Field-induced easy-axis softening of quantum ferromagnet with cubic anisotropy
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In this work, we study the two-dimensional $S = 2$ model that can lead to the well-known cubic single-ion anisotropy along with a ferromagnetic Heisenberg interaction under a perpendicular magnetic field. When the Heisenberg term ($J$) is ignored, this model can be exactly solved with a reshuffled local Hilbert space. A three-fold (two-fold) eigenstate degeneracy is found at $h = 0$ ($h = 2K$), where $h$ stands for the field strength and $K$ is the strength of cubic anisotropy. Around the second degeneracy point there is a huge gap that separates two low-energy states from the rest three. As we turn on the $J$ term, its leading-order contribution boils down to an effective hard-core bosonic model as $K, h \gg J$. By using the two-dimensional tensor network ansatz we reveal that indeed various ground-state ansatz with different magnetic easy axes possess competing energies. Our finding demonstrates that the easy axes can be “softened” as we turn on the magnetic field for such quantum model with cubic anisotropy, which goes beyond the mean-field analysis. Such easy-axis softening might provide a new measure to control the magnetic orientation for spinful semiconductors.

I. INTRODUCTION

Magnetic materials are highly crucial to the civilization with a long history. Entering the quantum era, people are keen on understanding its micro-mechanism while many are still left unsolved and the physics of cubic anisotropy [1] is among them. The simplest model for it includes a quartic term in the Hamiltonian whose easy axes are determined by the sign of its strength [2]. With a small magnetic field, it has been studied by Landau paradigm [3] and renormalization group (RG) theory [4] for its nature of phase transition. However, as the field strength goes larger, the above-mentioned calculations fail to obtain the correct physics.

On the other hand, spins, as a quantum object, are often influenced by each other on nearby sites within materials through the Heisenberg superexchange interaction [5], leading to possible explanations for peculiar phenomena such as the high-$T_c$ superconductivity and its related properties [6–12]. Thus, interplay between the superexchange and the cubic anisotropy terms may present an interesting phenomena while the brute-force quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) was not permissible because of the negative-sign problem or the local trapping due to the anisotropic term. This problem was studied many years ago but only within the mean-field analysis [13–15]. With $N$-component $\phi^4$ theory and using RG, previous studies revealed a critical $N_c$ where the cubic fixed point is stable when $N > N_c$ while the $O(N)$ symmetric fixed point is driven in the reverse scenario [16, 17], and the nature of its phase transition was also discussed [18]. For the real materials, recently, two-dimensional layered magnetic materials have drawn researchers’ attention because of its broad range of potential practical applications [19]. Among them, the ferromagnetic semiconductor thin film is of special interest because of its promising features from industrial point of view [20]. Various magnetic anisotropies can be also found in these materials [21]. It is important to notice that in many related works upon such magnetic materials, the determination of the easy-axis alignment plays an important role in their studies, in order to explain the experimental observation. However, the introduction of quantum entanglement and its possible influence are seldom discussed because most studies follow the mean-field paradigm. Moreover, despite a great amount of effort for its theoretical understanding through Zener’s or other phenomenological models [21], the microscopic picture is often overlooked. This provides us a strong motivation to look into this problem.

More than 30 years ago, the quantum ferromagnet with cubic anisotropy under an external field was investigated by Domański and Sznaid within the mean-field scope and a peculiar phase transition between polarized ($P$) and canted ($C$) magnetic phases was proposed [22]. The difference between these two phases lies in the fact that $C$ phase possesses magnetic orders perpendicular to the direction of field while $P$ does not. Again, its full understanding beyond the mean-field scope has not yet been attained, despite some previous works using perturbation theory and density-matrix renormalization group (DMRG) showing the existence of quadrupolar phase with easy axes aligning in $\langle 100 \rangle$ [23–25]. Especially, whether the easy-axis alignment can be altered by quantum effect also stays unknown. In most of the cases, mean-field analysis can already provide a quite accurate understanding, which is qualitatively correct. However, when different states possess competing energies under certain scenarios, which is the case in our study, introduction of quantum entanglement might lead to different results. One good example comes in the studies upon $t - J$ model, which is a strong candidate...
in explaining the high-$T_c$ cuprate superconductivity [26]. Although mean-field analysis always favors the $d$-wave superconducting state as the ground state while other states with instabilities sharing competing energies [10], more elaborated numerical tools demonstrate different outcomes [27]. Therefore, in our study after the mean-field analysis, we also adopt the two-dimensional tensor network ansatz aiming to provide a more thorough understanding.

