I. INTRODUCTION

In recent literature there has been considerable interest in the many-body scar states \([1–34]\) (for their pedagogical overview see \([35]\)). The scar states are typically spread throughout the energy range of the spectrum and are, therefore, relevant at high temperatures. They do not obey the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis (ETH) \([36–38]\), one of the most fundamental conjectures that allows us to bridge quantum mechanics with statistical physics. On the practical side, an initial state made of many-body scar states repeatedly returns to itself in time evolution preventing the loss of quantum information through thermalization. This offers intriguing prospects for quantum computing.

Examples of many-body scars have been found in a number of systems including correlated electron models with the Heisenberg \([19, 39–41]\), Hubbard \([12, 19, 21, 42]\) and density-density \([43, 44]\) interactions. These findings represent a scattered puzzle of scar phenomenology lacking a clear fundamental mechanism.

In our previous paper \([1]\) (see also \([23, 24]\)), we presented a general strategy for systematically designing the Hamiltonians with a many-body scar subspace \(S\) invariant under the action of a continuous group \(G\), which is bigger than the symmetry group of the Hamiltonian. The general form of such Hamiltonians is \(H = H_0 + \sum_j O_j T_j^g\), where \(T_j^g\) are generators of the symmetry group \(G\) and \(O_j\) are a set of operators such that the product \(O_j T_j^g\) is Hermitian. \(H_0\) must admit the states in \(S\) as eigenstates and the revivals are observed when the gaps between the corresponding eigenvalues have a common divisor.

In this work, we demonstrate that many of the commonly used condensed matter models of interacting electrons actually happen to be of this form and specify their group-invariant scar subspaces \(S\). This applies to the Hubbard, Heisenberg, and some other interactions, and any models constructed out of them on various lattices and in arbitrary dimension such as the extended 2D \(tJU\) model explicitly illustrates the novel properties of the invariant scars and supports our findings.

We also generalize the framework of \([1]\) and lift two of its constraints. First, for discrete groups \(G\) we propose to use \(T = g – 1\), where \(g \in G\) and \(g^{-1}H_0g = H_0\). Second, we no longer require the product \(OT\) to be Hermitian. This opens the way to studying the coherent time evolution of a group-invariant scar subspace in open systems. To our knowledge, many-body scars at finite energy density in non-Hermitian systems have not been discussed previously \([45]\), while the non-stationary, periodic phenomena in dissipative strongly-interacting systems is an emergent hot topic \([46–51]\).

In Sec. II we specify the three families of scar states that are relevant to our discussion of spin-\(\frac{1}{2}\) fermionic models. We describe their structures, and the generators \(T\) annihilating them. These generators may be viewed as the free Hamiltonians. In Sec. III we show how the well-known interaction terms, such as the Hubbard and Heisenberg interactions, decompose in terms of the same generators. As a consequence, the models including any linear combinations of such interaction terms also have \(H_0 + OT\) decomposition. In Table III we give these decompositions for several models, such as the \(J_1 – J_2\) and Haldane-Hubbard models. We conclude with an example (Sec. V) where the full construction is detailed for the \(tJU\) model and the numerical evidence of many-body scar states is provided.
The total fermion number is
\[ Q = \sum_{i=1}^{N} n_i , \]
and we will call the corresponding symmetry \( U(1)_Q \) (the actual generator is \( (Q - N)/2 \)).

The generators of the rotation group \( SU(2)_{\text{spin}} \) are given by
\[ Q_A = \sum_{i=1}^{N} S_i^A , \quad A = 1, 2, 3 . \]

The spin operator at site \( i \) is
\[ S_i^A = \frac{1}{2} c_i^\dagger \sigma^A c_i , \]
where \( \sigma^A \) are the Pauli matrices. In particular,
\[ 2S_i^3 = M_i = n_i^\uparrow - n_i^\downarrow \]
is the magnetization at site \( i \). The symmetry corresponding to total magnetization is \( U(1)_M \subset SU(2)_{\text{spin}} \).

Another important group is the pseudospin [54–56], which is denoted by \( SU(2)_{\eta} \). Its generators are (we usually assume that repeated indices are summed over):
\[ \eta^+ = c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{j\alpha} \sigma^A \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger ; \]
\[ \eta^- = (\eta^+)^\dagger , \quad \eta^3 = \frac{1}{2} (Q - N) , \]
so that \( U(1)_Q \subset SU(2)_{\eta} \).

The generators of \( SU(N) \) include the spin-independent hopping terms with generally complex amplitudes:
\[ T_{ij} = \lambda c_i^\dagger c_j + \text{h.c.} , \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} . \]

An alternate basis for the generators of \( SU(N) \) is
\[ T^a = t^a_{ij} c_i^\dagger c_j , \quad a = 1, \ldots, N^2 - 1 , \]
where \( t^a \) are the traceless Hermitian \( N \times N \) matrices.

The simple root generators of this algebra could be chosen as the nearest-neighbour hoppings
\[ T_i = c_i^\dagger \sigma^a n(i) \sigma^a c_i , \]
where \( n(i) \) is a nearest neighbour of the site \( i \) on a given lattice. Commuting simple roots we can restore the whole algebra (8). Any Hermitian spin-independent hopping terms on any lattice (including \( T_{ij}^T, T_{ij}^O \) below) are linear combinations of \( T_{ij} \). They belong to the \( SU(N) \) algebra and annihilate the \( SU(N) \) singlets.

There is another, less obvious, group \( \tilde{SU}(N) \), whose generators include the spin-preserving hopping with imaginary amplitude
\[ \tilde{T}_{kl}^O = i (c_k^\dagger c_l - c_l^\dagger c_k) , \]
and the spin-flip hopping
\[ \tilde{T}_{kl}^{\text{sym}} = c_k^\dagger \sigma^a_\beta c_l^\dagger \sigma^a_\beta^\dagger c_k + c_l^\dagger \sigma^a_\beta^\dagger c_k^\dagger \sigma^a_\beta c_k . \]

The spin-preserving hopping terms (11) are generators of the \( SO(N) \) subgroup of \( \tilde{U}(N) \).
FIG. 1. Three groups that act naturally on the Hilbert space are shown in ellipses. The corresponding generators are shown in the rectangular boxes, while the invariant states are shown in the circles.

By combining operators $\tilde{T}_{kl}$ (12) and $Q^A$ (4) we obtain more general hopping terms
\[ \tilde{T}^A_{ij} = e^\dagger_{i\alpha} \sigma^A_{\alpha\beta} c_{j\beta} + c^\dagger_{j\alpha} \sigma^A_{\alpha\beta} c_{i\beta} \] (13)
that annihilate the singlets of $\tilde{U}(N)$ and $SU(2)_{\text{spin}}$. A special case of these generators is the local magnetization $M_i$.

By commuting $\eta^+$ (7) and $T_{ij}$ (8) we can get the operators that annihilate the singlets of $SU(2)$ and of $U(N)$
\[ T^\dagger_{ij} = [\eta^+, T_{ij}] = \lambda_{\sigma\sigma'} e^\dagger_{i\sigma} c^\dagger_{j\sigma'}, \quad T^- = (T^\dagger)^\dagger. \] (14)

There is a particular set of generators of $U(N)$ that we will find useful:
\[ K_i = n_i - 1, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N. \] (15)

For example,
\[ K_N = n_N - 1 = \frac{\eta^3}{N} - T^{N^2-1}, \] (16)
where $T^{N^2-1}$ is the generator of $SU(N)$ corresponding to the matrix
\[ t^{N^2-1} = \text{diag} \left( \frac{1}{N}, \frac{1}{N}, \ldots, -1 + \frac{1}{N} \right). \] (17)

We have $\sum_{i=1}^N K_i = 2n^3$, and the square of $K_i$ can be expressed in terms of the local magnetization:
\[ K_i^2 = 1 - M_i^2, \] (18)
where we used $n_{1i}^2 = n_{i1}^2$ and $n_{ii}^2 = n_{ii}^2$. The groups $U(N)$ and $\tilde{U}(N)$ intersect on the group $O(N)$ that is generated by $\tilde{T}^O_{ij}$ in (11) (see also Fig. 1).

On a bipartite lattice, where the vertices can be split between two non-intersecting sets $W$ and $B$ (see Fig. 4), we can define additional type of generators $T'$, that form another group that we denote as $\tilde{SU}(N)'$ which is another embedding of the $SU(N)$ (11, 12). We introduce the operator
\[ R = \sum_{i} n_i, \quad R^\dagger R = I, \] (19)
and make a conjugation of (11); $\tilde{T}' = R^\dagger \tilde{T} R$. A particular subset of these $\tilde{SU}(N)'$ generators $T'$ is the nearest-neighbor hopping with real amplitude
\[ T'_{(i,j)} = e^\dagger_{i\sigma} c_{j\sigma} + \text{h.c.} \] (20)

Other ways of constructing a $\tilde{SU}(N)'$ algebra of longer-range hopping terms are discussed in the Appendix B. We will denote the spin preserving subgroup of this group as $SO(N)' \subset \tilde{SU}(N)'$.

