

# Superconductor-Insulator Transition in TMD moiré systems and the Deconfined Quantum Critical Point

Nayan Myerson-Jain<sup>1</sup> and Cenke Xu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106*

(Dated: June 21, 2024)

We propose that the recently observed superconductor-insulator transition (SIT) in a twisted bilayer transition metal dichalcogenides moiré system<sup>1</sup> at hole filling  $\nu = 1$  may be described by the deconfined quantum critical point (DQCP), which was originally proposed for the transition between the Néel order and the valence bond solid (VBS) order on the square lattice<sup>2,3</sup>. The key symmetries involved in the original DQCP include a  $SO(3)_s$  spin symmetry, as well as a  $C_4$  lattice rotation symmetry for the VBS order that is enlarged into a  $U(1)_v$  symmetry near the DQCP. In the current SIT under consideration, the counterpart of the  $SO(3)_s$  spin symmetry is an approximate  $SO(3)_v$  symmetry that transforms between different crystalline orders on the triangular lattice, and the role of the  $U(1)_v$  symmetry is replaced by the ordinary charge- $U(1)_e$  symmetry. At the DQCP, the  $SO(3)_v \times U(1)_e$  may enlarge into an emergent  $SO(5)$  symmetry. Under strain, the SIT is driven into either a prominent first order transition, or an “easy-plane” DQCP, which is expected to have an emergent  $O(4)$  symmetry.

PACS numbers:

## I. INTRODUCTION

The recent rapid experimental progress of searching for novel correlated states of matter in moiré systems has generated continuous excitement in the condensed matter community. Various exotic phases of matter, including the fractional Chern insulator<sup>4,5</sup>, fractional quantum anomalous Hall effects<sup>6–10</sup>, and even signatures of fractional topological insulators<sup>11</sup> have all been reported. Most recently, superconductivity has also been reported in twisted bilayer transition metal dichalcogenides (TMD) moiré systems at hole filling  $\nu = 1$  (one hole per moiré unit cell)<sup>1,12</sup>, and a continuous superconductor-insulator transition (SIT) tuned by the displacement field was observed<sup>1</sup>. Given all the remarkable unconventional phases identified in the TMD moiré systems, it is natural to ask whether the quantum phase transitions in these systems can also transcend the ordinary paradigm. The goal of this work is to propose that the SIT observed in Ref. 1 may be described by the deconfined quantum critical point (DQCP)<sup>2,3</sup>, an archetypal example of unconventional QCP beyond the standard paradigm.

The original DQCP was proposed as an unconventional quantum phase transition between the Néel order with spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) of the  $SO(3)_s$  spin symmetry, and a valence bond solid (VBS) order which spontaneously breaks the lattice  $C_4$  rotation symmetry, and at the DQCP the  $C_4$  symmetry is enlarged into a  $U(1)_v$  emergent symmetry. The DQCP has been an extremely active subfield in the theoretical and numerical condensed matter community<sup>13</sup>, and it has very profound connections to many other notions in theoretical physics, such as the 't Hooft anomaly, emergent symmetry<sup>14–19</sup>, the symmetry protected topological (SPT) phases<sup>20,21</sup> in one higher dimension<sup>22</sup>, the web of duality<sup>23,24</sup>, the “loss of conformality”<sup>23,25,26</sup>, and the intrinsic

sically gapless SPT phases<sup>27,28</sup>. But the study on DQCP has been mostly theoretical and numerical, except for a possible experimental realization of the DQCP with certain anisotropy in  $SrCu_2(BO_3)_2$ <sup>29–33</sup>, which was expected to be connected to the “easy-plane” DQCP<sup>34</sup>. But the experimental connection of the “full” DQCP with supposedly an emergent  $SO(5)$  symmetry has been elusive. In this work we hope to bridge the gap of the experimental connection of the DQCP.

The twisted bilayer TMD moiré system with hole filling can be modelled as a two-orbital continuum model for each spin/valley flavor, one orbital from each layer<sup>35–37</sup>. The tunnelling amplitude as well as the energy difference between the two layers together form a three component vector  $\Delta(\mathbf{r})$ , which depends on the spatial coordinate  $\mathbf{r}$  due to the twisting. The configuration of  $\Delta(\mathbf{r})$  may have a nonzero integer Skyrmion number within the moiré unit cell, which leads to a nonzero Chern number for the moiré minibands for each spin/valley index. At small twisting angle, the physics of the first two moiré minibands can be captured by the Kane-Mele tight-binding model<sup>38,39</sup> on the honeycomb moiré lattice. A displacement field in the twisted bilayer TMD moiré system explicitly breaks the exchange symmetry between the A/B sublattice (the  $C_{2y}$  symmetry) of the moiré honeycomb lattice, i.e. the holes prefer to stay on (for example) the sublattice A of the moiré lattice, which forms a triangular lattice. With larger twisting angle, at least one more sublattice at the center of each hexagon is needed to reproduce the physics of the moiré minibands<sup>40</sup>, but a displacement field still lifts the degeneracy among the three sublattices. Although the superconductivity happens when the holes are at half-filling of a pair of Chern bands with opposite Chern numbers, the nontrivial topology of the Chern bands may *not* play a crucial role at the observed superconductor-insulator transition, as the superconductor could still be ordinary rather than a topological su-




FIG. 1: The moiré lattice (a), and the effective triangular lattice (b) for the study of the SIT. The mean field state of the fermionic parton  $\psi_\alpha$  sees a  $\pi$ -flux on half of the triangle plaquettes (b).

perconductor. In fact, once the charge  $U(1)_e$  is broken, a quantum spin Hall insulator can be smoothly connected to an ordinary superconductor.

If the holes are gapped on both sides of the SIT, one can just focus on the bosonic sector of the system, if the goal is to understand the universality class of the SIT. It was argued (for example in Ref. 41) that the universal low energy features of certain SITs can be understood as superfluid-insulator transitions of interacting bosons. Given the observations in the last paragraph, and the “strong pairing” nature of the superconductor phase<sup>1</sup>, we may consider the SIT as a superfluid-insulator transition of hard core bosons on an effective triangular lattice at half-filling, i.e. on average half-boson per site. The hard core boson carries the same quantum number as a Cooper pair. The SIT can also be modelled as the low energy bosonic sector of interacting spin-1/2 fermions on the effective triangular lattice, also at half-filling. A direct and continuous SIT in this case must be beyond the ordinary Wilson-Fisher paradigm, at least in the limit with no disorder. In fact half-filled bosons (or spin-1/2 fermions) on a triangular lattice is prohibited from having a trivial insulator (gapped and nondegenerate), due to the Lieb-Shultz-Mattis theorem<sup>42–44</sup>. More specifically, the insulator must either spontaneously break certain symmetry, or it must form a gapless or topological spin liquid.

