Area law and universality in the statistics of subsystem energy
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We introduce Shannon(\Rényi) entropy of a subsystem energy as a natural quantity which mimics closely the behaviour of the entanglement entropy and can be defined for all quantum many body systems. For this purpose, consider a quantum chain in its ground state and then, take a subdomain of this system with natural truncated Hamiltonian. Since the total Hamiltonian does not commute with the truncated Hamiltonian, the subsystem can be in one of its eigenenergies with different probabilities. Using the fact that the global energy eigenstates are locally close to diagonal in the local energy eigenbasis, we argue that the Shannon(\Rényi) entropy of these probabilities follows an area law for the gapped systems. When the system is at the critical point, the Shannon(\Rényi) entropy follows a logarithmic behavior with a universal coefficient. Our results show that the Shannon(\Rényi) entropy of the subsystem energies closely mimics the behavior of the entanglement entropy in quantum chains. We support the arguments by detailed numerical calculations performed on the transverse field XY-chain.

Quantum information theory and particularly the concept of entanglement have played an increasingly important role in condensed matter and high energy physics in recent years. More specifically, it has been very useful in the study of different phases of many body quantum systems\textsuperscript{4,5}, structure of quantum field theories\textsuperscript{6,7} and understanding gravitation\textsuperscript{8–11}. The situation is more interesting when one considers the marginal probabilities as a local quantity, the associated probabilities are called formation probabilities and it is known that special type of them can be used to determine the central charge and the universality class of the critical points\textsuperscript{12–18}. For local observables, it is natural to expect that the Shannon(\Rényi) entropy be proportional with the size of the subsystem (volume-law) which makes the leading term non-universal and less interesting. However, numerous numerical calculations suggest that for critical quantum chains, the subleading term follows a logarithmic behavior with respect to the subsystem size with a coefficient which is universal and connected to the central charge\textsuperscript{21,24–28}. For other related studies see Refs.\textsuperscript{29–31}. Although from the experimental point of view, the Shannon (\Rényi) entropy of local observables in a subsystem looks a natural quantity, theoretically, it is interesting to make the quantity “basis independent” by minimizing over all the possible bases. This minimization leads to the von Neumann entanglement entropy and its generalizations quantum Rényi entropies\textsuperscript{32}. For a density matrix $\rho$, the quantum Rényi entropy for $\alpha \geq 0$ is given by

$$
S_\alpha = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln \text{tr} \rho^\alpha.
$$

For $\alpha = 1$, we recover the von Neumann entropy $S = -\text{tr} \ln \rho$. If we consider the total system be in a pure state (for example, the ground state) and calculate the reduced density matrix for a subsystem and plug this matrix in the above equation, we end up with the entanglement entropy of the subsystem with respect to its complement. Another way of looking to this quantity is by calculating the Shannon entropy in the Schmidt basis, which is a complicated non-local basis that minimizes the entropy. von Neumann entropy has been studied in a myriad of articles, for review see Refs.\textsuperscript{5,33–36}. The most relevant results for our purpose are the followings: the entanglement entropy of the ground state for gapped systems follows an area law\textsuperscript{5,33–36}. For infinitely long one
dimensional critical systems the Rényi (von Neumann) entropy of a subsystem with size \( l \) is given by

\[
S_\alpha = \frac{c}{6} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \ln l + \gamma_\alpha, \tag{3}
\]

where \( c \) is the central charge of the underlying conformal field theory and \( \gamma_\alpha \) is a non-universal constant. Based on the above results, one can make the following argument: Shannon entropy of a subsystem for local observables (basis) follows a volume law but it follows an area law (logarithmic law) in gapped (critical) systems for non-local Schmidt basis. This makes one to believe that there should be some non-local observables in between these two extreme cases. For example, one can think about the total number of particles in a subsystem and study its distribution as it has been done in the context of full counting statistics. One can also study other quantities such as the total magnetization distribution or the distribution of the subsystem energy. Among the many natural non-local quantities that one can study, we are interested in the one which, apart from being natural, can be defined for all the quantum chains and can mimic in the best way the entanglement entropy of a subsystem. In this paper, we argue that the subsystem energy is such a quantity. Its Shannon entropy follows an area law for gapped systems and it is logarithmic for critical systems. The coefficient of the logarithm is universal and may well be related to the central charge. The paper is organized as follows: based on some known results we first argue that the statistics of the subsystem energy is a perfect candidate which can mimic the entanglement entropy. Then, we will study in detail the transverse field XY chain numerically to demonstrate the validity of the arguments. To this end, we develop an elegant method to calculate the distribution of the eigenvalues of the quadratic observables in free fermionic systems.

