Macroscopically degenerate ground state in the SU(3) symmetric Heisenberg model on the kagome lattice

Karlo Penc

Wigner Research Centre for Physics Institute for Solid State Physics and Optics Budapest

supported by Hungarian NKFIH Grant K-124176

What are the SU(N) symmetric Heisenberg models that we are interested in?



 $\mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ is the transposition operator

N species on each site that are treated equally.

simplest example:

 $|\mathcal{P}_{ij}|\beta_i\alpha_j\rangle = |\alpha_i\beta_j\rangle$

SU(2) S=1/2 (fundamental representation) [but not the S=1]

What are the SU(N) symmetric Heisenberg models that we are interested in?

$$\mathcal{P}_{i,j} | \begin{array}{c} & & & \\ & & \\ \mathbf{j} & & \mathbf{j} \end{array} \rangle \rightarrow | \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ \mathbf{j} & & \mathbf{j} \end{array} \rangle$$
$$\mathbf{S}_1 \cdot \mathbf{S}_2 = S_1^z S_2^z + \frac{1}{2} \left(S_1^+ S_2^- + S_1^- S_2^+ \right)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2} |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle = \frac{1}{4} |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \left(2\mathbf{S}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right) |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle = |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$$
$$\mathbf{S}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2} |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle = -\frac{1}{4} |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + \frac{1}{2} |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle \qquad \rightarrow \qquad \left(2\mathbf{S}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right) |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle = |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$$

For the S = 1/2 fundamental representation of the SU(2):

$$\left(2\mathbf{S}_1\cdot\mathbf{S}_2+\frac{1}{2}\right)=\mathcal{P}_{1,2}$$

SU(2) vs. SU(3) - two sites

 $\mathcal{P}_{12}(|\alpha\beta\rangle - |\beta\alpha\rangle) = -(|\alpha\beta\rangle - |\beta\alpha\rangle)$ E=-1, odd wave function $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{P}_{12}$ $\mathcal{P}_{12}(|\alpha\beta\rangle + |\beta\alpha\rangle) = +(|\alpha\beta\rangle + |\beta\alpha\rangle)$ E=+1, even wave function Addition of two $S=\frac{1}{2}$ SU(2) spins: Addition of two SU(3) spins: $\frac{1}{2} \otimes \frac{1}{2} = 0 \oplus 1$ $3 \times 3 = \bar{3} + 6$ using Young diagrams: \otimes \square = \square \oplus $2 \times 2 = 1 + 3$ $\square \otimes \square = \square \oplus \square$ \square $|a\rangle$, $|b\rangle$, and $|c\rangle$. \uparrow and \downarrow spins $|ab\rangle - |ba\rangle$, $|ab\rangle - |ba\rangle$, $|ab\rangle - |ba\rangle$ odd (anti-symmetrical). $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ singlet odd (anti-symmetrical) $|aa\rangle$, $|bb\rangle$, $|cc\rangle$, $|ab\rangle$ + $|ba\rangle$, $|ac\rangle + |ca\rangle$, and $|bc\rangle + |cb\rangle$ $\square |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle+|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle triplet$ even (symmetrical) even (symmetrical)

SU(3) irreps on 3 sites

Addition of three SU(3) spins (27 states):

 $3 \times 3 \times 3 = 1 + 2 \times 8 + 10$ $\square \otimes \square \otimes \square = \square \oplus 2 \times \square \oplus \square$

SU(3) singlet spins fully antisymmetrized

 $= |abc\rangle + |bca\rangle + |cab\rangle - |acb\rangle - |acb\rangle - |acb\rangle$



in the SU(3) singlet the spins are fully entangled: we cannot write it in a product form



What do we know about SU(3) Kagome ?

The trimerized/simplex solid state/simplex valence-bond crystal for the fundamental **3** irrep model and S=1 Kagome (BLBQ, including the pure Heisenberg point)



D. P. Arovas, Phys. Rev. B 77, 104404 (2008).

SU(3)

Large-N expansion: Hermele & Gurarie, Phys. Rev. B 84, 174441 (2011);

iPEPS and ED: Corboz, Penc, Mila, & Läuchli, Phys. Rev. B 86, 041106(R) (2012)

S=1

H. J. Changlani, A. M. Läuchli, Trimerized ground state of the spin-1 Heisenberg antiferromagnet on the kagome lattice, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 100407 (2015)

