

Non-Hermitian entanglement dip from scaling-induced exceptional criticality

Sirui Liu,^{1,2,3} Hui Jiang,^{1,*} Wen-Tan Xue,¹ Qingya Li,¹ Jiangbin Gong,^{1,3,4} Xiaogang Liu,^{2,3} and Ching Hua Lee^{1,3,†}

¹*Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117551, Singapore*

²*Department of Chemistry, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117543, Singapore*

³*Joint School of National University of Singapore and Tianjin University,*

International Campus of Tianjin University, Binhai New City, Fuzhou 350207, China

⁴*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 117543, Singapore*

(Dated: August 7, 2024)

It is well established that the entanglement entropy of a critical system generally scales logarithmically with system size. Yet, in this work, we report a new class of non-Hermitian critical transitions that exhibit dramatic divergent dips in their entanglement entropy scaling, strongly violating conventional logarithmic behavior. Dubbed scaling-induced exceptional criticality (SIEC), it transcends existing non-Hermitian mechanisms such as exceptional bound states and non-Hermitian skin effect (NHSE)-induced gap closures, which are nevertheless still governed by logarithmic entanglement scaling. Key to SIEC is its strongly scale-dependent spectrum, where eigenbands exhibit an exceptional crossing only at a particular system size. As such, the critical behavior is dominated by how the generalized Brillouin zone (GBZ) sweeps through the exceptional crossing with increasing system size, and not just by the gap closure per se. We provide a general approach for constructing SIEC systems based on the non-local competition between heterogeneous NHSE pumping directions, and show how a scale-dependent GBZ can be analytically derived to excellent accuracy. Beyond 1D free fermions, SIEC is expected to occur more prevalently in higher-dimensional or even interacting systems, where antagonistic NHSE channels generically proliferate. SIEC-induced entanglement dips generalize straightforwardly to kinks in other entanglement measures such as Renyi entropy, and serve as spectacular demonstrations of how algebraic and geometric singularities in complex band structures manifest in quantum information.

Introduction.— Entanglement scaling behavior provides an established diagnostic for critical phase transitions. Deeply rooted in boundary conformal field theory [1–9], it universally associates logarithmic entanglement entropy (EE) scaling $S \sim \log L$ with 1D criticality [10–24]. This seminal scaling property has also seen generalizations to higher-dimensional and topological systems, where midgap modes and nodal structures contribute distinctive signatures to the entanglement scaling [25–38], some with measurable prospects [39–46].

Of late, established results in critical entanglement scaling have been challenged in non-Hermitian contexts [10–24]. In so-called exceptional points (EPs) [47–59], geometric defectiveness blurs the distinction between occupied and unoccupied bands and probability non-conservation leads to fermionic occupancies effectively greater than one, giving rise to enigmatically negative free-fermion EE through the 2-point function [60–66]. This is further exacerbated by the non-Hermitian skin effect (NHSE) [67–94], which produces macroscopically many highly defective eigenstates indexed by complex momenta [51, 73, 95–127]. Yet, despite these complications, all known non-Hermitian free-fermion critical systems still exhibit the celebrated $S \sim \log L$ scaling.

In this work, we unveil a peculiar new class of non-Hermitian critical transitions which departs dramatically from logarithmic entanglement scaling. Dubbed scaling-

induced exceptional criticality (SIEC), it involves exceptional critical crossings that appear only at particular system sizes L_c , around which the entanglement entropy experiences characteristically divergent dips. As we shall elaborate through a rigorous generalized Brillouin zone (GBZ) construction, such dips can be traced to the breaking of scaling invariance which paradoxically lead to the emergence of supposedly scale-free gapless points.

Log-entanglement scaling from conventional non-Hermitian criticality.— To appreciate the unconventional ingredients for our SIEC entanglement dips, we first review known types of critical scenarios. We write an arbitrary non-interacting 1D lattice Hamiltonian as

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{k,\mu} E_\mu(k) |\psi_{k,\mu}^R\rangle \langle \psi_{k,\mu}^L| = \sum_{k,\mu} E_\mu(k) \psi_{k,\mu}^R [\psi_{k,\mu}^L]^* |k\rangle \langle k|, \quad (1)$$

where $|k\rangle$ is the quasi-momentum basis state and $|\psi_{k,\mu}^R\rangle, \langle \psi_{k,\mu}^L|$ are respectively the right and left eigenbands [128] of \mathcal{H} with band index μ . We stipulate that fermions occupy an arbitrary set of bands $\mu \in occ.$, such that state occupancy is described by the occupied band projector $P = \sum_{k,\mu \in occ.} |\psi_{k,\mu}^R\rangle \langle \psi_{k,\mu}^L| = \sum_k P_k |k\rangle \langle k|$, where $P_k = \sum_{\mu \in occ.} \psi_{k,\mu}^R [\psi_{k,\mu}^L]^*$. For an entanglement cut where the region $[x_L, x_R]$ is to be truncated, the biorthogonal [129] free-fermion EE is given by [19, 23]

$$S = -\text{Tr}[\bar{P} \log \bar{P} + (\mathbb{I} - \bar{P}) \log (\mathbb{I} - \bar{P})], \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{P} = \bar{\mathcal{R}} P \bar{\mathcal{R}}$ is the occupied band projector that is restricted to $x \notin [x_L, x_R]$ by the real-space projector $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \sum_{x \notin [x_L, x_R]} |x\rangle \langle x|$. In real-space, \bar{P} is a block Toeplitz

* phyhuij@nus.edu.sg

† phylch@nus.edu.sg




FIG. 1. Uniqueness of scaling-induced exceptional critical (SIEC) transitions in violating logarithmic entanglement scaling. (a) For a Hermitian critical point K_0 , eigenmomentum states (black dots) simply become denser and approach K_0 (red) as the system size L increases (cyan arrows), such that the closest approach $\Delta K_{\min} \sim \pi/L$ (brown curve), giving rise to $S \sim \log L$ (black curve). (b) Conventional logarithmic EE scaling from usual $\Delta K_{\min} \sim \pi/L$ eigenmomentum convergence still governs an exceptional non-Hermitian critical point K_0 , albeit with a negative coefficient ($S \sim -\log L$) due to divergent 2-point functions at exceptional criticality where $r \rightarrow 0$ (dark purple). (c) Logarithmic EE scaling also persists under the NHSE, since we still have $\Delta K_{\min} \sim \pi/L$ in the generalized Brillouin zone (GBZ) $z = e^{iK(k)}$. (d) By contrast, in our SIE-critical (SIEC) systems, the spectrum and GBZ themselves change with L (expanding cyan arrows), exhibiting critical touching K_0 (dark purple) only at a particular $L = \lfloor L_c \rfloor$. This leads to peculiar ΔK_{\min} scaling and a characteristic entanglement dip in S .

matrix with nonvanishing blocks $\bar{P}_{xx'} = \langle x | \bar{P} | x' \rangle$ (for $x, x' \notin [x_L, x_R]$) given by the Fourier transform

$$\bar{P}_{xx'} = \sum_k e^{ik(x'-x)} \sum_{\mu \in \text{occ.}} \psi_{k,\mu}^R [\psi_{k,\mu}^L]^* = \sum_k e^{ik(x'-x)} P_k. \quad (3)$$

Based on Eq. 3, we first review why the EE scales like $\log L$ in Hermitian critical points, as illustrated in Fig. 1(a). Consider a critical point K_0 (red) where the gap closes but the eigenspace remains full-rank i.e. non-defective. Due to the possible mixing of the occupied and unoccupied eigenstates at gap closure, the occupied band projector P_k generically become discontinuous i.e. singular at the critical point. However, due to the discrete momentum spacing (black dots) which scales like $2\pi/L$ (cyan arrows) in a finite lattice, the momentum sum in Eq. 3 only samples P_k down to a distance $\Delta k = k - K_0$ bounded below by $\Delta K_{\min} \sim \pi/L$ (brown curve) from the critical point i.e. $\bar{P}_{xx'} \sim \int_{\pi/L} e^{i\Delta k(x'-x)} P_{\Delta k} d(\Delta k)$ with a UV cutoff π/L . Since analytic singularities lead to power-law decay in their Fourier coefficients [130, 131] [132], we expect $P_{xx'}$, which are also the 2-point functions, to become long-ranged and cause substantial entanglement across the cut. Mathematically, this entanglement can be shown to diverge logarithmically with the inverse of the UV cutoff [133, 134], thereby yielding $S \sim \log L$ entanglement scaling [135].

Such $\log L$ entanglement scaling persists even if the critical point is geometrically defective (with completely non-orthogonal eigenstates), as is possible in non-Hermitian systems, as illustrated in Fig. 1(b). For a particular band, the overlap between its left and right

eigenstates $\langle \psi_k^L |, |\psi_k^R \rangle$ can be quantified through the phase rigidity [136–139] $r(k) = \frac{\langle \psi_k^L | \psi_k^R \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle \psi_k^L | \psi_k^L \rangle \langle \psi_k^R | \psi_k^R \rangle}}$, which is always unity in Hermitian systems, but ranging between $0 \leq r(k) \leq 1$ in non-Hermitian systems. In particular, at an exceptional critical point (EP) K_0 where $r(K_0) = 0$ [137] (dark purple), the occupied and unoccupied eigenstates coalesce and the occupied band projector P_k is not just discontinuous, but in fact divergent. Specifically, one or more matrix elements of P_k can be shown to diverge with $\Delta k = k - K_0$ as $(\Delta k)^{-B}$, which scales with $\Delta K_{\min} \sim L^B$, the model-dependent exponent B related to the order of the EP [63, 66]. Such divergences in P_k have also been recently shown to lead to $S \sim \log L$ entanglement scaling, albeit with a negative coefficient determined by B [63, 66], as presented in Supp. Sect. I.

Another key non-Hermitian phenomenon is the non-Hermitian skin effect (NHSE), but below we explain why the critical $\log L$ EE scaling still generically holds, as shown for the prototypical gapless non-Hermitian SSH [Fig. 1(c)] and other longer-ranged asymmetric hopping models I. In general, NHSE "skin" states can be modeled with exponentially decaying state profiles $e^{ikx} e^{-\kappa(k)x}$ for each wavenumber k , the inverse decay length $\kappa(k)$ determined through detailed boundary condition analysis [96, 99][140]. As such, the periodic and open boundary condition (PBC and OBC) eigenstates are approximately related through a complex quasi-momentum deformation $k \rightarrow K(k) = k + i\kappa(k)$, such that $\psi_{k,\mu}^R \rightarrow \psi_{K,\mu}^R$. This path $K(k)$, $k \in [0, 2\pi)$ is known as the generalized Brillouin zone (GBZ), and can be visualized as a closed loop $z = e^{iK(k)}$ that deviates from the unit circle e^{ik} due to the NHSE, as illustrated in Fig. 1(c).

Importantly, the modified entanglement entropy due to the NHSE can be directly computed through this GBZ deformation, since the eigen-equations for the left and right eigenstates depend on $K(k)$ according to [141]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(K)|\psi_{K,\mu}^R\rangle &= E_\mu(K)|\psi_{K,\mu}^R\rangle \\ \mathcal{H}^\dagger(K^*)|\psi_{K^*,\mu}^L\rangle &= E_\mu^*(K^*)|\psi_{K^*,\mu}^L\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

such that in the presence of skin state accumulation, $P_k \rightarrow \sum_{\mu \in \text{occ.}} |\psi_{K,\mu}^R\rangle \langle \psi_{K^*,\mu}^L|^\dagger = P_K$. As such, replacing P_k in Eq. 3 by P_K , we obtain the 2-point functions under the NHSE as

$$\bar{P}_{xx'} \xrightarrow{\text{NHSE}} \sum_k e^{ik(x'-x)} P_{K(k)=k+i\kappa(k)}. \quad (5)$$

Note that the Fourier sum for $\bar{P}_{xx'}$ is still with respect to k (and not K) because the NHSE does not alter the definition of the basis transform between real- and momentum-space. If P_K encounters a singularity K_0 along the GBZ path $K(k)$, then, like the above cases, the system would be critical and the EE would scale like

$$|S| \sim |\log \Delta K_{\min}|, \quad (6)$$

where ΔK_{\min} is determined [142] by the closest approach of $K(2\pi n/(L+1))$, $n = 1, \dots, L$ to the singularity. Since ΔK_{\min} would still scale like L^{-1} (brown curve) except in rare cases with sufficiently badly behaved $K(k)$ [143], the key takeaway is that the NHSE itself cannot give rise to critical entanglement scaling other than $S \sim \log L$.

Unconventional criticality from scale-dependent GBZ. – We have seen that two prominent non-Hermitian phenomena – exceptional point (EP) defectiveness and the NHSE – cannot by themselves lead to violations of $\log L$ entanglement scaling. This is because the closest approach to the critical point K_0 obeys $\Delta K_{\min} \sim L^{-1}$ for all but the most pathological GBZ paths $K(k)$.

In this work, a key insight is that qualitatively new entanglement scaling *can* however occur if the GBZ trajectory $K(k)$ also depends on L i.e. is scale-dependent. As L increases, ΔK_{\min} may vary non-monotonically with L , reaching a minimum when the $K(k)$ cuts across a singularity K_0 , as highlighted in Fig. 1(d) in red. The GBZ loop $e^{iK(2\pi n/(L+1))}$, $n = 1, \dots, L$ expands with increasing L (outward cyan arrows on loop of black dots), such that it intersects K_0 (dark purple) only at a special value of $L = L_c$. As such, we have rapid unconventional $\Delta K_{\min} \propto |L - L_c|$ scaling around $L \approx L_c$ (kink on brown curve). Since $S \sim -\log \Delta K_{\min}$, we thus also expect $\log L$ -violating EE scaling.

For such unconventional entanglement scaling, the system must meet the following conditions: (i) it must support qualitatively distinct dynamics at small L and large L , such as to have very different spectra and hence GBZs in these limits; (ii) it must possess at least two bands (components) to exhibit an exceptional critical transition between these limits.

Condition (i) can be generically met by weakly coupling two finite 1D NHSE chains $\nu = \text{I, II}$ with oppositely directed NHSE pumping to induce inter-chain tunneling [Fig. 2(a)]. As an important departure from usual literature, we label their basis $|x\rangle_\nu, |k\rangle_\nu$ in opposite directions [Fig. 2(a)], such that both chains are described by the same Hamiltonian H . This labeling, which assigns the momentum k based on the NHSE pumping, would turn out instrumental in our GBZ construction. Our system, with weak coupling δ , takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \sum_{x,x'=1}^L H_{xx'} |x\rangle_{\text{I}} \langle x'|_{\text{I}} + \sum_{x,x'=1}^L H_{xx'} |x\rangle_{\text{II}} \langle x'|_{\text{II}} \\ &+ \delta \sum_{x=1}^L \left[|x\rangle_{\text{I}} \langle L+1-x|_{\text{II}} + |L+1-x\rangle_{\text{II}} \langle x|_{\text{I}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{k;\nu} H_k |k\rangle_\nu \langle k|_\nu + \delta \sum_k \left[|k\rangle_{\text{I}} \langle -k|_{\text{II}} + | -k\rangle_{\text{II}} \langle k|_{\text{I}} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the last line describes only the bulk structure. Crucially, skin states grow exponentially with distance L in each chain, concomitantly enhancing the effective inter-chain tunneling probability. At small L , we have two effectively uncoupled OBC chains (faint double-arrows in Fig. 2(a)). But at large L , the exponentially larger tunneling probabilities (dark blue double-arrows) effectively close the two antagonistic chains into a loop, forming a PBC-like configuration. This construction indeed produces a distinctively scale-dependent spectrum, as shown in Fig. 2(b) for a minimal illustrative model with coupled

$$H_{\text{SSH}}(k) = (t_L + e^{-ik})\sigma_+ + (t_R + e^{ik})\sigma_- \quad (8)$$

chains, where $\sigma_\pm = (\sigma_x \pm i\sigma_y)/2$ are the Pauli matrices (see Fig. 4 and the supplement sect. I for other examples).

