

Periodic orbits, entanglement and quantum many-body scars in constrained models: matrix product state approach

Wen Wei Ho,¹ Soonwon Choi,¹ Hannes Pichler,^{2,1} and Mikhail D. Lukin¹

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

²*ITAMP, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*

(Dated: January 31, 2019)

We analyze quantum dynamics of strongly interacting, kinetically constrained many-body systems. Motivated by recent experiments demonstrating surprising long-lived, periodic revivals after quantum quenches in Rydberg atom arrays, we introduce a manifold of locally entangled spin states, representable by low-bond dimension matrix product states, and derive equations of motions for them using the time-dependent variational principle. We find that they feature isolated, unstable periodic orbits, which capture the recurrences and represent nonergodic dynamical trajectories. Our results provide a theoretical framework for understanding quantum dynamics in a class of constrained spin models, which allow us to examine the recently suggested explanation of ‘quantum many-body scarring’ [Nature Physics 14, 745-749 (2018)], and establish a possible connection to the corresponding phenomenon in chaotic single-particle systems.

Introduction. — Understanding non-equilibrium dynamics in closed quantum many-body systems is of fundamental importance. In ergodic systems, the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) provides a means to describe their late-time, steady-state behavior by equilibrium statistical mechanics [1–5]. The few known exceptions to this paradigm include exactly solvable, integrable systems [6–8], and strongly disordered, many-body localized systems, which feature extensive number of conservation laws [9–12]. At the same time, the dynamics of equilibration and thermalization is not as well understood. Concepts such as the ETH, while providing requirements for a system to eventually relax, do not unambiguously prescribe the mechanism nor the timescales on which this occurs; interesting transient dynamics like prethermalization can occur [6–8, 13–21]. Such non-equilibrium phenomena are generally challenging to analytically analyze & simulate, and much progress has thus been spurred by quantum simulation experiments in well-isolated, controllable many-body systems [22–34].

Recently, experiments on Rydberg atom arrays demonstrated surprising long-lived, periodic revivals after quantum quenches [28], with strong dependence of equilibration timescales on the initial state. Specifically, quenching from some unentangled product states, quick relaxation and thermal equilibration of local observables was observed, typical of a chaotic, ergodic many-body system. Conversely, quenching from certain other product states, coherent revivals with a well-defined period were instead observed, which were not seen to decay on the experimentally accessible timescales, a distinctively nonergodic dynamical behavior. Most surprisingly, these strikingly different behavior resulted from initial states that are all highly excited with similar, extensive energy densities, and are hence indistinguishable from a thermodynamic standpoint. The apparent simplicity of the special, slowly thermalizing initial states’ dynamics – *periodic, coherent many-body oscillations* – therefore brings to question

whether they can be understood in a simple, effective picture. In fact, recent theoretical work [35] suggested an intriguing analogy of the oscillations with the phenomenon of quantum scarring in chaotic single-particle systems, where a quantum particle shows similarly long-lived periodic revivals when launched along weakly unstable, periodic orbits of the underlying classical model [36]. However, to date, a firm connection to the theory of single-particle quantum scars [36] has not been established.

In this Letter, we develop a theoretical framework to analyze the quantum dynamics of a family of constrained spin models, which display similar phenomenology of long-lived periodic revivals from certain special initial states. Specifically, we introduce a manifold of simple, locally entangled states respecting the constraints, representable by a class of low bond dimension matrix product states (MPS), and derive equations of motions (EOM) for them using the time-dependent variational principle (TDVP) [38, 39]. We find that these EOM support isolated, unstable, periodic orbits. By quantifying the accuracy of this effective description, we show that these closed orbits indeed capture the persistent recurrences, and hence signal slow relaxation of local observables, a form of weak ergodicity breaking in dynamics, see Fig. 1(a,b). Furthermore, since the TDVP generates a Hamiltonian flow in the phase space parametrizing this (weakly entangled) manifold, one can associate our approach with a generalized “semiclassical” description of many-body dynamics in constrained Hilbert spaces. Our finding of periodic orbits in this description is therefore suggestive in establishing the connection to the theory of quantum scarring of single-particle systems of Heller [36].

Kinetically constrained spin models. — We consider a family of interacting, constrained spin models and demonstrate that they show atypical thermalization behavior for certain initial states. Consider a chain of L




Figure 1. (a) Flow diagrams of $\dot{\theta}_e(t), \dot{\theta}_o(t)$ for the model (1) with $s=1/2$. The color map gives the error γ , (5). There is an isolated, unstable periodic orbit (red curve) describing oscillatory motion between $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$ (green dot) and $|\mathbb{Z}'_2\rangle$ (blue dot), with numerically extracted period $T \approx 2\pi \times 1.51 \Omega^{-1}$. Conversely, motion from $|0\rangle$ (red dot) proceeds towards a saddle point where the error is large. (b): Dynamics of local observable $S_i^z(t)$. There are persistent, coherent oscillations in the local observable for $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$ with similar period, while $|0\rangle$ instead shows quick relaxation and equilibration towards a thermal value predicted by ETH [37].

spin- s particles on a ring, with Hamiltonian

$$H = \Omega \sum_i \mathcal{P} S_i^x \mathcal{P}. \quad (1)$$

Here, a basis on each site i is spanned by eigenstates $|n\rangle_i$ of $S_i^z + s \mathbb{I}_i$, with $n=0, \dots, 2s$, and S_i^x is the spin- s operator in the x -direction. The projector $\mathcal{P} = \prod_i \mathcal{P}_{i,i+1}$ is a product of commuting local projectors $\mathcal{P}_{i,i+1} = \mathbb{I}_i \otimes \mathbb{I}_{i+1} - Q_i \otimes Q_{i+1}$, with $Q_i = \mathbb{I}_i - P_i$ and $P_i = |0\rangle_i \langle 0|_i$, and constrains dynamics to a subspace where at least one of two neighboring spins is in the state $|0\rangle$, which has dimensionality $d \sim ((1 + \sqrt{8s+1})/2)^L$. When $s=1/2$, Eqn. (1) effectively models the experimental setup of [28], where the constraint stems from the Rydberg blockade mechanism (see also [40–44]).

The Hamiltonian (1) has a simple interpretation: each spin rotates freely about the x -axis if both its neighbors are in the state $|0\rangle$, while its dynamics is frozen otherwise. Despite its apparent simplicity, the Hamiltonian is nonintegrable and quantum chaotic, as seen in Fig. 2(a) from level repulsion in the energy eigenspectrum. The chaotic nature of the system is expected to govern the nonequilibrium dynamics arising from a quantum quench. For example, consider “simple”, unentan-




Figure 2. (a) Level spacing statistics in the momentum-zero, inversion-symmetric sector. Plotted is the r -statistics defined by the average of $r_n = \frac{\min(s_n, s_{n-1})}{\max(s_n, s_{n-1})}$ where $s_n = E_{n+1} - E_n$. There is a clear albeit slow trend with Hilbert space dimension d towards Wigner-Dyson statistics in the GOE class, indicated by $r \approx 0.53$, away from the integrable Poissonian (POI) limit of $r \approx 0.39$ (for discussion of the slow convergence, see [45, 46]). (b,c) Growth of entanglement entropy S_A following quenches from the $|0\rangle$ and $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$ states, of subregions A being (b) six contiguous sites, (c) a single-site, for the $s=1/2$ model. Total system size is $L=30$.

gled initial states, specifically product states in the z -basis that satisfy the constraints. All these states have the property that they have the same energy density under (1), corresponding to that of the infinite-temperature thermal state, and are hence thermodynamically indistinguishable. Under time evolution, one would expect a quick relaxation of local observables (on the timescale $t_r \sim \Omega^{-1}$) to infinite-temperature ensemble values [37], in accordance with ETH predictions [1–3, 47–50]. This behavior is indeed observed generically, as demonstrated previously [41–44], and also in Fig. 1(b) for the local observable $S_i^z(t)$ from the initial state $|0\rangle = \otimes_{i=1}^L |0\rangle_i$ ($s=1/2$). However, time evolution of the initial state $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle \equiv \otimes_{i=1}^{L/2} |0\rangle_{2i-1} |2s\rangle_{2i}$ does not follow this expectation. As shown in Fig. 1(b), the same observable instead unexpectedly exhibits long-lived, coherent oscillations with a well-defined period $T \approx 2\pi \times 1.51 \Omega^{-1}$. Furthermore, it does not relax to, nor oscillate about, the thermal value expected from ETH, at least on numerically accessible timescales and system sizes.

This striking departure from generic behavior is also reflected in the growth of entanglement entropy (EE) (Fig. 2(b,c)). While for generic initial states EE essentially grows linearly and quickly saturates to that of a random state [37], this is not the case for $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$. In particular, the single-site EE drops periodically, indicating that each spin is repeatedly partially disentangling itself from the rest of the chain. This tantalizingly hints that the motion for the $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$ state lies within a low-entanglement manifold of the Hilbert space, thereby possibly allowing for a simple, effective description of dynamics.

Equations of motion from the TDVP. — Motivated




Figure 3. (a) Geometrical depiction of the TDVP over a manifold of states $|\psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle$ parameterized by \mathbf{z} . The instantaneous motion $-iH|\psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle$ is projected onto the tangent space at the point, leading to motion on the manifold (green trajectory). The norm of the vector orthogonal to the manifold, $\Gamma = \gamma\sqrt{L}$ (c.f. Eqn. (5)), is a measure of its accuracy. (b) MPS representation of states $|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle$ (c.f. Eqn. (3)) used.

by these considerations, we analyze the dynamics of the system using the TDVP on a suitable variational manifold of simple, low entanglement states. For concreteness, we focus first on $s=1/2$. Starting from classical spin configurations, i.e. products of unentangled coherent states $\otimes_i |\vartheta_i, \varphi_i\rangle := \otimes_i [\cos(\vartheta_i/2)|0\rangle_i - ie^{i\varphi_i} \sin(\vartheta_i/2)|1\rangle_i]$, we construct states that respect the constraints set by \mathcal{P} , by explicitly projecting out neighboring excitations,

$$|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle = \mathcal{P} \bigotimes_i |(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle, \quad (2)$$

which is akin to a Gutzwiller projection to the constrained subspace [37, 51], see Fig. 3(b). Importantly, (2) is weakly entangled, and can be written as a particular matrix product state (MPS) with bond dimension $D=2$ [37, 52]. We find it convenient to normalize (2) and change to new variables $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}) \rightarrow (\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$ via a non-linear mapping [37], such that $|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle / \|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle = |\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle$, so that the MPS representation is given by

$$|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle = \text{Tr}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_L),$$

$$A_i(\theta_i, \phi_i) = \begin{pmatrix} P_i |(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle & Q_i |(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle \\ |0\rangle_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

and $|(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle = e^{i\phi_i S_i^z} e^{i\theta_i S_i^x} e^{-i\theta_i S_i^z} |0\rangle_i$, which is normalized in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ (see too [53, 54]). The generalization of (3) to spin- s then simply consists of replacing the appropriate operators and states with the spin- s analogs.

