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We introduce a novel measure for the quantum property commonly known as magic by considering the Rényi entropy of the probability distribution associated to a pure quantum state given by the square of the expectation value of Pauli strings in that state. We show that this is a good measure of magic from the point of view of resource theory and show bounds with other known measures of magic. The Rényi entropy of magic has the advantage of being easily computable because it does not need a minimization procedure. We define the magic power of a unitary operator as the average entropy of magic attainable by the action of this operator on the magic-free states, that is, stabilizer states, and show the basic properties of this quantity. As an application, we show that the magic power is intimately connected to out-of-time-order correlation functions and that maximal levels of magic are necessary for quantum chaos.

Introduction.— Quantum physics is inherently different from classical physics and this difference comes in two layers. First, quantum correlations are stronger than classical correlations and do violate Bell’s inequalities[1, 2]. Classical physics can only violate Bell’s inequalities at the expense of locality. Second, based on the assumption that P ≠ NP, quantum physics is exponentially harder to simulate than classical physics[3]. The theory of quantum computation is based on the fact that, by harnessing this complexity, quantum computers would be exponentially faster at solving certain computational tasks[3–7].

It is a striking fact that these two layers have a hierarchy: entanglement can be created by means of quantum circuits that can be efficiently simulated on a classical computer[8]. These states are called stabilizer states (STAB) and they constitute the orbit of the Clifford group, that is, the normalizer of the Pauli group. Therefore, starting from states in the computational bases, quantum circuits with gates from the Clifford group can be simulated on a classical computer, in spite of being capable of making highly entangled states. The second layer of quantumness thus needs non Clifford gates. These resources are necessary to unlock quantum advantage. Since there is never a free lunch, non-Clifford resources are harder to implement both at the experimental level and for the sake of error correction[9–13]. States beyond stabilizer states are said to possess magic. Understanding magic in quantum states is of fundamental importance to understand the achievable quantum advantage in schemes of quantum computing[14–17] or other quantum information protocols[18, 19].

In a broader context, one would like to know what is the bearing of this second layer of quantumness on other fields of physics: from black holes and quantum chaos[20, 21] to quantum many-body theory[21], entanglement theory[22], and quantum thermodynamics[23].

Standard measures of magic are based on general resource theory considerations. A good measure of magic must be stable under operations that send stabilizer states into stabilizer states and faithful, that is, stabilizer states (and only those) must have zero magic. The most important standard measures of magic are the Max-relative entropy of magic, the Min-relative entropy of magic, and the free robustness of magic. All these measures involve computing an extreme over all the possible Pauli decompositions of a state, and are therefore very hard to compute. The extremization procedure is fundamental to obtain faithfulness for general quantum states. However, if one is concerned with unitary evolutions and therefore only with pure quantum states, one can find other good measures of magic that are easier to compute, thereby providing an effective way of understanding quantum dynamics from the point of view of the resource theory of magic.

In this paper, we define a measure of magic for pure states as the Rényi entropy associated to the probability of a state being represented by a given Pauli string. We show that this quantity is well behaved from the point of view of resource theory and that is sandwiched between other known measures of magic. Then we proceed to investigate how much entropy of magic a unitary operator can achieve on average on the stabilizer states, that is, the free resources. In this way we study the magic power of several quantum gates or ensembles of unitaries.
Finally, we show that the magic power of a quantum evolution can be cast in terms of out-of-time-order correlation functions (OTOCs) and that is thus a necessary ingredient of quantum chaos.

Rényi Entropy of Magic.— In this section, we define a family of magic measure for pure states. Let \( \mathcal{P}_n \) be the group of all \( n \)-qubit Pauli strings with phases \( \pm 1 \) and \( \pm i \), then let \( \mathcal{P}_n := \mathcal{P}_n/(\pm \mathbb{I}) \) the quotient group containing all \( +1 \) phases and define \( \Xi_P(\psi) := d^{-1} \langle \psi | P | \psi \rangle^\frac{1}{2} \) as the scaled (normalized) expectation value of \( P \) in the pure state \( |\psi\rangle \), with \( d = 2^n \) the dimension of the Hilbert space of \( n \) qubits. Note that \( \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} \Xi_P(\psi) = tr|\psi\rangle \langle \psi| = 1 \). Thus, since \( \Xi_P(\psi) \geq 0 \) and sum to one, \( \{\Xi_P(\psi)\} \) is a probability distribution. We can see \( \Xi_P(\psi) \) as the probability of finding \( P \) in the representation of the state \( |\psi\rangle \). We can now define the \( \alpha \)-Rényi entropies associated to this probability distribution as:

\[
M_\alpha(\psi) := (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \log \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} \Xi_P^\alpha(\psi) - \log d \tag{1}
\]

where we have introduced a shift of \(-\log d\) for convenience. Now let \( \Xi(\psi) \) the vector with \( d^2 \) entries labeled by \( \mathcal{P}_n \); then we can rewrite the \( \alpha \)-Rényi entropy of magic in terms of its linearization norm as:

\[
M_\alpha(\psi) = \alpha(1 - \alpha)^{-1} \log \|\Xi(\psi)\|_\alpha - \log d \tag{2}
\]

The Rényi entropy of magic is a good measure of magic from the point of view of resource theory. Indeed, it has the following properties:

(i) faithfulness: \( M_\alpha(\psi) = 0 \) iff \( |\psi\rangle \in \text{STAB} \), otherwise \( M_\alpha(\psi) > 0 \).