While no exact analytic solution exists for the GBZ of generic \mathcal{H} [Eq. 7], below we outline a general procedure for deriving an approximate GBZ that nevertheless captures its scaling properties accurately:

1. First, for an isolated chain H , solve $\text{Det}(H_k - E\mathbb{I}) = 0$ to obtain the bulk dispersion of H i.e. relation between $z = e^{ik}$ and energy E .
2. Solve the above dispersion polynomial and obtain all possible solutions z_i for any given E . For each z_i , obtain the corresponding eigenstates $|\zeta(z_i)\rangle_{\text{I}}$ and $|\zeta(z_i)\rangle_{\text{II}}$ based on H and H^T . While values of E that satisfy the conventional GBZ condition $|z_i| = |z_j|$, $i \neq j$ correspond to the OBC spectrum of an *isolated* chain, this condition will be severely violated for the coupled system \mathcal{H} , even with tiny $\delta \neq 0$.
3. Introduce the inter-chain coupling δ and solve the OBC eigenequation $\mathcal{H}|\Psi_{\text{GBZ}}\rangle = E|\Psi_{\text{GBZ}}\rangle$ for both coupled chains using the ansatz $|\Psi_{\text{GBZ}}\rangle = \sum_i c_i \sum_{x=1}^L z_i^x |\zeta(z_i)\rangle_{\text{I}} \oplus z_i^{L+1-x} |\zeta(z_i)\rangle_{\text{II}}$, where c_i are linear combination coefficients to be eliminated. The




FIG. 2. Scaling-dependent critical spectrum and GBZ from antagonistic NHSE. (a) Our construction [Eq. 7] involves weakly coupling two chains H with opposite NHSE and momentum label k . Only for sufficiently long chains (Right) is the NHSE strong enough to effectively close the two chains into a loop with PBC-like dynamics. (b) Strongly L -dependent spectrum which undergoes a gapped to gapless exceptional critical transition at $L = 47 \approx L_c$ (cyan). (c) The corresponding L -dependent GBZ $z = e^{iK(k)}$ (colored loops), which pass through the critical point K_0 (where phase rigidity $r(z) = 0$) when L sweeps pass L_c . Parameters are $\delta = 8.4 \times 10^{-4}$ and $t_L = 1.62$, $t_R = 0.89$ in Eq. 8.

idea is to express the δ coupling terms entirely in terms of the OBC boundary contributions, both of which are what did not exist in the single-chain bulk solution in (2) above.

- From the above, solve for the full GBZ solutions z_i in terms of L , δ and H model parameters, eliminating E using the bulk dispersion from (1) if necessary. Due to the z_i^{L+1-x} factor in our ansatz, which arises from the antagonistic momenta in Eq. 7, the GBZs z_i typically satisfy a L -degree polynomial involving the model parameters, leading to generic $\sim 1/L$ -th power scaling of z_i with δ .

This GBZ effectively encapsulates the non-perturbative effects of the coupling δ through the scale-dependent complex deformation $K(k)$, henceforth allowing properties of the full system \mathcal{H} to be computed just through a single chain H . As detailed in Supplement sect. I and plotted in [Fig. 2(c)], the dominant scale-dependent GBZ for our minimal example H_{SSH} [Eq. 8] [144] scales like

$$z_1 = e^{iK(k)} \sim (\alpha_0 \delta)^{1/(L+1)} e^{ik}, \quad (9)$$

α_0 a model-dependent constant. Eq. 9 accurately predicts the spectrum of $\mathcal{H}(k)$ upon substituting $k \rightarrow -i \log z_1$ [Fig. 2(b)]. Correctly associating the antagonistic directions with opposite momenta [Eq. 7] was crucial in deriving this scaling-dependent GBZ and spectrum, which cannot be analytically derived as a function of L using conventional approaches [102, 105, 112, 118, 145, 146].

SIEC and entanglement dip.—Our L -dependent GBZ can give rise to a new phenomenon dubbed “scaling-induced




FIG. 3. Entanglement dip from SIEC. (a) Spikes in the \bar{P} eigenvalues p occur near $L \approx L_c$ [Eq. 10] for different inter-chain couplings $\delta = 0.83 \times 10^{-3}$, 1.6843×10^{-3} and 3.03×10^{-3} (green, black and purple respectively) of Eq. 8, with hopping asymmetries $t_L, t_R = 1.2e^{\pm 0.3}$. (b) Corresponding entanglement dips at these $L \approx L_c$, with characteristic $S \sim (L_c - L)^{-1/2}$ behavior for $L < L_c$. (c) Depth of entanglement dips in the parameter space of $t_L/t_R, \delta$ and the system sizes L realizing them, with large dips of $S_{\min} \leq -3$ along narrow bands separating regions of different L .

exceptional criticality” (SIEC) if the GBZ loop $e^{iK(k)}$ sweeps through an EP (where $r(K) = 0$, dark purple in Fig. 2(c)) when L is varied across a special value L_c . For our illustrative H_{SSH} and related models I, substituting Eq. 9 into $H_{\text{SSH}}(K(k))$ and demanding that it reduces to the Jordan form σ_- at the EP yields

$$L_c = -\alpha_0 \delta / \log t_R - 1, \quad (10)$$

$$K_c = K|_{L=L_c} = \pi + \frac{i\alpha_0 \delta}{L+1}, \quad (11)$$

which accurately predicts when the exceptional transition occurs, corroborated by numerical results in Fig. 2(b). As L_c is typically non-integer, actual lattice \mathcal{H} models with integer L experience dramatic SIEC divergences when $L \rightarrow L_c$, as controlled by [147]

$$\Delta_K = K(k) - K_c \approx (k - \pi) + i\delta \frac{\alpha_0(L_c - L)}{L_c^2}, \quad (12)$$

such that I $H_{\text{SSH}}(K) \approx (t_L - t_R^{-1})\sigma_+ - it_R \Delta_K \sigma_-$ for $L \approx L_c$, with the expected square root cusp in its eigenenergies $\pm \mathcal{E}_{\text{SSH}}(K) = \pm \sqrt{i(1 - t_L t_R)} \Delta_K$. In particular, its occupied band projector, which assumes the form $P(K) = (\mathbb{I} - H(K)/\mathcal{E}(K))/2$ for 2-component models, has divergent off-diagonal term $-\sqrt{i(t_L - t_R^{-1})/4t_R \Delta_K} \sigma_+$. Hence, with $k = \pi$, we obtain the unique scaling divergence

$$P \sim -\sqrt{\frac{t_L - 1/t_R}{4t_R \alpha_0 \delta}} \frac{L_c}{\sqrt{L_c - L}} \sigma_+, \quad (13)$$

which, unlike in conventional critical scenarios of Figs. 1(b,c), diverges due to $L \rightarrow L_c$ rather than vanishing momentum spacings. This square-root divergence shows up in the \bar{P} spectrum near $L \approx L_c$ [Fig. 3(a), also see I] which in turn translates to a characteristic $S \sim 1/\sqrt{|L_c - L|}$ divergence in the EE which we call the *entanglement dip* [Fig. 3(b)] [148].




FIG. 4. Entanglement dips and scale-dependent GBZ in more general models satisfying Eq. 7. Shown are the L -dependent GBZs for illustrative (a) $H = (t_L + 1/z)\sigma_+ + (t_R + z)\sigma_-$, (b) $H = (t_L + 1/3z^{-2})\sigma_+ + (t_R + z)\sigma_-$ (middle) and (c) $H = t_L\sigma_+ + (0.6 + 0.12i + z + 0.1z^{-2})\sigma_-$ (right), all with weak inter-chain coupling $\delta = 1.6 \times 10^{-3}$ and $t_L, t_R = 1.2e^{\pm 0.3}$ (here, L increases from top to bottom). (d) While their GBZs can be irregularly-shaped, entanglement dips in S consistently emerge at values of L where the GBZ loop intersects the critical point K_0 (red).

While such entanglement dips can in principle be infinitely deep, in practice its depth is limited by the how closely L_c approaches an integer. Shown in Fig. 3(c) is the minimal entanglement S_{\min} as the hopping asymmetry t_L/t_R and inter-chain coupling δ are varied. For each lattice size L , the EE dip becomes particularly deep along curves in parameter space (dark pink), even reaching $S_{\min} \approx -3$ in the region shown.

Generality of entanglement dips.— SIEC and entanglement dips are not limited to the coupled H_{SSH} chains explicitly computed so far. They are expected to show up

whenever the spectrum depends on L , and becomes gapless at an EP at a special $L \approx L_c$. This requires a scale-dependent GBZ that can be generically designed by coupling subsystems with competing NHSE pumping. Presented in Fig. 4 are other models containing oppositely-directed NHSE channels, albeit with lower symmetry. Evidently, they all exhibit scale-dependent GBZs, and importantly exhibit entanglement dips at $L \approx L_c$ whenever the GBZ encounters a critical point K_0 (red).

Discussion.— We have uncovered a new class of critical transitions marked by characteristic $S \sim (L_c - L)^{-1/2}$ EE dips, departing from the almost-universal $S \sim \log L$ critical scaling for free fermions, Hermitian or otherwise. Its peculiar scaling behavior originates from the scale-dependence of the GBZ itself, which fundamentally alters how a critical point can be approached.

Physically, such dramatically suppressed EE represent the unique non-conservation of probability from antagonistic non-Hermitian pumping, which never occurs in ordinary NHSE processes where the gain/loss can be "gauged away" with a basis redefinition. Beyond the EE, entanglement dips also translate to kinks in the Renyi entropy, whose measurement prospects we discuss in I.

Acknowledgements.— J.G. acknowledges support by the National Research Foundation, Singapore and A*STAR under its CQT Bridging Grant. C.H.L acknowledges support from the National Research Foundation, Singapore under its QEP2.0 programme (NRF2021-QEP2-02-P09), and the Ministry of Education, Singapore (MOE award number: MOE-T2EP50222-0003).

-
- [1] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, Entanglement entropy and quantum field theory, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2004**, P06002 (2004).
 - [2] J. L. Cardy, Boundary conformal field theory, (2004), [arXiv:hep-th/0411189](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0411189).
 - [3] T. Gulden, M. Janas, Y. Wang, and A. Kamenev, Universal finite-size scaling around topological quantum phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 026402 (2016).
 - [4] L. Taddia, F. Ortolani, and T. Pálmai, Renyi entanglement entropies of descendant states in critical systems with boundaries: conformal field theory and spin chains, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2016**, 093104 (2016).
 - [5] G. Y. Cho, A. W. W. Ludwig, and S. Ryu, Universal entanglement spectra of gapped one-dimensional field theories, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 115122 (2017).
 - [6] P. Patil, Y. Tang, E. Katz, and A. W. Sandvik, Indicators of conformal field theory: Entanglement entropy and multiple-point correlators, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 045140 (2017).
 - [7] Y. Zou, S. Sang, and T. H. Hsieh, Channeling quantum criticality, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 250403 (2023).
 - [8] R.-Z. Huang, L. Zhang, A. M. Läuchli, J. Haegeman, F. Verstraete, and L. Vanderstraeten, Emergent conformal boundaries from finite-entanglement scaling in matrix product states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 086503 (2024).
 - [9] N. G. Jones, Symmetry-resolved entanglement entropy in critical free-fermion chains, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **188**, 28 (2022).
 - [10] T. E. Lee, F. Reiter, and N. Moiseyev, Entanglement and spin squeezing in non-hermitian phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 250401 (2014).
 - [11] L. Herviou, N. Regnault, and J. H. Bardarson, Entanglement spectrum and symmetries in non-Hermitian fermionic non-interacting models, *SciPost Phys.* **7**, 069 (2019).
 - [12] A. Fring and T. Frith, Eternal life of entropy in non-hermitian quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 010102 (2019).
 - [13] Y.-B. Guo, Y.-C. Yu, R.-Z. Huang, L.-P. Yang, R.-Z. Chi, H.-J. Liao, and T. Xiang, Entanglement entropy of non-hermitian free fermions, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **33**, 475502 (2021).
 - [14] L. Ding, K. Shi, Y. Wang, Q. Zhang, C. Zhu, L. Zhang, J. Yi, S. Zhang, X. Zhang, and W. Zhang, Information retrieval and eigenstate coalescence in a non-hermitian quantum system with anti- \mathcal{PT} symmetry, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, L010204 (2022).
 - [15] Y.-T. Tu, I. Jang, P.-Y. Chang, and Y.-C. Tzeng, General properties of fidelity in non-Hermitian quantum systems with PT symmetry, *Quantum* **7**, 960 (2023).
 - [16] X. Turkeshi, M. Dalmonte, R. Fazio, and M. Schirò, Entanglement transitions from stochastic resetting of non-