The TDVP respects conservation laws, and in particular conserves the energy of the Hamiltonian (1) [37–39, 55]. On this general ground, we obtain that $\dot{\phi}=0$, and can set $\phi=0$, which is obeyed for initial product states in the z -basis [37]. Furthermore,

to describe the motions of the $|0\rangle$ and $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$ states, it suffices to focus on the submanifold of states with a two-site translational symmetry, i.e. $\theta_i = \theta_{i+2}$. The TDVP-EOM are obtained by projecting the instantaneous motion of the quantum system onto the tangent space of the variational manifold (Fig. 3(a)), and read $\sum_\mu \dot{\theta}_\mu \langle \partial_{\theta_\nu} \psi | \partial_{\theta_\mu} \psi \rangle = -i \langle \partial_{\theta_\nu} \psi | H | \psi \rangle$, for $\mu \in \{o, e\}$ (standing for even(e) and odd(o) sites). A lengthy but straightforward calculation [37] yields closed-form, analytic expressions: $\dot{\theta}_e(t) = f(\theta_e(t), \theta_o(t))$ and $\dot{\theta}_o(t) = f(\theta_o(t), \theta_e(t))$, with

$$f(x, y) = \Omega \left[1 - \cos^{4s-2} \left(\frac{x}{2} \right) + \cos^{4s-2} \left(\frac{x}{2} \right) \cos^{2s} \left(\frac{y}{2} \right) + 2s \sin \left(\frac{x}{2} \right) \cos^{6s-1} \left(\frac{x}{2} \right) \tan \left(\frac{y}{2} \right) \right]. \quad (4)$$

These EOM are coupled, nonlinear equations. Yet, remarkably, we find that for each spin- s , there is an isolated, unstable, periodic orbit \mathcal{C} , as seen in the corresponding flow diagrams for $s=1/2$ in Fig. 1(a), and $s=1, 2$, in Fig. 4(a,c). Furthermore, \mathcal{C} includes the points $(\theta_e, \theta_o) = (\pi, 0)$, and $(0, -\pi)$ (modulo 2π), corresponding to $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$ and its counterpart $|\mathbb{Z}'_2\rangle = \otimes_{i=1}^{L/2} |0\rangle_{2i} |2s\rangle_{2i-1}$ respectively. Thus, the EOM describe continual oscillations between these two product states (akin to a quantum Newton's cradle! [see also [22]]), which is manifestly an athermal, nonergodic behavior [56]. The periods of oscillations from the EOM can be determined by numerical integration of Eq. (4), and the extracted values match excellently with those from numerical simulations of local observables such as $S_i^z(t)$, see Fig. 1(b) and Fig. 4(b,d). This already indicates that the variational manifold (3) is well suited to capture central aspects of the exact quantum dynamics.

To further corroborate this fact, we quantify the error in TDVP evolution as the instantaneous rate at which the state evolving under the full Hamiltonian leaves the variational manifold (see Fig. 3, [38, 39]), given by

$$\gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \|(iH + \dot{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \partial_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) |\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle\| / \sqrt{L}, \quad (5)$$

where we have normalized it to be an intensive quantity. The numerically integrated error rates around the closed orbits $\epsilon_C = \oint_C \gamma(\theta_e(t), \theta_o(t)) dt$ yield $\epsilon_C \approx 0.17, 0.32, 0.41$ for $s=1/2, 1, 2$ respectively, which are small values compared to neighboring trajectories [37], illustrating that \mathcal{C} is indeed a good approximation to exact quantum dynamics. We stress that the ability to capture the key features of some dynamics of a chaotic many-body system within a low entanglement manifold is remarkable. This is in contrast to generic expectations; for example, the trajectory beginning at $(\theta_e, \theta_o) = (0, 0)$ for $s=1/2$, (i.e. the $|0\rangle$ state), instead traces out a path that terminates in a saddle point where γ is large (see Fig. 1(a)), indicating that this low entanglement manifold is unable to capture the large growth of entanglement from this state, as expected in a thermalizing system.




Figure 4. (a,c) Flow diagrams (4) and error γ for (a) $s=1$, (c) $s=2$. The indicated periodic orbits (red curves) have periods (a) $T \approx 2\pi \times 1.64 \Omega^{-1}$, and (c) $T \approx 2\pi \times 1.73 \Omega^{-1}$. Note that points $\theta_{o/e} = \theta_{o/e} \pm 2\pi$ are identified. (b,d) Relaxation of local observable $S_i^z(t)$ for (b) $s=1$, (d) $s=2$. One sees, similarly to Fig. 1, quick relaxation of the $|0\rangle$ state toward a thermal value predicted by ETH [37], while persistent oscillations for $|Z_2\rangle$, with similar periods in (a,c).

Discussion. — Our effective description of the persistent oscillations seen in the many-body systems (1), in terms of isolated, unstable orbits, provides a framework to analyze a possible connection with the phenomenon of quantum scarring in single-particle chaotic systems [36]. There, special, weakly unstable classical orbits of a single-particle, characterized by the condition $\lambda T < 1$ (where T is the period of the orbit and λ the average Lyapunov exponent about the orbit) play a central role: the persistent revivals and slow decay of a Gaussian wavepacket (a quantum particle) launched along such an orbit give rise to a statistically significant enhancement of certain wavefunctions’ probability densities about these orbits, above that expected of Berry’s conjecture [57]. Indeed, the apparent similarity between these phenomena, and atypical signatures in the ergodic properties of certain many-body eigenstates of the $s=1/2$ model (1) tied to the long-lived oscillations, motivated the recently proposed explanation in terms of quantum many-body scars [35, 46]. Our work provides a way to make such an analogy firmer: even though our variational manifold encompasses states that explicitly include quantum entanglement, the TDVP-EOM describe a Hamiltonian flow in the corresponding phase space [38, 39, 58, 59], and thus offer a notion of a “semiclassical trajectory” through the many-body Hilbert space. A natural extension of the condition $\lambda T < 1$ characterizing the instability of orbits is then the leakage out of the manifold $\epsilon_C = \oint_C \gamma(\boldsymbol{\theta}) dt < 1$;

it would be interesting to relate this quantity to the Lyapunov exponent of the EOM [59]. Furthermore, the effect of these orbits on the nature of many-body eigenstates deserve further study; however this has to be done while contending with the thermodynamic limit, a notion absent in the single-particle scenario.

Finally, we note that the equations of motion we obtained can also be understood as the leading order, saddle-point evaluation of a path integral for the constrained spin systems (1). In particular, the manifold of states $|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle$ is dense and supports a resolution of the identity on the constrained space, with an appropriate measure $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$ (see [37]), allowing the construction of a Feynman path integral [58, 60–63]. The TDVP-EOM extremize the action functional with the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = i\langle\psi|\partial_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\psi\rangle\dot{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + i\langle\psi|\partial_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\psi\rangle\dot{\boldsymbol{\phi}} - \langle\psi|H|\psi\rangle$, which evaluates (for $s=1/2$) to:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_i K_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \left[\sin^2\left(\frac{\theta_i}{2}\right) \dot{\phi}_i + \frac{\Omega}{2} \cos\left(\frac{\theta_{i+1}}{2}\right) \sin(\theta_i) \cos(\phi_i) \right],$$

where $K_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is given in [37]. This formulation provides a framework, which can be used to systematically recover quantum dynamics from the saddle-point limit, by including higher-order corrections, i.e. fluctuations.

Conclusion. — In this Letter, we introduced and analyzed the dynamics of a family of constrained spin models which show atypical thermalization behavior – long-lived, coherent revivals from certain special initial states, similar to recent quench experiments in a quantum simulator of Rydberg atoms. We derived an effective description of these systems in terms of equations of motion for dynamics of locally entangled spins and found that they host isolated, unstable, periodic orbits, which correspond to long-lived recurrences at the quantum many-body level. Our results establish a possible connection to quantum scarring in single-particle chaotic systems, and suggest a framework for a generalization of the theory of quantum scars by Heller [36], which is intimately tied to unstable periodic orbits, to the many-body case.

While our analysis demonstrates that the phenomenology of stable, long-lived oscillations from special initial states extends to a number of interacting, constrained models, one of the most important outstanding questions is related to their physical origin and the sufficient conditions for their existence. A complementary Letter [45] demonstrates that these models possess important features resembling ergodic systems that are close to integrability, and that these features can be enhanced by non-trivial deformations of the Hamiltonian. In [37], we show that our variational description of the periodic dynamics is able to capture the effect of these deformations by making the corresponding error γ smaller. While it is currently unclear if this near-integrable-like behavior is directly related to, required for, or follows from the existence of scar-like dynamics (see however recent work [64]

exploring the role of deformations on stabilizing the periodic dynamics), these observations as well as the framework presented here provide both theoretical foundations and important physical insights on which future studies of quantum dynamics can be based upon.

Acknowledgments. — We thank V. Khemani, A. Chandran, D. Abanin, A. Vishwanath, D. Jafferis, E. Demler, J. Nieva-Rodriguez, V. Kasper and E. Heller for useful discussions. This work was supported through the National Science Foundation (NSF), the Center for Ultracold Atoms, the Air Force Office of Scientific Research via the MURI, and the Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship. H.P. is supported by the NSF through a grant for the Institute for Theoretical Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics at Harvard University and the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory. W.W.H. is supported by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation’s EPiQS Initiative Grant No. GBMF4306.

