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We have investigated the field-angle behaviors of magnetic excitations under an in-plane magnetic field for proximate Kitaev systems. By employing the exact diagonalization method in conjunction with the linear spin wave theory, we have demonstrated that the magnetic excitation gap in the polarized phase is determined by the magnon excitation at $M$ points and has a strong anisotropy with respect to the field direction in the vicinity of the critical field limit. The specific heat from this magnon excitation bears qualitatively the same anisotropic behaviors as expected one for the non-Abelian spin liquid phase in the Kitaev model and experimentally observed one of the intermediate phases in $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$.

\textit{Introduction.} Quantum fluctuation in frustrated spin systems can prevent any classical magnetic orders and induce exotic quantum phases such as a quantum spin liquid (QSL). The Kitaev model, the ideal $S = \frac{1}{2}$ quantum spin system with bond-directional Ising interactions in a honeycomb lattice (see Fig. 1(a)), is one of intriguing systems which host the QSL phase as a ground state. In this exactly solvable model, spin dynamics can be interpreted as free Majorana fermions in a static $Z_2$ flux \cite{[1]}. Majorana fermions with a gapless energy spectrum leads to the ground QSL phase and the fractionalized magnetic excitation.

Majorana fermions in the Kitaev model acquire a mass gap $\Delta$ under the magnetic field. The gapped spectrum stabilizes the topological non-Abelian spin liquid (NASL) phase characterized by the Chern number of $C = \pm 1$ and protected chiral edge modes \cite{[1, 2]}. Because the mass gap is proportional to the multiplication of three components of the magnetic field with respect to local spin coordinate axes, the sign of $C$ and $\Delta$ shows strong field-angle dependency. For the in-plane field, the system has the $D_3$ symmetry such that the sign change and gap closing occur for the field applied to the bond direction between nearest neighboring (NN) spins as shown in Fig. 1(b) \cite{[3–5]}. The thermal Hall conductivity, specific heat, and magnetotropic coefficient emulate characteristic features of the Majorana energy spectrum. The field-angle behaviors of such quantities have been known as the key feature for the experimental identification of the NALS phase \cite{[3–6]}.

A lot of theoretical and experimental studies have been performed to find realistic Kitaev materials \cite{[7–9]}. Among the candidates, $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$ has been turned out to be the best proximate Kitaev system with dominant Kitaev interaction \cite{[10, 11]}. The ground state is not the QSL but the antiferromagnetic zigzag order due to the additional non-Kitaev interactions such as the Heisenberg interactions and two types of off-diagonal exchange interactions, called as $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma'$ terms \cite{[12–14]}. Observed magnetic continuum excitations and two-step magnetic entropy release have been regarded as the evidence of the fractionalized Majorana fermions \cite{[15–20]}. Moreover, recent studies \cite{[2, 3, 6, 21–38]} have revealed that the zigzag order is easily destroyed when the external magnetic field is applied and the intermediate phase (IP), putative QSL, emerges between the zigzag-order phase and polarized phase. The NASL phase has been highly anticipated as the IP candidate because recent thermal Hall conductivity experiments detected the half-integer plateau and its sign signature under both in-plane and out-of-plane magnetic fields \cite{[2, 3]}. Further, specific heat measurement also probed the expected field-angle anisotropy under an in-plane field \cite{[6]}. On the other side, strong sample dependency of the measured quantities has been reported \cite{[39]}. A very recent thermal conductivity experiment has reported the emergence of different types of QSL phase \cite{[40]},
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\caption{(a) The connection of three types of bond-dependent Ising interactions, and coordinate axes of local spins ($x$, $y$, $z$) and global honeycomb lattice ($a$, $b$, $c$) in the Kitaev model. The Ising directions in the $x$-, $y$-, and $z$-type bonds drawn with green, blue, and red lines are parallel to the $x$, $y$, and $z$ coordinate axes, respectively. The anticipated field-angle variations of (b) Majorana gap of the Kitaev model and (c) magnon gap in the polarized phase of proximate Kitaev systems under an in-plane field. $\varphi$ is the angle between the in-plane field and the $a$ axis. The radius of curves refers to the size of gap. The dark violet (sea green) curve denotes the Chern number $C = +1$ ($-1$). When the gap is determined at the $M_1$, $M_2$, and $M_3$ points (see the Brillouin zone in inset), the curve is drawn with green, red, and blue colors in (c), respectively.}
\end{figure}
and the detailed thermodynamics study [41] has purported the possibility of the absence of the IP itself. All in all, the nature of the IP and/or its existence are still under debate.

In this study, we investigated the field-angle dependence of magnetic excitation and magnetic specific heat for proximate Kitaev systems under an in-plane magnetic field. Using the exact diagonalization (ED) method and linear spin wave theory (LSWT), we demonstrated that the low-energy excitation features in the polarized phase for various models relevant to α-RuCl₃ can be interpreted in terms of the field-angle anisotropy of magnon gap, determined at one of three $M$ points depending on the field direction (see Fig. 1(c)). The magnetic specific heat dictated by this magnon dynamics shows qualitatively the same anisotropic behaviors as those in the Kitaev model. Our result suggests that the anisotropic behaviors in thermodynamic quantities alone are not a smoking gun of the intermediate NASL phase in α-RuCl₃ under the magnetic field, but requires further considerations.

**ED calculation.** To investigate the field-angle anisotropy of proximate Kitaev model under an in-plane magnetic field, we first adopted the simple $K$-$\Gamma$-$J_3$ model with $J_3/|K| = \Gamma/|K| = 0.1$ and $K < 0$, which well accounts for the magnetic phase of the system (see the general Hamiltonian for the proximate Kitaev system in Supplemental Material (SM) [42]). According to Ref. [38], its magnetic ground state is the zigzag order. When an in-plane magnetic field is applied, the magnetic phase transition happens from the zigzag-order phase to polarized phase at around $g\mu_B h/|K| = 0.1$, where $g$ is the $g$ factor of spins and $\mu_B$ is the Bohr magneton, without hosting any IP.

