

Non-Abelian fractionalization in topological minibands

Aidan P. Reddy,* Nisarga Paul,* Ahmed Abouelkomsan, and Liang Fu

Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA

(Dated: May 31, 2024)

Motivated by the recent discovery of fractional quantum anomalous Hall states in moiré systems, we consider the possibility of realizing non-Abelian phases in topological minibands. We study a family of moiré systems, skyrmion Chern band (SCB) models, which can be realized in two-dimensional semiconductor/magnetic skyrmion heterostructures and also capture the essence of twisted transition metal dichalcogenide (TMD) homobilayers. We show using many-body exact diagonalization that, in spite of strong Berry curvature variations in momentum space, the non-Abelian Moore-Read state can be realized at half filling of the second miniband. These results demonstrate the feasibility of non-Abelian fractionalization in moiré systems without Landau levels and shed light on the desirable conditions for their realization. In particular, we highlight the prospect of realizing the Moore-Read state in twisted semiconductor bilayers.

The fractional quantum Hall (FQH) effect has traditionally been limited to the context of two-dimensional electron systems in a strong magnetic field. Remarkably, recent experiments have observed a sequence of FQH states in twisted bilayer semiconductor $t\text{MoTe}_2$ [1–4] and rhombohedral pentalayer graphene/hBN [5] at *zero* field. In twisted bilayer semiconductors, the existence of such fractional quantum anomalous Hall (FQAH) states was theoretically predicted [6–8] as a consequence of Coulomb interactions in partially filled topological moiré bands [9] and spontaneous time-reversal symmetry breaking. Fractional and integer QAH states have also been proposed in other moiré material platforms, including twisted bilayer graphene [10–13], periodically strained graphene [14, 15] and narrow gap semiconductors subject to an electrostatic superlattice potential [16, 17]. These theoretical advances and experimental breakthroughs introduce a new frontier of strongly correlated topological quantum matter and offer the potential to achieve high-temperature topological protection.

To date, much work on the FQAH effect has focused on filling factors $\nu < 1$. Here, theoretical understanding is largely guided by the resemblance between the $|C| = 1$ band (C is the band Chern number) and the lowest Landau level (LLL). At fractional filling of a Chern band, Coulomb interaction can drive the system into fractional Chern insulator (FCI) states—the lattice analog of FQH states [18–22]. A natural question is how far this guiding principle can be pushed to higher fillings.

While the LLL typically hosts Abelian topological orders at fractional fillings, the first excited Landau level (1LL) is predicted to host even richer *non*-Abelian topological orders [23], e.g. the phase of the Moore-Read Pfaffian/ anti-Pfaffian state [24–26] or the Read-Rezayi state [27]. These phases support fractional quasiparticles obeying non-Abelian exchange statistics [28–31] and could provide a platform for fault-tolerant quantum computation [32–34]. Theoretical studies have also explored non-Abelian phases of fermions and bosons in lattice models [35–37] as well as quantum spin systems [38, 39]. The

advent of FQAH materials raises the exciting prospect of realizing non-Abelian fractionalization without a magnetic field and at elevated temperatures.

As a starting point, we note that theory predicts that the second moiré band in twisted transition metal dichalcogenide ($t\text{TMD}$) homobilayers is flat, well isolated, and has the same sign Chern number as the first moiré band over a wide range of twist angles [6, 40]. Motivated by this resemblance to the 1LL, we consider the possibility of non-Abelian FQAH states in the second $t\text{TMD}$ miniband. In particular, we study a family of continuum models, *skyrmion Chern band* models, which captures in a minimal setting the essential features of topological minibands in twisted TMD bilayers (such as $t\text{MoTe}_2$ and $t\text{WSe}_2$) as well as other material platforms. Within this family of models, including an “adiabatic model” for $t\text{MoTe}_2$ [41], we establish using many-body exact diagonalization that the analog of the non-Abelian state in the half-filled $n = 1$ LL can be realized in the second topological miniband. Our study provides a realistic material proposal for realizing non-Abelian phases in topological minibands and sheds light on the desirable conditions for their realization.

The following simple Hamiltonian defines our family of skyrmion Chern band (SCB) models in two dimensions:

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + J\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r}). \quad (1)$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the spin (or pseudospin) $\frac{1}{2}$ operator that couples to a periodic Zeeman field $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{a}_{1,2})$ with strength J . We assume $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r})$ is a noncoplanar (chiral) texture that defines a mapping of the real-space unit cell (a torus) to the Bloch sphere with a nonzero winding number, such as a *skyrmion* texture. It is well known that chiral textures give rise to an emergent real-space magnetic field $B^e(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\hbar}{2e}\hat{\mathbf{S}} \cdot (\partial_x \hat{\mathbf{S}} \times \partial_y \hat{\mathbf{S}})$, with an integer number of flux quanta per unit cell ($\hat{\mathbf{S}} = \mathbf{S}/S$). The resulting “topological Hall effect” has been widely studied in magnetic metals [42, 43]. On the other hand, skyrmion




FIG. 1. **Skyrmion Chern band (SCB) models.** Electrons strongly coupled to a skyrmion-like spin or pseudospin texture may exhibit flat topological minibands. (a) An example texture ($\alpha = 1, N_0 = 0.11$). (b) Emergent magnetic field B^e , or scalar chirality, associated with skyrmion textures (from part (a), on left; with $\alpha = 1.5, N_0 = 0.4$, on right). (c) Respective electronic band structures (using Eq. (1)), which exhibit flat 1st or 2nd topological minibands. Energy measured from $-J$ at large J .

textures have been less studied in low-density semiconductors. Here, the topological Hall effect manifests as a quantized anomalous Hall effect due to the formation of Chern bands [44]. In a recent work [45], we showed that remarkably, these Chern bands can become *flat* at a magic value of the magnetization $\bar{m} \equiv \int_{\text{u.c.}} S^z(\mathbf{r})/A_{\text{uc}}$, where A_{uc} is the unit cell area. SCB models can be potentially realized in a two-dimensional (2D) semiconductor proximity-coupled to a magnetic insulator. In Ref. [45] the heterostructure $\text{MoS}_2/\text{CrBr}_3$ is proposed which has the following advantages: a large exchange energy J , and the likelihood of a skyrmion crystal (SkX) even at zero field in chromium trihalide bilayers [46–48].

As we now describe, the combination of large J ($J \gg \hbar^2/ma^2$, where a is the moiré period and m is the effective mass of charge carriers) and an SkX allows for flat Chern bands. The large- J or “adiabatic” limit, which is generally achievable [45], enforces local alignment of the electron spin to $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r})$, which in turn induces a Berry phase. This is made clear by a position-dependent $\text{SU}(2)$ unitary transformation $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{r})$ which rotates the spin texture $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r})$ into $S(\mathbf{r})\hat{z}$ and introduces a gauge field $\mathbf{A}_i = \frac{i\hbar}{e}\mathbf{U}^\dagger\partial_i\mathbf{U}$. For large J , we make an “adiabatic” approximation and project onto the low-energy manifold of locally spin (anti)-aligned electrons and obtain the effective adiabatic Hamiltonian [45, 49]

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \frac{(\mathbf{p} - e\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}))^2}{2m} + \frac{\hbar^2}{8m}(\partial_i\hat{\mathbf{S}})^2 - JS(\mathbf{r}) \quad (2)$$

(summing $i = x, y$), where now $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r})$ is the $\downarrow\downarrow$ component of the $\text{SU}(2)$ gauge field and the second term originates from its off-diagonal elements. We refer to \mathbf{A} as the emergent gauge field, with curl $B^e(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\hbar}{2e}\hat{\mathbf{S}} \cdot (\partial_x\hat{\mathbf{S}} \times \partial_y\hat{\mathbf{S}})$, which is generally nonuniform. A skyrmion texture is one with a single flux quantum of emergent magnetic field B^e per unit cell, and is the simplest topologically nontrivial periodic spin texture. Eq. (2) establishes a parallel with ordinary Landau levels. The full SCB Hamiltonian Eq. 1 describes (pseudo-)spinful electrons without a magnetic field while the adiabatic Hamiltonian Eq. 2 describes (pseudo-)spinless electrons in a magnetic

field. However, all low-energy physical quantities associated with the two Hamiltonians are identical in the limit $J/(\hbar^2/(ma^2)) \rightarrow \infty$.

Indeed, TMD homobilayers are approximate SCB models with the role of σ played by the layer degree of freedom and their Chern bands can be understood in a similar fashion [9, 41]. In this case, the layer-pseudospin skyrmion texture corresponds to interlayer tunnelings and intralayer potentials within the K and K' valleys that vary spatially according to local interlayer stacking [9]. Over a wide range of fillings, charge carriers are driven into one valley by Coulomb interactions, spontaneously breaking time-reversal symmetry [8, 40, 50]. The lowest band can be made flat by tuning twist angle [6, 41], which creates favorable conditions for FQAH states [7, 8, 40, 51–53].

We now proceed to study the model defined by Eq. (2), further assuming $S(\mathbf{r})$ is constant (a natural assumption for 2D magnets) to drop the final term. For the skyrmion texture, we adopt a simple ansatz built out of three harmonics. In particular, we take $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{r})/N(\mathbf{r})$ with

$$\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{j=1}^6 e^{i\mathbf{q}_j \cdot \mathbf{r}} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_j + N_0 \hat{\mathbf{z}} \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{q}_j = \frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}a}(\cos\theta_j, \sin\theta_j)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_j = (i\alpha \sin\theta_j, -i\alpha \cos\theta_j, -1)/\sqrt{2}$ and the angles satisfy $\theta_2 = \theta_1 + 2\pi/3, \theta_3 = \theta_1 + 4\pi/3$, and $\theta_{j+3} = \theta_j + \pi$. This texture can be thought of as a normalized sum of three spin spirals forming a triangular SkX, as plotted in Fig. 1a. It is widely adopted in studies of chiral magnets and magnetic skyrmion crystals and qualitatively reproduces the real-space images of skyrmion crystals [54–58]. The parameter α controls coplanarity, while N_0 controls the out-of-plane magnetization \bar{m} (which monotonically increases with N_0). We will refer to the Hamiltonian defined with the skyrmion texture Eq. 3 as the SkX model.

In Fig. 1b we plot the emergent magnetic field for two examples textures, along with their associated large- J bandstructures in Fig. 1c. Even when $B^e(\mathbf{r})$ is highly




FIG. 2. **Band properties.** (Left) Bandwidths and (right) Berry curvature standard deviations of the two lowest bands in the SkX model as a function of coplanarity α and average S^z -magnetization \bar{m} , calculated using Eq. (1). Bands exhibit minima in similar regions.

nonuniform and changes sign within the unit cell, we observe that the topological minibands can be made quite flat. This is corroborated in Fig. 2, where we plot bandwidths and Berry curvature standard deviations for the lowest two bands across a range of parameters α and \bar{m} . Both quantities have a “magic line” in this parameter space, meaning they can be made relatively small by tuning a single parameter. Remarkably, we will see that a non-Abelian state can occur even when the Berry curvature fluctuates wildly.

We now study many-body physics at filling $\nu = \frac{3}{2}$ (that is, half-filling of the second miniband assuming full spin polarization) via numerical diagonalization. From here on, to enable direct comparison with Landau levels, we work with the effective Hamiltonian, Eq. 2. To make the many-body calculation tractable, we restrict our variational Hilbert space to that in which N_{uc} electrons fill the lowest band and $N_e - N_{uc}$ electrons remain in the second miniband where N_e is the number of electrons. The filled lowest band produces a Hartree-Fock self-energy $\Sigma(\mathbf{k})$ for particles in the second band that is accounted for with a renormalized single-particle energy dispersion, $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{k}) = \varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) + \Sigma(\mathbf{k})$ [59]. Here, $\varepsilon(\mathbf{k})$ is the non-interacting dispersion of the second miniband. Explicitly, we numerically diagonalize the effective projected Hamiltonian

$$\bar{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in BZ} \tilde{\varepsilon}(\mathbf{k}) n(\mathbf{k}) + \frac{1}{2A} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} v(\mathbf{q}) \bar{\rho}(-\mathbf{q}) \bar{\rho}(\mathbf{q}) \quad (4)$$

where $n(\mathbf{k}) = c_{2,\mathbf{k}}^\dagger c_{2,\mathbf{k}}$, $\bar{\rho}(\mathbf{q}) = P_2 \sum_i e^{-i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i} P_2$, and $v(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{2\pi e^2}{\epsilon|\mathbf{q}|}$ is the Fourier transform of the Coulomb potential. P_2 is a projector onto the Fock space of the second miniband and $c_{2,\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ creates a (magnetic) Bloch state




FIG. 3. **Non-Abelian states in SkX model.** (a) Low-energy many-body spectrum of the effective projected Hamiltonian Eq. 4 at half-filling of the second miniband computed via numerical diagonalization on cluster 24A, and (b) corresponding calculation of the 1LL. (c,d) Analogous data from cluster 30. The 10 (a,b) and 5 (c,d) lowest energy levels in each momentum sector are shown. $\alpha = 1$, $N_0 = 0.28$ (equivalently, $\bar{m} = 0.271$) and we set $\sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}}} \frac{e^2}{\epsilon a} = \frac{2\pi\hbar^2}{m A_{uc}}$.

in the second miniband. In the Supplemental Material, we describe our method for diagonalizing Eq. 2 in a Landau Level basis and define all clusters (=system geometries) we use, along with other methodology [59].