If the insulator has a  $Z_2$  topological order, there is a previously known mechanism for the SIT. In this scenario, the insulator phase in the phase diagram is a  $Z_2$  spin liquid<sup>45–48</sup>. A  $Z_2$  spin liquid on the triangular lattice does not need to break any lattice symmetry. The simplest  $Z_2$  spin liquid can be constructed with a parton formalism,  $c_{j,\alpha} = b_j f_{j,\alpha}$ :  $c_{j,\alpha}$  corresponds to the physical fermion (*e.g.* electron or hole),  $b_j$  and  $f_{j,\alpha}$  are the bosonic and fermionic partons respectively,  $\alpha = \uparrow, \downarrow$  is the spin index, and  $j$  labels the sites of the triangular lattice. Such a  $Z_2$  spin liquid corresponds to a mean field state of  $f_\alpha$  with the following mean field Hamiltonian:  $H_{\text{MF}} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} -t_{ij} f_{i,\alpha}^\dagger f_{j,\alpha} + \Delta_{ij} (\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} f_{i,\alpha} f_{j,\beta}) + h.c.$ . The parton construction mentioned above grants  $f_\alpha$  a local  $U(1)_g$  degrees of freedom, but the nonzero pairing




FIG. 2: Comparison between the original DQCP (a) and the DQCP proposed in this work (b). In the original DQCP, the transition is between an AF Néel order which has spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) of the  $SO(3)_s$  spin symmetry, and a VBS order that spontaneously breaks the  $C_4$  rotation symmetry of the square lattice. Here, the  $C_4$  rotation symmetry enlarges into an emergent  $U(1)_v$  symmetry near the DQCP. In our current case, the counterpart of the Néel order is a crystalline order on the triangular lattice, which is expected to enjoy an approximate  $SO(3)_v$  symmetry and the role of the  $U(1)_v$  symmetry is played by the ordinary charge  $U(1)_e$  symmetry. The vertical axis in (a) represents the term that breaks the  $U(1)_v$  symmetry down to  $C_4$ , which is dangerously irrelevant as was discussed in Ref. 2,3. In our current case, when  $\mathcal{L}_3$  in Eq. 13 is ignored, the crystalline orders on the triangular lattice will have an emergent  $SO(3)_v$  symmetry at the SIT. The vertical axis of (b) corresponds to Eq. 12 which breaks  $SO(3)_v$  and is dangerously irrelevant at the DQCP. The operator  $\mathcal{L}_3$  is a weakly relevant perturbation at the DQCP.

amplitude  $\Delta_{ij}$  breaks the  $U(1)_g$  gauge symmetry down to  $Z_2$ , hence the spin liquid phase becomes a  $Z_2$  spin liquid. The bosonic parton  $b$  carries both the physical  $U(1)_e$  charge, and also the  $Z_2$  gauge charge. The SIT in this case corresponds to condensing  $b$ . The condensation of  $b$  would suppress the  $Z_2$  gauge field due to the Higgs mechanism, and identify  $c_\alpha$  and  $f_\alpha$ . The mean field Hamiltonian of  $f_\alpha$  then becomes the BdG Hamiltonian of the physical fermion  $c_\alpha$ <sup>49</sup>. It was also shown numerically that a  $Z_2$  spin liquid is indeed in proximity with a superconductor<sup>50</sup>. Recently this mechanism of SIT has been explored in the current context of twisted bilayer TMD moiré system with a three-orbital model<sup>51</sup>.

In this work we propose a new candidate theory for the observed SIT. We will demonstrate that the observed SIT could actually be a deconfined quantum critical point (DQCP). In our current system, though there is no  $\text{SO}(3)_s$  spin symmetry, there is an approximate  $\text{SO}(3)_v$  symmetry that connects different crystalline orders, which plays the role as the  $\text{SO}(3)_s$  symmetry of the original DQCP. The  $\text{U}(1)_v$  symmetry is replaced by the charge  $\text{U}(1)_e$  symmetry (Fig. 2). We will also briefly discuss a second new candidate theory for the SIT, which is described by an  $N_f = 2$  QED, and it is dual to the easy-plane DQCP. The theory-II applies when the superconductor phase coexists with certain commensurate density wave.

Our proposal is partly motivated by the fact that experimentally the insulating phase is “competing” with the superconductor in the sense that when the SC is suppressed by (for example) temperature, the insulating phase emerges<sup>1</sup>. And the DQCP is precisely a theory describing the transition between two competing orders. The experimental signatures of our proposal will be discussed in more detail in section IV.

## II. A NEW CANDIDATE THEORY FOR THE SIT: THE DQCP

As was mentioned in the last section, for the purpose of understanding the universality of the SIT, we model the SIT as hard-core bosons, or (pseudo) spin-1/2 degrees of freedom on the effective triangular lattice. The symmetry allowed effective Hamiltonian of the pseudo spin-1/2 degrees of freedom takes the following form

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_z \tilde{S}_i^z \tilde{S}_j^z + J_{xy} (\tilde{S}_i^x \tilde{S}_j^x + \tilde{S}_i^y \tilde{S}_j^y) + \dots \quad (1)$$

Here  $\tilde{S}_i^z = n - 1/2$ , where  $n$  is the density of Cooper pair; and  $\tilde{S}_i^x, \tilde{S}_i^y$  are the real and imaginary parts of the Cooper pair operator. Note that there is a global constraint that  $\sum_i \tilde{S}_i^z = 0$ , due to the fixed half-filling of the charge density. Then one can introduce the fermionic partons using the standard formalism<sup>47</sup>:

$$\tilde{S}_i^a = \frac{1}{2} f_{i,\alpha}^\dagger \sigma_{\alpha\beta}^a f_{i,\beta}, \quad (2)$$

and construct states of Cooper pair  $\tilde{S}_i^a$  using states of  $f_\alpha$ . This parton formalism actually has a  $\text{SU}(2)_g$  invariance, which becomes explicit when one performs a particle-hole transformation of  $f_\downarrow$ :

$$\psi_{i,1} = f_{i,\uparrow}, \quad \psi_{i,2} = f_{i,\downarrow}^\dagger. \quad (3)$$

Then the states of  $\psi_{i,\alpha}$  could have a maximal  $\text{SU}(2)_g$  gauge invariance<sup>47</sup>.

The effective (pseudo) spin-1/2 model corresponds to the low energy bosonic sector of interacting fermions  $c_{j,\alpha}$

on the same triangular lattice. Hence alternatively, one can also formulate the parton theory directly starting with  $c_{j,\alpha}$ , which is a formalism quite broadly used in the studies of cuprates high temperature superconductor<sup>52–60</sup>, and other exotic quantum liquid states<sup>61–63</sup>:

$$c_{j,\alpha} = Z_{j,\alpha\beta} \psi_{j,\beta}, \quad (4)$$

where  $j$  again labels the sites of the effective triangular moiré lattice.  $Z_{\alpha\beta}$  is a  $2 \times 2$   $\text{SU}(2)$  matrix field, whose left and right transformations correspond to the spin symmetry, and a  $\text{SU}(2)_g$  gauge transformation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SU}(2)_s : Z &\rightarrow U_s Z, \\ \text{SU}(2)_g : Z &\rightarrow Z U_g^\dagger, \quad \psi \rightarrow U_g \psi, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $U_s$  and  $U_g$  are both  $\text{SU}(2)$  matrices. Here we stress that it is not necessary for the system to have a full spin  $\text{SU}(2)_s$  symmetry, as we are going to consider a phase diagram where  $Z_{\alpha\beta}$  is gapped. Indeed, the TMD moiré system has no spin  $\text{SU}(2)_s$  symmetry due to the spin-orbit coupling. In addition to the spin and gauge transformations,  $\psi_\alpha$  also carries the charge  $\text{U}(1)_e$  symmetry:

$$\text{U}(1)_e : c_\alpha \rightarrow e^{i\theta} c_\alpha, \quad \psi_\alpha \rightarrow e^{i\theta} \psi_\alpha. \quad (6)$$

The analysis of a parton formalism always starts with the mean field state of the partons. In this formalism, the most general mean field Hamiltonian for  $\psi_{j,\alpha}$  takes the following form

$$H_{\text{MF}} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} -t_{ij,\alpha\beta} \psi_{i,\alpha}^\dagger \psi_{j,\beta} + h.c. \quad (7)$$

where

$$t_{ij,\alpha\beta} \sim \langle Z_{i,\alpha\sigma}^\dagger t_{ij,\sigma\sigma'}^c Z_{j,\sigma'\beta} \rangle, \quad (8)$$

and  $t_{ij,\sigma\sigma'}^c$  is the hopping amplitude of  $c_{j,\alpha}$  on the effective triangular lattice, which may depend on the spin index  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ .

