

# Entanglement, non-Hermiticity and duality

Li-Mei Chen,<sup>1</sup> Shuai A. Chen,<sup>2,\*</sup> and Peng Ye<sup>1,3,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Physics, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, 510275, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute for Advanced Study, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China*

<sup>3</sup>*State Key Laboratory of Optoelectronic Materials and Technologies, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, 510275, China*

A rigorous duality is established to diagnose entanglement structure of non-Hermitian systems. During the duality process, entanglement spectrum and entanglement entropy keep invariant but Hermiticity may be substantially altered. We classify non-Hermitian models into two types. In type-I exemplified by the “non-reciprocal lattice model”, there exists at least one duality map that sends the original non-Hermitian model to a Hermitian model. In other words, entanglement structure of type-I non-Hermitian models is entirely controlled by Hermitian models. Therefore, known results of entanglement of Hermitian systems can be efficiently applied to type-I non-Hermitian systems. On the other hand, dual systems of type-II, exemplified by “non-Hermitian Su-Schrieffer-Heeger model”, are always non-Hermitian. We further notice that non-Hermitian systems with complex entanglement spectrum is of type-II but the inverse is not true. In summary, the entanglement diagnosis proposed in this Letter bridges non-Hermitian and Hermitian systems, shedding light on classification and characterization of generic non-Hermitian systems via entanglement. Several promising directions of future work are proposed.

For the past decades, Hermitian quantum matters have been intensively investigated. Classification and characterization of Hermitian quantum matters are deeply rooted in many-body treatment on quantum entanglement. Without symmetry, gapped phases are classified into short-ranged entangled (SRE) and long-range entangled (LRE) phases [1, 2]. A LRE phase, such as fractional quantum Hall states [3] is physically characterized by the robust ground state degeneracy on closed manifold and braiding statistics of topological excitations, and is often called *intrinsic* topological order [4–8]. LRE phases cannot be adiabatically connected to a direct product state via local unitary transformation (LU) that attempts to disentangle local degrees of freedom. In contrast to LRE, there exists *at least* one LU transformation such that SRE states can be connected to the direct product state without crossing phase transitions. When symmetry is considered, both LRE and SRE have finer phase structures. Symmetry Protected Topological phases, e.g., the Haldane phase [9, 10], are symmetric SRE states that admit symmetry-protected boundary anomaly [6, 11–14]. On the other hand, symmetric LRE states are called Symmetry Enriched Topological phases [6, 15–17] that admit fractionalized quantum number carried by topological excitations. Inspired by quantum information, it is also well-known that entanglement can be quantified via von Neumann entanglement entropy (EE):  $S_{EE} = -\text{Tr} \rho \log \rho$  with  $\rho = e^{-H_E}$  being the reduced density matrix. The spectrum of the entanglement “Hamiltonian”  $H_E$ , known as entanglement spectrum (ES) [18] encodes more fruitful information about quantum entanglement. In short, EE and ES can help identify and distinguish universal properties of phases [2, 4, 19–21].

On the other hand, Hermiticity of a Hamiltonian is one of the key postulates of isolated quantum systems in order to ensure both probability conservation and the real-valuedness of energy. Nevertheless, non-Hermiticity is still physically relevant and ubiquitous in, e.g., open systems. Non-Hermitian physics provides a versatile platform for a variety of classical and quantum systems (for a review, see the article [22]

and reference therein). While there have been tremendous progress in many aspects of non-Hermitian systems, entanglement structure of non-Hermitian systems is far less known, compared to the progress on many-body entanglement of Hermitian quantum matters such as LRE & SRE, EE & ES. One may wonder, in what sense does non-Hermiticity play an intrinsic role in determination of entanglement structure and is it possible to unify non-Hermitian and Hermitian systems from the entanglement perspective?

In this Letter, we build a rigorous duality between a non-Hermitian free-fermion system  $H_o$  and its dual  $H_d$ . The salient feature of the duality is that it keeps ES & EE invariant while Hermiticity may be substantially altered. In other words, the dual system  $H_d$  may be either non-Hermitian or Hermitian. If there exists *at least* one duality process that leads to Hermitian  $H_d$ ,  $H_o$  is called type-I non-Hermitian system. Otherwise,  $H_o$  is of type-II. The starting point of the establishment of the duality is the Peschel’s formula [23, 24], which has been proved still valid in non-Hermitian system [25, 26]. The Peschel’s formula states that entanglement spectrum can be fully determined by correlation matrix  $C$  for a free fermion system.  $C$  can be further expressed in terms of two projectors  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ . The non-Hermitian projector  $\mathcal{P}$  describes occupied single-particle states and the Hermitian projector  $\mathcal{R}$  defines a real space partition. The duality involves two key steps. Firstly, non-Hermiticity is transferred from  $\mathcal{P}$  to  $\mathcal{R}$  via a similarity transformation  $\mathcal{O}$ . Secondly, re-interpret roles of position and momentum which entails exchange of real space and momentum space.

The duality has profound physical and mathematical consequences, which essentially relies on the commutation relation between  $\Theta := \mathcal{O}\mathcal{O}^\dagger$  and  $\mathcal{R}$ . To some extent, the quantity  $\Theta$  encodes the entanglement information of non-Hermiticity, which paves a way towards understanding unique phenomena and functionalities in non-Hermitian systems. If there exists  $\mathcal{O}$  such that  $\Theta$  commutes with  $\mathcal{R}$ , then the dual reduced density matrix is Hermitian and  $H_o$  is of type-I. On one hand,

from the definition, non-Hermiticity of type-I doesn't play any essential role in EE and ES. But on the other hand, we are allowed to efficiently obtain ES and EE of type-I systems by means of known results of Hermitian systems. As a simple example, the non-reciprocal lattice model [27] is identified as type-I. Remarkably, as a byproduct, we prove that ES and EE of this model are independent of the parameter  $\alpha$  that measures the degree of "non-reciprocity". In contrast to type-I, the dual system  $H_d$  is always non-Hermitian for type-II systems. It indicates that entanglement structure of type-II system cannot be understood through any known results of Hermitian systems in the present duality process. The non-Hermitian Su-Schrieffer-Heeger (SSH) model [28–34] is one of simplest examples of type-II. In the remainder of this Letter, we explain the duality process by presenting one theorem and two corollaries. Two examples are computed in details. This work is concluded with several remarks and future directions and a Supplemental Material can be found in [35].

