

Long range order and symmetry breaking in Projected Entangled Pair State models

Manuel Rispler, Kasper Duivenvoorden, and Norbert Schuch

JARA Institute for Quantum Information, RWTH Aachen University, D-52056 Aachen, Germany

Projected Entangled Pair States (PEPS) provide a framework for the construction of models where a single tensor gives rise to both Hamiltonian and ground state wavefunction on the same footing. A key problem is to characterize the behavior which emerges in the system in terms of the properties of the tensor, and thus of the Hamiltonian. In this paper, we consider PEPS models with \mathbb{Z}_2 on-site symmetry and study the occurrence of long-range order and spontaneous symmetry breaking. We show how long-range order is connected to a degeneracy in the spectrum of the PEPS transfer operator, and how the latter gives rise to spontaneous symmetry breaking under perturbations. We provide a succinct characterization of the symmetry broken states in terms of the PEPS tensor, and find that using the symmetry broken states we can derive a local entanglement Hamiltonian, thereby restoring locality of the entanglement Hamiltonian for all gapped phases.

I. INTRODUCTION

Correlated quantum many-body systems exhibit a wide range of unconventional phenomena. Their rich physics emerges from the intricate entanglement structure of those systems, which however at the same time renders their theoretical study a challenging task. Some of the most important insights into the physics of those systems have thus been obtained through wavefunction ansatzes, such as the BCS or the Laughlin state. In recent years, ideas from quantum information have led to classes of ansatz wavefunctions constructed to capture the entanglement structure present in interacting quantum systems [1–6]. In particular, Projected Entangled Pair States (PEPS) [2] describe correlated many-body systems by associating a local tensor to each site which builds up the entanglement in the wavefunction through auxiliary indices. PEPS provide a faithful approximation for low-energy states of systems with local interactions [7, 8], making them the basis of powerful variational algorithms [9, 10]. At the same time, they form a framework for the construction of models: From the local tensor, one can construct parent Hamiltonians which inherit its symmetry structure and have a global wavefunction built from the tensor as their ground state [11, 12]. Thus, they can be used to construct “PEPS models” (Fig. 1a), where the physics is encoded in a tensor A which gives rise to a local Hamiltonian H and a ground state wavefunction $|\psi\rangle$ on the same footing, forming a versatile framework for the study of correlated quantum systems [13–21]. Within this framework, the key problem is to understand how the local properties of the tensor (and thus the Hamiltonian) determine the global properties, i.e., quantum order, of the wavefunction.

In the last years, considerable progress has been made in the study of topological order [22] in PEPS models: It has been understood how topological order is related to the structure of the local tensor, and how this allows to construct *all* topological ground states from a *single* tensor [12, 23, 24]. More recently, the mechanism behind topological phase transitions within this framework has been clarified [25], and it has been found that it can be

related to symmetry breaking in the so-called transfer operator [26]. Finally, PEPS models have also been shown to provide a natural framework to study the entanglement properties of correlated quantum systems through entanglement Hamiltonians [27] associated to the boundary of the system [28].

The aim of this paper is to initiate the development of an analogous framework for studying conventional long-range order and spontaneous symmetry breaking within PEPS models, thereby complementing the understanding of topological phases. We consider PEPS models where the local tensor carries a \mathbb{Z}_2 on-site symmetry, and investigate *i)* under which conditions long-range order emerges, and *ii)* how the different symmetry broken states can be described in terms of the single PEPS tensor. We first show that long-range order originates in a degeneracy of the transfer operator, and how the latter in turn leads to spontaneous breaking of the symmetry under fluctuations. We subsequently characterize the symmetry broken states in terms of the PEPS tensor, and show that they correspond to the extreme points of the degenerate fixed point space of the transfer operator. We demonstrate that the symmetry broken PEPS wavefunctions can be used to determine the spontaneous magnetization, and that they give rise to a local entanglement Hamiltonian, in contrast to previous findings [28], which establishes that all gapped phases can be assigned a short-ranged entanglement Hamiltonian.




FIG. 1. (a) PEPS models use a tensor A to provide a description of a wavefunction $|\psi\rangle$ and an associated parent Hamiltonian H on the same footing. (b) Properties of the tensor such as on-site symmetries are inherited by H . (c) The transfer operator \mathbb{T} encodes all correlations of the wavefunction.

II. PROJECTED ENTANGLED PAIR STATE MODELS

Let us start by introducing PEPS. W.l.o.g., we restrict to a square lattice with $N_h \times N_v$ sites. A PEPS model is described by a 5-index tensor $A_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^i$, $i = 0, \dots, d-1$, $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta = 0, \dots, D-1$, with d the physical dimension at each site and D the *bond dimension*. The PEPS wavefunction $|\Psi\rangle = \sum c_{i_1 \dots i_N} |i_1, \dots, i_N\rangle$ is obtained by arranging the tensors on the lattice and contracting the *virtual indices* α, \dots, δ of adjacent tensors as indicated by lines in Fig. 1a, yielding $c_{i_1 \dots i_N}$. We will consider systems on a long cylinder (or torus) of circumference N_v , such that the dependence on the boundaries becomes negligible.

To any PEPS, one can construct so-called *parent Hamiltonians* which have the corresponding PEPS as its ground state. Parent Hamiltonians ensure that the wavefunction on a small (e.g., 2×2) patch looks correct, i.e., as being built from the tensor A , which is e.g. accomplished by a projector onto the span of the tensors on that patch; under generic conditions, these Hamiltonians have a unique finite-volume ground state [11]. By blocking all N_v tensors in a column, a PEPS can equally be considered as a quasi-1D tensor network (a Matrix Product State, MPS) with tensors B^i and bond dimension D^{N_v} . In MPS, a central role is played by the transfer operator $\mathbb{T} = \sum_i B^i \otimes \bar{B}^i$; in particular, \mathbb{T}^ℓ appears in correlation functions at distance ℓ , whose decay is therefore governed by the spectrum of \mathbb{T} . For PEPS, \mathbb{T} has itself a 1D structure, cf. Fig. 1c. This leads to a more complex behavior, since in the thermodynamic limit the system grows simultaneously in both directions, and thus, the dimension of the space on which \mathbb{T} acts grows exponentially with the system size.