- hermitian quasiparticles, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, L241114 (2022).
- [17] G. M. Itable and F. N. Paraan, Entanglement entropy distinguishes pt -symmetry and topological phases in a class of non-unitary quantum walks, *Quantum Information Processing* **22**, 106 (2023).
- [18] M. Fossati, F. Ares, and P. Calabrese, Symmetry-resolved entanglement in critical non-hermitian systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 205153 (2023).
- [19] K. Kawabata, T. Numasawa, and S. Ryu, Entanglement phase transition induced by the non-hermitian skin effect, *Physical Review X* **13**, 021007 (2023).
- [20] L. Zhou, Entanglement phase transitions in non-hermitian quasicrystals, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 024204 (2024).
- [21] L. Zhou, Entanglement phase transitions in non-hermitian kitaev chains, *Entropy* **26**, 10.3390/e26030272 (2024).
- [22] B.-B. Wei and L. Jin, Universal critical behaviours in non-hermitian phase transitions, *Scientific Reports* **7**, 7165 (2017).
- [23] S.-Z. Li, X.-J. Yu, and Z. Li, Emergent entanglement phase transitions in non-hermitian aubry-andré-harper chains, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 024306 (2024).
- [24] L. Zhou, Entanglement phase transitions in non-hermitian floquet systems, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 023081 (2024).
- [25] D. Gioev and I. Klich, Entanglement entropy of fermions in any dimension and the widom conjecture, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 100503 (2006).
- [26] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, Topological entanglement entropy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 110404 (2006).
- [27] S. T. Flammia, A. Hamma, T. L. Hughes, and X.-G. Wen, Topological entanglement rényi entropy and reduced density matrix structure, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 261601 (2009).
- [28] R. Helling, H. Leschke, and W. Spitzer, A Special Case of a Conjecture by Widom with Implications to Fermionic Entanglement Entropy, *International Mathematics Research Notices* **2011**, 1451 (2010).
- [29] A. M. Turner, Y. Zhang, and A. Vishwanath, Entanglement and inversion symmetry in topological insulators, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 241102 (2010).
- [30] L. Fidkowski, Entanglement spectrum of topological insulators and superconductors, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 130502 (2010).
- [31] A. Alexandradinata, T. L. Hughes, and B. A. Bernevig, Trace index and spectral flow in the entanglement spectrum of topological insulators, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 195103 (2011).
- [32] T. L. Hughes, E. Prodan, and B. A. Bernevig, Inversion-symmetric topological insulators, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 245132 (2011).
- [33] P. Calabrese, M. Mintchev, and E. Vicari, Entanglement entropies in free-fermion gases for arbitrary dimension, *Europhysics Letters* **97**, 20009 (2012).
- [34] X.-L. Qi, H. Katsura, and A. W. W. Ludwig, General relationship between the entanglement spectrum and the edge state spectrum of topological quantum states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 196402 (2012).
- [35] M. Storms and R. R. P. Singh, Entanglement in ground and excited states of gapped free-fermion systems and their relationship with fermi surface and thermodynamic equilibrium properties, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 012125 (2014).
- [36] C. H. Lee and P. Ye, Free-fermion entanglement spectrum through wannier interpolation, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 085119 (2015).
- [37] M. Pretko, Nodal-line entanglement entropy: Generalized widom formula from entanglement hamiltonians, *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 235111 (2017).
- [38] Z.-K. Lin, Y. Zhou, B. Jiang, B.-Q. Wu, L.-M. Chen, X.-Y. Liu, L.-W. Wang, P. Ye, and J.-H. Jiang, Measuring entanglement entropy and its topological signature for phononic systems, *Nature Communications* **15**, 1601 (2024).
- [39] A. K. Pati, U. Singh, and U. Sinha, Measuring non-hermitian operators via weak values, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 052120 (2015).
- [40] M. Szyniszewski, A. Romito, and H. Schomerus, Entanglement transition from variable-strength weak measurements, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 064204 (2019).
- [41] C. Kokail, R. van Bijnen, A. Elben, B. Vermersch, and P. Zoller, Entanglement hamiltonian tomography in quantum simulation, *Nature Physics* **17**, 936 (2021).
- [42] M. Coppola, E. Tirrito, D. Karevski, and M. Collura, Growth of entanglement entropy under local projective measurements, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 094303 (2022).
- [43] D. Yang, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Efficient information retrieval for sensing via continuous measurement, *Phys. Rev. X* **13**, 031012 (2023).
- [44] A. G. Moghaddam, K. Pöyhönen, and T. Ojanen, Exponential shortcut to measurement-induced entanglement phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 020401 (2023).
- [45] S. Sankar, E. Sela, and C. Han, Measuring topological entanglement entropy using maxwell relations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 016601 (2023).
- [46] Y. Singhal, E. Martello, S. Agrawal, T. Ozawa, H. Price, and B. Gadway, Measuring the adiabatic non-hermitian berry phase in feedback-coupled oscillators, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, L032026 (2023).
- [47] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Real spectra in non-hermitian hamiltonians having pt symmetry, *Physical Review Letters* **80**, 5243–5246 (1998).
- [48] M. V. Berry, Physics of Nonhermitian Degeneracies, *Czech. J. Phys.* **54**, 1039 (2004).
- [49] W. D. Heiss, Exceptional points of non-hermitian operators, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **37**, 2455 (2004).
- [50] C. Dembowski, B. Dietz, H.-D. Gräf, H. L. Harney, A. Heine, W. D. Heiss, and A. Richter, Encircling an exceptional point, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 056216 (2004).
- [51] C. M. Bender, Making sense of non-hermitian hamiltonians, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **70**, 947 (2007).
- [52] I. Rotter, A non-hermitian hamilton operator and the physics of open quantum systems, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **42**, 153001 (2009).
- [53] L. Jin and Z. Song, Solutions of PT -symmetric tight-binding chain and its equivalent hermitian counterpart, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 052107 (2009).
- [54] N. Moiseyev, *Non-Hermitian Quantum Mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- [55] Z. Gong, Y. Ashida, K. Kawabata, K. Takasan, S. Higashikawa, and M. Ueda, Topological phases of non-hermitian systems, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 031079 (2018).
- [56] K. Kawabata, K. Shiozaki, M. Ueda, and M. Sato, Symmetry and topology in non-hermitian physics, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041015 (2019).

- [57] K. Kawabata, T. Bessho, and M. Sato, Classification of exceptional points and non-hermitian topological semimetals, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 066405 (2019).
- [58] A. Panigrahi, R. Moessner, and B. Roy, Non-hermitian dislocation modes: Stability and melting across exceptional points, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, L041302 (2022).
- [59] I. Mandal and E. J. Bergholtz, Symmetry and higher-order exceptional points, *Physical review letters* **127**, 186601 (2021).
- [60] N. J. Cerf and C. Adami, Negative entropy and information in quantum mechanics, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 5194 (1997).
- [61] S. Salek, R. Schubert, and K. Wiesner, Negative conditional entropy of postselected states, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 022116 (2014).
- [62] P.-Y. Chang, J.-S. You, X. Wen, and S. Ryu, Entanglement spectrum and entropy in topological non-hermitian systems and nonunitary conformal field theory, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 033069 (2020).
- [63] C. H. Lee, Exceptional bound states and negative entanglement entropy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 010402 (2022).
- [64] Y.-T. Tu, Y.-C. Tzeng, and P.-Y. Chang, Rényi entropies and negative central charges in non-Hermitian quantum systems, *SciPost Phys.* **12**, 194 (2022).
- [65] W.-T. Xue and C. H. Lee, Topologically protected negative entanglement, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03259 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.03259> (2024).
- [66] D. Zou, T. Chen, H. Meng, Y. S. Ang, X. Zhang, and C. H. Lee, Experimental observation of exceptional bound states in a classical circuit network, *Science Bulletin* **69**, 2194 (2024).
- [67] V. M. Martinez Alvarez, J. E. Barrios Vargas, and L. E. F. Foa Torres, Non-hermitian robust edge states in one dimension: Anomalous localization and eigenspace condensation at exceptional points, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 121401 (2018).
- [68] C. H. Lee, L. Li, and J. Gong, Hybrid higher-order skin-topological modes in nonreciprocal systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 016805 (2019).
- [69] C. H. Lee and R. Thomale, Anatomy of skin modes and topology in non-hermitian systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 201103 (2019).
- [70] L. Li, C. H. Lee, and J. Gong, Topological switch for non-hermitian skin effect in cold-atom systems with loss, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 250402 (2020).
- [71] K. Kawabata, M. Sato, and K. Shiozaki, Higher-order non-hermitian skin effect, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 205118 (2020).
- [72] N. Okuma, K. Kawabata, K. Shiozaki, and M. Sato, Topological origin of non-hermitian skin effects, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 086801 (2020).
- [73] K. Zhang, Z. Yang, and C. Fang, Correspondence between winding numbers and skin modes in non-hermitian systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 126402 (2020).
- [74] N. Okuma and M. Sato, Quantum anomaly, non-hermitian skin effects, and entanglement entropy in open systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 085428 (2021).
- [75] X.-Q. Sun, P. Zhu, and T. L. Hughes, Geometric response and disclination-induced skin effects in non-hermitian systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 066401 (2021).
- [76] B. A. Bhargava, I. C. Fulga, J. van den Brink, and A. G. Moghaddam, Non-hermitian skin effect of dislocations and its topological origin, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, L241402 (2021).
- [77] F. Schindler and A. Prem, Dislocation non-hermitian skin effect, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, L161106 (2021).
- [78] L. Li, S. Mu, C. H. Lee, and J. Gong, Quantized classical response from spectral winding topology, *Nature Communications* **12**, 5294 (2021).
- [79] C. H. Lee, Many-body topological and skin states without open boundaries, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 195102 (2021).
- [80] R. Shen and C. H. Lee, Non-hermitian skin clusters from strong interactions, *Communications Physics* **5**, 238 (2022).
- [81] M.-H. L. Xiujuan Zhang, Tian Zhang and Y.-F. Chen, A review on non-hermitian skin effect, *Advances in Physics: X* **7**, 2109431 (2022).
- [82] C. Shang, S. Liu, R. Shao, P. Han, X. Zang, X. Zhang, K. N. Salama, W. Gao, C. H. Lee, R. Thomale, A. Manchon, S. Zhang, T. J. Cui, and U. Schwingenschlögl, Experimental identification of the second-order non-hermitian skin effect with physics-graph-informed machine learning, *Advanced Science* **9**, 10.1002/advs.202202922 (2022).
- [83] K. Zhang, Z. Yang, and C. Fang, Universal non-hermitian skin effect in two and higher dimensions, *Nature Communications* **13**, 2496 (2022).
- [84] Z. Fang, M. Hu, L. Zhou, and K. Ding, Geometry-dependent skin effects in reciprocal photonic crystals, *Nanophotonics* **11**, 3447 (2022).
- [85] H. Zhang, T. Chen, L. Li, C. H. Lee, and X. Zhang, Electrical circuit realization of topological switching for the non-hermitian skin effect, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 085426 (2023).
- [86] Q. Zhou, J. Wu, Z. Pu, J. Lu, X. Huang, W. Deng, M. Ke, and Z. Liu, Observation of geometry-dependent skin effect in non-hermitian phononic crystals with exceptional points, *Nature Communications* **14**, 4569 (2023).
- [87] T. Wan, K. Zhang, J. Li, Z. Yang, and Z. Yang, Observation of the geometry-dependent skin effect and dynamical degeneracy splitting, *Science Bulletin* **68**, 2330–2335 (2023).
- [88] W. Wang, M. Hu, X. Wang, G. Ma, and K. Ding, Experimental realization of geometry-dependent skin effect in a reciprocal two-dimensional lattice, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 207201 (2023).
- [89] N. Okuma and M. Sato, Non-hermitian topological phenomena: A review, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **14**, 83–107 (2023).
- [90] R. Lin, T. Tai, L. Li, and C. H. Lee, Topological non-hermitian skin effect, *Frontiers of Physics* **18**, 53605 (2023).
- [91] Y. L. Gal, X. Turkeshi, and M. Schirò, Volume-to-area law entanglement transition in a non-Hermitian free fermionic chain, *SciPost Phys.* **14**, 138 (2023).
- [92] S. Jana and L. Sirota, Emerging exceptional point with breakdown of the skin effect in non-hermitian systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 085104 (2023).
- [93] R. Shen, T. Chen, B. Yang, and C. H. Lee, Observation of the non-hermitian skin effect and fermi skin on a digital quantum computer 10.48550/arXiv.2311.10143 (2023), arXiv:2311.10143.
- [94] Z. Lei, C. H. Lee, and L. Li, Activating non-hermitian skin modes by parity-time symmetry breaking, *Communications Physics* **7**, 100 (2024).
- [95] R. El-Ganainy, K. G. Makris, M. Khajavikhan, Z. H. Musslimani, S. Rotter, and D. N. Christodoulides, Non-

- hermitian physics and pt symmetry, *Nature Physics* **14**, 11 (2018).
- [96] S. Yao and Z. Wang, Edge states and topological invariants of non-hermitian systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 086803 (2018).
- [97] C. Yin, H. Jiang, L. Li, R. Lü, and S. Chen, Geometrical meaning of winding number and its characterization of topological phases in one-dimensional chiral non-hermitian systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 052115 (2018).
- [98] H. Jiang, C. Yang, and S. Chen, Topological invariants and phase diagrams for one-dimensional two-band non-hermitian systems without chiral symmetry, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 052116 (2018).
- [99] K. Yokomizo and S. Murakami, Non-bloch band theory of non-hermitian systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 066404 (2019).
- [100] H. Jiang, L.-J. Lang, C. Yang, S.-L. Zhu, and S. Chen, Interplay of non-hermitian skin effects and anderson localization in nonreciprocal quasiperiodic lattices, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 054301 (2019).
- [101] Z. Yang, K. Zhang, C. Fang, and J. Hu, Non-hermitian bulk-boundary correspondence and auxiliary generalized brillouin zone theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 226402 (2020).
- [102] L. Li, C. H. Lee, S. Mu, and J. Gong, Critical non-hermitian skin effect, *Nature communications* **11**, 5491 (2020).
- [103] L. Li, C. H. Lee, and J. Gong, Topological switch for non-hermitian skin effect in cold-atom systems with loss, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 250402 (2020).
- [104] E. J. Bergholtz, J. C. Budich, and F. K. Kunst, Exceptional topology of non-hermitian systems, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **93**, 015005 (2021).
- [105] K. Yokomizo and S. Murakami, Scaling rule for the critical non-hermitian skin effect, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 165117 (2021).
- [106] C.-X. Guo, C.-H. Liu, X.-M. Zhao, Y. Liu, and S. Chen, Exact solution of non-hermitian systems with generalized boundary conditions: Size-dependent boundary effect and fragility of the skin effect, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 116801 (2021).
- [107] D. Zou, T. Chen, W. He, J. Bao, C. H. Lee, H. Sun, and X. Zhang, Observation of hybrid higher-order skin-topological effect in non-hermitian topoelectrical circuits, *Nature Communications* **12**, 7201 (2021).
- [108] L. Li, C. H. Lee, and J. Gong, Impurity induced scale-free localization, *Communications Physics* **4**, 42 (2021).
- [109] K. Li and Y. Xu, Non-hermitian absorption spectroscopy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 093001 (2022).
- [110] L. Li, W. X. Teo, S. Mu, and J. Gong, Direction reversal of non-hermitian skin effect via coherent coupling, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 085427 (2022).
- [111] R. Yang, J. W. Tan, T. Tai, J. M. Koh, L. Li, S. Longhi, and C. H. Lee, Designing non-hermitian real spectra through electrostatics, *Science Bulletin* **67**, 1865 (2022).
- [112] M. Yang and C. H. Lee, Percolation-induced pt symmetry breaking, arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15008 (2023).
- [113] H. Jiang and C. H. Lee, Filling up complex spectral regions through non-hermitian disordered chains, *Chinese Physics B* **31**, 050307 (2022).
- [114] J. Liu, Z.-F. Cai, T. Liu, and Z. Yang, Reentrant non-hermitian skin effect in coupled non-hermitian and hermitian chains with correlated disorder, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03777 (<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.03777>) (2023).
- [115] T. Tai and C. H. Lee, Zoology of non-hermitian spectra and their graph topology, *Physical Review B* **107**, L220301 (2023).
- [116] H. Jiang and C. H. Lee, Dimensional transmutation from non-hermiticity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 076401 (2023).
- [117] S. Manna and B. Roy, Inner skin effects on non-hermitian topological fractals, *communications physics* **6**, 10 (2023).
- [118] F. Qin, Y. Ma, R. Shen, and C. H. Lee, Universal competitive spectral scaling from the critical non-hermitian skin effect, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 155430 (2023).
- [119] R. Shen, F. Qin, J.-Y. Desaulles, Z. Papić, and C. H. Lee, Enhanced many-body quantum scars from the non-hermitian fock skin effect, arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02395 (2024).
- [120] G.-F. Guo, X.-X. Bao, H.-J. Zhu, X.-M. Zhao, L. Zhuang, L. Tan, and W.-M. Liu, Anomalous non-hermitian skin effect: topological inequivalence of skin modes versus point gap, *Communications Physics* **6**, 363 (2023).
- [121] X. Zhang, B. Zhang, W. Zhao, and C. H. Lee, Observation of non-local impedance response in a passive electrical circuit, *SciPost Physics* **16**, 002 (2024).
- [122] Y. Qin, C. H. Lee, and L. Li, Dynamical suppression of many-body non-hermitian skin effect in anyonic systems, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12288 [10.48550/arXiv.2405.12288](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.12288) (2024).
- [123] F. Yang and E. J. Bergholtz, Anatomy of higher-order non-hermitian skin and boundary modes, arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03750 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.03750> (2024).
- [124] S. Hamanaka and K. Kawabata, Multifractality of many-body non-hermitian skin effect, arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08304 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.08304> (2024).
- [125] C. Ekman and E. J. Bergholtz, Liouvillian skin effects and fragmented condensates in an integrable dissipative bose-hubbard model, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10261 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.10261> (2024).
- [126] F. Qin, R. Shen, L. Li, and C. H. Lee, Kinked linear response from non-hermitian cold-atom pumping, *Physical Review A* **109**, 053311 (2024).
- [127] G.-G. Liu, S. Mandal, P. Zhou, X. Xi, R. Banerjee, Y.-H. Hu, M. Wei, M. Wang, Q. Wang, Z. Gao, *et al.*, Localization of chiral edge states by the non-hermitian skin effect, *Physical Review Letters* **132**, 113802 (2024).
- [128] D. C. Brody, Biorthogonal quantum mechanics, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **47**, 035305 (2013).
- [129] We used the biorthogonal \bar{P} such as to directly connect to the band occupancy interpretation; some other works [12, 14, 16, 17, 19–21, 23, 24] used the right eigenstate for both the bra and the ket, with very different results.
- [130] G. A. Almási, B. Friman, K. Morita, P. M. Lo, and K. Redlich, Fourier coefficients of the net baryon number density and chiral criticality, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 016016 (2019).
- [131] M. Aloisio, S. de Carvalho, C. de Oliveira, and E. Souza, *On the fourier asymptotics of absolutely continuous measures with power-law singularities* (2024).
- [132] In general, the exponent of the power-law decay of the

