

ON POLYNOMIAL LIEB-ROBINSON BOUNDS FOR THE XY CHAIN IN A DECAYING RANDOM FIELD

MARTIN GEBERT AND MARIUS LEMM

ABSTRACT. We consider the isotropic XY quantum spin chain in a random external field in the z direction, with single site distributions given by i.i.d. random variables times the critical decaying envelope $j^{-1/2}$. Our motivation is the study of many-body localization. We investigate transport properties in terms of polynomial Lieb-Robinson (PLR) bounds. We prove a zero-velocity PLR bound for large disorder strength λ and for small λ we show a partial converse, which suggests the existence of non-trivial transport in the model.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that a single quantum particle in one dimension which is subjected to an arbitrarily weak random potential exhibits exponential Anderson localization [3, 21]. In the presence of interactions, one enters the subject of many-body localization (MBL) which has been a hot topic of condensed-matter physics in recent years, see e.g. [4, 5, 11, 13, 17, 24] and references therein. On a heuristic level, MBL is described as *absence of thermalization*. Proposed criteria for this include the validity of an area law for the entanglement entropy and absence of information propagation (e.g. a zero-velocity Lieb-Robinson bound and logarithmic in time growth of the entanglement entropy). For an extensive list of possible criteria, see the review [14]. The very special MBL phase is expected to break down for sufficiently strong interactions, in what is called the *MBL transition* [27, 29].

A possible starting point for understanding MBL is the XY chain in an i.i.d. random field. This is an integrable toy model which can be mapped to non-interacting fermions in a random environment. Since the fermions are then localized in the usual Anderson sense, it can be shown rigorously that this model enjoys an area law for the entanglement entropy for large classes of states [1, 2, 28] and a zero-velocity Lieb-Robinson bound [6, 16]. However, a shortcoming of this toy model (apart from integrability) is that it will never display a transition to a

Date: January 13, 2016.

non-MBL phase because the fermions are localized at arbitrarily small disorder strength (which is equivalent to arbitrarily large interaction strength).

In this paper, we propose a variation of the above toy model which *rigorously displays features suggesting that such a transition occurs* as the disorder strength is varied. The model is the isotropic XY quantum spin chain on the half line with a random and *decaying* external field in the z direction. The Hamiltonian reads

$$H_n^{XY}(\omega) := - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\sigma_j^x \sigma_{j+1}^x + \sigma_j^y \sigma_{j+1}^y) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{V_j(\omega)}{j^{1/2}} \sigma_j^z$$

where V_j are i.i.d. and centered random variables and $\lambda > 0$ is a parameter describing the disorder strength. Note the decaying envelope $j^{-1/2}$ for the random field. It is critical in that the potential is just barely not in $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. For other decay rates, the random field is either too weak or too strong to observe a qualitative transition from MBL to non-MBL features (such as transport) when λ is varied.

We now explain in which sense our system exhibits features suggesting a transition from transport to localization as the disorder strength $\lambda > 0$ is *increased*. While our results will be more general and include bounds on the particle number transport as well, the key notion for quantifying many-body transport for this model are new *anomalous polynomial Lieb-Robinson (PLR) type bounds*. The traditional Lieb-Robinson (LR) bounds, see [22, 26], apply to general local Hamiltonians defined on a lattice and establish the existence of a certain “light cone” in spacetime outside of which correlations are exponentially small.

We say $\text{PLR}(a, b)$ holds for parameters $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and $b > 0$, if there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for any observables A supported at site 1 and B supported at site $k > 1$, we have the bound

$$(1) \quad \|[\tau_t^n(A), B]\| \leq C \|A\| \|B\| \left(\frac{t^a}{k} \right)^b.$$

Here τ_t^N is the Heisenberg time evolution generated by the Hamiltonian H_n^{XY} , see (3), and $\|\cdot\|$ is the standard operator norm. Intuitively, $\text{PLR}(a, b)$ says that in time t , information (as measured by the commutator of the initially localized observables) propagates at most a distance of order t^a , up to errors decaying like x^{-b} away from the modified “light cone” $t^a = k$ in spacetime. The case $a = 1$ corresponds to ballistic transport.

We will prove that the system exhibits the following features suggesting a transition from transport to localization as λ is increased. The precise statements are given later.

- When λ is *small enough*, $\text{PLR}(a, b)$ cannot hold if a is too big or b is too small. In other words, there exist observables A, B for which the bound (1) fails and in this sense transport is at least of order t^a . To give a concrete example, we show that for $\lambda < 2$, (1) fails with probability one if $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and $b > 1/2$ satisfy

$$a \left(1 + \frac{1}{2b-1} \right) < 1.$$

In particular, for any $b > 1/2$ there exists $a > 0$ such that (1) does not hold.

