

Highly complex novel critical behavior from the intrinsic randomness of quantum mechanical measurements on critical ground states - a controlled renormalization group analysis

Rushikesh A. Patil¹ and Andreas W. W. Ludwig¹

¹*Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA*

(Dated: September 4, 2024)

We consider the effects of weak measurements on the quantum critical ground state of the one-dimensional (a) tricritical and (b) critical quantum Ising model, by measuring in (a) the local energy and in (b) the local spin operator in a lattice formulation. By employing a controlled renormalization group (RG) analysis we find that each problem exhibits highly complex novel scaling behavior, arising from the intrinsically indeterministic (‘random’) nature of quantum mechanical measurements, which is governed by a measurement-dominated RG fixed point that we study within an ϵ expansion. In the tricritical Ising case (a) we find (i): multifractal scaling behavior of energy and spin correlations in the measured groundstate, corresponding to an infinite hierarchy of independent critical exponents and, equivalently, to a continuum of universal scaling exponents for each of these correlations; (ii): the presence of logarithmic factors multiplying powerlaws in correlation functions, a hallmark of ‘logarithmic conformal field theories’ (CFT); (iii): universal ‘effective central charges’ $c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ for the prefactors of the logarithm of subsystem size of the n th Rényi entropies, which are independent of each other for different n , in contrast to the unmeasured critical ground state, and (iv): a universal (‘Affleck-Ludwig’) ‘effective boundary entropy’ S_{eff} which we show, quite generally, to be related to the system-size independent part of the Shannon entropy of the measurement record, computed explicitly here to 1-loop order. – A subset of these results have so-far also been obtained within the ϵ expansion for the measurement-dominated critical point in the critical Ising case (b).

CONTENTS

		IX. Conclusions and Discussion	20
I. Introduction	2	Acknowledgments	21
II. The O’Brien-Fendley Model	3	A. Higher Cumulants and a Comment on ‘Non-Local’ Fields	21
III. Measurement Protocol and Replica Trick	4	1. Higher Cumulants: Ising tricritical point	21
A. Measuring $\hat{E}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ on Even Links	4	2. Higher Cumulants: Ising Critical Point	22
B. Calculation of Observables and Replica Trick	6	3. Locality of Observables	22
IV. Field Theory Representation and measurement RG Fixed Point	7	B. Irreducible Representations of the Symmetry Group	23
A. Field Theory Representation	7	Colliding Scaling Dimensions in Replica Limit $R \rightarrow 1$	23
B. Controlled Perturbative Renormalization Group Analysis	8	C. Details of Entanglement Entropy Calculation	24
V. Correlation Functions	9	D. OPE coefficient of two Twist Fields into $\Phi(x)$	25
A. Measurement-averaged moments of the spin-spin correlation function $\overline{\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle^N}$	9	E. Higher Loop Orders in the RG and the Ising Critical Point	26
B. Measurement averaged moments of the energy-energy correlation function $\overline{\langle \hat{E}_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \hat{E}_{j+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle^N}$	11	F. Brief Review - RG equations from the Operator Product Expansion (OPE)	29
C. Multifractality of Scaling Dimensions	12	G. Irrelevance of Higher Cumulants from Avoided Level Crossings	30
D. Logarithmic Correlation Functions	12	References	31
VI. Entanglement Entropies	14		
VII. Effective ‘ground-state degeneracy’ g_{eff}	16		
VIII. Measurements of $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ in the Quantum Ising Model	17		

I. INTRODUCTION

Effects of measurements have recently attracted substantial attention especially in the context of measurement-induced quantum phase transitions in deep quantum circuits, and related problems, which exhibit novel universality classes of phase transitions in such non-equilibrium quantum systems [1–30]. Another class of quantum systems subjected to measurements was recently introduced in Ref. [31], and subsequent works [32–34], considering the effects of measurements on one-dimensional quantum critical ground states. Ref. [31] considered a Luttinger liquid, and provided a field theory formulation with measurements acting on the one-dimensional zero-time slice in space-time, exhibiting a version of the Kosterlitz-Thouless transitions, while Ref. [32–34] similarly considered several types of measurements, with and without postselection, performed on the ground state of the critical one-dimensional quantum Ising model.[35] The aim of the present paper is to exhibit novel universality classes of critical behavior with highly complex and novel scaling behavior that can emerge when (weak) measurements are performed (without postselection) on quantum critical ground states. In the examples we discuss such critical behavior originates from a measurement-dominated fixed point occurring at a finite measurement strength, which we treat using a controlled renormalization group (RG) analysis, i.e. an ϵ expansion. Physically, the complexity of the scaling behavior originates from the intrinsic indeterministic (“random”) nature of quantum mechanical measurements. While so-far analytically-based tools for understanding measurement-induced transitions in deep quantum circuits have been largely elusive, problems involving measurements performed on one-dimensional quantum critical ground states are typically simpler technically, and thus more susceptible to a controlled RG analysis, as we demonstrate in the examples we study. Yet, they exhibit similar complex scaling behavior as that in the deep circuits.

The first problem we study, “problem (a)”, consists of measurements with the local energy operator on the ground state of the tricritical quantum Ising model, within a lattice formulation. After introducing replicas this can be written as the field theory of the $(1+1)$ -d tricritical Ising model in space-time with a perturbation acting solely on the $\tau = 0$ equal time-slice describing the measurements. This perturbation is relevant in the RG sense, and it flows to an infrared fixed point at finite measurement strength which can be controlled within an ϵ expansion. This is analogous to the Wilson-Fisher $\epsilon = 4-d$ expansion, except that here the dimension of space-time is always two, and a small parameter ϵ is obtained by generalizing the tricritical Ising model to the tricritical q -state Potts model, and expanding about $q = 4$ where the perturbation becomes marginal [which is in essence, an expansion in the small parameter $(4-q)$]. This allows for a systematic calculation of all universal scaling

properties at the infrared fixed point.

One reflection of the complexity of the finite measurement strength fixed point appears in correlation functions of the spin and energy operator taken in the measured ground state with measurement outcomes \vec{m} . When raised to the N th power and averaged over measurement outcomes with the Born probability these N th moments decay, for spin and energy correlations, with independent exponents, one for each moment order N . Thus, associated with each of the two observables (spin and energy) there is an infinite hierarchy of scaling exponents, in contrast to standard critical behavior. This is referred to as multifractal scaling. Since this scaling behavior has its origin [29, 36] in a universal scaling form of the entire probability distribution for the correlation function, also the non-integer N moments will scale giving rise to a continuous spectrum of scaling dimensions for each, the spin and the energy correlations.

Another exotic feature of the measurement-dominated fixed point that we find is that of a so-called “logarithmic conformal field theory” [37–40]. While at RG fixed points associated with conventional critical points correlation functions decay with powerlaws, here we observe in certain averaged correlation functions a powerlaw multiplied by a logarithm. This arises because at the finite measurement fixed point a rescaling of distances does not act diagonally on all observables, but may act in the form of a two-dimensional [41] non-diagonalizable “Jordan-form” matrix. When translated into the behavior of averaged correlation function this amounts to the presence of the multiplicative logarithm.

The entanglement entropies exhibit further complex universal behavior at the finite measurement strength critical point. While the universal coefficients of the logarithm of subsystem size in the n th Rényi entropy of the unmeasured ground state, $\frac{1}{3}c_n$, are all related to the central charge c , i.e. $c_n = \frac{c}{2}[1 + \frac{1}{n}]$, at the finite measurement critical point the universal coefficients $\frac{1}{3}c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ are all unrelated to each other and have a more complicated n dependence already to first order in ϵ which we calculate, and which is further modified in higher order in ϵ . This represents another hierarchy of independent universal quantities, similar to those encountered in spin and energy correlations functions discussed above. (Specifically, these are correlation functions of the “ n -twist field”, Sect. VI.) We furthermore show that the universal quantities $c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ also appear in the coefficient of the linear temperature dependence of the *extensive* measurement averaged Rényi entropies of the full mixed thermal Gibbs state of the system at finite temperature.

The problem of performing measurements on a quantum critical ground state can be viewed as a problem of the unmeasured critical (here conformally invariant) field theory in space-time with a defect at the zero-time slice, and the finite measurement strength fixed point represents a scale-invariant, in fact conformally invariant defect. After folding along the slice it becomes a boundary

condition on the (doubled) unmeasured conformal field theory (CFT). In general, to any boundary of a CFT is associated a universal constant, the ‘‘Affleck-Ludwig’’ boundary entropy [42]. Here we establish quite generally that for problems of measurements on 1d quantum critical ground states, the corresponding universal ‘‘effective boundary entropy’’ S_{eff} is the constant, system size independent piece of the Shannon entropy of the measurement record. (We have computed it here explicitly to lowest order in the ϵ expansion.) It may be viewed as a boundary analog of the ‘‘effective central charge’’ at measurement-induced transitions in deep quantum circuits, which arises from the universal finite-size dependence of the Shannon entropy of the measurement record of the (bulk) space-time of the circuit [29].

Lastly, we address the problem of weak measurements performed on the ground state of the *critical* Ising model with the Pauli $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ operator at lattice sites i , via an extension of the controlled RG analysis and ϵ expansion developed for the *tricritical* Ising case. We find that these measurements lead to similar complex scaling behavior governed by another measurement-dominated RG fixed point, occurring at a finite measurement strength. In particular, we obtain (to two-loop order) an infinite hierarchy of independent multifractal critical exponents for the set of measurement averaged moments of the $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ correlation function, leading again to a continuous spectrum of critical exponents and an independent scaling exponent of the typical connected correlation function. Moreover, we find, in analogy to the tricritical Ising case, independent coefficients $\frac{1}{3}c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ of the logarithm of subsystem size for the measurement averaged n -th Rényi entropies for different values of n , which we compute to leading order in the ϵ expansion. The presence of multiplicative logarithms in measurement averaged correlation functions (logarithmic CFT features) is currently being studied as well in the Ising case.

The remaining parts of the paper are structured in the following manner: In Section II, we introduce the O’Brien-Fendley model and discuss its zero temperature phase diagram which has a critical point in the universality class of the tricritical Ising point. For this quantum tricritical ground state, in Section III, we describe a measurement protocol with explicit Kraus operators corresponding to weak measurements. In Section IV, we develop a replica field theory to analyze the problem of described weak measurements on the tricritical ground state. We analyze the infrared behavior of the obtained replica field theory using a controlled perturbative RG expansion and determine the new ‘non-trivial’ fixed point in an ϵ -expansion. In Section V, we determine the long distance behavior of measurement averaged moments of correlation functions for the spin $\hat{\sigma}^z$ and the energy \hat{E} operator (defined in Section III) and demonstrate the logarithmic CFT features of the measurement-dominated fixed point. In Section VI, we calculate the measurement averaged n^{th} Rényi entanglement entropies and the von Neumann entanglement entropy. In Section VII, we dis-




FIG. 1: Phase Diagram of the O’Brien-Fendley Chain

cuss the Shannon entropy of the measurement record and the relationship of its constant universal part with the ‘effective boundary entropy’. In Section VIII, we discuss the case of Ising critical point under measurements with the $\hat{\sigma}^z$ spin operator. Section IX is reserved for conclusions and discussion of results.

II. THE O’BRIEN-FENDLEY MODEL

A variety of quantum mechanical systems in one-dimensional space with different microscopic appearance are known to exhibit a quantum critical point in the universality class of the tricritical Ising model, see e.g. Ref. [43–47]. In the present paper, we will consider one such microscopic realization convenient for our purposes, the O’Brien-Fendley chain introduced in Ref. 45. The O’Brien-Fendley chain is a 1d quantum chain with spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ (qubit) degrees of freedom at each site and is described by the Hamiltonian H

$$H = H_I + \lambda_3 H_3 \quad (1a)$$

$$H_I = - \sum_j (\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z + \hat{\sigma}_j^x) \quad (1b)$$

$$H_3 = \sum_j (\hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+2}^z + \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^x \hat{\sigma}_{j+2}^x) \quad (1c)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}^a$ ($a = x, y, z$) are the standard Pauli matrices. Note that at $\lambda_3 = 0$, the Hamiltonian H reduces to the Hamiltonian H_I of the *critical* 1d quantum Ising chain. As seen by inspection, the term H_3 in the Hamiltonian is invariant under the Kramers-Wannier (K-W) transformation given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z &= \tau_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \\ \hat{\sigma}_j^x &= \tau_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \tau_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Since there are no RG relevant K-W self-dual operators at the Ising critical point, for sufficiently small $\lambda_3 \neq 0$ the chain in Eq. 1a is described by a K-W invariant line of second order transitions parametrized by λ_3 , all in the Ising universality class. However, as discussed in Ref. 45, for large enough λ_3 the spectrum becomes gapped, and since the Hamiltonian is self-dual under the K-W transformation, there is a line of first order phase transitions on the phase boundary between the ferromagnetic and the paramagnetic phase. The phase diagram of the chain along the K-W line is shown in Fig. 1 (from Ref. 45). The renormalization group (RG) unstable critical point at $\lambda_3 = \lambda_{tc} \approx 0.856$, which separates the Ising second order phase transition line from the first order

phase transition line, lies in the universality class of the tricritical Ising model. In the present paper, we will consider performing measurements on the ground state of the *tricritical* quantum Ising Hamiltonian H of Eq.(1a) at $\lambda = \lambda_{tc}$.

III. MEASUREMENT PROTOCOL AND REPLICA TRICK

Coming first back to ordinary Ising case $\lambda_3 = 0$, the ground state of the critical quantum Ising chain H_I subject to measurements with operators $\hat{\sigma}_j^x$ or $\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z$ has been investigated in Ref. 32, 33 and 34. Measurements with $\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z$ and $\hat{\sigma}_j^x$ on the Ising critical ground state result in the same universal effects [32], because both operators represent (after subtraction of their expectation values) the energy operator ϵ of the Ising critical point with scaling dimension $X_\epsilon = 1$, up to corrections from subleading operators which are RG-irrelevant. In other words, their connected equal time correlation functions (denoted by a subscript c) in the Ising critical ground state, describing the correlations of the subtracted operators, decay asymptotically with the same exponent,

$$\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{i+1}^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z \rangle_c \sim \frac{1}{|i-j|^{2X_\epsilon}} \text{ and } \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^x \hat{\sigma}_j^x \rangle_c \sim \frac{1}{|i-j|^{2X_\epsilon}} \quad (3)$$

as $|i-j| \gg 1$.

We now move on to the O'Brien-Fendley chain which, as recalled above, has the *same* underlying lattice spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ (qubit) degrees of freedom as the ordinary Ising chain. Therefore, it is natural to study effects of measurements of similar operators for the O'Brien-Fendley chain. Interestingly, equal-time correlation functions of the *same* operators $\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z$ and $\hat{\sigma}_j^x$ in the ground state of the tricritical point of the O'Brien-Fendley chain decay asymptotically (after subtraction of the expectation values) with the critical exponent $X_\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{5}$ of the energy scaling operator \mathcal{E} of the Ising *tricritical* point [48],

$$\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{i+1}^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z \rangle_c \sim \frac{1}{|i-j|^{2X_\mathcal{E}}} \text{ and } \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^x \hat{\sigma}_j^x \rangle_c \sim \frac{1}{|i-j|^{2X_\mathcal{E}}} \quad (4)$$

as $|i-j| \gg 1$. Unlike the ordinary transverse field quantum Ising model, the subdominant contributions to both $\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z$ and $\hat{\sigma}_j^x$ are now *not* RG irrelevant. Specifically, these two lattice operators are represented [48] by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z &\sim \chi(x) \equiv AI + B\mathcal{E}(x) + C\mathcal{E}'(x) + D\mathcal{E}'' + \dots, \\ \hat{\sigma}_j^x &\sim \chi'(x) \equiv AI - B\mathcal{E}(x) + C\mathcal{E}'(x) - D\mathcal{E}'' + \dots, \\ (A, B, C, D &= \text{non-universal constants}), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where I is the identity field with A the tricritical expectation value of the corresponding lattice operator, while \mathcal{E}

(with scaling dimension $X_\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{5}$), \mathcal{E}' (with scaling dimension $X_{\mathcal{E}'} = \frac{6}{5}$), and \mathcal{E}'' (with scaling dimension $X_{\mathcal{E}''} = 3$) are the energy, the subdominant energy, and the further subleading energy scaling operators at the Ising *tricritical* point, the first two of which are RG-relevant as bulk operators; the ellipses denote more subleading operators. Forming the difference of $\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z$ and $\hat{\sigma}_j^x$, we define the operator $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}$ given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{j+\frac{1}{2}} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z - \hat{\sigma}_j^x), \quad (6)$$

which changes sign under the K-W duality transformation, Eq. 2. Owing to Eq. 5, this operator is a lattice representation of the energy scaling operator \mathcal{E} of the tricritical Ising critical point which is consequently also odd under K-W duality, with corrections from solely RG *irrelevant* (K-W odd) operators. For the same reason, the linear combination

$$\hat{\mathbf{E}}'_{j+\frac{1}{2}} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z + \hat{\sigma}_j^x), \quad (7)$$

with the opposite sign than in Eq. 6, is *even* under K-W duality and is (after subtraction of its expectation value) a lattice representation of the subleading energy operator $\mathcal{E}'(x)$ which, consequently, is K-W even (together with all occurring subleading operators) [49]. Note that $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}$ lies on the link of the lattice connecting site at j and $j+1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{j+\frac{1}{2}})^2 &= \\ &= \frac{1}{2}((\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z)^2 + (\hat{\sigma}_j^x)^2 - \hat{\sigma}_j^x \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z - \hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z \hat{\sigma}_j^x) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

implying that

$$\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{j+\frac{1}{2}} \text{ has eigenvalues } \pm 1. \quad (8)$$

We note in passing that, as verified by inspection, the operator $\hat{\mathbf{E}}'_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ also squares to the identity and therefore also has eigenvalues ± 1 . [50]

In the following, we will describe a protocol for performing measurements on the ground state of the O'Brien-Fendley chain.

A. Measuring $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ on Even Links

Note that the operators $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ on neighbouring links do not commute with each other, because $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ and $\hat{\sigma}_j^x$ on the same site do not commute. However, if we take $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ operators on alternate links, say even links (those where i is even), all of them commute with each other (see Fig. 2). Our measurement protocol consists in measuring the operators $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ on even links. [51] [52] Then on each even link, we can define the (weak-) measurement Kraus


$$\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{-\frac{3}{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{\sigma}_{-2}^z \hat{\sigma}_{-1}^z - \hat{\sigma}_{-2}^x) \quad \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{\sigma}_0^z \hat{\sigma}_1^z - \hat{\sigma}_0^x)$$


FIG. 2: ‘Energy’ Operator on Even Links

operator,

$$\hat{K}_{i+\frac{1}{2},\pm} := \frac{1 \pm \lambda \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{2(1 + \lambda^2)}}, \quad (9)$$

and the measurement operators $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ at different even links will commute with each other. For notational convenience, we will drop the lattice-position offsets of $+\frac{1}{2}$ from now on and label both operators as \hat{K}_i and $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_i$, i.e. by just i , which denotes the site at the left end of the link. [53]

When $\lambda = 1$, the Kraus operators in Eq. 9 reduce to projection operators $\hat{K}_{i,m_i} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + m_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i)$ onto the eigenstates of $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_i$ with eigenvalues $m_i = \pm 1$. The parameter $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ controls the ‘strength’ of the measurement. When $\lambda = 0$ no measurements are performed at all.

When the eigenvalue m_i is measured at site i , the measurement changes a (normalized) quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ to the following (normalized) state *after* this measurement

$$|\psi\rangle \rightarrow \frac{\hat{K}_{i,m_i}|\psi\rangle}{\|\hat{K}_{i,m_i}|\psi\rangle\|}. \quad (10)$$

Each measurement outcome $m_i = \pm 1$ at an even link i occurs with ‘Born-rule’ probability

$$p_B(m_i) = \langle \psi | (\hat{K}_{i,m_i})^\dagger \hat{K}_{i,m_i} | \psi \rangle = \frac{1}{2(1 + \lambda^2)} \left(1 + \lambda^2 + 2m_i \lambda \langle \psi | \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i | \psi \rangle \right), \quad (11)$$

which depends on the incoming state $|\psi\rangle$. The measurement operators for each even i satisfy the condition

$$\sum_{m_i=\pm 1} (\hat{K}_{i,m_i})^\dagger \hat{K}_{i,m_i} = \mathbf{1}_i, \quad (12)$$

where the right hand side denotes the identity operator [54]. This ensures the normalization of the Born-rule probabilities $p_B(m_i)$ defined above. Eq. (12) is referred to as the POVM [55] condition.

Let us take the quantum state on which we perform measurements to be the *ground state* $|0\rangle$ of the O’Brien-Fendley chain at the *tricritical* point. Since the measurement operators $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_i$ on the even links i commute with each other, the state obtained after measuring on all even links with measurement outcomes $\vec{m} := \{m_i\}$ is

$$|\Psi_{\vec{m}}\rangle = \frac{\prod_{i \in \text{Even}} \hat{K}_{i,m_i} |0\rangle}{\|\prod_{i \in \text{Even}} \hat{K}_{i,m_i} |0\rangle\|} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\vec{m}} |0\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle 0 | \hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\vec{m}} |0\rangle}}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\vec{m}} := \prod_{i \in \text{Even}} \hat{K}_{i,m_i}, \quad (14)$$

and

$$p_0(\vec{m}) = \langle 0 | \hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\vec{m}} |0\rangle \quad (15)$$

is the Born-rule probability to obtain measurement outcomes $\vec{m} = \{m_i\}$. We will refer to the state obtained upon performing measurements and corresponding to a particular set of measurement outcomes as a ‘quantum trajectory’. It will be convenient to write the RHS of Eq. 9 as

$$\hat{K}_{i,\pm} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}} \exp\{\pm \tilde{\lambda} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i\}, \quad (16)$$

where $0 \leq \tilde{\lambda} = \text{arctanh}(\lambda) < \infty$, and \mathcal{N} is a suitable normalization factor. Then we can write the product in Eq. 14 in the following form

$$\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\vec{m}} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}^{L/2}} \exp\{\tilde{\lambda} \sum_{i=\text{even}} m_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i\}, \quad (17)$$

where L denotes the number of sites. Let us define the variable t_i s.t.

$$t_i = \tilde{\lambda} m_i. \quad (18)$$

Since the measurement outcome is $m_i = \pm 1$, the variable t_i takes on values $\pm \tilde{\lambda}$. We can reformulate the measurements by ‘softening’ the variable $t_i = \pm \tilde{\lambda}$ to take on *continuous* values $-\infty < t_i < +\infty$ drawn from some distribution $P(t_i)$ which we take to be symmetric under $t_i \rightarrow -t_i$. Sometimes, it may be convenient to choose a Gaussian distribution whose variance is a measure of the ‘strength’ of measurements $\tilde{\lambda}$. The formulation given in Eqs. 16,17 above in terms of discrete measurement outcomes $m_i = \pm 1$ is simply a special case of this where the distribution $P(t_i)$ is the (normalized) sum of two delta functions peaked at $t_i = \pm \tilde{\lambda}$. It turns out that *only* the *cumulants* of the random variable t_i determined by the distribution $P(t_i)$ [56] will enter our formulation below, and the essential physics will turn out to depend only on the second cumulant and will thus be insensitive to other details of the distribution $P(t_i)$. This then also covers the case where, with some probability, no measurement is performed at a site, corresponding to the symmetric distribution $P(t_i)$ which is a (normalized) weighted sum of three delta functions, peaked at $t_i = 0$ and at $t_i = \pm \tilde{\lambda}$.

The corresponding reformulated Kraus operators

$$\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\vec{t}} \equiv \frac{1}{(\mathcal{N}')^{L/2}} \exp\left\{ \sum_{i \in \text{Even}} t_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \right\}, \quad \vec{t} \equiv \{t_i\}_{i \in \text{Even}}, \quad (19)$$

with a suitable choice of normalization factor \mathcal{N}' , satisfy again the required POVM condition

$$\left[\prod_{i \in \text{Even}} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_i P(t_i) \right) \right] (\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\vec{t}})^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\vec{t}} = \mathbf{1}. \quad (20)$$

This follows from Eq. 11 for any $P(t_i)$ symmetric under $t_i \rightarrow -t_i$ [57].