The goal of this work is not to analyze which mean field state has the most favorable energy, but to investigate the state that can potentially lead to an interesting nontrivial SIT. We consider a mean field state with  $t_{ij,\alpha\beta} = \pm t \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ , and the sign  $\pm 1$  distribution on the triangular lattice leads to a staggered  $\pi$ -flux state for the mean field band structure of  $\psi_\alpha$  (Fig. 1). This mean field state preserves the whole  $\text{SU}(2)_g$  gauge symmetry. Here we note that, the staggered  $\pi$ -flux state discussed here is different from the standard  $\pi$ -flux spin liquid on the triangular lattice often studied in the literature<sup>64–66</sup>, which has  $\text{U}(1)_g$  rather than  $\text{SU}(2)_g$  gauge invariance. In fact, the state discussed here would be “undesirable” in the context of spin liquid, as this state would break the  $\text{SU}(2)_s$  spin symmetry of the effective spin-1/2 operators  $\tilde{S}_i^a$ . But again, in our current system there is no  $\text{SU}(2)_s$  symmetry to begin with, hence the staggered  $\pi$ -flux state discussed here is legitimate.




FIG. 3: The approximate  $SO(3)_v$  symmetry. Due to the existence of the symmetry allowed term Eq. 12, the three component vector  $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$  has eight favored degenerate directions (for  $u > 0$ ), corresponding to the corners of a cube. When  $\mathcal{L}_3$  is absent, the discrete symmetry of  $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$  will enlarge into an emergent  $SO(3)_v$  at the DQCP, analogous to the  $C_4$  symmetry of the VBS order on the square lattice becomes an emergent  $U(1)_v$  symmetry at the original DQCP. With the presence of  $\mathcal{L}_3$ , the vector  $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$  prefers to point towards four corners of a tetrahedron.

It is known that a  $\pi$ -flux state on the triangular lattice has two Dirac points in the Brillouin zone, for each component  $\alpha = 1, 2$ . The index  $\alpha$  is a “color” index which couples to a  $SU(2)_g$  gauge field. Hence at low energy, the physics of the mean field state discussed above is expected to be described by the following Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}} = \sum_{v=1,2} \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,v} \gamma_{\mu} (\partial_{\mu} \delta_{\alpha\beta} - \sum_{l=1}^3 i a_{\mu}^l \tau_{\alpha\beta}^l) \psi_{\beta,v} + \dots, \quad (9)$$

where  $v = 1, 2$  labels the two Dirac valleys. We choose convention for the gamma matrices,  $\gamma_{\mu} = (-\sigma^2, \sigma^3, \sigma^1)$  where  $\vec{\sigma}$  are Pauli matrices that carry only Dirac spinor indices (as opposed to  $\vec{\tau}$  which are labeled by color indices). We note that the two Dirac-valleys discussed here are *not* the standard valleys associated with the moiré superlattice, but are merely labels for two degenerate Dirac cones in the spectrum of the staggered  $\pi$ -flux state.

The theory in Eq. 9 is  $N_f = 2$  QCD with an  $SU(2)_g$  gauge field, where the ellipses in Eq. 9 include other terms allowed by the symmetry, such as the Maxwell term of the  $SU(2)_g$  gauge field, and gauge invariant four-fermion or higher order terms. As we will show later, one particular combination of the four-fermion terms will be important, as it is the tuning parameter of the SIT.

Eq. 9 is the same field theory as the renowned  $\pi$ -flux spin liquid state of the spin-1/2 frustrated quantum magnet on the square lattice. However, we stress that here  $\psi$  carries the charge  $U(1)_e$  symmetry, but no spin quantum number. As was discussed in detail in Ref. 23, Eq. 9 is one of many possible representations of the deconfined quantum critical point (DQCP), which was originally proposed as a potential direct continuous quantum phase transition between the antiferromagnetic Néel order and the Valence bond solid (VBS) order of a spin-1/2 frustrated quantum magnet on the square lattice<sup>2,3</sup>. In the original DQCP, the key symmetries include a  $SO(3)_s$  spin symmetry, and a  $C_4$  rotation symmetry of the VBS order,

which will be enlarged into a  $U(1)_v$  symmetry near the DQCP. Furthermore, it was proposed theoretically<sup>14</sup> and also observed numerically that<sup>17,18</sup>, the  $SO(3)_s \times U(1)_v$  symmetry further enlarge into an emergent  $SO(5)$  symmetry in the infrared at the DQCP.

In fact, the  $SO(5)$  symmetry is the maximal possible continuous global symmetry of Eq. 9, which is most clearly revealed in the Majorana fermion basis. When we write the Dirac fermion  $\psi$  as  $\psi = \chi_1 + i\chi_2$  with Majorana fermions  $\chi_{1,2}$ , another two-component flavor index was introduced, and there are in total eight components of Majorana fermions including the gauged color space, and the valley space. The maximal continuous transformation on the eight Majorana fermions is  $SO(8)$ , which includes the  $SU(2)_g$  gauge symmetry as its subgroup. Then, the maximal global symmetry should be a subgroup of  $SO(8)$  which commutes with  $SU(2)_g$ , and this maximal global symmetry is  $SO(5)$ . This symmetry analysis was discussed in detail in Ref.<sup>67,68</sup>.

At first glance, it seems rather *unlikely* that the current system under study can realize the DQCP, as the microscopic symmetry of the TMD moiré system is too low. For example, there is no spin  $SO(3)_s$  symmetry to begin with. However, in the following we will demonstrate that, what plays the role of the  $SO(3)_s$  symmetry of the originally proposed DQCP, is actually an approximate  $SO(3)_v$  symmetry that transforms among different crystalline orders on the triangular lattice; and the  $U(1)_v$  symmetry of the original DQCP is replaced by the charge  $U(1)_e$  symmetry.

In fact, it was observed long back that, the crystalline orders on the triangular lattice may very well enjoy a far larger emergent symmetry near various critical points or critical phases<sup>69-72</sup>, compared with the microscopic lattice symmetry. In order to demonstrate this approximate  $SO(3)_v$  symmetry in our current set-up, let us consider the following three-component vector of crystalline order:

$$\hat{\mathbf{V}} \sim \bar{\psi}_v \vec{\mu}_{vv'} \psi_{v'}. \quad (10)$$

$\vec{\mu}$  are the three Pauli matrices that operate on the Dirac-valley space. With a displacement field, the current moiré system has the translation symmetries, time-reversal symmetry, as well as a  $C_3$  rotation symmetry of the triangular lattice. Under these symmetries, the vector  $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$  transforms as<sup>108</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &: (\hat{V}_1, \hat{V}_2, \hat{V}_3) \rightarrow (-\hat{V}_1, -\hat{V}_2, \hat{V}_3), \\ T_2 &: (\hat{V}_1, \hat{V}_2, \hat{V}_3) \rightarrow (-\hat{V}_1, \hat{V}_2, -\hat{V}_3), \\ C_3 &: (\hat{V}_1, \hat{V}_2, \hat{V}_3) \rightarrow (-\hat{V}_3, \hat{V}_1, -\hat{V}_2), \\ \mathcal{T} &: (\hat{V}_1, \hat{V}_2, \hat{V}_3) \rightarrow (\hat{V}_1, \hat{V}_2, \hat{V}_3). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Here,  $\hat{V}_i$  are density waves at the three  $M$  points of the moiré Brillouin zone:  $K_1 = (\pi/\sqrt{3}, -\pi)$ ,  $K_2 = (\pi/\sqrt{3}, \pi)$ ,  $K_3 = (2\pi/\sqrt{3}, 0)$  (Fig. 2(b)). Though these symmetries are smaller than the full symmetry of a




