15}$ except $C_m(1, 0)$, which does not enter in the following results. Then

$$[Z^n, T^{lm}] = \left[Z^{n-1} \sum_{l''=l-1}^{l+1} C_m(l, l'')T^{l''m} - \sum_{l''=l-1}^{l+1} (-1)^{l''-l+1} C_m(l, l'')T^{l''m} Z^{n-1} \right] = \dots = 2 \sum_p \left[\prod_{j=1}^n C_m(p_j) \right] T^{l'm}, \quad (\text{A11})$$

Here array p denotes a path in size space from l to l' . For example, $p = (l+1, l+1, l, l+1)$ is a path $l \rightarrow l+1 \rightarrow l+1 \rightarrow l \rightarrow l+1$ with $l' = l+1$ and $n = 4$. Let n_{\pm} be the number of terms in which $l \rightarrow l \pm 1$, and n' the number of steps in which $l \rightarrow l$. In (A11) we also denote $C_m(p_j) = C_m(p_{j-1}, p_j)$ where $p_0 \equiv l$, and \sum_p only contains path p with an odd n' . Suppose a path has n_+ steps of forward hopping (i.e. increasing l by 1), and n_- steps of backward hopping. They satisfy $n = n_+ + n_- + n'$, $l' - l = n_+ - n_-$. The number of paths with a given n' will be $\leq \frac{n!}{n_+!n_-!n'!}$, where the inequality is due to presence of boundaries $1 \leq l \leq 2S$. For one such path,

$$\prod_{j=1}^n C_m(p_j) \leq \left(\frac{m}{2}\right)^{n'} \left(\frac{2S+1}{\sqrt{15}}\right)^{n-n'}, \quad (\text{A12})$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{Q}_{l'}[Z^n, T^{lm}]\| &\leq 2 \sum_{n'=1,3,5,\dots}^n \frac{n!}{n_+!n_-!n'!} \left(\frac{\sqrt{15}m}{2(2S+1)}\right)^{n'} \left(\frac{2S+1}{\sqrt{15}}\right)^n \\ &\leq 2 \frac{n+1}{2} \frac{n!}{([n/3]!)^3} \left(\frac{\sqrt{15}S}{2S+1}\right)^{n-1} \frac{\sqrt{15}m}{2(2S+1)} \left(\frac{2S+1}{\sqrt{15}}\right)^n \leq \frac{l}{2} S^{n-1} \frac{(n+1)!}{([n/3]!)^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A13})$$

Putting back $n_z = n$, $\|\mathbb{Q}_L|[Z^{n_z}, T^{lm}]\|$ is then bounded by adding a $\sqrt{n_z}$ factor, since there are n_z choices of l' . Note that the norm here represents the Frobenius norm, which is why we only require a square root here: the operators with different l' are necessarily orthogonal. Gathering all the prefactors,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_n \mathbb{Q}_l\| \leq h(n) \frac{l}{2} \sum_{\alpha} \frac{\sqrt{n_{\alpha}}(n_{\alpha}+1)!}{([n_{\alpha}/3]!)^3}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

Finally, using that each \mathbb{Q}_l projects onto a disjoint subspace, together with the Frobenius norm,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{L,n} &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{\alpha} n_{\alpha} - 1} \max \left(\max_{l \in R_L} \|\mathbb{Q}_{L+1} \mathcal{L}_n \mathbb{Q}_l\|, \max_{l \in R_{L+1}} \|\mathbb{Q}_L \mathcal{L}_n \mathbb{Q}_l\| \right) \\ &\leq h(n) \sqrt{\sum_{\alpha} n_{\alpha} - 1} \frac{(n_0 - 1)(L+1)}{2} \sum_{\alpha} \frac{\sqrt{n_{\alpha}}(n_{\alpha}+1)!}{([n_{\alpha}/3]!)^3}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A15})$$

which leads to (A1). \square

Theorem 2. Let initial operator \mathcal{O} have support only on vertex $i_0 \in V$, and obey $(\mathcal{O}|\mathcal{O}) = 1$. Let $|\mathcal{O}(t)\rangle = e^{\mathcal{L}t}|\mathcal{O}\rangle$. For Hamiltonian (7) with $|\kappa_i^{\alpha\beta}| \leq 1$ and $|\kappa_{i_j}^{\alpha\beta}| \leq \kappa$,

$$\sum_{i:D_i \geq D} \sum_l l^2(\mathcal{O}(t)|\mathbb{P}_{il}|\mathcal{O}(t)) \leq F_0 e^{2\mu_b t - D \ln b}, \quad \mu_b = c + \frac{9}{4}k(1+b)\kappa, \quad (\text{A16})$$

with constant F_0, c , for any $b > 1$.