In the following content, we will first introduce our model Hamiltonian in Section II with some preliminary analysis. We start from studying the one-site Hamiltonian when $J = 0$ in Section III and conduct the mean-field analysis in Section IV A. We then adopt iPEPS in Section IV B for a better numerical calculation and discuss the results there. In Section V we tackle our Hamiltonian through the perturbation theory to the leading order and realize that it is equivalent to a HCB model, leading to the competing scenario among different $C$ states. Finally, we will argue the possibly practical usage of such field-induced softening of magnetic easy axes and summarize this work in Section VI.

II. MODEL HAMILTONIAN

In this work, we study the quantum ferromagnet in the presence of the related lowest order single-ion term of the cubic anisotropy [28] and magnetic field in the square lattice, of which the Hamiltonian reads

$$H = -J \sum_{(i,j)} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + K \sum_{i,\alpha}(S_{i\alpha}^z)^4 - h \sum_i S_{i}^z,$$

(1)

with $S = 2$ and $\alpha = x, y, z$. Spins on nearest-neighbor sites $((i,j))$ are connected through a ferromagnetic Heisenberg term ($J > 0$). The second term reflects the cubic anisotropy and with $K > 0$, the easy axes go along (111). Finally, a Zeeman term along $z$-axis is also considered when a magnetic field is present. Equation (1) does not possess the $U(1)$ symmetry and its symmetric group is reduced to a 8-order group. This can be seen by replacing $(\pm S^x, \pm S^y)$ with $\beta, \bar{\beta} = x, y$ and $\beta \neq \bar{\beta}$ into Eq. (1) while leaving itself unchanged. In abstract algebra, this group is referred to as the $D_8$ group [29]. Such symmetry is isomorphic to $Z_4 \times Z_2$, where $\times$ refers to the semidirect product because $Z_4$ is a normal subgroup to $D_8$ while $Z_2$ is not.

As $C$ phase appears, $D_8$ symmetry is spontaneously broken due to the formation of planar magnetization in the $x$-$y$ plane. Among the possible orders, we can have two magnetic orientations that still preserve one of the reflection symmetries of $D_8$. One is when the magnetization aligns parallel to one of the $2\sigma_d$ (the mirror planes parallel to main diagonal axes, i.e., $\theta = \pi/4, 3\pi/4, 5\pi/4$, and $7\pi/4$ in Fig. 1(a)). Another one is when the magnetization lies in one of the $2\nu$ (the mirror planes parallel to cubic axes, i.e., $\theta = 0, \pi/2, \pi$, and $3\pi/2$ in Fig. 1(a)). These two scenarios, although breaking the $D_8$ symmetry, still preserve $C_s$ reflection symmetry which is a subgroup of $D_8$ and thus have a 4-fold degeneracy. Besides the above two cases, the general canted phase (i.e., $0 < \theta < \pi/4$ (mod $\pi/4$)) possesses a 8-fold degeneracy.

We will start our analysis by solving the one-particle Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) with $J = 0$. Such one-particle Hamiltonian shows a three(two)-fold degeneracy at $h = 0$ ($h = 2K$). Due to such degeneracy, by manipulating the phase factor while we superpose among the degenerate states we are able to construct any product state whose planar order orients in any desired direction. By including the $J$ term, however, a specific orientation might be stabilized under the so-called quantum order by disorder (OBD) effect [30–32]. To study such effect we first conduct the mean-field calculation based on the 5 local orthonormal states on each site with non-zero $J$ and observe two $P$ phases with one $C$ phase in the phase diagram. Especially, the easy axes of $C$ phase’s planar magnetization always align along $(110)$ in the mean-field calculation. However, near the $h = 2K$ region all possible canted states with different $\theta$ share very competing energies, due to the above-mentioned two-fold degeneracy at $h = 2K$ and a large energy gap. In what follows, we restrict $\theta$ to be in the range $\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{4}]$ with no loss of generality.

For the purpose of a more detailed calculation, we adopt the $2D$ tensor network ansatz in the thermodynamic limit, the infinite projected entangled-pair states (iPEPS) [33–35], in order to take into account the quantum fluctuation beyond the mean-field treatment. According to the iPEPS estimation, the dome of the $P$ phase is larger compared to the mean-field result. In addition, our iPEPS studies reveal a very competing scenario for different $C$ states around $h = 2K$, which we interpret as the field-induced easy-axis softening. This is due the huge energy gap among eigenstates that degenerates the Heisenberg term into an effective hard-core bosonic (HCB) model as the leading-order contribution.

