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Restricted Boltzmann machines (RBMs) are a class of neural networks that have been successfully employed as a variational ansatz for quantum many-body wavefunctions. Here, we develop an analytic method to study quantum many-body spin states encoded by random RBMs with independent, identically-distributed complex Gaussian weights. By mapping the computation of ensemble-averaged observables to statistical mechanics models, we are able to investigate the parameter space of the RBM ensemble in the thermodynamic limit. We discover qualitatively distinct wavefunctions by varying RBM parameters, which correspond to distinct phases in the equivalent statistical mechanics model. Notably, there is a regime in which the entanglement entropy exhibits volume-law scaling and approaches the maximal bound expected for random quantum states in the thermodynamic limit. However, these near-maximal entropy states do not form quantum state designs and feature no level repulsion in the entanglement spectrum. These fine-grained properties are capable of discriminating between random Gaussian RBM states and truly random quantum states.

I. INTRODUCTION

A fundamental challenge in the study of quantum many-body systems is the problem of efficiently describing physically interesting wavefunctions. In principle, a complete description of a quantum state requires classical resources that scale exponentially with system size. Fortunately in many cases, the set of physically relevant states occupy a small fraction of Hilbert space and can be parametrized efficiently. For instance, ground states of gapped local Hamiltonians, which typically exhibit area-law entanglement [1, 2], can be efficiently represented by matrix product states in one spatial dimension [3, 4] or by tensor network states [5] in higher dimensions. However, it remains a daunting task to construct a suitable ansatz for more general many-body wavefunctions while efficiently capturing their salient macroscopic properties.

An analogous challenge is encountered in the field of machine learning, where one is tasked with learning classical probability distributions over high-dimensional spaces. The shared “curse of dimensionality,” which besets both machine learning and quantum many-body physics, offers a tantalizing hint that similar techniques can be employed in both fields [6] and has led to a growing interest in the application of machine learning techniques to physics (for review see [7–9] and references therein). In machine learning applications, neural networks serve as function approximators capable of extracting physically relevant correlations in high-dimensional spaces. Notably, there exist universal approximation theorems [10–13] that prove the expressive power of neural networks to approximate arbitrary multivariable classical functions.

Motivated by the success of neural networks in learning classical probability distributions over high-dimensional spaces, neural network quantum states [14–25] have been proposed to efficiently parameterize certain classes of many-body quantum states. The breadth of neural network architectures and parameters, and the inherent nonlinearity built into their functional form, allow them to serve as a more general variational ansatz than typical tensor networks [26]. Recent works [14, 16, 25] have shown that a particular category of elementary neural networks, known as restricted Boltzmann machines (RBMs), are capable of efficiently representing a large class of quantum states, including examples with maximal bipartite entanglement [27, 28].

It is therefore desirable to characterize the set of many-body wavefunctions with efficient RBM representations. Other ensembles of quantum states have been studied with analytical methods, such as Haar-random states [29] and random tensor network states [30]. To date, the study of random RBM states has been limited to finite-size numerics [27].

In this paper, we analytically characterize many-body quantum spin states encoded by single-layer random Gaussian RBMs, and support our conclusions with finite-size numerics. Using techniques similar to those used in the study of random tensor networks [30], we are able to describe ensemble-averaged properties of the RBM states, such as their second Rényi entropy and statistical fluctuations in the norm of the variational wavefunction. In particular, we find that the computation of such quantities may be mapped to classical statistical mechanical models of (coupled) spin chains of length $N$. Interestingly, in the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$, these models exhibit phase transitions as one varies the ensemble parameters. These transitions separate wave-
functions with qualitatively different properties. Using both analytics and numerics, we show that random Gaussian RBM states are able to exhibit maximal entanglement at leading order in $1/N$ for a particular regime of RBM parameters. However, even in this special case, the Gaussian RBM ensemble can be distinguished from the ensemble of Haar-random states: it does not form a quantum state design, and our numerical studies show that the entanglement spectrum features no level repulsion.

The paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we introduce the construction of an RBM and its mapping to a quantum many-body state of $N$ spins, and establish the parameters of the RBM ensemble under consideration. In Sec. III, we study the norm fluctuations of the RBM ensemble as a function of its three-dimensional parameter space, and establish two regimes of qualitatively different behaviors, corresponding to vanishing and non-vanishing norm fluctuations to lowest order in $1/N$. In Sec. IV, we study the ensemble-averaged second Rényi entropy and construct a phase diagram over the parameter space of the RBM ensemble. We report our findings of a near-maximal volume law regime in the large-$N$ limit, and support these analytic results with finite-size numerics. In Sec. V, we numerically investigate other properties of the RBM states such as their von Neumann entropy, the density of states and level statistics of the entanglement spectrum, and their relation to quantum state designs. We summarize our findings and carry further discussions in Sec. VI.

II. CONSTRUCTION OF THE RBM ENSEMBLE

We begin by introducing the mapping between an RBM configuration and a quantum spin state. An RBM is a two-layer, bipartite neural network model where the visible neurons are located in the first layer and the hidden neurons are located in the second layer (see Fig. 1). Edges, which generate interactions between the neurons, are permitted between the two layers, but not within the layers themselves. We will choose the neurons to be binary variables taking on the values $\{-1, 1\}$. There will be $N$ visible neurons, corresponding to physical spin variables, and $M$ hidden neurons, corresponding to auxiliary spin variables. The parameters of an RBM consist of a collection of weights $w_{mj}$ that represent interactions between the visible and hidden neurons, as well as on-site potentials $a_j$, $b_m$ on the visible and hidden neurons, respectively. The parameters $\mathcal{W} = \{w_{mj}, a_j, b_m\}$ are generically complex. The configuration of an RBM is then mapped to an unnormalized many-body quantum state $|\Psi\rangle$ of $N$ spins as follows:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{s}} e^{-\sum_j a_j s_j - \sum_m b_m h_m - \sum_{j,m} w_{mj} s_j h_m} |\mathbf{s}\rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{h}$ are shorthands for the many-body configurations of visible layer spins $\mathbf{s} \equiv \{s^1, s^2, \ldots, s^N\}$ and hidden layer spins $\mathbf{h} \equiv \{h^1, h^2, \ldots, h^M\}$. We will reserve $m$ (and $m'$) as indices for the hidden layer neurons in order to distinguish them from the physical spin indices.

For simplicity, we will restrict our attention to the zero-bias case ($a_j = b_m = 0$). However, the analytic method that we shall develop is applicable more generally. In the zero-bias case, the simplified expression for the unnormalized wavefunction encoded by an RBM is

$$|\Psi\rangle = \prod_{m=1}^{M} \cosh \left( \sum_j w_{mj} s^j \right) |\mathbf{s}\rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where we have explicitly summed over the hidden spin indices.

We shall consider an ensemble of RBMs obtained by drawing the network weights from a probability distribution. As such, we will take the weights to be independent and identically-distributed (iid) random complex variables. Because the RBM wavefunction is unnormalized by convention, the average norm and the norm fluctuations will be properties of the ensemble. We can write the random weight as $w_{mj} = w^R_{mj} + iw^I_{mj}$ where the real and imaginary part are independently drawn from Gaussian distributions of mean 0 and variances $\sigma^2_R$ and $\sigma^2_I$, respectively.

We now define an appropriate thermodynamic (large-$N$) limit of the RBM wavefunction by considering the $N$-dependent scaling of the available parameters. For a fixed spin configuration, the wavefunction amplitude is the product of $M$ independent random variables $\cosh \left( \sum_j w_{mj} s^j \right)$ introduced by $M$ hidden spins. In order to define an appropriate large-$N$ limit, the scaling of the variances should be chosen such that $\sum_j w_{mj} s^j$ remains an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ number as $N$ increases. This implies $\sigma_R^2 = u^2 / N$ and $\sigma_I^2 = v^2 / N$ for some set of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constants $u$ and $v$. As such, $u$, $v$, and $\lambda \equiv M/N$ (the ratio of hidden/auxiliary spins to visible/physical spins) will

![FIG. 1. A schematic of the RBM architecture considered: There are $N$ visible neurons in the first layer labeled by $s^j$ and $M$ hidden neurons in the second layer labeled by $h^m$. The two layers are all-to-all connected with weights $w_{mj}$. This architecture will be used to encode wavefunctions of $N$ physical quantum spins.](image-url)
span the three-dimensional parameter space of our RBM ensemble.