Let us now turn towards systems with on-site symmetries. In PEPS models, symmetries are encoded locally in the tensor: A symmetry action u_g on the physical level translates to an action U_g on the virtual system in a way where it cancels out when contracting tensors, see Fig. 1c, giving rise to an invariant wavefunction $|\Psi\rangle = U_g^{\otimes N} |\Psi\rangle$ [29]. This induces a symmetry $[\mathbb{T}, U_g^{\otimes N_v} \otimes \bar{U}_g^{\otimes N_v}] = 0$ of \mathbb{T} , which is therefore block-diagonal in a basis of irreducible representations (irreps) of U_g . At the same time, the parent Hamiltonian H enjoys by construction the same symmetry, i.e., we obtain a PEPS model with symmetry $[H, u_g^{\otimes N}] = 0$. An instructive example is the ‘‘Ising PEPS’’ [30] with $A = |0\rangle\langle\theta, \theta, \theta, \theta| + |1\rangle\langle\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta}|$, where the ket (bra) corresponds to the physical (virtual) indices, and $|\theta\rangle = \cos\theta|0\rangle + \sin\theta|1\rangle$, $|\bar{\theta}\rangle = \sin\theta|0\rangle + \cos\theta|1\rangle$. This model has a \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry with non-trivial action $u_1 = U_1 = X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The wavefunction is of the form

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_N} e^{-\beta/2 H_{\text{cl}}(i_1, \dots, i_N)} |i_1, \dots, i_N\rangle$$

with H_{cl} the classical 2D Ising model; it thus has the same σ_z correlation functions and therefore undergoes a

second-order phase transition at

$$\theta_c = \frac{1}{2} \arcsin \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\sqrt{2}}} \right] \approx 0.349596. \quad (1)$$

III. LONG-RANGE ORDER AND SPONTANEOUS SYMMETRY BREAKING

As we have seen, PEPS form a natural framework to model systems with on-site symmetries: By encoding the symmetry locally into the tensor, we obtain a local Hamiltonian with the same symmetry which depends smoothly on the parameters of the tensor, and whose ground state wavefunction can be constructed from the very same tensor. However, we have also found that by changing parameters, such a model can undergo a phase transition to a symmetry broken phase. Nevertheless, the PEPS wavefunction $|\Psi\rangle$, which is the unique ground state of the system, remains invariant under the symmetry throughout the phase diagram, $|\Psi\rangle = u_g^{\otimes N} |\Psi\rangle$; e.g., for the Ising PEPS at zero temperature ($\theta = 0$), we have $|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0 \dots 0\rangle + |1 \dots 1\rangle)$. This leads to the central question of this work: How can we characterize symmetry breaking in PEPS models, and how can we construct the distinct symmetry broken states starting from a single *symmetric* tensor A ?

Let us for a moment leave aside PEPS models and consider the analogous question for general Hamiltonians with a symmetry: Generically, these systems have a unique finite volume ground state which therefore carries the full symmetry of the Hamiltonian. Since the average magnetization $\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_i Z_i \rangle$ in those states is zero, the ordered phase is characterized through non-vanishing long-range order $\langle \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j} Z_i Z_j \rangle \sim \text{const}$. In order to obtain the symmetry broken states, one couples the system to a small external field $H' = H + h \sum_i Z_i$ and considers the ground state $|\Psi_{N,h}\rangle$, taking first the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ and subsequently $h \rightarrow 0$; if in the limit $\langle \frac{1}{N} \sum_i Z_i \rangle \neq 0$, one says that the system exhibits spontaneous symmetry breaking.

How are these two notions of long-range order and spontaneous symmetry breaking related, and can one construct an approximate symmetry broken state for a finite system? Given a unique finite-volume ground state with long-range order such as $|\Psi\rangle \approx |0 \dots 0\rangle + |1 \dots 1\rangle$ and order parameter Z , one can construct an orthogonal state $|\Phi\rangle \propto \sum_i Z_i |\Psi\rangle$ whose energy approaches the ground state as $N \rightarrow \infty$ [31]. A generic local perturbation will select a unique ground state from the space spanned by $|\Psi\rangle$ and $|\Phi\rangle$, assuming a gap above. In fact, it can be proven that the only states which do not exhibit long-range order for any observable O with $\langle O \rangle = 0$, i.e., which are stable under arbitrary perturbations and thus form the symmetry broken states, are $|\Psi\rangle \pm |\Phi\rangle$ [32]; this is, the symmetry broken states can be constructed from the symmetric ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ alone. It is straightforward to see from this argument that the value of the long-range order is just the spontaneous magnetization

squared. It should be pointed out, however, that the above argument relies on the validity of the perturbative treatment which cannot be justified rigorously in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, as the *total* perturbation diverges, and in fact, the equality between the two notions of symmetry breaking and the values of the corresponding order parameters has not been proven rigorously except for very few cases such as the Ising model [33].

In the following, we will follow a very similar reasoning in order to relate long-range order and spontaneous symmetry breaking in PEPS, and in particular to show how to construct the set of symmetry-broken states (i.e., those which are stable under arbitrary local perturbations) starting from a single object, namely the unique symmetric PEPS wavefunction $|\Psi\rangle$ and its associated symmetric tensor A . Here, a central role will be played by the one-dimensional transfer operator and in particular its spectral properties and eigenstates, partly taking the role of the Hamiltonian in the preceding discussion. We will start by showing that long-range order in the wavefunction is closely related to an approximate degeneracy in the spectrum of the transfer operator. Subsequently, we study the behavior of the transfer operator under perturbations, and we show that *arbitrary* perturbations induce a splitting of the degenerate subspace in a *fixed* basis—independent of the perturbation—which therefore describes the symmetry broken states of the model.

In the following discussion, we will restrict to the symmetry group \mathbb{Z}_2 , and denote the physical (virtual) symmetry action by x (X).

A. Long-range order and the spectrum of the transfer operator

Let us first see how long-range order in a PEPS model with \mathbb{Z}_2 on-site symmetry is related to the properties of the underlying tensor and in particular the transfer operator. We start by defining long-range order (in analogy to Ref. [32]): We say that $|\Psi\rangle$ has long-range order if there exists a local operator $Z = Z^\dagger$ with $Zx = -xZ$ and $\|Z\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$ (the *order parameter*), and $c > 0$ s.th. for sufficiently large N_v ,

$$\lim_{N_h \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_h N_v^2} \sum_{m,n} \langle \Psi | Z_m Z_n | \Psi \rangle \geq c N_v \quad (2)$$

where the sum runs over all sites—i.e., on an infinite cylinder, the spins are correlated at least over a distance proportional to the circumference. [Away from fixed point wavefunctions, we indeed cannot expect correlations along the cylinder over arbitrary distances; on the other hand, e.g. in the Ising PEPS correlations only break down after a distance $\exp(cN_v)$.] Note that Z can depend on the lattice site, such as in the case of an anti-ferromagnet. In such a case, we will also have to restrict the possible values of N_v accordingly, e.g. to even numbers (or we have to block tensors), and we will tacitly

assume this in the following. (Corresponding restrictions on N_h will not be necessary in the limit $N_h \rightarrow \infty$ away from fixed point wavefunctions.)