(ii) stability under free operations \( C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}) \):

\[
M_\alpha(C|\psi\rangle) = M_\alpha(\psi) \tag{3}
\]

(iii) additivity:

\[
M_\alpha(|\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle) = M_\alpha(|\psi\rangle) + M_\alpha(|\phi\rangle) \tag{4}
\]

The proof can be found in the App.A1. We are particularly interested in the case \( \alpha = 2 \):

\[
M_2(\psi) = -\log d \|\Xi(\psi)\|_2^2 \tag{5}
\]

the above quantity can be rewritten in terms of the projector \( Q := d^{-2} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} P \otimes 4 \) as:

\[
M_2(\psi) = -\log d \tr(Q|\psi\rangle \langle \psi| \otimes 4) .
\]

The \( \alpha \)-Rényi entropies of magic are upper bounded as \( M_\alpha(\psi) \leq \log d \). The proof is elementary: from the hierarchy of Rényi-entropies we have that for any \( \alpha > 0 \), \( M_\alpha(|\psi\rangle) \leq \log \text{card}(\langle\psi\rangle)/d \), then note that \( \text{card}(\langle\psi\rangle) \leq d^2 \), where \( \text{card}(\langle\psi\rangle) \) is the number of non-zero entries of \( \Xi(\psi) \). This bound is generally quite loose for pure states. For the \( 2-\text{Rényi} \) entropy of magic we can obtain a tighter bound:

\[
M_2(\psi) < \log(d + 1) - \log 2 .
\]

This is easy to see by picking an Hermitean operator \( \rho \) and setting \( \Xi_1(\rho) := \tr(\rho) = d^{-1} \) and \( \Xi_\ell(\rho) := \tr(\rho^\ell) = d^{-1}(d + 1)^{-1} \) for all \( \ell \neq 1 \) which maximizes the \( 2-\text{Rényi} \) entropy by keeping \( \tr\rho = 1 \) and \( \tr\rho^2 = 1 \), although \( \rho \) results being non-positive in general [24].

Another useful measure of magic is given by the linear entropy of magic, defined as:

\[
M_{\text{lin}}(\psi) = 1 - d \|\Xi(\psi)\|_2^2
\]

which obeys the following properties:

(i) faithfulness: \( M_{\text{lin}}(\psi) = 0 \) iff \( |\psi\rangle \in \text{STAB} \), otherwise \( M_{\text{lin}}(\psi) > 0 \).

(ii) stability under free operations \( C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}) \):

\[
M_{\text{lin}}(C|\psi\rangle) = M_{\text{lin}}(|\psi\rangle) .
\]

(iii) upper bound:

\[
M(|\psi\rangle) < 1 - 2(d + 1)^{-1}
\]

the proofs are easy consequences of the previous considerations.

Let us now show how this measure of magic compares to other measures: the min-relative entropy of magic is defined as:

\[
D_{\min}(\psi) := -\log \max_{\sigma \in \text{STAB}} \langle \sigma | \psi \rangle^2 \tag{6}
\]

and the stabilizer nullity [26, 27] as:

\[
\nu(\psi) := d - \log |\text{St}(\psi)| ,
\]

where \( \text{St}(\psi) := \{ P \in \mathcal{P}_n : P|\psi\rangle = \pm |\psi\rangle \} \).

**Proposition.** The \( \alpha \)-Rényi entropies are sandwiched between the min-relative entropy of magic and the stabilizer nullity:

\[
D_{\min}(\psi) \leq M_\alpha(\psi) \leq \nu(\psi) \tag{7}
\]

the proof can be found in App.A2. Notice that for \( \alpha = 1/2 \), the Rényi entropy reduces to \( M_{1/2}(\psi) = 2 \log D(\psi) \), where \( D(\psi) := d^{-1} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} |\tr(P|\psi\rangle \langle \psi|)| \) is the stabilizer norm defined in [28]. More generally, the \( \alpha \)-Rényi entropies (with \( \alpha \geq 1/2 \)) can be upper bounded by twice the log-free robustness of magic [29]:

\[
\mathcal{R}(\psi) := \min_{\sigma_i} \{ |\langle x_1 | \psi \rangle|^2 \} = \sum_i \langle x_i | \sigma_i \rangle \subset \text{STAB} \}
\]

\[
M_\alpha(\psi) \leq 2 \log \mathcal{R}(\psi) .
\]

The proof of this inequality follows straightforwardly from the hierarchy of Rényi entropies and from the bound proven in [29]: \( D(\psi) \leq \mathcal{R}(\psi) \) for any state \( |\psi\rangle \).

**Example.** In order to understand the advantages of the Rényi entropy of magic in terms of its computability, let us now compute it for \( n \) copies of the
magic state $|H\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + e^{i\pi/4}|1\rangle)$. A straightforward calculation, see App.A.3, yields
\[
M_\alpha(|H\rangle \otimes n) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}(n \log(2^{1-\alpha} + 1) - n) \tag{6}
\]
Note that the computation of the robustness of magic is hard for $n > 5$[29, 30].

**Magic power.**— As we have seen, although being limited to pure states, the Rényi entropy of magic offers the advantage of being easily computable as it does not involve a minimization procedure. As we are concerned with pure states only, we can use this measure to characterize how much magic can be produced by unitary evolution, e.g., quantum gates. We define the magic power of a unitary operator $U$ as
\[
\mathcal{M}(U) := \frac{1}{|\text{STAB}|} \sum_{|\psi\rangle \in \text{STAB}} \mathcal{M}(U|\psi\rangle) \tag{7}
\]
where $\mathcal{M}(|\psi\rangle)$ is one of the entropy of magic measures introduced in the previous section, i.e. one of the $\alpha$–Rényi entropy of magic $M_\alpha(|\psi\rangle)$ or the linear entropy of magic $M_{lin}(|\psi\rangle)$. Also the magic power is invariant under free operations, that is, $\mathcal{M}(U|\psi\rangle) = \mathcal{M}(C_1U|\psi\rangle) = \mathcal{M}(U|C_2\psi\rangle)$, with $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{C}(d)$ and is faithful, that is, $\mathcal{M}(U) = 0$ for the free operations $U \in \mathbb{C}(d)$ and is greater than zero otherwise. A proof of these properties is in App.B.1.

