

Deconfined quantum critical points in fermionic systems with spin-charge separation

Niccolò Baldelli,¹ Arianna Montorsi,² Sergi Julià-Farré,¹ Maciej Lewenstein,^{1,3} Matteo Rizzi,^{4,5} and Luca Barbiero²

¹*ICFO - Institut de Ciències Fotòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain*

²*Institute for Condensed Matter Physics and Complex Systems, DISAT, Politecnico di Torino, I-10129 Torino, Italy*

³*ICREA, Pg. Lluís Companys 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain*

⁴*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Cologne, D-50937 Köln, Germany*

⁵*Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Institute of Quantum Control, Peter Grünberg Institut (PGI-8), 52425 Jülich, Germany*

Deconfined quantum critical points are exotic transition points not predicted by the Landau–Ginzburg–Wilson symmetry-breaking paradigm. They are associated to a one-point gap closing between distinct locally ordered phases, thus to a continuous phase transition. Because of this intrinsic criticality, at deconfined quantum critical points algebraic decay of all the correlation functions is expected. Here, we show that it is possible to go beyond this assumption. Specifically, we consider one dimensional interacting fermions where the phenomenon of spin-charge separation arises. We first explore the low energy regimes where a sine-Gordon Hamiltonian can provide accurate results. By means of a field theory approach we find that continuous phase transitions between different locally ordered phases can occur. As a consequence of the decoupled spin and charge degrees of freedom, we find that in two cases only one gap vanishes while the other remains finite. We then derive a microscopic model where such phase transitions take place. By performing a numerical analysis, we unambiguously find that deconfined quantum critical points can indeed be further characterized by the long-range order of a parity operator signaling the presence of a finite gap. Our results provide new interesting insights on the widely investigated topic of quantum phase transitions.

I. INTRODUCTION

The mechanism by which one physical state is transformed into a different one, namely a phase transition, represents one of the most fundamental concepts in several areas of physics [1, 2]. In many cases, phase transitions are realized when an order parameter capturing the properties of a physical state abruptly vanishes, thus signaling the appearance of a phase with new features. This specific mechanism is usually defined as a first order or, equivalently, a discontinuous phase transition [3]. Notably, a large variety of phase transitions displaying different behaviors exist. Paradigmatic examples are for instance the Berezinskii–Kosterlitz–Thouless [4, 5], Ising [6] and, the more exotic, symmetric mass generation [7] phase transitions. Within this diversity, the Landau–Ginzburg–Wilson symmetry-breaking paradigm [8, 9] rigorously predicts the appearance of discontinuous phase transitions connecting locally ordered phases (LOp) with different symmetry properties. Nevertheless, pioneering analysis proved [10, 11] that it is possible to go beyond this paradigm. In particular, quantum fluctuations can generate second order continuous phase transitions between distinct gapped LOp. This implies the presence of a gap closing, or equivalently, the simultaneous and continuous vanishing of the two order parameters characterizing the different LOp, at a single point: the deconfined quantum critical point (DQCP) [12]. Here, as proved for two dimensional systems [10, 11], very fascinating and intriguing phenomena including charge fractionalization and emergent gauge fields can appear. In

addition, DQCPs are further characterized by the phenomena of symmetry enrichment, meaning that they exhibit symmetry properties not present in any of the two LOp they connect. This extraordinary variety of physical effects generated an intense theoretical effort which unveiled DQCPs in two-dimensional spin [13–25] and fermionic [26–29] models as well as in 3D [30, 31], and 1D [32–39] Hamiltonians. Notably, these previous studies all focused on systems where only a gap dictates the properties of phases with different symmetries. As a consequence, the gap closing at the transition point was always associated to fully gapless DQCPs where all the correlations have an algebraic decay. This is completely justified by the fact that in the large majority of possible LOp, the gaps capturing different degrees of freedom are always intrinsically related. In this regard, fermionic systems deserve special attention. In one dimension, strongly interacting fermions can indeed display the celebrated phenomenon of spin-charge separation [40–42]. The latter is associated to the decoupling of spin and charge degrees of freedom which can therefore behave completely independently one from the other. It then appears not obvious whether DQCPs can exist in presence of spin-charge separation and how this phenomenon might affect their properties.

Here, we tackle this fundamental and interesting problem. Specifically, in section II we first consider interacting one dimensional fermions in the low energy limit, which are effectively described by a sine-Gordon model. By relying on a field theory analysis, also called bosonization [43, 44], we discuss how for conserved both particle number and total spin magnetization, among the others,

three possible LOp can take place: a charge density wave (CDW), an antiferromagnet (AF) and a bond-order-wave (BOW) insulator. Notably, these present both spin and charge gapped degrees of freedom, i. e. they are fully gapped regimes. Here, bosonization is able to prove the following key aspects: power law decay of specific correlation functions occurs at the phase transitions between the three different LOp phases, thus proving the presence of at least one gap closing in one single point; in two of these transition points, one gap closes while the other one remains finite as signaled by the long-range of one nonlocal parity correlator; at each of the three transition points one or two additional continuous symmetry, not characterizing the different LOp, emerge. In order to enforce these findings, in section III we then derive a microscopic model where the three LOp occur as a function of the Hamiltonian parameters. Here, in addition to bosonization, we perform a Variational Uniform Matrix Product States (VUMPS) [45, 46] based analysis. This method has the advantage that it can mimic the thermodynamic limit allowing for a systematic scaling procedure close to phase transitions. Notably, the numerical analysis of this model rules out a possible second order phase transition where both the charge and the spin gap vanish in one point. Here, our results find indeed the appearance of a first order transition in agreement with the Landau's predictions. At the same time, our results based on the derivation of Luttinger parameters, correlation lengths and correlators decay, show that continuous phase transitions where one gap closes and the other remains finite characterize our model. On one hand, this result proves the appearance of an emergent $su(2)$ symmetry in the channel associated with the gap closing. On the other, in agreement with bosonization, the presence of an additional finite gap induces long-range order of a parity correlator. Moreover, by performing a bond-dimension scaling extrapolation, we accurately extract the critical exponents which govern how the local order parameters vanish at the transition point. Here, we find values not compatible with the Ising universality class thus unambiguously proving the appearance of one dimensional DCQPs. Contrary to those previously investigated, here we find partially gapped DQCPs characterized by long-range order of a nonlocal parity operator. Our results thus demonstrate that the celebrated phenomenon of spin-charge separation can largely enrich the physical properties of DQCPs. More generally, our findings provide a relevant contribution towards a deeper comprehension of quantum phase transitions.

