

Hydrodynamics of operator spreading and quasiparticle diffusion in interacting integrable systems

Sarang Gopalakrishnan¹, David A. Huse², Vedika Khemani³, and Romain Vasseur⁴

¹ *Department of Physics and Astronomy, CUNY College of Staten Island, Staten Island, NY 10314; Physics Program and Initiative for the Theoretical Sciences, The Graduate Center, CUNY, New York, NY 10016, USA*

² *Physics Department, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA*

³ *Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA and*

⁴ *Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003, USA*

We address the hydrodynamics of operator spreading in interacting integrable lattice models. In these models, operator spreading is due to the ballistic propagation of quasiparticles. The operator front moves ballistically with a velocity that is locally set by the fastest quasiparticle velocity. However, in *interacting* integrable systems, this velocity depends on the density of the other quasiparticles, so equilibrium density fluctuations cause the front to follow a biased random walk — and therefore to broaden diffusively. Ballistic front propagation and diffusive front broadening are also generically present in *non*-integrable systems in one dimension; thus, although the mechanisms for operator spreading are distinct in the two cases, these coarse grained measures for operator spreading (which include out-of-time-ordered commutators) do not distinguish between them. The diffusion constant for the front broadening can be quantitatively predicted by an expression we derive explicitly for a particular integrable model (the “Floquet-Fredrickson-Andersen” model), and for which we present a simple geometric interpretation using kinetic theory that applies to generic interacting integrable systems. Our results elucidate the microscopic mechanism for diffusive corrections to ballistic transport in interacting integrable models.

How an initially local perturbation spreads under time evolution is a central question in many-body quantum dynamics. Recently, a general coarse-grained phenomenology for such “operator spreading” was proposed for many-body systems with chaotic dynamics; this description was motivated by the ansatz that chaotic systems have essentially random time-evolution, constrained only by locality and a small (intensive) number of local conservation laws [1–10]. In one dimension, the coarse-grained description suggests that operators spread ballistically, with a “front” that broadens diffusively [6, 7]. In chaotic systems, conventional time-ordered response functions do not diagnose the operator front, since conventional observables relax locally; even in the case of conserved quantities, the two-point function spreads diffusively while the front spreads ballistically [8, 9, 11–13]. Instead, the dynamics of the operator front can be captured by the out-of-time-order commutator (OTOC) [14–16] which is a simple measure of the “footprint” of the spatially spreading operator:

$$C(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} \langle [O_0(t), W_x]^\dagger [O_0(t), W_x] \rangle, \quad (1)$$

where W_x, O_0 are local norm-one operators at position x and 0, and the expectation value is taken in a chosen equilibrium ensemble. As the operator $O_0(t)$ spreads in a chaotic system, $C(x, t)$ grows to become of order one inside a “light cone” that is bounded by the propagating front.

Integrable systems have very different dynamics from chaotic ones: they have ballistically propagating quasiparticles, as well as an extensive number of conservation laws [17–25]. Thus, one might expect the dynamics of

operator spreading in these systems to differ from that in chaotic systems; and, indeed, integrable systems that can be mapped to free fermions have fronts that broaden subdiffusively as $t^{1/3}$ [26–29]. A quasiparticle description also holds for *interacting* integrable systems, so it is tempting to conclude that such systems also have $t^{1/3}$ broadening of the operator front.

We argue here that *interacting* integrable systems, in fact, have operator fronts that broaden diffusively, i.e., as $t^{1/2}$ — just as in non-integrable systems. In interacting integrable systems, the ballistically propagating quasiparticles also exhibit subleading diffusive spreading [30–40]. This subleading behavior manifests itself in the shape of an operator near its front [38]. Although operator fronts broaden diffusively in both chaotic and interacting integrable systems, the mechanisms are different: in the latter case, we expect diffusive broadening of conventional response functions as well as OTOCs. Our results show that the behavior of the OTOC at and beyond the front does *not* distinguish between non-integrable and interacting integrable systems, despite the qualitatively different mechanisms governing operator spreading in the two cases. Further, while the saturation value of the OTOC behind the front in non-interacting models is operator-dependent and decays to zero in some cases signaling the lack of chaos [41], we discuss below that we expect local operators in interacting integrable models to generically have OTOCs that saturate to a nonzero value as the front fills in. It is presently unclear whether the dynamics and saturation value of a generic OTOC behind the front in interacting integrable systems is universal and distinct from the chaotic case, but the distinction between the two seems weak at best.

We quantitatively address the question of operator spreading in interacting integrable systems using a general hydrodynamic framework [42, 43]. To this end, we develop a simple geometric picture of quasiparticle diffusion using kinetic theory, thinking of quantum integrable systems as a soliton gas [44–46]. According to this picture, a quasiparticle experiences random time delays as it propagates, owing to collisions with other quasiparticles, and these random time delays cause diffusion. This picture is illustrated first for a specific integrable model, the Floquet-Fredrickson-Andersen (FFA) model [38, 47, 48]; the diffusive broadening of the OTOC in this model was already demonstrated [38]. The FFA model has several features that greatly simplify our analysis and allow for explicit closed-form expressions for the diffusion constant: it has strictly linearly dispersing quasiparticles, so all left-movers and all right-movers have the same velocity; also, single quasiparticles can be addressed, and the dynamics in the computational basis are classical, allowing for large-scale numerical simulations. Our analytic and numerical results for the FFA model are in excellent agreement with one another. We generalize our results to other integrable models. In the general case, our results can be regarded as a geometric perspective derived from general considerations of kinetic theory on the formula recently postulated by Ref. [37] using apparently different methods.

General Geometric Picture from Kinetic Theory.—The main result of our work is a simple and quantitative geometric picture for computing quasiparticle diffusion within the framework of generalized hydrodynamics (GHD) [35, 42–45, 49–53]. The simplest way to understand the origin of diffusion is as follows. In an interacting integrable system, the velocity of a quasiparticle depends on the densities of all the other quasiparticles near it. Generically, this relationship is linear: $\partial v_k / \partial \rho_q \neq 0$, where k and q denote quantum numbers (quasimomenta, species, etc.) of quasiparticles. Further, the densities of each type of quasiparticle exhibit $1/\sqrt{\ell}$ fluctuations in a region of length ℓ . Thus, v_k should vary by an amount $\sim 1/\sqrt{\ell}$ while passing through such a region, and therefore the time a quasiparticle takes to traverse the region will also fluctuate by $\sqrt{\ell}$. This immediately implies diffusive broadening of the quasiparticle front.

