Pole skipping away from maximal chaos

Gábor Sárosi (CERN)

Based on 1908.03574 with Mezei 2010.08558 with Choi and Mezei

Plan

- **1. Introduction: quantum butterfly effect**
- 2. Pole skipping
- 3. Large q SYK chain

Butterfly effect

"Footprint" of a Heisenberg operator

$$C(t, x) = -\left\langle [W(t, x), V(0, 0)]^2 \right\rangle_{\beta}$$



Sensitivity to initial data [Larkin-Ovchinnikov]

9 XC

 \mathbb{V}

without

X

$$[q(t), p(0)] \propto \{q(t), p(0)\} = \frac{\partial q(t)}{\partial q(0)}$$

rep104

Butterfly effect

 $C(t) = -\langle [W(t), V(0)]^2 \rangle_{\text{thermal}}$



Butterfly effect with local interactions

Scaling ansatz [Kemani-Huse-Nahum,Xu-Swingle]



- $\lambda(v)$ is a velocity dependent Lyapunov exponent
- For $x \ll t$ we recover the ordinary exponent $\lambda_L = \lambda(0)$
- The edge of the "butterfly cone" is defined by $\lambda(v_B) = 0$ v_B is the butterfly speed

OTOC in AdS/CFT

AdS/CFT with Einstein gravity (near horizon scattering) [Shenker-Stanford]



$$OTOC(t, x) \approx 1 - \#G_N e^{\frac{2\pi}{\beta}(t - |x|/v_B)} \rightarrow \lambda(v) = \frac{2\pi}{\beta} \left(1 - \frac{v}{v_B} \right)$$
$$\lambda_L \equiv \lambda(0) = \frac{2\pi}{\beta}$$

Chaos bound

Universal bounds:

 $\lambda_L \equiv \lambda(0) \le \frac{2\pi}{\beta}$

[Maldacena-Shenker-Stanford]





Example

AdS/CFT with stringy corrections [Shenker-Stanford]

$$\lambda(\mathbf{v}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\pi}{\beta} \left(2 - \frac{\mathbf{v}_*}{\mathbf{v}_B} - \frac{\mathbf{v}^2}{\mathbf{v}_* \mathbf{v}_B} \right), & \mathbf{v} < \mathbf{v}_* \\ \frac{2\pi}{\beta} \left(1 - \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}_B} \right), & \mathbf{v} \ge \mathbf{v}_* \end{cases}$$
$$\mathbf{v}_* = \frac{d^2}{4\mathbf{v}_B} \left(\frac{\ell_{\text{string}}}{\ell_{\text{AdS}}} \right)^2$$

How special are maximally chaotic theories?

Original expectation: $\lambda_L = \frac{2\pi}{\beta}$ implies a weakly coupled gravity dual

Counter example: SYK/tensor models in 0+1d

Higher dimensions: $\lambda_L = \frac{2\pi}{\beta}$ for local operators is much stronger Example: CFT on $S_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{H}_{d-1}$ (conformal to Rindler) $\lambda(\mathbf{v}) \leftrightarrow j(\Delta)$ spin of leading Regge trajectory $\lambda(\mathbf{v}) = \frac{2\pi}{\beta} \left(1 - \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}_B}\right) \rightarrow j(\Delta) = 2$ flat trajectory; infinite gap for higher spin single traces

If gravity EFT is dual to an ensemble average, $\lambda(0) = \frac{2\pi}{\beta}$ suggests that each element of the ensemble should have a weakly coupled bulk dual

In a nutshell

 $C(t,x) = -\langle [W(t,x), V(0,0)]^2 \rangle \sim \epsilon e^{\lambda(\frac{x}{t})t}$



Energy density retarded two point function $G_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}^{R}(\omega, p)$

has a family of hydrodynamic poles defined by

 $\omega_{\text{pole}}(p \to 0) = 0$

for small p the possibilities:

$$\omega_{\text{pole}}(p) = \begin{cases} \pm c_s p + \dots & \text{(sound)} \\ -iDp^2 + \dots & \text{(energy diffusion)} \end{cases}$$

Prediction of AdS/CFT: Residue on this pole line vanishes at

[Grozdanov,Schalm,Scopelliti]

$$(\omega, p)\mathbf{p.s.} = i\lambda_L \left(1, \frac{1}{v_B}\right)$$

Prediction of AdS/CFT: Residue on this pole line vanishes at

Proposed explanatio

Lyapunov growth coming from exchange of hydrodynamic "fluid field"



Example: 2d CFTs (maximal chaos in 2d) [Haehl-Rozali]

$$S_{\text{hydro}} \propto \int dt [\partial_{x^{-}} \sigma_{L} (\partial_{t}^{3} - \partial_{t}) \sigma_{L} + \partial_{x^{+}} \sigma_{R} (\partial_{t}^{3} - \partial_{t}) \sigma_{R}]$$

$$\langle \sigma_{L} \sigma_{L} \rangle (\omega, p) \propto \frac{1}{\omega(\omega^{2} + 1)(\omega - p)}$$

$$\uparrow \qquad \uparrow$$
Exp growth from pole at $\omega = -i, p = i$
in real space giving e^{t-x}

But energy density is a local functional of the hydro field:

$$T_L \propto \partial_t^3 \sigma_L - \partial_t \sigma_L$$
$$G_{T_L T_L}^R \propto \frac{\omega^2 (\omega^2 + 1)^2}{\omega (\omega^2 + 1)(\omega - p)} = \frac{\omega (\omega^2 + 1)}{\omega - p}$$

No growth, pole is skipped.

$$(\omega, p)$$
p.s. = $i\lambda_L \left(1, \frac{1}{v_B}\right)$

Most known examples have maximal chaos $\lambda_L = \frac{2\pi}{\beta}$

Is there a pole skipping phenomenon away from maximal chaos? If yes, what's the generalization?