In Fig. 3, we show many-body spectra obtained by diagonalizing \bar{H} on two finite-size toruses. For $N_{uc} = 24$, the number of electrons occupying the second miniband is even (12), while for $N_{uc} = 30$, it is odd (15). In the two cases, we observe sixfold and two-fold ground state quasi-degeneracies. (The finite-size splitting among these quasi-degenerate states decreases with increasing interaction strength.) These are precisely the degeneracies expected of a Moore-Read state on the torus due to an even-odd effect [25, 76, 77]. Moreover, the quasi-degenerate ground states have the same center-of-mass momenta as both the Coulomb ground state of the 1LL and the Moore-Read state [59, 78, 79]. We note that the Hartree-Fock self-energy $\Sigma(\mathbf{k})$ seems to help stabilize these ground state quasi-degeneracies – upon neglecting $\Sigma(\mathbf{k})$, they may not appear for a given parameter set.

Having established a Moore-Read state in the SkX model, we now turn to twisted TMDs. The layer pseudospin texture in t TMDs differs from the spin texture of the SkX model: it has different spatial symmetry and contains two merons (half skyrmions) rather than a single skyrmion per unit cell. Additionally, its emergent magnetic field comprises sharp peaks forming a kagome lattice and its pseudospin field strength $S(\mathbf{r})$ is non-uniform.

Despite these differences, our calculations for t MoTe₂




FIG. 4. **Adiabatic model for $t\text{MoTe}_2$.** (a) Minibands of holes in $t\text{MoTe}_2$ calculated in the adiabatic model at $\theta = 2.5^\circ$ with parameters from Ref. [40]. Exact diagonalization spectra at $\nu = \frac{3}{2}$ assuming full spin polarization on clusters 24A (b) and 30 (c), using Coulomb interaction with $\epsilon = 5$, showing the expected topological ground state quasi-degeneracies of the Moore-Read state. (d) Spectrum of Pf interpolation Hamiltonian H_γ with six quasidegenerate ground states highlighted in red.

(using the adiabatic model for the $t\text{MoTe}_2$, which we detail in the Supplemental Material [59]) find the same ground state quasidegeneracies at half filling of its second miniband (Fig. 4(b-c)). In Fig. 4(d), we show that the ground state evolves continuously to the Moore-Read model wavefunction under an interpolation Hamiltonian [59], $H_\gamma = (1 - \gamma)H_{\text{TMD}} + \gamma H_{\text{Pf}}$, preserving the gap throughout the range $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$. Here, H_{Pf} is the Pfaffian parent Hamiltonian [59, 60]. This strongly supports the non-Abelian nature of the ground state in $t\text{MoTe}_2$.

In the half-filled first Landau level, because of exact particle-hole (PH) symmetry, the Pfaffian (Pf) state and its PH conjugate (aPf) are degenerate in the thermodynamic limit [64, 80]. In contrast, our system lacks PH symmetry, so this degeneracy is not expected. To distinguish the two candidate topological orders, we compare overlaps of the $t\text{MoTe}_2$ ground state with the exact Pf and aPf model states. For the same parameters as in Fig. 4, we find that the $t\text{MoTe}_2$ ground state on cluster 26 (24A) has overlaps of 0.68 (0.64) with the Pf ground state subspace and 0.60 (0.57) with the aPf subspace [59]. The enhancement of Pf relative to aPf overlaps suggests that Pf topological order is more likely to emerge in the thermodynamic limit. We note that band mixing effects [81] may alter the ground state.

We now address the question of why SCB models host non-Abelian FQAH states resembling that of the half-filled 1LL. A natural way to quantify the similarity between the i^{th} SCB miniband and the corresponding LL is through the “LL weight”,

$$W_i = \frac{1}{N_{uc}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left| \langle \psi^{(i)}(\mathbf{k}) | \psi_{\text{LL}}^{(i-1)}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \right|^2. \quad (5)$$

Despite the magnetic field and scalar potential fluctuations present in the effective Hamiltonian Eq. 2, its LL weights turn out quite high. In Fig. 5(a,b), we show the LL weights of the lowest two minibands in the adiabatic model for $t\text{MoTe}_2$. Over a broad range of twist angles the LL weights of the first and second minibands remain high, $> 90\%$. While the LL weights vary smoothly with interlayer twist θ , the bandwidths show cusp minima at “magic” values of θ [6, 41, 45]. At small twist angles, the low-energy wavefunctions tend to localize in real space about maxima in $S(\mathbf{r})$ and form bands with low LL weights. At large twist angles, LL weights become larger but the adiabatic approximation becomes less accurate because kinetic energy increases relative to J . The lowest two bands of the SkX model exhibit even higher LL weights than the $t\text{TMD}$ adiabatic model, $> 99\%$ (Fig. 5(c,d)).

Remarkably, we find that even when the LL weight is very close to 1, Berry curvature can vary strongly throughout the Brillouin zone. For instance, given the SkX model parameters of Fig. 3, the LL weight of the second band is 0.989, yet the Berry curvature, in units such that its average is unity, ranges from 0.16 to 1.53 with a standard deviation of 0.38. The Berry curvature in the adiabatic $t\text{MoTe}_2$ model at $\theta = 2.5^\circ$ fluctuates even more strongly, varying from -3.4 to $+4.3$ with a standard deviation of 1.58. Notably, the quantum weight $K = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d^2k \text{Tr}(g(\mathbf{k}))$, where $g(\mathbf{k})$ the Fubini-Study metric [82, 83], is ~ 3.02 for the SkX model and ~ 3.23 for the adiabatic $t\text{MoTe}_2$ model—both close to the value of the 1LL (3 and $2n+1$ for the $n\text{LL}$ [84]).

In conclusion, we have shown that a family of skyrmion Chern band (SCB) models with two-body Coulomb interactions host Moore-Read fractional quantum anomalous Hall states. SCB models are naturally realized in 2D semiconductors proximity-coupled to 2D magnets [45], and approximate the TMD moiré systems in which Abelian FQAH states have been observed [1–4, 9]. At filling $\nu = \frac{3}{2}$, our many-body exact diagonalization spectra exhibit the topological degeneracy expected of the Moore-Read state, including the even-odd effect [76].

The realization of non-Abelian topological order in any setting carries with it significant challenges and equally significant reward. In moiré systems, these challenges could be mitigated by the exceptional degree of tunability. Moreover, our work shows that the necessary conditions are far less stringent than might have been thought,




FIG. 5. **LL weight and bandwidth.** (a) LL weight W_i (Eq. 5) and (b) bandwidth of the lowest two minibands of the adiabatic model for $t\text{MoTe}_2$ with parameters from Ref. [40]. (c,d) Analogous quantities for the SkX model at fixed $\alpha = 1$ as a function of average spin texture magnetization \bar{m} . In (d), $\hbar\omega_c = 2\pi\hbar^2/(mA_{uc})$ is the effective cyclotron energy.

and band properties can deviate significantly from those of the 1LL. For instance, Berry curvature can be *far* from uniform.

Finally, we note that there is evidence for nontrivial topology and ferromagnetism in the second miniband of $t\text{TMDs}$. In particular, *double* quantum spin Hall states at $\nu = 4$ in $t\text{MoTe}_2$ and $t\text{WSe}_2$ [6, 85, 86], enabled by time-reversal symmetry and robust S_z /valley conservation, indicate that the first two moiré bands of a given spin/valley have Chern numbers of the same sign [9, 40]. Further, small-angle $t\text{MoTe}_2$ devices show large anomalous Hall resistance in the range $1 < \nu < 2$ [85], indicating spontaneous spin polarization. Full spin polarization may enable a non-Abelian FCI state at filling factor $\nu = \frac{3}{2}$, as in monolayer WSe_2 under a large magnetic field [87, 88]. In addition, a non-Abelian state may occur at $\nu = \frac{5}{2}$, due to complete filling of the lowest miniband of both spins and half filling of the second miniband of one spin.

Acknowledgements— We thank Yang Zhang for collaboration on Ref.[45]. We thank Kin Fai Mak, Jie Shan, Kaifei Kang, Emil Bergholtz and Xiaodong Xu for stimulating discussions. A.P.R. acknowledges helpful conversations with Nicolás Morales-Durán, Sankar Das Sarma, and Kirill Shtengel. This work was supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) under Award No. FA9550-22-1-0432. The authors acknowledge the MIT SuperCloud and Lincoln Laboratory Supercomputing Center for providing computing resources that have contributed to the research results reported within this paper. N.P. acknowledges a KITP graduate fellowship. A.A was supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation (KAW 2022.0348). L.F. was partly supported by the Simons Investigator Award from the Simons Foundation.

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

- [1] J. Cai, E. Anderson, C. Wang, X. Zhang, X. Liu, W. Holtzmann, Y. Zhang, F. Fan, T. Taniguchi, K. Watanabe, *et al.*, Signatures of fractional quantum anomalous hall states in twisted mote2, *Nature*, 1 (2023).
- [2] H. Park, J. Cai, E. Anderson, Y. Zhang, J. Zhu, X. Liu, C. Wang, W. Holtzmann, C. Hu, Z. Liu, *et al.*, Observation of fractionally quantized anomalous hall effect, *Nature*, 1 (2023).
- [3] Y. Zeng, Z. Xia, K. Kang, J. Zhu, P. Knüppel, C. Vaswani, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, K. F. Mak, and J. Shan, Thermodynamic evidence of fractional chern insulator in moiré mote2, *Nature*, 1 (2023).
- [4] F. Xu, Z. Sun, T. Jia, C. Liu, C. Xu, C. Li, Y. Gu, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, B. Tong, *et al.*, Observation of integer and fractional quantum anomalous hall states in twisted bilayer mote2, arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06177 (2023).
- [5] Z. Lu, T. Han, Y. Yao, A. P. Reddy, J. Yang, J. Seo, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, L. Fu, and L. Ju, Fractional quantum anomalous Hall effect in multilayer graphene, *Nature* **626**, 759 (2024).
- [6] T. Devakul, V. Crépel, Y. Zhang, and L. Fu, Magic in twisted transition metal dichalcogenide bilayers, *Nature communications* **12**, 6730 (2021).
- [7] H. Li, U. Kumar, K. Sun, and S.-Z. Lin, Spontaneous fractional chern insulators in transition metal dichalcogenide moiré superlattices, *Physical Review Research* **3**, L032070 (2021).
- [8] V. Crépel and L. Fu, Anomalous hall metal and fractional chern insulator in twisted transition metal dichalcogenides, *Physical Review B* **107**, L201109 (2023).
- [9] F. Wu, T. Lovorn, E. Tutuc, I. Martin, and A. MacDonald, Topological insulators in twisted transition metal dichalcogenide homobilayers, *Physical review letters* **122**, 086402 (2019).
- [10] A. Abouelkomsan, Z. Liu, and E. J. Bergholtz, Particle-Hole Duality, Emergent Fermi Liquids, and Fractional Chern Insulators in Moiré Flatbands, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 106803 (2020).
- [11] P. J. Ledwith, G. Tarnopolsky, E. Khalaf, and A. Vishwanath, Fractional Chern insulator states in twisted bilayer graphene: An analytical approach, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 023237 (2020).
- [12] C. Repellin and T. Senthil, Chern bands of twisted bilayer graphene: Fractional Chern insulators and spin phase transition, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 023238 (2020).
- [13] Y. Xie, A. T. Pierce, J. M. Park, D. E. Parker, E. Khalaf, P. Ledwith, Y. Cao, S. H. Lee, S. Chen, P. R. Forrester, *et al.*, Fractional chern insulators in magic-angle twisted bilayer graphene, *Nature* **600**, 439 (2021).
- [14] Q. Gao, J. Dong, P. Ledwith, D. Parker, and E. Khalaf, Untwisting moiré physics: Almost ideal bands and fractional chern insulators in periodically strained monolayer graphene, *Physical Review Letters* **131**, 096401 (2023).
- [15] J. W. Venderbos and L. Fu, Interacting dirac fermions under a spatially alternating pseudomagnetic field: Realization of spontaneous quantum hall effect, *Physical Review B* **93**, 195126 (2016).
- [16] S. A. A. Ghorashi, A. Dunbrack, A. Abouelkomsan, J. Sun, X. Du, and J. Cano, Topological and stacked flat

