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Quantum many-body dynamics under measurement.— We consider a generic (nonintegrable) quantum many-body system subject to continuous observation. We assume that the system is initially prepared in a thermal equilibrium state \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{eq}} \), which is characterized by the mean energy \( E_0 \), or equivalently by the corresponding temperature \( T_0 = 1/\beta_0 \). We set \( \hbar = 1 \) and \( k_B = 1 \) throughout this Letter. Following the standard theory of quantum measurement [106], we model a measurement process as repeated indirect measurements. We start from the separable state

\[
\hat{\rho}_{\text{tot}}(0) = \hat{\rho}_{\text{eq}} \otimes \hat{P}_0,
\]

where \( \hat{P}_0 \) is a projection operator on the reference state of the meter. The system interacts with a meter during a time in- terval \( \delta t \) via the total Hamiltonian \( \hat{H}_{\text{tot}} = \hat{H} + \hat{V} \), where \( \hat{H} \) is the many-body Hamiltonian of the measured system and \( \hat{V} = v \sum_{m=1}^{M} \hat{L}_m \otimes \hat{A}_m \) describes the system-meter interaction. We assume that \( \hat{L}_m \) is either a single local operator or the sum of local operators on the system and conserves the
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The last decade has witnessed remarkable progress in understanding of thermalization in isolated quantum systems. Combining the ideas of the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis and quantum measurement theory, we extend the framework of quantum thermalization to open many-body systems. A generic many-body system subject to continuous observation is shown to thermalize at a single trajectory level for any realization of measurement outcomes. We show that the nonunitary nature of quantum measurement causes several unique thermalization mechanisms that are unseen in isolated systems. We present numerical evidence of our find- ings by applying our theory to specific models that can be experimentally realized by quantum gas microscopy and in atom-cavity systems. Our theory also provides a general way to determine an effective temperature of many-body systems subject to the Lindblad master equation and thus should be applicable to noisy dynamics or dissipative systems coupled to nonthermal environments as well as continuously monitored systems. Our work provides yet another insight into why thermodynamics emerges so universally.

Statistical mechanics offers a universal framework to de- scribe thermodynamic properties of a system involving many degrees of freedom [1–8]. Systems described by statistical mechanics can be divided into three distinct classes: (i) systems in contact with large thermal baths, (ii) isolated systems, and (iii) systems coupled to nonthermal environments. Thermalization in the first class can be described by a phenomeno- logical master equation in which the detailed balance condition ensures that the system always relaxes to the Gibbs en- semble with the temperature of the thermal bath [9–14]. The last decade has witnessed considerable progress in our under- standing of thermalization in the second class [15–37], as pro- moted by quantum gas experiments [38–42]. In particular, the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) [6, 7, 27–37] has emerged as a generic mechanism of thermalization un- der unitary dynamics of isolated quantum systems. The ETH has been numerically confirmed for a number of many-body Hamiltonians [27–37] with notable exceptions of integrable [43–49] or many-body localized systems [50, 51].

In class (iii), a coupling to a nonthermal environment viol- ates the detailed balanced condition, as a nonthermal environ- ment permits arbitrary nonunitary processes such as contin- uous measurements [52–70] and engineered dissipation [71– 87]. There, the bath temperature does not exist \textit{a priori} and a number of fundamental questions arise. Does the system still thermalize and, if yes, in what sense? How are steady states under such situations related to the thermal equilibrium of the system Hamiltonian? These questions are directly relevant to recent experiments realizing various types of controlled dissipations and measurements [81–87] and to the founda- tions of open-system nonequilibrium statistical mechanics. The related questions were previously addressed in numeri- cal studies of specific examples [52, 63, 88–90]. Yet, model- independent, comprehensive understanding of thermalization and dynamics in open generic many-body systems is still elu- sive.

The aim of this Letter is to extend the framework of quan- tum thermalization to many-body systems coupled to generic environments permitted by quantum measurements and con- trolled dissipations. Combining the ETH proposed in statis- tical mechanics and quantum measurement theory developed in quantum optics, we derive a matrix-vector product expres- sion of the time-averaged density matrix, and show that a generic many-body system under continuous observation will thermalize for any realization of measurement outcomes. The obtained density matrix also provides a general way to de- termine an effective temperature of open many-body systems governed by the Lindblad master equation. Our results can thus be applied to dissipative many-body dynamics of a sys- tem coupled to (not necessarily thermal) environment [72–88] or under noisy unitary operations [91–100]. We also present numerical evidence of these findings by applying our theory to open quantum dynamics of specific models, which are directly relevant to experimental setups of quantum gas microscopy [101, 102] and atom-cavity systems [103–105]. Our results give yet another insight into why thermodynamics emerges so universally.
total particle number. We also assume that \( \hat{A}_m \) acts on the meter state such that \( \hat{P}_t \hat{A}_m = \delta_{tm} \hat{A}_m \), where \( \hat{P}_t \)'s are projection operators satisfying \( \sum_{t=0}^{M} \hat{P}_t = 1 \). After each interaction, we perform a projection measurement \( \{ \hat{P}_t \} \) on the meter to read out an outcome \( l = 0, 1, \ldots, M \). The meter is then reset to the reference state \( \hat{P}_0 \). For each measurement process, the meter exhibits either (i) a change in the state of the meter corresponding to outcome \( m = 1, 2, \ldots, M \) or (ii) no change. The case (i) is referred to as a quantum jump process and accompanied by the nonunitary mapping

\[
\mathcal{E}_m(\rho) = \text{Tr}_M[\hat{P}_m \hat{U}(\delta t) \rho_{\text{eq}} \hat{U}^\dagger(\delta t) \hat{P}_m] \approx \gamma \delta t \hat{L}_m \hat{\rho} \hat{L}_m^\dagger, \tag{2}
\]

where \( \text{Tr}_M[\cdot] \) denotes the trace over the meter, \( \hat{U}(\tau) = e^{-i\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}\tau} \), and \( \gamma = \nu^2 \delta t \text{Tr}_A[\hat{P}_0 \hat{A}_m^\dagger \hat{A}_m] \) \([107]\). To derive the last expression in Eq. (2), we assume a short-time interval \( \gamma \delta t \ll 1 \). In contrast, the case (ii) is referred to as a no-count process, leading to

\[
\mathcal{E}_0(\rho) \simeq (1 - i\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}\delta t) \rho (1 + i\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}\delta t), \tag{3}
\]

