## Measuring the boundary gapless state and criticality via disorder operator

Zenan Liu,<sup>1</sup> Rui-Zhen Huang,<sup>2</sup> Yan-Cheng Wang,<sup>3,4,\*</sup> Zheng Yan,<sup>5,6,†</sup> and Dao-Xin Yao<sup>1,7,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>State Key Laboratory of Optoelectronic Materials and Technologies,

Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Magnetoelectric Physics and Devices,

Center for Neutron Science and Technology, School of Physics,

Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, Ghent University, Krijgslaan 281, S9, B-9000 Ghent, Belgium

<sup>3</sup>Collaborative Center for Physics and Chemistry, Institute of International Innovation,

Beihang University, Yuhang District, Hangzhou 311115, China

<sup>4</sup> Tianmushan Laboratory, Hangzhou 311115, China

<sup>5</sup>Department of Physics, School of Science, Westlake University, 600 Dunyu Road, Hangzhou 310030, China

<sup>6</sup>Institute of Natural Sciences, Westlake Institute for Advanced Study, 18 Shilongshan Road, Hangzhou 310024, China

<sup>7</sup>International Quantum Academy, Shenzhen 518048, China

(Dated: November 13, 2023)

The disorder operator is often designed to reveal the conformal field theory (CFT) information in the quantum many-body system. By using large-scale quantum Monte Carlo simulation, we study the scaling behavior of disorder operator on the boundary in the two-dimensional Heisenberg model on the square-octagon lattice with gapless topological edge state. In the Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki (AKLT) phase, the disorder operator is shown to hold the perimeter scaling with a logarithmic term associated with the Luttinger Liquid parameter K. This effective Luttinger Liquid parameter K reflects the low energy physics and CFT for (1+1)d boundary. At bulk critical point, the effective K is suppressed but keep finite value, indicating the coupling between the gapless edge state and bulk fluctuation. The logarithmic term numerically capture this coupling picture, which reveals the  $(1+1)d SU(2)_1$  CFT and (2+1)d O(3) CFT at boundary criticality. Our work paves a new way to study the exotic boundary state and boundary criticality.

Introduction.- Quantum critical behaviors is an important and long-historical topic in the quantum manybody physics. The unconventional phase transition is beyond the Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson paradigm and has attracted many analytical and numerical studies such as deconfined quantum critical point (DQCP) [1–3] and topological phase transition [4-8]. In addition, when the bulk undergoes the phase transition, the boundary can also emerge exotic critical behaviors, dubbed surface critical behaviors (SCB). The exotic surface criticality draws renewed attention which is induced by the couple between the gapless boundary state and critical bulk fluctuation. The edge-bulk-coupled picture is widely found to play an important role in the nontrivial surface criticality of different quantum antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model [9]. The gapless edge state composed of dangling spin-1/2 is considered as the origin of unconventional SCBs [10–14]. However, the exotic boundary criticality is also observed without gapless edge state in spin-1 model [15], which leads to more controversial problems in the boundary criticality and requires for more useful detecting methods.

In recent years, the non-local operators have been widely used to reveal the entanglement and categorical symmetry for quantum many-body system, such as symmetry domain walls or field lines of emergent gauge field [16–20]. They pave a new path to probe the phase and phase transition from the view of high-form symmetry or domain wall. Disorder operator is a non-local observable which is proposed to extract the high-form symmetry of quantum many body systems [21–23]. It has been successfully used to detect the high form symmetry breaking at Ising transition [24]. And the current central charge can be extracted from the disorder operator at (2+1)d O(2) and O(3) phase transition in the CFT[25, 26]. Fermion disorder operators are also designed to explore the universal feature of Fermi Liquid, Luttinger Liquid, fermion QCP and reflect the nonunitary conformal field theory (CFT) of fermion DQCP [27–29]. The disorder operator satisfies the new universal scaling behaviors, where the subleading logarithmic term extracts the general feature of CFT at the conformal invariant QCP.

