Many-body localization in XY spin chains with long-range interactions: An exact diagonalization study
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We investigate the transition from the many-body localized phase to the ergodic thermalized phase at an infinite temperature in an XY spin chain with $L$ spins, which experiences power-law decaying interactions in the form of $V_{ij} \sim 1/|i-j|^\alpha$ ($i,j = 1, \cdots , L$) and a random transverse field. By performing large-scale exact diagonalization for the chain size up to $L = 18$, we systematically analyze the energy gap statistics, half-chain entanglement entropy, and uncertainty of the entanglement entropy of the system at different interaction exponents $\alpha$. The finite-size critical scaling allows us to determine the critical disorder strength $W_c$ and critical exponent $\nu$ at the many-body localization phase transition, as a function of the interaction exponent $\alpha$ in the limit $L \to \infty$. We find that both $W_c$ and $\nu$ diverge when $\alpha$ decreases to a critical power $\alpha_c \approx 1.16 \pm 0.17$, indicating the absence of many-body localization for $\alpha < \alpha_c$. Our result is useful to resolve the contradiction on the critical power found in two previous studies, $\alpha_c = 3/2$ from scaling argument in Phys. Rev. B 92, 104428 (2015) and $\alpha_c \approx 1$ from quantum dynamics simulation in Phys. Rev. A 99, 033610 (2019).

I. INTRODUCTION

After Anderson published his famous paper on single-particle localization in 1958 [1], he and his collaborator Fleishman considered the possibility that the insulation properties of the single-particle localization also hold in the presence of inter-particle interactions [2]. It took a long time to eventually show that this possibility is true for interacting many-body systems [3–4]. Many-body localization (MBL) since then became a flourishing research frontier that attracts intense attention from different fields of physics. For recent reviews, see, for example, Refs. [5–7].

MBL systems defy the laws of standard quantum statistics, by explicitly violating the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis [5–7] and preventing themselves from thermal equilibration. This makes them interesting to study, for the purpose of obtaining a new understanding of quantum physics. These systems are also fascinating because of their unique features to block all transport phenomena. The fact that MBL preserves the initial states of the system makes it important for practical applications such as storage systems for qubits in a quantum computer [6–8].

To date, there are a number of techniques developed to understand MBL, including analytic calculations [9], numerically exact diagonalization [8–10], renormalization group approaches such as the excited-state real-space renormalization group and density matrix renormalization groups (DMRG and its time-dependent version tDMRG) [15–20], and perturbation methods such as Born approximation [21] and self-consistent theories [22]. Recently, a renormalization flow technique, namely the Wegner-Wilson flow renormalization, has also been applied to investigate the MBL phase transition [23].

Even though MBL has now been investigated for quite a while and general consensus is slowly gained [5–7], the understanding of such an intriguing phenomenon in some many-body systems remains as a challenge. In particular, there is a debate concerning the possibility of MBL phase transition in disordered spin chains with long-range power-law decaying interactions (i.e., $V_{ij} \sim 1/|i-j|^\alpha$ for two spins at site $i$ and at site $j$) [24–26]. For a sufficiently large interaction exponent $\alpha \to \infty$, the interaction is essentially short-range, for which the existence of MBL is widely accepted [12, 33]. However, in general, one may anticipate that MBL will cease to exist when the interaction exponent is smaller than a threshold, $\alpha < \alpha_c$, where $\alpha_c$ depends on the dimensionality $d$ and also on the type of the system [24].

Actually, in the case of Anderson localization with single-particle power-law hopping terms, an old argument by Anderson establishes $\alpha_c = d$, based on the breakdown of perturbative expansion [2]. This argument was recently generalized to interacting spin systems, by considering resonant spin-pair excitations that lead to the threshold $\alpha_c = 3d/2$ for an XY chain [26] and $\alpha_c = 2d$ for a Heisenberg chain. These nice predictions, unfortunately, have not been rigorously examined by extensive numerical calculations. This seems necessary, as the breakdown of perturbation expansion is not equivalent to the breakdown of localization [29].

