Heating rates in periodically driven strongly interacting quantum many-body systems
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We study heating rates in strongly interacting quantum lattice systems in the thermodynamic limit. Using a numerical linked cluster expansion, we calculate the energy as a function of the driving time and find a robust regime in which heating is exponential in time. The heating rates are shown to be in excellent agreement with Fermi’s golden rule. We discuss the relationship between heating rates and, within the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis, the smooth function that characterizes the off-diagonal matrix elements of the drive operator in the eigenbasis of the static Hamiltonian. We show that such a function, in nonintegrable and (remarkably) integrable Hamiltonians, can be probed experimentally by studying heating rates as functions of the frequency of the drive.
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Periodic perturbations, e.g., involving electromagnetic fields, are ubiquitous in experiments to excite and probe quantum systems and study their response functions. Recent developments both in theory and experiments have expanded the scope of periodic driving to generate effective magnetic fields [1–4], as well as to engineer topologically non-trivial band structures [5–8] and novel time-crystalline phases [9–14]. However, under periodic driving, generic many-body interacting systems are expected to heat up and (for a bounded spectrum, typical of lattice fermions and spins) equilibrate at long times to states that are effectively at infinite temperature [15, 16]. Driven strongly interacting systems with many particles whenever conservation laws are weakly broken. Non-integrability and quantum dynamics under time-independent perturbations, which can be Fourier decomposed as $g(\tau)\hat{K} = \sum_{m>0} 2g_m \sin(m\Omega\tau)\hat{K}$. After

We consider a time-periodic Hamiltonian of the form $H(\tau) = H_0 + g(\tau)\hat{K}$, where $H_0$ is the static Hamiltonian and $g(\tau)\hat{K}$ is a weak time-periodic perturbation of strength $g$, period $T = 2\pi/\Omega$, and zero time average. The system is initialized at $\tau = 0$ in a state $\hat{\rho}_I = \exp[-\beta_1\hat{H}_I]/\text{Tr}\{\exp[-\beta_1\hat{H}_I]\}$ that is a thermal equilibrium state of an initial static Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_I$ at an inverse temperature $\beta_I$. At stroboscopic times $\tau = nT$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$), the density matrix $\hat{\rho}(\tau)$ can be written as $\hat{\rho}(\tau) = (\hat{U}_F)^n\hat{\rho}_I(\hat{U}^\dagger_F)^n$, where $\hat{U}_F = \mathcal{T}\exp[-i\int_0^T \hat{H}(t)dt]$ is the (time-ordered $\mathcal{T}$) Floquet evolution operator (we set $\hbar = 1$). We assume that $\hat{H}_I, \hat{H}_0$, and $\hat{K}$ are translationally invariant sums of local operators, and that they are mutually noncommuting (non-trivial dynamics occurs even if $g = 0$).

The obvious conservation law broken by $g(\tau)\hat{K}$ is energy conservation. For sufficiently small $g$ in the thermodynamic limit, we expect prethermalization to occur (independently of the value of $\Omega$), wherein the system quickly relaxes to the equilibrium state of $H_0$ described by a (generalized) Gibbs ensemble [up to $O(g)$ corrections]. The relaxation towards “infinite temperature” can be described by a slowly evolving (generalized) Gibbs ensemble of $H_0$, characterized by the instantaneous expectation values of the conserved quantities of $H_0$ [33]. The latter can be calculated using drift equations, and the ensuing relaxation rates follow Fermi’s golden rule [33].

