

Finite-Depth Preparation of Tensor Network States from Measurement

Rahul Sahay¹ and Ruben Verresen^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138 USA*

²*Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

(Dated: April 29, 2024)


Although tensor network states constitute a broad range of exotic quantum states, their realization is challenging and often requires resources whose depth scales with system size. In this work, we explore criteria on the local tensors for enabling deterministic state preparation via a single round of measurements and on-site unitary feedback. We use these criteria to construct families of measurement-preparable states in one and two dimensions, tuning between distinct symmetry-breaking, symmetry-protected, and intrinsic topological phases of matter. For instance, in one dimension we chart out a three-parameter family of preparable states which interpolate between the AKLT, cluster, GHZ and other states of interest. Our protocol even allows one to engineer preparable quantum states with a range of desired correlation lengths and entanglement properties. In addition to such constructive approaches, we present diagnostics for verifying whether a given tensor network state is preparable using measurements. We conclude by charting out generalizations, such as considering multiple rounds of measurements, implementing matrix product operators, and using incomplete basis measurements.

Introduction. In recent years, projective measurements and unitary feedback have emerged as powerful tools in the quest to realize interesting states of matter in quantum devices [1–24]. Explorations into the capabilities of these tools have led to both an increased theoretical understanding into the complexity of quantum states but also experimental advances in creating previously unrealized phases of matter [25–29]. Nevertheless, much remains to be understood regarding the landscape of quantum states that are deterministically preparable in this way. This is especially the case for the realization of quantum states away from clean renormalization group fixed points. Indeed, while isolated deterministic examples [12, 13] have been discovered for one-dimensional quantum systems, organizing principles, broader classes of preparable quantum states, and higher-dimensional generalizations are lacking.

In this work, we study the preparation of tensor network states¹ [30–32] which are known to capture a rich landscape of many-body quantum states. In particular, we will start from disentangled clusters of qudits and perform a single round of parallel entangling measurements, followed by on-site unitary feedback to guarantee a deterministic result. Our approach proceeds by identifying a criteria on local tensors that ensures preparability, inspired in part by an initial work by Smith et al. [13], and motivated by results presented in our companion paper [33] that establishes this criteria as necessary and sufficient in a more restricted setting. We will use this to (i) construct landscapes of preparable quantum states in one and two dimensions, (ii) develop settings where correlation and entanglement properties of a desired quantum

state can be engineered, and finally (iii) develop diagnostics for determining when a many-body quantum state is preparable.


Preparability condition. Let $|\Psi\rangle$ be a tensor network state generated by a local tensor A . While our discussion applies to general dimensions, we sketch it in two dimensions:



The diagram shows a 2D grid of blue circular tensors labeled 'A'. Each tensor has four legs: two horizontal legs (virtual) and two vertical legs (physical). The horizontal legs are connected to form a grid, while the vertical legs are left open, representing the uncontracted physical indices of the state $|\Psi\rangle$.

$$|\Psi\rangle = \text{Diagram of 2D tensor network with horizontal and vertical legs} \quad (1)$$


As usual, here we contract the ‘virtual’ legs of A (horizontal; dimension χ), giving rise to $|\Psi\rangle$ on the uncontracted ‘physical’ legs (vertical; dimension d). The goal will be to prepare this state in finite time using measurement and feedback. The general methodology will be to start with decoupled clusters of qudits, each of which has a wavefunction given by a single A tensor. Note that in this approach, all legs of A correspond to actual qudits in the system; the ‘virtual’ legs simply correspond to ancillas:



The diagram shows a single blue circular tensor labeled 'A' with four open legs: two horizontal and two vertical, representing a single qudit with dimension χ and d respectively.

$$|A\rangle^{\otimes N} = \text{Diagram of N decoupled A tensors} \quad (2)$$

We now want to ‘fuse’ these legs together. This is achieved by performing (generalized) Bell measurements on the ancilla qudits. Indeed, in the case of the ideal measurement outcome $|\mathbb{1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\chi}} \sum_{a=1}^{\chi} |a\rangle |a\rangle$, we see that the post-measurement state is Eq. (1). For more generic outcomes $\alpha \in \{1, 2, \dots, \chi^2\}$, however, we obtain the insertion of an operator V_α in the virtual bond:



The diagram shows two blue circular tensors 'A' connected by a horizontal virtual bond. A small box labeled 'V_alpha' is inserted into this bond. The vertical legs of the tensors are open, representing the physical indices.

$$\text{Diagram of two A tensors connected by a bond with V_alpha} \rightarrow \text{Diagram of two A tensors with V_alpha in the bond} \quad (3)$$

¹ Specifically, we consider those that fall within the general class of “projected entangled pair states” including the matrix product state and its two-dimensional generalizations.

where V_α is the operator whose Choi state defines the measurement outcome $|V_\alpha\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\chi}} \sum_{a,b=1}^{\chi} (V_\alpha)_{a,b} |a\rangle |b\rangle$. In this work, we will consider the case where V_α is unitary, which is equivalent to the measurement basis $\{|V_\alpha\rangle\}$ being maximally-entangled. In fact, in our companion work [34] we derive this as a necessary property for preparability in a broad range of circumstances. The resulting set of unitary operators $\{V_\alpha\}$ then defines a trace-orthogonal basis of $\chi \times \chi$ matrices, also called a *unitary error basis* [35–37]. Note that the ideal measurement outcome corresponds to $V_1 = \mathbb{1}$.

In summary, in this approach we arrive at the desired state Eq. (1) with virtual operators inserted. Although these depend on the measurement outcome, deterministic state preparation requires that for each set of outcomes, there exists a unitary which can correct for them. I.e., we need²:

$$\text{Diagram (4)} \quad (4)$$

(with site- and measurement-dependent U 's in general) such that we can correct for the measurement outcome by applying U^\dagger on the physical qubits. This daunting global condition becomes more wildy if we look for a local condition where a each V_α can be pushed through the tensor network:

$$\text{Diagram (5)} \quad (5)$$

This in turn requires the newly spawned virtual operators $V_\alpha^{l,r,f}$ to appropriately push through.

