

Inhomogeneous SU(2) symmetries in homogeneous integrable U(1) circuits and transport

Marko Žnidarič

Physics Department, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics,
University of Ljubljana, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

(Dated: December 18, 2024)

We study quantum circuits with nearest-neighbor U(1) gates discovering new inhomogeneous screw SU(2) and $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetries. Despite the model being homogeneous – all gates are the same – symmetry generators are not. Rather, they exhibit an even-odd staggering and a nonzero quasi-momentum, and depend on gate parameters. Such parameter-dependent symmetries can be identified by the Ruelle-Pollicott spectrum of a momentum-resolved truncated propagator. They can be thought of as a generalization of the standard SU(2) symmetry of the XXZ model that upon introducing the staggered field splits into a local SU(2) symmetry and a non-local $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$. Picking an arbitrary U(1) gate and varying the gate duration one will transition through different phases: fractal ballistic transport, Kardar-Parisi-Zhang superdiffusion at the critical manifold including superdiffusive helix states, and diffusion within which there is also localization. To correctly explain transport the non-local SU(2) symmetries do not matter, while the inhomogeneous local ones that almost commute with the propagator do.

Symmetry is one of the most overarching concepts in physics [1]. While in principle just delineating a playing field for dynamics, at low temperatures, for instance, they are restrictive enough to pin down scenarios to only a handful of possibilities. To classify the phases one essentially needs to know symmetries of the order parameter and the Hamiltonian [2, 3]. In integrable models the effects of symmetries are the strongest. A symmetry brings with it a conservation law, and integrable systems are, vaguely speaking, systems with an extensive number of conserved quantities [4–6].

How do we find symmetries of a known system? Often this is done by inspection – in a suitable frame symmetries are “obvious”. Studying integrable Floquet quantum circuits we will find new SU(2) and $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetries where this is not the case – looking at the Hamiltonian the symmetries will not be clear at all – and the Floquet circuit will have richer symmetries than the Hamiltonian. Numerically looking for spectral multiplets will also not bear fruit because the symmetry is exact only in the thermodynamic limit. Nevertheless, identifying such “hidden” SU(2) symmetry is crucial for transport.

We are going to study homogeneous circuits with U(1) preserving gates described by a 4-parameter integrable family [7], a special case being the 2-parameter XXZ gates [8–11]. Extra parameters will bring new phenomena not found in neither the XXZ circuit nor in the chain. A century since discovery Heisenberg-type integrable models [12] still manage to surprise with beautiful mathematical structures having physical consequences that can be probed in experiments [13–19].

Any two-qubit gate with U(1) symmetry, i.e., conserving the magnetization $\sigma_1^z + \sigma_2^z$, can be written as

$$U_{1,2} = e^{-ih_{1,2}\tau}, \quad h_{1,2} = \sigma_1^x \sigma_2^x + \sigma_1^y \sigma_2^y + \Delta \sigma_1^z \sigma_2^z + B(\sigma_2^z - \sigma_1^z) + D(\sigma_1^x \sigma_2^y - \sigma_1^y \sigma_2^x) + M(\sigma_1^z + \sigma_2^z). \quad (1)$$

The one-step propagator is denoted by U and is a product of the above gates $U_{k,k+1}$ applied in a brickwall pat-




FIG. 1. Phases as a function of τ for $D = B = \Delta = 1$. When blue curve $|\mathfrak{D}|$ (2) crosses 1 the circuit is critical (blue circle); crossings of green dashed curve (10) mark position of non-local SU(2) symmetries (green triangles, Eq.(11)). Red curve (right axis) indicates the transport type: ballistic in phase II, diffusive in I, and localization at orange diamonds (Eq.(12)), and is the spin current in the middle of the circuit at $t = 250$ starting from a weakly polarized domain wall.

tern, $U = (\prod_{l=1}^L U_{2l-1,2l})(\prod_{l=1}^L U_{2l,2l+1})$, with L qubits (we assume even L). It has been shown in Ref. [7] that all such same-gate U(1) circuits with periodic boundary conditions (PBC), regardless of parameter values, are Yang-Baxter integrable. Because the total magnetization $Z = \sum_{l=1}^L \sigma_l^z$ is conserved M under PBC affect only the overall phase and we set it to $M = 0$.

Mischievous symmetries. – It is known [10] that transport of the XXZ circuits, i.e. at $B = D = 0$, varies between ballistic, diffusive, and superdiffusive. Crucial property determining the transport type are symmetries. Especially interesting is superdiffusion in interacting integrable systems [20–25]. It has been explained [26] that integrable models with a non-Abelian symmetry, like the SU(2), will generically display superdiffusion (in symmetry-invariant states). To that end we first look at




FIG. 2. Eigenphases spectrum of U for $L = 4$ as a function of τ , while $\Delta = D = B = 1$. At the critical point τ_c (blue; circle in Fig. 1) there are no $SU(2)$ multiplets, while at green lines (τ_+ (11) for integer k) there are. Blue/green numbers are degeneracies. Red circles are extra degeneracies that will be important for fractality. Vertical orange lines are Eq.(12).

symmetries of our model (1).