B. Calculation of Observables and Replica Trick

Consider now a general measurement average (denoted by an ‘overbar’) of the quantum mechanical expectation of N (potentially different) operators $\hat{O}_1, \hat{O}_2, \dots, \hat{O}_N$, where each of these we consider here to be a local operator or a product of local operators. We will compute this average using the Born-rule probability distribution $p_0(\vec{m})$, Eq. 15. We will also assume, for now, that each operator \hat{O}_i commutes with the Kraus operator $\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}$, but we will relax this assumption at the end of this section. Then averaging over measurement outcomes we obtain the measurement-averaged expectation values

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{[\langle \hat{O}_1 \rangle_{\vec{m}} \dots \langle \hat{O}_N \rangle_{\vec{m}}]} \\ &= \sum_{\vec{m}} p_0(\vec{m}) \frac{\langle 0 | \hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{O}_1 \hat{K}_{\vec{m}} | 0 \rangle \dots \langle 0 | \hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{O}_N \hat{K}_{\vec{m}} | 0 \rangle}{p_0^N(\vec{m})} \quad (21) \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} \sum_{\vec{m}} \left(\langle 0 | \hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{O}_1 \hat{K}_{\vec{m}} | 0 \rangle \dots \langle 0 | \hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{O}_N \hat{K}_{\vec{m}} | 0 \rangle \times \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times [\langle 0 | \hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}} | 0 \rangle]^{R-N} \right) \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} \sum_{\vec{m}} \left(\langle 0 | \hat{O}_1 \hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}} | 0 \rangle \dots \langle 0 | \hat{O}_N \hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}} | 0 \rangle \times \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times [\langle 0 | \hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}} | 0 \rangle]^{R-N} \right). \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

Note that when $N = 1$ the last factor in the above equation disappears since $(R - N) \rightarrow 0$ in the required $R \rightarrow 1$ limit. Thus, the average of a single expectation value of an operator or of a product of operators \hat{O}_1 (such as e.g. those appearing in a 2-point function) is unaffected by measurements,

$$\overline{[\langle \hat{O}_1 \rangle_{\vec{m}}]} = \sum_{\vec{m}} \langle 0 | \hat{O}_1 \hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}} | 0 \rangle = \langle 0 | \hat{O}_1 | 0 \rangle, \quad (23)$$

where the last equality follows from the POVM condition, Eq. 12. Coming back to Eq. 22, if we replicate the Hilbert space R times, Eq. 22 can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{[\langle \hat{O}_1 \rangle_{\vec{m}} \dots \langle \hat{O}_N \rangle_{\vec{m}}]} \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} \sum_{\vec{m}}^{R \otimes} \langle 0 | \hat{O}_1^{(1)} \hat{O}_2^{(2)} \dots \hat{O}_N^{(N)} (\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}})^{\otimes R} | 0 \rangle^{\otimes R} \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} \text{Tr}(\hat{O}_1^{(1)} \hat{O}_2^{(2)} \dots \hat{O}_N^{(N)} (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes R} \sum_{\vec{m}} (\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}})^{\otimes R}). \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

Here, the trace ‘Tr’ is now performed in the replicated Hilbert space, and superscripts on the operators indicate which Hilbert space factor, in the R -fold tensor product Hilbert space, they act on. For the measurement protocol discussed in subsection III A, after ‘softening’ the measurement outcomes to take on continuous values, we

can replace $\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}$ in Eq. 24 by $\hat{K}_{\vec{t}}$ in Eq. 19, and also replace the sum $\sum_{\vec{m}}$ by the integral over t_i as in Eq. 20. Thus, we will make the following substitution in Eq. 24

$$\sum_{\vec{m}} (\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}})^{\otimes R} \rightarrow \left[\prod_{i \in \text{even}} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_i P(t_i) \right) \right] (\hat{K}_{\vec{t}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{t}})^{\otimes R}. \quad (25)$$

Moreover, since \hat{E}_i is an hermitian operator, we have $\hat{K}_{\vec{t}}^\dagger = \hat{K}_{\vec{t}}$, and using Eq. 19, we can write

$$(\hat{K}_{\vec{t}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{t}})^{\otimes R} = \frac{1}{(\mathcal{N}')^{RL}} \exp \left\{ 2 \sum_{i=\text{even}} t_i \left(\sum_{a=1}^R \hat{E}_i^{(a)} \right) \right\}. \quad (26)$$

As discussed in Section III A, $P(t_i)$ is a symmetric distribution under $t_i \rightarrow -t_i$. Here $\{t_i\}_{i \in \text{even}}$ are independent random variables with joint distribution $\tilde{P}(\{t_k\}) = \prod_{i \in \text{even}} P(t_i)$, and the first and second moments of the distribution are given by

$$\bar{t}_i = 0, \quad \overline{t_i t_j} = 2\tilde{\Delta} \delta_{i,j}. \quad (27)$$

Here, $\tilde{\Delta}$ quantifies the strength of the measurements, and we assume that higher cumulants of $P(t_i)$ vanish; and they will be shown to *not* change the physics at long distances in App. A. Then using Eq. 26 and Eq. 27 we obtain using the cumulant expansion [58]

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\prod_{i=\text{even}} dt_i P(t_i) \right) (\hat{K}_{\vec{t}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{t}})^{\otimes R} \propto \\ & \propto \exp \left\{ \tilde{\Delta} \sum_{i=\text{even}} 4 \left(\sum_{a=1}^R \hat{E}_i^{(a)} \right)^2 \right\} \quad (28) \end{aligned}$$

$$\propto \exp \left\{ 4\tilde{\Delta} \sum_{i=\text{even}} \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^R \hat{E}_i^{(a)} \hat{E}_i^{(b)} \right\} \quad (29)$$

where in Eqs. 28 and Eq. 29, we have dropped unimportant overall multiplicative constants and consequently replaced the equality signs by proportionality signs, and in Eq. 29 we have used $\hat{E}_i^2 = 1$ (see Eq. 6). Using Eqs. 24, 25 and 29, we can then write the measurement averaged moments of expectation values as

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{[\langle \hat{O}_1 \rangle_{\vec{m}} \dots \langle \hat{O}_N \rangle_{\vec{m}}]} \propto \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} \text{Tr} \left(\hat{O}_1^{(1)} \hat{O}_2^{(2)} \dots \hat{O}_N^{(N)} \times \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes R} \exp \left\{ 4\tilde{\Delta} \sum_{i=\text{even}} \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^R \hat{E}_i^{(a)} \hat{E}_i^{(b)} \right\} \right) \quad (30) \end{aligned}$$

In the derivation of Eq. 30, we assumed that operators \hat{O}_i commute with the Kraus operator $\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}$ [59]. We will close this section by discussing the case when this assumption is not satisfied. See also the discussion at




FIG. 3: The action in the path integral of Eq. 31 is defined on the above cut cylinder geometry. The direction along the axis and along the circumference of the cylinder are labeled by space coordinate x and imaginary time τ , respectively. Note that the line $\tau = +\beta/2$ is ‘glued’ to $\tau = -\beta/2$ line, and the field configurations on these two lines are identified with each other, i.e. $\phi(x, +\beta/2) = \phi(x, -\beta/2)$ for all x .

the end of App. A. Since each operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ is either a ‘local’ operator or a product of ‘local’ operators, it will commute with most Kraus operators \hat{K}_{j,m_j} in the product $\hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\bar{m}} = \prod_j \hat{K}_{j,m_j}$, and it might *not* commute with only a few \hat{K}_{j,m_j} which have support on the same sites j as the operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$. We expect such local commutator terms of operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ to generically be subleading in scaling dimension [60], such that the leading order long distance behavior of the measurement averaged moments of the ground state expectation value of operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ is still given by Eq. 30.

IV. FIELD THEORY REPRESENTATION AND MEASUREMENT RG FIXED POINT

A. Field Theory Representation

In field theory language, the ground state density matrix of the O’Brien-Fendley chain at the Ising tricritical point can be written as a path integral [61] over the cut cylinder shown in Fig. 3,

$$|0\rangle\langle 0| = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{-\beta H}}{\mathcal{Z}} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \int D\phi e^{-S_*} |\phi(x, 0^-)\rangle\langle \phi(x, 0^+)| \quad (31)$$

$$S_* = \int d\tau \int dx \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\partial_x \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\tau \phi)^2 + g_3^* \phi^6 \right\}, \quad (32)$$

$$D\phi = \prod_{\tau=-\beta/2}^{+\beta/2} \prod_x d\phi(x, \tau),$$

where $|0\rangle$ is the ground state of the tricritical Ising Hamiltonian, and S_* is the effective Landau-Ginzburg

(-Zamolodchikov [62]) fixed point action of the Ising tricritical point, defined on the 2d space-(imaginary)time geometry in Fig. 3. [63]

We can insert the path integral representation from Eq. 31 into Eq. 30, and replace the *local* operators (or products of local operators) $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ with the corresponding continuum fields $\mathcal{O}_i^{(a_i)}(x, 0^-)$ in the respective replica copy “ a_i ”. Following Eqs. 5, 6, we can also replace the measurement operator $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_i^{(a)}$ in Eq. 30 by the corresponding continuum energy scaling operator $\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$ in replica copy “ a ”. The field \mathcal{E} is expressed in terms of the Landau-Ginzburg field ϕ by

$$\mathcal{E}(x, \tau) = : \phi^2 : (x, \tau), \quad (33)$$

where ‘ $: \cdot :$ ’ indicates standard ‘normal ordering’ [64] of the field ϕ^2 [62]. Thus, in continuum language, we obtain the following expression for the averages

$$\overline{[\langle \hat{\mathcal{O}}_1 \rangle_{\bar{m}} \dots \langle \hat{\mathcal{O}}_N \rangle_{\bar{m}}]} \propto \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} \int_{\substack{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^-) \\ = \phi^{(a)}(x, 0^+)}} \left[\prod_{a=1}^R D\phi^{(a)} \right] \mathcal{O}_1^{(1)} \mathcal{O}_2^{(2)} \dots \mathcal{O}_N^{(N)} e^{-\mathbb{S}} \quad (34)$$

$$\text{where, } -\mathbb{S} = \sum_{a=1}^R (-1) S_*^{(a)} + \Delta \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \Phi(x) \quad (35)$$

$$\Phi(x) := \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^R \mathcal{E}^{(a)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(b)}(x, 0) \text{ and } \Delta = (\text{constant}) \times \tilde{\Delta}. \quad (36)$$

Due to the trace in Eq. 30, the $\tau = 0^-$ and $\tau = 0^+$ boundaries of the cut cylinder in Fig. 3 will be glued, and the field configurations $\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^-)$ and $\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^+)$ are identified for all replica indices “ a ” as shown in Eq. 34 [65].

A different perspective to verify the form of defect interaction appearing in Eq. 35 and 36 is to consider symmetries of the system, and in particular Kramers-Wannier duality. Note that although our ground state $|0\rangle$ is invariant under Kramers-Wannier duality, an individual quantum trajectory will generally not be invariant under it. However, since we average over all measurement outcomes, we expect this symmetry to be restored in an average sense. Thus, the K-W symmetry will appear as an average (“weak”) symmetry of the ensemble of quantum trajectories. This implies, in particular, that although the total replica action (in IR) will be not invariant if we take $\mathcal{E}^{(a)} \rightarrow -\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$ in a single replica, the action will be invariant if we perform the transformation $\mathcal{E}^{(a)} \rightarrow -\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$ for all replica indices (a) simultaneously. The most RG relevant perturbation supported on the $\tau = 0$ time-slice and in the presence of this average (“weak”) symmetry is of the form $\mathcal{E}^{(a)} \mathcal{E}^{(b)}$ for replica indices $a \neq b$ [66]. Finally, we must consider the sum of

terms $\mathcal{E}^{(a)}\mathcal{E}^{(b)}$ over all possible pairs of unequal replica indices for the action to be symmetric under permutation of replica indices. This gives us Eq. 35 with $\Phi(x)$ in Eq. 36 back [67].

B. Controlled Perturbative Renormalization Group Analysis

At the Ising tricritical point, the scaling dimension of the field $\mathcal{E} = : \phi^2 :$ is $X_{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{1}{5}$ [68]. Thus, the RG eigenvalue of the coupling constant Δ in Eq. 35 is $y_{\Delta} = 1 - 2X_{\mathcal{E}} = 3/5 > 0$, implying that the perturbation is relevant. To study the effect of this perturbation, we will use a perturbative RG analysis, controlled by a small parameter ϵ . To obtain such a small parameter ϵ , we will consider the following generalization of the action in Eq. 35, where

$$-\mathbb{S} = \sum_{a=1}^R (-1) S_*^{(a)} + \Delta \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \Phi(x)$$

$$\Phi(x) = \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^R \mathcal{E}^{(a)}(x,0)\mathcal{E}^{(b)}(x,0).$$
(37)

But now we consider, instead of Eq. 32, the more general fixed point described by the action

$$S_* = \int d\tau \int dx \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\tau \phi)^2 + g_{m-1}^* \phi^{2(m-1)} \right\},$$
(38)

where

$$\mathcal{E} = : \phi^{m-2} :,$$
(39)

and where $m \geq 4$ is an even integer.

Note that setting $m = 4$ in the above equations, we recover the problem at hand, i.e. the action and the field \mathcal{E} given by Eq. 32 and 33, respectively. For any integer $m \geq 3$ (even or odd), the fixed point action in Eq. 38 describes exactly [62] the multi-critical points famously known as the m^{th} unitary minimal model conformal field theories (CFTs) of central charge [68, 69]

$$c(m) = 1 - \frac{6}{m(m+1)}.$$
(40)

(The same comment as in footnote [63] applies to this Landau-Ginzburg action.) We note that for arbitrary integer values $m \geq 3$, the operator \mathcal{E} in Eq. 39 is no longer the ‘energy’ field of the Ising multi-critical point described by the Landau-Ginzburg action in Eq. 38 (which would be $: \phi^2 :$). However, we will restrict ourselves to only *even* values of m [70], and keep using the symbol \mathcal{E} for the field in Eq. 39 for the following reason. For the central charges $c(m)$, Eq. 40, with *even* integer values of $m \geq 4$, there is another critical model with the same central charge, in addition to that described by the action in

Eq. 38. This is the *tricritical* q -state Potts model, where the value of q is given [71–75] by

$$\sqrt{q} = 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{m}, \quad m \geq 4 \text{ (even)}. \quad (41)$$

When $q = 2$, this is of course the tricritical Ising model, which is described by the Landau-Ginzburg action in Eq. 32 above, but for other values of the number q of Potts states in Eq. 41, e.g. for $q = 3$, it is a slightly different theory than the one in Eq. 38, with the same central charge [76, 77]. This will not be of relevance for the observables of interest to us, which turn out to be present in both theories (see also below). For example and of particular interest to us, when $m \geq 4$ is even, the operator \mathcal{E} from Eq. 39 is precisely the same operator as the energy (‘thermal’) operator in the tricritical q -state Potts model of the same central charge [73–75]. (In CFT language, that operator is the so-called Kac-Table primary operator $\varphi_{1,2}$ which has the scaling dimension listed in Eq. 42 below.) When $m \rightarrow \infty$, the value of q approaches $q = 4$, describing the $q = 4$ state tricritical Potts model, which turns out to be the same as the critical (ordinary) $q = 4$ -state Potts model at central charge $c = 1$ [73–75]. Moreover, for even m , all operators that appear when performing repeated operator product expansions of \mathcal{E} with itself are operators present simultaneously in both, the tricritical q -state Potts model and the Landau-Ginzburg multicritical point described by Eq. 38 [78], and all correlation functions of an arbitrary number of \mathcal{E} operators are exactly the same in both systems. Since, as we will discuss shortly, we will be interested in computing the RG equation (beta function) for the coupling constant Δ in the generalized model Eq. 38 for even values of m , which is uniquely determined [79] (to arbitrary loop order) by the set of the correlation functions of an arbitrary number of \mathcal{E} operators (which, as just mentioned, are the same for both systems), we can use either the Landau-Ginzburg formulation of Eq. 38 or equivalently the tricritical q -state Potts model formulation, both yielding the same result for this RG equation [80].

Specifically, we will proceed as follows. We are interested in the properties of the replica field theory in Eq. 37 – 39 when $m = 4$, describing the effects of the quantum mechanical measurements on the tricritical Ising ground state, as described in the previous sections. We will study the generalization of this field theory to large even values of the parameter m which, as already mentioned, provides an expansion parameter ϵ that is small when m (even) is large. This is a pure field theory problem. We will find that for large even values of m , the field theory in Eq. 37 will exhibit a fixed point at a non-vanishing value Δ_* of the coupling constant Δ , controlled by the parameter $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$, small when the even integer m is large. At this fixed point, we compute universal properties (including critical exponents) of a variety of observables perturbatively controlled by the small parameter ϵ . This is the same logic as in the familiar Wilson-Fisher $\epsilon = 4 - d$ expansion in dimensions

d smaller than 4. In contrast, here we always remain in $2 = (1 + 1)$ dimensions, but we vary the central charge $c(m)$ by varying the even integer m [81]. (This type of ϵ -expansion within conformal perturbation theory in two dimensions was first performed in Refs. [82–84] and subsequently used in many works.). This approach allows us to establish that at the finite- Δ_* fixed point the system has an extremely rich universal scaling behavior (to be discussed in subsequent sections), which we can access in a controlled manner perturbatively in ϵ (in the sense of an ϵ -expansion). Physically, this rich scaling behavior originates, as $m \rightarrow 4$, from the intrinsic *randomness* resulting from the *indeterministic* outcomes of the quantum mechanical measurements performed on the ground state of the Ising tricritical point. We now proceed to discuss the RG equation for the coupling constant Δ in Eq. 37. For an arbitrary even integer $m \geq 4$, the scaling dimension of \mathcal{E} in Eq. 39 (with action S_* in Eq. 38) is [68, 85],

$$X_{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2(m+1)}. \quad (42)$$

Thus, the RG eigenvalue of the coupling constant Δ is

$$y_{\Delta} = 1 - X_{\Delta} = 1 - 2X_{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{3}{(m+1)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon \quad (43)$$

which is greater than zero, implying that the perturbation is relevant and we will flow away from the unperturbed fixed point at $\Delta = 0$ for any given m . To obtain the 1-loop RG equation for the coupling constant Δ , we will need the OPE of the operator $\Phi(x)$ (from Eq. 37 with \mathcal{E} from Eq. 39) with itself (see for example Refs. 84, 86–88). For any conformal minimal model with even $m \geq 4$ in Eq. 38, the fusion rule [89] of $\mathcal{E} =: \phi^{m-2}$: with itself is given by,

$$\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} = I + \mathcal{E}' \quad (44)$$

where $\mathcal{E}' =: \phi^{2m-4}$: is another scaling field in the m^{th} Landau-Ginzburg theory and it is irrelevant on the 1-dimensional $\tau = 0$ time slice, for any $m \geq 4$ [90]. In tricritical q -state Potts language where, as mentioned above, \mathcal{E} is the (leading) energy operator, \mathcal{E}' is simply the subleading energy operator. From Eq. 37,44, one obtains the OPE

$$\Phi(x_1)\Phi(x_2) \sim \frac{b}{|x_1 - x_2|} \Phi(x_2) + \dots,$$

where

$$b = 4(R - 2), \quad (45)$$

and the ellipsis indicates fields which are irrelevant when supported on the $\tau = 0$ time-slice for $m \geq 4$ (which includes the $m = 4$ Ising tricritical case, Eq. 35), and can be ignored. To 1-loop order, the RG equation is then given by [86], [84], [87]

$$\frac{d\Delta}{dl} = y_{\Delta}\Delta + b\Delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta^3). \quad (46)$$

Thus, when the number of replicas is $R < 2$, there is a new fixed point at a non-vanishing *positive* value

$$\Delta_* = \frac{-1}{b}y_{\Delta} + \mathcal{O}(y_{\Delta}^2) = \frac{\epsilon}{4(2-R)} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) > 0 \quad (47)$$

$$\epsilon = \frac{3}{m+1}.$$

We are interested in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$ relevant for measurements (satisfying the Born rule) [21, 22], and since Δ describes a second cumulant, we are interested in a non-negative value $\Delta \geq 0$. Finally, we also note that the RG analysis for the replica action from Eq. 37 (with action S_* in Eq. 38 and $m \geq 4$) has been performed to two loop order [91] in Ref. [92], and from this analysis we obtain the following fixed point coupling up to second order in ϵ ,

$$\Delta_* = \frac{\epsilon}{4(2-R)} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4(2-R)^2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3), \quad (48)$$

a result that will be used further below. Note that the 1-loop results in Eq. 47 and Eq. 48 match as they should because the 1-loop contribution b to the RG equation is independent of the used RG scheme.

V. CORRELATION FUNCTIONS

In this section, we will discuss measurement-averaged moments of various correlation functions in the ground state of the tricritical O'Brien-Fendley chain. Following the logic of the preceding section, we will first express these measurement-averaged moments at the Ising tricritical point as correlation functions of corresponding fields in the replica Landau-Ginzburg field theory describing the Ising tricritical point as in Eqs. 32, 35, 36. Subsequently, we will consider the generalization of these correlation functions to the sequence of field theories with parameter $m \geq 4$ (even) in Eqs. 37, 38, 39, which possess a small expansion parameter ϵ when m is large. We will identify the generalization of the fields of the Ising tricritical point to general values of (even) m , and calculate their correlation functions in the replica field theory at the RG fixed point controlled by ϵ (discussed in the preceding section). This provides, analogous to the ordinary Wilson-Fisher $\epsilon = (4 - d)$ -expansion, a controlled expansion of critical exponents and other universal properties in an expansion in ϵ . Just as in the case of Wilson-Fisher expansion the case of $d = 2$ and $d = 3$ dimensions is of particular interest, of particular interest to us is the case of $m = 4$.

A. Measurement-averaged moments of the spin-spin correlation function $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle^N$

If we consider two lattice spin operators $\hat{\sigma}^z$ at the Ising tricritical point at sites i and j (also see footnote [59]), we

can use Eqs. 32, 34, 35, 36 to express the measurement-averaged N^{th} moment of their ground state correlation function in replica field theory language: At long wavelengths and to leading order in scaling dimension, the lattice operator $\hat{\sigma}^z$ is represented [48] at the Ising tricritical point of the O'Brien-Fendley chain by the spin field $\sigma(x) = \phi$ appearing in the action Eq. 32. The N -th moment average $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle^N$ is then given in continuum language by the following correlation function in the replica field theory for the Ising tricritical point, discussed in Eqs. 32, 34, 35, 36

$$\overline{\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle^N} \sim \langle \mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0) \mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(y, 0) \rangle, \quad (49)$$

where we have defined $\mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, \tau)$ as

$$\mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, \tau) := \left[\prod_{i=1}^N \sigma^{(\alpha_i)}(x, \tau) \right], \quad (50)$$

and $1 \leq \alpha_i \leq R$ are pairwise distinct replica indices in the R -replica theory. As $R \rightarrow 1$, the physics at long distances is determined by the new, measurement-dominated fixed point discussed in the previous section, and the correlation function in Eq. 49 will asymptotically exhibit power law behavior,

$$\langle \mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0) \mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(y, 0) \rangle \propto \frac{1}{|x - y|^{2X_N^{(\sigma), R=1}}}, \quad (51)$$

as $|x - y| \rightarrow \infty$.

Here the power law exponent $X_N^{(\sigma), R=1}$ characterizes the scaling behavior of the measurement averaged N^{th} moment of the $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ correlation function at the Ising tricritical point.

We can evaluate the power law exponent $X_N^{(\sigma), R}$ in an expansion in $\epsilon = \frac{3}{m+1}$ at the new fixed point Δ_* discussed in the previous Section IV B, by computing the above correlation function with the generalized replica action in Eq. 37 – 39. To this end, we use the spin field of the generalization of the Ising tricritical point to the tricritical q -state Potts model for $\sqrt{q} = 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{m}$ with $m \geq 4$ even, which has scaling dimension [73]

$$X_\sigma = \frac{m^2 - 4}{8m(m+1)}, \quad (m \geq 4, \text{ even}), \quad (52)$$

and which we denote by the same symbol $\sigma(x)$ as that used above in the tricritical Ising case. The tricritical Potts spin field is known [93] to have a natural OPE with the tricritical Potts energy operator,

$$\sigma \times \mathcal{E} = \sigma + \sigma', \quad (53)$$

where the subleading tricritical Potts spin field σ' has scaling dimension $X_{\sigma'} = \frac{9m^2 - 4}{8m(m+1)}$. We note in passing that the scaling dimensions of the tricritical q -state Potts spin and subleading spin fields also match those of the following fields in the Landau-Ginzburg formulation [94],

$$\sigma(x) =: \phi^{\frac{m}{2}-1} : (x) \quad \sigma'(x) =: \phi^{3(\frac{m}{2}-1)} : (x). \quad (54)$$

At $m = 4$, this gives back the spin field and the subleading spin field of the tricritical Ising CFT, $\sigma(x) = \phi$ and $\sigma'(x) =: \phi^3 :$.

Let us denote, for general even values of m , the coefficient of the field σ in the OPE of \mathcal{E} and σ in the tricritical q -state Potts model by $c_{\sigma\mathcal{E}\sigma}$. Then, the OPE of $\mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}$ (recalling its definition in Eq. 50) with $\Phi(x)$ is given by

$$\Phi(x) \cdot \mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(y, 0) \sim \frac{N(N-1)c_{\sigma\mathcal{E}\sigma}^2}{|x-y|^{2X_\sigma}} \mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0) + \dots \quad (55)$$

where the ellipsis indicates fields which, at $\epsilon = 0$ ($m = \infty$), have scaling dimensions different from those of $\mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0)$. Upon using the OPE in Eq. 55, the 1-loop RG equation for $\mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0)$ is given by

$$\frac{dg_{\{\alpha_i\}}}{d\ell} = (1 - NX_\sigma)g_{\{\alpha_i\}} + 2N(N-1)c_{\sigma\mathcal{E}\sigma}^2 \Delta g_{\{\alpha_i\}} + \dots, \quad (56)$$

where the scaling dimension X_σ of the tricritical Potts spin field $\sigma(x)$ was recalled in Eq. 52, and we have defined $g_{\{\alpha_i\}}$ as the coupling constant for the term $\int dx \mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0)$ when added to the action. The ellipsis in the above equation indicates not only the higher order terms but also quadratic terms involving couplings other than $g_{\{\alpha_i\}}$ and Δ . This yields the decay exponent for the correlation function of the replicated product of tricritical Potts spins (i.e. $\mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0)$) at the new fixed point Δ_* of the field theory Eq. 37 – 39 to first order in ϵ ,

$$\langle \mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0) \mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(y, 0) \rangle \propto \frac{1}{|x-y|^{2X_N^{(\sigma), R}}},$$

$$X_N^{(\sigma), R} = NX_\sigma - \frac{N(N-1)c_{\sigma\mathcal{E}\sigma}^2}{2(2-R)} \epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \quad (57)$$

The OPE coefficient $c_{\sigma\mathcal{E}\sigma}$ can also be expanded in powers of ϵ about $\epsilon = 0$ (corresponding to $m = \infty$). The $m = \infty$ conformal minimal model corresponds to the 4-state tricritical Potts model, and we can replace the OPE coefficient $c_{\sigma\mathcal{E}\sigma}$ in the above equation by its value in the 4-state tricritical Potts model [95]; any ϵ -dependence of the OPE coefficient $c_{\sigma\mathcal{E}\sigma}$ will only yield contributions of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ to Eq. 57. The OPE coefficient in the tricritical 4-state Potts model is equal [95] to $c_{\sigma\mathcal{E}\sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, yielding

$$X_N^{(\sigma), R} = \frac{N}{8} \left[1 - \frac{1}{3} \left(1 + \frac{6(N-1)}{(2-R)} \right) \right] \epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \quad (58)$$

In the limit $R \rightarrow 1$ the above expression provides, as $m \rightarrow 4$, an expansion in $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ (in the sense of the ϵ -expansion) of the scaling dimension of the measurement averaged N^{th} moment of the $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ correlation function at the Ising tricritical point,

$$X_N^{(\sigma), R=1} = \frac{N}{8} \left[1 - \frac{1}{3} (1 + 6(N-1)) \right] \epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \quad (59)$$

Note that this expression shows that for the first moment, $N = 1$, the first order correction in ϵ to the exponent X_σ (observed without measurements) vanishes, consistent with the expected absence of corrections to X_σ arising from Born-rule measurements in the tricritical Ising case, $m = 4$, to any order in ϵ due to the result in Eq. 23.

