

Confinement-Induced Enhancement of Superconductivity in a Spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ Fermion Chain Coupled to a \mathbb{Z}_2 Lattice Gauge Field

Zi-Yong Ge¹ and Franco Nori^{1,2,3}

¹*Theoretical Quantum Physics Laboratory, RIKEN Cluster for Pioneering Research, Wako-shi, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*

²*RIKEN Center for Quantum Computing, Wako-shi, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*

³*Department of Physics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1040, USA*

(Dated: August 16, 2022)

We investigate a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermion chain minimally coupled to a \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge field. In the odd-gauge sector, the model reduces to the Hubbard model with repulsive onsite interaction coupled to a \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge field. We uncover how electric fields affect low-energy excitations by both analytical and numerical methods. In the half-filling case, despite electric fields, the system is still a Mott insulator, just like the Hubbard model. For hole-doped systems, holes are confined under nonzero electric fields, resulting in a hole-pair bound state. Furthermore, this bound state also significantly affects the superconductivity, which manifests itself in the emergence of attractive interactions between bond singlet Cooper pairs. Specifically, numerical results reveal that the dimension of the dominant superconducting order parameter becomes smaller when increasing the electric field, signaling an enhancement of the superconducting instability induced by lattice fermion confinement. Our results provide insights for understanding unconventional superconductivity in \mathbb{Z}_2 LGTs and might be experimentally addressed in quantum simulators.

Introduction.—Lattice gauge theories (LGTs) were originally proposed to understand the confinement of quarks and became a fundamental concept in high-energy physics [1]. In correlated electronic systems, due to strong quantum fluctuations, LGTs can also emerge leading to many exotic quantum phases [2–7]. Moreover, LGTs have also applied to understand high- T_c superconductors, where $U(1)$ [8], $SU(2)$ [9, 10] and \mathbb{Z}_2 [11] gauge theories have been introduced in doped Mott insulators [12–14]. However, studying LGTs coupled to dynamical matter fields, especially in the 2D case, is a quite challenging task for conventional methods. Explicitly, there is a sign problem for quantum Monte Carlo methods [15–17], and the density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) [18–20] method is difficult to extend to high-dimensional systems due to large entanglement entropies. Recently, with the rapid development of quantum simulations [21–27], studying LGTs in synthetic quantum many-body systems has become possible [28–44]. Quantum simulations provide an alternative for understanding or solving hard problems in LGTs. Meanwhile, quantum simulators are also an outstanding platform to study non-equilibrium dynamics of LGTs [45–47].

The simplest example of LGTs is \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge theories [2, 5, 48, 49]. Motivated by recent quantum simulation experiments, studying \mathbb{Z}_2 LGTs coupled to dynamical matter fields has attracted considerable interests [50–61]. These works mainly focus on single-component matter fields. However, to relate to unconventional superconductors, spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ (two-component) fermions should be considered as the matter field. Generally, there exists different low-energy physics between single- and multi-component fermions coupled to gauge fields. For instance, deconfined phases are absent in 2D single-component fermions coupled to \mathbb{Z}_2 LGTs, while they can emerge in two- or multi-component cases [62, 63]. However, \mathbb{Z}_2 LGTs coupled to spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermions are not yet fully understood even in 1D, especially the superconducting order in the odd-gauge sector with doped holes [11, 63]. Moreover,

it is still an open question how to realize this system in quantum simulators.

In this work, we present systematic investigations of a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermion chain coupled minimally to a \mathbb{Z}_2 LGT. To relate to the physics of Mott insulators and unconventional superconductors, we mainly consider low-energy excitations in the odd-gauge sector. Thus, the system is equivalent to the Hubbard model coupled to a \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge field. We first present a phenomenological analysis of the ground state and derive the effective Hamiltonian in the large electric field limit. The half-filling system is still a Mott insulator with the spin sector being an antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model. Hence, similar to the Hubbard model, there is a deconfined spinon excitation, although lattice fermions are confined. However, in hole-doped systems, the electric field can induce confinement of holes resulting in the emergence of hole-pair bound states. Moreover, the kinetic term of the hole pair can contribute to an attractive interaction between bond singlet Cooper pairs, which is expected to enhance the superconductivity. We also adopt DMRG [18–20] methods to support the above analytical discussion. Numerical results demonstrate that lattice fermions are indeed always confined in half-filling systems, whereas they become deconfined in hole-doped systems when electric fields are absent. In addition, there exists a deconfined spinon excitation in both half-filling and hole-doped cases, just like the Hubbard model. Regarding superconductivity, we find that bond singlet pairs are the dominating superconducting order parameter in hole-doped systems. Remarkably, the dimension of this order parameter becomes smaller when increasing an applied electric field, revealing that the confinement of holes can enhance superconductivity. Finally, we also propose an approach to implement our model in experimental quantum simulators.

Model.—Here we consider a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermion chain coupled

to a dynamical \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge field. The Hamiltonian reads

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} = & -t \sum_{j=1}^{L-1} \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} (\hat{f}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} + \text{H.c.}) \\ & - h \sum_{j=1}^L \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x - \frac{U}{4} \sum_{j=1}^{L-1} \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^x \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{f}_{i,\sigma}^\dagger$ ($\hat{f}_{j,\sigma}$) is the creation (annihilation) operator of the fermion living on site j , $\hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^\alpha$ is the Pauli matrix acting on the link between sites j and $(j+1)$ (labeled by $(j+\frac{1}{2})$), and L is the system size. The first term describes fermions coupled minimally to gauge fields via the Ising version of the Peierls substitution with amplitude $t > 0$. The second term is an electric field with strength $h > 0$. The third term is a ferromagnetic Ising interaction of electric fields with strength $U > 0$.

The Hamiltonian \hat{H} is \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge invariant with the generator defined as

$$\hat{G}_j = \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^x (-1)^{\hat{N}_j} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x, \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{N}_j = \hat{n}_{j,\uparrow} + \hat{n}_{j,\downarrow}$ ($\hat{n}_{j,\sigma} = \hat{f}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j,\sigma}$) is the fermion number on site j . In addition to gauge invariance, \hat{H} also possesses a global $SU_s(2) \times U(1)$ symmetry for the arbitrary filling factor. Here $U(1)$ represents the conservation of total fermion number, i.e., $[\sum_j \hat{N}_j, \hat{H}] = 0$, and $SU_s(2)$ corresponds to the spin rotation. Specifically, for the half filling, due to the particle-hole symmetry, this continuous symmetry is enlarged to $SU_s(2) \times SU_\eta(2) \times U(1)$, where $SU_\eta(2)$ is the pseudospin rotation symmetry [64, 65].