Employing the ED method with the periodic 24-site cluster, we numerically explored the magnetic excitation features as a function of strength and direction of an in-plane magnetic field (see SM for the calculation detail [42]). Figure 2 presents the dynamical spin structure factor (DSSF) $C_q(\omega)$ of the $K$-$\Gamma$-$J_3$ model with $J_3/|K| = \Gamma/|K| = 0.1$ and $K < 0$ at (a) $\Gamma$, (b) $M_1$, and (c) $M_2$ points as a function of the field strength $h$ when a magnetic field is along the $a$ axis ($\varphi = 0^\circ$). The $\Gamma$, $K_1$, $M_1$, and $M_2$ points are defined in Fig. 1. DSSF at (d) $M_1$ and (f) $M_2$ points as a function of the field angle $\varphi$, the angle between the in-plane field and the $a$ axis, when $g\mu_B h/|K| = 0.12$. All results are calculated by the ED method with a periodic 24-site cluster. The circle data represent the lowest seven excitation energies calculated by the thick-restarted Lanczos method [43] (see SM for the detail [42]).

![FIG. 2. Dynamic spin structure factors (DSSFs) $C_q(\omega)$ of the $K$-$\Gamma$-$J_3$ model with $J_3/|K| = \Gamma/|K| = 0.1$ and $K < 0$ at (a) $\Gamma$, (b) $M_1$, and (c) $M_2$ points as a function of the field strength $h$ when a magnetic field is along the $a$ axis ($\varphi = 0^\circ$). The $\Gamma$, $K_1$, $M_1$, and $M_2$ points are defined in Fig. 1. DSSF at (d) $M_1$ and (f) $M_2$ points as a function of the field angle $\varphi$, the angle between the in-plane field and the $a$ axis, when $g\mu_B h/|K| = 0.12$. All results are calculated by the ED method with a periodic 24-site cluster. The circle data represent the lowest seven excitation energies calculated by the thick-restarted Lanczos method [43] (see SM for the detail [42]).](image)

As shown in Fig. 2(d) and (e), the excitation gap at $\varphi = 0^\circ$ is higher than that at $\varphi = 90^\circ$, which means that the magnetic entropy under the $b$-axis field ($\varphi = 90^\circ$) is easier to be thermally populated in a low-temperature limit than the $a$-axis-field case ($\varphi = 0^\circ$). Hence, the magnetic specific heat $C_m$ has a lower gap for the field along the $b$ axis than the $a$ axis, which is well captured in Fig. 3(a). Here we employed the $K$-$\Gamma$-$J_3$ model with $g\mu_B h/|K| = 0.12$ (see SM for the calculation detail [42]). Also, we found the six-fold symmetricity of $C_m$ upon the field angle $\varphi$ for the low-temperature case ($k_B T/|K| \lesssim 0.01$) as shown in Fig. 3(b). $C_m$ periodically varies with minimum values at $\varphi = n \times 60^\circ$ and maximum values at $\varphi = (2n + 1) \times 30^\circ$. The anisotropic behaviors are suppressed when the field strength is in-
creased from $g\mu_B h/|K| = 0.12$ to 0.2, which is consistent with the experimental observations of $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$ [6].

**Spin wave theory.** To get further insight on the field-angle anisotropy under an in-plane magnetic field, we examined the excitation features in terms of the LSWT (see SM for the detail [42]). We performed the LSWT calculation within the polarized phase in which all spins are ferromagnetically ordered along the field direction. By reducing the field strength from the infinity, we traced the variation of magnon dispersions in the $K$-$\Gamma$-$J_3$ model.

In the classical magnetic phase diagram for $J_3/|K| = \Gamma/|K| = 0.1$, the polarized phase is stabilized when $g\mu_B h/|K|$ is larger than about 0.295 (0.305) for the $a$-axis ($b$-axis) field. The calculated magnon bands are always gapped in this field limit. The gap is monotonically diminished as the field strength is reduced. Eventually, the magnon bands condense at the $M_{2,3}$ points ($M_1$ point) under the $a$-axis ($b$-axis) field with the critical field strength of $g\mu_B h/|K| = 0.2930$ (0.3048) (see SM [42] and Fig. 4(a)). For the field-angle dependence, as analogous to the previous DSSFs, the magnon bands have the $D_3$ character in the critical field limit: the low-lying excitation gap at $0^\circ \leq \varphi \leq 60^\circ$, $60^\circ \leq \varphi \leq 120^\circ$, and $120^\circ \leq \varphi \leq 180^\circ$, is determined at $M_1$, $M_2$, and $M_3$ points, respectively. The gap minima are located at $\varphi = (2n + 1) \times 30^\circ$ as shown in Fig. 4(b).

Based on the magnon dispersions, we calculated the magnon specific heat $C_m$ which is attributed to one-magnon excitation. Figure 4(c) presents $C_m$ behaviors as a function of temperature $T$ under both $a$- and $b$-axis fields at the critical field strength of $g\mu_B h/|K| = 0.3048$. For the $b$-axis field, the $C_m$ is gapless since the magnon is gapless at the critical strength, while it is still gapped for the $a$-axis field. The six-fold symmetric behaviors of $C_m$, at low $T$, can be also observed such that minimum and maximum values at $\varphi = n \times 60^\circ$ and $(2n + 1) \times 30^\circ$ as shown in Fig. 4(d). The anisotropic behaviors are progressively suppressed as the field strength is increased beyond the critical value. All behaviors are consistent with both results of ED calculation and experimental observations of $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$ [6].

**Application to $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$.** Various magnetic models have been proposed to describe the magnetic and thermal properties of $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$ [7, 11, 14, 16, 17, 33, 46–52]. Here, we extended our study to a few representative models (Model 1 to 7), of which the ground state is the zigzag order like $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$, as shown in Table I. In the ED calculation, they show the phase transition from the zigzag order to polarized phase without hosting any IP under

| Table I. Some magnetic models have been proposed for proximate Kitaev system $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$ before. The unit of magnetic exchange interactions is meV. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$J$</th>
<th>$K$</th>
<th>$\Gamma$</th>
<th>$\Gamma'$</th>
<th>$K_2$</th>
<th>$J_3$</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>-6.55</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>[46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-15.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>-0.1175</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>[48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>-10.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>[49]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an in-plane magnetic field (see SM [42]).