- Fourier coefficients is directly dependent on the singularity branching order [130, 149].
- [133] J. L. Cardy and I. Peschel, Finite-size dependence of the free energy in two-dimensional critical systems, *Nuclear Physics B* **300**, 377 (1988).
- [134] E. Fradkin and J. E. Moore, Entanglement entropy of 2d conformal quantum critical points: Hearing the shape of a quantum drum, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 050404 (2006).
- [135] It can be proven that the $\sim 1/L$ cutoff away from a branching singularity in the symbol P_k causes the eigenvalues of \bar{P} to deviate from 0 and 1 with $\log L$ spacing [133].
- [136] K. Ding, C. Fang, and G. Ma, Non-hermitian topology and exceptional-point geometries, *Nature Reviews Physics* **4**, 745 (2022).
- [137] J. Wiersig, Petermann factors and phase rigidities near exceptional points, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 033042 (2023).
- [138] Y.-Y. Zou, Y. Zhou, L.-M. Chen, and P. Ye, Detecting bulk and edge exceptional points in non-hermitian systems through generalized petermann factors, *Frontiers of Physics* **19**, 23201 (2023).
- [139] H. Wang, Y.-H. Lai, Z. Yuan, M.-G. Suh, and K. Vahala, Petermann-factor sensitivity limit near an exceptional point in a brillouin ring laser gyroscope, *Nature Communications* **11**, 1610 (2020).
- [140] This can involve various subtleties when there is more than one competing NHSE channel, as in our entanglement dip model discussed later.
- [141] In Eq. 4, \mathcal{H} and E_μ are regarded as functions of K , such that the conjugation operator only acts on the coefficients of K , and not K itself.
- [142] To satisfy OBCs, the discrete effective momenta on the GBZ are obtained by subdividing 2π into $L + 1$ instead of L intervals, and discarding the endpoints.
- [143] Even when the GBZ $K(k) = k + i\kappa(k)$ contains cusps, the singularities encountered by $P_K(k)$ at most acquire different branching numbers, and that can only modify the coefficient of the $\log L$ EE scaling.
- [144] The subdominant GBZ solutions $|z_i| < |z_1|$ can control the lower bound of the decaying eigenstates, as detailed in Supplement Sect. I.
- [145] S. Rafi-Ul-Islam, Z. B. Siu, H. Sahin, C. H. Lee, and M. B. Jalil, Critical hybridization of skin modes in coupled non-hermitian chains, *Physical Review Research* **4**, 013243 (2022).
- [146] Y.-C. Wang, K. Suthar, H. Jen, Y.-T. Hsu, and J.-S. You, Non-hermitian skin effects on thermal and many-body localized phases, *Physical Review B* **107**, L220205 (2023).
- [147] ΔK_{\min} measures the departure from a critical point at the same L , while ΔK measures that from a theoretical critical point limit at another, possibly non-integer, L .
- [148] Since the eigenvalues of the projector P are strictly 0 or 1, entanglement can be regarded as a measure of how much the entanglement cut i.e. $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ causes $\bar{P} = \bar{\mathcal{R}}P\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ to depart from being a true projector onto the occupied bands (which extend across the cut), and spectacularly so for negative entanglement.
- [149] M. Távora, E. J. Torres-Herrera, and L. F. Santos, Power-law decay exponents: A dynamical criterion for predicting thermalization, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 013604 (2017).
- [150] R. S. K. Mong and V. Shivamoggi, Edge states and the bulk-boundary correspondence in dirac hamiltonians, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 125109 (2011).
- [151] Y. Xiong, Why does bulk boundary correspondence fail in some non-hermitian topological models, *Journal of Physics Communications* **2**, 035043 (2018).
- [152] F. Song, S. Yao, and Z. Wang, Non-hermitian topological invariants in real space, *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 246801 (2019).
- [153] S. Longhi, Probing non-hermitian skin effect and non-bloch phase transitions, *Physical Review Research* **1**, 023013 (2019).
- [154] C. H. Lee and S. Longhi, Ultrafast and anharmonic rabi oscillations between non-bloch bands, *Communications Physics* **3**, 147 (2020).
- [155] S. Longhi, Non-bloch-band collapse and chiral zener tunneling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 066602 (2020).
- [156] C. H. Lee, L. Li, R. Thomale, and J. Gong, Unraveling non-hermitian pumping: Emergent spectral singularities and anomalous responses, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 085151 (2020).
- [157] P. Törmä, Physics of ultracold fermi gases revealed by spectroscopies, *Physica Scripta* **91**, 043006 (2016).
- [158] C. J. Vale and M. Zwierlein, Spectroscopic probes of quantum gases, *Nature Physics* **17**, 1305 (2021).
- [159] J. Li, A. K. Harter, J. Liu, L. de Melo, Y. N. Joglekar, and L. Luo, Observation of parity-time symmetry breaking transitions in a dissipative floquet system of ultracold atoms, *Nature communications* **10**, 855 (2019).
- [160] Z. Ren, D. Liu, E. Zhao, C. He, K. K. Pak, J. Li, and G.-B. Jo, Chiral control of quantum states in non-hermitian spin-orbit-coupled fermions, *Nature Physics* **18**, 385 (2022).
- [161] S. Lapp, F. A. An, B. Gadway, *et al.*, Engineering tunable local loss in a synthetic lattice of momentum states, *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 045006 (2019).
- [162] W. Gou, T. Chen, D. Xie, T. Xiao, T.-S. Deng, B. Gadway, W. Yi, and B. Yan, Tunable nonreciprocal quantum transport through a dissipative aharonov-bohm ring in ultracold atoms, *Physical review letters* **124**, 070402 (2020).
- [163] Y. Takasu, T. Yagami, Y. Ashida, R. Hamazaki, Y. Kuno, and Y. Takahashi, Pt-symmetric non-hermitian quantum many-body system using ultracold atoms in an optical lattice with controlled dissipation, *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics* **2020**, 12A110 (2020).
- [164] F. Ferri, R. Rosa-Medina, F. Finger, N. Dogra, M. Soriente, O. Zilberberg, T. Donner, and T. Esslinger, Emerging dissipative phases in a superradiant quantum gas with tunable decay, *Physical Review X* **11**, 041046 (2021).
- [165] R. Rosa-Medina, F. Ferri, F. Finger, N. Dogra, K. Kroeger, R. Lin, R. Chitra, T. Donner, and T. Esslinger, Observing dynamical currents in a non-hermitian momentum lattice, *Physical Review Letters* **128**, 143602 (2022).
- [166] F. Qin, R. Shen, and C. H. Lee, Non-hermitian squeezed polarons, *Physical Review A* **107**, L010202 (2023).
- [167] R. Shen, T. Chen, M. M. Aliyu, F. Qin, Y. Zhong, H. Loh, and C. H. Lee, Proposal for observing yang-lee criticality in rydberg atomic arrays, *Physical Review Letters* **131**, 080403 (2023).
- [168] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, Laser cooling and trapping of neutral atoms: theory, *Physics reports* **219**, 153 (1992).
- [169] S. Chu, Laser manipulation of atoms and particles, *Sci-*

- ence **253**, 861 (1991).
- [170] C. Muldoon, L. Brandt, J. Dong, D. Stuart, E. Brainis, M. Himsforth, and A. Kuhn, Control and manipulation of cold atoms in optical tweezers, *New Journal of Physics* **14**, 073051 (2012).
 - [171] M.-M. Cao, K. Li, W.-D. Zhao, W.-X. Guo, B.-X. Qi, X.-Y. Chang, Z.-C. Zhou, Y. Xu, and L.-M. Duan, Probing complex-energy topology via non-hermitian absorption spectroscopy in a trapped ion simulator, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 163001 (2023).
 - [172] H. J. Metcalf and P. Van der Straten, *Laser cooling and trapping* (Springer Science & Business Media, 1999).
 - [173] W. Ketterle and N. Van Druten, Evaporative cooling of trapped atoms, in *Advances in atomic, molecular, and optical physics*, Vol. 37 (Elsevier, 1996) pp. 181–236.
 - [174] P. D. Lett, R. N. Watts, C. I. Westbrook, W. D. Phillips, P. L. Gould, and H. J. Metcalf, Observation of atoms laser cooled below the doppler limit, *Physical review letters* **61**, 169 (1988).
 - [175] J. Denschlag, J. E. Simsarian, D. L. Feder, C. W. Clark, L. A. Collins, J. Cubizolles, L. Deng, E. W. Hagley, K. Helmerson, W. P. Reinhardt, *et al.*, Generating solitons by phase engineering of a bose-einstein condensate, *Science* **287**, 97 (2000).

Supplementary Materials

I. HOW TO OBTAIN THE SYSTEM SIZE-DEPENDENT EFFECTIVE GBZ AND SPECTRUM

Recent work has revealed the crucial importance of the generalized Brillouin zones (GBZ) in describing non-Hermitian lattice Hamiltonians open boundary conditions (OBCs) [71, 73, 150]. For a given Hamiltonian $H(z)$ where $z = \exp(ik)$, the two roots z of the characteristic (dispersion) equation $\det(H(z) - E) = 0$ with equal absolute values $|z|$ represents two “standing wave” solutions that can be superposed to satisfy OBCs at both ends. This is the typical way the GBZ is defined [69, 73, 96, 99, 101, 151–156].

However, there exist many systems where the usual GBZ approach gives a poor approximation to the actual numerical spectrum. Consider two weakly coupled chains exhibiting the non-Hermitian skin effect (NHSE) in opposite directions. In the weak coupling limit, we expect the presence of localized skin states at the ends of the individual chains. Due to the oppositely directed skin effect, these state accumulations must also be oppositely directed. Consequently, it is not tenable to exploit the same “standing waves” to satisfy the system’s boundary conditions.

In other words, for such systems with competitive skin effect channels, it is not possible to accurately model the net skin effect using the usual GBZ approach. Below, we shall present a new alternative approach using *different* momentum wavevector directions in different chains, and show that how we can derive a *size-dependent GBZ* which accurately considers the effect of the coupling different skin effect channels.

A. Coupled 1D chains with opposite NHSE

We write down a model in which non-Hermitian 1D chains with antagonistic NHSE, denoted by H and H^\dagger , are weakly coupled together by a small coupling parameter δ . In the simplest cases, the coupling acts only between corresponding pairs of sites in a ladder-like fashion, such that the coupled Hamiltonian takes the form

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{pmatrix} H & \delta \mathbb{I} \\ \delta \mathbb{I} & H^T \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S1})$$

where $\delta \mathbb{I}$ is the identity matrix acting in the basis of H or H^T , as shown in Fig. S1(a). We specialize H to the well-known non-Hermitian SSH model [96, 97], which is simple enough for analytic solutions and yet topologically nontrivial:

$$H = \sum_n \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} |n\rangle\langle n-1| + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t_L \\ t_R & 0 \end{pmatrix} |n\rangle\langle n| + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} |n\rangle\langle n+1|. \quad (\text{S2})$$

By diagonalizing H in the Fourier basis, we obtain eigenenergies

$$E = \pm \sqrt{(t_L + 1/z)(t_R + z)}. \quad (\text{S3})$$

Under periodic boundary conditions (PBCs), we simply have $z = e^{ik}$ where k is the momentum. In the absence of any NHSE, this should also approximately represent “bulk” spectrum under open boundary conditions (OBCs), since boundary effects should only affect a subdominant proportional of the eigenstates.

However, it is well-known that due to the NHSE, the boundaries would significantly affect the *entire* spectrum, such that we must have [96] $z = e^{ik - \kappa(k)}$ for $E(z)$ to correctly approximate the OBC spectrum. Here, $\kappa(k)$ represents the complex deformation of the momentum $k \rightarrow k + i\kappa(k)$, $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$, which is what defines the GBZ.

Here, we first show how to compute the GBZ of fully *uncoupled* H chains. We note that to satisfy OBCs at both ends of a 1D chain, an eigenfunction $|\Psi\rangle$ must be a linear combination [96] of at least two different non-Bloch wave functions $\sum_n z_1^n (|n, A\rangle + \phi_{z_1} |n, B\rangle)$ and $\sum_n z_2^n (|n, A\rangle + \phi_{z_2} |n, B\rangle)$, where A, B and n label the sublattices and unit-cells, z_1, z_2 are the two solutions of Eq. S3 which satisfy $z_1 z_2 = t_R/t_L$, and $\phi_{z_{1,2}} = (t_R + z_{1,2})/E$. Crucially, the OBCs $\langle 0, B|\Psi\rangle = \langle L+1, A|\Psi\rangle = 0$ enforce the constraint $z_1^{L+1} \phi_{z_2} = z_2^{L+1} \phi_{z_1}$ such that $(\phi_{z_1}/\phi_{z_2})^{1/L} \approx 1$. Consequently, for our uncoupled chain H , the GBZ satisfies $|z_1| = |z_2|$ and is simply given by $\left\{ z = \sqrt{t_R/t_L} \exp(ik) \mid k = \frac{2m\pi}{L+1}, m = 1, 2, \dots, L \right\}$ i.e. with skin depth $\kappa_H = \frac{1}{2} \log |z| = \frac{1}{2} \log(t_R/t_L)$. Its transpose conjugate is an oppositely directed chain H^T that possesses skin depth $\kappa_{H^\dagger} = -\kappa_H = -\frac{1}{2} \log(t_R/t_L)$.

Note that the condition $|z_1| = |z_2|$, which is commonly lauded as the GBZ constraint, will no longer be valid once we consider coupled chains with different NHSE directions.

Before we discuss the coupled ($\delta \neq 0$) case, we note that our system possesses spatial inversion symmetry \mathcal{I} represented by

$$\mathcal{I}\mathcal{H}\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{H}, \quad \mathcal{I} = \sum_n (\tau_x \otimes \sigma_x) |L+1-n\rangle \langle n|, \quad (\text{S4})$$

such that the wave function accumulates similarly at both ends of the chain. This \mathcal{I} symmetry is a consequence of the inversion symmetry between H and H^\dagger , and is *not* fundamental to the general construction of our size-dependent effective GBZ. However, it offers to simplify the system's boundary conditions by half, and is thus helpful to obtaining the analytic results that follow.

B. The new approach: Scale-dependent energies and GBZ

We next derive the size-dependent effective GBZ for two antagonistic NHSE chains coupled by a non-zero but small δ coupling. Since δ is small, the effect of the coupling term is insufficient to alter the orientations of the NHSE within each of the two chains, which are in opposite directions. As such, the usual GBZ approach, which assigns the *same* decay parameter magnitude $|z|$ to all subsystems (i.e. both chains), is doomed to be inadequate.