- bands in bilayer graphene with a superlattice potential, *Physical Review Letters* **130**, 196201 (2023).
- [17] T. Tan, A. P. Reddy, L. Fu, and T. Devakul, Designing topology and fractionalization in narrow gap semiconductor films via electrostatic engineering, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03085 (2024).
- [18] D. Sheng, Z.-C. Gu, K. Sun, and L. Sheng, Fractional quantum hall effect in the absence of Landau levels, *Nature communications* **2**, 389 (2011).
- [19] T. Neupert, L. Santos, C. Chamon, and C. Mudry, Fractional quantum hall states at zero magnetic field, *Physical review letters* **106**, 236804 (2011).
- [20] N. Regnault and B. A. Bernevig, Fractional Chern insulator, *Physical Review X* **1**, 021014 (2011).
- [21] E. Tang, J.-W. Mei, and X.-G. Wen, High-temperature fractional quantum hall states, *Physical review letters* **106**, 236802 (2011).
- [22] K. Sun, Z. Gu, H. Katsura, and S. D. Sarma, Nearly flatbands with nontrivial topology, *Physical review letters* **106**, 236803 (2011).
- [23] R. Willett, J. P. Eisenstein, H. L. Störmer, D. C. Tsui, A. C. Gossard, and J. H. English, Observation of an even-denominator quantum number in the fractional quantum Hall effect, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 1776 (1987).
- [24] G. Moore and N. Read, Nonabelions in the fractional quantum hall effect, *Nucl. Phys. B* **360**, 362 (1991).
- [25] N. Read and D. Green, Paired states of fermions in two dimensions with breaking of parity and time-reversal symmetries and the fractional quantum Hall effect, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 10267 (2000).
- [26] M. Levin, B. I. Halperin, and B. Rosenow, Particle-Hole Symmetry and the Pfaffian State, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 236806 (2007).
- [27] N. Read and E. Rezayi, Beyond paired quantum Hall states: Parafermions and incompressible states in the first excited Landau level, *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 8084 (1999).
- [28] E. Witten, Quantum field theory and the Jones polynomial, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **121**, 351 (1989).
- [29] K. Fredenhagen, K. H. Rehren, and B. Schroer, Superselection sectors with braid group statistics and exchange algebras, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **125**, 201 (1989).
- [30] J. Fröhlich and F. Gabbiani, BRAID STATISTICS IN LOCAL QUANTUM THEORY, *Rev. Math. Phys.* **02**, 251 (1990).
- [31] T. D. Imbo, C. Shah Imbo, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Identical particles, exotic statistics and braid groups, *Phys. Lett. B* **234**, 103 (1990).
- [32] A. Yu. Kitaev, Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons, *Ann. Phys.* **303**, 2 (2003).
- [33] M. Freedman, A. Kitaev, M. Larsen, and Z. Wang, Topological quantum computation, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **40**, 31 (2003).
- [34] C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman, and S. Das Sarma, Non-Abelian anyons and topological quantum computation, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 1083 (2008).
- [35] B. A. Bernevig and N. Regnault, Emergent many-body translational symmetries of abelian and non-abelian fractionally filled topological insulators, *Physical Review B* **85**, 075128 (2012).
- [36] Z. Liu, E. J. Bergholtz, and E. Kapit, Non-Abelian fractional Chern insulators from long-range interactions, *Physical Review B* **88**, 205101 (2013).
- [37] D. Wang, Z. Liu, W.-M. Liu, J. Cao, and H. Fan, Fermionic non-abelian fractional Chern insulators from dipolar interactions, *Physical Review B* **91**, 125138 (2015).
- [38] A. Kitaev, Anyons in an exactly solved model and beyond, *Ann. Phys.* **321**, 2 (2006).
- [39] G. Jackeli and G. Khaliullin, Mott Insulators in the Strong Spin-Orbit Coupling Limit: From Heisenberg to a Quantum Compass and Kitaev Models, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 017205 (2009).
- [40] A. P. Reddy, F. Alsallom, Y. Zhang, T. Devakul, and L. Fu, Fractional quantum anomalous hall states in twisted bilayer MoTe_2 and WSe_2 , *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 085117 (2023).
- [41] N. Morales-Durán, N. Wei, J. Shi, and A. H. MacDonald, Magic angles and fractional Chern insulators in twisted homobilayer transition metal dichalcogenides, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 096602 (2024).
- [42] P. Bruno, V. Dugaev, and M. Taillefumier, Topological hall effect and Berry phase in magnetic nanostructures, *Physical review letters* **93**, 096806 (2004).
- [43] J. H. Han, *Skyrmions in Condensed Matter* (Springer International Publishing, Cham, Switzerland, 2017).
- [44] K. Hamamoto, M. Ezawa, and N. Nagaosa, Quantized topological Hall effect in skyrmion crystal, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 115417 (2015).
- [45] N. Paul, Y. Zhang, and L. Fu, Giant proximity exchange and flat Chern band in 2d magnet-semiconductor heterostructures, *Science Advances* **9**, eabn1401 (2023).
- [46] M. Akram, H. LaBollita, D. Dey, J. Kapeghian, O. Erten, and A. S. Botana, Moiré Skyrmions and Chiral Magnetic Phases in Twisted CrX_3 ($X = \text{I, Br, and Cl}$) Bilayers, *Nano Lett.* 10.1021/acs.nanolett.1c02096 (2021).
- [47] K. Hejazi, Z.-X. Luo, and L. Balents, Noncollinear phases in moiré magnets, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **117**, 10721 (2020).
- [48] K. Hejazi, Z.-X. Luo, and L. Balents, Heterobilayer moiré magnets: Moiré skyrmions and commensurate-incommensurate transitions, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, L100406 (2021).
- [49] P. Bruno, V. K. Dugaev, and M. Taillefumier, Topological Hall Effect and Berry Phase in Magnetic Nanostructures, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 096806 (2004).
- [50] E. Anderson, F.-R. Fan, J. Cai, W. Holtzmann, T. Taniguchi, K. Watanabe, D. Xiao, W. Yao, and X. Xu, Programming correlated magnetic states with gate-controlled moiré geometry, *Science* **381**, 325 (2023).
- [51] N. Morales-Durán, J. Wang, G. R. Schleder, M. Angeli, Z. Zhu, E. Kaxiras, C. Repellin, and J. Cano, Pressure-enhanced fractional Chern insulators along a magic line in moiré transition metal dichalcogenides, *Physical Review Research* **5**, L032022 (2023).
- [52] C. Wang, X.-W. Zhang, X. Liu, Y. He, X. Xu, Y. Ran, T. Cao, and D. Xiao, Fractional Chern Insulator in Twisted Bilayer MoTe_2 , arXiv 10.48550/arXiv.2304.11864 (2023), 2304.11864.
- [53] A. P. Reddy and L. Fu, Toward a global phase diagram of the fractional quantum anomalous hall effect, arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10406 (2023).
- [54] K. Karube, J. S. White, D. Morikawa, M. Bartkowiak, A. Kikkawa, Y. Tokunaga, T. Arima, H. M. Rønnow, Y. Tokura, and Y. Taguchi, Skyrmion formation in a bulk chiral magnet at zero magnetic field and above room temperature, *Phys. Rev. Mater.* **1**, 074405 (2017).
- [55] J.-H. Park and J. H. Han, Zero-temperature phases for chiral magnets in three dimensions, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**,

- 184406 (2011).
- [56] Y. Tokura and N. Kanazawa, Magnetic Skyrmion Materials, *Chem. Rev.* 10.1021/acs.chemrev.0c00297 (2020).
- [57] S.-Z. Lin and S. Hayami, Ginzburg-landau theory for skyrmions in inversion-symmetric magnets with competing interactions, *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 064430 (2016).
- [58] A. Tonomura, X. Yu, K. Yanagisawa, T. Matsuda, Y. Onose, N. Kanazawa, H. S. Park, and Y. Tokura, Real-space observation of skyrmion lattice in helimagnet mnsi thin samples, *Nano Lett.* **12**, 1673 (2012).
- [59] See Supplemental Material at URL-will-be-inserted-by-publisher, which includes Refs. [60-75], for details on exact diagonalization, nature and characterization of ground states, the adiabatic model for t TMDs, and further remarks.
- [60] E. H. Rezayi and F. D. M. Haldane, Incompressible paired hall state, stripe order, and the composite fermion liquid phase in half-filled landau levels, *Physical Review Letters* **84**, 4685 (2000).
- [61] D. Yoshioka, *The quantum Hall effect*, Vol. 133 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2013).
- [62] Y.-L. Wu, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, Gauge-fixed wannier wave functions for fractional topological insulators, *Physical Review B* **86**, 085129 (2012).
- [63] Y.-L. Wu, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, Bloch model wave functions and pseudopotentials for all fractional chern insulators, *Physical review letters* **110**, 106802 (2013).
- [64] S.-S. Lee, S. Ryu, C. Nayak, and M. P. Fisher, Particle-hole symmetry and the $\nu=5/2$ quantum hall state, *Physical review letters* **99**, 236807 (2007).
- [65] H. Li and F. D. M. Haldane, Entanglement spectrum as a generalization of entanglement entropy: Identification of topological order in non-abelian fractional quantum hall effect states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 010504 (2008).
- [66] A. Sterdyniak, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, Extracting excitations from model state entanglement, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 100405 (2011).
- [67] E. J. Bergholtz and A. Karlhede, Quantum hall system in tao-thouless limit, *Physical Review B* **77**, 155308 (2008).
- [68] B. A. Bernevig and F. D. M. Haldane, Model fractional quantum hall states and jack polynomials, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 246802 (2008).
- [69] E. Ardonne, E. J. Bergholtz, J. Kailasvuori, and E. Wikberg, Degeneracy of non-abelian quantum hall states on the torus: domain walls and conformal field theory, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2008**, P04016 (2008).
- [70] J. Zak, Magnetic translation group, *Physical Review* **134**, A1602 (1964).
- [71] S. M. Girvin and K. Yang, *Modern condensed matter physics* (Cambridge University Press, 2019).
- [72] J. Wang, J. Cano, A. J. Millis, Z. Liu, and B. Yang, Exact landau level description of geometry and interaction in a flatband, *Physical review letters* **127**, 246403 (2021).
- [73] F. Haldane, A modular-invariant modified weierstrass sigma-function as a building block for lowest-landau-level wavefunctions on the torus, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **59** (2018).
- [74] F. D. M. Haldane and E. H. Rezayi, Periodic laughlin-jastrow wave functions for the fractional quantized hall effect, *Physical Review B* **31**, 2529 (1985).
- [75] N. Morales-Durán, N. Wei, J. Shi, and A. H. MacDonald, Magic Angles and Fractional Chern Insulators in Twisted Homobilayer TMDs, arXiv 10.48550/arXiv.2308.03143 (2023), 2308.03143.
- [76] M. Oshikawa, Y. B. Kim, K. Shtengel, C. Nayak, and S. Tewari, Topological degeneracy of non-Abelian states for dummies, *Ann. Phys.* **322**, 1477 (2007).
- [77] Z. Papić, F. Haldane, and E. Rezayi, Quantum phase transitions and the $\nu=5/2$ fractional hall state in wide quantum wells, *Physical review letters* **109**, 266806 (2012).
- [78] M. R. Peterson, T. Jolicoeur, and S. D. Sarma, Finite-layer thickness stabilizes the pfaffian state for the $5/2$ fractional quantum hall effect: wave function overlap and topological degeneracy, *Physical review letters* **101**, 016807 (2008).
- [79] H. Wang, D. Sheng, and F. Haldane, Particle-hole symmetry breaking and the $\nu=5/2$ fractional quantum hall effect, *Physical Review B* **80**, 241311 (2009).
- [80] M. Levin, B. I. Halperin, and B. Rosenow, Particle-hole symmetry and the pfaffian state, *Physical review letters* **99**, 236806 (2007).
- [81] A. Abouelkomsan, A. P. Reddy, L. Fu, and E. J. Bergholtz, Band mixing in the quantum anomalous hall regime of twisted semiconductor bilayers, *Physical Review B* **109**, L121107 (2024).
- [82] Y. Onishi and L. Fu, Quantum weight, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13847 (2024).
- [83] Y. Onishi and L. Fu, Fundamental Bound on Topological Gap, *Phys. Rev. X* **14**, 011052 (2024).
- [84] T. Ozawa and B. Mera, Relations between topology and the quantum metric for chern insulators, *Physical Review B* **104**, 045103 (2021).
- [85] K. Kang, B. Shen, Y. Qiu, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, J. Shan, and K. F. Mak, Observation of the fractional quantum spin hall effect in moiré $\nu=2$, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03294 (2024).
- [86] K. Kang, Y. Qiu, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, J. Shan, and K. F. Mak, Observation of the double quantum spin hall phase in moiré $\nu=2$, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04196 (2024).
- [87] Q. Shi, E.-M. Shih, M. V. Gustafsson, D. A. Rhodes, B. Kim, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, Z. Papić, J. Hone, and C. R. Dean, Odd- and even-denominator fractional quantum hall states in monolayer $\nu=2$, *Nature Nanotechnology* **15**, 569 (2020).
- [88] J. Pack, Y. Guo, Z. Liu, B. S. Jessen, L. Holtzman, S. Liu, M. Cothrine, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, D. G. Mandrus, *et al.*, Charge-transfer contact to a high-mobility monolayer semiconductor, arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19782 (2023).

