

Z_2 spin liquid and chiral antiferromagnetic phase in Hubbard model on the honeycomb lattice: duality between Schwinger-fermion and Schwinger-boson representations

Yuan-Ming Lu¹ and Ying Ran¹

¹*Department of Physics, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467, USA*

(Dated: November 7, 2018)

In our previous work¹, we identify the Sublattice-Pairing State (SPS) in Schwinger-fermion representation as the spin liquid phase discovered in recent numerical study on a honeycomb lattice². In this paper, we show that SPS is identical to the zero-flux Z_2 spin liquid in Schwinger-boson representation found by Wang³ by an explicit duality transformation. SPS is connected to an *unusual* antiferromagnetic ordered phase, which we term as chiral-antiferromagnetic (CAF) phase, by an $O(4)$ critical point. CAF phase breaks the $SU(2)$ spin rotation symmetry completely and has three Goldstone modes. Our results indicate that there is likely a hidden phase transition between CAF phase and simple AF phase at large U/t . We propose numerical measurements to reveal the CAF phase and the hidden phase transition.

PACS numbers:

Introduction In a recent numerical study², it is found that the Hubbard model on the honeycomb lattice hosts a spin disordered insulating phase in the neighborhood of the Mott transition, which does not break any physical symmetry. If this is the case, this phase should be a novel spin liquid phase with fractionalized excitations⁴. Similar fractionalized spin liquids have been shown to exist in various artificial models^{5–10}, but so far there is no simple and hopefully realizable Hamiltonian that hosts such exotic phases. This remarkable numerical study makes an important footstep along finding spin liquid phases in correlated electron systems.

There are a lot of different spin liquids on the honeycomb lattice, characterized by different topological orders, or different Projective Symmetry Groups (PSG)¹¹. For example, in a previous study we show that there can be 128 distinct spin liquid phases within the Schwinger-fermion representation¹. Which one is realized in the Hubbard model? In the numerical study², it is shown that the spin liquid phase have a full energy gap, and is smoothly connected (*i.e.* through a continuous phase transition) to both the semi-metal phase for small U/t and the Neel phase for large U/t . These three conditions strongly restricts the candidate spin liquid phases.

In our previous study by Schwinger-fermion approach¹, we use only two of the three conditions and show that there is only one natural spin liquid, coined the Sublattice Pairing State (SPS), which has a full energy gap and can be smoothly connected to the semi-metal phase. Is SPS compatible with the third condition? In other words, can SPS be connected to a magnetic ordered phase by a continuous phase transition? Describing ordinary magnetic ordered phase in Schwinger-fermion approach has been a puzzle for a long time. In this work we show a solution, which allows us to study phase transitions between SPS and a magnetic ordered phase.

SPS is a fully-gapped Z_2 spin liquid on the honeycomb lattice. Its mean-field fermionic spinon band structure, after choosing a proper gauge, is given as follows: (see

FIG. 3a)

$$H_{SPS}^{MF} = t_1 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{j\alpha} + t_2 \sum_{\langle\langle ij \rangle\rangle} f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{j\alpha} - \mu \sum_i f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{i\alpha} + \Delta \sum_{\langle\langle ij \rangle\rangle} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{j\beta}^\dagger + h.c. \quad (1)$$

where $t_{1,2}$ are real numbers. In Schwinger-fermion approach, f -spinons are coupled to an $SU(2)$ gauge field^{11,12}. However due to non-zero t_2 and Δ , this $SU(2)$ gauge degree of freedom is reduced to Z_2 through Higgs mechanism. Thus at low energy f -spinons in Eq.(1) are coupled to a dynamical Z_2 gauge field and stay in the deconfined phase.

Recently Wang³ identified the 0-flux state as the most promising spin liquid phase in the Schwinger-boson approach. 0-flux state is also a Z_2 state with a full energy gap, smoothly connected to an antiferromagnetic phase through an $O(4)$ critical point. However it is not clear whether the 0-flux state can be smoothly connected to the semi-metal phase. Can be SPS related to the 0-flux state? The two states are described in two completely different languages: one in Schwinger-fermion and the other in Schwinger-boson, and the relation between these two representations has been a longstanding problem. In this paper, we find that strikingly, SPS and 0-flux state are identical by an explicit duality transformation in the low energy effective theory.

