Thermalization of small quantum systems: From the zeroth law of thermodynamics

Jiaozi Wang,[1] Wen-ge Wang,[1,*] and Jiao Wang[2]

[1]*Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China*
[2]*Department of Physics, Fujian Key University Laboratory for Low-Dimensional Condensed Matter Physics, and Jiujiang Research Institute, Xiamen University, Xiamen 361005, Fujian, China*

(Dated: March 18, 2022)

Thermalization of isolated quantum systems has been studied intensively in recent years and significant progresses have been achieved. Here, we study thermalization of small quantum systems that interact with large chaotic environments under the consideration of Schrödinger evolution of composite systems, from the perspective of the zeroth law of thermodynamics. Namely, we consider a small quantum system that is brought into contact with a large environmental system; after they have relaxed, they are separated and their temperatures are studied. Our question is under what conditions the small system may have a detectable temperature that is identical with the environmental temperature. This should be a necessary condition for the small quantum system to be thermalized and to have a well-defined temperature. By using a two-level probe quantum system that plays the role of a thermometer, we find that the zeroth law is applicable to quantum chaotic systems, but not to integrable systems.

arXiv:1905.06100v2 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 4 Jun 2019

I. INTRODUCTION

Whether and how a quantum system reaches thermalization is a long-standing problem that has been perseveringly studied for long [1–6], since von Neumann's seminal work [7]. Modern experimental advances in ultracold atoms and trapped ions [8–16] have attracted more interest and efforts on this problem [17–20], with particular focus on small quantum systems [17]. Generally speaking, studies on this issue proceeded in two directions: one for isolated systems and another for systems coupled with environments.

For isolated quantum systems, rapid and important progresses have been achieved in recent years [20, 21]. The eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH), first proposed in Refs. [22] and [23], has established a general framework for understanding thermalization results in isolated systems. It claims that for local observables, every energy eigenstate is thermal, i.e., indistinguishable from the corresponding (micro)canonical ensemble [24]. It implies the possibility that the expectation value of a local observable in an isolated quantum system far from equilibrium may relax to a (almost) time independent result that agrees with the ensemble average predicted by orthodox statistical mechanics [24–30].

But for systems interacting with environments, not as many works have been done and some important problems remain open [31–39]. For example, one basic question is under what condition a system may evolve into a steady state and, when this happens, whether the system may be characterized by a temperature. Indeed, although temperature is a core concept for quantum thermalization, it has not been fully understood yet [40–42]. In this respect, it was found that, when the effective dimension of the initial state of the system-environment composite is large, the reduced density matrix (RDM) of the system will relax to a steady state [32]. Under some assumptions [33–35], the steady RDM may further result in a Gibbs form parameterized by the environmental temperature. Following these progresses, one immediate task is to justify those assumptions, or to reveal the conditions under which they are applicable. Another crucial task is to clarify and distinguish two temperatures involved here. One we refer to as the *environment-assigned temperature*, denoted by β_E, which is the temperature of the environment the system interacts with. It also appears as a parameter in the steady RDM of the system after relaxation. Another temperature is the temperature the system may own when it is decoupled from the environment after relaxation. We refer to it as the *internal temperature*, denoted by β_I; it characterizes the motion of the system in its own internal freedom at the thermal state it may reach.

One question is, under what condition an internal temperature can be defined and related to the environment-assigned temperature. So far, internal temperature has not been addressed in the context of environment interaction and compared with the environment temperature, yet. In literatures, explicitly or implicitly, the two temperatures have been assumed to be identical, making the meaning of temperature somehow confusing. One reason could be that β_E appears in the Gibbs form of the RDM. But, the role played by the RDM is only the 'initial condition' when being disconnected from the environment, which cannot fully govern the system's ongoing evolution and hence its thermal property. Another reason might be that the zeroth law of thermodynamics has been taken for granted in the present context. Nevertheless, it is well known that in principle the thermodynamic laws are for macroscopic systems exclusively. The above question is equivalent to ask under what condition or to what extent the zeroth law can be extended to small quantum systems. Our motivation in this work is to clarify this question.

*Electronic address: wgwang@ustc.edu.cn

To this end, a necessary and important step is to measure and determine the temperature of a studied small quantum system when it is decoupled from the environment, if it may thermalize. As the system is isolated when being decoupled, we can take advantage of the temperature-detecting strategy developed recently in Ref. [43] for an isolated quantum system based on the principle that, as an internal property of the system itself, internal temperature can only be assigned to the system when it can be detected in a reliable way and the measured value is independent of detection details.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we will study the Schrödinger evolution of the system-environment composite and show that, regardless of the size and the dynamics of the system, the RDM will relax to a Gibbs steady state given by β_E in general. In Sec. III, we will study the measurement of β_I and reveal the condition for that such a measurement can be performed. In Sec. IV, we will put our theoretical results into numerical tests, and finally, we will summarize our study in Sec. V.

II. RELAXATION OF THE SYSTEM-ENVIRONMENT COMPOSITE

In this section, we study thermalization of a small quantum system in contact with a large quantum environment, with the consideration of Schrödinger evolution of composite systems. We will show that, under the conditions stated below on both the environment and the coupling term, a system, chaotic or integrable, will finally evolve into a Gibbs steady state with the corresponding β parameter equal to the environment temperature, or β_E. The conditions are:

- For the environment, (i) it should be a chaotic system, (ii) it should be large and its density of states can be approximately assumed to be an exponential function within the energy range of the small quantum system, and (iii) the number of eigenstates in initial state should be also large.
- For the coupling term, it should be appropriately adjusted to satisfy that (i) the system-environment composite is chaotic, and (ii) the width of the local density of states (LDOS) of the composite system is narrow [to satisfy Eq. (B20) in Appendix B], which implies that the coupling is relatively weak.

Let us begin with our main setup. The Hamiltonian of the composite system is

$$H = H_S + \lambda H_{IS} \otimes H_{I\mathcal{E}} + H_{\mathcal{E}} \tag{1}$$

with H_S and $H_{\mathcal{E}}$ being that of the system and of the environment, respectively, and the middle term on the r.h.s. being the coupling. The eigenstates of H_S and $H_{\mathcal{E}}$ are denoted by $|\psi_k^S\rangle$ and $|\phi_j^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle$,

$$H_{\mathcal{S}}|\psi_k^{\mathcal{S}}\rangle = E_k^{\mathcal{S}}|\psi_k^S\rangle, \quad H_{\mathcal{E}}|\phi_j^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle = E_j^{\mathcal{E}}|\phi_j^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle \ , \tag{2}$$

and the corresponding density of states are denoted by $\rho_S(E^S)$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E^{\mathcal{E}})$, respectively. Eigenstates of the total Hamiltonian H are denoted by $|\psi_\alpha\rangle$ with energies E_α, $H|\psi_\alpha\rangle = E_\alpha|\psi_\alpha\rangle$, which can be decomposed as

$$|\psi_\alpha\rangle = \sum_{k,j} C_{kj}^\alpha |\psi_k^S\rangle|\phi_j^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle. \tag{3}$$

The LDOS of an unperturbed state $|\psi_k^S\rangle|\phi_j^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle$ is defined as $L_{kj}(E) = \sum |C_{kj}^\alpha|^2\delta(E_\alpha - E)$.

