

# Parent Hamiltonian for Fully-augmented Matrix Product States

Xiangjian Qian<sup>1</sup> and Mingpu Qin<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Key Laboratory of Artificial Structures and Quantum Control (Ministry of Education),  
School of Physics and Astronomy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China

<sup>2</sup>Hefei National Laboratory, Hefei 230088, China

(Dated: January 17, 2024)

Fully-augmented Matrix Product States (FAMPS) was proposed recently (Chin. Phys. Lett. 40, 057102 (2023)) as an accurate numerical tool to study two-dimensional quantum many-body systems. It is constructed by including a disentangler layer upon MPS. The cost of simulating quantum models with FAMPS is similar as DMRG (with small overhead), but FAMPS can support area-law entanglement entropy for two-dimensional systems. These properties make FAMPS an effective and efficient tool. In this work, we demonstrate that for each FAMPS we can construct a two-dimensional Hamiltonian with the FAMPS being its ground state. We show how to construct the parent Hamiltonian for given FAMPS. We also perform numerical simulation to show that the algorithm proposed in Chin. Phys. Lett. 40, 057102 (2023) can find the exact FAMPS for the parent Hamiltonian. FAMPS and the corresponding parent Hamiltonian provides a useful framework for the future study of two-dimensional quantum many-body systems.

PACS numbers: 71.27.+a

*Introduction* – Density Matrix Renormalization Group (DMRG) [1–5] is one of the most successful numerical methods to study quantum many-body systems. But the application of DMRG to two-dimensional (2D) systems is not as successful [6] as the one-dimensional (1D) cases because of the limited entanglement encoded in the underlying wavefunction ansatz: Matrix Product States (MPS). To overcome this limitation, other ansatzes were proposed to generalize MPS to 2D, like Projected Entangled Pair States (PEPS) [7], Multiscale Entanglement Renormalization Ansatz (MERA) [8, 9], Projected Entangled Simplex States (PESS) [10] and so on [11, 12]. These ansatzes can faithfully encode the entanglement required for 2D systems [11], but the cost of them are typically very high, making simulation with large bond dimensions difficult.

Fully-augmented Matrix Product States (FAMPS) [13] was proposed by considering the trade-off between the entanglement encoded in the ansatz and the overall cost. FAMPS is constructed by augmenting MPS with unitary transformation of physical degrees of freedom, i.e., the so called disentanglers [8]. It has been demonstrated that FAMPS can support area-law entanglement for 2D systems while maintaining the low cost of DMRG ( $O(D^3)$  with  $D$  the bond dimension) with a small overhead ( $O(d^4)$  with  $d$  the dimension of local physical degree of freedom). Numerical results have shown the improvement of accuracy of FAMPS over MPS [13, 14].

It is known that for both MPS and PEPS, we can construct the parent Hamiltonian whose ground state is exactly the given MPS [15, 16] or PEPS [17]. This framework provides important tool in the study of quantum many-body systems [11]. It is natural to ask whether




FIG. 1: The blue lines show a scheme to arrange an 1D lattice (MPS) into a 2D one for the Majumdar-Ghosh model (state) with open boundary conditions. The disentanglers in FAMPS are denoted as dashed black rectangles. The solid rectangles in different colors denote different interaction terms of  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  in the parent Hamiltonian of FAMPS in Eq. (11). More discussion can be found in the main text.

we can also construct parent Hamiltonian for FAMPS. In the rest of the paper, we will give a positive answer to this question by illustrating the steps to build the parent Hamiltonian for FAMPS.

*Parent Hamiltonian for FAMPS* – DMRG is arguably the workhorse for the study of quasi-one-dimensional quantum many body systems [1–3]. The underlying wave-function ansatz of DMRG is MPS [18], which is defined as

$$|\text{MPS}\rangle = \sum_{\{\sigma_i\}} \text{Tr}[A^{\sigma_1} A^{\sigma_2} A^{\sigma_3} \cdots A^{\sigma_n}] |\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_3 \cdots \sigma_n\rangle \quad (1)$$

where  $A$  is a rank-3 tensor with one physical index  $\sigma_i$  (with dimension  $d$ ) and two virtual indices (with dimension  $D$ ).

