Fracton topological phases from strongly coupled spin chains
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We provide a new perspective on fracton topological phases, a class of three-dimensional topologically ordered phases with unconventional fractionalized excitations that are either completely immobile or only mobile along particular lines or planes. We demonstrate that a wide range of these fracton phases can be constructed by strongly coupling mutually intersecting spin chains and explain via a concrete example how such a coupled-spin-chain construction illuminates the generic properties of a fracton phase. In particular, we describe a systematic translation from each coupled-spin-chain construction into a parton construction where the partons correspond to the excitations that are mobile along lines. Remarkably, our construction of fracton phases is inherently based on spin models involving only two-spin interactions and thus brings us closer to their experimental realization.

One of the most striking features of topologically ordered phases in two dimensions is the existence of quasiparticle excitations with fractional quantum numbers and fractional exchange statistics [1]. In three dimensions, this fractionalization attains an even more exotic character and has proven to be a vast and exciting frontier. For example, there are loop-like excitations in addition to point-like excitations, and the intricate braiding patterns exhibited by these loop-like excitations are essential for characterizing the topological order [2, 3].

Fracton topological phases are topologically ordered phases in three dimensions with a particularly extreme form of fractionalization [4–7]. In these phases, there are point-like excitations that are either completely immobile or only mobile in a lower-dimensional subsystem, such as an appropriate line or plane. Remarkably, the restricted mobility of excitations has a purely topological origin and appears in translation-invariant systems without any disorder. In addition to being of fundamental interest from the perspective of topological phases, and providing an exciting disorder-free alternative to many-body localization [10, 11], this phenomenology has important implications for quantum-information storage. Indeed, the informational interest from the perspective of topological phases, and systems without any disorder. In addition to being of fundamentally ordered phases [12, 13].

In recent years, several different viewpoints have been presented on fracton topological phases. From a purely conceptual perspective, fracton phases can be understood by gauging classical spin models with particular subsystem symmetries [14–15] or in terms of generalized parton constructions with overlapping directional gauge constraints and/or interacting parton Hamiltonians [16]. While these approaches can be used to understand the generic properties of fracton phases, the concrete spin models they provide are far from realistic as they involve interactions between many spins at the same time. From a more practical perspective, fracton phases can be constructed by coupling orthogonal stacks of two-dimensional topologically ordered layers [17–18]. This approach can lead to more realistic spin models involving only two-spin interactions [19], although it is not immediately clear what kind of fracton phase is obtained from a generic construction.

In this Letter, we provide an understanding of fracton topological phases in terms of coupled spin chains and, along with it, a systematic route to construct realistic spin models hosting such fracton phases. This coupled-spin-chain construction is useful for three main reasons. First, like all coupled-chain (i.e., coupled-wire) constructions, it decomposes the system into its most basic building blocks, and dealing directly with these building blocks offers significant versatility in describing a rich variety of fracton phases. Second, the coupled-spin-chain constructions directly translate into generalized parton constructions, and the generic properties of the corresponding fracton phases can then be readily understood. For example, one can immediately identify the excitations with restricted mobility and their respective lower-dimensional subsystems (i.e., lines or planes). Third, the coupled-spin-chain constructions naturally give rise to fracton spin models involving only two-spin interactions, which are more amenable to a potential experimental implementation.

Fracton spin model.—Our coupled-spin-chain construction works for any 4n-coordinated (n ≥ 2) lattice with 2n spin-one-half degrees of freedom per site. For concreteness, however, we concentrate on the eight-coordinated (n = 2) body-centered-cubic (BCC) lattice, which is characterized by the (conventional) cubic lattice vectors a₁,₂,₃ and the nearest-neighbor bond vectors b₁,₂,₃ [see Fig. 1(a)].