*Preliminaries*—The original Hamiltonian describes a non-Hermitian system of free fermions  $H_o = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha}^{\dagger} H_{\alpha\beta} c_{\beta}$  with  $H_o \neq H_o^{\dagger}$  and  $\{c_{\alpha}^{\dagger}, c_{\beta}\} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$  as fermionic operators.  $H_o$  can be diagonalized by a biorthogonal basis from the right and left eigenvectors [36, 37]  $|r, \alpha\rangle$  and  $|l, \alpha\rangle$  that satisfy the biorthogonal condition  $\langle l, \alpha | r, \beta \rangle = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ , i.e.,  $H_o |r, \alpha\rangle = \epsilon_{\alpha} |r, \alpha\rangle$ ,  $H_o^{\dagger} |l, \alpha\rangle = \epsilon_{\alpha}^* |l, \alpha\rangle$ . Therefore, we can decompose  $H_o = \sum_{\alpha} \epsilon_{\alpha} |r, \alpha\rangle \langle l, \alpha|$ . Introduce bifermionic operators  $\psi_{r\alpha}^{\dagger} |0\rangle \equiv |r, \alpha\rangle$  and  $\psi_{l\alpha}^{\dagger} |0\rangle \equiv |l, \alpha\rangle$  with an anti-commutation relation  $\{\psi_{l\alpha}, \psi_{r\beta}^{\dagger}\} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$  and we can construct a many-body state,  $|G_r\rangle = \prod_{\alpha \in \text{occ}} \psi_{r\alpha}^{\dagger} |0\rangle$ ,  $|G_l\rangle = \prod_{\alpha \in \text{occ}} \psi_{l\alpha}^{\dagger} |0\rangle$ , where occ denotes a set of the occupied states. *Hereafter*, when asserting a static state as a physical one or to be occupied, we assume that its eigenenergy be real. Otherwise, it is unstable under time evolution. Hence we can restrict a many-body state composed of single-particle states with real eigenenergies, whose Hamiltonian is quasi-Hermitian [38, 39] with the whole real spectrum.

From the right and left states, we can construct a density matrix  $\rho = |G_r\rangle \langle G_l|$  such that  $\rho^2 = \rho$  and  $\rho^{\dagger} \neq \rho$ . With this generalized notation, by partitioning the total system into subsystems  $A$  and  $B$ , we realize measurement of entanglement  $S_{\text{ent}} = -\text{Tr} \rho_A \ln \rho_A$  with the reduced density matrix  $\rho_A$  as taking partial trace of subsystem B,

$$\rho_A = \text{Tr}_B \rho = e^{-H_E}, H_E = \sum_{i,j \in A} c_i^{\dagger} (h_E)_{ij} c_j. \quad (1)$$

The Peschel's formula asserts that the entanglement Hamiltonian  $h_E$  can be obtained from two-point correlation matrix  $C_o$  with elements  $(C_o)_{ij} = \langle G_l | c_i^{\dagger} c_j | G_r \rangle$ ,  $i, j \in A$  via the relation  $h_E \sim C_o$ :  $h_E = \log(C_o^{-1} - \mathbb{I})$  with  $\mathbb{I}$  as an identity matrix. We can reformulate correlation matrix  $C_o$  in terms of the real space projector  $\mathcal{R}_o = \sum_{i \in A} |i\rangle \langle i|$  onto region  $A$  and single-particle projector  $\mathcal{P}_o = \sum_{\alpha \in \text{occ}} |r, \alpha\rangle \langle l, \alpha|$  onto occupied states [26, 40],

$$C_o = \mathcal{R}_o \mathcal{P}_o \mathcal{R}_o. \quad (2)$$

Therefore, ES of  $\rho_A$  is fully determined by correlation matrix  $C_o$  via the relation  $h_E \sim C_o$ . One significant feature is that  $\mathcal{P}_o$  is no longer Hermitian  $\mathcal{P}_o \neq \mathcal{P}_o^{\dagger}$ , while a real-space projector  $\mathcal{R}_o$  must be Hermitian  $\mathcal{R}_o = \mathcal{R}_o^{\dagger}$ .

*Duality process*—The essence to our duality is that two operators share the same spectrum, which is concluded in Theorem. 1.

**Theorem 1.** *Given a quasi-Hermitian Hamiltonian  $H_o$ , there exists a non-singular similarity transformation  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{O}_o^{-1} \mathcal{P}_o \mathcal{O}_o$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{O}_o^{-1} \mathcal{R}_o \mathcal{O}_o$  such that*

$$\text{Spec}(\mathcal{R}_o \mathcal{P}_o \mathcal{R}_o) = \text{Spec}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}) \quad (3)$$

with  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{\dagger}$ .

*Proof.* The proof is separated into two steps. The first step is to transfer non-Hermiticity. Existence of a non-singular similarity transformation is a direct consequence of the definition of quasi-Hermiticity, which states that one can map  $H_o$  into a Hermitian system  $\tilde{H}$ ,

$$\tilde{H} = \mathcal{O}^{-1} H_o \mathcal{O} \quad (4)$$

and  $\mathcal{O}^{-1} |r, \alpha\rangle (= \mathcal{O}^{\dagger} |l, \alpha\rangle)$  is an eigenvector of  $\tilde{H}$  with an eigenvalue  $\epsilon_{\alpha}$  such that  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{O}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_o \mathcal{O}$  is Hermitian  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{\dagger} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ . Since we do not require the transformation in Eq. (4) to be unitary, the eigenvectors of  $\tilde{H}$  and  $H_o$  can be qualitatively different while the eigenvalues are the same. Eq. (4) asserts the fact that a Hermitian  $\tilde{H}$  corresponds to a quasi-Hermitian system  $H_o$  via  $\mathcal{O}_o$  to encode non-Hermiticity. Consequently, we can reformulate the correlation matrix  $C_o$  in Eq. (2) as,

$$C_o = \mathcal{R}_o \mathcal{P}_o \mathcal{R}_o = \mathcal{O} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{O}^{-1}, \quad (5)$$

where the new projector  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{O}^{-1} \mathcal{P}_o \mathcal{O}$  is Hermitian  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}^{\dagger} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  whereas  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{O}^{-1} \mathcal{R}_o \mathcal{O}$  may lose Hermiticity. This procedure transfers non-Hermiticity from  $\mathcal{P}$  to  $\mathcal{R}$  and it is a subtle point for non-Hermitian systems. Since a non-singular similarity does not alter spectrum, we have  $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{R}_o \mathcal{P}_o \mathcal{R}_o) = \text{Spec}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}})$ .

