

Higher Berry Curvature from the Wave function II: Locally Parameterized States Beyond One Dimension

Ophelia Evelyn Sommer,¹ Ashvin Vishwanath,¹ and Xueda Wen^{2,1,3}

¹*Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge MA 02138*

²*School of Physics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA*

³*Department of Physics, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, USA*

(Dated: May 10, 2024)

We propose a systematic wave function based approach to construct topological invariants for families of lattice systems that are short-range entangled using local parameter spaces. This construction is particularly suitable when given a family of tensor networks that can be viewed as the ground states of d dimensional lattice systems, for which we construct the closed $(d+2)$ -form higher Berry curvature, which is a generalization of the well known 2-form Berry curvature. Such $(d+2)$ -form higher Berry curvature characterizes a flow of $(d+1)$ -form higher Berry curvature in the system. Our construction is equally suitable for constructing other higher pumps, such as the (higher) Thouless pump in the presence of a global on-site $U(1)$ symmetry, which corresponds to a closed d -form. The cohomology classes of such higher differential forms are topological invariants and are expected to be quantized for short-range entangled states. We illustrate our construction with exactly solvable lattice models that are in nontrivial higher Berry classes in $d = 2$.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction and results	1
A. Introduction	1
B. Main results	2
II. Higher Berry curvatures from matrix product states	3
A. Brief review of bulk formula for higher Berry curvatures from MPS	3
B. Bulk boundary correspondence	4
III. Higher Berry curvature and Thouless pump for locally parameterised states	5
A. General formalism	5
B. Higher Berry curvature and higher Thouless pump	6
C. Higher Berry curvatures for tensor networks	8
IV. Higher Berry curvature calculation in $d = 2$	9
A. Suspension construction and bulk-boundary correspondence	9
B. Bulk calculation	10
V. Discussion	11
Acknowledgments	12
A. Higher Berry curvatures for locally parametrized states beyond tensor networks	12
B. Relation to KS formulas	13
C. Higher Thouless charge pump in exactly solvable models	13
1. Thouless charge pump in $d = 1$	13
2. Higher Thouless charge pump	15
References	16

I. INTRODUCTION AND RESULTS

A. Introduction

The Berry phase, which arises as a generic feature of the evolution of a quantum state, has permeated all branches of physics ever since its discovery. As Berry showed¹, the Berry phase along a loop in the parameter space can be evaluated by integrating the 2-form Berry curvature over a surface enclosed this loop. The integral of Berry curvature over a closed manifold is known to give rise to a quantized topological invariant, the Chern number, which plays an essential role in many topological phenomena such as the integer quantum Hall effect².

Recently, initiated by Kitaev's proposal³, the many-body generalization of Berry curvature of parameterized quantum systems has seen rapid developments.⁴⁻²⁵ In [3](#), Kitaev outlined a construction of this higher Berry curvatures for families of Euclidean lattice systems in general dimensions. The main motivation is to use these higher Berry curvatures and the corresponding topological invariants to probe the topology of space of gapped systems²⁶⁻²⁸. Later in [4](#), based on a parameterized family of gapped Hamiltonians, Kapustin and Spodyneiko gave an explicit construction of higher Berry curvatures in general dimensions – the Berry curvature 2-form was generalized to higher Berry curvature $(d+2)$ -form for gapped systems in d spatial dimensions.

Physically, such $(d+2)$ form higher Berry curvatures characterize a pump of $(d+1)$ form higher Berry curvatures¹². For gapped systems, the integral of the higher Berry curvature over a $(d+2)$ dimensional parameter space X gives an invariant, the so-called higher Berry invariant, that is believed to be quantized for short range entangled systems and take values in $H^{d+2}(X, \mathbb{Z})$, generalizing the Chern number to gapped systems in $d \geq 1$ dimensions. When there is a global

continuous symmetry G , a similar construction based on the parameterized Hamiltonians gives rise to invariants of gapped symmetric systems in $d \geq 1$ dimensions⁵. For example, in the case of $G = U(1)$, one can generalize the well-known Thouless pump in $d = 1$ ²⁹ to higher Thouless pumps in $d > 1$ ⁵.

The higher Berry curvatures and higher Thouless pumps were studied systematically in the framework of operator algebras¹⁴. Although one needs a parent Hamiltonian to define the higher Berry curvature it was shown that the higher Berry invariants depend only on the family of ground states, but not the choice of local parent Hamiltonians.

A natural question can be asked: Can one define the higher Berry curvature directly from the wave function without using invoking a parent Hamiltonian? In [30](#) we answer this question using Matrix product states in $d = 1$ and in this work we, we answer the question by providing a systematic way of constructing the higher Berry curvatures for locally parameterized states, such as tensor network states where each tensor can be locally parameterized³¹, in general dimensions. It is known that tensor network states can represent the ground states of a large class of quantum many-body systems. For example, in $d = 1$, any ground state of a gapped quantum spin chain can be represented efficiently using the matrix product states (MPS) – this has led to the classification of all possible symmetry protected topological phases for $d = 1$ quantum spin systems^{32–34}. In this work, based on the family of locally parameterized states, we give an explicit construction of the $(d + 2)$ form higher Berry curvature in a d dimensional system. When there is a global $U(1)$ symmetry, we also construct the closed d -form in a d dimensional system, which characterizes the higher Thouless pump⁵.

By considering jointly the space of differential forms and simplex chains on a lattice, the expanded continuity equation for higher Berry curvature becomes a collection of descent equations relating a p chain q form to a $p + 1$ chain $q + 1$ form, which also appear in [3](#) and [4](#). Our novel technical insight is that these can be solved explicitly for arbitrary local parameter spaces, which means that we can define the higher Berry curvature and higher Thouless pumps in arbitrary dimensions simply in terms of the wavefunction and these local parameter spaces. The explicit solution using Hamiltonian densities found in [4](#) is a special case of this construction.

We also want to highlight recent efforts in extracting the higher Berry invariant from $d = 1$ translationally-invariant or uniform matrix product states (uMPS). In [21](#) and [22](#), the authors study the higher Berry invariant by analyzing the gerbe structure of the parameterized family of $d = 1$ uMPS, which was used in [23](#), to numerically calculate the associated invariant. The relation between these structures and our construction is explored in³⁰. It would be interesting to see how such structures can be generalized to the non-translationally invariant and

higher dimensional wave function ansätze considered here.

B. Main results

In this paper, we find a novel wavefunction based construction for the $(d + 2)$ -form higher Berry curvatures in d dimensional systems, as well as the d -form for higher Thouless pumps in d dimensional systems with a global $U(1)$ symmetry, using local parameter spaces. See Eqs.[\(24\)](#), [\(25\)](#), and Eqs.[\(26\)](#), [\(27\)](#), respectively. Our results can be straightforwardly applied to tensor network states including the $d = 1$ MPS results in Ref.[30](#).

Our approach to construct higher Berry curvatures and higher Thouless pumps requires the following data:

1. A coarse graining of a spatial manifold M called the lattice $\Lambda \subset M$.
2. A collection of parameter spaces X_p associated to each point $p \in \Lambda$, such that the total parameter space is a subset of their product $X \subseteq \prod_p X_p$. We only care about the germ of the parameter space inside this product space.
3. A local fluctuation in a parameter space has an exponentially decaying impact on the observables of interest.

If $q^{(n)}$ corresponds to the n -form (higher) charge of a conserved quantity, we can construct the associated (higher) flow, and hence for non-compact M , we find topological invariants associated with the transport of the (higher) charge to boundaries at infinity. In particular, a many-body Hilbert space with a local factorisation $\mathcal{H} = \otimes_p \mathcal{H}_p$ and an associated family of gapped ground states can furnish such data in different ways. By taking the local observables to be the 2-form local Berry curvature $F^{(2)}$, we construct the higher Berry curvature, while if the local observable is a 0-form $U(1)$ charge, we obtain the (higher) Thouless pump.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In [Sec.II](#), we give a brief review of the construction of higher Berry curvature from $d = 1$ MPS, and introduce the bulk-boundary correspondence that will be useful in studying higher dimensional systems. In [Sec.III](#), we generalize our construction to higher Berry curvatures and higher Thouless pumps in arbitrary dimensions. In [Sec.IV](#), we illustrate our construction with $d = 2$ examples. Then we conclude and discuss several future directions in [Sec.V](#). There are also several appendices. In [appendix A](#) we illustrate that our approach is not intrinsic to tensor network states, or Hamiltonians. In particular we describe how the exactly solvable model considered in [Sec.II](#) gives the same higher Berry curvature when parameterised by a family of local unitaries. In [appendix B](#), we discuss the connection between the present approach and that in [Kapustin and Spodeneiko⁴](#), which can be viewed as choosing the local parameter space to be the space of coupling constants.

We also give details on higher Thouless pumps in exactly solvable lattice models in appendix C.

II. HIGHER BERRY CURVATURES FROM MATRIX PRODUCT STATES

Before we introduce our construction of higher Berry curvatures in general dimensions, it is helpful to give a brief review of the construction in one dimension³⁰ to be self contained, and since the physical picture is more transparent. More details can be found in Ref.30.

A. Brief review of bulk formula for higher Berry curvatures from MPS

Higher Berry curvature is associated with the flow of Berry curvature between boundaries at infinity in a lattice system¹². In Ref.30, we make this connection clearly at the level of the wave function in one dimensional systems, by utilizing local parameter spaces, which is to say, that a family of wave functions will often have a notion of a local variation. We briefly review the main results of Ref.30 here.

To build up to the $d = 1$ system of an infinite length, consider a finite subset of the one-dimensional lattice, consisting of N sites, such that the total Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \otimes_{p=1}^N \mathcal{H}_p$, where \mathcal{H}_p is the local Hilbert space at site p with a basis $|s_p\rangle$. We consider a parameterized family of canonical matrix product states which can be viewed as the ground states of gapped systems:

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{\{s_p\}} A_1^{s_1} \cdots A_N^{s_N} |s_1 \cdots s_N\rangle \quad (1)$$

$$= \begin{array}{c} \boxed{A_1} - \boxed{A_2} - \cdots - \boxed{A_N} \\ | \quad | \quad \quad \quad | \\ s_1 \quad s_2 \quad \cdots \quad s_N \end{array} \quad (2)$$

where we have used the conventional tensor network contraction diagrams (The reader is directed towards the reviews 31 and 35 for details on MPS). We consider this family of MPS to be functions $X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, with associated exterior derivatives $d = \sum_p d_p$. Here the local derivative d_p is just to vary the parameters in the tensor at site p .