Recall that based on the analytical integrability structure two phases have been found [7], with criticality expressed in terms of $\mathfrak{D}(\Delta, D, B, \tau)$ as

$$|\mathfrak{D}| = 1, \quad \mathfrak{D} \equiv \frac{\sin(2\tau\Delta)}{\sin(2\tau J_{\text{eff}})} \frac{J_{\text{eff}}}{\sqrt{1+D^2+B^2}}, \quad J_{\text{eff}} \equiv \sqrt{1+D^2+B^2}. \quad (2)$$

The phase I is obtained for $|\mathfrak{D}| > 1$, while the phase II for $|\mathfrak{D}| < 1$. At zero magnetization and infinite temperature transport in the XXZ circuit [10] ($B = D = 0$) is diffusive in phase I, ballistic in phase II, with the critical point $|\mathfrak{D}| = 1$ displaying superdiffusion and Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) 2-point correlations [27, 28] and happens at $|\Delta| = 1$ (in the basic cell $2\Delta\tau, 2\tau \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$). In the XXZ circuit the critical point therefore coincides with the isotropic generator where the $SU(2)$ symmetry is obvious. However, for the newly discovered general integrable gate (1) with $B, D \neq 0$ one does not seem to have any obvious $SU(2)$ symmetry at the 3-dimensional critical manifold $|\mathfrak{D}| = 1$. For instance, setting $D = B = \Delta = 1$ the critical condition is satisfied only at special values of τ , the smallest one being $\tau_c \approx 0.605535 \frac{\pi}{4}$ (Fig. 1).

To nevertheless identify the presence of any possible non-obvious $SU(2)$ symmetry we have looked at the eigenphases spectrum of U . While one could use Bethe ansatz to get the Floquet spectrum [29] we simply use numerical diagonalization with a view of possibly using it also on systems with not-yet-known integrability. Namely, if one has an $SU(2)$ symmetry (and no other) one should see corresponding degeneracies: L spins $\frac{1}{2}$ can be coupled into a total spin s running over integer/half-integer values $s = L/2, L/2 - 1, \dots$, with the number of multiplets of spin s being $\binom{L+1}{L/2-s} \frac{1+2s}{L+1}$. For instance, for $L = 4$ one has $2[s = 0] \oplus 3[1] \oplus [2]$, i.e., one should see 2 nondegenerate eigenvalues, 3 multiplets with degeneracy 3, and one 5 times degenerate eigenvalue. In Fig. 2 we show an example of a spectrum as a function of τ for

open boundary conditions (OBC). Surprisingly, there are no multiplets at the critical τ_c (nor for PBC), while on the other hand there are $SU(2)$ multiplets at other non-critical values in phase I. This is puzzling because, as we shall show later, the transport is superdiffusive at the critical point, while it is diffusive in phase I. It looks as the symmetries are just the opposite of what they should be [26]: apparently one has superdiffusion without $SU(2)$, while in the presence of $SU(2)$ one sees diffusion.

We will resolve this conundrum by: (i) finding a “hidden” $SU(2)$ symmetry at the critical manifold; the symmetry generators will be spatially dependent even though the propagator U is translationally invariant, (ii) explicitly construct the $SU(2)$ generators, related to $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetry, at special points in phase I, and show that those generators are not local.

Inhomogeneous $SU(2)$ at the critical manifold. – For $B = D = 0$ one has the well known $SU(2)$ generators, Z and the ladder operators $2S^\pm = \sum_i \sigma_i^x \pm i \sigma_i^y$. If one has $B = 0$ but nonzero $D \neq 0$ things are still simple. Namely, by a unitary rotation W [30]

$$W = e^{-i\vartheta \sum_{i=1}^L \sigma_i^z}, \quad \tan(2\vartheta) = D, \quad (3)$$

one can transform an OBC circuit with $D \neq 0$ to a circuit with $D = 0$ (Appendix D). The $SU(2)$ generators for $B = 0$ are therefore the rotated ones, explicitly $\tilde{S}^+ = \sum_l \sigma_l^+ e^{-i2l\vartheta}$. So far those generators are exactly the same as for the autonomous XXZ spin chain with the D term. The phase 2ϑ is a nonzero quasi-momentum of the conserved one-site translations operator.

The interesting case is $B \neq 0$. First, we note that a brickwall circuit is invariant under translations by two sites, not by one like the spin chain, and we have to allow for an even/odd site effects. The standard Z still commutes with U so we only have to find the new \tilde{S}^+ . The following staggered ansatz will work

$$\tilde{S}^+ = \sum_l (\sigma_{2l-1}^+ + e^{-i(2\vartheta-\alpha)} \sigma_{2l}^+) e^{-i4l\vartheta}. \quad (4)$$

There is a relative phase α and a nonzero momentum 2ϑ determined by $\tan(2\vartheta) = D$. While such \tilde{S}^+ always satisfies $SU(2)$ algebra it does not commute with U . In fact, it turns out that regardless of α it never commutes with U (for OBC or PBC) – this is in accordance with the absence of $SU(2)$ multiplets (Fig. 2). However, with an appropriate α such \tilde{S}^+ almost commutes with U . That is, in a finite system with OBC one has

$$U^\dagger \tilde{S}^+ U - \tilde{S}^+ = 0 + (\text{boundary terms}), \quad (5)$$

where boundary terms act nontrivially either on site 1 or on L . Such an almost commutation has been for instance found also for quasilocal charges in the XXZ chain [31]. Plugging the ansatz for \tilde{S}^+ in Eq.(5) we obtain after some manipulations an explicit expression for the phase,

$$e^{i\alpha(\tau, \Delta, B)} = \mathfrak{D} \frac{\cos(2\tau J_{\text{eff}})}{\cos(2\tau\Delta)} - i \frac{B}{\sqrt{1+D^2}} \tan(2\tau\Delta). \quad (6)$$




FIG. 3. Ruelle-Pollicott eigenvalues for a critical circuit with $\Delta = D = B = 1$ and τ_c . One can see peaks at $k = \pm\frac{\pi}{2}$ corresponding to non-trivial screw $SU(2)$ operators \tilde{S}^\pm (4).

