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Dynamical systems with many degrees of freedom are relatively well understood if they exhibit particular symmetries and conservation laws, or if they are sufficiently far from any such special situation. However, many cases of interest are somewhere in between and therefore quite resistant to a satisfying theoretical description. Here, we propose a general theory of how an isolated many-body quantum system relaxes towards its thermal long-time limit, provided it is sufficiently close to a reference case whose temporal relaxation is known. Our predictions agree very well with numerical and experimental results from the literature, which could not be quantitatively explained by any other analytical theory so far. The universality and simplicity of our main finding is akin to other basic relations in statistical physics, but with the distinctive feature of pertaining to the far-from-equilibrium realm.

I. INTRODUCTION

The question of how the behavior of a given system changes in response to a weak perturbation is ubiquitous in physics. If many degrees of freedom are involved, the microscopic dynamics is commonly expected to be extremely sensitive against small changes (chaotic [1]), so that it is virtually impossible to theoretically predict the response exactly or in terms of well-controlled approximations [2]. Yet, the actually observed behavior in experiments and numerical simulations is often found to obey relatively simple and robust “laws”. Here, we specifically ask how the temporal relaxation of an isolated many-body quantum system is altered by a small modification of the Hamiltonian, and we bridge the inevitable gap between what is theoretically feasible and what is actually observed by adopting the general framework of random matrix theory [1, 3]. Essentially, the idea is to consider not one specific but rather an entire ensemble of perturbations, most of which still closely resemble the one of actual interest. Our first main result is an analytical prediction for the ensemble-averaged, time-dependent deviations of the perturbed from the unperturbed expectation values. In a second step, we show that nearly all members of the ensemble behave very similar to the average. Finally, we argue that also the system of actual interest belongs to that vast majority. In the context of random matrix theory, this is a well-established line of reasoning, which has to our knowledge never been rigorously justified, but is extremely successful in practice [3]. In fact, it has been originally devised by Wigner for the very purpose of exploring chaotic quantum many-body systems and is by now widely recognized as a remarkably effective tool in this context [1]. We emphasize once more that such an approach should not be viewed as a randomization of the real physical perturbation [4, 5]. Rather, the basic assertion is that the “true” (non-random) perturbation belongs to the vast majority of all the very similarly behaving members of some properly chosen ensemble. As a validation, we will also compare our predictions with various experimental and numerical examples.

II. GENERAL CONTEXT

We study the temporal relaxation of an isolated many-body quantum system with Hamiltonian

$$H = H_0 + \lambda V$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

where $H_0$ describes the unperturbed system, $V$ the perturbation, and $\lambda$ the coupling. Considering the unperturbed behavior as given, our aim is to characterize the time evolution of the same initial state when the dynamics is subject to reasonably weak perturbations, as specified more precisely later on.

For example, $H_0$ may model two isolated subsystems (or a system and its environment), and $V \lambda$ their interaction. If both are prepared in thermal equilibrium states with different temperatures, the perturbation causes a relaxation towards a new thermal equilibrium of the compound system. More generally, already the unperturbed subsystems may exhibit some non-trivial relaxation, which is then modified by the perturbation.

Second, if the considered observable commutes with $H_0$ (constant of motion), one may ask for the response to a perturbation which breaks the corresponding symmetry. Specifically, for the population of an unperturbed energy level one should recover Fermi’s golden rule, whose rigorous justification is known to be a daunting task. Similarly, the initial state may commute with $H_0$ (steady state). In particular, the case of an eigenstate of $H_0$ is tantamount to a so-called quantum quench.

Third, analytical solutions may be available for $H_0$ but not for $H$. For instance, $H_0$ may describe a non-interacting many-body system and $V$ the interactions, or $H_0$ may be integrable and $H$ non-integrable. Often, such unperturbed models are expected to violate the so-called eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH [6–9])
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and thus to approach in the long-time limit a nonthermal steady state. Hence, also the perturbed relaxation will stay for a long time close to that nonthermal state (prethermalization [10–15]), before ultimately approaching a genuine thermal long-time limit.

Finally, interesting examples even without a steady long-time limit of the unperturbed system are conceivable and will be covered by our approach.

Note that the above mentioned issues of equilibration, thermalization, and ETH play an important role as far as the general context of our present paper is concerned, but they are not its actual subject. Rather, we will take for granted previously established concepts and results regarding those issues. Likewise, with respect to the extensive pertinent literature, we only refer here to a few seminal works and recent reviews [4–27].

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Focusing on possibly large but finite systems, the Hamiltonian $H$ in (1) exhibits a discrete set of eigenvalues $E_n$ and eigenvectors $|\psi_n\rangle$, with $n$ running from one to infinity, or, for instance, for a spin model, to some finite upper limit. At time $t = 0$, the system is prepared in a pure or mixed initial state $\rho(0)$, which then evolves according to the Schrödinger or von Neumann equation, so that the state at a later time $t > 0$ is given by $\rho(t) = e^{-iHt} \rho(0) e^{iHt} (h = 1)$. Denoting the expectation value of an observable (self-adjoint operator) $A$ in the state $\rho$ by $\langle A \rangle_\rho := \text{Tr}(\rho A)$, its time evolution can thus be written as

$$\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} = \sum_{m,n} e^{i(E_n - E_m) t} \rho_{mn}(0) A_{nm}, \tag{2}$$

where $\rho_{mn}(t) := \langle m | \rho(t) | n \rangle$ and $A_{nm} := \langle n | A | m \rangle$.

Of foremost interest to us are the deviations of the perturbed expectation values (2) from the corresponding expectation values $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(0)}$ when the same initial state $\rho(0)$ evolves according to the unperturbed Hamiltonian $H_0$ with eigenvalues $E_n^0$ and eigenvectors $|\psi_n^0\rangle$. These are given by (2), except that $E_n$, $\rho_{mn}(0)$, and $A_{nm}$ are replaced by their unperturbed counterparts $E_n^0$, $\rho_{mn}^0(0)$ := $\langle m | \rho(0) | n \rangle^0$, and $A_{nm}^0 := \langle n | A | m \rangle^0$. Finally, the unitary basis transformation

$$U_{nm} := \langle m | n \rangle^0 \tag{3}$$

can be employed to rewrite (2) in the form

$$\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} = \sum_{\mu_1,\mu_2,\nu_1,\nu_2} \rho_{\mu_1\nu_1\mu_2\nu_2}^0 A_{\mu_2\nu_2}^0 W_{\mu_1\nu_1}^{\mu_2\nu_2}(t), \tag{4}$$

where

$$W_{\mu_1\nu_1}^{\mu_2\nu_2}(t) := \sum_{m,n} e^{i(E_n - E_m) t} U_{m\mu_1} U_{n\mu_2} U_{m\nu_2}^* U_{n\nu_1}^*. \tag{5}$$

Generically, the energy levels $E_n$, considered as a function of $\lambda$, exhibit a so-called level-repulsion mechanism with the result that neighboring levels avoid to cross each other [1]. Without loss of generality, we thus can choose the labels $n$ so that $E_{n+1} \geq E_n$ for all $n$ and all relevant $\lambda$-values. According to textbook statistical mechanics, the levels furthermore give rise to well-defined (local) level densities, and the typical level spacings $E_{n+1} - E_n$ are extremely small (exponentially small in the system’s degrees of freedom [4, 28]).

Given $\rho(0)$, and possibly after adding a trivial constant to $V$ in (1), we can and will assume that $\text{Tr}(\rho(0) H) = \text{Tr}(\rho(0) H_0) =: E$. Moreover, we restrict ourselves to cases in which both the unperturbed and the perturbed systems exhibit macroscopically well-defined energies; i.e., there exists an energy interval

$$I := [E - \Delta/2, E + \Delta/2] \tag{6}$$

of macroscopically small but microscopically large width $\Delta$, so that the probability $\rho_{mn}(0)$ to encounter the unperturbed system in the energy eigenstate $|n\rangle$ is negligibly small for all $E_n \not\in I$, and likewise for the unperturbed system. At the same time, the number of levels $E_n$ contained in $I$ is required to be still exponentially large (see above) and their density to be approximately constant throughout $I$. Finally, this level density is assumed to be nearly the same for the unperturbed and the perturbed system. Denoting Boltzmann’s constant by $k_B$ and the number of levels with $E_n \leq E$ by $\Omega(E)$, Boltzmann’s entropy is $S(E) := k_B \ln[\Omega(E)]$. It follows that the level density is directly connected to the system’s thermodynamic properties. Our above assumption of nearly identical level densities thus essentially means that the two systems must exhibit similar thermodynamic properties. This is the specification announced below (1) of when a perturbation is considered as weak. Put differently, perturbations which entail phase transitions or other significant changes of the thermodynamics are “non-weak” and henceforth excluded.

Denoting the inverse level density as $\varepsilon$ (mean level spacing), our above considerations imply

$$E_n - E_m \sim E_n^0 - E_m^0 \sim (n - m) \varepsilon \tag{7}$$

whenever $E_n, E_m \in I$ or $E_n^0, E_m^0 \in I$. Another justification of (7) is obtained by exploiting our approximation $\rho_{mn}(0) = 0$ for $E_n \not\in I$ and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $|\rho_{mn}(0)|^2 \leq \rho_{mn}(0) \rho_{nm}(0)$, implying that only summands with $E_n, E_m \in I$ actually contribute in (2) and thus in (5). Focusing on not too large times $t$, it is then reasonable to expect that all $E_n - E_m$ in (2) and (5) can be well approximated according to (6). More precisely, it can be rigorously shown [29] that if each $E_n \in I$ is changed into $E_n + \epsilon_n$ then the corresponding change of (2) is upper bounded (in modulus) by $|A| ||t| \max |\epsilon_n|$, where $|A|$ is the operator norm of $A$. Choosing $\epsilon_n := E_n^0 - E_n$ and recalling that the levels are extremely dense implies that replacing all $E_n - E_m$ by $E_n^0 - E_m^0$ indeed only changes the expectation values in (2) by an unobservable amount for all experimentally relevant times $t$, and likewise for the second approximation in (7). In particu-
lar, we thus can approximate (5) by

$$W_{\nu_1 \nu_2}(t) = \sum_{m,n} e^{i(n-m)\xi t} U_{m\nu_1} U_{n\nu_2}^* U_{mn}^* U_{nu_2}. \tag{8}$$

IV. RANDOM MATRIX APPROACH

The remaining task is to evaluate (3), (8), and finally (4). As stated in the introduction, we will do this by means of a random matrix approach: We still consider $H_0$, $\rho(0)$, and $A$ as given and fixed, but instead of working with the specific matrix $V_{mn}^0 := \langle \rho(0)| V| n \rangle_0$ pertaining to the actual physical perturbation of interest, we consider an entire ensemble of random matrices $V_{mn}^0$, so that most of its members emulate the main properties of the “true” perturbation reasonably well. The most common examples, such as Gaussian orthogonal or unitary ensembles (GOE or GUE [1, 3]), are therefore not suitable for our purposes. For instance, if $H_0$ models noninteracting particles and $V$ some few-body interactions, the true matrix $V_{mn}^0$ is known to be sparse (most entries are zero) [3, 27, 30, 31]. Accordingly, it is appropriate to work with an ensemble of sparse random matrices in (1).

Similarly, the true perturbation may give rise to a purely real matrix or to a so-called banded matrix [6, 30, 32–34], hence the random matrices should be of the same type.

Indicating averages over the $V$ ensemble by $\langle \cdots \rangle_V$, our main objectives will be (see also Secs. I and V) to evaluate $\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V$ according to (4) and to show that the corresponding variance $\langle \xi^2(t) \rangle_V$ is small, where $\xi(t) := \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} - \langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V$. In view of (8), averages over four $U$ matrix elements are thus required for $\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V$ and averages over eight of them for $\langle \xi^2(t) \rangle_V$. This raises the question which of the above exemplified specific features of the $V$ ensemble are relevant with respect to those averages over several $U$ matrix elements. The simplest connection between the $V$’s and $U$’s is obtained by treating (1) in terms of elementary (Rayleigh-Schrödinger) perturbation theory. Quantitatively, such an approach may only lead to useful analytical approximations for exceedingly small $\lambda$-values in (1) due to the extremely dense energy eigenvalues of $H_0$ (see above) and the concomitant small denominators. Hence, nonperturbative methods will be indispensable for our present purposes. However, qualitatively it is quite plausible on the basis of such a perturbative approach that beyond those extremely small $\lambda$-values, a large number of $V$ matrix elements will appreciably contribute to any given $U$ matrix element (or products thereof). It is thus reasonable to expect that some generalized kind of central limit theorem (CLT) may apply, so that only a few basic statistical properties of the $V$’s will be actually relevant for the $U$’s. In particular, quite significant correlations between the $V_{mn}^0$ may still be admitted, but like in the CLT they should be largely irrelevant with respect to the $U$’s. All these expectations are confirmed by a considerable variety of numerical examples and (nonperturbative) analytical results [6, 27, 29–35]. Though the “true” perturbation in (1) will often be much better captured with the help of certain (possibly quite complicated) correlations between different $V_{mn}^0$’s, we thus can and will henceforth focus – as usual in random matrix theory [1, 3, 27] – on ensembles with statistically independent $V_{mn}^0$’s (apart from the trivial constraint $(V_{mn}^0)^* = V_{nm}^0$).

Next, we temporarily approximate the $V_{mn}^0$ as being identically distributed. Moreover, the indices $m$ and $n$ are extended to arbitrary integers (the concomitant $E_n^0$’s are extended via (7)). Some of the underlying arguments are as follows: Similarly as below (7) one sees that only labels $m, n$ with $E_n^0, E_n^0 \in I$ actually matter, hence extending and possibly modifying things for the remaining labels should be of little import. Since only the difference $m - n$ counts in (7), and since the exact upper and lower limits of $I$ in (6) should not matter, one expects that if a random matrix approach for $V$ is possible at all, then the statistics of the $V_{mn}^0$’s should only depend on $m - n$, and should only change rather slowly upon variations of $m - n$. By neglecting these changes altogether, we tacitly exclude banded matrices for the time being (later we will admit them again). More precisely, the bandedness of the true perturbation $V_{mn}^0$ should be negligible at least for all $m, n$ with $E_n^0, E_n^0 \in I$. We finally remark that only the off-diagonal elements $V_{mn}^0$ ($m \neq n$) are actually required to be identically distributed, while the statistics of the diagonals ($m = n$) may still be different [29, 36].

Within the above setting, the pertinent probability distribution of the random $V_{mn}^0$’s still depends on the specific physical system under consideration, and thus has to be inferred from the corresponding “true” $V_{mn}^0$’s. In particular, distributions with a pronounced delta peak at zero correspond to the previously mentioned possibility of sparse matrices. As commonly taken for granted, and justified in more detail in the Supplemental Material [37], we furthermore can assume without loss of generality that $|V_{mn}^0|_V = 0$ for $m \neq n$. Accordingly, and in agreement with the above mentioned similarities to the CLT, the most important property of the $V_{mn}^0$’s will thus turn out to be the off-diagonal variance,

$$\sigma_v^2 := \langle |V_{mn}^0|^2 \rangle_V, \quad \text{for} \ m \neq n, \tag{9}$$

while all further details (higher moments) of their distribution will be largely irrelevant.

V. MAIN RESULTS

Referring to the Supplemental Material [37] for the detailed derivation, we find as our first key result that

$$\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V = Q + e^{-\Gamma t} \left\{ \langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V - Q \right\} + R(t), \tag{10}$$
where \( t \geq 0 \) and

\[
\Gamma := 2\pi \lambda^2 \sigma_\tau^2 / \varepsilon , \tag{11}
\]

\[
Q := \sum_{m,n} \rho_{mn}^0 A_{nn}^0 q(m - n) , \tag{12}
\]

\[
q(n) := \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\Gamma / \varepsilon + n^2}{} , \tag{13}
\]

\[
R(t) := \sum_{m,n} \rho_{mn}^0 A_{nn}^0 r(t, m - n) , \tag{14}
\]

\[
r(t, n) := e^{-\Gamma t} q(n) \left\{ 1 - \cos(t\varepsilon) - \frac{\Gamma \sin(t\varepsilon)}{n\varepsilon} \right\} . \tag{15}
\]

We recall that \( \hbar \) has been absorbed into \( t \), that \( \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \) represents the unperturbed behavior, \( \lambda \) the coupling from (1), \( \varepsilon \) the mean level spacing from (7), and \( \sigma_\tau^2 \) the variance from (9). Anticipating that \( R(t) \) will turn out to be negligible, the exponential term in (10) governs the temporal modification of the unperturbed behavior, while \( Q \) is the long-time limit. Its explicit form in (12) and (13) has been originally obtained by Deutsch [6], see also [35, 38]. Similarly as in those previous works, \( \delta := \varepsilon / \Gamma \) is considered as a small parameter in (10)-(15), i.e., subleading terms in \( \delta \) have been omitted. Without going into the details, non-small \( \delta \) corresponds to negligibly weak perturbations in (1), see also next section and Ref. [29]. (In particular, \( \delta \gg 1 \) pertains to the previously mentioned realm of elementary perturbation theory.) Assuming \( \delta \ll 1 \) in (13), the sum \( \sum_n q(n) \) can be approximated by an integral, whose value is unity. Likewise, one finds that \( \sum_n r(t, n) \approx 0 \) for all \( t \geq 0 \).

If the unperturbed system satisfies the ETH, the \( A_{nn}^0 \) are well approximated for all \( n \) with \( E_n \in \mathbb{I} \) by the microcanonical expectation value \( \langle A \rangle_{mc} \) corresponding to the energy interval \( I \) from (6) [6–9]. But since all the remaining \( A_{nn}^0 \)'s are actually irrelevant (see below (7)), we can set them equal to \( \langle A \rangle_{mc} \) as well. Recalling that \( \sum_n q(n) \approx 1 \) and \( \sum_n r(t, n) \approx 0 \), it follows with (12) and (14) that \( Q \approx \langle A \rangle_{mc} \) and \( R(t) \approx 0 \). While we exploited the ETH to deduce these approximations, they are expected to apply much more generally (see also Fig. 1) the average behavior is negligibly small for the vast majority of all members of the considered \( V \) ensemble. More precisely, the probability to encounter a notable deviation is exponentially small in the system’s degrees of freedom. Referring to the Supplemental Material [37] for the quantitative derivation, and taking for granted that the real physical perturbation in (1) belongs to this vast majority (see Sec. I), we can conclude that

\[
\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} = \langle A \rangle_{mc} + e^{-\Gamma t} \left\{ \langle A \rangle_{\rho_0(t)} - \langle A \rangle_{mc} \right\} . \tag{16}
\]

This is the central result of our present work. A comparison with various examples and some generalizations will be provided in the next two sections.

Similarly as in the Supplemental Material [37], one can show [38] that \( \rho_{nn}(0)V = \sum_m \rho_{mm}^0 q(m/2) / 2 \). With (7), (13), and \( \rho_{nn}(0) \geq 0 \) this implies that the \( E_n \)'s with non-negligible \( \rho_{nn}(0) \) are “spread out” over an energy interval on the order of \( \Gamma \) compared to the \( E_n^0 \)'s with non-negligible \( \rho_{nn}^0(0) \). The weak coupling condition as specified below (6) thus requires that

\[
\Gamma \ll \Delta . \tag{17}
\]

VI. NUMERICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL EXAMPLES

Our first examples are still relatively close to the random matrix approach from the previous sections. The detailed specification of the two actually considered models is provided in the caption of Fig. 1. The resulting numerical solutions for both models (dashed and dotted lines in Fig. 1) compare very well with the corresponding analytical approximations (solid lines), determined by (16) and (11) without any free parameter. We furthermore verified that the agreement becomes better and better upon increasing the dimensionality \( N \) of the considered models. Similarly, the weak coupling condition below (6) turns out to be better and better fulfilled as \( N \) increases.

The examples in Fig. 1 nicely illustrate several important aspects of the general theory: (i) One single random matrix \( V_{mn}^0 \) indeed behaves very similar to the ensemble average. (ii) The number of nonvanishing \( \rho_{nn}^0(0) \)'s does not have to be large. (iii) The unperturbed system does not have to approach a steady long-time limit, and it may violate the ETH. (iv) The statistics of the \( V_{mn}^0 \)'s enters via (9). In particular, the perturbation matrix may be real or complex and possibly sparse.

For even simpler initial conditions and observables than in Fig. 1, namely \( \rho(0) = A = |n\rangle \langle n| \), one essentially recovers Fermi’s golden rule, but now based on a non-perturbative derivation. As expected (and therefore not shown), one finds a similar agreement between theory and numerics as in Fig. 1 (see also Fig. 6 below), and likewise for various other \( \rho(0) \)'s and \( A \)'s.

Our second example is the numerical exploration by Flesch et al. [39] of the bosonic Hubbard chain

\[
H := -J \sum_{i=1}^{L} (\hat{b}_{i+1} \hat{b}_{i} + \hat{b}_{i} \hat{b}_{i+1}) + U \sum_{i=1}^{L} \hat{n}_{i}(\hat{n}_{i} - 1) \tag{18}
\]

with periodic boundary conditions, creation (annihilation) operators \( \hat{b}_{i} \) (\( \hat{b}_{i} \)), and \( \hat{n}_{i} := \hat{b}_{i} \hat{b}_{i}^\dagger \). For the initial state \( \rho(0) \) considered in Ref. [39] and Fig. 2, the
FIG. 1: Sparse random matrix models. The considered models are of the form (1), where $H_0$ exhibits $N \gg 1$ equidistant levels $E_{nm} = \varepsilon n$ (cf. (7)), while the matrix elements $V_{nm}$ are independent random variables (apart from $\langle V_{nm} \rangle = E_{mn}$), generated according to one of the following two options. First option: With probability $p$ we set $V_{nm} = 0$, otherwise the real and imaginary parts of $V_{mn}$ are Gaussian distributed with mean zero and variance $1/2$ if $m \neq n$, while the $V_{nn}$ are purely real and of unit variance. Second option: We set $V_{nm} = 0$ with probability $p$ and $V_{nn} = \pm 1$ with probabilities $(1-p)/2$. The actually chosen values are $N = 2^{14} = 16384$, $\varepsilon = 1/512$, and $p = 0.8$, exemplifying a sparse and either complex or real matrix with $\sigma^2 = 0.2$ according to (9). As initial conditions we choose $\rho(0) = |\psi \rangle \langle \psi|$ with $|\psi \rangle := (|n_+ \rangle + |n_- \rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, $n_\pm := N/2 \pm \nu$, and $\nu = 256$. As the observable we take $A := \rho(0)$ ("fidelity"), implying $A_{nm}^2 = (\delta_{nm} + \delta_{m-n})/2$ (ETH violated) and $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} = \cos^2(t/2)$ (see (2)). Finally, $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)}$ is numerically determined by diagonalizing (1) and evaluating (2). Dashed: The so-obtained results for $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)}$ for one perturbation $V$ generated according to the first option and various $\lambda$ values. Dotted: Same for the second option. Solid: Analytical predictions from (16), exploiting in (11) that $\varepsilon = 1/512$ and $\sigma^2 = 0.2$ for both options, and adopting the obvious approximation $\langle A \rangle_{\text{mc}} = 0$.

