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Two-component coupled Bose gas in a 1D optical lattice is examined. In addition to the postulated Mott insulator and Superfluid phases, multiple bosonic components manifest spin degrees of freedom. Coupling of the components in the Bose gas within same site and neighboring sites leads to substantial change in the previously observed spin phases revealing fascinating remarkable spin correlations. In the presence of strong interactions it gives rise to unconventional effective ordering of the spins leading to unprecedented spin phases: site-dependent z-x spin configuration with tunable (by hopping parameter) proclivity of spin alignment along z. Exact analysis and Variational Monte Carlo (VMC) along with stochastic minimization on Entangled Plaquette State (EPS) bestow a unique and enhanced perspective into the system beyond the scope of mean-field treatment. The physics of complex intra-component tunneling and inter-component coupling and filling factor greater than unity are discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ultracold gases provide an unparalleled platform to explore physics found in atomic or molecular gases, offering a manifold of prospects to simulate and examine canonical models of strongly correlated electrons in condensed matter systems [1, 2], owing to them being clean, versatile, and highly controllable. Observation of superfluid to Mott insulator transition [3] and theoretical and experimental demonstration of exotic quantum phase transitions [4] in cold atomic setups have paved the way towards studying many-body physics [1, 2, 5–7], in association with strong correlations [3, 8], and relating to the emergence of collective and thermodynamic behavior [5, 9]. Experimental demonstrations—of cold atoms in lattices via weak trapping potential superimposed onto optical lattices [6], achievement of low temperature relevant for spin orders [1, 10–12] necessary for superexchange couplings resulting in effective nearest-neighbor spin–spin interaction demonstrated in array of double wells [13] via a combination of evaporative and adiabatic cooling [14–21], and simulating magnetic fields via artificial gauge potential [22, 23]—provide immense relevance to this field. Quantum magnetism, a most fascinating area of research in condensed matter physics, can be reproduced using cold atoms with tunable geometry and parameters; for instance, experimental study of itinerant magnetism in ultracold Fermi systems with repulsive interactions [24], classical magnetism in triangular lattices [25] with fast oscillations of optical lattice enabling tuning the sign of nearest-neighbor tunneling [26], bosons with strong interactions in a tilted lattice at commensurate fillings for study of Ising model and quantum phase transition [27, 28] and possible realization of quantum dimer models [27, 29].

Bose–Hubbard Hamiltonian describing the dynamics of bosonic atoms is a quintessential model to probe strongly correlated many-body quantum systems [5, 30, 31] and simulate lattice spin models [1, 2, 31–39] such as quadratic-biquadratic spin model [40], or antiferromagnetic spin chains [27] and spin-1 model exhibiting Haldane (gapped) insulator phase [41–45]. Interesting extensions of Bose–Hubbard model, such as inclusion of next-to-nearest-neighbor tunneling or long range interactions [46–50], spinor bosons with multiple internal degrees of freedom [51, 52] and addition of non-linear coupling between the components [53–58], display fascinating remarkable phase diagram [47, 55–58]. A two-component Bose–Hubbard in Mott phase reveals pseudospins effectively coupled by Heisenberg exchange [38] imitating spin-1/2 Hamiltonian ideal for study of quantum magnetism [38, 59, 60], displays a spin-Mott phase in spin-1 Hamiltonian [11, 38, 39, 59, 61, 62], and in the presence of strong repulsions presents finite-temperature phase structure with possibility of checkerboard long range order, supercounterflow, superfluidity, and phase separation [63]. Realization of controllable Bose–Bose mixtures [64] makes way for the experimental reproduction of spin Hamiltonians, with detection and study of magnetic phases such as antiferromagnetic Néel and xy ferromagnetic phases.

The physics of coherent coupling in ultracold gases is consequential for quantum information processing and simulation [31, 37]; supported by the demonstration of strong coupling between Bosonic Mott insulators and light [65, 66] and the recent work in cold atoms proposing the realization and manipulation of new quantum states [67–74] and high precision quantum limited measurements [75]. In the two-component Bose gas, introducing coupling reveals fascinating physics; for instance, the phase separation in weak interaction limit [76] changing dramatically [77–88], modifying the Mott-insulator–superfluid transition [89], and altering entanglement properties [90]. With the introduction of non-linear coupling in many-body systems, stable collective modes appear, thus paving the way for robust control [91, 92], with their localization properties and robustness against perturbations demonstrated in a tilted Bose–Hubbard model [93].

Here, we study Bose gas with two components trapped in 1D optical lattice forming a two component Bose–Hubbard Model. Presence of multiple bosonic components manifests spin degrees of freedom in addition to Mott insulator and
superfluid phases [38, 59]. The coupling of the two components on the nearest-neighboring sites with strong on-site interactions presents unconventional effective ordering generating unprecedented spin behavior. The formation of a new site-dependent \( z \)-directional configuration occurs owing to this coupling. The choice of spin alignment along \( z \) can be tuned using hopping parameters. This unique phase preferentially places a component on one site and a superposition in its nearest-neighbors. Multiple perspectives—mean-field approximation, exact analysis, and entangled-plaquette states (EPS)—enhance the understanding of the system; capturing correlations beyond the scope of a mean-field treatment. The physics of filling factor greater than unity and the consideration of complex intra-component tunneling and inter-component coupling are discussed.

This paper is sectioned as follows: II describes the coupled two-component Bose–Hubbard model, III details the mapped spin-1/2 model, IV is the multi-perspective study of the spin phases, V extends to discuss complex intra-component tunneling and inter-component coupling as well as the physics of occupancy greater than unity, and VI summarizes the results and discusses their implications and future avenues.

II. THE MODEL

We consider a 1D system comprising two kinds of bosons trapped in an optical lattice as shown in Fig. 1. The two components termed as \( a \) and \( b \) can be envisioned as two internal levels of an atom. We assume low temperature and the optical lattice to be deep enough for the atoms to be confined to the lowest Bloch band describing a two-component Bose–Hubbard model [39, 94]. The optical lattice is tilted, creating an energy offset between the neighboring sites as shown in Fig. 1, with the assumption that the potential applied to create this tilt is a perturbation. This tilt can be introduced using a magnetic or a static electric field gradient [95, 96]. The tilting of the lattice prevents the natural hopping between components \( a \) (or \( b \)) and is obtained via light assisted tunneling: resonant two-photon Raman transition [95].