According to recent progresses achieved in the study on foundation of quantum statistical mechanics, many properties of the so-called typical states within appropriately-large energy shells are similar to those of thermal states. So, a typical state of the environment, representing a thermal state with a temperature β_0, is taken as its initial state, which reads

$$|\Phi_0^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle = \sum_{E_j^{\mathcal{E}}\in\Gamma_0} D_j|\phi_j^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle, \tag{4}$$

where D_j are Gaussian random numbers with a same variance, with the normalisation condition $\sum_j |D_j|^2 = 1$. We use N_{Γ_0} to indicate the number of energy levels in the energy shell $\Gamma_0 = [E_0^{\mathcal{E}} - \delta E/2, E_0^{\mathcal{E}} + \delta E/2]$, and the value of $E_0^{\mathcal{E}}$ is determined by β_0 as $\frac{\partial \ln \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E)}{\partial E}|_{E=E_0^{\mathcal{E}}} = \beta_0$. For the system, we consider a generic initial state $|\psi_0^S\rangle = \sum_k C_k|\psi_k^S\rangle$.

Now we study the time evolution of the composite system after the interaction is turned on, with the consideration of Schrödinger evolution of composite system. Note that, due to the previously stated requirement that the environment is large and has an exponential density of states, the interaction does not change the temperature of the environment.

If the composite system is a quantum chaotic system, its energy levels, as well as their spacings, should have no degeneracy. It is known that, in this situation, beyond a sufficiently long time, the distance between the RDM of the system, $\rho_S(t) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{E}}(|\Psi(t)\rangle\langle\Psi(t)|)$, and its long-time average, denoted by $\overline{\rho}_S$, scaling as $N_{\Gamma_0}^{-1/2}$, where $\overline{\rho}_S$ is defined as $\overline{\rho}_S = \lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \rho_S(t)dt$. This implies that for large N_{Γ_0}, if $\rho_S(t)$ has a steady state, it should be $\overline{\rho}_S$. Applying results given in Refs. [44, 45] to the system-environment composite studied here with $\mathrm{Tr}_S(H_I) = 0$, we can see that the steady state of the system have an approximately-diagonal form in the eigenbasis $\{|\psi_k^S\rangle\}$, when the coupling parameter λ satisfies the conditions mentioned previously. In other words, the eigenbasis of the self-Hamiltonian of the system is a preferred basis [46, 47], so we only need to study the diagonal elements $\rho_{kk}(t) = \langle\psi_k^S|\rho_S(t)|\psi_k^S\rangle$, especially its steady value $\overline{\rho}_{kk} = \langle\psi_k^S|\overline{\rho}_S|\psi_k^S\rangle$. Here we omit the subscript S in $\overline{\rho}_{kk}$ and $\rho_{kk}(t)$ for brevity. Considering the random feature of components of eigenfunctions (EF) in chaotic systems, one can write $\overline{\rho}_{kk}$ as (see Appendix A)

$$\overline{\rho}_{kk} \simeq \frac{1}{N_{\Gamma_0}}\sum_{k_0}|C_{k_0}|^2 \sum_{E_{j_0}^{\mathcal{E}}\in\Gamma_0}|C_{k_0 j_0}^\alpha|^2 \sum_\alpha\sum_j |C_{kj}^\alpha|^2. \tag{5}$$

By defining $\mathcal{F}^k_{k_0j_0} = \sum_\alpha |C^\alpha_{k_0j_0}|^2 F_{\alpha k}$ with $F_{\alpha k} = \sum_j |C^\alpha_{kj}|^2$, $\overline{\rho}_{kk}$ can be rewritten as

$$\overline{\rho}_{kk} = \frac{1}{N_{\Gamma_0}} \sum_{k_0} |C_{k_0}|^2 \sum_{E^{\mathcal{E}}_{j_0} \in \Gamma_0} \mathcal{F}^k_{k_0j_0}. \tag{6}$$

If the environment is chaotic and the coupling term is adjusted to satisfy the conditions given in the beginning of this section, we can derive the value of $F_{\alpha k}$ and $\mathcal{F}^k_{k_0j_0}$ (see Appendix B) as

$$F_{\alpha k} \simeq F_k(E_\alpha) \simeq \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E_\alpha - E^S_k)}{\sum_l \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E_\alpha - E^S_l)}, \tag{7}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}^k_{k_0j_0} \simeq F_k(E^S_{k_0} + E^{\mathcal{E}}_{j_0}) \simeq \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E^S_{k_0} + E^{\mathcal{E}}_{j_0} - E^S_k)}{\sum_l \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E^S_{k_0} + E^{\mathcal{E}}_{j_0} - E^S_l)}. \tag{8}$$

If $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E)$ can be taken as an nearly exponential function within the energy range of the small system, then

$$\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E^S_{k_0} + E^{\mathcal{E}}_{j_0} - E^S_l) \simeq \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E^S_{k_0} + E^{\mathcal{E}}_{j_0}) \exp(-\beta_0 E^S_l). \tag{9}$$

Substituting Eq. (9) into Eq. (8), we therefore have

$$\mathcal{F}^k_{k_0j_0} \simeq \frac{\exp(-\beta_0 E^s_k)}{\sum_k \exp(-\beta_0 E^S_k)}. \tag{10}$$

Noting that $\mathcal{F}^k_{k_0j_0}$ is independent of k_0 and j_0 according to Eq.(10) and the normalisation condition $\sum_{k_0} |C_{k_0}|^2 = 1$, we can further obtain that

$$\overline{\rho}_{kk} \simeq \frac{\exp(-\beta_0 E^s_k)}{\sum_k \exp(-\beta_0 E^S_k)}. \tag{11}$$

It is worth emphasizing that in the calculation of $\overline{\rho}_{kk}$, we have only assumed that the environment and the composite system are chaotic, without any requirements on the system itself. This implies that a small quantum system, in spite of its size and whether chaotic or not, should evolve into the Gibbs state when being coupled to a large environment with appropriate coupling. Though as a parameter the temperature of the environment enters the RDM, we cannot assume for granted that it serves as the internal temperature of the system. We are to study this topic in the next section.

III. DETECTION OF THE TEMPERATURE OF SYSTEM

In this section, we study how to determine the temperature of the system after it is decoupled from the environment with a steady RDM, based on the method established in Ref. [43]. We will show that the system can possess a well-defined temperature only when it is chaotic and its size is not too small, and importantly, in this case the value of the temperature is close to the environment temperature.