III. THE ONE-SITE ($J = 0$) LIMIT

According to the previous results [22], Eq. (1) undergoes a peculiar phase transition when $K$ is dominant relative to $J$. Moreover, if $J = 0$, Eq. (1) degenerates to a one-site Hamiltonian. Therefore, it is natural to start with solving Eq. (1) with $J = 0$. Because $S = 2$, the local Hilbert space is five-dimensional and $S_z = 1, 0, -1$ are still good states. On the other hand, due to the quartic term $S_z = 2$ and -2 are connected and we need to re-construct new eigenstates. The results are

$$\begin{pmatrix}
|\psi_1\rangle \\
|\psi_2\rangle \\
|\psi_3\rangle \\
|\psi_4\rangle \\
|\psi_5\rangle
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
N(|2\rangle - |\alpha\rangle - |2\rangle) \\
|1\rangle \\
|0\rangle \\
|1\rangle \\
N(|\alpha\rangle |2\rangle + |2\rangle)
\end{pmatrix},$$

(2)

where $|2\rangle, |1\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle$, and $|2\rangle$ represent the eigenstates of $S^z$ with

$$\alpha = \frac{\sqrt{16h^2 + 36K^2 - 4h}}{6K} (< 1),$$

(3)

$$N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^2 + 1}}.$$
with ground state (GS) phase diagram in Fig. 1(b). There are two with three-fold degeneracy among $|\psi_1\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle$, and $|\psi_3\rangle$. Such phase diagram also explains the reason why one can observe a peculiar phase effect by turning on the $J$ term, we anticipate that a certain direction will be selected due to the OBD effect, thus lifting the degeneracy.

**A. Mean-field analysis**

We first study this effect with mean-field approximation (MFA). The mean-field Hamiltonian reads

$$H_{MF} = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j + K \sum_{i,\alpha} (S_i^\alpha)^4 - h \sum_i S_i^z. \quad (5)$$

By introducing the mean-field of $\langle \vec{S}_j \rangle$ Eq. (5) again reduces to a one-site Hamiltonian and can be solved iteratively. By self-consistently solving Eq. (5), we plot the mean-field phase diagram in Fig. 2(a) as dashed lines, along with the phase boundaries by iPEPS which will be discussed in the next section. To determine $P$ and $C$ phases, we rely on the following orders

$$M_p = \sqrt{\langle S^x \rangle^2 + \langle S^y \rangle^2},$$

$$S_z = \langle S_z \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where $M_p$ is nonzero in $C$ phase. For the $P$ phase inside the dome, $S_z \approx 1$ while $S_z > 1$ for the $P$ phase beyond $h = 2K$. Notice that $S_z$ does not have to be strictly equal to 1 because $U(1)$ symmetry is not present in our Hamiltonian. Moreover, in $C$ phase MFA always favors the direction of $\theta = \pi/4$, which is consistent with previous results [22]. However, other $C$ states with different $\theta$ also possess competing energies around $h = 2K$. For example, when $J = 0.1K$ and $h = 2K$, their energy difference is smaller than $10^{-5}$. This is because such energy difference comes from including $|\psi_3\rangle$ to $|\psi_5\rangle$, whose weights are very small due to the energy gap (Fig. 1(c)). In sum, quantum OBD by MFA predicts $\theta = \pi/4$ in $C$ phase, despite a very small energy difference.

Our MFA study suggests a phase coherence among our five local eigenstates, which minimizes the energy of the Heisenberg term, $E_J$. As we turn on $J$, our wavefunction becomes a product state of the locally superposed state,

$$|\psi_{\text{local}}\rangle = c_0 |\psi_1\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{4} c_i e^{i\phi_i} |\psi_{i+1}\rangle, \quad (7)$$