II. FIELD THEORY OF INTERACTING FERMIONS

The standard field theory treatment of 1D lattice systems of correlated fermions is based on a weak coupling approach, known as bosonization. As this technique has been largely employed, see [43, 44] for exhaustive

references, here we just summarize the relevant steps needed to derive the low energy properties of a many-body fermionic system with short range interaction. The starting point consists in defining the continuum limit by replacing the discrete sum over sites j with integrals over the coordinate $x = ja$, i.e. $\sum_j \rightarrow \frac{1}{a} \int dx$ with a a lattice spacing. Thanks to the peculiar nature of the one dimensional Fermi surface consisting of just two disconnected points $\pm k_F$, usual fermionic operators $c_{j\sigma}, c_{j\sigma}^\dagger$, with $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ labeling the spin orientation, can be rewritten in terms of right (R) and left (L) fermionic fields $\psi_{\chi\sigma}(x)$ ($\chi = R, L$),

$$c_{j\sigma} \rightarrow \sqrt{a} [e^{ik_F x} \psi_{R\sigma}(x) + e^{-ik_F x} \psi_{L\sigma}(x)] \quad . \quad (1)$$

The bosonization procedure amounts to rewriting the above fields as appropriate exponentials of bosonic fields $\phi_{\chi\sigma}(x)$, multiplied by a Klein factor $\eta_{\chi\sigma}$ to reproduce their correct anticommutation algebra: $\psi_{\chi\sigma}(x) = \frac{\eta_{\chi\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}} e^{i\sqrt{4\pi}\chi\phi_{\chi\sigma}(x)}$. It is then customary to introduce first the linear combinations $\phi_\sigma(x) = \phi_{R\sigma}(x) + \phi_{L\sigma}(x)$ and $\theta_\sigma(x) = \phi_{R\sigma}(x) - \phi_{L\sigma}(x)$; and finally their superpositions $\varphi_c(x) = \phi_\uparrow + \phi_\downarrow$, and $\varphi_s(x) = \phi_\uparrow - \phi_\downarrow$, and similarly $\vartheta_c = \theta_\uparrow + \theta_\downarrow$ and $\vartheta_s = \theta_\uparrow - \theta_\downarrow$. At half filling $k_F = \pi/(2a)$ the resulting mapping reads:

$$\psi_{\chi\sigma} = \frac{\eta_{\chi\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}} e^{i\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}[\chi\varphi_c(x) + \vartheta_c(x) + \sigma(\chi\varphi_s(x) + \vartheta_s(x))]} \quad , \quad (2)$$

where, with an abuse of notation, χ and σ in the exponent now stand for signs: $R = +$ and $L = -$, $\uparrow = +$ and $\downarrow = -$. Moreover $\alpha \sim a$ is an ultraviolet cutoff, and appropriate commutation relations hold between the bosonic fields. The procedure outlined above allows describing the low energy behavior of most one dimensional fermionic systems. In case of conserved total magnetization and particle number a fermionic system is described by two decoupled sine-Gordon models $\mathcal{H} = \sum_{\nu=c,s} \mathcal{H}_\nu^{SG}$ in the spin (s) and charge (c) degrees of freedom. Explicitly:

$$\mathcal{H}_\nu^{SG} = \frac{1}{2} \int dx \left[v_\nu K_\nu (\nabla \vartheta_\nu(x))^2 + \frac{v_\nu}{K_\nu} (\nabla \varphi_\nu(x))^2 + \frac{g_\nu}{\pi^2 a^2} \cos(\sqrt{8\pi} \varphi_\nu(x)) \right] \quad . \quad (3)$$

Notice that here v_ν , K_ν and g_ν are the excitation velocities, Luttinger parameters, and coupling amplitudes respectively, which depend on the microscopic Hamiltonian parameters. In Eq. (3), the competition between the quadratic and the cosine terms determines the properties of the system. Specifically, in the first line fluctuations of the fields are promoted, whereas the cosine term in the second line favors the pinning of the field $\varphi_\nu(x)$ to a x independent value minimizing the system energy. The resulting phase diagram can be established by means of a well known RG analysis [43] of the model in Eq. (3). In each channel the cosine term turns out to be irrelevant if

	Disordered Phases		Symmetry Protected Topological Phases			Locally Ordered Phases		
	Luther-Emery Liquid	Mott Insulator	Haldane Insulator	Haldane Liquid	Spin Haldane Insulator	Bond Order Wave	Charge Density Wave	Antiferromagnet
φ_c	<i>unpinned</i>	0	$\sqrt{\pi/8}$	<i>unpinned</i>	$\sqrt{\pi/8}$	0	$\sqrt{\pi/8}$	0
φ_s	0	<i>unpinned</i>	<i>unpinned</i>	$\sqrt{\pi/8}$	$\sqrt{\pi/8}$	0	0	$\sqrt{\pi/8}$
Δ_c	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Δ_s	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

TABLE I. List of all the possible gapped phase in one-dimensional fermionic systems with $u(1)$ charge and spin symmetry described by the Hamiltonian in Eq.(3). These phases are distinguished by considering the values of the φ_ν and the induced gap structures.

the coupling g_ν satisfies

$$2\pi v_\nu(K_\nu - 1) \geq |g_\nu| \quad . \quad (4)$$

When the cosine term becomes relevant instead, $\varphi_\nu(x)$ prefers to pin to an appropriate constant value, and a gap Δ_ν opens in the corresponding ν -channel. Since the gapless excitations are suppressed, the long wavelength fluctuations and the associated power law behavior of correlations captured by K_ν are also suppressed: K_ν effectively flows to 0 in the ν -channel.

In general, depending on the negative or positive sign of g_ν in Eq. (4), the pinning values of φ_ν are respectively 0 and $\sqrt{\pi/8}$. In presence of total charge/spin vector conservation of the microscopic lattice Hamiltonian though, the RG flow in the corresponding channel is restricted to solely the line $2\pi v_\nu(K_\nu - 1) = g_\nu$, implying that the cosine term can become relevant only for $g_\nu < 0$ ($\varphi_\nu = 0$). In this case $K_\nu = \frac{1}{2\pi v_\nu}(1 + g_\nu)$: the theory is gapless for $K_\nu > 1$ and gapped for $K_\nu < 1$. More generally, rooted in the total charge/spin conservation of the lattice Hamiltonian is the global $u(1)$ symmetry

$$\vartheta_\nu \rightarrow \vartheta_\nu + const \quad . \quad (5)$$

and a further solution to Eq. (4) can be found, corresponding to the choice $\varphi_\nu = \sqrt{\pi/8}$ [47].

When the cosine term is irrelevant, the effective Hamiltonian reduces to a Gaussian model, exhibiting the further $u(1)$ symmetry

$$\varphi_\nu(x) \rightarrow \varphi_\nu(x) + const \quad , \quad (6)$$

so that the full symmetry in a gapless channel will be enriched to $u(1) \times u(1) \cong su(2)$ [48]. When the cosine term becomes relevant though, the above symmetry becomes discrete, namely

$$\varphi_\nu(x) \rightarrow \varphi_\nu(x) + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \quad . \quad (7)$$

Relevantly, also other discrete like the translational, spin-flip and inversion symmetries characterize \mathcal{H} , see for instance [35, 49]. According to the Landau's picture [8], some of these could be spontaneously broken generating LOp captured by a corresponding local order parameter.