We introduce to this system inter-component coupling; this can be obtained by applying a microwave field nearly resonant to the transition frequency of the two internal states as can be seen in Fig. 1 (inset).

The resulting system is governed by the following Hamiltonian:

\[
H = \sum_i (-t_a a_i^+ a_{i+1} - t_b b_i^+ b_{i+1} + H.c.) + \sum_{k=a,b,i} \sum_{i<j} U_{ab} n_i n_j + U_{\text{int}} n_i n_j + J_1 (a_i^+ a_{i+1} + a_{i+1}^+ a_i) + J_2 (b_i^+ b_{i+1} + b_{i+1}^+ b_i)
\]

where \( a_i \) and \( b_i \) are the bosonic annihilation operators for components \( a \) and \( b \) at site \( i \), respectively. \( t_a \) is the component-dependent tunneling parameter and \( U \) is the intra-component on-site interaction. The inter-component on-site interaction is given as \( U_{ab} \), which can be tuned via Feshbach resonance. Two kinds of inter-component couplings are present: \( J_1 \) and \( J_2 \) representing the same-site and nearest-neighbor coupling, respectively. The energy offset between nearest-neighboring sites of the optical lattice (Fig. 1) differentiates the couplings, where \( J_2 \) defines the inter-component coupling between \( b \) at site \( i \) and \( a \) at site \( i+1 \). The presence of this offset also allows independent tuning of \( J_1 \) and \( J_2 \) (Fig. 1 inset). The two component Bose–Hubbard shows spin degrees of freedom that arise from the bosonic components in addition to the known Mott insulator and superfluid phases. In the deep Mott limit \( U, U_{ab} \gg t_a, J_1, J_2 \), with the average number of particles per site being fixed due to the high energy cost of bosons hopping from one site to another, this can be mapped to a spin system. In the following sections we study the system in the deep Mott limit, specifically for the case of one particle per site that is mapped to spin-1/2, where \( a \): \( \uparrow \) and \( b \): \( \downarrow \).

III. EFFECTIVE SPIN HAMILTONIAN

Strong on-site interactions divide the Hilbert space into low-energy and high-energy subspaces, which are coupled by the coupling and tunneling coefficients as shown in Fig. 2. A particle hopping from one site to another increases the occupancy, thus going from a low-energy to high-energy subspace, and thus incurring high energy cost in the process. Whereas two particles exchanging positions preserve the occupancy, hence not requiring as high an energy cost. To study the relevant physics, the effective low-energy subspace is obtained by decoupling the existing subsystems; in this process removing any first order hopping that increases the occupancy and retaining the second order virtual hopping terms that preserves the occupancy.

The two-component Bose–Hubbard model mapped to an effective spin (low-energy) Hamiltonian via canonical trans-
formation and followed by a perturbative expansion up to second order:

\[
H_{\text{eff}} = \sum_i \left[ -J_z (\sigma_i^z \sigma_{i+1}^z + \sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x) + J_y \sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x \\
- h_z (\sigma_i^z) - (h_x + J_1) \sigma_i^x + J_{z2} \sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x - J_{z3} \sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x \right] 
\]

where \( J_z = U_c / a \), \( J_y = U_a / a \) and \( h_x = J_2 (t_a + t_b) / 2U_a \), \( h_z \) act as fictitious magnetic fields along \( z \) and \( x \), transforming the system to a spin-polarized state. Unconventional ordering terms, \( J_z3 = h_x / U \) and \( J_{z3} = h_z / U \) arise due to the directional nearest-neighbor inter-component coupling. They align the spins along \( x \) on one site and \( z \) in the neighboring sites or vice versa providing a simple way to implement site-dependent spin alignment. We choose to consider only \( J_z \) in our work as \( J_y \), with no energy cost in same-site coupling, trivially leads the system to an \( x \) ferromagnetic phase. The correlations uniquely seen in the presence of \( J_z \) is expected to result in the states \(|a+b|_2\rangle \langle a|_1 \) or \(|b| \langle a+b|_2\rangle \langle b|_1 \) at suitable strengths of \( t_a, t_b, \) and \( J_z \). Previous work studying the two-component Bose–Hubbard model in the absence of inter-component coupling, shows \( x \) ferromagnetic (FM; \( t_a \sim t_b \)), \( z \) anti-ferromagnetic (AFM; \( t_{abh} \gg t_{v2a} ; U \gg U_{ab} \)) [39] and \( z \) FM \( t_{v2b} \gg t_{v1a} ; U \sim U_{ab} \) spin phases. With the introduction of inter-component coupling, we see new ordering terms \( h_z, J_{z3}, \) and \( J_{z2} \), significance of which is understood by studying the system behavior dictated by parameters \( t_a, t_b, \) and \( J_z \). In the study, on-site intra- and inter-component interactions are considered to be comparable \( (U \sim U_{ab}) \), where the intra-component interaction is allowed to fluctuate between \( a \) or \( b \). This limit is preferred as the unconventional correlations \( J_{z3} \) and \( J_{z2} \) are inversely proportional to \( U \), and would have a small contribution in the other limit \( (U \gg U_{ab}). \)