-
- [1] J. M. Deutsch, “Quantum statistical mechanics in a closed system,” *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, 2046–2049 (1991).
- [2] Mark Srednicki, “Thermal fluctuations in quantized chaotic systems,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **29**, L75 (1996).
- [3] Mark Srednicki, “The approach to thermal equilibrium in quantized chaotic systems,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **32**, 1163 (1999).
- [4] Marcos Rigol, Vanja Dunjko, and Maxim Olshanii, “Thermalization and its mechanism for generic isolated quantum systems,” *Nature* **452**, 854 (2008).
- [5] James R. Garrison and Tarun Grover, “Does a single eigenstate encode the full hamiltonian?” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021026 (2018).
- [6] J. Berges, Sz. Borsányi, and C. Wetterich, “Prethermalization,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 142002 (2004).
- [7] Marcos Rigol, Vanja Dunjko, Vladimir Yurovsky, and Maxim Olshanii, “Relaxation in a completely integrable many-body quantum system: An ab initio study of the dynamics of the highly excited states of 1d lattice hardcore bosons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 050405 (2007).
- [8] Marcos Rigol, “Breakdown of thermalization in finite one-dimensional systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 100403 (2009).
- [9] David A. Huse, Rahul Nandkishore, and Vadim Oganesyan, “Phenomenology of fully many-body-localized systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 174202 (2014).
- [10] Maksym Serbyn, Z. Papić, and Dmitry A. Abanin, “Local conservation laws and the structure of the many-body localized states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 127201 (2013).
- [11] R. Nandkishore and D. A. Huse, “Many-body localization and thermalization in quantum statistical mechanics,” *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **6**, 15–38 (2015).
- [12] Dmitry A. Abanin and Z. Papić, “Recent progress in many body localization,” *Annalen der Physik* **529**, 1700169 (2017).
- [13] T. Barthel and U. Schollwöck, “Dephasing and the steady state in quantum many-particle systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 100601 (2008).
- [14] Corinna Kollath, Andreas M. Läuchli, and Ehud Altman, “Quench dynamics and nonequilibrium phase diagram of the bose-hubbard model,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 180601 (2007).
- [15] M. Gring, M. Kuhnert, T. Langen, T. Kitagawa, B. Rauer, M. Schreitl, I. Mazets, D. Adu Smith, E. Demler, and J. Schmiedmayer, “Relaxation and prethermalization in an isolated quantum system,” *Science* **337**, 1318–1322 (2012).
- [16] Matteo Marcuzzi, Jamir Marino, Andrea Gambassi, and Alessandro Silva, “Prethermalization in a nonintegrable quantum spin chain after a quench,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 197203 (2013).
- [17] Takashi Mori, Tomotaka Kuwahara, and Keiji Saito, “Rigorous bound on energy absorption and generic relaxation in periodically driven quantum systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 120401 (2016).
- [18] T. Kuwahara, T. Mori, and K. Saito, “Floquet-magnus theory and generic transient dynamics in periodically driven many-body quantum systems,” *Annals of Physics* **367**, 96–124 (2016).
- [19] Dmitry A. Abanin, Wojciech De Roeck, Wen Wei Ho, and Francois Huveneers, “Effective hamiltonians, prethermalization, and slow energy absorption in periodically driven many-body systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 014112 (2017).
- [20] Dmitry Abanin, Wojciech De Roeck, Wen Wei Ho, and Francois Huveneers, “A rigorous theory of many-body prethermalization for periodically driven and closed quantum systems,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **354**, 809–82 (2017).
- [21] Wen Wei Ho, Ivan Protopopov, and Dmitry A. Abanin, “Bounds on energy absorption and prethermalization in quantum systems with long-range interactions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 200601 (2018).
- [22] Toshiya Kinoshita, Trevor Wenger, and David S. Weiss, “A quantum newton’s cradle,” *Nature* **440**, 900 (2006).
- [23] Adam M Kaufman, M Eric Tai, Alexander Lukin, Matthew Rispoli, Robert Schittko, Philipp M Preiss, and Markus Greiner, “Quantum thermalization through entanglement in an isolated many-body system,” *Science* **353**, 794–800 (2016).
- [24] Michael Schreiber, Sean S. Hodgman, Pranjal Bordia, Henrik P. Lüschen, Mark H. Fischer, Ronen Vosk, Ehud Altman, Ulrich Schneider, and Immanuel Bloch, “Observation of many-body localization of interacting fermions in a quasirandom optical lattice,” *Science* **349**, 842–845 (2015).
- [25] Bernhard Rauer, Sebastian Erne, Thomas Schweigler, Federica Cataldini, Mohammadamin Tajik, and Jörg Schmiedmayer, “Recurrences in an isolated quantum many-body system,” *Science* **360**, eaan7938–310 (2018).
- [26] Florian Meinert, Michael Knap, Emil Kirilov, Katharina Jag-Lauber, Mikhail B Zvonarev, Eugene Demler, and Hanns-Christoph Nägerl, “Bloch oscillations in the absence of a lattice,” *Science* **356**, 945–948 (2017).
- [27] Henning Labuhn, Daniel Barredo, Sylvain Ravets, Sylvain de Léséleuc, Tommaso Macrì, Thierry Lahaye, and Antoine Browaeys, “Tunable two-dimensional arrays of single Rydberg atoms for realizing quantum Ising models,” *Nature* **534**, 667–670 (2016).
- [28] Hannes Bernien, Sylvain Schwartz, Alexander Keesling, Harry Levine, Ahmed Omran, Hannes Pichler, Soon-

- won Choi, Alexander S. Zibrov, Manuel Endres, Markus Greiner, Vladan Vuletic, and Mikhail D. Lukin, “Probing many-body dynamics on a 51-atom quantum simulator,” *Nature* **551**, 579 (2017).
- [29] Brian Neyenhuis, Jiehang Zhang, Paul W. Hess, Jacob Smith, Aaron C. Lee, Phil Richerme, Zhe-Xuan Gong, Alexey V. Gorshkov, and Christopher Monroe, “Observation of prethermalization in long-range interacting spin chains,” *Science Advances* **3** (2017), 10.1126/sciadv.1700672.
- [30] J. Zhang, P. W. Hess, A. Kyprianidis, P. Becker, A. Lee, J. Smith, G. Pagano, I.-D. Potirniche, A. C. Potter, A. Vishwanath, N. Y. Yao, and C. Monroe, “Observation of a discrete time crystal,” *Nature* **543**, 217–220 (2017).
- [31] Esteban A Martinez, Christine A Muschik, Philipp Schindler, Daniel Nigg, Alexander Erhard, Markus Heyl, Philipp Hauke, Marcello Dalmonte, Thomas Monz, Peter Zoller, and Rainer Blatt, “Real-time dynamics of lattice gauge theories with a few-qubit quantum computer,” *Nature* **534**, 516–519 (2016).
- [32] Wen Wei Ho, Soonwon Choi, Mikhail D. Lukin, and Dmitry A. Abanin, “Critical time crystals in dipolar systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 010602 (2017).
- [33] Soonwon Choi, Joonhee Choi, Renate Landig, Georg Kucsko, Hengyun Zhou, Junichi Isoya, Fedor Jelezko, Shinobu Onoda, Hitoshi Sumiya, Vedika Khemani, Curt von Keyserlingk, Norman Y. Yao, Eugene Demler, and Mikhail D. Lukin, “Observation of discrete time-crystalline order in a disordered dipolar many-body system,” *Nature* **543**, 221–225 (2017).
- [34] J. Choi, H. Zhou, S. Choi, R. Landig, W. W. Ho, J. Isoya, F. Jelezko, S. Onoda, H. Sumiya, D. A. Abanin, and M. D. Lukin, “Probing quantum thermalization of a disordered dipolar spin ensemble with discrete time-crystalline order,” ArXiv e-prints (2018), arXiv:1806.10169 [quant-ph].
- [35] C. J. Turner, A. A. Michailidis, D. A. Abanin, M. Serbyn, and Z. Papić, “Weak ergodicity breaking from quantum many-body scars,” *Nature Physics* **14**, 745–749 (2018).
- [36] Eric J. Heller, “Bound-state eigenfunctions of classically chaotic hamiltonian systems: Scars of periodic orbits,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 1515–1518 (1984).
- [37] See supplemental material for details on calculations.
- [38] Jutho Haegeman, J. Ignacio Cirac, Tobias J. Osborne, Iztok Pizorn, Henri Verschelde, and Frank Verstraete, “Time-dependent variational principle for quantum lattices,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 070601 (2011).
- [39] Jutho Haegeman, Christian Lubich, Ivan Oseledets, Bart Vandereycken, and Frank Verstraete, “Unifying time evolution and optimization with matrix product states,” *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 165116 (2016).
- [40] B Sun and F Robicheaux, “Numerical study of two-body correlation in a 1d lattice with perfect blockade,” *New Journal of Physics* **10**, 045032 (2008).
- [41] B Olmos, M Miller, and I Lesanovsky, “Thermalization of a strongly interacting 1d rydberg lattice gas,” *New Journal of Physics* **12**, 013024 (2010).
- [42] Igor Lesanovsky, Beatriz Olmos, and Juan P. Garrahan, “Thermalization in a coherently driven ensemble of two-level systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 100603 (2010).
- [43] C. Ates, J. P. Garrahan, and I. Lesanovsky, “Thermalization of a strongly interacting closed spin system: From coherent many-body dynamics to a fokker-planck equation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 110603 (2012).
- [44] S Ji, C Ates, J P Garrahan, and I Lesanovsky, “Equilibration of quantum hard rods in one dimension,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2013**, P02005 (2013).
- [45] V. Khemani, C. R. Laumann, and A. Chandran, “Signatures of integrability in the dynamics of Rydberg-blockaded chains,” ArXiv e-prints (2018), arXiv:1807.02108 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [46] C. J. Turner, A. A. Michailidis, D. A. Abanin, M. Serbyn, and Z. Papić, “Quantum scarred eigenstates in a Rydberg atom chain: entanglement, breakdown of thermalization, and stability to perturbations,” ArXiv e-prints (2018), arXiv:1806.10933 [cond-mat.quant-gas].
- [47] Mark Srednicki, “Chaos and quantum thermalization,” *Phys. Rev. E* **50**, 888–901 (1994).
- [48] Lea F. Santos, Anatoli Polkovnikov, and Marcos Rigol, “Entropy of isolated quantum systems after a quench,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 040601 (2011).
- [49] L. F. Santos, F. Borgonovi, and F. M. Izrailev, “Chaos and statistical relaxation in quantum systems of interacting particles,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 094102 (2012).
- [50] E. J. Torres-Herrera and Lea F. Santos, “Quench dynamics of isolated many-body quantum systems,” *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 043620 (2014).
- [51] Martin C. Gutzwiller, “Correlation of electrons in a narrow s band,” *Phys. Rev.* **137**, A1726–A1735 (1965).
- [52] G. Vidal, “Classical simulation of infinite-size quantum lattice systems in one spatial dimension,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 070201 (2007).
- [53] Igor Lesanovsky, “Many-body spin interactions and the ground state of a dense rydberg lattice gas,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 025301 (2011).
- [54] Igor Lesanovsky, “Liquid ground state, gap, and excited states of a strongly correlated spin chain,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 105301 (2012).
- [55] Eyal Leviatan, Frank Pollmann, Jens H. Bardarson, David A. Huse, and Ehud Altman, “Quantum thermalization dynamics with Matrix-Product States,” ArXiv e-prints (2018), arXiv:1702.08894 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [56] Note that due to the parametrization, $(\theta_e, \theta_o) = (\pi/2, 0)$ gives the same state as $(\theta_e, \theta_o) = (\pi/2, -\pi)$. There is additionally a coordinate singularity at each point.
- [57] M V Berry, “Regular and irregular semiclassical wavefunctions,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **10**, 2083 (1977).
- [58] A. G. Green, C. A. Hooley, J. Keeling, and S. H. Simon, “Feynman Path Integrals Over Entangled States,” ArXiv e-prints (2016), arXiv:1607.01778 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [59] A. Hallam, J. Morley, and A. G. Green, “The Lyapunov Spectrum of Quantum Thermalisation,” ArXiv e-prints (2018), arXiv:1806.05204 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [60] R. P. Feynman, “Space-time approach to non-relativistic quantum mechanics,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **20**, 367–387 (1948).
- [61] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields* (Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- [62] A. Zee, *Quantum Field Theory in a Nutshell* (Princeton University Press, 2010).
- [63] A. Altland and B. Simons, *Condensed Matter Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [64] Soonwon Choi, Christopher J. Turner, Hannes Pichler, Wen Wei Ho, Alexios A. Michailidis, Zlatko Papić, Maksym Serbyn, Mikhail D. Lukin, and Dmitry A.

