Non-Abelian fracton order from gauging a mixture of subsystem and global symmetries
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We demonstrate a general gauging procedure of a pure matter theory on a lattice with a mixture of subsystem and global symmetries. This mixed symmetry can be either a semidirect product of a subsystem symmetry and a global symmetry, or a non-trivial extension of them. We demonstrate this gauging procedure on a cubic lattice in three dimensions with four examples: $G = \mathbb{Z}_3^{\text{sub}} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}}$, $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}}$, $1 \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \to G \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}} \to 1$, and $1 \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \to G \to K_4^{\text{glo}} \to 1$. The former two cases and the last one produce the non-Abelian fracton orders. Our construction of the gauging procedure provides an identification of the electric charges of these fracton orders with irreducible representations of the symmetry. Furthermore, by constraining the local Hilbert space, the magnetic fluxes with different geometry (tube-like and plaquette-like) satisfy a subalgebra of the quantum double models (QDMs). This algebraic structure leads to an identification of the magnetic fluxes to the conjugacy classes of the symmetry.

The discovery of topological quantum phases of matter revolutionizes our understanding of quantum many-body phases and leads to many theoretical developments and remarkable experimental results. Fractional quantum Hall states [1, 2] are the most studied topological quantum phases that host fractional excitations with non-Abelian braiding statistics, robust gapless edge modes, and ground state degeneracies. The long-range entanglement and intrinsic strong correlations in these topological quantum phases bring a key challenge of studying these phases.

The concept of the emergent “gauge” degrees of freedom (DOF) in the topological quantum phases provides the breakthrough of tackling these systems. For example, the notion of the flux attachment in the composite electrons gives rise to the dynamical gauge fields in the fractional quantum Hall states. The fractional braiding statistics can be understood from the knot structures of these dynamical gauge fields described by the topological quantum field theories (TQFT)[3–7]. The topological properties of these phases at low-energy are governed by the TQFTs. The structure of TQFT allows us to extract their mathematical structure and enable us to apply the language of the modular tensor category[8, 9] to describe these systems. On the other hand, various exactly-solvable models of the lattice gauge theories (LGTs)[10] also describe the fundamental excitations of the topological quantum phases and provide insights from studying these models. The famous models are the Kitaev’s quantum double models (QDMs)[11], which are the exactly-solvable limit of the LGTs based on a discrete group $G$ on a two-dimensional lattice. The Kitaev’s QDMs (the toric code is one of them) have fundamental excitations like anyons whose fusion and braiding statistics are characterized by the modular tensor category.

A generalization of the topological quantum phases in three dimensions is believed to have more exotic phases beyond current theoretical developments. The “fracton order”, is one of the novel lattice models discovered recently[12–40]. These three-dimensional lattice models share common features with the two-dimensional counterparts such as ground state degeneracies on the torus and fractional excitations. However, some of the excitations, which are referred to fractons, cannot be moved by local operators, and are intrinsically immobile. This unique feature has no counterparts in two dimensions. It is desired to develop new concepts and mathematical tools for understanding the properties of the fracton order. Furthermore,
the fracton order is related to tensor gauge theories[41] and is proposed to be applicable for quantum memory[42, 43].

A natural extension of current existing theories of fractons is the non-Abelian generalization. These non-Abelian fractons may be applicable for topological quantum computation and quantum memory. A variety of the non-Abelian constructions, including gauging bilayer/permutation symmetries[44, 45], cage-net models[20], the layer constructions[21, 46, 47] and the topological defect networks[48, 49] are proposed. The former construction relies on gauging a global $\mathbb{Z}_2$ permutation symmetry of the “Abelian” fracton models and the second one requires flux-string condensation. These models are restricted in a certain geometry (e.g., the cage-net model and the layer construction) or a specific layer construction (e.g., gauging bilayer fractons). Due to the restrictions from these proposals, a generalization to other non-Abelian fracton orders is not straightforward. To overcome this difficulty, we propose a general gauging procedure of constructing the non-Abelian fracton from gauging a pure matter theory on a lattice with a mixture of a subsystem symmetry and a global symmetry. This mixed symmetry can be a semidirect product of a subsystem symmetry and a global symmetry, or a non-trivial extension of them. The gauge principle on the lattice has tremendous success in constructing many models with topological order. In particular, gauging the Abelian subsystem symmetries gives rise to the Abelian fracton lattice models[50]. Following our gauge principle, one can obtain the (non-)Abelian fracton from gauging the (non-)Abelian versions of the mixed symmetry. We demonstrate several examples of the gauged Hamiltonian in the exactly-solvable limit that host (non-)Abelian fractons and other excitations. To the best of our knowledge, gauging the mixed symmetry on a lattice has not been discussed in the literature[60].

Comparing with gauging the bilayer/permutation fracton orders, which the non-Abelian fractons are constructed from (1) gauging subsystem symmetry of the matter field, (2) taking the exactly-solvable limit, and (3) gauging the global symmetry, our gauging procedure only requires one-step gauging. This one-step gauging process is very general and allows us to construct various lattice models that host (non-)Abelian fracton orders, which the non-Abelian fractons are constructed from. This one-step gauging process is very general and allows us to construct various lattice models that host (non-)Abelian fractons, e.g., the nearest neighbor interactions and the plaquette around a plaquette $p$ equals $h$. They satisfy

$$A_{g_1}A_{g_2} = A_{g_1g_2}, \quad B_h B_{h_2} = \delta_{h_1h_2} B_{h_1},$$

$$A_g B_h = B_{gh^{-1}} A_g, \quad \sum_h B_h = 1. \quad (1)$$

The pure electric charges are classified by the irreducible representations (irreps) of $G$ in that $A_g$ acts on the Hilbert subspace with a specific charge according to that representations, while $B_h = \delta_{h,e}$ ($e$ is the identity) on this subspace. The pure magnetic fluxes are classified by the conjugacy classes of $G$ in that the Hilbert subspace with a specific flux is generated by the state with $B_h = \delta_{h,g}$, where $g$ runs over all elements of that conjugacy class.

In our one-step gauging procedure, the local gauge transformations can generate a local symmetry $G^{\text{local}}$, which allows us to identify the electric charges (including non-Abelian fractons) with the irreps of $G^{\text{local}}$. In addition, the magnetic excitations together with the local gauge transformations form a subalgebra of the QDMs in the constrained local Hilbert space. This algebraic structure allows us to identify the magnetic excitations with the conjugacy classes of $G^{\text{local}}$. With the one-step gauging, we construct explicitly the underlying local $G^{\text{local}} = S_3, D_4, Z_4$, and $Q_8$ symmetries, by gauging $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}}$, $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}) \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}}$, $1 \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \to G \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}} \to 1$, and $1 \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \to G \to K_4^{\text{glo}} \to 1$, respectively. We further identify charges with the irreps of these symmetries, and the magnetic fluxes with the conjugacy classes of $G^{\text{local}}$ in these systems. These excitations are summarized in Tables I, II, III, and IV.

This paper is organized as follows: In section II, we present the details of the general gauging procedure. In section III, we provide an example of gauging $G = \mathbb{Z}_3^{\text{sub}} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}}$ that produces a new non-Abelian fracton model. In section IV, we provide the example of gauging $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}) \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}}$ that reproduces the non-Abelian fracton in the gauged bilayer X-Cube code[44, 45]. In section V, we reproduce a non-trivial $Z_4$ fracton order which has a hybrid structure discussed in Ref.[51]. In section VI, we construct a new non-Abelian fracton model by gauging a mixed symmetry from a non-trivial extension, $1 \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \to G \to K_4^{\text{glo}} \to 1$. Our gauging procedure is very general, and can be easily generalized to more exotic mixed symmetries. One interesting example will be a generalization of the $\mathbb{Z}_N^{\text{sub}} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}}$, which is related to the continuous field-theoretic approach in Refs. [52–54]. Finally, we summarize our results in section VII.

II. GENERAL GAUGING PROCEDURE

We start with an “ungauged” system, which can be described as consisting purely of the matter degrees of freedom on lattice sites. The ungauged systems is described by $H = H_o + H_n$, where $H_o$ is the onsite terms and $H_n = -\sum_c J_c c + \text{H.c.}$ is the non-onsite couplings with strengths $J_c$. The ungauged Hamiltonian has a symmetry $G$ such that the non-onsite couplings $c$ are the minimal symmetric couplings, e.g., the nearest neighbor interactions and the plaquette
For each of the $G$-invariant minimal couplings $c$ in $H_n$, we define a gauge degree of freedom (DOF) $\tau_c$ with Hilbert space dimension equals the number of distinct eigenvalues of $c$. We label the computational basis of the $\tau_c$ with respect to the eigenvalues of the minimal couplings [61]. These gauge fields $\tau_c$ are placed on the links or plaquettes for the corresponding minimal couplings $c$. We define $\supp c$ to be the set of vertices that $c$ acts on. When all the matter sites are in the same state such that the matter state is the simultaneous eigenstate of all $c$, the corresponding state of all the gauge DOF constitute a natural flat connection, and is denoted by $|0\rangle$.

2. Construct the gauge transformation $A_{v,g}$: On the matter DOF, $A_{v,g}$ acts on the matter DOF on the site $v$ by $g$ as the original symmetry transformation, but leave other matter DOF on other sites unchanged. This action leads to changes of the eigenvalues of the non-onsite couplings $c$. To ensure the system is invariant under the gauge transformation, the gauge DOF must compensate the changes of the eigenvalues of $c$. The gauge transformations need to satisfy $A_{v,g_1}A_{v,g_1} = A_{v,g_2}$ and $[A_{v_1,g_1}, A_{v_2,g_2}] = 0$ when $v_1 \neq v_2$. This means that $G$ is promoted to a local symmetry $G_{\text{local}}$ of the gauged system. We demonstrate a systematical way for construction the gauge transformation in Appendix A [62].

3. Construct the gauge flux: The existence of flux means that the gauge field is “twisted”, which corresponds to the violation of some “relations” that should be satisfied when the connection is flat. Those “relations” come from the dependence between the couplings $c$ in the ungauged system. That is, some of $c$ can be combined (product or sum) to the identity. Similar to the “minimal” coupling, we can find the “minimal” relations consists of local combination of the $c$ on a plaquette or a tube that produce the identity. We denote these relations by $R_r\{\{c\}\} = 1$, where $r$ is the label. We define $\supp r$ to be the union of $\supp c$ for all $c$ in the combination. Then the corresponding flux term is

$$B_r = R_r\{\{Z\}\} \prod_{\supp r' \subseteq \supp r} P_{r'},$$

where $R_r\{\{Z\}\}$ is the relation with $c$ replaced by the computational-basis operators (generalized $Z$) of the corresponding $\tau_r$, and $P_{r'}$ is the projector onto the $B_{r'} = 1$ subspace [63]. These projectors must be included when some smaller $r'$ is contained in the geometry of $r$ to ensure that the final Hamiltonian is gauge invariant [64].

4. Construct the gauged non-onsite terms $H_n(\tau) = - \sum_c J_c c(\tau) + \text{H.c.}$: The gauged coupling is defined to be a gauge-invariant (commutes with all $A_{v,g}$) operator acting on all the matter and gauge DOF within the geometry of $c$, $\supp c(\tau) \subseteq \supp c \cup \{\tau_r' \mid \supp r' \subseteq \supp c\}$. (3)

When the gauge DOF of a state is trivial, $c(\tau)$ reduces to the ungauged coupling $c$:

$$c(\tau) (|m\rangle_{\text{matter}} \otimes |0\rangle_{\text{gauge}}) = (c|m\rangle_{\text{matter}}) \otimes |0\rangle_{\text{gauge}}.$$ (4)

For a general state $|\alpha\rangle$, $c(\tau)|\alpha\rangle$ can be computed by expanding $|\alpha\rangle$ with the computational basis of the gauged DOF. For each term, we use a series of $A_{v,g}$ to rotate the gauge DOF of each term to be $|0\rangle$. We apply (4) to the terms that succeed, and drop the terms that fail.

