

# The trade-off between diagonal and off-diagonal elements in the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis

Zhiqiang Huang (黄志强)<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*State Key Laboratory of Magnetic Resonance and Atomic and Molecular Physics,  
Innovation Academy for Precision Measurement Science and Technology,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan 430071, China*

(Dated: July 12, 2024)

In order to bypass the local measurement as an intermediate quantity in the proof of the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH), we have proposed a measurement-independent distinguishability measure. In this paper, we establish the connection between this measure and several other ETH measures in a more unified way. We first prove a universal trade-off relation for the diagonal and off-diagonal elements of the measure. Then we extend it to the discussion of eigenstate typicality and the average observable. In the trade-off relationship, the exponential increase of off-diagonal elements will directly suppress the value of off-diagonal elements, and the diagonal elements will also be suppressed indirectly. This relationship gives another perspective to understand the physical mechanism behind ETH. Finally, by numerically calculating one-dimensional Ising spin chain, we examine several trade-off relationships and strong and weak ETH.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The equilibration and the thermalization of an isolated quantum system are fundamental for understanding the emergence of quantum statistical mechanics from unitary quantum mechanics. The eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) [1, 2], that the expectation values of quantum observables in an energy eigenstate should approximately coincide with the thermal expectation values, provides a possible mechanism for the thermalization of an isolated quantum system. In the original proposal by Deutsch and Srednicki [3–5], a random perturbation is added to a closed quantum system, and the ETH holds if the perturbed system becomes chaotic. This randomness makes it difficult to understand its physical origin and mathematical description.

In many studies of the ETH, for example, [6–14], one does not presume the random energy perturbations, or simply the random Hamiltonians, but tries to derive the statistical properties solely from quantum properties. They are dedicated to proving the so called “strong (weak) ETH”, which states all (almost all) energy eigenstates have thermal properties when considering local observables. The strong ETH postulates that the local distinguishability between the eigenstate and some universal density matrix decreases exponentially with system size. And it is generally believed that it does not apply to integrable systems and many-body localized systems. The weak ETH focuses on eigenstate typicality, which postulates that the average distinguishability between the eigenstate and canonical ensemble decreases algebraically with system size. And it can be proved for generic translationally invariant systems including integrable systems [9, 11, 12].

In many ETH mathematical proof articles such as

[11, 12, 15], they usually first define a distinguishability measure defined by an arbitrary observable, and then prove that the distinguishability between the eigenstate and canonical ensemble tends to zero in the thermodynamic limit, independent of the specific form of observable. This inspires us to directly construct a distinguishability measure that is independent of measurement. The trace norm used in [14] is such a measure, but this measure is not easy to transform and is not very convenient for further theoretical analysis. In our previous work [17], we tried to discuss ETH using Belavkin-Staszewski relative entropy and the variance  $V(\rho_B, O_{ij}^{B_1})$ . But in that work, we did not realize the significance of some formulas, nor did we perform numerical calculations on specific models, so we came to conclusions similar to weak ETH. In this paper, we continue to explore the properties of  $V(\rho_B, O_{ij}^{B_1})$  and perform numerical verification using specific models.

We begin in Section II with some preliminary results about ETH, subsystem ETH, weak ETH and ETH with average observable. We show how the distinguishability measure  $V(\rho_B, O_{ij}^{B_1})$  is related to commonly used measures and show how to extend it to the average observable. In Section III, we prove that there exists a universal trade-off equation for the diagonal and off-diagonal elements of  $V(\rho_B, O_{ij}^{B_1})$ . This trade off relationship can be extended to the discussion of eigenstate typicality and the average observable. In Section IV, we examine the trade-off relation and the strong (weak) ETH by numerically simulating an Ising spin chain with a transverse and longitudinal magnetic field. In the final Section V we conclude this paper and discuss some related issues.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we recollect the basics of ETH and subsystem ETH, the weak ETH with eigenstate typicality in

\* hzq@wipm.ac.cn

the sense of [6, 7, 10, 11] and the eigenstate thermalization with macroscopic observable the sense of [11, 12].

### A. ETH and subsystem ETH

Consider an isolated or closed quantum system  $B$  with Hamiltonian  $H$ . Suppose the size of the system is  $N$  and  $H$  has eigenvectors  $|E_i\rangle, i = 1, 2, \dots, D_N$  with energy eigenvalues  $E_i$ , i.e.  $H|E_i\rangle = E_i|E_i\rangle$ . For a few-body observable  $A^{B_1}$ , the measure

$$d^{(1)}(\Pi_B^{ij}, \rho_B; A^{B_1}) := |\text{Tr}[A^{B_1}(|E_i\rangle\langle E_j| - \rho_B \delta_{ij})]| \quad (1)$$

can measure the local (in)distinguishability between the energy eigenstates and the  $\rho_B$ . With this measure, the local ETH can be formulated as  $d^{(1)}(\Pi_B^{ij}, \rho^{ens}; A^{B_1}) \leq \mathcal{O}(e^{-S/2})$ , where  $\rho^{ens}$  is some universal density matrix.

In the measure (1), the distinguishability is measurement-dependent. If a measurement-independent measure is needed, then the most straightforward one is to consider the measure

$$d^{(2)}(\rho_{ij}^{B_1}, \rho_{B_1}) := \|\rho_{ij}^{B_1} - \rho_{B_1} \delta_{ij}\|, \quad (2)$$

where  $\rho_{ij}^{B_1} = \text{Tr}_{\bar{B}_1} |E_i\rangle\langle E_j|$  is the reduced density matrix of the subsystem  $B_1$  and the trace distance  $\|O\| = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \sqrt{O^\dagger O}$ . The measure (2) is used to study *subsystem* ETH, which proposes  $d^{(2)}(\rho_{ij}^{B_1}, \rho_{B_1}) \sim \mathcal{O}(e^{-S/2})$ . The subsystem ETH as given by (2) is in fact stronger than the local ETH as in (1), due to the following inequality [14]

$$d^{(1)}(\Pi_B^{ii}, \rho_B; A_{B_1}) \leq \sqrt{\|\rho_{ii}^{B_1} - \rho_{B_1}\|_1 \text{Tr}[(\Pi_B^{ii} + \rho_B) A_{B_1}^2]}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_1 = 2\|\cdot\|$  is the Schatten 1-norm (trace norm).

