

Branching States as The Emergent Structure of a Quantum Universe

Akram Touil,^{1,2,*} Fabio Anza,^{3,4,†} Sebastian Deffner,^{1,5,‡} and James P. Crutchfield^{4,§}

¹*Department of Physics, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD 21250, USA*

²*Center for Nonlinear Studies, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545*

³*InQubator for Quantum Simulation (IQUS), Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA*

⁴*Complexity Sciences Center and Physics Department,*

University of California at Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616

⁵*Instituto de Física ‘Gleb Wataghin’, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, 13083-859, Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil*

Quantum Darwinism builds on decoherence theory to explain the emergence of classical behavior within a quantum universe. We demonstrate that the differential geometric underpinnings of quantum mechanics provide a uniquely informative window into the structure of correlations needed to validate Quantum Darwinism. This leads us to two crucial insights about the emergence of classical phenomenology, centered around the nullity of quantum discord. First, we show that the so-called branching structure of the joint state of system and environment is the only one compatible with zero discord. Second, we prove that for small, but nonzero discord, the structure of the globally pure state is arbitrarily close to the branching form. These provide strong evidence that this class of branching states is the only one compatible with the emergence of classical phenomenology, as described in Quantum Darwinism.

Why does the world appear classical? Despite striking successes in describing our quantum universe, understanding the quantum-to-classical transition is still an enigma. The core issue originates in understanding the emergence of macroscopic, predominantly classical, behavior from the specificity of microscopic quantum dynamics. More than a century after its development, quantum mechanics now offers a plethora of techniques to exploit when probing the classical limit: $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ approaches (saddle point approximations in path-integrals and WKB theory), coherent states, and high-temperature thermal states are a few that come to mind.

More recently, the rise of quantum information theory (QI), with its improved understanding of exquisitely-quantum resources, including entanglement and coherence, brought new concepts and powerful technical tools into this mix. Within the realm of equilibrium systems, notable techniques that clarify such micro-to-macro connections are found in the tools of quantum typicality [1–3], large-deviations theory [4], and, more generally, concentration of measure phenomena [5]. Indeed, the problem of understanding the emergence of thermal equilibrium in a quantum system exhibits similarities to the issue of understanding the emergence of classicality. Both involve a large number of degrees of freedom and macroscopic systems are, to a certain degree, both classical and thermal [6]. However, the perspectives target different questions: a classical limit does not require equilibrium, but it can support it.

Unequivocally, environment-induced decoherence [7, 8] is now recognized as a necessary element in the complex mechanism that leads a quantum system to hide its quantum-only nature in favor of a classical phenomenology. Taking one step further, Quantum Darwinism (QD) [9–17] then recognizes the active role played by a structured, many-body environment in explaining the emergence of classicality. In QD, the environment is un-

derstood as a communication channel, through which one learns about components of the world around us. The many-body nature of environments, therefore, becomes central, leading to the conclusion that classical information about pointer states is all that can be faithfully accessed by the different parts of an environment probing it. While the phenomenological picture of QD enjoys empirical support [18–20], the many-body nature of environments hinders our general ability to uniquely pinpoint the structure [21] of quantum correlations underlying the emergence of classical phenomenology. Perhaps even more concerning is the possible nonuniqueness of such a structure, allowing for competing mechanisms to underlie the quantum-to-classical transition. This Letter provides clear answers to both of these challenges.

To properly frame them recall that entanglement, intended as a feature of a many-body system, is dual to the concept of separable states, intended as a specific structure of quantum states. That is, zero entanglement uniquely selects states that are separable. In more general terms, there is a duality between requiring that a given information-theoretic quantity has a specific value and the structure of compatible states. From this perspective, our work achieves two goals: First, we show conceptual and practical relevance of the tools of Geometric Quantum Mechanics (GQM), especially within the larger effort to characterize the structures of many-body quantum states compatible with a given subsystem phenomenology. Second, the intuition developed through GQM leads to a rigorous proof of the following: *There is one and only one quantum-state structure compatible with QD’s characterization of classical behavior: singly-branching states* (as defined in Refs. [13, 14]). Hereafter, for simplicity, we refer to these states as *branching states*.

Our development is organized as follows. After a brief overview of QD, that introduces notation, we summarize GQM’s basic notions, as detailed in Refs. [22–30] and pro-

vide a geometric description for decoherence in the pointer basis. We proceed to show how the geometric picture identifies the branching form as the unique structure for the many-body globally pure-state compatible with QD. We then state the main result and sketch the proof, which is detailed in the Appendix. Finally, we discuss the implications of our results and provide a few forward-looking conclusions.

Quantum Darwinism. QD posits a universe comprised of a quantum system \mathcal{S} of interest and its surrounding environment \mathcal{E} , jointly described by a many-body pure state $|\psi_{\mathcal{SE}}\rangle$ evolving unitarily. Classicality emerges in a two-step process. (1) Einselection: the environment \mathcal{E} decoheres \mathcal{S} 's state with only the pointer states surviving [7, 8]. (2) The pure state reaches a configuration in which measurements on environmental fragments reveal almost (and only) all the classical information about \mathcal{S} . In other words, when observers make measurements on small fragments of \mathcal{E} they reach consensus regarding the classical information inferred about \mathcal{S} 's state.

This implies that classical information about the pointer states proliferates across the many fragments comprising the environment. This proliferation, or redundancy, of information is the hallmark of classicality. It is witnessed by considering \mathcal{E} 's many-body nature and is recognized via an additional splitting of \mathcal{E} into $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{F} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{F}}$. That is, the environment \mathcal{E} consists of $|\mathcal{F}| = m$ and $|\bar{\mathcal{F}}| = N - m$ fragments, respectively, where $N = |\mathcal{E}|$ is \mathcal{E} 's total size. Physically, \mathcal{F} represents the environment fragments captured by the observer and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ is the rest.

