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We study the bipartite von Neumann entanglement entropy and matrix elements of local operators in the eigenstates of an interacting integrable Hamiltonian (the paradigmatic spin-1/2 XXZ chain), and contrast their behavior with that of quantum chaotic systems. We find that the leading term of the average (over all eigenstates in the zero magnetization sector) eigenstate entanglement entropy has a volume-law coefficient that is smaller than the universal (maximal entanglement) one in quantum chaotic systems. This establishes the entanglement entropy as a powerful measure to distinguish integrable models from generic ones. Remarkably, our numerical results suggest that the volume-law coefficient of the average entanglement entropy of eigenstates of the spin-1/2 XXZ chain is the same as, or very close to, the one for translationally invariant quadratic fermionic models.

We also study matrix elements of local operators in the eigenstates of the spin-1/2 XXZ chain at the center of the spectrum. For the diagonal matrix elements, we show evidence that the support does not vanish with increasing system size, while the average eigenstate to eigenstate fluctuations vanish in a power law fashion. For the off-diagonal matrix elements, we show that they follow a distribution that is close to (but not quite) log-normal, and that their variance is a well-defined function of ω = Eα − Eβ (Eα are the eigenenergies) whose magnitude scales as 1/D, where D is the Hilbert space dimension.

I. INTRODUCTION

Much work has been done in the last decade to understand the far-from-equilibrium dynamics and description after equilibration of isolated nonintegrable (generic) and integrable quantum many-body systems [1–3]. Despite tremendous progress in recent years [4–13], the microscopics of interacting integrable systems are those which remain less understood. On the one hand, interactions are present in those systems as in nonintegrable ones (making their study challenging), and on the other hand, they exhibit extensive numbers of local conserved quantities as noninteracting systems do. The presence of such quantities precludes thermalization in integrable (noninteracting and interacting) quantum systems [14–18].

Thermalization does occur in generic isolated quantum systems, and is understood to be a consequence of quantum chaos and eigenstate thermalization [1, 19–21]. Essentially, the matrix elements of observables (few-body operators) ̂O in eigenstates of generic quantum Hamiltonians are described by the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) ansatz [1, 22]:

\[ O_{αβ} = O(̃E)δ_{αβ} + e^{-S(̃E)/2}f_{O}(̃E, ω)R_{αβ}, \]

where ̃E ≡ (Eα + Eβ)/2, ω = Eα − Eβ, and S(̃E) is the thermodynamic entropy at energy ̃E. The functions O(̃E) and fO(̃E, ω) are smooth, and Rαβ is a random variable with zero mean and unit variance (variance 2) for α ≠ β (α = β) in Hamiltonians that exhibit time-reversal symmetry. The smoothness of the diagonal matrix elements allows observables described by Eq. (1) to thermalize (i.e., to be described by traditional ensembles of statistical mechanics) for experimentally relevant initial conditions. The off-diagonal matrix elements control the approach to and fluctuations about equilibrium [1].

The ETH ansatz (1) has been extensively tested in exact diagonalization studies of nonintegrable Hamiltonians [1, 21, 23–38]. The failure of the ETH ansatz in integrable systems is manifested through the support of the diagonal matrix elements not exhibiting indications of shrinking with increasing system size, and through their large variance for the system sizes available in exact diagonalization studies (because there is no exponential decay with increasing system size as in quantum chaotic systems) [9, 23–25, 28, 38, 39]. Instead, the variance of the diagonal matrix elements is expected to decay as a power law in system size [40–42]. For observables with vanishing norm (e.g., intensive translational invariant observables) it was recently highlighted that the variance of the diagonal matrix elements must vanish at least as quickly as a power law in system size because it is bounded from above by the norm [38].