The second step is to prove  $\text{Spec}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}) = \text{Spec}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}})$ . Suppose an eigenstate  $|\xi\rangle$  of  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$  with  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} |\xi\rangle = c |\xi\rangle$ , and then  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} |\xi\rangle = |\xi\rangle$  by observing  $c \tilde{\mathcal{R}} |\xi\rangle = \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} |\xi\rangle = c |\xi\rangle$ . Thus,  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} |\xi\rangle$  is an eigenstate of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ :  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} (\tilde{\mathcal{P}} |\xi\rangle) = c \tilde{\mathcal{P}} |\xi\rangle$ . Therefore, given an eigenstate  $|\xi\rangle$  of  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$  with eigenvalue  $c$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} |\xi\rangle$  is an eigenstate of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  with eigenvalue  $c$ . The converse is also true. Thus, we have  $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{R}_o \mathcal{P}_o \mathcal{R}_o) = \text{Spec}(\tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}) = \text{Spec}(\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}})$ .  $\square$

If we interchange roles of momentum and positions to define new projectors  $\mathcal{P}_d$  and  $\mathcal{R}_d$  i.e.  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$  being the projector into occupied states to define  $\mathcal{P}_d$  and instead the projector  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  depicting the partition to define  $\mathcal{R}_d$ , we obtain a new correlation matrix  $C_d = \mathcal{R}_d \mathcal{P}_d \mathcal{R}_d$  with the dual Hamiltonian  $H_d$ . Then, Theorem. 1 claims the two distinguished systems  $H_o$  and  $H_d$

share the same EE and ES through the duality, whose procedures can be depicted as

$$\mathcal{P}_o \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_o\mathcal{O}} \tilde{\mathcal{P}} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow x} \mathcal{R}_d, \quad \mathcal{R}_o \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}^{-1}\mathcal{R}_o\mathcal{O}} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow k} \mathcal{P}_d. \quad (6)$$

Whether the dual Hamiltonian  $H_d$  is Hermitian or not is determined by commutativity between operators  $\Theta := \mathcal{O}\mathcal{O}^\dagger$  and  $\mathcal{R}_o$ . However, it admits freedom in Eq. (4) to find  $\mathcal{O}$ . Given  $\mathcal{O}_1$  that meets Eq. (4), then  $\mathcal{O}_2 = \mathcal{O}_1 U_1 S U_2$  also maps  $H_o$  into a Hermitian one  $\mathcal{O}_2^{-1} H_o \mathcal{O}_2 = U_2^\dagger \Lambda U_2$  where  $U_1$  is a unitary matrix that diagonalizes  $\mathcal{O}_1^{-1} H_o \mathcal{O}_1$ ,  $U_2$  is unitary and a non-singular matrix  $S$  commutes with the spectral matrix  $\Lambda$  of  $H_o$ . The form of  $\mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}_2^\dagger = \mathcal{O}_1 U_1 S S^\dagger U_1^\dagger \mathcal{O}_1^\dagger$  depends on  $S$  and in general, commutativity between  $\mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_1^\dagger$  and  $\mathcal{R}_o$  may not keep in consistent with commutativity between  $\mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}_2^\dagger$  and  $\mathcal{R}_o$  [See Supplemental Material[35]].

We can categorize quasi-Hermitian systems into two types. If there exists  $\mathcal{O}$  such that  $\Theta$  commutes with  $\mathcal{R}_o$ ,  $[\Theta, \mathcal{R}_o] = 0$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$  preserves Hermiticity and the dual system is Hermitian, which we regard as type-I. Otherwise, the system is categorized into type-II. The ES and EE of type-I obey the same tendency as a Hermitian system. Thus we can understand it within the context of Hermitian systems. For example, we expect that the entanglement formula [41–44] inspired by Wisdom conjecture stills works and directly obtain EE and ES from known results on Hermitian systems without complicated calculations. On the other hand, non-Hermiticity is supposed to play an intrinsic role in entanglement of type-II. In practice, to determine the type of a system, one can start with  $\mathcal{O}$  that diagonalizes  $\mathcal{O}^{-1} H_o \mathcal{O} = \Lambda$ . If  $[\mathcal{O}\mathcal{O}^\dagger, \mathcal{R}_o] = 0$ , then it belongs to type-I. Otherwise, we have to check whether some  $S$  exists to solve the equation  $[\mathcal{O} S S^\dagger \mathcal{O}^\dagger, \mathcal{R}_o] = 0$ .

Based on the theorem, two corollaries naturally follow.

**Corollary 1.** *The entanglement spectrum for type-I non-Hermitian system is real. A non-Hermitian system with complex entanglement spectrum belongs to type-II.*

The Corollary 1 is a direct consequence of the duality process. The real ES of a type-I comes from identical spectrum to a Hermitian system. The converse-negative proposition of the first part produces the second argument. We point out that we does not exclude a type-II system possessing a real ES.

**Corollary 2.** *In the case of a Hermitian system, one recovers the “position-momentum duality”.*

The Corollary 2 is obvious since one can simply choose  $\mathcal{O}$  to be an identity matrix, which exactly recovers the result established in Ref. 40.

*Nonreciprocal model*—As a warm-up, we consider one of the simplest non-Hermitian models [27] on a chain of  $L$  sites

$$H_o = -t \sum_{x=1}^L e^\alpha c_x^\dagger c_{x+1} + e^{-\alpha} c_{x+1}^\dagger c_x, \quad (7)$$

where  $c_x^\dagger$  and  $c_x$  are the fermion creation and annihilation operators at site  $x$  respectively. The nonreciprocal left/right




FIG. 1. (Color online) Entanglement entropy  $S_A$  (a) v.s.  $L_A$  with  $L = 100$ ,  $\alpha = 0.1$  and (b) v.s.  $\alpha$  with  $L = 100$ ,  $L_A = 20$ ; entanglement spectrum (c) v.s.  $L_A$  with  $L = 100$ ,  $\alpha = 0.1$  and (d) v.s.  $\alpha$  with  $L = 100$ ,  $L_A = 20$  for non-reciprocal model in Eq. (7). In (a),  $S_A$  calculated via the definition in Eq. (1) marked by blue triangles is consistent with the formula of  $S_A$  guided by a red line that is inferred by the duality. (b) shows  $S_A$  is independent of  $\alpha$ . (c) depicts EE dependence on the size of region  $A$ . (d) shows EE is not altered when  $\alpha$  changes. All calculations are conducted under open boundary condition at half-filling with  $t = 1$ .