For our present purposes, keep in mind the physical situation illustrated in Fig. 1, where QD phenomenology becomes clear. An agent receives photons that interacted with an object whose state quickly decoheres to a classical mixture of pointer states. In this case, \mathcal{S} is the object of interest. The photons collected by the agent are the m fragments of the environment, and the rest are the $N - m$ photons inaccessible to the agent but that, nonetheless, fill space and interact with \mathcal{S} . If the agent begins observing with no knowledge of the system's state, a small initial number of photons is very informative. This leads to a steep increase of mutual information $I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F})$ between observed fragments \mathcal{F} and system \mathcal{S} . However, after the anticipated value $I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}) \approx H_{\mathcal{S}}$ is reached, observing additional photons does not lead to substantial further gain of information about \mathcal{S} . This is the mutual-information signature of the classical plateau, where discord between \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{S} is small. One transcends the classical plateau only by measuring a genuinely large fraction of the environment: $m/N \approx 1$. This then reveals the quantum nature of the joint \mathcal{SE} via a steep rise of $I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F})$ to its maximal (classically-forbidden) value $2H_{\mathcal{S}}$.

The QD framework provides a clear information-theoretic characterization of classical behavior, implicitly defined by the plateau in Fig. 1 and explicitly characterized by decoherence in the pointer state basis; $I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F})/H_{\mathcal{S}} \in$




FIG. 1. An observer extracts information from a quantum system \mathcal{S} embedded in a photonic environment by capturing m photons \mathcal{F} , and inferring properties about \mathcal{S} . The plot shows how the mutual information $I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F})$ scales as a function of the fraction $m/N \equiv |\mathcal{F}|/|\mathcal{F} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{F}}|$ of captured photons. After an initial raise, it does not matter how many photons we capture, we still only have access to approximately the same amount of information about the system. This is true unless $m \approx N$, in which case we effectively measure the entire set of photons and the quantum nature of \mathcal{S} is revealed. The plateau identifies a region in which the observer can only learn classical information about the system, via pointer states.

$[1 - \delta, 1 + \delta]$ and $D(\mathcal{S} : \bar{\mathcal{F}}) \leq \epsilon$, where $D(\mathcal{S} : \bar{\mathcal{F}})$ is the discord between \mathcal{S} and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ and the check accent identifies which of the two subsystems undergoes measurement, namely $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$.

Notably, recent advances in QD were driven by developments in quantum information theory—developments that proved crucial in tackling foundational questions. The following proposes that geometric quantum mechanics be added to the toolbox and then shows how to formulate QD in terms of geometric quantum states. This leads directly to deriving two conditions for the nullity of discord and, eventually, to recognizing the branching form as the only state structure compatible with the emergence of classicality.

Geometric states. GQM recognizes that the Hilbert space description of a quantum state is redundant: multiplying a ket by a complex number produces a different ket that corresponds to the same physical state. Removing redundancy leads to the quantum state space that, for a system with Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of dimension D [32], is the complex projective Hilbert space: $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathbb{C}P^{D-1}$. Upon choosing a reference basis $\{|e_\alpha\rangle\}_\alpha$, a pure state is parametrized by D complex homogeneous coordinates $|Z\rangle = \sum_\alpha Z^\alpha |e_\alpha\rangle$, where $Z \sim \lambda Z$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}/\{0\}$ and thus $Z \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$.

The space $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ has a rich geometric structure, with several differential-geometric tools that address its quantumness. Most relevant to our purposes is that there is a preferred notion of an invariant measure, the Fubini-Study volume element. This allows leveraging measure theory to define ensembles and so to describe mixed states. Concretely, using probability-phase coordinates $Z^\alpha = \sqrt{p_\alpha} e^{i\nu_\alpha}$, up to an overall numerical factor, one has: $dV_{FS} \sim \prod_{\alpha=0}^{D-1} dp_\alpha d\nu_\alpha$. This is akin to the standard $\prod_n dx_n dp_n$ measure used in classical statistical mechanics to define integrals in phase space [33]. The Fubini-Study volume element leads rather directly to defining a geometric quantum state as a probability measure μ on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$ —an ensemble of pure states. Thus, a pure state, a point $Z_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})$, is represented with a Dirac measure $\mu_{\text{pure}} = \delta_{Z_0}$ [34], while a finite ensemble is a convex combination of weighted Dirac measures: $\mu_{\text{ensemble}} = \sum_j \lambda_j \delta_{Z_j}$, with $\sum_j \lambda_j = 1$ [35].

The relation with density matrices is straightforward: $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ is the expectation value of $Z^\alpha \bar{Z}^\beta$ computed with μ : $\rho_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbb{E}_\mu[Z^\alpha \bar{Z}^\beta] = \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H})} d\mu(Z) Z^\alpha \bar{Z}^\beta$. Reference [29] showed how to obtain the geometric quantum state of an open quantum system interacting with an environment. We now exploit the same construction to build the geometric quantum state of \mathcal{S} and then examine QD through the lens of GQM. In particular, we focus on decoherence and einselection as QD's two building blocks. The starting point—the focal point of our analysis—is the joint system pure state $|\psi_{SE}\rangle$ [36].

Decoherence. Any composite state $|\psi_{SE}\rangle$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_{SE}\rangle &\equiv |\psi_{S\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}}\rangle = \sum_{i,\alpha,\beta} \psi_{i\alpha\beta} |a_i\rangle |f_\alpha\rangle |\bar{f}_\beta\rangle, \\ &= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \sqrt{X_{\alpha\beta}} |\chi_{\alpha\beta}\rangle |f_\alpha\rangle |\bar{f}_\beta\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\{|a_i\rangle\}_i$, $\{|f_\alpha\rangle\}_\alpha$ and $\{|\bar{f}_\beta\rangle\}_\beta$ are arbitrary orthonormal bases on \mathcal{H}_S , $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}$, respectively, while $X_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_i |\psi_{i\alpha\beta}|^2$ and $|\chi_{\alpha\beta}\rangle = \sum_i \frac{\psi_{i\alpha\beta}}{\sqrt{X_{\alpha\beta}}} |a_i\rangle$. Following Ref. [29], the geometric quantum state of \mathcal{S} is then

$$\mu_S = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} X_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{\chi_{\alpha\beta}}. \quad (2)$$

This is visualized as a measure on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_S)$, as Fig. 2 illustrates.