We start by considering a generic nearest neighbor Hamiltonian of an infinite system

\[
H = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} H_{i,i+1},
\]

where \( H_{i,i+1} \) has support in the set of sites \( i \) and \( i+1 \). Now, consider \( l \) contiguous sites and define a truncated Hamiltonian for the subsystem as

\[
H_l = \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} H_{i,i+1}. \tag{4}
\]

For interacting Hamiltonians, we always have \( \{H, H_l\} \neq 0 \), which means that if the total system is in its ground state, the subsystem can be in different eigenstates \( |e_j\rangle \) with different probabilities \( p(e_j) \). Note that for short-range Hamiltonians the right-hand side of \( \{H, H_l\} \) is dependent just on the boundary terms which hints on “weak” uncertainty relations. To study the corresponding probabilities, one can first calculate the reduced density matrix of the subsystem \( \rho_l = \text{tr}_{l+1} |\psi_g\rangle \langle \psi_g| \) where the trace is over the complement of the subsystem. The reduced density matrix is exactly diagonal in the Schmidt basis which leads to the quantum entanglement entropy, but it has off-diagonal terms in every other basis. However, an interesting theorem is proved in Ref. 52, see also Ref. 53; which indicates that global energy eigenstates are locally close to diagonal in the local energy eigenbasis. In other words, the reduced density matrix is weekly diagonal in the eigenbasis of the truncated Hamiltonian. This theorem suggests that the eigenbasis of the subsystem Hamiltonian is not that much different from the Schmidt basis. It is equivalent to say that \( p(e_j)\)'s are close to the Schmidt coefficients. One can then guess that although the Shannon entropy calculated by using \( p(e_j)\)'s is for sure bigger than the von Neumann entropy, it should not be too far from it. For example, one can guess that the Shannon entropy in this case follows the area law for gapped systems and has logarithmic behavior for critical systems. In the rest of this paper, we will show that indeed this argument is correct and the Shannon entropy of the subsystem energy follows closely the von Neumann entanglement entropy.

The Hamiltonian of the XY-chain is

\[
H_{XY} = -J \sum_{j=1}^{L} \left[ \frac{1 + \gamma}{4} \sigma^x_j \sigma^x_{j+1} + \frac{1 - \gamma}{4} \sigma^y_j \sigma^y_{j+1} \right].
\]

where the \( \sigma^\alpha_j \) (\( \alpha = x, y, z \)) are Pauli matrices. \( J > 0 \) is the spin coupling, \( \gamma \) is the anisotropic parameter and \( h \) is the external magnetic field. For \( \gamma = 1 \) and \( \gamma = 0 \), the XY model reduces to the Ising spin chain and XX chain, respectively. The phase diagram of the model is rich and depicted in Fig. 1. For \( \gamma, h \geq 0 \), there are two different critical lines with different universality classes corresponding to the central charges of \( c = 1 \) and \( c = \frac{2}{3} \) for the critical XX line and the critical XY line, respectively.

To calculate the statistics of the subsystem energy we first need to write the above Hamiltonian in a more suitable form. Introducing canonical spinless fermions through the Jordan-Wigner transformation, \( e^\dagger_l = \prod_{n<l} \sigma^+_n \sigma^l_\alpha \), the Hamiltonian (4) becomes

\[
H = e^\dagger A e + \frac{1}{2} e^\dagger B e + \frac{1}{2} c^T B^T c - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} A \tag{5}
\]
with appropriate $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ matrices. We use the hat symbol to indicate the matrices for the total system, while the symbols without hat will indicate the subsystem. The method that we present here and elaborate in the supplemental material is quite general and can be used for any Hamiltonian with $A$ and $B$ being symmetric and antisymmetric matrices.\footnote{For the truncated Hamiltonian $H_D$ (for quantum chains $D = l$), the same form of the Hamiltonian can be used. Although the method can be generalized for more general states, we consider that the total system is in its ground state. To this end, the probability of the subsystem in different energy states can be calculated from the reduced density matrix by using the standard method of Ref.\footnote{Consider $G$ as the correlation matrix with the elements $G_{ij} = \langle (c_i^\dagger - c_i)(c_j^\dagger + c_j) \rangle$, then, the reduced density matrix can be written as (see supplemental material):}