\*qinmingpu@sjtu.edu.cn

FAMPS is an extension of MPS by including an extra layer of disentanglers [13], which is connected to the physical indices of MPS. FAMPS is defined as

$$|\text{FAMPS}\rangle = D(u)|\text{MPS}\rangle \quad (2)$$

where  $D(u) = \prod_m u_m$  denotes the disentangler layer satisfying the unitary condition  $D(u)D^\dagger(u) = D^\dagger(u)D(u) = I$ .  $u_m$  is the local disentangler which usually involves only two sites [13]. In practical calculations, we need to follow some criteria [13] in the construction of FAMPS to make the cost low. Other than that, there are much freedom in the scheme to place disentanglers and the way to rearrange a one dimensional MPS into a two dimensional form. This extension makes FAMPS capable of describing two dimensional systems more accurately than MPS and extends the power of MPS to wider cylinders. At the same time, the ( $O(D^3)$ ) low cost of DMRG is maintained with small overhead ( $O(d^4)$ ) [13].

It is known that for each MPS, we can construct a local, frustration-free, 1D parent Hamiltonian with the given MPS being its ground state [15, 16]. In the following, we will discuss the construction of parent Hamiltonian for FAMPS defined in Eq. (2). Suppose we have the parent Hamiltonian for the MPS part in the FAMPS, i.e.,  $H_{\text{MPS}}|\text{MPS}\rangle = E_g|\text{MPS}\rangle$ . We can easily have  $D(u)H_{\text{MPS}}D^\dagger(u)|\text{MPS}\rangle = E_gD(u)|\text{MPS}\rangle$  and  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}|\text{FAMPS}\rangle = E_g|\text{FAMPS}\rangle$  with the definition  $H_{\text{FAMPS}} = D(u)H_{\text{MPS}}D^\dagger(u)$ . So it is obvious that  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}$  is the parent Hamiltonian of  $|\text{FAMPS}\rangle$  defined in Eq. (2). This conclusion is easy to understand because the disentangler-layer  $D(u)$  essentially consist of unitary transformations. Because the parent Hamiltonian  $H_{\text{MPS}}$  is local [15, 16], it is obvious that we can also make the interaction local when rearranging the MPS into a 2D form. Disentangler  $u_m$  is usually chosen as local unitary transformation, so  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}$  is a local 2D Hamiltonian.

*A simple example: the Majumdar-Ghosh state* – In the following, we take the Majumdar-Ghosh (MG) state [19] as a concrete example to show the explicit form of  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}$ . For the spin-1/2 Heisenberg chain with both nearest ( $J_1$ ) and next nearest ( $J_2$ ) neighboring interactions with the Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_i J_1 S_i \cdot S_{i+1} + J_2 S_i \cdot S_{i+2}, \quad (3)$$

it is known that at the Majumdar-Ghosh point ( $J_2/J_1 = 0.5$ ), the ground state is the product of singlets of all nearest neighboring sites. The ground states have two-fold degeneracy connecting by transnational operation under periodic boundary conditions. The ground state can be represented as an MPS shown in Eq. (1) with bond dimension  $D = 3$ . The local matrices are

$$A^\uparrow = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, A^\downarrow = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