Supplemental Material for *Non-Abelian fractionalization in topological minibands*

Aidan P. Reddy,* Nisarga Paul,* Ahmed Abouelkomsan, and Liang Fu
Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

CONTENTS

I. Pfaffian wavefunction and parent three-body interaction	1
A. Proof that Pfaffian state is a zero-energy eigenstate of parent interaction	1
B. Equations for numerical calculation	2
II. Characterization of the $\nu = \frac{3}{2}$ states	3
A. Overlaps	3
B. Hamiltonian interpolation	4
C. Entanglement Spectroscopy	4
D. Miscellaneous extended numerical data	5
E. Further remarks	6
III. Working on a torus with a net magnetic flux	8
IV. Hartree-Fock self energy	11
V. Adiabatic model for twisted MoTe ₂	12
References	13

I. PFAFFIAN WAVEFUNCTION AND PARENT THREE-BODY INTERACTION

A. Proof that Pfaffian state is a zero-energy eigenstate of parent interaction

The Pfaffian wavefunction for an even number of electrons on a plane is [1]

$$\Psi_{\text{Pf}}(\{z_i\}) = \text{Pf} \left(\frac{1}{z_i - z_j} \right) \prod_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^2 e^{-\frac{1}{4\ell^2} \sum_i |z_i|^2}. \quad (1)$$

The Pfaffian of a $2n \times 2n$ antisymmetric matrix M is

$$\text{Pf}(M) = \frac{1}{2^n n!} \sum_{\sigma} \text{sgn} \sigma \left[\prod_{i=1}^n M_{\sigma(2i-1), \sigma(2i)} \right] \quad (2)$$

where σ is a permutation of the matrix indices. Expanding $\text{Pf}(\frac{1}{z_i - z_j})$ gives

$$\Psi_{\text{Pf}}(\{z_i\}) = \frac{1}{2^{N_e/2} (N_e/2)!} \sum_{\sigma} \text{sgn} \sigma \prod_{i=1}^{N_e/2} (z_{\sigma(2i-1)} - z_{\sigma(2i)}) \prod_{j < (2i-1)} (z_{\sigma(2i-1)} - z_{\sigma(j)})^2 e^{-\frac{1}{4\ell^2} \sum_i |z_i|^2}. \quad (3)$$

We refer to each term in this sum over σ as a ‘‘Jastrow string’’. In each Jastrow string, each electron i is paired with exactly one other electron j , meaning that the Jastrow string contains the factor $(z_i - z_j)$. For all other electrons $k \neq j$, there is an ‘‘unpaired’’ quadratic Jastrow factor $(z_i - z_k)^2$.

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

The following three-body interaction produces the Pfaffian wavefunction as its exact zero-energy ground state when projected to the LLL [2]:

$$\hat{V}_{\text{Pf}} = \ell^{10} U_{\text{Pf}} \frac{1}{3!} \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \nabla_i^4 \nabla_j^2 \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_k). \quad (4)$$

To clarify, we note that an overall minus sign was incorrectly written in the definition of \hat{V}_{Pf} in Ref. [2].

We now prove that the Pfaffian parent Hamiltonian, $H_{\text{Pf}} = P_{\text{LLL}} \hat{V}_{\text{Pf}} P_{\text{LLL}}$ where P_{LLL} projects onto the LLL, is positive semidefinite [3]. Let us decompose an arbitrary many-body wavefunction in the LLL $\Psi_{\text{LLL}}(\{z_i\})$ as

$$\Psi_{\text{LLL}} = pg \quad (5)$$

where p is a polynomial in z_i , $g = e^{-\frac{1}{4\ell^2} \sum_i |z_i|^2}$ in the symmetric gauge, and we leave the dependence on $\{z_i\}$ implicit. Due to Fermi statistics, $p \propto \prod_{i \neq j} (z_i - z_j)$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_{\text{LLL}} | \nabla_1^4 \nabla_2^2 \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_3) | \Psi_{\text{LLL}} \rangle &= \left(\prod_i \int d^2 r_i \right) (\bar{\partial}_1^2 \partial_1^2 \bar{\partial}_2 \partial_2 \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_3)) (\bar{p} p g^2) \\ &= \left(\prod_i \int d^2 r_i \right) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_3) (\bar{\partial}_1^2 \partial_1^2 \bar{\partial}_2 \partial_2 \bar{p} p g^2) \\ &= \left(\prod_i \int d^2 r_i \right) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_3) \bar{\partial}_1^2 \partial_1^2 [|\partial_2 p|^2 g^2 + \bar{p} \bar{\partial}_2 \partial_2 (p g^2) + p \bar{\partial}_2 \partial_2 (\bar{p} g^2)] \\ &= \left(\prod_{i \neq 3} \int d^2 r_i \right) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) \bar{\partial}_1^2 \partial_1^2 (|\partial_2 p|^2 g^2) |_{\mathbf{r}_3 = \mathbf{r}_2} \\ &= \left(\prod_{i \neq 3} \int d^2 r_i \right) \delta^2(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2) |\partial_1^2 \partial_2 p|^2 g^2 |_{\mathbf{r}_3 = \mathbf{r}_2} \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where we define $\partial_i = \partial_{x,i} - i\partial_{y,i}$ so that $\nabla_i^2 = \bar{\partial}_i \partial_i$. In these manipulations, we repeatedly use the fact that if $p \propto (z_i - z_j)^n$, it must be acted on by $\partial_{i/j}^n$ to lose all factors of $(z_i - z_j)$ and thus not vanish when integrated against $\delta^2(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)$. We also use the fact that the part of $\partial_2 p|_{\mathbf{r}_3 = \mathbf{r}_2}$ that survives the integral over \mathbf{r}_3 against $\delta^2(\mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_3)$ is $\propto (z_1 - z_2)(z_1 - z_3)|_{\mathbf{r}_3 = \mathbf{r}_2} = (z_1 - z_2)^2$ and thus needs to be acted on by ∂_1^2 to survive integration over \mathbf{r}_2 against $\delta^2(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)$.

We now show that this integral vanishes for the Pfaffian wavefunction. We note that the only Jastrow string that survives in $|\partial_2 p|_{\mathbf{r}_3 = \mathbf{r}_2}$ is that in which particles 2 and 3 are paired. Because (1, 2) and (1, 3) are unpaired in this Jastrow string, $|\partial_2 p|_{\mathbf{r}_3 = \mathbf{r}_2} \propto (z_1 - z_2)^2 (z_1 - z_3)^2 |_{\mathbf{r}_3 = \mathbf{r}_2} = (z_1 - z_2)^4$. Thus, at least 4 factors of $(z_1 - z_2)$ remain in $|\partial_1^2 \partial_2 p|^2 g^2 |_{\mathbf{r}_3 = \mathbf{r}_2}$ and the final line above vanishes.

B. Equations for numerical calculation

For the purpose of numerical calculation, it is useful to write the Pf parent interaction as

$$\hat{V}_{\text{Pf}} = \frac{1}{3!} \frac{1}{A^2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3} v(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3) : \rho(-\mathbf{q}_1) \rho(-\mathbf{q}_2) \rho(-\mathbf{q}_3) : \quad (7)$$

where $\rho(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_i e^{-i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i}$ and

$$v(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_3, \mathbf{q}_3) = -\ell^{10} U_{\text{Pf}} q_2^2 q_1^4 \delta_{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{q}_1 + \mathbf{q}_2 + \mathbf{q}_3}. \quad (8)$$

The Pf parent Hamiltonian is then

$$H_{\text{Pf}} = \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_6} V_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3; \mathbf{k}_4, \mathbf{k}_5, \mathbf{k}_6} c_{\mathbf{k}_1}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}_2}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}_3}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}_6} c_{\mathbf{k}_5} c_{\mathbf{k}_4} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3; \mathbf{k}_4, \mathbf{k}_5, \mathbf{k}_6} &= \langle 0, \mathbf{k}_1; 0, \mathbf{k}_2; 0, \mathbf{k}_3 | \hat{V}_{\text{Pf}} | 0, \mathbf{k}_4; 0, \mathbf{k}_5; 0, \mathbf{k}_6 \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{A^2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3} v(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2, \mathbf{q}_3) \langle 0, \mathbf{k}_1 | e^{i\mathbf{q}_1 \cdot \mathbf{r}} | 0, \mathbf{k}_4 \rangle \langle 0, \mathbf{k}_2 | e^{i\mathbf{q}_2 \cdot \mathbf{r}} | 0, \mathbf{k}_5 \rangle \langle 0, \mathbf{k}_3 | e^{i\mathbf{q}_3 \cdot \mathbf{r}} | 0, \mathbf{k}_6 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The anti-Pfaffian (aPf) state is $|\text{aPf}\rangle = C_{\text{ph}}|\text{Pf}\rangle$ where we define the anti-unitary particle-hole conjugation operator C_{ph} by the relation $C_{\text{ph}}\alpha c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger C_{\text{ph}}^{-1} = \bar{\alpha} c_{\mathbf{k}}$, $C_{\text{ph}}\alpha c_{\mathbf{k}} C_{\text{ph}}^{-1} = \bar{\alpha} c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ where α is a complex number, the overbar denotes complex conjugation, and $c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ is a LLL creation operator. The aPf parent Hamiltonian is then

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{aPf}} &= C_{\text{ph}} H_{\text{Pf}} C_{\text{ph}}^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_6} \bar{V}_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3; \mathbf{k}_4, \mathbf{k}_5, \mathbf{k}_6} c_{\mathbf{k}_1} c_{\mathbf{k}_2} c_{\mathbf{k}_3} c_{\mathbf{k}_6}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}_5}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}_4}^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Note that the definition of C_{ph} implies $C_{\text{ph}}|\text{empty band}\rangle = |\text{full band}\rangle$ because $c_{\mathbf{k}}|\text{empty band}\rangle = 0 = C_{\text{ph}}c_{\mathbf{k}}|\text{empty band}\rangle = C_{\text{ph}}c_{\mathbf{k}}C_{\text{ph}}^{-1}C_{\text{ph}}|\text{empty band}\rangle = c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger(C_{\text{ph}}|\text{empty band}\rangle)$. Since the state $C_{\text{ph}}|\text{empty band}\rangle$ is annihilated by all $c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$, it is $|\text{full band}\rangle$.