The total Berry curvature for $|\psi\rangle$ is the well known differential two-form $\Omega^{(2)} = -\text{Im} \langle d\psi | d\psi \rangle = d\mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A} = -\text{Im} \langle \psi | d\psi \rangle$ is the one-form Berry connection, and we always take the state $|\psi\rangle$ to be normalized. As discussed in Ref.30, we proposed to take $F_p^{(2)} = d_p \mathcal{A}$ as the definition of the Berry curvature at site p , and it is obvious that $\Omega^{(2)} = \sum_p F_p^{(2)}$. In general, because there is entanglement between site p and the rest of the system, $F_p^{(2)}$ is not a closed two-form. It needs not have a quantized integral over a closed 2-manifold of parameters X , i.e., $\int_X F_p^{(2)} \notin 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, and further consider deforming X into some other two manifold Y , then $\int_X F_p^{(2)} \neq \int_Y F_p^{(2)}$.

In particular if Z is a 3-manifold with X and Y as boundaries, then $\int_{X-Y} F_p^{(2)} = \int_Z dF_p^{(2)} \neq 0$ by Stokes theorem. Thus the Berry curvature of a point can change, but since the total Berry curvature $\sum_p F_p^{(2)}$ is closed, the way for the Berry curvature to change at a point is if it flows from another. Thus we define the flow $p \rightarrow q$ of Berry curvature as $F_{pq}^{(3)}$, which satisfies the continuity equation

$$\sum_p F_{pq}^{(3)} = dF_q^{(2)}. \quad (3)$$

Using the local variation, a solution to this continuity equation is

$$F_{pq}^{(3)} = d_p F_q^{(2)} = d_p d_q \mathcal{A}. \quad (4)$$

Any other solution is related to this one by the addition of a flow that is a pure circulation - that is if $\tilde{F}_{pq}^{(3)}$ is a solution, then $\tilde{F}_{pq}^{(3)} - F_{pq}^{(3)} = \sum_r C_{pqr}$, for some three-form C_{pqr} which is completely anti symmetric in p, q, r . This ambiguity does not modify the invariants we are interested in.

Next, to define the flow of Berry curvature from the left boundary to the right boundary, we should pick a middle of the system say some point a , then the higher Berry curvature which characterizes this flow can be written as

$$\Omega^{(3)} = \sum_{p < a < q} F_{pq}^{(3)}. \quad (5)$$

For a gapped state, it is expected that $F_{pq}^{(3)}$ decays exponentially as a function of the distance $|p - q|$. From this point of view, $\Omega^{(3)}$ can be viewed as a local quantity near $x = a$ that captures the flow of Berry curvature, and the definition in (5) works well for an infinite 1d system. Because of this local property, $\Omega^{(3)}$ may be different depending on the choice of a . However, the integral of $\Omega^{(3)}$ over a closed 3-manifold X is a quantized topological invariant, i.e.,

$$\int_X \Omega^{(3)} \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}. \quad (6)$$

This quantization property has been proved for $d = 1$ uMPS in Ref.30. The underlying physics of this topological invariant corresponds to the Chern number pump¹², which is an analogy of the well known Thouless charge pump in 1d. As illustrated in Ref.30, the formula in (5) in terms of MPS is suitable for both analytic and numerical calculations in a general lattice system.

It is emphasized that the above construction is not limited to a tensor network state, where one can vary the parameters in a local tensor. One can consider more general states that are locally parameterized. See, e.g., a concrete example in appendix A, where the family of states are related by local unitary transformations.

Furthermore, the Higher Berry curvature $\Omega^{(3)}$ in (5) is related to the Schmidt decomposition across a cut between

regions A and B , $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} |\alpha\rangle_{[A]} |\alpha\rangle_{[B]}$. Using left canonical MPS it takes the simple form³⁰

$$\Omega^{(3)} = \text{Im} \sum_{\alpha} \text{d}c_{\alpha}^2 \langle \text{d}\alpha | \text{d}\alpha \rangle_{[A]}, \quad (7)$$

where the tensor network provides a regularisation scheme to make sense of this formula that naively consists of infrared divergent terms³⁰.

B. Bulk boundary correspondence

We can also study the higher Berry invariant via the bulk boundary correspondence, as in Ref.12. This discussion will be useful for our later study of higher dimensional systems. Here in $d = 1$, by introducing a fictitious boundary, the higher Berry invariant will equal the accumulated Chern number of this boundary.

To illustrate this bulk-boundary correspondence, we consider the exactly solvable model as studied recently in Refs.12, 22, and 30. Let $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}$ be a $d = 1$ lattice of spin 1/2 systems, with local Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_p = \mathbb{C}^2$. We associate to each site Pauli matrices, and let $|\mathbf{n}\rangle$ be a coherent state along the direction of $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Consider the parameter space $X = S^3$ embedded into \mathbb{R}^4 as (\mathbf{w}, w_4) satisfying $\mathbf{w}^2 + w_4^2 = 1$, where $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2, w_3)$. While we do not require a Hamiltonian to compute the higher Berry curvature, to explain how we arrive at our particular choice of wave function, we consider the ground state of a nearest neighbour Hamiltonian

$$H_{1d}(w) = \sum_p H_p^{\text{onsite}}(w) + H_{p,p+1}^{\text{int}}(w), \quad (8)$$

where the onsite term is a single-spin term that takes the form of a Zeeman coupling with alternating sign

$$H_p^{\text{onsite}}(w) = (-1)^p \mathbf{w} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_p, \quad (9)$$

and the interaction term is a two-spin term whose coefficient depends on w_4 :

$$H_{p,p+1}^{\text{int}} = g_p(w_4) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_p \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{p+1}. \quad (10)$$

The coupling constant takes the form

$$g_p(w_4) = \begin{cases} w_4, & p \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1 \text{ and } w_4 > 0 \\ -w_4, & p \in 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ and } w_4 < 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (11)$$

Note that $\mathbf{w}^2 = 1 - w_4^2$, so the onsite coupling vanishes at the poles $w_4 = \pm 1$. Here the ground state forms one of the two spin singlet coverings of \mathbb{Z} (depending on which pole), and for all parameters the Hamiltonian completely dimerizes and is gapped. The Hamiltonian

can be visualized for different values of $w_4 \in [-1, 1]$ as:

$$(12)$$

We use \pm to represent the sign of the Zeeman coupling at this site, while \bullet represents the case of vanishing Zeeman coupling. Interaction terms are represented by solid lines joining pairs of lattice sites. It is convenient to parameterise X with hyperspherical coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= \sin(\alpha) \sin(\theta) \cos(\phi), & w_2 &= \sin(\alpha) \sin(\theta) \sin(\phi), \\ w_3 &= \sin(\alpha) \cos(\theta), & w_4 &= \cos(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

where $0 \leq \alpha, \theta \leq \pi$, $0 \leq \phi \leq 2\pi$. By applying the MPS formula of our higher Berry curvature in (5) and choosing $x = a$ along the dashed line in (12), it was found that³⁰

$$\Omega^{(3)} = \frac{1}{2} \cos \alpha \sin \theta \text{d}\alpha \wedge \text{d}\theta \wedge \text{d}\phi, \quad (13)$$

for $0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi/2$, and $\Omega^{(3)} = 0$ otherwise. One can check explicitly that $\int_{X=S^3} \Omega^{(3)} = 2\pi$.

Now we introduce a physical boundary at a point $N \in 2\mathbb{Z}$, so that the system is defined on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}_{\leq N}$, and consider the same Hamiltonian (8). The flow of Berry curvature $F_{pq}^{(3)}$ decays exponentially in the distance $|p - q|$. As such, taking a cut a deep in the bulk, the higher Berry invariant defined on the whole lattice \mathbb{Z} will differ exponentially little from the one defined on this truncated system. From equation (3), and noting that the edge defined as $a < p \leq N$ is finite, we can define

$$\Omega^{(3)} = \text{d} \sum_{p>a} F_p^{(2)} = \text{d}\omega^{(2)} \quad (14)$$

where $\omega^{(2)} = \sum_{p>a} F_p^{(2)}$ is the boundary berry curvature. In the exactly solvable model, if $a \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1/2$, then the boundary is decoupled when $-1 \leq w_4 \leq 0$. Thus we find

$$\omega^{(2)} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \sin \alpha \sin \theta \text{d}\theta \wedge \text{d}\phi, & 0 \leq w_4 \leq 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} \sin \theta \text{d}\theta \wedge \text{d}\phi, & -1 \leq w_4 \leq 0, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

which is of course just the Schmidt weighted Berry curvature of the boundary. Because the higher Berry curvature of the model is nontrivial, $\omega^{(2)}$ cannot be well defined over the whole of $X = S^3$, which manifests as a gapless Weyl point at $w_4 = -1$. If we deform the model by taking the boundary parameter space to exclude this Weyl point $X_{\text{bdy}} = D^{(3)} = S^3 \setminus \{w_4 = -1\}$, the Berry invariant will be

$$\int_{S_{\text{bulk}}^3} \Omega_{\text{bulk}}^{(3)} = \int_{D^3} \Omega^{(3)} = \int_{S^2} \omega^{(2)} = 2\pi \quad (16)$$




FIG. 1. A locally parameterised system on a lattice Λ means we associate to each $q \in \Lambda$ both a Hilbert space and a local space of parameters. Observables live on simplexes of the lattice, consisting of points $[p]$, flows $[ps]$ between points p and s , circulations $[pqr]$ $p \rightarrow q \rightarrow r$ and so on. Note that we do not only consider simplexes which are nearest neighbours on a lattice.

$d\partial q^{(n)} = 0$. The continuity equation relating the change in $q^{(n)}$ to the accumulation of a current $q^{(n+1)}$ becomes

$$\partial q^{(n+1)} = dq^{(n)}. \quad (19)$$

This is the *descent equation*, and by iterating we can find all *higher charges* $q^{(>n)}$ related to $q^{(n)}$. By contracting any higher charge $q^{(m)}$ with a closed, non-exact cochain b , we find a closed non-exact differential form $\langle q^{(m)}, b \rangle$ on X and therefore a topological invariant of the family of d -dimensional system when integrated. The choice of b will shift the differential form by at most an exact form, and hence not modify the topological invariant.