B. Measurement averaged moments of the energy-energy correlation function $\langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{j+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle^N$

Let us now consider, again at the Ising tricritical point, two energy operators $\hat{\mathbf{E}}$ (given in Eq. 6) on links $i + \frac{1}{2}$ and $j + \frac{1}{2}$ of the lattice (also see footnote [59]). We can again use Eqs. 32, 34, 35, 36 to express the measurement averaged N^{th} moment of the correlation function $\langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{j+\frac{1}{2}} \rangle$ in field theory language. In continuum language, as discussed in Section III, the lattice operator $\hat{\mathbf{E}}$ is given by the energy scaling field \mathcal{E} at the Ising tricritical point. Thus, from Eq. 35, the measurement averaged N^{th} moment of $\langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$ (as before, we have dropped the lattice offset $+1/2$ on the $\hat{\mathbf{E}}$ operators for notational simplicity) can be written as

$$\overline{\langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle^N} \sim \langle \mathfrak{E}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0) \mathfrak{E}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(y, 0) \rangle \quad (60)$$

where we have defined,

$$\mathfrak{E}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, \tau) := \left[\prod_{i=1}^N \mathcal{E}^{(\alpha_i)}(x, \tau) \right] \quad (61)$$

and α_i are pairwise distinct replica indices in the R -replica field theory. Again, as $R \rightarrow 1$, the physics at long distances is determined by the new, measurement-dominated fixed point discussed in the previous section, and the correlation function in Eq. 60 will asymptotically exhibit power law behavior,

$$\langle \mathfrak{E}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0) \mathfrak{E}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(y, 0) \rangle \propto \frac{1}{|x - y|^{2\mathbf{X}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}}}, \quad (62)$$

as $|x - y| \rightarrow \infty$.

Here the power law exponent $\mathbf{X}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}$ characterizes the scaling behavior of the measurement averaged N^{th} moment of the $\langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$ correlation function at the Ising tricritical point.

Analogous to the discussion of the moments of the spin operator in the preceding subsection, we can evaluate the power law exponent $\mathbf{X}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R}$ in an expansion in $\epsilon = \frac{3}{m+1}$ at the new fixed point Δ_* discussed in the previous Section IV B, by computing the above correlation function with the generalized replica action in Eq. 37 – 39. Unlike the product $\mathfrak{S}^{\{\alpha_i\}}$ of replicated spin fields in Eq. 50, the product $\mathfrak{E}^{\{\alpha_i\}}$ of replicated energy fields doesn't turn out to be [36, 92] a scaling operator at the new RG fixed

point (even to 1-loop order). The corresponding scaling operators at the new fixed point are instead given by a linear superposition of $\mathfrak{E}^{\{\beta_i\}}$ with different possible sets of replica indices $\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N\}$. These scaling operators at the new fixed point transform in irreducible representations of the permutation group S_R of the R replicas (as introduced in Ref. [36]). Thus, the correlation function $\langle \mathfrak{E}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0) \mathfrak{E}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(y, 0) \rangle$ will be expressed as a sum of power laws which, at large distances, turn out to be dominated [36, 92] by the leading (smallest) scaling dimension in the sum. Details are provided in App. B. In a theory with R replicas, we obtain

$$\langle \mathfrak{E}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(x, 0) \mathfrak{E}^{\{\alpha_i\}}(y, 0) \rangle \propto \frac{1}{|x - y|^{2\mathbf{X}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R}}}, \quad |x - y| \rightarrow \infty \quad (63)$$

where for the case of Born rule measurements ($R \rightarrow 1$),

$$\mathbf{X}_{N=1}^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3) \quad (64a)$$

$$\mathbf{X}_{N>1}^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1} = \frac{N}{2} \left[1 + \epsilon - (3N - 5)\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3) \right]. \quad (64b)$$

Analogous to the case of the moments of the spin operator, as $m \rightarrow 4$, the above expression for $\mathbf{X}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}$ provides an expansion in $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ (in the sense of the ϵ -expansion) of the scaling dimension of the measurement averaged N^{th} moment of the $\langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$ correlation function at the Ising tricritical point.

We note that for the first moment, $N = 1$, the above scaling dimension matches with the scaling dimension of the energy operator $X_{\mathcal{E}}$ (from Eq. 42) at the unperturbed fixed point up to second order in $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$. This is again consistent with Eq. 23 which implies that, in the tricritical Ising case, $m = 4$, there should be no corrections to $X_{\mathcal{E}}$ at any order in ϵ arising from measurements following the Born-rule.

We close this section by noting that it turns out [96] that the N^{th} moments of the correlation function of the *subtracted* energy operator describing the deviation from its expectation value in a fixed quantum trajectory,

$$\delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i := \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i - \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \rangle, \quad (65)$$

$$\langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle = \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle - \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \rangle \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle,$$

decay with a *single* power law, and not with a sum of different power laws as the N^{th} moments listed in Eq. 60. That is, at the Ising tricritical point, the moments of the resulting *connected* correlation function of energy operators decay with a single power law,

$$\overline{\langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle^N} = \overline{\left[\langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle - \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \rangle \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle \right]^N} \propto \quad (66)$$

$$\propto \frac{1}{|x - y|^{2\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}}}, \quad N \geq 1,$$

where the expression for $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}$ is that on the right hand side of Eq. 64b, however now valid for all positive

integers N , including $N = 1$. In the language of the replica field theory, this is written in the form

$$\langle \mathfrak{E}_{NNR}(x, 0) \mathfrak{E}_{NNR}(y, 0) \rangle \propto \frac{1}{|x - y|^{2\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}}}, \quad (67)$$

as $|x - y| \rightarrow \infty$

where the field $\mathfrak{E}_{NNR}(x, 0)$, transforming in a specific irreducible representation of the permutation group S_R of the replicas, is defined in Eq. B1 of App. B.

C. Multifractality of Scaling Dimensions

We know from the POVM condition, Eq. 23, that the measurement-averaged first moment of correlation functions such as $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$ exhibits the same power law behavior as in the unmeasured ground state of the tricritical Ising Hamiltonian. (This has also been verified within the ϵ expansion to the order we have evaluated it - see Eqs. 59, 64a above.) From Eqs. 59 and 64b, however, one sees that for each of the two operators $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ and $\delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i$ we have obtained an infinite number of independent scaling dimensions which are associated with the measurement-averaged higher integer moments of their correlation functions. This is a signature of multifractality. In a fixed quantum trajectory both correlation functions $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ and $\langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$ are bounded from above and are non-negative for sufficiently weak measurement strength [97]. This is in line with the field theory calculation which represents a controlled perturbative RG calculation in the (weak) strength of measurements. Then, the N th moments of these correlation functions for integer values of N are known to determine the entire probability distribution of these correlation functions (and are analytic functions of N). (See e.g. Refs. 36, 98–101.) Thus, the exponents $\mathbf{X}_N^{(\sigma), R=1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}$, while initially defined for integer values of N , are in fact defined for real values of N (by analytic continuation). Hence, to each of the two operators $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ and $\delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i$ is associated a continuous spectrum of scaling dimensions, obtained by continuously varying N .

Moreover, physically, while correlation functions represent random observables which are not self-averaging (as also reflected by the non-linear dependence of Eqs. 59 and 64b on the moment order N), their logarithm *is* self-averaging, and a cumulant expansion in the logarithm of the correlation function corresponds to a Taylor expansion of $\mathbf{X}_N^{(\sigma), R=1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}$ in N about $N = 0$ (see, e.g. Refs. 13, 24, 29, 36, and 102). This provides the *typical* scaling exponents,

$$\mathbf{X}_{\text{typ}}^{(\sigma), R=1} = \lim_{N \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{X}_N^{(\sigma), R=1}}{N}, \quad (68)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{typ}}^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1} = \lim_{N \rightarrow 0} \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_N^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}}{N}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\log \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle} &= -2\mathbf{X}_{\text{typ}}^{(\sigma), R=1} \log |x - y|, \\ \overline{\log \langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle} &= -2\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{typ}}^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1} \log |x - y|. \end{aligned}$$

Specifically, Eq. 59,

$$\mathbf{X}_{\text{typ}}^{(\sigma), R=1} = \frac{1}{8} \left[1 + \frac{5}{3}\epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \right], \quad (69)$$

and Eq. 64b,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{typ}}^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1} = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \epsilon + 5\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3) \right], \quad (70)$$

provide, as $m \rightarrow 4$, an expansion in $\epsilon = 3/(m + 1)$ of the scaling exponents of, respectively, the typical spin-spin and the typical (connected) energy-energy correlation function with Born-rule measurements on the ground state of the tricritical Ising Hamiltonian.

D. Logarithmic Correlation Functions

Until now, we have used the replica field theory formalism with an arbitrary number R of replicas and its $R \rightarrow 1$ limit to evaluate various quantities averaged with Born-rule probabilities (see Eq. 24). In taking the $R \rightarrow 1$ limit, the scaling dimensions of two operators which are distinct when $R \neq 1$ may become equal at $R = 1$. Such a collision of scaling dimensions while taking replica limits can give rise to “logarithmic correlation functions” at the measurement-dominated fixed point. The corresponding logarithmic factors multiplying the power law decay of certain correlation functions at criticality are a hallmark of so-called logarithmic CFTs, which are a class of non-unitary CFTs. (See e.g. Ref. 37–40, 96, and 103). We demonstrate in the present subsection that the indeterministic (random) nature of measurement outcomes performed on a critical ground state generates critical states that carry these hallmarks of logarithmic CFTs. In this section, we address these logarithmic CFT features of the measurement-dominated fixed point, and in particular, highlight correlation functions which contain multiplicative logarithms of distance on top of a power law decay.

As discussed in Sect. VB, the scaling operators at the new fixed point $\Delta_*(\epsilon)$ (Eq. 48) transform in irreducible representations of the symmetric group S_R and the correlation functions of such operators exhibit a pure power law decay at the new fixed point. Let us consider two operators \mathcal{O} and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ both transforming in irreducible representations of the symmetric group S_R s.t. the two correlation functions $\langle \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \rangle$ are pure power law decaying at the new fixed point $\Delta_*(\epsilon)$, i.e.

$$\langle \mathcal{O}(x, 0) \mathcal{O}(y, 0) \rangle = \frac{A(R)}{|x - y|^{2X(R)}}, \quad (71)$$

$$\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(x, 0) \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(y, 0) \rangle = \frac{\tilde{A}(R)}{|x - y|^{2\tilde{X}(R)}}. \quad (72)$$

Let us suppose that the correlators have colliding scaling dimensions in the replica limit $R \rightarrow 1$,

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow 1} (\tilde{X}(R) - X(R)) = 0 \quad (\text{but } \tilde{X}(R) \neq X(R) \text{ if } R \neq 1), \quad (73)$$

and that the amplitudes $A(R)$ and $\tilde{A}(R)$ of the correlators can be normalized s.t.

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow 1} (\tilde{A}(R) + A(R)) = \mathcal{K}, \quad (74)$$

where \mathcal{K} is a constant.

Then as $R \rightarrow 1$, we can write,

$$\tilde{A}(R) = -A(R) + \mathcal{K} \quad (75)$$

$$\tilde{X}(R) = X(R) + a(R-1) \quad (76)$$

where $a \neq 0$ is also a constant independent of R . Then in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(x, 0) \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(y, 0) \rangle + \langle \mathcal{O}(x, 0) \mathcal{O}(y, 0) \rangle = \\ &= \frac{\tilde{A}(R)}{|x-y|^{2\tilde{X}(R)}} + \frac{A(R)}{|x-y|^{2X(R)}} \\ &= \frac{-A(R) + \mathcal{K}}{|x-y|^{2X(R)+2a(R-1)}} + \frac{A(R)}{|x-y|^{2X(R)}} \\ &= \frac{1}{|x-y|^{2X(R)}} [\mathcal{K} + 2aA(R)(R-1) \log|x-y| + \\ & \quad + \mathcal{O}((R-1))] \quad (77) \end{aligned}$$

Now the last term in the above equation clearly vanishes as $R \rightarrow 1$ and therefore we are left with,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} [\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(x, 0) \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(y, 0) \rangle + \langle \mathcal{O}(x, 0) \mathcal{O}(y, 0) \rangle] = \\ &= \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} \frac{\mathcal{K} + 2aA(R)(R-1) \log|x-y|}{|x-y|^{2X(R=1)}}. \quad (78) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in addition to Eq. 73 and 74, if we have

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow 1} A(R)(R-1) = \text{finite} \quad (79)$$

or equivalently,

$$A(R) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{R-1}\right) \quad (80)$$

we see that the following correlation function will be logarithmic at the new fixed point,

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow 1} [\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(x, 0) \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(y, 0) \rangle + \langle \mathcal{O}(x, 0) \mathcal{O}(y, 0) \rangle]. \quad (81)$$

In App. B, we identify two such operators \mathcal{O} and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ which transform irreducibly under the symmetric group S_R ,

$$\mathcal{O} = \frac{1}{R-1} \mathfrak{E}_{20R} = \frac{1}{R-1} \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^R \mathcal{E}^a \mathcal{E}^b \quad (82)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{O}} &= \frac{1}{(R-1)(R-2)} \mathfrak{E}_{22R} \\ &= \frac{1}{(R-1)(R-2)} \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b; a,b \neq 1,2}}^R (\mathcal{E}^a - \mathcal{E}^1)(\mathcal{E}^b - \mathcal{E}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Here the field \mathfrak{E}_{NMR} , transforms in a specific irreducible representation of the symmetric group S_R and is defined in Eq. B1 of App. B. The normalization factors in front of \mathfrak{E}_{20R} and \mathfrak{E}_{22R} are chosen such that they satisfy the criterion in Eqs. 74 and 80. (See App. B.)

In App. B, we show that the scaling dimensions of above two operators (which have unequal scaling dimensions at a generic $R \neq 1$) become equal to each other at $R = 1$. Then, following our analysis above, the correlator (see App. B for its detailed form)

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} [\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(y, 0) \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(x, 0) \rangle + \langle \mathcal{O}(y, 0) \mathcal{O}(x, 0) \rangle] = \\ & \quad 4\langle \mathcal{E}^1(y, 0) \mathcal{E}^1(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^2(y, 0) \mathcal{E}^3(x, 0) \rangle \\ & \quad - 3\langle \mathcal{E}^1(y, 0) \mathcal{E}^2(y, 0) \mathcal{E}^3(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^4(x, 0) \rangle \quad (84) \end{aligned}$$

is logarithmic at all fixed points $\Delta_*(\epsilon)$ parameterized by even m . In particular, as $m \rightarrow 4$, we obtain the result that the following correlator averaged over measurements with Born-rule probability should be logarithmic at the Ising tricritical point,

$$\overline{4\langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \rangle \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle - 3\langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \rangle^2 \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle^2} \propto \frac{\log|j-i| + \mathcal{O}(1)}{|j-i|^{2\mathbf{X}_{N=2}^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}}}, \quad (85)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_{N=2}^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}$ is given by Eq. 64b and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ denotes a constant.

Finally, we note that in logarithmic CFTs the dilation operator of the scale transformations is not diagonalizable, and the logarithmic correlation functions are associated to Jordan cells of the dilation operator [37, 38, 103]. In particular, the Jordan cell or the ‘logarithmic pair (C, D) ’ associated to the logarithmic correlation function in Eq. 84 is formed by the following scaling operators in the $R \rightarrow 1$ replica limit,

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \mathcal{O} + \tilde{\mathcal{O}} \\ &\rightarrow \mathcal{E}^1 \mathcal{E}^2 + \sum_{\alpha \neq 1}^R \mathcal{E}^\alpha \mathcal{E}^1 + \sum_{\alpha \neq 2}^R \mathcal{E}^\alpha \mathcal{E}^2 - \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta=1 \\ \alpha \neq \beta}}^R \mathcal{E}^\alpha \mathcal{E}^\beta, \quad (86) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$C = (X(R) - \tilde{X}(R))\mathcal{O} \rightarrow -a \times \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta=1 \\ \alpha \neq \beta}}^R \mathcal{E}^\alpha \mathcal{E}^\beta \quad (87)$$




FIG. 4: Comparing with the Riemann surfaces that appear in the calculation of entanglement entropies for translationally-invariant (non-random) CFTs (see Ref. [104] or [105]), we have k n -sheeted Riemann surfaces for the calculation of the measurement averaged n^{th} Rényi entropy. In total, we have $R = nk + 1$ copies of the theory, where the standalone copy comes from Born-rule probability factor, and all $nk + 1$ copies are interacting with each other (but not with themselves) on the defects shown in red lines. The explicit form of the interaction is given in App. C (Eq. C10).

where the universal constant a is defined in Eq. 76. The correlation functions of the operators C and D are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D(x, 0)D(y, 0) \rangle &= \frac{\tilde{A}(R)}{|x-y|^{2\tilde{X}(R)}} + \frac{A(R)}{|y-x|^{2X(R)}}, \\ \langle C(x, 0)D(y, 0) \rangle &= \frac{A(R)(X(R) - \tilde{X}(R))}{|x-y|^{2X(R)}}, \\ \langle C(x, 0)C(y, 0) \rangle &= \frac{A(R)(X(R) - \tilde{X}(R))^2}{|x-y|^{2X(R)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

and thus in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$ (see Eq. 78),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D(x, 0)D(y, 0) \rangle &\rightarrow \frac{2\zeta \times (\log|x-y| + \mathcal{O}(1))}{|x-y|^{2\mathbf{X}_{N=2}^{(\epsilon), R=1}}}, \\ \langle C(x, 0)D(y, 0) \rangle &\rightarrow \frac{-\zeta}{|x-y|^{2\mathbf{X}_{N=2}^{(\epsilon), R=1}}}, \\ \langle C(x, 0)C(y, 0) \rangle &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

where $\zeta := \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} a(R-1)A(R)$.

VI. ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPIES

At long wavelengths, the n^{th} Rényi entanglement entropy of the ground state of a translationally invariant, i.e. non-random $(1+1)d$ CFT can be expressed as the logarithm of the correlation function of two n -twist fields by considering n copies of the corresponding 2D CFT [104]. (See also Ref. 106.) Following our calculations of

measurement averaged moments of correlation functions and, in particular, the measurement averaged logarithm of correlation functions in Sect. VC, we will now also calculate the average of the logarithm of the twist field correlation functions (which are the Rényi entropies) using the controlled perturbative RG expansion. This will involve calculating the correlation function of multiple copies of twist fields in the generalized replica action given in Eq. 37 – 39. Since the twist fields are geometrical in nature, their generalization to higher m theories appearing in Eq. 38 is natural. This will allow us to evaluate the universal coefficient of the logarithm of subsystem size of the measurement averaged Rényi entanglement entropies at the tricritical Ising point in an expansion in $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$.

To calculate the n^{th} Rényi entropy, we will have to consider n copies of a state, corresponding to a given set of measurement outcomes, and ‘glue’ the copies to form a n -sheeted Riemann surface (see App. C). Moreover, to be able to perform the average over measurement outcomes of the *logarithm* of the n -twist field correlation function, we will have to introduce another replica index k . Overall we need to introduce $R = nk + 1$ replica copies, where the additional copy comes due to the Born rule probability factor $p_0(m)$ (analogous to Eq. 21), and the limit $k \rightarrow 0$ or $R \rightarrow 1$ will correspond to the Born-rule measurement averaged Rényi entropy(s) [22]. The details of these calculations are given in App. C and we obtain the following expression for the measurement averaged n^{th} Rényi entropy $\overline{S_{n,A}}$

$$\overline{S_{n,A}} = \frac{1}{1-n} \frac{d}{dk} \Big|_{k=0} \left\langle \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}(u, 0) (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)})^{-1}(v, 0) \right) \right\rangle_{\Delta_*}. \quad (90)$$

Here, $\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}(u, 0)$ denotes the twist field, where the superscript j specifies which copy of the Riemann surface (out of k copies) the twist field corresponds to, and the subscript n signifies that we are dealing with twist fields for a n -sheeted Riemann surface (compare Fig. 4). The subscript Δ_* indicates that the correlation function is evaluated at the measurement-dominated fixed point.

We now evaluate the scaling dimension of the replicated twist field, occurring in the correlation function in Eq. 90, in the replica field theory Eq. 37, 38, 39 to 1-loop order in the ϵ expansion using the OPE. The coefficient of the twist field in the OPE of the twist field with the perturbation $\Phi(x)$ is calculated in App. D and is equal to kI_n , where I_n is defined as

$$I_n = \frac{n}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty ds \frac{1-s^{n-1}}{(1-s)(1+s^n)} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (91)$$

Then the 1-loop RG equation for the scaling dimension of the twist fields $[\prod_j^k \mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}]$ can be obtained as usual, e.g., from the RG equation for a coupling constant $g_{(n,k)}$ for the term $\int dx [\prod_j^k \mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}]$ when added to the action. This yields

$$\frac{dg_{(n,k)}}{dl} = (1 - kd_n)g_{n,k} + 2k\Delta I_n g_{n,k} + \dots \quad (92)$$

where $d_n := \frac{c}{12}(n - \frac{1}{n})$ is the scaling dimension of twist field \mathcal{T}_n in the unperturbed CFT [107], and the ellipsis represents terms that will end up contributing only to corrections of second order in ϵ . Then [108]

$$\langle \prod_{j=1}^k (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}(u, 0)(\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)})^{-1}(v, 0)) \rangle_{\Delta_*} \propto \left(\frac{u-v}{a} \right)^{-2d_{n,k}^*}$$

where, $d_{n,k}^* = kd_n - 2k\Delta_* I_n + \mathcal{O}((\Delta_*)^2)$. (93)

Here, we have inserted a short distance cutoff a to make the final result dimensionless. The measurement-averaged n^{th} Rényi entanglement entropy for an interval of length $l = |u-v|$ is then given, using Eq. 90, by

$$\overline{S_{n,A}} = \frac{c_n^{(\text{eff})}}{3} \ln \frac{l}{a} + \mathcal{O}(1) \quad \text{where,} \quad (94)$$

$$c_n^{(\text{eff})} = c(m) \left(\frac{1+1/n}{2} \right) - \frac{3I_n}{(n-1)} \epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \quad (95)$$

where $c(m)$ is the central charge of the unperturbed theory, Eq. 40, while I_n is the integral in Eq. 91. To obtain the measurement-averaged von Neumann entanglement entropy, we take the limit $n \rightarrow 1$ in the above equation. From Eq. 91, one obtains

$$\left. \frac{dI_n}{dn} \right|_{n=1} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty ds \frac{\ln(s)}{s^2-1} = \frac{\pi}{8}. \quad (96)$$

Thus, using Eqs. 94, 95 and 96, the measurement-averaged von Neumann entropy is

$$\overline{S_{1,A}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow 1} \overline{S_{n,A}} = \frac{c_{n=1}^{(\text{eff})}}{3} \ln \frac{l}{a} + \mathcal{O}(1), \quad (97)$$

where $c_{n=1}^{(\text{eff})}$ at the measurement-dominated fixed point Δ_* is given by

$$c_{n=1}^{(\text{eff})} = c(m) - \frac{3\pi}{8} \epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \quad (98)$$

This provides, as $m \rightarrow 4$, an expansion in $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ of the “effective central charge” at the measurement-dominated fixed point of the tricritical Ising ground state. Note that, unlike in translationally invariant (i.e., unmeasured and thus non-random) CFTs [104], here the measurement averaged n^{th} Rényi entanglement entropies $\overline{S_{n,A}}$ are *not* simply a $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{1}{n})$ multiple of the von Neumann entropy. Rather, the universal coefficients of the logarithm of subsystem size are all independent of each other for different measurement averaged Rényi entanglement entropies. This feature is similar to having a hierarchy of independent (“multifractal”) scaling dimensions for measurement-averaged moments of correlation functions of operators, as discussed in Section VC. Note that the n^{th} Rényi entropy being $\frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{1}{n})$ times the von Neumann entanglement entropy plays a central role in the calculation of entanglement spectrum shown in

Ref. 109 for the usual (unmeasured) 1d critical ground states. Thus, we expect the entanglement spectrum of the present system under measurements to exhibit qualitatively different universal features when compared to the (unmeasured) 1d critical ground states.