where \( \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = \hat{H} - i\Gamma/2 \) is an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian with \( \Gamma = \gamma \sum_m \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{L}_m \). Each outcome \( l \) is obtained with a probability \( p_l = \text{Tr}[\hat{E}_l(\rho)] \). Taking the limit \( \delta t \to 0 \) while keeping \( \nu^2 \delta t \) finite, the system exhibits a nonunitary stochastic evolution which is continuous in time and known as quantum trajectory dynamics \([106, 108, 109]\). Each realization of a trajectory is characterized by a sequence of measurement outcomes and given as

\[
\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}}(t; T) = \hat{\Pi}_{T; \mathcal{M}} \hat{P}_{\text{eq}} \hat{P}_0 \hat{\Pi}_{T; \mathcal{M}}^\dagger, \tag{4}
\]

where \( \mathcal{M} = \{m_1, \ldots, m_n\} \) and \( T = \{t_1, \ldots, t_n\} \) denote the types and occurrence times of quantum jumps, and \( \hat{\Pi}_{T; \mathcal{M}} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} [\hat{U}(\Delta t_i) \hat{L}_m \hat{U}(t_1) \hat{U}(\Delta t_i)] \) with \( \Delta t_i = t_{i+1} - t_i, t_{n+1} = t \) and \( \hat{U}(\tau) = e^{-i\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}\tau} \).

**Statistical ensemble.—** We are interested in the thermalization process caused by the interplay between many-body dynamics and measurement backaction of continuous observation. We consider a situation in which the equilibration time in the measured many-body system is shorter than a typical waiting time of observing a quantum jump. We ensure this by taking the limit \( \gamma \to 0 \) while keeping \( \gamma \mu \) finite. This guarantees that a finite number of quantum jumps typically occur during a given time interval \([0, t]\), but that the system still has not yet reached a steady state (such as an infinite-temperature state) even in the long-time regime. When a waiting time exceeds the equilibration time, the memory of the occurrence times \( T \) will eventually be lost and long-time values of physical observables can be studied by the time-averaged density matrix:

\[
\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}}(t) = \int_0^t dt_n \cdots \int_0^{t_2} dt_1 \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}}(t; T). \tag{5}
\]

To proceed with the calculation, we assume that for each eigenstate \( |E_a\rangle \) of \( \hat{H} \) the expectation values of arbitrary few-body observables coincide with those of the corresponding Gibbs ensemble. This condition is generally believed to hold when the system satisfies the ETH \([35]\), as numerically supported in a number of Hamiltonians \([27–37]\). The leading contribution in \( \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}} \) can then be given upon the normalization as

\[
\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}} = \frac{\Lambda_{\mathcal{M}}[\hat{\rho}_{\text{eq}}]}{Z(\mathcal{M})}, \tag{6}
\]

where we define \( \Lambda_{\mathcal{M}} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \langle \Lambda_m \rangle \hat{O} = \hat{L}_m \hat{O} \hat{L}_m^\dagger \), \( \Lambda = \sum_n \hat{P}_n \hat{O} \hat{P}_n \) and \( \hat{P}_n = |E_a\rangle \langle E_a| \), and \( Z(\mathcal{M}) \) is a normalization constant. Physically, the dephasing channel \( \Lambda \) originates from the ergodic, relaxation dynamics during the no-count process. While the non-Hermiticity in \( \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} \), which is due to the backaction of the no-count process, can slightly modify the energy distribution, its contribution can be neglected in the thermodynamic limit \([110]\). This follows from the strong suppression of fluctuations in the decay rate \( \Gamma \) among eigenstates that are close in energy, as satisfied by the ETH (see e.g., the top panel in Fig. 2c). The ensemble \( \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}} \) is parametrized by a sequence of measurement outcomes \( \mathcal{M} \). In fact, if the system is translationally invariant, only the information about the number of jumps is sufficient to characterize thermodynamic properties of \( \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}} \).

In the matrix representation, the ensemble (6) has a simple factorized form:

\[
\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}} \propto \sum_a [\mathcal{V}_m \cdots \mathcal{V}_m \hat{P}_{\text{eq}}]_a \hat{P}_a, \tag{7}
\]

where we introduce a vector \( \langle p_{\text{eq}} \rangle_a = \langle E_a | \hat{\rho}_{\text{eq}} | E_a \rangle \) and the matrix \( \langle \mathcal{V}_m \rangle_{ab} = \langle E_a | \hat{L}_m | E_b \rangle^2 \). It follows from the cluster decomposition property \([46, 111, 112]\) of thermal eigenstates for local operators \( \hat{O}_{x,y} \) that

\[
\lim_{|x-y| \to \infty} \text{Tr}[\hat{O}_x \hat{O}_y \hat{P}_a] - \text{Tr}[\hat{O}_x \hat{P}_a] \text{Tr}[\hat{O}_y \hat{P}_a] = 0. \tag{8}
\]

Then we can show \([110]\) that the standard deviation of energy in the ensemble (7) is subextensive and thus its energy distribution is strongly peaked around the mean value \( \bar{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \). We introduce an effective temperature \( \beta_{\text{eff}}^M \) from the condition \( \bar{E}_{\mathcal{M}} = \text{Tr}[\hat{H} \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}}] \) with \( \beta_{\text{eff}} = e^{-\beta \Gamma}/Z(\beta_{\text{eff}}) \) being the Gibbs ensemble. The ETH then guarantees that, if we focus on a few-body observable \( \hat{O} \), \( \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}} \) is indistinguishable from the Gibbs ensemble:

\[
\text{Tr}[\hat{O} \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}}] \simeq \text{Tr}[\hat{O} \hat{\rho}_{\beta_{\text{eff}}^M}]. \tag{9}
\]

Here and henceforth we understand \( \simeq \) to be the equality in the thermodynamic limit. Thus, a generic quantum system under measurement process thermalizes by itself at every single trajectory.

The derivation of the matrix-vector product ensemble (MVPE) in Eq. (7) is one of the main results in this Letter. In open many-body dynamics it is highly nontrivial to precisely estimate an effective temperature of the system. One usually has to design ad hoc techniques for each specific problem. In contrast, the MVPE provides a general and efficient way to determine an effective temperature under physically plausible assumptions as demonstrated later. If the ETH holds, any
physical quantity can be calculated from the Gibbs ensemble at an extracted temperature.