Overall, we found all considered models bear the essentially same field-angle anisotropy. More specifically, the DSSFs, magnon dispersions, and magnon specific heat behaviors under an in-plane magnetic field are the same between Model 1–4 and the $K$-$\Gamma$-$J_3$ model. Small differences in DSSFs and/or magnon condensation are found for Model 5–7: (i) DSSFs $C_{M1}$ and $C_{M2}$ do not determine the excitation gap for $a$- and $b$-axis fields for Model 7. (ii) The magnon condensation point is slightly shifted from the $M_2$ to $\Gamma$ points under the $b$-field for Models 5 and 6. Still, the quantitative features remain very similar (see the detail in SM [42]). Therefore, our results suggest the potential role of magnon dynamics in explaining the field-angle anisotropy of low-temperature thermal properties for $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$.

Previously, we proposed the $K$-$J_3$ model with $K < 0$ and $J_3 > 0$ as the simplest model to account for the IP for the $a$-axis field [38], where we found the magnon simultaneously condenses at both the $M$ and $M_2$ points with the suppression of the anisotropy in the magnon specific heat $C_m(T)$ (see the detail in SM [42]). Hence, we conjecture that the $\Gamma$-term plays a significant role in the in-plane anisotropic feature in the proximate Kitaev model with ferromagnetic $K$ ($K < 0$).

**Discussion.** In contrast with the ED calculations of various models to show no IP, plausible evidence of intermediate NASL phase such as the half plateau thermal Hall conductivity and field-angle anisotropy of specific heat has been reported in $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$ in the intermediate range of the $a$-axis field ($7 \sim 10$ T) [3, 6]. The lower bound field is coincident with the critical field at which the zigzag order totally disappears. However, the upper phase boundary is not evident. The thermodynamic quantities such as magnetic susceptibility, specific heat, and magnetic Grüneisen parameter show no clear anomalies at around the upper field [32, 35, 41]. Moreover, the recent electron spin resonance (ESR) experiment unveiled that the single-magnon excitation is present across the upper field [36]. The magnon dynamics of polarized phase is certainly anticipated to emerge even for the intermediate region of $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$.

An important remark on the magnon dynamics of the polarized phase is that the excitation gap is determined at not the $\Gamma$ point but $M$ points in contrast with the NASL phase in which the magnetic excitation gap appears at the $\Gamma$ point. The full magnetic excitation features, which can be measured by the inelastic neutron scattering (INS) and resonant inelastic x-ray scattering experiments, are crucial for determining the nature/existence of IP of $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$. According to recent INS, Raman spectroscopy, and ESR experiments [18, 36, 37, 54], the minimum excitation energy at the $\Gamma$ point evidently decreases before the phase boundary and increases again after the boundary. In the experimental resolution, however, it is hardly resolved whether the gap is genuinely closed or not. It was also verified that the excitation energy at the $M_2$ point in the INS is almost constant in the zigzag order limit and that it increases by losing its spectral weight after the phase boundary. This behavior is quite similar to our ED calculation. However, only magnetic excitation along the $\Gamma$-$M_2$ line under the $a$-axis field has been reported in the hitherto INS measurement. The momentum resolved excitations except for the $\Gamma$ point are limited in Raman spectroscopy and ESR experiments. Experimental observations with different momentum lines and various field directions are highly required.

The recent theoretical study has pointed out that the magnon topology in the polarized phase of the proximate Kitaev system can give rise to the field-angle variation in the thermal Hall conductivity which has the same sign structure as that in the NASL phase [53]. Our result supports novel significant feature of this magnon dynamics. Thus, the field-angle anisotropy of both specific heat and thermal Hall conductivity cannot be taken as a key evidence for the NASL phase. For the ultimate identification, one should test more comprehensively a few characteristic features which are inherent to Majorana fermion dynamics, e.g., the continuum excitation at the $\Gamma$ point, the half-integer plateau of thermal Hall conductivity under the $a$-axis field, and $T^2$-behavior of the specific heat at low temperature under the $b$-axis field.

**Conclusion.** Based on the numerical ED calculation and LSWT analysis, we have explored the field-angle anisotropy of proximate Kitaev systems under an in-plane magnetic field. We have found that the low-lying excitation gap, interpreted as the magnon excitation in the polarized phase, is determined at not the $\Gamma$ but $M$ points in the vicinity of the phase boundary between the zigzag order and polarized phase. Also, the excitation gap has the 60$^\circ$ periodicity for the field angle with its minimum when the field is along the NN bond direction. The anisotropy of the low-energy magnon gap can reproduce the field-angle anisotropy of the specific heat, which was considered a hallmark of the NASL phase. Our results provide a novel insight into determining the nature/existence of IP in the field-induced phase transition of $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$.
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SPIN HAMILTONIAN

Let $\mathbf{S}^A_i$ and $\mathbf{S}^B_i$ be two base spins at the $i$-th unit cell of a honeycomb lattice. The general Kitaev Hamiltonian with first, second, and third nearest neighboring (NN) interactions and external magnetic field are given as following:

$$H = \sum_{\gamma A} \mathbf{S}^A_i \cdot \mathbf{j}_{\gamma A} \cdot \mathbf{S}^B_{i_{\gamma A}} + \sum_{\gamma B} \left( \mathbf{S}^A_i \cdot \mathbf{j}_{\gamma B} \cdot \mathbf{S}^A_{i_{\gamma B}} + \mathbf{S}^B_i \cdot \mathbf{j}_{\gamma B} \cdot \mathbf{S}^B_{i_{\gamma B}} \right) + \sum_{\gamma C} \mathbf{S}^A_i \cdot \mathbf{j}_{\gamma C} \cdot \mathbf{S}^B_{i_{\gamma C}} - g\mu_B \sum_i \mathbf{h} \cdot (\mathbf{S}^A_i + \mathbf{S}^B_i),$$  \hspace{1cm} (S0)

