

Extracting the number of type-B Goldstone modes and the dynamical critical exponent for a type of scale-invariant states

Huan-Qiang Zhou,¹ Yan-Wei Dai,¹ Qian-Qian Shi,¹ Ian P. McCulloch,^{2,3,1} and Murray T. Batchelor^{4,1}

¹*Centre for Modern Physics, Chongqing University, Chongqing 400044, The People's Republic of China*

²*Department of Physics, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 30013, Taiwan*

³*School of Mathematics and Physics, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia*

⁴*Mathematical Sciences Institute, The Australian National University, Canberra ACT 2601, Australia*

A generic scheme is proposed to perform a finite-entanglement scaling analysis for scale-invariant states which appear as highly degenerate ground states arising from spontaneous symmetry breaking with type-B Goldstone modes. This allows us to extract the number of type-B Goldstone modes and the dynamical critical exponent, in combination with a finite block-size scaling analysis, from numerical simulations of quantum many-body systems in the context of tensor network representations. The number of type-B Goldstone modes is identical to the fractal dimension, thus reflecting an abstract fractal underlying the ground state subspace. As illustrative examples, we investigate the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model, the SU(3) ferromagnetic model and the SO(4) spin-orbital model.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last decades, much attention has been paid to investigations into quantum critical phenomena [1]. In particular, significant effort has been made in achieving a long-term goal towards a complete classification of quantum phase transitions and quantum states of matter in one-dimensional quantum many-body systems [2, 3]. Historically, this may be dated back to the early work by Polyakov [4], who speculated that scale invariance implies conformal invariance. This speculation eventually led to the creation of conformal field theory [5], thus making it possible to classify all possible critical points in terms of central charge and conformal dimensions. Given a few counter-examples are known [6–9], it appears to be necessary to launch a systematic search for scale-invariant, but not conformally invariant, quantum states of matter.

Indeed, the presence of scale-invariant, but not conformally invariant, quantum states of matter strongly suggests that the current classification of quantum phase transitions and quantum states of matter is far from complete, even for those relevant to spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) [10]. As it turns out, highly degenerate ground states arising from SSB with type-B Goldstone modes (GMs) are scale-invariant [11–13], with the SU(2) Heisenberg ferromagnetic model being a paradigmatic example. In fact the highly degenerate ground states admit an exact singular value decomposition, thus exhibiting self-similarities underlying the ground state subspace. In other words, an abstract fractal is revealed, living in a Hilbert space, which may be characterized in terms of the fractal dimension, first introduced by Castro-Alvaredo and Doyon [14] for the SU(2) Heisenberg ferromagnetic states. A remarkable fact is that the fractal dimension may be identified with the number of type-B GMs [11, 12], thus unveiling a deep connection between scale-invariant states and the counting rule of the GMs [15]. The establishment of the counting rule is largely based on an insightful observation made by Nambu [16], culminating in the classification of type-A and type-B GMs.

In addition, our current understanding of quantum critical phenomena has been reshaped from the novel perspective of

quantum information science [17, 18]. In particular, the entanglement entropy is demonstrated to be a powerful means for characterizing quantum phase transitions [19–22]. This in turn motivated the development of powerful tensor network representations to simulate quantum many-body systems [23–29]. As a by-product, a finite-entanglement scaling analysis is developed to replace a finite-size scaling analysis, as advocated [30–32] for conformally invariant quantum states, which allows to extract central charge from numerical simulations in the infinite Matrix Product State (iMPS) representation for one-dimensional quantum many-body systems. A natural question arises as to whether or not there is a parallel between scale-invariant quantum states and conformally invariant quantum states. That is, a generic scheme to perform a finite-entanglement scaling analysis is needed for scale-invariant quantum states.

This work aims to address this question for scale-invariant states, which appear to be highly degenerate ground states arising from SSB with type-B GMs. This allows us to extract the number of type-B GMs and the dynamical critical exponent, in combination with a finite block-size scaling analysis, from numerical simulations of quantum many-body systems in the context of tensor network representations. As recently argued [11, 12], the number of type-B GMs is identical to the fractal dimension, thus reflecting an abstract fractal underlying the ground state subspace. As illustrative examples, we investigate the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model, the SU(3) ferromagnetic model and the SO(4) spin-orbital model.

II. FINITE-ENTANGLEMENT SCALING FOR SCALE-INVARIANT STATES

Let us consider a quantum many-body system described by Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} on a lattice. If the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} possesses the symmetry group G , which is spontaneously broken into H , then the counting rule is established as $N_A + 2N_B = N_{BG}$ [15], where N_A and N_B are the numbers of type-A and type-B GMs, and N_{BG} is equal to the dimension of the coset space G/H . Here and hereafter, we focus on a one-dimensional quantum

many-body system, with L being the system size. According to the Mermin-Wagner-Coleman theorem [33], no type-A GM survives in one spatial dimension. Hence the number N_A of type-A GMs must be zero.

Suppose the system is partitioned into a block B and its environment E , with the block consisting of n (contiguous) lattice sites, and the other $L - n$ lattice sites constituting the environment E . As demonstrated in Refs. [11, 12], for any non-zero fillings f_α ($\alpha = 1, \dots, R$, with R being the rank of G , if it is semisimple), the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ scales logarithmically with the block size n in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$:

$$S_f(n) = \frac{N_B}{2} \ln n + S_{f0}, \quad (1)$$

where S_{f0} is an additive non-universal constant. Combining with a field-theoretic prediction made by Castro-Alvaredo and Doyon [14], one is able to identify the number of type-B GMs with the fractal dimension $d_f = N_B$ [11, 12]. Such a logarithmic scaling behavior of the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ provides an efficient way to extract the number of type-B GMs, or equivalently, the fractal dimension from numerical simulations of quantum many-body systems in the context of the iMPS representation [24]. However, this requires us to ensure that the simulation results be accurate, with the bond dimension χ being extremely large. We have described a subroutine to efficiently evaluate the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ in Section A of the Supplementary Material (SM). In this way we are able to perform a finite block-size scaling analysis of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ for scale-invariant states, which appear to be highly degenerate ground states for quantum many-body systems undergoing SSB with type-B GMs (for more details, cf. Section B of the SM).