In 1D, i.e., MPS, long-range order is in one-to-one correspondence with a degeneracy of the transfer operator \mathbb{T} —roughly speaking, the only way to build long-range correlations over arbitrary distances using the constant virtual dimension is an exact degeneracy of the leading eigenvalue of \mathbb{T} . In 2D, however, the situation is much less clear due to the exponentially growing dimension of the virtual space on which \mathbb{T} acts. However, as we will show, under certain conditions Eq. (2) still implies the existence of an almost degenerate second eigenvalue. To this end, define a “dressed” transfer operator \mathbb{T}_{Z_s} , where we insert Z on the physical index at position $s = 1, \dots, N_v$, and correspondingly $\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} = \frac{1}{N_v} \sum_{s=1}^{N_v} \mathbb{T}_{Z_s}$; such operators arise in expectation values such as Eq. (2). Assume that \mathbb{T} is diagonalizable, $\mathbb{T} = \sum \lambda_i |r_i\rangle \langle l_i|$ with $\langle l_i | r_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$. Here, we use $|\cdot\rangle$ to denote (eigen-)vectors on the level of the transfer operator, i.e., on the virtual indices; due to the ket-bra structure of the transfer operator, these vectors can themselves be regarded as operators, in which case we will write them without brackets. Since $[\mathbb{T}, X^{\otimes N_v} \otimes X^{\otimes N_v}] = 0$, the eigenvectors of \mathbb{T} transform even or odd under the symmetry (i.e., as different irreps), and we will denote the largest eigenvalue in the even (odd) symmetry sector by λ_+ (λ_-), with corresponding eigenvectors $|r_\pm\rangle \langle l_\pm|$. We thus have that $(X^{\otimes N_v} \otimes X^{\otimes N_v})|r_\pm\rangle = \pm|r_\pm\rangle$, or (if interpreting the eigenvectors as operators)

$$X^{\otimes N_v} r_\pm X^{\otimes N_v} = \pm r_\pm . \quad (3)$$

Note that this implies that r_- cannot be positive semidefinite, and since \mathbb{T} must have a positive semidefinite fixed point (as it is a completely positive map), it follows that $|\lambda_+| \geq |\lambda_-|$.

Our goal is to show that λ_+ and λ_- , as a function of N_v , become degenerate as $N_v \rightarrow \infty$. We can thus assume that $|\lambda_-| < |\lambda_+|$ (otherwise there is nothing to show). We will additionally restrict to the case where the largest eigenvalue λ_+ is non-degenerate also within the even parity sector, since an exact degeneracy at *finite* N_v hints an additional symmetry in the wavefunction which we would have to incorporate for a full description. This implies $\lambda_+ > 0$ [34, 35] and we can w.l.o.g. normalize our tensors such that $\lambda_+ = 1$. We can now re-express Eq. (2) as

$$cN_v \leq \lim_{N_h \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{p=0}^{N_h-2} \frac{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}}^p \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}}^p \mathbb{T}^{N_h-p-2}]}{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}]} + 1 , \quad (4)$$

where the additive term $+1$ stems from the case where both Z 's are in the same column, and using $\|Z\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$. In order to simplify the r.h.s., we split the sum at $p = N_h/2 - 1$ and use cyclicity of the trace, together with

$p \leftrightarrow N_h - p - 2$, to obtain two identical sums,

$$cN_v \leq \lim_{N_h \rightarrow \infty} 2 \sum_{p=0}^{N_h/2-1} \frac{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^{N_h-p-2}]}{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}]} + 1.$$

(If N_h is even, the term $p = N_h/2 - 1$ appears only once, but this bears no relevance.) Since the largest eigenvalue of \mathbb{T} is non-degenerate, we have that

$$\|\mathbb{T}^M - |r_+\rangle\langle l_+|\|_{\text{tr}} \leq c\Gamma^M, \quad (5)$$

where $\Gamma < 1$ upper bounds the second largest eigenvalue of \mathbb{T} [36]. (Note though that c can heavily depend on N_v and properties of \mathbb{T} .) Using a sequence of triangle inequalities and taking the limit $N_h \rightarrow \infty$ (see Appendix for details), we can then replace $\mathbb{T}^{N_h} \rightarrow |r_+\rangle\langle l_+|$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} cN_v &\leq 2 \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \text{tr} [\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_+\rangle\langle l_+|] + 1 \\ &= 2 \sum_i \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \lambda_i^p \underbrace{(\langle l_+ | \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_i\rangle \langle l_i | \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_+\rangle)}_{=: m_i} + 1, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where in the last step, we have expanded \mathbb{T} in its eigenbasis.

As $\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}}$ anticommutes with the symmetry, $\langle l_+ | \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_i\rangle = 0$ for eigenvectors $|r_i\rangle$ from the even sector. Thus, only eigenvectors from the odd sector contribute to the sum. For those eigenvectors, $|\lambda_i| \leq |\lambda_-|$, and therefore

$$\left| \sum_p \lambda_i^p m_i \right| \leq \frac{1}{1 - |\lambda_i|} |m_i| \leq \frac{1}{1 - |\lambda_-|} |m_i|.$$

If now $m_i \geq 0$, we have $\sum_i |m_i| = \langle l_+ | \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_+\rangle \leq 1$ (since $\|Z\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$) and thus

$$cN_v \leq \frac{2}{1 - |\lambda_-|} + 1,$$

i.e., $|\lambda_-| \geq 1 - O(1/N_v)$: We find that long-range order implies that the gap of \mathbb{T} closes in the thermodynamic limit at least as $1/N_v$. The required condition $m_i \geq 0$ is automatically satisfied if \mathbb{T} and $\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}}$ are hermitian, which in particular holds if the tensor and thus the PEPS model is invariant under combined reflection and time reversal, but turns out to be true also for a range of other models [37].

We thus find that under certain conditions, long-range order implies that the transfer operator has approximately degenerate eigenvalues $\lambda_+ \approx \lambda_-$ in the even and odd sector, together with non-vanishing matrix elements $\langle l_{\pm} | \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_{\mp}\rangle$. Conversely, an approximately degenerate eigenvalue in the odd sector, together with non-vanishing matrix elements, will clearly give rise to long-range order.