A. Classification of the possible gapped phases

In order to derive the LOp, one has to explore the different solutions for gapped phases provided by Eq. (3). Specifically, it is important to obtain a complete classification of all the possible partly (i.e. with a non vanishing gap in just one of the two channels) or fully (when a gap is present in both channel) gapped regimes taking place in one dimensional fermionic systems, with short range interaction and two $u(1)$ symmetries associated to total charge and spin- z conservation. In this regard, it is possible to show [50–52] that, generally, the presence of a gapped channel can be formally captured by the non vanishing expectation value of a nonlocal parity, also called disorder [53–55] in higher dimension, or string order operator [56]. On a one dimensional lattice, their microscopic and bosonized expressions read respectively

$$O_P^\nu(j) = e^{i\pi \sum_{i<j} S_i^\nu} \rightarrow O_P^\nu(x) \sim \cos\left(\sqrt{2\pi}\varphi_\nu(x)\right) \quad (8)$$

$$O_S^\nu(j) = O_P^\nu(j)S_j^\nu \rightarrow O_S^\nu(x) \sim \sin\left(\sqrt{2\pi}\varphi_\nu(x)\right) \quad , \quad (9)$$

where $S_j^s = (n_{j\uparrow} - n_{j\downarrow})$ and $S_j^c = (1 - n_j)$. Here $n_j = n_{j\uparrow} + n_{j\downarrow}$ is the number operator on lattice site j . As usual, also in this nonlocal case the finite value of the order parameter reflects into the long-range order of the corresponding correlation functions, defined as

$$C_X^\nu(r) = \langle O_X^{\nu\dagger}(x)O_X^\nu(x+r) \rangle \quad , \quad (10)$$

with $X = P, S$. In the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$, a finite value of $C_X^\nu = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} C_X^\nu(r)$ captures the presence of long-range order. More specifically, states of matter which ordering is identified solely by a finite string order, i.e. $C_S^\nu \neq 0$, can be recognized [52] as symmetry protected topological phases (SPTp) [57–62]. Notably, their intrinsic nonlocality makes SPTp the paradigmatic example of states escaping the Landau's theory of LOp. The outlined field theory approach provides through Eqs. (9) and (10) three different cases where at least one $C_S^\nu \neq 0$. In particular, when $\varphi_c = \sqrt{\pi/8}$ and φ_s is unpinned, $C_S^\nu \neq 0$ describes an insulator. Based on the formal analogy with

the SPTp occurring in spin-1 Heisenberg [63–65] and Bose-Hubbard models [66–69], this phase is also known as Haldane insulator (HI). Whereas, for $\varphi_s = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8}}$ and φ_c unpinned, $C_S^s \neq 0$ identifies a spin gapped SPTp also known as Haldane liquid (HL) [70, 71]. Interestingly, field theory predicts as well a solution where $\varphi_s = \varphi_c = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8}}$. In this latter case both C_S^s and C_S^c are non vanishing and a fully gapped SPTp that we dub as spin Haldane insulator (SHI) occurs. The latter being analogous to the topological regime of spinful SSH models [72–75].

Two additional solutions describing partly gapped phases also emerge by the study of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (3): one where $\varphi_c = 0$ and φ_s is unpinned and a different one where $\varphi_s = 0$ and φ_c is unpinned. Eqs. (8), (10) show that these are identified by a finite value of either C_P^s or C_P^c . Because of the fact that these phases do not own any local order as they can be classified uniquely through parity operators, we name them disordered phases (Dp). Obviously, the absence of any local order make Dp also escape the Landau’s classification of phases of matter. Going more into details, the field theory approach described above provides through Eq. (8) two different solutions supporting the presence of Dp: a spin gapped Luther-Emery liquid (LEL) phase where $\varphi_s = 0$ and φ_c is unpinned so that $C_P^s \neq 0$ and $C_P^c = C_S^c = 0$; a Mott insulator (MI) where the gaps $\Delta_c \neq 0$, $\Delta_s = 0$ reflect the unpinning of φ_s and the pinning of φ_c to zero so that $C_P^c \neq 0$ and all the other nonlocal order parameters are vanishing.

Up to now, the field theory treatment unveiled quantum regimes with no local orders. Notably, throughout the above bosonization treatment three fully gapped LOP can be identified. In particular, the RG treatment of eq. (3) provides the solutions: a) $\varphi_c = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8}}$ and $\varphi_s = 0$; b) $\varphi_c = 0$ and $\varphi_s = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8}}$; c) $\varphi_c = 0$ and $\varphi_s = 0$. The first scenario implies that both $C_S^c \neq 0 \neq C_P^s$. In this case it is useful to introduce the charge density wave (CDW) local order parameter, defined on a L -site lattice as the expectation value of the operator

$$\mathcal{O}_{CDW} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_j (-1)^j S_j^c. \quad (11)$$

In the continuum, upon introducing the usual integral over x , $\mathcal{O}_{CDW} = \frac{1}{L} \int dx \mathcal{O}_{CDW}(x)$, one can show [43, 49] that

$$\mathcal{O}_{CDW}(x) \sim \sin\left(\sqrt{2\pi}\varphi_c(x)\right) \cos\left(\sqrt{2\pi}\varphi_s(x)\right) \quad (12)$$

and the specific values of φ_ν clearly imply $\mathcal{O}_{CDW}(x) \neq 0$. As intuitive from Eq. (11), the phase characterized by a non vanishing CDW order parameter breaks the discrete translation symmetry $c_{j\sigma} \rightarrow c_{j+1\sigma}$, which in terms of the bosonic fields reads $\varphi_c(x+a) \rightarrow \varphi_c(x) + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}$, $\varphi_s \rightarrow \varphi_s$ [49]. As a matter of fact, one can see that also the discrete symmetry Eq. (7) in the charge channel turns out to be broken. Also the b) solution, with $C_S^s \neq 0 \neq C_P^c$,

supports a description in terms of a local order parameter. In this case, upon introducing the antiferromagnetic (AF) order parameter

$$\mathcal{O}_{AF}(j) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_j (-1)^j S_j^s, \quad (13)$$

one can show that in the continuum limit the corresponding quantity reads $\mathcal{O}_{AF} = \frac{1}{L} \int dx \mathcal{O}_{AF}(x)$ with

$$\mathcal{O}_{AF}(x) \sim \cos\left(\sqrt{2\pi}\varphi_c(x)\right) \sin\left(\sqrt{2\pi}\varphi_s(x)\right) . \quad (14)$$