To develop a more quantitative understanding, we use the fact that a suitable coarse-grained description of an interacting integrable system exists in terms of a generalized hard-rod gas [44]. Although to leading order, quasiparticles move ballistically with a speed renormalized by the densities of the other quasiparticles, they also diffuse because of random shifts due to collisions with other quasiparticles. These shifts are random because of thermal fluctuations. Consider a quasiparticle (of type α and group velocity v) that starts at a position $x = 0$ and travels for a time t . In this time interval, it collides with quasiparticles with velocities v' that were initially at positions between 0 and $x'(v') = (v - v')t$ (Fig. 1). When quasiparticles collide, they scatter elastically; be-




FIG. 1. Geometric picture of quasiparticle diffusion: the worldline of the “tagged” quasiparticle (thick black line), with mean velocity v_0 , wanders owing to collisions with other quasiparticles (dashed lines). In a time t , the tagged quasiparticle collides with quasiparticles moving at velocity v_i so long as those quasiparticles started out in a spatial window of size $|v_i - v_0|t$; their density fluctuations inside this window govern front broadening.

cause of these scattering events, the velocity $v_\alpha(k)$ – with k the pseudo-momentum or rapidity – depends on the densities of all other quasiparticles. This is the basis of GHD [42, 43], which provides a coarse-grained description of the dynamics of integrable systems at the “Euler scale” (*i.e.* neglecting diffusive effects), in the language of quasiparticles. To compute the diffusion of a tagged quasiparticle with quantum numbers (α, k) , we need to take into account the thermal fluctuations of the densities of the other quasiparticles it collides with. Even though the tagged quasiparticle will essentially move ballistically with velocity $v_{\alpha,k}$, it will also wander owing to collisions with other quasiparticles. In a time t , the tagged quasiparticle collides with quasiparticles moving at velocity $v_{\beta,k'}$ if they started out in a spatial window of size $|v_{\alpha,k} - v_{\beta,k'}|t$ (Fig. 1). The density fluctuations of these quasiparticles govern the diffusive broadening of the ballistic trajectory of the tagged quasiparticle as

$$\delta x_{\alpha,k}^2(t) = [\delta v_{\alpha,k}]^2 t^2 = t^2 \sum_{\beta} \int dk' \left(\frac{\partial v_{\alpha,k}}{\partial n_{\beta,k'}} \right)^2 [\delta n_{\beta,k'}]^2, \quad (2)$$

where $n_{\beta,k'}$ denotes the occupation number (called “generalized Fermi factor”, to be defined more precisely below) of the quasiparticles of type β with pseudo-momentum k' . In that formula, we used the fact that the equilibrium fluctuations of the generalized Fermi factor are diagonal [54] $\langle \delta n_{\beta,k'} \delta n_{\gamma,k''} \rangle = \delta_{\beta,\gamma} \delta(k' - k'') C_{\beta}(k') / \ell$, where the fluctuations are computed over a region of size ℓ . (The ℓ -dependence is as one would expect from central-limit arguments.) Crucially, the fluctuations of $n_{\beta,k'}$ are computed over a region of size $\ell = |v_{\alpha,k} - v_{\beta,k'}|t$. Thus, the broadening of the tagged trajectory takes the form

$$\delta x_{\alpha,k}^2(t) = t \sum_{\beta} \int dk' \left(\frac{\partial v_{\alpha,k}}{\partial n_{\beta,k'}} \right)^2 \frac{C_{\beta}(k')}{|v_{\alpha,k} - v_{\beta,k'}|}. \quad (3)$$

We derive explicit expressions for $C_\beta(k')$ below. We note that the geometric picture in principle allows us to compute higher-order corrections to propagation beyond diffusion (if we include the diffusive broadening in our estimate of the region over which fluctuations are computed), but we will not pursue these corrections here.

Eq. (3) captures the diffusion of any type of quasiparticle. To characterize the width of the “front” of a spreading operator, we simply compute the broadening of the quasiparticle with the largest velocity.

FFA model.—We now explicitly check this result in the case of the Floquet-Fredrickson-Andersen model, an adaptation of Bobenko’s Rule 54 cellular automaton [47]. This model is a dispersionless hard-rod gas with two types of quasiparticles (left-movers and right-movers), and all particles of a given species have the same speed. The diffusive broadening of operator fronts in this model was numerically demonstrated in Ref. [38]. The dynamics of the model are given by the sequence of unitary gates

$$U = W(\text{odd} \rightarrow \text{even})W(\text{even} \rightarrow \text{odd}), \quad (4)$$

where $W(\text{even} \rightarrow \text{odd})$ consists of the following rule, applied to each odd spin n : apply the Pauli operator σ_n^x unless the neighboring even sites, $n-1$ and $n+1$, are both in the $|\downarrow\rangle$ state. This rule is implemented through the gates $\text{Toffoli}(n-1, n+1 \rightarrow n)\text{CNOT}(n-1 \rightarrow n)\text{CNOT}(n+1 \rightarrow n)$, i.e., controlled NOT and Toffoli gates are applied to the target site from its neighbors. $W(\text{odd} \rightarrow \text{even})$ then applies the same rule but with even and odd sites interchanged. The unit cell consists of two sites; in what follows we measure space in terms of unit cells. (The dynamics is symmetric under simultaneous spatial translation by a single lattice site and time translation by a half-step, but not under either operation separately.)

The dynamics of the FFA model can be described in terms of left- and right-moving quasiparticles. Each quasiparticle of either type has the same velocity, i.e., the dispersion relation is purely linear. This strict dispersionlessness is a distinctive feature of Floquet models, and cannot exist in a local lattice Hamiltonian. When two quasiparticles collide, each is delayed by one time-step; thus the model resembles hard rods with length -1 . Microscopically, a “free” right-moving quasiparticle consists of two up spins, occupying an odd site and the even site to its right; a left-mover is similar, but occupies an odd site and the even site to its left. A configuration of the form $\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow$ contains a left- and a right-mover on top of each other; such composites form when two quasiparticles are in the process of colliding.

The FFA model differs from most integrable models in having only two velocities. In generic integrable systems, the density of quasiparticles with each rapidity is separately conserved, so the conservation laws of the model can all be understood in terms of the rapidity distribution of quasiparticles. In the FFA model, there are only two velocities, so specifying the densities of left- and right-movers is evidently not enough to fix the conservation

laws. The remaining conservation laws are the asymptotic *spacings* between adjacent left- and right-movers. The quantity we are concerned with here (the broadening of the front) couples to the velocities rather than the spacings, so in the rest of this paper we shall treat the spacings as randomly distributed.

