

Quantum spin liquid phase in the Shastry-Sutherland model revealed by high-precision infinite projected entangled-pair states

Philippe Corboz,¹ Yining Zhang,¹ Boris Ponsioen,¹ and Frédéric Mila²

¹*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Amsterdam, Science Park 904, 1098 XH Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

²*Institut de théorie des phénomènes physiques, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland*

The Shastry-Sutherland model is an effective model of the layered material $\text{SrCu}_2(\text{BO}_3)_2$, which exhibits an extremely rich phase diagram as a function of pressure and magnetic field. Motivated by the recent controversy regarding its phase diagram at zero magnetic field, we perform large-scale simulations based on infinite projected entangled-pair states (iPEPS), a two-dimensional tensor network ansatz to represent the ground state directly in the thermodynamic limit. By employing the latest optimization techniques, we obtain variational states with lower energy than previous results obtained from other methods. Using systematic extrapolations to the exact infinite bond dimension limit, our simulations reveal a narrow quantum spin liquid phase between the plaquette and antiferromagnetic phases in the range $0.785(5) \leq J'/J \leq 0.82(1)$.

Introduction.— The frustrated compound $\text{SrCu}_2(\text{BO}_3)_2$ is arguably one of the most fascinating quantum materials. It exhibits extremely rich physics when subjected to pressure and a magnetic field, including an intriguing sequence of magnetization plateaus [1–11], spin supersolid phases [9, 10], topological excitations [12, 13], a critical point at finite temperature [14], and a proximate deconfined quantum critical point (DQCP) [15]. As a function of pressure, experiments have identified a phase transition between a dimer phase and a plaquette phase [14, 16–21], followed by an antiferromagnetic (AF) phase at higher pressure [14, 15, 18, 21] with the possibility of a narrow quantum spin liquid or a DQCP in between [15].

Many of the properties of the compound are remarkably well captured by the Shastry-Sutherland model, [1, 22–31] a frustrated $S = 1/2$ spin model on an orthogonal dimer lattice, given by the Hamiltonian

$$H = J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j + J' \sum_{\langle\langle i,j \rangle\rangle} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \quad (1)$$

with J and J' the intra- and interdimer coupling strength, respectively. For small values of J'/J the ground state is an exact product of dimer singlets [22]. In the $J'/J \rightarrow \infty$ limit, the model reduces to the square lattice Heisenberg model with an AF ground state. For intermediate J'/J a valence-bond solid phase is realized, with strong bonds forming around plaquettes [32–35]. An early infinite projected entangled-pair state (iPEPS) study [35] identified the range of the plaquette phase to be $0.675(2) < J'/J < 0.765(15)$, with transitions being strongly and weakly first order, respectively.

More recently, there have been new predictions regarding the location and nature of the second transition. A narrow quantum spin liquid phase between plaquette and AF phase was predicted using the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) on cylinders [36, 37], a pseudofermion functional renormalization group approach [38],




FIG. 1. Phase diagram of the Shastry-Sutherland model obtained with iPEPS. A narrow quantum spin liquid (QSL) phase is found between the plaquette and antiferromagnetic phases. The thickness of a bond is proportional to the negative bond energy, and dashed lines indicate bonds with positive energies.

neural-network quantum states (NQS) [39], and variational Monte Carlo (VMC) [40]. Other DMRG [41] and iPEPS [42] studies found a weak first-order transition at a slightly higher value of J'/J . Finally, a DQCP was predicted in Ref. [43] based on field theory and infinite DMRG results, and in Ref. [44] based on variational Monte Carlo (VMC) combined with finite PEPS (VMC-PEPS). Thus, a consensus on the phase diagram is still lacking, highlighting the need for additional high-precision data.