hopping  $t e^{\pm\alpha}$  can arise from asymmetric gain/loss. Under open boundary condition(OBC), it is exactly analytically solvable and one can write down the right and left eigenvectors  $|r, k\rangle$  and  $\langle l, k|$  as  $|r, k\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{L+1}} \sum_x e^{-\alpha x} \sin \frac{\pi k x}{L+1} |x\rangle$  and  $\langle l, k| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{L+1}} \sum_x e^{\alpha x} \sin \frac{\pi k x}{L+1} \langle x|$  with real gapless spectrum  $\epsilon(k) = -2t \cos \frac{\pi k}{L+1}$  parametrized by momentum indices  $k = 0, 1, \dots, L$ . A similarity transformation  $c_x^\dagger \rightarrow c_x^\dagger e^{-x\alpha}$  and  $c_x \rightarrow c_x e^{x\alpha}$ , which defines in real space the matrix  $\mathcal{O} = \text{diag}(1, e^\alpha, \dots, e^{L\alpha})$  in Eq. (4), leads to its Hermitian counterpart  $\tilde{H} = -t \sum_{x=1}^L c_x^\dagger c_{x+1} + c_{x+1}^\dagger c_x$ . Partition the system into two subregions  $A$  and  $B$ , and the single-particle projectors are

$$\mathcal{P}_o = \sum_{k \in \text{occ}} |r, k\rangle \langle l, k|, \quad \mathcal{R}_o = \sum_{x \in A} |x\rangle \langle x| \quad (8)$$

and for  $\tilde{H}$ , we have the projectors  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \sum_{k \in \text{occ}} |k\rangle \langle k|$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \sum_{x \in A} |x\rangle \langle x|$ , where  $|k\rangle = \mathcal{O}^{-1} |r, k\rangle$  is its eigenstate. Interchanging the roles of momentum of positions defines dual projectors

$$\mathcal{P}_d = \sum_{k \in A} |k\rangle \langle k|, \quad \mathcal{R}_d = \sum_{x \in \text{occ}} |x\rangle \langle x|. \quad (9)$$

Here the real space and momentum space are re-interpreted, in which the single-particle projector  $\mathcal{P}_d$  means that states with momentum in region  $A$  are occupied and  $\mathcal{R}_d$  defines a real-space partition. Rewriting  $\mathcal{P}_d = \sum_k \theta(-\epsilon(k)) |k\rangle \langle k|$  where

the energy dispersion  $\varepsilon(k) < 0$  only when  $k \in A$ , we can construct the dual Hamiltonian  $H_d$ ,

$$H_d = \sum_{k \in A} \varepsilon(k) c_k^\dagger c_k \quad (10)$$

or in the real space  $H_d = \sum_{xy} t_{xy} c_x^\dagger c_y$  with  $t_{xy}$  being the Fourier transformation of  $\varepsilon(k)$  under OBC. Remarkably, the dual Hamiltonian in Eq. (10) does not depend on the parameter  $\alpha$ , which indicates that non-Hermiticity plays no role in EE and ES in original non-Hermitian system. It is further numerically checked in Figures. 1(b) and (d) that no changes in EE and ES occur when we change  $\alpha$ . Furthermore, the quantity  $\mathcal{O}\mathcal{O}^\dagger$  for the present choice is diagonal in the real space such that the at least one dual system is Hermitian regardless of the system partition.

In summary, the non-Hermitian non-reciprocal model in Eq. (7) shares the same entanglement entropy with the dual Hermitian free fermi gas in Eq. (10), which exemplifies a type-I system. This feature allows to understand entanglement of type-I from the perspective of a Hermitian system. For example, instead of complicated calculation, we can directly extract that in nonreciprocal model, momentum and positions enter  $S_A$  symmetrically with the expression [40, 45–47] as  $S_A = \frac{1}{6} \ln \left[ \frac{L}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi L_A}{L} \sin \frac{\pi L_F}{L} \right] + \dots$ , where  $L_A$  denotes the length of region  $A$ ,  $L_F$  is number of the occupied bands of its  $L$  eigenstates and.  $\dots$  includes constant and also finite-size corrections from  $1/L$  and higher. Figure. 1(a) shows consistency between  $S_A$  from Eqs. (1) and the duality.

*Non-Hermitian SSH model*—Another example is the non-Hermitian Su-Schrieffer-Heeger (SSH) model [28–34] in a bipartite lattice with  $2N$  sites at half-filling,

$$H_o = \sum_{x=1}^{N-1} \omega c_{2x}^\dagger c_{2x+1} + v c_{2x+1}^\dagger c_{2x+2} + \text{h.c.} \\ + \sum_{i=1}^N iu \left( c_{2i}^\dagger c_{2i} - c_{2i+1}^\dagger c_{2i+1} \right) \quad (11)$$

with  $u, v, \omega \in \mathbb{R}$ . Here we introduce staggered imaginary chemical potentials. Under periodic boundary condition, then  $H_{\text{SSH}}$  is translationally invariant and can be reformulated in the momentum space as  $H_o = \oplus_k H_k$  with  $H_k = \begin{bmatrix} iu & v_k \\ v_k^* & -iu \end{bmatrix}$ , where  $v_k = \omega e^{-ika} + v$  with  $a$  the lattice constant. The system is PT invariant  $\sigma_x H_k \sigma_x = H_k^*$  with spectrum  $\epsilon_{k,\pm} = \pm \sqrt{|v + \omega e^{ika}|^2 - u^2}$  and we restrict ourselves in the region of real spectrum. The matrix  $\mathcal{O} = \oplus_k \mathcal{O}_k$  in momentum space can be taken as

$$\mathcal{O}_k = \begin{bmatrix} -e^{-i(\theta_k + \varphi_k)} & 1 \\ 1 & e^{-i(\theta_k - \varphi_k)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

where we reparametrize  $\rho_k e^{i\varphi_k} = v + \omega e^{ika}$  and  $\rho_k e^{i\theta_k} = \epsilon_k + iu$ . At half-filling, we can have the two operators

