

Rigorous lower bound of dynamic critical exponents in critical frustration-free systems

Rintaro Masaoka,¹ Tomohiro Soejima,² and Haruki Watanabe^{1,*}

¹*Department of Applied Physics, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan*

²*Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*

(Dated: June 11, 2024)

The dynamic critical exponent z characterizes the finite-size gap in gapless quantum many-body systems. We establish a rigorous lower bound $z \geq 2$ for frustration-free Hamiltonians on any lattice in any spatial dimension, given that their ground state exhibits a power-law decaying correlation function. This bound applies to representative classes of frustration-free Hamiltonians, including Rokhsar-Kivelson Hamiltonians, which are in one-to-one correspondence to Markov chains with locality, as well as parent Hamiltonians of critical projected entangled pair states with either a unique ground state or topologically degenerate ground states, and Hamiltonians with a plane-wave ground state.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum many-body systems are generally complex to solve. One way to approach this problem is to develop intuition and understanding from tractable models. A class of such systems called frustration-free systems has attracted much attention in condensed matter physics because it includes various models despite its simplicity. A Hamiltonian is frustration-free if and only if the ground states of Hamiltonian simultaneously minimize all local terms of the Hamiltonian.

Although frustration-free systems are fine-tuned, they provide pivotal representative models for various gapped phases. The Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki (AKLT) model helps to understand a 1D symmetry-protected topological phase [1]. The Kitaev toric code provided a solvable model for 2D topological ordered phase [2]. The success of these models is based on the scenario that a frustration-free nature does not affect the universal properties of gapped quantum phases.

However, gapless frustration-free systems often behave differently from ordinary gapless systems. For example, the dynamic critical exponent of frustration-free gapless systems takes different values compared to those of ordinary gapless systems. The dynamic critical exponent z of a Hamiltonian is defined by the behavior of the finite size gap $\epsilon \sim L^{-z}$, where L is the linear dimension of the system. In contrast to ordinary gapless systems, which exhibit $z = 1$ due to emergent Lorentz symmetry, gapless frustration-free systems tend to exhibit $z \geq 2$. This behavior is quite interesting because it cannot be described by relativistic conformal field theory. The observation that gapless frustration-free systems often appear as multicritical points in phase diagrams [3–5] also suggests the peculiarity of this class.

There are numerical confirmations of the lower bound $z \geq 2$ in many examples such as the Rokhsar–Kivelson (RK) point of the quantum dimer model [6–8], ferromagnetic Heisenberg models [9, 10], and many other mod-

els [4, 5, 11–18]. In some models, it has also been observed numerically that the dynamic critical exponent changes from $z \geq 2$ to $z = 1$ when a perturbation violates frustration-freeness [4, 11, 13]. Therefore, frustration-freeness is considered to be strongly related to the dynamic critical exponent.

Despite these numerous indications, there is no general proof of $z \geq 2$ and only partial results. This bound has been shown analytically for specific frustration-free systems [7, 8, 10, 19, 20] with Nambu-Goldstone modes, and this result is generalized to the systems with quasi-Nambu-Goldstone modes [20]. However, other examples suggest that a more profound understanding is possible. Also, there are upper bounds of the spectral gap for translation-invariant frustration-free Hamiltonians in the open boundary condition [21–23], which yields $z \geq 2$ for gapless frustration-free Hamiltonian [13]. However, we cannot use this inequality as an upper bound for bulk modes since we cannot rule out the possibility that low-energy excitations are edge modes [13].

In this paper, we first give proof of $z \geq 2$ for a broader class of frustration-free systems whose ground states have correlation functions that exhibit power-law decay as the system size increases. This result does not assume translation invariance and is independent of boundary conditions. The proof uses an inequality by Gosset and Huang [24], which is based on the detectability lemma [25, 26]. Our result covers RK Hamiltonians [6, 27, 28] with a critical ground state and parent Hamiltonians of projected entangled pair states (PEPS) [29–31] as long as the PEPS is critical. The established bound implies that the critical frustration-free systems cannot be described by relativistic conformal field theories.

Our result also has important implications for the dynamic critical exponents of Markov chains for critical statistical systems. In statistical mechanics, the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method is an essential numerical technique for sampling probability distributions of huge dimensions arising from many-body systems. It is known that RK Hamiltonians, a class of frustration-free Hamiltonians, correspond to local Markov chains with

* hwatanabe@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

TABLE I: Dynamic critical exponents for MCMC with local state updates and detailed balance condition. For all examples in this list, $z \geq 2$ holds.

Models	Dynamic critical exponent z
Ising (2D)	2.1667(5) [14]
Ising (3D)	2.0245(15) [15]
Heisenberg (3D)	2.033(5) [16]
Three-state Potts (2D)	2.193(5) [17]
Four-state Potts (2D)	2.296(5) [18]

detailed balance condition [27, 28]. The gapless nature of RK Hamiltonians corresponds to the divergence of the relaxation time of Markov chains. This is characterized by the relaxation time τ being proportional to L^z , where L is the system size. The dynamic critical exponent z is the same as in the RK Hamiltonian. Using this correspondence, we can provide a rigorous proof for the empirical fact that $z \geq 2$ for the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method with local state updates and detailed balance condition (Table I). This class of algorithms includes the most standard methods such as Gibbs sampling (heat bath) algorithm [32] and the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm [33, 34]. In the context of MCMC, there have long been efforts to reduce the relaxation time by nonlocal state updates [35, 36] and violating the detailed balance condition [37, 38]. The established bound stands as a no-go theorem that provides a rigorous foundation for these works: the dynamic critical exponents of Markov chains for critical systems cannot be smaller than two without violating locality or the detailed balance condition.

II. $z \geq 2$ FOR FRUSTRATION-FREE CRITICAL SYSTEMS

This section presents a general framework for proving the lower bound of dynamic critical exponents $z \geq 2$ for frustration-free systems. The proof relies on an inequality by Gosset and Huang [24].

A. Frustration-free Hamiltonians

We consider a Hamiltonian written as

$$\hat{H} = \sum_i \hat{H}_i \quad (1)$$

defined on a d -dimensional lattice Λ . The index i need not be associated with a lattice site in Λ . Each \hat{H}_i is a Hermitian operator with a finite range support, which is assumed to be independent of L . The local term \hat{H}_i is called local Hamiltonian. A Hamiltonian \hat{H} is frustration-free if there exists a ground state of \hat{H} simultaneously minimizes all \hat{H}_i . It follows that other ground states also

must simultaneously minimize all \hat{H}_i . We do not assume translation invariance.

B. The Gosset–Huang inequality

Let \hat{H} be a frustration-free Hamiltonian with the ground space projector \hat{G} and the spectral gap ϵ . The spectral gap is the energy difference between the ground states and the first excited state. We assume each \hat{H}_i is a projector.

Let $\hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\hat{O}'_{\mathbf{y}}$ be local operators which has finite range supports around $\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \Lambda$, respectively. For any normalized ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ of \hat{H} and local operators $\hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\hat{O}'_{\mathbf{y}}$, the following inequality holds [24].

$$\frac{|\langle \Psi | \hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger (\hat{\mathbb{1}} - \hat{G}) \hat{O}'_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi \rangle|}{\|\hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}} | \Psi \rangle\| \|\hat{O}'_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi \rangle\|} \leq 2 \exp\left(-g' |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{g^2 + \epsilon}}\right), \quad (2)$$

where $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|$ is the distance between \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} in Λ , and g and g' are constants determined by details of the Hamiltonian. We call this inequality the Gosset–Huang inequality. The accurate definitions of the constants and the proof of the inequality are explained in the Appendix A.

C. A proof of $z \geq 2$ for frustration-free critical systems

In this work, we define the dynamic critical exponent z for a Hamiltonian by

$$\epsilon = \Theta(L^{-z}), \quad (3)$$

where ϵ is the spectral gap of the Hamiltonian and L is the linear dimension of the system [39]. The dynamic critical exponent can depend on boundary conditions as exemplified by in Ref. [12].

Theorem 1. *For a frustration-free Hamiltonian with a ground space projector \hat{G} , the dynamic critical exponent z satisfies $z \geq 2$ if there exists a ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ and local operators $\hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\hat{O}'_{\mathbf{y}}$ such that*

$$\frac{|\langle \Psi | \hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger (\hat{\mathbb{1}} - \hat{G}) \hat{O}'_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi \rangle|}{\|\hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}} | \Psi \rangle\| \|\hat{O}'_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi \rangle\|} = \Omega(L^{-\Delta}). \quad (4)$$

for a positive number Δ and \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} with $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| = \Theta(L)$ [40].

Proof. First, we replace each local Hamiltonian with a projector while preserving its kernel. This operation does not change the ground states and the dynamic critical exponent. Using Eq. (3) and $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| = \Theta(L)$, the right-hand side of the Gosset–Huang inequality can be expressed as

$$2 \exp\left(-g' |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{g^2 + \epsilon}}\right) = 2 \exp(-\Omega(L^{1-z/2})). \quad (5)$$

Combining the assumption in Eq. (4) and the Gosset–Huang inequality, we have

$$\Omega(L^{-\Delta}) \leq 2 \exp(-\Omega(L^{1-z/2})). \quad (6)$$

If $z < 2$, this inequality is violated for a sufficiently large L . Thus, the dynamic critical exponent satisfies $z \geq 2$. \square

To find the correlation function in Eq. (4), we need to know not only the state $|\Psi\rangle$ but also all the other ground states. In many cases, however, it is sufficient to check that the correlation function for one $|\Psi\rangle$ satisfies

$$\frac{|\langle \Psi | \hat{O}_x^\dagger (\hat{1} - |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|) \hat{O}'_y | \Psi \rangle|}{\|\hat{O}_x|\Psi\rangle\| \|\hat{O}'_y|\Psi\rangle\|} = \Omega(L^{-\Delta}) \quad (7)$$

and

$$\frac{\langle \Psi | \hat{O}_x^\dagger | \Psi' \rangle}{\|\hat{O}_x|\Psi\rangle\|} = o(L^{-\Delta/2}), \quad \frac{\langle \Psi' | \hat{O}'_y | \Psi \rangle}{\|\hat{O}'_y|\Psi\rangle\|} = o(L^{-\Delta/2}) \quad (8)$$

for all other degenerate ground states $|\Psi'\rangle$ with $\langle \Psi | \Psi' \rangle = 0$. If the ground states are topologically degenerate, then the properties of (8) hold for any local operators \hat{O}_x^\dagger and \hat{O}'_y .

D. Classification of critical frustration-free systems

Let us distinguish two situations in which Theorem 1 can be used: (i) When the left-hand side of Eq. (4) exhibits power-law decay as $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| \rightarrow \infty$. (ii) When the left-hand side of Eq. (4) does not depend on \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} but exhibits power-law decay as $L \rightarrow \infty$.