If we have our system at finite temperature, the unmeasured state is given by Gibbs state $\rho = \frac{e^{-\beta H}}{\mathcal{Z}}$, in contrast to the (pure) critical ground state. Following steps that parallel the pure state calculation above (using twist fields), we find that the measurement averaged n^{th} Rényi entanglement entropy can be written as

$$\overline{S_{n,A}} = \frac{1}{1-n} \left(\frac{d}{dk} \Big|_{k=0} \frac{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)_A}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)_\emptyset} \right) \quad (99)$$

where now,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_A(\beta) &= \sum_{\vec{m}} \text{Tr}((K_{\vec{m}} e^{-\beta H} K_{\vec{m}}^\dagger)^{\otimes nk+1} \mathcal{S}_{n,A}^k) \\ \mathcal{Z}_\emptyset(\beta) &= \sum_{\vec{m}} \text{Tr}((K_{\vec{m}} e^{-\beta H} K_{\vec{m}}^\dagger)^{\otimes nk+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

(See Eq. C5 for the definition of $\mathcal{S}_{n,A}^k$). Then following the discussion in App. C, one verifies that the average entanglement entropy is still given by Eq. 90, but now the twist field correlation function in this equation is calculated on a cylinder of finite circumference β instead of a plane. Since we are interested in evaluating this correlation function of twist-fields at the new fixed point Δ_* , which is conformally invariant, we can use the conformal transformation

$$w \rightarrow z = \frac{\beta}{2\pi} \log w \quad (101)$$

to map the twist field correlation on the plane (given in Eq. 93) to the twist field correlation function on the cylinder. Thus, the measurement averaged n^{th} Rényi entanglement entropy for a region of length $l \equiv |u-v|$ at finite (inverse) temperature β is given by

$$\overline{S_{n,A}} = \frac{c_n^{(\text{eff})}}{3} \ln \left(\frac{\beta}{\pi a} \sinh \frac{\pi l}{\beta} \right) + \mathcal{O}(1), \quad (102)$$

where the universal coefficient $c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ is given by Eqs. 91, 95. At inverse temperature $\beta \ll l$, this reduces to

$$\frac{\overline{S_{n,A}}}{l} \sim c_n^{(\text{eff})} \frac{\pi}{3} \frac{1}{\beta}. \quad (103)$$

If we take the subsystem size l to approach the length L of the total system, the universal coefficients $c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ will also appear in the measurement averaged (*not* entanglement) Rényi entropies calculated for the full mixed state of the system at finite temperatures [110]. At finite temperatures satisfying the condition $\beta \ll L$, the measurement averaged Rényi entropy of the mixed state of the system is then given by

$$\frac{\overline{R_n}}{L} \sim c_n^{(\text{eff})} \frac{\pi}{3} \frac{1}{\beta} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\beta^2}\right), \quad (104)$$

which is extensive in the total system size L . We also note that, since the Rényi entropy of the full system is a self-averaging quantity, it is thus represented by its average in Eq. 104. This expression should be contrasted with the Rényi-index n dependence of the extensive Rényi entropies for the unmeasured, i.e. non-random 1d quantum critical system at thermal equilibrium, which is given by [111], [104]

$$\frac{R_n}{L} = c(m) \cdot \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \right) \right] \frac{\pi}{3} \frac{1}{\beta} + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\beta^2} \right), \quad (105)$$

where $c(m)$, Eq. 40, is the central charge of the corresponding unmeasured $2D$ CFT. We note that due to the n -dependence of the universal coefficient c_n^{eff} (from Eq. 91, 95) in Eq. 104, the leading order finite temperature behavior of the measurement averaged n^{th} Rényi entropy of the *full* mixed state of the system does not satisfy the simple relation in Eq. 105, which is valid for translationally invariant (unmeasured, non-random) CFTs.

VII. EFFECTIVE “GROUND-STATE DEGENERACY” g_{eff}

At measurement-induced phase transitions of deep random quantum circuits with measurements in the bulk of the space-time of the circuit there exists a universal quantity known as the “effective central charge” which is defined in terms of the replica limit $R \rightarrow 1$ of the derivative with respect to R of the universal finite-size correction of the free energy of the circuit on a cylinder or strip of finite circumference or width. In a sense, it replaces the notion of the central charge which is zero at $R = 1$, in the non-unitary CFT describing the transition. The “effective central charge” has been shown in Ref. 29 and 30 to represent the universal finite-size scaling behavior of the Shannon-entropy of the measurement record of the circuit, the latter providing an expression for the logarithm of the partition function in the language of the measurements performed on the circuit. The “effective central charge” is *not* equal to the universal coefficient of the logarithm of subsystem size of the entanglement entropy at measurement-induced transitions in these deep random quantum circuits.

In CFTs with boundary (or defect, before folding [112], [113]) there is a quantity referred to as the “ground-state degeneracy g ” or “zero-temperature entropy” $S := \ln g$ which is a universal constant associated with any specific conformally invariant boundary RG fixed point. It plays a role for boundary (defect) CFTs analogous to the role played by the central charge in a bulk CFT. In particular, in unitary CFTs it decreases upon boundary RG flows, a property often referred to as the “g-theorem” [42],[114]. The *defect* (boundary, after folding) piece $\ln Z_d$ (subscript d standing for “defect”) of the logarithm of the partition function of a CFT on a cylinder of large length β and circumference $L \ll \beta$ has [115] a non-universal contribu-

tion f_d per unit length L of the defect, plus a universal constant, length- L independent contribution $S = \ln g$,

$$\ln Z_d = f_d \cdot L + S, \quad S = \ln g.$$

In the defect (boundary, after folding) CFT of interest in the present paper the universal quantity $S(R) = \ln g(R)$ depends on the number R of replicas and must vanish in the $R \rightarrow 1$ limit due to the POVM condition Eq. 12.

In general we obtain for the type of measurement problems on a critical ground state discussed in the present paper, analogous to the logic used in Ref. 29 to obtain the Shannon entropy of a deep circuit with bulk measurements, an expression for the partition function Z_R of our system from Eq. 24 and Eq. 15 upon setting all operators to the identity,

$$Z_{R=1+r} = \sum_{\vec{m}} p(\vec{m}) [p(\vec{m})]^r$$

or :

$$\ln Z_{R=1+r} =$$

$$= \ln \left\{ \sum_{\vec{m}} [p(\vec{m}) + rp(\vec{m}) \ln(p(\vec{m})) + \mathcal{O}(r^2)] \right\}$$

and :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} \Big|_{r=0} \ln Z_{R=1+r} &= \sum_{\vec{m}} p(\vec{m}) \ln(p(\vec{m})) = \\ &= -S_{Shannon}(\{p(\vec{m})\}) = f_{d,\text{eff}} \cdot L + S_{\text{eff}}, \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

where

$$S_{Shannon}(\{p(\vec{m})\}) = - \sum_{\vec{m}} p(\vec{m}) \ln(p(\vec{m})) \quad (107)$$

is the Shannon entropy of the measurement record, while

$$f_{d,\text{eff}} := \left(\frac{d}{dr} \Big|_{r=0} f_d(R=1+r) \right) = \text{non-universal}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}} &:= \frac{d}{dr} \Big|_{r=0} S(R) = \frac{d}{dR} \Big|_{R=1} \ln g(R) = \\ &= \left(\frac{d}{dR} \Big|_{R=1} g(R) \right) / g(R=1) := \ln g_{\text{eff}} = \text{universal} \end{aligned}$$

The “effective boundary entropy” S_{eff} , the logarithm of the “effective boundary degeneracy” g_{eff} , therefore characterizes the universal constant, i.e. system-size- L independent part of the Shannon entropy of the measurement record on the critical ground state. The Shannon entropy thus expresses the Born-rule averaged *defect* free energy in terms of a quantity directly related to the measurements. The “effective boundary entropy” S_{eff} plays a role in our problem of measurements on the quantum critical ground states analogous to the role played by the “effective central charge” in the deep circuits with bulk measurements where, as already mentioned, the latter describes the universal finite-size scaling information contained in the measurement record in the space-time bulk of the circuit.

The value of g_0 at our ultraviolet defect (boundary) fixed point $\Delta = 0$ is $S_0 = \ln g_0 = 0$ since there the space-time has no defect at all and thus there is no defect (boundary) contribution to the free energy of the space-time. We have calculated the universal boundary entropy $S(R) = \ln g(R)$ at our new fixed point Δ_* , Eq. 48, using our ϵ -expansion. Following Ref. 42 and 92, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g(R) &= g_0 + \delta g(R), \text{ where } g_0 = 1, \\ \ln g(R) &= \ln[1 + \delta g(R)] = \delta g(R) + \mathcal{O}(\delta g(R))^2, \\ \delta g(R) &= -\frac{\pi^2 R(R-1)}{24(R-2)^2} \epsilon^3 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4). \end{aligned}$$

We note that $\ln g(R)$, the universal constant contribution from the boundary to the logarithm of the partition function vanishes as $R \rightarrow 1$ to the order in ϵ we are considering, consistent with requirement from the POVM condition enforcing a partition function equal to unity in this limit. The “effective ground state degeneracy” g_{eff} of the defect (boundary) fixed point Δ_* is thus found to lowest non-vanishing order in the ϵ expansion to be

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\text{eff}} &= 1 + \delta g_{\text{eff}}, \\ \delta g_{\text{eff}} &:= \left(\frac{d}{dR} \right) \Big|_{R=1} \delta g(R) = -\frac{\pi^2}{24} \epsilon^3 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the universal constant contribution to the Shannon entropy of the measurement record on the tricritical Ising ground state is, owing to Eq. 106, given by the following expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \left[S_{\text{Shannon}}(\{p(\vec{m})\}) \right]_{\text{universal part}} &= \\ &= -S_{\text{eff}} = -\ln g_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\pi^2}{24} \epsilon^3 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4), \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

as $m \rightarrow 4$.

We close this section by noting that the ‘boundary entropy’ [42] has recently also been discussed in the different context of decoherence in Refs. 116 and 117.

VIII. MEASUREMENTS OF $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ IN THE QUANTUM ISING MODEL

(a): So far we addressed in this paper the problem of measurements with the energy operator $\hat{E}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}$, Eq. 6, performed on the ground state of the tricritical quantum Ising model (using the formulation by O’Brien and Fendley). We developed an $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ expansion for the resulting rich and novel critical properties, where $m \geq 4$ is an *even* integer characterizing a subset of minimal model CFTs which can be represented by tricritical q -state Potts models ($\sqrt{q} = 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{m}$, Eq. 41). The tricritical Ising model itself, the aim of our study, corresponds to the smallest *even* value $m = 4$.

(b): In the present section we address the problem of measurements with the Pauli spin operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$, performed on the ground state of the *critical* (not tricritical) quantum Ising model. We will again develop an

$\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ expansion for corresponding resulting rich and novel critical properties of this system. Here, however, $m \geq 3$ is an *odd* integer that characterizes another (complementary) subset of minimal model CFTs, which can be represented as a subset of Ising multicritical points (namely those with $m = \text{odd}$). The Ising model itself, the aim of our study, corresponds to the smallest *odd* value $m = 3$.

There is a common principle unifying problems (a) and (b), which allows us to apply the logic we have already developed for (a) also to (b) - with some modifications:

As described above, the continuum field \mathcal{E} describing the measurement operator $\hat{E}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}$ Eq. 5, 6 in the O’Brien-Fendley model is the energy operator of the tricritical Ising point. This, as already mentioned above, corresponds to the so-called Kac-Table primary field $\varphi_{1,2}$ of the minimal model CFT [see, e.g., Refs. 69, 85] with $m = 4$ describing the tricritical Ising model. Moreover, for arbitrary *even* values of $m \geq 4$, the same Kac-Table primary field $\varphi_{1,2}$ of the minimal model CFT corresponds to the energy operator \mathcal{E} in the corresponding tricritical q -state Potts model that we use to define our ϵ expansion, i.e. $\mathcal{E} = \varphi_{1,2}$ for $m \geq 4$ *even*. At the same time, this operator is represented in the Landau-Ginzburg description with action Eq. 38 by

tricritical Ising :

$$\mathcal{E} = \varphi_{1,2} = :\phi^{m-2}:, \text{ when } m \geq 4, m = \text{even}, \quad (109)$$

(see Eq. 39).

On the other hand, for the $m = 3$ conformal minimal model, describing the critical Ising model, the continuum field representing the spin operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ is also represented by the Kac-Table $\varphi_{1,2}$ operator at that value $m = 3$. Moreover, for arbitrary *odd* values of $m \geq 3$, the same Kac-Table primary field $\varphi_{1,2}$ of the minimal model CFT is represented in the Landau-Ginzburg description with action Eq. 39 again by $\varphi_{1,2} = :\phi^{m-2}:$, with the crucial difference that since now $m = \text{odd}$, this field now changes sign under the Ising Z_2 symmetry $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$. We will use this field as the generalization of the spin operator of the Ising model ($m = 3$ minimal model CFT) to the minimal model CFT at *odd* $m \geq 3$, and will denote it by the symbol

critical Ising :

$$\mathcal{S} := \varphi_{1,2} = :\phi^{m-2}:, \text{ when } m \geq 3, m = \text{odd}. \quad (110)$$

The operator \mathcal{S} plays, for the $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ expansion with *odd* $m \geq 3$ in the Ising case, exactly the same role that the operator \mathcal{E} played for the $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ expansion with *even* $m \geq 4$ in the tricritical Ising case that we have already described in this paper. Various discussions and calculations discussed so-far for the tricritical Ising case can literally be taken over to the Ising case by simply replacing \mathcal{E} by \mathcal{S} , and by replacing “ $m \geq 4, m = \text{even}$ ” by “ $m \geq 3, m = \text{odd}$ ”.

However, before proceeding with this, we need to understand a subtlety of the Ising case, $m = 3$. This will be

done below after briefly reviewing again our ϵ expansion approach.

Let us recapitulate that in Sect. III we started with a quantum critical ground state in the universality class of the Ising tricritical point ($m = 4^{\text{th}}$ minimal model) and considered the problem of performing measurements of the lattice energy operator $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}$ in Eq. 6 (which is odd under Kramers-Wannier duality) on it. In the process of analyzing this problem within an ϵ expansion, we introduced the generalized replica action in Eq. 37, with action S_* corresponding to the m^{th} minimal model CFT (Eq. 38) and a field \mathcal{E} in this CFT. We motivated the choice of the field \mathcal{E} in these higher minimal model CFTs by restricting to only the *even* m minimal model CFTs and using the tricritical q -state Potts formulation of the *even* m minimal model CFTs, where the field \mathcal{E} in Eq. 39 corresponds to the energy operator in the tricritical q -state Potts model, which for $q = 2$ is the same as the tricritical Ising point. This provided the basis for the ϵ expansion, where the control parameter $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ is small when the *even* integer $m \geq 4$ is large.

Until now, for us the generalized replica field theory in Eqs. 37 – 39 with *even* $m \geq 4$ minimal model CFTs only served as a tool to perturbatively study the replica field theory for measurements at the Ising tricritical point (i.e. the replica field theory at $m = 4$) in the small parameter $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ via the ϵ expansion we developed in Sect. IV B above. However, as purely a defect field theory problem with replica action in Eqs. 37 – 39, it is clear that the perturbative RG analysis presented in Sect. IV B applies to *any* m^{th} minimal model with $m \geq 4$, *including also* the minimal model CFTs with *odd* m . This is because the field \mathcal{E} , Eq. 109, being the energy operator of the tricritical q -state Potts models, when $m \geq 4$ is *even*, was only used to motivate the choice of field \mathcal{E} in the minimal models with larger parameter $m > 4$, and the field theory problem is perfectly well defined with just Eqs. 37 – 39 also for *odd* values of m , as far as the RG analysis is concerned [118]. Excluding Sect. V A on the (replicated) tricritical Potts spin correlation functions, the results from perturbative RG analysis for the entanglement entropies in Sect. VI and the (replicated) $\mathcal{E} =: \phi^{m-2}$ field correlation functions in Sect. V B also readily extend to all $m \geq 4$ (both even and odd) minimal model CFTs in Eq. 38. However, the physical meaning of this replica field theory in Eq. 37, and the corresponding $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ expansion, is completely different in the case of $m \geq 3$ with $m = \text{odd}$, as compared to the case of $m \geq 4$ with $m = \text{even}$, discussed in Sect. IV B: The former case will serve to describe the $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ expansion for the problem of $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ measurements on the ground state of the critical quantum Ising Hamiltonian. In this case, it is useful to rename the operator \mathcal{E} , Eq. 109 as \mathcal{S} , Eq. 110, which is now *odd* under the Ising Z_2 symmetry. (In the Ising case, $m = 3$, \mathcal{S} is the continuum field representing the Pauli $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ operator that is measured in this case.) For general $m \geq 3$ with $m = \text{odd}$ the replica field theory action is the same as in Eqs. 37 – 38, but

with the field \mathcal{E} replaced by \mathcal{S} , i.e.

$$-S = \sum_{a=1}^R (-1) S_*^{(a)} + \Delta \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx \Phi(x) \quad (111)$$

$$\Phi(x) = \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^R \mathcal{S}^{(a)}(x,0) \mathcal{S}^{(b)}(x,0), \quad (112)$$

$$S_* = \int d\tau \int dx \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\partial_x \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\tau \phi)^2 + g_{m-1}^* \phi^{2(m-1)} \right\}, \quad (113)$$

with the notation \mathcal{S} as defined in Eq. 110.

For the $m = 3$ minimal model, the lowest value of $m = \text{odd}$, describing the Ising critical point, however, there is an additional subtlety that arises in the RG analysis of the replica action in Eqs. 111 – 113. For minimal models $m \geq 4$, the terms denoted by the ellipsis “...” in the OPE in Eq. 45 of the perturbation Φ (Eq. 37 and Eq. 112 for $m = \text{even}$ and *odd*, respectively), with itself contained only irrelevant fields localized on the $\tau = 0$ time-slice. Hence we obtained Eq. 46 at 1-loop order, which described the RG flow of Δ . Precisely at the Ising critical point $m = 3$ however, for an arbitrary number of replicas R , the OPE in Eq. 45 of the perturbation Φ , Eq. 112, with itself contains a term which is *exactly* marginal. In particular, in the case of $m = 3$, the following term

$$\sum_{\alpha} \epsilon^{(\alpha)} \quad \text{where} \quad \epsilon =: \phi^2 :=: \phi^{2m-4} : |_{m=3} \quad (114)$$

appears on the RHS of Eq. 45. Here, $: \phi^{2m-4} :$ is irrelevant on the $\tau = 0$ time-slice for minimal models with $m \geq 4$ but it is *exactly* marginal at $m = 3$, i.e. at the Ising critical point. This term, however, turns out to come (see Eq. E7 in App. E) with a coefficient $(R-1)$ in the OPE in Eq. 45, and hence it vanishes in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$. Moreover, we show in App. E that in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$ such a term cannot be generated under the RG in any order of the coupling constant Δ of the perturbation Φ . Since the exactly marginal term in Eq. 114 cannot be produced under the RG in the $R \rightarrow 1$ limit at $m = 3$, the Ising case [119], the RG analysis performed in Sect. IV B, V B and VI will also provide an expansion in large *odd* m (small $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$) for the generalized replica theory in Eqs. 111 – 113 all the way down to $m = 3$, i.e. down to the Ising critical point. Thus in the replica limit $R \rightarrow 1$, the 1-loop RG equation derived in Eq. 46 also applies to an expansion in ϵ and $m = \text{odd}$, down to the Ising critical point.

To discuss this case in detail, let us consider the 1d quantum Ising model at its *critical* (*not tri-critical*) point described by the Hamiltonian in Eq. 1b, which lies in the universality class of the $m = 3$ minimal model CFT. Let us consider performing (weak-) measurements with operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ at *all* sites i on the ground state of the *critical* Ising model (Eq. 1b). Since $(\hat{\sigma}_i^z)^2 = 1$ and $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ at different sites commute with each other, one immediately verifies that the details from sections III A and III B, where

the O'Brien-Fendley chain at its Ising *tricritical* point was discussed, generalize straightforwardly to the case of measurements with $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ on the ground state of the *critical* quantum Ising model, where the measurement operator \hat{E}_i of the former is now replaced by $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$. In particular, the measurement averaged moments of correlation functions for this measurement protocol are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{[\langle \hat{\mathcal{O}}_1 \rangle_{\bar{m}} \dots \langle \hat{\mathcal{O}}_N \rangle_{\bar{m}}]} &\propto \lim_{R \rightarrow 1} \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_1^{(1)} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_2^{(2)} \dots \hat{\mathcal{O}}_N^{(N)} \times \right. \\ &\times (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes R} \exp \left\{ 4\tilde{\Delta} \sum_{i=\text{integer}} \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^R (\hat{\sigma}_i^z)^{(a)} (\hat{\sigma}_i^z)^{(b)} \right\} \Big). \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

Here, the state $|0\rangle$ now denotes the ground state of the *critical* Ising Hamiltonian listed in Eq. 1b. In the above equation, in contrast to the corresponding equation Eq. 30 of the tricritical point for the O'Brien-Fendley chain, we have a sum over *all* sites i and operators $(\hat{\sigma}_i^z)^{(a)}$. This is because in the present section we are performing measurements at all sites i with operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$, instead of with operator \hat{E}_i for even i . Just as in the tricritical Ising case, Eqs. 14, 19, we have gone over to a formulation using continuous (“softened”) measurement outcomes t_i with a symmetric distribution $P(t_i)$, which we again for now first assume to be a zero-mean Gaussian Eq. 27 (only second cumulant non-vanishing).

In continuum language, one now sees that equation Eq. 115 above reduces to Eq. 30 but where the action S_* in Eq. 32 is now the Landau-Ginzburg(-Zamolodchikov) action of the Ising *critical* point, i.e.

$$S_* = \int d\tau \int dx \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\partial_x \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\tau \phi)^2 + g_2^* \phi^4 \right\}, \quad (116)$$

as opposed to that of the Ising *tricritical* point in Eq. 32. Also, in contrast to Eq. 36, the perturbation $\Phi(x)$ is now given by

$$\Phi(x) = \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^R \mathfrak{s}^{(a)}(x, 0) \mathfrak{s}^{(b)}(x, 0), \quad (117)$$

where the field $\mathfrak{s}(x, \tau)$ is the the continuum field corresponding to the lattice operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ at the Ising critical point with the scaling dimension $1/8$ [69, 120]. As discussed at the start of this section, the field \mathfrak{s} is given by the Kac’s table field $\varphi_{1,2}$ at the Ising critical point, and thus can be obtained by taking $m \rightarrow 3$ limit of the field \mathcal{S} in Eq. 110. The special symbol $\mathfrak{s}(x, \tau)$ for the field \mathcal{S} in the Ising case $m = 3$ (and only for $m = 3$) is used to stress the additional subtlety arising in this case. In particular, substituting $m = 3$ in the generalized replica field theory in Eqs. 111, 112, and 113, we precisely recover the replica field theory for measurements performed with the operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ at the Ising critical point. We note

that the role played by the average (“weak”) Kramers-Wannier symmetry mentioned in the last paragraph of Sect. IV is now played by the average (“weak”) Ising Z_2 symmetry. Thus, the perturbation in Eq. 117 represents the most RG relevant perturbation invariant under the (“average”) Ising Z_2 and replica permutation symmetries. Less relevant interaction terms which can be thought of as being associated with higher cumulants of the distribution $P(t_i)$ are discussed in App. A 2 and are found to be irrelevant at the new fixed point Δ_* . This means that our result will also be valid for weak measurements where the distribution $P(t_i)$ is a (normalized) sum of delta functions.

Since the replica field theory for measurements performed with the operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ at the Ising critical point corresponds to the limit $m \rightarrow 3$ of the generalized replica theory in Eq. 111 with *odd* $m \geq 3$, we see, following the discussion on the analogy between replica field theories in Eqs. 37 – 38 for even m and replica field theories in Eqs. 111 – 113 for odd m , that the expansion in $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$

$$\Delta_* = \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3) \quad (118)$$

(obtained by taking $R \rightarrow 1$ in Eq. 48) provides, as $m \rightarrow 3$, the location (in coupling constant space) of the measurement-dominated fixed point which governs the IR physics of measurements with the spin-operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ performed at all sites on the ground state of the critical quantum Ising model [121]. By reasoning completely parallel to the tricritical case discussed above, the measurement-averaged n^{th} Rényi entanglement entropy $S_{n,A}$ for an interval of length l of the ground state of the critical Ising chain subjected to $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ measurements at all sites is given by the ϵ -expansion from Eq. 94,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{S_{n,A}} &= \frac{c_n^{(\text{eff})}}{3} \ln \frac{l}{a} + \mathcal{O}(1) \quad \text{where,} \\ c_n^{(\text{eff})} &= c(m) \left(\frac{1+1/n}{2} \right) - \frac{3I_n}{(n-1)} \epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \quad (119) \\ I_n &= \frac{n}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty ds \frac{1-s^{n-1}}{(1-s)(1+s^n)} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

but *now* in the limit $m \rightarrow 3$ with $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$. Finally, since the field $\mathfrak{s}(x, \tau)$ is the $m \rightarrow 3$ limit of the field \mathcal{S} defined in Eq. 110 for general odd- m minimal model CFTs (which in turn forms the analogue of the field \mathcal{E} Eq. 109 defined for even- m minimal model CFTs), the measurement averaged N^{th} moment of the correlation function of the $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ operator at the Ising critical point will be given by $m \rightarrow 3$ limit of Eq. 64,

$$\mathbf{X}_{N=1}^{(\hat{\sigma}_{1s}), R=1} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3) \quad (120a)$$

$$\mathbf{X}_{N>1}^{(\hat{\sigma}_{1s}), R=1} = \frac{N}{2} \left[1 + \epsilon - (3N-5)\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3) \right]. \quad (120b)$$

This shows that at the Ising critical point, the scaling dimensions of the measurement averaged moments of the

$\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ correlation function exhibit multifractal scaling (see Sect. VC). In particular, at the Ising critical point with measurements, the typical connected correlation function of the $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ operator will be given by the following power law exponent

$$\tilde{\chi}_{\text{typ}}^{(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{Is}}), R=1} = \frac{1}{2} [1 + \epsilon + 5\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)] \quad (121)$$

as $m \rightarrow 3$, where the definition of $\tilde{\chi}_{\text{typ}}^{(\hat{\sigma}_{\text{Is}}), R=1}$ is completely analogous to the definition of $\tilde{\chi}_{\text{typ}}^{(\mathcal{E}), R=1}$ in the tricritical Ising case. [122]

IX. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

We have demonstrated that performing weak measurements on relatively simple quantum critical ground states can give rise to critical states with highly complex and novel scaling behavior described by novel universality classes. We started our study with the critical ground state in the universality class of the Ising tricritical point in the lattice formulation by O’Brien and Fendley, and subjected it to weak measurements with a lattice operator which corresponds to the continuum energy operator at the Ising tricritical point. The described weak measurements turn out to be a relevant perturbation at the Ising tricritical point and the critical properties of the states obtained upon measurements are no longer dictated by the Ising tricritical point itself. We showed that the critical behavior of the tricritical Ising ground state subjected to the described weak measurements is governed by a new, measurement-dominated fixed point, which occurs at a finite strength of measurements. We presented a controlled perturbative RG analysis, i.e. an ϵ expansion, to study the universal critical properties of this measurement-dominated fixed point and we calculated a variety of universal quantities (described below) in this ϵ expansion.