Having finished the construction of our RBM ensemble, let us highlight some of its important properties. One feature that will have important consequences later is the qualitatively different roles of \( u \) and \( v \): as one can see in Eq. (2), the imaginary part of the weights, \( \psi_j \), is a direct product state, \( |\psi_j\rangle \equiv |\psi_j^h\rangle \otimes |\psi_j^s\rangle \) (4) is a single spin state at site \( j \) that depends on the hidden neuron states. Since \( |\psi_j^h\rangle \) is a direct product state, we conclude that the Schmidt decomposition for any bipartition of the system contains at most \( 2^M \) terms. In other words, the rank of the reduced density operator for all subsystems are bounded from above by \( 2^M \). Consequently, the von Neumann entropy and all Rényi entropies are upper-bounded by \( M \log 2 \).

### III. NORM FLUCTUATION AND PHASE TRANSITIONS

Since the wavefunction encoded by the Gaussian RBM ensemble is unnormalized, we begin by discussing the computation of the norm and its fluctuations. Because the square of the norm is a slightly easier quantity to work with, we compute \( \langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle \equiv (\Psi | \Psi \rangle)^2 \) and compare it to \( \langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle \). The latter may be computed exactly from the average norm:

\[
\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle = \sum_s \prod_m \cosh(W_{sm}^+)^2 \cosh(W_{sm}^-)
\]

\[
= \frac{N}{2 \pi^2} \left[ \exp(2u^2) + \exp(-2v^2) \right]^M
\]

where, for convenience, we have defined the random variable \( W_{sm}^\pm = \sum_j w_{mj}s_j \). The average was performed by taking advantage of the independence of the random weights and then using Gaussian integrals (see Appendix B). For later convenience, it is useful to recast the above formula as

\[
\frac{\log \langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle}{N} = \lambda(u^2 - v^2) + \lambda \log \cosh(u^2 + v^2) + \log 2.
\]

Meanwhile, we can compute \( \overline{Z_0} \equiv \langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle^2 \) by explicitly substituting the expression for the wavefunction components in Eq. (1),

\[
Z_0 = \sum_{s_1,s_2} \prod_m \cosh(W_{s_1}^+)^* \cosh(W_{s_2}^m)^* \cosh(W_{s_1}^m) \cosh(W_{s_2}^m)
\]

\[
(7)
\]

where \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \) are two spin configurations. The ensemble average over Gaussian weights may be computed analytically as shown in Appendix C. Here, we simply present the result of the calculation:

\[
Z_0 = e^{2M(u^2-v^2)} \sum_{s_1,s_2} \left[ \frac{1}{4} 2 + e^{2(u^2+v^2)} \cosh 4\phi u^2 \\
+ e^{-2(u^2+v^2)} \cosh 4\phi v^2 \right]^M.
\]

As a shorthand, we have defined \( \phi \equiv (s_1 \cdot s_2)/N \), where \( s_1 \cdot s_2 \) stands for \( \sum_{j=1}^N s_j s_j \). The fact that \( Z_0 \) depends on the spin configurations \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \) only through their dot product \( \phi \) comes from the symmetry of the ensemble; variables in the two copies simultaneously permuting or flipping the spin leaves \( Z_0 \) unchanged. Ultimately, this is due to the aforementioned symmetries of the random weights; they are iid random variables, and their probability distribution possesses a \( Z_2 \) symmetry \( w_{mi} \sim -w_{mj} \). We can further recast \( Z_0 \) as a partition function of a statistical mechanics problem:

\[
\overline{Z_0} = \sum_\phi \exp(-NF(\phi)),
\]

where the sum is over all possible values of \( \phi \), and the free energy density \( F(\phi) \equiv \mathcal{E}(\phi) - \mathcal{S}(\phi) \) contains two contributions: an “energetic” part \( \mathcal{E}(\phi) \) from the interactions of the coupled spin configurations \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \), and an “entropic” part \( \mathcal{S}(\phi) \), which comes from the degeneracy of \( (s_1,s_2) \) configurations that map to the same \( \phi \).
The energy density is given by
\[ \mathcal{E}(\phi) = -\lambda \left[ \log \Omega(\phi) + 2(u^2 - v^2) - \log 2 \right], \tag{10} \]
with
\[ \Omega(\phi) \equiv 1 + \frac{e^{2(u^2 + v^2) \phi}}{2} \cosh 4\phi u^2 + \frac{e^{-2(u^2 + v^2) \phi}}{2} \cosh 4\phi v^2. \tag{11} \]

Meanwhile, the entropy density is given by
\[ S(\phi) = -\frac{1 - \phi}{2} \log \frac{1 - \phi}{2} - \frac{1 + \phi}{2} \log \frac{1 + \phi}{2} + \log 2. \tag{12} \]

where we have neglected terms of higher order in $1/N$.

The dominant contributions to $\mathcal{Z}_0$ will come from $\phi$ values which minimize the free energy $\mathcal{F}(\phi)$; this in turn corresponds to finding $\phi$ such that $\mathcal{E}(\phi)$ is small and $S(\phi)$ is large. Since the physical parameters of the RBM ensemble $(u, v, \lambda)$ also enter into the expression, one may anticipate that tuning such parameters can result in phase transitions associated to changes in the free energy minima. Importantly, the free energy density is symmetric under $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$, which will lead to classification of phases by this $Z_2$ symmetry. It is worth commenting that phase transitions in RBM-encoded functions have been observed in other contexts, such as for classical probability distributions for machine learning tasks [31].

One can check that the entropy density $S(\phi)$ is maximized at $\phi = 0$ while the energy density $\mathcal{E}(\phi)$ is minimized at $\phi = \pm 1$. Given that the energy contribution is proportional to $\lambda$ and the entropy part is independent of $\lambda$, one expects that for certain fixed $(u, v)$, tuning $\lambda$ can result in a second-order phase transition which separates the entropy-dominated phase with a single minimum from the energy-dominated phase with two minima. These two phases are classified by symmetry: the energy density dominates in the $Z_2$-symmetry-broken phase, while the entropy density dominates in the $Z_2$-symmetric phase.

Furthermore, one can also deduce the existence of an additional first-order transition from the dependence of the energetic part on $(u, v, \lambda)$. For sufficiently large $v$ with $u < v$, the energy profile near $\phi = 1$ possesses a sharp dip due to the second exponential term in Eq. (11). This gives rise to additional free energy minima that can become dominant over the local minimum at $\phi = 0$. Hence, we find an additional first-order phase transition when new free energy minima formed at $|\phi| \approx 1$ become the global minima. In Fig. 2, we show cross sections of the phase diagram in the $\lambda - v$ plane for fixed $u = 0$ and $u = 0.5$. From the phase diagrams, one notes that the phase boundaries approach a constant $\lambda_c$ associated with the phase boundary. We begin by writing a limiting expression for the energy density:
\[ \mathcal{E}(\phi) = \begin{cases} \lambda \log 4, & \text{If } |\phi| < 1; \\ \lambda \log \frac{8}{3}, & \text{If } |\phi| = 1, \end{cases} \tag{13} \]

where in each case, we have taken the dominating exponential factor in $\Omega(\phi)$. For a large but finite $v$, the minimum energy at $|\phi| = 1$ increases quickly through a transition region of width $\sim 1/v^2$ and approaches its maximum value for $|\phi| = 0$. The above expression approximates the sharply sloped energy near $|\phi| = 1$ as a discontinuous function in the large-$v$ limit. As shown in Fig. 2, the approximation already works sufficiently well for $(u, v) = (0, 4)$ since the global minimum either is very close to $\pm 1$ (red regime) or is located at 0 (blue regime).

We can compare the local minima of the free energy in the two cases. For $|\phi| < 1$, the free energy is locally minimized at $\phi = 0$ with $\mathcal{F}(\phi = 0) = 2 \lambda \log 2 - 2 \log 2$. On the other hand, for $|\phi| = 1$, the free energy is $\mathcal{F}(\phi = \pm 1) = \lambda \log \frac{8}{3} - 2 \log 2$. These two values for the minimum free energy coincide at the phase boundary at $\lambda = \lambda_c \equiv \frac{\log 3 - \log 2}{\log 2}$. At this critical $\lambda$, a first-order (symmetry-breaking) phase transition separates two phases.