Instead, in our approach, we assign the decay parameter z to one chain and $1/z$ to the other chain. Ultimately, the OBC eigenstate would in general consist of a linear combination of two or more eigensolutions, which we will first solve for, separately. Writing each z eigensolution as $|\varphi\rangle = \sum_{n,\alpha} \varphi_{\alpha,n} |n,\alpha\rangle$ with sublattice $\alpha = A, B$ (chain I), A', B' (chain II), we have $\varphi_{A(B),n} = \varphi_{B'(A'),L+1-n}$. Concretely,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{A,n} &= z^n, & \varphi_{B,n} &= \phi_z z^n; \\ \varphi_{A',n} &= \phi_z z^{L+1-n}, & \varphi_{B',n} &= z^{L+1-n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5})$$

Due to spatial inversion symmetry \mathcal{I} , the decay in both chains are exactly equal but opposite – in more generic cases where the two coupled chains are not related by \mathcal{I} , they would need to be separately solved for.

In the above, the assignment of z and $1/z$ decay parameters to chains I and II only addresses their relative decay directions. To solve for what value/s the decay parameter z should take, we need to incorporate the weak couplings and the open boundary conditions. In our approach, the idea is to (i) first solve for the bulk relation between z and the corresponding eigenenergy E in the uncoupled limit, and then (ii) invoke the weak couplings and boundary conditions to obtain a size-dependent effective GBZ consistent with that relation.

In our given Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} , the full bulk equations take the form

$$\begin{cases} t_L \varphi_{B,n} + \varphi_{B,n-1} + \delta \varphi_{A',n} = E \varphi_{A,n} \\ t_R \varphi_{A,n} + \varphi_{A,n+1} + \delta \varphi_{B',n} = E \varphi_{B,n} \\ t_R \varphi_{B',n} + \varphi_{B',n-1} + \delta \varphi_{A,n} = E \varphi_{A',n} \\ t_L \varphi_{A',n} + \varphi_{A',n+1} + \delta \varphi_{B,n} = E \varphi_{B',n} \end{cases} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}} \begin{cases} t_L \varphi_{B,n} + \varphi_{B,n-1} + \delta \varphi_{B,L+1-n} = E \varphi_{A,n} \\ t_R \varphi_{A,n} + \varphi_{A,n+1} + \delta \varphi_{A,L+1-n} = E \varphi_{B,n} \end{cases}, \quad (\text{S6})$$

with site $n = 2, 3, \dots, L-1$ and eigenvalue E . Due to \mathcal{I} symmetry, the four equations (from two chains with two sublattices each) are simplified to two equations. Substituting Eq. S5 into the above,

$$\begin{cases} (-E + (t_L + 1/z)\phi_z)z^n + \phi_z z^{L+1-n}\delta = 0 \\ ((t_R + z) - E\phi_z)z^n + z^{L+1-n}\delta = 0 \end{cases}. \quad (\text{S7})$$

For step (i), we work in the $\delta \ll 1$ limit and neglect the inter-chain couplings δ to obtain

$$\begin{cases} (-E + (t_L + 1/z)\phi_z)z^n \approx 0 \\ ((t_R + z) - E\phi_z)z^n \approx 0 \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} -E & t_L + 1/z \\ t_R + z & -E \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \phi_z \end{pmatrix} = (H(z) - E) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \phi_z \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (\text{S8})$$

Via the same steps as in the previous subsection on a single chain, these bulk equations give (Eq. S3)

$$E = \pm \sqrt{(t_L + 1/z)(t_R + z)}, \quad \phi_z = \frac{t_R + z}{E} = \frac{E}{t_L + 1/z}, \quad (\text{S9})$$

which, for a particular eigenenergy E , corresponds to two solutions $z = z_1, z_2$ which satisfy

$$E^2 = (t_L + 1/z)(t_R + z), \quad (\text{S10})$$

$$t_L z^2 + (t_R t_L + 1 - E^2)z + t_R = 0. \quad (\text{S11})$$

WLOG, we label them in the order $|z_2| \leq \sqrt{|t_R/t_L|} \leq |z_1|$ since, according to Vieta's formulas,

$$z_1 z_2 = t_R/t_L. \quad (\text{S12})$$

Had the 2-component subsystem $H(z)$ existed in isolation, the GBZ solution would just have been given by $|z_1| = |z_2|$, with the OBC skin spectrum given by the set of E satisfying this equality constraint. However, in the presence of (even very weak) inter-chain couplings, the incorporation of the full boundary conditions will give rise to a very different constraint from $|z_1| = |z_2|$, as we will soon see.

We next proceed to step (ii) where we consider the boundaries at unit-cells 1 and L without neglecting the weak couplings δ . To satisfy the boundary conditions, we now have to consider an eigensolution that superposes all the (two) different single-chain GBZ solutions z_1, z_2 from step (i), we write the ansatz OBC eigenfunction as

$$|\Psi_{\text{GBZ}}\rangle = |\varphi_{z_1}\rangle - c|\varphi_{z_2}\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^L \sum_{\alpha=A, B, A', B'} \psi_{n,\alpha} |n, \alpha\rangle = \sum_n \left(\begin{pmatrix} z_1^n \\ z_1^n \phi_{z_1} \\ z_1^{L+1-n} \phi_{z_1} \\ z_1^{L+1-n} \end{pmatrix} - c \begin{pmatrix} z_2^n \\ z_2^n \phi_{z_2} \\ z_2^{L+1-n} \phi_{z_2} \\ z_2^{L+1-n} \end{pmatrix} \right) |n\rangle, \quad (\text{S13})$$

where the coefficient c controls the relative amplitude of the z_1, z_2 non-Bloch contributions. We next substitute this ansatz Eq. S13 into the open boundary conditions, where $\psi_{n,\alpha}$ disappear at $n = 0$ and $L + 1$ (and beyond):

$$\begin{cases} t_L \psi_{B,1} + \delta \psi_{A',1} = E \psi_{A,1} \\ t_R \psi_{A,L} + \delta \psi_{B',L} = E \psi_{B,L} \\ t_R \psi_{B',1} + \delta \psi_{A,1} = E \psi_{A',1} \\ t_L \psi_{A',L} + \delta \psi_{B,L} = E \psi_{B',L} \end{cases} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{I}} \begin{cases} \delta \psi_{B,L} = E \psi_{A,1} - t_L \psi_{B,1} \\ \delta \psi_{A,1} = E \psi_{B,L} - t_R \psi_{A,L} \end{cases}. \quad (\text{S14})$$

To proceed, the *key* idea is that the extra terms involving the small inter-chain coupling δ , which were not taken into account in deriving the bulk z_1, z_2 solutions, must exactly compensate the missing terms due to the open boundaries. By explicitly substituting E in terms of $z_{1,2}, \phi_{z_{1,2}}$ and the hoppings using Eq. S9, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} (1 - \delta z_1^L) \phi_{z_1} = c(1 - \delta z_2^L) \phi_{z_2} \\ (z_1^L - \delta) z_1 = c(z_2^L - \delta) z_2 \end{cases}, \quad (\text{S15})$$

which yields

$$(1 - \delta z_1^L)(z_2^L - \delta) z_2 \phi_{z_1} = (1 - \delta z_2^L)(z_1^L - \delta) z_1 \phi_{z_2}. \quad (\text{S16})$$

We comment that z_1, z_2 , which were previously derived under the uncoupled ($\delta = 0$) approximation, has now become dependent on the coupling δ through E (even though this dependence is hidden behind Eq. S9, which was derived under the uncoupled approximation). Since the inter-chain couplings are weak, we are safe to assume that they cannot fundamentally reverse the NHSE direction within each chain. That is, in the case of $|t_R/t_L| < 1$, we have $|z_2| \leq \sqrt{|t_R/t_L|} \leq |z_1| \leq 1$. Together with $\delta \ll 1$ and $|z_j| < 1$, we can thus approximate $1 - \delta z_j^L \approx 1$ ($j = 1, 2$), thereby simplifying the above to

$$(z_2^{L+1} - \delta z_2) \phi_{z_1} \approx (z_1^{L+1} - \delta z_1) \phi_{z_2}. \quad (\text{S17})$$

Moving all the δ terms to the right-hand side of the equation,

$$z_1^{L+1} \phi_{z_2} - z_2^{L+1} \phi_{z_1} \approx \delta(z_1 \phi_{z_2} - z_2 \phi_{z_1}). \quad (\text{S18})$$

Recalling that $z_1 z_2 = t_R/t_L$, we can further simplify the above into

$$z_1^{L+1} \phi_{z_2} - \frac{1}{z_1^{L+1}} \left(\frac{t_R}{t_L} \right)^{L+1} \phi_{z_1} \approx \delta(z_1 \phi_{z_2} - z_2 \phi_{z_1}), \quad (\text{S19})$$

that is,

$$z_1^{L+1} \approx \frac{\delta(z_1 \phi_{z_2} - z_2 \phi_{z_1})}{2\phi_{z_2}} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\delta(z_1 \phi_{z_2} - z_2 \phi_{z_1})}{2\phi_{z_2}} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{t_R}{t_L} \right)^{L+1} \frac{\phi_{z_1}}{\phi_{z_2}}}, \quad (\text{S20})$$

with the larger root chosen since $|z_2| \leq \sqrt{|t_R/t_L|} \leq |z_1| \leq 1$.

Below, we highlight two extreme but highly relevant cases:

- $\delta \ll t_R^L/t_L^L$, which is the regime where the coupling δ is so weak that it remains negligible despite the presence of NHSE competition. In this case, only the second term under the square root in Eq. S20 survives:

$$\begin{aligned} z_1^{L+1} &\approx \frac{\delta(z_1\phi_{z_2} - z_2\phi_{z_1})}{2\phi_{z_2}} + \sqrt{\frac{t_R^{L+1}}{t_L^{L+1}} \frac{\phi_{z_1}}{\phi_{z_2}}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{t_R^{L+1}}{t_L^{L+1}} \frac{\phi_{z_1}}{\phi_{z_2}}} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\delta(z_1\phi_{z_2} - z_2\phi_{z_1})}{2\phi_{z_2}} \right)^2 \\ &\approx \sqrt{\frac{t_R^{L+1}}{t_L^{L+1}} \frac{\phi_{z_1}}{\phi_{z_2}}} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S21})$$

As ${}^{L+1}\sqrt{\phi_{z_1}/\phi_{z_2}} \approx 1$ for moderately large L , where $\phi_z = (t_R + z)/E$, we recover

$$z_1, z_2 \approx \sqrt{\frac{t_R}{t_L}} e^{\pm ik} , \quad (\text{S22})$$

with $k = n\pi/(L+1)$, $n = 1, 2, \dots, L$. This is just the usual GBZ expression for satisfying OBCs $\psi(x=0) = \psi(x=L+1) = 0$ in the uncoupled ($\delta = 0$) case.

- $\delta \gg t_R^L/t_L^L$, which defines the strongly coupled regime. Here, the first term under the square root in Eq. S20 dominates, such that

$$\begin{aligned} z_1^{L+1} &\approx \frac{\delta(z_1\phi_{z_2} - z_2\phi_{z_1})}{\phi_{z_2}} + \left(\frac{\delta(z_1\phi_{z_2} - z_2\phi_{z_1})}{2\phi_{z_2}} \right)^{-1} \frac{t_R^{L+1}}{t_L^{L+1}} \frac{\phi_{z_1}}{\phi_{z_2}} \\ &\approx \frac{\delta(z_1\phi_{z_2} - z_2\phi_{z_1})}{\phi_{z_2}} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S23})$$

In principle, the above expression can be exactly solved to yield the GBZ (i.e. z_1), which we see must depend on the system size L . However, because ϕ_{z_1}, ϕ_{z_2} depend on E , which further depends on the system parameters in a complicated manner, it is useful to perform some approximations such that the right-hand side does not depend explicitly on E . One convenient series of approximations is

$$\begin{aligned} z_1 &= \left(\delta \times \frac{(z_1\phi_{z_2} - z_2\phi_{z_1})}{\phi_{z_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{L+1}} e^{ik} \\ &\xrightarrow{{}^{L+1}\sqrt{\phi_{z_2}/\phi_{z_1}} \approx 1} \left(\delta \times \frac{(z_1\phi_{z_2} - z_2\phi_{z_1})}{\phi_{z_1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{L+1}} e^{ik} \\ &\xrightarrow{\phi_z = (t_R + z)/E} \left(\delta \times \frac{t_R(t_L z_1 - t_R/z_1)}{t_L(t_R + z_1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{L+1}} e^{ik} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S24})$$

While this expression technically needs to be solved self-consistently for z_1 , noting that the right-hand side depends very slowly due to the $1/(L+1)$ exponent, we can simply approximate z_1 in it with suitable constants i.e. $z_1 \approx -1$ such as to obtain

$$z_1 \approx \left(\delta \times \frac{t_R(t_R - t_L)}{t_L(t_R - 1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{L+1}} e^{ik} , \quad (\text{S25})$$

with $k = 2n\pi/(L+1)$, $n = 1, 2, \dots, L$.

This approximate expression for the GBZ is dependent on the system size L in the form of the exponent $1/(L+1)$, which gives weak dependence on the inter-chain coupling δ as well as a constant factor containing the other system parameters. While it is not the only possible approximation, it is relatively compact and agrees well with the numerical GBZ values [Fig. S1(b)] obtained by substituting the exact OBC spectrum E_0 of our 4-component physical system into $\det(\mathcal{H}(z) - E_0\mathbb{I}) = 0$, and solving for z . Also, it predicts a spectrum $E_{\text{GBZ}} = \pm\sqrt{(t_L + 1/z_1)(t_R + z_1)}$ that agrees very well with that numerically-obtained exact OBC spectrum E_0 , as shown in Fig. S1(c-f). Regardless of the exact choice of approximation, the $\delta^{1/(L+1)}$ dependence holds universally, and suggests a slow but δ -dependent convergence of the GBZ onto the unit circle in the $L \rightarrow \infty$ limit. In Fig. S1(c'-f'), the $|z_1|^x, |z_2|^x$ spatial decay profiles predicted by the GBZ (brown) near $E_0 = 0$ also exhibit excellent agreement with the upper and lower envelope limits of the numerical eigenstate Ψ closest to $E_0 = 0$ in Fig. S1(c-f).

In all, our approximate size-dependent GBZ solution for our coupled HN model system is given by

$$z = \exp(iK) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{t_R/t_L} e^{ik}, & L \leq L' \\ e^{-\frac{\alpha}{L+1}} e^{ik}, & L \geq L' \end{cases}, \quad \alpha = -\log \left| \delta \times \frac{t_R(t_R - t_L)}{t_L(t_R - 1)} \right|, \quad (\text{S26})$$

where

$$L' = -\alpha / \log \sqrt{t_R/t_L} - 1, \quad (\text{S27})$$

is the transition length in which the energy spectrum or skin depth $-\log |z|$ switches from being size-independent to size-dependent [Fig. S1(b)]. The value of L' is determined by setting both expressions for the GBZ to be equal i.e. $|z_1| = \sqrt{t_R/t_L} = \exp(-\alpha/(L' + 1))$. The very good agreement between our analytic GBZ solution (Eq. S26) and exact numerics is presented in Fig. S1 for the skin depth $-\log |z|$, spectrum E and eigenfunction decay.

In a nutshell, we have shown that as the system size L increases, the GBZ and spectrum always switches from being size-independent to size-dependent as L crosses L' . This is given by our approximate GBZ expression Eq. S26 which nevertheless exhibits excellent agreement with numerical results from exact diagonalization. Our approach was based on neglecting the effect of weak coupling terms in the bulk equations but retaining their influence in enforcing the boundary conditions, which allowed for analytic headway in writing down the energy expression from the characteristic equation of a single chain $\det(H(z) - E) = 0$. This is justified because while extremely weak couplings should not significantly affect the bulk, they would still nontrivially interplay with the boundary conditions due to the high sensitivity of non-Hermitian systems to spatial inhomogeneities. To conclude, with nonzero coupling between chains with antagonistic NHSE, the GBZ is found to be no longer given by the usual $|z_1| = |z_2|$ condition, but instead takes on a L -dependent behavior that crucially involves the coupling strength δ .