In the first case, the ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ is critical. However, $|\Psi\rangle$ is distinguished from the ground state of conformal field theories since the dynamic critical exponent satisfies $z \geq 2$. Examples of Hamiltonians in this class are discussed in Sec. III and Sec. IV.

The second case is another type of criticality. This situation arises if there exists a ground state $|\Psi'\rangle$ with $\langle \Psi | \Psi' \rangle = 0$ such that

$$\langle \Psi | \hat{O}_x^\dagger | \Psi' \rangle \langle \Psi' | \hat{O}'_y | \Psi \rangle = \Omega(L^{-\Delta}) \quad (9)$$

for some $\Delta > 0$. This implies that different ground states can be connected by local operators. For example, in phases with spontaneous breaking of a continuous symmetry, $|\Psi'\rangle$ is given by applying the broken generator \hat{Q} to the ground state. Examples of Hamiltonians in this class are discussed in Sec. V.

III. ROKHSAR–KIVELSON HAMILTONIANS

Let us define the RK Hamiltonians and review their relations to Markov chains. The degeneracy of the ground states and correlation functions of RK Hamiltonians can be obtained using the correspondence to Markov chains.

A. Markov chain

We consider n -valued spins on a d dimensional lattice. Let \mathcal{C} be a classical spin configuration and $w(\mathcal{C})$ be its Boltzmann weight. The Boltzmann weights must be non-negative. We assume that the Boltzmann weight $w(\mathcal{C})$ is given by the product of the form

$$w(\mathcal{C}) = \prod_x w_x(\mathcal{C}), \quad (10)$$

and each local weight $w_x(\mathcal{C})$ depends only on spins in a finite region. The expectation value of a physical quantity \mathcal{O} in the Boltzmann distribution is defined by

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle := \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{w(\mathcal{C})}{Z} \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{C}), \quad (11)$$

where the partition function Z is written as

$$Z := \sum_{\mathcal{C}} w(\mathcal{C}). \quad (12)$$

The Markov chain is defined by the master equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} p_{\mathcal{C}} = \sum_{\mathcal{C}'} W_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'} p_{\mathcal{C}'}, \quad (13)$$

which describes the time evolution of the probability distribution $p_{\mathcal{C}}$. The transition-rate matrix $W_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'}$ must satisfy $W_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'} > 0$ when $\mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{C}'$ and the conservation of probability

$$\sum_{\mathcal{C}} W_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'} = 0. \quad (14)$$

We also assume the detailed balance condition

$$W_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'} w(\mathcal{C}') = W_{\mathcal{C}'\mathcal{C}} w(\mathcal{C}) \quad (15)$$

so that $p_{\mathcal{C}} = w(\mathcal{C})/Z$ is a steady state solution of the Master equation. This property is called the balance condition.

B. Rokhsar–Kivelson Hamiltonians

We consider the Hilbert space spanned by states $|\mathcal{C}\rangle$ labeled by classical configurations \mathcal{C} . For a given Boltzmann weight $w(\mathcal{C})$, we introduce the following state:

$$|\Psi_{\text{RK}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \sqrt{\frac{w(\mathcal{C})}{Z}} |\mathcal{C}\rangle. \quad (16)$$

For an operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ that satisfies $\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{\mathcal{O}} | \mathcal{C}' \rangle = \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{C}) \delta_{\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}'}$, the expectation values in $|\Psi_{\text{RK}}\rangle$ are equal to the one in Eq. (11):

$$\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} | \hat{\mathcal{O}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{w(\mathcal{C})}{Z} \langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{\mathcal{O}} | \mathcal{C} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle. \quad (17)$$

A Hamiltonian is called a Rokhsar–Kivelson (RK) Hamiltonian, or a stochastic matrix form Hamiltonian [27, 28] if (i) it is frustration-free, (ii) one of its ground states is written as Eq. (16), and (iii) the off-diagonal elements of local Hamiltonians in the classical configuration basis are real and non-positive, i.e., $\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{H}_i | \mathcal{C}' \rangle \leq 0$ when $\mathcal{C}' \neq \mathcal{C}$. It follows that \hat{H}_i is symmetric, i.e., $\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{H}_i | \mathcal{C}' \rangle = \langle \mathcal{C}' | \hat{H}_i | \mathcal{C} \rangle$.

C. Correspondence between Rokhsar–Kivelson Hamiltonians and Markov chains

Let us discuss the correspondence between RK Hamiltonians and Markov chains illustrated in Fig. 1.

Let $\hat{H} = \sum_i \hat{H}_i$ be an RK Hamiltonian. Without loss of generality, we assume the energy of the ground state is zero. We define a positive diagonal operator \hat{S} by

$$\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{S} | \mathcal{C}' \rangle := \sqrt{\frac{w(\mathcal{C})}{Z}} \delta_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'}. \quad (18)$$

and the local transition-rate matrix as

$$\hat{W}_i := -\hat{S} \hat{H}_i \hat{S}^{-1}. \quad (19)$$

Then the transition-rate matrix for the corresponding Markov chain is given by $\hat{W} := \sum_i \hat{W}_i$ and $W_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'} = \langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{W} | \mathcal{C}' \rangle$.

To clarify the properties of the local transition-rate matrix \hat{W}_i , let us define

$$\langle 1 | := \langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} | \hat{S}^{-1} = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \langle \mathcal{C} |, \quad (20)$$

$$|w\rangle := \hat{S} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{w(\mathcal{C})}{Z} | \mathcal{C} \rangle. \quad (21)$$

The former represents the (unnormalized) uniform distribution, and the latter represents a Boltzmann distribution. Since the Hamiltonian is frustration-free,

$$\sum_{\mathcal{C}} \langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{W}_i = \langle 1 | \hat{W}_i = -\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} | \hat{H}_i \hat{S}^{-1} = 0. \quad (22)$$

This means \hat{W}_i conserves probability. Also, since the off-diagonal elements of \hat{H}_i are non-positive, the off-diagonal elements of \hat{W}_i are non-negative. Therefore, \hat{W}_i is a transition-rate matrix. Furthermore, since \hat{H}_i is symmetric, \hat{W}_i satisfies the detailed balance condition:

$$\begin{aligned} (W_i)_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'} w(\mathcal{C}') &= -\sqrt{w(\mathcal{C})w(\mathcal{C}')} \langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{H}_i | \mathcal{C}' \rangle \\ &= -\sqrt{w(\mathcal{C}')w(\mathcal{C})} \langle \mathcal{C}' | \hat{H}_i | \mathcal{C} \rangle \\ &= (W_i)_{\mathcal{C}'\mathcal{C}} w(\mathcal{C}). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The balance condition $\hat{W}_i |w\rangle = 0$ can be expressed as $\hat{H}_i | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle = 0$. Since the local transition-rate matrix \hat{W}_i satisfies all the necessary properties, $\hat{W} := \sum_i \hat{W}_i$ is a legitimate transition-rate matrix for a Markov chain.




FIG. 1: Correspondence between an RK Hamiltonian and a Markov chain. The d -dimensional ground state corresponds to the d -dimensional Boltzmann distribution as in Eq. (17). The Hamiltonian and the transition-rate matrix of a Markov chain are connected by Eq. (19)

Conversely, we can construct an RK Hamiltonian from a Markov chain by reversing the above steps. A transition-rate matrix \hat{W} corresponding to an RK Hamiltonian can be written as $\hat{W} = \sum_i \hat{W}_i$. Each local \hat{W}_i has a finite range support and satisfies all the necessary properties to be a transition-rate matrix and the detailed balance condition on its own. The class satisfying these properties includes the Gibbs sampling (heat bath) algorithm [32] and the Metropolis-Hastings algorithms [33, 34]. We discuss the constructions of RK Hamiltonians from these algorithms in Sec. III G.

The above correspondences are summarized in Table II.

D. Dynamic critical exponent

The imaginary time evolution by an RK Hamiltonian written as $e^{-\hat{H}t}$ corresponds to a stochastic matrix $e^{\hat{W}t}$. Since $-\hat{H}$ and \hat{W} are connected by a similarity transformation, their spectra are the same. For a diagonal operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ in the basis $\{|\mathcal{C}\rangle\}$, the autocorrelation function [41] is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\mathcal{O}}(t) &:= \frac{\langle \mathcal{O}_{t_0+t} \mathcal{O}_{t_0} \rangle - \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle^2}{\langle \mathcal{O}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle^2} \\ &= \frac{\langle 1 | \hat{\mathcal{O}} e^{\hat{W}t} \hat{\mathcal{O}} |w\rangle - (\langle 1 | \hat{\mathcal{O}} |w\rangle)^2}{\langle 1 | \hat{\mathcal{O}}^2 |w\rangle - (\langle 1 | \hat{\mathcal{O}} |w\rangle)^2} \\ &= \frac{\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} | \hat{\mathcal{O}} e^{-\hat{H}t} \hat{\mathcal{O}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle - (\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} | \hat{\mathcal{O}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle)^2}{\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}^2 | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle - (\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} | \hat{\mathcal{O}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Let E_α be nonzero eigenvalues of \hat{H} . The autocorrelation function can be written as

$$A_{\mathcal{O}}(t) = \sum_{\alpha} a_{\alpha} \exp(-E_{\alpha} t). \quad (25)$$

The relaxation time τ is defined by

$$\tau := \max_{\alpha} \frac{1}{E_{\alpha}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}, \quad (26)$$

TABLE II: Correspondence between RK Hamiltonians and Markov chains

RK Hamiltonian	Markov chain
Hamiltonian: \hat{H}	Transition-rate matrix: $\hat{W} = -\hat{S}\hat{H}\hat{S}^{-1}$
Ground state expectation value: $\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} \hat{\mathcal{O}} \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle$	Boltzmann weight expectation value: $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle := \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \frac{w(\mathcal{C})}{Z} \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{C})$
Frustration-freeness: $\hat{H} = \sum_i \hat{H}_i$ with following properties	Locality: $\hat{W} = \sum_i \hat{W}_i$ with following properties
$\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} \hat{H}_i = 0$	Conservation of probability: $\sum_{\mathcal{C}'} (W_i)_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'} = 0$
$\hat{H}_i \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle = 0$	Balance condition: $\sum_{\mathcal{C}'} (W_i)_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'} w(\mathcal{C}') = 0$
Symmetry: $\langle \mathcal{C} \hat{H}_i \mathcal{C}' \rangle = \langle \mathcal{C}' \hat{H}_i \mathcal{C} \rangle$	Detailed balance condition: $(W_i)_{\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}'} w(\mathcal{C}') = (W_i)_{\mathcal{C}'\mathcal{C}} w(\mathcal{C})$

where ϵ is the spectral gap of the RK Hamiltonian.