We study the evolution of the energy defined by the static Hamiltonian, which is also the time-average Hamiltonian $\overline{H}(\tau) = \overline{H}_0$, $E(\tau) = \overline{\text{Tr}}\{\overline{H}_0\overline{\rho}(\tau)\}$. We consider general time-periodic perturbations, which can be Fourier decomposed as $g(\tau)\hat{K} = \sum_{m>0} 2g_m \sin(m\Omega\tau)\hat{K}$. After

Here, we report on the implementation of a numerical linked cluster expansion (NLCE) for driven systems. NLCEs can be used for arbitrary interaction strengths and in arbitrary dimensions. NLCEs were originally introduced to study thermal equilibrium ensembles [44]. They were recently implemented to study thermalization [45] and quantum dynamics under time-independent Hamiltonians in one [33, 46] and two [47, 48] dimensions, and combined with dynamical quantum typicality [49]. We use NLCEs to accurately determine heating rates in strongly interacting one-dimensional lattices in the thermodynamic limit. The numerically obtained rates are shown to be in agreement with Fermi’s golden rule predictions. We argue that, in addition to helping understand the stability of prethermal states, heating rates can be used as probes of the structure of the off-diagonal matrix elements of the operator used to drive the system in the eigenstates of the static Hamiltonian.
a short initial transient dynamics generated by $\hat{H}_0$ (because the initial state is a thermal equilibrium state of $\hat{H}_t$, and $[\hat{H}_t, \hat{H}_0] \neq 0$), in the linear response regime the system starts to absorb energy independently from each Fourier mode $m$. The average rate of energy absorption over a cycle is $\dot{E}(\tau) = \sum_{m>0} \dot{E}_m(\tau)$ with

\[
\dot{E}_m(\tau) = 2\pi g m^2 \sum_{i,f} |\langle E^0_i | \hat{K} | E^0_f \rangle|^2 (E_f^0 - E_i^0) P^0(\tau) \times \delta(E_f^0 - E_i^0 \pm m\Omega),
\]

where $|E^0_i\rangle$ ($|E^0_f\rangle$) are the eigenkets of $\hat{H}_0$ with eigenenergies $E^0_i$ ($E^0_f$), and $P^0(\tau) = \langle E^0_i | \hat{\rho}(\tau) | E^0_f \rangle$ is the projection of $\hat{\rho}(\tau)$ in the basis of $\hat{H}_0$. The latter defines the so-called diagonal ensemble (DE) at time $\tau$ [50], $\hat{\rho}_{\text{DE}}(\tau) = P^0(\tau)|E^0_i\rangle\langle E^0_f|$. $\hat{\rho}_{\text{DE}}(\tau)$ characterizes the equilibrated state under $\hat{H}_0$ at time $\tau$. We define the rate $\Gamma(\tau) = \sum_{m>0} \Gamma_m(\tau)$, where $\Gamma_m(\tau) = \dot{E}_m(\tau)/|E_\infty - E(\tau)|$ is the rate for Fourier mode $m$, and $E_\infty$ is the energy at infinite temperature. When $|E_\infty - E(\tau)| \ll 1$, one expects $\Gamma(\tau)$ to be independent of $\tau$ and heating to be exponential.

We focus on a one-dimensional lattice system of hardcore bosons, with $\hat{H}_0$ and $\hat{K}$ given by

\[
\hat{H}_0 = \sum_i \left[ -t b_i^\dagger b_{i+1} - t' b_i^\dagger b_{i+2} + h c. \right] + \text{H.c.}
\]

\[
+V \left( \frac{\hat{n}_i}{2} \right) \left( \frac{\hat{n}_{i+1}}{2} + 1 \right) + V' \left( \frac{\hat{n}_i}{2} + 1 \right) \left( \frac{\hat{n}_{i+2}}{2} \right),
\]

\[
\hat{K} = -\sum_i \left( b_i^\dagger b_{i+1} + \text{H.c.} \right),
\]

where standard notation was used [51]. We drive the system with a square wave $g(\tau) = g \text{sgn}[\sin(\Omega \tau)]$, and set $t = V = 1$ (our unit of energy and frequency). $\hat{H}_0$ is integrable for $t' = V' = h = 0$ (and mappable to the spin-1/2 XXZ Hamiltonian [51]), and nonintegrable for nonvanishing $t'$, $V'$, and $h$. We numerically study both the integrable and nonintegrable (with $t' = V' = 0.8$ and $h = 1.0$) cases, and select $\hat{H}_1$ to have the same terms as $\hat{H}_0$ [Eq. (2)] but with different nearest neighbor coupling parameters: $t_1 = 0.5$ and $V_1 = 2.0$.