We also find out that the antiferromagnetic phase connected to the 0-flux state (or SPS) is rather unusual and *not* the simple Neel phase, because it breaks the $SU(2)$ spin-rotation symmetry completely and has three Goldstone modes. On the other hand the magnetic order is still colinear. We dub this phase as chiral-antiferromagnetic (CAF) phase. In CAF phase, aside from the usual antiferromagnetic spin order parameter $\vec{N} = (-1)^{i_s} \vec{S}_i$ where $i_s = 0, 1$ for A and B sublattices respectively, there is another vector-chirality spin order parameter $\vec{n} = \sum_{\langle\langle ij \rangle\rangle} \nu_{ij} \vec{S}_i \times \vec{S}_j$ whose expectation value satisfies $\langle \vec{n} \rangle \perp \langle \vec{N} \rangle$, and $\nu_{ij} = +1(-1)$ if one makes




FIG. 1: Proposed schematic phase diagram of the Hubbard model on the honeycomb lattice. The hidden phase transition might happen at a large U/t , which is not reached in the numerical study².

a left(right) turn when going from site j to i as shown by the arrows in FIG. 3b. Since the usual AF phase should exist in the large U/t limit¹³, our results suggest a hidden phase transition, which might happen in the "Neel" ordered phase of the numerical study² or at larger U/t not studied before. In other words the numerical study may not distinguish CAF and simple AF phases. We propose the schematic phase diagram as shown in Fig.1.

Continuous phase transition from SPS to CAF phase We first discuss the continuous phase transition from SPS to CAF phase. Describing an ordinary magnetic ordered phase in Schwinger-fermion approach is highly non-trivial: this is because a Schwinger-fermion mean-field ansatz has at least an unbroken Z_2 gauge symmetry and to describe a regular magnetic phase, the gauge degree of freedoms must be confined. The first demonstration of a regular magnetic-ordered phase in Schwinger-fermion approach is given in Ref. 14. It is shown that the easy-plane antiferromagnetic order (XY order) on the honeycomb lattice is described by a quantum spin Hall (QSH) band structure of the fermionic spinon along S^z direction coupled with a dynamical $U(1)$ gauge field, where \uparrow ($S^z = \frac{1}{2}$) spinon band has a Chern-number $\nu = 1$ while \downarrow ($S^z = -\frac{1}{2}$) spinon band has a Chern-number $\nu = -1$. Because of the QSH effect, the gauge fluctuation is bound to S^z spin density fluctuation, and the Goldstone mode of the easy-plane Neel order is nothing but the photon of the $U(1)$ gauge field. The long-range spin-spin correlation function in the Neel phase is dual to the long-range monopole-monopole correlation function in the Coulomb phase of the $U(1)$ gauge field. Indeed one can compute the monopole quantum number¹⁴ to show the spin order pattern is antiferromagnetic.

Armed with this result, we now consider an $SU(2)$ spin rotation symmetric system. CAF phase is described by spinon band structure in the presence of a fluctuating $O(3)$ QSH order parameter \vec{n} , coupled with a $U(1)$ gauge field. Its mean-field ansatz is: (see FIG. 3b)

$$H_{CAF}^{MF} = t_1 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{j\alpha} + t_2 \sum_{\langle\langle ij \rangle\rangle} f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{j\alpha} - \mu \sum_i f_{i\alpha}^\dagger f_{i\alpha} + \vec{n} \cdot \sum_{\langle\langle ij \rangle\rangle} i\nu_{ij} f_{i\alpha}^\dagger \vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta} f_{j\beta}, \quad (2)$$

Note that the non-vanishing t_2 term, as well as the QSH order \vec{n} , breaks the $SU(2)$ gauge symmetry down to $U(1)$.




FIG. 2: The honeycomb lattice and its Bravais lattice vector $\vec{a}_{1,2}$. $\vec{d}_{1,2,3}$ are the three vectors defined in the effective Lagrangian of z boson for the SPS-CAF phase transition. Two generators of symmetry group are also shown: 60° rotation C_6 around the center of a plaquette and the horizontal mirror reflection σ .