The off-diagonal matrix elements of observables in the eigenstates of integrable interacting quantum many-body systems have received little attention. While such results have been reported for specific models and system sizes alongside those of quantum chaotic systems [24, 25, 32], there has been no systematic study of their properties. For noninteracting models (or models mappable to them), the existence of an increasingly large (with increasing system size) fraction of vanishing off-diagonal matrix elements precludes the definition of a meaningful function fO(̃E, ω), in contrast to quantum chaotic models [26]. On the other hand, recent results by two of us (KM and MR) in the context of periodically driven systems provided strong evidence that one can define (and experimentally measure) a function |fO(̃E, ω)|^2 = e^{S(̃E)}|O_{αβ}|^2 for interacting integrable models [43]. Ex-
ploring this, along with other properties of the off-diagonal (and diagonal) matrix elements in the spin-1/2 XXZ chain, is one of the two central goals of this work.

The other central goal of this work is to study the structure of highly-excited energy eigenstates by means of their bipartite entanglement. Recently, much work has been devoted to understanding entanglement properties of highly-excited eigenstates of many-body Hamiltonians [44–79]. Here we study the average entanglement entropy over all eigenstates of the spin-1/2 XXZ Hamiltonian in the zero-magnetization sector. We argue that this average universally reveals the fundamentally different nature of interacting integrable models as compared with quantum-chaotic ones. While in both non-integrable and integrable interacting systems the leading term of the average entanglement entropy exhibits a volume-law scaling, we show that the corresponding volume-law coefficient is markedly different between the two.

In quantum chaotic systems [56] it matches the prediction by Page [80] for random pure states in the Hilbert space, while it is smaller for interacting integrable systems. Remarkably, our results for interacting spin-1/2 integrable systems are consistent with this coefficient being the same as, or very close to, the one for translationally invariant free [55] and (more generally) quadratic [63, 65] fermionic Hamiltonians. This suggests that, entanglement-wise, the overwhelming majority of the eigenstates are very similar between interacting spin-1/2 integrable Hamiltonians and noninteracting fermionic Hamiltonians.

The presentation is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we discuss the specific integrable and nonintegrable models and observables considered, as well as details about the numerical calculations carried out. In Sec. III, we compare the average entanglement entropy of eigenstates of the spin-1/2 XXZ chain with that of eigenstates of non-interacting and nonintegrable models. In Sec. IV, we discuss the distributions and scaling properties of the diagonal matrix elements of two local observables at the center of the spectrum. In Sec. V, we discuss the off-diagonal matrix elements of the same observables: their distributions, scaling properties, and functional dependence of \( |f_{\alpha}(\bar{E}, \omega)|^2 \) on \( \omega \), for \( \bar{E} \) at the center of the spectrum. Lastly, in Sec. VI, we summarize our results.

II. MODEL

We study the spin-1/2 XXZ chain with the addition of next-nearest neighbor interactions, with \( L \) sites and periodic boundary conditions. The Hamiltonian is

\[
\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{L} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \hat{S}_{i}^{+}\hat{S}_{i+1}^{-} + \text{H.c.} \right) + \Delta \hat{S}_{i}^{x}\hat{S}_{i+1}^{x} \right] + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{L} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \hat{S}_{i}^{+}\hat{S}_{i+2}^{-} + \text{H.c.} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{S}_{i}^{z}\hat{S}_{i+2}^{z} \right],
\]

where \( \hat{S}_{i}^{\nu} \) are spin-1/2 operators in the \( \nu \in \{x, y, z\} \) directions on site \( i \), and \( \hat{S}_{i}^{x} = \hat{S}_{i}^{-} \pm i\hat{S}_{i}^{y} \) are the corresponding ladder operators. When \( \lambda = 0 \), Hamiltonian (2) is integrable and can be solved exactly using Bethe ansatz [81]. When \( \lambda \neq 0 \), Hamiltonian (2) is quantum chaotic [82]. We set \( \lambda = 0 \) and 1 to compare the integrable and non-integrable regimes, respectively. Unless otherwise specified, we show results for \( \Delta = 0.55 \) and \( \Delta = 1.1 \) to illustrate that they are qualitatively similar in the (nearest-neighbor) easy-plane (\( \Delta < 1 \)) and easy-axis (\( \Delta > 1 \)) regimes.

