

Tripartite entanglement dynamics following a quantum quench

Clément Berthiere*

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique, CNRS, Université de Toulouse, France

(Dated: August 23, 2024)

We investigate the dynamics of multipartite entanglement after quenches from initial states which generate multiplets of quasiparticle excitations beyond the usual pair structure. We focus on the dynamics of tripartite entanglement through the lens of the Markov gap—a computable quantity that signals irreducible tripartite entanglement when positive. In the XX spin chain, we show that the Markov gap is positive at intermediate times, implying the presence of tripartite entanglement. After a time delay, the Markov gap increases and then decays at longer times, thus exhibiting an entanglement barrier. We argue that those qualitative features are consistent with an interpretation of the spreading of tripartite entanglement by triplets of tripartite-entangled quasiparticles.

The investigation of non-equilibrium dynamics in isolated many-body quantum systems has emerged as a central topic in modern physics. Understanding how entanglement and correlations spread in these systems is not only fascinating, but also of fundamental importance across various domains, including condensed matter, statistical physics, and quantum field theory. One of the most studied protocols is the quantum quench (e.g., [1–5]) in which an extended system evolves unitarily under an Hamiltonian after having been initially prepared in a non-equilibrium state. Recent progress on the experimental front [6–9] has made possible the engineering of Hamiltonian dynamics of isolated quantum systems, and the measuring of non-trivial physical properties such as the growth of entanglement following a quantum quench [10–12] and out-of-time ordered correlators [13–16].

Much of the research has focused on the time evolution of bipartite entanglement measures after a quantum quench [17–41], such as the entanglement entropy. Many qualitative features of the entanglement dynamics of integrable many-body quantum systems may be understood using a simple physical description put forward in [17]. Within the so-called quasiparticle picture, the initial state is regarded as a source of pairs of entangled quasiparticle excitations which ballistically propagate across the system and carry entanglement. The type of entangled quasiparticles responsible for the entanglement spreading is dictated by the initial state. Recently, the focus has expanded from conventional quenches generating pairs of entangled quasiparticles to richer quenches that give rise to entangled multiplets of quasiparticles [42–45], which are particularly relevant in the context of multipartite entanglement dynamics.

The structure of entanglement becomes significantly more complex when more than two parties are involved [46, 47], leading to the emergence of several inequivalent classes of entanglement. To comprehensively understand the entanglement structure of a quantum system, it is essential to investigate its multipartite entanglement properties, see, e.g., [48–56]. Recent theoretical activities have explored the time evolution of the tripartite mutual




FIG. 1. (a) A finite system divided into three parts A , B and C , of respective size ℓ_A , ℓ_B and ℓ_C . (b) An infinite system ($\ell_C \rightarrow \infty$) with subsystems A and B such that $\ell_A = \ell_B = \ell$.

information after a quantum quench, e.g., [45, 57–60]. In out-of-equilibrium systems, a negative tripartite mutual information is used as a diagnostic of scrambling [61–63], associated with the notion of chaos. Importantly, it should be noted that the tripartite mutual information is *not* a measure of three-party entanglement, but of four-party. Tripartite entanglement, representing the simplest level of complexity beyond bipartite entanglement, deserves to be explored with particular attention.

In this letter, we investigate the dynamics of tripartite entanglement following a quantum quench producing triplets of quasiparticles. To that aim, we consider the Markov gap, a computable quantity that signals irreducible tripartite entanglement when positive [49]. We show that this quantity is positive at intermediate times in the hydrodynamic regime, implying the presence of tripartite entanglement. The time evolution of the Markov gap is consistent with an interpretation of the spreading of tripartite entanglement by triplets of tripartite-entangled quasiparticles. Conversely, the Markov gap can be exploited to witness the existence of multiplets with at least three (entangled) excitations.

Markov gap — We first review the definitions of the mutual information $I(A : B)$ and the reflected entropy $S_R(A : B)$, from which is defined the Markov gap.

The mutual information is a measure of correlation between two subsystems of a general quantum state. It is defined as $I(A : B) = S(A) + S(B) - S(A \cup B)$, where $S(X) = -\text{Tr}(\rho_X \log \rho_X)$ is the entanglement entropy of ρ_X on subsystem X .

* clement.berthiere@irsamc.ups-tlse.fr




FIG. 2. Dynamics of the Markov gap in the XX chain after the quench from $|\psi_0\rangle$. The dotted lines correspond to different lengths $\ell = \min(\ell_A, \ell_B)$ of the subsystems, while the solid teal lines are the extrapolations to the hydrodynamic limit $t, \ell \rightarrow \infty$ with t/ℓ fixed. (a) Equal subsystem sizes. The inset shows a close-up around time $t = \ell/\sqrt{3}$ before which the Markov gap is zero. (b) Unequal subsystem sizes $\ell_B = 3\ell_A$. A time delay $t_d = \ell/\sqrt{3}$ and a secondary increase at time $t_b = \ell\sqrt{3}$ are observed.