In the Dirac limit ($t_2, |\vec{n}| \equiv m \ll t_1$) we can write down the effective Lagrangian of CAF phase in imaginary time:

$$\mathcal{L} = \psi^\dagger \gamma_0 (\partial_\mu - ia_\mu) \gamma_\mu \psi + m \hat{n} \cdot \psi^\dagger \vec{M} \psi + \frac{1}{4g_a^2} f_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{2u} (\partial_\mu \hat{n})^2. \quad (3)$$

where ψ is a 8-component complex fermion describing the long wavelength part of f -spinon around the two Dirac points K and $K' = -K$ in the Brillouin Zone: $\psi_k \equiv (f_{K+k,A}, f_{K+k,B}, f_{K'+k,B}, f_{K'+k,A})$ and we neglect spin indices. γ_μ are Pauli matrices in the sublattice space: $\gamma_0 = \mu_3, \gamma_1 = \mu_2, \gamma_2 = -\mu_1$. $\vec{M} = \gamma_0 \vec{\sigma}$ are the QSH masses, and space/time are rescaled so that the Fermi velocity is one. Non-universal coupling u describes the fluctuation of the QSH order parameter: unit vector \hat{n} .

There are three gapless modes in CAF phase: two \hat{n} fluctuating modes and one photon mode. The photon mode is in-plane spin wave of anti-ferromagnetic order \vec{N} ($\vec{N} \perp \hat{n}$), and the spin $SU(2)$ symmetry is completely broken. The combination $C_6 \cdot \mathbf{T}$ of the 60° space rotation around the hexagon center and time-reversal \mathbf{T} leaves both order parameters invariant. This symmetry indicates that the magnetic order in CAF phase is still collinear.

Comparing Eq.(2) with Eq.(1), s-wave pairing Δ of spinons in SPS phase is replaced by the $O(3)$ QSH order \vec{n} in CAF phase. If we group these orders together into a 5-component vector $\vec{V} = (\text{Re}\Delta, \text{Im}\Delta, \vec{n})$ and ignore gauge fields for the moment, as pointed out by Grover and Senthil¹⁵, fluctuations of \vec{V} has a Wess-Zumino-Witten (WZW) term after integrating out fermions. This WZW term allows us to construct an $O(4)$ phase transition between SPS and CAF.

WZW term is a topological Berry phase in the nonlinear sigma model of $\hat{V} = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5)$ ($|\hat{V}| = 1$) in




FIG. 3: (color online) Mean-field ansatz of (a) SPS phase and (b) CAF phase in terms of f -fermion. $t_{1,2}$ are real fermion-hopping parameters, while s-wave pairing order parameter Δ can be complex. Vector \vec{n} is the QSH order parameter in the CAF phase. $\nu_{ij} = 1$ if $i \rightarrow j$ is along the arrow direction.

2+1 dimension¹⁶:

$$S_{WZW} = \frac{2\pi i}{\text{Area}(S^4)} \int_0^1 d\rho \int d^3x \epsilon_{abcde} v_a \partial_\rho v_b \partial_t v_c \partial_x v_d \partial_y v_e \quad (4)$$

where $\text{Area}(S^4) = \frac{8\pi^2}{3}$, and $\hat{V}(x, y, t, \rho)$ is a smooth extension of space-time configuration $\hat{V}(x, y, t)$ to 4-disk: $\hat{V}(x, y, t, \rho = 1) = \hat{V}(x, y, t)$ and $\hat{V}(x, y, t, \rho = 0) = \hat{V}_0$ is a fixed vector. The physical meaning of the WZW term is that a Skyrmion (anti-Skyrmion) of \hat{n} in two space dimensions actually carries fermion charge 2(-2). And the hedgehog instanton of \hat{n} in 2+1 dimension creates a charge-2 s-wave fermion pair. Due to this WZW term, as shown in Ref. 15, a direct phase transition between a QSH insulator and an s-wave superconductor on the honeycomb lattice becomes possible.