In a recent quantum dynamics study in one dimension (1D), growth of entanglement entropy and quantum Fisher information were simulated [31]. While the results for the Heisenberg spin chain are consistent with the predicted critical interaction exponent $\alpha_c = 2$, the results for the XY spin chain indicate $\alpha_c \approx 1$, smaller than the predicted threshold $\alpha_c = 3/2$. The disagreement for the XY chain suggests that MBL in such a system needs more stringent numerical tests. This is a timely task considering its experimental relevance. Most recently, a disordered XY chain with power-law interactions has been successfully engineered by using strings of up to 20 trapped $^{40}$Ca$^+$ ions [34].

To resolve the discrepancy between the perturbative
We can easily identify an ergodic thermalized phase at weak disorder and an MBL phase when the disorder is sufficiently strong. The finite-size scaling at different interaction exponents enables us to determine the critical disorder strength $W_c(\alpha)$ in the thermodynamic limit $L \to \infty$. We find that $W_c(\alpha)$ increases rapidly as we decrease the interaction exponent $\alpha$ down to 1.0. At the same time, the uncertainty of $W_c(\alpha)$ indicated by the finite-size scaling also dramatically increases. By using a power-law fit to $W_c(\alpha)$, we extract a critical interaction exponent $\alpha_c \approx 1.16 \pm 0.17$, which is consistent with the dynamics simulation [31]. We do not find any singular behavior of the critical disorder strength $W_c$ at $\alpha = 3/2$, which is in tension with the prediction by the perturbative argument based on the consideration of resonant spin-pair excitations [26].

II. DISORDERED 1D XY SPIN CHAINS

We consider an XY chain with total $L$ spins in a random transverse field with power-law decaying interactions, described by the model Hamiltonian [31] [34],

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq L} \frac{J_0}{|j-i|^{\alpha}} \left( \hat{\sigma}_i^x \hat{\sigma}_j^x + \hat{\sigma}_i^y \hat{\sigma}_j^y \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{L} h_i \hat{\sigma}_i^z \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma_i^\pm = (\hat{\sigma}_i^x \pm i \hat{\sigma}_i^y)/2$ and $\hat{\sigma}_i^z$ are the Pauli matrices at site $i$ and we take an exchange interaction strength $J_0 = 1$ as the units of energy. The interaction exponent $\alpha > 0$ characterizes the range of interactions. In the case of an infinitely large $\alpha \to \infty$, we recover the short-range nearest-neighbor interaction. The random transverse field $h_i$ is uniformly distributed in the interval $[-W, +W]$. This model has conserved $z$-component of total spin operator $\hat{S}_z = \sum_{i=1}^{L} \hat{\sigma}_i^z$, i.e., $[\hat{H}, \hat{S}_z] = 0$. As a result, we consider the sector $\hat{S}_z = 0$.

To examine MBL at infinite temperature, we consider the many-body energy levels near zero energy. This is obvious for short-range interactions, where the energy levels distribute symmetrically with respect to zero energy. In our case with long-range interactions, we may define an average energy $\epsilon$ of the system at temperature $T$, $\epsilon = \text{Tr}(\hat{H} e^{-\beta \hat{H}})/\text{Tr}(e^{-\beta \hat{H}})$, where $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$. By evaluating $\epsilon$ using ED at different interaction exponents, we find that $\epsilon$ always are very close to zero when we increase the temperature to infinity.

In our simulations, the model Hamiltonian is solved by ED and the 50 eigenstates with energy closest to zero energy $\epsilon = 0$ are chosen. For each point evaluated at certain disorder strength $W$ and interaction exponent $\alpha$, various MBL indicators are calculated for this set of eigenstates and are averaged over 10$^3$ different disorder realizations (600 for the largest system size $L = 18$).
FIG. 2. Averaged ratio of successive gaps $\langle r \rangle$ for $\alpha = 2.5$ (top), $\alpha = 1.2$ (middle) and $\alpha = 0.5$ (bottom), at different spin chain lengths. The dashed blue line indicates the thermal limit, $\langle r \rangle_{\text{GOE}} \approx 0.5307$, whereas the red dashed line shows the localized limit, $\langle r \rangle_{\text{Poisson}} \approx 0.3863$. The insets highlight the area near the phase transition, where the crossing point between curves with different chain lengths is anticipated to appear.