$$
\rho_D = \det \frac{1}{2}(1 - G)e^H, \quad (6)
$$

$$
H = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{c}^\dagger \mathbf{M} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{c} + 1) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \ln (\mathbf{F}_s), \quad (7)
$$

where $H$ is the entanglement Hamiltonian and

$$
\mathbf{M} \mathbf{N} = \ln \left( \mathbf{F}_s - \mathbf{F}_a \mathbf{F}_a^{-1} \mathbf{F}_s \mathbf{F}_s^{-1} \right), \quad (8)
$$

where $\mathbf{F}_a = e^{\mathbf{F}_a^T}$ and $\mathbf{F}_s = e^{\mathbf{F}_s^T}$ and $\mathbf{F} = (G + I)(I - G)^{-1}$. The second step is to diagonalize the truncated Hamiltonian $H_D$ with the standard method of Ref.\footnote{The idea is based on canonical transformation}

$$
\left( \begin{array}{c} c \\ c^\dagger \end{array} \right) = \mathbf{U}^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{c} \eta \\ \eta\end{array} \right), \quad (9)
$$

which leads to

$$
H_D = \sum_k |\lambda_k| (\eta_k^\dagger \eta_k - 1/2). \quad (10)
$$

For more details, see supplemental material. Note that the modes $\lambda_k$ can be used to calculate all the energy levels. The idea is based on writing the entanglement Hamiltonian in the basis that the truncated Hamiltonian is diagonal, i.e. $\eta$ basis. Now, we introduce the fermionic coherent states, i.e. $|\gamma\rangle = |\gamma_1, \gamma_2, ..., \gamma_{|D|}\rangle = e^{-\sum_{i=1}^{|D|} \gamma_i \eta_i^\dagger}|0\rangle$, where $\gamma_i$’s are Grassmann numbers with the following properties: $\gamma_m \gamma_m + \gamma_m \gamma_n = 0$ and $\gamma_m^2 = \gamma_n^2 = 0$. Here, $|D|$ is the number of sites in the region $D$.

Then, one can finally write (see supplemental material):

$$
\langle \gamma |\rho_D| \gamma'\rangle = \det \frac{1}{2}(1 - G) \frac{\det(\mathbf{F}_s)}{\det(\mathbf{F}_a)} \Gamma \ e^{\frac{1}{2} (\gamma - \gamma') \tilde{F} (\gamma + \gamma')} \quad (11)
$$

where

$$
\tilde{F}_s = e^{\tilde{Y}}, \quad \tilde{F} = \tilde{X} + e^{\tilde{Y}},
$$

with

$$
\tilde{X} = \tilde{T}_{12} (\tilde{T}_{22})^{-1}, \quad \tilde{Z} = (\tilde{T}_{21})^{-1} \tilde{T}_{22}, \quad e^{-\tilde{Y}} = \tilde{T}_{22}^T,
$$

$$
\tilde{T}_{12} = 0.75, \quad \tilde{T}_{21} = 0.50 \ , \quad \tilde{T}_{22} = 1.00 \ , \quad h = 0.50
$$

FIG. 2. (color online) Up: logarithmic behavior of the Shannon entropy of the subsystem energy of the critical XY chain for $\gamma = h = 0$ and $\gamma = h = 1$. Down: Area law of the Shannon entropy for various values of the parameters of the gapped XY chain.

$$
\mathbf{T} = \left( \begin{array}{cc} \tilde{T}_{11} & \tilde{T}_{12} \\ \tilde{T}_{21} & \tilde{T}_{22} \end{array} \right) = U \left( \begin{array}{cc} \mathbf{F}_s - \mathbf{F}_a \mathbf{F}_a^{-1} & \mathbf{F}_a \mathbf{F}_a^{-1} \\ -\mathbf{F}_a^{-1} \mathbf{F}_a & \mathbf{F}_a^{-1} \mathbf{F}_a \end{array} \right) U^\dagger.
$$