Abanin, “Emergent $SU(2)$ dynamics and perfect quan-

tum many-body scars,” arXiv e-prints , arXiv:1812.05561 (2018), [arXiv:1812.05561](https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.05561) [quant-ph].

Supplemental Material: Periodic orbits, entanglement and quantum many-body scars in constrained models: matrix product state approach

Wen Wei Ho,¹ Soonwon Choi,¹ Hannes Pichler,^{2,1} and Mikhail D. Lukin¹

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

²*ITAMP, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*

(Dated: January 31, 2019)

In this supplemental material, we (i) provide details on normalizing the ‘Gutzwiller projected’ variational state via a non-local mapping, (ii) derive the effective equations of motion using the time-dependent variational principle (TDVP), as well as the error γ , (iii) derive the measure $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$ for the purposes of writing a resolution of the identity on the constrained space, and hence a path integral, (iv) explain what it means to thermalize in the constrained space, and (v) repeat the TDVP calculations for the deformed model of [1].

I. NORMALIZING THE ‘GUTZWILLER PROJECTED’ STATE

In this section we show that for spin $s = 1/2$, the ‘Gutzwiller projected’ state

$$|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle = \mathcal{P} \bigotimes_i |(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $|(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle = e^{i\varphi_i/2} e^{i\varphi_i S_i^z} e^{-i\vartheta_i S_i^x} |0\rangle_i = \cos(\vartheta_i/2) |0\rangle_i - i e^{i\varphi_i} \sin(\vartheta_i/2) |1\rangle_i$ (a spin-coherent state), can be normalized and written explicitly as a bond dimension two matrix product state (MPS), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle &\equiv \frac{|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle}{\| |\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle \|} = \text{Tr}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_L), \\ A_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{\phi}_i) &= \begin{pmatrix} P_i |(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle & Q_i |(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle \\ |0\rangle_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

via a non-local mapping $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi}) \rightarrow (\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$. This is the form of the variational state used in the TDVP calculation. In the above,

$$|(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle = e^{i\phi_i/2} e^{i\phi_i S_i^z} e^{-i\theta_i S_i^x} |0\rangle_i = \cos(\theta_i/2) |0\rangle_i - i e^{i\phi_i} \sin(\theta_i/2) |1\rangle_i \quad (3)$$

is (another) spin-coherent state, $\mathcal{P} = \prod_i \mathcal{P}_{i,i+1}$ the projector onto the constrained subspace, with $\mathcal{P}_{i,i+1}$ a local projector defined as $\mathcal{P}_{i,i+1} = \mathbb{I}_i \otimes \mathbb{I}_{i+1} - Q_i \otimes Q_{i+1}$, and $Q_i = \mathbb{I} - P_i$, $P_i = |0\rangle_i \langle 0|_i$.

MPS representation

We start by writing $|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle = \mathcal{P} \bigotimes_i |(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle$ as a bond dimension two MPS. This is possible because \mathcal{P} can be cast as a matrix product operator bond dimension two. To derive this, we iterative apply the projector $\mathcal{P}_{i,i+1}$ on each pair of sites starting from one end of the chain. Letting $a_i = \cos(\vartheta_i/2)$, $b_n = -i e^{i\varphi_i} \sin(\vartheta_i/2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle &= \mathcal{P} \bigotimes_{i=1}^L |(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle \\
&= \left(\prod_{j=1}^L \mathcal{P}_{j,j+1} \right) \bigotimes_{i=1}^L |(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle \\
&= \left(\prod_{j=2}^L \mathcal{P}_{j,j+1} \right) (a_1 a_2 |0\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2 + a_1 b_2 |0\rangle_1 |1\rangle_2 + b_1 a_2 |1\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2) \bigotimes_{i=3}^L |(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle \\
&= \left(\prod_{j=2}^L \mathcal{P}_{j,j+1} \right) \text{Tr} \left[\begin{pmatrix} a_1 |0\rangle_1 & b_1 |1\rangle_1 \\ a_1 |0\rangle_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_2 |0\rangle_2 & b_2 |1\rangle_2 \\ a_2 |0\rangle_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right] \bigotimes_{i=3}^L |(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle \\
&= \left(\prod_{j=2}^L \mathcal{P}_{j,j+1} \right) \text{Tr} [\mathcal{A}(a_1, b_2) \mathcal{A}(a_2, b_2)] \bigotimes_{i=3}^L |(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle, \tag{4}
\end{aligned}$$

and where

$$\mathcal{A}(a_n, b_n) = \begin{pmatrix} a_n |0\rangle_n & b_n |1\rangle_n \\ a_n |0\rangle_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

In the above, the more conventional representation would entail a decomposition into basis states, i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}(a_n, b_n) = \sum_s \mathcal{A}^s(a_n, b_n) |s\rangle, \tag{6}$$

where $s = 0, 1$ and

$$\mathcal{A}^0(a_n, b_n) = \begin{pmatrix} a_n & 0 \\ a_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{A}^1(a_n, b_n) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b_n \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{7}$$

For the induction step we assume that

$$|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle = \left(\prod_{j=k}^L \mathcal{P}_{j,j+1} \right) \text{Tr} \left[\prod_{n=1}^k \mathcal{A}(a_n, b_n) \right] \bigotimes_{i=k+1}^L |(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle \tag{8}$$

and it is then easy to show

$$|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle = \left(\prod_{j=k+1}^L \mathcal{P}_{j,j+1} \right) \text{Tr} \left[\prod_{n=1}^{k+1} \mathcal{A}(a_n, b_n) \right] \bigotimes_{i=k+2}^L |(\vartheta_i, \varphi_i)\rangle. \tag{9}$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\boxed{|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{A}(a_1, b_1) \mathcal{A}(a_2, b_2) \cdots \mathcal{A}(a_L, b_L)]}. \tag{10}$$

Gauge transformations

An MPS has a gauge degree of freedom, which we will exploit to turn $|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle$ into a normalized form. Let $\mathcal{A}(a_i, b_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'(a_i, b_i, c_i, a_{i+1}, c_{i+1}) = B(a_i, c_i) \mathcal{A}(a_i, b_i) B^{-1}(a_{i+1}, c_{i+1})$ where

$$B(a_i, c_i) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{c_i}{a_i} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

We have also introduced variables c_i s that depend on (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) , which we will choose below. Then

$$\mathcal{A}'(a_i, b_i, c_i, a_{i+1}, c_{i+1}) = c_i \begin{pmatrix} \frac{a_i}{c_i} |0\rangle_i & \frac{b_i a_{i+1}}{c_i c_{i+1}} |1\rangle_i \\ |0\rangle_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

Dropping the prefactor c_i does not affect the nature of the state as it is just a normalization factor. Thus, let $\mathcal{A}'(a_i, b_i, c_i, a_{i+1}, c_{i+1}) \rightarrow A(a_i, b_i, c_i, a_{i+1}, c_{i+1}) = \mathcal{A}'(a_i, b_i, c_i, a_{i+1}, c_{i+1})/c_i$. At this stage, let us choose $c_i(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ so that the condition

$$\frac{|a_i|^2}{|c_i|^2} + \frac{|b_i|^2 |a_{i+1}|^2}{|c_i|^2 |c_{i+1}|^2} = 1 \quad (13)$$

is satisfied. We note that there is a solution, as we can rewrite the above condition as

$$G_i = 1 + \frac{F_i}{G_{i+1}} \quad (14)$$

where $F_i = |b_i|^2/|a_i|^2$ and $G_i = |c_i|^2/|a_i|^2$. This gives a recurrence relation; writing it out we have explicitly a generalized continued fraction

$$G_i = 1 + \frac{F_i}{1 + \frac{F_{i+1}}{1 + \frac{F_{i+2}}{\dots}}} \quad (15)$$

Assuming that $G_{L+1} = G_1$, the continued fraction becomes periodic, and one can write down the quadratic equation that G_i obeys, so that $|c_i|^2 = G_i |a_i|^2$ can be explicitly solved in terms of F_i s which are each a function of (a_i, b_i) . However, the solution does not fix the phase of c_i . We can therefore fix it to be real, so that we can define real parameters (θ_i, ϕ_i) so that $\cos(\theta_i/2) = a_i/c_i$ and $-ie^{i\phi_i} \sin(\theta_i/2) = \frac{b_i a_{i+1}}{c_i c_{i+1}}$. One thus sees that $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})$ are related to $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$ by a non-local mapping. In particular, the angle θ_i at 'site i ', depends on the azimuthal angles $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ at all other sites.

With this choice of c_i s, we claim that the state

$$|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle \equiv \frac{|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle}{\| |\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle \|} = \text{Tr}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_L),$$

$$A_i(\theta_i, \phi_i) = \begin{pmatrix} P_i |(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle & Q_i |(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle \\ |0\rangle_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta_i/2) |0\rangle_i & -ie^{i\phi_i} \sin(\theta_i/2) |1\rangle_i \\ |0\rangle_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

where $|(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle = e^{i\phi_i/2} e^{i\phi_i S_i^z} e^{-i\theta_i S_i^x} |0\rangle_i$, is now normalized, in the thermodynamic limit.