Since the exotic boundary criticality is combined by both edge and bulk modes which seems to contain either the CFT information of edge excitation or bulk branch, how to extract the composite CFTs at the special criticality is a core problem to be solved when we want to study the mechanism of the exotic edge class. In this work, we firstly introduce the disorder operator to probe the boundary state and boundary criticality by taking the S = 1/2 Heisenberg model on the square-octagon lattice as an example. The scaling behaviors also hold the perimeter law with subleading logarithmic term in the Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki (AKLT) phase. This logarithmic term is related to the Luttinger Liquid (LL) parameter K at small angle value, which demonstrates that the boundary is governed by LL in the IR limit. The most intriguing case is that the logarithmic term  $s(\theta)$  can capture the LL parameter K for boundary and current

central charge J for bulk at QCP. This logarithmic term scaling is different from the bulk disorder operator at (2+1)d QCP, which provides a new tool to understand the boundary physics.



FIG. 1.  $J_1$ - $J_2$  Heisenberg model on the square-octagon lattice. There are two different measurement region M (orange region) for disorder operator on the edge, dubbed method 1 (a) and method 2 (b). (c) Ground-state phase diagram of this model. We mainly consider the phase transition between the AKLT state and S = 1/2 Néel state

Model and Method.- We investigate the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$   $J_1 - J_2$  Heisenberg model on a square-octagon lattice via quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) simulations[30–32], also dubbed AKLT model.

$$H = J_1 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j + J_2 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle'} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \tag{1}$$

where  $J_1$  is the inter-unit-cell coupling and  $J_2$  is intraunit-cell coupling. We define  $g = J_2/J_1$  and set  $J_1 = 1$ . This model can host rich phase program via tuning the coupling  $J_2$ , which including S = 2 Néel state, AKLT state, S = 1/2 Néel state and plaquette valence bond crystal (PVBC) [10, 33, 34]. These phase are all separated by O(3) quantum critical points. The AKLT state is a symmetry-protected topological phase whose boundary is protected by translation symmetry and spinrotation symmetry [35, 36]. So the gapless boundary is governed by an effective S = 1/2 Heisenberg chain in the low energy physics. At the bulk O(3) quantum critical point, the boundary gapless mode is coupled to the bulk fluctuation which induces the unconventional boundary criticality. This demonstrates that boundary has richer physics and critical behaviors than bulk.

Disorder operator.- For a quantum system with U(1) symmetry, the disorder operator can be constructed by U(1) rotation angle  $U(\theta) = \prod_i e^{i\theta(S_i^z + \frac{1}{2})}$ , where  $S_i^z$  is the

U(1) charge on site *i*. Given a region *M* on the lattice, we can define the disorder operator  $X_M(\theta) = \prod_M e^{i\theta(S_i^z + \frac{1}{2})}$ . The ground state expectation  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  is the module of  $\langle X(\theta) \rangle$  defined as the disorder parameter which can extract the order and high form symmetry of disorder phase. The scaling behaviors of  $X(\theta)$  rely on whether the phase is ordered or disordered. In the disordered phase,  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  is proportional to  $e^{-a(\theta)l}$ , where l is the perimeter of the region M, meaning it obeys the perimeter law. In the U(1) symmetry breaking ordered phase, it usually satisfies  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle| \sim e^{-l \ln l}$ . More interestingly, the logarithmic correction term will appear in the scaling behavior of  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  at QCP. The previous analytical and numerical works pointed out that  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  can hold the following form for a rectangle region at (2+1)dQCP [21, 25, 26],

$$\ln|\langle X(\theta)\rangle| = -a_1l + s\ln l + a_0 \tag{2}$$

where all the coefficients are as functions of  $\theta$ . This logarithmic term  $s(\theta)$  originates from the corner of the region M, which is also a universal function of operator angle  $\theta$ and the open angle  $\alpha$  of corner in region M ( $\alpha = \pi/2$  in rectangle region). This corner correction s can be used to detect the universal feature at QCP. Some previous works [25, 26] have suggested that this term take the simple form as  $s(\theta) = \frac{C_J}{(4\pi)^2}\theta^2$  ( $\theta \to 0$ ), where  $C_J$  is current central charge dependent on the universality in the CFT. For a pure (1+1)d gapless system, the leading term of  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  becomes logarithmic term rather than linear term l, due to the fact that the boundary of disorder operator is point-like domain wall. So the scaling of  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  take the following form [27, 37],