The relationship between the $2$–Rényi magic power and the linear magic power follows easily from the Jensen inequality:
\[
M_2(U) \geq -\log(1 - M_{lin}(U)) \tag{8}
\]
The linear magic power can be computed explicitly by averaging the fourth tensor power of the Clifford group:
\[
M_{lin}(U) = 1 - 4(4 + d)^{-1} - d(4 + d) \times \operatorname{tr}(D_+^{-1} \operatorname{tr}(U^{\otimes 4} \mathcal{Q} U^{\otimes 4} \Pi_{\text{sym}})) \tag{9}
\]
with $\Pi_{\text{sym}} := \frac{1}{d!} \sum_{\pi \in S_d} \mathcal{T}_{\pi}$ the projector onto the completely symmetric subspace of the permutation group $S_d$, $\mathbb{Q} = d^{-2} \sum_p \mathbb{P}^{\otimes 4}$ and $D_+ = \operatorname{tr}(Q \Pi_{\text{sym}}) = (d+1)(d+2)/6$. The proof can be found in App.B.2. This result, through Eq.(8), also gives a lower bound to the $2$–Rényi magic power. In the following, we provide some useful results on the linear magic power (and, through lower bounds, for the $2$–Rényi magic power). First of all, we provide a characterization of those unitaries that have zero power: the linear magic power $M_{lin}(U) = 0$ if and only if $\left\{ Q \Pi_{\text{sym}}, U^{\otimes 4} \right\} = 0$, see App.B.3 for the proof. A second interesting result is a characterization of this quantity in terms of the operator $\Delta Q \Pi_{\text{sym}} := U^{\otimes 4} Q \Pi_{\text{sym}} U^{\otimes 4} - Q \Pi_{\text{sym}}$, that is, the difference between the operator $Q \Pi_{\text{sym}}$ after and before unitary evolution through $U^{\otimes 4}$. We have
\[
M_{lin}(U) = d^2 - d + 1 \|\Delta Q \Pi_{\text{sym}}\|_2^2 \tag{10}
\]
which follows straightforwardly from $\|\Delta Q \Pi_{\text{sym}}\|_2^2 = 2D_+ - 2 \operatorname{tr}(U^{\otimes 4} Q U^{\otimes 4} \Pi_{\text{sym}})$. Then again one can apply the bound Eq.(8) in this form.

After having characterized the magic power of a unitary $U$, we are interested in knowing what is the average value that this quantity attains over the unitary group. We have therefore the following fact: the average linear magic power over the unitary group $U(d)$ is equal to:
\[
E_U[M_{lin}(U)] = 1 - 4(d+3)^{-1} \tag{11}
\]
and consequently the $2$–Rényi magic power is lower bounded by:
\[
E_U[M_2(U)] \geq \log(d+3) - \log 4 \tag{12}
\]
The proof can be found in App.B.5. This average is also typical. The linear magic power indeed shows strong typicality with respect to $U \in U(d)$:
\[
\Pr(\|M_{lin}(U) - E_U[M_{lin}(U)]\| \geq \epsilon) \leq 4e^{-Cd\epsilon^2} \tag{13}
\]
where $C = O(1)$. In other words, the overwhelming majority of unitaries attains a nearly maximum value of $M_{lin}(U) = 1 - \Omega(d^{-1})$. For a proof, see App.B.6. As a corollary, the average $2$–Rényi magic power over the full unitary group $U(d)$ saturates the bound Eq.(12) up to an exponentially small error. Note that, because of the left/right invariance of the Haar measure over groups, the average $2$–Rényi entropy of magic over the all the set of pure states is equal to the average $2$–Rényi magic power over the unitary group, namely $E_{\{\psi\}}\left[M_2(\{\psi\})\right] = E_U[M_2(U)]$. To conclude this section, let us show how the magic power lower bounds the $T$–count $t(U)$, i.e. the minimum number of $T$ gates needed in addition of Clifford resources to obtain a given unitary operator[27]:
\[
t(U) \geq \log_2(d - 4 + d)M_{lin}) + \log_2(d + 3) - 2 \tag{14}
\]
the proof can be found in App.B.4. According to the typicality result, for a generic $U \in U(d)$, with overwhelming probability, one obtains $t(U) \gtrsim \Omega(n)$. $\{\psi\}$.
We notice that magic will converge exponentially fast with which qubits these gates are applied to. From direct evaluation of Eq. (9), we find:

**Example 1 - T-gate.** The linear magic power for a number $k$ of T-gates is equal to:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}}(T^\otimes k \otimes \mathbb{1}^{(n-k)}) = 1 - 24 \times 2^{-5k} + \Omega(d^{-1}) \quad (15)$$

**Example 2 - Toffoli gate.** The linear magic power for a single Toffoli gate reads:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}}(\text{CCNOT} \otimes \mathbb{1}^{(n-3)}) = 21/32 + \Omega(d^{-1}) \quad (16)$$

Notice that the linear magic power of three T-gates is greater than a single Toffoli gate, both being three-qubit gates.

**Magic power and chaos.**— Having defined a measure of magic power, we now use it to investigate some important questions in many-body quantum physics and quantum chaos theory. In[20], it was shown that, in order to obtain the typical behavior of the eight-point out-of-time-order correlation functions (8-OTOC) for universal unitaries, a number of T-gates of order $\Omega(N)$ was both necessary and sufficient. The universal behavior of 8-OTOC is a mark of the onset of quantum chaos[20]. Since the T-gates are non Clifford resources, this raises the more general question of what is the amount of magic necessary to drive a quantum system towards quantum chaos. In[20], the setting is that of a Clifford circuit doped by $k$-layers of non-Clifford one qubit gates, e.g., the $\theta$-phase gates, what we call $k$-doped random quantum Clifford circuit[20, 22, 31, 32]. We start addressing the question of what is the magic power associated to such circuits. We can show that

**Proposition.** The magic power is monotone under a $k$-doped random quantum circuit and it is given by

$$\mathbb{E}_\mathcal{C}_k[\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}}(U)] = 1 - (3 + d)^{-1} \left(4 + (d - 1) f(\theta)^k\right) \quad (17)$$

with $f(\theta) = \frac{7d^2 - 3d + d(d + 3)\cos(4\theta) - 8}{8d^2 - 1}$ The proof can be found in App.C1. Note that iff $k = \Omega(n)$ then $\mathbb{E}_\mathcal{C}_k[\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}}(U)] = \mathbb{E}_\mathcal{U}[\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}}(U)]$, unless, of course, $\theta = \pi/2$ in which case the phase gate is in the Clifford group and $f = 1$. This proposition shows how magic increases with non-Clifford doping. We notice that magic will converge exponentially fast to the universal maximal value with the number $k$ of non-Clifford gates used. This is the same type of behavior shown by the 8-OTOCs[20].