5. Construct the “electric field” terms $H_e$: The terms are the dynamical part of the gauge fields, which are gauge-invariant operators.

The final gauged Hamiltonian is

$$H_g = H_0 + H_n(\tau) - \sum_r B_r + H_e,$$ (5)

and the physical Hilbert space has the constraint $A_{v,g}|\text{physical}\rangle = |\text{physical}\rangle$. The gauged Hamiltonian $H_g$ has a generalization of the confined-deconfined and the Higgsed-deconfined phase transition [55].

The exactly-solvable limit of the gauged Hamiltonian $H_g$ can be obtained by eliminating the non-onsite couplings and hopping terms of the fluxes. (taking both coupling and the hopping strengths to be vanishing).

$$H_g = H_0 - \sum_r B_r.$$ (6)

If $G$ is a global or subsystem $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry, then the above procedure reproduces the gauging process of Ref. [50]. Also, if $G$ is a global symmetry with the regular representation on the matter on a 2D lattice, then the above procedure gives the
Kitaev G-QDM introduced in Ref. [11] if we eliminate the matter DOF by choosing the unitary gauge. The idea of a semidirect product of global and subsystem symmetry in the continuous quantum field theories appeared in Refs. [52–54]. In the following, we focus on the $H_g$ for $G = \mathbb{Z}_3^{sub} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{glob}$, $G = (\mathbb{Z}_2^{sub} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{sub}) \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{glob}$, 1 → $\mathbb{Z}_2^{sub} \rightarrow G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{glob} \rightarrow 1$, and 1 → $\mathbb{Z}_2^{sub} \rightarrow G \rightarrow K_4^{glob} \rightarrow 1$. In the exactly-solvable limit, these gauged lattice models describe (non-)Abelian fractons.

### III. EXAMPLE: GAUGING $G = \mathbb{Z}_3^{sub} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{glob}$

The system is a three dimensional (3D) cubic lattice with a qutrit (labeled as 0) and a qubit (labeled as 2) on each site, corresponding to the quantum clock matter and the twist defect charge. The Hamiltonian is

$$H_o = -\sum_{\text{sites}} (XI + X^\dagger I + IX),$$

$$H_n = -J_0 \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} |c_0| - J_2 \sum_{\text{links}} |c_2| + \text{H.c.}, \quad (7)$$

where the minimal couplings are

$$|c_0| := \begin{pmatrix} Z[0] & Z^\dagger I \\ Z^\dagger I & ZI \end{pmatrix},$$

$$|c_2| := \begin{pmatrix} IZ \\ IZ \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Here $X$ and $Z$ are the (generalized) Pauli operators, $|\psi\rangle := \langle \psi |\psi\rangle$ is denoted as a projector, and the operators on the first and the second entries on the site act on the qutrit and the qubit, respectively.

The other two directions are represented as

$$|c_0| := \begin{pmatrix} Z[0] & Z^\dagger [1] \\ Z[1] & ZI \end{pmatrix},$$

$$|c_0| := \begin{pmatrix} Z^\dagger I & ZI \\ ZI & Z^\dagger I \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

These graphical notations of operators on the lattice define the minimal couplings and are included in the $\sum_{\text{plaquettes}}$ in $H_n$. All graphical notations in this article will follow these orientations.

$$G = \mathbb{Z}_3^{sub} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{glob}$$

$G = (\mathbb{Z}_2^{sub} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{sub}) \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{glob}$, 1 → $\mathbb{Z}_2^{sub} \rightarrow G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{glob} \rightarrow 1$, and 1 → $\mathbb{Z}_2^{sub} \rightarrow G \rightarrow K_4^{glob} \rightarrow 1$. In the exactly-solvable limit, these gauged lattice models describe (non-)Abelian fractons.

The procedure of gauging works as follows:

1. We put one qubit on each link (corresponds to $c_2$) and one qutrit on each plaquette (corresponds to $c_0$). Denote the clock operators of the qutrits by $X_0$ and $Z_0$, and define $X_1 = X_0^a$, $Z_1 = Z_0^b$ for notational convenience.

2. Based on the general gauging procedure we described in Sec. II.2, the gauge transformations are

$$A_{v,g^{(0)}} = \sum_{a,b,c,d,e,f=0,1}^{a,b,c,d,e,f} |X_{a+b}^\dagger \rangle \langle X_{a+b}|,$$

$$A_{v,g^{(2)}} = \sum_{d,e,f} |X_{a+d}^\dagger \rangle \langle X_{a+d}|,$$

$$S = |0\rangle \langle 0| + |2\rangle \langle 1| + |1\rangle \langle 2|. \quad (10)$$

$S = |0\rangle \langle 0| + |2\rangle \langle 1| + |1\rangle \langle 2|.$

The procedure of gauging works as follows:

1. We put one qubit on each link (corresponds to $c_2$) and one qutrit on each plaquette (corresponds to $c_0$). Denote the clock operators of the qutrits by $X_0$ and $Z_0$, and define $X_1 = X_0^a$, $Z_1 = Z_0^b$ for notational convenience.

2. Based on the general gauging procedure we described in Sec. II.2, the gauge transformations are
There are two types of ways to combine the $c$'s to produce the identity. The first type is the product of four $c_2$ on the links:

$$R_p\{\{c\}\} = \prod_{p \in \text{plaquettes}} R_p = c_2 \cdot c_2 = 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

The corresponding gauge field term is the plaquette operator of the link qubit:

$$B_p = R_p\{\{Z\}\} = \frac{Z}{Z}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

The second type is the tube-like product and sum of the $c_i$'s on the plaquettes (define $c_1 = c_0^1$ for notational convenience.)

$$R_{t,i}(\{c\}) = \sum_{a,b=\{0,1\}} c_{i[a][b]}^{c} c_{i+a} = 1,$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

where $[a] := \frac{1}{2} (c_2 + (-1)^a)$. Here we denote $B_{t,1} = B_{t,0}^\dagger$ and the corresponding field terms are

$$B_{t,i} = R_{t,i}(\{Z\}) \prod_{\text{six faces}} P_p,$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

where $P_p$ is the projector onto the subspace that $B_p = 1$ and $p$ runs over the six faces of the smallest cube containing the tube $t$. One should be notified that the projectors are essential. $B_{t,0} + B_{t,1}$ commutes with all $A_{v,g}$ (so that the Hamiltonian is gauge invariant), but would not do so if we exclude the projectors $P_p$.

4. The gauged couplings are

$$c_0(\tau) := \sum_{a,b,c,d,e=0,1} \left[ \begin{array}{l} a \\ b \\ c \\ d \\ e \end{array} \right], \quad c_2(\tau) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \tau \text{ belongs to plaquette } \{a,b,c,d\}, \\ 0 & \text{else}. \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

Note that in $c_0(\tau)$, the gauge DOF from $c_2$ along the boundary of the plaquette is also included. This is in contrast to gauging pure global or pure subsystem symmetry, in which $c(\tau)$ is simply obtained by combining $c$ with the corresponding $\tau_c$. This reflects the fact that when global and subsystem symmetry is mixed together, the branch cut created by the global part may split the coupling of the subsystem part.

The requirement $b + c + d + e = 0$ in the summation reflects the fact that if there is a $2\pi^2$ flux in the plaquette ($B_p = -1$), then we cannot use $A_{v,g}$ to eliminate all gauge DOF along the plaquette boundary, giving the value 0 for the gauged coupling.

5. The electric field terms are

$$H_e = -g_0 \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} \left( X_0 + X_1 \right) - g_2 \sum_{\text{links}} X,$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

where

$$X = \sum_{a,b,c,d,e=0,1} \left[ \begin{array}{l} a \\ b \\ c \\ d \\ e \end{array} \right], \quad X_0 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \tau \text{ belongs to plaquette } \{a,b,c,d\}, \\ 0 & \text{else}. \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

The decorated $X$ operator ensures the electric field is invariant under the gauge transformation $A_{v,g}$. As in the case of the toric code and the X-Cube code, we can choose the unitary gauge to eliminate the matter DOF. We regard the “physical state” satisfying the constraints as an equivalent class of computational basis state, and choose the representative such that all matter DOF are in the reference state $|00\rangle$. In this case, the
Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_u = - \sum_{v \text{ sites}} \left( A^u_{v,g} (0) + \left( A^u_{v,g} (0) \right)^2 + A^u_{v,g} (2) \right) - \sum_{\ell \text{ tubes}} (B_{\ell,0} + B_{\ell,1}) - \sum_{p \text{ plaquettes}} B_p - \left( J_0 \sum_{p \text{ plaquettes}} \left( Z_0 \cdot P_p + J_2 \sum_{\text{links}} X + \text{H.c.} \right) \right) - g_0 \sum_{p \text{ plaquettes}} \left( \left| X_0 \right| + \left| X_1 \right| \right) - g_2 \sum_{\text{links}} X,$$

(21)

where $A^u_{v,g}$ is the gauge part of $A_{v,g}$ by removing the operation on the center vertex of (11) and (12). The decorated $X$ operator becomes $X$ in the unitary gauge. The Hilbert space contains only the gauge DOF without constraints. The above Hamiltonian $H_u$ describes the pure lattice gauge theory of $Z_3^{\text{sub}} \times Z_2^{\text{glo}}$.

Note that this model can also be constructed in the way similar to Refs. [44, 45] by gauging the charge conjugation symmetry of the $Z_3$ X-Cube code [29]. Also note that the combination of global and subsystem symmetry of this model is similar to the field-theoretic approach in Ref. [52], where the $Z_3^{\text{sub}}$ is the discrete version of $U(1)_{x_3}$ in that paper, with the possible directions of $\Lambda$ restricted by the cubicity of the lattice.

### A. Excitations

In the exactly solvable limit ($J_0 = J_1 = J_2 = g_0 = g_2 = 0$), the system is deeply in the deconfined phase and the fundamental excitations are fully mobile particles, fractons, and strings.

These excitations are

- $[f_0]$: The non-Abelian fracton, corresponding to the excitation of $A^u_{v,g} (0) + \left( A^u_{v,g} (0) \right)^2$ in (21). It is created at the four corners of the membrane operator

$$M^{(m,n)}_{v,i} = \sum_{\{a_m\}, \{b_n\} = 0,1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \ldots 0 \ldots 0 \\ a_{11} \\ \vdots \\ a_{1n} \\ \vdots \\ a_{m1} \ldots a_{mn} \\ b_{01} \ldots b_{0n} \\ \vdots \\ b_{k1} \ldots b_{kn} \\ \vdots \\ b_{0m+1,1} \ldots b_{0m+1,n} \end{bmatrix},$$

(22)

where $v$ is the upper left corner and $i = 0, 1$. Note that

$$A^u_{v,g} (2) M^{(m,n)}_{v,0} |GS\rangle = M^{(m,n)}_{v,1} |GS\rangle,$$

(23)

This means that the fracton created by $M^{(m,n)}_{v,0}$ and $M^{(m,n)}_{v,1}$ belongs to the same superselection sector, so is the same species $[f_0]$. Also note that this membrane operator only work when acting on a state with $B_p = +1$ for all plaquette $p$ on and near (at most one lattice spacing) the membrane.