First of all, let us recall some main results of Ref. [43] and explain the concept of internal temperature. Different from the environment temperature, internal temperature β_I should be an internal property of system and should be detected in a reliable way. If we want to detect a small system's temperature by coupling a probe (thermometer) to it, due to the small size of the system, back action from the probe is nonnegligible; moreover, the probing result may depend on the form, the location, and the strength of the system-probe coupling, as well as the Hamiltonian and the initial state of the probe. A reliable temperature detection can be achieved only when it is free from these factors. In the operational sense, only when such a reliable temperature detection result is achieved, can the system be regarded to possess a meaningful temperature. For small quantum systems, the operational temperature-detection method established in Ref. [43] is:

- Couple a two-level probe, in an initial state $|m_0\rangle = |0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$, to the studied small quantum system.
- Wait until the probe reaches a steady state $\overline{\rho}_p$ and gets a value of β^{m_0} by fitting the steady state $\overline{\rho}_p$ to the Gibbs state $\frac{1}{Z}e^{-\beta H_p}$, where β^{m_0} is the result of β when choosing $|m_0\rangle$ as the probe's initial state and H_p is the (effective) Hamiltonian of the probe.
- Calculate the average of $\beta^{(0)}$ and $\beta^{(1)}$, denoted by $\overline{\beta} = \frac{\beta^{(0)}+\beta^{(1)}}{2}$.

Based on the above detection method, it was found that [43], for a chaotic system that is not very small in size, under an initial condition as a typical state, and within certain regime of the coupling term, the value of $\overline{\beta}$ is insensitive to details of the detection. Thus an internal temperature can be assigned to the system, with its value given by $\beta_I = \overline{\beta}$.

Now we take this method to study a small quantum system after it is coupled to a large environment and has reached a Gibbs state. We need to disconnect the system with the environment and, then, couple it to a two-level probe. The Hamiltonian of the system-probe composite is written as

$$H_{SP} = H_p + \lambda H^{sp}_I + H_S, \tag{12}$$

where $H_p = \Delta_p s_x$ and $H^{sp}_I = H^{sp}_{IS} \otimes H^{sp}_{IP}$. Here $s_x = \frac{\sigma_x}{2}$, with σ_x being a Pauli matrix. We use $|m\rangle (m = 0, 1)$ to denote eigenstates of the probe Hamiltonian H_p with eigenvalues e_m, $H_p|m\rangle = e_m|m\rangle$. Eigenstates of the composite Hamiltonian H_{SP} are denoted by $|\psi^{sp}_\mu\rangle$ with energies E^{sp}_μ, $H_{SP}|\psi^{sp}_\mu\rangle = E^{sp}_\mu|\psi^{sp}_\mu\rangle$, and

$$|\psi^{sp}_\mu\rangle = \sum_{k,m} C^\mu_{km}|\psi^S_k\rangle|m\rangle. \tag{13}$$

Let us consider $|m_0\rangle$ as the initial state of the probe. Based on discussions given in Sec. II, the initial state of the system is a Gibbs state,

$$\rho_{kk} = \frac{1}{Z}\exp(-\beta_E E_k^S) \tag{14}$$

with

$$Z = \sum_k \exp(-\beta_E E_k^S). \tag{15}$$

Now we turn to the evolution of the RDM of the probe. If H_{sp} is chaotic, under similar consideration as in Sec. II, the steady state of the probe should be close to its long time average $\overline{\rho}^p$, diagonalized in the eigenbasis of probe. Thus, we only need to consider the diagonal terms, which can be written as

$$\overline{\rho}_{mm}^{(m_0)} \simeq \frac{1}{Z}\sum_{k_0}\exp(-\beta_E E_{k_0}^S)\sum_{\mu}|C_{k_0m_0}^{\mu}|^2\sum_k|C_{km}^{\mu}|^2, \tag{16}$$

and in turn

$$\overline{\rho}_{mm}^{(m_0)} \simeq \frac{1}{Z}\sum_{k_0}\exp(-\beta_E E_{k_0}^S)\mathcal{G}_{k_0m_0}^m \tag{17}$$

with $\mathcal{G}_{k_0m_0}^m = \sum_\mu |C_{k_0m_0}^{\mu}|^2 G_{\mu m}$ and $G_{\mu m} = \sum_k |C_{km}^{\mu}|^2$. Similar to the derivation of Eq. (8), if (i) H_S is chaotic, and (ii) the coupling term H_I^{sp} is appropriately adjusted such that H_{sp} is chaotic and the width of LDOS of H_{sp} is still narrow [to satisfy Eq. (B22) in Appendix B], we can derive $\mathcal{G}_{k_0m_0}^m$ as

$$\mathcal{G}_{k_0m_0}^m \simeq \frac{\rho_S(E_{k_0}^S + e_{m_0} - e_m)}{\sum_n \rho_S(E_{k_0}^S + e_{m_0} - e_n)}. \tag{18}$$

In order to calculate the value of $\overline{\rho}_{mm}^{(m_0)}$, we need the concrete form of $\rho_S(E)$. Here, we consider the case that the density of states of the system has a Gaussian form, $\rho_S(E) = \exp(-\alpha E^2)$, which is general in systems with bounded local interactions [48]. Moreover, one may assume that α can be taken as a power-law-decay function of the particle number N (for the Ising model $\alpha \propto \frac{1}{N+c}$, see Ref. [49]). From these properties, we can get the approximate value of $\overline{\rho}_{mm}^{m_0}$ up to the third order of Δ_p (see Appendix C), i.e.,

$$\overline{\rho}_{mm}^{(m_0)} \simeq \frac{1}{1+\exp[2(-1)^m\alpha(E_{k_0}^S + e_{m_0})\Delta_p]} + \frac{(-1)^{(1-m)}\alpha\beta\Delta_p^3}{8}. \tag{19}$$

Then, using $\beta^{m_0} = \frac{1}{\Delta_p}\ln\frac{\rho_{00}^{(m_0)}}{\rho_{11}^{(m_0)}}$, we have

$$\beta^{m_0} \simeq \beta_0 + 2\alpha e_{m_0} + \frac{\alpha\beta\Delta_p^2}{2} \tag{20}$$

and

$$\overline{\beta} \simeq \beta_E + \frac{\alpha\beta_E}{2}\Delta_p^2. \tag{21}$$

The value of $\overline{\beta}$ is independent of other factors but still depends on Δ_p. Since α is usually a power-law-decay function of N, when N is not small, $\overline{\beta}$ has a weak dependence on the level spacing Δ_p of the probe. Thus, $\overline{\beta}$ is insensitive to all the detection details and, hence, it can be defined as the internal temperature of the system. Namely,

$$\beta_I = \overline{\beta}. \tag{22}$$

The difference between β_I and β_E is therefore

$$\frac{\beta_E - \beta_I}{\beta_E} \simeq \frac{\alpha}{2}\Delta_p^2. \tag{23}$$

At the end of this section, we discuss the difference and relation of the two concepts of temperature, i.e., internal temperature β_I and environment-assigned temperature β_E. A system in contact with a large environment may evolve to a Gibbs state and gain its β_E from the environment, under certain conditions stated previously. But, to possess an internal temperature usually requires more; that is, one needs to get a value of $\overline{\beta}$ insensitive to all the detail factors of the detection [see Eq. (22)].