Our theoretical prediction from (16). In particular, we again approximated $\Gamma$ in (12) by $4.98 \lambda^2$, i.e., only one single fit parameter was used in the comparison with all numerical and experimental data in Figs. 2 and 3. Incidentally, the agreement in Fig. 3 becomes better as $\lambda$ increases. Fig. 2(a) implies that the same tendency will be recovered when comparing the numerical results with the experimental data, suggesting that the model (18) itself may not capture all experimentally relevant details for small $\lambda$.

Next we turn to the spin-1/2 XXZ chain with anisotropy parameter $\lambda$ from Fig. 4, exhibiting a gapless "Luttinger liquid" and a gapped, Ising-ordered antiferromagnetic phase for $\lambda \leq 1$ and $\lambda > 1$, respectively [41]. Similarly as in the previous example, the quantitative value of $\sigma^2 / \varepsilon$ in (12) is unknown and hence treated as a fit parameter. The main difference compared to the

model (18) can be recast as an effective spin-1/2 chain by means of a mapping which becomes asymptotically exact for large interactions parameters $U$ [40]. In the limit $U \to \infty$, the so-obtained "unperturbed" effective Hamiltonian $H_0$ amount to an XX model. The leading finite-$U$ correction takes the form $U^{-1} H_1$, containing nearest neighbor, next-nearest neighbor, as well as three-spin terms [40]. In other words, $H_1$ plays the role of the perturbation $V$ in (1), and $1/U$ that of $\lambda$. As detailed in the caption of Fig. 2, the unperturbed behavior $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)}$ and the microcanonical value $\langle A \rangle_{\text{mc}}$ are analytically known. Hence, the only remaining parameter in (16) is $\Gamma$. Since the ratio $\sigma^2 / \varepsilon$ in (12) is independent of $\lambda$ (see (9)), but quantitatively not available for our present example from [39], we treated it as a fit parameter, yielding $\Gamma = 4.98 \lambda^2$. The resulting agreement with the numerics in Fig. 2 speaks for itself.

An experimental realization of the model (18) in terms of a strongly correlated Bose gas has been explored by Trotzky et al. in Ref. [25] and is compared in Fig. 3 with the experimental data, suggesting that the model (18) itself may not capture all experimentally relevant details for small $\lambda$.
remarkably well all the way up to the critical point at the XXZ model is integrable for all bosonic Hubbard model (18) is that the XXZ model is integrable for all \( \lambda \) values. The analytics in Fig. 4 explains the numerics by Barmettler et al. from Ref. [41] remarkably well all the way up to the critical point at \( \lambda = 1 \).

Our last example is the fermionic Hubbard model of Balzer et al. from Ref. [42], see Fig. 5. As before, \( \sigma_i^z / \varepsilon \) is treated as a fit parameter, yielding good agreement between numerics and analytics up to quite large \( \lambda \) values. The remaining deviations for large \( \lambda \) and small \( t \) hint, as we will see in the next section, at a banded structure of the perturbation matrix.

We also found good agreement with further numerical studies, e.g., of hard-core bosons with nearest- and next-nearest-neighbor hopping and interaction [15], and of spinless fermions with dimerization, nearest- and next-nearest-neighbor hopping, and nearest-neighbor interaction [43]. Finally, the scaling behavior \( \Gamma \propto \lambda^2 \) in (11) has also been reported, among others, in Refs. [14, 44–46].

VII. EXTENSIONS

As a generalization of (9), we assume that

\[
\left[ V_{mn}^0 \right]_\nu = \sigma^z_\nu F(|m - n|),
\]

where \( F(n) \) changes relatively slowly as a function of \( n \) and approaches unity for small \( n \) (with the possible exception of \( n = 0 \)). The previous case (9) is thus recovered if \( F(n) = 1 \) for all \( n > 0 \). On the other hand, banded \( V \) matrices are obtained if \( F(n) \to 0 \) for large \( n \) [6, 30, 32–34].

To tackle such banded and possibly at the same time sparse interaction matrices, we extended in the Supple-
mental Material [37] the supersymmetry techniques from Ref. [30], yielding as a generalization of (16) the result

$$\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} = \langle A \rangle_{\text{mc}} + |g(t)|^2 \left\{ \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} - \langle A \rangle_{\text{mc}} \right\}, \quad (20)$$

$$g(t) := \sum_{n} e^{\text{int}} u(n), \quad (21)$$

where $u(m - n) := |U_{mn}|^2 \nu$. Moreover, if there exists a characteristic “bandwidth” $B \gg 1$, up to which $F(n)$ stays close to unity, and beyond which $F(n)$ notably decreases, then $u(n)$ exhibits a crossover (cutoff) around $n \approx B$ from a Breit-Wigner behavior $u(n) \approx 2\Gamma\varepsilon/\pi B^2 + (2\varepsilon n)^2$ for small $n$ to a significantly faster decay for large $n$ [30, 33]. For $\Gamma \ll \varepsilon B$ one thus readily recovers (16) apart from a slight modification for small $t$ (see also Fig. 6).

In other words, (16) even applies to banded perturbation matrices, provided $\lambda$ is sufficiently small. This “universality” of (16) is of particular importance when comparing the theory with numerical or experimental examples, for which the details of $V_{mn}^0$ are usually not available (cf. Figs. 2-5).

Beyond the regime $\Gamma \ll \varepsilon B$, a more convenient quantifier of the bandwidth is $B' := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F(n)$, usually satisfying $B' \geq B$. If $B' < \infty$ and $\Gamma \gg \varepsilon B'$, then $u(n)$ in (21) is found to approximate a semicircle distribution with radius $(4B'T/\pi\varepsilon)^{1/2}$, while condition (17) must be replaced by

$$\gamma := (4\varepsilon B'T/\pi\varepsilon)^{1/2} \ll \Delta. \quad (22)$$

According to (21), the crucial factor $|g(t)|^2$ in (20) thus takes the form

$$|g(t)|^2 = |2 J_1(\gamma t)/\gamma t|^2, \quad (23)$$

where $J_1(x)$ is a Bessel function of the first kind.

Altogether, the characteristic relaxation time scale of $|g(t)|^2$ in (20) can thus be estimated as $\Gamma^{-1}$ in the regime $\Gamma \ll \varepsilon B$ and as $\gamma^{-1}$ in the regime $\Gamma > \varepsilon B'$, scaling with the coupling strength $\lambda$ as $\lambda^{-2}$ and $|\lambda|^{-1}$, respectively, with a crossover around $\Gamma = \gamma$. In any case, this time scale is lower bounded by $\Delta^{-1}$ due to (17) and (22).

A comparison of these analytical predictions with numerical results is exemplified by Fig. 6. Note that this example essentially amounts to a generalization of Fermi’s golden rule (see also previous section). Moreover, in view of Fig. 6 it seems plausible that the deviations between theory and numerics for small $t$ in Fig. 5 may be due to a banded matrix. The same may apply to the similar (but weaker) deviations in Figs. 2(n) and 4.

**VIII. CONCLUSIONS**

We explored how the temporal relaxation of an observable changes when an isolated many-body system is subject to a weak, time-independent perturbation. Our main result (16) predicts that this change is of exponential form under very general conditions. In particular, a purely exponential decay arises when $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)}$ in (16) is time-independent, for instance, since the observable $A$ is a constant of motion, or $\rho_{0}(t)$ is a steady state of the unperturbed system. Phenomenologically, such “exponential laws” are extremely common, and our theory substantially extends previous attempts to explain why this is so even in isolated systems, see [22, 27, 47-49] and references therein.

If the unperturbed system is integrable (or many-body localized [26]), then $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)}$ in (16) often approaches a
long-time limit different from the pertinent thermal equilibrium value $\langle A \rangle_{\text{me}}$ [8, 9]. For a generic (integrability-breaking) and sufficiently weak perturbation, initially (16) then still closely follows the unperturbed relaxation towards a nonthermal steady state (prethermalization [10–15]), but ultimately there must be a transition to $\langle A \rangle_{\text{me}}$. We thus obtained, as a by-product, a general theory of prethermalization, which complements and significantly generalizes previous analytical results [11, 12, 14, 15, 29].

We also generalized our approach to cases where the relevant perturbation matrix is banded, resulting in (20). Quite remarkably, one still recovers (16) if the perturbation is sufficiently weak. Apart from that, we found as the main condition regarding the “smallness” of the perturbation that the thermodynamic properties of the perturbed system must not differ much from those of the unperturbed system (assuming both systems were at thermal equilibrium).

Our theoretical predictions were found to agree very favorably with various numerical and experimental examples from the literature, see Figs. 2-5, none of which could be quantitatively explained by any previous analytical approach. Specifically, the authors of Ref. [25] concluded that a theoretical explanation of the experimental approach. Specifically, the authors of Ref. [25] concluded that a theoretical explanation of the experimentally and numerically observed relaxation behavior constituted one of the major open problems of their work.

Overall, our results are of foremost use when, very roughly speaking, the system is close to some kind of “special situation”: The observable $A$ or the initial state $\rho(0)$ is (almost) conserved, $H_0$ is (almost) integrable, $H_0$ describes isolated subsystems, whose energies are still almost conserved when weakly interacting via $V$, etc. Thus, already the unperturbed relaxation $\langle A \rangle_{\text{rel}}(t)$ is relatively slow or “special” in some other way, and changes quite significantly when the perturbation is switched on. The complementary, “generic” case without any “special relations” between $A$, $\rho(0)$, and $H_0$ has been previously explored in [50], predicting an unperturbed relaxation towards $\langle A \rangle_{\text{me}}$ on the very short time scale $\Delta^{-1}$. According to (17), the perturbed relaxation in (16) thus remains almost unchanged. (As expected, weakly perturbing an already generic system has little effect.) Moreover, this very fast relaxation will be typically non-exponential in time [50]. In turn, our present theory applies just in most of the situations which were previously excluded in [50], and predicts a less rapid and essentially exponential relaxation. Together, the two complementary theories thus cover a wide variety of “generic” as well as “special” relaxation scenarios.
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SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Throughout this Supplemental Material, equations from the main paper are indicated by an extra letter “m”. For example, “Eq. (m1)” refers to Equation (1) in the main paper. Likewise, section numbers with a prefix “m” relate to the corresponding sections from the main paper, such as “Sec. mV” for Sec. V (“Main results”) from the main text.

In Sec. I of this Supplemental Material, we recall the general formal setup, specify the considered ensembles of perturbations \( V \), and establish the smallness of the parameter \( \delta \) defined below Eq. (m15), on which all the subsequent calculations rely. In Sec. II, we provide the essential steps for the derivation of our two key results, the ensemble-averaged time evolution (m10) and the smallness of deviations from this average (see above (m16)). The technically more involved details underlying these derivations are deferred to the remaining three sections: the supersymmetry calculation for second and fourth moments of the eigenvector overlaps \( U_{mn} := \langle m|n \rangle_0 \) in Sec. III, a generalized approximation for fourth and higher such moments in Sec. IV, and the evaluation of the eighth moments in Sec. V.

Regarding the discussion in the main paper, this Supplemental Material hence addresses the following issues:

(i) The assumption \( |V_{mn}|_V = 0 \) stated above Eq. (m9) is treated in Sec. I C.

(ii) The derivation of Eqs. (m10)-(m15) is provided in Secs. II A and III.

(iii) The derivation of Eq. (m16) is provided in Secs. II B and V.

(iv) The results stated in Sec. mVII are obtained mainly in Sec. IV and in part also in Secs. III and V.

I. PRELIMINARIES

We start by recalling the general formal setup (but not its justification and physical meaning) from the main paper: Considered are perturbed systems of the form

\[
H = H_0 + \lambda V .
\]  

(1)

The eigenvectors of \( H \) and \( H_0 \) are denoted as \( |n\rangle \) and \( |n_0\rangle \), respectively, and the corresponding eigenvalues \( E_n \) and \( E_0^n \) are supposed to satisfy the approximation

\[
E_n - E_m \simeq E_0^n - E_0^m \simeq (n-m) \varepsilon .
\]  

(2)

A key role will be played by the perturbation matrix

\[
V_{mn} := \langle m|n \rangle_0
\]  

(3)

and by the basis transformation matrix

\[
U_{mn} := \langle m|n \rangle_0 .
\]  

(4)

(For simplicity, (3) will be referred to either as “matrix” or as “matrix element”, and similarly for (4).)

Given some initial state \( \rho(0) \) and observable \( A \), and choosing time units so that \( \hbar = 1 \), the unperturbed expectation values can be written by means of (2) in the form

\[
\langle A \rangle_{\rho_0(t)} = \sum_{m,n} e^{i(n-m)\varepsilon t} \rho_{mn}^0(0) A_{nm}^0 ,
\]  

(5)

\[
\rho_{mn}^0(0) := \langle m|\rho(0)|n \rangle_0 ,
\]  

(6)

\[
A_{nm}^0 := \langle n|A|m \rangle_0 ,
\]  

(7)

while the perturbed expectation values take the form

\[
\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} = \sum_{\mu_1,\mu_2} \rho_{\mu_1,\mu_2}^0(0) A_{\mu_1\mu_2}^0 W_{\mu_1\mu_2}(t) ,
\]  

(9)

\[
W_{\mu_1\mu_2}(t) := \sum_{m,n} e^{i(n-m)\varepsilon t} U_{m\mu_1} U_{n\mu_2}^* U_{m\mu_2}^* U_{n\mu_1}^* .
\]  

(10)

A. Random matrices

As discussed in more detail in Secs. mI and mIV, we consider statistical ensembles of perturbations \( V \), where each member of the ensemble is given by a formally infinite dimensional random matrix (3), and we indicate the concomitant statistical averages by the symbol \( \langle \ldots \rangle_V \). Furthermore, we take for granted that all matrix elements \( V_{mn}^0 \) are statistically independent of each other (apart from the trivial constraint \( (V_{mn}^0)^* = V_{nm}^0 \) since \( V \) is Hermitian), that their mean values are zero (at least for \( m \neq n \), see also Sec. I C below), and that their statistical properties do not depend on \( m \) and \( n \) separately, but only on the difference \( m-n \). As a consequence, also the \( U_{mn}^\nu \)’s from (4) amount to random matrix elements, whose statistical properties only depend on \( m-n \). In particular,

\[
u(m-n) := \langle |U_{mn}|^2 \rangle_V
\]  

(11)

is a well-defined function of \( m-n \) alone, and analogously for arbitrary “moments” of the form \( \langle |U_{mn}|^k |U_{nm}^*|^l \rangle_V \) and for more general averages over several \( U \) matrix elements. Moreover, we observe that \( u(n) \) is a real-valued, non-negative function of \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \) with the property

\[
\sum_n u(n) = 1 ,
\]  

(12)

as can be inferred from \( \sum_n |U_{mn}|^2 = 1 \) and (11).

In passing, the following two side remarks may be noteworthy: (i) Apart from the \( U \)-matrix elements, all other quantities appearing in (5)-(10) are non-random (independent of \( V \)). (ii) The quantity \( u(n) \) from (11) is
closely related to the ensemble average of the so-called strength function or local (spectral) density of states (LDOS) \( h_n(E) := \sum_{m} |U_{mn}|^2 \delta (E - E_m) \) [27, 30, 33, 51]. Indeed, by “washing out” the delta function \( \delta (E - E_m) \) over several level spacings \( \varepsilon \), one readily infers from (2) and (11) that \( u(m-n) \simeq \varepsilon \left[ h_n(E_m) \right]_{|V|} \) [30].

Taking for granted that the mean values of \( V^0_{mn} \) are zero (at least for \( m \neq n \), see also Sec. IC below), the most important property of the random matrix elements \( V^0_{mn} \) are their variances (or second moments). As in Sec. mIV, we assume that there exists a constant \( \sigma^2 > 0 \) so that these variances can be written in the form

\[
\sigma^2_{mn} := \langle |V^0_{mn}|^2 \rangle_{V} = \sigma^2 F(|m-n|) ,
\]

where \( F(n) \) is a “form factor”, which changes relatively slowly as a function of \( n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) and approaches unity for small \( n \) values, with the possible exception that \( F(0) \) may be different from one, but still of order unity.

Explicitly, we will mainly focus on cases where the probability densities for the random matrix elements \( V^0_{mn} \) are of the general form

\[
P_{mn}(v) = \tilde{P}_{|m-n|}(v) ,
\]

\[
\tilde{P}_j(v) = p_j \delta (v) + (1 - p_j) f_j \left( \frac{v}{\sigma_j \sqrt{F(j)}} \right)
\]

with \( j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( 0 \leq p_j < 1 \), \( \tilde{\sigma}_j := \sigma_j / \sqrt{1 - p_j} \), and where \( f_j(z) \) are generic probability distributions with vanishing mean and unit variance. For \( m = n \), the argument \( v \) in (14) and (15) is understood to be real. For \( m \neq n \), the argument may be complex or real, depending on whether we are dealing with an ensemble of complex or purely real matrices (see also Sec. IV C below for additional formal details). Finally, we tacitly restrict ourselves to indices with \( m \leq n \) in (14) since \( (V^0_{mn})^* = V^0_{nm} \).

As stated below (15), \( f_j(z) \) is assumed to be a probability distribution with vanishing mean even when \( j = 0 \), i.e., \( \langle V^0_{mn} \rangle_{V} \) is assumed to vanish. As discussed in more detail in Sec. IC, this assumption is usually expected to be fulfilled at least in very good approximation, but in principle there still could be exceptional cases. On the other hand, our subsequent calculations could also be readily generalized to cases with non-vanishing \( \langle V^0_{nn} \rangle_{V} \).

Only to avoid further complications in the notation and calculations, we disregard such a more general setup in the following. Finally, and as already mentioned in Sec. mIV, we also may recall that the statistics of the diagonal elements \( V^0_{nn} \) is well-known to be of minor relevance [29, 36].

Our next remark is that (13) can be readily recovered from (14) and (15). Furthermore, the possibility of so-called sparse random matrices [3, 27, 30, 31] is admitted via the term \( p_j \delta (v) \) in (15), which quantifies the fraction of strictly vanishing matrix elements \( V^0_{mn} \). In most cases, one actually expects that the diagonal elements are non-sparse, i.e., \( p_0 = 0 \), and that all off-diagonal elements exhibit (approximately) the same sparsity, i.e., \( p_j = p_1 \) for all \( j \geq 1 \).

The most important example, on which we mostly focused in the main paper, is recovered for \( F(n) = 1 \) for all \( n > 0 \). Further relevant examples, namely so-called banded random matrices [6, 30, 32-34], correspond to the case when \( F(n) \) tends to zero for large \( n \).

As in Sec. mVII, we will consider two quantifiers \( B \) and \( B' \) of the bandwidth, where \( B \) is such that \( F(n) \) stays close to unity up to \( n \simeq B \) and then notably decreases with \( n \), whereas

\[
B' := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F(n) .
\]

Note that \( B' \) is larger than (or at least comparable to) \( B \) and may be infinite in some cases. We also remark that a banded matrix may at the same time be sparse.

From the distributions of the individual entries (14), we then obtain the total distribution of the matrix \( V \) in the \( H_0 \) eigenbasis,

\[
P(V) := \prod_{m \leq n} P_{mn}(V^0_{mn}) .
\]

Averaging over the ensemble of perturbations means an integral over the probability measure \([dV] P(V)\), where

\[
[dV] := \prod_n dV^0_{nn} \left[ \prod_{m<n} dV^0_{mn} dV^0_{mn} \right]
\]

is the Lebesgue measure of all independent entries of \( V \) and \( dV^0_{mn} dV^0_{mn} \) is understood as a shorthand notation for \( 2 \ d(\text{Re} V^0_{mn}) d(\text{Im} V^0_{mn}) \), and where we tacitly focused on complex-valued \( v \) for \( m \neq n \) in (14). Symbolically, taking averages over the \( V \) ensemble may thus be written in the two equivalent forms \( \cdots |_V = \int [dV] \cdots P(V) \).

### B. Small parameter

A general feature of all the subsequent calculations is that they amount to approximations in which the quantity

\[
s := \max_{n} u(n)
\]

plays the role of a small parameter, i.e., we always assume that \( s \ll 1 \).

Our first remark is that the small parameter \( \delta := \varepsilon / \Gamma \), which was introduced in the main paper below Eq. (m15), is almost, but not exactly identical to \( s \). Namely, we will find later that for the specific \( V \) ensembles considered in Sec. mV, the two small parameters are related via

\[
\delta = (\pi / 2) s .
\]

Our second remark is that in most cases \( u(n) \) is found to assume its maximum at \( n = 0 \) and hence \( s = u(0) \). However, exceptions with \( s \neq u(0) \) are still possible, as exemplified in Fig. 1 of Ref. [30].
Our next objective is to quantify the “smallness” of $s$ somewhat more precisely. Quite obviously, the actual value of $s$ depends on many details of the specific model under consideration, hence somewhat more general statements are only possible in terms of nonrigorous arguments and rough estimates.

As detailed in Sec. mIII, the mean level spacing $\varepsilon$ from (2) is exponentially small in the system’s degrees of freedom $[4, 28]$. For a typical macroscopic system with, say, $f = 10^{23}$ degrees of freedom, $\varepsilon$ is thus an unimaginably small number (on the corresponding natural energy scale, which usually will be very roughly speaking on the order of $10^{7}$ Joule with $|x| \ll f$). Also for “mesoscopic” systems with considerably less extreme $f$ values (arising for example in cold atom experiments or in numerical simulations), the level spacing $\varepsilon$ is usually still expected to be extremely small on the natural energy scale of the system at hand.