We first construct a FAMPS based on the MPS representation of the MG state. We only discuss system with open

boundary conditions in this work. We can reorganize the 1D MG chain and the corresponding MPS ground state into a 2D form, as illustrated by the blue lines in Fig. 1. We then introduce disentanglers, represented by dashed black rectangles in Fig. 1, to construct a FAMPS. For simplicity, we only include disentanglers on half the sites of the system. It is known in [13] that there is no non-trivial degree of freedom in the two-site disentangler if we want to maintain the  $SU(2)$  symmetry. Therefore, in this work, we only consider  $U(1)$  symmetry in the disentanglers. As a result, the parent Hamiltonian for FAMPS solely possesses  $U(1)$  symmetry. Nevertheless, as shown in [13], we can block two sites into one to maintain the  $SU(2)$  symmetry in the disentangler and construct parent Hamiltonian with  $SU(2)$  symmetry for FAMPS. For simplicity, we consider the disentanglers with  $U(1)$  symmetry as

$$u_m = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

According to the discussion above, the parent Hamiltonian for the MG state induced FAMPS can be obtained as

$$H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}} = D(u)H_{\text{MPS}}^{\text{MG}}D^\dagger(u) = \prod_m u_m H_{\text{MPS}}^{\text{MG}} \prod_m u_m^\dagger \quad (6)$$

with  $H_{\text{MPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  the Hamiltonian in Eq. (3) with  $J_2/J_1 = 0.5$ .

Due to the locality of  $H_{\text{MPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  (containing only two-site operators) and the unitarity of  $u_m$  ( $u_m u_m^\dagger = u_m^\dagger u_m = I$ ), the interaction terms in  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  can be classified into four types, illustrated by different colored solid rectangles in Fig. 1.

For  $S_j \cdot S_k$  term with sites  $j$  and  $k$  connected to two different disentanglers  $u_{ij}$  and  $u_{kl}$  ( $i, j$  denote the sites involved in the disentangler  $u_{ij}$ ) denoted as solid gray rectangles in Fig. 1, we have term in  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} h_{ijkl}^4 &= \prod_m u_m S_j \cdot S_k \prod_m u_m^\dagger \\ &= u_{ij} u_{kl} S_j \cdot S_k u_{ij}^\dagger u_{kl}^\dagger \\ &= -\frac{1}{4} \Delta_{ij} \Delta_{kl} + \frac{1}{4} \Delta_{ij} (S_k^z + S_l^z) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \Delta_{kl} (S_i^z + S_j^z) - \Delta_{il} S_j^z S_k^z \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} (S_i^z S_k^z + S_i^z S_l^z + S_j^z S_k^z + S_j^z S_l^z) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (\Delta_{jl} S_k^z - \Delta_{ik} S_j^z) + \frac{1}{4} \Delta_{jk} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\Delta_{ij} = S_i^+ S_j^- + S_i^- S_j^+$  and  $S^+, S^-, S^z$  are Pauli matrices. We can see that  $h_{ijkl}^4$  contains interactions involving 4, 3 and 2 sites.

For  $S_i \cdot S_j$  term with only one site ( $j$ , for example) connected to a disentangler  $u_{jk}$ , represented by solid pink

rectangles in Fig. 1, we have term in  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{ijk}^3 &= \prod_m u_m S_i \cdot S_j \prod_m u_m^\dagger \\
&= u_{jk} S_i \cdot S_j u_{jk}^\dagger \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \Delta_{jk} S_i^z + \frac{1}{2} (S_j^z + S_k^z) S_i^z \\
&\quad + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} \Delta_{ij} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \Delta_{ik} S_j^z
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We can see that  $h_{ijk}^3$  contains interactions involving 3 and 2 sites.

For  $S_i \cdot S_j$  term that sites  $i$  and  $j$  are connected by a single disentangler  $u_{ij}$  (solid light blue rectangles in Fig. 1), we have the term in  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{ij}^2 &= \prod_m u_m S_i \cdot S_j \prod_m u_m^\dagger \\
&= u_{ij} S_i \cdot S_j u_{ij}^\dagger \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (S_i^z - S_j^z) + S_i^z S_j^z
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We can see that the original Heisenberg term  $S_i \cdot S_j$  is transformed into an Ising-type interaction with the disentangler defined in Eq. (5). It is noteworthy that the ground state of  $S_i \cdot S_j$  term is a singlet, representing a maximally entangled state, while the ground state of  $h_{ij}^2$  is a product state. This transformation provides a vivid example on the usefulness of disentangler to reduce the entanglement in a quantum system.

