

Renormalized Classical Theory of Quantum Magnets

David Dahlbom,^{1,*} Hao Zhang,^{1,2} Zoha Laraib,¹ Daniel M. Pajerowski,³ Kipton Barros,² and Cristian D. Batista^{1,3}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA*

²*Theoretical Division and CNLS, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA*

³*Neutron Scattering Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, USA*

(Dated: April 13, 2023)

We derive a renormalized classical spin (RCS) theory for $S > 1/2$ quantum magnets by constraining a generalized classical theory that includes all multipolar fluctuations to a reduced CP^1 phase space of dipolar $\text{SU}(2)$ coherent states. In the special case that the spin Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}^S$ is linear in the spin operators \hat{S}_j for each lattice site j , the RCS Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}$ coincides with the usual classical model $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}} = \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathcal{H}}^S$. In the presence of single-ion anisotropy terms or biquadratic interactions, however, the RCS theory is more accurate than \mathcal{H}_{cl} . Many real magnetic systems are well modeled by spin Hamiltonians with strongly non-linear single-ion anisotropy terms. For such systems, use of the RCS theory is essential to accurately model thermodynamic phase diagrams and to extract the correct Hamiltonian parameters from neutron scattering data.

The development of semiclassical approximations to treat interacting quantum systems has played a fundamental role in physics since the early days of quantum mechanics [1]. While semiclassical theories become exact when a “control parameter” α of the quantum mechanical Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha)$ is sent to infinity, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}} = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathcal{H}}(\alpha)$, a vast amount of experimental evidence accumulated over many decades indicates that classical approximations often remain accurate for small values of α . This intriguing observation is particularly evident in quantum magnetism, where magnetic materials are described by spin Hamiltonians and α is typically associated with the spin (S) of the magnetic ions: $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}} = \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathcal{H}}^S$. Although S is of order one for most quantum magnets, semiclassical approaches became the standard tool to describe these materials because of their extraordinary success in reproducing experimental observations, such as the collective modes (magnons) of magnetically ordered materials revealed by inelastic neutron scattering (INS) data. Indeed, one of the most active areas of quantum magnetism is the search for real magnets that exhibit strong deviations from semiclassical theories. While deviation is the rule for most quasi-1D magnets, finding examples of quasi-2D and 3D magnets that fall into this category is actually rather difficult [2].

Classical and semiclassical approximations are based on coherent states, which link the quantum and classical worlds. The coherent states of a Lie group are obtained by applying the group elements to a reference state known as the highest weight state, and the resulting manifold of coherent states constitutes the phase space of the resulting classical formulation [3, 4]. Quantum spin systems admit more than one classical limit since there is freedom to choose different Lie groups, each of which generates a different set of coherent states. A natural choice is the group of spin rotations, $\text{SU}(2)$, which leads to the traditional dipole-only classical limit of quantum spin systems. The resulting phase space of coherent states $|\Omega_j\rangle$ (j is a lattice site index) is the 2D sphere $S^2 \cong \text{CP}^1$, which represents different possible orientations of dipole moments $\vec{\Omega}_j = \langle \Omega_j | \hat{S}_j | \Omega_j \rangle$ ($|\vec{\Omega}_j| = S$). The classical equations of motion are obtained by taking the large- S limit of the Heisenberg equation of motion,

where the spin index S labels the irreducible representations of the $\text{SU}(2)$ group. The result,

$$\dot{\vec{\Omega}}_j = \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}}{\partial \vec{\Omega}_j} \times \vec{\Omega}_j, \quad (1)$$

is the well-known Landau-Lifshitz (LL) equation [5, 6]. Gilbert extended this dynamics with the introduction of damping in 1954 [7]. The resulting Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert (LLG) equation is now a fundamental tool in applied magnetism [8–10].

This is the traditional classical limit of a quantum spin theory, and it is indeed the optimal one whenever the Hamiltonian only includes terms that are linear in the spin operators of each site. A Hamiltonian with only Heisenberg or Zeeman interactions satisfies this condition, for example. When nonlinear terms are present, such as those associated with single-ion anisotropies or biquadratic exchange interactions, an alternative classical limit with more degrees of freedom better captures the spin dynamics within each local Hilbert space. This alternative limit is based on coherent states of $\text{SU}(2S+1)$ instead of coherent states of $\text{SU}(2)$ and results in a classical phase space of CP^{2S} instead of $\text{CP}^1 \cong S^2$ [11–13]. When the phase space of this generalized dynamics is constrained to the phase space of the traditional dynamics, the result is a renormalized classical spin (RCS) Hamiltonian, $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}$, that replaces \mathcal{H}_{cl} in Eq. (1). The derivation of this renormalized hamiltonian is the main goal of this work.

Relative to the traditional classical limit, the RCS theory provides a better approximation of the spin dynamics, which is crucial for solving the inverse INS problem of extracting a model from scattering data. The RCS theory also produces more accurate thermodynamic phase diagrams because of the inclusion of $1/S$ corrections that are significant for finite spin values. Finally, $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}$ can be regarded as the starting point for a generalized projected spin-wave theory, whose expansion parameter is the inverse of the coefficient α that labels the degenerate irreps of $\text{SU}(N)$ with $N = 2S + 1$ (loop expansion) [11, 14].

As a final remark, one could alternatively model a magnetic system using the *unconstrained* classical dynamics of

SU(N) coherent states [11–13]. Indeed, this approach should be preferred whenever nonlinear contributions dominate (e.g., single-ion anisotropies). When the nonlinear terms are relatively weak, however, the SU(N) spin dynamics may introduce extra modes that would decay into the multi-magnon continuum (over-damping) upon accounting for quantum loop corrections. In such cases, the RCS theory may be preferable.

Renormalized Classical Theory. The magnetic degrees of freedom of quantum magnets are described by effective spin operators \hat{S}_j that can either represent the actual spin degree of freedom for magnetic ions with weak spin-orbit interaction, or the total angular momentum \hat{J}_j for magnetic ions with strong spin-orbit coupling. Spin Hamiltonians include single-ion and interaction terms:

$$\hat{H} = \underbrace{\hat{H}^Z + \hat{H}^A}_{\text{Single-ion}} + \underbrace{\hat{H}^{\text{Bil}} + \hat{H}^{\text{Biq}}}_{\text{Interaction}}, \quad (2)$$

to be detailed below.

The Zeeman coupling to an external magnetic field \mathbf{B}_j is

$$\hat{H}^Z = -\mu_B \sum_j \mathbf{B}_j^\mu g^{\mu\nu} \hat{S}_j^\nu, \quad (3)$$

where μ_B is the Bohr magneton, $g^{\mu\nu}$ is the gyromagnetic tensor, and we are using the convention of summation over repeated Greek indices. Additionally there may be a single-ion anisotropy term

$$\hat{H}^A = \sum_{j,q,k} A_q^{(k)} \hat{O}_q^{(k)}(\hat{S}_j). \quad (4)$$

This term includes only even powers of the spin operators due to time-reversal invariance. In general, \hat{H}^A is expressed as a linear combination of Stevens operators, $\hat{O}_q^{(k)}$, which span the k -irrep of SO(3). The coefficients, $A_q^{(k)}$, are the crystal field parameters.

For the vast majority of real magnets the dominant interactions are bilinear. The most general bilinear interaction is,

$$\hat{H}^{\text{Bil}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \hat{S}_i^\mu \mathcal{J}^{\mu\nu} \hat{S}_j^\nu, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{J}^{\mu\nu}$ is the exchange tensor. Additionally, there are bi-quadratic or higher order interactions that may be significant in Mott insulators that are not deep inside the Mott regime or in f -electron magnets where the spin-orbit coupling is comparable to the intra-atomic Coulomb interaction. For a simple illustration of the renormalization procedure, we will consider a particular isotropic form for the bi-quadratic interaction,

$$\hat{H}^{\text{Biq}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \mathcal{K}_{ij} (\hat{S}_i \cdot \hat{S}_j)^2. \quad (6)$$

Many other multi-spin interactions with single-site nonlinearities in the spin operators \mathbf{S}_j are possible, and the renormalizations of each such interaction must be derived on a case-by-case basis.

