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We introduce a scheme to perform Monte Carlo Renormalization Group with the coupling constants of the system Hamiltonian encoded in a tensor network. With this scheme we compute the tangent space to the manifold of the critical Hamiltonians representable by a tensor network at the closest-neighbor critical coupling for three models: the two and three dimensional Ising models and the two dimensional three-state Potts model.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the application of Renormalization Group (RG) to critical phenomena, there has been a continuing progress in realizing the RG program non-perturbatively. In dealing with classical lattice models, two successful numerical implementations of real-space RG are Monte Carlo Renormalization Group (MCRG) and a variety of algorithms under the general name tensor network renormalization group (TNRG). MCRG uses Monte Carlo (MC) sampling to compute, in a truncated space of coupling terms, the renormalized Hamiltonian and the Jacobian matrix of the RG transformation of the block-spin variables, according to an a priori chosen coarse-graining procedure, such as the majority rule. Here and in the following, we incorporate the thermodynamical parameters of the system, such as the temperature, into the definition of a Hamiltonian, treating them as the coupling constants of the system. On the other hand, TNRG starts with a tensor network representation of the system partition function. At each RG iteration, it locally contracts the finer tensor network to obtain a renormalized tensor network defined on a coarser length scale so that the partition functions represented by the fine and the coarser tensor network differ by as small a truncation error as possible. So far, the two methods have been developed independently with little cross-fertilization from each other. Here we describe how MCRG can be performed with coupling constants encoded in a tensor network. In doing so, we determine the tangent space to the set of critical Hamiltonians representable by a tensor network, whose significance we discuss below.

In a proper implementation of renormalization, the theory of RG requires that

A) the non-critical microscopic Hamiltonians flow into trivial fixed-points characteristic of the phases they represent

B) different critical microscopic Hamiltonians flow into a unique non-trivial fixed-point in the absence of marginal RG operators

For any numerical RG implementation, it is not immediately obvious that these two requirements are satisfied. In fact, for TNCG, even requirement A presented a challenge to its first example, the Tensor Renormalization Group (TRG). In TRG, the corner double line (CDL) tensor, which describes a lattice of independent small spin clusters, does not flow into the infinite-temperature fixed-point as expected, but to its own distinct fixed-point. To solve this issue, subsequent TNRG algorithms have found different ways to produce a proper RG flow. A reassuring consequence of restoring the proper RG structure is that the numerical error of these algorithms is all much smaller than TRG. Under these algorithms, only the critical tensor flows into a non-trivial tensor, and the destination of the renormalization is indeed fixed, i.e. the tensor at the \( n \)th iteration equals to the tensor at the \( (n+1) \)st iteration up to gauge freedom for sufficiently large \( n \). The success of the later TNRG algorithms reveals that a proper fixed-point tensor likely exists in TNCG, as required by the theory of RG, and that it is important to respect the proper structure of RG for numerical efficiency.

In this paper, we focus on requirement B. The set of all critical Hamiltonians of a system is typically a differentiable manifold, and is called the critical manifold of the system. We call the set of critical Hamiltonians representable by a tensor network the tensor network critical manifold (TNCM), which is a submanifold of the critical manifold. The invariance of the fixed-point Hamiltonian with respect to the change of the microscopic Hamiltonian along the critical manifold has been observed for the majority-rule coarse-graining procedure in the 2D and 3D Ising model by MCRG. Similarly, one would expect that in TNCG as a critical microscopic tensor is perturbed along the tangent space of TNCM, the change in the final renormalized tensor at a sufficiently large iteration level should change at most to quadratic order of the perturbation. This is a very interesting issue which concerns with the deep mystery of universality. To the best knowledge of the author, this invariance has not been checked for TNRG algorithms, partly due to the fact that the tangent space to TNCM is not known.