To show that it is non-Abelian, we consider the following two states

$$|\psi_1\rangle = M^{(L,L)}_{v,0} M^{(2L,2L)}_{v,0} M^{(3L,3L)}_{v,0} |GS\rangle,$$

$$|\psi_2\rangle = M^{(L,L)}_{v,1} M^{(2L,2L)}_{v,1} M^{(3L,3L)}_{v,0} |GS\rangle,$$

(24)

where $L$ is large. The excitation patterns of the two states are both

$$[f_0] - [f_0] - [f_0] - [f_0] - [f_0]$$

$$[f_0] - [f_0]$$

$$[f_0] - [f_0]$$

$$[f_0] - [f_0]$$

$$[f_0] - [f_0]$$

(25)

Now, for the state $|\psi_1\rangle$, the four $[f_0]$'s on the upper left square of (25) can be fused to the vacuum by applying an additional $M^{(L,L)}_{v,0}$. On the other hand, they cannot be fused to the vacuum for $|\psi_2\rangle$. This means that
\[ f_0 \] has non-trivial fusion rules, and therefore is non-Abelian. If we continue this pattern to apply \( n \) \( M_{e,i} \)'s to the ground state, it can be shown that there are asymptotically \( 2^n \) fusion channels, which implies the quantum dimension of \( [f_0] \) is 2.

- \( \phi \): The \( Z_2^{\text{flo}} \) charge, corresponding to the excitation of \( A_{v,g(2)}^u \) in (21). It is an Abelian quasiparticle that can move freely in 3D, created at the end point of the string operator

\[
\ldots Z \ldots Z \ldots \ldots Z \ldots .
\]

- \( \epsilon_{d} \), where \( d = x, y, z \): The non-Abelian lineon constrained to move in the \( d \) direction, corresponding to the excitation of \( B_{t,0} + B_{t,1} \) in (21). It is created at the endpoints of the string operator (the direction of the string is \( d \))

\[
S_{v,t}^{L} = \sum_{\{a_k\} = 0,1} \psi_{L}^{S_{v,t}^{L}} = \frac{1}{\lambda} S_{v,t}^{L}
\]

where \( v \) is the upper left vertex and \( i = 0, 1 \). Similar to \( f_0 \), we have

\[
A_{v,g(2)}^u S_{v,0}^n |GS\rangle = S_{v,1}^n |GS\rangle,
\]

so \( i = 0, 1 \) results in the same species. Also, this string operator only works when acting on a state with \( B_p = +1 \) for all plaquette \( p \) on and near (at most one lattice spacing) this string.

To show that it is non-Abelian, we consider the following two states

\[
|\psi_1\rangle = S_{v,1}^L S_{v,0}^L S_{v,1}^L |GS\rangle,
|\psi_2\rangle = S_{v,1}^L S_{v,0}^L S_{v,0}^L |GS\rangle.
\]

where \( L \) is large. The excitation patterns of the two states are both

\[
[e_d] - [e_d] - [e_d] - [e_d].
\]

Now, for the state \( |\psi_1\rangle \), the two \( [e_d] \)'s on the left of (30) can be fused to the vacuum by applying an additional \( S_{v,0}^L \). On the other hand, they cannot be fused to the vacuum for \( |\psi_2\rangle \). This means that \( [e_d] \) has non-trivial fusion rules, and therefore is non-Abelian. If we continue this pattern to apply \( n \) \( S_{v,i} \)'s to the ground state, it can be shown that there are asymptotically \( 2^n \) fusion channels, which implies the quantum dimension of \( [e_d] \) is 2.

- \( \sigma \): The \( Z_2^{\text{flo}} \) flux, which is a flexible string-like excitation (referred to the \( \sigma \) string) corresponding to the excitation of \( B_p \) in (21). It is created along the boundary of the membrane operator

\[
\sum_{\{a_{ij}\} = 0,1,2, \{c_{ij}\} = 0,1} \psi_{\text{L}^{n}} |\psi_{r} \rangle
\]

where

\[
|\psi_{r} \rangle = X_{0}^{\tilde{\psi}^{(i,j)}} S_{2}^{(i,j)}
\]

\[
\tilde{\psi}^{(i,j)} = a_{1j}(-1)^{b_{1j} + \cdots + b_{i-1,j}} + a_{2j}(-1)^{b_{2j} + \cdots + b_{i-1,j}} + \cdots + a_{i-1,j}(-1)^{b_{i-1,j}}
\]

\[
\tilde{c}^{(i,j)} = a_{1i}(-1)^{c_{1i} + \cdots + c_{i-1,j}} + a_{1i}(-1)^{c_{1i} + \cdots + c_{i-1,j}} + \cdots + a_{i-1,j}(-1)^{c_{i-1,j}}
\]

The projectors on this decorated membrane operator ensures no additional excitations on the membrane. The excitations of \( A_{v,g(0)}^u \) and \( A_{v,g(2)}^u \) are referred to the electric charge excitations. These excitations are local with respect to the vertex \( v \), and can be specified from the local operators which form a representation of \( S_3 \) on the Hilbert space. Hence we can identify electric charges of the
\[ G = \mathbb{Z}_{3}^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_{2}^{\text{glo}} \] fracton model with the irreducible representation of \( G_{\text{local}} \cong S_{3} \) (left panel of Table 1). This identification is the same as the quantum double model (QDM) with \( S_{3} \) symmetry.[11]

In the same spirit as the QDM, the magnetic fluxes would be the conjugacy classes of \( G_{\text{local}} \cong S_{3} \). To construct the corresponding magnetic fluxes in the \( G = \mathbb{Z}_{3}^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_{2}^{\text{glo}} \) fracton model, we first fix a plaquette \( p_{0} \) and a tube \( t_{0} \) adjacent to a chosen vertex \( v_{0} \):

\[ p_{0} = \begin{array}{c}
\text{\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{image}}
\end{array}, \quad t_{0} = \begin{array}{c}
\text{\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{image}}
\end{array} \quad (33) \]

where the constituent of that geometry is indicated with dots. Then we classify the fluxes by different types of excitations of \( B_{p_{0}} \) and/or \( B_{t_{0},t} \). Unlike the QDM, the excitations of \( B_{p_{0}} \) and/or \( B_{t_{0},t} \) inevitably lead to the excitations of \( B_{p} \) and/or \( B_{t_{0},t} \) of some other \( p \) or \( t \). Due to the geometry of the tube excitations \( B_{t_{0},t} \) and the plaquette excitation \( B_{p_{0}} \) are incomparable, a direct analogy to the magnetic fluxes in the QDM seems not possible. Nevertheless, we impose the constraints on the Hilbert space to make such possibility possible. Define the projectors on this cube adjacent to \( v_{0} \):

\[ P_{\text{side}} = \begin{array}{c}
\text{\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{image}}
\end{array}, \quad P_{\text{corner}} = \begin{array}{c}
\text{\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{image}}
\end{array} \quad (34) \]

Imposing the constraint \( P_{\text{side}} = 1 \) means there should be no \( \mathbb{Z}_{2}^{\text{glo}} \) flux through the upper, lower, left, and right faces of the cube. This means that if there is \( \mathbb{Z}_{2}^{\text{glo}} \) flux through the front face (\( B_{p_{0}} = -1 \)), it must come out from the back face. Equivalently, if there is a loop-like excitation going through our region of discussion, the region must be at the side of the loop. On the other hand, imposing \( P_{\text{corner}} = 1 \) means there should be no \( \mathbb{Z}_{2}^{\text{glo}} \) flux through the upper, lower, right, and back faces of the cube. This means that if there is \( \mathbb{Z}_{2}^{\text{glo}} \) flux through the front face (\( B_{p_{0}} = -1 \)), it must come out from the left face. Equivalently, if there is a loop-like excitation going through our region of discussion, the region must be at the corner of the loop. Here, we emphasize again that the plaquette excitation \( B_{p_{0}} \) can be either at the side of the \( \sigma \) string which is specified by the protector \( P_{\text{side}} = 1 \), or at the corner of the \( \sigma \) string which is specified by the protector \( P_{\text{corner}} = 1 \).

For either \( P_{\text{side}} = 1 \) or \( P_{\text{corner}} = 1 \), the flux operators can be mapped to a subalgebra of the QDM algebra as follows

\[ B_{p_{0}} \rightarrow B_{c} + B_{g^{(0)}} + B_{g^{(2)}} \]
\[ - B_{g^{(2)}} - B_{g^{(0)2}} - B_{g^{(2)2}} \]
\[ B_{t_{0},0} \rightarrow B_{c} + e^{\frac{i\pi}{3}} B_{g^{(0)2}} + e^{\frac{i\pi}{3}} B_{g^{(0)2}} \]
\[ B_{t_{0},1} \rightarrow B_{c} + e^{-\frac{i\pi}{3}} B_{g^{(0)2}} + e^{\frac{i\pi}{3}} B_{g^{(0)2}}, \quad (35) \]

where \( B_{g} \) is the QDM flux operator in Eq. (1). We can also identify the star operators \( A_{\text{g},g} \) with the QDM star operator \( A_{g} \) Eq. (1). The map of \( A_{s} \) and \( B_{s} \)’s together forms an injective algebra homomorphism into the QDM algebra. In particular, they satisfy the relations (note that all the \( B_{s} ")’s commute)

\[ B_{p_{0}}^{2} = 1, \quad B_{t_{0},0}^{2} = B_{t_{0},1}, \quad B_{t_{0},0}^{3} = B_{t_{0},1}^{3} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + B_{p_{0}}), \]
\[ B_{p_{0}} B_{t_{0},i} = B_{t_{0},i+1} = 0, \quad i = 0, 1, \]
\[ A_{g} B_{p_{0}} = B_{p_{0}} A_{g}, \quad A_{g} B_{t_{0},i} = B_{t_{0},i} A_{g}, \quad \forall g \in S_{3}, \quad i = 0, 1. \quad (36) \]

In this way, the star and the flux operator of this fracton models is identified with a subalgebra of that of the corresponding QDM.

Note that this subalgebra is enough to distinguish all of the conjugacy classes of \( S_{3} \) (more rigorously, if a state is the eigenstate of \( B_{g_{0}} = 1, B_{g} = 0, g \neq g_{0} \) for some \( g_{0} \) in \( S_{3} \), then we can determine the conjugacy class of \( g_{0} \) only by the eigenvalues of the image of \( B_{p_{0}} \) or \( B_{t_{0},i} \)). This allows us to identify the fluxes of this fracton model with the conjugacy classes of \( S_{3} \).

The corresponding fluxes are listed in the right panel of Table 1.

IV. EXAMPLE: GAUGING \( G = (\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_{2}^{\text{sub}}) \times \mathbb{Z}_{2}^{\text{glo}} \)

The system is a 3D cubic lattice with 3 qubits (labeled as 0, 1, 2) on each site. 0 and 1 labels are corresponding to the Ising spin of the first layer and the second layer. 2 label is the twist defect charge in Refs. [44, 45]. The Hamiltonian is

\[ H_{g} = - h \sum_{\text{sites}} (XII + IIX + IIX), \]
\[ H_{n} = - J_{0} \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} \left| c_{0} \right| - J_{1} \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} \left| c_{1} \right| - J_{2} \sum_{\text{links}} \left| c_{2} \right|, \quad (37) \]

where the minimal couplings are

\[ c_{1} := \begin{pmatrix}
ZI[0] & ZII & IZ[1] & IZI
\end{pmatrix}, \quad ZII
\]
\[ c_{1} := \begin{pmatrix}
ZI[1] & ZII & IZ[0] & IZI
\end{pmatrix}, \quad ZII
\]
\[ c_{1} := \begin{pmatrix}
IZ[0] & IZI & ZII & IZI
\end{pmatrix}, \quad IZI
\]
\[ c_{1} := \begin{pmatrix}
IZ[1] & IZI & ZII & IZI
\end{pmatrix}, \quad IZI
\]
\[ c_{1} := \begin{pmatrix}
IZI & IZI & ZII & IZI
\end{pmatrix}, \quad IZI
\]
Here $X$ and $Z$ are the Pauli operators, $|\psi\rangle := |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$ is denoted as a projector, and the operators on the first, second, and third entries on the site act on the Ising spin on the first layer, the Ising spin on the second layer, and the twist defect charge, respectively.

$$G = (\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^\text{glo}$$

is generated by $g^{(1)}_P$ and $g^{(2)}$, where $g^{(1)}_P$ acts on the matter by flipping (apply $X$) the $i$th qubit ($i = 0, 1$) on each site of a shifted coordinate plane $P$; $g^{(2)}$ acts on the matter by flipping the 3rd qubit and swapping the first two qubits on each site of the entire system. That is

$$g^{(0)}_P = \prod_{\text{sites } (a)} X, \quad g^{(1)}_P = \prod_{\text{sites } (a)} IX, \quad g^{(2)} = \prod_{\text{sites } (all)} \text{SWAP} X.$$

The procedure of gauging works as follows:

1. We put one qubit on each link (corresponds to $c_2$) and two qubits on each plaquette (corresponds to $c_0$ and $c_1$, and labeled by 0 and 1). These qubits are the gauge fields.