Specifically, the first requirement is that the system should be chaotic. As the second requirement, one should be able to adjust the strength of coupling term (λ) to ensure the composite system being chaotic and the width of LDOS being narrow enough (to satisfy Eq. (B22) in Appendix B) at the same time. But, it is impossible to achieve this, when the system is very small. The reasons can be stated as follows. The minimum value of λ to ensure the composite system being chaotic, denoted by λ_c usually increase with decrease of the system's size. Thus, when the system's size is quite small, λ_c is large. This usually can not guarantee narrowness of the LDOS to satisfy Eq. (B22) in Appendix B, which would invalid our derivations given above. Hence, a very small system may not possess an internal temperature. Another reason is that a small N usually results in a large α, then, according to Eq.(21), $\overline{\beta}$ varies notably with Δ_p.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we put our main analytical results obtained in the above two sections into numerical tests.

A. Relaxation of the system-environment composite

We adopt the defect Ising model as our system. It consists of N spins with the nearest neighboring interactions




FIG. 1: Diagonal elements of RDM (dots) of the system, $\rho_{kk}(t)$, versus eigenvalues E_k^S in the defect Ising model at an instant t after the system relaxed. (a) and (b) are for systems consists $N = 7$ spins, with (a) chaotic case and (b) integrable case. (c) and (d) are similar to (a) and (b), respectively, but for systems consists $N = 12$ spins. The (black lines) indicate the analytical predictions by Eq. (11).

and the periodic boundary condition. The Hamiltonian is

$$H_S = \sum_i s_z^i s_z^{i+1} + g \sum_i s_x^i + \mu(h_1 s_z^1 + h_4 s_z^4), \qquad (24)$$

where

$$s_{x,y,z} = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{x,y,z} \qquad (25)$$

and the parameters h_1, h_4, and g are fixed ($h_1 = 1.11, h_4 = 1.61$, and $g = 0.6$). The parameter μ controls dynamical properties of the system: For $\mu = 0$, the system is integrable; for $\mu \simeq [0.1, 1]$, it is chaotic; and for $\mu > 1$, the system exhibits the so-called many-body localisation (MBL). In our simulations, we take $\mu = 0$ and $\mu = 0.3$ to represent the integrable and chaotic dynamics, respectively. The environment has a Hamiltonian

$$H_\mathcal{E} = s_x^\mathcal{E} + \lambda_R s_z^\mathcal{E} \otimes H_{IR} + H_R, \qquad (26)$$

where H_{IR} is a random matrix and H_R is a diagonal matrix, whose density of states has an exponential shape, $\rho_R(E) = C\exp(\beta_0 E)$. The parameter λ_R is appropriately adjusted to ensure that the environment is chaotic. When λ_R is not very large, $\rho_\mathcal{E}(E)$ has an exponential shape similar to $\rho_R(E)$ with the same exponent, i.e., $\rho_\mathcal{E}(E) = C'\exp(\beta_0 E)$. Here, we use $H_\mathcal{E}$ to simulate a chaotic environment at a temperature β_0.

The coupling term H_I is

$$H_I = (\mu_N s_z^N + \mu_{N-1} s_z^{N-1}) \otimes s_z^\mathcal{E}. \qquad (27)$$

We set $\mu_N = 0.91$ and $\mu_{N-1} = -1.11$ in our simulations in order to break the parity symmetry of the system.




FIG. 2: Dependence of $\overline{\beta}$ (with $\Delta_p = 0.4$) on the coupling strength λ and the form of coupling term H_{IS}^{sp} in the defect Ising model. (a) is for the integrable dynamics and the system consists of $N = 13$ spins. (b) and (c) are for the chaotic dynamics with $N = 13$ (b) and $N = 7$ (c) spins, respectively. In each panel, and blue squares (red dots) are for $H_{IS}^{sp} = s_x$ ($H_{IS}^{sp} = s_y$); the three sets of data for a given H_{IS}^{sp}, from bottom to top, are for $\beta_E = 0.1$, 0.3, and 0.5, respectively.

To simulate the evolution of the system-environment composite, an accurate high order split-step method is used to factorize the unitary evolution operator [50, 51]. In Fig. 1, the results for the case that the defect Ising system has 7 and 12 spins and the environment has a dimension $d_\mathcal{E} = 2^{12}$, are shown. It can be seen that no matter the system is chaotic or integrable, large or small, a steady RDM will be reached and it is close to the Gibbs state predicted by Eq. (11).




FIG. 3: Dependence of $\overline{\beta}$ on Δ_p (a) and on Δ_p^2 (b), respectively, for $\beta_E = 0.1$ (red dots), $\beta_E = 0.3$ (blue squares) and $\beta_E = 0.5$ (gray triangles). As a comparison, the black dashed line in (b) indicates our analytical result of Eq. (23).

B. Numerical results for internal temperature of the system

As the steady RDM of the system can be well simulated by a Gibbs state regardless of whether it is chaotic or not, in the numerical study of internal temperature of the system we use Gibbs state as its initial state instead of the true RDM.

Results of $\overline{\beta}$ for different λ values and different form of coupling term are shown in Fig. 2. It can be seen in Fig. 2(a) that, if system is integrable, the detection result $\overline{\beta}$ depends strongly on the form of the coupling term H_{IS}^{sp} and, moreover, in the whole region of λ investigated, $\overline{\beta}$ deviates from β_E significantly. Thus, we can conclude that an integrable quantum system cannot be assigned an internal temperature.

For a chaotic system that is not small in size, as shown in Fig. 2(b) with $N = 13$ spins, $\overline{\beta}$ is nearly independent of λ in a considerably wide range of $\lambda \in (0.25, 0.5)$ and the value is very close to β_E. This implies that the system has an internal temperature given by $\overline{\beta}$. But, when the system is small, as shown in Fig. 2(c) for $N = 7$, the detection result $\overline{\beta}$ depends on the form of the coupling term H_{IS} and, in the whole region of λ investigated, $\overline{\beta}$ deviates from β_E obviously. This is in consistence with our previous analysis that a very small system does not have an internal temperature, either.

Finally, in Fig. 3(b) the validity of Eq. (23) is checked. Although it deviates obviously from the simulation results, we find that its slope agrees with that of the latter for $\Delta_p^2 \in (0, 0.5)$. The main difference appears in the intercept. The reason could be that, a Gibbs state is a mix state of all eigenstates of the system, also includes those near the bounds of spectrum which have been well known to have some regular properties often and can not be regarded to be chaotic. Therefore, the value of $\overline{\beta}$ may deviate from our prediction of Eq. (23). One may introduce a small modification to Eq. (23) by

$$\frac{\beta_E - \beta_I}{\beta_E} \simeq \frac{\alpha}{2}\Delta_p^2 + \delta(\beta_E), \tag{28}$$

where $\delta(\beta_E)$ represents a modification due to regular eigenstates (near boundaries) in the Gibbs state. It is worth noting that the weight of the regular eigenstates usually decreases with the decrease of β_E, resulting in decrease of $\delta(\beta_E)$, which is consistent with the numerical results in Fig. 3(b).