FIG. 4: (a). The originally expected RG flow of  $g$  in Eq. 16. There is a full  $SO(5)$  symmetry along the axis  $r = 0$ , and there are two fixed points while increasing  $g$  from zero, the one with larger  $g$  corresponds to the DQCP. The tuning parameter  $r$  in Eq. 17 tunes the transition between the superconductor and the crystalline insulator. (b). A possible scenario of the RG flow based on up-to-date understanding. The two fixed points in (a) annihilate and become a pair of nearby complex fixed points, causing  $g$  to flow very slowly in the dashed region. This “walking” RG flow leads to an approximate conformal symmetry.

triangular lattice, they already guarantee that at the quadratic level of  $\hat{V}$ , the only symmetry allowed term is  $|\hat{V}|^2$ , which has a  $SO(3)_v$  symmetry, and it should be part of the Lagrangian in Eq. 9. Higher order terms of  $\hat{V}$  may break the  $SO(3)_v$  symmetry, but they are at least sixth order of  $\psi$ . For example the following term

$$\mathcal{L}_4 \sim u(|\hat{V}_1|^4 + |\hat{V}_2|^4 + |\hat{V}_3|^4) \quad (12)$$

is allowed by the microscopic symmetry, but it is a product of eight fermions, and is expected to be highly irrelevant for the  $N_f = 2$  QCD Eq. 9. Another term which is the product of six fermions is also allowed by symmetry:

$$\mathcal{L}_3 \sim u' \hat{V}_1 \hat{V}_2 \hat{V}_3. \quad (13)$$

We will discuss the role of  $\mathcal{L}_3$  at the DQCP later.

The  $U(1)_v$  symmetry of the original DQCP now becomes the charge  $U(1)_e$  symmetry, and the order parameter of the  $U(1)_e$  symmetry are the real and imaginary parts of the inter-valley gauge singlet  $s$ -wave superconductor Cooper pair:

$$\hat{\Delta} \sim \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} \psi_{\alpha v}^t \gamma_0 \mu_{v v'}^2 \psi_{\beta v'}. \quad (14)$$

The crystalline symmetries in Eq. 11, the  $U(1)_e$  symmetry, and time-reversal together guarantee that all fermion-bilinear terms are not allowed in Eq. 9, except for one: the chemical potential for charge density  $\mu \bar{\psi} \gamma_0 \psi$ .

But the chemical potential is tuned to zero in the system, due to the fixed half-filling of charge density.

To make further connections with DQCP, we define a five-component unit vector  $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_5)$  with  $|\mathbf{n}|^2 = 1$ , and couple it to the fermion bilinear operators as

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}} + \frac{1}{g} (\partial_\mu \mathbf{n})^2 + m \left( \sum_{a=1}^3 n_a \hat{V}_a + n_4 \text{Re}[\hat{\Delta}] + n_5 \text{Im}[\hat{\Delta}] \right). \quad (15)$$

Following the procedure of Ref. 73, integrating out the fermions would lead to the following low energy effective nonlinear sigma model (NLSM) field theory for  $\mathbf{n}$  with a Wess-Zumino-Witten term at level-1:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{g} (\partial_\mu \mathbf{n})^2 + \frac{2\pi i}{\Omega_4} \int_0^1 du \epsilon_{abcde} n^a \partial_x n^b \partial_y n^c \partial_\tau n^d \partial_u n^e. \quad (16)$$

The NLSM above is another “classic” description of the DQCP which well captures the intertwinement of the order parameters involved in the DQCP<sup>14</sup>.

The relation between the NLSM, the  $N_f = 2$  QCD, and the DQCP is shown in the proposed RG flow diagram of  $g$  of Eq. 16. The originally proposed RG flow of  $g$  is that (Fig. 4(a)), if one starts with small  $g$  where the NLSM is in its ordered phase, increasing  $g$  is expected to first drive an order-disorder phase transition; and due to the existence of the WZW term in Eq. 16, the disordered phase was expected to be controlled by a stable fixed point with  $SO(5)$  symmetry, which corresponds to the  $N_f = 2$  QCD and is also the DQCP tuned to the critical point. The tuning parameter of the DQCP, which tunes the Néel-VBS transition in the original DQCP, and the SIT transition in our current context, corresponds to the following term:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \mathcal{L} &\sim r(n_1^2 + n_2^2 + n_3^2 - n_4^2 - n_5^2) \\ &\sim r(|\hat{V}|^2 - |\hat{\Delta}|^2) = r(|\bar{\psi} \vec{\mu} \psi|^2 - |\psi^t \gamma_0 \mu^2 \epsilon \psi|^2) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The first and second line of Eq. 17 are supposed to be the tuning parameters of the DQCP in Eq. 16 and Eq. 9 respectively.

To investigate the details of the crystalline order ( $r < 0$  in Eq. 17), we need to analyze the role of the higher order term Eq. 12 in the crystalline ordered phase. This term is irrelevant at the DQCP, but it will play important role in the phase with  $r < 0$ , i.e.  $u$  is actually “dangerously irrelevant”. For  $r < 0$  and  $u > 0$ , the system would have an eight fold degenerate crystalline order, corresponding to

$$\langle \hat{V} \rangle \sim V(\pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1); \quad (18)$$

while for  $u < 0$ , there are six degenerate ground states with

$$\langle \hat{V} \rangle \sim V(\pm 1, 0, 0), V(0, \pm 1, 0), V(0, 0, \pm 1). \quad (19)$$



A nonzero  $\mathcal{L}_3$  in Eq. 13 would lift the degeneracy, and favor  $\hat{V}$  to point along four diagonal directions of a cube, which form a tetrahedron (Fig. 3).

Here, we would also like to clarify the nature of the DQCP, which has been an extensively studied subject in the last two decades. As we explained before, the originally expected RG flow of the coupling constant  $g$  of the NLSM is shown in Fig. 4(a)<sup>74,75</sup>, with two fixed points one of which is the DQCP and also the  $N_f = 2$  QCD. But since the early days of the numerical simulation of the Néel-VBS DQCP, which is supposedly realized in the  $J-Q$  model on the square lattice<sup>15,16</sup>, people have noticed that though many aspects of the transition appear to be continuous, there are always various difficulties fitting the data with the standard  $(2+1)d$  CFT. For example, the critical exponents are drifting with the system size<sup>17,18,76,77</sup>, and the exponents extracted seem incompatible with the bounds established by the conformal Bootstrap<sup>78–80</sup>. Also, nonlocal probes such as entanglement entropy at the DQCP are found to be inconsistent with a  $(2+1)d$  CFT<sup>81–85</sup>. In Fig. 4(b) we sketch one of the possible scenarios of the RG flow of  $g$  based on the up-to-date understanding: the two fixed points in Fig. 4(a) in fact annihilate and become a pair of nearby complex fixed points, causing  $g$  to flow very slowly in the dashed region<sup>23</sup>. This slow RG flow due to the annihilation of real fixed points, and emergence of complex fixed points is referred to as the “loss of conformality”<sup>25</sup>. But with a large and finite system size, we are still expected to see critical behavior due to the slow RG flow of  $g$ , even though eventually the DQCP is an extremely weak first order transition<sup>86,87</sup>. In fact, the approximate conformal symmetry has been well-observed in the fuzzy sphere realization<sup>26</sup> of Eq. 16, even though there is a weakly relevant  $SO(5)$  singlet. We also note that, recently another possible scenario for DQCP was proposed, that there exists a nearby multi-critical point with a full  $SO(5)$  symmetry<sup>87,88</sup>.