This rephrases the problem of measurement-based state preparation as a game of locally pushing operators until all measurement outcomes are reduced to unitaries on the physical degrees of freedom, where they can easily be corrected. This is an interesting many-body problem of sorts, and a full solution and characterization of tensors with these properties poses an exciting research question. In our companion paper, we show how this problem becomes tractable in at least one scenario—a one-dimensional setting where the flow of classical information is unidirectional. In the present work, we instead take a more phenomenological approach, demonstrating the power of this approach in a more general setting where a full solution is not yet available.

Before transitioning to concrete examples, we highlight that Eq. (5) can be proven to be *equivalent* to the following symmetry condition on the doubled PEPS tensor:

$$\text{Diagram (6)} \quad (6)$$

where we introduced \mathbb{E} following Ref. 38. It is clear that Eq. (5) implies Eq. (6), and while the other direction can be proven using Kraus' theorem, we provide a constructive proof for U in the Supplemental Materials.

Landscape of Preparable $\chi = 2$ MPS. Let us explore how already the simplest instance of the above provides a remarkably rich phase diagram. We consider one-dimensional matrix product states (MPS) with bond dimension $\chi = 2$. In this case, the only unitary error basis possible is given by the Pauli matrices $\{\mathbb{1}, X, Y, Z\}$ (up to global conjugation if $V_1 = \mathbb{1}$) [36]. If we now consider the one-dimensional analog of Eq. (6), the left-hand side is the MPS transfer matrix with a natural solution:

$$\mathbb{E} = \lambda_1 \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} + \lambda_x X \otimes X + \lambda_y Y \otimes Y + \lambda_z Z \otimes Z, \quad (7)$$

where the λ_i 's are required to be real, non-negative, and sum to 1 for \mathbb{E} to be a valid transfer matrix. Indeed, the commutation relations of Pauli matrices directly ensures that $(V_\alpha \otimes \bar{V}_\alpha) \mathbb{E} (V_\alpha^\dagger \otimes V_\alpha^T) = \mathbb{E}$ for any $V_\alpha \in \{\mathbb{1}, X, Y, Z\}$. Up to physical isometry, this uniquely identifies the following MPS tensor:

$$\text{Diagram (8)} \quad (8)$$

where $\sigma^i \in \{\mathbb{1}, X, Y, Z\}$ labels the Pauli matrices³.

Given this class of preparable matrix product states, we can readily explore its phenomenology. Since the parameters λ_i of the MPS are non-negative and sum to 1, the landscape of preparable matrix product states corresponds to points in the interior and boundary of the (non-regular) tetrahedron shown in Fig. 1. Furthermore, since $\sigma^{x,y,z}$ in Eq. (8) can be permuted amongst themselves via a unitary MPS gauge transformation, we can always choose $\lambda_x \geq \lambda_y \geq \lambda_z$ (though we show the full phase diagram for ease of visualization).

Our guided tour of this landscape begins with by noting that the celebrated AKLT chain [39] corresponds to the point $\lambda = (0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$ on the tetrahedron, where we imagine embedding the spin-1 into a four-state qudit.

² Here we have chosen an on-site unitary feedback. To the best of our knowledge this pertains to all known examples of deterministic measurement-based state preparation.

³ In our companion work [34], we show that this captures all preparable $\chi = 2$ MPS where V_α pushes through uniformly.

qudit has $\{\lambda_{a,b}\}_{a,b=1,\dots,\chi}$ as its entanglements spectrum. This follows from Eq. (9) being in canonical form with a flat bipartition entanglement spectrum, such that:

$$\rho = \cdots \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{A} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{A} \text{---} \end{array} \right] \cdots = \frac{1}{\chi} \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{A} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{A} \text{---} \end{array} \right] \quad (11)$$

We thus see that efficiently preparable states can have very rich correlation functions and entanglement properties.

Higher-dimensional examples. To illustrate how these ideas can be used to prepare states in higher dimensions, let us consider a state $|\Psi(\beta)\rangle$ which interpolates from a trivial product state ($\beta = 0$) to the square lattice toric code [56] ($\beta \rightarrow \infty$). In particular, $|\Psi(\beta)\rangle \propto e^{\beta \sum_v A_v} |+\rangle^{\otimes N}$ where $A_v = \prod_{l \in v} Z_l$ and $B_p = \prod_{l \in p} X_l$ are the ‘star’ and ‘plaquette’ stabilizers of the toric code. We can prepare this state using measurement by starting with the following $\chi = 2$ PEPS tensor:

$$\text{---} \text{A} \text{---} = \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \quad (12)$$

where the orange circles are Hadamard matrices, the white circle is $e^{\alpha Z}$ where $\tanh \alpha = e^{-2\beta}$, and the ‘T’ and ‘X’-junctions are to be understood as Kronecker deltas δ_{ijk} and δ_{ijkl} respectively. We can follow our general prescription by noticing that the Pauli’s again form a unitary error basis with nice push-through rules:

$$\text{---} \text{A} \text{---} = \text{---} \text{A} \text{---}, \quad \text{---} \text{A} \text{---} = \text{---} \text{A} \text{---}, \quad (13)$$

where X can take any turn. This way, the Z errors can be locally corrected, whereas the X errors can be pushed through to infinity, or more efficiently pairwise annihilated wherever they are found. We note that upon acting with a finite-depth local unitary circuit, this measurement-preparable path constitutes a phase transition between a trivial and higher-form SPT phase, where the toric code arises as a gapless critical point [57].