- When λ is *large enough*, the system is “polynomially localized” in the sense that

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|[\tau_t^n(A), B]\| \right] \leq C \|A\| \|B\| \left(\frac{1}{k} \right)^{\kappa \lambda^2 - 5/4}$$

for a coefficient $0 < \kappa \leq \frac{5}{16}$. This is a disorder-averaged version of $\text{PLR}(0, \kappa \lambda^2 - 5/4)$ and may be understood as a *zero-velocity PLR bound*. It is of course only effective when λ is large enough to guarantee $\kappa \lambda^2 - 5/4 > 0$.

One can also remove the expectation and instead obtain a statement that holds with probability one by a simple interchange of summation, but this comes at the price of having the constant C depend on the realization of the randomness.

- Remark 1.1.*
- (i) Of course, all statements are independent of the system size n to retain relevance in the thermodynamic limit.
 - (ii) It follows from [8, Thm. 2.6] and Proposition 3.9 that if only exponentially small errors are tolerated in an LR bound, then our model will exhibit ballistic transport for all $\lambda > 0$. This fits with the localization being only polynomial in type, even for large λ .
 - (iii) We emphasize that our results do *not* exclude that for small λ , an analogue of (2) holds with the exponent $\kappa \lambda^2 - 5/4$ replaced by a number $b \leq 1/2$. If this were true, it would be misleading to speak of a true transition from non-trivial transport to localization and it is for this reason that we do not claim to prove such a transition.

To prove the results, we use the standard method of expressing the XY chain in terms of free fermions via the Jordan-Wigner transformation. The basic idea is to take bounds for the corresponding one-body system [10, 15, 19, 20] and to pull them through the (non-local) Jordan-Wigner transformation by extending ideas of [16].

[16] considered a non-decaying random external field which yields an exponentially localized system. We extend their ideas to a situation in which errors decay only polynomially. Related papers which study the dependence of parameters in LR bounds and their generalizations on the external field are [7, 8, 9, 18]. The idea of studying polynomial LR bounds was conceived in [7, 8], but there it was only shown that the idea does *not* apply to the random dimer model (a model with anomalous one-body transport).

For large λ , we use the fact that the Kunz-Souillard method utilized in [10] actually yields a polynomial bound on the eigenfunction correlator (11). We are grateful to David Damanik for pointing us to [10].

As mentioned before, we also show similar results for particle number transport. We have also attempted without success to prove analogous results for the entanglement entropy of eigenstates in the spirit of the recent works [1, 2, 12, 28]. However we ran into difficulty bounding the entanglement entropy of eigenstates in the “localization regime” of large λ because of the growth in j of the bound (11). We believe that this question constitutes an interesting open problem.

We close the introduction with

Remark 1.2. For the $\text{PLR}(a, b)$ bounds defined by (1) and (2), we only consider observables A supported at site 1. If A is supported at a site $j > 1$, the decaying factor is *not* replaced by the distance of the supports $|j - k|$ (as would be the case in a direct polynomial generalization of the LR bound, compare [7, 8]), but instead by $\min\{j, k\} / \max\{j, k\}$. The precise statement is in Theorem 3.2. The reason why one cannot expect the distance $|j - k|$ is that the system is far from being translation-invariant.

2. THE MODEL

2.1. The XY Chain in a random decaying external field. For every $n \in \mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, we consider the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{H}_n = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \mathbb{C}^2.$$

On \mathcal{H}_n , the Hamiltonian of the isotropic XY chain with a random decaying external field is given by

$$H_n^{XY}(\omega) := - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (\sigma_j^x \sigma_{j+1}^x + \sigma_j^y \sigma_{j+1}^y) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{V_j(\omega)}{j^{1/2}} \sigma_j^z,$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a coupling constant. The sequence $(V_j(\omega))_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a family of i.i.d. random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$. We assume that its single-site distribution has zero mean and is absolutely continuous with a bounded density of compact support. In the above,

$$\sigma^x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

are the *Pauli matrices* and $\sigma_j^{x,y,z}$ is short-handed for

$$\mathbb{1}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{1}_{j-1} \otimes \sigma_j^{x,y,z} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{j+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{1}_n$$

for $1 \leq j \leq n$. In the following we omit the ω -dependence for brevity. For a finite set $J \subset \mathbb{N}$, we define the algebra of observables supported on J by

$$\mathcal{A}_J = \bigotimes_{j \in J} \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2),$$

where $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ is the set of all complex 2×2 matrices. We will often make use of the fact that for $J \subset J'$, there is a natural embedding of \mathcal{A}_J into $\mathcal{A}_{J'}$ by tensoring with the identity on $J' \setminus J$. Also, we set $\mathcal{A}_j \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\{j\}}$.