2. Based on the general gauging procedure we described in Sec. II.2 [details are demonstrated in Appendix A1], the gauge transformations are

$$A_{v,g^{(2)}} = \begin{pmatrix} S_{01} & X & X S_{01} \\ X & X & X \\ X & S_{01} & X \end{pmatrix}.$$  

(41)

where $v$ in $A_{v,g}$ indicates the site in the center. The $S_{01}$ is the shorthand notation for the SWAP operator. The $X_i$, $i = 0, 1$ on the center of the plaquette defined as $X_0 = XI$ and $X_1 = IX$, where the first and second entries refer to the layer indices. One should be notified that $i$ in $X_i$ is integer modulo two. On the other hand, the $X$ and $[a]$ on the link refer to the operators on the gauge field with respect to the twist defect charge. The gauge transformations for other $g$ can be obtained by $A_{v,g^{(0)}_2} = A_{v,g^{(1)}} A_{v,g^{(2)}}$ from the above two cases. Note that they generate a local $(\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \cong D_4$ symmetry for the gauged system:

$$G^\text{local} = \left\{ g^{(0)}_i, g^{(1)}_i, g^{(2)}_i \mid (g^{(i)})^2 = 1, \right.$$ 

$$g^{(0)}_i g^{(2)}_i = g^{(2)}_i g^{(1)}_i \right\} \cong D_4. \quad (42)$$

3. There are two types of ways to combine the $c$’s to produce the identity. The first type is the product of four $c_2$ on the links:

$$R_p(\{c\}) = c_2 \cdot \cdots c_2 = 1, \quad p \in \text{plaquettes}. \quad (43)$$

The corresponding gauge field term is the plaquette operator of the link qubit:

$$B_p = R_p(\{Z\}) = \begin{vmatrix} Z & 1 \\ -1 & Z \end{vmatrix}. \quad (44)$$
The electric field terms are

\[ H_e = -g_0 \sum_{p \text{ plaquettes}} \left( |X_0\rangle + |X_1\rangle \right) - g_2 \sum_{\text{links}} |X\rangle \]

where

\[ R_{t,i}(\{c\}) = \sum_{a,b=0,1} [a]_c c_i c_{i+a} c_{i+b} c_{i+a+b} , \]

and

\[ B_{t,i} = R_{t,i}(\{Z\}) \prod_{\text{six faces}} P_p \]

where \( P_p \) is the projector onto the subspace that \( B_p = 1 \) and \( p \) runs over the six faces of the smallest cube containing the tube \( t \). One should be notified that the projectors are essential. \( B_{t,0} + B_{t,1} \) commutes with all \( A_{v,g} \) (so that the Hamiltonian is gauge invariant), but would not do so if we exclude the projectors \( P_p \).

4. The gauged coupling terms are

\[ c_0(\tau) = \sum_{a,b,c,d,e=0,1} Z_a a \begin{bmatrix} b \end{bmatrix} Z_{a+b} a \begin{bmatrix} c \end{bmatrix} , \]

\[ c_1(\tau) = \sum_{a,b,c,d,e=0,1} Z_{a+c+1} b \begin{bmatrix} e \end{bmatrix} Z_a a \begin{bmatrix} d \end{bmatrix} - Z_{a+b+c} , \]

\[ c_2(\tau) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} Z \end{bmatrix} . \]

Note that in \( c_0(\tau) \) and \( c_1(\tau) \), the gauge DOF from \( c_2 \) along the boundary of the plaquette is also included. This is in contrast to gauging pure global or pure subsystem symmetry, in which \( c_2(\tau) \) is simply obtained by combining \( c \) with the corresponding \( \tau \). This reflects the fact that when global and subsystem symmetry is mixed together, the branch cut created by the global part may split the coupling of the subsystem part. In this case, we need to trace the switching of the layer index created by the branch cut along the plaquette.

5. The electric field terms are

\[ H_e = -g_0 \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} \left( |X_0\rangle + |X_1\rangle \right) - g_2 \sum_{\text{links}} |X\rangle \]

The decorated \( \tilde{X} \) operator ensures the electric field is invariant under the gauge transformation \( A_{v,g} \). As in the case of the toric code and the X-Cube code, we can choose the unitary gauge to eliminate the matter DOF. We regard the “physical state” satisfying the constraints as an equivalent class of computational basis state, and choose the representative such that all matter DOF are in the reference state \( |000\rangle \). In this case, the Hamiltonian becomes

\[ H_a = - \sum_{\text{v sites}} \left( A_{v,g,0} + A_{v,g,1} + A_{v,g,2} \right) \]

\[ - \sum_{\text{tubes}} (B_{t,0} + B_{t,1}) - \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} B_p \]

\[ - \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} \left( J_0 |X_0\rangle + J_1 |X_1\rangle \right) P_p - J_2 \sum_{\text{links}} \]

\[ - g_0 \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} \left( |X_0\rangle + |X_1\rangle \right) - g_2 \sum_{\text{links}} \]

and the Hilbert space contains only the gauge DOF without constraints. The above Hamiltonian \( H_a \) describes the pure lattice gauge theory of \( (\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}) \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}} \).
A. Excitations

In the exactly solvable limit \((J_0 = J_1 = J_2 = g_0 = g_2 = 0)\), the system is deeply in the deconfined phase and the fundamental excitations are fully mobile particles, fractons, and strings. These excitations are

- \([f_0]\): The non-Abelian fracton, corresponding to the excitation of the first term in (50). It is created at the four corners of the membrane operator

\[
M'_{v,i}^{(m,n)} = \sum_{\{a_k\}, \{b_k\} = 0, 1} [-a_{11}] \cdots [-a_{1n}] Z_i \cdots Z_i + a_{11} + \cdots + a_{1n} \cdots \cdots [a_{m1}] \cdots [a_{m,n}] Z_i \cdots Z_i + a_{m1} + \cdots + a_{m,n}.
\]  

(51)

where \(v\) is the upper left corner and \(i = 0, 1\). Note that

\[
A^u_{v,g(2)} M'_{v,0}^{(m,n)}|GS\rangle = M'_{v,1}^{(m,n)}|GS\rangle,
\]

(52)

where \(A^u_{v,g(2)}\) is the summand of the second term of (50) centered at \(v\). This means that the fracton created by \(M_{v,0}^{(m,n)}\) and \(M_{v,1}^{(m,n)}\) belongs to the same superselection sector, so is the same species \([f_0]\). Also note that this membrane operator only work when acting on a state with \(B_p = +1\) for all plaquette \(p\) on and near (at most one lattice spacing) the membrane.

To show that it is non-Abelian, we consider the following two states

\[
|\psi_1\rangle = M_{v,0}^{(L,L)} M_{v,0}^{(2L,2L)} M_{v,0}^{(3L,3L)} |GS\rangle
\]

\[
|\psi_2\rangle = M_{v,0}^{(L,L)} M_{v,0}^{(2L,2L)} M_{v,1}^{(3L,3L)} |GS\rangle
\]

(53)

where \(L\) is large. The excitation patterns of the two states are both

\[
[f_0] \cdots [f_0] \cdots [f_0] \cdots [f_0] \cdots [f_0] \cdots [f_0] \cdots [f_0] \cdots [f_0]
\]

(54)

Now, for the state \(|\psi_1\rangle\), the four \([f_0]\)'s on the upper left square of (54) can be fused to the vacuum by applying an additional \(M_{v,0}^{(L,L)}\). On the other hand, they cannot be fused to the vacuum for \(|\psi_2\rangle\). This means that \([f_0]\) has non-trivial fusion rules, and therefore is non-Abelian. If we continue this pattern to apply \(n\) \(M_{v,i}\)'s to the ground state, it can be shown that there are asymptotically \(2^n\) fusion channels, which implies the quantum dimension of \([f_0]\) is 2.

- \(\phi\): The \(Z^{g_{0}}\) charge, corresponding to the second term in (50). It is an Abelian quasiparticle that can move freely in 3D, created at the end point of the string operator

\[
\cdots Z \cdots Z \cdots \cdots Z 
\]

(55)

- \([\epsilon_d]\), where \(d = x, y, z\): The non-Abelian linecon constrained to move in the \(d\) direction, corresponding to the third term in (50). It is created at the endpoints of the string operator (the direction of the string is \(d\))

\[
S_{v,i}^L = \sum_{\{a_k\} = 0, 1} [-a_{1}] \cdots [-a_{n}]
\]

(56)

where \(v\) is the upper left vertex and \(i = 0, 1\). Similar to \([f_0]\), we have

\[
A^u_{v,g(2)} S_{v,0}^n |GS\rangle = S_{v,1}^n |GS\rangle,
\]

(57)

so \(i = 0, 1\) results in the same species. Also, this string operator only works when acting on a state with \(B_p = +1\) for all plaquette \(p\) on and near (at most one lattice spacing) this string.
To show that it is non-Abelian, we consider the following two states

\[
|\psi_1\rangle = S_{v,0}^{\ell} S_{v,0}^{2\ell} S_{v,0}^{3\ell} |GS\rangle
\]

\[
|\psi_2\rangle = S_{v,0}^{\ell} S_{v,1}^{\ell} S_{v,0}^{3\ell} |GS\rangle,
\]

where \( L \) is large. The excitation patterns of the two states are both

\[
[e_d] - [e_d] - [e_d] - [e_d] - [e_d].
\]

Now, for the state \( |\psi_1\rangle \), the two \([e_d]\)'s on the left of (59) can be fused to the vacuum by applying an additional \( S_{v,0}^{\ell} \). On the other hand, they cannot be fused to the vacuum for \( |\psi_2\rangle \). This means that \([e_d]\) has non-trivial fusion rules, and therefore is non-Abelian. If we continue this pattern to apply \( n \) \( S_{v,0}^{\ell} \)'s to the ground state, it can be shown that there are asymptotically \( 2^n \) fusion channels, which implies the quantum dimension of \([e_d]\) is 2.

- \( \sigma \): The \( \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}} \) flux, which is a flexible string-like excitation (referred to the \( \sigma \) string) corresponding to the fourth term in (50). It is created along the boundary of the membrane operator

\[
\sum_{\{a_{ij}, \{b_{ij}\} = 0,1}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\tilde{X}^{(11)} & \tilde{X}^{(12)} & \cdots & \tilde{X}^{(1n)} \\
[a_{11} b_{11}] & \cdots & [a_{1n} b_{1n}] \\
\tilde{X}^{(21)} & \tilde{X}^{(22)} & \cdots & \tilde{X}^{(2n)} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\tilde{X}^{(m1)} & \tilde{X}^{(m2)} & \cdots & \tilde{X}^{(mn)} \\
[a_{m1} b_{m1}] & \cdots & [a_{mn} b_{mn}] \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\tilde{X}^{(ij)} = a_{ij} + b_{ij} + \cdots + a_{i-1,j} + b_{i-1,j}
\]

\[
\tilde{X}^{(ij)} = a_{i1} + b_{i1} + \cdots + a_{i,j-1} + b_{i,j-1}
\]

where

\[
\tilde{X}^{(ij)} = (X_0 X_1)^{\tilde{e}^{(ij)}} S_2
\]

\[
\tilde{e}^{(ij)} = a_{ij} + b_{ij} + \cdots + a_{i-1,j} + b_{i-1,j}
\]

\[
\tilde{e}^{(ij)} = a_{i1} + b_{i1} + \cdots + a_{i,j-1} + b_{i,j-1}
\]

The projectors on this decorated membrane operator ensures no additional excitations on the membrane.