Our second example is $|\Psi(\beta)\rangle \propto e^{\beta \sum_v X_v} |\text{GHZ}\rangle$ on the square lattice. In principle we could prepare this via a two-step process by applying the gauging map [6] to the previous example. However, it is interesting to see that it is *directly* preparable. Moreover, the push-through rules are quite different, potentially suggesting different generalizations. The local tensor for $\beta = 0$ is simply the Kronecker delta, and $A(\beta)$ is then given by appending $e^{\beta X}$ to the physical leg. We read off the following push-through rules:

$$\text{---} \text{A} \text{---} = \text{---} \text{A} \text{---}, \quad \text{---} \text{A} \text{---} = \text{---} \text{A} \text{---}, \quad (14)$$

where Z can again take any turn on the virtual bonds. One might worry about a single X spawning into three other virtual X insertions. This means that an *odd* number of X ’s on a single plaquette cannot be removed. Fortunately, this has zero probability of happening, since the corresponding tensor network contracts to zero. Since we are guaranteed an even number of X insertions per plaquette, they form closed loops such that we can correct them by acting on the enclosed domains.

Diagnostics. The fact that the landscape of preparable tensor network states is so rich, naturally raises the question: how do we test whether a given tensor network can be prepared in this way? The key condition is Eq. (6), which can be interpreted as a generalized eigenvalue equation. It is most instructive to interpret \mathbb{E} as a matrix in the *vertical* direction, where we think of the top virtual bonds as input and the bottom bonds as output. Then \mathbb{E} is a positive semi-definite map and can be diagonalized as $\mathbb{U}^\dagger \mathbb{D} \mathbb{U}$ where $\mathbb{D} \geq 0$. Hence, if \mathbb{V}_α denotes the tensor product of V_α operators⁵ in Eq. (6), then the space of solutions is spanned by $\mathbb{V}_\alpha = \mathbb{U}^\dagger \mathbb{D}_\alpha^\dagger \mathbb{U}$ where $\{\mathbb{D}_\alpha\}$ are matrices which commute with \mathbb{D} . Thus in the generic case where \mathbb{D} is a non-degenerate diagonal matrix, then $\{\mathbb{D}_\alpha\}$ is simply given by the χ^z independent choices of diagonal matrices (where z is the number of virtual bonds; $z = 2$ for MPS).


The crux of the matter is to then find *disentangled* states within this vector space of solutions; indeed those correspond to tensor product operators on the separate virtual legs in Eq. (6). In the most general case, this can be achieved by a non-linear optimization within this space, which we have bench-marked for several of our examples. Alternatively, one can employ a bootstrap-inspired approach: if Eq. (6) admits disentangled solutions, this implies a non-trivial constraint on the set of solutions after blocking several sites. Hence, disentangled solutions can be found by obtaining the intersection of these solution spaces.

In a subset of cases, such as the one-dimensional examples we studied where V_α pushes through uniformly and commute up to a phase, the unitary error basis is given by the columns of \mathbb{U} itself. This is easiest to see by noting that Eq. (8) and Eq. (9) are already in this diagonalized form. Indeed, \mathbb{U} being a unitary super-operator is equivalent to its columns defining an error basis. Hence, this shows that in certain cases, one can claim success after a finite number of steps. Moreover, in certain cases one can conclude a state is *not* preparable: our companion work [34] identifies a no-go theorem in a one-dimensional setting based on properties of the entanglement spectrum and correlation functions.


Generalizations. Thus far, we have discussed the

⁵ I.e., $\mathbb{V}_\alpha = V_\alpha \otimes (V_\alpha^l)^\dagger \otimes (V_\alpha^r)^\dagger \otimes (V_\alpha^f)^\dagger$.

preparation of interesting families of one- and two-dimensional tensor networks by ‘fusing’ or ‘gluing’ their virtual legs together by one-round of complete basis measurement. Here, we provide first steps for generalizations where we permit *multiple* rounds of measurements and feedback, as well as exploring the preparation and application of tensor network *operators*. To do so, let us recognize that, since the cluster state corresponds to point $\lambda = (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$ of Eq. (8), it is preparable from one-round of measurements and tensor product unitary feedback⁶. However, we may re-interpret the cluster state’s MPS representation as a matrix product operator (MPO) via:


(15)

In recent years, this MPO has been appreciated as representing the Kramers-Wannier ‘gauging’ map [6, 11, 60–64]. Ref. 6 showed how the action of this MPO can be deterministically implemented on a given input state using a finite-depth measurement-based protocol. Here we offer a re-interpretation, viewing the cluster state in Eq. (15) as a ‘stored-program’ [65–67], which is prepared first and then applied to a given many-body state using measurements. In particular, given an initial many-body state (say, prepared with one-round of measurements and feedback), we can apply the above MPO (blue) to the state (orange) as:


(16)

where the gray circles indicate the measurements performed between one-sublattice of the cluster state and the qubits of the original state. One can readily show that undesired measurement outcomes can always be corrected at the physical level in such a case [6]. This can be viewed as a generalization of the standard teleportation protocol [68], where the resource is a cluster state instead of decoupled Bell pairs.

Lastly, another natural extension is to only use *incomplete* basis measurements. This can be naturally motivated in cases where some of the error correction is local. E.g., in the toric code example we saw that Z errors can be locally corrected. This means that the feedback protocol can be turned into a logical quantum gate, obviating the need for the corresponding measurement. In other words, the toric code example can be prepared⁷ using

⁶ We remark in our companion work [34] that, it can in fact be prepared using a one-site unit cell by leveraging its properties as a dipole SPT [58, 59].