As clear, this AF phase is related to the breaking the discrete lattice spin flip invariance $c_{j,\sigma} \rightarrow c_{j,-\sigma}$, which in fact also amounts to the breaking of the Eq. (7) symmetry for the spin field. Finally, the phase described by the solution c) has $C_P^c \neq 0 \neq C_P^s$ which corresponds to the LOP known as bond-order-wave (BOW). The BOW phase is characterized by a non vanishing expectation value of the operator

$$\mathcal{O}_{BOW}(j) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_j (-1)^j B_j \quad (15)$$

with $B_j = \sum_\sigma (c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger c_{j+1,\sigma} + h.c.)$ which thus signals that the broken discrete symmetry is the site inversion. In the continuum

$$\mathcal{O}_{BOW}(x) \sim \cos\left(\sqrt{2\pi}\varphi_c(x)\right) \cos\left(\sqrt{2\pi}\varphi_s(x)\right), \quad (16)$$

will in fact remain finite when integrated over x . The complete classification of gapped and partly gapped many-body phases is reported in Table I

B. Beyond Landau phase transitions

The previous analysis allowed defining three LOP. It appears thus crucial to understand whether such phases are connected through continuous or first order phase transitions. As already indeed pointed out, in the former case the gap vanishes uniquely in one specific point and therefore algebraic decay of the two correlation functions having long-range or exponential decay in the two LOP should be predicted. In addition, one should distinguish the case where at these transitions only one of the two gaps closes from the case where both gaps vanish independently. While this latter scenario might occur at the AF-CDW transition as signaled by the different value of both φ_s and φ_c in AF and CDW, the constant value of $\varphi_s(\varphi_c)$ in BOW and CDW(AF) is compatible with the fact that only $\Delta_c(\Delta_s) = 0$ at the BOW-CDW(AF) transition point. As a consequence, in this last scenario the presence of a second order transition will be further enriched by one gap $\Delta_\nu \neq 0$ and the corresponding nonlocal order parameter O_P^ν will remain finite. Therefore, one might detect a LEL(MI) with spin(charge) parity order at the BOW-CDW(AF). Whereas, in presence of second




FIG. 1. Study of the critical point between the BOW and the CDW phases appearing in Eq. (24) for $U = 4$, $J_z = 0$ and $t = 1$. (a) Luttinger parameters K_s and K_c . While the first is almost vanishing for all the considered values of V thus proving that the spin gap remains always finite, K_c shows a size independent cusp in one single point thus proving the charge gap closing. (b) The correlation length ξ_c shows a bond-dimension χ -divergence in the form of a cusp only in one point, also signaling a closing of a gap. (c) Algebraic decay of C_{CDW} and C_{BOW} associated to long-range order of the spin parity operator C_S^s at the CDW-BOW transition point. All the results have been obtained through VUMPS simulation by keeping a unit cell of two sites.

order AF-CDW transition both gaps have to close and a LL behavior can take place. Only in this latter case all correlation functions would then display algebraic decay. In order to better exploit this crucial point, it is convenient to first relate the decay of correlation functions at the transition points to the Luttinger parameters K_ν . Here, the Tomonaga Luttinger theory [40, 41] predicts the K_ν 's to induce in the MI, LEL, and LL phases different algebraic decay of the correlation functions relative to the order parameters in eqs.(12), (14), (16). Notably, these latter will have the same decay only in the fully gapless LL phase. Explicitly, for each of the above local order parameter, one can define correlation functions $C_X(r)$ as in (10) (with $X = AF, BOW, CDW$). Based on the previous argument, it can then be proved that at the CDW-AF transition, where a LL should emerge, all three correlation functions decay with the same algebraic decay, namely

$$C_{AF}(r) \sim C_{BOW}(r) \sim C_{CDW}(r) \sim r^{-(K_c + K_s)}. \quad (17)$$

Crucially, we find that at the BOW-CDW transition solely $K_s = 0$ and therefore the relation again showing the presence of algebraic decay

$$C_{CDW}(r) \sim r^{-K_c} \sim C_{BOW}(r) \quad (18)$$

holds. In addition, the fixed value $\varphi_s = 0$ proves that long-range of the spin parity has to occur. Analogously, at the BOW-CDW transition $K_c = 0$ and $\varphi_s = 0$, therefore

$$C_{AF}(r) \sim r^{-K_s} \sim C_{BOW}(r) \quad (19)$$

and $C_P^s \neq 0$. The above results clearly rule out the presence of discontinuous phase transitions between different

LOp. At the same time, this analysis points in the direction that exotic DQCPs characterized by long-range order of nonlocal order parameter can exist at the BOW-CDW and BOW-AF transition while standard fully gapless DQCPs might appear at the CDW-AF critical point.

III. MICROSCOPIC HAMILTONIAN

As the field theory analysis suggests that very peculiar beyond-Landau phase transitions occur in strongly interacting fermionic systems, we turn to confirming this intuition at a microscopical level. To do that, we design a lattice Hamiltonian where both the three LOp and phase transition between them can occur. In particular, while broken translational symmetry is usually induced by the intersite density-density interaction

$$H_{IS}(j) = S_j^c S_{j+1}^c, \quad (20)$$

antiferromagnetic order can emerge in presence of the magnetic coupling

$$H_{AF}(j) = S_j^s S_{j+1}^s. \quad (21)$$

In addition, the competition between intersite and onsite interaction of the form of

$$H_{OS}(j) = n_{j\uparrow} n_{j,\downarrow} \quad (22)$$

can give rise to BOW ordering [49]. Finally, away from strongly interacting perturbative regimes, quantum fluctuations are induced by tunneling process

$$H_{TP}(j) = B_j \quad (23)$$

with $B_j = \sum_{\sigma} (c_{j,\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j+1,\sigma} + h.c.)$. All these contributes and their relative strength are captured by the following Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_j [-tH_{TP}(j) + VH_{IS}(j) + J_z H_{AF}(j) + UH_{OS}(j)] \quad (24)$$

As specified, here we are interested in the half-filling and vanishing total magnetization regime, i.e. $\sum_j S_j^{\nu} = 0$ for both $\nu = c, s$.

A. Bosonization analysis

We can extract important information about possible beyond-Landau phase transitions, by applying the bosonization approach to this microscopic model. Specifically, we can derive the parameters in Eq.(3) in terms of the microscopic couplings t, U, V, J_z . More in detail, we get

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\nu} &= 2at(2 - K_{\nu}), \\ K_c &= 1 - \frac{1}{4\pi t}(U + 6V + 2J_z), \\ K_s &= 1 - \frac{1}{4\pi t}(-U + 2V + 6J_z), \\ g_c &= -(U - 2V + 2J_z)a = -g_s. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The bosonization and renormalization group approach outlined above predicts that the transitions between LOP occur independently in the two channels for $g_{\nu} = 0$. In this case, since $g_c = -g_s$, they identify the same line, namely

$$U + 2J_z = 2V \quad . \quad (26)$$

Thus along such line, a continuous CDW-AF transition is predicted, in principle compatible with a fully gapless DQCP. However, it is a well known fact that when the above analysis is complemented by other results, for instance by level crossing analysis[49], the actual transition lines observed in the two channels split: the BOW-CDW and BOW-AF transitions will occur in the weak coupling region, while they will merge into the CDW-AF transition at intermediate couplings only. If this is the case, in the weakly coupled regime this theory turns out to be compatible with the presence of the partly gapped DQCPs envisaged previously.