Before examining concrete examples, we discuss some general properties of thermalization under quantum measurement in comparison with thermalization in isolated systems. Firstly, since $H$ has no local conserved quantities, it satisfies $[H, \hat{L}_m] \neq 0$ and thus the matrix $V_m$ should change the energy distribution. It is this noncommutativity between the Hamiltonian and measurement operators that leads to heating or cooling under measurement. Secondly, it is worthwhile to mention similarities and differences between Eq. (7) and the density matrix of isolated systems under slow time-dependent operations [35] or a sudden quench [27, 113–115]. Both density matrices are diagonal in the energy basis and coefficients are represented in the matrix-vector product form. The unitarity inevitably leads to the doubly stochastic condition of the transition matrix $\sum_n(V)_{ab} = \sum_n(V)_{ab} = 1$, which causes the energy of the system to increase or stay constant [25, 26, 116]. However, in the nonunitary evolution considered here, $V$ cannot be interpreted as the transition matrix and also the doubly stochastic condition is generally violated. This is why it is possible to cool down the system if one uses artificial (typically non-Hermitian) measurement operators $\hat{L}_m$ [72, 73].

**Numerical demonstrations.** — To demonstrate our general approach, we consider a Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \hat{K} + \hat{U}$ of hard-core bosons on an open one-dimensional lattice with nearest- and next-nearest-neighbor hopping and an interaction: $\hat{K} = -\sum_i(t_b \hat{b}_i^\dagger \hat{b}_{i+1} + \text{H.c.})$ and $\hat{U} = \sum_i(U_{\text{eff}} \hat{n}_i \hat{n}_{i+1} + U' \hat{n}_i \hat{n}_{i+2} + \text{H.c.})$, where $\hat{b}_i$ (\(\hat{b}_i^\dagger\)) is the annihilation (creation) operator of a hard-core boson on site $l$ and $\hat{n}_i = \hat{b}_i^\dagger \hat{b}_i$. This model is, in general, nonintegrable and has been numerically confirmed to satisfy the ETH [28, 32, 35, 37]. We set the system size and the total number of particles as $L = 18$ and $N = 6$. As a measurement process, we consider (i) a local one $L_i = \hat{n}_i$, where a quantum jump is labeled by a lattice site $l$, and (ii) a global one $L = \sum_i (-1)^l \hat{n}_i$, where a type of jump is unique. Both processes are experimentally realizable; the former corresponds to site-resolved position measurement of ultracold atoms via light scattering, and the latter can be implemented by monitoring photons leaking out of a cavity coupled to a certain collective mode of atoms (microscopic derivations based on atom-photon interactions can be found in Refs. [52, 63, 117]).

To test the validity of the MVPE (7) for describing open many-body dynamics, it suffices to use an energy eigenstate as the initial state. Results for a general initial distribution $p_{\text{eq}}$ can be obtained as merely a linear sum of the results for single eigenstates. To be specific, we start from an eigenstate $|E_0\rangle$ corresponding to the initial temperature $T_0 = 3h$. We set $t = 0$ as the first detection time of a quantum jump.

Figure 1 shows a typical trajectory dynamics under the local measurement. After each detection, measurement backaction localizes an atom on the detected lattice site, which subsequently spreads over and quickly relaxes toward an equilibrium density (Fig. 1a). Figure 1b shows the corresponding dynamics of the kinetic energy $\langle \hat{K} \rangle$ (top) and the occupation $\langle \hat{n}_i \rangle$ at zero momentum (bottom), and compares them with the predictions from the MVPE $\hat{P}_M$ (red chain) and the Gibbs ensemble $\hat{P}_G$ (green dashed). For each time interval, the dynamical values agree with the MVPE predictions within time-dependent fluctuations. To gain further insights, Fig. 1c plots the diagonal matrix elements of each observable in energy basis (top two panels) and energy distributions after every quantum jump (the other panels). Small eigenstate-to-eigenstate fluctuations in observables and the remarkable agreement in the energy distribution explain the success of the MVPE description in Fig. 1b. It is remarkable that only a few jumps are sufficient to smear out the initial memory of a single eigenstate after which the distribution is almost indistinguishable from that of the corresponding Gibbs ensemble, thus validating the relation (9). Small fluctuations after the first jump (Fig. 1b) indicate that even a single quantum jump generates a sufficiently large effective dimension to make the system equilibrate, which can be understood from the substantial delocalization of an energy eigenstate in the Fock basis [118]. A discrepancy of the Gibbs ensemble from $\langle \hat{n}_i \rangle(t)$ in Fig. 1b can be attributed to the small system size (see the finite-size scaling analysis in [110]). In this respect, it may be advanta-
 FIG. 2. (a) Typical time evolution of the distribution with the global jump operator \( \hat{L} = \sum_{i} (-1)^{i} \hat{n}_{i} \), which gives the difference \( \bar{N}_{e} - \bar{N}_{o} \) of particle numbers at even and odd sites. Every time jump occurs, the distribution peaks at \( \hat{L} = \pm 4 \) after which it rapidly relaxes to the equilibrium profile due to the noncommutativity of \( \hat{L} \) with the system Hamiltonian \( \hat{H} \). (b) The corresponding dynamics of \( \langle \hat{n}_{k=0} \rangle \) and (c) the diagonal values of the detection rate \( \hat{\Gamma} \) (top panel) and the energy distributions after each jump (other panels). The eigenstate-to-eigenstate fluctuation in \( \hat{\Gamma} \) is significantly suppressed in the non-integrable case. The parameters are the same as in Fig. 1.

geous to use \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{MVPE}} \) rather than \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{MVPE}} \) for small systems that can be prepared in experiments.

Figure 2 shows a typical realization under the global measurement. Figure 2a plots the time evolution of the distribution of \( \hat{L} = \sum_{i} (-1)^{i} \hat{n}_{i} \), which is the difference of particle numbers at even and odd sites. Each detection creates a cat-like post-measurement state having large fractions on \( \hat{L} = \pm 4 \) for a brief moment. It then quickly collapses into a thermal state since \( \hat{H} \) does not commute with \( \hat{L} \). In Fig. 2b, the corresponding dynamics of \( \langle \hat{n}_{k=0} \rangle \) is compared with the predictions from the MVPE \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{MVPE}} \) and the Gibbs ensemble \( \hat{\rho}_{\text{Gibbs}} \). Figure 2c shows the diagonal values \( \Gamma_{\alpha} \) of the detection rate (top panel) and energy distributions after each jump (the other panels). Again, we find an excellent agreement between the exact values and the MVPE, and a rapid collapse of the energy distribution into that of the Gibbs ensemble.