Norm

To see this, let us calculate its norm explicitly. To this end we define the transfer matrix on a given site:

$$\mathcal{T}(\bar{\theta}, \bar{\phi}, \theta, \phi) = A(\bar{\theta}, \bar{\phi})^\dagger \otimes A(\theta, \phi) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\bar{\theta}/2) \cos(\theta/2) & 0 & 0 & e^{i(\phi - \bar{\phi})} \sin(\bar{\theta}/2) \sin(\theta/2) \\ \cos(\bar{\theta}/2) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cos(\theta/2) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

where the hermitian-conjugating operation (\dagger) acts in an element-wise fashion on the matrix. Evaluating $\mathcal{T}(\theta, \phi, \theta, \phi)$ yields $T(\theta) = \mathcal{T}(\theta, \phi, \theta, \phi)$, where

$$T(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2(\theta/2) & 0 & 0 & \sin^2(\theta/2) \\ \cos(\theta/2) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \cos(\theta/2) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

which does not depend on ϕ .

Now, $T(x)$'s left and right eigenvectors are found to be

$$|l_1(x)\rangle = (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ \sin^2(x/2)) / (1 + \sin^2(x/2)) \quad (19)$$

$$|l_2(x)\rangle = (-1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1) / (1 + \sin^2(x/2)) \quad (20)$$

$$|l_3(x)\rangle = (0 \ 1 \ 0 \ -\cos(x/2)) \quad (21)$$

$$|l_4(x)\rangle = (0 \ -1 \ 1 \ 0) \quad (22)$$

and

$$|r_1(x)\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \cos(x/2) \\ \cos(x/2) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |r_2(x)\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin^2(x/2) \\ \cos(x/2) \\ \cos(x/2) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |r_3(x)\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |r_4(x)\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

with corresponding eigenvalues given by

$$\lambda_1(x) = 1, \quad \lambda_2(x) = -\sin^2(x/2), \quad \lambda_3(x) = 0, \quad \lambda_4(x) = 0. \quad (24)$$

Note that these eigenvectors are normalized such that $\langle l_i(x) | r_j(x) \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$. With this we can resolve the identity as $1 = \sum_{k=1}^4 |r_k(x)\rangle \langle l_k(x)|$. We also will use the following notation $\langle l_i(x) | r_j(y) \rangle = \mathcal{M}_{i,j}(x, y)$ which gives the matrix

$$\mathcal{M}(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{\sin^2(x/2) - \sin^2(y/2)}{1 + \sin^2(x/2)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1 + \sin^2(y/2)}{1 + \sin^2(x/2)} & 0 & 0 \\ \cos(y/2) - \cos(x/2) & \cos(y/2) - \cos(x/2) & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

which we point out has matrix element $\mathcal{M}_{2,1}(x, y) = 0$. By definition, we have that

$$\mathcal{M}(x, y) \mathcal{M}(y, z) = \mathcal{M}(x, z), \quad (26)$$

and also that, for all $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$,

$$\mathcal{M}_{k,k}(x, y) \mathcal{M}_{k,k}(y, z) = \mathcal{M}_{k,k}(x, z). \quad (27)$$

Using these we are now equipped to calculate the norm of our variational state:

$$\langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle = \text{Tr} [T(\theta_1) T(\theta_2) \dots T(\theta_N)] \quad (28)$$

$$= \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_N=1}^4 \left(\prod_{j=1}^N \lambda_{k_j}(\theta_j) \right) \langle l_{k_1}(\theta_1) | r_{k_2}(\theta_2) \rangle \langle l_{k_2}(\theta_2) | r_{k_3}(\theta_3) \rangle \dots \langle l_{k_N}(\theta_N) | r_{k_1}(\theta_1) \rangle \quad (29)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^2 \left(\prod_{j=1}^N \lambda_k(\theta_j) \right) = 1 + \prod_{j=1}^N (-\sin^2(\theta_j/2)). \quad (30)$$

Since the product of $\sin^2(\theta_j/2)$ s in the r.h.s. of the above equation generically vanishes in the thermodynamic limit, this shows that the state is normalized,

$$\boxed{\langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle = 1}. \quad (31)$$

This is important for the purposes of the TDVP calculations in order for the dynamics to be norm preserving.

MPS for higher spins

We can generalize the variational MPS that we derived above for $s = 1/2$, to higher spins, by simply taking the higher-spin analogs of both the operators and states:

$$|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle \equiv \text{Tr}(A_1 A_2 \dots A_L),$$

$$A_i(\theta_i, \phi_i) = \begin{pmatrix} P_i |(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle & Q_i |(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle \\ |0\rangle_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (32)$$

where $|\langle\theta_i, \phi_i\rangle\rangle = e^{i\phi_i s} e^{i\phi_i S_i^z} e^{-i\theta_i S_i^x} |0\rangle_i$, $P_i = |0\rangle_i \langle 0|_i$ and $Q_i = \mathbb{I}_i - P_i$. Once again, this state is normalized in the thermodynamic limit. This can be seen easily from the fact that the transfer matrix is

$$\mathcal{T}(\theta, \phi, \theta, \phi) = A(\theta, \phi)^\dagger \otimes A(\theta, \phi) = \begin{pmatrix} \langle\langle\theta, \phi|P|(\theta, \phi)\rangle\rangle & 0 & 0 & \langle\langle\theta, \phi|Q|(\theta, \phi)\rangle\rangle \\ \langle\langle\theta, \phi|0\rangle\rangle & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \langle\langle 0|(\theta, \phi)\rangle\rangle & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (33)$$

which similarly to the $s = 1/2$ case has a single dominant eigenvalue equal to 1.

II. TDVP CALCULATIONS

The time-dependent variational principle generates dynamics on a variational manifold of states that is most ‘optimal’, a condition which can be formulated in two generically equivalent ways: (i) the geometric principle, and (ii) the action principle.

In the former geometrical principle, dynamics on the variational manifold is derived by continually projecting the full quantum evolution at any point in the manifold onto its tangent space, so that motion always remains within the manifold. In other words, assuming a parameterization of the manifold by \mathbf{z} (in our case, $\mathbf{z} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$), one minimizes the motion out of the tangent space, or equivalently the vector orthogonal to the tangent space,

$$\min_{\dot{\mathbf{z}}} \|\dot{\mathbf{z}} \partial_{\mathbf{z}} |\psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle + iH|\psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle\|. \quad (34)$$

This leads to the equations of motion

$$\sum_k \langle\partial_{z_l} \psi(\mathbf{z})|\partial_{z_k} \psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle \dot{z}_k + i\langle\partial_{z_l} \psi(\mathbf{z})|H|\psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle, \quad (35)$$

where $\langle\partial_{z_l} \psi(\mathbf{z})|\partial_{z_k} \psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle$ is the so-called Gram matrix. In this geometrical picture, the instantaneous error resulting from the TDVP motion can naturally be quantified as

$$\Gamma(\mathbf{z}) = \|\dot{\mathbf{z}} \partial_{\mathbf{z}} |\psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle + iH|\psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle\|. \quad (36)$$

The error between the true unitary and the TDVP time evolution, is then upper bounded as $\|e^{-iHt}|\psi_0\rangle - |\psi(\mathbf{z}(t))\rangle\| \leq \int_0^t \Gamma(\mathbf{z}(t)) dt$, where $|\psi(\mathbf{z}(0))\rangle = |\psi_0\rangle$. In a many-body system, however, since $\Gamma(\mathbf{z})$ scales as $\sim \langle\psi(\mathbf{z})|H^2|\psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle^2 \sim L$, this is not a particularly useful bound. Instead, we will consider the normalized, intensive version of the error,

$$\gamma(\mathbf{z}) = \Gamma(\mathbf{z})/\sqrt{L}, \quad (37)$$

where L is the total number of sites, as was used in the main text. This has the interpretation of the instantaneous rate of leakage per site of the wavefunction out of the manifold.

In the latter action principle, one extremizes the action of the following classical Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} = i\langle\psi(\mathbf{z})|\partial_{\mathbf{z}} \psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle \dot{\mathbf{z}} - \langle\psi(\mathbf{z})|H|\psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle, \quad (38)$$

where in the above, it is implicitly assumed that the dimensionality of the manifold is large enough to support a symplectic structure; this means that \mathbf{z} must be at least even dimensional.

We note here that the TDVP has the property that it generates classical dynamics in the phase space \mathbf{z} , via the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} above, or equivalently, the corresponding Hamiltonian which is related via a Legendre transformation. Thus, the TDVP respects conservation laws. In particular, the energy of the system is conserved: that is, $\partial_t \langle\psi(\mathbf{z})|H|\psi(\mathbf{z})\rangle = 0$, a fact that will be useful to us in simplifying the following calculations.

Geometric principle

Let us derive the EOMs for all spin- s representations using the geometric principle of the TDVP on the states $|\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle$ (32), i.e. by evaluating Eqn. (35). As we are interested in describing the dynamics of the states $|0\rangle$ and

$|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$, we will further focus on the states having a two-site unit cell translational invariance, i.e. $(\theta_{2i}, \phi_{2i}) = (\theta_e, \phi_e)$ and $(\theta_{2i+1}, \phi_{2i+1}) = (\theta_o, \phi_o)$. We first establish some notations:

$$\begin{aligned} |(\theta, \phi)\rangle &\equiv P|(\theta, \phi)\rangle + Q|(\theta, \phi)\rangle \\ &= x|0\rangle + Q|(\theta, \phi)\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

which defines $x \equiv \langle 0|(\theta, \phi)\rangle$. Then we have

$$\langle(\theta, \phi)|P|(\theta, \phi)\rangle = |x|^2, \quad \langle(\theta, \phi)|Q|(\theta, \phi)\rangle = 1 - |x|^2. \quad (40)$$

The one-site transfer matrix (33) is then

$$\mathcal{T}(\theta, \phi) = A(\theta, \phi)^\dagger \otimes A(\theta, \phi) = \begin{pmatrix} |x|^2 & 0 & 0 & 1 - |x|^2 \\ x^* & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \equiv T(x), \quad (41)$$

which looks similar to (18) for $s = 1/2$. The two site-transfer matrix, which we will use extensively in the calculations below, is given by $T(x_o, x_e) \equiv T(x_o)T(x_e)$. Its left and right eigenvectors are found to be

$$\langle(l_1| = \frac{1}{|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2|x_e|^2} (|x_e|^2 \ 0 \ 0 \ |x_o|^2(1 - |x_e|^2)) \quad (42)$$

$$\langle(l_2| = (0 \ 0 \ 1 \ -x_o) \quad (43)$$

$$\langle(l_3| = (0 \ 1 \ 0 \ -x_o^*) \quad (44)$$

$$\langle(l_4| = \frac{1}{|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2|x_e|^2} (-|x_e|^2 \ 0 \ 0 \ |x_e|^2) \quad (45)$$

and

$$|r_1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ x_o^* \\ x_o \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |r_2\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |r_3\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |r_4\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{|x_o|^2(-1+|x_e|^2)}{|x_e|^2} \\ x_o^* \\ x_o \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (46)$$

with corresponding eigenvalues given by

$$\lambda_1 = 1, \quad \lambda_2 = 0, \quad \lambda_3 = 0, \quad \lambda_4 = (-1 + |x_o|^2)(-1 + |x_e|^2). \quad (47)$$