![FIG. 2. Phase diagrams for the statistical mechanics model associated to the calculation of $\mathcal{Z}_0$ for (a) $u = 0$, and (b) $u = 0.5$. In both cases, there are two phases which are classified by the $Z_2$ symmetry of $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$: a phase with two free energy minima at $\phi^* \approx \pm 1$ (red) and another phase with $\phi^* = 0$ (blue). For $u = 0$ in panel (a), the first-order phase boundary (green dashed line) at large $v$ approaches $\lambda = \lambda_c$, where $\lambda_c \equiv \frac{\log 3 - \log 2}{\log 2} \approx 1.71$. In panel (b), both sides of the first-order transition spontaneously break the $Z_2$ symmetry with nonzero $\phi^*$, so that the first-order transition line can end at a second-order critical point. There is also a second-order transition (dashed-dotted line) at smaller $\lambda$.](image)

Now we can compare the norm fluctuations of the two phases. For the phase dominated by the $\phi = 0$ free energy minimum, we have
\[
\frac{\log \mathcal{Z}_0}{N} \approx 2 \lambda \left[ \log \cosh (u^2 + v^2) + (u^2 - v^2) \right] + 2 \log 2. \tag{14}\]

Comparing Eq. (14) to Eq. (6), we can see that the norm
fluctuations vanish to leading order in the large-\(N\) limit: 
\[
\frac{1}{N} \log Z_N \approx \frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{\langle \Psi | \psi \rangle^2}{\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle} \right) + O(1/N^2).
\]
This interesting result is specific to the \(Z_2\) symmetric phase. By contrast, in the symmetry breaking phase, the norm fluctuations are generically large.

Finally, we compare our analysis with numerics at finite \(N\). To verify the difference in the norm fluctuations between the two phases, we compute \(\frac{1}{N} \log \left( \frac{\langle \Psi | \psi \rangle^2}{\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle} \right)\) as a function of \(\lambda = M/N\) for different \(N\). For \((u, v) = (0, 4)\), we expect a first-order phase transition at \(\lambda = \lambda_c \approx 1.71\) that should manifest as a non-differentiable change in the norm fluctuations. From Fig. 3, one sees that numerics indeed show evidence of a first-order transition in the large-\(N\) thermodynamic limit.

![Fig. 3](image)

**FIG. 3.** Evidence for a first-order transition in the norm fluctuations using finite-\(N\) scaling. (a) Fluctuations in the norm as characterized by \(\frac{1}{N} \log \left( \frac{\langle \Psi | \psi \rangle^2}{\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle} \right)\). (b) Finite-size scaling at \(\lambda = 1.5\) indicates that \(\frac{1}{N} \log \left( \frac{\langle \Psi | \psi \rangle^2}{\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle} \right)\) decreases towards zero (the large-\(N\) prediction) as \(N\) increases (\(1/N \rightarrow 0\)). The dashed line is the error weighted quadratic fit and the shaded area is the 90\% confidence band. To better access the large-\(N\) behavior, we have added an additional data point from \(10^4\) disorder realizations of \(N = 24\).

### IV. SECOND RÉNYI ENTROPY AND PHASE TRANSITIONS

In this section, we examine the second Rényi entropy of a generic subregion \(A\) of the Gaussian RBM ensemble. Like the previous calculation of \(\langle \Psi | \psi \rangle\), we shall map the computation of the second Rényi entropy to a statistical mechanics model. The relevant parameters of the statistical model are the subregion size \(\alpha = |A|/N\) as well as \((u, v, \lambda)\), which span a four-dimensional parameter space. For clarity, we will focus on the subspaces (i) \(a = 1/2\) for general \(u, v\) and (ii) \((u, v) = (0, \infty)\) for general \(a\), which will encompass the region of near-maximal entropy. In the second case, we shall analytically compute the second Rényi entropy as a function of \(a\) in the thermodynamic limit, and compare these to finite-\(N\) numerics. In the following, we will refer to the curve of entropy versus \(a\) as the “Page curve”\([29]\) following the name convention in random states and black hole evaporation. Built upon the understanding of these special cases, we will later discuss qualitative features of Page curves for more generic parameters.

#### A. Mapping to a statistical mechanics model

Here, we introduce the analytic machinery for computing the second Rényi entropy of the RBM ensemble in large-\(N\) limit. For the parameter regime with vanishingly small norm fluctuations, the ensemble-averaged second Rényi entropy may be computed exactly in the large-\(N\) limit. We begin by expressing the second Rényi entropy of a subregion \(A\) using a doubled copy of the system \(|\Psi\rangle\langle \Psi|\):

\[
S_2(A) = -\log \left( \frac{\text{Tr}(X_A |\Psi\rangle\langle \Psi| \otimes |\Psi\rangle\langle \Psi|)}{\text{Tr}(|\Psi\rangle\langle \Psi| \otimes |\Psi\rangle\langle \Psi|)} \right),
\]

where \(X_A\) is the swap operator acting to swap the subregion \(A\) configurations of the two copies. A proof of this formula may be found in \([32]\). Note that the denominator of the expression in parentheses is equivalent to \(Z_0\). Similarly, we shall define \(Z_1\) to be the numerator,

\[
Z_1 = \text{tr} (X_A |\Psi\rangle\langle \Psi| \otimes |\Psi\rangle\langle \Psi|).
\]

The ensemble-averaged \(S_2(A)\) may be expanded in powers of the fluctuations \(\delta Z_1 = Z_1 - Z_0\) and \(\delta Z_0 = Z_0 - \bar{Z}_0\):

\[
S_2(A) = -\log \left( \frac{Z_1 + \delta Z_1}{Z_0 + \delta Z_0} \right) = -\log \frac{Z_1}{Z_0} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n} \left( \frac{\delta Z_1^n}{Z_0^n} - \frac{\delta Z_1^{n-1}}{Z_1^{n-1}} \right) \approx -\log \frac{Z_1}{Z_0}.
\]

The approximation in Eq. (17) is only justified when the fluctuations \(\delta Z_1\) and \(\delta Z_0\) are small in the large-\(N\) expansion, i.e., \(\delta Z_0/Z_0 \ll 1, \delta Z_1/Z_1 \ll 1\) as \(N \rightarrow \infty\). Hence, the following analytic computation of the approximation \(-\log (Z_1/Z_0)\) will only be applicable in a certain region of the parameter space. However, as we will demonstrate later, the approximation provides valuable insights into the behavior of entropy, and remains valid in the near-maximal entropy regime.

We begin by computing the components of the ensemble-averaged tensor

\[
\langle \Psi | \psi \rangle \otimes |\Psi\rangle\langle \Psi| = \sum_{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4} \Gamma_{s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4} |s_1 \rangle \otimes |s_4\rangle \langle s_2|,
\]

(18)
Under these constraints, identifies yields where \( \Gamma \) that the RBM ensemble is invariant under permutation of the spin variables provided that the actions are per-
the expression for \( A \) and its complement \( W \). FIG. 4. An illustration of ensemble-averaged tensor
\[ s = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{s_i} s_i. \]

where

\[ \Gamma_{s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4} = \prod_n \cos(W_{s_1}^m) \cos(W_{s_2}^m) \cos(W_{s_3}^m) \cos(W_{s_4}^m). \]  