For  $S_i \cdot S_j$  term not connected to any disentangler (solid yellow rectangles in Fig. 1), the term in  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  is unchanged because

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{ij}^1 &= \prod_m u_m S_i \cdot S_j \prod_m u_m^\dagger \\
&= S_i \cdot S_j
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

To conclude,  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  contains interactions involving 4, 3, and 2 sites and also onsite terms. Formally,  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  can be written as

$$H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}} = \sum_i J_i h_i^4 + \sum_j J_j h_j^3 + \sum_k J_k h_k^2 + \sum_l J_l h_l^1 \tag{11}$$

where  $h^i$  denotes interaction term involving  $i$  sites with interaction strength  $J_i$ .

We also study the Hamiltonian in Eq. (11) on a  $8 \times 8$  square lattice with open boundary conditions, using both FAMPS and MPS. First we perform a FAMPS calculation for the Hamiltonian in Eq. (11). The results are shown in Fig. 2. In the calculation, we first perform a FAMPS simulation without disentanglers (basically a pure MPS calculation). Then we include disentanglers (initialized as identity) upon the MPS, and perform FAMPS simulations by optimizing the MPS and disentanglers iteratively, following the algorithm in [13]. As discussed above, the bond dimension of the exact MPS




FIG. 2: Ground state energy versus optimization step in FAMPS for  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  in Eq. (11) on a  $8 \times 8$  lattice with open boundary conditions. The bond dimension is set as  $D = 3$ . A pure MPS simulation is performed followed by FAMPS simulation with disentanglers. It can be seen that the MPS energy is far away from the exact value, but by including disentanglers, the FAMPS energy converges to the exact value ( $-0.375$ ) in three steps. The inset shows the relative error of the ground state energy as a function of iteration step in FAMPS.

representation of the MG state is  $D = 3$  which means FAMPS with  $D = 3$  is enough for the exact ground state of  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$ . So we set  $D = 3$  in the FAMPS calculation. As shown in Fig. 2, the MPS energy with  $D = 3$  is far away from the exact ground state energy of  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}^{\text{MG}}$  ( $E_g = -0.375$ ). However, after adding disentanglers, we can find that the energy is converged to the exact value in 3 steps. In the inset of Fig. 2, we show the relative error of FAMPS energies versus the optimization step in FAMPS, from which we can see the convergence of the energy to the exact value. This result aligns well with our expectation and validates the algorithm proposed in Ref [13].

We also perform a pure MPS (DMRG) simulation with different bond dimensions for the same system. The results are shown in Fig. 3. We can see that the relative error of energy in MPS is still at the level of  $10^{-3}$  even with bond dimension  $D = 400$ , while FAMPS can basically give the exact energy with  $D = 3$ .

*Discussion* – The parent Hamiltonian for any given FAMPS can be constructed following the Majumdar-Ghosh case. First we can construct the parent Hamiltonian  $H_{\text{MPS}}$  for the MPS part in FAMPS, then we can construct the parent Hamiltonian for FAMPS  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}$  by transforming each term in  $H_{\text{MPS}}$  with the disentanglers in FAMPS. The form of the parent Hamiltonian for FAMPS can be complicated depending on the specific structure of FAMPS. But  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}$  is essentially a 2D Hamiltonian if the disentanglers are local in 2D, meaning all the interaction terms in FAMPS are local in 2D. It will be interesting to explore the variation in FAMPS




FIG. 3: Relative error of the ground state energy as a function of bond-dimension  $D$  in pure MPS (DMRG) simulation for the same system in Fig. 2. It can be seen that the relative error of energy in MPS is still at the level of  $10^{-3}$  even with bond dimension  $D = 400$ , while FAMPS can basically give the exact energy with  $D = 3$  as shown in Fig. 2.

to see whether we can construct  $H_{\text{FAMPS}}$  in the simplest form, i.e., with only nearest neighboring interactions in 2D.