Although straightforward, the measure (2) is not in a very convenient form, and it is difficult to relate it to other quantities. If using the Schatten 2-norm directly instead of the trace norm, then due to  $\|T\|_2 \leq \|T\|_1$ , we will obtain a weaker condition, under which it is difficult to guarantee that  $d^{(1)}$  is small. Next we introduce another less direct measure. Using the rescaling map  $\mathcal{J}_\rho^\alpha(\cdot) := \rho^\alpha(\cdot)\rho^\alpha$ , we can transform the elements in eq. (2) as

$$\rho_{ij}^{B_1} - \rho_{B_1} \delta_{ij} = \mathcal{J}_{\rho_{B_1}}^{1/2}(O_{ij}^{B_1} - \langle O_{ij}^{B_1} \rangle), \quad (4)$$

where  $O_{ij}^{B_1} := \mathcal{J}_{\rho_{B_1}}^{-1/2}(\rho_{ij}^{B_1})$  and  $\langle O_{ij}^{B_1} \rangle = \text{Tr}(O_{ij}^{B_1} \rho_B) = \delta_{ij}$ . By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2d^{(2)}(\rho_{ij}^{B_1}, \rho_{B_1}) &= \|\mathcal{J}_{\rho_{B_1}}^{1/2}(O_{ij}^{B_1} - \langle O_{ij}^{B_1} \rangle)\|_1 \\ &\leq \|(\rho_{B_1})^{1/2}(O_{ij}^{B_1} - \langle O_{ij}^{B_1} \rangle)\|_2 \|(\rho_{B_1})^{1/2}\|_2 \\ &= \sqrt{\text{Tr}[(O_{ij}^{B_1} - \langle O_{ij}^{B_1} \rangle)^\dagger \rho_B (O_{ij}^{B_1} - \langle O_{ij}^{B_1} \rangle)]} \\ &= \sqrt{V(\rho_B, O_{ij}^{B_1})} =: d^{(3)}(\rho_{ij}^{B_1}, \rho_{B_1}), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the Schatten  $p$ -norm  $\|T\|_p = \{\text{Tr}[(T^\dagger T)^{p/2}]\}^{1/p}$  and the variance

$$V(\rho, A) := \text{Tr}[(A - \langle A \rangle)^\dagger \rho (A - \langle A \rangle)]. \quad (6)$$

In this paper, we will focus on the measure  $d^{(3)}$ . Due to eq. (5), it is the upper bound of the three measures. Therefore, the ETH obtained will be the strongest one. In addition, because the variance is very easy to transform, it is easy to connect with other quantities, which we will show later.

### B. Weak ETH with eigenstate typicality

It is a strong assumption that all energy eigenstates satisfy the ETH. People are usually concerned with the Hilbert subspace within an ensemble. Let  $\rho_B = \sum_j p_j \Pi_B^j$  be the state of the total system  $B$  expanded in the orthonormal basis  $\{\Pi_B^j\}$  of rank-1 projectors. In many studies of the ‘‘weak’’ ETH, they try to derive the statistical properties and consider the quantification of the probabilistic typicality or concentration with respect to the measure  $d^{(1)}$  and uses [11]

$$\Delta(\rho_B, A) = \int [d^{(1)}(\Pi_B^{ii}, \rho_B; A^{B_1})]^2 p_d, \quad (7)$$

where the probability distribution  $p_d$  is obtained from the  $p_j$ 's through a Radon-Nikodym derivative. By the Chebyshev inequality, we have that

$$P_\rho(d^{(1)}(\Pi_B^{ii}, \rho_B; A^{B_1}) \geq \epsilon) \leq \frac{\Delta(\rho, A)^2}{\epsilon^2}, \quad \forall \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+. \quad (8)$$

Therefore, when  $\Delta(\rho, A)$  is very small, the expectation of the projectively measured observable would concentrate on the expectation of observable calculated with respect to the state  $\rho_B$ . if

$$\Delta(\rho^{\text{mc}}, A_{B_1}) \sim \mathcal{O}(N^{-\alpha}), \quad (9)$$

with  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , i.e. the expectations of a local observable  $A^{B_1}$  with respect to the results of local measurements concentrate the expectation of  $A^{B_1}$  with respect to  $\rho^{\text{mc}}$ , then we know that each pure state  $\Pi_B^{ii}$  cannot be distinguished from the microcanonical  $\rho^{\text{mc}}$  in the large  $N$  limit. This is the *weak ETH with eigenstate typicality* [11]. By replacing the measure  $d^{(1)}$  with other measures, we can get other forms of weak ETH.