Now let us discuss the role of  $\mathcal{L}_3$  in Eq. 13 at the DQCP. At first glance, this term is a product of six fermions, which also appears highly irrelevant. However, a more careful investigation shows that, assuming the DQCP has an emergent  $SO(5)$  symmetry, then  $\mathcal{L}_3$  belongs to the symmetric rank-3 tensor representation of the  $SO(5)$  which is in the same representation of the triple-monopole in the  $CP^1$  formalism of the DQCP and the triple-monopole is allowed by symmetry for the Néel-VBS DQCP realized on a honeycomb lattice. Both the Monte-Carlo study and the fuzzy sphere realization of the DQCP suggest that the triple-monopole of the  $CP^1$  representation of the DQCP is weakly relevant<sup>26,89,90</sup>. For example, the Monte Carlo determines that the triple-monopole has scaling dimension  $2.80(3)$ <sup>89</sup>. Hence  $\mathcal{L}_3$  should also be a weakly relevant perturbation at the DQCP. Nevertheless, previous numerical works suggest that even with this weakly relevant perturbation, the DQCP may still behave like a continuous transition over a large window of length scale. For example, signatures




FIG. 5: The phase diagram around the DQCP under strain. The parameter  $s$  in Eq. 20 is tuned by the strain. A positive  $s$  will shift the transition point, and drive the DQCP into a first order transition between the SC and an insulator with the  $V_3$  order; a negative  $s$  will drive the DQCP into the easy-plane DQCP between the SC and an insulator with the  $V_1, V_2$  order.

of DQCP were also found at the Néel-VBS transition on the honeycomb lattice<sup>91,92</sup>.

### III. SIGNATURES OF THE DQCP

In this section we discuss the experimental signatures of the proposed candidate theory for SIT. In particular, we would like to distinguish the current theory of SIT from the previously known theory of SIT between the superconductor and a  $Z_2$  spin liquid state discussed in the introduction.

The most obvious difference between these two theories is that, the SC-to- $Z_2$  spin liquid theory should be insensitive to the lattice symmetry breaking. In particular, if the  $Z_2$  spin liquid and the superconductor are both gapped, the nature of the transition should belong to the  $3D$   $XY^*$  transition, whose universality class does not change when the lattice symmetry is weakly broken. But our current DQCP theory is more sensitive to the lattice symmetry. For example, let us consider an external strain field that breaks the  $C_3$  rotation symmetry. This strain field acts like a term  $-s|V_3|^2$  in the Lagrangian, which favors  $V_3$  over  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  if  $s > 0$  and the DQCP now has an “easy-axis” anisotropy. In the NLSM description of the DQCP, this term is  $-s(n_3)^2$ , and is a strongly relevant perturbation.

A relevant perturbation on a critical point can lead to several possible consequences. At the DQCP, leveraging the  $SO(5)$  emergent symmetry, one can conclude that, with a positive  $s$ , the DQCP becomes a first order transition between the SC and an insulator with the order of  $V_3$ , and the transition point is shifted from  $r = 0$ . This analysis was given in Ref. 23 in the context of the original DQCP on the square lattice. In the current case, let us turn on both the tuning parameter  $r$  of the DQCP, and

the extra strain which breaks the  $C_3$  rotation symmetry:

$$\delta\mathcal{L}' = -s(n_3)^2 - r(n_4^2 + n_5^2). \quad (20)$$

Along the axis  $s = r > 0$ , there is an emergent  $SO(3)$  symmetry that rotates among  $\vec{n} = (n_3, n_4, n_5)$ , and the system would develop an order of  $\vec{n}$  which spontaneously breaks the emergent  $SO(3)$ . Now the line  $r = s$  becomes the transition line, and tuning  $r$  away from  $s$  would drive a prominent first order transition between the order of  $(n_4, n_5)$  (the superconductor) and the order of  $n_3$ , i.e. an insulator with the crystalline order of  $\langle V_3 \rangle \neq 0$ . Hence with the strain, one should see hysteresis when scanning through the SIT.

Let us also consider a strain along the opposite direction, i.e. adding a term  $-s(n_3)^2$  with negative  $s$  in the Lagrangian. As was discussed thoroughly in the literature of the DQCP, this term would drive the DQCP to an easy-plane DQCP. The easy-plane DQCP is still a direct transition between the SC and the crystalline insulator with  $V_1$  or  $V_2$  order. Again, though the easy-plane DQCP should still be a very weak first order transition<sup>93-96</sup>, it may appear continuous for a large length scale. And very nontrivial physics can still occur at the easy-plane DQCP, including an emergent  $O(4)$  symmetry<sup>30,93,95-97</sup>. Although  $\mathcal{L}_3$  in Eq. 13 is a weakly relevant perturbation at the full DQCP, to the best knowledge of the authors, it is unclear whether  $\mathcal{L}_3$  is relevant or irrelevant at the easy-plane DQCP. The predicted phase diagram under strain is sketched in Fig. 5.

Another difference between the DQCP and the SC-to-Z2 spin liquid transition theory is that, our current theory of DQCP is a theory of “competing orders”. Indeed, the experiments suggest that, when the SC is suppressed, the insulating state emerges. In fact, in our theory the SC and the crystalline phases not only compete with each other but also have a mutual ’t Hooft anomaly, in the sense that the defect of one order parameter should carry the quantum number of the other. For example, the vortex of the SC carries the fractionalized quantum number of  $\hat{V}$ , which should have nonzero lattice momentum. Hence if one creates a vortex inside the superconductor, the vortex core should have crystalline order.

#### IV. THE SECOND CANDIDATE THEORY

In this section we propose a second candidate theory for the observed SIT, but the nature of the SC phase and the crystalline-insulator are different from the previous theory. To facilitate the discussion, we take a different parton construction from Eq. 4:

$$c_{j,\uparrow} = b_j\psi_{j,1}, \quad c_{j,\downarrow} = b_j^\dagger\psi_{j,2}. \quad (21)$$

We still consider mean field state of  $\psi_\alpha$  with the same form of mean field Hamiltonian as Eq. 7, with  $t_{ij,\alpha\beta} = \pm t\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ . The sign of  $t_{ij,\alpha\beta}$  still constitutes a staggered  $\pi$ -flux shown in Fig. 1(b), except now the gauge field

fluctuation is  $U(1)_g$  rather than  $SU(2)_g$ . The low energy physics of this state is given by  $N_f = 4$  QED, where the  $U(1)$  gauge field couples via  $\tau^3$  in Eq. 9. One can also obtain the same theory by condensing a Higgs field in Eq. 9 that breaks the  $SU(2)_g$  gauge group down to  $U(1)_g$ .

Now, we consider the adding the following extra fermion bilinear terms to  $N_f = 4$  QED:

$$\delta\mathcal{L} = m_1\bar{\psi}\tau^3\psi + m_2\bar{\psi}\mu^3\psi. \quad (22)$$

The first term  $m_1\bar{\psi}\tau^3\psi$  is actually allowed by the symmetry and gauge invariance, and hence it should exist on top of the  $N_f = 4$  QED. The second term  $m_2\bar{\psi}\mu^3\psi$  is precisely  $\hat{V}_3$ , and it breaks part of the lattice symmetry as it carries finite momentum.

We assume that  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are both *finite* and *positive*, and we consider the tuning parameter  $\delta m = m_1 - m_2$ . Near the critical point  $\delta m = 0$ , of the four Dirac fermions, the two with quantum numbers  $\tau^3\mu^3 = +1$  are well-gapped, while the other two with  $\tau^3\mu^3 = -1$  have low energy and mass  $\delta m$ . Hence, the low energy theory describing this transition is  $N_f = 2$  QED:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{QED}} = \bar{\psi}_\alpha\gamma_\mu(\partial_\mu\delta_{\alpha\beta} - ia_\mu\tau_{\alpha\beta}^3)\psi_\beta + \delta m(\bar{\psi}\tau^3\psi) + \dots \quad (23)$$

Eq. 23 has “half” of the fermion modes of Eq. 9: the fermion in Eq. 23 with  $\tau^3 = +1$  corresponds to the Dirac fermion in Eq. 9 with  $\tau^3 = +1$ ,  $\mu^3 = -1$ ; and the fermion in Eq. 23 with  $\tau^3 = -1$  correspond to the Dirac fermion with  $\tau^3 = -1$ ,  $\mu^3 = +1$  in Eq. 9.