For the reflected entropy [64] (see also, e.g., [65–75]), we consider the canonical purification $|\sqrt{\rho_{AB}}\rangle$ of ρ_{AB} , where we regard the operator $\sqrt{\rho_{AB}}$ as a state in a doubled Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A^*} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B^*}$. The reflected entropy is then defined as $S_R(A : B) = S(AA^*)$, i.e. the entanglement entropy associated to $|\sqrt{\rho_{AB}}\rangle$.

The Markov gap M is the difference between reflected entropy and mutual information: $M \equiv S_R - I$. The reflected entropy being lower bounded by the mutual information [64], the Markov gap is a nonnegative quantity. For Gaussian states, these quantities can be computed using the two-point correlation function [41, 67, 76, 77], as explained in Sec. I of Supplemental Material (SM) [78].

For pure tripartite states, a positive Markov gap $M > 0$ signals tripartite entanglement that cannot be reduced to bipartite entanglement with local unitaries [49] (see also [48, 50, 55, 79] for further studies). Note that the Markov gap does not detect GHZ-type entanglement, e.g. it is zero for the GHZ state of three qubits. Our objective is to study the dynamics of (non-GHZ) tripartite entanglement following quantum quenches from low-entangled initial states, through the lens of the Markov gap.

Quench protocol and setup — A fermionic chain is prepared at $t = 0$ in the state $|\psi_0\rangle$. At time $t > 0$, we let the initial state evolve as $|\psi(t)\rangle = e^{-itH} |\psi_0\rangle$ under the tight-binding Hamiltonian $H = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_i (c_i^\dagger c_{i+1} + c_{i+1}^\dagger c_i)$, with c_i standard fermionic operators, which can be mapped onto the XX spin chain. We study the time evolution generated by the above Hamiltonian on the initial state:

$$|\psi_0\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^{L/3} c_{3i}^\dagger |0\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where L is the total size of the chain such that $L/3$ is integer. This state is Gaussian and invariant under translation of three sites, and presents a single fermion per unit

cell. In SM Sec. II, we consider generalizations of this state to arbitrary size of unit cell and arbitrary number of fermions in each cell, as well as other states.

The state $|\psi_0\rangle$ in (1) generates triplets of quasiparticle excitations after the quench (e.g., [42]), instead of the more conventional pair structure that leads to a growth of bipartite entanglement only as pairs of entangled quasiparticles spread in the system. It is natural to wonder whether the spreading of multiplets of quasiparticles may lead to a growth of multipartite entanglement—in the case at hand of tripartite entanglement.

We study the time evolution of the Markov gap as a witness of tripartite entanglement after quantum quenches described above. The system is divided into three contiguous parts A , B and C , see Fig. 1(a). For simplicity, we work in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, which we access by letting the length of subsystem C be infinite (see Fig. 1(b)). We choose the characteristic length scale to be $\ell = \min(\ell_A, \ell_B)$.

Tripartite entanglement spreading — We study the time evolution of the Markov gap M in the XX chain after a global quantum quench from the triplet state $|\psi_0\rangle$ (cf. (1)). Our numerical results are reported in Fig. 2 which shows data for M/ℓ plotted as a function of t/ℓ , where $\ell = \min(\ell_A, \ell_B)$. We consider two cases: equal subsystem sizes $\ell_A = \ell_B$ displayed in Fig. 2(a), and different subsystem sizes $\ell_B = 3\ell_A$ showed in Fig. 2(b).

We find that the Markov gap is nonvanishing in the hydrodynamic regime $t, \ell \rightarrow \infty$ with t/ℓ fixed. The hydrodynamic extrapolations (solid lines in Fig. 2) are fits of our finite-size results for $90 \leq \ell \leq 2070$. We observe a time delay $t_d = \min(\ell_A, \ell_B)/\sqrt{3}$ before which the Markov gap is zero. At time $t > t_d$, the Markov gap becomes positive and increases rapidly, signaling a production of tripartite entanglement. A second sharp increase is observed at time $t_b = \max(\ell_A, \ell_B)/\sqrt{3}$ for $\ell_A \neq \ell_B$, see

Fig. 2(b) (note that $t_b = t_d$ for $\ell_A = \ell_B$). A plateau develops as one of the subsystems becomes larger than the other. After reaching its maximum value, the Markov gap decreases and vanishes in the large-time limit, thus displaying an entanglement barrier. The decay is rather slow, as $\sim t^{-1}$, which means that tripartite entanglement persists in the system for infinitely long times.

The features described above are consistent with a quasiparticle interpretation of the spreading of tripartite entanglement. The initial state acts as a source of triplets of quasiparticles produced homogeneously throughout the system at time $t = 0$. Quasiparticles emitted from the same position are assumed to be entangled. As they propagate ballistically for $t > 0$, quasiparticles carry and spread entanglement throughout the system. Entanglement between the three parties A, B, C at time t is thus related to the triplets of entangled quasiparticles that are shared between A, B, C , see Fig. 3.