The equation (11) can be used to calculate all the desired probabilities using the same method that was developed in Ref.\footnote{First of all, it is easy to see that to find the probability of a subsystem in its ground state, one needs to put all the $\gamma$’s equal to zero, then we have}

$$
p(e_g) = \det \frac{1}{2}(1 - G) \frac{\det(\mathbf{F}_s)}{\det(\mathbf{F}_a)} \Gamma \ , \quad (12)
$$

To find the probability of other energies, one needs to know the corresponding modes $\lambda_k$’s in which generate the desired energy and then, perform a Grassmann integral over the corresponding $\gamma_k$’s and put the other $\gamma$’s equal to zero. The result is

$$
p(e) = \det \frac{1}{2}(1 - G) \frac{\det(\mathbf{F}_s)}{\det(\mathbf{F}_a)} \Gamma \sum_n \text{Min} [\tilde{F}], \quad (13)
$$

where $\text{Min}[\tilde{F}]$ is the corresponding principal minor of the matrix $\tilde{F}$ and the sum takes care of the degeneracies. Using the equation (13), we first, calculated the Shannon entropy of the subsystem energy for different gapped points of an infinite XY chain and verified the area law, see Figure 2. Then, we calculated the same quantity for the critical regions which shows the logarithmic behavior for the Shannon entropy, see Figure 2. In general, for the Rényi entropy, we find

$$
H_\alpha = e(\alpha) \ln l + \beta_\alpha. \quad (14)
$$

Afterwards, in the Figure 3, we verified that these coefficients are universal in the sense that on the critical XX
Remarkably, they follow a very similar behavior which indicates that probably (at least for large) we can not describe them by quantum field theories. Our calculations indicates that, in the scaling limit, most of possible energies for the subsystem increases exponentially with the subsystem size there is a limitation of the Shannon entropy is negligible. In the Figure 4, we plotted the \( \epsilon(\alpha) \) for the critical XX, i.e. \( \gamma = h = 0 \) and the critical Ising, i.e. \( \gamma = h = 1 \) with respect to \( \alpha \). The solid line is the CFT result for the Rényi entanglement entropy.

We also checked the universality of these values on the critical line, see supplemental material. For the semi-infinite systems, the coefficients are within one percent from the half of the above values. Note that this quantity is different from the quantity called fidelity in Refs.\(^{58,59}\). Finally, it is worth mentioning that for finite systems the Shannon information has one important difference from the von Neumann entropy. Because of the Schmidt decomposition for the von Neumann entropy we have \( S(l) = S(L - l) \), however, this relation is not valid (weakly broken) for the Shannon entropy that we considered here. We will discuss in more detail the finite systems in another work.

**Conclusions** In this letter, we showed that the subsystem energy entropy is an excellent quantity which can mimic the entanglement entropy at and off the critical point. For non-critical systems, it follows an area law and at the critical point it follows a logarithmic behavior with a universal coefficient. It can be used to detect the phase transition and determine the universality class. It would be very important to calculate this quantity in QFT (CFT) to have a better idea about the nature of the universality of the presented results.\(^{61}\). The recent developments regarding the distribution of the energy-momentum tensor in QFT(CFT) might be very useful, see Ref.\(^{62}\) and references therein.
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23. The volume law simply reflects that the state spreads over exponential number of configurations.
50. The generalization to short-range interacting systems, finite systems, and higher boundaries is trivial.
53. The precise statement of the theorem is the following: consider an arbitrary eigenstate of the total Hamiltonian $|E\rangle$ and a sub-region $D$ with complement $\overline{D}$. Define $D' = D \cup D_b$ where $D_b$ is a region around $D$ which the boundary terms of the sites inside $D$ interact. Then, the theorem tells us that there is a density matrix $\rho_E$ in $D'$ which is weakly diagonal in the eigenbasis of $H_{D'}$ and satisfies $tr_{\overline{D}}|E\rangle\langle E| \approx tr_{D_b} \rho_E$. Here, the weakly diagonal means that for two different eigenvectors $|e_1\rangle$ and $|e_2\rangle$ of the Hamiltonian $H_{D'}$, we have $\langle e_1| \rho_E |e_2\rangle \leq e^{-(l-r)(e_1-e_2)^2/8cv^2}$, where $c$, $v$, $l$ and $r$ are constants.
54. In principle to calculate the full distribution one might first try to calculate the generating function of the subsystem energy distribution as it was done in [49], see also supplemental material. Different explicit determinant formulas can be calculated for the generating functions but their forms are normally too complicated to be useful to calculate the probability distributions even numerically.