We implement a NLCE to calculate the energy per site $e(\tau) = E(\tau)/L$ at stroboscopic times in the thermodynamic limit ($L \to \infty$). Within NLCEs, $e(\tau)$ is expressed as a sum over the contributions of all connected clusters (c) that can be embedded in the lattice, $e(\tau) = \sum_c M(c) \times W^c(\tau)$, where $M(c)$ is the number of “embeddings” (per site) of cluster c, and $W^c(\tau)$ is the weight of $e(\tau)$ in cluster c. $W^c(\tau)$ is obtained recursively using the inclusion-exclusion principle: $W^c(\tau) = E_c(\tau) - \sum_{s \subseteq c} W^s(\tau)$, where s denotes the connected subclusters of c and $E_c(\tau) = \text{Tr}[\hat{H}_0^c \hat{\rho}(\tau)]$ is the energy in cluster c [Here $\hat{H}_0^c$ is the static Hamiltonian, and $\hat{\rho}(\tau)$ is the density matrix at time $\tau$, both in cluster c]. The series starts with the smallest cluster (a site) for which $W_\tau(\tau) = E_\tau(\tau)$. For each cluster, $E_c(\tau)$ is calculated numerically using full exact diagonalization. We use maximally connected clusters (clusters with contiguous sites and all possible bonds) as they are optimal to study dynamics in chains in the presence of nearest and next-nearest neighbor interactions [45, 46, 53]. The order of the NLCE is set by the number of sites of the largest cluster considered. For nonintegrable $\hat{H}_0$, we compute 17
orders of the NLCE (after exploiting all symmetries, the dimension of largest sector of the Hamiltonian is 32,896). When $\hat{H}_0$ is integrable, due to particle number conservation, we are able to compute 18 orders of the NLCE (the dimension of the largest sector in this case is 21,942).

In the main panels of Fig. 1, we show NLCE results for $\langle e(\tau) \rangle$ vs $\tau$ for (a) the nonintegrable and (b) the integrable static Hamiltonians, for three strengths $g = 0.05$, 0.2, and 0.8 of the drive (of period $T = 1.0$). The initial state is a thermal equilibrium state of $\hat{H}_1$ at an inverse temperature $\beta_I = (30)^{-1}$. The exponential fits, which exclude the short-time transient dynamics and long times at which the NLCE does not converge, make apparent that the approach of $e(\tau)$ to the infinite temperature energy $(E_\infty/L = 0)$ is exponential. The rates obtained from such fits are plotted in the insets of Fig. 1 vs $g$, for the two highest orders of the NLCE. They agree with each other, indicating that the rates obtained from the fits are robust. Remarkably, the rates are $\propto g^2$ and are in excellent agreement with Fermi’s golden rule [Eq. (1)], evaluated numerically using full exact diagonalization in chains with periodic boundary conditions (see Ref. [52]).

It follows from eigenstate thermalization for nonintegrable Hamiltonians [50, 54–56] (generalized eigenstate thermalization for integrable Hamiltonians [57, 58]) $\hat{H}_0$ that the predictions of $\rho_{DE}(\tau)$ for few-body operators agree with those of the thermal (generalized Gibbs) ensemble [56, 58–60]. We first focus on the case in which $\hat{H}_0$ is nonintegrable with no local conservation law. In this case, the inverse temperature $\beta(\tau)$ alone characterizes the thermal (grand canonical) ensemble at $\tau$, $\rho_{GE}(\tau) = \exp[-\beta(\tau)\hat{H}_0]/\text{Tr}\{\exp[-\beta(\tau)\hat{H}_0]\}$, where $\beta(\tau)$ is determined by the condition $\text{Tr}[\hat{H}_0 \rho_{GE}(\tau)] = \text{Tr}[\hat{H}_0 \hat{H}_0 \rho_{DE}(\tau)]$. Only when $\beta(\tau) \ll 1$ is that one expects $\Gamma(\tau)$ to become independent of $\beta(\tau)$, and $E(\tau)$ to approach $E_\infty$ as a single exponential.

