Universal properties of single particle excitations across the many-body localization transition

Atanu Jana^{1,3}, V. Ravi Chandra^{1,3}, Arti Garg^{2,3}

¹ School of Physical Sciences, National Institute of Science Education and Research Bhubaneswar, Jatni, Odisha 752050, India

Theory Division, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics,

1/AF Bidhannagar, Kolkata 700 064, India and

³ Homi Bhabha National Institute, Training School Complex, Anushaktinagar, Mumbai 400094, India

Understanding the nature of the transition from the delocalized to the many-body localized (MBL) phase is an important unresolved issue. To probe the nature of the MBL transition, we investigate the universal properties of single-particle excitations produced in highly excited many-body eigenstates of a disordered interacting quantum many-body system. In a class of one-dimensional spinless fermionic models, we study the finite size scaling of the ratio of typical to average values of the single-particle local density of states and the scattering rates across the MBL transition. Our results indicate that the MBL transition in this class of one-dimensional models of spinless fermions is continuous in nature. The critical exponent ν with which the correlation length ξ diverges at the transition point W_c , $\xi \sim |W - W_c|^{-\nu}$, satisfies the Chayes-Chayes-Fisher-Spencer(CCFS) bound $\nu \geq 2/d$ where d is the physical dimension of the system. The transition point W_c and the critical exponent ν do not change significantly with the range of interactions between fermions as long as the hopping is short range.

The role of disorder in quantum many-body systems has been a major focus of research in condensed matter physics for several decades. Anderson localization is a fascinating example of a disorder-driven phenomenon in which a non-interacting quantum system can become diffusion-less in the presence of strong enough disorder [1]. Almost two decades ago, Anderson localization was generalised for the case of interacting quantum systems [2] which is known as many-body localization (MBL) [3]. In the MBL phase, a subsystem of an isolated quantum system does not thermalize with the rest of the system serving as its bath [3-5]. The MBL system has strong memory of initial states [6-18] and can be described in terms of local integrals of motion [19–21]. Even highly excited states of an isolated MBL system obey area law of entanglement entropy [5, 22-27]. This is also reflected in slow growth of the subsystem entanglement for the MBL system in a quench protocol [18, 28–30]. Although the MBL phase has been rigorously proved to exist in strongly disordered 1-dimensional spin chains with short range interactions [31], broad agreement about the nature of the transition from the delocalized phase to the MBL phase has been elusive. We provide strong evidence in favor of a continuous transition from the delocalized phase to the MBL phase in this work.

The MBL transition is an atypical transition which does not necessarily follow the standard paradigm used to classify phase transitions. This makes it crucial to search for criteria that can provide hints towards the nature of the MBL transition. One such criterion is given by Chayes-Chayes-Fisher-Spencer(CCFS) bound on the critical exponent ν with which the correlation length ξ diverges at the transition point [32]. According to the CCFS criterion, for all systems with quenched random disorder that undergo a continuous transition including the localization transition, $\nu \geq 2/d$, where d is the physical dimension for the system, irrespective of whether there is an analogous transition in the clean system [32– 34]. The finite size scaling of the Anderson localization transition for the non-interacting model in higher dimensions ($d \geq 3$) has been shown to satisfy this bound for the critical exponent [36–40].

A couple of phenomenological real-space renormalization group studies were performed for the MBL systems which predicted a critical point at the MBL transition with the critical exponent $\nu \sim 3$ [41–45] that satisfies the CCFS bound. One major source of concern has been that the finite-size scaling analysis for the majority of conventional characterizations of the MBL phase, such as level spacing ratio and entanglement entropy gives the critical exponent $\nu < 1$ violating the CCFS bound [5, 23, 46, 47]. There are only a few exceptions, such as the Schmidt gap, which has been shown to be consistent with the CCFS criterion [48-50]. The violation of the CCFS bound, as well as the disparity between phenomenology and numerical calculations prompted an avalanche based [51, 52]renormalization group approach [53–55] that predicted a Kosterlitz-Thouless (KT) like transition and has been explored in some recent numerical studies [56–59]. In short, there is no agreement on the nature of the delocalization to MBL transition, so it is essential to identify appropriate physical observables that can characterize the MBL transition.

With this motivation, in this work we investigate single-particle excitations obtained via infinite temperature single-particle Green's function in real space across the MBL transition. Green's functions in the Fock space have been studied in the context of MBL [60–62], however



FIG. 1: Panel (a): The ratio of the typical to average local DOS $\rho_{typ}(\omega = \mu_{eff})/\rho_{avg}(\omega = \mu_{eff})$ as a function of the disorder strength W for $\alpha = 1$. The ratio is of order one for $W \ll W_c$ and for $W > W_c$, it is vanishingly small. Panel (b): The cost function C_X (in Eq. 2) for $X = \rho_{typ}(\omega = \mu_{eff})/\rho_{avg}(\omega = \mu_{eff})$ as a function of the critical disorder strength W_c and the correlation length exponent ν . Panel (c): The ratio of the typical to average value of local DOS $\rho_{typ}(\omega = \mu_{eff})/\rho_{avg}(\omega = \mu_{eff})$ plotted as a function of scaled disorder strength $(W - W_c)L^{1/\nu}$ for $W_c \approx 7.1$ and $\nu \approx 2.5$ corresponding to the region of the cost function shown in the middle panel with the minimum value of C_x . The bottom three panels depict the same quantities for $\alpha = 3$. The calculations are done in the middle of the energy band for a rescaled energy bin $\epsilon \in [0.495, 0.505]$. Details of the error-analysis and the cost function minimization are provided in SM [66].

single-particle Green's functions in real space, which have been widely utilised to analyse Anderson localization in non-interacting models [63], have attracted attention in the analysis of the MBL phase only recently [64, 65]. We analyse the finite size scaling of the corresponding local density of states (LDOS) and the scattering rates and demonstrate that the ratio of the typical to average value of the local density of states as well as the scattering rates both adhere to the single parameter scaling $X[L,W] \sim \overline{X}((W-W_C)L^{1/\nu})$ with the critical exponent satisfying the CCFS inequality for a finite value of W_c . Notably, we observe a good quality scaling collapse with $\nu > 2/d$ for the ratio of the typical to average value of the LDOS as well as the scattering rates not only for the system with nearest neighbour interactions but also for a whole class of one dimensional models with powerlaw interactions of different ranges and nearest neighbour hopping. The transition occurs nearly at the same value of the critical disorder W_c for all ranges of interactions studied. Finite size scaling of eigenlevel spacing ratio, on the other hand, does not satisfy the CCFS bound of the critical exponent which is consistent with earlier studies [5, 23, 46, 47].