Showing that $(\dot{\phi}_o, \dot{\phi}_e) = (0, 0)$ and $(\phi_o, \phi_e) = (0, 0)$

Let us now show that for the states of interest, $|0\rangle$ and $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$, $(\dot{\phi}_o, \dot{\phi}_e) = (0, 0)$ and therefore we have that $(\phi_o, \phi_e) = (0, 0)$. This follows from evaluating the energy expectation value $\langle\psi(\theta, \phi)|H|\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle$ where $H = \Omega \sum_i \mathcal{P}S_i^x \mathcal{P}$. To wit:

$$\begin{aligned} h(\theta, \phi) &\equiv A(\theta, \phi)^\dagger \otimes (S^x A(\theta, \phi)) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \langle(\theta, \phi)|P & \langle(\theta, \phi)|Q \\ \langle 0| & 0 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} S^x P|(\theta, \phi)\rangle & S^x Q|(\theta, \phi)\rangle \\ S^x|0\rangle & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x^*y & xy^* & s_x - x^*y - xy^* \\ 0 & 0 & y^* & 0 \\ 0 & y & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where $y \equiv \langle 0|S^x|(\theta, \phi)\rangle$ and $s_x \equiv \langle(\theta, \phi)|S^x|(\theta, \phi)\rangle$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\psi(\theta, \phi)|H|\psi(\theta, \phi)\rangle &= \frac{L}{2} \Omega \sum_{i=1}^4 (\langle l_i|h(\theta_o, \phi_o)T(x_e) + T(x_o)h(\theta_e, \phi_e)|r_i\rangle) \\ &= \frac{L}{2} \Omega \frac{s_{x_e}|x_o|^2 + s_{x_o}|x_e|^2 + |x_o|^2 x_o^* x_e y_2 + |x_e|^2 x_o^* x_e y_1 + x_o x_e |x_e|^2 y_1^* + |x_o|^2 x_o x_e y_2^*}{|x_e|^2 + |x_o|^2 - |x_o|^2|x_e|^2} \\ &= \frac{L}{2} \Omega \frac{2s \cos^{4s-1}(\frac{\theta_o}{2}) \cos^{6s}(\frac{\theta_e}{2}) \sin(\frac{\theta_o}{2}) \sin(\phi_o) + (e \leftrightarrow o)}{\cos^{4s}(\frac{\theta_o}{2}) + \cos^{4s}(\frac{\theta_e}{2}) - \cos^{4s}(\frac{\theta_o}{2}) \cos^{4s}(\frac{\theta_e}{2})}, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where we have used that $x = \cos^{2s}(\theta/2)$, $y = is \cos^{2s-1}(\theta/2) \sin(\theta/2) e^{i\phi}$, $s_x = s \sin(\theta) \sin(\phi)$.

Clearly, $\langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | H | \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle = 0$ for $(\phi_o, \phi_e) = (0, 0)$. This energy expectation value equals the energies of the states $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$, and the angles $(\phi_o, \phi_e) = (0, 0)$ encompass the states. Since the EOMs from the TDVP preserve energy expectation values, we have therefore that $(\dot{\phi}_o, \dot{\phi}_e) = (0, 0)$, and we can henceforth drop all dependence on ϕ in our calculations, so that $|\langle \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi} \rangle \rightarrow |\boldsymbol{\theta}\rangle = e^{-i\theta S^x} |0\rangle$.

Gram matrix

With $|\langle \boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi} \rangle \rightarrow |\boldsymbol{\theta}\rangle = e^{-i\theta S^x} |0\rangle$, let us calculate the two-by-two Gram matrix

$$G_{\mu\nu} \equiv \langle \partial_{\theta_\mu} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | \partial_{\theta_\nu} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle \quad (50)$$

where $\mu, \nu = o, e$. We have also that $G_{oe} = G_{eo}|_{\theta_o \rightarrow \theta_e, \theta_e \rightarrow \theta_o}$ and $G_{ee} = G_{oo}|_{\theta_o \rightarrow \theta_e, \theta_e \rightarrow \theta_o}$, so it suffices to calculate G_{oe} and G_{oo} . The following objects will also be useful to us:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}T(x) &\equiv \partial_\theta A(\theta)^\dagger \otimes A(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} x(x^*)' & 0 & 0 & -x(x^*)' \\ (x^*)' & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \partial T(x) &\equiv A(\theta)^\dagger \otimes \partial_\theta A(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} x^* x' & 0 & 0 & -x^* x' \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x' & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where

$$A(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} P|\theta\rangle & Q|\theta\rangle \\ |0\rangle & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (52)$$

and (\prime) refers to the derivative with respect to θ .

To compute G_{oe} , we consider the two different cases depending on where the two derivatives $(\partial_{\theta_o}, \partial_{\theta_e})$ act: (i) within the same (two-site) unit cell or (ii) in different unit cells. For (i), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \lambda_i^{L/2-1} (\langle l_i | \bar{\partial}T(x_o) \partial T(x_e) | r_i \rangle) = 0 \quad (53)$$

in the thermodynamic limit, while for (ii), we also have

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_k (\langle l_i | [\bar{\partial}T(x_o) T(x_e)] T(x_o, x_e)^k [T(x_o) \partial T(x_e)] T(x_o, x_e)^{L/2-k-2} | r_i \rangle) = 0 \quad (54)$$

in the thermodynamic limit. Thus,

$$\boxed{G_{oe} = G_{eo} = 0} \quad (55)$$

To compute G_{oo} , we consider also the two cases where the two derivatives act. For the case where they act on differing unit cells, we once again have

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_k (\langle l_i | [\bar{\partial}T(x_o) T(x_e)] T(x_o, x_e)^k [\partial T(x_o) T(x_e)] T(x_o, x_e)^{L/2-k-2} | r_i \rangle) = 0 \quad (56)$$

in the thermodynamic limit. For the case where they act on the same unit cell, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=1}^4 \lambda_i^{L/2-1} (\langle l_i | \begin{pmatrix} \langle \partial_{\theta_o} \theta_o | P | \partial_{\theta_o} \theta_o \rangle & 0 & 0 & \langle \partial_{\theta_o} \theta_o | Q | \partial_{\theta_o} \theta_o \rangle \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T(x_e) | r_i \rangle) \\ &= \frac{\langle \theta_o | (S^x)^2 | \theta_o \rangle}{|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2 |x_e|^2} = \frac{s/2}{|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2 |x_e|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Thus,

$$G_{oo} = G_{ee} = \frac{L}{2} \frac{s/2}{|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2|x_e|^2}. \quad (58)$$

Dynamical term

We now compute the dynamical term $i\langle \partial_{\theta_\mu} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | H | \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle$. Since the state is assumed to have two-site translational invariance, S^x in the Hamiltonian H could act on either the odd (o) or even (e) sites of the unit cell.

We consider the scenario where S^x acts on an odd site, and where the derivative (on θ_o) acts in a different unit cell. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_k ((l_i | [\bar{\partial}T(x_o)T(x_e)] T(x_o, x_e)^k [h(x_o, y_o)T(x_e)] T(x_o, x_e)^{L/2-k-2} | l_i)) \\ &= \frac{x_o|x_e|^2(-1+|x_e|^2)(x_o^*)'(y_o x_o^* x_e^* + x_o x_e y_o^*)}{(|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2|x_e|^2)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Next we consider the scenario where S^x acts on an odd site, while the derivative acts within the same unit cell. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^4 \lambda_i^{L/2-1} ((l_i | \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (x_o^*)'y_o & x_o y_o' & tt_o - x_o(y_o^*)' - x_o^* y_o \\ 0 & 0 & (y_o^*)' & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} T(x_e) | r_i)) \\ &= \frac{|x_2|^2(tt_o + y_o(-1+x_e^*)(x_o^*)' + x_o(-1+x_e)(y_o^*)')}{|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2|x_e|^2} \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where $tt_o \equiv \langle \partial_{\theta_o} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | S^x | \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle$.

Moving forward, we consider the scenario where S^x acts on an even site. Similarly, there are two cases: for the case where the derivative acts in a different unit cell, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^4 \sum_k ((l_i | [\bar{\partial}T(x_o)T(x_e)] T(x_o, x_e)^k [T(x_o)h(x_e, y_e)] T(x_o, x_e)^{L/2-k-2} | l_i)) \\ &= -\frac{|x_o|^2 y_e x_e^* (x_o^*)'}{|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2|x_e|^2} + \frac{x_o x_e (-1 + |x_o|^2) x_e^* (-1 + |x_e|^2) (x_o^*)' (y_e x_o^* x_e^* + x_o x_e y_e^*)}{(|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2|x_e|^2)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Lastly, the on-site term is

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \lambda_i^{L/2-1} ((l_i | \partial T(\theta_o) h(x_e, y_e) | r_i)) = \frac{x_o (x_o^*)' |x_e|^2 (y_e x_o^* x_e^* + x_o x_e y_e^*)}{|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2|x_e|^2}. \quad (62)$$

Thus,

$$i\langle \partial_{\theta_o} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | H | \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle = i \frac{L}{2} \Omega ((59) + (60) + (61) + (62)), \quad (63)$$

and $i\langle \partial_{\theta_e} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | H | \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle$ is given by the above expression but with θ_o, θ_e swapped.