Decoherence occurs when the states $\{|\chi_{\alpha\beta}\rangle\}_{\alpha,\beta}$ cluster around pointer states. For a qubit, with pointer states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, this leads to geometric quantum states with two clusters around antipodal points on the Bloch sphere. For a generic \mathcal{S} of dimension D_S , clustering around pointer states leads to the following organization

$$\mu_S = \sum_{n=1}^{D_S} \sum_{(\alpha,\beta) \in \Omega_n} X_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{\chi_{\alpha\beta}}, \quad (3)$$




FIG. 2. Decohered geometric quantum state with pointer states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$: Red points are the $\chi_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ with probability mass $X_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$ and such that the Fubini-Study distance from $Z(|0\rangle)$ is small: $D_{FS}(\chi_{\alpha\beta}, 0) \leq \epsilon$. The other side of the Bloch sphere, not visible, has a qualitatively identical clustering around $|1\rangle$.

where Ω_n identifies the cluster of (α, β) associated with the n th pointer state. The reduced density matrix of \mathcal{S} is

$$\rho_S = \sum_{n,m=1}^{D_S} |n\rangle \langle m| \left(\sum_{(\alpha,\beta) \in \Omega_n \cap \Omega_m} X_{\alpha\beta} \right). \quad (4)$$

Decoherence means ρ_S 's off-diagonal matrix elements are almost vanishing $\sum_{\alpha,\beta \in \Omega_n \cap \Omega_m} X_{\alpha\beta} \approx 0$. This implies that each state $\chi_{\alpha\beta}$ belongs to a unique cluster Ω_n of nonoverlapping states [37], each centered around a pointer state. Before illustrating clustering in a generic many-qubit model [16], we establish how the condition of zero discord results in a specific form of branching states in the universal wave function.

Nullity of discord. We explored decoherence from the perspective of geometric quantum states. Now, we assume decoherence happened and explore conditions for the nullity of discord to identify the organizational structure of $X_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\chi_{\alpha\beta}$ that is consistent with the vanishing of all quantum correlations. Reference [38] already established that the nullity of discord $D(S : \bar{\mathcal{F}})$ —the check accent indicates the subsystem being measured—can be written as a condition on the form of the reduced state of $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}$, such that

$$D(S : \bar{\mathcal{F}}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \rho_{S\mathcal{F}} = \sum_j p_j \sigma_S^j \otimes |f_j\rangle \langle f_j|. \quad (5)$$

In our case, we can show that there is $\{X_{\alpha\beta}\}_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that $D(S : \bar{\mathcal{F}}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow X_{\alpha\beta} X_{\alpha'\beta} = 0$, for all $\alpha \neq \alpha'$. (6)

Additionally, we can show that

$$X_{\alpha\beta}X_{\alpha'\beta} = 0, \text{ for all } \alpha \neq \alpha' \Leftrightarrow \text{there exists } g(\beta) \text{ such that } X_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{\alpha, g(\beta)} X_{g(\beta)\beta}, \quad (7)$$

where $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a deterministic function mapping a label $\beta = 1, \dots, D_{\mathcal{F}}$ onto a label $g(\beta) = 1, \dots, D_{\mathcal{F}}$ [39].

These propositions establish that the only global-state structure compatible with both decoherence and exactly zero discord is given by a branching form

$$D(\mathcal{S} : \tilde{\mathcal{F}}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow |\psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}\rangle = \sum_{\beta} \sqrt{X_{g(\beta)\beta}} |\chi_{g(\beta)\beta}\rangle |f_{g(\beta)}\rangle |\bar{f}_{\beta}\rangle. \quad (8)$$

Proximity to a branching form. The geometric framing of decoherence and discord strongly suggests that the mechanism underlying the emergence of classicality is self-organization: the elements of the support of the geometric quantum state $\{\chi_{\alpha\beta}\}$ spontaneously form clusters Ω_n , each centered around a pointer state. In turn, this corresponds to a branching structure of the global pure state $|\psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}\rangle$. However, as proven above, the condition holds if and only if discord is *exactly* zero. Little can be said about the realistic situation in which discord is small but not exactly zero. More puzzling, due to discord's highly nonlinear character, there is no guarantee that a generic small-discord state will be in the proximity of a zero discord one.

Entanglement has an analogous statement which pertains to the fact that a generic state with low entanglement of formation might be far from the closest separable state. While this is technically true, the geometric analysis paints a rather compelling picture, pointing towards the fact that clustering around pointer states is the only way in which classical behavior can emerge. Violation of this condition intuitively leads to violation of decoherence or large discord.

We are thus led to believe that the branching form, which is directly connected to the clustering property, might not be destroyed by a small amount of discord or small values of $\rho_{\mathcal{S}}$'s off-diagonal elements. This intuition, brought about by the geometric formalism, turns out to be correct. The branching structure is the only one possible in the case in which the environment is a good communication channel. This is indeed what happens when discord is small and the mutual information is near the classical plateau $I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}) \approx H_{\mathcal{S}}$. In point of fact, the following can be rigorously proven:

Theorem: Given a pure state $|\psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}\rangle$ such that $D(\mathcal{S}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}) \leq \epsilon_D$ and $|I_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}} - H_{\mathcal{S}}| \leq \epsilon_I$, then for all $\epsilon_D, \epsilon_I > 0$ there exists $\eta(\epsilon_D, \epsilon_I) \geq 0$ with $\eta \in \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_D, \epsilon_I)$ and a branching state $|\text{GHZ}\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{D_{\mathcal{S}}} \sqrt{y_n} |n\rangle |\phi_n^{\mathcal{F}}\rangle |\phi_n^{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}\rangle$ such that

$$|\langle \psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}} | \text{GHZ} \rangle|^2 \geq 1 - \eta(\epsilon_D, \epsilon_I). \quad (9)$$

The Appendix gives the proof.