Application to many-body Lindblad dynamics. — Having established the validity of the MVPE, we now discuss its application to the Lindblad dynamics. The quantum trajectory dynamics offers a numerical method to solve the Lindblad master equation [14, 90]:

\[
\frac{d\hat{\rho}}{dt} = \mathcal{L}[\hat{\rho}] = -i[\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}, \hat{\rho}] + \gamma \sum_{m} \hat{L}_{m} \hat{\rho} L_{m}^{\dagger},
\]

where \( \hat{\rho}(t) = \sum_{\mathcal{M}} \hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{M}}(t) \) is the density matrix averaged over all trajectories. Equation (10) can describe the temporal evolution of a system weakly coupled to its environment [14] or a system under noisy unitary operations [91–94, 100]. Yet, especially for a many-body system, it is often very demanding to take the ensemble average due to a vast number of possible trajectories.

For the case of a translationally invariant Hamiltonian \( \hat{H} \) and a local operator \( \hat{L}_{m} \), our approach suggests a simple way to overcome the above difficulty. In this case, the matrix \( \mathcal{V}_{m} \) is independent of a spatial label \( m \) and thus the MVPE in Eq. (7) is solely characterized by the number \( n \) of jumps:

\[
\hat{\rho}_{n} \propto \sum_{\mathcal{M}} [\mathcal{V}^{n}]_{\mathcal{P}_{0} \mathcal{M}_{n}} \hat{P}_{\mathcal{M}_{n}}.
\]

As the detection rate \( \hat{\Gamma} \) of jumps consists of few-body observables, the distribution of \( n \) is sharply peaked around the mean value \( \pi \) if the ETH holds. These observations lead to

\[
\text{Tr}[\hat{O} e^{\mathcal{L} t} \hat{\rho}_{\text{MVPE}}] \simeq \text{Tr}[\hat{O} \hat{\rho}_{\text{Gibbs}}]\ simeq \text{Tr}[\hat{O} \hat{\rho}_{\text{Gibbs}}],
\]

where \( \pi \) is the mean number of jumps during \([0, t]\) that can be determined from the implicit relation \( t \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{\pi} 1/\Gamma_{n} \) with \( \Gamma_{n} = \text{Tr}[\hat{\Gamma} \hat{\rho}_{n}] \), and \( \beta_{\text{eff}} \) is the corresponding effective temperature. Thus, expectation values of physical observables in the many-body Lindblad dynamics agree with those predicted from the typical MVPE or the Gibbs ensemble at an appropriate effective temperature. Since solving Eq. (10) requires the diagonalization of a \( D^{2} \times D^{2} \) Liouvillian with \( D \) being the dimension of the Hilbert space, our approach (11) allows a significant simplification of the problem. We have applied our approach to the Lindblad dynamics of the above lattice model and demonstrated the relation (11) aside from finite-size corrections [110].

Summary and Discussions. — Combining the ideas of the ETH and quantum measurement theory, we find that a generic quantum many-body system under continuous observation thermalizes at a single trajectory level for any realization of measurement outcomes. We have presented the matrix-vector product ensemble (7), which can quantitatively describe the dynamics and give an effective temperature of open many-body systems. This can also be used to analyze a many-body Lindblad master equation and thus should have a broad applicability to dissipative [72–87] or noisy systems [91–94, 100], in addition to continuously monitored ones. These findings are supported by numerical simulations of nonintegrable systems subject to local and global observations, which can be experimentally realized by quantum gas microscopy and in atom-cavity systems.

The present study opens several research directions. Firstly, it is intriguing to elucidate thermalization at the trajectory level when the system Hamiltonian is integrable [43–49]. Under measurements, quantum jumps act as weak integrability-breaking perturbations and, if their effects are insignificant, we expect prethermalization [24, 43], i.e., a phenomenon in which observables approach quasistationary values consistent with the generalized Gibbs ensemble [43]. Ultimate thermalization will happen when quantum jumps sufficiently mix the distribution, leading to the unbiased probability weights on nonthermal rare states admitted in the weak variant of ETH [24, 29, 119, 120]. We present our first attempt to elucidate this picture in the Supplementary Materials [110] and leave detailed analyses as interesting future problems. Another
important system is a many-body localized system [50, 51] where even the weak ETH can be violated [121]. Secondly, it is interesting to explore possible connections between the predictions made in the random unitary circuit dynamics [94–99] and the nonintegrable open trajectory dynamics studied here. They share several intriguing similarities; they satisfy the locality, have no energy conservation, thus relaxing to the infinite-temperature state, and obey the Lindblad master equation upon the ensemble average (at least) in a certain case [94]. It is particularly interesting to test the predicted scrambling in infinite-temperature state, and obey the Lindblad master equation [95].
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Supplementary Materials

Derivation of the matrix-vector product form of the time-averaged density matrix

We here provide technical details on the derivation of Eq. (7) in the main text which is the matrix-product form of the density matrix in open many-body dynamics. To begin with, we consider the following time-averaged density matrix describing the dynamics of the system under continuous observation (see Eq. (5) in the main text)

$$\hat{\rho}_M(t) = \int_0^t dt_n \cdots \int_0^{t_2} dt_1 \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^{\Delta t_i}} \sum_{\{a_i\} \{b_i\}} \prod_{i=1}^n \left[ \hat{U}(\Delta t_i) \sqrt{\gamma} \hat{L}_{a_i} \hat{U}(\Delta t_i) \rho_{eq} \hat{U}^\dagger(\Delta t_i) \right] \prod_{i=1}^n \left[ \sqrt{\gamma} \hat{L}_{a_i} \hat{U}(\Delta t_i) \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (S1)

where the time average is taken over all possible occurrence times of quantum jump events. To rewrite this, we expand a non-Hermitian effective Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{eff}$ as $\hat{H}_{eff} = \sum_a \lambda_a |\Lambda_a^R\rangle \langle \Lambda_a^L|$, where $\lambda_a$ is a complex eigenvalue, and the right (left) eigenstates $|\Lambda_a^R\rangle$ ($|\Lambda_a^L\rangle$) satisfy the orthonormal condition $\langle \Lambda_a^R | \Lambda_b^L \rangle = \delta_{ab}$. We then insert the relation $\hat{U}(\tau) = e^{-i\hat{H}_{eff}\tau} = \sum_a e^{-i\lambda_a \tau} |\Lambda_a^R\rangle \langle \Lambda_a^L|$ into Eq. (S1), obtaining