For example, we checked that the smallest probability which corresponds to the highest energy decays super-exponentially with the subsystem size, i.e. $\ln p_{\text{min}} \propto e^{-l}$. We believe that the same is true for majority of states with high energies which makes their contribution to the Shannon entropy negligible. One might also understand the absence of the volume-law based on the same line of argument.


The bosonic systems, especially coupled harmonic oscillators will be studied in an other work.
SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL FOR AREA LA W AND UNIVERSALITY IN THE STATISTICS OF SUBSYSTEM ENERGY

In this supplemental material for the sake of completeness, we summarize the standard method of free fermion diagonalization\textsuperscript{1}. Then, we provide the details regarding the main formula of the paper, i.e. (13). We also discuss the numerical results in the last section in more details.

A. Diagonalization of the Free Fermions

In this subsection, we summarize the result of Ref.\textsuperscript{1}. Consider a generic (real) truncated free fermion Hamiltonian defined in domain $D$:

$$H_D = \sum_{ij} [c_i^\dagger A_{ij} c_j + \frac{1}{2} c_i^\dagger B_{ij} c_j^\dagger + \frac{1}{2} c_i B_{ji} c_j] - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} A,$$

where $c_i^\dagger$ and $c_i$ are fermionic creation and annihilation operators and $i = 1, 2, ..., \vert D \vert$, where $\vert D \vert$ is the number of sites in the region $D$. The Hermitian Hamiltonian requires $A$ and $B$ to be symmetric and antisymmetric matrices respectively. To diagonalize the Hamiltonian we use the following canonical transformation

$$\begin{pmatrix} c \\ c^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = U^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \eta \\ \eta^\dagger \end{pmatrix},$$

with

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} g & h \\ h^* & g^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, we can write the diagonalized form of the Hamiltonian as follows

$$H_D = \sum_k \vert \lambda_k \vert (\eta_k^\dagger \eta_k - \frac{1}{2}).$$

Note that $g$ and $h$ can be derived from the following equations:

$$g = \frac{1}{2} (\phi + \psi),$$

$$h = \frac{1}{2} (\phi - \psi),$$

where we have

$$(A + B) \phi_k = \vert \lambda_k \vert \psi_k,$$

$$\lambda_k (A - B) \psi_k = \vert \lambda_k \vert \phi_k,$$

or

$$(A - B)(A + B) \phi_k = \vert \lambda_k \vert^2 \phi_k,$$

$$(A + B)(A - B) \psi_k = \vert \lambda_k \vert^2 \psi_k.$$

When $\lambda_k \neq 0$, $\phi_k$ and $\lambda_k$ can be calculated by solving the eigenvalue equation \textsuperscript{S7}, then, $\psi_k$ can be determined using \textsuperscript{S8}. When $\lambda_k = 0$, $\phi_k$ and $\psi_k$ can be deduced directly from \textsuperscript{S7} and \textsuperscript{S8}.

The correlation matrix $G$ for the full system defined as

$$G_{ij} = \langle (c_i^\dagger - c_i)(c_j^\dagger + c_j) \rangle$$

can be also calculated using the above procedure as follows:

$$G = (\hat{h}^\dagger - \hat{g}^\dagger)(\hat{g} + \hat{h}).$$

Note that in the above equation we put hat on the $g$ and $h$ matrices to emphasize that one should calculate them using the $A$ and $B$ matrices. Since we never calculate the correlation matrix for the truncated Hamiltonian we do not put hat on this matrix.
B. Reduced Density Matrix in the Local Energy Basis