In view of (12) and (19) it seems reasonable to expect, and will be confirmed by all our particular examples below, that $u(n)$ is generically a rather slowly varying function of its argument $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, decaying on a characteristic scale of the order of $s^{-1}$ from its maximal value at $n = 0$ towards its asymptotic value zero for $|n| \to \infty$. Moreover, we will later find that its Fourier transform
govern the modification of the temporal relaxation in (9) due to the perturbation $\lambda V$ in (1). Therefore, the characteristic time scale of this modification will be of the order of $s/\varepsilon$, where, as said above (5), we are working in time units with $\hbar = 1$. Since $\varepsilon$ is exponentially small in the degrees of freedom $f$, also $s$ is expected to be exponentially small in $f$, at least if one disregards extremely weak perturbations, which entail modifications of the relaxation which are themselves exponentially slow in $f$. All these considerations may thus be symbolically summarized as
doing so each matrix element $V_{m,n}^0$ in (3) acquires an extra factor $e^{i(\phi_n - \phi_m)}$. If we now choose a basis with an arbitrary but fixed set of randomly generated phases $\phi_n$, and if we take for granted that the resulting matrix elements $V_{m,n}^0$ of the “true” physical perturbation $V$ in (1) can be reasonably described within a random matrix approach at all, then only random matrix ensembles which exhibit the above property seem appropriate to faithfully emulate the actual system at hand (see also Sec. mIV).

(ii) All pertinent ensembles considered in the literature and in the following sections exhibit this invariance property.

The first and simplest consequence of the above invariance property is that the ensemble average (mean value) of $V_{m,n}^0$ must be equal to the ensemble average of $e^{i(\phi_n - \phi_m)}V_{m,n}^0$ for arbitrary phases $\phi_n$ and indices $m,n$. This is only possible if the average actually vanishes,

\begin{equation}
\langle V_{m,n}^0 \rangle_V = 0 ,
\end{equation}

at least for all $m \neq n$. For a direct numerical verification of this property by means of a concrete physical model system, see also Ref. [52].

As a second consequence, one readily sees that the probability densities $P_{m,n}(v)$ with $m \neq n$ in (14) will not depend separately on the real and imaginary parts of $v$, but only on the absolute value $|v|$ (see also Sec. IV C below). Hence, the same must apply for the functions $f_j(z)$, appearing on the right hand side of (15).

Regarding the case $m = n$, we note that the considerations above (m6) in the main paper are tantamount to the requirement $\text{Tr}(\rho(0)V) = 0$ for the true perturbation $V$. As stated in the main paper, by adding a trivial constant to $V$ we may assume that $\text{Tr}(\rho(0)V) = 0$ without loss of generality. This assumption simplifies some details, but it is not an indispensable prerequisite of our approach.) In either case, a similar argument as before (see (i) above) may then be invoked: If the true perturbation can be reasonably described within a random matrix approach at all, then only random ensembles which exhibit the property $\langle V_{m,n}^0 \rangle_V = 0$ seem appropriate to faithfully emulate the actual system at hand. In other words, (23) actually applies for arbitrary indices $m$ and $n$.

C. Invariance property of the ensemble

Throughout our present work, we restrict ourselves to ensembles of perturbations $V$ which are invariant (all statistical properties remain the same) when each matrix element $V_{m,n}^0$ of every member of the ensemble is multiplied by a factor $e^{i(\phi_n - \phi_m)}$ for any arbitrary but fixed set of phases $\phi_n \in [0,2\pi]$. This restriction does not amount to any significant loss of generality for the following reasons (see also [29, 34, 38]):

(i) According to textbook quantum mechanics, multiplying each eigenvector $|n\rangle_H$ of the unperturbed Hamiltonian $H_0$ in (1) by a factor of the form $e^{i\phi_n}$ with an arbitrary but fixed phase $\phi_n \in [0,2\pi]$ does not entail any physically observable changes. On the other hand, by

II. TYPICAL TIME EVOLUTION

In the first subsection II A, we provide a preliminary sketch of the essential steps leading to the ensemble-averaged time evolution (m10)-(m15), while a more in-depth derivation will be worked out in the subsequent Sec. III. In the second subsection II B, we argue that this average time evolution is typical in the sense that
the probability to observe non-negligible deviations in an individual realization of the random perturbations \( V \) is exponentially suppressed in the system’s degrees of freedom. The formal details regarding the derivation of this result will be given in Sec. V.

### A. Ensemble-averaged time evolution

For the sake of convenience, we begin by recalling Eqs. (m10)-(m15):

\[
[(A)_{\mu(t)}]_V = Q + e^{-\Gamma|t|} \left\{ (A)_{\rho(t)} - Q \right\} + R(|t|),
\]

\[
\Gamma := 2\pi \lambda^2 \sigma_v^2 / \varepsilon,
\]

\[
Q := \sum_{m,n} \rho_{mm}^0(0) A_{mn}^0 q(m - n),
\]

\[
q(n) := \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\Gamma / \varepsilon}{(\Gamma / \varepsilon)^2 + n^2},
\]

\[
R(t) := \sum_{m,n} \rho_{nm}^0(0) A_{mn}^0 r(t, m - n),
\]

\[
r(t, n) := e^{-\Gamma t} q(n) \left\{ 1 - \cos(t \varepsilon n) - \frac{\Gamma \sin(t \varepsilon n)}{n \varepsilon} \right\},
\]

where the restriction to \( t \geq 0 \) from the main paper has been abandoned.

In order to derive these results, our first task is to evaluate the ensemble average of Eq. (9). Recalling that \( \rho_{\mu\nu}^0 \) and \( A_{\mu\nu}^0 \) are fixed (independent of \( V \)), this amounts to averaging Eq. (10), i.e., we need to determine the average of a product of four \( U \) matrix elements (“fourth moments”). This calculation builds on the result for the “second moment” in (11), which we will derive for the considered random matrix ensemble in Sec. III by means of supersymmetry methods [1, 53, 54].

Moreover, for the random matrix ensembles introduced in Sec. mIV (namely, \( F(n) = 1 \) for all \( n > 0 \)), we will show that the function \( u(n) \) from (11) amounts to a Breit-Wigner distribution,

\[
u(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\Gamma / \varepsilon}{(\Gamma / 2\varepsilon)^2 + n^2},
\]

with \( \Gamma \) from (25), wherein \( \sigma_v^2 \) denotes the variance of the (off-diagonal) perturbation matrix elements as defined in (13). In addition, we will show that the same result (30) also applies to the banded random matrix ensembles introduced in Sec. mVII and Sec. I, as long as the perturbation is sufficiently weak so that \( \Gamma \ll \varepsilon B \), where \( B \) is the “first bandwidth” defined above Eq. (16). With respect to the small parameter \( s \) from (19) and (22), we can infer from (30) that

\[
s = u(0) = 2\varepsilon / \pi \Gamma.
\]

In particular, we thus recover the previously anticipated relation (20) between the small parameters \( s \) and \( \delta := \varepsilon / \Gamma \).

Finally, we will show that in the complementary regime of “not too weak perturbations”, the function \( u(n) \) from (11) is given by a semicircle distribution,

\[
u(n) = \frac{2\varepsilon^2}{\pi \gamma^2} \sqrt{\gamma^2 / \varepsilon^2 - n^2} \Theta(\gamma^2 / \varepsilon^2 - n^2),
\]

where \( \Theta(x) \) is the Heaviside step function and \( \gamma := \sqrt{8B^2} \lambda \sigma_v = \sqrt{4\varepsilon B^2 / \pi} \). More precisely, the perturbation must be so that \( \gamma \gg \varepsilon B' \), where \( B' \) denotes the “second bandwidth” from Eq. (16). The detailed derivation of these results by means of supersymmetry techniques is postponed to Sec. III B.

Using similar techniques and exploiting the symmetry properties of the unitary transformation matrices \( U_{mn} \), we then compute in Sec. III C their above mentioned “fourth moments”. For large bandwidths and to leading order in the small parameter \( s \) from (31), we eventually find for these moments the result

\[
[U_{\mu_1\mu_2} U_{\nu_1\nu_2} U_{\mu_1\nu_2}^* U_{\nu_1\mu_2}^*]_V = \delta_{\mu_1\nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2\nu_2} d_{\mu_1\mu_2}^{mn} + \delta_{\mu_1\nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2\nu_1} (\delta_{mn} d_{\mu_1\mu_2}^{mn} + f_{\mu_1\mu_2}^{mn})
\]

with

\[
d_{\mu_1\mu_2}^{mn} := u(m - \mu_1) u(n - \mu_2),
\]

\[
f_{\mu_1\mu_2}^{mn} := - \left( \frac{\Gamma / \varepsilon}{4\pi} \right) u(m - \mu_1) u(n - \mu_2) \frac{(\Gamma / \varepsilon)^2 + (\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2 + (m - n)^2 - (\mu_1 + \mu_2 - m - n)^2}{(m - \mu_2)^2 + (\Gamma / 2\varepsilon)^2} \frac{1}{[(n - \mu_1)^2 + (\Gamma / 2\varepsilon)^2]},
\]

and \( u(n) \) from (30). The numerical example in Fig. 7 indicates that the analytical approximation (33) actually seems to work surprisingly well already for relatively moderate values of the small parameter \( s \), or equivalently,
FIG. 7: Fourth moments $[U_{\mu_1\mu_2}^n U_{n_1,n_2}^* U_{\mu_1\mu_2}^n U_{n_1,n_2}^*]_V$ for various combinations of fixed and variable indices as indicated in the respective panels. Solid: Analytical approximation from (33). Dots: Numerical averages over $10^5$ randomly sampled perturbation matrices $V_{mn}^0$. The considered random matrix model is of the form (1), where $H_0$ exhibits $N = 512$ equidistant levels with level spacing $\varepsilon = 1$ (cf. (2)). The matrix elements $V_{mn}^0$ are independent random variables (apart from $(V_{mn}^0)^* = V_{nm}^0$). The diagonal elements $V_{m,m}^0$ are Gaussian distributed with zero mean and unit variance. For $m < n$, the real and imaginary parts of $V_{mn}^0$ are independent Gaussian distributed random variables with mean zero and variance $1/2$. The perturbation strength is $\lambda = 1.33$, implying $\sigma_e^2 = 1$, $\Gamma \simeq 11$, and $\Delta \simeq 0.06$ according to (13), (25) and (19), (30), respectively. The $y$-axes are scaled as specified in the top-left corner of each panel. In (a), the $d_{\mu_1,\mu_2}^{n_1,n_2}$ branch on the right hand side of (33) is probed as a function of $n_2$ or $\mu_1 = \nu_1$. Likewise, in (b) and (c) the $f_{\mu_1,\nu_2}^{n_1,n_2}$ branch is probed as a function of $n_2$ and $\mu_1 = \nu_2$, respectively.

for random matrix models of relatively moderate dimensions $N$.

In order to compute $[(A)_{\rho(t)}]_V$, we substitute the result (33) for the fourth moments into (10) to obtain the average $[W_{\mu_1,\mu_2}^{\rho(t)}(t)]_V$. Together with Eq. (5), we then find
The remaining sums over \( m \) and \( n \) can be further simplified by exploiting the fact that \( d^{mn}_{\mu \nu} \) and \( f^{mn}_{\mu \nu} \) are slowly varying functions of \( m \) and \( n \), as can be inferred from (30), (33b), (33c), and the fact that \( s = 2\varepsilon / \pi \Gamma \) is assumed to be a small parameter, i.e. \( \Gamma / \varepsilon \gg 1 \). As a consequence, we can approximate the above sums by integrals. More precisely, the first sum takes the form

\[
\sum_n d^{mn}_{\mu \nu} = \int dn \, u(n - \mu) \, u(n - \nu) = q(\mu - \nu),
\]

where we exploited (33b), (30), and (27). Turning to the second term in (34), we note that

\[
\sum_{m,n} e^{i(n-m) \varepsilon t} d^{mn}_{\mu \nu} = e^{i(\nu - \mu) \varepsilon t} |g(t)|^2,
\]

where

\[
g(t) := \sum_n e^{i n \varepsilon t} u(n),
\]

i.e., \( g(t) \) is the (discrete) Fourier transform of the function \( u(n) \) from (11). Approximating once again the sum by an integral and exploiting (30) yields

\[
g(t) = \int dn \, e^{i n \varepsilon t} u(n) = e^{-|t|/2}. \tag{38}
\]

We thus can conclude that the second term in (34) is given by the unperturbed behavior \( \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \) times the exponentially decaying function \( |g(t)|^2 = e^{-|t|} \). With respect to the remaining third term in (34), a similar (but somewhat longer) calculation yields the result

\[
\sum_{m,n} e^{i(n-m) \varepsilon t} f^{mn}_{\mu \nu} = -e^{-|t|/2} (\mu - \nu) \left[ \frac{e^{-i(\mu - \nu) \varepsilon t}}{2\pi(\mu - \nu)} \left( 1 + \frac{\epsilon^i(\mu - \nu) \varepsilon t}{(\mu - \nu) \varepsilon} \right) + \frac{\epsilon^i(\mu - \nu) \varepsilon t}{(\mu - \nu) \varepsilon} \right] \tag{39}
\]

with \( \text{sgn}(t) := t/|t| \). Collecting all terms one readily recovers (24)-(29).

### B. Fluctuations about the ensemble average

In this subsection, we will argue that the time-dependent expectation values \( \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \) for one particular, randomly sampled expectation perturbation \( V \) is practically indistinguishable from the ensemble-averaged behavior (24), at least for the vast majority of all members of the \( V \) ensemble. To this end, we consider, for a fixed \( V \), the deviation

\[
\xi(t) := \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} - \langle \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V \tag{40}
\]

of the expectation value \( \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \) from the average \( \langle \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V \). (Note that \( \xi(t) \) still depends on \( V \), but for the sake of simplicity we desired from explicitly indicating this dependence.) To show that \( \xi(t) \) is negligibly small for the overwhelming majority of \( V \)'s, the main task will be to establish an upper bound for the variance

\[
\langle \langle \xi^2 \rangle \rangle_V = \left[ \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)}^2 \right]_V - \left[ \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \right]_V^2 \tag{41}
\]

As detailed in Sec. V below, our pertinent key result is the estimate

\[
\langle \langle \xi^2 \rangle \rangle_V \leq c s \| A \|^2, \tag{42}
\]

where \( s \) is our small parameter from (19) and (22), \( \| A \| \) is the operator norm of \( A \), and \( c \) is some positive real number which does not depend on any further details of the considered system. (In particular, it is independent of \( s \), \( A \), \( \rho(0) \), and of the perturbation strength \( \lambda \) in (1)). Very roughly speaking, we can estimate \( c \) to be at most on the order of \( 10^3 \).

Since \( s \) in (42) is exponentially small in the degrees of freedom according to (22), it is reasonable to expect that...
for most $V$’s the deviations $\xi(t)$ in (40) will be negligibly small in comparison with other unavoidable inaccuracies, for instance due to experimental resolution limits, statistical fluctuations and finite size effects in numerical simulations, and so on.

More precisely, by invoking the Chebyshev inequality from probability theory, one can infer from (42) that, for any $\kappa > 0$,

$$\text{Prob}\left( |\xi(t)| \leq \kappa \|A\| \right) \geq 1 - (cs/\kappa)^2,$$

(43)

where the left hand side denotes the probability that $|\xi(t)| \leq \kappa \|A\|$ when randomly sampling $V$’s from the ensemble under consideration. Choosing, for instance, $\kappa = \sqrt{2}$, it follows with (22) that the deviation in (41) will indeed be negligibly small with a probability very close to unity, i.e., in the vast majority of cases when randomly sampling $V$’s from the ensemble.

Until now, the time $t$ in (40)-(43) was tacitly considered as arbitrary but fixed. Our next goal is to generalize these statements for single time points to entire time intervals. To this end, the two essential observations are that the right hand side of (42) is independent of $t$ and that averaging over $V$ and integrating over $t$ are commuting operations. Focusing on the quantities

$$D := [d_V]_t',$$

$$d_V := \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \xi^2(t),$$

(44)

(45)

one therefore can readily infer from (42) that

$$D \leq cs \|A\|^2$$

(46)

for arbitrary $t_2 > t_1 \geq 0$. Since $d_V \geq 0$ one can conclude (similarly as above, or by invoking the Markov inequality from probability theory) that also the quantity $d_V$ must be very small for the vast majority of all $V$’s. For all members of this vast majority, it follows with (45) that also the integrand $\xi^2(t)$ itself must be very small for the vast majority of all $t \in [t_1, t_2]$. For all those times $t$ it follows that also the deviation in (40) must remain negligibly small (for sufficiently small $s$). Since this conclusion applies to any given time interval $[t_1, t_2]$, we can say that

$$\langle A \rangle_{p(t)} = \langle \langle A \rangle_{p(t)} \rangle_V$$

(47)

amounts to a very good approximation for the vast majority of all perturbations $V$ and times $t$. (For most $V$’s, the deviations are either negligibly small or negligibly rare.) In particular, the approximation is expected to apply to the “true” (non-random) $V$ of actual interest, provided its essential features were well captured by the chosen random matrix ensemble (see also Secs. mI and Sec. mIV in the main paper).

III. EIGENVECTOR CORRELATIONS FROM SUPERSYMMETRY

In this section, we derive the results (30) and (32) for the “second moments” (11), and the corresponding results (33a)-(33c) for the “fourth moments”, solving the pertinent random matrix problem by means of supersymmetry methods. We lay out the general procedure in Sec. III A before presenting the explicit calculations for the second and fourth moments in Secs. III B and III C, respectively.

Throughout this section we tacitly restrict ourselves to matrices with complex-valued off-diagonals $V^0_{mn}$ (see also discussion below Eq. (15)). The case of purely real matrices is recovered by combining the results from [30] with the approach from Sec. IV below.

A. Outline of the method

In this subsection, we sketch the general methodology on which the more detailed calculations in the subsequent Secs. III B and III C are based.

During most of the actual calculation, we choose a Hilbert space of large, but finite dimension $N$ so that $H_0$, $V$, and $H$ in (1) amount to $(N \times N)$ matrices (in the eigenbasis of $H_0$). Eventually, we will let $N \to \infty$ while keeping both the perturbation strength $\lambda$ and the average level spacing $\varepsilon$ fixed. In the considered ensemble of these Hamiltonians (1), $H_0$ is fixed and $V$ is a Hermitian and possibly sparse and/or banded random matrix distributed according to (17) (in the eigenbasis of $H_0$).

a. Eigenvector overlaps from resolvents. As pointed out in Sec. mIV as well as in Sec. II A, the key task is to evaluate the ensemble average over products of $U$ matrix elements (4). Such products can be expressed in terms of the resolvent or Green’s function of the Hamiltonian $H = H_0 + \lambda V$, defined as the operator $G(z) := (z - H)^{-1}$. To do so, we choose an arbitrary but fixed energy level $E_n$ of $H$ and consider the matrix element $G^0_{\nu\mu}(E_n \pm i\eta) := \langle \nu | G(E_n \pm i\eta) | \mu \rangle$, yielding

$$G^0_{\nu\mu}(E_n \pm i\eta) = \sum_m \frac{E_n - E_m \mp i\eta}{(E_n - E_m)^2 + \eta^2} U_{m\nu} U^*_{m\mu}. \quad (48)$$

Provided that the averaged overlaps $[U_{m\nu} U^*_{m\mu}]_V$ are sufficiently slowly varying with $m$, so that sums over $m$ can be approximated by integrals, we then can conclude that

$$[U_{m\nu} U^*_{m\mu}]_V = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\pi} \lim_{\eta \to 0^+} \left[ G^0_{\nu\mu}(E_n - i\eta) - G^0_{\nu\mu}(E_n + i\eta) \right],$$

(49)

and similarly for higher-order moments. Hence we can express the product of two eigenvector overlaps in terms of the advanced and retarded resolvents $G^0_{\nu\mu}(E_n - i\eta)$ and $G^0_{\nu\mu}(E_n + i\eta)$, respectively. For the fourth-order moments, we simply combine two such second-order expressions (details will be given in Sec. III C).
The advantage of the resolvent formalism is that the matrix elements of $G(z)$ can be expressed as a Gaussian integral with kernel $G^{-1}(z) = z - H$. Introducing the abbreviation $z^{\pm} := E \pm i\eta$ with $E \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\eta > 0$ for the argument of the retarded and advanced resolvents, the resolvent matrix element can be written as

$$G_{\nu\mu}^{0}(z^{\pm}) = \frac{\mp i \det(z^{\pm} - H)}{(2\pi i)^{N}} \int \left[ \prod_{\alpha} dx_{\alpha} dx_{\alpha}^{*} \right] x_{\nu} x_{\mu}^{*} \times \exp \left\{ \pm i \sum_{\alpha,\beta} x_{\alpha}^{*} \left( z^{\pm} \delta_{\alpha\beta} - H_{\alpha\beta}^{0} \right) x_{\beta} \right\},$$

where $H_{\alpha\beta}^{0} := \langle \alpha | H | \beta \rangle_{0}$, and the choice of the sign in the argument of the exponential ensures convergence since $\eta > 0$. The normalization factor $\det(z^{\pm} - H)$, and even more so its average, are in general hard to compute because $z^{\pm} - H$ is a high-dimensional matrix. Nevertheless, it can be expressed conveniently by extending the Gaussian integral to anticommuting numbers.

### b. Supersymmetry method

Our method of choice for the evaluation of average resolvents uses so-called supersymmetry techniques [1, 53–56]. The underlying concept of graded algebras and vector spaces introduces a set of anticommuting or Grassmann numbers $\chi_{1}, \chi_{2}, \ldots$, with the defining property that $\chi_{i} \chi_{j} = -\chi_{j} \chi_{i}$ for any two such elements. The above cited references provide an introduction to the linear algebra and calculus on the resulting superspaces.