Proof. Define

$$\mathcal{F} := \sum_{il} b^{D_i} l^\nu \mathbb{P}_{il}, \quad (\text{A17})$$

where ν is to be determined, and \mathbb{P}_{il} is a projector onto operators which have size l on site i . (Note that for $i \neq i'$, \mathbb{P}_{il} and $\mathbb{P}_{i'l'}$ do not project onto disjoint sets.) Denote $H_{ii} = \kappa_i^{\alpha\beta} S_i^\alpha S_i^\beta / (2S+1)$, $H_{ij} = \kappa_{ij}^{\alpha\beta} S_i^\alpha S_j^\beta / (2S+1)$, $\mathcal{L}_{ii} = i[H_{ii}, \cdot]$, $\mathcal{L}_{ij} = i[H_{ij}, \cdot]$. Set $F = (\mathcal{O}|\mathcal{F}|\mathcal{O})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dF}{dt} &= (\mathcal{O}|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L}|\mathcal{O}) = \sum_i (\mathcal{O}|\mathcal{O}^{[b^{D_i} \sum_l l^\nu \mathbb{P}_{il}, \mathcal{L}_{ii}]|\mathcal{O})} + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\mathcal{O}|\mathcal{O}^{[b^{D_i} \sum_l l^\nu \mathbb{P}_{il} + b^{D_j} \sum_l l^\nu \mathbb{P}_{jl}, \mathcal{L}_{ij}]|\mathcal{O})} \\ &= \sum_i b^{D_i} G_{ii} + \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (b^{D_i} G_{ij} + b^{D_j} G_{ji}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A18})$$

where

$$G_{ii} = -2 \sum_l l^\nu (\mathcal{O}|\mathcal{L}_{ii}|\mathcal{O}_{il}) = -2 \sum_l l^\nu (\mathcal{O}_{il+1} + \mathcal{O}_{il-1}|\mathcal{L}_{ii}|\mathcal{O}_{il}) = 2 \sum_{l>0} f(l) (\mathcal{O}_{il+1}|\mathcal{L}_{ii}|\mathcal{O}_{il}) \quad (\text{A19})$$

where $f(l) \equiv (l+1)^\nu - l^\nu$, $|\mathcal{O}_{il}) = \mathbb{P}_{il}|\mathcal{O})$. We define G_{ij} similarly. Let $\mathcal{O}_{il,jl'} = \mathbb{P}_{il}\mathbb{P}_{jl'}\mathcal{O}$. Since $(\mathcal{O}_{il}|\mathcal{L}_{ij}|\mathcal{O}_{il}) = 0$, only the $\mathbb{P}_{il\pm 1}$ terms in e.g. $[Z_i Z_j, T_i^{lm} T_j^{l'm'}] = (Z_i T_i^{lm}) m' T_j^{l'm'} + m T_i^{lm} (T_j^{l'm'} Z_j)$ contribute to the sum:

$$G_{ij} = -2 \sum_l l^\nu (\mathcal{O}|\mathcal{L}_{ij}|\mathcal{O}_{il}) = 2 \sum_{l>0} f(l) (\mathcal{O}_{il+1}|\mathcal{L}_{ij}|\mathcal{O}_{il}) = 2 \sum_{l>0} f(l) \sum_{l'>0} (\mathcal{O}_{il+1,jl'}|\mathcal{L}_{ij}|\mathcal{O}_{il,jl'}). \quad (\text{A20})$$

