

Revivals imply quantum many-body scars

Álvaro M. Alhambra¹ and Henrik Wilming²

¹*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, ON N2L 2Y5, Canada*

²*Institute for Theoretical Physics, ETH Zurich, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland*

(Dated: November 14, 2019)

We derive general rigorous results relating revivals in the dynamics of quantum many-body systems to the entanglement properties of energy eigenstates. For a D -dimensional lattice system of N sites initialized in a low-entangled and short-range correlated state, our results show that a perfect revival of the state after a time at most $O(\text{poly}(N))$ implies the existence of at least $O(\sqrt{N}/\log^{2D}(N))$ “quantum many-body scars”: energy eigenstates with energies placed in an equally-spaced ladder and with Rényi entanglement entropy at most $O(\log(N)) + O(|\partial A|)$ for any region A of the lattice. This shows that quantum many-body scars are a necessary consequence of revivals, independent of particularities of the Hamiltonian leading to them. We also present results for approximate revivals, for revivals of expectation values of observables and prove that the duration of revivals of states has to become vanishingly short with increasing system size.

The behaviour of out of equilibrium quantum many-body systems has been gathering a large amount of attention in recent years. This has largely been motivated by the recent progress of experimental platforms such as cold atoms, ion traps or Rydberg atoms, where many of these systems can be realized in practice [1–3]. One of the most widely studied situations in this context is that of “quantum quenches”: The system is first prepared in an initial pure state, to then be subjected to an instantaneous change of Hamiltonian $H_0 \rightarrow H$ that drives it out of equilibrium. In generic cases, it is believed that the dynamics will relax to an equilibrium state locally indistinguishable from a thermal ensemble, as granted by the Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis (ETH) [4, 5]. Both the ETH and this relaxing behaviour have been confirmed in numerous numerical and experimental works [6, 7]. However, there are various cases where this prediction fails notoriously. They include integrable systems that relax to a so-called generalized Gibbs ensemble [8], and also many-body localized systems [9], characterized by the presence of quasi-local integrals of motion [10] which prevent the system from thermalizing due to memory of the initial conditions.

Recently, a new kind of deviation from the predictions of the ETH has been found. It consists of systems which, rather than relaxing, actually revive back to the initial state after a short time. This phenomenon was first found in the experiment of Ref. [3], which showed that a system of 51 Rydberg atoms did not thermalize as expected when prepared in a particular initial product state. Shortly after, this was associated with the presence of a number of anomalous energy eigenstates in the spectrum [11], the so called *quantum many-body scars*. Numerous recent efforts have aimed to characterize these eigenstates [12–18] and, since their discovery, they have been found in further classes of models [19–28] (including driven ones [29, 30]), some of which even display perfect revivals when the system is prepared in particular product states [31, 32] or matrix product states (MPS) [33, 34].

Motivated by these recent findings, we here derive a number of analytical results that apply to many-body

systems exhibiting revivals at short times. Our results significantly improve upon a Lemma presented in Ref. [31]. We first derive properties of the energy spectrum and eigenstates that have to be fulfilled whenever (approximate) revivals appear in a local quantum many-body system, independent of the details of the Hamiltonian and in any dimension D of the underlying lattice. We show that the existence of at least $O(\sqrt{N}/\log^{2D}(N))$ (where N is the system size) quantum many-body scars follows from the early revivals of low-entangled and short-range correlated initial states, when the revival time τ is at most of the order of $\text{poly}(N)$. We prove that all of these quantum many-body scars have Rényi entanglement entropies (of orders $\alpha > 1$) of at most $O(\log(N)) + O(|\partial A|)$, for any subset A of the lattice sites, with the area law term vanishing if the initial state experiencing revivals is a product state. Our bounds hence match the scaling that has been found in concrete model Hamiltonians [20–22, 31–34]. In dimension $D = 2$ or higher and for initial product states, our results show that quantum-many-body scars show even weaker entanglement in terms of Rényi entropies of order $\alpha > 1$ than allowed by an area law (with log corrections).

Our manuscript is structured as follows: In Section I we state our assumptions on the initial states and define the notion of exact and approximate revivals. Then, in Section II, we give constraints on the energy distribution of initial states with revivals, which we use in Section III to give bounds on the entanglement entropy. In Section IV we explain the consequences of perfect revivals on an observable, and in Section V we give universal constraints that all periodic revivals must obey. In the Appendix we include the proof of some of the technical statements and discuss a model example to benchmark our bounds.

I. SYSTEMS WITH REVIVALS

We consider a system on a regular D -dimensional lattice Λ of N sites with a local Hamiltonian $H = \sum_{x \in \Lambda} h_x$, where the local terms h_x are uniformly bounded by a

constant \hbar : $\|h_x\| \leq \hbar$. As usual, we denote the unitary implementing time-evolution by $U_t = \exp(-iHt)$ and the energy eigenstates by $|E_j\rangle$. Without loss of generality, we assume that the ground state energy vanishes, $E_0 = 0$, and set $\hbar = 1$. We further assume that the system is prepared in a pure state $|\Psi\rangle$ which:

- i) Is a *low-entangled* state: For every region A on the lattice, the reduced density matrix σ_A has rank at most $\chi^{|\partial A|}$, where $|\partial A|$ is the area of the boundary of A and χ is independent of the system size.
- ii) Is *short-range correlated* and out of equilibrium: It fulfills exponential decay of correlation with a finite correlation length and the standard deviation of the energy is given by $\sigma \equiv \sqrt{\langle H^2 \rangle - \langle H \rangle^2} = s\sqrt{N}$ for some constant $s > 0$.

The statement of assumption **i)** is somewhat technical, but it includes all states that can be represented by a tensor network with constant bond dimension, such as projected entangled-pair states (PEPS) in $D=2$ and matrix product states (MPS) in $D=1$. The constant χ is then directly related to the bond dimension. In particular, for product states we have $\chi = 1$. The upper bound $\sigma \leq s\sqrt{N}$ required in assumption **ii)** follows directly from the finite correlation length. The assumption therefore simply makes explicit that the initial state must not be an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian. We emphasize that generic tensor network states also have a finite correlation length [35].

The way in which we understand revivals of a state is in terms of the fidelity with the initial state, captured by the following definition.

Definition 1. *An initial state $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_j c_j |E_j\rangle$ evolved with a Hamiltonian H has an ϵ -revival at time τ if*

$$|F(\tau) - F(0)| \leq \epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where $F(t) = |f(t)|$ with $f(t) = \langle \Psi | e^{-itH} | \Psi \rangle = \sum_i |c_j|^2 e^{-itE_j}$.

The definition only involves an ϵ -revival at a single time τ . However, it implies that there are further periodic approximate revivals at later times. Concretely, an ϵ -revival at time τ implies (see appendix **A 1** for derivation)

$$F(m\tau) \geq 1 - m\sqrt{2\epsilon}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2)$$

We emphasize that the revival of the full many-body state is a very strong condition and $f(t)$, sometimes known as “spectral form factor” and its absolute $F(t)$ value as “survival probability”, is not a directly measurable quantity ($F(t)$ is, however, measurable in principle using an interferometric Ramsey scheme [36–39]). For this reason, we also consider the case of a perfectly recurring expectation value of an observable A , leading to similar results under an additional assumption (see Section **IV**).