*Conclusions* – In this work, we establish that FAMPS can serve as the exact ground state for certain two-dimensional Hamiltonians. Utilizing the Majumdar-Ghosh state as an illustrative example, we outline the procedure to construct the parent Hamiltonian for

FAMPS. Through numerical simulations, we show that the algorithm proposed in Ref [13] can find the exact FAMPS for its parent Hamiltonian. The existence of 2D parent Hamiltonian for FAMPS aligns with the conclusion in Ref [13] that FAMPS can support area-law entanglement for 2D systems. The construction of parent Hamiltonians for FAMPS can stimulate more efficient optimization methods for FAMPS in the future. FAMPS and the corresponding parent Hamiltonians provides a useful framework for the future study of two dimensional quantum systems. We can also construct uncle Hamiltonian for FAMPS based on the so-called uncle Hamiltonian for MPS [20]. It will be interesting to consider the parent Hamiltonian for FAMPS with fermionic degrees of freedom in the future.

### Acknowledgments

The calculation in this work is carried out with TensorKit [21]. The computation in this paper were run on the Siyuan-1 cluster supported by the Center for High Performance Computing at Shanghai Jiao Tong University. MQ acknowledges the support from the National Key Research and Development Program of MOST of China (2022YFA1405400), the Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology (2021ZD0301902), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12274290) and the sponsorship from Yangyang Development Fund.

- 
- [1] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2863 (1992), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.69.2863>.
  - [2] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 10345 (1993), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.48.10345>.
  - [3] U. Schollwöck, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 259 (2005), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.77.259>.
  - [4] U. Schollwöck, Annals of Physics **326**, 96 (2011), ISSN 0003-4916, january 2011 Special Issue, URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003491610001752>.
  - [5] E. Stoudenmire and S. R. White, Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics **3**, 111 (2012), <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-020911-125018>, URL <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-020911-125018>.
  - [6] S. Liang and H. Pang, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 9214 (1994), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.49.9214>.
  - [7] F. Verstraete and J. I. Cirac, arXiv e-prints cond-mat/0407066 (2004), cond-mat/0407066.
  - [8] G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 220405 (2007), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.99.220405>.
  - [9] G. Evenbly and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 180406 (2009), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.180406>.
  - [10] Z. Y. Xie, J. Chen, J. F. Yu, X. Kong, B. Normand, and T. Xiang, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 011025 (2014), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.4.011025>.
  - [11] J. I. Cirac, D. Pérez-García, N. Schuch, and F. Verstraete, Rev. Mod. Phys. **93**, 045003 (2021), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.93.045003>.
  - [12] T. Xiang, Density Matrix and Tensor Network Renormalization, Cambridge University Press (2023).
  - [13] X. Qian and M. Qin, Chinese Physics Letters **40**, 057102 (2023), URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0256-307X/40/5/057102>.
  - [14] X. Qian and M. Qin, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2309.13630 (2023), 2309.13630.
  - [15] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R. F. Werner, Communications in Mathematical Physics **144**, 443 (1992).
  - [16] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, arXiv e-prints quant-ph/0608197 (2006), quant-ph/0608197.
  - [17] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, J. I. Cirac, and M. M. Wolf, arXiv e-prints arXiv:0707.2260 (2007), 0707.2260.
  - [18] S. Östlund and S. Rommer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3537 (1995), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.3537>.

- 1103/PhysRevLett.75.3537.
- [19] C. K. Majumdar, Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics **3**, 911 (1970), URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0022-3719/3/4/019>.
- [20] C. Fernández-González, N. Schuch, M. M. Wolf, J. I. Cirac, and D. Pérez-García, Communications in Mathematical Physics **333**, 299 (2015), 1210.6613.
- [21] The SU(2) symmetry code is developed with TensorKit package at <https://github.com/Jutho/TensorKit.jl>.