Detecting transition between Abelian and non-Abelian topological orders through symmetric tensor networks
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We propose a unified scheme to identify phase transitions out of the Z2 Abelian topological order, including the transition to a non-Abelian chiral spin liquid. Using loop gas and string gas states [H.-Y. Lee, R. Kaneko, T. Okubo, N. Kawashima, Phys. Rev. Lett. 123, 087203 (2019)] on the star lattice Kitaev model as an example, we compute the overlap of minimally entangled states through transfer matrices. We demonstrate that, similar to the anyon condensation, continuous deformation of a Z2-projected entangled-pair state (PEPS) also allows us to study the transition between Abelian and non-Abelian topological orders. We show that the charge and flux anyons defined in the Abelian phase transmute into the σ anyon in the non-Abelian topological order. Furthermore, we show that both the LG and SG states have infinite correlation length in the non-Abelian regime, consistent with the recent claim that a chiral PEPS has a gapless parent Hamiltonian.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past decades, significant efforts have been devoted to understand topologically ordered phases and topological phase transitions. Topological phases [1, 2] cannot be characterized by a local order parameter and can be characterized by properties such as the ground-state degeneracy, and non-trivial quasiparticle statistics [3–7]. Recently, it is realized that these states can be understood through the quantum entanglement, using notions such as topological entanglement entropy [8–10], and entanglement spectrum [11–13]. The latter reveals the edge physics of the topological state, and can be easily computed for the projected entangled-pair states (PEPS) [14], a tensor network that has been successfully represented the ground state wavefunction for systems with both conventional and topological orders. For a symmetry group G, the G-injective PEPS [15] forms a natural framework to represent topological ordered systems. It encodes topological properties in the local symmetries on the virtual dimensions. The parent Hamiltonian of a G-injective PEPS automatically encodes the degenerate ground state subspace and supports anyonic excitations, allowing us to study the topological properties through its entanglement degrees of freedom. However, it is shown that a G-injective PEPS does not guarantee a topologically ordered phase since the system can be driven into a topologically trivial phase by a physical deformation of the local tensor [16–22]. For example, the phases and phase transitions of the two dimensional (2D) toric code (TC) model with finite string tension, whose ground state is represented by a Z2-injective PEPS [18], can be fully understood within this framework. Similar idea of detecting topological phase transitions has also been generalized to non-Abelian cases recently [23–25].

A new class of Z2-injective ansatz called loop gas (LG) and string gas (SG) is constructed to represent the ground state of the Kitaev models [5] on the honeycomb lattice [26–28]. Surprisingly, when the same ansatz is applied to the Kitaev model on the star lattice, the entanglement entropy and spectrum suggest that flux anyon in the Z2-topological order become the σ anyon in the non-Abelian chiral spin liquid (CSL) [29]. However, exact results show that the ground state subspace should be three dimensional in the non-Abelian regime [30], inconsistent with the four-fold degenerate ground state structure for the Z2-injective PEPS.

In this paper, we propose to use the overlap of MESs [31] as a unified framework to understand the phase transitions out of a Z2 topological order. Using the gauge-symmetry preserved higher-order tensor renormalization group (GSP-HOTRG) algorithm, the overlap can be obtained from the eigenvalue of the corresponding transfer matrix. Our results show that similar to the anyon condensation, the transition from an Abelian to a non-Abelian topologically ordered phase can be understood as both the charge and flux transmute into the σ anyon, resolving the mismatch between the dimension of the ground state subspace for a Z2-injective PEPS and degeneracy of the CSL ground state of the star lattice Kitaev model. We also show that the correlation lengths of LG and SG states diverge in the CSL regime, consistent with the recent claim that the parent Hamiltonian of a chiral PEPS is gapless [32–34].

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly review the properties of Z2-injective PEPS. In Sec. III, we show the relation between the overlap of MESs and the transfer matrix. In Sec. IV, we revisit the toric code with string tension and demonstrate how to detect anyon condensation transitions using the MES overlap picture. In Sec. V we apply the method to the Kitaev model on the star lattice and show how to detect the Abelian to non-Abelian topological order transition using MES overlap. We show that the flux and charge anyons transmute into the σ anyon from the full transfer matrix spectrum. We conclude in Sec. VI.