$$\ln|\langle X(\theta)\rangle| = s\ln l + a_0 \tag{3}$$

Here, the logarithmic term can be connected to the LL parameter K in the region of small angle value, which can be derived from the LL theory [37]. In the LL system such as spin-1/2 XXZ chain, the analytical result have suggested  $s(\theta) = -\frac{K}{2\pi^2}\theta^2$  ( $\theta \to 0$ ), where K is the LL parameter of systems. For one-dimensional spin-1/2 XXZ chain, K can be exactly solved from the anisotropic parameter  $K = (\pi/2)/(\pi - \arccos(\Delta))$  ( $\Delta$  is anisotropic parameter) [38]. In this way, the disorder operator provides a simple way to measure the LL parameter.

In the past, disorder operator is usually defined on the bulk, which captures the universal feature of bulk criticality or bulk phase. Meanwhile, the boundary has been found that it contains richer physics especially at QCP [11, 12, 39–42], but it has not been explored widely via non-local operators. When the disorder operator is defined on the boundary, similarly, it seemingly can also extract the universal feature of gapless state and even boundary criticality, which should be demonstrated through logarithmic term. For disorder operator on the edge, the measurement region M will produce the line domain wall boundary in the bulk, which contributes to the leading term  $\sim l$ . So it may take the similar form as Eq.3, where the logarithmic term capture the boundary physics. At the same time, two kinds of the definitions for the disorder operator on the edge are performed in Fig.1(a) and (b). We use the method 1 to measure the boundary disorder operator in the most QMC simulation, as it can reflect the effective Heisenberg chain on the boundary in our previous study [33]



FIG. 2. (a) Disorder parameter  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  as a function of edge length l with system size L = 80 for g = 0.3(a). Fig.(b) show the subleading term  $s(\theta)$  obtained from (a), with system size L = 32, 48, 64, 80. (c) The coefficient of the logarithmic correction  $s(\theta)$  for small value of  $\theta$  with system size L = 32, 48, 64, 80, 96, 128 at g = 0.3. Fig.(d) shows the finite size extrapolation of Luttinger Liquid parameter K with increasing system size L with different g.

*Results.*- In the 1d XXZ chain, the disorder operator successfully extracts the LL parameter K which is well consistent with the theory value (more details can be found in the Appendix A). For the 2d AKLT model, the gapless boundary is equivalent to effective 1d Heisenberg chain in the AKLT phase, which can be considered as a (1+1)d system due to the gapped bulk. Naturally, the disorder operator on the boundary may have the similar scaling behavior as it in the pure (1+1)d systems. As shown in Fig.2, we obtain the boundary disorder operator value with g = 0.3 and L = 80. The scaling behaviors satisfies the Eq.2, where the leading term l originates from the touch between the boundary disorder operator and bulk in the disorder phase. The small angle value of  $s(\theta)$  can be fitted well by  $s(\theta) = -\frac{K}{2\pi^2}\theta^2$  rather than  $s(\theta) = \frac{C_J}{(4\pi)^2} \theta^2$  at small angle value (Fig.2), which is different from the (2+1)d disorder operator results. The LL parameter K is obtained from the fitting  $s(\theta)$  with system

size from L = 32 to 128. For small g, the extrapolation of fitting K will converge to 0.5, which is consistent with the LL parameter of S = 1/2 Heisenberg chain. Thus the unique  $(1+1)d SU(2)_1$  can be well captured in the deep AKLT state. When g gets closed to QCP, the extrapolation of K becomes smaller, such as g = 0.5 and g = 0.6035 results in Fig.2 (d). The feature of LL on the boundary becomes weaker and weaker, and the boundary can not be considered as pure (1+1)d system which is not described well by the unique (1+1)d CFT any more.