FIG. 1. Schematic diagram of the energy distribution and of the intervals $\Delta_\delta(l)$, with equally-spaced peaks of width δ/τ . In the limit of perfect revivals, the peaks have width 0. The upper bound follows from the Berry-Esseen theorem (Theorem 5 in the Appendix). Theorem 1 guarantees that at least $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N}/\log^D(N))$ peaks have a weight larger than $\mathcal{O}(1/\text{poly}(N))$.

II. CONSTRAINTS ON THE ENERGY DISTRIBUTION

From the definition $f(t) = \langle \Psi | \exp(-iHt) | \Psi \rangle$, it is clear that $f(t)$ is the characteristic function of the probability distribution of energy. In this section, we therefore study the properties of the probability distribution of energy in the case of ϵ -revivals of a state that fulfills assumption **ii)** above. First we show that if there are approximate revivals at short times τ , a large weight of the distribution is contained within equally-spaced “peaks”, whose spacing depends on τ (see Fig. 1). This is true for any initial state. We then make use of the fact that the probability distribution of energy of a state with a finite correlation length is roughly Gaussian, which we use to show that at least $\sim \sqrt{N}$ of the peaks each contain total weight of at least $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$.

To set up some notation, let us introduce $\alpha(t)$ as the phase of $f(t)$:

$$f(t) = e^{i\alpha(t)} F(t), \quad \alpha(0) = 0. \quad (3)$$

Given $\alpha(\tau)$ and an arbitrary constant $0 \leq \delta \leq \pi$, we define for all $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ the energy intervals

$$\Delta_\delta(l) = \frac{2\pi l + \alpha(\tau)}{\tau} + \left[-\frac{\delta}{\tau}, \frac{\delta}{\tau} \right], \quad (4)$$

where addition is point-wise, and the interval between two consecutive such intervals

$$\bar{\Delta}_\delta(l) = \left(\frac{2\pi l + \alpha(\tau)}{\tau} + \frac{\delta}{\tau}, \frac{2\pi(l+1) + \alpha(\tau)}{\tau} - \frac{\delta}{\tau} \right). \quad (5)$$

These partition the real line as $\mathbb{R} = \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \Delta_\delta(l) \cup \bar{\Delta}_\delta(l)$. Notice that since $\|H\| \leq \hbar N$, the number of intervals $\Delta_\delta(l)$ in the spectrum with nonzero energy eigenvalues is

at most

$$n \equiv \frac{\tau h}{2\pi} N \propto \tau N. \quad (6)$$

To de-clutter the notation in what follows, let us also introduce p as the probability measure of energy of the initial state, so that

$$p(\Delta_\delta(l)) = \sum_{i: E_i \in \Delta_\delta(l)} |c_i|^2. \quad (7)$$

The following lemma lower bounds the probability of measuring an energy on the initial state within one of the intervals $\Delta_\delta(l)$.

Lemma 1. *Let $\epsilon \geq |F(\tau) - F(0)|$. Then*

$$\sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p(\Delta_\delta(l)) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{1 - \cos(\delta)}. \quad (8)$$

The proof can be found in Appendix A 2. The Lemma tells us that if an ϵ -revival at time τ happens, the energy distribution must be mostly contained in the intervals $\Delta_\delta(l)$ as long as $\cos(\delta)$ is not too close to unity. The smaller ϵ (which is equivalent to an increasingly exact revival), the narrower the intervals $\Delta_\delta(l)$ can be made, by choosing a δ such that the RHS of (8) is close to 1. If the recurrence time τ is very large, both the distance between the intervals $\Delta_\delta(l)$ and their width $2\delta/\tau$ is small. In a finite system, for every $\epsilon > 0$, recurrence theorems guarantee [40, 41] the existence of a corresponding recurrence time τ_R . For generic systems, however, one expects that $\tau_R = \mathcal{O}(\exp(N))$. In this case, the distance between the intervals $\Delta_\delta(l)$ becomes comparable to or smaller than the level-spacing, so that the union of the $\Delta_\delta(l)$ automatically contains (almost) all energy eigenvalues.

The next important feature of energy distributions of local models in a state with finite-correlation length is given by the Berry-Esseen theorem [42]. This is a strengthening of the central limit theorem, in which the error of having finite sample sizes is bounded by the number of samples. It allows us to derive the second key constraint.

Lemma 2. *Let $|\Psi\rangle$ be a state fulfilling assumption ii). Then there exists a constant $K \geq 0$ (independent of N) such that*

$$p(\Delta_\delta(l)) \leq \frac{\delta}{\sigma\tau} + K \frac{\log^{2D}(N)}{\sqrt{N}}. \quad (9)$$

The proof can be found in Appendix A 3. Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 have competing effects: While Lemma 1 shows that the distribution clusters around at most n evenly spaced energy intervals, Lemma 2 guarantees that no particular interval of energy width δ can contain a weight larger than $\delta/(\tau\sigma) + K \log^{2D}(N)/\sqrt{N}$. Together, they imply the existence of a large number of intervals containing each a certain minimum weight:

Theorem 1. *Given an initial state fulfilling assumption ii) and with an ϵ -revival at time τ , then for every $c > 1$ and $0 < \delta \leq \pi$, the number $N_{c,\delta}$ of intervals $\Delta_\delta(l)$ in the energy distribution with $p(\Delta_\delta(l)) > 1/(cN)$ is lower bounded as*

$$N_{c,\delta} \geq \sqrt{N} \frac{\left[1 - \frac{h\tau}{2\pi c} - \frac{\epsilon}{1 - \cos(\delta)}\right]}{\delta/(\tau\sigma) + K \log^{2D}(N)}. \quad (10)$$

Proof. The total number of peaks $\Delta_\delta(l)$ is upper bounded by $n = hN\tau/2\pi$. Hence the total number of peaks such that $p(\Delta_\delta(l)) \leq 1/(cN)$ is trivially also upper bounded by n . Let the index set J_δ collect the peaks such that $p(\Delta_\delta(l)) > 1/(cN)$. Then using Lemma 1 we find

$$1 - \frac{\epsilon}{1 - \cos(\delta)} \leq \sum_{l \notin J_\delta} p(\Delta_\delta(l)) + \sum_{l \in J_\delta} p(\Delta_\delta(l)) \quad (11)$$

$$\leq n \frac{1}{cN} + \sum_{l \in J_\delta} p(\Delta_\delta(l)) \quad (12)$$

$$= \frac{h\tau}{2\pi c} + \sum_{l \in J_\delta} p(\Delta_\delta(l)). \quad (13)$$

Using Lemma 2 we then get

$$1 - \frac{\epsilon}{1 - \cos(\delta)} \leq \frac{h\tau}{2\pi c} + \frac{N_{c,\delta}}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\frac{\delta}{\sigma\tau} + K \log^{2D}(N) \right)$$

and re-arranging yields the desired bound. \square

To understand this bound, let us make a specific choice for c and δ , assuming that ϵ is very small. For example, we can choose $c = 2h\tau/\pi$ and $\delta = \sqrt{2\epsilon}$, so that $\epsilon/(1 - \cos(\delta)) \approx 1/2$ and we find

$$N_{c,\delta} \geq \frac{\sqrt{N}}{4} \left[\frac{\sqrt{2\epsilon}}{\tau\sigma} + K \log^{2D}(N) \right]^{-1}. \quad (14)$$

We see that the number of peaks of width $\sqrt{2\epsilon}$ such that each of them contains weight at least $(\pi/2)/(h\tau N)$ is essentially lower bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N}/\log^{2D}(N))$.