At this point, we are ready to show a direct connection between the R\'enyi entropy of magic and the OTOCs. We have the following

**Theorem.** The linear magic power is equal to the fourth power of the 2-OTOC of the Pauli operators $P_1, P_2$ averaged over both all the initial states with the Haar measure and over the Pauli group, that is,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}}(U) = 1 - 4(d + 4)^{-1} - d^2(d + 3)4^{-1}(d + 4)^{-1} \times \mathbb{E}_{\psi} \left[\langle \text{OTOC}_2(\tilde{P}_1, P_2, \psi)^4 \rangle_{P_1, P_2}\right] \quad (18)$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle_{P_1, P_2}$ is the average over the Pauli group $\mathcal{P}_n$, $\mathbb{E}_{\psi} [\cdot]$ is the Haar average over set of pure states and

$$\langle \text{OTOC}_2(\tilde{P}_1, P_2, \psi) \rangle := \langle \psi | \tilde{P}_1 P_2 | \psi \rangle \quad (19)$$

where $\tilde{P}_1 \equiv U^\dagger P_1 U$. The proof can be found in App.C2. As a corollary, we can bound the 2–R\'enyi magic power in the usual way through Eq.(9).

As we can see, the average fourth power of the 2–OTOC is related to the same moment of the Haar distribution of the following averaged 8 point out-of-time-order correlation function: $\langle \text{OTOC}_8 \rangle := \langle \text{d}^{-1} \text{tr}(P_1 P_2 P_3 P_4 P_1 P_2 P_3 P_5 P_1 P_2 P_3 P_6 P_1 P_2 P_3 P_5) \rangle$, where the average $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is taken over all the Pauli operators $P_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 6$. One can therefore show that the linear magic power is related to the 8-OTOC as follows

**Theorem.** The linear magic power can be expressed as an 8-point OTOC up to an exponentially small error in $d$:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}}(U) \simeq 1 - \frac{4}{(d + 4)} \left(1 - \frac{d^2(d + 3)}{4} \langle \text{OTOC}_8 \rangle\right)$$

The proof can be found in App.C4 and it relies on the fact that the 2–OTOCs have strong typicality with respect to $|\psi\rangle$. We can comment on this last result: in order for the 8–OTOCs to attain the Haar value $\sim d^{-4}$ associated to quantum chaotic behavior (cfr. App.C5), a nearly maximal value of the magic power is necessary.

**Conclusions.**— Harnessing the power of quantum physics to obtain an advantage over classical information processing is at the heart of the efforts to build a quantum computer and finding quantum algorithms. The quantumness beyond classical simulability is quantified in terms of how many non-Clifford resources are necessary, and this notion has been colloquially dubbed magic. This information-theoretic notion is also involved - beyond quantum computation - in physical processes like thermalization, quantum thermodynamics, black holes dynamics, and the
onset of quantum chaotic behavior[20, 21, 33, 34]. In order to investigate these processes through the lens of magic, more amenable measures of magic not relying on extremization procedures are necessary. If one is concerned with closed quantum systems, their physics is described by unitary evolution and one needs to address pure quantum states only. In this paper, we have shown a new measure of magic for pure quantum states in terms of the Rényi entropies of a probability distribution associated to the (squared) expectation values of Pauli strings and show that this is a good measure of magic from the point of view of resource theory. Thanks to this new measure, we can define the notion of magic power of a unitary evolution, i.e., the average magic obtainable with this evolution on the set magic-free states, and show that the onset of quantum chaos requires a maximal amount of the Rényi entropy of magic. In perspective, it would be important to go beyond pure states and address the more general case of completely positive quantum maps describing open quantum systems.
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### Appendix A: α-Rényi entropy of magic

1. Properties of Rényi entropy of magic

In this section, we give a proof of the properties (i), (ii) and (iii) for the α–Rényi entropy of magic. Let us rewrite $M_{\alpha}(|\psi\rangle)$ as

$$M_{\alpha}(|\psi\rangle) = (1 - \alpha)^{-1} \log d - \alpha \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}_n} \langle \psi | p | \psi \rangle^{2\alpha} - \log d$$

(A1)

(i) If $|\psi\rangle$ is a stabilizer state $\langle \psi | p | \psi \rangle = \pm 1$ only for $d$ mutually commuting Pauli operators and thus $M_{\alpha}(|\psi\rangle) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \log d - \log d = 0$. Conversely, let $M_{\alpha}(|\psi\rangle) = 0$, this means that $\|\Xi(|\psi\rangle)\|_{\alpha} = d^{(1 - \alpha)/\alpha}$. From the bound on the $l_p$ norms, namely $\|A\|_p \leq \text{card}(A) \frac{1}{\gamma} \|A\|_q$, setting $\alpha > 1$, putting $p = 2\alpha$ and $q = 2$ we have:

$$\text{card}(\Xi(|\psi\rangle)) \leq d$$

(A2)

since the state is pure we also have $\text{card}(\Xi(|\psi\rangle)) \geq d$ and so $\text{card}(\Xi(|\psi\rangle)) = d$. Moreover, the bound on the $l_p$ norm can be saturated iff $\Xi(|\psi\rangle)$ has $d$ entries with equal weight; in other words we can write the state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ as:

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \frac{1}{d} \sum_p \phi_p p$$

(A3)

where $\phi_p$ are $\pm 1$, this is a stabilizer state[24]. The proof for $\alpha < 1$ follows in a similar fashion by setting $p = 2$ and $q = 2\alpha$. Once proven (i) for $\alpha < 1$ and $\alpha > 1$ we automatically have the proof for $\alpha = 1$ by continuity.

(ii) Let $C \in \mathbb{C}_n$ the Clifford group on $n$–qubits. The action of a Clifford operator on a Pauli operator $P \in \mathbb{P}_n$ reads $C^* PC = \phi Q$ where $Q \in \mathbb{P}_n$, $\phi = \pm 1$, thus trivially the $\alpha$–Rényi magic is conserved for free operations.

(iii) Consider $|\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle$ where $|\psi\rangle \in S(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and $|\phi\rangle \in S(\mathcal{H}_2)$ with $d_1 = \dim \mathcal{H}_1$ and $d_2 = \dim \mathcal{H}_2$, then:

$$M_{\alpha}(|\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \log d_1^{-\alpha}d_2^{-\alpha} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}_n} \langle \psi \otimes \phi | p | \psi \otimes \phi \rangle^{2\alpha} - \log d_1 - \log d_2$$

(A4)

For every $P \in \mathbb{P}_n$ we can write it as $P = P_1 \otimes P_2$, thus $\sum_{P \in \mathbb{P}_n} \langle \psi \otimes \phi | p | \psi \otimes \phi \rangle^{2\alpha} = \sum_{P_1 \in \mathbb{P}_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}_2} \langle \psi | P_1 | \psi \rangle^{2\alpha} \langle \phi | P_2 | \phi \rangle^{2\alpha} \otimes \langle \phi | P_2 | \phi \rangle^{2\alpha} \otimes \langle \phi | P_2 | \phi \rangle^{2\alpha}$ and thus:

$$M_{\alpha}(|\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \log d_1^{-\alpha} \sum_{P_1 \in \mathbb{P}_1} \langle \psi | P_1 | \psi \rangle^{2\alpha} + \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \log d_2^{-\alpha} \sum_{P_2 \in \mathbb{P}_2} \langle \phi | P_2 | \phi \rangle^{2\alpha} - \log d_1 - \log d_2 = M_{\alpha}(|\psi\rangle) + M_{\alpha}(|\phi\rangle)$$

(A5)

this concludes the proof.
2. Bounding the Rényi entropy of magic

In this section, we provide a proof for the bounds to the Rényi entropy of magic given in Eq.(5).