A more convenient way is to develop a finite-entanglement scaling analysis for scale-invariant states in the context of the iMPS representation, in parallel to conformally invariant states [30–32]. For this purpose, we turn to the entanglement entropy $S_f(\chi)$ for the semi-infinite chain instead of a finite-size block, which is defined as $S_f(\chi) = -\sum_\alpha \Lambda_\alpha^2 \ln \Lambda_\alpha^2$, in terms of the singular values Λ_α ($\alpha = 1, \dots, \chi$, with χ being the bond dimension). To achieve this goal, we remark that, for a finite-size block, the time τ taken for a local disturbance to propagate through the entire block in a coherent way scales linearly with n : $\tau \sim n$. Taking into account the dispersion relation $\omega \sim k^z$, with z being the dynamical critical exponent, we have $\xi \sim \tau^z$, where ξ is the correlation length. Hence it is plausible to replace n by $\xi^{1/z}$. Accordingly, for any nonzero fillings f_α ($\alpha = 1, \dots, R$), the entanglement entropy $S_f(\chi)$ for the semi-infinite chain takes the form

$$S_f(\chi) = \frac{N_B}{2z} \ln \xi(\chi) + S_{f0}(\chi). \quad (2)$$

Here $S_{f0}(\chi)$ is an additive non-universal constant. We remark that the correlation length $\xi(\chi)$ scales as $\xi \sim \chi^\kappa$, with κ being the finite-entanglement scaling exponent, introduced in Ref. [30] for conformally invariant states.

With the above discussions in mind, we are able to extract the number of type-B GMs, or equivalently, the fractal

dimension, from the iMPS representation for scale-invariant states, if the dynamical critical exponent is known, and vice versa. Here we remark that an alternative way to extract the dynamical critical exponent z from simulation results of the infinite Density Matrix Renormalization Group (iDMRG) algorithm [24] is described in Section C of the SM.

III. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

To illustrate the generic scheme we focus on three fundamental models, which are chosen as typical examples to exhibit SSB with type-B GMs.

The first model is the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model described by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = - \sum_j \mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j+1}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{S}_j = (S_j^x, S_j^y, S_j^z)$ denotes the spin- s operator at site j . The model possesses the symmetry group $SU(2)$, with the generators being $S^x = \sum_j S_j^x$, $S^y = \sum_j S_j^y$ and $S^z = \sum_j S_j^z$. In this case, SSB occurs from $SU(2)$ to $U(1)$, with the number of type-B GMs $N_B = 1$ [15].

The second model is the $SU(3)$ spin-1 ferromagnetic model described by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = - \sum_j [(\mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j+1}) + (\mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j+1})^2], \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{S}_j = (S_j^x, S_j^y, S_j^z)$ are spin-1 operators at site j . Note that this model appears as a special case of the well-studied spin-1 bilinear-biquadratic model, with its peculiarity being that the Hamiltonian (4) is exactly solvable by means of the Bethe ansatz [34]. The model possesses the symmetry group $SU(3)$, with the generators being realized in terms of the spin-1 operators $K_\alpha = \sum_j K_\alpha^j$ ($\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, 8$), where $K_1 = 1/2 \sum_j S_j^x$, $K_2 = 1/2 \sum_j S_j^y$, $K_3 = 1/2 \sum_j S_j^z$, $K_4 = 1 - 3/2 \sum_j (S_j^z)^2$, $K_5 = 1/2 \sum_j ((S_j^x)^2 - (S_j^y)^2)$, $K_6 = 1/2 \sum_j (S_j^y S_j^z + S_j^z S_j^y)$, $K_7 = 1/2 \sum_j (S_j^z S_j^x + S_j^x S_j^z)$ and $K_8 = 1/2 \sum_j (S_j^x S_j^y + S_j^y S_j^x)$. In this case, the number of type-B GMs $N_B = 2$, given SSB occurs from $SU(3)$ to $U(1) \times U(1)$ [11].

The third model is the $SO(4)$ spin-orbital model described by the Hamiltonian [35]

$$\mathcal{H} = - \sum_j (\boldsymbol{\zeta} + \mathbf{S}_j \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j+1})(\boldsymbol{\zeta} + \mathbf{T}_j \cdot \mathbf{T}_{j+1}), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{S}_j = (S_j^x, S_j^y, S_j^z)$ are spin-1/2 operators and $\mathbf{T}_j = (T_j^x, T_j^y, T_j^z)$ are orbital pseudo-spin 1/2 operators at site j . Here we restrict ourselves to the two particular points $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = 3/4$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = \infty$, both of which share the same ground state subspace. Actually, the model (5), with $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = 3/4$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = \infty$, may be recognized as the model studied by Kolezhuk and Mikeska [36], with the opposite sign, and a model consisting of two decoupled $SU(2)$ spin-1/2 Heisenberg ferromagnetic chains. The model possesses the symmetry group $SO(4)$,




FIG. 1. The entanglement entropy $S_f(\chi)$ versus $\ln \xi(\chi)$ for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3) with s being $1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 . The different fillings (a) $f = s$ and (b) $f = s - 1/2$ have been chosen. The bond dimension χ ranges from 20 to 160.

isomorphic to $SU(2) \times SU(2)$, with the generators of the two copies of $SU(2)$ being $S^x = \sum_j S_j^x$, $S^y = \sum_j S_j^y$, and $S^z = \sum_j S_j^z$, and $T^x = \sum_j T_j^x$, $T^y = \sum_j T_j^y$ and $T^z = \sum_j T_j^z$. In this case, SSB occurs from $SO(4)$ to $U(1) \times U(1)$, with the number of type-B GMs $N_B = 2$.

IV. SIMULATION RESULTS

In order to simulate the three selected models (3), (4) and (5), one needs to develop the iDMRG algorithm [24], with $U(1)$, $U(1) \times U(1)$ and $U(1) \times U(1)$ being implemented as a symmetry group, respectively. This is necessary, since we have to target a specific ground state with a given filling. In this sense, the iDMRG algorithm is the method of choice, which is able to efficiently produce the iMPS representation for one of the highly degenerate ground states arising from SSB with type-B GMs.

In Fig. 1, we plot the entanglement entropy $S_f(\chi)$ versus $\ln \xi(\chi)$ for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3) with $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 . Here we have chosen different fillings: (a) $f = s$ and (b) $f = s - 1/2$, with the bond dimension χ ranging from 20 to 160. To this end, the unit cell in the iMPS representation consists of two lattice sites. For $f = s$, the number of type-B GMs is extracted to be $N_B = 0.9924, 0.9904, 0.992$ and 0.9912 for $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 , respectively. The relative error is less than 1%, if we adopt the value of the dynamical critical exponent to be $z = 2$, as predicted from the conventional spin wave theory. Conversely, the other way around is to extract the dynamical critical exponent if we adopt $N_B = 1$. The dynamical critical




FIG. 2. The entanglement entropy $S_f(\chi)$ versus $\ln \xi(\chi)$ for the $SU(3)$ ferromagnetic model (4). Here we have chosen the fillings $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and $f = (1/4, 1/2)$, with the bond dimension χ ranging from 80 to 1000.