The traditional classical limit of the spin Hamiltonian \hat{H} is obtained by taking the large- S limit:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}} = \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \hat{H}(S) = \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \langle \vec{\Omega} | \hat{H}(S) | \vec{\Omega} \rangle \quad (7)$$

with $|\vec{\Omega}\rangle \equiv \bigotimes_j |\vec{\Omega}_j\rangle$. In other words, the Hamiltonian operator is replaced by its expectation value (classical Hamiltonian) for a generic coherent state. Another simplification that arises in the $S \rightarrow \infty$ limit is the factorization of the expectation value of a product of on-site operators into the product of the expectation values of each individual operator:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \langle \vec{\Omega} | \hat{S}_j^\mu \hat{S}_j^\nu \dots \hat{S}_j^\eta | \vec{\Omega} \rangle &= \langle \vec{\Omega} | \hat{S}_j^\mu | \vec{\Omega} \rangle \langle \vec{\Omega} | \hat{S}_j^\nu | \vec{\Omega} \rangle \dots \langle \vec{\Omega} | \hat{S}_j^\eta | \vec{\Omega} \rangle \\ &= \Omega_j^\mu \Omega_j^\nu \dots \Omega_j^\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

However, to describe a quantum mechanical system with a *finite* value of S that includes non-linear terms in the components of an on-site spin operator \hat{S}_j , Eq. (8) becomes an extra approximation on top of the one made in Eq. (7). In other words, we can obtain a more accurate classical approximation of $\hat{H}(S)$ if we avoid using the approximation suggested by Eq. (8), which is exact only in the $S \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Notice that

$$\langle \vec{\Omega} | \hat{S}_j^\mu \hat{S}_j^\nu \dots \hat{S}_j^\eta | \vec{\Omega} \rangle = f(\vec{\Omega}_j), \quad (9)$$

where the f is a polynomial function of the components of the classical spin vector $\vec{\Omega}_j$. Motivated by this observation, we introduce the RCS Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}} = \langle \vec{\Omega} | \hat{H}(S) | \vec{\Omega} \rangle, \quad (10)$$

where the expectation value is computed exactly for each value of S . Before discussing the formal mathematical procedure that leads to the RCS Hamiltonian, we illustrate its derivation by considering the non-linear contributions \hat{H}^A and \hat{H}^{Biq} . As shown in the supplementary material (SM), group theory dictates that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}^A = \sum_{j,q,k} \tilde{A}_q^{(k)} \mathcal{O}_q^{(k)}(\vec{\Omega}_j) \quad (11)$$

with $\tilde{A}_q^{(k)} = c^{(k)} A_q^{(k)}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} c^{(2)} &= 1 - \frac{1}{2} S^{-1}, & c^{(4)} &= 1 - 3S^{-1} + \frac{11}{4} S^{-2} - \frac{3}{4} S^{-3} \\ c^{(6)} &= 1 - \frac{15}{2} S^{-1} + \frac{85}{4} S^{-2} - \frac{225}{8} S^{-3} + \frac{137}{8} S^{-4} - \frac{15}{4} S^{-5} \end{aligned}$$

As expected, $\lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}^A = \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}^A$ because $\lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} c^{(k)} = 1$, but these renormalization factors become significant for low spin values. For instance,

$$c^{(2)}(S=1) = 1/2, \quad c^{(4)}(S=2) = 3/32, \quad c^{(6)}(S=3) = 5/324. \quad (12)$$

In words: if a spin-1 quadratic single-ion anisotropy is approximated classically using the large- S limit, the anisotropy strength will be underestimated by factor of $1/c^{(2)} = 2$. For higher-order single-ion anisotropies, the errors become even more severe.




Figure 1. Variational phase diagram of the spin Hamiltonian Eq. (14). Phase notation and additional details may be found in reference [15].

For the biquadratic interaction we have (see SM):

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}^{\text{Biq}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \mathcal{K}_{ij} \left[r(\vec{\Omega}_1 \cdot \vec{\Omega}_2)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \vec{\Omega}_1 \cdot \vec{\Omega}_2 + S^3 + \frac{S^2}{4} \right] \quad (13)$$

with $r = \left(1 - \frac{1}{S} + \frac{1}{4S^2}\right)$. Besides being renormalized, the biquadratic interaction generates a bilinear term that is absent in the large- S limit and is comparable in amplitude to the biquadratic interaction for $S = 1$. Moreover, the renormalization factor becomes $r(S = 1) = 1/4$, implying that the amplitude of the biquadratic term is 4 times smaller than $r(S \rightarrow \infty) = 1$.

As explained in the SM, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}$ can be formally derived by imposing a constraint on the classical spin dynamics that is obtained by using coherent states of $\text{SU}(2S+1)$. The phase space of this generalized classical Hamiltonian is the complex projective space CP^{2S} , which includes all possible multipolar fluctuations of the spin degree of freedom. The constraint consists of restricting the dynamics to the reduced $\text{CP}^1 \cong S^2$ phase space of pure dipoles. Since this constraint preserves the local structure of the dynamics, the resulting dipole dynamics is guaranteed to have the form of the LL equation (1), but the classical Hamiltonian may be renormalized ($\mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}$).

If $\mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}} \neq \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}$, the RCS Hamiltonian will produce an S -dependent thermodynamic phase diagram that coincides with the usual classical phase diagram only in the $S \rightarrow \infty$ limit. This simple observation has many implications for real magnets, as can be illustrated with a model that has been extensively studied in the context of magnetic skyrmion crystals of centrosymmetric materials [15]. The spin- S Hamiltonian,

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_i \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_j - h \sum_i \hat{S}_i^z - \frac{K}{2} \sum_i (\hat{S}_i^z)^2, \quad (14)$$

includes ferromagnetic nearest-neighbor exchange interactions and antiferromagnetic next-nearest-neighbor interactions on a triangular lattice: $J_{ij} = J_1 < 0$ ($J_{ij} = J_2 > 0$) for nearest (next-nearest) neighbors spins i and j and $J_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The second and third terms are, respectively, Zeeman coupling to a magnetic field along the z -axis and easy-axis ($K > 0$) single-ion anisotropy. Leonov and Mostovoy [15] used a variational

scheme to compute the classical phase diagram of this model, shown in Fig. 1, by taking the large- S limit, i.e., by using the classical Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_{cl} . For sufficiently small magnetic fields, the lowest energy state of \mathcal{H}_{cl} is the ‘‘vertical spiral’’ (VS) phase with a polarization plane parallel to the z -axis and a propagation wave vector $\pm \mathbf{Q}_\nu$ ($\nu = 1, 2, 3$) parallel to the three possible directions related by 120° rotations about the z -axis. Several multi- \mathbf{Q} orderings corresponding to a superposition of more than one spiral are induced upon increasing h . A detailed description of each phase can be found in Ref. [15]. The most interesting phase is the triple- \mathbf{Q} skyrmion crystal (SkX) that extends over the interval $0.05 \lesssim K/|J_1| \lesssim 0.6$ of single-ion anisotropy values. However, if we use the RCS theory,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \vec{\Omega}_i \cdot \vec{\Omega}_j - h \sum_i \Omega_i^z - \frac{\tilde{K}(S)}{2} \sum_i (\hat{\Omega}_i^z)^2, \quad (15)$$

with $\tilde{K} = K(1 - \frac{1}{2S})$, the range of stability of the SkX phase is S -dependent. In particular, for $S = 1$ the SkX phase is stable over a range of K values that is twice as large as the range obtained for $S \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, lowering the spin of the magnetic ions is a guiding principle in the search to find more robust SkXs in centrosymmetric materials. It is also noteworthy that exactly the same variational phase diagram is obtained for the $S = 1$ case if we use direct products of coherent states of $\text{SU}(3)$ as a variational space [11]. Finally, note that the only difference between $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}$ and \mathcal{H}_{cl} is a renormalization of the single-ion anisotropy. More drastic differences between the phase diagrams of the two classical models, such as the presence of different phases, can be expected if more than one Hamiltonian parameter is renormalized.