**Two sites (\( N = 2 \)):** The aim here is to investigate the spin phases that may emerge due to the unconventional correlations and identify the parameter phase regions where they materialize by examining a simplified two-site system. The two-site picture provides a facile description allowing for an exhaustive examination of the ground state forming the spin phases and the causative second order processes involved in the deep Mott limit. Additionally, such a straightforward illustration permits the pursuit of exact diagonalization for studying the effective spin Hamiltonian and validating the effective spin system, by comparing the ground states of the original and the mapped two-component Bose–Hubbard Hamiltonian. The basis states for two sites, each hosting either component \( a \) or \( b \), are \(|a| \langle a|_2 \rangle \langle a|_1 \), \(|b| \langle b|_2 \rangle \langle b|_1 \), \(|a| \langle b|_2 \rangle \langle b|_1 \), and \(|b| \langle a|_2 \rangle \langle a|_1 \). The coupling and tunneling couples these states to high-energy states \(|aa| \rangle_2 \langle 0|_1 \rangle_2, |ab| \rangle_1 \langle ab|_2 \rangle_2, |bb| \rangle_1 \langle bb|_2 \rangle_2, \) and \(|0|_1 \rangle_1 \langle ab|_2 \rangle_2, |bb| \rangle_1 \langle bb|_2 \rangle_2 \) as shown in Fig. 2(a). The combination of these different couplings result in hopping between low-energy states via an inter-
FIG. 3. Probability of the basis states (i) $|a\rangle_1|a\rangle_2 \rightarrow |b\rangle_1|b\rangle_2$, (ii) $|b\rangle_1|b\rangle_2 \rightarrow |a\rangle_1|a\rangle_2$, (iii) $|a\rangle_1|b\rangle_2 \rightarrow |b\rangle_1|a\rangle_2$, and (iv) $|b\rangle_1|a\rangle_2 \rightarrow |a\rangle_1|b\rangle_2$. The probabilities are determined in the deep Mott regime ($U \sim U_{ab}$) and presented as a function of intra-component tunneling: (a) $t_a$ ($t_b = 0U_{ab}$) and (b) $t_b$ ($t_a = 0U_{ab}$) and inter-component coupling ($J_2$).

FIG. 4. Schematic of spin phases hypothesized to emerge in the presence of inter-component coupling ($J_2$), studied using a simplified two-site system. The phases are shown in the deep Mott regime ($U \sim U_{ab}$) and presented as a function of intra-component tunneling ($t_{ab}$) and $J_2$, at different $t_a$ and $t_b$ limits: (a) $t_a \gg t_b$ and (b) $t_a \sim t_b$.

The presence of inter-component coupling ($J_2$) is surmised from the ground state composition as shown in Fig. 3 at $t_a \gg J_2$. Similarly, for significant $t_b$ the state $|b\rangle_1|b\rangle_2$ (via $|bb\rangle_1|0\rangle_2$ or $|0\rangle_1|bb\rangle_2$) or for significant $J_2$ the state $|b\rangle_1|a\rangle_2$ (via $|bb\rangle_1|0\rangle_2$ or $|0\rangle_1|aa\rangle_2$) has highest delocalization as illustrated in Fig. 3. The interesting states appear in the limit when one of the tunnelings is significant when compared to coupling ($J_2 \sim t_{ab,0} \gg t_{ab,b}$). When $t_a \sim J_2 \gg t_b$, the ground state (having maximum paths of hopping) is a superposition of the higher probability states $|b\rangle_1|b\rangle_2$ and $|b\rangle_1|a\rangle_2$, whereas when $t_a \sim J_2 \gg t_b$, the ground state is a superposition of $|a\rangle_1|a\rangle_2$ and $|b\rangle_1|a\rangle_2$ as seen in Fig. 3. Studying the probability of basis states forming the ground state of the original two-component Bose–Hubbard model (Appendix B), we confirm that the mapped system is an appropriate representation for the parameter strengths considered. More importantly, the states arising due to the unconventional correlations are not an artifact of the mapping as they also appear in the original Hamiltonian ground state.

We explain the ground state by studying the effective Hamiltonian. The preference for $|a\rangle_1|a\rangle_2$ or $|b\rangle_1|b\rangle_2$ appears due to $J_2$, $h\propto t_{ab,b}$ ordering, whereas the preference for the superposition of states $|a\rangle_1|a\rangle_2$ and $|b\rangle_1|a\rangle_2$ or $|b\rangle_1|b\rangle_2$ and $|b\rangle_1|a\rangle_2$ emerges due to $J_{x,z}$. A schematic of the spin phases is surmised from the ground state composition as shown in Fig. 4. Introducing $J_2$, the system with $t_{ab,b} \gg t_{ab,a}$ demonstrating a biased $z$ FM phase shifts to a new site-dependent phase with one site along $z$ and the other along $x$ arising due to $J_{x,z}$ and $J_{z,z}$. The orientation along $z$ depends on $t_a$ and $t_b$. This eventually shifts to a $z$ AFM phase due to $J_z$. A system around $t_a \sim t_b$ initially having an $xy$ FM spin phase becomes an $x$ FM due to $h_x$, finally shifting to a $z$ AFM phase. The presence of spin phases corresponding to the unconventional correlations in both the mapped and the original Hamiltonians act as a motivation to pursue many-body physics. In a large system, overlapping correlations could potentially lead to an intricate phase space leading to rich new physics.
IV. SPIN PHASES

In this section, we study the spin phases that arise in our system by evaluating the spin order parameters and correlations. The presence of the new phases emerging due to the unconventional correlations are further confirmed with the examination of the population of components $a$ and $b$ at each site. The study is performed using three different methods: (a) mean-field approximation, (b) exact analysis for small system size ($N < 14$), and (c) Variational Monte Carlo with stochastic minimization (VMC-SM) on Entangled-Plaquette States (EPS) for large system size ($N > 15$).

Mean-field approximation is the simplest approach pursued where each site is treated independent of the others, making it computationally efficient. Additionally, it is unaffected by system size or boundary condition. To illustrate the spin phases within mean-field, we designate every alternate site to subspace $A$ and its neighboring sites to $B$. The following variational ansatz is considered:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \prod_{i \in A} (\cos(\theta_i) |a_i\rangle + \sin(\theta_i) |b_i\rangle) \prod_{i+1 \in B} (\cos(\theta_{i+1}) |a_{i+1}\rangle + \sin(\theta_{i+1}) |b_{i+1}\rangle)$$

Within mean-field approximation, the spin order along $x$ and $z$ computed using Pauli matrices:

$$\langle \sigma^x_{i\rightarrow i+1} \rangle = \sin 2\theta_{AB}; \quad \langle \sigma^z_{i\rightarrow i+1} \rangle = \cos 2\theta_{AB};$$

the expectation of $x$ and $z$ spin correlations on sites $i, i+1$: $\langle \sigma^x_i \sigma^z_{i+1} \rangle = \cos 2\theta_A \cos 2\theta_B; \quad \langle \sigma^z_i \sigma^x_{i+1} \rangle = \sin 2\theta_A \sin 2\theta_B; \quad (\text{5})$

and unconventional spin correlations on sites $i, i+1$:

$$\langle \sigma^z_i \sigma^z_{i+1} \rangle = \cos 2\theta_A \sin 2\theta_B; \quad \langle \sigma^z_i \sigma^z_{i+1} \rangle = \sin 2\theta_A \cos 2\theta_B \quad (\text{6})$$

The simplicity of mean-field approximation, in treating each site independent of others, may not accurately reflect the system behavior due to the presence of spin exchanges in the effective spin Hamiltonian correlating neighboring sites. This could dilute the effect of the unconventional correlations by being beyond the scope of the mean-field treatment.