We found the first manifestation of the novel scaling properties of the measurement-dominated fixed point in the scaling properties of the measurement-averaged moments of correlation functions. In particular, we showed that the measurement averaged N th moments of both the spin and the energy correlation function at the tricritical Ising point decay with independent power-law exponents for each N . Thus, there exists an infinite number of independent scaling exponents associated with each correlation function. Moreover, noninteger moments N of the correlation functions also exhibit scaling behavior, resulting in a continuous spectrum of scaling exponents for each operator, spin and energy. Each continuous spectrum of scaling exponents is related to a universal scaling form of the probability distribution of the given correlation function in states obtained upon measurements, and we determined the typical scaling behavior of the spin and the connected energy correlation function. We also demonstrated the presence of logarithmic

CFT features at the measurement-dominated fixed point, in particular the presence of logarithmic correlation functions. We showed that, unlike in usual (unitary) CFTs where all correlation functions are power law decaying, measurement-averaged correlations functions may possess a multiplicative logarithm of distance on top of a power law decay. Such logarithmic correlation functions are associated with the non-diagonalizability of the dilation operator, and we also identified the ‘logarithmic pair’ of scaling operators that span the 2×2 Jordan cell of the dilation operator corresponding to the obtained logarithmic correlation function.

Another novel feature of the finite measurement strength fixed point was found in the universal coefficients $\frac{1}{3}c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ of the logarithm of subsystem size in the measurement averaged n th Rényi entanglement entropies. We found that similar to the infinite hierarchy of scaling exponents in the case of moments of the correlation functions, the universal coefficients $c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ associated with the n th measurement averaged Rényi entanglement entropies are also independent of each other for different n . This is in contrast to the unmeasured 1d quantum critical ground states (and all unitary CFTs) where the universal coefficients of the logarithm of subsystem size for all n th Rényi entropies are all related solely to a single number, the central charge of the corresponding 2D CFT. We showed that $c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ also appears in the coefficient of the leading order finite temperature correction to the measurement averaged *extensive* n th Rényi entropy of the full (thermal) mixed Gibbs state of the system.

The problem of performing weak measurements on a 1d quantum critical ground state can be formulated as a field theory problem with a one dimensional defect at the zero-time slice of the corresponding (replicated) (1+1)d CFT. We showed, generally, that for a given 1d quantum critical ground state, the universal ‘Affleck-Ludwig’ effective boundary entropy associated with this defect (boundary, after folding) appears as a constant, system size independent piece in the Shannon entropy of the measurement record on the ground state. In the case of the tricritical Ising ground state subjected to weak measurements with the energy operator, we calculated this universal contribution to the Shannon entropy to leading order in the ϵ expansion. We note that the role of the effective boundary entropy in the case of a 1d critical ground state subjected to measurements is analogous to that of the ‘effective central charge’ at the measurement-induced transition of a deep quantum circuit, where the latter characterizes the finite size dependence of the Shannon entropy of the measurement record on the bulk of the deep quantum circuit at the measurement-induced transition.

Finally, we also studied the ground state of the quantum critical Ising model subjected to weak measurements with the spin operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$. By appropriately generalizing the controlled perturbative RG analysis, i.e. the ϵ expansion, developed in the case of the tricritical Ising point, we demonstrated that the critical behavior of the critical Ising ground state subjected to weak measure-

ments with the $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ operator is also governed by another measurement-dominated fixed point, which occurs at a finite strength of measurements. At the Ising critical point, we determined the power-law exponents of the measurement averaged moments of the $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ correlation function to two-loop order in the ϵ expansion and found these exponents to be independent of each other. We also obtained the power law exponent of the typical connected correlation function of the $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ at the Ising critical point in the ϵ expansion. Lastly, we also calculated, to leading order in the ϵ expansion, the universal coefficients $\frac{1}{3}c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ of the logarithm of subsystem size in the measurement averaged n th Rényi entanglement entropies at the Ising critical point. Again, analogous to the case of the tricritical Ising point, the universal coefficients $c_n^{(\text{eff})}$ at the Ising critical point are also found to be independent of each other for different values of n .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of us (AWWL) thanks Sam Garratt for an inspiring discussion on Ref. 31 in Fall 2022, as well as especially Romain Vasseur and Chao-Ming Jian for collaboration on several previous works in the related area of measurement induced phase transitions.

Appendix A: Higher Cumulants and a Comment on ‘Non-Local’ Fields

1. Higher Cumulants: Ising tricritical point

We begin by discussing the Ising tricritical point. In Eq. 29, we averaged over measurement outcomes by assuming that only the second cumulant of the distribution $P(t_i)$ is non-zero. In this Appendix, we will provide justification for why the higher even cumulants of $P(t_i)$ [123] cannot change the critical behavior of the system at long distances.

A non-vanishing $(2n)^{\text{th}}$ cumulant ($\tilde{\Delta}_{2n}$) of $P(t_i)$ will give rise to the following term

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{2n} \sum_{i=\text{even}} 4 \left(\sum_{a=1}^R \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i^{(a)} \right)^{2n} \quad (\text{A1})$$

in the exponential on the RHS of Eq. 29. The above expression can be simplified, using $\left(\hat{\mathbf{E}}_i^{(a)} \right)^2 = 1$, which shows that it corresponds to a superposition of terms of the following form (summed over all even i)

$$\sum_{a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}, \dots, a_{j_{2k}} \substack{\text{all indices are} \\ \text{pairwise distinct}}} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i^{(a_{j_1})} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i^{(a_{j_2})} \dots \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i^{(a_{j_{2k}})}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where k is an integer less than n . In continuum language, we can replace each $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_i^{(a_{j_l})}$ in the above expression with the corresponding continuum field $\mathcal{E}^{(a_{j_l})}(x, 0)$ in the replica copy “ a_{j_l} ”. Going over to continuum language, the above expression thus reads

$$\sum_{a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}, \dots, a_{j_{2k}} \substack{\text{all indices are} \\ \text{pairwise distinct}}} (\mathcal{E}^{(a_{j_1})})(\mathcal{E}^{(a_{j_2})}) \dots (\mathcal{E}^{(a_{j_{2k}})}). \quad (\text{A3})$$

In principle, in each of the parentheses in the above expression we can have a contribution from the subleading energy field \mathcal{E}'' which (just like the leading energy field \mathcal{E}) is also odd under K-W duality and can appear in the continuum representation of the lattice operator [compare Eqs. 5,6]. However, \mathcal{E}'' (scaling dimension = 3) is highly irrelevant as a field with support on the 1-dimensional time slice $\tau = 0$, and we can drop it. Coming back to Eq. A3, since the scaling dimension of the field \mathcal{E} at the Ising tricritical point is $1/5$, for all $k > 2$ the term appearing in Eq. A3 is irrelevant as a field with support on the 1-dimensional time slice $\tau = 0$, and again we can ignore it. The only relevant term coming from the higher cumulants $k \geq 2$ (apart from the $k = 1$ term already appearing in Eq. 36) is the $k = 2$ term,

$$\sum_{a,b,c,d \substack{\text{all indices are} \\ \text{pairwise distinct}}} \mathcal{E}^{(a)} \mathcal{E}^{(b)} \mathcal{E}^{(c)} \mathcal{E}^{(d)}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

which arises from all cumulants higher than or equal to the four. This term has scaling dimension $4/5 < 1$ (while being less relevant than $\Phi(x)$ in Eq. 36.)

The discussion above of scaling dimensions of the operators in Eq. A3 arising from higher cumulants was referring to the Ising tricritical point where the measurement strength is $\Delta = 0$. However, since we are in fact interested in the measurement-dominated fixed point at which $\Delta_* \neq 0$, which we control within the $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ -expansion, we are really concerned with the relevance/irrelevance of these operators at the $\Delta_* \neq 0$ fixed point. Now, all “higher-cumulant” ($k \geq 2$) operators in Eq. A3 are highly irrelevant at the $\Delta_* \neq 0$ fixed point when $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ is small, i.e. when m is large: At $\epsilon = 0$ (where $1/m = 0$) they have scaling dimensions = $2k \times (1/2) > 1$, i.e. are irrelevant (by integers) on the one-dimensional time-slice when $k \geq 2$, and for small ϵ those scaling dimensions only change by small amounts (of order $\epsilon, \epsilon^2, \dots$ etc.) when going to the finite- Δ_* fixed point of order ϵ . More specifically, one can show explicitly [92] that the operators in Eq. A3 become even more irrelevant at the $\Delta_* \neq 0$ fixed point within the 1-loop epsilon expansion, as compared to their dimensions = $2k \times (1/2)$ at the $\Delta = 0$ fixed point. (I.e. the order ϵ shifts of their scaling dimensions away from their already highly irrelevant $\epsilon = 0$ values are all positive.) This is a familiar feature of the epsilon expansion, well known already from that of ϕ^4 Landau-Ginzburg theory

in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions where, although the ϕ^6 perturbation is relevant at the *Gaussian* fixed point when $d < 3$ (while being irrelevant when $d > 3$), it is *irrelevant* at the *Wilson-Fisher* fixed point of physical interest for all dimensions $d \geq 2$. Analogously, in the epsilon expansion from Sect. IV B of interest in this paper, while the operator in Eq. A3 associated with the fourth cumulant $k = 2$ is, at the *unperturbed* fixed point $\Delta = 0$ (analogous to the Gaussian fixed point in ϕ^4 Landau-Ginzburg theory), relevant when $m = 4$ and irrelevant for all even values $m > 4$, it is analogously expected to be irrelevant at the $\Delta_* \neq 0$ fixed point of interest, Eq. 48, for all even values $m \geq 4$, i.e. including $m \rightarrow 4$. (A general argument for the irrelevance of all higher cumulants ($k \geq 2$) based on avoided level crossings is presented in App. G.)

Hence, we do not expect the higher cumulants of the distribution $P(t_i)$ to change the long distance behavior of the system. This implies in particular that in the case weak measurements with discrete measurement outcomes (Eqs. 9, 17, 19), where $P(t_i)$ is a (normalized) sum of delta functions [compare the discussion below Eq. 17] and thus contains even cumulants higher than the second, the same critical behavior results as in the case of a zero-mean Gaussian distribution $P(t_i)$.

2. Higher Cumulants: Ising Critical Point

Following the above discussion for the tricritical Ising case, we will now provide a justification for why the higher even cumulants of $P(t_i)$ are not expected to change the critical long-wavelength properties in the case of measurements with the $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ operator on the ground state of the critical quantum Ising model. Analogous to Eq. A2, the higher cumulants for the $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ measurements will give rise to terms of form

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{all indices are} \\ \text{pairwise distinct} \\ a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}, \dots, a_{j_{2k}}} (\hat{\sigma}_i^z)^{(a_{j_1})} (\hat{\sigma}_i^z)^{(a_{j_2})} \dots (\hat{\sigma}_i^z)^{(a_{j_{2k}})}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

which will appear in the exponential in Eq. 115. In continuum language, we can replace each $(\hat{\sigma}_i^z)^{(a_{j_i})}$ operator in the above equation by the continuum field $\mathfrak{s}^{(a_{j_i})}(x, \tau)$. Since the scaling dimension of $\mathfrak{s}^{(a_{j_i})}(x, \tau)$ is $1/8$, all the terms with $k > 4$ appearing in the above equation are irrelevant at the (unmeasured) Ising critical point. Thus, at the Ising critical point, the 4-replica and 6-replica terms (corresponding to $k = 2$ and $k = 3$ in Eq. A5) are relevant, while the 8-replica term (corresponding to $k = 4$) is marginal (while these terms are all less relevant than the perturbation $\Phi(x)$ in Eq. 117 corresponding to $k = 1$).

In analogy with the tricritical Ising case in the preceding subsection, the discussion above of the scaling dimensions of the operators in Eq. A5 arising from higher cumulants was referring to the Ising critical point where

the measurement strength is $\Delta = 0$. However, again, as we are interested in the measurement-dominated fixed point at which $\Delta_* \neq 0$, which we control within the $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ -expansion [where now $m = \text{odd}$], we are really interested in the relevance/irrelevance of these operators at this new fixed point. Again, all ‘‘higher-cumulant’’ operators ($k \geq 2$) in Eq. A5 are highly irrelevant at the $\Delta_* \neq 0$ fixed point when $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$ is small [124], i.e. when $m = \text{odd}$ is large: At $\epsilon = 0$ ($1/m = 0$) they have again scaling dimensions $= 2k \times (1/2) > 1$, i.e. are again irrelevant (by integers) on the one-dimensional time-slice when $k \geq 2$. And again, for small ϵ those scaling dimensions only change by small amounts when going to the finite- Δ_* fixed point of order ϵ . Again, specifically, within the 1-loop epsilon expansion [92] these operators become more *irrelevant* as compared to their already irrelevant scaling dimensions $= 2k \times (1/2)$ at $\Delta = 0$. Again, in analogy with the discussion of the ϕ^6 term in the $d = 4 - \epsilon$ expansion of ϕ^4 Landau-Ginzburg theory, the operators in Eq. A5 with $k = 2, 3, 4$ are expected to be irrelevant at the $\Delta_* \neq 0$ fixed point of interest for all odd values of $m \geq 3$, i.e. including $m = 3$. (For a general argument for the irrelevance of all higher cumulants ($k \geq 2$) based on avoided level crossings we refer again to App. G.)

Hence, again, we do not expect the higher cumulants of the distribution $P(t_i)$ to change the long distance behavior of the system. This implies again in particular that in the case of weak measurements with discrete measurement outcomes (Eqs. 9, 17, 19), where $P(t_i)$ is a (normalized) sum of delta functions (compare discussion below Eq. 17) and thus contains even cumulants higher than the second, the same critical behavior results as in the case of a zero-mean Gaussian distribution $P(t_i)$.

3. Locality of Observables

We will close this section by discussing the significance of ‘locality’ of fields \mathcal{O}_i associated with lattice operators $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ and which appear in Eq. 35. Note that in deriving Eq. 35, we assumed that the operators $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ in their continuum representation correspond to ‘local’ fields \mathcal{O}_i , i.e. \mathcal{O}_i can be expressed in terms of local combinations involving the Landau-Ginzburg field $\phi(x, \tau)$ and its normal ordered higher powers. Important differences in the gluing of field configurations $\{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^-)\}_{j=1}^R$ and $\{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^+)\}_{j=1}^R$ (appearing in Fig. 3 and Eq. 31) could occur if the fields \mathcal{O}_i are *non-local*. An example of this is seen in the case of measurements performed on the Tomonaga-Luttinger liquids (TLLs), studied in Ref. [31], when calculating the correlations functions of phase $e^{i\theta(x)}$. The phase $\theta(x)$ is termed as a ‘non-local’ field in the bosonic theory of the field $\phi(x)$ [125] as they satisfy the following equal time commutator

$$[\phi(x), \theta(x')] = i\pi H(x - x') = \begin{cases} i\pi & x \geq x' \\ 0 & x < x' \end{cases}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

In the calculation of phase correlation functions, as noted in Ref. [31], the two field configurations $\{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^-)\}_{j=1}^R$ and $\{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^+)\}_{j=1}^R$ differ with each other on an interval of values of position x , and are not ‘identified/glued’ on this interval. In this work, we have only considered correlation functions (and their moments) of lattice operators $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_i$ which correspond to ‘local’ fields in continuum, i.e. they can be expressed as local combinations of Landau-Ginzburg field ϕ and normal ordered higher powers of ϕ .

Appendix B: Irreducible Representations of the Symmetry Group

Unlike the unperturbed critical theory ($\Delta = 0$), the operators $\prod_{i=1}^N \mathcal{E}^{(\alpha_i)}(x, 0)$ ($1 \leq \alpha_i \leq R$ in a theory with R replica) are no longer scaling operators at the new fixed point ($\Delta = \Delta_*$). Rather, as discussed in Ref. [36] and [92], the scaling operators at the new fixed point are formed out of linear superposition of operators $\prod_{i=1}^N \mathcal{E}^{(\alpha_i)}(x, 0)$ for different choices of replica indices $\{\alpha_i\}$, and they transform in irreducible representations of the symmetric group S_R . Following Ref. [92], the corresponding scaling operators at the new fixed point are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{E}_{NMR} = & \sum_{\substack{\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j \\ 1 \leq \alpha_i \leq \\ R-M}} (\mathcal{E}^{(\alpha_1)} - \mathcal{E}^{(R)}) \dots (\mathcal{E}^{(\alpha_M)} - \mathcal{E}^{(R-M+1)}) \mathcal{E}^{(\alpha_{M+1})} \dots \mathcal{E}^{(\alpha_N)} \\ & (0 \leq M \leq N). \quad (\text{B1}) \end{aligned}$$

The scaling dimensions of the above operators are calculated to two-loop order in Ref. [92] in a dimensional regularization [by $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$] RG scheme, with minimal subtraction of poles in ϵ . From their analysis, the scaling dimension of the operator in Eq. B1 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}_{NM}^{(\mathcal{E}),R} &= NX_{\mathcal{E}} - \gamma(\Delta_*) \dots \left(X_{\mathcal{E}} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2(m+1)} \right) \\ & \quad (\text{B2}) \\ \Delta^* &= \frac{\epsilon}{4(2-R)} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4(2-R)^2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3) \dots \left(\epsilon = \frac{3}{m+1} \right) \\ \gamma(\Delta) &= 2\tilde{b}_{NMR}\Delta - 8(N(R-N) + (N-1)\tilde{b}_{NMR})\Delta^2 \\ & \quad + \mathcal{O}(\Delta^3) \\ \tilde{b}_{NMR} &= 2((N-M)R - N^2 + M(M-1)) \end{aligned}$$

In table I, we list the scaling dimensions $\mathbf{X}_{NM}^{(\mathcal{E}),R}$ for $R = 0, 1$ and $N = 1, 2, 3$. Out of the N scaling dimensions, corresponding to different values of M in Eq. B2, the smallest one dictates the power law behavior of

TABLE I: Scaling Dimensions $\mathbf{X}_{NM}^{(\mathcal{E}),R}$ for $N = 1, 2, 3$ and $R = 0, 1$.

(N, M)	$\mathbf{X}_{NM}^{(\mathcal{E}),R=0}$	$\mathbf{X}_{NM}^{(\mathcal{E}),R=1}$
(1, 0)	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$	$\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$
(1, 1)	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$
(2, 0)	$1 + \epsilon - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$	$1 + \epsilon - \epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$
(2, 1)	$1 + \epsilon - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$	$1 + 2\epsilon - \epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$
(2, 2)	$1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$	$1 + \epsilon - \epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$
(3, 0)	$\frac{3}{2} + 3\epsilon - \frac{27\epsilon^2}{8} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$	$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{9\epsilon}{2} - 9\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$
(3, 1)	$\frac{3}{2} + 3\epsilon - \frac{27\epsilon^2}{8} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$	$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{11\epsilon}{2} - 10\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$
(3, 2)	$\frac{3}{2} + 2\epsilon - \frac{23\epsilon^2}{8} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$	$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{9\epsilon}{2} - 9\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$
(3, 3)	$\frac{3}{2} - \frac{15\epsilon^2}{8} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$	$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{3\epsilon}{2} - 6\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$

$\overline{\langle \mathcal{E}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}(y, 0) \rangle^N}$ when $|x - y| \rightarrow \infty$. Setting $R = 1$ and minimizing the scaling dimension $\mathbf{X}_{NM}^{(\mathcal{E}),R}$ in Eq. B2 over possible values of M , we obtain Eqs. 64a and 64b.

As an aside, we note that in Ref. [92] they were interested in the limit $R \rightarrow 0$ (which corresponds to quenched disorder), and in this limit the smallest scaling dimension for a fixed N in Eq. B2 is given by,

$$\mathbf{X}_N^{(\mathcal{E}),R=0} = \frac{N}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} (3N - 4) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) \right). \quad (\text{B3})$$

Colliding Scaling Dimensions in Replica Limit $R \rightarrow 1$

As discussed in Sect. VD, scaling dimensions of operators with unequal scaling dimensions at generic replica number $R \neq 1$ can become equal to each other at $R = 1$. To see this collision of scaling dimensions in replica limit $R \rightarrow 1$, we consider two operators \mathfrak{E}_{20R} and \mathfrak{E}_{22R} from Eq. B1. We note that the correlation function of the \mathfrak{E}_{20R} operator is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathfrak{E}_{20R}(r, 0) \mathfrak{E}_{20R}(0, 0) \rangle &= 2R(R-1) \times \\ & \left(\langle \mathcal{E}^1(r) \mathcal{E}^1(0) \mathcal{E}^2(r) \mathcal{E}^2(0) \rangle + \right. \\ & \quad + \frac{(R-2)(R-3)}{2} \langle \mathcal{E}^1(r) \mathcal{E}^2(r) \mathcal{E}^3(0) \mathcal{E}^4(0) \rangle \\ & \quad \left. + 2(R-2) \langle \mathcal{E}^1(r) \mathcal{E}^1(0) \mathcal{E}^2(r) \mathcal{E}^3(0) \rangle \right), \quad (\text{B4}) \end{aligned}$$

while for \mathfrak{E}_{22R} operator,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathfrak{E}_{22R}(r, 0) \mathfrak{E}_{22R}(0, 0) \rangle &= (R-3)(R-2)^2(R-1) \times \\ & \left(\langle \mathcal{E}^1(r) \mathcal{E}^1(0) \mathcal{E}^2(r) \mathcal{E}^2(0) \rangle + \langle \mathcal{E}^1(r) \mathcal{E}^2(r) \mathcal{E}^3(0) \mathcal{E}^4(0) \rangle \right. \\ & \quad \left. - 2 \langle \mathcal{E}^1(r) \mathcal{E}^1(0) \mathcal{E}^2(r) \mathcal{E}^3(0) \rangle \right). \quad (\text{B5}) \end{aligned}$$

Ignoring the overall R dependent constants, clearly, the expressions in parentheses in Eqs. B4 and B5 are identical to each other in $R \rightarrow 1$ limit. Thus, the two operators \mathfrak{E}_{20R} and \mathfrak{E}_{22R} have colliding scaling dimensions in the replica limit $R \rightarrow 1$, i.e. the scaling dimensions of the two operators are equal to each other in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$ at the new fixed point $\Delta_*(\epsilon)$ ($\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$) for all even values of m . (This can also be verified using the ϵ -expansion for the scaling dimensions of the two operators using Eq. B2.) Moreover, with the given normalization for operator \mathcal{O} (Eq. 82) and operator $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ (Eq. 83), it can be easily verified that the criterion in Eq. 74 is satisfied by the amplitudes of correlators $\langle \mathcal{O}(r)\mathcal{O}(0) \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(r)\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(0) \rangle$. Finally, since the correlation functions in the parentheses of Eqs. B4 and B5 are physical correlators, we expect to get a finite answer for them in the $R \rightarrow 1$ limit, and thus operators \mathcal{O} and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ also satisfy the criterion in Eq. 80. As discussed in Sect. VD, such colliding of scaling dimensions give rise to logarithmic correlation functions at the new fixed point.