Besides producing different phase diagrams, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}$ and \mathcal{H}_{cl} will in general lead to different dispersion relations of the normal modes (spin-waves) of a given phase. The linear spin-wave theory (LSWT) is obtained by quantizing the harmonic oscillators of each normal mode. The spin-waves of the classical theory become the magnons (collective modes) of the quantum mechanical theory. Since Hamiltonian parameters are typically extracted by fitting the magnons measured with INS, using the renormalized classical Hamiltonian is critical to extract correct values. This problem is illustrated by considering the fully polarized phase of the same Hamiltonian, $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$, which has the *exact* single-magnon dispersion

$$\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = S[\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{k}) - \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{0})] + h + \tilde{K}S, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_j e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij}} J_{ij}$. Equation (16) coincides with the dispersion relation that is obtained from the renormalized classical Hamiltonian, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{cl}}$, but is different from the dispersion relation $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = S[\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{k}) - \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{0})] + h + KS$ that is obtained from \mathcal{H}_{cl} using the traditional LSWT approximation based on a $1/S$ expansion. In other words, the value of the actual single-ion anisotropy is $(1 - 1/2S)^{-1}$ times bigger than the value obtained by fitting the magnon dispersion with the traditional (unrenormalized) LSWT, giving a relative correction of 100% for $S = 1$ and still 17% for $S = 7/2$. Moreover, from Eq. (12), in the presence of quartic ($q = 4$) and sixth ($q = 6$)




Figure 2. The lowest-order normal self-energies generated by decay (left) and by source (right) cubic vertices. The external legs have a unique (magnon) flavor, while the internal legs can have any flavor ν .

order single-ion anisotropy terms, the unrenormalized LSWT predicts amplitudes that are of order 10 and 100 times bigger than the actual values for the lowest values of S that are compatible with these anisotropies. Such discrepancies manifest dramatically when parameters that have been estimated by fitting traditional LSWT calculations to INS data are compared to estimates made using other measurements, such as magnetization.

Practically, scientific progress in quantum magnetism relies heavily on INS data, and the recent development of performant and robust $SU(2)$ LSWT codes (e.g., SpinW) has been instrumental in opening the bottleneck between observables and model Hamiltonians, providing crucial information closer to the beginning of the materials life cycle [16]. Of the reports published in the past year that makes reference to SpinW, nearly 20% include Hamiltonians with terms that are nonlinear in site spin operators. Looking back at existing literature, the more accurate RCS corrected values may be obtained using either the factors here or the recipe for generation of non-tabulated terms. Looking forward, estimates should be made either using the appropriate $SU(N)$ LSWT or both the traditional $SU(2)$ LSWT together with the RCS theory, with the results of both methods reported together. This will facilitate the creation of more accurate models, enabling us to test our understanding and guide future technological materials engineering. The open-source code Sunny provides an implementation of the RCS theory [17].

We note that previous works used Bose operator expansions to show the need to renormalize $SU(2)$ LSWT for spin Hamiltonians with single-ion anisotropy terms. In 1961, Oguchi and Honma performed a $1/S$ expansion of the square root that appears in the Holstein-Primakoff transformation to order $1/S^0$ and in this way derived the $(1 - 1/2S)$ renormalization factor of the quadratic single-ion anisotropy [18]. The same renormalization of the anisotropy term is present in subsequent works using different theoretical approaches. For example, in 1976, Kowalska and Lindgård used a generalized crystal-field Hamiltonian with an expansion parameter of the crystal field strength divided by the exchange field strength [19]. Later efforts echo this result, whether using Holstein-Primakoff [20] or Dyson-Maleev [21] transformations. However, since these works focused on the linearized dynamics (LSWT), the renormalization of the underlying classical theory and the corresponding non-linear LL equations were not discussed. In

other words, what remained hidden is that the renormalization of the linearized LSWT Hamiltonian arises from a more fundamental renormalization of the classical Hamiltonian.

The failure to recognize that this renormalization takes place at a more fundamental level presents a danger when adding $1/S$ corrections to LSWT calculations using one of the approaches just described. Specifically, the renormalization presented here can change the *classical* ground state, which in turn is used as the starting point for a spin-wave calculation. If $1/S$ corrections are added to the LSWT calculation only, and not to the calculation leading to the ground state, LSWT dispersion calculations may fail, either by gapping out Goldstone modes or by predicting unphysical, imaginary frequencies.

As already mentioned, the renormalized classical Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} can be obtained by restricting the generalized dynamics of $SU(2S+1)$ coherent states (phase space CP^{2S}) to the submanifold of dipoles ($SU(2)$ coherent states in CP^1) [22]. Since the CP^{2S} phase space contains $2S$ pairs of conjugate coordinates and momenta, the number of normal modes per spin is $2S$. The quantization of these normal modes is implemented by introducing Holstein-Primakoff bosons $b_{j\nu}$ with $2S$ flavors ($1 \leq \nu \leq 2S$). The restriction of the linearized dynamics to the plane tangent to the CP^1 phase space of $SU(2)$ coherent states is equivalent to projecting out the $2S - 1$ bosons representing fluctuations that are orthogonal to this plane. In other words, the renormalized spin-wave Hamiltonian can be obtained by keeping only one boson flavor (the one associated with magnon modes) of the generalized spin-wave Hamiltonian. Quantum corrections to the generalized spin-wave Hamiltonian are implemented via a loop expansion for the propagators of the $2S$ bosons (one for each flavor). This loop expansion is actually an expansion in the inverse of a parameter α that labels degenerate irreps of $SU(2S+1)$ (generalization of the $1/S$ expansion) [14]. Once again, the restricted dynamics is obtained by keeping only the bosonic propagator for the single-flavor that represents magnon modes. However, the internal lines of the diagrammatic expansion of this propagator can have any flavor, as illustrated by the case shown in Fig. 2 corresponding to the lowest-order normal self-energies.

These mathematical observations reveal that the renormalized classical Hamiltonian and the corresponding renormalized spin-wave theory (including quantum corrections) is a projection of a generalized spin-wave theory, whose “control parameter” is $1/\alpha$ instead of $1/S$ (where α labels degenerate irreducible representations of $SU(2S+1)$ [11]). Thus, it is not surprising that the renormalization factors contain higher order corrections in $1/S$. The most important corollary is that the renormalized spin-wave theory with the above-mentioned quantum corrections still preserves the Goldstone modes of theories that spontaneously break continuous symmetries because these symmetries are preserved to each order of the $1/\alpha$ expansion.

In summary, we have provided a general renormalization procedure which is essential for deriving accurate classical and semi-classical approximations of spin Hamiltonians that include arbitrary non-linear contributions. While the procedure

was illustrated with the most common non-linear terms (single-ion anisotropy and isotropic biquadratic interactions), more general cases, such as anisotropic four spin interactions, can naturally appear in magnetic materials with strong spin-orbit coupling, such as $4f$ -electron systems. Since semi-classical methods are the most common approximation used for solving the inverse scattering problem, the renormalization procedure presented here is necessary for extracting correct Hamiltonian parameters from INS data. In particular, the traditional method of fitting the measured INS data with the “plain vanilla LSWT” (large- S limit) can lead to serious inconsistencies between the neutron-derived parameters and those derived from other measurements.

We thank Martin Mourigal, Alan Tennant and Xiaojian Bai for helpful discussions. This work was funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, 631 Office of Basic Energy Sciences, under Award No. DE-SC-DE-SC-0018660. K. B. and H. Z. acknowledge support from the LANL LDRD program. Z. L. (phase diagram of Fig. 1) acknowledges support from U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Science and Engineering Division. D. P. acknowledges support by the DOE Office of Science (Office of Basic Energy Sciences). This research used resources of the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725.

* ddahlbom@utk.edu

- [1] E. Schrödinger, *Naturwissenschaften* **14**, 664 (1926).
 [2] Large deviations from semiclassical behavior in 2D or 3D materials generally arise for low- S materials, and near points where the classical spin Hamiltonian exhibits extensive ground state

degeneracy.

- [3] A. M. Perelomov, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **26**, 222 (1972).
 [4] L. G. Yaffe, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **54**, 407 (1982).
 [5] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz (1935).
 [6] M. Lakshmanan, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **369**, 1280 (2011).
 [7] T. L. Gilbert, *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **40**, 3443 (2004).
 [8] B. Hillebrands and K. Ounadjela, *Spin Dynamics in Confined Magnetic Structures* (Berlin: Springer, 2002).
 [9] D. C. Mattis, *Theory of Magnetism I: Statics and Dynamics* (Berlin: Springer, 1988).
 [10] M. D. Stiles and J. Miltat, Spin-transfer torque and dynamics, in *Spin Dynamics in Confined Magnetic Structures III*, edited by B. Hillebrands and A. Thiaville (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006) pp. 225–308.
 [11] H. Zhang and C. D. Batista, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 104409 (2021).
 [12] D. Dahlbom, H. Zhang, C. Miles, X. Bai, C. D. Batista, and K. Barros, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 054423 (2022).
 [13] D. Dahlbom, C. Miles, H. Zhang, C. D. Batista, and K. Barros, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 235154 (2022).
 [14] S.-H. Do, H. Zhang, T. J. Williams, T. Hong, V. O. Garlea, J. A. Rodriguez-Rivera, T.-H. Jang, S.-W. Cheong, J.-H. Park, C. D. Batista, and A. D. Christianson, *Nature Communications* **12**, 5331 (2021).
 [15] A. O. Leonov and M. Mostovoy, *Nature Communications* **6**, 8275 (2015).
 [16] S. Toth and B. Lake, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **27**, 166002 (2015).
 [17] <https://github.com/SunnySuite/Sunny.jl>.
 [18] T. Oguchi, *Phys. Rev.* **117**, 117 (1960).
 [19] P. A. Lindgård and A. Kowalska, *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* **9**, 2081 (1976).
 [20] E. Rastelli and P. A. Lindgard, *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* **12**, 1899 (1979).
 [21] E. Rastelli and A. Tassi, *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* **17**, 727 (1984).
 [22] We emphasize that the use of $SU(N)$ coherent states does not require an $SU(N)$ -invariant Hamiltonian. Instead, $SU(N)$ appears as the group of possible time-evolution operators of an approximate local Hamiltonian. See Supplementary Material for details.