To illustrate this, in the main panel of Fig. 2 we plot $|\langle e(\tau) \rangle|$ (normalized by its initial value $|\langle e(0) \rangle|$) for various initial inverse temperatures $\beta_I \in [0.01, 0.5]$ ($g = 0.5$ and $T = 1.0$). The normalized energies $e(\tau)/e(0)$ for $\beta_I = 0.033$ and 0.01 exhibit a nearly identical exponential decay (within the times at which the NLCE has converged) implying that $\Gamma(\tau)$ is independent of $\beta_I$ [hence, of $\beta(\tau)$] when $\beta_I \lesssim 0.03$. For $\beta_I \gtrsim 0.2$, one can still use exponentials to fit $e(\tau)$, but the rates obtained depend on $\beta_I$. In the inset in Fig. 2, we report the rates obtained from such fits vs $\beta_I$, using two orders of the NLCE and for two values of $g$. The rates from the two orders of the NLCE agree with each other and agree well with Fermi’s golden rule predictions. [Better agreement is seen for $g = 0.2$ than for $g = 0.5$ due to $O(g^3)$ corrections.] The increase in the rate seen in the inset in Fig. 2 with decreasing $\beta_I$ is the one expected to occur as a function of driving time for initial low-temperature states.

Next we focus on the dependence of the heating rates on $\Omega$. In nonintegrable systems, the eigenstate thermal-
predicted by Eq. (5). NLCE results are not reported for small and large values of $\Omega$ because the time interval in which the NLCE converges is not sufficiently long to produce robust exponential fits. The normalized rates for $g = 0.2$ and $g = 0.3$ are nearly identical to one another, and are well described by Eq. (5). For high values of $\Omega$, we find that the evaluation of Eq. (5) results in heating rates that can be well described by an exponential in $\Omega$. This is consistent with rigorous bounds [10, 17, 35].

When $\hat{H}_0$ is integrable (the spin-$1/2$ XXZ limit), the prethermal states are described by a generalized Gibbs ensemble (GGE) $\hat{\rho}_{\text{GGE}}(\tau)$ [62–64]. When $\hat{\rho}_I$ is a thermal state with $\beta_I \ll 1$ (or in general after long driving times), $\hat{\rho}_{\text{GGE}}(\tau) \simeq \hat{\rho}_{\text{GGE}}(\tau)$ with $\beta(\tau) \ll 1$ [65]. In this regime, Eq. (5) can also describe the heating rates for the integrable static Hamiltonian provided that, at least on average [66], the $K_{i,j}^{(s)}$ are described by Eq. (4). In Fig. 3(a), we show the equivalent of Fig. 3(a) but for the integrable case. Despite the clear differences between the nonintegrable and integrable cases in the dependence of the heating rates on $\Omega$, the heating rates in the latter can be well described by Eq. (5).

The previous results show that heating rates can be used to probe the function $f_{K}^{(s)}(E, m\Omega)$ in nonintegrable and integrable systems. Still, Eq. (4) involves the density of states. For large systems sizes, since $E$ is extensive but $\Omega$ is not: $D^{(s)}(E + m\Omega/2)D^{(s)}(E - m\Omega/2) \simeq |D^{(s)}(E)|^2$ and $F^{(s)}_{\text{min,max}} \pm m\Omega/2 \simeq E^{(s)}_{\text{min,max}}$. Using the saddle point approximation to compute the integral in Eq. (5), and using that $D^{(s)}(E_{\infty})$ is maximal, the heating rate for Fourier mode $m$ in the thermodynamic limit ($\Gamma_{\infty}^m$) takes the form