We study the matrix elements of two local operators: The nearest neighbor \( z \)-interaction

\[
\hat{A} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \hat{S}_{i}^{z}\hat{S}_{i+1}^{z},
\]

and the next-nearest neighbor flip-flop operator

\[
\hat{B} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \left( \hat{S}_{i}^{+}\hat{S}_{i+2}^{-} + \text{H.c.} \right). \tag{4}
\]

To study the entanglement entropy of energy eigenstates, as well as the matrix elements of \( \hat{A} \) and \( \hat{B} \) in those eigenstates, it is important to resolve all the symmetries of the Hamiltonian [1, 25]. First, we note that Hamiltonian (2) conserves the total magnetization in the \( z \)-direction, \( M^z = \sum_i \hat{S}_i^z \). In this work we focus on the zero magnetization sector in chains with even numbers of lattice sites. The next important symmetry is translation, which allows one to block diagonalize the Hamiltonian in different total quasimomentum \( k \) sectors. All quasimomentum sectors are used in the average entanglement entropy calculations reported in Sec. III. Within the \( M^z = 0 \) and \( k = 0 \) sector, there are two further symmetries, namely, spin inversion (\( Z_2 \)) and space reflection (\( P \)). In our studies of matrix elements we focus on the even-\( Z_2 \) even-\( P \) sector within the \( M^z = 0 \) and \( k = 0 \) sector. We use full exact diagonalization of periodic chains with up to \( L = 26 \) sites. The even-\( Z_2 \) even-\( P \) sector within the \( M^z = 0 \) and \( k = 0 \) sector of the chain with \( L = 26 \), the largest considered, has 101,340 states.

III. ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY

In this section, we study the entanglement properties of eigenstates \( \{\alpha\} \) of Hamiltonian (2) in the zero magnetization sector. We consider a bipartition into a subsystem \( A \) and its complement \( \bar{A} \) that consist of \( L_A \) and \( L - L_A \) consecutive lattice sites, respectively. We calculate the bipartite entanglement entropy of an eigenstate \( \alpha \) as

\[
S_\alpha = -\text{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_A \ln(\hat{\rho}_A)],
\]

where \( \hat{\rho}_A = \text{Tr}_A\{\alpha\}<\alpha| \) is the reduced density matrix of the subsystem \( A \). We average \( S_\alpha \) over all Hamiltonian eigenstates in the zero magnetization sector to obtain the
average entanglement entropy $\bar{S} = D^{-1} \sum_\alpha S_\alpha$, where $D = \binom{L}{L/2}$.

The upper bound for the entanglement entropy of pure states in a given magnetization sector (or, equivalently, in a given particle-number sector when mapping spin-1/2 systems onto hard-core bosons or spinless fermions), for a given $L_A/L$, depends both on the magnetization and on $L_A/L$. The leading term, which scales with the volume, depends on the magnetization [56, 61]. There is also a subleading, $O(1)$, term that depends on $L_A/L$ [56].

Because of this bound, in the zero magnetization sector, the leading and first subleading terms in the average entanglement entropy of random pure states with normally distributed real coefficients are [56]

$$\bar{S}_{\text{ran}} \left( L_A, \frac{L_A}{L} \right) = L_A \ln(2) + \frac{L_A}{L} + \ln(1 - \frac{L_A}{L}) \frac{2}{2} - \frac{1}{5} \sum_{n_R=0}^{L_A} \left( \frac{L_A}{L} \right)^2 ,$$

$$= L_A \ln(2) + \frac{L_A}{L} + \ln(1 - \frac{L_A}{L}) \frac{2}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{L_A}{L} \right) .$$

(6)

On the r.h.s. of Eq. (6), the first two terms are the upper bound for the entanglement entropy of pure states in the $M^z = 0$ sector [56], while the third term is the generalization of the correction derived by Page [80] for the $M^z = 0$ sector of a system with conserved $M^z$. We think of $\bar{S}_{\text{ran}} \left( L_A, \frac{L_A}{L} \right)$ as an upper bound for the average entanglement entropy over all eigenstates of any given physical Hamiltonian. The dashed line in Fig. 1(a) shows $\bar{S}_{\text{ran}} \left( L_A, \frac{L_A}{L} \right)$ in the thermodynamic limit.