Note that the trace of this tensor yields \( \overline{Z}_0 \) while the trace of the swap operator acting on the above tensor yields \( \overline{Z}_1 \), as shown in Fig. 4. One can partition the spin configurations into the configurations on subsystem \( A \) and its complement \( B \)
\[ s_k = (s_k^A, s_k^B), \]  

where \( s_k^A \) and \( s_k^B \) while the trace identifies \( s_k^A = s_k^A, s_k^2 = s_k^B, s_k^3 = s_k^A, s_k^4 = s_k^B \) and \( s_k^2 = s_k^B \). The swap operator switches \( s_k^A \) and \( s_k^B \) while the trace identifies \( s_k^A = s_k^A, s_k^1 = s_k^B, s_k^2 = s_k^A, s_k^3 = s_k^B \) and \( s_k^4 = s_k^B \). As with \( \overline{Z}_0 \), symmetry constrains the possible form of the expression for \( \overline{Z}_0 \) after performing the sum. Recall that the RBM ensemble is invariant under permutation or inversion of the random weights. This implies that \( \Gamma_{s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4} \) is invariant under permutations or negations of the spin variables provided that the actions are performed in the four copies simultaneously. This restricts \( \Gamma_{s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4} \) to be a function of \( s_k \) for \( j, k \in 1 \ldots 4 \). After the identification implemented by the trace, \( \Gamma_{s_1 s_2 s_3 s_4} \) can only depend on \( s_1 \) and \( s_2 \) through two “order param-
\[ \phi_A \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \in A} s_j^1 s_j^2 \quad \phi_B \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \in B} s_j^1 s_j^2. \]  

As with \( \overline{Z}_0 \), one can recast the expression for \( \overline{Z}_1 \) as a statistical mechanics model that depends on \( \phi_A \) and \( \phi_B \). In particular, \( \overline{Z}_1 \) becomes a partition function associated to coupled spin chains. The explicit formula for \( \overline{Z}_1 \) can be straightforwardly worked out using Gaussian integrals (see Appendix D), and yields
\[ \overline{Z}_1 = \sum_{\phi_A, \phi_B} \exp \left[ -N \mathcal{F}(\phi_A, \phi_B) \right] \]  

where the free energy density \( \mathcal{F} \) is defined to be a difference of two contributions
\[ \mathcal{F}(\phi_A, \phi_B) = \mathcal{E}(\phi_A, \phi_B) - S(\phi_A, \phi_B). \]  

As before, \( \mathcal{E} \) represents the “energetic” contribution from the coupling of the spin chains,
\[ \mathcal{E} = -2(\lambda (u^2 - v^2) + \lambda \log 2) \]  

\[ \gamma \equiv (\phi_A + \phi_B)(u^2 - v^2). \]

Meanwhile, \( S(\phi_A, \phi_B) \) represents the “entropic” contribution from the degeneracy of spin configurations pairs \( (s_1, s_2) \) associated to a fixed \( (\phi_A, \phi_B) \),
\[ S(\phi_A, \phi_B) = \log 2 + aH_b \left( \frac{a - \phi_A}{2a} \right) + bH_b \left( \frac{b - \phi_B}{2b} \right) \]  

where \( a \) and \( b \) represent the fraction of \( N \) sites comprising subsystem \( A \) and \( B \), respectively \( a \equiv |A|/N, \ b \equiv |B|/N = 1 - a \), and \( H_b \) is the binary entropy function \( H_b(p) = -p \log p - (1 - p) \log p \). The log 2 comes from spin-flip symmetry of \( \phi_A \) and \( \phi_B \).

Notice that \( \overline{Z}_1 \) reduces to \( \overline{Z}_0 \) if one sets \( a = \phi_A = 0 \). For small fluctuations of \( Z_0 \) and \( Z_1 \), the second Rényi entropy may be approximated by
\[ \overline{S}_2(A) \approx \mathcal{F}(\phi_A^*, \phi_B^*) + \frac{\log \overline{Z}_0}{N}, \]  

where \( \mathcal{F}(\phi_A^*, \phi_B^*) \) is the global minimum of the free energy density and \( (\phi_A^*, \phi_B^*) \) is its location. This approximation is accurate to lowest order in \( 1/N \) if the fluctuations in \( Z_0 \) and \( Z_1 \) are small.
B. Half-system second Rényi entropy

We begin by examining the half-system second Rényi entropy \((a = b = 1/2)\), as it provides a useful measure for the degree of entanglement in a wavefunction. The hyperplanes \(u = 0, 0.5\) were selected for studying \(S_2\) as a function of \((v, \lambda)\). Phase diagrams were obtained by numerically minimizing the free energy in Eq. (24) and using the minimizing order parameters \((\phi_A^*, \phi_B^*)\) to compute the second Rényi entropy [33], as shown in Fig. 5. Noticeably, at \(a = b = 1/2\), the free energy is symmetric under \(\phi_A \leftrightarrow \phi_B\); this comes from the permutation symmetry of random weights in the RBM. Accordingly, there are two phases which are classified by this symmetry. In the plots of \(\phi_A^* + \phi_B^*\) [Fig. 5(a-b)], the blue regime is dominated by a free energy minimum \((\phi_A^*, \phi_B^*)\) close to \((0, 0)\), while the dark red regime is dominated by a free energy minimum \((\phi_A^*, \phi_B^*)\) close to \((1, 1)\). Both regimes belong to the same phase since one can traverse the parameter space from one regime to the other without breaking the \(\phi_A \leftrightarrow \phi_B\) symmetry. However, there does exist a phase that breaks the \(\phi_A \leftrightarrow \phi_B\) symmetry, which we numerically found to be separated by a first order phase boundary (dashed yellow in Fig. 5). Nevertheless, there is in principle no reason to forbid the appearance of a second-order phase transition in other parameter regimes.

Importantly, in the phase diagrams for both \(u = 0, 0.5\), the boundary lines separating the symmetry-broken phase become independent of \(v\) in the large-\(v\) limit. In the specific case where \(u = 0\), the symmetry-broken phase can approach the maximal half-system entropy of \((N/2)\log 2\) at large \(v\) to lowest order in \(1/N\), as shown in Fig. 5(a,c). This is in contrast with the numerical investigation of a different RBM ensemble in Ref. [27] where the maximal entropy is not reached. Note that the symmetry-broken phase resides fully in the regime of small norm fluctuations, which are required for our approximation of Eq. (28) to be accurate. We will confirm the accuracy of the analytic treatment in the near-maximal entropy regime in numerical calculations presented in the next subsection.

C. Page curves at the limit of \((u, v) = (0, \infty)\)

We shall now focus on the limit of \(u = 0\) and \(v = \infty\), where the maximal entropy can be achieved in the large-\(N\) limit for a range of \(\lambda\). To gain insight into the behavior of the second Rényi entropy, we shall produce Page curves of \(S_2(A)\) by sweeping the value of \(a\) between 0 and 1.

Let us study the free energy as a function of \((\phi_A, \phi_B)\) over the full domain \(D = [-a, a] \times [-b, b]\). The dominating exponentials in Eq. (25) lead to step-like behavior near the edges of the domain, in analogy with the behavior of the energy density of \(Z_0\). In particular, we expect a near-constant plateau for \((\phi_A, \phi_B)\) on the interior of \(D\), which dips sharply on the boundary of \(D\) \((\phi_A = a \text{ or } \phi_B = b)\) as well as at the corners \((\phi_A, \phi_B) = (a, b)\) or \((\phi_A, \phi_B) = (-a, b)\) [see Fig. 6(a) for an example at large but finite \(v\)]. Further taking into account the entropy density, we find the global minimum of the free energy is located at one of the four local minima \((\phi_A, \phi_B) = \{(0, 0), (a, 0), (0, b), (a, b)\}\). The corresponding free energies of these local minima are:

\[
\begin{align*}
F(0, 0) &= -2 \log 2, \\
F(a, 0) &= -\lambda \log 2 - \log 2 - a \log 2, \\
F(0, b) &= -\lambda \log 3 - \log 2, \\
F(a, b) &= -\lambda \log 3 - \log 2.
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 6 shows that the situation at finite \(v\) quickly approaches the \(v \to \infty\) limit. Using parameters \((a, u, v, \lambda) = (1/2, 0, 4, 3/4)\), we see that the energy density in Fig. 6(a) exhibits the predicted step-like function behavior near the edges of the domain, and the free energy in Fig. 6(b) possesses local minima at the expected

![FIG. 5. Phase diagrams for a half-system partition at fixed \(u = 0\) (a, c) and \(u = 0.5\) (b, d). (a) and (b) capture information about the configuration \((\phi_A^*, \phi_B^*)\) that minimizes the free energy density associated to \(Z_0\). (c) and (d) plot the approximate averaged second Rényi entropy \(S_2/\langle N \log 2 \rangle\) using Eq. (28). The dashed yellow line separates two phases of the free energy of \(Z_0\). The phase outside the dashed yellow line preserves the \(\phi_A \leftrightarrow \phi_B\) symmetry (which swaps spins in the two equally-partitioned subsystems), while the phase within the dashed yellow line breaks the symmetry. Interestingly, the symmetry-broken phase has near-maximal entropy for \((u, v) = (0, \infty)\) in the large-\(N\) limit. For these parameters, the phase boundary is at \(\lambda = 1/2\) and \(\lambda = \lambda_c/2\), where \(\lambda_c\) is the critical \(\lambda\) for the transition of \(Z_0\).](image-url)
locations to great accuracy.