Exact analysis provides the most accurate description of the system. Being devoid of any approximations, it is the most successful in capturing the effect of the unconventional correlations. Additionally, it provides direct comparisons to $N = 2$, where the effective spin Hamiltonian is validated. Although the exact analysis does provide a better insight into the system, owing to its large computational expense, this is limited to smaller system sizes $N < 14$, where the effect of small system size and boundary can be observed. For the thermodynamic limit, this demands a numerical method that captures correlations better than mean-field but with lesser computational cost than exact analysis.

Entangled-Plaquette States (EPS) form a class of tensor network states, where the lattice is divided into plaquettes, and the wavefunction of the system is given by the product of the plaquette wave functions which are scalar in nature[97]. This goes beyond the mean-field, by considering overlapping or entangled-plaquettes, and is more computationally efficient than exact analysis as the number of steps to obtain the system ground state undergo a low order polynomial increase with system size. It allows for large system sizes while retaining most of the effects of the correlations. The state for the system is a sum over all possible spin configurations $n)$ with each configuration weighted by amplitude $W(n)$ [98]:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_n W(n)|n\rangle; \quad n = n_1, n_2, n_3, \ldots, n_N$$

where $n_i = \pm 1 \forall i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. In our ansatz with overlapping plaquettes ($P$), each consisting of two sites, coefficients ($C^n_P$; correlator elements) are assigned for all $2^2$ possible configurations in each plaquette. The amplitude ($W(n)$) for each spin configuration in the state is given as a product of these correlator elements [98]:

$$W(n) = \prod_{P=1}^{N-1} C^{n_1 n_2}_{P} = C_1^{n_1 n_2} C_2^{n_3 n_4} \ldots C_{N-1}^{n_{N-1} n_N}$$

Variational Monte Carlo (VMC) along with stochastic minimization (SM) is used to obtain the optimized plaquette wave functions that minimize the energy and best describe the ground state [97]. The fluctuations in order parameters and correlations, a downside of the Monte Carlo approach are small and do not affect the behavior of the spin orders and correlations. Additionally, it demonstrates oscillations to represent the system hopping between degenerate ground states.

Employing all three methods in our analysis helps in validating each method and identifying areas where they fail. It also helps acquire an accurate interpretation of the results that best reflect the system behavior, with minimal effect of system size and mean-field approximation.

Results: The spin phases are studied at strong on-site intra- and inter-component interaction ($U \sim U_{ab}$) in Figs. 5, 6, and 7. In a strong coupling limit ($J_2 \gg t_{ab}$, $J_2 \ll U, U_{ab}$), zAFM spin phase emerges due to the strong effective ordering along $z$: $J_z$ as seen in Figs. 5(a) and 7(i). With no significant intra-particle tunneling, only component $b$ at some site $j$ is allowed to tunnel to $a$ at site $j+1$, and vice versa, resulting in highest delocalization of configuration $|a_j\rangle|b_j\rangle$ or $|b_j\rangle|a_j\rangle$, allowing the formation of the observed $z$ AFM phase. The $z$ AFM illustrated for exact analysis in Figs. 5(a iii) and 5(a iv) is biased with a preference for component $b$ (or spin down $z$) on odd-numbered sites and component $a$ (or spin up $z$) on even-numbered sites. The bias emerges due to the correlation $J_{xz}$ or $J_{za}$, and is observable due to a finite system size.