in the mean-field manner. All the pre-factors, $c_0$ and $c_i$, are related to their separate eigenenergies and always stay positive or zero. For example, near $h = 0$, $c_0$, $c_1$, and $c_3$ possess dominant weights. Besides, the phase factors, $\phi_1$ to $\phi_4$, provide extra degrees of freedom to stabilize the energy (here we assign $|\psi_1\rangle$ with the trivial phase). According to our MFA, in $C$ phase $\langle \phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4 \rangle = (5\pi/4, 3\pi/2, 7\pi/4, 0)$, suggesting that a coherence is attained and it leads to the $\theta = \pi/4$ magnetization. It is important to note that such coherence is a consequence of our reshuffled local Hilbert space because in the sole Heisenberg model there is no easy-axis appearing after the $SU(2)$ symmetry breaking.
the translational invariance, we adopt the tensor using gradients calculated by automatic differentiation. For environment tensors from CTMRG, their dimension is denoted as $D$. For bulk tensors they have four auxiliary bonds with dimension $D$ and one physical bond with dimension $d$ ($d = 5$ in our case). This ansatz becomes exact only when $D \rightarrow \infty$. For environment tensors from CTMRG, their dimension is denoted as $\chi$ and generally $\chi \geq D^2$. Due to the translational invariance, we adopt the $1 \times 1$ unit cell. In this work, we are going to variationally optimize the iPEPS tensor network ansatz considers one or many rank-5 tensors in the repeating unit cell and scales to the infinite size with corner-transfer-matrix renormalization group (CTMRG) technique [9, 36, 37]. For bulk tensors they have four auxiliary bonds with dimension $D$ and one physical bond with dimension $d$ ($d = 5$ in our case). This ansatz becomes exact only when $D \rightarrow \infty$. For environment tensors from CTMRG, their dimension is denoted as $\chi$ and generally $\chi \geq D^2$. Due to the translational invariance, we adopt the $1 \times 1$ unit cell. In this work, we are going to variationally optimize the iPEPS tensor using gradients calculated by automatic differentiation (AD) [38, 39]. Details of such iPEPS calculation are included in Appendix A 1.

The resulting phase diagram is also shown in Fig. 2(a) with dots connected by solid lines. Phase transition points are determined by scaling the planar order parameter $\chi$ dimension is denoted as $\chi$ when $D = 5$ and $\chi = 35$ are shown for (b) $J = 0.04K$ and (c) $J = 0.08K$. A $C \rightarrow P \rightarrow C \rightarrow P$ phase transition can be clearly seen in (b), while only two phases exist in (c).

B. iPEPS study

In the previous sections, our MFA already tells us that all the five local states become coherent in their phase factors. However, such scenario becomes exact only when each site is isolated from other sites, which is indeed the case for MFA since we consider a one-site Hamiltonian in Eq. (5). When we allow the inter-site correlation, the information on each site will “leak” into surrounding sites, causing the decoherence. Of course, our wavefunction as a whole can still reach coherence in its ground state, but such coherence does not necessarily hold for each site. Moreover, when single-site decoherence takes place, its easy axes can be altered. Thus, in order to better study the quantum effect upon these competing states, we will apply iPEPS for such purpose. The iPEPS tensor network ansatz considers one or many rank-5 tensors in the repeating unit cell and scales to the infinite size with corner-transfer-matrix renormalization group (CTMRG) technique [9, 36, 37]. For bulk tensors they have four auxiliary bonds with dimension $D$ and one physical bond with dimension $d$ ($d = 5$ in our case). This ansatz becomes exact only when $D \rightarrow \infty$. For environment tensors from CTMRG, their dimension is denoted as $\chi$ and generally $\chi \geq D^2$. Due to the translational invariance, we adopt the $1 \times 1$ unit cell. In this work, we are going to variationally optimize the iPEPS tensor using gradients calculated by automatic differentiation (AD) [38, 39]. Details of such iPEPS calculation are included in Appendix A 1.

The resulting phase diagram is also shown in Fig. 2(a) with dots connected by solid lines. Phase transition points are determined by scaling the planar order parameter $\chi$ dimension is denoted as $\chi$ when $D = 5$ and $\chi = 35$ are shown for (b) $J = 0.04K$ and (c) $J = 0.08K$. A $C \rightarrow P \rightarrow C \rightarrow P$ phase transition can be clearly seen in (b), while only two phases exist in (c).