B. Higher Berry curvature and higher Thouless pump

By solving the descent equations (19) we can obtain the flow of Berry curvature, and hence the higher Berry curvature, and this task is greatly facilitated by the use of local parameter spaces. Such a solution is necessarily non-unique, since if $q^{(n+1)}$ solves it, then we may add the boundary of any chain and obtain a new solution $q^{(n+1)} + \partial[\dots]$. Varying only the parameters at a single site p gives us a collection of exterior derivative operators d_p , such that $d = \sum_{p \in \Lambda} d_p$. We would like these to act on the space of simplex chain valued differential forms. We define the simplex-exterior derivative

$$\hat{d} : \frac{1}{(n+1)!} c_{p_0 \dots p_n} [p_0 \dots p_n] \mapsto \frac{1}{(n+1)!} d_q c_{p_0 \dots p_n} [qp_0 \dots p_n]. \quad (20)$$

A pictorial interpretation of this operation can be seen in figure 2. To understand this operation, consider the

case of the charge 0-chain $q = q_p[p]$. The simplex-exterior derivative is a current $\hat{d}q = \frac{1}{2}(d_p q_q - d_q q_p)[pq]$. This is exactly the solution to the question the descent equation poses, if the total charge $Q = \sum_p q_p$ is conserved. Indeed we can verify that $\partial(\hat{d}q) = dq - d_p(Q)[p]$, so if the total charge cannot be modified by local parameter variations, then $\hat{d}q$ solves the descent equation of q . The simplex-exterior can be viewed as a factorisation of the total exterior derivative $d = \partial\hat{d} + \hat{d}\partial$. It is straightforward to check that

$$\partial(\hat{d}^n q) = n d \hat{d}^{n-1} q + (-1)^n \hat{d}^n \partial q. \quad (21)$$

Recall the descent equation (19), it seems as if, ignoring this second term, it would be possible to solve the descent equation for $q^{(n)}$ simply by applying \hat{d} . A full solution requires us to think about this second term however, but it is most often the case that $\hat{d}\partial q \propto dq$. In particular, if $q^{(k)}$ obeys $\hat{d}\partial q^{(k)} = -\alpha dq^{(k)}$, then a solution to the descent equations is simply

$$q^{(n+k)} = \frac{\alpha!}{(n+\alpha)!} \hat{d}^n q^{(k)} \quad (22)$$

for any n . The gapped condition on the family of states can be succinctly phrased as the statement that if $q^{(k)}$ is a local operator with finite correlation length, so too is $\hat{d}q^{(k+1)}$. It is possible to spoil this property with a bad choice of parameter space, but for many physically reasonable choices, we expect this property to hold, and it can in any case be checked a posteriori as we did for MPS in³⁰. Such reasonable choices likely include some suitably restricted tensor networks, a finite depth unitary preparing our state from a resource state, sequential quantum




FIG. 2. Graphical illustration of the action of \hat{d} defined in equation (20). For each site in the lattice Λ we have a parameter space X_p , and by specifying the parameter value at each point, which is itself a point in $X \subseteq \prod_p X_p$, we find a short-range entangled wave function. From the wave function we can calculate observables, whether they be local to a point in the lattice, measuring the flow between two such points, a circulation etc., such observables take values that are naturally associated with (linear combinations of) simplexes. The action of \hat{d} is to consider the variation of this observable with respect to local parameters at all points. In particular, in this illustration we consider variations with respect to some point p_4 . This changes the wave function, and hence changes the value of the observable $d_{p_4} q$. We associate the rate of change with an observable living on a new simplex, which we obtain by appending the point p_4 .

circuits³⁷, or letting the local parameter space X_p be the coupling constants on the terms in a Hamiltonian which are finitely supported around p , in which case we recover the results of Ref. 4, see appendix B.

Focusing on the higher Berry curvature, if we start with the 1-form Berry connection

$$F^{(1)} = \mathcal{A} = -\text{Im} \langle \psi | d\psi \rangle, \quad (23)$$

the higher Berry flow is

$$F^{(n+2)} = -\frac{1}{(n+1)!} \hat{d}^{n+1} \text{Im} \langle \psi | d\psi \rangle \quad (24)$$

and by specifying a nontrivial n -cochain b , the higher Berry curvature in a d dimensional system becomes

$$\Omega^{(d+2)} = \langle F^{(d+2)}, b \rangle. \quad (25)$$

In d dimensions, the higher Berry curvature is a flow of $(d-1)$ -dimensional higher Berry curvature. See, e.g., a detailed discussion on this physical picture in Ref. 12. We remark in passing the curious fact that the formal sum of all higher Berry flows is the formal exponential of \hat{d} acting on the connection $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} F^{(n)} = e^{\hat{d}} \mathcal{A}$.

We could equally well descend from an Abelian symmetry charge, with the requirement that the local variations should also preserve the symmetry. For a $U(1)$ symmetry this leads to the Thouless pump and higher dimensional generalisations⁵. In particular, let \hat{Q}_p be the local $U(1)$ charge operator at site p , from which the total charge operator is $\hat{Q} = \sum_p \hat{Q}_p$. For any state $|\psi\rangle$ we define the charge at site p as the expectation value $Q_p = \langle \psi | \hat{Q}_p | \psi \rangle$. The chain representing this charge distribution is the 0-form $Q^{(0)} = \sum_p Q_p [p]$. By solving the descent equation we define the n -flow of charge $Q^{(n)}$, and for states with local parameter spaces, where the local parameter variations preserve the total charge, we have

$$Q^{(n)} = \frac{1}{n!} \hat{d}^n Q^{(0)}. \quad (26)$$

On $M = \mathbb{R}^d$, by choosing a closed and non-exact co-chain b , we can define the closed d -form in a d dimensional system as

$$\tilde{Q}^{(d)} = \langle Q^{(d)}, b \rangle \quad (27)$$

which characterizes the flow of charge between boundaries at infinity for $d=1$, and the flow of the $d-1$ higher

contracting the network in (30). It will be interesting to apply the recently developed isometric tensor network⁴⁴, which allows for highly efficient contraction of the tensor network, to parameterized systems in higher dimensions.

Finally, we give several remarks on the higher Berry curvatures constructed from tensor network states:

(i) It is obvious that the higher Berry curvature vanishes for a constant family of tensor network states, i.e., states that are independent of parameters in the parameter space.

(ii) The higher Berry curvature is additive under the stacking of families of states, or more precisely the tensor product of two states, with the same underlying parameter space.

(iii) As long as the tensor network states are short-range entangled, one can argue that our higher Berry curvatures give a quantized higher Berry invariant, by following the argument in Ref.4 (see their Appendix A) and using the descent equation in (19). The key property is that the short-range entangled states (after stacking with a suitable constant family of SRE states) can be continuously deformed to a trivial product state. Then one can relate the higher Berry invariant to the quantized Chern number of a finite system.

(iv) While the gauge independence of our higher Berry curvature for 1d canonical MPS has been studied in Ref.30, we have not studied in detail the gauge structure of the tensor network states in higher dimensions, and it is possible that for generic tensor network states this may spoil the locality property we require of local parameter spaces, but for (semi⁴⁵) injective tensor networks we expect this construction to be equivalent to the construction in Ref.4, by a parent Hamiltonian construction.

IV. HIGHER BERRY CURVATURE CALCULATION IN $d = 2$

In $d \geq 2$ dimensions a direct calculation of the HBC becomes more involved. In our PEPS formulation this can be attributed to the more complicated contraction structure of the network. Nevertheless, in this section, we will construct a family of $d = 2$ lattice models using the suspension construction¹², which we will show belongs in the higher Berry class using first the bulk-boundary correspondence, before computing the higher Berry curvature explicitly.

A. Suspension construction and bulk-boundary correspondence

The suspension construction yields a system in the nontrivial higher Berry class in $d = 2$ over S^4 , using $d = 1$ systems in the nontrivial higher Berry class over S^3 , in exactly the same way the Berry curvature pump in $d = 1$ over S^3 was obtained from nontrivial $d = 0$ systems over S^2 . In particular embed S^4 into \mathbb{R}^5 with coordinates




FIG. 3. Illustration of $d = 2$ exactly solvable model over S^4 with nontrivial higher Berry invariant. The \pm signs indicate the sign of the local Zeeman coupling of a spin at a given site, while the lines connecting spins indicate entanglement. The regions $R_{1,2,3,4}$ are the four quadrants, and the higher Berry curvature measures the circulation around the point \mathbf{a} . The state $|\phi\rangle$ corresponds to the 4-spin wave function that can be tiled to obtain the full wave function when $w_4, w_5 > 0$.

$w = (\mathbf{w}, w_4, w_5)$ with $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, such that $\mathbf{w}^2 + w_4^2 + w_5^2 = 1$. The lattice has sites $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^2$, spin 1/2 Hilbert spaces at every \mathbf{x} as before, with coherent states along the direction \mathbf{n} denoted $|\mathbf{n}\rangle$. At the equator $w_5 = 0$ the system consists of Chern number pumps along the x_2 direction for each x_1 . These pumps alternate in their flow, which in the concrete construction from Sec.II corresponds to alternating their local magnetic field, see figure 3 for an illustration of the system. Away from $w_5 = 0$, we deform the system by coupling each chain with antiferromagnetic terms, such that for $w_5 < 0$ we couple the chains at $x_1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ to the chains at $x_1 + 1$, while for $w_5 > 0$ the coupling is between $x_1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ and $x_1 - 1$. In particular when $w_5 = \pm 1$, the system consists entirely of spin singlet covering, with each singlet along the x_1 directions. A Hamiltonian for such a system can be written

$$H_{2d}(w) = \sum_{x_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} H_{1d, x_1}((-1)^{x_1} \mathbf{w}, w_4) + H_{x_1, x_1+1}^{\text{int}}(w) \quad (31)$$

here H_{1d, x_1} is the Hamiltonian from (8) taking along the $x_1 \times \mathbb{Z}$ line, and the interaction is $H_{x_1, x_1+1}^{\text{int}}(w) = h_{\mathbf{x}}(w_5) \sum_{x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}+(1,0)}$. We take $h_{\mathbf{x}}(w_5) = d_+(w_5) \Theta(w_5) \delta_{x_1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}} + d_-(w_5) \Theta(-w_5) \delta_{x_1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}+1}$, where d_+, d_- vanish at $w_5 = 0$, and are otherwise positive. Their exact form is not important, as long as the gap never closes, which can be achieved by e.g. $d_{\pm} = |w_5|$.

