Ergodicity probes: using time-fluctuations to measure the Hilbert space dimension
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Quantum devices, such as quantum simulators, quantum annealers, and quantum computers, may be exploited to solve problems beyond what is tractable with classical computers. This may be achieved as the Hilbert space available to perform such ‘calculations’ is far larger than that which may be classically simulated. In practice, however, quantum devices have imperfections, which may limit the accessibility to the whole Hilbert space. Actually, the dimension of the space of quantum states that are available to a quantum device is a meaningful measure of its functionality, but unfortunately this quantity cannot be directly experimentally determined. Here we outline an experimentally realisable approach to obtaining the scaling of the required Hilbert space of such a device to compute such evolution, by exploiting the thermalization dynamics of a probe qubit. This is achieved by obtaining a fluctuation-dissipation theorem for high-temperature chaotic quantum systems, which facilitates the extraction of information on the Hilbert space dimension via measurements of the decay rate, and time-fluctuations.

I. INTRODUCTION

The ability to control and manipulate microscopic systems at the single particle level is an essential requirement for many quantum technologies. Experimental setups where atoms or qubits can be arranged in ordered structures and studied in quantum non-equilibrium states include neutral atoms in optical lattices [1–3], trapped ions [4–7], Rydberg atoms [8, 9], and superconducting circuits [10, 11]. These systems can be used for the quantum simulation of many-body models, or different forms of digital or adiabatic quantum computing. Most of these physical setups have limitations in the accessibility to certain observables. Thus, having extra tools to characterize quantum systems in a simple and efficient way can be useful in the diagnosis and certification of quantum devices.

One of the most prominent properties of a quantum device is its size in terms of the dimension of the associated Hilbert space. The size of a quantum computer or simulator is often given in terms of number of qubits, a measure that ignores the effect of disorder or the possible lack of connectivity between different zones in the device. A more useful quantity would be the number of eigenstates of the Hamiltonian that take part in the quantum dynamics. This is however an elusive measure in realistic experimental situations.

In this work we show that the equilibration dynamics [12–17] of a quantum system can be used to extract information on the dimension of the Hilbert space. Indeed, advancements in quantum technologies described above have inspired a bounty of theoretical work in the field of quantum thermalization [18–29]. In the following, we aim to help ‘bridge the gap’ between theoretical and experimental work in this field [30].

We assume a quantum quench scenario [8, 20, 27, 31] in which a quantum system is initialized in a fully-decohered, infinite temperature state, except for a subsystem that acts as a sensor and is prepared in a pure state. For simplicity, we assume that this subsystem is a single qubit, which we refer to as the ‘probe’ qubit. The relaxation dynamics of the probe qubit depends on the details of the underlying structure of the Hamiltonian, however, in the most generic case of non-integrable systems, an appropriate description can be given in terms of random matrix theory (RMT) [24, 29, 32–36]. We show that the time-fluctuations of the probe in the long-time limit contain information about the Hilbert space dimension of the device.

Our article is structured as follows. Firstly, we present the basic scheme and summarize our main result, which relies on an infinite-temperature fluctuation dissipation theorem (FDT) [37] for the dynamics of the probe qubit. We continue, presenting numerical calculations that validate our predictions via exact diagonalization of a spin chain Hamiltonian. We then summarize our key findings, before presenting a more detailed derivation of our analytical results in terms of RMT.

II. RESULTS

A. Set Up

We assume that we have a quantum system (from here on, “quantum device”) that is initially in an infinite temperature state. This is the case, for example, of a quantum computer device that has not been properly initialized. A single qubit in the device, the ‘probe’ qubit, is prepared in a pure state. We then let this qubit evolve in time and reach an equilibrium state. We assume that
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where \( \rho \) is the density matrix of the quantum device, which we assume to be in a fully decohered state, \( \rho_B = (1/N_B) \sum_{\alpha} |\phi_{B,\alpha}\rangle \langle \phi_{B,\alpha}| \). Later on this condition will be relaxed, allowing for high but finite temperatures. The system evolves under the interacting Hamiltonian,

\[
H = H_0 + V,
\]

where \( H_0 = 1 \otimes H_B \) is just the Hamiltonian of the device and we assume that the qubit does not evolve at all in the absence of coupling to the device, which is given by the operator \( V \).

The quantity under study, the long-time fluctuations, are defined by

\[
\delta^2(T) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left( (\sigma_z(t)) - \mu_{\sigma_z}(T) \right)^2 dt,
\]

where \( \mu_{\sigma_z}(T) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \langle \sigma_z(t) \rangle \). Assuming only that the many-body eigenenergies are non-degenerate, and that also their energy gaps are non-degenerate, we may express the time fluctuations in terms of matrix elements between eigenstates of the coupled qubit-device system [24], \( H|\psi_\mu\rangle = E_\mu|\psi_\mu\rangle \),

\[
\delta^2_\sigma(\infty) = \sum_{\mu \neq \nu} |\rho_{\mu\nu}|^2 |(\sigma_z)_{\mu\nu}|^2,
\]

where \( \rho_{\mu\nu} = \langle \psi_\mu | \psi_\nu \rangle \), and \( (\sigma_z)_{\mu\nu} = \langle \psi_\mu | \sigma_z | \psi_\nu \rangle \).

We assume that \( V \) is well approximated by a random matrix and build on a statistical theory for the many-body wavefunctions \([38]\),

\[
|\psi_\mu\rangle = \sum_\alpha c_\mu(\alpha)|\phi_\alpha\rangle,
\]

where summations are understood to be taken from 1 to \( 2N_B \), the dimension of the probe + device Hilbert space. Here we have \( H_0 \) diagonalized by the non-interacting basis |\( \phi_\alpha \rangle \) and \( V \) is approximated by a random matrix from the Gaussian Orthogonal Ensemble (GOE), appropriately scaled by a coupling strength \( g \). Later on we will relax these approximations. In Ref. [38] we showed that this model can be solved and it allows us to calculate matrix elements in the interacting basis.

The initial state can be written in terms of eigenstates of the joint qubit-device system,

\[
\rho(t = 0) = \frac{1}{N_B} \sum_{\alpha \in \text{odd}} |\phi_\alpha\rangle \langle \phi_\alpha|,
\]

where the joint qubit-device Hamiltonian eigenbasis is built by ordering product states such that \( |\phi_\alpha\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle |B, \phi_{2\alpha - 1}\rangle \) (\( \alpha \) odd), \( |\phi_\alpha\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle |B, \phi_{2\alpha}\rangle \) (\( \alpha \) even).

### B. Main Result

We prove that, assuming that the qubit-device dynamics are ergodic, the following relation is satisfied

\[
\delta^2_\sigma(\infty) = \chi(N)\Gamma^{-1},
\]

The quantity \( \chi(N) \), with \( N \) the total number of qubits in the total probe plus device system, depends on the size of the system in the following way,

\[
\chi(N) = C \frac{1}{N_B \overline{D(E)}}.
\]

The quantity \( \overline{D(E)} \) is the average inverse decay rate of the qubit, and where \( \overline{D(E)} \) is the average density of states (DOS) of the system. Both are defined below (see Eq. (32)) in a more precise manner. \( N_B \) is the device Hilbert space dimension, and finally, \( C \) is a constant of order 1 that does not depend on the size of the system or coupling strength. Eq. (7) can be thus understood as a fluctuation-dissipation relation, which relates the time-fluctuations in the steady-state with the decay rate after a quantum quench.

Eq. (8) assumes that the system is ergodic, that is, \( V \) couples the qubit to the whole spectrum of the quantum device. In that case the function \( \chi \propto e^{-N_B} \), where \( N_B \) is the number of sites in the device.

Our approach relies on the calculation of correlation functions from a statistical theory of random wavefunctions \( c_\mu(\alpha) \). Here we summarize the essential ingredients to our model, and give details in the Methods section below. Our theory, developed in Ref. [38] by extending Deutch’s RMT model [39–41], can be used to obtain arbitrary correlation functions \( \langle c_\mu(\alpha)c_\nu(\alpha\cdots) \rangle \), where \( \langle \cdots \rangle \) denotes the ensemble average over an ensemble of random matrix perturbations, \( V \), for a \( N \times N \) Hamiltonian of the form (2), with \( (H_0)_{\alpha\beta} = \alpha \omega_0 \delta_{\alpha\beta} \),...
with $\omega_0 = \frac{1}{N} \mu V$ and $V$ a random matrix selected from the GOE, with $\langle V^2 \rangle_{\mu \nu} = \frac{(1+\delta_{\mu\nu})g^2}{N}$. We showed that these may be expressed as sums of products of four-point correlation functions, given by (for $\mu \neq \nu$),

$$\langle c_\mu(\alpha)c_\nu(\beta)c_\mu(\alpha')c_\nu(\beta') \rangle_V = \Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\Lambda(\nu, \beta)\delta_{\alpha\alpha'}\delta_{\beta\beta'},$$

$$\Lambda(\mu, \alpha) = \frac{\Lambda^{(2)}(\mu, \nu)}{\Lambda^{(2)}(\mu, \nu)}(\delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{\alpha'\beta'} + \delta_{\alpha\beta'}\delta_{\alpha'\beta}),$$

(9)

where $\Lambda(\mu, \alpha)$ is defined as

$$\langle c_\mu(\alpha)c_\nu(\beta) \rangle_V = \Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\delta_{\alpha\beta},$$

$$\Lambda(\mu, \alpha) := \frac{\omega_0 \Gamma}{\pi (E_\alpha - E_\mu)^2 + \Gamma^2},$$

(10a)

(10b)

with $\Gamma = \frac{\pi g^2}{2N\omega_0}$. $\Lambda^{(2)}(\mu, \nu)$ is defined similarly to Eq. (10b), with $\Gamma \to 2\Gamma$.

In the case applied here, where the observable is diagonal in the non-interacting basis, we require that the microcanonical average of $(\sigma z)_{\alpha\alpha}$ varies slowly over the width $\Gamma$ of the many-body eigenstates. This is a reasonable assumption for such systems, where the observable equilibrium value is not sensitive to energy on the microscopic level. Further, in our specific case here, we have in fact that this average is approximately constant (zero) over the entire bulk of the spectrum, as the probe qubit has no additional field acting to bias a particular state.

