

Incommensurate gapless ferromagnetism connecting competing symmetry-enriched deconfined quantum phase transitions

Anthony Rey,¹ Ömer M. Aksoy,² Daniel P. Arovas,³ Claudio Chamon,⁴ and Christopher Mudry^{1,5}

¹*Condensed Matter Theory Group, PSI Center for Scientific Computing, Theory and Data, 5232 Villigen PSI, Switzerland*

²*Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

³*Department of Physics, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA*

⁴*Department of Physics, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215, USA*

⁵*Institut de Physique, EPF Lausanne, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland*

(Dated: February 24, 2025)

Interpolating between distinct symmetry-enriched critical points is believed to require going through either a multicritical point or an intervening gapped phase. We present a scenario, in which a gapless extended phase serves as a “hub” connecting multiple symmetry-enriched deconfined quantum critical points. As a concrete example, we construct a lattice model with $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry for quantum spin-1/2 degrees of freedom that realizes four distinct gapful phases supporting antiferromagnetic long-range order and one extended incommensurate gapless ferromagnetic phase. The quantum phase transition between any two of the four gapped and antiferromagnetic phases goes through either a (deconfined) quantum critical point, a quantum tricritical point, or the incommensurate gapless ferromagnetic phase. In this phase diagram, it is possible to interpolate between four deconfined quantum critical points by passing through the extended gapless ferromagnetic phase. We identify the phases in the model and the nature of the transitions between them through a combination of analytical arguments and density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) studies.

Introduction — In one-dimensional space, when periodic boundary conditions (PBC) hold, there is a single quantum phase of bosonic matter that is described by a non-degenerate and gapped ground state [1]. For example, any local Hamiltonian hosting quantum spin degrees of freedom, obeying PBC, and supporting a non-degenerate gapped ground state can be adiabatically connected without gap closing, up to adding or removing ancilla degrees of freedom, to a trivial quantum paramagnet whose ground state is a product state of the quantum spins. This picture changes in the presence of symmetries, namely, when the adiabatic evolution is restricted to be invariant under a symmetry transformation from a group G . There are then degenerate and gapped ground states that cannot be connected to a G -symmetric product state without gap closing or spontaneous breaking of G . This possibility leads to the concept of symmetry protected topological (SPT) phases [1–6].

Just like gapped phases, quantum critical points or gapless phases can also be enriched by symmetries [7–44]. For example, when enriched by a global $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry, there are two kinds of Ising conformal field theories (CFT) [12]. It is believed that any smooth path in the coupling space of a microscopic, local, and $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetric Hamiltonian that interpolates between these two Ising CFT must go through either a multicritical point or a gapped phase.

In this work we offer a scenario where a gapless extended phase serves as a “hub” connecting multiple symmetry-enriched deconfined quantum critical points (DQCP). We study the interplay of four symmetry-enriched DQCP, with each one describing a continuous quantum phase transition between two gapped phases of




FIG. 1. (Color online) Phase diagram of Hamiltonian (1). Squares (circles) on the boundary denote stable (unstable) fixed points (DQCP).

matter supporting distinct long-range orders. While two of the four DQCP separate two gapped phases realizing the same SPT phase, the other two DQCP separate those phases that realize distinct SPT gapped phases of matter. Hence, the latter two DQCP can also be interpreted as examples of quantum topological phase transitions (QTPT). We construct a local, $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetric lattice Hamiltonian [Eq. (1)] for quantum spin-1/2 degrees of freedom that depends on two dimensionless couplings and that interpolates between all four DQCP. We show that any two of the four DQCP are distinct in that they cannot be smoothly connected in

the parameter space without encountering a multicritical point or gap opening. Surprisingly, we find that the competition between the four symmetry-enriched DQCP leads to an extended gapless phase in the center of the phase diagram, see Fig. 1, which is connected to all four symmetry-enriched DQCP through four tricritical points. This phase (i) supports a pair of degenerate ground states that are ferromagnetically ordered along the quantization Z -axis in spin space, (ii) is incommensurate in that the longitudinal spin-spin correlation function is long-ranged with, for both periodic and open boundary conditions (OBC), an oscillatory factor $e^{iq^z s}$, whereby the wave-vector q^z is not commensurate with the lattice and s is the separation between two spins, and (iii) is gapless in that the transverse spin-spin correlation functions decay algebraically with the wave-vector π . We call this phase the incommensurate gapless ferromagnetic phase. Our work thus provides an explicit example of an exotic gapless phase resulting from the competition between different symmetry-enriched DQCP.

Model and its symmetries — We define the family of Hamiltonians parameterized by two dimensionless couplings $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ by

$$\hat{H}_b(\theta, \lambda) := (1 - \lambda) \sum_{j=1}^{2N-b} \hat{h}_j(\theta) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{2N-3b} \hat{Z}_j \hat{h}_{j+1}(\theta) \hat{Z}_{j+3}, \quad (1a)$$

with

$$\hat{h}_j(\theta) := \cos \theta \hat{X}_j \hat{X}_{j+1} + \sin \theta \hat{Y}_j \hat{Y}_{j+1}. \quad (1b)$$

Here, \hat{X}_j , \hat{Y}_j , and \hat{Z}_j are on-site Pauli operators that commute on unequal sites and satisfy the Pauli algebra on the same site, e.g., $\hat{X}_j \hat{Y}_j = i\hat{Z}_j$. Periodic boundary conditions follow from choosing $b = 0$ under the assumption that $\hat{X}_{j+2N} \equiv \hat{X}_j$ and $\hat{Y}_{j+2N} \equiv \hat{Y}_j$. Open boundary conditions follow from choosing $b = 1$. The number of sites $2N$ with N a positive integer is explicitly even.

When $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ and $\lambda = 0$, Hamiltonian (1) reduces to that of the anisotropic, nearest-neighbor, and antiferromagnetic quantum spin-1/2 XY model. As the coupling λ is tuned from 0 to 1, the two-body XY interactions in Hamiltonian (1) compete with the four-body interactions obtained by dressing each two-body XY interaction with a two-body third-neighbor ZZ interaction. We call the limit $\lambda = 1$ of Hamiltonian (1) the “dressed” quantum spin-1/2 XY model.

For any pair $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, Hamiltonian (1) is invariant under a $\mathbb{Z}_2^X \times \mathbb{Z}_2^Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2^T$ symmetry generated by the operators

$$\hat{X} := \prod_{j=1}^{2N} \hat{X}_j, \quad \hat{Y} := \prod_{j=1}^{2N} \hat{Y}_j, \quad \hat{T} := \hat{Y} \mathcal{K}, \quad (2)$$

respectively, where \mathcal{K} denotes complex conjugation. The subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2^X \times \mathbb{Z}_2^Y$ implements global π rotations around

the X , Y , and Z axes in spin space, while the subgroup \mathbb{Z}_2^T implements the reversal of time. Because the number of sites $2N$ is even, the symmetry generators in Eq. (2) commute pairwise.

Gapped phases — In the coupling space (θ, λ) from Fig. 1, Hamiltonian (1) realizes four gapped phases, which we label as Neel_x , Neel_y , $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$, and $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$. The properties of each gapped phase are captured by the exactly solvable point in the corresponding corner of the phase diagram, marked by a square in Fig. 1.

The $\text{Neel}_{x(y)}$ phase is controlled by the exactly solvable point at $\theta = 0$ ($\pi/2$) and $\lambda = 0$, i.e., the lower left (right) corner in Fig. 1. At this point, Hamiltonian (1) reduces to the classical Ising antiferromagnet with XX (YY) couplings. Consequently, the $\text{Neel}_{x(y)}$ phase is long-range ordered with spontaneously broken \hat{Y} (\hat{X}) and \hat{T} symmetries. In the thermodynamic limit, the ground states are twofold degenerate for both phases independently of the choice between PBC or OBC.

The $\text{Neel}_{y(x)}^{\text{SPT}}$ phase is controlled by the exactly solvable stable fixed point at $\theta = 0$ ($\pi/2$) and $\lambda = 1$, i.e., the upper left (right) corner in Fig. 1. At this point, Hamiltonian (1) reduces to that of a cluster model [45] with $ZXXZ$ ($ZYYZ$) couplings. When PBC are chosen, the $\text{Neel}_{y(x)}^{\text{SPT}}$ phase describes the same long-range order as the $\text{Neel}_{y(x)}$ phase does in that the same internal symmetries, \hat{X} (\hat{Y}) and \hat{T} , are spontaneously broken by the selection of one out of two degenerate ground states. However, each one of the two degenerate ground states in the $\text{Neel}_{y(x)}^{\text{SPT}}$ phase realizes a nontrivial SPT state protected by the unbroken \hat{Y} and $\hat{X}\hat{T}$ (\hat{X} and $\hat{Y}\hat{T}$) symmetries [46–48]. Hence, when OBC are chosen, the $\text{Neel}_{y(x)}^{\text{SPT}}$ phase supports two decoupled quantum spin-1/2 degrees of freedom localized on the left and right boundaries, respectively, i.e., the ground states are now eightfold (instead of twofold) degenerate in the thermodynamic limit. While the $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ and $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ phases support distinct long-range orders, their symmetry-breaking ground states realize the same SPT phases.

Symmetry-enriched DQCP — The four corners describing the gapped phases in the coupling space in Fig. 1 are pairwise connected by four edges. When restricted to any of these edges, Hamiltonian (1) describes a linear interpolation between two exactly solvable models that support distinct long-range orders. The midpoint of each edge, marked by a circle in Fig. 1, is then a DQCP that separates two gapped phases with competing long-range orders, as we now explain.

At the midpoint $(\pi/4, 0)$ of the lower horizontal edge in Fig. 1, Hamiltonian (1) reduces to the well-known isotropic spin-1/2 quantum XY model, which is the DQCP between the Neel_x and Neel_y phases [49]; a $c = 1$ CFT with a non-degenerate gapless ground state [50]. The two exactly solvable corners controlling the Neel_x and Neel_y phases are related to each other by the unitary transformation $\hat{U}_R = \hat{U}_{\pi/2} \hat{X}$, where $\hat{U}_{\pi/2}$ and \hat{X}




FIG. 2. (Color online) Number n of eigenenergies E_m with an energy smaller than $E_0 + \Delta\varepsilon$, where E_0 is the ground state energy calculated using ED with PBC for $2N = 10$ sites, $\Delta\varepsilon = 0.3$, and the integer $0 \leq m < n$. We also quote the value of n for the five distinct phases computed with OBC in parentheses.

implement rotations in spin space by $\pi/2$ and π around the Z - and X -axes, respectively, i.e., the only non-trivial action of \hat{U}_R on the Pauli operators is given by $(\hat{X}_j, \hat{Y}_j) \mapsto (\hat{Y}_j, \hat{X}_j)$ for any site j .

The two midpoints $(0, 1/2)$ and $(\pi/2, 1/2)$ of the left and right vertical edges in Fig. 1 are the two DQCP between the $\text{Neel}_{x(y)}$ and $\text{Neel}_{y(x)}^{\text{SPT}}$ phases, respectively. These DQCP are also QTPT between distinct topological phases [48]. Indeed, when PBC are chosen, the two corners in the phase diagram of Fig. 1 that control the $\text{Neel}_{x(y)}$ and $\text{Neel}_{y(x)}^{\text{SPT}}$ phases are related to each other by the unitary transformation $\hat{U}_E = \hat{U}_{CZ} \hat{U}_{\pi/2} \hat{X}$. Here, \hat{U}_E is the composition of \hat{U}_R with the global controlled- Z unitary, whose only non-trivial action on the Pauli operators is defined by $\hat{A}_j \mapsto \hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{A}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1}$ with $A = X, Y$ for any site j . This unitary equivalence breaks down for OBC. The unitary \hat{U}_E is an example of an entangler, that exchanges distinct SPT phases when PBC are chosen [51]. Here, it becomes an anomalous \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry of the two DQCP at the midpoints of the vertical edges [48].

The midpoint $(\pi/4, 1)$ of the top horizontal edge in Fig. 1 is the DQCP between the $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ and $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ phases. When PBC are chosen, this DQCP is unitarily equivalent to that at $(\pi/4, 0)$ under the action of the entangler \hat{U}_E . Hence, it is also described by the $c = 1$ CFT and has the same bulk properties. However, when OBC are chosen, this unitary equivalence no longer holds. As opposed to the spin-1/2 quantum XY model at $(\pi/4, 0)$, the dressed spin-1/2 quantum XY model at $(\pi/4, 1)$ has four degenerate ground states associated with zero-modes localized on the boundaries [48].




FIG. 3. (Color online) Magnitudes of the staggered magnetization per site along the X -axis (3) and the uniform magnetization per site along the Z -axis (4), obtained along the line $\lambda = 0.4$ using DMRG with OBC for $2N = 64, 128, 256$ sites. The sharp suppression of the order parameters on both sides of the quantum phase transition around $\theta = 0.57$ indicates that the correlation length is larger than the length of the chain.

Phase diagram — We now turn our attention to the fate of the four gapped phases labeled by squares and the associated four DQCP labeled by circles in Fig. 1. Each corner of the phase diagram in Fig. 1 realizes a gapped phase of matter supporting long-range order. Associated to the long-range order is a degeneracy of two that originates from time-reversal symmetry and that is independent of the choice between PBC and OBC. Additionally, the degeneracy of the upper corners increases by a factor of four upon choosing OBC. The locus of points in coupling space along which such a degeneracy changes defines the phase boundary of each one of these four phases. An estimate of the location of these phase boundaries is achieved by diagonalizing Hamiltonian (1) for $2N = 10$ sites and counting the number of eigenenergies within a distance of $\Delta\varepsilon = 0.3 > 1/(2N)$ from the ground-state energy, as is illustrated in Fig. 2. In doing so, we find a fifth phase centered around the point $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ that is shaped like a diamond with a degeneracy of two for both PBC and OBC. We show using DMRG that, remarkably, this fifth phase is gapless, while it supports long-range ferromagnetic order along the quantization Z -axis in spin space.

Incommensurate gapless ferromagnetic phase — The DMRG [52] numerical study was performed using our own code as well as the open-source Julia library ITensor [53, 54]. While confirming the existence of the nonvanishing value taken by the antiferromagnetic (AF) order parameter (the staggered magnetization) [55]

$$m_{\text{sta}}^x := \lim_{\mathbf{B}_{\text{sta}} \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^{2N} (-1)^j \langle \hat{X}_j \rangle_{\beta, \mathbf{B}_{\text{sta}}} \quad (3)$$

in the Neel_x phase from Fig. 1, we establish with Fig. 3 the nonvanishing value taken by the ferromagnetic (FM) order parameter (the uniform magnetization) [55]

$$m_{\text{uni}}^z := \lim_{\mathbf{B}_{\text{uni}} \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^{2N} \langle \hat{Z}_j \rangle_{\beta, \mathbf{B}_{\text{uni}}} \quad (4)$$

inside the FM_z phase from Fig. 1. The maximum value taken by m_{uni}^z inside the FM_z phase from Fig. 1 is 4/10, i.e., 40% of the classical uniform magnetization per site, independently of $2N > 32$ and the choice between PBC and OBC.

We argue that the FM_z phase in Fig. 1 is critical as follows [48]. First, the spin-spin correlation functions

$$C_{j,j+s}^\alpha := \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \hat{A}_j \hat{A}_{j+s} \rangle_\beta \quad (5)$$

with $A = X, Y, Z$ decay algebraically as $(-1)^s s^{-\eta^\alpha(\theta, \lambda)}$ for $\alpha = x, y$ with both PBC and OBC, if $s \gg 1$ [56]. The exponents η^x and η^y are identical on the $O(2)$ -symmetric line $\theta = \pi/4$, while they differ when this symmetry is explicitly broken for $\theta \neq \pi/4$, as is illustrated in Fig. 4. We quote the values $\eta^x = \eta^y = 1$ at $(\pi/4, 1/2)$. Second, any point from the FM_z phase in Fig. 1 realizes a $c = 1$ CFT, where the central charge c is obtained from the bipartite entanglement entropy [57]. Finally, any energy spacing between two consecutive non-degenerate eigenenergies scales as $1/(2N)$ in the thermodynamic limit.

The incommensurability of the FM_z phase is corroborated by the form $C_{j,j+s}^z \sim (m_{\text{uni}}^z)^2 + A \cos(q^z s + \phi)$ with $s \gg 1$ [56] of the correlation function, as is illustrated in Figs. 4(a) and 4(b). We find that the dependence on λ of q^z is symmetric with respect to the $\lambda = 1/2$ line, while it is independent of θ [48]. Moreover, q^z is a monotonically decreasing function of increasing λ in the interval from the tricritical point up to $\lambda = 1/2$. The wave-vector q^z saturates to the approximate value $q^z \simeq 2\pi \times 3/10$ for $\lambda \in [0.45, 0.5]$ at $\theta = \pi/4$. We could not establish if this dependence on λ is continuous or displays a non-analytic behavior, reminiscent of disorder points [58]. Hereto, the amplitude A is independent of θ , but is sensitive to the choice between OBC and PBC and is a decreasing function of λ upon approaching the phase boundary of the FM_z phase in Fig. 1. The uniform magnetization m_{uni}^z along the vertical cut at $\theta = \pi/4$ is a function of λ that behaves in the vicinity of the tricritical value $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.25$ as $(\lambda - \lambda_{\text{tri}})^{1/6}$ [48], see Fig. 4(c). Remarkably, Fig. 4(d) shows that $q^z(\lambda)$ is proportional to $m_{\text{uni}}^z(\lambda)$ along the vertical cut at $\theta = \pi/4$. This proportionality extends to the scaling exponent $\eta^x(\lambda)$ and to the scaling exponent $\eta^{z,c}(\lambda)$ of the connected two-point function for \hat{Z}_j , as [48]

$$q^z = \pi(1 - |m_{\text{uni}}^z|) \propto \eta^x \propto \eta^{z,c}. \quad (6)$$

As such this proportionality is reminiscent of the critical phase called the Tomonaga-Luttinger-Liquid phase with central charge one (TLL1) in the study done in Ref. [59] of the quantum spin-1/2 chain with nearest- and next-nearest-neighbor Heisenberg exchange couplings in a uniform magnetic field.

Phase boundaries — The phase boundary of anyone of the four gapped phases in Fig. 1 terminates at two of the four DQCP located at $(\pi/4, 0)$, $(\pi/2, 1/2)$, $(\pi/4, 1)$, and $(0, 1/2)$ through straight segments emanating from the four tricritical points. The DQCP $(\pi/4, 0)$ and $(\pi/4, 1)$




FIG. 4. (Color online) Spin-spin correlation functions C^α defined in Eq. (5) computed using DMRG with OBC, for $2N = 128$, $\lambda = 0.4$ and $\theta = \pi/4 - 0.1$ with (a) C^x and C^y and (b) C^z . Fits used are labeled “p” for power law, “e” for exponential, and “q” for cosine form. In both cases, $q^z \simeq 2\pi \times 3/10$. Goodness of fit for “p” is always greater than that for “e”. The insets show the Fourier transforms of the respective correlations, where the abscissa is the frequency $f^\alpha \equiv q^\alpha/(2\pi)$ and the ordinate is the expansion coefficient $A(f^\alpha)$, $\alpha = x, y, z$. (c) Dependence on λ of the uniform magnetization m_{uni}^z defined in Eq. (4) and the frequency f^z of the Fourier transform of the spin-spin correlations C^z in the bulk of a chain with $2N = 512$ sites obtained using DMRG with OBC at $\theta = \pi/4$. The inset shows the fit_{\log} Ansatz $\ln |m_{\text{uni}}^z(\lambda)| \sim 1/6 \ln |\lambda - \lambda_{\text{tri}}|$, where $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.25$. (d) Proportionality between $f^z(\lambda)$ and $m_{\text{uni}}^z(\lambda)$ on a chain of $2N = 512$ sites obtained using DMRG with OBC at $\theta = \pi/4$. The different values of λ are specified by different colors.

are known analytically to realize a $c = 1$ CFT. Whereas it was possible to confirm numerically the value of the central charge $c = 1$ at the two DCQP $(\pi/4, 0)$ and $(\pi/4, 1)$ with a systematic uncertainty of less than 3%, the same estimate of $c = 1$ at the two DCQP $(0, 1/2)$ and $(\pi/2, 1/2)$ suffers a systematic uncertainty of order 30% due to strong finite-size effects [48]. The same systematic uncertainty of order 30% also plagues the numerical estimate of $c = 1$ upon exiting the FM_z phase [48].

Spin-spin correlations $C_{j,j+s}^x$ and $C_{j,j+s}^y$ at $(\pi/4, 0)$ and $(\pi/4, 1)$ are observed numerically to decay as $(-1)^s s^{-1/2}$, as expected from the Jordan-Wigner transformation to a free fermion theory [48]. Strong finite-size effects pre-

vented us from estimating the rate of decay of correlation functions at either $(0, 1/2)$ or upon exiting the FM_z phase [48].

The resolution of the phase boundaries in Fig. 2 can be improved by measuring the competing order parameters along a cut in the phase diagram, as is done in Fig. 3. For example, we locate in this way the two tricritical points attached to the Neel_x phase at $(0.3 \pm 0.04, 1/2)$ and $(\pi/4, 0.25 \pm 0.005)$. Exiting the FM_z to anyone of the four gapped phases is done through a smooth concave curve [60] that connects a pair of tricritical points as is qualitatively captured by Fig. 1.

The location of the latter tricritical point is consistent with the following ED study. The dependence on $2N$ of the spacing $\delta E_{1,0}$ between the first excited energy E_1 above the ground-state energy E_0 at the point $(\pi/4, 0)$ is computed for increasing values of λ . The position of the tricritical point is the value of λ at which $\delta E_{1,0}$ changes from a power to an exponential suppression as a function of $2N$ [48].

Degeneracies at the phase boundaries with OBC — With PBC, the degeneracy of the ground-state energy is onefold at the four DQCP. This fact has been verified numerically with DMRG [48]. The SPT nature of the gapped phases at the upper-left and right corners of the phase diagram in Fig. 1 has a measurable signature at the DQCP $(\pi/4, 1)$ as its ground-state degeneracy with OBC is fourfold [48]. The vertical boundary separating the $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ and $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ phases with $\lambda < 1$ exhibits a twofold ground-state degeneracy as measured by DMRG under OBC [48]. We have verified that the finite-size spacing between the second and the first energies above the ground-state energy scales as $\alpha_2/(2N)$ with $\alpha_2 \sim (1 - \lambda)^2$ in the vicinity of $\lambda = 1$ along $\theta = \pi/4$ [48]. The same analysis shows that the spacing between the fourth and third excited energies scales as $\alpha_4/(2N)$ with $\alpha_4 \sim (1 - \lambda)^1 + 4.88$, which is consistent with a mean-field analysis. Strong finite-size effects did not allow a reliable measurement of the ground-state degeneracies under OBC along the phase boundaries $(\theta, 1/2)$ and $(\pi/2 - \theta, 1/2)$, where $0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_{\text{tri}}$ with the tricritical value $\theta_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.3$ [48].

Dynamical exponent z — For any point in Fig. 1 realizing a gapless phase of matter, the dynamical critical exponent can be computed by measuring the first nonvanishing finite-size spacing between low-lying excitation energies above the ground-state's. Using DMRG, we observe the scaling $(2N)^{-z}$ [61] with $z = 1$ in the FM_z phase as well as at the points $(\pi/4, 0)$, $(\pi/2, 1/2)$, $(\pi/4, 1)$, and $(0, 1/2)$ [48].

Discussion — We introduced a Hamiltonian that interpolates between four DQCP enriched by $\mathbb{Z}_2^X \times \mathbb{Z}_2^Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2^T$ -symmetry. We showed using analytical means that the four DQCP realized at the boundaries of the coupling space are distinct. We then numerically obtained the phase diagram inside the coupling space, confirming that the four symmetry-enriched DQCP cannot be connected to one another without gap-opening transitions

or passing through multicritical points. Importantly, we found that the four distinct DQCP are all connected to an extended gapless phase that is ferromagnetically ordered with incommensurate oscillatory longitudinal correlations. In closing, we conjecture that the topology of the phase diagram we found for the one-dimensional model (1) would be similar for its natural generalization in higher-dimensions; a combination of an XY model and its version dressed with products of \hat{Z} on all neighbors to sites sharing a bond. We note that such generalization of the model, in any dimension, does not have a sign problem for $\lambda \leq 1/2$ (and its dual for $\lambda \geq 1/2$) and could therefore be studied via quantum Monte Carlo simulations.

Acknowledgments — We thank Saran Prembabu, Subir Sachdev, and Rahul Sahay for discussion. This work is supported by SNSF Grant 219339 (A.R.), by NSF Grant DMR-2022428 (Ö.M.A.), and by DOE Grant DE-FG02-06ER46316 (C.C.).

Supplemental Material

Appendix A: Definitions

The goal of the Supplementary Material is twofold. First, a symmetry analysis of Hamiltonian (A1) is provided. Second, numerical results are presented in support of the conjectured phase diagram from Fig. 5.

We consider the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H}_b(\theta, \lambda) := & (1 - \lambda) \sum_{j=1}^{2N-b} \left(\cos \theta \widehat{X}_j \widehat{X}_{j+1} + \sin \theta \widehat{Y}_j \widehat{Y}_{j+1} \right) \\ & + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{2N-3b} \widehat{Z}_j \left(\cos \theta \widehat{X}_{j+1} \widehat{X}_{j+2} + \sin \theta \widehat{Y}_{j+1} \widehat{Y}_{j+2} \right) \widehat{Z}_{j+3}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1a})$$

where coupling space is defined by

$$0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2, \quad 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1, \quad (\text{A1b})$$

$b = 0$ for periodic boundary conditions (PBC), $b = 1$ for open boundary conditions (OBC), and

$$\widehat{X}_j \widehat{Y}_k = (-1)^{\delta_{j,k}} \widehat{Y}_k \widehat{X}_j, \quad \widehat{X}_j \widehat{Y}_j = i \widehat{Z}_j, \quad \widehat{X}_j^2 = \widehat{Y}_j^2 = \widehat{Z}_j^2 = \mathbb{1}, \quad (\text{A1c})$$

for any $j, k = 1, \dots, 2N$. We choose a basis for the 2^{2N} -dimensional global Hilbert space for which any \widehat{Z}_j operators is diagonal. To this end, we denote by \mathbf{a} the string $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2N})$, where $a_j = 0, 1$ at every site. Then, the global Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \cong \mathbb{C}^{2^{2N}}$ is spanned by the states $|\mathbf{a}\rangle$ that satisfy

$$\widehat{Z}_j |\mathbf{a}\rangle = (-1)^{a_j} |\mathbf{a}\rangle, \quad \widehat{X}_j |\mathbf{a}\rangle = |\mathbf{a} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(j)}\rangle, \quad \widehat{Y}_j |\mathbf{a}\rangle = i(-1)^{a_j} |\mathbf{a} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(j)}\rangle, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(j)}$ is a string with all its entries vanishing except the one at j , which is the number one, and the addition of the components in $\mathbf{a} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(j)}$ is defined modulo 2.

1. Symmetries

Hamiltonian (A1) commutes with the pair of unitary operators

$$\widehat{X} := \prod_{j=1}^{2N} \widehat{X}_j, \quad \widehat{Y} := \prod_{j=1}^{2N} \widehat{Y}_j. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Hamiltonian (A1) also commutes with the antinunitary operator

$$\widehat{T}' := \mathsf{K}, \quad (\text{A4a})$$

where K denotes complex conjugation under which

$$\mathsf{K} \widehat{X}_j \mathsf{K} = \widehat{X}_j, \quad \mathsf{K} \widehat{Y}_j \mathsf{K} = -\widehat{Y}_j, \quad \mathsf{K} \widehat{Z}_j \mathsf{K} = \widehat{Z}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, 2N. \quad (\text{A4b})$$

Operators \widehat{X} , \widehat{Y} , and \widehat{T}' generate the symmetry group

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^X \times \mathbb{Z}_2^Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2^T, \quad (\text{A5a})$$

whereby \mathbb{Z}_2^X is generated by \widehat{X} , \mathbb{Z}_2^Y is generated by \widehat{Y} , and \mathbb{Z}_2^T is generated by reversal of time

$$\widehat{T} := \widehat{Y} \widehat{T}'. \quad (\text{A5b})$$




FIG. 5. (Color online) Phase diagram of Hamiltonian (A1). Squares (circles) on the boundary denote stable (unstable) fixed points (DQCP).

Appendix B: Gapped and gapless fixed-points

There are four stable fixed points denoted by squares in Fig. 5 and four unstable fixed points denoted by circles in Fig. 5. We claim that all stable and unstable fixed points are pairwise distinct, respectively. This claim is to be proved by analyzing the symmetries preserved by each fixed-point and the pattern by which the corresponding set of symmetries are fractionalized.