The $d = 2$ higher Berry curvature is the pump of a

pump, and so is equal to the circulation of Berry curvature current $F^{(4)}$ evaluated around plaquettes enclosing a “core” at $\mathbf{a} \in \Lambda + (1/2, 1/2)$. To properly capture the circulation around \mathbf{a} one can choose many equivalent expressions for $b_{\mathbf{a}}$, but for computational purposes we find it most convenient to compose it of the properly anti-symmetrized $d = 1$ boundaries, as opposed to the conical choice mentioned before: let $f_i^p = \Theta(x_i(p) - a_i)$ be a step function and define

$$b_{\mathbf{a}} = (f_1^{p_1} - f_1^{p_0})(f_2^{p_2} - f_2^{p_1})(p_0 p_1 p_2) \quad (32)$$

$$= \delta \left[\frac{1}{2} (f_1^{p_0} + f_1^{p_1})(f_2^{p_1} - f_2^{p_0})(p_0 p_1) \right] = \delta \tilde{b}_{\mathbf{a}} \quad (33)$$

where $\tilde{b}_{\mathbf{a}}$ is a 1-cochain that is not cocontrolled in a system without a boundary. Take regions R_i to be the i 'th quadrant centered at \mathbf{a} , then $b_{\mathbf{a}}^{p_0 p_1 p_2}$ vanishes unless all three points are in different regions. With this cochain, the higher Berry curvature is

$$\Omega^{(3)} = \langle F^{(4)}, b_{\mathbf{a}} \rangle \quad (34)$$

where $F^{(n)}$ is defined by (24) for arbitrary n . We can immediately see that our family has to be in the higher Berry class, by imposing a spatial boundary on the right side of the $d = 2$ system. That is, the system is defined by retaining only those lattice sites with $x_1 \leq N$. In our lattice model in (31), one can find that $F_{pqr}^{(4)}$ is only nonzero when p, q, r are near the point \mathbf{a} . In a general gapped ground state, we expect the locality of $F^{(4)}$ is still true. Due to this locality of $F^{(4)}$ in our lattice model, the higher Berry curvature $\Omega^{(4)}$ is insensitive to the existence of a boundary if we choose \mathbf{a} deep in the bulk. Using the existence of boundary, one can find

$$\Omega^{(4)} = d \langle F^{(3)}, \tilde{b}_{\mathbf{a}} \rangle = d\omega^{(3)}. \quad (35)$$

Noting that $\tilde{b}_{\mathbf{a}}^{p_0 p_1}$ is non-zero whenever $x_2(p_0)$ and $x_2(p_1)$ lie on opposite sides of a_2 , and if $x_1(p_0) > a_1$ or $x_1(p_1) > a_1$, we see that $\omega^{(3)}$ is the 3-form boundary higher Berry curvature, where the boundary consists of all lattice sites with $x_1 > a_1$ ¹². When the boundary is decoupled from the bulk, $\omega^{(3)}$ is the closed 3-form we evaluated in section II. However, $\omega^{(3)}$ is not globally well defined, because the boundary will become gapless for certain parameters. To evaluate $\Omega^{(4)}$, we therefore cover S^4 with two charts $D_{N/S}^4 = \{w \in S^4, \pm w_5 \geq 0\}$, with common boundary of opposite orientation $S^3 = \pm \partial D^4$. On the two charts D_N^4 and D_S^4 , we impose different boundaries, and consider the two families of PEPS that correspond to the ground states of H_{2d} in (31) with a boundary imposed at $x_1 = N$ and $x_1 = N - 1$ (where $N \in 2\mathbb{Z}$) respectively, as seen in Fig.4. With this choice, the ground states are always gapped, and $\omega_{N/S}^{(3)}$ in (35) are well defined on both D_N^4 and D_S^4 . So we may evaluate

$$\int_{S^4} \Omega^{(4)} = \int_{S^3} \omega_N^{(3)} - \omega_S^{(3)}. \quad (36)$$




FIG. 4. Families of $d = 2$ PEPSs corresponding to the ground states of $d = 2$ lattice models in (31) with a spatial boundary terminated at layer $x_1 = N$ (top) and $x_1 = N - 1$ (bottom), where $N \in 2\mathbb{Z}$. The blue dashed lines indicate the steps in the functions $f_1(p) = \Theta(x_1(p) - a_1)$ and $f_2(p) = \Theta(x_2(p) - a_2)$.

Since the $d = 2$ system becomes decoupled $d = 1$ systems at $w_5 = 0$, the PEPS becomes decoupled $d = 1$ MPS. One can find that $\omega_N^{(3)} - \omega_S^{(3)}$ in (36) equals the closed 3-form higher Berry curvature $\Omega^{(3)}$ for the $d = 1$ MPS along $x_1 = N$, and so the higher Berry class is as promised

$$\int_{S^4} \Omega^{(4)} = \int_{S^3} \Omega^{(3)} = 2\pi. \quad (37)$$

One can repeat this procedure to even higher dimensions. For the lattice models obtained from suspension construction in Ref. 12, one can show that our higher Berry curvatures constructed from tensor networks give the same higher Berry invariants as those from Kapustin and Spodyneiko’s construction⁴.

B. Bulk calculation

In addition to the bulk-boundary correspondence, it is also possible to calculate the higher Berry curvature directly in terms of the wave function, by using a PEPS parameterization. In particular the unit cell is 2×2 sites, and we use tensors A , which act on a virtual space with basis $|\cdot\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle, |3\rangle, |4\rangle$. Since there can only be higher Berry curvature when there is entanglement between three of the regions R_i , we may focus on the parameters $w_4, w_5 > 0$. Let i, j denote 1, 2, 3, 4, and we can write the 2×2 unit cell of PEPS tensors in this

parameter range in terms of MPS tensors

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ | \\ \text{---} \boxed{A_{22}} \text{---} \cdot \\ | \\ j \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} j \\ | \\ \text{---} \boxed{A_{11}} \text{---} i \\ | \\ \cdot \end{array} = B_{ij}^s \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{c} \cdot \\ | \\ \text{---} \boxed{A_{12}} \text{---} j \\ | \\ i \end{array} = j \text{---} \boxed{A_{21}} \text{---} \cdot = \tilde{B}_{ij}^s
 \end{array}$$

Entanglement occurs only within this unit cell, and so the total wave function is a product of plaquette states $|\phi\rangle$, which are related to the MPS tensors as $\langle s_{11}, s_{21}, s_{22}, s_{12} | \phi \rangle = \text{Tr} B^{s_{11}} \tilde{B}^{s_{21}} B^{s_{22}} \tilde{B}^{s_{12}}$. While one could in principle solve the ground state for an particular interpolating Hamiltonian, since the coupling between pumps is arbitrary, we might as well just write down a wave function over S^4 which couples the pumps correctly. We take the MPS to have the form of the vertical pump stacked with a horizontal pump, i.e.

$$B^s = \begin{pmatrix} \langle s | \mathbf{w} \rangle & \langle s | -\mathbf{w} \rangle & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \langle s | \mathbf{w} \rangle \\ 0 & 0 & \langle s | -\mathbf{w} \rangle \end{pmatrix} \quad (38)$$

$$\tilde{B}^s = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \langle s | -\mathbf{w} \rangle & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\beta \langle s | \mathbf{w} \rangle & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i^{1/2} \delta \langle s | -\mathbf{w} \rangle & -i^{1/2} \gamma \langle s | \mathbf{w} \rangle \end{pmatrix} \quad (39)$$

where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, and normalization requires $1 = (\alpha^2 + \beta^2)^2 + (\delta^2 + \gamma^2)^2$. Let $\omega^{(2)}$ be half the solid angle area element of the S^2 corresponding to the directions \mathbf{w} . Using equation (30), and replacing the tripartition with the cochain $b_{\mathbf{a}}$, the higher Berry curvature is

$$\Omega^{(4)} = \Theta(w_4)\Theta(w_5) \text{Im} \text{Tr} \mathbb{E}_B^B d\mathbb{E}_B^{\tilde{B}} \mathbb{E}_B^d d\mathbb{E}_B^B d\mathbb{E}_B^{\tilde{B}} \quad (40)$$

$$= 2\Theta(w_4)\Theta(w_5) [d\alpha^2 d\beta^2 + d\gamma^2 d\delta^2] \omega^{(2)}. \quad (41)$$

As mentioned before there are some arbitrariness present in the choice of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$, relating to the choice of interaction for which this is the ground state. However, no matter the choice, the higher Berry invariant is always 2π quantized, as can be checked by Stokes theorem. In particular by the suspension construction, on the boundary $\Gamma_1 : w_4 = 0, w_5 \in [0, 1]$ $\alpha = \beta = 0$, while on $\Gamma_2 : w_5 = 0, w_4 \in [0, 1]$ it holds that $\alpha^2 = 1 - \beta^2$ and α goes from 1 to $1/\sqrt{2}$, and finally on $\Gamma_3 : \mathbf{w} = 0$, we have $\alpha^2 = \beta^2$ and α goes from $1/\sqrt{2}$ to 0. Similarly for γ, δ

with $\Gamma_{1,2}$ swapped. Thus the integral becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int \Omega^{(4)} &= 4\pi \left[\int_{w_{4,5}>0} d\alpha^2 d\beta^2 + d\gamma^2 d\delta^2 \right] \\
 &= 4\pi \left[\int_{\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3} \alpha^2 d\beta^2 + \gamma^2 d\delta^2 \right] \\
 &= 4\pi \left[0 + \frac{3}{8} - \frac{1}{8} + \frac{3}{8} + 0 - \frac{1}{8} \right] \\
 &= 2\pi.
 \end{aligned}$$

To illustrate, we find the simplest choice is obtained by defining $\hat{w}_5 = w_5/\sqrt{w_4^2 + w_5^2}$, $\hat{w}_4 = w_4/\sqrt{w_4^2 + w_5^2}$, and letting

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \hat{w}_4 (1 + |\mathbf{w}|)}; & \beta &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \hat{w}_4 (1 - |\mathbf{w}|)} \\
 \delta &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \hat{w}_5 (1 + |\mathbf{w}|)}; & \gamma &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \hat{w}_5 (1 - |\mathbf{w}|)}
 \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\Omega^{(4)} = \Theta(w_4)\Theta(w_5) (-\hat{w}_4 d\hat{w}_4 + \hat{w}_5 d\hat{w}_5) d|\mathbf{w}| \omega^{(2)}, \quad (42)$$

which can be easily computed directly, and as promised $\int_{S^4} \Omega^{(4)} = \int_{S^2} \omega^{(2)} = 2\pi$.