As mentioned above, we compute here the tangent space to TNCM using a technique recently introduced in MCRG for the 2D and 3D Ising model and the 2D three-state Potts model. We hope that the tangent space to TNCM reported here can help further clarify the renormalization procedure in TNRG algorithms. The pa-
per is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the scheme to perform MCRG with tensor networks. In Sec. III, we review the method to compute the tangent space to the critical manifold with MCRG. In IV, we report the results on the example models. In V, we discuss and conclude.

II. MONTE CARLO RENORMALIZATION GROUP WITH TENSOR NETWORKS

We first review the tensor network representation of a classical partition function. Although the representation is general, for concreteness let us consider the two-dimensional Ising model on a square lattice with the Hamiltonian:

\[ H(\sigma) = -K \sum_{\langle x,y \rangle} \sigma_x \sigma_y \]  (1)

where \( \langle x, y \rangle \) denotes nearest-neighbor pairs and \( \sigma_x = \pm 1 \) on each lattice site. \( K > 0 \) is the coupling constant. Its partition function has a tensor network representation shown in Fig. 1.

\[ Z = \sum_{ijkl} A^a_{ijkl} A^b_{pqri} A^c_{nojm} \cdots \]  (2)

where the superscripts, \( a, b, c, \ldots \), on \( A \) denote the distinct tensors located at different positions on the lattice. The tensor indices, \( ijk \ldots \), take values 0 or 1, labeling a tensor of bond dimension \( \chi = 2 \). One can also label the spin associated with tensor \( A^a \) by its relative position, \( x \), to \( A^a \) with the notation \( \sigma_x^a \). As shown in Fig. 1 (right panel), there can be four relative positions in a 2D square lattice: \( x = 0, 1, 2, 3 \). Note that each spin in the 2D square lattice is associated with two tensors, and can serve, for example, both as \( \sigma_0^a \) and \( \sigma_3^a \) in the left panel of Fig. 1. We have also defined the tensor indices of \( A \) to be written as \( A_{i0i1i2i3} \) where the tensor legs 0, 1, 2, 3 are labelled in Fig. 1 (right). For example, to describe the homogeneous Ising model in Eq. 1, the four-leg tensor \( A^a \) has tensor elements:

\[ A^a_{i0i1i2i3} = e^{K(\eta_0 \eta_1 + \eta_1 \eta_2 + \eta_2 \eta_3 + \eta_3 \eta_0)} \]  (3)

where \( \eta_i \) is the Ising spin associated with the tensor index \( i \):

\[ \eta_i \equiv \begin{cases} -1, & i = 0 \\ 1, & i = 1 \end{cases} \]  (4)

To perform MCRG, one needs to write the partition function as a configuration sum in terms of a Hamiltonian \( H(\sigma) \):

\[ Z = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} e^{-H(\sigma)} \]  (5)

and the Hamiltonian needs to be written as a sum of \( N_c \) coupling terms, \( S_\beta(\sigma) \):

\[ H(\sigma) = \sum_{\beta=1}^{N_c} K_\beta S_\beta(\sigma) \]  (6)

where \( K_\beta \) is the coupling constant of the corresponding coupling term labeled by \( \beta \). Traditionally, the coupling terms have been chosen as spin products, such as the nearest-neighbor product. The partition function in Eq. 2 and Eq. 5 will be equal if the Hamiltonian is given by:

\[ H(\sigma) = \sum_{a=1}^{N_A} \ln(A^a_{i0i1i2i3}) \]  (7)

when \( \sigma_0^a = \eta_0, \sigma_1^a = \eta_1, \sigma_2^a = \eta_2, \sigma_3^a = \eta_3 \). Here \( N_A \) is the number of tensors in the network. Thus, the Hamiltonian which gives the same partition function as does the tensor network is the following:

\[ H(\sigma) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_A} \sum_{i0i1i2i3} \ln A^a_{i0i1i2i3} \delta_{\sigma_0^a, \eta_0} \delta_{\sigma_1^a, \eta_1} \delta_{\sigma_2^a, \eta_2} \delta_{\sigma_3^a, \eta_3} \]  (8)