We now provide the basis for each invariant subspace. Each subspace should be invariant under the action of $H_0$ for the invariant states to be scars [1]. A particular $H_0$ may have eigenstates that are different from the basis discussed below but may be obtained from it by a rotation.

The subspace invariant under $U(N)$ and $SU(2)_\eta$ is spanned by $|n^{\xi}\rangle$ which have the highest possible physical spin; namely, they form the spin-$(\xi^2)$ representation of $SU(2)_{\text{spin}}$: [1]
\[ |n^{\xi}\rangle = \frac{\xi^n}{\sqrt{N! (N-n)!}} |0^\xi\rangle, \quad |0^\xi\rangle = \prod_{j=1}^N c_{j+} |0\rangle, \] (21)
where $n = 0, \ldots, N$, and
\[ \zeta = Q_1 + iQ_2 = \sum_{j=1}^N c_{j+}^\dagger c_{j-} \] (22)
is the spin raising operator.

The states $|n^n\rangle$ are invariant under $\tilde{U}(N)$ and $SU(2)_{\text{spin}}$; they form the $N+1$ dimensional representation of pseudospin $SU(2)_\eta$:
\[ |n^n\rangle = \frac{(\eta^n)^n}{\sqrt{N! (N-n)!}} |0\rangle, \quad n = 0, \ldots, N, \] (23)
where $\eta = \eta^+$. On a bipartite lattice we can further define the states $|n^{\eta'}\rangle$ that are invariant under $\tilde{U}(N)'$ and form the $N+1$ dimensional representation of $SU(2)'_\eta$:
\[ |n^{\eta'}\rangle = R |n^n\rangle = \frac{(\eta^n)^n}{\sqrt{N! (N-n)!}} |0\rangle, \quad \eta' = \sum_{j=1}^N e^{i\pi j} c_{j+}^\dagger c_{j-}. \] (24)

These states are known as the $\eta$-pairing states [54, 57] [58]. It is not hard to check that $[M_i, \eta] = [M_i, \eta'] = 0$. Therefore, the states $|n^{\eta'}\rangle$ and $|n^{\eta'}\rangle'$ are annihilated by the local magnetizations $M_i$.

All three families of scars have a very high degree of symmetry with respect to the spatial index $j$. As a consequence, when the sites are arranged into a lattice, all three families
III. INTERACTION TERMS

Let us consider an arbitrary lattice with $N$ sites on which spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ electrons can be placed and let $i$ and $j$ be arbitrary sites on the lattice. We would like to rewrite the commonly used electron-electron interaction terms in the form $H_0 + OT$ and analyze their action on the three invariant subspaces.

A. Hubbard interaction

In the Hubbard model, two electrons interact only when they are located on the same site $i$. The Hubbard interaction at site $i$ may be written in terms of the generators $K_i$ of group $U(N)$:

$$H_{Hub}^{ij} = n_i \uparrow n_i \downarrow = \frac{1}{2} \left( n_i^2 - n_i \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( K_i^2 + K_i \right).$$

(25)

This annihilates the $|n^\uparrow\rangle$ states. While neither $|n^\downarrow\rangle$ nor $|n^0\rangle$ are eigenstates of (25) they are eigenstates of the Hubbard interaction summed over the full lattice that we write using (25), (18) and (15) as

$$\sum_i H_{Hub}^{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left( Q - N + \sum_i K_i^2 \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( Q - \sum_i M_i^2 \right).$$

(26)

to obtain an expression in terms of a constant and the $U(N)$ or $SU(2)_{\text{spin}}$ generators. Therefore, for the $|n^\uparrow\rangle$ and $|n^\downarrow\rangle$ states we have

$$\sum_i H_{Hub}^{ij} |n^\downarrow\rangle = n |n^\downarrow\rangle = \frac{Q}{N} |n^\downarrow\rangle,$$

$$\sum_i H_{Hub}^{ij} |n^0\rangle = n |n^0\rangle.$$  

A slightly modified Hubbard interaction

$$\tilde{H}_{Hub}^{ij} = (2n_i \uparrow - 1) (2n_i \downarrow - 1) = (-1)^{n_i},$$

(27)

can be cast in the form

$$\tilde{H}_{Hub}^{ij} = 1 - 2M_i^2 = K_i^2 - 1$$

(28)

and has the advantage that all three invariant states are eigenstates on every site: $\tilde{H}_{Hub}^{ij} |n^\uparrow\rangle = - |n^\uparrow\rangle$; $\tilde{H}_{Hub}^{ij} |n^\downarrow\rangle = |n^0\rangle$; $\tilde{H}_{Hub}^{ij} |n^0\rangle = |n^\downarrow\rangle$.

B. Density-density interaction

The density-density interaction at different sites, $H_{dd}^{ij} = n_i n_j$, can also be written in terms of the generators (15):

$$H_{dd}^{ij} = (K_i + 1) (K_j + 1).$$

(29)

For the $SU(N)$-invariant states $|n^\xi\rangle$, we have $H_{dd}^{ij} |n^\xi\rangle = |n^\xi\rangle$. Neither $|n^\uparrow\rangle$ nor $|n^\downarrow\rangle$ states are eigenstates of $H_{dd}^{ij}$ since $K_i$ does not act on them with a definite value.

### Table II. Action of generators on the invariant states. The entries $\ast$: These operators act with a constant when summed over all lattice sites, see Tab. IV.

| $|n^\uparrow\rangle$ | $|n^\downarrow\rangle$ | $|n^0\rangle$ |
|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| $T_{ij}$ (8) | $K_i$ (15) | $\eta^\uparrow$ (7) |
| $\eta^\downarrow$ (7) | $T_{ij}^0$ (11) | $T_{ij}^1$ (13) |
| $\ast$ | $\ast$ | $\ast$ |
| $\ast$ | $\ast$ | $\ast$ |
| $\ast$ | $\ast$ | $\ast$ |

Note: $\eta^\uparrow$ and $\eta^\downarrow$ are generators of $SU(2)_{\text{spin}}$.
The generalized density-density interaction reads
\[ H^\text{dd}_{ij} = \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} V^{\sigma\sigma'}_{ij} n_{i\sigma} n_{j\sigma'} = \alpha_{ij} n_i n_j + \beta_{ij} n_i M_j + \gamma_{ij} M_i n_j + \delta_{ij} M_i M_j, \]
and \( M_i \ket{n^n} = M_i \ket{n^n} = 0 \) (see Tab II). \( M_{\eta} \) does not annihilate \( \ket{n^\chi} \) and mixes them with the non-singlet states. However \( \ket{n^\chi} \) are eigenstates of the total magnetization: \( \sum_i M_i \ket{n^\chi} = (N - 2n) \ket{n^\chi}. \)

Similarly, \( \ket{n^n} \) and \( \ket{n^n}' \) are not eigenstates of \( n_i \), but for the total fermion number \( Q \) we have \( Q \ket{n^n}' = 2n \ket{n^n}' \) and \( Q \ket{n^n} = 2n \ket{n^n} \). For \( \ket{n^\chi} \) we have \( n_i \ket{n^\chi} = \ket{n^\chi} \). The above observations mean that \( H^\text{dd}_{ij} \) annihilates \( \ket{n^n} \) and \( \ket{n^n}' \) states when \( \alpha_{ij} = 0 \) and leaves \( \ket{n^\chi} \) unchanged when \( \beta_{ij} = \gamma_{ij} = 0 \) or \( \beta_{ij} = \gamma_{ij} = \delta_{ij} = 0 \).

When the coefficients in Eq. (30) are translation-invariant, \( V^{\sigma\sigma'}_{i-j} \), the \( \ket{n^\chi} \) become eigenstates of the \( \beta \) and \( \gamma \) terms:
\[ \sum_i \beta_k n_i M_{i+k} \ket{n^\chi} = \beta_k \sum_i M_{i+k} \ket{n^\chi} = \beta_k (N - 2n) \ket{n^\chi}. \]

We note that Ref. [21] demonstrated that for \( \sum_i V^{\sigma\sigma'}_{ij} = 0 \) (satisfied by the \( \beta, \gamma, \delta \) and violated by \( \alpha_{ij} \) terms) (30) respects \( \eta \)-symmetry and admits the \( \ket{n^n}' \) states as scars.

C. Heisenberg interaction

The Heisenberg interaction \( H^\text{Heis}_{ij} \equiv \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \) couples spins at two different sites \( i \) and \( j \). It can be written in the Hilbert space of spin-1/2 complex fermions using (5). The constraint \( \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j = 3/4 \) translates into the requirement of half-filling on each site: \( n_i = 1 \). This sector of Hilbert space contains the \( \ket{n^\chi} \) states and a single, half-filled \( \ket{n^n} / \ket{n^n}' \) state, while the full fermionic Hilbert space contains all three invariant subspaces.