Central to our discussion will be the following two unitary transformations

$$\hat{U}_R := \hat{U}_{\pi/2} \hat{X}, \quad \hat{U}_{\pi/2} := \prod_{j=1}^{2N} e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4} \hat{Z}_j}, \quad \hat{X} := \prod_{j=1}^{2N} \hat{X}_j, \quad (\text{B1a})$$

$$\hat{U}_E := \hat{U}_{CZ} \hat{U}_R, \quad \hat{U}_{CZ} := \prod_{j=1}^{2N} \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \hat{Z}_j + \hat{Z}_{j+1} - \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1} \right), \quad (\text{B1b})$$

which act on the Pauli operators by conjugation as ¹

$$\hat{U}_R: \left(\hat{X}_j, \hat{Y}_j, \hat{Z}_j \right) \mapsto \hat{U}_R \left(\hat{X}_j, \hat{Y}_j, \hat{Z}_j \right) \hat{U}_R^\dagger = \left(\hat{Y}_j, \hat{X}_j, -\hat{Z}_j \right), \quad (\text{B1c})$$

$$\hat{U}_E: \left(\hat{X}_j, \hat{Y}_j, \hat{Z}_j \right) \mapsto \hat{U}_E \left(\hat{X}_j, \hat{Y}_j, \hat{Z}_j \right) \hat{U}_E^\dagger = \left(\hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{Y}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1}, \hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{X}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1}, -\hat{Z}_j \right), \quad (\text{B1d})$$

for any $j = 1, \dots, 2N$ provided PBC are chosen ($b = 0$). When PBC are chosen ($b = 0$), conjugation of Hamiltonian (A1) by these unitary transformations gives

$$\hat{U}_R \hat{H}_0(\theta, \lambda) \hat{U}_R^\dagger = \hat{H}_0(\pi/2 - \theta, \lambda), \quad \hat{U}_E \hat{H}_0(\theta, \lambda) \hat{U}_E^\dagger = \hat{H}_0(\theta, 1 - \lambda). \quad (\text{B2})$$

¹ Unitarity of \hat{U}_{CZ} is a consequence of the identity

$$\left(1 + \hat{Z}_j + \hat{Z}_{j+1} - \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1} \right) \left(1 + \hat{Z}_j + \hat{Z}_{j+1} - \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1} \right) = 4 \hat{\mathbb{1}}.$$

The effect of conjugation of either \hat{X}_j or \hat{Y}_j by \hat{U}_{CZ} requires the sequential use of the pair of identities

$$\left(1 + \hat{Z}_j + \hat{Z}_{j+1} - \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1} \right) \left(1 - \hat{Z}_j + \hat{Z}_{j+1} + \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1} \right) = 4 \hat{Z}_{j+1},$$

and

$$\left(1 + \hat{Z}_{j-1} + \hat{Z}_j - \hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{Z}_j \right) \left(1 + \hat{Z}_{j-1} - \hat{Z}_j + \hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{Z}_j \right) = 4 \hat{Z}_{j-1}.$$

It follows from the Pauli algebra (A1c) that

$$\hat{U}_{CZ} \hat{A}_j \hat{U}_{CZ}^\dagger = \hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{A}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1}, \quad \hat{A}_j = \hat{X}_j, \hat{Y}_j,$$

for $j = 1, \dots, 2N - 3b$.

Hence, \widehat{U}_R and \widehat{U}_E generate \mathbb{Z}_2 reflections of the phase diagram 5 about the $\theta = \pi/4$ and $\lambda = 1/2$ lines, respectively. When the parameter space (A1b) is restricted to any one of these two lines, the corresponding unitary transformation in Eq. (B1) becomes a symmetry of the Hamiltonian (A1). Along any of these two lines, the Abelian symmetry group (A5a) is enlarged to a discrete non-Abelian symmetry group owing to the algebra

$$\widehat{U}_R \widehat{X} \widehat{U}_R^\dagger = \widehat{Y}, \quad \widehat{U}_E \widehat{X} \widehat{U}_E^\dagger = \widehat{Y}, \quad (\text{B3})$$

when PBC are chosen ($b = 0$).

When OBC are chosen ($b = 1$), \widehat{U}_R still implements a reflection about the $\theta = \pi/4$ line, i.e.,

$$\widehat{U}_R \widehat{H}_1(\theta, \lambda) \widehat{U}_R^\dagger = \widehat{H}_1(\pi/2 - \theta, \lambda), \quad (\text{B4})$$

while the unitary equivalence under the action of \widehat{U}_E defined by

$$\widehat{U}_E: (\widehat{X}_j, \widehat{Y}_j, \widehat{Z}_j) \mapsto \begin{cases} \left(\widehat{Y}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1}, \widehat{X}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1}, -\widehat{Z}_j \right), & j = 1, \\ \left(\widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{Y}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1}, \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{X}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1}, -\widehat{Z}_j \right), & j = 2, \dots, 2N-1, \\ \left(\widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{Y}_j, \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{X}_j, -\widehat{Z}_j \right), & j = 2N, \end{cases} \quad (\text{B5})$$

is lost.

1. Gapped stable fixed-points

When $\lambda = 0$, the two gapped stable fixed points $(0, 0)$ and $(\pi/2, 0)$ correspond to the Neel_x and Neel_y phases, respectively. At these points, Hamiltonian (A1) reduces to the pair of Ising antiferromagnets

$$\widehat{H}_b(0, 0) = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-b} \widehat{X}_j \widehat{X}_{j+1}, \quad (\text{B6a})$$

$$\widehat{H}_b(\pi/2, 0) = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-b} \widehat{Y}_j \widehat{Y}_{j+1}, \quad (\text{B6b})$$

with the pair of orthonormal ground states

$$|\text{Neel}_x, \pm\rangle := \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{\{a_j=0,1\}} (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^{2N} j a_j} (\pm 1)^{\sum_{j=1}^{2N} a_j} |\mathbf{a}\rangle, \quad (\text{B6c})$$

$$|\text{Neel}_y, \pm\rangle := \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{\{a_j=0,1\}} (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^{2N} j a_j} (\pm i)^{\sum_{j=1}^{2N} a_j} |\mathbf{a}\rangle, \quad (\text{B6d})$$

and the pair of order parameters

$$m_{\text{sta}}^x[\text{Neel}_x, \pm] := \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{j=1}^{2N} (-1)^j \langle \text{Neel}_x, \pm | \widehat{X}_j | \text{Neel}_x, \pm \rangle = \pm 1, \quad (\text{B6e})$$

$$m_{\text{sta}}^y[\text{Neel}_y, \pm] := \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{j=1}^{2N} (-1)^j \langle \text{Neel}_y, \pm | \widehat{Y}_j | \text{Neel}_y, \pm \rangle = \pm 1, \quad (\text{B6f})$$

for any choice of boundary conditions b , respectively.

The ground states of both Hamiltonians (B6a) and (B6b) span a two-dimensional vector space. One possible orthonormal and complete basis for their ground states is the choice (B6c) and (B6d), respectively. In either cases, these basis elements are interchanged by the action of time-reversal \widehat{T} ,

$$|\text{Neel}_x, \pm\rangle = \widehat{T} |\text{Neel}_x, \mp\rangle, \quad (\text{B7a})$$

$$|\text{Neel}_y, \pm\rangle = \widehat{T} |\text{Neel}_y, \mp\rangle. \quad (\text{B7b})$$

Distinct subgroups of the symmetry group (A5a) survive its spontaneous symmetry breaking, as measured by the order parameters (B6e) and (B6f). To see this, we first observe that either one of the pair of ground states $|\text{Neel}_x, \pm\rangle$ and $|\text{Neel}_y, \pm\rangle$ in Eq. (B6c) and Eq. (B6d) breaks the symmetry group (A5a) down to the unbroken symmetry subgroup

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^X \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{YT}, \quad (\text{B8a})$$

$$\mathbb{Z}_2^Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{XT}, \quad (\text{B8b})$$

respectively, where \mathbb{Z}_2^{YT} (\mathbb{Z}_2^{XT}) is the diagonal subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}_2^Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2^T$ ($\mathbb{Z}_2^X \times \mathbb{Z}_2^T$). Second, we observe that \hat{U}_R does not commute with the global symmetry subgroup generated by \hat{X} and \hat{Y} since

$$\hat{U}_R \hat{X} = \hat{Y} \hat{U}_R, \quad (\text{B9})$$

i.e., it acts non-trivially on the full symmetry group (A5a). Combining both observations, we conclude that the two gapped stable fixed-point Hamiltonians in Eqs. (B6a) and (B6b) are exchanged under the action of \hat{U}_R . Correspondingly, the unitary operator \hat{U}_R interchanges the symmetry-breaking Neel_x and Neel_y orders or, equivalently, the unbroken symmetry subgroups $\mathbb{Z}_2^X \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{YT}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_2^Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{XT}$.

The other two gapped stable fixed points when $\lambda = 1$ are located at $(0, 1)$ and $(\pi/2, 1)$ and given by the quantum spin-1/2 $c = 3$ cluster chains [45–47]

$$\hat{H}_b(0, 1) = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-3b} \hat{Z}_j \hat{X}_{j+1} \hat{X}_{j+2} \hat{Z}_{j+3}, \quad (\text{B10a})$$

$$\hat{H}_b(\pi/2, 1) = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-3b} \hat{Z}_j \hat{Y}_{j+1} \hat{Y}_{j+2} \hat{Z}_{j+3}, \quad (\text{B10b})$$

respectively. When PBC are chosen ($b = 0$), the fixed-point Hamiltonians (B10a) and (B10b) are unitarily equivalent to Hamiltonians (B6a) and (B6b), respectively, owing to the relation (B2). Thus, with PBC ($b = 0$), they have the pair of orthonormal ground states

$$|\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}, \pm\rangle = (-1)^N \hat{U}_E |\text{Neel}_x, \pm\rangle = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{\{a_j=0,1\}} (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^{2N} a_j(j+a_{j+1})} (\pm i)^{\sum_{j=1}^{2N} a_j} |\mathbf{a}\rangle, \quad (\text{B11})$$

$$|\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}, \pm\rangle = (-1)^N \hat{U}_E |\text{Neel}_y, \pm\rangle = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{\{a_j=0,1\}} (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^{2N} a_j(j+a_{j+1})} (\pm 1)^{\sum_{j=1}^{2N} a_j} |\mathbf{a}\rangle,$$

which describe the Neel_y^{SPT} and Neel_x^{SPT} phases, respectively. Notice that just like \hat{U}_R , the unitary transformation \hat{U}_E interchanges the underlying long-range order since

$$\hat{U}_E \hat{X} = \hat{Y} \hat{U}_E \quad (\text{B12})$$

holds for PBC ($b = 0$).

In addition to exchanging the subgroups $\mathbb{Z}_2^Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{XT}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_2^X \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{YT}$ of the symmetry group (A5a), that are left unbroken by the symmetry-breaking ground states (B11), respectively, the unitary transformation \hat{U}_E also introduces non-zero (short-range) entanglement to the ground state. Therefore, the ground states of the resulting Neel_y^{SPT} and Neel_x^{SPT} phases describe non-trivial SPT phases. To see that, we follow the strategy adopted in Refs. [46, 47] and write the fixed point Hamiltonians (B10a) and (B10b) as

$$\hat{H}_b(0, 1) = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-3b} \left(\hat{Z}_j \hat{Y}_{j+1} \hat{Z}_{j+2} \right) \left(\hat{Z}_{j+1} \hat{Y}_{j+2} \hat{Z}_{j+3} \right), \quad (\text{B13a})$$

$$\hat{H}_b(\pi/2, 1) = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-3b} \left(\hat{Z}_j \hat{X}_{j+1} \hat{Z}_{j+2} \right) \left(\hat{Z}_{j+1} \hat{X}_{j+2} \hat{Z}_{j+3} \right), \quad (\text{B13b})$$

respectively. In both Hamiltonians (B13a) and (B13b), all three-body terms in the parentheses commute pairwise. Hence, the ground-state properties can be captured by the mean-field Hamiltonians

$$\widehat{H}_b^\pm(0,1) = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-2b} (-1)^j (\pm 1) \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{Y}_{j+1} \widehat{Z}_{j+2}, \quad (\text{B14a})$$

$$\widehat{H}_b^\pm(\pi/2,1) = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-2b} (-1)^j (\pm 1) \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{X}_{j+1} \widehat{Z}_{j+2}, \quad (\text{B14b})$$

which admit the $|\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}, \pm\rangle$ and $|\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}, \pm\rangle$ states as their non-degenerate gapped ground-state, respectively. Both pairs of mean-field Hamiltonians (B14a) and (B14b) are that of the quantum spin-1/2 $c = 2$ cluster chain [45–47] with fourfold degenerate ground states when OBC are chosen ($b = 1$). Importantly, this fourfold ground-state degeneracy is protected by the symmetries preserved by the pairs of mean-field Hamiltonians (B14a) and (B14b), which are the $\mathbb{Z}_2^Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{XT}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_2^X \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{YT}$ symmetry groups, respectively.

Next, we claim that the pattern encoding the symmetry fractionalization is the same for all four mean-field Hamiltonians (B14a) and (B14b).

We are going to verify this claim first for the pair of Hamiltonians $\widehat{H}_b^\pm(0,1)$. When OBC ($b = 1$) are imposed, the terms $\widehat{Z}_{2N-1} \widehat{Y}_{2N} \widehat{Z}_1$ and $\widehat{Z}_{2N} \widehat{Y}_1 \widehat{Z}_2$ do not appear in either one of the pair of Hamiltonians $\widehat{H}_b^\pm(0,1)$. Therefore, choosing the left boundary around site $j = 1$ without loss of generality, we may define the boundary spin-1/2 degrees of freedom

$$\widehat{S}_L^X := \widehat{X}_1 \widehat{Z}_2, \quad \widehat{S}_L^Y := \widehat{Y}_1 \widehat{Z}_2, \quad \widehat{S}_L^Z := \widehat{Z}_1, \quad (\text{B15})$$

for either one of the pair of Hamiltonians $\widehat{H}_b^\pm(0,1)$. One verifies that this triplet of boundary operators satisfies the Pauli algebra (A1c). Moreover, one verifies that, under the remaining $\mathbb{Z}_2^Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{XT}$ symmetry, this triplet of operators transforms as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Y}: (\widehat{S}_L^X, \widehat{S}_L^Y, \widehat{S}_L^Z) &\mapsto (+\widehat{S}_L^X, -\widehat{S}_L^Y, -\widehat{S}_L^Z), \\ \widehat{X} \widehat{T}: (\widehat{S}_L^X, \widehat{S}_L^Y, \widehat{S}_L^Z) &\mapsto (-\widehat{S}_L^X, +\widehat{S}_L^Y, +\widehat{S}_L^Z). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B16})$$

These transformation rules can be satisfied by defining the boundary symmetry operators

$$\widehat{Y}_L := \widehat{S}_L^X, \quad (\widehat{X} \widehat{T})_L := \widehat{S}_L^Z \mathcal{K}_L. \quad (\text{B17})$$

Here, the symbol \mathcal{K}_L acts as complex conjugation (cc) does on \mathbb{C} numbers, it treats the pair of operators \widehat{S}_L^X and \widehat{S}_L^Z as cc does with real numbers, and it treats operator \widehat{S}_L^Y as cc does with imaginary numbers. One then verifies that the boundary symmetries realize the projective algebra

$$\widehat{Y}_L (\widehat{X} \widehat{T})_L = -(\widehat{X} \widehat{T})_L \widehat{Y}_L, \quad (\widehat{X} \widehat{T})_L (\widehat{X} \widehat{T})_L = \mathbb{1}, \quad (\text{B18})$$

for either one of the pair of Hamiltonians $\widehat{H}_b^\pm(0,1)$. Hence, the global $\mathbb{Z}_2^Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{XT}$ symmetry with a non-projective representation fractionalizes at the left boundary for either one of the pair of Hamiltonians $\widehat{H}_b^\pm(0,1)$. A similar relation can be realized at the right boundary as well [47] for either one of the pair of Hamiltonians $\widehat{H}_b^\pm(0,1)$.

Second, we are going to show that the same symmetry fractionalization pattern occurs for the pair of Hamiltonians $\widehat{H}_b^\pm(\pi/2,1)$. We notice that the boundary degrees of freedom are exactly the same as for the pair of Hamiltonians $\widehat{H}_b^\pm(0,1)$. However, now the bulk symmetries act as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{X}: (\widehat{S}_L^X, \widehat{S}_L^Y, \widehat{S}_L^Z) &\mapsto (-\widehat{S}_L^X, +\widehat{S}_L^Y, -\widehat{S}_L^Z), \\ \widehat{Y} \widehat{T}: (\widehat{S}_L^X, \widehat{S}_L^Y, \widehat{S}_L^Z) &\mapsto (+\widehat{S}_L^X, -\widehat{S}_L^Y, +\widehat{S}_L^Z). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B19})$$

These transformation laws suggest that we define, with the help of Eq. (B15), the boundary symmetry operators through

$$\widehat{X}_L := \widehat{S}_L^Y, \quad (\widehat{Y} \widehat{T})_L := \mathcal{K}_L. \quad (\text{B20})$$

While these operators are distinct from the ones defined in Eq. (B17), one verifies that they satisfy the same projective algebra found in Eq. (B18), namely,

$$\widehat{X}_L \left(\widehat{Y} \widehat{T} \right)_L = - \left(\widehat{Y} \widehat{T} \right)_L \widehat{X}_L, \quad \left(\widehat{Y} \widehat{T} \right)_L \left(\widehat{Y} \widehat{T} \right)_L = \mathbb{1}. \quad (\text{B21})$$

We conclude that all four mean-field Hamiltonians (B14a) and (B14b), describe the same SPT phase of matter. The stable fixed-point Hamiltonians (B10a) and (B10b) each have eightfold degenerate gapped ground states when OBC are chosen.

The unitary transformation \widehat{U}_E defined in Eq. (B2) is the composition of the pair of operators \widehat{U}_R and \widehat{U}_{CZ} . The operator \widehat{U}_{CZ} is also known as the SPT “entangler,” which is a globally symmetric (finite-depth) unitary transformation that maps the trivial SPT phase to the non-trivial cluster SPT state [51, 62]. Hence, the effect of the unitary transformation \widehat{U}_E is to interchange the Neel_x and Neel_y long-range orders and then “paste” the cluster state by introducing non-zero entanglement on each symmetry breaking ground state. We therefore label the images of the Neel_x and Neel_y phases under this transformation by $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ and $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$, respectively.

We close this discussion by presenting in closed form the full (not only the ground states) spectral decomposition of all Hamiltonians denoted by squares in Fig. 5. To this end, we will use a different basis than the basis (A2).

Each corner of the phase diagram in Fig. 5 can be written as the Hamiltonian

$$\widehat{H}_c^{(b_c)} := \sum_{j=1}^{2N-b_c} \widehat{C}_j, \quad (\text{B22a})$$

where the spin-1/2 cluster c operator \widehat{C}_j is given by

$$\widehat{C}_j = \widehat{X}_j \widehat{X}_{j+1} \equiv \widehat{M}_j^{(1)} \widehat{M}_{j+1}^{(1)}, \quad \widehat{M}_j^{(1)} \equiv \widehat{X}_j, \quad (\text{B22b})$$

at the corner (0,0) with $c = 1$ and $b_c = 0, 1$ for PBC and OBC, respectively,

$$\widehat{C}_j = \widehat{Y}_j \widehat{Y}_{j+1} \equiv \widehat{M}_j^{(1)} \widehat{M}_{j+1}^{(1)}, \quad \widehat{M}_j^{(1)} \equiv \widehat{Y}_j, \quad (\text{B22c})$$

at the corner $(\pi/2, 0)$ with $c = 1$ and with $b_c = 0, 1$ for PBC and OBC, respectively,

$$\widehat{C}_j = \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{Y}_{j+1} \widehat{Y}_{j+2} \widehat{Z}_{j+3} \equiv \widehat{M}_j^{(3)} \widehat{M}_{j+1}^{(3)}, \quad \widehat{M}_j^{(3)} \equiv \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{X}_{j+1} \widehat{Z}_{j+2}, \quad (\text{B22d})$$

at the corner $(\pi/1, 1)$ with $c = 3$ and $b_c = 0, 3$ for PBC and OBC, respectively, and

$$\widehat{C}_j = \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{X}_{j+1} \widehat{X}_{j+2} \widehat{Z}_{j+3} \equiv \widehat{M}_j^{(3)} \widehat{M}_{j+1}^{(3)}, \quad \widehat{M}_j^{(3)} \equiv \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{Y}_{j+1} \widehat{Z}_{j+2}, \quad (\text{B22e})$$

at the corner (0,1) with $c = 3$ and $b_c = 0, 3$ for PBC and OBC, respectively. As \widehat{C}_j is Hermitean and squares to the identity, its eigenvalues are ± 1 . As any pair $\widehat{C}_j, \widehat{C}_{j'}$ commutes for any pair of sites j, j' , all \widehat{C}_j labeled by j can be simultaneously diagonalized. As the product of all \widehat{C}_j labeled by $j = 1, \dots, 2N$ is the identity, only $2N - 1$ of the $2N$ operators \widehat{C}_j with $j = 1, \dots, 2N$ are independent. To identify the last quantum number that is needed to label all the energy eigenstates, we observe that $\widehat{M}_j^{(3)}$ is Hermitean, squares to the identity, and commutes with $\widehat{M}_{j'}^{(3)}$ for any $j, j' = 1, \dots, 2N$. Hence, all 2^{2N} energy eigenvalues and energy eigenfunctions of $\widehat{H}_c^{(b_c)}$ are given by

$$E_{\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{2N-1}}^{(b_c)} = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-b_c} c_j, \quad \mathbf{m}_1 = \pm 1, \quad c_j = \pm 1, \quad \mathbf{c}_{2N} = \prod_{j=1}^{2N-1} c_j, \quad (\text{B23a})$$

and

$$|E_{\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{2N-1}}^{(b_c)}\rangle \equiv |\mathbf{m}_1, \mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{2N-1}\rangle, \quad (\text{B23b})$$

respectively, where $\mathbf{m}_1 = \pm 1$ is the eigenvalue of $\widehat{M}_1^{(c)}$ and $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{2N-1} = \pm 1$ are the $2N - 1$ independent eigenvalues of the independent operators $\widehat{C}_1, \dots, \widehat{C}_{2N-1}$. As the energy eigenvalues are independent of the quantum number

$m_1 = \pm 1$, it follows that all energy eigenstates are at least two-fold degenerate for any number of sites $2N$ and for both PBC and OPB. For PBC, one finds the equally spaced energy eigenvalues ²

$$E_n^{(0)} = - \left(2N - 2n - 2\delta_{c_{2N,+1}} \right), \quad (\text{B24a})$$

whereby the label $n = 0, 1, \dots, 2N - 1$ is the number of $c_j = +1$ for $j = 1, \dots, 2N - 1$ and with the degeneracies

$$d_n^{(0)} = 2 \times \frac{(2N - 1)!}{n! (2N - 1 - n)!}, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, 2N - 1. \quad (\text{B24b})$$

For OBC, one finds instead the equally spaced energy eigenvalues

$$E_n^{(c)} = - (2N - c - 2n), \quad (\text{B25a})$$

with $n = 0, \dots, 2N - c$ the number of $c_j = +1$ for $j = 1, \dots, 2N - c$. The degeneracy $d_n^{(c)}$ of the eigenvalue $E_n^{(c)}$ is the factor 2^c (that accounts for the fact that $E_n^{(c)}$ does not depend on $m_1, c_{2N-c+1}, \dots, c_{2N-1}$) times the number of ways to choose n out of $2N - c$, namely,

$$d_n^{(c)} = 2 \times 2^{c-1} \times \frac{(2N - c)!}{n! (2N - c - n)!}, \quad n = 0, \dots, 2N - c. \quad (\text{B25b})$$

With PBC, the degeneracy $d_n^{(0)}$ for any finite size $2N$ is an artifact of the integrability of Hamiltonian (B22a). As soon as one moves away from the corners of the phase diagram in Fig. 5, the degeneracy $d_n^{(0)}$ is completely lifted by the fact that the Hamiltonian (A1) is not the sum of pairwise commuting operators anymore. All eigenstates are non-degenerate for any finite size $2N$ and it is only in the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$ that a minimum degeneracy of two is recovered sufficiently close to the corners of the phase diagram in Fig. 5.

2. Gapless unstable fixed-points

The locations of the four unstable gapless fixed points in the phase diagram 5 can be understood as the fixed points under the two unitary transformations (B2). We claim that any pair of these four unstable gapless fixed points are distinct.

To show this, we focus first on the \hat{U}_R operator, that interchanges the pair of Neel_x (Neel_x^{SPT}) and Neel_y (Neel_y^{SPT}) orders. This operator also exchanges the pair of symmetry operators \hat{X} and \hat{Y} according to (B9). Consider any Hamiltonian that commutes with \hat{X} , \hat{Y} , and \hat{U}_R , as is the case along the line $\theta = \pi/4$. Consequently, there cannot be a symmetry breaking pattern by which a \hat{U}_R -symmetric ground state of an \hat{U}_R -symmetric Hamiltonian breaks spontaneously the symmetry generated by \hat{X} , while preserving the symmetry generated by \hat{Y} , or vice versa. Any \hat{U}_R -symmetric ground state of an \hat{U}_R -symmetric Hamiltonian must either break spontaneously or preserve simultaneously both the \hat{X} and \hat{Y} symmetries. For any boundary conditions ($b = 0, 1$), the \hat{U}_R -symmetric fixed-point Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_b(\pi/4, 0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{2N-b} \left(\hat{X}_j \hat{X}_{j+1} + \hat{Y}_j \hat{Y}_{j+1} \right), \quad (\text{B26a})$$

corresponds to the isotropic point of the spin-1/2 quantum XY model and thus realizes the scenario by which the ground state is symmetric under the group generated by both \hat{X} and \hat{Y} and non-degenerate for any finite chain of length $2N$ for any boundary conditions ($b = 0, 1$), while gapless in the thermodynamic limit. The low-energy theory is described by a conformal field theory (CFT) with central charge $c = 1$. Being unitarily equivalent by \hat{U}_E to this fixed-point when PBC are chosen, the \hat{U}_R -symmetric fixed-point Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_b(\pi/4, 1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{2N-3b} \hat{Z}_j \left(\hat{X}_{j+1} \hat{X}_{j+2} + \hat{Y}_{j+1} \hat{Y}_{j+2} \right) \hat{Z}_{j+3}, \quad (\text{B26b})$$

² Notice the following subtlety. In the case n odd, the constraint $c_{2N} = \prod_{j=1}^{2N-1} c_j$ always enforces $c_{2N} = +1$ so that an additional

degeneracy arises from the equality of the energies $E_{2m-1} = E_{2m}$ for any $m = 1, 2, \dots$

also realizes the scenario by which the ground state is symmetric under the group generated by both \widehat{X} and \widehat{Y} , non-degenerate and gapped for any finite chain of length $2N$ for PBC ($b = 0$), while gapless in the thermodynamic limit. Hereto, the low-energy theory is described by a CFT with central charge $c = 1$ when PBC are selected. Since both Hamiltonians (B26a) and (B26b) describe transitions between gapped phases that are identical from the SPT classification point of view, but support distinct long-range orders, the two gapless fixed points are examples of deconfined quantum critical points (DQCP).

The distinction between the DQCP at $(\pi/4, 0)$ and $(\pi/4, 1)$ becomes apparent when OBC are chosen. In this case, for any finite value of the chain length $2N$, Hamiltonian (B26a) supports a non-degenerate ground state, whereas Hamiltonian (B26b) supports fourfold-degenerate ground states, owing to the presence of boundary zero modes. Hence, the gapless fixed-point Hamiltonian (B26b) can be thought of as realizing a DQCP with non-trivial symmetry fractionalization compared to the gapless fixed-point Hamiltonian (B26a). We will argue on the basis of numerics in the next section that, as we tune λ away from $\lambda = 1$, the effect of the small perturbation (B26a) on the unperturbed Hamiltonian (B26b) is to lower the ground-state degeneracy of four of Hamiltonian (B26b) to a ground-state degeneracy of two when OBC are selected for any finite value of the chain length $2N$. Furthermore, when λ is lowered from the value $\lambda = 1$ below a value at which three distinct phases meet, there is a quantum phase transition to an extended gapless phase that breaks spontaneously down to the identity the non-Abelian symmetry group present along the $\theta = \pi/4$ line that is generated by \widehat{X} , \widehat{Y} , \widehat{T} , and \widehat{U}_R .