II. SYMMETRIC PEPS AND ANYONS

A translational invariant PEPS wave function can be written in terms of a local tensor A_{αβγδ} i with the physical index i and
III. MINIMAL ENTANGLED STATES AND TRANSFER MATRICES

Ground states subspace and the anyonic excitation are closely related, and we can construct a special ground state basis, the minimally entangled states (MESs), to reflect the anyonic excitation of the topological phases. Basically, the MES basis can be obtained by creating a pair of anyons on a torus, wrapping them around a closed non-contractable loop, and finally annihilating them. To be specific, a MES is the eigenstate of the Wilson loop operator with a definite type of anyon excitation; therefore we can construct the MESs in the ground state subspace by \( |\psi_A(g, \alpha)\rangle = \sum_{h \in \mathbb{Z}_2} \chi(h) |\psi_A(g, h)\rangle \), with \( g \in \{I, Z\} \) [Fig. 1(d)]. We then follow the same notation in Ref. [16] to denote \( g = I(Z) \) as 0(π)-flux and the parity \( \alpha \), as even (trivial) and odd (non-trivial). The four MESs \( |I\rangle, |e\rangle, |m\rangle, |e\rangle \) then correspond to \( |\psi_A(0, 0)\rangle, |\psi_A(0, \alpha)\rangle, |\psi_A(\pi, e\rangle), |\psi_A(\pi, \alpha)\rangle \), respectively. The overlap of MESs provides the information about the identities of the anyonic excitations and can be obtained from a transfer matrix (TM) [Fig. 2(a)]. Starting from a local tensor \( A \) representing a \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-topological order, we form a double tensor \( \mathbb{E} \) [Fig. 2(b)] by contracting the physical indices of \( A \) and its adjoint \( A^\dagger \), \( \mathbb{E} \equiv \sum_s (A^\dagger_{i,j,k,l}) \times (A^\dagger_{l',j',k',l''})^* \). The corresponding transfer matrix is given by

\[
T \equiv t\text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}^1 \mathbb{E}^2 \cdots \mathbb{E}^L).
\]

The minimally entangled topological sectors corresponding to the quasi-particles can be obtained by inserting the string operator \( Z_g = u_g^2 \) (\( g \approx 0.1 \)) along the cylinder direction and choosing the projector \( P_\alpha (\alpha = \text{even}, \text{odd}) \) in either the bra or ket. This gives us 16 blocks of transfer matrices. Since each topological sector corresponds to an MES, we can label each block by the overlap of MESs \( \langle a | b \rangle \), with \( a, b = I, e, m, e \). The transfer matrices (Fig. 2(c)) are defined as

\[
T_{\langle a | b \rangle} = T_{\langle g, \alpha | a \rangle} = P_{\alpha}^{\dagger} \left( t\text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}^1 \mathbb{E}^2 \cdots \mathbb{E}^L Z_g^2) \right) P_{\alpha}^{\dagger}.
\]

Here \( a = (g, \alpha) \) and \( b = (g', \alpha') \), \( g (\alpha) \) and \( g' (\alpha') \) label the string (parity) operator in the ket and bra layer. The largest eigenvalue \( \lambda_{\langle a | b \rangle} \) of \( T_{\langle a | b \rangle} \) gives the overlap of the two MESs in the thermodynamic limit.

In the following, we will directly refer the transfer matrix for a given block as \( \langle a | b \rangle \). The transfer matrices can be divided into four types: (a) \( \alpha = \alpha' \) and \( g = g' \) corresponds to the regular TM computing the norm of the MES, \( \langle a | a \rangle \), with \( a = I, e, m, e \) (red color in Fig. 2(c)), (b) \( \alpha \neq \alpha' \) and \( g = g' \) corresponds to the TM measuring the charge difference between the bra and ket (blue), (c) \( \alpha = \alpha' \) and \( g \neq g' \) corresponds to the TM measuring the flux difference between the bra and ket (yellow), (d) \( \alpha \neq \alpha' \) and \( g \neq g' \) corresponds to the TMs measuring the both charge and flux (fermion) difference between the bra and ket (green).