III. MBL INDICATORS WITH FINITE SPINS

The first convenient MBL indicator is the energy gap statistics characterized by the averaged ratio of successive gaps $\langle r \rangle = \langle \min\{\delta_{n+1, \delta_n}\} / \max\{\delta_{n+1, \delta_n}\} \rangle$, where $\delta_n \equiv E_{n+1} - E_n$ and $E_n$ is the energy of the $n$th eigenstate closest to zero energy. This ratio takes values between $\langle r \rangle_{\text{GOE}} \approx 0.5307$ for a Gaussian orthogonal ensemble (GOE) in the thermalized phase and $\langle r \rangle_{\text{Poisson}} \approx 2\ln(2) - 1 \approx 0.3863$ for a Poisson distribution in the MBL phase. The disorder strength dependences of $\langle r \rangle$ at $\alpha = 2.5, 1.2$ and 0.5 are presented in Fig. 2 (from top to bottom), together with the two limiting values indicated by the blue and red dashed lines, respectively.

In all the subplots, the gap statistics are close to the GOE prediction at weak disorder and approach the Poisson limit at sufficiently strong disorder, indicating the possibility of a phase transition in between. At an infinite system size, the phase transition would manifest itself as a sudden jump in $\langle r \rangle$ from GOE to Poisson limits at a certain critical disorder strength $W_c$. For the finite-size system simulated in this work, we instead see a smooth crossover, as anticipated. The possible existence of a phase transition may be characterized by the crossing point between curves corresponding to $L$ and $L - 2$ spins, which approaches $W_c$ as $L$ increases and hence provides a lower-bound estimation of $W_c$. As shown in the insets, for $\alpha = 2.5$ we find a clear drift of the cross point at about $W \sim 2.5$. For $\alpha = 1.2$, the shift of the cross point becomes difficult to identify. The situation for $\alpha = 0.5$ is even worse. The crossing point seems to lie at much stronger disorder strength around $W \sim 30$, where the quality of the data does not allow us to determine possible crossing points. Overall, we find that the MBL transition, if it exists, becomes increasingly difficult to occur as the interaction exponent $\alpha$ decreases.

The crossing points may also be seen in the normalized half-chain entanglement entropy $S_E/S_T$ at finite spins, which is another MBL diagnostics. At finite $L$, the normalization is provided by the Page value $S_T \equiv (L\ln 2 - 1)/2$ for a random pure state. In the thermal phase $S_E$ is expected to reach $S_T$, exhibiting a volume law; while deep in the MBL phase it would follow an area law and become independent of the system size, making $S_E/S_T$ vanishingly small for large system size. These two lim-
Fig. 4. Uncertainty of the entanglement entropy $\delta S_L$ exponentations are worth noting. First, for the largest interaction exponents, with increasing $L$ the peak positions of the curves move towards stronger disorder. As the final MBL indicator, we check the uncertainty $\delta S_L$ at the three interaction exponents $\alpha = 0.5$ (top), $\alpha = 1.2$ (middle) and $\alpha = 2.5$ (bottom), divided by the Page value $S_T \equiv (L \ln 2 - 1)/2$, as a function of the disorder strength at different chain sizes $L$. For all the interaction exponents, with increasing $L$ the peak positions of $\delta S_L$ increase super-linearly with $L$.

As the final MBL indicator, we check the uncertainty $\delta S_L$ at the three interaction exponents $\alpha = 0.5$ (top), $\alpha = 1.2$ (middle) and $\alpha = 2.5$ (bottom), divided by the Page value $S_T \equiv (L \ln 2 - 1)/2$, as a function of the disorder strength at different chain sizes $L$. For all the interaction exponents, with increasing $L$ the peak positions of $\delta S_L$ increase super-linearly with $L$.