Appendix C: Details of Entanglement Entropy Calculation

Given a set of measurement outcomes $\vec{m} = \{m_j\}$, the state obtained after measurements is

$$|\Psi_{\{m_j\}}\rangle = \frac{\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}|0\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle 0|(\hat{K}_{\vec{m}})^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}}|0\rangle}}. \quad (\text{C1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{n,A}(|\Psi_{\{m_j\}}\rangle) &= \frac{1}{1-n} \left\{ \ln(\text{Tr}_A(\text{Tr}_{\bar{A}}(K_{\vec{m}}|0\rangle\langle 0|(K_{\vec{m}})^\dagger)^n)) - \ln(\text{Tr}(K_{\vec{m}}|0\rangle\langle 0|(K_{\vec{m}})^\dagger)^n) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-n} \left\{ \ln \text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}_{n,A}(K_{\vec{m}}|0\rangle\langle 0|(K_{\vec{m}})^\dagger)^{\otimes n}) - \ln \text{Tr}((K_{\vec{m}}|0\rangle\langle 0|(K_{\vec{m}})^\dagger)^{\otimes n}) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{1-n} \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{k} \times \left\{ \text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}_{n,A}^k(K_{\vec{m}}|0\rangle\langle 0|(K_{\vec{m}})^\dagger)^{\otimes nk}) - \text{Tr}((K_{\vec{m}}|0\rangle\langle 0|(K_{\vec{m}})^\dagger)^{\otimes nk}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

Here the permutation operator $\mathcal{S}_{n,A}$ is defined [22] as

$$\mathcal{S}_{n,A} = \prod_x \chi_{g_x} \text{ and } g_x = \begin{cases} (1, 2, \dots, n) & x \in A \\ \text{identity} = e & x \in \bar{A} \end{cases}, \quad (\text{C5})$$

where g_x labels the permutation on site x , and $\chi_{g_x} = \sum_{[i]} |i_{g_x(1)} i_{g_x(2)} \dots i_{g_x(n)}\rangle \langle i_1 i_2 \dots i_n|$ is its representation on the replicated on-site Hilbert space. Since the operator $(K_{\vec{m}})^{\otimes nk} = K_{\vec{m}} \otimes K_{\vec{m}} \dots \otimes K_{\vec{m}}$ commutes with the permutation operator $\mathcal{S}_{n,A}$, using cyclicity of trace we can write Eq. C4 as

$$S_{n,A}(|\Psi_{\{m_j\}}\rangle) = \frac{1}{1-n} \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{k} \times \left\{ \text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}_{n,A}^k(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes nk} (\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}})^{\otimes nk}) - \text{Tr}((|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes nk} (\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}})^{\otimes nk}) \right\} \quad (\text{C6})$$

Then the average of the n^{th} Rényi entropy over the measurement outcomes with Born rule is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{S_{n,A}} &= \sum_{\vec{m}} p_0(\vec{m}) S_{n,A}(|\Psi_{\{m_j\}}\rangle) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{(1-n)k} \sum_{\vec{m}} p_0(\vec{m}) \left\{ \text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}_{n,A}^k(|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes nk} (\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}})^{\otimes nk}) - \text{Tr}((|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes nk} (\hat{K}_{\vec{m}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{m}})^{\otimes nk}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C7})$$

The n^{th} Rényi entanglement entropy of a spatial region $A = [u, v]$ in this state is given by

$$S_{n,A}(|\Psi_{\{m_j\}}\rangle) = \frac{1}{1-n} \ln \left\{ \text{Tr}_A \left[\rho_A(|\Psi_{\{m_j\}}\rangle) \right]^n \right\}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

where the reduced density matrix is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_A(|\Psi_{\{m_j\}}\rangle) &= \text{Tr}_{\bar{A}}(|\Psi_{\{m_j\}}\rangle\langle \Psi_{\{m_j\}}|) \\ &= \frac{\text{Tr}_{\bar{A}}(K_{\vec{m}}|0\rangle\langle 0|(K_{\vec{m}})^\dagger)}{\text{Tr}(K_{\vec{m}}|0\rangle\langle 0|(K_{\vec{m}})^\dagger)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

and \bar{A} is complement of spatial region A . Then

Since $p_0(\vec{\mathbf{m}}) = \text{Tr}(K_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}}|0\rangle\langle 0|(K_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}}^\dagger)^\dagger) = \text{Tr}(|0\rangle\langle 0|K_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}}^\dagger K_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}})$ we obtain $\overline{S_{n,A}} = \frac{1}{1-n} \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{k} [\mathcal{Z}_A - \mathcal{Z}_\emptyset]$, where

$$\mathcal{Z}_A = \sum_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}_{n,A}^k (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes nk+1} (\hat{K}_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}})^{\otimes nk+1}) \text{ and } \mathcal{Z}_\emptyset = \sum_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}} \text{Tr}((|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes nk+1} (\hat{K}_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}})^{\otimes nk+1}). \quad (\text{C8})$$

Owing to the POVM condition Eq. 12, $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{Z}_\emptyset = 1$, we can write the measurement averaged n^{th} Rényi entropy as

$$\overline{S_{n,A}} = \frac{1}{1-n} \lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\mathcal{Z}_A}{\mathcal{Z}_\emptyset} - 1 \right) = \frac{1}{1-n} \left(\frac{d}{dk} \Big|_{k=0} \frac{\mathcal{Z}_A}{\mathcal{Z}_\emptyset} \right). \quad (\text{C9})$$

Using Eq. 29, 31, 5 and following the arguments in the derivation of Eq. 35, \mathcal{Z}_A can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_A &= \sum_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}_{n,A}^k (|0\rangle\langle 0|)^{\otimes nk+1} (\hat{K}_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}}^\dagger \hat{K}_{\vec{\mathbf{m}}})^{\otimes nk+1}) \propto \\ &\propto \int \prod_{a=1}^{nk+1} D\phi^{(a)} e^{-\sum_{a=1}^{nk+1} S_*^{(a)} + \Delta \int dx \Phi(x)} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}_{n,A}^k |\{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^+)\}\rangle\langle\{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^-)\}\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C10})$$

where,

$$\Phi(x) = \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^R \mathcal{E}^{(a)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(b)}(x, 0) \text{ and } |\{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^\pm)\}\rangle = \bigotimes_{a=1}^R |\{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^\pm)\}\rangle \quad (\text{C11})$$

Upon making use of the definition Eq. C4, the factor $\text{Tr}(\mathcal{S}_{n,A}^k |\{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^+)\}\rangle\langle\{\phi^{(a)}(x, 0^-)\}\rangle)$ in Eq. C10 does the job gluing the $nk + 1$ replicas into k n -sheeted Riemann surfaces, as illustrated in Fig. 4: Each of these k n -sheeted Riemann surfaces contain n replicas which are glued in the spatial region A along the $\tau = 0$ equal-time slice, and there is one additional replica representing a plane that remains unglued. Thus we conclude that the ratio $\mathcal{Z}_A/\mathcal{Z}_\emptyset$ of partition functions equals the correlation function of two twist fields describing these k n -sheeted Riemann surfaces. Thus we can express the measurement-averaged Rényi entropies from Eq. C9 in terms of the twist fields as

$$\overline{S_{n,A}} = \frac{1}{1-n} \frac{d}{dk} \Big|_{k=0} \left\langle \prod_{j=1}^k (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}(u, 0) (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)})^{-1}(v, 0)) \right\rangle_{\Delta_*}, \quad (\text{C12})$$

where the superscript j on the twist fields denotes the Riemann surface (out of k) to which the twist field corresponds, and the subscript n indicates that we are dealing with twist fields for a n -sheeted Riemann surface. $(\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)})^{-1}$ denotes the twist field conjugate (“inverse”) to $\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}$.

Appendix D: OPE coefficient of two Twist Fields into $\Phi(x)$

In order to compute the scaling dimension of the twist field at the new fixed point to 1-loop order in the small parameter $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$, we will need the OPE coefficient

with which the perturbation $\Phi(x)$ (from Eqs. 37, 39) appears in the OPE of the twist fields. This is equivalent to finding the following three point correlation function in the unperturbed replica theory (with action in Eq. 38)

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \prod_j^k (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}(u, 0) (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)})^{-1}(v, 0)) \Phi(x) \right\rangle = \\ &\sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^{nk+1} \left\langle \prod_j^k (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}(u, 0) (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)})^{-1}(v, 0)) \mathcal{E}^{(a)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(b)}(x, 0) \right\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D1})$$

We know from Ref. [104] that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \mathcal{E}^{(a)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(b)}(x, 0) \rangle_{(\mathcal{R}_n)^{k+1}} = \\ &\frac{\langle \prod_{j=1}^k (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}(u, 0) (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)})^{-1}(v, 0)) \mathcal{E}^{(a)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(b)}(x, 0) \rangle}{\langle \prod_j^k (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}(u, 0) (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)})^{-1}(v, 0)) \rangle}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

The LHS of the above equation calculates the correlator for the two specified fields $\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{(b)}$ in the geometry shown in Fig. 4, which involves k copies of a n -sheeted Riemann surface and *one* plane, denoted by the subscript $(\mathcal{R}_n)^k + 1$ on the correlator. On the LHS of the above equation, the index a is to be thought of as equal to a combined index (i, α) . The index i here indicates either a Riemann surface out of the k copies of the n -sheeted Riemann surface (when $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$) or it indicates the plane (when $i = k + 1$). When the index i corresponds

to a Riemann surface, the index α denotes the Riemann sheet of that n -sheeted Riemann surface on which the field is located [126]. On the other hand, the correlators on the RHS of the above equation are evaluated in the $nk + 1$ independent replicas of the m^{th} minimal model and the labels a and b indicate the replica copy of the theory.

Now to evaluate the correlator $\langle \mathcal{E}^{(a)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(b)}(x, 0) \rangle_{(\mathcal{R}_n)^{k+1}}$, we can use a conformal transformation to map each of the k copies of the n -sheeted Riemann surface to a plane. In particular, we note that since \mathcal{E} is a (Virasoro) primary field, its expectation value on the plane vanishes [127]. So $\langle \mathcal{E}^{(a)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(b)}(x, 0) \rangle_{(\mathcal{R}_n)^{k+1}}$ is zero unless both $\mathcal{E}^{(a)}(x, 0)$ and $\mathcal{E}^{(b)}(x, 0)$ lie on the same n -sheeted Riemann surface, i.e. $a = (j, \alpha)$ and $b = (j, \beta)$ for the same Riemann surface j [128]. The correlator $\langle \mathcal{E}^{(\alpha)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(\beta)}(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}_n}$ for a single n -sheeted Riemann surface \mathcal{R}_n can be calculated using the following conformal transformation

$$z = f(w) = \left(\frac{w-u}{w-v} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}. \quad (\text{D3})$$

In particular, if w corresponds to a point $(x, 0)$ on the α^{th} sheet in the n -sheeted Riemann surface,

$$z = f(\underbrace{\alpha, (x, 0)}_{\substack{(x, 0) \text{ on the} \\ \alpha^{\text{th}} \text{ sheet}}}) = \left(\frac{x-u}{x-v} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{\frac{2\pi\alpha i}{n}} \text{ with } \alpha \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}. \quad (\text{D4})$$

Since \mathcal{E} is a (Virasoro) primary field,

$$\langle \mathcal{E}^{(\alpha)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(\beta)}(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}_n} = \left| \frac{dw_1}{dz_1} \right|^{-X_{\mathcal{E}}} \left| \frac{dw_2}{dz_2} \right|^{-X_{\mathcal{E}}} \langle \mathcal{E}^{(\alpha)}(z_1) \mathcal{E}^{(\beta)}(z_2) \rangle_{\text{plane}}, \quad (\text{D5})$$

where w_1 denotes position $(x, 0)$ in the α^{th} sheet and w_2 denotes position $(x, 0)$ in the β^{th} sheet. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dw_1}{dz_1} &= n \frac{(x-v)(x-u)}{u-v} \left(\frac{x-v}{x-u} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{-\frac{2\pi\alpha i}{n}}, \\ \frac{dw_2}{dz_2} &= n \frac{(x-v)(x-u)}{u-v} \left(\frac{x-v}{x-u} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} e^{-\frac{2\pi\beta i}{n}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D6})$$

$$\text{and } |z_1 - z_2| = 2 \left| \left(\frac{x-u}{x-v} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \sin \left(\frac{\pi(\alpha-\beta)}{n} \right) \right|.$$

Then using Eq. D5 as well as $\langle \mathcal{E}^{(\alpha)}(z_1) \mathcal{E}^{(\beta)}(z_2) \rangle_{\text{plane}} = 1/(|z_1 - z_2|^{2X_{\mathcal{E}}})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{E}^{(\alpha)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(\beta)}(x, 0) \rangle_{\mathcal{R}_n} &= \\ &= \left| \frac{(u-v)}{2n(x-v)(x-u) \sin \left(\frac{\pi(\alpha-\beta)}{n} \right)} \right|^{2X_{\mathcal{E}}} \\ &= \langle \mathcal{E}^{(a)}(x, 0) \mathcal{E}^{(b)}(x, 0) \rangle_{(\mathcal{R}_n)^{k+1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D7})$$

where in the last equality we recall that $a = (j, \alpha)$ and $b = (j, \beta)$. The last equality in the above equation follows because, as already mentioned above, we are interested in the case when both the fields $\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{(b)}$ lie on the same Riemann surface \mathcal{R}_n , since otherwise the correlator is zero. Finally, from Eq. D1, D2 and $\langle \mathcal{T}_n(u, 0) (\mathcal{T}_n)^{-1}(v, 0) \rangle = 1/|u-v|^{2d_n}$, we obtain for the desired three point function

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \prod_j^k (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)}(u, 0) (\mathcal{T}_n^{(j)})^{-1}(v, 0)) \Phi(x) \rangle &= \\ &= \frac{C_{n,k}}{|u-v|^{2kd_n-2X_{\mathcal{E}}} |x-u|^{2X_{\mathcal{E}}} |x-v|^{2X_{\mathcal{E}}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D8})$$

$$\text{with } C_{n,k} = k \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta=1 \\ \alpha \neq \beta}}^n \frac{1}{|2n \sin \left(\frac{\pi(\alpha-\beta)}{n} \right)|^{2X_{\mathcal{E}}}}. \quad (\text{D9})$$

Thus, the required OPE coefficient is

$$C_{n,k} = k \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta=1 \\ \alpha \neq \beta}}^n \frac{1}{|2n \sin \left(\frac{\pi(\alpha-\beta)}{n} \right)|^{2X_{\mathcal{E}}}} = \frac{k}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\left(\sin \left(\frac{\pi\alpha}{n} \right) \right)^{2X_{\mathcal{E}}}}. \quad (\text{D10})$$

Moreover, as $2X_{\mathcal{E}} = 1 - \epsilon$, with $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$, the above OPE coefficient can be expanded in powers of ϵ as

$$C_{n,k} = \frac{k}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\sin \left(\frac{\pi\alpha}{n} \right)} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (\text{D11})$$

To obtain the von Neumann entanglement entropy, we also want to be able to analytically continue the n -dependence in the above expression to $n \rightarrow 1$. Thus, we want an expression for the above OPE coefficient which is an analytic function of n at $n = 0$, and which is valid for all real numbers n and which reduces to Eq. D11 when n is a natural number (≥ 2). Following Ref. [129], we can write $1/\sin(\pi x)$ in the form (see also Ref. [130])

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sin(\pi x)} &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} dt \frac{t^{x-1}}{1+t} \quad x \in (0, 1) \text{ implying} \\ \frac{1}{\sin \left(\frac{\pi\alpha}{n} \right)} &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} dt \frac{t^{\frac{\alpha-n}{n}}}{1+t} = \frac{n}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} ds \frac{s^{\alpha-1}}{1+s^n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D12})$$

From Eq. D11, the OPE coefficient then can be written as $C_{n,k} = kI_n$, where I_n is defined as

$$I_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{n}{2\pi} \int_0^{\infty} ds \frac{1-s^{n-1}}{(1-s)(1+s^n)} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (\text{D13})$$

We make use of Eq. D13 in Sect. VI below Eq. 91.

Appendix E: Higher Loop Orders in the RG and the Ising Critical Point

We noted in Section VIII that when $m = 3$, i.e. in the case of the Ising critical point, there is an additional

subtlety associated with the RG analysis of the replica action in Eq. 111 – 113. This is due to the term in Eq. 114, which appears in the OPE in Eq. 45 for a generic number R of replicas, and although it is irrelevant for minimal models $m \geq 4$, it becomes marginal at $m = 3$. We noted in Section VIII that, as shown in Eq. E7 below, the coefficient of this marginal term in Eq. 114 comes with a factor of $(R - 1)$ in the OPE in Eq. 45. Thus, in the $R \rightarrow 1$ limit, this term is not generated by the RG to second (1-loop) order in the coupling constant Δ of the perturbation Φ . In this appendix, we will show that the term in Eq. 114 cannot be generated by the RG to any (higher-loop) order in the coupling Δ in the replica limit $R \rightarrow 1$, relevant for Born-rule measurements. We will provide two different arguments, (i) and (ii).

(i): In the first argument we use the fact that all terms that could possibly be generated under the RG at arbitrary order in the coupling Δ can be obtained by analyzing the multiple OPE

$$\underbrace{\Phi(x) \times \Phi(x) \times \cdots \times \Phi(x)}_{n \text{ \# of } \Phi(x)} \quad (\text{E1})$$

where Φ from Eq. 117 is the perturbation given by,

$$\Phi = \sum_{\substack{a,b=1 \\ a \neq b}}^R \mathfrak{s}^{(a)} \mathfrak{s}^{(b)}. \quad (\text{E2})$$

We use the well-known fact (see e.g. Refs. 84, 86–88) which states that the only operators that can be generated under the RG to any order are the operators that appear in the multiple OPE of the perturbation in Eq. E1, and in multiple OPEs of the operators that appear in Eq. E1. – A brief review of this can be found, if desired, in App. F. – By analyzing these OPEs, we will show below that the marginal operator, Eq. 114, does not appear in any of these multiple OPEs in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$, and thus cannot be generated in this limit in any order.

We begin by discussing the possible operators that can occur in a multiple OPE of the operator Φ in Eq. E1. The CFT describing the Ising critical point has three primary fields: I , \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{e} (identity, spin, and energy). The OPEs between these primary fields are given [131] by,

$$\mathfrak{s} \times \mathfrak{s} = I + \mathfrak{e}, \quad (\text{E3})$$

$$\mathfrak{s} \times \mathfrak{e} = \mathfrak{s}, \quad (\text{E4})$$

$$\mathfrak{e} \times \mathfrak{e} = I, \quad (\text{E5})$$

$$I \times \mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}, \quad I \times \mathfrak{e} = \mathfrak{e}, \quad I \times I = I \quad (\text{E6})$$

For the purpose of the following discussion, we only care about whether or not a field appears in the OPE of two given fields, and its exact coefficient is immaterial. Let us now first consider the OPE in Eq. E1 for $n = 2$. Using

the above OPE relations in each replica copy, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi \times \Phi &= 4(R-2)\Phi + 4a_1(R-1) \sum_{a=1}^R \mathfrak{e}^{(a)} + \\ &+ a_2 \sum_{\substack{a \neq b, a \neq c, \\ b \neq c}} \mathfrak{e}^{(a)} \mathfrak{s}^{(b)} \mathfrak{s}^{(c)} + a_3 \sum_{\substack{\text{all indices are} \\ \text{pairwise distinct} \\ a, b, c, d}} \mathfrak{s}^{(a)} \mathfrak{s}^{(b)} \mathfrak{s}^{(c)} \mathfrak{s}^{(d)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E7})$$

where a_1 , a_2 and a_3 are R independent numerical constants. We see that the marginal term $\sum_{a=1}^R \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ comes with a prefactor $(R - 1)$, which vanishes in the $R \rightarrow 1$ limit. For $n = 3$, the OPE in Eq. E1 can be obtained by contracting the RHSs of Eqs. E7 and E2. In particular, Φ on the RHS of Eq. E7 can be contracted with Φ in Eq. E2, and the term $\sum_{a=1}^R \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ will be again be produced with a $(R - 1)$ prefactor. Moreover, the term $\sum_{\substack{a \neq b, a \neq c, \\ b \neq c}} \mathfrak{e}^{(a)} \mathfrak{s}^{(b)} \mathfrak{s}^{(c)}$ in Eq. E7 can contract with $\Phi = \sum_{a \neq b} \mathfrak{s}^{(a)} \mathfrak{s}^{(b)}$ to give,

$$\left(\sum_{\substack{a \neq b, a \neq c, \\ b \neq c}} \mathfrak{e}^{(a)} \mathfrak{s}^{(b)} \mathfrak{s}^{(c)} \right) \times \Phi = \binom{R-1}{2} \sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)} + \text{other terms} \quad (\text{E8})$$

where again the marginal term $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ comes with a factor which vanishes in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$ of interest. Finally, we note that when contracted with Φ the last term in Eq. E7 cannot produce the marginal term [132]. Thus, one can conclude that as $R \rightarrow 1$, the marginal term $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ does also not occur in the OPE in Eq. E1 for $n = 3$.

We now present an induction argument for the absence of the operator $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ in the OPE of Eq. E1 for any n number of operators Φ , and for the set of operators appearing in this OPE. To this end, let us assume that the operator $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ does not appear in the $R \rightarrow 1$ limit in the OPE of n operators Φ . Let us also assume that the most general replica term that can occur in the OPE of n operators Φ is

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{all indices are} \\ \text{pairwise distinct} \\ a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2k}, \\ b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k}} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_1)} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_2)} \dots \mathfrak{s}^{(a_{2k})} \mathfrak{e}^{(b_1)} \mathfrak{e}^{(b_2)} \dots \mathfrak{e}^{(b_l)}, \quad \text{where } 2k + l \leq 2n. \quad (\text{E9})$$

For $n = 2$ this corresponds to the terms appearing in Eq. E7, and this is our first step in the induction. Now to obtain the OPE of $(n + 1)$ operators Φ in Eq. E1, we have to contract all the terms that appear in Eq. E9 above with $\Phi = \sum_{a \neq b} \mathfrak{s}^{(a)} \mathfrak{s}^{(b)}$. Since only the terms in the same replica copy can be contracted with each other, out of all the sub-terms shown in Eq. E9 which appear in OPEs of n operators Φ , only the following terms can be contracted with another Φ to get the marginal $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$

term:

$$\sum_{a_i \neq a_j} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_i)} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_j)} = \Phi, \quad (\text{E10})$$

$$\sum_{\substack{a_i \neq a_j, a_i \neq b_k, \\ a_j \neq b_k}} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_i)} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_j)} \mathfrak{e}^{(b_k)}. \quad (\text{E11})$$

From Eq. E7 and Eq. E8 we see that both of these sub-terms when contracted with Φ produce the marginal $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$, and that the corresponding coefficient vanishes in the $R \rightarrow 1$ limit in both cases. Moreover, all terms that can appear in the OPE of Eq. E9 with the perturbation Φ are again of the form of Eq. E9 with n replaced by $n + 1$. This completes the induction argument. Thus, in summary, we have proven so far that

- (a) the only operators that can appear in the multiple OPE of n operators Φ are the operators of the form appearing in Eq. E9, and
- (b) of those the marginal operator, having $k = 0$ and $l = 1$, appears with a combinatorial coefficient that vanishes in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$.

Finally, since the operators appearing in Eq. E9 can all be generated in the OPE in Eq. E1, and thus could be generated by the RG (with combinatorial coefficients that we have not determined), we would have finished demonstrating that the marginal operator cannot be generated in the RG to any order, if we could show that the marginal operator cannot appear in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$ in the OPE of an arbitrary number of operators of the type listed in Eq. E9. We will now show that this is indeed the case.

First, we observe that it is sufficient to show that this is the case for only *two* such operators, because by definition the operators appearing in Eq. E9 form a closed set of operators under the OPE [133]. Namely, when we consider an arbitrary number of successive OPEs of operators of the form of Eq. E9, the marginal operator would not be generated in this multiple OPE if it was not generated in any of the individual successive OPEs in this limit (which involves only two operators). On the other hand, we can show as follows that in the OPE of *two* operators from Eq. E9 the marginal operator can only appear with a combinatorial coefficient that vanishes in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$:

Note that only the terms in the same replica copy can contract under the OPE. Moreover, the marginal operator \mathfrak{e} is only produced either when two \mathfrak{s} fields are fused (see Eq. E3) or when the \mathfrak{e} field fuses with the identity (see Eq. E6). Therefore, the general term which appears in Eq. E9 can produce the marginal operator $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ only (i) when it contracts with itself (i.e., both operators have the same values of k and l), i.e. with

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{all indices are} \\ \text{pairwise distinct} \\ a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2k}, \\ b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k}} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_1)} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_2)} \dots \mathfrak{s}^{(a_{2k})} \mathfrak{e}^{(b_1)} \mathfrak{e}^{(b_2)} \dots \mathfrak{e}^{(b_l)}, \quad (\text{E12})$$

or (ii) when it contracts with another operator of the form in Eq. E9 with the same value of k but with l replaced by $l + 1$, namely with

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{all indices are} \\ \text{pairwise distinct} \\ a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2k}, \\ b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k}} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_1)} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_2)} \dots \mathfrak{s}^{(a_{2k})} \mathfrak{e}^{(b_1)} \mathfrak{e}^{(b_2)} \dots \mathfrak{e}^{(b_l)} \mathfrak{e}^{(b_{l+1})}. \quad (\text{E13})$$

Let us first consider the OPE of the term in Eq. E9 itself, i.e. with the term in Eq. E12. Since we are interested in the coefficient of the marginal operator $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$, we can consider two identical $\mathfrak{s}^{(a)}$ fields, one in each of the two identical operators from Eq. E9 we are considering the OPE of, and contract these two fields to produce the field $\mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$, while the rest of the fields in these two operators, which includes both $\mathfrak{s}^{(a_i)}$ and $\mathfrak{e}^{(b_i)}$, should contract to produce the identity. Since $a_i, b_i \neq a$, the number of choices for the replica indices of the remaining $\mathfrak{s}^{(a_i)}$ and $\mathfrak{e}^{(b_i)}$ fields is given by $\binom{R-1}{2k+l-1}$. Thus, the marginal operator $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ appears with a prefactor $\binom{R-1}{2k+l-1}$ in the OPE of the general term in Eq. E9 with itself, and this prefactor thus vanishes in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$. When $k = 1$ and $l = 0$, this statement is the same as $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ appearing with a prefactor of $(R - 1)$ as shown in Eq. E7. Analogously, one sees that in the OPE of Eq. E9 with Eq. E13 the marginal operator $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ appears with a prefactor $\binom{R-1}{2k+l}$, thus also vanishing in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$. When $k = 1$ and $l = 0$ in Eqs. E9 and E13, this statement implies that the marginal operator appears with a prefactor of $\binom{R-1}{2}$ in the OPE of Eq. E2 and Eq. E11, which was verified in Eq. E8. Thus, we see that whenever the marginal operator is produced under the OPE of two (same or different) general operators of the type shown in Eq. E9, it always comes with a prefactor which vanishes in $R \rightarrow 1$ limit. This concludes our proof. Thus, to summarize our argument (i), we conclude that in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$, the operator $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ *cannot* be generated under the RG in any order in perturbation theory with Δ .

One can check that this result also holds if we include higher replica terms arising from higher cumulants discussed in App. A2, and the proof of this statement proceeds analogous to the above discussion. Finally, we note that besides Φ , the exactly marginal operator and the higher replica terms discussed in App. A2, all other terms that could be generated under the RG are of the form of those in Eq. E9, involving a mixture of \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{e} (the term in Eq. E11 being the simplest example), and are all irrelevant under the RG, as terms with support on the $\tau = 0$ time-slice.

(ii): We will now give another argument which is perhaps more physical, for why the operator $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$ cannot be generated under the RG in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$ of relevance to Born-rule measurements. The operator $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$, if it were to be generated at any order in RG, can be handled non-perturbatively by using the exact solution

due to Bariev [134], and McCoy and Perk [135]. Using the exact solution one sees that when the Ising critical point CFT is perturbed with the exactly marginal operator $\epsilon(x, \tau)$ supported on the one-dimensional time-slice and in the absence of any other perturbation, the power law exponent of the $\mathfrak{s}(x, \tau)$ two-point correlation function along the time-slice (defect line) should change continuously with the coupling strength of the marginal operator supported on the defect line. In our replica field theory, in addition to a possible perturbation $\sum_a \epsilon^a$ generated under the RG, we will also have the defect perturbation Φ itself, from Eq. E2. Ignoring higher cumulants, which cannot change the low energy details (see App. A2), the same replica field theory would also arise when we consider performing measurements with $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ on the state

$$|\psi\rangle = \exp\left\{\kappa \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{i+1}^z\right\}|0\rangle \quad (\kappa \neq 0) \quad (\text{E14})$$

where $|0\rangle$ is the ground state at the Ising critical point and the operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_{i+1}^z$ represents the continuum field ϵ at the Ising critical point. If we insert in Eq. 115 in place of the state $|0\rangle$ the state $|\psi\rangle$ from Eq. E14, we see that upon going over to the continuum formulation, we will obtain the discussed replica theory with *both*, the marginal $\sum_a \epsilon^a$ as well as the $\Phi(x)$ interaction added along the one-dimensional time-slice. Thus, if the marginal $\sum_a \epsilon^a$ term were to be generated under the RG in the replica field theory for $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ measurements performed on the critical ground state $|0\rangle$, we get the same replica theory as that for $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ measurements performed on the state $|\psi\rangle$. This is a contradiction because Eq. 23 tells us that the measurement averaged correlation function of the $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ operator, which represents the field $\mathfrak{s}(x, \tau)$, should be the same as that in the unmeasured state, be it $|0\rangle$ or $|\psi\rangle$. Since the $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ correlation function has different power law behavior in states $|0\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle$, they *cannot* be described by the same replica field theory at any energy scale. Thus, in the replica field theory for the Ising critical ground state $|0\rangle$ under Born-rule $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ measurements, the marginal $\sum_a \epsilon^a$ term cannot be generated at any order in the RG.