When Boltzmann weights are changed, a phase transition can occur, which can be regarded as a quantum phase transition of the corresponding RK Hamiltonian. The RK Hamiltonians corresponding to critical points are conformal quantum critical points [8, 11], which means the ground state is conformally invariant in the scaling limit. At this point, there is a power-law decaying correlation function in a ground state. Thus, the Hamiltonian is gapless [42], and a critical slowing down occurs in the corresponding Markov chain. Gapless means the spectral gap converges to zero, and the spectrum becomes dense near the lowest energy.

The dynamic critical exponent z is defined by

$$\tau = \Theta(L^z), \quad (27)$$

where L is the system size. This exponent z is identical to the quantum one.

E. Degeneracy of the ground states

Let us consider the degeneracy of the ground states of an RK Hamiltonian. We consider the transition graph \mathcal{G} whose vertices are labeled by the classical configurations \mathcal{C} , and there is an edge between \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' if $\langle \mathcal{C}' | \hat{W}_i | \mathcal{C} \rangle > 0$. If \mathcal{G} is connected, a Markov chain or an RK Hamiltonian is said to be ergodic. In this case, we can use the Perron-Frobenius theorem to $e^{-\hat{H}t}$, and the ground state is unique.

If \mathcal{G} is not connected, we can use the Perron-Frobenius theorem for each connected component. We denote the connected components of \mathcal{G} as $\{\mathcal{G}^{(n)}\}$. The Hilbert space can be decomposed into a direct sum as

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_n \mathcal{H}^{(n)}, \quad \mathcal{H}^{(n)} = \text{Span}\{|\mathcal{C}^{(n)}\rangle\}_{\mathcal{C}^{(n)} \in \mathcal{G}^{(n)}}. \quad (28)$$

The Hamiltonian \hat{H} and the time evolution operator $e^{-\hat{H}t}$ is block diagonalized by this decomposition as

$$\hat{H} = \bigoplus_n \hat{H}^{(n)}, \quad e^{-\hat{H}t} = \bigoplus_n e^{-\hat{H}^{(n)}t}. \quad (29)$$

Since \hat{H} is positive-semidefinite, $H^{(n)}$ are also positive-semidefinite. We can easily construct the ground state of

$H^{(n)}$ with zero eigenvalue as

$$|\Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z^{(n)}}} \sum_{\mathcal{C}^{(n)}} \sqrt{w(\mathcal{C}^{(n)})} |\mathcal{C}^{(n)}\rangle, \quad (30)$$

where

$$Z^{(n)} := \sum_{\mathcal{C}^{(n)}} w(\mathcal{C}^{(n)}). \quad (31)$$

Using the Perron-Frobenius theorem for each $e^{-\hat{H}^{(n)}t}$, we find that there are no other ground states than $|\Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)}\rangle$ if $|\Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)}\rangle \neq 0$. The connected component $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ such that $|\Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)}\rangle = 0$ represents configurations that are excluded by the constraint condition and can be ignored when considering ground states.

If an arbitrary configuration is obtained with multiple local updates from a particular configuration, we can construct an ergodic RK Hamiltonian for sufficiently large support of each \hat{H}_i . However, if there is a topological invariant conserved for any local update, the configuration space is decomposed into topological sectors, each sector having a ground state. Such an example is the RK point of the quantum dimer model discussed in Sec. III G.

F. $z \geq 2$ for RK Hamiltonians

We obtain the following theorem by applying Theorem 1 to RK Hamiltonians.

Corollary 1. *For every RK Hamiltonian corresponding to a critical system with a unique ground state, the dynamic critical exponent satisfies $z \geq 2$.*

Proof. From the assumption of uniqueness of the ground state, the state $|\Psi_{\text{RK}}\rangle$ given in Eq. (16) is the unique ground state of the RK Hamiltonian. Since the corresponding classical statistical system is at a critical point, there exists a local quantity $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that

$$\frac{\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle - \langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^* \rangle \langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}|^2 \rangle \langle |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}}|^2 \rangle}} = \Theta(|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^{-2\Delta_{\mathcal{O}}}), \quad (32)$$

where $\Delta_{\mathcal{O}}$ is the scaling dimension of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}$. Let $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| = \Theta(L)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{x}} := \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{C}) |\mathcal{C}\rangle \langle \mathcal{C}|$. From the correspon-

dence between classical and quantum correlation functions in Eq. (17), we have

$$\frac{\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\dagger} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle - \langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\dagger} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle \langle \Psi_{\text{RK}} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle}{\| \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{x}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle \| \| \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle \|} = \Theta(L^{-2\Delta_{\mathcal{O}}}). \quad (33)$$

Since the ground space projector of the Hamiltonian is $|\Psi_{\text{RK}}\rangle\langle\Psi_{\text{RK}}|$, we can use Theorem 1 to obtain $z \geq 2$. \square

The following theorem also holds from the correspondence between RK Hamiltonians and Markov chains.

Corollary 2. *For every Markov chain for a critical statistical system, the dynamic critical exponent satisfies $z \geq 2$ if (i) the Markov chain is ergodic i.e. the steady state is unique, (ii) the transition-rate matrix is decomposed into a sum of local transition-rate matrices, and (iii) the detailed balance condition holds for each local transition-rate matrix.*

Note that z is the same for the continuous dynamics $e^{\hat{W}t}$ and the discrete dynamics $(\hat{1} + \hat{W})^t$.

Without mentioning the uniqueness of the ground state degeneracy, the following corollary holds.

Corollary 3. *For RK Hamiltonians or corresponding Markov chains, the dynamic critical exponent satisfies $z \geq 2$ if there exists a critical connected component of the transition graph, on which correlation functions follow a power law.*

Proof. Let $|\Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)}\rangle$ be a ground state defined in Eq. (30). We have $\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} | \hat{\mathcal{O}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n')} \rangle = 0$ for $n \neq n'$ and a diagonal operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ in the classical configuration basis. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\dagger} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} \rangle - \langle \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\dagger} \hat{G} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} \rangle| \\ &= |\langle \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\dagger} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} \rangle - \langle \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{\dagger} | \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} \rangle \langle \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi_{\text{RK}}^{(n)} \rangle| \\ &= |\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle^{(n)} - \langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^* \rangle \langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle^{(n)}|, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle^{(n)} := \frac{1}{Z^{(n)}} \sum_{\mathcal{C}^{(n)}} w(\mathcal{C}^{(n)}) \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{C}^{(n)}). \quad (35)$$

Therefore if there exist n and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ such that

$$\frac{|\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle^{(n)} - \langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^* \rangle^{(n)} \langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle^{(n)}|}{\sqrt{\langle |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{x}}|^2 \rangle^{(n)} \langle |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{y}}|^2 \rangle^{(n)}}} = \Theta(L^{-2\Delta_{\mathcal{O}}}), \quad (36)$$

then we obtain $z \geq 2$ using Theorem 1. \square

G. Examples

1. The Gibbs sampling algorithm

As an example of the construction of RK Hamiltonians, we introduce the Gibbs sampling (heat-bath) algorithm [32], one of the most standard MCMC algorithms.

We divide the system into the R_i : A finite size region around a position i , B_i : The boundary of R_i interacting with R_i , and E_i : The external system not interacting with R_i . Then, we can decompose the Boltzmann weight as

$$\begin{aligned} w(\mathcal{C}) &= \prod_x w_x(\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i}, \mathcal{C}_{E_i}) \\ &= w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i}) w^{E_i}(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}, \mathcal{C}_{E_i}), \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i}, \mathcal{C}_{E_i}$ are the configurations in R_i, B_i, E_i , respectively. We consider the Gibbs sampling algorithm that updates the variables in R_i in one step. The local transition-rate matrices are given by

$$\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{W}_i | \mathcal{C}' \rangle = \langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{W}_i(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}) | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i} \rangle \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{B_i}} \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{E_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{E_i}}, \quad (38)$$

where

$$\langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{W}_i(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}) | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i} \rangle = \frac{w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i})}{\sum_{\mathcal{C}''_{R_i}} w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}''_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i})} - \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{R_i}}. \quad (39)$$

This conserve probability and satisfies the detailed balance condition. The corresponding local Hamiltonian is written as

$$\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{H}_i | \mathcal{C}' \rangle = \langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{H}_i(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}) | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i} \rangle \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{B_i}} \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{E_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{E_i}}, \quad (40)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{H}_i(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}) | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i} \rangle \\ &= \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{R_i}} - \frac{\sqrt{w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i}) w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}'_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i})}}{\sum_{\mathcal{C}''_{R_i}} w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}''_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i})}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

2. The Metropolis-Hastings algorithm

Another famous MCMC algorithm is the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm [33, 34]. The transition-rate matrix is given by

$$\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{W} | \mathcal{C}' \rangle = A(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}') Q(\mathcal{C}' | \mathcal{C}) \quad (\mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{C}'). \quad (42)$$

The diagonal elements are determined so that probability conserves:

$$\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{W} | \mathcal{C} \rangle = - \sum_{\mathcal{C}' \neq \mathcal{C}} A(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{C}) Q(\mathcal{C}' | \mathcal{C}). \quad (43)$$

A proposal distribution $Q(\mathcal{C}' | \mathcal{C})$ takes non-negative values and $A(\mathcal{C}', \mathcal{C})$ is defined as

$$A(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}') := \min \left(1, \frac{w(\mathcal{C}) Q(\mathcal{C}' | \mathcal{C})}{w(\mathcal{C}') Q(\mathcal{C} | \mathcal{C}')} \right). \quad (44)$$

The transition-rate matrix satisfies detailed balance condition since

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{W} | \mathcal{C}' \rangle w(\mathcal{C}') &= \min (w(\mathcal{C}') Q(\mathcal{C} | \mathcal{C}'), w(\mathcal{C}) Q(\mathcal{C}' | \mathcal{C})) \\ &= \langle \mathcal{C}' | \hat{W} | \mathcal{C} \rangle w(\mathcal{C}). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

The corresponding RK Hamiltonian is given by

$$\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{H} | \mathcal{C}' \rangle = -\sqrt{\frac{w(\mathcal{C}')}{w(\mathcal{C})}} A(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}') Q(\mathcal{C} | \mathcal{C}') \quad (46)$$

for $\mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{C}'$ and $\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{H} | \mathcal{C} \rangle = -\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{W} | \mathcal{C} \rangle$. This Hamiltonian is local if the given Boltzmann weight $w(\mathcal{C})$ and the proposal distribution $Q(\mathcal{C} | \mathcal{C}')$ are local. We decompose the system into a finite region R_i , the boundary B_i , and the external system E_i as before. We assume the Boltzmann weight is decomposed as in Eq. (37) and $Q(\mathcal{C} | \mathcal{C}')$ is written as

$$Q(\mathcal{C} | \mathcal{C}') = \sum_i Q_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i}) \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{B_i}} \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{E_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{E_i}}. \quad (47)$$