Supplemental Material for Renormalized Classical Theory of Quantum Magnets

David Dahlbom,¹ Hao Zhang,¹ Zoha Laraib,¹ Daniel M. Pajerowski,² Kipton Barros,³ and Cristian D. Batista^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA*

²*Neutron Scattering Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, USA*

³*Theoretical Division and CNLS, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA*

(Dated: April 13, 2023)

In this supplement, we review some relevant facts about generalized coherent states; derive the Landau-Lifshitz (LL) equations using coherent states of $SU(2)$; and generalize these equations using coherent states of $SU(N)$. We next constrain the generalized dynamics to a dynamics of dipoles only. The resulting equations of motion will have the same form as the LL equations but nonlinear terms will be renormalized. Readers interested in the renormalization factors alone may skip directly to Sections D and E.

As a precaution, we emphasize that the use of $SU(N)$ coherent states does not require an $SU(N)$ -invariant Hamiltonian. Indeed, it is very often the terms that break continuous symmetries, such as on-site anisotropies, that motivate the use of the techniques presented here. Instead, $SU(N)$ appears as the group of possible time-evolution operators of an approximate local Hamiltonian. $SU(N)$ in particular is the relevant group simply because it is the set of all possible transformations that may be applied to an N -level quantum system.

A. Generalized coherent states

A generalized coherent state of a particular group may be realized by applying any action of this group to a reference state $|S\rangle$. For $SU(2)$, the reference state is taken to be the z -polarized state $|S\rangle: \hat{S}^z|S\rangle = S|S\rangle$. Group actions may be generated by exponentiating linear combinations of the spin operators, which form a basis for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. Thus an arbitrary $SU(2)$ coherent state may be written,

$$|\Omega\rangle = e^{i\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 c_{\alpha}\hat{S}^{\alpha}} |S\rangle, \quad (S1)$$

for real coefficients c_{α} . The set of all coherent states of a group is generated by considering the application of all possible group actions to the reference state. When considering the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ representation of $SU(2)$, this procedure is simply a recipe for producing any pure state.

Different group actions may produce equivalent coherent states, i.e., states differing only by an overall phase factor [S1]. When this is true, the manifold of coherent states will have lower dimensionality than the group that was used to generate the states. For example, a general group element of $SU(2)$ may be parameterized by three numbers, such as the c_{α} above or the more familiar Euler angles, but the manifold of coherent states is only 2-dimensional. This fact is made more obvious after setting up a one-to-one correspondence between coherent states and a real 3-vector through a map that eliminates overall phase:

$$|\Omega\rangle \mapsto \langle\Omega|\hat{S}^{\alpha}|\Omega\rangle \equiv \Omega^{\alpha}, \quad (S2)$$

where $\alpha = x, y, z$. This map, which corresponds to the familiar Bloch sphere construction, associates to each distinct coherent state a point on the sphere. If phase-equivalence is treated appropriately, the map is invertible, so the correspondence between points on a sphere and coherent states of $SU(2)$ is one-to-one [S3]. Consequently, we may parameterize the set of coherent states using only two angles. In particular, if we choose to represent a coherent state as in Eq. (S1), we may write the three coefficients c_{α} as functions of these two angles. The choice of a particular parameterization involves fixing a gauge.

We emphasize these points because the manifold of coherent states will become the classical phase space in the appropriate limit [S4, S5]. Thus the choice of group used to define coherent states is also a choice about the structure of the resulting classical dynamics, which will have a local Hamiltonian structure with $N - 1$ degrees of freedom. For example, the choice $N = 2$ yields the Landau-Lifshitz dynamics, which describes the evolution of a dipole on the sphere; this 2-dimensional manifold can be locally interpreted as a canonical phase space by the Darboux-Lie theorem [S6].

The construction of coherent states of $SU(N)$ proceeds in the same manner. Group actions may now be generated by exponentiating linear combinations of the elements of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(N)$. This algebra is $(N^2 - 1)$ -dimensional, and is thus spanned by $N^2 - 1$ generators, \hat{T}^{α} . The generalization of Eq. (S1) to an arbitrary $SU(N)$ coherent state, $|\Psi\rangle$, is

$$|\Psi\rangle = e^{i\sum_{\alpha=1}^{N^2-1} c_{\alpha}\hat{T}^{\alpha}} |S\rangle, \quad (S3)$$

for real coefficients c_α . We continue to take $|S\rangle$ as the reference state. In the fundamental (N -dimensional) representation, this is simply a recipe for generating all pure states. As before, it is possible to set up a one-to-one correspondence between coherent states and a vector of expectation values:

$$|\Psi\rangle \mapsto \langle\Psi|\hat{T}^\alpha|\Psi\rangle \equiv \Psi^\alpha. \quad (\text{S4})$$

The number of components in this vector is the dimension of the group. For $SU(N)$, this is $N^2 - 1$. The resulting manifold of coherent states is again a lower-dimensional object than the group itself. Specifically, it is the complex projective space $\mathbb{C}P^{N-1}$ [S7]. (Note that $\mathbb{C}P^1$ is topologically equivalent to the two-sphere.) This is a $2(N-1)$ -dimensional manifold, and we may in principle parameterize any $SU(N)$ coherent state with $2(N-1)$ angles. An important consequence is that the $N^2 - 1$ expectation values, Ψ^α , are constrained, just as the three expectation values in Eq. (S2) are restricted to the sphere.

Without loss of generality, it is always possible to choose the generators \hat{T}^α such that the first three correspond to the spin operators:

$$\hat{T}^\alpha = \hat{S}^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3. \quad (\text{S5})$$

With such a choice, the first three generators form an $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ subalgebra of $\mathfrak{su}(N)$. The manifold of coherent states generated by this subalgebra,

$$|\Psi\rangle = e^{i\sum_{\alpha=2}^3 c_\alpha \hat{T}^\alpha} |S\rangle, \quad (\text{S6})$$

is identical to the one defined in Eq. (S1). The resulting coherent states may therefore be labeled $|\Omega\rangle$ as well. The distinction is that this manifold of $SU(2)$ coherent states is a submanifold of the larger manifold of $SU(N)$ coherent states. The latter may be obtained by considering group actions generated by the entire set of generators \hat{T}^α , not just the first three. We note that, in principle, there are many embeddings $SU(2)$ coherent states in the manifold of $SU(N)$ coherent states. In the following, references to $SU(2)$ coherent states as part of the larger manifold of $SU(N)$ coherent states will always be references specifically to those states generated by the spin operators, as in Eq. (S6).

As an initial motivation for considering this larger set of coherent states, consider the single-site Hamiltonian containing only a quadrupolar term:

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \left(\hat{S}^z\right)^2.$$

The time-evolution operator will simply be

$$U(t) = e^{i(\hat{S}^z)^2 t},$$

where we have set $\hbar = 1$. Note that this does not generate an $SU(2)$ group action, since $(\hat{S}^z)^2$ does not belong to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. Put more concretely, there is no way to write $(\hat{S}^z)^2$ as a linear combination of the spin operators. When the time evolution operator is applied to some arbitrary state, say the z -polarized state,

$$e^{i(\hat{S}^z)^2 t} |S\rangle,$$

it will typically generate motion away from the two-sphere generated by the spin operators. This presents a problem for a classical dynamics defined on this sphere. In contrast, $(\hat{S}^z)^2$ can always be written as a linear combination of generators of $SU(N)$ with $N > 2$. The operator therefore belongs to $\mathfrak{su}(N)$, and the time evolution operator will generate a coherent state of $SU(N)$. Such a state will always be representable in the classical limit taken with respect to $SU(N)$ coherent states. This geometric observation has analytical consequences that will be explored in the next section.