Initial states that produce only pairs of quasiparticles, such as the Néel and dimer states, cannot entangle more than two parties and are thus expected to yield a vanishing Markov gap in the hydrodynamic regime. We have checked that this is indeed the case. For initial states that give rise to multiplets of quasiparticle excitations, we expect that multipartite entanglement can be accordingly produced after a quench.

Discussion — Multipartite entanglement is difficult to grasp in quantum many-body systems, even more so in out-of-equilibrium settings. Through the lens of the Markov gap, we have investigated the dynamics of tripartite entanglement following a quantum quench in the XX spin chain from an initial state generating triplets of quasiparticle excitations. The Markov gap, when positive, signals irreducible tripartite entanglement. We have shown that this quantity is positive at intermediate times in the hydrodynamic regime, implying the presence of tripartite entanglement. After a time delay, the Markov gap increases and then decays at longer times, thus exhibiting an entanglement barrier. Those qualitative features are consistent with an interpretation of the spreading of tripartite entanglement by triplets of tripartite-entangled




FIG. 3. Within the quasiparticle picture, only multiplets that are shared between all the subsystems A, B, C contribute to the Markov gap. Here is depicted a triplet produced at the boundary of A and B . The times $t_1 < t_2 < t_3$ at which quasiparticles change subsystem are shown. For $0 \leq t \leq t_1$, the triplet is shared between A and B only; the Markov gap thus zero. At $t = t_1$, the leftmost quasiparticle leaves A to enter C , while the second and third quasiparticles stay in A and B , respectively, hence the triplet starts to contribute to the Markov gap. For $t > t_2$, the two left quasiparticles have left A such that the Markov gap vanishes again.

quasiparticles. We expect that n -partite entanglement can be similarly produced after quantum quenches from initial states generating n -plets of quasiparticles.

We have performed numerical calculations to access the hydrodynamic regime of large subsystems and long times, with their ratio fixed. The entanglement entropy following a quench from the initial state (1) for a single interval of length ℓ can be obtained analytically and reads

$$S(t) = s(1/3) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{dk}{2\pi} \min(\sqrt{3}|v_k|t, \ell), \quad (2)$$

where $s(x) = -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x)$ and $v_k = \sin k$. The mutual information of two adjacent subsystems can easily be inferred from this formula. It would be interesting to analytically compute the reflected entropy, to obtain the full analytical form of the Markov gap.

Acknowledgments — It is a pleasure to thank Vincenzo Alba and Yijian Zou for enlightening correspondences. I am grateful to Gilles Perez for many interesting discussions and valuable comments on the draft.

-
- [1] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, “Quantum Quenches in Extended Systems,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **0706**, P06008 (2007), [arXiv:0704.1880](#).
- [2] A. Polkovnikov, K. Sengupta, A. Silva, and M. Vengalattore, “Nonequilibrium dynamics of closed interacting quantum systems,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 863 (2011), [arXiv:1007.5331](#).
- [3] C. Gogolin and J. Eisert, “Equilibration, thermalisation, and the emergence of statistical mechanics in closed quantum systems,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79**, 056001 (2016), [arXiv:1503.07538](#).
- [4] P. Calabrese, F. H. L. Essler, and G. Mussardo, “Introduction to ‘Quantum Integrability in Out of Equilibrium Systems’,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **2016**, 064001 (2016).
- [5] F. H. L. Essler and M. Fagotti, “Quench dynamics and relaxation in isolated integrable quantum spin chains,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **1606**, 064002 (2016), [arXiv:1603.06452](#).
- [6] R. Blatt and C. F. Roos, “Quantum simulations with trapped ions,” *Nat. Phys.* **8**, 277–284 (2012).
- [7] C. Monroe, W. C. Campbell, L. M. Duan, Z. X. Gong, A. V. Gorshkov, P. W. Hess, R. Islam, K. Kim, N. M. Linke, G. Pagano, P. Richerme, C. Senko, and N. Y. Yao, “Programmable quantum simulations of spin systems with trapped ions,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **93**, 025001 (2021), [arXiv:1912.07845](#).
- [8] A. Browaeys and T. Lahaye, “Many-body physics with individually controlled Rydberg atoms,” *Nat. Phys.* **16**, 132–142 (2020), [arXiv:2002.07413](#).