In order to evaluate Eq. (4), we thus use Eq. (5) to write $\delta^2(\infty)$ in terms of the random wave-functions $c_\mu(\alpha)$, and non-interacting matrix elements $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ and $(\sigma^z)_{\alpha\beta}$. We then use the self-averaging property of random matrices, which here may be written $\delta^2(\infty) = \langle \delta^2(\infty) \rangle_V$, and obtain the relevant correlation functions $\langle c_\mu(\alpha)c_\nu(\beta) \rangle_V$ (note that matrix elements in the non-interacting basis are not affected by the ensemble average). We thereby obtain,

$$\delta^2(\infty) = \frac{W_0 \omega_0}{4\pi N\Gamma},$$

(11)

where $W_0$ depends only on the choice of probe observable. We see that this is a particular simple case of Eq. (7), valid for the random matrix toy model where the DOS, $\omega_0^{-1}$ and $\Gamma$ are constant in energy over the entire bulk of the spectrum.

In order to relate this to the time-decay of the probe observable $\sigma_z$, we must further calculate the time evolution $\sigma_z(t) = \text{Tr}[\rho(t)\sigma_z]$, which can be approached by the same recipe to obtain for a generic observable $O$,

$$O(t) = \langle (O(t))_0 - O_{DE} \rangle e^{-2\Gamma t} + O_{DE},$$

(12)

where $O_{DE}$ is the diagonal ensemble of the observable $O$, which we find to be equal to the long-time average of $O$ as required. We derive Eq. (12) in the supplemental material. This is analogous to the result in Reference [42] for pure-states. We note that the same Equation has similarly been obtained in Ref. [34], which allows also for the perturbation matrix $V$ to be inhomogeneous. In the specific case of interest here, Eq. (12) becomes,

$$\sigma_z(t) = e^{-2\Gamma t},$$

(13)

as $\langle \sigma_z(t) \rangle_0 = 1$ and $\langle \sigma_z \rangle_{MC} = 0$. We note that for the random matrix case here, $\Gamma$ is constant in energy over the bulk states, in the sense that an initial eigenstate $|\phi_\alpha\rangle$ of $H_0$ will decay at the same rate for all $\alpha$ in the bulk of the spectrum, and thus we have $\Gamma = \Gamma_{MC}$ in Eq. (7). We thus observe the emergence of a classical fluctuation-dissipation theorem, relating the time-fluctuations and decay rate of our probe observable $\sigma_z$. The susceptibility $\chi(N)$ in Eq. (8) can be seen to be related to the Hilbert space dimension of the device, $N_B$, and thus measurements of the decay rate, $\Gamma$, and fluctuations $\delta^2(\infty)$, which are both obtainable from the time evolution, can be exploited to infer $N_B$.

C. Application to Real Systems

In this section, we show the application to a spin-chain system using exact diagonalization [43, 44]. We note that some care must be taken in doing so; rather than a constant density of states (DOS) $\omega_0^{-1}$, and decay rate $\Gamma$, these quantities may in principle change with energy, and thus we have $\omega_0^{-1} \to D(E)$, and $\Gamma \to \Gamma(E)$. We instead make the much weaker assumption that the DOS, and decay rate vary slowly with respect to the energy width of a single random wave-function, $\Gamma(E)$. More concretely, we assume $\frac{\Gamma(E) - \Gamma_{MC}}{\Gamma(E)} \ll 1$, and $\frac{D(E) - D(E + \Gamma(E))}{D(E)} \ll 1$.
is being utilized in the unitary dynamics we will observe.

We show in the Methods section, these assumptions lead to our main result, Eq. (7).

In Fig. 2, we show the manifestation of Eq. (7) in a spin-chain system described by the Hamiltonian $H = H_S + H_B + H_{SB}$, where $H_S = 0$ is the system Hamiltonian (acting as our probe), $H_B$ is our device Hamiltonian, given by

$$H_B = \sum_{j=1}^{N} (B^{(B)}_z \sigma_z^{(j)} + B^{(B)}_x \sigma_x^{(j)}) + \sum_{j>1}^{N-1} [J_x \sigma_x^{(j)} \sigma_x^{(j+1)} + J_x \sigma_y^{(j)} \sigma_y^{(j+1)} + \sigma_z^{(j)} \sigma_z^{(j+1)}],$$

which acts on sites with index $>1$, which is the probe index. The probe and device are coupled by the interaction Hamiltonian,

$$H_{SB} = J^{(SB)}_z \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_z^{(N_m)} + J^{(SB)}_x \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_{z}^{(N_m)} + \sigma_z^{(1)} \sigma_{z}^{(N_m)}.$$

Here $N_m$ is the device site where the probe is coupled, which we set as 2 throughout. This spin-chain model may be related to the random matrix toy model, $H = H_0 + V$, via the prescription $H_0 \Leftrightarrow H_S + H_B$, and $V \Leftrightarrow H_{SB}$. In particular, we see that, as $\chi(N) = \frac{S_0^2(\infty)}{\Gamma - 1} \propto N_B^{-1}$, we expect that if all of the available Hilbert space is being utilized in the unitary dynamics we will observe the following scaling:

$$\chi(N) \propto e^{-cN_B}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

This is the relation that we test in Fig. 3.

It is important to note that this exponential scaling of $\chi(N)$, Eq. (16), is expected from not only the contribution of $\mathcal{N}_B$, but also from the average DOS $\bar{D}(E)$.

This average is often trivially obtained, as for example, for an ensemble of $N$ two-level systems $\bar{D}(E) = \frac{1}{N} \int_0^{\Delta E} dED(E) = \frac{2N}{\Delta E}$, where $\Delta E$ is the range of energies available $E_{\text{max}} - E_{\text{min}}$, regardless of the microscopic properties of the DOS. We thus also study the quantity $\chi(N)\bar{D}(E)$, as this quantity has no dependence on the DOS, and an observation of the exponential scaling in system size is confirmation that, indeed, $\mathcal{N}_B \propto e^{cN}$. This is shown in Fig. 4, where we observe an exponential scaling of the Hilbert space dimension, with $c \approx 0.62$, compared to $\ln(2) \sim 0.69$ if the entire Hilbert space were explored in the dynamics.

We further observe in Figs. 3 and 4, that the FDT similarly applies at finite temperatures $\beta = \frac{1}{k_B T} > 0$. The extension of our theoretical approach to this case is discussed below, with details given in the supplemental material. Indeed, we can show that for high temperatures, such that $\beta^{-1} \gg \Gamma$, we obtain an FDT of the same form as Eq. (7), by employing a high energy cutoff $(\rho_B)_{\alpha\alpha} \sim e^{-\beta E_{\alpha}}$ to the bath state occupation.

For finite temperatures, we show in the Methods section below, that the FDT depends on the partition function $Z_\beta$ itself, rather than the Hilbert space dimension. Indeed, one can see that in the infinite temperature limit $Z_0 = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \sum_\alpha e^{-\beta E_{\alpha}} \delta_{\alpha,\text{odd}} = \mathcal{N}_B$. We note that in Ref. [42], the current authors obtained

Figure 3: Observation of the FDT, Eq. (7), for varying device size $N - 1$, for temperatures $\beta$. Fit (yellow dashed line) is performed to the function $ae^{cN}$ for the infinite temperature case, $\beta = 0$, and thus confirms the exponential scaling of $\chi(N)$. In this case, we observe an exponential scaling for all temperatures, as the average density of states also scales exponentially with $N$. Note that here we have $\Gamma \sim 0.2$ so the high temperature limit is defined by approximately $\beta \ll 5$.

Figure 4: As in Fig. 3, however accounting for the exponential scaling of the average DOS with device size. Fit (yellow dashed line) is performed to the function $ae^{cN}$ for the infinite temperature case, $\beta = 0$, and thus confirms the exponential scaling of $\chi(N)\bar{D}(E)$ as defined by approximately $\beta \ll 5$. In this case, we observe an exponential scaling for only high temperatures, and confirm that for low temperatures $\chi(N)\bar{D}(E)$ is independent of $N$. Note that here we have $\Gamma \sim 0.2$ so the high temperature limit is defined by approximately $\beta \ll 5$.\hspace{1cm}
III. DISCUSSION

The results shown above demonstrate how the chaotic dynamics of thermalization may be exploited in order to gain information on the complexity of the unitary quantum dynamics of a system. We have proposed an experimentally viable protocol, by which measurements of a local observable of a probe qubit may be exploited to measure the Hilbert space dimension of an ergodic quantum device, initialized in an infinite temperature state. We note that this measures the dimension of the states directly involved in dynamics only, and thus provides a more accurate measure of the complexity of the dynamics than a simple estimate of the Hilbert space dimension from the number of qubits. In this sense, such a measurement of a large enough quantum device, if shown to be ergodic in the sense outlined above, would be a convincing indicator of the so called ‘quantum supremacy’ of the quantum device.

On a practical level, our results may be observed in two ways: observation of a probe observable for (i) changing the number of qubits/ions/... in the quantum device (as in Figs. 3 and 4), or (ii) changing the probe-device coupling (as in Fig. 2). The latter is perhaps the simplest experimental methodology, which we show can confirm the ergodic behaviour of a system, that is, that the unitary dynamics requires an extensive proportion of the Hilbert space, by showing a linear relationship between the long-time fluctuations and decay rate. For a model where the device size may be altered, our FDT provides even deeper insight, allowing also for the experimental observation of the scaling of the Hilbert space dimension with system size.
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V. METHODS

In what follows we present a more detailed overview of the methods and approximations used in obtaining our analytical results. More detailed derivations, and additional information, is given in the supplemental material.
B. Fluctuation-Dissipation Theorem for RMT Model

We now employ the RMT approach developed in Refs. [38, 42] to the calculation of the long-time fluctuations of Eq. (4). The following derivation is repeated in the supplemental material in more detail; here we aim to capture the key steps, assumptions, and methodology. We begin by writing Eq. (6) as,

$$
\rho_{\mu \nu} = \sum_{\alpha} w_{\alpha} c_{\mu}(\alpha)c_{\nu}(\alpha),
$$

(19)

where \( w_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{N} \delta_{\alpha, \text{odd}} \). Then using Eqs. (4) and (5), we may write the time fluctuations as,

$$
\delta_{O}^{2}(\infty) = \sum_{\mu \neq \nu, \alpha \beta} c_{\mu}(\alpha)c_{\mu}(\beta)c_{\nu}(\beta)w_{\alpha}w_{\beta} \times \sum_{\alpha' \beta'} c_{\mu}(\alpha')c_{\mu}(\beta')c_{\nu}(\beta')O_{\alpha'\alpha}O_{\beta'\beta'},
$$

(20)

where coefficients of the initial state are labelled as unprimed indices \( \alpha, \beta \), and coefficients of the observable are labelled by primed indices.