- \( f_0^{(0)} f_0^{(1)} \): the composite Abelian fracton created at the four corners of \( M_{v,0}^{(m,n)} M_{v,1}^{(m,n)} \).

- \( e_d^{(0)} e_d^{(1)} \): the composite Abelian lineon created by the two ends of \( S_{v,0}^{n} S_{v,1}^{n} \).

The excitations of \( A_{v,g}^{(0)} \), \( A_{v,g}^{(1)} \), and \( A_{v,g}^{(2)} \) are referred to the electric charge excitations. These excitations are local with respect to the vertex \( v \), and can be specified from the local operators which form a representation of \( D_4 \) on the Hilbert space. Hence we can identify electric charges of the \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}} \) fracton model with the irreducible representation of \( D_4 \) (left panel of Table II). This identification is the same as the quantum double model (QDM) with \( D_4 \) symmetry [11].

In the same spirit as the QDM, the magnetic fluxes would be the conjugacy classes of \( G^{\text{local}} \cong D_4 \). To construct the corresponding magnetic fluxes in the \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}} \) fracton model, we first fix a plaquette \( p_0 \) and a tube \( t_0 \) adjacent to a chosen vertex \( v_0 \):

\[
p_0 = v_0, \quad t_0 = v_0
\]

where the constituent of that geometry is indicated with dots. Then we classify the fluxes by different types of excitations of \( B_{p_0} \) and/or \( B_{t_0,i} \). Unlike the QDM, the excitations of \( B_{p_0} \) and/or \( B_{t_0,i} \) inevitably leads to the excitations of \( B_p \) and/or \( B_{t,i} \) of some other \( p \) or \( t \). Due to the geometry of the tube excitations \( B_{t_0,i} \) and the plaquette excitation \( B_{p_0} \) are incompressible, a direct analogy to the magnetic fluxes in the QDM seems not possible. Nevertheless, we impose the constraints on the Hilbert space to make such correspondence possible.
Define the projectors on this cube adjacent to \( v_0 \):

\[
P_{\text{side}} = \begin{pmatrix}
  P_p & & & \\
  & P_p & & \\
  & & P_p & \\
  & & & P_p
\end{pmatrix}, \quad P_{\text{corner}} = 
\begin{pmatrix}
  P_p & & & & & \\
  & P_p & & & & \\
  & & P_p & & & \\
  & & & P_p & & \\
  & & & & P_p & \\
  & & & & & P_p
\end{pmatrix}
\]  

(63)

Imposing the constraint \( P_{\text{side}} = 1 \) means there should be no \( \mathbb{Z}_2^\text{glo} \) flux through the upper, lower, left, and right faces of the cube. This means that if there is \( \mathbb{Z}_2^\text{glo} \) flux through the front face (\( B_{p_0} = -1 \)), it must come out from the back face. Equivalently, if there is a loop-like excitation going through our region of discussion, the region must be at the side of the loop. On the other hand, imposing \( P_{\text{corner}} = 1 \) means there should be no \( \mathbb{Z}_2^\text{glo} \) flux through the upper, lower, right, and back faces of the cube. This means that if there is \( \mathbb{Z}_2^\text{glo} \) flux through the front face (\( B_{p_0} = -1 \)), it must come out from the left face. Equivalently, if there is a loop-like excitation going through our region of discussion, the region must be at the corner of the loop. Here, we emphasize again that the plaquette excitation \( B_{p_0} \) can be either at the side of the \( \sigma \) string which is specified by the protector \( P_{\text{side}} = 1 \), or at the corner of the \( \sigma \) string which is specified by the protector \( P_{\text{corner}} = 1 \).

For either \( P_{\text{side}} = 1 \) or \( P_{\text{corner}} = 1 \), the flux operators can be mapped to a subalgebra of the QDM algebra as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
B_{p_0} &\rightarrow B_e + B_{g(0)} + B_{g(1)} + B_{g(0)g(1)} \\
&- B_{g(2)} - B_{g(0)g(2)} - B_{g(1)g(2)} - B_{g(0)g(1)g(2)}, \\
B_{t_{0,0}} &\rightarrow B_e - B_{g(0)} + B_{g(1)} - B_{g(0)g(1)}, \\
B_{t_{0,1}} &\rightarrow B_e + B_{g(0)} - B_{g(1)} - B_{g(0)g(1)},
\end{align*}
\]  

(64)

where \( B_g \) is the QDM flux operator in Eq. (1). We can also identify the star operators \( A_{v_0}^{A_{v_0}g} \) with the QDM star operator \( A_g \) Eq. (1). The map of \( A' \)’s and \( B' \)’s together forms an injective algebra homomorphism into the QDM algebra. In particular, they satisfy the relations (note that all the \( B' \)’s commute)

\[
\begin{align*}
B_{p_0}^2 &= 1, \quad B_{t_{0,0},0}^2 = B_{t_{0,1},1}^2 = \frac{1}{2}(1 + B_{p_0}), \\
B_{p_0}B_{t_{0,i}} = B_{t_{0,i}}B_{p_0}, &\quad i = 0, 1, \\
B_{p_0}B_{t_{0,0}}B_{t_{0,1}} = B_{t_{0,0}}B_{t_{0,1}}, \\
&\quad \forall g \in D_4, i = 0, 1, \\
A_gB_{p_0} = B_{p_0}A_g, &\quad \forall g \in D_4, \\
&\quad \forall g \in D_4, i = 0, 1, \\
&\quad g = g^{(2)}, g^{(0)}g^{(2)}, g^{(1)}g^{(2)}, g^{(0)g(1)}g^{(2)}, \quad i = 0, 1. 
\end{align*}
\]  

(65)

In this way, the star and the flux operator of this fracton model is identified with a subalgebra of that of the corresponding QDM.

Unlike the \( S_3 \) case, this subalgebra is not enough to distinguish all of the conjugacy classes of \( D_4 \), since \( (g^{(2)}, g^{(0)}g^{(2)}) \) and \( (1, B_{t_{0,i}}) \) both correspond to \( B_{p_0} = -1, B_{t_{0,0}} = B_{t_{0,1}} = 0 \). To avoid this situation, we define another flux operator which does not exist in the original Hamiltonian

\[
B_{t_{0,2}} = \begin{pmatrix}
  ZZ & & & \\
  & ZZ & & \\
  & & ZZ & \\
  & & & ZZ
\end{pmatrix} \cdot (1 - P_{p_0}).
\]  

(66)

This flux operator is interpreted as a tube operator wrapping around \( \ell \) twice as \( B_{t_{0,0}}B_{t_{1,1}} \) when \( B_{p_0} = -1 \) (the front plaquette). Then we have the additional correspondence

\[
B_{t_{0,2}} \mapsto B_g^{(2)} - B_{g(0)g(2)} - B_{g(1)g(2)} + B_{g(0)g(1)g(2)},
\]  

(67)

and additional relations

\[
\begin{align*}
B_{t_{0,2}}^2 &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - B_{p_0}), \quad B_{p_0}B_{t_{0,2}} = -B_{t_{0,2}}, \\
B_{t_{0,0}}B_{t_{0,1}}B_{t_{0,2}} = 0, \quad &\quad A_gB_{t_{0,2}} = B_{t_{0,2}}A_g, \quad \forall g \in D_4. 
\end{align*}
\]  

(68)

After including \( B_{t_{0,2}} \), this subalgebra is enough to distinguish all of the conjugacy classes of \( D_4 \). To be more precise, if a state is the eigenstate of \( B_{p_0} = 1, B_{t_{0,i}} = 0, g \neq g_0 \) for some \( g_0 \in D_4 \), then we can determine the conjugacy class of \( g_0 \) only by the eigenvalues of the image of \( B_{p_0} \) and \( B_{t_{0,i}} \). This allows us to identify the fluxes of this fracton model with the conjugacy classes of \( D_4 \). The corresponding fluxes is in the right panel of Table II.
V. EXAMPLE: GAUGING $1 \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \to G \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glob}} \to 1$

The system is a 3D cubic lattice with a $d = 4$ qudit on each site. The Hamiltonian is

$$H_0 = - \sum_{\text{sites}} (1 + X + X^2 + X^3),$$

$$H_n = -J_0 \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} c_0 - J_1 \sum_{\text{links}} c_1 + \text{H.c.},$$

where the minimal couplings are

$$c_0 := f \left( \frac{c_0}{Z} \right), \quad c_0 = \begin{bmatrix} Z \hline Z^\dagger \end{bmatrix}$$

$$c_1 := \frac{Z^2}{Z^2}.$$ (70)

where $f(1) = f(i) = 1$, $f(-1) = f(-i) = -1$. The construction of this function $f$, along with another choice of the coupling terms which are more similar to the previous cases, is discussed in Appendix B. Although $c_0$ is not a coupling in $H_n$, it can be obtained from $c_0$ and $c_1$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{c}_0 \end{bmatrix} = \sqrt{\frac{c_0}{c_1}}.$$ (71)

where the square root takes the eigenvalue $-1$ of the operator inside it to $+i$.

$G$ is generated by $g_{p}^{(0)}$ and $g^{(1)}$, where

$$g_{p}^{(0)} = \prod_{s \in P} X^2, \quad g^{(1)} = \prod_{s \in \text{all}} X.$$ (72)

Note that $g_p^{(0)}$’s generate a normal subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}$ of $G$, but $G$ is not a semidirect product of this $\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}$ with $G/\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glob}}$. Nevertheless, $G$ can still be presented as the group extension

$$1 \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \to G \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glob}} \to 1.$$ (73)

In the notation of Ref. [51], this symmetry is called $(\mathbb{Z}_4, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. The procedure of gauging works as follows:

1. We put one qubit on each link (corresponds to $c_1$) and one qubit on each plaquette (corresponds to $c_0$). Although we do not view $c_0$ as a minimal coupling term in $H_n$ and therefore do not put the corresponding gauge qudit, we can still define the “dressed $Z$” operator associated with $\tilde{c}_0$ on the plaquettes, which acts on the gauge qubits on both the plaquettes and the links:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Z} \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} Z \hline \sqrt{Z} \end{bmatrix}. $$ (74)

In addition, we define the “dressed $X$” operator associated to the link

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{X} \end{bmatrix} := \sum_{a,b,c=0,1} \begin{bmatrix} X \hline b+c \end{bmatrix}.$$ (75)

They satisfy the commutation relations

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Z} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{X} \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{X} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Z} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Z} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{X} \end{bmatrix} = +i \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{X} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Z} \end{bmatrix},$$

and all other combinations commute.

2. Based on the general gauging procedure we described in Sec. II.2, the gauge transformations are

$$A_{v,g^{(1)}} = \begin{bmatrix} X \hline X^\dagger \end{bmatrix}.$$ (76)

$$A_{v,g^{(0)}} = A_{v,g^{(1)}}^2 = \begin{bmatrix} X \hline X \end{bmatrix}.$$ (77)

Note that these generate a local $\mathbb{Z}_4$ symmetry for the gauged system:

$$G^{\text{local}} = \left\langle g^{(0)} \right| \left( g^{(0)} \right)^4 = 1 \right\rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_4.$$ (78)

We will denote $(g^{(0)})^n$ simply by $n$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, 3$, as the usual notation for $\mathbb{Z}_4$. 