A more interesting scenario lies in the $C$ phase area. Unlike MFA which always favors $\theta = \pi/4$, after introducing the entanglement we discover that the easy axes do not need to align along $|x| = |y|$ all the time, although it is still favored when the field stays weak. In Fig. 3, we demonstrate the energy of our GS ansatz ($E_{GS}$) and its corresponding $\theta$ during the optimization process. When $h = 0$ (Fig. 3(a)), one can see that as $E_{GS}$ converges, $\theta$ is relatively stably equal to $\pi/4$, suggesting that easy-axis aligning along (110) is favorable. On the other hand, when $h = 2K$ (Fig. 3(b)) even as $E_{GS}$ converges $\theta$ fluctuates greatly, meaning that various ansatz with different $\theta$ competes with each other energetically. For each plot we also demonstrate its energy profile along $\theta$, as long as $E_{GS}$ sits in between a chosen interval which is around 0.1% of its own value. In contrast to the fact that sampled points all gather around $\theta = 45^\circ$ in Fig. 3(a), we have a very long profile for those points fulfilling the criteria in Fig. 3(b). In order to show the effect of $J$, we demonstrate the same plots

![Diagram](image-url)
for \( J = 0.2K \) (Fig. 3(c)) and \( J = 0.5K \) (Fig. 3(d)) with \( h = 2K \). From the energy profile, one can see that the easy axes gradually resume as \( J \) increases. This is because a strong enough \( J \) can lead to a tunneling which overcomes the energy gap; thus the phase coherence once again emerges. In Appendix A2, We will provide the detailed values for \( E_{GS} \) and \( \theta \) with some sampled \( J \)-s. In our interpretation, the above scenario represents the fact that easy axes are “softened” under certain conditions and can be hardly determined. We will provide a proper reasoning for such softening of easy axes in the following section.

V. EFFECTIVE MODEL AROUND \( h = 2K \)

Our iPEPS calculation in the previous section suggests a scenario of softening the easy axes in the \( C \) phase around \( h = 2K \), which can already be sensed in MFA due to the small energy difference among states with different easy axes. Its cause comes from the fact that there is a huge energy gap that separates \( |\psi_1\rangle \) and \( |\psi_2\rangle \) from the rest. Since \( J \) is small, we can treat the Heisenberg \( J \) term as the perturbative term and we are going to consider its leading-order contribution. From our MFA, we notice that the possibility to find \( |\psi_3\rangle \) to \( |\psi_5\rangle \) \((P(\psi_3) + P(\psi_4) + P(\psi_5))\) is smaller than 0.01 (\( \approx 0.004 \) for \( J = 0.1K, \ h = 2K \)). Thus, the local Hilbert space boils down to be two-dimensional in the leading order, composed of \( |\psi_1\rangle \) and \( |\psi_2\rangle \). Therefore, we can reconstruct the perturbative Hamiltonian by considering the algebra using \( |\psi_1\rangle \) and \( |\psi_2\rangle \).

For the original \( S = 2 \) system, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \psi_1 | S^z | \psi_1 \rangle &= (N_1)^2 (2a^- - 2), \\
\langle \psi_2 | S^z | \psi_2 \rangle &= 1, \\
\langle \psi_1 | S^+ | \psi_2 \rangle &= \langle \psi_2 | S^- | \psi_1 \rangle = 2N_1 a^-,
\end{align*}
\]

while all the other terms are zero. As a result, the perturbative term can be re-written as

\[
H^{(1)} = - J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \tau_i^z \cdot \tau_j^z,
\]

with

\[
\tau^+ = (\tau^-)^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2N_1 a^- \end{bmatrix}, \tau^z = \begin{bmatrix} (N_1)^2 (2a^- - 2) & 0 \\
0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

With further elaboration, Eq. (9) can be expressed as (see Appendix B)

\[
H_{\text{HCB}}^{(1)} = - t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (\sigma_i^+ \sigma_j^- + \sigma_i^- \sigma_j^+) + V \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sigma_i^+ \sigma_j^- + B \sum_i \sigma_i^z,
\]

where \( t = 2J(N_1 a^-)^2 \), \( V = -J \gamma_1^2 \), and \( B = 4J \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \) with \( \gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}[(N_1)^2(2a^- - 2) - 1] \) and \( \gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2}[(N_1)^2(2a^- - 2) + 1] \). \( \sigma \) stands for the Pauli matrix. This effective Hamiltonian suggests an emergence of \( U(1) \) symmetry, due to the accidental
two-fold degeneracy at \( h = 2K \) and a huge gap that separates the competing eigenenergies of \(|\psi_1\rangle\) and \(|\psi_2\rangle\) from other local states around that point.