Equations of motion

We now evaluate all the expressions to obtain the equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}_o &= G_{oo}^{-1} i \langle \partial_{\theta_o} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | H | \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle \\ \dot{\theta}_e &= G_{ee}^{-1} i \langle \partial_{\theta_e} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | H | \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

We use that

$$\begin{aligned}
x &= \cos^{2s} \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \\
x' &= -s \sin \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \cos^{2s-1} \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \\
y &= ix' \\
y' &= -i \frac{s}{2} (1 - s + s \cos(\theta)) \cos^{2s-2} \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \\
tt &= -is/2
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\theta}_o &= \Omega \left[1 - \cos^{4s-2} \left(\frac{\theta_o}{2} \right) + \cos^{4s-2} \left(\frac{\theta_o}{2} \right) \cos^{2s} \left(\frac{\theta_e}{2} \right) + 2s \cos^{6s-1} \left(\frac{\theta_o}{2} \right) \sin \left(\frac{\theta_o}{2} \right) \tan \left(\frac{\theta_e}{2} \right) \right], \\
\dot{\theta}_e &= \Omega \left[1 - \cos^{4s-2} \left(\frac{\theta_e}{2} \right) + \cos^{4s-2} \left(\frac{\theta_e}{2} \right) \cos^{2s} \left(\frac{\theta_o}{2} \right) + 2s \cos^{6s-1} \left(\frac{\theta_e}{2} \right) \sin \left(\frac{\theta_e}{2} \right) \tan \left(\frac{\theta_o}{2} \right) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

Error calculation

We present here the calculation of the error Γ (which is related to γ via (37)). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma^2 &= \langle \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | H^2 | \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle - i \sum_{\mu=o,e} \dot{\theta}_\mu \langle \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | H | \partial_{\theta_\mu} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle + i \sum_{\mu=o,e} \dot{\theta}_\mu \langle \partial_{\theta_\mu} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | H | \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle \\
&+ \sum_{\mu,\nu} \dot{\theta}_\mu \dot{\theta}_\nu \langle \partial_{\theta_\mu} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | \partial_{\theta_\nu} \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

When evaluated along the EOMs derived from the TDVP, the middle two terms vanish. Since the last term is nothing but the Gram matrix, we simply have to evaluate the first term, $\langle \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | H^2 | \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle$. We only present here the final result. It is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) | H^2 | \psi(\theta_o, \theta_e) \rangle &= \frac{L}{2} \frac{|x_o|^2 \left(\frac{s}{2} (|x_o|^2 |x_e|^2 - 2x_o |x_e|^2 + 1 + |x_e|^2) + 2 \langle \theta_e | (S^x)^2 | 0 \rangle (x_o x_e - x_e) \right)}{|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2 |x_e|^2} + (o \leftrightarrow e) \\
&+ \frac{L}{2} \frac{4|x_o|^2 |x_e|^2 \langle \theta_e | (S^x)^2 | 0 \rangle \langle 0 | (S^x)^2 | \theta_o \rangle}{|x_o|^2 + |x_e|^2 - |x_o|^2 |x_e|^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Error along the trajectory of the $|0\rangle$ state

The error around an orbit \mathcal{C} of the equations of motion generated by TDVP is defined by

$$\epsilon = \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \gamma dt. \tag{69}$$

Note that the trajectory from the state $|0\rangle$, also lies on an orbit for $s = 1$ and 2 . The error along such an orbit is $\epsilon_{\mathcal{C}} = 1.17, 1.15$ for $s = 1, 2$ respectively, larger than that quoted for the orbit that $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$ lives on.

Action Principle

Full Lagrangian

Let us calculate the full Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) = i \langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | \partial_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle \dot{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + i \langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | \partial_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle \dot{\boldsymbol{\phi}} - \langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | H | \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle, \tag{70}$$

on which extremizing its action will yield the TDVP equations. Let us henceforth focus on the $s = 1/2$ case only, so that in what follows, T, \mathcal{T} correspond to the appropriate $s = 1/2$ matrices defined earlier.

We define a few useful objects: $T_\sigma(\theta) = \partial_\sigma \mathcal{T}|_{\bar{\theta}=\theta, \bar{\phi}=\bar{\phi}}$ (for $\sigma = \bar{\theta}, \bar{\phi}, \theta, \phi$), which once again do not depend on ϕ :

$$T_{\bar{\theta}} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -\sin(\theta/2) \cos(\theta/2) & 0 & 0 & \cos(\theta/2) \sin(\theta/2) \\ -\sin(\theta/2) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (71)$$

$$T_\theta = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -\sin(\theta/2) \cos(\theta/2) & 0 & 0 & \cos(\theta/2) \sin(\theta/2) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sin(\theta/2) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (72)$$

$$T_{\bar{\phi}} = -T_\phi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \sin^2(\theta/2) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (73)$$

Now, we have:

$$\langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | \partial_{\theta_i} \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle = \text{tr}\{T(\theta_1) \dots T_{\theta_i}(\theta_i) \dots T(\theta_N)\} \quad (74)$$

$$= \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_N=1}^4 \left(\prod_{j \neq i} \lambda_{k_j}(\theta_j) \right) \mathcal{M}_{k_1, k_2}(\theta_1, \theta_2) \dots \mathcal{M}_{k_i, k_{i+1}}^\theta(\theta_i, \theta_{i+1}) \dots \mathcal{M}_{k_N, k_1}(\theta_N, \theta_1) \quad (75)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \cos(\theta_i/2) \prod_j (-\sin^2(\theta_j/2)). \quad (76)$$

Here we used again the structure of the matrix $(l_i(x)|T_\theta(x)|r_j(y)) = \mathcal{M}_{i,j}^\theta(x, y)$ given by

$$\mathcal{M}^\theta(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\sin(x/2) \cos(x/2) (\sin^2(y/2)+1)}{\sin^2(x/2)+1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{\sin(x/2) \cos(x/2) (\sin^2(y/2)+1)}{\sin^2(x/2)+1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sin(x/2) & \sin(x/2) \sin^2(y/2) & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (77)$$

Similarly we find

$$\langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | \partial_{\phi_i} \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle = \frac{i \sin^2(\theta_i/2)}{\sin^2(\theta_i/2) + 1} F_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (78)$$

$$F_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left(1 - \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\sin^2(\theta_j/2) - \sin^2(\theta_{j+1}/2)}{\sin^2(\theta_j/2) + 1} \frac{\sin^2(\theta_i/2) + 1}{\sin^2(\theta_{j+1}/2) + 1} \prod_{n=j+1}^{i-1} (-\sin^2(\theta_n/2)) - \prod_{j \neq i} (-\sin^2(\theta_j/2)) \right) \quad (79)$$

and

$$\langle \partial_{\phi_i} \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle = -\langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | \partial_{\phi_i} \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle. \quad (80)$$

For the energy expectation value we get

$$\langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) | \sum_i S_i^x | \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \frac{\cos(\theta_{i+1}/2) \sin(\theta_i) \sin(\phi_i)}{\sin^2(\theta_i/2) + 1} F_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (81)$$

In summary, in the thermodynamic limit the Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_i K_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \left(\sin^2(\theta_i/2) \dot{\phi}_i + \frac{\Omega}{2} \cos(\theta_{i+1}/2) \sin(\theta_i) \sin(\phi_i) \right), \quad (82)$$

where

$$K_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \left(\frac{1}{\sin^2(\theta_i/2) + 1} + \sum_{j \neq i} \left(\frac{1}{\sin^2(\theta_j/2) + 1} - \frac{1}{\sin^2(\theta_{j+1}/2) + 1} \right) \prod_{n=j+1}^{i-1} (-\sin^2(\theta_n/2)) \right). \quad (83)$$

Two-site unit cell Lagrangian

We derive the Lagrangian for a state with two-site unit cell translational invariance. This encompasses the $|0\rangle$ and $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$, in particular. Let $(\theta_{2i}, \phi_{2i}) = (\theta_e, \phi_e)$ and $(\theta_{2i+1}, \phi_{2i+1}) = (\theta_o, \phi_o)$.

$$K_{2i} = \frac{1}{1 + \sin^2(\theta_e/2)} + \left(\frac{1}{1 + \sin^2(\theta_e/2)} - \frac{1}{1 + \sin^2(\theta_o/2)} \right) (1 + \sin^2(\theta_o/2)) \sum_{k=0}^{N/2 \rightarrow \infty} \sin^{2k}(\theta_e/2) \sin^{2k}(\theta_o/2) \quad (84)$$

$$= \frac{\cos^2(\theta_o/2)}{1 - \sin^2(\theta_e/2) \sin^2(\theta_o/2)}. \quad (85)$$

Analogously

$$K_{2i+1} = \frac{\cos^2(\theta_e/2)}{1 - \sin^2(\theta_o/2) \sin^2(\theta_e/2)}. \quad (86)$$

Thus

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\cos^2(\theta_o/2)}{1 - \sin^2(\theta_e/2) \sin^2(\theta_o/2)} \left(\sin^2(\theta_e/2) \dot{\phi}_e + \frac{\Omega}{2} \cos(\theta_o/2) \sin(\theta_e) \sin(\phi_e) \right) + (e \leftrightarrow o). \quad (87)$$

III. MEASURE AND RESOLUTION OF THE IDENTITY

In this section we write down the measure $\mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$ required for a resolution of the identity on the constrained space, which then allows for a path integral description of the system. Let us only focus on the case $s = 1/2$. The ‘outer product transfer matrix’ is given by

$$A(\theta, \phi) \otimes A(\theta, \phi)^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2(\theta/2)|0\rangle\langle 0| & ie^{-i\phi} \cos(\theta/2) \sin(\theta/2)|0\rangle\langle 1| & ie^{i\phi} \cos(\theta/2) \sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle\langle 0| & \sin^2(\theta/2)|1\rangle\langle 1| \\ \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle\langle 0| & 0 & -ie^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle\langle 0| & 0 \\ \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle\langle 0| & ie^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2)|0\rangle\langle 1| & 0 & 0 \\ |0\rangle\langle 0| & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (88)$$

Let us postulate an ansatz for the measure to be

$$\mu(\theta, \phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} (\alpha + \beta \cos(\theta)), \quad (89)$$

where ϕ, θ are both to be integrated from 0 to 2π . Then, we have

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta d\phi \mu(\theta, \phi) A(\theta, \phi) \otimes A(\theta, \phi)^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\pi}{2}(2\alpha + \beta)P & 0 & 0 & \frac{\pi}{2}(2\alpha - \beta)Q \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2\pi\alpha P & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (90)$$

where $P = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $Q = \mathbb{I} - P$. Choosing $\alpha = \frac{2+\sqrt{5}}{(3+\sqrt{5})\pi}, \beta = \frac{2}{(3+\sqrt{5})\pi}$ gives

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta d\phi \mu(\theta, \phi) A(\theta, \phi) \otimes A(\theta, \phi)^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\varphi}Q \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \varphi P & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \equiv \mathbb{A} \quad (91)$$

where $\varphi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ is the Golden Ratio. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \int \prod_i \mu(\theta_i, \phi_i) |\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle \langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})| &= \int \int \prod_i \mu(\theta_i, \phi_i) \text{Tr}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_L) (\text{Tr}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_L))^\dagger \\
&= \int \int \prod_i \mu(\theta_i, \phi_i) \text{Tr} \left(\prod_i A(\theta_i, \phi_i) \otimes A(\theta_i, \phi_i)^\dagger \right) \\
&= \text{Tr}(\mathbb{A}_1 \mathbb{A}_2 \cdots \mathbb{A}_L) \\
&= P_1 P_2 \cdots P_L + Q_1 P_1 \cdots P_L + P_1 Q_1 P_2 \cdots P_L + \cdots + P_1 Q_1 P_2 Q_3 \cdots Q_L + \cdots \\
&= \mathcal{P},
\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

the identity operator on the constrained space. This is because the trace of the product of \mathbb{A}_i s generates an equal weight linear combination of all possible products of local projectors onto ‘0’s and ‘1’s states which are consistent with the constraints. Thus, we have the resolution of the identity and the measure

$$\boxed{\int \int \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) |\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle \langle \psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})| = \mathcal{P}, \text{ where } \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) \equiv \prod_i \mu(\theta_i, \phi_i)}. \tag{93}$$

The path integral over the ‘Gutzwiller projected’ states then follows, with the full Lagrangian derived earlier.