- **Upper bound**: we first prove that:

\[
|\text{St}(|\psi\rangle)| \leq \frac{d^2}{\text{card}(|\psi\rangle)}
\]

(A6)

where we recall that \(\text{St}(|\psi\rangle) := \{P \in \mathcal{P}_n | P|\psi\rangle = \pm |\psi\rangle\}\). Consider a pure state \(|\psi\rangle\) and its expansion in the Pauli basis, i.e. \(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = d^{-1}\sum P |\psi\rangle P\). The number of elements of this sum is, by definition, equal to \(\text{card}(|\psi\rangle)\). Let \(\text{St}(|\psi\rangle) = S\). First, it’s easy to see that \(S\) must be equal to \(2^s\) for some \(s\), because if \(P_1, \ldots, P_s\) stabilize \(|\psi\rangle\) also the group generated by \(P_1, \ldots, P_2\) stabilizes \(|\psi\rangle\) and \(|\langle P_1, \ldots, P_s|\rangle| = 2^s\). Then, in order to \(P_1, \ldots, P_s\) to stabilize \(|\psi\rangle\) they must commute among each other and commute with all the \(\text{card}(|\psi\rangle)\) Pauli operators in the Pauli decomposition of \(|\psi\rangle\). Now, since \(s\) mutually commuting Pauli operators commute at most with \(d^2/2^s\) Pauli operators[35], \(\text{card}(|\psi\rangle)\) cannot exceed \(d^2/2^s\) otherwise \((P_1, \ldots, P_s)\) can never stabilize \(|\psi\rangle\). We conclude that \(\text{card}(|\psi\rangle) \leq d^2/2^s \equiv d^2/|\text{St}(|\psi\rangle)|\). In order to conclude the proof is sufficient to apply the log to this inequality and get

\[
M_0(|\psi\rangle) \equiv \log \frac{\text{card}(|\psi\rangle)}{d} \leq \nu(|\psi\rangle),
\]

(A7)

then from the hierarchy of Rényi entropies one easily gets the upper bound of Eq.(5).

- **Lower bound**: we have \(\lim_{\alpha \to \infty} M_\alpha(|\psi\rangle) = -\log \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} d^{-1} |\langle P|\psi\rangle|^2\). Now, the following chain of inequality holds:

\[
\max_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} d^{-1} |\langle P|\psi\rangle|^2 \leq \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} d^{-1} |\langle \sigma|\psi\rangle| \leq \max_{\sigma \in \text{STAB}} \text{tr}((\langle \sigma|\psi\rangle \langle \psi|\sigma\rangle) = 2^{-D_{\text{min}}(|\psi\rangle))}
\]

(A8)

only the last inequality needs explanations. It comes from the fact that any Pauli operators can be written as a sum of \(d \equiv 2^n\) stabilizer up to relative phases \(\pm 1\), namely \(P = \sum_\sigma \Phi_\sigma \sigma\), therefore:

\[
|\langle P|\psi\rangle| \leq \sum_\sigma |\langle \sigma|\psi\rangle| = d \max_{\sigma \in \text{STAB}} (\langle \psi|\sigma\rangle \langle \sigma|\psi\rangle)
\]

(A9)

taking minus the log of Eq.(A8):

\[
D_{\text{min}}(|\psi\rangle) \equiv \log \max_{\sigma \in \text{STAB}} (\langle \sigma|\psi\rangle \langle \psi|\sigma\rangle) \leq \log \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} d^{-1} |\langle P|\psi\rangle|^2 \equiv M_\infty(|\psi\rangle)
\]

(A10)

lastly, from the hierarchy of Rényi entropies, one obtains the lower bound in Eq.(5).

3. An example: \(\alpha\)-Rényi entropy of magic for the magic state

The magic state is a single qubit quantum state defined as \(|\mathcal{H}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + e^{i\pi/4}|1\rangle\). We can write the density matrix \(|\mathcal{H}\rangle\langle\mathcal{H}|\) in the Pauli decomposition as:

\[
|\mathcal{H}\rangle\langle\mathcal{H}| = \frac{1}{2} |\mathbb{I}| + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} (X - Y)
\]

(A11)

In order to compute the \(\alpha\)-Rényi magic of the \(n\)-fold tensor power, we need to find the vector \(\Xi(|\mathcal{H}\rangle^\otimes n)\) containing the probability distribution in the Pauli basis. Thus we need the following expansion:

\[
|\mathcal{H}\rangle\langle\mathcal{H}|^\otimes n = \frac{1}{2^n} \left( |\mathbb{I}| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (X - Y) \right)^\otimes n
\]

(A12)
It can be easily checked that among the $4^n$ possible Pauli operators we have only $3^n$ non zero entries for $\Xi(|H)^{\otimes n}|$ and $\Xi_\rho(|H)^{\otimes n}| = \frac{1}{2^n n!}$ for $2^k C_n^k$ Pauli operators for $k = 0, \ldots, n$. Indeed, note that:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} 2^k = 3^n \quad (A13)$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} 2^{k} \frac{1}{2^{k+n}} = 1 \quad (A14)$$

$$i.e. \text{the non zero entries are } 3^n \text{ and it is a normalized probability distribution. The } \alpha-\text{Renyi entropy of magic:}$$

$$M_\alpha(|H)^{\otimes n}| = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} 2^{\alpha(n+k)} - n = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} (n \log(2^{1-\alpha} + 1) - n) \quad (A16)$$

**Appendix B: Magic Power**

1. **Properties of the magic power**

   In this section, we give a proof of the properties (i) and (ii) for the magic power presented in the main text.