⁷ This observation was also made in Ref. 8 for deterministically preparing the fixed-point toric code.

only a ‘ $ZZ = \pm 1$ ’ measurement between the two ancillas (rather than a full Bell basis measurement which includes $XX = \pm 1$) [51]. In our companion work we also highlight how even in the one-dimensional case this can be utilized to prepare states whose entanglement spectrum is not flat [34].

In conclusion, the submanifold of tensor network states which can be efficiently prepared using measurement invites further exploration. It exhibits remarkably rich phenomenology, whilst at the same time displaying tight connections between its entanglement spectra and correlation functions—which need not hold for more generic tensor network states. We have highlighted several exciting open questions, and many more remain, including complete classifications beyond those in the companion work [34], improved numerical algorithms for detecting preparability, charting out the physical properties (in)compatible with measurement-based preparation, and finally bringing these ideas to experimental fruition in novel platforms with mid-circuit measurement capabilities [29, 69–77].

Note added: The posting of this preprint to the arXiv was coordinated with simultaneous postings by Smith et al. [40] and Stephen et al. [78]. Both discuss the measurement-based preparation of matrix product states, and were developed independently from this work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Richard Allen, Soonwon Choi, Kevin Smith, and Francisco Machado. R.S. acknowledges support from the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research, Department of Energy Computational Science Graduate Fellowship under Award Number DESC0022158. R.V. is supported by the Simons Collaboration on Ultra-Quantum Matter, which is a grant from the Simons Foundation (618615, Ashvin Vishwanath).

-
- [1] H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Persistent entanglement in arrays of interacting particles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 910 (2001).
 - [2] R. Raussendorf, S. Bravyi, and J. Harrington, Long-range quantum entanglement in noisy cluster states, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 062313 (2005).
 - [3] M. Aguado, G. K. Brennen, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, Creation, manipulation, and detection of abelian and non-abelian anyons in optical lattices, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 260501 (2008).
 - [4] A. Bolt, G. Duclos-Cianci, D. Poulin, and T. M. Stace, Foliated quantum error-correcting codes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 070501 (2016).

- [5] L. Piroli, G. Styliaris, and J. I. Cirac, Quantum circuits assisted by local operations and classical communication: Transformations and phases of matter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 220503 (2021).
- [6] N. Tantivasadakarn, R. Thorngren, A. Vishwanath, and R. Verresen, Long-range entanglement from measuring symmetry-protected topological phases, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2112.01519](#) (2021), [arXiv:2112.01519 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [7] R. Verresen, N. Tantivasadakarn, and A. Vishwanath, Efficiently preparing Schrödinger’s cat, fractons and non-Abelian topological order in quantum devices, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2112.03061](#) (2021), [arXiv:2112.03061 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [8] T.-C. Lu, L. A. Lessa, I. H. Kim, and T. H. Hsieh, Measurement as a shortcut to long-range entangled quantum matter, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 040337 (2022).
- [9] S. Bravyi, I. Kim, A. Kliesch, and R. Koenig, Adaptive constant-depth circuits for manipulating non-abelian anyons, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01933* (2022).
- [10] J. Y. Lee, W. Ji, Z. Bi, and M. P. A. Fisher, Decoding measurement-prepared quantum phases and transitions: from ising model to gauge theory, and beyond (2022), [arXiv:2208.11699 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [11] N. Tantivasadakarn, A. Vishwanath, and R. Verresen, Hierarchy of topological order from finite-depth unitaries, measurement, and feedforward, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 020339 (2023).
- [12] G.-Y. Zhu, N. Tantivasadakarn, A. Vishwanath, S. Trebst, and R. Verresen, Nishimori’s cat: Stable long-range entanglement from finite-depth unitaries and weak measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 200201 (2023).
- [13] K. C. Smith, E. Crane, N. Wiebe, and S. Girvin, Deterministic constant-depth preparation of the aklt state on a quantum processor using fusion measurements, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 020315 (2023).
- [14] N. Tantivasadakarn, R. Verresen, and A. Vishwanath, Shortest route to non-abelian topological order on a quantum processor, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 060405 (2023).
- [15] D. Gunn, G. Styliaris, T. Kraft, and B. Kraus, Phases of Matrix Product States with Symmetric Quantum Circuits and Symmetric Measurements with Feedforward, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2312.13838](#) (2023), [arXiv:2312.13838 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [16] Y. Li, H. Sukeno, A. P. Mana, H. P. Nautrup, and T.-C. Wei, Symmetry-enriched topological order from partially gauging symmetry-protected topologically ordered states assisted by measurements, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 115144 (2023).
- [17] T.-C. Lu, Z. Zhang, S. Vijay, and T. H. Hsieh, Mixed-state long-range order and criticality from measurement and feedback, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 030318 (2023).
- [18] L. Piroli, G. Styliaris, and J. I. Cirac, Approximating many-body quantum states with quantum circuits and measurements, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2403.07604](#) (2024), [arXiv:2403.07604 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [19] D. Malz, G. Styliaris, Z.-Y. Wei, and J. I. Cirac, Preparation of matrix product states with log-depth quantum circuits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 040404 (2024).
- [20] Y. Li, M. Litvinov, and T.-C. Wei, Measuring topological field theories: Lattice models and field-theoretic description (2023), [arXiv:2310.17740 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [21] Y. Wu, J. Yao, and P. Zhang, Preparing quantum states by measurement-feedback control with bayesian optimization, *Frontiers of Physics* **18**, 10.1007/s11467-023-1311-5 (2023).
- [22] H. Sukeno and T.-C. Wei, Quantum simulation of lattice gauge theories via deterministic duality transformations assisted by measurements, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, 042611 (2024).
- [23] H. Buhrman, M. Folkertsma, B. Loff, and N. M. P. Neumann, State preparation by shallow circuits using feed forward (2023), [arXiv:2307.14840 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [24] J. Y. Lee, Y.-Z. You, and C. Xu, Symmetry protected topological phases under decoherence (2024), [arXiv:2210.16323 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [25] M. Iqbal, N. Tantivasadakarn, T. M. Gatterman, J. A. Gerber, K. Gilmore, D. Gresh, A. Hankin, N. Hewitt, C. V. Horst, M. Matheny, T. Mengle, B. Neyenhuis, A. Vishwanath, M. Foss-Feig, R. Verresen, and H. Dreyer, Topological Order from Measurements and Feed-Forward on a Trapped Ion Quantum Computer, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2302.01917](#) (2023), [arXiv:2302.01917 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [26] M. Foss-Feig, A. Tikku, T.-C. Lu, K. Mayer, M. Iqbal, T. M. Gatterman, J. A. Gerber, K. Gilmore, D. Gresh, A. Hankin, N. Hewitt, C. V. Horst, M. Matheny, T. Mengle, B. Neyenhuis, H. Dreyer, D. Hayes, T. H. Hsieh, and I. H. Kim, Experimental demonstration of the advantage of adaptive quantum circuits, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2302.03029](#) (2023), [arXiv:2302.03029 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [27] E. H. Chen, G.-Y. Zhu, R. Verresen, A. Seif, E. Bäumer, D. Layden, N. Tantivasadakarn, G. Zhu, S. Sheldon, A. Vishwanath, S. Trebst, and A. Kandala, Realizing the Nishimori transition across the error threshold for constant-depth quantum circuits, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2309.02863](#) (2023), [arXiv:2309.02863 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [28] M. Iqbal, N. Tantivasadakarn, R. Verresen, S. L. Campbell, J. M. Dreiling, C. Figgatt, J. P. Gaebler, J. Johansen, M. Mills, S. A. Moses, J. M. Pino, A. Ransford, M. Rowe, P. Siegfried, R. P. Stutz, M. Foss-Feig, A. Vishwanath, and H. Dreyer, Non-Abelian topological order and anyons on a trapped-ion processor, *Nature (London)* **626**, 505 (2024), [arXiv:2305.03766 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [29] D. Bluvstein, S. J. Evered, A. A. Geim, S. H. Li, H. Zhou, T. Manovitz, S. Ebadi, M. Cain, M. Kalinowski, D. Hangleiter, J. P. Bonilla Ataides, N. Maskara, I. Cong, X. Gao, P. Sales Rodriguez, T. Karolyshyn, G. Semeghini, M. J. Gullans, M. Greiner, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, Logical quantum processor based on reconfigurable atom arrays, *Nature* **626**, 58–65 (2023).
- [30] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R. F. Werner, Finitely correlated states on quantum spin chains, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **144**, 443 (1992).
- [31] J. I. Cirac, D. Pérez-García, N. Schuch, and F. Verstraete, Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states: Concepts, symmetries, theorems, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **93**, 045003 (2021).
- [32] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, D. Perez-Garcia, and J. I. Cirac, Criticality, the area law, and the computational power of projected entangled pair states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 220601 (2006).
- [33] Sahay, Rahul and Verresen, Ruben, Finite-Depth Preparation of Tensor Network States from Measurement, (), to appear.
- [34] Sahay, Rahul and Verresen, Ruben, Classifying One-Dimensional Quantum States Prepared by a Single Round of Measurements, (), to appear.