FIG. 3. The entanglement entropy $S_f(\chi)$ versus $\ln \xi(\chi)$ for the $SO(4)$ spin-orbital model (5) with $\zeta = 3/4$ and $\zeta = \infty$. Here we have chosen the fillings $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and $f = (5/12, 5/12)$, with the bond dimension χ ranging from 100 to 1000.

exponent is extracted to be $z = 2.0153, 2.0194, 2.0161$ and 2.0178 for $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 , respectively. The relative error is less than 1%. Similarly, for $f = s - 1/2$, the number of type-B GMs is extracted to be $N_B = 0.9928, 0.992, 0.9904$ and 0.9916 for $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 , respectively. Then a relative error is less than 1%, if we adopt the dynamical critical exponent value $z = 2$. Conversely, the dynamical critical exponent is extracted to be $z = 2.0145, 2.0161, 2.0194$ and 2.0169 for $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 , respectively, with the relative error again less than 1%.

In Fig. 2, we plot the entanglement entropy $S_f(\chi)$ versus $\ln \xi(\chi)$ for the $SU(3)$ ferromagnetic model (4). The filling factors are chosen to be $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and $f = (1/4, 1/2)$, with the bond dimension χ ranging from 80 to 1000. Here the unit cell in the iMPS representation consists of three and

four lattice sites, respectively. The number of type-B GMs is extracted to be $N_B = 1.9804$ for $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and 1.9816 for $(1/4, 1/2)$, with the relative error being less than 1%, if we adopt the dynamical critical exponent $z = 2$, as predicted from the conventional spin wave theory. Conversely, adopting the value $N_B = 2$, the dynamical critical exponent is extracted to be $z = 2.0198$ for $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and 2.0186 for $(1/4, 1/2)$, with again the relative error less than 1%.

Fig. 3 shows plots of the entanglement entropy $S_f(\chi)$ versus $\ln \xi(\chi)$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5), with (a) $\zeta = 3/4$ and (b) $\zeta = \infty$. Here we have chosen the fillings $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and $f = (5/12, 5/12)$, with the bond dimension χ ranging from 100 to 1000. The unit cell in the iMPS representation consists of four and six lattice sites, respectively. If we adopt the dynamical critical exponent $z = 2$, as predicted from the conventional spin wave theory, the best linear fit is exploited to estimate the number of type-B GMs as $N_B = 1.9296$ and 1.9468 in Fig. 3(a), with relative error less than 4%, and $N_B = 1.9512$ and 1.9524 in Fig. 3(b), with relative error less than 3%. Here if we adopt $N_B = 2$, the dynamical critical exponent is extracted to be $z = 2.073$ and 2.059 in Fig. 3(a) and $z = 2.05$ and 2.0488 in Fig. 3(b), with in each case a relative error less than 4%.

V. SUMMARY

A generic scheme to perform a finite-entanglement scaling analysis has been put forward for highly degenerate ground states arising from SSB with type-B GMs, which are scale-invariant, but not conformally invariant. Extensive numerical simulations have been performed for the three selected models – the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model, the SU(3) ferromagnetic model and the SO(4) spin-orbital model. Actually, the number of type-B GMs N_B may be reliably extracted from finite block-size scaling, as long as the bond dimension χ is large enough, within a reasonable accuracy. A detailed exposition for a finite block-size scaling analysis to extract the number of type-B GMs has been described in Section D of the SM. This in turn allows us to extract the dynamical critical exponent from finite-entanglement scaling.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We appreciate insightful discussions with John Fjærestad about the counting rule for the GMs.

-
- [1] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).
- [2] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 0355107 (2011); X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 235128 (2011).
- [3] F. Pollmann and A.M. Turner, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 125441 (2012); Y. Fuji, F. Pollmann, and M. Oshikawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 177204 (2015); F. Pollmann, E. Berg, A. M. Turner, and M. Oshikawa, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 075125 (2012).
- [4] A. M. Polyakov, *JETP Lett.* **12**, 381 (1970).
- [5] A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, and A. B. Zamolodchikov, *Nucl. Phys. B* **241**, 333 (1984).
- [6] M. Hortacsu, R. Seiler, and B. Schroer, *Phys. Rev. D* **5**, 2519 (1972); B. Schroer and J. A. Swieca, *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 480 (1974); B. Schroer, J. A. Swieca, and A. H. Volkel, *Phys. Rev. D* **11**, 1509 (1975); M. Luscher and G. Mack, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **41**, 203 (1975); N. M. Nikolov, Y. S. Stanev, and I. T. Todorov, *J. Phys. A* **35**, 2985 (2002).
- [7] A. Strominger and T. Takayanagi, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **7**, 369 (2003); W. McElgin, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 066009 (2008); D. Harlow, J. Maltz, and E. Witten, *JHEP* **1112**, 071 (2011).
- [8] A. LeClair, J. M. Roman, and G. Sierra, *Nucl. Phys. B* **700**, 407 (2004); A. LeClair and G. Sierra, *J. Stat. Mech.* **0408**, P08004 (2004).
- [9] A. B. Zamolodchikov, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **69**, 165 (1979); J. P. Gauntlett, D. Martelli, J. Sparks, and S.-T. Yau, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **273**, 803 (2007); A. D. Shapere and Y. Tachikawa, *JHEP* **0812**, 020 (2008); F. Cachazo, B. Fiol, K. A. Intriligator, S. Katz, and C. Vafa, *Nucl. Phys. B* **628**, 3 (2002).
- [10] P. W. Anderson, *Basic Notions of Condensed Matter Physics*, Addison-Wesley: The Advanced Book Program (AddisonWesley, Reading, MA, 1997).
- [11] Q.-Q. Shi, Y.-W. Dai, H.-Q. Zhou, and I. McCulloch, arXiv: 2201.01071 (2022).
- [12] H.-Q. Zhou, Q.-Q. Shi, I. McCulloch, and M. T. Batchelor, arXiv:2302.13126 (2023).
- [13] Q.-Q. Shi, Y.-W. Dai, S.-H. Li, and H.-Q. Zhou, arXiv:2204.05692 (2022).
- [14] O. A. Castro-Alvaredo and B. Doyon, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 120401 (2012).
- [15] H. Watanabe and H. Murayama, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 251602 (2012); H. Watanabe and H. Murayama, *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 031057 (2014).
- [16] Y. Nambu, *J. Stat. Phys.* **115**, 7 (2004).
- [17] T. J. Osborne and M. A. Nielsen, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 032110 (2002).
- [18] A. Osterloh, L. Amico, G. Falci, and R. Fazio, *Nature* **416**, 608 (2002).
- [19] G. Vidal, J. I. Latorre, E. Rico, and A. Kitaev, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 227902 (2003).
- [20] V. E. Korepin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 096402 (2004).
- [21] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, *J. Stat. Mech.* P06002 (2004).
- [22] H.-Q. Zhou, T. Barthel, J. O. Fjærestad, and U. Schollwöck, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 050305 (2006).
- [23] G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 070201 (2007).
- [24] I. P. McCulloch, arXiv: 0804.2509 (2008); I.P. McCulloch, *J. Stat. Mech.* **2007**, P10014 (2007); F. Heidrich-Meisner, I. P. McCulloch, and A. K. Kolezhuk, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 179902 (2010); F. Zhan, J. Sabbatini, M. J. Davis, and I. P. McCulloch, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 023630 (2014).
- [25] R. Orús and G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 155117 (2008).
- [26] J. Jordan, R. Orús, G. Vidal, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 250602 (2008).
- [27] I. Pižorn and F. Verstraete, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 245110 (2010).
- [28] P. Corboz, J. Jordan, and G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 245119 (2010); L. Tagliacozzo and G. Vidal, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 115127 (2011).