There are two types of ways to combine the $c$'s to produce the identity. The first type is the product of four $c_1$ on the links:

$$R_p(\{c\}) = \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & 0 \\ 0 & c_1 \end{pmatrix} = 1, \quad p \in \text{plaquettes} \quad (80)$$

The corresponding gauge field term is the plaquette operator of the link qubit.

$$B_p = R_p(\{Z\}) = \prod_{\text{six faces}} Z \prod_{\text{plaquettes}} P_p \quad (81)$$

The second type is the tube-like product of $\tilde{c}_0$

$$R_t(\{c\}) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{c}_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{c}_0 \end{pmatrix} = 1, \quad t \in \text{tubes}, \quad (82)$$

The corresponding field term is

$$B_t = R_t(\{Z\}) \prod_{\text{six faces}} P_p \quad (83)$$

Note that, unlike the non-Abelian cases, the projectors $P_p$ are not necessary. This is because that $R_t(\{Z\})$ commutes with all $A_{v,g}$.

4. The gauged couplings are

$$[c_0(\tau)] := \tilde{f} \left( \begin{array}{c} Z \\ Z \end{array} \right) = \prod_{\text{six faces}} P_p \quad (84)$$

Again, in this case the projector $P_p$ is not necessary.

5. The electric field terms are

$$H_e = -g_0 \sum_{p \text{ plaquettes}} \left[ X \right] - g_1 \sum_{\text{links}} \left( \chi + \chi^\dagger \right) \quad (85)$$

As in the case of the toric code and the X-Cube code, we can choose the unitary gauge to eliminate the matter DOF. We regard the “physical state” satisfying the constraints as an equivalent class of computational basis state, and choose the representative such that all matter DOF are in the reference state $|0\rangle$. In this case, the Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_a = - \sum_{v \text{ sites}} \left( 1 + A_{v,g(1)}^u + A_{v,g(2)}^u + A_{v,g(1)}^v \right) \cdot \prod_{p \text{ plaquettes}} B_p$$

$$- \sum_{t \text{ tubes}} \left( B_t + B_t^\dagger \right) - \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} B_{p}$$

$$- \left( J_0 \sum_{p \text{ plaquettes}} \left( \sum_{\text{links}} \left( \hat{Z} \right) + J_1 \sum_{\text{links}} \hat{Z} + \text{H.c.} \right) \right)$$

$$- g_0 \sum_{p \text{ plaquettes}} \left( \chi + \chi^\dagger \right) \quad (86)$$

and the Hilbert space contains only the gauge DOF without constraints. The above Hamiltonian $H_a$ describes the pure lattice gauge theory of $G$. Note that if we replace $X^{(1)}$ and $Z^{(1)}$ by the usual Pauli operators $X$ and $Z$ on the corresponding links and plaquettes, the resulting model will be just the tensor product of an X-cube code and a 3D toric code.

A. Excitations

In the exactly solvable limit ($J_0 = J_1 = g_0 = g_1 = 0$), the system is deeply in the deconfined phase and the fundamental excitations are fully mobile particles, fractons, and strings. These excitations are

- $e$: The Abelian fracton, corresponding to the excitation of the first line of $(86)$, with the eigenvalues of the four terms being $1, i, -1$ and $i$, respectively. It is created at the upper left and lower right corners of the membrane operator

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
\tilde{Z} & \cdots & \tilde{Z} & \tilde{Z} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\tilde{Z} & \cdots & \tilde{Z} & \tilde{Z} \\
\tilde{Z} & \cdots & \tilde{Z} & \tilde{Z}
\end{array} \quad (87)$$

with its antiparticle $e^3$ created at the upper right and the lower left corner.

- $e^2$: The combination of two $e$’s, which is an Abelian fully mobile particle. It corresponds to the excitation of the first line, with the eigenvalues of the four terms being $1, -1, 1$ and $-1$, respectively. In addition to be created at the edge of the square of the membrane for $e$, it can also be created at the endpoints of the string operator:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
-Z & -Z & \cdots & -Z & -Z \\
\end{array} \quad (88)$$

Indeed, the square of the membrane for $e$ is just two copies of this string, one at the top and one at the bottom of the membrane.
• $m$: The flexible string-like excitation corresponding to the excitation $B_p = -1$. It is created at the boundary of the membrane operator

$$\tilde{X}^i \tilde{X}^i \cdots (89)$$

$$\tilde{X}^i \tilde{X}^i \cdots (90)$$

Note that this membrane also excites the $B_t$ operators. If we look at the $R_t((Z))$ (without the projectors), the excitation has eigenvalues $\pm i$ at the corners of the membrane, but still have 1 otherwise. The $m^2$ string can be created by the similar membrane operator with replacing $\tilde{X} \rightarrow \tilde{X}^1$.

• $m^2$, where $d = x, y, z$: The Abelian lineon constrained to move in the $d$ direction, corresponding to the excitation having $B_t = -1$. It is created at the endpoints of the string operator (the direction of the string is $d$)

$$\begin{array}{c}
X \\
X \\
\ldots \\
X \\
X 
\end{array} (90)$$

It is also created at the corners of the square of the membrane for $m$.

The excitations of $A^a_{v,0(1)}$, $A^a_{v,g(0)}$, and $(A^a_{v,g(1)})^\dagger$ are referred to the electric charge excitations. These excitations are local with respect to the vertex $v$, and can be specified from the local operators which form a representation of $Z_4$ on the Hilbert space. Hence we can identify electric charges of the $G$ fracton model with the irreducible representation of $G_{\text{local}} \cong Z_4$ (left panel of Table III). This identification is the same as the quantum double model (QDM) with $Z_4$ symmetry[11].

In the same spirit as the QDM, the magnetic fluxes would be the conjugacy classes of $G_{\text{local}} \cong Z_4$, that is, elements of $Z_4$. To construct the corresponding magnetic fluxes in the $1 \rightarrow Z_2^{\text{sub}} \rightarrow G \rightarrow Z_2^{\text{glob}} \rightarrow 1$ fracton model, we first fix a plauette $p_0$ and a tube $t_0$ adjacent to a chosen vertex $v_0$:

$$p_0 = \begin{array}{c}
\bullet \\
\bullet \\
\bullet \\
\bullet \\
\bullet \\
\end{array}, \quad t_0 = \begin{array}{c}
\bullet \\
\bullet \\
\bullet \\
\bullet \\
\bullet \\
\end{array} (91)$$

where the constituent of that geometry is indicated with dots. Then we classify the fluxes by different types of excitations of $B_{p_0}$ and/or $B_{t_0}$. Unlike the QDM, the excitations of $B_{p_0}$ and/or $B_{t_0}$ inevitably leads to the excitations of $B_p$ and/or $B_t$ of some other $p$ or $t$. Due to the geometry of the tube excitations $B_{m_0}$ and the plaquette excitation $B_{p_0}$ are incomparable, a direct analogy to the magnetic fluxes in the QDM seems not possible. Nevertheless, we impose the constraints on the Hilbert space to make such correspondence possible. Define the projectors on this cube adjacnt to $v_0$:

$$P_{\text{side}} = \begin{array}{c c c}
P_{p} & P_{p} & P_{p} \\
\bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
\bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
\bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
\bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
\end{array}, \quad P_{\text{corner}} = \begin{array}{c c c}
P_{p} & P_{p} & P_{p} \\
\bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
\bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
\bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
\bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\
\end{array} (92)$$

Imposing the constraint $P_{\text{side}} = 1$ means there should be no $Z_2^{\text{glob}}$ flux through the upper, lower, left, and right faces of the cube. This means that if there is $Z_2^{\text{glob}}$ flux through the front face ($B_{p_0} = -1$), it must come out from the back face. Equivalently, if there is a loop-like excitation going through our region of discussion, the region must be at the side of the loop. On the other hand, imposing $P_{\text{corner}} = 1$ means that there should be no $Z_2^{\text{glob}}$ flux through the upper, lower, right, and back faces of the cube. This means that if there is $Z_2^{\text{glob}}$ flux through the front face ($B_{p_0} = -1$), it must come out from the left face. Equivalently, if there is a loop-like excitation going through our region of discussion, the region must be at the corner of the loop. Here, we emphasize again that the plaquette excitation $B_{p_0}$ can be either at the side of the $m$ string which is specified by the projector $P_{\text{side}} = 1$, or at the corner of the $m$ string which is specified by the projector $P_{\text{corner}} = 1$.

For $P_{\text{corner}} = 1$, the flux operators can be mapped to a subalgebra of the QDM algebra as follows

$$B_{p_0} \rightarrow B_0 - B_1 + B_2 - B_3$$

$$B_{t_0} \rightarrow B_0 - B_2 \quad (93)$$

where $B_g$ is the QDM flux operator in Eq. (1). We can also identify the star operators $A^a_{v,g}$ with the QDM star operator $A_g$ Eq. (1). The map of $A$’s and $B$’s together forms an injective algebra homomorphism into the QDM algebra. In particular, they satisfy the relations (note that all the $B$’s commute)

$$B_{p_0}^2 = 1, \quad B_{t_0}^2 = \frac{1}{2}(1 + B_{p_0}), \quad B_{p_0}B_{t_0} = B_{t_0}$$

$$A_gB_{p_0} = B_{p_0}A_g, \quad A_gB_{t_0} = B_{t_0}A_g, \quad \forall g \in Z_4 \quad (94)$$
TABLE III: Left/right panel: Pure electric charges/magnetic fluxes of the gauged 1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \rightarrow G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}} \rightarrow 1 model. This correspondence of fluxes with the conjugacy classes is meaningful only if we choose \( P_{\text{corner}} = 1 \), that is, the point of interest must be at the corner if there is a flexible string.

In this way, the star and the flux operator of this fracton models is identified with a subalgebra of that of the corresponding QDM.

Unlike the \( S_3 \) case, this subalgebra is not enough to distinguish all of the conjugacy classes of \( \mathbb{Z}_4 \), since \( \{1\} \) and \( \{3\} \) both correspond to \( B_{p_0} = -1, B_{t_0} = 0 \). To avoid this situation, we note that in this Abelian case, the zero-flux projectors in the definition of \( B_{t_0} \), is not necessary. Hence we can define the flux operator without the projectors. (this does not mean that we need to modified the Hamiltonian)

\[
B_{t_0}' = \begin{bmatrix}
v_0 & Z^1 & \cdots & Z^3 \\
Z & \ddots & & \\
\vdots & & \ddots & \\
Z & & & Z
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Then we have the correspondence

\[
B_{t_0}' \mapsto B_0 + iB_3 - B_2 - iB_3
\]

and additional relations

\[
B_{t_0}^2 = B_{p_0}, \quad B_{p_0}B_{t_0}' = B_{t_0'}^\dagger, \quad B_{t_0}B_{t_0}' = \frac{1}{2}(1 + B_{p_0}),
\]

\[
A_gB_{t_0} = B_{t_0}'A_g, \quad \forall g \in \mathbb{Z}_4
\]

After including \( B_{t_0}' \), the corresponding subalgebra is enough to distinguish all of the elements of \( \mathbb{Z}_4 \) (more rigorously, if a state is the eigenstate of \( B_{p_0} = 1, B_g = 0, g \neq g_0 \) for some \( g_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_4 \), then we can determine \( g_0 \) only by the eigenvalues of the image of \( B_{p_0}, B_{t_0} \) and \( B_{t_0}' \). In this case, \( B_{t_0} \) alone is enough to distinguish them.) This allows us to identify the fluxes of this fracton model with the conjugacy classes of \( \mathbb{Z}_4 \) in the situation that \( P_{\text{corner}} = 1 \). The corresponding fluxes is in the right panel of Table III.