B. The classical limit taken with respect to coherent states

We briefly review the procedure for taking a classical limit with respect to coherent states of $SU(2)$ and $SU(N)$. Details are available in [S5]. For simplicity, we will only consider expressions that are polynomials in spin operators, which covers all Hamiltonians of interest here.

A classical limit may be derived by replacing operators with expectation values, where these expectation values are calculated with respect to the coherent states of a group in a limit where the representation of this group is sent to infinity. The label

of the representation serves as the control parameter in this limiting procedure. For example, the limit taken with respect to coherent states of $SU(2)$ uses S as the control parameter.

An expression such as

$$\lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \langle S | \hat{S}^z | S \rangle = \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} S$$

becomes infinite in the infinite- S limit, so it is formally necessary to renormalize after taking the limit. Typically the expression is simply renormalized to S , where S refers to the angular momentum of the original quantum Hamiltonian [S8]. In the remainder of this note, the action of taking the limit will always be assumed to also include this renormalization step. As a consequence, for simple terms that are linear in the spin operators, the following holds

$$\lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\alpha | \Omega \rangle = \langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\alpha | \Omega \rangle.$$

In other words, the expectation value taken in the fundamental representation is the same (after renormalization) in infinite- S representation. This gives us the substitution rule,

$$\hat{S}^\alpha \rightarrow \langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\alpha | \Omega \rangle = \Omega^\alpha, \quad (S7)$$

for spin operators when they appear as isolated terms.

A subtlety arises when considering the expectation of a product of operators, e.g., $\hat{S}^\alpha \hat{S}^\beta$. It can be shown,

$$\langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\alpha \hat{S}^\beta | \Omega \rangle = \langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\alpha | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\beta | \Omega \rangle + O(S), \quad (S8)$$

that is, the expectation of the product of operators is the product of the expectations plus corrections terms of order S or lower. Since the first term is of order S^2 , the remaining terms will disappear in the large- S limit:

$$\lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\alpha \hat{S}^\beta | \Omega \rangle = \langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\alpha | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\beta | \Omega \rangle.$$

This gives us the factorization rule,

$$\hat{S}^\alpha \hat{S}^\beta \rightarrow \langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\alpha | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \hat{S}^\beta | \Omega \rangle = \Omega^\alpha \Omega^\beta, \quad (S9)$$

which may be generalized to an arbitrary product of operators as in Eq. (8) of the main paper. The factorization rule is an approximation and only becomes exact in the infinite representation limit. An important motivation for introducing $SU(N)$ coherent states is the elimination of this approximation.

A final point should be made about taking the classical limit of more complicated expressions containing groups of terms modified by common coefficients. If the relative value of these coefficients is to be maintained after taking the limit, only terms of highest-order in S within each group will survive. For example, consider the single-ion Hamiltonian,

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = A \left(\hat{S}^z \right)^2 + D \left(\left(\hat{S}^x \right)^2 + \left(\hat{S}^y \right)^2 + \left(\hat{S}^z \right)^4 \right). \quad (S10)$$

We may replace A with A/S^2 and D/S^4 to maintain the relative importance of the two contributions in the large- S limit. This will have the effect of killing terms of order less than S^2 in the A group and less than S^4 in the D group. Thus,

$$\lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathcal{H}} = A (\Omega^z)^2 + D (\Omega^z)^4. \quad (S11)$$

The procedure for deriving the classical limit with $SU(N)$ coherent states is essentially identical to the above, however S can no longer serve as an irrep label. A convenient choice is instead given by a family of degenerate irreps labeled by a single number, λ_1 . See [S5] for details. The classical limit is again determined by replacing operators with expectation values, where these expectation values are now be calculated with respect to $SU(N)$ coherent states in the $\lambda_1 \rightarrow \infty$ limit.

Since we are working with coherent states of $SU(N)$, we are free to express any operator in terms of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(N)$. The latter may be thought of as the space of $N \times N$ Hermitian matrices, with generators \hat{T}^α serving as a basis for this space. For each of these generators we will have

$$\lim_{\lambda_1 \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Psi | \hat{T}^\alpha | \Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi | \hat{T}^\alpha | \Psi \rangle = \Psi^\alpha. \quad (S12)$$

That is, the expectation value in the infinite- λ_1 limit (with appropriate renormalization) is the same as the expectation value in the fundamental representation. Moreover, since the \hat{T}^α serve as a basis for all Hermitian operators in an N -level system, we may always rewrite a product of spin operators as follows,

$$S^\alpha \hat{S}^\beta = \sum_{\gamma} c_{\gamma} \hat{T}^{\gamma} \quad (\text{S13})$$

for some choice of c_{γ} . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda_1 \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Psi | \hat{S}^\alpha \hat{S}^\beta | \Psi \rangle &= \sum_{\gamma} c_{\gamma} \lim_{\lambda_1 \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Psi | \hat{T}^{\gamma} | \Psi \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\gamma} c_{\gamma} \langle \Psi | \hat{T}^{\gamma} | \Psi \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\gamma} c_{\gamma} \Psi^{\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that it was never necessary to invoke the factorization rule. This is in fact a general feature of the large- λ_1 when considering an expectation value with respect to a single $SU(N)$ coherent state: there is never any need to apply the factorization rule or drop lower-order terms. The treatment of many-spin wave functions requires an additional assumption, which is discussed in Section C.

In what follows, we will derive classical equations of motion with respect to $SU(N)$ coherent states in the large- λ_1 limit. We will then constrain these dynamics to dipoles, i.e., to the coherent states generated by linear combinations of spin operators only. The resulting equations will be compared to the LL equations, which are instead the product of the large- S limit. We will find that the two results are identical except that certain terms have been renormalized. This renormalization may be expressed in terms of powers of S^{-1} . Indeed, these corrections capture precisely the terms that are dropped when applying the factorization rule in the large- S limit, Eq. (S8). We emphasize, however, that the results are obtained entirely within the context of a controlled large- λ_1 approximation; the set of S^{-1} corrections to the large- S limit is not arbitrary. Our central observation is that when these S^{-1} corrections are applied to the LL equations, one recovers exactly a constrained form of the large- λ_1 limit.

C. Restricted equations of motion

Let $\hat{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{S})$ be a many-spin Hamiltonian where $\mathbf{S} = (S_1^x, S_1^y, S_1^z, \dots, S_n^x, S_n^y, S_n^z)$ and n is the number of sites. We assume that the Hamiltonian may be written strictly as a polynomial in the spin operators on each site. The associated classical equations of motion may be derived using the substitution rules outlined above with the additional assumption that we neglect entanglement between sites. This condition is enforced by restricting to a tensor product basis of coherent states of $SU(2)$,

$$|\Omega\rangle = \bigotimes_j |\Omega_j\rangle$$

where j is the site index. This choice in turn restricts the time-evolution operator to be an element of tensor product $\bigotimes_j SU(2)_j$, where $SU(2)_j$ is the group of (local) rotations of the spin j . Heisenberg's equations of motion may then be applied to each spin operator:

$$i\hbar \frac{d\hat{S}_j^\alpha}{dt} = \left[\hat{S}_j^\alpha, \hat{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{S}) \right] = i\hbar \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial \hat{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{S})}{\partial \hat{S}_j^\beta} \hat{S}_j^\gamma \quad (\text{S14})$$

The operator derivative on the right is to be interpreted in the sense described in Appendix A, and involves an implicit contraction of the matrix indices for \hat{S}_j^β and \hat{S}_j^γ . The anti-symmetric Levi-Civita tensor arises from the commutation relations $[S^\alpha, S^\beta] = i\hbar \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} S^\gamma$. Formally, the commutation relations define the *structure constants* associated with basis for a Lie algebra, and $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ are the structure constants of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ with the spin operators serving as a basis.

If we define the classical Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}} \equiv \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Omega | \hat{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{S}) | \Omega \rangle \quad (\text{S15})$$

and apply the substitutions rule given in Eq. (S7), we may write,

$$\frac{d\Omega_j^\alpha}{dt} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{\text{cl}}}{\partial \Omega_j^\beta} \Omega_j^\gamma, \quad (\text{S16})$$

which are precisely the LL equations. Note that calculating \mathcal{H}_{cl} demands attention to the details outlined in Section B. In particular, it may be necessary to apply the factorization rule and drop terms of lower order in S from groups of terms modified by a common coefficient. Detailed examples may be found in [S5, S9, S10].