Finally, the *Heisenberg dynamics* of an observable $A \in \mathcal{A}_J$ under the Hamiltonian H_n^{XY} is defined by

$$(3) \quad \tau_t^n(A) := e^{itH_n^{XY}} A e^{-itH_n^{XY}}.$$

2.2. The Jordan-Wigner transformation. We use the standard procedure, going back to [23], of mapping the XY chain to free fermions via the Jordan-Wigner transformation.

For the details of the diagonalization procedure, we refer to Section 3.1 in [16]. Here we only recall what we need to establish notation. The first step is to introduce the lowering operator

$$(4) \quad a_j = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_j^x - i\sigma_j^y) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}_j$$

and its adjoint the raising operator a_j^* for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. The Jordan-Wigner transformation maps these to the fermion operators

$$(5) \quad c_1 = a_1, \quad c_j = \sigma_1^z \dots \sigma_{j-1}^z a_j \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq n.$$

The $\{c_j\}$ then satisfy the canonical anticommutation relations (CAR). We have the identity

$$(6) \quad a_j^* a_j = c_j^* c_j.$$

In terms of the fermion operators, the Hamiltonian reads,

$$(7) \quad H_n^{XY} = 2\mathcal{C}^* H_n \mathcal{C} - \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{V}_j$$

where $\mathcal{C} := (c_1, \dots, c_n)^T$ and $\tilde{V}_j := \frac{\lambda}{j^{1/2}} V_j$. The $n \times n$ matrix H_n is given by

$$(8) \quad H_n = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{V}_1 & 1 & & \\ 1 & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ & & 1 & \tilde{V}_n \end{pmatrix},$$

Note that H_n can be identified with a discrete Schrödinger operator on the half line, i.e. on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$, with the random decaying potential $\{\tilde{V}_j\}$ and zero boundary conditions at site $n+1$. The constant $\sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{V}_j$ in (7) does not change the Heisenberg dynamics (3) and can thus be ignored in the following.

We will often use that the Heisenberg dynamics of the c_j operators is given in the following simple fashion.

Proposition 2.1. [16, Sec. 3] *For all $1 \leq j, k \leq n$, the identity*

$$(9) \quad \tau_t^n(c_j) = \sum_{m=1}^n \langle \delta_j, e^{-2itH_n} \delta_m \rangle c_m$$

holds and consequently

$$(10) \quad \|[\tau_t^n(a_j), B]\| \leq 2 \sum_{m=1}^n |\langle \delta_j, e^{-2itH_n} \delta_m \rangle| (\|[c_m, B]\| + \|[c_m^*, B]\|)$$

Proof. (9) follows from diagonalizing the one-particle operator H_n , see [16, Eq. (3.15)]. Taking adjoints, the same is also true for c_k^* . The bound (10) follows directly from [8, Eq. (8)] by applying (9). \square

3. POLYNOMIAL LIEB-ROBINSON TYPE BOUNDS

3.1. Localization for large enough λ . We start with recalling an old result by [10] which provides bounds on the eigenfunction correlator of the Anderson model with a random decaying potential.

Lemma 3.1. *Let H_n be the operator given in (8). Then there exist constants $C, \kappa > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $1 \leq j \leq k \leq n$, we have*

$$(11) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|g| \leq 1} |\langle \delta_j, g(H_n) \delta_k \rangle| \right] \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} (jk)^{1/4} \left(\frac{j}{k} \right)^{\kappa \lambda^2}.$$

In particular, one can choose $g(x) = e^{-itx}$ in the above. The exponent κ will feature in all of the following bounds and we show later that it satisfies $\kappa \leq \frac{5}{16}$, see Corollary 3.12.

Proof. We estimate

$$(12) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{|g| \leq 1} |\langle \delta_j, g(H_n) \delta_k \rangle| \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{E \in \sigma(H_n)} |\psi_E^n(j)| |\psi_E^n(k)| \right] =: \bar{\rho}^n(j, k, \mathbb{R})$$

where the sequence $(\psi_E^n)_{E \in \sigma(H_n)}$ denotes the normalized eigenvectors of H_n counted with multiplicity. An adaption of [10, Prop. III.1] implies

$$(13) \quad \bar{\rho}^n(j, k, \mathbb{R}) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} (jk)^{1/4} \left(\frac{j}{k} \right)^{\kappa \lambda^2}.$$

The latter follows from inequality [10, Eq. III.16] using the bounds [10, Eq. III.14 and eq. III.15] and we remark that in the result [10, Eq. III.4] the 1/2-exponent should be replaced by an 1/4-exponent. \square

As a consequence, we obtain a disorder-averaged polynomial Lieb-Robinson type bound with $a = 0$ for the spin chain H_n^{XY} .