Given that the Fubini-Study distance between two quantum states is $D_{FS}(\psi, \phi) = \arccos(|\langle \psi | \phi \rangle|)$, we obtain the following corollary. If a state $|\psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}\rangle$ satisfies the requirements of classicality, up to some (ϵ_D, ϵ_I) , then it will be close, in Fubini-Study distance, to a branching state: $D_{FS}(\psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}, \text{GHZ}) \in \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_D, \epsilon_I)$. This selects the branching form as the unique structure of correlations that is compatible with classical behavior, as characterized in Quantum Darwinism. This constitutes our main result.

Example: coherent information extraction. To illustrate the clustering property, the nullity condition in Eq. (6), and also provide numerical support to the validity of the main theorem, we use a generalized “c-maybe” model. This generalizes the model of information extraction introduced and analyzed in Ref. [16]. There a single qubit \mathcal{S} interacts with an environment of qubits via an imperfect c-not gate. This is modeled with a controlled-unitary operation acting on \mathcal{S} and the i th environmental qubit with $\text{CU}_i := |0_{\mathcal{S}}\rangle\langle 0_{\mathcal{S}}| \otimes U_i^0 + |1_{\mathcal{S}}\rangle\langle 1_{\mathcal{S}}| \otimes U_i^1$. In the ideal case $U_i^0 = \mathbb{I}_i$ and $U_i^1 = \sigma_i^x$ this is a perfect c-not gate. The generic $U_i^{0,1}$ are meant to model a more realistic, imperfect, yet still coherent, transfer of information between a system and its environment.

Despite the model's apparent simplicity, it describes a wide class of many-qubit models and captures aspects of the photon scattering model; cf. Ref. [16]'s supplemental material. Within this model of information extraction, we can see, both analytically and numerically, how the branching form results directly from the action of the imperfect gates. To ease presentation, in the analytical section we make use of $U_i^0 = \mathbb{I}_i$, $U_i^1 = \sqrt{\gamma}\sigma_i^x + \sqrt{1-\gamma}\sigma_i^z$, with $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, but the general results are independent of this choice. This is verified in the numerical example, where we look at the model in which $U_k^{0,1}$ are randomly drawn from the Haar measure.

Analytical example. If the system is initially in state $\sqrt{1-p}|0_{\mathcal{S}}\rangle + \sqrt{p}e^{i\phi}|1_{\mathcal{S}}\rangle$ and the environment is in the uniform “all-up” state, the dynamics leads to

$$|\psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{E}}\rangle = \sqrt{1-p}|0_{\mathcal{S}}\rangle \bigotimes_{i=1}^m |0_i\rangle \bigotimes_{i=1}^{N-m} |0_i\rangle + \sqrt{p}e^{i\phi}|1_{\mathcal{S}}\rangle \bigotimes_{i=1}^m |\gamma_i\rangle \bigotimes_{i=1}^{N-m} |\gamma_i\rangle, \quad (10)$$

with $|\gamma_i\rangle := U_i|0_i\rangle = \sqrt{1-\gamma}|0_i\rangle + \sqrt{\gamma}|1_i\rangle$, for all i .

We can now explicitly write the system's geometric quantum state. We adopt the following multi-index notation for the environment labels that recognizes the many-body nature of an environment made of qubits: $\alpha \rightarrow \vec{S}_{\mathcal{F}} = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$ and $|f_{\alpha}\rangle \rightarrow |\vec{S}_{\mathcal{F}}\rangle = \bigotimes_{k=1}^m |s_k\rangle$, with $s_k \in \{0, 1\}$. Analogous definitions hold for $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$: $\beta \rightarrow \vec{T}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ and $|\bar{f}_{\beta}\rangle \rightarrow |\vec{T}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}\rangle$, with $t_k \in \{0, 1\}$. This then leads to a geometric quantum state parametrized by $X_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow X(\vec{S}_{\mathcal{F}}, \vec{T}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}})$ and $|\chi_{\alpha\beta}\rangle \rightarrow |\chi(\vec{S}_{\mathcal{F}}, \vec{T}_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}})\rangle$.




FIG. 3. Numerical experiment with dynamics generated by controlled-unitaries drawn randomly from the Haar measure, with μ_S^{rand} being the resulting geometric quantum state. (Left) Probability measure $\mu_S^{\text{rand}}[C_1](\rho)$ of spherical caps $C_1(\rho)$ with progressively increasing Fubini-Study radius ρ . As the environment size increases, the curves steepen, signaling that smaller and smaller regions around $|1_S\rangle$ contain increasingly large fractions of the probability mass. As $\rho \rightarrow 0.5$ we see $\mu_S^{\text{rand}}[C_1](\rho) \rightarrow p$, where $\sqrt{p}e^{i\phi}$ is the amplitude of $|1_S\rangle$ in the system's initial state. In the example reported here, we have $p = 0.3$. (Left, inset) Example of a spherical cap of Fubini-Study radius ρ , centered on $|1_S\rangle$. (Right) Using the Bloch sphere to represent \mathbb{CP}^1 , we look at the probability density of μ_S^{rand} , for $N = 18$, in a small region around the north pole. Due to the fact that the region is small, we can use b_x, b_y , the x and y components of the Bloch vector, as coordinates to approximate a small spherical cap around the north pole with flat coordinates $(b_x, b_y) \in (-0.1, 0.1) \times (-0.1, 0.1)$. The concentration of μ_S^{rand} around $|1_S\rangle$ is evident. While here we show results pertaining only concentration around $|1_S\rangle$, the same hold for $|0_S\rangle$.