$$\hat{\rho}_M(t) = \sum_{\{a_i\} \{b_i\}} \mathcal{F}(t; \{a_i\}, \{b_i\}) \prod_{i=1}^n \left[ \sqrt{\gamma} \langle \Lambda_a^{i+1} | \Lambda_a^L | \rho_{eq} | \Lambda_b^R \rangle | \Lambda_a^{i+1} \rangle \langle \Lambda_a^L \rangle \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (S2)

where we introduce the matrices $V_m$ and $P_{eq}$ as

$$(V_m)_{ab} = \langle \Lambda_a^L | \hat{L}_m | \Lambda_b^R \rangle, \quad (P_{eq})_{ab} = \langle \Lambda_a^L | \rho_{eq} | \Lambda_b^R \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S3)

and $\mathcal{F}$ involves the time integration of the exponential factor

$$\mathcal{F}(t; \{a_i\}, \{b_i\}) = e^{-i(\Lambda_{a_{n+1}} - \Lambda_{b_{n+1}}) t} \prod_{i=1}^n \left[ \int_0^t dt_n \cdots \int_0^{t_2} dt_1 e^{-i\sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i t_i} \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (S4)

with

$$\Delta_i = \lambda_a - \lambda_b - (\lambda_{a_{i+1}} - \lambda_{b_{i+1}}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S5)

To extract generic features of the trajectory many-body dynamics described by Eq. (S2), we consider the limit of minimally destructive observation, i.e., we take $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ while keeping $\gamma t = \mu$ finite. Here, $\mu$ characterizes the mean number of jumps during a given time interval $[0, t]$. We also assume that, for each many-body eigenstate $|E_a\rangle$ of the system Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$, the expectation value of any few-body observable coincides with that over the corresponding Gibbs ensemble. This assumption is known as the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) and has been numerically verified for a number of systems [27–37].

Assuming the minimally destructive limit and the ETH, we can achieve several simplifications. Firstly, we have only to take into account the leading contributions of the integral $\mathcal{F}$ in the limit of $t \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., the terms with $a_i = b_i$ with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n + 1$. Secondly, the eigenstates $|\Lambda_a^{RL}\rangle$ are replaced by those $|E_a\rangle$ of the system Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$, as the minimally destructive limit ensures the vanishingly small non-Hermiticity $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ in the effective Hamiltonian. Accordingly, to express an imaginary part $\Gamma_a$ of an eigenvalue $\lambda_a$, we can use the perturbative result $\Gamma_a = \langle E_a | \sum_m \hat{L}_m \hat{L}_m | E_a \rangle$. These simplifications lead to

$$\hat{\rho}_M(t) \approx \sum_{\{a_i\}} e^{-n \hat{\Gamma}_{a_{n+1}}} \int_0^n \sum_{\{a_{n+1}\}} \mu_{n+1} \cdots \int_0^2 \sum_{\{a_{n+1}\}} \mu_{n} e^{-\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \mu_i} \langle V_m \rangle_{a_{n+1} a_n} \cdots \langle V_m \rangle_{a_2 a_1} \langle p_{eq} \rangle_{a_1} \langle E_a \rangle \langle E_a \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S6)

where $V_m$ and $p_{eq}$ are matrices whose elements are defined by

$$(V_m)_{ab} = |\langle E_a | \hat{L}_m | E_b \rangle|^2, \quad (p_{eq})_{a} = \langle E_a | \rho_{eq} | E_a \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S7)

and we introduce variables

$$\mu_i \equiv \gamma t_i,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S8)

$$\hat{\Gamma}_a \equiv \Gamma_a / \gamma = \langle E_a | \sum_m \hat{L}_m \hat{L}_m | E_a \rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S9)

$$\delta \hat{\Gamma}_{a_i} \equiv \hat{\Gamma}_{a_i} - \hat{\Gamma}_{a_{i+1}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S10)

To attain a further simplification, we note the fact that the off-diagonal elements $\langle V_m \rangle_{ab}$ vanish exponentially fast with the energy difference $\omega = |E_a - E_b|$ [26, 90]. Thus, the dominant contributions to Eq. (S6) are made from matrix-vector products
for the elements $a_i$ and $a_{i+1}$ that are close in energy, i.e., the elements satisfying $|E_{a_i} - E_{a_{i+1}}|/|E_{a_i} + E_{a_{i+1}}| \ll 1$. For such elements, the ETH guarantees that the fluctuation of the decay rate is strongly suppressed $|\Gamma_{a_i} - \Gamma_{a_{i+1}}|/|\Gamma_{a_i} + \Gamma_{a_{i+1}}| \ll 1$, as we consider physical jump operators $\hat{L}_m$ consisting of few-body operators. We thus neglect $\delta \Gamma_a$’s in Eq. (S6), leading to

$$\hat{\varrho}_M(t) \simeq \frac{\mu^n}{m!} e^{-\mu t} \sum_a [\rho_{m_a} \cdots \rho_{m_1}]|E_a\rangle\langle E_a|.$$  (S11)

Finally, while successive multiplications of matrices $\rho_m$ on the initial distribution $\rho_{eq}$ can eventually change the mean energy $\bar{E}$ by an extensive amount, they still keep the energy fluctuation subextensive as shown in the next section. In other words, the energy distribution is strongly peaked around the mean value during each time interval between jump events. The ETH then guarantees that the distribution of the detection rate $\Gamma$ is also strongly peaked and its fluctuation around the mean value is vanishingly small in the thermodynamic limit. We thus replace $\tilde{\Gamma}_a$ in Eq. (S11) by its mean value $\bar{\Gamma}$ in the final distribution $\langle \prod_{i=1}^m \rho_{m_i} \rangle_{eq}$, and arrive at the following simple expression of the density matrix:

$$\hat{\varrho}_M(t) \simeq \frac{\mu^n}{m!} e^{-\mu \bar{\Gamma}} \sum_a [\rho_{m_a} \cdots \rho_{m_1}]|E_a\rangle\langle E_a|.$$  (S12)

which gives Eqs. (6) and (7) in the main text after normalization. We remark that, in finite-size systems, the distribution in the energy basis is often rather broad. Hence, in practice it can also be useful to employ the expression (S11) as a matrix-vector product ensemble especially when the diagonal elements of the detection rate $\Gamma_a$ vary significantly as a function of energy.