The remaining two unstable fixed-points are located at the \widehat{U}_E -symmetric points $(0, 1/2)$ and $(\pi/2, 1/2)$, the end points of the line ($\lambda = 1/2$, $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2$) along which Hamiltonian (A1) has an enlarged non-Abelian symmetry group that is generated by \widehat{X} , \widehat{Y} , \widehat{T} , and \widehat{U}_E when PBC ($b = 0$) are selected. At these fixed points [which are \widehat{U}_E -symmetric for PBC ($b = 0$)], Hamiltonian (A1) becomes

$$\widehat{H}_b(0, 1/2) = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-b} \widehat{X}_j \widehat{X}_{j+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{2N-3b} \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{X}_{j+1} \widehat{X}_{j+2} \widehat{Z}_{j+3}, \quad (\text{B27a})$$

$$\widehat{H}_b(\pi/2, 1/2) = \sum_{j=1}^{2N-b} \widehat{Y}_j \widehat{Y}_{j+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{2N-3b} \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{Y}_{j+1} \widehat{Y}_{j+2} \widehat{Z}_{j+3}, \quad (\text{B27b})$$

respectively. Hamiltonians (B27a) and (B27b) are unitarily equivalent under the action of \widehat{U}_R for any boundary conditions ($b = 0, 1$). Application of the Jordan-Wigner transformation to $\widehat{H}_b(0, 1/2)$ [and hence $\widehat{H}_b(\pi/2, 1/2)$] yields a strongly interacting Majorana chain. We could not show by analytical means that this strongly interacting Majorana chain realizes a CFT at low energies.

Instead, we shall present numerical evidences that support the conjecture that, in the thermodynamic limit, $\widehat{H}_b(0, 1/2)$ [and hence $\widehat{H}_b(\pi/2, 1/2)$] realizes a continuous phase transition with two attributes of a CFT, namely a dynamical exponent $z = 1$ and a central charge $c = 1$. Finite-size corrections and incommensuration effects for both OBC and PBC were too strong to estimate scaling exponents entering two-point functions at criticality or the onset of long-range order away from criticality.

The phase boundaries $(0, 1/2)$ and $(\pi/2, 1/2)$ each realize simultaneously a DQCP and a quantum topological phase transition (QTPT). This can be understood from the presence of the \widehat{U}_E symmetry when PBC ($b = 0$) are selected, which not only exchanges the Neel_x and Neel_y orders, but also exchanges the topological attribute realized by the quantum spin-1/2 $c = 1$ cluster ring with that realized by the quantum spin-1/2 $c = 3$ cluster ring. In fact, the presence of the \widehat{U}_E symmetry obeyed by both Hamiltonians (B27a) and (B27b) when PBC ($b = 0$) are selected puts a stronger constraint than the presence of the \widehat{U}_R symmetry obeyed by both Hamiltonians (B26a) and (B26b). According to Eq. (B2), the unitary symmetry \widehat{U}_E is nothing but the composition of $\widehat{U}_{\pi/2}$ with the generator $\widehat{U}_{CZ} \widehat{X}$ of the so-called CZX symmetry, which was first introduced in Ref. [63]. The latter is known to be an anomalous symmetry, i.e., any Hamiltonian that commutes with the CZX operator \widehat{U}_{CZ} cannot have a non-degenerate and gapped ground state [63–65], unlike with a \widehat{U}_R -symmetric Hamiltonian. The additional composition with the generator $\widehat{U}_{\pi/2}$ of the \widehat{U}_R symmetry does not change the anomaly associated to the CZX symmetry. Hence, the gaplessness of the two presumed DQCP at $(0, 1/2)$ and $(\pi/2, 1/2)$ is consistent with the presence of the anomalous \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry generated by \widehat{U}_E when PBC ($b = 0$) are selected. The two DQCP (B27a) and (B27b) are not to be distinguished by their boundary signatures. Rather, they are to be distinguished by the fact that they are related by the unitary \widehat{U}_R , which does not commute with the global $\mathbb{Z}_2^X \times \mathbb{Z}_2^Y$ symmetry.

Appendix C: Numerics

We have studied Hamiltonian (A1) through exact diagonalization (ED) and density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) with either open boundary conditions (OBC) or periodic boundary conditions (PBC).

The DMRG study was mostly done with the Julia library ITensor. The input to DMRG is an initial variational state $|\Psi_{\text{ini}}\rangle$ in the form of a matrix product state. The output after n DMRG sweeps is the state $|\Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]}\rangle$. The desired state $|\Psi\rangle$ is the state $|\Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]}\rangle$ such that the three conditions

$$\left\langle \Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]} \left| \left[\widehat{H}_b(\theta, \lambda) - \left\langle \Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]} \left| \widehat{H}(\theta, \lambda) \right| \Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]} \right\rangle \right] \right| \Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]} \right\rangle < \epsilon_{\text{variance}}, \quad (\text{C1a})$$

$$\left| \left\langle \Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]} \left| \widehat{H}_b(\theta, \lambda) \right| \Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]} \right\rangle - \left\langle \Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n-1]} \left| \widehat{H}_b(\theta, \lambda) \right| \Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n-1]} \right\rangle \right| < \epsilon_{\text{energy}}, \quad (\text{C1b})$$

$$\left| \max_l S_{\Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]}}(l) - \max_l S_{\Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n-1]}}(l) \right| < \epsilon_{\text{entropy}}, \quad (\text{C1c})$$

hold. Here, the entanglement entropy $S_{\Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]}}(l)$ for the state $|\Psi_{\text{ini}}^{[n]}\rangle$ is defined in Eq. (C71). Unless stated otherwise, we choose

$$\epsilon_{\text{variance}} = 10^{-6}, \quad \epsilon_{\text{energy}} = 10^{-9}, \quad \epsilon_{\text{entropy}} = 10^{-6}. \quad (\text{C1d})$$

1. Five phases

We begin the study of Hamiltonian (A1) by examining the fate of the four gapped phases labeled by squares and the four fixed points labeled by circles in Fig. 5.

The phase boundaries of the four phases adiabatically connected to the corners of the phase diagram in Fig. 5 are identified as the loci in coupling space where the degeneracies of the ground states in the thermodynamic limit change. To estimate the location of these phase boundaries, we have diagonalized Hamiltonian (A1) with PBC for $2N = 10$ sites and counted the eigenenergies within a window of energy $\Delta\varepsilon = 0.3 > 1/(2N)$ above the ground-state energy, as shown in Fig. 6(a). A less precise estimate can also be obtained by diagonalizing the Hamiltonian with OBC for $2N = 10$ sites and by counting the eigenenergies within a smaller window of energy $\Delta\varepsilon = 0.2 > 1/(2N)$ above the ground-state energy, as shown in Fig. 6(b). Through this analysis, we have identified a fifth phase centered around $(\pi/4, 1/2)$, shaped like a diamond, with a degeneracy of two under both PBC and OBC.

According to the transformation laws (B2) of Hamiltonian (A1a) under the unitary transformations \widehat{U}_{R} and \widehat{U}_{E} defined in Eq. (B1) that apply for PBC, any point in the phase diagram in Fig. 5 has the same ground-state degeneracy as its image under (i) a π -rotation about the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the phase diagram and (ii) a reflection about the line $(\pi/4, \lambda)$ of the phase diagram. In contrast, under OBC, any point in the phase diagram in Fig. 5 has the same ground-state degeneracy as its image solely under a reflection about the line $(\pi/4, \lambda)$ in Fig. 5. We have confirmed numerically these two predictions using ED in Figs. 6(a) and 6(b), respectively. This π -rotational relation is reduced to a mirror symmetry along the U(1)-symmetric line $(\pi/4, \lambda)$ under OBC, as \widehat{U}_{E} is no longer a symmetry of Hamiltonian (A1) [see Fig. 6(b)]. The loss of the \widehat{U}_{E} symmetry under OBC allows for the area labeled Neel_x or Neel_y to be larger than the area labeled $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ or $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ in Fig. 6(b) for any given finite number of sites $2N$.

We have confirmed numerically using DMRG the expectation that there are four antiferromagnetic Ising-like gapped phases, each smoothly connected to one of the four corners of Fig. 5. These phases are identified as Neel_x , Neel_y , $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$, and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$, labeled counterclockwise starting from the point $(0, 0)$ in Fig. 5. Additionally, we have determined the nature of the phase labeled FM_z in Fig. 5. To achieve these conclusions, we define a set of observables that will serve as probes throughout our exploration of the phase diagram in Fig. 5.

a. Order parameters and correlation functions

Label with $\alpha = x, y, z$ the X -, Y -, Z -axis in spin space, respectively. For each $\alpha = x, y, z$, define on the site j the Pauli operator

$$\widehat{\sigma}_j^\alpha := \begin{cases} \widehat{X}_j, & \alpha = x, \\ \widehat{Y}_j, & \alpha = y, \\ \widehat{Z}_j, & \alpha = z, \end{cases} \quad (\text{C2})$$




FIG. 6. (Color online) (a) Number n of eigenenergies E_m with an energy smaller than $E_0 + \Delta\varepsilon$, where E_0 is the ground state energy calculated using ED with PBC for $2N = 10$ sites, $\Delta\varepsilon = 0.3$, and the integer $0 \leq m < n$. We also quote the value of n for the five distinct phases computed with OBC in parentheses. (b) Number n of eigenenergies E_m with an energy smaller than $E_0 + \Delta\varepsilon$, where E_0 is the ground state energy calculated using ED with OBC for $2N = 10$ sites, $\Delta\varepsilon = 0.2$, and the integer $0 \leq m < n$. We also quote the value of n for the five distinct phases computed with PBC in parentheses. Under OBC, we observe very strong finite-size effects that not only broadens the width but also moves the position of the putative phase transition.

in the X -, Y -, Z -axis in spin space, respectively.

For any state $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^{2N}}$, with $\mathbb{C}^{2^{2N}}$ the domain of definition of Hamiltonian (A1), the following correlation functions are defined.

For any $\alpha = x, y, z$, the two-point correlation function C^α , the connected component of the two-point correlation function $C^{\alpha,c}$, and the dressed two-point correlation function $C^{\text{SPT},\alpha}$ in the state $|\Psi\rangle$ are defined by the expectation values

$$C_{j_0, j_0+s}^\alpha[\Psi] := \langle \Psi | \hat{\sigma}_{j_0}^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+s}^\alpha | \Psi \rangle, \quad (\text{C3a})$$

$$C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{\alpha,c}[\Psi] := \langle \Psi | \hat{\sigma}_{j_0}^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+s}^\alpha | \Psi \rangle - \langle \Psi | \hat{\sigma}_{j_0}^\alpha | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+s}^\alpha | \Psi \rangle, \quad (\text{C3b})$$

$$C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{\text{SPT},\alpha}[\Psi] := \langle \Psi | (\hat{\sigma}_{j_0-1}^z \hat{\sigma}_{j_0}^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+1}^z) (\hat{\sigma}_{j_0-1+s}^z \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+s}^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+1+s}^z) | \Psi \rangle, \quad (\text{C3c})$$

respectively. When OBC are selected, these two-point correlation functions depend on both j_0 and $j_0 + s$. Notice that $C^{\text{SPT},\alpha}$ is the correlation between two monomials of order three. For $\alpha = x, y$, the correlation $C^{\text{SPT},\alpha}$ is the relevant order parameter for one of the SPT phases governed by the $c = 3$ cluster spin-1/2 chain (B10a) and (B10b) in the phase diagram shown in Fig. 5. The correlation function $C^{\text{SPT},\alpha}$ in Eq. (C3c) for $\alpha = x, y$ is obtained by conjugation of the spin operators by \hat{U}_{CZ} on the right-hand side of Eq. (C3a),

$$\begin{aligned} C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{\text{SPT},\alpha}[\Psi] &= \left\langle \Psi \left| (\hat{\sigma}_{j_0-1}^z \hat{\sigma}_{j_0}^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+1}^z) (\hat{\sigma}_{j_0-1+s}^z \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+s}^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+1+s}^z) \right| \Psi \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \Psi \left| (\hat{U}_{\text{CZ}} \hat{\sigma}_{j_0}^\alpha \hat{U}_{\text{CZ}}^\dagger) (\hat{U}_{\text{CZ}} \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+s}^\alpha \hat{U}_{\text{CZ}}^\dagger) \right| \Psi \right\rangle \\ &= \left(\left\langle \Psi \left| \hat{U}_{\text{CZ}} \right. \right\rangle \hat{\sigma}_{j_0}^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+s}^\alpha \left(\hat{U}_{\text{CZ}}^\dagger \left| \Psi \right\rangle \right) \right) \\ &\equiv \left\langle \Psi_{\text{CZ}} \left| \hat{\sigma}_{j_0}^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+s}^\alpha \right| \Psi_{\text{CZ}} \right\rangle \\ &= C_{j_0, j_0+s}^\alpha[\Psi_{\text{CZ}}]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

For any $r = 1, 2, \dots$, we also define the expectation value $G^{r,\alpha}$ of r -string operators in the state $|\Psi\rangle$ by the expectation value

$$G_{j_0, \dots, j_0+r-1}^{r,\alpha}[\Psi] := \begin{cases} \langle \Psi | \hat{\sigma}_{j_0}^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+1}^\alpha | \Psi \rangle, & r = 2, \\ \langle \Psi | \hat{\sigma}_{j_0}^z \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+1}^\alpha \cdots \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+r-2}^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j_0+r-1}^z | \Psi \rangle, & r > 2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{C5})$$

These string-expectation values are used to identify the topological character of the state $|\Psi\rangle$.

Finally, for any $\alpha = x, y, z$, the uniform (FM) magnetization m_{uni}^α , the staggered (AFM) magnetization m_{sta}^α , the uniform (FM) SPT magnetization $m_{\text{uni,SPT}}^\alpha$, and the staggered (AFM) SPT magnetization $m_{\text{sta,SPT}}^\alpha$ in the state $|\Psi\rangle$ are defined by the expectation values³

$$m_{\text{uni}}^\alpha[\Psi] := \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^{2N} \langle \Psi | \hat{\sigma}_j^\alpha | \Psi \rangle, \quad (\text{C6a})$$

$$m_{\text{sta}}^\alpha[\Psi] := \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^{2N} (-1)^j \langle \Psi | \hat{\sigma}_j^\alpha | \Psi \rangle, \quad (\text{C6b})$$

$$m_{\text{uni,SPT}}^\alpha[\Psi] := \frac{1}{2N-2b} \sum_{j=1+b}^{2N-b} \langle \Psi | \hat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z \hat{\sigma}_j^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z | \Psi \rangle, \quad (\text{C6c})$$

$$m_{\text{sta,SPT}}^\alpha[\Psi] := \frac{1}{2N-2b} \sum_{j=1+b}^{2N-b} (-1)^j \langle \Psi | \hat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z \hat{\sigma}_j^\alpha \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z | \Psi \rangle, \quad (\text{C6d})$$

respectively. The parameter $b = 0$ (1) dictates the choice of PBC (OBC). One verifies that

$$m_{\text{uni,SPT}}^\alpha[\Psi] = m_{\text{uni}}^\alpha[\Psi_{\text{CZ}}], \quad m_{\text{sta,SPT}}^\alpha[\Psi] = m_{\text{sta}}^\alpha[\Psi_{\text{CZ}}], \quad |\Psi_{\text{CZ}}\rangle = \hat{U}_{\text{CZ}}^\dagger |\Psi\rangle, \quad \alpha = x, y, \quad (\text{C7})$$

hold for PBC. We shall use the short-hand notation

$$\langle \cdot \rangle_\Psi \equiv \langle \Psi | \cdot | \Psi \rangle \quad (\text{C8})$$

for any expectation value in the state $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^{2N}}$.

Figure 7 serves as a guide in the exploration of the five phases of Hamiltonian (A1) with the help of numerical estimates for the thermodynamic limit of the order parameters (C6) and of the correlation functions (C3) and (C5). We hereby define the space average

$$\overline{G^{r,\alpha}}[\Psi] := \frac{1}{N-r+1} \sum_{j_0=1}^{N-r+1} G_{j_0, \dots, j_0+r-1}^{r,\alpha}[\Psi] \quad (\text{C9})$$

for any state $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^{2N}}$. This correlation function is useful when choosing OBC.

b. The Neel_x phase

The Neel_x phase is the only one of the four gapped phases for which it is possible to find a ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ such that, in the thermodynamic limit,

$$\overline{G^{2,x}}[\Psi] \neq 0, \quad \overline{G^{2,y}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad \overline{G^{4,x}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad \overline{G^{4,y}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad (\text{C10})$$

in Fig. 7.

With PBC, any one of the four corners in Fig. 5 is unitarily equivalent to a classical antiferromagnetic nearest-neighbor Ising chain with the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0(0,0)$ defined in Eq. (B6a).

³ We do not index m_{uni}^α and m_{sta}^α with the label $b = 0, 1$ defining the boundary conditions, as m_{uni}^α and m_{sta}^α were independent of

$b = 0, 1$ when non-vanishing.




FIG. 7. (Color online) The dependence on θ and λ of (a) $\overline{G^{2,x}}[\Psi]$, (b) $\overline{G^{2,y}}[\Psi]$, (c) $\overline{G^{2,z}}[\Psi]$, (d) $\overline{G^{4,x}}[\Psi]$, (e) $\overline{G^{4,y}}[\Psi]$, (f) $\overline{G^{4,z}}[\Psi]$, (g) $\overline{G^{6,z}}[\Psi]$, (h) $\overline{G^{8,z}}[\Psi]$, and (i) $\overline{G^{10,z}}[\Psi]$, defined in Eqs. (C5) and (C9), is shown through intensity plots. Here, the state $|\Psi\rangle$ that approximates the ground state is computed using DMRG for a chain of length $2N = 128$ with OBC. The bond dimension $\chi = 128$ is used in the DMRG.

For the classical antiferromagnetic nearest-neighbor Ising chain $\hat{H}_0(0,0)$, all ordered energy eigenvalues

$$E_0 \leq E_1 \leq \dots \leq E_n \leq E_{n+1} \leq \dots \quad (\text{C11})$$

with the orthonormal eigenfunctions

$$|\Psi_0\rangle, |\Psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\Psi_n\rangle, |\Psi_{n+1}\rangle, \dots \quad (\text{C12})$$

are at least two-fold degenerate, for any spin configuration must share the same energy as the one obtained by reversing the direction of all spins through the operation of time reversal \hat{T} . Moreover, any two distinct but consecutive energy




FIG. 8. (Color online) The case of OBC. Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy spacings $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, 3$, above the ground-state energy E_0 obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 128$) for (a) the point $(0, 0)$ and (b) the point $(\pi/20, 1/10)$ in the Neel_x phase from Fig. 5.




FIG. 9. (Color online) The case of PBC. Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy spacings $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, 3$, above the ground-state energy E_0 obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 128$) for (a) the point $(0, 0)$ and (b) the point $(\pi/20, 1/10)$ in the Neel_x phase from Fig. 5.

eigenvalues are equally spaced. This spacing is the gap $\Delta_0(0, 0)$ that can be computed from subtracting the energy of any one of the two Neel_x states ⁴

$$|\Psi_0\rangle := |\leftarrow\rightarrow \cdots \leftarrow\rightarrow \leftarrow\rightarrow \leftarrow\rightarrow \cdots \leftarrow\rightarrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C13a})$$

$$|\Psi_1\rangle := \hat{T} |\Psi_0\rangle, \quad \hat{T} |\rightarrow\rangle = i |\leftarrow\rangle, \quad \hat{T} |\leftarrow\rangle = -i |\rightarrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C13b})$$

in the basis for which

$$\hat{\sigma}_j^x |\rightarrow\rangle_j = + |\rightarrow\rangle_j, \quad (\text{C13c})$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_j^x |\leftarrow\rangle_j = - |\leftarrow\rangle_j, \quad (\text{C13d})$$

from the energy of one of the excited states, say

$$|\Psi_2\rangle := \begin{cases} |\leftarrow\rightarrow \cdots \leftarrow\rightarrow \leftarrow\rightarrow \rightarrow\leftarrow \rightarrow\leftarrow \cdots \rightarrow\leftarrow\rangle, & \text{for OBC,} \\ |\leftarrow\rightarrow \cdots \leftarrow\rightarrow \rightarrow\leftarrow \leftarrow\rightarrow \leftarrow\rightarrow \cdots \leftarrow\rightarrow\rangle, & \text{for PBC,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C13e})$$

$$|\Psi_3\rangle := \hat{T} |\Psi_2\rangle, \quad (\text{C13f})$$

⁴ The state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is the representation in the basis that diagonalizes $\hat{\sigma}_j^x$ of the state $|\text{Neel}_x, +\rangle$ defined by Eq. (B6c) in the basis that

diagonalizes $\hat{\sigma}_j^z$

The existence of the energy gap $E_2 - E_1$ guarantees the stability of the Neel_x phase in the phase diagram in Fig. 5.

The energy with respect of Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}_1(0, 0)$ of the Neel_x state (C13a) and its time-reversed counterpart (C13b) is that of the twofold-degenerate ground-state energy $E_0 = E_1$ of $\widehat{H}_1(0, 0)$. Under OBC, this energy is [see Eq. (B25)]

$$E_0 = -2N + 1 \quad (\text{C14a})$$

for $\widehat{H}_1(0, 0)$ and it is the reference energy in Fig. 8. Under PBC, this energy is [see Eq. (B24)]

$$E_0 = -2N \quad (\text{C14b})$$

for $\widehat{H}_0(0, 0)$ and it is the reference energy in Fig. 9. The first excited state defined in Eq. (C13e) of Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}_1(0, 0)$ is [see Eq. (B25)]

$$E_2 = -2N + 3 \quad (\text{C15a})$$

when OBC are chosen. It follows that the differences in the energies $E_1 - E_0$ and $E_2 - E_1$ of Fig. 8(a) are independent of $2N$. The first excited state defined in Eq. (C13e) of Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}_0(0, 0)$ is [see Eq. (B24)]

$$E_2 = -2N + 4 \quad (\text{C15b})$$

when PBC are chosen. Hereto, it follows that the differences in the energies $E_1 - E_0$ and $E_2 - E_1$ of Fig. 9(a) are independent of $2N$. The dependence on the choice between OBC and PBC for the value of $E_2 - E_1$ can be understood as follows. Under OBC, excitations can support an odd number of domain walls, e.g., Eq. (C13e), with each domain wall contributing the energy +2, e.g., Fig. 8(a). In contrast, under PBC, excitations must support an even number of domain walls, e.g., Eq. (C13e), with each domain wall contributing an energy of +2, e.g., Fig. 9(a). This difference in the structure of the excitations affects the degeneracy of the excitation energy E_2 . For OBC, the degeneracy for the lowest lying excited states is ⁵

$$2(2N - 1). \quad (\text{C16a})$$

For PBC, the degeneracy for the lowest lying excited states is ⁶

$$2N(2N - 1). \quad (\text{C16b})$$

These distinctions highlight the significant impact of boundary conditions on the energy eigenvalue spectrum and the corresponding physical properties of the Neel_x phase.

When moving slightly away from the corner (0, 0) in Fig. 5, the Neel_x state (C13a) and its time-reversed counterpart (C13b) are no longer exact ground states. Moreover, for any finite number $2N$ of sites, the energy E_0 is strictly lower than the energy E_1 of the first excited state. However, the energy spacing $E_1 - E_0$ between the ground state energy E_0 and the first excited state energy E_1 is observed numerically to vanish exponentially fast with $2N$ so that a two-fold degeneracy of the ground state is recovered in the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$. For example, for a chain made of $2N = 32$ sites at $(\pi/20, 1/10)$, $E_1 - E_0 \approx 0$ within numerical precision under both PBC and OBC.

We have tracked the excitation energy E_2 , which remains non-degenerate with E_0 in the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$, upon approaching the phase boundary to the Neel_x phase. The energy gap $E_2 - E_1$ at $(\pi/20, 1/10)$ is smaller than the energy gap $E_2 - E_1$ at (0, 0) for any system size $2N$. This difference is evident when comparing Figs. 8(a) and 8(b) for OBC and in Figs. 9(a) and 9(b) for PBC. This difference aligns with the expectation of a gap closing upon exiting the Neel_x phase.

At the corner (0, 0), the two orthogonal ground states $|\Psi_0\rangle$ and $|\Psi_1\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (A1) exhibit the staggered magnetization

$$|m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]| = |m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_1]| = 1, \quad (\text{C17a})$$

⁵ With OBC, select either one of the two ground states $|\Psi_0\rangle$ or $|\Psi_1\rangle$ by fixing the eigenvalue of \widehat{X}_1 on the first site. There are “choose one sites out of $2N - 1$ sites” ways of creating one domain wall labeled by $j = 2, \dots, 2N$ by reversing the eigenvalues of \widehat{X}_k for all $k = j, j + 1, \dots, 2N$. This is the degeneracy $d_1^{(1)}$ defined in Eq. (B25b)

⁶ With PBC, starting from either the classical antiferromagnetic states $|\Psi_0\rangle$ or $|\Psi_1\rangle$, there are “choose two sites out of $2N$ sites”

ways of creating two domain walls labeled by $j = 1, \dots, 2N$ and $j' = j + 1, \dots, 2N$ by reversing the eigenvalues of \widehat{X}_k with $j \leq k \leq j'$. The same degeneracy $2N(2N - 1)$ is obtained from observing that $E_n^{(0)} = E_{n+1}^{(0)}$ for $n = 1, 3, 5, \dots, 2N - 5, 2N - 3$ in Eq. (B24a) to derive the number of ways there are to insert two domain walls by adding $d_2^{(0)}$ to $d_1^{(0)}$ defined in Eq. (B24b)

indicating perfect classical (Neel_x) antiferromagnetic order. This is shown in Fig. 10(a) for OBC and in Fig. 11(a) for PBC. More specifically, the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ in Eq. (C13a) has the staggered magnetization

$$m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0] = +1, \quad (\text{C17b})$$

while its time-reversed image $|\Psi_1\rangle$ in Eq. (C13b) has the staggered magnetization

$$m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_1] = -1. \quad (\text{C17c})$$

The states $|\Psi_0\rangle$ in Eq. (C13a) and $|\Psi_1\rangle$ in Eq. (C13b) define an orthonormal basis for the ground states of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0(0,0)$. Another basis of this two-dimensional subspace associated with the eigenvalues $E_0 = E_1$ is formed by the cat states $|\Psi_+\rangle$ and $|\Psi_-\rangle$ defined by

$$|\Psi_{\pm}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\Psi_0\rangle \pm |\Psi_1\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{\mathbb{1}} \pm \hat{T}) |\Psi_0\rangle. \quad (\text{C18})$$

It follows that both states $|\Psi_{\pm}\rangle$ obey (here we make use of the hypothesis that $2N$ is even to deduce that $\hat{T}^2 = \hat{\mathbb{1}}$)

$$\hat{T} |\Psi_{\pm}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{T} \pm \hat{T}^2) |\Psi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{T} \pm \hat{\mathbb{1}}) |\Psi_0\rangle = \pm |\Psi_{\pm}\rangle. \quad (\text{C19})$$

As $|\Psi_{\pm}\rangle$ are symmetric and antisymmetric linear combinations of orthonormal eigenstates of opposite staggered magnetization

$$m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0] = -m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_1], \quad (\text{C20})$$

the staggered magnetization of $|\Psi_{\pm}\rangle$ vanishes for any finite system size $2N$, i.e.,

$$m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_{\pm}] = 0. \quad (\text{C21})$$

For any finite number of sites $2N$, it is only at the corner $(0,0)$ of the Neel_x phase that it is possible to choose a ground state with non-vanishing magnetization, for it is only there in the Neel_x phase that the ground state is exactly two-fold degenerate. For any finite number of sites $2N$ and at any point in the Neel_x phase distinct from the corner $(0,0)$, the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is a non-degenerate eigenstate of \hat{T} , and thus exhibits $m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0] = 0$. This prevents a priori the use of $m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]$ as a probe to locate the phase transition upon exiting the Neel_x phase.

In DMRG, the initial state is chosen such that it is not an eigenstate of the time-reversal operator \hat{T} . Consequently, the DMRG state $|\Psi_0^{\text{DMRG}}\rangle$ that approximates the energy of the true ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ to exponential accuracy can exhibit a non-vanishing value for $m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0^{\text{DMRG}}]$ and can be used as a probe to survey the extend of the Neel_x phase. In effect, DMRG mimics the standard procedure in statistical physics to detect spontaneous symmetry breaking by which (i) the order parameter is coupled linearly to a source that is then added to the Hamiltonian in order the break explicitly the symmetry that is broken spontaneously by the order parameter acquiring a non-vanishing expectation value, (ii) the thermodynamic limit is taken, and (iii) the source is switched off, i.e.,

$$m_{\text{sta}}^x := \lim_{B \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^{2N} (-1)^j \langle \hat{\sigma}_j^x \rangle_{\beta, B}, \quad (\text{C22a})$$

where

$$\langle \hat{\sigma}_j^x \rangle_{\beta, B} := \frac{\text{Tr} \left\{ e^{-\beta \left[\hat{H}_b(\theta, \lambda) - B \sum_{j=1}^{2N} (-1)^j \hat{\sigma}_j^x \right]} \hat{\sigma}_j^x \right\}}{\text{Tr} \left\{ e^{-\beta \left[\hat{H}_b(\theta, \lambda) - B \sum_{j=1}^{2N} (-1)^j \hat{\sigma}_j^x \right]} \right\}}. \quad (\text{C22b})$$

Henceforth, we will use the symbol Ψ_0 as a reference to the DMRG state that approximates the exact target eigenstate in the thermodynamic limit that breaks spontaneously time-reversal symmetry.