C. Effective size-dependent two-component model

The key purpose of any GBZ construction is to “remove” the NHSE, such that the Hamiltonian evaluated on the GBZ (i.e. “surrogate Hamiltonian” [156]) can already accurately reproduce the OBC spectrum without actually diagonalizing it under OBCs. In our case, the size-dependent GBZ obtained in the previous subsection has already encapsulated the effects of the coupling and the antagonistic NHSE.

As such, working in our effect size-dependent GBZ z , we can accurately study \mathcal{H} (Eq. S1) as two uncoupled copies of 2-component chains H i.e. $\mathcal{H} = H(K) \oplus H^T(-K)$, where $K = -i \log z$. The effects of the coupling and NHSE are implicit in the imaginary part of K . From Eq. S2,

$$H(K) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t_L + e^{-iK} \\ t_R + e^{iK} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S28})$$

even though our approach would work well for generic $H(k)$ of similar levels of complexity. To recall,

$$K = -i \log z = k + i \frac{\alpha}{L+1}, \quad (\text{S29})$$

from Eq. S26, where the real part $k = \text{Re}K = 2m\pi/(L+1)$ with $m = 1, 2, \dots, L$, and the imaginary part $\text{Im}K = \frac{\alpha}{L+1}$ is controlled by

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} -\log \left| \delta \times \frac{t_R(t_R - t_L)}{t_L(t_R - 1)} \right|, & L \geq L' \\ -(L+1) \log \sqrt{t_R/t_L}, & L \leq L' \end{cases}, \quad (\text{S30})$$

from Eq. S26 and S27. From direct diagonalization of $H(K)$, the eigenenergies are given by

$$\mathcal{E} = \pm \sqrt{(t_L + \exp(-iK))(t_R + \exp(iK))}, \quad (\text{S31})$$

which has a similar form as Eq. S3; but when evaluated on the GBZ (Eq. S26), it should reproduce the OBC spectrum of the entire original 4-component model \mathcal{H} (Eq. S1). Note that we have used the notation \mathcal{E} to refer to the eigenenergies predicted by the GBZ, which are supposed to closely approximate the true eigenenergies E .

Importantly, because of the size dependence of the GBZ, $H(K)$ can possess exceptional points (EPs) at special sizes $L = L_c$ where the corresponding $K = K_c$ gives rise to $t_R + \exp(iK_c) = 0$ and $t_L + \exp(-iK_c) \neq 0$. When that occurs,




FIG. S1. **Scaling-dependent GBZ, spectrum and eigenfunctions of the 4-component model \mathcal{H} [Eq. S1].** (a) The two chain 4-component model [Eq. S1] incorporates equal but opposite hopping asymmetries t_L and t_R in both chains I and II. Even a small inter-chain coupling δ can lead to significant scaling dependence when $t_L \neq t_R$. (b) Agreement of the scale-dependent skin depth $\log |z|$ obtained via two different ways: numerically, by solving $\det(\mathcal{H}(z) - E_0) = 0$ from the numerical eigenspectrum E_0 and choosing slowest decaying z solution (blue crosses); analytically, via the scale-dependent generalized Brillouin zone (GBZ) we derived [Eq. S26] (red dots). L' [Eq. S27] represents the system size at which the skin depth (GBZ) transitions from being scale-independent to scale-dependent. (c-f, c'-f') Energy spectra at various system sizes L and illustrative eigenfunctions at energies E_0 (green diamonds in (c-f)) of smallest absolute value. Excellent agreement is observed between the numerical (blue) and analytically-derived GBZ (red) spectra [Eq. S26] and eigenfunctions [Eq. S12, Eq. S13]. The lower bound for the eigenfunctions (lower red curves) results from the superposition of z_1 and z_2 solutions in Eq. S13, and is generally non-monotonic except at the critical scale $L \approx L_c$ [Eq. S32], where it exhibits a perfectly exponential profile since both z solutions coalesce. Parameters are $t_L = 1.2e^{0.3}$, $t_R = 1.2e^{-0.3}$, and $\delta = 1.6 \times 10^{-3}$ for all panels.

$H(K)$ is of the Jordan form σ_+ and is not of full rank (defective). We will soon investigate how this scaling-induced EP lead to unconventional entanglement behavior. Substituting $K_c = k_c + i\alpha/(L_c + 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 t_R + \exp(iK_c) &= t_R + \exp(-\alpha/(L_c + 1) + ik_c) = 0 \\
 \Rightarrow k_c &= \pi, \quad \alpha/(L_c + 1) = -\log t_R \\
 \Rightarrow L_c &= -\frac{\alpha}{\log t_R} - 1,
 \end{aligned} \tag{S32}$$

with $\alpha = -\log \left| \delta \times \frac{t_R(t_R - t_L)}{t_L(t_R - 1)} \right|$. Here, L_c represents the critical length in which an EP appears, and should not be confused with $L' = -\alpha / \log \sqrt{t_R/t_L} - 1$ (Eq. S27), which is the length above which the GBZ becomes size dependent. Evidently, such a scaling-induced EP exists only if $L_c > L'$.

Even though L_c was derived from the approximately-obtained GBZ, it already predicts the scaling-induced EP transition to excellent accuracy, when compared to the critical L_c obtained from exact diagonalization spectra (which must be an integer), as shown in Fig. S2.




FIG. S2. **The critical system size L_c dependence on δ for the coupled 4-component model [Eq. S1] and its effective two-component approximation [Eq. S28].** The spectral gap of our model closes at an EP at the critical system size L_c , which is analytically predicted to depend logarithmically on the small inter-chain coupling parameter δ . Excellent agreement is observed between the numerically determined integer L_c (black dots) and its analytical prediction [Eq. S32]. Since δ is built into the GBZ for the two-component, single-chain approximation [Eq. S28], its excellent numerical agreement is testimony to the validity of our scale-dependent GBZ approach.

1. Critical behavior near the scaling-induced EP

To prepare for the study of the entanglement properties near the scaling-induced EPs described above, we describe how the Hamiltonian behaves in their neighborhood. We first expand the size-dependent quasi-momentum K , both its real and imaginary parts, as $\Delta_K = K - K_c$ where $K = k + i\alpha/(L+1)$ and $K_c = \pi + i\alpha/(L_c+1)$ [See Eqs. S26 and S32], such that $\Delta_K = \text{Re}\Delta_K + i\text{Im}\Delta_K$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}\Delta_K &= k - \pi, \\ \text{Im}\Delta_K &= \alpha \left(\frac{1}{L+1} - \frac{1}{L_c+1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S33})$$

With these, the Hamiltonian (Eq. S28) can be expanded near $K = K_c$ as

$$\begin{aligned} H(K) &\xrightarrow{\Delta_K = K - K_c} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t_L + e^{-iK_c} e^{-i\Delta_K} \\ t_R + e^{iK_c} e^{i\Delta_K} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\xrightarrow[\substack{e^{i\Delta_K} \approx 1 + i\Delta_K \\ t_R + \exp(iK_c) = 0}]{} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t_L - 1/t_R \\ -it_R \Delta_K & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S34})$$

This yields the eigenenergies of $H(K_c + \Delta_K)$ to be $\pm \mathcal{E} = \pm \sqrt{i(1 - t_L t_R) \Delta_K}$.

2. Critical properties of the occupied band projector P_K

The geometric defectiveness of an EP is reflected in the divergences of the occupied band projector P , since the latter will not be well-defined with the occupied and valence bands merge into one. For a 2-component model, $P = \sum_k P_k |k\rangle \langle k|$ is defined (in the biorthogonal basis) as

$$P_K = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{I} - \frac{H(K)}{\mathcal{E}(K)} \right), \quad (\text{S35})$$

where $\mathcal{E}(K)$ is the eigenvalue of the Hamiltonian $H(K)$ (Eq. S28). Note that we have analytically continued $P_k \rightarrow P_K$ into the GBZ. Ordinarily, away from gap closure points, $P(K)$ projects onto a well-defined occupied band since $\mathcal{E}(K) \neq 0$. But at an EP ($K = K_c$) where $\Delta_K = 0$, $\mathcal{E}(K) = \sqrt{i(1 - t_L t_R) \Delta_K}$ vanishes, rendering P_K singular.

Close to an EP, where Δ_K is very small,

$$P_K = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & P_K^{+-} \\ P_K^{-+} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_K^{+-} = \frac{1}{P_K^{-+}}, \quad (\text{S36})$$

where

$$P_K^{+-} \approx -\frac{\sqrt{t_L/t_R - 1/t_R^2}}{2\sqrt{-i\Delta_K}}, \quad (\text{S37})$$

with $\Delta_K = K - K_c = k - \pi + i\left(\frac{\alpha}{L+1} - \frac{\alpha}{L_c+1}\right)$. In a finite system, the the quasi-momentum $k = \text{Re}K$ points take the values $2\pi/(L+1), 4\pi/(L+1), \dots$, such that $\text{Re}\Delta_K \sim \pi/L$ for even-sized systems, and $\text{Re}\Delta_K = 0$ for odd-sized systems. However, the imaginary momentum deviation $\text{Im}\Delta_K$ is approximately $\frac{\alpha}{L+1} - \frac{\alpha}{L_c+1} = \frac{\alpha(L_c-L)}{(L+1)(L_c+1)} \sim \alpha(L_c-L)/L^2 \approx \alpha(L_c-L)/L_c^2$ near K_c , which is much smaller than $1/L$. Since $P_K^{+-} \propto \Delta_K^{-1/2}$, the strength of the singularity depends on both the real and the imaginary parts of Δ_K , as illustrated in the complex P_+ plot in Fig. S3a ($L = 43$ is the most divergent). To elaborate on the qualitatively different cases of even and odd L :

- Even L , such that $\min|\text{Re}\Delta_K| \neq 0$:

Here, the closest momentum point passes approximately within π/L of $\text{Re}K_c = \pi$, such that $|\Delta_K| = \left| \frac{\pi}{L} + i\left(\frac{\alpha}{L_c+1} - \frac{\alpha}{L+1}\right) \right| \approx \frac{\pi}{L}$ for modest system sizes of L , $L_c \sim 10 - 10^2$. The scaling behavior is dominated by $|\Delta_K| \sim \text{Re}\Delta_K$ masking the effect of the imaginary part. As shown in Fig. S3b, the most divergent contribution to $P_K^{+-} \sim \Delta_K^{-1/2} \sim L^{1/2}$ arises from $k = \pi - \pi/L$, but because $|\Delta_K|$ diverges with L and not L_c , it does not really capture the value of L_c .

- Odd L , such that $\min|\text{Re}\Delta_K| = 0$:

Here, $k = \pi$ is visited in the GBZ, and $\text{Re}\Delta_K = 0$ while $\Delta_K = i\left(\frac{\alpha}{L+1} - \frac{\alpha}{L_c+1}\right) \sim \alpha(L_c-L)/L_c^2$. We hence have $|P_K^{+-}| \sim \Delta_K^{-1/2} \sim L_c/\sqrt{\alpha|L_c-L|}$, which indeed shows up as a divergence at $L \approx L_c$ in the P^{+-} plots in Fig. S3c.

The fundamental difference between our scaling-induced EPs and usual critical points is that the divergence in the projector does not stem from $\text{Re}\Delta_K$, which typically scales like L^{-1} , but instead arises from $\text{Im}\Delta_K$, which diverges at $L \approx L_c$.




FIG. S3. **Potentially divergent matrix element P_K^{+-} [Eq. S36] of our truncated projection operator P_K [Eq. S35] in even vs. odd L systems.** (a) Complex values of the off-diagonal element P_K^{+-} , which traces a different loop for each system size L as k cycles over a period $[0, 2\pi)$ with discrete points $(2m-1)\pi/L$, $m = 1, 2, \dots, L$ (drawn as solid dots). The $k = \pi$ point exist only for odd L , and causes P_K^{+-} to diverge to infinity as $L \rightarrow L_c = -\frac{\alpha}{\log t_R} - 1 = 42.79$ [Eq. S32], $\alpha = -\log \left| \delta \times \frac{t_R(t_R - t_L)}{t_L(t_R - 1)} \right|$. (b, c) The values of $|P_K^{+-}|$, $\text{Re}(P_K^{+-})$ and $\text{Im}(P_K^{+-})$ as a function of system size L , plotted as separate branches for each k value for (b) even and (c) odd L . While there exists for even L a $k = \pi - \pi/(L+1)$ branch that departs from the other branches, for odd L , the $k = \pi$ branch exhibits a sharp kink for $L = 43 \approx L_c = 42.79$. Parameters are $t_L = 1.2e^{0.3}$, $t_R = 1.2e^{-0.3}$, $\delta = 1.6 \times 10^{-3}$.

II. FREE-FERMION ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY DIP DUE TO SCALING-INDUCED EPS

In the previous section, we have derived the system-size (scaling) dependent GBZ that captures the effects of coupling two chains with antagonistic NHSE, and used that to accurately approximate our original 4-component system with an effective 2-component (single-chain) Hamiltonian. The key conclusion was that, for odd system sizes L , the truncated occupied band projector \bar{P} is expected to diverge at a special $L = L_c$ (in practice, the computed L_c is usually not an integer, and \bar{P} becomes very large though finite.)

In this section, we show how this divergence lead to an anomalous dip in the entanglement entropy (EE) scaling of free fermions, and how that can be analytically estimated and characterized. We note that this EE scaling is atypical because, in usual cases where the non-Hermiticity is isotropic, quantum correlations will spread evenly throughout the system, mirroring the distribution seen in Hermitian quantum systems. Even in prototypical NHSE systems where the Hermiticity can be gauged away through a basis transform. the hopping asymmetry does not lead to nontrivial modifications to the EE. In our case however, the EE is shown not to conform to standard area or volume laws but instead exhibit a unique entanglement dip.

For free fermions, the entanglement spectrum can be obtained by truncating the occupied band projector P in real-space. In 1D, we define a real-space partition $[x_L, x_R]$, such that truncated band projector \bar{P} can be obtained from P via

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{P} &= \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{[x_L, x_R]} P \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{[x_L, x_R]}, \\ \bar{\mathcal{R}}_{[x_L, x_R]} &= \sum_{x \notin [x_L, x_R]}^L |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \mathbb{I}, \\ P &= \sum_{n, (\text{Re}E_n) < 0} |\psi_n^R\rangle\langle \psi_n^L|,\end{aligned}\tag{S38}$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{[x_L, x_R]}$ is the projector onto sites outside of $[x_L, x_R]$ (note that the index n was expressed as indices (k, μ) in the main text, such as to emphasize the momentum k). For two-component models, the above general expression for P reduces to Eq. S35. The eigenvalues of the projection operators can be interpreted as occupancy probabilities. For P , they are limited to either 1 and 0. However, when the system is divided in to the $[x_L, x_R]$ and its complement, the truncated occupied matrix \bar{P} reveals the entanglement between these two regions, resulting in occupancy probabilities (eigenvalues) p away from 1 and 0. The free-fermion entanglement entropy (EE) S quantifies this entanglement, and is given by

$$\begin{aligned}S(\bar{P}) &= -\text{Tr}(\bar{P} \log \bar{P} + (\mathbb{I} - \bar{P}) \log(\mathbb{I} - \bar{P})) \\ &= -\sum_p (p \log p + (1 - p) \log(1 - p)).\end{aligned}\tag{S39}$$

A. Entanglement entropy scaling and dip in the effective 2-component model Eq. S28

To investigate the EE behavior, we first compute \bar{P} in its real-space basis, such that $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_{[x_L, x_R]}$ can be implemented as the truncation to a submatrix. Employing the Fourier Transform $|x, \alpha\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_k e^{-ikx} |k, \alpha\rangle$, we can express its real-space matrix elements as

$$\langle c_{x_1, \alpha}^\dagger c_{x_2, \beta} \rangle = \langle x_1, \alpha | \bar{P} | x_2, \beta \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{L} \sum_k P_K^{\alpha\beta} e^{ik(x_1 - x_2)}, & x_1, x_2 \notin [x_L, x_R] \\ 0 & x_1, x_2 \in [x_L, x_R] \end{cases},\tag{S40}$$

where $\alpha, \beta = \pm$ represent the sublattices A, B , and $K = k + i\alpha/(L + 1)$. Note that even though P_K is evaluated in the GBZ K , the fourier transform is still between the real-space lattice and the usual BZ k .