Far away from the renormalization group fixed point, the subleading eigenvalues of the transfer matrix can be interpreted as the excitation energy [17, 35], and the dominant eigenvalues of the transfer matrices measuring the charge (flux) difference can be interpreted as the charge (flux) excitation energy [17]. Similarly, the green blocks in Fig. 2(c)
alpha \neq alpha' and g \neq g' correspond to the fermionic excitation. This remarkable correspondence makes the relation between MES and anyon more apparent, allowing us to use these 16 transfer matrices to study anyon condensation. As we will discuss in the following section, by tuning the wave function without spoiling the Z2-injectivity, it is possible to drive the system from a topological ordered phase to a topological trivial phase through the condensation of anyons.

It is also possible that an anyon can transmute into another type of anyon. For example, when the D(Z4) quantum double model is continuously deformed to the toric code or the double semion model, some of the anyons distinct in the D(Z4) phase can be identified as the same [18,19]. Similarly, in the case of the Z2-injective PEPS, we can ask which anyons we can identify as the same.

Since the TM is periodic around the cylinder, we can label the states with the momentum quantum number. Interestingly, it has been shown in Ref. [17] that the momentum quantum number of |e⟩ will be shifted by half a spacing, i.e., k = 2π(n + ½)/L, where n = 0, ..., L − 1 and L is the circumference of the cylinder. This momentum polarization makes |e⟩ impossible to become other MESs. This makes sense in the anyon condensation picture that fermion can never condense (corresponds to |e⟩ ≠ |I⟩), which has been proven in the more general case [18]. Discarding the possibility that |e⟩ becomes |e⟩ or |m⟩, we are left with the only choice to identify |e⟩ and |m⟩ as the same state. Later we will see that the LG and SG states satisfy this condition.

In order to compute the dominant eigenvalue of each TM block in the thermodynamic limit, we employ the higher-order tensor renormalization group method to merge the sites. To keep the block structure during coarse graining, it is important to carefully preserve the symmetry. Here we develop a GSP-HOTRG method which extends the idea in Ref. [37] to compute the spectrum of the transfer matrices by coarse-graining along the cylinder direction (see App. A for details).

**IV. TORIC CODE WITH FINITE STRING TENSION**

Here we revisit the toric code (TC) model with finite string tension, which is the simplest example with the phase transition from a topological order to a topologically trivial phase [16][17]. We add the string tension by applying the operator Q_ε(β_x, β_z) = exp \( \frac{ξ_ε β_x^2 + ξ_z β_z^2}{4} \) to the TC,

\[
|Ψ(β_x, β_z)⟩ = \prod_ε Q_ε(β_x, β_z) \times \prod_v \left( 1 + \sum_{ε \neq v} σ^ε_z \right) \prod_p \left( 1 + \sum_{ε \in ∂p} σ^ε_z \right) |Ω⟩,
\]

where ɛ/p labels the the vertex/plaquette, and |Ω⟩ indicates the fully polarized spin state |Ω⟩ = ⊗_ε|↑⟩_ε. For β_z = 0 and β_x → ∞, the system is driven to the charge condensed (CC) phase. On the other hand, as β_x → ∞ and β_z = 0, the system is driven to the flux condensed (FC) phase. Therefore, it is expected that by tuning the parameters β_x, β_z, phase transitions will occur.

At the Z2 topological order (TO) fixed point, the eigenvalues λ_(ε|m) = 1, |ε| = I, e, m, e⟩, and zero otherwise, indicating these four MESs are orthonormal. At the fixed point of the CC phase, λ_(I|m) = λ_(I|e) = λ_(e|I) = λ_(e|e) = 1, and zero otherwise, suggesting that sector |e⟩ is identical to |I⟩ while |m⟩ and |e⟩ are confined. Similarly, at the fixed point of the FC phase, we have λ_(I|m) = λ_(I|e) = λ_(m|m) = λ_(m|e) = 1.