- [29] P. Czarnik, M. M. Rams, and J. Dziarmaga, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 235142 (2016).
- [30] L. Tagliacozzo, T. R. de Oliveira, S. Iblisdir, and J. I. Latorre, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 024410 (2008).
- [31] Y.-W. Dai, B.-Q. Hu, J.-H. Zhao, and H.-Q. Zhou, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **43**, 372001 (2010); H.-L. Wang, Y.-W. Dai, B.-Q. Hu, and H.-Q. Zhou, *Phys. Lett. A* **375**, 4045 (2011).
- [32] F. Pollmann, S. Mukerjee, A. M. Turner, and J. E. Moore, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 255701 (2009).
- [33] N. D. Mermin and H. Wagner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **17**, 1133 (1966); S. R. Coleman, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31**, 259 (1973).
- [34] B. Sutherland, *Phys. Rev. B* **12**, 3795 (1975).
- [35] K. I. Kugel and D. I. Khomskii, *Sov. Phys. Usp.* **25**, 2319 (1982).
- [36] A. K. Kolezhuk and H. J. Mikeska, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2709 (1998).

Supplementary Material for “Extracting the number of type-B Goldstone modes and the dynamical critical exponent for a type of scale-invariant states”

Huan-Qiang Zhou,¹ Yan-Wei Dai,¹ Qian-Qian Shi,¹ Ian P. McCulloch,^{2,3,1} and Murray T. Batchelor^{4,1}

¹Centre for Modern Physics, Chongqing University, Chongqing 400044, The People’s Republic of China

²Department of Physics, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 30013, Taiwan

³School of Mathematics and Physics, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia

⁴Mathematical Sciences Institute, The Australian National University, Canberra ACT 2601, Australia

PACS numbers:

A. A subroutine to efficiently evaluate the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$

In order to extract the number of type-B GMs N_B , or equivalently, the fractal dimension d_f , from a finite-size scaling analysis of the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$, a subroutine is developed to efficiently evaluate the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$.

We assume that a ground state $|\psi\rangle$ in the iMPS representation is invariant under the two-site translation. Hence, it is represented by two tensors A_o and A_e , as shown in Fig. S1(a), where l and r are the bond indices: $l, r = 1, \dots, \chi$, with χ being the bond dimension, and s is the physical index: $s = 1, \dots, d$, with d being the dimension of the local Hilbert space.

The subroutine to efficiently evaluate the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ consists of three steps, as shown in parts (b), (c) and (d) of Fig. S1: First, contract two tensors A_o and A_e to form one single tensor θ , reshape θ into a matrix G , labeled by the combined bond indices and the combined physical indices, perform a singular value decomposition for G , and truncate the physical indices, with a flow chart being shown in Fig. S2. Second, repeat the above process for a newly-formed tensor $A^{(1)}$ until the block size is reached, thus leading to a tensor Θ . Third, an approximation to the reduced density matrix ρ_n may be evaluated from the tensor Θ .

The subroutine is tested for the SU(2) spin-1/2 ferromagnetic states, with bond dimension $\chi = 50$. For comparison, the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ takes the value 2.065418553 if no truncation is performed. Hence the subroutine yields a reliable result, with a relative error being less than 3.6×10^{-7} . See Table S1.

TABLE S1: The block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$, with block size $n = 16$ and bond dimension $\chi = 50$, is evaluated for the SU(2) spin-1/2 ferromagnetic states. ϵ denotes a preset precision for performing repeated truncation.

ϵ	M_1	M_2	M_3	$S_f(n)$	relative error
10^{-3}	16	70	160	2.065417803	3.6×10^{-7}
10^{-4}	16	90	250	2.065418523	1.5×10^{-8}
10^{-5}	16	120	320	2.065418552	5.7×10^{-10}




FIG. S1: (a) A single tensor $A_{o/e}$ in the iMPS representation. Here o/e refers to an odd/even site, l and r are the bond indices: $l, r = 1, \dots, \chi$, with χ the bond dimension, and s the physical index: $s = 1, \dots, d$, with d the dimension of the local Hilbert space. (b) Contraction of two tensors A_o and A_e to form one single tensor θ . (c) Reshape θ into a matrix G , labeled by the combined bond indices and the combined physical indices, perform a singular value decomposition for G , and truncate the physical indices to ensure that $|\lambda_M/\lambda_1| < \epsilon$, where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M$ are the singular values, with M the number of states to be kept, and ϵ a preset precision. Afterwards, discard V and contract U and λ to form one single tensor ϕ and reshape it into one single tensor $A^{(1)}$. (d) Repeat this process until the block size is reached, thus leading to one single tensor Θ . (e) An approximation to the reduced density matrix for a block may be evaluated from Θ . Here we have chosen the block size $n = 16$ for illustration. Hence, a sequence of successive truncation consists of three different types of contractions, with M_1 , M_2 and M_3 denoting the number of states to be kept after each successive truncation.