FIG. S4. **Comparison of entanglement entropy scaling behavior with and without scaling-induced exceptional criticality.** (a) For our 2-component effective model [Eq. S29] with scale-dependent GBZ given by $\text{Im}K = \frac{\alpha}{L+1}$, the entanglement entropy experiences a pronounced dip at $L = 41 \approx L_c$. This only occurs for odd L , where the $\text{Re}K = \pi$ point is sampled. (b) Had the same model Eq. S29 been a physical model with fixed GBZ, rather than an effective model of a L -dependent GBZ, there would not have been any entanglement dip. We have fixed $\text{Im}K = -\log \left| \delta \times \frac{t_R(t_R - t_L)}{t_L(t_R - 1)} \right| / (L_c + 1) = -0.123$, with parameters $t_L = 1.2e^{0.3}$, $t_R = 1.2e^{-0.3}$, $\delta = 1.6 \times 10^{-3}$.

Because of the peculiar scaling properties of our GBZ of our effective 2-band model Eq. S28, \bar{P} behaves very differently for odd and even L [See Fig. S4]. For odd L , we have shown that the discretized momenta in the GBZ contain one point where $\text{Re}K = \pi$, i.e. $\min|\text{Re}\Delta_K|$ from the EP is zero, where $\Delta_K = i \left(\frac{\alpha}{L+1} - \frac{\alpha}{L_c+1} \right)$. In this case, P_K^{+-} [Eq. S37] is divergent as $|L - L_c|^{-1/2}$ near the EP. However, for even L , the divergence is only asymptotic with $L^{1/2}$, as explained below Eq. S37. In the following, we elaborate on the above:

$$\langle x_1, + | \bar{P} | x_2, - \rangle \approx \frac{1 - (-1)^L}{2L} P_{K=\pi+i\frac{\alpha}{L+1}}^{+-} e^{i\pi(x_1-x_2)} + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\pi+\pi/L}^{2\pi} P_{K=k+i\frac{\alpha}{L+1}}^{+-} dk. \quad (\text{S41})$$

Here we have split the integral contributions into two parts: the first term is from $\text{Re}\Delta_K = \pi$ and exists only when L is odd, while the second term contains all other momentum point contributions. From the arguments below Eq. S37, the first term behaves like:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1 - (-1)^L}{2L} P_{K=\pi+i\frac{\alpha}{L+1}}^{+-} e^{i\pi(x_1-x_2)} &\approx -\frac{1 - (-1)^L}{2L} \frac{\sqrt{t_L/t_R - 1/t_R^2}}{2\sqrt{-i\Delta_K}} e^{i\pi(x_1-x_2)} \\ &\xrightarrow[L \rightarrow L_c]{\Delta_K = K - K_c, \text{Re}\Delta_K = 0} \frac{1 - (-1)^L}{2L} \frac{\sqrt{t_L t_R - 1}}{2t_R} \left(\frac{(L+1)(L_c+1)}{\alpha(L_c-L)} \right)^{1/2} e^{i\pi(x_1-x_2)} \\ &\xrightarrow[L \approx \sqrt{(L_c+1)(L+1)}]{} (1 - (-1)^L) \frac{\sqrt{t_L t_R - 1}}{4\sqrt{\alpha} \cdot t_R} (L_c - L)^{-1/2} e^{i\pi(x_1-x_2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S42})$$

The second term behaves like

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\pi+\pi/L}^{2\pi} P_{k+i\frac{\alpha}{L+1}}^{+-} dk &\approx \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\pi} \frac{\sqrt{t_L/t_R - 1/t_R^2}}{2\sqrt{-i\Delta_K}} e^{i(\pi+\text{Re}\Delta_K)(x_1-x_2)} d\text{Re}\Delta_K \\ &\propto L^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S43})$$

In the above, we have not focused on the spatial $x_1 - x_2$ dependence, since we are primarily concerned about the L -scaling behavior. Diagonalizing \bar{P} , it is numerically verified [See Fig. S4(a)] that due to our scaling-induced EP, odd and even-sized systems behave qualitatively differently. Near the critical size, the EE (computed from the eigenvalues p of \bar{P} via Eq. S39) for odd L exhibits a divergence which we call an *entanglement dip*, while in even- L systems, it changes continuously with size.

However, this entanglement dip disappears if the system does not possess such a scaling-dependent GBZ. If we were to instead consider Eq. S28 to be the physical (not effective) model for a non-antagonistic NHSE

chain which exhibits a scaling-independent EP point, such that $K = k + i\frac{\alpha}{L_0+1}$ with fixed L_0 (instead of L), its EE would no longer show abrupt changes with size, despite still exhibiting odd/even system size effects [See Fig. S4(b)].

B. Effect of entanglement truncation interval in the effective 2-component model

The entanglement dip at $L \approx L_c$ occurs universally, regardless of the actual entanglement cut region $[x_L, x_R]$, since it is not specifically dependent on the real-space profile of the matrix elements of \tilde{P} . In Fig. S4(a) for our 2-component model Eq.S28, the odd-sized EE is shown to consistently exhibit $(L - L_c)^{-0.5}$ divergence regardless of the truncation region.

This entanglement dip remains qualitatively similar (as it should be) in the EE of its parent 4-component coupled system [Eq. S1], even though the GBZ takes on a more intricate structure and the real part of the EP momentum is not rigorously fixed at π . Indeed, for this 4-component coupled system, the entanglement dip is observed in both odd and even-sized systems [See Fig. S4(b)], implying that it is not fundamentally based on the positions of the $\text{Re}K$ momentum points. What is fundamental is the fact that the EP lies on a GBZ whose imaginary part of momentum deviation Δ_K gives rise to a $(L - L_c)^{-0.5}$ divergence in P .

1. Single unit-cell truncation

Since the entanglement dip is largely independent of the truncation region, we can make further analytic progress by focusing on *single-site* entanglement where only one unit-cell $x_L = x_R$ exists in the untruncated region $[x_L, x_R] = [x_L, x_L]$. For a single unit-cell, the Fourier phase factor $e^{ik(x_1-x_2)}$ in $\langle x, \alpha | P | x, \beta \rangle$ [Eq. S41] disappears, and the single




FIG. S5. **Entanglement dip with different entanglement cuts.** For different truncated regions $[x_L, x_R]$ implemented by the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{[x_L, x_R]} = \sum_{x \notin [x_L, x_R]} |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \mathbb{I}$, similar behavior is observed in the entanglement entropy (EE) of (a) our effective 2-component model $H(K)$ Eq. S28 and (b) its parent 4-component coupled chain model \mathcal{H} Eq. S1. For all cases, a prominent entanglement dip occurs, with approximate asymptotic $(L_c - L)^{-0.5}$ behavior. Parameters are $t_L = 1.2e^{0.3}$, $t_R = 1.2e^{-0.3}$, $\delta = 1.6 \times 10^{-3}$, corresponding to $L_c = 42.79$ for (a) and $L'_c = 41.8$ for (b).

unit-cell truncated projector (we call it \tilde{P} here to emphasize the single unit cell special case) is

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{P}^{+-} &= -\frac{1}{L} \sum_k P_K^{+-} \xrightarrow{L \gg 1} -\frac{1}{L} P_{\pi+i}^{+-} + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{k \neq \pi} P_{k+i}^{+-} dk \\
&= \frac{1}{2L} \frac{\sqrt{t_L - e^{-\frac{\alpha}{L+1}}}}{\sqrt{t_R - e^{-\frac{\alpha}{L+1}}}} + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{k \neq \pi} \frac{\sqrt{t_L - e^{-ik + \frac{\alpha}{L+1}}}}{\sqrt{t_R - e^{-ik - \frac{\alpha}{L+1}}}} dk \\
&\xrightarrow{t_R - \exp(\frac{\alpha}{L_c - 1}) = 0} \frac{\sqrt{t_L t_R - 1}}{2t_R L} \left(\frac{\alpha}{L+1} - \frac{\alpha}{L_c + 1} \right)^{-1/2} - \frac{1}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{-t_L}{t_R}} \mathcal{F} \left(\text{asin} \sqrt{-t_R e^{-\frac{\alpha}{L+1}}}, \frac{1}{t_R t_L} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{S44}$$

where $\mathcal{F}(m, \phi)$ represents the Elliptic integral of the second kind, which varies very weakly with system size L due to the slow $e^{-\frac{\alpha}{L+1}}$ functional dependence, and can be approximated as $\sqrt{(t_L + 1)(t_R + 1)}/2\pi t_R$. Hence the above is approximated by

$$\tilde{P}^{+-} \approx \frac{\sqrt{t_L t_R - 1}}{2\sqrt{\alpha} \cdot t_R} (L - L_c)^{-1/2} + \frac{\sqrt{(t_L + 1)(t_R + 1)}}{2\pi t_R}, \tag{S45}$$

with $\sqrt{(L+1)(L_c+1)} \approx L$ near the entanglement dip. By contrast, the other off-diagonal term \tilde{P}^{-+} is not sensitive to L , as given by

$$\tilde{P}^{-+} = -\frac{1}{L} \sum_k P_K^{-+} \approx \frac{\sqrt{(t_L + 1)(t_R + 1)}}{2\pi t_L}. \tag{S46}$$

Hence the occupation probability eigenvalues \tilde{p} of \tilde{P} are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{p}_{\text{Approx.}} &= \frac{1}{2} \pm \sqrt{\tilde{P}^{+-} \times \tilde{P}^{-+}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \pm \left(\frac{1}{4} \frac{t_R}{t_L} \sqrt{\frac{t_L/t_R - 1/t_R^2}{\alpha}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{L - L_c}} + \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{t_R t_L}} \sqrt{(t_L + 1)(t_R + 1)} \right) + \mathcal{O},
\end{aligned} \tag{S47}$$

where the small constant \mathcal{O} is of the order of 10^{-1} . For entanglement dips that are not too deep (i.e $\tilde{p} \approx 0$ or equivalently $\tilde{p} \approx 1$), we can further approximate the EE by

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\text{Approx.}} &\xrightarrow{|\tilde{p}| \rightarrow 0} -2(\tilde{p} \log \tilde{p} - (1 - \tilde{p})\tilde{p}) \\
&= 2(b \log(0.5 - a) - 2ab)(L_c - L)^{-0.5} + 0.25 + a^2 + \mathcal{O}',
\end{aligned} \tag{S48}$$

where $a = \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{t_R t_L}} \sqrt{(t_L + 1)(t_R + 1)} + \mathcal{O}$, $b = \frac{1}{4} \frac{t_R}{t_L} \sqrt{\frac{t_L/t_R - 1/t_R^2}{\alpha}}$, \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{O}' representing small offsets that can be adjusted to mitigate the imperfect approximation [See Fig. S6(b)].




FIG. S6. **Scaling behavior of the \bar{P} spectrum and the EE of the 2-component model [Eq. S28] with single unit-cell truncation.** (a) The excellent agreement between the numerical spectra of \bar{P} [Eq. S38] and its single unit-cell approximation \tilde{P} [Eq. S45], as well as its analytically approximated spectrum $\tilde{p}_{\text{Approx.}}$ [Eq. S47]. Note that \tilde{P} only yields the nontrivial pair of eigenvalues away from 0 and 1, whose kink near $L \approx L_c$ is well-approximated by $\tilde{p}_{\text{Approx.}}$. (b) The corresponding scaling of the entanglement entropy (EE) $S(\bar{P})$ and $S(\tilde{P})$ from the eigenvalues of \bar{P} and \tilde{P} shown in panel (a), along with the analytical result $S_{\text{Approx.}}$ given by Eq. S48. The results exhibit good consistency, and in particular all predict the same entanglement dip. Parameters are $t_L = 1.2e^{0.3}$, $t_R = 1.2e^{-0.3}$, $\delta = 1.6 \times 10^{-3}$. The coefficients a and b in Eq. S48 are calculated as $a = 0.3905$ and $b = 0.0456$ with small constants $\mathcal{O} = 0.14$, $\mathcal{O}' = -0.035$ [Eq. S47, S48], corresponding to the critical scale being $L_c = 42.79$.

2. Effect of the length of the entanglement truncation interval

In Hermitian systems, it is well-known that the EE of a cut region $[1, n_{\text{cut}}]$ varies strongly like $S \sim \log(L \sin \frac{\pi n_{\text{cut}}}{L})$, as can be proven with boundary CFTcite. Hence it is prudent to check whether SIEC behavior is nontrivially influenced by n_{cut} .

In Fig. S7, it was found that the effect of n_{cut} qualitatively depends on whether $L < L_c$, $L \approx L_c$ or $L > L_c$. In the first regime $L < L_c$ before the onset of the EE dip, the system is essentially gapped and n_{cut} does not appreciably change either the \bar{P} spectrum or S . However, for the second regime $L \approx L_c$ where the EE dip occurs, the \bar{P} eigenvalues do become significantly enhanced at $n_{\text{cut}} \approx L/2$, lying very far out of $[0, 1]$. For the third regime $L > L_c$, the system behaves essentially like an ordinary gapless system, with positive S and \bar{P} eigenvalues lying within $[0, 1]$. One state traverses the \bar{P} spectral gap between 0 and 1, reminiscent of the spectral flow of a topological edge mode.

Interestingly, as shown in the bottom row of Fig. S7, despite the very different \bar{P} behavior at or after the onset of the EE dip (second and third regimes), the EE continues to adhere approximately to the conventional $S \sim \log(L \sin \frac{\pi n_{\text{cut}}}{L})$ behavior as n_{cut} varies (for fixed L).

C. Controlling the depth of entanglement dips

Below, we explore the relationship between the depth of the entanglement dip (i.e. minimum EE S_{min}) varying the coupling parameter δ while keeping other parameters constant. This approach is based on our analytical understanding of how L_c varies with δ [See Fig. S2]. Here, we numerically identify parameters that lead to exceptionally negative S_{min} values, where the entanglement dip represents drastic departures from usual $\log L$ entanglement scaling.

Although the theoretically predicted L_c varies continuously with δ [Eq. S32], an actual lattice contains only an integer number of unit cells L . This prevents us from getting infinitesimally close to L_c , where S truly diverges. Away from that, how negative a dip S can reach depends on commensurability considerations, as shown in Fig. S8. For certain fine-tuned values of δ , the EE through S_{min} can dip below -4 (such as at $\delta = 1.68441635 \times 10^{-3}$ or 2.131947×10^{-3}), corresponding to extremely large p eigenvalues. Such dips occur both for our effective two-component model (a) as well as its parent four-component model (b), even though the dip positions are different. But what remains consistent are the shapes and qualitative order of magnitude of the entanglement dips.