\( H^\text{Heis}_{ij} \) consists of \( SU(2)_\text{spin} \) generators and therefore annihilates the singlets of this group \( \ket{n^n} \) and \( \ket{n^n}' \). In terms of the \( SU(N) \) generators it can be written (see Appendix A2) as
\[ \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j = \frac{1}{4} + C_{ij}, \]
where
\[ C_{ij} = \frac{1}{4} (E_{ij} E_{ji} + E_{ji} E_{ij} + K_i K_j) \]
and \( E_{ij} = c_{ij}^\dagger c_{ji} \) are \( SU(N) \) generators that are a linear combination of the \( SU(N) \) generators from Sec. II. Because \( C_{ij} \) is a linear combination of generators we have \( \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \ket{n^\chi} = \frac{1}{4} \ket{n^\chi} \).

D. Symmetry-breaking perturbation

To highlight the ergodicity-breaking properties of the invariant states and to be able to tune to the fully chaotic regime we will consider a simple symmetry-breaking term of the OT form that we write down for a rectangular lattice in two dimensions, where \( i \) labels the horizontal and \( j \) the vertical direction:
\[ H^\text{OT}_{ij} = \sum_{i,j} r_{ij} (\hat{M}_{ij} + \hat{M}_{i(j+1)}) S_{ij}^\text{hor} + q_{ij} (\hat{M}_{ij} + \hat{M}_{i(j+1)}) S_{ij}^\text{vert}, \]

where \( r_{ij}, q_{ij} \in [0, 1] \) are real random numbers and
\[ \hat{M}_{ij} = r_M c_{ij}^\dagger c_{ji}^\dagger - q_M c_{ij} c_{ji}, \]
\[ S_{ij}^\text{hor} = \sum_\sigma c_{(i+1)j\sigma} c_{ij\sigma} + \text{h.c.}, \]
\[ S_{ij}^\text{vert} = \sum_\sigma c_{(j+1)i\sigma} c_{ij\sigma} + \text{h.c.}, \]
where \( r_M, q_M \) are also random numbers, that we chose to be \( r_M = 1.426974 \) and \( q_M = 2.890703 \).

Both \( S_{ij}^\text{hor} \) and \( S_{ij}^\text{vert} \) are special cases of the hopping \( T_{ij}' \) (20) which is simultaneously a generator for \( SU(N) \) and \( SU(N)' \) groups (see Sec II and Tab. II). Therefore the full perturbation term \( H^\text{OT}_{ij} \) is of the pure OT form and annihilates two invariant families: \( \ket{n^\chi} \) and \( \ket{n^n}' \). It can be added to any model supporting these states as scars without changing their energy but breaking all symmetries except the particle number conservation.

We note that the symmetry-breaking terms such as (33) also lead to the absence of any dynamical symmetries that could otherwise cause persistent oscillations of local observables [59].

E. Non-Hermitian perturbation

One often describes an open system by a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian that results from a reduction of the Hermitian Hamiltonian of the full system to an open subsystem. The non-Hermitian Hamiltonian may not conserve the norm of the state which corresponds to the probability leaking out or into the open system. To illustrate that the invariant states remain stable and decoupled also in non-Hermitian systems with Hamiltonian \( H_0 + OT \), we consider the following non-Hermitian term.
\[ H^\text{nH}_{ij} = \sum_{i,j} (\hat{M}_{ij} - \hat{M}_{i(j+1)}) S_{ij}^\text{hor} + q_{ij} (\hat{M}_{ij} - \hat{M}_{i(j+1)}) S_{ij}^\text{vert}. \]

This only differs by a “−” sign from Eq. (33), and thus also annihilates the same two invariant families \( \ket{n^\chi} \) and \( \ket{n^n}' \). This operator is invariant under complex conjugation, and its eigenvalues form complex conjugate pairs. According to the
classification of Ref [60, 61], the model falls into the Gini-
bre symmetry class AI, and therefore will have the same level
statistics as the Giniibre GUE (GinUE) distribution [62].

Another possibility to obtain a non-Hermitian term of the
OT form annihilating invariant states is by taking only a "half" of
the hoppings (8), (11), (12), (13), (20), without the hermi-
tian conjugate.

A 2D modified Hubbard model of this form

\[
H_{nH}^{\text{subbar}} = \sum_{i,j} \left( t_1 c_{i,j}^\dagger c_{i+1,j+1}^{\sigma} + c_{i,j} c_{i+1,j+1}^{\sigma} \right) + t_2 (c_{i,j+1}^{\dagger} c_{i,j}^{\sigma} + c_{i,j+1} c_{i,j}^{\sigma}) + U n_{i,j} n_{i,j},
\]

(36)

where \( t_1 \neq t_2 \) are real parameters, was recently shown [63]
to be amenable to quantum Monte-Carlo simulation. Since
the considered hopping terms are certain generators of the
\( SU(N) \) group they annihilate the \( |n^\xi\rangle \) states.

IV. MODELS WITH INVARIANT SCARS

The interaction terms considered above, as well as their lin-
ear combinations, are of the form \( H_0 + OT \). Together with the
generators from Sec II they can be used as building blocks for
designing Hamiltonians in which some of the invariant states
\( |n^\xi\rangle, |n^\eta\rangle, \) and \( |n^\sigma\rangle \) are many-body scars.

Many commonly used models, such as the Hubbard,
Heisenberg, and \( tJU \) models fall into this class. In Table III
we explicitly re-write them as \( H_0 + OT \) and indicate the in-
variant states comprising the scar subspace, the derivations
and some more details are given in Appendix A. The presence
of \( |n^\eta\rangle \)'s scars in the extended Hubbard and Hirsch models,
that has been demonstrated in the literature [15, 21], is a di-
rect consequence of the group theoretic structure presented in
this work.

Because several families of scars with different symme-
tries may be present in the same model simultaneously the
\( H_0 + OT \) decomposition is different between \( |n^\xi\rangle \) and the
paired \( |n^\eta\rangle / |n^\eta\rangle' \) states. However, the difference is only in
that a certain constant term (shown in third column of Table
III) is either a part of \( H_0 \) or \( OT \) depending on which group we
consider (full separate expressions with respect to each group
are given in Appendix A).

To facilitate the design of custom models not listed here we
also added Table IV to the Appendix which gives the action of
other common Hamiltonian terms on the invariant states.

Note that in models that conserve spin, the \( |n^\xi\rangle \) states that
comprise a maximum spin-\( N/2 \) representation of \( SU(2)_{\text{spin}} \)
will not be true scars. To make them such, adding a pertur-
bation breaking spin-conservation (such as (33) or (35)) is re-
quired. Analogously, the states \( |n^\eta\rangle' \) only become true scars
upon addition of an \( \eta \)-pairing symmetry breaking perturbation
of the \( OT \) form.

A. Engineering the location of scars in the spectrum

1. Making a scar the ground state

The energies of the scars and the basis in the invariant sub-
space are determined by the \( H_0 \) part of the Hamiltonian, and
we can change their position in the spectrum by adding a term
to \( H_0 \) that commutes with it (is diagonal in the basis selected
by \( H_0 \)).

The \( |n^\xi\rangle \) states form the maximum spin representation of
\( SU(2)_{\text{spin}} \) and have a definite total spin and its axis projec-
tion quantum numbers. This means that a sufficiently strong
magnetic field will make the \( |n^\xi\rangle \) state with the largest axis
projection the ground state. It also controls the splitting be-
tween the \( |n^\xi\rangle \) states and the revivals period. For the basis in
Eq. (21) one would use the \( B_z = Q_3 (4) \) magnetic field while
for the basis (44) used later in our numerical example we will
use the \( B_y = Q_2 \) field (4).

The states \( |n^\eta\rangle \) and \( |n^\eta\rangle' \) have a definite particle number
and include the states with maximal and minimal possible particle
number (all filled \( |N^\eta\rangle \) or \( |N^\eta\rangle' \) and all empty \( |0^\eta\rangle \) or
\( |0^\eta\rangle' \)). This guarantees that a sufficiently large chemical po-
tential term can be used to make an all-filled scar state the
ground state.

2. Coupling to the rest of the scar subspace

Suppose we are at zero temperature and are in the ground
state which per the above results is a scar state. Now we turn
on for a limited time the “raising operator” of the correspond-
ing scar family.

In case the ground state is an all-filled \( |N^\eta\rangle \) or \( |N^\eta\rangle' \) state we add a term \( \eta^- + \eta^+ \) to the Hamiltonian (see (24) and (7)).
This may potentially be made by placing the system into a
direct contact with a superconductor. As a result, the system
will be initialized to a state that is a linear combination of
\( |n^\eta\rangle \) or \( |n^\eta\rangle' \).

In case the ground state is a state with maximal spin \( |N^\xi\rangle \)
we add a term \( \xi^- + \xi^+ \) (22) to the Hamiltonian. This may be
implemented by introducing an external magnetic field \( B_z =
Q_1 \) for basis (21) and \( B_z = Q_1 \) for basis (44)). As a result the
system will be initialized to a state within the \( |n^\xi\rangle \) subspace.

After the above steps the system is initialized to a state in
the singlet scar subspace. At this point one may choose to
lower or turn off the magnetic field or the chemical potential
that was used in the first step IV A 1 to make one of the scar
states the ground state.

It would be interesting to analyze the relation of the above
scheme to a number of protocols for preparing a paired \( |n^\eta\rangle' \)
state that rely on dissipation or periodical driving [66–69].