Theorem 3.2. *Let κ be as in Lemma 3.1 above. Suppose that $\kappa \lambda^2 > \frac{5}{4}$. Then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all choices of $1 \leq j \leq k \leq n$,*

$$(14) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|[\tau_t^n(A), B]\| \right] \leq C \|A\| \|B\| (jk)^{5/4} \left(\frac{j}{k} \right)^{\kappa \lambda^2}$$

holds for all observables $A \in \mathcal{A}_j$ and $B \in \mathcal{A}_{k, \dots, n}$.

We emphasize that the constant C is also uniform in n .

Proof. Note that \mathcal{A}_j is spanned by the matrices $\{a_j, a_j^*, a_j a_j^*, a_j^* a_j\}$. According to Proposition 2.1, we can estimate

$$(15) \quad \mathbb{E} \|[\tau_t^n(a_j), B]\| \leq 2 \sum_{m=1}^n |\langle \delta_j, e^{-2itH_n} \delta_m \rangle| (\| [c_m, B] \| + \| [c_m^*, B] \|)$$

We note that $[c_m, B] = 0$ for all $m < k$. Hence, Lemma 3.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned}
 (15) &\leq \frac{4C}{\lambda} \|B\| \sum_{l=1}^j \sum_{m=k}^n (lm)^{1/4} \left(\frac{l}{m}\right)^{\kappa\lambda^2} \\
 (16) &\leq \frac{4C}{\lambda} \|B\| \sum_{l=1}^j \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} (lm)^{1/4} \left(\frac{l}{m}\right)^{\kappa\lambda^2} \\
 &\leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \|B\| (jk)^{5/4} \left(\frac{j}{k}\right)^{\kappa\lambda^2}
 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ which is finite for $\lambda > \sqrt{\frac{5}{4\kappa}}$. Taking adjoints the same estimate is true for a_j^* . For the products $a_j^* a_j$ and $a_j a_j^*$, we use the Leibniz rule $[AB, C] = A[B, C] + [A, C]B$. \square

Remark 3.3. Instead of the distance $|j - k|$ of the supports of the observables, which would appear in a straightforward polynomial generalization of the traditional LR bound as was proposed in [7, 8], the right hand side depends on the quotient j/k . Note that the distance $|j - k|$ is not so natural for our model, which is far from being translation-invariant.

However, if we consider observables A supported at a *fixed* site, say the site 1, the bound (14) reduces to a polynomial Lieb-Robinson bound involving the distance of the supports. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}_1$. Then the bound

$$(17) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|[\tau_t^n(A), B]\| \right] \leq C \|A\| \|B\| \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{\kappa\lambda^2 - 5/4}$$

holds uniformly in $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B \in \mathcal{A}_{k, \dots, n}$ for some $1 \leq k \leq n$.

For small t the above is not satisfactory. One can improve the result:

Proposition 3.4. *Let κ be as in Lemma 3.1. There exists a constant C such that for all choices of $1 \leq j \leq k \leq n$,*

$$(18) \quad \mathbb{E} [\|[\tau_t^n(A), B]\|] \leq C \|A\| \|B\| |t| \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{\kappa\lambda^2 - 5/4}$$

holds for all observables $A \in \mathcal{A}_1$, $B \in \mathcal{A}_{k, \dots, n}$.

Proof. We follow the proof of [16, Cor. 3.4]. Define

$$(19) \quad f(t) := [\tau_t(A), B].$$

Then, $f(t)$ solves the ODE

$$(20) \quad f'(t) = i[f(t), \tau_t^n(H_1)] - i[[B, \tau_t^n(H_1)], \tau_t^n(A)].$$

where $H_1 := \sigma_1^x \sigma_2^x + \sigma_1^y \sigma_2^y + V_1 \sigma_1^z$. Following [25, App. A] we obtain

$$(21) \quad \|f(t)\| \leq \int_0^{|t|} ds \|\tau_s^n(H_1), B\|.$$

Since H_1 is supported on $\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$ we use Theorem 3.2 to obtain a time independent bound on the integrand which yields the theorem. \square

Instead of bounds in expectation, one can also obtain almost sure bounds, but at the price of getting an ω -dependent constant.