In translationally invariant systems, \( \ln A^a_{i0i1i2i3} \) is independent from \( a \), and

\[ H(\sigma) = \sum_{i0i1i2i3} \ln A^a_{i0i1i2i3} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_A} \delta_{\sigma_0^a, \eta_0} \delta_{\sigma_1^a, \eta_1} \delta_{\sigma_2^a, \eta_2} \delta_{\sigma_3^a, \eta_3} \]

\[ \equiv \sum_{\beta=1}^{N_c} K_\beta S_\beta(\sigma) \]  (9)

where we have identified the logarithm of each tensor element, \( \ln A^a_{i0i1i2i3} \), as one coupling constant \( K_\beta \) with a corresponding coupling term \( S_\beta(\sigma) \). Thus, the ordered tuple \( i0i1i2i3 \) plays the role of \( \beta \):

\[ K_\beta = K_{i0i1i2i3} = \ln A^a_{i0i1i2i3} \]  (10)
and

\[ S_\beta(\sigma) = S_{i_1i_2i_3}(\sigma) = \sum_{n=1}^{N_A} \delta_{\sigma_0,\eta_0} \delta_{\sigma_1,\eta_1} \delta_{\sigma_2,\eta_2} \delta_{\sigma_3,\eta_3} \]

(11)

For a tensor network with \( n \) legs and bond dimension \( \chi \) on each leg, there are therefore \( N_c = \chi^n \) coupling terms, for example in 16 the case of 2D square lattice Ising model. MCRG can then be performed with Eq. 3

Note that in most TNRG algorithms, with the exception of Non-negative Tensor Network Renormalization[12] the tensor elements are not always non-negative along the RG flow, and thus cannot be interpreted as a Hamiltonian. However, since we are interested in the tensors before any renormalization, which are element-wise positive, taking the logarithm does not pose a problem.

III. THE TANGENT SPACE TO THE CRITICAL MANIFOLD

When used to represent Hamiltonians with Eq. 2 the tensor network states in Fig. 1 span a \( k \) dimensional vector space of the Hamiltonians. For example, after taking account of the symmetry and the multiplicative freedom of a tensor network, \( k = 3 \) in the case of 2D square lattice Ising model as will be explained later. Embedded in this vector space is a \( k - p \) dimensional manifold of the Hamiltonians that are critical, where \( p \) is the number relevant RG operators of the system, or the codimension of the critical manifold. For the Ising models, for example, \( p = 1 \) in the \( Z_2 \) symmetric coupling space. Here we compute the tangent space to the critical manifold in this vector space exploiting the fact that the fixed-point Hamiltonian of the system after many iterations of majority-rule coarse-graining is invariant with respect to the change of the microscopic Hamiltonian along the critical manifold.

In an MCRG calculation, block-spins \( \sigma' \) are defined with a conditional probability \( T(\sigma' | \sigma) \) given the unrenormalized spin configuration \( \sigma \), which realizes the scale transformation. In the rest of the paper, we use \( T \) to represent the \( b = 2 \) majority-rule with a random pick on ties, where \( b \) is the linear size of a spin block. \( T \) can be iterated \( n \) times to define the \( n \)-th order block-spins \( \mu \):

\[ T^{(n)}(\mu | \sigma) = \sum_{\sigma^{(n-1)}} \sum_{\sigma^{(i)}} T(\mu | \sigma^{(n-1)}) \ldots T(\sigma^{(1)} | \sigma) \]

(12)

This defines the \( n \)-th level renormalized Hamiltonian \( H^{(n)}(\mu) \) up to an \( \mu \)-independent constant \( g \):

\[ H^{(n)}(\mu) = -\ln \sum_{\sigma} T^{(n)}(\mu | \sigma) e^{-H^{(0)}(\sigma)} + g = \sum_{\alpha} K^{(n)}_{\alpha} S_{\alpha}(\mu) + g \]