At \( h = 2K \), we have \((t, V, B) = (1.8J, -0.81J, -0.36J)\) and thus Eq. (11) represents a HCB Hamiltonian with an attractive potential under an external magnetic field. Since \(|t| > |V|\), this model is expected to realize a superfluid phase with emergent \( U(1) \) symmetry breaking, which does not favor any specific easy axes for the planar magnetization. Thus, the energy difference among \( C \) states cannot be obtained with only the leading-order correction, while higher-order effect stays negligible due to the energy gap. Such fact also suggests that different \( C \) states could be very competitive in their energies and therefore cannot be easily determined with iPEPS. It also explains the reason why our preliminary trials using QMC suffer from a very slow and difficult convergence, which is also seen in the iPEPS studies. Thus, to pin down the true GS, one might need a more powerful numerical tool or a proper higher-order correction. However, it is not easy or even practical due to the nature of a large-energy-gap existence, leading to a competing scenario among different \( C \) states.

Recall that our previous MFA demonstrates a phase coherence among local states and, on the other hand, a decoherence can be triggered while entanglement can be properly taken care of. This happens at around \( h = 2K \) and can be understood through an emergent \( U(1) \) symmetry breaking. If \( J \) becomes large enough to introduce more weights for the other three eigenstates, the coherence will be restored to minimize \( E_I \). At \( h = 0 \), however, such decoherence is not found because there are three states, \(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, \) and \(|\psi_3\rangle\), possessing dominant weight and thus the coherence stays robust to weak entanglement. In conclusion, our analysis and numerical calculation suggest a scenario of local eigenstate decoherence caused by the magnetic field and a ferromagnetic Heisenberg coupling, representing the softening of magnetic easy axes.

A simple way for further confirming our effective theory is by adding a small in-plane magnetic field and see if the magnetic moment can be guided. We will demonstrate this in the next section.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this article, we studied the simplest non-trivial quantum magnetic phenomena caused by the cubic spin anisotropy. Instead of \( U(1) \) symmetry, our mother Hamiltonian enjoys the \( D_8 \) symmetry and planar magnetization appears after symmetry breaking. Within the classical limit, mean-field calculation reveals two \( P \) and one \( C \) phases. The first \( P \) phase exists within a dome area while the other one appears after the saturation. Within \( C \) area, MFA always favors \( \theta = \pi/4 \) easy axes under a phase coherence of local eigenstates, while other possibilities possess competing energies near \( h = 2K \), due to the ground state degeneracy as \( J = 0 \) and a large energy gap. Once we try to push further using iPEPS, we discover that the first \( P \) dome grows while the second phase boundary agrees well with the MFA result. Moreover, the easy axes for \( C \) phase’s in-plane magnetization does no longer align along \(|\langle 110\rangle\). Instead, \( C \) states with various easy axes share competing energies which are not easy to distinguish. Our calculation suggests a softening of easy axes once we turn on the magnetic field, caused by an effective HCB model as the leading-order correction.

Our discovery provides a new possibility in manipulating the magnetism of diluted magnetic semiconductor (DMS) [21], where such manipulation plays an important role in designing new devices for future spintronics [40]. Previously, a well studied way for such purpose comes from the electrical manipulation for Mn-doped III-V DMS, such as (Ga,Mn)As and (In,Mn)As, which possesses ferromagnetism due to the Mn dopant. By applying an external electric field, the magnetic easy axes can be shifted due to the altering of carrier concentration led by the field [41–44]. Particularly, the Mn-doped gallium phosphide ceramic, \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{P} \), provides a good platform in realization of our proposed scenario. For GaP it has the neutral Mn acceptor \((\text{Mn}^+)\) with spin \( S = 2 \) [45] as well as the ferromagnetic exchange [46], whose Curie temperature (and thus the strength of superexchange coupling) can be adjusted by the Mn concentration [47]. Under a low temperature, moreover, it has a \(|\langle 011\rangle\) cubic anisotropy along with a negligible in-plane uniaxial anisotropy, leading to an easy axis close to \(| \langle 011 \rangle | \) [48, 49]. This easy axis can also be rotated from in-plane \(| \langle 011 \rangle | \) to the film normal \(| \langle 100 \rangle | \) through alloying nitrogen which changes the strain state of the film [49]. We believe that our proposal here can be used to describe the physical scenario of a well-doped \( \text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{Mn}_x\text{P}_{1-y}\text{N}_y \) whose easy axis goes along \(| \langle 111 \rangle | \). After casting a controlled external magnetic field \(| \langle 100 \rangle | \), the softening of in-plane easy axis takes place, leading to an easy manipulation of magnetism by applying a small in-plane field. As a demonstration, we introduce an extra in-plane field to Eq. (1),