$$\mathcal{P}_o = \sum_{k \in \text{occ}} |r, k, -\rangle \langle l, k, -|, \quad \mathcal{R}_o = \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{s=1,2} |i, s\rangle \langle i, s|, \quad (13)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}_o$  projects onto all occupied states with negative energies with  $|r, k, -\rangle$  ( $|l, k, -\rangle$ ) as its right(left) eigenvector and  $\mathcal{R}_o$  defines partition with  $s = 1, 2$  labelling two sublattices. With the similarity transformation, we obtain the projector for the corresponding dual system,  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \sum_{k \in \text{occ}} |k, -\rangle \langle k, -|$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \sum_{i \in A} \sum_{s=1,2} \mathcal{O}^{-1} |i, s\rangle \langle i, s| \mathcal{O}$ . Interchange the roles on positions and momentum and we have

$$\mathcal{P}_d = \sum_{k \in A, \ell = \pm} \mathcal{O}_d^{-1} |k, \ell\rangle \langle k, \ell| \mathcal{O}_d, \quad \mathcal{R}_d = \sum_{x \in \text{occ}} |x, -\rangle \langle x, -|, \quad (14)$$

where in the dual real space,  $\mathcal{O}_d = \oplus_{x=1}^N \mathcal{O}_x$  corresponds to the similarity transformation in Eq. (4) and  $\ell$  can be interpreted as internal degrees or layer indices. The expression of  $\mathcal{O}_x$  is obtained by replacing  $k$  in Eq. (12) by  $x$ , and  $\rho_x e^{i\varphi_x} = v + \omega e^{i\frac{2\pi x}{Na}}$ ,  $\rho_x e^{i\theta_x} = \epsilon_x + iu$ . We can introduce biorthogonal basis  $|r, k, \ell\rangle = \mathcal{O}_d^{-1} |k, \ell\rangle$  and bifermonic operators  $\psi_{r,k,\ell}^\dagger |0\rangle = |r, k, \ell\rangle$ ,  $\psi_{l,k,\ell}^\dagger |0\rangle = |l, k, \ell\rangle$  such that  $\mathcal{P}_d = \sum_{k \in A, \ell = \pm} |r, k, \ell\rangle \langle l, k, \ell|$ , and the dual Hamiltonian takes the form as  $H_d = \sum_{k,s} \epsilon_{k,\ell} \psi_{r,k,\ell}^\dagger \psi_{l,k,\ell}$  where  $\epsilon_{k,\ell}$  is the dispersion relation that is constrained by  $\epsilon_{k,\ell} < 0$  for  $k \in A$ ,  $\ell = \pm$ . Specifically, we can take  $A$  to be half the chain, then the dispersion relation can be simply chosen as  $\epsilon_{k,\ell} = -2t\sqrt{N} \cos ka$ . Thus, the dual Hamiltonian can be formulated as

$$H_d = -t \sum_x \sum_{y=x\pm a} c_x^\dagger e^{i\mathbf{A}_{x,y} \cdot \sigma + iA_{x,y}^0 \sigma_0} c_y, \quad (15)$$

where  $c_x = (c_{x,-}, c_{x,+})^T$  is a two-component spinor,  $\sigma = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$  is a vector of Pauli matrices and  $\sigma_0$  is an identity matrix. The fields  $\mathbf{A}_{x,y}$  and  $A_{x,y}^0$  reside at the link  $(x, y)$  and no longer keeps anti-symmetric on its spatial indices,  $\mathbf{A}_{x,y} \neq -\mathbf{A}_{y,x}$ ,  $A_{x,y}^0 \neq -A_{y,x}^0$ . Thus we map non-Hermitian SSH model to non-Hermitian non-Abelian gauge field theory. The original band indices are interpreted as component indices and  $\mathcal{R}_d$  involves partition on the internal spinor degrees as well as spatial degrees. General expressions for the dual Hamiltonian are presented in Supplemental Material [35]. On the other hand, commutation with  $\mathcal{R}_0$  requires  $\Theta$  to be a block diagonal matrix. There does not exist  $S$  such that  $\mathcal{O} S S^\dagger \mathcal{O}^\dagger$  meets the requirement. Therefore, the non-Hermitian SSH belongs to type-II, which is consistent with its complex ES.

*Conclusions*—In this Letter, we are interested in the role that non-Hermiticity plays in quantum entanglement and develop a rigorous duality for probing the role. We make an initial step towards a unified picture of non-Hermiticity and Hermiticity from the entanglement perspective. Several implications and applications are discussed. Motivated by this work, we present here several questions for future study. First, is there a similar / generalized duality or generalized LU for characterizing many-body entanglement of non-Hermitian interacting systems [48, 49]? For example, we can define non-Hermitian version of LRE states via generalized LU. Second, is it possible to find Wannier interpolation on non-Hermitian free fermion entanglement [50]? Such an interpolation may

help us to semi-analytically understand ES of non-Hermitian fermion systems. Third, how can we further physically distinguish two subclasses of type-II systems? In Corollary 1, we have shown that ES of type-II systems may be either complex and real. So, it is interesting to further investigate finer structures of type-II systems. This work was supported by the Sun Yat-sen University startup grant and NSFC Grant No. 11847608.