The result holds for any value of τ , but if τ scales very quickly with N , this result loses its predictive power. For $\tau = \text{poly}(N)$, one still finds a total weight of $1/\text{poly}(N)$ in each peak, which is sufficient for our arguments on entanglement in the next section. However, if we consider the usual recurrence time τ_R for some $\epsilon > 0$ in a generic system, which is $\tau_R = \mathcal{O}(\exp(N))$, our bound trivializes: the r.h.s. becomes negative if we do not choose c exponentially large in the system size. At the same time, if we choose c exponentially large, the peaks are only required to contain an exponentially small amount of weight, which does not yield useful information.

III. BOUNDS ON ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY

We now come to estimating the entanglement entropy of (approximate) eigenstates of the system. The previous discussion motivates the definition of the following

normalized pure states

$$|\hat{E}_l\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p(\Delta_\delta(l))}} \sum_{E_j \in \Delta_\delta(l)} c_j |E_j\rangle. \quad (15)$$

These are approximate energy eigenstates with energy $\hat{E}_l = (2\pi l + \alpha(\tau))/\tau$ for which δ/τ controls the precision, in the sense that

$$\left\| H |\hat{E}_l\rangle - \hat{E}_l |\hat{E}_l\rangle \right\| \leq \frac{\delta}{\tau} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\left\| U_t |\hat{E}_l\rangle - e^{-i\hat{E}_l t} |\hat{E}_l\rangle \right\| \leq \sqrt{2(1 - \cos(\delta t/\tau))} \approx \delta \frac{t}{\tau}, \quad (17)$$

where the last approximation holds for $\delta t/\tau \ll 1$. The states $|\hat{E}_l\rangle$ hence dephase in a time of order τ/δ , but cannot be distinguished from eigenstates on time-scales much smaller than that. In the limit $\delta/\tau \rightarrow 0$ they converge to actual eigenstates provided that the limit exists, i.e., the interval $\Delta_\delta(l)$ actually contains an eigenstate in this limit.

Theorem 1 implies that the initial state has a fidelity of at least $1/cN$ with $N_{c,\delta}$ of the approximate eigenstates. This is in fact enough to bound the Rényi entanglement entropy S_α of those approximate eigenstates for every region of the lattice, which is the focus of our next main result. We remind the reader at this point that the Rényi entropies are defined as

$$S_\alpha(\rho) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log(\text{Tr}[\rho^\alpha]). \quad (18)$$

In the limit $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ they converge to the von Neumann entropy pointwise and they fulfill $S_\alpha \leq S_\beta$ for $\alpha \geq \beta$. In the limit $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, one obtains $S_\infty(\rho) = -\log(\|\rho\|)$.

Theorem 2. *There exist at least $N_{c,\delta}$ many of the approximate eigenstates $|\hat{E}_l\rangle$ with the following property: For all $\alpha > 1$ and for any subregion A of the lattice, the Rényi entanglement entropy is bounded as*

$$S_\alpha(\hat{\rho}_A^{(l)}) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} [\log cN + |\partial A| \log(\chi)], \quad (19)$$

where $N_{c,\delta}$ is bounded as per Theorem 1 and $\hat{\rho}_A^{(l)} = \text{Tr}_{A^c}[|\hat{E}_l\rangle\langle\hat{E}_l|]$.

Proof. This result is a slight extension of an argument from Ref. [43]: Since the fidelity F between two quantum state cannot decrease under tracing out sub-systems, we have

$$|\langle\Psi|\Phi\rangle|^2 \leq F(\rho_A, \sigma_A)^2, \quad (20)$$

where, $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_{A^c}[|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|]$ is the reduced state of Φ on A and σ_A that of $|\Psi\rangle$. The fidelity between two states is smaller than that of the outcome-distributions of any measurement on the states. We can therefore use the

binary projective measurement $\{P_\sigma, \mathbf{1} - P_\sigma\}$, with P_σ being the projector onto the image of σ_A , to find

$$F(\rho_A, \sigma_A)^2 \leq \text{Tr}[\rho_A P_\sigma] \leq \text{rank}(\sigma_A) \|\rho_A\| \quad (21)$$

$$= \text{rank}(\sigma_A) \exp(-S_\infty(\rho_A)). \quad (22)$$

In Refs. [43, 44] it was further shown that $S_\infty \geq \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} S_\alpha$. Using assumption i), we thus find in our case

$$\frac{1}{cN} \leq |\langle\Psi|\hat{E}_l\rangle|^2 \leq \chi^{|\partial A|} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} S_\alpha(\hat{\rho}_A^{(l)})\right) \quad (23)$$

and solving for $S_\alpha(\hat{\rho}_A^{(l)})$ yields the desired bound. \square

In $D = 1$, $|\partial A|$ simply counts the number of connected components of A and for a product state we have $\chi = 1$, so that the area law term vanishes. As long as $c = \mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(N))$, the result then leads to $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N}/\text{poly}(\log(N)))$ approximate eigenstates with entanglement entropy of order $\mathcal{O}(\log(N))$. Since $\tau < c$, this allows for a longer revival time, of up to $\tau = \mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(N))$.

For systems that exhibit perfect revivals, $\epsilon = 0$, we can choose $\delta = 0$, so that by Eq. (16) the $|\hat{E}_l\rangle$ become exact eigenstates with energies in the set $\{(2\pi k + \alpha(\tau))/\tau\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

Corollary 1. *If $F(\tau) = F(0)$ for some τ , there exists a set of at least $N_{c,0}$ energy eigenstates $|E_l\rangle$ with energies in the set $\{(2\pi k + \alpha(\tau))/\tau\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and such that their entanglement entropy of any region is bounded as*

$$S_\alpha(\rho_A^{(l)}) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} [\log cN + |\partial A| \log(\chi)], \quad \alpha > 1, \quad (24)$$

where

$$N_{c,0} \geq \sqrt{N} \frac{(1 - \frac{h\tau}{2\pi c})}{K \log^{2D}(N)}. \quad (25)$$

This bound on the entropy is consistent with the examples of [20–22, 31–34], which display eigenstates with a $\log(N)$ scaling of the von Neumann entropy (see Appendix B for a more detailed comparison).

