

Preferred basis derived from eigenstate thermalization hypothesis

Hua Yan, Jiaozi Wang, and Wen-ge Wang*

*Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China and
CAS Key Laboratory of Microscale Magnetic Resonance,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China*

We study the long-time average of the reduced density matrix (RDM) of an m -level central system, which is locally coupled to a large environment, under an overall Schrödinger evolution of the total system. We consider a class of interaction Hamiltonian, whose environmental part satisfies the so-called eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) ansatz with a constant diagonal part in the energy region concerned. On the eigenbasis of the central system's Hamiltonian, $\frac{1}{2}(m-1)(m+2)$ relations among elements of the averaged RDM are derived. When steady states exist, these relations imply the existence of a preferred basis, given by a renormalized Hamiltonian that includes certain averaged impact of the system-environment interaction. Numerical simulations performed for a qubit coupled to a defect Ising chain confirm the analytical predictions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Properties of small open quantum systems, which are coupled to large quantum environments, have attracted lots of attention and been studied extensively in recent decades in various fields of physics [1–5]. Such a central system is described by its reduced density matrix (RDM) and may approach a steady state in many situations. For example, it is now well known that the phenomenon of decoherence, due to interaction with huge quantum environments, may happen in such a way that the RDM becomes approximately diagonal on a so-called preferred (pointer) basis [6–11]. Under pure-dephasing interactions, decoherence has been studied well, with preferred bases given by eigenbases of self-Hamiltonians [10, 12–14]. While, under strong interactions with complex environments and with the self-Hamiltonians negligible, preferred bases may be given by eigenbases of the interaction Hamiltonians [6, 12, 15].

The situation is much more complicated with a generic dissipative interaction, whose Hamiltonian is not commutable with the central system's self-Hamiltonian, due to the interplay of decoherence and relaxation. In this generic case, knowledge about preferred basis is still far from being complete. Under a sufficiently weak interaction and by a first-order perturbation theory, it was found that the system's eigenbasis is approximately a preferred basis under a quantum chaotic environment [16]. And, when the total system's eigenfunctions possess certain special randomness, a preferred basis (if existing) should be given by the eigenbasis of a renormalized self-Hamiltonian [17]. These results are in agreement with a generic expectation for Markovian processes described by Lindblad master equations, as exemplified in solvable models [2, 3, 13]. While, when non-Markovian effects due to dynamics of the total system are taken into account, nonnegligible offdiagonal elements of RDM have been found at long times in various spin-boson models on the

spin's energy basis [18–22].

In this paper, we go further in the study of properties of steady states of small open systems, by directly computing their long-time averaged RDM under overall Schrödinger evolutions of total systems. A key point of our approach is to consider those environments, for which the environmental parts of the interaction Hamiltonians satisfy the so-called eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) ansatz [23–28] and their diagonal elements in the ansatz may be treated as constants within the energy regions of relevance. We are to derive $\frac{1}{2}(m-1)(m+2)$ relations among elements of such an averaged RDM for an m -level central system. When steady state exist, these relations imply that the central system has a preferred (pointer) basis, which is given by the eigenbasis of a renormalized self-Hamiltonian that includes certain impact of the system-environment interaction.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we specify the systems to be studied. In Sec. III, we derive the above-mentioned relations. Numerical simulations are presented in Sec. V, to illustrate validity of the analytical predictions for a central system as a qubit. Finally, conclusions and discussions are given in Sec. VI.

II. SETUP

In this section, we discuss basic properties of the Hamiltonians of the systems to be studied. We use S to denote the central system and use \mathcal{E} to denote its (large) environment which consists of N particles ($N \gg 1$). Hilbert spaces of S and \mathcal{E} are denoted by \mathcal{H}^S and $\mathcal{H}^{\mathcal{E}}$, respectively, with dimensions m and $d_{\mathcal{E}}$. The Hamiltonian of the total system is written as

$$H = H^S + H^I + H^{\mathcal{E}}, \quad (1)$$

where H^S and $H^{\mathcal{E}}$ are self-Hamiltonians of S and \mathcal{E} , respectively, which are obtained in the weak coupling limit, and H^I represents a local interaction Hamiltonian.

Normalized eigenstates of the total system are denoted

* wgwang@ustc.edu.cn

by $|n\rangle$ with energies E_n in the increasing-energy order,

$$H|n\rangle = E_n|n\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Normalized eigenstates of H^S and of $H^\mathcal{E}$ are denoted by $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|i\rangle$, respectively, with labels α and i as positive integers starting from 1. The corresponding eigenenergies are denoted by e_α^S and e_i , both in the increasing-energy order,

$$H^S|\alpha\rangle = e_\alpha^S|\alpha\rangle, \quad (3a)$$

$$H^\mathcal{E}|i\rangle = e_i|i\rangle, \quad (3b)$$

where for brevity we have omitted a superscript \mathcal{E} for e_i . We use Δ_S to indicate the energy scope the central system S , i.e.,

$$\Delta_S := e_m^S - e_1^S. \quad (4)$$

We use H^0 to indicate the uncoupled Hamiltonian,

$$H^0 = H^S + H^\mathcal{E}. \quad (5)$$

Its eigenstates are written as $|\alpha\rangle|i\rangle$, in short, $|\alpha i\rangle$, satisfying $H^0|\alpha i\rangle = E_{\alpha i}|\alpha i\rangle$, where $E_{\alpha i} = e_\alpha^S + e_i$. In the increasing-energy order, we write $|\alpha i\rangle$ as $|E_r\rangle$, with a one-to-one correspondence of $r \leftrightarrow (\alpha, i)$ and $E_r = E_{\alpha i}$,

$$H^0|E_r\rangle = E_r|E_r\rangle \quad (E_r \geq E_{r-1}). \quad (6)$$

Expansions of the states $|n\rangle$ on the two bases of $|\alpha i\rangle$ and $|E_r\rangle$ are written as

$$|n\rangle = \sum_{\alpha i} C_{\alpha i}^n |\alpha i\rangle = \sum_r C_r^n |E_r\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $C_{\alpha i}^n$ and C_r^n are expansion coefficients, giving the energy eigenfunctions (EFs) of $|n\rangle$ on the two bases.