The two phases in the phase diagram with positive and negative  $\delta m$  are identified as the SC phase and a crystalline-insulator phase respectively. When  $\delta m > 0$ , i.e.  $m_1 > m_2 > 0$ , the gauge flux of  $a_\mu$  will have the charge of  $\psi$ . More precisely, it carries charge- $2e$  under the  $U(1)_e$  symmetry due to the dual quantum spin Hall effect (i.e., the spin-flux carries electric charge). The gauge flux of  $a_\mu$  is generically a conserved quantity, and the photon phase of  $a_\mu$  is dual to the condensate of gauge fluxes. This condensate is equivalently a charge- $2e$  superconductor due to the dual quantum spin Hall effect. Hence we identify the phase with  $\delta m > 0$  as a superconductor phase. In fact, the superconductor phase arises here for essentially the same reason as Skyrmion condensation induced superconductivity, when the Skyrmion carries electric charges<sup>98-101</sup>. It was also shown before that a “gauged” quantum spin Hall state can lead to inplane Néel order and superconductor<sup>102</sup>.

The critical point of Eq. 23 is located at  $\delta m = 0$ , which is  $N_f = 2$  QED. It was shown that  $N_f = 2$  QED is self-dual<sup>103-105</sup>, and hence it was conjectured to possess an  $O(4)$  emergent symmetry in the infrared. This emergent  $O(4)$  symmetry was seen numerically<sup>93,95-97</sup>. It was also shown that the  $N_f = 2$  QED is dual to the easy-plane Abelian Higgs model with two flavors of scalar fields (also referred to as the easy-plane noncompact  $CP^1$  model)<sup>23,106</sup>, which describes the DQCP with an easy-plane anisotropy.




FIG. 6: The phase diagram of the second candidate theory of the SIT, which corresponds the  $N_f = 2$  QED, and it is also dual to the easy-plane DQCP.

To identify more details of the SC phase, we need to analyze the monopole quantum number of the U(1) gauge field  $a_\mu$ , with  $\delta m > 0$ . Most importantly, we would like to know whether the Cooper pair condenses at zero momentum, or finite momentum. This not an easy task, but results from previous studies that thoroughly analyzed the monopole quantum numbers of the staggered  $\pi$ -flux Dirac spin liquid on the triangular lattice may be used. It was shown that<sup>65,66</sup>, with a quantum spin Hall mass term,  $m_1 \bar{\psi} \tau^3 \psi$ , the  $\pi$ -flux state would have nonzero staggered charge density  $\bar{\psi} \gamma_0 \psi$  at the center of each triangle of the lattice. This charge distribution leads to finite momentum carried by the monopole operator of the gauge field considered therein. However, in our current case, we argue that since the gauge field is generated by  $\tau^3$ , the extra charge density  $\bar{\psi} \gamma_0 \psi$  should be “invisible” to the gauge fluxes. We conjecture here that the superconductivity induced by the dual-QSH effect due to the QSH mass term  $m_1$  and the gauge fluctuation of  $a_\mu \tau^3$  would still order at zero momentum.

Of course, we assumed that there is a nonzero  $m_2$  throughout the phase diagram, and a nonzero  $m_2$  leads to a density wave order in the superconductor. Hence in this second theory, the superconductor has coexisting Cooper pair condensate and a density wave order at momentum  $K_3 = (2\pi/\sqrt{3}, 0)$ .

When  $\delta m < 0$ , i.e.  $m_1 < m_2$ , there is no dual quantum spin Hall effect and the superconductor disappears. However, the monopole of the U(1) gauge field will still carry crystalline symmetry quantum number due to the fermion modes trapped by the monopole. In this case, there is further crystalline symmetry breaking due to the flux condensate of the U(1) gauge field. Further analysis

analogous to Ref. 65,66 is demanded to fully determine the crystalline order in this case.

## V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this work we propose that the superconductor-to-insulator transition observed recently in the twisted bilayer TMD moiré system may be described by the DQCP, which is a subject that has attracted enormous attention and efforts in multiple disciplines of physics in the last two decades. We propose that the crystalline order on the effective triangular lattice has an approximate  $SO(3)_v$  symmetry, which is the counterpart of the  $SO(3)_s$  spin symmetry of the original DQCP; and the charge  $U(1)_e$  symmetry plays the role as the emergent  $U(1)_v$  symmetry that rotates between VBS orders in the original DQCP. We also demonstrated that the DQCP may be driven into either a prominent first order transition, or an easy-plane DQCP under strain.

Physics discussed in this work may also have applications in other systems, especially when the system can be modelled by strongly interacting bosons on the triangular lattice at half-filling. We note here that our theory is different from the previously discussed superfluid-insulator transition for bosons on the triangular lattice<sup>107</sup>. Potential connections between these two formalisms will be explored in the future.

We also briefly discussed a second candidate theory for the SIT, where the superconductor is induced by a “dual” quantum spin Hall effect, meaning the spin gauge field fluctuation would lead to charge condensate, i.e. a superconductor. To fully identify the nature of the superconductivity, and the crystalline order of the insulator phase of the second theory, we need detailed analysis of the monopole quantum numbers of the gauge field, which we defer to future study.

The authors thank Matthew Fisher, Chao-Ming Jian, Xue-Yang Song for very helpful discussions. C.X. acknowledges support from the Simons foundation through the Simons investigator program.

<sup>1</sup> Y. Xia, Z. Han, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, J. Shan, and K. F. Mak, *Unconventional superconductivity in twisted bilayer  $wse_2$*  (2024), 2405.14784.

<sup>2</sup> T. Senthil, A. Vishwanath, L. Balents, S. Sachdev, and M. P. A. Fisher, *Science* **303**, 1490 (2004).

<sup>3</sup> T. Senthil, L. Balents, S. Sachdev, A. Vishwanath, and M. P. A. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 144407 (2004), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.70.144407>.

<sup>4</sup> E. M. Spanton, A. A. Zibrov, H. Zhou, T. Taniguchi, K. Watanabe, M. P. Zaletel, and A. F. Young, *Science* **360**, 62 (2018), URL <https://doi.org/10.1126/2Fscience.aan8458>.

<sup>5</sup> 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., *Nature (London)* **600**, 439 (2021), 2107.10854.

<sup>6</sup> J. Cai, E. Anderson, C. Wang, X. Zhang, X. Liu, W. Holtzmann, Y. Zhang, F. Fan, T. Taniguchi, K. Watanabe, et al., *Nature* **622**, 63 (2023), URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/2Fs41586-023-06289-w>.

<sup>7</sup> H. Park, J. Cai, E. Anderson, Y. Zhang, J. Zhu, X. Liu, C. Wang, W. Holtzmann, C. Hu, Z. Liu, et al., *Nature* **622**, 74 (2023), URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/2Fs41586-023-06536-0>.