- [35] E. Knill, Group representations, error bases and quantum codes, arXiv preprint quant-ph/9608049 (1996).
- [36] A. Klappenecker and M. Rotteler, On the monomiality of nice error bases, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **51**, 1084 (2005).
- [37] A. Klappenecker and M. Rotteler, Beyond stabilizer codes .i. nice error bases, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **48**, 2392 (2002).
- [38] N. Schuch, D. Poilblanc, J. I. Cirac, and D. Pérez-García, Topological order in the projected entangled-pair states formalism: Transfer operator and boundary hamiltonians, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 090501 (2013).
- [39] I. Affleck, T. Kennedy, E. H. Lieb, and H. Tasaki, Rigorous results on valence-bond ground states in antiferromagnets, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 799 (1987).
- [40] K. C. Smith, A. Khan, B. K. Clark, S. Girvin, and T.-C. Wei, Constant-depth preparation of matrix product states with adaptive quantum circuits, To appear.
- [41] Z.-C. Gu and X.-G. Wen, Tensor-entanglement-filtering renormalization approach and symmetry-protected topological order, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 155131 (2009).
- [42] N. Schuch, D. Pérez-García, and I. Cirac, Classifying quantum phases using matrix product states and projected entangled pair states, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 165139 (2011).
- [43] F. Pollmann, A. M. Turner, E. Berg, and M. Oshikawa, Entanglement spectrum of a topological phase in one dimension, *Physical Review B* **81**, 10.1103/physrevb.81.064439 (2010).
- [44] A. M. Turner, F. Pollmann, and E. Berg, Topological phases of one-dimensional fermions: An entanglement point of view, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 075102 (2011).
- [45] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev, Topological phases of fermions in one dimension, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 075103 (2011).
- [46] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Classification of gapped symmetric phases in one-dimensional spin systems, *Phys. Rev. B Condens. Matter* **83**, 035107 (2011).
- [47] W. Son, L. Amico, and V. Vedral, Topological order in 1d cluster state protected by symmetry, *Quantum Information Processing* **11**, 1961 (2012).
- [48] X. Chen, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Two-dimensional symmetry-protected topological orders and their protected gapless edge excitations, *Phys. Rev. B Condens. Matter* **84**, 235141 (2011).
- [49] F. Pollmann, E. Berg, A. M. Turner, and M. Oshikawa, Symmetry protection of topological phases in one-dimensional quantum spin systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 075125 (2012).
- [50] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Symmetry-Protected topological orders in interacting bosonic systems, *Science* **338**, 1604 (2012).
- [51] See supplementary material.
- [52] S. D. Geraedts and O. I. Motrunich, Exact models for symmetry-protected topological phases in one dimension (2014), [arXiv:1410.1580 \[cond-mat.stat-mech\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1410.1580).
- [53] L. H. Santos, Rokhsar-kivelson models of bosonic symmetry-protected topological states, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 155150 (2015).
- [54] M. M. Wolf, G. Ortiz, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, Quantum phase transitions in matrix product systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 110403 (2006).
- [55] N. G. Jones, J. Bibo, B. Jobst, F. Pollmann, A. Smith, and R. Verresen, Skeleton of matrix-product-state-solvable models connecting topological phases of matter, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 033265 (2021).
- [56] A. Kitaev, Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons, *Annals of Physics* **303**, 2–30 (2003).
- [57] N. Tantivasadakarn, R. Thorngren, A. Vishwanath, and R. Verresen, Pivot Hamiltonians as generators of symmetry and entanglement, *SciPost Phys.* **14**, 012 (2023).
- [58] J. H. Han, E. Lake, H. T. Lam, R. Verresen, and Y. You, Topological quantum chains protected by dipolar and other modulated symmetries, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 125121 (2024).
- [59] H. T. Lam, Classification of dipolar symmetry-protected topological phases: Matrix product states, stabilizer hamiltonians, and finite tensor gauge theories, *Phys. Rev. B* **109**, 115142 (2024).
- [60] N. Seiberg, S. Seifnashri, and S.-H. Shao, Non-invertible symmetries and lsm-type constraints on a tensor product hilbert space (2024), [arXiv:2401.12281 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.12281).
- [61] D. Aasen, R. S. K. Mong, and P. Fendley, Topological defects on the lattice: I. the ising model, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **49**, 354001 (2016).
- [62] L. Lootens, C. Delcamp, G. Ortiz, and F. Verstraete, Dualities in one-dimensional quantum lattice models: Symmetric hamiltonians and matrix product operator intertwiners, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 020357 (2023).
- [63] L. Lootens, C. Delcamp, and F. Verstraete, Dualities in one-dimensional quantum lattice models: Topological sectors, *PRX Quantum* **5**, 010338 (2024).
- [64] J. Haegeman, K. Van Acoleyen, N. Schuch, J. I. Cirac, and F. Verstraete, Gauging quantum states: From global to local symmetries in many-body systems, *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, 011024 (2015).
- [65] D. Gottesman and I. L. Chuang, Demonstrating the viability of universal quantum computation using teleportation and single-qubit operations, *Nature* **402**, 390–393 (1999).
- [66] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, A one-way quantum computer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5188 (2001).
- [67] H. J. Briegel, D. E. Browne, W. Dür, R. Raussendorf, and M. Van den Nest, Measurement-based quantum computation, *Nature Physics* **5**, 19–26 (2009).
- [68] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and einstein-podolsky-rosen channels, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [69] K. Singh, C. E. Bradley, S. Anand, V. Ramesh, R. White, and H. Bernien, Mid-circuit correction of correlated phase errors using an array of spectator qubits, *Science* **380**, 1265–1269 (2023).
- [70] S. A. Moses, C. H. Baldwin, M. S. Allman, R. Ancona, L. Ascarrunz, C. Barnes, J. Bartolotta, B. Bjork, P. Blanchard, M. Bohn, J. G. Bohnet, N. C. Brown, N. Q. Burdick, W. C. Burton, S. L. Campbell, J. P. Campora, C. Carron, J. Chambers, J. W. Chan, Y. H. Chen, A. Chernoguzov, E. Chertkov, J. Colina, J. P. Curtis, R. Daniel, M. DeCross, D. Deen, C. Delaney, J. M. Dreiling, C. T. Ertsgaard, J. Esposito, B. Estey, M. Fabrikant, C. Figgatt, C. Foltz, M. Foss-Feig, D. Francois, J. P. Gaebler, T. M. Gatterman, C. N. Gilbreth, J. Giles, E. Glynn, A. Hall, A. M. Hankin, A. Hansen, D. Hayes, B. Higashi, I. M. Hoffman, B. Horning, J. J. Hout, R. Jacobs, J. Johansen, L. Jones, J. Karcz, T. Klein, P. Lauria, P. Lee, D. Liefer, S. T. Lu, D. Lucchetti, C. Lytle, A. Malm, M. Matheny, B. Mathew-