FIG. 3. Spin correlation functions  $C_{||}(r)$  at r = L/2 on the surface are shown at Fig.(a) (AKLT state) and (b)(Néel state). Fig.(c) and (d) show the fitting Luttinger Liquid parameter K obtained from the disorder operator and correlation functions in the AKLT state and during the phase transition.

In order to verify the results of disorder operator, we calculate the boundary spin correlation function  $C_{\parallel}(r)$ to obtain the effective LL parameter. Here  $C_{||}(r)$  means that the spin we measure is along the boundary with r parallel to the boundary. According to the LL theory, The two-point spin correlation function in S = 1/2Heisenberg chain satisfy  $C(L/2) \sim L^{-2K}$  [37](L is the system size and K is LL parameter), as depict in Fig.3 (a) and (b). Although the boundary for Néel state can not be regarded as pure (1+1)d system, the effective K can still be obtained from the correlation function. In the AKLT state, the fitting K obtained from the disorder operator is consistent with the correlation function in small g (Fig.3). As g gets closed to QCP, K obtained from the correlation function keep closed to 0.5 and suddenly decrease until around QCP. However, The K fitted by disorder operator gradually decrease and deviate from 0.5 when q > 0.4, suggesting that the bulk fluctuation influences the disorder operator near the QCP. The effective K from the correlation function looks sharp while the disorder operator looks much smoother. In the Néel state, the fitting K gradually becomes smaller and decays to 0 as g increases, indicating the boundary can



FIG. 4. The refitting logarithmic correction  $s(\theta)$  for small value  $\theta$  for method 1(a) and method 2(b) at quantum critical point with system size from 32 to 128. (c) The refitting LL parameter obtained from disorder operator are compared with the correlation function. The blue dot is the results of correlation function.

not be well described by (1+1)d LL theory due to the coupling from the gapless bulk. Meanwhile, the disorder operator clearly shows that the boundary goes from the (1+1)d physics to the (2+1)d, indicating the bulk displays a phase transition.

Moreover, the unconventional boundary criticality behaviors is induced when the gapless topological edge mode is coupled to the gapless bulk fluctuation [9]. When we revisit the disorder operator at QCP, we find the bulk fluctuation should make difference in the disorder operator physically. At bulk QCP, the logarithmic correction  $s(\theta)$  in the scaling of disorder operator capture the QCP feature, which is contributed by the corner of measurement region M. For the boundary disorder operator, we note that there are also two corners in the region Mwith opening angle  $\pi/2$ . Because the bulk QCP belongs to O(3) universality class, these corner contribution can be equal to one half of  $\frac{C_J}{(4\pi)^2}$  at small angle value in CFT. Therefore, according to this boundary criticality feature, we suggest that the logarithmic term s take the following form at small angle value,

$$s(\theta) = \left(-\frac{K}{2\pi^2} + \frac{C_J}{2(4\pi)^2}\right)\theta^2 \tag{4}$$

Here the LL parameter K captures the  $(1+1)d SU(2)_1$ CFT and  $C_J$  captures the (2+1)d O(3) CFT. As we know, the theory value of  $\frac{C_J}{(4\pi)^2}$  is 0.01147 from numerical bootstrap [43] in the O(3) CFT. When we refit the logarithmic term  $s(\theta)$  via Eq.4 with the theory value of  $\frac{C_J}{(4\pi)^2}$ , it is surprising to find that the disorder operator of fitting K is almost consistent with the results of correlation function as shown in Fig.4. The extrapolation of fitting K is 0.2579(2), which is very closed to 0.261(3) obtained from C(L/2). Also, we use the measurement method 2 to capture the effective K at QCP (Fig.4). The fitting K from method 2 converges to 0.2720(2) as  $L \to \infty$ , which also agrees well with the results of C(L/2). Because the boundary couples with the bulk, there may be high-order correction in the subleading term. Therefore, it is reasonable that the fitting K from disorder operator may deviate a little from the correlation function.