Corollary 3.5. *Let λ be big enough. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $B \in \mathcal{A}_{k,\dots,n}$. For all $\epsilon > 0$ and \mathbb{P} -almost every ω , there exists a random constant $C_\omega^\epsilon(A, B)$ independent of n such that*

$$(22) \quad \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\tau_t^n(A), B\| \leq C_\omega^\epsilon(A, B) \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{\kappa\lambda^2 - 5/4 - \epsilon}.$$

Proof. For any $\epsilon > 0$

$$(23) \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \|\tau_t^n(A), B\| \right] |k|^{\kappa\lambda^2 - 9/4 - \epsilon} < \infty.$$

The claim now follows from Fubini's theorem. \square

Note that the exceptional set of ω 's depends on A and B .

3.2. Lower bounds on transport for small enough λ . In this section we restrict ourselves to pairs of observables for which one of the observables is supported at the site 1.

Definition 3.6. Let $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and $b \geq 0$. We say that H_n^{XY} exhibits the polynomial Lieb-Robinson type bound $\text{PLR}(a, b)$, if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(24) \quad \|\tau_t^n(A), B\| \leq C \left(\frac{t^a}{k}\right)^b$$

holds for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_1$, $B \in \mathcal{A}_{k,\dots,n}$.

Let H be the discrete Schrödinger operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ which arises as the inductive limit of the family $(H_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Definition 3.7. We define the p -th moment of the position operator

$$(25) \quad |X|^p(t) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} k^p |\langle e^{-itH} \delta_j, \delta_k \rangle|^2$$

and its *time-average*

$$(26) \quad \langle |X|^p \rangle(T) := \frac{2}{T} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-2t/T} |X|^p(t)$$

for all $T > 0$. The upper and lower transport exponents are defined by

$$(27) \quad \beta^-(p) := \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln |X|^p(t)}{p \ln t} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta^+(p) := \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln |X|^p(t)}{p \ln t}$$

and their averaged versions are defined by

$$(28) \quad \langle \beta^-(p) \rangle := \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \langle |X|^p \rangle(T)}{p \ln T} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \beta^+(p) \rangle := \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \langle |X|^p \rangle(T)}{p \ln T}.$$

Theorem 3.8. *Assume $\text{PLR}(a, b)$ holds for some $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and $b > 1/2$. Then,*

$$(29) \quad \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \beta^+(2b - 1 - \epsilon) \leq a \left(1 + \frac{1}{2b - 1} \right).$$

Proof. The strong resolvent-convergence of H_n to H (this follows e.g. from the geometric resolvent identity) implies the convergence

$$(30) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle e^{itH_n} \delta_1, \delta_k \rangle = \langle e^{itH} \delta_1, \delta_k \rangle,$$

for any $1 \leq k \leq n$. Hence, Fatou's lemma implies the inequality

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} k^{2b-1-\epsilon} |\langle e^{-itH} \delta_1, \delta_k \rangle|^2 &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq M} k^{2b-1-\epsilon} |\langle e^{-itH} \delta_1, \delta_k \rangle|^2 \\ &\leq \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq M} k^{2b-1-\epsilon} |\langle e^{-itH_n} \delta_1, \delta_k \rangle|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary.

Now, we bound the one-body propagation in terms of the many-body propagation using [8, Lm. 4.1]. It implies that for any $1 \leq k \leq n$

$$(32) \quad |\langle e^{-itH_n} \delta_1, \delta_k \rangle| \leq \|[\tau_t^n(c_1), a_k^*]\|.$$

Using this and the assumption that $\text{PLR}(a, b)$ holds, we bound

$$(33) \quad (31) \leq t^{2ab} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} k^{-1-\epsilon}.$$

Since the latter is summable for any $\epsilon > 0$, this implies

$$(34) \quad \beta^+(2b - 1 - \epsilon) \leq \frac{2ab}{2b - 1 - \epsilon}$$

and therefore (29) follows. \square

Proposition 3.9. *Let $p > \frac{\lambda}{4}$. The lower bound*

$$(35) \quad \beta^+(p) \geq 1 - \frac{\lambda}{4p}$$

holds \mathbb{P} -almost surely. In the case of $\lambda < 2$ one has

$$(36) \quad \beta^+(p) = 1$$

\mathbb{P} -almost surely.

Before we give the proof, which is based on results in [15, 19, 20], we discuss the consequences of combining Theorem 3.8 and Proposition 3.9. What we obtain can be interpreted as lower bounds on transport, as we explained in the introduction, however see also the caveat in Remark 1.1(iii).