IV. REVIVALS IN AN OBSERVABLE

Assuming a revival of the full many-body state is a rather strong condition. Intuitively, it should be possible that physically relevant observables have a revival in terms of their expectation value at time τ and yet the full many-body state has small overlap with the initial state, $F(\tau) \ll 1$. It may therefore be surprising that similar conclusions as above can be reached when one assumes that the expectation value is periodic,

$$\langle A(t) \rangle = \langle A(t + \tau) \rangle \quad \forall t, \quad (26)$$

and one further assumption on the observable. To state this assumption, let us write

$$\langle A(t) \rangle = \sum_{i,j} c_i c_j^* A_{ij} e^{-i(E_i - E_j)t} = \sum_{\omega} v_{\omega} e^{-i\omega t}, \quad (27)$$

such that $v_\omega = \sum_{E_i - E_j = \omega} c_i c_j^* A_{ij}$. Then for any ω' ,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \frac{dt}{T} (\langle A(t + \tau) \rangle - \langle A(t) \rangle) e^{i\omega' t} \\ &= (e^{-i\tau\omega'} - 1)v_{\omega'}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that either the frequency ω' does not appear in the dynamics of the expectation value ($v_{\omega'} = 0$) or it is of the form $\omega' = 2\pi l/\tau$. For local observables in many-body systems, we expect that in general $A_{ij} \neq 0$ unless A and H share some symmetry. It therefore seems reasonable to assume that generically

$$v_\omega = 0 \implies c_i c_j^* = 0, \forall E_i - E_j = \omega. \quad (28)$$

We thus conclude that $c_i c_j^* \neq 0$ only if $E_i - E_j = 2\pi l/\tau$ for some integer l . This in turn implies $F(0) = F(\tau)$, which is the assumption of Corollary 1. We leave it as an open problem to explore the setting of approximate ϵ -revivals of local observables.

V. UNIVERSAL CONSTRAINTS ON REVIVALS

It is expected that if revivals of the initial product state exist, their duration (i.e., the time for which $F(t)$ is larger than some constant) must become vanishingly short in the thermodynamic limit (see Fig. 2). This is also a feature found in the concrete models (see, for example, Refs. [32, 33]). We illustrate this with two different and general results. The first one shows that the average fidelity over time decays with system size for any initial state fulfilling assumption ii).

Theorem 3. *Let $|\Psi\rangle$ be a pure state fulfilling assumption ii). Then*

$$\int_0^T \frac{dt}{T} |F(t)|^2 \leq \frac{5\pi}{2\sigma T} + K' \frac{\log^{2D}(N)}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (29)$$

where $K' \geq 0$ is a constant independent of system size.

A revival at a time τ of fidelity at least $(1 - \epsilon)$ for a time interval of length τ_{rev} contributes to the LHS of Eq. (29) with $(1 - \epsilon)\tau_{\text{rev}}/\tau$, so that

$$\frac{(1 - \epsilon)\tau_{\text{rev}}}{\tau} \leq \frac{5\pi}{2\sigma\tau} + K' \frac{\log^{2D}(N)}{\sqrt{N}} \propto O(1/\sqrt{N}), \quad (30)$$

which restricts the revivals of high fidelity to either a very short time interval τ_{rev} or a very late time τ . In Appendix B we show that the model from [32] effectively saturates this bound.

The second result utilizes the Lieb-Robinson bound [45] to show that a short time after an initial product state is prepared (or equally, after a perfect revival), its overlap with the initial state has to be sub-exponentially small in the system size. For simplicity, we formulate and prove this result only in the case of a D -dimensional




FIG. 2. Illustration of the typical behaviour of the fidelity of a system with revivals. According to Theorems 3 and 4, the width of the peaks τ_{rev} must decrease with system size.




FIG. 3. Schematic illustration for the idea behind Theorem 4: An operator located in region A_i at time $t = \tau$ can (approximately) only be influenced by the region $A_i(\tau)$ at time $t = 0$ due to the past Lieb-Robinson “light-cone”. If the quantum state of the regions $A_i(\tau)$ factorizes at time $t = 0$, it follows that correlation functions between operators supported in the regions A_i (approximately) factorize at time τ . Since translationally invariant product states have exponentially small overlap, one hence expects that the states at times $t = 0$ and $t = \tau$ have exponentially small fidelity (as evidenced by concrete models, see Appendix B).

cubic lattice of side-length L and with a translationally invariant initial state and Hamiltonian. We emphasize, however, that a similar argument applies on any regular D -dimensional lattice and also for initial states that are only translationally invariant with a higher period than the lattice spacing.

Theorem 4. *Consider the translationally invariant initial state $|\Psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle^{\otimes N}$ on the cubic lattice $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}_L^D$ evolving under a strictly local, uniformly bounded, and translationally invariant Hamiltonian H . Define*

$$k(t) = -\log(\langle \Psi | \rho_x(t) \otimes \mathbf{1} | \Psi \rangle), \quad (31)$$

where $\rho_x(t) = \text{Tr}_{\{x\}^c}[U_t |\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi| U_t^\dagger]$ is the reduced density matrix of an arbitrary site x at time t . If $|\Psi\rangle$ is not an eigenstate, then for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a time $0 < \tau < \delta$ such that $k(\tau) > 0$. For any such fixed time τ and for large enough L , we have

$$F(\tau)^2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}[L^D k(\tau)]^{1/1+D}\right)\right). \quad (32)$$

The theorem says that, whenever $k(\tau) > 0$, the fidelity between $|\Psi\rangle$ and the time-evolved state $U_\tau |\Psi\rangle$ is sub-

exponentially small in the linear size of the system L . Furthermore, from a perturbative expansion one quickly finds that for small τ we have $k(\tau) = \mathcal{O}(\tau^2)$. The proof of Theorem 4 is relatively involved and presented in Appendix A5. However, the idea behind it is simple and sketched in Fig. 3.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have derived general results on the energy spectrum and the entanglement of (approximate) energy eigenstates for systems that show revivals. Most importantly, our results show that the presence of “quantum many-body scars” with small amounts of entanglement of order $\log(N)$ is a necessary consequence of the existence of revivals of a low entangled state with a revival time that is at most $\mathcal{O}(\text{poly}(N))$. This explains why this scaling behaviour has been found in the concrete models studied so far [20–22, 31–34]. One drawback of our results is that they only yield non-trivial information for Rényi entanglement entropies of orders $\alpha > 1$. While it is often found in practice that von Neumann entropy and the higher order Rényi entanglement entropies show a similar scaling behaviour, this is not always the case. In particular our bounds on the Rényi entanglement entropies do not guarantee the existence of an efficient description in terms of matrix product states (MPS) [46] (although a similar bound on the von Neumann would not imply this either). Indeed, it is known [43] that there exist states with both *i)* an arbitrarily large overlap with a product state and *ii)* a volume-law scaling of the von Neumann entropy, while all Rényi entropies of order $\alpha > 1$ are bounded by a constant (depend on α). It is an interesting open problem to find arguments for bounding the von Neumann entropy instead of the Rényi entropy of the quantum many-body scars in generality. A further interesting open problem is to understand whether the

emergent (approximate) SU(2) representations that are connected to quantum many-body scars in concrete models [22, 31–34] can be derived from general arguments. Finally, it would be interesting to see whether similar results to the case of approximate revival of the initial state can also be derived for approximate revivals of (generic) expectation values of observables. This would also be interesting from the point of view of bounding equilibration time-scales in interacting quantum many-body system, a problem where relatively little rigorous progress has been made so far (see, for example, Refs. [7, 47–49] and references therein for recent discussions of this problem). In particular, it is an interesting open problem whether ϵ -approximate revivals of local observables and at early times are possible in *entanglement-ergodic* systems [43], where all energy eigenstates at positive energy density fulfill weak volumes laws of entanglement.