Now, using the self-averaging property of random matrices, we may replace the product of coefficients \( c_{\mu}(\alpha) \) by their ensemble average \( \langle \cdot \cdot \cdot \rangle_{V} \); the above expression may then be written in terms of a sum of the 8-point correlation function

$$
\langle c_{\mu}(\alpha)c_{\nu}(\alpha)c_{\mu}(\beta)c_{\nu}(\beta)c_{\mu}(\alpha')c_{\nu}(\alpha')c_{\mu}(\beta')c_{\nu}(\beta') \rangle_{V}.
$$

(21)

The bulk of the derivation, which is given in more detail in the supplemental material, is obtaining a this correlation function from the method of contractions outlined in the previous section. From this approach, we see that this 8-point correlation function may be split up into a sum of four-point correlation functions, each consisting of both Gaussian and non-Gaussian contractions. The key point behind the method lies in keeping the contractions that contribute to the highest order, which are those that contract equal pairs of non-interacting indices, such that the number of summations is not restricted.

An example of each type of contraction of the 8-point correlation function, Gaussian, non-Gaussian, and mixed, are

$$
\langle c_{\mu}(\alpha)c_{\nu}(\alpha)c_{\mu}(\beta)c_{\nu}(\beta)c_{\mu}(\alpha')c_{\nu}(\alpha')c_{\mu}(\beta')c_{\nu}(\beta') \rangle_{V} = \Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\Lambda(\nu, \alpha)\Lambda(\mu, \alpha')\Lambda(\nu, \alpha')\delta_{\alpha, \beta}\delta_{\alpha', \beta'},
$$

(22)

$$
\langle c_{\mu}(\alpha)c_{\nu}(\alpha)c_{\mu}(\beta)c_{\nu}(\beta)c_{\mu}(\alpha')c_{\nu}(\alpha')c_{\mu}(\beta')c_{\nu}(\beta') \rangle_{V} = \Lambda_{\mu \nu}(\alpha' \alpha')\Lambda_{\mu \nu}(\beta' \beta'),
$$

(23)

and,

$$
\langle c_{\mu}(\alpha)c_{\nu}(\alpha)c_{\mu}(\beta)c_{\nu}(\beta)c_{\mu}(\alpha')c_{\nu}(\alpha')c_{\mu}(\beta')c_{\nu}(\beta') \rangle_{V} = \Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\Lambda(\nu, \alpha)\Lambda(\nu, \alpha')L_{\mu \nu}(\alpha' \beta' \beta'),
$$

(24)

respectively.

The second key aspect of the derivation of the FDT is the definition of course grained averages of observable elements \( O_{\alpha \alpha} \),

$$
\sum_{\alpha} \Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\Lambda(\nu, \alpha)O_{\alpha \alpha} = [\overline{O_{\alpha \alpha}}]_{\Gamma}(\mu, \nu),
$$

(25)

with \( E_{\Gamma} := \frac{E - E_{W}}{\Gamma} \), and \( [\overline{O_{\alpha \alpha}}]_{\Gamma} = \sum_{\alpha} \Lambda(\Gamma, \alpha)O_{\alpha \alpha} \). The key assumption in writing (25) is then that this average changes slowly in energy \( E_{\Gamma} \) with respect to the width \( \Gamma \). Similar averages over the initial state, or mixed averages must also be defined, such as

$$
\sum_{\alpha} \Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\Lambda(\nu, \alpha)w_{\alpha} = [\overline{w_{\alpha}}]_{\Gamma}(\mu, \nu),
$$

(26)

$$
\sum_{\alpha} \Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\Lambda(\nu, \alpha)w_{\alpha}O_{\alpha \alpha} = [\overline{w_{\alpha}O_{\alpha \alpha}}]_{\Gamma}(\mu, \nu).
$$

Note that, \( [\overline{O_{\alpha \alpha}}]_{\Gamma} \) can be interpreted as a microcanonical average of the observable \( O \).

Now, using Eqs. (25) and (26), we obtain three contributions to the long-time fluctuations, from the Gaussian, non-Gaussian, and mixed contractions above, which can be written as,

$$
\delta_{O}^{2}(\infty) = \delta_{G}^{2}(\infty) + \delta_{NG}^{2}(\infty) + \delta_{M}^{2}(\infty) = \sum_{\mu \neq \nu} W_{\mu}(\alpha' \beta')^{2},
$$

(27)

with

$$
W_{\mu} = [\overline{w_{\alpha}^{2}}]_{\mu}[O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu} + 2[\overline{w_{\alpha}O_{\alpha \alpha}}]_{\mu}[O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu} + 3[\overline{w_{\alpha}^{3}}]_{\mu}[O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu} - [\overline{w_{\alpha}^{2}}]_{\mu}[O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu} - 4[\overline{w_{\alpha}O_{\alpha \alpha}}]_{\mu}[O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu} - [\overline{w_{\alpha}^{3}}]_{\mu}[O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu}.
$$

(28)

We note that up to this point in the derivation the only assumptions are that the observable and density matrix are diagonal in the non-interacting basis, and smooth in the sense that the averages of Eq. (25) and (26) may be defined. We now take our device to be in an initial infinite temperature state, such that \( [\overline{w_{\alpha}^{2}}]_{\mu} = [w_{\alpha}^{2}]_{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \), and \( [\overline{w_{\alpha}}]_{\mu} = [w_{\alpha}]_{\mu} = \frac{1}{2N} \). As such, \( W_{\mu} = W \) is in fact energy independent, as the probe Hamiltonian \( H_{S} = 0 \), so microcanonical averages of probe observables are also energy independent. Now, we define, as all terms in \( W \) are \( \sim [w_{\alpha}^{2}]_{\mu} \),

$$
W_{O} = \frac{W}{[w_{\alpha}^{2}]}_{\mu}.
$$

(29)
which is thus a constant of the order of unity that depends only on the observable. Finally, taking the thermodynamic limit, such that $\sum_{\mu} \to \int_0^{\Delta E} \int_0^{\Delta E} \frac{dE_\mu dE_\nu}{\omega_0}$, and using that $\Delta E \gg \Gamma$, we obtain,

$$\delta_0^2(\infty) = \frac{W_O \omega_0}{4\pi N_B \Gamma},$$

(30)

where we have used that $\Delta E := 2N_B \omega_0$.

We can see, then, that Eq. (30) is of the form of our main result, Eq. (7), where $C = \frac{W_O}{4\pi}$. What follows is to generalize this relation, allowing the DOS and $\Gamma$ to vary in energy, and for finite temperatures.

C. Extension to Realistic Systems

As discussed above, the key issue with directly applying the RMT results to realistic models is that in general the DOS, and decay rate, are energy dependent, and thus change over the width of the initial state distribution (this is especially important for the high/infinite temperatures considered here). In order to account for this, in the evaluation of the integrals over energy we must instead use $\Gamma \to \Gamma(E)$, and $\omega_0^{-1} \to D(E)$. In the following we make the assumption that neither $\Gamma(E)$, nor $D(E)$, vary appreciably over the width $\Gamma$, i.e. $\frac{\Gamma(E) - \Gamma(E + \Gamma(E))}{\Gamma(E)} \ll 1$, and $\frac{D(E) - D(E + \Gamma(E))}{D(E)} \ll 1$.

Using instead these weaker assumptions, which are more appropriate for a physical system, we obtain

$$\delta_0^2(\infty) = \frac{W_O}{4\pi N_B D(E)} \frac{1}{\Gamma(E)^{-1}},$$

(31)

where $C = \frac{W_O}{4\pi}$ depends only on the choice of observable, and the unbiased average of a function $A(E)$ is defined by,

$$\overline{A(E)} = \frac{1}{\Delta E} \int_0^{\Delta E} dE A(E).$$

(32)

This is shown in full in the supplemental material.

D. Extension to Finite Temperature Theory

We may extend this model further, and account for finite temperatures described by $w_\alpha = \frac{1}{Z_\beta} e^{-\beta E_\alpha} \delta_{\alpha, \text{odd}}$, with $Z_\beta = \sum_{\alpha} e^{-\beta E_\alpha} \delta_{\alpha, \text{odd}}$. In this case we have $|w_\alpha|_\mu = \frac{1}{2Z_\beta} e^{-\beta E_\mu}$, and $|w_\alpha|^2 = \frac{1}{2Z_\beta} e^{-2\beta E_\nu} = 2|w_\alpha|_\mu^2$, which allows us to write in Eq. (27)

$$W_\mu = \frac{W_O}{2Z_\beta^2} e^{-2\beta E_\mu},$$

(33)

such that we include an effective high-energy cut-off in the bath for $E_\mu \gg \beta^{-1}$. A similar application to that above yields

$$\delta_0^2(\infty) = \frac{W_O \Delta E'(\beta)}{8\pi Z_\beta^2} \frac{(\Gamma(E)^{-1})_2}{2\beta},$$

(34)

where the averages $\langle \cdots \rangle_\beta$ are defined by the unbiased thermal average e.g. of the function $A(E)$,

$$\langle A(E) \rangle_\beta := \frac{1}{\Delta E'(\beta)} \int_0^{\Delta E} dE e^{-\beta E_\mu} A(E),$$

(35)

where $\Delta E'(\beta) = \int_0^{\Delta E} dE e^{-\beta E}$. We note that our results may be consistently recast terms of a more familiar thermal average of the form $\frac{1}{Z_\beta} \int_0^{\Delta E} dE \langle D(E_\mu) e^{-\beta E} \cdots \rangle$, which is shown in the supplemental material.