Discussion. - The boundary criticality can be controlled by the bulk interaction or boundary interaction, which is also well captured by the boundary conformal field theory (BCFT) [44–46]. The boundary of AKLT state is governed by the unique  $(1+1)d SU(2)_1$  CFT, which exactly contributes to the logarithmic term. As bulk approaches the critical point, The  $SU(2)_1$  CFT is unstable against the bulk fluctuation, where LL parameter K is suppressed by the Néel order. This boundary criticality is a special transition fixed point under the renormalization group, which is similar to the phase transition between Néel order and VBS order in one-dimensional system with non-local interaction [9, 47, 48]. However, it is difficult to derive the analytical expression for  $s(\theta)$ from the boundary critical correlation function at QCP. According to the physics picture for disorder operator, we suggest that it will take the above form as Eq.4. The correlation function results further confirm this conjecture that it captures the composite CFT at QCP as Fig.4 shown. For (2+1)d Heisenberg model, the boundary gapless state often exists at QCP which couples to the bulk mode, which leads to the unconventional SCB. therefore, the LL parameter K keeps finite value in the thermodynamic limit. Moreover, if the gapless edge state is suppressed to zero by bulk fluctuation at QCP, the LL parameter K will also decay to 0 rather than finite value at QCP. It is interesting to explore how LL parameter K disappears with the central charge term  $\frac{C_J}{(4\pi)^2}$  leaving at QCP in this case, which leaves for future work.

**Conclusion.**- In summary, we firstly apply the disorder operator to study the boundary state and boundary criticality in the two-dimensional AKLT model. In the AKLT state, the boundary gapless state can be considered as effective S = 1/2 Heisenberg chain, which has well-defined LL parameter K. The effective K can be obtained from the logarithmic term  $s(\theta)$  at small angle

value, which is closed to the K obtained from the correlation function. As the bulk undergoes the phase transition between AKLT state and Néel state, the LL parameter K gradually decrease and then decay to about 0 in the Néel state, which is clearly shown in the disorder operator and correlation function. More importantly, the disorder operator can capture the current central charge  $C_J$  of O(3) CFT and LL paremeter K of  $(1+1)d SU(2)_1$ CFT, which can be also confirmed via correlation function. These results demonstrate that the boundary gapless state couples to the bulk fluctuation in the AKLT model, which can be numerically considered as composite CFT in the disorder operator. Our work shows that the non-local disorder operator can detect the boundary state and criticality, which provides a new window to understand the CFT information on the boundary.

Acknowledgements.- We wish to thank Zi Yang Meng and Meng Cheng for useful discussions. ZY thanks the support from the start-up funding of Westlake University. Z.L. and D.X.Y. are supported by NKRDPC-2022YFA1402802, NSFC-92165204, NSFC-11974432, Leading Talent Program of Guangdong Special Projects (201626003), and Shenzhen International Quantum Academy (Grant No. SIQA202102). Y.C.W. acknowledges the support from Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. LZ23A040003), and the support from the High-performance Computing Centre of Zhongfa Aviation Institute of Beihang University.

\* ycwangphys@buaa.edu.cn

- <sup>†</sup> zhengyan@westlake.edu.cn
- <sup>‡</sup> yaodaox@mail.sysu.edu.cn
- [1] A. W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 227202 (2007).
- [2] T. Senthil, L. Balents, S. Sachdev, A. Vishwanath, and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 70, 144407 (2004).
- [3] J. Zhao, Y.-C. Wang, Z. Yan, M. Cheng, and Z. Y. Meng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 010601 (2022).
- [4] A. M. Essin and M. Hermele, Phys. Rev. B 90, 121102 (2014).
- [5] J.-W. Mei and X.-G. Wen, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:1507.03007 (2015), arXiv:1507.03007 [condmat.str-el].
- [6] Y.-C. Wang, C. Fang, M. Cheng, Y. Qi, and Z. Y. Meng, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1701.01552 (2017), arXiv:1701.01552 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [7] Y.-C. Wang, X.-F. Zhang, F. Pollmann, M. Cheng, and Z. Y. Meng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 057202 (2018).
- [8] Z. Yan, Y.-C. Wang, N. Ma, Y. Qi, and Z. Y. Meng, npj Quantum Mater. 6, 39 (2021).
- [9] C.-M. Jian, Y. Xu, X.-C. Wu, and C. Xu, SciPost Phys. 10, 033 (2021).
- [10] L. Zhang and F. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 118, 087201 (2017).
- [11] C. Ding, L. Zhang, and W. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, 235701 (2018).