In this Letter, we revisit the SSM using large-scale iPEPS simulations to resolve the controversial phase diagram. By leveraging the latest methodological advances, including more accurate and efficient optimization and systematic extrapolation techniques, we can simulate the model with unprecedented accuracy directly in the thermodynamic limit. Our results uncover a QSL phase within a narrow window $0.785(5) < J'/J < 0.82(1)$ between the plaquette and AF phases, as summarized in Fig. 1. Our findings are consistent with the predictions from DMRG [36, 37] and NQS [39] based on finite-size data. Besides this, we demonstrate that iPEPS achieves

lower variational energies than NQS while using over an order of magnitude fewer variational parameters, demonstrating the relevance of the variational space defined by tensor networks and further establishing iPEPS as a state-of-the-art tool for studying frustrated spin systems, complementing finite-size 2D approaches.

Method.— An iPEPS is a two-dimensional tensor network ansatz to represent 2D ground states directly in the thermodynamic limit [45–47], which has been successfully applied to a broad range of strongly correlated systems, see e.g. Refs. [48–70]. It consists of a unit cell of rank-5 tensors repeated on a square lattice, where each tensor has four auxiliary legs with bond dimension D connecting the neighboring tensors and one physical leg with dimension d , representing the local Hilbert space. The accuracy of the ansatz can be systematically controlled by D . We consider two different setups: the dimer setup, which uses one tensor per dimer ($d = 4$) and the single-site setup, which uses one tensor per site ($d = 2$). To improve the efficiency, we exploit the $U(1)$ spin symmetry of the model [71, 72]. The contraction of the tensor network is performed using the corner transfer matrix method [48, 73–75]. Its accuracy is controlled by the environment bond dimension χ , which we set sufficiently large (up to $\chi = 500$ for $D = 10$) to ensure that the contraction error of local observables is negligible. The tensors are optimized by minimizing the energy of the ansatz using automatic differentiation [76–78], which produces more accurate tensors than methods based on imaginary time evolution [79–81]. The extrapolation of the energy to the infinite D limit is based on the energy variance, computed using a newly developed technique [82, 83] (see also Ref. [84]).

Benchmark comparison.— To demonstrate the competitiveness of our approach, we first present a benchmark comparison of the energy per site, E_s , at $J'/J = 0.8$ between our iPEPS results and data from NQS [39], DMRG [36], VMC-PEPS [44], and VMC combined with NQS [40]. In Fig. 2, the iPEPS energies in the thermodynamic limit are plotted as a function of variance of the energy per site, $var = (\langle H^2 \rangle - \langle H \rangle^2)/N$. The lowest variational energy for $D = 10$ with approximately 16'000 variational parameters is -0.44891 (in units of J), and the extrapolated value is $-0.44896(2)$. The NQS data is based on a Vision Transformer (ViT) variational wave function with approximately 300'000 variational parameters on periodic $L \times L$ lattices. The energy increases with system size, reaching $E_s = -0.44885$ for the largest size, with an extrapolated value of $-0.4486(2)$, which are both higher than the $D = 10$ iPEPS result.

The DMRG data was obtained for $2L \times L$ cylinders with sizes up to $L = 14$ [36], with energies above -0.447 (not visible in the plot) and an extrapolated value of $-0.44837(30)$. The VMC results are based on finite PEPS wavefunctions with open boundary conditions and a fixed bond dimension of $D = 8$, for sizes up to $L = 20$.




FIG. 2. Comparison of the energy per site E_s obtained with different methods. The iPEPS data is plotted as a function of the variance of the energy per site. The $D = 10$ iPEPS has the lowest variational energy and lies close to the extrapolated value in the infinite D limit.

The various extrapolations shown in Fig. 2 were obtained by evaluating the energy on different clusters. They lie within the range $[-0.44882, -0.44874]$, which is compatible with our $D = 8$ iPEPS result but higher than the value in the infinite- D limit. This indicates that, to obtain accurate thermodynamic estimates based on finite PEPS, extrapolations in both D and L are required, rather than extrapolating only in L at a fixed D .