E. Recovery of Pure State FDT - Low Temperature Limit

In Ref. [42] the current authors derived an FDT for pure states from the same random matrix model discussed here. This FDT can be written in the current context as

$$\delta_0^2(\infty) = \frac{\Delta O_{\alpha \alpha}^2}{4\pi D(E_{\alpha \alpha}) \Gamma},$$

(36)

where $D(E_{\alpha \alpha})$ is the density of states at the initial state energy $E_{\alpha \alpha}$, which is chosen to be in the bulk of the spectrum, and $\Delta O_{\alpha \alpha}^2 := \langle O_{\alpha \alpha} \rangle - \langle O_{\alpha \alpha} \rangle^2$. We note that our finite temperature result, taken in the low temperature limit $\beta \to \infty$, recovers the same form as this pure state FDT, i.e. $W_O$ can be seen to be equal to $\Delta O^2$ for low temperatures. This is shown in the supplemental material by noting that up until Eq. (28) no assumptions are made on the temperature of the initial state. Low temperature averages may then instead be defined, assuming an initial state $\rho_{\alpha \alpha} \sim e^{-\beta(E_{\alpha \alpha} - E_0)} \delta_{\alpha, \text{odd}}$, with a low energy cut-off at $E_0$, which is the energy of the populated pure state at zero temperature.
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I. SUMMARY OF RMT APPROACH

A. Model

The random matrix model under study may be expressed by a non-interacting part

\[ (H_0)_{\alpha\beta} = E_\alpha \delta_{\alpha\beta} \]  

where \( E_\alpha = \alpha \omega_0 \), and \( \omega_0 = 1/N \) is the spacing between energy levels, and perturbation term, modeled by a random matrix,

\[ V_{\alpha\beta} = h_{\alpha\beta} \]  

where \( h_{\alpha\beta} \) are independent random numbers selected from the Gaussian Orthogonal Ensemble (GOE), such that the matrix \( h \) has the probability distribution,

\[ P(h) \propto \exp \left[ - \frac{N}{4g^2} \text{Tr} h^2 \right], \]  

\[ G^{(od)}(\xi,\zeta) = \int \int \exp \left[ - \sum_{\alpha} \left( \frac{c^2(\alpha)}{2\Lambda(\mu,\alpha)} + \frac{c^2(\alpha)}{2\Lambda(\nu,\alpha)} + \xi_{\mu,\alpha} c_\mu(\alpha) + \xi_{\nu,\alpha} c_\nu(\alpha) \right) \right] \frac{\delta(\sum_{\alpha} c_\mu(\alpha) c_\nu(\alpha)) \prod_{\alpha} dc_\mu(\alpha) dc_\nu(\alpha)}{\Lambda^2(\mu,\nu)}, \]  

\[ (\mu \neq \nu) \] to be equal to

\[ \langle c_\mu(\alpha_0) c_\nu(\beta_0) c_\mu(\alpha) c_\nu(\beta) \rangle_V = \frac{1}{G_{\mu\nu}} \frac{\partial^{\nu_\alpha}}{\partial \xi_{\nu,\alpha}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{\nu_{\beta_0}}}{\partial \xi_{\nu_{\beta_0}}} G_{\mu\nu} \bigg|_{\xi_{\mu,\alpha}=0,\xi_{\nu,\alpha}=0}. \]  

In particular, the correlation function \( \langle c_\mu(\alpha_0) c_\nu(\beta_0) c_\mu(\alpha) c_\nu(\beta) \rangle_V \) was found in [S1] for giving \( \langle h_{\alpha\beta} \rangle = 0 \), and \( \langle h_{\alpha\beta}^2 \rangle = g^2/N \) for \( \alpha \neq \beta \), and otherwise \( \langle h_{\alpha\alpha}^2 \rangle = 2g^2/N \).

In Ref. [S1] the current authors developed a consistent theoretical model of random wave functions \( |\psi_\mu\rangle = \sum_\alpha c_\mu(\alpha) |\phi_\alpha\rangle \), for the random matrix model above. We make the ansatz on the probability distribution on the \( c_\mu(\alpha) \)s,

\[ p(c,\Lambda) = \frac{1}{Z_g} e^{-\sum_{\alpha} \frac{c^2(\alpha)}{2\Lambda(\mu,\alpha)}} \prod_{\mu \neq \nu} \delta(\sum_{\alpha} c_\mu(\alpha) c_\nu(\alpha)), \]  

where the \( \delta \)-function term explicitly accounts for the orthogonality of the many-body eigenstates (which we showed to be necessary in order to obtain a consistent form for the off-diagonal matrix elements). This distribution \( \Lambda(\mu,\alpha) \) can then be shown to be a Lorentzian of width \( \Gamma = \frac{\pi g^2}{\omega_0} \) [S1, S2]. From Eq. (S4), one can calculate arbitrary correlation functions of the \( c_\mu(\alpha) \) coefficient by first defining the generating function,
due to mutual orthogonality of two random wavefunctions. For the diagonal part, we have the much simpler generating function,

$$G^{(d)}_{\mu\nu} = \int \exp \left[ -\sum_{\alpha} \frac{c_{\mu}(\alpha)^2}{2A(\mu, \alpha)} \right] \prod_{\alpha} dc_{\mu}(\alpha). \quad (S9)$$

Thus, we have,

$$\langle c_{\mu}(\alpha)c_{\nu}(\beta)c_{\mu}(\alpha')c_{\nu}(\beta') \rangle_{\nu} = \Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\Lambda(\mu, \alpha')\delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{\alpha'\beta'} + \Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\Lambda(\mu, \beta)(\delta_{\alpha\alpha'}\delta_{\beta\beta'} + \delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{\alpha'\beta'}), \quad (S10)$$

for the diagonal case.

B. Assumptions on Observables

In the following, assumptions of the form,

$$\sum_{\alpha} \Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\Lambda(\nu, \alpha)O_{\alpha\alpha} = [O_{\alpha\alpha}]_\mu \Lambda^{(2)}(\mu, \nu), \quad (S11)$$

will be necessary in order to compute summations over the non-interacting indices. In this section we explain in more detail the requirements on the form of $O_{\alpha\alpha}$ for Eq. (S11) to be valid.

The essential assumption here, which we label smoothness of $O_{\alpha\alpha}$, as in Ref. [S3], is that the microcanonical average $[O_{\alpha\alpha}]_\mu \Lambda^{(2)}(\mu, \nu)$ changes slowly over the width $\Gamma$ of the function $\Lambda(\mu, \alpha)\Lambda(\nu, \alpha)$. We showed in Ref. [S3] that this is the case under the conditions,

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\omega_0} \gg 1,$$

$$\Gamma^2 \frac{d^2}{dE_\mu^2} [O_{\alpha\alpha}]_\mu \ll 1, \quad (S12)$$

which thus leads us to two reasonable conditions,

1. There are many states in the energy width $\Gamma$

2. The microcanonical average changes slowly over the width $\Gamma$.

We note that the latter condition, combined with the fact that the microcanonical average and time average are equal (which is shown below), is equivalent to the statement that the time-average of the observable is not sensitive to the particular initial state (microstate), rather, it’s macroscopic energy.

C. RMT Numerics

Here we confirm our analytical results with numerical calculations with the random matrix Hamiltonian. In particular, we show in Fig. S1a, that the infinite temperature fluctuation-dissipation theorem (FDT),

$$\delta_{\alpha}^2(\infty) = \frac{W_0\omega_0}{4\pi N_B \Gamma}, \quad (S13)$$

is satisfied in this model. This is shown for two ‘observables’ of the RMT model, $O_{\text{odd}}$ and $O_{\text{sym}}$, which are chosen to be diagonal in the non-interacting basis, with diagonal elements given by,

$$(O_{\text{odd}})_{\alpha\alpha} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha = \text{odd} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (S14)$$

for $O_{\text{odd}}$, and

$$(O_{\text{sym}})_{\alpha\alpha} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha = \text{odd} \\ -1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (S15)$$

for $O_{\text{sym}}$. These observables are chosen, as in Refs. [S1, S3], as they resemble realistic observables, such as local Pauli operators, in the sense that they are well defined, sparse, and highly degenerate [S4] in the non-interacting basis. For our RMT numerical calculations, we define the initial state as

$$\rho_{\alpha\beta} = e^{-\beta(E_\alpha - E_0)}\delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{\alpha,\text{odd}}, \quad (S16)$$

such that $\langle O(0) \rangle = 1$. The energy shift $E_0$ is simply to avoid edge effects at lower temperatures, where a large fraction of the initial state population would otherwise be in the ground state.

In Fig. S2 we plot the time dependence of the above observables for an infinite temperature initial state, and compare these to the observable time dependence of Eq. (S27), derived below.

The high temperature limit, in which our FDT is derived, is defined by $\beta^{-1} \gg \Gamma$. In the numerics, we use $g = 0.05$, and thus $\Gamma \sim 0.007$, so the high temperature limit requires $\beta \lesssim 125$. We show plots for $\beta = 100$ and $\beta = 500$ in Figs. S1b and S1c, respectively. For the parameters used these correspond to a high temperature, near the edge of the expected limit, and a low temperature initial state. We observe that the finite temperature form in fact works well for all $\beta$ values. This is further discussed analytically in the final section below, where we see that the low temperature limit of our current approach is equal to the pure state result previously obtained in Ref. [S3].

II. TIME DEPENDENCE OF OBSERVABLES

Before discussing further details of the specific model above, we present a description of the time dependence of ‘generic’ observables (defined below), from an arbitrary initial condition

$$\rho(0) = \sum_{\alpha\beta} w_{\alpha\beta}|\phi_{\alpha}\rangle\langle\phi_{\beta}|. \quad (S17)$$
Figure S1: (a) Numerical confirmation of the random matrix FDT for an infinite temperature initial state, Eq. (S77) for observables $O_{\text{odd}}$ and $O_{\text{sym}}$. (b) Shows the random matrix FDT for a high temperature initial state $\beta = 100$, and (c) for a low temperature ($\beta = 500$). Here $g = 0.04$, so $\Gamma \sim 0.007$, and thus the high temperature limit $\beta \ll \Gamma^{-1}$ is approximately $\beta \ll 125$.

We thus observe that the finite temperature result Eqs. (S60) and (S74) (which we note are equivalent, the latter is used here), is fulfilled for all temperatures. We note that the low temperature limit above uses $\rho_B \sim e^{-\beta (E - E_0)}$, with $E_0 = E_{\text{max}}^2$, to ensure that the initial state is not simply the ground state. For this limit we also use $W_O = [\Delta E^2]$, as discussed in the final section. Simulations are performed with a single realization of the random matrix $V$, and thus we observe directly the self-averaging property.

Figure S2: Time dependence of random matrix observables $O_{\text{odd}}$ and $O_{\text{sym}}$. Exact diagonalization numerics (solid lines) show time evolutions for a single realization of the random matrix perturbation $V$. RMT calculation (dashed lines), show Eq. (S27), with $\langle O(t) \rangle = 1$, and $\langle O \rangle_{MC} = \langle O_{\text{odd}} \rangle = 0.05$ for $O = O_{\text{sym}}(O_{\text{odd}})$. Parameters used are $N = 500, g = 0.05, \beta = 100$.