FIG. 6. Surface plots of the (a) energy density and the (b) free energy associated to $Z_1$ for parameters $(a,u,v,\lambda) = (1/2,0,4,3/4)$. The energy density is sharply sloped near the boundaries of the $(\phi_A,\phi_B)$ domain, indicating that its behavior may be approximated by step functions. To high accuracy, the free energy has four local minima at coordinates $(0,0), (a,0), (0,b), \text{ and } (a,b)$.

We may analytically construct the Page curve at different $\lambda$ by considering which of the free energy minima dominates for different $a$. Note that the approximation for $S_Z(\bar{A})$ in Eq. (28) requires the norm fluctuations to be small, and as per the discussion in Sec. III, is strictly valid only for $\lambda$ below $\lambda_c$. First, for $a$ near 0, one can compare free energies in Eq. (29) and find that the global minimum of the free energy is at $(a,0)$. Hence, near the edge of the Page curve, the minimum free energy grows linearly as a function of $a$ and one can obtain the corresponding second Rényi entropy as shown in the Page curves in Fig. 7. This suggests that in the chosen limiting case, the entropy saturates the maximal volume law for small subregions. Similarly, we anticipate analogous linearly decreasing behavior near $a = 1$ because the Page curve is symmetric due to the spin permutation symmetry of the wavefunction.

When $(a,0)$ is no longer the global minimum of the free energy, the entropy with respect to subregion size transitions at some critical value $a = a_c$ from linear growth to a plateau, as shown in Fig. 7(a,c,d). In this regime, as the subregion size increases, the entropy does not obey a volume law. Due to the symmetry of the Page curve, the plateau will terminate at $a = 1 - a_c$. The dominant minimum in the plateau regime of the Page curve as well as the width of the plateau depends on the value of $\lambda$. Notably, if $a_c = 1/2$, there is no plateau regime, but rather a direct transition between the two linear regions. One can solve for the global minimum in each of the regimes, and we summarize the results for different $\lambda$ below:

- For $\lambda < 1/2$, $a_c = \lambda$ and the plateaued regime is dominated by the free energy minimum at $(\phi_A,\phi_B) = (0,0)$ yielding $S_Z/N \approx \lambda \log 2$. The plateau behavior can be understood as saturating the entropy bound set by the number of hidden neurons: $M \log 2$.

- For $1/2 < \lambda < \lambda_c/2$, there is no plateau regime. The linear growth of the entropy reaches its maximal value at $a = 1/2$, which also saturates the Page value of $S_Z/N = 1/2 \log 2$. At $a = 1/2$, there are degenerate free energy minima at $(\phi_A,\phi_B) = (1/2,0)$ and $(0,1/2)$. The large-$N$ solution spontaneously breaks the $\phi_A \leftrightarrow \phi_B$ symmetry, which defines the phase within the dashed yellow line in Fig. 5(a,c).

- For $\lambda_c/2 < \lambda < \lambda_c$, $a_c = 1 - \lambda/\lambda_c$, and the plateaued regime is dominated by the free energy minimum at $(\phi_A,\phi_B) = (a,b)$.

These analytic results are also summarized in Fig. 7. Interestingly, the analytics predict that for large $\lambda$ (i.e. $\lambda > \lambda_c/2$), the height of the plateau decreases as a function of $\lambda$.

FIG. 7. The Page curves for the averaged Rényi entropy in the $(u,v) = (0, \infty)$ limit at $\lambda = 0.25, 0.75, 1, 1.25$ for panels (a-d). We can compare these results to Fig. 2. At $\lambda = \lambda_c$, the Page curve becomes $S_Z = 0$ and this is also when the norm fluctuation becomes large as the result of $Z_0$ will begin to be dominated (for $\lambda > \lambda_c$) by a different free energy minimum at $|\phi| = 1$. 
We can compare the analytically determined Page curves with the finite-N numerical results, as shown in Fig. 8. The numerical results are obtained using \((u, v) = (0, 4)\), where the calculations at \((u, v) = (0, \infty)\) are predicted to work sufficiently well (see Fig. 6). One can see that the numerically obtained Page curves converge to the analytic prediction for small \(\lambda\) [see Fig. 8(a-b)]. The convergence is less obvious at large \(\lambda\) [see Fig. 8(c)], which is no surprising since the analytic approximation in Eq. (28) breaks down when the fluctuations \(\delta Z_0\) and \(\delta Z_1\) are large, which is expected for the large \(\lambda\) regime. Nevertheless, the analytic computation does correctly predict that the maximum half-system entropy is suppressed at large \(\lambda\).

Remarkably, for \(\lambda = 0.75\) — which is within the regime of near-maximal volume-law second Rényi entropy — we observe that the deficit in the maximum entropy \(N/2 \log 2 - S_2(N/2)\) appears to converge to some small \(N\)-independent value. The finite-size scaling plot in Fig. 8(d) indicates that in the thermodynamic limit, the average second Rényi entropy density is nearly maximal, and the plotted deficit entropy is close to that of Haar-random states \((\log 2 \approx 0.69)\) \([34]\). That being said, given that the RBM ensemble has only a polynomial number of free parameters in the system size, we expect that it will not be able to fully capture all features of the ensemble of Haar-random quantum states. This motivates us to investigate more fine-grained diagnostics that can qualitatively distinguish between random RBM states in the near-maximal entropy regime and Haar-random states. We will postpone a more detailed discussion of this to Sec. V.

D. Possible types of Page curves

Now considering the whole \((u, v, \lambda)\) parameter space, we may classify the different types of Page curves that can be obtained based on qualitative features that persist in the large-\(N\) limit. Obtaining the full phase diagram for the Page curves requires solving the statistical mechanics problem in Eq. (24) in the four-dimensional parameters space \((a, u, v, \lambda)\), and will not be the task of the present paper. Instead, we obtain Page curves from several representative points in parameter space, as shown in Fig. 9. Interestingly, we observe Page curves of three qualitatively different types (see Fig. 9), which can be classified based on the following features: (i) a shallow middle region and two non-differentiable corners, (ii) a single non-differentiable kink at \(a = 1/2\), and (iii) no corners or kinks. This indicates that the presence of non-differentiable kinks/corners is not restricted to the special case considered in the previous subsection, but is a more general feature which indicates a transition in the free energy minimum. Finite-\(N\) numerics show strong support for the existence of Page curves of all three types for generic \((u, v, \lambda)\). Indeed, as shown in Fig. 9(b-d), the numeric Page curves converge to the analytic predictions as \(N\) increases for these representative parameter points.