The 2D version of Eq. (1) in the odd sector ($\hat{G}_j = -1$) is promised to be relevant for understanding superconductivity in doped Mott insulators [11]. However, this is challenging for conventional numerical and analytic methods [62, 63]. In the following, we will demonstrate that the 1D case can be addressed analytically by perturbation theories in the strong electric field limit. To relate to the physics of Mott insulators and superconductivity, we focus on the odd gauge sector. Thus, the Ising interaction of gauge fields under this gauge constraint is equivalent to an onsite repulsive interaction of fermions, i.e., $-\hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^x \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x = (1 - 2\hat{n}_{j,\uparrow})(1 - 2\hat{n}_{j,\downarrow})$. Therefore, the Hamiltonian (1) reduces to a Hubbard model when $h = 0$. Hereafter, we mainly study how electric fields affect the low-energy physics of the Hubbard model.

Charge configurations of ground states.—To shed light on how the confinement of lattice fermions occurs, we first analyze phenomenologically the configuration of the charge sector in ground states. For simplicity, we can consider the limit $h, U \gg t$, where the terms $\hat{H}_h := -h \sum_{j=1}^L \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x$ and $\hat{H}_U := -\frac{U}{4} \sum_{j=1}^{L-1} \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^x \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x$ dominate the energy.

In the half-filling case, if each site occupies one fermion, then under the gauge constraint $\hat{G}_j = -1$, all τ spins can be polarized at $\langle \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \rangle = 1$, simultaneously. This configuration can indeed minimize the energy of both \hat{H}_h and \hat{H}_U . In addition, exciting a double occupation and a hole costs energy




FIG. 1. Diagram of the hole pair dynamics. The orange dashed ellipses represents a hole-pair bound state $|0-0\rangle$, which can hop to NN bonds under the action of \hat{H}_K .

$\sim (h + U)$, i.e., there is a charge gap. Thus, the system is still a Mott insulator identical to the Hubbard model, and lattice fermions $\hat{f}_{j,\sigma}$ should be confined. We note that the existence of electric fields can only enlarge the charge gap, but cannot change the Mott insulator phase in this case.

In hole-doped systems, it is not possible for each site to be occupied by a fermion, so not all τ spins can be polarized at $\langle \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \rangle = 1$ in the odd-gauge sector. In addition, the double occupation should also be suppressed due to its energy cost $\sim (h + U)$. Thus, only holes and single-occupation states are allowed in the ground state. To reveal the configuration of the charge sector, we take the case of two holes as an example (to fix the even fermion parity subspace, we only consider an even number of holes.). The corresponding gauge-invariant configuration has the form

$$|\dots + 1 + 0 - 1 - 1 - \dots - 1 - 1 - 0 + 1 + 1 + \dots\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $|\pm\rangle$ labels the eigenstate of $\hat{\tau}^x$ with eigenvalue ± 1 , and $|0\rangle$ ($|1\rangle$) labels a hole (single occupation). In Eq. (3), there are r links polarized at the state $|- \rangle$, where r is the distance between two holes. Thus, there is a string tension between two holes with energy hr , so the hole becomes confined when $h \neq 0$. For large h , to minimize the energy, these two holes should be bonded on two nest-neighbor (NN) sites. Generalizing to the multi-hole systems, we can find that holes must exist in pairs, i.e., form hole-pair bound states $|0-0\rangle$, which are absent in the Hubbard model. Therefore, in the presence of doped holes, the existence of \hat{H}_h can significantly affect the charge degrees of freedom, resulting in a distinct low-energy physics from the Hubbard model.

Effective Hamiltonian in the strong electric field limit.—To further uncover the effect of electric fields, we can consider the effective Hamiltonian in a limiting case of $h \gg t$ and $U \rightarrow 0$. Using the Schrieffer-Wolf transformation [66, 67], we can

obtain $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = \hat{H}_h + \hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_K$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}_S &= J \sum_j \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \cdot (\hat{s}_j \cdot \hat{s}_{j+1} + \hat{\eta}_j \cdot \hat{\eta}_{j+1}), \\ \hat{H}_K &= -\frac{iJ}{2} \sum_{j,\sigma} (\hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y - \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z) (\hat{f}_{j-1,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} - \text{H.c.}),\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

and the effective coupling $J = t^2/h$. Two spin operators are defined as $\hat{s}_j := \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \hat{f}_{j,\alpha}^\dagger \sigma_{\alpha\beta} \hat{f}_{j,\beta}$ and $\hat{\eta}_j := \hat{P}^{-1} \hat{s}_j \hat{P}$, where σ are Pauli matrices, and \hat{P} corresponds to the particle-hole transformation. Detailed derivations are presented in the Supplemental Materials (SM) [68].

In half-filling systems, since the charge sector is frozen, the effective Hamiltonian in Eq. (4) is reduced to a 1D antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model [68], which is identical to the Hubbard model. Therefore, in addition to the charge sector, the electric field cannot affect the physics of the spin sector. According to properties of the 1D Heisenberg model [4, 12, 69], there will be a deconfined spinon excitation. The spin operator \hat{s}_j is indeed gauge invariant, so this spinon excitation is physically allowed. For a system with doped holes, due to the absence of double occupations, the term $\hat{\eta}_i \cdot \hat{\eta}_j$ in Eq. (4) only contributes a density-density interaction [68]. In addition, the third term \hat{H}_K allows a hole-pair bound state $|0-0\rangle$ to hop to NN sites [see Fig. 1]. Therefore, in this system, the dynamics of the charge sector is contributed by hole pairs, while the spin sector is still an antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model.