Along the β_z = 0 axis, there exists a phase transition from the TO to the CC phase as shown in Fig. [3]. As we increase β_z, only the regular and charge difference TMs [red and blue blocks in Fig. [2]c] are non-zero, and there are only four distinct eigenvalues: λ_(I|m) = λ_(I|e), λ_(m|m) = λ_(m|e), λ_(e|e) = λ_(e|I), λ_(m|e) = λ_(m|e). We choose one in each as a representative. The system exhibits phase transition at β_z = β_z^c ≈ 0.8814 [Fig. [3]a].

We find λ_(I|m) does not have significant change for L > 256; in the following, we will use L = 256 data to represent the thermodynamic limit. For β_x < β_x^c, λ_(m|m) = λ_(I|I) = 1 and λ_(I|e) = λ_(m|e) < 1, which is consistent with Fig. [2]c.
that the blocks in red and blue blocks should be regarded as the same, respectively. For \( \beta > \beta_c \), \( \lambda_{(1/e)} = \lambda_{(1/1)} = 1 \) and \( \lambda_{(m/m)} = \lambda_{(m/e)} < 1 \). This indicates that the classification in Fig. 2(c) no longer applies; instead, we should identify the blocks in the first (fourth) column as the same. At \( L = 1 \) and 8, for \( \beta < \beta_c \), while \( \lambda_{(1/e)} = \lambda_{(m/e)} \) in the thermodynamic limit, \( \lambda_{(1/e)} \) is always larger than \( \lambda_{(m/e)} \). This is in fact due to the \( \pi/L \) shift of momentum for \( \epsilon \) as mentioned in Sec. III. In particular, at \( \beta = \beta_c \), \( \lambda_{(m/m)} \) and \( \lambda_{(1/e)} \) are always the same regardless of the system size, as shown in Fig. 3(b). Therefore, we can accurately identify the critical point by using the crossing of \( \lambda_{(m/m)} \) and \( \lambda_{(1/e)} \) merely from a single tensor. Note that this is only true for \( \beta > \beta_c \). For \( \beta \neq 0 \), if we continuously deform \( \beta \), the crossing point will shift as we keep increasing \( L \). This arises from the fact that at this scenario, not only regular and charge difference blocks but the flux and fermion difference blocks are also non-zero. However, even if we fix \( \beta \) to other values than 0, after \( L > 4 \), the crossing point is almost fixed, meaning that we can still identify the critical point using very small system sizes.

At \( L = 256 \), \( \lambda_{(1/e)} = \lambda_{(m/m)} \to 1 \). We can interpret \( \lambda_{(1/e)} \to 1 \) as \( |e \rangle \) begins to condense and \( \lambda_{(m/m)} \to 1 \) as \( |m \rangle \) begins to confine. On the other hand, as mentioned in Sec. III since no other MES can become exactly the same as \( |e \rangle \), we know that \( \lambda_{(m/e)} \to 1 \) indicates a gapless excitation. Similarly, for the TO to FC transition, only the regular and flux difference TMs (red and yellow blocks in Fig. 2(b)) are non-zero. In fact, all the above observations and arguments can be directly adopted to this case once we switch the charge difference to flux difference.

This idea of using the non-vanishing TMs to distinguish phases, surprisingly, can also be extended to the Abelian to non-Abelian TO transition, as we will demonstrate in the next section.

V. KITAEV MODEL ON THE STAR LATTICE

We extend the ideas developed in the Sec. IV to study the phase transition from an Abelian to a non-Abelian spin TO. We will study the quantum phase transition of the Kitaev model on the star lattice by studying TMs built from the \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-injective LG and SG states \([26, 28]\). The Hamiltonian is defined as \([30]\)

\[
H = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} S_i^\gamma S_j^\gamma - J' \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle \in \gamma'} S_i^{\gamma'} S_j^{\gamma'}
\]  