Generalized hydrodynamics of the FFA model.— The total number of right and left movers N_R, N_L are separately conserved by the Floquet evolution of the FFA model. The density of right(left)-movers $\rho_{R/L}(i)$ range from 0 to 1 and satisfy the continuity equations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t(\rho_R + \rho_L) + \partial_x(\rho_R - \rho_L) &= 0, \\ \partial_t(\rho_R - \rho_L) + \partial_x j_- &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

These equations hold exactly microscopically, and a microscopic expression of j_- is given in [55]. Note that the current of the total density $\rho_+ = \rho_R + \rho_L$ is ρ_- which is itself a conserved quantity, implying pure ballistic transport for ρ_+ . (The Kubo formula for $j_+ \equiv \rho_R - \rho_L$ gives a pure $\delta(\omega)$ contribution.) In the hydrodynamic (Euler) limit, we replace j_- by its equilibrium expectation value $j_- = \rho_R v_R - \rho_L v_L$ where the velocities v_R and v_L depend on the densities as

$$v_{R/L} = \pm 1 \mp \frac{2\rho_{L/R}}{1 + \rho_R + \rho_L}. \quad (6)$$

These formulas coincide with the prediction for a hard rod gas with effective length $a = -1$, and can also be derived in an elementary way [55] as the left movers slow down the right movers and vice versa. The equations (5) and (6) capture the ballistic transport in this model.

Diffusion in the FFA model.— In order to include diffusive corrections to this ballistic transport, we need to incorporate the equilibrium fluctuations of the densities of quasiparticles, which lead to fluctuations in the velocities through the relation (6). The density fluctuations are not diagonal in the left/right mover basis, i.e., $\langle \delta\rho_L \delta\rho_R \rangle \neq 0$ with $\delta\rho_{R/L} = \rho_{R/L} - \langle \rho_{R/L} \rangle$. However, we can define the generalized “Fermi factor” $n_{R/L} = 3\rho_{R/L}/(1 + \rho_R + \rho_L)$; one can check that $\langle \delta n_L \delta n_R \rangle = 0$. The GHD equations describe the advection of these Fermi factors [55]. From eq. (6), the velocity of a right-mover is given by $v_R = 1 - 2n_L/3$; we have confirmed this expression numerically. (For simplicity we express our results for right-movers, but exactly analogous expressions can be written for left-movers.) To compute the velocity fluctuations, we need to compute the fluctuations $\langle \delta n_L \delta n_L \rangle$. We do this to leading order, by expanding δn_L in terms of $\delta\rho_R$ and $\delta\rho_L$, and computing the fluctuations of the densities. This can be done by writing a partition function $Z(\mu_L, \mu_R) = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \exp(-\mu_L N_L - \mu_R N_R)$. Z can be computed explicitly as a 4×4 transfer matrix, and the density fluctuations can be evaluated by taking derivatives [55]. We specialize to the case $\rho_L = \rho_R = \rho$; in this case, the density fluctuations fit the analytic form $\langle (\delta n_L)^2 \rangle = \frac{9\rho(1-\rho)}{(1+2\rho)^4\ell}$ for a system of size ℓ . According to our geometric argument sketched above, we compute the




FIG. 2. Upper panel: biased random walk of a single right-moving quasiparticle in the FFA model for a specific initial product state (left) and diffusive broadening when averaged over 1000 product states (right). Lower panel: variance of front position vs. filling; numerical results (averaged over 1000 random product states) are in good agreement with the analytic formula (7). We emphasize that there are *no* free parameters. Inset: OTOCs in the FFA model generically fill in behind the front [38].

fluctuations over a distance $\ell = t|v_R - v_L| = 2tv_R$. Plugging these results into Eq. (2), we arrive at the following analytic expression for the variance of the quasiparticle position

$$\delta x^2(t) = t \frac{2\rho(1-\rho)}{(1+2\rho)^3}, \quad (7)$$

for a tagged quasiparticle propagating through an equilibrium state with density (filling) $\rho = \rho_R = \rho_L$. This prediction is in excellent agreement with numerical simulation of the dynamics (Fig. 2). The simplicity of our model allows us to directly measure the dynamics of a tagged quasiparticle, as follows. We evaluate the OTOC $\langle [P_\downarrow(i-1, B)\sigma^+(i, A)\sigma^+(i, B)\sigma^-(i+1, A)\sigma^-(i+1, B)P_\downarrow(i+2, A), \sigma_j^z(t)]^2 \rangle$ where $P_{\uparrow/\downarrow}$ are projectors onto up/down spins, and A and B label the two spins in the i th unit cell. This corresponds to translating a single right-mover without creating or destroying any quasiparticles. In hard-rod models generally, translating a quasiparticle does not cause a butterfly effect; instead, the OTOC simply gives the time trace of the tagged quasiparticle (Fig. 2). We emphasize that the existence of operators that can tag and translate single quasiparticles is a very special feature of the FFA model; OTOCs of other generic local operators in the FFA model fill in behind the front and look similar to the chaotic case [38] (Fig. 2).

In more general interacting integrable models, a special local operator that exclusively translates a single quasiparticle is extremely unlikely to exist. Acting with a local operator in such models creates quasiparticles of all pseudo-momenta [56, 57] traveling with a range of possible velocities (in contrast to the FFA model which only has a single velocity). As a result, the OTOCs of local operators should generically fill in behind the front. Numerical results for the more generic XXZ chain are shown in [55]. While our numerics do not conclusively settle whether the dynamics and saturation value behind the front in the XXZ model is universal and distinct from the chaotic case, the distinction, if present, is empirically quite weak for the operators we have considered.

Generic integrable systems.— Our picture can be straightforwardly generalized to other integrable systems with a quasiparticle description, like the XXZ spin chain. Integrable systems can be described in terms of stable quasiparticles, even at infinite temperature. These quasiparticles provide a convenient basis to understand thermodynamics and hydrodynamics in these models. Equilibrium states associated with a generalized Gibbs ensemble (GGE) [58, 59] correspond to a distribution of occupied quasiparticle states $\rho_{\alpha,k}$ with α the particle type and k a pseudo-momentum [56, 57]. This distribution is related to the total density of states $\rho_{\alpha,k}^{\text{tot}}$ through the so-called Bethe equation $\rho_{\alpha,k}^{\text{tot}} + \sum_{\beta} \int dk' \mathcal{K}_{\alpha\beta}(k, k') \rho_{\beta,k'} = \frac{1}{2\pi}$, where the kernel $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha\beta}(k, k')$ encodes the two-body phase shifts of the model [60]. Ballistic transport in these models can be captured in terms of GHD, where the quasiparticle densities are assumed to be defined locally $\rho_{\alpha,k}(x, t)$, and satisfy the continuity equation

$$\partial_t \rho_{\alpha,k} + \partial_x j_{\alpha,k} = 0, \quad (8)$$

with $j_{\alpha,k} = v_{\alpha,k}[\rho] \rho_{\alpha,k}$, provided derivative corrections are ignored [42, 43]. Crucially, the effective quasiparticle velocity $v_{\alpha,k}[\rho]$ depends on the densities of all the other quasiparticles through some effective “dressing” operation by the interaction kernel $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha\beta}(k, k')$.