We further analyze the kinetic term \hat{H}_K to uncover how the hole-pair bound state affects the superconductivity. This term can be rewritten as interactions of bond Cooper pairs [68]

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H}_K &= J \sum_j \hat{\Phi}_{1,0}(j-1) \hat{\Phi}_{1,0}^\dagger(j) - \hat{\Phi}_{0,0}(j-1) \hat{\Phi}_{0,0}^\dagger(j) + \text{H.c.} \\ &= J \sum_j \hat{\Phi}_{1,\uparrow}(j-1) \hat{\Phi}_{1,\uparrow}^\dagger(j) + \hat{\Phi}_{1,\downarrow}(j-1) \hat{\Phi}_{1,\downarrow}^\dagger(j) + \text{H.c.},\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

where $\hat{\Phi}_{s,m}^\dagger$ ($s = 0, 1$ and $m = 0, \uparrow, \downarrow$) is the gauge-invariant order parameter of bond Cooper pairs with the form

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Phi}_{0,0}^\dagger(j) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \cdot (\hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\downarrow}^\dagger - \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\uparrow}^\dagger), \\ \hat{\Phi}_{1,0}^\dagger(j) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \cdot (\hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\downarrow}^\dagger + \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\uparrow}^\dagger), \\ \hat{\Phi}_{1,\sigma}^\dagger(j) &:= \hat{f}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma}^\dagger.\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

Here $\hat{\Phi}_{0,0}^\dagger$ represents a singlet pair, while the other three ones are triplet pairs. In an antiferromagnetic background, triplet pairing should be suppressed due to a large energy cost. Meanwhile, they also exhibit repulsive interactions in Eq. (5), which are generally irrelevant to the superconductivity. However, the situation is different for singlet pairs, which are low-energy pairings in antiferromagnetic backgrounds and have attractive interactions in \hat{H}_K . Therefore, $\hat{\Phi}_{0,0}$ should be




FIG. 2. Correlation functions of lattice fermions and spins with $L = 256$. (a, b) $C_f^t(r)$ for half and 3/8 filling, respectively. The black dashed lines are fitting exponential functions. (c, d) $C_s^s(r)$ for half and 3/8 filling, respectively. The red line is the spin-exchange correlation function of 1D Heisenberg model. To reduce finite-size effects, we calculate the correlation function between sites $L/2$ and $L/2 + r$.

the dominate pairing that contributes to the charge dynamics. Moreover, this term should be also expected to enhance the superconducting instability due to the attractive interaction. Thus we expect a superconducting single phase under large electric fields and proper doping.

Numerical simulations.—To verify the above results, we need to perform numerical simulations. We adopt the DMRG algorithm, which is one of the most efficient methods to numerically study 1D quantum many-body systems. We project ground states to the specific gauge sector by adding a Lagrange multiplier λ_j to the original Hamiltonian, i.e., calculating the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{\text{num}} := \hat{H} + \sum_j \lambda_j \hat{G}_j$. Since $[\hat{G}_j, \hat{H}] = 0$, \hat{H} should have the same eigenstates as \hat{H}_{num} . When $\lambda_j \gg 1$, the ground state of \hat{H}_{num} satisfies $\langle \hat{G}_j \rangle = -1$, which is the ground state of \hat{H} in the odd-gauge sector. Here we mainly study how electric fields affect excitations of this system in the presence of large U , i.e., the effect of confinement concerning the 1D Hubbard model. To probe excitations, we need to calculate the corresponding gauge-invariant correlation functions. During the calculation, we choose $\lambda_j = 100$, $t = 1$, $U = 8$, and open boundary conditions with system size up to $L = 256$. The maximum bond dimension is $\chi = 600$ and truncation errors $\sim 10^{-7}$. The expectation value of the \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge generator satisfies $|\langle \hat{G}_j \rangle + 1| < 10^{-12}$. We note that, despite the absence of rigorous gauge invariance, this numerical method can naturally extend to study experimental imperfections.

We first consider lattice fermions by introducing a string correlation function [58] $C_\sigma^t(i-j) := \langle \hat{f}_{i,\sigma}^\dagger (\prod_{i \leq \ell < j} \hat{\tau}_{\ell+\frac{1}{2}}^z) \hat{f}_{j,\sigma} \rangle$. As shown in Fig. 2(a), for the




FIG. 3. Correlation functions of superconducting order parameters. The scaling of different superconducting order parameters with $h = 1$ and $L = 256$ in the cases of (a) half filling and (b) 3/8 filling. (c) Correlation functions of bond singlet pairs for different electric fields. (d) The dimension of bond singlet pairs versus electric fields. To reduce finite-size effects, we calculate the correlation function $C_{\Phi_{\alpha}}(r) = \langle \hat{\Phi}_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(L/2+r)\hat{\Phi}_{\alpha}(L/2) \rangle$.

large U , $C_{\sigma}^f(i-j)$ shows exponential decay in the half-filling case for arbitrary electric fields (including $h = 0$). Thus, the lattice fermion is always confined in this Mott insulator. For hole-doped systems, when $h = 0$, C_{σ}^f shows a power law decay, indicating a deconfinement of $f_{i,\sigma}^{\dagger}$ [see Fig. 2(b)]. However, it becomes confined for finite h , which is consistent with the string tension between holes. For the spinon excitation, we define a spin-exchange correlation function $C^s(i-j) := \langle \hat{s}_i^{\dagger} \hat{s}_j \rangle$, which is also gauge invariant. Figures. 2(c-d) show that this correlation function has a power-law scaling in both half-filling and hole-doped systems, indicating the existence of deconfined spinon excitations. Moreover, in the half-filling case, Fig. 2(c) shows that the C^s is nearly identical to the spin-exchange correlation function of the 1D Heisenberg model for arbitrary h , indicating that the increase in h can hardly affect the effective Hamiltonian (Heisenberg model).

Now, we focus on the superconductivity in hole-doped systems. For 1D spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermions, in addition to bond pairs defined in Eq. (6), we can also introduce a site singlet pair $\hat{\Phi}_{ss}^{\dagger}(j) := \hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^{\dagger} \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow}^{\dagger}$. To study the superconductivity, we need to calculate correlators of the above Cooper pair order parameters, i.e., $C_{\Phi_{\alpha}}(i-j) := \langle \hat{\Phi}_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(i)\hat{\Phi}_{\alpha}(j) \rangle$ ($\alpha = ss/0, 0/1, 0/1, \uparrow/1, \downarrow$). As shown in Fig. 3(a), $C_{\Phi_{\alpha}}$ exhibits an exponential decay for all superconducting order parameters in the case of half-filling suggesting the Mott insulator. In Fig. 3(b), we present the result of $C_{\Phi_{\alpha}}$ with 3/8 filling. It shows that all types of Cooper pairs have power law scalings $C_{\Phi_{\alpha}}(i-j) \sim |i-j|^{-2\Delta_{\Phi_{\alpha}}}$, where $\Delta_{\Phi_{\alpha}}$ is the dimension of $\hat{\Phi}_{\alpha}$. In addition, the bond singlet pair is indeed the dominate pairing. Moreover, the dimension of this pair becomes smaller when




FIG. 4. Lattice skeleton of Eq. (7). Top/bottom blue sites represent A/B -spins (matter fields), and orange sites are τ -spins (gauge fields). Each τ -spin can couple to its 4 NN σ -spins.

increasing h [see Figs. 3(c,d)]. Thus, the electric field can indeed enhance superconductivity, which is consistent with the effective Hamiltonian in Eq. (4). In the SM [68], we also present the density-density correlation function, with dimension larger than $\Delta_{\Phi_{0,0}}$ for large h in the case of 3/8 filling, indicating that superconducting correlations can be dominant under the proper doping.