At the transition lines (26), according to (25) one has $K_c \approx 1 - \frac{2V}{\pi t}$ and $K_s \approx 1 - \frac{2J_z}{\pi t}$, differing from each other for any non-vanishing $V \neq J_z$. These values for the Luttinger parameters will be similar at the CDW-AF, or BOW-AF and BOW-CDW transitions. On the other hand, depending on the actual gap closing, eqs. (17), (18), and (19) predict a completely different dependence on K_{ν} in the power law decay of correlation functions. Thus we expect that the latter will potentially be valuable indicators of the possible type of DQCP.




FIG. 2. Scaling of the order parameters around the BOW-CDW transition relative to the model in Eq. (24) for $U = 4$, $J_z = 0$ and $t = 1$ as a function of the bond dimension χ . Both the (a) BOW and the (b) CDW order parameters vanish continuously at transition. By extrapolating the limit $\chi \rightarrow \infty$, it is possible to extract the critical exponent $\beta_{CDW}, \beta_{BOW} \neq 1/8$, thus excluding an Ising transition.

B. VUMPS analysis

Since bosonization is believed to provide accurate results in the low energy limit, in the following we employ numerical calculations to explore the possible appearance of DQCPs away from this regime. To unveil this point, we perform a numerical analysis based on the VUMPS technique. Here, the state is described by an infinitely repeating unit cell of tensors defined on the sites of the lattice. The tensors are then variationally optimized with a procedure similar to DMRG [76], by using the rest of the (infinite) system as an environment. Compared to infinite DMRG, VUMPS has the advantage to completely replace the full environment at each step, making its convergence significantly faster. This is crucial especially at critical points, where a larger bond dimension is required to get accurate results. Moreover, the absence of boundaries in the variational state makes it easier to escape metastable states that can become more favourable around the critical point where two phases with different symmetries meet. This being exactly the situation that we find at the phase transitions we are studying. Indeed, the use of VUMPS has proved critical in the analysis of




FIG. 3. First order phase transition between the BOW and the CDW phases in the model Eq. (24) for $U = 8$, $J_z = 0$ and $t = 1$. Here the values of the order parameters \mathcal{O}_{BOW} and \mathcal{O}_{CDW} are independent on the bond dimension χ and present a sharp discontinuity at the transition point, thus ruling out the presence of second order phase transition.

DQCPs in other systems [33, 38].

1. BOW-CDW

For $J_z = 0$, the Hamiltonian in Eq.(24) is the known extended Fermi-Hubbard model [49, 77–80]. For dominating U/t , the system is in Dp MI. The situation changes drastically for larger values of V . Here, two LOp can take place: a BOW phase when $V \sim U$ are away from strongly interacting perturbative regimes and a CDW for dominant intersite repulsion.

To certify that at the BOW-CDW critical point a gap closing occurs and that it only happens in the charge sector, we extrapolate the Luttinger parameters K_ν . Specifically, we extract their thermodynamic value by computing the static structure factors $P_\nu(q) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_r e^{iqr} \langle S_i^\nu S_{i+r}^\nu \rangle$ which relate to the Luttinger constants through the equation

$$K_\nu = \lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \frac{P_\nu(q)}{q} \sim 2\pi \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_\nu(q = 2\pi/L) - P_\nu(q = 0)}{L}. \quad (27)$$

As discussed in the previous sections, this quantity is expected to be zero for a finite Δ_ν , and finite in the case of a gapless channel. Although our analysis considers relatively large interactions $U/t = 4$, our VUMPS simulations provide results compatible with the field theory. On one hand, in Fig.1(a) we indeed find that $K_s \approx 0$ at the CDW-BOW transition point, meaning that $\Delta_s \neq 0$. On the other, K_c shows a L -dependence compatible with a vanishing thermodynamic value for all the considered values of V , except at the transition point where the size dependence is absent. This strongly points in the direction that a continuous phase transition between the two LOp persists not only in low energy regimes. In order

to enforce this aspect, we extract the correlation length $\xi_\nu(\chi)$ relative to the ν degrees of freedom [81]. A genuine second-order phase transition can indeed be identified by considering the scaling of the correlation length ξ_ν as a function of the bond dimension χ . In particular, one has to expect that in presence of a single point gap closing, the correlation length would show a χ -dependence in the form of a cusp uniquely at that point. Fig. 1(b) shows this behavior for ξ_c , thus unambiguously confirming the continuous nature of this transition. Notably, this charge gap closing clearly supports the phenomenon of symmetry enriching. Indeed, based on the previous symmetry arguments, the presence of a gapless sector is associated to a $su(2)$ symmetry. Therefore, it is straightforward to realize that an emergent $su(2)$ symmetry relative to the charge degrees of freedom which is not present either in BOW and CDW takes place at the CDW-BOW transition point. Further relevant informations can be derived by calculating the decay of the correlators in $C_{CDW}(r)$ and $C_{BOW}(r)$. Fig. 1(c) clearly proves their expected algebraic decay at the transition point. In addition, the same figure confirms that the spin parity parity has long-range order ($C_P^s \neq 0$). Based on this analysis, we have strong indications that peculiar DQCPs can occur in one-dimensional interacting fermionic systems. As underlined, previous examples found indeed fully gapless DQCPs. As a consequence of the phenomenon of spin-charge separation, our analysis shows instead strong evidences on the presence DQCPs with a finite gap and long-range order of a nonlocal order parameter.

In order to rule out the possibility to ascribe this phase transition in Ising universality class, in Fig. 2 we report an analysis of the behavior of the local order parameters in Eqs. (11) and (15). Specifically, we are interested in extracting the critical exponent $\beta_{BOW/CDW}$ governing how the local BOW and CDW order parameters vanish at the transition point, i.e.

$$\mathcal{O}_{BOW/CDW}(|V - V_C|) \propto |V - V_C|^{\beta_{BOW/CDW}}. \quad (28)$$

where V_C is the critical value of the intersite interaction where we detect the charge gap closing. Crucially, while an Ising phase transition would formally imply $\beta_{BOW/CDW} = 1/8$, our results based on an extrapolation in the limit $\chi \rightarrow \infty$ find different values of such critical exponent thus proving this phase transition as a novel example of a 1D DQCP. As pointed out, with respect to previously investigated DQCPs here such beyond Landau's transition points are further associated to a gapped excitation spectrum giving rise to long-range order of the spin parity operator. Notably, in agreement with previous finite-size studies on the same model [79], we find the BOW-CDW phase transition to become discontinuous for larger values of the interactions and therefore the partially gapped DQCPs disappear. However, this result is certainly not surprising. When increasing the contact interaction U , the mean-field treatment of the transition associated to negligible quantum fluctuations becomes indeed more accurate and a genuine first-order transition




FIG. 4. Study of the critical point between the BOW and the AF phases appearing in Eq. (24) for $U = 4$, $J_z = t = 1$. (a) Luttinger parameters K_c and K_s . While the first is almost vanishing for all the considered values of V thus proving that the spin gap remains always finite, K_s shows a size independent cusp in one single point thus proving the spin gap closing. (b) The correlation length ξ_s shows a bond-dimension χ -divergence in the form of a cusp only in one point, also signaling a closing of a gap. (c) Algebraic decay of C_{AF} and C_{BOW} associated to long-range order of the charge parity operator C_S^c at the AF-BOW transition point. All the results have been obtained through VUMPS simulation by keeping a unit cell of two sites.

is expected. We prove this point for $U = 8t$ in Fig. 3. In this case, the order parameters \mathcal{O}_{BOW} and \mathcal{O}_{CDW} exhibit a sharp jump at the critical point independent of the bond dimension χ , thus discarding the possibility of a single point gap closing.