3. Low-energy subspace composed of scars only

We can also arrange for all the low-energy subspace be
composed solely of many-body scars. To do that we need
can be chosen to be the quadratic Casimir operator of the expressions in terms of $\Phi = \langle \Phi | \Phi \rangle$ and non-local operator. Second, we can use a term in energy for large $N$ does annihilate the scars (and the scars only). Increasing the magnitude of a perturbed $tJU$ term at half-filling (where the Hubbard interaction is zero). However it also annihilates the scars and pushes non-scar states high in energy for large $U$ at half-filling (where the $H_0$ energy contribution of the Hubbard interaction is zero). However it also “accidentally” annihilates some of the non-scar states and thus doesn’t alone allow to create a scar-only low-energy subspace.

| Model            | $H_0$                      | $H_0^\perp = OT^\perp$ | $O \cdot T$ | $|n^\downarrow\rangle$ | $|n^\uparrow\rangle$ | $|n^\downarrow\rangle'$ | $|n^\uparrow\rangle'$ |
|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Hubbard          | $(\frac{U}{2} - \mu) Q$    | $-\frac{U N}{2}$         | $t \sum_{(ij)} T'_{ij} + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{i} K_i^2$ | ✓            | ✓                                      |
| Heisenberg       | $\frac{J}{4} N_{11}^{nn}$ | $J \sum_{(ij)} C_{ij}$  | ✓            | ✓                                      | ✓                                      |
| $J_1 - J_2$      | $\frac{J_1 N_1^{nn} + J_2 N_2^{nn}}{4}$ | $J_1 \sum_{(ij)} C_{ij} + J_2 \sum_{(kl)} C_{kl}$ | ✓            | ✓                                      |
| Haldane-Shastry  | $\frac{\pi^2 (N^2 - 1) N}{24 N^2}$ | $-\frac{\pi^2}{32 N^2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{e^{\pi i n^2}}{2^{n^2 - 1}}$ | ✓            | ✓                                      |
| $t - J$          | $\frac{J}{4} N_{11}^{nn}$ | $J \sum_{(ij)} C_{ij} + t \sum_{(ij)} T'_{ij}$ | ✓            | ✓                                      |
| Hirsch (reduced) | $(\frac{U}{2} - \mu) Q$    | $-\frac{U N}{2}$         | $J \sum_{(ij)} C_{ij} + t \sum_{(ij)} T'_{ij} + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{i} K_i^2$ | ✓            | ✓                                      |
| Hirsch (full)    | $(\frac{U}{2} - \mu) Q$    | $-\frac{U N}{2}$         | $\sum_{(ij)} O^{HRT}_{ij} T'_{ij} + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{i} K_i^2$ | ✓            | ✓                                      |
| Haldane-Hubbard  | $(\frac{U}{2} - \mu) Q$    | $-\frac{U N}{2}$         | $t_1 \sum_{(ij)} T'_{ij} + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{i} K_i^2 + t_2 \sum_{(kl), \sigma} \left( e^{i \Phi_{kl}} \sum_{\alpha \beta} c_{k\alpha}^\dagger c_{l\beta} + \text{h.c.} \right)$ | ✓            | ✓                                      |

TABLE III. Known models as $H_0 + OT$. The decomposition is different for paired $|n^\downarrow\rangle |n^\uparrow\rangle'$ and $|n^\downarrow\rangle$ states. The term in the $H_0^\perp = OT^\perp$ column is part of $H_0$ for $SU(N)$ group and a part of $OT$ for $SU(N)$ or $SU(2)$ (N groups). Eqs. (18) and (31) allow to easily switch between the expressions in terms of $SU(N)$ and $SU(2)$ spin generators. All models are considered in the unrestricted Hilbert space that allows any on-site occupations incl. double-occupations. All decompositions are valid in any dimension and on any lattice except for the models that involve the $|n^\downarrow\rangle'$ states - they only become scars when the lattice is bipartite. $N_{11}^{nn}$ and $N_{22}^{nn}$ are the numbers of nearest- and next-nearest-neighbour pairs in a particular lattice. *: only when $\Phi = \pi/2$, $t_1 = 0$. **: only when $\Phi = \pi/2$.

to add a positive definite operator $P$ to the Hamiltonian that annihilates the scars (and the scars only). Increasing the magnitude of such a term will leave the scars untouched but will push the rest of the spectrum up in energy.

For the scar states invariant under a particular group we have two options for designing the desired operator $P$. First, $P$ can be chosen to be the quadratic Casimir operator of the corresponding group, which may however be a complicated and non-local operator. Second, we can use $P = \sum_k (T_k T_k^\dagger)^l$, where $T_k$ are the simple root generators of the group (10) and $l > 0$ is an integer.

The Hubbard interaction already includes (26) a similar term $P = \sum_i K_i^2$ with $K_i$ the generator of $U(N)$ (15). It does annihilate the $|n^\downarrow\rangle$ scars and pushes non-scar states high in energy for large $U$ at half-filling (where the $H_0$ energy contribution of the Hubbard interaction is zero). However it also “accidentally” annihilates some of the non-scar states and thus doesn’t alone allow to create a scar-only low-energy subspace.

V. TWO-DIMENSIONAL tJU MODEL

We illustrate the concepts discussed above using the example of a perturbed $tJU$ model on a 2D rectangular bipartite lattice shown in Fig. 4. The Hamiltonian of the standard $tJU$ model [70–72] combines the Hubbard and Heisenberg interactions

$$H^{tJU} = t \sum_{(ij)} c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + J \sum_{(ij)} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + U \sum_i n_{i\uparrow} n_{i\downarrow} - \mu Q$$

and can be viewed as a generalization of Hubbard or t-J models relevant for high-$T_c$ superconductivity [73].

The $H_0 + OT$ decomposition of this model can be performed w.r.t. to two groups $U(N)$ and $U(N)'$ which leads to two families of group-invariant scars $|n^\downarrow\rangle$ and $|n^\downarrow\rangle'$. In case of $U(N)$ we have

$$H^{tJU} = J \sum_{(ij)} C_{ij} + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{i} K_i^2 ,$$

while for the group $U(N)'$ it is

$$H^{tJU} = Q \left( \frac{U}{2} - \mu \right) + t \sum_{(ij)} T'_{ij} + J \sum_{(ij)} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j - \frac{U}{2} \sum_i M_i^2 ,$$

where we have used the $H_0 + OT$ decomposition of individual terms (20), (26), (31) derived earlier. In both equations the first line is $H_0$ and acts on the invariant states with a constant while the second $OT$ line only consists of terms proportional
to group generators that annihilate the invariant states. Note
that the two expressions (38) and (39) are only different by
assigning a certain constant term to \( H_0 \) or \( OT \) as indicated in
the decomposition given in Table III.

We recall that a group \( G \)-invariant states become scars in
a model that can be written as \( H_0 + \sum_k O_k T_k \) where \( T_k \) are
generators of \( G \). Note that a generator of any subgroup of \( G \)
is also a generator of \( G \) and can also appear as \( T_k \) in the
decomposition. This is actually the case in (39) (and all other
decompositions w.r.t. paired states) where the hopping term is
a generator of \( SU(N) \) while the Heisenberg and magnetization
terms are both proportional to a generator of \( SU(2)_{\text{spin}} \).
All these terms are thus generators of the full symmetry group
of the \( | n \rangle \rangle \) discussed in the introductions.

The standard \( JU \) model (37) conserves the total physical
spin. Therefore the states \( | n \rangle \rangle \) form a separate symmetry sector
of this model. To make them true scars we break the total spin
conservation by adding a perturbation (33). The full \emph{Hermitian}
Hamiltonian we study numerically reads

\[
H^{JU}_h = H^{JU}_h + \beta H^p_h + \gamma Q_2 ,
\]

where we added a term proportional to the \( SU(2)_{\text{spin}} \) generator \( Q_2 \) (4).
It acts as \( H_0 \) on \( | n \rangle \rangle \) and splits them according to
the index \( n \): \( Q_2 | n \rangle \rangle = (2n - N) | n \rangle \rangle \). For the \( SU(2)_{\text{spin}} \)
invariant states \( | n \rangle \rangle \) it is of the pure \( OT \) form and annihilates
them exactly.

Note that by increasing \( \gamma \) we can make the scar state with
maximum \( Q_2 \), \( | S_1 \rangle \rangle \) (44), the ground state. This may be used to
initialize the system to a state from many-body scar subspace
as described in Sec. IV A. The full \emph{non-Hermitian} Hamiltonian
we consider is

\[
H^{JU}_{nh} = H^{JU}_h + \beta_1 H^p_{nh} ,
\]

where for numerical investigations we set \( \beta_1 = 0.4\beta \).
In both the Hermitian and the non-Hermitian cases, the part of the
full Hamiltonian that acts with a constant on the invariant states is

\[
E^{(n)}_0 = \frac{J}{4} N_1^{(n)} + \left( \frac{U}{2} - \mu \right) Q - \frac{U N}{2} + \gamma Q_2 ,
\]

\[
E^{(n \prime)}_0 = \left( \frac{U}{2} - \mu \right) Q .
\]

The states \( | n \rangle \rangle \) are already eigenstates of (43) as written in
Eq. (24) while the states in Eq. (21) are not the eigenstates
of (42). Instead, the basis in the \( SU(N) \)-invariant subspace
determined by the Hamiltonian (42) reads

\[
| n \rangle \rangle_{JU} = \frac{\tilde{\zeta}^n}{2^n \sqrt{N_1^{(n\prime)}}} | S_1 \rangle \rangle ,
\]

\[
| S_1 \rangle \rangle = \prod_a c_{a1} + ic_{a2} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}} | 0 \rangle \rangle ,
\]

where \( \tilde{\zeta} = Q_S - iQ_1 \).