Then, off-diagonal elements of the Hamiltonian are written as $\langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{H}_i | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i} \rangle = \sum_i \langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{H}_i(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}) | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i} \rangle \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{B_i}} \delta_{\mathcal{C}_{E_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{E_i}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{H}_i(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}) | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i} \rangle &= -\sqrt{\frac{w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}'_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i})}{w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i})}} A_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{R_i}) \\ &\quad \times Q_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i}), \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &A_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}'_{R_i}) \\ &:= \min \left(1, \frac{w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i}) Q_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}}(\mathcal{C}'_{R_i} | \mathcal{C}_{R_i})}{w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}'_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i}) Q_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Diagonal elements are written as $\langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{H} | \mathcal{C} \rangle = \sum_i \langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{H}_i(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}) | \mathcal{C}_{R_i} \rangle$ and

$$\langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{H}_i(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}) | \mathcal{C}_{R_i} \rangle = \sum_{\mathcal{C}'_{R_i}} A_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}}(\mathcal{C}'_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{R_i}) Q_{\mathcal{C}_{B_i}}(\mathcal{C}'_{R_i} | \mathcal{C}_{R_i}). \quad (50)$$

The local Hamiltonian \hat{H}_i satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mathcal{C}'} \sqrt{w(\mathcal{C}')} \langle \mathcal{C} | \hat{H}_i | \mathcal{C}' \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{C}'_{R_i} \neq \mathcal{C}_{R_i}} \sqrt{w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}'_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i})} \langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{H}_i(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}) | \mathcal{C}'_{R_i} \rangle \\ &\quad + \sqrt{w^{R_i}(\mathcal{C}_{R_i}, \mathcal{C}_{B_i})} \langle \mathcal{C}_{R_i} | \hat{H}_i(\mathcal{C}_{B_i}) | \mathcal{C}_{R_i} \rangle \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Therefore, $\hat{H}_i | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle = 0$ and the Hamiltonian \hat{H} is frustration-free.

3. The Ising RK Hamiltonian

Using the Gibbs sampling algorithm, let us discuss the RK Hamiltonian corresponding to the Ising model on any

lattice Λ . The resulting Hamiltonian is the same as the one treated in Ref. [11] in the case of the square lattice, except for a dual transformation and changes in the coefficients for projectors.

A classical configurations \mathcal{C} can be labeled by the list of the values of spins $s_{\mathbf{x}} = \pm 1$ as $\mathcal{C} = \{s_{\mathbf{x}}\}_{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda}$. The Boltzmann weight of the Ising model is

$$w(\mathcal{C}) = \exp \left(K \sum_{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle} s_{\mathbf{x}} s_{\mathbf{y}} \right), \quad (52)$$

where $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle$ is the edge connecting \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , and K is the coupling constant. The unique ground state $|\Psi_{\text{RK}}\rangle$ corresponding to the Ising model is given by

$$\langle \mathcal{C} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z}} \exp \left(\frac{K}{2} \sum_{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle} s_{\mathbf{x}} s_{\mathbf{y}} \right), \quad (53)$$

where Z is the partition function.

For the Ising model, $R_{\mathbf{x}}$ refers to the single site at \mathbf{x} , $B_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the set of lattice sites adjacent to \mathbf{x} , and $E_{\mathbf{x}}$ includes all other sites. The RK Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda} \hat{H}_{\mathbf{x}}$ corresponding to the Gibbs sampling algorithm is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \{s\} | \hat{H}_{\mathbf{x}} | \{s'\} \rangle \\ &:= \langle s_{\mathbf{x}} | \hat{H}_{\mathbf{x}}(\{s_{\mathbf{y}}\}_{\mathbf{y} \in B_{\mathbf{x}}}) | s'_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \prod_{\mathbf{y} \in B_{\mathbf{x}}} \delta_{s_{\mathbf{y}}, s'_{\mathbf{y}}} \prod_{\mathbf{z} \in E_{\mathbf{x}}} \delta_{s_{\mathbf{z}}, s'_{\mathbf{z}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle s_{\mathbf{x}} | \hat{H}_{\mathbf{x}}(\{s_{\mathbf{y}}\}_{\mathbf{y} \in B_{\mathbf{x}}}) | s'_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\ &= \delta_{s_{\mathbf{x}}, s'_{\mathbf{x}}} - \frac{\exp(\frac{K}{2}(s_{\mathbf{x}} + s'_{\mathbf{x}}) \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in B_{\mathbf{x}}} s_{\mathbf{y}})}{\sum_{s''_{\mathbf{x}}} \exp(K s''_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in B_{\mathbf{x}}} s_{\mathbf{y}})}. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

This Hamiltonian is ergodic since one can obtain any spin configuration from a particular spin configuration by repeating local spin flips.

We obtain a critical point by tuning the coupling constant K . The dynamic critical exponent z satisfies $z \geq 2$ due to ergodicity and Corollary 1. For the square lattice, the exact value of K is $\frac{1}{2} \ln(1 + \sqrt{2}) \approx 0.44$ and the numerical value of $z = 2.1667(5)$ is computed by MCMC [14]. For the cubic lattice, only numerical values of $K \approx 0.22$ [43] and $z = 2.0245(15)$ are known [15].

4. The RK point of the quantum dimer model

Let us consider the square lattice and let l_e be a variable associated with the edge e , which takes the value of zero or one. A classical configuration $\mathcal{C} = \{l_e\}$ is called a dimer configuration if

$$l_{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle} + l_{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{e}_1 \rangle} + l_{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_2 \rangle} + l_{\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{e}_2 \rangle} = 1 \quad (56)$$




FIG. 2: (a) A staggered configuration. (b) A dimer configuration (solid line) in the same topological sector as the reference configuration (dashed line). (c) A dimer configuration (solid line) in a topological sector different from the reference configuration (dashed line).

for all vertices $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Here $\mathbf{e}_1 := (1, 0)$, $\mathbf{e}_2 := (0, 1)$ and $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle$ is the edge connecting vertices \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} . We illustrate examples of dimer configurations in Fig. 2, where solid edges represent $l = 1$ and empty edges represent $l = 0$. The dimer constraint simply implies that precisely one solid line ends at each vertex.

We consider the Hilbert space spanned by $|\{l_e\}\rangle$. The Hamiltonian of the RK point is given by

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{p: \text{plaquettes}} \hat{H}_p + \sum_{v: \text{vertices}} \alpha \hat{\Pi}_v. \quad (57)$$

Here, \hat{H}_p is defined for each plaquette as

$$\hat{H}_p := |\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array}\rangle \langle \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array}| + |\begin{array}{|c|} \hline | \\ \hline \end{array}\rangle \langle \begin{array}{|c|} \hline | \\ \hline \end{array}| \\ - \frac{1}{2} (|\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array}\rangle + |\begin{array}{|c|} \hline | \\ \hline \end{array}\rangle) (\langle \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array}| + \langle \begin{array}{|c|} \hline | \\ \hline \end{array}|), \quad (58)$$

The term $\hat{\Pi}_v$ is the projector to the subspace that violates the dimer constraint in Eq. (56) around the vertex v , and α is a positive parameter.

The Hamiltonian in Eq. (57) is an RK Hamiltonian since one of the ground states is written as

$$|\Psi_D\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|D|}} \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in D} |\mathcal{C}\rangle, \quad (59)$$

where D is the set of all dimer configurations and $|D|$ is the number of its elements. Namely, the Boltzmann weight $w(\mathcal{C})$ is one for dimer configurations and zero for other configurations. The transition-rate matrix of the corresponding Markov chain \hat{W} is given by $-\hat{H}$ [44].

The configuration space is decomposed into topological sectors and staggered configurations [45] illustrated in Fig. 2. Any state in the same topological sector can be obtained by repeating local transitions $\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{---} \\ \hline \end{array} \leftrightarrow \begin{array}{|c|} \hline | \\ \hline \end{array}$. Staggered configurations in Fig. 2 (a) are isolated and do not admit any local transition. Each topological sector Ω has a unique ground state given by

$$|\Psi_\Omega\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\Omega|}} \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \Omega} |\mathcal{C}\rangle. \quad (60)$$

The state $|\mathcal{C}\rangle$ corresponding a staggered configuration \mathcal{C} is also a ground state. Excluding staggered configurations,

correlation functions on the ground states exhibit power-law decay. Therefore, we can use Corollary 3.

There is a numerical study of the dynamic critical exponent, which found $z = 2.01(2)$ [11]. We can also obtain the dynamic critical exponent from the effective field theory. Dimer configurations on the square lattice can be described by height variables [7]. In the continuum limit, the height variable description is identified with the effective field theory called quantum Lifshitz theory [7, 8], whose action is given by

$$S = \int d^3x \left(\frac{1}{2} (\partial_t \varphi)^2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{2} (\nabla^2 \varphi)^2 \right). \quad (61)$$

The RK point corresponds to $\kappa = 1/(2\pi)$. This field theory is solvable. The system is decomposed into independent harmonic oscillators by the Fourier transform, and the dispersion relation is $E_k = \kappa|k|^2$, where E_k is the energy of the mode with momentum k . Therefore, the dynamic critical exponent is exactly $z = 2$.

IV. PARENT HAMILTONIANS OF CRITICAL PROJECTED ENTANGLED PAIR STATES

We can construct various frustration-free models called parent Hamiltonians, whose ground state is written as projected entangled pair states (PEPS) [29, 30]. Various conditions determine the degeneracy of the ground states [31, 46]. In this paper, we treat one of such conditions, called injectivity [31].

A. Definitions

PEPS is a state specified by a graph and a tensor located at each vertex of the graph. The tensor $A^{(i)}$ on a vertex i has a physical spin index s_i and virtual spin indices $\sigma_{\langle i, i_1 \rangle}, \dots, \sigma_{\langle i, i_n \rangle}$, which correspond to the edges incident to the vertex i . A PEPS $|\Psi(A)\rangle$ is given by

$$|\Psi(A)\rangle = \sum_{\{s\}, \{\sigma\}} \prod_i A_{s_i \sigma_{\langle i, i_1 \rangle} \dots \sigma_{\langle i, i_n \rangle}}^{(i)} |\{s\}\rangle. \quad (62)$$

Here, all pairs of virtual spins representing the same edge are contracted. For example, PEPS for the square lattice is depicted as

$$|\Psi(A)\rangle = \dots \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \vdots \end{array} \dots, \quad (63)$$

where the diagonal lines represent physical spins and the horizontal and vertical lines represent virtual spins. We note that each $A^{(i)}$ need not be the same tensor.