For the simplicity in discussion, we consider a product form of H^I ,

$$H^I = H^{IS} \otimes H^{I\mathcal{E}}, \quad (8)$$

where H^{IS} and $H^{I\mathcal{E}}$ are Hermitian operators acting on the two spaces of \mathcal{H}^S and $\mathcal{H}^\mathcal{E}$, respectively. (Generalization to a generic local interaction Hamiltonian will be briefly discussed in Sec. IV B.) Elements of H^{IS} and $H^{I\mathcal{E}}$ on $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|i\rangle$ are written as

$$H_{\alpha\beta}^{IS} = \langle \alpha | H^{IS} | \beta \rangle, \quad (9a)$$

$$H_{ij}^{I\mathcal{E}} = \langle i | H^{I\mathcal{E}} | j \rangle. \quad (9b)$$

To describe locality of the interaction, we further divide the environment \mathcal{E} into a small part denoted by \mathcal{E}_1 and a large part denoted by \mathcal{E}_2 , such that the system S is coupled to \mathcal{E}_1 only. That is, $H^{I\mathcal{E}}$ has the following form,

$$H^{I\mathcal{E}} = H^{I\mathcal{E}_1} \otimes I^{\mathcal{E}_2}, \quad (10)$$

where $H^{I\mathcal{E}_1}$ is an operator that acts on the Hilbert space of \mathcal{E}_1 and $I^{\mathcal{E}_2}$ indicates the identity operator on the Hilbert space of \mathcal{E}_2 .

Although the exact condition under which the ETH ansatz proposed in Ref.[25] is applicable is still unclear, it is usually expected valid at least for local operators of many-body quantum chaotic systems [27, 28]. Here, we assume that this ansatz is applicable to the operator $H^{I\mathcal{E}}$. According to this hypothesis, (i) diagonal elements $H_{ii}^{I\mathcal{E}}$ on average vary slowly with the eigenenergy e_i ; (ii) fluctuations of $H_{ii}^{I\mathcal{E}}$ possess certain random feature and are very small, scaling as $e^{-S(e)/2}$, where $S(e)$ is proportional to the particle number N of \mathcal{E} and is related to the microcanonical entropy in a semiclassical treatment; and (iii) off-diagonal elements $H_{ij}^{I\mathcal{E}}$ with $i \neq j$ behave in a way similar to fluctuations of $H_{ii}^{I\mathcal{E}}$ [23–27, 29]. These predictions are written in the following concise form, usually referred to as the ETH ansatz,

$$H_{ij}^{I\mathcal{E}} = h(e)\delta_{ij} + e^{-S(e)/2}g(e, \omega)R_{ij}, \quad (11)$$

where $e = (e_i + e_j)/2$, $\omega = e_j - e_i$, $h(e)$ is a slowly-varying function of e , $g(e, \omega)$ is some smooth function, and R_{ij} indicate random variables with a normal distribution (zero mean and unit variance).

An analytical expression of the function $g(e, \omega)$ is still lacking. Numerically, three regimes have been observed for $|g(e, \omega)|$ with respect to the per-site energy denoted by ξ , provided that e lies in the central region of the spectrum [5, 27]. That is, it shows a plateau for $\omega \ll \xi$ [26, 30], decays exponentially for large $\omega \gg \xi$, and is proportional to $N^{1/2}$ within an intermediate regime [31–35].

We set the initial state of the total system at a time $t = 0$ as a pure state with a product form, that is,

$$|\Psi(0)\rangle = |\phi_S\rangle \otimes |\mathcal{E}_0\rangle. \quad (12)$$

Here, $|\phi_S\rangle$ indicates an arbitrary normalized state of the central system S , written as

$$|\phi_S\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} c_{0\alpha} |\alpha\rangle; \quad (13)$$

and $|\mathcal{E}_0\rangle$ is an arbitrary environmental state that lies within a narrow energy shell denoted by $\Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}$,

$$|\mathcal{E}_0\rangle = \sum_{e_i \in \Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}} c_{0i} |i\rangle. \quad (14)$$

The shell $\Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}$ is centered at an energy e_0 and has a width δe_0 , namely, $\Gamma_0^\mathcal{E} = [e_0 - \delta e_0/2, e_0 + \delta e_0/2]$.

III. THE MAIN RESULT

In this section, we derive the main result of this paper, as relations among elements of the long-time averaged RDM. Specifically, we give some formal discussions in Sec. III A, then, give an upper bound for the effective energy region occupied by the wave function in Sec. III B, and finally derive the main result in Sec. III C.

A. Preliminary discussions

The total system evolves under Schrödinger equation,

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iHt/\hbar}|\Psi(0)\rangle. \quad (15)$$

We write $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ in the following expansion with respect to the central system's states $|\alpha\rangle$,

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{\alpha=1}^m |\alpha\rangle |\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle, \quad (16)$$

and call $|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle$ the *environmental branches* of $|\Psi(t)\rangle$. These branches, as vectors in the environmental Hilbert space, are written as

$$|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle = \langle \alpha | \Psi(t) \rangle, \quad (17)$$

and are usually not normalized. It is direct to find that

$$|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle = \sum_{\alpha'} c_{0\alpha'} \langle \alpha | e^{-iHt/\hbar} | \alpha' \rangle | \mathcal{E}_0 \rangle, \quad (18)$$

and

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle = H_{\alpha\alpha} |\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle + \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} H_{\alpha\beta} |\mathcal{E}_\beta(t)\rangle, \quad (19)$$

where $H_{\alpha\beta}$ indicate operators that act on the Hilbert space of the environment, as defined below,

$$H_{\alpha\beta} := \langle \alpha | H | \beta \rangle. \quad (20)$$

By definition, the RDM of the system S , denoted by $\rho^S(t)$, is given by $\rho^S(t) = \text{Tr}_E \rho(t)$, where $\rho(t) = |\Psi(t)\rangle \langle \Psi(t)|$. It is easy to check that elements of the RDM on the basis $\{|\alpha\rangle\}$, namely $\rho_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = \langle \alpha | \rho^S(t) | \beta \rangle$, have the following expression,

$$\rho_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = \langle \mathcal{E}_\beta(t) | \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t) \rangle. \quad (21)$$

Making use of Eq.(19), after some deviation, one finds that the elements $\rho_{\alpha\beta}^S(t)$ satisfy the following equation (see Appendix A),

$$i\hbar \frac{d\rho_{\alpha\beta}^S(t)}{dt} = W_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} + W_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)}, \quad (22)$$

where

$$W_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)} = (e_\alpha^S - e_\beta^S) \rho_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = \langle \alpha | [H^S, \rho^S(t)] | \beta \rangle, \quad (23a)$$

$$W_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)} = \sum_{\gamma=1}^m H_{\alpha\gamma}^{IS} F_{\beta\gamma}(t) - \sum_{\gamma=1}^m H_{\gamma\beta}^{IS} F_{\gamma\alpha}(t). \quad (23b)$$

Here, $F_{\alpha\beta}(t)$ indicate c -number quantities defined below,

$$F_{\alpha\beta}(t) := \langle \mathcal{E}_\alpha(t) | H^{IE} | \mathcal{E}_\beta(t) \rangle, \quad (24)$$

and, from them, we define the following operator,

$$F(t) := \sum_{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta}(t) |\alpha\rangle \langle \beta|. \quad (25)$$