In the concrete model, there are four spins σᵣ,ⱼ with flavors j = 1, 2, 3, 4 at each site r of the BCC lattice, and the Hamiltonian in terms of these spins reads

$$H = -J \sum_j \sum_{(r, r')} \sigma_{r,j}^x \sigma_{r',j}^y - \lambda J \sum_r \sum_{(j, j')} \sigma_{r,j}^z \sigma_{r,j'}^z,$$

where ⟨j, j’⟩ implies a summation over all pairs of spins at the same site, and ⟨r, r’⟩ₖ implies a summation over all j bonds (j = 1, 2, 3, 4) such that the arrow in Fig. 1(a) points from r to r’ at each bond. The first (nearest-neighbor) term describes decoupled spin chains of the four spin flavors along the (1 1 1) directions traced out by strings of the four corresponding bond types, while the second (on-site) term introduces a coupling between spin chains of distinct spin flavors intersecting at any site. Note that the individual (decoupled) spin chains are both critical and macroscopically degenerate.

In the strong-coupling regime (λ ≫ 1), the four spins σᵣ,ⱼ at each site r are locked together by the on-site terms, and thus σᵣ,ⱼ = σᵣ,j’ for all j and j’. The local Hilbert space is then
a critical coupling strength $\lambda$. For $\lambda \to \infty$, these degenerate local states give rise to an exponentially large ground-state degeneracy. However, if $\lambda$ is finite, the nearest-neighbor terms select particular superpositions of these ground states by inducing a low-energy Hamiltonian within the ground-state subspace in terms of the effective spin components

$$
\begin{align*}
X_r &\equiv \sum_i \sigma^x_{r,i} \sigma^x_{r,2} \sigma^x_{r,3} \sigma^x_{r,4} = -\sigma^y_{r,1} \sigma^y_{r,2} \sigma^y_{r,3} \sigma^y_{r,4} = \ldots, \\
Y_r &\equiv \sum_i \sigma^y_{r,1} \sigma^y_{r,2} \sigma^y_{r,3} \sigma^y_{r,4} = \sigma^x_{r,1} \sigma^x_{r,2} \sigma^x_{r,3} \sigma^x_{r,4} = \ldots, \\
Z_r &\equiv \sum_i \sigma^z_{r,1} = \sigma^z_{r,2} = \sigma^z_{r,3} = \sigma^z_{r,4}.
\end{align*}
$$

(2)

For our BCC model in Eq. (1), the lowest-order non-trivial Hamiltonian term $W_r$ arises at order $32$ in degenerate perturbation theory (see the Supplementary Material [20]) and is a product of $14$ effective spin operators [see Fig. (b)]. Ignoring any trivial (i.e., constant) terms, the effective Hamiltonian at this order is then $H = \sum_r W_r$, where

$$
W_r \sim \frac{J}{\lambda^{31}} \prod_{\pm} X_{r\pm a_1} X_{r\pm a_2} X_{r\pm a_3} Y_{r\pm b_1} Y_{r\pm b_2} Y_{r\pm b_3} Y_{r\pm b_4}.
$$

(3)

Since $[W_r, W_{r'}] = 0$ for all $r$ and $r'$, the Hamiltonian $H$ corresponds to a commuting-projector model, where each eigenstate is characterized by $W_r = \pm 1$. Furthermore, the only non-trivial terms arising at higher orders of perturbation theory are products of $W_r$, and this commuting-projector model thus captures an entire strong-coupling phase $\lambda > \lambda_C$ above a critical coupling strength $\lambda_C$.

This strong-coupling phase of the model in Eq. (1) is identified as a type-I fracton phase [14], which is characterized by the following (closely related) features. First of all, there is a ground-state degeneracy that scales as $\sim 2^L$ with the linear system dimension $L$ due to the planar conservation laws captured by a single effective spin $\Sigma_r$ as its two states can be characterized by $\Sigma^x_r = \sigma^x_r = \pm 1$. For $\lambda \to \infty$, these degenerate local states give rise to an exponentially large ground-state degeneracy. However, if $\lambda$ is finite, the nearest-neighbor terms select particular superpositions of these ground states by inducing a low-energy Hamiltonian within the ground-state subspace in terms of the effective spin components
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posing the overlapping directional gauge constraints

\[ G_{\mathbf{r},j,j'} = \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j'} \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},j} \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},j'} = 1. \] (5)

These gauge constraints are indeed directional as each of them only acts on partons in a particular \( \{1\ 1\ 0\} \) plane and overlapping as any two such planes intersect along a particular \( \{1\ 1\ 1\} \) direction. We also note that there are three independent gauge constraints at each site which correctly reconcile eight Majorana fermions with a single spin.