T. Liu, W. Li, A. Weichselbaum; J von Delft, Jan, G. Su, Simplex valence-bond crystal in the spin-1 kagome Heisenberg antiferromagnet, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 060403(R) (2015)

Trimerized phase in the S = 1 Kagome antiferromagnet with ring exchange

arXiv:1909.02020

Spin–lattice coupling and the emergence of the trimerized phase in the S = 1 Kagome antiferromagnet $Na_2Ti_3Cl_8$

Arpita Paul, Chia-Min Chung, Turan Birol, and Hitesh J. Changlani

layers of edge-sharing TiCl6 octahedra

$$\mathcal{H} = J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j + J_{bq} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j)^2 + \frac{J_R}{2} \sum_{\Delta = i, j, k} \left((\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j) \left(\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_k \right) + (\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_k) \left(\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \right) \right)$$



Simplex solid in SU(3) Kagome

D. P. Arovas, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 104404 (2008). SU(N) singlet on N sites, represented by $b^{\dagger}_{\alpha}(i)$ Schwinger bosons:

 $\epsilon^{\alpha_1\cdots\alpha_N}b^{\dagger}_{\alpha_1}(i_1)\cdots b^{\dagger}_{\alpha_N}(i_N)|0\rangle,$



Addition of two SU(3) spins:

3	×	3	=	3	+	6
	\otimes		=	Η	\oplus	

Each site hosts the symmetric, 6 dimensional irrep because of the bosons (like in the S=1 AKLT wave function case).

But we can do this with fermions as well !

SU(3) singlet on 3 sites, represented by fermions :

$$|\mathbf{1}(i_1, i_2, i_3)\rangle = \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} \varepsilon^{\alpha \beta \gamma} f^{\dagger}_{\alpha}(i_1) f^{\dagger}_{\beta}(i_2) f^{\dagger}_{\gamma}(i_3) |0\rangle = \mathcal{F}_{i_1, i_2, i_3} |0\rangle$$

femionic simplex solid wave function:



Do we know the parent Hamiltonian?

A guess: sum of local projectors, like in the S=1 AKLT model

$$\mathcal{H} = J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \mathcal{P}_{i,j} + K \sum_{\triangle,\bigtriangledown} \left(\mathcal{P}_{i,j,k} + \mathcal{P}_{i,k,j} \right)$$

We may try it on a small system: we generate the FSS, and ask if the condition for being an eigenstate

 $\langle FSS | \mathcal{H}^2 | FSS \rangle \langle FSS | FSS \rangle = \langle FSS | \mathcal{H} | FSS \rangle^2$

is satisfied with some values of J/K.



But how does this happen?







#of states in (4,4,4) sector = 34650, but symmetry group large



Comparing the S=1 AKLT chain with FSS



\odot	1	8^{R}	8^{L}	$\overline{10}$
1		8^R	8^L	
8^{R}	8^R	8^{L}	${f 1}\oplus{f 10}$	8^{R}
8^{L}	8^L	${f 1} \oplus {f 10}$	8^R	8^{L}
$\overline{10}$		8^R	8^{L}	10

Fermionic simplex solid eigenstate of the

$$\mathcal{H}^{\text{FSS}} = \sum_{\Delta, \bigtriangledown} \left(c_1 | \mathbf{1} \rangle \langle \mathbf{1} | + c_{\mathbf{10}} | \mathbf{10} \rangle \langle \mathbf{10} | \right)$$

and ground state when $c_1>0$ and $c_{10}>0$.

$$c_1 = 3K - 3J$$
$$c_{10} = 3K + 3J$$

$$\mathcal{H} = J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \mathcal{P}_{i,j} + K \sum_{\triangle,\bigtriangledown} \left(\mathcal{P}_{i,j,k} + \mathcal{P}_{i,k,j} \right)$$



Lower bound on energy

Let us write the lattice Hamiltonian as a sum offer the lattice of a Hamiltonian defined on a (9-site) open cluster:

$$\mathcal{H}(J,K) = \sum_{\text{lattice}} \mathcal{H}_9(J_1, J_2, J_3, K_1, K_2)$$
where
$$\mathcal{H}_9(J_1, J_2, J_3, K_1, K_2) = \bigcup_{J_2} \bigcup_{J_1 \\ J_3 \\ J_2 \\ J_3 \\ K_2 \\ J_2 \\ J_3 \\ J_2 \\ J_2$$