We use an overline to indicate the long-time average of a term. For example, the long-time average of the RDM is written as $\bar{\rho}^S$,

$$\bar{\rho}^S = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \rho^S(t') dt'. \quad (26)$$

Clearly, in the case that a steady state of the RDM exists, it is given by $\bar{\rho}^S$. Since the elements $\rho_{\alpha\beta}^S(t)$ have bounded values, the long-time average of $d\rho_{\alpha\beta}^S(t)/dt$ must be zero, i.e., $\overline{d\rho_{\alpha\beta}^S(t)/dt} = 0$. Then, Eq.(22) gives that

$$\overline{W_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}} + \overline{W_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)}} = 0. \quad (27)$$

Substituting the explicit expressions of $W_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)}$ and $W_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)}$ in Eq.(23) into Eq.(27), one finds the following formal relation for the long-time averaged RDM,

$$(e_\alpha^S - e_\beta^S) \bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S + \sum_{\gamma=1}^m \left[H_{\alpha\gamma}^{IS} \bar{F}_{\beta\gamma} - H_{\gamma\beta}^{IS} \bar{F}_{\gamma\alpha} \right] = 0. \quad (28)$$

It is straightforward to verify that a concise form of Eq.(28) is written as

$$[H^S, \bar{\rho}^S] + [H^{IS}, \bar{F}^T] = 0, \quad (29)$$

where \bar{F}^T indicates the transposition of \bar{F} .

B. An upper bound for environmental-branches' energy regime

In this section, we derive an upper bound for the energy region within which all the branches $|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle$ lie. Making use of Eqs.(12)-(14) and (15)-(17), straightforward derivation gives the following expression of $|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle$,

$$|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle = \sum_{e_j \in \Gamma_0^\epsilon} \sum_{i,\beta,n} c_{0\beta} c_{0j} C_{\beta j}^n C_{\alpha i}^{n*} e^{-iE_n t} |i\rangle. \quad (30)$$

We use Ω_n^ϵ , which is written as

$$\Omega_n^\epsilon := [E_n - \frac{1}{2}w_n^\epsilon, E_n + \frac{1}{2}w_n^\epsilon] \quad (31)$$

with a small positive parameter ϵ , to indicate the main-body region of the EF C_r^n of $|n\rangle$, such that all considerable components C_r^n lie within it. More exactly, the width w_n^ϵ is determined, up to a small error ϵ , by the following relation,

$$\sum_{E_r \in \Omega_n^\epsilon} |C_r^n|^2 \doteq 1 - \epsilon \quad (\epsilon \ll 1), \quad (32)$$

where “ \doteq ” means that, for a given ϵ , the region Ω_n^ϵ is chosen such that the left hand side of Eq.(32) is the closest to its right hand side (rhs). We use w_{\max}^ϵ to




FIG. 1: A schematic illustration of the energy region Γ^ε in energy e_i . The upper panel: the environmental branch that moves to the farthest left from the initial shell Γ_0^ε due to the system-environment interaction. The lower panel: the branch that moves to the farthest right.

indicate the maximum value of w_n^ε for states $|n\rangle$ of relevance.

We use Γ^ε to indicate an energy region of e_i , within which all considerable components of all the branches $|\langle i|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle|$ lie at an arbitrary time. We write it as

$$\Gamma^\varepsilon = [e_0 - \delta e/2, e_0 + \delta e/2], \quad (33)$$

centered at e_0 with a width δe . In order to find an estimate to δe , one may consider an upper bound of $|\langle i|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle|$, written as [cf. Eq.(30)]

$$|\langle i|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle| \leq \sum_{e_j \in \Gamma_0^\varepsilon} \sum_{\beta, n} |c_{0\beta} c_{0j} C_{\beta j}^n C_{\alpha i}^{n*}|. \quad (34)$$

From the rhs of Eq.(34), one sees that the widest Γ^ε should correspond to the case in which the interaction H^I may effectively couple all levels of S (unnecessarily coupling them directly), such that most EFs of $|n\rangle$ contain considerable components for all values of α . In this case, the interaction may move the initial shell Γ_0^ε to both the left and right directions along the axis of e_i by an energy of Δ_S , as illustrated in Fig.1. Further, taking into account the effect of finite width of EFs, we find the following expression of δe ,

$$\delta e = \delta e_0 + 2\Delta_S + w_{\max}^\varepsilon. \quad (35)$$

Note that, in the above-discussed case, δe in Eq.(35) gives an effective estimate to the width of the energy region of relevance. While, in other cases, δe may just give an upper bound for the relevant energy width. For example, when the interaction is very weak, components outside Γ_0^ε may be quite small such that the effective energy width is given by $\delta e_0 < \delta e$. (See also discussions to be given in Sec.IV A.)

C. Relations among elements of averaged RDM

In this section, we derive the main result, as relations that elements of $\bar{\rho}^S$ satisfy. To this end, let us write the expansion of $|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle$ on the basis of $|i\rangle$ in the following form,

$$|\mathcal{E}_\alpha(t)\rangle = \sum_i f_{\alpha i}(t)|i\rangle \quad (36)$$

with expansion coefficients $f_{\alpha i}(t)$. Substituting Eq.(36) into Eqs.(21) and (24), taking the long-time average, and making use of the fact that Γ^ε gives the effective environmental region for the wave function, one gets the following expressions of $\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S$ and $\bar{F}_{\beta\alpha}$,

$$\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S = \sum_i \overline{f_{\beta i}^* f_{\alpha i}} \simeq \sum_{e_i \in \Gamma^\varepsilon} \overline{f_{\beta i}^* f_{\alpha i}}, \quad (37)$$

$$\bar{F}_{\beta\alpha} = \sum_{i,j} \overline{f_{\beta j}^* f_{\alpha i} H_{ji}^{I\varepsilon}} \simeq \sum_{e_i, e_j \in \Gamma^\varepsilon} \overline{f_{\beta j}^* f_{\alpha i} H_{ji}^{I\varepsilon}}. \quad (38)$$

Substituting the ETH ansatz Eq.(11) into Eq.(38), one gets that

$$\bar{F}_{\beta\alpha} \simeq \sum_{e_i \in \Gamma^\varepsilon} h(e_i) \overline{f_{\beta i}^* f_{\alpha i}} + \Delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (39)$$

where $\Delta_{\alpha\beta}$ indicates the fluctuation term given by

$$\Delta_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{e_i, e_j \in \Gamma^\varepsilon} \overline{f_{\beta i}^* f_{\alpha j}} e^{-S(e)/2} g(e, \omega) R_{ij}. \quad (40)$$