where $\gamma_1$, $\gamma_2$, and $\gamma_3$ represent the bond types of first, second, and third NN spins, respectively. $i$ and $i_{\gamma n}$ are the unit cell indices of two spins in the $\gamma_n$ bond (see Fig. S1). $\gamma = (x, y, z)$ can be characterized with coordinate axes of spins. $\gamma_2$ refers to the bond with the opposite direction of the $\gamma_2$ bond. $g$ is the $g$ factor of spins and $\mu_B$ is the Bohr magneton. $\mathbf{j}_{\gamma n}$ is the superexchange dyadic tensor of the $\gamma$-type $n$-th NN bond defined by

$$\mathbf{j}_{\gamma n} = J_n \hat{a}\hat{a} + J_n \hat{b}\hat{b} + (J_n + K_n) \gamma\gamma + \Gamma_n \left( \hat{a}\hat{b} + \hat{b}\hat{a} \right) + \Gamma' \left( \hat{a}\hat{\gamma} + \hat{\gamma}\hat{a} + \hat{\gamma}\hat{b} + \hat{b}\hat{\gamma} \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (S0)

where $\alpha$, $\beta$, and $\gamma$ are cyclically ordered coordinate axes of spins and $\hat{\gamma}$ is the unit vector along the $\gamma$ axis. $J_n$, $K_n$, $\Gamma_n$, and $\Gamma'$ are the exchange parameters of the Heisenberg interaction, Kitaev interaction, and two types of off-diagonal interactions between $n$-th NN spins, respectively. The global coordinate axes $a$, $b$, and $c$ can be defined so that the $a$ ($b$) axis is parallel (perpendicular) to the displacement between two spins in the $z_1$-type bond and the $c$ axis is normal to the honeycomb lattice. Unit vectors $\hat{a}$, $\hat{b}$, and $\hat{c}$ can be given as $\hat{a} = \frac{\hat{b} + 2\hat{c}}{\sqrt{6}}$, $\hat{b} = \frac{-\hat{a} + \hat{c}}{\sqrt{2}}$, and $\hat{c} = \frac{\hat{a} + \hat{b} + \hat{c}}{\sqrt{3}}$ in terms of spin coordinate axes. In main text, the exchange parameters between first NN spins are simply denoted by $J$, $K$, $\Gamma$, and $\Gamma'$ omitting neighbor indices.

![Fig. S1. Schematic diagram of a periodic 24-site cluster. ‘A’ and ‘B’ refer to two base sites of a honeycomb lattice. The bonds between first, second, and third nearest neighboring (NN) spins are drawn with solid, fine dotted, and thick dotted lines, respectively. $x$, $y$, and $z$ types of bonds are highlighted by green, blue, and red colors, respectively. $x_1$, $x_2$, and $x_3$ mean the $x$-type first, second, and third NN bonds. Schematic diagram of the Brillouin zone of a honeycomb lattice and the field directions are presented at the right side of figure.](image)

ED CALCULATION

To solve the general Kitaev Hamiltonian, we employed a periodic 24-site cluster as shown in Fig. S1, which has the $C_3$-rotation symmetry along the $c$ axis. Using the exact diagonalization (ED) method based on the Lanczos...
algorithm [S1], we obtained the ground state. To explore the excitation properties, we calculated the dynamical spin structure factor (DSSF) $C_q(\omega)$ at momentum $q$ and energy $\omega$ as following:

$$C_q(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \left[ \sum_{\alpha \in \{x, y, z\}} \langle S_{-q, \alpha} \frac{1}{\omega - H + E_g + i\delta S_{q, \alpha}} \rangle \right],$$  

(S0)

where $S_{q, \alpha}$ is the $\alpha$ component of spin operator $S_q$ at momentum $q$, $E_g$ is the ground state energy, and $\delta (= 0.01|K|)$ is the broadening parameter. $S_q$ is defined as $S_q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{-iq|\mathbf{r}_i|} \mathbf{S}_i$, where $\mathbf{r}_i$ is the position vector of the $i$-th spin $\mathbf{S}_i$ in the honeycomb lattice and $N$ is the total number of spin sites.

We also performed the finite-temperature Lanczos method (FTLM) [S2, S3] to calculate the specific heat. The specific heat at temperature $T$ is given as

$$C_v(T) = \frac{k_B}{N(k_BT)^2} \left( \langle H^2 \rangle - \langle H \rangle^2 \right),$$  

(S0)

where $H$ is the spin Hamiltonian and $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant. The expectation values of $H$ and $H^2$ can be approximately estimated as following:

$$\langle H \rangle \approx \frac{N_{st}}{ZN_sc} \sum_{r=1}^{N_{st}} \sum_{m=0}^{N_L} \varepsilon_{r,m} e^{-\beta \varepsilon_{r,m}},$$  

(S0)

$$\langle H^2 \rangle \approx \frac{N_{st}}{ZN_sc} \sum_{r=1}^{N_{st}} \sum_{m=0}^{N_L} (\varepsilon_{r,m})^2 e^{-\beta \varepsilon_{r,m}},$$  

(S0)

where $N_{st}$, $N_{sc}$, and $N_L$ are the size of Hilbert space, the number of initial random states, and the number of Lanczos iteration steps, respectively. $\varepsilon_{r,m}$ refers to the $m$-th eigenvalue calculated by the Lanczos method with the $r$-th initial random state. $Z$ is the partition function which is also approximately calculated as

$$Z \approx \frac{N_{st}}{N_{sc}} \sum_{r=1}^{N_{st}} \sum_{m=0}^{N_L} e^{-\beta \varepsilon_{r,m}} |\langle \psi_{r,m} | \phi_r \rangle|^2,$$  

(S0)

where $|\phi_r\rangle$ is the normalized $r$-th initial random state and $|\psi_{r,m}\rangle$ is the $m$-th eigenstate calculated by the Lanczos method with the initial state $|\phi_r\rangle$. In the calculation, we set $N_{sc} = 250$ and $N_L = 200$.