- [9] L. K. Joshi, A. Elben, A. Vikram, B. Vermersch, V. Galitski, and P. Zoller, “Probing Many-Body Quantum Chaos with Quantum Simulators,” *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 011018 (2022), [arXiv:2106.15530](#).
- [10] A. M. Kaufman, M. E. Tai, A. Lukin, M. Rispoli, R. Schittko, P. M. Preiss, and M. Greiner, “Quantum thermalization through entanglement in an isolated many-body system,” *Science* **353**, 794–800 (2016), [arXiv:1603.04409](#).
- [11] T. Brydges, A. Elben, P. Jurcevic, B. Vermersch, C. Maier, B. P. Lanyon, P. Zoller, R. Blatt, and C. F. Roos, “Probing Rényi entanglement entropy via randomized measurements,” *Science* **364**, 260–263 (2019), [arXiv:1806.05747](#).
- [12] A. Elben *et al.*, “Mixed-state entanglement from local randomized measurements,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 200501 (2020), [arXiv:2007.06305](#).
- [13] J. Li, R. Fan, H. Wang, B. Ye, B. Zeng, H. Zhai, X. Peng, and J. Du, “Measuring Out-of-Time-Order Correlators on a Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Quantum Simulator,” *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031011 (2017), [arXiv:1609.01246](#).
- [14] M. Gärttner, J. G. Bohnet, A. Safavi-Naini, M. L. Wall, J. J. Bollinger, and A. M. Rey, “Measuring out-of-time-order correlations and multiple quantum spectra in a trapped ion quantum magnet,” *Nature Phys.* **13**, 781 (2017), [arXiv:1608.08938](#).
- [15] K. A. Landsman, C. Figgatt, T. Schuster, N. M. Linke, B. Yoshida, N. Y. Yao, and C. Monroe, “Verified Quantum Information Scrambling,” *Nature* **567**, 61–65 (2019), [arXiv:1806.02807](#).
- [16] M. K. Joshi, A. Elben, B. Vermersch, T. Brydges, C. Maier, P. Zoller, R. Blatt, and C. F. Roos, “Quantum information scrambling in a trapped-ion quantum simulator with tunable range interactions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 240505 (2020), [arXiv:2001.02176](#).
- [17] P. Calabrese and J. L. Cardy, “Evolution of entanglement entropy in one-dimensional systems,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **0504**, P04010 (2005), [arXiv:cond-mat/0503393](#).
- [18] G. De Chiara, S. Montangero, P. Calabrese, and R. Fazio, “Entanglement entropy dynamics in Heisenberg chains,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **0603**, P03001 (2006), [arXiv:cond-mat/0512586](#).
- [19] M. Fagotti and P. Calabrese, “Evolution of entanglement entropy following a quantum quench: Analytic results for the XY chain in a transverse magnetic field,” *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 010306 (2008), [arXiv:0804.3559](#).
- [20] A. M. Läuchli and C. Kollath, “Spreading of correlations and entanglement after a quench in the one-dimensional Bose Hubbard model,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **2008**, 05018 (2008), [arXiv:0803.2947](#).
- [21] J.-M. Stéphan and J. Dubail, “Local quantum quenches in critical one-dimensional systems: entanglement, the Loschmidt echo, and light-cone effects,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **2011**, 08019 (2011), [arXiv:1105.4846](#).
- [22] H. Kim and D. A. Huse, “Ballistic Spreading of Entanglement in a Diffusive Nonintegrable System,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 127205 (2013), [arXiv:1306.4306](#).
- [23] M. Kormos, L. Bucciattini, and P. Calabrese, “Stationary entropies after a quench from excited states in the Ising chain,” *EPL* **107**, 40002 (2014), [arXiv:1406.5070](#).
- [24] A. Coser, E. Tonni, and P. Calabrese, “Entanglement negativity after a global quantum quench,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **1412**, P12017 (2014), [arXiv:1410.0900](#).