Generically, the two quantities of $\bar{F}_{\beta\alpha}$ and $\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S$ do not have a simple relationship. One key observation made here is that they may possess a simple relation, if the function $h(e)$ may be regarded as a constant within the energy shell Γ^ε . More exactly, the condition is that

$$\left| \frac{1}{h_0} \Delta h \right| \ll 1, \quad (41)$$

where $h_0 = h(e_0)$ and Δh indicates the maximum difference between $h(e_i)$ within Γ^ε , i.e.,

$$\Delta h = \max_{e_i, e_j \in \Gamma^\varepsilon} |h(e_i) - h(e_j)|. \quad (42)$$

In fact, under the condition (41), from Eqs.(37) and (39) one finds that

$$\bar{F}_{\beta\alpha} \simeq h_0 \bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S + \Delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (43)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\bar{F}^T \simeq h_0 \bar{\rho}^S + \Delta, \quad (44)$$

where Δ is a fluctuation operator defined by

$$\Delta := \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta} |\alpha\rangle \langle \beta|. \quad (45)$$

Let us consider a generic case, in which $h_0 \neq 0$ and its N -dependence is much weaker than $e^{-S(e)/2}$ with $S(e) \sim N$. In this case, since Δ scales as $e^{-S(e)/2}$ [see Eq.(40)], at sufficiently large N , one has $\|\Delta\| \ll \|h_0\bar{\rho}^S\|$. Thus, one may neglect the operator Δ on the rhs of Eq.(44) at large N . Then, substituting $\bar{F}^T \simeq h_0\bar{\rho}^S$ into Eq.(29), one gets that

$$[\tilde{H}^S, \bar{\rho}^S] \simeq 0, \quad (46)$$

where \tilde{H}^S is a renormalized self-Hamiltonian of the central system, defined by

$$\tilde{H}^S := H^S + h_0 H^{IS}. \quad (47)$$

To summarize, as the main result of this paper, Eq.(46) holds under the condition of Eq.(41) and at sufficiently large N . Writing Eq.(46) explicitly, one finds that

$$(e_\alpha^S - e_\beta^S)\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S + h_0 \sum_\gamma [H_{\alpha\gamma}^{IS}\bar{\rho}_{\gamma\beta}^S - \bar{\rho}_{\alpha\gamma}^S H_{\gamma\beta}^{IS}] \simeq 0. \quad (48)$$

This gives $m(m-1)/2$ relations among elements of the averaged RDM for $\alpha \neq \beta$ and $(m-1)$ relations for $\alpha = \beta$.

As an illustration of the above main result, let us consider a two-level system. From Eq.(48) with $\alpha \neq \beta$, one gets that

$$\bar{\rho}_{12}^S \simeq \frac{\eta_r h_0}{1 - \eta_d h_0} (\bar{\rho}_{22}^S - \bar{\rho}_{11}^S), \quad (49)$$

where

$$\eta_d = \frac{H_{11}^{IS} - H_{22}^{IS}}{e_2^S - e_1^S}, \quad \eta_r = \frac{H_{12}^{IS}}{e_2^S - e_1^S}. \quad (50)$$

The quantity η_d gives a relative measure for the strength of dephasing, while, η_r gives a relative measure for the strength of relaxation or dissipation. Meanwhile, in the case of $\alpha = \beta$, one gets that

$$H_{12}^{IS}\bar{\rho}_{21}^S - \bar{\rho}_{12}^S H_{21}^{IS} \simeq 0, \quad (51)$$

which implies approximate realness of $H_{12}^{IS}\bar{\rho}_{21}^S$.

IV. FURTHER DISCUSSIONS

In this section, we discuss two situations, in which some modified versions of the above main result still hold when some restrictions used in the above derivations are loosed. In Sec.IV A, we derive an expression for offdiagonal elements of the averaged RDM under sufficiently weak couplings, without the restriction in Eq.(41). In Sec.IV B, we give a brief discussion for a generic local interaction Hamiltonian.

A. Offdiagonal elements at very weak couplings

Under very weak system-environment interactions, one may employ a first-order perturbation treatment to derive an explicit expression for offdiagonal elements of the long-time averaged RDM for nondegenerate levels, without using the condition in Eq.(41).

Let us consider two nondegenerate levels α and β of the central system S , with $e_\beta^S \neq e_\alpha^S$. Under weak couplings, the zeroth-order term of $\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S$ is computed by Eq.(21) with the zeroth-order branches, which we denote by $|\mathcal{E}_\alpha^{0th}(t)\rangle$. Clearly, $|\mathcal{E}_\alpha^{0th}(t)\rangle$ is given by the Schrödinger evolution from an initial state $c_{0\alpha}|\alpha\rangle|\mathcal{E}_0\rangle$ under vanishing H^I . Making use of Eq.(14) for $|\mathcal{E}_0\rangle$, one directly gets that

$$|\mathcal{E}_\alpha^{0th}(t)\rangle = c_{0\alpha} e^{-ie_\alpha^S t} \sum_{e_j \in \Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}} e^{-ie_j t} c_{0j} |j\rangle. \quad (52)$$

Due to the term $e^{-ie_\alpha^S t}$ on the rhs of Eq.(52), one sees that $\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S$ has a vanishing zeroth-order term.

To compute the first-order term of $\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S$, let us rewrite Eq.(28) as

$$\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S = \frac{1}{e_\beta^S - e_\alpha^S} \sum_{\gamma=1}^m [H_{\alpha\gamma}^{IS}\bar{F}_{\beta\gamma} - H_{\gamma\beta}^{IS}\bar{F}_{\gamma\alpha}]. \quad (53)$$

The basic idea is to substitute the zeroth-order contributions to \bar{F} into the rhs of Eq.(53). To get the zeroth-order term of $\bar{F}_{\alpha\beta}$, indicated as $\bar{F}_{\alpha\beta}^{0th}$, one may substitute Eq.(52) into Eq.(24) and take the long-time average. The result is written as

$$\bar{F}_{\alpha\beta}^{0th} = |c_{0\alpha}|^2 h_1 \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (54)$$

with some quantity h_1 . If the environment \mathcal{E} has a nondegenerate spectrum, then, it is direct to find that

$$h_1 = \sum_{e_i \in \Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}} |c_{0i}|^2 H_{ii}^{I\mathcal{E}}. \quad (55)$$

Otherwise, we need to divide the set of the label i into subsets according to the degeneracy, which we denote by \mathcal{D}_q with a label q , such that $e_i = e_j$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{D}_q$. In the latter case, one has

$$h_1 = \sum_{q \in \Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}} \sum_{i, j \in \mathcal{D}_q} c_{0i}^* H_{ij}^{I\mathcal{E}} c_{0j}, \quad (56)$$

where $q \in \Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}$ means that $e_i \in \Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}$ for $i \in \mathcal{D}_q$.