The generalized equations are derived in a directly analogous manner, but, instead of using coherent states of $SU(2)$, the limit is taken with respect to coherent states of $SU(N)$, where typically $N = 2S + 1$ and S is the total effective spin on each site. The Hilbert space is first restricted to a tensor product basis of $SU(N)$ coherent states,

$$|\Psi\rangle = \bigotimes_j |\Psi_j\rangle.$$

We consider the same Hamiltonian as before. Note, however, that all terms of the Hamiltonian that are nonlinear in the spin operators for a single site may now be expressed as linear combinations of the generators of $SU(N)$, as in Eq. (S13). To express this fact notationally, we here call the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(\mathbf{T})$, where \mathbf{T} is the vector of all generators of $SU(N)$ on all sites.

Heisenberg's equations of motion are again applied, now to each generator T_j^α ,

$$i\hbar \frac{d\hat{T}_j^\alpha}{dt} = [\hat{T}_j^\alpha, \hat{H}(\mathbf{T})] = i\hbar f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial \hat{H}(\mathbf{T})}{\partial \hat{T}_j^\beta} \hat{T}_j^\gamma, \quad (\text{S17})$$

with an implicit contraction on the matrix elements of \hat{T}_j^β and \hat{T}_j^γ . Now the structure constants $f_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ of $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ appear, arising from the commutator $[\hat{T}_j^\alpha, \hat{T}_j^\beta] = i\hbar f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \hat{T}_j^\gamma$. The classical Hamiltonian is next defined using the large- λ_1 limit. Since the Hamiltonian is linear in the generators, we may apply Eq. (S12) and simply write,

$$\mathcal{H}_{SU(N)} \equiv \langle \Psi | \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{T}) | \Psi \rangle. \quad (\text{S18})$$

Using this definition and applying our substitution rules to Eq. (S17), we find,

$$\frac{d\Psi_j^\alpha}{dt} = f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Psi_j^\beta} \Psi_j^\gamma. \quad (\text{S19})$$

These generalized equations have the same form as the traditional LL equations of Eq. (S16). However, the number of dynamical variables on each site has increased to $N^2 - 1$, and the cross product, which comes from the structure constants of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$, has been generalized using the structure constants of $\mathfrak{su}(N)$. Additionally, since the new classical Hamiltonian is defined by taking an expectation with respect to the tensor product of $SU(N)$ coherent states, it is never necessary to invoke the factorization rule or drop lower-order terms.

While the generalized LL dynamics of Eq. (S19) has many advantages, it may also introduce sharp modes that would be washed out in multi-magnon continua when higher-order corrections in λ_1 are included. We therefore propose restricting the generalized dynamics to a dynamics of dipoles only. The Appendix B of this SM contains a direct calculation showing that the restricted dynamics takes the form,

$$\frac{d\Omega_j^\alpha}{dt} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega_j^\beta} \Omega_j^\gamma. \quad (\text{S20})$$

These equations are identical to the LL equations except that \mathcal{H}_{cl} has been replaced with $\mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}$, i.e., the classical Hamiltonian has been calculated using $SU(N)$ coherent states in the large- λ_1 limit. Since the manifold of $SU(N)$ coherent states contains within it the submanifold of $SU(2)$ coherent states generated by the spin operators, restricting $\mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}$ to this submanifold is a natural operation. To make practical use of Eq. (S20), it is necessary to evaluate $\mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}$ on this restricted space and see how it differs from \mathcal{H}_{cl} . Recall that, for any term that is linear in the spin operators, the large- S and large- λ_1 classical limits agree. The remainder of the SM is therefore dedicated to examining the difference between these limits when they are applied to a large class of nonlinear terms.

D. Renormalization of on-site anisotropies

On-site anisotropies are a common source of terms that are nonlinear in the spin operators. A useful basis for expressing such anisotropies is the Stevens operators, \hat{O}_{kq} . Like the spherical tensors, the Stevens operators (for each fixed k) are an irrep of $SO(3)$. That is, under a physical 3D rotation, each \hat{O}_{kq} transforms to linear combination of $\hat{O}_{kq'}$ involving $q' = -k, \dots, k$. There

is a simple linear relationship between Stevens operators and spherical tensors [S11]. Stevens operators, unlike spherical tensors, are Hermitian. The set of all \hat{O}_{kq} for $k = 1, \dots, N-1$ and $q = -k, \dots, k$ can be used as a basis for the $N^2 - 1$ generators of $SU(N)$.

Following the approach described in Section B, the classical limit of a Stevens operator may be found by evaluating its expectation value with respect to a coherent state in the infinite representation. The only states that are relevant for the restricted dynamics, Eq. (S20), are the coherent states of $SU(2)$ generated by the spin operators. We label these $|\Omega\rangle$. Our task, then, is to evaluate

$$\langle \Omega | \hat{O}_{kq} | \Omega \rangle$$

in both the large- λ_1 and large- S limits.

By construction, the limiting procedures will produce results that transform according to identical irreps and will be defined on the same domain, namely the two-sphere. They will therefore be proportional. Moreover, the proportionality constant will be independent of q [S12]. It follows that

$$\langle \Omega | \hat{O}_{kq} | \Omega \rangle = c_k \left[\lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \langle S | \hat{O}_{kq} | S \rangle \right], \quad (\text{S21})$$

for any $|\Omega\rangle$, where the expectation on the left is precisely what emerges in the large- λ_1 limit, Eq. (S12). To determine c_k , we may simply evaluate both sides of this equation using any $SU(2)$ coherent state. The z -polarized state, $|S\rangle$, is a particularly convenient choice.

We will restrict our attention to Stevens operators \hat{O}_{kq} where k is even (to respect time-reversal symmetry) and less than or equal to 6. Since the proportionality constant is independent of q , we will take $q = 0$. The relevant Stevens operators are then:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{O}_{20} &= 3 \left(\hat{S}^z \right)^2 - \mathbf{S}^2 \\ \hat{O}_{40} &= 35 \left(\hat{S}^z \right)^4 - (30\mathbf{S}^2 - 25) \left(\hat{S}^z \right)^2 + 3\mathbf{S}^4 - 6\mathbf{S}^2 \\ \hat{O}_{60} &= 231 \left(\hat{S}^z \right)^6 - (315\mathbf{S}^2 - 735) \left(\hat{S}^z \right)^4 \\ &\quad + (105\mathbf{S}^4 - 525\mathbf{S}^2 + 294) \left(\hat{S}^z \right)^2 \\ &\quad - 5\mathbf{S}^6 + 40\mathbf{S}^4 - 60\mathbf{S}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Beginning with \hat{O}_{20} , the left-hand side of Eq. (S21) is evaluated directly,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S | \hat{O}_{20} | S \rangle &= 3 \langle S | \left(\hat{S}^z \right)^2 | S \rangle - \langle S | \mathbf{S}^2 | S \rangle \\ &= 3S^2 - S(S+1). \end{aligned}$$

The large- S limit is calculated as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \langle S | \hat{O}_{20} | S \rangle &= 3 \langle S | \hat{S}^z | S \rangle^2 \\ &\quad - \left(\langle S | \hat{S}^x | S \rangle^2 + \langle S | \hat{S}^y | S \rangle^2 + \langle S | \hat{S}^z | S \rangle^2 \right) \\ &= 2S^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have made use of the factorization rule. We can now solve for c_2 :

$$3S^2 - S(S+1) = c_2 \left(2S^2 \right) \implies c_2 = 1 - \frac{1}{2S}.$$

The same procedure can be applied to find c_4 and c_6 . Evaluating expectation values, we find,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S | \hat{O}_{40} | S \rangle &= 8S^4 - 24S^3 + 22S^2 - 6S \\ \langle S | \hat{O}_{60} | S \rangle &= 16S^6 - 120S^5 + 340S^4 - 550S^3 + 274S^2 - 60S, \end{aligned}$$

Taking care to drop terms of lower order in S , the large- S limit yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \langle S | \hat{O}_{40} | S \rangle &= 8S^4 \\ \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} \langle S | \hat{O}_{60} | S \rangle &= 16S^6. \end{aligned}$$

It is now straightforward to solve for the remaining c_k :

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 &= 1 - \frac{1}{2}S^{-1} \\ c_4 &= 1 - 3S^{-1} + \frac{11}{4}S^{-2} - \frac{3}{4}S^{-3} \\ c_6 &= 1 - \frac{15}{2}S^{-1} + \frac{85}{4}S^{-2} - \frac{225}{8}S^{-3} + \frac{137}{8}S^{-4} - \frac{15}{4}S^{-5} \end{aligned}$$

E. Renormalization of Biquadratic interactions

n -spin interactions with $n > 2$ are another common source of nonlinear terms. If we restrict attention to interactions that respect time-reversal symmetry, requiring n to be even, the simplest example is the isotropic biquadratic interaction:

$$(\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2)^2$$

We will directly calculate this term in both classical limits to determine the appropriate renormalization. This example is provided as a template for more general n -spin interactions.