- [25] A. Nahum, J. Ruhman, S. Vijay, and J. Haah, “Quantum Entanglement Growth Under Random Unitary Dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031016 (2017), [arXiv:1608.06950](#).
- [26] J. S. Cotler, M. P. Hertzberg, M. Mezei, and M. T. Mueller, “Entanglement Growth after a Global Quench in Free Scalar Field Theory,” *JHEP* **11**, 166 (2016), [arXiv:1609.00872](#).
- [27] A. S. Buyskikh, M. Fagotti, J. Schachenmayer, F. Essler, and A. J. Daley, “Entanglement growth and correlation spreading with variable-range interactions in spin and fermionic tunneling models,” *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 053620 (2016), [arXiv:1601.02106](#).
- [28] J. Dubail, J.-M. Stéphan, J. Viti, and P. Calabrese, “Conformal field theory for inhomogeneous one-dimensional quantum systems: the example of non-interacting Fermi gases,” *SciPost Phys.* **2**, 002 (2017), [arXiv:1606.04401](#).
- [29] C. von Keyserlingk, T. Rakovszky, F. Pollmann, and S. Sondhi, “Operator hydrodynamics, OTOCs, and entanglement growth in systems without conservation laws,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021013 (2018), [arXiv:1705.08910](#).
- [30] V. Alba, “Entanglement and quantum transport in integrable systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 245135 (2018), [arXiv:1706.00020](#).
- [31] L. Hackl, E. Bianchi, R. Modak, and M. Rigol, “Entanglement production in bosonic systems: Linear and logarithmic growth,” *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 032321 (2018), [arXiv:1710.04279](#).
- [32] V. Alba and P. Calabrese, “Entanglement dynamics after quantum quenches in generic integrable systems,” *SciPost Phys.* **4**, 017 (2018), [arXiv:1712.07529](#).
- [33] X. Wen, Y. Wang, and S. Ryu, “Entanglement evolution across a conformal interface,” *J. Phys. A* **51**, 195004 (2018), [arXiv:1711.02126](#).
- [34] V. Alba and P. Calabrese, “Quantum information scrambling after a quantum quench,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 115150 (2019), [arXiv:1903.09176](#).
- [35] G. Perez, R. Bonsignori, and P. Calabrese, “Quasiparticle dynamics of symmetry-resolved entanglement after a quench: Examples of conformal field theories and free fermions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, L041104 (2021), [arXiv:2010.09794](#).
- [36] G. Perez, R. Bonsignori, and P. Calabrese, “Exact quench dynamics of symmetry resolved entanglement in a free fermion chain,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **2109**, 093102 (2021), [arXiv:2106.13115](#). [Erratum: *J. Stat. Mech.* 2212, 129901 (2022)].
- [37] V. Alba and F. Carollo, “Hydrodynamics of quantum entropies in Ising chains with linear dissipation,” *J. Phys. A* **55**, 074002 (2022), [arXiv:2109.01836](#).
- [38] B. Bertini, K. Klobas, and T.-C. Lu, “Entanglement Negativity and Mutual Information after a Quantum Quench: Exact Link from Space-Time Duality,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 140503 (2022), [arXiv:2203.17254](#).
- [39] V. Alba and F. Carollo, “Logarithmic negativity in out-of-equilibrium open free-fermion chains: An exactly solvable case,” *SciPost Phys.* **15**, 124 (2023), [arXiv:2205.02139](#).
- [40] G. Perez and R. Bonsignori, “Analytical results for the entanglement dynamics of disjoint blocks in the XY spin chain,” *J. Phys. A* **55**, 505005 (2022), [arXiv:2210.03637](#).
- [41] C. Berthiere and G. Perez, “Reflected entropy and computable cross-norm negativity: Free theories and sym-