- son, K. Mayer, D. B. Miller, M. Mills, B. Neyenhuis, L. Nugent, S. Olson, J. Parks, G. N. Price, Z. Price, M. Pugh, A. Ransford, A. P. Reed, C. Roman, M. Rowe, C. Ryan-Anderson, S. Sanders, J. Sedlacek, P. Shevchuk, P. Siegfried, T. Skripka, B. Spaun, R. T. Sprengle, R. P. Stutz, M. Swallows, R. I. Tobey, A. Tran, T. Tran, E. Vogt, C. Volin, J. Walker, A. M. Zolot, and J. M. Pino, A race-track trapped-ion quantum processor, *Phys. Rev. X* **13**, 041052 (2023).
- [71] E. Deist, Y.-H. Lu, J. Ho, M. K. Pasha, J. Zeiher, Z. Yan, and D. M. Stamper-Kurn, Mid-circuit cavity measurement in a neutral atom array, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 203602 (2022).
- [72] M. A. Norcia, W. B. Cairncross, K. Barnes, P. Battaglino, A. Brown, M. O. Brown, K. Cassella, C.-A. Chen, R. Coxe, D. Crow, J. Epstein, C. Griger, A. M. W. Jones, H. Kim, J. M. Kindem, J. King, S. S. Kondov, K. Kotru, J. Lauigan, M. Li, M. Lu, E. Megidish, J. Marjanovic, M. McDonald, T. Mittiga, J. A. Muniz, S. Narayanaswami, C. Nishiguchi, R. Notermans, T. Paule, K. A. Pawlak, L. S. Peng, A. Ryou, A. Smull, D. Stack, M. Stone, A. Sucich, M. Urbanek, R. J. M. van de Veerdonk, Z. Vendeiro, T. Wilkason, T.-Y. Wu, X. Xie, X. Zhang, and B. J. Bloom, Midcircuit qubit measurement and rearrangement in a ^{171}Yb atomic array, *Phys. Rev. X* **13**, 041034 (2023).
- [73] T. M. Graham, L. Phuttitarn, R. Chinnarasu, Y. Song, C. Poole, K. Jooya, J. Scott, A. Scott, P. Eichler, and M. Saffman, Midcircuit measurements on a single-species neutral alkali atom quantum processor, *Phys. Rev. X* **13**, 041051 (2023).
- [74] E. Bäumer, V. Tripathi, D. S. Wang, P. Rall, E. H. Chen, S. Majumder, A. Seif, and Z. K. Mineev, Efficient long-range entanglement using dynamic circuits (2023), [arXiv:2308.13065 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.13065).
- [75] S. Anand, C. E. Bradley, R. White, V. Ramesh, K. Singh, and H. Bernien, A dual-species rydberg array (2024), [arXiv:2401.10325 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.10325).
- [76] E. Bäumer, V. Tripathi, A. Seif, D. Lidar, and D. S. Wang, Quantum fourier transform using dynamic circuits (2024), [arXiv:2403.09514 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.09514).
- [77] R. Finkelstein, R. B.-S. Tsai, X. Sun, P. Scholl, S. Direkci, T. Gefen, J. Choi, A. L. Shaw, and M. Endres, Universal quantum operations and ancilla-based readout for tweezer clocks (2024), [arXiv:2402.16220 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.16220).
- [78] D. T. Stephen and O. Hart, Preparing matrix product states via fusion: constraints and extensions, To appear.
- [79] J. Hauschild and F. Pollmann, Efficient numerical simulations with Tensor Networks: Tensor Network Python (TeNPy), *SciPost Phys. Lect. Notes*, **5** (2018), code available from <https://github.com/tenpy/tenpy>, [arXiv:1805.00055](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.00055).