Allowing one component to tunnel by a small increase in intra-component tunneling $t_{ab} > t_{ba}, (J_2 > t_{ab} > t_{ba})$, remarkable site and intra-component tunneling dependent spin phase materializes as depicted in Fig. 5. The phase demonstrates a strong $z$ order at one site and strong $x$ order at the neighboring sites. Spin orientation along $z$ depends on the intra-component tunneling, with up spin at $t_a > t_b$ as seen in Fig. 5 and down spin at $t_b > t_a$. The presence of only one significant intra-component tunneling ($t_{ab} > t_{ba}$) allows for only
its tunneling. Along with strong coupling, which allows for the tunneling between $b$ at a site $j$ to $a$ at $j+1$, and vice versa, causes high delocalization for configuration $|a⟩|^{+\uparrow}|\sigma⟩_{i+1}$ or $|^{+\downarrow}|\sigma⟩_{i+1}$ at $t_a > t_b$ and $|b⟩|^{+\uparrow}|\sigma⟩_{i+1}$ or $|^{+\downarrow}|\sigma⟩_{i+1}|b⟩_{i+1}$ at $t_a > t_b$. The new z-x and z-z spin phases obtained via exact diagonalization in Fig. 5(a iii&iv and b iii&iv) are biased similar to the z AFM, preferring $x_{t-1} \downarrow x_{t+1}$ at $t_b > t_a$ and $\uparrow_{t-1} x_i \uparrow_{t+1}$ at $t_a > t_b$. The unprecedented spin correlations and site configurations are further examined in Fig. 6 as a function of coupling $J_2$. The strong coupling ($J_2 \sim 0.4U_{ab}$) creates a superposition of both components on one site whereas prefers component $a$ on the neighboring sites at $t_a > t_b$, resulting in the formation of $|a⟩|^{+\uparrow}|\sigma⟩_{i+1}$ or $|^{+\downarrow}|\sigma⟩_{i+1}|a⟩_{i+1}$, as shown in Fig. 6(i). The spin correlations show a strong x-z (x-x) with z-x (z-z) approaching zero as shown in Fig. 6(ii). Similarly at $t_b > t_a$, component $b$ is preferred on one site and a superposition on the neighboring sites, resulting in unconventional correlation z-x (x-z) obtaining a strong negative correlation while x-z (x-x) approaches zero. The spin phases observed in the tunneling-coupling regime are $\uparrow_i x_{i+1}$ or $\downarrow_i x_{i+1}$ at $t_a > t_b$, and $\downarrow_i x_{i+1}$ or $x_{i-1} \downarrow x_{i+1}$ at $t_b > t_a$. In exact analysis for system size $N = 8$, aside from the previously observed bias, higher probability of component $a$ on site $i+1$ and nearly equal presence of both components on site $i$ at $t_b > t_a$ and higher probability of component $b$ on site $i$ and nearly equal presence of both components on site $i+1$ at $t_a > t_b$ exists over the (larger than mean-field) coupling range as illustrated in Fig. 6(b i). Confirmed by observing the z-x and x-z spin correlations in Fig. 6(b ii), the $x_{t-1} \uparrow x_{t+1}$ and $z_{t-1} \downarrow x_{t+1}$ phases deviate at a weaker coupling resulting in a net $x_{t-1} \uparrow x_{t+1}$ phase at $t_a > t_b$ and $\downarrow_{t-1} x_i \downarrow_{t+1}$ phase at $t_b > t_a$ over the (larger than mean-field) coupling range. This makes the unconventional spin correlations more significant in exact analysis when compared to mean-field, due to the inability of the mean-field ansatz in capturing the site correlations. We note, even though $x_{t-1} \sigma_1$ and $z_{t-1} \sigma_1$ and $x_{t+1} \sigma_1$ and $z_{t+1} \sigma_1$ represent the same spin phases, the small deviation in correlations, as seen in Fig. 6(b ii), are due to the effect of boundary condition with this deviation decreasing with increasing $N$. The site configuration and unconventional correlations for system size $N = 20$ obtained via VMC-SM on EPS in Fig. 6(c) represents a behavior that comprises the trend seen in both the exact analysis and the mean-field approximation. The new phases obtained here are degenerate, forming $x_{t-1}$ $\uparrow_{t+1}$ or $\uparrow_{t+1}$ $x_{t+1}$ at $t_a > t_b$ and $\downarrow_{t-1}$ $x_i$ $\downarrow_{t+1}$ or $\downarrow_{t-1}$ $x_i$ $\downarrow_{t+1}$ at $t_b > t_a$, which is similar to the mean-field results. The z-x and x-z persist over a long range of coupling as in exact analysis, resulting in stronger x-z and z-x phases, indicating the ability of this method to capture correlations beyond a mean-field treatment. We also note that the correlations $x_{t-1} \sigma_1$ and $z_{t+1} \sigma_1$ or $z_{t-1} \sigma_1$ and $x_{t+1} \sigma_1$ representing same spin phase are identical and unaffected by the boundary condition, unlike in our exact analysis. The coexistence of x-x and z-z at weak and strongly coupling in Fig. 6(ii), arising due to simultaneous non-vanishing of $\sigma_z$ and $\sigma_z$ on nearest-neighboring sites, is confirmed by the observation of z-x and x correlations in Fig. 7(b). The observed unconventional phases emerge due to correlations $J_{x}$ and $J_{z}$, and is preferentially chosen by the effective ordering $h_{z}$ and $h_{z}$.

When one component’s intra-component tunneling is as strong as the coupling ($J_2 \sim 0.4U_{ab}$), simultaneous non-vanishing of $\sigma_z$ and $\sigma_z$ exists on nearest-neighboring sites, owing to the strong $J_{x}$, $J_{z}$, and $h_z$ ordering. When a component is allowed to tunnel, preference of that component on all sites is expected; this leads to the spin up zFM for $t_a \gg t_b$ and spin
down zFM for $t_b \gg t_a$ as seen in Figs. 5(a) and 7(b). However, this preference changes with strong coupling as seen in Fig. 5, and 7(b).

Presence of both $t_a$ and $t_b$ results in an $xy$ FM [99]; addition of strong coupling ($J_2 \sim t_a \sim t_b$) creates a strong $x$FM phase due to $h_l$ ordering, shown in Fig. 7(a). With both components being allowed to hop, all sites have equal presence of components $a$ and $b$. The spin correlations obtained via VMC-SM on EPS are comparable to the mean-field treatment for correlations along $z$ and $x$. However, VMC-SM on EPS is able to capture the $xy$ phase, which is beyond the scope of the mean-field (see Fig. 7). The presence of an $xy$ FM phase, lowers the $x$ correlation in this numerical method. Additionally, we observe a non-zero $z$ correlation as a consequence of the $xy$ phase: in a pure $x$ FM phase there is no $z$ correlation, whereas in a pure $xy$ FM phase, $z$ correlation on neighboring sites yield $-1$.

Fig. 8, 9 and 10 present the spin orders, unconventional spin correlations $x$-$z$ and $z$-$x$, and spin correlations along $z$, $x$ and $xy$, respectively, as a function of intra-component tunneling $t_a$ or $t_b$ and for strong coupling $J_2$. This comparison of the behavior for the three numerical methods, viz. exact analysis ($N = 8$), VMC-SM on EPS ($N = 20$), and mean-field approximation, presented here to demonstrate their similarities, which validates our analysis.
FIG. 9. Unconventional spin correlations on site $i \in A$ and $i+1, i-1 \in B$ evaluated via ED: exact diagonalization ($N = 8$), VMC: VMC-SM on EPS ($N = 20$), and MF: mean-field approximation. The correlations are shown as a function of tunneling ($t_{ab}$ where $t_{ab} = 0.0U_{ab}$) in the deep Mott regime ($U = 1.2U_{ab}$) at strong coupling $J_2(=0.4U_{ab})$. All the parameters are scaled by the inter-component interaction ($U_{ab}$).