However, if we choose \( P_{\text{side}} = 1 \) instead, then we have \( B_{t_0}^2 = 1 \) on the fracton side instead of \( B_{t_0}^2 = B_{p_0} \), which implies that the previous mapping into \( \mathbb{Z}_4 \) QDM is no longer a homomorphism. Curiously, it is isomorphic to the \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \) QDM algebra by the mapping

\[
B_{p_0} \mapsto B_{(0,0)} - B_{(0,1)} + B_{(1,0)} - B_{(1,1)},
\]

\[
B_{t_0} \mapsto B_{(0,0)} - B_{(1,0)},
\]

\[
B_{t_0}' \mapsto B_{(0,0)} + B_{(0,1)} - B_{(1,0)} - B_{(1,1)}.
\]

Here the first \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) is associated to \( m_2^2 \), and the second \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) is associated to \( m \). This explains why when we apply the square of the membrane for the string excitation \( m \), we create four lineons at the corners but nothing at the edge of the membrane. The fusion rules of the fluxes behave like the \( \mathbb{Z}_4 \) QDM (\( m \times m = m^2 \)) only at the corners, while at the edge of a string excitation, they behave like a \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \) QDM (\( m \times m = 0 \)) instead.

VI. EXAMPLE: GAUGING \( 1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \rightarrow G \rightarrow K_4^{\text{glo}} \rightarrow 1 \)

The system is a 3D cubic lattice with three qubits on each site. We use the following correspondence of the qubits with the elements of \( Q_8 \):

\[
|000\rangle \leftrightarrow 1, \quad |001\rangle \leftrightarrow i, \quad |010\rangle \leftrightarrow j, \quad |011\rangle \leftrightarrow k,
\]

\[
|100\rangle \leftrightarrow -1, \quad |101\rangle \leftrightarrow -i, \quad |110\rangle \leftrightarrow -j, \quad |111\rangle \leftrightarrow -k.
\]

The Hamiltonian is

\[
H_o = -\sum_{\text{sites}}(IXI + IIX + XII),
\]

\[
H_n = -J_0 \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} \begin{bmatrix} c_0 \end{bmatrix} - J_1 \sum_{\text{links}} c_1 - J_2 \sum_{\text{links}} c_2,
\]

where the minimal couplings are

\[
\begin{bmatrix} c_0 \end{bmatrix} := \sum_{a=00,01,10,11} |Z_0[a] Z_0 Z^a\rangle, \quad \begin{bmatrix} c_1 \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} IZI \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} c_2 \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} IIZ \end{bmatrix},
\]

where

\[
a := (a^{(1)}, a^{(2)}), \quad |a\rangle := [a^{(1)}]_1 [a^{(2)}]_2, \quad Z^a := Z_1^{a^{(1)}} Z_2^{a^{(2)}}.
\]
$G$ is generated by $g_p^{(-)}$, $g^{(i)}$, $g^{(j)}$, $g^{(k)}$ where

$$g_p^{(-)} = \prod_{\text{sites } a \in p} X_{II},$$

$$g^{(i)} = \prod_{\text{sites } a, b = 0, 1} \sum_{a = 0, 1} X_0^a X_1[a][b],$$

$$g^{(j)} = \prod_{\text{sites } a, b = 0, 1} \sum_{a = 0, 1} X_0^{a+b} X_1[a][b],$$

$$g^{(k)} = \prod_{\text{sites } a, b = 0, 1} \sum_{a = 0, 1} X_0^a X_1[a] X_2,$$

which are the subsystem multiplication of $-1 \in Q_8$ and the global multiplication of $i, j, k \in Q_8$, respectively. Note that $g_p^{(-)}$'s generate a normal subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}$ of $G$, but $G$ is not a semidirect product of this $\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}$ with $G/\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \cong K_4^{\text{glo}}$. Nevertheless, $G$ can still be presented as the group extension

$$1 \to \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \to G \to K_4^{\text{glo}} \to 1.$$  

In the notation of Ref. [51], this symmetry is called $(Q_8, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. The procedure of gauging works as follows:

1. We put two qubits on each link (corresponds to $c_1$ and $c_2$) and one qubit on each plaquette (corresponds to $c_0$).

2. Based on the general gauging procedure we described in Sec. II.2, the gauge transformations are

Note that these generate a local $Q_8$ symmetry for the gauged system:

$$G^{\text{local}} = \langle g^{(i)}, g^{(j)}, g^{(k)} \mid (g^{(i)})^2 = (g^{(j)})^2 = (g^{(k)})^2 \rangle = (g^{(k)})^2 = g^{(i)} g^{(j)} g^{(k)} \cong Q_8.$$  

(111)
We will use the usual notation for $Q_S$, denoting $g^{(i)}$ by $i$, $(g^{(i)})^2$ by $-1$, etc.

3. There are two types of ways to combine the $c$'s to produce the identity. The first type is the product of four $c_1$ or $c_2$ on the links:

$$R_{p,i}(\{c\}) = \begin{vmatrix} c_1 & c_1 & c_1 & c_1 \\ c_{c+1} & c_{c+1} & c_{c+1} & c_{c+1} \end{vmatrix} = 1, \quad p \in \text{plaquettes}, \quad i = 0, 1$$

The corresponding gauge field term is the plaquette operator of the link qubit.

$$B_{p,i} = R_{p,i}(\{Z\}) = \begin{vmatrix} Z_i & Z_i \\ Z_i & Z_i \end{vmatrix}$$

The second type is the tube-like product

$$R_t(\{c\}) = \sum_{a,b,c,d=0,1} \begin{vmatrix} c_0 & c_0 \\ c_0 & c_0 \\ c_{a+c} & c_{a+c} \\ c_{a+c} & c_{a+c} \end{vmatrix} = 1, \quad t \in \text{tubes}$$

The corresponding field term is

$$B_t = R_t(\{Z\}) \prod_{\text{six faces}} P_{p,1}P_{p,2}$$

4. The gauged coupling terms are

$$c_0(\tau) = \sum_{a,b,c,d,e=0,1} \begin{vmatrix} a & a+b \\ a+b & b \\ a & b \end{vmatrix}$$

5. The electric field terms are

$$H_e = -g_0 \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} \begin{vmatrix} X \\ XI \end{vmatrix} - g_1 \sum_{\text{links}} X_{1}^{(i)} - g_2 \sum_{\text{links}} X_{1}^{(j)}$$

where

$$\hat{X}^{(i)} = \sum_{a,...,g=0,1} X_{12}^{d+e} \begin{vmatrix} [a]_{12} \\ c_{12} \end{vmatrix}$$

$$\hat{X}^{(j)} = \sum_{a,...,h=0,1} X_{12}^{g} \begin{vmatrix} [b]_{12} \\ c_{12} \end{vmatrix}$$

The decorated $\hat{X}^{(i)}$ and $\hat{X}^{(j)}$ operators ensure the electric field is invariant under the gauge transformation $A_{v,g}$. As in the case of the toric code and the X-Cube code, we can choose the unitary gauge to eliminate the matter DOF. We regard
the “physical state” satisfying the constraints as an equivalent class of computational basis state, and choose the representative such that all matter DOF are in the reference state $|000\rangle$.

In this case, the Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_u = -\sum_{v \text{ sites}} \left( A_{v,g(i)}^u + A_{v,g(j)}^u + A_{v,g(-)}^u \right) - \sum_{t \text{ tubes}} B_t - \sum_{p \text{ plaquettes}} (B_{p,1} + B_{p,2}) - J_0 \sum_{p \text{ plaquettes}} \frac{1}{Z} \cdot P_{p,1} P_{p,2} - \sum_{\text{links}} \left( J_1 Z I + J_2 I Z \right) - g_0 \sum_{p \text{ plaquettes}} \frac{1}{Z} - g_1 \sum_{\text{links}} \tilde{X}^{(i)}_p - g_2 \sum_{\text{links}} \tilde{X}^{(j)}_p,$$  \hspace{1cm} (121)

where the dressed operators in the unitary gauge are [65]

$$\tilde{X}^{(i)}_u = \sum_{a,\bar{b}=0,1} \left[ b \right]_{2} \cdot X^a \cdot [\bar{a}]_{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (122)

and

$$\tilde{X}^{(j)}_u = \sum_{a,b,c,d=0,1} \left[ [ab]_{2} \cdot X^{a+b} \cdot [cd]_{2} \right] \cdot X^{c+d},$$  \hspace{1cm} (123)

and the Hilbert space contains only the gauge DOF without constraints. The above Hamiltonian $H_u$ describes the pure lattice gauge theory of $G$.

### A. Excitations

In the exactly solvable limit, the system is deeply in the deconfined phase and the fundamental excitations are fully mobile particles, fractons, and strings. These excitations are

- $\phi^{(q)}$, $q = i,j,k$: An Abelian quasiparticle that can move freely in 3D, corresponding to $A_{v,g(q')} = -1, q' \neq q$. For $q = i,j,k$, it is created at the end point of the string operator

$$-IZ-IZ-\cdots-IZ- ,$$  \hspace{1cm} (124)

- $\phi^{(Z)}$: The non-Abelian fracton, created at the four corners of the membrane operator

$$M^{(m,n)}_{v,b_0} = \sum_{(v,b_0) \in \{00,01,10,11\}}$$

where $v$ is the upper left corner

$$\tilde{Z} = \sum_{a=00,01,10,11} \left[ a \right]_{2} \cdot Z^a$$  \hspace{1cm} (128)

and addition of boldface letters are componentwise and modulo 2. The membranes for different choices of $b_0$ differ by an additional string for some $\phi^{(q)}$ along the left edge of the membrane. Note that

$$A_{v,g(i)}^u M^{(m,n)}_{v,00} |GS\rangle = -M^{(m,n)}_{v,01} |GS\rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (129)

$$A_{v,g(j)}^u M^{(m,n)}_{v,00} |GS\rangle = -M^{(m,n)}_{v,10} |GS\rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (130)

$$A_{v,g(k)}^u M^{(m,n)}_{v,00} |GS\rangle = -M^{(m,n)}_{v,11} |GS\rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (131)

This means that the fracton created by $M^{(m,n)}_{v,b_0}, b_0 = 00,01,10,11$ belongs to the same superselection sector, so is the same species $[\phi^{(Z)}]$. Also note that this membrane operator only work when acting on a state with $B_{p,1} = +1$ for all plaquette $p$ on and near (at most one lattice spacing) the membrane. To show that it is non-Abelian, we consider the following two states

$$|\psi_1\rangle = M^{(1,L)}_{v,00} M^{(2L,2L)}_{v,00} M^{(3L,3L)}_{v,00} |GS\rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (132)

$$|\psi_2\rangle = M^{(1,L)}_{v,00} M^{(2L,2L)}_{v,00} M^{(3L,3L)}_{v,01} |GS\rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (133)
where $L$ is large. The excitation patterns of the two states are both

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
[f_0] & [f_0] & [f_0] & [f_0] \\
[f_0] & [f_0] & [f_0] & [f_0] \\
[f_0] & [f_0] & [f_0] & [f_0] \\
[f_0] & [f_0] & [f_0] & [f_0] \\
[f_0] & [f_0] & [f_0] & [f_0] \\
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Now, for the state $|\psi_1\rangle$, the four $[f_0]$'s on the upper left square of (134) can be fused to the vacuum by applying an additional $M^{(L,L)}_{v,00}$. On the other hand, they cannot be fused to the vacuum for $|\psi_2\rangle$. This means that $[f_0]$ has non-trivial fusion rules, and therefore is non-Abelian. If we continue this pattern to apply $n M_{v,i}$'s to the ground state, it can be shown that there are asymptotically $2^n$ fusion channels, which implies the quantum dimension of $[f_0]$ is 2.

- $e_d$, the Abelian lineon, corresponding to $B_t = -1$. It is created at the endpoints of the string

\[
X \quad X \quad \cdots \quad X \quad X,
\]

(135)

- $\sigma^{(q)}, q = i, j, k$: The flexible string-like excitation corresponding to the excitation $(B_{p,1}, B_{p,2}) = (-1, 1), (1, -1), (-1, -1)$, respectively.