B. Spontaneous symmetry breaking

Let us now investigate spontaneous symmetry breaking in PEPS models with long-range order, and in particular how to construct the symmetry broken states. The symmetry broken states are those states which remain ground states under generic perturbations, where for a given perturbation, we first need to take the thermodynamic limit and subsequently take the strength of the perturbation to zero. In the context of PEPS models, the natural perturbations to consider are perturbations of the tensor which can be realized by acting solely on the physical index, $A_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^i \rightarrow \sum (\mathbb{1} + \Lambda)_{ij} A_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^j$ with $\|\Lambda\| \ll 1$, as these both correspond to small perturbations of the parent Hamiltonian and leave us in the PEPS manifold [38]. Such a perturbation gives in turn rise to a perturbation of the transfer operator, $\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{[\Lambda]}$, and thus the symmetry broken states will exactly correspond to boundary conditions given by the stable fixed points of $\mathbb{T}_{[\Lambda]}$ in the appropriate limit.

1. Hermitian transfer operator

How will the transfer operator of a system with long-range order respond to such perturbations? To this end, consider the limit $N_v \rightarrow \infty$ where $\lambda_-/\lambda_+ \rightarrow 1$, and let us assume that \mathbb{T} has a gap below the two degenerate eigenvalues, $\mathbb{T} = |r_+\rangle\langle l_+| + |r_-\rangle\langle l_-| + \dots$. A sufficiently small perturbation will then induce a splitting within this subspace without mixing it with lower-lying eigenvectors; the basis in which this splitting occurs is independent of the strength of Λ and thus leaves us with a single fixed point $\mathbb{T}_{[\Lambda]}^{N_h} \sim |r_{\uparrow}\rangle\langle l_{\uparrow}|$ in the limit $N_h \rightarrow \infty$, even if later $\|\Lambda\| \rightarrow 0$. This fixed point is therefore the boundary condition for the symmetry broken state under perturbation Λ .

Naively, one might expect that the symmetry broken fixed point sensitively depends on the exact form of the perturbation chosen. However, as we will show in the following, the symmetry broken fixed point $|r_{\uparrow}\rangle\langle l_{\uparrow}|$ is independent of Λ . We will first consider the case of a hermitian transfer operator, i.e., $\langle r_i | = \langle l_i |$ and $\langle r_i | r_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$, and a hermiticity-preserving perturbation. A generic such perturbation to \mathbb{T} will induce a splitting of the two degenerate eigenvalues in an orthogonal basis

$$\begin{aligned} |r_{\uparrow}\rangle &\propto |r_+\rangle + \gamma |r_-\rangle \\ |r_{\downarrow}\rangle &\propto |r_+\rangle - \frac{1}{\gamma^*} |r_-\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since $r_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ are non-degenerate eigenvectors of $\mathbb{T}_{[\Lambda]}$, which is a completely positive (CP) map, they must be hermitian, and thus $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\mathbb{T}_{[\Lambda]}$ is a completely positive map, its leading (non-degenerate) eigenvector must be a positive operator,

$$r_{\uparrow} \propto r_+ + \gamma r_- \geq 0. \quad (7)$$

Using Eq. (3) and the fact that conjugation preserves positivity, we find that also

$$r_+ - \gamma r_- = X^{\otimes N_v} (r_+ + \gamma r_-) X^{\otimes N_v} \geq 0. \quad (8)$$

Since for a pair of positive operators $P, Q \geq 0$, it holds that $\text{tr}[PQ] \geq 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \text{tr}[(r_+ + \gamma r_-)(r_+ - \gamma r_-)] \\ &= (r_+ | r_+) - \gamma^2 (r_- | r_-), \end{aligned}$$

and thus $|\gamma| \leq 1$. By changing the sign of Λ , we can exchange the two leading eigenvectors, i.e., $|r_\downarrow\rangle$ becomes the leading eigenvector, and thus $r_\downarrow \geq 0$. Following the same line of reasoning as before, this yields $|\gamma| \geq 1$, and thus, $\gamma = \pm 1$. We thus find that regardless of the perturbation, the transfer operator always acquires the same pair of fixed points

$$|r_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle \propto |r_+\rangle \pm |r_-\rangle,$$

solely as a consequence of its complete positivity. Note that $r_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ are the extremal positive states $r_+ + \gamma r_- \geq 0$, i.e., the stable symmetry broken states are those where the symmetry is maximally broken, as intuitively expected.

2. Non-hermitian transfer operator

Let us now consider the non-hermitian case. Since $(r_+)(l_+ | + |r_-\rangle(l_- | = |r_+\rangle(l_\uparrow | + |r_\downarrow\rangle(l_\downarrow |)$, it follows that

$$|r_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle \propto |r_+\rangle \pm \lambda |r_-\rangle \text{ and } (l_{\uparrow\downarrow} | \propto (l_+ | \pm \frac{1}{\lambda} (l_- |$$

where hermiticity of the eigenvectors implies $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and we w.l.o.g. choose $\lambda > 0$. Again, complete positivity of $\mathbb{T}_{[\Lambda]}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{[\Lambda]}^\dagger$, together with the possibility to change the ordering of eigenvectors by changing the sign of Λ , implies that $r_{\uparrow\downarrow}, l_{\uparrow\downarrow} \geq 0$. To determine λ , consider

$$\mathcal{S} := \text{supp } r_+ \equiv (\ker r_+)^{\perp}, \quad (9)$$

and let $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}}$ be the orthogonal projector onto \mathcal{S} . Complete positivity of \mathbb{T} implies that $\text{supp } r_- \subset \mathcal{S}$ [39], and therefore $\text{supp } r_{\uparrow\downarrow} \subset \mathcal{S}$, i.e., $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} r_{\uparrow\downarrow} \Pi_{\mathcal{S}} = r_{\uparrow\downarrow}$. Define

$$\tilde{l}_{\uparrow\downarrow} = \Pi_{\mathcal{S}} l_{\uparrow\downarrow} \Pi_{\mathcal{S}} \geq 0;$$

since $(\tilde{l}_{\uparrow\downarrow} | r_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle) = \text{tr}[\tilde{l}_{\uparrow\downarrow}^\dagger r_{\uparrow\downarrow}] = \text{tr}[\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} l_{\uparrow\downarrow}^\dagger \Pi_{\mathcal{S}} r_{\uparrow\downarrow}] = \text{tr}[l_{\uparrow\downarrow}^\dagger r_{\uparrow\downarrow}] = (l_{\uparrow\downarrow} | r_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle) = 1$, we have that

$$\tilde{l}_{\uparrow\downarrow} \neq 0. \quad (10)$$

As $r_{\uparrow\downarrow} = r_+ \pm \lambda r_-$, and $r_+ \geq 0$, $\lambda \geq 0$, it follows that $\ker r_{\uparrow\downarrow} \cap \mathcal{S}$ ($\ker r_{\downarrow} \cap \mathcal{S}$) is contained in the negative (positive) eigenspace of r_- , which implies that

$$(\ker r_{\uparrow\downarrow} \cap \mathcal{S}) \perp (\ker r_{\downarrow} \cap \mathcal{S}). \quad (11)$$