Let us keep the WZW term in mind and study the CAF to SPS phase transition. Starting from the effective theory of the CAF phase Eq.(3), it is convenient to introduce the CP^1 representation of the \hat{n} order parameter: $\hat{n} = w^\dagger \vec{\sigma} w$ where $w = (w_1, w_2)^T$ are two complex numbers satisfying $|w_1|^2 + |w_2|^2 = 1$. This representation has a $U(1)$ gauge redundancy and thus w -bosons couple to a $U(1)$ gauge field A_μ at low energy. After integrating out the f -spinon of Eq.(3) the effective Lagrangian is:

$$L = |(\partial_\mu - iA_\mu)w|^2 + r|w|^2 + s|w|^4 + \frac{1}{2g_a^2} f_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{2g_A^2} F_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{i}{\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} A_\mu \partial_\nu a_\lambda \quad (5)$$

where the constraint $|w_1|^2 + |w_2|^2 = 1$ is softened²⁹. $f_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu a_\nu - \partial_\nu a_\mu$ and $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ are the field strengths of the two gauge fields. A key observation of the present work is the mutual Chern-Simons (CS) term between A_μ and a_μ . While an explicit derivation of this term is given in Appendix A, it can be easily understood:

a Skyrmion of \hat{n} is well-known to be represented as a 2π A_μ gauge flux. Now the WZW term dictates this 2π A_μ flux to carry charge-2 of a_μ gauge field, which is exactly described by the mutual CS term.

What are the phases described by the effective Lagrangian Eq.(5)? When $r < 0$, w -boson condenses and \hat{n} is ordered, so the system is in the CAF phase. Note that in this phase the mutual Chern-Simons term does not qualitatively modify the low energy gauge dynamics: the A_μ gauge fields are gapped out due to the Higgs mechanism. Remarkably, when $r > 0$, w -bosons are gapped and \hat{n} is disordered, and the system is actually in the Z_2 SPS spin liquid phase. The $U(1)$ mutual Chern-Simons term or the WZW term is essential to make this identification. The relation between mutual CS theory and Z_2 gauge theory was firstly discussed in Ref. 17. Here, based on the WZW term and monopole physics, we are able to further identify the PSG of this Z_2 state.

In the \hat{n} disordered phase, the mutual CS term opens up mass gaps for both A_μ and a_μ gauge fluctuations¹⁷: $m_a^2 \sim g_A^2, m_A^2 \sim g_a^2$. Meanwhile, the real time (Minkowski spacetime) equations of motion (with source term $-a^\mu j_\mu - A^\mu J_\mu$) become

$$j_\mu = \frac{1}{g_a^2} \partial^\nu f_{\nu\mu} + \frac{1}{\pi} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu} \partial^\alpha A^\beta$$

$$J_\mu = \frac{1}{g_A^2} \partial^\nu F_{\nu\mu} + \frac{1}{\pi} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu} \partial^\alpha a^\beta + iw^\dagger \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu w, \quad (6)$$

where the last term is the w -boson current $i[w^\dagger(\partial_\mu - iA_\mu)w - w(\partial_\mu + iA_\mu)w^\dagger]$. These equations of motion indicate that one flux quanta of a_μ (A_μ) carries two units of A_μ (a_μ) gauge charge. And one unit of A_μ (a_μ) gauge charge in turn carries π -flux of a_μ (A_μ) gauge field. As a result, f -spinon sees the w -boson as a π -flux and vice versa. These are the two gapped fundamental excitations in a Z_2 gauge theory: gauge charge and vison, and they are dual degrees of freedom. If we define the f -spinon (w -boson) as the Z_2 gauge charge, w -boson (f -spinon) will be the vison. From the viewpoint of f -spinons, we just showed that their visons, *i.e.* w -bosons carry spin quantum number.

Now let's discuss the monopoles of a_μ and A_μ in Eq.(5). In \hat{n} ordered phase (CAF phase), where A_μ is Higgsed out, the a_μ monopole is bound with a spin flip due to the QSH effect. Therefore a_μ monopole events are suppressed in the CAF phase by spin rotation symmetry and a_μ stays in Coulomb phase. However in the \hat{n} disordered phase, there is no QSH effect and monopole events of both a_μ and A_μ are allowed. Let us denote their monopole creation operators as V_a^\dagger and V_A^\dagger respectively. What are the physical consequences of these monopole events?