The crucial observation is that for a Gaussian integral similar to (50), if performed over Grassmannian, anticommuting numbers $\chi_{\alpha}$ and $\chi_{\alpha}^{*}$, we obtain

$$\int \left[ \prod_{\alpha} d\chi_{\alpha} d\chi_{\alpha}^{*} \right] \exp \left\{ i \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \chi_{\alpha} \left( z^{\pm} \delta_{\alpha\beta} - H_{\alpha\beta}^{0} \right) \chi_{\beta} \right\} = i^{N} \det(z^{\pm} - H)$$

where our normalization for the Grassmann integral is \( \int d\chi^{*} \chi \chi^{*} = 1 \). Combining (50) and (51), we can thus write

$$G_{\nu\mu}^{0}(z^{\pm}) = \mp i \int \left[ \prod_{\alpha} dx_{\alpha} dx_{\alpha}^{*} \right] x_{\nu} x_{\mu}^{*} \times \exp \left\{ i \sum_{\alpha,\beta} x_{\alpha}^{*} \left( z^{\pm} \delta_{\alpha\beta} - H_{\alpha\beta}^{0} \right) x_{\beta} \right\} + \chi_{\alpha} \left( z^{\pm} \delta_{\alpha\beta} - H_{\alpha\beta} \right) \chi_{\beta} \right\}. \quad (52)$$

To condense the notation, we introduce a supervector $X := (X_{1} \cdots X_{N})^{T}$ with

$$X_{\alpha} := \begin{pmatrix} x_{\alpha} \\ \chi_{\alpha} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (53)$$

In the following, we will refer to the commuting component $X_{\alpha B} := x_{\alpha}$ as the **bosonic** part, and to the anticommuting component $X_{\alpha F} := \chi_{\alpha}$ as the **fermionic** part of the supervector $X_{\alpha}$. Similarly, for a supermatrix $M$, we use the notation $M_{BB}$ to address the bosonic-bosonic sector, and consequently $M_{BF}$ for the bosonic-fermionic, $M_{FB}$ for the fermionic-bosonic, and $M_{FF}$ for the fermionic-fermionic sectors. Using the above definition of $X$, we can then express (52) as

$$G_{\nu\mu}^{0}(z^{\pm}) = \mp i \int \left[ dX dX^{*} \right] x_{\nu} x_{\mu}^{*} e^{iX^{\dagger} \left[ (z^{\pm} z_{N} - H^{\pm}) \otimes L^{\pm} \right] X},$$

Here, $z_{N}$ denotes the identity operator of the $N$-dimensional Hilbert space, $L^{\pm} := \text{diag}(\pm 1, 1)$ operates in superspace, and $[dX dX^{*}] := \prod_{\alpha} dx_{\alpha} dx_{\alpha}^{*} d\chi_{\alpha} d\chi_{\alpha}^{*}$ for short. Henceforth, we will omit the identity operators and Kronecker products if dimensionality and target space are clear from the context. In particular, $z^{\pm} - H$ is trivial in superspace whereas $L^{\pm}$ is trivial in Hilbert space. To obtain the average over all perturbations, we then have to integrate over the distribution (17) of $V$, i.e.

$$[G_{\nu\mu}^{0}(z^{\pm})]_{V} = \mp i \int \left[ dV \right] \int \left[ dX dX^{*} \right] \left( \frac{dX dX^{*}}{(2\pi i)^{N}} \right) P(V) x_{\nu} x_{\mu}^{*} \times e^{iX^{\dagger} \left[ (z^{\pm} H_{0} - \lambda V) \right] X}. \quad (55)$$

The necessary modifications for the computation of the fourth moment (33), involving products of two resolvents, will be further discussed in Sec. III C.

#### c. Outline of the algorithm

The general procedure to evaluate expressions like Eq. (55) involves the following steps: First, we integrate over the matrix elements $T^{\alpha\beta}$ of the perturbation $V$, which can be carried out straightforwardly as the integrals are of Gaussian type due to a (generalized) central limit theorem. The remaining superintegrals then involves an exponent of fourth order in the supervector $X$. Therefore, second, we invoke a Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation [53, 57, 58] by introducing an auxiliary integral over a supermatrix. Thereby, we reduce the dependence on $X$ in the exponent to second order. This allows us, third, to perform the (now Gaussian) integral over the supervector $X$. Fourth and last, we evaluate the remaining integral over the Hubbard-Stratonovich supermatrix by means of a saddle-point approximation, making use of the large dimensionality $N$ of the considered Hilbert space. In the end, we thus obtain explicit expressions for (products of) averaged resolvents, which give us access to the averaged eigenvector overlap products according to Eq. (49).

### B. Second moment

In this subsection, we derive expressions (30) and (32) for the function $u(n)$ characterizing the average of two eigenvector overlaps in the limiting cases of large and...
small perturbation bandwidths, respectively. To this end, we compute the average of the second moment (49) by calculating the average resolvents (55).

\[
\left[ e^{-i\lambda X^\dagger L^\pm V X} \right]_V = \left[ e^{-i\lambda \left[ \sum_{\alpha} X^\dagger_{\alpha} L^\pm X_{\alpha} V^0_{\alpha\alpha} + \sum_{\alpha<\beta} (X^\dagger_{\alpha} L^\pm X_{\beta} + X^\dagger_{\beta} L^\pm X_{\alpha})(\text{Re}V^0_{\alpha\beta}) + \sum_{\alpha<\beta} (X^\dagger_{\alpha} L^\pm X_{\beta} - X^\dagger_{\beta} L^\pm X_{\alpha})(\text{Im}V^0_{\alpha\beta}) \right] } \right]_V. \tag{56}
\]

Recalling the definition of \( \sigma_{\alpha\alpha} \) from (13), and introducing \( Y_{\alpha} := \sigma_{\alpha\alpha} X^\dagger_{\alpha} L^\pm X_{\alpha} /2 \) and \( Y_{\alpha\beta} := \sigma_{\alpha\beta} X^\dagger_{\alpha} L^\pm X_{\beta} \), the exponent \( X^\dagger L^\pm V X \) on the left hand side of (56) can be rewritten as \( Z + Z^* \), where

\[
Z := \sum_{\alpha} Y_{\alpha} \frac{V^0_{\alpha\alpha}}{\sigma_{\alpha\alpha}} + \sum_{\alpha<\beta} Y_{\alpha\beta} \frac{V^0_{\alpha\beta}}{\sigma_{\alpha\beta}}. \tag{57}
\]

In other words, \( Z \) amounts to a weighted sum of \( N(N-1)/2 \) independent random variables \( V^0_{\alpha\beta}/\sigma_{\alpha\beta} \) of zero mean and unit variance. According to the central limit theorem, we thus can conclude that \( Z \) approaches, for large \( N \), a Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance \( Y^2 := \sum_{\alpha} Y_{\alpha}^2 + \sum_{\alpha<\beta}|Y_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \), and analogously for \( X^\dagger L^\pm V X = Z + Z^* \).

Since all random variables \( V^0_{\alpha\beta} \) only occur in combina-

tions of the form (57) in the average resolvent (55), only the limiting distribution of \( Z \) actually matters. Hence, we may approximate the distributions \( P_{\mu\nu}(v) \) from Eq. (14) by any other distributions with the same values of the mean and variance (since they lead, for a given \( X \), to the same limiting distribution for \( Z \)). In particular, we may use

\[
P_{\alpha\alpha}(v) = \frac{e^{-v^2/2\sigma_{\alpha\alpha}^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_{\alpha\alpha}} \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\alpha\beta}(v) = \frac{e^{-|v|^2/2\sigma_{\alpha\beta}^2}}{\pi(\sigma_{\alpha\beta})^2} \quad (\alpha < \beta),
\]

approximating each matrix element by a normal distribution (with real argument \( v \) for \( \alpha = \beta \) and complex \( v \) for \( \alpha < \beta \)). Evaluating the integrals over all \( V^0_{\alpha\beta} \) (\( \alpha \leq \beta \)) in (55), which factorize because all matrix elements are independent, we then obtain

\[
[G_{\nu\mu}(z^\pm)]_V = \mp i \int \frac{[dX[dX^*]}{(2\pi)^N} x_\nu x^*_\mu \exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} (\sigma_{\alpha\beta})^2 \text{str} \left[ X_{\alpha} X^\dagger_{\alpha} L^\pm X_{\beta} X^\dagger_{\beta} L^\pm \right] + i \sum_{\alpha} (z^\pm - E^0_{\alpha}) X^\dagger_{\alpha} L^\pm X_{\alpha} \right\},
\]

where \( \text{str} \) denotes the supertrace, i.e., \( \text{str} M = \text{Tr}M_{BB} - \text{Tr}M_{FF} \) for a supermatrix \( M \).

For later use, we also note here that the integrand is invariant under a transformation \( X \mapsto TX, X^\dagger \mapsto X^\dagger T^\dagger \) for any (pseudo)unitary \( T \) which satisfies \( T^\dagger L^\pm T = L^\pm \).

\[b. \text{Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation.} \]

As outlined at the end of Sec. III A, our next step is a supersymmetric Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation \([53, 57, 58]\) to get rid of the fourth-order term in \( X \) in the exponent of (59). To do so, we introduce a set of \((2 \times 2)\) supermatrices \( R_{\alpha} \),

\[
R_{\alpha} := \begin{pmatrix} r_{\alpha 1} & \rho_{\alpha} \\ \rho_{\alpha}^* & r_{\alpha 2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{60}
\]

with real numbers \( r_{\alpha 1}, r_{\alpha 2} \) and anticommuting \( \rho_{\alpha}, \rho_{\alpha}^* \). The choice of an imaginary FF entry ensures convergence of the following integral. Namely, the Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation is then based on the identity \([1]\)

\[
\int \frac{[dR]}{(2\pi)^N} \exp \left\{ -\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{(\sigma_{\alpha\beta})^2}{2} \text{str} (R_{\alpha} R_{\beta}) + i \sum_{\alpha} \text{str} \left( R_{\alpha} X_{\alpha} X^\dagger_{\alpha} L^\pm \right) \right\}
\]

\[
= \exp \left\{ -\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{\lambda^2 (\sigma_{\alpha\beta})^2}{2} \text{str} \left( X_{\alpha} X^\dagger_{\alpha} L^\pm X_{\beta} X^\dagger_{\beta} L^\pm \right) \right\}, \tag{61}
\]
where $\sigma^{-2}$ is the inverse of the Hilbert space matrix $\sigma^2$ with entries $(\sigma^2)_{\alpha\beta} := (\sigma_{\alpha\beta})^2$. Moreover, $|dR| := \prod_{\alpha} dR_{\alpha}$ denotes the collective measure of all $R_{\alpha}$ with $dR_{\alpha} = d\nu_{\alpha}d\nu_{\alpha}^\dagger d\rho_{\alpha} d\rho_{\alpha}^\dagger$. Substituting (61) into (59), we obtain

$$[G_{\nu\mu}^0(z^\pm)]_V = \mp i \int \frac{|dR|}{(2\pi)^N} \int \frac{|dX dX^\ast|}{(2\pi)^N} x_{\nu} x_{\mu}^\ast \exp \left\{ -\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{(\sigma^{-2})_{\alpha\beta}}{2\lambda^2} \text{str}(R_{\alpha} R_{\beta}) + i \sum_{\alpha} X_{\alpha}^\dagger L^\pm (R_{\alpha} + z^\pm - E_{\alpha}^0) X_{\alpha} \right\}. \tag{62}$$

Comparing Eqs. (59) and (62), we observe that the Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation essentially identifies $R_{\alpha} \sim X_{\alpha} X_{\alpha}^\dagger L^\pm$. The integral over the supervector $X$ in (62) now has a Gaussian structure. Therefore, we can evaluate it straightforwardly to find

$$[G_{\nu\mu}^0(z^\pm)]_V = \delta_{\nu\mu} \int \frac{|dR|}{(2\pi)^N} \left[ (R_{\mu} + z^\pm - E_{\mu}^0)^{-1} \right]_{BB} \exp \left\{ -\sum_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{(\sigma^{-2})_{\alpha\beta}}{2\lambda^2} \text{str}(R_{\alpha} R_{\beta}) \right\} \prod_{\alpha} \text{sdet} (R_{\alpha} + z^\pm - E_{\alpha}^0)^{-1}, \tag{63}$$

where $\text{sdet} M$ denotes the superdeterminant of $M$. Using the relation $\text{sdet} M = \exp(\text{str} \ln M)$, we can move these superdeterminants to the exponent, leading to

$$[G_{\nu\mu}^0(z^\pm)]_V = \delta_{\nu\mu} \int \frac{|dR|}{(2\pi)^N} \left[ (R_{\mu} + z^\pm - E_{\mu}^0)^{-1} \right]_{BB} \exp \left\{ -\text{str} \left[ \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \frac{(\sigma^{-2})_{\alpha\beta}}{2\lambda^2} R_{\alpha} R_{\beta} + \sum_{\alpha} \ln (R_{\alpha} + z^\pm - E_{\alpha}^0) \right] \right\}. \tag{64}$$

c. **Saddle-point approximation.** Keeping in mind the huge dimension $N$ of the considered Hilbert space and the fact that we will eventually take the limit $N \to \infty$, the remaining integral over the supermatrices $R_{\alpha}$ can be evaluated using a saddle-point approximation [1, 56, 59].

The reason is that the exponent in (64) is a sum of terms similar in form, so that the exponential is strongly peaked around the global maximum of the real part of its argument and/or highly oscillatory except at points where its imaginary part becomes stationary. Hence the dominant contributions arise from the steepest saddle points in the complex, multidimensional $R$ plane, where the first variation of the exponent vanishes. Computing this first variation and multiplying by the matrix $\lambda^2 \sigma^2$, we obtain the saddle-point equation

$$R_{\mu} + \lambda^2 \sum_{\alpha} (\sigma_{\mu\alpha})^2 (R_{\alpha} + z^\pm - E_{\alpha}^0)^{-1} = 0. \tag{65}$$

To find the saddle points, we first look for diagonal solutions of this equation and consider one component $\hat{R}(E_{\mu}^0, z^\pm)$ of $R_{\mu}$, explicitly indicating the dependence of the solution on both the unperturbed and perturbed energy levels. Any further solutions can be generated from diagonal ones by means of the (pseudo)unitary symmetry transformation introduced below Eq. (59) [1]. Next, we substitute the variances $(\sigma_{\alpha\beta})^2$ according to Eq. (13) with $F(n)$ as specified there, and we make use of the assumption that the energy levels are very dense and approximately uniformly distributed, so that the density of states is essentially $\varepsilon^{-1}$ (cf. (2)). Hence, we can approximate the sum on the right-hand side of (65) by an integral and arrive at

$$\hat{R}(E_{\mu}^0, z^\pm) + \int \frac{dE}{\varepsilon} \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{z^\pm - E + \hat{R}(E, z^\pm)} F(|E|/\varepsilon) = 0. \tag{66}$$

In fact, given the assumed homogeneity of the spectrum, the solution will only depend on the energy difference $z^\pm - E_{\mu}$, i.e., $\hat{R}(E_{\mu}^0, z^\pm)$ can be rewritten in the form $\hat{R}(z^\pm - E_{\mu}^0)$. This simplifies the equation further, resulting in the convolution-type relation

$$\hat{R}(z^\pm) + \int \frac{dE}{\varepsilon} \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{z^\pm - E + \hat{R}(z^\pm - E)} = 0. \tag{67}$$

Unfortunately, no general solution to the saddle-point equation (67) is known to us. However, analytic solutions are available in the limiting cases of large and small bandwidth (or, equivalently, weak and strong perturbations).

d. **Large perturbation bandwidth.** Provided that the typical scale of the integrand in Eq. (67) is much smaller than $\varepsilon B$, where $B$ is the bandwidth introduced above Eq. (16), the band profile is essentially constant in the relevant regime, $F(|E|/\varepsilon) \approx 1$. Using this approximation in the corresponding integral, we find

$$\int \frac{dE}{\varepsilon} \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{z^\pm - E + \hat{R}(z^\pm - E)} \approx \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon} \int \frac{dE}{z^\pm - E + \hat{R}(z^\pm - E)}. \tag{68}$$

Substituting into Eq. (67), we find that the equation has a constant solution $\hat{R}(z^\pm) = \hat{r}^\pm$ because

$$PV \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{z^\pm - E + \hat{r}^\pm} = \mp i \pi \tag{69}$$

if $\text{Im} r^+ > 0$ and $\text{Im} r^- < 0$, meaning that the imaginary parts of $r^+$ and $z^\pm$ have to have the same sign so that the integrand does not become singular. Note that we evaluated the integral in the principal-value sense as indicated
by the symbol ‘PV’. Hence, for a large bandwidth $B$, a solution to (65) is given by

$$ R_{\mu} := R^{\pm 1} = i \Gamma 1/2 \quad \text{with} \quad \Gamma := \frac{2 \pi \lambda^2 \sigma^2}{\varepsilon} \quad (70) $$

for all $\mu$. We point out that this result may also be extrapolated from the discrete saddle-point equation (65) in the limit $N \to \infty$. The self-consistency condition for the large-bandwidth approximation, meaning that the integrand in (67) is slowly varying compared to the band profile, becomes $\Gamma / \varepsilon \ll B$ as stated above Eq. (m20) and below Eq. (30). Furthermore, we observe that the solution (70) does not lie on the original contour of integration in (61), see also (60). However, the contour can be adjusted accordingly by shifting $r_1 \mapsto r_1 \pm i \Gamma / 2$, which is allowed because the poles in the integrand at $r_1 = E_\alpha - z^\pm$ all lie on the same side of the real axis, below it for ‘+’ and above it for ‘−’, respectively.

As mentioned below Eq. (65), any further solutions of the saddle-point equation can be generated from the diagonal one by means of symmetry transformations $T$ satisfying $T^T L \pm T = L \pm$. From the Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation (61), we understand that the supermatrix $R$ transforms as $R \mapsto T R T^{-1}$ under this symmetry. But since the solution $R_{\mu}$ from (70) is proportional to the unit matrix, all transformed solutions collapse back onto the diagonal one, so that this is indeed the only solution of (65). We remark that this will be manifestly different when computing the fourth moment in Sec. III C. Furthermore, one also verifies straightforwardly that the self-consistency condition for the narrow-band approximation stated below Eq. (32), namely $\gamma / \varepsilon \gg B'$, hence the full diagonal saddle-point solution becomes $R_{\mu} := \hat{R}(z^\pm - E_\mu^0) \mathbb{1}$. For the same reasons as in the large-bandwidth approximation, this is the only solution and the integral (64) becomes

$$ [G^0_{\nu \mu}(z^\pm)]_V = \delta_{\mu \nu} \frac{2}{\gamma^2} \left( z^\pm - E_\mu^0 \mp i \sqrt{\gamma^2 - (z^\pm - E_\mu^0)^2} \right). \quad (75) $$

Using Eqs. (2) and (49) again, the second moment then reads $[U_{n \mu} U^*_{n \nu}]_V = \delta_{\mu \nu} u(n-\mu)$ with $u(n)$ specified in Eq. (32).

C. Fourth moment

In this subsection, we derive expression (33) for the fourth moment of eigenvector overlaps. As some of the steps are straightforward generalizations of the calculation of the second moment in Sec. III B, the presentation will be tightened in these places. Moreover, we immediately assume a normal distribution (58) for the perturbation matrix elements $V^0_{\mu \nu}$ because the general case of sparse and banded perturbations can be reduced to this effective model as sketched in Sec. III B. In addition, we only consider the case of a large perturbation bandwidth, which is the physically most relevant scenario for generic many-body systems. More precisely, as the large bandwidth limit essentially amounts to a full random matrix (cf. Sec. III B), we will assume right from the beginning that the variance $(\sigma_{\mu \nu})^2 = \sigma^2 = 1$ for all $V^0_{\mu \nu}$ and control the interaction strength by the parameter $\lambda$.

e. Small perturbation bandwidth. The second limiting case for which the saddle-point equation (67) can be solved analytically is that of a narrow band profile. More precisely, the bandwidth $B'$ from Eq. (16) is supposed to be small compared to the typical scale of the integrand in (67), where bounds for the validity of this approximation will again be given a posteriori. In this case, we can approximate $\hat{R}(z^\pm - E)$ in the integrand by its central value $\hat{R}(z^\pm)$. Approximating the sum on the right hand side of (16) by an integral, we thus arrive at the following quadratic algebraic equation

$$ \hat{R}(z^\pm)^2 + z^\pm \hat{R}(z^\pm) + 2 B' \lambda^2 \sigma^2 = 0. \quad (73) $$

From this we conclude that

$$ \hat{R}(z^\pm) = \frac{1}{2} \left( -z^\pm \pm i \sqrt{\gamma^2 - (z^\pm)^2} \right) \quad (74) $$

with $\gamma := \sqrt{8 B' \lambda \sigma}$. The choice of the sign in front of the square root in (74) already corresponds to the required choice to match the imaginary part of $z^\pm$ as can be seen by substituting (74) into (67) and noticing that the integrand would exhibit a pole otherwise. Moreover, this substitution allows us to extract the self-consistency condition for the narrow-band approximation stated below Eq. (32), namely $\gamma / \varepsilon \gg B'$. Hence the full diagonal saddle-point solution becomes $R_{\mu} := \hat{R}(z^\pm - E_\mu^0) \mathbb{1}$. For the same reasons as in the large-bandwidth approximation, this is the only solution and the integral (64) becomes

$$ [G^0_{\nu \mu}(z^\pm)]_V = \delta_{\mu \nu} \frac{2}{\gamma^2} \left( z^\pm - E_\mu^0 \mp i \sqrt{\gamma^2 - (z^\pm - E_\mu^0)^2} \right). \quad (75) $$

Using Eqs. (2) and (49) again, the second moment then reads $[U_{n \mu} U^*_{n \nu}]_V = \delta_{\mu \nu} u(n-\mu)$ with $u(n)$ specified in Eq. (32).
(ii) be complex conjugated upon \( \mu_1 \leftrightarrow \nu_1 \) and \( \mu_2 \leftrightarrow \nu_2 \).