For the state in Eq. (10), these have the following values: $X(\vec{S}_{\mathcal{F}}, \vec{T}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}}) = 1 - p + p(1 - \gamma)^N$ when $\vec{S}_{\mathcal{F}} = \vec{T}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}} = \vec{0}$ and $X(\vec{S}_{\mathcal{F}}, \vec{T}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}}) = p\gamma^N$ if at least one of them is not $\vec{0}$; $|\chi(\vec{0}_{\mathcal{F}}, \vec{0}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}})\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{1-p}}{\sqrt{1-p+p(1-\gamma)^N}}|0_S\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{p(1-\gamma)^{N/2}}}{\sqrt{1-p+p(1-\gamma)^N}}e^{i\phi}|1_S\rangle$ and $|\chi(\vec{S}_{\mathcal{F}}, \vec{T}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}})\rangle = |1_S\rangle$ whenever $\vec{S}_{\mathcal{F}} \neq \vec{0}_{\mathcal{F}}$ or $\vec{T}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}} \neq \vec{0}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}}$. This leads to the following exact form of the geometric quantum state ($\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma^k = 0$)

$$\mu_S = (1 - p)\delta_{Z(|0_S\rangle)} + p\delta_{Z(|1_S\rangle)}. \quad (11)$$

This provides an analytical example of the duality between the properties listed above—decoherence, clustering, $D(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}) \approx 0$, and $I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}) \approx H_S$ —and the branching form for the global wave-function $|\psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}\overline{\mathcal{F}}}\rangle$. This duality holds exactly in the limit $m, N \rightarrow \infty$ or up to some small value for $m, N \gg 1$. This can be verified by direct computation of the quantities involved.

Numerical example. To strengthen the case for the emergence phenomenology revealed in the main theorem and to provide stronger evidence that this is generic, consider the opposite case in which extracting information occurs in a random way. $U_k^{0,1}$ are now drawn randomly from the Haar measure on the unitary group. We then consider joint systems with progressively larger environment size made by $N_{\mathcal{E}} = 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18$ qubits. For each, we generate the geometric quantum state μ_S^{rand} by applying the random gates and then extract the cumulative distribution of the probability mass contained in progressively smaller regions around $|0_S\rangle$ and $|1_S\rangle$. Using a Bloch sphere representation for \mathbb{CP}^1 , these correspond to spherical caps $C_{0/1}$ centered around the north (0) and south (1) poles, respectively. Geometrically, these are defined as $C_0(\rho) := \{Z \in \mathbb{CP}^1 : D_{FS}(Z, Z(|0_S\rangle)) \leq \rho\}$ and analogously for $C_1(\rho)$, centered on $Z(|1_S\rangle)$.

As we increase the environment's size, the cumulative functions $\mu_S^{\text{rand}}[C_0](\rho)$ and $\mu_S^{\text{rand}}[C_1](\rho)$ become increas-

ingly steep, proving that the support of the geometric quantum state becomes increasingly clustered around the pointer states. Each cluster then has probability mass provided by the initial state: $1 - p$ for $|0_S\rangle$ and p for $|1_S\rangle$. Figure 3 shows the results.

In the limit of large environment $m, N \gg 1$, we conclude that the geometric quantum state becomes $\mu_S^{\text{rand}} = (1 - p)\delta_{Z(|0_S\rangle)} + p\delta_{Z(|1_S\rangle)}$. It is straightforward to see that this satisfies all the properties discussed above, thus providing a second clarifying example of the main theorem's result.

In summary, in the mesoscopic and macroscopic regime $m, N \gg 1$ of the c-maybe model, the conditions for the validity of the main theorem spontaneously emerge. And, independently, we can verify the emergence of the global-state branching form, together with its duality with the clustering property of the geometric quantum state around the pointer states: $|0_S\rangle$ and $|1_S\rangle$.

Concluding remarks. Geometric Quantum Mechanics is a differential-geometric approach to quantum mechanics that improves our quantum toolbox by adding new tools and concepts. In this work, we exploited its ability to describe open quantum systems via classical probability measures on the space of quantum states, using the procedure established in Refs. [28, 29]. Part of the strength of using GQM lies its ability to visualize, from the perspective of a subsystem, the structure of the globally pure wave-function. We leveraged this to investigate the structures of quantum states compatible with the emergence of a classical phenomenology, as prescribed by Quantum Darwinism. Using a combination of tools of geometric quantum mechanics and quantum information theory we established that classical phenomenology can emerge *if and only if* the global wave-function is sufficiently close to a branching form, in which each branch has sufficiently low entanglement. The emergence of classicality is therefore understood as a self-organizing process occurring in the space of quantum states in which, in the limit of large environments, the support of the geometric quantum state becomes clustered around the pointer states. This has been illustrated directly, both analytically and numerically, in two realistic models of information extraction.

Our work achieves two major goals: First, it clearly shows how to use geometric quantum mechanics to investigate properties of an open quantum system by directly examining the structure of the global wave-function. Second, this allowed us, for the first time, to (i) give a complete structural characterization of a global wave-function with subsystems acting classically and (ii) prove that such structure is indeed unique.

It is still actively debated if and how classical reality is consistent with a deeply quantum universe. QD gives compelling arguments for the emergence of classicality as a consequence of decoherence and observation. Our results show that classical reality is encoded in highly structured, symmetric quantum states and that the structural properties

of quantum states supporting classicality are unique. As such, our results provide further, strong evidence that QD is indeed a highly productive path to follow for understanding and describing the transition from the quantum world to the classical.

A.T. acknowledges support from the Center for Nonlinear Studies and the U.S DOE under the LDRD program at Los Alamos. F.A. acknowledges support from Templeton World Charity Foundation under grant TWCF0336 and acknowledges that this work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics, Inqubator for Quantum Simulation (IQUS) under Award Number DOE (NP) Award DE-SC0020970. S.D. acknowledges support from the U.S. National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMR-2010127. J.P.C acknowledges support from FQXi Grant number FQXi-RFP-IPW-1902 and U.S. Army Research Laboratory and the U.S. Army Research Office under grants W911NF-21-1-0048 and W911NF-18-1-0028.