The energies of the invariant states are given by

\[
E^{(n)}_0 = (U - 2\mu) n ,
\]

\[
E^{(n \prime)}_0 = \frac{J}{4} N_1^{(n \prime)} - \mu N + \gamma (2n - N) ,
\]

where \( n \) is the index of a state in its respective family \( (24) \) or
(44).

The energy of the product state \( | 0 \rangle_{JU} = | S_1 \rangle \rangle \) in large sys-
tems is proportional to \( N \) and therefore has good chances to be
the ground state at half-filling for \( (J/2 - \mu - \gamma) < 0 \). An \( | n \rangle \rangle \)
state is more likely to be the ground state when \( (U - 2\mu) < 0 \).
A more detailed analysis of the conditions leading to a scar state
being the ground state in our model is provided in Sec IV A.

Because both Hermitian and non-Hermitian models we
consider have an exact \( H_0 + OT \) decomposition, they have
the two families \( | n \rangle \rangle \) and \( | n \rangle \rangle \) as scars for any choices of the
coupling constants. The two scar families form two equidis-
tant towers of states with the energies given in (42) and (43).
Revivals within each individual subspace can be observed for
any values of the couplings. However, to see the revivals of an
initial state that is a mix of \( | n \rangle \rangle \) and \( | n \rangle \rangle \) subspaces all the

gaps in (42) and (43) must have a common divisor which rep-
resents a constraint on the choice of the constants \( \mu, U \), and
\( \gamma \).

A. Numerical results

For the numerical experiment we use the \( N_x \times N_y = 3 \times 3 \)
lattice and set \( t = -0.4 \), \( J = 1 \), \( U = 8 \), \( \mu = 1.3 \). For \( \gamma = 1 \)
this corresponds to the g.s. filling of \( \nu = \frac{Q_1}{2N} = 0.44(4) \),
11\% below the half-filling which corresponds to the poten-
tially high-\( T_c \)-relevant regime \([74, 75] \). For our simulation we
instead choose \( \gamma = 3.6 \). At this value the half-filled \( | S_1 \rangle \rangle \)
becomes the ground state. This simplifies the initialization of
the system to the scar subspace in experiment, which is further discussed in Sec. IV A. Because \( | S_1 \rangle \rangle \) is a product state, it can alternatively be created by application of a simple
gate circuit on each site (see SM of Ref \([1] \)).

The level statistics parameters of \( r = 0.5306 \) \( (r_{GOE} = 0.5359) \) and \( r_{nh} = 0.7378 \) \( (r_{Ginibre} \approx 0.74) \) are close to
the values of the corresponding random ensembles (defined in
Appendix C 2) and thus indicate that the bulk spectra of both
systems are fully chaotic. This is further elaborated by the
gap distribution (Fig. 6 and 8) and by the presence of the
"dip-ramp-plateau" structure in the spectral structure factor
plot Fig. 6) typical for chaotic systems.

In the spectrum of the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian (41) (see
Fig. 5) we observe that all the scar states remain at the real axis
and are not effected by the non-Hermitian terms. The non-Hermitian spectrum also has a "conjugation symmetry": for
every state with energy \( a + ib \) there is another state with energy \( a - ib \). All the observables measured in any two such
states (such as entanglement entropy) are also equal. For this
reason we choose to plot such observables as a function of the
real part of the energy eigenvalue: \( \text{Re} E \).
VI. DISCUSSION

We have shown explicitly that a selection of well-known models (Table III) is of the $H_0 + OT$ form and support group-invariant scars for any coupling constant and without a need for fine-tuning. A large number of other models can be built by combining the terms we list as generators in Sec. II. Of particular interest are the “superconducting” terms in (14) and the spin-flip hopping terms in (12). It will be very interesting to explore the interplay of the weak ergodicity breaking and the superconductivity or topology by studying the models built of such terms.

From the quantum computation perspective, the group-invariant scar subspace we consider constitutes a “decoherence-free” subspace which can be used to reduce noise in the universal quantum computation [77, 78]. Thus, another interesting direction for future work is the development of specific protocols that would enable quantum computation at finite temperature.

Many of the models we are considering are among the most commonly and widely used in condensed matter physics. Therefore there is a great potential for studying these models and the weak ergodicity breaking effects therein in cold atoms quantum simulations, and also for identifying materials that could host this phenomenon. We do describe conditions under which the ground state is a many-body scar or the full low-energy subspace consists solely of scars, which should further facilitate the experimental explorations.

Finally, we have demonstrated that the invariant scar subspace continues to undergo stable, coherent time evolution in a class of suitably designed open systems with non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. This greatly expands the realm of weak ergodicity breaking phenomena and will hopefully inspire new theoretical and experimental studies. In particular, it would be interesting to study the relation of the degenerate (e.g. in (45), no $B_y$ field for $|n\uparrow\rangle$ or $\mu = U/2$ for $|n\downarrow\rangle$) group-invariant scar subspaces in the non-Hermitian systems to the “exceptional points”, the degeneracies in the non-Hermitian operators that lead to numerous exotic phenomena and are being intensively studied currently [50, 79–81].
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Appendix A: Derivation of the $H_0 + OT$ form

Throughout this section we will use the following definitions: the filling fraction $\nu = \frac{N}{2N}$; $N^{1n}$ and $N^{2n}$ are the numbers of nearest- and next-nearest-neighbour pairs in a particular lattice.

1. Hubbard model

The Hubbard model reads

$$H^{Hub} = t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle, \sigma} \left( c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} \right) - \mu Q + U \sum_i H_i^{Hub},$$

where $i$ and $j$ label sites of a lattice and $\langle i, j \rangle$ stands for the nearest neighbours.

Substituting our result (25) we obtain the $H_0 + OT$ form in terms of $SU(N)$ generators,

$$H^{Hub} = Q \left( \frac{U}{2} - \mu \right) - U \frac{N}{2} + T_{\langle i,j \rangle} + U \sum_i K_i^2. \quad (A1)$$

The hopping term $t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle, \sigma} \left( c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma} \right)$ is a special case of $T_{ij} (8)$, is thus a generator of $SU(N)$ and annihilates $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle$ subspace.

On a bipartite lattice this hopping term is in addition a special case of $T'_{\langle ij \rangle} (20)$ is therefore a generator of $SU(N)'$ and thus annihilates the $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle'$ subspace. Using (18) we obtain the $H_0 + OT$ decomposition w.r.t. the group $SU(N)'$:

$$H^{Hub} = Q \left( \frac{U}{2} - \mu \right) + T_{\langle i,j \rangle} - U \frac{2}{2} \sum_i M_i^2. \quad (A2)$$

Comparing the two expressions (A1) and (A2) we notice that they are similar except that the constant $2\frac{N}{2}$ belongs to $H_0$ in the first and to $OT$ in the second equation.

Only $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle$ states are scars for the Hubbard model on an arbitrary lattice. Because the $H_0 + OT$ decomposition of the Hubbard model is possible w.r.t. two groups $SU(N)$ and $SU(N)'$ on a bipartite lattice the singlets of these groups $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle$ and $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle'$ together form the $2N + 2$-dimensional scar subspace.

In the pure Hubbard model the $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle$ subspace ($Q = N$) is degenerate with energy (see (A1))

$$H^{Hub} |n^{1\sigma}\rangle = -\mu N |n^{1\sigma}\rangle \quad (A3)$$

while the paired states $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle'$ ($Q = 2n - N$) are split equidistantly, according to their particle number (see (A2))

$$H^{Hub} |n^{1\sigma}\rangle' = (U - 2\mu)n |n^{1\sigma}\rangle'. \quad (A4)$$

The paired states $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle'$ are not eigenstates of the Hubbard model, they are mixed by the hopping terms.

2. Heisenberg model

It is convenient to map the Heisenberg interaction into the fermionic model containing 2 complex fermions (spin up and spin down) on each lattice site using (5), where the spin at site $i$ is expressed as $\vec{S}_i = \frac{1}{2} c_{i\alpha}^\dagger \vec{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta} c_{i\beta}$.