   (i) Let $C_1, C_2$ be two Clifford operators. Then thanks to the left/right invariance of the Haar measure over the Clifford group, we have $M(U C_2) = M(U)$ and $M(C_1 U C_2) = M(C_1 U)$. Then:

   $$M(C_1 U) = \frac{1}{|STAB|} \sum_{|\psi\rangle \in STAB} M(C_1 U |\psi\rangle) = \frac{1}{|STAB|} \sum_{|\psi\rangle \in STAB} M(U |\psi\rangle) = M(U) \quad (B1)$$

   where we used the stability under Clifford operations of $M(|\psi\rangle)$.

   (ii) For $U \in \mathfrak{C}(d)$ the proof is trivial thanks to the left-right invariance of the Haar measure over the Clifford group. Conversely, if $C \notin \mathfrak{C}(d)$ there exists $|\psi\rangle \in STAB$ such that $U |\psi\rangle \notin STAB$ and thus, thanks to the faithfulness of the magic measure $M(|\psi\rangle)$ over pure states, one has $M(U) > 0$.

2. **Exact computation of the linear magic power: proof of Eq.(9)**

   To prove Eq.9 we first calculate the average over the stabilizer states. Note that

   $$\frac{1}{|STAB|} \sum_{|\psi\rangle \in STAB} \text{tr}(Q U^{\otimes 4} |\psi\rangle \langle \psi\rangle^{\otimes 4} U^{\otimes 4}) = E_C[\text{tr}(Q U^{\otimes 4} C^{\otimes 4} |0\rangle \langle 0\rangle^{\otimes 4} C^{\otimes 4} U^{\otimes 4})] \quad (B2)$$

   i.e. the average over stabilizer states can be seen as the average over the Clifford group $E_C$ on a reference stabilizer state, e.g. $|0\rangle \langle 0\rangle^{\otimes 4}$. The integration of $|0\rangle \langle 0\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ over the Clifford group$^{[20, 24]}$ returns us:

   $$E_C[\text{tr}(Q U^{\otimes 4} C^{\otimes 4} |0\rangle \langle 0\rangle^{\otimes 4} C^{\otimes 4} U^{\otimes 4})] = \frac{1}{d(4+d)} \left(4 + \frac{d}{\text{tr}(Q \Pi_{sym})} \text{tr}(Q U^{\otimes 4} Q \Pi_{sym} U^{\otimes 4})\right) \quad (B3)$$

   We can now look at the average of $M_{lin}(U)$, it reads:

   $$M_{lin}(U) = \frac{1}{|STAB|} \sum_{|\psi\rangle \in STAB} M_{lin}(U |\psi\rangle) = \frac{1}{|STAB|} \sum_{|\psi\rangle \in STAB} (1 - d \|\Xi(U |\psi\rangle)\|^2) \quad (B4)$$
where we used that $\text{STAB}^{-1} \sum_{\psi \in \text{STAB}} = 1$, and for the last equivalence we used the results of Eq. (B3). This concludes the proof.

3. Zero power unitaries

In this section, we prove the characterization for zero power unitaries, i.e. $M_{\text{lin}}(U) = 0$ iff $|U^{\otimes 4}, Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}\rangle = 0$. Starting from Eq. (9), note that:

$$\text{tr}([U^{\otimes 4}, Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}]^2) = 2 \text{tr}(Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}) - 2 \text{tr}(U^{\otimes 4} Q U^{\otimes 4} Q\Pi_{\text{sym}})$$

(B5)

Thus:

$$\text{tr}(U^{\otimes 4} Q U^{\otimes 4} Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}) = \text{tr}(Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}) - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}([U^{\otimes 4}, Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}]^2)$$

(B6)

recalling that $\text{tr}(A^2) \equiv \|A\|^2_2$, we can rewrite the linear magic power as:

$$M_{\text{lin}}(U) = \frac{d}{2(4 + d) \text{tr}(Q\Pi_{\text{sym}})^2} \|U^{\otimes 4}, Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}\|^2_2$$

(B7)

therefore we have $M_{\text{lin}}(U) = 0$ iff $\|U^{\otimes 4}, Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}\|^2_2 = 0$ and this happens iff $|U^{\otimes 4}, Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}\rangle = 0$. This concludes the proof.

4. Lower bound to the $T$–count: proof of Eq. (14)

To prove the bound on the $T$–count, we first find the relationship between magic power and the unitary stabilizer nullity defined in [27] as:

$$v(U) = 2n - \log_2 s(U)$$

(B8)

where $s(U)$ is defined as the number of $\pm 1$ of $\text{tr}(P_1 U P_2 U)/d$ varying $P_1, P_2$ in the Pauli group. Let $\text{St}(U)$ be the set of Pauli operators that returns $\text{tr}(P_1 U P_2 U)/d = \pm 1$, we can bound $s(U)$ as:

$$s(U) = \sum_{P_1, P_2 \in \text{St}(U)} |\text{tr}(P_1 U P_2 U)/d| \leq \sum_{P_1, P_2 \in \text{St}(U)} (\text{tr}(P_1 U P_2 U)/d)^4 \leq \sum_{P_1, P_2 \in \text{St}(U)} (\text{tr}(P_1 U P_2 U)/d)^4$$

(B9)

Now, starting from Eq. (C4):

$$M_{\text{lin}}(U) = 1 - \frac{1}{4 + d} \left( 4 + \frac{(d + 3)}{4d^2} \sum_{P_1, P_2}(E_{\psi}) (|\psi| U P_1 U P_2 |\psi|)^4 \right)$$

(B10)

we can upper bound $M_{\text{lin}}(U)$ using the Jensen inequality for the average on pure states and obtain:

$$M_{\text{lin}}(U) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{4 + d} \left( 4 + \frac{(d + 3)}{4d^2} \sum_{P_1, P_2}(E_{\psi}) (|\psi| U P_1 U P_2 |\psi|)^4 \right) = 1 - \frac{1}{4 + d} \left( 4 + \frac{(d + 3)}{4d^2} \sum_{P_1, P_2}(\text{tr}(U P_1 U P_2))^4 \right)$$

(B11)
using Eq. (B9) we relate the linear magic power to the unitary stabilizer nullity as:

\[
M_{\text{lin}}(U) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{4 + d} \left( 4 + \frac{(d + 3)}{4d^2} \sum_{P_1, P_2} (\text{tr}(U^\dagger P_1 U P_2))^4 \right) = 1 - \frac{1}{4 + d} \left( 4 + \frac{(d + 3)}{4} 2^{-\nu(U)} \right) \tag{B12}
\]