* akramt1@umbc.edu

† fanza@uw.edu

‡ deffner@umbc.edu

§ chaos@ucdavis.edu

- [1] M. Gemmer, Michel, *Quantum thermodynamics* (Springer, 2008).
- [2] W. Popescu, Short, *Nat. Phys.* **2**, 754 (2006).
- [3] S. Deffner, *Nat. Phys.* **11**, 383 (2015).
- [4] H. Touchette, *Phys. Rep.* **478**, 1 (2009).
- [5] M. Ledoux, *The concentration of measure phenomenon* (American Mathematical Society, 2001).
- [6] A. Le, Winter, *Entropy* **23**, 11 (2021).
- [7] W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. D* **24**, 1516 (1981).
- [8] W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. D* **26**, 1862 (1982).
- [9] W. H. Zurek, *Ann. Phys.* **9**, 855 (2000).
- [10] W. H. Zurek, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 715 (2003).
- [11] H. Ollivier, D. Poulin, and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 220401 (2004).
- [12] H. Ollivier, D. Poulin, and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 042113 (2005).
- [13] R. Blume-Kohout and W. H. Zurek, *Foundations of Physics* **35**, 1857 (2005).
- [14] R. Blume-Kohout and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 062310 (2006).
- [15] W. H. Zurek, *Nat. Phys.* **5**, 181 (2009).
- [16] A. Touil, B. Yan, D. Girolami, S. Deffner, and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 010401 (2022).
- [17] D. Girolami, A. Touil, B. Yan, S. Deffner, and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 010401 (2022).
- [18] T. K. Unden, D. Louzon, M. Zwolak, W. H. Zurek, and F. Jelezko, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.140402 (2019).
- [19] M.-C. Chen, H.-S. Zhong, Y. Li, D. Wu, X.-L. Wang, L. Li, N.-L. Liu, C.-Y. Lu, , and J.-W. Pan, *Science Bulletin* **64**, 10.1016/j.scib.2019.03.032 (2019).
- [20] M. A. Ciampini, G. Pinna, P. Mataloni, and M. Paternostro,

- Phys. Rev. A **98**, [10.1103/PhysRevA.98.020101](#) (2018).
- [21] Here, by “structure” we mean the organization of the coefficients defining the state. Separable states, or zero-discord states are an example.
- [22] F. Strocchi, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **38**, 36 (1966).
- [23] A. Ashtekar and T. A. Schilling, in *AIP Conference Proceedings*, Vol. 342 (AIP, 1995) pp. 471–478.
- [24] D. C. Brody and L. P. Hughston, *J. Geom. Physics* **38**, 19 (2001).
- [25] G. W. Gibbons, *J. Geom. Physics* **8**, 147 (1992).
- [26] A. Heslot, *Phys. Rev. D* **31**, 1341 (1985).
- [27] T. W. B. Kibble, *Comm. Math. Physics* **65**, 189 (1979).
- [28] F. Anza and J. P. Crutchfield, *Phys. Rev. X Quantum* **3**, [020355](#) (2022).
- [29] F. Anza and J. P. Crutchfield, *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 062218 (2021).
- [30] F. Anza and J. P. Crutchfield, [arxiv:2008.08683](#) (2021).
- [31] J. R. Anglin and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 7327 (1996).
- [32] Here, we focus on finite dimensional Hilbert spaces without loss of generality.
- [33] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics: Volume 5*, Vol. 5 (Elsevier, 2013).
- [34] This is a Dirac measure in a nonflat space, hence $\tilde{\delta} = \delta/\sqrt{\det g}$, where g is the determinant of the Fubini-Study metric.
- [35] Mathematically, a measure is more general than a probability density. The latter exists only if the measure is absolutely continuous. However, with a slight abuse of language, we refer to both as to geometric quantum states. Details can be found in Refs.[22–30].
- [36] At this point, it is crucial to emphasize that we assume neither an epistemic nor ontic view of the wave function. Instead, we consider it to be an element of a Hilbert space or a collection of points on a complex projective manifold. And, we then explore how this leads to an inevitable emergent structure (branching state structure) that accounts for classical behavior.
- [37] We assume that the self-Hamiltonians of the system and environment commute with the interaction Hamiltonian. Otherwise, the pointer states become an approximate notion [7, 8, 31].
- [38] A. Datta, [arXiv preprint arXiv:1003.5256](#) (2010).
- [39] The Appendix gives detailed proofs of both propositions. Additionally, we prove a third proposition on the nullity of discord in terms of the Frobenius Norm.
- [40] M. A. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (2002).
- [41] M. Zwolak, *Entropy* **24**, [10.3390/e24060781](#) (2022).

Supplementary material

Branching States as The Emergent Structure of a Quantum Universe

Akram Touil, Fabio Anza, Sebastian Deffner, James P. Crutchfield

Proofs of propositions

proof of proposition 1: (\Leftarrow) We generally have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{S\mathcal{F}} &= \sum_{\alpha, \alpha', \beta} \sqrt{X_{\alpha\beta} X_{\alpha'\beta}} |\chi_{\alpha\beta}\rangle \langle \chi_{\alpha'\beta}| \otimes |f_{\alpha}\rangle \langle f_{\alpha'}|, \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \neq \alpha', \beta} \sqrt{X_{\alpha\beta} X_{\alpha'\beta}} |\chi_{\alpha\beta}\rangle \langle \chi_{\alpha'\beta}| \otimes |f_{\alpha}\rangle \langle f_{\alpha'}| + \sum_{\alpha, \beta} X_{\alpha\beta} |\chi_{\alpha\beta}\rangle \langle \chi_{\alpha\beta}| \otimes |f_{\alpha}\rangle \langle f_{\alpha}|.\end{aligned}\tag{S1}$$