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Materials A: Constructive Proof for Physical Unitarity

Theorem (Virtual-Physical Correspondence) Suppose A is a tensor with physical Hilbert space dimension d and every virtual leg has dimension χ . Below, we show this tensor as a matrix product state but we remark that the theorem statement and proof are agnostic to dimension. Now, suppose that V is an operator acting on the virtual legs. Then, there exists a unitary U such that:




$$\text{Diagram: } V \text{ (yellow box) with two vertical virtual legs and one horizontal physical leg } A \text{ (blue circle).} = \text{Diagram: } A \text{ (blue circle) with one vertical virtual leg and one horizontal physical leg } U. \quad (17)$$

if and only if, V leaves the transfer operator invariant:



$$\text{Diagram: } V \text{ (yellow box) with two vertical virtual legs and one horizontal physical leg } A \text{ (blue circle).} = \text{Diagram: } A \text{ (blue circle) with one vertical virtual leg and one horizontal physical leg } \bar{A} \text{ (blue circle).} = \text{Diagram: } A \text{ (blue circle) with one vertical virtual leg and one horizontal physical leg } V^\dagger \text{ (yellow box).} \quad (18)$$

Moreover, U can take the form:



$$U = \text{Diagram: } V \text{ (yellow box) with two vertical virtual legs and one horizontal physical leg } A \text{ (blue circle).} + \left(\text{Diagram: } A \text{ (blue circle) with one vertical virtual leg and one horizontal physical leg } A \text{ (blue circle).} \right) \quad (19)$$

where \hat{A} is the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse of A (viewed as a map from virtual to physical bonds).

Proof. Let us remark that the forwards direction of this proof is trivial. Therefore, we focus our attention on the backwards direction. We prove this by explicit construction of U . To do so, it is convenient and illuminating to perform a singular value decomposition on the matrix product state as:

$$\text{---} \bigcirc A \text{---} = \text{---} \bigcirc U \text{---} \begin{matrix} \bigcirc s \\ \bigcirc V^\dagger \end{matrix} \rightarrow \text{---} \bigcirc U \text{---} \begin{matrix} \bigcirc s \end{matrix} \quad (20)$$

where in the last step we dropped the V^\dagger because it can always be removed from the matrix product state by a physical local unitary transformation. We will call the above the “vertical representation” of the MPS tensor (for lack of a better name and because I’ll refer to it from time to time). Vertical representation in hand, we consider the following trial unitary operator:

$$U = \begin{matrix} \begin{matrix} \bigcirc s^+ \\ \bigcirc U \\ \bigcirc V \\ \bigcirc U \\ \bigcirc s \end{matrix} \\ + \left(1 - \begin{matrix} \bigcirc s^+ \\ \bigcirc s \end{matrix} \right) \end{matrix} = X + (1 - P) \quad (21)$$

where we introduced the notation s^+ to refer to the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse of the singular value matrix. Operationally, the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse (for diagonal matrices) is obtained by inverting each of the non-zero elements along the diagonal of s and then taking the transpose. It is worth noting some special properties of s^+ :

1. s^+ and s are weak inverses of one another. That is to say that $s^+ s s^+ = s^+$ and similarly $s s^+ s = s$.
2. $s^+ s$ and $s s^+$ are both projectors (i.e. are idempotent and hermitian). In the case, where s is injective (i.e. full rank), $s^+ s = 1$.