For a finite region R_i around the point i , we consider the reduced density matrix defined as

$$\rho_{R_i} := \text{Tr}_{\Lambda \setminus R_i} |\Psi(A)\rangle\langle\Psi(A)|, \quad (64)$$

where $\Lambda \setminus R_i$ is the region excluding R_i from the graph. The local Hamiltonian \hat{H}_i of the parent Hamiltonian for a PEPS $|\Psi(A)\rangle$ and an interaction range R_i is the projector such that

$$\ker \hat{H}_i = \text{supp}(\rho_{R_i}), \quad (65)$$

where $\text{supp}(\rho_{R_i})$ is the support space of ρ_{R_i} .

B. Injectivity

A PEPS $|\Psi\rangle$ is said to be critical if there exists a power-law decaying correction function in $|\Psi\rangle$. For the parent Hamiltonian of a critical PEPS, the dynamic critical exponent z satisfies $z \geq 2$ if the ground state is unique.

Here, we introduce the injectivity, which guarantees that the ground state is unique. For a region R on the graph, the linear map Γ_R is defined by

$$\Gamma_R(C) := \sum_{\{s_R\}} \sum_{\{\sigma_R\}} \sum_{\{\sigma_{\partial R}\}} C_{\{\sigma_{\partial R}\}} \times \left(\prod_{i \in R} A^{(i)} \right)_{\{s_R\}\{\sigma_R\}\{\sigma_{\partial R}\}} |\{s_R\}\rangle, \quad (66)$$

where $\{s_R\}$ is the set of physical spins on R , $\{\sigma_{\partial R}\}$ is the set of virtual spins on the boundary of R , and $\{\sigma_R\}$ is the set of virtual spins inside R . For example, if tensors are on a square lattice and R is a plaquette consisting of four vertices, then $\Gamma_R(C)$ can be depicted as

$$\Gamma_{\boxplus}(C) = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{\begin{array}{cc} \boxed{A} & \boxed{A} \\ \boxed{A} & \boxed{A} \end{array}} \\ C \end{array} . \quad (67)$$

A region R is injective if Γ_R is an injective map. Also, a PEPS is injective if there is a proper covering of disjoint injective regions. We consider a super-lattice such that each vertex is an injective region. The ground state of the parent Hamiltonian with an injective PEPS is unique if the interaction range contains adjacent two vertices of the super-lattice [31]. Thus, the following corollary is derived from Theorem 1.

Corollary 4. *For parent Hamiltonians of injective PEPS with a sufficiently large interaction range, if the ground state is critical, the dynamic critical exponent satisfies $z \geq 2$.*

Injectivity is a helpful tool to guarantee the uniqueness of the ground state, but it is not a necessary condition.

For example, the quantum state in Eq. (53) corresponding to the Ising model on the square lattice, which can be described as PEPS by a method explained later, is not injective. However, the ground state of the parent Hamiltonian of this state is unique if the interaction range is sufficiently large [31].

Theorem 1 is also valid in the presence of topological degeneracy. For instance, the ground state of the RK point of the quantum dimer model in Eq. (59) can also be represented as PEPS. This model has both topological order and a critical ground state.

C. PEPS for Ising model on the honeycomb lattice

The quantum state $|\Psi_{\text{RK}}\rangle$ in Eq. (16) corresponding to a local Boltzmann weight can be described as PEPS [30]. In this case, injectivity is determined by the structure of the graph [31]. As an example, let us consider the Ising model on the honeycomb lattice. The Boltzmann weight is given by

$$w(\{s\}) = \prod_{\langle i,j \rangle} w^{i,j}(s_i, s_j), \quad w^{i,j}(s_i, s_j) = e^{K s_i s_j}, \quad (68)$$

where s_i is the spin on the vertex i and $\langle i, j \rangle$ runs over all edges of the honeycomb lattice. The quantum state corresponding to the Boltzmann weight is

$$|\Psi_{\text{RK}}\rangle := \sum_{\{s\}} \sqrt{w(\{s\})} |\{s\}\rangle = \sum_{\{s\}} \prod_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sqrt{w^{i,j}(s_i, s_j)} |\{s\}\rangle. \quad (69)$$

Let i_1, i_2 , and i_3 be the three vertices adjacent to a vertex i . We define the δ tensor by

$$\delta_{s_i \sigma_{i,i_1} \sigma_{i,i_2} \sigma_{i,i_3}} := \begin{cases} 1 & (s_i = \sigma_{i,i_1} = \sigma_{i,i_2} = \sigma_{i,i_3}), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

Inserting δ for each vertex, the wavefunction of $|\Psi\rangle$ is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \{s\} | \Psi_{\text{RK}} \rangle &= \prod_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sqrt{w^{i,j}(s_i, s_j)} \\ &= \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \prod_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sqrt{w^{i,j}(s_i, s_j)} \times \prod_i \delta_{s_i \sigma_{i,i_1} \sigma_{i,i_2} \sigma_{i,i_3}} \\ &= \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \prod_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sqrt{w^{i,j}(\sigma_{i,j}, \sigma_{j,i})} \times \prod_i \delta_{s_i \sigma_{i,i_1} \sigma_{i,i_2} \sigma_{i,i_3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

This is a PEPS because $\sqrt{w^{i,j}}$ can be regarded as a tensor having a trivial one-dimensional physical spin index. This delta insertion process is valid for arbitrary local Boltzmann weights. One can construct a uniform PEPS by the singular value decomposition for $\sqrt{w^{i,j}}$ and grouping of tensors (Fig. 3). Since $\sqrt{w^{i,j}}$ is a symmetric invert-




FIG. 3: Construction of a uniform PEPS

ible matrix for indices s_i and s_j , there is a decomposition

$$\sqrt{w(s_i, s_j)} = \sum_{s_{(i,j)}=1,2} \phi_{s_i s_{(i,j)}} \phi_{s_j s_{(i,j)}}. \quad (72)$$

We define a tensor $A^{(i)}$ by

$$A_{s_i \sigma_{(i,i_1)} \sigma_{(i,i_2)} \sigma_{(i,i_3)}}^{(i)} := \phi_{s_i, \sigma_{(i,i_1)}} \phi_{s_i, \sigma_{(i,i_2)}} \phi_{s_i, \sigma_{(i,i_3)}}. \quad (73)$$

The state $|\Psi\rangle$ can be written by $A^{(i)}$ as

$$|\Psi_{\text{RK}}\rangle = |\Psi(A)\rangle = \sum_{\{s\}, \{\sigma\}} \prod_i A_{s_i \sigma_{(i,i_1)} \sigma_{(i,i_2)} \sigma_{(i,i_3)}}^{(i)} |\{s\}\rangle. \quad (74)$$

The PEPS in Eq. (74) is injective. We consider a hexagonal region R consisting of six adjacent vertices. This region has six physical spins and six outer virtual spins. Therefore, Γ_R is a square matrix given by

$$(\Gamma_R)_{\{s\}, \{\sigma\}} = \prod_{i=1}^6 \phi_{\sigma_i, s_i} \sqrt{w(s_i, s_{i+1})}, \quad (75)$$

where $s_7 = s_1$. Since this is a product of invertible matrices, Γ_R is injective. Therefore, if the Ising model is at a critical point, we have $z \geq 2$ for the parent Hamiltonian of $|\Psi(A)\rangle$ whose interaction range contains adjacent hexagonal regions.

V. HAMILTONIANS WITH A PLANE-WAVE GROUND STATE

Let us consider a frustration-free Hamiltonian on a d -dimensional lattice Λ , for which the following two states are ground states.

$$|\Psi\rangle, |W\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{L^d \mathcal{N}}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \Lambda} \hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}} |\Psi\rangle, \quad (76)$$

where $\hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a local operator, L is the system size, and \mathcal{N} is a normalization constant. There could be other ground states $|\Psi'\rangle$ as long as $\langle \Psi' | \hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}} | \Psi \rangle = 0$. We assume $\|\hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}} |\Psi\rangle\| = \Theta(1)$ and the correlation function for $\hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $|\Psi\rangle$ decays exponentially:

$$\langle \Psi | \hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \hat{O}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi \rangle = e^{-\Omega(L)}. \quad (77)$$

The normalization constant \mathcal{N} is evaluated as

$$\mathcal{N} = \frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Lambda} \langle \Psi | \hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \hat{O}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi \rangle = \Theta(1). \quad (78)$$

Let $|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}| = \Theta(L)$. The correlation function for $\hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}$ with the ground space projector \hat{G} is

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle \Psi | \hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \hat{O}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi \rangle - \langle \Psi | \hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \hat{G} \hat{O}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi \rangle| \\ &= \left| e^{-\Omega(L)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N} L^d} \sum_{\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}'} \langle \Psi | \hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}}^\dagger \hat{O}_{\mathbf{x}'} | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | \hat{O}_{\mathbf{y}'}^\dagger \hat{O}_{\mathbf{y}} | \Psi \rangle \right| \\ &= \left| e^{-\Omega(L)} - \frac{\Theta(1)}{L^d} \right| = \Theta(L^{-d}). \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

This satisfies the assumption of Theorem 1. Thus, we obtain $z \geq 2$.

A. XXZ model with fine-tuned magnetic field

Let us give an example of frustration-free systems with a plane-wave ground state. We consider a Hilbert space of qubits on an arbitrary d -dimensional lattice Λ given by

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_{i \in \Lambda} \mathcal{H}_i, \quad \mathcal{H}_i = \text{Span}\{|0_i\rangle, |1_i\rangle\}. \quad (80)$$

Let $\hat{H}_{i,j}$ be a positive-semidefinite operator satisfying

$$\ker \hat{H}_{i,j} = \text{Span}\{|0_i 0_j\rangle, |0_i 1_j\rangle + |1_i 0_j\rangle\}. \quad (81)$$

This can be realized as a spin-1/2 XXZ model with the fine-tuned magnetic field:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{i,j} &= \frac{1}{4} \hat{\mathbb{1}} - \hat{\mathbf{s}}_i \cdot \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j + (1 - \Delta) \left(\hat{s}_i^z - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(\hat{s}_j^z - \frac{1}{2} \right) \\ &= -\hat{s}_i^x \hat{s}_j^x - \hat{s}_i^y \hat{s}_j^y - \Delta \hat{s}_i^z \hat{s}_j^z \\ &\quad - \frac{1 - \Delta}{2} (\hat{s}_i^z + \hat{s}_j^z) + \frac{2 - \Delta}{4} \hat{\mathbb{1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

where Δ is a parameter such that $\Delta < 1$. The total Hamiltonian is $\hat{H} := \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \hat{H}_{i,j}$, where $\langle i,j \rangle$ runs over all edges of the lattice. If Λ is connected, the ground states of the Hamiltonian are given by

$$|\Psi\rangle := |0 \cdots 0\rangle, \quad |W\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\Lambda|}} \sum_{i \in \Lambda} \hat{s}_i^- |\Psi\rangle. \quad (83)$$

Since $\hat{H}_{i,j} |\Psi\rangle = 0$, the Hamiltonian is frustration-free. The correlation function for $|\Psi\rangle$ and \hat{s}_i^- is

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle \Psi | \hat{s}_i^+ \hat{s}_j^- | \Psi \rangle - \langle \Psi | \hat{s}_i^+ \hat{G} \hat{s}_j^- | \Psi \rangle| \\ &= |\delta_{ij} - \langle \Psi | \hat{s}_i^+ | W \rangle \langle W | \hat{s}_j^- | \Psi \rangle| \\ &= \left| \delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{L} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Therefore, we can use Theorem 1 by setting $|i-j| = \Theta(L)$ to obtain $z \geq 2$.