The three components of the spin \( \Sigma_{\mathbf{r}} \) are identified with the three inequivalent gauge-invariant operators

\[ X_{\mathbf{r}} = \gamma_{\mathbf{r},1} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},2} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},3} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},4} = -\hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},1} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},2} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},3} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},4} = \ldots, \]
\[ Y_{\mathbf{r}} = \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},1} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},2} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},3} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},4} = \gamma_{\mathbf{r},1} \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},2} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},3} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},4} = \ldots, \]
\[ Z_{\mathbf{r}} = i \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},1} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},1} = i \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},2} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},2} = i \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},3} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},3} = i \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},4} \gamma_{\mathbf{r},4}, \] (6)

where the equivalent expressions of each spin component are related by the gauge constraints \( G_{\mathbf{r},j,j'} \). Each term \( W_{\mathbf{r}} \) in the spin Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H} \) is then readily written in terms of the partons and decomposes into a product of 32 bond-fermion operators \( i \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},j} \) in Eq. (4) [see Fig. 3(b)]. Since the terms \( W_{\mathbf{r}} \) also commute with the gauge constraints, the exact eigenstates of the spin Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H} \) are thus obtained from those of the (non-interacting) parton Hamiltonian \( \mathcal{H} \) by enforcing the gauge constraints via appropriate projections.

From a comparison of Figs. 1 and 3 there is clearly an intimate connection between the coupled-spin-chain construction in Eq. (1) and the parton construction in Eq. (4). Indeed, the spin-combination rules in Eq. (2) for obtaining the effective low-energy Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H} \) in degenerate perturbation theory are identical to the corresponding parton-decomposition rules in Eq. (6) via the substitutions \( \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j}^x \leftrightarrow \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} \), \( \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j}^y \leftrightarrow \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},j} \), and \( \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j}^z \leftrightarrow i \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},j} \). This connection can be understood by means of the Jordan-Wigner transformation

\[ \left( \begin{array}{c} \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j}^x \\ \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j}^y \\ \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j}^z \end{array} \right) = \left[ \prod_{\mathbf{r} < \mathbf{r}'} \prod_{j' < j} \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j'} \left( i \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j'} \right)^z - 1 \right] \left( \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},j} \right), \] (7)

where the additional factor \( (i \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j}^z)^z - 1 \) with respect to the standard form is a local spin rotation. Within the low-energy subspace characterized by \( \Sigma_{\mathbf{r}} \), the Jordan-Wigner strings in the square brackets then disappear due to the spin-locking constraints \( \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j}^x \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j'}^x = 1 \) or, equivalently, due to the corresponding gauge constraints \( G_{\mathbf{r},j,j'} = 1 \). We emphasize, however, that this connection is restricted to the low-energy subspace and that it would thus be incorrect to argue for Eq. (4) by directly substituting Eq. (7) into Eq. (1).

Extended fracton phase.—As discussed in Ref. [16], parton constructions can be used to understand the generic properties of fracton phases. In general, a strongly correlated spin phase is characterized by its parton construction via the invariant gauge group (IGG), which consists of all gauge transformations (i.e., generic products of local gauge constraints) that commute with the parton Hamiltonian.

For a type-I fracton phase, the IGG is generically \( \mathbb{Z}_N^3 \) with \( N \sim L \) due to the presence of planar IGG elements that are related to the planar conservation laws of the corresponding spin model [16]. For our BCC construction, in particular, there is a planar IGG element for each \( \{1\ 1\ 0\} \) plane as the product of all \( G_{\mathbf{r},j,j'} \) in a \( \{1\ 1\ 1\} \) plane spanned by a net of \( j \) and \( j' \) bonds commutes with \( \mathcal{H} \) in Eq. (4). The partons themselves can then be identified with the excitations that are only mobile along particular \( \{1\ 1\ 1\} \) directions. Indeed, since each parton \( \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} (\hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},j}) \) anticommutes with three planar IGG elements containing \( G_{\mathbf{r},j,j'} \) with \( j' \neq j \), it is constrained to move along the intersection of the three corresponding planes, which is a \( \{1\ 1\ 1\} \) direction traced out by a string of \( j \) bonds.