- [13] C. Ding, W. Zhu, W. Guo, and L. Zhang, SciPost Phys. 15, 012 (2023).
- [14] Z. Wang, F. Zhang, and W. Guo, Phys. Rev. B 108, 014409 (2023).
- [15] L. Weber and S. Wessel, Phys. Rev. B 100, 054437 (2019).
- [16] W. Ji and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Res. 2, 033417 (2020).
- [17] L. Kong, T. Lan, X.-G. Wen, Z.-H. Zhang, and H. Zheng, Phys. Rev. Res. 2, 043086 (2020).
- [18] Z. Nussinov and G. Ortiz, Annals of Physics **324**, 977 (2009).
- [19] Z. Yan, R. Samajdar, Y.-C. Wang, S. Sachdev, and Z. Y. Meng, Nature Communications 13, 5799 (2022).
- [20] Z. Yan, Y.-C. Wang, R. Samajdar, S. Sachdev, and Z. Y. Meng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **130**, 206501 (2023).
- [21] X.-C. Wu, C.-M. Jian, and C. Xu, SciPost Phys. 11, 033 (2021).
- [22] E. Lake, "Higher-form symmetries and spontaneous symmetry breaking," (2018), arXiv:1802.07747 [hep-th].
- [23] E. Fradkin, Journal of Statistical Physics 167, 427 (2017).
- [24] J. Zhao, Z. Yan, M. Cheng, and Z. Y. Meng, Phys. Rev. Res. 3, 033024 (2021).
- [25] Y.-C. Wang, M. Cheng, and Z. Y. Meng, Phys. Rev. B 104, L081109 (2021).
- [26] Y.-C. Wang, N. Ma, M. Cheng, and Z. Y. Meng, SciPost Phys. 13, 123 (2022).
- [27] W. Jiang, B.-B. Chen, Z. H. Liu, J. Rong, F. F. Assaad, M. Cheng, K. Sun, and Z. Y. Meng, "Many versus one: the disorder operator and entanglement entropy in fermionic quantum matter," (2023), arXiv:2209.07103 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [28] Z. H. Liu, W. Jiang, B.-B. Chen, J. Rong, M. Cheng, K. Sun, Z. Y. Meng, and F. F. Assaad, Phys. Rev. Lett. 130, 266501 (2023).
- [29] Z. H. Liu, Y. D. Liao, G. Pan, W. Jiang, C.-M. Jian, Y.-Z. You, F. F. Assaad, Z. Y. Meng, and C. Xu, "Disorder operator and rényi entanglement entropy of symmetric mass generation," (2023), arXiv:2308.07380 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [30] A. W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. B 59, R14157 (1999).
- [31] A. W. Sandvik, AIP Conference Proceedings **1297**, 135 (2010).
- [32] A. W. Sandvik, (2019), arXiv:1909.10591 [cond-mat.strel].
- [33] Z. Liu, J. Li, R.-Z. Huang, J. Li, Z. Yan, and D.-X. Yao, Phys. Rev. B 105, 014418 (2022).
- [34] J.-H. Huang, Z. Liu, H.-Q. Wu, and D.-X. Yao, Phys. Rev. B 106, 085101 (2022).
- [35] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 799 (1987).
- [36] Z.-C. Gu and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B 80, 155131 (2009).
- [37] T. Giamarchi, Quantum physics in one dimension, Vol. 121 (Clarendon press, 2003).
- [38] M.-F. Yang, Phys. Rev. B 76, 180403 (2007).
- [39] Y. Deng, H. W. J. Blöte, and M. P. Nightingale, Phys. Rev. E 72, 016128 (2005).
- [40] W. Zhu, C. Ding, L. Zhang, and W. Guo, Phys. Rev. B 103, 024412 (2021).
- [41] F. Parisen Toldin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 126, 135701 (2021).
- [42] M. A. Metlitski, SciPost Phys. **12**, 131 (2022).
- [43] D. Poland, S. Rychkov, and A. Vichi, Rev. Mod. Phys.