Model: We study a class of one-dimensional models of

spinless fermions in the presence of random disorder and power-law interactions. The Hamiltonian of the models studied is

$$H = -t \sum_{i} [c_{i}^{\dagger} c_{i+1} + h.c.] + \sum_{i} \epsilon_{i} n_{i} + \sum_{ij} V_{ij} n_{i} n_{j} (1)$$

with periodic boundary conditions. Here, the onsite potential $\epsilon_i \in [-W/t, W/t]$ (uniformly distributed) with W as the disorder strength. We study power-law interactions with $V_{ij} = \frac{V}{|r_i - r_j|^{\alpha}}$, where α fixes the range of interactions. We have considered $\alpha = 1, 2$ and 3 in this study. We also consider the limit of the very short range interactions by studying the case of nearest neighbour interactions with $V_{i,i+1} = V$ and $V_{ij} = 0$ for |j - i| > 1. In the entire analysis the strength of interactions has been fixed to be V = t(= 1) and the system is half-filled. We study the model using full diagonalization, for the several system sizes from L = 12to L = 18. We study the Green's function in the *nth* eigenstate $G_n(i, j, t) = -i\Theta(t)\langle \Psi_n | \{c_i(t), c_i^{\dagger}(0)\} | \Psi_n \rangle$, where i, j are lattice site indices. The associated self energy is $\tilde{\Sigma}_n(\omega) \equiv \mathbf{G_0^{-1}}(\omega) - \mathbf{G_n^{-1}}(\omega)$ where $\mathbf{G_0}(\omega)$ and $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{n}}(\omega)$ are Fourier transforms of the non-interacting and interacting Green's function respectively. The LDOS



FIG. 2: Panel [a]: The ratio of the typical to average LDOS $\rho_{typ}(\omega = 0)/\rho_{avg}(\omega = 0)$ plotted as a function of the scaled disorder strength $(W - W_c)L^{1/\nu}$. The critical disorder $W_c \sim 7.3t$ and the exponent $\nu \sim 2.2$ are obtained by minimising the cost function C_X (in Eq. 2) details of which are shown in the SM [66]. Panel [b]: A similar trend is seen in the ratio of the typical to average value of the scattering rate $\Gamma_{typ}(\omega = 0)/\Gamma_{avg}(\omega = 0)$. All quantities are computed for the system with nearest neighbour interactions and for states in the middle of the eigenspectrum for a rescaled energy $\epsilon \in [0.495, 0.505]$

 $\rho_n(i,\omega)$ and scattering rate are obtained from the imaginary part of the Green's function and the self energy respectively as $\rho_n(i,\omega) = \left(-\frac{1}{\pi}\right) Im \left[G_n(i,i,\omega+i\eta)\right)$ and $\Gamma_n(i,\omega) = -Im \left[\Sigma_n(i,i,\omega+i\eta)\right]$ where η is an infinitesimal broadening which should be of the order of but larger than the typical value of level spacing for adjacent eigenvalues. Details about η dependence of the Green's function are discussed in the SM [66].

The transition from the delocalized to the MBL phase is seen in the disordered averaged Green's function calculated for the mid spectrum eigen-states with rescaled energy $\epsilon_n = \frac{E_n - E_{min}}{E_{max} - E_{min}} \sim 0.5$. We analyse the ratio of typical to average value of the LDOS and scattering rates for $\omega = \mu_{eff}$ where μ_{eff} is the effective chemical potential of the system. The relevant details of our computations are presented in supplemental materials (SM) [66].

Finite-size Scaling Analysis: We assume that the characteristic length scale diverges with a power law at the MBL transition point $\xi \sim |W - W_C|^{-\nu}$. As a result a normalized observable X obeys the scaling $X[\delta, L] \sim \bar{X}(\delta L^{1/\nu})$ with $\delta = W - W_c$. To have a quantitative estimate of the scaling collapse, we calculate the costfunction for the quantity $\{X_i\}$ [56, 67].

$$C_X = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_{total}-1} |X_{j+1} - X_j|}{max\{X_j\} - min\{X_j\}} - 1$$
(2)

Here N_{total} is the total number of values of $\{X_i\}$ for various values of disorder W and system sizes L. We arrange all N_{total} values of $\{X_i\}$ according to increasing values of $(W - W_C)L^{1/\nu}$. C_X should be zero close for a perfect data collapse but for the finite size data that we have, we look for a minimum of the cost function with respect to the exponent ν for W_c values which are close to the intuitive guess of the transition point. We study the ratios of typical to average LDOS and scattering rates introduced earlier using a single parameter scaling form $(X[\delta, L] \sim \bar{X}(\delta L^{1/\nu}))$, which has also been used to study scaling properties of other quantities relevant in context of MBL [5, 23, 46, 47]. As we will show shortly, this scaling ansatz results in very good scaling collapse for these quantities. Below we first discuss the scaling for the system with power-law interactions followed by the results for the system with nearest neighbour interactions.