Importantly, the parton construction is valid beyond the exactly solvable model \( \tilde{H} \). In fact, any sufficiently weak local perturbation that commutes with all the IGG elements can be added to Eq. (4) while leaving the projected parton ground state in the original fracton phase. In addition to the terms \( i \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r}+b,j} \) already present, the generic quadratic terms appearing are then \( i \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r}+xb,j} \), where \( x \) is an arbitrary integer, and \( \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} \) is either \( \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} \) or \( \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},j} \). In turn, these generic terms lead to non-trivial parton dispersions along the respective \( \{1\ 1\ 1\} \) directions of motion. While the resulting parton ground state does not correspond to an exactly solvable spin model, it can be used as the starting point of a variational description.

Generalized constructions.—Our coupled-spin-chain construction is extremely versatile and readily generalizes to a rich variety of fracton phases. First, it can be defined on any \( 4n \)-coordinated \( (n \geq 2) \) lattice with \( 2n \) spins \( \sigma_{\mathbf{r},j}=1,\ldots,2n \) at each site \( \mathbf{r} \). Second, the intersecting spin chains can be embedded in the lattice in many different ways. In particular, they do not have to follow straight lines and might even connect back into themselves to form closed loops.

![FIG. 3: Exact parton construction of our BCC model. (a) Each spin \( \Sigma_{\mathbf{r}} \) (large white sphere) is decomposed into eight Majorana fermions (colored dots) at the bonds around the site \( \mathbf{r} \): four \( \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} \) above \( \mathbf{r} \) and four \( \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},j} \) below \( \mathbf{r} \) with flavors \( j = 1 \) (red), \( j = 2 \) (green), \( j = 3 \) (blue), and \( j = 4 \) (purple). Each bond is occupied by two Majorana fermions \( \gamma_{\mathbf{r},j} \) and \( \hat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{r},j} \) that are in a state characterized by the bond-fermion operator \( r_{\mathbf{r},j} \hat{r}_{\mathbf{r},j} = \pm 1 \) (black line). (b) Decomposition of each term \( W_{\mathbf{r}} \) in the effective spin Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H} \) [see Fig. 1(b)] into a product of bond-fermion operators (black lines).]
FIG. 4: Coupled-spin-chain constructions (a) and effective strong-coupling Hamiltonians (b) capturing type-I fracton phases on two different lattices. The notation is taken from Fig. 1. For the second construction, the strong-coupling Hamiltonian has three independent terms and corresponds to the X-cube model [14].

Formally, the Hamiltonian is Eq. (1) for any such coupled-spin-chain construction, where the different bond types are assigned to the given lattice in a particular way. It is crucial that there are precisely two bonds of each type \( j \) around each site \( r \) at which the two corresponding terms act with spin operators \( \sigma^x_{r,j} \) and \( \sigma^y_{r,j} \), respectively. Two examples of such generalized constructions are presented in Fig. 4(a) on a primitive hexagonal lattice and on a cubic lattice formed by corner-sharing octahedra. For each construction, there is a type-I fracton phase in the strong-coupling limit, and the independent terms \( W_r \) of the effective strong-coupling Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H} \) are given in Fig. 4(b). Remarkably, the type-I fracton phase of the second construction is captured by the X-cube model [14].

Moreover, the fracton phase in the strong-coupling limit can be readily analyzed without obtaining the concrete form of the effective Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H} \). Due to the connection between the coupled-spin-chain construction and the parton construction, the terms \( W_r \) in \( \tilde{H} \) necessarily decompose into products of appropriate bond-fermion operators when written in terms of the partons. The fracton phase is then captured by the non-interacting parton Hamiltonian in Eq. (4), where the different bond types are assigned to the lattice in the same way as in Eq. (1). For such a generalized parton construction, the IGG elements are products of gauge constraints \( G_{r,j,j'} \) along nets of \( j \) and \( j' \) bonds, while the partons themselves correspond to excitations that are mobile along respective strings of \( j \) bonds (i.e., the individual spin chains).

Summary and outlook.—We have provided a general framework for describing fracton topological phases in terms of an interpenetrating set of spin chains that are strongly coupled at their intersection points. It is clear from the examples presented that this construction can easily describe many different fracton phases by spin models involving only two-spin interactions. This work covers the strong-coupling limit of these spin models, while the weak-coupling limit and the quantitative domain of the fracton phase in the strong-coupling regime (i.e., the value of \( \lambda_C \)) remain to be understood.