- metry resolution,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 054508 (2023), [arXiv:2307.11009](#).
- [42] B. Bertini, E. Tartaglia, and P. Calabrese, “Entanglement and diagonal entropies after a quench with no pair structure,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **6**, 063104 (2018), [arXiv:1802.10589](#).
- [43] A. Bastianello and P. Calabrese, “Spreading of entanglement and correlations after a quench with intertwined quasiparticles,” *SciPost Phys.* **5**, 033 (2018), [arXiv:1807.10176](#).
- [44] S. S. Roy, G. Ramírez, S. N. Santalla, G. Sierra, and J. Rodríguez-Laguna, “Exotic correlation spread in free-fermionic states with initial patterns,” *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 214306 (2022), [arXiv:2112.13382](#).
- [45] F. Caceffo and V. Alba, “Negative tripartite mutual information after quantum quenches in integrable systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 134434 (2023), [arXiv:2305.10245](#).
- [46] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, “Quantum entanglement,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009), [arXiv:quant-ph/0702225](#).
- [47] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, “Entanglement detection,” *Phys. Rep.* **474**, 1 (2009), [arXiv:0811.2803](#).
- [48] C. Akers and P. Rath, “Entanglement Wedge Cross Sections Require Tripartite Entanglement,” *JHEP* **04**, 208 (2020), [arXiv:1911.07852](#).
- [49] Y. Zou, K. Siva, T. Soejima, R. S. K. Mong, and M. P. Zaletel, “Universal tripartite entanglement in one-dimensional many-body systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 120501 (2021), [arXiv:2011.11864](#).
- [50] P. Hayden, O. Parrikar, and J. Sorce, “The Markov gap for geometric reflected entropy,” *JHEP* **10**, 047 (2021), [arXiv:2107.00009](#).
- [51] Y. Liu, R. Sohal, J. Kudler-Flam, and S. Ryu, “Multipartitioning topological phases by vertex states and quantum entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 115107 (2022), [arXiv:2110.11980](#).
- [52] P. M. Tam, M. Claassen, and C. L. Kane, “Topological multipartite entanglement in a Fermi liquid,” *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 031022 (2022), [arXiv:2204.06559](#).
- [53] G. Perez, C. Berthiere, and W. Witczak-Krempa, “Separability and entanglement of resonating valence-bond states,” *SciPost Phys.* **15**, 066 (2023), [arXiv:2212.11740](#).
- [54] Y. Liu, Y. Kusuki, J. Kudler-Flam, R. Sohal, and S. Ryu, “Multipartite entanglement in two-dimensional chiral topological liquids,” *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 085108 (2024), [arXiv:2301.07130](#).
- [55] C. Berthiere, B. Chen, and H. Chen, “Reflected entropy and Markov gap in Lifshitz theories,” *JHEP* **09**, 160 (2023), [arXiv:2307.12247](#).
- [56] G. Perez and W. Witczak-Krempa, “The Fate of Entanglement,” [arXiv:2402.06677](#).
- [57] E. Iyoda and T. Sagawa, “Scrambling of Quantum Information in Quantum Many-Body Systems,” *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 042330 (2018), [arXiv:1704.04850](#).
- [58] O. Schnaack, N. Bölter, S. Paeckel, S. R. Manmana, S. Kehrein, and M. Schmitt, “Tripartite information, scrambling, and the role of Hilbert space partitioning in quantum lattice models,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 224302 (2019), [arXiv:1808.05646](#).
- [59] F. Carollo and V. Alba, “Entangled multiplets and spreading of quantum correlations in a continuously monitored tight-binding chain,” *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, L220304 (2022), [arXiv:2206.07806](#).
- [60] V. Marić and M. Fagotti, “Universality in the tripartite information after global quenches,” *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, L161116 (2023), [arXiv:2209.14253](#).
- [61] P. Hayden and J. Preskill, “Black holes as mirrors: Quantum information in random subsystems,” *JHEP* **09**, 120 (2007), [arXiv:0708.4025](#).
- [62] Y. Sekino and L. Susskind, “Fast Scramblers,” *JHEP* **10**, 065 (2008), [arXiv:0808.2096](#).
- [63] P. Hosur, X.-L. Qi, D. A. Roberts, and B. Yoshida, “Chaos in quantum channels,” *JHEP* **02**, 004 (2016), [arXiv:1511.04021](#).
- [64] S. Dutta and T. Faulkner, “A canonical purification for the entanglement wedge cross-section,” *JHEP* **03**, 178 (2021), [arXiv:1905.00577](#).
- [65] H.-S. Jeong, K.-Y. Kim, and M. Nishida, “Reflected Entropy and Entanglement Wedge Cross Section with the First Order Correction,” *JHEP* **12**, 170 (2019), [arXiv:1909.02806](#).
- [66] J. Kudler-Flam, Y. Kusuki, and S. Ryu, “Correlation measures and the entanglement wedge cross-section after quantum quenches in two-dimensional conformal field theories,” *JHEP* **04**, 074 (2020), [arXiv:2001.05501](#).
- [67] P. Bueno and H. Casini, “Reflected entropy, symmetries and free fermions,” *JHEP* **05**, 103 (2020), [arXiv:2003.09546](#).
- [68] T. Li, J. Chu, and Y. Zhou, “Reflected Entropy for an Evaporating Black Hole,” *JHEP* **11**, 155 (2020), [arXiv:2006.10846](#).
- [69] C. Berthiere, H. Chen, Y. Liu, and B. Chen, “Topological reflected entropy in Chern-Simons theories,” *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 035149 (2021), [arXiv:2008.07950](#).
- [70] P. Bueno and H. Casini, “Reflected entropy for free scalars,” *JHEP* **11**, 148 (2020), [arXiv:2008.11373](#).
- [71] C. Akers, T. Faulkner, S. Lin, and P. Rath, “The Page curve for reflected entropy,” *JHEP* **06**, 089 (2022), [arXiv:2201.11730](#).
- [72] M. J. Vasli, M. R. Mohammadi Mozaffar, K. Babaei Velni, and M. Sahraei, “Holographic study of reflected entropy in anisotropic theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 026012 (2023), [arXiv:2207.14169](#).
- [73] Y. Lu and J. Lin, “The Markov gap in the presence of islands,” *JHEP* **03**, 043 (2023), [arXiv:2211.06886](#).
- [74] M. Afrasiar, J. K. Basak, A. Chandra, and G. Sengupta, “Reflected entropy for communicating black holes. Part I. Karch-Randall braneworlds,” *JHEP* **02**, 203 (2023), [arXiv:2211.13246](#).
- [75] R. Sohal and S. Ryu, “Entanglement in tripartitions of topological orders: A diagrammatic approach,” *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 045104 (2023), [arXiv:2301.07763](#).
- [76] I. Peschel, “Calculation of reduced density matrices from correlation functions,” *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **36**, L205 (2003), [arXiv:cond-mat/0212631](#).
- [77] I. Peschel and V. Eisler, “Reduced density matrices and entanglement entropy in free lattice models,” *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **42**, 504003 (2009), [arXiv:0906.1663](#).
- [78] See Supplemental Material for further details and results.
- [79] K. Siva, Y. Zou, T. Soejima, R. S. K. Mong, and M. P. Zaletel, “Universal tripartite entanglement signature of ungappable edge states,” *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, L041107 (2022), [arXiv:2110.11965](#).
- [80] P. Hayden, M. Headrick, and A. Maloney, “Holographic Mutual Information is Monogamous,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 046003 (2013), [arXiv:1107.2940](#).