As stated earlier, when moving away from the corner $(0,0)$ in Fig. 5, the Neel_x state (C13a) and its time-reversed counterpart (C13b) are no longer exact ground states. However, sufficiently close to $(0,0)$, for instance at $(\pi/20, 1/10)$,




FIG. 10. (Color online) The case of OBC. Spin expectations values in the states obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 32$) as approximations to the exact eigenstates with energies (a) E_0 at $(0, 0)$, (d) E_0 at $(\pi/20, 1/10)$, (c) E_2 at $(0, 0)$, and (d) E_2 at $(\pi/20, 1/10)$.




FIG. 11. (Color online) The case of PBC. Spin expectations values in the states obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 32$) as approximations to the exact eigenstates with energies (a) E_0 at $(0, 0)$, (b) E_0 at $(\pi/20, 1/10)$, (c) E_2 at $(0, 0)$, and (d) E_2 at $(\pi/20, 1/10)$.

the DMRG approximation to the ground state of Hamiltonian (A1) remains qualitatively similar to the Neel_x states in the sense that it also supports a non-vanishing magnetization. The DMRG approximation $|\Psi_0\rangle$ to the ground state at $(\pi/20, 1/10)$ from Fig. 5 displays a reduced staggered magnetization of

$$|m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]| \simeq 0.99 < 1, \quad (\text{C23})$$

as shown for both OBC in Fig. 10(b) and PBC in Fig. 11(b), relative to the classical value of one at $(0, 0)$ from Fig. 5, shown in Fig. 10(a) for OBC and Fig. 11(a) for PBC. This reduction from the classical (Neel_x) value (C17) to $|m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]| \simeq 0.99$ reflects the effects of quantum fluctuations that arises as the first line on the right-hand side of Eq. (A1a) does not commute with the second line.

At the corner $(0, 0)$, the excited state $|\Psi_2\rangle$ with the energy E_2 in Eq. (C13e) supports one (two) domain wall(s) for OBC (PBC). The existence of the domain walls shows up in the dependence on j of the local expectation value

$$\langle \hat{X}_j \rangle_{\Psi_2} \equiv \langle \hat{\sigma}_j^x \rangle_{\Psi_2} := \langle \Psi_2 | \hat{\sigma}_j^x | \Psi_2 \rangle. \quad (\text{C24})$$

Whereas Fig. 10(a) shows the dependence $(-1)^j$ on j for $\langle \hat{X}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$, Fig. 10(c) shows one domain wall between $j = 2$ and $j = 3$ when OBC are selected. Similarly, whereas Fig. 11(a) shows the dependence $(-1)^j$ on j for $\langle \hat{X}_j \rangle_{\Psi_2}$, Fig. 11(c)

shows two domain walls; one located between $j = 32$ and $j = 1$ and one located between $j = 27$ and $j = 28$ when PBC are selected.

At $(\pi/20, 1/10)$ from Fig. 5, the dependence on j of the local spin expectation value $\langle \hat{X}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ is $0.99 \times (-1)^{j+1}$ for OBC in Fig. 10(b) and $0.99 \times (-1)^{j+1}$ for PBC in Fig. 11(b). At $(\pi/20, 1/10)$ from Fig. 5, the difference between OBC and PBC for the excited state $|\Psi_2\rangle$ with the energy E_2 is more subtle. For OBC, the single domain wall between $j = 16$ and $j = 17$ has a vanishing local magnetization that corresponds to the periodic modulation $\cos(\pi j/2N)$ present in $\langle \hat{X}_j \rangle_{\Psi_2}$, as can be seen in Fig. 10(d). For PBC, $\langle \hat{X}_j \rangle_{\Psi_2}$ is domain-wall free, it is only affected by the uniform suppression $|m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_2]| \simeq 0.87$ of its magnitude as is shown in Fig. 11(d).

c. The Neel_y phase

The Neel_y phase is the only one of the four gapped phases for which it is possible to find a ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ such that, in the thermodynamic limit,

$$\overline{G^{2,x}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad \overline{G^{2,y}}[\Psi] \neq 0, \quad \overline{G^{4,x}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad \overline{G^{4,y}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad (\text{C25})$$

in Fig. 7.

The unitary transformation \hat{U}_R defined in Eq. (B1a) realizes the reflection about the line $\theta = \pi/4$ from the phase diagram in Fig. 5 for both PBC and OBC, since

$$\hat{U}_R \hat{H}_b(\theta, \lambda) \hat{U}_R^\dagger = \hat{H}_b(\pi/2 - \theta, \lambda) \quad (\text{C26})$$

holds for $b = 0, 1$. Consequently, the numerical characterization of the Neel_x phase made in Sec. C1b must also hold for the Neel_y phase if the replacements

$$(\theta, \lambda) \rightarrow (\pi/2 - \theta, \lambda), \quad \hat{X}_j \rightarrow \hat{Y}_j, \quad m_{\text{sta}}^x \rightarrow m_{\text{sta}}^y, \quad (\text{C27})$$

are made. We have verified that both the ED and DMRG simulations agree with this prediction.

d. The Neel_x^{SPT} phase

The Neel_x^{SPT} phase is the only one of the four gapped phases for which it is possible to find a ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ such that, in the thermodynamic limit,

$$\overline{G^{2,x}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad \overline{G^{2,y}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad \overline{G^{4,x}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad \overline{G^{4,y}}[\Psi] \neq 0, \quad (\text{C28})$$

in Fig. 7.

The unitary transformation \hat{U}_E defined in Eq. (B1b) realizes the reflection about the line $\lambda = 1/2$ from the phase diagram in Fig. 5 for PBC, since

$$\hat{U}_E \hat{H}_{b=0}(\theta, \lambda) \hat{U}_E^\dagger = \hat{H}_{b=0}(\theta, 1/2 - \lambda) \quad (\text{C29})$$

holds if and only if $b = 0$. The composition $\hat{U}_{CZ} \equiv \hat{U}_E \hat{U}_R$ realizes the rotation by π about the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ from the phase diagram in Fig. 5 for PBC, since

$$\hat{U}_{CZ} \hat{H}_{b=0}(\theta, \lambda) \hat{U}_{CZ}^\dagger = \hat{H}_{b=0}(\pi/2 - \theta, 1/2 - \lambda) \quad (\text{C30})$$

holds if and only if $b = 0$. Hence, when PBC are imposed, the properties of the Neel_x^{SPT} phase are unitarily equivalent under conjugation by \hat{U}_{CZ} to the ones of the Neel_x phase.

After imposing PBC at the corner $(\pi/2, 1)$ from Fig. 5, we know from Sec. B1 that the ordered energy eigenvalues

$$E_0 \leq E_1 \leq \dots \leq E_n \leq E_{n+1} \leq \dots \quad (\text{C31})$$

with the orthonormal eigenfunctions

$$|\Psi_0\rangle, |\Psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\Psi_n\rangle, |\Psi_{n+1}\rangle, \dots \quad (\text{C32})$$

of Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}_0(\pi/2, 1)$ defined in Eq. (B10b), are at least two-fold degenerate for any number $2N$ of sites. Indeed, any “spin” configuration must share the same energy as the one obtained by reversing the direction of all “spins” through the operation of reversal of time \widehat{T} . Moreover, any two distinct but consecutive energy eigenvalues are equally spaced. This spacing is the gap $\Delta_0(\pi/2, 1) = \Delta_0(0, 0)$ that can be computed from subtracting the energy of any one of the two $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ states ⁷

$$|\Psi_0\rangle := |\Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \Leftrightarrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C33a})$$

$$|\Psi_1\rangle := \widehat{T} |\Psi_0\rangle, \quad \widehat{T} |\Rightarrow\rangle_j = \text{i} |\Leftarrow\rangle_j, \quad \widehat{T} |\Rightarrow\rangle_j = -\text{i} |\Leftarrow\rangle_j, \quad (\text{C33b})$$

in the “spin” basis for which

$$(\widehat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z \widehat{\sigma}_j^x \widehat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z) |\Rightarrow\rangle_j = + |\Rightarrow\rangle_j, \quad \widehat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z \widehat{\sigma}_j^x \widehat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z = \widehat{U}_{\text{CZ}} \widehat{\sigma}_j^x \widehat{U}_{\text{CZ}}^\dagger, \quad |\Rightarrow\rangle_j = \widehat{U}_{\text{CZ}} |\rightarrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C33c})$$

$$(\widehat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z \widehat{\sigma}_j^x \widehat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z) |\Leftarrow\rangle_j = - |\Leftarrow\rangle_j, \quad \widehat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z \widehat{\sigma}_j^x \widehat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z = \widehat{U}_{\text{CZ}} \widehat{\sigma}_j^x \widehat{U}_{\text{CZ}}^\dagger, \quad |\Leftarrow\rangle_j = \widehat{U}_{\text{CZ}} |\leftarrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C33d})$$

from the energy of one of the excited states, say

$$|\Psi_2\rangle := |\Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C33e})$$

$$|\Psi_3\rangle := \widehat{T} |\Psi_2\rangle, \quad \widehat{T} |\Rightarrow\rangle_j = \text{i} |\Leftarrow\rangle_j, \quad \widehat{T} |\Rightarrow\rangle_j = -\text{i} |\Leftarrow\rangle_j, \quad (\text{C33f})$$

The existence of this gap guarantees the stability of the $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ phase in the phase diagram in Fig. 5.

In contrast, after imposing OBC at the corner $(\pi/2, 1)$ from Fig. 5, we know from Sec. B 1 that the ground states of Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}_1(\pi/2, 1)$ defined in Eq. (B10b) are eightfold degenerate for any number $2N$ of sites. An orthonormal basis for these ground states is

$$|\Psi_0\rangle := |\uparrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \uparrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C34a})$$

$$|\Psi_1\rangle := \widehat{T} |\Psi_0\rangle, \quad (\text{C34b})$$

$$|\Psi_2\rangle := |\uparrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \downarrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C34c})$$

$$|\Psi_3\rangle := \widehat{T} |\Psi_2\rangle, \quad (\text{C34d})$$

$$|\Psi_4\rangle := |\downarrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \uparrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C34e})$$

$$|\Psi_5\rangle := \widehat{T} |\Psi_4\rangle, \quad (\text{C34f})$$

$$|\Psi_6\rangle := |\downarrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \downarrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C34g})$$

$$|\Psi_7\rangle := \widehat{T} |\Psi_6\rangle, \quad (\text{C34h})$$

where the state $|\uparrow\rangle_j$ and $|\downarrow\rangle_j$ are defined by the action

$$\widehat{\sigma}_j^z |\uparrow\rangle_j = + |\uparrow\rangle_j, \quad \widehat{T} |\uparrow\rangle_j = \text{i} |\downarrow\rangle_j, \quad (\text{C34i})$$

$$\widehat{\sigma}_j^z |\downarrow\rangle_j = - |\downarrow\rangle_j, \quad \widehat{T} |\downarrow\rangle_j = -\text{i} |\uparrow\rangle_j, \quad (\text{C34j})$$

for $j = 1, \dots, 2N$.

When OBC are chosen, the ground-state (first excited) energy of $\widehat{H}_1(\pi/2, 1)$ is [see Eq. (B25) and Fig. 12(a)]

$$E_0 = -2N + 3 \quad (E_8 = -2N + 5). \quad (\text{C35a})$$

When PBC are chosen, the ground-state (first excited) energy of $\widehat{H}_0(\pi/2, 1)$ is [see Eq. (B24) and Fig. 13(a)]

$$E_0 = -2N \quad (E_2 = -2N + 4). \quad (\text{C35b})$$

When moving slightly away from the corner $(\pi/2, 1)$ in Fig. 5 under OBC, the $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ state (C33a) and its time-reversed counterpart (C33b) [the eight states (C34)] are no longer exact ground states. Moreover, for any finite

⁷ The state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ is the image by \widehat{U}_{CZ} of the representation in

the basis that diagonalizes $\widehat{\sigma}_j^x$ of the state $|\text{Neel}_x, +\rangle$ defined by Eq. (B6c) in the basis that diagonalizes $\widehat{\sigma}_j^z$




FIG. 12. (Color online) The case of OBC. Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy spacings $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, \dots, 9$, obtained with DMRG and OBC ($\chi = 128$) for (a) the point $(\pi/2, 1)$ and (b) the point $(19\pi/20, 9/10)$ in the $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ phase from Fig. 5.




FIG. 13. (Color online) The case of PBC. Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy spacings $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, \dots, 3$, obtained with DMRG and PBC ($\chi = 128$) for (a) the point $(\pi/2, 1)$ and (b) the point $(19\pi/20, 9/10)$ in the $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ phase from Fig. 5.

number $2N$ of sites, the energy E_0 in Eq. (C35) is strictly lower than the energy E_1 of the first excited state. However, the energy spacing $E_1 - E_0$ between the ground-state energy E_0 in Eq. (C35) and the first excited state energy E_1 is observed numerically to vanish exponentially fast with $2N$ so that a two-fold degeneracy of the ground state is recovered in the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$. For example, for a chain made of $2N = 32$ sites at $(19\pi/20, 9/10)$, $E_1 - E_0 \approx 0$ within numerical precision under both PBC and OBC.

We have tracked the excitation energy E_8 (E_2) in Eq. (C35a) [Eq. (C35b)]. It remains non-degenerate with E_0 in the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$ upon approaching the phase boundary of the $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ phase. The energy gap $E_8 - E_7$ ($E_2 - E_1$) at $(19\pi/20, 9/10)$ is smaller than the energy gap $E_8 - E_7$ ($E_2 - E_1$) at $(\pi/2, 1)$ for any system size $2N$. This difference is evident when comparing Figs. 12(a) and 12(b) for OBC [Figs. 13(a) and 13(b) for PBC]. This difference aligns with the expectation of a gap closing upon exiting the $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ phase.

At the corner $(\pi/2, 1)$ from Fig. 5, the eight orthogonal ground states $|\Psi_n\rangle$, $n = 0, \dots, 7$, defined in Eq. (C34) exhibit the staggered magnetization [see Eq. (C6d)]

$$|m_{\text{sta,SPT}}^x[\Psi_n]| = 1, \quad n = 0, \dots, 7. \quad (\text{C36})$$

This saturation of the staggered magnetization indicates perfect ($\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$) antiferromagnetic order for the local order parameter

$$\hat{U}_{\text{CZ}} \hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{U}_{\text{CZ}}^\dagger = \hat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z \hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z, \quad j = 2, \dots, 2N - 1. \quad (\text{C37})$$

This is shown in Fig. 14(a). More specifically, four of the ground states (C34) have the staggered magnetization

$$m_{\text{sta,SPT}}^x[\Psi_n] = -1, \quad n = 0, 2, 4, 6, \quad (\text{C38})$$

while their time-reversed images have the staggered magnetization

$$m_{\text{sta,SPT}}^x[\Psi_n] = +1, \quad n = 1, 3, 5, 7. \quad (\text{C39})$$

In fact, the four ground states $|\Psi_n\rangle$ with $n = 0, 1, 2, 4, 6$ ($n = 1, 2, 5, 7$) from Eq. (C34) are eigenstates with eigenvalue -1 ($+1$) of the staggered SPT ordered parameter

$$\widehat{m}_{\text{sta,SPT}}^x := \frac{1}{2N-2} \sum_{j=2}^{2N-1} (-1)^j \widehat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z \widehat{\sigma}_j^x \widehat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z. \quad (\text{C40})$$

The fourfold degeneracy of those ground states that are eigenstates of $\widehat{m}_{\text{sta,SPT}}^x$ arises from the free quantum spin-1/2 degrees of freedom at both ends the chain. These free quantum spin-1/2 contribute to the expectation value of magnitude one for $\widehat{Z}_1 \equiv \widehat{\sigma}_1^z$ and $\widehat{Z}_{2N} \equiv \widehat{\sigma}_{2N}^z$ as is shown in Fig. 14(a). In contrast, the two ground states (C33) selected by PBC are non-degenerate eigenstates of the staggered SPT ordered parameter

$$\widehat{m}_{\text{sta,SPT}}^x := \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^{2N} (-1)^j \widehat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z \widehat{\sigma}_j^x \widehat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z = \widehat{U}_{\text{CZ}} \widehat{m}_{\text{sta}}^x \widehat{U}_{\text{CZ}}^\dagger, \quad \widehat{m}_{\text{sta}}^x := \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^{2N} (-1)^j \widehat{\sigma}_j^x = -\widehat{T} \widehat{m}_{\text{sta}}^x \widehat{T}. \quad (\text{C41})$$

This is shown in Fig. 15(a). As there are no free quantum spin-1/2 at the ends of the chains, the expectation value of $\widehat{Z}_j \equiv \widehat{\sigma}_j^z$ vanishes for all sites $j = 1, \dots, 2N$, as is shown in Fig. 15(a).

Figure 14(b) for OBC and Fig. 15(b) for PBC show that, at the corner $(\pi/2, 1)$ from Fig. 5, there are excited states $|\Psi\rangle$ and sites j such that the expectation value

$$\langle \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{X}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_\Psi \equiv \langle \widehat{\sigma}_{j-1}^z \widehat{\sigma}_j^x \widehat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z \rangle_\Psi = 0 \quad (\text{C42})$$

vanishes, while the expectation value

$$\left| \langle \widehat{Z}_j \rangle_\Psi \right| \equiv \left| \langle \widehat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle_\Psi \right| = 1 \quad (\text{C43})$$

saturates to its classical value, respectively. This property is a signature of the extensive degeneracies (B25b) for OBC and (B24b) for PBC, respectively, of the excited states of the quantum spin-1/2 cluster Hamiltonians, as we now explain.

Without loss of generality, we consider the corner $(0, 0)$ from Fig. 5 under OBC. We choose the ground state

$$|\text{Neel}_x, +\rangle := | \leftarrow \rightarrow \cdots \leftarrow \rightarrow \leftarrow \rightarrow \leftarrow \rightarrow \cdots \leftarrow \rightarrow \rangle \quad (\text{C44a})$$

in the basis (C13c) and (C13d). Its energy is $E_0 = -2N + 1$ [see Eq. (C14a)]. Equipped with this ground state, we define the pair of orthonormal excited eigenstates

$$\begin{aligned} |+_k\rangle &:= \widehat{Z}_k \widehat{Z}_{k+1} \cdots \widehat{Z}_{2N-1} \widehat{Z}_{2N} |\text{Neel}_x, +\rangle \\ &= | \leftarrow \rightarrow \cdots \leftarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \leftarrow \rightarrow \leftarrow \cdots \rightarrow \leftarrow \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C44b})$$

$$\begin{aligned} |_{+k+1}\rangle &:= \widehat{\mathbb{1}}_k \widehat{Z}_{k+1} \cdots \widehat{Z}_{2N-1} \widehat{Z}_{2N} |\text{Neel}_x, +\rangle \\ &= | \leftarrow \rightarrow \cdots \leftarrow \rightarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \rightarrow \leftarrow \cdots \rightarrow \leftarrow \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C44c})$$

for any $k = 2, \dots, 2N$. The excited energy eigenstate $|+_k\rangle$ is a domain wall between the sites $k-1$ and k . The excited energy eigenstate $|_{+k+1}\rangle$ is a domain wall between the sites k and $k+1$. The pair of energy eigenstates $|+_k\rangle$ and $|_{+k+1}\rangle$ are degenerate with the energy eigenvalue $E_0 + 2$. Hence, the symmetric and antisymmetric linear combinations

$$|_{+k,k+1}^{(s)}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|+_k\rangle + |_{+k+1}\rangle), \quad (\text{C45a})$$

$$|_{+k,k+1}^{(a)}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|+_k\rangle - |_{+k+1}\rangle), \quad (\text{C45b})$$




FIG. 14. (Color online) The case of OBC. Dependence on the site index $j = 1, \dots, 2N$ of the local cluster and spin expectations values in the states obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 32$) as approximations to the exact eigenstates with energies (a) E_0 at $(\pi/2, 1)$, (b) E_8 at $(\pi/2, 1)$, (c) E_0 at $(19\pi/20, 9/10)$, and (d) E_8 at $(19\pi/20, 9/10)$.

are an orthonormal pair of excited energy eigenstates with the energy eigenvalue $E_0 + 2$. The pair of identities

$$|+_k\rangle = \widehat{Z}_k |_{+_{k+1}}\rangle, \quad (\text{C46a})$$

$$|_{+_{k+1}}\rangle = \widehat{Z}_k |+_k\rangle, \quad (\text{C46b})$$

implies that

$$\widehat{Z}_k |_{+_{k,k+1}}^{(s)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\widehat{Z}_k^2 |_{+_{k+1}}\rangle + \widehat{Z}_k |_{+_{k+1}}\rangle \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|_{+_{k+1}}\rangle + |+_k\rangle) = |_{+_{k,k+1}}^{(s)}\rangle, \quad (\text{C47a})$$

$$\widehat{Z}_k |_{+_{k,k+1}}^{(a)}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\widehat{Z}_k^2 |_{+_{k+1}}\rangle - \widehat{Z}_k |_{+_{k+1}}\rangle \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|_{+_{k+1}}\rangle - |+_k\rangle) = -|_{+_{k,k+1}}^{(a)}\rangle. \quad (\text{C47b})$$

In turn, the Pauli algebra obeyed by \widehat{X}_j , \widehat{Y}_j , and \widehat{Z}_j implies that

$$\widehat{X}_k |_{+_{k,k+1}}^{(s)}\rangle = |_{+_{k,k+1}}^{(a)}\rangle, \quad (\text{C48a})$$

$$\widehat{X}_k |_{+_{k,k+1}}^{(a)}\rangle = |_{+_{k,k+1}}^{(s)}\rangle. \quad (\text{C48b})$$

In particular, it follows that

$$\langle +_{k,k+1}^{(s)} | \widehat{Z}_k |_{+_{k,k+1}}^{(s)} \rangle = +1, \quad (\text{C49a})$$

$$\langle +_{k,k+1}^{(a)} | \widehat{Z}_k |_{+_{k,k+1}}^{(a)} \rangle = -1, \quad (\text{C49b})$$




FIG. 15. (Color online) The case of PBC. Dependence on the site index $j = 1, \dots, 2N$ of the local cluster and spin expectations values in the states obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 32$) as approximations to the exact eigenstates with energies (a) E_0 at $(\pi/2, 1)$, (b) E_2 at $(\pi/2, 1)$, (c) E_0 at $(19\pi/20, 9/10)$, and (d) E_2 at $(19\pi/20, 9/10)$.

while

$$\langle +_{k,k+1}^{(s)} | \widehat{X}_k | +_{k,k+1}^{(s)} \rangle = \langle +_{k,k+1}^{(a)} | \widehat{X}_k | +_{k,k+1}^{(a)} \rangle = 0. \quad (\text{C49c})$$

On the other hand, one verifies that, for any $l \neq k$,⁸

$$\langle +_{k,k+1}^{(s)} | \widehat{Z}_l | +_{k,k+1}^{(s)} \rangle = 0, \quad (\text{C50a})$$

$$\langle +_{k,k+1}^{(a)} | \widehat{Z}_l | +_{k,k+1}^{(a)} \rangle = 0, \quad (\text{C50b})$$

while⁹

$$\langle +_{k,k+1}^{(s)} | \widehat{X}_l | +_{k,k+1}^{(s)} \rangle = (-1)^{\delta_{1,\text{sgn}(l-k)}} (-1)^l, \quad (\text{C50c})$$

$$\langle +_{k,k+1}^{(a)} | \widehat{X}_l | +_{k,k+1}^{(a)} \rangle = (-1)^{\delta_{1,\text{sgn}(l-k)}} (-1)^l. \quad (\text{C50d})$$

⁸ The states $\widehat{Z}_l | +_k \rangle$ and $\widehat{Z}_l | +_{k+1} \rangle$ are orthogonal to both $| +_k \rangle$ and $| +_{k+1} \rangle$ if $l \neq k$

⁹ After expressing the states $| +_{k,k+1}^{(s)} \rangle$ and $| +_{k,k+1}^{(a)} \rangle$ in terms of the state $|\text{Neel}_x, +\rangle$, one may replace the operator \widehat{X}_l by the C-number $(-1)^{\delta_{1,\text{sgn}(l-k)}} (-1)^l$ if $l \neq k$

We consider the corner $(\pi/2, 1)$ from Fig. 5. We choose the ground state

$$|\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}, -, \uparrow\downarrow\rangle := |\uparrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \Leftrightarrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \downarrow\rangle \quad (\text{C51a})$$

when selecting OBC in the basis (C33c) and (C33d) for sites $2, \dots, 2N-1$ and in the basis that diagonalizes \widehat{Z}_1 and \widehat{Z}_{2N} for sites 1 and $2N$. We choose the ground state

$$|\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}, -\rangle := |\Rightarrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \Leftrightarrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \Leftarrow\rangle \quad (\text{C51b})$$

when selecting PBC in the basis (C33c) and (C33d) for all sites. Equipped with the ground state (C51a), we define for any $k = 2, \dots, 2N-1$ the pair of orthonormal excited eigenstates

$$|\Psi_8\rangle_k := |\uparrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \Leftrightarrow \Leftarrow \cdots \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \downarrow\rangle \equiv \prod_{j=k}^{2N-1} \widehat{Z}_j |\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}, -, \uparrow\downarrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C52a})$$

$$|\Psi_9\rangle_{k+1} := |\uparrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \cdots \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \downarrow\rangle \equiv \prod_{j=k+1}^{2N-1} \widehat{Z}_j |\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}, -, \uparrow\downarrow\rangle, \quad (\text{C52b})$$

for OBC. These are two excited states out of the $8(2N-3)$ -dimensional eigenspace with eigenenergy E_8 that support one domain wall [compare with Eq. (C16a)]. Equipped with the ground state (C51b), we define for any $k = 1, \dots, 2N-1$ the pair of orthonormal excited eigenstates

$$|\Psi_2\rangle_k := |\Rightarrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \Leftrightarrow \Leftarrow \cdots \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow\rangle \equiv \prod_{j=k}^{2N-1} \widehat{Z}_j |\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}, -\rangle, \quad (\text{C53a})$$

$$|\Psi_3\rangle_{k+1} := |\Rightarrow \Leftrightarrow \cdots \Leftrightarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \cdots \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \Leftarrow\rangle \equiv \prod_{j=k+1}^{2N} \widehat{Z}_j |\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}, -\rangle, \quad (\text{C53b})$$

for PBC. These are two excited states out of the $2N(2N-1)$ -dimensional eigenspace with eigenenergy E_2 that support two domain walls [compare with Eq. (C16b)]. We define the symmetric and antisymmetric linear combinations

$$|+\text{OBC}\rangle_{k,k+1} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\Psi_8\rangle_k + |\Psi_9\rangle_{k+1}), \quad |-\text{OBC}\rangle_{k,k+1} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\Psi_8\rangle_k - |\Psi_9\rangle_{k+1}), \quad (\text{C54a})$$

for OBC and

$$|+\text{PBC}\rangle_{k,k+1} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\Psi_2\rangle_k + |\Psi_3\rangle_{k+1}), \quad |-\text{PBC}\rangle_{k,k+1} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\Psi_2\rangle_k - |\Psi_3\rangle_{k+1}), \quad (\text{C54b})$$

for PBC. One verifies that

$$\widehat{Z}_k |\pm\text{OBC}\rangle_{k,k+1} = \pm |\pm\text{OBC}\rangle_{k,k+1}, \quad (\text{C55a})$$

$$\widehat{Z}_k |\pm\text{PBC}\rangle_{k,k+1} = \pm |\pm\text{PBC}\rangle_{k,k+1}, \quad \widehat{Z}_{2N} |\pm\text{PBC}\rangle_{k,k+1} = \pm |\pm\text{PBC}\rangle_{k,k+1}, \quad (\text{C55b})$$

for $k = 2, \dots, 2N-1$, from which it follows that

$${}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm\text{OBC} | \widehat{Z}_k | \pm\text{OBC} \rangle_{k,k+1} = \pm 1, \quad (\text{C56a})$$

$${}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm\text{PBC} | \widehat{Z}_k | \pm\text{PBC} \rangle_{k,k+1} = \pm 1, \quad {}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm\text{PBC} | \widehat{Z}_{2N} | \pm\text{PBC} \rangle_{k,k+1} = \pm 1. \quad (\text{C56b})$$

Moreover, because \widehat{Z}_k and $\widehat{Z}_{k-1} \widehat{X}_k \widehat{Z}_{k+1}$ anticommute, the effect of $\widehat{Z}_{k-1} \widehat{X}_k \widehat{Z}_{k+1}$ on the eigenstates of \widehat{Z}_k with eigenvalues differing by a sign is to interchange them. We then deduce that

$${}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm\text{OBC} | \widehat{Z}_{k-1} \widehat{X}_k \widehat{Z}_{k+1} | \pm\text{OBC} \rangle_{k,k+1} = 0, \quad (\text{C57a})$$

$${}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm\text{PBC} | \widehat{Z}_{k-1} \widehat{X}_k \widehat{Z}_{k+1} | \pm\text{PBC} \rangle_{k,k+1} = 0, \quad {}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm\text{PBC} | \widehat{Z}_{2N-1} \widehat{X}_{2N} \widehat{Z}_1 | \pm\text{PBC} \rangle_{k,k+1} = 0. \quad (\text{C57b})$$

On the other hand, for any $l \neq k, 2N$, we have

$${}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm\text{OBC} | \widehat{Z}_l | \pm\text{OBC} \rangle_{k,k+1} = 0, \quad (\text{C58a})$$

$${}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm\text{PBC} | \widehat{Z}_l | \pm\text{PBC} \rangle_{k,k+1} = 0, \quad {}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm\text{PBC} | \widehat{Z}_{2N} | \pm\text{PBC} \rangle_{k,k+1} = 0, \quad (\text{C58b})$$

and

$${}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm_{\text{OBC}} | \widehat{Z}_{l-1} \widehat{X}_l \widehat{Z}_{l+1} | \pm_{\text{OBC}} \rangle_{k,k+1} = (-1)^{\delta_{1,\text{sgn}(l-k)}} (-1)^{l+1}, \quad (\text{C59a})$$

$${}_{k,k+1}\langle \pm_{\text{PBC}} | \widehat{Z}_{l-1} \widehat{X}_l \widehat{Z}_{l+1} | \pm_{\text{PBC}} \rangle_{k,k+1} = (-1)^{\delta_{1,\text{sgn}(l-k)}} (-1)^{l+1}. \quad (\text{C59b})$$

These expectation values for OBC explain what is observed numerically in Fig. 14(b).