Our construction of fracton phases is analogous to how the toric-code model is obtained in the spatially anisotropic limit of the Kitaev honeycomb model [1]. Indeed, if we form two pairs out of the four spin flavors in Eq. (1) and only introduce couplings within each pair, we obtain two orthogonal stacks of two-dimensional topologically ordered layers; see the Supplementary Material [24]. The fracton phase is then recovered by including the remaining couplings between the two orthogonal stacks [19]. In a conceptual sense, the coupled-layer models of fracton phases introduced in Refs. [17] and [18] are thus an intermediate step between our coupled-spin-chain models and the commuting-projector models in Ref. [14].

Finally, it follows from our work that parton constructions describing fracton phases can be generally converted into appropriate spin models. While the non-interacting parton constructions in this work give rise to coupled-spin-chain models involving two-spin interactions, the interacting parton constructions in Ref. [16] translate into more general spin models involving four-spin interactions. Remarkably, these parton constructions describe both type-I and type-II fracton phases, characterized by immobile excitations at the corners of membrane and fractal operators, respectively [24]. Our formalism thus brings us one step closer to realizing these highly unconventional topological phases in the laboratory.
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See the Supplementary Material for a more detailed description of degenerate perturbation theory and the relation of our work to coupled-layer constructions.

In fact, for an $L \times L \times L$ system, a detailed analysis shows that the ground-state degeneracy is $2^{12L-10}$.

The coupled-spin-chain models in this work typically describe type-I fracton phases as they have excitations that are mobile along the individual spin chains. Nevertheless, type-II fracton phases with only immobile excitations can in principle also be captured if all spin chains form closed loops. This extension of our work is currently in progress.
Here we describe the degenerate perturbation theory in the strong-coupling limit (λ ≫ 1) of our coupled-spin-chain Hamiltonian \( H \) and explain how the lowest-order effective Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H} \) is obtained. From the perspective of perturbation theory, the coupled-spin-chain Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) of the main text can be written as

\[
H = H_0 + \sum_j \sum_{\langle r, \tilde{r} \rangle_j} V_{\langle r, \tilde{r} \rangle_j}, \quad H_0 = -\lambda J \sum_r \sum_{\langle j, j' \rangle} \sigma_{r,j}^z \sigma_{r,j'}^z, \quad V_{\langle r, \tilde{r} \rangle_j} = -J \sigma_{r,j}^x \sigma_{\tilde{r},j'}^y,
\]

where the first term \( H_0 \) is the unperturbed Hamiltonian, and \( V_{\langle r, \tilde{r} \rangle_j} \) in the second term are the perturbations. For a lattice of \( N \) sites, the ground-state subspace of \( H_0 \) contains \( 2^N \) degenerate states |\( \Psi_0 \rangle \) with energies \( E_0 = -6N\lambda J \). At order \( p \) in degenerate (Brillouin-Wigner) perturbation theory, the low-energy Hamiltonian induced within this ground-state subspace is then

\[
\tilde{H}_p = \sum_{j_1, \ldots, j_p} \sum_{\langle r_1, \tilde{r}_1 \rangle_{j_1}, \ldots, \langle r_p, \tilde{r}_p \rangle_{j_p}} P \prod_{l=1}^{p-1} \left[ V_{\langle r_l, \tilde{r}_l \rangle_{j_l}} (E - H_0)^{-1} (1 - P) \right] V_{\langle r_p, \tilde{r}_p \rangle_{j_p}},
\]