Phase transition at finite D .— We next discuss the results for the transition between the plaquette phase and its adjacent phase at larger J'/J for finite D , shown in Fig 3(a) and Fig 3(b) for the dimer and single-site setups, respectively. At finite D , the adjacent phase exhibits finite AF order, however, we will show further below that the order vanishes in the infinite D limit, i.e. that the adjacent phase is in fact a QSL. We consider the plaquette order parameter given by the difference between the high and low energy bonds, $\Delta = \max(E_b) - \min(E_b)$ and the local magnetic moment, $m = \sqrt{\langle S^x \rangle^2 + \langle S^y \rangle^2 + \langle S^z \rangle^2}$.

In the dimer setup, a sudden drop in the plaquette order parameter is observed at the transition, consistent with a first order transition. The AF order parameter exhibits smoother behavior, suggesting either a continuous or weakly first-order transition. In the single-site setup, both order parameters show smooth behavior across the transition. In both setups, the location of the transition initially shifts from $J'/J \sim 0.77$ for $D = 4$ to $J'/J \sim 0.785$ for $D = 6$ where it remains for larger values of D .

Extrapolations based on constrained ansätze.— The fact that at finite D both order parameters are finite near the phase transition makes it challenging to accurately estimate the energy of the pure individual phases. To resolve this problem, we consider two different constrained iPEPS ansätze based on the dimer setup, which respect




FIG. 3. Plaquette order parameter Δ (open symbols) and local magnetic moment m (filled symbols) for different bond dimensions as a function of J'/J , obtained with the dimer setup (a) and single-site setup (b). The transition initially shifts to larger values of J'/J with increasing D , but stabilizes around $J'/J \sim 0.785$ for $D \geq 6$.

the lattice and translational symmetries of the plaquette phase and the AF phase, respectively. The plaquette ansatz consists of a 2×2 unit cell built from a single tensor A , which is rotated by 90 degrees between neighboring sites of the 2×2 cell. This ansatz is compatible with the plaquette order but not with the AF order; i.e., the AF order parameter is zero by construction. The AF ansatz is parametrized by a single tensor that is mirror symmetric with respect to the x - and y - axes on one sublattice, and by its $SU(2)$ conjugate (with flipped spin), rotated by 90 degrees, on the other sublattice. This ansatz can produce finite AF order but no plaquette order. We note that both ansätze are also compatible with a potential QSL phase.

By using these constrained ansätze, we can accurately determine the energies of the individual phases and locate the transition from the intersection of their energies. Figure 4(a) shows the order parameters in the vicinity of the transition for the two ansätze at different D , illustrating that we can obtain clean representations of the two phases on both sides of the phase transition. Figure 4(b) shows the energy difference between the plaquette and AF states, from which the location of the phase transition can be determined. As previously observed, the




FIG. 4. Results based on two constrained iPEPS ansätze: the plaquette (P) ansatz, which, by construction, can represent the plaquette order but not the AF order, and the AF ansatz, which can represent the AF order but not the plaquette order. (a) Plaquette order parameter (open symbols) and local magnetic moment (filled symbols) as a function of J'/J for different bond dimensions. (b) Energy difference between the plaquette state and the AF state. The location of the phase transition can be determined from the intersection with the dashed $E_P - E_{AF} = 0$ line, which at large and infinite D , is located around $J'/J \sim 0.785(5)$. (c)-(e) Energies of the two competing states for three different values of J'/J around the transition as a function of the energy variance per site.

phase transition shifts to larger values with increasing D but stabilizes around $J'/J \sim 0.785$ at large D , also when extrapolating the energies to the infinite D limit based on the energy variance [85], see Figs. 4(c)-(e). The extrapolated energies are found to be extremely close in the range $J'/J \in [0.78, 0.79]$, with an energy difference below $10^{-5} J$. Finally, we find that the plaquette order parameter remains finite around the transition in the infinite D limit (see Fig. 5), which, along with the small angle between the intersecting energies at the transition, suggests that the transition is weakly first order.