2. AF-BOW

We now move to the analysis of the model in Eq. (24) for $J_z > 0$. As specified, this term allows for the breaking of the discrete spin flip symmetry. A part from slightly moving the transition points, we find indeed that the main role played by small J_z is to replace in the Hamiltonian ground state the Dp MI with a LOp AF. Thanks to this aspect, we can now perform an analysis analogous to the one made in the previous section to investigate whether the AF-BOW transition point can also be classified as a partially gapped DQCP. Here, we focus on intermediate interactions $U/t = 4$ and $J_z/t = 1$ while varying V/t and we again start by exploring the behavior of the Luttinger parameters. Our results in Fig. 4(a) find that at the transition point $K_c \approx 0$ [82] while K_s shows a finite value not affected by different L . This analysis combined with the clear cusp of $\xi_s(\chi)$ shown in Fig. 4(b) demonstrates that the CDW-AF is also a continuous phase transition where the spin gap closes and Δ_c remains finite. Based on the already pointed out symmetry arguments, this result shows the emergence at the critical point of a $su(2)$ symmetry related to the spin degrees of freedom not present in either the BOW or the AF phase. Fig. 4(c) also demonstrates that such symmetry enriched transition point is associated to long-range order of the C_P^c while the correlators C_{AF} and C_{BOW} decay algebraically. Thanks to these findings, we can again firmly state that the phase transition between the two

LOp AF and BOW is continuous and thus supporting the possible appearance of a partly gapped DQCP. The results in Fig. 5 confirm this intuition. As before, we can indeed study how the local order parameters \mathcal{O}_{AF} and \mathcal{O}_{BOW} vanish at the transition point. By performing a χ -extrapolation we show that both quantities vanish continuously for $V = V_c$. By calculating their critical exponent through

$$\mathcal{O}_{BOW/AF}(|V - V_C|) \propto |V - V_C|^{\beta_{BOW/AF}}, \quad (29)$$

we find $\beta_{AF} \sim 0.62$ and $\beta_{BOW} \sim 0.59$, again discarding the possibility of an Ising transition. As a consequence, this result proves again that the decoupling between spin and charge degrees of freedom can support the appearance of a partly gapped DQCP which in the specific BOW-AF case is characterized by $\Delta_c \neq 0$ while having long-range order of C_P^c .

Because of the specific values of the considered J_z , we do not find conclusive evidences of the possible disappearance of these DQCPs for larger interaction where, in analogy with previous case, the BOW-AF transition might become discontinuous. This is because the BOW phase disappears when increasing U before the onset of a first-order BOW-CDW transition could happen. Nevertheless, it cannot be excluded that such a change of behaviour could happen for a different value of J_z .

3. AF-CDW

Finally, we study the AF-CDW phase transition. As already pointed out at the level of field theory, in order to find such transition to be continuous, both gaps have to vanish at the transition point. This aspect clearly rules out the possible presence of a partly gapped DQCPs




FIG. 5. Scaling of the order parameters around the the AF-BOW transition point in appearing in Eq. (24) for $U = 4$, $J_z = t = 1$ as a function of the bond dimension χ . Both the (a) AF and the (b) BOW order parameters vanish continuously at transition. By extrapolating the limit $\chi \rightarrow \infty$, it is possible to extract the critical exponent $\beta_{AF}, \beta_{BOW} \neq 1/8$, excluding an Ising transition.

while in principle it still allows for standard fully gapless DQCPs where all the correlators decay algebraically. As already discussed, the presence of such a DQCPs would require a fine tuning of the microscopic parameters in order to have a simultaneous closing of both the spin and charge gaps. At the level of field theory, this scenario is not possible in our microscopic model as can be seen by deriving the Luttinger parameters K_c and K_s in Eq. 25 for this transition. This point is further confirmed numerically. We indeed find that the AF-CDW transition is always first order for $J_z/t = 1$ for all values of U/t . In Fig. 6 we prove this for the case of $U/t = 8$. As can be seen, the sharp jump of the order parameters \mathcal{O}_{BOW} and \mathcal{O}_{AF} at the transition point associated to the absence of any χ -dependence totally rules the possible appearance of continuous phase transition.




FIG. 6. First order phase transition between the AF and the CDW phases appearing in Eq. (24) for $U = 8$ and $J_z = t = 1$. Here the order parameters \mathcal{O}_{AF} and \mathcal{O}_{CDW} are independent on the bond dimension χ and present sharp discontinuity at the transition point thus ruling out the presence of second order phase transition.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We analysed the phase transitions connecting the possible locally ordered phases taking place in interacting one dimensional fermionic systems. By means of analytical and numerical treatments, we have been able to prove that some of them are not captured by the Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson symmetry-breaking paradigm. Contrary to previous studies, we indeed demonstrated that the phenomenon of spin-charge separation peculiar of interacting low dimensional fermions enables the presence of a one-dimensional version of deconfined critical points. These latter turn out to be not fully gapped but only partly gapped critical points where, therefore, long-range of specific nonlocal correlation functions occurs. In conclusion, we also point out that at least one of these phase transitions, the bond-order-wave charge-density-wave, has been predicted to characterize the phase diagram of ultracold dipolar atoms in optical lattice [75, 83]. Here, the presence of partially gapped deconfined quantum critical point can be probed by measuring the defect production [84] predicted by the Kibble-Zurek mechanism [85–90] in continuous transitions. In addition, quantum gas microscopy [91] allows for an accurate onsite resolution of local density [92] and magnetization [93] and therefore for an accurate probing of nonlocal order parameters. As consequence, we believe that our results not only unveiled a novel interesting type of deconfined quantum critical points but also paved the way towards their experimental detection which represents a fundamental challenge in solid experiments [94–97].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge useful discussions with M. P. A. Fisher, M. Oshikawa, G. Palumbo and L. Santos. ICFO group acknowledges support from: ERC AdG NO-QIA; MCIN/AEI (PGC2018-0910.13039/501100011033, CEX2019-000910-S/10.13039/501100011033, Plan National FIDEUA PID2019-106901GB-I00, Plan National STAMEENA PID2022-139099NB-I00 project funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by the “European Union NextGenerationEU/PRTR” (PRTR-C17.I1), FPI); QUANTERA MAQS PCI2019-111828-2); QUANTERA DYNAMITE PCI2022-132919 (QuantERA II Programme co-funded by European Union’s Horizon 2020 program under Grant Agreement No 101017733), Ministry of Economic Affairs and Digital Transformation of the Spanish Government through the QUANTUM ENIA project call – Quantum Spain project, and by the European Union through the Recovery, Transformation, and Resilience Plan – NextGenerationEU within the framework of the Digital Spain 2026 Agenda; Fundació Cellex; Fundació Mir-Puig; Generalitat de Catalunya (European Social Fund FEDER and CERCA program, AGAUR Grant No. 2021 SGR 01452,