On the opposite (low-entropy) side of physical Hamiltonians one has noninteracting (free) fermions. Translationally invariant free fermionic Hamiltonians exhibit the same leading term of the average entanglement entropy as the XX model, Eq. (2) with $\Delta = \lambda = 0$ [65]. It was proved in Ref. [55] that the leading (volume) term of the average entanglement entropy over all (i.e., including all particle-number sectors) eigenstates in those models is

$$\bar{S}_{\text{free}} \left( L_A, \frac{L_A}{L} \right) = S_{\text{free}} \left( \frac{L_A}{L} \right) L_A \ln(2),$$

with $S_{\text{free}} \left( \frac{L_A}{L} \right) < 1$ for $L_A/L > 0$. In Ref. [55], $S_{\text{free}} \left( \frac{L_A}{L} \right)$ was computed numerically [dashed-dotted line in Fig. 1(a)] and, for $L_A = L/2$, it was found that $S_{\text{free}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) = 0.20711(1)$. The horizontal lines in Figs. 1(b) and 1(c) show $S_{\text{free}} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) / S_{\text{max}}$. Subsequently, it was conjectured that $S_{\text{free}} \left( \frac{L_A}{L} \right)$ is universal for all translationally invariant quadratic fermionic models [63, 65].

In Fig. 1(a), we show the average entanglement entropy over all eigenstates within the half-filled sector of noninteracting fermions, as well as within the zero-magnetization sector of integrable ($\Delta = 0.55$ and $\lambda = 0$) and nonintegrable ($\Delta = 0.55$ and $\lambda = 1$) points of Eq. (2), for chains with $L = 20$. The results at the nonintegrable point are closest to the thermodynamic limit ones obtained in Ref. [55] by averaging over all fillings. Figure 1(b), for
FIG. 2. EEVs ($O_{\alpha\alpha}$) of local observables $\hat{A}$ [(a) and (b), see Eq. (3)] and $\hat{B}$ [(c) and (d), see Eq. (4)] at integrable [(a) and (c), $\lambda = 0$] and nonintegrable [(b) and (d), $\lambda = 1$] points of Hamiltonian (2), plotted vs the eigenstate energies per site $E_\alpha / L$, for each eigenstate $|\alpha\rangle$. Results are shown for chains with $L = 22$, 24, and 26 sites, and are superposed to demonstrate non-shrinking (shrinking) support in the integrable (nonintegrable) case. $\Delta = 0.55$ in all plots (qualitatively similar results were obtained, not shown, for other values of $\Delta$).

$L_A / L = 1/2$, shows that the differences seen in Fig. 1(a) appear to vanish in the thermodynamic limit as expected (the zero magnetization sector is the one dominant in the thermodynamic limit when averaging over all fillings).

The numerical results at the interacting integrable point ($\Delta = 0.55$) in Fig. 1(a) are in between the ones for random pure states and the noninteracting ones. However, the finite-size scaling analysis reported in Fig. 1(c) for $L_A / L = 1/2$ suggests that the leading term of the average entanglement entropy at $\Delta = 0.55$ (easy-plane regime) is the same as, or very close to, the one for noninteracting fermions. As a matter of fact, finite-size scaling analyses in Fig. 1(c) for $\Delta = 1.1$, 1.45 (easy-axis regime) and $\Delta = 1.0$ (Heisenberg point, the most symmetric point in the spin-1/2 XXZ model) suggest that this is true independently of the value of $\Delta$.