(13)

where \( K^{(n)}_{\alpha} \) is the \( n \)-th level renormalized coupling constant associated with the coupling term \( S_{\alpha}(\mu) \). The subscript \((0)\) refers to the unrenormalized system. As the coarse-graining is iterated, the change of \( H^{(0)} \) along the critical manifold produces a change in \( H^{(n)} \) that decays exponentially with \( n \), and thus for sufficiently large \( n \), \( H^{(n)} \) can be viewed as invariant as \( H^{(0)} \) changes along the critical manifold. In particular, the tangent space to the critical manifold will be the kernel of the Jacobian matrix of the \( n \)-th level RG transformation:

\[ A^{(n,0)}_{\alpha\beta} \partial K^{(0)}_{\beta} = 0, \quad \text{where } A^{(n,0)}_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\partial K^{(n)}_{\alpha}}{\partial K^{(0)}_{\beta}} \]

(14)

In general, the number of coupling terms to completely describe the renormalized Hamiltonian grows combinatorially with the renormalized lattice size and is infinite on an infinite lattice. One cannot include all the coupling terms necessary to represent \( H^{(n)} \) in practice, thus a finite number of renormalized coupling terms are used and a truncation error is incurred. However, as long as the truncation is well-defined, i.e. the truncation from \( H^{(n)} \) to \( K^{(n)}_{\text{truncate}} \) is unique, the invariance of \( H^{(n)} \) with respect to the change of \( K^{(0)} \) along the critical manifold dictates the invariance of \( K^{(n)}_{\text{truncate}} \) as well. Thus, one can replace the \( K^{(n)}_{\alpha} \) in Eq. 14 with \( K^{(n)}_{\alpha,\text{truncate}} \), and the kernel of \( A^{(n,0)}_{\alpha\beta} \) will still be the tangent space to the critical manifold with no truncation error. In the following, we use \( K^{(n)}_{\alpha} \) to denote the truncated renormalized constants.

Here we adopt the truncation scheme given by the Variational Monte Carlo Renormalization Group (VMCRG[5]) which considers the bias potentials \( V(\mu) \) of the coarse-grained variable \( \mu \) expanded in a finite set of renormalized couplings \( S_{\alpha}(\mu) \) with parameters \( J_\alpha \):

\[ V(\mu) = \sum_{\alpha} J_\alpha S_{\alpha}(\mu) \]

(15)

VMCRG minimizes a functional \( \Omega[V] \) of the bias potentials \( V \), defined as the the relative entropy

\[ \Omega[V] = D_{KL}(P_I || P_V) \]

(16)

between the bias distribution under \( V \):

\[ P_V(\mu) \propto \sum_{\sigma} \exp(-H^{(0)}(\sigma)) T^{(n)}(\mu | \sigma) \exp(-V(\mu)) \]

(17)

and the trivial distribution \( P_I(\mu) \). \( \Omega[V] \) can also be written as

\[ \Omega[V] = \ln \sum_{\mu} \exp(-H^{(n)}(\mu) - V(\mu)) + \sum_{\mu} P_I(\mu) V(\mu) \]

(18)

up to a constant. It was shown that \( \Omega[V] \) is convex and its unique minimizer \( V_{\text{min}} = \sum_{\alpha} J_{\alpha,\text{min}} S_{\alpha}(\mu) \) can be found with stochastic gradient descent so that the correlation length and time in the sampling of the bias distribution in Eq. 17 are greatly reduced with \( V_{\text{min}} \). If the set of coupling terms \( S_{\alpha} \) is complete, \( V_{\text{min}}(\mu) = \sum_{\alpha} J_{\alpha,\text{min}} S_{\alpha}(\mu) = -H^{(n)}(\mu) \). We thus identify

\[ K^{(n)}_{\alpha} = -J_{\alpha,\text{min}} \]