<sup>8</sup> Y. Zeng, Z. Xia, K. Kang, J. Zhu, P. Knappell, C. Vaswani, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, K. F. Mak, and



- J. Shan, *Integer and fractional chern insulators in twisted bilayer mote2* (2023), 2305.00973.
- <sup>9</sup> 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 a graphene moire superlattice* (2023), 2309.17436.
  - <sup>10</sup> F. Xu, Z. Sun, T. Jia, C. Liu, C. Xu, C. Li, Y. Gu, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, B. Tong, et al., arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06177 (2023).
  - <sup>11</sup> 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 mote2* (2024), 2402.03294.
  - <sup>12</sup> Y. Guo, J. Pack, J. Swann, L. Holtzman, M. Cothrine, K. Watanabe, T. Taniguchi, D. Mandrus, K. Barnak, J. Hone, et al., *Superconductivity in twisted bilayer wse2* (2024), 2406.03418.
  - <sup>13</sup> T. Senthil, *Deconfined quantum critical points: a review* (2023), 2306.12638.
  - <sup>14</sup> T. Senthil and M. P. A. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 064405 (2005).
  - <sup>15</sup> A. W. Sandvik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 227202 (2007), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.227202>.
  - <sup>16</sup> R. G. Melko and R. K. Kaul, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 017203 (2008), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.017203>.
  - <sup>17</sup> A. Nahum, P. Serna, J. T. Chalker, M. Ortuño, and A. M. Somoza, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 267203 (2015), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.267203>.
  - <sup>18</sup> A. Nahum, J. T. Chalker, P. Serna, M. Ortuño, and A. M. Somoza, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 041048 (2015), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.5.041048>.
  - <sup>19</sup> G. Sun, N. Ma, B. Zhao, A. W. Sandvik, and Z. Y. Meng, *Chinese Physics B* **30**, 067505 (2021), ISSN 1674-1056, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1674-1056/abf3b8>.
  - <sup>20</sup> X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 155114 (2013), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.87.155114>.
  - <sup>21</sup> X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, *Science* **338**, 1604 (2012).
  - <sup>22</sup> A. Vishwanath and T. Senthil, *Phys. Rev. X* **3**, 011016 (2013), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.3.011016>.
  - <sup>23</sup> C. Wang, A. Nahum, M. A. Metlitski, C. Xu, and T. Senthil, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031051 (2017), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.7.031051>.
  - <sup>24</sup> T. Senthil, D. T. Son, C. Wang, and C. Xu, *Physics Reports* **827**, 1 (2019), ISSN 0370-1573, duality between (2+1)d quantum critical points, URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0370157319302637>.
  - <sup>25</sup> D. B. Kaplan, J.-W. Lee, D. T. Son, and M. A. Stephanov, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 125005 (2009), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.80.125005>.
  - <sup>26</sup> Z. Zhou, L. Hu, W. Zhu, and Y.-C. He, *The SO(5) deconfined phase transition under the fuzzy sphere microscope: Approximate conformal symmetry, pseudo-criticality, and operator spectrum* (2024), 2306.16435.
  - <sup>27</sup> R. Thorngren, A. Vishwanath, and R. Verresen, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 075132 (2021), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.104.075132>.
  - <sup>28</sup> R. Wen and A. C. Potter, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 245127 (2023), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.107.245127>.
  - <sup>29</sup> J. Guo, G. Sun, B. Zhao, L. Wang, W. Hong, V. A. Sidorov, N. Ma, Q. Wu, S. Li, Z. Y. Meng, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 206602 (2020), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.206602>.
  - <sup>30</sup> B. Zhao, P. Weinberg, and A. W. Sandvik, *Nature Physics* **15**, 678–682 (2019), ISSN 1745-2481, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41567-019-0484-x>.
  - <sup>31</sup> Y. Cui, L. Liu, H. Lin, K.-H. Wu, W. Hong, X. Liu, C. Li, Z. Hu, N. Xi, S. Li, et al., *Science* **380**, 1179–1184 (2023), ISSN 1095-9203, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.adc9487>.
  - <sup>32</sup> J. Guo, P. Wang, C. Huang, B.-B. Chen, W. Hong, S. Cai, J. Zhao, J. Han, X. Chen, Y. Zhou, et al., *Deconfined quantum critical point lost in pressurized sruc2(bo3)2* (2023), 2310.20128.
  - <sup>33</sup> J. Y. Lee, Y.-Z. You, S. Sachdev, and A. Vishwanath, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041037 (2019), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.9.041037>.
  - <sup>34</sup> M. A. Metlitski and R. Thorngren, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 085140 (2018), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.98.085140>.
  - <sup>35</sup> F. Wu, T. Lovorn, E. Tutuc, I. Martin, and A. H. MacDonald, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 086402 (2019), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.086402>.
  - <sup>36</sup> H. Yu, M. Chen, and W. Yao, *National Science Review* **7**, 12–20 (2019), ISSN 2053-714X, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwz117>.
  - <sup>37</sup> T. Devakul, V. Crépel, Y. Zhang, and L. Fu, *Nature Communications* **12** (2021), ISSN 2041-1723, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-27042-9>.
  - <sup>38</sup> C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, *Physical Review Letter* **95**, 226801 (2005).
  - <sup>39</sup> C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, *Physical Review Letter* **95**, 146802 (2005).
  - <sup>40</sup> V. Crépel and A. Millis, *Bridging the small and large in twisted transition metal dicalcogenide homobilayers: a tight binding model capturing orbital interference and topology across a wide range of twist angles* (2024), 2403.15546.
  - <sup>41</sup> L. Balents, L. Bartosch, A. Burkov, S. Sachdev, and K. Sengupta, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **160**, 314 (2005), ISSN 0375-9687, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1143/PTPS.160.314>.
  - <sup>42</sup> E. H. Lieb, T. D. Schultz, and D. C. Mattis, *Ann. Phys.* **16**, 407 (1961).
  - <sup>43</sup> M. B. Hastings, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 104431 (2004), URL <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.69.104431>.
  - <sup>44</sup> M. Oshikawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1535 (2000), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.1535>.
  - <sup>45</sup> N. Read and S. Sachdev, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 1773 (1991), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.66.1773>.
  - <sup>46</sup> X. G. Wen, *Phys. Rev. B* **44**, 2664 (1991), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.44.2664>.
  - <sup>47</sup> X.-G. Wen, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 165113 (2002), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.65.165113>.
  - <sup>48</sup> R. Moessner and S. L. Sondhi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1881 (2001), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.1881>.