$$
\Gamma_{\infty}^m = \frac{2\pi (m\Omega d_m)^2}{\text{Tr}(H_0^2)} \sum_s |f_{K}^{(s)}(E_{\infty}, m\Omega)|^2 Z(s),
$$

where $Z(s)$ is the Hilbert space dimension of sector $s$. Thus the rate for Fourier mode $m = 1$, which Fig. 4 shows to be in excellent agreement with the heating rates obtained from the NLCE dynamics for $\Omega \gtrsim 2$, provides a direct probe of the average $|f_{K}^{(s)}(E_{\infty}, \Omega)|^2$ over all sectors of the Hamiltonian in the thermodynamic limit (see Ref. [52]).

In summary, we studied heating in strongly interacting driven lattice systems and showed that, at sufficiently high effective temperatures $|\beta(\tau)^{-1} \gtrsim 2$, it can be well characterized by rates no matter whether the system is nonintegrable or integrable. We also showed that the rates agree with Fermi’s golden rule predictions for both nonintegrable or integrable cases. We then argued that heating rates can be used to probe the structure of off-diagonal matrix elements of the operator used to drive the system, in the eigenstates of the static Hamiltonian.
Our results suggest that, on average, there is a well-defined $f^2_s(E, \Omega)$ in integrable interacting systems. This has been confirmed in a recent full exact diagonalization study of the spin-1/2 XXZ chain [66] but needs to be further explored to place it on equal footing with what is known for quantum chaotic systems [56, 67–71].
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NUMERICAL EVALUATION OF EQ. (1) IN THE MAIN TEXT

Equation (1) in the main text is evaluated using full exact diagonalization of chains with \( L \) sites and periodic boundary conditions. Defining a small energy window \( \Delta E \), Eq. (1) is modified to the following expression (which is amenable to numerical evaluation)

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \langle E \rangle_{\tau} = \frac{2\pi g_m}{L \Delta E} \sum_i P_i(\tau) \times \sum_{|E_i - E_j| \leq \Delta E / 2} \left| \langle E_i | \hat{K} | E_j \rangle \right|^2 (E_i - E_j),
\]

(S1)

where \( |E_i \rangle \) (\( |E_j \rangle \)) are eigenkets of \( \hat{H}_0 \) with eigenenergies \( E_i \) (\( E_j \)), and \( P_i(\tau) = \langle E_i | \hat{\rho}(\tau) | E_i \rangle \). With this coarse graining procedure, \( \Gamma_{\Delta E,m}(\tau) \) for Fourier mode \( m \) is calculated as

\[
\Gamma_{\Delta E,m}(\tau) = \frac{\dot{E}_{\Delta E,m}(\tau)}{E_\infty - E(\tau)},
\]

(S2)

where \( E(\tau) \) is also evaluated using full exact diagonalization, and \( E_\infty = 0 \) for our model. \( \Gamma_{\Delta E}(\tau) = \sum_{m>0} \Gamma_{\Delta E,m}(\tau) \) is the relaxation rate of \( E(\tau) \).

In Fig. S1, we show \( \Gamma_{\Delta E}(\tau) \) vs \( \tau \) for three values of \( \Delta E \) when \( g = 0.05, 0.2, \) and 0.8, for the nonintegrable \( [L = 18, \text{Fig. S1(a)}] \) and the integrable \( [L = 20, \text{Fig. S1(b)}] \) static Hamiltonians (the period of the drive is \( T = 1.0 \)). The initial thermal state has \( \beta_f = (30)^{-1} \). It is apparent in Fig. S1 that \( \Gamma_{\Delta E}(\tau) \) is nearly constant, with a slight drift at long times (apparent for \( g = 0.8 \)), and that it is independent of the value of \( \Delta E \). We identify a range of \( \Delta E \) and \( \tau \) where \( \Gamma_{\Delta E}(\tau) \) is (nearly) constant [and where the dynamics of \( e(\tau) \) is exponential and robust against finite-size effects] and compute the average of \( \Gamma_{\Delta E}(\tau) \) in this range.