Diffusive broadening can be captured by reintroducing fluctuations in the GHD picture. In a homogeneous equilibrium (GGE) state, the fluctuations of the generalized Fermi factor $n_{\alpha,k} = \rho_{\alpha,k}/\rho_{\alpha,k}^{\text{tot}}$ in an interval of length ℓ are diagonal in k , and are given by [54]

$$\langle \delta n_{\alpha,k} \delta n_{\beta,k'} \rangle = \delta_{\alpha,\beta} \delta(k - k') \frac{n_{\beta,k'}(1 - n_{\beta,k'})}{\rho_{\beta,k'}^{\text{tot}} \ell}. \quad (9)$$

(Note that n_k is a dimensionless quantity.) In the basis of generalized Fermi factors, the fluctuations are essentially free-fermion-like. Contrary to non-interacting models though, the quasiparticle velocities of interacting integrable models depend nontrivially on the densities, or equivalently on the Fermi factors, of all the other quasiparticles, leading to broadening of the ballistic trajectories given by (2). From the explicit form of the quasiparticle velocity in terms of the generalized Fermi factors,

we find that the functional derivative $\frac{\delta v_{\alpha,k}}{\delta n_{\beta,k'}}$ can also be computed explicitly, and is given by [55]

$$\frac{\delta v_{\alpha,k}}{\delta n_{\beta,k'}} = (v_{\alpha,k} - v_{\beta,k'}) \frac{\rho_{\beta,k'}^{\text{tot}}}{\rho_{\alpha,k}^{\text{tot}}} \mathcal{K}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{dr}}(k, k'), \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{dr}}(k, k')$ is a “dressed” version of the scattering kernel, which satisfies the integral equation $\mathcal{K}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{dr}}(k, k') = \mathcal{K}_{\alpha\beta}(k, k') - \sum_{\gamma} \int dk'' \mathcal{K}_{\alpha\gamma}(k, k'') \mathcal{K}_{\gamma\beta}^{\text{dr}}(k'', k') n_{\gamma,k''}$. Plugging this expression (10) into (2), with the explicit form of the Fermi factor fluctuations (9) computed over a distance $\ell = |v_{\alpha,k} - v_{\beta,k'}|t$, we find

$$\delta x_{\alpha,k}^2(t) = t \frac{1}{(\rho_{\alpha,k}^{\text{tot}})^2} \sum_{\beta} \int dk' |v_{\alpha,k} - v_{\beta,k'}| \times (\mathcal{K}_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{dr}}(k, k'))^2 \rho_{\beta,k'} (1 - n_{\beta,k'}). \quad (11)$$

This formula gives an explicit expression for the diffusive broadening of a quasi-particle α with pseudo-momentum k propagating through an homogenous equilibrium state due to thermal fluctuations. It can be evaluated explicitly for any integrable model, and for the fastest quasi-particle, coincides with the diffusive broadening of the operator spreading front.

Transport.—We emphasize that we expect this broadening to occur both for OTOCs, but also in regular (time-ordered) correlators. The subleading diffusive spreading of quasiparticles also has consequences for transport properties, and in fact agrees with recently conjectured “Navier-Stokes” corrections that were obtained from a form-factor (matrix-element) expansion of the Kubo formula [37]. To see this, consider an homogeneous equilibrium (GGE) state characterized by a generalized Fermi factor distribution $n_{\alpha,k}^{\text{eq}}$. A small perturbation $\hat{n}_{\alpha,k}(x, t)$ over this GGE state should propagate with mean velocity $v_{\alpha,k}[n^{\text{eq}}]$, but with diffusive broadening $\delta x_{\alpha,k}^2(t) = 2D_k t$ given by eq. (11). The corresponding linear-response hydrodynamic equation thus reads

$$\partial_t \hat{n}_{\alpha,k} + v_{\alpha,k}[n^{\text{eq}}] \partial_x \hat{n}_{\alpha,k} = D_k [n^{\text{eq}}] \partial_x^2 \hat{n}_{\alpha,k} + \dots \quad (12)$$

where the dots include higher-derivative corrections, but also $\partial_x^2 \hat{n}_{\beta,k'}$ terms with $(\beta, k') \neq (\alpha, k)$. Our expression for D_k in this equation coincides precisely with the very recent prediction of Ref. [37], and thus provides an intuitive and general microscopic derivation of this result.

We emphasize, however, that there are still distinctions between operator spreading and transport. First, operator spreading is dominated by the *fastest* quasiparticle, whereas transport generally involves all quasiparticles. Second, although both transport and operator fronts inherit the diffusive broadening of single quasiparticles, the behavior of OTOCs inside the front is different from that of two-point correlators; the former generically

fill in, while the latter decay deep inside the front. Third, different conserved quantities couple differently to quasiparticles, leading to distinct transport properties: for example, energy transport in the XXZ spin chain is always ballistic whereas spin transport is sub-ballistic for $J_z \geq J_x = J_y$ [18, 52]. Thus, time-ordered correlators may not detect the ballistic operator front in all cases. Numerical results for two-point correlators, OTOCs, and diffusive front broadening for the XXZ model are shown in [55].

Discussion.—This paper presented a geometric derivation of the diffusion of quasiparticles using kinetic theory, and the resulting diffusive broadening of operator fronts, in interacting integrable systems. Although diffusive front broadening takes place in both chaotic and interacting integrable models, the mechanisms are quite different. Nevertheless, coarse grained measures of the front dynamics like the growth of OTOCs are not able to discriminate between these mechanisms.

In interacting integrable models, the diffusion constant for OTOCs coincides exactly with the diffusion constant for corrections to ballistic quasiparticle transport; thus our Eq. (11) coincides with the diffusion constant computed in Ref. [37], although our derivation seems simpler and conceptually distinct. Whether our hydrodynamic approach can be generalized to construct a fluctuating hydrodynamics of integrable systems, or potentially extended to situations like the isotropic Heisenberg chain for which the diffusion is anomalous [61, 62], are left as questions for future work.

In addition to the diffusive effect discussed here, interacting integrable systems have a subleading $t^{1/3}$ front-broadening that they share with free-fermion models [26]. One might wonder if there are any natural circumstances in which the diffusive broadening we predict might be absent, causing the $t^{1/3}$ effect to dominate. Eq. (11) suggests that this essentially never happens in an interacting system, as all terms are positive and therefore the integrand would have to vanish identically.