### C. The average observable

In a multi-body system, the states of each subsystem fluctuate. Even for a system with translational invariance of the Hamiltonian, only the translational invariance of the Gibbs state (canonical ensemble) and the

microcanonical ensemble can be guaranteed. The energy eigenstate can still fluctuate. At this time, compared with the translational invariant ensemble, the fluctuations in space will make the energy eigenstate more distinguishable from the ensemble. Let us partition the lattice of system  $B$  into  $\mathcal{C} = |B|/|B_1|$  blocks with the same size, where  $|B|$  means the number lattice points of in  $B$ . These  $\mathcal{C}$  blocks are identical copies of  $B_1$ . In order to eliminate the influence of spatial fluctuations, or consider the macroscopic observable [12], one can consider the following the average observable

$$A^B = \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \sum_i A^{B_i}, \quad (10)$$

where  $A^{B_i}$  is the translational copy of  $A^{B_1}$ . Substituting  $A^B$  into eq. (1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d^{(1)}(\Pi_B^{ij}, \rho; A^B) &= \left| \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \sum_k \text{Tr}[(\sigma_{B_k}^{ij} - \delta_{ij} \rho_{B_k}) A^{B_k}] \right| \\ &= \left| \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \sum_k \sigma_{B_1}^{ij,k} - \delta_{ij} \bar{\rho}_{B_1} \right) A^{B_1} \right] \right| \\ &= d^{(1)} \left( \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \sum_k \sigma_{B_1}^{ij,k}, \bar{\rho}_{B_1}; A^{B_1} \right), \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sigma_{B_1}^{j,k}$  is the translational copies of  $\sigma_{B_k}^j$ ,  $\bar{\rho}_B = (\sum_k \hat{T}_k \rho_B) / \mathcal{C}$  and  $\hat{T}_k$  is a translation operator that can translate  $B_k$  to  $B_1$ . According to our previous article [17], it can also be given an upper limit by variance

$$d^{(1)}(\Pi_B^{ij}, \rho; A)^2 \leq V(\bar{\rho}, \bar{O}_{ij}^{B_1}) \|A^{B_1}\|_\infty^2, \quad (12)$$

where  $\bar{O}_{ij}^{B_1} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \sum_k \mathcal{J}_{\rho_{B_1}}^{-1/2}(\sigma_{B_1}^{ij,k})$  and  $\sigma_{B_1}^{ij,k}$  is the translational copies of  $\sigma_{B_k}^{ij}$ .

### III. TRADE-OFF BETWEEN DIAGONAL AND OFF-DIAGONAL ELEMENTS

#### A. Trade-off between diagonal and off-diagonal elements

The diagonal element  $V_{\text{dg}}^i = V(\rho_B, O_{ii}^{B_1})$  and the off-diagonal element  $V_{\text{off}}^{ij} = V(\rho_B, O_{i \neq j}^{B_1})$  in  $d^{(3)}$  are not independent. According to eq. (A5), they have the following relationship

$$V_{\text{dg}}^i + \sum_{j \neq i} V_{\text{off}}^{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1 \quad (13)$$

The index  $j$  in this formula is taken over the full Hilbert space, and its dimension  $D_N$  grows exponentially with the number of sites. While the right side of (13) only depends on the local state of the  $\rho_B$ . It generally increases with  $D_{B_1}^2$ , but basically does not change with  $N$ .




FIG. 1. Diagonal and off-diagonal elements versus eigenstate. The eigenstate indices are arranged from low to high energy. In the plot,  $\text{Var}_{\text{dg}} = V_{\text{dg}}^i$ ,  $\text{Var}_{\text{off}} = \sum_{j \neq i} V_{\text{off}}^{ij}$ ,  $\text{SN}_{\text{dg}} = \|\rho_{ii}^{B_1} - \rho_{B_1}\|_1^2$  and  $\text{SN}_{\text{off}} = \sum_{j \neq i} \|\rho_{ij}^{B_1}\|_1^2$ . The measure  $\text{Var}_{\text{dg}}$  is very close to the measure  $\text{SN}_{\text{dg}}$ , so it is covered by the latter. Parameters:  $g = 1.05$ ,  $h = 0.1$ ,  $N = 12$ ,  $N_{B_1} = 1$ ,  $\rho_B = \sum_i \Pi_i / D_N$ .

This makes the off-diagonal measure exponentially suppressed. If we consider the average of these off-diagonal elements

$$V_{\text{off}}^i = \frac{1}{D_N - 1} \sum_{j \neq i} V_{\text{off}}^{ij}, \quad (14)$$

which will decrease exponentially with  $N$ . Of course, the exponential decrease in the average of the off-diagonal elements does not mean that the maximum values of the off-diagonal elements and the diagonal element will also decrease exponentially. Although the diagonal element are not directly suppressed, eq. (13) gives a trade-off relation between the diagonal element and the off-diagonal elements. Suppose  $V_{\text{dg}}^i / V_{\text{off}}^i = f^i(N)$ , then we have

$$V_{\text{dg}}^i = \frac{f^i(N)}{f^i(N) + D_N} (\text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1). \quad (15)$$

On the one hand, if  $f^i(N)$  does not increase exponentially, or increases exponentially at a rate much slower than  $D_N$ , then in the large  $N$  limit the diagonal elements will still be exponentially small. On the other hand, if the diagonal element is not decreasing exponentially, then  $f^i(N)$  must be increasing exponentially. Therefore, the exponential growth of  $f^i(N)$  is a necessary condition for the diagonal element not to decrease exponentially.

The index  $i$  in eq. (13) can be chosen arbitrarily, but the right side of the formula is independent of  $i$ . When the measure  $V_{\text{dg}}$  of a certain eigenstate is large, then the average measure of its off-diagonal elements  $V_{\text{off}}^i$  must be small, and vice versa. We show this trade-off relation in fig. 1. Since the measure  $d^{(2)}$  and  $d^{(3)}$  are related by eq. (5), the trade-off between the diagonal and off-diagonal elements will also be reflected in the measure

$d^{(2)}$ , although it is not an exact equation relationship like eq. (13). We performed calculations using a specific model, and the diagonal element and the sum of corresponding off-diagonal elements of the two measures are shown in fig. 1. From the fig. 1, we can also see that in general, the diagonal element is much larger than the average of the off-diagonal elements, but since there are  $D_N - 1$  off-diagonal elements, their sum is much larger than diagonal elements.