Substituting the above zeroth-order terms $\bar{F}_{\alpha\beta}^{0th}$ into the rhs of Eq.(53), one gets the following expression of $\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S$ up to the first-order term,

$$\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S \simeq \frac{H_{\alpha\beta}^{IS} h_1}{e_\beta^S - e_\alpha^S} (|c_{0\beta}|^2 - |c_{0\alpha}|^2). \quad (57)$$

Note that Eq.(57) holds as long as the interaction is sufficiently weak. In the case that the initial shell $\Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}$

is narrow and the ETH ansatz in Eq.(11) is satisfied, one has $h_1 \simeq h_0$ and, then, e.g., for a two-level central system, Eq.(57) gets that

$$\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S \simeq \eta_r h_0 (|c_{0\beta}|^2 - |c_{0\alpha}|^2) \quad \text{for } \alpha = 1, \beta = 2. \quad (58)$$

Clearly, the two equations of (49) and (58) give almost the same predictions for very weak couplings.

B. A generic interaction

In this section, we give a brief discussion for a generic local interaction Hamiltonian, which is written as

$$H^I = \sum_{\nu} H^{IS,\nu} \otimes H^{I\mathcal{E},\nu}, \quad (59)$$

with some label ν and with local operators $H^{I\mathcal{E},\nu}$. For such a generic H^I , the operator $F(t)$ in Eq.(25) is written as

$$F(t) = \sum_{\nu} F_{\alpha\beta}^{\nu}(t) |\alpha\rangle\langle\beta|, \quad (60)$$

where

$$F_{\alpha\beta}^{\nu}(t) = \langle \mathcal{E}_{\alpha}(t) | H^{I\mathcal{E},\nu} | \mathcal{E}_{\beta}(t) \rangle. \quad (61)$$

Following the same arguments as those given in Sec.III, one may study the long-time average of this generic operator $F(t)$ and get similar results.

Specifically and similarly, we consider the following conditions: (i) The operators $H^{I\mathcal{E},\nu}$ satisfy the ETH ansatz, (ii) an equation like Eq.(41) holds (with the impact of the label ν taken into account), and (iii) N is sufficiently large. The final result is that

$$[\tilde{H}^S, \bar{\rho}^S] \simeq 0, \quad (62)$$

where

$$\tilde{H}^S = H^S + \sum_{\nu} h_{\nu 0} H^{IS,\nu}. \quad (63)$$

On the rhs of Eq.(63), $h_{\nu 0} = h^{I\mathcal{E},\nu}(e_0)$, where $h^{I\mathcal{E},\nu}(e)$ is the diagonal function that appears in the ETH ansatz for $H^{I\mathcal{E},\nu}$.

V. NUMERICAL TESTS

In this section, we present numerical simulations that have been performed for checking analytical predictions given above. For this purpose, we consider a two-level system as the central system S and one defect Ising chain as the environment \mathcal{E} .

The defect Ising chain is composed of a number N of $\frac{1}{2}$ -spins lying in an inhomogeneous transverse field, whose Hamiltonian is written as

$$H^{\mathcal{E}} = h_x \sum_{l=1}^N S_l^x + d_1 S_1^z + d_5 S_5^z + J_z \sum_{l=1}^N S_l^z S_{l+1}^z, \quad (64)$$




FIG. 2: Values of $|\bar{\rho}_{12}^S|$ (triangles) versus the coupling strength λ , both in the logarithm scale, for $\Delta_S = 0.05$ and 0.3 under two interaction Hamiltonians of $H_{(1)}^I$ and $H_{(2)}^I$. The solid lines (red) represent predictions of Eq.(49), and the dashed-dotted lines (blue) show predictions of Eq.(58) obtained at very weak coupling. The values of λ_c at $\Delta_S = 0.05$, for agreement between solid lines and triangles, are larger than those at $\Delta_S = 0.3$. Parameters: $(c_{01}, c_{02}) = (0.51, 0.86)$, $N = 13$, $e_0 = -1.2$, $\delta e_0 = 0.2$, and $k = 7$.

where S_l^x and S_l^z indicate Pauli matrices divided by 2 at the l -th site. The parameters h_x , J_z , d_1 and d_5 are adjusted, such that the defect Ising chain is a quantum chaotic system; that is, for levels not close to edges of the energy spectrum, the nearest-level-spacing distribution $P(s)$ is close to the Wigner-Dyson distribution $P_W(s) = \frac{\pi}{2} s \exp(-\frac{\pi}{4} s^2)$, the latter of which is almost identical to the prediction of the random matrix theory (RMT) [36–38]. Exact values of the parameters used are $h_x = 0.9$, $J_z = 1.0$, $d_1 = 1.11$, $d_5 = 0.6$, and $N = 13$. In our numerical computation of EFs, the periodic boundary condition was implied and the so-called Krylov-space method was used.

The central system is coupled to the k -th spin of the defect Ising chain, with a self-Hamiltonian

$$H^S = \Delta_S S^z. \quad (65)$$

We study two specific forms of the interaction Hamiltonian, indicated as $H_{(1)}^I$ and $H_{(2)}^I$,

$$H_{(1)}^I = \lambda S^x \otimes S_k^x, \quad (66a)$$

$$H_{(2)}^I = \lambda (S^x + S^z) \otimes S_k^x. \quad (66b)$$




FIG. 3: (a) w_{max}^ϵ versus the coupling strength λ , for $\Delta_S = 0.05$ (open squares) and $\Delta_S = 0.3$ (open circles). Parameter $\epsilon = 0.05$. Inset: δe [see Eq.(35)] versus λ . (b) $|\Delta h/h_0|$ versus λ .

According to Eq.(50), one has $\eta_d = 0$ and $\eta_r = \frac{\lambda}{2\Delta_S}$ for $H_{(1)}^I$, and has $\eta_d = \frac{\lambda}{\Delta_S}$ and $\eta_r = \frac{\lambda}{2\Delta_S}$ for $H_{(2)}^I$. Numerically, we have checked that the ETH ansatz is valid for local operators in the defect Ising chain (see Appendix B).

According to analytical analyses given in Secs.III C and IV A, for a narrow initial shell $\Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}$ for which $h_1 \simeq h_0$, $\bar{\rho}_{12}^S$ should have the following properties.