Thus, based on these results, we conclude that the plaquette phase persists up to a value $J'/J \sim 0.785(5)$, which is compatible with the prediction from NQS ($J'/J \sim 0.78$) and DMRG from Ref. [36] ($J'/J \sim 0.79$) and Ref. [41] ($J'/J \sim 0.785(5)$), but incompatible with




FIG. 5. Plaquette order parameter Δ obtained with the plaquette ansatz, showing that the order parameter does not vanish at the transition, compatible with a first-order phase transition.

VMC-PEPS ($J'/J \sim 0.828(5)$), which may be due to the fact that those results were based on finite- D data only.

Finite correlation length scaling.— We next turn our focus on the AF order parameter m and perform a systematic finite correlation length scaling (FCLS) analysis [62, 86, 87] to determine its value in the infinite D limit. The main idea of FCLS [88, 89] for gapless systems is similar to conventional finite-size scaling, except that the system size is replaced by the dominant correlation length ξ_D extracted from the iPEPS ansatz for each value of D . For the square lattice Heisenberg model, which can be adiabatically connected to the AF phase in the SSM, the asymptotic behavior of the order parameter is $m^2(\xi_D) = m_\infty + \alpha/\xi_D + \mathcal{O}(1/\xi_D^2)$ [90]. To estimate ξ_D we employ the extrapolation technique from Ref. [91].

Figure 6(a) shows the data for m^2 obtained with both the dimer and single-site setup as a function of inverse ξ_D . In the large $J'/J = 100$ limit, the extrapolated result is compatible with the value from the square lattice Heisenberg model [92], as expected. Upon decreasing J'/J the local magnetic moment decreases and vanishes around $J'/J \sim 0.812$, before reaching the onset of the plaquette phase. Omitting the smallest bond dimension value $D = 3$ in the linear extrapolation yields a slightly higher value of $J'/J \sim 0.827$.

Discussion.— The vanishing local magnetic moment m and the absence of lattice and translational symmetry breaking in the range $J'/J \in [0.785(5), 0.82(1)]$ are compatible with a QSL phase, consistent with previous results from NQS [39], DMRG [36], and VMC [40], which predicted an algebraic QSL [93]. The fact that the order parameter remains finite at finite D and only vanishes in the infinite D limit is compatible with an algebraic quantum spin liquid rather than a gapped one, as in the J_1 - J_2 Heisenberg model [62]. By fitting our data at $J'/J = 0.8$ to the expected power-law scaling form $m^2(\xi_D) \sim \xi_D^{-(1+\eta)}$ [39, 94], we extract values for η in the interval [0.3, 0.5], depending on the fitting range, com-




FIG. 6. Finite correlation length scaling analysis of the squared local magnetic moment. (a) Linear extrapolations of the m^2 data as a function of the inverse effective correlation length ξ_D for different values of J'/J , based on the combined data from the dimer setup (triangles) and the single-site setup (circles). The QMC result [92] for the square-lattice Heisenberg model in the infinite J'/J limit is indicated by the black diamond. (b) Extrapolated value of m^2 , which vanishes for $J'/J \lesssim 0.812$, i.e. before the onset of the plaquette phase, indicated by the vertical grey line. (c) Log-log plot of the m^2 data in the QSL phase for $J'/J = 0.8$, with linear fits based on two different data ranges.

patible with the estimates $\eta = 0.3$ from DMRG [36] and NQS [39], and $\eta = 0.5$ from VMC [40].

In summary, we revisited the phase diagram of the SSM based on high-precision iPEPS simulations and identified a QSL phase in the range $0.785(5) \leq J'/J \leq 0.82(1)$. Using constrained iPEPS ansätze enabled us to accurately determine the weakly first-order transition between the plaquette and QSL phase from the intersection of their energies. By performing a systematic FCLS analysis of the AF order parameter, we located the continuous transition between the QSL and AF phases. Our data complement previous finite-size variational data and further support the algebraic nature of the QSL.

In future, refined experiments would be valuable to explore the potential existence of a QSL phase in $\text{SrCu}_2(\text{BO}_3)_2$. On the theory side, it will be interesting to investigate the robustness of our findings upon incorporating additional interactions beyond the standard SSM, such as a weak interlayer coupling [24, 95–98], Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interactions [24, 99, 100], or small distortions in the coupling strengths [101].