Supplemental Material: Tripartite entanglement dynamics following a quantum quench

Clément Berthiere

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique, CNRS, Université de Toulouse, France

(Dated: August 23, 2024)

I. MARKOV GAP FOR GAUSSIAN FERMIONIC STATES

For Gaussian fermionic states with conserved particle number, the entanglement entropy of a subsystem A can be computed using the standard formula [76, 77]

$$S(A) = -\text{Tr}[C_A \log C_A - (\mathbb{1} - C_A) \log(\mathbb{1} - C_A)], \quad (\text{S1})$$

where C is the two-point correlation matrix with elements $C_{ij} = \text{Tr}(\rho c_i^\dagger c_j)$, and C_A is its restriction to subsystem A . The reflected entropy can be computed similarly [41, 67] in terms of the “reflected” correlation matrix

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{AB} & \sqrt{C_{AB}(\mathbb{1} - C_{AB})} \\ \sqrt{C_{AB}(\mathbb{1} - C_{AB})} & C_{AB} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S2})$$

where C_{AB} is the correlation matrix for ρ_{AB} . Introducing \mathbf{C}_A as the restriction of \mathbf{C} to subsystem A , the reflected entropy is obtained as

$$S_R(A : B) = -\text{Tr}[\mathbf{C}_A \log \mathbf{C}_A - (\mathbb{1} - \mathbf{C}_A) \log(\mathbb{1} - \mathbf{C}_A)]. \quad (\text{S3})$$

With these formulas in hand, one can easily compute the Markov gap defined in the main text.

II. TIME-DEPENDENT CORRELATION FUNCTIONS IN THE THERMODYNAMIC LIMIT

We consider quenches to the tight-binding model with Hamiltonian

$$H = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_j^L (c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j), \quad (\text{S4})$$

on a periodic chain of length L . The c_j 's are the fermionic annihilation operators at site j . The Jordan-Wigner transformation maps the model onto the XX spin chain. The XX Hamiltonian can be put in a diagonal form

$$H = \sum_k \epsilon_k d_k^\dagger d_k, \quad \text{where} \quad \epsilon_k = -\cos k, \quad d_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_j e^{-ijk} c_j, \quad k = \frac{2\pi m}{L}, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots, L. \quad (\text{S5})$$

Since all the states we consider are Gaussian, the time evolution after the quench is completely characterized by the two-point correlation matrix

$$C_{ij}(t) = \langle \psi | e^{itH} c_i^\dagger c_j e^{-itH} | \psi \rangle. \quad (\text{S6})$$

The fermion operator in the Heisenberg picture reads

$$e^{itH} c_j^\dagger e^{-itH} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{k,l} e^{-i(j-l)k} e^{it\epsilon_k} c_l^\dagger. \quad (\text{S7})$$

Plugging this into (S6) yields

$$C_{ij}(t) = \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{\substack{k,k' \\ l,l'}} e^{-i(i-l)k} e^{i(j-l')k'} e^{it(\epsilon_k - \epsilon_{k'})} C_{ll'}(0). \quad (\text{S8})$$

We focus on two classes of initial states with periodic patterns. Both are invariant under translation of p sites and are Gaussian. The *crystal states* $|C_{p,q}\rangle$ possess q fermions in each unit cell of p sites. In contrast, for the states $|W_p\rangle$ there is in each cell a single fermion in a specific quantum state—a W state. For that reason, we call these states *W-product states*. In the following, we give explicit expression of the corresponding correlation matrices in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$.

1. Crystal states

We define the class of crystal states as

$$|C_{p,q}\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^{L/p} \left(\prod_{j=0}^{q-1} c_{pi-j}^\dagger \right) |0\rangle = \underbrace{|\downarrow \cdots \downarrow}_{p-q} \underbrace{|\uparrow \cdots \uparrow}_q |\downarrow \cdots \rangle, \quad (\text{S9})$$

where L is divisible by p and $0 < q < p$. This state presents a periodic pattern of p sites, while its filling fraction is q/p . For $p = 2$ and $q = 1$, it reduces to the well-known Néel state $|\downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \cdots\rangle$. We have $C_{ij}(0) = \frac{q}{p} \text{diag}(0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1, \dots)$.

In the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, the time-dependent correlation matrix for a quench from crystal states reads

$$C_{ij}(t) = C_{ij}(\infty) + \frac{i^{j-i}}{p} \sum_{n \in \omega_{p,q}} a_{i,j}^n J_{j-i}(2t \sin(\pi n/p)), \quad (\text{S10})$$

where $J_\alpha(z)$ is Bessel's function of the first kind, and

$$C_{ij}(\infty) = \frac{q}{p} \delta_{i,j}, \quad (\text{S11})$$

$$a_{i,j}^n = \frac{\sin\left(\frac{n\pi q}{p}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{n\pi}{p}\right)} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(i-j) + \frac{\pi n}{p}(i+j+q-1)\right), \quad (\text{S12})$$

$$\omega_{p,q} = [1, p-1] \setminus \left\{ \frac{p}{d_{p,q}}, \frac{2p}{d_{p,q}}, \dots, p - \frac{p}{d_{p,q}} \right\}, \quad (\text{S13})$$

with $d_{p,q}$ the greatest common divisor of p and q .