Acknowledgements. The authors acknowledge useful discussions with Cheng-Ju Lin. H. W. acknowledges support from the Swiss National Science Foundation through SNSF project No. 200020_165843 and through the National Centre of Competence in Research *Quantum Science and Technology* (QSIT). This research was supported in part by Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade. Below we report the estimated CO₂ emissions for transport due to this project (template from scientific-conduct.github.io).

Transport

Total CO ₂ -Emission For Transport [kg]	2910
Were The Emissions Offset?	Yes
Total CO ₂ -Emission [kg]	2910

-
- [1] R. Blatt and C. F. Roos, *Nature Physics* **8**, 277 (2012).
 - [2] C. Gross and I. Bloch, *Science* **357**, 995 (2017).
 - [3] H. Bernien, S. Schwartz, A. Keesling, H. Levine, A. Omran, H. Pichler, S. Choi, A. S. Zibrov, M. Endres, M. Greiner, *et al.*, *Nature* **551**, 579 (2017).
 - [4] M. Srednicki, *Phys. Rev. E* **50**, 888 (1994).
 - [5] M. Srednicki, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **32**, 1163 (1999).
 - [6] L. D’Alessio, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, *Advances in Physics* **65**, 239 (2016).
 - [7] C. Gogolin and J. Eisert, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **79**, 056001 (2016).
 - [8] L. Vidmar and M. Rigol, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2016**, 064007 (2016).
 - [9] R. Nandkishore and D. A. Huse, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **6**, 15 (2015).
 - [10] J. Z. Imbrie, V. Ros, and A. Scardicchio, *Annalen der Physik* **529**, 1600278 (2017).
 - [11] C. J. Turner, A. A. Michailidis, D. A. Abanin, M. Serbyn, and Z. Papić, *Nature Physics* **14**, 745 (2018).
 - [12] W. W. Ho, S. Choi, H. Pichler, and M. D. Lukin, *Physical review letters* **122**, 040603 (2019).
 - [13] C.-J. Lin and O. I. Motrunich, *Physical review letters* **122**, 173401 (2019).
 - [14] V. Khemani, C. R. Laumann, and A. Chandran, *Physical Review B* **99**, 161101 (2019).
 - [15] T. Iadecola, M. Schecter, and S. Xu, (2019), [arXiv:1903.10517](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.10517).
 - [16] N. Shiraishi, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2019**, 083103 (2019).
 - [17] F. M. Surace, P. P. Mazza, G. Giudici, A. Lerose, A. Gambassi, and M. Dalmonte, (2019), [arXiv:1902.09551](https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.09551).
 - [18] C.-J. Lin, A. Chandran, and O. I. Motrunich, (2019), [arXiv:1910.07669](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.07669).
 - [19] N. Shiraishi and T. Mori, *Physical review letters* **119**,

- 030601 (2017).
- [20] O. Vafek, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, *SciPost Physics* **3**, 043 (2017).
- [21] C. J. Turner, A. A. Michailidis, D. A. Abanin, M. Serbyn, and Z. Papić, *Phys. Rev. B* **98** (2018), 10.1103/physrevb.98.155134.
- [22] S. Moudgalya, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, *Physical Review B* **98**, 235156 (2018).
- [23] S. Ok, K. Choo, C. Mudry, C. Castelnuovo, C. Chamon, and T. Neupert, (2019), [arXiv:1901.01260](#).
- [24] K. Bull, I. Martin, and Z. Papić, *Physical Review Letters* **123** (2019), 10.1103/physrevlett.123.030601.
- [25] A. J. James, R. M. Konik, and N. J. Robinson, *Physical review letters* **122**, 130603 (2019).
- [26] S. Moudgalya, B. A. Bernevig, and N. Regnault, (2019), [arXiv:1906.05292](#).
- [27] T. Iadecola and M. Žnidarič, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 036403 (2019).
- [28] A. Hudomal, I. Vasić, N. Regnault, and Z. Papić, (2019), [arXiv:1910.08101](#).
- [29] S. Pai and M. Pretko, *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 136401 (2019).
- [30] A. Haldar, D. Sen, R. Moessner, and A. Das, (2019), [arXiv:1909.04064](#).
- [31] S. Choi, C. J. Turner, H. Pichler, W. W. Ho, A. A. Michailidis, Z. Papić, M. Serbyn, M. D. Lukin, and D. A. Abanin, *Physical Review Letters* **122**, 220603 (2019).
- [32] M. Schechter and T. Iadecola, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 147201 (2019).
- [33] S. Chattopadhyay, H. Pichler, M. D. Lukin, and W. W. Ho, (2019), [arXiv:1910.08101v1](#).
- [34] T. Iadecola and M. Schechter, (2019), [arXiv:1910.11350v1](#).
- [35] C. Lancien and D. Pérez-García, (2019), [arXiv:1906.11682v1](#).
- [36] G. De Chiara, T. Calarco, S. Fishman, and G. Morigi, *Physical Review A* **78**, 043414 (2008).
- [37] J. Goold, T. Fogarty, N. L. Gullo, M. Paternostro, and T. Busch, *Physical Review A* **84**, 063632 (2011).
- [38] M. Knap, A. Shashi, Y. Nishida, A. Imambekov, D. A. Abanin, and E. Demler, *Physical Review X* **2**, 041020 (2012).
- [39] M. Cetina, M. Jag, R. S. Lous, I. Fritsche, J. T. Walraven, R. Grimm, J. Levinsen, M. M. Parish, R. Schmidt, M. Knap, *et al.*, *Science* **354**, 96 (2016).
- [40] P. Bocchieri and A. Loinger, *Physical Review* **107**, 337 (1957).
- [41] D. Wallace, *J. Math. Phys.* **56**, 022105 (2015).
- [42] F. G. Brandao and M. Cramer, (2015), [arXiv:1502.03263](#).
- [43] H. Wilming, M. Goihl, I. Roth, and J. Eisert, *Physical Review Letters* **123** (2019), 10.1103/physrevlett.123.200604.
- [44] C. Beck, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **41**, 67 (1990).
- [45] E. H. Lieb and D. W. Robinson, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **28**, 251 (1972).
- [46] N. Schuch, M. M. Wolf, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, *Physical review letters* **100**, 030504 (2008).
- [47] H. Wilming, M. Goihl, C. Krumnow, and J. Eisert, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:1704.06291](#) (2017), [arXiv:1704.06291 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [48] T. R. de Oliveira, C. Charalambous, D. Jonathan, M. Lewenstein, and A. Riera, *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 033032 (2018).
- [49] H. Wilming, T. R. de Oliveira, A. J. Short, and J. Eisert, “Equilibration times in closed quantum many-body systems,” in *Thermodynamics in the quantum regime - recent progress and outlook*, edited by F. Binder, L. A. Correa, C. Gogolin, J. Anders, and G. Adesso (Springer, Berlin, 2018).
- [50] C. Fuchs and J. van de Graaf, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **45**, 1216 (1999).
- [51] A. S. L. Malabarba, L. P. García-Pintos, N. Linden, T. C. Farrelly, and A. J. Short, *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 012121 (2014).
- [52] L. P. García-Pintos, N. Linden, A. S. L. Malabarba, A. J. Short, and A. Winter, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031027 (2017).
- [53] M. Kliesch, C. Gogolin, and J. Eisert, in *Many-Electron Approaches in Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics* (Springer International Publishing, 2014) pp. 301–318.