We now remark on the particle-hole symmetry of LL-projected two-body interaction Hamiltonians. A generic band-projected Hamiltonian $H_{\text{band}} = P_{\text{band}} H P_{\text{band}}$ with a two-body interaction can be written as

$$H_{\text{band}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{q}} V_{[\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}], [\mathbf{k}'-\mathbf{q}]; \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} c_{[\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}]}^\dagger c_{[\mathbf{k}'-\mathbf{q}]}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}'} c_{\mathbf{k}}. \quad (12)$$

Its particle-hole conjugate is

$$C_{\text{ph}} H_{\text{band}} C_{\text{ph}}^{-1} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \varepsilon(\mathbf{k}) (1 - c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}}) + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \Sigma(\mathbf{k}) \left(\frac{1}{2} - c_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{q}} \bar{V}_{[\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}], [\mathbf{k}'-\mathbf{q}]; \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} c_{[\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}]}^\dagger c_{[\mathbf{k}'-\mathbf{q}]}^\dagger c_{\mathbf{k}'} c_{\mathbf{k}} \quad (13)$$

where $\Sigma(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} (V_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'; \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'} - V_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'; \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{k}})$ a Hartree-Fock self energy. In the $n\text{LL}$, both $\varepsilon(\mathbf{k})$ and $\Sigma(\mathbf{k})$ are \mathbf{k} -independent. This is a consequence of magnetic translation symmetry and can be verified by direct calculation using the results of section III. Upon restricting consideration to states for which $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$, the Hartree-Fock self-energy term vanishes and we find that $H_{n\text{LL}}$ is particle-hole symmetric: $C_{\text{ph}} H_{n\text{LL}} C_{\text{ph}}^{-1} = H_{n\text{LL}}$.

II. CHARACTERIZATION OF THE $\nu = \frac{3}{2}$ STATES

A. Overlaps

Because a generic Chern band lives in a non-LL Hilbert space (e.g. a torus in the continuum without a net magnetic flux or a lattice), the overlap between a many-body state in its Fock space and a many-body state in a LL Fock space is trivially zero. Therefore, direct comparison between many-body states in generic Chern band and LL Fock spaces requires a modified definition of overlap. A natural procedure is to map Fock states in the LL and Chern band Fock spaces to a new Fock space whose basis states are defined by sets $\{\mathbf{k}\}$ of occupied (magnetic) Bloch states: $(\prod_{\mathbf{k} \in \{\mathbf{k}\}} c_{\text{LL}, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger) |\text{vac}\rangle \rightarrow |\{\mathbf{k}\}\rangle$, $(\prod_{\mathbf{k} \in \{\mathbf{k}\}} c_{\text{band}, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger) |\text{vac}\rangle \rightarrow |\{\mathbf{k}\}\rangle$. Here, the vacuum state $|\text{vac}\rangle$ includes full bands below the band of interest. Under this mapping, a Chern band many-body state $|\Psi_{\text{band}}\rangle = \sum_{\{\{\mathbf{k}\}\}} \alpha(\{\mathbf{k}\}) (\prod_{\mathbf{k} \in \{\mathbf{k}\}} c_{\text{band}, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger) |\text{vac}\rangle \rightarrow \sum_{\{\{\mathbf{k}\}\}} \alpha(\{\mathbf{k}\}) |\{\mathbf{k}\}\rangle \equiv |\Psi'_{\text{band}}\rangle$ and likewise a LL many-body state $|\Psi_{\text{LL}}\rangle = \sum_{\{\{\mathbf{k}\}\}} \beta(\{\mathbf{k}\}) (\prod_{\mathbf{k} \in \{\mathbf{k}\}} c_{\text{LL}, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger) |\text{vac}\rangle \rightarrow \sum_{\{\{\mathbf{k}\}\}} \beta(\{\mathbf{k}\}) |\{\mathbf{k}\}\rangle \equiv |\Psi'_{\text{LL}}\rangle$. Schematically, the overlap is then $\mathcal{O} = |\langle \Psi'_{\text{band}} | \Psi'_{\text{LL}} \rangle| = |\sum_{\{\{\mathbf{k}\}\}} \alpha^*(\{\mathbf{k}\}) \beta(\{\mathbf{k}\})|$. However, this procedure is physically ambiguous because the gauge transformation $c_{\text{band}, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger \rightarrow e^{i\theta(\mathbf{k})} c_{\text{band}, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ changes \mathcal{O} . Nevertheless, several gauge fixing procedures have been

shown to produce high overlaps between Chern band fractional Chern insulator and LL fractional quantum Hall states [4, 5].

In our case, working in a Landau level basis offers a practical advantage. Since the effective adiabatic Hamiltonian (Eq. 2 in the main text) is defined on a continuum torus with a net magnetic flux, each of its magnetic Bloch miniband eigenstates $|i, \mathbf{k}\rangle$ is a linear combination of LL magnetic Bloch states $|n, \mathbf{k}\rangle$ with different Landau Level indices at fixed \mathbf{k} : $|i, \mathbf{k}\rangle = \sum_n z_{in\mathbf{k}} |n, \mathbf{k}\rangle$ (see section III). We simply set the coefficient $z_{21\mathbf{k}}$ of the 1LL state in the second miniband state at each \mathbf{k} to be real and positive. With this gauge choice, we define the overlap through the mapping described in the previous paragraph.

We define $|\Psi_{i,\text{Pf}}\rangle$ as the i^{th} exact ground state of H_{Pf} . As stated in the main text and shown explicitly in Fig. 5, there are six such ground states when the number of electrons is even and two when it is odd. Under the mapping described above, $|\Psi_{i,\text{Pf}}\rangle \rightarrow |\Psi'_{i,\text{Pf}}\rangle$. We note that there exists an interaction (defined in section II E) for every Landau level whose ground state upon projection at half filling becomes $|\Psi'_{i,\text{Pf}}\rangle$ under the mapping defined above. Therefore, we are free to think of $|\Psi'_{i,\text{Pf}}\rangle$ as originating from a LLL or 1LL (or n LL, for that matter) state as convenient. Analogous statements hold for the aPf.

The ground state overlap reported in the main text is defined as $\mathcal{O} = \sqrt{\sum_{i \in (\text{a})\text{Pf}} |\langle \Psi'_{i,(\text{a})\text{Pf}} | \Psi'_{GS} \rangle|^2}$ where $|\Psi_{GS}\rangle$ the exact ground state (not averaged over quasidegenerate ground state manifold) of the Hamiltonian of interest (in this case, the adiabatic model for $t\text{MoTe}_2$).

B. Hamiltonian interpolation

In Fig. 1, we show the energy spectra of Hamiltonians H_γ interpolating between H_{TMD} or H_{SkX} and H_{Pf} or H_{aPf} on two example clusters. Precisely, the interpolation Hamiltonian is defined as

$$H_\gamma = \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4} (1 - \gamma) V_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2; \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4}^{\text{band}} c_{2, \mathbf{k}_1}^\dagger c_{2, \mathbf{k}_2}^\dagger c_{2, \mathbf{k}_4} c_{2, \mathbf{k}_3} + \gamma \frac{1}{3!} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_6} \left(\prod_{i=1}^6 \frac{\langle 2, \mathbf{k}_i | 1\text{LL}, \mathbf{k}_i \rangle}{|\langle 2, \mathbf{k}_i | 1\text{LL}, \mathbf{k}_i \rangle|} \right) V_{\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3; \mathbf{k}_4, \mathbf{k}_5, \mathbf{k}_6}^{\text{Pf}} c_{2, \mathbf{k}_1}^\dagger c_{2, \mathbf{k}_2}^\dagger c_{2, \mathbf{k}_3}^\dagger c_{2, \mathbf{k}_4} c_{2, \mathbf{k}_5} c_{2, \mathbf{k}_6} \quad (14)$$

The superscript ‘‘band’’ is either TMD or SkX. The factor $\left(\prod_{i=1}^6 \frac{\langle 2, \mathbf{k}_i | 1\text{LL}, \mathbf{k}_i \rangle}{|\langle 2, \mathbf{k}_i | 1\text{LL}, \mathbf{k}_i \rangle|} \right)$ simplifies to 1 upon setting $z_{21\mathbf{k}}$ to be real and positive. $c_{2, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ creates a magnetic Bloch state $|2, \mathbf{k}\rangle$ in the second adiabatic $t\text{MoTe}_2$ or SkX miniband.

In each case, the energy gap between the highest quasidegenerate ground state and next excited state remains open as a function of the interpolation parameter γ . We refrain from interpreting these data as a demonstration of ‘‘adiabatic connectivity’’ because this interpretation would imply that the Pf and aPf states are adiabatically connected to each other. This cannot be true because the two model states correspond to distinct topological orders [6, 7] and distinct topological orders are not adiabatically connected by definition. This paradoxical behavior is a finite-size artifact. We observe very similar behavior (not shown) upon interpolating between the Coulomb 1LL Hamiltonian and H_{Pf} or H_{aPf} as that shown in Fig. 1.

C. Entanglement Spectroscopy

Entanglement spectroscopy [8] has been shown to be a powerful tool to probe possible topologically ordered states. Depending on the chosen cut, the low-lying entanglement states convey information about the underlying topological order. Here, we focus on particle entanglement spectrum (PES)[9]. By partitioning the system in the particle space into two subspaces, $N = N_A + N_B$, PES is defined as the set $\{\xi = -\log \epsilon_i\}$ where $\{\epsilon_i\}$ are the eigenvalues of the reduced density matrix ρ_A obtained by tracing N_B particles, $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_{N_B} \rho$ and $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^d |\Psi_i\rangle \langle \Psi_i|$ is the density matrix for d quasi-degenerate ground states.

For gapped topologically ordered phases, PES has been shown in numerous cases to exhibit an *entanglement* gap, below which the number of states matches the dimension of the quasi-holes Hilbert space which is a unique characteristic of the underlying topological order. The counting rules can be derived in different ways [10, 11]. The MR (Pfaffian or anti-Pfaffian) non-Abelian state satisfies the (2,4) counting rule [12] which forbids no more than 2 particles in each 4 consecutive orbitals.

We calculate the PES for the SkX model by tracing either electrons (Fig. 2) or holes (Fig. 3). We trace out different number particles N_B and analyze the resulting entanglement gaps. We only find a consistent entanglement




FIG. 1. Energy spectrum of an interpolation Hamiltonian H_γ interpolating between the adiabatic model for $t\text{MoTe}_2$ with a Coulomb interaction and the exact Pfaffian (a-b) and anti-Pfaffian (c-d) three-body interaction Hamiltonians on two example clusters. (e-h) Analogous data for the SkX model. Parameters: (a-d) $\theta = 2.5^\circ$, $\epsilon = 5$; (e-h) $\alpha = 1.0$, $N_0 = 0.28$, $\frac{e^2}{\epsilon a_m} = \hbar\omega_c = \frac{2\pi\hbar^2}{m A_{uc}}$. In each case, we set $U_{\text{Pf}} = \frac{e^2}{\epsilon\ell} = \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}}} \frac{e^2}{\epsilon a_m}$.




FIG. 2. Particle entanglement spectrum (PES) for the SCB model calculated on cluster 24A for different cuts obtained by tracing out *electrons*. Out of all cuts considered, only the cut corresponding to leaving $N_A = 3$ particles (leftmost panel) leads to an entanglement gap with low-lying states consistent with the expected quasi-hole counting of the MR state.

gap with the MR non-Abelian state counting rule only for $N_A = 3$ particles (electrons or holes). While entanglement gaps exist for different N_A , we find that the number of states below these gaps doesn't match the (2,4) counting rule.

We conjecture that this mismatch is due to the ground state being a superposition of the Pfaffian and the anti-Pfaffian with different weights. Indeed a similar behavior is observed in the 1LL (Fig 4). While the Pf and the aPf individually satisfy the (2,4) counting rule, it's not clear if a superposition of the two would satisfy the same counting rule. We leave this to future work.

D. Miscellaneous extended numerical data

In Fig. 5, we compare spectra of the Coulomb LLL and 1LL projected Hamiltonians with the spectrum of the Pf parent Hamiltonian on several finite-size systems.