Panel (a) of Fig. 1 shows the ratio of the typical to average value of the LDOS for the system with power-law interactions and $\alpha = 1$. Probability distribution functions for the LDOS have been shown in SM [66]. For weak disorder, the typical value of the LDOS is of the order of the average LDOS while for large values of W in the MBL phase the typical value of the LDOS becomes vanishingly small though the corresponding average value is still finite. The ratio of typical to average value of LDOS increases with the system size for weak disorder while for very large disorder it becomes essentially independent of the chain size. Interestingly, at the disorder value $W^{\star} \sim 7.1t$ where the ratio becomes independent of the system size, it also becomes constant with respect to disorder W within numerical precision. In order to obtain the best scaling collapse of the finite size data for the ratio of typical to average values of the LDOS, we calculated the cost function C_X which is shown in panel (b) of Fig. 1 for $\alpha = 1$. C_X decreases as the value of the parameter W_c is increased from 5t, having a broad minima for $7.1t \leq W_c \leq 7.9t$ and $2.3 \leq \nu \leq 2.7$. With further increase in W_c and ν , C_X shows a slow increase. Details of cost-function minimization are provided in SM [66]. The finite size scaling collapse shown in panel (c) of Fig. 1 has been made for $W_c = 7.1t \sim W^*$ for which C_X has a minimum for $\nu = 2.5$ though any point in (W_c, ν) plane corresponding to the minimum of the cost function would give a good quality scaling collapse. The bottom panel in Fig. 1 shows similar plots for $\alpha = 3$. As one can see that the finite size scaling and the minimization of the cost function provides a critical point W_c which is very close to the one obtained for $\alpha = 1$ and again the critical exponent $\nu \sim 2.5$. In fact, the critical disorder W_c and the critical exponent ν do not change with the increase in the range of interaction even for $\alpha = 0.5$. We also studied the finite size scaling of the ratio of typical to average value of scattering rates and obtain almost the same transition point and critical exponent ν as that from the LDOS, details of which are provided in the SM [66].

Further, we analyse the LDOS and scattering rates for the system with nearest neighbour interactions. Fig. 2 shows the finite size scaling for the ratio of the LDOS and scattering rates. Once again, we observe an excellent data collapse for $W_c \sim 7.3t$ and $\nu \sim 2.2$ for both quantities. The corresponding cost function plots, which are very similar to the one shown for the system with powerlaw interactions, are shown in the SM [66]. This shows that for all ranges of interactions studied, the LDOS and the scattering rates of the single particle excitations satisfy the CCFS bound. This is because the single-particle excitations are exponentially unlikely to be excited in the MBL phase at large scales though the excitations typically propagate up to large scale in the delocalized phase. This feature of the single particle excitations, and the associated LDOS is basically the property required from a finite volume event in the CCFS argument to identify the characteristic length ξ and to prove the bound on ν .

We also analysed the behaviour of the level spacing ratio, which is frequently used to study the MBL transition. As shown in SM [66], the cost function in the $W_c - \nu$ plane has a very different pattern for the level spacing ratio compared to the LDOS and scattering rates studied above. For the level spacing ratio, cost function has a minimum at very small values of $W_c^{lsr} \sim 5.3t$ and $\nu = 0.64$. With further increase in W_c and ν the cost function shows a rapid increase. Thus, the critical exponent ν obtained from the finite-size scaling of the level spacing ratio strongly violates the CCFS criterion, in complete contrast to the LDOS and scattering rates. Details of the cost function and the scaling collapse for the level spacing ratio have been discussed in the SM [66].

Conclusions and Discussions: The MBL transition involves many higher excited states and entails a transition from the delocalized phase, where eigenstates are extended and obey volume law of entanglement, to the localised side, where eigenstates are localised and obey area law of entanglement. We present strong evidence in favour of a continuous delocalization to MBL transition where the correlation length exponent obeys the CCFS criterion. This is especially significant in light of recent disagreements and controversies regarding the nature of the MBL transition and the stability of the MBL phase. We show that the ratio of typical to average LDOS and scattering rates can be used to characterise the delocalization to MBL transition. Our analvsis also demonstrates that the MBL phase exists in a system with uniform long-range interactions and nearest neighbour hopping, which is consistent with existing theoretical [49, 68-73] and experimental studies [74-76]. The MBL transition in systems with uniform long-range interactions is also continuous in nature.

Although the ratio of typical to average LDOS and the scattering rate scale with a single parameter such that the critical exponent $\nu \geq 2/d$ with a finite value of the transition point, the level spacing ratio scales with a critical exponent that is much smaller than 2/d. The most reasonable and physically plausible explanation for this

is that different physical quantities approach the thermodynamic limit in different ways. According to our scaling analysis, the transition in level spacing ratio takes place at a disorder value W_c^{lsr} that is smaller than the disorder value at which Green's function quantities undergo transition W_c with $W_C^{lsr} < W_c$. This is consistent with recent proposals [79] which showed that as the disorder strength is increased for a finite-size system, the system first transitions from ergodic to non-ergodic phase with level spacing ratio showing a transition into Poissonian statistics, followed by a transition where there are no system wide resonances, which is reflected in transition in dynamical quantities like those obtained from single particle Green's function and time dependent density imbalance [80]. However, one can not rule out the possibility that the level spacing ratio and single particle excitations may continue to exhibit two distinct transitions even in the thermodynamic limit with an intermediate non-ergodic phase preceding the MBL phase. The CCFS criterion may not apply at W_c^{lsr} for the transition from ergodic to some intermediate non-ergodic phase because it describes how the correlation length diverges approaching the transition point from the MBL side.

Intriguingly, the exponent obtained from the finite-size scaling of level spacing ratio is quite close to the one obtained from the scaling of the local self energy in the Fock space for the MBL phase [62] which may be because, deep in the localized phase, perturbative corrections to eigenvalues from the hopping terms are directly related to the Feenberg self energy [1] of the effective Anderson model on Fock space. Further, the critical exponent obtained from level spacing ratio is also close to the correlation length exponent for the Anderson model on random regular graphs [77, 78]. The critical exponent of the correlation length in the Fock space must be obeying a modified generalized CCFS criterion $\nu \geq 4/L$ rather than the standard one, which is written in terms of the physical dimension d of the system, because the connectivity of a typical node in the Fock space itself scales with L. This shows that while some physical quantities, like the level spacing ratio, seem to follow the critical exponent of the correlation length in the Fock space, others, like the single particle LDOS, stick to the system's physical dimension and follow the conventional CCFS bound.