(5)

where \( \langle i,j \rangle \) and \( \langle i',j' \rangle \) are the pairs on the intratriangle (\( \gamma = x,y,z \)) and the intertriangle (\( \gamma' = x',y',z' \)) links connecting site \( i \) ans \( j \) as shown in Fig. 4(a), respectively. The Hamiltonian can be block diagonalized by the eigenvalues of two types of flux operators defined on the triangle plaquette \( \hat{V}_p = \hat{\sigma}_1^x \hat{\sigma}_2^z \hat{\sigma}_3^z \) and the dodecagon plaquette \( \hat{W}_p = \hat{\sigma}_1^x \hat{\sigma}_2^z \hat{\sigma}_3^z ... \hat{\sigma}_9^z \), where \( \hat{\sigma}_i^x = i_x, i_y, i_z \) is the Pauli matrix. To gain insights into the model, we consider two extreme limits: the isolated-dimer limit (\( J = 0, J' = 1 \)) and the isolated-triangle limit (\( J = 1, J' = 0 \) [Fig 4(b)]. The perturbative study in Ref. [28] shows that in the isolated-dimer limit, while the Hamiltonian does not map exactly onto the standard toric code, the ground state is the same as the toric code on the honeycomb lattice. On the other hand, the isolated-triangle limit can be mapped onto the Kitaev honeycomb model at the isotropic point which exhibits a non-Abelian topological order. This suggests that there should exist a phase transition between the two phases. Exact results shows that the model has two distinct gapped phases: \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) topological order when \( J'/J > \sqrt{3} \) and non-Abelian CSL with Ising anyon, when \( J'/J < \sqrt{3} \). The latter can be distinguished from the former by its three-fold topological degeneracies which can be labeled using MES basis in Ising anyon: \( |I \rangle, |\sigma \rangle, |e \rangle \). In both regime, the ground states live in the vortex-free sector \( \{ V_p = 1, V_p = 1 \} \).

A. Loop gas and string gas states

Let us first consider an LG operator: \( \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} = \text{Tr} \prod_{\alpha} Q_{\alpha}^{x_{\alpha y_{\alpha z_{\alpha}}} | s \rangle \langle s' |} \) with the LG tensor defined as

\[
Q_{000} = I, Q_{011} = -iU^x, Q_{101} = -iU^y, Q_{110} = -iU^z.
\]

(6)

where \( U^\gamma = e^{i\pi S^\gamma}, \gamma = x, y, z \) is the \( \pi \)-rotation operator for a given spin (Fig. 3(a)) [28]. One can easily verify that the LG tensor is invariant under the global \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) symmetry on the virtual dimension: \( Q(u_x \otimes u_y \otimes u_y) = Q \) with \( u_x = I, \sigma^z \).

Therefore, applying \( \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} \) on any injective PEPS yields a \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-injective PEPS. \( \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} \) is a projector to the vortex-free space such that \( W_p \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} = \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} W_p = \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}}, \hat{V}_p \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} = \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} \hat{V}_p = \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} \hat{V}_p = \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} \). Another interesting property of \( \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} \) is that the creation of flux anyon pair discussed in Sec. III now corresponds to two vortices \( W_p = -1 \) at the endpoint of the string \( u_x \otimes L \) [26].

The LG state can then be obtained by applying \( \hat{Q}_{\text{LG}} \) on an initial product state \( |\Psi(\theta)\rangle = \otimes_{\alpha} |\psi_{\alpha}(\theta)\rangle \) where \( \alpha \) is the sites index for a given triangular plaquette and \( |\psi_{\alpha}(\theta)\rangle = \)}
The magnetic state \( |\theta,\gamma\rangle \) satisfies
\[
\langle \theta, \gamma | \sigma^\gamma | \theta, \gamma \rangle = \delta_{\gamma,\gamma'} \cos \theta + (1 - \delta_{\gamma,\gamma'}) \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{2}},
\]
where \( \theta \) is a tunable parameter and \( \gamma, \gamma' = x, y, z \). To simplify the notation, we follow the convention in Ref. [29] to parametrize the Hamiltonian \( H = H(\phi) \) with \( J' = \sin(\phi) \), \( J = \cos(\phi) \). The ground state for a given Hamiltonian \( H(\phi) \) can then be obtained by variationally optimizing the parameter \( \theta \) to find the lowest energy.