where the projector \( P = \prod_r \prod_{j, j'} (1 + \sigma_{r,j}^x \sigma_{r,j'}^y) \) annihilates any state outside the ground-state subspace, and the energy \( E \) can (in principle) be determined self-consistently via \( E = E_0 + \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \Psi_0 | \tilde{H}_p | \Psi_0 \rangle \). Importantly, the unperturbed Hamiltonian \( H_0 \) is an exclusive function of commuting \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) operators \( \sigma_{r,j}^x \sigma_{r,j'}^y = \pm 1 \), and any state |\( \Psi_0 \rangle \) in its ground-state subspace is characterized by \( \sigma_{r,j}^x \sigma_{r,j'}^y = \pm 1 \) for all \( r, j, \) and \( j' \). Since each perturbation term \( V_{\langle r, \tilde{r} \rangle_j} \) either commutes or anticommutes with each \( \sigma_{r,j}^x \sigma_{r,j'}^y \), each resolvent \( (E - H_0)^{-1} \) in Eq. (9) acts on an eigenstate of \( H_0 \) characterized by the same definite values \( \sigma_{r,j}^x \sigma_{r,j'}^y = \pm 1 \) for any state |\( \Psi_0 \rangle \) in the ground-state subspace acted upon by \( \tilde{H}_p \). Substituting the resolvents with their corresponding eigenvalues, the low-energy Hamiltonian in Eq. (9) then takes the form

\[
\tilde{H}_p = \sum_{j_1, \ldots, j_p} \sum_{\langle r_1, \tilde{r}_1 \rangle_{j_1}, \ldots, \langle r_p, \tilde{r}_p \rangle_{j_p}} \Lambda_{\langle r_1, \tilde{r}_1 \rangle_{j_1}, \ldots, \langle r_p, \tilde{r}_p \rangle_{j_p}} P \prod_{l=1}^{p-1} \left[ V_{\langle r_l, \tilde{r}_l \rangle_{j_l}} (1 - P) \right] V_{\langle r_p, \tilde{r}_p \rangle_{j_p}},
\]

where each \( \Lambda_{\langle r_1, \tilde{r}_1 \rangle_{j_1}, \ldots, \langle r_p, \tilde{r}_p \rangle_{j_p}} \sim 1/(\lambda J)^{p-1} \) is a product of resolvent eigenvalues. Due to the projectors \( P \) and \( 1 - P \), the only non-vanishing terms in \( \tilde{H}_p \) are the ones where (i) each intermediate state in between the perturbation terms \( V_{\langle r_l, \tilde{r}_l \rangle_{j_l}} \) is outside the ground-state subspace and (ii) the product \( \prod_{l=1}^{p-1} V_{\langle r_l, \tilde{r}_l \rangle_{j_l}} \) can be expressed entirely in terms of the effective spin operators \( X_r, Y_r, \) and \( Z_r \) in Eq. (2) of the main text. It can then be checked with the aid of a computer that the lowest-order non-trivial (i.e., non-constant) terms are obtained at order \( p = 32 \) in perturbation theory and that the resulting low-energy Hamiltonian is \( \tilde{H}_{32} = \sum_r W_r \), where \( W_r \) is given in Eq. (3) of the main text. Furthermore, it can be verified that any terms obtained at higher orders of perturbation theory are products of \( W_r \). Note, however, that the coefficient of \( W_r \) in Eq. (3) of the main text is not straightforward to evaluate as it is the sum of contributions from 32! different coefficients \( \Lambda_{\langle r_1, \tilde{r}_1 \rangle_{j_1}, \ldots, \langle r_{32}, \tilde{r}_{32} \rangle_{j_{32}}} \).

**RELATION TO COUPLED-LAYER CONSTRUCTIONS**

Here we demonstrate that the low-energy Hamiltonian \( \tilde{H} \) can be obtained from the coupled-spin-chain Hamiltonian \( H \) in two consecutive steps via an intermediate coupled-layer Hamiltonian. In the first step, we form two pairs of sites \( j = 1, 2 \) and \( j = 3, 4 \) out of the four spin flavors \( j = 1, 2, 3, 4 \) in Eq. (1) of the main text and restrict the on-site couplings to act only within the individual pairs. The coupled-spin-chain Hamiltonian takes the modified form

\[
H' = -J \sum_{j} \sum_{\langle r, \tilde{r} \rangle_j} \sigma_{r,j}^x \sigma_{\tilde{r},j}^y - \lambda J \sum_r \left( \sigma_{r,1}^z \sigma_{r,2}^z + \sigma_{r,3}^z \sigma_{r,4}^z \right) = \sum_{(101)} H_{(101)} + \sum_{(101)} H_{(101)},
\]

where the spin flavors \( j = 1, 2 \) and \( j = 3, 4 \) are only coupled within individual \( (101) \) and \( (101) \) planes by the Hamiltonians