V. DISCUSSION

In this work, we propose a systematic wavefunction based approach to construct higher Berry curvatures and higher Thouless pumps for a parametrized family of systems with local parameter spaces. We apply this approach to parametrized families of tensor networks that correspond to the ground states of short-range entangled systems. We construct $(d+2)$ -form higher Berry curvatures for a d dimensional system, as well as d -form that characterizes the higher Thouless pumps in a d dimensional system with $U(1)$ symmetry. Our formulas are suitable for both analytical studies of exactly solvable models and numerical studies of general lattice models, and we illustrate these applications with several examples.

In the following, we mention several interesting future problems. One future direction is to apply our approach to the study of parametrized topologically ordered systems. In this case, it is expected that the higher Berry invariants as well as the higher Thouless pump may be fractional. See, e.g., a recent study on this fractional phenomenon in parametrized families of systems from the field theory point of view¹³.

It is also desirable to give a rigorous proof of the quantization of higher Berry curvatures in our construction. For $d=1$ MPS, the proof has been given for the translationally invariant MPS in Ref.30, where it was shown that our higher Berry curvature corresponds to the curvature for the gerbe in translationally invariant MPSs. In

higher dimensions, one can argue that our higher Berry curvatures for short-range entangled states also give a quantized higher Berry invariant by following the same argument in Ref.4, but a rigorous proof is still needed.

Another future direction is to study how to detect higher Berry curvatures in experiments. Even for $d = 1$ parametrized systems, the expressions of higher Berry curvatures constructed in this work are different from those obtained from the Hamiltonians⁴ and from the numerical approach²³. It seems to us there is not a canonical way of defining higher Berry curvatures, in contrast to the canonical 2-form Berry curvature, knowing only the family of states. In particular, they correspond to different ways of embedding X into some parameter space with locality $\prod_p X_p$. Physically, different ways of constructing higher Berry curvatures may correspond to different protocols to detect them. It is an interesting future work to study how to detect such higher Berry curvatures in experiments.

Note added: While completing this manuscript, we became aware of an upcoming related work Ref.46 to appear on arXiv on the same day.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Michael Hermele and Cristian Batista for helpful discussions and general comments and Daniel Parker for insights into MPS. This work was supported in part by the Simons Collaboration on Ultra-Quantum Matter, which is a grant from the Simons Foundation (618615, XW, AV; 651440, XW, MH).

Appendix A: Higher Berry curvatures for locally parametrized states beyond tensor networks

Our approach of constructing higher Berry curvatures and higher Thouless pumps not only works for tensor network states as illustrated in the main text, but also works for other types of locally parametrized states. In this appendix, we give an example on the family of states that are generated by applying parametrized local unitary operators on a reference state $|\psi_0\rangle$:

$$|\psi(\{\lambda_p\})\rangle = U(\{\lambda_p\})|\psi_0\rangle, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $U(\{\lambda_p\})$ denotes the unitaries that depend on local parameters in the local parameter spaces X_p for arbitrary lattice sites $p \in \Lambda$. Hereafter, for simplicity of writing we will write (A1) as $|\psi\rangle = U|\psi_0\rangle$. Then the total variation of the family of states decomposes into a sum over local variations

$$d|\psi\rangle = \sum_p d_p|\psi\rangle = \sum_p (d_p U)|\psi_0\rangle. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Note that in general one cannot choose unitary operators U that are smooth everywhere in the whole parameter

space. In this case, we can cover the parameter space by several charts. Then the unitary operators can be smooth everywhere on each chart.

Since the unitary operators U in (A1) depend on both the lattice sites and the external parameters, this allows us to define the simplex chain and differential forms following the procedures in Sec.III. More explicitly, to construct the higher Berry curvatures, one can start from the regular 1-form \mathcal{A} as

$$\mathcal{A} = -\text{Im}\langle\psi|d\psi\rangle = -\text{Im}\sum_p \langle\psi_0|(d_p U)|\psi_0\rangle. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Then the n -chain valued $(n+2)$ -form $F^{(n+2)}$ can be obtained from (24), based on which one can construct the $(n+2)$ -form higher Berry curvature according to (25).

In the following, let us illustrate this construction with the exactly solvable model in Sec.II. We consider the same configuration in (12). Let us focus on $w_4 \geq 0$ first. For each dimer on sites $p \in 2\mathbb{Z} - 1$ and $(p+1) \in 2\mathbb{Z}$, the wavefunction can be expressed as

$$|\psi\rangle_{p,p+1} = [U_p(\theta, \phi) \otimes U_{p+1}(\theta, \phi)] U_{p,p+1}(\alpha) |\psi_0\rangle. \quad (\text{A4})$$

The total wavefunction is a tensor product of wavefunctions on each dimer. Here $|\psi_0\rangle = |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ is the ground state of the dimer at $w_4 = 0$ and $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, w_2, w_3) = (0, 0, 1)$. The unitary operator U_p acts on the local Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_p , and the parameters in U_p belong to the local parameter space X_p . More explicitly, we have

$$U_p = U_{p+1} = U(\theta, \phi) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} & -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{-i\phi} \\ \sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{i\phi} & \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

where $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi$, $0 \leq \phi \leq 2\pi$. Here $U(\theta, \phi)$ rotates the eigenstates of σ^z to eigenstates of $\mathbf{w} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}$. The unitary operator $U_{p,p+1}$, which acts on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_p \otimes \mathcal{H}_{p+1}$, has the expression

$$\begin{aligned} U_{p,p+1}(\alpha) &= |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow| + |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow| \\ &+ \sqrt{\frac{1 + \sin \alpha}{2}} (|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow| - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\uparrow|) \\ &- \sqrt{\frac{1 - \sin \alpha}{2}} (|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\uparrow| + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow|). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

where $0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi/2$. Now we have the freedom to decide α in $U_{p,p+1}(\alpha)$ belongs to the parameter spaces X_p or X_{p+1} . In fact, the same ‘gauge freedom’ also appears in the MPS formalism (See Appendix.C). Choosing $\alpha \in X_p$ here corresponds to the right canonical MPS, and choosing $\alpha \in X_{p+1}$ corresponds to the left canonical. For either choice, we can evaluate the higher Berry curvature $\Omega^{(3)}$ by using (4) and (5), where the 1-form \mathcal{A} is now given in (A3). We find that for either $\alpha \in X_p$ or $\alpha \in X_{p+1}$, the higher Berry curvature $\Omega^{(3)}$ has the same expression as the MPS result in (13).

Next, for $w_4 < 0$, since the spins at sites $p \in 2\mathbb{Z} - 1$ and $(p+1) \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ are decoupled from each other, there

is no Berry curvature flow across the cut (dashed line in (12)). Repeating the above procedure, one can find the higher Berry curvature vanishes for $w_4 < 0$, which again agrees with the MPS result.

As a remark, for the purpose of illustrating our construction, we choose a very simple family of unitary operators in the above discussion. These unitary operators are not smooth everywhere over the parameter space S^3 . One can find they are not well defined at $\alpha = 0$ and $\theta = \pi$. More rigorously, one should cover S^3 with open covers. On each open cover, the unitary operators can be smooth and well defined everywhere. For the toy model we consider here, one should be able to write down the smooth unitary operators on each open cover by following a similar procedure in Ref.30.

Appendix B: Relation to KS formulas

In Ref. 4, Kapustin and Spodyneiko first introduced Kitaev's idea of the higher Berry curvature to the literature. They formalise the notion using coarse geometry as we do here, and consider gapped Hamiltonians whose ground states are short range entangled. While the choice of local parent Hamiltonian is immaterial to the invariant, which is a characteristic only of the short-range entangled states, their formulation requires picking a parent Hamiltonian. In this appendix we show that their formulation can be derived in the language of local parameter spaces.

Consider as before a lattice Λ , and a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with a tensor product factorisation over Λ , so that $\mathcal{H} = \otimes_{p \in \Lambda} \mathcal{H}_p$. For each $p \in \Lambda$, consider the space of finitely ranged self-adjoint operators X_p with maximal range r . That is, if H_p, H_q are such operators, and $d(p, q) > 2r$, then they must commute $[H_p, H_q] = 0$. We can define a finitely ranged Hamiltonian as a sum of such operators $H = \sum_p H_p$. Let the total parameter space X be the subset of $\prod_{p \in \Lambda} X_p$ such that the ground state is unique and gapped. Then the Hamiltonian implicitly defines a map $X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ taking any set of parameters to the gapped ground state. The Berry curvature of such a ground state is extensive and hence divergent, but by using a complex contour integral encircling the ground state energy it formally takes the form

$$F = \frac{i}{2} \int \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \text{Tr}[G dH G^2 dH], \quad (\text{B1})$$

where dH is the exterior derivative of the Hamiltonian, and $G(z) = (z - H)^{-1}$ is the resolvent. Since it is located over all of space we can view it as a -1 -chain, and find a local Berry curvature 0 -chain, which has F as a boundary. In particular using the simplex-exterior derivative their choice can be written⁴

$$F^{(2)} = \frac{i}{2} \int \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \text{Tr} \left[G dH G^2 \hat{d}H \right]. \quad (\text{B2})$$

We can check that $\hat{d}\partial F^{(2)} = -2dF^{(2)}$, so by equation (22)

the higher Berry flow is simply

$$F^{(n+2)} = \frac{2}{(n+2)!} \hat{d}^n F^{(2)}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Using $\hat{d}G = G\hat{d}HG$, we find

$$\hat{d}^n F^{(2)} = i \sum_{l=0}^n c_l^n \int \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \text{Tr} \left[dH (G\hat{d}H)^l G^2 (\hat{d}HG)^{n-l+1} \right] \quad (\text{B4})$$

where $c_l^n = (-)^n n!(n-l+1)/2$, where by the product of two simplexes $[p_0 \cdots p_n][q_0 \cdots q_m]$ is meant the simplex $[p_0 \cdots p_n q_0 \cdots q_m]$. This is of course not generically a well defined operation on chains with finite correlation length, but it is on the free chains without that constraint. We still use the product since by the assumption on local parameter spaces, the total expression is controlled. To prove the formula, we just need the simplex-exterior derivative of any given term

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d} \text{Tr} \left[dH (G\hat{d}H)^a G^2 (\hat{d}HG)^b \right] \\ = - (a+1) \text{Tr} \left[dH (G\hat{d}H)^{a+1} G^2 (\hat{d}HG)^b \right] \\ - (b+1) \text{Tr} \left[dH (G\hat{d}H)^a G^2 (\hat{d}HG)^{b+1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally the higher Berry flow becomes

$$F^{(n+2)} = \frac{(-)^n i}{(n+2)(n+1)} \sum_{l=0}^n (n-l+1) \int \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \text{Tr} \left[dH (G\hat{d}H)^l G^2 (\hat{d}HG)^{n-l+1} \right]. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Expanding the simplex indices, this is the higher Berry curvature result in Ref. 4.