To gain more insights, we first consider two limits where the LG state is the exact ground state [29, 38]. However, for \( \theta \neq 0 \), the LG state is the exact ground state [29, 38].

In the isolated-dimer limit, the ground state is the same as the LG state. However, for \( \theta = 0 \), the LG state is not the exact ground state [29, 38]. Nevertheless, the LG state can be constructed as \( \psi(\theta = \pi/2) \).

\[\text{FIG. 5.} \] (a) Non-zero elements of the LG tensor. Here we denote the the virtual index \( 0(1) \) as black(red) leg. (b) The resulting states (up to a phase factor) of LG operators acting on \( |x, +\rangle \) for a given set of virtual indices. Similar expression can be derived for the initial states \( |y(\gamma, +)\rangle \). (c) The resulting states (up to a phase factor) of LG operators acting on \( |y(\gamma, +)\rangle \) for a given set of virtual indices. Here we use the thick lines to denote that the virtual legs are contracted.

\[\text{FIG. 6.} \] The overlaps of the LG states for \( \theta = 0 \) and \( \lambda \) increase from 0 increase. At \( \theta = 0 \), these two eigenvalues are exactly the same, meaning that we have reached the transition point.

In the following, we study the topological properties of the LG and SG states by computing the overlap of MESs, which corresponds to the dominant eigenvalues of the TM blocks, \( \lambda_{\langle m|b\rangle} \).

As we continuously change the parameter for both the LG and SG states, we find that only the regular and the TMs measuring the fermion difference (red and green blocks in Fig. 5) are non-zero, and there are only four distinct eigenvalues, \( \lambda_{\langle 1|1\rangle} = \lambda_{\langle e|e\rangle} \), \( \lambda_{\langle m|e\rangle} \), and \( \lambda_{\langle e|m\rangle} \), while others are zero. Therefore, in each category we choose one as the representative. Note that since \( \lambda_{\langle 1|1\rangle} \) is always the largest, we normalize it to 1.

\[\text{FIG. 6.} \] The overlaps of the LG states for \( L = 1, 8 \), and 256. For \( L = 1, 8 \), we can see that as \( \theta \) increases from 0 to \( \theta_c \), \( \lambda_{\langle m|e\rangle} \) gradually decrease and \( \lambda_{\langle e|m\rangle} \) gradually increase. At \( \theta = \theta_c \), these two eigenvalues are exactly the same, meaning that we have reached the transition point.

However, if we keep increasing \( \theta \), the \( \lambda_{\langle m|m\rangle} \) and \( \lambda_{\langle e|e\rangle} \) do not cross. Unlike the level crossing for the charge or...
flux condensation transition in the toric code with string tension (see Sec. [IV]), here the dominant eigenvalues for the TM blocks only touch, indicating that $\theta < \theta_c$ and $\theta > \theta_c$ are in the same phase. At system size $L = 256$, we find that $\lambda_{(m|e)} = \lambda_{(I|e)} < 1$ for $\theta \neq \theta_c$. This means that $\langle m|e \rangle$ and $\langle I|e \rangle$ should be regarded as the same excitation, and we group them with the same (green) color in Fig. 2(c). Therefore, all the LG states live in the topologically ordered phase, except at $\theta = \theta_c$.

At the transition point $\theta = \theta_c$, all $\lambda$’s approach 1 as the size increases. Similar to the transition points studied in Sec. [IV], $\lambda_{(I|e)} \rightarrow 1$ indicates a gapless excitation; however, we can interpret $\lambda_{(m|e)} \rightarrow 1$ as $\langle e \rangle$ and $\langle m \rangle$ become the same state. In addition, the spectrum of $\langle m|e \rangle$ shows no matter how large the system size is, it will always have two degenerate fixed point; on the other hand, $\langle m|m \rangle$ and $\langle e|e \rangle$ have a unique fixed point. This means that $\langle m \rangle$ can never be identified with $\langle e \rangle$. We find that $\lambda_{(m|e)}$ is always equal to $\lambda_{(m|m)} = \lambda_{(e|e)}$ regardless of the system size (see Fig. 6(b)). This argument can also be supported by the calculation of topological entropy $\gamma$. We find that both $\langle e \rangle$ and $\langle m \rangle$ can yield exactly the same $\gamma = 1/2 \times \ln 2$ at $\theta = \theta_c$, while $\langle I \rangle$ and $\langle e \rangle$ give $\gamma = \ln 2$. Also, by identifying $\langle e \rangle$ with $\langle m \rangle$, we can explain the three-fold degeneracy of the ground state with the correct total quantum dimension $D = \sqrt{1^2 + 1^2 + (\sqrt{2})^2} = 2$.