Several observations are in place. The resulting screw $SU(2)$ symmetry holds only at the critical manifold, $|\mathcal{D}| = 1$ (where $|e^{i\alpha}| = 1$ [32]). It is exact only in the thermodynamic limit [33], and is not isotropic. Despite the system being homogeneous the translational invariance is broken: $\tilde{X} = \tilde{S}^+ + \tilde{S}^-$ and \tilde{Y} rotate in the xy plane as one moves along spins, and there is a phase difference between even and odd sites. Interestingly, the generators explicitly depend on gate parameters. This symmetry is new and is not possible in the Hamiltonian chain $H = \sum_l h_{l,l+1}$ where the B terms mutually cancel.

Considering that such a symmetry is not at all visible in the spectrum, neither for OBC nor for PBC, and that its generators are parameter-dependent and therefore hard to identify by inspection, one might wonder how can one in general find such symmetries? One way is offered by the recently introduced momentum-resolved operator propagator [34] developed in the context of Ruelle-Pollicott (RP) resonance spectra. Namely, one can write down a linear operator M that propagates operators in an infinite system. Such an operator is unitary, however, if truncated down to only local operators with nontrivial support on at most r consecutive sites it becomes non-unitary. In a translationally invariant system one can work in a given quasi-momentum block k (for zero momentum see Ref. [35]). RP spectra, traditionally used in studies of chaotic systems [34, 35], are useful also [7] in integrable systems. Namely, eigenvalues 1 of $M(k)$ indicate the presence of strictly local conserved operators. Numerically constructing $M(k)$ for our circuit (see Refs. [7, 34] for details) we plot in Fig. 3 three largest eigenvalues for operators with support on $r = 1, 3, 5$ sites. We can see a degenerate eigenvalue at momentum $k = 0$ which is r times degenerate with the corresponding eigenvectors being translationally invariant conserved local charges Q_p^\pm [7]. In addition though we get two non-degenerate peaks at $k = \pm 4\vartheta$ corresponding to $SU(2)$ ladder operators (4). Because they are strictly local and 1-body they are visible already for $r = 1$.

Non-local $SU(2)$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetries.— It remains to explain what will turn out to be non-local $SU(2)$ sym-

metries that do not influence transport (green lines in Fig. 2). Quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ is important in many areas of mathematics and physics, including integrability due to its deep connection to the R matrix [36–38]. For q that are not roots of unity ($q^m \neq \pm 1$) the multiplets of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ are exactly the same as those of $SU(2)$. Therefore it immediately follows that there also exist generators of $SU(2)$: they can be explicitly constructed for any finite L via diagonalization (Appendix A). We are therefore going to look for $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetries.

We are inspired by $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetry observed [39, 40] in the XXZ chain with OBC and boundary fields given by our B of strength $1 + B^2 = \Delta^2$ ($q + q^{-1} = 2\Delta$), for a Floquet setting see Ref. [11]. This can be immediately generalized to $D \neq 0$ using the rotation by W (3). A potential negative sign s of Δ , $s = \text{sign}(\Delta)$, can be flipped by a rotation with $W(\vartheta = \pi/2)$. Provided

$$\Delta^2 = J_{\text{eff}}^2 = 1 + D^2 + B^2, \quad s = \text{sign}(\Delta), \quad (7)$$

is satisfied, $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ generators

$$S_q^\pm = \sum_l q^{-Z_{[1,l-1]}/2} \otimes \sigma_l^\pm e^{\mp i 2l(\vartheta + \frac{\pi}{2} \frac{1-s}{2})} \otimes q^{Z_{[l+1,L]}/2}, \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{1}{2}(q + q^{-1}) = \frac{J_{\text{eff}}}{\sqrt{1+B^2}},$$

where $Z_{[j,p]} \equiv \sum_{l=j}^p \sigma_l^z$, commute with OBC U for any τ (for $s \cdot B > 0$ one takes the solution with $q > 1$, otherwise $q < 1$), as well as with $H = \sum_l h_{l,l+1}$. Together with Z they satisfy the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ algebra

$$[Z, S_q^\pm] = \pm 2S_q^\pm, \quad [S_q^+, S_q^-] = [Z]_q, \quad [x]_q \equiv \frac{q^x - q^{-x}}{q - q^{-1}}. \quad (9)$$

The condition (7) can be generalized realizing that the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ is present if

$$|\sin(2\tau\Delta)/\sin(2\tau J_{\text{eff}})| = 1. \quad (10)$$

This immediately gives new τ -dependent $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ points,

$$\tau_\pm = \frac{k\pi}{J_{\text{eff}} \pm \Delta}, \quad s = \mp 1, \quad (11)$$

with the above generators (8). For integer k (full green triangles in Fig. 1) they exactly commute with U for OBC, while for half-integer k (empty green triangles in Fig. 1) they exactly commute under OBC with $\tilde{U} = U\sigma_1^z\sigma_L^z$.

Once one identifies $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetries (Fig. 4(a)) one can construct $SU(2)$ generators (see Appendix A). Expanding them over the basis of Pauli matrices, their locality can be quantified by the range r of a basis operator (the largest distance between two non-identity Paulis), and the number p of non-identity Paulis (e.g., two-body next-nearest neighbor terms have $p = 2$ and $r = 3$). Locality of $SU(2)$ generators is in fact similar to those of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ (8). They are products of σ_l^\pm and σ_p^z , with the highest contribution to S^+ (leading order in q) coming from σ_l^+ , the next order from $\sigma_l^+\sigma_p^z$, and so on, see




FIG. 4. Transport for $D = B = 1$. (a) Phase diagram: gray regions are diffusive phase I, colored ballistic phase II (colors at constant \mathfrak{D} (13)), blue the critical manifold. Vertical black line is a cross-section shown in Fig. 1 and (e), green dashed curves indicate $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetry, orange ones localization and white dotted curves non-interacting. (b-d) Superdiffusion and KPZ 2-point correlations at the critical τ_c (blue circle in (a)), $L = 10^4$, $\chi = 256$. Green points in (c) show $\langle \tilde{\sigma}_i^x \rangle$ for the initial state polarized in the \tilde{x} direction (see text). (e) Fractal dependence of the current in the middle of the chain on τ in the ballistic phase, starting from a weakly polarized domain wall ($\Delta = 1$, $L = 4000$, $t = 10^3$). Red curve (bottom axis) is for the 2nd ballistic region in (a), blue curve (top axis) for the 3rd. Vertical dashed lines and p/m mark strongest peaks (13).