- (i) At very weak couplings, it is described by Eq.(49), which is very close to Eq.(58), independent of the value of Δ_S .
- (ii) With the increase of λ , the prediction given by Eq.(49) may follow the exact $\bar{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S$ up to some value of λ , which we denote by λ_c .
- (iii) In the case that the interaction H^I may effectively couple all levels of S , λ_c is related to breakdown of Eq.(41). In other cases, it is possible for λ_c to exceed the breakdown of Eq.(41), since Eq.(41) is a sufficient but not necessary condition for validity of Eq.(49).
- (iv) Since the width w_{max}^ϵ usually increases with increasing λ , the condition (41) implies that larger values of λ_c should usually correspond to smaller values of Δ_S .

We have numerically checked the above predictions for various values of Δ_S , of the interaction strength λ , and of the central system's initial state. The environmental initial state was taken as typical states within an energy shell $\Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}$ given by $e_0 = -1.2$ and $\delta e_0 = 0.2$. The value of $|\Delta h/h_0|$ for $\Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}$, which was computed with $\Gamma^\mathcal{E}$ on the rhs of Eq.(42) replaced by $\Gamma_0^\mathcal{E}$, is about $0.25 \ll 1$, implying that $h_1 \simeq h_0$.

Some examples are shown in Fig.2. It is seen that, at very small λ , predictions of Eq.(49) (solid lines) and of Eq.(58) (dashed-dotted lines) are quite close to the exact values of $|\bar{\rho}_{12}^S|$ (triangles), even for a relatively large value of $\Delta_S = 0.3$. When computing the rhs of Eq.(49), exact values of $\bar{\rho}_{11}^S$ and $\bar{\rho}_{11}^S$ were used.

With increasing λ , the dashed-dotted (blue) lines gradually deviate from the exact $|\bar{\rho}_{12}^S|$. While, as predicted analytically, the solid (red) lines follow the triangles further up to some values of λ_c . Specifically, $\lambda_c \approx 0.07$ at $\Delta_S = 0.05$, which, as expected, is obviously larger than $\lambda_c \approx 0.01$ at $\lambda = 0.3$.

As shown in Fig.3, the width w_{max}^ϵ increases with increasing λ as expected and, as a result, the width δe of $\Gamma^\mathcal{E}$ also increases with λ . Values of $|\Delta h/h_0|$ versus λ are also presented, which show that Eq.(41) is never satisfied for $\Delta_S = 0.3$, with $|\Delta h/h_0| \gtrsim 0.7$. While, at $\Delta_S = 0.05$, $|\Delta h/h_0|$ remains small for $\lambda < 0.07$ gets an obvious increment at λ about 0.07.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this paper, the long-time averaged RDM has been studied for an m -level central system S , which is locally coupled to a very large environment \mathcal{E} , with the total system undergoing a Schrödinger evolution. On the eigenbasis of the central system, $\frac{1}{2}(m-1)(m+2)$ approximate relations have been derived among elements of its steady state (if existing). These relations hold for a class of the interaction Hamiltonian, for which the environmental part satisfies the ETH ansatz and the diagonal term in the ansatz (namely the function $h(e)$) may be regarded as a constant within energy region of relevance.

Due to the above-discussed relations, the steady RDM is approximately commutable with a renormalized Hamiltonian \tilde{H}^S of the central system, which includes certain averaged effect of the system-environment interaction. As a result, decoherence may lead to a preferred basis given by the eigenbasis of the renormalized Hamiltonian, even under a dissipative system-environment interaction. This phenomenon was observed numerically in certain specific models previously (see, e.g., Ref.[39]). Beside the field of decoherence, results of this paper may also be useful in other fields in which properties of steady states of small quantum systems are of relevance, such as quantum thermodynamics [40–43].

It could be of interest to note that the renormalized

Hamiltonian \tilde{H}^S given in Eq.(47) is in consistency with a standard treatment employed in the master-equation approach to RDM. There, at an initial stage before the derivation begins, the self-Hamiltonian of the central system is taken as certain renormalized Hamiltonian H_{mas}^S , given by $H_{\text{mas}}^S = H^S + H^{IS} \text{tr}(H^{IE} \rho_{\text{th}}^{\mathcal{E}})$, where $\rho_{\text{th}}^{\mathcal{E}}$ denotes a thermal state of the environment. The formal similarity between H_{mas}^S and \tilde{H}^S is clear.

However, there is a big difference between them. In fact, in our approach, the operator \tilde{H}^S is derived by faithfully taking the long-time average over the overall Schrödinger evolution, which indicates the existence of a preferred basis. While, in the master-equation approach, the operator H_{mas}^S is mainly employed for the sake of convenience in derivation, though with deep physical intuition lying behind it. Moreover, only after certain type of analytical solution to a derived master equation is found, which is usually a very difficult task expect in some special models, could it become clear whether H_{mas}^S may indeed be of relevance to steady state. And, as based a perturbative treatment, validity of the master-equation approach at long times is a subtle issue.

Finally, we give a brief discussion on the condition Eq.(41), under which our main results are derived.

(i) As long as $w_{\text{max}}^{\epsilon}$ is notably smaller than $(\delta e_0/2 + \Delta_S)$, validity of Eq.(41) is independent of the interaction strength. This implies that our main results may be valid much above the weak coupling limit, even to some nonweak interaction regime, as illustrated by our numerical simulations.

(ii) According to numerical simulations with some analytical analysis [27, 33, 44, 45], $h(e)$ is usually a function of per-site energy, i.e.

$$h(e_i) = \tilde{h}(e_i/N), \quad (67)$$

where $\tilde{h}(x)$ is some smooth function of x . This expression gives that

$$|h(e_i) - h(e_j)| = \left| \tilde{h}'(e_i/N) \right| \frac{|e_i - e_j|}{N} + O(1/N^2), \quad (68)$$

and, as a result, $\Delta h \sim 1/N$. This implies that one may make the condition (41) fulfilled by increasing N , if, for example, the width $w_{\text{max}}^{\epsilon}$ may be kept not large, meanwhile, parameters are arranged such that $\Delta_S, (e_0/N)$, and δe_0 are almost independent of N .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 11535011, 11775210, and 12175222.