Appendix C: Higher Thouless charge pump in exactly solvable models

In this appendix, we apply our formulas in Eqs.(26) and (27) to lattice systems with a global $U(1)$ symmetry. These parametrized systems include the well known Thouless charge pump in $1d$ systems, and higher dimensional systems with higher Thouless charge pump. The topological invariants in terms of a family of Hamiltonians in higher Thouless pumps were recently studied in Ref. 5.

1. Thouless charge pump in $d = 1$

We consider a $d = 1$ lattice models with a global $U(1)$ symmetry, with the parameter space $X = S^1$. This model has the interesting feature of $U(1)$ charge Thouless pump as we adiabatically change the parameters along $X = S^1$.

Let $w = (w_1, w_2) \in S^1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ be the standard embedding of the unit circle, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ be the corresponding angle, which is a parameterization via the

map $\alpha \mapsto (\cos \alpha, \sin \alpha)$. The family of Hamiltonians we consider are very similar to the those in Sec. II. In fact it may be constructed by restricting the Berry curvature pump to the $\theta = 0, \pi$ part of the parameter space, after a slight rearrangement of parameters. As such it has the form

$$H_{1d}(w) = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} H_p^{\text{onsite}}(w) + H_{p,p+1}^{\text{int}}(w), \quad (\text{C1})$$

where the terms are now given by

$$H_p^{\text{onsite}}(w) = (-1)^p w_1 \sigma_p^3, \quad H_{p,p+1}^{\text{int}} = g_p(w_2) \sigma_p \cdot \sigma_{p+1} \quad (\text{C2})$$

and g_p is defined by equation (11). Pictorially, the Hamiltonians for different values of $\alpha \in [0, 2\pi]$ can be visualized as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\alpha = 2\pi: \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \\
\alpha = 7\pi/4: \quad \oplus \text{---} \ominus \quad \oplus \text{---} \ominus \quad \oplus \text{---} \ominus \quad \oplus \text{---} \ominus \quad \oplus \\
\alpha = 3\pi/2: \quad \bullet \text{---} \bullet \quad \bullet \text{---} \bullet \quad \bullet \text{---} \bullet \quad \bullet \text{---} \bullet \quad \bullet \\
\alpha = 5\pi/4: \quad \ominus \text{---} \oplus \quad \ominus \text{---} \oplus \quad \ominus \text{---} \oplus \quad \ominus \text{---} \oplus \quad \ominus \\
\alpha = \pi: \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \\
\alpha = 3\pi/4: \quad \ominus \text{---} \oplus \quad \oplus \text{---} \ominus \quad \oplus \text{---} \ominus \quad \oplus \text{---} \ominus \quad \oplus \text{---} \ominus \\
\alpha = \pi/2: \quad \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \bullet \\
\alpha = \pi/4: \quad \ominus \oplus \\
\alpha = 0: \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus \quad \ominus \quad \oplus
\end{array} \quad (\text{C3})$$

Similar to (12), we use “+” (resp. “−”) to represent a lattice site p with non-zero single-spin term, with the sign representing the corresponding sign of the coefficient of σ_p^z , and “•” represents a lattice site with vanishing single-spin term, as occurs at $w_1 = \cos \alpha = 0$. The $U(1)$ charge operator is defined as $\hat{Q} = \sum_p \hat{Q}_p = \sum_p \frac{1}{2} \sigma_p^3$. It is straightforward to check that \hat{Q} commutes with the Hamiltonians $H_{1d}(w)$ for arbitrary $w \in S^1$. As we tune the parameters $\alpha \in [0, 2\pi]$ in this model, a quantized $U(1)$ charge will be pumped along the $d = 1$ chain. This quantized charge corresponds to the topological invariant, which is an integral of 1-form $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}$:

$$Q_{\text{pump}} = \int_{S^1} \tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f), \quad (\text{C4})$$

with

$$\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f) = \langle Q^{(1)}, \delta f \rangle. \quad (\text{C5})$$

Here $Q^{(1)}$ is the one-form constructed from the $U(1)$ invariant MPS, $f(p) = \Theta(p - a)$ where $a \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1/2$ as indicated by the dashed line in (C3), and δf is defined as

$(\delta f)(p, q) = f(q) - f(p)$. The explicit expression of $Q^{(1)}$ is

$$Q_{p_0 p_1}^{(1)} = d_{p_0} \langle \hat{Q}_{p_1} \rangle - d_{p_1} \langle \hat{Q}_{p_0} \rangle. \quad (\text{C6})$$

The physical meaning of $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f)$ in (C5) can be intuitively understood as follows. With the simple choice of $f(p) = \Theta(p - a)$, (C5) can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f) = \sum_{p < a < q} Q_{pq}^{(1)} = d_L \langle \hat{Q}_R \rangle - d_R \langle \hat{Q}_L \rangle, \quad (\text{C7})$$

where we have defined $d_L := \sum_{p < a} d_p$, $d_R = \sum_{p > a} d_p$, $\hat{Q}_L = \sum_{p < a} \hat{Q}_p$, and $\hat{Q}_R = \sum_{p > a} \hat{Q}_p$. They satisfy the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned}
d_L + d_R &= d = \sum_{p \in \Lambda} d_p, \\
\hat{Q}_L + \hat{Q}_R &= \hat{Q} = \sum_{p \in \Lambda} \hat{Q}_p.
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{C8})$$

Then (C7) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{Q}^{(1)} &= (d - d_R) \langle \hat{Q}_R \rangle - d_R [\langle \hat{Q} \rangle - \langle \hat{Q}_R \rangle] \\
&= d \langle \hat{Q}_R \rangle = -d \langle \hat{Q}_L \rangle,
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{C9})$$

where we have considered the total charge $\langle \hat{Q} \rangle$ is conserved. That is, the closed 1-form $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}$ measures the increasing of charge in the right half chain, or equivalently the decreasing of charge in the left half chain, as expected.

Now we apply the above formulas to the toy model in (C1). We will consider both the left and right canonical MPSs. Since our 1d model is composed of decoupled dimers, one can consider the Schmidt decomposition on each dimer. For the dimer living on sites p and $p + 1$, the wavefunction can be expressed as

$$|\psi\rangle_{p,p+1} = \sum_{\alpha} \Lambda_{\alpha} |\alpha\rangle_p \otimes |\alpha\rangle_{p+1}. \quad (\text{C10})$$

The Schmidt coefficients Λ_{α} can always be chosen positive, the states $\{|\alpha\rangle_p\}$ and $\{|\alpha\rangle_{p+1}\}$ form orthonormal sets in the Hilbert spaces \mathcal{H}_p and \mathcal{H}_{p+1} respectively, i.e., $\langle \alpha | \beta \rangle_p = \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle_{p+1} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$. By normalization, we have $\sum_{\alpha} \Lambda_{\alpha}^2 = \langle \psi | \psi \rangle_{p,p+1} = 1$. One can rewrite the wavefunction in (C10) as

$$|\psi\rangle_{p,p+1} = \sum_{s_p} \sum_{s_{p+1}} \Gamma^{s_p} \Lambda \Gamma^{s_{p+1}} |s_p\rangle \otimes |s_{p+1}\rangle, \quad (\text{C11})$$

where $\Gamma_{0\alpha}^{s_p} = \langle s_p | \alpha \rangle_p$, $\Gamma_{\alpha 0}^{s_{p+1}} = \langle s_{p+1} | \alpha \rangle_{p+1}$, and $s_p, s_{p+1} \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$. In the left canonical MPS, one can choose

$$A^{s_p} = \Gamma^{s_p}, \quad A^{s_{p+1}} = \Lambda \Gamma^{s_{p+1}}. \quad (\text{C12})$$

They satisfy the left canonical condition:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s_p} (A^{s_p})^\dagger A^{s_p} &= \mathbb{I}_2, \quad \sum_{s_p} A^{s_p} (\Lambda)^2 (A^{s_p})^\dagger = 1, \\ \sum_{s_{p+1}} (A^{s_{p+1}})^\dagger A^{s_{p+1}} &= 1, \quad \sum_{s_{p+1}} A^{s_{p+1}} (A^{s_{p+1}})^\dagger = (\Lambda)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C13})$$

Similarly, in the right canonical MPS, one can choose the tensors A^{s_p} and $A^{s_{p+1}}$ as

$$A^{s_p} = \Gamma^{s_p} \Lambda, \quad A^{s_{p+1}} = \Gamma^{s_{p+1}}, \quad (\text{C14})$$

which satisfy the right canonical conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s_p} A^{s_p} (A^{s_p})^\dagger &= 1, \quad \sum_{s_p} (A^{s_p})^\dagger A^{s_p} = (\Lambda)^2, \\ \sum_{s_{p+1}} A^{s_{p+1}} (A^{s_{p+1}})^\dagger &= \mathbb{I}_2, \quad \sum_{s_{p+1}} (A^{s_{p+1}})^\dagger (\Lambda)^2 A^{s_{p+1}} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C15})$$

In our toy model, for the choice of the left canonical form of MPS in (C12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{\uparrow p} &= (1, 0), \quad \Gamma^{\downarrow p} = (0, -1), \\ \Gamma^{\uparrow p+1} &= (0, 1)^T, \quad \Gamma^{\downarrow p+1} = (1, 0)^T, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C16})$$

and

$$\Lambda = \text{diag}(\sqrt{(1 + \cos \alpha)/2}, \sqrt{(1 - \cos \alpha)/2}). \quad (\text{C17})$$

Here $p \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi$. Similarly one can obtain the MPS for $\pi < \alpha \leq 2\pi$.