(19)
Within VMCRG, the truncated RG Jacobian matrix can then be computed by inverting the following equation:\[23\]

\[\sum_{\alpha} \langle S_{\gamma}(\mu), S_{\alpha}(\mu) \rangle V_{\text{min}} \frac{\partial K_{\alpha}^{(n)}}{\partial \beta_\beta} = \langle S_{\gamma}(\mu), S_{\beta}(\sigma) \rangle V_{\text{min}} \]

where \(\langle X, Y \rangle V_{\text{min}} = \langle XY \rangle V_{\text{min}} - \langle X \rangle V_{\text{min}} \langle Y \rangle V_{\text{min}}\) is the connected correlation function of observable \(X\) and \(Y\) in the ensemble sampled according to Eq. 17 with \(V_{\text{min}}\).

For systems whose critical manifold has codimension 1, its tangent space \(\{\delta K_{\beta}^{(n)}\}\) is a hypersurface and is determined by its normal vector \(v\):

\[\sum_\beta v_\beta \delta K_{\beta}^{(n)} = 0 \quad (21)\]

Thus each row vector of \(A_{\alpha\beta}^{(n,0)}\) is a normal vector, and they should all be the same after normalization. If this is the case in our calculation, then it is an attestation to the assumption that an invariant fixed-point Hamiltonian exists under the majority-rule, that the microscopic Hamiltonian sampled is critical, and that the critical manifold has codimension 1. This will serve as a good consistent check for our calculation.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

A. 2D square lattice Ising model

As demonstrated in Eq. 9 there is one coupling term for each tensor element. The space of Hamiltonians representable by a tensor network in Fig. 1 is thus spanned by 16 coupling terms for the 2D square lattice Ising model. However, if we are only interested in the tensor networks representing the Hamiltonians symmetric under spin flip and the symmetry transformation of the underlying lattice, certain tensor elements should be restrained to equal one another, and there are only four truly distinct tensor elements, listed in Table I. Accordingly there are also only four couplings terms. The \(\beta = 1\) coupling term, for example, will be defined as the sum of \(i_0i_1i_2i_3 = 0000\) and 1111 coupling terms:

\[S_1(\sigma) = \sum_{a=1}^{N_4} \delta_{\sigma_0,\eta_0} \delta_{\sigma_1,\eta_0} \delta_{\sigma_2,\eta_0} \delta_{\sigma_3,\eta_0} + \sum_{a=1}^{N_4} \delta_{\sigma_0,\eta_1} \delta_{\sigma_1,\eta_1} \delta_{\sigma_2,\eta_1} \delta_{\sigma_3,\eta_1} \quad (22)\]

and

\[K_1 = \ln A_{0000} = \ln A_{1111} \quad (23)\]

The coupling terms for \(\beta = 2, 3, 4\) are analogously summed with their respective symmetry partners according to Table I. The four coupling terms thus formed, however, are not linearly independent, as evidenced by the equation

\[\sum_{\beta=1}^{4} S_{\beta}(\mu) = N_A \quad (24)\]

Here we identify two Hamiltonians if they are different only by a constant, so the constant function should be treated as the zero element of the vector space of Hamiltonians. The vector space of Hamiltonians we will consider is therefore only three dimensional:

\[H(\mu) = \sum_{\beta=1}^{3} K_\beta S_\beta(\mu) + K_4(N_A - S_1(\mu) - S_2(\mu) - S_3(\mu)) = \sum_{\beta=1}^{3} (K_\beta - K_4) S_\beta(\mu) + \text{constant} = \sum_{\beta=1}^{3} K_\beta' S_\beta(\mu) + \text{constant} \quad (25)\]

The Jacobian matrix of the RG transformation which we will compute will be that of \(K_\beta'\):

\[A_{\alpha\beta}^{(n,0)} = \frac{\partial K_{\alpha}^{(n)}}{\partial \beta_\beta} \quad (26)\]