By equations of motion it is shown that an a_μ monopole creates 2 units of A_μ gauge charge, and vice versa. Thus such monopole events simply mean that $f_\alpha^\dagger f_\beta^\dagger$ and $w_\alpha^\dagger w_\beta^\dagger$ pairing terms exist in the effective action. These pairing terms, or monopole events, break the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry down to Z_2 .

We should focus on one set of dual variables $f(V_A^\dagger)$ and $w(V_a^\dagger)$ to write down the effective theory. First take a look at the V_A^\dagger operator: what is the symmetry of the corresponding f -spinon pairing term? The quantum number of this monopole operator is determined by the WZW term: a Skyrmion of \hat{n} carries an s-wave pair of f -spinon. Therefore we showed that \hat{n} disordered phase is nothing but the SPS, whose mean-field ansatz is given in Eq.(1).

The phase transition from SPS to CAF phase is described by w -boson condensation in Eq.(5). But due to the topological Berry's phase, this is a rather "high-energy" description of the criticality. To find a low energy description without topological terms, we should resort to another formulation as shown in the next section.

Duality between Schwinger-fermion and Schwinger-boson representations

In this section we focus on the dual variables of f -spinons: the w -bosons. The SPS phase is then a Z_2 phase with w -bosons as Z_2 charges, but f -spinons as visons. In this formulation SPS-CAF phase transition is naturally presented as a Higgs condensation of w -bosons.

First we need to represent the order parameters of the CAF phase in terms of w . The QSH order is $\hat{n} = w^\dagger \vec{\sigma} w$, but what is the Neel order parameter? Neel order in CAF phase corresponds to the monopole of a_μ , namely a pairing of w -boson. There are two spin-1 bosonic pairing order parameters satisfying this requirement, *i.e.* the real and imaginary part of $(i\sigma_y w^*)^\dagger \vec{\sigma} w$:

$$\hat{n}_1 + i\hat{n}_2 = (i\sigma_y w^*)^\dagger_\alpha \vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta} w_\beta. \quad (7)$$

It is easy to verify that $\hat{n} = \hat{n}_1 \times \hat{n}_2$, so there are only two independent vectorial order parameters. The issue is, which one is the Neel order parameter \vec{N} : \hat{n}_1 or \hat{n}_2 ?

A $U(1)$ gauge transformation $w \rightarrow e^{i\theta} w$ generates a rotation in the \hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2 plane. By fixing a proper gauge, we can always choose \hat{n}_1 as the Neel order. We will work within this gauge $\vec{N} = \hat{n}_1$ throughout the phase transition. Such a gauge fixing breaks the $U(1)$ gauge redundancy down to Z_2 : $w \rightarrow \pm w$.

The physical symmetries of the QSH (or vector spin chirality) and the Neel order parameters completely determine the transformation rules of the w -boson up to a Z_2 gauge redundancy:

$$\begin{aligned} T_1, T_2 : & \quad \hat{n} \rightarrow \hat{n}, & \quad \vec{N} \rightarrow \vec{N}, & \quad w \rightarrow w, \\ \mathbf{T} : & \quad \hat{n} \rightarrow \hat{n}, & \quad \vec{N} \rightarrow -\vec{N}, & \quad w \rightarrow iw^*, \\ \sigma : & \quad \hat{n} \rightarrow -\hat{n}, & \quad \vec{N} \rightarrow -\vec{N}, & \quad w \rightarrow i\sigma_y w^*, \\ C_6 : & \quad \hat{n} \rightarrow \hat{n}, & \quad \vec{N} \rightarrow -\vec{N} & \quad w \rightarrow iw. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where time-reversal transformation \mathbf{T} is anti-unitary. The reason why there are no further arbitrariness on the transformation rules of w can be easily understood by the following construction. If we write w -boson as an $SU(2)$ matrix:

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 & w_2^* \\ w_2 & -w_1^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

then the most general $O(4)$ transformation leaving $|w_1|^2 + |w_2|^2 = 1$ is $U \rightarrow V_L U V_R$, where V_L and V_R are both $SU(2)$ rotations (V_L is spin rotation), and $O(4) \sim SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$. In this representation, the vectors $\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \hat{n}$ are the 1st, 2nd and 3rd columns of a 3 by 3 rotation matrix R :¹⁸

$$R^{ab} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(U^\dagger \sigma^a U \sigma^b) \quad (10)$$

Clearly, to leave R invariant, the transformations $V_{L,R}$ must be ± 1 .