We assume a particular form for our generic observables, such that in the non-interacting basis such observables are sparse and may be expressed as $\sum_{\alpha} O_{\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{n}^{N} O_{\alpha, \alpha+n} \delta_{\beta, \alpha+n}$, where for a given observable there is a non-extensive number $N_O$ of groups of non-zero matrix elements at given energy widths. We refer the reader to Ref. [S42] for a more detailed discussion of this form, and note that it is easily seen to be true for e.g. Pauli operator observables.

The time dependence of Eq. (S17) may be written as,

$$
\rho(t) = \sum_{\alpha\beta} \sum_{\mu\nu} w_{\alpha\beta} c_{\mu}(\alpha)c_{\nu}(\beta)e^{-i(E_{\mu} - E_{\nu})t} |\psi_{\mu}\rangle \langle \psi_{\nu}|,
$$

which may be used to obtain the time evolved observable expectation value by $O(t) = \text{Tr}(\rho(t)O)$. We will see that under certain conditions our RMT approach may obtain the full dynamics of the thermalization of $O$.

To begin, we see that by taking the trace over the interacting basis $\{ |\psi_{\mu}\rangle \}$, we obtain

$$
O(t) = \sum_{\mu'} \langle \psi_{\mu'} | \sum_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} w_{\alpha\beta} c_{\mu}(\alpha)c_{\nu}(\beta)e^{-i(E_{\mu} - E_{\nu})t} |\psi_{\mu}\rangle \langle \psi_{\nu}|O|\psi_{\mu'}\rangle.
$$

Noting the so-called diagonal ensemble contribution is defined by,

$$
O_{DE} = \sum_{\alpha\mu} w_{\alpha\mu} c_{\mu}^{2}(\alpha)O_{\alpha\mu},
$$

which can be seen to be equal to the long-time average value of the observable

$$
\overline{O(t)} := \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt O(t) = O_{DE},
$$
assuming no degenerate energy levels, we thus define

\[
\Delta O(t) := O(t) - O_{\text{DE}} = \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{\beta} \sum_{\mu \neq \nu} w_{\alpha \beta} c_{\mu}(\alpha) c_{\nu}(\beta) e^{-i(E_{\mu} - E_{\nu})t} \langle \psi_{\mu}|O|\psi_{\nu}\rangle,
\]

(S22)
as \(O_{\mu \nu} = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\mu}(\alpha) c_{\nu}(\beta) O_{\alpha \beta}\), we have

\[
\Delta O(t) = \sum_{\alpha \beta} \sum_{\mu \neq \nu} w_{\alpha \beta} c_{\mu}(\alpha) c_{\nu}(\beta) c_{\mu'}(\alpha') c_{\nu'}(\beta')
\]
\[
\times e^{-i(E_{\mu} - E_{\nu})t} O_{\alpha' \beta'}.
\]

(S23)

We see that, assuming self averaging, this depends on the four-point correlation function given by Eq. (S7), such that

\[
\Delta O(t) = \sum_{\mu \nu} e^{-i(E_{\mu} - E_{\nu})t} \left[ \sum_{\alpha} w_{\alpha \beta} O_{\alpha \beta} \Lambda(\mu, \alpha) \Lambda(\nu, \beta) \right.
\]
\[
- \sum_{\alpha} w_{\alpha \alpha} O_{\alpha \beta} \frac{\Lambda(\mu, \alpha) \Lambda(\mu, \beta) \Lambda(\nu, \alpha) \Lambda(\nu, \beta)}{\Lambda(2)(\mu, \nu)}
\]
\[
- \sum_{\alpha} w_{\alpha \beta} O_{\alpha \alpha} \frac{\Lambda(\mu, \alpha) \Lambda(\mu, \beta) \Lambda(\nu, \alpha) \Lambda(\nu, \beta)}{\Lambda(2)(\mu, \nu)} \right].
\]

(S24)

The third term can be shown to be small, proof of which we delay to the end of this section. We now use the smoothness assumption, which may be seen as a microcanonical averaging of matrix elements, as in Refs. [S1, S3], by writing \(\sum_{\alpha} O_{\alpha \alpha} \Lambda(\mu, \alpha) \Lambda(\nu, \alpha) \approx \bar{O}_{\alpha \alpha} \pi^{(2)}(\mu, \nu), \) where \(\pi := \frac{\mu + \nu}{2}\) and \(\bar{O}_{\alpha \alpha} = \sum_{\alpha} O_{\alpha \alpha} \Lambda(\pi, \alpha)\). We thus have, noting that \(\Lambda(\mu, \alpha) = \Lambda(\mu, \beta) = \Lambda(\alpha, \beta)\),

\[
\Delta O(t) = (O(t))_0 e^{-2\Gamma t}
\]
\[
- \sum_{\mu \nu} \sum_{\alpha} O_{\alpha \alpha} \bar{O}_{\alpha \alpha} \pi^{(2)} e^{-i(E_{\mu} - E_{\nu})t} \Lambda(\mu, \alpha) \Lambda(\nu, \beta),
\]

(S25)

where to obtain the first term one may make the change of variables \(\mu(\nu) \rightarrow \mu(\nu) - \alpha(\beta)\), and perform the integrals over the new variables, with \((O(t))_0 := \sum_{\alpha \beta} w_{\alpha \beta} O_{\alpha \beta} e^{-i(E_{\mu} - E_{\nu})t}\) is the free evolution of the observable under the Hamiltonian \(H_0\).

Now, we can see that the summations in the second term of Eq. (S25) have contribution terms for elements where the initial diagonal part of the density matrix \(w_{\alpha \alpha}\) is large. Then, for any given \(\alpha\) the observable microcanonical average \(\bar{O}_{\alpha \alpha} \pi^{(2)} \) may be taken outside of the summation assuming that it is constant over the width \(\Gamma\) around the energy \(E_\alpha\). Such that,

\[
\Delta O(t) = (O(t))_0 e^{-2\Gamma t} - \sum_{\alpha} \bar{O}_{\alpha \alpha} w_{\alpha \alpha} e^{-2\Gamma t},
\]

(S26)

Noting that at \(t = 0\) we by definition have \(\Delta O(0) := \langle O(0) \rangle - \langle O_{\text{DE}} \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \bar{O}_{\alpha \alpha} w_{\alpha \alpha}\), we obtain that \(\sum_{\alpha} \bar{O}_{\alpha \alpha} w_{\alpha \alpha} = \langle O_{\text{DE}} \rangle\). Noting Eq. (S21), we see that the equality of the time and microcanonical averages is derived from our RMT approach. Thus, using the definition in Eq. (S22), we obtain

\[
O(t) = (\langle O(t) \rangle_0 - \langle O_{\text{DE}} \rangle) e^{-2\Gamma t} + \langle O_{\text{DE}} \rangle.
\]

(S27)

This is the same as that obtained in Reference [S3] for pure-states.

What remains, then is to bound third term in Eq. (S24), for which we proceed by defining,

\[
A(t) = \sum_{\mu \nu} \sum_{\alpha \beta} w_{\alpha \beta} O_{\alpha \beta} \frac{\Lambda(\mu, \alpha) \Lambda(\mu, \beta) \Lambda(\nu, \alpha) \Lambda(\nu, \beta)}{\Lambda(2)(\mu, \nu)}
\]
\[
\times e^{-i(E_{\mu} - E_{\nu})t}.
\]

(S28)

We may now use the relation \(\sum_{i} a_i \leq \sum_{i} |a_i|\), to write

\[
|A(t)| \leq \sum_{\mu \nu} \sum_{\alpha \beta} w_{\alpha \beta} O_{\alpha \beta} \frac{\Lambda(\mu, \alpha) \Lambda(\mu, \beta) \Lambda(\nu, \alpha) \Lambda(\nu, \beta)}{\Lambda(2)(\mu, \nu)}
\]
\[
\times e^{-i(E_{\mu} - E_{\nu})t} \leq \sum_{\mu \nu} \sum_{\alpha \beta} w_{\alpha \beta} O_{\alpha \beta} \frac{\Lambda(\mu, \alpha) \Lambda(\mu, \beta) \Lambda(\nu, \alpha) \Lambda(\nu, \beta)}{\Lambda(2)(\mu, \nu)}
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{\alpha \beta} |w_{\alpha \beta} O_{\alpha \beta}| \sum_{\mu \nu} \Lambda(\mu, \alpha) \Lambda(\mu, \beta) \Lambda(\nu, \alpha) \Lambda(\nu, \beta)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{3\omega_0}{4\pi \Gamma} \sum_{\alpha} |w_{\alpha \beta} O_{\alpha \beta}|, \]

(S29)

where we have used that,

\[
\sum_{\mu \nu} \sum_{\alpha \beta} \frac{\Lambda(\mu, \alpha) \Lambda(\mu, \beta) \Lambda(\nu, \alpha) \Lambda(\nu, \beta)}{\Lambda(2)(\mu, \nu)}
\]
\[
= \omega_0 \left(\frac{E_\alpha - E_\beta}{2}\right)^2 T + 12T^3 \leq \frac{3\omega_0}{4\pi \Gamma}.
\]

(S30)

Now, using \(\sum_{\alpha \beta} O_{\alpha \beta} = \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{n} N_{\alpha} O_{\alpha, \alpha+n} \delta_{\beta, \alpha+n}\), we have

\[
\sum_{\alpha \beta} |w_{\alpha \beta} O_{\alpha \beta}| = \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{n} |w_{\alpha, \alpha+n} O_{\alpha, \alpha+n}| \leq \max_{\alpha \beta} (O_{\alpha \beta}) \sum_{\alpha, n} w_{\alpha, \alpha+n}.
\]

(S31)

Now, we see that in the case of \(w_{\alpha \beta} \sim \delta_{\alpha \beta}\), the bound simply becomes

\[
|A(t)| \leq \max_{\alpha} (O_{\alpha \alpha}) \frac{3\omega_0}{4\pi \Gamma}.
\]

(S32)
similarly, this is the case for our application studied in the main text, where $O_{\alpha\beta} \sim \delta_{\alpha\beta}$. We note that the condition of diagonal $w_{\alpha\beta}$ correspond to a reasonable initial state in many experimental situations, since thermalization takes place typically by incoherent exchange of energy in the basis of eigenstates of $H_0$. For states with coherences, to bound this quantity we require that the coherences are not large on the off-diagonals defined by $\alpha, \alpha + n$, in the sense that $\sum_\alpha w_{\alpha,\alpha+n} \lesssim O(1)$, so
\[ |A(t)| \lesssim N_0 \max(O_{\alpha\alpha}) \frac{3\omega_0}{4\pi \Gamma}. \] (S33)

In this sense, ‘special’ initial states may be chosen that do not satisfy this bound, but they are highly atypical.