V. EXTENSION

In this section we discuss the effect of complex tunneling and coupling coefficients on the spin phases, and extend our study to comment on the effective spin system at occupancy greater than unity.

**Complex coefficients:** Complex phases are associated with the nearest-neighbor intra-component tunnelings $t_a$ and $t_b$ and the inter-component coupling $J_2$ resulting in new hopping parameters: $t_a = |t_a| e^{i\theta_a}$, $t_b = |t_b| e^{i\theta_b}$ and $J_2 = |J_2| e^{i\theta_2}$. The Hamiltonian for the resulting system:

$$
H = \sum_i (|t_a| e^{i\theta_a} a_i^+ a_{i+1} + |t_b| e^{i\theta_b} b_i^+ b_{i+1} + |J_2| e^{i\theta_2} + H.c.)
+ \sum_{k=a,b,c} \frac{U_k}{2} n_{ki} (n_{ki} - 1) + \sum_i U_{ab} n_{ai} n_{bi} 
$$

The mapped effective spin Hamiltonian in the presence of complex coefficients:

$$
H_{eff} = -J_z \sum_i \sigma_i^z \sigma_{i+1}^z + J_p \sum_i \left[ \cos(\theta_a - \theta_b)(\sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x + \sigma_i^y \sigma_{i+1}^y) + \sin(\theta_a - \theta_b)(\sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x - \sigma_i^y \sigma_{i+1}^y) \right] 
+ h_x \sum_i \left[ (t_a \cos(\theta_a - \theta_j) + t_b \cos(\theta_b - \theta_j)) \sigma_i^x - (t_a \sin(\theta_a - \theta_j) + t_b \sin(\theta_b - \theta_j)) \sigma_i^y \right] 
+ J_{xx} \sum_i \left[ \cos(\theta_a - \theta_j) \sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x - \sin(\theta_a - \theta_j) \sigma_i^y \sigma_{i+1}^y \right] 
+ J_{xy} \sum_i \left[ \cos(\theta_b - \theta_j) \sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x - \sin(\theta_b - \theta_j) \sigma_i^y \sigma_{i+1}^y \right] 
$$

The ferromagnetic ordering ($J_{xx}$) of neighboring sites along $x$ splits to $x-x$ and $x-y$ ordering and that along $y$ splits to $y-x$ and $y-y$ ordering. This splitting is dependent on the phase difference of coefficients $t_a$ and $t_b$. However, the ordering $J_z$ (along $z$) remains unchanged. The fictitious magnetic field ($h_x$) along $x$ splits to $x$ and $y$; this splitting is dependent on the phase difference between tunneling ($t_a$ or $t_b$) and coupling ($J_2$). The fictitious magnetic field ($h_y$) along $z$ remains unchanged. A similar effect on the unconventional correlations with $x-z(z-x)$ ordering on neighboring sites splitting to $x-z$ and
$y$-$z$($z$-$x$ and $z$-$y$) dependent on the phase difference of $t_a$ or $t_b$ and $J_2$. The complex hopping parameters result in an accumulation of phase with each hop. In the case when a component hops to the neighboring site and back, there is no net phase accumulated, which results in the $z$ ordering terms remaining unaffected. In any other hopping, a net phase is obtained, which is proportional to the difference of the complex phases associated with tunneling and coupling. Since this is a one-dimensional system, there is only a trivial effect of these complex coefficients; interesting outcomes are expected at higher dimensions.

**Occupancy > 1**: Considering two particles per site, the two-component Bose-Hubbard system is mapped to a spin-1 system with basis states $|aa⟩$, $|ab⟩$, and $|bb⟩$ mapped to $|1⟩$, $|0⟩$, and $|−1⟩$, respectively. Considering the limit $U=U_{ab}$, since only spin Mott phase ($|0⟩$) persists for $U≥U_{ab}$, the effective spin-1 Hamiltonian:

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \mu \sum_i (S_i^z)^2 - h_c^{(1)} \sum_i S_i^z - h_c^{(2)} \sum_i S_i^z - J_z \sum_i S_i^z S_{i+1}^z - J_y \sum_i S_i^y S_{i+1}^y + J_x \sum_i S_i^x S_{i+1}^x$$

(9)

where $S_i^a$ are the spin-1 matrices. $\mu = U - U_{ab}$ orders the sites along spin Mott ($|0⟩$) phase for $\mu > 0$ and along $z$ ($|1⟩$ or $|−1⟩$) for $\mu < 0$. Terms $h_c^{(1)} = 6 h_{c/a}/|t_{ua}|$ and $h_c^{(2)} = 6 h_{c/a}/|t_{ua}|$ act as fictitious magnetic fields polarizing the spins along $z$ and $x$, respectively. Similar to spin-1/2, we note $J_y = 4 h_{y/a}/|t_{ua}|$ provides ferromagnetic ordering along $x$ and $y$ and $J_z = 4 h_{z/a}/|t_{ua}|$ provides anti-ferromagnetic or ferromagnetic ordering along $z$ (dependent on the tunneling and coupling parameters $t_a$, $t_b$, and $J_2$). $J_{xy} = 4 h_{xy/a}/|t_{ua}|$ and $J_{yz} = 4 h_{y/a}/|t_{ua}|$ provide the unconventional ordering along $x$-$z$ and $z$-$x$ on nearest-neighbor sites. As expected, despite increasing the occupancy, the unconventional ordering persists. In spin-1, an additional competing parameter $\mu$ appears with an additional spin Mott phase.

Generalizing to spin $S = \frac{M}{2}$ for occupancy $M$, the effective spin-$S$ Hamiltonian ($S_i^a$ are spin $S$ matrices):

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \mu \sum_i (S_i^z)^2 - h_c^{(S)} \sum_i S_i^z - h_c^{(S)} \sum_i S_i^z - J_z \sum_i S_i^z S_{i+1}^z - J_y \sum_i S_i^y S_{i+1}^y + J_x \sum_i S_i^x S_{i+1}^x$$

(10)

where $h_c^{(S)} = (2S+1) h_{c/a}/|t_{ua}|$ and $h_c^{(S)} = (2S+1) h_{c/a}/|t_{ua}|$.