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 101001604).

-
- [1] H. Kageyama, K. Yoshimura, R. Stern, N. V. Mushnikov, K. Onizuka, M. Kato, K. Kosuge, C. P. Slichter, T. Goto, and Y. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3168 (1999).
- [2] K. Onizuka, H. Kageyama, Y. Narumi, K. Kindo, Y. Ueda, and T. Goto, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **69**, 1016 (2000).
- [3] K. Kodama, M. Takigawa, M. Horvatić, C. Berthier, H. Kageyama, Y. Ueda, S. Miyahara, F. Becca, and F. Mila, *Science* **298**, 395 (2002).
- [4] M. Takigawa, K. Kodama, M. Horvatić, C. Berthier, H. Kageyama, Y. Ueda, S. Miyahara, F. Becca, and F. Mila, *Physica B: Condensed Matter* **346–347**, 27 (2004).
- [5] F. Levy, I. Sheikin, C. Berthier, M. Horvatić, M. Takigawa, H. Kageyama, T. Waki, and Y. Ueda, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **81**, 67004 (2008).
- [6] S. E. Sebastian, N. Harrison, P. Sengupta, C. D. Batista, S. Francoual, E. Palm, T. Murphy, N. Marcano, H. A. Dabkowska, and B. D. Gaulin, *PNAS* **105**, 20157 (2008).
- [7] M. Jaime, R. Daou, S. A. Crooker, F. Weickert, A. Uchida, A. E. Feiguin, C. D. Batista, H. A. Dabkowska, and B. D. Gaulin, *PNAS* **109**, 12404 (2012).
- [8] M. Takigawa, M. Horvatić, T. Waki, S. Krämer, C. Berthier, F. Lévy-Bertrand, I. Sheikin, H. Kageyama, Y. Ueda, and F. Mila, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 067210 (2013).
- [9] Y. H. Matsuda, N. Abe, S. Takeyama, H. Kageyama, P. Corboz, A. Honecker, S. R. Manmana, G. R. Foltin, K. P. Schmidt, and F. Mila, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 137204 (2013).
- [10] Z. Shi, S. Dissanayake, P. Corboz, W. Steinhardt, D. Graf, D. M. Silevitch, H. A. Dabkowska, T. F. Rosenbaum, F. Mila, and S. Haravifard, *Nat. Comm.* **13**, 2301 (2022).
- [11] T. Nomura, P. Corboz, A. Miyata, S. Zherlitsyn, Y. Ishii, Y. Kohama, Y. H. Matsuda, A. Ikeda, C. Zhong, H. Kageyama, and F. Mila, *Nat Commun* **14**, 3769 (2023), number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [12] J. Romhányi, K. Penc, and R. Ganesh, *Nat Commun* **6**, 1 (2015).
- [13] P. A. McClarty, F. Krüger, T. Guidi, S. F. Parker, K. Refson, A. W. Parker, D. Prabhakaran, and R. Coldea, *Nature Phys* **13**, 736 (2017), number: 8 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [14] J. L. Jiménez, S. P. G. Crone, E. Fogh, M. E. Zayed, R. Lortz, E. Pomjakushina, K. Conder, A. M. Läuchli, L. Weber, S. Wessel, A. Honecker, B. Normand, C. Rüegg, P. Corboz, H. M. Rønnow, and F. Mila, *Nature* **592**, 370 (2021).
- [15] Y. Cui, L. Liu, H. Lin, K.-H. Wu, W. Hong, X. Liu, C. Li, Z. Hu, N. Xi, S. Li, R. Yu, A. W. Sandvik, and W. Yu, *Science* **380**, 1179 (2023).
- [16] T. Waki, K. Arai, M. Takigawa, Y. Saiga, Y. Uwatoko, H. Kageyama, and Y. Ueda, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **76**, 073710 (2007).
- [17] S. Haravifard, D. Graf, A. E. Feiguin, C. D. Batista, J. C. Lang, D. M. Silevitch, G. Srajer, B. D. Gaulin, H. A. Dabkowska, and T. F. Rosenbaum, *Nat. Comm.* **7**, 11956 (2016).