Moreover, since $\text{tr}[\tilde{l}_{\uparrow\downarrow} r_{\uparrow\downarrow}] = \text{tr}[l_{\uparrow\downarrow} r_{\uparrow\downarrow}] = (l_{\uparrow\downarrow} | r_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle) = 0$, we have $\text{supp } \tilde{l}_{\uparrow\downarrow} \subset \ker r_{\uparrow\downarrow}$, and thus

$$\text{supp } \tilde{l}_{\uparrow\downarrow} \subset \ker r_{\uparrow\downarrow} \cap \mathcal{S} \quad (12)$$

(as $\text{supp } \tilde{l}_{\uparrow\downarrow} \subset \mathcal{S}$). Eq. (12) has two implications: First, together with Eq. (10), $\tilde{l}_{\uparrow\downarrow} \neq 0$, it shows that $\ker r_{\uparrow\downarrow} \cap \mathcal{S} \neq 0$. Since $\mathcal{S} = \text{supp } r_+$ [Eq. (9)], this implies that $r_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ are again the extremal points of the positive cone $r_+ + \lambda r_- \geq 0$. Second, by combining Eq. (12) with Eq. (11), we find that $\text{supp } \tilde{l}_{\uparrow} \perp \text{supp } \tilde{l}_{\downarrow}$, and thus

$$0 = \text{tr}[\tilde{l}_{\uparrow} \tilde{l}_{\downarrow}] = \text{tr}[\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} (l_+ + \lambda l_-) \Pi_{\mathcal{S}} (l_+ - \lambda l_-)],$$

which allows us to determine the corresponding value of λ as $\lambda = [\text{tr}[(\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} l_+)^2] / \text{tr}[(\Pi_{\mathcal{S}} l_-)^2]]^{1/2}$. Together, this proves that also in the non-hermitian case, the fixed points of the transfer operator under perturbations, i.e., the symmetry broken states, are uniquely determined independent of Λ , and correspond to the extremal symmetry-broken states.

IV. NUMERICAL STUDY AND ENTANGLEMENT HAMILTONIANS

Having understood the structure of the symmetry broken states in the thermodynamic limit, let us now investigate the accuracy of our result for finite systems, and use our findings to re-examine the entanglement spectra and Hamiltonians of models with symmetry breaking.

To this end, we have performed numerical simulations for two models. First, we have considered the Ising PEPS introduced in Sec. II. As its transfer operator is isometric to the transfer operator of the 2D classical Ising model and it exhibits the same σ_z correlation functions, it allows us to benchmark our numerical findings against exact results.

As a second model, we have studied the square lattice AKLT model with nematic field [28]. The AKLT model [14] is constructed by placing spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ singlets on the links and subsequently projecting them onto the spin 2 subspace, i.e., A is of the form $\Pi_{S=2}(\mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)$, where $\Pi_{S=2}$ projects onto the spin-2 space; the model can be mapped to a ferromagnetic model through a sublattice rotation. Subsequently, a ‘‘nematic field’’ $A \rightarrow \sum N_{ij} A_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}^j$, $N = \exp(\alpha S_z^2)$ favoring large values of S_z^2 is applied to the AKLT tensor which yields a model with $U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry and eventually leads to breaking of the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry [28].

In all cases, the simulations have been carried out through an exact diagonalization of the transfer operator (cf., e.g., Ref. [40]), where the transfer operator \mathbb{T} is applied to a vector by sequential contraction of indices rather than by building its matrix representation. Thus, the largest objects which need to be stored are on the order of the size of an eigenvector, D^{2N_v} , rather than that of the transfer operator, D^{4N_v} ; at the same time,




FIG. 2. Numerical results for the Ising PEPS. (a,b) Error analysis for $\Lambda = \epsilon Z$, $\theta = \pi/16$: a) Scaling of the error $\delta = 1 - |(f|g)|^2$ between the fixed point of $\mathbb{T}_{[\Lambda]}$, $|f\rangle$, and of its projection onto $|r_{\pm}\rangle$, $|g\rangle$; we find $\delta/N_v \sim \epsilon^2$. (The data for different N_v almost exactly coincide.) b) The deviation of $\omega = |(r_-|g)/(r_+|g)|^2$ from 1 vanishes exponentially in N_v . (c) Magnetization, computed from the symmetry broken states $|r_+\rangle + |r_-\rangle$, for $N_v = 4, \dots, 12$ (blue), extrapolated curve (red), and exact solution from the correspondence to the classical 2D Ising model (dashed green).

one obtains results with machine precision, allowing for an accurate scaling.

A. Error scaling

Our derivation involved a number of assumptions, in particular neglecting the coupling to eigenstates other than $|r_{\pm}\rangle$ in second and higher order perturbation theory even in the limit $N_v \rightarrow \infty$, and neglecting the splitting between λ_{\pm} [41]. In order to assess the validity of neglecting the coupling to the other levels, we have compared the fixed point $|f\rangle$ of the perturbed transfer operator $\mathbb{T}_{[\Lambda]}$, with Λ a general perturbation, to the fixed point $|g\rangle$ obtained after projecting $\mathbb{T}_{[\Lambda]}$ onto $|r_{\pm}\rangle$ and $|l_{\pm}\rangle$. Fig. 2a shows the result for the Ising PEPS, where we find that the error $\delta = 1 - |(f|g)|^2$ scales as $\delta \sim N_v \|\Lambda\|^2$. This scaling is consistent with a second order perturbation treatment, where one assumes that the local perturbation Λ has only a local effect on $|r_{\pm}\rangle$, and thus can only be undone by a term in its vicinity, leading to $O(N_v)$ contributions, rather than $O(N_v^2)$, of amplitude $\|\Lambda\|^2$ each. The same behavior is found for the nematical AKLT model, cf. Fig. 3a. We have subsequently also verified the validity of neglecting the splitting between λ_{\pm} : Fig. 2b shows that the exact solution for the two-dimensional degenerate subspace, $|g\rangle$, in turn converges exponentially to $|r_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle$ as $N_v \rightarrow \infty$, consistent with an exponentially vanishing splitting $1 - \lambda_-/\lambda_+$.