The finite-size scaling analyses in Figs. 1(b) and 1(c) suggest that the main effect of interactions is subleading, and that they change the first subleading term from $O(1)$ in noninteracting models [the leading correction to $S / S_{\text{ran}}^{\text{max}}$ in Fig. 1(b)] to $O(1/L_A)$ in interacting integrable models [the leading correction to $S / S_{\text{ran}}^{\text{max}}$ in Fig. 1(c)] is $\propto 1/L_A$.

IV. DIAGONAL MATRIX ELEMENTS

In this section, we study expectation values of observables in eigenstates of interacting integrable and nonintegrable Hamiltonians, referred to in what follows as the eigenstate expectation values (EEVs) of the observables, in the even-$Z_2$ even-$P$ sector within the $M^z = 0$ and $k = 0$ sector (see Sec. II).

In Fig. 2, we show the EEVs of observables $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ as functions of the eigenenergies per site ($E_\alpha / L$) for different chain sizes at integrable [Figs. 2(a) and 2(c)] and nonintegrable [Figs. 2(b) and 2(d)] points of Hamiltonian (2). At the nonintegrable point, for both observables, it is clear from the plots that the support (maximum spread) of the distribution of EEVs around each $E_\alpha / L$ (away from the edges of the spectrum) shrinks upon increasing the chain size $L$. This suggests that the support vanishes in the thermodynamic limit and the EEVs are described by the smooth function $O(E)$, which, in turn, is the thermal expectation value of observable $\hat{O}$ at energy $E$. Hence, one expects all EEVs at the nonintegrable point to be thermal in the thermodynamic limit. On the other hand, at integrability, Figs. 2(a) and 2(c) show that the support of the EEVs is wide and does not shrink with increasing system size. The wide nonshrinking support indicates that at the integrable point ETH is not satisfied, as nonthermal states persist in the thermodynamic limit. The next question to address at the integrable point is how those EEVs are distributed.

In Fig. 3, we show the normalized distribution (color coded) of the EEVs for observables $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ for two different system sizes ($L = 22$ and 26) at the integrable point in Fig. 2, along with the microcanonical averages (solid lines) for the respective observables. The microcanonical averages are calculated using the results from $L = 26$ in an energy window $\delta E$ that is small enough to
We show the microcanonical average (calculated for each integrable point ($\Delta = 0$) of Hamiltonian (2)).

We show the microcanonical average (calculated for $L = 26$ using $\delta E/L = 0.025$) as a solid (red) line. Results are reported for $L = 22$ [(a) and (c)] and $L = 26$ [(b) and (d)].

In order to quantify the differences seen in Fig. 2 between the EEVs of observables in integrable and nonintegrable systems, we study the average of the absolute value of the eigenstate-to-eigenstate fluctuations [31, 33, 37]

$$|\delta O_{\alpha\alpha}| = |O_{\alpha\alpha} - O_{\alpha+1\alpha+1}|,$$

where the index $\alpha$ labels the eigenenergies $E_\alpha$ (sorted in increasing order), and $[\ldots\ldots]$ denotes an average over the central 50% of eigenstates. To carry out an accurate comparison between our results for $|\delta O_{\alpha\alpha}|$ and the ETH ansatz for quantum chaotic systems, a modification needs to be introduced to the ansatz in order to tailor it to our observables of interest. This modification is related to the fact that we focus on intensive operators that are defined via extensive sums, as seen in Eqs. (3) and (4), in the presence of translational invariance. The norm of those operators scales as $1/\sqrt{L}$ [38], as opposed to the $O(1)$ norm one has in mind when writing Eq. (1). As a
result, for the diagonal part of our operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$, Eq. (1) needs to be rewritten as:

$$O_{\alpha\alpha} = O(E_{\alpha}) + \frac{e^{-S(E_{\alpha})/2}}{\sqrt{L}} f_O(E_{\alpha}, 0) R_{\alpha\alpha}. \quad (9)$$