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS

In this paper, firstly, we study the condition under which small systems in contact with large, quantum chaotic environments may evolve to a Gibbs state with a parameter β given by the environmental temperature. It is shown that, in spite of being integrable or chaotic, large or small, such a system may evolve into the Gibbs state under appropriate interaction with the environment. In this case, the small system gets a temperature-type property that is imposed by its environment, which we call an environment-assigned temperature.

That a system possesses an environment-assigned temperature does not necessarily imply that it should possess a temperature as an internal property, in the sense that it can be measured by a small probe in a reliable way. Therefore, secondly, for a small system in a Gibbs state with an environment-assigned temperature, we study the condition for it to possess an internal temperature in the sense mentioned above. It is found that only chaotic systems which are not very small may possess an internal temperature, which coincides with the environmental temperature.

Our study shows that the zeroth law of thermodynamics is still useful for small quantum systems. But, its application may face situations much more complex than those met at the macroscopic level. In particular, distinguishing between environment-assigned temperature and internal temperature should be useful, in the attempt of clarifying complicated situations that may be met when using the concept of temperature for small systems.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by NSFC (Grants No. 11275179, No. 11535011, No. 11775210, and No. 11335006).

[1] D. T. Haar, Rev. Mod. Phys. **27**, 289 (1955).
[2] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. A **30**, 504 (1984).
[3] R. V. Jensen and R. Shankar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 1879 (1985).
[4] H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1373 (1998).
[5] S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and A. Winter, Nature Physics **2**, 754-758 (2006).
[6] S. Goldstein, J. L. Lebowitz, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 050403 (2006).
[7] J. v. Neumann, Zeitschrift fr Physik **57**, 30 (1929), English translation (by R. Tumulka), The European Physical Journal H 35, **201** (2010).
[8] T. Kinoshita, T. Wenger, and D. S. Weiss, Nature **440**, 900 (2006).
[9] M. Gring, M. Kuhnert, T. Langen, T. Kitagawa, B. Rauer, M. Schreitl, I. Mazets, D. A. Smith, E. Demler, and J. Schmiedmayer, Science **337**, 1318 (2012).
[10] M. Cheneau, P. Barmettler, D. Poletti, M. Endres, P. Schau, T. Fukuhara, C. Gross, I. Bloch, C. Kollath, and S. Kuhr, Nature **481**, 484 (2012).
[11] U. Schneider, L. Hackermüller, J. P. Ronzheimer, S. Will, S. Braun, T. Best, I. Bloch, E. Demler, S. Mandt, D. Rasch, et al., Nature Physics **8**, 213 (2012).
[12] S. Trotzky, Y.-A. Chen, A. Flesch, I. P. McCulloch, U. Schollwöck, J. Eisert, and I. Bloch, Nature Physics **8**, 325 (2012).
[13] T. Langen, R. Geiger, M. Kuhnert, B. Rauer, and J. Schmiedmayer, Nature Physics **9**, 640 (2013).
[14] A. M. Kaufman, M. E. Tai, A. Lukin, M. Rispoli, R. Schittko, P. M. Preiss, and M. Greiner, Science **353**, 794 (2016).
[15] P. Richerme, Z.-X. Gong, A. Lee, C. Senko, J. Smith, M. Foss-Feig, S. Michalakis, A. V. Gorshkov, and C. Monroe, Nature **511**, 198 (2014).
[16] G. Clos, D. Porras, U. Warring, and T. Schaetz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 170401 (2016).
[17] A. Polkovnikov and D. Sels, Science **353**, 752 (2016).
[18] A. Polkovnikov, K. Sengupta, A. Silva, and M. Vengalattore, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 863 (2011).
[19] J. Eisert, M. Friesdorf, and C. Gogolin, Nature Physics **11**, 124 (2015).
[20] L. DAlessio, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, Advances in Physics **65**, 239 (2016).
[21] F. Borgonovi, F. M. Izrailev, L. F. Santos, V. G. Zelevinsky, Phys. Rep. **626**, 1-58 (2016).
[22] J. M. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2046 (1991).
[23] M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. E **50**, 888 (1994).
[24] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, Nature **452**, 854 (2008).
[25] M. Srednicki, J. Phys. A **32** 1163 (1999).
[26] L. F. Santos, F. Borgonovi, and F. M. Izrailev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108** 094102 (2012).
[27] M. Rigol and M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 110601 (2012).
[28] M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 170601 (2014).
[29] S. Sorg, L. Vidmar, L. Pollet, and F. Heidrich-Meisner, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 033606 (2014).
[30] E. J. Torres-Herrera and L. F. Santos, Phys. Rev. E **89**, 062110 (2014).
[31] S. Yuan, Mikhail I. Katsnelson, and H. De Raedt, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **78**, 094003 (2009).
[32] N. Linden, S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and A. Winter, Phys. Rev. E **79**, 061103 (2009).
[33] S. Genway, A. F. Ho, and D. K. K. Lee, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 023609 (2012).
[34] A. Riera, C. Gogolin, and J. Eisert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 080402 (2012).
[35] W.-g. Wang, Phys. Rev. E 86, 011115 (2012).
[36] N. Sedlmayr, J. Ren, F. Gebhard, and J. Sirker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 100406 (2013).
[37] D. Freeman, C. M. Herdman, D. J. Gorman, and K. B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 134302 (2014).
[38] G. De Palma, A. Serafini, V. Giovannetti, and M. Cramer. Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 220401 (2015)
[39] O. Fialko, Phys. Rev. E **92**, 022104, (2015).
[40] S. Hilbert, Peter Hänggi, and J. Dunkel, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 062116 (2014).
[41] M. Kliesch, *et. al*, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 031019 (2014).
[42] S. Braun, *et al.*, Science **339**(6115), 52-55, (2013).
[43] J. Wang and W.-g. Wang, Phys. Rev. E **96**,032207 (2017).
[44] L. He and W.-g. Wang, Phys.Rev.E **89**, 022125 (2014).
[45] H. Yan, J. Wang, and W.-g. Wang, arXiv:1902.10944.
[46] J. P. Paz and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 5181 (1999).
[47] W.-g. Wang, J. Gong, G. Casati, and B. Li, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 012108 (2008).
[48] C. Gogolin and J. Eisert, Rep. Prog. Phys. **79**, 056001 (2016).
[49] Y. Y. Atas and E. Bogomolny, J. Phys. A **47**, 335201 (2014).
[50] M. Suzuki,Phys. Lett. A **165**, 387 (1992).
[51] C. Mejia-Monasterio, T. Prosen, and G. Casati, Europhys. Lett. **72**, 520 (2005).