These symmetry transformation rules allow us to reveal the connection between the SPS state here and the 0-flux state in the Schwinger-boson representation obtained by Wang³. In Wang's work, the Neel order is represented by the z -boson as $\vec{N} = z^\dagger \vec{\sigma} z$ in the effective theory. From Eq.(10), we can easily construct the duality transformation between the w -boson and z -boson representations: $U_w = U_z V_R$, $V_R = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_y}$, namely:

$$w = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(z - i\sigma_y z^*) \quad \text{or} \quad z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(w + i\sigma_y w^*) \quad (11)$$

Under duality transformation:

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{N} &= \text{Re}[(i\sigma_y w^*)^\dagger \vec{\sigma} w] = z^\dagger \vec{\sigma} z, \\ \hat{n} &= w^\dagger \vec{\sigma} w = -\text{Re}[(i\sigma_y z^*)^\dagger \vec{\sigma} z]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

From Eq.(8),(11), we can obtain transformation rules of z -bosons:

$$\begin{aligned} T_1, T_2 : & \quad z \rightarrow z, \\ \mathbf{T} : & \quad z \rightarrow \sigma_y z, \\ \sigma : & \quad z \rightarrow i\sigma_y z^*, \\ C_6 : & \quad z \rightarrow \sigma_y z^*, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which are exactly the transformation rules found by Wang³ for 0-flux state up to a Z_2 gauge arbitrariness. This explicitly confirms that the z -bosons constructed in Eq.(11) are the same z -bosons discussed by Wang, and the SPS phase here is identical to the 0-flux phase in Schwinger-boson description.

Following the discussion in Ref. 3, we can write down the general symmetry-allowed effective theory for the phase transition in terms of z -boson:

$$\begin{aligned} L &= |\partial_\tau z|^2 + c^2 |\nabla z|^2 + m^2 |z|^2 + u(|z|^2)^2 \\ &+ \lambda_H (i\sigma_y z^*)^\dagger \left[\sum_i (\vec{d}_i \cdot \nabla)^3 \right] z + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

For instance, the single time derivative term $z^\dagger \partial_\tau z$ is forbidden by σ , and $z^T (-i\sigma_y) \partial_\tau z$ is forbidden by C_6 . Here λ_H is the Higgs coupling which reduces the $U(1)$ gauge degrees of freedom in the z -boson formulation down to Z_2 . $\vec{d}_1 = -\vec{a}_1, \vec{d}_2 = \vec{a}_2$, and $\vec{d}_3 = \vec{a}_1 - \vec{a}_2$ as shown in FIG. 2. The Higgs coupling can also be written as a pairing of w -bosons: $\lambda_H (i\sigma_y w^*)^\dagger \left[\sum_i (\vec{d}_i \cdot \nabla)^3 \right] w + h.c.$ By naive

power counting λ_H is irrelevant, therefore we have an $O(4)$ critical point between the CAF (z -condensed) phase and the SPS (z -gapped) phase. The critical behavior of this transition is well-studied^{19–21}.

Discussion In this study, our main prediction is the CAF phase. Unlike the usual AF phase, CAF phase has two order parameters: Neel \vec{N} and QSH \hat{n} . As CAF phase is very likely to be the magnetic ordered phase adjacent to the spin liquid phase found in the Hubbard model on the honeycomb lattice, in the following we propose an explicit numerical methods to detect the CAF phase.