To summarise, our work presents a thorough analysis of the universal properties of single-particle excitations across the MBL transition in a class of models with varying range of interaction and provides a clear and strong evidence in favour of a continuous delocalization to MBL transition. Interestingly, both the quantities studied in this work, namely, the single-particle LDOS and scattering rates can be measured in experiments. The search for additional physical quantities that can shed more light on the nature of the MBL transition is unquestionably critical.

A.G. acknowledges Science and Engineering Research

Board (SERB) of Department of Science and Technology (DST), India under grant No. CRG/2018/003269 for financial support. A.G. also acknowledges National Supercomputing Mission (NSM) for providing computing resources of 'PARAM Shakti' at IIT Kharagpur, which is implemented by C-DAC and supported by the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) and Department of Science and Technology (DST), Government of India. V.R.C acknowledges funding from the Department of Atomic Energy, India under the project number 12-R&D-NIS-5.00-0100.

- [1] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. 109, 1492 (1958).
- [2] D. M. Basko, I. L. Aleiner, and B. L. Altshuler, Ann. Phys. (Amsterdam), **321**, 1126 (2006).
- [3] E. Altman and R. Vosk, Ann. Rev. Cond. Matt. Phys.
 6, 383 (2015); E. Altman, Nature Physics, 14, 979 (2018); F. Alet, and N. Laflorencie, C. R.Physique 19, 498 (2018); R. Nandkishore and D. A. Huse, Ann. Rev. Cond. Mat. Phys. 6, 15 (2015); D. A. Abanin, E. Altman, I. Bloch, and M. Serbyn, Rev. Mod. Phys. 91, 021001 (2019).
- [4] V. Oganesyan and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B75, 155111 (2007).
- [5] D. J. Luitz, N. Laflorencie, F. Alet, Phys. Rev. B 91, 081103(R) (2015).
- [6] D. J. Luitz, N. Laflorencie, and F. Alet, Phys. Rev. B 93, 060201(R) (2016).
- [7] M. Schreiber, S. S. Hodgmann, P. Bordia, H. P. Luschen, M. H. Fischer, R. Vosk, E. Altman, U. Schneider, and I. Bloch, Science **349**, 842 (2015).
- [8] P. Bordia, H. P. Luschen, S. S. Hodgman, M. Schreiber, I. Bloch, and U. Schneider, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 140401 (2016).
- [9] H. P. Lüschen, P. Bordia, S. Scherg, F. Alet, E. Altman, U. Schneider, I. Bloch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 260401 (2017).
- [10] D. J. Luitz, and Y. Bar Lev, Ann. Phys. **529**, 1600350 (2017).
- [11] E. V. H. Doggen, F. Schindler, K. S. Tikhonov, A. D. Mirlin, T. Neupert, D. G. Polyakov, I. V. Gornyi, Phys. Rev. B 98, 174202 (2018).
- [12] E. V. H. Doggen and A. D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. B 100, 104203 (2019).
- [13] T. Chanda, P. Sierant, and J. Zakrzewski, Phys. Rev. B 101, 035148 (2020).
- [14] A. Kshetrimayum, M. Goihl, and J. Eisert, Phys. Rev. B 102, 235132 (2020).
- [15] Y. Prasad and A. Garg, Phys. Rev. B 103, 064203 (2021).
- [16] P. Pöpperl, E. V.H. Diggen, J. F. Karcher, A. D. Mirlin, K. S. Tikhonov, Annals of Phys. 435, 168486 (2021).
- [17] S. Nandy, F. Evers, and S. Bera, Phys. Rev. B 103, 085105 (2021).
- [18] Y. Prasad and A. Garg, Phys. Rev. B 105, 214202 (2022).
- [19] M. Serbyn, Z. Papic, and D. A. Abanin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 127201 (2013).

- [20] M. Serbyn, Z. Papic, and D. A. Abanin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 127201 (2013).
- [21] V. Ros, M. Muller, and A. Scardicchio, Nuc. Phys. B 891, 420 (2015).
- [22] S. Iyer, V. Oganesyan, G. Refael, and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B 87, 134202 (2013).
- [23] J. A. Kjall, H. H. Bardarson, and F. Pollmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 107204 (2014).
- [24] S. Bera, H. Schomerus, F. H-Meisner, and J. H. Bardarson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 046603 (2015).
- [25] P. Naldesi, E. Ercolessi, and T. Roscilde, SciPost Phys. 1, 010 (2016).
- [26] X. Li, S. Ganeshan, J. H. Pixley, and S. D. Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 186601 (2015).
- [27] S. Nag and A. Garg, Phys. Rev. B 96, 060203(R) (2017).
- [28] J. H. Bardarson, F. Pollmann, and J. E. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 017202 (2012).
- [29] M. Serbyn, Z. Papic, and D. A. Abanin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 260601 (2013).
- [30] R. Modak and S. Mukerjee, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115, 230401 (2015).
- [31] J. Z. Imbrie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 027201 (2016); J. Z.
 Imbrie, Journal of Statistical Physics **163**, 998 (2016).
- [32] J. T. Chayes, L. Chayes, D. S. Fisher, and T. Spencer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 2999 (1986); J. T. Chayes, L. Chayes, D. S. Fisher, and T. Spencer, Commun. Math. Phys. 120, 501-523 (1989).
- [33] A. Chandran, C. R. Laumann, and V. Oganesyan, arXiv:1509.04285.
- [34] This is a much stronger criterion than the original one established by Harris [35] according to which if $\nu \geq 2/d$ for a clean system undergoing a continuous transition then disorder is irrelevant in the renormalisation group sense.
- [35] A. B. Harris, J. Phys. C 7, 1671 (1974).
- [36] B.I. Shklovskii, B. Shapiro, B.R. Sears, P. Lambrianides, and H. B. Shore, Phys. Rev. B 47, 11487 (1993).
- [37] I. Kh. Zharekeshev and Bernhard Kramer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 717 (1997).
- [38] K. Slevin and T. Ohtsuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 382 (1999).
- [39] E. Tarquini, G. Biroli, and M. Tarzia, Phys. Rev. B 95, 094204 (2017).
- [40] T. Devakul and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B 96, 214201 (2017).
- [41] R. Vosk, D. A. Huse, and E. Altman, Phys. Rev. X 5, 031032 (2015).
- [42] A. C. Potter, R. Vasseur, and S. A. Parameswaran, Phys. Rev. X 5, 031033 (2015).
- [43] L. Zhang, B. Zhao, T. Devakul, and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B 93, 224201 (2016).
- [44] P. T. Dumitrescu, R. Vasseur, and A. C. Potter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 110604 (2017).
- [45] Shi-Xin Zhang and H. Yao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 206601 (2018).
- [46] V. Khemani, D. N. Sheng, and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. Lett. 119, 075702 (2017).
- [47] P. Sierant and J. Zakrzewski, Phys. Rev. B 99, 104205 (2019).
- [48] P. Sierant, M. Lewenstein, A. Scardicchio, and J. Zakrzewski, arXiv:2203.15697.
- [49] R. Yousefjani and A. Bayat, Phys. Rev. B 107, 045108 (2023).
- [50] J. Gray, S. Bose and A. Bayat, Phys. Rev. B