As the final MBL indicator, we check the uncertainty $\delta S_L$ at the three interaction exponents $\alpha = 0.5$ (top), $\alpha = 1.2$ (middle) and $\alpha = 2.5$ (bottom), divided by the Page value $S_T \equiv (L \ln 2 - 1)/2$, as a function of the disorder strength at different chain sizes $L$. For all the interaction exponents, with increasing $L$ the peak positions of $\delta S_L$ increase super-linearly with $L$.

As the final MBL indicator, we check the uncertainty $\delta S_L$ at the three interaction exponents $\alpha = 0.5$ (top), $\alpha = 1.2$ (middle) and $\alpha = 2.5$ (bottom), divided by the Page value $S_T \equiv (L \ln 2 - 1)/2$, as a function of the disorder strength at different chain sizes $L$. For all the interaction exponents, with increasing $L$ the peak positions of $\delta S_L$ increase super-linearly with $L$.

As the final MBL indicator, we check the uncertainty $\delta S_L$ at the three interaction exponents $\alpha = 0.5$ (top), $\alpha = 1.2$ (middle) and $\alpha = 2.5$ (bottom), divided by the Page value $S_T \equiv (L \ln 2 - 1)/2$, as a function of the disorder strength at different chain sizes $L$. For all the interaction exponents, with increasing $L$ the peak positions of $\delta S_L$ increase super-linearly with $L$. The inset in the bottom panel blows up the thermalized phase. As the interaction exponent $\alpha$ decreases from 2.5 to 1.2, the universal curve obtained from the critical scaling changes significantly.

Fig. 5. Finite-size critical scaling collapse for the data of the half-chain entanglement entropy $S_E/L$ at $\alpha = 2.5$ (top) and $\alpha = 1.2$ (bottom). The data at different chain lengths are shown by blue squares ($L = 18$), green circles ($L = 16$), red triangles ($L = 14$) and black diamonds ($L = 12$). The inset shows the growth in $\delta S_E/S_T$ at $\alpha = 0.5$ (top), $\alpha = 1.2$ (middle) and $\alpha = 2.5$ (bottom). The case of an intermediate interaction exponent, $\alpha = 2$, turns out to be marginal and the half-chain entanglement entropy $S_E$ at different chain lengths is much faster. As $L$ increases the peak position scales as it essentially plays the same role of the crossing point.

As the final MBL indicator, we check the uncertainty $\delta S_L$ at the three interaction exponents $\alpha = 0.5$ (top), $\alpha = 1.2$ (middle) and $\alpha = 2.5$ (bottom), divided by the Page value $S_T \equiv (L \ln 2 - 1)/2$, as a function of the disorder strength at different chain sizes $L$. For all the interaction exponents, with increasing $L$ the peak positions of $\delta S_L$ increase super-linearly with $L$. The critical exponent $\nu$ turns out to be very different in the two cases.

From the three MBL indicators, we may conclude the existence and absence of the MBL phase transition at large ($\alpha = 2.5$) and small interaction exponents ($\alpha = 0.5$), respectively. The case of an intermediate interaction exponent, i.e., $\alpha = 1.2$, turns out to be marginal and requires further exploration.
IV. FINITE-SIZE SCALING

We thus consider the finite-size scaling properties of the data for the three MBL indicators. Focusing on the normalized half-chain entanglement entropy $S_E / L$ near the MBL transition (i.e., $W \sim W_c$), the data might be fit to the scaling form \[ S_E(L,W) = L \tilde{f} \left[ \frac{L}{\xi(W)} \right] = L \tilde{f} \left[ (W-W_c) L^{1/\nu} \right], \]