### III. MEASUREMENT OF $\Gamma^{-1}$

In this section we show that, when measuring the decay of an observable, the decay rate that one has access to is in fact a thermal average over the inverse widths $\Gamma^{-1}$. To see this, one may simply consider the time integration of the evolution obtained above from the initial state,
\[ \rho_\alpha = \frac{1}{Z_\beta} e^{-\beta E_\alpha} \delta_{\alpha,\text{odd}}, \] (S34)

describing our probe-device model, with an initial finite temperature device state at inverse temperature $\beta$. The time integration is then,
\[ \lim_{T \to \infty} \int_0^T dt \Delta O(t) = \lim_{T \to \infty} \int_0^T dt \sum_\alpha w_\alpha (1 - O_{DE}) e^{-2\Gamma_\alpha t} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_\alpha \Gamma_\alpha^{-1} w_\alpha = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_\alpha \Gamma_\alpha^{-1} e^{-\beta E_\alpha} \delta_{\alpha,\text{odd}} \] (S35)
\[ := -\frac{1}{2} \langle (\Gamma(E)^{-1}) \rangle_\beta, \]

where we have used in the second line that $O_{DE} = 0$, where we have defined the thermal average $\langle \cdots \rangle_\beta$ at inverse temperature $\beta$. We thus see that it is the thermal average of the inverse decay rate that is measured by a fit to the time dependence of an observable.

Note that this thermal average is not the same as the unbiased thermal average defined in the main text. The integral form here, of the thermal average of a function $A(E)$, is given by,
\[ \langle A(E) \rangle_\beta := \frac{1}{Z_\beta} \int_0^{E_{\Delta E}} dED(E) e^{-\beta(E-E_\alpha)} A(E). \] (S36)

In the final section we re-express our FDT in terms of this average, and show that the form differs only by a constant that is independent of $N$ and the coupling strength, and thus the scaling with Hilbert space dimension remains the same, and this difference is not important for our application.

### IV. FLUCTUATION-DISSIPATION THEOREM

#### A. Derivation from RMT

Here we perform the full derivation of the infinite temperature FDT for the random matrix model that was sketched in the main text. We employ the RMT approach developed in Refs. [S1, S3] to the calculation of the long-time fluctuations, defined by,
\[ \delta_z^2(\infty) = \sum_{\mu,\nu} |\rho_{\mu\nu}|^2 |\langle \sigma_z \rangle_{\mu\nu}|^2. \] (S37)

We begin by writing the initial density operator as,
\[ \rho_{\mu\nu} = \sum_\alpha w_\alpha \psi_\alpha(\alpha) c_\nu(\alpha), \] (S38)

where $w_\alpha = \frac{1}{N_\alpha} \delta_{\alpha,\text{odd}}$. Then using Eqs. (S37), and that $|\psi_\mu \rangle = \sum_\alpha c_\mu(\alpha)|\phi_\alpha \rangle$, we may write the time fluctuations as,
\[ \delta_z^2(\infty) = \sum_{\mu\nu} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} c_\mu(\alpha)c_\nu(\beta)c_\mu(\beta)c_\nu(\beta)w_\alpha w_\beta \] (S39)
\[ \times \sum_{\alpha',\beta'} c_\mu(\alpha')c_\nu(\alpha')c_\mu(\beta')c_\nu(\beta')O_{\alpha'\alpha'}O_{\beta'\beta'}, \]

where coefficients of the initial state are labelled as unprimed indices $\alpha, \beta$, and coefficients of the observable are labelled by primed indices.

Using the self-averaging property of random matrices, we may replace the product of coefficients $c_\mu(\alpha)$ by their ensemble average $\langle \cdots \rangle_V$; the above expression may then be written in terms of a sum of 8-point correlation functions:
\[ \delta_z^2(\infty) = \sum_{\mu\nu} \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\alpha',\beta'} w_\alpha w_\beta O_{\alpha'\alpha'}O_{\beta'\beta'} \times \langle c_\mu(\alpha)c_\nu(\alpha)c_\mu(\beta)c_\nu(\beta)c_\mu(\alpha')c_\nu(\alpha')c_\mu(\beta')c_\nu(\beta') \rangle_V. \] (S40)

Now, using the method of contractions outlined above, we see that this 8-point correlation function may be split up into four-point correlation functions, each consisting of both Gaussian and non-Gaussian contractions. We see that contributions to the long-time fluctuations may be split into three groups: products of Gaussian contractions, products of non-Gaussian contractions, and mixed products of two Gaussian and one non-Gaussian contraction.

An example of the first form, Gaussian contractions only, is
\[ (c_\mu(\alpha)c_\nu(\alpha)c_\mu(\beta)c_\nu(\beta)c_\mu(\alpha')c_\nu(\alpha')c_\mu(\beta')c_\nu(\beta'))V = \Lambda(\mu,\alpha)\Lambda(\nu,\alpha)\Lambda(\mu,\alpha')\Lambda(\nu,\alpha')\delta_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{\alpha'\beta'}. \] (S41)
Indeed, there are three such contractions, occurring each time between pairs of indices, that only contribute two kronecker-δ factors - \( \sim \delta_{a\beta} \delta_{a'\beta'} \), \( \delta_{a\alpha} \delta_{\beta\beta'} \), \( \delta_{a\alpha'} \delta_{\beta'\beta} \). Other Gaussian contractions may be defined, but may be ignored due to a reduction in the number of summations.

In a similar manner, we may define non-Gaussian contractions that do not reduce the number of summations at all, such that they contribute on the same order as the Gaussian contractions above. An example is,

\[
\langle c_\mu(c_\mu,c_\alpha(c_\beta,c_\alpha(c_\beta,c_\alpha(c_\beta(c_\beta,c_\alpha))))_\nu = L^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu} L^{\alpha'\beta'}_{\mu\nu} \delta_{a\beta}.
\]  
(S42)

It can be easily seen that there are three non-Gaussian contractions of this form, with the other two being defined by swapping pairs of primed and unprimed indices in turn.

Finally, we see that mixed contractions may also contribute, for example,

\[
\langle c_\mu(c_\alpha(c_\beta,c_\alpha(c_\beta,c_\alpha(c_\beta,c_\alpha))))_\nu = \Lambda(\mu,\nu)\Lambda(\nu,\alpha)L^{\alpha'\beta'}_{\mu\nu} \delta_{a\beta}.
\]  
(S43)

We can see that there are six terms of this form that contribute only on \( \delta \) factor. These are \( \delta_{a\beta}, \delta_{a\alpha}, \delta_{a\alpha'}, \delta_{a\beta'}, \delta_{a'\beta}, \delta_{a'\beta'} \).

We thus obtain that for the contribution from Gaussian contractions, \( \delta^2_G(\infty) \),

\[
\delta^2_G(\infty) = \sum_{\mu\nu} \sum_{a\alpha} w_{a\alpha} w_{\alpha'\beta} O_{\alpha'\beta} L_{\mu\nu}^{a\beta} \Lambda(\mu,\alpha)\Lambda(\nu,\beta)
\]

\[
+ \Lambda(\mu,\nu)\Lambda(\nu,\alpha)\Lambda(\mu,\beta)\Lambda(\nu,\beta)
\]

\[
\times \sum_{w_{a\alpha} O_{\alpha'\beta}} + 2w_{a\beta} O_{a\alpha} O_{a\beta}]
\]  
(S44)

Similarly, for the non-Gaussian (\( \delta^2_{NG}(\infty) \)), and mixed (\( \delta^2_{M}(\infty) \)) contractions we have

\[
\delta^2_{NG}(\infty) = 3 \sum_{\mu\nu} \sum_{a'\alpha'\beta'} w_{a\alpha} w_{a'\beta} O_{a'\alpha'} O_{a'\beta'} L_{\mu\nu}^{a'\beta'} L_{\mu\nu}^{a'\beta'}
\]

\[
(\mu,\alpha)\Lambda(\nu,\alpha)\Lambda(\mu,\beta)\Lambda(\nu,\beta)
\]

\[
\sum_{w_{a\alpha} O_{a\beta}} + 2w_{a\beta} O_{a\alpha} O_{a\beta}]
\]  
(S45)

and

\[
\delta^2_{M}(\infty) = \sum_{\mu\nu} \sum_{a'\alpha'\beta'} \Lambda(\mu,\alpha)\Lambda(\mu,\beta)\Lambda(\nu,\beta)
\]

\[
\sum_{w_{a\alpha} O_{a\beta}} + 2w_{a\beta} O_{a\alpha} O_{a\beta}]
\]  
(S46)

respectively.

In order to perform the summations over non-interacting indices in Eq. (S40) we define coarse grained averages of observable elements \( O_{a\alpha} \) as in Eq. (S11). The key assumption in writing (S11) is that the average,

\[
[O_{a\alpha}]_\mu := \sum_{\alpha} \Lambda(\mu,\alpha)O_{a\alpha},
\]  
(S47)

changes slowly in energy \( E_\pi \) with respect to the width \( \Gamma \). Similar averages over the initial state, or mixed averages must also be defined, such as

\[
\sum_{\alpha} \Lambda(\mu,\alpha)\Lambda(\nu,\alpha)w_{\alpha} = [w_{\alpha}]_\pi \Lambda(\mu,\nu)
\]

\[
\sum_{\alpha} \Lambda(\mu,\alpha)\Lambda(\nu,\alpha)w_{\alpha} O_{a\alpha} = [w_{a\alpha}]_\pi \Lambda(\mu,\nu).
\]  
(S48)

Note that, \( [O_{a\alpha}]_\pi \) can be interpreted as a microcanonical average of the observable \( O \).