Appendix A. The main point relevant for transport is that those generators are not local – while the weight of many-body terms decays exponentially with p (they are quasi few-body) their range extends over the whole system, $r \sim L$, i.e., terms like $\sigma_i^+ \sigma_L^z$ have approximately the same weight as $\sigma_i^+ \sigma_{i+1}^z$. It is not clear if such few-body non-local symmetries have physical consequences (sometimes non-local conserved charges do matter [41]).

For $B = 0$ (implying $q = 1$) the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ condition (10) coincides with the criticality (2) and $SU(2)$ (4) – e.g. blue and green curves in Fig. 4(a) would overlap. Interestingly, as the field B is switched on the local $SU(2)$ symmetry splits into two symmetries: one acquires a nonzero staggering phase α and stays local – this is the local $SU(2)$ at the critical manifold; the other keeps trivial α (translational invariance by one site) but becomes non-local – this is the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$. B causes new symmetries not present in Floquet or Hamiltonian XXZ systems.

Transport. – Knowing symmetries, in particular the $SU(2)$ one, we are now ready to understand magnetization transport (Fig. 4(a)) in $U(1)$ integrable circuits at infinite temperature and zero magnetization. At the critical manifold the “hidden” inhomogeneous $SU(2)$ symmetry whose generators (4) are sums of local 1-body terms suggests superdiffusion with a dynamical exponent $z = \frac{3}{2}$, similar as in the standard isotropic XXX circuit [10]. This is indeed what is observed in Fig. 4(b). Starting with a mixed weakly polarized domain wall under OBC (initial polarization $\langle \sigma_i^z \rangle = \pm \mu = 10^{-3}$, see Appendix B), we: (i) see a clear superdiffusive growth of the transferred magnetization from the left to the right chain half, $\Delta Z \sim t^{1/z}$, (ii) using the same numerical simulation on $L = 10^4$ spins we calculate the infinite temperature correlation function [27] $\langle \sigma_0^z(0) \sigma_l^z(t) \rangle_{T=\infty} = \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} \frac{z'}{\mu}$, where $z' \equiv \langle \sigma_{l-1}^z(t) \rangle - \langle \sigma_l^z(t) \rangle$ [42], showing agreement with the KPZ scaling function $f(\varphi)$ [43] (determining the surface slope correlations in the KPZ equation [44])

over 4 decades. One could also start with a domain-wall polarized in the \tilde{x} direction, where the conserved magnetization $\sum_l \tilde{\sigma}_l^x$, with $\tilde{\sigma}_l^x = \cos \varphi_l \sigma_l^x + \sin \varphi_l \sigma_l^y$, has quasi-momentum (4) phase $\varphi_l = 2(l+1)\vartheta - (1 + e^{i\pi l})\alpha/2$. Interestingly, even starting with a state polarized up, $\langle \tilde{\sigma}_l^x \rangle = \mu$, i.e., not a domain-wall but a kind of a superdiffusive helix state (see Refs. [30, 45–47] for helix states), due to unmatched phases at boundaries a superdiffusive front will spread from the edge (Fig. 4(c) and Fig. 7(c)). This explains a mysterious observation, made already [27] for standard $SU(2)$, that in high-precision KPZ simulations larger L than suggested by the central superdiffusive lightcone hitting the boundary is needed.

In phase I, including points with the non-local $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetry, we find diffusion, see Fig. 7(b) in Appendix B. Therefore, the non-local nature of $SU(2)$ generators (Appendix A), specifically the long-range 2-body terms $\sigma_i^+ \sigma_j^z$ is enough to render such a symmetry irrelevant for transport. On a somewhat similar note we remark that phases brought by strings of σ_i^z are enough to break superdiffusion to diffusion even if they act locally, an example being the XX non-local dephasing model [48] that otherwise shows superdiffusion [49, 50]. Even though based in exact $SU(2)$ multiplets it looked that the connection [26] between transport and $SU(2)$ symmetry was broken, everything is fine provided one understands that (i) the symmetries need to hold only in the thermodynamic limit; in finite systems there can be boundary violations, and (ii) the generators need to be local.

In the middle of phase I one also has points with localization because the gate becomes diagonal. This happens when \mathfrak{D} is infinite and one resonantly annuls hopping,

$$2J_{\text{eff}}\tau = k\pi, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (12)$$

Those points are visible also in spectra (Fig. 2) as extra degeneracies (for even L just L different eigenphases).