- <sup>49</sup> T. Grover, N. Trivedi, T. Senthil, and P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 245121 (2010), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.81.245121>.
- <sup>50</sup> H.-C. Jiang and S. A. Kivelson, Physical Review Letters **127** (2021), ISSN 1079-7114, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.097002>.
- <sup>51</sup> S. Kim, J. F. Mendez-Valderrama, X. Wang, and D. Chowdhury, *Theory of correlated insulator(s) and superconductor at  $\nu = 1$  in twisted  $wse_2$*  (2024), 2406.03525.
- <sup>52</sup> S. Sachdev, M. A. Metlitski, Y. Qi, and C. Xu, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 155129 (2009), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.80.155129>.
- <sup>53</sup> S. Sachdev, *Exotic phases and quantum phase transitions: model systems and experiments* (2009), 0901.4103.
- <sup>54</sup> E. G. Moon and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 035117 (2009), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.80.035117>.
- <sup>55</sup> Y. Qi and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 115129 (2010), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.81.115129>.
- <sup>56</sup> E. G. Moon and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 224508 (2011), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.83.224508>.
- <sup>57</sup> Q.-H. Huo, Y. Jiang, R.-Z. Wang, and H. Yan, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **101**, 27001 (2013), 1202.4511.
- <sup>58</sup> D. Chowdhury and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 245136 (2014), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.90.245136>.
- <sup>59</sup> D. Chowdhury and S. Sachdev, in *Quantum Criticality in Condensed Matter* (WORLD SCIENTIFIC, 2015), URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/9789814704090\\_0001](http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/9789814704090_0001).
- <sup>60</sup> P. M. Bonetti and W. Metzner, Phys. Rev. B **106**, 205152 (2022), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.106.205152>.
- <sup>61</sup> C. Xu and S. Sachdev, Physical Review Letters **105** (2010), ISSN 1079-7114, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.057201>.
- <sup>62</sup> C. Xu, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 024408 (2011), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.83.024408>.
- <sup>63</sup> L. Zou and D. Chowdhury, Phys. Rev. Res. **2**, 023344 (2020), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.2.023344>.
- <sup>64</sup> Y.-M. Lu, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 165113 (2016), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.93.165113>.
- <sup>65</sup> X.-Y. Song, Y.-C. He, A. Vishwanath, and C. Wang, Physical Review X **10** (2020), ISSN 2160-3308, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.10.011033>.
- <sup>66</sup> X.-Y. Song, C. Wang, A. Vishwanath, and Y.-C. He, Nature Communications **10** (2019), ISSN 2041-1723, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-11727-3>.
- <sup>67</sup> Y. Ran and X. gang Wen, *Continuous quantum phase transitions beyond landau's paradigm in a large- $n$  spin model* (2006), cond-mat/0609620.
- <sup>68</sup> C. Xu, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 054432 (2008), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.78.054432>.
- <sup>69</sup> R. Moessner and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 224401 (2001), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.63.224401>.
- <sup>70</sup> C. Xu and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 064405 (2009), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.79.064405>.
- <sup>71</sup> C.-M. Jian, A. Thomson, A. Rasmussen, Z. Bi, and C. Xu, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 195115 (2018), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.97.195115>.
- <sup>72</sup> L. Zou, Y.-C. He, and C. Wang, Phys. Rev. X **11**, 031043 (2021), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.11.031043>.
- <sup>73</sup> A. G. Abanov and P. B. Wiegmann, Nucl. Phys. B **570**, 685 (2000).
- <sup>74</sup> R. Ma and C. Wang, Phys. Rev. B **102**, 020407 (2020), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.102.020407>.
- <sup>75</sup> A. Nahum, Phys. Rev. B **102**, 201116 (2020), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.102.201116>.
- <sup>76</sup> A. W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 177201 (2010), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.177201>.
- <sup>77</sup> H. Shao, W. Guo, and A. W. Sandvik, Science **352**, 213 (2016), URL <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad5007>.
- <sup>78</sup> D. Poland, S. Rychkov, and A. Vichi, Rev. Mod. Phys. **91**, 015002 (2019), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.91.015002>.
- <sup>79</sup> Y. Nakayama and T. Ohtsuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 131601 (2016), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.131601>.
- <sup>80</sup> Z. Li, *Bootstrapping conformal  $qed_3$  and deconfined quantum critical point* (2022), 1812.09281.
- <sup>81</sup> J. Zhao, Y.-C. Wang, Z. Yan, M. Cheng, and Z. Y. Meng, Physical Review Letters **128** (2022), ISSN 1079-7114, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.128.010601>.
- <sup>82</sup> M. Song, J. Zhao, Z. Y. Meng, C. Xu, and M. Cheng, *Extracting subleading corrections in entanglement entropy at quantum phase transitions* (2024), 2312.13498.
- <sup>83</sup> M. Song, J. Zhao, M. Cheng, C. Xu, M. M. Scherer, L. Janssen, and Z. Y. Meng, *Deconfined quantum criticality lost* (2024), 2307.02547.
- <sup>84</sup> Z. Deng, L. Liu, W. Guo, and H.-q. Lin, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2401.12838 (2024), 2401.12838.
- <sup>85</sup> J. D'Emidio and A. W. Sandvik, *Entanglement entropy and deconfined criticality: emergent  $so(5)$  symmetry and proper lattice bipartition* (2024), 2401.14396.
- <sup>86</sup> K. Chen, Y. Huang, Y. Deng, A. B. Kuklov, N. V. Prokof'ev, and B. V. Svistunov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 185701 (2013), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.185701>.
- <sup>87</sup> J. Takahashi, H. Shao, B. Zhao, W. Guo, and A. W. Sandvik,  *$So(5)$  multicriticality in two-dimensional quantum magnets* (2024), 2405.06607.
- <sup>88</sup> S. M. Chester and N. Su, *Bootstrapping deconfined quantum tricriticality* (2024), 2310.08343.
- <sup>89</sup> G. J. Sreejith and S. Powell, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 184413 (2015), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.92.184413>.
- <sup>90</sup> B.-B. Chen, X. Zhang, and Z. Y. Meng, *Emergent conformal symmetry at the multicritical point of  $(2+1)d$   $so(5)$  model with wess-zumino-witten term on sphere* (2024), 2405.04470.
- <sup>91</sup> R. Ganesh, J. van den Brink, and S. Nishimoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 127203 (2013), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.127203>.
- <sup>92</sup> S. Pujari, K. Damle, and F. Alet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 087203 (2013), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.087203>.
- <sup>93</sup> Y. Q. Qin, Y.-Y. He, Y.-Z. You, Z.-Y. Lu, A. Sen, A. W. Sandvik, C. Xu, and Z. Y. Meng, Phys. Rev. X **7**, 031052 (2017), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevX.7.031052>.

- 1103/PhysRevX.7.031052.
- <sup>94</sup> J. Zhao, Z. Y. Meng, Y.-C. Wang, and N. Ma, *Scaling of disorder operator and entanglement entropy at easy-plane deconfined quantum criticalities* (2024), 2406.02681.
- <sup>95</sup> P. Serna and A. Nahum, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 195110 (2019), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.99.195110>.
- <sup>96</sup> T. Sato, M. Hohenadler, and F. F. Assaad, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 197203 (2017), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.197203>.
- <sup>97</sup> N. Karthik and R. Narayanan, Phys. Rev. D **96**, 054509 (2017), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.96.054509>.
- <sup>98</sup> T. Grover and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 156804 (2008), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.156804>.
- <sup>99</sup> E. Khalaf, S. Chatterjee, N. Bultinck, M. P. Zaletel, and A. Vishwanath, Science Advances **7** (2021), ISSN 2375-2548, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abf5299>.
- <sup>100</sup> Y. Liu, Z. Wang, T. Sato, M. Hohenadler, C. Wang, W. Guo, and F. F. Assaad, Nature Communications **10** (2019), ISSN 2041-1723, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10372-0>.
- <sup>101</sup> Z. H. Liu, W. Jiang, B.-B. Chen, J. Rong, M. Cheng, K. Sun, Z. Y. Meng, and F. F. Assaad, Phys. Rev. Lett. **130**, 266501 (2023), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.130.266501>.
- <sup>102</sup> Y. Ran, A. Vishwanath, and D.-H. Lee, *A direct transition between a neel ordered mott insulator and a  $d_{x^2-y^2}$  superconductor on the square lattice* (2008), URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/0806.2321>.
- <sup>103</sup> C. Xu and Y.-Z. You, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 220416 (2015), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.92.220416>.
- <sup>104</sup> P.-S. Hsin and N. Seiberg, Journal of High Energy Physics **2016**, 95 (2016), ISSN 1029-8479, URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09\(2016\)095](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/JHEP09(2016)095).
- <sup>105</sup> D. F. Mross, J. Alicea, and O. I. Motrunich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 016802 (2016), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.016802>.
- <sup>106</sup> A. C. Potter, C. Wang, M. A. Metlitski, and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. B **96**, 235114 (2017), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.96.235114>.
- <sup>107</sup> A. A. Burkov and L. Balents, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 134502 (2005), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.72.134502>.
- <sup>108</sup> The symmetry of the effective triangular moiré lattice is smaller than the full symmetry of a standard triangular lattice. For the symmetries under consideration here one can use the projective symmetry group (PSG) derived for the standard  $\pi$ -flux spin liquid state<sup>64-66</sup>.