In Fig. 6 we show many-body spectra for the SkX and adiabatic $t\text{MoTe}_2$ models on additional clusters. In both cases, the ground state momentum sectors and degeneracies are consistent with Pfaffian or antiPfaffian states.




FIG. 3. Particle entanglement spectrum (PES) for the SCB model calculated on cluster 24A for different cuts obtained by tracing out *holes*. Out of all cuts considered, only the cut corresponding to leaving $N_A = 3$ holes (leftmost panel) leads to an entanglement gap consistent with the expected quasi-hole counting of the MR state.




FIG. 4. Particle entanglement spectrum (PES) for the 1LL on calculated on cluster 24A for different cuts. Out of all cuts considered, only the cut corresponding to leaving $N_A = 3$ particles (holes) (leftmost panel) leads to an entanglement gap consistent with the expected quasi-hole counting of the MR state.

In Fig. 7 we show the momentum distribution functions $n(\mathbf{k})$ in the exact ground state of the adiabatic $t\text{MoTe}_2$ model on several finite clusters. $n(\mathbf{k})$ is smooth and nearly uniform.

Finally, in Fig. 8, we define the finite-size systems used in this work and show their corresponding (magnetic) Brillouin zone meshes.

E. Further remarks

Given that \hat{V}_{Pf} has zero-energy Pfaffian ground states upon projection to the LLL, one might expect that it also has ground states in the Pfaffian phase upon projection to the 1LL. We find by direct calculation that this is not the case. $P_{1\text{LL}}\hat{V}_{\text{Pf}}P_{1\text{LL}}$ produces ground states with different center of mass magnetic momentum quantum numbers and degeneracies than does H_{Pf} . Similarly, projecting \hat{V}_{Pf} to either the second SkX or adiabatic TMD bands does not produce a spectrum consistent with a Pf ground state.

Formally, we can define a three-body interaction $\hat{V}_{\text{Pf},n\text{LL}}$ such that the spectrum of $P_{n\text{LL}}\hat{V}_{\text{Pf},n\text{LL}}P_{n\text{LL}}$ is independent of n by replacing $v(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_3, \mathbf{q}_3)$ in Eq. 7 with $v_{n\text{LL}}(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_3, \mathbf{q}_3) = -\frac{\ell^{10}U_{\text{Pf}}q_1^4q_2^2}{L_n(\ell^2q_1^2/2)L_n(\ell^2q_2^2/2)L_n(\ell^2q_3^2/2)}\delta_{\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2+\mathbf{q}_3,\mathbf{0}}$. The Laguerre polynomials in the denominator serve to cancel out factors in the $n\text{LL}$ form factors not present in the LLL from factor (see section III). We find that projecting $\hat{V}_{\text{Pf},1\text{LL}}$ to the second SkX and adiabatic $t\text{MoTe}_2$ band does not produce a Pf-like spectrum.




FIG. 5. Comparison of low-energy spectra of LLL (a-f) and 1LL (g-l) at $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$ with Coulomb interaction, and the exact Pf parent Hamiltonian (m-p), on several finite-size toruses. Ground state degeneracies are labeled. The Coulomb 1LL and exact Pf parent Hamiltonians' center-of-mass quasimomenta and degeneracies match in each case and differ from those of the Coulomb LLL Hamiltonian whose ground states correspond to a composite Fermi liquid phase. $U_{\text{Pf}} = \frac{e^2}{\epsilon l}$.




FIG. 6. Additional many-body spectra of the adiabatic model for $t\text{MoTe}_2$ (a,b) and the SkX model (c,d) on two different clusters. The expected twofold and sixfold ground state quasidegeneracies are present on clusters 26 and 28 with $N_e = 13 = \text{odd}$ and $N_e = 14 = \text{even}$ respectively. Parameters: (a,b) $\theta = 2.5^\circ$, $\epsilon = 5$; (c,d) $\alpha = 1.0$, $N_0 = 0.28$, $\frac{e^2}{\epsilon \alpha_M} = \hbar \omega_c$.




FIG. 7. Example momentum distribution functions, $n(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{N_{GS}} \sum_{i \in GS} \langle i | c_{2,\mathbf{k}}^\dagger c_{2,\mathbf{k}} | i \rangle$, where $c_{2,\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ creates a particle in the magnetic Bloch state with magnetic crystal momentum \mathbf{k} in the second miniband of the $t\text{MoTe}_2$ adiabatic model. GS is the set of exactly degenerate lowest-energy many-body states. Parameters: $\theta = 2.5^\circ$, $\epsilon = 5$.




FIG. 8. Momentum space mesh diagrams of the finite-size clusters used in this work. \mathbf{L}_i are the torus boundary vectors. $\mathbf{a}_1 = a_m(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, -\frac{1}{2})$ and $\mathbf{a}_2 = a_m(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, +\frac{1}{2})$. $\mathbf{T}_i = \frac{2\pi\epsilon_{ij}\mathbf{L}_j \times \hat{z}}{|\mathbf{L}_1 \times \mathbf{L}_2|}$ are the momentum basis vectors. Mesh points $\mathbf{k} = k_1\mathbf{T}_1 + k_2\mathbf{T}_2$ (modulo reciprocal lattice vector) points are labeled by the integer $k = k_1 + N_1k_2$. k_i takes on all integer values from 0 through $(N_i - 1)$.

III. WORKING ON A TORUS WITH A NET MAGNETIC FLUX

Here we describe how we perform calculations on the adiabatic effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} (Eq. 2 in the main text), which contains a net magnetic flux, on a torus. We take an algebraic approach, exploiting the magnetic translation algebra. Our discussion builds on the supplementary material of Ref. [13].

We begin with the standard LL Hamiltonian, $H_{\text{LL}} = \pi^2/(2m) = \hbar\omega_c(a^\dagger a + 1/2)$. Here $\pi = \mathbf{p} + \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r})$, $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}) = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) = -B_0\hat{z}$ (this sign choice, with $B_0 > 0$ and (electron charge) $= -e < 0$, gives holomorphic rather than antiholomorphic LLL wavefunctions, up to the Gaussian factor), $a = \frac{\ell}{\hbar\sqrt{2}}(\pi_x + i\pi_y)$, $\omega_c = eB_0/(mc)$, $2\pi\ell^2 B_0 = \Phi_0$, and $\Phi_0 = hc/e$ is the flux quantum. H_{LL} is not translation invariant: $[T(\mathbf{d}), H_{\text{LL}}] \neq 0$ where $T(\mathbf{d}) = e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{r}}$ is the translation operator. However, since $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}) = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r})$ is translation invariant, π is translation invariant up to a gauge transformation: $T(\mathbf{d})\pi T^\dagger(\mathbf{d}) = \pi + \nabla\chi_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{r}) = e^{-i\chi_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{r})}\pi e^{i\chi_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{r})}$ where $\chi_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{2\pi}{\Phi_0} \int_{\mathbf{r}'}^{\mathbf{r}+\mathbf{d}} d\mathbf{r}' \cdot \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}')$. This motivates the definition of a magnetic translation operator [14, 15]

$$t(\mathbf{d}) = e^{i\chi_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{r})}T(\mathbf{d}) \quad (15)$$

that bakes the gauge transformation into the translation operator and is a symmetry of the Hamiltonian: $[t(\mathbf{d}), \pi] = 0 = [t(\mathbf{d}), H_{\text{LL}}]$.

It follows from the definition of $\chi_{\mathbf{d}}(\mathbf{r})$ that

$$t(\mathbf{d}')t(\mathbf{d}) = e^{i\frac{1}{2\ell^2}\mathbf{d}' \wedge \mathbf{d}}t(\mathbf{d} + \mathbf{d}') \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbf{d}' \wedge \mathbf{d} = (\mathbf{d}' \times \mathbf{d}) \cdot \hat{z}$. Eq. 16 is the magnetic translation algebra. Note that $\mathbf{d}' \wedge \mathbf{d}/\ell^2 = 2\pi\Phi(\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}')/\Phi_0$ where $\Phi(\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}')$ is the magnetic flux enclosed by the rhombus with sides \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}' .

It is useful to decompose the position operator into a ‘‘Landau orbit’’ $\tilde{\mathbf{R}} = \frac{\ell^2}{\hbar}\hat{z} \times \pi$ and ‘‘guiding center’’ \mathbf{R} : $\mathbf{r} = \tilde{\mathbf{R}} + \mathbf{R}$ [13, 16]. The cartesian components of the guiding center and Landau orbits obey the algebra

$$[R_i, R_j] = -i\epsilon_{ij}\ell^2; [\tilde{R}_i, \tilde{R}_j] = +i\epsilon_{ij}\ell^2; [R_i, \tilde{R}_j] = 0. \quad (17)$$

The Landau level index lowering operator is related to the Landau orbit as $a = \frac{1}{\ell\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{R}_y - i\tilde{R}_x)$.

In any gauge in which $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}') = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}')$, the magnetic translation operator becomes

$$t(\mathbf{d}) = e^{i\mathbf{P}\cdot\mathbf{d}/\hbar} \quad (18)$$

where $\mathbf{P} = \frac{\hbar}{2}\hat{z} \times \mathbf{R}$ is the generator of magnetic translations. It is useful to define the magnetic momentum boost operator

$$\tau(\mathbf{q}) = e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \quad (19)$$

which is equivalent to the magnetic translation operator: $t(\mathbf{d}) = \tau(\mathbf{d} \times \hat{z}/\ell^2)$. Written in terms of the magnetic momentum boost operators, the magnetic translation algebra is

$$\tau(\mathbf{q}')\tau(\mathbf{q}) = e^{i\frac{\ell^2}{2}\mathbf{q}'\wedge\mathbf{q}}\tau(\mathbf{q}' + \mathbf{q}). \quad (20)$$

Yet another useful way to express the magnetic translation algebra is

$$t(\mathbf{d})\tau(\mathbf{q}) = e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{d}}\tau(\mathbf{q})t(\mathbf{d}). \quad (21)$$

We work on a torus defined by the two primitive boundary vectors $\mathbf{L}_1, \mathbf{L}_2$. A choice of magnetic boundary conditions Φ_i defines a single-particle Hilbert space in which all states $|\psi\rangle$ obey the equation $t(\mathbf{L}_i)|\psi\rangle = e^{i2\pi\Phi_i}|\psi\rangle$ [17, 18]. The number of flux quanta through the surface of the torus is $N_\Phi = B_0\mathbf{L}_1 \wedge \mathbf{L}_2/(2\pi\ell^2)$. The magnetic boundary condition requires $[t(\mathbf{L}_1), t(\mathbf{L}_2)] = 0$ which implies that N_Φ must be an integer. We define the primitive wavevectors $\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2$ by the condition that $\tau(N_\Phi\mathbf{Q}_i) = t(\mathbf{L}_i)$, which gives $\mathbf{Q}_i = \epsilon_{ij}\mathbf{L}_j \times \hat{z}/(N_\Phi\ell^2)$. For $\tau(\mathbf{q})|\psi\rangle$ to belong to the same Hilbert space as $|\psi\rangle$ (that is, obey the same boundary condition), it must be that $[\tau(\mathbf{q}), \tau(\mathbf{L}_i)] = [\tau(\mathbf{q}), \tau(N_\Phi\mathbf{Q}_i)] = 0$. In turn, this requires $\mathbf{q} = q_1\mathbf{Q}_1 + q_2\mathbf{Q}_2$ for integer q_1, q_2 . These are the allowed (=boundary-condition-preserving) wavevectors \mathbf{q} .

We define primitive magnetic lattice vectors \mathbf{a}_i that obey condition $\mathbf{a}_1 \wedge \mathbf{a}_2 = 2\pi\ell^2$ – that is, that the magnetic unit cell, the rhombus defined by \mathbf{a}_1 and \mathbf{a}_2 , encloses one flux quantum. Additionally, we require that the magnetic unit cell tile the torus, meaning that there exists a matrix M with integer elements such that $\mathbf{L}_i = M_{ij}\mathbf{a}_j$. It follows from the magnetic translation algebra that the set of operators $t(\mathbf{A})$ mutually commute where $\mathbf{A} = A_1\mathbf{a}_1 + A_2\mathbf{a}_2$ (with integer A_i) is a magnetic lattice vector. Because $[H_{\text{LL}}, t(\mathbf{A})] = 0$, we can define a LL magnetic Bloch basis $|n, \mathbf{k}\rangle$ that simultaneously diagonalizes H_{LL} and $t(\mathbf{A})$. Here n is the LL index and \mathbf{k} labels the eigenvalues of $t(\mathbf{A})$ in a way we now discuss.