In Table II, we report the matrix \(P_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{A_{\alpha\beta}^{(n,0)}}{A_{\alpha 0}^{(n,0)}}\), computed at the nearest-neighbor critical tensor in Eq. 8 with \(K = 0.4406868\). Its rows are the normal vector to the tangent plane of TNCM, normalized so that the first element of the vector is 1. The consistency among

| \(P_{\alpha\beta}\) | \(-0.522(1)\) | \(-0.0184(3)\) |
| \(-0.522(7)\) | \(-0.018(1)\) |
| \(-0.522(3)\) | \(-0.0185(3)\) |

TABLE II. The matrix \(P_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{A_{\alpha\beta}^{(n,0)}}{A_{\alpha 0}^{(n,0)}}\) for the isotropic 2D square Ising model. A 256\(^2\) lattice was used with the renormalization level \(n = 5\). The simulations were performed on 16 cores independently, each of which ran \(3 \times 10^6\) Metropolis MC sweeps. The mean is cited as the result and twice the standard error as the statistical uncertainty.

the different rows confirms our assumptions. The statistical uncertainties of the result, however, are different for different rows, because the connected correlation functions of different coupling terms \(\alpha, \beta\) have different
variance in an MC sampling. One should always cite the result with the least statistical uncertainty. In converting the computed $\delta K'_\beta$ with $\beta = 1, 2, 3$ to the actual change in the tensor elements, $\delta K_\beta$ with $\beta = 1, 2, 3, 4$, one is free to choose the values of $\delta K_\beta$ so long as the resultant $\delta K'_\beta = \delta K_\beta - \delta K_4$ conforms to the computed value. Here we take $\delta K_\beta = \delta K'_\beta$ for $\beta = 1, 2, 3$ and $\delta K_4 = 0$. This freedom is the same multiplicative normalization freedom $\delta K = K = 1$ that respect the symmetry of the 2D square lattice is.

$$\ln A_{i_0 i_1 i_2 i_3} = K_c \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 \end{array} \right) + \delta K_2 \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 0.522(1) & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right) + \delta K_3 \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 0.0184(3) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.0184(3) \end{array} \right)$$

where $K_c = 0.4406868$, and $\delta K_2$ and $\delta K_3$ are infinitesimally small, but otherwise arbitrary.

B. 2D square lattice three-state Potts mode

Next consider the three-state Potts model on a 2D square lattice:

$$H(\sigma) = -K \sum_{\langle x, y \rangle} \delta_{\sigma_x \sigma_y}$$

(28)

where $\langle x, y \rangle$ denotes nearest-neighbor pairs and $K > 0$. The spin at each lattice site takes on $\sigma_x = 0, 1, 2$ three possible values. The system experiences a continuous phase transition at $K_c = 1.005053$.

This model is also representable by a tensor network in Fig. 1 with bond dimension $\chi = 3$. The map from tensor indices to spin variables is simply the identity map:

$$\eta_i = i, \text{ for } i = 0, 1, 2$$

(29)

The tensor-representable Hamiltonian can again be written as in Eq. 9 with $N_c = 3^4 = 81$.

Unlike the 2D Ising model, the symmetry classes of the coupling terms are one-to-one to identify by hand. VMCRG, however, can be used to find the symmetry partners of the many coupling terms. To perform this task, the renormalized constants after one iteration of $2 \times 2$ majority-rule is determined with all of the 81 couplings terms, shown in Fig. 2. The couplings with the same renormalized constants (up to some noise) are then the symmetry partners with one another. There are thus six symmetry classes and coupling terms, listed in Table III.

Eliminating the linear dependence, we use the first five coupling terms to span the space of Hamiltonians representable by a tensor network, in which is embedded a four-dimensional critical manifold. (The codimension of the critical manifold for the 2D three-state Potts model is also one.) The tangent space to TNCM is again in a tensor network state.