The interesting feature of the unitary stabilizer nullity is that, being submultiplicative with respect to the product of unitaries, it lower bounds the T-counts \(t(U)\), the minimum number of T-gates needed in addition to Clifford circuits to decompose the unitary operator \(U\):

\[
\nu(U) \leq t(U) \tag{B13}
\]

we can further upper bound the linear magic power with the T-counts \(t(U)\) as:

\[
M_{\text{lin}}(U) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{4 + d} \left( 4 + \frac{(d + 3)}{4} 2^{-t(U)} \right) \tag{B14}
\]

Let us express the above bound in terms of \(t(U)\):

\[
t(U) \geq - \log_2 \left( d - \frac{4}{4 + d} M_{\text{lin}}(U) \right) + \log_2 \left( d + 3 \right) - 2 \tag{B15}
\]

5. Average of the magic power over the unitary group: proof of Eqs. (11) and (12)

First of all, note that the average over all the stabilizer states can be treated as the average over the Clifford group on a reference stabilizer state. Since we need to compute the average over the full unitary group, we can exploit the left/right invariance of the Haar measure and avoid averaging over the Clifford group and instead average only over the full unitary group. The result reads:

\[
E_U[M_{\text{lin}}(U)] = E_U[M_{\text{lin}}(U|\psi\rangle)] = 1 - E_U \left[ \text{tr}(Q U^\otimes 4 |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| U^\dagger U^\otimes 4) \right] = 1 - \frac{\text{tr} Q \Pi_{\text{sym}}}{\text{tr} \Pi_{\text{sym}}} = 1 - \frac{4}{d + 3} \tag{B16}
\]

where we used the well known result:

\[
E_U[|\psi^\otimes 4 \rangle \langle \psi^\otimes 4| U^\otimes 4 U^\dagger U^\otimes 4] = \frac{\Pi_{\text{sym}}}{\text{tr} \Pi_{\text{sym}}} \tag{B17}
\]

Then, the proof of Eq. (12) follows easily from Jensen inequality:

\[
E_U[M_2(U)] \geq - \log(1 - E_U[M_{\text{lin}}(U)]) \tag{B18}
\]

6. Typicality of the magic power: an application of Levy’s lemma

Levy’s lemma is frequently employed in quantum mechanics to prove strong concentration bounds on scalar functions of unitary operator \(U \in U(d)\) and of quantum pure states \(|\psi\rangle\), see for example [36–38]. The game consists in bounding the Lipschitz constant \(\eta_f\) of a function \(f\) (cfr. [39]): if one finds \(\lim_{d \to \infty} \frac{\eta_f}{d} = 0\), then Levy’s lemma proves a strong concentration of \(f\) around its average value, for large \(d\). Let us bound the Lipschitz constant of \(M_{\text{lin}}(U)\):

\[
|M_{\text{lin}}(U) - M_{\text{lin}}(V)| = \frac{d}{(4 + d) \text{tr} [\Pi_{\text{sym}} Q]} |\text{tr}(Q \Pi_{\text{sym}} (U^\otimes 4 Q U^\otimes 4 - V^\otimes 4 Q V^\otimes 4))| \leq \frac{d}{(4 + d) \text{tr} [\Pi_{\text{sym}} Q]} \|Q \Pi_{\text{sym}}\|_1 \|U^\otimes 4 Q U^\otimes 4 - V^\otimes 4 Q V^\otimes 4\|_\infty
\]
\[
\leq \frac{2d}{(4 + d)} \|Q\|_{\infty} \|U^{\otimes 4} - V^{\otimes 4}\|_{\infty}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{8d}{(4 + d)} \|U - V\|_{\infty}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{8d}{(4 + d)} \|U - V\|_2
\]

where in the first inequality we used the property of the Schatten $p$–norms: $|\text{tr}(AB)| \leq \|A\|_p \|B\|_q$ with $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$; in the second inequality we employed the following fact:
\[
\|U^{\otimes 4}QU^{\otimes 4} - V^{\otimes 4}QV^{\otimes 4}\|_{\infty} = \|U^{\otimes 4}Q(U^{\otimes 4} - V^{\otimes 4}) + (U^{\otimes 4} - V^{\otimes 4})QV^{\otimes 4}\|_{\infty}
\leq \|Q\|_{\infty}\|U^{\otimes 4} - V^{\otimes 4}\|_{\infty} + \|QV^{\otimes 4}\|_{\infty}\|U^{\otimes 4} - V^{\otimes 4}\|_{\infty}
\leq 2\|Q\|_{\infty}\|U^{\otimes 4} - V^{\otimes 4}\|_{\infty}
\]
and the fact that $\|Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}\|_1 = \text{tr}(Q\Pi_{\text{sym}})$. In the third inequality we used $\|Q\|_{\infty} = 1$ and $\|U^{\otimes 4} - V^{\otimes 4}\|_{\infty} \leq 4\|U - V\|_{\infty}$ and lastly, in the fourth inequality, the hierarchy of the Schatten $p$–norms, namely $\|A\|_p \leq \|A\|_q$ with $p > q$.

We thus find the Lipschitz constant to be bounded by a $O(1)$ constant, namely $\eta \leq \frac{8d}{4 + d}$ and the Levy’s lemma applies (cfr. [38]).

**Appendix C: Magic power and chaos**

1. **Average over the $k$–doped Clifford circuit**

The average over the $k$–doped Clifford circuit can be easily made by exploiting the techniques developed in [20]:

\[
E_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}}(U)} = 1 - a_k \text{tr}(Q\Pi_{\text{sym}}) - b_k \text{tr}(Q\Pi_{\text{sym}})
\]

where we used the average of $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|^{\otimes 4}$ over the doped Clifford circuit (cfr. Application 3 of [20]); for completeness, here we write down the coefficients $a_k$ and $b_k$ for a stabilizer state $|\psi\rangle \in \text{STAB}$ obtained in [20]:

\[
a_k = \frac{24}{(d^2 - 1)(d + 2)(d + 4)} \left(\frac{(d + 3)}{4} - 1\right) \left(\frac{7d^2 - 3d + d(d + 3)\cos(4\theta) - 8}{8(d^2 - 1)}\right)^k
\]
\[
b_k = \frac{1}{D_{\text{sym}}} + \frac{24}{(d^2 - 1)(d + 2)(d + 4)} \left(\frac{4}{d(d + 3)} - \frac{1}{d}\right) \left(\frac{7d^2 - 3d + d(d + 3)\cos(4\theta) - 8}{8(d^2 - 1)}\right)^k
\]