Corollary 3.10. *Let (a, b) be a pair of $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and $b > 1/2$. If either of the following two conditions applies, then $\text{PLR}(a, b)$ cannot hold.*

- $\lambda < 2$ and $a \left(1 + \frac{1}{2b-1}\right) < 1$
- $2 \leq \lambda < 2b - 1$ and $a \left(1 + \frac{1}{2b-1}\right) < 1 - \frac{\lambda}{4(2b-1)}$.

In particular, for any fixed pair (a, b) of $0 \leq a \leq 1$ and $b > 1/2$, one can choose λ large enough to get that $\text{PLR}(a, b)$ cannot hold.

Remark 3.11. A shortcoming of our results is that we need to assume $b > 1/2$, see Remark 1.1(iii). This is ultimately a consequence of summing up one-body transport bounds when inverting the Jordan-Wigner transformation (compare Proposition 2.1) and is therefore intimately connected to the core of the method.

We also get a bound on the maximal power of the polynomial decay coefficient κ which was introduced considered in the previous section.

Corollary 3.12. *The constant κ from Proposition 3.1 satisfies $\kappa \leq \frac{5}{16}$.*

Proof. Note that κ is independent of λ . Fix $\lambda < 2$ and $p > 0$. By Proposition 3.9, $\sup_{t>0} |X|^p(t) = \infty$. Recalling the definition (25) of $|X|^p(t)$ and using the estimate in Lemma 3.1 then gives $p + 1/4 - \kappa\lambda^2 \geq -1$. Sending $\lambda \rightarrow 2$ and $p \rightarrow 0$ yields $\kappa \leq \frac{5}{16}$. \square

It remains to give the

Proof of Prop. 3.9. For equation (35), we apply the lower bound [15, Thm. 5.1, Eq. (5.3)] to the function $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with $f \equiv 1$ on $\sigma(H)$. This provides for any $\epsilon > 0$ the bound

$$(37) \quad \langle |X| \rangle_j^p(T) \geq C_\omega(p, \epsilon) T^{p-2\gamma-\epsilon},$$

\mathbb{P} -almost surely, where $\gamma := \inf_{E \in (-2, 2)} \frac{\lambda}{8-2E^2}$. This implies

$$(38) \quad \langle \beta^-(p) \rangle \geq 1 - \frac{\lambda}{4p}.$$

The chain of inequalities $\langle \beta^-(p) \rangle \leq \langle \beta^+(p) \rangle \leq \beta^+(p)$ gives the result. To see the last inequality, note that $\beta := \beta^+(p) > 0$ implies for any $\epsilon > 0$, $|X|_1^p(t) \leq Ct^{p\beta+\epsilon}$. This readily gives

$$(39) \quad \langle |X|_1^p \rangle(T) = \frac{2}{T} \int_0^\infty dt e^{-2t/T} |X|_1^p(t) \leq CT^{p\beta+\epsilon}$$

and the inequality $\langle \beta^+(p) \rangle \leq \beta$.

For equation (36), we use [19, Thm 5.1] with $m = p$, where we have to prove its assumption, which is $P_c \delta_1 \neq 0$. Here, P_c is the orthogonal projection onto continuous part of the spectrum. Since $|\lambda| < 2$, the operator H exhibits singular continuous spectrum [20], thus $P_c \neq 0$. Now, $P_c \delta_1 \neq 0$ follows from cyclicity of δ_1 , which can be proven by induction because the Hamiltonian acts on the half space $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ only. \square

4. PROPAGATION BOUNDS FOR THE NUMBER OPERATOR

In this section, we derive bounds on the propagation of the number operator. These follow easily by combining a computation in [1] with the bounds on the one-body dynamics discussed before.

We define the number operator and the local number operator by

$$(40) \quad \mathcal{N} := \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^* a_j \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}_S := \sum_{j \in S} a_j^* a_j,$$

where a_j is given in (4) and $S \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$. This measures the number of up-spins in S . Let

$$(41) \quad \rho = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n \rho_j, \quad \rho_j := \begin{pmatrix} \eta_j & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - \eta_j \end{pmatrix}$$

and $0 \leq \eta_j \leq 1$. We denote by $\rho_t := e^{-itH_n} \rho e^{itH_n}$ the time evolution of the state ρ and by $\langle A \rangle_\rho := \text{tr}[A\rho]$ the expectation of an observable A with respect to the state ρ .