where $\xi(W) \propto |W-W_c|^{-\nu}$ is the correlation length near the transition and $\nu$ is the critical exponent. As shown in Fig. 5, we find that for both $\alpha = 2.5$ and $\alpha = 1.2$, the normalized entropy data sets at different chain lengths collapse nicely onto each other. A similar scaling collapse is also observed for the spectral gap statistics (see Appendix B). The excellent scaling collapse might be viewed as a convincing confirmation of the existence of an MBL phase transition, particularly for the case of $\alpha = 1.2$, where the naïve trace of the crossing points in both $\langle r \rangle$ and $S_E / S_T$ fails to draw conclusions. We note, however, that the scaling collapse at $\alpha = 1.2$ comes with large errors for the critical disorder strength $W_c$ and critical exponent $\nu$, both of which are used as fitting parameters in the data collapse. This is an important feature we shall discuss in the following.

The same finite-size scaling analysis is applied to multiple data sets of $S_E / L$ for $\alpha$ in the range $[1.0, 2.5]$. The resulting critical disorder strength and critical exponent are reported in Fig. 6. With decreasing $\alpha$ close to 1.0, it is easy to see that both parameters start to diverge, along with a dramatically increasing uncertainty. This is a strong indication of the existence of a critical interaction exponent $\alpha_c$, below which the system is unable to be many-body localized even for an arbitrarily strong disorder.

To determine $\alpha_c$, we fit $W_c(\alpha)$ and $\nu(\alpha)$ by using the following power-law formalism,

$$\eta(\alpha) = A_\eta (\alpha - \alpha_{c,\eta})^{-\gamma_\eta},$$

where $\eta$ stands for either $W_c$ or $\nu$. As the system size in our simulation is still relatively small, the divergence in $W_c(\alpha)$ and $\nu(\alpha)$ can not fully manifest itself when $\alpha$ is close to $\alpha_c$. To overcome this subtlety, we impose a low-bound $\alpha_f$ and only the data at $\alpha > \alpha_f$ are selected for the curve fitting. We choose $\alpha_f$ in such a way that the fitting errors for the fitting parameters $A_\eta$, $\gamma_\eta$ and $\alpha_{c,\eta}$ are minimized (see Appendix B).

For the critical disorder strength, the best fit then leads to $\alpha_f = 1.3$, $\gamma_{W_c} = 0.78 \pm 0.06$, and $\alpha_{c,W_c} = 1.16 \pm 0.03$. For the critical exponent, we instead obtain $\alpha_f = 1.2$, $\gamma_{\nu} = 0.38 \pm 0.02$, and $\alpha_{c,\nu} = 1.17 \pm 0.01$. The different exponents $\gamma$ found in the two fittings should not be taken seriously, since in principle there is no constraint for their equality. It is remarkable that the two fittings lead to essentially the same critical interaction exponent $\alpha_c \approx 1.16$. We note that, here the error for $\alpha_c$ only counts for the numerical error of the curve fitting. It does not fully include the large uncertainty in $W_c(\alpha)$ and $\nu(\alpha)$ near $\alpha_c$ that we emphasized earlier. To take them into account in a more reasonable way, we use the bootstrap resampling (see Appendix C). We find $\alpha_{c,W_c} = 1.16 \pm 0.17$ and $\alpha_{c,\nu} = 1.17 \pm 0.14$. Conservatively, we therefore conclude,

$$\alpha_c = 1.16 \pm 0.17.$$  \[4\]

This is the central result of our work.

A few remarks are now in order. First, the critical interaction exponent obtained in the above could be useful to resolve the discrepancy in $\alpha_c$, predicted by the perturbative argument based on the resonant spin-pair excitations \[26\] or calculated from the dynamics simulation for the growth of entanglement entropy and for the imbalance \[31\]. The latter (with $\alpha_c \approx 1$) is supported by our ED study. The good agreement on $\alpha_c$ suggests that the two numerical calculations complement each other. As the quantum dynamics simulation can access longer spin chains (i.e., $L = 30$ for the XY model and $L = 40$ for the Heisenberg model in \[31\]) than ED, we believe that our finite-size scaling analysis could be reliable and robust, against future ED studies with larger $L$, considering the rapidly increasing capacity in computation. There is some tension between our result $\alpha_c \approx 1.16$ and the prediction $\alpha_c = 3/2$ from the perturbative argument.
Our finite-size scaling analysis does not show any singular behavior at $\alpha = 1.5$. As we tune the interaction exponent $\alpha$ across 1.5, both the critical disorder strength $W_c$ and the critical exponent $\nu$ remain rather smoothly, with small uncertainties comparable to those at large $\alpha$ (i.e., at $\alpha = 2.5$).