B. Finite block-size scaling of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$

The subroutine to efficiently evaluate the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$, described in Subsection A, is exploited to perform a finite block-size scaling analysis of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ [S1, S2] for the three selected models – the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model, the SU(3) ferromagnetic model and the SO(4) spin-orbital model – in the context of the iDMRG algorithm [S3], with a fixed value of




FIG. S2: A flow chart to contract two tensors Γ_A and Γ_B to form one single tensor θ , reshape θ into a matrix G , labeled by the combined bond indices and the combined physical indices, perform a singular value decomposition for G , and truncate the physical indices to ensure that $|\lambda_M/\lambda_1| < \epsilon$, where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M$ are the singular values, with M being the number of states to be kept, and ϵ is a preset precision.

the bond dimension. A more detailed exposition on the extraction of the number of type-B GMs from different values of the bond dimension χ is outlined in Section D.

In Fig. S3, we plot the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3), with $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 , as a simulation result of the U(1) iDMRG algorithm in the iMPS representation for different fillings f . For $f = s$, the number of type-B GMs is extracted to be $N_B = 1.002, 0.982, 0.9786$ and 0.97 for $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 , respectively, where the block size ranges from $n = 5$ to $n = 20$. The relative error is less than 3%, compared to the exact value $N_B = 1$. For $f = s - 1/2$, the number of type-B GMs is extracted to be $N_B = 1.0298, 1.0052, 0.9804$ and 0.9722 for $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 , respectively, with the block size ranging from $n = 6$ to $n = 20$. The relative error is less than 3% compared to the exact value $N_B = 1$.

In Fig. S4, we plot the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ for the SU(3) ferromagnetic model (4), as a simulation result of the U(1) \times U(1) iDMRG algorithm in the iMPS representation for $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ on the three-site unit cell and for $f = (1/4, 1/2)$ on the four-site unit cell. The best linear fit is exploited to estimate the number of type-B GMs $N_B = 1.8702$ for $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and 1.8772 for $(1/4, 1/2)$, with relative error less than 6.5%, compared to the exact value $N_B = 2$. The block size ranges from $n = 5$ to $n = 18$.

In Fig. S5, we plot the block entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5) with (a) $\zeta = 3/4$ and (b) $\zeta = \infty$, as a simulation result of the U(1) \times U(1) iDMRG algorithm in the iMPS representation for $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ on the four-site unit cell and for $f =$




FIG. S3: The entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SU(2) spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (1), with $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 . We have chosen different fillings: (a) $f = s$ and (b) $f = s - 1/2$, with bond dimension $\chi = 160$.




FIG. S4: The entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SU(3) ferromagnetic model (4). The different fillings are as indicated, with bond dimension $\chi = 300$.

$(5/12, 5/12)$ on the six-site unit cell. For $\zeta = 3/4$, the best linear fit is exploited to estimate the number of type-B GMs $N_B = 1.9104$ for $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and 1.9352 for $(5/12, 5/12)$, with relative error less than 4.5%, compared to the exact value $N_B = 2$. For $\zeta = \infty$, the best linear fit is exploited to estimate the number of type-B GMs $N_B = 1.9212$ for $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and 1.9544 for $(5/12, 5/12)$, with relative error less than 4%, compared to the exact value $N_B = 2$. The block size ranges from $n = 4$ to $n = 18$.

C. The dynamical critical exponent z from two types of correlation lengths

The correlation length ξ is defined as $\xi = 1/\ln|\Lambda_1/\Lambda_2|$ with Λ_1 and Λ_2 the largest and second largest eigenvalues of the transfer matrix E for a block consisting of n contiguous lattice




FIG. S5: The entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5) with (a) $\zeta = 3/4$ and (b) $\zeta = \infty$. The different fillings are as indicated, with bond dimension $\chi = 400$.

sites [S5], as schematically shown in Fig. S6. We exploit p and q to label the left and right bonds, where $p = (p_1, \dots, p_R)$ and $q = (q_1, \dots, q_R)$, with R being the rank of a (semisimple) symmetry group G . Here, the SSB pattern is from a symmetry group G to a residual symmetry group H : $G \rightarrow H$. Hence the entries of the transfer matrix E vanish unless $p = q$. That is, the transfer matrix E is in a block-diagonal form.

With this fact in mind, one may introduce two distinct types of correlation lengths, each of which in principle constitutes an infinite sequence. One type is $\xi_{u,q}$, defined as $\xi_{u,q} = 1/\ln(\Lambda_{1,q}/\Lambda_{2,q})$, which is restricted to a given sector labeled by q . Here all sectors are allowed, including the first sector, labelled by $q = (0, \dots, 0)$. The other type is ξ_q ($q \neq (0, \dots, 0)$), defined as $\xi_q = 1/\ln(\Lambda_{1,0}/\Lambda_{1,q})$, which involves two distinct sectors, labelled by $(0, \dots, 0)$ and q . $\Lambda_{1,q}$ and $\Lambda_{2,q}$ denote the largest and second largest eigenvalues of the transfer matrix E in sector q . This is due to the fact that the spectrum of the transfer matrix E is split into different sectors. Actually, the correlation length ξ may be identified as one of the ξ_q 's. Here we remark that, for a chosen value of the bond dimension χ , one is able to produce the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ and the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ from the iMPS representation.

Physically, the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ in sector q , is *temporal*, because it essentially describes a time evolution, due to the fact that *only* one sector is involved. This amounts to stating that q is conserved. This is in contrast to the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ which is *spatial*, since it involves different sectors such that a local spatial disturbance propagates across a given block, as far as the spread of information is concerned. Remarkably, for a scale-invariant state, one may expect that both the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ and the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$




FIG. S6: A diagrammatic representation of the transfer matrix E , consisting of n contiguous lattice sites, with n even. Here $p = (p_1, \dots, p_R)$ and $q = (q_1, \dots, q_R)$ label the left and right bonds, with R the rank of a (semisimple) symmetry group G . The SSB pattern is from a symmetry group G to a residual symmetry group H : $G \rightarrow H$.

must scale with the bond dimension χ in an identical way, regardless of the values of q . More precisely, one may anticipate that the scaling relations of both the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ and the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ with the bond dimension χ in the iMPS representation do not depend on q . As a consequence, it is sufficient to consider $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$, due to their practical q independence.

Hence it is necessary to take into account the dynamical critical exponent z , as it appears in the dispersion relation $\omega \sim k^z$. As such, we might speculate that there is a remarkable scaling relation between $\xi(\chi)$ and $\xi_u(\chi)$, of the form

$$\xi_u(\chi) \sim \xi^{1/z}(\chi). \quad (\text{S1})$$

This offers an alternative means to extract the dynamical critical exponent z , which even holds for conformal field theory with $z = 1$, as a result of the Lorentz invariance. That is, there is no difference between the two choices, i.e., either $\xi(\chi)$ or $\xi_u(\chi)$, for conformally invariant states, if a scaling relation is concerned. In practice, this observation offers an alternative way to determine the correlation length ξ from simulation results of the iDMRG algorithm when a proper symmetry group is implemented. In contrast, this is not the case for scale-invariant states arising from SSB with type-B GMs, given they are not subject to the Lorentz invariance. Here, we remark that the correlation length $\xi_u(\chi)$ has been exploited in Ref. [S6] to study the scaling behavior of the entanglement entropy $S_f(\chi)$. Instead, the correlation length ξ has been adopted in Ref. [S7]. This explains the discrepancy between the scaling relations there.