97,201105(R) (2018).

- [51] D. J. Luitz, F. m. c. Huveneers, and W. De Roeck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 150602 (2017).
- [52] A. Morningstar, D. A. Huse, and J. Z. Imbrie, Phys. Rev. B 102, 125134 (2020).
- [53] A. Goremykina, R. Vasseur, and M. Serbyn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 040601 (2019).
- [54] P. T. Dumitrescu, A. Goremykina, S. A. Parameswaran, M. Serbyn, and R. Vasseur, Phys. Rev. B 99, 094205 (2019).
- [55] A. Morningstar and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B 99, 224205 (2019).
- [56] J. Šuntajs, J. Bonca, T. Prosen, and L. Vidmar, Phys. Rev. B **102**, 064207 (2020).
- [57] N. Laflorencie, G. Lemarié, and N. Macé, Phys. Rev. Research 2, 042033 (2020).
- [58] M. Hopjan, G. Orso, and F. Heidrich-Meisner, Phys. Rev. B 104, 235112 (2021).
- [59] S. Roy and D. E. Logan, Phys. Rev. B 104, 174201 (2021).
- [60] D. E. Logan and S. Welsh, Phys. Rev. B 99, 045131 (2019).
- [61] S. Roy and D. E. Logan, Phys. Rev. B 101, 134202 (2020).
- [62] J. Sutradhar, S. Ghosh, S. Roy, D. E. Logan, S. Mukerjee, and S. Banerjee, Phys. Rev. B 106, 054203 (2022).
- [63] 50 years of Anderson localization, by E. Abrahams, World Scientific Publishing (2010).
- [64] A. Jana, V. R. Chandra, and A. Garg, Phys. Rev. B 104, L140201 (2021).
- [65] N. Roy, J. Sutradhar, S. Banerjee, arXiv:2208.10714.
- [66] See supplementary material.

- [67] S. M. Bhattacharjee and F. Seno, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 34, 6375 (2001).
- [68] A. L. Burin, arXiv:cond-mat/0611387; A. L. Burin, Phys. Rev. B 91, 094202 (2015).
- [69] N. Y. Yao, C. R. Laumann, S. Gopalakrishnan, M. Knap, M.Muller, E. A. Demler, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 243002 (2014).
- [70] D. B. Gutman, I. V. Protopopov, A. L. Burin, I. V. Gornyi, R. A. Santos, and A. D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. B 93, 245427 (2016).
- [71] K. S. Tikhonov and A. D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. B 97, 214205 (2018).
- [72] S. Nag and A. Garg, Phys. Rev. B 99, 224203 (2019).
- [73] S. Roy and D. E. Logan, SciPost Phys. 7, 042 (2019).
- [74] J. Zhang, P. Hess, A. Kyprianidis, P. Becker, A. Lee, J. Smith,G. Pagano, I. D. Potirniche, A. C. Potter, A. Vishwanath et al., Nature 543, 217 (2017).
- [75] S. Choi, J. Choi, R. Landig, G. Kucsko, H. Zhou, J. Isoya, F. Jelezko, S. Onoda, H. Sumiya, V. Khemani et al., Nature 543, 221 (2017).
- [76] J. Smith, A. Lee, P. Richerme, B. Neyenhuis, P. W. Hess, P. Hauke, M. Heyl, D. A. Huse, and C. Monroe, Nat. Phys. **12**, 907 (2016).
- [77] M. Pino, Phys. Rev. Res. 2, 042031 (R) (2020).
- [78] V. Kravtsov, B. Altshuler, and L. Ioffe, Ann. Phys. 389, 148 (2018).
- [79] A. Morningstar, L. Colmenarez, V. Khemani, D. J. Luitz, and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B 105,174205 (2022).
- [80] E. V. H. Doggen, F. Schindler, K. S. Tikhonov, A. D. Mirlin, T. Neupert, D. G. Polyakov, and I. V. Gornyi, Phys. Rev. B 98,174202 (2018).