Since our lattice model is composed of decoupled dimers, one can find that for the chosen $f(p)$ in (C3), the closed 1-form $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}$ is nonzero only when $0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi$ and it is contributed by the tensors at p and $p + 1$ as:

$$\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f) = Q_{p,p+1}^{(1)} = d_p \langle \hat{Q}_{p+1} \rangle - d_{p+1} \langle \hat{Q}_p \rangle. \quad (\text{C18})$$

More concretely, in the left canonical form, one has

$$\langle \hat{Q}_p \rangle = \frac{\cos \alpha_{p+1}}{2}, \quad \langle \hat{Q}_{p+1} \rangle = -\frac{\cos \alpha_{p+1}}{2}. \quad (\text{C19})$$

Here we use α_{p+1} to emphasize that it parameterizes the tensor at site $p + 1$. Then based on (C18), one can obtain the 1-form $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f)$ as

$$\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f) = Q_{p,p+1}^{(1)} = d_p \langle \hat{Q}_{p+1} \rangle - d_{p+1} \langle \hat{Q}_p \rangle = \frac{\sin \alpha}{2} d\alpha \quad (\text{C20})$$

for $0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi$ and $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f) = 0$ for $\pi \leq \alpha \leq 2\pi$. It is reminded that $d_p := d\alpha_p \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_p}$, and in the last step of (C18) we have taken $\alpha_p = \alpha$. Therefore, the topological invariant is

$$Q_{\text{pump}} = \int_{S^1} \tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f) = \int_0^\pi \frac{\sin \alpha}{2} d\alpha = 1, \quad (\text{C21})$$

which measures the charge pumped across $x = a$ (See the dashed line in (C3)) as we tune the parameter adiabatically along S^1 .

One can also check the choice of the right canonical form of MPS explicitly. One has

$$\langle \hat{Q}_p \rangle = \frac{\cos \alpha_p}{2}, \quad \langle \hat{Q}_{p+1} \rangle = -\frac{\cos \alpha_p}{2}. \quad (\text{C22})$$

Here α_p parameterizes the tensor at site p . Then based on (C18), one can obtain the 1-form $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f)$, which is the same as the result for the left canonical form of MPS.

One can also consider the ‘symmetric canonical form’, by choosing $A^{s_p} = \Gamma^{s_p} \sqrt{\Lambda}$, $A^{s_{p+1}} = \sqrt{\Lambda} \Gamma^{s_{p+1}}$ for $0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi$ and $A^{s_{p-1}} = \Gamma^{s_{p-1}} \sqrt{\Lambda}$, $A^{s_p} = \sqrt{\Lambda} \Gamma^{s_p}$ for $\pi \leq \alpha \leq 2\pi$ where $p \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$. Again, it is found the 1-form $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f)$ is the same as that for the left/right canonical form of MPS.

Note that the 1-form $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f)$ depends on the choice of f , which is similar to the feature of higher Berry curvatures $\Omega^{(3)}(f)$ ³⁰. For example, by choosing $f'(p) = \Theta(p - a)$ with $a \in 2\mathbb{Z} - 1/2$ (i.e., shifting the dashed line in (C3) by an odd number of sites), then for the various canonical forms introduced above, one can obtain

$$\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f') = -\frac{\sin \alpha}{2} d\alpha, \quad \pi \leq \alpha \leq 2\pi, \quad (\text{C23})$$

and $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f') = 0$ for $0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi$. However, the topological invariant $Q_{\text{pump}} = \int_{S^1} \tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f') = 1$ is the same as (C21).

Physically, $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}(f)$ corresponds to the ‘‘current’’ which may vary in space for an inhomogeneous system. The integral of this current, which measures the charge pumped along the $1d$ system, is a topological invariant.

2. Higher Thouless charge pump

Higher Thouless charge pump in a general SRE system with a global $U(1)$ symmetry was firstly discussed in Ref.5. For a d dimensional lattice system over $X = S^d$, one can define d -form $\tilde{Q}^{(d)}$. The topological invariant $\int_{S^d} \tilde{Q}^{(d)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ characterizes the quantized Thouless charge pump in SRE systems. Here, we show our construction of d forms gives the expected topological invariant in systems with nontrivial higher Thouless pumps. We will be brief since the discussion follows the same procedure based on the bulk-boundary correspondence in Sec.IV.

Let us give an explicit example of $d = 2$ lattice system over $X = S^2$. As before let $(w_1, w_2, w_3) = w \in S^2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ be the standard embedding of the two-sphere in \mathbb{R}^3 , and let (\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2) be the unit vector of (w_1, w_2) . The family of systems can be constructed from the $d = 1$ system in (C1) based on the suspension construction as introduced in Ref.12. The Hamiltonians are

$$H_{2d}(w) = \sum_{x_1 \in \mathbb{Z}} H_{1d, x_1}((-1)^{x_1} \hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2) + H_{x_1, x_1+1}^{\text{int}}(w) \quad (\text{C24})$$

where $H_{1d,x}$ is the $d = 1$ Hamiltonian from (C1) along the $d = 1$ sublattice of points with first coordinate x . The coupling is

$$H_{x_1, x_1+1}^{\text{int}}(w) = h_{\mathbf{x}}(w_3) \sum_{x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{x_1, x_2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{x_1+1, x_2} \quad (\text{C25})$$

For $w_3 = 0$, the $d = 2$ system is a collection of decoupled $d = 1$ systems with alternating charges. One can check that H_{2d} in (C24) is gapped everywhere over S^2 .

The closed 2 forms $\tilde{Q}^{(2)}(f)$ characterizing the Thouless charge pump are

$$\tilde{Q}^{(2)}(f) = \langle Q^{(2)}, \delta f_1 \cup \delta f_2 \rangle, \quad (\text{C26})$$

where $Q^{(2)}$ are (non-closed) 2-forms constructed from $d = 2$ PEPSs:

$$Q_{rppq}^{(2)} = d_r d_p \langle \hat{Q}_q \rangle - d_r d_q \langle \hat{Q}_p \rangle - d_q d_p \langle \hat{Q}_r \rangle + d_p d_q \langle \hat{Q}_r \rangle \quad (\text{C27})$$

up to an exact form. $f_{1,2} = \Theta(x_{1,2}(p) - a_{1,2})$ are chosen in the same way as in Sec.IV (See also Fig.4).

Instead of calculating $Q^{(2)}(f)$ in an infinite system directly, which is involved, we study it in a semi-infinite system based on bulk-boundary correspondence. We impose a spatial boundary along $x_1 = N$ by retaining only those lattice sites with $x_1 \leq N$. In our lattice model, $Q_{ppqr}^{(2)}$ is a local quantity, and $\tilde{Q}^{(2)}(f)$ is contributed by the tensors near $(x_1, x_2) = (a_1, a_2)$. As long as we choose (a_1, a_2) deep in the bulk, $\tilde{Q}^{(2)}(f)$ are the same for the infinite system and the semi-infinite system. In the semi-infinite system, we can write $\tilde{Q}^{(2)}(f)$ as

$$\tilde{Q}^{(2)}(f) = d \langle Q^{(1)}, f_1 \cup \delta f_2 \rangle =: d\omega^{(1)}(f), \quad (\text{C28})$$

where $Q^{(1)}$ is defined in (C6). For a system with nontrivial higher Thouless pump, $\omega^{(1)}$ is not globally well defined

over $X = S^2$. But if we cover S^2 with two charts D_N^2 and D_S^2 , then $\omega^{(1)}$ can be globally well defined over each chart. More explicitly, we choose D_N^2 (D_S^2) as the subspace of S^2 with $w_3 \geq 0$ ($w_3 \leq 0$). Over D_N^2 (D_S^2), the boundary of the $2d$ lattice is imposed along $x_1 = N$ ($x_1 = N - 1$) where $N \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ (See Fig.4). One can find the ground states of H_{2d} are gapped everywhere over D_N^2 and D_S^2 respectively. The 1-forms $\omega_N^{(1)}$ ($\omega_S^{(1)}$) are globally well defined for the corresponding family of PEPSs. Then one has

$$\int_{S^2} \tilde{Q}^{(2)}(f) = \int_{D_N^2} \tilde{Q}^{(2)} + \int_{D_S^2} \tilde{Q}^{(2)} = \int_{S^1} (\omega_N^{(1)} - \omega_S^{(1)}),$$

where $S^1 = D_N^2 \cap D_S^2$. Note that over S^1 where $w_3 = 0$, H_{2d} in (C24) becomes decoupled $1d$ systems. In this case, $\omega_N^{(1)} - \omega_S^{(1)} = \tilde{Q}^{(1)}$, where $\tilde{Q}^{(1)}$ is the closed 1-form for the decoupled $1d$ system along $x_1 = N$. Therefore, we have

$$\int_{S^2} \tilde{Q}^{(2)} = \int_{S^1} \tilde{Q}^{(1)} = 1. \quad (\text{C29})$$

Therefore, the topological invariant that characterizes the higher Thouless pump in H_{2d} in (C24) is quantized.

We can further study those lattice models obtained from the suspension construction in even higher dimensions¹² by following the similar procedures above. Two essential ingredients in this procedure are (i) the descent equations and (ii) the locality property of $Q^{(n)}$. Here $Q^{(n)}$ is related to the closed form $\tilde{Q}^{(n)}$ through $\tilde{Q}^{(n)} = \langle Q^{(n)}, b \rangle$. While the locality property of $Q_{p_0 \dots p_n}^{(n)}$ is apparent in our dimerized lattice models, it is an interesting future problem to show this property for general $U(1)$ invariant gapped ground states.