In the main text, we focus on the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle \equiv |C_{3,1}\rangle = |\downarrow \downarrow \uparrow \cdots\rangle$, for which the correlation matrix reads

$$C_{ij}(t) = \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} + \frac{2(-1)^j}{3i^{i-j}} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{6}(i+j)\right) J_{i-j}(t\sqrt{3}). \quad (\text{S14})$$

2. W-product states

We define the class of W-product states as

$$|W_p\rangle = \frac{1}{p^{L/2p}} \prod_{i=1}^{L/p} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} c_{pi-j}^\dagger \right) |0\rangle, \quad (\text{S15})$$

where L is divisible by p , and $1/p$ is the filling fraction. For $p = 2$, it reduces to the dimer state which is the product of singlets states $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow \downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow \uparrow\rangle)$. For $p \geq 3$, the state $|W_p\rangle$ is a product of W states which are representatives of non-biseparable states. We have $C(0) = \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{1}_p \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{1}_p$, with $\mathbb{1}_p$ the unit constant matrix of size p .

The time-dependent correlation function following the quench from this state reads

$$C_{ij}(t) = C_{ij}(\infty) + \frac{i^{j-i}}{p^2} \sum_{n,r=1}^{p-1} i^{\pm r} a_{i,j}^{n,\pm r} J_{j-i \pm r}(2t \sin(\pi n/p)), \quad (\text{S16})$$

where

$$C_{ij}(\infty) = \frac{1}{p} \delta_{i,j} + \frac{1}{p^2} \sum_{n=1}^{p-1} (p-n) \delta_{i-j, \pm n}, \quad (\text{S17})$$

$$a_{i,j}^{n,\pm r} = \frac{\sin\left(\frac{n\pi r}{p}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{n\pi}{p}\right)} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(j-i \pm r - 2) - \frac{\pi n}{p}(i+j-1)\right). \quad (\text{S18})$$

In the next section, we consider the initial state $|W_3\rangle = \left(\frac{|\downarrow \downarrow \uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow \uparrow \downarrow\rangle + |\uparrow \downarrow \downarrow\rangle}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \otimes \cdots$, with correlation matrix

$$C_{ij}(t) = C_{ij}(\infty) + \frac{2(-1)^j}{9i^{i-j+1}} \left[\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{6}(i+j-1)\right) J_{i-j \pm 1}(t\sqrt{3}) + i \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{6}(i+j-1)\right) J_{i-j \pm 2}(t\sqrt{3}) \right]. \quad (\text{S19})$$

III. TIME EVOLUTION OF MARKOV GAP FOR CRYSTAL AND W-PRODUCT STATES

We numerically compute the time evolution of the Markov gap for several representatives of the two classes of initial states introduced above. For both classes, we find qualitative features similar to that for the state (1) in the main text: a time delay that depends on the initial state and an entanglement barrier, see Figs. S1 and S2.

For the initial state $|C_{4,2}\rangle = |\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\cdots\rangle$, which generates multiplets with four quasiparticles, we observe a clear second peak. Four quasiparticles can spread entanglement in more ways than triplets can, which may allow for the appearance of such second peak. It is interesting to note that quenches from the state $|C_{4,2}\rangle$ were recently studied through the lens of tripartite mutual information (TMI) in [45]. There it was found that the TMI is negative at intermediate times in the hydrodynamic regime, in contrast with multiplets with less than four quasiparticles for which it is positive or zero. A negative TMI means that the mutual information is monogamous, similarly to holographic theories [80].




FIG. S1. Dynamics of the Markov gap in the XX chain after quenches from $|C_{p,q}\rangle$ for equal subsystem sizes $\ell_A = \ell_B = \ell = 360$. The insets show close-ups around times before which the Markov gap is zero.




FIG. S2. Dynamics of the Markov gap in the XX chain after quenches from $|W_p\rangle$ for equal subsystem sizes $\ell_A = \ell_B = \ell$. The insets show close-ups around times before which the Markov gap is zero. (a) Time dependence of the Markov gap following a quench from $|W_{p=3}\rangle$. The dotted lines correspond to different lengths ℓ of the subsystems, while the solid teal line is the extrapolation to the hydrodynamic limit $t, \ell \rightarrow \infty$ with t/ℓ fixed. (b) Time dependence of the Markov gap following quenches from $|W_p\rangle$ for $p = 3, 4, 5, 6$ for fixed $\ell = 180$.