Supplementary material for "Universal Properties of single particle excitations across the many-body localization transition"

Atanu Jana^{1,3}, V. Ravi Chandra^{1,3}, Arti Garg^{2,3}

¹ School of Physical Sciences, National Institute of Science Education and Research Bhubaneswar, Jatni, Odisha 752050, India

² Theory Division, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics,

1/AF Bidhannagar, Kolkata 700 064, India and

³ Homi Bhabha National Institute, Training School Complex, Anushaktinagar, Mumbai 400094, India

I. FINITE-SIZE SCALING OF SINGLE PARTICLE SCATTERING RATES

In the main text in Fig. 1 we analyzed the finite-size scaling of single particle LDOS for the system with power-law interactions. We now present details of the finite size scaling for the scattering rates. In Fig. 1, in the top row we present the data for the system with $\alpha = 1$. In the top left panel we show the ratio of typical to average value of the scattering rate $\Gamma_{typ}(\omega)/\Gamma_{avq}(\omega)$ obtained from the middle of the many-body eigenspectrum and $\omega = \mu_{eff}$. In sharp similarity to the LDOS, the ratio of typical to average value of the scattering rate is of order one for weak disorder and becomes vanishingly small and size independent for very large values of disorder. In order to determine the nature of the transition, we did the finite size scaling. As mentioned in the main paper, we calculated the cost function C_X to quantify the finite size scaling collapse. In the top middle panel we show the color plot of the cost function in $W_c - \nu$ plane. C_X is very large for small values of W_c for any value of ν considered. For slightly larger values of W_c , C_X has a non-monotonic dependence on ν such that C_X first decrease as ν increases, attains a minima and then starts increasing again. The best minima obtained in the range of parameters considered, occurs for $7.1 \le W_c \le 7.9t$ and for $2.3 \le \nu \le 2.7$. More details about the minimum pf the cost function are given in section VI. The rightmost panel in the top row shows the scaling collapse as a function of the scaled disorder $(W - W_c)L^{1/\nu}$ with $W_c = 7.1t \sim W^{\star}$ (as explained in the main text) and $\nu = 2.5$. We would like to emphasize that the ratio of typical to average scattering rate obeys the single parameter scaling and shows a good quality data collapse for the value of the exponent $\nu \geq 2$ which satisfies the CCFS inequality. In the lower row of Fig. 1 we have shown similar plots for $\alpha = 3$ which correspond to a shorter range of interactions. As shown here the critical point W_C and the critical exponent ν are almost independent of the range of interactions.



FIG. 1: Panel(a) shows the ratio of the typical to average values of the scattering rate $\Gamma_{typ}(\omega)/\Gamma_{avg}(\omega)$ at $\omega = \mu_{eff}$, as a function of disorder W for various system sizes and $\alpha = 1$. Panel(b) shows the cost function C_X calculated for $X = \Gamma_{typ}(\omega = \mu_{eff})/\Gamma_{avg}(\omega = \mu_{eff})$ in $W_c - \nu$ plane. The cost function has a broad minimum for 7.1 $\leq W_c \leq$ 7.9 and $2.3 \leq \nu \leq 2.7$. Panel (c) shows the scaling collapse for $\Gamma_{typ}(\omega = \mu_{eff})/\Gamma_{avg}(\omega = \mu_{eff})$ as a function of the scaled disorder $(W - W_c)L^{1/\nu}$ for $W_c = 7.1t$ and $\nu = 2.5$. Similar trend of the scattering rates, the corresponding cost function and the scaling collapse is seen for $\alpha = 3$ in the bottom row panels. Scattering rate $\Gamma(\omega)$ has been computed for states in the middle of the eigenspectrum for a rescaled energy bin $E \in [0.495, 0.505]$.



FIG. 2: The left panel shows the cost function C_X in the $W_c - \nu$ plane for $X = \rho_{typ}(\omega = 0)/\rho_{avg}(\omega = 0)$ and the right panel shows C_X for $X = \Gamma_{typ}(\omega = 0)/\Gamma_{avg}(\omega = 0)$. In the right panel, the cost function has minimum around $W_c = 7.3t$ over a width of around 0.3t and for $2.0 \le \nu \le 2.4$. In the left panel, a broad minimum of C_X exists for $7.1t \le W_c \le 7.9t$ and $2.1 \le \nu \le 2.7$.

II. COST FUNCTIONS FOR THE SYSTEM WITH NEAREST NEIGHBOUR INTERACTIONS

In the main text in Fig. 2 we have shown the scaling collapse for the LDOS and scattering rate for the system with nearest neighbour interactions. Here, we provide the supporting calculation of the cost function which was minimised to obtain the critical point and the critical exponent used in the scaling collapse plot. As shown in Fig. 2, the cost function for the ratio of the LDOS has a broad minima around $7.1t \le W_c \le 7.9t$ and $2.1 \le \nu \le 2.7$ but for the ratio of the scattering rates, the cost function has a minima around $7.0t \le W_c \le 7.7t$ and $2.0 \le \nu \le 2.4$. In the main text, we have shown the scaling collapse at $W_c = 7.3 \sim W^*$, as discussed in the main paper. It is interesting to notice that not only the qualitative features of the cost function but also the region of minima in $W_c - \nu$ plane is almost the same for all the ranges of interaction considered.

III. FINITE SIZE SCALING FOR LEVEL SPACING RATIO

In this section we compare the behaviour of a commonly used diagnostic of the transition, namely the level spacing ratio with the disorder averaged local density of states and the scattering rates obtained from the Green's functions. The level spacing ratios r_n are defined in the usual way $r_n = \frac{\min(\delta_n, \delta_{n+1})}{\max(\delta_n, \delta_{n+1})}$, where, $\delta_n = E_{n+1} - E_n$. Fig. 3 shows the plot of disorder averaged r_n vs disorder W for various system sizes for the system with nearest neighbour interactions. Level spacing ratio obeys Wigner-Dyson statistics for weak disorder and in the very strong disorder limit it obeys the Poissonian statistics. To determine the nature of transition in the level spacing ratio as the disorder strength is increased, we did the finite size scaling assuming the single parameter ansatz mentioned in the main text. The cost function C_X for the level spacing ratio is shown in the middle panel of Fig. 3 which has a very different trend in $W_c - \nu$ plane as compared to the cost function for the LDOS and scattering rates. C_x for the level spacing ratio has a minima for $\nu = 0.64$ and it increases as ν increases beyond 0.64. A similar trend of the cost function of the level spacing ratio is seen for the system with power-law interactions. For all the ranges of interactions studied, we found $\nu < 1$.