In the main text, all the rates reported in Figs. 1 and 2 for which Eq. (1) was used were obtained averaging over \( \Delta E / L = \{0.002, 0.004, \ldots, 0.04\} \) and \( \tau = \{3, 4, \ldots, 10\} \) (a total of 160 values) for the nonintegrable \( \hat{H}_0 \), and \( \Delta E / L = \{0.002, 0.004, \ldots, 0.02\} \) and \( \tau = \{2, 3, \ldots, 6\} \) (a total of 50 values) for the integrable \( \hat{H}_0 \). The standard deviation of the averages were reported as error bars.

FIG. S1. \( \Gamma_{\Delta E}(\tau) = \sum_{m>0} \Gamma_{\Delta E,m}(\tau) \) [see Eq. (S2)] evaluated using full exact diagonalization of chains with \( L \) sites and periodic boundary conditions for three values of \( \Delta E \) for (a) the nonintegrable and (b) the integrable static Hamiltonians. Each system is driven with \( g = 0.05, 0.2, 0.8, \) and period \( T = 1.0, \) and the initial state is at an inverse temperature \( \beta_f = (30)^{-1} \). The solid line is the average \( \Gamma_{\Delta E}(\tau) \) over (a) \( \Delta E / L = \{0.002, 0.004, \ldots, 0.04\} \) and \( \tau = \{3, 4, \ldots, 10\} \) (a total of 160 values) for the nonintegrable \( \hat{H}_0 \), and (b) \( \Delta E / L = \{0.002, 0.004, \ldots, 0.02\} \) and \( \tau = \{2, 3, \ldots, 6\} \) (a total of 50 values) for the integrable \( \hat{H}_0 \).
DERIVATION OF EQ. (5) IN THE MAIN TEXT

Equation (1), accounting for the block diagonalization of $\hat{H}_0$ in symmetry sectors $\{s\}$, has the form

$$\dot{E}_m(\tau) = 2\pi g_m^2 \sum_s \left( \sum_{i,j \in s} |K_{i,j}^{(s)}|^2 (E_i^0 - E_j^0) P_i^0(\tau) \delta(E_i^0 - E_j^0 \pm m\Omega) \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (S3)

where $K_{i,j}^{(s)} = (E_i^0 | \hat{K} | E_j^0)$, for $i, j \in s$, and $P_i^0(\tau) = (E_i^0 | \hat{\rho}(\tau) | E_i^0)$. From ETH it follows that the results from the diagonal ensemble and the Gibbs ensemble agree [50, 54–56], so one can replace $P_i^0(\tau)$ by $\exp(-\beta(E_i^0)/Z(\tau)$, where $Z(\tau)$ is the partition function, and the inverse temperature $\beta(\tau)$ is set by the energy $E(\tau)$.

Using the Gibbs ensemble, the ETH ansatz for $K_{i,j}^{(s)}$ (see main text), and replacing sums by integrals, Eq. (S3) can be written as

$$\dot{E}_m(\tau) = 2\pi m\Omega (g_m)^2 \sum_s \left\{ \int_{E_{\min}^{(s)}}^{E_{\max}^{(s)}} dE e^{-\frac{\beta(\tau)E}{2}} \left| f_K^{(s)}(E + m\Omega/2, m\Omega) \right|^2 \frac{D^{(s)}(E)D^{(s)}(E + m\Omega)}{D^{(s)}(E + m\Omega/2)} \right. \right.
- \left. \int_{E_{\min}^{(s)}}^{E_{\max}^{(s)}} dE e^{-\frac{\beta(\tau)E}{2}} \left| f_K^{(s)}(E - m\Omega/2, m\Omega) \right|^2 \frac{D^{(s)}(E)D^{(s)}(E - m\Omega)}{D^{(s)}(E - m\Omega/2)} \right\}, \hspace{1cm} (S4)

