SCALING THEORY OF MANY-BODY ERGODICITY BREAKING

Rafał Świętek^{1,2}, *M. Hopjan*¹, *C. Vanoni*^{3,4}, *A. Scardicchio*^{4,5} and *L. Vidmar*^{1,2}

¹Department of Physics, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia ²Department of Theoretical Physics, J. Stefan Institute, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia ³SISSA – International School for Advanced Studies, via Bonomea 265, 34136, Trieste, Italy ⁴*INFN Sezione di Trieste, Via Valerio 2, 34127 Trieste, Italy* ⁵*ICTP*, Strada Costiera 11, 34151, Trieste, Italy

Introduction

- The overwhelming majority of physical systems thermalize, *i.e.*, the long time dynamics match thermal ensembles
- Quantum systems have RMT statistics, when their classical counterpart is chaotic [1].
- Similarly for many-body interacting models \rightarrow RMT predicts the emergence of ergodicity
- On the level of observables, Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis (ETH) is a sufficient condition for thermalization [2]

 $\langle n|\hat{O}|m\rangle = O(\bar{E})\delta_{m,n} + \rho(\bar{E})^{-1/2}f(\bar{E},\omega)R_{nm}$ (1) in the asymptotic limit $L \gg L_0$. The limiting case $\eta \to \infty$ corresponds to the transition point. This ansatz is consistent with fading ergodicity scenario developed in Ref. [6]. At the critical point $s = s_c = 1 - c_0$. Next, from Eq. (7) we find

$$\beta_{\rm erg}(s;c) = -\frac{1-s}{s} \ln \frac{1-s}{c}, \qquad (8)$$

where c (equivalently L_0) might have parameter dependence. On the other hand if we consider

$$\tilde{\beta}_s = \frac{d\ln s}{d\ln \tilde{L}} = \beta_{\rm erg}(s; c_0) \tag{9}$$

or equivalently

The finite-size corrections shown in Fig. 3 cause the envelope of the beta function to detach strongly from the SPS. We model this behaviour by an additional correction term, which vanish in the ETH and localized limit, *i.e.*, we define

$$\beta_{\rm env}(s) = \ln s - (1-s)\ln\frac{1-s}{a_1} - a_2s\ln s \qquad (16)$$

with some fitting constants a_1 and a_2 .

Below in Fig. 4 we test this ansatz to the enevelope of the beta function. Remarkably, the functional dependence in Eq. (16) fits the data in the entire range of α considered.

	0.95				α					
U	(a)			0.65	0.70	0.75	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.9:
-1	-					Г				



Violation of ETH can be manifested in different ways. A paradigmatic example is the absence of transport in the Anderson model. A milestone in the study of Anderson localization in *d*-dimensions is the analysis of the RG flow for the dimensionless conductance g by the gang of four [3]:

$$g(L) = \begin{cases} \sigma L^{d-2} & \text{metallic regime} \\ \sim \exp\{-L/\xi\} & \text{insulating regime} \end{cases}$$
(2)



Recent studies focused then on modern observables, such as the fractal dimension D for both higher-dimensional Anderson model and RRG [4, 5]. Is this phenomenology applicable to local interacting systems?

$$\tilde{\beta}_s = \beta_s \cdot \left(1 - \frac{L_0}{L}\right)$$

(10)

(14)

we find for $L \gg L_0$ the single-parameter ansatz with linear corrections

$$\beta_{s}(s,L) = \beta_{\text{erg}}(s;c_{0}) + \frac{\beta_{\text{erg}}(s;c_{0})L_{0}}{L} \xrightarrow{L \to \infty} \beta_{\text{erg}}(s;c_{0}), \quad (11)$$
provided $L_{0} < \infty$, *i.e.*, we can summarize in the following
$$\begin{cases} L_{0} \to \infty & \text{two-parameter scaling} \\ L_{0} \sim \text{const} < \infty & \text{one-parameter scaling} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Coincidentally, this expressions allows for estimating the critical exponent (after linearizing the beta function at the critical point)

$$\nu = \frac{1}{s_c \beta'_s(s_c)} = 1 \tag{13}$$

On the non-ergodic side the wavefunctions become localized with exponential tails. Hence, the entanglement can be als approximated as exponentially small, *i.e.*, $s \sim$ $\exp\{-L/\xi\}$. This yields the beta function on the localized side

$$\beta_{
m loc}(s) \sim \ln \frac{s}{s_c}$$

with critical exponent $\nu = 1$ at $s = s_c$.



0.29, 0.08, 0.04 for $g_0 = 0.5, 1, 2$ re-

spectively.



The decoupling of the envelope function from the SPS cause the critical exponent to deviate from the predicted $\nu = 1$. Fig. 5 shows the data collapse for all values of g_0 considered here.