When the biquadratic interaction is fully expanded, all resulting terms will have degree 4. The large- S classical limit may therefore be calculated simply by replacing each spin operator with its expectation value taken with respect to a coherent state on each site: $S_j^\alpha \rightarrow \langle \Omega_j | S_j^\alpha | \Omega_j \rangle = \Omega_j^\alpha$. The result is then

$$(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}_2)^2. \quad (\text{S22})$$

The large- λ_1 classical limit may be calculated by directly taking the expectation value of $(\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2)^2$ with respect to the tensor product of two $SU(2)$ coherent states, which will be denoted $|\Omega_1 \Omega_2\rangle$. We begin by exploiting the invariance of the biquadratic interaction under $SU(2)$ rotations,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega_1, \Omega_2 | (\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2)^2 | \Omega_1 \Omega_2 \rangle &= \langle \Omega_1, \Omega_2 | U_g^\dagger U_g (\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2)^2 U_g^\dagger U_g | \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \rangle \\ &= \langle \Omega_1, \Omega_2 | U_g^\dagger (\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2) U_g | \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $U_g = e^{i\mathbf{n} \cdot (\mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_2)\alpha}$ is a global spin rotation. We may specifically choose U_g to transform Ω_1 to be the maximal weight state $|S\rangle$:

$$U_g | \Omega_1, \Omega_2 \rangle = |S, \Omega'_2\rangle$$

We additionally have the freedom to specify that this transformation place the vector $\boldsymbol{\Omega}'_2 = \langle \Omega_2 | \mathbf{S}_2 | \Omega_2 \rangle$ in the plane orthogonal to the y -axis. $\boldsymbol{\Omega}'_2$ will then have the general form $(S \sin \theta, 0, S \cos \theta)$, where θ is the angle between $\boldsymbol{\Omega}'_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}'_2$. In particular, we have $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}_2 = \boldsymbol{\Omega}'_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\Omega}'_2 = S^2 \cos \theta$. We may then write

$$\langle \Omega_1, \Omega_2 | (\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2)^2 | \Omega_1 \Omega_2 \rangle = \langle S, \Omega'_2 | (\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2)^2 | S, \Omega'_2 \rangle.$$

We introduce another unitary transformation that changes the relative angle between $\boldsymbol{\Omega}'_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}'_2$. This can be achieved by rotating the second spin about the y -axis. Specifically, we will select a transformation which carries $\boldsymbol{\Omega}'_2$ into the maximal weight state as well: $U_r = e^{-iS_2^y \theta}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega_1, \Omega_2 | (\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2)^2 | \Omega_1 \Omega_2 \rangle &= \langle S, \Omega'_2 | (\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2)^2 | S, \Omega'_2 \rangle \\ &= \langle S, S | U_r (\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2)^2 U_r^\dagger | S, S \rangle \\ &= \langle S, S | (\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot U_r \mathbf{S}_2 U_r^\dagger)^2 | S, S \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbf{S}_2 is a vector operator, its transformation under U_r is equivalent to a transformation on the left by an orthogonal matrix R_r ,

$$U_r \mathbf{S}_2 U_r^\dagger = R_r^{\mu\nu} \hat{S}^\nu.$$

Inserting this into our calculation, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle S, S | \left(\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot U_r \mathbf{S}_2 U_r^\dagger \right)^2 | S, S \rangle \\
&= \langle S, S | \left(\hat{S}_1^\mu R_r^{\mu\nu} \hat{S}_2^\nu \right)^2 | S, S \rangle \\
&= S^4 (R_r^{zz})^2 + \frac{S^2}{4} (1 - R_r^{xx}) + \frac{S^2}{4} [(R_r^{xx})^2 - R_r^{xx}] + (R^{xz})^2 S^3 \\
&= S^4 (\cos \theta)^2 + \frac{S^2}{4} (1 - \cos \theta) + \frac{S^2}{4} \cos \theta (\cos \theta - 1) \\
&\quad + (1 - \cos^2 \theta) S^3 \\
&= \left(S^4 - S^3 + \frac{S^2}{4} \right) (\cos \theta)^2 - \frac{S^2}{2} \cos \theta + S^3 + \frac{S^2}{4} \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{1}{S} + \frac{1}{4S^2} \right) (\mathbf{\Omega}_1 \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}_2)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{\Omega}_1 \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}_2 + S^3 + \frac{S^2}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

By comparing with Eq. (S22), it is clear that not only must $(\mathbf{\Omega}_1 \cdot \mathbf{\Omega}_2)^2$ be renormalized—by a rather substantial amount for realistic spin values—but it is also necessary to introduce a quadratic correction, the order of which is similar to the quartic term.

Appendix A: Operator derivative

Consider the $SU(N)$ Lie algebra with generators \hat{T}^α that satisfy

$$[\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{T}^\beta] = i f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \hat{T}^\gamma. \quad (\text{S23})$$

In this appendix, we will assume the \hat{T}^α are matrices in some chosen basis. Further, we can assume that the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ is some arbitrary polynomial of \hat{T}^α . For the purposes of this study, we may particularly assume the Hamiltonian is restricted to the spin operators, \hat{T}^α with $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$, but the argument will be made in general. The commutator, $[\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{\mathcal{H}}]$ is closely related to the derivative $d\hat{\mathcal{H}}/d\hat{T}^\alpha$, in a way that we will now make explicit. For this argument, it suffices to consider a single term in the polynomial,

$$\hat{A} = \hat{T}^{\beta_1} \hat{T}^{\beta_2} \dots \hat{T}^{\beta_n}. \quad (\text{S24})$$

Each index β_i is selecting one of the $N^2 - 1$ generators of $SU(N)$.

The Lie bracket satisfies the a generalization of the ‘‘product rule’’ familiar for derivatives,

$$[\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{A}] = \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{T}^{\beta_1} \dots \hat{T}^{\beta_{i-1}}) [\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{T}^{\beta_i}] (\hat{T}^{\beta_{i+1}} \dots \hat{T}^{\beta_n}). \quad (\text{S25})$$

Using the $SU(N)$ structure constants, this becomes

$$[\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{A}] = i f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{T}^{\beta_1} \dots \hat{T}^{\beta_{i-1}}) (\delta_{\beta, \beta_i} \hat{T}^\gamma) (\hat{T}^{\beta_{i+1}} \dots \hat{T}^{\beta_n}), \quad (\text{S26})$$

with δ_{β, β_i} the usual Kronecker delta. Although the generators do not commute, we can move the \hat{T}^γ operator to the right by making the matrix elements explicit,

$$[\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{A}]_{kl} = i f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{T}^{\beta_1} \dots \hat{T}^{\beta_{i-1}})_{km} \delta_{\beta, \beta_i} (\hat{T}^{\beta_{i+1}} \dots \hat{T}^{\beta_n})_{nl} \right] \hat{T}_{mn}^\gamma, \quad (\text{S27})$$

with summation over repeated matrix indices m, n implied.

Now we will consider ordinary partial derivatives with respect to matrix elements of the generators, e.g.,

$$\partial \hat{T}_{kl}^{\beta_i} / \partial \hat{T}_{mn}^\beta = \delta_{\beta_i \beta} \delta_{km} \delta_{ln}. \quad (\text{S28})$$

Using the product rule for derivatives, the term in square brackets of Eq. (S27) is recognized as the usual partial derivative of the matrix A ,

$$[\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{A}] = i f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial \hat{A}}{\partial \hat{T}_{mn}^\beta} \hat{T}_{mn}^\gamma. \quad (\text{S29})$$

By linearity, a similar result holds for the full Hamiltonian H , which is a sum over terms of the form of \hat{A} .