### LINEAR SPIN WAVE THEORY

In the polarized phase, all spins are ferromagnetically ordered along the magnetic field direction. We performed the liner spin wave theory (LSWT) assuming that an in-plane magnetic field is applied away from the $a$ axis with the field angle $\varphi$. According to the Holstein-Primakoff transformation, the spin operators can be written in terms of two bosonic operators as following:

$$S_{ix}^A = \frac{\sqrt{2S - a_i^\dagger a_i + a_i^\dagger}}{2} \sqrt{2S - a_i^\dagger a_i} \approx \sqrt{\frac{S}{2}} \left( a_i + a_i^\dagger \right),$$  

(S0a)

$$S_{iy}^A = \frac{\sqrt{2S - a_i^\dagger a_i - a_i^\dagger}}{2i} \sqrt{2S - a_i^\dagger a_i} \approx -i \sqrt{\frac{S}{2}} \left( a_i - a_i^\dagger \right),$$  

(S0b)

$$S_{iz}^A = S - a_i^\dagger a_i,$$  

(S0c)

$$S_{ix}^B = \frac{\sqrt{2S - b_i^\dagger b_i + b_i^\dagger}}{2} \sqrt{2S - b_i^\dagger b_i} \approx \sqrt{\frac{S}{2}} \left( b_i + b_i^\dagger \right),$$  

(S0d)
\[
S_{i'y'} = \frac{\sqrt{2S - b_i^\dagger b_i - b_i^\dagger \sqrt{2S - a_i^\dagger a_i}}}{2i} \approx -i \sqrt{\frac{S}{2}} (b_i - b_i^\dagger),
\]
(S0e)

\[
S_{i'z'} = S - b_i^\dagger b_i,
\]
(S0f)

where \(a_i^\dagger (a_i)\) and \(b_i^\dagger (b_i)\) are the bosonic creation (annihilation) operators of magnons at the \(i\)-th \(A\) and \(B\) sublattices, respectively, and \(x', y', \) and \(z'\) are coordinate axes defined as

\[
\hat{x}' = -\hat{c} = \frac{-\hat{x} - \hat{y} - \hat{z}}{\sqrt{3}},
\]
(S0a)

\[
\hat{y}' = -\sin \varphi \hat{a} + \cos \varphi \hat{b} = \frac{-\sin \varphi - \sqrt{3} \cos \varphi}{\sqrt{6}} \hat{x} + \frac{-\sin \varphi + \sqrt{3} \cos \varphi}{\sqrt{6}} \hat{y} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} \sin \varphi \hat{z},
\]
(S0b)

\[
\hat{z}' = \cos \varphi \hat{a} + \sin \varphi \hat{b} = \frac{\cos \varphi - \sqrt{3} \sin \varphi}{\sqrt{6}} \hat{x} + \frac{\cos \varphi + \sqrt{3} \sin \varphi}{\sqrt{6}} \hat{y} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} \cos \varphi \hat{z},
\]
(S0c)

where \(x, y, \) and \(z\) are coordinate axes of spins, and \(a, b, \) and \(c\) are global coordinate axes of lattice.

The magnetic interactions between first, second, and third NN spins in Eq. S0 can be approximately expressed in terms of the bosonic operators as following:

\[
\mathbf{S}_i^A \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_n} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i'\gamma_n}^B \approx Sc_{\gamma_n}(\varphi) \left( S - a_i^\dagger a_i - b_i^\dagger b_i \right) + Sd_{\gamma_n}(\varphi) a_i^\dagger b_i^\dagger + Sh_{\gamma_n}(\varphi) a_i^\dagger b_i + Sh_{\gamma_n}(\varphi) a_i^\dagger b_i^\dagger,
\]
(S0)

\[
\mathbf{S}_i^A \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i'\gamma_2}^B + \mathbf{S}_i^B \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) \cdot \mathbf{S}_{i'\gamma_2}^A \approx Sc_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) \left( 2S - a_i^\dagger a_i - b_i^\dagger b_i \right) + Sd_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) a_i^\dagger a_i^\dagger + Sh_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) a_i^\dagger a_i^\dagger + Sh_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) a_i^\dagger a_i^\dagger + Sh_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) b_i^\dagger b_i^\dagger + Sh_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) b_i^\dagger b_i^\dagger + Sh_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) b_i^\dagger b_i^\dagger,
\]
(S0)

and

\[
\mathbf{h} \cdot (\mathbf{S}_i^A + \mathbf{S}_i^B) = h \left( 2S - a_i^\dagger a_i - b_i^\dagger b_i \right),
\]
(S0)