Proposed experimental implementation.—Finally, we present an approach to realize a 1D \mathbb{Z}_2 LGT coupled to two-component fermions in quantum simulators. According to the above discussion, we know that \hat{H}_U is an irrelevant term for low-energy physics. Thus, without loss of generality, we just need to consider the Hamiltonian (1) with $U = 0$ in quantum simulations, which is sufficient to demonstrate the above physics. Here we mainly apply an array of spins (or two-level systems) with NN hopping g , where the lattice configuration is shown in Fig. 4. Thus, the original Hamiltonian of this system can be written as

$$\hat{H}_{qs} = g \sum_j \sum_{\ell=A,B} (\hat{\sigma}_{\ell,j}^{\dagger} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^{-} + \hat{\sigma}_{\ell,j+1}^{\dagger} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^{-} + \text{H.c.}) + \sum_j (V_A \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^{\dagger} \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^{-} + V_B \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^{\dagger} \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^{-} + h \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x). \quad (7)$$

We let the potential of A - and B -spins satisfy $V_A = -V_B \gg g, h$. Using the Schrieffer-Wolf transformation, we can obtain the effective spin Hamiltonian as [68]

$$\hat{H}_e = \sum_j (g_e \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^{\dagger} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{A,j+1}^{-} - g_e \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^{\dagger} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{B,j+1}^{-} + \text{H.c.}) + h \sum_j \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x, \quad (8)$$

where $g_e = \lambda^2/V_A$. This is a \mathbb{Z}_2 LGT coupled to two species of spins. To map the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_e to Eq. (1), we first apply a particle-hole transformation of the B -spin to change the sign of the coupling between B -spins and gauge fields [68]. Then, via a Jordan-Wigner transformation, we can map A/B -spins to spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermions, and the final Hamiltonian will become Eq. (1) with $U = 0$ [68]. Generally, the Hamiltonian in Eq. (7) is accessible in various of artificial quantum many-body systems, including optical lattice [21, 22, 26], Rydberg atoms [27, 70], and superconducting circuits [71, 72].

Summary and outlook.—We have systematically studied the ground state of a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermion chain coupled to a \mathbb{Z}_2 LGT. In the odd-gauge sector, the model is equivalent to a 1D Hubbard model coupled to a \mathbb{Z}_2 LGT. At half filling, the

system is a Mott insulator, and the spin sector is an antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model with fractionalized spinon excitations. In hole-doped systems, the lattice fermion is confined under nonzero electric fields, leading to the emergence of hole-pair bound states. Remarkably, we also demonstrate that this hole pair can enhance the superconducting instability. We also propose possible experimental realizations of this model in an array of two-level systems. Our results demonstrate that the confinement of lattice fermions can enhance a superconducting instability, which paves the way for understanding unconventional superconductors with \mathbb{Z}_2 LGTs. Meanwhile, our model could also be implemented experimentally in state-of-art quantum simulators [21–27]. A particularly interesting and natural extension of our work would be generalizing our model to 2D, which is significant for understanding high- T_c superconductors. It will be another interesting issue to consider a ladder model, which is one of the simplest cases that open a spin gap [73–76].

Acknowledgements.—We thank R.-Z. Huang for insightful discussions. This work is supported in part by: Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation (NTT) Research, the Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST) [via the Quantum Leap Flagship Program (Q-LEAP), and the Moonshot R&D Grant Number JPMJMS2061], the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) [via the Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI) Grant No. JP20H00134], the Army Research Office (ARO) (Grant No. W911NF-18-1-0358), the Asian Office of Aerospace Research and Development (AOARD) (via Grant No. FA2386-20-1-4069), and the Foundational Questions Institute Fund (FQXi) via Grant No. FQXi-IAF19-06.

-
- [1] K. G. Wilson, Confinement of quarks, *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 2445 (1974).
- [2] J. B. Kogut, An introduction to lattice gauge theory and spin systems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **51**, 659 (1979).
- [3] R. Moessner, S. L. Sondhi, and E. Fradkin, Short-ranged resonating valence bond physics, quantum dimer models, and Ising gauge theories, *Phys. Rev. B* **65**, 024504 (2001).
- [4] E. Fradkin, *Field theories of condensed matter physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2013).
- [5] A. Kitaev, Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons, *Annals of Physics* **303**, 2 (2003).
- [6] Y. Zhou, K. Kanoda, and T.-K. Ng, Quantum spin liquid states, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 025003 (2017).
- [7] T. Senthil, A. Vishwanath, L. Balents, S. Sachdev, and M. P. A. Fisher, Deconfined quantum critical points, *Science* **303**, 1490 (2004).
- [8] G. Baskaran and P. W. Anderson, Gauge theory of high-temperature superconductors and strongly correlated Fermi systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **37**, 580 (1988).
- [9] I. Affleck, Z. Zou, T. Hsu, and P. W. Anderson, SU(2) gauge symmetry of the large- U limit of the Hubbard model, *Phys. Rev. B* **38**, 745 (1988).
- [10] E. Dagotto, E. Fradkin, and A. Moreo, SU(2) gauge invariance and order parameters in strongly coupled electronic systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **38**, 2926 (1988).
- [11] T. Senthil and M. P. A. Fisher, \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge theory of electron fractionalization in strongly correlated systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **62**, 7850 (2000).
- [12] E. Manousakis, The spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg antiferromagnet on a square lattice and its application to the cuprous oxides, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **63**, 1 (1991).
- [13] E. Dagotto, Correlated electrons in high-temperature superconductors, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **66**, 763 (1994).
- [14] P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, and X.-G. Wen, Doping a Mott insulator: Physics of high-temperature superconductivity, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 17 (2006).
- [15] D. M. Ceperley, Path integrals in the theory of condensed helium, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **67**, 279 (1995).
- [16] W. M. C. Foulkes, L. Mitas, R. J. Needs, and G. Rajagopal, Quantum Monte Carlo simulations of solids, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 33 (2001).
- [17] R. Mondaini, S. Tarat, and R. T. Scalettar, Quantum critical points and the sign problem, *Science* **375**, 418 (2022).
- [18] S. R. White, Density matrix formulation for quantum renormalization groups, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2863 (1992).
- [19] U. Schollwöck, The density-matrix renormalization group, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 259 (2005).
- [20] U. Schollwöck, The density-matrix renormalization group in the age of matrix product states, *Ann. Phys.* **326**, 96 (2011).
- [21] M. Lewenstein, A. Sanpera, V. Ahufinger, B. Damski, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, Ultracold atomic gases in optical lattices: mimicking condensed matter physics and beyond, *Adv. Phys.* **56**, 243 (2007).
- [22] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, Many-body physics with ultracold gases, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 885 (2008).
- [23] I. Buluta and F. Nori, Quantum simulators, *Science* **326**, 108 (2009).
- [24] I. Buluta, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, Natural and artificial atoms for quantum computation, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **74**, 104401 (2011).
- [25] I. M. Georgescu, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, Quantum simulation, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 153 (2014).
- [26] C. Gross and I. Bloch, Quantum simulations with ultracold atoms in optical lattices, *Science* **357**, 995 (2017).
- [27] A. Browaeys and T. Lahaye, Many-body physics with individually controlled Rydberg atoms, *Nat. Phys.* **16**, 132 (2020).
- [28] T. Byrnes and Y. Yamamoto, Simulating lattice gauge theories on a quantum computer, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 022328 (2006).
- [29] E. Zohar, J. I. Cirac, and B. Reznik, Simulating compact quantum electrodynamics with ultracold atoms: Probing confinement and nonperturbative effects, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 125302 (2012).
- [30] D. Banerjee, M. Dalmonte, M. Müller, E. Rico, P. Stebler, U.-J. Wiese, and P. Zoller, Atomic quantum simulation of dynamical gauge fields coupled to Fermionic matter: From string breaking to evolution after a quench, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 175302 (2012).
- [31] P. Hauke, D. Marcos, M. Dalmonte, and P. Zoller, Quantum simulation of a lattice Schwinger model in a chain of trapped ions, *Phys. Rev. X* **3**, 041018 (2013).
- [32] D. Marcos, P. Rabl, E. Rico, and P. Zoller, Superconducting circuits for quantum simulation of dynamical gauge fields, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 110504 (2013).
- [33] G. K. Brennen, G. Pupillo, E. Rico, T. M. Stace, and D. Vodola, Loops and strings in a superconducting lattice gauge simulator, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 240504 (2016).
- [34] E. Zohar, A. Farace, B. Reznik, and J. I. Cirac, Digital quantum simulation of \mathbb{Z}_2 lattice gauge theories with dynamical Fermionic matter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 070501 (2017).