Acknowledgments.—The authors thank Adam Nahum, Vadim Oganesyan, Tomaz Prosen and Brian Swingle for helpful discussions. This work was supported by NSF Grant No. DMR-1653271 (S.G.), DOE grant No. DE-SC0016244 (D.A.H.), DOE Office of Basic Energy Sciences Division of Materials Sciences and Engineering under Award DE-SC0019168 (R.V.), and NSF PHY-1748958 (S.G., R.V.). V.K. is supported by the Harvard Society of Fellows and the William F. Milton Fund. S.G., V.K. and R.V. are grateful to the KITP Program “The Dynamics of Quantum Information”, where part of this work was completed. S.G. performed this work in part at the Aspen Center for Physics, which is supported by NSF Grant No. PHY-1607611.

- Physics **2016**, 77 (2016).
- [3] M. Mezei and D. Stanford, Journal of High Energy Physics **2017**, 65 (2017).
 - [4] W. Brown and O. Fawzi, ArXiv e-prints (2012), [arXiv:1210.6644 \[quant-ph\]](#).
 - [5] A. Nahum, J. Ruhman, S. Vijay, and J. Haah, *Physical Review X* **7**, 031016 (2017), [arXiv:1608.06950 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).
 - [6] A. Nahum, S. Vijay, and J. Haah, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021014 (2018).
 - [7] C. W. von Keyserlingk, T. Rakovszky, F. Pollmann, and S. L. Sondhi, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021013 (2018).
 - [8] V. Khemani, A. Vishwanath, and D. A. Huse, arXiv preprint [arXiv:1710.09835](#), *Phys. Rev. X* [in press] (2018).
 - [9] T. Rakovszky, F. Pollmann, and C. von Keyserlingk, arXiv preprint [arXiv:1710.09827](#) (2017).
 - [10] A. Chan, A. De Luca, and J. Chalker, arXiv preprint [arXiv:1712.06836](#) (2017).
 - [11] H. Kim and D. A. Huse, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 127205 (2013).
 - [12] A. Bohrdt, C. B. Mendl, M. Endres, and M. Knap, *New Journal of Physics* **19**, 063001 (2017), [arXiv:1612.02434 \[cond-mat.quant-gas\]](#).
 - [13] D. J. Luitz and Y. Bar Lev, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 020406 (2017), [arXiv:1702.03929 \[cond-mat.dis-nn\]](#).
 - [14] A. Larkin and Y. N. Ovchinnikov, *Sov Phys JETP* **28**, 1200 (1969).
 - [15] S. H. Shenker and D. Stanford, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **3**, 67 (2014), [arXiv:1306.0622 \[hep-th\]](#).
 - [16] J. Maldacena, S. H. Shenker, and D. Stanford, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2016**, 106 (2016).
 - [17] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, *Physical Review Letters* **96**, 136801 (2006).
 - [18] T. c. v. Prosen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 217206 (2011).
 - [19] J.-S. Caux and F. H. L. Essler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 257203 (2013).
 - [20] B. Wouters, J. De Nardis, M. Brockmann, D. Fioretto, M. Rigol, and J.-S. Caux, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 117202 (2014).
 - [21] E. Ilievski, J. De Nardis, B. Wouters, J.-S. Caux, F. H. L. Essler, and T. Prosen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 157201 (2015).
 - [22] E. Ilievski, M. Medenjak, T. Prosen, and L. Zadnik, ArXiv e-prints (2016), [arXiv:1603.00440 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).
 - [23] R. Vasseur and J. E. Moore, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2016**, 064010 (2016).
 - [24] M. Fagotti, M. Collura, F. H. L. Essler, and P. Calabrese, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 125101 (2014).
 - [25] V. Alba and P. Calabrese, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**, 7947 (2017).
 - [26] T. Platini and D. Karevski, *The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems* **48**, 225 (2005).
 - [27] V. Khemani, D. A. Huse, and A. Nahum, ArXiv e-prints (2018), [arXiv:1803.05902 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).
 - [28] S. Xu and B. Swingle, arXiv preprint [arXiv:1802.00801](#) (2018).
 - [29] M. Fagotti, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 220302 (2017).
 - [30] J. L. Lebowitz and J. K. Percus, *Phys. Rev.* **155**, 122 (1967).
 - [31] G. El, *Physics Letters A* **311**, 374 (2003).
 - [32] G. A. El and A. M. Kamchatnov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 204101 (2005).
 - [33] M. Medenjak, K. Klobas, and T. c. v. Prosen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 110603 (2017).
 - [34] M. Kormos, C. P. Moca, and G. Zaránd, arXiv preprint [arXiv:1712.09466](#) (2017).
 - [35] B. Doyon and H. Spohn, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2017**, 073210 (2017).
 - [36] H. Spohn, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **59**, 091402 (2018).
 - [37] J. De Nardis, D. Bernard, and B. Doyon, arXiv preprint [arXiv:1807.02414](#) (2018).
 - [38] S. Gopalakrishnan, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 060302 (2018).
 - [39] K. Klobas, M. Medenjak, T. Prosen, and M. Vanicat, arXiv preprint [arXiv:1807.05000](#) (2018).
 - [40] K. Klobas, M. Medenjak, and T. Prosen, [arXiv:1808.07385](#).
 - [41] C.-J. Lin and O. I. Motrunich, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 144304 (2018).
 - [42] O. A. Castro-Alvaredo, B. Doyon, and T. Yoshimura, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 041065 (2016).
 - [43] B. Bertini, M. Collura, J. De Nardis, and M. Fagotti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 207201 (2016).
 - [44] B. Doyon, T. Yoshimura, and J.-S. Caux, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 045301 (2018).
 - [45] V. B. Bulchandani, R. Vasseur, C. Karrasch, and J. E. Moore, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 045407 (2018).
 - [46] S. Sachdev and A. P. Young, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2220 (1997).
 - [47] A. Bobenko, M. Bordemann, C. Gunn, and U. Pinkall, *Communications in mathematical physics* **158**, 127 (1993).
 - [48] T. Prosen and C. Mejía-Monasterio, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **49**, 185003 (2016).
 - [49] B. Doyon and T. Yoshimura, *SciPost Phys.* **2**, 014 (2017).
 - [50] B. Doyon and H. Spohn, *SciPost Phys.* **3**, 039 (2017).
 - [51] V. B. Bulchandani, R. Vasseur, C. Karrasch, and J. E. Moore, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 220604 (2017).
 - [52] E. Ilievski and J. De Nardis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 020602 (2017).
 - [53] B. Doyon, J. Dubail, R. Konik, and T. Yoshimura, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 195301 (2017).
 - [54] P. Fendley and H. Saleur, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 10845 (1996).
 - [55] See Supplemental Material for microscopic continuity equations for the FFA model, details about the thermodynamics and hydrodynamics of the FFA model, and a derivation of quasiparticle diffusion for general integrable models.
 - [56] E. Ilievski, E. Quinn, J. D. Nardis, and M. Brockmann, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2016**, 063101 (2016).
 - [57] E. Ilievski, E. Quinn, and J.-S. Caux, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 115128 (2017).
 - [58] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, *Nature* **452**, 854 (2008).
 - [59] L. Vidmar and M. Rigol, ArXiv e-prints (2016), [arXiv:1604.03990 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).
 - [60] M. Takahashi, *Thermodynamics of One-Dimensional Solvable Models* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).
 - [61] M. Ljubotina, M. Žnidarič, and T. Prosen, *Nature Communications* **8**, 16117 EP (2017).
 - [62] E. Ilievski, J. De Nardis, M. Medenjak, and T. Prosen, ArXiv e-prints (2018), [arXiv:1806.03288 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](#).