Now, using Eqs. (S11) and (S48), we obtain,

\[
\delta^2_G(\infty) = \sum_{\mu\nu} \sum_{a\alpha} |w_{a\alpha}|^2 O_{a\alpha}^2 + 2[w_{a\alpha}]_\pi \Lambda(\mu,\nu) \Lambda^2(\mu,\nu),
\]

\[
\delta^2_{NG}(\infty) = 3 \sum_{\mu\nu} |w_{a\alpha}|^2 O_{a\alpha}^2 \Lambda(\mu,\nu) \Lambda(\mu,\nu,\nu) \Lambda(\mu,\nu,\alpha) \Lambda(\mu,\beta) \Lambda(\nu,\beta)
\]

\[
+ 2[w_{a\alpha}]_\pi \Lambda(\mu,\nu) O_{a\alpha}^2 + w_{a\alpha} O_{a\alpha} O_{a\alpha}
\]  
(S49)

We thus define \( W_\pi \) by

\[
\delta^2_G(\infty) = \delta^2_G(\infty) + \delta^2_{NG}(\infty) + \delta^2_M(\infty)
\]

\[
= \sum_{\mu\nu} W_{a\alpha} \Lambda(\mu,\nu) \Lambda^2(\mu,\nu),
\]  
(S50)

with,

\[
W_{\mu} = [w_{a\alpha}]_\pi O_{a\alpha}^2 + 2[w_{a\alpha}]_\pi O_{a\alpha}^2 + 3[w_{a\alpha}]_\pi O_{a\alpha}^2
\]

\[
- [w_{a\alpha}]_\pi O_{a\alpha}^2 - 4[w_{a\alpha}]_\pi O_{a\alpha}^2 w_{a\alpha} O_{a\alpha}
\]  
(S51)

We now take our device to be in an initial infinite temperature state, such that \( [w_{a\alpha}]_\pi = [w_{a\alpha}]_\pi = \frac{1}{2} [w_{a\alpha}]_\pi \), as such, \( W_\pi = W \) is in fact energy independent, as the probe Hamiltonian \( H_S = 0 \), so microcanonical averages of probe observables are also energy independent. Now, as \( [w_{a\alpha}]_\pi = 2[w_{a\alpha}]_\pi \), all terms in
$W$ are $\propto |w_{\alpha}|^2$, we define,
\begin{equation}
W_O = \frac{W}{|w_{\alpha}|^2} = [O_{\alpha\alpha}^2] + O_{\uparrow}^2 + \frac{3}{2}[O_{\alpha\alpha}]^2 - \frac{1}{2}O_{\uparrow\uparrow},
\end{equation}
(S52)
where $O_{\uparrow} = \langle \uparrow | O | \uparrow \rangle$, and we have used that $|w_{\alpha}O_{\alpha\alpha}| = O_{\uparrow}|w_{\alpha}|$. We see that $W_O$ is a constant of the order of unity that depends only on the observable. Finally, taking the thermodynamic limit, such that $\sum_{\mu,\nu} \rightarrow \int_0^{\Delta E} \int_0^{\Delta E} \frac{dE_{\mu}dE_{\nu}}{\omega_{\alpha}^2}$, we have
\begin{equation}
\delta_O^2(\infty) = \frac{W_O}{2N_B^2} \int_0^{\Delta E} \int_0^{\Delta E} \frac{dE_{\mu}dE_{\nu}}{\omega_{\alpha}^2} \Lambda_2(\mu, \nu)^2, \tag{S53}
\end{equation}
which may be evaluated as,
\begin{equation}
\int_0^{\Delta E} \int_0^{\Delta E} \frac{dE_{\mu}dE_{\nu}}{\omega_{\alpha}^2} \Lambda_2(\mu, \nu)^2 = \int_0^{\Delta E} dE_{\mu} \frac{\arccot \frac{2\pi E_{\mu}}{\Delta E}}{\pi},
\end{equation}
(S54)
where in the last line we have used that $\Delta E \gg \Gamma$, such that $\arccot \frac{2\pi E_{\mu}}{\Delta E} \approx \frac{\pi}{2}$. We then obtain,
\begin{equation}
\delta_O^2(\infty) = \frac{W_O\omega_{\alpha}}{4\pi N_B \Gamma}, \tag{S55}
\end{equation}
where we have used that $\Delta E := 2N_B\omega_{\alpha}$.

We can see, then, that Eq. (S55) is of the form of our main result, Eq. (3) of the main text, where $C = \frac{W_O}{4\pi}$. What follows is to generalize this relation, allowing the DOS and $\Gamma$ to vary in energy, and for finite temperatures.

### B. Extension to Realistic Systems

As discussed in the main text, the key issue with directly applying the RMT results to realistic models is that in general the DOS, and decay rate, are energy dependent, and thus change over the width of the initial state distribution (this is especially important for the high/finite temperatures considered here). In order to account for this, we must then go back to the evaluation of the integrals over energy, in Eq. (S53), and substitute $\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma(E)$, and $\omega_{\alpha}^{-1} \rightarrow D(E)$. In the following we make the assumption that neither $\Gamma(E)$, nor $D(E)$, vary appreciably over the width $\Gamma$, i.e. $\frac{\Gamma(E)-\Gamma(E+\Gamma(E))}{\Gamma(E)} \ll 1$, and $\frac{D(E)-D(E+\Gamma(E))}{D(E)} \ll 1$.

We see then, that the integral in Eq. (S53) is now
\begin{equation}
\delta_O^2(\infty) = \frac{W_O}{2N_B^2} \int_0^{\Delta E} \int_0^{\Delta E} \frac{dE_{\mu}dE_{\nu}}{\omega_{\alpha}^2} \frac{D(E_{\mu})D(E_{\nu})}{(E_{\mu}-E_{\nu})^2 + 4\Gamma(E)^2}, \tag{S56}
\end{equation}
where,
\begin{equation}
\Lambda_2^{(2)}(\mu, \nu) = \frac{1}{D(E)} \left( \frac{2\Gamma(E)/\pi}{(E_{\mu}-E_{\nu})^2 + 4\Gamma(E)^2} \right), \tag{S57}
\end{equation}
with $E = \frac{E_{\mu}+E_{\nu}}{2}$. Now, we further define $\omega = E_{\mu}-E_{\nu}$, and make the change of variables $E_{\mu}, E_{\nu} \rightarrow \omega, E$, and thus obtain
\begin{equation}
\delta_O^2(\infty) = \frac{W_O}{2N_B^2} \int_0^{\Delta E} \int_0^{\Delta E} dE \omega \frac{D(E + \frac{\omega}{2})D(E - \frac{\omega}{2})}{D(E)^2} \times \left( \frac{2\Gamma(E)/\pi}{\omega^2 + 4\Gamma(E)^2} \right)^2
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\approx \frac{W_O}{2N_B^2} \int_0^{\Delta E} dE \frac{1}{4\pi \Gamma(E)}, \tag{S58}
\end{equation}
where in the second line we have assumed that $D(E)$ and $\Gamma(E)$ is approximately constant over the width $\Gamma$. Now, we define the unbiased average of a function $A(E)$ as,
\begin{equation}
\bar{A}(E) = \frac{1}{\Delta E} \int_0^{\Delta E} dE A(E), \tag{S59}
\end{equation}
and see that, noting $\Delta E = \frac{2N_B}{d(E)}$,
\begin{equation}
\delta_O^2(\infty) = \frac{W_O}{4\pi N_B D(E)} \bar{\Gamma}(E)^{-1} \tag{S60}
\end{equation}
where $C = \frac{W_O}{4\pi}$ depends only on the choice of observable. We note that for the random matrix model, as the DOS and $\Gamma(E)$ are both constant in energy, the average $\bar{\Gamma}(E)^{-1}$ is equal to the thermal average $\langle (\bar{\Gamma}(E)^{-1}) \rangle_{\beta=0}$ obtained from a fit to the decay of an observable (see Section III above). In the case above, however, where the DOS and $\Gamma(E)$ change in energy, the unbiased average decay rate is not necessarily the same as that obtained from a fit to the decay. We may fix this problem directly, as we do in the last section, where we see that the unbiased thermal averages may be replaced by regular thermal averages weighted by the DOS at the expense of a constant that depends on the functional form of $D(E)$ and $\Gamma(E)$ (but importantly, not on $N$, or the coupling strength).

We can also see, that if $\Gamma(E)$ is approximately constant over the width of the DOS, which is often the case in such systems, then the biased and unbiased thermal averages of $\bar{\Gamma}(E)^{-1}$ are approximately equal for $\beta \rightarrow 0$, and Eq. (S60) may be directly experimentally confirmed.

### C. Finite Temperature FDT

To extend our theory to finite temperatures described by
\begin{equation}
\rho(t=0) = \frac{1}{N_B^2} \sum_{\alpha \leq O} |\phi_{\alpha}\rangle\langle \phi_{\alpha}|, \tag{S61}
\end{equation}
where the joint qubit-device Hamiltonian eigenbasis is built by ordering product states such that \(|\phi_\alpha\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle |B, \phi_{\alpha+}\rangle\) (\(\alpha\) odd), \(|\phi_\alpha\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle |B, \phi_{\alpha}\rangle\) (\(\alpha\) even). In this case, writing \(\rho(0) = \sum_\alpha w_\alpha |\phi_\alpha\rangle \langle \phi_\alpha|\), we have

\[
w_\alpha = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{Z_\beta} e^{-\beta E_\mu} & \text{if } \alpha \in \text{odd} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},
\]

where \(Z_\beta = \sum_\alpha e^{-\beta E_\mu} \delta_\alpha,\text{odd} \), when the device is initially a finite temperature state at inverse temperature \(\beta = \frac{1}{k_B T}\), and the probe qubit is initially in state \(|\uparrow\rangle\). We thus obtain for the microcanonical averages of \(w_\alpha\), assuming that \(\beta^{-1} \gg \Gamma\),

\[
[w_\alpha]_\mu = \frac{1}{2Z_\beta} e^{-\beta E_\mu},
\]

and

\[
[w_\alpha^2]_\mu = \frac{1}{2Z_\beta^2} e^{-2\beta E_\mu},
\]

such that \([w_\alpha^2]_\mu = 2[w_\alpha]_\mu^2\). Now, our most general form for the long-time fluctuations (which assumes only the ability to define the required microcanonical averages that vary smoothly over a width \(\Gamma\)) is

\[
\delta_\beta^2(\infty) = \sum_{\mu \neq \nu} W_\mu \langle A(2)\rangle^2, 
\]

where \(E_\mu := E_{\mu} + \frac{E_0}{2}\), and \(W_\mu\) is written in Eq. (S51). Indeed, noting that the mixed average \([w_\alpha O_{\alpha\mu}]_\mu = 2[w_\alpha]_\mu O_\uparrow\), where \(O_\uparrow := \langle \uparrow | O | \uparrow \rangle\), we observe that as each term is \(\propto [w_\alpha]_\mu^2\). We then define

\[
W_\mu = W_0 \frac{[w_\alpha]_\mu}{[w^2]_\mu} = \frac{W_0}{2Z_\beta^2} e^{-2\beta E_\mu},
\]

so

\[
\delta_\beta^2(\infty) = \frac{W_0}{2Z_\beta^2} \sum_{\mu \neq \nu} e^{-2\beta E_\mu} A(2)^2.
\]