Finally, there is the ballistic phase II. In the ballistic phase the speed of transport (i.e., Drude weight) will

have fractal dependence on any generic parameter. For instance, picking an arbitrary fixed set of Δ, D, B , and varying the gate duration τ one will repeatedly cross through phases II (Fig. 4(a)) within which the transport speed is a fractal. This is shown in Fig. 4(e) where we simply plot a finite-time proxy for the Drude weight given by the current in the middle of the chain after evolving the initial weakly polarized domain-wall. For definition of the current see Appendix C. The fractal dependence comes from quasilocal conserved charges [51] which can be constructed at roots of unity $q = e^{i\pi p/m}$ using finite-dimensional representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$. In the XXZ spin chain those commensurate conditions are $\Delta = \cos(\pi p/m)$ for any coprime integers p and m , while in the XXZ circuit [10] it was identified that one of the R -matrix parameters η had to be a rational multiple of π . With that in mind, and the fact that the criticality condition (2) is simple in terms of the R -matrix parameters [7], as well as our identification of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetries in the diffusive phase (11), we can generalize the above conditions to

$$\mathfrak{D} = \cos(\pi p/m). \quad (13)$$

\mathfrak{D} therefore plays the role of a generalized ‘‘anizotropy’’. The strongest fractal peaks occur for small values of m ; in Fig. 4(e) we indicate location of the ones for $m = 2$ and $m = 3$, which are also locations of extra degeneracies in the Floquet spectrum (red circles in Fig. 2). For finite times fractal peaks are broadened with their width scaling as $\sim 1/\sqrt{t}$, see also Ref. [10]. Interestingly, fractal structure has been observed also in the steady state density of the XXZ chain under appropriate boundary driving [52]. Ballistic transport is especially fast at the non-interacting points $\mathfrak{D} = 0$, or explicitly $\tau/(\pi/4) = 2k/\Delta$. Observe that transport at those points is not always the fastest, e.g., in Fig. 4(e) the red peak at the free point $p/m = 1/2$ is smaller than the one at $2/3$.

Discussion and outlook. – Studying magnetization conserving integrable nearest-neighbor quantum circuits we find new types of $SU(2)$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetries. Symmetry generators are spatially inhomogeneous and parameter-dependent despite the system being homogeneous. We also offer a numerical method to identify such

hard-to-identify symmetries.

All properties that we discuss trivially apply to the corresponding Hamiltonian system obtained for $\tau \rightarrow 0$, however, the most interesting parameter B is absent as it only produces boundary fields. We provide a generalization of the XXZ criticality condition to any $U(1)$ circuit. Importantly, it shows that the fact that criticality and isotropy coincide in the XXZ model is accidental. Those two are inequivalent notions, and it is the inhomogeneous $SU(2)$ symmetry and not the isotropy that matters. It would be interesting to better understand how the local $SU(2)$ symmetry of the XXZ model splits into the local staggered $SU(2)$ and the non-local $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetry upon nonzero B .

The model shows transport ranging from fractal ballistic, to diffusion and KPZ superdiffusion, as well as localization. Because one can use any $U(1)$ gate it is experimentally attractive – no fine tuning is required. Results also highlight a subtle nature of symmetries. To observe superdiffusion $SU(2)$ generators have to be local, though they do not need to be exactly conserved.

Regarding the fractal transport it should be possible to repeat steps of Ref. [10] (numerical solution of the Fredholm eq.) to get the fractal structure directly for $t \rightarrow \infty$. Systems with an exact quantum group symmetries are of special interest due to their simplified integrability [53], an example being $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ and the XXX spin chain, or the anizotropic XXZ chain with special boundary fields [39]. In our Floquet system it would be interesting to understand if the exact $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetries of U at special points have any physical consequences, and if with appropriate boundary terms they can be made exact or almost exact, including at other parameters. A direct connection to the underlying integrability and Bethe equations, and if there are other conserved operators with non-zero quasi-momentum, is also unexplored. Better understanding superdiffusive spin helix states is open.

Acknowledgment. – I would like to thank Enej Ilievski, Tomaž Prosen and Sebastian Diehl for discussions, and acknowledge Grants No. J1-4385 and No. P1-0402 from Slovenian Research Agency (ARIS). Hospitality of the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics (KITP) and support by grant NSF PHY-2309135 is also appreciated.

-
- [1] D. J. Gross, *Symmetry in physics: Wigner’s legacy*, Phys. Today **48**(12), 46 (1995).
 [2] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
 [3] X.-G. Wen, *Colloquium: Zoo of quantum-topological phases of matter*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **89**, 041004 (2017).
 [4] J.-S. Caux and J. Mossel, *Remarks on the notion of quantum integrability*, J. Stat. Mech. **2011**, P02023 (2011).
 [5] R. J. Baxter, *Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics*, (Academic Press, 1982).
 [6] L. Faddeev, *Instructive history of the quantum inverse scattering method*, Acta Appl. Math. **39**, 69 (1995).
 [7] M. Žnidarič, U. Duh, and L. Zadnik, *Integrability is generic in homogeneous $U(1)$ -invariant nearest-neighbor qubit circuits*, arXiv:2410.06760 (2024).
 [8] V. Gritsev and A. Polkovnikov, *Integrable Floquet dynamics*, SciPost Phys. **2**, 021 (2017).
 [9] M. Vanicat, L. Zadnik, and T. Prosen, *Integrable Trotterization: Local conservation laws and boundary driving*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 030606 (2018).
 [10] M. Ljubotina, L. Zadnik, and T. Prosen *Ballistic spin transport in a periodically driven integrable quantum system*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 150605 (2019).
 [11] Y. Miao, V. Gritsev, and D. V. Kurlov, *The Floquet Baxter*