Supplemental Material for “Hydrodynamics of operator spreading and quasiparticle diffusion in interacting integrable systems”

Sarang Gopalakrishnan,¹ David A. Huse,² Vedika Khemani,³ and Romain Vasseur⁴

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, CUNY College of Staten Island, Staten Island, NY 10314; Physics Program and Initiative for the Theoretical Sciences, The Graduate Center, CUNY, New York, NY 10016, USA*

²*Physics Department, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA*

³*Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*

⁴*Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003, USA*

(Dated: September 6, 2018)

I. CONTINUITY EQUATIONS IN THE FFA MODEL

The densities of right and left moving quasiparticles in the FFA models can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_R(i) &= P_\uparrow(i, A)P_\uparrow(i, B) + P_\downarrow(i-1, B)P_\uparrow(i, A)P_\downarrow(i, B) + P_\downarrow(i, A)P_\uparrow(i, B)P_\downarrow(i+1, A), \\ \rho_L(i) &= P_\uparrow(i-1, B)P_\uparrow(i, A) + P_\downarrow(i-1, B)P_\uparrow(i, A)P_\downarrow(i, B) + P_\downarrow(i, A)P_\uparrow(i, B)P_\downarrow(i+1, A),\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where $N_R = \sum_i \rho_R(i)$ and $N_L = \sum_i \rho_L(i)$ are conserved by the time evolution. It is convenient to define

$$\rho_\pm(i) = \rho_R(i) \pm \rho_L(i). \quad (2)$$

Given the simple dynamics of the FFA model, one can readily compute the time evolution of these operators over a single Floquet cycle. For example, $U^\dagger(P_\uparrow(i, A)P_\uparrow(i, B))U = P_\downarrow(i-1, B)P_\uparrow(i, A)P_\downarrow(i, B) + P_\uparrow(i-1, B)P_\downarrow(i, A)P_\downarrow(i, B)$, and $U^\dagger(P_\downarrow(i-1, B)P_\uparrow(i, A)P_\downarrow(i, B))U = P_\uparrow(i-1, B)P_\downarrow(i, A)P_\uparrow(i, B)$. Using these relations and rewriting $\rho_{R/L}(i, t+1) - \rho_{R/L}(i, t)$ as telescopic sums, we find, after a lengthy but straightforward calculation

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_+(i, t+1) - \rho_+(i, t) + j_+(i+1, t) - j_+(i, t) &= 0, \\ \rho_-(i, t+1) - \rho_-(i, t) + j_-(i+1, t) - j_-(i, t) &= 0.\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

The lattice currents are given by

$$\begin{aligned}j_+(i) &= \rho_-(i-1), \\ j_-(i) &= P_\downarrow(i-1, B)P_\uparrow(i, A)P_\downarrow(i, B) + P_\uparrow(i-1, B)P_\downarrow(i, A) + P_\downarrow(i-1, B)P_\downarrow(i, A)P_\uparrow(i, B).\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

The first equation indicates that the total current $J_+ = \sum_i j_+(i)$ is a conserved quantity, implying ballistic transport for ρ_+ .

II. THERMODYNAMICS AND HYDRODYNAMICS OF THE FFA MODEL

Equilibrium states in the FFA model can be characterized by the classical partition function

$$Z = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} e^{-\mu_R N_R - \mu_L N_L}, \quad (5)$$

which can be computed using the 4×4 transfer matrix

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & e^{-\mu_R - \mu_L} & e^{-\mu_R/2} \\ e^{-\mu_R - \mu_L} & e^{-\mu_R - \mu_L} & e^{-\mu_L} & e^{-\mu_R/2 - \mu_L} \\ 1 & 1 & e^{-\mu_R - \mu_L} & e^{-\mu_R/2} \\ e^{-\mu_R/2} & e^{-\mu_R/2} & e^{-\mu_R/2 - \mu_L} & e^{-\mu_R - \mu_L} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

written in the basis $\{\downarrow\downarrow, \uparrow\downarrow, \downarrow\uparrow, \uparrow\uparrow\}$. Density averages and fluctuations in the thermodynamic limit can be obtained from various derivatives of the largest eigenvalue of T . We find that the density fluctuations are non-diagonal,




FIG. 1: Nature of fluctuations and transport in the FFA model near full filling. The dynamics of the model is oscillatory with period 3 (left); thus, quasiparticles move with a velocity that also oscillates with period 3 (right). After coarse-graining in time, though, the quasiparticles can be seen to move exactly ballistically with no front-broadening.

$\langle \delta \rho_R \delta \rho_L \rangle \neq 0$ in the right and left moving basis. However, if we define the generalized “Fermi factor” $n_{R/L} = 3\rho_{R/L}/(1 + \rho_R + \rho_L)$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\delta n_L)^2 \rangle &= \langle (\delta n_R)^2 \rangle = \frac{9\rho(1-\rho)}{(1+2\rho)^4 N}, \\ \langle \delta n_R \delta n_L \rangle &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

for a system of size N in an equilibrium state with filling $\rho = \rho_R = \rho_L$.

Using this transfer matrix, we can also compute the equilibrium averages of the currents $j_{\pm} = \rho_R v_R \pm \rho_L v_L$. We find

$$v_{R/L} = \pm 1 \mp \frac{2\rho_{L/R}}{1 + \rho_R + \rho_L}. \quad (8)$$

This formula coincides with the velocities of a hard rod gas with only two “bare” velocities $v_R^0 = 1$ and $v_L^0 = -1$, and effective length $a = -1^{1,2}$. One can also understand this formula in an elementary way as follows: if a right mover starts at $(0, 0)$ and goes to (x, t) , it encounters all the left movers that started at points closer than $x - v_L t$. The time t is determined by accounting for the fact that the “bare” velocity is 1, and that each collision with a left mover adds an extra time step. This means that $t = x + \rho_L(x - v_L t)$, which yields $v_R = x/t = (1 + \rho_L v_L)/(1 + \rho_L)$. Repeating the argument for left movers, we find $v_L = (-1 + \rho_R v_R)/(1 + \rho_R)$. Solving these two equations yields (8).