Known examples with non-maximal chaos: • 2d CFT $\langle T^{00}T^{00}\rangle$ is universal, displays pole skipping at $(\omega, p) = i\frac{2\pi}{\beta}(1,1)$ [Haehl-Rozali] All 2d CFTs have $v_B = 1$ [Mezei-Sarosi] Not all 2d CFTs have $\lambda_L = \frac{2\pi}{\beta}$ • d > 2 CFT on Rindler space $\langle T^{00}T^{00} \rangle$ is universal, displays pole skipping at $(\omega, p) = i(1, d-1)$ [Haehl-Rozali] $\lambda(v)$ On Rindler space $v_R^{(T)} = (d-1)^{-1}$ [Perlmutter] In general $v_B \le v_R^{(T)}$ [Mezei-Sarosi] $\lambda(v)$ $\mathbf{v}_B = \mathbf{v}_B^{(T)}$ v_* $v_B < v_B^{(T)}$

Pole skipping with higher derivatives [Grozdanov]

Our conjecture:

$$(\omega, p)_{\text{p.s.}} = i\lambda_L^{(T)} \left(1, \frac{1}{v_B^{(T)}}\right)$$
$$\lambda_L^{(T)} \equiv \frac{2\pi}{\beta}, \text{ and } v_B^{(T)} \text{ are the stress tensor contributions}$$
$$\lambda(v)$$
$$v_B = v_B^{(T)}$$
$$v_B = v_B^{(T)}$$

Anticlimatic in that λ_L cannot be read from stress tensor 2pt func

Strong in that $v_B^{(T)} = v_B$ in many non-maximally chaotic theories

Main example: SYK chain

 $\{\chi_{i,x},\chi_{j,x}\}=\delta_{xy}\delta_{ij}$



$$H = i^{q/2} \sum_{x=0}^{M-1} \left(\sum_{1 < i_1 < \ldots < i_q < N} J_{i_1 \ldots i_q, x} \chi_{i_1, x} \cdots \chi_{i_q, x} + \sum_{\substack{1 < i_1 < \ldots < i_{q/2} < N \\ 1 < j_1 < \ldots < j_{q/2} < N}} J'_{i_1 \ldots i_{q/2} j_1 \ldots j_{q/2}, x} \chi_{i_1, x} \cdots \chi_{i_{q/2}, x} \chi_{j_1, x+1} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x+1} \right)$$
[Gu-Qi-Stanford]

The J and J' are random variables, their variances are the couplings

$$\frac{\pi w}{\cos \frac{\pi w}{2}} \sim \beta \sqrt{\overline{J^2} + \overline{J'^2}} \qquad \gamma \sim \sqrt{\overline{J'^2}/(\overline{J^2} + \overline{J'^2})}$$

Solvable large N limit [Kitaev]

Even more solvable if also large q, $q/N \rightarrow 0$ [Maldacena-Stanford]

Four point function in SYK models

Large *N* is dominated by summable diagramms



Still complicated to solve for ______ but much "cheaper" problem than direct diagonalization

Four point function in SYK models

Large *N* is dominated by summable diagramms

Four point function:



Four point function in SYK models

The Schwinger-Dyson equations simplify drastically in the large q limit

$$\underbrace{0}_{q = 1} = K(\tau_1, \tau_2 | \tau_3, \tau_4) \approx \left[\delta(\tau_1 - \tau_3)\delta(\tau_2 - \tau_4) + \cdots\right] \left(\partial_{\tau_3}\partial_{\tau_4} + V(\tau_3 - \tau_4)\right)$$

$$\underbrace{0}_{q = 1} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{q - 2} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{q - 2$$

The problem reduces to solving partial differential equations!