where \(c_{\gamma_n}(\varphi) = \hat{x}' \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_n} \cdot \hat{z}', \) \(h_{\gamma_n}(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \hat{x}' \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_n} \cdot \hat{z}' + \hat{y}' \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_n} \cdot \hat{y}' - i \hat{z}' \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_n} \cdot \hat{y}' + i \hat{y}' \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_n} \cdot \hat{x}' \right), \) \(d_{\gamma_n}(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \hat{x}' \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_n} \cdot \hat{z}' - \hat{y}' \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_n} \cdot \hat{y}' + i \hat{z}' \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_n} \cdot \hat{y}' + i \hat{y}' \cdot \mathbf{\tilde{J}}_{\gamma_n} \cdot \hat{x}' \right). \) We define the spinor operators \(\psi_i^\dagger = \left( a_i^\dagger \ b_i^\dagger \right), \) \(\psi_i^\dagger = \left( a_i b_i \right), \) and \(\psi_i = \left( a_i \ b_i \right), \) respectively.
\[
\left( a_i, b_i \right)^\top, \text{ and } \psi_i^* = \left( a_i^\dagger b_i^\dagger \right)^\top. \text{ Equation S0 can be given as following:}
\]
\[
H \approx -NS^2 E(h, \varphi) + \varepsilon(h, \varphi) \sum_i \psi_i^\dagger \psi_i
+ S \sum_{i, j_1} \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
0 & 0 \\
h_{\beta_1}(\varphi) & 0
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_1} + S \sum_{i, j_1} \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
0 & h_{\beta_1}(\varphi) \\
0 & 0
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_1}
+ \frac{S}{2} \sum_{i, j_1} \left[ \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
0 & 0 \\
d_{\beta_1}(\varphi) & 0
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_1}^* + \text{h.c.} \right] + \frac{S}{2} \sum_{i, j_1} \left[ \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
0 & d_{\beta_1}(\varphi) \\
0 & 0
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_1}^* + \text{h.c.} \right]
+ S \sum_{i, j_2} \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
h_{\beta_1}(\varphi)^* & 0 \\
0 & h_{\beta_2}(\varphi)
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_2} + S \sum_{i, j_2} \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
h_{\beta_1}(\varphi) & 0 \\
0 & h_{\beta_2}(\varphi)^*
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_2}
+ \frac{S}{2} \sum_{i, j_2} \left[ \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
d_{\beta_2}(\varphi) & 0 \\
0 & d_{\beta_2}(\varphi)
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_2}^* + \text{h.c.} \right] + \frac{S}{2} \sum_{i, j_2} \left[ \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
d_{\beta_2}(\varphi) & 0 \\
0 & d_{\beta_2}(\varphi)^*
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_2}^* + \text{h.c.} \right]
+ \frac{S}{2} \sum_{i, j_3} \left[ \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
h_{\beta_1}(\varphi)^* & 0 \\
0 & h_{\beta_3}(\varphi)
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_3} + \frac{S}{2} \sum_{i, j_3} \left[ \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
h_{\beta_1}(\varphi) & 0 \\
0 & h_{\beta_3}(\varphi)^*
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_3}
+ \frac{S}{2} \sum_{i, j_3} \left[ \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
d_{\beta_3}(\varphi) & 0 \\
0 & d_{\beta_3}(\varphi)
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_3}^* + \text{h.c.} \right] + \frac{S}{2} \sum_{i, j_3} \left[ \psi_i^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
d_{\beta_3}(\varphi) & 0 \\
0 & d_{\beta_3}(\varphi)^*
\end{array} \right) \psi_{j_3}^* + \text{h.c.} \right],
\]
(S0)
where \(\varepsilon(h, \varphi) = \frac{\hbar \Delta}{S} - \sum_{\gamma_1} c_{\gamma_1}(\varphi) - 2 \sum_{\gamma_2} c_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) - \sum_{\gamma_3} c_{\gamma_3}(\varphi), E(h, \varphi) = \varepsilon(h, \varphi) + \frac{\hbar \Delta}{S},\) and \(N\) is the number of unit cells in the lattice.

To rewrite the Hamiltonian in momentum space, we performed the Fourier transformation of spinor operators like \(\psi_i^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k \in \text{BZ}} e^{-i k \cdot r_i} \psi_k \) and \(\psi_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_i e^{-i k \cdot r_i} \psi_i\), where \(r_i\) is the position vector of the \(i\)-th unit cell. Equation S0 can be transformed as following:
\[
H \approx -NS^2 E(h, \varphi)
+ S \sum_{k \in \text{BZ}} \psi_k^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
h_2(h, \varphi, k) & h_1(h, \varphi, k) \\
h_1(h, \varphi, k)^* & h_3(h, \varphi, k)
\end{array} \right) \psi_k + \frac{S}{2} \sum_{k \in \text{BZ}} \left[ \psi_k^\dagger \left( \begin{array}{cc}
d_2(h, \varphi, k) & d_1(h, \varphi, k) \\
d_1(h, \varphi, k)^* & d_2(h, \varphi, k)
\end{array} \right) \psi_k^* + \text{h.c.} \right],
\]
(S0)
where
\[
\begin{align*}
h_1(h, \varphi, k) &= \sum_{\gamma_1} h_{\gamma_1}(\varphi) e^{i k \cdot r_{\gamma_1}} + \sum_{\gamma_3} h_{\gamma_3}(\varphi) e^{i k \cdot r_{\gamma_3}},
\end{align*}
\]
(S0a)
\[
\begin{align*}
h_2(h, \varphi, k) &= \varepsilon(h, \varphi) + \sum_{\gamma_2} \left[ h_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) e^{i k \cdot r_{\gamma_2}} + h_{\gamma_2}(\varphi)^* e^{-i k \cdot r_{\gamma_2}} \right],
\end{align*}
\]
(S0b)
\[
\begin{align*}
h_3(h, \varphi, k) &= \varepsilon(h, \varphi) + \sum_{\gamma_2} \left[ h_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) e^{-i k \cdot r_{\gamma_2}} + h_{\gamma_2}(\varphi)^* e^{i k \cdot r_{\gamma_2}} \right],
\end{align*}
\]
(S0c)
\[
\begin{align*}
d_1(h, \varphi, k) &= \sum_{\gamma_1} d_{\gamma_1}(\varphi) e^{i k \cdot r_{\gamma_1}} + \sum_{\gamma_3} d_{\gamma_3}(\varphi) e^{i k \cdot r_{\gamma_3}},
\end{align*}
\]
(S0d)
\[
\begin{align*}
d_2(h, \varphi, k) &= \sum_{\gamma_2} \left[ d_{\gamma_2}(\varphi) e^{i k \cdot r_{\gamma_2}} + d_{\gamma_2}(\varphi)^* e^{-i k \cdot r_{\gamma_2}} \right],
\end{align*}
\]
(S0e)
where \(r_{\gamma_n} = r_{\gamma_n} - r_i\) and \(r_{\gamma_n} = -r_{\gamma_n} + r_i\). According to the Bogoliubov transformation, Equation S0 is extended as following:
\[
H \approx -NS \left[ SE(h, \varphi) + \varepsilon(h, \varphi) \right] + \frac{S}{2} \sum_{k \in \text{BZ}} \left( \psi_k^\dagger \psi_{-k}^* \begin{pmatrix} h(h, \varphi, k) & d(h, \varphi, k) \\
d(h, \varphi, -k)^\dagger & h(h, \varphi, -k)^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_k \psi_{-k}^* \end{pmatrix} \right),
\]
(S0)
where

\[
\mathbf{h}(h, \varphi, \mathbf{k}) = \begin{pmatrix}
h_2(h, \varphi, \mathbf{k}) & h_1(h, \varphi, \mathbf{k}) \\
h_1(\varphi, \mathbf{k})^* & h_3(h, \varphi, \mathbf{k})
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{S0a}
\]

\[
\mathbf{d}(\varphi, \mathbf{k}) = \begin{pmatrix}
d_2(\varphi, \mathbf{k}) & d_1(\varphi, \mathbf{k}) \\
d_1(\varphi, \mathbf{k})^\dagger & d_2(\varphi, \mathbf{k})
\end{pmatrix}. \tag{S0b}
\]