Appendix A: Derivation of Eq. (5)

In this appendix, we give the derivation of Eq. (5). What is concerned here is diagonal elements $\rho_{kk}(t)$, written as

$$\rho_{kk}(t)=\sum_k \langle\phi_j^{\mathcal{E}}|\langle\psi_k^S|\exp(-iHt)|\Phi_0^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle|\psi_0^S\rangle\langle\Phi_0^{\mathcal{E}}|\langle\psi_0^S|\exp(iHt)|\phi_j^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle|\psi_k^S\rangle. \tag{A1}$$

Substituting $|\Phi_0^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle=\sum_{E_j^{\mathcal{E}}\in\Gamma_0} D_j|\phi_j^{\mathcal{E}}\rangle$ and $|\psi_0^S\rangle=\sum_k C_k|\psi_k^S\rangle$ into the above equation, straightforward derivation gives that

$$\rho_{kk}(t)=\sum_{k_0 l_0} C_{k_0}C_{l_0}\sum_{j_0 i_0} D_{j_0}D_{i_0}\sum_{\alpha,\beta} C^{\alpha}_{k_0 j_0}C^{\beta}_{l_0 i_0}\sum_j C^{\alpha}_{kj}C^{\beta}_{kj}\exp(-i(E_\alpha-E_\beta)t), \tag{A2}$$

where $C^{\alpha}_{k_0 j_0}$ are components of the eigenfunctions (EFs) of the composite system. For a chaotic composite system, its energy levels are usually nondegenerate, and so do the level spacings. Therefore, for the long time average of ρ_{kk}, all the contributions from the terms with $\alpha\neq\beta$ can be neglected and, then, one gets that

$$\overline{\rho}_{kk}=\sum_{k_0 l_0} C_{k_0}C_{l_0}\sum_{j_0 i_0} D_{j_0}D_{i_0}\sum_{\alpha} C^{\alpha}_{k_0 j_0}C^{\alpha}_{l_0 i_0}\sum_j |C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2. \tag{A3}$$

It proves convenient to write $\overline{\rho}_{kk}$ as

$$\overline{\rho}_{kk}=\overline{\rho}^d_{kk}+\overline{\rho}^{nd}_{kk}, \tag{A4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\rho}^d_{kk}&=\sum_{k_0}|C_{k_0}|^2\sum_{j_0}|D_{j_0}|^2\sum_{\alpha}|C^{\alpha}_{k_0 j_0}|^2\sum_j|C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2,\\ \overline{\rho}^{nd}_{kk}&=\sum_{k_0\neq l_0 \text{ or } j_0\neq i_0} C_{k_0}C_{l_0}D_{j_0}D_{i_0}\sum_{\alpha} C^{\alpha}_{k_0 j_0}C^{\alpha}_{l_0 i_0}\sum_j|C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

Below, we show that, when the dimension of the environment is sufficiently large, one has $\overline{\rho}^{nd}_{kk}\ll\overline{\rho}^d_{kk}$. To this end, we rewrite $\overline{\rho}^{nd}_{kk}$ as

$$\overline{\rho}^{nd}_{kk}=\sum_{k_0\neq l_0 \text{ or } j_0\neq i_0} C_{k_0}C_{l_0}D_{j_0}D_{i_0}S^k_{k_0 l_0 j_0 i_0}, \tag{A6}$$

where

$$S^k_{k_0 l_0 j_0 i_0}=\sum_{\alpha} C^{\alpha}_{k_0 j_0}C^{\alpha}_{l_0 i_0}\sum_j|C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2. \tag{A7}$$

Let us first study properties of $S^k_{k_0 l_0 j_0 i_0}$. For a chaotic composite system, in the basis of the uncoupled Hamiltonian H_0, the interaction Hamiltonian matrix usually has a full structure and its elements have random phases. Then, according to a result of Ref.[1], phases of different components of the EFs have weak correlations. For this reason, when summing over α, $C^{\alpha}_{k_0 j_0}C^{\alpha}_{l_0 i_0}$ can be regarded as random numbers. Note that on average $|C^{\alpha}_{k_0 j_0}C^{\alpha}_{l_0 i_0}|$ scales as $1/D$, where $D=d_{\mathcal{E}}d_S$ is dimension of the composite system, and $\sum_j|C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2\propto\frac{1}{d_S}$. Thus,

$$S^k_{k_0 l_0 j_0 i_0}\propto\sqrt{D}\cdot\frac{1}{D}\cdot\frac{1}{d_S}=\frac{1}{d_S\sqrt{D}}. \tag{A8}$$

Hence, $S^k_{k_0 l_0 j_0 i_0}$ can be regarded as some kind of random numbers scaling as $\frac{1}{d_S\sqrt{D}}$.

The coefficients D_{j_0} are random numbers, scaling as $D_{j_0}\propto\frac{1}{\sqrt{N_{\Gamma_0}}}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E_0^S)\delta E}}$. Moreover, C_{k_0} scales as $C_{k_0}\propto\frac{1}{\sqrt{N_S}}$, where N_S is the number of k_0 with $C_{k_0}\neq 0$. Then, from Eq.(A6), one gets the following estimate,

$$\overline{\rho}^{nd}_{kk}\propto N_S N_{\mathcal{E}}\cdot\frac{1}{N_S}\cdot\frac{1}{N_{\mathcal{E}}}\cdot\frac{1}{d_S\sqrt{D}}=\frac{1}{d_S\sqrt{D}}=\frac{1}{d_S\sqrt{d_S d_{\mathcal{E}}}}. \tag{A9}$$

Similarly, the scale of $\overline{\rho}^d_{kk}$ can be easily estimated,

$$\overline{\rho}^d_{kk}\propto\frac{1}{d_S}. \tag{A10}$$

From Eqs. (A8) and (A10), one finds that $\overline{\rho}^{nd}_{kk}\ll\overline{\rho}^d_{kk}$ when the dimension of the environment is sufficiently large. Hence, $\overline{\rho}^{nd}_{kk}$ can be neglected and this gives Eq. (5).

Appendix B: Derivation of Eq. (7) and Eq. (8)

In this appendix, we discuss properties of the quantity $F_{\alpha k}=\sum_j |C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2$ and $\mathcal{F}^{k}_{k_0 j_0}=\sum_\alpha |C^{\alpha}_{k_0 j_0}|^2 F_{\alpha k}$. We derive Eqs. (7) and (8) under the following conditions: (i) Both the environment and the composite system are chaotic; (ii) widths of the LDOS (denoted by w_L) and of the EFs (denoted by w_E) of the composite system are narrow. We note that the derivations to be presented below can also be used to derive Eq. (18).

As the composite system is a quantum chaotic system, there are irregular components in the main bodies of its EFs. Making use of results given in Ref. [2], C^{α}_{kj} can be written in the following form

$$C^{\alpha}_{kj}=R^{\alpha}_{kj}\sqrt{\langle |C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2\rangle}, \tag{B1}$$

where R_{kj} can be regarded as a Gaussian random number with unit variance and

$$\langle |C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2\rangle=\frac{1}{\rho(E_\alpha)\epsilon}\sum_{E_\beta\in[E_\alpha-\frac{\epsilon}{2},E_\alpha+\frac{\epsilon}{2}]}|C^{\beta}_{kj}|^2, \tag{B2}$$

The quantity $\langle |C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2\rangle$ gives the average shape of the EFs within a very narrow energy region ϵ. It can be written as a smooth function of E_α, i.e., $\langle |C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2\rangle=\mathcal{C}_{kj}(E_\alpha)$. Then, Eq. (B1) can be rewritten as

$$C^{\alpha}_{kj}=R^{\alpha}_{kj}\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_{kj}(E_\alpha)}. \tag{B3}$$

Substituting Eq. (B3) into the expression $F_{\alpha k}=\sum_j |C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2$, one gets

$$F_{\alpha k}=F_k(E_\alpha)+R_{\alpha k}, \tag{B4}$$

where $F_k(E_\alpha)$ is a smooth part, written as

$$F_k(E_\alpha)=\sum_j\langle |C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2\rangle=\sum_j\mathcal{C}_{kj}(E_\alpha), \tag{B5}$$

and $R_{\alpha k}=F_{\alpha k}-F_k(E_\alpha)$ is a fluctuation part, scaling as $R_{\alpha k}\propto\frac{1}{d_S\sqrt{d_\mathcal{E}}}$.