Lower bound on energy

The energy calculated from the ground states of the sub-Hamiltonians will always be lower that the ground state energy of H, as the true ground state of H can be viewed as a variational wavefunction for H9.

$$E_{\rm LB} = \max_{\substack{J=J_1+2J_2+J_3\\K=K_1+3K_2}} E_{\rm GS}(J_1, J_2, J_3, K_1, K_2)$$



Actually, the energies of a single triangle gives also a lower bond (per triangle)

$$\varepsilon_{1} = -3J + 2K$$
$$\varepsilon_{8} = -K$$
$$\varepsilon_{10} = 3J + 2K$$

The FM and the FSS saturate the lower bound, they are ground states (beware uniqueness)

Tensor network: the wave function



each triangle represents the antisymmetrizing Levi-Civita symbol

Tensor network: the overlap



graph of contracted Levi-Civita symbols

R. Penrose, Applications of negative dimensional tensors, 1971

Penrose polynomial, defined for plane graphs

12: 13392 27: 1828256832 36: 2220531642144

gfortran has 128-bit long integer type:-)

Example for overlap (12 sites)

 $\varepsilon^{1,9,11}\varepsilon^{2,13,14}\varepsilon^{3,6,15}\varepsilon^{4,8,12}\varepsilon^{5,16,17}\varepsilon^{7,10,19}\varepsilon^{18,20,21}\varepsilon^{22,23,24}\varepsilon^{25,37,49}\varepsilon^{26,38,50}\varepsilon^{27,39,51}\varepsilon^{28,40,52}\varepsilon^{29,41,53}\varepsilon^{30,42,54}\varepsilon^{31,43,55}\varepsilon^{32,44,56}\varepsilon^{33,45,57}\varepsilon^{34,46,58}\varepsilon^{35,47,59}\varepsilon^{36,48,60}\varepsilon^{21,13,25}\varepsilon^{2,14,26}\varepsilon^{3,15,27}\varepsilon^{4,16,28}\varepsilon^{5,17,29}\varepsilon^{6,18,30}\varepsilon^{7,19,31}\varepsilon^{8,20,32}\varepsilon^{9,21,33}\varepsilon^{10,22,34}$

 $\varepsilon_{11,23,35}\varepsilon_{12,24,36}\varepsilon_{37,45,47}\varepsilon_{38,43,50}\varepsilon_{39,49,51}\varepsilon_{40,52,55}\varepsilon_{41,42,53}\varepsilon_{44,48,60}\varepsilon_{46,58,59}\varepsilon_{54,56,57}$



Penrose graph

Evaluating Penrose graphs

$$\varepsilon_{i,j,k} \varepsilon^{i,j,k} = 6$$
$$\varepsilon_{i,j,k} \varepsilon^{i,j,l} = 2\delta_k^l$$
$$\varepsilon_{i,j,k} \varepsilon^{i,l,m} = \delta_j^l \delta_k^m - \delta_j^m \delta_k^l$$

implied sum over repeated indices





Evaluating Penrose graphs



 $\dots \varepsilon_{1,2,8} \, \varepsilon^{2,3,4} \, \varepsilon_{4,5,6} \, \varepsilon^{6,7,8} \dots = \delta_1^3 \delta_5^7 + \delta_1^7 \delta_5^3$



 $= -\,\delta_1^2 \delta_3^6 \delta_5^4 - \delta_1^6 \delta_3^4 \delta_5^2 - \delta_1^4 \delta_3^2 \delta_5^6 + \delta_1^4 \delta_3^6 \delta_5^2$

Evaluating using tensor network



Tensor network: the overlap



is simply a product of matrices

Spin-spin correlation function



Spin-spin correlation function



decays exponentially,

$$\langle \mathrm{FSS}|P_{0,r}|\mathrm{FSS}\rangle = C(r) \approx 3^{-r}$$



full ED for small system (12 sites) - degenerate GS



The $\vartheta = 3\pi/4$ (J = -K) case



triangles having no more than two colors are degenerate eigenstates

385427 states are degenerate 3¹²=531441 is the total number of states

ϑ



the building blocks are:



The J = K case: Lego time!



"current conservation" - some kind of a Coulomb liquid ?

On each bond 3 possibilities: 2 directions of arrow and absence of an arrow.