\* s-chen16@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

† yepeng5@mail.sysu.edu.cn

- [1] X.G. Wen, *Quantum Field Theory of Many-Body Systems: From the Origin of Sound to an Origin of Light and Electrons*, Oxford Graduate Texts (OUP Oxford, 2004).
- [2] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Local unitary transformation, long-range quantum entanglement, wave function renormalization, and topological order,” *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 155138 (2010), arXiv:1004.3835 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [3] R. B. Laughlin, “Anomalous Quantum Hall Effect: An Incompressible Quantum Fluid with Fractionally Charged Excitations,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 1395–1398 (1983).
- [4] Alexei Kitaev, “Anyons in an exactly solved model and beyond,” *Annals of Physics* **321**, 2–111 (2006), arXiv:cond-mat/0506438 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [5] Xiao-Gang Wen, “A theory of 2+1D bosonic topological orders,” *National Science Review* **3**, 68–106 (2015), <https://academic.oup.com/nsr/article-pdf/3/1/68/31565649/nwv077.pdf>.
- [6] Xiao-Gang Wen, “Colloquium: Zoo of quantum-topological phases of matter,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **89**, 041004 (2017), arXiv:1610.03911 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [7] Parsa Bonderson, Kirill Shtengel, and J. K. Slingerland, “Interferometry of non-Abelian anyons,” *Annals of Physics* **323**, 2709–2755 (2008), arXiv:0707.4206 [quant-ph].
- [8] AtMa P. O. Chan, Peng Ye, and Shinsei Ryu, “Braiding with Borromean Rings in  $(3+1)$ -Dimensional Spacetime,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 061601 (2018), arXiv:1703.01926 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [9] F. D. M. Haldane, “Continuum dynamics of the 1-D Heisenberg antiferromagnet: Identification with the  $O(3)$  nonlinear sigma model,” *Physics Letters A* **93**, 464–468 (1983).
- [10] Ian Affleck, Tom Kennedy, Elliott H. Lieb, and Hal Tasaki, “Rigorous results on valence-bond ground states in antiferromagnets,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 799–802 (1987).
- [11] Zheng-Cheng Gu and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Tensor-entanglement-filtering renormalization approach and symmetry-protected topological order,” *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 155131 (2009), arXiv:0903.1069 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [12] Frank Pollmann, Erez Berg, Ari M. Turner, and Masaki Oshikawa, “Symmetry protection of topological phases in one-dimensional quantum spin systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 075125 (2012), arXiv:0909.4059 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [13] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, Zheng-Xin Liu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Symmetry-Protected Topological Orders in Interacting Bosonic Systems,” *Science* **338**, 1604 (2012).
- [14] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, Zheng-Xin Liu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Symmetry protected topological orders and the group cohomology of their symmetry group,” *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 155114 (2013), arXiv:1106.4772 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [15] Maissam Barkeshli, Parsa Bonderson, Meng Cheng, and Zhenghan Wang, “Symmetry fractionalization, defects, and gauging of topological phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 115147 (2019).
- [16] Shang-Qiang Ning, Zheng-Xin Liu, and Peng Ye, “Topological gauge theory, symmetry fractionalization, and classification of symmetry-enriched topological phases in three dimensions,” arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1801.01638 (2018), arXiv:1801.01638 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [17] Shang-Qiang Ning, Zheng-Xin Liu, and Peng Ye, “Symmetry enrichment in three-dimensional topological phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 245120 (2016).
- [18] Hui Li and F. D. M. Haldane, “Entanglement spectrum as a generalization of entanglement entropy: Identification of topological order in non-abelian fractional quantum hall effect states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 010504 (2008).
- [19] Michael Levin and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Detecting Topological Order in a Ground State Wave Function,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 110405 (2006), arXiv:cond-mat/0510613 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [20] Alexei Kitaev and John Preskill, “Topological Entanglement Entropy,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 110404 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0510092 [hep-th].
- [21] Xiao-Liang Qi, Hoshio Katsura, and Andreas W. W. Ludwig, “General Relationship between the Entanglement Spectrum and the Edge State Spectrum of Topological Quantum States,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 196402 (2012), arXiv:1103.5437 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [22] Yuto Ashida, Zongping Gong, and Masahito Ueda, “Non-Hermitian Physics,” arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2006.01837 (2020), arXiv:2006.01837 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [23] Ingo Peschel, “Calculation of reduced density matrices from correlation functions,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **36**, L205–L208 (2003).
- [24] Ingo Peschel and Viktor Eisler, “Reduced density matrices and entanglement entropy in free lattice models,” *Journal of Physics A Mathematical General* **42**, 504003 (2009), arXiv:0906.1663 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [25] Loïc Herviou, Nicolas Regnault, and Jens H. Bardarson, “Entanglement spectrum and symmetries in non-Hermitian fermionic non-interacting models,” *SciPost Physics* **7**, 069 (2019), arXiv:1908.09852 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [26] Po-Yao Chang, Jih-Shih You, Xuetao Wen, and Shinsei Ryu, “Entanglement spectrum and entropy in topological non-hermitian systems and nonunitary conformal field theory,” *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 033069 (2020).
- [27] Sen Mu, Ching Hua Lee, Linhu Li, and Jiangbin Gong, “Emergent Fermi surface in a many-body non-Hermitian Fermionic chain,” arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1911.00023 (2019), arXiv:1911.00023 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [28] W. P. Su, J. R. Schrieffer, and A. J. Heeger, “Soliton excitations in polyacetylene,” *Phys. Rev. B* **22**, 2099–2111 (1980).
- [29] Shi-Dong Liang and Guang-Yao Huang, “Topological invariance and global Berry phase in non-Hermitian systems,” *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 012118 (2013), arXiv:1502.00443 [quant-ph].
- [30] Marcel Klett, Holger Cartarius, Dennis Dast, Jörg Main, and Günter Wunner, “Relation between  $PT$ -symmetry breaking and topologically nontrivial phases in the Su-Schrieffer-Heeger and Kitaev models,” *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 053626 (2017), arXiv:1702.00173 [quant-ph].
- [31] Simon Lieu, “Topological phases in the snon-Hermitian Su-Schrieffer-Heeger model,” *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 045106 (2018), arXiv:1709.03788 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [32] Marcel Klett, Holger Cartarius, Dennis Dast, Jörg Main, and Günter Wunner, “Topological edge states in the Su-Schrieffer-