Let $|0, \mathbf{0}\rangle$ be a LLL magnetic Bloch state and define ϕ_i by the equation $t(\mathbf{a}_i)|0, \mathbf{0}\rangle = e^{i2\pi\phi_i}|0, \mathbf{0}\rangle$. We note that the magnetic primitive lattice vector boundary condition ϕ_i is related to the torus magnetic boundary condition Φ_i as $\Phi_i = M_{ij}\phi_j + \frac{1}{2}M_{i1}M_{i2}$. Given $|0, \mathbf{0}\rangle$, the general LL magnetic Bloch state is

$$|n, \mathbf{k}\rangle = |n\rangle \otimes |\mathbf{k}\rangle \quad (22)$$

where

$$|n\rangle = \frac{(a^\dagger)^n}{\sqrt{n!}}|0\rangle \quad (23)$$

and

$$|\mathbf{k}\rangle = \tau(\mathbf{k})|0\rangle \quad (24)$$

where \mathbf{k} is an allowed wavevector as defined above.

With these definitions, the property

$$t(\mathbf{a}_i)|\mathbf{k}\rangle = e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{a}_i + 2\pi\phi_i)}|\mathbf{k}\rangle \quad (25)$$

follows from the magnetic translation algebra, Eq. 21. We emphasize that it is not possible to satisfy the equation $t(\mathbf{A})|\mathbf{k}\rangle = e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{A} + 2\pi\phi_i)}|\mathbf{k}\rangle$ (analogous to the ordinary Bloch case) for all magnetic lattice vectors \mathbf{A} because this would contradict the magnetic translation algebra.

We define the primitive magnetic reciprocal lattice vectors $\mathbf{b}_i = \epsilon_{ij}\mathbf{a}_j \times \hat{z}/\ell^2$ to obey the usual $\mathbf{a}_i \cdot \mathbf{b}_j = 2\pi\delta_{ij}$. From this definition, we have $t(\mathbf{a}_i) = \tau(-\epsilon_{ij}\mathbf{b}_j)$. Since $|\mathbf{k}\rangle$ is an eigenstate of $t(\mathbf{A})$, it must also be an eigenstate of all $\tau(\mathbf{g})$ where $\mathbf{g} = g_1\mathbf{b}_1 + g_2\mathbf{b}_2$ for integer g_1, g_2 is a magnetic reciprocal lattice vector. Therefore, $|\mathbf{k}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{g}\rangle$ are redundant labels for the same quantum state differing only by an overall phase. The number of unique states

$|\mathbf{k}\rangle$ is therefore equal to the number of allowed \mathbf{q} that are unique modulo \mathbf{g} . This number is N_{Φ} , the expected LL degeneracy.

We now write the wavefunction of the state $|0, \mathbf{0}\rangle$ only to show that it exists. We will not use it for calculations. In the symmetric gauge $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\hbar}{2\ell^2} \mathbf{r} \times \hat{z}$, the wavefunction of this state is

$$\langle z, \bar{z} | 0, \mathbf{0} \rangle = \tilde{\sigma} \left(z + \frac{\phi_i - \frac{1}{2}}{\bar{a}_i} \right) e^{-|z|^2/2} \quad (26)$$

where $z = \frac{1}{\ell\sqrt{2}}(x + iy)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(z)$ is the modified Weierstrass sigma function [13, 16, 19], which is holomorphic (entire) and quasiperiodic with respect to the magnetic lattice (that is, $\{\mathbf{A}\}$ sent to the complex plane). The property $t(\mathbf{a}_i)|0, \mathbf{0}\rangle = e^{i2\pi\phi_i}|0, \mathbf{0}\rangle$ can be verified by using the explicit symmetric gauge form of $t(\mathbf{a}_i)$ and the quasiperiodicity of the modified Weierstrass sigma function under magnetic lattice translations: $\tilde{\sigma}(z + a_i) = -e^{\bar{a}_i(z + \frac{a_i}{2})}\tilde{\sigma}(z)$ [13]. This wavefunction lives in the LLL because it is the product of a Gaussian and a holomorphic function and thus is annihilated by the LL index lowering operator a .

The central ingredient in our numerical calculations is the matrix element

$$\langle m, \mathbf{p} | e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} | n, \mathbf{k} \rangle = \langle m | e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{R}}} | n \rangle \langle \mathbf{p} | \tau(\mathbf{q}) | \mathbf{k} \rangle. \quad (27)$$

We have

$$\langle m | e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{R}}} | n \rangle = e^{-\ell^2|\mathbf{q}|^2/4} G_{mn}(q) \quad (28)$$

where $q = \ell(q_x + iq_y)/\sqrt{2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} G_{mn}(f) &= \langle m | e^{fa^\dagger} e^{-\bar{f}a} | n \rangle \\ &= \begin{cases} f^{m-n} \sqrt{\frac{m!}{n!}} L_n^{m-n}(|f|^2) & n \leq m \\ (-\bar{f})^{n-m} \sqrt{\frac{m!}{n!}} L_m^{n-m}(|f|^2) & n > m. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

This can be derived by noting that $i\mathbf{q} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{R}} = (qa^\dagger - \bar{q}a)$, using the BCH formula to show $e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\tilde{\mathbf{R}}} = e^{(qa^\dagger - \bar{q}a)} = e^{-|q|^2/2} e^{qa^\dagger} e^{-\bar{q}a}$, Taylor expanding these exponentials, simplifying using harmonic oscillator algebra, and comparing to the power series definition of the generalized Laguerre polynomials $L_n^\alpha(x)$. We caution against potential numerical instability in computing the Laguerre polynomials for large LL index. We find that the `ClassicalOrthogonalPolynomials.jl` package works well.

Next, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{p} | \tau(\mathbf{q}) | \mathbf{k} \rangle = e^{i\frac{\ell^2}{2}(-\mathbf{p}\wedge(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q})+\mathbf{q}\wedge\mathbf{k})} \sum_{\mathbf{g}} \delta_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{p},\mathbf{g}} \eta(\mathbf{g}) \quad (30)$$

where

$$\eta(\mathbf{g}) = \langle \mathbf{0} | \tau(\mathbf{g}) | \mathbf{0} \rangle. \quad (31)$$

This follows from the definition of $|\mathbf{k}\rangle$ and the magnetic translation algebra. Setting $\phi_1 = \phi_2 = \frac{1}{2}$ gives $\eta(\mathbf{g}) = +1$ if both g_1 and g_2 are even and -1 otherwise. With this choice of ϕ_i , the wavefunction $\langle z, \bar{z} | 0, \mathbf{0} \rangle$ has its zero at the origin and the collective set of zeros of $\langle z, \bar{z} | 0, \mathbf{k} \rangle$ over all \mathbf{k} is inversion symmetric about the origin. Therefore, it best respects the point group symmetries about the origin of the Hamiltonian at hand. For this reason, it corresponds most directly to periodic boundary conditions in the absence of magnetic flux and is the choice we use throughout this work.

The Hamiltonian for an electron in a periodic magnetic field and scalar potential with net one flux quantum per unit cell is

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{\pi^2}{2m} + V(\mathbf{r}) \\ &= \hbar\omega_c \left[a^\dagger a + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta A_+ \delta A_-}{(\ell B_0)^2} + \frac{\delta A_-}{\ell B_0} a + a^\dagger \frac{\delta A_+}{\ell B_0} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta B}{B_0} + \frac{V}{\hbar\omega_c} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $\omega_c = e|B_0|/(mc)$ is the cyclotron frequency and we leave the \mathbf{r} -dependence implicit in the second line. The effective Hamiltonian for SCB models, Eq. 2 in the main text, takes this form. Here we define $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}) = -(B_0 + \delta B)\hat{z}$ where δB has zero spatial average. Similarly, we define $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_0 + \delta\mathbf{A}$ such that $\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_0 = -B_0\hat{z}$ and $\nabla \times \delta\mathbf{A} = -\delta B\hat{z}$. Fourier expanding the magnetic field fluctuations as where $\omega_c = e|B_0|/(mc)$ is the cyclotron frequency and we leave the \mathbf{r} -dependence implicit in the second line. The effective Hamiltonian for SCB models, Eq. 2 in the main text, takes this form. Here we define $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}) = -(B_0 + \delta B)\hat{z}$ where δB has zero spatial average. Similarly, we define $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_0 + \delta\mathbf{A}$ such that $\nabla \times \mathbf{A}_0 = -B_0\hat{z}$ and $\nabla \times \delta\mathbf{A} = -\delta B\hat{z}$. Fourier expanding the magnetic field fluctuations as $\delta B(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{g}} \delta B_{\mathbf{g}} e^{i\mathbf{g}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \hat{z}$, we have $\delta\mathbf{A} = i \sum_{\mathbf{g}} (g_y, -g_x) \frac{(-\delta B_{\mathbf{g}})}{|\mathbf{g}|^2} e^{i\mathbf{g}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \equiv \sum_{\mathbf{g}} \delta\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{g}} e^{i\mathbf{g}\cdot\mathbf{r}}$. $\delta A_+ = \delta A_x + i\delta A_y$ and $\delta A_- = \delta A_x - i\delta A_y$. Since $\delta A(\mathbf{r})$ is periodic, the Bravais lattice magnetic translation operators $t(\mathbf{A})$ are unmodified from the uniform-field case discussed above.

In practice, we obtain the effective magnetic field and scalar potential Fourier coefficients of an SCB model by numerically evaluating the spin texture $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r})$ on a fine, uniform grid spanning a single Bravais lattice unit cell, calculating derivatives entering the effective magnetic field and the $(\partial_i \hat{S})^2$ term through finite difference (whose convergence we verified), and then numerically Fourier transforming.

The formulas we provide here allow for numerical diagonalization of Eq. 32 in the magnetic Bloch basis $|n, \mathbf{k}\rangle$. The resultant magnetic Bloch band eigenstates $|i, \mathbf{k}\rangle$ where i is a band index are linear combinations of LL magnetic Bloch states at the same $|\mathbf{k}\rangle$: $|i, \mathbf{k}\rangle = \sum_n z_{in\mathbf{k}} |n, \mathbf{k}\rangle$. The LL weight from the main text is then $W_i = \frac{1}{N_{uc}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} |z_{i(i-1)\mathbf{k}}|^2$. Interaction matrix elements can be calculated from $\langle m, \mathbf{p} | e^{-i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} | n, \mathbf{k}\rangle$ as usual. Explicitly, the LL basis matrix elements of a two-body interaction \hat{V} with Fourier transformed interaction potential $v(\mathbf{q})$ are

$$\langle n_1, \mathbf{k}_1; n_2, \mathbf{k}_2 | \hat{V} | n_3, \mathbf{k}_3; n_4, \mathbf{k}_4 \rangle = \frac{1}{A} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} v(\mathbf{q}) \langle n_1, \mathbf{k}_1 | e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} | n_3, \mathbf{k}_3 \rangle \langle n_2, \mathbf{k}_2 | e^{-i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} | n_4, \mathbf{k}_4 \rangle. \quad (33)$$

Two-body interaction matrix elements in a generic magnetic Bloch band with index i are then

$$\langle i, \mathbf{k}_1; i, \mathbf{k}_2 | \hat{V} | i, \mathbf{k}_3; i, \mathbf{k}_4 \rangle = \sum_{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4} z_{in_1\mathbf{k}_1}^* z_{in_2\mathbf{k}_2}^* z_{in_3\mathbf{k}_3} z_{in_4\mathbf{k}_4} \langle n_1, \mathbf{k}_1; n_2, \mathbf{k}_2 | \hat{V} | n_3, \mathbf{k}_3; n_4, \mathbf{k}_4 \rangle. \quad (34)$$