In this section, we present the details of the derivation of the equation (13). The starting point is the following reduced density matrix written in fermionic coherent basis:

\[ \rho_D(\xi, \xi') = \frac{1}{Z} \langle \xi | \rho_D | \xi' \rangle \]

where we have \( F = (G + \mathbb{I})(\mathbb{I} - G)^{-1} \) with \( G \) being the correlation matrix. In the above, we introduced the fermionic coherent state as follows,

\[ |\xi\rangle = |\xi_1, \xi_2, ..., \xi_{|D|}\rangle = e^{-\sum_{k=1}^{D} \xi_k c_k^\dagger} |0\rangle, \]

where \( \xi_k \)'s are Grassmann numbers which satisfy the following properties: \( \xi_n \xi_m + \xi_m \xi_n = 0 \) and \( \xi_n^2 = \xi_m^2 = 0 \). Then, it is straightforward to show that

\[ c_k |\xi\rangle = \xi_k |\xi\rangle. \]

If we expand the exponential (13), we can rewrite it as,

\[ \rho_D(\xi, \xi') = \det \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} - G) e^{\frac{1}{2}(\xi - \xi')^T F (\xi + \xi')}, \]

We notice that, \( \xi F \xi \xi' = \xi F \xi \xi' \). Then, we get,

\[ \rho_D(\xi, \xi') = \det \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} - G) e^{\frac{1}{2}(\xi F \xi + \xi' F \xi')}, \]

where \( F_a = \frac{F - F^T}{2} \) and \( F_s = \frac{F + F^T}{2} \). By converting the Grassmann variables to fermionic operators, we have,

\[ \rho_D = \det \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} - G) e^{\frac{1}{2}c^T F_a c + \frac{1}{2}c^T \ln(F_s)c - \frac{1}{2}c^T F_a c}, \]

We would like to write the reduced density matrix as

\[ \rho_D = \det \frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I} - G) e^H \]

Where \( H \) is the entanglement Hamiltonian that can be calculated by combining the exponential terms in the equation (13). In other words, we would like to have

\[ H = \sum_{lm} c_l^T M_{lm} c_m + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l} N_{lm} c_m^T + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l} N_{ml} c_m] - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} M, \]

where \( M \) and \( N \) are symmetric and antisymmetric matrices. They can be calculated using Balian-Brezin formula.

\[ T = \exp \begin{pmatrix} M & N \\ -N & -M \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{T}_{11} & \text{T}_{12} \\ \text{T}_{21} & \text{T}_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} F_s & -F_a F_s^{-1} F_a & F_s F_a^{-1} \\ -F_s^{-1} F_a & F_a^{-1} & F_s \end{pmatrix}. \]

Then, we get

\[ \text{T}_{11} = \ln \begin{pmatrix} F_s - F_a F_s^{-1} F_a & F_s F_a^{-1} \\ -F_s^{-1} F_a & F_a^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \]

Now, we can rewrite the entanglement Hamiltonian as follows

\[ H = \frac{1}{2} (c^T c) \begin{pmatrix} M & N \\ -N & -M \end{pmatrix} (c c^T) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \ln(F_s). \]

By using the relation (22), we can rewrite the entanglement Hamiltonian with respect to the \( \eta_k \)'s as follows:

\[ H = \frac{1}{2} (\eta^T \eta) U \begin{pmatrix} M & N \\ -N & -M \end{pmatrix} U^\dagger (\eta \eta^T) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \ln(F_s) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{2} (\eta^T \eta) Q \begin{pmatrix} \eta \\ \eta^\dagger \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \ln(F_s), \]
where
\[
Q = \begin{pmatrix}
Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\
Q_{21} & Q_{22}
\end{pmatrix} = U \begin{pmatrix}
M & N \\
-N & -M
\end{pmatrix} U^\dagger.
\] (S25)

The reduced density matrix in the \(\eta\) basis is finally:
\[
\rho_D = \det \frac{1}{2}(I - G)[\det(F_s)]^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{1}{2}(\eta | \eta')}(Q_{11} Q_{12} Q_{21} Q_{22})(\eta | \eta').
\] (S26)

Now, we define the coherent basis of the \(\eta\) representation as
\[
\eta_k | \gamma > = \gamma_k | \gamma >.
\] (S27)

Using the above basis, we have
\[
\langle \gamma | \rho_D | \gamma' \rangle = \det \frac{1}{2}(I - G)[\det(F_s)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \langle \gamma | e^{\frac{1}{2}(\eta | \eta')}X \eta | e^{\frac{1}{2}(\eta | \eta')}Y \eta | e^{\frac{1}{2}(\eta | \eta')}Z \eta | e^{\frac{1}{2}(\eta | \eta')}Y | \gamma' \rangle.
\] (S28)