This may be evaluated, including a variable density of states \(D(E)\), as in the main text for the infinite temperature case, via

\[
\delta_\beta^2(\infty) = \frac{W_0}{2Z_\beta^2} \int_0^\Delta E \int_{-\Delta E}^{\Delta E} dE d\omega \frac{D(E + \frac{\omega}{2}) D(E - \frac{\omega}{2})}{D(E)^2} \\
\times e^{-2\beta E} \left( \frac{2\Gamma(E)/\pi}{\omega^2 + 4\Gamma(E)^2} \right)^2 \\
\approx \frac{W_0}{4Z_\beta^2} \int_0^\Delta E dE e^{-2\beta E} \frac{1}{4\pi \Gamma(E)},
\]

where in the second line we have made the change of variables \(E_\mu, E_\nu \to E, \omega\) with \(E = \frac{E_\mu + E_\nu}{2}\) and \(\omega = E_\mu - E_\nu\), and used that \(\Delta E \gg \Gamma\) as in the main text. We now define the unbiased thermal average of the function \(A(E)\) as,

\[
\langle A(E) \rangle_\beta := \frac{1}{\Delta E'} \int_0^{\Delta E'} dE A(E) e^{-\beta E},
\]

where \(\Delta E' = \int_0^{\Delta E} dE e^{-\beta E}\). Now, we have

\[
\delta_\beta^2(\infty) = \frac{W_0}{4\pi N_B D(E)} \Gamma(E^{-1})_2.\beta.
\]

Noting then, that \(\lim_{\beta \to 0} Z_\beta = N_B\), and \(\lim_{\beta \to 0} \Delta E' = \Delta E = \frac{2N_B}{D(E)}\), we recover the infinite temperature case as required,

\[
\delta_\beta(\infty) = \frac{W_0}{4\pi N_B D(E)} \Gamma(E^{-1}).
\]

We note that, unlike in the RMT case above, the average \(\langle \Gamma(E^{-1}) \rangle_\beta\) is not equal to the thermal average \(\langle \Gamma(E^{-1}) \rangle_\beta\), which is that obtained from a fit to the decay. In the following section we show how the FDT may be defined in terms of this thermal average.

V. FDT IN TERMS OF THERMAL AVERAGES

In this section, we show that the FDT may be recast in terms of the thermal averages \(\langle \cdots \rangle_\beta\) obtained from the a fit to the decay, shown in Sec III. We begin by re-expressing our finite temperature FDT in terms of the thermal averages,

\[
\langle A(E) \rangle_\beta := \frac{1}{Z_\beta} \int_0^{\Delta E} \int_{-\Delta E}^{\Delta E} dE d\omega D(E) e^{-\beta (E - E_0)} A(E),
\]

with \(Z'_\beta := \int_0^{\Delta E} dE D(E) e^{-\beta (E - E_0)}\), where we have introduced the low-energy cut-off \(E_0\), which is the energy of our zero temperature pure state. The addition of this cut-off ensures that, for non-zero \(E_0\), the initial state is not the ground state of the bath at zero temperature.

To include this thermal average, we return to Eq. (S68), and note that,

\[
\int_0^{\Delta E} dE e^{-2\beta E} \frac{1}{\Gamma(E)} = Z'_\beta \langle (D(E)^{-1} \Gamma(E)^{-1}) \rangle_2.\beta.
\]

We thus obtain,

\[
\delta_\beta(\infty) = \frac{W_0 Z'_\beta}{8\pi Z_\beta^2} \langle (D(E)^{-1} \Gamma(E)^{-1}) \rangle_2.\beta.
\]

We note that this can be put in the same form as the infinite temperature case, \(\delta_\beta(\infty) \sim \Gamma^{-1}\), by noting that the quantity

\[
C_\beta' = \frac{\langle (D(E)^{-1} \Gamma(E)^{-1}) \rangle_2.\beta}{\langle (D(E))^2 \rangle^{-1}_{2.\beta} \langle (\Gamma(E)^{-1})^2 \rangle_{2.\beta}}
\]
depends only on the particular forms of the functions $D(E)$ and $\Gamma(E)$, and the temperature - importantly, not on $N$, or on the system-bath coupling strengths (for weak couplings). As such, we can write

$$\delta^2_{O}(\infty) = C'_{\beta} \frac{W_{O}Z_{2\beta}}{8\pi Z_{\beta}^2 \langle \langle \Gamma(E)^{-1} \rangle \rangle_{2\beta}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S76)

and thus we recover the form of our main result, Eq. (3) of the main text, with $\chi(N) = C_{\beta} Z_{2\beta} \frac{W_{O}Z_{\beta}}{8\pi Z_{\beta}^2 \langle \langle D(E) \rangle \rangle_{2\beta}}$.

For the random matrix case, where $D(E)^{-1} = \omega_0$, and $\Gamma(E) = \Gamma$ is constant, we also have,

$$\delta^2_{O}(\infty) = \frac{W_{O}Z_{2\beta}\omega_0}{8\pi Z_{\beta}^2 \Gamma}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S77)

as in this case, the thermal average $\langle \langle \cdot \cdot \cdot \rangle \rangle_{\beta}$ and unbiased thermal average $\langle \langle \cdot \cdot \cdot \rangle \rangle_{0}$, can be seen to be equal.

We can check that, as required, one obtains the infinite temperature limit derived above by sending $\beta \to 0$ by noting that for the infinite temperature case, we have

$$\delta^2_{O}(\infty) = \frac{W_{O}}{2N_{B}} \int_{0}^{\infty} dE \frac{1}{4 \pi \Gamma(E)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S78)

which, in terms of the infinite temperature thermal average, may be written (noting that $\lim_{\beta \to 0} Z_{\beta} = 2N_{B}$),

$$\delta^2_{O}(\infty) = \frac{W_{O}}{4\pi N_{B}} \langle \langle D(E)^{-1} \Gamma(E)^{-1} \rangle \rangle_{0} \hspace{1cm} \text{(S79)}$$

\begin{equation}
\frac{W_{O}}{4\pi N_{B}} \langle \langle D(E)^{-1} \Gamma(E)^{-1} \rangle \rangle_{0} = C'_{\beta} \frac{W_{O}}{4\pi N_{B}} \langle \langle \Gamma(E)^{-1} \rangle \rangle_{0}.
\end{equation}

A. Low Temperature FDT

We now turn to the low temperature limit of Eq. (S65) for which we expect to obtain the same result as the pure state case of Ref. [S3], given by,

$$\delta^2_{O}(\infty) = \frac{\Delta O_{\alpha \alpha}^2}{4\pi D(E_{\alpha \alpha}),}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S80)

where $D(E_{\alpha \alpha})$ is the density of states at the initial state energy $E_{\alpha \alpha}$, which is chosen to be in the bulk of the spectrum, and $\Delta O_{\alpha \alpha}^2 := [O_{\alpha \alpha}^2] - [O_{\alpha \alpha}]^2$. We have that in this limit,

$$\langle \langle A(E) \rangle \rangle_{\infty} = A(E_0),$$  \hspace{1cm} (S81)

so

$$C'_{\infty} = \frac{D(E_0)^{-1} \Gamma(E_0)^{-1}}{D(E_0)^{-1} \Gamma(E_0)^{-1} - 1} = 1,$$  \hspace{1cm} (S82)

and thus,

$$\delta^2_{O}(\infty) = \frac{W_{O}}{4\pi D(E_0)} \Gamma(E_0)^{-1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S83)

which is the zero temperature limit, Eq. (S80) when $W_{O} = [\Delta O_{\alpha \alpha}^2]$. Which can be seen to be the case for zero temperature as follows. Recalling that $W_{O}$ is defined by

$$W_{O} = \frac{W_{\mu}}{w_{\alpha}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S84)

where,

$$W_{\mu} = \frac{w_{\alpha}^2}{N_{B}} [O_{\alpha \alpha}^2]_{\mu} + \frac{2}{N_{B}} w_{\alpha} O_{\alpha \alpha} [O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu} + \frac{3}{2} \frac{w_{\alpha}}{N_{B}} |O_{\alpha \alpha}|^2_{\mu}$$

$$- \frac{w_{\alpha}}{N_{B}} [O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu}^2 - \frac{w_{\alpha}^2}{N_{B}} [O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu}^2 - \frac{w_{\alpha}^2}{N_{B}} [O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu}^2.$$

We see that in the zero temperature limit $w_{\alpha} \sim \delta_{\alpha \alpha}$, and thus, the averages in Eq. (S48) contribute to a lower order as the number of summations is reduced for terms with, e.g. $w_{\alpha} w_{\beta}$, over terms with, e.g. $w_{\alpha}^2$. This can be seen to lead to $[w_{\alpha}]_{\mu}^2 \ll [w_{\alpha}]_{\mu}^2$. Similarly, both terms above with mixed averages $[w_{\alpha} O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu}$ contribute on the order $[w_{\alpha}]_{\mu}^2$, as $[w_{\alpha} O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu} = [w_{\alpha}]_{\mu} O_{\alpha \alpha}$. Using only the remaining terms, we have that,

$$W_{\mu} = \frac{w_{\alpha}^2}{N_{B}} [O_{\alpha \alpha}^2]_{\mu} - \frac{w_{\alpha}^2}{N_{B}} [O_{\alpha \alpha}]_{\mu}^2 = \frac{w_{\alpha}^2}{N_{B}} [\Delta O_{\alpha \alpha}^2],$$  \hspace{1cm} (S86)

so,

$$W_{O} = [\Delta O_{\alpha \alpha}^2],$$  \hspace{1cm} (S87)

as required.

We recall that until Eq. (S65), no assumptions on the initial state or observable are made other than the ability to define the required microcanonical averages. As such, taking the low temperature limit at this point, as we have done above, does not contradict any assumptions made.
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