¹ M. V. Berry, ‘‘Quantal phase factors accompanying adiabatic changes,’’ *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **392**, 45–57 (1984).
² D. J. Thouless, M. Kohmoto, M. P. Nightingale, and M. den Nijs, ‘‘Quantized hall conductance in a two-dimensional periodic potential,’’ *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 405–408 (1982).
³ A. Kitaev, ‘‘Differential forms on the space of statistical mechanics models,’’ (2019), talk at the conference in celebration of Dan Freed’s 60th birthday <https://web.ma.utexas.edu/topqft/talkslides/kitaev.pdf>.
⁴ Anton Kapustin and Lev Spodyneiko, ‘‘Higher-dimensional generalizations of berry curvature,’’ *Physical Review B* **101** (2020), 10.1103/physrevb.101.235130.
⁵ Anton Kapustin and Lev Spodyneiko, ‘‘Higher-dimensional generalizations of the thouless charge pump,’’ (2020), [arXiv:2003.09519 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.09519).
⁶ Po-Shen Hsin, Anton Kapustin, and Ryan Thorngren, ‘‘Berry phase in quantum field theory: Diabolical points

and boundary phenomena,’’ *Physical Review B* **102** (2020), 10.1103/physrevb.102.245113.

⁷ Clay Cordova, Daniel Freed, Ho Tat Lam, and Nathan Seiberg, ‘‘Anomalies in the space of coupling constants and their dynamical applications i,’’ *SciPost Physics* **8** (2020), 10.21468/scipostphys.8.1.001.
⁸ Clay Cordova, Daniel Freed, Ho Tat Lam, and Nathan Seiberg, ‘‘Anomalies in the space of coupling constants and their dynamical applications II,’’ *SciPost Physics* **8** (2020), 10.21468/scipostphys.8.1.002.
⁹ Dominic V. Else, ‘‘Topological goldstone phases of matter,’’ *Physical Review B* **104** (2021), 10.1103/physrevb.104.115129.
¹⁰ Yichul Choi and Kantaro Ohmori, ‘‘Higher berry phase of fermions and index theorem,’’ *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2022** (2022), 10.1007/jhep09(2022)022.
¹¹ David Aasen, Zhenghan Wang, and Matthew B. Hastings, ‘‘Adiabatic paths of hamiltonians, symmetries of topological order, and automorphism codes,’’ *Physical Review B* **106**

- (2022), [10.1103/physrevb.106.085122](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.1103/physrevb.106.085122).
- ¹² Xueda Wen, Marvin Qi, Agnès Beaudry, Juan Moreno, Markus J. Pflaum, Daniel Spiegel, Ashvin Vishwanath, and Michael Hermele, “Flow of (higher) berry curvature and bulk-boundary correspondence in parametrized quantum systems,” (2022), [arXiv:2112.07748 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.07748).
 - ¹³ Po-Shen Hsin and Zhenghan Wang, “On topology of the moduli space of gapped hamiltonians for topological phases,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **64**, 041901 (2023).
 - ¹⁴ Anton Kapustin and Nikita Sopenko, “Local Noether theorem for quantum lattice systems and topological invariants of gapped states,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **63**, 091903 (2022), [arXiv:2201.01327 \[math-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.01327).
 - ¹⁵ Ken Shiozaki, “Adiabatic cycles of quantum spin systems,” *Physical Review B* **106** (2022), [10.1103/physrevb.106.125108](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.1103/physrevb.106.125108).
 - ¹⁶ Sven Bachmann, Wojciech De Roeck, Martin Fraas, and Tijn Jappens, “A classification of G -charge Thouless pumps in 1D invertible states,” [arXiv e-prints](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.03763), [arXiv:2204.03763 \[math-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.03763) (2022), [arXiv:2204.03763 \[math-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.03763).
 - ¹⁷ Shuhei Ohyama, Ken Shiozaki, and Masatoshi Sato, “Generalized thouless pumps in $(1+1)$ -dimensional interacting fermionic systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 165115 (2022).
 - ¹⁸ Shuhei Ohyama, Yuji Terashima, and Ken Shiozaki, “Discrete higher berry phases and matrix product states,” (2023), [arXiv:2303.04252 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.04252).
 - ¹⁹ Adam Artymowicz, Anton Kapustin, and Nikita Sopenko, “Quantization of the higher Berry curvature and the higher Thouless pump,” [arXiv e-prints](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.06399), [arXiv:2305.06399 \(2023\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.06399), [arXiv:2305.06399 \[math-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.06399).
 - ²⁰ Agnes Beaudry, Michael Hermele, Juan Moreno, Markus Pflaum, Marvin Qi, and Daniel Spiegel, “Homotopical foundations of parametrized quantum spin systems,” (2023), [arXiv:2303.07431 \[math-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.07431).
 - ²¹ Shuhei Ohyama and Shinsei Ryu, “Higher structures in matrix product states,” [arXiv e-prints](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.05356), [arXiv:2304.05356 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.05356) (2023), [arXiv:2304.05356 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.05356).
 - ²² Marvin Qi, David T. Stephen, Xueda Wen, Daniel Spiegel, Markus J. Pflaum, Agnès Beaudry, and Michael Hermele, “Charting the space of ground states with tensor networks,” [arXiv e-prints](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.07700), [arXiv:2305.07700 \(2023\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.07700), [arXiv:2305.07700 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.07700).
 - ²³ Ken Shiozaki, Niclas Heinsdorf, and Shuhei Ohyama, “Higher Berry curvature from matrix product states,” [arXiv e-prints](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.08109), [arXiv:2305.08109 \(2023\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.08109), [arXiv:2305.08109 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.08109).
 - ²⁴ Lev Spodyneiko, “Hall conductivity pump,” [arXiv e-prints](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.14332), [arXiv:2309.14332 \(2023\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.14332), [arXiv:2309.14332 \[cond-mat.mes-hall\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.14332).
 - ²⁵ Arun Debray, Sanath K. Devalapurkar, Cameron Krulewski, Yu Leon Liu, Natalia Pacheco-Tallaj, and Ryan Thorngren, “A Long Exact Sequence in Symmetry Breaking: order parameter constraints, defect anomaly-matching, and higher Berry phases,” [arXiv e-prints](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16749), [arXiv:2309.16749 \(2023\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16749), [arXiv:2309.16749 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16749).
 - ²⁶ A. Kitaev, “Toward a topological classification of many-body quantum states with short-range entanglement,” (2011), talk at Simons Center for Geometry and Physics <http://scgp.stonybrook.edu/archives/1087>.
 - ²⁷ A. Kitaev, “On the classification of short-range entangled states.” (2013), talk at Simons Center for Geometry and Physics <http://scgp.stonybrook.edu/archives/16180>.
 - ²⁸ A. Kitaev, “Homotopy-theoretic approach to spt phases in action: Z_{16} classification of three-dimensional superconductors,” (2015), talk at Institute for Pure and Applied Mathematics <http://www.ipam.ucla.edu/programs/workshops/symmetry-and-topology-in-quantum-matter/>.
 - ²⁹ D. J. Thouless, “Quantization of particle transport,” *Phys. Rev. B* **27**, 6083–6087 (1983).
 - ³⁰ Ophelia Evelyn Sommer, Ashvin Vishwanath, and Xueda Wen, “Higher berry curvature from the wave function i: Schmidt decomposition and matrix product states,” (2024), to appear.
 - ³¹ J. Ignacio Cirac, David Pérez-García, Norbert Schuch, and Frank Verstraete, “Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states: Concepts, symmetries, theorems,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **93**, 045003 (2021).
 - ³² Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Classification of gapped symmetric phases in one-dimensional spin systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 035107 (2011).
 - ³³ Frank Pollmann, Erez Berg, Ari M. Turner, and Masaki Oshikawa, “Symmetry protection of topological phases in one-dimensional quantum spin systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 075125 (2012).
 - ³⁴ Norbert Schuch, David Pérez-García, and Ignacio Cirac, “Classifying quantum phases using matrix product states and projected entangled pair states,” *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 165139 (2011).
 - ³⁵ Román Orús, “A practical introduction to tensor networks: Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states,” *Annals of Physics* **349**, 117–158 (2014).
 - ³⁶ John Roe, *Lectures on coarse geometry*, 31 (American Mathematical Soc., 2003).
 - ³⁷ Xie Chen, Arpit Dua, Michael Hermele, David T. Stephen, Nathanan Tantivasadakarn, Robijn Vanhove, and Jing-Yu Zhao, “Sequential quantum circuits as maps between gapped phases,” *Physical Review B* **109** (2024), [10.1103/physrevb.109.075116](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.1103/physrevb.109.075116).
 - ³⁸ Davide Gaiotto, Anton Kapustin, Nathan Seiberg, and Brian Willett, “Generalized global symmetries,” *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2015**, 172 (2015).
 - ³⁹ Anton Kapustin and Ryan Thorngren, “Higher Symmetry and Gapped Phases of Gauge Theories,” in *Algebra, Geometry, and Physics in the 21st Century: Kontsevich Festschrift*, Progress in Mathematics, edited by Denis Auroux, Ludmil Katzarkov, Tony Pantev, Yan Soibelman, and Yuri Tschinkel (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017) pp. 177–202.
 - ⁴⁰ Daniel Aloni, Eduardo García-Valdecasas, Matthew Reece, and Motoo Suzuki, “Spontaneously broken (-1) -form $u(1)$ symmetries,” (2024), [arXiv:2402.00117 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.00117).
 - ⁴¹ Jacob McNamara and Cumrun Vafa, “Baby universes, holography, and the swampland,” (2020), [arXiv:2004.06738 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.06738).
 - ⁴² Yuya Tanizaki and Mithat Ünsal, “Modified instanton sum in QCD and higher-groups,” *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2020**, 123 (2020).
 - ⁴³ Thomas Vandermeulen, “Lower-form symmetries,” (2022), [arXiv:2211.04461 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.04461).
 - ⁴⁴ Michael P. Zaletel and Frank Pollmann, “Isometric tensor network states in two dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 037201 (2020).
 - ⁴⁵ Andras Molnar, Yimin Ge, Norbert Schuch, and J. Ignacio Cirac, “A generalization of the injectivity condition for projected entangled pair states,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **59**, 021902 (2018).

⁴⁶ Shuhei Ohyama and Shinsei Ryu, (2024), to appear.