**Subextensive energy fluctuation in the matrix-vector product ensemble**

In this section, we show that energy fluctuation in the following matrix-vector product ensemble is subextensive:

$$\hat{\varrho}_M = \frac{\Lambda_M[\hat{\varrho}_{eq}]}{Z(M)} = \frac{1}{Z(M)} \sum_a [\rho_{m_a} \cdots \rho_{m_1}]|E_a\rangle\langle E_a|.$$  (S13)

Here, we introduce $\Lambda_M = \prod_{i=1}^n (\Lambda \circ L_m, \circ \Lambda)$ with $L_m[\hat{O}] = \hat{L}_m \hat{O} \hat{L}_m^\dagger$, $\Lambda[\hat{O}] = \sum_a \hat{P}_a \hat{O} \hat{P}_a$ and $\hat{P}_a = |E_a\rangle\langle E_a|$, and $Z(M) = \sum_a [\rho_{m_a} \cdots \rho_{m_1}]|E_a\rangle\langle E_a|$. We assume that thermal eigenstates satisfy the cluster decomposition property (CDP) (c.f. Eq. (8) in the main text), which is a fundamental property that lies at the heart of quantum many-body theory [46, 47, 111, 112] and should hold true for any physical states (with only a few exceptions such as (long-lived) macroscopic superposition states [47]). From this assumption together with the ETH, it follows that any diagonal ensemble with a strongly peaked energy distribution satisfies the CDP in the thermodynamic limit. In particular, the initial thermal equilibrium state $\rho_{eq}$ also satisfies the CDP since its energy fluctuation (i.e., the standard deviation) is subextensive by definition.

Below we show that if energy fluctuation in an ensemble $\hat{\varrho}$ diagonal in the energy basis is subextensive and thus $\hat{\varrho}$ satisfies the CDP, then a post-measurement ensemble $\rho_m \propto \Lambda_m[\hat{\varrho}]$ after a single quantum jump with $\Lambda_m = \Lambda \circ L_m \circ \Lambda$ also satisfies these conditions. From the induction it then follows that an energy fluctuation of the density matrix (S13) is also subextensive.

**Local measurement**

We first show the subextensiveness of energy fluctuation in the post-measurement ensemble $\rho_m$ for a local measurement, in which a measurement operator $\hat{L}_m$ acts on a local spatial region. The variance of energy is given as

$$(\Delta E)^2 = \text{Tr}[\hat{H}^2 \rho_m] - (\text{Tr}[\hat{H} \rho_m])^2 = \frac{1}{(Z(m))^2} \left[ Z(m) \text{Tr}[\hat{H}^2 L_m[\hat{\varrho}]] - \left( \text{Tr}[\hat{H} L_m[\hat{\varrho}]] \right)^2 \right],$$  (S14)

where $Z(m) = \text{Tr}[\Lambda_m[\hat{\varrho}]]$ is a normalization constant. We express the Hamiltonian and measurement operators as sums of local operators:

$$\hat{H} = \sum_x \hat{h}_x, \quad \hat{L}_m = \sum_{x \in D_m} \hat{i}_x.$$  (S15)
where $D_m$ denotes a local spatial region on which $\hat{L}_m$ acts. To rewrite Eq. (S14), we calculate the quantity
\begin{equation}
\Delta_{xy} = \frac{1}{(Z(m))^2} \left[ Z(m) \mathrm{Tr}[\hat{h}_x \hat{h}_y \mathcal{L}_m[\hat{\rho}]] - \mathrm{Tr}[\hat{h}_x \mathcal{L}_m[\hat{\rho}]] \mathrm{Tr}[\hat{h}_y \mathcal{L}_m[\hat{\rho}]] \right] = \frac{1}{(\langle \hat{L}_m \hat{L}_m \rangle)^2} \left[ \langle \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{L}_m \rangle \langle \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{h}_x \hat{h}_y \hat{L}_m \rangle - \langle \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{h}_x \hat{L}_m \rangle \langle \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{h}_y \hat{L}_m \rangle \right],
\end{equation}
where we denote $\mathrm{Tr}[\hat{\rho}] = \langle \cdot \rangle$. Using the condition $|\hat{\rho}| = 0$ for $x \neq y$, we obtain in the limit $|x - y| \to \infty$
\begin{equation}
\langle \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{L}_m \rangle \langle \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{h}_x \hat{h}_y \hat{L}_m \rangle \sim \langle \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{L}_m \rangle \langle \hat{h}_x \rangle \langle \hat{h}_y \rangle,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\langle \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{h}_x \hat{L}_m \rangle \langle \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{h}_y \hat{L}_m \rangle \sim \langle \hat{L}_m^\dagger \hat{L}_m \rangle^2 \langle \hat{h}_x \rangle \langle \hat{h}_y \rangle.
\end{equation}
Here, we use the CDP of $\hat{\rho}$ in deriving the last expressions. We thus obtain $\lim_{|x-y| \to \infty} \Delta_{xy} = 0$. It follows that the standard deviation of energy is subextensive:
\begin{equation}
\lim_{V \to \infty} \frac{\Delta E}{V} = \lim_{V \to \infty} \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{xy} \Delta_{xy}}}{\sum_{xy} 1} = 0.
\end{equation}

In particular, it is physically plausible to assume that $\Delta_{xy}$ decays exponentially fast or at least faster than $V^{-1}$ in the thermodynamic limit. Under this condition, we obtain the square-root scaling:
\begin{equation}
\Delta E \simeq \sqrt{\sum_x \Delta_{xx}} \propto O(\sqrt{V}).
\end{equation}

**Global measurement**

We next consider a global measurement, in which a measurement operator acts on an entire region of the system. As $D_m$ is independent of a label $m$, we abbreviate a label and denote a measurement operator as $\hat{L} = \sum_z \hat{l}_z$ for the sake of simplicity. It turns out that we need to discuss the two different cases separately depending on whether or not an expectation value $\lim_{V \to \infty} \langle \hat{L} \rangle / V$ vanishes in the thermodynamic limit.