- Heeger model subject to balanced particle gain and loss,” *European Physical Journal D* **72**, 214 (2018), arXiv:1802.06128 [quant-ph].
- [33] Chuanhao Yin, Hui Jiang, Linhu Li, Rong Lü, and Shu Chen, “Geometrical meaning of winding number and its characterization of topological phases in one-dimensional chiral non-Hermitian systems,” *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 052115 (2018), arXiv:1802.04169 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [34] Shunyu Yao and Zhong Wang, “Edge States and Topological Invariants of Non-Hermitian Systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 086803 (2018), arXiv:1803.01876 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [35] Supplemental Materials and url to be added.
- [36] Stefan Weigert, “Completeness and orthonormality in PT-symmetric quantum systems,” *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 062111 (2003), arXiv:quant-ph/0306040 [quant-ph].
- [37] Dorje C. Brody, “Biorthogonal quantum mechanics,” *Journal of Physics A Mathematical General* **47**, 035305 (2014), arXiv:1308.2609 [quant-ph].
- [38] F. G. Scholtz, H. B. Geyer, and F. J. W. Hahne, “Quasi-Hermitian operators in quantum mechanics and the variational principle,” *Annals of Physics* **213**, 74–101 (1992).
- [39] N. Bebbiano and J. da Providência, “Non-self-adjoint operators with real spectra and extensions of quantum mechanics,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **60**, 012104 (2019), arXiv:1808.08863 [quant-ph].
- [40] Ching Hua Lee, Peng Ye, and Xiao-Liang Qi, “Position-momentum duality in the entanglement spectrum of free fermions,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2014**, 10023 (2014), arXiv:1403.1039 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [41] Dimitri Gioev and Israel Klich, “Entanglement Entropy of Fermions in Any Dimension and the Widom Conjecture,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 100503 (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0504151 [quant-ph].
- [42] T. Barthel, M. C. Chung, and U. Schollwöck, “Entanglement scaling in critical two-dimensional fermionic and bosonic systems,” *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 022329 (2006), arXiv:cond-mat/0602077 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [43] Weifei Li, Letian Ding, Rong Yu, Tommaso Roscilde, and Stephan Haas, “Scaling behavior of entanglement in two- and three-dimensional free-fermion systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 073103 (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0602094 [quant-ph].
- [44] Hsin-Hua Lai and Kun Yang, “Entanglement entropy scaling laws and eigenstate typicality in free fermion systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 081110 (2015), arXiv:1409.1224 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [45] Pasquale Calabrese and John Cardy, “Entanglement entropy and quantum field theory,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2004**, 06002 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0405152 [hep-th].
- [46] Pasquale Calabrese and John Cardy, “Entanglement Entropy and Quantum Field Theory: A Non-Technical Introduction,” *International Journal of Quantum Information* **4**, 429 (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0505193 [quant-ph].
- [47] A. R. Its and V. E. Korepin, “The Fisher-Hartwig Formula and Entanglement Entropy,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* **137**, 1014–1039 (2009).
- [48] Wenjie Xi, Zhi-Hao Zhang, Zheng-Cheng Gu, and Wei-Qiang Chen, “Classification of topological phases in one dimensional interacting non-Hermitian systems and emergent unitarity,” arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1911.01590 (2019), arXiv:1911.01590 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [49] Meng-Lei Yang, Heng Wang, Cui-Xian Guo, Xiao-Ran Wang, Gaoyong Sun, and Su-Peng Kou, “Anomalous Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking in non-Hermitian Systems with Biorthogonal Z2-symmetry,” arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2006.10278 (2020), arXiv:2006.10278 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [50] Ching Hua Lee and Peng Ye, “Free-fermion entanglement spectrum through Wannier interpolation,” *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 085119 (2015), arXiv:1410.8670 [cond-mat.quant-gas].

## Supplemental Material for ‘‘Entanglement, non-Hermiticity and duality’’

In this supplemental material, we make some explanation on the similarity transformation and detailed derivations on the dual model for non-Hermitian SSH model.

### SM-1: Similarity transformation

We have much freedom to choose the similarity transformations. Here we illustrate how such freedom affects Hermiticity of the dual system. Given a quasi-Hermitian system  $H_o$ , we can choose  $\mathcal{O}$  to map it to its spectrum matrix  $\Lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{O}^{-1}H_o\mathcal{O} = \Lambda$  and a general similarity transformation  $\mathcal{O}'$  has the form as  $\mathcal{O}' = U\mathcal{O}S$  where  $U$  is a unitary matrix and  $S$  commutes with  $\Lambda$ . The form of  $S$  depends on properties of spectrum. For example, if  $H_o$  is non-degenerate, then  $S$  must be a diagonal matrix. On the other hand,  $S$  can be of a more general form. To show the effect of  $S$ , we consider a Hamiltonian defined on two sites with only one particle,

$$H_o = re^{i\theta}c_1^\dagger c_1 + sc_1^\dagger c_2 + re^{-i\theta}c_2^\dagger c_2 + sc_2^\dagger c_1. \quad (16)$$

It has right eigenvectors  $|-\rangle = -e^{-i\alpha}|1\rangle + |2\rangle$  and  $|+\rangle = |1\rangle + e^{-i\alpha}|2\rangle$  with eigenenergies  $\epsilon_{\pm} = r \cos \theta \pm \sqrt{s^2 - r^2 \sin^2 \theta}$ , which can help construct the similarity transformation

$$\mathcal{O} = -e^{-i\alpha}|1\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 2| + |2\rangle\langle 1| + e^{-i\alpha}|2\rangle\langle 2|, \quad (17)$$

which diagonalizes  $H_o$ ,

$$\mathcal{O}^{-1}H_o\mathcal{O} = \epsilon_-|-\rangle\langle -| + \epsilon_+|+\rangle\langle +|. \quad (18)$$

Here  $|x\rangle$  denotes the particle resides at site  $x$  and  $se^{i\alpha} = ir \sin \theta + \sqrt{s^2 - r^2 \sin^2 \theta}$ . Or in the matrix form, we have

$$H_o = \begin{bmatrix} re^{i\theta} & s \\ s & re^{-i\theta} \end{bmatrix} \quad (19)$$

and

$$\mathcal{O} = \begin{bmatrix} -e^{-i\alpha} & 1 \\ 1 & e^{-i\alpha} \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

with the spectrum matrix  $\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_- & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon_+ \end{bmatrix}$ .

When  $s^2 \neq r^2 \sin^2 \theta$ ,  $H_o$  is non-degenerate and then  $S$  is diagonal and we set  $S = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ . Thus, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta &= \mathcal{O}S S^\dagger \mathcal{O}^\dagger \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} |\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 & -e^{-i\alpha}|\lambda_1|^2 + e^{i\alpha}|\lambda_2|^2 \\ -e^{i\alpha}|\lambda_1|^2 + e^{-i\alpha}|\lambda_2|^2 & |\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

and the commutator depends on  $S$

$$[\Theta, \mathcal{R}] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{-i\alpha}|\lambda_1|^2 - e^{i\alpha}|\lambda_2|^2 \\ -e^{i\alpha}|\lambda_1|^2 + e^{-i\alpha}|\lambda_2|^2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

where we take the first site as region  $A$  with  $\mathcal{R} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . When  $\alpha \neq 0$ , no  $S$  exists to ensure  $[\Theta, \mathcal{R}] = 0$  and the dual system is non-Hermitian, which is consistent with complex entanglement spectrum. When  $\alpha = 0$ , we can find  $S$  to make  $[\Theta, \mathcal{R}] = 0$ . In fact,  $H_o$  reduces to a Hermitian system. When  $s^2 = r^2 \sin^2 \theta$ ,  $H_o$  is not normal and can not be diagonalized.