As an illustration, we evaluate $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3), the SU(3) ferromagnetic model (4) and the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5). For our purpose, the iDMRG algorithm is the method of choice to simulate the models under investigation, since it is necessary to implement a proper symmetry group, i.e., the residual symmetry group H , to target a specific ground state [S4]. Specifically, the rank R is 1 for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model, and the rank R is 2 for the SU(3) ferromagnetic model and the SO(4) spin-orbital model. Accordingly, the residual symmetry group U(1) has been implemented for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model, and the residual symmetry group




FIG. S7: The spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model with filling $f = s$. (Left panels) Scaling relation between the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ and bond dimension χ , with χ ranging from 40 to 160 and $q = 0, 1, 2, 3$: (a) $s = 1/2$; (b) $s = 1$; (c) $s = 3/2$; (d) $s = 2$. (Right panels) Scaling relation between the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ in sector q and bond dimension χ , with χ ranging from 30 to 160 and $q = 1, 2, 3, 4$: (e) $s = 1/2$; (f) $s = 1$; (g) $s = 3/2$; (h) $s = 2$.

$U(1) \times U(1)$ has been implemented for the $SU(3)$ ferromagnetic model and the $SO(4)$ spin-orbital model. In addition, we evaluate $\xi_q(\chi)$ for each of the three models. The dynamical critical exponent z can be extracted according to the scaling relation (S1) between $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$.

1. The spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model

For filling $f = s$, we plot the scaling of the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ with bond dimension in Fig. S7(a)(b)(c)(d) and the scaling of the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ with bond dimension in Fig. S7(e)(f)(g)(h), for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3), with $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2. The corresponding plots for filling $f = s - 1/2$ are shown in Fig. S8. Our numerical results confirm that the scaling relations for




FIG. S8: The spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model with filling $f = s - 1/2$. (Left panels) Scaling relation between the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ and bond dimension χ , with χ ranging from 40 to 160 and $q = 0, 1, 2, 3$: (a) $s = 1/2$; (b) $s = 1$; (c) $s = 3/2$; (d) $s = 2$. (Right panels) Scaling relation between the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ and bond dimension χ , with χ ranging from 30 to 160 and $q = 1, 2, 3, 4$: (e) $s = 1/2$; (f) $s = 1$; (g) $s = 3/2$; (h) $s = 2$.

both correlation lengths $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ and $\xi_q(\chi)$, as follow from the iDMRG simulations in the iMPS representation, do not depend on q , within a reasonable error (less than 3.9%). As a consequence, one only needs to introduce the two correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$, as far as their scaling relation is concerned.

For this same model, in Fig. S9 and Fig. S10, we plot the scaling relation between the correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$ for $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2, with different fillings $f = s$ and $f = s - 1/2$. The scaling relation (S1) is confirmed, regardless of our choice of sector q , to evaluate the correlation length $\xi_u(\chi)$, thus offering an alternative means to extract the dynamical critical exponent z . The best linear fits yield $z = 2$, with relative error less than 1%, compared to the exact value $z = 2$ from the conventional spin wave theory, as shown in Table S2 and Table S3.




FIG. S9: Scaling relation between the correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$ for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model with $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 and filling $f = s$. Different sectors are labelled by q . (a) The sector $q = 0$, with bond dimension χ ranging from 20 to 160 . (b) The sector $q = 1$, with bond dimension χ ranging from 30 to 160 . Corresponding estimates for the scaling exponent are shown in Table S2.

TABLE S2: Estimates for the dynamical critical exponent z , compared to the exact value $z = 2$, for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model, with filling $f = s$. Results for sectors $q = 0$ and $q = 1$ are shown.

Sector	s	$1/2$	1	$3/2$	2
$q = 0$		1.9988	1.9948	1.9992	2.0024
$q = 1$		2.0104	2.0052	2.0072	2.0076




FIG. S10: Scaling relation between the correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$ for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model with $s = 1/2, 1, 3/2$ and 2 and filling $f = s - 1/2$. (a) The sector $q = 0$, with bond dimension χ ranging from 20 to 160 . (b) The sector $q = 1$, with bond dimension χ ranging from 30 to 160 . Corresponding estimates for the scaling exponent are shown in Table S3.

TABLE S3: Estimates for the dynamical critical exponent z , compared to the exact value $z = 2$, for the spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model, with filling $f = s - 1/2$. Results for sectors $q = 0$ and $q = 1$ are shown.

Sector	s	$1/2$	1	$3/2$	2
$q = 0$		2.0004	1.9984	1.9972	2.0012
$q = 1$		2.0124	2.0096	2.006	2.0076




FIG. S11: The SU(3) ferromagnetic model. (Left panels) Scaling relation between the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ and bond dimension χ , with χ ranging from 180 to 1000 and $(q_1, q_2) = (0, 0), (0, 6), (1/2, 3)$ and $(1, 0)$: (a) $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and (b) $f = (1/4, 1/2)$. (Right panels) Scaling relation between the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ and bond dimension χ , with χ ranging from 200 to 1000 : (c) $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and (d) $f = (1/4, 1/4)$. The sector values (q_1, q_2) are as indicated.




FIG. S12: Scaling relation between the correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$ for the SU(3) ferromagnetic model for different sectors, with fillings $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and $(1/4, 1/2)$. (a) The sector $(q_1, q_2) = (0, 0)$, with bond dimension χ ranging from 50 to 1000 . (b) The sector $(q_1, q_2) = (1/2, 3)$, with bond dimension χ ranging from 50 to 1000 . (c) The sector $(q_1, q_2) = (1, 0)$, with bond dimension χ ranging from 90 to 1000 . Corresponding estimates for the scaling exponent are shown in Table S4.

2. The SU(3) ferromagnetic model

Turning to the SU(3) ferromagnetic model (4), for chosen fillings $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and $f = (1/4, 1/2)$, we plot the scaling of the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ with bond dimension in Fig. S11 (a)(b) and of correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ with bond dimension in Fig. S11(c)(d). Our numerical results confirm that

TABLE S4: The dynamical critical exponent estimates for the SU(3) ferromagnetic model in sector q with the indicated fillings.