- terization, *SciPost Phys.* **16**, 078 (2024).
- [12] H. A. Bethe, *Zur Theorie der Metalle*, *Z. Phys.* **71**, 205 (1931).
- [13] P. N. Jepsen et al., *Spin transport in a tunable Heisenberg model realized with ultracold atoms*, *Nature* **588**, 403 (2020).
- [14] D. Wei et al., *Quantum gas microscopy of Kardar-Parisi-Zhang superdiffusion*, *Science* **376**, 716 (2022).
- [15] N. Keenan, N. F. Robertson, T. Murphy, S. Zhuk, and J. Goold, *Evidence of Kardar-Parisi-Zhang scaling on a digital quantum simulator*, *npj Quantum Inf.* **9**, 72 (2023).
- [16] K. Maruyoshi et al., *Conserved charges in the quantum simulation of integrable spin chains*, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **56**, 165301 (2023).
- [17] Y. Kim et al., *Evidence for the utility of quantum computing before fault tolerance*, *Nature* **618**, 500 (2023).
- [18] E. Rosenberg et al., *Dynamics of magnetization at infinite temperature in a Heisenberg spin chain*, *Science* **384**, 48 (2024).
- [19] P. Zhang et al., *Emergence of steady quantum transport in a superconducting processor*, *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 10115 (2024).
- [20] M. Žnidarič, *Spin transport in a one-dimensional anisotropic Heisenberg model*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 220601 (2011).
- [21] S. Gopalakrishnan and R. Vasseur, *Kinetic theory of spin diffusion and superdiffusion in XXZ spin chains*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 127202 (2019).
- [22] M. Dupont and J. E. Moore, *Universal spin dynamics in infinite-temperature one-dimensional quantum magnets*, *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 121106(R) (2020).
- [23] V. B. Bulchandani, *Kardar-Parisi-Zhang universality from soft gauge modes*, *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 041411(R) (2020).
- [24] Ž. Krajnik and T. Prosen, *Kardar-Parisi-Zhang physics in integrable rotationally symmetric dynamics on discrete space-time lattice*, *J. Stat. Phys.* **179**, 110 (2020).
- [25] P. Glorioso, L. V. Delacretaz, X. Chen, R. M. Nandkishore, and A. Lucas, *Hydrodynamics in lattice models with continuous non-Abelian symmetries*, *SciPost Phys.* **10**, 015 (2021).
- [26] E. Ilievski, J. De Nardis, S. Gopalakrishnan, R. Vasseur, B. Ware, *Superuniversality of superdiffusion*, *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 031023 (2021).
- [27] M. Ljubotina, M. Žnidarič, and T. Prosen, *Kardar-Parisi-Zhang physics in the quantum Heisenberg magnet*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 210602 (2019).
- [28] F. Weiner, P. Schmittecker, S. Bera, and F. Evers, *High-temperature spin dynamics in the Heisenberg chain: Magnon propagation and emerging Kardar-Parisi-Zhang scaling in the zero-magnetization limit*, *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 045115 (2020).
- [29] I. L. Aleiner, *Bethe ansatz solutions for certain periodic quantum circuits*, *Annals of Physics* **433**, 168593 (2021).
- [30] F. C. Alcaraz and W. F. Wreszinski, *The Heisenberg XXZ hamiltonian with Dzyaloshinsky-Moriya interaction*, *J. Stat. Phys.* **58**, 45 (1990).
- [31] T. Prosen, *Open XXZ spin chain: Nonequilibrium steady state and a strict bound on ballistic transport*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 217206 (2011).
- [32] One can also write $\tan \alpha = -\frac{B}{J_{\text{eff}}} \tan(2\tau J_{\text{eff}})$. For $B = 0$ we have $e^{i\alpha} = \pm 1$, which takes care of e.g. negative Δ .
- [33] For two almost commuting Hermitean operators one can always find two close exactly commuting operators [54]. Presumably the symmetry could be made exact just by an appropriate boundary/edge gates.
- [34] M. Žnidarič, *Momentum-dependent quantum Ruelle-Pollicott resonances in translationally invariant many-body systems*, *Phys. Rev. E* **110**, 054204 (2024).
- [35] T. Prosen, *Ruelle resonances in quantum many-body systems*, *J. Phys. A* **35**, L737 (2002).
- [36] P. P. Kulish and N. Y. Reshetikhin, *Quantum linear problem for the sine-Gordon equation and higher representations*, *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov (LOMI)* **101**, 101 (1981).
- [37] V. G. Drinfeld, *Hopf algebras and the quantum Yang-Baxter equation*, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **283**, 1060 (1985).
- [38] M. Jimbo, *A q-difference analogue of $U(g)$ and the Yang-Baxter equation*, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **10**, 63 (1985).
- [39] V. Pasquier and H. Saleur, *Common structure between finite systems and conformal field theories through quantum groups*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **330**, 523 (1990).
- [40] P. P. Kulish and E. K. Sklyanin, *The general $U_q[\mathfrak{sl}(2)]$ invariant XXZ integrable quantum spin chain*, *J. Phys. A* **24**, L435 (1991).
- [41] M. Fagotti, *Global quenches after localized perturbations*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 110602 (2022); M. Fagotti, V. Marić, and L. Zadnik, *Nonequilibrium symmetry-protected topological order: emergence of semilocal Gibbs ensembles*, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 115117 (2024).
- [42] Due to slight even-odd site staggering we average magnetization over two consecutive sites, and calculate the derivative between even sites.
- [43] M. Prähofer and H. Spohn, *J. Stat. Phys.* **115**, 255 (2004).
- [44] M. Kardar, G. Parisi, Y.-C. Zhang, *Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 889 (1986).
- [45] V. Popkov, X. Zhang, and A. Klümper, *Phantom Bethe excitations and spin helix eigenstates in integrable periodic and open spin chains*, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, L081410 (2021).
- [46] P. N. Jepsen et al., *Long-lived phantom helix states in Heisenberg quantum magnets*, *Nat. Phys.* **18**, 899 (2022).
- [47] V. Popkov, M. Žnidarič, and X. Zhang, *Universality in the relaxation of spin helices under XXZ spin-chain dynamics*, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 235408 (2023).
- [48] M. Žnidarič, *Superdiffusive magnetization transport in the XX spin chain with nonlocal dephasing*, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 075105 (2024).
- [49] Y. Wang, C. Fang, and J. Ren, *Superdiffusive transport in quasi-particle dephasing models*, *SciPost Phys.* **17**, 150 (2024).
- [50] Y. Wang, J. Ren, and C. Fang, *Superdiffusive transport on lattices with nodal impurities*, *Phys. Rev. B* **110**, 144201 (2024).
- [51] T. Prosen and E. Ilievski, *Families of quasilocal conservation laws and quantum spin transport*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 057203 (2013).
- [52] M. Yao, A. Lingenfelter, R. Belyansky, D. Roberts, and A. A. Clerk, *Hidden time-reversal in driven XXZ spin chains: exact solutions and new dissipative phase transitions*, [arXiv:2407.12750](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.12750) (2024).
- [53] R. I. Nepomechie and A. L. Retore, *Surveying the quantum group symmetries of integrable open spin chains*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **930**, 91 (2018).