One can directly measure the QSH order by $\langle \vec{n}(x) \cdot \vec{n}(0) \rangle$ correlation function, or the vectorial spin chirality correlation function $\langle (\nu_{i+x, j+x} \vec{S}_{i+x} \times \vec{S}_{j+x}) \cdot (\nu_{ij} \vec{S}_i \times \vec{S}_j) \rangle$. Because QSH order is odd under $\sigma \cdot \mathbf{T}$, while pure Neel order is $\sigma \cdot \mathbf{T}$ even, one does not expect a long range correlation of QSH order in a usual AF phase. Thus the long

range QSH correlation function is an intrinsic signature of the CAF phase. In addition, one can show that the QSH direction is normal to the Neel direction. For example, one can pin the Neel order by an infinitesimal (in thermodynamic limit) staggered magnetic field along S_z direction, and then to measure the QSH order parameters by correlation function. One should find the QSH order parameters have only x, y components. In the real world, as mentioned in Ref. 2, such an exotic spin liquid may be realized in many candidate systems: *e.g.* expanded graphene-like system in group *IV* elements^{23,24}, as well as fermions in optical lattices^{25,26}.

YR thanks for helpful comments from Ashvin Vishwanath. YML thanks Prof. Ziqiang Wang for support during this work under DOE Grant DE-FG02-99ER45747. YR is supported by the startup fund at Boston College.

¹ Y.-M. Lu and Y. Ran, arXiv:1005.4229v1 (2010)

² Z. Y. Meng, T. C. Lang, S. Wessel, F. F. Assaad, and A. Muramatsu, Nature **464**, 847 (2010)

³ F. Wang, arXiv:1004.2693v2 (2010)

⁴ M. Oshikawa and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 060601 (2006)

⁵ I. Affleck and J. B. Marston, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 3774 (1988)

⁶ N. Read and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1773 (1991)

⁷ D. S. Rokhsar and S. A. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2376 (1988)

⁸ R. Moessner and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1881 (2001)

⁹ X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 016803 (2003)

¹⁰ A. Kitaev, Annals of Physics **321**, 2 (2006)

¹¹ X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 165113 (2002).

¹² I. Affleck, Z. Zou, T. Hsu, and P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 745 (1988).

¹³ C. Gros, R. Joynt, and T. M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **36**, 381 (1987).

¹⁴ Y. Ran, A. Vishwanath, and D.-H. Lee, arXiv:0806.2321v2 (2008)

¹⁵ T. Grover and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 156804 (2008)

¹⁶ A. G. Abanov and P. B. Wiegmann, Nuclear Physics B **570**, 685 (2000)

¹⁷ S.-P. Kou, M. Levin, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 155134 (2008)

¹⁸ P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, T.-K. Ng, and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 6003 (1998)

¹⁹ A. V. Chubukov, T. Senthil, and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2089 (1994)

²⁰ A. V. Chubukov, S. Sachdev, and T. Senthil, Nuclear Physics B **426**, 601 (1994), ISSN

²¹ S. V. Isakov, T. Senthil, and Y. B. Kim, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 174417 (2005)

²² L. Balents and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **55**, R11973 (1997)

²³ L. Seehofer, G. Falkenberg, and R. Johnson, Surface Science **290**, 15 (1993)

²⁴ S. Cahangirov, M. Topsakal, E. Aktürk, H. Ahin, and

S. Ciraci, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 236804 (2009)

²⁵ L.-M. Duan, E. Demler, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 090402 (2003)

²⁶ R. Jordens, N. Strohmaier, K. Gunter, H. Moritz, and T. Esslinger, Nature **455**, 204 (2008)

²⁷ A. G. Abanov and P. B. Wiegmann, Journal of High Energy Physics **2001**, 030 (2001)

²⁸ M. V. Berry, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences **392**, 45 (1984)

²⁹ The constraint can be enforced by a Lagrangian multiplier λ . Eq.(5) can be obtained by introducing the saddle point expansion of λ .

Appendix A: Derivation of the mutual Chern-Simons term

We start from the following low energy effective Lagrangian of spinon fields ψ (see Eq. 3) in imaginary time (*i.e.* Euclidean space-time):