IV. DETAILS OF CALCULATIONS

We compute the disorder averaged LDOS and scattering rates for $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ and the nearest neighbour cases of the Hamiltonian in Eq.(1) of the main text. We have used full exact diagonalization without any approximation and calculated single particle Green's function and the self energy. The LDOS and scattering rates are extracted from the Lehmann representation of the Green's function $G_n(i, j, \omega)$ whose diagonal element is given by:

$$G_n(i,i,\omega^+) = \sum_m \frac{|\langle \Psi_m | c_i^{\dagger} | \Psi_n \rangle|^2}{\omega + i\eta - E_m + E_n} + \frac{|\langle \Psi_m | c_i | \Psi_n \rangle|^2}{\omega + i\eta + E_m - E_n}$$
(1)



FIG. 3: Panel(a) shows the level spacing ratio as a function of disorder W for various system sizes for the system with nearest neighbour interactions. Here r_n has been calculated for middle of the many-body eigenspectrum for a rescaled energy bin $E \in [0.495, 0.505]$. The cost function C_X for the level spacing ratio has been shown in panel (b). The cost function has a minimum for $5.2t < W_c < 5.4t$ and $0.5 < \nu < 0.7$. In panel (c) we have shown the scaling collapse using $W_c = 5.3t$ and $\nu = 0.64$.

We calculate the LDOS and the scattering rates for the many-body eigenstates in the middle of the spectrum, that is with a rescaled energy bin $\epsilon \in [0.495, 0.505]$ for a large range of ω and for a large number of independent disorder realisations. Note, that though the values of E_n are confined in the middle of the many-body spectra, the sum over eigenstates m in the Lehmann sum still runs over the entire spectrum. Hence, these quantities require information about the entire eigenspectrum and any truncation of the Lehmann sum using only a part of the eigenspectra would lead to erroneous results, especially for the self energy. For each value of α we use 15000, 1000, 500 and 50 realisations



FIG. 4: $\rho_{typ}(\omega)$ vs ω for various values of the disorder strength W for the system with power-law interactions with $\alpha = 1$. $\rho_{typ}(\omega)$ is peaked at $\omega \sim \mu_{eff}$ where μ_{eff} is the chemical potential of the system.

of disorder for L = 12, 14, 16, 18 respectively to calculate the averages of the LDOS and scattering rates. For the system with nearest neighbour interactions, we use 15000, 10000, 3000, 200 realization of disorder for L = 12, 14, 16, 18 respectively to calculate the averages of level spacing ratio. For the disorder averaging of the LDOS and scattering rates, we used 15000, 1000, 500 configurations of disorder for L = 12, 14, 16, 18 Here, the typical value is obtained by calculating the geometric average over the lattice sites, energy bin and various independent disorder configurations.

Fig. 4 shows the typical value of LDOS $\rho_{typ}(\omega)$ vs ω for various disorder values and a couple of system sizes. For systems with power-law interactions typical value of local density of states has a peak around $\omega = \mu_{eff}$ where $\mu_{eff} = \sum_{|j-i|=1}^{L/2} \frac{1}{|j-i|^{\alpha}}$ (for V = 1) is the effective chemical potential of the system under the assumption that the disorder averaged system will respect particle hole symmetry. Thus, for power-law interacting case we have shown scaling of ratio of typical to average value of LDOS and scattering rate for $\omega \sim \mu_{eff}$. For the system with nearest neighbour interactions we have shown results for $\omega = 0$. The LDOS $\rho_{typ}(\omega)$ and the scattering rate $\Gamma_{typ}(\omega)$ are very



FIG. 5: $\rho_{typ}(\omega = \mu_{eff})$ vs η for various values of W and L. $\rho_{typ}(\omega = \mu_{eff})$ increases sharply for $\eta \sim \Delta$ though it shows a much slower increase or a saturating trend for $\eta > \Delta$. Data point at $\eta = \Delta$ are shown in red in the plots. The data shown is for the case of power-law interactions with $\alpha = 1$.

flat around $\omega = 0$ over a width of around 2W and μ_{eff} for nearest neighbour interaction is V/2. Thus, effectively the behaviour of LDOS and scattering rate at $\omega = \mu_{eff}$ and $\omega = 0$ is the same for the system with nearest neighbour interactions.

The choice of broadening η in the Green's function: The broadening η should be of the order of but larger than the typical spacing between the adjacent eigenvalues for all the parameters considered in the study. A smaller value of η would not broaden the delta functions involved in the calculation of the LDOS resulting in larger fluctuations in $\rho(\omega)$ vs ω plots for nearby ω values. We studied η dependence of LDOS for a range of disorder values and for various system sizes. Fig. 5 shows $\rho_{typ}(\omega = \mu_{eff})$ vs η for L = 16 and L = 14 and various values of disorder. For $\eta \sim \Delta$, where Δ denotes the typical value of the level spacing of adjacent eigenvalues, $\rho_{typ}(\omega = \mu_{eff})$ increases with η but for any $\eta > \Delta$, $\rho_{typ}(\mu_{eff})$ shows much slower increase with η for any strength of disorder W considered. Based on this analysis. the infinitesimal η is chosen to be 10^{-2} in our work for various disorder values and system sizes. The choice of broadening in our work is consistent with most of the earlier works on calculation of Kubo formula in the context of MBL systems [1, 2] and calculation of LDOS in the context of disordered non-interacting systems [3, 4].

V. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND ERROR ESTIMATION

In this section, we provide details of the standard error on the ratio of typical to average values of the quantities we have studied. Let X_i with $i = 1...N_C$ are the variables for a given set of parameter in the Hamiltonian under study. Here, *i* corresponds to various sets of *X* obtained for a large number of many-body eigenstates (N_E) lying in the energy bin for which the data has been calculated, the number of lattice sites *L* and the number of disorder configurations N_d such that $N = N_E \times L \times N_d$. Standard error around the arithmetic mean X_{avg} of *X* is given by $\Delta X = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i - X_{avg})^2}}{N} = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}}$. Here σ is the standard deviation. Thus, the error-bars around the mean are $X_{avg} \pm \Delta X$.