B. Magnetization

The knowledge of the boundary conditions $|r_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle$ and $|l_{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle$ of the symmetry broken states allows us to com-




FIG. 3. Nematic AKLT model. (a) Error analysis, cf. Fig. 2b. (b) Critical exponents for the correlation length, determined as $\xi_{\text{gap}} = -1/\ln(\lambda_-/\lambda_+)$ in the disordered phase and $\xi_{\text{mag}} \equiv \xi(\theta)$ from the magnetization fit (cf. Fig. 2c) in the symmetry-broken phase. (c) Magnetization m for $N_v = 4, \dots, 12$ and extrapolated value (cf. Fig. 2c); the inset shows the critical exponent of m .

pute the approximate spontaneous magnetization for finite N_v . For the Ising PEPS, we find that the finite N_v data reproduces the analytic expression for the infinite system very well away from the critical point, with the error vanishing exponentially in both N_v and the distance from the critical point; this is consistent with the expectation that the error should vanish as $e^{-N_v/\xi}$ with ξ the correlation length. On the other hand, there are strong finite size effects as we approach the critical point, as shown in Fig. 2c; indeed, it is natural to expect that finite size effects will dominate as soon as $\xi \sim N_v$. Nevertheless, it is still possible to accurately extrapolate the magnetization curve to the thermodynamic limit even very close to the critical point. To this end, we first determine the behavior of the correlation length in the proximity of the critical point by fitting $m_{\theta}(N_v) = a + b \exp(-N_v/\xi_{\theta})$ as a function of N_v , and subsequently fitting $1/\xi_{\theta}$ quadratically (shown in the inset; note that this makes an implicit assumption about the critical exponent of ξ); the critical point from the fit is $\theta_{c,\xi} \approx 0.349666$, as compared to the exact value $\theta_{c,\text{ex}} \approx 0.349596$. The resulting fitting function $\xi'(\theta)$ is then used in the scaling ansatz $m_{\theta}(N_v) = m_{\theta}(\infty) + f N_v^{-g} \exp[-N_v/\xi'(\theta)]$, where the algebraic factor N_v^{-g} accounts for short-range effects [42]. Altogether, this extrapolation yields a very accurate approximation to the analytical curve even in the regime very close to the critical point where finite size effects seemingly dominate, as shown in Fig. 2c.

We have subsequently applied the same analysis to determine the magnetization curve of the nematic AKLT model. The data for $N_v = 4, \dots, 12$ and the extrapolated magnetization curve are shown in Fig. 3c, and we find a value of $\alpha_c \approx 0.0447$ for the critical point. Using this value of α_c , we have subsequently studied the critical scaling of the model. Fig. 3b shows the critical scaling of two different correlation lengths— ξ_{mag} , ob-




FIG. 4. Interaction strength vs. interaction range of H_{ent} [28] for (a) the Ising PEPS ($\theta = 0.19, 0.23, \dots, 0.51$) and (b) the nematic AKLT model ($\alpha = 0, 0.01, \dots, 0.1$), where blue=trivial phase, green=symmetry broken phase, and red=critical point. The insets show H_{ent} computed from σ_+ , where the interaction becomes long-ranged after the phase transition. The main panels show H_{ent} derived from the symmetry broken states (gray lines indicate the data from σ_+), and we find that in both cases, H_{ent} becomes more local again after the phase transition.

tained by fitting the magnetization as a function of N_v as $m(N_v) = a + b \exp(-N_v/\xi_{\text{mag}})$, and ξ_{gap} , obtained by an exponential fit $\xi(N_v) = \xi_{\text{gap}} + a \exp(-bN_v)$ of the correlation length $\xi(N_v) = -\ln(\lambda_-/\lambda_+)$ extracted from the gap of the transfer operator—both of which yield a critical exponent of $\nu \approx 1$ for the correlation length. The inset of inset of Fig. 3c shows the corresponding analysis for the magnetization, which is compatible with a critical exponent $\beta = 1/8$, therefore suggesting that the nematic AKLT model is in the 2D Ising universality class.

C. Entanglement Hamiltonian

Let us now turn towards entanglement spectra and the entanglement Hamiltonian. The entanglement spectrum of a state on e.g. an infinite cylinder is given by the spectrum of the reduced density operator ρ_L of the half-infinite cylinder, and its low-energy part can be interpreted as the spectrum of a Gibbs state $e^{-H_{\text{ent}}}$ of an “entanglement Hamiltonian” H_{ent} [27]. In the context of PEPS models, it has been shown [28] that the spectrum of ρ_L is equal to the spectrum of the symmetrized fixed

point of \mathbb{T} ,

$$\sigma_{\bullet} = \sqrt{l_{\bullet}^T r_{\bullet}} \sqrt{l_{\bullet}^T},$$

where \bullet denotes a possible label of the fixed point, such as in the case of multiple sectors. In turn, σ_{\bullet} allows to define the entanglement Hamiltonian through $H_{\text{ent}} := -\ln \sigma_{\bullet}$.

In Ref. [28], H_{ent} has been studied for both the Ising PEPS and the nematic AKLT model based on the unique fixed point of \mathbb{T} for finite N_v , i.e., $\bullet = +$, and it has been found that it is (quasi-)local (i.e., the interactions decay exponentially with distance) in the trivial phase, the interaction length diverges at the phase transition, and H_{ent} remains long-ranged in the symmetry-broken phase; the corresponding results for both models are shown in the insets of Figs. 4a,b.

However, as we have argued, in the symmetry broken phase the physically meaningful states, i.e., those which are stable under arbitrary perturbations, are the symmetry broken ones, and we should therefore rather use the symmetry broken fixed points $\bullet = \uparrow, \downarrow$ when determining H_{ent} . In Fig. 4, we compare the interaction range of H_{ent} derived from $\bullet = \uparrow, \downarrow$ [43] with the one obtained from $\bullet = +$ (insets) for the Ising PEPS (Fig. 4a) [44] and the nematic AKLT model (Fig. 4b): We find that by considering the latter, the locality of H_{ent} in the symmetry broken phase is restored, and H_{ent} diverges only at the phase transition, in accordance with the intuition that the interaction length of the entanglement Hamiltonian should reflect the characteristic length scale of the system, and thus should be finite away from the critical point.