At $(19\pi/20, 9/10)$ from Fig. 5, expectation values in the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ have the following features. The dependence on $j = 2, \dots, 2N - 1$ of the local cluster expectation value $\langle \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{X}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ is $0.99 \times (-1)^{j+1}$, while $\langle \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{Y}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_0}$, $\langle \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_0}$, $\langle \widehat{X}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$, $\langle \widehat{Y}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$, and $\langle \widehat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ all vanish for both OBC ($b = 0$) in Fig. 14(c) and PBC ($b = 1$) in Fig. 15(c). For OBC, $\langle \widehat{Z}_1 \rangle_{\Psi_0}$, and $\langle \widehat{Z}_{32} \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ acquire non-vanishing expectation values at the end points $j = 1$ and $j = 32$, unlike for the PBC case.

At $(19\pi/20, 9/10)$ from Fig. 5, expectation values in the excited state $|\Psi_8\rangle$ have the following features. For PBC, $\langle \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{X}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_2}$ is $0.87 \times (-1)^j$, while $\langle \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{Y}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_2}$, $\langle \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_2}$, $\langle \widehat{X}_j \rangle_{\Psi_2}$, $\langle \widehat{Y}_j \rangle_{\Psi_2}$, and $\langle \widehat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_2}$ all vanish according to Fig. 15(d). For OBC, the non-vanishing values of $\langle \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{X}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_8}$, $\langle \widehat{Z}_{j-1} \widehat{Z}_j \widehat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_8}$, and $\langle \widehat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_8}$ decay exponentially fast in magnitude from the boundaries at $j = 1$ and $j = 32$ according to Fig. 14(d).

e. The Neel_y^{SPT} phase

The Neel_y^{SPT} phase is the only one of the four gapped phases for which it is possible to find a ground state $|\Psi\rangle$ such that, in the thermodynamic limit,

$$\overline{G^{2,x}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad \overline{G^{2,y}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad \overline{G^{4,x}}[\Psi] \neq 0, \quad \overline{G^{4,y}}[\Psi] = 0, \quad (\text{C60})$$

in Fig. 7.

The unitary transformation \widehat{U}_R defined in Eq. (B1) realizes the reflection symmetry of the phase diagram in Fig. 5 with respect to $\theta = \pi/4$, which holds for both OBC and PBC. More specifically, the Hamiltonian (A1) transforms under conjugation by \widehat{U}_R as

$$\widehat{U}_R \widehat{H}_b(\theta, \lambda) \widehat{U}_R^\dagger = \widehat{H}_b(\pi/2 - \theta, \lambda), \quad (\text{C61})$$

for $b = 0, 1$. Consequently, the description of the Neel_x^{SPT} phase in Sec. C1d equally holds for the Neel_y^{SPT} phase if the following replacements

$$(\theta, \lambda) \rightarrow (\pi/2 - \theta, \lambda), \quad \widehat{X}_j \rightarrow \widehat{Y}_j, \quad m_{\text{sta,SPT}}^x \rightarrow m_{\text{sta,SPT}}^y, \quad (\text{C62})$$

are made. We have verified numerically the equivalence between the properties of the Neel_x^{SPT} and the Neel_y^{SPT} phases once the identifications (C62) are performed.

f. The FM_z phase

According to Fig. 6, a fifth phase, centered around the point $(\pi/4, 1/2)$, is observed. This phase has a diamond-like shape and exhibits a twofold degeneracy for both PBC and OBC. We label this phase the FM_z phase. We now explain why this interpretation is appropriate. We consider first the case of PBC.

As is illustrated in Fig. 16 for PBC, the local spin expectation value $\langle \widehat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ ($\langle \widehat{X}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$, $\langle \widehat{Y}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$) along the Z-axis (X -, Y -axis) in spin space is non-vanishing (vanishing) and independent of $j = 1, \dots, 2N$, for any point in the FM_z phase from Fig. 5 with Ψ_0 the ground state approximated by DMRG. For example, we read from Fig. 16 the values

$$m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0] = \begin{cases} 0.3125, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 3/10), \\ 0.3750, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 1/2), \\ 0.3125, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 7/10). \end{cases} \quad (\text{C63})$$

The magnetization $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C6a) is observed to reach its maximum ≈ 0.4 in absolute value at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of Fig. 5, whereby, the larger the system size $2N$, the closer to 0.4 the magnetization $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$.




FIG. 16. (Color online) The case of PBC. Dependence on the site index $j = 1, \dots, 2N$ of the local cluster and spin expectation values obtained using the DMRG approximation ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 32$) to the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ whose energy is E_0 at (a) $(\pi/4, 1/2)$, (b) $(\pi/4, 3/10)$, and (c) $(\pi/4, 7/10)$.

The magnetization $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ converges to zero upon approaching the boundaries of the FM_z phase. The quantum fluctuations are maximum at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of Fig. 5 due to the non-commuting nature of the competing terms in Hamiltonian (A1) and the enhanced symmetries of Hamiltonian (A1) at this point. We interpret the fact that the magnetization $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ peaks in absolute value at $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ as a manifestation of order by disorder.

As is also illustrated in Fig. 16 for PBC, the cluster expectation value $\langle \hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ ($\langle \hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{X}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_0}$, $\langle \hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{Y}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_0}$) is non-vanishing (vanishing) and independent of $j = 1, \dots, 2N$, for any point in the FM_z phase from Fig. 5 with Ψ_0 the ground state approximated by DMRG. The uniform SPT magnetization defined in Eq. (C6c) has the opposite sign from that of the uniform magnetization at any point in the FM_z phase. From Fig. 16 we read the values

$$m_{\text{uni,SPT}}^z[\Psi_0] = \begin{cases} -0.493, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 3/10), \\ -0.582, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 1/2), \\ -0.493, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 7/10). \end{cases} \quad (\text{C64})$$

In summary, the FM_z phase under PBC supports long-range order along the Z -axis in spin space, with a uniform magnetization no greater than 40% of the uniform magnetization of the ferromagnetic product state

$$|\text{Ferro}_z\rangle \equiv |\uparrow \uparrow \dots \uparrow\rangle, \quad \hat{Z}_j |\uparrow\rangle_j = +|\uparrow\rangle_j, \quad \hat{Z}_j |\downarrow\rangle_j = +|\uparrow\rangle_j. \quad (\text{C65})$$

The FM_z phase has two orthonormal ground states

$$|\Psi_0\rangle, \quad |\Psi_1\rangle = \hat{T} |\Psi_0\rangle, \quad (\text{C66a})$$

that support a uniform magnetization of opposite signs and of magnitude

$$m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0] = -m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_1] \neq 0. \quad (\text{C66b})$$

The case of OBC displays strong boundary effects which are tied to criticality and incommensuration effects, as we now discuss.

2. Criticality and incommensuration of the FM_z phase

Of all five phases in Fig. 5, it is only the FM_z phase that has a distinctive coloring in all panels from Fig. 7. The interpretation of Figs. 7(c), 7(f), 7(g), 7(h), 7(i), and 16 is that the FM_z phase exhibits long-range ferromagnetic (FM) order along the Z -axis in spin space.

The fact that $\overline{G^{r,z}}[\Psi_0]$, with $|\Psi_0\rangle$ the DMRG approximation to the ground state of Hamiltonian (A1), varies and changes sign as a function of r strongly suggests the existence of oscillations in the spin-spin correlations along the Z -axis in spin space, with the period of oscillations controlled by λ . This observation aligns with the empirical fact that $\langle \widehat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ displays oscillations as a function of j when OBC are selected, as we shall discuss in section C 2 b.

Figures 7(a), 7(b), 7(d), and 7(e), imply the non-vanishing values of

$$\overline{G^{2,x}}[\Psi_0] \neq 0, \quad \overline{G^{2,y}}[\Psi_0] \neq 0, \quad \overline{G^{4,x}}[\Psi_0] \neq 0, \quad \overline{G^{4,y}}[\Psi_0] \neq 0, \quad (\text{C67})$$

in the FM_z phase. This empirical fact suggests that the FM_z phase supports, in addition to long-range FM order along the Z -axis in spin space, quasi-long-range AFM order for the local spins and local clusters along the X - and Y -axes in spin space. We are going to give in what follows supporting evidences for the claim that long-range FM order coexists with AFM criticality in the FM_z phase.

a. Criticality

The criticality of the FM_z phase in Fig. 5 is corroborated by three observations.

- a. First, the two transverse components $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^\alpha[\Psi_0]$ of the spin-spin correlation functions in the DMRG approximation to the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (A1) defined in Eq. (C3a) decay algebraically as

$$C_{j_0, j_0+s}^\alpha[\Psi_0] \propto (-1)^s s^{-\eta^\alpha[\Psi_0]}, \quad 1 \ll j_0, s, j_0 + s \ll 2N, \quad \alpha = x, y, \quad (\text{C68})$$

with both PBC and OBC for any point in the FM_z phase from Fig. 5.

- b. Second, any point in the FM_z phase from Fig. 5 realizes a CFT with the central charge $c = 1$.
- c. Finally, any energy spacing between non-degenerate consecutive eigenenergies scales as $1/(2N)$ in the thermodynamic limit for any point in the FM_z phase from Fig. 5.

a. *Quasi-long-range AFM order in the FM_z phase from Fig. 5* — Representative examples of the dependence on the separation s of the transverse spin-spin correlation functions (C3a) in the FM_z phase from Fig. 5 are shown in Fig. 17(a) for OBC and Fig. 17(b) for PBC. The best fit selects the algebraic decay (C68) for the transverse components, whereby

$$\eta^x[\Psi_0] = 0.76 \pm 0.03, \quad \eta^y[\Psi_0] = 1.22 \pm 0.06, \quad (\text{C69a})$$

for $(\theta, \lambda) = (\pi/4 - 0.1, 0.4)$ and under OBC, while

$$\eta^x[\Psi_0] = \eta^y[\Psi_0] = 1.00 \pm 0.06, \quad (\text{C69b})$$

for $(\theta, \lambda) = (\pi/4, 1/2)$ and under PBC.

b. *CFT with central charge $c = 1$* — The FM_z phase exhibits quasi-long-range order along the X - and Y -axes, suggesting that each point within this phase realizes a CFT with central charge c . We have determined the value of the central charge

$$c := \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} c_{2N} \quad (\text{C70a})$$

in the FM_z phase from Fig. 5 by comparing the CFT prediction [57]

$$S_{\text{CFT}, 2N}(l) = \begin{cases} \frac{c_{2N}}{3} \ln \left(\frac{2N}{\pi} \sin \left(\frac{\pi l}{2N} \right) \right) + \text{const}, & \text{for PBC,} \\ \frac{c_{2N}}{6} \ln \left(\frac{4N}{\pi} \sin \left(\frac{\pi l}{2N} \right) \right) + \text{const}, & \text{for OBC,} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C70b})$$

for the bipartite entanglement entropy $S_{2N}(l)$ against its numerical evaluation $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$. Hereby, we define the entanglement entropy $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$ on the bond l of the matrix product state that approximates the ground state of Hamiltonian (A1) as follows. Assuming the matrix product state is in the so-called mixed canonical form on the bond l with bond dimension χ , the entanglement entropy for the matrix product state is defined as

$$S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l) = - \sum_{i=1}^{\chi} s_i^2(l) \ln s_i^2(l), \quad (\text{C71})$$




FIG. 17. (Color online) Dependence on s given j_0 for the spin-spin correlation functions $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^x[\Psi_0]$ and $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^y[\Psi_0]$, defined in Eq. (C3a), computed using the DMRG approximation to the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (A1) (a) under OBC, at $(\theta, \lambda) = (\pi/4 - 0.1, 0.4)$, with $j_0 = (2N - 80)/2$, $\chi = 128$ and $2N = 128$ and (b) under PBC, at $(\theta, \lambda) = (\pi/4, 1/2)$, with $j_0 = (2N - 64)/2$, $\chi = 256$ and $2N = 128$. Fits used are labeled “p” for power law, “e” for exponential. Goodness of fit for “p” is always greater than that for “e”. The best fits for η^x and η^y are independent of the choice for j_0 . The insets show the Fourier transforms of the respective correlations, where the abscissa is the frequency $f \equiv q/(2\pi)$ and the ordinate is the expansion coefficient $A(f)$.




FIG. 18. (Color online) Dependence on the number $2N$ of sites of the entanglement entropy $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$ at $(\pi/4, 1/2)$. The entanglement entropy $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$ is defined in Eq. (C71) for a matrix product state obtained using DMRG with (a) OBC and $\chi = 256$ and (b) PBC and $\chi = 512$. The slope of the linear fit performed for each system size $2N$ gives the central charge c in the insets of each panel. Error bars are given in the inset of (a). For all panels, the value of δl defined in Eq. (C72) is $2N/2$.

where $s_i(l)$ is the i^{th} singular value on the bond l .

We have used DMRG to evaluate the bipartite entanglement entropy $S_{2N}(l)$ in the FM_z phase of Fig. 5. By plotting the dependence of $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$ on $\ln\left(\frac{4N}{\pi} \sin\left(\frac{\pi l}{2N}\right)\right)$, we were able to confirm the validity of the CFT prediction (C70) with $c = 1$. A representative example of such a procedure at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the phase diagram 5 is found in Fig. 18. The range over which $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$ defined in Eq. (C71) is fitted by $S_{\text{CFT}, 2N}(l)$ defined in Eq. (C70b) is

$$\delta l \equiv l_{\max} - l_{\min}, \quad 1 \leq l_{\min} < l_{\max} \leq 2N. \quad (\text{C72a})$$

Here, we choose

$$\delta l \approx 2N/2, \quad l_{\min} \approx 2N/4, \quad 2N - l_{\max} \approx 2N/4, \quad (\text{C72b})$$

so that the bonds l_{\min} and l_{\max} are each a distance of $2N/4$ away from the first bond $l = 1$ and the last bond $l = 2N - 1$ entering the matrix product state. The range δl must be a finite fraction of the number $2N$ of sites because the initial matrix product state used for DMRG under both PBC and OBC breaks explicitly the translation symmetry.

In Fig. 18(a), the bipartite entanglement entropy $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$ shows oscillations as a function of l . This oscillatory behaviour is a the signature of the incommensuration in the FM_z phase [66], which we shall explore in Sec. C 2 b.

It is well known that extracting the central charge in finite systems is more accurate with PBC, as finite-size effects are strongly suppressed compared to OBC. However, choosing PBC significantly increases the computational cost of the DMRG algorithm [52]¹⁰. Imposing PBC, we find that $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ realizes a CFT with $c = 1$. We computed c for other points inside the FM_z phase and consistently found $c = 1$ with the same level of precision as in Fig. 18(b).

c. Gapless excitations — An alternative strategy in support of the existence of a CFT that encodes criticality for any point in the FM_z phase from Fig. 5 involves analyzing the dependence on the system size $2N$ in the limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$ of the differences

$$\delta_n(2N) := E_n(2N) - E_{n-1}(2N), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (\text{C73})$$

between consecutive low-lying energy eigenvalues. For these low-lying excited energy eigenvalues¹¹, CFT implies the dependence on the length $L \equiv 2N \mathbf{a}$ of the chain with the lattice spacing \mathbf{a} given by

$$E_n(L) - E_0(L) = \sum_{m=1}^n \delta_m(L) \sim \frac{2\pi}{L} \hbar v \Delta_n + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L \ln L}\right), \quad (\text{C74})$$

where $E_n(L)$ is the n^{th} excited energy above the ground-state energy $E_0(L)$ when PBC are selected, v plays the role of the “speed of light” in the CFT, and Δ_n denotes the scaling dimension of the primary fields ϕ_n in the CFT that is associated to the eigenenergy E_n [67], i.e., the scaling dimension Δ_n is the power that characterizes the algebraic decay of the two-point function for the primary field ϕ_n . Numerical evaluation of the dependence on $1/L$ of Eq. (C74) and of the dependence on the separation s entering the two-point function for the primary field ϕ_n allows to extract the “speed of light” v and the scaling dimension Δ_n . The central charge c of the CFT can then be determined by the numerical estimate of the dependence on L of the ground-state energy

$$E_0(L) \sim e_0 \times L - \frac{\pi \hbar v c}{6L} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{L \ln L}\right), \quad (\text{C75})$$

where e_0 is the ground-state energy per site in the thermodynamic limit $L \equiv 2N \mathbf{a} \rightarrow \infty$ [67]. However, an accurate estimate for the “speed of light” v proved challenging.

Indeed, we were unable to measure the product $v \Delta_n$ on the right-hand side of Eq. (C74), because we found that the dependence on $2N$ of the energy difference (C73) is of the form

$$\delta_n(2N) \sim \frac{\cos(Q_n \times 2N)}{2N}, \quad Q_n \approx \frac{2\pi}{10}, \quad (\text{C76})$$

in the FM_z phase from Fig. 5, as is illustrated in Fig. 19. Figure 19 applies to the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of Fig. 5. Figure 19(a) shows that the dependence on the number $2N$ of lattice points of the energy difference $E_4 - E_3$ takes the same form as the right-hand side of Eq. (C76). A periodic oscillation is superimposed over the power law decay $1/(2N)$. Figures 19(b) and 19(c) for $E_{2m+1} - E_{2m}$ with $m = 0, 1, 2$ show that $E_{2m+1} - E_{2m}$ is exponentially suppressed as a function of $2N$, i.e., that E_{2m+1} and E_{2m} become degenerate in the thermodynamic limit. Figures 19(b) and 19(c) for $E_{2m} - E_{2m-1}$ with $m = 1, 2$, show that $E_{2m} - E_{2m-1}$ is of the form (C76) with a characteristic periodicity of order $2\pi Q_n^{-1} \approx 10$ that prevents access to sufficiently large systems sizes for an accurate estimate of $v \Delta_n$.

b. Incommensuration

Incommensuration effects become manifest upon using OBC as opposed to PBC. For example, the non-vanishing local expectation values from Fig. 16 are independent of the site index when PBC are selected, while they become strongly site-dependent when OBC are selected as is illustrated in Fig. 20.

According to Fig. 20, the only non-vanishing local expectation values are the ground-state expectation values of \hat{Z}_j

¹⁰ Specifically, if DMRG converges to a ground state with variance V using a bond dimension χ with OBC, achieving the same variance V with PBC requires a bond dimension of χ^2 . This in-

creases the computational cost of DMRG by $\mathcal{O}(\chi^3)$ when using PBC over OBC

¹¹ Only the low lying excitations associated to the primary fields (as opposed to their descendants, say) are considered.




FIG. 19. (Color online) The case of OBC. Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy differences $E_n - E_{n-1}$ for $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the FM_z phase from Fig. 5. Energy eigenvalues are obtained using DMRG ($\chi = 128$) (a) Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy difference $E_4 - E_3$ is a non-monotonic decrease of the form (C76). (b) Dependence on $1/(2N)$ with $32 \leq 2N = 32 + 10k \leq 128$, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$ of the energy differences $E_n - E_{n-1}$ for $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$. (c) Dependence on $1/(2N)$ with $34 \leq 2N = 34 + 10k \leq 128$, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$ of the energy differences $E_n - E_{n-1}$ for $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$. Linear fits of $E_n - E_{n-1}$ for each n in panels (b) and (c) are represented by lines whose colors correspond to the colors of the data points in the legend.




FIG. 20. (Color online) The case of OBC. Dependence on the site index $j = 1, \dots, 2N$ of the local cluster and spin expectation values obtained using the DMRG approximation ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 32$) to the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ whose energy is E_0 at (a) $(\pi/4, 1/2)$, (b) $(\pi/4, 3/10)$, (c) $(\pi/4, 7/10)$, and (d) $(\pi/4 - 0.1, 1/2)$ from Fig. 5. Dependence on $j = 1, \dots, 2N$ of the local spin expectations values computed using the DMRG approximation ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 256$) to the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ whose energy is E_0 at (e) $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ and (f) $(\pi/4, 7/10)$ from Fig. 5.

and $\hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1}$. For a chain made of $2N = 32$ sites under OBC, they oscillate around the mean values

$$m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0] = \begin{cases} 0.373, & \text{at } (\pi/4 - 0.1, 1/2), \\ 0.375, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 7/10), \\ 0.375, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 1/2), \\ 0.312, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 3/10), \\ 0.373, & \text{at } (\pi/4 + 0.1, 1/2), \end{cases} \quad (\text{C77a})$$

defined in Eq. (C6a) and

$$m_{\text{uni,SPT}}^z[\Psi_0] = \begin{cases} -0.591, & \text{at } (\pi/4 - 0.1, 1/2), \\ -0.543, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 7/10), \\ -0.594, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 1/2), \\ -0.507, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 3/10), \\ -0.591, & \text{at } (\pi/4 + 0.1, 1/2), \end{cases} \quad (\text{C77b})$$

defined in Eq. (C6c). As was the case with Eq. (C63), these mean values reach their maxima in absolute value at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the phase diagram 5. As was the case with Eq. (C63), they are symmetric with respect to the mirror symmetry about the U(1)-symmetry axis $\theta = \pi/4$. Unlike was the case with Eq. (C63), they are not symmetric about the axis $\lambda = 1/2$. For a chain of length $2N = 32$, the ground-state expectation values of \hat{Z}_j and $\hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1}$ can be fitted with the pair of Ansatz

$$\langle \hat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0} = m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0] + A_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0] \cos(q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0]j + \phi_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0]), \quad 1 \ll j \ll 2N, \quad (\text{C78a})$$

and

$$\langle \hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_0} = m_{\text{uni,SPT}}^z[\Psi_0] + A_{\text{loc,SPT}}^z[\Psi_0] \cos(q_{\text{loc,SPT}}^z[\Psi_0]j + \phi_{\text{loc,SPT}}^z[\Psi_0]), \quad 1 \ll j \ll 2N, \quad (\text{C78b})$$

respectively, whereby the wave numbers of the oscillations are

$$\frac{q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0]}{2\pi} = \begin{cases} 0.313, & \text{at } (\pi/4 - 0.1, 7/10), \\ 0.324, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 7/10), \\ 0.313, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 1/2), \\ 0.323, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 3/10), \\ 0.313, & \text{at } (\pi/4 + 0.1, 7/10), \end{cases} \quad (\text{C79a})$$

for $\langle \hat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ and

$$\frac{q_{\text{loc,SPT}}^z[\Psi_0]}{2\pi} = \begin{cases} 0.313, & \text{at } (\pi/4 - 0.1, 7/10), \\ 0.324, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 7/10), \\ 0.313, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 1/2), \\ 0.325, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 3/10), \\ 0.313, & \text{at } (\pi/4 + 0.1, 7/10), \end{cases} \quad (\text{C79b})$$

for $\langle \hat{Z}_{j-1} \hat{Z}_j \hat{Z}_{j+1} \rangle_{\Psi_0}$. We empirically observe that $q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0]$ and $q_{\text{loc,SPT}}^z[\Psi_0]$ are a function of $|1/2 - \lambda|$ only.

To obtain a more precise estimate of $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ and $q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0]$, we compute these quantities on a chain of length $2N = 256$ [see Figs. 20(e) and 20(f)]. The local spin expectation values $\langle \hat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ oscillates around the mean values

$$m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0] = \begin{cases} 0.340, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 7/10), \\ 0.398, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 1/2), \\ 0.337, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 3/10), \end{cases} \quad (\text{C80a})$$

with the wave number of oscillations

$$\frac{q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0]}{2\pi} = \begin{cases} 0.323, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 7/10), \\ 0.301, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 1/2), \\ 0.328, & \text{at } (\pi/4, 3/10). \end{cases} \quad (\text{C80b})$$

We observe in Eq. (C80a) that the values of the uniform magnetization $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ for a chain of $2N = 256$ sites is approximately equal at the points $(\pi/4, 3/10)$ and $(\pi/4, 7/10)$ as opposed to Eq. (C77a) for a chain of $2N = 32$ sites. This observation is explained as follows. (i) The unitary transformation \hat{U}_{E} defined in Eq. (B1) does not realize the reflection symmetry about the line $\lambda = 1/2$ under OBC. (ii) The difference in $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ at the points $(\pi/4, 3/10)$ and




FIG. 21. (Color online) The case of OBC. Dependence on s given j_0 for the spin-spin correlation functions $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C3a) and computed using the DMRG approximation ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 128$) to the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (A1) at $(\theta, \lambda) = (\pi/4 - 0.1, 0.4)$. (a) $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ for $j_0 = (2N - 80)/2$. (b) $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ for $j_0 = (2N - 72)/2$. Fit used is “q” for cosine form. In both cases, $q^z \approx 2\pi \frac{3}{10}$. The best fit for q^z is independent of the choice for j_0 . The insets show the Fourier transforms of the respective correlations, where the abscissa is the frequency $f^z \equiv q^z/(2\pi)$ and the ordinate is the expansion coefficient $A(f^z)$.




FIG. 22. (Color online) The case of OBC. Dependence on the separation s of the spin-spin correlation function $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C3a) in the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (A1) at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the FM_z phase from Fig. 5. The ground state is approximated by the DMRG ($\chi = 256$) matrix product state, with (a) $2N = 512$ and $j_0 = (2N - 256)/2$ given and (b) $2N = 1024$ and $j_0 = (2N - 512)/2$ given. Connected part $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C3b) with (a) $2N = 512$ and $j_0 = (2N - 256)/2$ given and (b) $2N = 1024$ and $j_0 = (2N - 512)/2$ given. Fits used are labeled “q” for cosine form and “d” for an algebraically damped cosine. In all cases, $q^z \simeq 2\pi \frac{3}{10}$. The insets show the Fourier transforms of the respective correlations, where the abscissa is the frequency $f^z \equiv q^z/(2\pi)$ and the ordinate is the expansion coefficient $A(f^z)$.

$(\pi/4, 7/10)$ is attributed to the effect of the free spin-1/2 degrees of freedom at both ends of the chain. (iii) The difference in $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ at the points $(\pi/4, 3/10)$ and $(\pi/4, 7/10)$ vanishes in the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$.

The oscillatory behavior observed in Fig. 20 is a signature of both the incommensurability present in the FM_z phase in Fig. 5, and criticality as $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ and $m_{\text{uni, SPT}}^z[\Psi_0]$ are observed to be sensitive to the choice between PBC and OBC in the thermodynamic limit. We now analyze the two-point correlation functions to establish quantitatively the incommensuration of the FM_z phase, illustrated in Figs. 21 and 22 for OBC, and in Fig. 23 for PBC.