The formula (13) is valid for any  $\rho_B$ . In addition to the usual canonical ensemble  $\rho^c = e^{-\beta H}/Z(\beta)$  and micro-canonical ensembles, even the pure states  $\Pi_i^B = |E_i\rangle\langle E_i|$  can be used. For the latter, the diagonal element in eq. (13) will be zero, which will give

$$\sum_{j \neq i} V(\Pi_i^B, O_{ij}^{B_1}) = \text{Tr}(\sigma_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1, \quad (16)$$

The sum of all corresponding off-diagonal elements will be directly determined by the local state  $\sigma_{B_1} = \text{Tr}_{\bar{B}_1} \Pi_i^B$ .

### B. Weak ETH

Here we consider using measure  $d^{(3)}$  to study weak ETH with eigenstate typicality, for which we need to consider the ‘‘diagonal’’ probabilistic typicality

$$\langle V_{\text{dg}} \rangle := \sum_i p_i V_{\text{dg}}^i \quad (17)$$

and the ‘‘off-diagonal’’ probabilistic typicality

$$\langle V_{\text{off}} \rangle := \sum_i p_i V_{\text{off}}^i. \quad (18)$$

Since the relationship eq. (13) holds for each  $i$ , the following relationship can be obtained after averaging the probabilities:

$$\langle V_{\text{dg}} \rangle + (D_N - 1) \times \langle V_{\text{off}} \rangle = \text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1. \quad (19)$$

For the same reason as in the previous section, the  $\langle V_{\text{off}} \rangle$  will decrease exponentially with  $N$ . The decreasing behavior of  $\langle V_{\text{dg}} \rangle$  depends on the specific model.

### C. The average observable

If we consider the distinguishability measure  $V(\bar{\rho}_B, \bar{O}_{ij}^{B_1})$  given by the average observable, then according to eq. (A7), the corresponding diagonal and off-diagonal elements also have the following trade-off relationship

$$\begin{aligned} V(\rho_B, \bar{O}_{ii}^{B_1}) + \sum_{j \neq i} V(\rho_B, \bar{O}_{ij}^{B_1}) &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} (\text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1) \\ + \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}^2} \sum_{\beta, \alpha, l, k \neq l} p'_\alpha \text{Tr}[O_{\alpha\beta}^{B_k, \dagger} \otimes O_{\alpha\beta}^{B_l} (\sigma_{B_k B_l}^{ii} - \sigma_{B_k}^{ii} \otimes \rho_{B_l}^1)], \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where  $\rho_{B_l}^1$  is the translational copy of  $\rho_{B_1}$ . Although formula (20) is valid for any  $\rho_B$ , it can only be connected to eq. (12) when  $\bar{\rho}_B$  is used. Therefore, all quantities related to  $\rho_B$  need to be replaced by  $\bar{\rho}_B$ , which is translation invariant. In this case  $\bar{\rho}_{B_l}^1 = \bar{\rho}_{B_l}$ . The local term in eq. (20) becomes  $\text{Tr}(\bar{\rho}_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1$  which is related to the local state  $\bar{\rho}_{B_1}$ , and there is an additional factor  $1/\mathcal{C}$ . The local term decreases algebraically as  $\mathcal{C}$  increases. The second term on the right side of eq. (20) is related to the spatial correlation of  $\sigma^{ii}$  and the difference between  $\sigma_{B_l}^{ii}$  and  $\bar{\rho}_{B_l}$ .

Of course, we can also consider both the average observable and eigenstate typicality. In this case, we need to consider the following ‘‘diagonal’’ probabilistic typicality

$$\langle V_{\text{dg}} \rangle = \sum_i p_i V(\rho, \bar{O}_{ii}^{B_1}). \quad (21)$$

And the ‘‘off-diagonal’’ probabilistic typicality

$$\langle V_{\text{off}} \rangle = \frac{1}{D_N - 1} \sum_{i, j \neq i} p_i V(\rho, \bar{O}_{ij}^{B_1}). \quad (22)$$

After averaging the probability of eq. (20), we can get the trade-off relationship

$$\langle V_{\text{dg}} \rangle + (D_N - 1) \times \langle V_{\text{off}} \rangle = \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} (\text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1) + V_{\text{Cor}}^{\text{Avg}}, \quad (23)$$

where

$$V_{\text{Cor}}^{\text{Avg}} := \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}^2} \sum_{\beta, \alpha, l, k \neq l} p'_\alpha \text{Tr}[O_{\alpha\beta}^{B_k, \dagger} \otimes O_{\alpha\beta}^{B_l} (\rho_{B_k B_l} - \rho_{B_k} \otimes \rho_{B_l})] \quad (24)$$

In the formula (22), except for  $\rho_{B_k B_l}$  and  $\rho_{B_k}$ , all quantities related to  $\rho_B$  need to be replaced by  $\bar{\rho}_B$ . If  $\rho_B$  is translation invariant, then  $\bar{\rho}_B = \rho_B$ , and the second term on the right side of eq. (23) is only related to the correlation of  $\rho_B$ . If the spatial correlation of  $\rho_B$  decays exponentially or algebraically fast enough, the right side of eq. (23) will be algebraically decaying  $O(N^{-\epsilon})$  [17]. Compared with eq. (19), the right side of eq. (23) is not only related to the local state but also to the correlation decay. They generally decrease algebraically with the increase of  $N$ . This is consistent with the intuition that that spatial averaging can smooth out and reduce differences. Although this algebraic decay is not enough to guarantee strong ETH, it can ensure that weak ETH is valid even for integrable systems. This algebraic decay is also the conclusion of our previous article [17], but in this article we did not notice that eq. (23) has  $D_N - 1$  off-diagonal elements, which will cause the average off-diagonal elements to be exponentially suppressed, so their values can be further restricted. Since the right side of eq. (23) decreases with  $N$ , the conclusion that  $\langle V_{\text{off}} \rangle$  will decrease exponentially is still applicable. In addition, due to the smoothing caused by the average observable, the values of  $\langle V_{\text{dg}} \rangle$  and  $\langle V_{\text{off}} \rangle$  here will be smaller than those defined in the previous section.