B. Ferromagnetic Heisenberg model

The result of the previous subsection is generalized to similar models. Let us consider a spin- s ferromagnetic Heisenberg model on an arbitrary d -dimensional lattice Λ . The local Hamiltonian on an edge $\langle i, j \rangle$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}_{i,j} &= \frac{2s(2s+1)}{2} \hat{\mathbb{1}} - \frac{1}{2} (\hat{s}_i + \hat{s}_j)^2 \\ &= s^2 \hat{\mathbb{1}} - \hat{s}_i \cdot \hat{s}_j.\end{aligned}\quad (85)$$

The total Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \hat{H}_{i,j}, \quad (86)$$

where $\langle i, j \rangle$ runs over all edges of the lattice. This Hamiltonian has the following two ground states.

$$|\Psi\rangle := |0 \cdots 0\rangle, \quad |W\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2s|\Lambda|}} \sum_{i \in \Lambda} \hat{s}_i^- |\Psi\rangle. \quad (87)$$

Other ground states has total z -spin $s^z \leq s|\Lambda| - 2$. Therefore, $s_i^- |\Psi\rangle$ is orthogonal to all ground states except for $|W\rangle$. The state $|\Psi\rangle$ spontaneously breaks the global $SU(2)$ symmetry of the Hamiltonian and only has $U(1)$ symmetry generated by $\sum_i \hat{s}_i^z$. The plane wave state $|W\rangle$ can be written as

$$|W\rangle = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2s|\Lambda|}} \sum_{i \in \Lambda} \hat{s}_i^x |\Psi\rangle. \quad (88)$$

Since $\sum_i \hat{s}_i^x$ is a generator of spontaneously broken symmetry, $|W\rangle$ represents a Nambu-Goldstone mode. The correlation function for $|\Psi\rangle$ and \hat{s}_i^- is

$$\begin{aligned}& |\langle \Psi | \hat{s}_i^+ \hat{s}_j^- | \Psi \rangle - \langle \Psi | \hat{s}_i^+ \hat{G} \hat{s}_j^- | \Psi \rangle| \\ &= \left| 2s\delta_{ij} - \langle \Psi | \hat{s}_i^+ | W \rangle \langle W | \hat{s}_j^- | \Psi \rangle \right| \\ &= 2s \left| \delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \right| = \Theta(L^{-d}).\end{aligned}\quad (89)$$

Therefore, we can use Theorem 1 to obtain $z \geq 2$.

C. Hard-core boson

Let us consider the Hamiltonian of hard-core boson given by

$$\hat{H}_{i,j} := (\hat{a}_i - \hat{a}_j)^\dagger (\hat{a}_i - \hat{a}_j) + g \hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_i \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_j, \quad (90)$$

where \hat{a}_i^\dagger and \hat{a}_i are the bosonic creation and annihilation operator at site i , and g is a positive parameter. The kernel of the local Hamiltonian is

$$\ker \hat{H}_{i,j} = \text{Span}\{|0_i 0_j\rangle, |0_i 1_j\rangle + |1_i 0_j\rangle\}. \quad (91)$$

Thus, the Hamiltonian is equivalent to the one in Eq. (81) when restricted to the Hilbert space spanned by configurations of zeros and ones. Therefore, this model is also gapless, and its dynamic critical exponent satisfies $z \geq 2$.

VI. DISSCUSSIONS

In this paper, we have shown the rigorous lower bound $z \geq 2$ for frustration-free systems with correlation functions that exhibit power-law decay as the system size increases.

The established lower bound holds for RK Hamiltonians with critical ground states and parent Hamiltonians of critical PEPS with a unique ground state or topologically degenerate ground states. The ground states of these systems have power-law decaying correlation functions, and the ground states themselves are critical. These systems are distinguished from the quantum critical points described by conformal field theories.

Using the correspondence between RK Hamiltonians and Markov chains, we also showed $z \geq 2$ for Markov chains with local state updates and the detailed balance condition. The study of dynamic critical exponents in statistical mechanics has mainly used numerical calculations and field-theoretic approaches such as the epsilon expansion. On the other hand, the Gosset-Huang inequality we employed is based on the detectability lemma, which has developed in the field of quantum information. Our results suggest that the quantum information perspective is useful for understanding dynamical critical phenomena.

The established lower bound also holds for frustration-free systems with plane-wave ground states. These systems differ from other examples in that the correlation functions for one ground state decay exponentially. The advantage of the argument by the Gosset-Huang inequality is that these different types of quantum critical points can be treated within the same framework.

Finally, we discuss the limitations of our argument based on the Gosset-Huang inequality and present a broader conjecture beyond it. An example of a gapless frustration-free system where the Gosset-Huang inequality cannot be applied is the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger uncle Hamiltonian introduced in Ref. [47]. As shown in our accompanying paper [48], the correlation function of this model for any local operator decays exponentially with system size, even though the system is gapless with quadratic dispersion relation and hence the dynamic critical exponent is $z = 2$ [48]. Based on this observation, we conjecture that the lower bound $z \geq 2$ holds in general, even in situations where our argument cannot be directly applied.

In this work we reinforce the unique features of gapless frustration-free systems. Further studies on this interesting quantum phase are expected.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thanks to Hidemaro Suwa for useful discussions. The work of H.W. is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant No. JP24K00541. This research is funded in part

by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation's EPiQS Initiative, Grant GBMF8683 to T.S.

Appendix A: Proof of the Gosset–Huang inequality

In this section, we prove the Gosset–Huang inequality following [24].

1. Interaction graph

For the formulation and the proof of the Gosset–Huang inequality, it is useful to define an interaction graph. The interaction graph for a Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{|A|} \hat{H}_i$ has N vertices labeled $1, \dots, N$ and there is an edge between vertex i and vertex j precisely when $[\hat{H}_i, \hat{H}_j] \neq 0$. If two vertices i and j share an edge, we say that i is adjacent to j and write $i \sim j$. The degree g_i of a vertex i is given by the number of vertices adjacent to i . The maximum degree g of the graph is defined by $g := \max_i g_i$.

For local operators \hat{O} and \hat{O}' , we consider a chain of operators

$$\hat{O}, \hat{H}_{i_1}, \hat{H}_{i_2}, \dots, \hat{H}_{i_{l-1}}, \hat{O}' \quad (\text{A1})$$

such that

$$[\hat{O}, \hat{H}_{i_1}] \neq 0, \quad [\hat{H}_{i_j}, \hat{H}_{i_{j+1}}] \neq 0, \quad [\hat{H}_{i_{l-1}}, \hat{O}'] \neq 0. \quad (\text{A2})$$

This chain corresponds to a path connecting the positions of \hat{O} and \hat{O}' on the interaction graph. The distance $\tilde{d}(\hat{O}, \hat{O}')$ between \hat{O} and \hat{O}' is given by the minimum length l of such a chain. If $[\hat{O}, \hat{O}'] \neq 0$, we define $\tilde{d}(\hat{O}, \hat{O}') = 1$.

2. Detectability lemma

First, we show the following lemma.

Lemma 1 (Detectability lemma [25, 26]). *Let $\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{H}_i$ be a frustration-free Hamiltonian with the ground space projector \hat{G} and the spectral gap ϵ , and let each \hat{H}_i be a projector. Let $\hat{P}_i := \hat{1} - \hat{H}_i$ and $\hat{P} := \prod_i \hat{P}_i$, where the product is taken in any order. Then*

$$\|\hat{P} - \hat{G}\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{g^2}{\epsilon + g^2}}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where g is the maximum degree of the interaction graph.

Proof. We follow the argument in Ref. [26]. Let $\hat{P} = \hat{P}_{\sigma(1)} \hat{P}_{\sigma(2)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)}$ for an arbitrary permutation σ of indices $1, 2, \dots, N$. Let us consider the quantity $\|\hat{H}_i \hat{P}_{\sigma(j)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\|$ for any state $|\psi\rangle$ and perform the

following operations. If \hat{H}_i commute with $H_{\sigma(j)}$, we use

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{H}_i \hat{P}_{\sigma(j)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\| &= \|\hat{P}_{\sigma(j)} \hat{H}_i \hat{P}_{\sigma(j+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\| \\ &\leq \|\hat{H}_i \hat{P}_{\sigma(j+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

Otherwise, we use

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{H}_i \hat{P}_{\sigma(j)} \hat{P}_{\sigma(j+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\| \\ &\leq \|\hat{H}_i \hat{P}_{\sigma(j+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\| + \|\hat{H}_i \hat{H}_{\sigma(j)} \hat{P}_{\sigma(j+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\| \\ &\leq \|\hat{H}_i \hat{P}_{\sigma(j+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\| + \|\hat{H}_{\sigma(j)} \hat{P}_{\sigma(j+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

If we start from $\|\hat{H}_i \hat{P} |\psi\rangle\|$ and repeat this procedure, we obtain the sum of the following g_i terms:

$$\|\hat{H}_i \hat{P} |\psi\rangle\| \leq \sum_{\sigma(l) \sim i} \|\hat{H}_{\sigma(l)} \hat{P}_{\sigma(l+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\|. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Since the square of the average can be bounded above by the average of the square, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{H}_i \hat{P} |\psi\rangle\|^2 &\leq g_i^2 \left(\frac{1}{g_i} \sum_{\sigma(l) \sim i} \|\hat{H}_{\sigma(l)} \hat{P}_{\sigma(l+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\| \right)^2 \\ &\leq g_i^2 \frac{1}{g_i} \sum_{\sigma(l) \sim i} \|\hat{H}_{\sigma(l)} \hat{P}_{\sigma(l+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