91, 015002 (2019).

- [44] J. L. Cardy, Nuclear Physics B 240, 514 (1984).
- [45] J. L. Cardy, Nuclear Physics B **275**, 200 (1986).
- [46] J. L. Cardy, Nuclear Physics B **324**, 581 (1989).
- [47] A. W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 137204 (2010).
- [48] S. Yang, D.-X. Yao, and A. W. Sandvik, "Deconfined quantum criticality in spin-1/2 chains with long-range interactions," (2020), arXiv:2001.02821.

## Appendix A: disorder operator in XXZ chain

In order to show the disorder operator can extract the feature of (1+1)d system, we first perform the numerical results in the S = 1/2 XXZ chain. Generally, the XXZ chain can be mapped to the free fermion chain with interaction by Jordan-Wigner transformation. The scaling of disorder operator should be equivalent to the fermion disorder operator in the free fermion chain. In the XXZ chain with  $\Delta = 0$ ,  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  satisfy the scaling behavior of eq.3, as shown in Fig.5. And now the systems becomes a XY chain with  $\Delta = 0$ , which can mapped to the free fermion chain without interaction. Therefore the logarithmic term  $s(\theta)$  can be obtained from the fitting of 3 at any angle value. As we know,  $s(\theta)$  hold the simple form  $s(\theta) = -\frac{K}{2\pi^2}\theta^2$  at small angle value [27], where the LL parameter K = 0 when  $\Delta = 0$ , according to the analytical results. the scaling of fitting LL parameter K converge to 1, which is well consistent with the theory.



FIG. 5. Disorder parameter  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  of S = 1/2 XXZ chain with  $\Delta = 0$ . (a)  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  as a function of system size L. (b) the logarithmic correction  $s(\theta)$  obtained from (a). (c) Small angle value of  $s(\theta)$ . (d) Finite size extrapolation of Luttinger Liquid parameter K.

And the XXZ chain becomes a isotropic Heisenberg chain which is also at a Kosterlitz-Thouless (KT) phase transition with  $\Delta = 1$ . The scaling of  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  can be fitted by Eq.3, which capture the logarithmic term s. The scaling of fitting LL parameter K converge to 0.52, which is closed to the theory value K = 0.5. For the Heisenberg chain, there is a marginal operator in the field form of Hamiltonian [37], which causes much strong finite size effect in the simulation. So the extrapolation of fitting K is hard to converge to exact 0.5.



FIG. 6. Disorder parameter  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  of S = 1/2 XXZ chain with  $\Delta = 1$ . (a)  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  as a function of system size L. (b) the logarithmic correction  $s(\theta)$  obtained from (a). (c) Small angle value of  $s(\theta)$ . (d) Finite size extrapolation of Luttinger Liquid parameter K.

Appendix B: scaling behaviors in the AKLT state

For g = 0.4 and g = 0.5, the scaling behaviors of disorder operator also satisfy the same form as Eq.2 as shown in Fig.7 (a) and (c). This further demonstrates that the leading term is the perimeter l in the AKLT phase. And the logarithmic term  $s(\theta)$  are all negative at full angle value  $\theta$ , which reflects the (1+1)d physics. Similar to g = 0.3 case, the logarithmic term can extract the effective LL parameter K by fitting the same equation at small angle limit (Fig.4 (c) and (f)). These results further confirm that the disorder operator can capture the only one (1+1)d  $SU(2)_1$  CFT in the deep AKLT state, which is distinguished from the case of composite CFT at QCP.



FIG. 7. Disorder parameter  $|\langle X(\theta) \rangle|$  as a function of edge length l with system size L = 80 for g = 0.4 (a) and 0.5 (d). Fig.(b) and (e) show the subleading term  $s(\theta)$  obtained from the scaling of disorder operator, with system size L = 32, 48, 64, 80. The coefficient of the logarithmic correction  $s(\theta)$  for small value of  $\theta$  with system size L = 32, 48, 64, 80, 96, 128 at g = 0.4 (c) and g = 0.5 (f).