To obtain the SG state for each $\phi$, we optimize the free parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ in Eq. (8) to obtain the variational ground state of Eq. (5). Figure 7 shows the dominant eigenvalues of the transfer matrices constructed from the SG state. Recall that the ground state of the star lattice Kitaev is an Abelian spin liquid at $\pi/3 < \phi < \pi$, and non-Abelian at $0 < \phi < \pi/3$. For $\phi = \pi$, the SG state is $Z_2$-isometric just like the LG state at $\theta = 0$. For $L = 1$, as $\phi$ decreases from $\phi = \pi$ to $\phi \approx 0.24\pi$, $\lambda_{(m|m)}$ gradually decreases and $\lambda_{(m|e)}$ gradually increases. At $\phi \approx 0.24\pi$, these two eigenvalues become identical. Different from the transition in toric code charge condensation, if we keep decreasing $\phi$, both $\lambda_{(m|m)}$ and $\lambda_{(m|e)}$ increase together. In fact, $\lambda_{(m|e)}$ should never become larger than $\lambda_{(m|m)}$ since the dominant eigenvalues of the regular transfer matrix will always be larger than other blocks for the norm of the states to stay positive. However, the trend for $\phi < 0.24\pi$ is also different from the LG case. The increase of both $\lambda_{(m|m)}$ and $\lambda_{(m|e)}$ strongly suggest that $\langle e \rangle$ becomes $\langle m \rangle$ in that regime. This is also consistent with the topological entanglement entropy of $\langle m \rangle$ becomes $1/2 \log(2)$ at $\phi < 0.24\pi$ [29]. As $\phi \rightarrow 0$, both $\lambda_{(m|m)}$ and $\lambda_{(m|e)}$ begin to decrease to the same point as $\phi \approx 0.24\pi$, suggesting that we have two transition points at $\phi = 0$ and $\phi = 0.24\pi$.

As we further increase the circumference to $L = 256$, all $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ for $\phi < 0.24\pi$. The diverging correlation length suggests that the parent Hamiltonian of the SG states is gapless in this regime. However, as shown in Ref. [33], there might exist other non-frustration-free gapped Hamiltonian, in our case the Kitaev star lattice Hamiltonian, which can also be well approximated by the SG states. This result is also compatible with the no-go theorem [32] that the parent Hamiltonian of a chiral PEPS is gapless.

C. Transfer Matrix Spectrum

The full spectrum of the transfer matrices labeled by the momentum quantum numbers can be used to support our picture that $\langle e \rangle$ and $\langle m \rangle$ are identical [17]. In Fig. 8, we observe that not only the dominant eigenvalues match $\lambda_{(e|e)} = \lambda_{(m|m)} = \lambda_{(m|e)}$, but their full spectra also match. This means that the two MES $\langle m \rangle$ and $\langle e \rangle$ are exactly the same state. In contrast, while in the thermodynamic limit $\lambda_{(I|I)} = \lambda_{(I|e)}$, their spectra are always different. This strongly suggests that $\lambda_{(e|e)} = \lambda_{(m|m)} = \lambda_{(m|e)}$ is due to the degeneracy of the state while $\lambda_{(I|I)} = \lambda_{(I|e)}$ is due to the mode softening.