Appendix A: Technical proofs of main results

1. Proof of Inequality (2)

Here we show inequality (2), using the notation $|\Psi(t)\rangle = U_t |\Psi\rangle$. First, from the triangle inequality and the unitary invariance of the trace-norm, we find

$$\| |\Psi(0)\rangle\langle\Psi(0)| - |\Psi(m\tau)\rangle\langle\Psi(m\tau)| \|_1 \leq m \| |\Psi(0)\rangle\langle\Psi(0)| - |\Psi(\tau)\rangle\langle\Psi(\tau)| \|_1. \quad (\text{A1})$$

We now make use of the Fuchs-van de Graaf inequalities [50]

$$1 - F(\rho, \sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \sqrt{1 - F(\rho, \sigma)^2}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $F(\rho, \sigma) = \|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}\|_1$ is the fidelity between two quantum states. In our case we have

$$F(t) = |\langle\Psi(t)|\Psi(0)\rangle| = F(|\Psi(t)\rangle\langle\Psi(t)|, |\Psi(0)\rangle\langle\Psi(0)|). \quad (\text{A3})$$

Using $F(\tau)^2 = (1 - \epsilon)^2 \geq 1 - 2\epsilon$, we thus find

$$1 - F(m\tau) \leq m\sqrt{1 - F(\tau)^2} \leq m\sqrt{2\epsilon}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

which proves the claim.

2. Proof of Lemma 1

The proof follows from simple applications of inequalities between complex numbers. Since $f(0) = 1$, we have

$$|F(\tau) - F(0)| = \left| e^{-i\alpha(\tau)} f(\tau) - f(0) \right| \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$= \left| \sum_j |c_j|^2 \left(1 - e^{-i\alpha(\tau) - iE_j\tau} \right) \right|. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Since for any complex number we have $|z| = \sqrt{\text{Re}z^2 + \text{Im}z^2} \geq |\text{Re}z|$, we get the lower bound

$$|F(\tau) - F(0)| \geq \sum_j |c_j|^2 (1 - \cos(E_j\tau + \alpha(\tau))). \quad (\text{A7})$$

We now split up the summation in terms of the intervals $\Delta_\delta(l)$ and $\bar{\Delta}_\delta(l)$ and neglect the contributions from $\Delta_\delta(l)$. This yields a lower bound

$$|F(\tau) - F(0)| \geq \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j: E_j \in \bar{\Delta}_\delta(l)} |c_j|^2 (1 - \cos(E_j\tau + \alpha(\tau))). \quad (\text{A8})$$

For $E_j \in \bar{\Delta}_\delta(l)$ we have that

$$\cos(E_j\tau + \alpha(\tau)) \leq \cos(\delta). \quad (\text{A9})$$

We hence obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\geq |F(\tau) - F(0)| \geq (1 - \cos(\delta)) \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p(\bar{\Delta}_\delta(l)) \\ &\Rightarrow \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p(\bar{\Delta}_\delta(l)) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{1 - \cos(\delta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

Using the normalization of the probability distribution of energy, we then find

$$1 - \frac{\epsilon}{1 - \cos(\delta)} \leq \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} p(\Delta_\delta(l)). \quad (\text{A11})$$

3. Proof of Lemma 2

We first need the Berry-Esseen theorem for local Hamiltonians from [42], which reads as follows.

Theorem 5. (Lemma 8 of [42]) *Let $|\Psi\rangle$ be a state with a finite correlation length, energy variance σ , and a local Hamiltonian with uniformly bounded local terms, of a system of N particles on a D -dimensional lattice. Given the cumulative function*

$$J(x) = \sum_{E_i \leq x} |c_i|^2 \quad (\text{A12})$$

and the Gaussian cumulative function

$$G(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{dt}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{(t-H)^2}{2\sigma^2}}, \quad (\text{A13})$$

then

$$\sup_x |J(x) - G(x)| \leq C \frac{\log^{2D}(N)}{s^3 \sqrt{N}}, \quad (\text{A14})$$

where C is a constant and $s = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}}$.

The proof of Lemma 2 follows straightforwardly from this result. Let us first recall the definition of $p(\Delta_\delta(l))$ from the main text,

$$p(\Delta_\delta(l)) = \sum_{i: E_i \in \Delta_\delta(l)} |c_i|^2, \quad (\text{A15})$$

where $\Delta_\delta(l) = \frac{2\pi l + \alpha(\tau)}{\tau} + [-\frac{\delta}{\tau}, \frac{\delta}{\tau}]$. Using the notation of Theorem 5, we can write

$$p(\Delta_\delta(l)) = J\left(\frac{2\pi l + \alpha(\tau)}{\tau} + \frac{\delta}{\tau}\right) - J\left(\frac{2\pi l + \alpha(\tau)}{\tau} - \frac{\delta}{\tau}\right). \quad (\text{A16})$$

Now, using the triangle inequality and the Berry-Esseen bound,

$$|J(x+y) - J(x)| \leq |G(x+y) - G(x)| + |J(x+y) - G(x+y) + G(x) - J(x)| \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$\leq |G(x+y) - G(x)| + 2 \sup_x |J(x) - G(x)| \quad (\text{A18})$$

$$\leq |G(x+y) - G(x)| + K \frac{\log^{2D}(N)}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad (\text{A19})$$

where $K \geq 2C/s^3$. By definition we have that, for all $x \geq 0$,

$$|G(x+y) - G(x)| = \int_x^{x+y} \frac{dt}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{(t-\langle H \rangle)^2}{2\sigma^2}} \leq \int_{-y/2+\langle H \rangle}^{y/2+\langle H \rangle} \frac{dt}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{(t-\langle H \rangle)^2}{2\sigma^2}} = \int_{-y/2}^{y/2} \frac{dt}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}} \leq \frac{y}{2\sigma}, \quad (\text{A20})$$

where in the last step we have used that $\text{Erf}[x] \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-x}^x dt e^{-t^2} \leq \sqrt{2x}$. Setting $y = \frac{2\delta}{\tau}$ completes the proof.