FIG. 2. The correlation term  $V_{Cor}^{Avg}$  versus  $N$ . Parameters:  $g = 1.05$ ,  $N_{B_1} = 1$ .

#### IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

To illustrate the previous proof, here we numerically simulate an Ising spin chain with a transverse and longitudinal magnetic field

$$H = \sum_{k=1}^N (-\sigma_z^k \otimes \sigma_z^{k+1} + g\sigma_x^k + h\sigma_z^k). \quad (25)$$

This system is nonintegrable unless one of the coupling constants  $g$  or  $h$  is zero. We use periodic boundary conditions here. Although the numerical simulation uses a translation-invariant system, this is only for simplicity and is not necessary. Almost all the derivations in sections II and III are applicable to non-translation-invariant systems.

We used ITensor Library [16] to solve the system by exact diagonalization and perform numerical calculations. In order to facilitate the comparison with the results of [14], we consider the cases of  $g = 1.05$  and  $h = 0$  or  $h = 0.1$ . Some basic properties of the system, such as energy state distribution, energy-temperature curve and mutual information of canonical ensemble are given in appendix B.

##### A. The impact of energy difference and temperature on distinguishability

Although equation (13) holds for all energy eigenstates, the diagonal element measure  $V_{dg}^i$  varies for different energy eigenstates. This difference is also shown in fig. 1. According to fig. 3(a), there is some randomness in the change of the measure  $V_{dg}^i$  with the eigenstate, but in general the greater the energy difference between  $E_i$  and  $E(\rho_B)$ , the greater the average distinguishability. In addition, integrability also has a great influence. For an integrable system, the diagonal element  $V_{dg}^i$  is more random and the average distinguishability is also stronger.

Because of the reasons mentioned above, for a fixed  $\rho_B$ , it may not make sense to consider the maximum value of the diagonal elements  $V_{dg}^i$  for the entire energy eigenstate space. It is more meaningful to consider the maximum value within a certain energy shell, such as

$$\mathcal{M}_{E,\Delta} = (E - \Delta E/2, E + \Delta E/2). \quad (26)$$

with  $E = E(\rho_B)$ . Moreover, when considering energy eigenstates within  $\mathcal{M}_{E,\Delta}$ , it should be a better choice to choose an ensemble  $\rho_B$  with the same energy as  $E$ . In fig. 3(b), we have selected the canonical ensemble with corresponding energies for different energy shells and calculated the average distinguishability

$$\sum_{E_i \in \mathcal{M}_{E,\Delta}} V_{dg}^i / d_{\mathcal{M}}, \quad (27)$$

where  $d_{\mathcal{M}}$  is the number of energy levels inside the energy shell. It should be noted that this average distinguishability is not the same as the ‘‘diagonal’’ probabilistic typicality in eq. (17). The  $\rho_B$  used in  $V_{dg}^i$  may not be the microcanonical ensemble composed of  $\mathcal{M}_{E,\Delta}$ . According to fig. 3(b), although the average distinguishability also changes with the energy center  $E$ , the degree of change is much smaller than the change caused by the energy difference showed in fig. 3(a). Besides, the average distinguishability in the integrable system is still larger than that in the non-integrable system.

##### B. The ETH under the local observable

In this section, we mainly examine the strong and weak ETH under the local observable. We calculated two energy shells  $\mathcal{M}'_{E=0,\Delta}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{E(\beta),\Delta}$ , where  $\Delta E = 0.2N$  and  $E(\beta) = E(\rho^c(\beta = 0.1))$ . These two energy shells contain both highly excited states. For the energy shell  $\mathcal{M}$ , we considered the canonical ensemble  $\rho^c(\beta = 0.1)$ , microcanonical ensemble  $\rho^{mc} = \sum_{E_i \in \mathcal{M}} \Pi^i / d_{\mathcal{M}}$ . For the energy shell  $\mathcal{M}$ , we used microcanonical ensemble  $\rho'^{mc} = \sum_{E_i \in \mathcal{M}'} \Pi^i / d_{\mathcal{M}'}$ . We calculated the average distinguishability of the eigenstates within the energy shell

$$\bar{V}_{(off-)dg}^{Loc} = \frac{1}{d_{\mathcal{M}}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_{E,\Delta E}} V_{(off-)dg}^i. \quad (28)$$

For two microcanonical ensembles, this average is just the ‘‘(off-)diagonal’’ probabilistic typicality (17-18). In order to examine whether for all states in the energy shell, the diagonal elements  $V_{dg}^i$  is exponentially small, we calculated

$$V_{dg,max}^{Loc} = \max_{E_i \in \mathcal{M}} V_{dg}^i. \quad (29)$$

We also calculated the maxima of the off-diagonal elements relative to the diagonal elements

$$V_{off,max}^{Loc} = \max_{E_i \in \mathcal{M}, j} V_{off}^{ij}. \quad (30)$$




FIG. 3. Parameters:  $g = 1.05$ ,  $N = 15$ ,  $N_{B_1} = 1$ . (a) The local diagonal element measure  $V_{dg}^i$  versus energy (difference). We used  $\rho_B = \sum_i \Pi_i / D_N$  and  $E(\rho_B) = 0$ . (b) The average  $V_{dg}^i$  under the energy shell of different energy centers  $E$ . We used  $\Delta E = 0.2$  and  $\rho_B = \rho^c(\beta)$ , where the  $E(\beta) = E$ .




FIG. 4. Parameters:  $g = 1.05$ ,  $N_{B_1} = 1$ . (a) The average diagonal elements  $\overline{V}_{dg}^{Loc}$  versus  $N$ . (b) The maximum diagonal element  $V_{dg,max}^{Loc}$  versus  $N$ . (c) The average off-diagonal elements  $\overline{V}_{off}^{Loc}$  versus  $N$ . (d) The maximum diagonal element  $V_{off,max}^{Loc}$  versus  $N$ .