where $E_{\min}^{(s)}$ ($E_{\max}^{(s)}$) is the minimum (maximum) energy in sector $s$, and we used that $|f_K^{(s)}(E, -\omega)| = |f_K^{(s)}(E, \omega)|$. A change of variable $E \rightarrow E + m\Omega/2$ in the first integral, and $E \rightarrow E - m\Omega/2$ in the second integral, allows us to rewrite the expression above as

$$\dot{E}_m(\tau) = 4\pi m\Omega (g_m)^2 \sinh \left( \frac{\beta(\tau)m\Omega}{2} \right) \sum_s \int_{E_{\min}^{(s)} + m\Omega/2}^{E_{\max}^{(s)} - m\Omega/2} dE e^{-\frac{\beta(\tau)E}{2}} \left| f_K^{(s)}(E, m\Omega) \right|^2 \frac{D^{(s)}(E + m\Omega/2)D^{(s)}(E - m\Omega/2)}{D^{(s)}(E)} \right]. \hspace{1cm} (S5)

At high temperatures, when $\beta(\tau) \ll 1$, we have to lowest order in $\beta(\tau)$

$$\sinh \left( \frac{\beta(\tau)m\Omega}{2} \right) \approx \frac{\beta(\tau)m\Omega}{2}, \quad e^{-\frac{\beta(\tau)E}{2}} \approx 1, \quad Z(\tau) \approx \text{Tr}[1], \quad \text{and} \quad |E_{\infty} - E(\tau)| \approx \frac{\beta(\tau)\text{Tr}[\hat{H}_0^2]}{\text{Tr}[1]}. \hspace{1cm} (S6)

Using Eqs. (S5) and (S6), the heating rate $\Gamma_m = \dot{E}_m(\tau)/[E(\infty) - E(\tau)]$ reduces to Eq. (5) in the main text.

Numerical evaluation of Eq. (5) in the main text

Like Eq. (1), Eq. (5) in the main text is evaluated using full exact diagonalization of chains with $L$ sites and periodic boundary conditions. We define a small energy window $\Delta E$ which we use to bin the spectrum of $\hat{H}_0$ in each symmetry sector $s$. Each bin $\alpha$, with energy $E_\alpha$, includes all eigenstates with eigenenergies $E_j^0 \in (E_\alpha - \Delta E/2, E_\alpha + \Delta E/2)$. The density of states at energy $E_\alpha$ is then $D^{(s)}(E_\alpha) = n_\alpha/\Delta E$, where $n_\alpha$ is the number of energy eigenstates in bin $\alpha$. The function $|f_K^{(s)}(E_{\alpha}, \omega_\alpha)|^2$, with $\omega_\alpha > 0$, after coarse graining is given by

$$|f_K^{(s)}(E_{\alpha}, \omega_\alpha)|^2 = D^{(s)}(E_{\alpha}) \left( \sum_{j,k} \frac{|E_j^0| |\hat{K}| E_k^0|^2}{\sum_{j,k} 1} \right), \hspace{1cm} (S7)

where $E_j^0$ and $E_k^0$ satisfy $(E_j^0 + E_k^0)/2 \in (E_\alpha - \Delta E/2, E_\alpha + \Delta E/2)$ and $|E_j^0 - E_k^0| \in (\omega_\alpha - \Delta E, \omega_\alpha + \Delta E)$. This coarse graining procedure modifies Eq. (5) in the main text to

$$\Gamma_m^L = \frac{2\pi (m\Omega g_m)^2}{\text{Tr}(\hat{H}_0^2)} \sum_s \sum_\alpha \Delta E |f_K^{(s)}(E_{\alpha}, m\Omega)|^2 \frac{D^{(s)}(E_{\alpha} + m\Omega/2)D^{(s)}(E_{\alpha} - m\Omega/2)}{D^{(s)}(E_{\alpha})}, \hspace{1cm} (S8)

where the inner sum is over all the bins $\alpha$ whose energy $E_\alpha \in (E_{\min}^{(s)} + m\Omega/2, E_{\max}^{(s)} - m\Omega/2)$.