\[
H_{(101)} = -J \sum_{r \in (101)} \left[ \sigma_{r,1}^x \sigma_{r+1,1}^y + \sigma_{r,3}^x \sigma_{r+1,3}^y \right] - \lambda J \sum_{r \in (101)} \sigma_{r,1}^z \sigma_{r,2}^z,
\]

\[
H_{(101)} = -J \sum_{r \in (101)} \left[ \sigma_{r,3}^x \sigma_{r+1,3}^y + \sigma_{r,4}^x \sigma_{r+1,4}^y \right] - \lambda J \sum_{r \in (101)} \sigma_{r,3}^z \sigma_{r,4}^z.
\]
In the strong-coupling regime ($\lambda \gg 1$), the two spins $\sigma_{r,j}$ within each pair $j = 1, 2$ and $j = 3, 4$ are locked together by the on-site couplings at each site $r$. The local Hilbert space is then captured by two effective spins $\mu_r$ and $\tau_r$ as its four states can be characterized by $\mu^z_r = \sigma^z_{r,1} = \sigma^z_{r,2} = \pm 1$ and $\tau^z_r = \sigma^z_{r,3} = \sigma^z_{r,4} = \pm 1$. For each coupled-spin-chain Hamiltonian in Eq. (12), we employ degenerate perturbation theory to obtain a low-energy Hamiltonian in terms of these effective spins. Treating the second (on-site) term as the unperturbed Hamiltonian and the first (nearest-neighbor) term as the perturbation, the lowest-order non-trivial Hamiltonian terms arise at order 4 in perturbation theory, and the resulting low-energy Hamiltonians are given by

\[ \tilde{H}_{(10 \bar{1})} \sim \frac{J}{\lambda^3} \sum_{r \in \{10 \bar{1}\}} \mu^x_r \mu^y_{r+b_1} \mu^y_{r+b_2} \mu^x_{r+b_1+b_2}, \]

\[ \tilde{H}_{(101)} \sim \frac{J}{\lambda^3} \sum_{r \in \{101\}} \tau^x_r \tau^y_{r+b_3} \tau^y_{r+b_4} \tau^x_{r+b_3+b_4}. \]

Importantly, the two-dimensional Hamiltonians $\tilde{H}_{(10 \bar{1})}$ and $\tilde{H}_{(101)}$ are topologically ordered as they are each equivalent to the toric-code Hamiltonian up to canonical transformations (see Refs. [1] and [23] in the main text).

In the second step, we restore the remaining on-site couplings between spin flavors $j = 1, 2$ and $j = 3, 4$. In terms of the effective spins $\mu_r$ and $\tau_r$ and the single-layer Hamiltonians in Eq. (13), the Hamiltonian then takes the coupled-layer form

\[ \hat{H} = \sum_{\{10 \bar{1}\}} \tilde{H}_{(10 \bar{1})} + \sum_{\{101\}} \tilde{H}_{(101)} - 4\lambda J \sum_r \mu^z_r \tau^z_r. \] (14)

In the strong-coupling regime ($\lambda \gg 1$), the two effective spins $\mu_r$ and $\tau_r$ at each site $r$ are locked together by the remaining on-site couplings. The local Hilbert space is then captured by a single effective spin $\Sigma_r$ as its two states can be characterized by $\Sigma^z_r = \mu^z_r = \tau^z_r = \sigma^z_{r,j} = \pm 1$. To obtain a low-energy Hamiltonian in terms of these effective spins, we employ degenerate perturbation theory, treating the third (on-site) term as the unperturbed Hamiltonian and the first two (single-layer) terms as the perturbations. The lowest-order non-trivial Hamiltonian terms arise at order 8 in perturbation theory, and the resulting low-energy Hamiltonian is $\hat{H} = \sum_r W_r$, where $W_r$ is given in Eq. (3) of the main text. Remarkably, the coupled-layer Hamiltonian in Eq. (14) is analogous to the coupled-layer constructions introduced in Refs. [17] and [18] of the main text. Indeed, the fracton topological order is obtained in our second step by strongly coupling orthogonal stacks of two-dimensional topologically ordered layers. Note, however, that we have only two (rather than three) such orthogonal stacks (see also Ref. [19] in the main text).