Sector	f	(1/3, 1/3)	(1/4, 1/2)
$(q_1, q_2) = (0, 0)$		1.9589	1.9739
$(q_1, q_2) = (1/2, 3)$		1.9227	1.9135
$(q_1, q_2) = (1, 0)$		1.9346	1.9164




FIG. S13: The SO(4) spin-orbital model with $\zeta = 3/4$. (Left panels) Scaling relation between the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ and bond dimension χ , with χ ranging from 200 to 1000 and indicated values for (q_1, q_2) : (a) $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and (b) $f = (5/12, 5/12)$. (Right panels) Scaling relation between the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ and bond dimension χ , with χ ranging from 200 to 1000: (c) $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and (d) $f = (5/12, 5/12)$.

the scaling relations for both correlation lengths with the bond dimension, as follows from the iDMRG simulations in the iMPS representation, do not depend on q , within a reasonable error (less than 4%). As a consequence, one only needs to introduce the two correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$, as far as their scaling relation is concerned.

In Fig. S12, we plot the scaling relation between the correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$ with fillings $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and $(1/4, 1/2)$. The scaling relation (S1) is again confirmed, regardless of our choice of sector to evaluate the correlation length $\xi_u(\chi)$, thus offering an alternative means to extract the dynamical critical exponent z . The best linear fits yield $z = 2$, with a relative error less than 5%, compared to the exact value $z = 2$ from the conventional spin wave theory, as shown in Table S4.




FIG. S14: The SO(4) spin-orbital model with $\zeta = \infty$. (Left panels) Scaling relation between the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ and bond dimension χ , with χ ranging from 200 to 900 and indicated values for (q_1, q_2) : (a) $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and (b) $f = (5/12, 5/12)$. (Right panels) Scaling relation between the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ and bond dimension χ , with χ ranging from 200 to 900: (c) $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and (d) $f = (5/12, 5/12)$.




FIG. S15: Scaling relation between the correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model with $\zeta = 3/4$. (a) The sector $(q_1, q_2) = (0, 0)$ with bond dimension χ ranging from 100 to 1000. (b) The sector $(q_1, q_2) = (1, 0)$ with bond dimension χ ranging from 100 to 1000. The fillings are chosen to be $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and $(5/12, 5/12)$. The corresponding estimates for the dynamical critical exponent z are given in Table S5.

3. The SO(4) spin-orbital model

For the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5) with $\zeta = 3/4$ and $\zeta = \infty$, and chosen fillings $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and $(5/12, 5/12)$, we plot the scaling of the correlation length $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ with bond dimension in Fig. S13(a)(b) and S14(a)(b) and the correlation length $\xi_q(\chi)$ with the bond dimension χ in Fig. S13(c)(d) and S14(c)(d). Our numerical results for this model also confirm that the scaling relations for both correlation lengths $\xi_{u,q}(\chi)$ and $\xi_q(\chi)$ with bond dimension, as follow from the iDMRG simulations in the iMPS representation, do not depend on q , within a reasonable error (less than 3.5%). We thus only consider the two correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$, as far as their scaling relation is concerned.

In Fig. S15 and Fig. S16, we plot the scaling relation be-




FIG. S16: Scaling relation between the correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model with $\zeta = \infty$. (a) The sector $(q_1, q_2) = (0, 0)$ with bond dimension χ ranging from 100 to 1000. (b) The sector $(q_1, q_2) = (1, 0)$ with bond dimension χ ranging from 100 to 1000. The fillings are chosen to be $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and $(5/12, 5/12)$. The corresponding estimates for the dynamical critical exponent z are given in Table S6.

TABLE S5: Estimates of the dynamical critical exponent z for the SO(4) spin-orbital model with $\zeta = 3/4$ for sectors $(q_1, q_2) = (0, 0)$ and $(q_1, q_2) = (1, 0)$. The bond dimension ranges from 100 to 1000, with a relative error less than 2%, compared to the exact value $z = 2$. The fillings f are as indicated.

Sector	f	(1/2, 1/2)	(5/12, 5/12)
$(q_1, q_2) = (0, 0)$		2.0214	2.0288
$(q_1, q_2) = (1, 0)$		1.9728	1.99

tween the correlation lengths $\xi_u(\chi)$ and $\xi(\chi)$ with $\zeta = 3/4$ and $\zeta = \infty$, respectively. The scaling relation (S1) is again confirmed, regardless of our choice of a sector to evaluate the correlation length $\xi_u(\chi)$, thus offering an alternative means to extract the dynamical critical exponent z . In this case, the best linear fits yield $z = 2$, with the relative error less than 2% and 3%, compared to the exact value $z = 2$ from the conventional spin wave theory. The estimates are shown in Table S5 and Table S6.

D. The number of type-B GMs extracted from finite block-size scaling with increasing χ

As follows from a finite block-size scaling analysis of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ [S1, S2] given in Eq. (1), the number of type-B GMs may be extracted from the iDMRG simulations [S3] for different values of the bond dimension χ , if a proper symmetry is implemented. In principle, one may perform an extrapolation to obtain an accurate estimate of the number of type-B GMs, as the bond dimension χ tends to infinity.

TABLE S6: Estimates of the dynamical critical exponent z for the SO(4) spin-orbital model with $\zeta = \infty$ for sectors $(q_1, q_2) = (0, 0)$ and $(q_1, q_2) = (1, 0)$. The bond dimension ranges from 100 to 1000, with a relative error less than 3%, compared to the exact value $z = 2$. The fillings f are as indicated.

Sector	f	(1/2, 1/2)	(5/12, 5/12)
$(q_1, q_2) = (0, 0)$		1.9853	1.9976
$(q_1, q_2) = (1, 0)$		1.9497	1.9585




FIG. S17: The entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SU(2) spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3) with filling $f = s$, where (a) $s = 1/2$, (b) $s = 1$, (c) $s = 3/2$ and (d) $s = 2$. The bond dimensions are $\chi = 80, 120, 140$ and 160 , with the block size ranging from $n = 5$ to $n = 20$.

1. The SU(2) spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model

Fig. S17 shows a plot of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SU(2) spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3) with filling $f = s$ and different values of s . The

TABLE S7: Estimates for the number of type-B GMs N_B extracted from the finite block-size scaling of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ for the SU(2) spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3) with filling $f = s$ and bond dimensions $\chi = 80, 120, 140, 160$. The block size ranges from $n = 5$ to $n = 20$.