In the end, we present the tangent space to TNCM in matrix form by combining $i_0 i_1$ of $A_{i_0 i_1 i_2 i_3}$ as a row index $m = i_0 + 2i_1$ and $i_2 i_3$ as a column index $n = i_2 + 2i_3$.

To the linear order of $\delta K_2$ and $\delta K_3$, the set of all critical Hamiltonians representable by of a tensor network in Fig. 1 that respect the symmetry of the 2D square lattice is.

FIG. 2. Optimization trajectory of the tensor network renormalization group.

C. 3D cubic lattice Ising model

In the end, we consider the Ising model Hamiltonian of Eq. 11 in the 3D cubic lattice. Although there has not been TNRG algorithms that generate a proper RG flow for this model, we still present here the result of TNCM in anticipation of further advancement of TNRG in 3D.
In Table V. Again, eliminating the linear dependence, the symmetrized coupling terms, found with VMCRG, listed coupling terms are present by Eq. 9. Among them are 13 which admits a 11-dimensional critical manifold. The of Hamiltonians representable by a 3D tensor network, first 12 coupling terms are used to span the vector space symmetry classes. Only one representative of each class is listed.

| TABLE V. The tensor elements which belong to distinct symmetry classes. Only one representative of each class is listed. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\beta$ | $t_0 t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4 t_5 t_6 t_7$ | $\beta$ | $t_0 t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4 t_5 t_6 t_7$ |
| 1 | 00000000 | 8 | 11101000 |
| 2 | 10000000 | 9 | 10011000 |
| 3 | 11000000 | 10 | 11011000 |
| 4 | 01100000 | 11 | 01111000 |
| 5 | 11100000 | 12 | 00111100 |
| 6 | 11110000 | 13 | 10010110 |
| 7 | 01101000 |  |  |

In the cubic lattice, the tensors have eight legs, shown in Fig. 3. They are placed in a network where each spin is associated with two tensors and each nearest-neighbor bond of the lattice is accounted once by the network, similar to the case in two dimension (Fig. 1, left). $2^8 = 256$ coupling terms are present by Eq. 9. Among them are 13 symmetrized coupling terms, found with VMCRG, listed in Table V. Again, eliminating the linear dependence, the first 12 coupling terms are used to span the vector space of Hamiltonians representable by a 3D tensor network, which admits a 11-dimensional critical manifold. The matrix $P_{\alpha \beta} = \frac{A^{(n,0)}_{\alpha \beta}}{A^{(n,0)}_{n=1}}$ is rather large, so we only cite here the row with the least statistical uncertainty in Eq. 30 and note that the consistency among the rows is indeed observed. A $64^3$ lattice was used with the renormalization level $n = 3$. The simulations were performed on 464 cores independently, each of which ran $9 \times 10^5$ Metropolis MC sweeps. The mean is cited as the result and twice the standard error as the statistical uncertainty.

$$P_{1 \beta} = [1, 0.590(4), -0.151(3), -0.037(2), -0.621(3) \ldots ]$$

(30)

V. DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we have shown how MCRG can be performed with coupling constants encoded in a tensor network. While the associated finite number of coupling terms do not represent the exact renormalized Hamiltonian, the tangent space to the critical manifold can still be obtained free of truncation error. The tangent spaces to TNCM are then computed for three example models with MCRG. Although the TNRG algorithms do not deal with Hamiltonians in the coarse-graining, the structure of a fixed-point tensor does seem to survive. In principle, based on the invariance of this fixed-point tensor with respect to change in the starting tensor along TNCM, the tangent space to TNCM could also be obtained within TNRG algorithms, at least for two-dimensional lattices, if the gauge freedom can be properly accounted. The tangent space methods developed for matrix product states\textsuperscript{15}, for example, could be useful to accomplish this task. As one has more analytical control in TNRG than in MCRG, a detailed understanding of how this happens, i.e., how irrelevant operators get suppressed to produce the fixed-point, could further our understanding of universality in the RG framework.
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