In contrast to Eq. (S1), Eq. (S8) does not involve calculating the time evolution of the system. As a result, we are able to evaluate Eq. (S8) in chains with $L = 19$ ($L = 21$) for the nonintegrable (integrable) static Hamiltonian. The dimension of the largest symmetry resolved sector is 13,797 (16,796) for the nonintegrable (integrable) $\hat{H}_0$. 

FIG. S2. Rate (normalized by $g^2$) for the $m = 1$ mode, $\Gamma_m^{L}$ [see Eq. (S8)] and $\Gamma_m^{\infty}$ [see Eq. (S9)], evaluated using full exact diagonalization of chains with $L$ sites and periodic boundary conditions for (a) the nonintegrable and (b) the integrable static Hamiltonians, for two values of $\Delta E$. The rates are evaluated at $\Omega = \Delta E, 2\Delta E, \ldots$, for each value of $\Delta E$. For the spectrum of $H_0$, the values: (a) $\Delta E/L \simeq 0.014$ and (b) $\Delta E/L \simeq 0.006$ correspond to $10L$ bins, and (a) $\Delta E/L \simeq 0.004$ and (b) $\Delta E/L \simeq 0.002$ correspond to $40L$ bins. For $\Gamma_m^{\infty}$, in both panels, results are reported for $\Delta E$ corresponding to $40L$ bins for the two largest chain sizes $L$ studied.

In Fig. S2, we show heating rates for the $m = 1$ mode, $\Gamma_m^{L}$, evaluated at $\Omega = \Delta E, 2\Delta E, \ldots$ for two values of $\Delta E$ for the nonintegrable and the integrable static Hamiltonians. Our values of $\Delta E/L$ are such that the spectrum of $H_0$ is divided into $10L$ bins [(a) $\Delta E/L \sim 0.014$ and (b) $\Delta E/L \sim 0.006$] and $40L$ bins [(a) $\Delta E/L \sim 0.004$ and (b) $\Delta E/L \sim 0.002$]. The results obtained can be seen to be robust against the choice of $\Delta E$. For the results reported in Fig. 3 of the main text, we use $\Delta E/L \sim 0.004$ ($40L$ bins) to evaluate $\Gamma_1^{18}$, $\Gamma_1^{19}$, and $\Gamma_1^{19}$ in Fig. 3(a) for the nonintegrable static Hamiltonian, and $\Delta E/L \sim 0.002$ ($40L$ bins) to evaluate $\Gamma_1^{20}$, $\Gamma_1^{21}$, and $\Gamma_1^{21}$ in Fig. 3(b) for the integrable static Hamiltonian.

In Fig. S2, we also show Eq. (6) in the main text evaluated using full exact diagonalization of chains with periodic boundary conditions and $L$ sites. The coarse grained Eq. (6), using Eq. (S7), has the form

$$\Gamma_m^{\infty} = \frac{2\pi (m \Omega g_m)^2}{\text{Tr}(H_0^2)} \sum_s |f_K^{(s)}(0, m \Omega)|^2 Z(s). $$

(S9)

It is apparent in Fig. S2, both for the nonintegrable and the integrable static Hamiltonians, that the results for $\Gamma_m^{\infty}$ calculated using Eq. (S9) do not agree with the ones for $\Gamma_m^{L}$ using Eq. (S8). This is because of strong finite-size effects in $\Gamma_m^{\infty}$, and the disagreement increases as $\Omega$ increases. The fact that finite-size effects in $\Gamma_m^{\infty}$ increase with increasing $\Omega$ is also apparent in the increasing discrepancy between the results for the two chain sizes shown in Fig. S2. This is in contrast to the results for $\Gamma^L$ (similar to $\Gamma_m^{L}$ at large $\Omega$) evaluated from Eq. (S8) and reported in Fig. 3 in the main text for two systems sizes. The strong finite-size effects in $\Gamma_m^{\infty}$ are not surprising as the assumptions made to derive Eq. (6) are not valid for the small system sizes studied in this work.