We first consider the case in which $\langle \hat{L} \rangle$ scales as
\begin{equation}
\langle \hat{L} \rangle = \langle \sum_z \hat{l}_z \rangle \propto O(V),
\end{equation}
so that the expectation value $\lim_{V \to \infty} \langle \hat{L} \rangle / V$ does not vanish. From the CDP of $\hat{\rho}$, the leading term in $\Delta_{xy}$ defined in Eq. (S16) can be estimated in the limit $|x - y| \to \infty$ as
\begin{equation}
\Delta_{xy} = \frac{1}{\langle \hat{L} \rangle^2} \left( \sum_{z,w} \langle \hat{l}_z \hat{l}_w \rangle \langle \sum_z \hat{l}_z \hat{h}_x \hat{h}_y \hat{l}_w \rangle - \langle \sum_z \hat{l}_z \hat{h}_x \hat{l}_w \rangle \langle \sum_z \hat{l}_z \hat{h}_y \hat{l}_w \rangle \right) \approx \frac{1}{\langle \hat{L} \rangle^4} \left[ \langle \sum_z \hat{l}_z \rangle^2 \langle \sum_z \hat{l}_z \hat{h}_x \hat{h}_y \rangle^2 - \langle \langle \sum_z \hat{l}_z \hat{h}_x \hat{l}_w \rangle \langle \sum_z \hat{l}_z \hat{h}_y \hat{l}_w \rangle \rangle^2 + c.c. \right] \propto O \left( \frac{1}{V^2} \right).
\end{equation}
We thus conclude that the standard deviation of energy is subextensive:
\begin{equation}
\Delta E = \sqrt{\sum_x \Delta_{xx}^2} + \sum_{x \neq y} \Delta_{xy} \simeq \sqrt{\sum_x \Delta_{xx}} \propto O(\sqrt{V}).
\end{equation}

We next consider the other case in which an expectation value of $\hat{L} / V$ vanishes in the thermodynamic limit. To be specific, we impose the following condition
\begin{equation}
\langle \hat{L} \rangle = \langle \sum_z \hat{l}_z \rangle \propto o(\sqrt{V}).
\end{equation}
For instance, in the numerical example presented in the main text, an expectation value of $\hat{L} = \sum_m (-1)^m \hat{n}_m$ with respect to arbitrary energy eigenstate is exactly zero, and thus the condition (S26) is satisfied. Using this condition, we can rewrite $\langle \hat{L}^\dagger \hat{L} \rangle$ as

$$\langle \hat{L}^\dagger \hat{L} \rangle = \sum_{z,w} \langle \hat{l}^\dagger_z \hat{l}_w \rangle \simeq \sum_{z,w} (\langle \hat{l}^\dagger_z \hat{l}_w \rangle - \langle \hat{l}^\dagger_z \rangle \langle \hat{l}_w \rangle) \simeq \sum_z (\langle \hat{l}^\dagger_z \rangle - \langle \hat{l}^\dagger_z \rangle \langle \hat{l}_z \rangle) \propto O(V).$$

(S27)

Here, in the first approximate equality we add the $o(V)$ contribution in Eq. (S26), and in the second approximate equality we use the CDP of $\hat{\rho}$ and the scaling (S26). The leading contribution in $\Delta_{xy}$ of Eq. (S23) is obtained as

$$\Delta_{xy} \simeq \frac{\langle \hat{l}^\dagger_x \hat{h}_x \rangle \langle \hat{h}_y \hat{y} \rangle + c.c.}{\sum_z (\langle \hat{l}^\dagger_z \hat{l}_z \rangle - \langle \hat{l}^\dagger_z \rangle \langle \hat{l}_z \rangle)} \propto O\left(\frac{1}{V}\right),$$

(S28)

again leading to a subextensive energy fluctuation:

$$\Delta E = \sqrt{\sum_x \Delta_{xx} + \sum_{x \neq y} \Delta_{xy}} \propto O(\sqrt{V}).$$

(S29)

Finite-size scaling analysis

In this section, we present the results of the finite-size scaling analysis for testing the precision of the predictions from the matrix-vector product ensemble (MVPE) and the corresponding Gibbs ensemble with an effective temperature. Here and henceforth, we apply our theory to the specific model of one-dimensional hard-core bosons discussed in the main text. The system Hamiltonian $H = \hat{K} + \hat{U}$ consists of the kinetic energy $\hat{K}$ and the interaction term $\hat{U}$, which involve the nearest- and next-nearest-neighbor hopping and an interaction (see Fig. S1):

$$\hat{K} = - \sum_l (t_h \hat{b}^\dagger_l \hat{b}_{l+1} + t_h^* \hat{b}^\dagger_{l+1} \hat{b}_l + \text{H.c.}),$$

(S30)

$$\hat{U} = \sum_l (U \hat{n}_l \hat{n}_{l+1} + U' \hat{n}_l \hat{n}_{l+2}),$$

(S31)

where $\hat{b}^\dagger_l$ ($\hat{b}_l$) is the annihilation (creation) operator of a hard-core boson on site $l$ and $\hat{n}_l = \hat{b}^\dagger_l \hat{b}_l$. We use the open boundary conditions. To be specific, when we consider a nonintegrable case, we set $t_h = t_h^* = U = U' = 1$ for which the system is known to satisfy the ETH [28, 32, 35, 37]. We consider local or global continuous measurements performed on this many-body system. The local measurement is associated with a jump operator $\hat{L}_l = \hat{n}_l$ acting on the lattice site $l$, which physically corresponds to a site-resolved position measurement of atoms in an optical lattice as realized in quantum gas microscopy (see Fig. S1(a)) [52, 101, 102, 117]. The global measurement is associated with a jump operator $\hat{L} = \sum_l (-1)^l \hat{n}_l$ acting on an entire region of the system, which can be realized by continuously monitoring photons leaking out of a cavity coupled to a certain collective atomic mode (see Fig. S1(b)) [63].