Since we are focusing on the regime $E_{\alpha}/L \approx 0$, in which $S(E_{\alpha}) \approx \ln(D)$, we expect the average eigenstate to eigenstate fluctuations of $\hat{O}$ to have a variance $\propto (LD)^{-1}$, where $D$ is the dimension of the Hilbert space of the symmetry sector studied. For integrable systems, on the other hand, the average eigenstate-to-eigenstate fluctuations are expected to have a variance proportional to $1/\sqrt{L}$ [42].

In Fig. 5, we show the finite size scaling of $|\delta A_{\alpha\alpha}|$ [Figs. 5(a) and 5(b)] and $|\delta B_{\alpha\alpha}|$ [Figs. 5(c) and 5(d)] at two integrable [(a) and (c), $\lambda = 0$] and two nonintegrable [(b) and (d), $\lambda = 1$] points of Hamiltonian (2). We report results for $\Delta = 0.55$ and $\Delta = 1.1$. The symbols show the numerical results, while the lines depict fits to the functions $\overset{\text{fit}}{f}(L) = c_1/\sqrt{L} + c_2/L$ [(a) and (c)] and $c_1(\sqrt{L})^{-c_2}$ [(b) and (d)] for $L = 22$ through $26$.

V. OFF-DIAGONAL MATRIX ELEMENTS

In this section, we study the off-diagonal matrix elements of observables $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ within 200 energy eigenstates at the center of the spectrum of a chain with $L = 26$ sites. In this eigenstate window, $E = (E_{\alpha} + E_{\beta})/2 \approx 0$ and $\omega = |E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta}| \approx 0$. For nonintegrable systems, this window is small enough to have $f_O(E, \omega)$ approximately constant, so that the probability distribution of $O_{\alpha\beta}$ is determined by $R_{\alpha\beta}$.

In Fig. 6 we show the probability distributions of $A_{\alpha\beta}$ and $B_{\alpha\beta}$ at integrable and nonintegrable points of Hamiltonian (2), with $\Delta = 0.55$. At the nonintegrable point, Figs. 6(b) and 6(d) clearly show that the numerical results are well described by Gaussian distributions, as expected. At the integrable point, on the other hand, the distributions are fundamentally different [Figs. 6(a) and 6(c)]. While they also have approximately zero mean, they exhibit sharp peaks at the origin. Analyses of the distributions of the $\ln |O_{\alpha\beta}|$ (shown in the insets) provide a better insight on the distributions of $O_{\alpha\beta}$. We find that, for our observables, the $\ln |O_{\alpha\beta}|$ distributions have skewed normal-like shapes [insets in Figs. 6(a) and 6(c)].

Gaussian distributions with the same mean and variance as our numerical results for $\ln |O_{\alpha\beta}|$, shown as continuous lines in the main panels, capture the sharp peaks observed for the distributions of $O_{\alpha\beta}$ at the origin, but fail to capture the higher weight at the tails. The distribution which fully characterizes our results for $O_{\alpha\beta}$ at integrability remains a question for future studies.

In order to gain insight about the distribution of $O_{\alpha\beta}$ for $\omega > 0$, instead of carrying out an analysis like the one for $\omega \approx 0$ in Fig. 6, we study the ratio

$$\Gamma_O(\omega) = \frac{|O_{\alpha\beta}|^2}{\overline{|O_{\alpha\beta}|^2}}, \quad (10)$$