- How is ETH broken when approaching the critical point?
- Is it abrupt or is it a smooth process? Is there an intermediate phase? \rightarrow see Ref. [6] for details
- Is the single-parameter scaling (SPS) hypothesis at all valid for interacting systems?



Phenomonelogical Theory

For our study we consider the single-site entanglement entropy, *i.e.*, we treat all other spins as bath

 $\hat{\rho}^n = \operatorname{Tr}_{bath} |n\rangle \langle n| \rightarrow S_A^n = -\operatorname{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho}^n \ln \hat{\rho}^n\right) \rightarrow s = \frac{\overline{S}_A}{\ln 2}.$ (3)

For U(1) conserving models one can show that the singlesite entanglement entropy directly relates to the fluctuations of diagonal matrix elements of the local magnetization \hat{S}_{ℓ}^{z} . For particle-number breaking models this expression is similarly true.

The main quantity of interest is the beta function



Quantum Sun Model



We study the toy model for avalanches, the Quantum Sun model [7]

$$\hat{H} = \hat{R} + g_0 \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} \alpha^{u_\ell} \hat{S}^x_{n_\ell} \hat{S}^x_\ell + \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} h_\ell \hat{S}^z_\ell.$$
(15)

In this model there exist a transition for $\alpha = \alpha_c \approx 1/\sqrt{2}$ between an ergodic and localized phase.



Figure 5: (a) Raw data scaled entanglement entropy s for different system sizes an values of g_0 in the vicinity of the estimated transition. (b) Finite-size data collapse using a cost function minimization for the values of α shown in panel (a). The dashed line denotes a fit of $s = 1/(1 + c \exp\{-(L/\xi)^{1/\nu}\})$ to the collapsed data. We normalize the values on the x-xaxis by $\Delta z =$ $\max(L/\xi) - \min(L/\xi)$ to show different g_0 on the same scale.

Lastly let us comment on the critical exponent. We have a set of equations using the beta function in Eq. (16)

$$\begin{cases} \beta(s_c) = 0\\ s_c \beta'(s_c) = \nu^{-1} \end{cases} \to \nu^{-1} = 1 + (1 - A)s_c \frac{1 - s_c + \ln s_c}{1 - s_c} \,. \end{cases}$$
(17)

Next, we test our prediction to the critical exponent extracted from Fig. 5:



Figure 6: Numerical curves of Eq. (13) for different values of A. Black dots are numerical data for $g_0 = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.5, 1, 2, 3.$

Conclusions

• At sufficiently large system sizes $L \gg L_0$ there exists one-parameter scaling for many-body interact-

If single-parameter scaling is true, then around the critical point s_c we can define the function h(s)

$$\beta(s) = \frac{1}{\nu s} h(s - s_c),$$

(5)

(6)

where for h(x) = x we have $\nu = (s_c \beta'(s_c))^{-1}$. This function determines the collapse as

 $s(L) = s_c + f\left(\left(L/\xi\right)^{1/\nu}\right)$

for some f(z) and localization length $\xi \simeq |\alpha_0 - \alpha_c|^{-\nu}(1 + 1)$ $c_1(\alpha_0 - \alpha_c) + ...).$ We model the entanglement entropy in the entire **ergodic** regime as

> $s = 1 - ce^{-L/\eta} = 1 - c_0 e^{-(L-L_0)/\eta}$ (7)

Figure 2: Finite-size scaling of 1 - s in ergodic phase for (a) $g_0 = 0.5$, (b) $g_0 = 1$ and (c) $g_0 = 2$ with a $F(x) = c \exp\{-L/\eta\}$ fit to the data displayed by the dashed lines. The solid line resembles the RMT-like scaling with $\eta_{\rm RMT} = 1/\ln 2$. The dash-dotted line is the critical value of $c_0 = 1 - s_c$.



Figure 3: Numerical data for $\beta(s)$ for (a) $g_0 = 0.5$, (b) $g_0 = 1$ and (b) $g_0 = 2.0$ in the ergodic regime. The arrows indicate the increase in system size L and the colors denote the value of interaction α . The dashed lines show Eq. (8) with values of c extracted in Fig. 2, while the solid black line shows Eq. 8 for $c = c_0$.

ing models

- Many-body ergodicity-breaking transitions are characterized by the critical exponent $\nu = 1$
- There exist finite size corrections, which are irrelevalnt if $L_0 < \infty$
- For finite systems the corrections to the SPS change the critical exponent by decoupling the envelope from the SPS

References

[1] L. D'Alessio *et al.* Adv. Phys. 65 (2022) [2] M. Srednicki, J. Phys. A. 32, 1163 (1999) [3] E. Abrahams *et al.* PRL 42, 673 (1979) [4] B. Altshuler *et al.* arxiv:2403.01974 [5] C. Vanoni *et al.* PNAS 121 (2024) [6] M. Kliczkowski *et al.* arxiv:2407.16773 (2024) [7] J. Šuntajs and L. Vidmar, PRL. 129, 060602 (2022)