To reveal properties of $F_k(E)$, we start from a Taylor expansion of $F_k(E)$, i.e.,

$$F_k(E+\Delta E)\simeq\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n!}\frac{\partial^n F_k(E)}{\partial E^n}(\Delta E)^n. \tag{B6}$$

We use Δ^n_F to indicate the region of ΔE, within which $F_k(E)$ can be approximated by the above expansion cut at the n-th order. To the first order approximation, $F_k(E_\alpha)$ is calculated within the region Δ^1_F and this gives that

$$F_k(E_\alpha)\simeq\frac{1}{N_\alpha}\sum_{E_\beta\in[E_\alpha-\Delta^1_F,E_\alpha+\Delta^1_F]}F_k(E_\beta)\simeq\frac{1}{N_\alpha}\sum_{E_\beta\in[E_\alpha-\Delta^1_F,E_\alpha+\Delta^1_F]}\sum_j|C^{\alpha}_{kj}|^2, \tag{B7}$$

where

$$N_\alpha=\sum_{E_\beta\in[E_\alpha-\Delta^1_F,E_\alpha+\Delta^1_F]}1=\int_{E_\alpha-\Delta^1_F}^{E_\alpha+\Delta^1_F}\rho(E)dE. \tag{B8}$$

Here, $\rho(E)$ represents the density of states of the composite system. When the coupling is not strong, one has the following approximation,

$$\rho(E)\simeq\sum_{l=1}^{d_S}\rho_\mathcal{E}(E-E^S_l), \tag{B9}$$

where $\rho_\mathcal{E}(E)$ represents the density of states of the environment. Thus, one has

$$N_\alpha\simeq\sum_{l=1}^{d_S}\int_{E_\alpha-\Delta^1_F}^{E_\alpha+\Delta^1_F}\rho_\mathcal{E}(E-E^S_l)dE. \tag{B10}$$

By introducing a step function $\Pi^{\Delta}_{E_\alpha}(E)$, defined as

$$\Pi^{\Delta}_{E_\alpha}(E) = \begin{cases} 1 & E \in [E_\alpha - \Delta, E_\alpha + \Delta], \\ 0 & otherwise, \end{cases} \tag{B11}$$

one can rewrite $F_k(E_\alpha)$ as

$$F_k(E_\alpha) = \frac{1}{N_\alpha} \sum_j \sum_{E_\beta} \Pi^{\Delta^1_F}_{E_\alpha}(E_\beta) |C^\beta_{kj}|^2. \tag{B12}$$

Moreover, if the width of LDOS w_L is narrow enough to guarantee that

$$w_L \ll \Delta^1_F, \tag{B13}$$

then, for most LDOS $L_{kj}(E_\alpha)$ (with a fixed k and a variant j), their main bodies should lie within the flat region of the function $\Pi(E)$. Taking into account the normalization condition $\sum_\alpha |C^\alpha_{km}|^2 = 1$ and the fact that a narrow LDOS $L_{km}(E_\alpha)$ is approximately centered at $E_\alpha \simeq E^S_k + E^{\mathcal{E}}_j$, one finds that

$$\sum_{E_\beta} \Pi^{\Delta^1_F}_{E_\alpha}(E_\beta) |C^\beta_{kj}|^2 \simeq \begin{cases} 1 & E^S_k + E^{\mathcal{E}}_j \in [E_\alpha - \Delta^1_F, E_\alpha + \Delta^1_F], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{B14}$$

This gives that

$$F_k(E_\alpha) \simeq \frac{\int_{E_\alpha - \Delta^1_F}^{E_\alpha + \Delta^1_F} \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E - E^S_k) dE}{\sum_{l=1}^{d_S} \int_{E_\alpha - \Delta^1_F}^{E_\alpha + \Delta^1_F} \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E - E^S_l)}. \tag{B15}$$

In the case that Δ^1_F is narrow and $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E)$ varies slowly within Δ^1_F, one gets the following approximation,

$$F_{\alpha k} \simeq F_k(E_\alpha) \simeq \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E_\alpha - E^S_k)}{\sum_l \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E_\alpha - E^S_l)}, \tag{B16}$$

which is just Eq.(7). In addition, $\mathcal{F}^k_{k_0 j_0}$ can be expressed using $F_k(E_\alpha)$,

$$\mathcal{F}^k_{k_0 j_0} \simeq \sum_\alpha |C^\alpha_{k_0 j_0}|^2 F_k(E_\alpha). \tag{B17}$$

If, furthermore, variation of $F_k(E_\alpha)$ within the width w_L can be neglected, or

$$w_L \leq \Delta^0_F, \tag{B18}$$

then, using the normalisation condition and the fact that the LDOS is centered at $E_\alpha \simeq E^S_k + E^{\mathcal{E}}_j$, one obtains that

$$\mathcal{F}^k_{k_0 j_0} \simeq F_k(E^S_{k_0} + E^{\mathcal{E}}_{j_0}) \simeq \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E^S_{k_0} + E^{\mathcal{E}}_{j_0} - E^S_k)}{\sum_l \rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E^S_{k_0} + E^{\mathcal{E}}_{j_0} - E^S_l)}, \tag{B19}$$

which is just Eq. (8) in the main text. Note that Eq.(B18) usually implies Eq.(B13).

To summarize, the conditions that have been used to derive Eq. (7) and Eq. (8) can be rephrased as follows.

- Both the environment and the system-environment composite are chaotic.
- Widths of the LDOS of the composite system are sufficiently narrow, such that

$$w_L \leq \Delta^0_F. \tag{B20}$$

Noting that the above discussions do not depend on the concrete form of $\rho_{\mathcal{E}}(E)$. Hence, the above derivation of Eq. (8) can be extended to the derivation of Eq. (18). Under similar considerations, $G_{\nu m}$ can be written in the following form

$$G_{\mu m} = G_m(E^{sp}_\mu) + g_{\mu m}, \tag{B21}$$

where $G_m(E^{sp}_\mu)$ is a smooth-varying part and $g_{\mu m}$ is a fluctuation part, scaling as $g_{\mu m} \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_S}}$.