- [35] L. Barbiero, C. Schweizer, M. Aidelsburger, E. Demler, N. Goldman, and F. Grusdt, Coupling ultracold matter to dynamical gauge fields in optical lattices: From flux attachment to Z_2 lattice gauge theories, *Sci. Adv.* **5**, eaav7444 (2019).
- [36] C. Schweizer, F. Grusdt, M. Berngruber, L. Barbiero, E. Demler, N. Goldman, I. Bloch, and M. Aidelsburger, Floquet approach to $Z(2)$ lattice gauge theories with ultracold atoms in optical lattices, *Nat. Phys.* **15**, 1168 (2019).
- [37] F. Goerg, K. Sandholzer, J. Minguzzi, R. Desbuquois, M. Messer, and T. Esslinger, Realization of density-dependent Peierls phases to engineer quantized gauge fields coupled to ultracold matter, *Nat. Phys.* **15**, 1161 (2019).
- [38] B. Yang, H. Sun, R. Ott, H.-Y. Wang, T. V. Zache, J. C. Halimeh, Z.-S. Yuan, P. Hauke, and J.-W. Pan, Observation of gauge invariance in a 71-site Bose-Hubbard quantum simulator, *Nature (London)* **587**, 392 (2020).
- [39] A. Celi, B. Vermersch, O. Viyuela, H. Pichler, M. D. Lukin, and P. Zoller, Emerging two-dimensional gauge theories in Rydberg configurable arrays, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 021057 (2020).
- [40] F. M. Surace, P. P. Mazza, G. Giudici, A. Lerose, A. Gambassi, and M. Dalmonte, Lattice gauge theories and string dynamics in Rydberg atom quantum simulators, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 021041 (2020).
- [41] Z. Davoudi, M. Hafezi, C. Monroe, G. Pagano, A. Seif, and A. Shaw, Towards analog quantum simulations of lattice gauge theories with trapped ions, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 023015 (2020).
- [42] Z.-Y. Ge, R.-Z. Huang, Z.-Y. Meng, and H. Fan, Quantum simulation of lattice gauge theories on superconducting circuits: Quantum phase transition and quench dynamics, *Chin. Phys. B* **31**, 020304 (2021).
- [43] Z. Wang, Z.-Y. Ge, Z. Xiang, X. Song, R.-Z. Huang, P. Song, X.-Y. Guo, L. Su, K. Xu, D. Zheng, and H. Fan, Observation of emergent Z_2 gauge invariance in a superconducting circuit, *Phys. Rev. Research* **4**, L022060 (2022).
- [44] Z.-Y. Zhou, G.-X. Su, J. C. Halimeh, R. Ott, H. Sun, P. Hauke, B. Yang, Z.-S. Yuan, J. Berges, and J.-W. Pan, Thermalization dynamics of a gauge theory on a quantum simulator, *Science* **377**, 311 (2022).
- [45] M. Dalmonte and S. Montangero, Lattice gauge theory simulations in the quantum information era, *Contemp. Phys.* **57**, 388 (2016).
- [46] M. C. Banuls, R. Blatt, J. Catani, A. Celi, J. I. Cirac, M. Dalmonte, L. Fallani, K. Jansen, M. Lewenstein, S. Montangero, *et al.*, Simulating lattice gauge theories within quantum technologies, *The European physical journal D* **74**, 1 (2020).
- [47] E. Rinaldi, X. Han, M. Hassan, Y. Feng, F. Nori, M. McGuigan, and M. Hanada, Matrix-Model Simulations Using Quantum Computing, Deep Learning, and Lattice Monte Carlo, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 010324 (2022).
- [48] E. Fradkin and L. Susskind, Order and disorder in gauge systems and magnets, *Phys. Rev. D* **17**, 2637 (1978).
- [49] E. Fradkin and S. H. Shenker, Phase diagrams of lattice gauge theories with Higgs fields, *Phys. Rev. D* **19**, 3682 (1979).
- [50] A. Smith, J. Knolle, D. L. Kovrizhin, and R. Moessner, Disorder-free localization, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 266601 (2017).
- [51] A. Smith, J. Knolle, R. Moessner, and D. L. Kovrizhin, Absence of ergodicity without quenched disorder: From quantum disentangled liquids to many-body localization, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 176601 (2017).
- [52] C. Prosko, S.-P. Lee, and J. Maciejko, Simple Z_2 lattice gauge theories at finite fermion density, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 205104 (2017).
- [53] A. Smith, J. Knolle, R. Moessner, and D. L. Kovrizhin, Dynamical localization in Z_2 lattice gauge theories, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 245137 (2018).
- [54] O. Di Stefano, A. Settineri, V. Macrì, L. Garziano, R. Stassi, S. Savasta, and F. Nori, Resolution of gauge ambiguities in ultrastrong-coupling cavity quantum electrodynamics, *Nature Physics* **15**, 803 (2019).
- [55] S. Jiang and O. Motrunich, Ising ferromagnet to valence bond solid transition in a one-dimensional spin chain: Analogies to deconfined quantum critical points, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 075103 (2019).
- [56] L. Garziano, A. Settineri, O. Di Stefano, S. Savasta, and F. Nori, Gauge invariance of the Dicke and Hopfield models, *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 023718 (2020).
- [57] D. González-Cuadra, L. Tagliacozzo, M. Lewenstein, and A. Bermudez, Robust topological order in Fermionic Z_2 gauge theories: From Aharonov-Bohm instability to soliton-induced deconfinement, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 041007 (2020).
- [58] U. Borla, R. Verresen, F. Grusdt, and S. Moroz, Confined phases of one-dimensional spinless Fermions coupled to Z_2 gauge theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 120503 (2020).
- [59] U. Borla, R. Verresen, J. Shah, and S. Moroz, Gauging the Kitaev chain, *SciPost Phys.* **10**, 148 (2021).
- [60] M. Kebrić, L. Barbiero, C. Reinmoser, U. Schollwöck, and F. Grusdt, Confinement and Mott transitions of dynamical charges in one-dimensional lattice gauge theories, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 167203 (2021).
- [61] U. Borla, B. Jeevanesan, F. Pollmann, and S. Moroz, Quantum phases of two-dimensional Z_2 gauge theory coupled to single-component fermion matter, *Phys. Rev. B* **105**, 075132 (2022).
- [62] F. F. Assaad and T. Grover, Simple Fermionic model of deconfined phases and phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 041049 (2016).
- [63] S. Gazit, M. Randeria, and A. Vishwanath, Emergent Dirac fermions and broken symmetries in confined and deconfined phases of Z_2 gauge theories, *Nat. Phys.* **13**, 484 (2017).
- [64] C. N. Yang and S. Zhang, SO_4 symmetry in a Hubbard model, *Modern Physics Letters B* **04**, 759 (1990).
- [65] S. Zhang, Pseudospin symmetry and new collective modes of the Hubbard model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 120 (1990).
- [66] J. R. Schrieffer and P. A. Wolff, Relation between the Anderson and Kondo Hamiltonians, *Phys. Rev.* **149**, 491 (1966).
- [67] S. Bravyi, D. P. DiVincenzo, and D. Loss, Schrieffer–Wolff transformation for quantum many-body systems, *Ann. Phys.* **326**, 2793 (2011).
- [68] See Supplemental Material, .
- [69] T. Giamarchi, *Quantum physics in one dimension* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2004, 2004).
- [70] M. Saffman, T. G. Walker, and K. Mølmer, Quantum information with Rydberg atoms, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 2313 (2010).
- [71] J.-Q. You and F. Nori, Atomic physics and quantum optics using superconducting circuits, *Nature* **474**, 589 (2011).
- [72] X. Gu, A. F. Kockum, A. Miranowicz, Y.-X. Liu, and F. Nori, Microwave photonics with superconducting quantum circuits, *Phys. Rep.* **718**, 1 (2017).
- [73] E. Dagotto and T. M. Rice, Surprises on the Way from One- to Two-Dimensional Quantum Magnets: The Ladder Materials, *Science* **271**, 618 (1996).
- [74] E. Dagotto, J. Riera, and D. Scalapino, Superconductivity in ladders and coupled planes, *Phys. Rev. B* **45**, 5744 (1992).
- [75] D. Poiblanc, D. J. Scalapino, and S. Capponi, Superconducting gap for a two-leg t - J ladder, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 137203 (2003).
- [76] A. Jaefari and E. Fradkin, Pair-density-wave superconducting order in two-leg ladders, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 035104 (2012).