QuantumCAT U16-011424, co-funded by ERDF Operational Program of Catalonia 2014-2020); Barcelona Supercomputing Center MareNostrum (FI-2023-1-0013); EU Quantum Flagship (PASQuanS2.1, 101113690); EU Horizon 2020 FET-OPEN OPTologic (Grant No 899794); EU Horizon Europe Program (Grant Agreement 101080086 — NeQST), ICFO Internal “QuantumGaudi” project; European Union’s Horizon 2020 program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 847648; “La Caixa” Junior Leaders fellowships, La Caixa” Foundation (ID 100010434): CF/BQ/PR23/11980043. M.R. acknowledges support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) via project Grant No. 277101999 within the CRC network TR 183 and the EU Quantum Flagship (PASQuanS2.1, 101113690). L. B. acknowledges financial support within the DiQut Grant No. 2022523NA7 funded by European Union – Next Generation EU, PRIN 2022 program (D.D. 104 - 02/02/2022 Ministero dell’Università e della Ricerca). Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union, European Commission, European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA), or any other granting authority. Neither the European Union nor any granting authority can be held responsible for them.

-
- [1] C. Domb, M. S. Green, and J. L. Lebowitz, *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena No. v. 8 (Academic Press, 1972).
- [2] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- [3] K. Binder, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **50**, 783 (1987).
- [4] V. L. Berezinsky, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **32**, 493 (1971).
- [5] J. M. Kosterlitz and D. J. Thouless, *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* **6**, 1181 (1973).
- [6] L. D. Landau, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **7**, 19 (1937).
- [7] J. Wang and Y.-Z. You, *Symmetry* **14** (2022), 10.3390/sym14071475.
- [8] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshitz, and M. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics* (Butterworth-Heinemann, New York, 1999).
- [9] K. G. Wilson and J. Kogut, *Phys. Rep.* **12**, 75 (1974).
- [10] T. Senthil, A. Vishwanath, L. Balents, S. Sachdev, and M. P. A. Fisher, *Science* **303**, 1490 (2004).
- [11] T. Senthil, L. Balents, S. Sachdev, A. Vishwanath, and M. P. A. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 144407 (2004).
- [12] T. Senthil, (2023), [arXiv:2306.12638 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.12638).
- [13] A. W. Sandvik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 227202 (2007).
- [14] F.-J. Jiang, M. Nyfeler, S. Chandrasekharan, and U.-J. Wiese, *J. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp* **2008**, P02009 (2008).
- [15] J. Lou, A. W. Sandvik, and N. Kawashima, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 180414 (2009).
- [16] A. Banerjee, K. Damle, and F. Alet, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 155139 (2010).
- [17] A. W. Sandvik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 177201 (2010).
- [18] K. Harada, T. Suzuki, T. Okubo, H. Matsuo, J. Lou, H. Watanabe, S. Todo, and N. Kawashima, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 220408 (2013).
- [19] K. Chen, Y. Huang, Y. Deng, A. B. Kuklov, N. V. Prokof’ev, and B. V. Svistunov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 185701 (2013).
- [20] A. Nahum, J. T. Chalker, P. Serna, M. Ortuño, and A. M. Somoza, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 041048 (2015).
- [21] H. Shao, W. Guo, and A. W. Sandvik, *Science* **352**, 213 (2016).
- [22] C. Wang, A. Nahum, M. A. Metlitski, C. Xu, and T. Senthil, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 031051 (2017).
- [23] J. Y. Lee, Y.-Z. You, S. Sachdev, and A. Vishwanath, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041037 (2019).
- [24] Y.-C. Wang, N. Ma, M. Cheng, and Z. Y. Meng, *SciPost Phys.* **13**, 123 (2022).
- [25] M. Song, J. Zhao, L. Janssen, M. M. Scherer, and Z. Y. Meng, (2023), [arXiv:2307.02547 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.02547).
- [26] Z.-X. Li, S.-K. Jian, and H. Yao, (2019), [arXiv:1904.10975 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.10975).
- [27] F. F. Assaad and T. Grover, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 041049 (2016).
- [28] Z. H. Liu, W. Jiang, B.-B. Chen, J. Rong, M. Cheng, K. Sun, Z. Y. Meng, and F. F. Assaad, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 266501 (2023).
- [29] Y. D. Liao, G. Pan, W. Jiang, Y. Qi, and Z. Y. Meng, (2023), [arXiv:2302.11742 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.11742).
- [30] D. Charrier, F. Alet, and P. Pujol, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 167205 (2008).
- [31] G. J. Sreejith and S. Powell, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 184413 (2015).
- [32] S. Jiang and O. Motrunich, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 075103 (2019).