It follows that

$$4 \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j = \left( c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\uparrow} - c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow} \right) \left( c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\uparrow} - c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow} \right)$$

$$+ \left( c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\uparrow} + c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow} \right) \left( c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\uparrow} + c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow} \right)$$

$$- \left( c_{i\uparrow}^\dagger c_{i\uparrow} - c_{i\downarrow}^\dagger c_{i\downarrow} \right) \left( c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow} + c_{j\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\uparrow} \right)$$

$$- c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{i\beta} c_{j\beta} c_{j\alpha} - c_{j\alpha} c_{i\alpha} c_{i\beta} c_{j\beta}$$

$$- c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\alpha} c_{i\beta} c_{j\beta} + c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{i\alpha} + c_{j\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\alpha}. \quad (A5)$$

This may be written as

$$\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} E_{ij} E_{ji} + \frac{1}{4} E_{ij} E_{ji} - \frac{1}{4} K_i K_j, \quad (A6)$$

where we introduced the following generators of $SU(N)$:

$$E_{ij} = c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\alpha}, \quad H_{ij} = c_{i\alpha}^\dagger c_{i\alpha} - c_{j\alpha}^\dagger c_{j\alpha} = K_i - K_j$$

$$[E_{ij}, E_{ji}] = H_{ij}, \quad [H_{ij}, E_{ij}] = 2E_{ij},$$

$$[H_{ij}, E_{ji}] = -2E_{ji}. \quad (A7)$$

When we restrict to the subspace $K_i = 0$ (the locally half-filled, original Heisenberg model sector) we get

$$\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2} E_{ij} E_{ji} \quad (A8)$$

Eqs. (A6) and (A8) represent the $H_0 + OT$ decomposition of the Heisenberg interaction w.r.t. to the group $SU(N)$. It follows that the $SU(N)$-invariant states $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle$ are degenerate eigenstates of $\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j$ on any lattice, in any dimension and for any $i$ and $j$ with energy $\frac{1}{4}$.

We note that the Heisenberg interaction consists exclusively of the $SU(2)_{spin}$ generators $S_1^A$. Therefore it is of pure $OT$ form w.r.t. to the group $SU(2)_{spin}$ and thus exactly annihilates the $SU(2)_{spin}$-invariant states $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle$ and $|n^{1\sigma}\rangle'$. This is also true for the Heisenberg model and its special cases containing the spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg interaction only and discussed below (Haldane-Shastry, $J_1$-$J_2$, Majumdar-Ghosh).

The Heisenberg Hamiltonian reads

$$H_{Heisenberg} = J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j. \quad (A9)$$
Using Eqs. (A6) and (31) it can be written in the $H_0 + OT$ form (w.r.t. $SU(N)$) as

$$H_{\text{Heisenberg}} = \frac{J}{4} N_1^\text{nn} + J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} C_{i,j}, \quad (A10)$$

where $N_1^\text{nn}$ is the number of nearest-neighbour links on a given lattice and $C_{i,j}$ are the $SU(N)$ generators.

Therefore the $SU(N)$-invariant states $|n^\xi\rangle$ are degenerate eigenstates of the Heisenberg model with the energy

$$E_{n^\xi}^{\text{Heisenberg}} = \frac{J}{4} N_1^\text{nn}. \quad (A11)$$

The $SU(2)_{\text{spin}}$-invariant states $|n^\eta\rangle$ and $|n^\eta\rangle'$ are annihilated by the Heisenberg Hamiltonian (A9) which is of pure $OT$ form w.r.t. $SU(2)_{\text{spin}}$.

3. Haldane-Shastry model

The isotropic ($\Delta = 0$) Hamiltonian $[82]$ of the 1D Haldane-Shastry model $[82, 83]$ reads

$$H^{\text{HS}} = \sum_{n<n'} J(n-n') \vec{S}_n \cdot \vec{S}_{n'}, \quad (A12)$$

with $J(n-n') = \frac{\pi^2}{N^2 \sin^2 \left( \frac{\pi (n-n')}N \right)}$.

We have seen that each of such terms acts on $|n^\xi\rangle$ states with a constant (Sec. III C and Eq. (31)): $\vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j |n^\xi\rangle = \frac{1}{4} |n^\xi\rangle$.

Therefore all the $|n^\xi\rangle$ states are degenerate in the isotropic Haldane-Shastry model, are scars and have the energy

$$E_{n^\xi}^{\text{HS}} = \frac{\pi^2}{4 N^2} \sum_k \frac{1}{\sin^2 \left( \frac{\pi k}N \right)} = \frac{\pi^2}{4 N^2} \frac{N^3 - N}{6}, \quad (A13)$$

which is always integer in units of $\frac{\pi^2}{4 N^2}$.

We note that Ref. [82] does mention the existence of such integer-energy states:

“For the isotropic model, the numerical study reveals a surprising fact: States are grouped into highly degenerate supermultiplets, and at every value of the crystal momentum and parity, every energy level is contained in the set derived from states with real pseudomomenta, and the energies in units of $\frac{\pi^2}{4 N^2}$ are all integers.”

As discussed in Sec. A2 both families of paired states are exactly annihilated by the Haldane-Shastry Hamiltonian.

4. $J_1$-$J_2$ model

$J_1$-$J_2$ model is the Heisenberg interaction between nearest-neighbours ($J_1$) and next-nearest-neighbours ($J_2$):

$$H_{J_1,J_2} = J_1 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + J_2 \sum_{\langle\langle kl \rangle\rangle} \vec{S}_k \cdot \vec{S}_l \quad (A14)$$

Using Eq. (31) we write

$$H_{J_1,J_2} = J_1 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} H_{\text{Heis}}^{ij} + J_2 \sum_{\langle\langle kl \rangle\rangle} H_{\text{Heis}}^{kl} =$$

$$J_1 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \left( C_{ij} + \frac{1}{4} \right) + J_2 \sum_{\langle\langle kl \rangle\rangle} \left( C_{kl} + \frac{1}{4} \right) =$$

$$\frac{1}{4} \left( J_1 N_1^\text{nn} + J_2 N_2^\text{nn} \right) + J_1 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} C_{ij} + J_2 \sum_{\langle\langle kl \rangle\rangle} C_{kl} \quad (A15)$$

where the $SU(N)$-generators $C_{ij}$ are defined in Eq. (32).

It follows that $H_{J_1,J_2} |n^\xi\rangle = \frac{1}{4} \left( J_1 N_1^\text{nn} + J_2 N_2^\text{nn} \right) |n^\xi\rangle$, while $H_{J_1,J_2}$ annihilates the paired states $|n^\eta\rangle$ and $|n^\eta\rangle'$ just as each of its terms does individually. Therefore all three families decouple in the $J_1$-$J_2$ model and are scars.

a. Special case $J_1 = 2 J_2$: Majumdar-Ghosh model

We also note that the above results directly apply to the Majumdar-Ghosh model which is a special case with $J_1 = 2 J_2$.

5. Hirsch model

a. The “reduced” version $[15, 64]$

The “reduced” Hirsch model for which the $|n^\eta\rangle'$ states were shown to be scars in Ref. [15] reads

$$H_{\text{Hir}} = - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle, \sigma} \left[ t - X (n_i, -\sigma + n_j, -\sigma) \right] \left( c^\dagger_{i,\sigma} c_{j,\sigma} + h.c. \right)$$

$$+ U \sum_j n_j,\uparrow n_j,\downarrow - \mu Q, \quad (A16)$$

where $X$ is a real number and $-\sigma$ is the opposite direction of spin $\sigma$ or equivalently [15]

$$H_{\text{Hir}} = - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \left[ t - X (n_i + n_j - 1) \right] \sum_{\sigma} \left( c^\dagger_{i,\sigma} c_{j,\sigma} + h.c. \right)$$

$$+ U \sum_j n_j,\uparrow n_j,\downarrow - \mu Q. \quad (A17)$$

Defining

$$O^{HR}_{ij} = - \left[ t - X (n_i + n_j - 1) \right], \quad (A18)$$

noticing that the terms $T_{\langle ij \rangle}'$ are generators of both $\widehat{SU}(N)'$ and $SU(N)$ (see (20)) and using Eq. (25) for $n_j,\uparrow n_j,\downarrow$ we obtain the $H_0 + OT$ form for the model (A17) with respect to the group $SU(N)$ ($|n^\xi\rangle$ scars)

$$H_{\text{Hir}} = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} O^{HR}_{ij} T_{\langle ij \rangle}' + \frac{U}{2} \sum_j K_j^2 + Q \left( \frac{U}{2} - \mu \right) - \frac{U N}{2} \quad (A19)$$
and with respect to the group $\widetilde{SU}(N)' \times SU(2)'_\text{spin}$ ($|n^c\rangle$ scars)

$$H^\text{Hir}_r = \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} O^{HRT}_{ij} T_{ij} + Q \left( \frac{U}{2} - \mu \right) - \frac{U}{2} \sum_i M_i^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (A20)$$

On a generic lattice $T'_{(ij)}$ is a generator of $SU(N)$ and the half-filled $SU(N)$-invariant $|n^c\rangle$ states become scars with the energies,

$$H^\text{Hir}_r |n^c\rangle = -\mu N |n^c\rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A21)

On a bipartite lattice the nearest-neighbour hopping $T_{(ij)}$ is a generator of $\widetilde{SU}(N)'$. Therefore in addition to the $|n^c\rangle$ the $|n^v\rangle$ states become scars with the energies

$$H^\text{Hir}_r |n^v\rangle = (U - 2\mu) n |n^v\rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A22)

b. The full version from Ref. [65]