4. Proof of Theorem 3

The proof follows an argument first found in [51, 52], combined with the Berry-Esseen theorem (see section A3). Since the integrand of the LHS is positive, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \frac{dt}{T} |F(t)|^2 &\leq \frac{5}{4} \int_0^T \frac{T dt}{T^2 + (t - \frac{T}{2})^2} |F(t)|^2 \quad (\text{A21}) \\ &= \sum_{l,m} |c_l|^2 |c_m|^2 \frac{5}{4} \int_0^T \frac{T dt}{T^2 + (t - \frac{T}{2})^2} e^{-it(E_l - E_m)} \\ &\leq \sum_{l,m} |c_l|^2 |c_m|^2 \frac{5}{4} \left| \int_0^T \frac{T dt}{T^2 + (t - \frac{T}{2})^2} e^{-it(E_l - E_m)} \right| \\ &= \frac{5\pi}{4} \sum_{l,m} |c_l|^2 |c_m|^2 e^{-T|E_l - E_m|} \end{aligned}$$

Appendix B of [51] (and also Appendix B of [52]) then shows that

$$\sum_{l,m} |c_l|^2 |c_m|^2 e^{-T|E_l - E_m|} \leq 4 \max_E \sum_{E_l \in \{E, E+1/T\}} |c_l|^2 \equiv 4\xi(1/T). \quad (\text{A22})$$

Next, we use again the Berry-Esseen theorem (Theorem 5). Note that we can write

$$\xi(1/T) = \max_E J(E+1/T) - J(E). \quad (\text{A23})$$

Let us define E^* as the solution of the optimization in Eq. (A23). This yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi(1/T) - G\left(E^* + \frac{1}{T}\right) + G(E^*)| &\leq 2 \sup_x |J(x) - G(x)| \\ &\leq 2C \frac{\log^{2D}(N)}{s^3 \sqrt{N}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A24})$$

where in the first line we use the triangle inequality, and in the second the Berry-Esseen. Thus

$$\int_0^T \frac{dt}{T} |F(t)|^2 \leq 5\pi \left(G\left(E^* + \frac{1}{T}\right) - G(E^*) \right) + 10\pi C \frac{\log^{2D}(N)}{s^3 \sqrt{N}} \quad (\text{A25})$$

$$\leq 5\pi \text{Erf}[1/(\sqrt{2\sigma}T)] + 10\pi C \frac{\log^{2D}(N)}{s^3 \sqrt{N}}, \quad (\text{A26})$$

where $\text{Erf}[x] \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-x}^x dt e^{-t^2}$. The result now follows from the fact that $\text{Erf}[x] \leq \sqrt{2}x$ and setting $K' \geq 10\pi C/s^3$.

5. Proof of Theorem 4

The proof of Theorem 4 relies on Lieb-Robinson (LR) bounds [45], which apply under our assumptions on the Hamiltonian stated in the main text. LR bounds can be stated in different ways, see Ref. [53] for a review. For our purposes, the following formulation will be most suitable. To state it, we have to set up some notation. For any region X of the lattice $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}_L^D$, we define

$$H_X = \sum_{x: \text{supp}(h_x) \subseteq X} h_x \quad (\text{A27})$$

as the sum of Hamiltonian terms supported in the region X . For any region X we define the complement $X^c = \Lambda \setminus X$ and $|X|$ to be the number of lattice sites contained in X . For any two regions of the lattice X, Y we denote by $d(X, Y)$ the lattice distance between the regions. For any region X we further define U_t^X as the unitary propagator for time t under the Hamiltonian H_X . Given our conventions, we thus have $U_t = U_t^\Lambda$. Now let A be a local observable. By abuse of notation, we also denote by A its supporting region on the lattice and hence by $|A|$ the corresponding number of sites of the lattice on which it acts. We further define

$$A^X(t) = U_t^{X^\dagger} \hat{A} U_t^X, \quad A_\Lambda(t) = A(t). \quad (\text{A28})$$

We are now in position to state the LR bounds that we will use.

Lemma 3 (Lieb-Robinson bounds). *Let A be a local observable and H a strictly local, and uniformly bounded Hamiltonian. Then there exist constants $K_{\text{LR}}, v_{\text{LR}} \geq 0$ such that for all X with $l := d(A, X^c) \geq 2D - 1$ we have*

$$\|A^X(t) - A(t)\| \leq \|A\| K_{\text{LR}} l^{D-1} e^{v_{\text{LR}} t - l}. \quad (\text{A29})$$

The Lieb-Robinson bounds tell us that we can approximate the time evolution of a local observable A by time evolution constrained to a neighbourhood X around it as long as the distance l from A to the complement of X is much larger than $v_{\text{LR}} t$. In turn this implies that regions on a lattice that are a distance l apart cannot build up significant correlations within a time much smaller than l/v_{LR} .

For now, we will keep the proof slightly more general than the statement in the theorem and consider an initial state $|\Psi\rangle = \otimes_x |\psi_x\rangle$ that need not be translationally invariant. We then specialize to the latter case towards the end of the proof. In the following we write $|\Psi(\tau)\rangle = U_\tau |\Psi\rangle$. First, using that $|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi(0)\rangle$ is a product state, we find for any region A :

$$|\langle \Psi(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle|^2 = \langle \Psi(\tau) | \otimes_{x \in \Lambda} |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x| | \Psi(\tau) \rangle \leq \langle \Psi(\tau) | \otimes_{x \in A} |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x| \otimes \mathbf{1}_{A^c} | \Psi(\tau) \rangle. \quad (\text{A30})$$

Viewing $A_x = |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x| \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\Lambda \setminus \{x\}}$ as a local observable supported on site $x \in A$ and $A = \otimes_{x \in A} |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x| \otimes \mathbf{1}_{A^c}$ as one supported on region A , we can then make use of the Heisenberg picture to get

$$|\langle \Psi(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle|^2 \leq \langle \Psi(0) | A(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle. \quad (\text{A31})$$

We now fix the region A to consist of a sub-lattice of sites, all of which are a distance $2(l+1)+r$ apart from each other, where r is the maximum diameter of the support size of the Hamiltonian terms:

$$r = \max_{x \in \Lambda} |\text{diam}(\text{supp}(h_x))|. \quad (\text{A32})$$

The distance l will be fixed later. We define $B_x(l)$ to be an l -neighbourhood of x ,

$$B_x(l) = \{y \in \Lambda \mid d(x, y) \leq l\}, \quad (\text{A33})$$

and set $X = \cup_{x \in A} B_x(l-1)$. With this choice we have $d(A, X^c) = l$ and

$$U_t^X = \prod_{x \in A} V^x(t), \quad (\text{A34})$$

where $V^x(t)$ is only supported within $B_x(l-1)$, which implies

$$A^X(t) = \prod_{x \in A} A^x(t). \quad (\text{A35})$$

Using the LR-bounds and that $|\Psi(0)\rangle$ is a product state, we then find

$$\langle \Psi(0) | A(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle \leq \langle \Psi(0) | A^X(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle + K_{\text{LR}} l^{D-1} e^{v_{\text{LR}} \tau - l} = \prod_{x \in A} \langle \Psi(0) | A_x^X(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle + K_{\text{LR}} l^{D-1} e^{v_{\text{LR}} \tau - l}. \quad (\text{A36})$$

We can now make use of the LR-bounds again to approximate each factor:

$$\langle \Psi(0) | A_x^X(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle \leq \langle \Psi(0) | A_x(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle + K_{\text{LR}} l^{D-1} e^{v_{\text{LR}} \tau - l} = \langle \Psi(\tau) | A_x | \Psi(\tau) \rangle + K_{\text{LR}} l^{D-1} e^{v_{\text{LR}} \tau - l}. \quad (\text{A37})$$

Using that $\|A(t)\| = \|A^X(t)\| = \|A_x^X(t)\| = \|A_x(t)\| = 1$, we can then bound

$$\langle \Psi(0) | A(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle \leq \prod_{x \in A} \langle \Psi(0) | A_x(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle + 2|A| K_{\text{LR}} l^{D-1} e^{v_{\text{LR}} \tau - l}. \quad (\text{A38})$$