V. OTHER ENTANGLEMENT FEATURES

In this section, we study other features of the RBM ensemble such as the von Neumann entropy, the entanglement spectrum and its level statistics, and the relation of the ensemble to quantum state designs. These features will reveal further characteristics of the different regimes observed in the preceding sections. In particular, these properties will clarify the similarities and differences between random RBM states and Haar-random quantum states in the regime of near-maximal entanglement entropy.
A. Von Neumann entropy

The numeric study of the ensemble-averaged second Rényi entropy can be straightforwardly extended to the von Neumann entropy. For comparison with the second Rényi entropy, we use the same parameters as before, fixing \((u,v) = (0,4)\) and obtaining Page curves at different \(\lambda\). The finite-\(N\) Page curves of the ensemble-averaged von Neumann entropy are shown in Fig. 10. Generally, one expects qualitatively similar behavior since the von Neumann entropy is an upper bound for the second Rényi entropy. Indeed, one can see from Fig. 10 that the von Neumann entropy follows a trend similar to that of the second Rényi entropy: near the edges of the Page curve, one observes near-maximal volume-law behavior, while the behavior near \(a = \frac{1}{2}\) is strongly \(\lambda\)-dependent. The linear behavior at the edges is anticipated since the second Rényi entropy is bounded from above by the von Neumann entropy, and both are saturated by volume-law linear growth. Likewise, at small \(\lambda\), the plateau-like behavior near the center of the curve has a value near the \(M \log 2\) upper bound of the second Rényi entropy. For \(\lambda = 0.75\) the von Neumann entropy approaches the maximal-entropy curve expected for a random quantum state at large \(N\). This coincides with the regime in which one observes the maximal second Rényi Page curve. Furthermore, like the second Rényi entropy, a finite-size scaling analysis shows that the deficit between the half-system von Neumann entropy and the maximal possible value of \((N/2) \log 2\) approximately approaches a finite value, which is close to the theoretical deficit of \(1/2\) for Haar-random states [29]. This represents yet another characteristic shared by random quantum states and RBM wavefunctions at these parameters. At larger \(\lambda\), the von Neumann entropy is sub-maximal and has a more apparent convergence, unlike the second Rényi entropy at large \(\lambda\).
B. Entanglement spectrum and level statistics

The entanglement spectrum refers to the eigenvalue spectrum of $-\log \rho_A$ with $\rho_A$ the reduced density matrix for subregion $A$. The entanglement spectrum probes more fine-grained entanglement properties of a quantum state than the entanglement entropy, and has been a powerful tool in characterizing quantum phases of matter [35]. In this subsection, we will study the density of states of the entanglement spectrum, and its level statistics. We will demonstrate that for the near-maximal entanglement regime, the density of states is close to the Marchenko-Pastur distribution for random states [36, 37]. In contrast, for other regions of the phase diagram, we observe a deviation from the Marchenko-Pastur distribution, which is consistent with the results of a previous study of a slightly different ensemble [27]. However, even for the near-maximal entanglement regime, the level statistics are qualitatively different than that of random states.

In the following we choose $N = 20$ and compute the ensemble-averaged entanglement spectrum for a half-system bipartition $|A| = 10$ with parameters $(u, v) = (0, 4)$ while varying $\lambda$. The averaged entanglement spectrum is obtained by taking the average values of the list of descending ordered eigenvalues of the reduced density matrix $\xi_k$. The density of states is obtained from properly normalized histogram plots of all sampled eigenvalues. The results are plotted in Fig. 11. Note that the rank of the reduced density matrix is bounded from above by $2^M$ [see discussion below Eq. (3)]. Therefore for $\lambda < 0.5$ (i.e. $M < 10 = |A|$), the reduced density matrix has at most $2^M$ nonzero eigenvalues. We avoid this reduction of nonzero eigenvalues by choosing $\lambda > 0.5$; namely, we select $\lambda = 0.75, 1.25, 1.75$ (corresponding to $M = 15, 25, 35$). For the study of the average entanglement spectrum and the density of states of the entanglement Hamiltonian [Fig. 11(a)], we do not show cases for $\lambda < 0.5$, which certainly deviate from results of the Marchenko-Pastur distribution for a generic random state with the discussed zero eigenvalues of the reduced density matrix. On the other hand, to study the level statistics [Fig. 11(b)], we also include the case of $\lambda < 0.5$, where only the non-zero eigenvalues of the reduced density matrix are collected in counting the correlation between levels.

Interestingly, for $\lambda = 0.75$ which is in the near-maximal entropy regime, the eigenvalue distribution is very close to that of a random state derived from Marchenko-Pastur distribution [36, 37], which is a novel result compared to the observations of Ref. [27]. Since the regime has near-maximal entropy, we expect almost all of the degrees of freedom in subregion $A$ to be entangled and the entanglement spectrum to have $2^{|A|}$ nearly degenerate levels. However, higher order $1/N$ effects split the zeroth-order degenerate levels, producing a distribution close to the Marchenko-Pastur distribution for random state. Note that the approximate agreement of the entanglement spectrum for the near-maximal entropy RBM wavefunction and that of a random quantum spin state is a much stronger result than the saturation of the entropy bound. It also implies that all half-system Rényi entropies approximately agree with those of a random state.

Notably absent from the ensemble-averaged entanglement spectrum is information about the statistical correlations between levels in the spectrum, which is captured by the level statistics. Much like the level statistics of a Hamiltonian spectrum, the level statistics of the entanglement spectrum may be used to diagnose thermalization in quantum systems as demonstrated in Ref. [38]. It was found that for a thermalized eigenstate, the level statistics of the entanglement spectrum are sufficiently captured by a random matrix ensemble belonging to the same symmetry class of the associated Hamiltonian. On the other hand, for a many-body localized state, the level statistics of the entanglement spectrum follow a semi-Poisson distribution [38] (which is different from the predicted distribution for the energy level statistics for an integrable system). Here, we would like to determine the level statistics of the entanglement spectrum in different parameter regimes to characterize the types of wavefunctions encoded by our Gaussian RBM ensemble.

We adopt the formalism of Ref. [39] for studying the level statistics. In particular, the $n^{th}$ level spacing ratio $r_n$ is defined to be

$$ r_n \equiv \delta_n / \delta_{n-1} $$

where $\delta_n$ is the level spacing between $n$th level and $(n + 1)$th levels. The distribution of the level spacing ratios $r$ will inform us about the statistical correlations.
in the entanglement spectrum, and provide more fine-grained information for comparison of our RBM ensemble with the Haar-random ensemble. For direct comparison with our prior results, we select the same parameters \((a, u, v) = (\frac{1}{4}, 0.4)\) and collect entanglement spectrum data for randomly drawn Gaussian RBM states with a fixed \(N = 20\) and varying \(M\). From the whole set of empirically-generated \(r_n\), we can obtain the (approximate) distribution \(p(r)\), which is the probability density that a level spacing ratio \(r\) occurs. The numeric results, which are summarized in Fig. 12, show no level repulsion for any of the explored values of \(\lambda\) in the three regimes (small \(\lambda\), intermediate \(\lambda\) with near-maximal entropy behavior, and large \(\lambda\)). Note that for \(\lambda = 0.25\) \((M = 5)\), we consider only the \(2^5 = 32\) nonzero eigenvalues of the reduced density matrix when producing the distribution \(p(r)\). It is worth mentioning that the distributions for \(\lambda = 0.25\) and \(\lambda = 0.75\) are very similar, while for larger \(\lambda\) case, statistically more level spacing ratios are “condensing,” yielding a spike at \(r = 0\).

An analogous investigation may also be done using the reduced level spacing ratios \(\tilde{r}_n\), which is defined to be strictly \(\leq 1\):

\[
\tilde{r}_n = \min \left\{ r_n, \frac{1}{r_n} \right\} \quad (31)
\]

For \(M = 5\) (small \(\lambda\)), we obtain \(\langle \tilde{r} \rangle \approx 0.416\). For \(M = 15\) (in the near-maximal entropy regime), the average reduced level spacing ratio for the chosen states corresponding to nonzero eigenvalues of the reduced density matrix is \(\langle \tilde{r} \rangle \approx 0.422\). For \(M = 25\) and \(M = 35\), we can obtain values of \(\langle \tilde{r} \rangle \approx 0.406\) and \(0.376\), respectively. These values are close to the average reduced level spacing ratio of a Poisson statistics \((2\log 2 - 1 \approx 0.386 [40])\).

C. Relation to quantum state designs

The deviation of the level statistics of the entanglement spectrum from that of a generic random quantum state is a reflection of the fact that the RBM ensemble does not form a quantum state design [41]. In fact, a symmetry argument can be made to prove that any zero-bias random RBM ensemble cannot be a quantum state design. First, note that up to a normalization factor, the density matrix for a general zero-bias RBM state is as follows:

\[
|\Psi\rangle\langle \Psi | = \sum_{s_1, s_2} \prod_m \cosh W_{s_1}^m \cosh (W_{s_2}^m)^* |s_1\rangle\langle s_2 | \quad (32)
\]

The density matrix has matrix elements

\[
\rho_{s_1, s_2} \sim \prod_m \cosh W_{s_1}^m \cosh (W_{s_2}^m)^* \quad (33)
\]

The symmetry of the \(\cosh()\) in the wave function implies symmetry of the matrix elements

\[
\rho_{s_1, s_2} = \rho_{s_2, s_1} \quad (34)
\]

where \(s_\mathbb{Z} \equiv \{-s_1^0, -s_2^0, ..., -s_N^0\}\). Therefore, upon averaging, the density matrix cannot be the identity since \(\rho_{s, s} = \rho_{s, s}^{-}\). Hence, a zero-bias RBM ensemble cannot form a 1-design.