As a comparison, we can consider non-reciprocal model on the two-site lattices

$$H_o = rc_1^\dagger c_1 + t_{12}c_1^\dagger c_2 + rc_2^\dagger c_2 + t_{21}c_2^\dagger c_1. \quad (23)$$

We can take the similarity transformation to be

$$\mathcal{O} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{t_{12}} & \sqrt{t_{12}} \\ -\sqrt{t_{21}} & \sqrt{t_{21}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (24)$$

and

$$[\Theta, \mathcal{R}] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & (|\lambda_1|^2 - |\lambda_2|^2)\sqrt{t_{12}t_{21}} \\ (-|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_2|^2)\sqrt{t_{12}t_{21}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

When  $|\lambda_1| = |\lambda_2|$ ,  $\Theta$  and  $R$  commutes and we build a map to Hermitian system. When  $|\lambda_1| \neq |\lambda_2|$ , the dual system is non-Hermitian.

### SM-2: Non-Hermitian SSH model

Here we present details on duality of non-Hermitian SSH model. To be more transparent, here we work in the framework of Dirac's notations. The similarity transformation  $\mathcal{O} = \oplus_k \mathcal{O}_k$  can be written as

$$\mathcal{O}_k = -e^{-i(\theta_k + \varphi_k)} |k, 1\rangle \langle k, 1| + |k, 1\rangle \langle k, 2| + |k, 2\rangle \langle k, 1| + e^{-i(\theta_k - \varphi_k)} |k, 2\rangle \langle k, 2|, \quad (26)$$

where  $|k, s\rangle$  denotes a basis vector carrying momentum  $k$  on sublattice  $s$ . So we have the projector  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} &= \sum_{x \in A} \mathcal{O}^{-1} |x, s\rangle \langle x, s| \mathcal{O} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{k, k'} \mathcal{O}_k^{-1} |x, s\rangle \langle x, s| \mathcal{O}_{k'} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{k, k'} \frac{e^{i(k-k')x}}{1 + e^{-2i\theta_k}} [(e^{i\varphi_k - i\varphi_{k'}} e^{-i\theta_k - i\theta_{k'}} + 1) |k, 1\rangle \langle k', 1| \\ &\quad + (-e^{i\varphi_k} e^{-i\theta_k} + e^{i\varphi_{k'}} e^{-i\theta_{k'}}) |k, 1\rangle \langle k', 2| + (e^{-i\varphi_k} e^{-i\theta_k} - e^{-i\varphi_{k'}} e^{-i\theta_{k'}}) |k, 2\rangle \langle k', 1| \\ &\quad + (e^{-i\varphi_k + i\varphi_{k'}} e^{-i\theta_k - i\theta_{k'}} + 1) |k, 2\rangle \langle k', 2|], \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where we use the relation

$$\mathcal{O}_k |k, 1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} e^{ikx} \left( -e^{-i(\theta_k + \varphi_k)} |k, 1\rangle + |k, 2\rangle \right) \quad (28)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_k |k, 2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} e^{ikx} \left( |k, 1\rangle + e^{-i(\theta_k - \varphi_k)} |k, 2\rangle \right) \quad (29)$$

with  $\rho_k e^{i\varphi_k} = v + \omega e^{ika}$  and  $\rho_k e^{i\theta_k} = \epsilon_k + iu$ . Exchange the roles of positions and momentum and we have the dual single-particle projector  $\mathcal{P}_d$  to occupied states

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_d &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x, y, k \in A} \frac{e^{i(x-y)k}}{1 + e^{-2i\theta_x}} [(e^{i\varphi_x - i\varphi_y} e^{-i\theta_x - i\theta_y} + 1) |x, -\rangle \langle y, -| \\ &\quad + [-e^{i\varphi_x} e^{-i\theta_x} + e^{i\varphi_y} e^{-i\theta_y}] |x, -\rangle \langle y, +| + [e^{-i\varphi_x} e^{-i\theta_x} - e^{-i\varphi_y} e^{-i\theta_y}] |x, +\rangle \langle y, -| \\ &\quad + [e^{-i\varphi_x + \varphi_y} e^{-i\theta_x - i\theta_y} + 1] |x, +\rangle \langle y, +|. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Therefore, we have the dual Hamiltonian,

$$H_d = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{x, y, k, \ell, \ell'} \epsilon_{k, \ell} e^{i(x-y)k} U_{xy}^{\ell \ell'} c_{x, \ell}^\dagger c_{y, \ell'}, \quad (31)$$

where

$$U_{xy} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-2i\theta_x}} \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\varphi_x - i\varphi_y} e^{-i\theta_x - i\theta_y} + 1 & -e^{i\varphi_x} e^{-i\theta_x} + e^{i\varphi_y} e^{-i\theta_y} \\ e^{-i\varphi_x} e^{-i\theta_x} - e^{-i\varphi_y} e^{-i\theta_y} & e^{-i\varphi_x + i\varphi_y} e^{-i\theta_x - i\theta_y} + 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (32)$$

and  $\rho_x e^{i\varphi_x} = v + \omega e^{i\frac{2\pi x}{Na}}$ ,  $\rho_x e^{i\theta_x} = \epsilon_x + iu$ . The spectrum dispersion relation is constrained to  $\epsilon_{k, \ell} < 0$  when  $k \in A$ . Its form depends on choices of region  $A$ . For example, if  $A$  is half the chain, we can take  $\epsilon_{k, \ell} = -2t\sqrt{N} \cos ka$  to be independent of



index  $\ell$ . In this case, we arrange  $c_x = (c_{x,-}, c_{x,+})$  as a two-component spinor such that the dual Hamiltonian can be formulated in a compacted form,

$$\begin{aligned} H_d &= -t \sum_x \sum_{y=x\pm a} c_x^\dagger U_{xy} c_y \\ &= -t \sum_x \sum_{y=x\pm a} c_x^\dagger e^{iA_{x,y}\cdot\sigma + iA_{x,y}^0\sigma_0} c_y. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Here we identify  $U_{xy} = e^{iA_{x,y}\cdot\sigma + iA_{x,y}^0\sigma_0}$  to give non-Abelian gauge field theory of the non-Hermitian version. The form of  $\epsilon_{k,\ell}$  for a general region  $A$  can be obtained by adding a proper chemical potential.