**VI. SUMMARY**

In conclusion, coupling of the two components in the nearest-neighbor sites via a microwave field gives rise to a unique site-dependent $z$-$x$ spin configuration, where the spin alignment along $z$ is tuned using the intra-component tunneling coefficients. This spin configuration presents as one of the components ($a$ or $b$) on one site, and a superposition of them in the nearest-neighbor sites. Our analysis demonstrates that coupling of the components in the nearest-neighbor sites provides an additional parameter to tune between the previously seen $α$ AFM, $z$ FM and $x$ FM spin phases in a spin independent optical lattice.

We employ exact analysis for small system size ($N = 8$) and Variational Monte Carlo along with stochastic minimization on Entangled-Plaquette State for large system size ($N = 20$). These confirm the presence of strong unconventional correlations beyond the mean-field approximation. Introduction of complex intra-component tunneling and inter-component coupling alters the ordering along $x$. The unconventional correlations split to have $x$ and $y$ order on a site and $z$ on nearest-neighbor sites. For filling factor greater than unity, the unconventional correlations persist.

**Future Avenues**: Our work provides new insights into the Bose-Hubbard model and offers an easily tunable phase parameter. The effect of the coupling can be extended to allow for the analyze the topological order in this system. Additionally, the effect of the unconventional correlations for a generalized $M$ occupancy at even and odd fillings using the mapped spin-$\frac{M}{2}$ Hamiltonian can be studied. Our assessment of the mapped system with complex hopping coefficients is extendable to higher dimensions. Finally, unexpected spin behaviors may emerge when considering Rydberg atoms on account of their long-range interactions.
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Appendix A: Effective Hamiltonian: Canonical Transformation

Define two complementary subspaces: $H_P$ (low-energy) with projector $\mathcal{P}$ and $H_Q$ (high-energy) with projector $\mathcal{Q} (= 1 - \mathcal{P})$. The effective Hamiltonian can be expressed as [100]:

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{P}H_{\mathcal{P}} - \mathcal{P}H_{\mathcal{Q}} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{Q}}} \mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{P}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

The zeroth order has no contribution as the hopping terms in the Hamiltonian lead to higher occupancy and are thus projected out. The interaction terms yield 0 for unit occupancy. In $\mathcal{P}HQ$ or $\mathcal{Q}HP$ the only contribution is from hopping terms $(t_i, t_n, J_2)$ in the Hamiltonian that can couple the two subspaces. Whereas, in $\mathcal{Q}HQ$, only the interaction terms $(U, U_{ab})$ contribute as they do not change the subspace.

$$\mathcal{P}HQ - \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{Q}}} \mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{P} \left( \sum_i (-t_a a_i^\dagger a_{i+1} - t_b b_i^\dagger b_{i+1} + H.c.) \right) - J_2(b_i^\dagger a_{i+1} + a_i^\dagger b_i) Q \times \left[ \frac{1}{Q \left( \sum_{i=\sigma_i} U_{ab} n_{i+1} - \sum_i U_{ab} n_{i+1} \right)} \right] \times \left( \sum_i (-t_a a_i^\dagger a_{i+1} - t_b b_i^\dagger b_{i+1} + H.c.) \right) - J_2(b_i^\dagger a_{i+1} + a_i^\dagger b_i) \mathcal{P}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A2)

There are nine second order or virtual hopping processes that contribute to and form the effective Hamiltonian. The first and second are processes describing two particles of the same component exchanging positions. The eighth and ninth are processes when component $b$ (or $a$) hops from $(i+1) \cap (i-1)$ to $i$ and component $a$ (or $b$) hops from $i$ to $(i+1) \cap (i-1)$. These four processes have been studied previously [99] and result in the formation of z FM and xy FM phases. With the introduction of $J_3$, five additional processes arise. The third process describes component $a$ at $i+1$ and $b$ at $i$ exchange positions. The fourth and sixth together represent $(a \leftrightarrow b)_i, a_{i+1} \rightarrow b_i, (a \leftrightarrow b)_{i+1}$. Similarly, the fifth and seventh together describe $b_i, (a \leftrightarrow b)_i, a_{i+1} \rightarrow (a \leftrightarrow b)_i, a_{i+1}$. The processes are derived and expressed as follows:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \[ \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{Q}}} \sum_i -t_a (a_i^\dagger + a_{i+1}^\dagger) a_i Q \sum_i -t_a (a_i^\dagger a_{i+1} + a_i^\dagger a_{i+1}) \mathcal{P} = \frac{t_a^2}{U_{ab}} \sum_i \mathcal{P} n_{i+1} \mathcal{P} a_i^\dagger a_i + t_a^2 \sum_i \mathcal{P} n_{i+1} a_i^\dagger a_i \mathcal{P} + \frac{t_a^2}{U} \sum_i \mathcal{P} (1 + \sigma_i^z) \mathcal{P} (1 + \sigma_i^z) \]

\item \[ \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{Q}}} \sum_i t_b (b_i^\dagger + b_{i+1}^\dagger) b_i Q \sum_i -t_b (b_i^\dagger b_{i+1} + b_i^\dagger b_{i+1}) \mathcal{P} = \frac{t_b^2}{U_{ab}} \sum_i (1 - \sigma_i^z) \mathcal{P} (1 - \sigma_i^z) \]

\item \[ \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{Q}}} \sum_i -J_2 (a_i^\dagger b_{i+1} + b_i^\dagger a_{i+1}) Q \sum_i -J_2 (b_i^\dagger a_{i+1} + a_i^\dagger b_{i+1}) \mathcal{P} = \frac{J_2^2}{\mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{Q}}} \sum_i \mathcal{P} n_{i+1} b_i Q b_i + n_{b_i+1} a_i Q a_i \mathcal{P} + \frac{J_2^2}{U_{ab}} \sum_i \mathcal{P} n_{i+1} (1 - n_{i+1}) + n_{b_i+1} (1 - n_{b_i+1}) \mathcal{P} \]

\item \[ \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{Q}}} \sum_i -t_a (a_i^\dagger + a_{i+1}^\dagger) a_i Q \sum_i -J_2 (b_i^\dagger a_{i+1} + a_i^\dagger b_{i+1}) \mathcal{P} = \frac{J_2 t_a}{U_{ab}} \sum_i \mathcal{P} n_{i+1} b_i Q a_i + n_{b_i+1} a_i Q b_i \mathcal{P} + \frac{J_2 t_a}{U} \sum_i \mathcal{P} n_{i+1} (1 - n_{i+1}) n_{b_i+1} (1 - n_{b_i+1}) n_{b_i+1} \mathcal{P} \]

The fourth and fifth processes together contribute to the fictitious magnetic field $h_i$ and new correlation $J_{sz}$.