Velocity dependent Lyapunov exponent

[Choi,Mezei,Sarosi]





$$\varepsilon_{x}(0) = i^{q/2} \left(\sum_{i_{1} < \ldots < i_{q}} J_{i_{1} \ldots i_{q}, x} \chi_{i_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{i_{q}, x} \right)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i_{1} < \ldots < i_{q/2} \\ j_{1} < \ldots < j_{q/2}}} \left[J'_{i_{1} \ldots i_{q/2} j_{1} \ldots j_{q/2}, x} \chi_{i_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{i_{q/2}, x} \chi_{j_{1}, x+1} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x+1} + J'_{i_{1} \ldots i_{q/2} j_{1} \ldots j_{q/2}, x-1} \chi_{i_{1}, x-1} \cdots \chi_{i_{q/2}, x-1} \chi_{j_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x} \chi_{j_{1}, x+1} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x+1} + J'_{i_{1} \ldots i_{q/2} j_{1} \ldots j_{q/2}, x-1} \chi_{i_{1}, x-1} \cdots \chi_{i_{q/2}, x-1} \chi_{j_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x} \chi_{j_{1}, x+1} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x+1} + J'_{i_{1} \ldots i_{q/2} j_{1} \ldots j_{q/2}, x-1} \chi_{i_{1}, x-1} \cdots \chi_{i_{q/2}, x-1} \chi_{j_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x} \chi_{j_{1}, x+1} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x+1} + J'_{i_{1} \ldots i_{q/2} j_{1} \ldots j_{q/2}, x-1} \chi_{j_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x} \chi_{j_{1}, x+1} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x+1} + J'_{i_{1} \ldots i_{q/2} j_{1} \ldots j_{q/2}, x-1} \chi_{j_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x} \chi_{j_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x} \chi_{j_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x} \chi_{j_{1}, x+1} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x-1} \chi_{j_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x} \chi_{j_{1}, x} \cdots \chi_{j_{q/2}, x$$

Aim: calculate

$$G_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}(\tau,x) = \langle T\varepsilon_{x+y}(\tau)\varepsilon_{y}(0)\rangle_{\text{conn}} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}e^{in\tau}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\frac{dp}{2\pi}\ e^{ipx}G_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}^{M}(n,p)$$

 $G_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}(\tau, x) = \langle T\varepsilon_{x+y}(\tau)\varepsilon_y(0) \rangle_{\text{conn}}$

Idea: extract from fermion four point function [Choi, Mezei, Sarosi]

$$\lim_{\substack{\tau_1 \to \tau_2 \\ \tau_3 \to \tau_4}} \partial_{\tau_1} \partial_{\tau_3} \left(\operatorname{Tr} \left[e^{-\beta H} \chi_{i,x}(\tau_1) \chi_{i,x}(\tau_2) \chi_{j,y}(\tau_3) \chi_{j,y}(\tau_4) \right] - \operatorname{disconnected} \right) \propto G_{\varepsilon \varepsilon}(\tau_2 - \tau_4, x - y)$$
Reminder:
$$\left(1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \right)^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{0} \left(1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \right)^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(1 - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \right)^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(1 - \int$$

Turning the crank, we obtain an expression [Choi, Mezei, Sarosi]

$$G_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}^{R}(\omega,p) = -\frac{Nw}{2q^{2}} \left(\partial_{\theta} \log \psi_{n}(\theta_{w}) + \tan \frac{\pi w}{2} \right) \Big|_{n \to -i\omega + \epsilon}$$

$$\begin{split} \psi_n(\theta) &= c_o \psi_n^o(\theta) + c_e \psi_n^e(\theta) \,, \\ c_o &= \frac{\Gamma\left(1 - \frac{h}{2} - \frac{n}{2w}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi h}{2} + \frac{\pi n}{2w}\right) \sin\left(\frac{n\pi}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{h}{2} + \frac{n}{2w}\right)} \,, \\ c_e &= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{h}{2} - \frac{n}{2w}\right) \cos\left(\frac{\pi h}{2} + \frac{\pi n}{2w}\right) \cos\left(\frac{n\pi}{2}\right)}{2\Gamma\left(1 - \frac{h}{2} + \frac{n}{2w}\right)} \,, \\ \psi_n^e &= \sin(\theta)^h {}_2F_1\left(\frac{h - n/w}{2}, \frac{h + n/w}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \cos^2\theta\right) \,, \\ \psi_n^o &= \cos(\theta) \sin(\theta)^h {}_2F_1\left(\frac{1 + h - n/w}{2}, \frac{1 + h + n/w}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \cos^2\theta\right) \,, \\ h &= \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \sqrt{9 + 4\gamma(\cos(p) - 1)}\right) \,, \\ \theta_w &= \frac{\pi}{2}(1 - w) \,, \end{split}$$

The only known non-perturbative thermal correlator that is not fixed by symmetry

Pole skipping



Diffusive dispersion relations



Diffusion

One may extract the diffusion constant:

$$D = \frac{1}{12} \gamma w \left(\pi w \tan\left(\frac{\pi w}{2}\right) + 2 \right)$$

Conjectured bounds:





- SYK chain has analytically solvable limit (large N and large q) interpolating between weakly coupled (w = 0) and maximally chaotic (w = 1) physics
- We can calculate $\lambda(v)$ exactly as a function of the coupling

There is a phase where chaos is maximal above a critical velocity, and there is a phase where it isn't



In a nutshell

• $G^{R}_{\varepsilon\varepsilon}(\omega, p)$ can be calculated exactly as a function of the couplings

• This is the only such known thermal correlator, has interesting analytic properties

Confirms the modified pole-skipping conjecture

$$(\omega, p)$$
p.s. = $i\lambda_L^{(T)}\left(1, \frac{1}{\mathbf{v}_B^{(T)}}\right)$

Summary