Second, the fourth moment must relate to the second moment (72) when tracing out eigenvectors of the unperturbed or perturbed Hamiltonians. Hence the result should

(iii) reduce to the second moment when summing over \( n_1 \) or \( n_2 \), i.e.

\[
\sum_{n_1} [U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1}^* U_{n_2 \nu_2}^*]V = \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} [U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_2 \nu_2}^*]V;
\]

(77)

(iv) reduce to the second moment when summing over \( \mu_1 = \nu_2 \) or \( \mu_2 = \nu_1 \), i.e.

\[
\sum_{\mu_1, \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_2} [U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1}^* U_{n_2 \nu_2}^*]V = \delta_{n_1 n_2} [U_{n_1 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1}^*]V.
\]

Furthermore, the Gaussian distribution of the perturbation matrix elements together with the Isserlis (or Wick) theorem (see also Secs. IV A and IV C below) imply that we always need to pair up factors of \( U \) and \( U^* \). This will become obvious in the explicit calculations below. In any case, it already affirms the general structure (33a) with \( \eta_{\mu_1 \mu_2} \) and \( f_{\mu_1 \nu_2} \) to be determined.

To compute the correlator (76), we proceed as for the second moment and aim at extracting it from the product of average resolvents similarly to (49). As we are dealing with a product of four overlap matrices now, we have to consider products of two resolvents. A crucial observation is that we need to distinguish the cases \( n_1 = n_2 \) (single eigenvector) and \( n_1 \neq n_2 \) (two distinct eigenvectors).

b. Resolvent approach: single eigenvector. In the first case, \( n_1 = n_2 = n \), we perform similar steps as those leading to Eq. (49) to express the fourth-order overlap in terms of resolvents, yielding

\[
-\frac{8\pi^2}{e^2} [U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1}^* U_{n_2 \nu_2}^*]V = \lim_{\eta \to 0^+} \{ [G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_1} (z^+) C^0_{\nu_2 \mu_2} (z^+)] + [G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_1} (z^-) C^0_{\nu_2 \mu_2} (z^+)] + [G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_1} (z^-) C^0_{\nu_2 \mu_2} (z^-)] + [G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_1} (z^-) C^0_{\nu_2 \mu_2} (z^-)] \}
\]

(79)

Here \( z^\pm := E_n \pm i\eta \) as in Sec. III B. The symmetrization in the Greek indices becomes necessary because such symmetrized combinations of resolvents are the only quantities that can be computed as Gaussian integrals if the argument of both factors is the same. Indeed, the corresponding integral is essentially the same as in Eq. (54) except that we have four factors of \( x \) in the integrand now to account for the fourth moment. Therefore,

\[
\int \frac{dX dX^*}{(2\pi)^N} x_{\nu_1} x_{\nu_2} x_{\mu_1}^* x_{\mu_2}^* e^{ix^\dagger L^+ (z^+-H) x} = G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_1} (z^+) G^0_{\nu_2 \mu_2} (z^+) + G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_2} (z^-) G^0_{\nu_2 \mu_1} (z^-),
\]

(80)

and similarly for \( z^- \), where the right-hand side was obtained using the Isserlis/Wick theorem. Averaging Eq. (80) over the ensemble of perturbations works analogously to the calculation of the second moment in Sec. III B, except that we now have four factors \( x_{\nu_1} x_{\nu_2} x_{\mu_1}^* x_{\mu_2}^* \) in the integrand instead of two. When going from the equivalent of Eq. (62) to the equivalent of Eq. (64), we need to use the Isserlis/Wick theorem again and obtain two inverse matrix elements in the remaining superintegral over the Hubbard-Stratonovich matrix \( R \),

\[
\begin{align*}
[G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_1} (z^+) C^0_{\nu_2 \mu_2} (z^+) + G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_2} (z^-) C^0_{\nu_2 \mu_1} (z^+)]V &= (\delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} + \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1}) \int \frac{dR}{2\pi} (R + z^+ - E^0_{\mu_1})^{-1}_{\mathrm{BB}} (R + z^- - E^0_{\mu_2})^{-1}_{\mathrm{BB}} \exp \left\{ -\mathrm{str} \left[ \frac{R^2}{2\lambda^2} + \sum_\alpha \ln (R + z^+ - E^0_{\alpha}) \right] \right\}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

(81)

Note that due to the constant variance \( \langle \sigma_{\mu \nu} \rangle^2 = 1 \) of the perturbation matrix elements assumed in this subsection, a single Hubbard-Stratonovich matrix \( R \) of the form (60) suffices in the transformation (61). Computing the \( R \)-integral by means of a saddle-point approximation works completely analogously, so that we eventually find

\[
(G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_1} (z^+) C^0_{\nu_2 \mu_2} (z^+) + G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_2} (z^-) C^0_{\nu_2 \mu_1} (z^-))V = \frac{\delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} + \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1}}{(z^+ - E^0_{\mu_1} + i\Gamma/2) (z^+ - E^0_{\mu_2} + i\Gamma/2)}. \]

(82a)
\[
[G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z^+)G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z^-) + G_{\nu_1 \mu_2}^0(z^-)G_{\nu_2 \mu_1}^0(z^+)]V = \frac{\delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} + \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1}}{(z^+ - E_{\mu_1}^0 - i\Gamma/2)(z^- - E_{\mu_2}^0 - i\Gamma/2)}. \quad (82b)
\]

In the remaining terms in Eq. (79), the resolvents are evaluated at distinct arguments \(z^+\) and \(z^-\) in the products, e.g., \(G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z^+)G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z^-)\). In this case, the calculation parallels the one for distinct eigenvectors, to which we will turn next.

c. Resolvent approach: distinct eigenvectors. If the perturbed eigenvectors \(|n_1\rangle\) and \(|n_2\rangle\) in Eq. (76) are distinct, \(n_1 \neq n_2\), the product of overlap matrices can be expressed in terms of the retarded and advanced resolvents by multiplying two expressions of the form (49).

Defining \(z_k := E_{n_k} \pm i\eta\), we obtain

\[
-\frac{4\pi^2}{\varepsilon^2} \left\langle U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} V^\ast_{n_1 \nu_1} V_{n_2 \nu_2} \right\rangle V = \lim_{\eta \to 0^+} \left\{ [G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z_1^+)G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z_2^-) + G_{\nu_1 \mu_2}^0(z_1^-)G_{\nu_2 \mu_1}^0(z_2^+)]V - [G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z_1^+)G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z_2^-) + G_{\nu_1 \mu_2}^0(z_1^-)G_{\nu_2 \mu_1}^0(z_2^+)]V \right\}.
\]

(83)

There is a decisive difference between the terms in the first line and the ones in the second line of this relation. In the first line, the imaginary parts of the argument of the two factors in each resolvent product are the same, so that we have a product of two retarded or two advanced resolvents. In contrast, the terms in the second line each involve one retarded and one advanced resolvent.

We inspect the first kind with energies shifted to the same side of the real axis first. Since \(z_1 \neq z_2\), we now need two supervectors \(X^{(1)}\) and \(X^{(2)}\) of the form (53) in order to write the product of resolvents as a Gaussian integral,

\[
G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z_1^+)G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z_2^-) = \int \frac{[dX^{(1)}dX^{(2)}]}{(2\pi)^N} \left[ X^{(1)\ast}_{\nu_1 \mu_1} X^{(2)\ast}_{\nu_2 \mu_2} \right] e^{iX^{(1)^\ast}_1 L_+ (z_1^+ - H) X^{(1)}_1 + iX^{(2)^\ast}_2 L_+ (z_2^- - H) X^{(2)}_2}.
\]

(84)

Averaging this expression over the ensemble of perturbations, the entire calculation for the second moment from Sec. III B carries over, except that we have essentially two copies of the same integral [1]. Most importantly, the resulting saddle-point equation still has a single solution proportional to the unit matrix. The upshot is that the averaged product of two advanced or two retarded resolvents factorizes into the product of two averages, i.e.

\[
[G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z_1^+)G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z_2^-)]_V = [G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z_1^+)]_V \left[ G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z_2^-) \right]_V, \quad (85a)
\]

\[
[G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z_1^-)G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z_2^+)]_V = [G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z_1^-)]_V \left[ G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z_2^+) \right]_V, \quad (85b)
\]

where the single averages were given in (71).

The situation is manifestly different for the average product of one retarded and one advanced resolvent, which is the form of the remaining terms both in Eq. (83) for two distinct eigenvectors and in Eq. (79) for a single eigenvector. There, the saddle-point equation obtained after averaging over the ensemble of \(V\)’s does not have a unique diagonal solution anymore, but instead exhibits a whole manifold of degenerate saddles.

Expressed as a Gaussian integral, the product of two different resolvents takes the form

\[
G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z_1^+)G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z_2^-) = \int \frac{[dX^{(1)}dX^{(2)}]}{(2\pi)^N} \left[ X^{(1)\ast}_{\nu_1 \mu_1} X^{(2)\ast}_{\nu_2 \mu_2} \right] e^{ix^{(1)}_1 L_+ (z_1^+ - H) x^{(1)}_1 + ix^{(2)}_2 L_+ (z_2^- - H) x^{(2)}_2} \times e^{iX^{(1)}_1 L_+ (z_1^+ - H) X^{(1)}_1 + iX^{(2)}_2 L_+ (z_2^- - H) X^{(2)}_2}.
\]

(86)

where the matrices \(L_\pm\) were defined below Eq. (54). To compress notation, we introduce a collective supervector \(X := (X_1 \cdots X_N)\) with

\[
X_\alpha := \left( x_1^{(1)} \chi_1^{(1)} x_2^{(2)} \chi_2^{(2)} \right)^T.
\]

(87)

In the following, we will refer to the first two components (superscript 1) as the retarded and the last two components (superscript 2) as the advanced sector. Furthermore, we define the abbreviations

\[
\tilde{\varepsilon} := \frac{z_1^+ + z_2^-}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_\varepsilon := z_1^+ - z_2^- \quad (88)
\]

as well as the diagonal matrices

\[
L := \text{diag}(1,1,-1,1) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda := \text{diag}(1,1,-1,-1).
\]

(89)

Note that \(\text{Im} \tilde{\varepsilon} = 0\) and \(\text{Im} \Delta_\varepsilon = 2\eta\). With these definitions, we can write Eq. (90) in the more compact form

\[
G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z_1^+)G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z_2^-) = \int \frac{[dXdX]}{(2\pi)^{2N}} \left[ x^{(1)\ast}_{\nu_1 \mu_1} x^{(2)\ast}_{\nu_2 \mu_2} \right] e^{ix_1 L_+ (\tilde{\varepsilon} + \Delta_\varepsilon \Lambda - H) x_1} \times \exp \{ iX_1 L_+ \left( \tilde{\varepsilon} + \Delta_\varepsilon \Lambda - H \right) X_1 \}.
\]

(90)

To compute an explicit expression for the average of this equation, we then follow the recipe outlined at the end of Sec. III A.

d. Ensemble average and symmetries. In the first step, we integrate Eq. (90) over the ensemble of perturbations specified by the distribution \(P(V)\) from Eqs. (17) and (58). Similarly as in Sec. III B, this leads to
Eq. (91) looks similar to Eq. (61) for the second moment, Hubbard-Stratonovich identity applicable to transform detail after we have derived a result for small $\Delta$. The situation is much more subtle and will be discussed in more agreement with our intuitive expectation that eigenvalues do not “feel” each other under the influence of the mean level spacing, $\Delta_z \sim \varepsilon \ll \Gamma$, and eigenvectors belong to close-by levels in the spectrum, corresponding to the regime where significant correlations due to the orthonormality constraint are expected. As $\Delta_z$ is small compared to the typical scale $\Gamma$ of eigenvector correlations in this case, we can neglect the term to leading order and the integrand in Eq. (91) becomes invariant under pseudounitary transformations $X \mapsto TX$, $X^\dagger \mapsto X^\dagger T^\dagger$ with $T^\dagger LT = L$. Hence the integrand has an approximate pseudounitary symmetry for small $\Delta_z$.

On the other hand, if $\Delta_z \gg \Gamma$, the $\Delta_z$ term is not negligible and the approximate symmetry breaks down. In this case, the approximation collapses to the result that would be obtained if we treated the eigenvectors as independent random variables, see also Sec. IV. This is in agreement with our intuitive expectation that eigenvectors correspond to levels that lie far apart in the spectrum do not “feel” each other under the influence of a weak perturbation. In the intermediate regime, the situation is much more subtle and will be discussed in more detail after we have derived a result for small $\Delta_z$ below.

d. Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation. The Hubbard-Stratonovich identity applicable to transform Eq. (91) looks similar to Eq. (61) for the second moment, except that a single $(4 \times 4)$ supermatrix $R$ suffices due to the constant variance $(\sigma_{\mu\nu})^2 = 1$. The domain of integration has to be chosen such that the integrals over both the supervector $X$ and the Hubbard-Stratonovich matrix $R$ converge. To this end, the matrix $R$ is conveniently parameterized as $[1, 55, 56]$

$$R = T \begin{pmatrix} P_1 - i\delta_0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_2 + i\delta_0 \end{pmatrix} T^{-1}. \quad (93)$$

The $(2 \times 2)$ supermatrices $P_1$ and $P_2$ are Hermitian, and the parameter $\delta_0 > 0$ will be adapted so that the integration contour passes through the saddle points [56]. The block-diagonalizing transformation matrix $T$ satisfies $T^\dagger LT = L$ and thus belongs to the (approximate) pseudounitary symmetry group of the integrand in (91). It can be parameterized as [56, 60]$

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1 + \tau^4 k^2} \tau \sqrt{1 + \tau^2 k^2} \tau^4 k \\ \tau \sqrt{1 + \tau^2 k^2} \tau^4 k \sqrt{1 + \tau^4 k^2} \tau \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tau := \begin{pmatrix} b_1^* & -\eta_2 \\ \eta_1^* & i b_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (94)$$

with $k := \text{diag}(1, -1)$, and where $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\eta_1, \eta_1^*, \eta_2, \eta_2^*$ are Grassmann variables. Altogether, we thus have $dR = dP_1 dP_2 d\tau d\tau^*$. Applying the transformation (92) to the integral (91), we obtain
Using the Isserlis/Wick theorem, we can then perform the Gaussian integration over \(X\), leading to

\[
[C^0_{\nu_1 \mu_1}(z^+_1) C^0_{\nu_2 \mu_2}(z^-_2)_V = \int \frac{dR}{(2\pi)^2} \exp \left\{ -\text{str} \left[ \frac{R^2}{2\lambda^2} + \sum_\alpha \ln \left( R + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_\alpha \right) \right] \right. \\
\times \left\{ -\delta_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1} \left[ (R + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_{\nu_1})^{-1} \right]_{1B,1B} \left[ (R + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_{\nu_2})^{-1} \right]_{2B,2B} \\
- \delta_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1} \left[ (R + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_{\nu_1})^{-1} \right]_{1B,2B} \left[ (R + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_{\nu_2})^{-1} \right]_{2B,1B} \right. \\
\right\}.
\]  

(96)

As before, the indices 1 and 2 for the supermatrix elements refer to the retarded and advanced components (corresponding to \(z^+_1\) and \(z^-_2\)), and B and F denote the bosonic and fermionic sectors of superspace, respectively.

\(f.\) Saddle-point approximation. To evaluate the remaining superintegral over \(R\), we employ a saddle-point approximation again. Upon variation of the exponent in Eq. (96), the resulting saddle-point equation reads

\[ R + \lambda^2 \sum_\alpha (R + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_\alpha)^{-1} = 0. \]  

(97)

Following the calculation to solve Eq. (65) for the second moment for large perturbation bandwidth, we readily conclude that a diagonal solution of (97) is given by

\[ R_\star := i \Gamma \Lambda/2 \]  

(98)

with \(\Gamma := 2\pi \lambda^2\epsilon\) as before. The crucial difference to the calculation for the second moment is that this diagonal solution is no longer proportional to the unit matrix. As observed below Eq. (91), the integral and hence also the saddle-point equation (97) has a pseudounitary symmetry for \(\Delta z \sim \varepsilon\), mediated by linear transformation matrices \(T\) with \(T^\dagger LT = L\). Given the solution \(R_\star\) from Eq. (98), all matrices \(TR_\star T^{-1}\) with pseudounitary \(T\) are also (approximate) saddle points, and they all contribute equally because the exponent of Eq. (96) is invariant when \(\Delta z\) is negligible. Therefore, we have to sum the contributions from all these saddles, i.e., we need to integrate over the symmetry group of transformation matrices \(T\).

Evaluating the integrand at the saddle points is straightforward and works analogously to the calculation for the second moment. Substituting \(R = TR_\star T^{-1}\) and introducing a new integration variable \(Q := TAT^{-1}\), the remaining integral over the manifold of degenerate saddles then reads

\[
[G^0_{\nu_1 \mu_1}(z^+_1) G^0_{\nu_2 \mu_2}(z^-_2)]_V = -\int d\mu(Q) \exp \left[ -\text{str} \sum_\alpha \ln \left( i \Gamma Q + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_\alpha \right) \right] \\
\times \left[ \delta_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1} \left( i \Gamma Q + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_{\nu_1} \right)^{-1} \right]_{1B,1B} \left( i \Gamma Q + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_{\nu_2} \right)^{-1} \right]_{2B,2B} \\
+ \delta_{\nu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1} \left( i \Gamma Q + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_{\nu_1} \right)^{-1} \right]_{1B,2B} \left( i \Gamma Q + \bar{z} + \Delta z \Lambda/2 - E^0_{\nu_2} \right)^{-1} \right]_{2B,1B} \\
\right\},
\]  

(99)

where \(d\mu(Q)\) denotes the integration measure, which we will specify in a moment after fixing a convenient parameterization for \(Q\). Note that we used \(Q^2 = \mathbb{1}\) and hence \(\text{str}(Q^2) = 0\) in the exponent.

\(g.\) Setting up the saddle-point integral. We observe that \(Q\) can be split into a product of matrices that are block-diagonal in either the retarded-advanced or the boson-fermion decomposition [1, 60, 61]. To this end, we first consider the pseudounitary transformation matrix \(T\) in the parameterization (94) and define \((2 \times 2)\) supermatrices \(A\) and \(B\) as

\[
A := \exp \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\alpha^* \\ \alpha & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B := \exp \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i\beta^* \\ i\beta & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\]  

(100a)

with anticommuting \(\alpha, \alpha^*, \beta, \beta^*\) given by

\[
\alpha := \frac{b_1 \eta_1^+ - b_2 \eta_2^+}{|b_1|^2 + |b_2|^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \frac{b_1 \eta_1^+ + b_2 \eta_2^+}{|b_1|^2 + |b_2|^2}
\]  

(100b)

in terms of the matrix elements of \(\tau\) from Eq. (94). We remark that \(A\) is unitary \((A^d A = \mathbb{1})\), while \(B\) is pseudounitary \((B^d k B = k)\). Noting that

\[
B^{-1} \tau A = \begin{pmatrix} \tau_B & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_F \end{pmatrix} =: \tilde{\tau},
\]  

(101)
we find that $T$ can be expressed as

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1 + k |\hat{T}|^2} & k \hat{T}^* \\ \sqrt{1 + k |\hat{T}|^2} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & B^{-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

where the left and right matrices are block-diagonal in the boson-fermion decomposition, and the middle matrix is block-diagonal in the retarded-advanced decomposition. Writing the bosonic and fermionic eigenvalues as $\gamma_{B,F} = r_{B,F} e^{i\phi_{B,F}}$ with $r_B \in [0, \infty)$, $r_F \in [0, 1]$, $\phi_B, \phi_F \in [0, 2\pi)$, the measure $d\mu(T)$ takes the form [1]

$$d\mu(T) = \frac{d\ell_B}{\pi} d\phi_B \frac{d\ell_F}{\pi} d\phi_F \frac{d\alpha}{\pi} d\beta^* d(i\beta^*).$$

(103)

Substituting (102) into the definition of $Q = T \Gamma T^{-1}$ and introducing new integration variables $\ell_B := 1 + 2r_B^2 \in [0, \infty)$ and $\ell_F := 1 - 2r_F^2 \in [-1, 1]$, we find

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \ell_B & 0 \\ 0 & \ell_F \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1 - \ell_F^2 e^{-i\phi}} \end{pmatrix},$$

(104a)

with

$$\hat{Q} := \begin{pmatrix} \ell_B & 0 \\ 0 & \ell_F \\ \sqrt{\ell_B^2 - 1} e^{i\phi_B} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1 - \ell_F^2 e^{-i\phi}} \\ 0 & -\ell_B \\ \ell_F & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$
Thus we sorted the terms by their dependence on the Grassmann variables.

\[ [G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0(z_1^+) G_{\nu_2 \mu_2}^0(z_2^-)] = \int_1^\infty d\ell_B \int_{-1}^1 d\ell_F \frac{1}{(\ell_B - \ell_F)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi_B \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi_F \int d\alpha d\beta d\beta^* \exp \left[ \frac{i\pi A_1}{\epsilon} (\ell_B - \ell_F) \right] \times [\delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} (D_{00} + D_{11} + D_{10} + D_{01}) + \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_2} [F_{00} + F_{11} + F_S + F_C] ] \]

with

\[ D_{00} := K_{\nu_1}(\ell_B)K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B)(z_1^+ - E_{\nu_1} + \frac{\mu}{2} B)(z_2^- - E_{\nu_2} - \frac{\mu}{2} B), \]

\[ D_{11} := -\alpha^* \beta^* \left[ K_{\nu_1}(\ell_B)(z_2^- - E_{\nu_1} - \frac{\mu}{2} B) - K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B)(z_2^- - E_{\nu_2} - \frac{\mu}{2} B) \right] \times \left[ K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B)(z_1^+ - E_{\nu_2} + \frac{\mu}{2} B) - K_{\nu_2}(\ell_F)(z_1^+ - E_{\nu_2} + \frac{\mu}{2} B) \right], \]

\[ D_{10} := \alpha^* \beta K_{\nu_1}(\ell_B)(z_2^- - E_{\nu_1} - \frac{\mu}{2} B) - K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B)(z_2^- - E_{\nu_2} - \frac{\mu}{2} B) \times \left[ K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B)(z_1^+ - E_{\nu_2} + \frac{\mu}{2} B) - K_{\nu_2}(\ell_F)(z_1^+ - E_{\nu_2} + \frac{\mu}{2} B) \right], \]

\[ D_{01} := -\beta \beta^* K_{\nu_1}(\ell_B)(z_2^- - E_{\nu_1} - \frac{\mu}{2} B) \times \left[ K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B)(z_1^+ - E_{\nu_2} + \frac{\mu}{2} B) - K_{\nu_2}(\ell_F)(z_1^+ - E_{\nu_2} + \frac{\mu}{2} B) \right], \]

\[ F_{00} := \frac{\Gamma^2}{4} K_{\nu_1}(\ell_B)K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B)(\ell_B^2 - 1) - K_{\nu_1}(\ell_F)K_{\nu_2}(\ell_F)(1 - \ell_F^2), \]

\[ F_{11} := -\alpha^* \beta^* \left[ K_{\nu_1}(\ell_B)(z_1^+ - E_{\nu_1} + \frac{\mu}{2} B) - K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B)(z_1^+ - E_{\nu_2} + \frac{\mu}{2} B) \right] \times \left[ K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B)(\ell_B^2 - 1) - K_{\nu_2}(\ell_F)(\ell_F^2 - 1) \right], \]

\[ F_S := (\alpha^* - \beta \beta^*) \frac{\Gamma^2}{4} K_{\nu_1}(\ell_B)K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B), \]

\[ F_C := -\frac{\mu^2}{8} \sqrt{\ell_B^2 - 1} \sqrt{1 - \ell_F^2} \left[ \alpha^* \beta K_{\nu_1}(\ell_B)K_{\nu_2}(\ell_F)e^{-i(\phi_B - \phi_F)} + \alpha^* \beta K_{\nu_1}(\ell_F)K_{\nu_2}(\ell_B)e^{i(\phi_B - \phi_F)} \right]. \]