Together with previous findings on how to recover locality of H_{ent} in topological phases [25], this shows that by considering the physically meaningful (this is, stable) fixed points, a local entanglement Hamiltonian can be obtained for *all* gapped phases, as intuitively expected.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the occurrence of long-range order and spontaneous symmetry breaking in PEPS models. We have shown that long-range order is closely related to a degeneracy in the transfer operator, and have characterized the symmetry broken (i.e., stable) states in terms of the fixed points r_{\pm} of the transfer operator, which we found to be the extremal positive semi-definite states $r_{\uparrow\downarrow} = r_+ \pm \lambda r_- \geq 0$ irrespective of the model and the perturbation. These fixed points do not only yield the physically relevant boundary conditions in the symmetry broken phase, but each one by itself already carries the full information about *both* fixed points, as $r_{\pm} = r_{\uparrow\pm} X^{\otimes N_v} r_{\uparrow} X^{\otimes N_v}$. Moreover, they give rise to local entanglement Hamiltonians, thereby establishing locality of the entanglement Hamiltonian for all gapped phases.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge helpful conversations with Ignacio Cirac, David Perez-Garcia, Volkher Scholz, and Frank

Verstraete. This work has been supported by the Alexander von Humboldt foundation, the ERC grant WAS-COSYS, and by JARA-HPC through grants jara0092 and jara0111.

-
- [1] U. Schollwöck, *Ann. Phys.* **326**, 96 (2011), arXiv:1008.3477.
- [2] F. Verstraete and J. I. Cirac, (2004), cond-mat/0407066.
- [3] G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 110501 (2008), quant-ph/0610099.
- [4] P. Corboz, G. Evenbly, F. Verstraete, and G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 010303(R) (2010), arXiv:0904.4151.
- [5] C. V. Kraus, N. Schuch, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 052338 (2010), arXiv:0904.4667.
- [6] C. Pineda, T. Barthel, and J. Eisert, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 050303(R) (2010), arXiv:0905.0669.
- [7] M. B. Hastings, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 085115 (2006), cond-mat/0508554.
- [8] A. Molnar, N. Schuch, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, (2014), arXiv:1406.2973.
- [9] P. Corboz, R. Orus, B. Bauer, and G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 165104 (2010), arXiv:0912.0646.
- [10] R. Orus, *Ann. Phys.* **349**, 117 (2014), arXiv:1306.2164.
- [11] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, J. I. Cirac, and M. M. Wolf, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **8**, 0650 (2008), arXiv:0707.2260.
- [12] N. Schuch, I. Cirac, and D. Pérez-García, *Ann. Phys.* **325**, 2153 (2010), arXiv:1001.3807.
- [13] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 799 (1987).
- [14] A. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **115**, 477 (1988).
- [15] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R. F. Werner, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **144**, 443 (1992).
- [16] D. Poilblanc, N. Schuch, D. Perez-Garcia, and J.I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 014404 (2012), arXiv:1202.0947; N. Schuch, D. Poilblanc, J.I. Cirac, and D. Perez-Garcia, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 115108 (2012), arXiv:1203.4816; D. Poilblanc and N. Schuch, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 140407 (2013), arXiv:1302.0306.
- [17] L. Wang, D. Poilblanc, Z.-C. Gu, X.-G. Wen, and F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 037202 (2013), arXiv:1301.4492.
- [18] D. Poilblanc, P. Corboz, N. Schuch, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 241106 (2014), arXiv:1404.5268.
- [19] M. Iqbal, D. Poilblanc, and N. Schuch, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 115129 (2014), 1407.7773.
- [20] T. Wahl, H.-H. Tu, N. Schuch, and J. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 236805 (2013), arXiv:1308.0316; S. Yang, T. B. Wahl, H.-H. Tu, N. Schuch, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 106803 (2015), arXiv:1411.6618.
- [21] C.-Y. Huang and T.-C. Wei, (2015), arXiv:1503.03419.
- [22] X.-G. Wen, *Quantum Field Theory of Many Body Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2004).
- [23] O. Buerschaper, (2013), arXiv:1307.7763.
- [24] M. B. Sahinoglu, D. Williamson, N. Bultinck, M. Marien, J. Haegeman, N. Schuch, and F. Verstraete, (2014), arXiv:1409.2150.
- [25] N. Schuch, D. Poilblanc, J. I. Cirac, and D. Perez-Garcia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 090501 (2013), arXiv:1210.5601.
- [26] J. Haegeman, V. Zauner, N. Schuch, and F. Verstraete, (2014), arXiv:1410.5443.
- [27] H. Li and F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 010504 (2008), arXiv:0805.0332.
- [28] J. I. Cirac, D. Poilblanc, N. Schuch, and F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 245134 (2011), arXiv:1103.3427.
- [29] D. Perez-Garcia, M. Sanz, C. E. Gonzalez-Guillen, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, *New J. Phys.* **12**, 025010 (2010), arXiv.org:0908.1674.
- [30] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, D. Perez-Garcia, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 220601 (2006), quant-ph/0601075.
- [31] P. Horsch and W. von der Linden, *Z. Phys. B* **72**, 181 (1988).
- [32] T. Koma and H. Tasaki, *J. Stat. Phys.* **76**, 745 (1994), arXiv:cond-mat/9708132.
- [33] B. Simon, *The statistical mechanics of lattice gases*, Vol. 1 (Princeton University Press, 2014).
- [34] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, *Quant. Inf. Comput.* **7**, 401 (2007), quant-ph/0608197.
- [35] D. E. Evans and E. Hoegh-Krohn, *J. London Math. Soc.* **17**, 345 (1978).
- [36] O. Szehr, D. Reeb, and M. M. Wolf, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **333**, 565 (2015), arXiv:1301.4827.
- [37] Note that even an exponential lower bound b^{N_v} on the r.h.s. of Eq. (2) might not be strong enough to bound the gap without extra assumptions: The convergence of \mathbb{T}^L to its fixed point can be roughly bounded by $\gamma^L L^{D^{2N_v}}$, where $\gamma = |\lambda_-/\lambda_+|$ and D^{2N_v} is the dimension of the space \mathbb{T} acts on [36]. Correlations are thus lost at a scale set by $\gamma^L \sim L^{D^{2N_v}}$; in order for a lower bound b^{N_v} to imply a bound on γ we thus need $b > D^2$.
- [38] J. Cirac, S. Michalakis, D. Perez-Garcia, and N. Schuch, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 115108 (2013), arXiv:1306.4003.
- [39] Otherwise, we could find a $P \geq 0$ s.th. $(P|r_+) = 0$, but $(P|r_-) \neq 0$. Applying \mathbb{T} repeatedly to $P \geq 0$ would therefore converge to the non-positive l_- , $(P|\mathbb{T}^\infty = (l_-|$, which would be in contradiction to \mathbb{T} being completely positive, i.e., mapping positive operators to positive operators.
- [40] N. Schuch, D. Poilblanc, J. I. Cirac, and D. Pérez-García, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 115108 (2012), arXiv:1203.4816.
- [41] Given the notorious difficulty to establish mathematically rigorous results about symmetry breaking for most classical models [33], and the fact that any classical model corresponds to a PEPS model [30], a fully rigorous derivation is indeed elusive.
- [42] The reason that we fit ξ'_θ independently in a first step is that in the relevant regime where $N_v \ll \xi'_\theta$, the second fit does not allow for an accurate determination of $\xi'(\theta)$ and might even return negative values.
- [43] Since for finite N_v , $r_+ + r_-$ is not positive, we have used $\sigma_\uparrow \propto r_+ + (1 + 2\lambda)r_-$, with $\lambda = 1 + \langle \tau|r_-|\tau \rangle / \langle \tau|r_+|\tau \rangle$.