Appendix A: Derivation of Eq.(22)

In this appendix, we derive Eq.(22). Using Eq.(21), the time evolution of the RDM is written as

$$i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = F_1 + F_2, \quad (A1)$$

where

$$F_1 = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = F_1 + F_2, \quad (A2a)$$

$$F_2 = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = i\tilde{\rho}_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) = F_1 + F_2, \quad (A2b)$$

Making use of Eq.(19), one finds that

$$F_1 = - \sum_{\gamma} \langle \mathcal{E}_{\gamma}(t) | H_{\gamma\beta} | \mathcal{E}_{\alpha}(t) \rangle. \quad (A3)$$

From Eqs.(8) and (20), one gets that

$$H_{\alpha\beta} = \langle \alpha | H | \beta \rangle = e_{\alpha}^S \delta_{\alpha\beta} + H_{\alpha\beta}^{IS} H^{IE} + H^{\mathcal{E}} \delta_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (A4)$$

Then, we write Eq.(A3) as follows,

$$F_1 = - e_{\beta}^S \langle \mathcal{E}_{\beta}(t) | \mathcal{E}_{\alpha}(t) \rangle - \sum_{\gamma} \langle H_{\gamma\beta}^{IS} | \mathcal{E}_{\gamma}(t) | H^{IE} | \mathcal{E}_{\alpha}(t) \rangle - \langle \mathcal{E}_{\beta}(t) | H^{\mathcal{E}} | \mathcal{E}_{\alpha}(t) \rangle. \quad (A5)$$

Noting Eqs.(21) and (24), the above equality gives that

$$F_1 = - e_{\alpha}^S \rho_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) - \sum_{\gamma} H_{\gamma\beta}^{IS} F_{\gamma\alpha}(t) - \langle \mathcal{E}_{\beta}(t) | H^{\mathcal{E}} | \mathcal{E}_{\alpha}(t) \rangle. \quad (A6)$$

Similarly, one finds

$$F_2 = e_{\alpha}^S \rho_{\alpha\beta}^S(t) + \sum_{\gamma} H_{\alpha\gamma}^{IS} F_{\beta\gamma}(t) + \langle \mathcal{E}_{\beta}(t) | H^{\mathcal{E}} | \mathcal{E}_{\alpha}(t) \rangle. \quad (A7)$$

Putting the above results together, one gets Eq.(22).

Appendix B: Verification of ETH ansatz

Due to the hypothesis feature of the ETH ansatz in Eq.(11), we have checked its validity in the model employed in this paper. We did this for the two local operators S_k^x and S_k^z at the site $k = 7$ in the defect Ising chain.

Diagonal ETH.— Let us first discuss predictions of Eq.(11) for diagonal elements of local observables. Expectation values of the two local observables, i.e.,

$$(S_k^a)_{ii} = \langle i | S_k^a | i \rangle \quad \text{with } a = x, z, \quad (B1)$$

are plotted in Fig.B. 1. It is seen that, in agreement with ETH, the diagonal elements fluctuate around certain slowly-varying function $h(e)$ and the fluctuations




FIG. B. 1: Upper panel: Diagonal matrix elements of two local observables S_k^z and S_k^x ($k = 7$) of the defect Ising chain vs the environmental energy $\epsilon_i = e_i/N$ for different chain size N . In agreement with the ETH ansatz in Eq.(11), these elements fluctuate around certain slowly-varying functions of e , respectively, and the fluctuations decrease with the increase of the particle number N . Lower panel: Locally averaged values of the above elements (within windows with a width 0.01), showing a feature of approximate size-independence.




FIG. B. 2: (a) Exponential decay of the deviation σ_d^a in Eq.(B2) with the increase of N , for fluctuations of the diagonal elements of S_k^x (empty squares) and of S_k^z (solid circles). (b) Exponential decay of σ_{nd}^a in Eq.(B4) for fluctuations of offdiagonal elements. The results are in agreement with the prediction of ETH in Eq.(11).




FIG. B. 3: Distributions of fluctuations of the diagonal elements of S_k^z [(a)] and of S_k^x [(b)], rescaled by σ_d^z and σ_d^x , respectively. And, distributions of the offdiagonal elements of S_k^z [(c)] and of S_k^x [(d)], rescaled by σ_{nd}^z and σ_{nd}^x , respectively. The dashed curves represent the Gaussian distribution with unit variance.

decrease with increasing the particle number N . Note that the horizontal axis is labelled by e_i/N . For $a = z$, the values of $h(e)$ are close to zero, while, for $a = x$, most of $|h(e)|$ are notably larger than zero.

To study quantitatively the fluctuations of $(S_k^a)_{ii}$, we have computed the standard deviations σ_d^a ,

$$\sigma_d^a = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{\Gamma_0^\epsilon}} \sum_{\epsilon_i \in \Gamma_0^\epsilon} |(S_k^a)_{ii} - \mu^a|^2}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

where

$$\mu^a = \frac{1}{N_{\Gamma_0^\epsilon}} \sum_{\epsilon_i \in \Gamma_0^\epsilon} (S_k^a)_{ii}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

As seen in Fig. B. 2 (a), the fluctuation decays exponentially with the increase of N , as predicted by the term $e^{-S(e)}$ in the second part on the rhs of Eq.(11). Moreover, in agreement with the prediction of ETH, the distributions of $[(S_k^a)_{ii} - \mu^a]/\sigma_d^a$ are close to the Gaussian form [Fig. B. 3 (a) and (b)].

Off-diagonal ETH.— Next, we discuss the offdiagonal elements $(S_k^a)_{ij}$. In agreement with the prediction of ETH, the probability distributions of $(S_k^a)_{ij}/\sigma_{nd}^a$ have a




FIG. B. 4: Locally averaged values (in the logarithm scale) of the absolute square of off-diagonal elements of (a) S_k^z and (b) S_k^x , within an energy shell centered at -1.2 and with a width 0.2 , versus $\omega = e_j - e_i$. Local averages were taken within small windows with a width 0.01 .

Gaussian form [Fig. B. 3 (c) and (d)], where σ_{nd}^a are the standard deviations for the offdiagonal elements,

$$\sigma_{nd}^a = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{\Gamma_0^\varepsilon}(N_{\Gamma_0^\varepsilon} - 1)} \sum_{i \neq j \in \Gamma_0^\varepsilon} |(S_k^a)_{ij}|^2}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

These standard deviations also decay exponentially with the increase of N [Fig. B. 2 (b)].

To get some knowledge about shapes of the function $g(e, \omega)$, which lacks an analytical expression, numerical simulations have been performed for locally averaged values of $|(S_k^z)_{ij}|^2$ and $|(S_k^x)_{ij}|^2$ for off-diagonal elements. As seen in Fig. B. 4, the function shows a size-independent feature, with an exponential-type decay at large ω .