We first bound G_{ii} . Since e.g. $XZ + ZX = [(X+Z)^2 - (X-Z)^2]/2 = (S^{\alpha_1})^2 - (S^{\alpha_2})^2$, where α_1, α_2 denotes the two diagonal directions in $x-z$ plane, $H_{ii} = \sum_\alpha \kappa_i^\alpha (S^\alpha)^2 / (2S+1)$, where there are 9 directions α in the sum, and $|\kappa_i^\alpha| \leq 1$. So we will bound operator growth $H_{ii} = Z^2 / (2S+1)$, multiplying the final answer by a factor of 9:

$$G_{ii} \leq 2 \cdot 9 \sum_{l>0} f(l) \|\mathcal{O}_{il+1}\| \|\mathbb{P}_{il+1} \mathcal{L}_{ii}|\mathcal{O}_{il})\| \leq 9 \sum_{l>0} f(l) \frac{(l+1)^2}{\sqrt{(2l+1)(2l+3)}} \varphi_{il} \varphi_{il+1}. \quad (\text{A21})$$

where $\varphi_{il} \equiv \|\mathcal{O}_{il}\|$. If $\nu = 2$ as suggested below, $f(l) = 2l+1$, and

$$G_{ii} \leq \frac{9}{2} \sum_{l>0} (l+1)^2 \left(\frac{2l+1}{2l+3} \varphi_{il}^2 + \varphi_{il+1}^2 \right) = \frac{9}{2} \left[\frac{12}{5} \varphi_{i1}^2 + \sum_{l>1} \varphi_{il}^2 \left(\frac{2l+1}{2l+3} (l+1)^2 + l^2 \right) \right] \leq \frac{657}{56} \sum_{l>0} \varphi_{il}^2 l^2. \quad (\text{A22})$$

To bound G_{ij} , we again assume $H_{ij} = \kappa_{ij}^{zz} Z_i Z_j / (2S+1)$ and add a prefactor 9:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{P}_{il+1} \mathcal{L}_{ij}|\mathcal{O}_{il,jl'})\| &\leq \frac{9}{2} \frac{\kappa}{2S+1} \left\| \mathbb{P}_{il+1} \sum_{mm'} \mathcal{O}_{mm'} \{Z_i, T_i^{lm}\} m' T_j^{l'm'} \right\| \\ &\leq \frac{9}{2} \frac{\kappa}{2S+1} \varphi_{il,jl'} 2 \sqrt{\frac{(l+1)^2 - 0^2}{(2l+1)(2l+3)}} \left(S + \frac{1}{2}\right) l' \leq \frac{9\kappa(l+1)}{2\sqrt{(2l+1)(2l+3)}} l' \varphi_{il,jl'}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A23})$$

where we used expansion $\mathcal{O}_{il,jl'} = \sum_{mm'} \mathcal{O}_{mm'} T_i^{lm} T_j^{l'm'}$ where operator $\mathcal{O}_{mm'}$ is proportional to the identity on sites i and j , and $a_{mm'} := \sqrt{(\mathcal{O}_{mm'}|\mathcal{O}_{mm'})}$. Since $\mathcal{O}_{mm'} T_i^{lm} T_j^{l'm'}$ are orthogonal for different pairs of $(lm, l'm')$, the norm is maximized simply by $a_{mm'} \propto \delta_{m0} \delta_{m'l'}$, as shown in the second line above. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{ij} &\leq 2 \sum_{l,l'>0} f(l) \|\mathcal{O}_{il+1,jl'}\| \|\mathbb{P}_{il+1} \mathcal{L}_{ij}|\mathcal{O}_{il,jl'})\| \leq \frac{9\kappa}{2} \sum_{l,l'>0} 2l' \frac{(f(l)/2)(l+1)}{\sqrt{(l+1/2)(l+3/2)}} \varphi_{il+1,jl'} \varphi_{il,jl'} \\ &\leq \frac{9\kappa}{2} \sum_{l,l'>0} \left(\varphi_{il+1,jl'}^2 \frac{(f(l)/2)^2 (l+1)^2}{(l+1/2)(l+3/2)} + \varphi_{il,jl'}^2 l'^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A24})$$




FIG. 2. Dynamics of the OTOC in the quantum kicked top at $hT = \pi/2$. The three line types correspond to three initial operators $\mathcal{O} = X, Y, Z$. The three colors correspond to $S = 100, 500, 1000$, as shown in the legend.