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\kappa > 0$ be as in Lemma 3.1. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $n \geq 1$ and $S \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$,*

$$(42) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} \langle \mathcal{N}_S \rangle_{\rho_t} \right] \leq \frac{C}{\lambda} \sum_{j \in S} \sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k (jk)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\min\{j, k\}}{\max\{j, k\}} \right)^{\kappa \lambda^2}.$$

This follows directly by combining results of [1] with Lemma 3.1.

Remark 4.2. To illustrate the above we split $\{1, \dots, n\} = I \cup J$ with $I := \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $J := \{m+1, \dots, n\}$ for $n > m \in \mathbb{N}$. We set $\eta_j = 0$

on I and $\eta_j = 1$ on the complement J . In other words $\rho = |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$ with the vector

$$(43) \quad |\varphi\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle^{\otimes m} \otimes |\uparrow\rangle^{\otimes (n-m+1)}$$

in standard notation. Let $m > l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S = \{1, \dots, l\}$. For $\kappa\lambda^2 > 5/4$, the above theorem implies the bound

$$(44) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} \langle \mathcal{N}_S \rangle_{\rho_t} \right] \leq C \left(\frac{l}{m} \right)^{\kappa\lambda^2} (lm)^{5/4}$$

for a constant $C > 0$ uniform in l, m, n . This is a time-independent bound on the number of up-spins which propagate from J into S and it decays as the distance $m \rightarrow \infty$ (when λ is large enough to guarantee $\kappa\lambda^2 > 5/4$).

Proof. The same computation that gives [1, eq. (41)] shows

$$(45) \quad \langle \mathcal{N}_S \rangle_{\rho_t} = \sum_{j \in S} \sum_{k=1}^n |\langle \delta_j, e^{2itH_n} \delta_k \rangle|^2 \eta_k.$$

Using this, Lemma 3.1 implies

$$(46) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} \langle \mathcal{N}_S \rangle_{\rho_t} \right] \leq \sum_{j \in S} \sum_{k=1}^n \eta_k \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \geq 0} |\langle \delta_j, e^{2itH_n} \delta_k \rangle|^2 \right]$$

The assertion now follow from $|\langle \delta_j, e^{2itH_n} \delta_k \rangle|^2 \leq |\langle \delta_j, e^{2itH_n} \delta_k \rangle|$ and Lemma 3.1. \square

Theorem 4.3. *If for some $0 \leq a \leq 1 < b$ and all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \leq n$*

$$(47) \quad \langle \mathcal{N}_1 \rangle_{\rho_t} \leq \left(\frac{t^a}{k} \right)^b$$

holds for all ρ of the form (41) and $\eta_j = 0$ for $j < k$. Then, the upper transport exponent satisfies the bound

$$(48) \quad \limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \beta^+(b-1-\epsilon) \leq \frac{ab}{b-1}.$$

Again, Proposition 3.9 then gives restrictions on the possible values of $0 \leq a \leq 1 < b$ for which (47) can hold. Therefore Theorem 4.3 may be interpreted as a lower bound on the transport of particles (from sites k and larger to the site 1) if at most error of order x^{-b} with $b > 1$ can be ignored, compare Remark 1.1(iii).

Proof. Let ρ_k be given as in (41) with $\eta_j = \delta_{j,k}$. By (45)

$$(49) \quad \langle \mathcal{N}_1 \rangle_{\rho_t^k} = |\langle \delta_1, e^{-itH_n} \delta_k \rangle|^2.$$