- [54] M. B. Hastings, *Making almost commuting matrices commute*, Commun. Math. Phys. **291**, 321 (2009).
- [55] G. Vidal, *Efficient simulation of one-dimensional quantum many-body systems*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 040502 (2004).
- [56] N. Reshetikhin, *Multiparameter quantum groups and twisted quasitriangular Hopf algebras*, Lett. Math. Phys. **20**, 331 (1990).
- [57] P. Kulish, *Twist deformations of quantum integrable spin chains*, p.167, in *Noncommutative Spacetimes: Symmetries in Noncommutative Geometry and Field Theory* (Springer, Berlin, 2009).

Appendix A: Construction of SU(2) generators from multiplets

Here we describe how to construct the generators of SU(2) that commute with U provided one has a system with the same multiplets as SU(2) and knows the Z generator. In our brickwall circuits the Z is conserved by construction, and we know that the system has exactly the same SU(2) multiplets for all parameters with $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetry and non root of unity q .

We shall construct the raising operator S^+ by first diagonalizing U and identifying degenerate blocks. In each degenerate block corresponding to one SU(2) multiplet and spanned by $\{|\xi_i\rangle\}$ we find a basis of Z by diagonalizing the projection $\langle \xi_i | Z | \xi_{i'} \rangle$, obtaining the eigenstates $|m\rangle$ of $\frac{1}{2}Z$ in the block. The operator S^+ in the block with spin s is now by definition equal to $\sum_{m=-s}^s \sqrt{s(s+1) - m(m+1)} |m+1\rangle \langle m|$, while the whole operator S^+ is a direct sum of such terms over all spin s multiplets. Once we have S^+ , the lowering operator is $S^- = (S^+)^\dagger$, thereby obtaining X and Y that have SU(2) algebra and commute with U by construction.

The important question is locality of X and Y (Z is local). In Fig. 5 we see that S^+ constructed according to the above prescription (red triangles) are non-local multi-body operators – expanding them over products of Pauli matrices $S^+ = \sum_{\alpha_1} c_{\alpha} \sigma_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots \sigma_L^{\alpha_L}$ we have terms with product of L operators in a system with L spins. However, it is important to note that we have a gauge freedom in constructing S^+ . Namely, each eigenstate $|m\rangle$ is determined upto a multiplicative phase $e^{i\varphi_m}$. It turns out that the choice of those phases can greatly influence the locality of S^+ , while on the other hand locality of the Casimir operator $S^2 = X^2 + Y^2 + Z^2$ does not depend on them. Looking at S^2 (Fig. 5) we can see that the exponential decay of S^2 indicates that also S^+ can be chosen such that they involve only few-body terms. This is indeed the case. Writing S^+ with all possible phases φ_m and numerically finding the optimal ones for which the weight of 1-body terms is the largest, we get S^+ for which the weight of many-body terms decays exponentially with the number of terms p (blue points).

We can classify locality of S^+ according to the total weight $w = \sum |c_{\alpha}|^2$ of operators with range r and the number of non-identity terms p . For instance, the operator $\sigma_1^x \sigma_4^z$ has $p = 2$ and $r = 4$. We see in Fig. 6 that the SU(2) generators constructed at $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ points and for the optimal choice of phases φ_m are quasi few body – weight decays exponentially with p – however, they span the whole system and contain operators with range $r \sim L$. The weight does not appreciably decay with r for fixed p . Both these properties hold also for $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ generators (8). For instance, one-body operators ($p = r = 1$) are all σ_i^{\pm} and have the average weight 1.4, the nearest-neighbor 2-body terms are all $\sigma_i^{\pm} \sigma_{i\pm 1}^z$ with the average weight 0.14, while 2-body range $r = 6$ terms are $\sigma_1^{\pm} \sigma_L^z$ and $\sigma_1^z \sigma_L^{\pm}$ with the average weight 0.06. The largest weight of any of 3-body term ($p = 3$) is 0.03, with




FIG. 5. Locality of SU(2) generators at $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ point $D = B = \Delta = 1$ and $\tau_+ \approx \frac{\pi}{4} 1.464$ (Eq.(11) with $k = 1$, giving $q = \frac{\sqrt{6-\sqrt{2}}}{2} \approx 0.518$). The total weight w_p of operators with p non-identity Pauli operators is shown for the Casimir S^2/L for $L = 2, \dots, 12$ (black circles), showing quasi few-body nature of generators. Red triangles show multi-body nature of S^+/\sqrt{L} with an arbitrary gauge, while blue circles quasi few-body nature for the optimal gauge, both for $L = 6$.




FIG. 6. Locality of S^+ for the optimal gauge choice and $L = 6$ (same data as blue points in Fig. 5). Circles indicate in log-scale the average weight w of operators according to the number of non-identity terms p and the range r .

the average of all 24 $r = p = 3$ terms being 0.007.