Second, unless at $\alpha \lesssim 1.4$ the critical exponent $\nu(\alpha)$ determined from our finite-size scaling violates the rigorous Harris/CCFS/CLO scaling bound that requires $\nu \geq 2/d = 2$ [35–40]. This is a well-known problem for the finite-size scaling analysis of the MBL transition. For the MBL transition in models with short-range interactions, the critical exponent $\nu$ extracted from finite-size scaling is about $\nu = 0.91 \pm 0.07$ or $0.80 \pm 0.04$ (for gap statistics or entanglement entropy, up to $L = 22$ [12]) or $\nu = 1.09$ (for entanglement entropy, up to $L = 18$ [13]), which is much smaller than the prediction of $\nu = 3.1 \pm 0.3$ obtained from the real-space renormalization group analysis [19, 20]. The latter satisfies the Harris/CCFS/CLO bound, and at the same time, $\delta S(\alpha)$ stops increasing super-linearly in a consistent way. The smooth change makes us believe that the universality class of the MBL transition with long-range interactions may belong to the same universal class of short-range models [27]. This anticipation might be confirmed by a real-space renormalization group study for the long-range XY model, if possible.

Finally, it is interesting to ask, what happens if we tune the interaction exponent $\alpha$ across the critical power $\alpha_c$ at a given strong disorder $W \gg W_c$? Here, the thermal to MBL transition is controlled (or driven) by $\alpha$ and, if the transition is continuous we may anticipate the correlation length $\xi$ diverges like $\xi(\alpha) = (\alpha - \alpha_c)^{-\nu}$ near the transition. As a result, the scaling law for the MBL indicators takes the form, for example, $S_E(L, \alpha)/L = b[L^{1/\nu}(\alpha - \alpha_c)]$. The finite-size scaling analysis may then give us an alternative way to accurately determine the critical interaction exponent $\alpha_c$.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusions, exact diagonalization of the model Hamiltonian for a disordered XY spin chain with long-range interactions has been performed to address the many-body localization phase transition, with the number of spins up to 18. The energy gap statistics, half-chain entanglement entropy and uncertainty of the entanglement entropy have been calculated, as a function of the chain length $L$ for different interaction exponents $\alpha$ that characterizes the range of interactions. All the three many-body localization diagnostics, after finite-size scaling analysis, suggest the existence of a critical interaction exponent $\alpha_c \approx 1.16 \pm 0.17$, below which the many-body localization disappears for arbitrary disorder strength in the thermodynamic limit. This result may help to resolve the discrepancy on $\alpha_c$ found in two recent theoretical studies [20, 21]. On the other hand, our result could also be useful for future experiments on many-body localization, to be carried out with up to 20 trapped $^{40}$Ca$^+$ ions [34] that simulate the disorder XY model with long-range interactions at the interaction exponent $\alpha \sim 1$. At this point, the small-size limitation of our exact diagonalization study becomes less relevant.
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Appendix A: Peak position in the uncertainty of the entanglement entropy

Here we discuss in more detail the peaks appearing in the uncertainty of the entanglement entropy $\delta S_E$. To reliably locate the peak position, we sample more data.
The spectral gap statistics

FIG. 8. The critical scaling collapse for the data sets of the spectral gap statistics \( \langle r \rangle \) at \( \alpha = 2.5 \) (top) and \( \alpha = 1.2 \) (bottom). The critical disorder strength \( W_c \) and the critical exponent \( \nu \) are the same as in Fig. 5.

points close to the maximum of \( \delta S_E \). At the same time, the number of different disorder realizations is increased by a factor of 100 for the chain lengths up to \( L = 12 \) and by a factor of ten for \( L > 12 \).