Z3 degrees of freedom

topological sectors (definition not obvious because of overlap and nonorthogonality)

The J = K case: singlet states characterized by directed loops on honeycomb lattice



local loops -> extensive number of loops

number of undirected loops = $2 \times 2 \times 2^{(Nhex-1)}$

Ν	undirected	directed	lin. ind.
12	32	69	48
27	1024	2551	2485
36	8192	22437	

The J = K case: other irreps also appear



What is the origin of the higher SU(3) irreps?

Lifting the degeneracy: K - J2 model $K = \cos \alpha$ ED in the Hilbert space spanned by singlets, 27 sites $J_2 = \sin \alpha$ 0.04 FSS FSS



E-E0

Lifting the degeneracy: K - J2 model



Topological sectors (polarizability)

 $2\pi i$

6



we calculate the eigenvalues of the polarization operator:

$$p = \sum_{j \in \text{bonds}} \omega^{l(j)} \mathscr{P}_j$$

Topological sectors (polarizability)



H. Lee, Y. Oh, J. H. Han, and H. Katsura Resonating valence bond states with trimer motifs Phys Rev B **95**, 060413(R) (2017)



Trimers are not the singlets of an SU(3) models (antisymmetry missing).

They defined winding numbers, leading to 3 topological sectors along both direction (Z3 vs Z2 in dimer coverings).



Xiao-Yu Dong, Ji-Yao Chen, Hong-Hao Tu SU(3) trimer resonating-valence-bond state on the square lattice Phys. Rev. B 98, 205117 (2018).

Trimers are now singlets of an SU(3) models (antisymmetry denoted by arrows).





I. Kurecic, L. Vanderstraeten, N. Schuch, A gapped SU(3) spin liquid with Z_3 topological order, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 045116 (2019)



FIG. 1. (a) The model is constructed from trimers $|\tau\rangle$ which are in a singlet state with representation $\mathcal{H}_v \equiv \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{\overline{3}}$ at each site (green dots), to which a map \mathcal{P}_{\bullet} is applied which selects the physical degrees of freedom from $\mathcal{H}_v \otimes \mathcal{H}_v$. (b) Mapping to a \mathbb{Z}_3 topological model: Each site holds a \mathbb{Z}_3 degree of freedom: one of two arrows or no arrow. The arrows are pointing towards the **3** representation and satisfy a Gauss law across each vertex due to the fusion rules of the SU(3) irreps.



The trimer singlet is new:

parent Hamiltonian has 17 (?) sites, not shown in the papers

I. Kurecic, L. Vanderstraeten, N. Schuch, A gapped SU(3) spin liquid with Z_3 topological order, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 045116 (2019)



$$N_{\text{sites}} = \frac{3}{2}N_{\mathbf{\bar{3}}\mathbf{\bar{3}}\mathbf{\bar{3}}} + 3N_{\mathbf{333}} + \frac{3}{2}N_{\mathbf{\bar{3}}\mathbf{3}}$$
$$N_{\text{tris}} = N_{\mathbf{\bar{3}}\mathbf{\bar{3}}\mathbf{\bar{3}}} + N_{\mathbf{333}} + N_{\mathbf{\bar{3}}\mathbf{3}}$$
$$3N_{\text{tris}} = 2N_{\text{sites}}$$

from these equations: $N_{333} = 0$



creates an unhappy triangle elsewhere (unless saved by non-orthogonality)

Tensor networks: AKLT state in the SU(3) square lattice

Olivier Gauthé and Didier Poilblanc

Entanglement properties of the two-dimensional SU(3) Affleck-Kennedy-Lieb-Tasaki state

Physical Review B 96, 121115(R) (2017)



the symmetrical **15** dimensional irrep and its conjugate alternate on the sublattice sites.

Conclusions

- Designed an exact AKLT-like ground state with a simple parent Hamiltonian.
- For special cases, a macroscopically large number of states become degenerate.
- Gauss law, states characterized by topological (?) quantum numbers (sectors)
- Point separating different phases
- many open questions: Coulomb phase, fractional excitations, origin of non-singlet states,...

Francisco H. Kim, Fakher F. Assaad, Karlo Penc, Frédéric Mila: Dimensional crossover in the SU(4) Heisenberg model in the six-dimensional antisymmetric self-conjugate representation: Quantum Monte Carlo versus linear flavor-wave theory Phys. Rev. B 100, 085103/1-8 (2019) (Received 18 June 2019; published 1 August 2019)



2 competing phases





changing the anisotropy (decreasing the coupling between the chains), there is a phase transition between the VBS and ordered state deconfined quantum critical point ?