As in eq. (13), here the index  $j$  is taken over the full Hilbert space.

According to eqs. (13) and (19), the local state of ensemble  $\rho_{B_1}$  is a key quantity. When  $N$  changes from 10 to 15, there is almost no change in  $\text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1$  for several ensembles, whether the system is integrable or not: When  $h = 0$ , we have  $\text{Tr}((\rho_{B_1}^c)^{-1}) - 1 = 3.04367676652 \pm 10^{-11}$ ,  $\text{Tr}((\rho_{B_1}^{\text{mc}})^{-1}) - 1 = 3.04 \pm 10^{-2}$  and  $\text{Tr}((\rho_{B_1}^{\text{mc}})^{-1}) - 1 = 3.0005 \pm 5 * 10^{-4}$ . When  $h = 0.1$ , we have  $\text{Tr}((\rho_{B_1}^c)^{-1}) - 1 = 3.04427703179 \pm 10^{-11}$ ,  $\text{Tr}((\rho_{B_1}^{\text{mc}})^{-1}) - 1 = 3.04 \pm 10^{-2}$  and  $\text{Tr}((\rho_{B_1}^{\text{mc}})^{-1}) - 1 = 3.0005 \pm 5 * 10^{-4}$ .

As shown in fig. 4(a-b), there is a big difference between integrable and non-integrable systems in the diagonal elements. For the non-integrable system, the average distinguishability of the diagonal elements decreases exponentially with  $N$ . Its exponential decay constant is about  $\frac{4}{5} \ln(2)$ , which is close to the  $\ln(2) = d \ln(1/D_N)/dN$  in eq. (14). The exponential decay constant of the maximum  $V_{\text{dg}}^i$  is smaller, about  $\frac{3}{5} \ln(2)$ . For the integrable system, its exponential decay constant of the average distinguishability is very small, about  $\frac{1}{5} \ln(2)$ . And the maximum  $V_{\text{dg}}^i$  seems to have almost no decay with  $N$ .

As shown in fig. 4(c-d), the difference in off-diagonal elements between integrable and non-integrable systems is small. Consistent with the prediction of eq. (14), the average of the off-diagonal elements is strictly exponentially suppressed. Whether integrable or not, their exponential decay constant is  $\ln(2)$ . The exponential decrease in the average of the off-diagonal elements does not mean that the maximum values of the off-diagonal elements will also decrease exponentially. As shown in fig. 4(d), although the maximum values of the off-diagonal elements do decrease with  $N$ , they do not show obvious regularity.

In addition, the average off-diagonal elements of the non-integrable system in the fig. 4(c) are all smaller than the average off-diagonal elements of the corresponding integrable system, which is consistent with the trade-off relationship between the diagonal and off-diagonal given by eq. (19).

### C. The ETH under the average observable

Now let us examine the strong and weak ETH under the average observable. The energy shells and ensembles are the same as in the previous section. Since the ensembles used here are all translation-invariant, we only need to replace  $V(\rho_B, O_{ij}^{B_1})$  with  $V(\rho_B, \overline{O}_{ij}^{B_1})$ , and we can get the corresponding  $\overline{V}_{(\text{off-})\text{dg}}^{\text{Avg}}$  and  $V_{(\text{off-})\text{dg},\text{max}}^{\text{Avg}}$  from the eqs. (28) to (30). According to eqs. (20) and (23), the local term can be obtained by multiplying the  $\text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1$  in the previous section by a factor  $1/\mathcal{C}$ . In average observable, the influence of spatial correlation of ensemble states  $V_{\text{Cor}}^{\text{Avg}}$  also needs to be considered. As can be seen from fig. 2, the correlation term is negative, so it will further reduce the up bound of the average (off-)diagonal el-

ements. In addition, the correlation terms are obviously different when the energy center is different. This is because the correlation of the ensemble  $\rho^{\text{mc}}$  with energy close to zero is weaker. At the same time, this difference also causes the two ensembles to be more obviously different from fig. 5(c) compared to fig. 4(c). The localized states of several ensembles are very close, but the correlation terms are different.

As shown in fig. 5(a-d), the big difference between integrable and non-integrable systems in the exponential decay constant of diagonal elements still holds. The average of the off-diagonal elements is still exponentially suppressed. And the maximum values of the off-diagonal elements still show no regularity. However, the average off-diagonal elements of the non-integrable system in the fig. 5(c) is no longer always smaller than the average off-diagonal elements of the corresponding integrable system. But this is still consistent with the trade-off relationship between the diagonal and off-diagonal given by eq. (23), since in the fig. 5(a) the average diagonal elements of the integrable system are now not always larger than those of the non-integrable system.

## V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this paper, we further study the measurement-independent and easily deformable distinguishability measure  $V(\rho_B, O_{ij}^{B_1})$ . We discuss how to introduce this measure in subsystem ETH, weak ETH and extend it to average observable. By deforming this measure, we find that there is an accurate and universal trade-off relationship between its diagonal and off-diagonal elements. Through numerical calculations, we can find that this trade-off relationship also exists for other ETH measures, but it is not an equality relationship. This trade-off relationship is not only applicable to common ensembles, but also to other states  $\rho_B$ . The right side of the trade-off equation is only related to the local state of  $\rho_B$ , while the left side of the equation has a diagonal element and  $D_N - 1$  off-diagonal elements. This makes the average of the off-diagonal elements must be exponentially suppressed. The diagonal element needs to be further considered in terms of its ratio to the average of the off-diagonal elements, which is related to whether the system is integrable. For weak ETH and average observable, we also give the trade-off relationship between the corresponding diagonal elements and off-diagonal elements. Subsequently, we did some numerical calculations. These calculations show that the distinguishability measure  $V(\rho_B, O_{ij}^{B_1})$  can indeed be used to analyze ETH. In addition, the numerical result that the average off-diagonal element is strictly suppressed by the exponential is also consistent with the conclusion of the trade-off relationship.