Consequently, we obtain

\[ \int D_{00} = D_{00}|_{\ell_B=\ell_F=1} = \frac{1}{(z_1^+ - E_{\nu_1} + \frac{\mu}{2}) (z_2^- - E_{\nu_2} - \frac{\mu}{2})} \]

and

\[ \int F_{00} = F_{00}|_{\ell_B=\ell_F=1} = 0. \]

For the integrals of \( D_{10} \) and \( D_{01} \), the singularity in the measure is lifted by an additional factor \((\ell_B - \ell_F)\) in the integrand, rendering the commuting integrals convergent. Due to the incomplete set of Grassmann variables in these terms, the total integral thus vanishes,

\[ \int D_{10} = \int D_{01} = 0. \]

Similarly, the bosonic integral of \( F_C \) converges, so that

\[ \int F_C = 0. \]

For the integral of \( F_S \), we note that the terms proportional to \( \alpha^* \beta^* \) and \( \beta \beta^* \), respectively, come with opposite signs, but are otherwise symmetric. Hence this integral has to vanish, too,

\[ \int F_S = 0. \]

Finally, we are left with the integrals of \( D_{11} \) and \( F_{11} \). The fermionic integral is evaluated straightforwardly, giving \( \int d\alpha d\beta d\beta^* \alpha^* \beta^* = 1 \). Furthermore, the angular integrals over \( \phi_B \) and \( \phi_F \) both yield a factor of \( 2\pi \).
compensating the corresponding factors in the measure. For the remaining integrals over \( e_\delta \) and \( \ell_F \), the following identities \([66, 67]\) turn out useful:

\[
\mathcal{I}(v, c) := \int_1^\infty d\ell \frac{e^{iv\ell}}{\ell + c} = -e^{-icv} \text{Ei}(icv + 1) \tag{117}
\]

if \( \text{Im}(v) > 0 \), \( |\text{arg}(1 + c)| < \pi \), and

\[
\mathcal{J}(v, c) := \int_{-1}^1 d\ell e^{-iv\ell} \ell + c = e^{icv}[\text{Ei}(-icv + 1) - \text{Ei}(-icv - 1)] \tag{118}
\]

The integrals of \( D_{11} \) and \( F_{11} \) can then be computed by decomposing the integrand into partial fractions in \( \ell_B \) and \( \ell_F \) and using identities (117) and (118) as well as derivatives thereof. Denoting \( a_{1i} := z_i - E_{1i}^0 \) and \( c_k := 2ia_{1k}a_{2k}/\Gamma \Delta_z + i\ell/2\Delta_z \), we obtain

\[
\int D_{11} = \frac{(a_{11}a_{21} - a_{21}\Delta_z + \frac{c_k^2}{\Delta_z})(a_{12}a_{22} + a_{12}\Delta_z + \frac{c_k^2}{\Delta_z})}{(a_{11}a_{21} - a_{12}a_{22})^2\Delta_z^2} \left[ \mathcal{I}(\frac{a_{1\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_1) - \mathcal{I}(\frac{a_{2\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_2) \right] \left[ \mathcal{J}(\frac{a_{1\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_1) - \mathcal{J}(\frac{a_{2\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_2) \right] \tag{120}
\]

and

\[
\int F_{11} = \frac{1}{(E_{12}^0 - E_{22}^0)\Delta_z(E_{11}^0 + E_{22}^0 - z_1 - z_2)} \times \left\{ \frac{(a_{11} - \frac{iv}{2})(a_{21} + \frac{iv}{2})}{\Delta_z} \mathcal{J}(\frac{a_{1\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_1) \left[ \frac{2\pi(a_{11} + \frac{iv}{2})(a_{21} - \frac{iv}{2})}{\Gamma\varepsilon} \mathcal{I}(\frac{a_{1\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_1) - e^{i\pi\Delta_z/\varepsilon} \right] - \frac{(a_{12} - \frac{iv}{2})(a_{22} + \frac{iv}{2})}{\Delta_z} \mathcal{J}(\frac{a_{2\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_2) \left[ \frac{2\pi(a_{12} + \frac{iv}{2})(a_{22} - \frac{iv}{2})}{\Gamma\varepsilon} \mathcal{I}(\frac{a_{2\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_2) - e^{i\pi\Delta_z/\varepsilon} \right] \right. \\
\left. - i\Gamma \cos(\frac{a_{1\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}) \left[ \mathcal{I}(\frac{a_{1\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_1) - \mathcal{I}(\frac{a_{2\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_2) \right] + \Gamma \sin(\frac{a_{1\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}) \left[ c_1 \mathcal{I}(\frac{a_{1\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_1) - c_2 \mathcal{I}(\frac{a_{2\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon}, c_2) \right] \right\} \tag{121}
\]

To simplify these expressions further, we observe that the arguments entering the exponential integral functions \( \mathcal{I} \) and \( \mathcal{J} \) in both expressions depend on the large, real parameter \( \Gamma/\varepsilon = 2/\pi s \) [cf. Sec. 1B]. Using the asymptotic expansion \( \text{Ei}(z) \sim e^z/z \) as \( \Re(z) \to \pm \infty \) (with a branch cut discontinuity of \( 2\pi \) in the imaginary part along the negative real line), we can approximate the integrals as

\[
\int D_{11} \approx \left( \frac{\Gamma\varepsilon}{2\pi\Delta_z} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{(a_{12} - \frac{iv}{2})(a_{22} + \frac{iv}{2})}{(a_{11} + \frac{iv}{2})(a_{12} + \frac{iv}{2})(a_{21} + \frac{iv}{2})(a_{22} - \frac{iv}{2})^2} \exp \left( \frac{2a_{1\Delta_z}}{\varepsilon} \right) \right] \frac{1}{(a_{11}^2 + \Gamma^2/4)(a_{22}^2 + \Gamma^2/4)}. \tag{122}
\]

if \( c \notin [-1, 1] \). Here \( \text{Ei}(x) \) denotes the exponential integral function \([66]\),

\[
\text{Ei}(z) := -\text{PV} \int_{-\infty}^z \frac{dt}{t}. \tag{119}
\]

The nonvanishing contributions to the averaged retarded-advanced resolvent \( [G^0_{\nu_1\mu_1}(z_1^+)G^{0^*}_{\nu_2\mu_2}(z_2^-)]_V \) as given in Eq. (110) are Eqs. (112), (113), (122), and (123). For the fourth moment of eigenvector overlaps, we also need the averaged advanced-retarded resolvent \( [G^0_{\nu_1\mu_1}(z_1^-)G^{0^*}_{\nu_2\mu_2}(z_2^+)]_V \) [see Eqs. (79) and (83)]. The contributions to this term are obtained from those of the retarded-advanced resolvent by exchanging all indices 1 and 2, i.e., \( \nu_1 \leftrightarrow \nu_2, \mu_1 \leftrightarrow \mu_2, \) and \( \nu_1 \leftrightarrow \nu_2 \). Combining the two and letting \( \eta \to 0 \), we then find

\[
\int F_{11} \approx \frac{i\Gamma\varepsilon/\pi \Delta_z}{(a_{11} + \frac{iv}{2})(a_{12} + \frac{iv}{2})(a_{21} - \frac{iv}{2})(a_{22} - \frac{iv}{2})}. \tag{123}
\]
\[
\lim_{\eta \to 0^+} \left[ G_{\nu \mu_1}^0 (z_1^+) G_{\nu_2 \mu_2} (z_2^-) + G_{\nu_1 \mu_1}^0 (z_1^-) G_{\nu_2 \mu_2} (z_2^-) \right] \nu \\
= \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} \left\{ \frac{1}{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + i \Gamma^2} \left[ \frac{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + E_n E_2 - (E_0^+ + E_2^+)(E_n + E_2^+) + \Gamma^2/2}{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + i \Gamma^2/4} \right] \right. \\
+ \left. \frac{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + i \Gamma^2}{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + i \Gamma^2/4} \left[ \frac{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + E_n E_2 - (E_0^+ + E_2^+)(E_n + E_2^+) + \Gamma^2/2}{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + i \Gamma^2/4} \right] \right\} \\
+ \frac{\sigma_n}{\sigma_0} \left[ \frac{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + i \Gamma^2}{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + i \Gamma^2/4} \right] \left[ \frac{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + E_n E_2 - (E_0^+ + E_2^+)(E_n + E_2^+) + \Gamma^2/2}{(E_n - E_0^+)^2 + i \Gamma^2/4} \right] \right\},
\]
where \( \sin(x) := (\sin x)/x \). Using (2) and combining Eqs. (71), (85) and (124) according to Eq. (83), we obtain a first estimate for the fourth moment of the overlaps involving two distinct eigenvectors \( |n_1 \rangle \) and \( |n_2 \rangle \),

\[
[U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1} U_{n_2 \nu_2}] | n_1 \neq n_2 \rangle \\
= \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} u(n_1 - n_1) u(n_2 - n_2) \{ 1 + \sin^2(\pi [n_1 - n_2]) - u(n_1 - \mu_1) u(n_2 - \mu_1) u(n_1 - n_2) u(n_2 - n_2) \}
\\n\times \left[ \frac{(\pi^2)^2}{\pi} \right] \left[ (\mu_1 + \mu_2 - n_1 - n_2)^2 + (\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2 - (n_1 - n_2)^2 + (\Gamma/\varepsilon)^2 \right] \right\} \\
- \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1} \left[ \frac{\Gamma}{4\pi \varepsilon} \right] u(n_1 - \mu_1) u(n_2 - n_2) \left[ (\Gamma/\varepsilon)^2 + \frac{\mu_1^2 + \mu_2^2 + n_1 - (n_1 + n_2)^2}{(n_1 - n_2)^2 + (\Gamma/2\varepsilon)^2} \right].
\]
Similarly, we combine Eqs. (82) and (124) according to (79) to obtain an estimate of the fourth overlap moment of a single perturbed eigenvector \( |n_1 \rangle \),

\[
[U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1} U_{n_2 \nu_2}] = (\delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} + \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1}) u(n_1 - \mu_1) u(n_2 - \mu_2) \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{2} [u(n_1 - \mu_1) + u(n_2 - \mu_2)] \\
- \frac{1}{2} [u(n_1 - \mu_1) + u(n_2 - \mu_2)] \right\}
\]

Next, we can combine Eqs. (125) and (126) and write \( [U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1} U_{n_2 \nu_2}] = (1 - \delta_{n_1 n_2}) [U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1} U_{n_2 \nu_2}] | n_1 \neq n_2 \rangle + \delta_{n_1 n_2} [U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1} U_{n_2 \nu_2}] | n_1 = n_2 \rangle \). In the following, we restrict ourselves to the leading-order contribution in the parameter \( s = \pi \varepsilon/2 \Gamma \) from Eqs. (19) and (31) or, equivalently, \( \delta = \varepsilon/\Gamma \). As this number is extremely small for typical many-body systems (see Sec. IB), it will be sufficient for our purposes to keep only terms of order \( s^3 \).

We consider the terms in Eq. (125) for \( n_1 \neq n_2 \) first. The function \( u(n) \) is of order \( u(n) \sim s \), see Eq. (30). The sinc function acts as a Kronecker-\( \delta \) and thus does not contribute for \( n_1 \neq n_2 \). Keeping only terms up to order \( s^3 \), we then find

\[
[U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1} U_{n_2 \nu_2}] | n_1 \neq n_2 \rangle \\
= \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} d_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{n_1 n_2} + \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1} \tilde{f}_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{n_1 n_2} + O(s^4)
\]
with

\[
d_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{n_1 n_2} := u(n_1 - \mu_1) u(n_2 - \mu_2),
\]

\[
\tilde{f}_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{n_1 n_2} := - \left( \frac{\pi \varepsilon}{4\pi \varepsilon} \right) u(n_1 - \mu_1) u(n_2 - \mu_2) \left[ \frac{(\pi^2)^2}{\pi} \right] \left[ (\mu_1 + \mu_2 - n_1 - n_2)^2 + (\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2 - (n_1 - n_2)^2 + (\Gamma/\varepsilon)^2 \right].
\]
Note that \( d_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{n_1 n_2} \) is already the same symbol as defined in Eq. (33b) in Sec. II A. For the single eigenvector correlations, we observe that they carry a prefactor \( \delta_{n_1 n_2} \) in the combined expression. This effectively reduces the order of these terms by a factor of \( s \) because we eventually sum over all perturbed eigenvectors \( |n_1 \rangle \) and \( |n_2 \rangle \) [see, e.g., Eqs. (5) and (m5)], but the double sum reduces to a single sum for the single eigenvector correlations. Hence we only keep terms of order \( s^2 \) in Eq. (126), so that

\[
[U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1} U_{n_2 \nu_2}] \\
= (\delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} + \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1}) d_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{n_1 n_2} + O(s^3)
\]

Altogether, we then obtain

\[
[U_{n_1 \mu_1} U_{n_2 \mu_2} U_{n_1 \nu_1} U_{n_2 \nu_2}] \\
\simeq \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} d_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{n_1 n_2} + \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_1} \left( \delta_{n_1 n_2} d_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{n_1 n_2} + \tilde{f}_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{n_1 n_2} \right).
\]
In addition, the correction should be of the same order in $\varepsilon$ with the integrals as before, one readily verifies that this result satisfies the Properties (i), (ii) and (iii) of the fourth moment. The fourth moment collected in the beginning of this subsection below Eq. (76). However, Property (iv) is violated: Substituting (131) into (78), we get

$$
\sum_{\mu_1, \mu_2} \delta_{\mu_1, \mu_2} [U_{n_1, \mu_1} U_{n_2, \mu_2} U_{n_3, \mu_1} U_{n_4, \mu_2}] \nu = \delta_{\mu_1, \nu_1} \left[ \delta_{n_1, n_2} u(n_1 - \mu_2) + q(n_1 - n_2) u(n_1 - \mu_2) \left( \frac{(n_1 - n_2)(n_1 - n_2 + 2\mu_2)}{2(n_2 - \mu_2)^2 + 1/\varepsilon^2} - 1 \right) \right],
$$

where $q(n)$ was defined in Eq. (35). The first term on the right-hand side is the expected reduction, but the additional, nonvanishing second term spoils the symmetry. Notably, this violation is not an artifact of the leading-order approximation. Rather, it can apparently be traced back to the approximate character of the saddle-point degeneracy discussed below Eq. (98). If the pseudounitary symmetry $T$ with $T^\dagger LT = L$ were perfect, all saddles $i\Gamma Q/2 = TR T^{-1}$ obtained from the diagonal solution by pseudounitary rotations would contribute equally. However, as mentioned above, the degeneracy becomes exact only in the limit of close-by eigenvectors (i.e. $n_1 = n_2$), and the approximation is still good for small $\Delta_z$ on the order of the mean level spacing $\varepsilon$, but breaks down when $|\Delta_z| \gg \Gamma$. This latter limit is correctly reflected in Eq. (131), too, because the term $f_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2}$ becomes negligible compared to $\rho_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2}$. However, in the intermediate regime with $\varepsilon \ll |\Delta_z| \lesssim \Gamma$, where the symmetry is neither perfect nor completely broken, the situation is much more subtle and, unfortunately, hardly analytically tractable. Fortunately, though, the symmetry property (iv) can be restored a posteriori.

To this end, we look for a correction term $\rho_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2}$ such that Property (iv) is retrieved when replacing $f_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2}$ by $f_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2} + \rho_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2}$. At the same time, the corrected term should still possess Properties (i) through (iii). Properties (i) and (ii) limit the possible form of the correction to a function of the invariants

$$
\Gamma / \varepsilon, \ (\mu_1 + \mu_2), \ (n_1 + n_2), \ (\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2, \ (n_1 - n_2)^2. \quad (133)
$$

In addition, the correction should be of the same order in $s$. Anticipating a structural similarity to the preliminary result (129), we thus make an ansatz of the form

$$
\rho_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2} := \left( \frac{1}{2\pi \varepsilon} \right) u(n_1 - \mu_1) u(n_2 - \mu_2) \times A(c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5) \frac{A(c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5)}{[(n_1 - \mu_2)^2 + (\Gamma/2\varepsilon)^2][[(n_2 - \mu_1)^2 + (\Gamma/2\varepsilon)^2]}, \quad (134a)
$$

with

$$
A(c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5) := c_0(\Gamma/\varepsilon)^2 + c_1(\mu_1 + \mu_2)(n_1 + n_2) + c_2(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2 + c_3(n_1 - n_2)^2 + c_4(\mu_1 + \mu_2)^2 + c_5(n_1 + n_2)^2, \quad (134b)
$$

and $c_0, \ldots, c_5$ being constants, independent of all variables in (133). Property (iii) requires that $\sum_{\mu_1, \mu_2} \rho_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2} = 0$. Solving for $c_5$, and using the constraints that all $c_i$ should be constants, we find that $c_5 = -c_4 = c_3 = c_1/2$ and $c_2 = c_0 = 0$. Hence the only free variable is, e.g., the coefficient $c_1$. Substituting this ansatz into the defining equation (78) of Property (iv), we find that $c_1 = -1$ solves the equation. The correction term thus reads

$$
\rho_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2} = \frac{1}{2\pi \varepsilon} u(n_1 - \mu_1) u(n_2 - \mu_2) \times \frac{(\mu_1 + \mu_2 - 2n_1)(\mu_1 + \mu_2 - 2n_2)}{[(n_1 - \mu_2)^2 + (\Gamma/2\varepsilon)^2][[(n_2 - \mu_1)^2 + (\Gamma/2\varepsilon)^2]}, \quad (135)
$$

Setting $f_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2} := f_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2} + \rho_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{n_1, n_2}$, we finally recover our main result for the fourth moments from Eq. (33). We remark that this result also comprises, as special cases, the previous findings from Refs. [35, 68], which were obtained by means of completely different approximations and under quite substantial additional restrictions. Yet another, and in fact more general, such approach will be elaborated in the subsequent Sec. IV.

**IV. GENERALIZED APPROXIMATION**

In the previous two sections, the result (m10)-(m15) (equivalent to Eqs. (24)-(29) from above) was derived by averaging (9) over some suitably defined ensemble of perturbations $V$. In doing so, the main task was to evaluate the average over the products of four $U$ matrix elements on the right hand side of (10), henceforth denoted as

$$
M_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \nu_1, \nu_2} := \left[ U_{n_1, \mu_1} U_{n_2, \mu_2} U_{n_3, \nu_1} U_{n_4, \nu_2} \right]_\nu. \quad (136)
$$

This task was accomplished in the previous section by means of rather demanding and lengthy supersymmetric methods. In the present section, an alternative way of evaluating such averages will be worked out. It is based on an approximation which considerably simplifies the actual calculations and which will lead to practically the same final result as the supersymmetric approach.

The general idea is to approximate the “fourth moments” on the right hand side of (136) solely in terms of the “second moments” $u(n)$ from (11) and then to exploit the previously known results for $u(n)$. In this
way, we will be able to treat, with relatively little effort, also more general cases than those which were explicitly worked out in the previous section.

A. Symmetry consideration

Our starting point is the following observation: If a given random perturbation $V$ with matrix elements $V_{mn}^0$ results, for the perturbed Hamiltonian $H$ in (1), in a certain set of eigenvectors $|n\rangle$ and corresponding matrix elements $U_{mn}$ according to (4), then a perturbation $\tilde{V}$ with modified matrix elements $\tilde{V}_{mn} := e^{i(\phi_n - \phi_m)} V_{mn}^0$ leads to a modified basis transformation of the form $\tilde{U}_{mn} = e^{i(\phi_n - \psi_m)} U_{mn}$, where the $\phi_n$ are arbitrary but fixed phases. Likewise, the $\psi_n$ are in principle once again arbitrary but fixed phases, which however are actually irrelevant, since they pairwise cancel in the fourfold products on the right hand side of (136). Explicitly, the corresponding modification of (136) takes the form
\begin{align}
\tilde{M}_{\mu \nu}^{\mu' \nu'} & := \left[ \tilde{U}_{\mu \mu'} \tilde{U}_{\nu \nu'} \tilde{U}_{\nu' \mu'} \tilde{U}_{\mu' \nu} \right] V = \\
e^{i(\phi_{\mu'} - \phi_\nu + \phi_\nu - \phi_{\mu'})} & \left[ U_{\mu \mu'} U_{\nu \nu'} U^*_{\nu' \mu'} U^*_{\mu' \nu} \right] V. \quad (137)
\end{align}

According to Sec. I C, all statistical properties of the $V$ ensemble must be independent of the phases $\phi_n$. Therefore, the same must apply, in particular, to the average in (137). It follows that the average in (137), and hence also the average in (136), must vanish except if the phases pairwise cancel each other. In other words, each of the first two $U$ matrix elements (without the “star” symbol) must have a “partner” among the last two $U$ matrix elements (with “stars”), which being partners means that the second indices are equal. The latter is the case if and only if one of the following two conditions is fulfilled: (i) $\mu_1 = \nu_2$ and $\mu_2 = \nu_1$; (ii) $\mu_1 = \nu_1$, $\mu_2 = \nu_2$, and $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ (the extra condition $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ prevents double counting of the case $\mu_1 = \nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu_2$). We thus can infer that
\begin{align}
M_{\mu \nu}^{\mu' \nu'} & = \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} F_{\mu \nu}^{\mu' \nu'} + \delta_{\mu_1 \nu_1} \delta_{\mu_2 \nu_2} G_{\mu \nu}^{\mu' \nu'}, \quad (138) \\
F_{\mu \nu}^{\mu' \nu'} & := \left[ U_{\mu \mu'} U^*_{\nu \nu'} \right] V, \quad (139) \\
G_{\mu \nu}^{\mu' \nu'} & := \tilde{\delta}_{\mu \nu} \left[ U_{\mu \mu'} [U_{\nu \nu'}] \right] V, \quad (140) \\
\tilde{\delta}_{\mu \nu} & := 1 - \delta_{\mu \nu}. \quad (141)
\end{align}

where $\delta_{\mu \nu}$ is the Kronecker delta.