In taking the classical limit, we will calculate the expectation of both sides of Eq. (S26) with respect to a product state. This allows us to ignore matrix ordering, e.g.,

$$\langle \hat{T}^{\beta_1} \hat{T}^{\beta_2} \dots \rangle = \langle \hat{T}^{\beta_1} \rangle \langle \hat{T}^{\beta_2} \rangle \dots = \Omega^{\beta_1} \Omega^{\beta_2} \dots \quad (\text{S30})$$

The result is,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{\mathcal{H}}] \rangle &= i f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Omega^{\beta_1} \dots \Omega^{\beta_{i-1}}) (\delta_{\beta, \beta_i} \Omega^\gamma) (\Omega^{\beta_{i+1}} \dots \Omega^{\beta_n}) \\ &= i f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial \langle \hat{\mathcal{H}} \rangle}{\partial \Omega^\beta} \Omega^\gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S31})$$

The second equality is justified by the usual product rule for derivatives, in direct analogy to the product rule for used in Eq. (S26).

Appendix B: Constrained generalized dynamics

Consider a generic spin Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$, which, for simplicity, we will take to be a single-site Hamiltonian; the generalization to a many-spin problem proceeds in the same way described in Section B. We will be considering expectation values with respect to the $SU(2)$ coherent states generated by the spin operators. As described in Section A, these $SU(2)$ coherent states will be considered as a submanifold of $SU(N)$ coherent states, so we are free to express the Hamiltonian as a linear combination of generators T^α belonging to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(N)$,

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N^2-1} b_\alpha \hat{T}^\alpha, \quad (\text{S32})$$

for real coefficients b_α .

We now propose another dynamics generated by a constrained Hamiltonian, \hat{h} , which we will define as a linear combination of the spin operators only. Since we have chosen \hat{T}^α for $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ to be the spin operators Eq. (S5), we may write this as:

$$\hat{h} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 c_\alpha \hat{T}^\alpha. \quad (\text{S33})$$

This operator will generate group actions in $SU(2)$, as in Eq. (S1), and represents the generic form of any closed dynamics on the $SU(2)$ coherent states of interest.

Recall from Eq. (S2) that the Bloch construction is a bijective map between $SU(2)$ coherent states and points on the sphere. We may therefore consider the expectation value of an operator with respect to an $SU(2)$ coherent state as a function on the sphere. In particular, we define

$$\mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}(\Omega^x, \Omega^y, \Omega^z) \equiv \langle \Omega | \hat{\mathcal{H}} | \Omega \rangle.$$

The “ $SU(N)$ ” subscript has been added because this expression is precisely $\mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}$ as defined in Eq. (S18) when restricted to the sphere.

We wish to examine the time evolution of $\mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}$, the expected value of our full Hamiltonian, under the dynamics generated by our restricted Hamiltonian, \hat{h} . We begin by applying the chain rule:

$$\frac{d\mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{dt} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega^\alpha} \frac{d\Omega^\alpha}{dt}. \quad (\text{S34})$$

Noting that $\Omega^\alpha = \langle \Omega | T^\alpha | \Omega \rangle$, the time evolution of this expression under \hat{h} can be found using Heisenberg's equations of motion for the operator \hat{T}^α ,

$$\frac{d\Omega^\alpha}{dt} = \left\langle \Omega \left| \frac{d\hat{T}^\alpha}{dt} \right| \Omega \right\rangle = \frac{-i}{\hbar} \langle \Omega | [\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{h}] | \Omega \rangle. \quad (\text{S35})$$

The commutator may be evaluated using the expansion in Eq. (S33) and invoking the $SU(N)$ structure constants,

$$[\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{h}] = \sum_{\beta=1}^3 c_\beta [\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{T}^\beta] = i f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} c_\beta T^\gamma \quad (\text{S36})$$

Substituting these two results into Eq. (S34) yields a classical dynamics,

$$\frac{d\Omega^\alpha}{dt} = \sum_{\beta=1}^3 \sum_{\gamma=1}^{N^2-1} f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} c_\beta \Omega^\gamma. \quad (\text{S37})$$

Since we have chosen the first three \hat{T}^α to be spin operators, it follows $f_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ for indices with values between 1 and 3. Moreover, the spin operators in fact form a subalgebra in the set of generators, so the γ -sum never need extend beyond three when both operators in the commutator have indices between one and three. Using this fact while substituting the last result into Eq. (S34), we find

$$\frac{d\mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{dt} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma=1}^3 \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega^\alpha} c_\beta \Omega^\gamma \quad (\text{S38})$$

This has the form of a scalar triple product. To ensure that the dynamics generated by \hat{h} keeps the expected value of the original Hamiltonian constant, we wish to determine the values of c_β such that the right-hand side is always zero. From geometric consideration, this means the c_β must be coplanar with the other two vectors:

$$c_\alpha = \kappa(t) \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega^\alpha} + \mu(t) \Omega^\alpha$$

for undetermined functions κ and μ . The restricted Hamiltonian then has the form

$$\hat{h} = \sum_{\alpha} \left[\kappa(t) \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega^\alpha} + \mu(t) \Omega^\alpha \right] \hat{T}^\alpha.$$

By expanding the definition of $\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega^\alpha}$ and comparing with Eq. (S32), we find,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega^\alpha} = \frac{\partial \langle \Omega | \hat{\mathcal{H}} | \Omega \rangle}{\partial \langle \Omega | \hat{T}^\alpha | \Omega \rangle} = b_\alpha.$$

If we impose the restriction that \hat{h} produce the same dynamics as $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ when the latter is itself a linear combination of only the spin operators, it follows that $\kappa(t) = 1$ and $\mu(t) = 0$. The restricted Hamiltonian is therefore

$$\hat{h} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega^\alpha} \hat{T}^\alpha.$$

The classical equations of motion for our restricted dynamics may now be calculated. Recall once again that we need only consider the first three \hat{T}^α and may therefore write the relevant structure constants $f_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ as $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} \hat{T}^\alpha &= [\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{h}] \\ &= \sum_{\beta=1}^3 \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega^\beta} [\hat{T}^\alpha, \hat{T}^\beta] \\ &= i\hbar \sum_{\beta,\gamma=1}^3 \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega^\beta} \hat{T}^\gamma \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation values of both sides we find,

$$\frac{d\Omega^\alpha}{dt} = \sum_{\beta,\gamma=1}^3 \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_{SU(N)}}{\partial \Omega^\beta} \Omega^\gamma,$$

which is precisely Eq. (S20) for a single site Hamiltonian.

-
- [S1] A. M. Perelomov, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **26**, 222 (1972).
[S2] R. Gilmore, *Annals of Physics* **74**, 391 (1972).
[S3] The inverse mapping may be constructed as follows. When constructing coherent states, take the highest-weight state as the reference state. (For details on the highest-weight state in this context, see [S5].) Construct the operator $\mathfrak{n} = \Psi^\alpha \hat{T}^\alpha$, summing over α . The highest-weight eigenvector of \mathfrak{n} is then the complex-vector representation of the coherent state corresponding to Ψ^α . For more details, see Part III of the supplementary material to [S13].
[S4] L. G. Yaffe, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **54**, 407 (1982).
[S5] H. Zhang and C. D. Batista, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 104409 (2021).
[S6] E. Hairer, C. Lubich, and G. Wanner, *Geometric Numerical Integration: Structure-Preserving Algorithms for Ordinary Differential Equations*, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013).
[S7] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of quantum states: an introduction to quantum entanglement* (Cambridge university press, 2017).
[S8] Alternatively, one may consider taking $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ together with $S \rightarrow \infty$ while holding $\hbar S$ constant.
[S9] D. Dahlbom, H. Zhang, C. Miles, X. Bai, C. D. Batista, and K. Barros, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 054423 (2022).
[S10] D. Dahlbom, C. Miles, H. Zhang, C. D. Batista, and K. Barros, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 235154 (2022).
[S11] C. Rudowicz, *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* **18**, 1415 (1985).
[S12] To show this formally, one may first consider spherical tensors and spherical harmonics. The expectation values of the spherical tensors with respect to coherent states will transform according to the same irreps as the spherical harmonics and will therefore be proportional. Repeated application of the orthogonality theorem for irreps will show proportionality that is independent of q . The result is analogous to the Wigner-Eckart theorem. The argument carries over to Stevens operators because they are related to the spherical tensors by a linear transformation that does not mix different ks . The transformation is given explicitly in [S11].
[S13] H. Zhang, Z. Wang, D. Dahlbom, K. Barros, and C. D. Batista, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2203.15248 (2022).