IV. HARTREE-FOCK SELF ENERGY

In this work, we consider many-body states in which the second miniband is partially occupied and the first miniband is full. Electrons in the second miniband acquire a Hartree-Fock self-energy through their interaction with electrons in the full first band. To show this, we consider the Hamiltonian of a generic multi-band system of electrons with a two-body interaction:

$$H = \sum_{i, \mathbf{k}} \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{k}) c_{i, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger c_{i, \mathbf{k}} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijklm} \sum_{\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{p}'\mathbf{k}\mathbf{p}} V_{i\mathbf{k}', j\mathbf{p}'; l\mathbf{k}, m\mathbf{p}} c_{i, \mathbf{k}'}^\dagger c_{j, \mathbf{p}'}^\dagger c_{m, \mathbf{p}} c_{l, \mathbf{k}}. \quad (35)$$

Here i is a band index and \mathbf{k} is a crystal momentum label. $V_{i\mathbf{k}', j\mathbf{p}'; l\mathbf{k}, m\mathbf{p}} = \langle i\mathbf{k}', j\mathbf{p}' | \hat{V} | l\mathbf{k}, m\mathbf{p} \rangle$ is a two-body interaction matrix element. We assume a translation-invariant two body potential so that $V_{i\mathbf{k}', j\mathbf{p}'; l\mathbf{k}, m\mathbf{p}} \propto \sum_{\mathbf{g}} \delta_{\mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{k}+\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{g}}$ where \mathbf{g} is a reciprocal lattice vector. Consider a ‘‘Fermi sea’’ single-Slater-determinant made of a full set of bands $|\text{FS}\rangle = \left(\prod_{i \in \text{full}} \prod_{\mathbf{k}} c_{i, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger \right) |0\rangle$ where $|0\rangle$ is the vacuum state annihilated by all $c_{i, \mathbf{k}}$. Using Wick’s theorem (see appendix 3 of Ref. [20]), we can rewrite H exactly as

$$H = \sum_{i, \mathbf{k}} \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{k}) : c_{i, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger c_{i, \mathbf{k}} : + \sum_{ij, \mathbf{k}} \Sigma_{ij}(\mathbf{k}) : c_{i, \mathbf{k}}^\dagger c_{j, \mathbf{k}} : \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijklm} \sum_{\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{p}'\mathbf{k}\mathbf{p}} V_{i\mathbf{k}', j\mathbf{p}'; l\mathbf{k}, m\mathbf{p}} : c_{i, \mathbf{k}'}^\dagger c_{j, \mathbf{p}'}^\dagger c_{m, \mathbf{p}} c_{l, \mathbf{k}} : + \sum_{i \in \text{full}, \mathbf{k}} (\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{k}) + \Sigma_{ii}(\mathbf{k})) \quad (36)$$

Here ‘‘ $:$ ’’ denotes normal ordering with respect to $|\text{FS}\rangle$ (i.e. moving all ladder operators that annihilate $|\text{FS}\rangle$ to the right of those that do not, keeping track of minus signs coming from Fermi statistics). Also,

$$\Sigma_{ij}(\mathbf{k}) = \Sigma_{ij}^H(\mathbf{k}) + \Sigma_{ij}^F(\mathbf{k}) \\ = \sum_{l \in \text{full}} \sum_{\mathbf{p}} (V_{i\mathbf{k}, l\mathbf{p}; j\mathbf{k}, l\mathbf{p}} - V_{i\mathbf{k}, l\mathbf{p}; l\mathbf{p}, j\mathbf{k}}) \quad (37)$$

is the Hartree-Fock self-energy. Assuming $|\text{FS}\rangle = \left(\prod_{\mathbf{k}} c_{1,\mathbf{k}}^\dagger\right) |0\rangle$ and retaining only terms for which the band index is 2 (i.e. projecting to the second miniband), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{H} = & \sum_{\mathbf{k}} (\varepsilon_2(\mathbf{k}) + \Sigma_{22}(\mathbf{k})) c_{2,\mathbf{k}}^\dagger c_{2,\mathbf{k}} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{p}'\mathbf{k}\mathbf{p}} V_{2\mathbf{k}',2\mathbf{p}';2\mathbf{k},2\mathbf{p}} c_{2,\mathbf{k}'}^\dagger c_{2,\mathbf{p}'}^\dagger c_{2,\mathbf{p}} c_{2,\mathbf{k}} + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} (\varepsilon_1(\mathbf{k}) + \Sigma_{11}(\mathbf{k})). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

This is equivalent to Eq. 4 of the main text, except for a term that depends only on the number of particles in the second band. This term includes a constant coming from the full band one-body and Hartree-Fock self-energies and a particle-number-dependent self-interaction energy coming from the fact that the interaction term in Eq. 4 of the main text is written as $\bar{\rho}(-\mathbf{q})\bar{\rho}(\mathbf{q})$ rather than $:\bar{\rho}(-\mathbf{q})\bar{\rho}(\mathbf{q}):$ (here, because $\bar{\rho}(\mathbf{q})$ involved only second-band ladder operators, it makes no difference whether the normal ordering “:” is with respect to $|\text{FS}\rangle$ or $|0\rangle$). Because the self-interaction energy depends only on the particle number, it does not affect $E - E_{GS}$ at fixed particle number.

We emphasize that $\langle \text{FS} | A\bar{H}B | \text{FS} \rangle = \langle \text{FS} | AHB | \text{FS} \rangle$ where A and B are arbitrary polynomials in the $c_{2,\mathbf{k}}$'s and $c_{2,\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$'s. This is because all terms in H (Eq. 36) are normal ordered with respect to $|\text{FS}\rangle$. All such terms involving non-second-band ladder operators thus annihilate $A|\text{FS}\rangle$. The only terms in H that contribute to the above matrix element are those involving only second-band ladder operators or numbers. These terms appear both in H and \bar{H} and make identical contributions to both matrix elements. It follows that diagonalizing \bar{H} in a basis spanned by the set of states $\{A|\text{FS}\rangle\}$ is equivalent to diagonalizing H in that basis. In other words, **calculating the ground state of \bar{H} in the basis $\{A|\text{FS}\rangle\}$ is equivalent to variationally minimizing H in this basis.** Further, $\langle \text{FS} | A\bar{H}B | \text{FS} \rangle = \langle 0 | A\bar{H}B | 0 \rangle$, so we are free to think of our basis states as either $\{A|0\rangle\}$ or $\{A|\text{FS}\rangle\}$ for the purpose of calculation. The latter choice is more physically meaningful.

V. ADIABATIC MODEL FOR TWISTED MOTE₂

The adiabatic model for $t\text{MoTe}_2$ was originally derived in Ref. [21]. While Ref. [21] works in the electron picture, we work in the hole picture, as in Ref. [22]. We use the continuum model parameters for $t\text{MoTe}_2$ defined in Table I of Ref. [22]. The K -valley projected continuum model for AA-stacked TMD homobilayers is given in layer space by [23]

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^*}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_b)^2 + \Delta_b(\mathbf{r}) & \Delta_T(\mathbf{r}) \\ \Delta_T(\mathbf{r})^\dagger & \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^*}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_t)^2 + \Delta_t(\mathbf{r}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (39)$$

The moiré potential and interlayer tunneling terms are given by

$$\Delta_{b/t} = -2V \sum_{i=1,3,5} \cos(\mathbf{g}_i \cdot \mathbf{r} \pm \phi) \quad (40a)$$

$$\Delta_T(\mathbf{r}) = w(1 + e^{-i\mathbf{g}_2 \cdot \mathbf{r}} + e^{-i\mathbf{g}_3 \cdot \mathbf{r}}), \quad (40b)$$

where V, w and ϕ are parameters which depend on the homobilayer. We adopt the parameters from Ref. [22] for $t\text{MoTe}_2$: $(V, w, \phi) = (11.2\text{meV}, -13.3\text{meV}, -91^\circ)$. The momentum shifts in the top and bottom layers are given by $\mathbf{k}_{b/t} = k_\theta(-1/2, \pm 1/2\sqrt{3})$ and the first shell of moiré reciprocal lattice vectors are $\mathbf{g}_j = k_\theta(\cos(\pi(j-1)/3), \sin(\pi(j-1)/3))$ for $j = 1, \dots, 6$, with $k_\theta = 4\pi/\sqrt{3}a$. The Hamiltonian for the opposite valley is the time reversal conjugate of H . To map this model onto a skyrmion Chern band model as discussed in the main text, it is necessary to remove the layer-dependent momentum shifts in the kinetic terms. This is accomplished by a gauge transformation $H \rightarrow UHU^\dagger = H'$ where

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\mathbf{k}_b \cdot \mathbf{r}} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\mathbf{k}_t \cdot \mathbf{r}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (41)$$

after which the tunneling becomes $\tilde{\Delta}_T(\mathbf{r}) = \Delta_T(\mathbf{r})e^{i(\mathbf{k}_b - \mathbf{k}_t) \cdot \mathbf{r}}$. The new Hamiltonian can be written

$$H' = \frac{\hbar^2 \mathbf{k}^2}{2m^*} \sigma_0 + \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + V(\mathbf{r}) \sigma_0 \quad (42)$$




FIG. 9. (a) Berry curvature $F(\mathbf{k})$ and (b) quantum metric trace $\text{tr}g(\mathbf{k})$ of the second $t\text{MoTe}_2$ adiabatic model band at $\theta = 2.5^\circ$. σ_{BC} is the standard deviation of the Berry curvature, in units such that its average is unity. S_{BZ} is the k -space area of the Brillouin zone.

where $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r}) = (\text{Re}(\tilde{\Delta}_T), \text{Im}(\tilde{\Delta}_T), \frac{\Delta_b - \Delta_t}{2})$ and $V(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\Delta_b + \Delta_t}{2}$. H' is now in skyrmion Chern band model form, except for an additional scalar potential term $V(\mathbf{r})\sigma_0$. The effective adiabatic Hamiltonian results from performing the same manipulations leading from Eq. (1) to Eq. (2) in the main text.

In Fig. 9, we show the Berry curvature and the trace of the quantum metric of the second $t\text{MoTe}_2$ adiabatic model band at $\theta = 2.5^\circ$.

-
- [1] G. Moore and N. Read, Nucl. Phys. B **360**, 362 (1991).
 - [2] E. H. Rezayi and F. D. M. Haldane, Physical Review Letters **84**, 4685 (2000).
 - [3] D. Yoshioka, *The quantum Hall effect*, Vol. 133 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2013).
 - [4] Y.-L. Wu, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, Physical Review B **86**, 085129 (2012).
 - [5] Y.-L. Wu, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, Physical review letters **110**, 106802 (2013).
 - [6] M. Levin, B. I. Halperin, and B. Rosenow, Physical review letters **99**, 236806 (2007).
 - [7] S.-S. Lee, S. Ryu, C. Nayak, and M. P. Fisher, Physical review letters **99**, 236807 (2007).
 - [8] H. Li and F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 010504 (2008).
 - [9] A. Sterdyniak, N. Regnault, and B. A. Bernevig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 100405 (2011).
 - [10] E. J. Bergholtz and A. Karlhede, Physical Review B **77**, 155308 (2008).
 - [11] B. A. Bernevig and F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 246802 (2008).
 - [12] E. Ardonne, E. J. Bergholtz, J. Kailasvuori, and E. Wikberg, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2008**, P04016 (2008).
 - [13] J. Wang, J. Cano, A. J. Millis, Z. Liu, and B. Yang, Physical review letters **127**, 246403 (2021).
 - [14] J. Zak, Physical Review **134**, A1602 (1964).
 - [15] S. M. Girvin and K. Yang, *Modern condensed matter physics* (Cambridge University Press, 2019).
 - [16] F. Haldane, Journal of Mathematical Physics **59** (2018).
 - [17] F. D. M. Haldane and E. H. Rezayi, Physical Review B **31**, 2529 (1985).
 - [18] F. Haldane, Physical review letters **55**, 2095 (1985).
 - [19] F. Haldane, Journal of Mathematical Physics **59** (2018).
 - [20] G. Giuliani and G. Vignale, *Quantum theory of the electron liquid* (Cambridge university press, 2008).
 - [21] N. Morales-Durán, N. Wei, J. Shi, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, 096602 (2024).
 - [22] A. P. Reddy, F. Alsallom, Y. Zhang, T. Devakul, and L. Fu, Phys. Rev. B **108**, 085117 (2023).
 - [23] F. Wu, T. Lovorn, E. Tutuc, I. Martin, and A. MacDonald, Physical review letters **122**, 086402 (2019).