Since $f(l) \sim l^{\nu-1}$, only $\nu = 2$ ensures that each summand over l has a prefactor of order $l^\nu = l^2 \leq l^\nu$, so that $\frac{dF}{dt}$ can be bounded by F . Then

$$G_{ij} \leq \frac{9\kappa}{2} \sum_{l, l' > 0} \left(\varphi_{il+1, j l'}^2 \frac{(l+1/2)(l+1)^2}{(l+3/2)} + \varphi_{il, j l'}^2 l'^2 \right) \leq \frac{9\kappa}{2} \sum_{l, l' > 0} \left(\varphi_{il, j l'}^2 l^2 + \varphi_{il, j l'}^2 l'^2 \right) \leq \frac{9\kappa}{2} \sum_{l > 0} l^2 (\varphi_{il}^2 + \varphi_{jl}^2), \quad (\text{A25})$$

where we have used

$$\varphi_{j l'}^2 = \sum_l \varphi_{il, j l'}^2. \quad (\text{A26})$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dF}{dt} &= \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{i, l} b^{D_i} l^2 \varphi_{il}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{657}{56} \sum_i b^{D_i} \sum_l \varphi_{il}^2 l^2 + \frac{9\kappa}{2} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (b^{D_i} + b^{D_j}) \sum_{l > 0} l^2 (\varphi_{il}^2 + \varphi_{jl}^2) \leq 2\mu_b F, \quad \mu_b \equiv \frac{657}{112} + \frac{9}{4} k(1+b)\kappa. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A27})$$

Thus,

$$F \leq F_0 e^{2\mu_b t}, \quad \text{where } F_0 = \sum_l l^2 (\mathcal{O} | \mathbb{P}_{i_0 l} | \mathcal{O}) \quad (\text{A28})$$

We are interested in the case where F_0 is at most $O(S^2)$, as by the assumption of the theorem the initial operator \mathcal{O} has support on a single vertex. Thus by Markov's inequality,

$$\sum_{i: D_i \geq D} \sum_l l^2 (\mathcal{O}(t) | \mathbb{P}_{il} | \mathcal{O}(t)) \leq F b^{-D} \leq F_0 e^{2\mu_b t - D \ln b}. \quad (\text{A29})$$

This completes the proof. \square

Appendix B: Additional numerical data and the saddle point growth exponent

Fig. 2 shows several cases of $F(\mathcal{O}(t))$ in kicked top. A clear exponential behavior is observed in this plot of $\log F$.

Next, we present the saddle point calculation for the kicked top to get λ_{saddle} . We start from the classical limit of (6), which leads to the dynamical map [41] for $hT = \pi/2$:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{t+1}^z &= J_t^y, \\ J_{t+1}^x &= J_t^x \cos(\kappa T J_{t+1}^z) + J_t^z \sin(\kappa T J_{t+1}^z), \\ J_{t+1}^y &= J_t^x \sin(\kappa T J_{t+1}^z) - J_t^z \cos(\kappa T J_{t+1}^z), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $\mathbf{J} = (J^x, J^y, J^z)$ is a classical vector with norm 1, and we replaced t/T by t for simplicity. One can verify that $\mathbf{J} = (\pm 1, 0, 0)$ are 2 fixed points, which yield an identical result. Linearize the map near $(1, 0, 0)$ for example,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{t+1}^z &= J_t^y, \\ J_{t+1}^y &= \kappa T J_{t+1}^z - J_t^z. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

Using ansatz $J_t^{z,y} \sim \delta J_{z,y}^0 \times e^{\omega t}$, we solve for ω and find the “quasinormal modes”

$$e^{\omega_{\pm}} = \frac{\kappa T \pm \sqrt{\kappa^2 T^2 - 4}}{2}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Thus we conclude there is an unstable saddle point when $\kappa T > 2$, and following [43], we predict that

$$\lambda_{\text{saddle}} T = \omega_+ = \log \left(\frac{\kappa T}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{\kappa^2 T^2}{4} - 1} \right) \quad (\text{B4})$$

Note that there are other nontrivial saddle points in the classical kicked top [3], which could give a better bound.