χ		80	120	140	160
$s = 1/2$	N_B	0.9804	0.9946	0.9986	1.0002
$s = 1$	N_B	0.9534	0.9758	0.978	0.982
$s = 3/2$	N_B	0.9248	0.9668	0.9722	0.9786
$s = 2$	N_B	0.9054	0.9156	0.9632	0.97




FIG. S18: The entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SU(2) spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3) with filling $f = s - 1/2$, where (a) $s = 1/2$, (b) $s = 1$, (c) $s = 3/2$ and (d) $s = 2$. The bond dimensions are $\chi = 80, 120, 140, 160$. The block size ranges from $n = 6$ to $n = 20$.

TABLE S8: Estimates for the number of type-B GMs N_B extracted from a finite block-size scaling of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ for the SU(2) spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3) with filling $f = s - 1/2$ and bond dimensions $\chi = 80, 120, 140, 160$. The block size ranges from $n = 6$ to $n = 20$.

	χ	80	120	140	160
$s = 1/2$	N_B	1.0214	1.0278	1.0288	1.0298
$s = 1$	N_B	0.9732	0.9962	0.999	1.0052
$s = 3/2$	N_B	0.931	0.9676	0.9756	0.9804
$s = 2$	N_B	0.9064	0.9526	0.9642	0.9722

best linear fit yields $N_B = 1$, with relative error less than 3%, with data shown in Table S7.

Fig. S18 shows a plot of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SU(2) spin- s Heisenberg ferromagnetic model (3) with filling $f = s - 1/2$ and different values of s . The best linear fit yields $N_B = 1$, with a relative error less than 3%, as indicated in Table S8.

2. The SU(3) ferromagnetic model

Fig. S19 shows a plot of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SU(3) ferromagnetic model (4) for different fillings. The best linear fit yields $N_B = 2$, with relative error less than 6.5%, as indicated in Table S9.




FIG. S19: The entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SU(3) ferromagnetic model (4) for filling values (a) $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and (b) $f = (1/4, 1/2)$. The bond dimensions are $\chi = 100, 120, 160, 200, 300$, with the block size ranging from $n = 5$ to $n = 18$.

TABLE S9: Estimates for the number of type-B GMs N_B extracted from the finite block-size scaling of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ for the SU(3) ferromagnetic model (4) with fillings $f = (1/3, 1/3)$ and $f = (1/4, 1/2)$. The bond dimensions are $\chi = 100, 120, 160, 200, 300$, with the block size n ranging from $n = 5$ to $n = 18$.

	χ	100	120	160	200	300
$f = (1/3, 1/3)$	N_B	1.6686	1.6982	1.7732	1.791	1.8702
$f = (1/4, 1/2)$	N_B	1.704	1.771	1.8138	1.825	1.8772

3. The SO(4) spin-orbital model

Fig. S20 shows a plot of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5) with $\zeta = 3/4$, for different fillings. The best linear fit yields $N_B = 2$, with relative error less than 4.5%, as indicated in Table S10.

Fig. S21 shows a plot of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5) with $\zeta = \infty$, for different fillings. The best linear fit yields $N_B = 2$, with relative error less than 4%, as indicated in Table S11.

In summary, our results for the three illustrative models in-

TABLE S10: Estimates for the number of type-B GMs N_B extracted from the finite block-size scaling of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5) with $\zeta = 3/4$. The fillings are $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and $f = (5/12, 5/12)$, where the bond dimensions are $\chi = 60, 100, 200, 300, 400$, with block size ranging from $n = 4$ to $n = 18$.

	χ	60	100	200	300	400
$f = (1/2, 1/2)$	N_B	1.703	1.7302	1.7886	1.8516	1.9104
$f = (5/12, 5/12)$	N_B	1.7236	1.7466	1.8358	1.8906	1.9352




FIG. S20: The entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5) with $\zeta = 3/4$ for fillings (a) $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and (b) $f = (5/12, 5/12)$. The bond dimensions are $\chi = 60, 100, 200, 300, 400$, with block size ranging from $n = 4$ to $n = 18$.




FIG. S21: The entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ versus $\ln n$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5) with $\zeta = \infty$. The fillings are (a) $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and (b) $f = (5/12, 5/12)$, with bond dimensions $\chi = 60, 100, 200, 300, 400$, and block size ranging from $n = 4$ to $n = 18$.

dicating that the estimates for the number of type-B GMs N_B tend to saturate, as the bond dimension χ increases. As a consequence, we are led to conclude that the number of type-B GMs N_B may be reliably extracted from finite block-size scaling, as long as the bond dimension χ is large enough, within a reasonable accuracy.

TABLE S11: Estimates for the number of type-B GMs N_B extracted from the finite block-size scaling of the entanglement entropy $S_f(n)$ for the SO(4) spin-orbital model (5) with $\zeta = \infty$. The fillings are $f = (1/2, 1/2)$ and $f = (5/12, 5/12)$, with bond dimensions $\chi = 60, 100, 200, 300, 400$, and block size ranging from $n = 4$ to $n = 18$.

	χ	60	100	200	300	400
$f = (1/2, 1/2)$	N_B	1.6768	1.7058	1.813	1.8558	1.9212
$f = (5/12, 5/12)$	N_B	1.7232	1.7682	1.8662	1.9118	1.9544

- [S1] Q.-Q. Shi, Y.-W. Dai, H.-Q. Zhou, and I. McCulloch, arXiv: 2201.01071 (2022).
- [S2] H.-Q. Zhou, Q.-Q. Shi, I. McCulloch, and M. T. Batchelor, arXiv:2302.13126 (2023).
- [S3] I. P. McCulloch, arXiv: 0804.2509 (2008); I.P. McCulloch, J. Stat. Mech. **2007**, P10014 (2007); F. Heidrich-Meisner, I. P. McCulloch, and A. K. Kolezhuk, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 179902 (2010); F. Zhan, J. Sabbatini, M. J. Davis, and I. P. McCulloch, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 023630 (2014).
- [S4] All the relevant iDMRG codes, exploited in this work, may be downloaded from the website <https://github.com/mptoolkit>.
- [S5] R. J. Baxter, Exactly-Solved Models in Statistical Mechanics (Academic Press, London, 1982).
- [S6] P. Chen, Z.-L. Xue, I. P. McCulloch, M.-C. Chung, M. Cazalilla, and S. K. Yip, J. Stat. Mech. P10007 (2013).
- [S7] Y.-W. Dai, Q.-Q. Shi, H.-Q. Zhou, and I. McCulloch, arXiv: 2201.01434 (2022).