The longitudinal component $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ of the spin-spin correlation function in the DMRG approximation to the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (A1) defined in Eq. (C3a) can be fitted by the periodic Ansatz

$$C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0] = \Gamma_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0] + A_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0] \cos(q^z[\Psi_0]s + \phi_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]), \quad 1 \ll j_0, s, j_0 + s \ll 2N, \quad (\text{C81})$$

with the non-vanishing constant $\Gamma_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]$, the amplitude $A_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]$, the wave number $q^z[\Psi_0]$ and the phase $\phi_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]$ real

valued. Under PBC, on the one hand, translation symmetry dictates that $\Gamma_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]$, $A_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]$, $q^z[\Psi_0]$ and $\phi_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]$ are independent of j_0 unless translation symmetry is spontaneously broken. We observe that there is no dependence on j_0 for any of the terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (C81) under PBC. Under OBC, on the other hand, we have anticipated that $q^z[\Psi_0]$ is the only quantity on the right-hand side of Eq. (C81) that remains independent of j_0 in the thermodynamic limit. This educated guess is confirmed by our numerics.

The best fit to the DMRG data selects the Ansatz (C81) for the longitudinal component of the spin-spin correlation functions at $(\theta, \lambda) = (\pi/4 - 0.1, 0.4)$, whereby we read from Fig. 21(a)

$$\Gamma_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0] = 0.1653 \pm 0.0003, \quad q^z[\Psi_0] = 2\pi \left(\frac{3}{10} + 0.005 \pm 9 \times 10^{-5} \right), \quad (\text{C82a})$$

for $j_0 = (128 - 80)/2$, while we read from Fig. 21(b)

$$\Gamma_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0] = 0.1183 \pm 0.0002, \quad q^z[\Psi_0] = 2\pi \left(\frac{3}{10} + 0.006 \pm 14 \times 10^{-5} \right), \quad (\text{C82b})$$

for $j_0 = (128 - 72)/2$. We do not quote the value taken by $A_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]$ in Eq. (C81) as it depends both on the choice of boundary conditions and on the choice of j_0 . We notice that the value taken by $\Gamma_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]$ for the choice we made of j_0 does not equal the square of the uniform magnetization $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ in Eq. (C6a), that we found in Fig. 16 to be approximately $0.4^2 = 0.16$. This is a consequence of the observation that the dependence on j_0 of $\Gamma_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]$ also displays a periodicity [of approximately 10 lattice spacings at $(\pi/4, 1/2)$]. Upon averaging $\Gamma_{j_0}^z[\Psi_0]$ over j_0 to account for this periodicity, we recover the anticipated relation according to which this average is the square of $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$.

The insets in each of the panels in Fig. 21 represent the discrete Fourier transforms of the correlations. We establish with confidence that the oscillations in $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ are modulated by a wave-vector $q^z \simeq 2\pi \times 3/10$. However, the discrete nature of the Fourier transforms limits the precision of q^z due to the discretization of the wave-vector interval $[-\pi, \pi]$ into n values, where n is the size of the range of separations s used for the fit. For example, $n = 60$ in Fig. 21(a). To mitigate this limitation, larger system sizes are analyzed in Fig. 22.

In Fig. 22, we show the correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ and $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$, defined in (C3a) and (C3b), respectively, for larger system sizes $2N = 512$ and $2N = 1024$, at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the FM_z phase. This allows us to obtain

$$\frac{q^z[\Psi_0]}{2\pi} = \begin{cases} 0.30116 \pm 1 \cdot 10^{-5}, & \text{for } 2N = 512, \\ 0.300804 \pm 3 \cdot 10^{-6}, & \text{for } 2N = 1024, \end{cases} \quad (\text{C83})$$

as shown in Figs. 22(a) and 22(b), respectively, using the Ansatz (C81) for the two-point correlation function $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$.

To decide if the oscillations in $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ originate from the oscillations in $\langle \widehat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$, we compute the second cumulant of the operator \widehat{Z}_j , i.e., the connected correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ defined in (C3b). Figures 22(c) and 22(d) show $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ for $2N = 512$ and $2N = 1024$, respectively.

In addition to the oscillations that persist, we observe a decay as a function of s . The fit_d that we use is given by

$$C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0] = \Gamma^{z,c}[\Psi_0] + A_{j_0}^{z,c}[\Psi_0] s^{-\eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0]} \cos(q^{z,c}[\Psi_0] s + \phi_{j_0}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]), \quad 1 \ll j_0, s, j_0 + s \ll 2N, \quad (\text{C84})$$

where only $A_{j_0}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ and $\phi_{j_0}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ depend on j_0 . We find the exponent of the algebraic decay to take the values

$$\eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0] = \begin{cases} 1.026 \pm 0.006, & \text{for } 2N = 512, \\ 1.002 \pm 0.002, & \text{for } 2N = 1024, \end{cases} \quad (\text{C85})$$

at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the FM_z phase. The wave-vector $q^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ obtained for $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ lies within the uncertainty interval of the wave-vector $q^z[\Psi_0]$ obtained for $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ in Eq. (C83). We thus claim that $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ is an algebraically decaying function of the form $s^{-\eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0]}$ with exponent $\eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0] = 1$, modulated by oscillations as a function of s with wave-vector $q^{z,c}[\Psi_0] = 2\pi \times 3/10$, i.e.,

$$q^z[\Psi_0] = q^{z,c}[\Psi_0]. \quad (\text{C86})$$

We now revisit the case of PBC. Within our numerical accuracy, $\langle \widehat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ is independent of j . However, an oscillatory dependence on s of the two-point function $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ along the Z -axis in spin space is present as is illustrated in




FIG. 23. (Color online) The case of PBC. (a) Dependence on the separation s of the spin-spin correlation function $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C3a) and computed using the DMRG ($\chi = 512$ and $2N = 128$) approximation to the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (A1) at $(\theta, \lambda) = (\pi/4, 1/2)$. (b) Connected part $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ of $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ for a DMRG with $\chi = 512$ and $2N = 128$. Fits used are labeled “q” for cosine form and “d” for an algebraically damped cosine form. In both cases, $q^z \simeq 2\pi \frac{3}{10}$. The insets show the Fourier transforms of the respective correlations, where the abscissa is the frequency $f^z \equiv q^z/(2\pi)$ and the ordinate is the expansion coefficient $A(f^z)$.

Fig. 23(a) at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ in Fig. 5. The fit of the form (C78a) applied to $\langle \widehat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ under PBC confirms that the wave-vector of the oscillations is approximately equal to that observed when OBC are chosen, i.e., $q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0] \simeq 2\pi \times 3/10$. The insets showing the Fourier transforms are consistent with $q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0] \simeq 2\pi \times 3/10$, together with a non-vanishing and non-decaying amplitude of oscillations.

We also analyze under PBC the connected correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C3b) by applying the fit of the form (C84), obtaining $\eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0] = 1.08 \pm 0.02$ [see Fig. 23(b)] at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ in Fig. 5. This result is consistent, albeit less accurate, compared to the one obtained using OBC. These findings further confirm the incommensuration of the spin-spin correlations along the Z -axis in spin space of the FM_z phase.

The insets in Figs. 21 and 22 display the Fourier transforms with respect to the s dependence of the spin-spin correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ under OBC defined in Eq. (C3a). For each λ on the $U(1)$ -symmetric line $\theta = \pi/4$, we extract the non-vanishing frequency

$$f^z[\Psi_0] \equiv q^z[\Psi_0]/(2\pi), \quad (\text{C87})$$

whose Fourier amplitude is the largest among non-vanishing frequencies. (The vanishing frequency corresponding to the long-range order is always tied to a Fourier amplitude that is a local extremum.) We report the values of $f^z[\Psi_0]$ as a function of λ in Figs. 24(a) and 24(b).

We also compute the Fourier transforms with respect to the j dependence of the spin expectation values $\langle \widehat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ under OBC. For each λ on the $U(1)$ -symmetric line $\theta = \pi/4$, we extract the non-vanishing frequency

$$f_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0] \equiv q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0]/(2\pi), \quad (\text{C88})$$

whose Fourier amplitude is the largest among non-vanishing frequencies. (The vanishing frequency corresponding to the long-range order is always tied to a Fourier amplitude that is a local extremum.) We report the values of $f_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0]$ as a function of λ in Figs. 24(c) and 24(d).

We observe from Figs. 24(a) and 24(b) that $q^z[\Psi_0] \equiv 2\pi f^z[\Psi_0]$ as a function of λ is (i) an increasing function of λ upon approaching the boundary from the inside of the FM_z phase, and (ii) a vanishing function of λ upon approaching the boundary from the outside of the FM_z phase. Due to the discrete nature of the Fourier transform, $q^z[\Psi_0]$ does not visually appear to be a smooth function of λ inside the FM_z phase. However, our numerics suggest that $q^z[\Psi_0]$ is inherently smooth as a function of λ taking values corresponding to the inside of the FM_z phase, decreasing to the minimum value $q^z[\Psi_0] \simeq 2\pi \times 3/10$ at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ in Fig. 5. The continuous variation of $q^z[\Psi_0]$ as a function of λ taking values corresponding to the inside of the FM_z phase confirms the existence of incommensuration of the spin-spin correlations along the Z -axis in spin space. We also observe by comparing Figs. 24(a) and 24(b) with Figs. 24(c) and 24(d) that

$$q^z[\Psi_0] = q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0] \quad (\text{C89})$$

as a function of λ at $\theta = \pi/4$ (the equality holds up to the second digit with our DMRG estimates of $q^z[\Psi_0]$ and $q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0]$).




FIG. 24. (Color online) The case of OBC. Dependence on λ for the given value of $\theta = \pi/4$ of the frequency f^z of the Fourier transform of (a) the spin-spin correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ for $2N = 256$, (b) same as for (a) except for $2N = 512$, (c) the local spin expectation values $\langle \hat{Z}_j \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ for $2N = 256$, and (d) same as for (c) except for $2N = 512$, in the bulk obtained by approximating the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ with the DMRG ($\chi = 128$) matrix product state. The insets are zooms within the window for which f^z is non-vanishing.

It is an empirical observation based on the values quoted in Eq. (C78) that Eq. (C89) is not limited to the vertical cut $\theta = \pi/4$ in the FM_z phase, but applies throughout the FM_z phase, i.e., $q^z[\Psi_0]$ and $q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0]$ only depend on λ (not on θ). The same is true of the absolute value of the uniform magnetization $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C6a). It is a function of λ only, as is implied by the values quoted in Eq. (C77).

Moreover, along the vertical line $\theta = \pi/4$ of the FM_z phase, we deduce from Fig. 25 that $|m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]|$ is approximately proportional to two scaling exponents and three wave vectors, namely

$$|m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]| \propto \eta^x[\Psi_0] \propto \eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0] \propto q^z[\Psi_0] = q^{z,c}[\Psi_0] = q_{\text{loc}}^z[\Psi_0], \quad 0 \leq \lambda \leq 0.5. \quad (\text{C90})$$

Relation (C90) is reminiscent of the critical phase called the Tomonaga-Luttinger-Liquid phase with central charge one (TLL1) in the study done in Ref. [59] of the quantum spin-1/2 chain with nearest- and next-nearest-neighbor Heisenberg exchange couplings in a uniform magnetic field.

The dependence on λ of $|m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]|$ along the vertical cut $(\pi/4, \lambda)$ shown in Fig. 25(a) can be fitted with the fit_{\log} Ansatz

$$m_{\text{fit}_{\log}}^z(\lambda) \equiv m_{2N, \text{tri}}^z \Theta(\lambda - \lambda_{2N, \text{tri}}) (\lambda - \lambda_{2N, \text{tri}})^{\beta_{\text{tri}}}, \quad (\text{C91a})$$

for λ in the vicinity of $\lambda_{2N, \text{tri}}$, where the fitting parameters are $m_{2N, \text{tri}}^z > 0$, $\lambda_{2N, \text{tri}} > 0$, and the scaling exponent $\beta_{\text{tri}} > 0$. We have found the values

$$m_{2N, \text{tri}}^z = 0.550 \pm 0.008, \quad \lambda_{2N, \text{tri}} = 0.2434 \pm 0.0006, \quad \beta_{\text{tri}} = 1/6 \pm 0.005. \quad (\text{C91b})$$

From Figs. 25(b), 25(c), and 25(d), we refine the relation (C90) to

$$|m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]| = \begin{cases} -(1.98 \pm 0.02) f^z[\Psi_0] + (0.99 \pm 0.01), \\ +(0.158 \pm 0.002) \eta^x[\Psi_0] + (0.247 \pm 0.001), \\ -(0.104 \pm 0.005) \eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0] + (0.505 \pm 0.006), \end{cases} \quad (\text{C92})$$

respectively. Consequently, we conjecture the relation

$$q^z[\Psi_0] \equiv 2\pi f^z[\Psi_0] = \pi (1 - |m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]|), \quad (\text{C93})$$

which is the only one in Eq. (C92) that is not subject to systematic errors upon the choice of the fitting range of the correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^x[\Psi_0]$ and $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ in Figs. 25(c) and 25(d), respectively. Hereto, we conjecture the following inverse relations

$$\eta^x[\Psi_0] = \frac{5}{3} (4 |m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]| - 1), \quad (\text{C94a})$$

$$\eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0] = 5 (1 - 2 |m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]|), \quad (\text{C94b})$$




FIG. 25. (Color online) The case of OBC. (a) Dependence on λ of the frequency f^z of the Fourier transform of the spin-spin correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C3a) and of the absolute value of the uniform magnetization $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C6a) in the bulk of a chain with $2N = 512$ sites obtained using DMRG ($\chi = 128$) with $j_0 = (2N - 512)/2$ at $\theta = \pi/4$. The inset shows the logarithm of the nonvanishing values of $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ for $\lambda > \lambda_{2N, \text{tri}}$, where $\lambda_{2N, \text{tri}}$ is obtained through the fit_{\log} Ansatz (C91a). (b) The dependence of $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ on the frequency $f^z[\Psi_0]$ of the Fourier transform of the spin-spin correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$, whereby both quantities are computed with DMRG [$2N = 512$, $\chi = 128$, $j_0 = (2N - 512)/2$] along the vertical line $\theta = \pi/4$ in the FM_z phase. (c) The dependence of $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ on the exponent $\eta^x[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C68) of the algebraic decay of the spin-spin correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^x[\Psi_0]$, whereby both quantities are computed with DMRG [$2N = 512$, $\chi = 128$, $j_0 = (2N - 512)/2$] along the vertical line $\theta = \pi/4$ in the FM_z phase. (d) The dependence of $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ on the exponent $\eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eq. (C84) of the algebraic decay of the spin-spin correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$, whereby both quantities are computed with DMRG [$2N = 512$, $\chi = 128$, $j_0 = (2N - 512)/2$] along the vertical line $\theta = \pi/4$ in the FM_z phase. The different values of λ along the line $\theta = \pi/4$ in the FM_z phase are specified by different colors.

that lie within the uncertainty interval of the fit used to obtain $\eta^x[\Psi_0]$ and $\eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$ for different choices of the fitting range of the correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^x[\Psi_0]$ and $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{z,c}[\Psi_0]$, respectively. We observe that, at the point $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the phase diagram in Fig. 5 where $|m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]| = 2/5$, relations (C93) and (C94) are consistent with the DMRG results

$$q^z[\Psi_0] = 2\pi \times 3/10, \quad \eta^x[\Psi_0] = 1, \quad \eta^{z,c}[\Psi_0] = 1, \quad (\text{C95})$$

at the point $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the phase diagram in Fig. 5.

3. Phase boundaries

We have established numerically the nature of the extended Neel_x , Neel_y , $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$, $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$, and FM_z phases. We now turn our attention to the study of the transitions between any two of these phases that share a common boundary.

a. Between Neel_x and Neel_y

a. *Location of the phase boundary* — The energy difference

$$E_1 - E_0 \quad (\text{C96})$$

between the first excited state with energy E_1 and the ground state with energy E_0 in either the Neel_x or Neel_y phase is a function of $2N$ that converges to zero

- (i) exponentially fast with the length $2N$ of the chain in the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ deep in a gapped phase,
- (ii) algebraically fast as $(2N)^{-z}$ with the length $2N$ of the chain in the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ upon exiting a gapped phase through a gap-closing transition.

A gap closing with the dynamical scaling exponent $z = 1$ between two gapped phases of matter can thus be identified through a cusp singularity when plotting the energy difference

$$2N(E_1 - E_0) \quad (\text{C97})$$




FIG. 26. (Color online) The case of PBC. Dependence on θ of the energy spacings $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$, above the ground state energy E_0 obtained with ED at $\lambda = 0$ for different system sizes $2N$. The fact that all lines reach an extremum at $\theta = \pi/4$ (dashed black line) is consistent with a gap closing as $1/(2N)$ in the thermodynamic limit.

as a function of the coupling driving a gap-closing phase transition between two gapped phases. Accordingly, Figure 26 is consistent with the existence of a deconfined quantum critical point (DQCP) with $z = 1$ located at $(\pi/4, 0)$.

We have located numerically the transition between the Neel_x and Neel_y phases at $(\pi/4, 0)$ by observing the cusps in the energy gap $E_1 - E_0$ shown in Fig. 26. We now present an alternative method to locate this phase transition, based on the computation of the order parameters. This method will be particularly useful to identify the phase transition upon exiting the FM_z phase.

It is known on analytical grounds [50] that the point $(\pi/4, 0)$ with the $O(2)$ -symmetry of Hamiltonian (A1) realizes a continuous phase transition along the line $\lambda = 0$ in the phase diagram from Fig. 5. Verifying this prediction numerically faces two hurdles. First, a (quantum) phase transition can only take place in the thermodynamic limit defined by taking the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ for the length of the chain $L = 2N \mathbf{a}$, while numerics demand that $2N$ is a finite number, i.e., that L is finite. Second, we approximate exact eigenstates of Hamiltonian (A1) using DMRG. We review the consequences of both limitations.

Suppose that the correlation length $\xi_{\text{phys}}(t)$ in the thermodynamic limit is known exactly as a function of t . Here, $t \equiv \theta - \pi/4$ is the coupling with the Neel_x fixed point at $t = -\pi/4$, the quantum critical point at $t = 0$, and the Neel_y fixed point at $t = +\pi/4$. The correlation length $\xi_{\text{phys}}(t)$ is an even positive function of t that diverges at $t = 0$, has two absolute minima at $t = \pm\pi/4$ of order \mathbf{a} , and is a strictly monotonic function of t on either side of $t = 0$. Suppose that it is possible to compute exactly the expectation value $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\Psi_{0,L}}$ of any operator \hat{O} in the ground state $|\Psi_{0,L}\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (A1) for a given finite system size L . If $L \gg \xi_{\text{phys}}(t)$, then $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\Psi_{0,L}}$ is a good approximation to $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\Psi_{0,L}}$, as one has good control over the finite-size corrections when $\xi_{\text{phys}}(t)/L \ll 1$. However, if $L \ll \xi_{\text{phys}}(t)$, then $\langle \hat{O} \rangle_{\Psi_{0,L}}$ will share the same behavior as the correlation function at criticality, as one has no control over the finite-size corrections when $\xi_{\text{phys}}(t)/L \gg 1$. The signature of the quantum phase transition at $t = 0$ when using exact diagonalization to compute the Neel_x and Neel_y order parameters is an interval of size $\delta t(L)$ centered around $t = 0$ in which the order parameters vanish, whereby $\delta t(L)$ is a positive function of L that converges to the value 0 in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$.

In practice, it is not possible for large system sizes $L \gg \mathbf{a}$ to obtain an exact eigenstate of Hamiltonian (A1). Approximations to an exact eigenstate of Hamiltonian (A1) such as DMRG are used instead. At criticality, here $t = 0$, DMRG tries to approximate a critical state with a matrix product state characterized by a correlation length $\xi_{\text{MPS}}(t = 0, \chi)$. Here, the correlation length $\xi_{\text{MPS}}(t, \chi)$ depends on the physical coupling t entering the Hamiltonian (A1) and an unphysical parameter, the bond dimension χ , that fixes the space of variational matrix product states from which DMRG selects the approximation to the exact ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$, say. This space of variational wave functions is incomplete as a basis of the Hilbert space for any given χ . The correlation length $\xi_{\text{MPS}}(t, \chi)$ of the DMRG state is an increasing function of χ that is bounded from above by the physical correlation length $\xi_{\text{phys}}(t)$. At criticality, $\xi_{\text{phys}}(t = 0) = \infty$ and all order parameters vanish. On the one hand, if $\xi_{\text{MPS}}(t = 0, \chi) \ll L$, then DMRG predicts erroneously non-vanishing values for all order parameters. On the other hand, if $\xi_{\text{MPS}}(t = 0, \chi) \gg L$, then DMRG predicts correctly vanishing values for all order parameters.

In summary, there are three regimes for which finite-size effects are not under control. There is the regime defined

by

$$L \ll \xi_{\text{phys}}(t), \quad (\text{C98a})$$

for which exact diagonalization predicts that all order parameters vanish. There is the regime defined by

$$L \ll \xi_{\text{MPS}}(t, \chi) \ll \xi_{\text{phys}}(t) \quad (\text{C98b})$$

for which DMRG agrees with exact diagonalization in that it also predicts that all order parameters vanish. There is the regime defined by

$$\xi_{\text{MPS}}(t, \chi) \ll L \ll \xi_{\text{phys}}(t), \quad (\text{C98c})$$

for which DMRG disagrees with exact diagonalization in that it predicts that some order parameters are non-vanishing. It is the regime (C98c) that is problematic, for it should cross over to the regime (C98b) in the limit $\chi \rightarrow \infty$. An example of this crossover is illustrated in Fig. 27 in which the value of the sum of the absolute values of the Neel_x and Neel_y order parameters at criticality $t = 0$ are plotted as a function of increasing χ for fixed system sizes $2N$. For the three quoted values of $2N$, a crossover from the regime (C98c) to the regime (C98b) is apparent. In the discussion of Fig. 28 that follows, χ is chosen sufficiently large for all system sizes to ensure that regime (C98b) holds when approaching the critical point at $t = 0$.

The Neel_x phase is characterized by a non-vanishing value of the order parameter $m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]$, defined in Eq. (C6b), when computed with the approximation to the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (A1) obtained using DMRG. The Neel_y phase is characterized by a non-vanishing value of the order parameter $m_{\text{sta}}^y[\Psi_0]$, also defined in (C6b), when computed with the approximation to the ground state $|\Psi_0\rangle$ of Hamiltonian (A1) obtained using DMRG. Figure 28 shows the absolute values of $m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]$ and $m_{\text{sta}}^y[\Psi_0]$ along the line $\lambda = 0$ for different system sizes $2N$. We observe a window in parameter space around $\theta = \pi/4$ where both order parameters vanish. The size of this window decreases as the system size increases, as is expected for a quantum phase transition taking place at $\theta = \pi/4$.

b. Degeneracies at the phase boundary — We have already verified numerically that the ground-state energy E_0 is onefold degenerate with OBC at the DQCP $(\pi/4, 0)$ in that the energy difference between the first excited state E_1 and the ground state E_0 decreases like $1/(2N)$ as opposed to being exponentially small in $2N$. We have verified that this onefold degeneracy persists for all points on the critical line at $\theta = \pi/4$ emanating from $(\pi/4, 0)$ [see Fig. 29] until the FM_z phase is reached.

The rate at which two consecutive energy eigenvalues approach each other as the system size is increased is a useful characterization of excited states. To this end, we define the “velocities” $v_{n,n-1}$ by taking the derivative with respect of the system size of two consecutive energy eigenvalues, namely we define

$$v_{n,n-1} := \frac{\partial(E_n - E_{n-1})}{\partial(2N)^{-1}}, \quad (\text{C99a})$$

assuming the partial ordering

$$E_{n-1} \leq E_n, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots, \quad (\text{C99b})$$

of the exact energy eigenvalues given the finite-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}^{2^{2N}}$. A “velocity” $v_{n,n-1}$ vanishes if $E_n - E_{n-1}$ is independent of $2N$ as occurs if E_n and E_{n-1} are degenerate for any choice of $2N$, say. A “velocity” $v_{n,n-1}$ vanishes in the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$ if it decays faster than $(2N)^{-1}$. The DMRG estimate of the “velocities” $v_{n,n-1}$ under OBC for different values of λ along the vertical boundary emanating from $(\pi/4, 0)$ are shown in Fig. 29. At $(\pi/4, 0)$, it is observed that all the non-vanishing velocities are equal, i.e.,

$$v_{1,0} = v_{3,2} = v_{4,3} \simeq 4.274. \quad (\text{C100})$$

Moving away from $(\pi/4, 0)$, the velocities $v_{1,0}$ and $v_{4,3}$ remain equal up to numerical precision and decrease linearly as a function of λ . However, these velocities differ from $v_{3,2}$, which decreases non-linearly as a function of λ . The strength of the finite-size effects close to the tricritical point at $(\pi/4, \lambda_{\text{tri}})$, $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.25$, prevent a reliable numerical estimate of these velocities at and in the vicinity of the tricritical point.

A similar study using PBC as opposed to OBC is summarized in Fig. 30. The ground-state degeneracy is confirmed to be onefold along the critical line at fixed $\theta = \pi/4$ emanating from $(\pi/4, 0)$, consistent with the results obtained for OBC. This agreement in ground-state degeneracy between PBC and OBC is expected. However, the excitation spectrum with PBC differs from that with OBC. For PBC, the non-vanishing velocities $v_{1,0}$ and $v_{3,2}$ both decrease linearly as a function of λ for small λ . Unlike with OBC in Fig. 29, these velocities are no longer identical for any value of λ . The strength of the finite-size effects close to the tricritical point at $(\pi/4, \lambda_{\text{tri}})$, $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.25$, prevent a reliable numerical estimate of these velocities at and in the vicinity of the tricritical point.




FIG. 27. (Color online) The case of PBC. DMRG estimate for the absolute value $|m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]| + |m_{\text{sta}}^y[\Psi_0]|$ of the relevant order parameters at $(\pi/4, 0)$ at fixed system sizes $2N$ as a function of the bond dimension χ .




FIG. 28. (Color online) The case of OBC. Relevant (non-vanishing) order parameters defined in (C6) obtained with the DMRG approximation ($\chi = 128$) across a cut around $\theta = \pi/4$ at $\lambda = 0$. The dotted black line indicates $\theta = \pi/4$.

c. Correlations at the phase boundary — The point $(\pi/4, 0)$ realizes the DQCP between the Neel_x and Neel_y phases. Its low-energy theory is described by the free-fermion CFT with the central charge $c = 1$ [50]. Numerical results confirm that the two-point correlation $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^x[\Psi_0]$ and $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^y[\Psi_0]$, defined in Eq. (C3a) for OBC, are equal due to the $O(2)$ -symmetry of Hamiltonian (A1) when $\theta = \pi/4$. These correlations follow the algebraic decay (C68), i.e., $(-1)^s s^{-\eta(\lambda=0)}$ with the exponent $\eta(\lambda = 0) = 1/2$ at $(\pi/4, 0)$ [see Fig. 31(a)].

Figure 31(b) shows the dependence on λ of the scaling exponent $\eta(\lambda)$ along the vertical boundary $(\pi/4, \lambda)$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 0.22$. Close to $\lambda = 0$, the exponent $\eta(\lambda)$ decreases linearly with λ . This linear relationship, however, breaks down upon approaching the tricritical point $(\pi/4, \lambda_{\text{tri}})$ with $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.25$ (see Sec. C4) at which the Neel_x , Neel_y , and FM_z phases meet. At around $\lambda = 0.18$, $\eta(\lambda)$ reaches a minimum. For larger values of λ , the scaling exponent $\eta(\lambda)$ is an increasing function of λ that converges smoothly to the value $\eta(\lambda = 1/2) = 1$ at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the phase diagram from Fig. 5.

d. Central charge at the phase boundary — The use of PBC with DMRG is best suited for the computation of the central charge c . With OBC, determining c is heavily influenced by finite-size effects, often necessitating extrapolation to the thermodynamic limit using large values of $2N$. In contrast, with PBC, c can be extracted with reasonable accuracy even for relatively small system sizes, typically involving only a few tens of sites.

Using PBC, we can fit $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$ defined in Eq. (C71) with the CFT Ansatz (C70) to extract the DMRG estimate for the central charge c_{2N} and then perform the extrapolation $c := \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} c_{2N}$. At $(\pi/4, 0)$, we already find that $2N = 64$ delivers the value $c = 1 \pm 0.001$ according to Fig. 32(a). Finite-size corrections for the central charge c_{2N} increase along the vertical boundary $(\pi/4, \lambda)$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 0.2$ according to Fig. 32(b). However, these finite-size corrections are consistent with the limiting value $c := \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} c_{2N} = 1$ for $(\pi/4, \lambda)$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 0.2$. Figure 32(c) is consistent with the limiting value $c := \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} c_{2N} = 0$ for $(\theta, 0)$ with $\theta \neq \pi/4$ in the closed interval $[0, \pi/2]$. The value $c = 1$ for $(\pi/4, \lambda)$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 0.2$ is the same as the value found in Sec. C2a for the central charge inside the FM_z phase. The strength of the finite-size effects close to the tricritical point at $(\pi/4, \lambda_{\text{tri}})$, $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.25$, prevent a reliable numerical estimate of the central charges at and in the vicinity of the tricritical point.