In the numerical calculations of this paper, we use the same ensemble to compare the eigenstates within an energy shell. The energy of these states will devi-




FIG. 5. Parameters:  $g = 1.05$ ,  $N_{B_1} = 1$ . (a) The average diagonal elements  $\bar{V}_{\text{dg}}^{\text{Avg}}$  versus  $N$ . (b) The maximum diagonal element  $V_{\text{dg,max}}^{\text{Avg}}$  versus  $N$ . (c) The average off-diagonal elements  $\bar{V}_{\text{off}}^{\text{Avg}}$  versus  $N$ . (d) The maximum diagonal element  $V_{\text{off,max}}^{\text{Avg}}$  versus  $N$ .

ate from the ensemble, and according to fig. 3(a), this energy difference will introduce additional distinguishability. Therefore, using an ensemble with the same energy for these energy eigenstates can further reduce the average distinguishability and the maximum distinguishability. The difficulty lies in how to obtain the corresponding microcanonical ensemble based on the eigenstate energy and quickly obtain its subsystem state. When  $N$  is large, the number of states within the energy shell is large. Constructing a microcanonical ensemble and obtaining the state of its subsystem is a relatively time-consuming operation.

In addition, in this paper, we did not discuss the cases that the size of subsystem  $B_1$  scales proportionally with the full system  $N_{B_1}/N_B = p$ . This is because [14] has already discussed this in detail. However, using the measurement form  $d^{(3)}$  of this paper, there are still some aspects worth considering. Considering local observations, since  $\text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1$  generally increases with  $D_{B_1}^2$ . If  $f^i(N)$  increases exponentially at a rate much slower than  $D_N$ .

Then there will be  $V_{\text{dg}}^i \propto D_{B_1}^2/D_N$ . According to eq. (5), we have  $d^{(2)} \sim D_{B_1}/D_N^{1/2}$ , which is consistent with the results of [14]. Similar to eq. (A5), it is easy to find that

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(\rho_B^c, O_{ii}^{B_1}) &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta} p'_\beta{}^{-1} |\langle \beta | (\rho_{ii}^{B_1} - \rho_{B_1}^c) | \alpha \rangle|^2 \\
 &\leq \sum_{\alpha, \beta} p'_\beta{}^{-1} (|\langle \beta | (\rho_{ii}^{B_1} - \rho_{B_1}^{\text{mc}}) | \alpha \rangle| + |\langle \beta | (\rho_{B_1}^{\text{mc}} - \rho_{B_1}^c) | \alpha \rangle|)^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

When  $B_1$  is scaled to infinity, one can do the similar semiclassical analysis as [14], and get an approximate value of  $V(\rho_B^c, O_{ii}^{B_1})$ . This can give another perspective to consider the local difference between the energy eigenstates and the canonical ensemble in the thermodynamic limit.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Xiao-Kan Guo for his helpful comments. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12305035.

### Appendix A: Variance relation

Here we show the detailed derivation of the most critical quantum variance relation eqs. (13) and (20) in the main text. According to the definition

$$\begin{aligned} V(\rho_B, O_{ij}^{B_1}) &= \|(\sigma_{B_1}^{ij} - \delta_{i,j} \rho_{B_1}) \rho_{B_1}^{-1/2}\|_2^2 \\ &= \text{Tr}(\sigma_{B_1}^{ij} \rho_{B_1}^{-1} \sigma_{B_1}^{ij\dagger}) - \delta_{i,j}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Suppose  $\rho_{B_1} = \sum_{\alpha} p'_{\alpha} \Pi_{B_1}^{\alpha}$ , we can rewrite

$$V_{\text{dg}}^i + \sum_{j \neq i} V_{\text{off}}^{ij} = \sum_{j, \alpha, \beta} p'_{\beta}{}^{-1} |\text{Tr}(\sigma_{B_1}^{ij} \Pi_{B_1}^{\alpha\beta})|^2 - 1, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where  $\Pi^{\alpha\beta} = |\alpha\rangle\langle\beta|$ . Since  $|\text{Tr}(\sigma_{B_1}^{ij} A^{B_1})|^2 = |\text{Tr}(\Pi^{ij} A^{B_1})|^2$ , combining it with

$$\mathcal{J}_{\rho_{B_k}}^{-1/2}(\Pi_{B_k}^{\alpha\beta}) = (p'_{\alpha} p'_{\beta})^{-1/2} \Pi_{B_k}^{\alpha\beta} \quad (\text{A3})$$

and using the defined

$$O_{\alpha\beta}^{B_1} = \mathcal{J}_{\rho_{B_1}}^{-1/2}(\Pi_{B_1}^{\alpha\beta}), \quad (\text{A4})$$

we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{dg}}^i + \sum_{j \neq i} V_{\text{off}}^{ij} &= \sum_{j, \alpha, \beta} p'_{\beta}{}^{-1} |\text{Tr}(\Pi_{B_1}^{\alpha\beta} \Pi_{B_1}^{ij})|^2 - 1 \\ &= \sum_{\beta, \alpha} p'_{\alpha} \text{Tr}[(O_{\alpha\beta}^{B_1})^{\dagger} \Pi_i O_{\alpha\beta}^{B_1}] - 1 \\ &= \sum_{\beta} p'_{\beta}{}^{-1} \text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1} O_{ii}^{B_1}) - 1 = \text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1}^{-1}) - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

which is just the eq. (13).