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL FOR
CONFINEMENT-INDUCED ENHANCEMENT OF SUPERCONDUCTIVITY IN A SPIN- $\frac{1}{2}$ FERMION CHAIN COUPLED TO A \mathbb{Z}_2 LATTICE GAUGE FIELD

I. Effective Hamiltonian in the case of strong tension

Here we present details of deriving the effective Hamiltonian with the Schrieffer-Wolf transformation [66, 67] in the case of $h \gg t$ and $U \rightarrow 0$. First, we rewrite the Hamiltonian as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H} &= \hat{H}_0 + \hat{H}_1, \\ \hat{H}_0 &= -h \sum_j \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x, \\ \hat{H}_1 &= -t \sum_j \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} (\hat{f}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} + \text{H.c.}),\end{aligned}\tag{S1}$$

where \hat{H}_0 is a diagonal term, while \hat{H}_1 is off-diagonal one. Now, for $h \gg t$, we use the Schrieffer-Wolff transformation [66, 67] to obtain the effective Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = e^{-\hat{S}} \hat{H} e^{\hat{S}}.\tag{S2}$$

To second order:

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = \hat{H}_0 + (\hat{H}_1 + [\hat{H}_0, \hat{S}]) + \frac{1}{2}[(\hat{H}_1 + [\hat{H}_0, \hat{S}]), \hat{S}] + \frac{1}{2}[\hat{H}_1, \hat{S}].\tag{S3}$$

When this condition holds

$$\hat{H}_1 + [\hat{H}_0, \hat{S}] = 0,\tag{S4}$$

then the final effective Hamiltonian reads

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = \hat{H}_0 + \frac{1}{2}[\hat{H}_1, \hat{S}].\tag{S5}$$

Here, we choose the form of \hat{S} as

$$\hat{S} = \frac{it}{2h} \sum_{j,\sigma} (\hat{f}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} + \text{H.c.}),\tag{S6}$$

where it is not difficult to verify that it indeed satisfies the condition in Eq. (S4).