IV. THERMALIZATION IN THE CONSTRAINED SPACE

We derive in this section what it means to thermalize (to infinite temperature) in the constrained Hilbert spaces that the constrained spin models are defined in. Consider a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ with zero energy $E = \langle \psi | H | \psi \rangle = 0$. The corresponding Gibbs ensemble that gives rise to a similar energy expectation value would be the infinite temperature ensemble, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{Z} \text{Tr}(H e^{-\beta H})|_{\beta=0} = 0, \tag{94}$$

since the spectra of the models are all particle-hole symmetric. In the above, the trace is over states in the constrained Hilbert space. Thus, if the system does thermalize beginning from the state $|\psi\rangle$, the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) states that the long-term expectation value of any local observable can be evaluated within the infinite-temperature Gibbs ensemble, namely

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \langle \psi | O(t) | \psi \rangle = \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} \text{Tr}(O), \tag{95}$$

where \mathcal{D} is the dimension of the Hilbert space.

Note that $\text{Tr}(O)/\mathcal{D}$ can be estimated by taking the expectation value within a random vector $|\psi_r\rangle$, i.e. $\langle \psi_r | O | \psi_r \rangle$. We can therefore evaluate the thermal expectation value of an operator O by explicitly constructing the expected reduced density matrix of a random vector on the support of O , while accounting for the global boundary conditions, which we will demonstrate below. In what follows, we will use periodic boundary conditions, but a similar calculation for systems with open boundary conditions can be straightforwardly performed. Note that the choice of boundary conditions will lead to very different thermal values, unlike in the case of normal, unconstrained spin systems in which bulk properties are insensitive to boundary conditions.

Let us consider first the case of spin $s = 1/2$ and an operator that acts on only one site, for example S_1^z on site 1. Now, a random vector can be decomposed in the product state basis,

$$|\psi_r\rangle = c_1 |001 \cdots\rangle + c_2 |010 \cdots\rangle + \cdots + c_i |100 \cdots\rangle + \cdots. \tag{96}$$

The ratio of the probabilities that the number of times ‘0’ appears at site 1 to the the number of times ‘1’ appears, is $(1 + \varphi)/1$, where $\varphi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ is the Golden Ratio. This can be derived by counting the number of states conditioning that the first site is 0(1), while enforcing that the boundary conditions are respected, assuming that the rest of the system is infinitely large. Thus, the expected reduced density matrix is given by

$$\rho_1 = \frac{1}{Z} \left(|0\rangle \langle 0| + \frac{1}{1 + \varphi} |1\rangle \langle 1| \right) \tag{97}$$

where $Z = (2 + \varphi)/(1 + \varphi)$. The infinite-temperature value of S_1^z is then

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} \text{Tr}(S_1^z) = \frac{1}{Z} \left(-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1 + \varphi} \frac{1}{2} \right) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\varphi}{2 + \varphi} \approx -0.2236, \quad (98)$$

which agrees with the numerically observed value that the $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ state equilibrates to. The above calculation also tell us that the expected entanglement entropy (EE) of a random vector over one site is

$$S_1 = -\text{Tr}(\rho_1 \log_2 \rho_1) \approx 0.8505. \quad (99)$$

Note that this is *not* the maximal value of entanglement possible, which would be $\max(S_1) = 1$.

A slightly more non-trivial example would involve the density matrix on three sites. The expected reduced density matrix of a random vector is

$$\rho_3 = \frac{1}{Z} \left(|000\rangle\langle 000| + |010\rangle\langle 010| + \frac{1}{\varphi} |00\rangle\langle 001| + \frac{1}{\varphi} |100\rangle\langle 100| + \frac{1}{1 + \varphi} |101\rangle\langle 101| \right). \quad (100)$$

As mentioned, the generalization to the case of spin- s systems is straightforward. Focusing on a single site, the ratio of the number of times ‘0’ appears to, ‘1’, ‘2’, \dots , ‘ $2s$ ’, is $1 + r$ where $r = (1 + \sqrt{1 + 8s})/4s$. Thus the reduced density matrix is

$$\rho_1 = \frac{1}{Z} \left(|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{1 + r} (\mathbb{I} - |0\rangle\langle 0|) \right) \quad (101)$$

where $Z = (2 + r)/(1 + r)$. The expectation value of S_1^z is then

$$\boxed{\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} \text{Tr}(S_1^z) = \frac{1}{Z} \left(-s + \frac{1}{1 + r} \frac{s}{2s} \right) = -s \frac{-1 + 4s + \sqrt{1 + 8s}}{1 + 8s + \sqrt{1 + 8s}}}. \quad (102)$$

This evaluates to -0.2236 , -0.5 , -1.053 , for $s = 1/2, 1, 2$ respectively, which agree with the values that the $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ state equilibrates to in all cases.

V. TDVP CALCULATIONS FOR A DEFORMED HAMILTONIAN

In Ref. [1], it has been noted that, for the case of $s = 1/2$, the atypical thermalization dynamics of the $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$ initial state can be enhanced by the addition of a suitable small perturbation. More specifically, it has been numerically demonstrated that the dynamics of $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$ under the Hamiltonian

$$H = \Omega \sum_i \mathcal{P} S_i^x \mathcal{P} + h \sum_i (P_{i-1} S_i^x P_{i+1} S_{i+2}^z + S_{i-2}^z P_{i-1} S_i^x P_{i+1}), \quad (103)$$

exhibits periodic oscillations for a longer duration of time for a certain small value of h , despite that the initial energy density still corresponds to that of the infinite temperature ensemble. Note that the term represented by h respects the constraint \mathcal{P} . In this section, we repeat our TDVP analysis for this Hamiltonian and show that the enhancement of the atypical dynamics can be quantified within our calculations. For brevity, we omit the details of the derivations, which is similar to calculations presented above, and simply present the results.

Similar to the previous case, we use the variational many-body wavefunction which has a matrix product state representation:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\phi})\rangle &\equiv \frac{|\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle}{\| |\psi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \boldsymbol{\varphi})\rangle \|} = \text{Tr}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_L), \\ A_i(\theta_i, \phi_i) &= \begin{pmatrix} P_i |(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle & Q_i |(\theta_i, \phi_i)\rangle \\ |0\rangle_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta_i/2) |0\rangle_i & -ie^{i\phi_i} \sin(\theta_i/2) |1\rangle_i \\ |0\rangle_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

It can be readily shown that $\phi_i = 0$ for our $|\mathbb{Z}_2\rangle$ initial state and that ϕ_i remains zero over time evolution within the variational manifold. Therefore, we focus on the effective equations of motions for the parameters $\{\theta_i\}$. Using




Figure 1. Flow diagrams of $\dot{\theta}_e(t), \dot{\theta}_o(t)$ for the Hamiltonian with various perturbation strengths h/Ω . For a range of h/Ω , the closed trajectory is still present.




Figure 2. (a) Integrated error ϵ_C of the TDVP orbit \mathcal{C} as a function of h . (b) The fluctuation \mathcal{F}_C of exact time evolution around the TDVP orbit \mathcal{C} as a function of h . We find that the minimum fluctuation is achieved when $h/\Omega \approx 0.045$.

two-site translational invariance, we only need to consider the dynamics of two parameters θ_e and θ_o . Based on the geometric principle, we compute the effective equations of motion:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{\theta}_e(t) &= \Omega \sec(\theta_o/2) (\cos^2(\theta_o/2) + \cos^2(\theta_e/2) \sin(\theta_e/2) \sin(\theta_o/2)) \\
 &\quad + h \sec(\theta_o/2) (\cos(\theta_e) \cos^2(\theta_o/2) + \cos^2(\theta_e/2) \cos(\theta_o) \sin(\theta_e/2) \sin(\theta_o/2)) \\
 \dot{\theta}_o(t) &= \Omega \sec(\theta_e/2) (\cos^2(\theta_e/2) + \cos^2(\theta_o/2) \sin(\theta_o/2) \sin(\theta_e/2)) \\
 &\quad + h \sec(\theta_e/2) (\cos(\theta_o) \cos^2(\theta_e/2) + \cos^2(\theta_o/2) \cos(\theta_e) \sin(\theta_o/2) \sin(\theta_e/2)).
 \end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

These equations of motion still support a periodic orbit \mathcal{C} as long as h remains small as seen in Fig. 1.

Similarly, one can also compute the integrated error $\epsilon_C \equiv \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \gamma dt$ of the closed orbit for different values of h . As shown in Fig. 2(a), we find that the error is minimized when the perturbation strength h/Ω is finite. Another important quantity that is closely related the error is the integrated ‘‘fluctuation’’ of the exact state evolution around the orbit:

$$\mathcal{F}_C \equiv \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \gamma^2 dt. \tag{106}$$

Fig. 2(b) shows the normalized \mathcal{F}_C as a function of the perturbation strength h/Ω . We find that the minimum fluctuation occurs at $h/\Omega \approx 0.045$. Interestingly, this value is in quantitative agreement with the optimal perturbation strength that renders the model most ‘integrable’-looking, with enhanced strength and duration of oscillations, as studied in Ref. [1].

[1] V. Khemani, C. R. Laumann, and A. Chandran, ‘‘Signatures of integrability in the dynamics of Rydberg-blockaded chains’’, ArXiv e-prints (2018), arXiv:1807.02108 [cond-mat.str-el].