- [1] F. Haake, M. Kus, and R. Scharf, “Classical and quantum chaos for a kicked top,” *Z. Phys.* **B65**, 381 (1987).
- [2] Fritz Haake, Harald Wiedemann, and Karol Życzkowski, “Lyapunov exponents from quantum dynamics,” *Annalen der Physik* **504**, 531–539 (1992).
- [3] Marek Kus, Fritz Haake, and Bruno Eckhardt, “Quantum effects of periodic orbits for the kicked top,” *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter* **92**, 221–233 (1993).
- [4] B.V. Chirikov, F.M. Izrailev, and D.L. Shepelyansky, “Quantum chaos: Localization vs. ergodicity,” *Physica D* **33**, 77 – 88 (1988).
- [5] I. L. Aleiner and A. I. Larkin, “Divergence of classical trajectories and weak localization,” *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 14423–14444 (1996).
- [6] Oded Agam, Igor Aleiner, and Anatoly Larkin, “Shot noise in chaotic systems: “classical” to quantum crossover,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3153–3156 (2000).
- [7] A. Larkin and Yu. N. Ovchinnikov, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **28**, 1200 (1969).
- [8] Stephen H. Shenker and Douglas Stanford, “Black holes and the butterfly effect,” *JHEP* **03**, 067 (2014), [arXiv:1306.0622 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [9] Daniel A. Roberts, Douglas Stanford, and Leonard Susskind, “Localized shocks,” *JHEP* **03**, 051 (2015), [arXiv:1409.8180 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] Douglas Stanford, “Many-body chaos at weak coupling,” *JHEP* **10**, 009 (2016), [arXiv:1512.07687 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] Juan Maldacena, Stephen H. Shenker, and Douglas Stanford, “A bound on chaos,” *JHEP* **08**, 106 (2016).
- [12] Aavishkar A. Patel and Subir Sachdev, “Quantum chaos on a critical Fermi surface,” *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 1844–1849 (2017), [arXiv:1611.00003 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [13] Yochai Werman, Steven A. Kivelson, and Erez Berg, “Quantum chaos in an electron-phonon bad metal,” (2017), [arXiv:1705.07895 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [14] Leonard Susskind, “Why do Things Fall?” (2018), [arXiv:1802.01198 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [15] Daniel A. Roberts, Douglas Stanford, and Alexandre Streicher, “Operator growth in the SYK model,” *JHEP* **06**, 122 (2018).
- [16] Xiao-Liang Qi and Alexandre Streicher, “Quantum Epidemiology: Operator Growth, Thermal Effects, and SYK,” *JHEP* **08**, 012 (2019), [arXiv:1810.11958 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [17] Alexandros Mousatov, “Operator Size for Holographic Field Theories,” (2019), [arXiv:1911.05089 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] Javier M. Magán and Joan Simón, “On operator growth and emergent Poincaré symmetries,” *JHEP* **05**, 071 (2020), [arXiv:2002.03865 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [19] Yuri D. Lensky, Xiao-Liang Qi, and Pengfei Zhang, “Size of bulk fermions in the SYK model,” (2020), [arXiv:2002.01961 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [20] Aaron Chew, Andrew Essin, and Jason Alicea, “Approximating the Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev model with Majorana wires,” *Physical Review B* **96**, 121119 (2017).
- [21] Gregory Bentsen, Yingfei Gu, and Andrew Lucas, “Fast scrambling on sparse graphs,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**, 6689–6694 (2019).
- [22] Anffany Chen, R. Ilan, F. de Juan, D. I. Pikulin, and M. Franz, “Quantum holography in a graphene flake with an irregular boundary,” *Physical Review Letters* **121**, 036403 (2018).
- [23] J. Marino and A. M. Rey, “Cavity-QED simulator of slow and fast scrambling,” *Physical Review A* **99**, 051803 (2019).
- [24] R. J. Lewis-Swan, A. Safavi-Naini, J. J. Bollinger, and A. M. Rey, “Unifying scrambling, thermalization and entanglement through measurement of fidelity out-of-time-order correlators in the Dicke model,” *Nature Communications* **10**, 1581 (2019).