\[
H_{\text{in-plane}} = -\sum_i \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{S}_i, \tag{12}
\]

where \( \mathbf{B} = B(\hat{e}_x \cos \phi + \hat{e}_y \sin \phi) \) with \( \hat{e}_x \) and \( \hat{e}_y \) being the
unit vectors along $x$ and $y$ directions. Here we set $B = 0.05K$ and present the $\theta$ of resulting GS, obtained by iPEPS, along with $\phi$ for $h = 0$ and $2K$ in Fig. 4. As one can see, with $h = 2K$ the resulting $\theta$ aligns well along the $\theta = \phi$ line, suggesting the guiding of magnetic moment by the in-plane field. On the other hand, when $h = 0$ since the easy axes remain “hard”, tilting of magnetization is less observant. Moreover, among red dots their energy difference is negligible ($\approx 10^{-4}$, approximately $0.001\%$ of the energy). The tiny energy difference for $h = 2K$ case supports our emergent $U(1)$ symmetry breaking scenario proposed in the previous section.

From Ref. 48 we notice that the contribution of cubic anisotropy decreases rapidly after 5 Kelvin, suggesting that this easy-axis softening exists in a very low temperature. Moreover, our scenario is suitable for any easy axis from $[01\bar{1}]$ to $[100]$ because by including a XXZ anisotropy to the Heisenberg term of our model, an easy-axis rotation can be realized while varying the anisotropy strength. An easy way to investigate this phenomenon is to detect the angular dependence of ferromagnetic resonance field under a perpendicular external magnetic field [48], which has, to the best of our knowledge, not been done by any group yet. In sum, the easy-axis softening proposed in this work unveils a new possibility in manipulating the magnetism for spinful semiconductors, leading to a potential usage for future semiconductor devices.
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Appendix A: infinite projected entangled pair states

1. iPEPS basics

In this work we make use of the infinite projected entangled pair states (iPEPS), which is a variational tensor network ansatz for approximating the ground state of a two dimensional quantum systems in thermodynamic limit [33–35], for studying our system beyond MFA. Obeying the area law, absence of sign problem and lattice size augmentation put iPEPS among one of the most desirable computational methods in many-body physics especially for strongly correlated systems. The basic idea in iPEPS consists of considering a repeating unit cell of interconnected tensors, so called the bulk tensors, and simulating an effective environment by constructing a series of border tensors. Each bulk tensor encodes the entanglement with its neighboring sites by having four virtual bonds with bond dimension equal to $D$, along with one physical index which reflects the local Hilbert space dimension ($d = 5$ in this work).

Since we consider a ferromagnetic system in a square lattice whose unit cell is $1 \times 1$, we can adopt the symmetry group of the square lattice for gaining efficiency during the calculation. Such lattice is invariant under the $C_{4v}$ point-group symmetry as shown in Fig. 5(a). Therefore, we adopt the same symmetry group for our tensor itself, making the permutation of virtual bonds leave the tensor unchanged.

In order to compute the norm and the observables we then contract the tensor ($A$) to its complex conjugate ($A^\dagger$) and trace out the physical bond so that it results in a double-layer tensor ($AA^\dagger$). This tensor object becomes the basic block while we approximate the environment tensors through the CTMRG procedure [9, 36, 37]. Since the computational cost for the exact contraction of a two-dimensional network grows exponentially, we construct the projector tensor through truncation after singular-value decomposing a tensor bond [9]. Once the CTMRG converges, we obtain the corner $C$ and edge $T$ tensors as depicted in Fig. 5(b). By constructing the environment tensors around the bulk tensor we can extrapolate the system size to the thermodynamic limit and calculate the energy or desired physical observables.

As a variational ansatz, various optimization methods based on the imaginary time evolution such as simple [33], full [50] and fast-full update [51] have already been proposed and implemented for oftentimes. On the other hand, although it is not an easy task to evaluate the energy gradient of each variational parameter, a breakthrough in optimization of iPEPS took place by adopting the idea of automatic differentiation (AD) [38], which has been employed for optimizing problems with large numbers of parameter and already proved its efficiency in many neural network studies.