Therefore, if $(\forall \alpha \neq \alpha'); X_{\alpha\beta} X_{\alpha'\beta} = 0$, we get

$$\rho_{S\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} X_{\alpha\beta} |\chi_{\alpha\beta}\rangle \langle \chi_{\alpha\beta}| \otimes |f_{\alpha}\rangle \langle f_{\alpha}|,\tag{S2}$$

which implies $D(S : \check{F}) = 0$. The other implication (\Rightarrow) is trivial. In fact, if $D(S : \check{F}) = 0$, we have [38]

$$\rho_{S\mathcal{F}} = \sum_j p_j \sigma_S^j \otimes |f_j\rangle \langle f_j|,\tag{S3}$$

where $p_j \sigma_S^j = \sum_{\beta} Y_{j,\beta} |\chi_{j\beta}\rangle \langle \chi_{j\beta}|$. Therefore,

$$\rho_{S\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{j, \beta} Y_{j,\beta} |\chi_{j\beta}\rangle \langle \chi_{j\beta}| \otimes |f_j\rangle \langle f_j|,\tag{S4}$$

hence $(\exists \{X_{j\beta}\}_{j, \beta})$ such that

$$\rho_{S\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{j, j', \beta} \sqrt{X_{j\beta} X_{j'\beta}} |\chi_{j\beta}\rangle \langle \chi_{j'\beta}| \otimes |f_j\rangle \langle f_{j'}|,\tag{S5}$$

and $(\forall \alpha \neq \alpha'); X_{\alpha\beta} X_{\alpha'\beta} = 0$. *QED.*

proof of proposition 2: The implication (\Leftarrow) is trivial, namely, $X_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{\alpha, g(\beta)} X_{g(\beta)\beta}$ implies that $(\forall \beta); (\exists! \alpha); X_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$, and $\alpha = g(\beta)$, hence $(\forall \alpha \neq \alpha'); X_{\alpha\beta} X_{\alpha'\beta} = 0$. For the implication (\Rightarrow), we have $(\forall \alpha \neq \alpha'); X_{\alpha\beta} X_{\alpha'\beta} = 0$, if we assume that there exist at least α_1 and α_2 such that $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$, $X_{\alpha_1\beta} = \delta_{\alpha_1, g(\beta)} X_{g(\beta)\beta}$, and $X_{\alpha_2\beta} = \delta_{\alpha_2, g(\beta)} X_{g(\beta)\beta}$, then we get $X_{\alpha_1\beta} X_{\alpha_2\beta} \neq 0$ which violates the assumption we started with. *QED.*

proof of proposition 3: We start by noting that the elements of the density matrix $\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}}$ have the following form:

$$(\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{\alpha\beta; \alpha'\beta'} = \langle \chi_{\alpha'\beta'} | \chi_{\alpha\beta} \rangle \sqrt{X_{\alpha\beta} X_{\alpha'\beta'}}.\tag{S6}$$

As derived in *proposition 1*,

$$D(S : \check{F}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow (\forall \alpha \neq \alpha'); X_{\alpha\beta} X_{\alpha'\beta} = 0,\tag{S7}$$

hence

$$D(S : \check{F}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow (\forall \alpha \neq \alpha'); \sum_{\beta\gamma} (\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{\alpha'\beta; \alpha'\gamma} (\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{\alpha\gamma; \alpha\beta} = 0.\tag{S8}$$

Additionally,

$$(\forall \alpha \neq \alpha'); \sum_{\beta\gamma} (\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{\alpha'\beta; \alpha'\gamma} (\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{\alpha\gamma; \alpha\beta} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{\alpha'\alpha} \sum_{\beta\gamma} (\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{\alpha'\beta; \alpha'\gamma} (\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{\alpha\gamma; \alpha\beta} = \sum_X \sum_{\beta\gamma} (\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{X\beta; X\gamma} (\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{X\gamma; X\beta},\tag{S9}$$

which simplifies to

$$D(S : \check{F}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{\beta\gamma} \left(\sum_{\alpha'} (\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{\alpha'\beta; \alpha'\gamma} \right) \left(\sum_{\alpha} (\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{\alpha\gamma; \alpha\beta} \right) = \sum_{\beta\gamma} \sum_X |(\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})_{X\gamma; X\beta}|^2,\tag{S10}$$

hence

$$D(S : \check{\mathcal{F}}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{\beta\gamma} (\rho_{\check{\mathcal{F}}})_{\gamma\beta} (\rho_{\check{\mathcal{F}}})_{\beta\gamma} = \sum_{\beta\gamma} \sum_X |(\rho_{\check{\mathcal{F}}})_{X\gamma;X\beta}|^2, \quad (\text{S11})$$

which reads

$$D(S : \check{\mathcal{F}}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \|\rho_{\check{\mathcal{F}}}\|_F^2 = \sum_{\beta\gamma} \sum_X |(\rho_{\check{\mathcal{F}}})_{X\gamma;X\beta}|^2. \quad (\text{S12})$$

For further simplifications, we introduce the notation: $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}} = \sum_X \Pi_X \rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}} \Pi_X$ (defined as a post-measurement state), where $\Pi_X = |X\rangle\langle X| \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}$. Therefore, we get

$$D(S : \check{\mathcal{F}}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \|\rho_{\check{\mathcal{F}}}\|_F^2 = \text{tr} \{ \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}} \rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}} \}, \quad (\text{S13})$$

which in turn simplifies to

$$D(S : \check{\mathcal{F}}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \|\rho_{\check{\mathcal{F}}}\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} (\|\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}}\|^2 + \|\rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}}\|^2 - D_{HS}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})) , \quad (\text{S14})$$

where $D_{HS}(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}}, \rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}}) = \text{tr} \{ (\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}} - \rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})(\tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}} - \rho_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}})^\dagger \}$. *QED.*

Epsilon-delta statement

The goal is to prove the following statement

$$D(\mathcal{S} : \check{\mathcal{F}}) \leq \epsilon_D \text{ and } H_S - \epsilon_I \leq I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}) \leq H_S \Leftrightarrow |\langle GHZ | \psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}} \rangle|^2 = 1 - \eta(\epsilon_D, \epsilon_I), \quad (\text{S15})$$

the constant $\eta(\epsilon_D, \epsilon_I)$ depends on ϵ_D and ϵ_I , such that $\eta(\epsilon_D, \epsilon_I) \rightarrow 0$ when $\epsilon_D \rightarrow 0$ and $\epsilon_I \rightarrow 0$. Hereafter, for simplicity, we adopt the notation $\eta \equiv \eta(\epsilon_D, \epsilon_I)$. Equivalently, by definition of the quantum mutual information, the statement reads

$$\chi(\mathcal{S} : \check{\mathcal{F}}) \geq H_S - (\epsilon_D + \epsilon_I) \text{ and } H_S - \epsilon_I \leq I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}) \leq H_S \Leftrightarrow |\langle GHZ | \psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}} \rangle|^2 = 1 - \eta, \quad (\text{S16})$$

where the state $|GHZ\rangle$ refers to the elements of the set of generalized GHZ states,