Since the microscopic averages of the currents coincide with this hydrodynamic expectation, one might be tempted to use the variance of the microscopic current instead of the expression we obtained from the density fluctuations and the coarse-grained velocity formulas (8). These two expressions do *not* agree; the discrepancy between them can be seen, and its mechanism most clearly understood, near the fully filled limit. At full filling, the dynamics consists of persistent period-3 oscillations (Fig. 1); the current oscillates in a 100100100... sequence. These current fluctuations, though strong, are not *random*, and they cause deterministic rather than random changes of the front velocity. After time averaging, these fluctuations cancel out exactly except for boundary terms. Thus they are not responsible for diffusive broadening. Instead, the fluctuations that cause diffusive broadening are the slow, random fluctuations that survive under coarse-graining.

The Euler hydrodynamics in the quasiparticle language (corresponding to the kinetic theory of these quasiparticles), leads to the following continuity equations

$$\partial_t \rho_{R/L} + \partial_x (v_{R/L} [\rho_R, \rho_L] \rho_{R/L}) = 0. \quad (9)$$

Using the definition of the “Fermi factors” above, we find the advection equations

$$\partial_t n_{R/L} + v_{R/L} [n_R, n_L] \partial_x n_{R/L} = 0. \quad (10)$$

This is a general property of Fermi factors in generic integrable systems^{3,4}.

III. QUASIPARTICLE DIFFUSION IN GENERIC INTEGRABLE MODELS

In this section, we derive explicitly the form of the quasiparticle diffusion using the kinetic theory argument given in the main text. The hydrodynamic equations for quantum integrable systems can be thought of either as Euler

equations for all the (local and quasi-local) conserved quantities, or equivalently, as kinetic equation for the quasi-particles. Let us define densities of *particles*, *holes* and *states* via

$$\begin{aligned}\ell\rho_k dk &= \{\# \text{ occupied pseudo-momenta in } [k, k + dk)\} \\ \ell\rho_k^h dk &= \{\# \text{ unoccupied pseudo-momenta in } [k, k + dk)\} \\ \ell\rho_k^{\text{tot}} dk &= \{\# \text{ allowed pseudo-momenta in } [k, k + dk)\}.\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

respectively, for a system of size ℓ . For simplicity, we are using a shorthand notation for k which labels both the types of quasiparticles and their pseudo-momenta. Let $\rho_k^{\text{tot}} = \rho_k + \rho_k^h$ be the total density of states, and it is also useful to define the generalized Fermi factor, given by $n_k = \frac{\rho_k}{\rho_k^{\text{tot}}}$, which is by definition a number between 0 and 1. These quantities are related by the *Bethe equations*

$$\rho_k^{\text{tot}} + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}(k, k') \rho_{k'} dk' = \frac{1}{2\pi},\tag{12}$$

for some scattering kernel $\mathcal{K}(k, k')$ whose precise form depends on the integral model under consideration. A given generalized Gibbs ensemble (GGE) state – including thermal states in particular – can be shown to correspond to a given distribution of quasi-particles ρ_k . Note that we can also choose to work with the Fermi factor n_k , since the Bethe equation together with $\rho_k^t = \rho_k + \rho_k^h$ fully fix the other distributions once n_k is known.

Assuming local equilibrium, we can imagine that these quantities all depend on x and t , and that the Bethe equation (12) is satisfied locally. The semi-classical kinetic equation for n_k is then quite simple^{3,4}

$$\partial_t n_k + v_k[n] \partial_x n_k = 0,\tag{13}$$

where $v_k[n]$ is the group velocity of the quasi-particles which can also be computed from Bethe ansatz. The effective group velocity⁵ is then given by $v_k[n] = \frac{\epsilon'_k[n]}{p'_k[n]}$, where ϵ'_k and p'_k are the dressed derivatives of the quasiparticle energy and momentum, given by

$$\epsilon'_k + \int dk' \mathcal{K}(k - k') n_{k'} \epsilon'_{k'} = \partial_k \epsilon_k^0,\tag{14}$$

$$p'_k + \int dk' \mathcal{K}(k - k') n_{k'} p'_{k'} = \partial_k p_k^0.\tag{15}$$

with ϵ_k^0 and p_k^0 the bare energy and momentum. Note that these equations are time-reversal invariant and ignore the density fluctuations responsible for diffusion that we now describe.

For a system of size ℓ , the fluctuations of the quasiparticle densities in a thermal state at temperature T (corresponding to an equilibrium Fermi factor n_k given by the thermodynamic Bethe ansatz⁶) read⁷

$$\langle \delta n_k \delta n_{k'} \rangle = \frac{1}{\rho_k^{\text{tot}} \ell} n_k (1 - n_k) \delta(k - k').\tag{16}$$

As explained in the main text, these fluctuations should be computed over a distance $\ell = |v_k - v_{k'}|t$. This leads to a broadening of the quasiparticle trajectories

$$\delta x_k^2(t) = t \int dk' \left(\frac{\delta v_k}{\delta n_{k'}} \right)^2 \frac{n_{k'} (1 - n_{k'})}{\rho_{k'}^{\text{tot}} |v_k - v_{k'}|}\tag{17}$$

The last step of the calculation is to compute the functional derivative $\frac{\delta v_k}{\delta n_{k'}}$ using eqs. (14) and (15). We see that we have $\frac{\delta \epsilon'_k}{\delta n_{k'}} = v_{k'} \frac{\delta p'_k}{\delta n_{k'}}$, so that

$$\frac{\delta v_k}{\delta n_{k'}} = \frac{v_{k'} - v_k}{p'_k} \frac{\delta p'_k}{\delta n_{k'}} = \frac{v_{k'} - v_k}{\rho_k^{\text{tot}}} \frac{\delta \rho_k^{\text{tot}}}{\delta n_{k'}},\tag{18}$$

since $p'_k = 2\pi\rho_k^{\text{tot}12}$ (see also Refs. 8,9 for related formulas). Let $-\frac{1}{p'_{k'}} \frac{\delta p'_k}{\delta n_{k'}} \equiv \mathcal{K}^{\text{dr}}(k, k')$. Using (15), this “dressed kernel” satisfies the integral equation

$$\mathcal{K}^{\text{dr}}(k, k') = \mathcal{K}(k, k') - \int dk'' \mathcal{K}(k, k'') \mathcal{K}^{\text{dr}}(k'', k') n_{k''}.\tag{19}$$




FIG. 2: (left) Right weight $\rho_R(x, t)$ for the spreading operator $\sigma_0^x(t)$ in an XXZ chain with $\Delta = 0.5$ showing ballistic front propagation with front broadening. Width of the spreading front $w(t)$ shows a scaling consistent with $w(t) \sim t^{1/2}$.