In spite of the strong finite-size effects close to the tricritical point $(\pi/4, \lambda_{\text{tri}})$, $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.25$, the results obtained with DMRG on the chain of $2N = 64$ sites support the conjecture that every point on the line $(\pi/4, \lambda)$, $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ realizes a CFT with central charge $c = 1$.




FIG. 29. (Color online) The case of OBC. (a) Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy differences $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, above the ground state energy E_0 obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 128$) at $\theta = \pi/4$ for different λ . Linear fits for each n are represented as lines whose color corresponds to the color of the data points in the legend. (b) Dependence on λ of the relevant nonvanishing velocities $v_{n,n-1} := \partial(E_n - E_{n-1})/\partial(2N)^{-1}$, $n = 1, 3, 4$, computed with DMRG ($\chi = 128$) at $\theta = \pi/4$ for systems sizes $2N \in [32, 128]$. Fits of the type $v_{n,n-1} = \alpha \lambda^\beta + \gamma$ for each n are computed.

b. Between $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$

a. *Location of the phase boundary* — Under PBC, the phase boundary between the $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ is the vertical interval $(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda)$, $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_{\text{tri}}$, with $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.25$ in Fig. 5 (see Secs. A 1 and C 3 a).

b. *Degeneracies at the phase boundary* — Under PBC, the DQCP at $(\pi/4, 0)$ and $(\pi/4, 1)$ are unitarily equivalent by the transformation \hat{U}_E in Eq. (B1b). The same is true for the vertical boundaries emanating from $(\pi/4, 0)$ and $(\pi/4, 1)$. Therefore, any property of the vertical boundary emanating from $(\pi/4, 0)$ carries over to the vertical boundary emanating from $(\pi/4, 1)$. The former properties have been derived in Sec. C 3 a. Remarkably, the converse is not true. Not all properties from the vertical boundary emanating from $(\pi/4, 1)$ carry over to the vertical boundary emanating from $(\pi/4, 0)$, owing to the sensitivity of the vertical boundary emanating from $(\pi/4, 1)$ to the change of boundary conditions from periodic to open ones.

When OBC are selected, the fixed point Hamiltonians (B10a) and (B10b) each have eightfold degenerate ground states for any finite length $L = 2N \mathbf{a}$ of the chain. This degeneracy arises because (i) Hamiltonians (B10a) and (B10b) each are the sum of $2N - 3$ pairwise commuting operators, (ii) there is a twofold degeneracy inherited from the case of PBC and (iii) there is an additional fourfold degeneracy that arises because of the existence of two independent boundary spin-1/2 degrees of freedom that decouple from the Hamiltonian [recall Eq. (B15)]. The twofold degeneracy shared by the fixed point Hamiltonians (B10a) and (B10b) under both PBC and OBC for any L is tied to time-reversal symmetry.

Prior to taking the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ and for any $0 < \theta < \pi/2$ and $\theta \neq \pi/4$ under PBC, the twofold degeneracy of the ground states of the fixed point Hamiltonians (B10a) and (B10b) is lifted along the horizontal line $(\theta, 1)$ from Fig. 5 by an amount exponentially small in the ratio

$$\frac{L}{\xi_{\text{PBC}}(\theta, 1)}, \quad \xi_{\text{PBC}}(\theta, 1) := \frac{\hbar v_{\text{PBC}}(\theta, 1)}{\Delta(\theta, 1)}, \quad (\text{C101a})$$




FIG. 30. (Color online) The case of PBC. (a) Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy differences $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, 3$, above the ground state energy E_0 obtained with DMRG and PBC at $\theta = \pi/4$ for different λ . Linear fits for each n are represented as lines whose color corresponds to the color of the data points in the legend. (b) Dependence on λ of the relevant nonvanishing velocities $v_{n,n-1} := \partial(E_n - E_{n-1})/\partial(2N)^{-1}$, $n = 1, 3$, computed with DMRG and PBC at $\theta = \pi/4$ for systems sizes $2N \in [16, 32]$. Fits of the type $v_{n,n-1} = \alpha \lambda^\beta + \gamma$ for each n are computed.




FIG. 31. (Color online) The case of OBC. (a) Dependence on the separation s in the spin-spin correlation functions $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^\alpha[\Psi_0]$ with $j_0 = (2N - 96)/2$ and $\alpha = x, y, z$ defined in Eq. (C3a) computed using DMRG ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 128$) at $(\pi/4, 0)$ in Fig. 5. The fit for $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^x[\Psi_0] = C_{j_0, j_0+s}^y[\Psi_0]$ is an algebraic decay. The p -value for each fit is given. (b) Scaling exponents $\eta(\lambda)$ for the algebraic decay of $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^x[\Psi_0] = C_{j_0, j_0+s}^y[\Psi_0] \sim (-1)^s s^{-\eta(\lambda)}$ as a function of λ holding $\theta = \pi/4$ fixed. Uncertainties on $\eta(\lambda)$ are shown in magenta.

where $v_{\text{PBC}}(\theta, 1)$ is a characteristic non-vanishing speed proportional to the “velocity”

$$v_{3,2}(\theta, 1) := \frac{\partial [E_{\text{PBC},3}(\theta, 1) - E_{\text{PBC},2}(\theta, 1)]}{\partial(2N)^{-1}} \quad (\text{C101b})$$

and $\Delta(\theta, 1)$ is the thermodynamic energy gap between the ground states and all the excited states in the partially




FIG. 32. (Color online) The case of PBC. (a) c_{2N} as a function of l with the CFT Ansatz (C70), whereby the central charge is $c_{2N} = 0.99935 \pm 2 \cdot 10^{-5}$, to $S_{\text{MPS},2N}(l)$ defined in Eq. (C71) and obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 256$ and $2N = 64$) at $(\pi/4, 0)$. (b) Central charge c_{2N} as a function of λ holding $\theta = \pi/4$ fixed for different values of $2N$ computed by fitting the entanglement entropy $S_{\text{MPS},2N}(l)$. (c) Central charge c_{2N} as a function of θ holding $\lambda = 0$ fixed for different values of $2N$ computed by fitting the entanglement entropy $S_{\text{MPS},2N}(l)$. In panels (b) and (c), δl defined in Eq. (C72) is $2N/2$.

ordered set

$$E_{\text{PBC},0}(\theta, 1) < E_{\text{PBC},1}(\theta, 1) \leq E_{\text{PBC},2}(\theta, 1) \leq E_{\text{PBC},3}(\theta, 1) \leq E_{\text{PBC},4}(\theta, 1) \leq \dots \quad (\text{C101c})$$

At the critical point $(\pi/4, 1)$ with PBC prior to taking the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, the energy difference between the energies $E_{\text{PBC},0}(\pi/4)$ and $E_{\text{PBC},1}(\pi/4)$ closes as the power law L^{-1} [see Fig. 33(a)]. We may then substitute $E_{\text{PBC},3}(\pi/4, 1) - E_{\text{PBC},2}(\pi/4, 1)$ by $E_{\text{PBC},1}(\pi/4, 1) - E_{\text{PBC},0}(\pi/4, 1)$ in the numerator of Eq. (C101b) [see Fig. 33(b)] with the limiting behavior

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \pi/4} \xi_{\text{PBC}}(\pi/4, 1) = \infty, \quad (\text{C101d})$$

due to the closing of the thermodynamic gap [see Fig. 33(a)].

When selecting OBC prior to taking the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, we have seen in Secs. C1d and C1e that the lifting of the degeneracy between the eight degenerate ground states of the fixed point Hamiltonians (B10a) and (B10b) incurred by choosing $0 < \theta < \pi/2$ and $\theta \neq \pi/4$ along the horizontal line $(\theta, 1)$ from Fig. 5 is also exponentially small in the ratio

$$\frac{L}{\xi_{\text{OBC}}(\theta, 1)}, \quad \xi_{\text{OBC}}(\theta, 1) := \frac{\hbar v_{\text{OBC}}(\theta, 1)}{\Delta(\theta, 1)}, \quad (\text{C102a})$$

where $v_{\text{OBC}}(\theta, 1)$ is a characteristic non-vanishing speed proportional to the “velocity”

$$v_{9,8} = \frac{\partial [E_{\text{OBC},9}(\theta, 1) - E_{\text{OBC},8}(\theta, 1)]}{\partial (2N)^{-1}} \quad (\text{C102b})$$

and $\Delta(\theta, 1)$ is the thermodynamic energy gap between the ground states and all the excited states in the partially ordered set

$$E_{\text{OBC},0}(\theta, 1) < E_{\text{OBC},1}(\theta, 1) \leq E_{\text{OBC},2}(\theta, 1) \leq \dots \leq E_{\text{OBC},8}(\theta, 1) \leq E_{\text{OBC},9}(\theta, 1) \leq E_{\text{OBC},10}(\theta, 1) \leq \dots \quad (\text{C102c})$$

Prior to taking the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ at the critical point $(\pi/4, 1)$ under OBC, the energy difference between any one of the four energies $E_{\text{OBC},0}(\pi/4, 1)$, $E_{\text{OBC},1}(\pi/4, 1)$, $E_{\text{OBC},2}(\pi/4, 1)$ or $E_{\text{OBC},3}(\pi/4, 1)$ and the energy $E_{\text{OBC},4}(\pi/4, 1)$ closes as the power law L^{-1} [see Fig. 34(a)] so that we may substitute $E_{\text{OBC},9}(\pi/4, 1) - E_{\text{OBC},8}(\pi/4, 1)$ by $E_{\text{OBC},4}(\pi/4, 1) - E_{\text{OBC},3}(\pi/4, 1)$ in the numerator of Eq. (C102b) [see Fig. 34(b)] with the limiting behavior

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \pi/4} \xi_{\text{OBC}}(\pi/4, 1) = \infty, \quad (\text{C102d})$$




FIG. 33. (Color online) The case of PBC. (a) Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy differences $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, 3$, above the ground state energy E_0 obtained with DMRG at $\theta = \pi/4$ for different λ . Linear fits for each n are represented as lines whose color corresponds to the color of the data points in the legend. (b) Dependence on $1 - \lambda \equiv \lambda'$ of the relevant nonvanishing velocities $v_{n,n-1} := \partial(E_n - E_{n-1})/\partial(2N)^{-1}$, $n = 1, 3$, computed with DMRG at $\theta = \pi/4$ for systems sizes $2N \in [16, 32]$. Fits of the form $v_{n,n-1} = \alpha(1 - \lambda)^\beta + \gamma$ for each n are shown in red for a restricted range of $1 - \lambda \equiv \lambda'$.

due to the closing of the thermodynamic gap [see Fig. 34(a)].

This is why, when selecting OBC, we observe numerically for any finite chain length $L = 2N$ that Hamiltonian (B26a) under OBC ($b = 1$) supports a non-degenerate ground state, whereas Hamiltonian (B26b) under OBC ($b = 1$) supports fourfold-degenerate ground states due to the presence of boundary zero modes, whose energy differences cannot be resolved in Fig. 34(a).

Prior to taking the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ at the critical point $(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda')$ with $0 < \lambda' < 0.1$ under OBC, the energy difference between any one of the two energies $E_{\text{OBC},0}(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda')$ or $E_{\text{OBC},1}(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda')$ and the energy $E_{\text{OBC},2}(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda')$ closes as the power law L^{-1} [see Fig. 34(b)] so that we may substitute $E_{\text{OBC},9}(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda') - E_{\text{OBC},8}(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda')$ by $E_{\text{OBC},2}(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda') - E_{\text{OBC},1}(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda')$ in the numerator of Eq. (C102b) with the limiting behavior

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow \pi/4} \xi_{\text{OBC}}(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda') = \infty, \quad (\text{C103})$$

due to the closing of the thermodynamic gap [see Fig. 34(a)]. Accordingly, upon tuning $1 - \lambda'$ to values just below 1, the small perturbation (B26a) on the unperturbed Hamiltonian (B26b) lowers the ground-state degeneracy from four to two when OBC are selected and after the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ has been taken.

We chose to plot the dependence on $1 - \lambda \equiv \lambda'$ close to $\lambda' = 0$ along the vertical boundary $(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda')$ from Fig. 5 of the “velocities” $v_{n,n-1}$ defined in Eq. (C99) that are vanishing when $\lambda' = 0$ and non-vanishing for any small deviation $0 < \lambda' \leq 0.1$ in Figs. 33(b) and 34(b). The change from a vanishing to a non-vanishing “velocity” as a function of λ' is the signature of a change in the degeneracy of two consecutive eigenvalues in the thermodynamic limit. In Fig. 34(b), we chose the range $0 \leq \lambda' \leq 0.1$ over which these “velocities” are monotonic functions of λ' . We also report the values of these “velocities” at $\lambda' = 0.2$ to emphasize that this monotonic dependence does not extend beyond the range $0 \leq \lambda' \leq 0.1$ and that the dependence on λ' is non-linear. The numerical estimate of these “velocities” becomes unreliable due to strong finite-size effects along the vertical boundary $(\pi/4, 1 - \lambda')$ with $0.2 < \lambda' < \lambda_{\text{tri}}$ where the value $1 - \lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.75$ is the approximate location of the tricritical point at which the $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$, $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$, and FM_z




FIG. 34. (Color online) The case of OBC. (a) Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy differences $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$, above the ground state energy E_0 obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 128$) at $\theta = \pi/4$ for different λ . Linear fits for each n are represented as lines whose color correspond to the color of the data points in the legend. (b) Dependence on $1 - \lambda \equiv \lambda'$ of the relevant nonvanishing velocities $v_{n,n-1} := \partial(E_n - E_{n-1})/\partial(2N)^{-1}$, $n = 2, 4, 6$, computed with DMRG ($\chi = 128$) at $\theta = \pi/4$ for systems sizes $2N \in [32, 64]$. Fits of the form $v_{n,n-1} = \alpha(1-\lambda)^\beta + \gamma$ for each n are shown in red for a restricted range of $1 - \lambda \equiv \lambda'$.

phases meet.

c. Correlations at the phase boundary — The point $(\pi/4, 1)$ realizes the DQCP between the $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ phases. Its low-energy theory is described by the free-fermion CFT with $c = 1$ when PBC are chosen [recall Eqs. (B1b) and (B2)].

Numerical results confirm that the two-point correlation $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{\text{SPT}, x}[\Psi_0]$ and $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{\text{SPT}, y}[\Psi_0]$, defined in Eq. (C3c) for OBC, are equal due to the $O(2)$ -symmetry of Hamiltonian (A1) at the point $(\pi/4, 1)$ from Fig. 5. These correlations follow the algebraic decay (C68), i.e., $(-1)^s s^{-\eta_{\text{SPT}}(\lambda=1)}$, with the exponent $\eta_{\text{SPT}}(\lambda = 1) = 1/2$ at $(\pi/4, 1)$ [see Fig. 35(a)].

Figure 35(b) shows the dependence on λ of the scaling exponent $\eta_{\text{SPT}}(\lambda)$ along the vertical boundary $(\pi/4, \lambda)$ from Fig. 5. Close to $\lambda = 1$, the exponent $\eta_{\text{SPT}}(\lambda) = \eta_{\text{SPT}}(1 - (1 - \lambda))$ decreases linearly with $0 \leq 1 - \lambda \ll 1$ away from the value $1/2$. This linear relationship, however, breaks down upon approaching the tricritical point $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.75$ at which the $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$, $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$, and FM_z phases meet. At around $\lambda = 0.82$, $\eta_{\text{SPT}}(\lambda)$ reaches a minimum. For smaller values of λ , the scaling exponent $\eta_{\text{SPT}}(\lambda)$ is an increasing function of λ that converges smoothly to the value $\eta_{\text{SPT}}(\lambda = 1/2) = 1$ at the center $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ of the phase diagram 5.

d. Central charge at the phase boundary — The fixed point $(\pi/4, 1)$ on the $O(2)$ -symmetric vertical line $\theta = \pi/4$ from Fig. 5 under PBC realizes a $c = 1$ CFT [recall Eqs. (B1b) and (B2)]. We have confirmed numerically this analytical prediction in Fig. 36 by computing the DMRG estimate for the central charge c_{2N} and then performing the extrapolation $c := \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} c_{2N}$. Figure 36(c) is consistent with the limiting value $c(\theta, 1) := \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} c_{2N}(\theta, 1) = 0$ with $\theta \neq \pi/4$ in the closed interval $[0, \pi/2]$. The DMRG estimates of $c_{2N}(\pi/4, \lambda)$ along the vertical boundary with $0.8 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ are shown in Fig. 36(b). They are consistent with the constant value $c(\pi/4, \lambda) = 1$ for $0.8 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ in the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., the same value found in Sec. C 2 a for the central charge inside the FM_z phase. Finite-size effects do not allow a reliable estimate of $c(\pi/4, \lambda)$ in the window $0.74 < \lambda < 0.8$ centered about the tricritical point $(\pi/4, \lambda_{\text{tri}})$ with $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.75$.




FIG. 35. (Color online) The case of OBC. (a) Dependence on the separation s in the spin-spin correlation functions $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{\text{SPT}, \alpha}[\Psi_0]$ with $\alpha = x, y, z$ defined in Eq. (C3c) for $j_0 = (2N - 96)/2$ computed using DMRG ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 128$) at $(\pi/4, 1)$ in Fig. 5. The fit for $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{\text{SPT}, x}[\Psi_0] = C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{\text{SPT}, y}[\Psi_0]$ is an algebraic decay. The p -value for each fit is given. (b) Scaling exponents $\eta_{\text{SPT}}(\lambda)$ for the algebraic decay of $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{\text{SPT}, x}[\Psi_0] = C_{j_0, j_0+s}^{\text{SPT}, y}[\Psi_0] \sim (-1)^s s^{-\eta_{\text{SPT}}(\lambda)}$ as a function of λ holding $\theta = \pi/4$ fixed. Uncertainties on $\eta_{\text{SPT}}(\lambda)$ are shown in magenta.




FIG. 36. (Color online) The case of PBC. (a) Fit as a function of l with the CFT Ansatz (C70), whereby the central charge is $c_{2N} = 1.0025 \pm 2 \cdot 10^{-4}$, to $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$ defined in Eq. (C71) and obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 256$ and $2N = 64$) at $(\pi/4, 1)$. (b) Central charge c_{2N} as a function of λ holding $\theta = \pi/4$ fixed for different values of $2N$ computed by fitting the entanglement entropy $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$. (c) Central charge c_{2N} as a function of θ holding $\lambda = 1$ fixed for different values of $2N$ computed by fitting the entanglement entropy $S_{\text{MPS}, 2N}(l)$. In panels (b) and (c), δl defined in Eq. (C72) is $2N/2$.

c. Between Neel_x and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$

The continuous phase transitions at $(\pi/4, 0)$ and $(\pi/4, 1)$ in the phase diagram 5 are both exactly soluble under PBC, for (i) the Jordan-Wigner transformation maps the quantum-spin-1/2 Hamiltonian (B26a) to a non-interacting chain of fermions hopping through a nearest-neighbor hopping [50] and (ii) the lines $(\theta, 0)$ and $(\theta, 1)$ under PBC are unitarily equivalent. The Jordan-Wigner transformation applied to Hamiltonian (A1) at $(0, 1/2)$ delivers an interacting fermionic lattice Hamiltonian that we could not solve exactly. We claim on the basis of numerical arguments that the Neel_x and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ phases meet at a single quantum critical point that is located at $(0, 1/2)$ along the line $(0, \lambda)$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ in Fig. 5. We were unable to compute the central charge at the putative quantum critical point at $(0, 1/2)$ due to strong finite-size effects reminiscent of the strong finite-size effects that prevented us from measuring the central charges at the pair of tricritical points $(\pi/4, \lambda_{\text{tri}})$ with $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.25$ and $\lambda_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.75$.

a. *Location of the phase boundary* — When PBC are chosen, each corner of the phase diagram in Fig. 5 has twofold degenerate ground states prior to taking the thermodynamic limit. This twofold degeneracy persists after the thermodynamic limit has been taken in all the gapped phases controlled by the four corners of the the phase diagram 5. Hence, the energy difference

$$E_1 - E_0 \tag{C104}$$




FIG. 37. (Color online) The case of PBC. Dependence on λ of the energy spacings $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$, above the ground state energy E_0 obtained with ED at $\theta = 0$. The fact that all lines reach an extremum at $\lambda = 1/2$ (dashed black line) is consistent with a gap closing as $1/(2N)$ in the thermodynamic limit. However, oscillations as a function of $2N$ with the approximate period 10 prevent a quantitative measurement of the “velocities” $\partial(E_n - E_{n-1})/\partial(2N)^{-1}$.

between the first excited energy eigenstate with energy E_1 and the ground state with energy E_0 in either the Neel_x or the $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ phase is a function of the length $L = 2N a$ of the chain that converges to the value zero

- (i) exponentially fast with the length L of the chain in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ deep in a gapped phase,
- (ii) algebraically fast as L^{-z} in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ upon exiting the gapped phase through a gap-closing transition.

A gap-closing transition between two gapped phases of matter can thus be identified through a cusp singularity when plotting the rescaled energy difference

$$(2N)^z (E_1 - E_0), \quad (\text{C105})$$

for some value of the dynamical exponent z as a function of the coupling driving the gap-closing phase transition.

In Fig. 37, we present the dependence on λ of

$$(2N) [E_1(0, \lambda) - E_0(0, \lambda)] \quad (\text{C106})$$

under PBC at fixed values of $\theta = 0$ and $2N$. The presence of a cusp at $\lambda = 1/2$ is consistent with the existence of a quantum phase transition with the dynamical exponent $z = 1$ at $(0, 1/2)$ along the line $(0, \lambda)$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ separating two gapped phases, each one being twofold degenerate. The cusp values taken by

$$(2N) [E_1(0, 1/2) - E_0(0, 1/2)] \quad (\text{C107})$$

oscillate as a function of $2N$ with an approximate period of 10. This is a sharp difference with the dependence on $2N$ of

$$(2N) [E_1(\pi/4, 0) - E_0(\pi/4, 0)] \quad (\text{C108})$$

from Fig. 26, which is strictly monotonic and rapidly convergent as a function of $2N$. We attribute the existence of a periodicity of approximately 10 as a function of $2N$ in the values (C107) as a signature of incommensuration effects that are related to the incommensuration effects observed in the FM_z phase, for they share the same periodicity (see Sec. C2b). These oscillations impede the accurate estimate of the “velocities”

$$v_{n,n-1}(0, 1/2) = \frac{\partial [E_n(0, 1/2) - E_{n-1}(0, 1/2)]}{\partial (2N)^{-1}}, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (\text{C109})$$

The severity of the finite-size effects at $(0, 1/2)$ relative to those at $(\pi/4, 0)$ is captured by comparing Fig. 38 against Fig. 27. The bond dimension χ needed to make sure that it is the regime (C98b) and not the regime (C98c) that holds when estimating the value of the order parameter at criticality is larger than 30 for $2N = 64$ in Fig. 27, whereas it is larger than 300 for $2N = 48$ in Fig. 38. This why in Fig. 39(a) when OBC are selected, for lack of sufficiently




FIG. 38. (Color online) The case of PBC. DMRG estimate for the absolute value $|m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]| + |m_{\text{sta,SPT}}^y[\Psi_0]|$ of the relevant order parameters at $(0, 1/2)$ at fixed system sizes $2N$ as a function of the bond dimension χ .

large bond dimension χ , there is a window for the values of λ centered about $\lambda = 1/2$ for which the competing order parameters Neel_x and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ are simultaneously non-vanishing. This problem is less severe in Fig. 39(b) when PBC are selected. The strong finite size effects at $(0, 1/2)$ are thus tied to the existence of boundary states in the $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ phase.

Another important finite-size effect present in Fig. 39(a) but absent in Fig. 39(b) is that each window for which the Neel_x and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ order parameters coexist for a fixed system size in Fig. 39(a) is centered at a value $\lambda_{2N,\star}$ larger than $\lambda_c = 1/2$, whereby the extrapolation $\lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{2N,\star}$ is consistent with the limiting value $\lambda_c = 1/2$. In Fig. 39(b), each window for which the Neel_x and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ order parameters simultaneously vanish for a fixed system size is centered at $\lambda_c = 1/2$. This difference is not an artifact of DMRG. It is already present with ED when comparing Fig. 6(a) and Fig. 6(b). In Fig. 6(a), the area of the Neel_x and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ “phases” are approximately the same, with their “phase boundary” approximately centered at $\lambda_c = 1/2$. In Fig. 6(b), the area of the Neel_x “phase” is larger than that of the $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ “phase.” Their “phase boundary” is located at the value $\lambda_{2N,\star} > \lambda_c = 1/2$, with $\lambda_{2N,\star}$ a decreasing function of $2N$ for the values of $2N$ for which ED is feasible. Hereto, we anticipate $\lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{2N,\star} = \lambda_c = 1/2$, it is only in the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$ that the difference in the number of terms present in

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2N-b} \left(\cos \theta \hat{X}_j \hat{X}_{j+1} + \sin \theta \hat{Y}_j \hat{Y}_{j+1} \right) \quad (\text{C110a})$$

and in

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2N-3b} \hat{Z}_j \left(\cos \theta \hat{X}_{j+1} \hat{X}_{j+2} + \sin \theta \hat{Y}_{j+1} \hat{Y}_{j+2} \right) \hat{Z}_{j+3}, \quad (\text{C110b})$$

becomes immaterial when OBC are selected through the choice $b = 1$ in Hamiltonian (A1a).

By the symmetry arguments of Sec. A1, we expect the phase boundary between the Neel_x and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ phases to be the horizontal interval $(\theta, 1/2)$, $0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_{\text{tri}}$, with $\theta_{\text{tri}} \approx 0.3$ in Fig. 5. We have verified this expectation by computing $E_1 - E_0$ under PBC and the order parameters under OBC.

b. Degeneracies at the phase boundary — Finite-size effects under OBC were too strong to study the ground-state degeneracy for any point along the phase boundary $(\theta, 1/2)$, $0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_{\text{tri}}$. The ground states are non-degenerate under PBC for any point along the phase boundary $(\theta, 1/2)$, $0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_{\text{tri}}$, by the symmetry arguments of Sec. A1.

c. Correlations at the phase boundary — Finite-size effects under OBC and PBC were too strong to study the correlation functions for any point along the phase boundary $(\theta, 1/2)$, $0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_{\text{tri}}$.

d. Central charge at the phase boundary — The strong finite-size effects present in Figs. 37, 38, and 39 are also present in Fig. 40. Figure 40 is an estimate of the central charge $c(0, 1/2)$ at the quantum critical point $(0, 1/2)$ along the line $(0, \lambda)$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. The computation of the central charge using DMRG involves taking the double limit

$$c(\theta, \lambda) = \lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\chi \rightarrow \chi_{2N}} c_{2N,\chi}(\theta, \lambda), \quad (\text{C111})$$

where, for given $2N$, χ_{2N} is the bond dimension for which the regime (C98b) holds. According to Fig. 40:




FIG. 39. (Color online) Relevant (non-vanishing) order parameters defined in Eq. (C6) obtained with DMRG across a cut around $\lambda = 1/2$ at $\theta = 0$ (a) with OBC ($\chi = 128$) and (b) with PBC ($\chi = 256$).




FIG. 40. (Color online) The case of PBC. Central charge c obtained with DMRG and PBC at $\theta = 0$ for different λ and bond dimensions χ , and with (a) $2N = 16$, (b) $2N = 32$ and (c) $2N = 64$. The dashed black line indicates the location of the boundary between the Neel_x and the $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ phases. (d) Central charge c obtained with DMRG and PBC at $(0, 1/2)$ in Fig. 5 for different bond dimensions $\chi \in [50, 1200]$ and system sizes $2N = 10, 12, \dots, 28, 30$. An extrapolation in the limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$ of the central charges $\lim_{\chi \rightarrow \infty} c_{2N,\chi}$ obtained for each size $2N$ is performed. For all panels, the value of δl defined in Eq. (C72) is $2N/2$.

1. For $2N = 16$ and $2N = 32$, the central charge $c_{2N,\chi}(0, \lambda)$ increases with increasing χ to some limiting value for

each λ .