\item \[ \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{Q}}} \sum_i -t_a (a_i^\dagger + a_{i+1}^\dagger) a_i Q \sum_i -J_2 (b_i^\dagger a_{i+1} + a_i^\dagger b_{i+1}) \mathcal{P} = \frac{J_2 t_a}{U_{ab}} \sum_i \mathcal{P} n_{i+1} b_i Q a_i + n_{b_i+1} a_i Q b_i \mathcal{P} + \frac{J_2 t_a}{U} \sum_i \mathcal{P} n_{i+1} (1 - n_{i+1}) n_{b_i+1} (1 - n_{b_i+1}) n_{b_i+1} \mathcal{P} \]

\item \[ \frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{Q}}} \sum_i -J_2 (a_i^\dagger b_{i+1} + b_i^\dagger a_{i+1}) Q \sum_i -J_2 (b_i^\dagger a_{i+1} + a_i^\dagger b_{i+1}) \mathcal{P} = \frac{J_2^2}{\mathcal{Q}H_{\mathcal{Q}}} \sum_i \mathcal{P} n_{i+1} b_i Q b_i + n_{b_i+1} a_i Q a_i \mathcal{P} + \frac{J_2^2}{U_{ab}} \sum_i \mathcal{P} n_{i+1} (1 - n_{i+1}) + n_{b_i+1} (1 - n_{b_i+1}) \mathcal{P} \]

\end{enumerate}
Finally, the effective spin Hamiltonian is:

\[
H_{eb} = \sum_i \left[ -J_x (\sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x + \sigma_i^y \sigma_{i+1}^y) + J_y \sigma_i^y \sigma_{i+1}^y - h_z (\sigma_i^z) \right]
\]

(A4)

Appendix B: N = 2

Consider two sites each hosting component \( a \) or \( b \), forming the basis states \( |a1a2, a1b1, a1b2, b1a1, b1b2 \rangle \) with the analysis restricted to the limit \( U \sim U_{ab} \). The coupling and the tunneling couples these basis states to high-energy states \( |aa1002, 001aa2, ab1002, 001ab2, bb1002, 001bb2 \rangle \) and \( |01002, 010bb2 \rangle \). The two-component Bose–Hubbard Hamiltonian for two sites:

\[
H = -t_a (a_1^+ a_2 + a_2^+ a_1) - t_b (b_1^+ b_2 + b_2^+ b_1) - J_x (b_1^+ a_2 + a_2^+ b_1) + \frac{U}{2} (n_{a,1}(n_{a,1} - 1) + n_{a,2}(n_{a,2} - 1) + n_{b,1}(n_{b,1} - 1) + n_{b,2}(n_{b,2} - 1)) + U_{ab}(n_{a,1}n_{b,1} + n_{a,2}n_{b,2})
\]

(B1)

The effective spin Hamiltonian is validated by comparing the behavior of the ground state of the original Hamiltonian to the mapped Hamiltonian. The ground state of the two-component Bose–Hubbard model is studied using basis states \( |a, a2, a1b1, ab1, b1a1, ba1, ba2, ab2, bb1, 001bb2 \rangle \) and \( |010bb2 \rangle \). This is chosen to ensure the preferred states have one particle per site, although the coupling and the tunneling can couple these states to states having two particles on one site and none on the neighboring site. On comparison, we note at higher values of \( t_{ab} \) or \( J_z \), the two show small deviation due to the failing of the Mott condition required for the effective picture, leading to a negligible but non-zero probability of higher energy states \( |aa1002, 001aa2, ab1002, 001ab2, bb1002, 001bb2 \rangle \) and \( |010bb2 \rangle \) in the ground state.

Compared to the original system, \( |b, a \rangle \) is not as pronounced, with some presence of \( |a, b \rangle \). Additionally, the states \( |a, a \rangle \) and \( |b, b \rangle \) are more pronounced. Overall, the behavior generally remains the same for both and the presence of unconventional correlations that cause the formation of superposition of \( |b, a \rangle \) and \( |b, b \rangle \) at \( t_a \gg t_b \) or \( b, a \) and \( |a, a \rangle \) at \( t_a \gg t_b \) exists.
FIG. 11. Probability of the high-energy basis states (a) $|aa\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2$, (b) $|0\rangle_1 |aa\rangle_2$, (c) $|ab\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2$, (d) $|0\rangle_1 |ab\rangle_2$, (e) $|bb\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2$, and (f) $|0\rangle_1 |bb\rangle_2$. The probabilities are determined in the deep Mott regime ($U \sim U_{ab}$) and presented as a function of intra-component tunneling $t_a$ ($t_a = 0 U_{ab}$) and inter-component coupling ($J_2$).

FIG. 12. Probability of the low-energy basis states (a) $|a\rangle_1 |a\rangle_2$, (b) $|b\rangle_1 |b\rangle_2$, (c) $|a\rangle_1 |b\rangle_2$, and (d) $|b\rangle_1 |a\rangle_2$. The probabilities are determined in the deep Mott regime ($U \sim U_{ab}$) and presented as a function of tunneling $t_b$ ($t_a = 0 U_{ab}$) and coupling ($J_2$).

FIG. 13. Novel spin correlations for system size $N = 10$, evaluated via exact diagonalization on sites $i \in A$, $i+1, i-1 \in B$. The correlations are shown as a function of tunnelings $t_b$ and $t_a$ in the deep Mott regime ($U = 1.2 U_{ab}$) and at strong coupling $J_2 (= 0.5 U_{ab})$. All the parameters are scaled by the inter-component interaction ($U_{ab}$).