The Hirsch model in its original formulation (Eq. 6 in Ref. [65], see also [84]) contains an additional density-density term but is missing the chemical potential

$$H^\text{Hir} = -t_0 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle, \sigma} \left( c^\dagger_{i,\sigma} c_{j,\sigma} + \text{h.c.} \right) + U \sum_i H^\text{Hub}_i +$$

$$+ V \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} n_i n_j + \Delta t \sum_{\langle ij \rangle, \sigma} \left( c^\dagger_{i,\sigma} c_{j,\sigma} + \text{h.c.} \right) (n_{i,-\sigma} + n_{j,-\sigma}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A23)

Defining

$$O^{HF}_{ij} = [-t_0 + \Delta t(n_i + n_j - 1)]$$  \hspace{1cm} (A24)

and using (29) for density-density we bring the full Hirsch model to the $H_0 + OT$ form w.r.t. the group $SU(N)$

$$H^\text{Hir} = \frac{U}{2} (Q - N) + V N_1^{nn} +$$

$$+ \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} O^{HF}_{ij} T_{ij} + \frac{U}{2} \sum J K_j^2 + V \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (K_i K_j + K_i + K_j).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A25)

We have seen in Sec. III B that the generic density-density interaction can be written in terms of the $SU(N)$ generators but doesn’t have the paired states as eigenstates.

Therefore only $|n^c\rangle$ states with energies

$$H^\text{Hir} |n^c\rangle = VN_1^{nn} |n^c\rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (A26)

are scars in the full Hirsch model [65].

6. Haldane-Hubbard model

The spin-full Haldane-Hubbard model is [85–87]

$$H^{HH} = t_1 \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle, \sigma} \left[ c^\dagger_{i,\sigma} c_{j,\sigma} + c^\dagger_{i,\sigma} c_{j,\sigma} \right] - \mu Q +$$

$$+ U \sum_i H^\text{Hub}_i + t_2 \sum_{\langle kl \rangle, \sigma} \left[ e^{i\Phi_{kl}^i} c^\dagger_{k,\sigma} c_{l,\sigma} + e^{-i\Phi_{kl}^i} c^\dagger_{l,\sigma} c_{k,\sigma} \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (A27)

and can be defined on any bipartite lattice and in particular on the 2D honeycomb lattice of graphene.

The model is obtained by adding the complex-amplitude next-nearest-neighbour hopping to the Hubbard model which means the $H_0 + OT$ decomposition only differs from Hubbard model by the addition of the $t_2$ hopping to the $OT$ (see Tab. III).

In the most general case the $t_2$ hopping terms are the generators of $SU(N)$ and the model possesses only one scar family $|n^c\rangle$ with the corresponding $H_0 + OT$ decomposition

$$H^{HH} = Q \left( \frac{U}{2} - \mu \right) - U N + \frac{t_2}{2} \sum T'_{(i,j)} +$$

$$+ t_2 \sum_{\langle kl \rangle, \sigma} \left[ e^{-i\Phi_{kl}^i} c^\dagger_{k,\sigma} c_{l,\sigma} + e^{-i\Phi_{kl}^i} c^\dagger_{l,\sigma} c_{k,\sigma} \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (A28)

For $\Phi_{kl} = \pi/2$ the amplitude of the $t_2$ hopping becomes purely imaginary and because the lattice in the Haldane-Hubbard model is always bipartite the hopping $t_1 + t_2$ is a generator of $\widetilde{SU}(N)'$ (see Sec B) and the $|n^v\rangle$ family of scars is added while the corresponding $H_0 + OT$ decomposition reads

$$H^{HH} (\Phi_{kl} = \pi/2) = Q \left( \frac{U}{2} - \mu \right) + t_1 \sum T'_{(i,j)} +$$

$$+ i t_2 \sum_{\langle kl \rangle, \sigma} \left[ c^\dagger_{k,\sigma} c_{l,\sigma} - c^\dagger_{l,\sigma} c_{k,\sigma} \right] - \frac{U}{2} \sum_i M_i^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A29)

If in addition $t_1 = 0$ then the remaining $t_2$ hopping alone is a generator (see Eq. (11)) of $SO(N)$ which is a subgroup of both $\widetilde{SU}(N)'$ and $\widetilde{SU}(N)$ and the third scar family of $\widetilde{SU}(N) \times SU(2)_\text{spin}$-invariant states $|n^v\rangle$ is added. The corresponding $H_0 + OT$ decomposition is

$$H^{HH} (\Phi_{kl} = \pi/2; t_1 = 0) = Q \left( \frac{U}{2} - \mu \right) +$$

$$+ i t_2 \sum_{\langle kl \rangle, \sigma} \left[ c^\dagger_{k,\sigma} c_{l,\sigma} - c^\dagger_{l,\sigma} c_{k,\sigma} \right] - \frac{U}{2} \sum_i M_i^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A30)

Appendix B: Hopping as a group generator

Any Hermitian spin-independent hopping terms on any lattice (including $T'$, $T_{ij}'$) are always special cases of the
complex-amplitude hopping $T_{ij}$ (Eq. (8)) and therefore belong to an $SU(N)$ algebra and annihilate the $|n\uparrow\rangle$ subspace.

Nearest neighbour hopping with real amplitude $T_{(ij)}^\sigma$ on a bipartite lattice is a generator of $SU(N)'$ and therefore annihilates the $SU(N)'$ singlets $|n\downarrow\rangle$.

In this section we discuss the algebraic properties of the other hopping types (incl. longer-range) that annihilate $|n\downarrow\rangle$ and often appear in condensed matter models.

The complication with purely real-amplitude hopping

$$T_{ij} = c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma} + c_{j\sigma}^\dagger c_{i\sigma},$$

(B1)

comes from the fact that a commutator of such terms might not always be expressed as $T_{kl}^\sigma$ alone but could also contain imaginary-amplitude terms which would mean that real-amplitude-only hopping does not in general form a closed algebra. In several special cases a constraint on the lattice type, hopping range or boundary conditions allows however for this algebra to be closed. For example $T_{ij}^\sigma$ is restricted to the nearest-neighbour hopping on a bipartite lattice.

Combining both nearest- and next-nearest-neighbour real-amplitude hopping does not lead to a closed algebra. Indeed, let us consider the following set

$$T_1 = c_{1\sigma}^\dagger c_{2\sigma} + \text{h.c.}, \quad T_2 = c_{2\sigma}^\dagger c_{3\sigma} + \text{h.c.}, \quad T_3 = c_{1\sigma}^\dagger c_{3\sigma} + \text{h.c.},$$

the hopping $T_{1,2}$ are nearest-neighbor, while $T_3$ is the next-nearest-neighbor. Then $T_3' = [T_1, T_2] = ic_{3\sigma}^\dagger c_{1\sigma} + \text{h.c.}$ and is not of the form of $T_3$ and therefore would generate the whole algebra $SU(N)$ instead of its subgroup.

However, on a bipartite lattice a closed $SO(N)'$ algebra is formed by long-range real-amplitude hopping that contains exclusively even-nearest-neighbour terms, meaning that it is a hopping over $2k$ neighbours, where $k$ is a non-negative integer. The number of the nearest neighbours hopped over by the term $\sum c_{i\sigma}^\dagger c_{j\sigma}$ is determined by the lattice as the smallest number of connected sites that need to be visited when traveling from site $i$ to site $j$. The even-nearest-neighbour hopping includes nearest-neighbour terms and is shown in red lines in Fig. 4 that only connect the members of different groups of the bipartite lattice (red-to-blue). Such hopping annihilates $|n\downarrow\rangle$ as a generator of $SO(N)'$ and $|n\uparrow\rangle$ as a generator of $SU(N)$.

Algebra $\tilde{SO}(N)'$ can also be constructed on a bipartite lattice when both even- and odd-nearest-neighbour hopping are present in the system. In this case, we must require that all the even-nearest-neighbour hopping terms have real amplitude while all the odd-nearest-neighbour terms have imaginary amplitude. Such a hopping will again annihilate both $|n\uparrow\rangle$ and $|n\downarrow\rangle$ subspaces. The prime example of this scenario is the Haldane model [85] discussed in Sec. A.6.

Appendix C: Numerical results

1. Spectrum

The imaginary and real components of the eigenvalues of Eq. (41) are shown in Fig. 5. While the majority of the eigenvalues of the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian become complex the eigenvalues corresponding to the invariant scar states remain real and the same as in the system without a non-Hermitian term. This demonstrates the stability of the many-body scar states in suitably designed open systems.

The spectrum also exhibits the conjugation symmetry: for every eigenvalue $E = E_r + iE_{im}$ there is a partner state with $E = E_r - iE_{im}$.