Summing the left-hand side from $i = 1$ to N yields the energy expectation of $\hat{P} |\psi\rangle$. Since there are at most g vertices \hat{H}_i that does not commute with $\hat{H}_{\sigma(l)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi | \hat{P}^\dagger \hat{H} \hat{P} | \psi \rangle &= \sum_{i=1}^N \|\hat{H}_i \hat{P} |\psi\rangle\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N g_i \sum_{\sigma(l) \sim i} \|\hat{H}_{\sigma(l)} \hat{P}_{\sigma(l+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\|^2 \\ &\leq g^2 \sum_{l=1}^N \|\hat{H}_{\sigma(l)} \hat{P}_{\sigma(l+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} |\psi\rangle\|^2 \\ &= g^2 \sum_{l=1}^N \langle \psi | \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(l+1)} (\hat{1} - \hat{P}_{\sigma(l)}) \hat{P}_{\sigma(l+1)} \cdots \hat{P}_{\sigma(N)} | \psi \rangle \\ &= g^2 (1 - \|\hat{P} |\psi\rangle\|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

Let $|\psi^\perp\rangle = (\hat{1} - \hat{G}) |\psi\rangle$. The state $\hat{P} |\psi^\perp\rangle$ is orthogonal to the ground states since $\hat{G} \hat{P} |\psi^\perp\rangle = \hat{G} |\psi^\perp\rangle = 0$. Therefore

$$\epsilon \|\hat{P} |\psi^\perp\rangle\|^2 \leq \langle \psi^\perp | \hat{P}^\dagger \hat{H} \hat{P} | \psi^\perp \rangle \leq g^2 (1 - \|\hat{P} |\psi^\perp\rangle\|^2), \quad (\text{A9})$$

where ϵ is the spectral gap of \hat{H} . Thus

$$\|\hat{P} |\psi^\perp\rangle\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{g^2}{g^2 + \epsilon}}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Also, we obtain

$$\|\hat{P}(\hat{\mathbb{1}} - \hat{G})\| = \|\hat{P} - \hat{G}\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{g^2}{g^2 + \epsilon}}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

□

3. The Gosset–Huang inequality

Theorem 2 ([24]). *Let $\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{H}_i$ be a frustration-free Hamiltonian with the ground space projector \hat{G} and the spectral gap ϵ , and let each \hat{H}_i be a projector. For local operators \hat{O} and \hat{O}' , the following inequality holds.*

$$\frac{|\langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger (\hat{\mathbb{1}} - \hat{G}) \hat{O}' | \Psi \rangle|}{\|\hat{O} | \Psi \rangle\| \|\hat{O}' | \Psi \rangle\|} \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{2(\tilde{d}(\hat{O}^\dagger, \hat{O}') - 2)}{2c - 1} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{g^2 + \epsilon}} \right), \quad (\text{A12})$$

where g is the maximum degree of the interaction graph and c is the chromatic number of the interaction graph. The chromatic number c of the interaction graph is the smallest number of colors needed for coloring the vertices so that no two adjacent vertices have the same color. Also, $\tilde{d}(\hat{O}^\dagger, \hat{O}')$ is the distance between \hat{O}^\dagger and \hat{O}' defined in Sec. A 1.

Since we are considering geometrically local Hamiltonians, the maximum degree g of the interaction graph does not depend on the system size. Also, c also does not depend on the system size since the greedy coloring ensures $c \leq g + 1$.

Proof. We divide vertices of the interaction graph into c colors so that no two adjacent vertices have the same color, which means the same colored \hat{H}_i commute with each other. We denote i -th vertex with color j as $\hat{H}_i^{(j)}$, and consider

$$\hat{P} := \prod_i \hat{P}_i^{(c)} \prod_i \hat{P}_i^{(c-1)} \dots \prod_i \hat{P}_i^{(2)} \prod_i \hat{P}_i^{(1)}, \quad (\text{A13})$$

where $\hat{P}_i^{(j)} := \hat{\mathbb{1}} - \hat{H}_i^{(j)}$. For the quantity $\langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger (\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P})^n | \Psi \rangle$, only P_i inside the “light cone” remains:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger \prod_i \hat{P}_i^{(1)} \prod_i \hat{P}_i^{(2)} \prod_i \hat{P}_i^{(3)} \dots \\ &= \langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger \prod_{i: \tilde{d}(\hat{P}_i^{(1)}, \hat{O})=1} \hat{P}_i^{(1)} \prod_{i: \tilde{d}(\hat{P}_i^{(2)}, \hat{O}) \leq 2} \hat{P}_i^{(2)} \prod_{i: \tilde{d}(\hat{P}_i^{(3)}, \hat{O}) \leq 3} \hat{P}_i^{(3)} \dots \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A14})$$

We have

$$\langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{O}' | \Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger (\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P})^n \hat{O}' | \Psi \rangle, \quad (\text{A15})$$

as long as the two light cones from \hat{O}^\dagger and \hat{O}' do not overlap (Fig. 4). Since $\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P}$ has $2c - 1$ layers, the maximum




FIG. 4: Two light cones from \hat{O}^\dagger (orange) and \hat{O}' (blue) in a one dimensional lattice.

of n is given by

$$n \leq m := \frac{\tilde{d}(\hat{O}^\dagger, \hat{O}') - 2}{2c - 1}. \quad (\text{A16})$$

Therefore, for polynomials $Q_m(x)$ such that $\deg Q_m(x) \leq m$ and $Q_m(1) = 1$,

$$\langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger \hat{O}' | \Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger Q_m(\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P}) \hat{O}' | \Psi \rangle. \quad (\text{A17})$$

Let $\hat{G}^\perp := \hat{\mathbb{1}} - \hat{G}$. We have

$$(\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P})^n - \hat{G} = (\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P} - \hat{G})^n = (\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P} - \hat{G})^n \hat{G}^\perp, \quad (\text{A18})$$

for $n > 0$ and $(\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P})^0 - \hat{G} = \hat{G}^\perp$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger (\hat{\mathbb{1}} - \hat{G}) \hat{O}' | \Psi \rangle \\ &= \langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger (Q_m(\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P}) - \hat{G}) \hat{O}' | \Psi \rangle \\ &= \langle \Psi | \hat{O}^\dagger Q_m(\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P} - \hat{G}) \hat{G}^\perp \hat{O}' | \Psi \rangle \\ &\leq \|\hat{O} | \Psi \rangle\| \|\hat{O}' | \Psi \rangle\| \|Q_m(\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P} - \hat{G})\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A19})$$

Since $\|\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P} - \hat{G}\| \leq g^2/(g^2 + \epsilon)$ from the detectability lemma 1,

$$\|Q_m(\hat{P}^\dagger \hat{P} - \hat{G})\| \leq \max_{0 \leq x \leq 1 - \delta} |Q_m(x)|, \quad (\text{A20})$$

where $\delta := \epsilon/(g^2 + \epsilon)$. We minimize the right-hand side of Eq. (A20) under the constraint $\deg Q_m \leq m$ and $Q_m(1) = 1$. The optimal polynomial is

$$Q_m(x) = \frac{T_m(\frac{2x}{1-\delta} - 1)}{T_m(\frac{2}{1-\delta} - 1)}, \quad (\text{A21})$$

where $T_m(x)$ is the degree m Chebyshev polynomial of the first kind defined by $T_m(x) = \cos(m \arccos x) = \cosh(m \operatorname{arccosh} x)$. The polynomial $T_m(x)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} T_m(x) &> \frac{1}{2} e^{m \operatorname{arccosh} x} \geq \frac{1}{2} e^{2m \tanh(\operatorname{arccosh} x/2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} e^{2m \sqrt{(x-1)/(x+1)}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A22})$$

for $x > 1$. Also $|T_m(x)| \leq 1$ for $|x| \leq 1$. Therefore $Q_m(x)$ satisfies

$$|Q_m(x)| \leq 2e^{-2m\sqrt{\delta}} = 2 \exp \left(-2m \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{g^2 + \epsilon}} \right), \quad (\text{A23})$$

for $0 \leq x \leq 1 - \delta$. From Eq. (A19), Eq. (A20) and Eq. (A23), we obtain

$$\frac{\langle \Psi | \hat{\mathcal{O}}(\hat{\mathbb{1}} - \hat{G}) \hat{\mathcal{O}}' | \Psi \rangle}{\| \hat{\mathcal{O}}^\dagger | \Psi \rangle \| \| \hat{\mathcal{O}}' | \Psi \rangle \|} \leq 2 \exp \left(-2m \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{g^2 + \epsilon}} \right). \quad (\text{A24})$$

□

Appendix B: Lower bound by plane wave variational state

This section gives a lower bound of the dynamic critical exponent for translation invariant gapless frustration-free systems by plane wave variational excitations. This bound yields $z \geq 2$ when there is a plane-wave ground state. Systems that spontaneously break a continuous symmetry naturally have such a ground state. Without a plane-wave ground state, this lower bound is generally looser than $z \geq 2$.

Let us consider a translation invariant frustration-free Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \sum_i \hat{H}_i$ on a d dimensional lattice with a ground state $|\Psi\rangle$. We can assume that each \hat{H}_i is a projector while preserving the ground space and the dynamic critical exponent. We consider the following plane wave state.

$$|\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k})\rangle = \sum_i e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}_i} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_i |\Psi\rangle. \quad (\text{B1})$$

We assume $\langle \Psi | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_i | \Psi \rangle = 0$ by subtracting a constant from $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$. Then the variational state $|\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k})\rangle$ is orthogonal to the ground state $|\Psi\rangle$. We assume that $|\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k})\rangle$ is also orthogonal to other ground states. The energy expectation of this state is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\langle \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) | \hat{H} | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle} &= \sum_i \frac{\langle \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) | \hat{H}_i^2 | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle} \\ &= L^d \frac{\| \hat{H}_i | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \|^2}{\| | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \|^2} \\ &= \frac{\| \sum_j e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}_j} \hat{H}_i \hat{\mathcal{O}}_j | \Psi \rangle \|^2}{\| | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \|^2 / L^d} \\ &= \frac{\| \sum_j e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}_j} [\hat{H}_i, \hat{\mathcal{O}}_j] | \Psi \rangle \|^2}{G_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{k})}, \quad (\text{B2}) \end{aligned}$$

where $G_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{k})$ is a correlation function in momentum space defined as

$$G_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{k}) := \frac{\| | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \|^2}{L^d} = \sum_j e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i)} \langle \Psi | \mathcal{O}_i^\dagger \mathcal{O}_j | \Psi \rangle. \quad (\text{B3})$$

The variational state $|\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k})\rangle$ is a gapless excitation if the numerator of Eq. (B2) converges to zero at $|\mathbf{k}| \rightarrow 0$, or the denominator diverges in the thermodynamic limit.