- [33] B. Roberts, S. Jiang, and O. I. Motrunich, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 165143 (2019).
- [34] R.-Z. Huang, D.-C. Lu, Y.-Z. You, Z. Y. Meng, and T. Xiang, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 125137 (2019).
- [35] C. Mudry, A. Furusaki, T. Morimoto, and T. Hikihara, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 205153 (2019).
- [36] B. Roberts, S. Jiang, and O. I. Motrunich, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 155143 (2021).
- [37] J. Y. Lee, J. Ramette, M. A. Metlitski, V. Vuletić, W. W. Ho, and S. Choi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 083601 (2023).
- [38] N. Baldelli, C. R. Cabrera, S. Julià-Farré, M. Aidelsburger, and L. Barbiero, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 153401 (2024).
- [39] A. Romen, S. Birnkammer, and M. Knap, *SciPost Phys. Core* **7**, 008 (2024).
- [40] S. Tomonaga, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **5**, 544 (1950).
- [41] J. M. Luttinger, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **4**, 1154 (1963).
- [42] F. D. M. Haldane, *Journal of Physics C Solid State Physics* **14**, 2585 (1981).
- [43] A. M. T. Alexander O. Gogolin, Alexander A. Nersisyan, *Bosonization and Strongly Correlated Systems* (Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- [44] T. Giamarchi, *Quantum Physics in One Dimension* (Oxford University Press, 2004).
- [45] J. Haegeman, T. J. Osborne, and F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 075133 (2013).
- [46] V. Zauner-Stauber, L. Vanderstraeten, M. T. Fishman, F. Verstraete, and J. Haegeman, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 045145 (2018).
- [47] Indeed, in this more general case the Luttinger parameters can be written in the form $K_\nu = \frac{1}{2\pi v_\nu}(1 + g_\nu - \kappa_\nu)$, allowing a further solution for $\kappa_\nu > 0$.
- [48] Notice that the effective $su(2)$ symmetry holds in the case of $su(2)$ symmetric choices of the microscopic parameters of a Hamiltonian.
- [49] M. Nakamura, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 16377 (2000).
- [50] A. Montorsi and M. Roncaglia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 236404 (2012).
- [51] L. Barbiero, A. Montorsi, and M. Roncaglia, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 035109 (2013).
- [52] A. Montorsi, F. Dolcini, R. C. Iotti, and F. Rossi, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 245108 (2017).
- [53] L. P. Kadanoff and H. Ceva, *Phys. Rev. B* **3**, 3918 (1971).
- [54] Z. Nussinov and G. Ortiz, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **106**, 16944 (2009), <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.0803726105>.
- [55] E. Fradkin, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **167**, 427 (2017).
- [56] M. den Nijs and K. Rommelse, *Phys. Rev. B* **40**, 4709 (1989).
- [57] F. Pollmann, E. Berg, A. M. Turner, and M. Oshikawa, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 075125 (2012).
- [58] E. Tang and X.-G. Wen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 096403 (2012).
- [59] X.-G. Wen, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 035147 (2014).
- [60] Z.-C. Gu and X.-G. Wen, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 115141 (2014).
- [61] T. Senthil, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **6**, 299 (2015).
- [62] H. Shapourian, K. Shiozaki, and S. Ryu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 216402 (2017).
- [63] F. D. M. Haldane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 1153 (1983).
- [64] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 799 (1987).
- [65] L. Barbiero, L. Dell'Anna, A. Trombettoni, and V. E. Korepin, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 180404 (2017).
- [66] E. G. Dalla Torre, E. Berg, and E. Altman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 260401 (2006).
- [67] D. Rossini and R. Fazio, *New Journal of Physics* **14**, 065012 (2012).
- [68] K. Sugimoto, S. Ejima, F. Lange, and H. Fehske, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 012122 (2019).
- [69] J. Fraxanet, D. González-Cuadra, T. Pfau, M. Lewenstein, T. Langen, and L. Barbiero, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 043402 (2022).
- [70] S. Fazzini, L. Barbiero, and A. Montorsi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 106402 (2019).
- [71] A. Montorsi, S. Fazzini, and L. Barbiero, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 043618 (2020).
- [72] F. Anfuso and A. Rosch, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 144420 (2007).
- [73] S. R. Manmana, A. M. Essin, R. M. Noack, and V. Gurarie, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 205119 (2012).
- [74] L. Barbiero, L. Santos, and N. Goldman, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 201115 (2018).
- [75] S. Julià-Farré, D. González-Cuadra, A. Patscheider, M. J. Mark, F. Ferlino, M. Lewenstein, L. Barbiero, and A. Dauphin, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **4**, L032005 (2022).
- [76] S. R. White, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2863 (1992).
- [77] P. Sengupta, A. W. Sandvik, and D. K. Campbell, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 155113 (2002).
- [78] A. W. Sandvik, L. Balents, and D. K. Campbell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 236401 (2004).
- [79] S. Ejima and S. Nishimoto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 216403 (2007).
- [80] Y. Z. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 246404 (2004).
- [81] The correlation length is extracted through the relation $\xi_\nu = -N/\log(\lambda_2)$ where N is the number of sites of a unit cell and λ_2 is second highest eigenvalue of the transfer matrix.
- [82] The increasing of K_c for larger values of V/t is due to the fact that the system is approaching the BOW-CDW transition.
- [83] M. Di Dio, L. Barbiero, A. Recati, and M. Dalmonte, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 063608 (2014).
- [84] A. Keesling, A. Omran, H. Levine, H. Bernien, H. Pichler, S. Choi, R. Samajdar, S. Schwartz, P. Silvi, S. Sachdev, P. Zoller, M. Endres, M. Greiner, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, *Nature* **568**, 207 (2019).
- [85] T. W. B. Kibble, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **9**, 1387 (1976).
- [86] T. Kibble, *Physics Reports* **67**, 183 (1980).
- [87] W. H. Zurek, *Nature* **317**, 505 (1985).
- [88] W. Zurek, *Physics Reports* **276**, 177 (1996).
- [89] A. Polkovnikov, K. Sengupta, A. Silva, and M. Vengalattore, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 863 (2011).
- [90] A. del Campo and W. H. Zurek, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **29**, 1430018 (2014), <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217751X1430018X>.
- [91] C. Gross and W. S. Bakr, *Nat. Phys.* **17**, 1316 (2021).
- [92] M. Endres, M. Cheneau, T. Fukuhara, C. Weitenberg, P. Schauß, C. Gross, L. Mazza, M. C. Bañuls, L. Pollet, I. Bloch, and S. Kuhr, *Science* **334**, 200 (2011), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.1209284>.
- [93] M. F. Parsons, A. Mazurenko, C. S. Chiu, G. Ji, D. Greif, and M. Greiner, *Science* **353**, 1253 (2016).

- [94] M. E. Zayed, C. Rüegg, J. Larrea J., A. M. Läuchli, C. Panagopoulos, S. S. Saxena, M. Ellerby, D. F. McMorrow, T. Strässle, S. Klotz, G. Hamel, R. A. Sadykov, V. Pomjakushin, M. Boehm, M. Jiménez-Ruiz, A. Schneidewind, E. Pomjakushina, M. Stingaciu, K. Conder, and H. M. Rønnow, *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 962 (2017).
- [95] J. Guo, G. Sun, B. Zhao, L. Wang, W. Hong, V. A. Sidorov, N. Ma, Q. Wu, S. Li, Z. Y. Meng, A. W. Sandvik, and L. Sun, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 206602 (2020).
- [96] T. Hong, T. Ying, Q. Huang, S. E. Dissanayake, Y. Qiu, M. M. Turnbull, A. A. Podlesnyak, Y. Wu, H. Cao, Y. Liu, I. Umehara, J. Gouchi, Y. Uwatoko, M. Matsuda, D. A. Tennant, G.-W. Chern, K. P. Schmidt, and S. Wessel, *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 3073 (2022).
- [97] Y. Cui, L. Liu, H. Lin, K.-H. Wu, W. Hong, X. Liu, C. Li, Z. Hu, N. Xi, S. Li, R. Yu, A. W. Sandvik, and W. Yu, *Science* **380**, 1179 (2023), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.adc9487>.