Figure 7 shows the critical scaling collapse for the entanglement entropy in Fig. 5, we use a finite critical disorder strength in the thermodynamic limit. For the latter, we notice that \( W_c \) increases slowly and rapidly at \( \alpha = 2.5 \) and \( \alpha = 0.5 \), respectively. The former is a sign of convergence towards a finite critical disorder strength and the critical exponent \( \nu \). The collapse is very satisfactory, both for \( \alpha = 1 \) (upper panel) and \( \alpha = 2 \) (bottom). The critical disorder strength \( \delta S_E \) as a function of \( E \). At the same time, \( \Delta S \) and \( \Delta \nu \) increase slowly and rapidly at \( \alpha = 2 \).

Appendix B: More results on the finite-size scaling

Figure 8 reports the critical scaling collapse for the spectral gap statistics \( \langle r \rangle \) at \( \alpha = 2.5 \) (top) and \( \alpha = 1.2 \) (bottom). To show the consistency with the critical scaling for the entanglement entropy in Fig. 5, we use the same critical disorder strength \( W_c \) and the critical exponent \( \nu \). The collapse is very satisfactory, both for large (\( \alpha = 2.5 \)) and intermediate (\( \alpha = 1.2 \)) interaction exponents.

Figure 9 shows the fitting error of the parameters \( A_\nu \), \( \gamma_\eta \) and \( \alpha_{c,\eta} \), obtained by the curve fitting at a given pre-selected interaction exponent \( \alpha_f \) for the data sets \( W_c(\alpha) \) (upper panel) and \( \nu(\alpha) \) (lower panel). There is a minimum for the fitting errors, occurring at \( \alpha_f = 1.3 \) for \( W_c(\alpha) \) and at \( \alpha_f = 1.2 \) for \( \nu(\alpha) \).

Appendix C: Bootstrap resampling

For a given set of data points \( X = \{x_i, y_i\} \), we usually fit them with a function \( f(x; \vec{a}) \) with fitting parameters \( \vec{a} \) using standard softwares such as gnuplot and MATLAB, which do not fully take into account the error \( \delta y_i \) for the calculated or measured value \( \bar{y}_i \). This is partly due to the non-linearity of the fitting function. To treat \( \delta y_i \) in a more confident way, a good strategy is resampling the data points by assuming noise \( \delta y_i \). This is the so-called bootstrap resampling.

To implement the bootstrap resampling, for each data point \( \{x_i, \bar{y}_i\} \), we assume a normal distributed \( y_i \) around the mean value \( \bar{y}_i \). Then we generate a number of new data sets \( X_k = \{x_i, \bar{y}_i\}_{k} \), \( k \in N_{\text{boot}} \), where \( N_{\text{boot}} \) is a sufficiently large integer. For each generated data set \( X_k \), we perform the fitting procedure and obtain fitting parameters \( \vec{a}_k \) with estimated errors. These estimated errors lead to a standard deviation \( \bar{s}_{\text{boot}} \), which can be considered as a confident uncertainty of \( \vec{a} \), i.e.,

\[
\Delta \vec{a} = \sqrt{\frac{N_{\text{boot}}}{N_{\text{boot}} - 1} \bar{s}_{\text{boot}}^2}.
\]

In our calculations, we choose \( N_{\text{boot}} \sim 10^5 \). The bootstrap resampling leads to

\[
\alpha_{c,w} = 1.16 \pm 0.17, \quad \gamma_w = 0.78 \pm 0.25,
\]

for the data set of critical disorder strength with \( \alpha_f = 1.3 \).
\begin{align}
\alpha_{c,\nu} &= 1.17 \pm 0.14, \quad \text{(C4)} \\
\gamma_{\nu} &= 0.38 \pm 0.10, \quad \text{(C5)}
\end{align}

for the data set of critical exponent with \( \alpha_f = 1.2 \).