- [18] M. E. Zayed, C. Rüegg, J. L. J. A. M. Läuchli, C. Panagopoulos, S. S. Saxena, M. Ellerby, D. F. McMorrow, T. Strässle, S. Klotz, G. Hamel, R. A. Sadykov, V. Pomjakushin, M. Boehm, M. Jiménez-Ruiz, A. Schneidewind, E. Pomjakushina, M. Stingaciu, K. Conder, and H. M. Rønnow, *Nature Physics* **13**, 962 (2017).
- [19] T. Sakurai, Y. Hirao, K. Hijii, S. Okubo, H. Ohta, Y. Uwatoko, K. Kudo, and Y. Koike, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **87**, 033701 (2018).
- [20] S. Bettler, L. Stoppel, Z. Yan, S. Gvasaliya, and A. Zheludev, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 012010 (2020).
- [21] J. Guo, G. Sun, B. Zhao, L. Wang, W. Hong, V. A. Sidorov, N. Ma, Q. Wu, S. Li, Z. Y. Meng, A. W. Sandvik, and L. Sun, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 206602 (2020).
- [22] B. Sriram Shastry and B. Sutherland, *Physica B+C* **108**, 1069 (1981).
- [23] S. Miyahara and K. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3701 (1999).
- [24] S. Miyahara and K. Ueda, *J. Phys.: Condensed Matter* **15**, R327 (2003).
- [25] P. Corboz and F. Mila, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 147203 (2014).
- [26] S. Wessel, I. Niesen, J. Stapmanns, B. Normand, F. Mila, P. Corboz, and A. Honecker, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 174432 (2018).
- [27] A. Wietek, P. Corboz, S. Wessel, B. Normand, F. Mila, and A. Honecker, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **1**, 033038 (2019).
- [28] P. Czarnik, M. M. Rams, P. Corboz, and J. Dziarmaga, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 075113 (2021).
- [29] J. Wang, H. Li, N. Xi, Y. Gao, Q.-B. Yan, W. Li, and G. Su, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 116702 (2023).
- [30] Z. Wang, P. McClarty, D. Dankova, A. Honecker, and A. Wietek, arXiv:2405.18475 [cond-mat] (2024), 10.48550/arXiv.2405.18475.
- [31] S. Nyckees, P. Corboz, and F. Mila, *Phys. Rev. B* **111**, 014428 (2025).
- [32] A. Koga and N. Kawakami, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 4461 (2000).
- [33] Y. Takushima, A. Koga, and N. Kawakami, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **70**, 1369 (2001).
- [34] A. Läuchli, S. Wessel, and M. Sigrist, *Phys. Rev. B* **66**, 014401 (2002).
- [35] P. Corboz and F. Mila, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 115144 (2013).
- [36] J. Yang, A. W. Sandvik, and L. Wang, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, L060409 (2022).
- [37] L. Wang, Y. Zhang, and A. W. Sandvik, *Chinese Phys. Lett.* **39**, 077502 (2022).
- [38] A. Keleş and E. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, L041115 (2022).
- [39] L. L. Viteritti, R. Rende, A. Parola, S. Goldt, and F. Becca, “Transformer Wave Function for the Shastry-Sutherland Model: emergence of a Spin-Liquid Phase,” (2023), arXiv:2311.16889 [cond-mat].
- [40] A. Maity, F. Ferrari, J. Y. Lee, J. Potten, T. Müller, R. Thomale, R. Samajdar, and Y. Iqbal, arXiv:2501.00096 [cond-mat] (2024),