For later convenience, we also can conclude along similar lines as below (137) that
\begin{align}
\left[ U_{\mu \mu'} \right] V & = 0 \quad (142a) \\
\left[ U_{\mu \mu'} U_{\nu \nu'} \right] V & = \left[ U_{\mu \mu'} U^*_{\nu \nu'} \right] V = 0 \quad (142b) \\
\left[ U_{\mu \mu'} U^*_{\nu \nu'} \right] V & = \delta_{mn} \delta_{\mu \nu} u(m - \mu). \quad (142c)
\end{align}

for arbitrary $m, \mu, n, \nu$, where $u(n)$ is defined in (11). Furthermore, taking into account (136) and (138) we can infer from (9) and (10) that
\begin{align}
\left[ \langle A \rangle_{\mu(t)} \right] V & = \sum_{m,n,\mu_1,\mu_2,\nu_1,\nu_2} \rho_0^{\mu_1 \nu_2} (0) A^{0 \mu_1 \nu_2} e^{i(n-m)\epsilon t} M_{m \mu_1 \mu_2 \nu_1 \nu_2}^{\mu_1 \nu_1 \mu_2 \nu_2} \\
& = \sum_{m,n,\mu,\nu} \rho_0^{0 \mu} (0) A^{0 \mu \nu} e^{i(n-m)\epsilon t} F_{\mu \nu}^{mn} + \sum_{m,n,\mu,\nu} \rho_0^{0 \mu} (0) A^{0 \mu \nu} e^{i(n-m)\epsilon t} G_{\mu \nu}^{mn}. \quad (143)
\end{align}

B. Real and complex random matrices

So far, it was always tacitly understood that the off-diagonal matrix elements $V_{mn}^0$ are in general complex-valued. On the other hand, it is well known from textbook random matrix theory [1, 3] that if the system exhibits a certain symmetry (related to time inversion) then the eigenvectors can be chosen so that $V_{mn}^0 = V_{nm}^0$ and $U_{mn}^0 = U_{nm}$ for all $m$ and $n$. Whether the considered system exhibits this symmetry or not, and thus the pertinent random matrix ensemble is purely real or not, is known to be of great importance for instance with respect to the level statistics [1, 3].

With respect to the quantities which are at the focus of our present work (namely, the perturbed expectation values in (9), the function $u(n)$ in (11), etc.), we found that ensembles with real-valued matrix elements $V_{mn}$ behave practically indistinguishable from their complex-valued counterparts.

For instance, in Sec. III B we derived the result (30) for certain complex-valued ensembles, while the same result was obtained in [30] for the corresponding real-valued ensembles, and likewise for the result in (32).

More precisely, this similarity between real- and complex-valued ensembles is found to only hold true under our usual assumption that $s$ in (19) is a small parameter (see (22)) and thus subleading terms in $s$ can be neglected. Put differently, with respect to the higher order corrections, differences between the real and complex ensembles may still be possible.

Throughout this Supplemental Material, we confine ourselves to the complex case. Though omitted here, we also worked out the real case and always found identical final results in (143) apart from the higher order corrections in $s$. Unfortunately, we are not aware of a simple general argument why this is so. (Item (i) in Sec. I C may be considered as a first hint.) We also remark that in contrast to the final results, the intermediate steps often differ quite considerably. For instance, in the real case only phases $\phi_n \in \{0, \pi\}$ would be admitted in (137), leading still to the same conclusion as in (138)-(142a) and (142c), whereas (142b) becomes invalid, and also the evaluation of $F_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{mn}$ and $G_{\mu_1 \mu_2}^{mn}$ in the following subsections yields quantitatively different results.
C. Complex random variables

Complex random variables are well-established in probability theory, yet it may be worthwhile to collect some issues of particular interest in our present context.

A complex random variable $z$ is defined as a pair $(x, y)$ of real random variables via $z = x + iy$. Accordingly, its probability distribution amounts to the joint distribution of the two real variables. The corresponding probability density may thus be written either in the form $\rho(z)$ or $\rho(x, y)$. Given the probability density $\rho$, the expectation value $E[f(x, y)]$ of an arbitrary function $f(x, y)$ can be readily determined as usual, in particular arbitrary “moments” of the form $E[z^k(z^*)^l]$.

The distribution (or the random variable itself) is called circular symmetric if the probability density $\rho$ does not depend on $x$ and $y$ separately, but only on $|z| = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$, i.e., it can be written in yet another alternative form, namely as $\rho(|z|)$. It is called Gaussian if $\rho(|z|) = \exp\left(-|z|^2/\sigma^2\right)/\pi\sigma^2$ for some $\sigma$, and non-Gaussian otherwise.

Similarly as in the discussion above (137), one sees that $U_{mn}$ is a complex random variable in the above specified sense, which must exhibit the same statistical properties as $e^{i\phi}U_{mn}$ for an arbitrary but fixed phase $\phi$. Hence, the distribution of $U_{mn}$ must be circular symmetric for any index pair $(m, n)$. Moreover, one readily sees, similarly as above (11), that the distribution of $U_{mn}$ does not depend on $m$ and $n$ separately, but only on the difference $m - n$, and likewise for all its moments $\{U_{mn}\}^k$.

If the distribution is furthermore Gaussian, then one readily verifies that

$$[|U_{mn}|^4]_V = 2 [|U_{mn}|^2]_V.$$  \hspace{1cm} (144)

Since the unitary $U$ must satisfy the relation $\sum_n |U_{mn}|^2 = 1$ for any $n$, we can conclude that $|U_{mn}| \leq 1$, hence the random variable $U_{mn}$ cannot be strictly Gaussian distributed. In the following, we will therefore not assume that the distribution is Gaussian. However, it will be taken for granted that the deviations from a Gaussian distribution are not too extreme, so that the fourth moment $[|U_{mn}|^4]_V$ can be written in the form

$$[|U_{mn}|^4]_V = \gamma(n - m) [|U_{mn}|^2]_V,$$  \hspace{1cm} (145)

with some real-valued, non-negative function $\gamma(n)$ which remains of order unity for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In other words, there exists a constant $C$ with the property that

$$0 \leq \gamma(n) \leq C = O(1)$$  \hspace{1cm} (146)

for all $n$. (In principle, this requirement could still be considerably weakened.) For instance, probability densities $\rho$ with extremely slowly decaying tails are thus excluded. Cases which are of interest to us but disobey (146) have to our knowledge never been observed so far.

Analogously, two complex random variables $z_1 = x_1 + iy_1$ and $z_2 = x_2 + iy_2$ give rise to a joint probability density $\rho(z_1, z_2)$, from which arbitrary expectation values $E[f(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2)]$ can be deduced. They are called uncorrelated if $E[z_1 z_2] = E[z_1] E[z_2]$ and $E[z_1^* z_2^*] = E[z_1^*] E[z_2^*]$ (analogous relations for $E[z_1 z_2^*]$ and $E[z_1^* z_2]$ then automatically follow). A fortiori, they are called independent if $\rho(z_1, z_2)$ can be written in the form $\rho_1(z_1) \rho_2(z_2)$.

Similar generalizations for more than two random variables are straightforward. In particular, if $(z_1, ..., z_n)$ are multivariate Gaussian variables with zero mean, then the Isserlis (or Wick) theorem reads

$$E[z_1 z_2 \cdots z_{2n}] = \sum \Pi E[z_j z_k],$$  \hspace{1cm} (147)

where the notation $\sum \Pi$ means summing over all distinct ways of partitioning $z_1, ..., z_{2n}$ into pairs $z_j z_k$ and each summand is the product of the $n$ pairs. (The complementary relation $E[z_1 z_2 \cdots z_{2n-1}] = 0$ is of less interest to us.) In particular, one readily recovers (144) as a special case.

Considering two arbitrary matrix elements $U_{mp}$ and $U_{n\nu}$ which are not identical, i.e., the index pairs $(m, \mu)$ and $(n, \nu)$ are different, it follows with (142a)-(142c) that they are uncorrelated in the above defined sense. On the other hand, they cannot be independent for the following reason: From the definition (4) of the unitary $U$, one readily infers the usual orthonormality relations

$$\sum_n U_{nm} U_{n\nu}^* = \delta_{\mu\nu}. \hspace{1cm} (148)$$

In particular, choosing $\mu$ arbitrary but fixed and focusing on $\nu = \mu$, it follows that the value of $|U_{nm}|^2$ for one specific $n = n_0$ is determined by the values of $|U_{n\mu}|^2$ for all $n \neq n_0$. Hence the random variable $U_{n\mu}$ cannot be independent from all the other $U_{nm}$’s with $n \neq n_0$.

In some previous analytical investigations [6, 7, 35], it was taken for granted that the $U_{mn}$ are, at least in sufficiently good approximation, independent and/or Gaussian random variables, and also in numerical examples we observed that these approximations seem to be fulfilled very well. However, we have seen above that neither of the two properties can be strictly true. Moreover, it has been observed for instance in [34] that the deviations from a Gaussian distribution may not necessarily be negligibly small. Accordingly, one main point of our subsequent considerations is to still admit (small) deviations from strict Gaussianity and/or independence, and to carefully keep track of their effects on the final results in (143).

D. Simplest approximation

As seen above, the complex random variables appearing in (139) and (140) are uncorrelated but not strictly independent. In this section, we investigate the consequences of treating them as (approximately) independent nevertheless (but still admitting deviations from Gaussianity).
Assuming that the $U$ matrix elements in (139) and (140) are independent, and observing (142a)-(142c), one can infer that (139) must be zero unless each of the two $U$ matrix elements without a “star” symbol has a complex conjugate counterpart among the two remaining $U$ matrix elements (with “stars”). This prerequisite can be fulfilled in two ways: (i) $\mu = \nu$; (ii) $\mu \neq \nu$ and $m = n$. It follows that

$$F_{\mu \nu}^{mn} = \delta_{\mu \nu} \left[ |U_{m \mu}|^2 |U_{n \nu}|^2 \right] V + \delta_{mn} \delta_{\mu \nu} \left[ |U_{m \mu}|^2 |U_{n \nu}|^2 \right] V .$$  \hfill (149)

Exploiting the above independence assumption once more, we can further conclude that $\left[ |U_{m \mu}|^2 |U_{n \nu}|^2 \right] V = \left[ |U_{m \mu}|^2 \right] V \left[ |U_{n \nu}|^2 \right] V$ unless $m = n$, and likewise for the last term in (149), yielding with (11)

$$F_{\mu \nu}^{mn} = \delta_{\mu \nu} \delta_{mn} \left[ |U_{m \mu}|^4 \right] V + \delta_{\mu \nu} \delta_{m n} \left[ u(m - \mu) u(n - \mu) \right] \left[ u(m - \mu) u(n - \nu) \right] .$$

Similarly, (140) takes the form

$$G_{\mu \nu}^{mn} := \delta_{\mu \nu} \left[ u(m - \mu) u(n - \nu) \right] .$$ \hfill (151)

By means of (150) and (151) one thus can rewrite (138) as

$$M_{\mu \nu}^{mn} := \delta_{\mu \nu} \delta_{mn} \left[ m_{m \mu}^2 \delta_{\mu \mu} \delta_{mn} \left[ u(m - \mu) u(n - \mu) \right] \right] + \delta_{\mu \nu} \delta_{m n} \left[ u(m - \mu) u(n - \mu) \right] + \delta_{\mu \nu} \delta_{m n} \left[ u(m - \mu) y(m - \mu) \right] ,$$ \hfill (152)

where we introduced the function

$$y(m - \mu) := \left[ |U_{m \mu}|^4 \right] V - 2 u^2(m - \mu) = \left\{ (m - \mu)^2 - 2 \right\} u^2(m - \mu) ,$$ \hfill (153)

and where we exploited (145) and (11) in the last step. If the $U_{mn}$ were Gaussian random variables, then the last term in (152) would vanish (see (144)), and the remaining first two terms could be readily recovered by exploiting the Isserlis theorem (147).

Introducing (152) into (143) yields, after a straightforward calculation (analogous to the one in Sec. II A), the result

$$\left[ \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \right] V = Q + |g(t)|^2 \left( \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \right) + S ,$$ \hfill (154)

where the three terms on the right hand side of (154) are the direct descendants of the three terms in (152), and where (155) and (157) are identical to (26) and (21), respectively.

If the $U_{mn}$ are approximated as Gaussian random variables then the quantity $S$ in (158) is zero, as can be concluded from the discussion below (153) and the definition (159). More generally, one readily can infer from (158) and $\sum_m p_{\rho m}(0) = 1$ that

$$|S| \leq |Y| \|A\| ,$$ \hfill (160)

where $\|A\|$ denotes the operator norm of $A$ (largest eigenvalue in modulus). Taking into account (146) and (153), we can conclude from (159) that

$$|Y| \leq (C + 2) \sum_n u^2(n) .$$ \hfill (161)

Estimating $u^2(n)$ from above by $u(n)$ max$_m u(m)$ and observing (12), it follows that $|Y| = (C + 2) \max_m u(m)$, and with (19), (160) that

$$|S| \leq (C + 2) s \|A\| .$$ \hfill (162)

Recalling the discussion of $C$ above (146) and that $s$ is a small parameter (see (22)), we can conclude that $S$ remains negligibly small in (154) even if the $U_{mn}$ are not Gaussian distributed.

Altogether, we thus arrive at the general approximation

$$\left[ \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \right] V = Q + |g(t)|^2 \left( \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} \right) .$$ \hfill (163)

Introducing the explicit results for $u(n)$ from the previous section, one readily recovers the approximation $|g(t)|^2 = e^{-t^2}$, while (156) becomes identical to (27). Hence (163) is seen to be already somewhat similar to the more rigorous result (24) which we derived in the previous section. Yet, the remaining differences are in fact quite serious, for instance: (i) At time $t = 0$ the system is always in the same initial state $\rho(0)$, independent of the perturbation $V$. It follows that both the first and the last terms in (163) must be equal to $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(0)}$. Moreover, (12) and (157) imply $g(0) = 1$. Altogether, for $t = 0$ the approximation (163) amounts to $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(0)} = Q + \langle A \rangle_{\rho(0)}$. However, $Q$ from (155) is in general not a small quantity. (ii) If one chooses $A = I$ (identity operator), then one readily sees that the left hand side of (163) as well as $Q$ and $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)}$ on the right hand side must be unity, yielding $1 = 1 + |g(t)|^2$. As seen above, $|g(t)|^2$ is unity for $t = 0$ and usually is found to remain non-negligible also within a notable interval of times $t > 0$ (recall our standard example $|g(t)|^2 = e^{-t^2}$). Even for the particularly simple observable $A = 1$ under consideration, (163) is thus far from being a satisfying approximation. For the same reason, the result (163) does not exhibit the correct transformation behavior if $A$ is replaced by $A + cI$ with $c \in \mathbb{R}$. 


In conclusion, the idea at the beginning of this subsection, namely to approximate the matrix elements $U_{mn}$ in terms of independent (not necessarily Gaussian) random variables, does not work sufficiently well for our present purposes.

E. Improved approximation

As seen in the previous subsections, the matrix elements $U_{mn}$ are known to be pairwise uncorrelated, but treating them as statistically independent is a too strong simplification. The most immediate reason which comes to mind is that such an assumption leads to a violation of the orthonormality conditions, see the discussion below Eq. (148).

In order to quantify the violation of the orthonormality relations (148), we note that those conditions are satisfied at least on average, i.e., $\sum_n U_{np}^* U_{np} = \delta_{\mu \nu}$, as can be readily concluded from (11) and (142c). Assuming that the $U_{mn}$ are independent, one furthermore can show, similarly as in Secs. IV C and IV D, that

$$\left[ \sum_n (U_{mn} U_{mn}^* - \delta_{\mu \nu})^2 \right]_{\nu} = O(\varrho (\mu - \nu)) \tag{164}$$

where $\varrho(n)$ is defined in (156). Finally, one can show analogously as below (161) that $\varrho(\mu - \nu) \leq s$, where $s$ is our small parameter from (19) and (22).

In other words, assuming that the $U_{mn}$ are independent leads to violations of the orthonormality relations (148) which, however, are with very high probability very weak. (A quantification of this qualitative statement can be worked out along similar lines as around Eq. (43).) Though treating the $U_{mn}$ as independent might thus seem to yield a very good approximation, the so-obtained final result (163) actually exhibits unacceptably large inaccuracies. Intuitively, this may be understood as follows: Though the committed error is with very high probability very small for every single summand on the right hand side of (143), there are so many summands that the resulting total error turns out to be non-negligible.

For the same reason, though the $U_{mn}$ are expected to be nearly Gaussian distributed, admitting small deviations – as it is done in our present approach – seems a potentially relevant issue: Even if each summand on the right hand side of (143) entails with very high probability a very small error when approximating the $U_{mn}$ as Gaussian distributed, the resulting total error in the final result may potentially be non-negligible.

In the following, our main idea is to improve the approximation from the previous subsection so that the orthogonality relations (148) are even better fulfilled.

In order to work this out in detail, let us focus as a first example on the evaluation of the specific average in (139). Furthermore, we choose two arbitrary indices $m$ and $n$ with $m \neq n$, but then keep them fixed. Generalizing the setup from the previous subsection, we consider two sets (“vectors” with components labeled by $\nu$) of complex random variables $y_\nu$ and $z_\nu$. The distribution of each given random variable $y_\nu$ is assumed to be identical to the distribution of the corresponding random matrix element $U_{mn}$, and analogously for $z_\nu$ and $U_{mn}$. But unlike the “true” random variables $U_{mn}$ and $U_{mn}$, all the “auxiliary” random variables $y_\nu$ and $z_\nu$ are now assumed to be strictly independent of each other. Indicating the corresponding averages (or expectation values) by the symbol $E[...]$, we thus can infer from (142a)-(142c) that

$$E[y_\nu] = E[z_\nu] = 0 \tag{165a}$$
$$E[y_\nu^2] = E[z_\nu^2] = 0 \tag{165b}$$
$$E[|y_\nu|^2] = u(m - \nu) \tag{165c}$$
$$E[|z_\nu|^2] = u(n - \nu) \tag{165d}$$

and analogously for the higher moments (cf. (145)). Similarly as before, the random variables $y_\nu$ and $z_\nu$ thus satisfy on average the orthonormalization conditions $E[\sum_\nu y_\nu z_\nu^*] = 1$, $E[\sum_\nu y_\nu^* y_\nu] = 1$, and $E[\sum_\nu y_\nu z_\nu] = 0$, but the single realizations do not strictly fulfill the corresponding (non-averaged) relations. In order to fix this problem, we next define yet another set of random variables, namely

$$v_\nu := a y_\nu \tag{166}$$
$$w_\nu := b (z_\nu - \epsilon y_\nu) \tag{167}$$
$$\epsilon := a \sum_\nu y_\nu z_\nu \tag{168}$$
$$a := \left( \sum_\nu |y_\nu|^2 \right)^{-1/2} \tag{169}$$
$$b := \left( \sum_\nu |z_\nu - \epsilon y_\nu|^2 \right)^{-1/2} \tag{170}$$

It readily follows that the two vectors $v_\nu$ and $w_\nu$ are now properly orthonormalized, i.e.,

$$\sum_\nu |v_\nu|^2 = 1 \tag{171a}$$
$$\sum_\nu |w_\nu|^2 = 1 \tag{171b}$$
$$\sum_\nu v_\nu^* w_\nu = 0 \tag{171c}$$

The central idea of the present section is to approximate the “true” random variables $U_{mn}$ and $U_{mn}$ in (139) for two arbitrary but fixed indices $m \neq n$ by the above specified “auxiliary” random variables $v_\nu$ and $w_\nu$, i.e., we adopt the approximation

$$F_{\mu \nu}^{\text{ran}} = E[v_\mu^* v_\nu w_\nu w_\nu^*] \quad \text{for } m \neq n. \tag{172}$$

The evaluation of (172) turns out to be still an extremely tedious task. Moreover, most of the effort is required to
find out that one could have adopted right from the beginning the following additional approximations in (166)-(170) with only negligibly small differences in the final results in (143): (i) It is sufficient to consider Gaussian random variables \( y_\nu \) and \( z_\nu \); (ii) The factors \( a \) and \( b \) can be approximated by unity. In particular, one finds by exploiting (165a)-(165d) that the relations

\[
E[v_\nu] = E[w_\nu] = 0, \quad (173a) \\
E[|v_\nu|^2] = u(m - \nu), \quad (173b) \\
E[|w_\nu|^2] = u(n - \nu), \quad (173c)
\]

are satisfied in very good approximation, i.e., up to higher order corrections in the small parameter \( s \) from (19), (22). (Note that by adding suitable corrections of higher order in \( s \) on the right hand side of (165c) and (165d), it is even possible to turn (173a)-(173c) into exact equalities.) The basic reason for (i) is similar as in the (much simpler) example from Sec. IV D: A possible non-Gaussianity may only show up in terms which exhibit (at least) one “extra Kronecker delta” compared to the other terms, as exemplified by the last summand in (152). Therefore, the number of such terms which contribute to the multiple sums in (143) is relatively small compared to the number of the other terms. Their total contribution to the final result (143) thus amounts to a higher order correction, as exemplified around (161). An intuitive explanation of (ii) is as follows: Similarly as in (164) one finds that the mean values of \( a \) and \( b \) are very close to unity and that the variances are very small. Hence, approximating them by unity amounts to very small corrections on the right hand side of (166)-(168). Since each of those terms is already very small in itself, these corrections are even much smaller, hence their contribution to the final result in (143) is negligible. The same applies to the factor \( a^2 \) in (168). A better understanding of why approximating \( a \) and \( b \) by unity is fundamentally different from approximating \( \epsilon \) by zero will only be possible after having seen the way in which \( \epsilon \) acts in the following calculations.