Hence, the computation in (31) and assumption (47) imply that for any $p > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
 |X|^p(t) &\leq \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq M} k^p |\langle e^{-itH_n} \delta_1, \delta_k \rangle|^2 \\
 (50) \quad &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} k^p \left(\frac{t^a}{k} \right)^b = t^{ab} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} k^{p-b}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Taking $p = b - 1 - \epsilon$ for an $\epsilon > 0$, the last sum is finite and this gives the assertion. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank David Damanik for pointing us to reference [10]. M.G. is grateful to Gian Michele Graf for his kind hospitality at ETH Zürich.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Abdul-Rahman, B. Nachtergaele, R. Sims and G. Stolz, Entanglement dynamics of disordered quantum XY chains, arXiv:1510.00262 (2015).
- [2] H. Abdul-Rahman and G. Stolz, A uniform area law for the entanglement of eigenstates in the disordered XY chain, *J. Math. Phys.* **56**, 121901 (2015).
- [3] P. W. Anderson, Absence of diffusion in certain random lattices, *Phys. Rev.* **109**, 1492–1505 (1958).
- [4] D. Basko, I. Aleiner and B. Altshuler, Metalinsulator transition in a weakly interacting many-electron system with localized single-particle states, *Annals of Physics* **321**, 1126 – 1205 (2006).
- [5] B. Bauer and C. Nayak, Area laws in a many-body localized state and its implications for topological order, *J. Stat. Mech. Theor. Exp.* **2013**, P09005 (2013).
- [6] C. K. Burrell and T. J. Osborne, Bounds on the speed of information propagation in disordered quantum spin chains, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 167201 (2007).
- [7] D. Damanik, M. Lemm, M. Lukic and W. Yessen, New Anomalous Lieb-Robinson Bounds in Quasiperiodic XY Chains, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 127202 (2014).
- [8] D. Damanik, M. Lemm, M. Lukic and W. Yessen, On an anomalous Lieb-Robinson bounds for the Fibonacci XY chain, arXiv:1407.4924; to appear in *J. Spectr. Theory* (2015).
- [9] D. Damanik, M. Lukic and W. Yessen, Quantum Dynamics of Periodic and Limit-Periodic Jacobi and Block Jacobi Matrices with Applications to Some Quantum Many Body Problems, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **337**, 1535–1561 (2015).
- [10] F. Delyon, B. Simon and B. Souillard, From power pure point to continuous spectrum in disordered systems, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Théor.* **42**, 283–309 (1985).

- [11] J. Eisert, M. Friesdorf and C. Gogolin, Quantum many-body systems out of equilibrium, *Nature Physics* **11**, 124–130 (2015).
- [12] A. Elgart, L. Pastur and M. Shcherbina, Large block properties of the entanglement entropy of disordered fermions, arXiv:1601.00294 (2016).
- [13] M. Friesdorf, A. H. Werner, W. Brown, V. B. Scholz and J. Eisert, Many-body localization implies that eigenvectors are matrix-product states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 170505 (2015).
- [14] C. Gogolin and J. J. Eisert, Equilibration, thermalisation, and the emergence of statistical mechanics in closed quantum systems - a review, arXiv:1503.07538 (2015).
- [15] F. Germinet, A. Kiselev and S. Tcheremchantsev, Transfer matrices and transport for Schrödinger operators, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **54**, 787–830 (2004).
- [16] E. Hamza, R. Sims and G. Stolz, Dynamical localization in disordered quantum spin systems, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **315**, 215–239 (2012).
- [17] S. Iyer, V. Oganesyan, G. Refael and D. Huse, Many-body localization in a quasiperiodic system, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 134202 (2013).
- [18] I. Kachkovskiy, On transport properties of isotropic quasiperiodic xy spin chains, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 1–15 (2015).
- [19] A. Kiselev and Y. Last, Solutions, spectrum, and dynamics for Schrödinger operators on infinite domains, *Duke Math. J.* **102**, 125–150 (2000).
- [20] A. Kiselev, Y. Last and B. Simon, Modified Prüfer and EFGP transforms and the spectral analysis of one-dimensional Schrödinger operators, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **194**, 1–45 (1998).
- [21] H. Kunz and B. Souillard, Sur le spectre des opérateurs aux différences finies alatoires, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **78**, 201–246 (1980).
- [22] E. H. Lieb and D. W. Robinson, The finite group velocity of quantum spin systems, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **28**, 251–257 (1972).
- [23] E. Lieb, T. Schultz and D. Mattis, Two soluble models of an antiferromagnetic chain, *Annals of Physics* **16**, 407 – 466 (1961).
- [24] R. Nandkishore and D. A. Huse, Many-body localization and thermalization in quantum statistical mechanics, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **6**, 15–38 (2015).
- [25] B. Nachtergaele, Y. Ogata and R. Sims, Propagation of correlations in quantum lattice systems, *J. Stat. Phys.* **124**, 1–13 (2006).
- [26] B. Nachtergaele and R. Sims, Lieb-Robinson bounds and the exponential clustering theorem, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **265**, 119–130 (2006).
- [27] A. Pal and D. A. Huse, Many-body localization phase transition, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 174411 (2010).
- [28] L. Pastur and V. Slavin, Area law scaling for the entropy of disordered quasifree fermions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 150404 (2014).
- [29] R. Vosk, D. A. Huse and E. Altman, Theory of the many-body localization transition in one-dimensional systems, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 031032 (2015).

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, LUDWIG-MAXIMILIANS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN,
THERESIENSTRASSE 39, 80333 MÜNCHEN, GERMANY
E-mail address: `gebert@math.lmu.de`

MATHEMATICS DEPT. MC 253-37, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
PASADENA, CA 91125
E-mail address: `mlemm@caltech.edu`