- 10.48550/arXiv.2501.00096.
- [41] X. Qian, R. Lv, J. Y. Lee, and M. Qin, “From the Shastry-Sutherland model to the j_1 - j_2 Heisenberg model,” (2024), arXiv:2411.17452 [cond-mat].
- [42] N. Xi, H. Chen, Z. Y. Xie, and R. Yu, Phys. Rev. B **107**, L220408 (2023).
- [43] J. Y. Lee, Y.-Z. You, S. Sachdev, and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. X **9**, 041037 (2019).
- [44] W.-Y. Liu, X.-T. Zhang, Z. Wang, S.-S. Gong, W.-Q. Chen, and Z.-C. Gu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **133**, 026502 (2024).
- [45] F. Verstraete and J. I. Cirac, arXiv:cond-mat/0407066 (2004).
- [46] Y. Nishio, N. Maeshima, A. Gendiar, and T. Nishino, Preprint (2004), arXiv:cond-mat/0401115.
- [47] J. Jordan, R. Orús, G. Vidal, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 250602 (2008).
- [48] P. Corboz, T. M. Rice, and M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 046402 (2014).
- [49] P. Nataf, M. Lajkó, P. Corboz, A. M. Läuchli, K. Penc, and F. Mila, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 201113 (2016).
- [50] H. J. Liao, Z. Y. Xie, J. Chen, Z. Y. Liu, H. D. Xie, R. Z. Huang, B. Normand, and T. Xiang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 137202 (2017).
- [51] I. Niesen and P. Corboz, Phys. Rev. B **95**, 180404(R) (2017).
- [52] J.-Y. Chen, L. Vanderstraeten, S. Capponi, and D. Poilblanc, Phys. Rev. B **98**, 184409 (2018).
- [53] H.-Y. Lee and N. Kawashima, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 205123 (2018).
- [54] S. S. Jahromi and R. Orús, Phys. Rev. B **98**, 155108 (2018).
- [55] I. Niesen and P. Corboz, Phys. Rev. B **97**, 245146 (2018).
- [56] H. Yamaguchi, Y. Sasaki, T. Okubo, M. Yoshida, T. Kida, M. Hagiwara, Y. Kono, S. Kittaka, T. Sakakibara, M. Takigawa, Y. Iwasaki, and Y. Hosokoshi, Phys. Rev. B **98**, 094402 (2018).
- [57] A. Kshetrimayum, C. Balz, B. Lake, and J. Eisert, arXiv:1904.00028 [cond-mat, physics:quant-ph] (2019).
- [58] S. S. Chung and P. Corboz, Phys. Rev. B **100**, 035134 (2019).
- [59] B. Ponsioen, S. S. Chung, and P. Corboz, Phys. Rev. B **100**, 195141 (2019).
- [60] H.-Y. Lee, R. Kaneko, L. E. Chern, T. Okubo, Y. Yamaji, N. Kawashima, and Y. B. Kim, Nat. Comm. **11**, 1639 (2020).
- [61] O. Gauthé, S. Capponi, M. Mambrini, and D. Poilblanc, Phys. Rev. B **101**, 205144 (2020).
- [62] J. Hasik, D. Poilblanc, and F. Becca, SciPost Physics **10**, 012 (2021).
- [63] W.-Y. Liu, J. Hasik, S.-S. Gong, D. Poilblanc, W.-Q. Chen, and Z.-C. Gu, Phys. Rev. X **12**, 031039 (2022).
- [64] M. Peschke, B. Ponsioen, and P. Corboz, Phys. Rev. B **106**, 205140 (2022).
- [65] J. Hasik, M. Van Damme, D. Poilblanc, and L. Vanderstraeten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 177201 (2022).
- [66] B. Ponsioen, S. S. Chung, and P. Corboz, Phys. Rev. B **108**, 205154 (2023).
- [67] E. L. Weerda and M. Rizzi, arXiv:2309.12811 (2023).
- [68] Y. Xu, S. Capponi, J.-Y. Chen, L. Vanderstraeten, J. Hasik, A. H. Nevidomskyy, M. Mambrini, K. Penc, and D. Poilblanc, Phys. Rev. B **108**, 195153 (2023).
- [69] J. Hasik and P. Corboz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **133**, 176502 (2024).
- [70] P. Schmall, J. Naumann, J. Eisert, and Y. Iqbal, arXiv:2407.07145 [cond-mat] (2024).
- [71] S. Singh, R. N. C. Pfeifer, and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 115125 (2011).