Appendix F: Brief Review - RG equations from the Operator Product Expansion (OPE)

In general one is interested in computing expectation values of \mathcal{O} , representing an operator or a product of operators in the perturbed theory such as in Eq. 111,

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{\Delta_0} = \frac{Z_*}{Z_{\Delta_0}} \langle \mathcal{O} e^{+\Delta_0 \int dx \Phi(x)} \rangle_*, \quad (\text{F1})$$

where expectation values $\langle \dots \rangle_*$ are taken in the unperturbed (i.e. critical) CFT (in the present case the Ising CFT, compare e.g. Eq. 116). Here $Z_* = Z_{\Delta_0=0}$ is the partition function of the unperturbed CFT, and Z_{Δ_0} is the fully interacting partition function obtained from

Eq. F1 by letting $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow 1$. The RG equations for all operators generated in perturbation theory to any order in Δ_0 is obtained by expanding the exponential on the right hand side of Eq. F1,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \dots 1 \rangle_* + \langle \dots \left(\Delta_0 \int_{x_1} \Phi(x_1) \right) \rangle_* + \\ & + \langle \dots \left(\frac{\Delta_0^2}{2!} \int_{x_1} \int_{x_2} \Phi(x_1) \Phi(x_2) \right) \rangle_* + \\ & + \langle \dots \left(\frac{\Delta_0^3}{3!} \int_{x_1} \int_{x_2} \int_{x_3} \Phi(x_1) \Phi(x_2) \Phi(x_3) \right) \rangle_* + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F2})$$

[136]. The following discussion is independent of the operator(s) \mathcal{O} , indicated by the ellipses, present in the expectation value [137]. In a general term in Eq. F2 we use the OPE which expands the product of n operators Φ into a complete set of operators $\Phi^{\mathcal{A}}$ located at, say, the position x_n of the last operator,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(x_1) \dots \Phi(x_{n-1}) \Phi(x_n) = \\ & = \sum_{\mathcal{A}} C_{\mathcal{A}}[(x_1-x_n), (x_2-x_n), \dots, (x_{n-1}-x_n)] \Phi^{\mathcal{A}}(x_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F3})$$

Most of the possible operators $\Phi^{\mathcal{A}}$ that appear are irrelevant, and we will mostly be interested in relevant or marginal ones. The integrals I_{n-1} over the $n-1$ relative coordinates appearing in the OPE coefficient $C_{\mathcal{A}}$ are performed against a suitable ‘‘cutoff function’’ which restricts the absolute values of all relative coordinates within the range between a short-distance cutoff a and a long-distance cutoff L . (There are many options for the ‘‘cutoff function’’, and our discussion and result will not depend on this choice.) Inserting these integrals into Eq. F2 the latter reads

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \dots 1 \rangle_* + \langle \dots \left(\Delta_0 \int_x \Phi(x) \right) \rangle_* + \\ & + \langle \dots \left(\frac{\Delta_0^2}{2!} \sum_{\mathcal{A}} I_1^{\mathcal{A}} \int_x \Phi^{\mathcal{A}}(x) \right) \rangle_* + \\ & + \langle \dots \left(\frac{\Delta_0^3}{3!} \sum_{\mathcal{A}} I_2^{\mathcal{A}} \int_x \Phi^{\mathcal{A}}(x) \right) \rangle_* + \dots = \\ & = \langle \dots \left(1 + \Delta \int_x \Phi(x) + \sum_{\Phi^{\mathcal{A}} \neq \Phi} \lambda_{\mathcal{A}} \int_x \Phi^{\mathcal{A}}(x) + \dots \right) \rangle_* \\ & = \langle \dots e^{\Delta \int_x \Phi(x) + \sum_{\Phi^{\mathcal{A}} \neq \Phi} \lambda_{\mathcal{A}} \int_x \Phi^{\mathcal{A}}(x)} \rangle_* \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F4})$$

where we have re-exponentiated in the last line of Eq. F4 (using standard logic) and we defined

$$\Delta \left(\Delta_0, \frac{a}{L} \right) = \Delta_0 \left[1 + \frac{\Delta_0}{2!} I_1 \left(\frac{a}{L} \right) + \frac{\Delta_0^2}{3!} I_2 \left(\frac{a}{L} \right) + \dots \right], \quad (\text{F5})$$

$$\text{and} \quad (\text{F6})$$

$$\lambda^{\mathcal{A}} \left(\Delta_0, \frac{a}{L} \right) = \left[\frac{\Delta_0^2}{2!} I_1^{\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{a}{L} \right) + \frac{\Delta_0^3}{3!} I_2^{\mathcal{A}} \left(\frac{a}{L} \right) + \dots \right],$$

for $\Phi^{\mathcal{A}} \neq \Phi$.

Here we used the abbreviation

$$\mathbf{I}_k\left(\frac{a}{L}\right) := \mathbf{I}_k^A\left(\frac{a}{L}\right), \quad \text{when } \Phi^A = \Phi, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

The dependence of the RG equations on Δ , at any order, is then obtained for both of the couplings Δ and λ^A in the standard manner: The RG equation for Δ reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Delta(\ell)}{d\ell} &= y_\Delta \cdot \Delta(\ell) + \left(a \frac{\partial}{\partial a}\right)_{|\Delta_0} \Delta\left(\Delta_0, \frac{a}{L}\right) = \\ &= y_\Delta \cdot \Delta(\ell) + b_2 \Delta^2(\ell) + b_3 \Delta^3(\ell) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F7})$$

where $\ell = \ln(L/a)$ and $\Delta(\ell = 0) = \Delta_0$ is kept fixed, while Eq. F5 is used to re-express the right hand side order-by-order in terms of $\Delta\left(\Delta_0, \frac{a}{L}\right) = \Delta(\ell)$. Here, y_Δ is the RG eigenvalue of the coupling Δ in the unperturbed CFT, i.e. $y_\Delta = 1 - X_\Delta = 3/(m+1)$; compare Eq. 42, but now with $m = \text{odd}$. The terms of up to order $\Delta^2(\ell)$ (1-loop order) are those listed in Eq. 46.

The RG equations for λ^A read

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\lambda^A(\ell)}{d\ell} &= y_A \cdot \lambda^A(\ell) + \left(a \frac{\partial}{\partial a}\right)_{|\Delta_0} \lambda^A\left(\Delta_0, \frac{a}{L}\right) = \\ &= y_A \cdot \lambda^A(\ell) + b_2^A \Delta^2(\ell) + b_3^A \Delta^3(\ell) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F8})$$

for $\Phi^A \neq \Phi$,

where $\lambda^A(\ell = 0) = 0$, and again Eq. F5 is used to re-express the right hand side order-by-order in terms of $\Delta\left(\Delta_0, \frac{a}{L}\right) = \Delta(\ell)$. Here, y_A are the RG eigenvalues of the couplings λ^A in the unperturbed CFT.

At this stage of the discussion only powers of $\Delta(\ell)$ appear on the right hand side of both RG equations Eqs. F7, F8, while we see from the latter equation that in general non-vanishing couplings λ^A of operators $\Phi^A \neq \Phi$ are generated. These will then appear in the argument of the exponential of the last line of Eq. F4. The key point then is the following: Upon the RG coarse-graining process these thereby generated couplings will generate additional terms in the RG equations. These additional terms can easily be understood and incorporated into our existing discussion due to the fact that the set of all thereby generated operators Φ^A with couplings λ^A form the set of operators listed in Eq. E9 which is closed under the Operator Product Expansion (OPE). This means that all the terms generated by the RG from the couplings λ^A of operators $\Phi^A \neq \Phi$ can be understood by simply generalizing Eq. F3 to multiple OPEs of the operators appearing in Eq. E9, namely to

$$\begin{aligned} &\Phi^{A_1}(x_1) \dots \Phi^{A_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}) \Phi^{A_n}(x_n) = \\ &= \sum_A \mathcal{C}_A^{A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}, A_n} [(x_1 - x_n), (x_2 - x_n), \dots, (x_{n-1} - x_n)] \Phi^A(x_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F9})$$

Employing the same logic that led to the RG equations Eqs. F7, F8 now leads to the same RG equations but with arbitrary powers of the coupling constants λ^A appearing on the right hand side of these equations.

The key result of this analysis is that the only couplings λ^A that can be generated under the RG are those of operators Φ^A that can appear on the right hand side of the multiple OPE in Eq. F9. Such contributions would be represented by a term of order $\lambda^{A_1} \dots \lambda^{A_{n-1}} \lambda^{A_n}$ on the right hand side of the RG equation for λ^A . However we show in argument (i) of App. E that all the OPE coefficients in Eq. F9, involving on the left hand side operators appearing in Eq. E9, vanish in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$, when Φ^A and λ^A appearing on the right hand side corresponds to the exactly marginal operator in Eq. 114 and its corresponding coupling constant. This then implies that the exactly marginal operator cannot be generated under the RG to any order in perturbation theory in the coupling Δ in the limit $R \rightarrow 1$.

Appendix G: Irrelevance of Higher Cumulants from Avoided Level Crossings

The “higher-moment operators” in Eq. A3 and in Eq. A5 whose scaling dimensions at the $\Delta_* \neq 0$ fixed point are of interest in App. A1 and App. A2, respectively, are conformal boundary operators: In the standard manner, these operators with support on the one-dimensional $\tau = 0$ time-slice in space-time can be viewed upon folding the space-time along this time-slice [112], [113] as operators with support on the boundary, the real axis, of the tensor product of two identical copies of the (non-random but replicated) bulk CFT, located in the upper half complex plane. The fixed point $\Delta_* \neq 0$ describes a scale- and conformally invariant boundary condition B_{Δ_*} on the two copies of the bulk CFT in the upper half plane, which determines all the universal properties of interest to us in this paper. After conformal mapping from the upper half complex plane to the interior of an infinitely long strip of finite width L with identical boundary conditions B_{Δ_*} on both sides, the spectrum of the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{Δ_*} , generating translations along the strip, is universally related by finite-size scaling [138],[139] and the operator-state correspondence to the scaling dimensions of the set of all operators with support on the boundary B_{Δ_*} , of interest to us here.

Here we will discuss, for each value of m or equivalently of $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$, the evolution (“spectral flow”) of a particular set of energy levels of the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\Delta(\ell)}$ where the coupling constant $\Delta = \Delta(\ell)$ (here $\ell = \ln(L/a)$), flows under the RG from the RG-unstable zero coupling fixed point $\Delta = 0$ in the ultraviolet to the RG-stable finite-coupling fixed point $\Delta_* = \Delta_*(\epsilon)$ in the infrared. For each value of m (or equivalently ϵ) this describes an RG flow between two conformally invariant boundary conditions. In the intermediate regime of length scales ℓ away from the two fixed points, the corresponding boundary condition $B_{\Delta(\ell)}$ will not be scale- nor conformally invariant, and the entire spectrum of the corresponding Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\Delta(\ell)}$ will undergo an evolution, i.e. a spectral flow with the length scale ℓ . Because

the operator coupling to Δ is invariant under the group S_R of permutations of the R replicas, we can classify all eigenstates of $\hat{H}_{\Delta(\ell)}$ according to irreducible representations of the permutation group S_R .

For each value of m we consider the spectrum of this Hamiltonian in each symmetry sector separately. Since the operators in Eq. A3 and in Eq. A5 of interest to us are singlets under permutations, we restrict attention to the S_R -singlet sector of the spectrum of $\hat{H}_{\Delta(\ell)}$. We know that this Hamiltonian is, due to the large conformal symmetry, integrable at the ultraviolet ($\Delta = 0$) as well as the infrared fixed point ($\Delta_* \neq 0$). However, at all intermediate scales ℓ away from the two fixed points this Hamiltonian is not expected to be integrable since the operator Φ coupling to Δ (and thus setting the boundary condition $B_{\Delta(\ell)}$ which determines the spectrum of $\hat{H}_{\Delta(\ell)}$) is not expected to conserve a macroscopic number of the conformal conservation laws present at the two fixed points. Given that the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\Delta(\ell)}$ is not integrable at intermediate scales, the evolution of its spectrum as a function of scale $\ell = \ln(L/a)$ in the S_R -singlet sector is expected to exhibit *avoided level crossings*. Now for each value of m (or ϵ), as discussed in App. A1 and App. A2, the scaling dimensions of the operators in Eq. A3 and in Eq. A5 at the ultraviolet fixed point $\Delta = 0$ are equal to $2k \times X_\epsilon = 2k \times X_{\varphi_{1,2}}$ when $m = \text{even}$, and $2k \times X_\epsilon = 2k \times X_{\varphi_{1,2}}$ when $m = \text{odd}$, respectively, and thus are strictly ordered in both cases. Here $X_\epsilon = X_{\varphi_{1,2}}$ is given by Eq. 42 for both cases, $m = \text{even}$ and $m = \text{odd}$ (see footnote [89]). Note that in the limit $m \rightarrow \infty$ ($\epsilon \rightarrow 0$), these dimensions become $2k \times (1/2) = k$ since $X_\epsilon = X_{\varphi_{1,2}} \rightarrow 1/2$. In either case, all these operators with $k > 1$ thus have, for any value of m (even or odd), scaling dimensions larger than the respective perturbation Φ (which corresponds to $k = 1$) at the ultraviolet fixed point $\Delta = 0$. For each case, i.e. for any *even* and for any *odd* value of m corresponding to Eq. A3 and Eq. A5 respectively, we expect, given the avoided level crossings, as we increase the scale $\ell = \ln(L/a)$ to run the RG via finite-size scaling from the ultraviolet to

the infrared fixed point $\Delta_*(\epsilon)$, that the relative ordering of these scaling dimensions for different values of k is preserved. In particular, we expect the scaling dimensions of all these operators with $k > 1$ to remain larger than the scaling dimension of the operator which has the smallest scaling dimension at the ultraviolet fixed point $\Delta = 0$, which is the one with $k = 1$, corresponding to the perturbation Φ . But since we know that the perturbation Φ must be irrelevant (i.e. must have scaling dimension > 1) at the infrared fixed point (as given by the slope of the corresponding RG beta function for Δ), we conclude that the scaling dimensions of all the operators with $k > 1$ will also need to be certainly larger than unity, due to avoided level crossings. This provides an argument supporting the irrelevance at the infrared fixed point of the operators in Eq. A3 and in Eq. A5 arising from all higher cumulants, both in the tricritical Ising (App. A1) as well as in the Ising (App. A2) case.

We close by noting that avoided level crossings of scaling dimensions of bulk operators in RG flows between two (bulk) 2D RG fixed points, arising from perturbations breaking the integrability of the ultraviolet CFT, have been observed explicitly via the Truncated Conformal Space approach [140], e.g. see Ref. [141] Sect. IV.C, Figs. 7, 8. Flows of boundary scaling dimensions in RG flows between two different boundary fixed points of the same bulk CFT have also been studied using the Truncated Conformal Space approach, see e.g. Ref. [142]; the latter particular investigation is of less direct relevance for us since in this study only an integrable boundary perturbation is discussed, but it demonstrates the ability to study RG flows between boundary fixed points effectively within the Truncated Conformal Space approach. Finally, all spectra numerically obtained from K. G. Wilson's numerical renormalization group approach to the Kondo- and other quantum impurity problems (see e.g. Ref. 143 and 144) precisely observe [139] related spectra of boundary RG flows between different fixed point boundary conditions on a fixed bulk CFT, exhibiting avoided crossings in a given symmetry sector.

-
- [1] Yaodong Li, Xiao Chen, and Matthew PA Fisher, "Quantum zeno effect and the many-body entanglement transition," *Physical Review B* **98**, 205136 (2018).
 - [2] Yaodong Li, Yijian Zou, Paolo Glorioso, Ehud Altman, and Matthew P A Fisher, "Cross entropy benchmark for measurement-induced phase transitions," *Physical Review Letters* **130**, 220404 (2023).
 - [3] Shayan Majidy, Utkarsh Agrawal, Sarang Gopalakrishnan, Andrew C. Potter, Romain Vasseur, and Nicole Yunger Halpern, "Critical phase and spin sharpening in su(2)-symmetric monitored quantum circuits," *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 054307 (2023).
 - [4] Yaodong Li, Xiao Chen, and Matthew PA Fisher, "Measurement-driven entanglement transition in hybrid quantum circuits," *Physical Review B* **100**, 134306 (2019).
 - [5] Brian Skinner, Jonathan Ruhman, and Adam Nahum, "Measurement-induced phase transitions in the dynamics of entanglement," *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 031009 (2019).
 - [6] Amos Chan, Rahul M Nandkishore, Michael Pretko, and Graeme Smith, "Unitary-projective entanglement dynamics," *Physical Review B* **99**, 224307 (2019).
 - [7] Soonwon Choi, Yimu Bao, Xiao-Liang Qi, and Ehud Altman, "Quantum Error Correction in Scrambling Dynamics and Measurement-Induced Phase Transition," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 030505 (2020), arXiv:1903.05124 [quant-ph].
 - [8] Andrew C Potter and Romain Vasseur, "Entanglement dynamics in hybrid quantum circuits," in *Entanglement in Spin Chains: From Theory to Quantum Technology*

- Applications* (Springer, 2022) pp. 211–249.
- [9] Matthew P A Fisher, Vedika Khemani, Adam Nahum, and Sagar Vijay, “Random quantum circuits,” *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **14**, 335–379 (2023).
 - [10] Xiangyu Cao, Antoine Tilloy, and Andrea De Luca, “Entanglement in a fermion chain under continuous monitoring,” *SciPost Physics* **7**, 024 (2019).
 - [11] Ali Lavasani, Yahya Alavirad, and Maissam Barkeshli, “Measurement-induced topological entanglement transitions in symmetric random quantum circuits,” *Nature Physics* **17**, 342–347 (2021).
 - [12] Adam Nahum, Sthitadhi Roy, Brian Skinner, and Jonathan Ruhman, “Measurement and entanglement phase transitions in all-to-all quantum circuits, on quantum trees, and in landau-ginsburg theory,” *PRX Quantum* **2**, 010352 (2021).
 - [13] Chao-Ming Jian, Hassan Shapourian, Bela Bauer, and Andreas W. W. Ludwig, “Measurement-induced entanglement transitions in quantum circuits of non-interacting fermions: Born-rule versus forced measurements,” *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2302.09094 (2023), arXiv:2302.09094 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
 - [14] Michele Fava, Lorenzo Piroli, Tobias Swann, Denis Bernard, and Adam Nahum, “Nonlinear sigma models for monitored dynamics of free fermions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12820* (2023).
 - [15] Michael J. Gullans and David A. Huse, “Dynamical purification phase transition induced by quantum measurements,” *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 041020 (2020).
 - [16] Michael J. Gullans and David A. Huse, “Scalable probes of measurement-induced criticality,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 070606 (2020).
 - [17] Yaodong Li and Matthew P. A. Fisher, “Statistical mechanics of quantum error correcting codes,” *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 104306 (2021).
 - [18] Utkarsh Agrawal, Aidan Zabalo, Kun Chen, Justin H. Wilson, Andrew C. Potter, J. H. Pixley, Sarang Gopalakrishnan, and Romain Vasseur, “Entanglement and charge-sharpening transitions in $u(1)$ symmetric monitored quantum circuits,” *Phys. Rev. X* **12**, 041002 (2022).
 - [19] Fergus Barratt, Utkarsh Agrawal, Andrew C. Potter, Sarang Gopalakrishnan, and Romain Vasseur, “Transitions in the learnability of global charges from local measurements,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 200602 (2022).
 - [20] Fergus Barratt, Utkarsh Agrawal, Sarang Gopalakrishnan, David A. Huse, Romain Vasseur, and Andrew C. Potter, “Field theory of charge sharpening in symmetric monitored quantum circuits,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 120604 (2022).
 - [21] Yimu Bao, Soonwon Choi, and Ehud Altman, “Theory of the phase transition in random unitary circuits with measurements,” *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 104301 (2020).
 - [22] Chao-Ming Jian, Yi-Zhuang You, Romain Vasseur, and Andreas W. W. Ludwig, “Measurement-induced criticality in random quantum circuits,” *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 104302 (2020), arXiv:1908.08051 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
 - [23] Yaodong Li, Sagar Vijay, and Matthew P A Fisher, “Entanglement domain walls in monitored quantum circuits and the directed polymer in a random environment,” *PRX Quantum* **4**, 010331 (2023).
 - [24] Yaodong Li, Romain Vasseur, Matthew P. A. Fisher, and Andreas W. W. Ludwig, “Statistical mechanics model for clifford random tensor networks and monitored quantum circuits,” *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 174307 (2024).
 - [25] Romain Vasseur, Andrew C. Potter, Yi-Zhuang You, and Andreas W. W. Ludwig, “Entanglement transitions from holographic random tensor networks,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 134203 (2019).
 - [26] Tianci Zhou and Adam Nahum, “Emergent statistical mechanics of entanglement in random unitary circuits,” *Physical Review B* **99**, 174205 (2019).
 - [27] Adam Nahum and Kay Jörg Wiese, “Renormalization group for measurement and entanglement phase transitions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 104203 (2023).
 - [28] Yaodong Li, Xiao Chen, Andreas W. W. Ludwig, and Matthew P. A. Fisher, “Conformal invariance and quantum nonlocality in critical hybrid circuits,” *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 104305 (2021).
 - [29] A. Zabalo, M. J. Gullans, J. H. Wilson, R. Vasseur, A. W. W. Ludwig, S. Gopalakrishnan, David A. Huse, and J. H. Pixley, “Operator scaling dimensions and multifractality at measurement-induced transitions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 050602 (2022).
 - [30] Abhishek Kumar, Kemal Aziz, Ahana Chakraborty, Andreas W. W. Ludwig, Sarang Gopalakrishnan, J. H. Pixley, and Romain Vasseur, “Boundary transfer matrix spectrum of measurement-induced transitions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 014303 (2024).
 - [31] Samuel J. Garratt, Zack Weinstein, and Ehud Altman, “Measurements conspire nonlocally to restructure critical quantum states,” *Phys. Rev. X* **13**, 021026 (2023).
 - [32] Zack Weinstein, Rohith Sajith, Ehud Altman, and Samuel J. Garratt, “Nonlocality and entanglement in measured critical quantum ising chains,” *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 245132 (2023).
 - [33] Zhou Yang, Dan Mao, and Chao-Ming Jian, “Entanglement in one-dimensional critical state after measurements,” (2023), arXiv:2301.08255 [quant-ph].
 - [34] Sara Murciano, Pablo Sala, Yue Liu, Roger S. K. Mong, and Jason Alicea, “Measurement-altered ising quantum criticality,” *Phys. Rev. X* **13**, 041042 (2023).
 - [35] Compare also Refs. 116, 117, 145, and 146 which consider different but related problems of effects of decoherence on 1d critical ground states, which we do not study in the present paper.
 - [36] Andreas W.W. Ludwig, “Infinite hierarchies of exponents in a diluted ferromagnet and their interpretation,” *Nuclear Physics B* **330**, 639–680 (1990).
 - [37] V. Gurarie, “Logarithmic operators in conformal field theory,” *Nuclear Physics B* **410**, 535–549 (1993).
 - [38] V. Gurarie and A. W. W. Ludwig, “Conformal field theory at central charge $c = 0$ and two-dimensional critical systems with quenched disorder,” in *From Fields to Strings: Circumnavigating Theoretical Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2005) pp. 1384–1440.
 - [39] Romain Vasseur, Jesper Lykke Jacobsen, and Hubert Saleur, “Logarithmic observables in critical percolation,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2012**, L07001 (2012).
 - [40] John Cardy, “Logarithmic correlations in quenched random magnets and polymers,” (1999), arXiv:cond-mat/9911024 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
 - [41] In simplest manifestation.
 - [42] Ian Affleck and Andreas W. W. Ludwig, “Universal non-integer “ground-state degeneracy” in critical quantum

- systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 161–164 (1991).
- [43] F. C. Alcaraz, J. R. Drugowich de Fel’icio, R. Köberle, and J. F. Stilck, “Hamiltonian studies of the blume-emery-griffiths model,” *Phys. Rev. B* **32**, 7469–7475 (1985).
- [44] Armin Rahmani, Xiaoyu Zhu, Marcel Franz, and Ian Affleck, “Phase diagram of the interacting majorana chain model,” *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 235123 (2015).
- [45] Edward O’Brien and Paul Fendley, “Lattice supersymmetry and order-disorder coexistence in the tricritical ising model,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 206403 (2018).
- [46] Kevin Slagle, David Aasen, Hannes Pichler, Roger S. K. Mong, Paul Fendley, Xie Chen, Manuel Endres, and Jason Alicea, “Microscopic characterization of ising conformal field theory in rydberg chains,” *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 235109 (2021).
- [47] Tarun Grover, D. N. Sheng, and Ashvin Vishwanath, “Emergent space-time supersymmetry at the boundary of a topological phase,” *Science* **344**, 280–283 (2014), <https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.1248253>.
- [48] Yijian Zou and Guifre Vidal, “Emergence of conformal symmetry in quantum spin chains: Antiperiodic boundary conditions and supersymmetry,” *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 045132 (2020).
- [49] To re-iterate, these results can be understood by using Kramers-Wannier duality. The O’Brien-Fendley chain is invariant under Kramers-Wannier duality throughout the line in its phase diagram depicted in Fig. 1. The energy scaling operator, $\mathcal{E}(x)$, and the subleading energy scaling operator, $\mathcal{E}'(x)$ are, respectively, odd and even under the K-W transformation at the tricritical Ising point. Since $\hat{\sigma}_j^z \hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z - \hat{\sigma}_j^x$ is odd under the K-W transformation (see Eq. 2), it *cannot* contain any contribution from the subleading energy field $\mathcal{E}'(x)$ in the continuum limit and is given by the energy field $\mathcal{E}(x)$ with corrections from solely RG irrelevant (K-W odd) operators.
- [50] $\hat{\mathcal{E}}'_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ does not commute with the operator $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$.
- [51] We note that the operator $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ (for an even link i) has support on the two lattice sites i and $i+1$, and one can check that each of its eigenvalues ± 1 is two-fold degenerate. This means that there will be two (linearly independent) eigenstates of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$, which can be chosen orthogonal, that will be associated with each of the measurement outcomes $+1$ and -1 . This does *not* imply that the post-measurement state is ambiguous. The state that results after observing any set of measurement outcomes is uniquely obtained by acting with the projector (or more generally, in the case of weak measurements, a Kraus operator) corresponding to the eigenspace associated with the measurement outcomes on the ‘incoming’ state before measurement. In the case of interest to us this will be, as we will discuss below, the ground state of the *tricritical* O’Brien-Fendley chain. See e.g. Eq. 13 below. (Measurement operators with two eigenvalues which are not both non-degenerate, have also been discussed in a different context in Ref. 3.)
- [52] We note that performing weak measurements with the operator $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}$ only on even links i does *not* imply that the system will effectively collapse onto a trivial ‘staggered’ state. Compare for example with Refs. 32 and 33, which consider performing measurements with the Pauli operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^x$ on all sites i of the critical quantum Ising chain (See Eq. 1b for the Hamiltonian). In terms of the Majorana formulation of the quantum Ising chain, this measurement operator reads $\hat{\sigma}_i^x = \hat{\gamma}_{2i} \hat{\gamma}_{2i+1}$, where $\hat{\gamma}_{2i}$ is a Majorana operator. Thus measuring $\hat{\sigma}_i^x$ corresponds to performing measurements only on the even-links of the underlying Majorana chain, however a ‘staggered’ state is not observed [32, 33]. In fact, even though measurements are performed only on the even links of the Majorana chain, it has been observed that for Born-rule measurements [32, 33] the long-distance critical properties of the system are the same as that of the unmeasured state, i.e. the Ising critical ground state (which is not ‘staggered’). In the same spirit, in our measurement protocol of our system we also would not expect to see a trivial ‘staggered’ state even though we are performing measurements only on the even-links of the chain (which are now the physical links of the spin-chain and not of the underlying Majorana chain). In our case, the critical behaviour of the unmeasured state, however, does get modified dramatically due to the presence of measurements as we will discuss in detail in the subsequent sections of the present paper. – A general proof of the impossibility of obtaining a trivial ‘staggered’ state, for our (and also the above) system will follow from Eq. 23 with $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_1 := \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}$. This equation implies that the expectation value of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_1$, a two point function, is unmodified by Born-rule measurements and thus exhibits the algebraic decay with distance $|i-j|$ characteristic of the unmeasured (tri-)critical ground state, which would be in contradiction with an exponential decay in a trivial ‘staggered’ state.
- [53] I.e. $\hat{K}_{i+\frac{1}{2}, m_i} \rightarrow \hat{K}_{i, m_i}$ where $m_i = \pm$, and correspondingly for $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$.
- [54] We note, continuing a previous footnote, that degeneracies of the measurements operators $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_i$ and thus of the Kraus operators does not affect the identity Eq. 12. For a similar situation with degeneracies of the eigenvalues of the measurement operators, see the already previously mentioned Ref. 3.
- [55] Standing for “Positive Operator Valued Measure”.
- [56] We consider only such distributions $P(t_i)$ for which all cumulants exist, i.e. are finite.
- [57] the role of $m_i \lambda$ being played by $\tanh(t_i)$.
- [58] We note that the normalization of the distribution $P(t_i)$ is chosen such that it satisfies Eq. 20 and hence it is *not* normalized as a probability distribution. However, multiplying and dividing $P(t_i)$ by an appropriate overall trivial constant we can use the formula for cumulant expansion, which is valid for probability distributions.
- [59] For the O’Brien-Fendley chain, we will consider calculating measurement averaged moments of the correlation function for operators $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ and $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j$. As noted earlier, the operators $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j$ at even sites j commute with each other, and hence the operator $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j$ at an even site j also commutes with the Kraus operator $\hat{K}_{\bar{m}}$ (see Eq. 19). Moreover, if we choose the operator $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ to lie on an odd sites i , it commutes with $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z - \hat{\sigma}_j^x)$ for all even sites j (see Fig. 2) and thus, it also commutes with the Kraus operator $\hat{K}_{\bar{m}}$. Therefore, the positions of operators for which we study the correlation functions in this paper can always be slightly “tuned” such that they

commute with the Kraus operator $\hat{\mathbf{K}}_m$.

- [60] We note that in Ref. [34] they have made a similar observation in a related context.
- [61] Compare also analogous discussions for different systems in Refs. [31], [145].
- [62] A B Zamolodchikov, “Conformal symmetry and multicritical points in two-dimensional quantum field theory,” *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **44**, 529 (1986).
- [63] In the present case of two dimensions there is no meaning to a perturbative study of the Landau-Ginzburg action about the Gaussian theory, since the field ϕ is dimensionless by naive power-counting, and a non-perturbative tool is needed. This is provided in Ref. 62 where it is shown that non-perturbative field identifications following from the exact equations of motion are exactly those obtained from the corresponding unitary minimal model CFT.
- [64] subtraction of the singular terms in the operator product expansion [OPE].
- [65] Important differences in the gluing of boundary field configurations could occur if the fields $\mathcal{O}_i^{(a)}$ cannot be expressed locally in terms of the Landau-Ginzburg field ϕ and its normal ordered higher powers. This issue is addressed in App. A 3.
- [66] Note that a term with equal replica indices of form $\mathcal{E}^{(a)}\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$, can be evaluated using point splitting and the operator product expansion [68, 69, 85] (OPE)

$$\mathcal{E}^{(a)} \times \mathcal{E}^{(a)} = I^{(a)} + \mathcal{E}'^{(a)}$$

where the operator $\mathcal{E}' = : \mathcal{E}\mathcal{E} : =: \phi^4 :$, in every replica “ a ”, is irrelevant as an operator with support on the 1-dimensional $\tau = 0$ time slice at the Ising tricritical point.

- [67] Due to high scaling dimensions, terms with more than four $\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$ fields and pairwise *unequal* replica indices are irrelevant under RG at the tricritical Ising point. The term with exactly four $\mathcal{E}^{(a)}$ fields (with pairwise unequal replica indices) is relevant at the tricritical Ising point and is less relevant than $\Phi(x)$ in Eq. 36. Moreover, we argue in App. A and G that this term is expected to be irrelevant at the new IR fixed point..
- [68] Daniel Friedan, Zongan Qiu, and Stephen Shenker, “Conformal invariance, unitarity, and critical exponents in two dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 1575–1578 (1984).
- [69] A.A. Belavin, A.M. Polyakov, and A.B. Zamolodchikov, “Infinite conformal symmetry in two-dimensional quantum field theory,” *Nuclear Physics B* **241**, 333–380 (1984).
- [70] We will relax this restriction in Sect. VIII, where we will consider an odd m minimal model, namely the Ising CFT.
- [71] V.I.S. Dotsenko and V.A. Fateev, “Conformal algebra and multipoint correlation functions in 2d statistical models,” *Nuclear Physics B* **240**, 312–348 (1984).
- [72] G. Delfino, “First-order phase transitions and integrable field theory. the dilute q -state potts model,” *Nuclear Physics B* **554**, 537–551 (1999).
- [73] Youjin Deng, Henk W. J. Blöte, and Benard Nienhuis, “Geometric properties of two-dimensional critical and tricritical potts models,” *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 026123 (2004).
- [74] B Nienhuis, “Analytical calculation of two leading ex-

ponents of the dilute potts model,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **15**, 199 (1982).

- [75] B. Nienhuis, A. N. Berker, Eberhard K. Riedel, and M. Schick, “First- and second-order phase transitions in potts models: Renormalization-group solution,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 737–740 (1979).
- [76] John L. Cardy, “Operator content of two-dimensional conformally invariant theories,” *Nuclear Physics B* **270**, 186–204 (1986).
- [77] A. Cappelli, C. Itzykson, and J.-B. Zuber, “Modular invariant partition functions in two dimensions,” *Nuclear Physics B* **280**, 445–465 (1987).
- [78] As already mentioned, the energy operator of the tricritical q -state Potts model is the so-called Kac-Table operator $\varphi_{1,2}$, and under repeated OPEs with itself, it generates the set of Kac-Table operators $\varphi_{1,n}$, all of which are common to both critical systems. (This set of operators forms an operator algebra closed under the operator product expansion.)
- [79] in a given RG scheme.
- [80] See also the discussion in App. F.
- [81] This is an expansion in $\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}(1-c(m))}$ about $c(m) = 1$, which can equivalently be viewed (as discussed above) as an expansion in $\frac{3}{2\pi}\sqrt{4-q}$ of the tricritical q state Potts model about the $q = 4$ state Potts model.
- [82] A. B. Zamolodchikov, “Renormalization Group and Perturbation Theory Near Fixed Points in Two-Dimensional Field Theory,” *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **46**, 1090 (1987).
- [83] Andreas W.W. Ludwig and John L. Cardy, “Perturbative evaluation of the conformal anomaly at new critical points with applications to random systems,” *Nuclear Physics B* **285**, 687–718 (1987).
- [84] Andreas W.W. Ludwig, “Critical behavior of the two-dimensional random q -state potts model by expansion in $(q - 2)$,” *Nuclear Physics B* **285**, 97–142 (1987).
- [85] P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu, and D. Sénéchal, *Conformal Field Theory*, Graduate Texts in Contemporary Physics (Springer, 1997).
- [86] J L Cardy, “Logarithmic corrections to finite-size scaling in strips,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **19**, L1093 (1986).
- [87] John Cardy, “Ch. 5, the perturbative renormalization group,” in *Scaling and Renormalization in Statistical Physics*, Cambridge Lecture Notes in Physics (Cambridge University Press, 1996) p. 83–110.
- [88] Andreas W.W. Ludwig and Kay Jörg Wiese, “The 4-loop β -function in the 2d non-abelian thirring model, and comparison with its conjectured “exact” form,” *Nuclear Physics B* **661**, 577–607 (2003).
- [89] As already recalled in footnote [78], the operator \mathcal{E} is the Kac-Table operator $\mathcal{E} = \varphi_{1,2}$.
- [90] The scaling dimension of \mathcal{E}' in the m^{th} minimal model is $2(\frac{m-1}{m+1}) > 1$ for any even $m \geq 4$ (see [68, 85]).
- [91] in a dimensional regularization [by $\epsilon = 3/(m+1)$] RG scheme, with minimal subtraction of poles in ϵ .
- [92] M. Jeng and A.W.W. Ludwig, “Random defect lines in conformal minimal models,” *Nuclear Physics B* **594**, 685–712 (2001).
- [93] As already mentioned, for even $m \geq 4$ the tricritical q -state Potts energy operator \mathcal{E} corresponds to the Kac-table primary field $\varphi_{1,2}$, while the leading tricritical Potts spin field σ corresponds to the Kac-Table pri-

- mary field $\varphi_{m/2,m/2}$ [73]. The OPE of these two fields reads $\varphi_{1,2} \times \varphi_{m/2,m/2} = \varphi_{m/2,m/2+1} + \varphi_{m/2,m/2-1} = \varphi_{m/2,m/2} + \varphi_{m/2,m/2+2}$, where in the last equality we have used the symmetry of the Kac Table, $h_{r,s} = h_{m-r,m+1-s}$, and $\varphi_{m/2,m/2+2}$ denotes the subleading tricritical Potts spin field σ' .
- [94] The only difference for even $m \geq 6$ is that in the Potts formulation there are two different spin and subleading spin fields, degenerate in scaling dimension. [77, 85] This doubling of spin fields in the Potts formulation will be of no relevance for us since we will only be interested in the two-point function of the tricritical q -state Potts spin fields.
- [95] Robbert Dijkgraaf, Erik Verlinde, and Herman Verlinde, “ $C = 1$ conformal field theories on Riemann surfaces,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **115**, 649 – 690 (1988).
- [96] Tom Davis and John Cardy, “Correlated correlation functions in random-bond ferromagnets,” *Nuclear Physics B* **570**, 713–725 (2000).
- [97] Since the operators $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ and $\hat{\mathbf{E}}_i$ have eigenvalues ± 1 , in any quantum state the correlation functions $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ and $\langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$ are both bounded from above and below. [E.g., the correlation function $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ lies in the interval $[-1, 1]$ (consider $(\hat{\sigma}_i^z - \hat{\sigma}_j^z)^2$), and analogously $\langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle = \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle - \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \rangle \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$ lies in the interval $[-2, 2]$.] If the given correlation function (either $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ or $\langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$) in the critical ground state $|0\rangle$ is oscillating between positive and negative values with a period consisting of a certain number of lattice sites as we vary j , we can choose to look at a subset of sites j for which the correlation function is strictly positive. Now, if we consider performing weak measurements (small λ) on the ground state $|0\rangle$, a particular quantum trajectory will be given by $|\psi_{\bar{m}}\rangle = \hat{\mathbf{K}}_{\bar{m}}|0\rangle/\sqrt{p_0(\bar{m})}$ (see Eq. 9 and Eq. 14). The correlation function $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ (or $\langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle = \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle - \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \rangle \langle \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$) in this quantum trajectory and for a given value of $|j - i|$ will be an analytic function of the measurement strength λ . Since $\lambda = 0$ corresponds to performing no measurements at all and given that the correlation function $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ (or $\langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$) was positive-valued in the ground state $|0\rangle$, for sufficiently small values of λ the correlation function will also be positive in a given quantum trajectory obtained upon measurements. For sufficiently weak measurement strength λ , we can thus restrict ourselves to correlation functions $\langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$ and $\langle \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_i \delta \hat{\mathbf{E}}_j \rangle$ which are bounded from above and are non-negative.
- [98] W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Volume 2* (J. Wiley and Sons, New York, 1966).
- [99] Edward Witten, “Open strings on the rindler horizon,” *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2019**, 126 (2019).
- [100] R.P. Boas Jr., “Entire functions,” (Academic Press, 1954) Chap. 9 Uniqueness Theorems, p. 153.
- [101] E.C. Titchmarsh, “The theory of functions (2nd ed.),” (Oxford University Press, 1939) Chap. 5 The Maximum-Modulus Theorem, p. 186.
- [102] Bernard Derrida, “Can disorder induce several phase transitions?” *Physics Reports* **103**, 29 – 39 (1984).
- [103] John Cardy, “Logarithmic conformal field theories as limits of ordinary cfts and some physical applications,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **46**, 494001 (2013).
- [104] Pasquale Calabrese and John Cardy, “Entanglement entropy and quantum field theory,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2004**, P06002 (2004); “Entanglement entropy and conformal field theory,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **42**, 504005 (2009).
- [105] J. L. Cardy, O. A. Castro-Alvaredo, and B. Doyon, “Form factors of branch-point twist fields in quantum integrable models and entanglement entropy,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* **130**, 129–168 (2008).
- [106] Christoph Holzhey, Finn Larsen, and Frank Wilczek, “Geometric and renormalized entropy in conformal field theory,” *Nuclear Physics B* **424**, 443–467 (1994).
- [107] V. G. Knizhnik, “Analytic fields on Riemann surfaces. II,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **112**, 567 – 590 (1987).
- [108] We note that the above result for the scaling dimension of the k^{th} moment of the n -twist field at the new Δ_* -fixed point is linear in k to 1-loop order. However, in analogy with observations made in Ref. 24 in a related context, we expect non-linearities in k to appear in higher orders in ϵ . We plan to address the calculation of these non-linearities in future work.
- [109] Pasquale Calabrese and Alexandre Lefevre, “Entanglement spectrum in one-dimensional systems,” *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 032329 (2008).
- [110] Since the subsystem size approaches the system size L , the twist fields will be sitting at the ends of the one dimensional quantum system and such correlator will no longer be a pure power law, and will depend on the full operator content of the theory. However, the leading order piece proportional to the system size will not depend on the boundary condition and will be the same as in Eq. 103.
- [111] Ian Affleck, “Universal term in the free energy at a critical point and the conformal anomaly,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 746–748 (1986); H. W. J. Blöte, John L. Cardy, and M. P. Nightingale, “Conformal invariance, the central charge, and universal finite-size amplitudes at criticality,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 742–745 (1986).
- [112] P. Fendley, A. W. W. Ludwig, and H. Saleur, “Exact conductance through point contacts in the $\nu = 1/3$ fractional quantum hall effect,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3005–3008 (1995).
- [113] André LeClair and Andreas W.W. Ludwig, “Minimal models with integrable local defects,” *Nuclear Physics B* **549**, 546–562 (1999).
- [114] Daniel Friedan and Anatoly Konechny, “Boundary entropy of one-dimensional quantum systems at low temperature,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 030402 (2004).
- [115] With periodic boundary conditions in the spatial direction of size L , we have to consider the CFT with a defect on a torus with radii β and L , where β denotes the inverse temperature (see Fig. 3). After folding the torus at $\tau = \beta/2$ and at $\tau = 0$ (the location of the defect), we obtain a finite ‘double-sheeted’ cylinder of circumference L and length $\beta/2$. The $\tau = 0$ boundary of this ‘doubled-sheeted’ cylinder is associated with the defect, while the boundary at $\tau = \beta/2$ is ‘trivial’ and it moves off to infinity in the limit $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ of interest, as we are interested in the ground state of the system. Thus, the defect free-energy can be thought of as being associ-

- ated with the boundary free-energy of this semi-infinite ('double-sheeted') cylinder.
- [116] Yijian Zou, Shengqi Sang, and Timothy H. Hsieh, "Channeling quantum criticality," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 250403 (2023).
- [117] Yuto Ashida, Shunsuke Furukawa, and Masaki Oshikawa, "System-environment entanglement phase transitions," (2023), [arXiv:2311.16343](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.16343) [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [118] Unlike the even m minimal model CFTs, there does *not* exist a tricritical q -state Potts model with the same central charge as the odd m minimal model CFTs. However, this is immaterial to the RG analysis of the replica action in Eq. 37 for the multicritical point given by an odd m minimal model CFT in Eq. 38 and with the symbol \mathcal{E} replaced by $\mathcal{S} =: \phi^{m-2}$. We note that for the odd m minimal model CFTs the field $\mathcal{S} =: \phi^{m-2}$ is one of the spin fields of the multicritical point and *not* an energy field, and this distinction is also inconsequential to the RG analysis of the replica action presented in Sect. IV B. As already mentioned above, for both odd m and even m minimal model CFTs, the field ϕ^{m-2} is the so-called Kac-Table operator $\varphi_{1,2}$. See also footnote [78].
- [119] Recall from the discussion above that, when $m > 3$, this term is replaced by an irrelevant operator on the time-slice which can be ignored.
- [120] R.J. Baxter, *Exactly Solved Models in Statistical Mechanics*, Dover books on physics (Dover Publications, 2007).
- [121] In App. A, we will show that the higher (> 2) cumulants of $P(t_i)$ (analogous to the case of tricritical Ising point) are inconsequential to the IR physics of measurement averaged quantities at Ising critical point. In particular, the higher cumulants generate terms where an even number (≥ 2) of pairwise unequal replica copies of spin field $s(x, \tau)$ interact with each other on the $\tau = 0$ time slice. Out of these the 4-replica and 6-replica terms are relevant, the 8-replica term is marginal, and all the other higher replica terms are irrelevant at the $m = 3$ minimal model CFT, i.e. the Ising critical point. Moreover, the aforementioned relevant and marginal terms at the Ising critical point ($m = 3$) are irrelevant at fixed points described by the large- m minimal model CFTs. Then following the standard reasoning used in the case of the ϕ^6 interaction at the Wilson-Fisher fixed point in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensions, the relevant and marginal terms at the Ising critical point are expected to be irrelevant at the new fixed point Δ_* even at $m = 3$. This is discussed in more detail in App. A 2. Also see App. G for a general argument for the irrelevance of higher cumulants ($2k \geq 4$) based on avoided level crossings.
- [122] I.e., $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\text{typ}}^{(\hat{\sigma}_i, \text{Is}), R=1}$ is obtained from the moments of the *subtracted* Pauli spin operator describing the deviation from its expectation value in a fixed quantum trajectory, $\delta\hat{\sigma}_i^z := \hat{\sigma}_i^z - \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \rangle$, and $\langle \delta\hat{\sigma}_i^z \delta\hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle = \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle - \langle \hat{\sigma}_i^z \rangle \langle \hat{\sigma}_j^z \rangle$.
- [123] The distribution $P(t_i)$ is taken to be an even function of t_i to satisfy Eq. 20.
- [124] For odd $m > 3$ minimal models, we denote the generalization of the field \mathfrak{s} by the symbol \mathcal{S} defined in Eq. 110.
- [125] $\partial_x \phi(x)$ is proportional to the density of the TLLs.
- [126] When the index i corresponds to the plane, there is no ambiguity of the Riemann sheet to which the field belongs and α can be taken to be zero.
- [127] All primary fields of a CFT are by convention subtracted so that their expectation values in the infinite plane vanish identically.
- [128] Here, the symbol β should not be confused with the inverse-temperature.
- [129] Iaroslav V. Blagouchine and Eric Moreau, "On a finite sum of cosecants appearing in various problems," (2023), [arXiv:2312.16657](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.16657) [math.NT].
- [130] George E. Andrews, Richard Askey, and Ranjan Roy, "The gamma and beta functions," in *Special Functions*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications (Cambridge University Press, 1999) p. 1–60.
- [131] In the above OPEs, we have *not* written the explicit coefficients which accompany the fields in the OPE and which depend on position of the fields. (For Ising critical point, this is same as the fusion rules of the theory.)
- [132] Note that the term $\mathfrak{s}^{(a_1)} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_2)} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_3)} \mathfrak{s}^{(a_4)}$ when contracted with $\mathfrak{s}^{(b_1)} \mathfrak{s}^{(b_2)}$ gives terms of the following form: $\mathfrak{s}^{(c_1)} \mathfrak{s}^{(c_2)}$, $\mathfrak{s}^{(c_1)} \mathfrak{s}^{(c_2)} \mathfrak{e}^{(c_3)}$ and $\mathfrak{s}^{(c_1)} \mathfrak{s}^{(c_2)} \mathfrak{e}^{(c_3)} \mathfrak{e}^{(c_4)}$. Thus, when contracted with Φ , the last term on the RHS of the OPE in Eq. E7 cannot produce the marginal operator $\sum_a \mathfrak{e}^{(a)}$.
- [133] I.e., they form a closed Operator Algebra.
- [134] R. Z. Bariev, "Effect of linear defects on the local magnetization of a plane Ising lattice," *Sov. Phys. JETP* **50**, 613 (1979).
- [135] Barry M. McCoy and Jacques H. H. Perk, "Two-spin correlation functions of an Ising model with continuous exponents," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, 840–844 (1980).
- [136] We note that in the above formula (and also in the subsequent formulae in this appendix) the symbol \int_x is a short hand for $\int \frac{d^2x}{a^{1-X_{\mathcal{A}}}}$, i.e. in addition to the integral over coordinate x of the integrand field $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$, the measure of the integral is normalized with a factor of short distance cutoff a raised to an appropriate power involving scaling dimension $X_{\mathcal{A}}$ of the field $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}}$ so that the corresponding coupling constant (like Δ_0 when $\Phi_{\mathcal{A}} = \Phi$) is dimensionless.
- [137] There is an analogous procedure to handle the RG equation of operators present in the expectation value, but this is not elaborated on here.
- [138] John L. Cardy, "Effect of boundary conditions on the operator content of two-dimensional conformally invariant theories," *Nuclear Physics B* **275**, 200–218 (1986).
- [139] Ian Affleck and Andreas W.W. Ludwig, "Critical theory of overscreened kondo fixed points," *Nuclear Physics B* **360**, 641–696 (1991).
- [140] V. P. Yurov and Alexei B. Zamolodchikov, "Truncated fermionic space approach to the critical 2-D Ising model with magnetic field," *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **6**, 4557–4578 (1991).
- [141] R.M. Konik, T. Pálmai, G. Takács, and A.M. Tsvelik, "Studying the perturbed wess-zumino-novikov-witten su(2) theory using the truncated conformal spectrum approach," *Nuclear Physics B* **899**, 547–569 (2015).
- [142] Giovanni Feverati, Kevin Graham, Paul A. Pearce, Gabor Zs. Toth, and Gerard Watts, "A renormalisation group for tcsa," (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0612203](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-th/0612203) [hep-th].
- [143] Kenneth G. Wilson, "The renormalization group: Critical phenomena and the kondo problem," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **47**, 773–840 (1975).
- [144] H. B. Pang and D. L. Cox, "Stability of the fixed point

- of the two-channel kondo hamiltonian,” *Phys. Rev. B* **44**, 9454–9457 (1991).
- [145] Jong Yeon Lee, Chao-Ming Jian, and Cenke Xu, “Quantum criticality under decoherence or weak measurement,” *PRX Quantum* **4**, 030317 (2023).
- [146] Nayan Myerson-Jain, Taylor L. Hughes, and Cenke Xu, “Decoherence through ancilla anyon reservoirs,” (2023), [arXiv:2312.04638](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.04638) [cond-mat.str-el].