To calculate the above equation we first define \(\bar{T}\) matrix,
\[
\bar{T} = e^Q = U \begin{pmatrix}
F_s - F^\dagger F^{-1} F_a F^{-1} \\
-F^{-1} F_a & F^\dagger
\end{pmatrix} U^\dagger.
\] (S29)

and
\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{X} &= \bar{T}_{12}(\bar{T}_{22})^{-1}, \\
\bar{Z} &= (\bar{T}_{22}^{-1})\bar{T}_{21}, \\
e^{-\frac{1}{2}Y} &= \bar{T}_{22}^{-1}.
\end{align*}
\] (S30)

Then, by decomposing the exponential factor in the equation \(\text{(S28)}\) (using the Balian-Brezin formula\(\text{a}\)), we get
\[
\langle \gamma | \rho_D | \gamma' \rangle = \det \frac{1}{2}(I - G)[\det(F_s)]^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{1}{2}(\gamma | \gamma')X \gamma | e^{\frac{1}{2}(\gamma | \gamma')}Y \gamma | e^{\frac{1}{2}(\gamma | \gamma')}Z \gamma | e^{\frac{1}{2}(\gamma | \gamma')}Y | \gamma' \rangle,
\] (S31)

which becomes,
\[
\langle \gamma | \rho_D | \gamma' \rangle = \det \frac{1}{2}(I - G)[\det(F_s)]^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{\frac{1}{2}(\gamma | \gamma')X \gamma | e^{\frac{1}{2}(\gamma | \gamma')}Y \gamma | e^{\frac{1}{2}(\gamma | \gamma')}Z \gamma | e^{\frac{1}{2}(\gamma | \gamma')}Y | \gamma' \rangle.
\] (S32)

After defining
\[
\bar{F}_s = e^Y,
\]
\[
\bar{F} = \bar{F}_s + \bar{F}_a = \bar{X} + e^Y,
\] (S33)

the reduced density matrix becomes,
\[
\langle \gamma | \rho_D | \gamma' \rangle = \det \frac{1}{2}(I - G)[\det(F_s)]^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}Y} e^{\frac{1}{2}X \gamma | e^{\frac{1}{2}Y \gamma | e^{\frac{1}{2}Z \gamma'} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}Y} | \gamma' \rangle.
\] (S34)

At this point, we explain how one can use the above equation to calculate the desired probabilities. The procedure is similar to the calculation of formation probabilities\(\text{a}\). First of all, one can think of \(|\gamma\rangle\) as a coherent state corresponding to the different excitation modes. For example, when all the \(\gamma_k\)'s are zero the corresponding coherent state is equal to the vacuum (no excited modes). Now, we excite a mode \(\lambda_k\) to get an excited state. That means in the corresponding coherent state we put one fermion in the \(\eta\) basis which simply is equivalent to the following Grassmann integration
\[
|0, 0, ..., 1_k, 0, ..., 0\rangle = \int d\gamma k |\gamma\rangle.
\] (S35)

The left hand side is the excited state with the mode \(k\) excited. It should now be clear that if we want to calculate the probability of the corresponding state we just need to first put \(|\gamma'\rangle = |\gamma\rangle\) and then put all the modes that are not
excited equal to zero and then Grassmann integrate over $\gamma_k$. This will lead to the one of the principal minors of the matrix $\tilde{F}$. The procedure is the same when we excite more modes that lead to the other excited states. There are $2|D|$ possible mode excitations which correspond to the same number of principal minors that the matrix $\tilde{F}$ have. One should note that sometimes different mode excitations lead to the same energy for the excited state. In this cases we need to sum the minors. One can now summarize the main equation of the article as

$$p(e) = \det \frac{1}{2}(I - G)\left[\frac{\det(F_s)}{\det(F)}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_e \text{Min}[\tilde{F}],$$

where the sum is over the degeneracy of the energy $e$.