- [72] B. Bauer, P. Corboz, R. Orús, and M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 125106 (2011).
- [73] T. Nishino and K. Okunishi, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65**, 891 (1996).
- [74] R. Orús, A. C. Doherty, and G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 077203 (2009).
- [75] P. Corboz, S. R. White, G. Vidal, and M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 041108(R) (2011).
- [76] H.-J. Liao, J.-G. Liu, L. Wang, and T. Xiang, Phys. Rev. X **9**, 031041 (2019).
- [77] B. Ponsioen, F. Assaad, and P. Corboz, SciPost Physics **12**, 006 (2022).
- [78] A. Francuz, N. Schuch, and B. Vanhecke, (2023), arXiv:2311.11894.
- [79] H. C. Jiang, Z. Y. Weng, and T. Xiang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 090603 (2008).
- [80] H. N. Phien, J. A. Bengua, H. D. Tuan, P. Corboz, and R. Orus, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 035142 (2015).
- [81] P. Corboz, Phys. Rev. B **94**, 035133 (2016).
- [82] E. A. Cortés Estay et al., *in preparation*.
- [83] J. D. Arias Espinoza and P. Corboz, Phys. Rev. B **110**, 094314 (2024).
- [84] L. Vanderstraeten, J. Haegeman, and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 165121 (2019).
- [85] The extrapolations of the energies based on a second order polynomial, using the three largest D values for the plaquette state. For the AF state we took the average of the extrapolated values based on the three and four largest D values.
- [86] P. Corboz, P. Czarnik, G. Kapteijns, and L. Tagliacozzo, Phys. Rev. X **8**, 031031 (2018).
- [87] M. Rader and A. M. Läuchli, Phys. Rev. X **8**, 031030 (2018).
- [88] L. Tagliacozzo, T. R. de Oliveira, S. Iblisdir, and J. I. Latorre, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 024410 (2008).
- [89] F. Pollmann, S. Mukerjee, A. M. Turner, and J. E. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 255701 (2009).
- [90] P. Hasenfratz and F. Niedermayer, Z. Physik B - Condensed Matter **92**, 91 (1993).
- [91] M. M. Rams, P. Czarnik, and L. Cincio, Phys. Rev. X **8**, 041033 (2018).
- [92] A. W. Sandvik and H. G. Evertz, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 024407 (2010).
- [93] A different conclusion was obtained in another iPEPS study [42], however, the results were limited to D values up to 7, and extrapolations of m were performed based on a $1/D$ extrapolation instead of a more accurate FCLS analysis.
- [94] Y. Nomura and M. Imada, Phys. Rev. X **11**, 031034 (2021).
- [95] K. Ueda and S. Miyahara, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **11**, L175 (1999).
- [96] A. Koga, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **69**, 3509 (2000).
- [97] P. Vlaar and P. Corboz, SciPost Physics **15**, 126 (2023).
- [98] E. Fogh, G. Giriat, M. E. Zayed, A. Piovano, M. Boehm, P. Steffens, I. Safulina, U. B. Hansen, S. Klotz, J.-R. Soh, E. Pomjakushina, F. Mila, B. Normand, and H. M. Rønnow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **133**, 246702 (2024).
- [99] O. Cépas, K. Kakurai, L. P. Regnault, T. Ziman, J. P.

- Boucher, N. Aso, M. Nishi, H. Kageyama, and Y. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 167205 (2001).
- [100] J. Romhányi, K. Totsuka, and K. Penc, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 024413 (2011).
- [101] C. Boos, S. P. G. Crone, I. A. Niesen, P. Corboz, K. P. Schmidt, and F. Mila, Phys. Rev. B **100**, 140413 (2019).