2. **Relating the magic power to the averaged fourth power of the 2–OTOC: proof of Eq. (18)**

Start from Eq. (9) and note that we can write $\Pi_{\text{sym}}$ as:

\[
\Pi_{\text{sym}} = \text{tr}(\Pi_{\text{sym}})E_{|\psi\rangle \langle\psi|^{\otimes 4}}
\]

where $E_{|\psi\rangle}$ is the Haar measure over the set of pure states. Thus we rewrite Eq. (9) as:

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}}(U) = 1 - \frac{1}{4 + d} \left(4 + \frac{d}{\text{tr}(Q\Pi_{\text{sym}})} \text{tr}(\Pi_{\text{sym}})E_{|\psi\rangle} [\text{tr}(U^{\otimes 4}QU^{\otimes 4}Q|\psi\rangle \langle\psi|^{\otimes 4})]\right)
\]
where we used the fact that the average over the Pauli group reads:

\[ \langle \psi \mid \sum_{P_1, P_2} E_{(\psi)} (\langle \psi \mid U^1 P_1 U^2 P_2 \mid \psi \rangle)^4 \rangle \]

\[ \overset{\sim}{=} \]

where \( \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} f(P) \equiv \langle f(P) \rangle_{P \in \mathcal{P}_n} \) is nothing but the average over the Pauli group \( \mathcal{P}_n \) of the function \( f(P) \).

3. Tipicality of the 2–OTOC with respect to \( |\psi\rangle \): further application of Levy’s lemma

In order to prove the above result we make use of the Levy’s lemma[39]. Let us compute the Lipschitz constant of the function \( \text{OTOC}_2(P_1, P_2, \psi) \equiv \langle \psi \mid \hat{P}_1 P_2 \psi \rangle = \text{tr}(\hat{P}_1 P_2 \psi) \):

\[ |\text{OTOC}_2(\hat{P}_1, P_2, \psi) - \text{OTOC}_2(\hat{P}_1, P_2, \phi)| = |\text{tr}(\hat{P}_1 P_2 (\psi - \phi))| \]

\[ \leq \|\hat{P}_1 P_2\|_{\infty} \|\psi - \phi\|_1 \]

\[ = 2 \sqrt{1 - \langle \phi | \phi \rangle^2} \]

\[ \leq 2 |\psi| - |\phi| \]  \hfill (C5)

In the second equality we used the fact that \( \|U\|_{\infty} = 1 \) for any unitary operator. Thus we find that the Lipschitz constant \( \eta \leq 2 \) and Levy’s lemma applies, cfr. [36].

4. The linear magic power and the 8–OTOC

Starting from Eq. (18) and using the fact that the 2–point OTOC shows strong tipicality with respect to \( |\psi\rangle \) we can write:

\[ \mathcal{M}_{\text{lin}}(U) \overset{\sim}{=} 1 - \frac{1}{4 + d} \left( 4 + \frac{(d + 3)d^2}{4} \left( \left( E_{(\psi)} \left[ \text{OTOC}_2(\hat{P}_1, P_2, \psi) \right] \right)^4 \right)_{P_1, P_2} \right) \]

\hfill (C6)

where \( \overset{\sim}{=} \) is an equality up to an exponentially small error in \( d \). The Haar average of the 2–point OTOC with respect to \( |\psi\rangle \) reads:

\[ E_{(\psi)} \left[ \text{OTOC}_2(\hat{P}_1, P_2, \psi) \right] = E_{(\psi)} \left[ \text{tr}(\hat{P}_1 P_2 \psi) \right] = d^{-1} \text{tr}(\hat{P}_1 P_2) \equiv \text{OTOC}_2(\hat{P}_1, P_2) \]  \hfill (C7)

lastly, the following equation holds:

\[ \langle d^{-1} \text{tr}(\hat{P}_1 P_2 p_3 p_4 \hat{P}_1 P_2 p_4 p_5 \hat{P}_1 p_3 p_5 p_6 \hat{P}_1 p_3 p_5 p_6 p_3) \rangle_{P_1, P_4, P_5, P_6} = \text{OTOC}_2(\hat{P}_1, P_2)^4 \]  \hfill (C8)

where we used the fact that the average over the Pauli group reads:

\[ \langle P_3 \hat{P}_1 P_2 P_3 \rangle_{P_3 \in \mathcal{P}_n} = \frac{1}{d} \text{tr}(\hat{P}_1 P_2) \]  \hfill (C9)

5. The average of the 8–OTOC over the full unitary group

In this section we compute the average over the full unitary group of the 8–OTOC defined in the main text as:

\[ \langle \text{OTOC}_8 \rangle \equiv \langle d^{-1} \text{tr}(\hat{P}_1 P_2 p_3 p_4 \hat{P}_1 P_2 p_4 p_5 \hat{P}_1 p_3 p_5 p_6 \hat{P}_1 p_3 p_5 p_6 p_3) \rangle_{P_1, P_2, P_4, P_5, P_6} \]  \hfill (C10)
In order to compute the average we recall the equality proved in the above section and

\[ \mathbb{E}_U[(\langle OTOC_8 \rangle)] = \mathbb{E}_U \left[ \langle OTOC_2(\tilde{P}_1, P_2)^4 \rangle_{P_1, P_2} \right] \]  

(C11)

by standard techniques we obtain:

\[ \mathbb{E}_U[(\langle OTOC_8 \rangle)] = \frac{1}{d^4} \sum_{\pi\sigma} W_{\pi\sigma} \operatorname{tr}(Q_{\pi\pi}) \operatorname{tr}(Q_{\sigma\sigma}) = \frac{4(d^4 - 9d^2 + 6)}{d^6(d^2 - 9)} = \Omega(d^{-4}) \]  

(C12)

where the projector $Q$ is defined as $Q = d^{-2} \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_n} \rho^{\otimes 4}$, $W_{\pi\sigma}$ are the Weingarten functions\cite{40, 41} and $T_{\pi}$ are permutation operators corresponding to permutations $\pi \in S_4$ the symmetric group of order 4.