Appendix B: Numerical simulations

Numerical simulation of unitary time evolution of density operators is performed by writing ρ in a matrix product operator (MPO) form with matrices of maximal bond size χ . Application of a single two-site gate is performed using standard time-evolved-block decimation (TEBD) techniques [55].

The initial state is a weakly polarized domain wall

$$\rho(0) \propto \prod_{l=1}^{L/2} (\mathbb{1} + \mu \sigma_l^z) \otimes \prod_{l=L/2+1}^L (\mathbb{1} - \mu \sigma_l^z), \quad (\text{B1})$$

with $\mu = 10^{-3}$. Such a state is numerically relatively easy




FIG. 7. Transport at $B = D = 1$. (a) Diffusive transport at $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ point with $\tau_+ \approx \frac{\pi}{4} \cdot 1.464$ (green triangle in Fig. 4(a)) despite the nonlocal $SU(2)$ symmetry ($L = 1536, \chi = 576$). (b) Fractal dependence on Δ at τ_c in the ballistic phase. All rational peaks p/m (13) with $2 \leq m \leq 7$ are marked by vertical dashed lines ($L = 4000$ and $t = 1000$). (c) Superdiffusive helix state at critical $\Delta = 1$ and τ_c (same data as in Fig. 4(c)) starting from the initial state with $\langle \sigma_l^x \rangle = \mu$ and $\langle \sigma_l^y \rangle = \langle \sigma_l^z \rangle = 0$.

to simulate, e.g., at the superdiffusive point we could get a relative precision of order 10^{-4} with $\chi = 256$. On top of it, as explained in Ref. [27], it can be used as a trick to calculate the equilibrium infinite-temperature 2-point autocorrelation function of σ^z to verify the KPZ scaling. If high precision is required one should stop simulation when the lightcone from the center touches a lightcone of small errors propagating from the edge. At the critical manifold this is a direct consequence of the screw $SU(2)$ symmetry – the edge of the open chain act as a defect due to rotation caused by D (4), nicely visible if one starts with a domain wall in the xy plane, or even a state polarized in the same direction (Fig. 7(c)).

We have checked transport at special parameter values in the diffusive phase I where one has $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ symmetry and therefore also $SU(2)$ operators that commute with U . An example is show in Fig. 7(a), where we can see that one gets diffusion. The non-locality of $SU(2)$ generators is enough, despite being quasi few-body operators, to not affect transport of magnetization. We note that the required bond size needed to describe time evolution in those cases is rather large, for instance, χ more than 500 at $t = 1000$. In Fig. 7(b) we show fractal dependence of the ballistic transport on Δ .

Appendix C: Current operator

The spin current operator is defined via the discrete-time continuity equation

$$U^\dagger Z_{[k,l]} U - Z_{[k,l]} = j_{k-1} - j_l, \quad (\text{C1})$$

where j_k is the local current operator between sites k and $k + 1$. For the brickwall circuit U is invariant under translations by 2 sites and we will have different current operator on even and odd sites. Specifically, the current

on even sites, i.e., on bonds between the legs of the 1st layer gates (Fig. 1), can be identified from $U^\dagger(\sigma_3^z + \sigma_4^z)U - (\sigma_3^z + \sigma_4^z) = j_2 - j_4$, and is explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} j_2 &= \mathcal{A}(\sigma_2^x \sigma_3^y - \sigma_2^y \sigma_3^x) + \mathcal{F}(\sigma_2^z - \sigma_3^z) + \mathcal{C}(\sigma_2^x \sigma_3^x + \sigma_2^y \sigma_3^y) \\ \mathcal{A} &= \frac{\sin(4\tau J_{\text{eff}})}{2J_{\text{eff}}} + \frac{BD \sin^2(2\tau J_{\text{eff}})}{J_{\text{eff}}^2}, \\ \mathcal{F} &= \frac{(1 + D^2) \sin^2(2\tau J_{\text{eff}})}{J_{\text{eff}}^2}, \\ \mathcal{C} &= \frac{B \sin^2(2\tau J_{\text{eff}})}{J_{\text{eff}}^2} - \frac{D \sin(4\tau J_{\text{eff}})}{2J_{\text{eff}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C2})$$

The current on odd sites is more complicated, in general a 4-site operator that can be calculated similarly as above.

Appendix D: Symmetries

Here we list some other symmetries of the model. Rotation by W (3), which is a Hamiltonian version of the twist transformation known from integrability and the R -matrix of the 6-vertex model [7, 56, 57], can transform D to zero, $WU'W^\dagger = U$, where U has gate parameters τ, Δ, B, D, M , while U' has $D' = 0$ and $\tau' = \tau\sqrt{1+D^2}$, $\Delta' = \Delta/\sqrt{1+D^2}$, $B' = B/\sqrt{1+D^2}$, $M' = M/\sqrt{1+D^2}$. Rotation by $\vartheta = \pi/2$, $W_{\pi/2} = W(\vartheta = \pi/2) = (-i)^{L(L+1)/2} \prod_l \sigma_{2l-1}^z$, $U' = W_{\pi/2}^\dagger U W_{\pi/2}$, instead flips all parameters except D , $\tau' = -\tau$, $\Delta' = -\Delta$, $D' = D$, and $B' = -B$. Particle-hole transformation $P = \prod_l \sigma_l^x$, $U' = P^\dagger U P$, changes the sign of two chiral terms, $\tau' = \tau$, $\Delta' = \Delta$, $D' = -D$ and $B' = -B$. Spatial reflection of sites R that changes site l to $L + 1 - l$, $U' = R^\dagger U R$, does the same as P . This means that U is invariant under the combined \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry RP .