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ |GHZ\rangle \left| (\exists |n\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S, |f_n\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{F}}, |\bar{f}_n\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\bar{\mathcal{F}}}, y_n \geq 0) ; |GHZ\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{D_S} \sqrt{y_n} |n\rangle |f_n\rangle |\bar{f}_n\rangle \right. \right\} \quad (\text{S17})$$

and

$$|\psi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}}\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{D_S} \sqrt{y_n} |n\rangle |\phi_{\mathcal{F}\bar{\mathcal{F}}}^n\rangle. \quad (\text{S18})$$

The second implication (\Leftarrow) is trivial, therefore to prove the statement in Eq. (S15) we only derive the first implication (\Rightarrow).

In the good decoherence limit, from Holevo's theorem, we have

$$\chi(\check{\mathcal{S}} : \mathcal{F}) \geq \chi(\mathcal{S} : \check{\mathcal{F}}), \quad (\text{S19})$$

hence

$$D(\check{\mathcal{S}} : \mathcal{F}) \leq D(\mathcal{S} : \check{\mathcal{F}}), \quad (\text{S20})$$

which shows that epsilon discord on the fragment's side implies epsilon discord on the system's side $D(\check{\mathcal{S}} : \mathcal{F}) \leq \epsilon_D$. It is noteworthy that, in the good decoherence limit, the optimal measurements on \mathcal{S} are rank-1 projections onto the pointer basis of \mathcal{S} . The epsilon discord condition, in addition to the fact that the mutual information is near the plateau, implies

$$0 \leq \sum_n p_n^{\mathcal{S}} H(\rho_n^{\mathcal{F}}) \leq \epsilon_I + \epsilon_D, \quad (\text{S21})$$

where $\rho_n^{\mathcal{F}}$ are the post-measurement states of the fragment \mathcal{F} , after we project \mathcal{S} onto the pointer basis (optimal measurement).

From the universal wave function (cf. Eq. (S18)), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{S\mathcal{F}} &= \sum_{n,m} \sqrt{y_n y_m} |n\rangle \langle m| \otimes \text{tr}_{\mathcal{F}} \{ |\phi_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{F}}^n\rangle \langle \phi_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{F}}^m| \}, \\
&= \sum_n y_n |n\rangle \langle n| \otimes \sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^n + \Delta_{S\mathcal{F}}, \\
&= \tilde{\rho}_{S\mathcal{F}} + \Delta_{S\mathcal{F}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S22}$$

We have

$$\tilde{\rho}_{S\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{n,k} y_n s_k^n |n\rangle \langle n| \otimes |k\rangle \langle k| \tag{S23}$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}
D(\rho_{S\mathcal{F}} \| \tilde{\rho}_{S\mathcal{F}}) &= -H_{S\mathcal{F}} - \text{tr} \{ \rho_{S\mathcal{F}} \ln \tilde{\rho}_{S\mathcal{F}} \}, \\
&= -H_{S\mathcal{F}} - \sum_{n,k} \langle n, k | \rho_{S\mathcal{F}} | n, k \rangle \ln y_n s_k^n, \\
&= -H_{S\mathcal{F}} - \sum_{n,k} y_n s_k^n \ln y_n s_k^n, \\
&= \tilde{H}_{S\mathcal{F}} - H_{S\mathcal{F}},
\end{aligned} \tag{S24}$$

where $\tilde{H}_{S\mathcal{F}} = H(\tilde{\rho}_{S\mathcal{F}}) = H(\sum_n y_n |n\rangle \langle n| \otimes \sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^n)$, which simplifies to $\tilde{H}_{S\mathcal{F}} = H(y_n) + \sum_n y_n H(\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^n) = H_S + \sum_n y_n H(\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^n)$ (cf. Ref. [40]). We note that $\sum_n y_n H(\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^n) = \sum_n p_n^S H(\rho_{\mathcal{F}}^n) \leq \epsilon_I + \epsilon_D$ (since projecting onto the pointer basis constitutes an optimal measurement on \mathcal{S} ; i.e. assuming good decoherence). Therefore, we get

$$D(\rho_{S\mathcal{F}} \| \tilde{\rho}_{S\mathcal{F}}) \leq H_S - H_{S\mathcal{F}} + \epsilon_I + \epsilon_D. \tag{S25}$$

Additionally, the condition $H_S - \epsilon_I \leq I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}) \leq H_S$ is equivalent to

$$-\epsilon_I \leq H_{\mathcal{F}} - H_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{F}} \leq 0. \tag{S26}$$

From Holevo's theorem, in the good decoherence limit [41], we have

$$H_S \geq \chi(\check{\mathcal{S}} : \mathcal{F}) \geq \chi(\mathcal{S} : \check{\mathcal{F}}). \tag{S27}$$

Now, using the fact that $(\exists \epsilon_D, \epsilon_I); \chi(\mathcal{S} : \check{\mathcal{F}}) \geq H_S - (\epsilon_I + \epsilon_D)$ and $H_S - \epsilon_I \leq I(\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}) \leq H_S$, we get

$$0 \leq H_S - H_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \epsilon_I + \epsilon_D. \tag{S28}$$

The above implies that

$$H_S - H_{S\mathcal{F}} \leq \epsilon_I + \epsilon_D. \tag{S29}$$

Hence we have proven that $D(\rho_{S\mathcal{F}} \| \tilde{\rho}_{S\mathcal{F}}) \leq 2(\epsilon_I + \epsilon_D)$ and $\sum_n y_n H(\sigma_{\mathcal{F}}^n) \leq \epsilon_I + \epsilon_D$, which shows that the states $|\phi_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{F}}^n\rangle$ are approximately product states (for each n), which proves that the global wave function is arbitrarily close to a GHZ state.