Taking for granted the above simplifications (i) and (ii), we are thus left with the approximations

\[
v_\nu = y_\nu, \quad (174) \\
w_\nu = z_\nu - y_\nu \sum_k y_k^* z_k, \quad (175)
\]

where \( y_\nu \) and \( z_\nu \) can be considered as independent Gaussian random variables with mean values and variances as specified in (165a)-(165d).

Introducing (174) and (175) into (172) yields

\[
F_{\mu\nu}^{mn} = F_1 - F_2 - F_3 + F_4 \quad \text{for } m \neq n, \quad (176a) \\
F_1 := E[y_\mu y_\nu^* y_\sigma y_\tau^* z_\mu^* z_\tau^*], \quad (176b) \\
F_2 := \sum_k E[y_\mu y_\nu^* y_\sigma y_\tau^* z_k z_\tau^*], \quad (176c) \\
F_3 := \sum_j E[y_\mu y_\nu^* y_\sigma y_j y_j^* z_k], \quad (176d) \\
F_4 := \sum_{j,k} E[y_\mu y_\nu^* y_\sigma y_j y_j^* z_k z_k^*]. \quad (176e)
\]

Due to our assumption that the random variables appearing in (176b)-(176e) are multivariate Gaussian variables with zero mean, the expectation values can be conveniently evaluated by means of the Isserlis theorem (147).

The term \( F_1 \) in (176b) amounts to those contributions which one would obtain in the absence of the last summand in (175), corresponding to the simple approximation adopted in Sec. IV D. Accordingly, \( F_1 \) must be identical to the previous finding (150) in the case \( m \neq n \), i.e.,

\[
F_1 = \delta_{\mu\nu} u(m - \mu) u(n - \mu). \quad (177)
\]

Moreover, the remaining contributions \( F_2, F_3, F_4 \) must be the descendants of the last term in (175), i.e., they are solely due to our improved approximation.

Focusing on the right hand side of (176c), one readily sees that only partitions in the Isserlis theorem (147) may possibly result in non-zero contributions for which \( z_k \) is paired with \( z_m^* \), and for which \( k \) agrees with \( \mu \), i.e.,

\[
F_2 = E[y_\mu y_\nu^* y_\sigma y_\tau^* E[z_k z_k^*]]. \quad (178)
\]

The last factor is given by (165d). The remaining factor can be readily evaluated along similar lines, yielding

\[
F_2 = u(m - \mu) u(m - \nu) u(n - \mu) + \delta_{\mu\nu} u(m - \mu) u(m - \mu) u(n - \mu). \quad (179)
\]

Due to the extra Kronecker delta, the second term on the right hand side of (179) turns out to entail a correction in the final result (143) which is of higher order in the small parameter \( s \) from (19), (22) compared to the contributions of the first term. In turn, the first term might seem to be a higher order correction compared to the contributions of \( F_1 \) from (177), since the former is of third and the latter of second order in \( u \), see also (19) and (22). However, it will turn out later that the “missing Kronecker delta” effectively compensates for this extra factor \( u \). Heuristically, this can be seen by summing over \( m, n, \) and \( \nu \) both in (177) and in the first line in (179): In both cases, the result is unity, suggesting that both terms will also comparably contribute to the more complicated sums in (143). This “effect” pinpoints the above announced fundamental difference between approximating \( a \) and \( b \) in (166)-(168) by unity, and approximating \( \epsilon \) in (168) by zero: \( \epsilon \) entails new leading order terms, while \( a \) and \( b \) only give rise to new subleading order terms and to small corrections of the already existing leading order terms. Technically speaking, the basic mechanism is that the extra sum in (175) enables a pairing of the four \( y \) factors in (178) without an extra Kronecker delta, while the same was not possible in the \( F_1 \) term from (176b) and (177), to which the extra sum in (178) did not contribute.

After an analogous evaluation of \( F_3 \) and \( F_4 \), one can rewrite (176a) in the form

\[
F_{\mu\nu}^{mn} = \delta_{\mu\nu} u(m - \mu) u(n - \mu) + u(m - \mu) u(m - \nu) [g(m - n) - u(n - \mu) - u(n - \nu)] + \text{h.o. for } m \neq n. \quad (180)
\]
The first term on the right hand side of (180) derives from $F_i$ and thus agrees with the previous finding (150) for $m \neq n$. The second line in (180) represents the crucial modification due to our present improved approximation. The symbol “h.o.” in the last line of (180) refers to a multitude of higher order terms, which later turn out (by similar calculations as around (160)) to entail subleading corrections in the final result (143). One of them is the last summand in (179), and they all have the property that they exhibit (at least) four factors of Kronecker deltas or $u$ functions, while all leading order terms exhibit three such factors.

Turning to the case $m = n$ in (139), the question whether the two column vectors $U_{mn}$ and $U_{nv}$ ($m$ and $n$ fixed, $v$ variable) are strictly orthogonal or not is obviously irrelevant. Hence one recovers the same result as previously in (136) if $m = n$. The same applies to $G_{\mu\nu}^{mn}$ in (140) if $m = n$, while in the case $m \neq n$ the previous result in (150) will be modified by additional terms, all of which however turn out to entail subleading corrections in the final result (143).

Introducing all these findings into (143) one obtains similarly as in (154)-(163) after a straightforward but somewhat lengthy calculation the approximation

$$\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V = Q + |g(t)|^2 \{ \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} - Q \} + \tilde{R}(t) + \tilde{S}, \quad (181)$$

$$\tilde{R}(t) := \sum_{m,n} R_{mn}(0) A_{\mu n}^{\rho} \tilde{r}(t, m - n), \quad (182)$$

$$\tilde{r}(t, n) := 2 |g(t)|^2 q(n) - g(t) [h(t, n) + h(t, -n)], \quad (183)$$

$$h(t, n) := \sum_m e^{-im \varepsilon t} u(m - n) u(m), \quad (184)$$

where $Q$, $q(n)$, and $g(t)$ are defined in (155)-(157). The last summand $\tilde{S}$ in (181) originates from the higher order terms in (180) as well as the corresponding higher order terms arising in $G_{\mu\nu}^{mn}$ (see above). Similarly as in (162), one can show that

$$|\tilde{S}| \leq 10 s ||A||, \quad (185)$$

implying with (19) and (22) that the last term in (181) is a negligible correction of higher order in $s$.

Until now, we approximated the coefficients $a$ and $b$ in (166)-(168) by unity and the random variables $y_\nu$ and $z_\nu$ in (174)-(175) as Gaussian distributed. As pointed out below (172), going beyond these approximations gives rise to a flurry of additional subleading order corrections, analogously to the correction $S$ encountered in (158)-(162). As a consequence, the factor 10 on the right hand side of (185) will be replaced by some larger factor, which, however, will usually still remain on the order of 10 to 100.

Exploiting the definitions (155)-(157) and (184), one readily verifies that $g(0) = 1$, $h(0, u) = q(n)$, and $\sum_n h(t, n) = g^*(t)$. It follows with (182), (183) that $	ilde{R}(0) = 0$ and that if $A_{\mu n}^{\rho}$ is independent of $n$ then $\tilde{R}(t) = 0$ for all $t$. Though there does not seem to be a reason why this must always be so [69], in all concrete examples known to us the function $u(n)$ from (11) always exhibits the symmetry

$$u(-n) = u(n). \quad (186)$$

It then readily follows from (157) that $g^*(t) = g(t)$ and from (184) that $h(t, n) = h^*(t, n)$.

On the one hand, (181) still shares some similarities with our previous approximation in (163), but it no longer exhibits the shortcomings discussed below (163). On the other hand, (181) generalizes (24)-(29), which we previously derived in Secs. II A and III by a supersymmetric approach in the case when $u(n)$ takes the form (30) and hence $g(t)$ in (157) is given (in very good approximation) by $e^{-\Gamma |t|/2}$ according to (38). We note that $R(t)$ in (28) and $\tilde{R}(t)$ in (182) exhibit the same essential properties (they vanish for $t = 0$, for $t \to \infty$, and if $A_{\mu n}^{\rho}$ is independent of $n$), but quantitatively they are found to be not exactly identical in all details. On the one hand, this corroborates a posteriori the validity of our present ad hoc approximation, on the other hand, it also indicates the limits which such an approximation still may comprise at least in principle. However, in practice both $R(t)$ and $\tilde{R}(t)$ can be considered as negligible according to the line of reasoning below Eq. (m15) in the main paper. In the same vein, we can also adopt the approximation $Q \approx \langle A \rangle_{mc}$ from the main paper, yielding

$$\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V = \langle A \rangle_{mc} + |g(t)|^2 \{ \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} - \langle A \rangle_{mc} \}. \quad (187)$$

From this result together with (37) and the considerations in Secs. II B and V, one finally recovers (m20), (m21) in Sec. mVII.

V. VARIANCE OF THE TIME EVOLUTION

The objective of this section is to show that the deviation

$$\xi(t) = \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)} - \langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V \quad (188)$$

from the average $\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V$ is negligibly small for the vast majority of all members of the V ensemble. (Recall that $\xi(t)$ still depends on $V$, but for the sake of simplicity we desisted from explicitly indicating this dependence.) In doing so, we will consider the same ensembles for which the average expectation values $\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V$ have been explored in the previous sections. As outlined in Sec. II B, this essentially amounts to establishing the upper bound

$$|\xi^2(t)|_V \leq c s ||A||^2, \quad (189)$$

(cf. Eq. (42)) for the variance

$$|\xi^2(t)|_V = \left[ \langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V \right]^2 - \left( \langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V \right)^2, \quad (190)$$

""
where $s$ is our small parameter from (19) and (22), $\|A\|$ is the operator norm of $A$, and $c$ is some positive real number which does not depend on any further details of the considered system (in particular, it is independent of $s$, $A$, $\rho(0)$, and of the perturbation strength $\lambda$ in (1)).

A. Basic considerations

In this subsection, we further elaborate on the considerations in Sec. mIV, in particular on the heuristically expected (and numerically confirmed) similarities between our present random matrix problem and the central limit theorem (CLT) for random variables.

The basic observation is that a large number of perturbation matrix elements $V_{mn}^0$ (see (3)) is intuitively expected to be of comparable relevance for the perturbed expectation value in (9). (For simplicity, we may imagine $t$ in (188)-(190) as arbitrary but fixed, see also Sec. II B). In other words, $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)}$ on the left hand side of (3) is a real-valued function of many, roughly speaking “equally important” arguments $V_{mn}^0$. If these arguments are furthermore randomly sampled according to the specific $V$ ensemble at hand, then it seems reasonable to expect – similarly as in the CLT – that the concomitant probability distribution of the real-valued random variable $\langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)}$ will be sharply peaked about the mean value $\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V$.

Or, in the words of Talagrand [70], “[a] random variable that depends (in a ‘smooth’ way) on the influence of many independent variables (but not too much on any of them) is essentially constant”. Basically (up to the “quantitative details”), this expectation is tantamount to the main result (189) of the present section.

CLT-like phenomena of the above kind are often referred to as “concentration of measure”, “typicality”, “self-averaging”, or “ergodicity” properties. Specifically in the context of random matrix theory, they are mostly taken for granted without any further comment. In other words, the main emphasis is put on evaluating ensemble-averaged properties, while the fluctuations about the average are tacitly assumed to be negligible, but are hardly ever explicitly considered.

In our present work, we do not take such a property for granted, but rather we derive it.

B. Derivation of the upper bound (189)

To begin with, we rewrite $\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V$ by means of (9) and (10) in the compact form

$$\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V = \sum_{i...n} \rho_{in} A_{kl} e_m^n K^{i...n},$$  \hspace{1cm} (191)

where we introduced the abbreviations

$$\rho_{mn} := g(|m|\rho(0)|n)_0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (192)

$$A_{mn} := g(|m|A|n)_0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (193)

$$e_m^n := e^{(n-m)t},$$  \hspace{1cm} (194)

$$K^{i...n} := [U_{mi} U_{nj}^* U_{nk} U_{ml}^*] \rho,$$  \hspace{1cm} (195)

$$i...n := i, j, k, l, m, n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (196)

Note that $\rho_{mn}$ and $A_{mn}$ are identical to the previous quantities $\rho^{(i)}_{mn}(0)$ and $A^{(0)}_{mn}$, and that

$$K^{i...n} = M^{ijkl}_{mn}$$  \hspace{1cm} (197)

due to (136).

As discussed in detail below (137), the average in (195) must vanish unless each of the $U$ matrix elements without a “star” has a “partner” among those with “stars”, where being partners means that the second indices are equal. Since there are two possibilities of pairing the $U$’s along these lines, (195) can be rewritten as the sum of two terms, namely (see also (138)-(141) and (197))

$$K^{i...n} = \frac{2}{\nu=1} \sum_{\nu=1} K_\nu,$$  \hspace{1cm} (198a)

$$K_1 := \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} \left[ U_{mi} U_{mj}^* U_{nk} U_{nl}^* \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (198b)

$$K_2 := \delta_{ij} \delta_{jk} \delta_{ij} \left[ \left| U_{mi} \right|^2 \left| U_{nj} \right|^2 \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (198c)

where the extra factor $\delta_{ij}$ in (198c) is needed to avoid double counting of the case $i = j = k = l$. Finally, (191) can be rewritten as

$$\langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V = \sum_{\nu=1} K_\nu,$$  \hspace{1cm} (199a)

$$K_\nu := \sum_{i...n} \rho_{in} A_{kl} e_m^n K_{\nu}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (199b)

Similarly as in (192)-(196) one finds that

$$\left[ \langle [A]_{\rho(t)} \rangle_V \right] = \sum_{i...n} \rho_{in} A_{kl} \rho_{i'} A_{k'l'} e_m^n e_m^{n'} L^{i...n}_{i'...n'},$$  \hspace{1cm} (200)

$$L^{i...n}_{i'...n'} := \left[ U_{mi} U_{nj}^* U_{nk} U_{nl}^* U_{m'i} U_{n'j} U_{k'l} U_{m'n'} \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (201)

Analogously as above (198a), one can conclude that the average in (201) must vanish unless the $U$ matrix elements with and without stars can be arranged into pairs with identical second indices. Since there are 24 possibilities of pairing the $U$’s along these lines, (201) must be of the form

$$L^{i...n}_{i'...n'} = \sum_{\nu=1} L_\nu.$$  \hspace{1cm} (202)

The explicit determination of the $L_\nu$ is a straightforward but somewhat tedious task, yielding
\[
\mathcal{L}_1 := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{n j}|^2 |U_{m' i'}|^2 |U_{n' j'}|^2 V \\
\mathcal{L}_2 := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{n j}|^2 |U_{m' i'} |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_3 := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{n j}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_4 := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_5 := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_6 := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_7 := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{n j}|^2 |U_{m' i'} |U_{m' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_8 := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_9 := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{10} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' i'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{11} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{n j}|^2 |U_{m' i'} |U_{m' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{12} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{13} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{n j}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{14} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{15} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{n j}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{16} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{17} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{18} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{19} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{20} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{21} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{22} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{23} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V \\
\mathcal{L}_{24} := \delta_l \delta_{jk} \delta_{\nu l} \delta_{\nu j} \nu |U_{m i}|^2 |U_{m' k'} |U_{n' j'}| V
\]

Note that the appearance of the \( \bar{\delta} \)-factors (to avoid double countings) depends on the order in which the 24 cases are executed. In the above list, the first four Kronecker deltas in every given \( \mathcal{L}_\nu \) uniquely determine with which among the 24 possible cases we are dealing, and the sequence of the indices \( \nu \) fixes the specific ordering of the 24 cases which we have chosen. Finally, (201) can be rewritten as

\[
\left[ \langle A \rangle_{\rho(t)}^2 \right]_{V} = \sum_{\nu=1}^{24} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\nu , \quad (204a)
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\nu := \sum_{i \ldots n , i' \ldots n'} \rho_{ij} A_{kl} \rho_{ij'} A_{kl'} n_{m}^e n_{m'}^e \mathcal{L}_\nu . \quad (204b)
\]

Taking into account in (204b) the explicit expressions for \( \mathcal{L}_\nu \) from (203a)-(203x), one can infer that

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_7 \quad (205a)
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4 = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{13} \quad (205b)
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_5 = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_9 \quad (205c)
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_6 = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{15} \quad (205d)
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{10} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{19} \quad (205e)
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{12} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{21} \quad (205f)
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{16} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{20} \quad (205g)
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{18} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{23} \quad (205h)
\]

Effectively, we are thus left with 16 summands in (204a).

The main remaining task is to evaluate the ensemble averages over eight \( U \) matrix elements on the right hand side of (203a)-(203x). In principle, this might be doable by a corresponding generalization of the supersymmetric approach from Sec. III. In practice, already for the averages over four \( U \) matrix elements in Sec. III, the explicit evaluation of the pertinent saddle-point approximation turned out to be at the limit of what seems analytically doable. Therefore, such an extension of the supersymmetric approach is beyond the scope of our present
work. Instead, we will adopt the alternative approach from Sec. IV.

We begin with recalling the evaluation of (198)-(199) by means of the approach from Sec. IV E, but employing a modified notation which is more suitable for the purpose of the subsequent generalizations. Focusing first on the cases with \(m \neq n\) in (198b) and (198c), we introduce independent Gaussian random variables \(z_{1i}\) and \(z_{2i}\) with (see also (165a)-(165c))

\[
E[z_{ai}] = E[(z_{ai})^2] = 0, \quad (206a)
\]

\[
E\left[(z_{ai})^2\right] = u(\kappa_\alpha - i), \quad (206b)
\]

\[
\kappa_1 := m, \quad (206c)
\]

\[
\kappa_2 := n, \quad (206d)
\]

and \(\alpha \in \{1, 2\}\). In a next step, we define the random variables (see also (174), (175))

\[
v_{1i} := z_{1i}, \quad (207)
\]

\[
v_{2i} := z_{2i} - z_{1i} \sum_k z_{1k}^* z_{2k}, \quad (208)
\]

and we adopt the approximations (see also (172))

\[
[U_{mij} U_{mkl}^* U_{mk}^* U_{ml}] = E[v_{1ij} v_{2k} v_{3l}^*] \quad (209)
\]

for the two averages appearing on the right hand side of (198b) and (198c). Note that in both cases the four indices \(i, j, k, l\) actually amount to coinciding pairs. While we assumed \(m \neq n\) so far, the corresponding approximations for \(m = n\) are

\[
[U_{mij} U_{mkl}^* U_{mk}^* U_{ml}] = E[v_{1ij} v_{2k} v_{3l}^*] \quad (210)
\]

After introducing (207) and (208) into (209) and (210), those averages can be explicitly evaluated by means of the Isserlis theorem (147) together with (206a) and (206b). These calculations and the subsequent evaluation of (198)-(199) have been explained in detail in Sec. IV E.

Next we turn to the averages over eight \(U\) matrix elements in (203a)-(203x). As before, we first focus on the cases where the four indices \(m, n, m', n'\) are pairwise distinct and we introduce four independent Gaussian random variables \(z_{\alpha i}\) (\(\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\)) with

\[
E[z_{\alpha i}] = E[(z_{\alpha i})^2] = 0, \quad (211a)
\]

\[
E\left[(z_{\alpha i})^2\right] = u(\kappa_\alpha - i), \quad (211b)
\]

\[
\kappa_1 := m, \quad (211c)
\]

\[
\kappa_2 := n, \quad (211d)
\]

Next, the random variables \(v_{\alpha i}\) are defined according to

\[
v_{\alpha i} := z_{\alpha i} - \sum_{\beta=1}^{\alpha-1} (z_{\beta i} \sum_k z_{\beta k}^* z_{\alpha k}) \quad (212)
\]

and we adopt the approximations

\[
[U_{mij} U_{m'jl}^* U_{mk}^* U_{ml}^* U_{m'n} U_{m'n'} U_{m'k}^* U_{m'l}] = E[v_{1ij} v_{2k} v_{3l} v_{4n} v_{5n'} v_{6k'} v_{7l'} v_{8}] \quad (213)
\]

for the averages appearing on the right hand side of (203a)-(203x). Again, in all those averages the 8 indices \(i, j, k, l, i', j', k', l'\) actually amount to coinciding pairs. In the remaining cases where the four indices \(m, n, m', n'\) are not pairwise distinct, only a smaller set of indices \(\alpha \in \{1, ..., \beta\}\) with \(\beta < 4\) is actually needed.

After introducing (212) into (213) (or its counterparts if \(m, n, m', n'\) are not pairwise distinct), the averages in (203a)-(203x) can be explicitly evaluated by means of the Isserlis theorem (147) together with (211a) and (211b). (Due to (204a)-(204h) not all of them are actually needed.) Finally, one is left with evaluating (204a) and (204b). These calculations are in principle not very difficult, but in practice they amount to a daunting task due to the huge number of different terms. Omitting the details of those very lengthy calculations, the main results are as follows:

The second moment in (204a) is dominated by the contributions of the summands \(\tilde{L}_\nu\) with indices \(\nu \in \{1, 2, 7, 8\}\). To leading order, they exactly cancel the corresponding dominating contributions to the last term in (190) which one obtains via (199a). All the remaining contributions by the two terms on the right hand side of (190) are found to be of subleading order in the small parameter \(s\) from (19) and (22). Yet another flurry of subleading order terms arises for the same reasons as discussed below (185). Explicitly, one finally arrives at the upper bound (189). As a first, rather conservative estimate for the constant \(c\) in (189) we furthermore obtained \(c \leq O(10^3)\). It seems likely that this rough upper bound could still be substantially reduced by painstakingly searching among the very numerous contributions to (199a) and (204a) for terms which cancel each other partially or even completely. Here, we have confined ourselves to separately bounding every single term relatively generously and without taking into account possible cancellations. Even in this case, our detailed calculations extended over a very large number of pages.