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}[\hat{H}_1, \hat{S}] &= -\frac{it^2}{2h} \left[\sum_{i,\sigma'} (\hat{f}_{i,\sigma'}^\dagger \hat{\tau}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{f}_{i+1,\sigma'} + \text{H.c.}), \sum_{j,\sigma} (\hat{f}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} + \text{H.c.}) \right] \\ &= -\frac{it^2}{2h} \left(\sum_{j,\sigma} (2i\hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x) (2\hat{n}_{j,\sigma} \hat{n}_{j+1,\sigma} - \hat{n}_{j,\sigma} - \hat{n}_{j+1,\sigma}) \right. \\ &\quad + \sum_j (-4i\hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x) (\hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow} \hat{f}_{j+1,\downarrow} \hat{f}_{j+1,\uparrow} + \text{H.c.}) \\ &\quad + \sum_j (4i\hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x) (\hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow} \hat{f}_{j+1,\downarrow} \hat{f}_{j+1,\uparrow} + \text{H.c.}) \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j,\sigma} (\hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y - \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z) (\hat{f}_{j-1,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} - \text{H.c.}) \right).\end{aligned}\tag{S7}$$

We define spin operators as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{s}}_j &:= \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \hat{f}_{j,\alpha}^\dagger \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta} \hat{f}_{j,\beta}, \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_j &:= \hat{P}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{s}}_j \hat{P},\end{aligned}\tag{S8}$$

where \hat{P} corresponds to the particle-hole transformation satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}^{-1} \hat{f}_{j,\uparrow} \hat{P} &= \hat{f}_{j,\uparrow} \\ \hat{P}^{-1} \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow} \hat{P} &= \begin{cases} \hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger, j = \text{odd}, \\ -\hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger, j = \text{even}, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S9})$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow} \hat{f}_{j+1,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\uparrow} + \text{H.c.} &= \hat{s}_j^+ \hat{s}_{j+1}^- + \text{H.c.} \\ \hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\downarrow} \hat{f}_{j+1,\uparrow} + \text{H.c.} &= -(\hat{\eta}_j^+ \hat{\eta}_{j+1}^- + \text{H.c.}) \\ \sum_{\sigma} 2\hat{n}_{j,\sigma} \hat{n}_{j+1,\sigma} - \hat{n}_{j,\sigma} - \hat{n}_{j+1,\sigma} &= \hat{s}_j^z \hat{s}_{j+1}^z + \hat{\eta}_j^z \hat{\eta}_{j+1}^z. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S10})$$

Therefore, Eq. (S7) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{H}_1, \hat{S}] &= \frac{t^2}{h} \sum_j \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \cdot (\hat{s}_j \cdot \hat{s}_{j+1} + \hat{\eta}_j \cdot \hat{\eta}_{j+1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{-it^2}{2h} \sum_{j,\sigma} (\hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y - \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z) (\hat{f}_{j-1,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} - \text{H.c.}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S11})$$

According to Eq. (S5), we can obtain the final form of the effective Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{\text{eff}} &= -h \sum_j \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x + J \sum_j \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \cdot (\hat{s}_j \cdot \hat{s}_{j+1} + \hat{\eta}_j \cdot \hat{\eta}_{j+1}) \\ &\quad - \frac{iJ}{2} \sum_{j,\sigma} (\hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y - \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z) (\hat{f}_{j-1,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} - \text{H.c.}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S12})$$

where $h = t^2/h$.

Now we consider the odd-gauge sector. In the case of half filling, as mentioned in the main text, all τ -spins are nearly polarized at the state $|+\rangle$, and each site occupies one fermion. Thus, $\hat{\eta}_j \cdot \hat{\eta}_{j+1} = \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y - \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z = 0$, and $\langle \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \rangle = 1$. So the effective Hamiltonian in this case is reduced to a 1D antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model (where the constant is neglected.)

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{hf}} = J \sum_j \hat{s}_j \cdot \hat{s}_{j+1}. \quad (\text{S13})$$

For hole-doped systems, since double occupations are forbidden, the term $\hat{\eta}_j \cdot \hat{\eta}_{j+1}$ only contributes a density-density interaction. Thus, the effective Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{hd}} = J \sum_j \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \cdot (\hat{s}_j \cdot \hat{s}_{j+1} + \hat{N}_j \hat{N}_{j+1}) + \frac{J}{2} \sum_{j,\sigma} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \cdot (\hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z + \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y) (\hat{f}_{j-1,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} - \text{H.c.}). \quad (\text{S14})$$

Here, the Heisenberg term $\hat{s}_j \cdot \hat{s}_{j+1}$ cannot vanish, iff the NN sites j and $(j+1)$ are both occupied by a single fermion, which makes the bond $(j+\frac{1}{2})$ at the state $|+\rangle$. Thus, $\hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \cdot (\hat{s}_j \cdot \hat{s}_{j+1})$ is equivalent to $\hat{s}_j \cdot \hat{s}_{j+1}$, which is also gauge invariant. The second term in $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{hd}}$ is the next-nearest-neighbor (NNN) hopping term of holes. If the site j is a single-occupation state, then $\langle \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^x \rangle = \langle \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \rangle = 1$, leading to $\hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z + \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y = 0$. If the site j is a hole, then $\langle \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^x \rangle = -\langle \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \rangle$ and $\hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z = \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y \neq 0$. That is, the NNN hopping of holes between $(j-1)$ and $(j+1)$ can contribute, iff the site in between is also a hole. Therefore, this term can be regarded as the NN hopping (kinetic term) of hole-pair bound states.

II. Kinetic term of hole pairs

Now we consider the effect of the kinetic term of hole pairs

$$\hat{H}_K = \frac{J}{2} \sum_{j,\sigma} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \cdot (\hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z + \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^y \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^y) (\hat{f}_{j-1,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} - \text{H.c.}). \quad (\text{S15})$$




FIG. S1. The correlation function of C_n and $C_{\Phi_{0,0}}$ with $L = 256$ and $3/8$ filling for (a) $h = 0.2$ and (b) $h = 2$. (c) The dimensions of density operator and bond singlet pairs versus h .