Ideally, $|\tau\rangle$ should be chosen as the most negative eigenvector of $r_+ + r_-$, but we have used $|\tau\rangle = |1\dots 1\rangle$ which is a very good approximation to it.

[44] Note that while the transfer operator of the Ising PEPS can be mapped to free fermions and its fixed point is thus the ground state of a free fermion Hamiltonian, it cannot

be understood any more in terms of free fermions after separating ket and bra index (as the corresponding map is not Gaussian), and thus the entanglement Hamiltonian of the Ising PEPS cannot be solved for analytically.

Appendix: Relation between long-range order and gap of the transfer operator

In this appendix, we give a detailed derivation of the equality of the r.h.s. of Eqs. (4) and (6). We start by splitting

$$\sum_{p=0}^{N_h-2} \frac{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^{N_h-p-2}]}{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}]} = S(0, N_{\text{cut}}) + S(N_{\text{cut}} + 1, N_h - 2),$$

where $N_{\text{cut}} = \lfloor \frac{N_h}{2} \rfloor - 1$, and

$$S(a, b) := \sum_{p=a}^b \frac{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^{N_h-p-2}]}{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}]}.$$

Due to cyclicity of the trace, $S(N_{\text{cut}} + 1, N_h - 2) = S(0, N_{\text{cut}} + \kappa)$, where $N_{\text{cut}} + \kappa = N_h - 2 - (N_{\text{cut}} + 1)$ and thus $\kappa = -1, 0$, depending whether N_h is even or odd.

We will now show that

$$\lim_{N_h \rightarrow \infty} S(0, N_{\text{cut}} + \kappa) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \text{tr} [\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_+\rangle(l_+)].$$

To this end, we will make use of Eq. (5),

$$\|\mathbb{T}^M - |r_+\rangle(l_+)\|_{\text{tr}} \leq c\Gamma^M \quad (5)$$

where $\Gamma < 1$, as well as

$$|\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} X]| \leq \|\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}}\|_{\text{op}} \|\mathbb{T}^p\|_{\text{op}} \|\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}}\|_{\text{op}} \|X\|_{\text{tr}} \leq \zeta \|X\|_{\text{tr}} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

with $\zeta := (c+1)\|\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}}\|_{\text{op}}^2$, which can be shown using Hölder's inequality, the submultiplicativity of the operator norm, and

$$\|\mathbb{T}^p\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\mathbb{T}^p - |r_+\rangle(l_+)\|_{\text{op}} + \||r_+\rangle(l_+)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\mathbb{T}^p - |r_+\rangle(l_+)\|_{\text{tr}} + 1 \stackrel{(5)}{\leq} c\Gamma^p + 1 \leq c + 1,$$

and finally

$$|\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}]| \geq |\text{tr}[|r_+\rangle(l_+)]| - |\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h} - |r_+\rangle(l_+)]| \geq 1 - \|\mathbb{T}^{N_h} - |r_+\rangle(l_+)\|_{\text{tr}} \geq 1 - c\Gamma^{N_h}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We now have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_p &:= \left| \frac{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^{N_h-p-2}]}{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}]} - \text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_+\rangle(l_+)] \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^{N_h-p-2}]}{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}]} - \frac{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_+\rangle(l_+)]}{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}]} \right| + \left| \frac{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_+\rangle(l_+)]}{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}]} - \frac{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} |r_+\rangle(l_+)]}{\text{tr}[|r_+\rangle(l_+)]} \right| \\ (\text{A.1,A.2}) &\leq \frac{\|\mathbb{T}^{N_h-p-2} - |r_+\rangle(l_+)\|_{\text{tr}}}{1 - c\Gamma^{N_h}} + \zeta \||r_+\rangle(l_+)\|_{\text{tr}} \left| \frac{\text{tr}[|r_+\rangle(l_+)] - \text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}]}{\text{tr}[\mathbb{T}^{N_h}] \text{tr}[|r_+\rangle(l_+)]} \right| \\ (\text{5,A.2}) &\leq \frac{\zeta c\Gamma^{N_h-p-2}}{1 - c\Gamma^{N_h}} + \zeta \||r_+\rangle(l_+)\|_{\text{tr}} \frac{c\Gamma^{N_h}}{1 - c\Gamma^{N_h}} \\ &\leq 2\zeta c\Gamma^{N_h-p-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have assumed that N_h is sufficiently large such that $1 - c\Gamma^{N_h} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, and have introduced $\nu := 1 + \|\lvert r_+ \rangle \langle l_+ \rvert\|_{\text{tr}}$. It follows that

$$\left| S(0, N_{\text{cut}} + \kappa) - \sum_{p=0}^{N_{\text{cut}} + \kappa} \text{tr} [\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \lvert r_+ \rangle \langle l_+ \rvert] \right| \leq \sum_{p=0}^{N_{\text{cut}} + \kappa} \Delta_p \leq \frac{N_h}{2} \times 2\zeta c\nu \Gamma^{N_h/2-1}$$

where we have used $N_{\text{cut}} + \kappa \leq \frac{N_h}{2} - 1$ and $N_h - p - 2 \geq N_h/2 - 1$. Clearly, the r.h.s. goes to zero as $N_h \rightarrow \infty$, and thus,

$$\lim_{N_h \rightarrow \infty} S(0, N_{\text{cut}} + \kappa) = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \text{tr} [\mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \mathbb{T}^p \mathbb{T}_{\hat{Z}} \lvert r_+ \rangle \langle l_+ \rvert]$$

as claimed.