Recall the discussion in Sec. [IV] once we drive the $Z_2$-injective wave functions from the TO phase to the CC phase, the original MES basis is no longer the appropriate basis. The $\langle e \rangle$ becomes exactly the same as $\langle I \rangle$, and the $\langle m \rangle$ is not a physical normalizable state. Similarly, for the LG and SG states in the non-Abelian regime, there exist no charge and flux anyons anymore. Combining with the calculation of entanglement
VI. DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

Now we have a unified picture to describe the transitions from TO to CC, FC, and non-Abelian phases in terms of the 16 blocks of the TM. The TO to CC transition can be detected when the blue blocks in Fig. 2(c) become distinct. To be more specific, as $|I\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ become the same state, $|m\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ are confined, and thus $\langle I|e\rangle$ and $\langle m|e\rangle$ are different. Similarly, the emergence of the FC(non-Abelian) phases can be observed as the yellow(green) blocks become distinct. Different from the CC and FC case, the non-Abelian case is not accompanied with the confinement of other particles. Since the parity even sector of a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-invariant tensor is always non-zero, the vacuum state $|I\rangle$ is always normalizable. In addition, the fact that no other MES can become $|e\rangle$, we conclude that $\mathbb{Z}_2$-injective tensors can only detect three types of anyon transitions from identifying the MESs: $|e\rangle = |I\rangle$, $|m\rangle = |I\rangle$, or $|e\rangle = |m\rangle$. However, there exist other types of topological phase transitions beyond this scheme. For instance, in Ref. [22], it is shown that the self-dual phase transition point of the TC wave function corresponds to the Kramers-Wannier duality of the Ashkin-Teller model, where none of the MESs become identical.

In the current work, we use the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-injective PEPS as an example to identify and classify topological phase transitions out the the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ TO. However, this scheme can be easily generalized to $G$-injective and MPO-injective PEPS [39]. The GSP-HOTRG method developed here is a powerful tool to determine whether the system undergoes a phase transition when the PEPS tensor acquires virtual symmetry. The low computation cost of the GSP-HOTRG, same as HOTRG, makes it suitable to perform finite-size scaling analysis, which can be used to extract scaling dimensions at the critical point. Further studies along these directions are worth pursuing.
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Appendix A: Gauge-Symmetry Preserved HOTRG

We apply the HOTRG coarse-graining scheme to merge tensors along the cylinder direction. Two sites are merged into a single site, generating a rank-6 tensor $E' = \sum g_{y}E_{x_{0},x_{1},x_{2},y_{2}}E_{y_{0},y_{1},y_{2}}$, where the indices of $E$ start on the right and go around clockwise to the top. This can be regarded as a rank-4 tensor by formally grouping the two indices $(x_{1},x_{2})$ on the right to one index, and similarly the two on the left to another. The bond dimension of tensor $E'$ along the cylinder direction is the square of the original bond dimension of tensor $E$. Applying an appropriate isometry $U$ truncates the size of these squared bond dimensions to a fixed number, say, $D_{out}$, and a truncated tensor $\tilde{E}$ can be obtained (Fig. 9).

For $\mathbb{Z}_2$ topologically ordered phases, we have the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge symmetry. In our calculation, we only preserve $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry of the double tensor $E$, i.e., we identify $(+,+), (-,-)$ as the even sector and $(+,-), (-,+)$ as the odd sector. Merging two rank-4 $E$ tensors along the $y$-axis, we obtain a new rank-6 tensor $E'$ which retains the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ structure. In order to determine the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetric isometries, $U_{g}(g = 0,1)$, we perform eigenvalue decomposition in each block of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ block-diagonal
Applying the isometry $U_q$ in each block generate a truncated tensor $\tilde{E}$ which preserve the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry. After $p$ steps of GSP-HOTRG, the final tensor represents a chain of $2^p$ tensors that preserves the gauge symmetry. The other TMs can be obtained by inserting string operator and choosing different boundary conditions.

$$M_{x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4} = \sum_{x_2, x_2', y_1, y_2} \bar{E'}_{x_1, x_1', y_1, x_2, x_2', y_1} \bar{E'}_{x_2, x_2', x_3, x_3', y_2, y_2'}$$

(A1)