where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are eigenstates that satisfy $|E|/L \leq 0.025$, while $\omega = |E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta}|$ takes values that vary throughout the entire spectrum. $\overline{\langle \rangle}$ denotes a running average of the relevant quantity over eigenstates in a small window around $E$ and $\omega$. If $O_{\alpha\beta}$ has a Gaussian distribution with zero mean, then $\Gamma_O(\omega) = \pi/2$. Namely, $\Gamma_O(\omega)$ is independent of $\omega$, model parameters, and the observable considered.
At the nonintegrable point, Figs. 7(b) and 7(d) show that both \( \Gamma_A(\omega) \) and \( \Gamma_B(\omega) \) are almost indistinguishable from \( \pi/2 \) for \( \omega \lesssim 5 \). Discrepancies from \( \pi/2 \) can be seen for \( \omega \gtrsim 5 \). In this regime, we find in the next section that the variance of the off-diagonal matrix elements decreases rapidly with increasing \( \omega \). For \( 5 \lesssim \omega \lesssim 8 \) in Figs. 7(b) and 7(d), \( \Gamma_A(\omega) \) and \( \Gamma_B(\omega) \) appear converged to results that could signal a small system-size-independent deviation from the Gaussian distribution prediction. However, finite-size effects are evident for \( \omega \gtrsim 8 \) (where \( \Gamma_A(\omega) \) and \( \Gamma_B(\omega) \) decrease with increasing system size) and could also be affecting the regime \( 5 \lesssim \omega \lesssim 8 \). Thus, whether \( \Gamma_O(\omega) \) agrees with the Gaussian distribution prediction at high values of \( \omega \) is something that requires future investigation. However, for \( \omega \lesssim 5 \), our results are a stringent test of the Gaussianity of the distributions of \( O_{\alpha\beta} \) in the nonintegrable case.

In contrast, at the integrable point, Figs. 7(a) and 7(c) show that \( \Gamma_A(\omega) \) and \( \Gamma_B(\omega) \) depend on \( \omega, L \), and the observable considered. Hence, the distribution of \( O_{\alpha\beta} \) is not Gaussian at any \( \omega \). A second point to be highlighted from the behavior of \( \Gamma_O(\omega) \) at integrability is that, since \( \Gamma_O(\omega) \) increases with increasing system size \( L \), \( |O_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \) decreases more slowly with increasing \( L \) than \( |O_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \). Since \( |O_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \) is the quantity that enters in fluctuation dissipation relations [1, 26], transport properties [27, 83], and
heating rates under periodic driving [43], in what follows we focus on the scaling of $|O_{\alpha\beta}|^2$ with increasing system size, and on the smooth function that characterizes the dependence of $|O_{\alpha\beta}|^2$ on $\omega$.

B. Variance

In Fig. 8, we show normalized distributions (color coded) of $\log_{10}|A_{\alpha\beta}|^2$ and $\log_{10}|B_{\alpha\beta}|^2$ vs $\omega$ at integrable and nonintegrable points of Hamiltonian (2), for eigenstates that satisfy $|E|/L \leq 0.025$. These results were obtained for $\Delta = 0.55$ in chains with $L = 26$. While for all values of $\omega$ the distributions are clearly different between the integrable and nonintegrable cases in that the former have a much broader support, neither of them have an integrable and nonintegrable cases in that the overall behavior is qualitatively similar. They exhibit a sort of "plateau" at intermediate values of $\omega$ ($0.5 \leq \omega \leq 4$) and a fast decay at larger values of $\omega$.

Next, we study how $|O_{\alpha\beta}|^2$ scales with increasing the system size (and, hence, with increasing the dimension $D$ of the Hilbert space). In the quantum chaotic case, we expect the scaling to be the one prescribed by the ETH. However, as we did when studying the fluctuations of the diagonal matrix elements in Sec. IV, we need to update the ETH ansatz to account for the fact that our translationally invariant operators $A$ and $\hat{B}$ have a norm that scales as $1/\sqrt{L}$. The ETH ansatz for the off-diagonal matrix elements of $A$ and $\hat{B}$ then has the form

$$O_{\alpha\beta} = e^{-S(\tilde{E})/2} \sqrt{D} f_O(\tilde{E},\omega)R_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (11)$$