The objective in AD optimization is to record down the computation graph from initial bulk tensors to the final energy

\[ \text{FIG. 5.} \quad (a) \text{iPEPS scheme with rank-5 tensors on each lattice site where thick and thin solid lines represent virtual (D) and physical (d) bonds respectively. Red dashed lines mark the inversion planes of C_{4v} point group (s_d for the inversion planes along principle axes and s_d for the diagonal inversion planes) and yellow arrows denote the C_2 and C_4 rotational invariance. (b) Corner (C), edge (T) and double layer (AA^\dagger) tensors in the upper-left corner. Grey bonds possess dimension equal to \chi which in general should be no smaller than }D^2, \text{ and the dimension for blue bonds is }D^2. \]
estimation (see the Appendix in Ref. 52). After completing one computation flow (one epoch), the energy gradients are evaluated by backward propagation; hence we can make use of these gradients to update the tensor elements (variational parameters) with a desired degree (learning rate), until a desirable convergence is achieved. We can then utilize the converged ansatz for further calculation of physical observables and a practical package for interested readers can be found in Ref. 39.

2. Phase boundary determination and detailed values of iPEPS results

The phase boundaries of iPEPS calculation between $P$ and $C$ phases in Fig. 2 has been determined by extrapolating the planar order parameter, $M_p = \sqrt{\langle S^x \rangle^2 + \langle S^y \rangle^2}$, along with $1/D$. We execute the calculation up to $D = 5$ and by checking whether the trend lines intersect $1/D = 0$ with a finite intercept or not, we can approximate the transition points.

For $h < 2$ ($h > 2$) we estimate the transition points through vertical (horizontal) cuts at various $h$ ($J$) with different bond dimensions. Fig. 6(a) (Fig. 6(b)) shows the results for several $J$s ($h$s) at $h = 0.7$ ($J = 0.03$). We also plot the trend line for each point and extrapolate it to $1/D = 0$. As $M_p$ after extrapolation goes to zero we obtain the desired transition point. As can be seen in Fig. 6, the transition point of $P \rightarrow C$ in the $P$ dome for $h = 0.7$ locates at around $J = 0.068$, while $C \rightarrow P$ of the saturation curve for $J = 0.03$ sits at around $h = 2.14$.

In Table I we demonstrate $E_{GS}$ and $\theta$ for a series of $J$ along $h = 2K$ and sample two competing ansatz for each point. For each $J$, we have conducted many calculations with different initial conditions, learning rate of back propagation, and so on. Numbers shown in Table I are two of the lowest variational energies so far we obtained for each $J$, despite a very small difference from other trials not shown here. As one can see, within those ansatz sharing very similar energies ($\Delta E < 10^{-5}$), their $\theta$ can be largely different. More importantly, they are not the only possibilities, suggesting that in $C$ phase the planar magnetization can point in various directions while sharing nearly the same energies, interpreted as the emergent $U(1)$ symmetry breaking proposed in the main text.

Appendix B: Effective hard-core bosonic model

In Section V we present an effective Hamiltonian of HCB for the first-order correction in perturbation theory and we will show the derivation here. First, re-write Eq. (9) into

$$H^{(1)} = -2J(N_1a^-)^2 \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \langle j \| \sigma_i^+ \sigma_j^- + \sigma_j^+ \sigma_i^- \| i \rangle - J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (\gamma_1 \sigma_i^z \gamma_2 \mathbb{1} + \gamma_2 \gamma_1 \mathbb{1})$$

(B1)

with $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}[(N_1)^2(2a^- - 2) - 1]$, $\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2}[(N_1)^2(2a^- - 2) + 1]$, and $\mathbb{1}$ stands for the identity matrix. After expanding Eq. (B1), we obtain

$$H^{(1)} = -2J(N_1a^-)^2 \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \langle j \| \sigma_i^+ \sigma_j^- + \sigma_j^+ \sigma_i^- \| i \rangle - \gamma_1^2 \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \langle j \| \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z - 4J\gamma_1\gamma_2 \sum_i \sigma_i^z$$

(B2)

where $\mathbb{1}_i \mathbb{1}_j$ term has been ignored since it only contribute a constant energy. By assigning $t = 2J(N_1a^-)^2$, $V = -\gamma_1^2$, and $B = 4J\gamma_1\gamma_2$, we obtain the Hamiltonian in Eq. (11).
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