However, we also have

$$\langle \Psi(0) | A_x(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle = \langle \Psi(\tau) | |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x| \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}^c} | \Psi(\tau) \rangle = \text{Tr} [\rho_x(\tau) |\psi_x\rangle \langle \psi_x|] =: \exp(-k_x(\tau)). \quad (\text{A39})$$

Putting the bounds together and using the assumption

$$k(\tau) = \min_{x \in \Lambda} k_x(\tau) > 0, \quad (\text{A40})$$

we thus find

$$|\langle \Psi(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle|^2 \leq \exp(-k(\tau)|A|) + 2|A| K_{\text{LR}} l^{D-1} \exp(v_{\text{LR}} \tau - l). \quad (\text{A41})$$

We now choose $l = (L^D k(\tau))^{1/(1+D)}$. For large enough L , we then find

$$|A| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{L}{l} \right)^D = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{L^D}{k(\tau)} \right)^{\frac{D}{1+D}}, \quad (\text{A42})$$

$$|A| \geq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{L^D}{k(\tau)} \right)^{\frac{D}{1+D}}. \quad (\text{A43})$$

This leads to

$$|\langle \Psi(\tau) | \Psi(0) \rangle|^2 \leq \left[1 + K_{\text{LR}} \left(\frac{L^D}{k(\tau)} \right)^{\frac{D}{1+D}} (L^D k(\tau))^{D-1/(D+1)} e^{v_{\text{LR}} \tau} \right] \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4} (L^D k(\tau))^{1/(1+D)}\right) \quad (\text{A44})$$

$$= \left[1 + K_{\text{LR}} \left(\frac{N^{2D-1}}{k(\tau)} \right)^{\frac{D}{1+D}} \right] \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4} (Nk(\tau))^{1/(1+D)}\right) \quad (\text{A45})$$

$$= \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left(-\frac{1}{4} (Nk(\tau))^{1/(1+D)}\right)\right). \quad (\text{A46})$$

What is left is to show that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a $\tau < \delta$ such that $k(\tau) > 0$. To do this, we now make use of translational invariance, so that $k(\tau) = k_x(\tau)$ for any $x \in \Lambda$. Suppose now contrarily that there exists a $\delta > 0$ and $k(\tau) = 0$ for all $\tau < \delta$. This means that $k(\tau)$ is constant over an open interval. But since on any finite system $k(\tau)$ is an analytic function, it then has to be constant. This in turn implies that

$$\rho_x(\tau) = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_x \quad (\text{A47})$$

for all τ , which implies that the initial state is an eigenstate. This finishes the proof of Theorem 4. We emphasize that we only used translational invariance of the initial state to argue that $k(\tau) > 0$. It should be clear from the argument given above that it can be generalized to situations where, for example, the initial state is translationally invariant with a higher period, or is only a product state after neighboring spins are blocked together.

Appendix B: Comparing the bounds with previous results

To illustrate the tightness of our bounds, we compare our results with those of a recently found model with quantum scars and perfect revivals in Ref. [32]. The model is the spin-1 XY model in a hypercubic lattice with $N = L^D$ particles and Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (S_i^x S_j^x + S_i^y S_j^y) + h \sum_i S_i^z + D \sum_i (S_i^z)^2, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where S_i^α are the spin-1 operators on site i . In Ref. [32] it was found that this Hamiltonian has $N + 1$ eigenstates $|\mathcal{S}_n\rangle$ with $n \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ which form a representation of $\text{SU}(2)$ and have equally spaced energies $E_n = h(2n - N) + ND$. Moreover, there exists a particular product state $|\Psi_0\rangle = \bigotimes_i |\psi_i\rangle$, the so-called ‘‘nematic Néel’’ state, which is such that

$$|F(t)|^2 = |\langle\Psi_0|e^{-iHt}|\Psi_0\rangle|^2 = \cos^{2N}(ht), \quad (\text{B2})$$

that is, it exhibits perfect revivals at periods of π/h , with a weight suppressed exponentially with the system size. This initial product state can be written as

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^N c_n |\mathcal{S}_n\rangle, \quad c_n^2 = \frac{1}{2^N} \binom{N}{n}, \quad (\text{B3})$$

so that $\langle H \rangle = ND$ and $\sigma = h\sqrt{N}$, which thus fulfills assumptions **i)** and **ii)** from the main text. One can easily calculate that for any $T = \pi l/h$ we have

$$\int_0^T \frac{dt}{T} |F(t)|^2 = \frac{(N - \frac{1}{2})!}{\sqrt{\pi} N!} = (\pi N)^{-1/2} + \mathcal{O}(N^{-3/2}), \quad (\text{B4})$$

which shows that the scaling of Theorem 3 is close to optimal.

For a bi-partition of the lattice $N = N_A + N_B$ with $N_A \leq N_B$, the scar eigenstates have a Schmidt decomposition $|\mathcal{S}_n\rangle = \sum_{k=0}^K \sqrt{\lambda_k^{(n)}} |i_{k,A}^{(n)}\rangle \otimes |i_{k,B}^{(n)}\rangle$ where $K = \max\{n, N_A\}$. The coefficients are calculated to be

$$\lambda_k^{(n)} = \frac{\binom{N_A}{k} \binom{N_B}{n-k}}{\binom{N}{n}}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Let us choose $N_A = N_B = N/2$. The Rényi- ∞ entropy can now be easily obtained by noting that for all n , the largest Schmidt coefficient is given by

$$\lambda_{\max}^{(n)} = \frac{\binom{N/2}{n/2}^2}{\binom{N}{n}}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Let us now do the change of variables $n = bN$, so that b is a $\mathcal{O}(1)$ number for the $\mathcal{O}(N)$ eigenstates in the bulk of the

spectrum. For large N , using Stirling's approximation, we find that

$$\left(\frac{N/2}{bN/2}\right)^2 \simeq \frac{1}{\pi N b(1-b)} \left(\frac{N}{2} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{bN}{2}\right)^b \left(\frac{(1-b)N}{2}\right)^{(1-b)}}\right)^N \quad (\text{B7})$$

$$\left(\frac{N}{bN}\right) \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi b(1-b)N}} \left(N \frac{1}{(bN)^b ((1-b)N)^{(1-b)}}\right)^N, \quad (\text{B8})$$

which leads to

$$\lambda_{\max}^{(n)} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi b(1-b)N}}, \quad (\text{B9})$$

and therefore

$$S_{\infty} \equiv -\log \lambda_{\max}^{(n)} \simeq \frac{1}{2} \log N + \frac{1}{2} \log(\pi b(1-b)/2). \quad (\text{B10})$$

This, together with the inequalities for Rényi entropies $S_{\alpha} \geq S_{\infty}$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$ and

$$\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} S_{\alpha} \leq S_{\infty} \quad \forall \alpha \geq 1, \quad (\text{B11})$$

implies that all the Rényi entropies with $\alpha > 1$ of the $\mathcal{O}(N)$ eigenstates also scale logarithmically, and that the Rényi entropies for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ scale at least logarithmically. Similar conclusions can likely be reached with further models in the literature such as [31, 33]. In contrast, Corollary 1 only guarantees the existence of $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N}/\log^{2D}(N))$ eigenstates in which the Rényi entropies with $\alpha > 1$ scale at most logarithmically.