- [25] Yahya Alavirad and Ali Lavasani, “Scrambling in the Dicke model,” *Physical Review A* **99**, 043602 (2019).
- [26] Gregory Bentsen, Tomohiro Hashizume, Anton S. Buyskikh, Emily J. Davis, Andrew J. Daley, Steven S. Gubser, and Monika Schleier-Smith, “Treelike interactions and fast scrambling with cold atoms,” *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 130601 (2019).
- [27] Ron Belyansky, Przemyslaw Bienias, Yaroslav A. Kharkov, Alexey V. Gorshkov, and Brian Swingle, “A minimal model for fast scrambling,” (2020), [arXiv:2005.05362 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [28] Zehan Li, Sayan Choudhury, and W. Vincent Liu, “Fast scrambling without appealing to holographic duality,” (2020), [arXiv:2004.11269 \[cond-mat.quant-gas\]](#).
- [29] Thomas Scaffidi and Ehud Altman, “Chaos in a classical limit of the Sachdev-Ye-Kitaev model,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 155128 (2019), [arXiv:1711.04768 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).
- [30] Gregory Bentsen, Ionut-Dragos Potirniche, Vir B. Bulchandani, Thomas Scaffidi, Xiangyu Cao, Xiao-Liang Qi, Monika Schleier-Smith, and Ehud Altman, “Integrable and chaotic dynamics of spins coupled to an optical cavity,” *Physical Review X* **9**, 041011 (2019).
- [31] Andrew Lucas, “Non-perturbative dynamics of the operator size distribution in the Sachdev–Ye–Kitaev model,” *J. Math. Phys.* **61**, 081901 (2020), [arXiv:1910.09539 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [32] Minh C. Tran, Chi-Fang Chen, Adam Ehrenberg, Andrew Y. Guo, Abhinav Deshpande, Yifan Hong, Zhe-Xuan Gong, Alexey V. Gorshkov, and Andrew Lucas, “Hierarchy of Linear Light Cones with Long-Range Interactions,” *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 031009 (2020), [arXiv:2001.11509 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [33] Chao Yin and Andrew Lucas, “Bound on quantum scrambling with all-to-all interactions,” *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 022402 (2020), [arXiv:2005.07558 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [34] Andrew Lucas and Andrew Osborne, “Operator growth bounds in a cartoon matrix model,” (2020), [arXiv:2007.07165 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [35] Elliott H. Lieb and Derek W. Robinson, “The finite group velocity of quantum spin systems,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **28**, 251–257 (1972).
- [36] Matthew B. Hastings and Tohru Koma, “Spectral gap and exponential decay of correlations,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **265**, 781–804 (2006), [arXiv:math-ph/0507008](#).
- [37] Avijit Das, Saurish Chakrabarty, Abhishek Dhar, Anupam Kundu, David A. Huse, Roderich Moessner, Samridhi Sankar Ray, and Subhro Bhattacharjee, “Light-cone spreading of perturbations and the butterfly effect in a classical spin chain,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 024101 (2018).
- [38] Adam Nahum, Sagar Vijay, and Jeongwan Haah, “Operator Spreading in Random Unitary Circuits,” *Physical Review X* **8**, 021014 (2018).
- [39] C. W. von Keyserlingk, Tibor Rakovszky, Frank Pollmann, and S. L. Sondhi, “Operator Hydrodynamics, OTOCs, and Entanglement Growth in Systems without Conservation Laws,” *Physical Review X* **8**, 021013 (2018).
- [40] Feifei Li, Carol Braun, and Anupam Garg, “The weyl-wigner-moyal formalism for spin,” *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **102**, 60006 (2013).
- [41] V. Constantoudis and N. Theodorakopoulos, “Lyapunov exponent, stretching numbers, and islands of stability of the kicked top,” *Phys. Rev. E* **56**, 5189–5194 (1997).
- [42] Efim B. Rozenbaum, Sriram Ganeshan, and Victor Galitski, “Lyapunov exponent and out-of-time-ordered correlator’s growth rate in a chaotic system,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 086801 (2017).
- [43] Tianrui Xu, Thomas Scaffidi, and Xiangyu Cao, “Does scrambling equal chaos?” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 140602 (2020).
- [44] Tomotaka Kuwahara and Keiji Saito, “Strictly linear light cones in long-range interacting systems of arbitrary dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 031010 (2020), [arXiv:1910.14477 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [45] Bruno Nachtergaele, Hillel Raz, Benjamin Schlein, and Robert Sims, “Lieb-robinson bounds for harmonic and anharmonic lattice systems,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **286**, 1073–1098 (2008).
- [46] J. Jünemann, A. Cadarso, D. Pérez-García, A. Bermudez, and J. J. García-Ripoll, “Lieb-robinson bounds for spin-boson lattice models and trapped ions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 230404 (2013).
- [47] Xizhi Han and Sean A. Hartnoll, “Quantum Scrambling and State Dependence of the Butterfly Velocity,” *SciPost Phys.* **7**, 045 (2019), [arXiv:1812.07598 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [48] Xiao Chen, Yingfei Gu, and Andrew Lucas, “Many-body quantum dynamics slows down at low density,” (2020), [arXiv:2007.10352 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [49] Michael A. Perlin, Chunlei Qu, and Ana Maria Rey, “Spin squeezing with short-range spin-exchange interactions,” (2020), [arXiv:2006.00723 \[quant-ph\]](#).