where $\tilde{E} = (E_\alpha + E_\beta)/2$, $\omega = E_\alpha - E_\beta$, and $S(\tilde{E})$ is the thermodynamic entropy at energy $\tilde{E}$. Since we are focusing on the regime $\tilde{E}/L \simeq 0$, in which $S(\tilde{E}) \simeq \ln(D)$, we expect $|O_{\alpha\beta}|^2 \propto (LD)^{-1}$, where $D$ is the dimension of the symmetry sector studied. Figures 9(b) and 9(d) show that this is indeed the way $|O_{\alpha\beta}|^2$ scales with increasing system size. More remarkably, as shown in Figs. 9(a) and 9(c), the same is equally true for the integrable case as conjectured in Ref. [43].

Armed with this knowledge, we can now extract the smooth function $|f_O(\tilde{E} \simeq 0,\omega)|^2$, which is independent of system size for nonvanishing values of $\omega$ [1], that char-
anomal decay of the insets in Figs. 10(a) and 10(c), we find that the first regime beyond the exponential one. As shown in after the plateau. This is well known for nonintegrable systems. Overall, the results in Fig. 10 strongly suggest that Gaussian decays of $|f_0(\bar{E},\omega)|^2$ with $\omega$ are not unique to integrable models.

VI. SUMMARY

We studied the bipartite von Neumann entanglement entropy and matrix elements of local operators in highly excited eigenstates of interacting integrable (the spin-1/2 XXZ chain) and nonintegrable models. For the average entanglement entropy over all eigenstates in the zero magnetization sector, we found that the leading term is extensive at interacting integrable points with a coefficient of the volume-law that is smaller (for nonvanishing ratios $L_A/L$) than the universal ln 2 coefficient in quantum chaotic models. Finite-size scaling analyses suggested that the coefficient at $L_A/L = 1/2$, and hence for arbitrary ratios $L_A/L$, is (almost) independent of the XXZ chain anisotropy parameter $\Delta$, and that it is equal or very close to that of translationally invariant free fermionic Hamiltonians. We find it plausible that all translationally invariant (two-state per site) integrable models (noninteracting and interacting) have the same average entanglement entropy for any given ratio $L_A/L$. This would mean that the volume-law coefficient of the entanglement entropy for the overwhelming majority of eigenstates of interacting integrable models is identical to that for the overwhelming majority of eigenstates of noninteracting ones. One could then think of two universality classes for the average entanglement entropy of all “q-bit” based physical Hamiltonians, (translationally invariant) free fermions characterizing integrable models and random matrices characterizing nonintegrable ones.

For the diagonal matrix elements of observables at the center of the spectrum, we showed evidence that at interacting integrable points the support does not vanish with increasing system size and that the average eigenstate to eigenstate fluctuations vanish as a power law in system size, while at nonintegrable points the support vanishes with increasing system size and the average eigenstate to eigenstate fluctuations vanish as an exponential in system size. For the off-diagonal matrix elements with $\bar{E} = (E_a + E_b)/2$ at the center of the spectrum, we showed that at interacting integrable points they follow a distribution that is close to (but not quite) lognormal, and that their variance is a well-defined function of $\omega = E_a - E_b$ whose magnitude scales as $1/D$, where $D$ is the Hilbert space dimension. The latter is a known property of the off-diagonal matrix elements of observables in nonintegrable models, which, however, exhibit
a Gaussian distribution. We also studied the smooth function $|f_O(E \approx 0, \omega)|^2$ that characterizes the variance and contrasted its behavior at interacting integrable and nonintegrable points. It was recently argued that this function can be measured in experiments with periodically driven systems, both nonintegrable and interacting integrable ones, by studying how heating rates change when changing the frequency of the drive [43]. An interesting open question is whether the Bethe ansatz can be used to analytically learn about the smooth function $|f_O(E, \omega)|^2$ in interacting integrable systems. This would open a path to the analytic understanding of the effect of interactions in the matrix elements of observables in many-body quantum systems.
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