The geometric standard error around X_{tup} is given by

$$\Delta X_{typ} = \exp\left(\frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\ln X_i - \ln X_{typ})^2}}{N}\right)$$
(2)

The maximum and minimum values of the typical value X_{typ} are $X_{typ}^{max} = X_{typ} \times \Delta X_{typ}$ to $X_{typ}^{min} = X_{typ}/\Delta X_{typ}$. Since we are interested in the ratio of typical to average values of the quantity X_{typ}/X_{avg} , the range of the ratio is $\left[\frac{X_{typ}^{max}}{X_{avg}-\Delta X}, \frac{X_{typ}^{min}}{X_{avg}+\Delta X}\right]$. The percentage relative error is of order 0.13% for weak disorder and less than 2% for very large disorders for the ratio of typical to average LDOS and scattering rates.

We further calculated the error bars on the cost function using the error-bars on the ratios of LDOS and scattering rates. Let X_i for $i \in [1, N_{total}]$ are the set of data points used in evaluation of the cost function as in Eq.(2) of the main paper. Statistical error in C is given by

$$\Delta C = \frac{\Delta X_1 + 2\sum_{i=2}^{N_{total}-1} \Delta X_i + \Delta X_{N_{total}}}{X_{max} - X_{min}} + \frac{(\Delta X_{max} + \Delta X_{min})\sum_{i=1}^{N_{total}} |X_{i+1} - X_i|}{(X_{max} - X_{min})^2} + \Delta C^{(2)}$$
(3)



FIG. 6: Top panels show the cost-function for the ratio of typical to average value of the LDOS $\frac{\rho_{typ}(\mu_{eff})}{\rho_{avg}(\mu_{eff})}$ for $\alpha = 1$ and the bottom panels show the cost-function for the level spacing ratio for the system with nearest neighbour interactions. The left panels in both the rows show C_{min}^W vs ν and the right panels in both the rows show C_{min}^{ν} vs W_c . The purple shaded regime shows the error-bars on the cost-function. Though the cost function for level spacing ratio has a sharp minimum w.r.t ν as well W, the cost function for LDOS has a broad minimum for $2.1 \leq \nu \leq 3$ and $7.0t \leq W_c \leq 8.9t$. Similar trend is seen for the cost function of the scattering rates.

which, upon ignoring the second order term in error, $\Delta C^{(2)}$, gives the relative error in C as $\frac{\Delta C}{C} \sim \frac{\Delta C_{num}}{C_{num}} + \frac{\Delta C_{deno}}{C_{deno}}$ where $C_{num/deno}$ are the numerator or denominator in the Eq.[2] of the main paper.

VI. MINIMIZATION OF THE COST FUNCTION

In the main paper, as well as in Section 1-3 of the SM we have shown density color plots of the cost function, which is a function of (W_c, ν) . For the ratio of typical to average value of LDOS and scattering rate, the cost function has a broad minimum in (W_c, ν) plane while for the level spacing ratio the cost function has a much sharper minimum. Here we describe how we determine the range of W_c and ν for which the cost function shows minimum. The cost-function $C(W_c, \nu)$ is minimised w.r.t ν for each value of W_c . This results in C_{min}^{ν} which has been plotted as a function of W_c in the left panels of Fig. 6. The global minima w.r.t W_c is obtained by finding the minima of C_{min}^{W} as a function of W_c . Similarly, minimising the cost function w.r.t W_c for each value of ν results in C_{min}^W ws ν plot shown in the right panels. The global minima w.r.t ν is obtained by finding the minima of C_{min}^W ws ν plot shown in the right panels. The global minima w.r.t ν is obtained by finding the minima of C_{min}^W w.r.t ν . As one can see from Fig. 6, within the error bars the cost function has a minima starting at $\nu \sim 2.3$ and only after $\nu \sim 2.9$ the cost function starts increasing again with ν . Similarly, we see that the cost function has a broad minimum starting at $W_c \sim 7.1t$ and the cost functions starts rising again for $W_c \sim 9t$. In contrast to this, for level spacing ratio the cost function shows a sharper minimum for $\nu \sim 0.6$ and $W_c \sim 5.3t$.

VII. PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS OF LDOS AND SCATTERING RATE

In this section, we discuss the probability distributions of the LDOS and the scattering rates. Fig. 7 shows the probability distribution function of $\ln(\rho(\mu_{eff}))$ for various values of W for the power-law interacting system with $\alpha = 1$. For weak disorder, $P(\ln(\rho))$ is close to a normal distribution, that is, LDOS obeys the log-normal distribution. But for larger values of disorder the distribution deviates from log-normal distribution significantly. As the disorder



FIG. 7: Probability distribution function of the logarithm of the local density of states $\rho(\omega \sim \mu_{eff})$ for a few values of the disorder W. For weak disorder, $P(\ln(\rho))$ is close to a normal distribution. As the disorder strength increases, the peak of the distribution shifts towards smaller values and the width of the distribution increases. The data shown is for power-law interacting system with $\alpha = 1$. The right panel shows the probability distribution function $P(\ln(\Gamma(\mu_{eff})))$ for the scattering rates.

strength increases, the peak of $P(\ln(\rho))$ shifts to more negative values and the tail becomes broader. This is reflected in smaller values of the typical LDOS compared to the average value of the distribution as W increases. Right panel of Fig. 7 shows the probability distribution of $\ln(\Gamma(\mu_{eff}))$ which is closer to log-normal distribution even for larger values of the disorder strength.

- [1] O. S. Barišić, J. Kokalj, I. Balog, and P. Prelovšek, Phys. Rev. B 94, 045126 (2016).
- [2] T. C. Berkelbach and D. R. Reichman, Phys. Rev. B 81, 224429 (2010).
- [3] L. Zhu and X. Wang, Phys. Lett. A **380**, 2233 (2016).
- [4] S. Wu, L. Jing, Q. Li, Q. W. Shi, J. Chen, H. Su, X. Wang, and J. Yang, Phys. Rev. B 77, 195411 (2008).