Here, $\langle \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^x \rangle = -\langle \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \rangle$, if site j is a hole, and $\langle \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x \rangle = \pm 1$ with a hole pair at bond $j \pm \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, Eq. (S15) can be simplified as

$$\hat{H}_K = J \sum_{j,\sigma} \hat{f}_{j-1,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma} + \text{H.c.} \quad (\text{S16})$$

In addition, since the site j should be a hole, we can insert a term $\hat{f}_{j,\sigma} \hat{f}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger$ into Eq. (S16). Thus, we can rewrite Eq. (S16) as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_K &= J \sum_j \hat{\Phi}_{1,0}(j-1) \hat{\Phi}_{1,0}^\dagger(j) - \hat{\Phi}_{0,0}(j-1) \hat{\Phi}_{0,0}^\dagger(j) + \text{H.c.} \\ &= J \sum_j \hat{\Phi}_{1,\uparrow}(j-1) \hat{\Phi}_{1,\uparrow}^\dagger(j) + \hat{\Phi}_{1,\downarrow}(j-1) \hat{\Phi}_{1,\downarrow}^\dagger(j) + \text{H.c.}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S17})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi}_{0,0}^\dagger(j) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \cdot (\hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\downarrow}^\dagger - \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\uparrow}^\dagger), \\ \hat{\Phi}_{1,0}^\dagger(j) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \cdot (\hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\downarrow}^\dagger + \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger \hat{f}_{j+1,\uparrow}^\dagger), \\ \hat{\Phi}_{1,\sigma}^\dagger(j) &= \hat{f}_{j,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{f}_{j+1,\sigma}^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S18})$$

Here, $\hat{\Phi}_{s,m}^\dagger$ ($s = 0, 1$ and $m = 0, \uparrow, \downarrow$) are order parameters of bond Cooper pairs, where $\hat{\Phi}_{0,0}^\dagger$ is a singlet pair while the other three ones are triplet pairs. Therefore, we have transformed the kinetic term of hole pairs into interaction terms of bond Cooper pairs.

III. Density-Density Correlation Functions

To verify whether the superconducting order dominates, we need to study correlation functions of other orders in the charge sector. One typical order there is the charge density wave (CDW) [4, 69], which can be characterized by density-density correlation functions, defined as

$$C_n(i-j) := \langle \hat{N}_i \hat{N}_j \rangle. \quad (\text{S19})$$

In Fig. S1, a comparison between C_n and $C_{\Phi_{0,0}}$, for the case of $3/8$ filling, is presented. We can find that the superconducting order dominates in the case of large h .

IV. Proposed experimental implementation

Here we show details about how to realize the Hamiltonian (1) in quantum simulators. We consider spin (or two-level) systems with spin exchange coupling, as well as tunable longitudinal and transverse fields. The lattice configuration is shown in Fig. 4




FIG. S2. Quench dynamics of Eqs. (S1) and (S20) with $L = 4$ (12 qubits). The horizontal axis is the time τ . The parameters are chosen as $J = 20$, $V = 400$, $t = g_e = 1$, and $h = 5$. We consider periodic boundary conditions. The initial state is $|\psi_0\rangle = | +0 - 0+ + \rangle$. Solid and dashed curves represent expectation values of the fermion number operator of the Hamiltonians in Eqs. (S1) and (S20), respectively.

of the main text, and the original Hamiltonian of this system can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{H}_{qs} &= \hat{H}_{qs,0} + \hat{H}_{qs,1}, \\
 \hat{H}_{qs,0} &= \sum_j V_A \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^+ \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^- + V_B \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^+ \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^- - h \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x, \\
 \hat{H}_{qs,1} &= g \sum_j \sum_{\ell=A,B} \hat{\sigma}_{\ell,j}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^- + \hat{\sigma}_{\ell,j+1}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^- + \text{H.c.}
 \end{aligned} \tag{S20}$$

To realize a \mathbb{Z}_2 LGT coupled to a two-component matter field, we let $V_A = -V_B = V \gg g, h$.

We apply the Schrieffer-Wolf transformation to obtain the effective spin Hamiltonian. Similar to Ref. [42], the generating function can be chosen as

$$\hat{S}' = \frac{ig}{V} \sum_j \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^- + \hat{\sigma}_{A,j+1}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^- - \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^- - \hat{\sigma}_{B,j+1}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^- - \text{H.c.} \tag{S21}$$

According to Eq. (S5), we can obtain the final effective Hamiltonian of \hat{H}_{qs} as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{H}_e &= \hat{H}_{qs,0} + \frac{1}{2} [\hat{H}_{qs,1}, \hat{S}'] \\
 &= g_e \sum_j (\hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{A,j+1}^- - \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{B,j+1}^- + \text{H.c.}) \\
 &\quad + g_e \sum_j (\hat{\tau}_{j-\frac{1}{2}}^+ (\hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^z - \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^z) \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^- + \text{H.c.}) \\
 &\quad + \sum_j (V + 2g_e) \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^+ \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^- + (V - 2g_e) \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^+ \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^- - h \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x,
 \end{aligned} \tag{S22}$$

where $g_e = g^2/V$. Here, we can find that the total spins of the A and B sublattices are both conserved, i.e., $[\sum_j \hat{\sigma}_{\ell,j}^+ \hat{\sigma}_{\ell,j}^-, \hat{H}_e] = 0$. Thus, the potential terms of A/B spins can be neglected. In addition, for large h , the term in the second line of Eq. (S22) is irrelevant [42]. Therefore, the effective Hamiltonian in this case can be simplified as

$$\hat{H}_e = g_e \sum_j (\hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{A,j+1}^- - \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{B,j+1}^- + \text{H.c.}) - h \sum_j \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x. \tag{S23}$$

Now we apply a particle-hole transformation of B -sites $\hat{P}_B = \prod_{j=\text{odd}} \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^z$, which can change the sign of the coupling strength

between B - and τ -spins. That is,

$$\hat{H}_e \rightarrow \hat{P}_B \hat{H}_e \hat{P}_B = g_e \sum_j \left(\hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{A,j+1}^- + \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^+ \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^z \hat{\sigma}_{B,j+1}^- + \text{H.c.} \right) - h \sum_j \hat{\tau}_{j+\frac{1}{2}}^x. \quad (\text{S24})$$

Finally, to map the matter field from spins to fermions, we can use a Jordan-Wigner transformation defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_{j,\uparrow}^\dagger &= \hat{\sigma}_{A,j}^+ \prod_{k<j} \hat{\sigma}_{A,k}^z, \\ \hat{f}_{j,\downarrow}^\dagger &= \hat{\sigma}_{B,j}^+ \prod_{k<j} \hat{\sigma}_{B,k}^z \prod_{l=1}^L \hat{\sigma}_{A,l}^z. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S25})$$

Hence, \hat{H}_e can be mapped to the Hamiltonian in Eq. (S1), i.e., a spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermion chain minimally coupled to a \mathbb{Z}_2 LGT. We also perform a numerical simulation to further demonstrate the above discussion. Here we use exact diagonalization to calculate the quench dynamics of Eqs. (S1) and (S20) with $L = 4$ (12 qubits). The parameters chosen are $J = 20$, $V = 400$, $t = g_e = 1$, and $h = 5$. To reduce the boundary effect, we consider periodic boundary conditions. The initial state is $|\psi_0\rangle = |\uparrow + 0 - 0 + \downarrow +\rangle$. As shown in Fig. S2, we can find consistent fermion density results when comparing the dynamics of Eqs. (S1) and (S20).