We use Δ^n_G to indicate the region of ΔE, within which $G_m(E + \Delta E)$ can be approximated by its Taylor expansion cut at the n-th order, Then following a similar procedure, one can get the conditions to derive Eq. (18) as follows

- Both the system and system-probe composite are chaotic.
- Widths of the LDOS of the system-probe composite (denoted by w'_L) are sufficiently narrow, such that

$$w'_L \leq \Delta^0_G. \tag{B22}$$

Appendix C: Derivation of Eq. (19)

In this section, we study properties of $\overline{\rho}^{(m_0)}_{mm}$ and derive Eq. (19). It proves convenient to introduce the following quantity,

$$\mathcal{G}_m(E) = \frac{\rho_S(E-e_m)}{\sum_n \rho_S(E-e_n)}. \tag{C1}$$

As stated in the main text, we consider the case that the system's density of states has a Gaussian form, i.e., $\rho_S(E) = \exp(-\alpha E^2)$, which leads to

$$\mathcal{G}_m(E^S_{k_0}+e_{m_0}) = \frac{1}{1+\exp[2(-1)^m\alpha(E^S_{k_0}+e_{m_0})\Delta_p]}. \tag{C2}$$

Thus, Eq. (18) can be equivalently written as

$$\mathcal{G}^m_{k_0m_0} \simeq \mathcal{G}_m(E^S_{k_0}+e_{m_0}). \tag{C3}$$

Making use of this result, Eq.(17), and the above expression of the density of states, one finds that

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\rho}^{(m_0)}_{mm} &\simeq \frac{1}{Z}\sum_{k_0}\exp(-\beta_E E^S_{k_0})\mathcal{G}_m(E^S_{k_0}+e_{m_0}) \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{Z}\int \rho_S(E)\exp(-\beta_E E)\mathcal{G}(E+e_{m_0})dE \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{Z}\int \exp(-\beta_E E-\alpha E^2)\mathcal{G}(E+e_{m_0})dE.\end{aligned} \tag{C4}$$

Setting $\beta = -2\alpha E$, after some straightforward derivations, one gets that

$$\overline{\rho}^{(m_0)}_{mm} \simeq \frac{1}{Z}\exp(\frac{\beta_E^2}{4\alpha})\int d\beta \exp[-\frac{1}{4\alpha}(\beta-\beta_E)^2]\mathcal{G}_m(-\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}+e_{m_0}). \tag{C5}$$

Noting that

$$Z = \exp(\frac{\beta_E^2}{4\alpha})\int d\beta \exp[-\frac{1}{4\alpha}(\beta-\beta_E)^2], \tag{C6}$$

one gets that

$$\overline{\rho}^{(m_0)}_{mm} \simeq \frac{\int d\beta \exp(-\frac{1}{4\alpha}(\beta-\beta_E)^2)\mathcal{G}_m(-\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}+e_{m_0})}{\int d\beta \exp(-\frac{1}{4\alpha}(\beta-\beta_E)^2)}. \tag{C7}$$

It is seen that $\overline{\rho}^{(m_0)}_{mm}$ can be regarded as a mean value of $\mathcal{G}_m(-\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}+e_{m_0})$, averaged over the Gaussian distribution $\exp[-\frac{1}{4\alpha}(\beta-\beta_E)^2]$. As stated in the main text, in many model systems with bound local interaction, the quantity α is a power-law decay function of N. Hence, for sufficiently large N, $\overline{\rho}^{(m_0)}_{mm}$ has the following simple expression,

$$\overline{\rho}^{(m_0)}_{mm} \simeq \mathcal{G}_m(-\frac{\beta_E}{2\alpha}+e_{m_0}). \tag{C8}$$

When N is not very large, we proceed from Eq. (C7). Let us focus on the case of $m=1$ and $m_0=1$. As $e_1 = -e_0 = \frac{\Delta_p}{2}$, one has

$$\mathcal{G}_1(-\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}+e_1) = \frac{1}{1+\exp[\beta\Delta_p-\alpha\Delta_p^2]}. \tag{C9}$$

Its Taylor expansion in β with respect to β_E (up to the third order) has the following form,

$$\mathcal{G}_1(-\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}+e_1) \simeq \mathcal{G}_1(-\frac{\beta_E}{2\alpha}+e_1) + \sum_{k=1}^{3} \frac{(\beta-\beta_E)^k}{k!} \frac{\partial^{(k)}\mathcal{G}_1(-\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}+e_1)}{\partial\beta^k}|_{\beta=\beta_E}. \tag{C10}$$

Substituting the above result into Eq. (C7) and noting that $\exp[-\frac{1}{4\alpha}(\beta-\beta_E)^2]$ is an even function of $\beta-\beta_E$, one gets that

$$\overline{\rho}_{11}^{(1)} \simeq \mathcal{G}_1(-\frac{\beta_E}{2\alpha}+e_1) + K_2(\beta_E), \tag{C11}$$

where

$$K_2(\beta_E) = \frac{\int d\beta \exp(-\frac{1}{4\alpha}(\beta-\beta_E)^2) \frac{\partial^2\mathcal{G}_1(-\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}+e_1)}{\partial\beta^2}|_{\beta=\beta_E}}{\int d\beta \exp(-\frac{1}{4\alpha}(\beta-\beta_E)^2)}. \tag{C12}$$

Making use of the expression of $\mathcal{G}_1(-\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}+e_1)$ in Eq. (C9) and performing the integration, one finds that

$$K_2(\beta_E) = \frac{\alpha\Delta_p^2 \exp(\beta_E\Delta+\alpha\Delta_p^2)[\exp(\beta_E\Delta_p+\alpha\Delta_p^2)-1]}{[1+\exp(\beta_E\Delta_p+\alpha\Delta_p)]^3}. \tag{C13}$$

Keeping $K_2(\beta_E)$ up to the third order of Δ_p, it gives

$$K_2(\beta_E) = \frac{\alpha\beta_E\Delta_p^3}{8}, \tag{C14}$$

and thus

$$\overline{\rho}_{11}^{(1)} \simeq \mathcal{G}_1(-\frac{\beta_E}{2\alpha}+e_1) + \frac{\alpha\beta\Delta_p^3}{8}. \tag{C15}$$

Following a similar procedure, one may derive expressions for $\overline{\rho}_{mm}^{(m_0)}$ of other values of m and m_0. Finally, the obtained results can be written in a uniform way, i.e.,

$$\overline{\rho}_{mm}^{(m_0)} \simeq \mathcal{G}_m(-\frac{\beta_E}{2\alpha}+e_{m_0}) + \frac{(-1)^{1-m}\alpha\beta\Delta_p^3}{8} = \frac{1}{1+\exp[2(-1)^m\alpha(E_{k_0}^S+e_{m_0})\Delta_p]} + \frac{(-1)^{1-m}\alpha\beta\Delta_p^3}{8}, \tag{C16}$$

which is just Eq. (19).

[1] Jiaozi Wang and Wen-ge Wang, Phys. Rev E .**96**, 052221 (2017).
[2] Jiaozi Wang and Wen-ge Wang, Phys. Rev. E **97**, 062219 (2018).