2. For $2N = 64$, the value $c_{2N,\chi}(0, \lambda)$ for a given λ as a function of χ is non-monotonic in χ .
3. The extrapolation (C111) based on the system sizes $2N = 10, 12, \dots, 28, 30$ with $\chi \in [50, 1200]$ gives the value

$$c(0, 1/2) = 1.01 \pm 0.03. \quad (\text{C112})$$

Our computational resources do not allow a reliable extrapolation of $c_{2N,\chi}(0, 1/2)$ to the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$ close to the quantum critical point $(0, 1/2)$ for the following reasons. First, the choice for the range δl of the values of the bonds l in Eq. (C71) over which the CFT fit (C70b) is used [recall Eq. (C72)] can be the cause of a systematic error that can be as large as 30% [as opposed to 1% at the point $(\pi/4, 0)$ and 3% at the point $(\pi/4, 1)$] of the value (C112). This systematic error dominates when δl is greater than $6N/4$, while the uncertainty on the CFT fit (C70b) dominates when δl is smaller than $6N/4$. Second, we could not verify that the extrapolation (C111) based on the system sizes $2N = 32, 34, \dots, 62, 64$ agrees with that done in Fig. 40(d).

d. Between Neel_x and FM_z

We have argued for the existence of a fifth diamond-shaped phase, labeled FM_z, which supports simultaneously long-range ferromagnetic order along the Z -axis in spin space and algebraic AF order along the X - and Y -axis in spin space. With PBC, the phase diagram is symmetric with respect to a π -rotation about the center of the FM_z phase $(\pi/4, 1/2)$ (as shown in Sec. A 1). Without loss of generality, we are going to locate and characterize the transition between the Neel_x and FM_z phases.

a. Location of the phase boundary — When PBC are chosen, each corner of the phase diagram in Fig. 5 has twofold degenerate ground states prior to taking the thermodynamic limit. This twofold degeneracy persists after the thermodynamic limit has been taken in all the gapped phases controlled by the four corners of the the phase diagram 5. Moreover, after taking the thermodynamic limit, the FM_z phase in Fig. 5 has a two-fold degenerate ground state for both PBC and OBC. Hence, the energy difference

$$E_1 - E_0 \quad (\text{C113})$$

between the first excited energy eigenstate with energy E_1 and the ground state with energy E_0 in either the Neel_x or the FM_z phase is a function of the length $L = 2N \mathbf{a}$ of the chain that converges to the value zero

- (i) exponentially fast with the length L of the chain in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ in either of the Neel_x or the FM_z phase,
- (ii) algebraically fast as L^{-z} in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ upon exiting the gapped phase through a gap-closing transition.

A gap-closing transition between two phases of matter can thus be identified through a cusp singularity when plotting the rescaled energy difference

$$(2N)^z (E_1 - E_0), \quad (\text{C114})$$

for some value of the dynamical exponent z as a function of the coupling driving the gap-closing phase transition.

In Fig. 41, we present the dependence on θ of

$$(2N) [E_1(\theta, 0.4) - E_0(\theta, 0.4)] \quad (\text{C115})$$

under PBC at fixed values of $\lambda = 0.4$ and $2N$. We observe that:

- (i) The cusps in $2N(E_1 - E_0)$ vary in height with $2N$. This is similar to the transition between the Neel_x and Neel_y^{SPT} phases in Fig. 37.
- (ii) The positions of the cusps in $2N(E_1 - E_0)$ occur at different values of θ for different values of $2N$. This is unlike in Figs. 26 and 37.




FIG. 41. (Color online) The case of PBC. Dependence on θ of the energy spacings $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$, above the ground state energy E_0 obtained with ED at $\lambda = 0.4$. All lines reach an extremum at different values of θ , unlike for Figs. 26 and 37.

The same behavior is observed for the energy spacings $2N(E_2 - E_1)$, $2N(E_3 - E_2)$, and $2N(E_4 - E_3)$ in Fig. 41. We interpret features (i) and (ii) as the signature of incommensuration accompanied by strong finite-size effects. These finite-size effects combined with our finite computing resources prevent us from measuring precisely the position of the putative continuous transition between the Neel_x and $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ phases using ED.

The phase transition from Neel_x to FM_z phases can, however, be located by measuring the order parameters $m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]$ and $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ defined in Eqs. (C6b) and (C6a), respectively. Figure 42 presents the dependence on θ of these order parameters along the horizontal cut $(\theta, 0.4)$, $0 \leq \theta \leq 0.8$, in the phase diagram 5 for different values of the number $2N$ of sites when OBC are selected. The DMRG results obtained for the numbers $2N = 64, 128$ of sites suggest that (i) there is a window

$$\theta \in [\theta_c - (\delta\theta_c)_{2N}, \theta_c + (\delta\theta_c)_{2N}] \quad (\text{C116})$$

of size $2(\delta\theta_c)_{2N}$ along the horizontal cut in which the order parameters $m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]$ and $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ vanish [recall the regime (C98b)] and (ii) the size $2(\delta\theta_c)_{2N}$ of this window decreases monotonically with increasing $2N$ with the extrapolated limiting value

$$\lim_{2N \rightarrow \infty} 2(\delta\theta_c)_{2N} = 0. \quad (\text{C117})$$

Hereto, there are strong finite-size effect. For example, the DMRG results obtained for the number $2N = 256$ of sites follow the regime (C98c), i.e., both order parameters $m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]$ and $m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]$ are non-vanishing at the point $(\theta_c, 0.4)$, where $\theta_c \approx 0.57$ is the approximate location of the boundary between the Neel_x and the FM_z phases along the horizontal cut $\lambda = 0.4$ in the phase diagram 5. The finite-size effects are strong as is evidenced by computing the crossover between the unphysical regime (C98c) and the physical regime (C98b) as a function of the bond dimension χ used to perform the DMRG estimate of $|m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]| + |m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]|$ at $(0.57, 0.4)$. According to Fig. 43, when $2N = 192$, the bond dimension must be larger than $\chi_{192} = 230$ for the matrix product state selected by DMRG to have a correlation length larger than $192 \mathbf{a}$.

We have measured $|m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]|$, $|m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]|$, and $|m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]| + |m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]|$ along several horizontal cuts in the lower left quadrant of the phase diagram 5 to determine the location of the phase boundary (θ_c, λ_c) separating the Neel_x from the FM_z phase, under the assumption that the phase transition is continuous. The error on the value (θ_c, λ_c) is the size $2(\delta\theta_c)_{2N}$ of the window over which $|m_{\text{sta}}^x[\Psi_0]| + |m_{\text{uni}}^z[\Psi_0]|$ vanishes when $2N = 128$. This phase boundary is presented in Fig. 44(a). We have then used the symmetries from Sec. A 1 to deduce in Fig. 44(b) the phase boundaries in the remaining three quadrants of the phase diagram 5.

b. Degeneracies at the phase boundary — The FM_z phase shares boundaries with the four gapped phases in Fig. 5. The phase transition from the FM_z phase to any of the four gapped phases realizes a continuous phase transition in the thermodynamic limit such that, prior to taking the thermodynamic limit, the non-degenerate ground state is separated from the first excited state by an energy difference that scales like $1/(2N)$ for a sufficiently large number $2N$ of sites. This scaling is presented in Fig. 45 at the point $(0.57, 0.4)$ from the phase diagram 5. As was the case with the dependence on $2N$ for the separation of two consecutive energies deep in the FM_z phase presented in Fig. 19, the power law scaling $1/(2N)$ in Fig. 45 is non-monotonic. There are oscillations in the separation of two consecutive energies as a function of $2N$ that are made manifest in Fig. 45(a). These oscillations occur with the same frequency $f^z[\Psi_0]$ as the oscillation frequency of the spin-spin correlations $C_{j_0, j_0+s}^z[\Psi_0]$ as a function of the separation




FIG. 42. (Color online) The case of OBC. Magnitudes of the staggered magnetization per site along the X -axis (C6b) and the uniform magnetization per site along the Z -axis (C6a), obtained along the line $\lambda = 0.4$ using DMRG ($\chi = 128$) for $N = 64, 128, 256$ sites. The sharp suppression of the order parameters on both sides of the quantum phase transition around $\theta = 0.57$ indicates that the correlation lengths in the gapped phases are larger than the length of the chain sufficiently close to the phase boundary.




FIG. 43. (Color online) The case of OBC. DMRG estimate for the absolute value $|m_{sta}^x[\Psi_0]| + |m_{uni}^z[\Psi_0]|$ of the relevant order parameters at $(0.57, 0.4)$ at fixed system sizes $2N$ as a function of the bond dimension χ .




FIG. 44. (Color online) The case of OBC. (a) Phase boundary between the Neel_x and FM_z phases in the lower left quadrant of Fig. 5. This phase boundary is obtained using DMRG ($\chi = 128$ and $2N = 128$) by locating the points in the phase diagram 5 for which the Neel_x and FM_z order parameters vanish simultaneously, as was done in Fig. 42. Panel (b) is obtained by mirroring the phase boundary in (a) using the operations represented by \hat{U}_R and \hat{U}_E . The uncertainties (horizontal bars colored in magenta) are the sizes of the windows in θ for which the two competing order parameters vanish as a function of θ holding λ fixed [recall Eq. (C98b)].

s , and the spin expectation values $\langle \sigma_j^z \rangle_{\Psi_0}$ as a function of the site index j . The frequency $f^z[\Psi_0]$ is approximately $3/10$.

Since the system size $2N$ must be an integer, unmasking these oscillations necessitates considering the scaling with $2N$ of $E_1 - E_0$ for values of $2N$ that are integer multiple of 10 to account for three full periods of oscillations. This adjustment yields an approximately linear relationship between the non-vanishing energy spacings and $1/(2N)$. However, because $f^z \simeq 3/10$ is only an approximation, the linearity is itself approximate. This is a partial explanation for the deviations from linear scaling evident in Fig. 45(b). A complementary explanation for the deviations from linearity is the error committed in identifying the critical value $\theta_c \approx 0.57$.

Finally, finite-size effects were too strong to study the degeneracies in the thermodynamic limit under OBC for any point along the phase boundary between the FM_z phase and any of the four gapped phases in Fig. 5, in particular the degeneracies between the FM_z and the eightfold-degenerate $\text{Neel}_y^{\text{SPT}}$ and $\text{Neel}_x^{\text{SPT}}$ phases.

c. Correlation at the phase boundary — Finite-size effects under OBC and PBC were too strong to study the correlation functions for any point along the phase boundary between the FM_z phase and any of the four gapped phases in Fig. 5.

d. Central charge at the phase boundary — We have argued in Sec. C2 that each point inside the FM_z phase is a gapless incommensurate phase that simultaneously supports long-range order along the Z -axis in spin space and realizes a $c = 1$ conformal field theory (CFT). Finite size effects inside the FM_z phase did not hamper the extrapolation from the measured $c \approx 1$ to the claim that $c = 1$, see Fig. 18(b).

Finite-size effects using DMRG ($\chi = 256$ and $2N = 128$) under PBC are much stronger at the point $(0.57 \pm 0.02, 0.4)$ in Fig. 5 on the boundary between the Neel_x and FM_z phases compared to the finite effects plaguing the estimate of the central charge using DMRG deep inside the FM_z as shown in Fig. 18(b). If we estimate the dependence of the central charge c as a function of θ along the horizontal cut $0 \leq \theta \leq 0.8$ with $\lambda = 0.4$ in the phase diagram 5, we find that:

1. The DMRG ($\chi = 256$ and $2N = 32$) estimate $c_{2N}(\theta, 0.4)$ is a non-monotonic function of θ that overshoots by 50% the value 1 as is shown in Fig. 46(a).
2. The DMRG ($\chi = 256$ and $2N = 64$) estimate $c_{2N}(\theta, 0.4)$ as a function of θ is well fitted by a smooth and monotonic regularization of the Heaviside step function $\Theta(\theta - \theta_c)$ with $\theta_c = 0.57 \pm 0.02$, as is shown in Fig. 46(b).

Observe that the number of values for the central charge $c_{2N}(\theta, 0.4)$ with θ in the vicinity of the putative critical value $\theta_c \approx 0.57$ is much less in Fig. 46(b) than it is in Fig. 46(a) due to the time needed for DMRG to converge when $2N = 64$ instead of $2N = 32$. Moreover, as was the case with the analysis made with Eq. (C111) to interpret Fig. 40(d), we find a strong dependence on the bond dimension χ for the values of $c_{2N, \chi}(\theta, 0.4)$ when $2N$ approaches 32 as is reported in Fig. 46(c). The extrapolation (C111) based on the system sizes $2N = 10, 12, \dots, 30, 32$ with $\chi \in [20, 800]$ gives the value

$$c(0.57, 0.4) = 0.96 \pm 0.05. \quad (\text{C118})$$

As was the case with the continuous phase transition at $(0, 1/2)$ in the phase diagram 5, our computational resources do not allow a reliable extrapolation of $c_{2N, \chi}(\theta_c, \lambda)$ to the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$ for the following reasons. First, the choice for the range δl of the values of the bonds l in Eq. (C71) over which the CFT fit (C70b) is used [recall Eq. (C72)] can be the cause of a systematic error that can be as large as 30% of the value [as opposed to 1% at the point $(\pi/4, 0)$ and 3% at the point $(\pi/4, 1)$] of the value (C118). This systematic error dominates when δl is greater than $6N/4$, while the uncertainty on the CFT fit (C70b) dominates when δl is smaller than $6N/4$. Second, we could not verify that the extrapolation (C111) based on the system sizes $2N = 34, 36, \dots, 62, 64$ agrees with that done in Fig. 46(c).

4. Tricritical points

There are four tricritical points in the phase diagram phase diagram presented in Fig. 5. Without loss of generality, in view of the symmetries discussed in Sec. A1, it is sufficient to locate the pair of tricritical points in the lower left quadrant of Fig. 5. This was done in Fig. 44 by computing the competing order parameters that distinguish the Neel_x from the FM_z phases. We find the estimate

$$(\theta_{\text{tri}}, \lambda_{\text{tri}}) = (\pi/4, 0.25 \pm 0.01) \quad (\text{C119})$$

for the tricritical point along the vertical cut $\theta = \pi/4$ and the estimate

$$(\theta_{\text{tri}}, \lambda_{\text{tri}}) = (0.3 \pm 0.04, 1/2) \quad (\text{C120})$$




FIG. 45. (Color online) The case of OBC. (a) Dependence on $1/(2N)$ of the energy spacing $E_1 - E_0$ above the ground state energy E_0 obtained with DMRG ($\chi = 128$) at the point $(0.57, 0.4)$ in the phase diagram 5. A non-monotonic dependence on $1/(2N)$ is visible. (b) To make the oscillatory behavior with a period of 10 in (a) explicit, the values of $E_n - E_{n-1}$, $n = 1, 2, 3$, as a function of $1/(2N)$ are plotted for $2N = 32 + 10k$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ in the range $[32, 128]$. Linear fits for each n are represented as lines whose color corresponds to the color of the data points in the legend.




FIG. 46. (Color online) The case of PBC. Dependence on θ of the DMRG ($\chi = 256$) estimate for the central charge c holding $\lambda = 0.4$ fixed with the number (a) $2N = 32$ and (b) $2N = 64$ of sites, respectively. The dashed black line indicates the location of the boundary between the Neel_x and the FM_z phases, $\theta_c \approx 0.57$. (c) Central charge c obtained with DMRG and PBC at $(0.57, 0.4)$ in Fig. 5 for different bond dimensions $\chi \in [20, 800]$ and system sizes $2N = 10, 12, 14, \dots, 30, 32$. An extrapolation in the limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$ of the central charges $\lim_{\chi \rightarrow \infty} c_{2N, \chi}$ obtained for each size $2N$ is performed. For all panels, the value of δl defined in Eq. (C72) is $2N/2$.




FIG. 47. (Color online) (a) Number n of eigenenergies E_m with an energy smaller than $E_0 + \Delta\varepsilon$, where E_0 is the ground state energy calculated using ED with PBC for $2N = 10$ sites, $\Delta\varepsilon = 10^{-7}$, and the integer $0 \leq m < n$. (b) Dependence on $1/(2N)$ with $2N$ taking the values $2N = 4, \dots, 20$ of $\lambda_{*,2N}$ obtained with ED and PBC at $\theta = \pi/4$. We define $\lambda_{*,2N}$ for each $2N$ as the value of λ at $\theta = \pi/4$ for which the energy gap $E_1 - E_0$ changes from $E_1 - E_0 \sim 10^{-1}$ to $E_1 - E_0 < 10^{-7}$.

for the tricritical point along the horizontal cut $\lambda = 1/2$.

The uncertainty for the tricritical point along the vertical cut $\theta = \pi/4$ can be improved with the help of ED as shown in Fig. 47. For each values of $2N$ and for any point along the the vertical cut $\theta = \pi/4$, we obtain the partially ordered energy eigenvalues

$$E_0 < E_1 \leq \dots \leq E_{2N-1} < E_{2N} \quad (\text{C121})$$

of Hamiltonian (A1). We define $\lambda_{*,2N}$ for each given number $2N$ of sites as the value of λ at $\theta = \pi/4$ for which the energy gap $E_1 - E_0$ changes from $E_1 - E_0 \sim 10^{-1}$ to $E_1 - E_0 < 10^{-7}$. We then extrapolate the values of $\lambda_{*,2N}$ to its value in the thermodynamic limit $2N \rightarrow \infty$. This procedure delivers the improved estimate

$$(\theta_{\text{tri}}, \lambda_{\text{tri}}) = (\pi/4, 0.254 \pm 0.003) \quad (\text{C122})$$

for the tricritical point along the vertical cut $\theta = \pi/4$. This procedure does not improve the estimate (C120).

-
- [1] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Classification of gapped symmetric phases in one-dimensional spin systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 035107 (2011), [arXiv:1008.3745 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [2] Z.-C. Gu and X.-G. Wen, Tensor-entanglement-filtering renormalization approach and symmetry-protected topological order, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 155131 (2009), [arXiv:0903.1069 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [3] F. Pollmann, E. Berg, A. M. Turner, and M. Oshikawa, Symmetry protection of topological phases in one-dimensional quantum spin systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 075125 (2012), [arXiv:0909.4059 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [4] F. Pollmann, A. M. Turner, E. Berg, and M. Oshikawa, Entanglement spectrum of a topological phase in one dimension, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 064439 (2010), [arXiv:0910.1811 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [5] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Complete classification of one-dimensional gapped quantum phases in interacting spin systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 235128 (2011), [arXiv:1103.3323 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [6] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev, Topological phases of fermions in one dimension, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 075103 (2011), [arXiv:1008.4138 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [7] J. P. Kestner, B. Wang, J. D. Sau, and S. Das Sarma, Prediction of a gapless topological haldane liquid phase in a one-dimensional cold polar molecular lattice, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 174409 (2011).

- [8] J. D. Sau, B. I. Halperin, K. Flensberg, and S. Das Sarma, Number conserving theory for topologically protected degeneracy in one-dimensional fermions, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 144509 (2011).
- [9] L. Fidkowski, R. M. Lutchyn, C. Nayak, and M. P. A. Fisher, Majorana zero modes in one-dimensional quantum wires without long-ranged superconducting order, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 195436 (2011).
- [10] A. Keselman and E. Berg, Gapless symmetry-protected topological phase of fermions in one dimension, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 235309 (2015), [arXiv:1502.02037 \[cond-mat.mes-hall\]](#).
- [11] J. Ruhman and E. Altman, Topological degeneracy and pairing in a one-dimensional gas of spinless fermions, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 085133 (2017).
- [12] T. Scaffidi, D. E. Parker, and R. Vasseur, Gapless Symmetry-Protected Topological Order, *Physical Review X* **7**, 041048 (2017), [arXiv:1705.01557 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [13] H.-C. Jiang, Z.-X. Li, A. Seidel, and D.-H. Lee, Symmetry protected topological luttinger liquids and the phase transition between them, *Science Bulletin* **63**, 753 (2018).
- [14] R. Verresen, N. G. Jones, and F. Pollmann, Topology and edge modes in quantum critical chains, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 057001 (2018).
- [15] D. E. Parker, T. Scaffidi, and R. Vasseur, Topological luttinger liquids from decorated domain walls, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 165114 (2018).
- [16] A. Keselman, E. Berg, and P. Azaria, From one-dimensional charge conserving superconductors to the gapless haldane phase, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 214501 (2018).
- [17] N. G. Jones and R. Verresen, Asymptotic correlations in gapped and critical topological phases of 1d quantum systems, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **175**, 1164–1213 (2019).
- [18] D. Ben-Zion, J. McGreevy, and T. Grover, Disentangling quantum matter with measurements, *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 115131 (2020).
- [19] R.-B. Wang, A. Furusaki, and O. A. Starykh, Majorana end states in an interacting quantum wire, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 165147 (2020).
- [20] R. Verresen, Topology and edge states survive quantum criticality between topological insulators (2020), [arXiv:2003.05453](#).
- [21] C. M. Duque, H.-Y. Hu, Y.-Z. You, V. Khemani, R. Verresen, and R. Vasseur, Topological and symmetry-enriched random quantum critical points, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, L100207 (2021).
- [22] R. Thorngren, A. Vishwanath, and R. Verresen, Intrinsically gapless topological phases, *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 075132 (2021).
- [23] U. Borla, R. Verresen, J. Shah, and S. Moroz, Gauging the Kitaev chain, *SciPost Phys.* **10**, 148 (2021).
- [24] R. Verresen, R. Thorngren, N. G. Jones, and F. Pollmann, Gapless topological phases and symmetry-enriched quantum criticality, *Phys. Rev. X* **11**, 041059 (2021).
- [25] Y. Hidaka, S. C. Furuya, A. Ueda, and Y. Tada, Gapless symmetry-protected topological phase of quantum antiferromagnets on anisotropic triangular strip, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 144436 (2022).
- [26] X.-J. Yu, R.-Z. Huang, H.-H. Song, L. Xu, C. Ding, and L. Zhang, Conformal boundary conditions of symmetry-enriched quantum critical spin chains, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 210601 (2022).
- [27] S.-C. Chang and P. Hosur, Absence of friedel oscillations in the entanglement entropy profile of one-dimensional intrinsically gapless topological phases (2022), [arXiv:2201.07260](#).
- [28] S. Prembabu, R. Thorngren, and R. Verresen, Boundary deconfined quantum criticality at transitions between symmetry-protected topological chains (2022), [arXiv:2208.12258](#).
- [29] H. Yang, L. Li, K. Okunishi, and H. Katsura, Duality, criticality, anomaly, and topology in quantum spin-1 chains, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 125158 (2023).
- [30] R. Wen and A. C. Potter, Bulk-boundary correspondence for intrinsically gapless symmetry-protected topological phases from group cohomology, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 245127 (2023).
- [31] S. Mondal, A. Agarwala, T. Mishra, and A. Prakash, Symmetry-enriched criticality in a coupled spin ladder, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 245135 (2023).
- [32] S. Yang, Z. Pan, D.-C. Lu, and X.-J. Yu, Emergent self-duality in a long-range critical spin chain: From deconfined criticality to first-order transition, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 245152 (2023).
- [33] X. Wang, L. Li, and J. Wu, Stability and fine structure of symmetry-enriched quantum criticality in a spin ladder triangular model (2023), [arXiv:2306.11446](#).
- [34] L. Li, M. Oshikawa, and Y. Zheng, Intrinsically/purely gapless-spt from non-invertible duality transformations (2023), [arXiv:2307.04788](#).
- [35] S.-J. Huang and M. Cheng, Topological holography, quantum criticality, and boundary states (2023), [arXiv:2310.16878](#).
- [36] R. Wen and A. C. Potter, Classification of 1+1d gapless symmetry protected phases via topological holography (2023), [arXiv:2311.00050](#).
- [37] L. Su and M. Zeng, Gapless symmetry-protected topological phases and generalized deconfined critical points from gauging a finite subgroup, *Physical Review B* **109**, 10.1103/physrevb.109.245108 (2024).
- [38] X.-J. Yu, S. Yang, H.-Q. Lin, and S.-K. Jian, Universal entanglement spectrum in gapless symmetry protected topological states (2024), [arXiv:2402.04042](#).
- [39] T. Ando, Gauging on the lattice and gapped/gapless topological phases (2024), [arXiv:2402.03566](#).
- [40] W.-H. Zhong, W.-L. Li, Y.-C. Chen, and X.-J. Yu, Topological edge modes and phase transition in the critical fermionic chain with long-range interaction (2024), [arXiv:2403.11880](#).
- [41] X.-J. Yu and W.-L. Li, Quantum phase transition between topologically distinct quantum critical points (2024), [arXiv:2403.03716](#).
- [42] L. Li, M. Oshikawa, and Y. Zheng, Decorated defect construction of gapless-spt states (2024), [arXiv:2204.03131](#).

- [43] H.-L. Zhang, H.-Z. Li, S. Yang, and X.-J. Yu, Quantum phase transition and critical behavior between the gapless topological phases (2024), [arXiv:2404.10576](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.10576).
- [44] S. Yang, H.-Q. Lin, and X.-J. Yu, Gifts from long-range interaction: Emergent gapless topological behaviors in quantum spin chain (2024), [arXiv:2406.01974](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01974).
- [45] M. Suzuki, Relationship among Exactly Soluble Models of Critical Phenomena. I*): 2D Ising Model, Dimer Problem and the Generalized XY-Model, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **46**, 1337 (1971), <https://academic.oup.com/ptp/article-pdf/46/5/1337/5268367/46-5-1337.pdf>.
- [46] R. Verresen, R. Moessner, and F. Pollmann, One-dimensional symmetry protected topological phases and their transitions, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 165124 (2017).
- [47] Ö. M. Aksoy and C. Mudry, Elementary derivation of the stacking rules of invertible fermionic topological phases in one dimension, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 035117 (2022), [arXiv:2204.10333 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.10333).
- [48] See Supplemental Material.
- [49] C. Mudry, A. Furusaki, T. Morimoto, and T. Hikihara, Quantum phase transitions beyond Landau-Ginzburg theory in one-dimensional space revisited, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 205153 (2019).
- [50] E. Lieb, T. Schultz, and D. Mattis, Two soluble models of an antiferromagnetic chain, *Annals of Physics* **16**, 407 (1961).
- [51] L. H. Santos, Rokhsar-kivelson models of bosonic symmetry-protected topological states, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 155150 (2015).
- [52] U. Schollwöck, The density-matrix renormalization group in the age of matrix product states, *Annals of Physics* **326**, 96–192 (2011).
- [53] M. Fishman, S. R. White, and E. M. Stoudenmire, The ITensor Software Library for Tensor Network Calculations, *SciPost Phys. Codebases* , 4 (2022).
- [54] M. Fishman, S. R. White, and E. M. Stoudenmire, Codebase release 0.3 for ITensor, *SciPost Phys. Codebases* , 4 (2022).
- [55] The angular bracket denotes averaging in the canonical ensemble at the inverse temperature β and in the presence of the source term that couples linearly with the order parameter.
- [56] For OBC, j and $j + s$ are chosen far away from the boundaries.
- [57] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, Entanglement entropy and quantum field theory, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2004**, P06002 (2004).
- [58] U. Schollwöck, T. Jolicœur, and T. Garel, Onset of incommensurability at the valence-bond-solid point in the $S=1$ quantum spin chain, *Physical Review B* **53**, 3304–3311 (1996).
- [59] T. Hikihara, T. Momoi, A. Furusaki, and H. Kawamura, Magnetic phase diagram of the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ antiferromagnetic zigzag ladder, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 224433 (2010).
- [60] Concave relative to the point $(\pi/4, 1/2)$.
- [61] A. W. Sandvik, Computational Studies of Quantum Spin Systems, *AIP Conference Proceedings* **1297**, 135 (2010), https://pubs.aip.org/aip/acp/article-pdf/1297/1/135/11407753/135_1_online.pdf.
- [62] N. Tantivasadakarn, R. Thorngren, A. Vishwanath, and R. Verresen, Pivot Hamiltonians as generators of symmetry and entanglement, *SciPost Phys.* **14**, 012 (2023).
- [63] X. Chen, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Two-dimensional symmetry-protected topological orders and their protected gapless edge excitations, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 235141 (2011).
- [64] M. Levin and Z.-C. Gu, Braiding statistics approach to symmetry-protected topological phases, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 115109 (2012), [arXiv:1202.3120 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.3120).
- [65] D. V. Else and C. Nayak, Classifying symmetry-protected topological phases through the anomalous action of the symmetry on the edge, *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 235137 (2014), [arXiv:1409.5436 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1409.5436).
- [66] Y. Zhuang, H. J. Changlani, N. M. Tubman, and T. L. Hughes, Phase diagram of the Z_3 parafermionic chain with chiral interactions, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 035154 (2015).
- [67] 3 - introduction to conformal invariance and finite-size scaling, in [Finite-Size Scaling](#), Current Physics–Sources and Comments, Vol. 2, edited by J. L. CARDY (Elsevier, 1988) pp. 325–331.