In terms of the dressed kernel, we have $\left(\frac{\delta v_k}{\delta n_{k'}}\right)^2 = (v_k - v_{k'})^2 [\mathcal{K}^{\text{dr}}(k, k')]^2 \left(\frac{\rho_{k'}^{\text{tot}}}{\rho_k^{\text{tot}}}\right)^2$. Plugging this expression in (17), we find

$$\delta x_k^2(t) = t \frac{1}{(\rho_k^{\text{tot}})^2} \int dk' |v_k - v_{k'}| [\mathcal{K}^{\text{dr}}(k, k')]^2 \rho_{k'} (1 - n_{k'}), \quad (20)$$

as claimed in the main text. This formula can be evaluated in any equilibrium (GGE) state.

IV. NUMERICS ON THE XXZ SPIN CHAIN

We now present some numerics on the XXZ chain using exact diagonalization. Despite the small sizes and times accessible to this study, we see many signatures of the qualitative features discussed in the main text, including the diffusive front broadening of operators.

The Hamiltonian is

$$H = \sum_i \sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x + \sigma_i^y \sigma_{i+1}^y + \Delta \sigma_i^z \sigma_{i+1}^z \quad (21)$$

where $\sigma_i^{x/y/z}$ are Pauli spin 1/2 operators on site i and we pick $\Delta = 0.5$ for specificity. For a spin-1/2 chain of length L , a complete orthonormal basis for all operators is given by the 4^L “Pauli strings” \mathcal{S} , which are products of Pauli matrices on distinct sites. We can then express our spreading operator in this basis of Pauli strings:

$$O_0(t) = \sum_{\mathcal{S}} a_{\mathcal{S}}(t) \mathcal{S}. \quad (22)$$

We measure the right front of the spreading operator $O(t)$ using the “right-weight” $\rho_R(x, t)$, defined as the total weight in $O(t)$ of basis strings that end at site x — which means that they act as the identity on all sites to the right of site x , but act as a non-identity on site x :

$$\rho_R(x, t) = \sum_{\substack{\text{strings } \mathcal{S} \text{ with} \\ \text{rightmost non-} \\ \text{identity on site } x}} |a_{\mathcal{S}}|^2, \quad \sum_i \rho_R(x, t) = 1. \quad (23)$$

The conservation law on $\rho_R(x, t)$ follows from unitarity and supports the identification of this quantity as an “emergent” density undergoing biased diffusion^{10,11}. The left front can be defined analogously. Fig 2 (right) shows $\rho_R(x, t)$ for an initial operator $O_0 = \sigma_0^x$ at different times in a system of length $L = 12$. We clearly see front propagating ballistically to the right as the weight of $O(t)$ spreads to longer Pauli strings; we also clearly see the front getting




FIG. 3: (left) Two-point time-ordered correlators and OTOCs in the XXZ model at $\Delta = 0.5$ showing that both these quantities detect the operator front(s), although they saturate to different values at late times. The multiple fronts visible in the data is consistent with the presence of multiple species of quasiparticles.

broader with increasing time before it reaches the end of the chain. We can quantify the width of the front by looking at the second moment of $\rho_R(x, t)$ in time:

$$w(t) = \sqrt{\sum_x x^2 \rho_R(x, t) - \left(\sum_x x \rho_R(x, t) \right)^2}. \quad (24)$$

Fig 2 (left) shows $w(t)$ plotted against time. While we have very limited dynamical range in time before the front reaches the end of the chain (and after an initial transient), the data seems consistent with a $w(t) \sim t^{1/2}$ scaling, and certainly quite far from the free fermion result of $w(t) \sim t^{1/3}$. The data for the spreading of $\sigma_0^z(t)$ looks very similar.

Next, we look at the behavior of two-point correlators and OTOCs: $\langle \sigma_0^z(t) \sigma_i^z(t) \rangle$ and $\langle |\sigma_0^z(t), \sigma_i^z(t)|^2 \rangle$ in Fig 3. We see that *both* the two-point correlator and the OTOC are able to detect the operator front for integrable systems, unlike the case of non-integrable systems (although two-point functions may not always work for this purpose, for example when additional symmetries force these to be zero or subballistic). Notice that the figures show the appearance of multiple fronts which is consistent with the presence of multiple species of quasiparticles in the XXZ model, each with their own “fastest” speed. Further, as discussed in the main text, while the two point function decays at late times, the OTOC generically saturates to a non-zero value as the front fills in. The saturation value of the OTOC is approximately 0.8 which is less than the generic value of 1 in chaotic systems. However, this difference is small and the saturation does show a weak increase with increasing system size (not shown). Whether this saturation value converges to a distinct universal value in large systems is presently unclear to us, but the difference is certainly weak. We note also that the non-monotonic behavior of the OTOC before saturation is generally not seen in chaotic models, so this may again be a weak signature of the lack of chaos. But the origin and universality of this behavior is again presently unsettled.

-
- ¹ H. Spohn, *Large scale dynamics of interacting particles*, Texts and monographs in physics (Springer-Verlag, 1991).
² B. Doyon and H. Spohn, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2017**, 073210 (2017).
³ B. Bertini, M. Collura, J. De Nardis, and M. Fagotti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 207201 (2016).
⁴ O. A. Castro-Alvaredo, B. Doyon, and T. Yoshimura, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 041065 (2016).
⁵ L. Bonnes, F. H. L. Essler, and A. M. Läuchli, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 187203 (2014).
⁶ M. Takahashi, *Thermodynamics of One-Dimensional Solvable Models* (Cambridge University Press, 1999).
⁷ P. Fendley and H. Saleur, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 10845 (1996).
⁸ V. B. Bulchandani, R. Vasseur, C. Karrasch, and J. E. Moore, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 220604 (2017).
⁹ V. B. Bulchandani, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 435203 (2017).
¹⁰ A. Nahum, S. Vijay, and J. Haah, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021014 (2018).
¹¹ C. W. von Keyserlingk, T. Rakovszky, F. Pollmann, and S. L. Sondhi, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021013 (2018).

¹² For the XXZ spin chain, this equation holds up to a sign that depends on the specie of quasiparticle, but this does not affect the calculation.