Furthermore, one can show that the RBMs do not form quantum state designs even in the subspace spanned by symmetric basis \(|s_+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}(|s_1\rangle + |s_2\rangle)\), which is invariant under \(|s\rangle \rightarrow |\bar{s}\rangle\). This is ultimately because of the high statistical correlation between the wavefunction components for \(|s_+\rangle\) and \(|s_+^-\rangle\). For example, assuming the norm fluctuations are small, we can consider the following element of the averaged density matrix:

\[
\rho_{s_+, s_+^-} \sim \cosh^M ((s \cdot s') (u^2 + v^2) / N) \quad (35)
\]

For \((s \cdot s') / N \approx 1\) (such as when \(s\) and \(s'\) differ by a small \(O(1)\) number of spins), the matrix elements remain large. Hence, even for the near-maximal entropy regime, the density matrix is not proportional to the identity and therefore a zero-bias RBM ensemble does not form...
a 1-design in the symmetric subspace.

It is interesting that we are able to recover the Page curve for an ensemble that is not a quantum state design. The ability to demonstrate a high-degree of entanglement entropy without mirroring the moments of the distribution of random quantum states is notable from a computational perspective. The nearly maximally-entangled RBM states share many of the same bipartite entanglement characteristics with a random quantum state, but are classically simulable in polynomial time. In other words, our results show that bipartite entanglement, characterized by the von Neumann entropy and Rényi entropies, is not the limiting factor in the efficient simulation of quantum states.

VI. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

The curse of dimensionality is a profound conceptual and practical obstacle in theoretical many-body physics and other sciences. Machine learning has shown promise in circumventing this barrier by providing efficient (and ideally, unbiased) parameterizations of data sets in high-dimensional spaces. The RBM ansatz for many-body wavefunctions considered in this work is one example of such a parameterization.

In this work, we have used tools from statistical physics to methodically characterize a generic ensemble of random RBM wavefunctions. Our findings confirm that not only can RBMs efficiently encode volume-law entangled states, in agreement with previous studies, but they do so generically, which sharply distinguishes them from other wavefunction ansatzes such as tensor network states. Importantly, we have demonstrated that random RBM states exhibit qualitatively different behavior as one tunes the parameters of the Gaussian random weights and the ratio of the number of hidden spins with the number of physical spins. Notably, in the thermodynamic limit $N \to \infty$, we find a parameter regime where the entanglement is maximal to lowest order in $1/N$. Interestingly, finite-size scaling analysis of the ensemble-averaged second Rényi and von Neumann entropies shows that the deficit between the half-system entropy and the maximal value of $(N/2) \log 2$ is close to that of a Haar-random state. However, we find that even in this parameter regime, random RBM states are not equivalent to random quantum states as revealed by the level statistics of the entanglement spectrum and the fact that they do not form a quantum state design.

It is intriguing that both Ref. [27] and our results indicate that the averaged bipartite entanglement entropy for an RBM wavefunction ensemble is maximized at a finite value of $\lambda$. This stands in apparent contradiction with the intuition that RBMs with more hidden neurons have greater representational power, and can encode functions with larger correlations. This appears to suggest an interesting limitation of the RBM ansatz: even if “wide” RBMs with more hidden neurons have greater representational power, wavefunctions that are highly entangled may comprise a fractionally smaller subspace of the set of all wavefunctions that could be encoded by the RBM. This conjecture would explain the apparent mismatch between the high expressivity of wide RBMs and the non-monotonic relationship between the averaged bipartite entanglement and $\lambda$. The practical implications of this would be that past a certain $\lambda$, adding more hidden neurons would not provide an advantage in targeting highly entangled wavefunctions during training. That being said, one prior investigation in a classical machine learning context showed that deeper neural network architectures can express more complex functions on average [42]. It is possible that deeper RBMs can likewise express more entangled wavefunctions on average even at large $\lambda$. Developing a more concrete understanding of the typical training landscape for RBM wavefunctions at larger values of $\lambda$ is an interesting topic for future research.

Our results pave a new path for studying neural network quantum states and provide new insights on the potential future directions in this field. First, our results reveal the richness of the RBM ansatz through the breadth of qualitatively different quantum wavefunctions generically encoded by RBMs. Our detailed characterization of a generic RBM ensemble provides guidance in the design and initialization of RBM quantum states for various tasks. Furthermore, our analytic approach may be straightforwardly generalized to explore the full RBM parameter space including the bias fields and to investigate other physical properties of interest (such as higher Rényi entropies). Such studies can facilitate a more detailed and fruitful understanding of the RBM quantum states in the future.
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Appendix A: Convenient formulas for ensemble-averaging

In the main text, the calculation of the ensemble-averaged $\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle$, $Z_0$ and $Z_1$ essentially boil down to the calculation of the following correlators:

$$\cosh(W_{s_1}^m)^* \cosh(W_{s_2}^m) \quad \text{and} \quad \cosh(W_{s_1}^m)^* \cosh(W_{s_2}^m)^* \cosh(W_{s_1}^m) \cosh(W_{s_2}^m).$$

The above correlations will ultimately depend on the correlators between random variables $(W_{s_1}^m)^*$ and $W_{s_1}^m$. Recall that $W_{s_1}^m \equiv \sum_j w_{mj}s_j^j$ and $w_{mj} = w_{mj}^R + i w_{mj}^I$ for $w_{mj}^R$, $w_{mj}^I$ random real Gaussian variables drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_R^2)$ and $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_I^2)$, respectively. Therefore we have $w_{mj}^R w_{mk}^R = \sigma_R^2 \delta_{jk}$, $w_{mj}^I w_{mk}^I = \sigma_I^2 \delta_{jk}$, and $w_{mj}^R w_{mk}^I = 0$. From these properties, it is straightforward to obtain:

$$W_{s_1}^m \left( W_{s_2}^m \right)^* = (s_i \cdot s_j)(u^2 + v^2)/N,$$

$$W_{s_1}^m W_{s_2}^m = \left( W_{s_1}^m \right)^* \left( W_{s_2}^m \right)^* = (s_i \cdot s_j)(u^2 - v^2)/N,$$

where we have defined $u^2 \equiv \sigma_R^2/N$ and $v^2 \equiv \sigma_I^2/N$.

The strategy for computing the correlators in (A1) is as follows: 1) expand the $\cosh()$ terms using exponential functions 2) recast the product of $\cosh()$ terms in the correlator as a partition function summing over classical binary variable configurations (which will represent the possible combinations of exponentials with positive and negative arguments), and 3) compute the ensemble-average directly by taking advantage of the Gaussianity of the random weights.

We will walk through the procedure in detail for $\cosh(W_{s_1}^m)^* \cosh(W_{s_2}^m)$, and then report the results from straightforward generalization to $\cosh(W_{s_1}^m)^* \cosh(W_{s_2}^m)^* \cosh(W_{s_1}^m) \cosh(W_{s_2}^m)$. First, we perform the expansion over exponentials (step 1),

$$\cosh(W_{s_1}^m)^* \cosh(W_{s_2}^m) = \frac{1}{4} \left( \exp(W_{s_1}^m)^* + \exp(-W_{s_1}^m)^* \right) \left( \exp(W_{s_2}^m)^* + \exp(-W_{s_2}^m)^* \right)$$

Next, we introduce auxiliary binary variables $\rho_i$ which take on values in $\{-1, +1\}$ to succinctly rewrite the above expression (step 2):

$$\cosh(W_{s_1}^m)^* \cosh(W_{s_2}^m) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\{\rho_i, i = \pm 1\}} \exp \left( \rho_1(W_{s_1}^m)^* + \rho_2 W_{s_2}^m \right)$$

Now we will take advantage of the following useful result for independent Gaussian random variables $x_k$:

$$\exp \left( \sum_k c_k x_k \right) = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_k c_k x_k \right)^2 \right].$$