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \bar{\psi} [i\gamma_\mu(\partial_\mu - ia_\mu) + im \hat{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma}] \psi \quad (\text{A1})$$

where we define $\bar{\psi} \equiv \psi^\dagger \gamma^0$. For simplicity let's denote $-i\mathcal{G}^{-1} = \gamma_\mu(\partial_\mu - ia_\mu) + m\hat{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$, then integrating out spinon fields ψ yield the effective action $\mathcal{S} = -\ln \det(\mathcal{G}^{-1}) = -\text{Tr} \ln(\mathcal{G}^{-1})$. Following the spirit of Abanov and Wiegmann^{16,27}, we use large- m expansion to obtain the low energy effective theory in the longwavelength limit $\omega \ll m$. By defining $\mathcal{G}_0^{-1} = i(\gamma_\mu \partial_\mu + m\hat{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma})$ we have $\mathcal{G}^{-1} = \mathcal{G}_0^{-1} + a_\mu \gamma_\mu$. Let's denote $\not{\partial} \equiv \gamma_\mu \partial_\mu$ and similarly $\not{a} \equiv \gamma_\mu a_\mu$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &= -\text{Tr} \ln(\mathcal{G}_0^{-1} + \not{a}) = -\text{Tr} \ln(\mathcal{G}_0^{-1}) - \text{Tr} \ln(1 + \mathcal{G}_0 \not{a}) \\ &= \mathcal{S}_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^l \text{Tr}(\mathcal{G}_0 \not{a})^l \end{aligned}$$

Here \mathcal{S}_0 gives the nonlinear-sigma-model dynamics $\sim (\partial_\mu \hat{n})^2$ of vector \hat{n} , while the coupling between vector \hat{n}

and gauge field a_μ is given by the 2nd term. In the large- m expansion we consider only the leading-order term:

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = -\text{Tr}(\mathcal{G}_0 \phi) = -\text{Tr} \left\{ \mathcal{G}_0^{-1} [\mathcal{G}_0^{-1} (\mathcal{G}_0^{-1})^\dagger]^{-1} \phi \right\}$$

It's straightforward to check that $\mathcal{G}_0^{-1} (\mathcal{G}_0^{-1})^\dagger = -\partial^2 + m^2 - m\vec{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\phi}\hat{n}$, therefore large- m expansion leads to

$$[\mathcal{G}_0^{-1} (\mathcal{G}_0^{-1})^\dagger]^{-1} = (-\partial^2 + m^2)^{-1} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{m\vec{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\phi}\hat{n}}{-\partial^2 + m^2} \right)^l$$

and consequently

$$\mathcal{S}_1 = -\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \text{Tr} \left\{ \frac{i(\not{\partial} + m\hat{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma})}{-\partial^2 + m^2} \left(\frac{m\vec{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\phi}\hat{n}}{-\partial^2 + m^2} \right)^l \phi \right\}$$

It turns out that $l = 0, 1$ terms both vanish and the leading-order correction to the low energy effective action is the following topological term:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{topo} &= -a_\mu \text{Tr} \left[\gamma_\mu \frac{im\hat{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma}}{-\partial^2 + m^2} \left(\frac{m\gamma_\nu (\partial_\nu \hat{n}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}}{-\partial^2 + m^2} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{i}{4\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} a_\mu \hat{n} \cdot (\partial_\nu \hat{n} \times \partial_\lambda \hat{n}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

Notice that in the CP^1 parametrization of order parameter $\hat{n} = w^\dagger \sigma w$, spinor w is the eigenvector of $\hat{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$ whose spin orientation is along unit vector \hat{n} . Therefore the Skyrmion current of \hat{n}

$$J_\mu^{Sk} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{4\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} \hat{n} \cdot (\partial_\nu \hat{n} \times \partial_\lambda \hat{n}) \quad (\text{A3})$$

which equals half the winding number of \hat{n} wrapping around S^2 , is nothing but the Berry's phase²⁸ for spinor w . Since spinor w obtains π phase (*i.e.* a minus sign) as \hat{n} wraps around S^2 once (*i.e.* \hat{n} covers 4π solid angle), this gives a direct correspondence between the Skyrmion current density and the $U(1)$ gauge field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ coupled to w :

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} \hat{n} \cdot (\partial_\nu \hat{n} \times \partial_\lambda \hat{n}) = \frac{1}{\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} \partial_\nu A_\lambda \quad (\text{A4})$$

Therefore the topological term (A2) is exactly the mutual Chern-Simons term mentioned in (5)

$$\mathcal{S}_{topo} = \frac{i}{\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} a_\mu \partial_\nu A_\lambda$$