First, we assume that $|\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{0})\rangle$ is a ground state. This case includes when the ground space has a spontaneously

broken on-site continuous symmetry [20]. If $|\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{0})\rangle$ is a ground state,

$$\hat{H}_i |\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{0})\rangle = \sum_j [\hat{H}_i, \hat{\mathcal{O}}_j] | \Psi \rangle = 0. \quad (\text{B4})$$

We can evaluate the numerator of Eq. (B2) using Eq. (B4) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\| \sum_j e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}_j} [\hat{H}_i, \hat{\mathcal{O}}_j] | \Psi \rangle \|^2 \\ &= \| \sum_j (e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}_j} - e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}_i}) [\hat{H}_i, \hat{\mathcal{O}}_j] | \Psi \rangle \|^2 \\ &= O(|\mathbf{k}|^2), \quad (\text{B5}) \end{aligned}$$

since $[\hat{H}_i, \hat{\mathcal{O}}_j]$ is nonzero only if \mathbf{x}_j is in a finite region around \mathbf{x}_i . The state $|\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k})\rangle$ is orthogonal to ground states if $\mathbf{k} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Thus, we obtain

$$\epsilon \leq \frac{\langle \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) | \hat{H} | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle} = \frac{O(|\mathbf{k}|^2)}{G_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{k})}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

We assume $|\Psi\rangle$ is a product state as in Ref. [20]. In this case,

$$G_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{k}) = \langle \Psi | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_i^\dagger \hat{\mathcal{O}}_i | \Psi \rangle = \Theta(1), \quad (\text{B7})$$

and we obtain $z \geq 2$ from Eq. (B6) by setting $|\mathbf{k}| = \Theta(2\pi/L)$. It is expected that $G_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{0}) = \Theta(1)$ for more general states.

Next, we consider the case of RK Hamiltonians with a unique critical ground state. Let $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ be a real diagonal operator in the classical configuration basis. If $|\Psi\rangle$ is critical, $G_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{0})$ diverges as

$$G_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{0}) = \sum_j \langle \mathcal{O}_i \mathcal{O}_j \rangle = \Theta(L^{d-2\Delta_{\mathcal{O}}}), \quad (\text{B8})$$

where $\Delta_{\mathcal{O}}$ is the scaling dimension of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ and L is the system size. Thus

$$\frac{\langle \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{0}) | \hat{H} | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{0}) \rangle}{\langle \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{0}) | \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{0}) \rangle} = \frac{O(1)}{G_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{0})} = O(L^{-(d-2\Delta_{\mathcal{O}})}). \quad (\text{B9})$$

Since $|\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{0})\rangle$ is orthogonal to ground states, we obtain

$$z \geq d - 2\Delta_{\mathcal{O}}. \quad (\text{B10})$$

For example, the RK Hamiltonian, whose ground state corresponds to the two-dimensional Ising model, satisfies $z \geq 7/4$ because the lowest scaling dimension of the operator, excluding the identity, is $1/8$. This bound is identical to the rigorous results of previous studies [49, 50]. A numerical calculation shows $z = 2.1667(5)$ [14].

For unitary conformal field theories and scalar operators, the unitarity bound is given [51] by

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{O}} \geq \frac{1}{2}(d-2). \quad (\text{B11})$$

Thus, we obtain $d - 2\Delta_{\mathcal{O}} \leq 2$. This bound also holds for spinning operators. Therefore, except when the equality in Eq. (B11) holds, our result $z \geq 2$ improves the lower

bound by plane wave variational states in the case of RK Hamiltonian, whose ground state corresponds to a unitary conformal field theory.

-
- [1] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **115**, 477 (1988).
- [2] A. Y. Kitaev, *Annals of Physics* **303**, 2 (2003), arxiv:quant-ph/9707021.
- [3] Z. Zhou, Z. Yan, C. Liu, Y. Chen, and X.-F. Zhang, “Emergent Rokhsar-Kivelson point in realistic quantum Ising models,” (2021), arxiv:2106.05518 [cond-mat].
- [4] R. R. Kumar, Y. R. Kartik, S. Rahul, and S. Sarkar, *Scientific Reports* **11**, 1004 (2021).
- [5] H. Saito and C. Hotta, *Physical Review Letters* **132**, 166701 (2024).
- [6] D. S. Rokhsar and S. A. Kivelson, *Physical Review Letters* **61**, 2376 (1988).
- [7] C. L. Henley, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **89**, 483 (1997).
- [8] E. Ardonne, P. Fendley, and E. Fradkin, *Annals of Physics* **310**, 493 (2004).
- [9] W. Heisenberg, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **49**, 619 (1928).
- [10] F. Bloch, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **61**, 206 (1930).
- [11] S. V. Isakov, P. Fendley, A. W. W. Ludwig, S. Trebst, and M. Troyer, *Physical Review B* **83**, 125114 (2011), arxiv:1012.3806 [cond-mat, physics:hep-th].
- [12] X. Chen, E. Fradkin, and W. Witczak-Krempa, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 464002 (2017), arxiv:1707.02317 [cond-mat, physics:hep-th, physics:math-ph].
- [13] H. Watanabe, H. Katsura, and J. Y. Lee, “Spontaneous breaking of $U(1)$ symmetry at zero temperature in one dimension,” (2023), arxiv:2310.16881 [cond-mat, physics:quant-ph].
- [14] M. P. Nightingale and H. W. J. Blöte, *Physical Review B* **62**, 1089 (2000).
- [15] M. Hasenbusch, *Physical Review E* **101**, 022126 (2020).
- [16] A. Astillero and J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, *Physical Review E* **100**, 062117 (2019).
- [17] Y. Murase and N. Ito, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **77**, 014002 (2008).
- [18] E. Arashiro, H. A. Fernandes, and J. R. D. de Felicio, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **388**, 4379 (2009), arxiv:cond-mat/0603436.
- [19] O. Ogunnaike, J. Feldmeier, and J. Y. Lee, “Unifying Emergent Hydrodynamics and Lindbladian Low Energy Spectra across Symmetries, Constraints, and Long-Range Interactions,” (2023), arxiv:2304.13028 [cond-mat, physics:quant-ph].
- [20] J. Ren, Y.-P. Wang, and C. Fang, “Quasi-Nambu-Goldstone modes in many-body scar models,” (2024), arxiv:2405.00785 [cond-mat, physics:quant-ph].
- [21] D. Gosset and E. Mozgunov, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **57**, 091901 (2016).
- [22] A. Anshu, *Physical Review B* **101**, 165104 (2020).
- [23] S. Knabe, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **52**, 627 (1988).
- [24] D. Gosset and Y. Huang, *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 097202 (2016).
- [25] D. Aharonov, I. Arad, U. Vazirani, and Z. Landau, *New Journal of Physics* **13**, 113043 (2011).
- [26] A. Anshu, I. Arad, and T. Vidick, *Physical Review B* **93**, 205142 (2016), arxiv:1602.01210 [cond-mat, physics:quant-ph].
- [27] C. L. Henley, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **16**, S891 (2004).
- [28] C. Castelnovo, C. Chamon, C. Mudry, and P. Pujol, *Annals of Physics* **318**, 316 (2005), arxiv:cond-mat/0502068.
- [29] F. Verstraete and J. I. Cirac, “Renormalization algorithms for Quantum-Many Body Systems in two and higher dimensions,” (2004), arxiv:cond-mat/0407066.
- [30] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, D. Perez-Garcia, and J. I. Cirac, *Physical Review Letters* **96**, 220601 (2006).
- [31] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, J. I. Cirac, and M. M. Wolf, “PEPS as unique ground states of local Hamiltonians,” (2007), arxiv:0707.2260 [cond-mat, physics:math-ph, physics:quant-ph].
- [32] S. Geman and D. Geman, *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **PAMI-6**, 721 (1984).
- [33] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller, and E. Teller, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **21**, 1087 (1953).
- [34] W. K. Hastings, *Biometrika* **57**, 97 (1970), 2334940.
- [35] R. H. Swendsen and J.-S. Wang, *Physical Review Letters* **58**, 86 (1987).
- [36] U. Wolff, *Physical Review Letters* **62**, 361 (1989).
- [37] H. Suwa and S. Todo, *Physical Review Letters* **105**, 120603 (2010), arxiv:1007.2262 [cond-mat, physics:math-ph].
- [38] K. S. Turitsyn, M. Chertkov, and M. Vucelja, *Physica D-Nonlinear Phenomena* **240**, 410 (2011).
- [39] For positive functions $f(L)$ and $g(L)$, we write $f(L) = \Theta(g(L))$ if $C_1 g(L) \leq f(L) \leq C_2 g(L)$ for sufficiently large L , where C_1 and C_2 are positive constants.
- [40] For positive functions $f(L)$ and $g(L)$, we write $f(L) = \Omega(g(L))$ if $Cg(L) \leq f(L)$ for sufficiently large L , where C is a positive constant.
- [41] D. P. Landau and K. Binder, *A Guide to Monte Carlo Simulations in Statistical Physics*, 4th ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014).
- [42] M. B. Hastings and T. Koma, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **265**, 781 (2006), arxiv:math-ph/0507008.
- [43] B. Liu and M. Gitterman, *American Journal of Physics* **71**, 806 (2003).
- [44] Mathematically speaking, if we set $w(C) = 0$ for non-dimer configurations to start with, \hat{S} lacks the inverse. This problem can be gone around by initially considering $w(C) = \epsilon > 0$ for non-dimer configurations and take the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow +0$ at the end.
- [45] H. S. Røising and Z. Zhang, *SciPost Physics Core* **6**, 054 (2023), arxiv:2303.04817 [cond-mat, physics:math-ph, physics:quant-ph].
- [46] N. Schuch, I. Cirac, and D. Pérez-García, *Annals of Physics* **325**, 2153 (2010).
- [47] C. Fernández-González, N. Schuch, M. M. Wolf, J. I. Cirac, and D. Pérez-García, *Communications in Math-*

- ematical Physics **333**, 299 (2015).
- [48] R. Masaoka, T. Soejima, and H. Watanabe, In progress. (2024).
- [49] B. I. Halperin, Physical Review B **8**, 4437 (1973).
- [50] E. Lubetzky and A. Sly, Communications in Mathematical Physics **313**, 815 (2012).
- [51] S. Minwalla, “Restrictions Imposed by Superconformal Invariance on Quantum Field Theories,” (1998), arxiv:hep-th/9712074.