(A5)

Since $W_{s_1}^m$ is a linear combination of independent random Gaussian variables (and is itself a Gaussian random variable), the above property may be invoked. These ensemble average can accordingly be brought inside the argument of the exponential and computed using the correlators in Eq. (A2) (step 3):

$$\cosh(W_{s_1}^m)^* \cosh(W_{s_2}^m) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\{\rho_i, i = \pm 1\}} \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \rho_1(W_{s_1}^m)^* + \rho_2 W_{s_2}^m \right)^2 \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\{\rho_i, i = \pm 1\}} \exp \left( f(\{\rho_i\}, s_1, s_2) \right)$$

(A6)
where the function $f$ is defined to be

$$f(\{\rho_i\}, s_1, s_2) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( \rho_1(W_m)^* + \rho_2W_m \right)^2$$

$$= (u^2 - v^2) + \rho_1\rho_2(s_1 \cdot s_2)(u^2 + v^2)/N,$$

Performing the analogous calculation for the other correlator in Eq. (A1), one has

$$\cosh(W_m^r)^* \cosh(W_m^r)^* \cosh(W_m^r) \cosh(W_m^r) = \frac{1}{16} \sum_{\{\tau_i, \pm \}} \exp[g(\{\tau_i\}, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4)]\]. \tag{A8}$$

where

$$g(\{\tau_i\}, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) \equiv \frac{1}{2}[\tau_1(W_m^r)^* + \tau_2(W_m^r)^* + \tau_3W_m^r + \tau_4W_m^r]^2$$

$$= 2(u^2 - v^2) + \sum_{k \in \{1, 2\}, l \in \{3, 4\}} \tau_k \tau_l (u^2 + v^2)(s_k \cdot s_l)/N$$

$$+ \tau_1 \tau_2(u^2 - v^2)(s_1 \cdot s_2)/N + \tau_3 \tau_4(u^2 - v^2)(s_3 \cdot s_4)/N. \tag{A9}$$

Appendix B: Derivation of $|\Psi|^2$ [Eq. (6)]

Using the correlator in Eq. (A6), we can write the average norm of the Gaussian RBM ensemble as

$$\langle |\Psi|^2 \rangle = \sum_s \prod_{m=1}^M \cosh(W_m^r)^* \cosh(W_m^r)$$

$$= \sum_s \prod_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\{\rho_i, \pm \}} \exp \left[ (u^2 - v^2) + \rho_1\rho_2(u^2 + v^2) \right].$$

Explicitly summing over the $\{\rho_i\}$ variables, one has

$$\langle |\Psi|^2 \rangle = \sum_{\{s\}} \prod_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{2} \left[ \exp(2u^2) + \exp(2v^2) \right]$$

$$= \frac{2^N}{2^M} \left[ \exp(2u^2) + \exp(-2v^2) \right]^M. \tag{B1}$$

Appendix C: Derivation of $Z_0 = \langle |\Psi|^2 \rangle^2$ [Eq. (8) and Eq. (9)]

Here, we compute $Z_0 = \langle |\Psi|^2 \rangle^2$ and map it to a partition function of a coupled spin chain problem. Using the correlator in Eq. A8, we can write $Z_0$ as

$$Z_0 = \sum_{s_1, s_2} \prod_{m=1}^M \cosh(W_m^r)^* \cosh(W_m^r)^* \cosh(W_m^r) \cosh(W_m^r)$$

$$= \frac{1}{16} \sum_{\{\tau_i, \pm \}} \exp[g(\{\tau_i\}, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_2)].$$

Explicitly summing over the $\{\tau_i\}$ variables gives Eq. (8):

$$Z_0 = e^{2M(u^2 - v^2)} \sum_{s_1, s_2} \left[ \frac{1}{4}(2 + e^{2(u^2 + v^2)} \cosh 4\phi u^2 + e^{-2(u^2 + v^2)} \cosh 4\phi v^2) \right]^M. \tag{C1}$$
where \( \phi \equiv (s_1 \cdot s_2)/N \). Since the terms in the sum really only depend on \( \phi \), \( Z_0 \) can be recast as a partition function whose free energy depends on a single effective degree of freedom \( \phi \), with some degeneracy factor that represents the number of \((s_1, s_2)\) configurations that map to the same \( \phi \), i.e.,

\[
Z_0 = \sum_{s_1, s_2} e^{-N\mathcal{E}(\phi)} = \sum_{\phi} \mathcal{D}(\phi) e^{-N\mathcal{E}(\phi)},
\]

where \( \mathcal{D}(\phi) \) is the degeneracy factor. Comparing to Eq. (C1) we can obtain the expression for \( \mathcal{E}(\phi) \) in Eq. (10).

Now let us compute this degeneracy factor \( \mathcal{D}(\phi) \). The dot product \( \phi = s_1 \cdot s_2 = \sum_i s_1^i s_2^i \) counts the difference between the number of indices for which \( s_1^i \) and \( s_2^i \) agree and the number for which they disagree, and is equivalent to addition modulo 2 for two binary vectors. The number of indices that agree is \( (N + \phi)/2 \) and the number of indices that disagree is \( (N - \phi)/2 \). Hence, the degeneracy factor is

\[
\mathcal{D}(\phi) = 2^N \left( \frac{N}{\phi + N} \right) = 2^N \frac{N!}{\frac{N + \phi}{2}! \frac{N - \phi}{2}!}.
\]

Now, \( Z_0 \) may be rewritten as a partition function of a statistical mechanics problem that depends on the single parameter \( \phi \):

\[
Z_0 = \sum_{\phi} \exp[-N\mathcal{F}(\phi)],
\]

where the free energy density \( \mathcal{F}(\phi) = \mathcal{E}(\phi) - \mathcal{S}(\phi) \) and the entropy density \( \mathcal{S}(\phi) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \log \mathcal{D}(\phi) \) is given by

\[
\mathcal{S}(\phi) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1 - \phi}{2} \log \frac{1 - \phi}{2} - \frac{1 + \phi}{2} \log \frac{1 + \phi}{2} + \log 2.
\]

where we have used Stirling’s approximation.

---

**Appendix D: Derivation of** \( Z_1 \equiv \text{tr} \left( X_A |\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi| \otimes |\Psi\rangle \langle \Psi| \right) \) [Eq. (23)]

The general correlator in Eq. (A8) may be used to compute \( Z_1 \), which is given by Eq. (21):

\[
Z_1 = \sum_{s_1, s_2} \left( \frac{1}{16} \sum_{\{\tau_i\}} \exp \left[ g(\{\tau_i\}, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) \right] \right)^M \delta_{s_2^A s_3^A} \delta_{s_2^B s_3^B} \delta_{s_2^C s_3^C},
\]

The delta tensors implement the following identifications (schematically depicted in Fig. 4):

\[
\begin{align*}
    s_1 \cdot s_3 &= s_2 \cdot s_4 = N\phi_A + |B|, \\
    s_1 \cdot s_4 &= s_2 \cdot s_3 = N\phi_B + |A|, \\
    s_1 \cdot s_2 &= s_3 \cdot s_4 = N(\phi_A + \phi_B),
\end{align*}
\]

where we have used the same notation of \( \phi_A \) and \( \phi_B \) as in the main text. Substituting these equations to the expression for \( g(\{\tau_i\}, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4) \) in Eq. (A9) and explicitly summing over \( \{\tau_i\} \) yields

\[
Z_1 = \sum_{s_1, s_2} e^{-N\mathcal{E}(\phi_A, \phi_B)} = \sum_{\phi_A, \phi_B} \mathcal{D}(\phi_A, \phi_B) e^{-N\mathcal{E}(\phi_A, \phi_B)},
\]

where \( \mathcal{E}(\phi_A, \phi_B) \) may be computed to take the form in Eq. (25). Analogous to the reasoning in the previous section, the degeneracy factor eventually yields the entropy density \( \mathcal{S}(\phi_A, \phi_B) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \log \mathcal{D}(\phi_A, \phi_B) \), whose formula is presented in Eq. (27).
To properly minimize the free energy and find the global minimum, one should properly take into account possible local minima near the $\phi_A = 1/2$ or $\phi_B = 1/2$ line and the corner $\phi_A = \phi_B = 1/2$. 