FIG. S7. **Scaling of the energy spectrum, \bar{P} spectrum and entanglement entropy (EE) with different truncation lengths n_{cut} in the 3 regimes: $L < L_c$, $L = L_c$ and $L > L_c$.** (a1-c1) The energy spectrum at different sizes L where the Fermi energy is set at $\text{Re}E = 0$, identifying the lower energy states in the gray area as the occupied states. (a2-c2) The \bar{P} spectrum p with the system divided into two partitions: the truncated region $x \in [1, n_{cut}]$ and non-truncated region $[n_{cut} + 1, L]$ which is kept. Eigenvalues that are significantly far from 0 and 1 are joined by a red curve which exhibits qualitatively different behavior in different regimes. (a3-c3) Scaling of the EE with n_{cut} . For $L < L_c$, the total EE (blue curve) and the EE contributed only by the red states in (a2-c2) (red curve) are quite similar due to the suppression of the EE by the gap. But for the two other regimes, they differ considerably, albeit still with the same qualitative n_{cut} dependence. Parameters used are $t_L = 1.2e^{0.3}$, $t_R = 1.2e^{-0.3}$, $\delta = 1.6844163 \times 10^{-3}$.




FIG. S8. **Sensitivity of the entanglement dip minimum S_{\min} with coupling δ .** The entanglement dip S_{\min} can yield negative EE for a wide range of parameters, and can even reach very negative values of $S_{\min} < -4$ across small parameter windows. Shown are the S_{\min} and the corresponding system chain length L where it is attained, both for our (a) 2-component effective model Eq. S28 with δ built into its scale-dependent GBZ and (b) its parent 4-component model Eq. S1 with δ being the physical inter-chain coupling. A more complete parameter space plot that shows the dependence of S_{\min} with t_L/t_R is given in Fig. 3(c) of the main text. Parameters are $t_L = 1.2e^{0.3}$, $t_R = 1.2e^{-0.3}$.

D. Suppressed NHSE in the entanglement eigenstates

Since P is a projector onto the occupied bands, the entanglement eigenstates Ψ_p with $\bar{P}\Psi_p = p\Psi_p$, $\bar{P} = \mathcal{R}_{[x_1, x_2]} P \mathcal{R}_{[x_1, x_2]}$ are expected to be approximate linear combinations of the occupied states that vanish outside of the interval $[x_1, x_2]$. In particular, they are expected to assume an exponentially decaying spatial profile if the constituent occupied states are all NHSE skin-localized states.

Yet, as we show below, the Ψ_p entanglement eigenstates exhibit reduced NHSE localization compared to the reference skin localization at the scaling induced exceptional point (EP). This is demonstrated in both Figs. S9 and S10. In the physical Hamiltonian, chain I exhibits the skin effect towards the right, while for chain II towards the left. Indeed, this skin localization is observed in both the physical Hamiltonian eigenstate Ψ_{EP} , as well as the eigenstate Ψ_{p_m} of \bar{P} corresponding to the most negative eigenvalue p_m , which dominates the contribution to the entanglement dip.

But, as evident from Figs. S9(c) and S10(c), the entanglement eigenstate Ψ_{p_m} shows a weaker skin localization than Ψ_{EP} , despite being approximately made up of skin modes. This can be interpreted as a signature of NHSE suppression in the entanglement eigenstate, and can be qualitatively understood as a consequence of the antagonistic competition between the oppositely directed NHSE chains.




FIG. S9. **Entanglement scaling and \bar{P} eigenstate profile for our physical 4-component model Eq. S1.** (a) \bar{P} spectrum as a function of system size L at half entanglement truncation. A conventional in-gap spectral branch for critical systems appears for $L > L_c$. (b) The resultant entanglement entropy scaling, with a pronounced entanglement dip before $L \approx L_c$. (c1) The spatial profiles of Ψ_{p_m} (the $S = S_{\text{min}}$ eigenstate of \bar{P} , colored red above) and Ψ_{EP} (eigenstate of Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}) are shown. Since \bar{P} is constructed using the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian, its eigenstate Ψ_{p_m} inherits the skin effect from the Hamiltonian. (c2) To eliminate the skin effect in Ψ_{p_m} and Ψ_{EP} , the profile of $|\Psi_{p_m}/\Psi_{\text{EP}}|$ represents the cumulative wavefunction distribution near the truncation point after excluding the EP eigenstate. Parameters used are $t_L = 1.2e^{0.3}$, $t_R = 1.2e^{-0.3}$, $\delta = 1.6 \times 10^{-3}$.




FIG. S10. Entanglement scaling and \bar{P} eigenstate profile for our physical 4-component model Eq. S1, for an extremely pronounced entanglement dip. This figure is similar to Fig. S9, but with inter-chain coupling tuned to $\delta = 1.6844163 \times 10^{-3}$ such that $L_c = 40.038$ becomes almost an integer, giving rise to very negative S_{\min} . (a) and (b) shows how the \bar{P} spectrum and corresponding entanglement entropy jump dramatically at $L \approx L_c$. However, as compared to Fig. S9(c1,c2), the spatial distribution of Ψ_{p_m} (depicted in (c1) and colored red in (a,b)) and $|\Psi_{p_m}/\Psi_{EP}|$ in (c2) do not exhibit obvious changes. Parameters are $t_L = 1.2e^{0.3}$, $t_R = 1.2e^{-0.3}$.

III. COMPARISON WITH OTHER TYPES OF CRITICAL SCENARIOS

To expand on the discussion surround Fig. 1 of the main text, we present in Fig. S11 other examples of NHSE and geometrically defective systems that all adhere to logarithmic entanglement scaling, and in Fig. S12 an elaboration of all the cases featured in Fig. 1 of the main text.




FIG. S11. Logarithmic entanglement entropy scaling in generic non-SIEC systems that are critical. Shown are examples of the EE scaling of non-Hermitian systems exhibiting the NHSE (top) and exceptional points (bottom), labeled by maximal hopping distance B as defined in the leftmost column. Regardless of form of the model, all cases exhibit $S \sim \log L$ scaling, even though $B > 1$ gives rise to irregular generalized Brillouin zones (GBZs) or higher-order EP points. Only other systems exhibiting the SIEC can violate this logarithmic EE scaling. Parameters are $t_L = 1.62$, $t_R = 0.89$, $t = 1$.




FIG. S12. **Entanglement scaling behavior of various types of critical systems, with $S \sim \log L$ scaling violated only in SIEC.** (a) For a critical point K_0 that is Hermitian, the spectral accumulation of eigenmomentum states (black dots) intensifies around the corresponding energy E_{K_0} (highlighted in red) with increasing system size L (cyan arrows). The nearest approach to K_0 hence scales like $\Delta K_{\min} \sim \pi/L$, leading to logarithmic entanglement entropy scaling with L , i.e. $S \sim \log L$. The Hermitian model used is $H(z) = (t_1 + t_2 z) \sigma_- + (t_1 + t_2 z^{-1}) \sigma_+$, $z = e^{ik}$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$, $t_1 = t_2 = 1$. (b) Even under the influence of the non-Hermitian skin effect (NHSE), the logarithmic scaling of entanglement entropy $S \sim \log L$ persists for a critical system because we still have $\Delta K_{\min} \sim \pi/L$ in the generalized Brillouin zone (GBZ) $z = e^{iK(k)}$ (circular path within the unit circle). The non-Hermitian model used is $H(z) = (t_R + t_2 z) \sigma_- + (t_L + t_2 z^{-1}) \sigma_+$, $t_L = t_2 = 1$, $t_R = 0.5$. (c) For an exceptional non-Hermitian critical point K_0 , the eigenmomentum convergence ΔK_{\min} remains proportional to π/L . Nevertheless, the logarithmic entanglement entropy $S \sim -\log L$ exhibits negative scaling, attributable to the divergence of 2-point functions due to geometric defectiveness (vanishing phase rigidity $r \rightarrow 0$ (dark purple)). The non-Hermitian exceptional point model used is $H(z) = ((2 - 2 \cos k) z^{-1}) \sigma_- + ((2 - 2 \cos k) z + 1) \sigma_+$, $z = e^{ik}$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$. (d) In the case of scaling-induced exceptional criticality (SIEC), both the spectrum and GBZ changes dramatically with system size L (visualized by widening cyan arrows), encountering the exceptional critical point K_0 only at a particular system size $L = L_c$. This condition induces a characteristic entanglement dip in entanglement entropy S , as explained in the previous sections. The SIEC model used is the same as that in Fig. 1 of the main text.

IV. MEASURING NEGATIVE BIORTHOGONAL ENTANGLEMENT

A distinctive feature of non-Hermitian systems is that the left and right eigenstates are essentially eigenstates of *different* Hamiltonians \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}^\dagger . Together, these left and right eigenstates form a biorthogonal basis that preserves the probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics, and are crucial for defining various physical quantities such as our biorthogonal \bar{P} and entanglement entropy S .

However, simultaneously obtaining information from both left and right eigenstates in experimental measurements is often challenging. Here, to address this difficulty, we suggest considering a larger system $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ comprising the original system \mathcal{H} and its conjugate \mathcal{H}^\dagger . These two subsystems are very weakly coupled via a end-to-end coupling [157, 158]

$\boldsymbol{\eta} = \eta|1\rangle\langle L| + h.c.$ that connects the $|1\rangle$ and $|L\rangle$ end sites:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H} & \boldsymbol{\eta} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}^\dagger & \mathcal{H}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{S49})$$

Importantly, this $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ coupling will not measurably affect the individual subsystems \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}^\dagger 's eigenenergies and eigenstates, since they already contain equal and opposite NHSE themselves, and hence are no longer subject to net antagonistic NHSE. The purpose of these minuscule couplings η is to enable cooperative response between the auxiliary system \mathcal{H}^\dagger and the target system \mathcal{H} , and their impact on their fundamental characteristics, such as eigenenergies and eigenstates, can be considered negligible.

The purpose of introducing the auxiliary Hamiltonian as \mathcal{H}^\dagger is such that the eigenstates of the larger constructed Hamiltonian contains both the left and right eigenvectors of the target Hamiltonian. Specifically, for an energy E , there are 2 linearly independent degenerate eigenstates $|\tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm}\rangle$ satisfying

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}|\tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm}\rangle = E|\tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm}\rangle, \quad |\tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm}\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} |\Psi_E^R\rangle \\ \pm K|\Psi_E^L\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{S50})$$

where K is complex conjugation operation and $|\Psi_E^R\rangle$ and $|\Psi_E^L\rangle$ represent the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} and its hermitian conjugate \mathcal{H}^\dagger also with eigenvalue E .




FIG. S13. (a) A schematic setup in which the non-Hermitian system interacts with the auxiliary system through a weak microwave coupling. (b) A weak coupling η are introduced between the endpoints of the \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}^\dagger systems.

Below, we show how to connect the biorthogonal normalization factor $\langle \Psi_E^L | \Psi_E^R \rangle$ of our target system \mathcal{H} to the *physically measurable* non-biorthogonal expectation in terms of the eigenstates of this enlarged Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. We define an operator $\hat{\Lambda} = \sigma_- \otimes \mathbb{I} K$, which is the joint operation of $\sigma_- \otimes \mathbb{I}$ and the complex conjugate operator K . The *non-biorthogonal* i.e. conventionally measurable expectation of $\hat{\Lambda}$ in the energy E eigenstate just gives the biorthogonal normalization factor:

$$\langle \hat{\Lambda} \rangle_E = \langle \tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm} | \hat{\Lambda} | \tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm} \rangle = \langle \Psi_E^L | \Psi_E^R \rangle. \quad (\text{S51})$$

Next, we show how the use of $\hat{\Lambda}$ can connect the non-biorthogonal expectation of an arbitrary operator \hat{A} with its

biorthogonal expectation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{E,\pm} \langle \hat{A} \hat{\Lambda} \rangle_E / \langle \hat{\Lambda} \rangle_E &= \sum_{E,\pm} \frac{1}{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm} | \hat{\Lambda} | \tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm} \rangle} \langle \tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm} | \hat{A} \hat{\Lambda} | \tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{E,\pm} \frac{1}{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm} | \hat{\Lambda} | \tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm} \rangle} (\langle \Psi_E^R | \pm \langle \Psi_E^L | K) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hat{A} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} K \begin{pmatrix} | \Psi_E^R \rangle \\ \pm K | \Psi_E^L \rangle \end{pmatrix} \\
&\xrightarrow{K^2=1} \sum_{E,\pm} \frac{1}{\langle \tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm} | \hat{\Lambda} | \tilde{\Psi}_{E,\pm} \rangle} (\langle \Psi_E^R | \pm \langle \Psi_E^L | K) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hat{A} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K | \Psi_E^R \rangle \\ \pm | \Psi_E^L \rangle \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \sum_{E,\pm} \frac{\pm 1}{\langle \Psi_E^L | \Psi_E^R \rangle} (\pm \langle \Psi_E^L | K \hat{A} \mathbf{0}) \begin{pmatrix} K | \Psi_E^R \rangle \\ \pm | \Psi_E^L \rangle \end{pmatrix} \tag{S52} \\
&= \sum_{E,\pm} \frac{1}{\langle \Psi_E^L | \Psi_E^R \rangle} \langle \Psi_E^L | K \hat{A} K | \Psi_E^R \rangle \\
&\xrightarrow{K \hat{A} = \hat{A} K} \sum_E \frac{2}{\langle \Psi_E^L | \Psi_E^R \rangle} \langle \Psi_E^L | \hat{A} | \Psi_E^R \rangle \\
&= 2\text{Tr}(\hat{A}P) = 2\langle A \rangle_P,
\end{aligned}$$

where $P = \sum_E \frac{1}{\langle \Psi_E^L | \Psi_E^R \rangle} |\Psi_E^R\rangle \langle \Psi_E^L|$ is the biorthogonal projection operator, summed over the occupied energies E . Here, the factor of 2 arises from the doubled number of (\pm) states in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. Although the biorthogonal expectation is arguably not directly measurable when we only have the target system \mathcal{H} , the above shows how we can express it in terms of the *physical* expectations $\langle \hat{A} \hat{\Lambda} \rangle_E$ and $\langle \hat{\Lambda} \rangle_E$. In particular, by setting $\hat{A} = c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\beta}$, we can obtain the two-point correlation functions $2\text{Tr}(P c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\beta})$, where i and j represent the unit cells and α and β denote sub-lattices.

The 2nd Renyi entropy or purity can be measured based on the expectation values concerning the two-point correlation functions, or equivalently, the distribution of the density matrix. By evaluating the two-point correlation functions within an entanglement cut region, one can construct the truncated occupied state projector \bar{P} of the subsystem. The 2nd Renyi entropy S_2 is then given by $S_2 = -\log \text{Tr}(\bar{P}^2)$. Therefore, by accurately measuring the expectation values corresponding to the correlation functions, we can derive the necessary information to compute the 2nd Renyi entropy.

Below, we provide a brief discussion of how some of the above steps may be implemented in quantum simulator systems. In principle, they are not restricted to any particular platform, but below we shall elaborate mostly in the context of ultracold atomic setups [159–167], rather than trapped ions or solid-state spin systems.

In cold atom systems, employing either bosonic atoms, such as 87Rb, or fermionic atoms, such as 173Yb or 40K, radio-frequency (RF) spectroscopy is a widely employed spectral measurement technique [157, 158]. It is based on weakly coupling the system to auxiliary energy levels using radio waves or microwaves, with weak coupling strength achievable by adjusting the laser power [168–170]. General RF spectroscopy as described by [109, 171] can measure both the real and imaginary parts of eigenvalues of non-Hermitian systems. And by inducing momentum transfer with coherent Raman laser beams and combining this with Time-of-Flight and absorption imaging techniques, the momentum distribution and spatial wave function of atoms can be accurately measured [172]. For measuring expectation values, there are various techniques specifically geared towards cold atomic experiments [172–175], such as time-of-flight measurements, absorption spectroscopy, Raman spectroscopy, and interference techniques.