We obtained the dynamic equation of motion of spinor operators as follows:

\[
i \hbar \partial_t \begin{pmatrix}
\psi_k \\
\psi_k^\dagger
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathbf{h}(h, \varphi, \mathbf{k}) & \mathbf{\Delta}(\varphi, \mathbf{k}) \\
-\mathbf{\Delta}(\varphi, \mathbf{k})^\dagger & -\mathbf{h}(h, \varphi, -\mathbf{k})^\dagger
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
\psi_k \\
\psi_k^\dagger
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{S0}
\]

where \( \mathbf{\Delta}(\varphi, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{d}(\varphi, \mathbf{k}) + \mathbf{d}(\varphi, -\mathbf{k})^\dagger] \). By solving the general eigenvalue problem of Eq. S0, we calculated magnon dispersions.

Let \( \epsilon_n(\mathbf{k}) \) be the \( n \)-th magnon band at a given momentum \( \mathbf{k} \) \((n = 1, 2)\). The average energy per unit cell can be given as:

\[
e(T) \approx -S^2E(h, \varphi) + \frac{S}{N} \sum_{n, \mathbf{k} \in BZ} \frac{\epsilon_n(\mathbf{k})}{e^{\beta \epsilon_n(\mathbf{k})} - 1}, \tag{S0}
\]

where \( \beta = k_B T \) because of the Bose-Einstein statistics of magnons. The magnon specific heat is deduced as

\[
C_m(T) = \frac{d}{dT}e(T) = k_B S \frac{\beta^2}{N} \sum_{n, \mathbf{k} \in BZ} \frac{\beta^2 \epsilon_n(\mathbf{k})^2 e^{\beta \epsilon_n(\mathbf{k})}}{(e^{\beta \epsilon_n(\mathbf{k})} - 1)^2}. \tag{S0}
\]

CLASICAL PHASE DIAGRAM AND MAGNON BANDS

To determine the polarized-phase region for the LSWT, we performed the classical Monte-Carlo (MC) calculation with the standard Metropolis algorithm. By considering a periodic \( 2 \times 36 \times 36 \) cluster, we ran the 40000 MC steps after 20000 MC steps for thermalization at \( k_B T / |K| = 0.02 \) and calculated the expectation value of the order parameter for the polarized phase as \( \frac{1}{N} \langle \sum_i S_i \rangle \). As shown in Fig. S2, the polarized phase of the classical \( K-\Gamma-J_3 \) models with \( \Gamma / |K| = J_3 / |K| = 0.1 \) and \( K < 0 \) is stabilized when \( g \mu_B h / |K| \) is larger than about 0.295 (0.305) for the \( a \)-axis (\( b \)-axis) field. Below the critical field, the order parameter for the polarized phase decreases monotonically from the saturation value while the order parameter for the zigzag order has the finite value.

![FIG. S2](image)

**FIG. S2.** Expectation values of the order parameters for the zigzag order and polarized phase of the classical \( K-\Gamma-J_3 \) model with \( \Gamma / |K| = J_3 / |K| = 0.1 \) and \( K < 0 \) under the (a) \( a \)-axis and (b) \( b \)-axis fields. They are calculated by the classical MC method at \( k_B T / |K| = 0.02 \). The lowest magnon energies at the \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) points in the polarized phase are presented with orange and red lines, respectively.

We calculated the magnon bands in the classical polarized phase. As shown in Fig. S2, the magnon bands show well-defined gapped spectra in the region. Moreover, we found that the magnon bands condense at the \( M_{2,3} \) points (\( M_1 \) point) under the \( a \)-axis (\( b \)-axis) field when \( g \mu_B h / |K| = 0.2930 \ (0.3048) \) which is almost coincident with the critical field for the classical polarized phase.
VARIOUS MODELS FOR $\alpha$-RUCL3

We investigated the magnetic phase transition of Models 1–7 for $\alpha$-RuCl$_3$ presented in Table I in main text under an in-plane magnetic field. As shown in Fig. S3, the second derivative of their ground state energy with respect to the field strength ($-d^2E_g/dh^2$) shows single peak in the ED calculation. All models simply take the magnetic phase transition from the zigzag order to the polarized phase without hosting any intermediate phase under both $a$- and $b$-axis fields. The critical field strengths for the $b$-axis field are presented in Table S1.

![FIG. S3. Second derivative of the ground state energy with respect to the field strength ($-d^2E_g/dh^2$) for Model 1 ($J = -4.6$ and $K = 7$ meV), Model 2 ($J = -1.53$, $K = -6.55$, $\Gamma = 5.25$, and $\Gamma' = -0.95$ meV), Model 3 ($J = -2.7$, $K = -10$, $\Gamma = 10.6$, and $\Gamma' = -0.9$ meV), Model 4 ($J = -0.5$, $K = -5$, $\Gamma = 2.5$, and $J_3 = 0.5$ meV), Model 5 ($J = -1.5$, $K = -10$, $\Gamma = 8.8$, and $J_3 = 0.4$), Model 6 ($J = -1.3$, $K = -15.1$, $\Gamma = 10.1$, $\Gamma' = -0.1175$, $K_2 = -0.68$, and $J_3 = 0.9$ meV), and Model 7 ($J = -4.0$, $K = -10.8$, $\Gamma = 5.2$, $\Gamma' = 2.9$). The ground state energy is obtained with the ED calculation of the periodic 24-site cluster shown in Fig. S1.](image)

We explored the behaviors of DSSFs, magnon dispersions, and magnon specific heat under both $a$- and $b$-axis fields for Models 1–7. Results are presented in Fig. S4 and S5.