In the final part of this subsection, it is worth mentioning that the results of this section can be used to get also an explicit formula for the generating function of the subsystem energy. Different versions of this quantity are already appeared in [5]. We present here another version which has different form but it is equivalent to the previous ones. The generating function is defined as:

$$M(z) = \text{tr}[\rho_D e^{zH_D}].$$

(S37)

After writing $H_D$ as

$$H_D = \frac{1}{2}(c^d c^\dagger) \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B & -A \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ c^\dagger \end{pmatrix}$$

(S38)

and using (S19) the trace can be calculated explicitly. The final result is

$$M(z) = \det \frac{1}{2}(I - G)\left[\det(F_s)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \det[I + e^{z(A \quad B) \begin{pmatrix} M & N \\ -N & -M \end{pmatrix}\frac{1}{2}}].$$

(S39)

The above equation can be also written as

$$M(z) = \det \frac{1}{2}(I - G)\left[\det(F_s)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \det[I + \begin{pmatrix} e^{z|\lambda|} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-z|\lambda|} \end{pmatrix}\tilde{T}]^{\frac{1}{2}};$$

(S40)

where $|\lambda|$ is the matrix of the eigenvalues of the subsystem Hamiltonian.

Since the involved matrices normally does not have simple properties it seems difficult to find the analytical properties of the above formula for large subsystem sizes.

C. Further Numerical Details

In this section, we will summarize further numerical results regarding the Rényi entropy of the subsystem energy. We will mostly focus on the $\alpha \to \infty$ where we can work with the biggest probability. In this case, we can calculate the entropy for relatively large subsystem sizes with high accuracy. For example, in the Fig. 5, we checked the area law for the gapped phase with much more accuracy. Then, in the table I and II we show the universality of the coefficient of the logarithm, i. e. $\epsilon(\infty)$, in the critical regime for the critical XY line and the XX line respectively. In the same tables one can also see that the coefficient corresponding to the semi-infinite case $\epsilon_s(\infty)$ is half of the infinite case. This is exactly what happens for the entanglement entropy [6]. Note that the coefficients of the critical Ising universality is with high accuracy half of the the XX universality. This indicates that most probably the coefficients $\epsilon(\infty)$ and $\epsilon_s(\infty)$ are linearly proportional to the central charge of the underlying CFT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(\hbar, \gamma)$</th>
<th>$\epsilon(\infty)$</th>
<th>$\epsilon_s(\infty)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(1, 1)$</td>
<td>0.111(1)</td>
<td>0.055(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(1, 0.5)$</td>
<td>0.111(1)</td>
<td>0.055(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(1, 0.75)$</td>
<td>0.111(1)</td>
<td>0.055(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(1, 1.25)$</td>
<td>0.111(1)</td>
<td>0.055(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(1, 1.5)$</td>
<td>0.111(1)</td>
<td>0.055(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I. The coefficients $\epsilon(\infty)$ and $\epsilon_s(\infty)$ for various $\gamma$’s on the critical XY line.
FIG. 5. (color online) Up: logarithmic behavior of the Rényi entropy ($\alpha \rightarrow \infty$) of the subsystem energy of the critical XY chain for $\gamma = h = 0$ and $\gamma = h = 1$. Down: area law of the Rényi entropy ($\alpha \rightarrow \infty$) for various values of the parameters of the gapped XY chain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n_c$</th>
<th>$\epsilon(\infty)$</th>
<th>$\epsilon_s(\infty)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\pi/2$</td>
<td>0.222(2)</td>
<td>0.111(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14\pi/30$</td>
<td>0.222(2)</td>
<td>0.111(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9\pi/20$</td>
<td>0.222(2)</td>
<td>0.111(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8\pi/18$</td>
<td>0.222(2)</td>
<td>0.111(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7\pi/16$</td>
<td>0.222(2)</td>
<td>0.111(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6\pi/14$</td>
<td>0.222(2)</td>
<td>0.111(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5\pi/12$</td>
<td>0.222(2)</td>
<td>0.111(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4\pi/10$</td>
<td>0.223(2)</td>
<td>0.111(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3\pi/8$</td>
<td>0.224(2)</td>
<td>0.112(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi/3$</td>
<td>0.225(2)</td>
<td>0.112(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. The coefficients $\epsilon(\infty)$ and $\epsilon_s(\infty)$ for various values of the fillings $h = -2 \cos n_c$ on the critical XX line, i.e. $\gamma = 0$.