Note that the second property guarantees that $(1 - P)$ is a projector. With these properties, we can prove first that U is unitary and can be pushed through A to yield V . To prove unitarity, note that:

$$U^\dagger U = X^\dagger X + (1 - P) + (1 - P)X + X^\dagger(1 - P) \quad (22)$$

We evaluate each term above individually. Let us first note that:

$$PX = \begin{matrix} \begin{matrix} \bigcirc s^+ \\ \bigcirc U \\ \bigcirc V \\ \bigcirc U \\ \bigcirc s \\ \bigcirc s^+ \\ \bigcirc s \end{matrix} \\ = \begin{matrix} \begin{matrix} \bigcirc s^+ \\ \bigcirc U \\ \bigcirc V \\ \bigcirc U \\ \bigcirc s \end{matrix} \end{matrix} = X \quad (23)$$

As an aside, note that a similar calculation reveals that $PX = XP = X$. This implies that U decomposes as a direct sum in the spaces with support on P and $(1 - P)$, with X only acting on the former space. Indeed, as a consequence of the above calculation, we have that:

$$U^\dagger U = X^\dagger X + (1 - P) \quad (24)$$

Now, let us note that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 X^\dagger X = & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} s^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \overline{U} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} V \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \overline{U} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} V^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} (s^\dagger)^\dagger \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} s^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \overline{U} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \overline{U} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} (s^\dagger)^\dagger \text{---} \end{array} = (s^\dagger)^\dagger s^\dagger s s^\dagger = (s s^\dagger)^\dagger (s s^\dagger) = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} s^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \end{array} = P
 \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where in the second step we used the fact that V leaves the transfer matrix invariant. Therefore, we have that:

$$U^\dagger U = 1 \tag{26}$$

Now, note that U is a square matrix and since U^\dagger is a left inverse of U , it is also its right inverse. Thus, $U U^\dagger = 1$. Thus, U is unitary. Having proven unitarity, we now prove that Eq. (17) holds. To do so, we first note the following non-trivial identity

$$U U^\dagger = X X^\dagger + (1 - P) + X(1 - P) + (1 - P) X^\dagger = 1 \implies X X^\dagger = P \tag{27}$$

This yields the following diagrammatic identity:

$$\begin{aligned}
 X X^\dagger = & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} s^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \overline{U} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} V^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} (s^\dagger)^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \overline{U} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} V \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} s^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \end{array} = P
 \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

We can use this identity to our advantage. In particular, we get that:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \begin{array}{c} \text{---} V \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} V \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} V \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \overline{U} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} V^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \overline{U} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} V \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \overline{U} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} V \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \overline{U} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} V \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} U \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} s \text{---} \end{array}
 \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where in the last step we used $s^\dagger (s^\dagger)^\dagger s^\dagger s = s^\dagger (s s^\dagger)^\dagger s = s^\dagger s s^\dagger s = s^\dagger s$.

Note that since $(1 - P)$ annihilates the MPS, the above proves that:



$$(30)$$

as desired. ■

Supplementary Materials B: Additional Details Regarding Preparable Phase Diagram

In the main text, we provided a guided tour of the landscape of $\chi = 2$ preparable phases, which corresponded to points within a tetrahedron (with states related by permuting the axes being physically equivalent). Here, we provide closed-form expressions for the trajectories shown in the text and provide a proof of the claim that the AKLT state is gluable with a physical deformation by an arbitrary on-site complex matrix.

Physically Motivated Trajectories in the Tetrahedron

In Fig. 1, we showed several physically motivated trajectories of preparable quantum states in the preparable tetrahedron. Specifically, we showed trajectories for the following families of states:

$$|\Psi_1(\beta)\rangle = e^{\beta \sum_x X_x} |\text{cluster}\rangle \quad |\Psi_2(\beta)\rangle = e^{\beta \sum_{x \text{ even}} X_x} |\text{cluster}\rangle \quad |\Psi_3(\beta)\rangle = e^{\beta \sum_n (S_n^z)^2} |\text{AKLT}\rangle \quad (31)$$

where the first interpolated between the cluster state and the trivial state, the middle interpolated between the cluster state and the GHZ, and the final interpolated between the AKLT state and the Néel state. The trajectories for each of these states are:

$$\lambda_1(\beta) = \frac{1}{2(1 + \cosh(4\beta))} \begin{pmatrix} e^{4\beta} \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ e^{-4\beta} \end{pmatrix} \quad \lambda_2(\beta) = \frac{1}{4 \cosh(2\beta)} \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\beta} \\ e^{-2\beta} \\ e^{2\beta} \\ e^{-2\beta} \end{pmatrix} \quad \lambda_3(\beta) = \frac{1}{1 + \cosh(2\beta)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ e^{2\beta} \\ e^{2\beta} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (32)$$

Arbitrary Invertible Complex Matrices on the AKLT State

We now show that the AKLT state is preparable even if one acts at the physical level with an arbitrary complex matrix. To do so, let us recall that the AKLT state is described by matrix product state tensors given by:



$$(33)$$

in the appropriate basis [79] (the so-called Cartesian basis). Furthermore, the AKLT tensor is symmetric under a full $SO(3)$ at the physical level, implying that any unitary acting at the physical level acts like a unitary gauge transformation of the MPS tensor.

Now, let us remark that, one can perform an SVD on M and the result will be:

$$M = USV^\dagger \quad S = \text{diag}(s_1, s_2, s_3) \quad (34)$$

where s_1, s_2 , and s_3 are in principle arbitrary but non-zero by assumption of invertibility. Note that this means that any unitary matrix of the form:

$$W = UDU^\dagger \quad (35)$$

where the white circles are $e^{\alpha X}$ with $\alpha = \text{arctanh}(e^{-2\beta})$. Note that the above is of the desired form and has a “ B ” tensor with a trivial physical leg. We recognize the same structure in the toric code example in the main text.