-
- [1] A. J. Leggett, S. Chakravarty, A. T. Dorsey, M. P. Fisher, A. Garg, and W. Zwerger, Dynamics of the dissipative two-state system, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **59**, 1 (1987).
- [2] H.-P. Breuer, F. Petruccione, *et al.*, *The theory of open quantum systems* (Oxford University Press on Demand, 2002).
- [3] R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum dynamical semigroups and applications*, Vol. 717 (Springer, 2007).
- [4] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and B. Vacchini, Colloquium: Non-markovian dynamics in open quantum systems, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **88**, 021002 (2016).
- [5] I. De Vega and D. Alonso, Dynamics of non-markovian open quantum systems, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **89**, 015001 (2017).
- [6] W. H. Zurek, Pointer basis of quantum apparatus: Into what mixture does the wave packet collapse?, *Physical review D* **24**, 1516 (1981).
- [7] W. H. Zurek, Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical, *Reviews of modern physics* **75**, 715 (2003).
- [8] M. Schlosshauer, Decoherence, the measurement problem, and interpretations of quantum mechanics, *Reviews of Modern physics* **76**, 1267 (2005).
- [9] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum measurement and control* (Cambridge university press, 2009).
- [10] J. P. Paz and W. H. Zurek, Quantum limit of decoherence: Environment induced superselection of energy eigenstates, *Physical Review Letters* **82**, 5181 (1999).
- [11] E. Joos, H. D. Zeh, C. Kiefer, D. J. Giulini, J. Kupsch, and I.-O. Stamatescu, *Decoherence and the appearance of a classical world in quantum theory* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2013).
- [12] T. Gorin, T. Prosen, T. Seligman, and W. Strunz, Connection between decoherence and fidelity decay in echo dynamics, *Physical Review A* **70**, 042105 (2004).
- [13] T. Albash and D. A. Lidar, Decoherence in adiabatic quantum computation, *Physical Review A* **91**, 062320 (2015).
- [14] U. Weiss, *Quantum dissipative systems*, Vol. 13 (World scientific, 2012).
- [15] D. Braun, F. Haake, and W. T. Strunz, Universality of decoherence, *Physical review letters* **86**, 2913 (2001).
- [16] W.-g. Wang, J. Gong, G. Casati, and B. Li, Entanglement-induced decoherence and energy eigenstates, *Physical Review A* **77**, 012108 (2008).
- [17] L. He and W.-g. Wang, Statistically preferred basis of an open quantum system: Its relation to the eigenbasis of a renormalized self-hamiltonian, *Physical Review E* **89**, 022125 (2014).
- [18] C. K. Lee, J. Cao, and J. Gong, Noncanonical statistics of a spin-boson model: Theory and exact monte carlo simulations, *Physical Review E* **86**, 021109 (2012).
- [19] C. Addis, G. Brebner, P. Haikka, and S. Maniscalco, Coherence trapping and information backflow in dephasing qubits, *Physical Review A* **89**, 024101 (2014).
- [20] K. Roszak, R. Filip, and T. Novotný, Decoherence control by quantum decoherence itself, *Scientific reports* **5**, 1 (2015).
- [21] Y.-J. Zhang, W. Han, Y.-J. Xia, Y.-M. Yu, and H. Fan, Role of initial system-bath correlation on coherence trapping, *Scientific reports* **5**, 1 (2015).
- [22] G. Guarnieri, M. Kolář, and R. Filip, Steady-state coherences by composite system-bath interactions, *Physical review letters* **121**, 070401 (2018).
- [23] J. M. Deutsch, Quantum statistical mechanics in a closed system, *Physical review a* **43**, 2046 (1991).
- [24] M. Srednicki, Chaos and quantum thermalization, *Physical review e* **50**, 888 (1994).
- [25] M. Srednicki, The approach to thermal equilibrium in quantized chaotic systems, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **32**, 1163 (1999).
- [26] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, Thermalization and its mechanism for generic isolated quantum systems, *Nature* **452**, 854 (2008).
- [27] L. D'Alessio, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, From quantum chaos and eigenstate thermalization to statistical mechanics and thermodynamics, *Advances in*

- Physics **65**, 239 (2016).
- [28] J. M. Deutsch, Eigenstate thermalization hypothesis, Reports on Progress in Physics **81**, 082001 (2018).
- [29] J. R. Garrison and T. Grover, Does a single eigenstate encode the full hamiltonian?, Physical Review X **8**, 021026 (2018).
- [30] E. Khatami, G. Pupillo, M. Srednicki, and M. Rigol, Fluctuation-dissipation theorem in an isolated system of quantum dipolar bosons after a quench, Physical review letters **111**, 050403 (2013).
- [31] D. A. Abanin, W. De Roeck, and F. Huvneers, Exponentially slow heating in periodically driven many-body systems, Physical review letters **115**, 256803 (2015).
- [32] S. Mukerjee, V. Oganesyan, and D. Huse, Statistical theory of transport by strongly interacting lattice fermions, Physical Review B **73**, 035113 (2006).
- [33] M. Brenes, T. LeBlond, J. Goold, and M. Rigol, Eigenstate thermalization in a locally perturbed integrable system, Physical review letters **125**, 070605 (2020).
- [34] T. LeBlond, D. Sels, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, Universality in the onset of quantum chaos in many-body systems, arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.07849 (2020).
- [35] T. LeBlond and M. Rigol, Eigenstate thermalization for observables that break hamiltonian symmetries and its counterpart in interacting integrable systems, Physical Review E **102**, 062113 (2020).
- [36] F. Haake, *Quantum Signatures of Chaos*, Vol. 54 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2013).
- [37] G. Casati, F. Valz-Gris, and I. Guarneri, On the connection between quantization of nonintegrable systems and statistical theory of spectra, Lettere al Nuovo Cimento **28**, 279 (1980).
- [38] O. Bohigas, M.-J. Giannoni, and C. Schmit, Characterization of chaotic quantum spectra and universality of level fluctuation laws, Physical review letters **52**, 1 (1984).
- [39] W.-g. Wang, L. He, and J. Gong, Preferred states of decoherence under intermediate system-environment coupling, Physical review letters **108**, 070403 (2012).
- [40] F. Binder, L. A. Correa, C. Gogolin, J. Anders, and G. Adesso, *Thermodynamics in the quantum regime: fundamental aspects and new directions*, Vol. 195 (Springer, 2019).
- [41] J. Goold, M. Huber, A. Riera, L. Del Rio, and P. Skrzypczyk, The role of quantum information in thermodynamics—a topical review, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **49**, 143001 (2016).
- [42] W.-g. Wang, Statistical description of small quantum systems beyond the weak-coupling limit, Physical Review E **86**, 011115 (2012).
- [43] W.-g. Wang, Decoherence approach to energy transfer and work done by slowly driven systems, Physical Review E **97**, 012128 (2018).
- [44] H. Kim, T. N. Ikeda, and D. A. Huse, Testing whether all eigenstates obey the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis, Physical Review E **90**, 052105 (2014).
- [45] M. Brenes, J. Goold, and M. Rigol, Low-frequency behavior of off-diagonal matrix elements in the integrable xxz chain and in a locally perturbed quantum-chaotic xxz chain, Physical Review B **102**, 075127 (2020).