2. Quantum chaos

We can better understand several properties of our system using knowledge from random matrix theory. There are three main random matrix ensembles corresponding to the Hermitian models that we study in this paper; these are commonly known as the Wigner ensembles consisting of the Gaussian Orthogonal Ensemble (GOE), the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE), and the Gaussian Symplectic Ensemble (GSE). The GOE is time reversal invariant and is a random real symmetric matrix ($H = H^T$) where the entries are drawn from a normal Gaussian distribution. The GUE is not time reversal invariant.
and is a random Hermitian matrix \((H = H^\dagger)\) where the entries are drawn from a complex Gaussian distribution. Finally, the GSE is time reversal invariant (but breaks rotational symmetry) and is comprised of real quaternion matrices. Here, we quantify quantum chaos in our models using three distinct measures, and we can compare some of these measures from our model to those of the corresponding random matrix ensemble. We examine the spectral form factor (SFF) \([88]\), the level spacings distribution \((P(s))\), and the mean spacings ratio, \((\langle r \rangle)\).

The main elements of the SFF for a random matrix is a dip ramp plateau structure. The ramp is caused by the repulsion of eigenvalues that are far apart; these eigenvalues are anti-correlated, which is why the ramp is below the plateau. The plateau is a result of generic level repulsion, as degeneracies are unlikely. The ramp and plateau occur at later times and thus probe shorter distances, and these elements are a result of a phenomena known as spectral rigidity. The dip occurs at early times and so it probes larger distances; it is the Fourier transform of the entire spectrum. For a random matrix that follows the Wigner-Dyson semicircle distribution, the slope of the dip thus resembles the Bessel function, and this is what we see when we plot its SFF. A chaotic system is expected to have these properties since they share the same nearest-neighbor statistics of the respective RMT ensemble. If our spectra have a well defined dip ramp plateau structure, we can conclude that there is evidence of quantum chaos in the models considered.

The level spacings distribution, \(P(s)\), is the probability density function (pdf) of the spacings between consecutive eigenvalues. A key feature of the \(P(s)\) of random Gaussian matrices is that it decays to zero as \(s \to 0\). This phenomenon is called level repulsion and implies that it is very unlikely for eigenvalues to be nearly identical.

\[ r = \frac{s_i}{s_{i-1}} \quad \text{where,} \quad s_i = \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i, \quad (C1) \]

where \(\lambda_i\) is the \(i^{th}\) eigenvalue. See equation (C3) for the definition for a non-Hermitian system. We also see level repulsion in the pdf of the consecutive level spacings ratio, \(P(r)\), as we send \(r \to 0\). The analytic mean level spacings ratios are calculated in \([89]\), and are \(\langle r \rangle \approx 0.5359\), \(\langle r \rangle \approx 0.6027\), and \(\langle r \rangle \approx 0.6762\) for the GOE, GUE, and GSE respectively.

Based on the Figs. 6 and 7, we can conclude that our Hermitian models have a chaotic bulk; the SFF has a dip ramp plateau structure, and the level spacings plots and \(\langle r \rangle\) values closely match those of the GOE.

\[ d_\alpha = \min_{\beta} |E_\alpha - E_\beta|, \quad (C2) \]

The \(r\)-value is defined as \([90]\).

\[ r_n = \frac{|d_{N_1} - d_n|}{|d_{N_2} - d_n|} \quad (C3) \]

where \(N_1\) is the nearest neighbor and \(N_2\) is the next nearest neighbor.

We can see from Fig. 8, that our non-Hermitian model shows evidence of a chaotic bulk. The level spacings plot fits closely to that of the Ginibre distribution, and the \(\langle r \rangle\) value of our model is also close to the Ginibre value. The interpretation of the SFF for the non-Hermitian model is less straightforward, though we do see a dip ramp plateau structure when considering only the real part of the eigenvalues. The dip ramp plateau structure is less clear when considering only the magnitude or imaginary part of the eigenvalues.
3. ETH violation

The violation of strong ETH by the scar states is demonstrated in Fig. 9 for Hermitian and Fig. 10 for non-Hermitian Hamiltonians. We evaluate the expectation values for the operators that define the off-diagonal long-range order of the two scars families:

\[ G_O = \langle \hat{c}_{x_1 y_1 \uparrow} \hat{c}_{x_1 y_1 \downarrow} ^\dagger \hat{c}_{x_2 y_2 \uparrow} \hat{c}_{x_2 y_2 \downarrow} ^\dagger \rangle \]

(C4)

for \( |n^\eta \rangle \) introduced in [54] and

\[ G_U = \langle \hat{c}_{x_1 y_1 \uparrow} \hat{c}_{x_1 y_1 \downarrow} ^\dagger \hat{c}_{x_2 y_2 \uparrow} \hat{c}_{x_2 y_2 \downarrow} ^\dagger \rangle \]

(C5)

for \( |n^\zeta \rangle \) introduced in [1].

Because of the high symmetry of the invariant states, these correlators, when evaluated for scars, do not depend on the coordinates \( x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 \) [1]. For the numerical evaluation we set the points 1 and 2 to be the most distant points in our system with open boundaries: \( (x_1, y_1) = (1, 1) \) and \( (x_2, y_2) = (3, 3) \).

Note that while all the \( |n^\eta \rangle \) states are at half-filling \( (Q = 9) \) the particle number of the paired states \( |n^\eta \rangle \) is \( 2n \) and therefore only one such state is visible for any fixed filling (the data shown is for \( Q = 8 \)).

The scar states are clearly away from the microcanonical average in both systems. Very strong magnetic field is present in both systems and couples to the states with non-zero magnetization. This results in the spikes seen in the data for the non-Hermitian system which is apparently more susceptible to the magnetic field.

4. Time evolution

To study the time evolution we prepare the initial state as a uniform mix of \( 2N + 2 = 20 \) eigenstates of the system that are either many body scars or randomly chosen generic eigenstates as shown in the top panels of Fig. 11.

As expected, during the time evolution the initial state made of scars repeatedly returns to itself (bottom left panel of Fig. 11) with the period \( T = 2\pi/w \approx 20.944 \) with \( w = 0.3 \) which is the greatest common divisor of the gaps between all the many-body scar states comprised of two families according to (45). In contrast, the information initially stored in the generic states quickly dissipates through thermalisation (bottom right panel of Fig. 11).

If we follow the identical initial state preparation protocol for the non-Hermitian system (Top Panels of Fig. 12) identical to the Hermitian case revivals are observed (Bottom Left Panel of Fig. 12). For the initial state composed of generic eigenstates the imaginary components of the eigenvalues lead to the probability density quickly flowing into the effectively open system. As can be seen in the bottom right panel of the Fig. 12, the norm of the time-evolved state and correspondingly the overlap explode already over one revivals period.
initial state dominated (99 percent by weight) by scars. The initial state composition. Bottom: Squared overlap between the initial state and the time-evolved states. Bottom Left: Initial state is composed of 20 generic states. Bottom Right: Initial state is composed of 20 generic states.

A similar phenomenon is observed also if only 1 percent (by weight) of generic states are admixed to 20 scar states (99 percent by weight).

FIG. 13. Initial state composition (Left Panel) and the squared overlap between initial and time-evolved states (Right Panel) for the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian (41) where 1 percent (by weight) of 29 generic states are admixed to 20 scar states (99 percent by weight).

The initial small imaginary components obtain exponential amplification with time, however a few periods of the revivals with the same period as in other systems can still be observed as shown in Fig. 13.

**Appendix D: Full symmetry of the scar families**

Since the states $|n\eta\rangle$ are invariant under the groups $U(N)$ and $SU(2)_{\eta}$, these states are invariant under the action of all the commutators. Thus we can take an arbitrary hopping (8) and commute it with (7) and see that they do not commute

$$T_{ij}^{\pm} = \left[ c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma} + c_{j\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger}, \eta^{\pm} \right] = \epsilon_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{i\sigma}^{\dagger} c_{j\sigma'}^{\dagger}. \tag{D1}$$

It means that the groups $U(N)$ and $SU(2)_{\eta}$, when joined together, do not form a direct product as in the case of $G_i$’s groups. Rather, they form a so called semi-direct product of these groups. And one can work out that it corresponds to

$$U(N) \times SU(2)_{\eta} = Sp(2N, \mathbb{C}), \tag{D2}$$

and the states $|n\eta\rangle$ are invariant with respect to this group $Sp(2N, \mathbb{C})$. Moreover, the Hilbert space could be decomposed in the following way

$$G_2 \subset G_{sp} = Sp(2N, \mathbb{C}) \times SU(2)_{\text{spin}},$$

$$H = \sum_{k \leq N} \langle k \rangle_{sp} \otimes \langle n - k \rangle_{su}, \tag{D3}$$

where $\langle k \rangle_{sp}$ corresponds to an antisymmetric representation of $Sp(2N, \mathbb{C})$ formed by multiplying $k$ copies of the fundamental representation, and $\langle k \rangle$ is a usual spin-$k$ representation of $SU(2)_{\text{eta}}$.

The same holds for the groups $\tilde{U}(N)$ and $SU(2)_{\text{spin}}$, but then we instead have another $\tilde{Sp}(2N, \mathbb{C})$ group:

$$G_3 \subset \tilde{G}_{sp} = \tilde{Sp}(2N, \mathbb{C}) \times SU(2)_{\eta}. \tag{D4}$$

---


[44] A phenomenon equivalent to scars at zero energy density was mentioned in the Supplementary material of Ref. [91].
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