The proof of eq. (20) is similar to eq. (A5), just replace  $O$  with  $\bar{O}$  and use

$$|\text{Tr}[(\frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \sum_k \sigma_{B_1}^{ij,k}) A^{B_1}]|^2 = |\text{Tr}[\Pi^{ij} (\frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \sum_k A^{B_k})]|^2. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Now we need to use  $\bar{O}_{\alpha\beta}^B = \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \sum_k O_{\alpha\beta,1}^{B_k}$  and  $O_{\alpha\beta,1}^{B_k}$  is the translational copies of  $O_{\alpha\beta}^{B_1}$ . Using these, we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} &V(\rho, \bar{O}_{ii}^{B_1}) + \sum_{j \neq i} V(\rho, \bar{O}_{ij}^{B_1}) \\ &= \sum_{\beta, \alpha} p'_{\alpha} \text{Tr}[(\bar{O}_{\alpha\beta}^B)^{\dagger} \Pi_i \bar{O}_{\alpha\beta}^B] - 1 \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}^2} \sum_{\beta, \alpha, k} p'_{\alpha} \text{Tr}[(O_{\alpha\beta,1}^{B_k})^{\dagger} \Pi_i O_{\alpha\beta,1}^{B_k}] - \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}^2} \sum_{\beta, \alpha, l, k \neq l} p'_{\alpha} \text{Tr}[(O_{\alpha\beta,1}^{B_k})^{\dagger} \Pi_i O_{\alpha\beta,1}^{B_l}] - \frac{\mathcal{C}-1}{\mathcal{C}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

where the local terms

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\beta, \alpha} p'_{\alpha} \text{Tr}[(O_{\alpha\beta,1}^{B_k})^{\dagger} \Pi_i O_{\alpha\beta,1}^{B_k}] \\ &= \sum_{\beta} p'_{\beta}{}^{-1} \text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1} \mathcal{J}_{\rho_{B_1}}^{-1/2}(\sigma_{B_1}^{ii,k})) = \text{Tr}(\rho_{B_1}^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

Combining it with

$$\text{Tr}[(O_{\alpha\beta,1}^{B_k})^{\dagger} \sigma_{B_k}^{ii}] \times \text{Tr}(\rho_{B_l}^1 O_{\alpha\beta,1}^{B_l}) = p'_{\alpha}{}^{-1} \text{Tr}[\Pi_{\alpha} \sigma_{B_k}^{ii}] \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (\text{A9})$$

we will get eq. (20).

### Appendix B: Basic properties of the model

Here we simply illustrate the basic properties of the model. As shown in fig. 6(a), The density of states of integrable and non-integrable systems are very close. The density of states for non-integrable systems is smoother and can be reasonably approximated by the binomial distribution [14]. The plot of fig. 6(c) gives the energy temperature curve of the system. As shown in fig. 6(d), the mutual information  $I(B_1, B_2)$  decays exponentially with the distance between sites. The plot is for the  $h = 0.1$  system, and the mutual information of the  $h = 0$  system is very close to it, so it is not plotted here.

- 
- [1] L. D'Alessio, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, From quantum chaos and eigenstate thermalization to statistical mechanics and thermodynamics, *Adv. Phys.* **65**, 239 (2016).
  - [2] J. M. Deutsch, Eigenstate thermalization hypothesis, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **81**, 082001 (2018).
  - [3] J. M. Deutsch, Quantum statistical mechanics in a closed system, *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, 2046 (1991).
  - [4] M. Srednicki, Chaos and quantum thermalization, *Phys. Rev. E* **50**, 888 (1994).
  - [5] M. Srednicki, The approach to thermal equilibrium in quantized chaotic systems, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **32**, 1163 (1999).
  - [6] H.-H. Lai, K. Yang, Entanglement entropy scaling laws and eigenstate typicality in free fermion systems, *Physical Review B*, 91 (2015) 081110.




FIG. 6. Parameters:  $g = 1.05$ ,  $N = 15$ . (a) The number of states of the spin chain system. (b) The energy probability distribution of canonical ensemble.  $\beta = 0.1$ . (c) The energy versus thermodynamic beta.  $\beta = 0.1$ . (d) The value of  $\log_{10} I(B_1, B_2)$  between two sites.  $\beta = 0.1$ .

- [7] K.K.W. Ma, A. Volya, K. Yang, Eigenstate thermalization and disappearance of quantum many-body scar states in weakly interacting fermion systems, *Physical Review B*, 106 (2022) 214313.
- [8] G. Biroli, C. Kollath, and A. M. Läuchli, Effect of rare fluctuations on the thermalization of isolated quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 250401 (2010).
- [9] T. Mori, Weak eigenstate thermalization with large deviation bound, arXiv:1609.09776.
- [10] H. Tasaki, Typicality of Thermal Equilibrium and Thermalization in Isolated Macroscopic Quantum Systems, *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 163 (2016) 937-997.
- [11] E. Iyoda, K. Kaneko, and T. Sagawa, Fluctuation theorem for many-body pure quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 100601 (2017).
- [12] T. Kuwahara and K. Saito, Eigenstate thermalization from the clustering property of correlation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 200604 (2020).
- [13] Q. Miao and T. Barthel, Eigenstate entanglement: Crossover from the ground state to volume laws, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 040403 (2021).
- [14] A. Dymarsky, N. Lashkari, and H. Liu, Subsystem eigenstate thermalization hypothesis, *Phys. Rev. E* **97**, 012140 (2018).
- [15] G. Cipolloni, L. Erdos, and D. Schröder, Eigenstate thermalization hypothesis for Wigner matrices, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **388**, 1005 (2021).
- [16] M. Fishman, S. White, E.M. Stoudenmire, The ITensor software library for tensor network calculations, *SciPost Physics Codebases*, DOI (2022) 004.
- [17] Z. Huang, X.-K. Guo, Subsystem eigenstate thermalization hypothesis for translation invariant systems, *Physical Review E*, 109 (2024) 054120.