For Models 1–4 in Fig. S4, the overall behaviors of DSSFs $C_{M_1}$ and $C_{M_2}$, magnon dispersions, and magnon specific heat under both $a$- and $b$-axis fields are qualitatively the same as those of the $K$-$\Gamma$-$J_3$ model with $\Gamma/|K| = J_3/|K| = 0.1$ and $K < 0$. The magnetic excitation gap is determined by $C_{M_1}$ under the $a$-axis field ($\varphi = 0^\circ$) and $C_{M_2}$ under the $b$-axis field ($\varphi = 90^\circ$), respectively. The excitation gap under the $b$-axis field is always smaller than that under the $a$-axis field. Also, the magnon band condenses at the $M_2$ point under the $b$-axis field, while any magnon band does not condense under the $a$-axis field with the same strength. At the critical field strength, the magnon specific heat $C_m(T)$ is gapless under the $b$-axis field, while that is gapped under the $a$-axis field. In Ref. [S4], both DSSFs and magnon dispersions under both $a$- and $b$-axis fields for Model 4 have already studied. Our results are well consistent with their results.

For Models 5–7 in Fig. S5, slightly deviated behaviors occur in the DSSFs, magnon condensation, or both. For Model 7, the DSSFs $C_{M_1}$ and $C_{M_2}$ no longer determine the excitation gap under both $a$- and $b$-axis fields. For Models 5 and 6, the magnon condensation under the $b$-axis field occurs at not the $M_2$ point but the momentum point slightly shifted from $M_2$ to $\Gamma$.

For the validity of the magnon calculations, we checked the critical field of the classical polarized phase using the classical MC calculations. As shown in Table S1, both critical field strengths are consistent each other for all models. The $K$-$J_3$ model with $K < 0$ and $J_3 > 0$ has been proposed as the simplest proximate Kitaev model which shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSWT</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE S1. The critical values of $g\mu_Bh/|K|$ for Models 1 to 7 presented in Table I in main text under the $b$-axis field. They are estimated with the second derivative of the ground state energy in the ED calculation, the magnon condensation in the LSWT, and the order parameter for the polarized phase in the classical MC calculation.
FIG. S4. Dynamical spin structure factors $C_{M_1}(\omega)$ under the $a$-axis field ($\varphi = 0^\circ$) and $C_{M_2}(\omega)$ under the $b$-axis field ($\varphi = 90^\circ$), and the magnon dispersions and magnon specific heats under both $a$- and $b$-axis fields at the critical field strength for (a) – (d) Model 1 ($J = -4.6$ and $K = 7$ meV), (e) – (h) Model 2 ($J = -1.53$, $K = -6.55$, $\Gamma = 5.25$, and $\Gamma' = -0.95$ meV), (i) – (l) Model 3 ($J = -2.7$, $K = -10$, $\Gamma = 10.6$, and $\Gamma' = -0.9$ meV), and (m) – (p) Model 4 ($J = -0.5$, $K = -5$, $\Gamma = 2.5$, and $J_3 = 0.5$ meV). The critical field strength, at which the magnon bands condense under the $b$-axis field, is $g\mu_B h/|K| \approx 0.343$ for Model 1, 0.242 for Model 2, 0.204 for Model 3, and 0.293 for Model 4. Circle data in (a), (b), (e), (i), (j), (m), and (p) represent the lowest seven excitation energies calculated by the thick-restarted Lanczos method [S1].

The genuine intermediate phase under both the $a$- and $c$-axis fields [S5]. We have explored the behaviors of DSSFs, magnon dispersions, and magnon specific heat of the $K$–$J_3$ model under in-plane magnetic fields. As shown in Fig. S6, the field-angle anisotropy in the $K$–$J_3$ model is less evident than those in other models. The DSSFs $C_{M_1}$, $C_{M_2}$, and $C_{M_3}$ are almost constant in the range of $0^\circ \leq \varphi \leq 60^\circ$, $60^\circ \leq \varphi \leq 120^\circ$, and $120^\circ \leq \varphi \leq 180^\circ$, respectively. The magnon bands in the polarized phase condense almost simultaneously at the three $M$ points and the field-angle anisotropy of magnon specific heat is almost suppressed.

FIG. S5. Dynamical spin structure factors $C_{M_1}(\omega)$ under the $a$-axis field ($\varphi = 0^\circ$) and $C_{M_2}(\omega)$ under the $b$-axis field ($\varphi = 90^\circ$), and the magnon dispersions and magnon specific heats under both $a$- and $b$-axis fields at the critical field strength for (a) – (d) Model 5 ($J = -1.5$, $K = -10$, $\Gamma = 8.8$, and $J_3 = 0.4$), (e) – (h) Model 6 ($J = -1.3$, $K = -15.1$, $\Gamma = 10.1$, $\Gamma' = -0.1175$, $K_2 = -0.68$, and $J_3 = 0.9$ meV), and (i) – (l) Model 7 ($J = -4.0$, $K = -10.8$, $\Gamma = 5.2$, $\Gamma' = 2.9$, and $J_3 = 3.26$ meV). The critical field strength, at which the magnon bands condenses under the $b$-axis field, is $g\mu_B h/|K| \approx 0.202$ for Model 5, 0.178 for Model 6, and 0.106 for Model 7. Circle data in (a), (b), (e), (f), (i), and (j) represent the lowest seven excitation energies calculated by the thick-restarted Lanczos method \[S1\].

FIG. S6. Dynamical spin structure factors (a) $C_{M_1}(\omega)$ and (b) $C_{M_2}(\omega)$ as a function of a field angle $\varphi$ in the $K$-$J_3$ model with $J_3/|K| = 0.1$, $K < 0$, and $g\mu_B h/|K| = 0.16$. (c) Magnon dispersions and (d) magnon specific heats under both $a$- and $b$-axis fields at the critical field strength ($g\mu_B h/|K| = 0.15$) in the $K$-$J_3$ model. Circle data in (a) and (b) represent the lowest seven excitation energies calculated by the thick-restarted Lanczos method [S1].