We numerically simulate quantum trajectory dynamics starting from the energy eigenstate $|E_0\rangle$ corresponding to the initial temperature $T_0 = 3 t_h$ as explained in the main text. To perform the finite-size scaling analysis, we calculate the relative error of

![FIG. S1. Quantum many-body systems under (a) local and (b) global continuous measurements. (a) Hard-core bosons on a lattice are subject to site-resolved position measurement via light scattering. (b) The cavity photon field is coupled to a collective mode of atoms and photons emanating from the cavity are continuously monitored.](image-url)
The relative error of the predictions of the MVPE or the corresponding Gibbs ensemble from the time-averaged value:

\[ r_{\hat{\rho}} = \frac{\overline{\hat{O}(t)} - \langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}}}{\overline{\hat{O}(t)} + \langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\hat{\rho}}} \]  

(S32)

where \( \overline{\hat{O}(t)} \) denotes the time-averaged value of an observable \( \hat{O} \) over the trajectory dynamics during the time interval involving \( t \) between quantum jumps, \( \langle \cdot \rangle_{\hat{\rho}} = \text{Tr}[\cdot \hat{\rho}] \) with \( \hat{\rho} \) being chosen to be either the MVPE \( \hat{\rho}_M \) or the Gibbs ensemble \( \hat{\rho}_{\beta_{\text{eff}}} \) with an effective temperature \( \beta_{\text{eff}} \). As an observable \( \hat{O} \), we use the kinetic energy \( \hat{K} \) or the occupation number \( \hat{n}_{k=0} \) at zero momentum.

We find that the convergence of the corresponding Gibbs ensemble predictions (open circles) is slower than that of the MVPE. This fact can be attributed to a combination of broad energy distributions of finite-size systems and large fluctuations in diagonal elements of observables (see e.g., Fig. 1(c) in the main text). It is worthwhile to mention that a similar slow convergence of the observable \( \hat{n}_{k=0} \) to the equilibrium value due to finite-size effects has also been found in the time-dependent density-matrix renormalization-group calculations of the Bose-Hubbard model with spontaneous emissions [89].

**Application of the matrix-vector product ensemble to the Lindblad dynamics**

We now argue that the matrix-vector product ensemble (MVPE) serves as an efficient solver of the many-body Lindblad dynamics. To be specific, we consider a global continuous measurement \( \hat{L} = \sum_i (-1)^i \hat{n}_i \) acting on the nonintegrable hard-core boson model as analyzed above. The MVPE is characterized solely by the number \( n \) of jumps and we denote it as \( \hat{\rho}_n \propto \sum_{\alpha_1}[v_\alpha^m p_{\text{eq}}]|E_\alpha\rangle \langle E_\alpha| \). To apply the MVPE to the Lindblad dynamics, we determine the typical number \( n_t \) of jumps as a function of time \( t \) from the relation \( n_t = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \Theta(t - \sum_{n=0}^{m} 1/\Gamma_n) \), where \( \Theta(x) \) is the Heaviside step function and \( \Gamma_n \equiv \text{Tr}[\hat{\Gamma} \hat{\rho}_n] \).

This estimation can be justified by the ETH that is satisfied for the system Hamiltonian we consider; the ETH together with the subextensive energy fluctuation in the MVPE guarantees that the detection rate \( \hat{\Gamma} \) has a strongly peaked distribution, and we thus approximate it by the mean value \( \Gamma_n \) during each time interval between quantum jumps. Figure S3 compares the MVPE
predictions (red solid line) with the Lindblad dynamics (black dashed curve) corresponding to the heating dynamics of (a) the kinetic energy and (b) the occupation number at zero momentum under the global measurement. The stepwise behavior in the MVPE prediction originates from the discreteness of \( \pi_t \), which will diminish in the thermodynamic limit. The agreement found in Fig. S3 thus demonstrates the relation (11) in the main text aside from the stepwise finite-size contributions.

**Numerical analysis on integrable systems**

An isolated integrable many-body system often fails to thermalize because the Gibbs ensemble is not sufficient to fix distributions of an extensive number of local conserved quantities. Here we present numerical results of trajectory dynamics with an integrable system Hamiltonian. To be specific, we consider a local measurement process \( \hat{L}_n = \hat{n}_l \) and choose the parameters as \( t_h = U = 1 \) and \( t'_h = U' = 0 \). For the sake of comparison, in Fig. S4 we present the results for the trajectory dynamics with the same occurrence times and types of quantum jumps as realized in the nonintegrable results presented in Fig. 1 of the main text. The initial state is again chosen to be the energy eigenstate \( |E_0\rangle \) of the integrable many-body Hamiltonian having an energy corresponding to the temperature \( T_0 = 3t_h \).

Figure S4(a) shows the spatiotemporal dynamics of the atom number at each lattice site. Measurement backaction localizes an atom at the site of detection and the density waves propagate ballistically through the system. The induced density fluctuations are significantly larger than those found in the corresponding nonintegrable results, and the relaxation to the equilibrium profile seems to be not reached during each time interval between quantum jumps in the integrable case. Also, the ballistic propagations of density waves are reflected back at the boundaries and can disturb the density; the finite-size effects can be more significant in the integrable case than the corresponding nonintegrable one. It merits further study to identify an equilibration time scale of density waves are reflected back at the boundaries and can disturb the density; the finite-size effects can be more significant.

The thermalization behavior can be also inferred from the eventual agreement between the time-dependent values of the observables and the predictions from the Gibbs ensemble after several jumps (see Fig. S4(b)). Nevertheless, it is still evident that a largely biased weight on an initial (possibly nonthermal) state can survive when a number of jumps is small (see e.g., the panels (i) and (ii) in Fig. S4(c)), and thus the generalized Gibbs ensemble can be a suitable description in such a case. To make concrete statements, we need a larger system size and more detailed analyses with physically plausible initial conditions. We leave it as an interesting open question to examine to what extent the initial memory of a possible nonthermal state can be kept under the integrability-breaking continuous measurement process.
FIG. S4. Numerical results on the trajectory dynamics for which the system Hamiltonian is integrable and the measurement is local. (a) Spatiotemporal dynamics of the atom-number distribution at each lattice site and (b) the corresponding dynamics of the kinetic energy $\hat{K}$ (top panel) and the occupation number at zero momentum $\hat{n}_{k=0}$ (bottom panel). (c) Top two panels show the diagonal values of each observable in the energy basis for the integrable case (red triangle) and the nonintegrable case (blue circle). Other panels show the changes of energy distributions after each jump. The system size is $L_s = 18$ and the total number of bosons is $N = 6$. We set $t_h = U = 1$ and $t'_h = U' = 0$ for the integrable system Hamiltonian, and set $t_h = t'_h = U = U' = 1$ to plot nonintegrable results in the top two panels of (c).