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{X}^{(q)}_a & \quad \tilde{X}^{(q)}_a & \quad \tilde{X}^{(q)}_a \\
\tilde{X}^{(q)}_a & \quad \tilde{X}^{(q)}_a & \quad \tilde{X}^{(q)}_a \\
\vdots & \quad \vdots & \quad \vdots \\
\tilde{X}^{(q)}_a & \quad \tilde{X}^{(q)}_a & \quad \tilde{X}^{(q)}_a \\
\end{align*}
\]

(136)

where $\tilde{X}^{(i)}_a$ and $\tilde{X}^{(j)}_a$ are defined before and

\[
\tilde{X}^{(k)}_a = \tilde{X}^{(i)}_a \tilde{X}^{(j)}_a
\]

(137)

The excitations of $A^u_{v,g^{(i)}}, A^u_{v,g^{(j)}},$ and $A^u_{v,g^{(k)}}$ are referred to the electric charge excitations. These excitations are local with respect to the vertex $v$, and can be specified from the local operators which form a representation of $Q_8$ on the Hilbert space. Hence we can identify electric charges of the G fracton model with the irreducible representation of $G_{\text{local}} \cong Q_8$ (left panel of Table IV). This identification is the same as the quantum double model (QDM) with $Q_8$ symmetry\cite{11}.

In the same spirit as the QDM, the magnetic fluxes would be the conjugacy classes of $G_{\text{local}} \cong Q_8$. To construct the corresponding magnetic fluxes in the $1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^\text{ab} \rightarrow G \rightarrow K_4^\text{glo} \rightarrow 1$ fracton model, we first fix a plaquette $p_0$ and a tube $t_0$ adjacent to a chosen vertex $v_0$:

\[
p_0 = \begin{array}{c}
\includegraphics[width=2cm]{cube.png}
\end{array}, \quad t_0 = \begin{array}{c}
\includegraphics[width=2cm]{tube.png}
\end{array}
\]

(138)

where the constituent of that geometry is indicated with dots. Then we classify the fluxes by different types of excitations of $B_{p_0,i}$ and/or $B_{t_0}$. Unlike the QDM, the excitations of $B_{p_0,i}$ and/or $B_{t_0}$ inevitably leads to the excitations of $B_p$ and/or $B_t$ of some other $p$ or $t$. Due to the geometry of the tube excitations $B_{t_0}$ and the plaquette excitation $B_{p_0,i}$ are incomparable, a direct analogy to the magnetic fluxes in the QDM seems not possible. Nevertheless, we impose the constraints on the Hilbert space to make such correspondence possible. Define the projectors on this cube adjacent to $v_0$:

\[
P_{\text{side}} = \begin{bmatrix}
P_{p} & P_p & P_p \\
P_p & P_{p} & P_p \\
P_p & P_p & P_{p}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad P_{\text{corner}} = \begin{bmatrix}
P_{p} & P_p & P_p \\
P_p & P_{p} & P_p \\
P_p & P_p & P_{p}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(139)

where $P_p := p_{p,1}P_{p,2}$. Imposing the constraint $P_{\text{side}} = 1$ means there should be no $K_4^\text{glo}$ flux through the upper, lower, left, and right faces of the cube. This means that if there is $K_4^\text{glo}$ flux through the front face ($B_{p_0,1} = -1$ and/or $B_{p_0,2} = -1$), it must come out from the back face. Equivalently, if there is a loop-like excitation going through our region of discussion, the region must be at the side of the loop. On the other hand, imposing $P_{\text{corner}} = 1$ means there should be no $K_4^\text{glo}$ flux through the upper, lower, right, and back faces of the cube. This means that if there is $K_4^\text{glo}$ flux through the front face ($B_{p_0,1} = -1$ and/or $B_{p_0,2} = -1$), it must come out from the left face. Equivalently, if there is a loop-like excitation going through our region of discussion, the region must be at the corner of the loop. Here, we emphasize again that the plaquette excitation $B_{p_0,i}$ can be either at the side of the $\sigma^{(q)}$ string which is specified by the projector $P_{\text{side}} = 1$, or at the corner of the $\sigma^{(q)}$ string which is specified by the projector $P_{\text{corner}} = 1$.

For either $P_{\text{side}} = 1$ or $P_{\text{corner}} = 1$, the flux operators can be
mapped to a subalgebra of the QDM algebra as follows

\[ B_{p0,1} \mapsto B_1 + B_1 - B_j - B_k + B_{-1} - B_{-j} - B_{-k}, \]
\[ B_{p0,2} \mapsto B_1 - B_1 + B_j - B_k + B_{-1} - B_{-j} - B_{-k}, \]
\[ B_{t0} \mapsto B_1 - B_{-1}, \]

(140)

where \( B_j \) is the QDM flux operator in Eq. (1). We can also identify the star operators \( A^{v_g}_{w_q} \) with the QDM star operator \( A_g \) Eq. (1). The map of \( A \)'s and \( B \)'s together forms an injective algebra homomorphism into the QDM algebra. In particular, they satisfy the relations (note that all the \( B \)'s commute)

\[
\begin{align*}
B_{p0,1}^2 &= B_{p0,2}^2 = 1, \\
B_{p0,1}B_{t0} &= B_{p0,2}B_{t0} = B_{p0,1}B_{p0,2}B_{t0} = B_{t0}, \\
B_{t0}^2 &= \frac{1}{4} (1 + B_{p0,1} + B_{p0,2} + B_{p0,1}B_{p0,2}), \\
A_g B_{p0,i} &= B_{p0,i} A_g, A_g B_{t0} = B_{t0} A_g, \forall g \in Q_8, i = 1, 2 \\
\end{align*}
\]

(141)

In this way, the star and the flux operator of this fracton model is identified with a subalgebra of that of the corresponding QDM.

Note that this subalgebra is enough to distinguish all of the conjugacy classes of \( Q_8 \) (more rigorously, if a state is the eigenstate of \( B_{q0} = 1, B_g = 0, g \neq g_0 \) for some \( q_0 \in Q_8 \), then we can determine the conjugacy class of \( g_0 \) only by the eigenvalues of the image of \( B_{p0} \) and \( B_{t0} \)). This allows us to identify the fluxes of this fracton model with the conjugacy classes of \( Q_8 \). The corresponding fluxes are listed in the right panel of Table IV.

### VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we demonstrate a systematical gauging procedure on a lattice with pure matter fields. This general procedure works not only for a semidirect product of the global and subsystem symmetries, but also for a non-trivial extension of them. We give four examples of gauging \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glob}} \), \( G = (\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}) \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glob}}, 1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \rightarrow G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glob}} \rightarrow 1, \) and \( 1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \rightarrow G \rightarrow K_4^{\text{glob}} \rightarrow 1 \). The former two cases and the last one produce the non-Abelian fracton orders. By using a one-step gauging, we give a transparent identification of electric charges with the irreducible representations of \( G^{\text{local}} \), which include the non-Abelian fracton. Furthermore, to compare the magnetic excitations with different geometry (tubes and plaquettes), we set a specific constraint on the local Hilbert space. We observe that the magnetic excitations satisfy the subalgebra of the QDMs, which allows us to identify the magnetic excitations as the conjugacy classes of \( G^{\text{local}} \). Our gauging procedure is very general, and can be easily extended to more exotic symmetries such as \((\mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}}) \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glob}}\), and can produce different types of non-Abelian version of fractons.

Before we close the discussion, we would like to point out some future directions.

1. If one applies the symmetry of “(1D subsystem) × (2D subsystem) × global” or “fractal × global” form, we expect the gauged Hamiltonian in the exactly-solvable limit can produce new types of non-Abelian fractons.

2. The fully gauged Hamiltonian contains matter and gauge fields, which may contain partial confined-deconfined or Higgsed-deconfined transition for some of the excitations. One can also consider other types of matter fields such as the Majorana fermion.

3. The quotient superselection sector (QSS)[56] is a method to identify fracton species. We would like to understand the deep relation between a non-Abelian generalization of QSS and the corresponding electric charges with the irreps of \( G^{\text{local}} \).

4. Although we associate the magnetic fluxes with the conjugacy class of \( G^{\text{local}} \) in the constrained local Hilbert space from the subalgebra of the QDMs, some magnetic fluxes (e.g., \( B_{t0,2} \) in the second example) cannot be obtained from our gauging procedure. A direct identification of the fluxes with structures of \( G \) and \( G^{\text{local}} \) from the general gauging process is still desired.

5. The ungauging map[57] is the map from the zero-flux subspace of a pure lattice gauge system back to the matter Hilbert space with the symmetry. We expect that it can be generalized to non-Abelian symmetries.

Note added. While preparing the update of this paper, we recently learnt of a related work by Tantrivasadakarn, Ji, and Vijay[58], which they construct a solvable lattice model labelled as \((Q_8, \mathbb{Z}_2)\) in their terminology, which is our fourth example.
We construct a virtual state of matter fields $|\tilde{m}\rangle$ associated with another virtual state $|\tilde{m}'\rangle$ that satisfies Eq. (A2).

2. $|\tau_c'\rangle$ associates with another virtual state $|\tilde{m}'\rangle$. Since $|\tau_c'\rangle$ is the compensation of the changes of $A_{v,g}$ acting on the matter field, the virtual state $|\tilde{m}'\rangle$ is obtained by applying $g^{-1}$ to the state $|\tilde{m}\rangle$ on $v$, $|\tilde{m}'\rangle = \bigotimes_{s \neq v} |m_s\rangle \otimes g^{-1} |\tilde{m}_v\rangle$.

3. The eigenvalue of $c$ for the virtual state $|\tilde{m}'\rangle, c|\tilde{m}'\rangle = \tau_c' |\tilde{m}'\rangle$ then specifies the state $|\tau_c'\rangle$. This step determines the gauge transformation $A_{v,g}$ on $|\tau_c\rangle$. It is required that $|\tilde{m}\rangle$ and $|\tilde{m}'\rangle$ are eigenstates of $c$ with the same eigenvalue, $\forall c \notin C_\nu$ (otherwise one should choose a larger $C_\nu$).

The above definition automatically implies $A_{v,g_1}A_{v,g_2} = A_{v,g_1g_2}$, and $C_\nu$ is chosen to be the minimal set such that $A_{v,g}$ is well-defined for all $g$ and that $[A_{v_1,g_1}, A_{v_2,g_2}] = 0$ when $v_1 \neq v_2$. This means that $G$ is promoted to a local symmetry of the gauged system. In the cases of gauging pure global or pure subsystem symmetries, we simply have $C_\nu = \{c \mid v \in \text{supp } c\}$. However, when global and subsystem symmetries are mixed together, the choice of $C_\nu$ becomes nontrivial. See the example below.

1. Specific example for obtaining $A_{v,g}$ for $(\mathbb{Z}_2^{ab} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{ab}) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2^{bh}$

The reference state is $|000\rangle$. At each vertex $v$ (the intersection of the three black axes below), the support $C_\nu$ of the gauge transformation is chosen to contain twelve $c_0$ and $c_1$ couplings on the plaquettes, and nine $c_2$ couplings on the links.
Here we demonstrate the calculation of $A_{v,g_P^{(0)}}$, where $P$ is any of the three shifted coordinate planes containing $v$. Since $g_P^{(0)}$ acts on $v$ by the operator $X_0$, $A_{v,g_P^{(0)}}$ also acts on $v$ by $X_0$. Also, by definition, $A_{v,g_P^{(0)}}$ acts on other sites trivially. Now we demonstrate how to calculate its action on the gauge DOF. Suppose we want to calculate $A_{v,g_P^{(0)}}$ acting on a computation basis state in which the part of the state around $v$ is

\[ \bigotimes_{c \in C_v} |\tau_c\rangle = \begin{array}{llllll}
|0\rangle & |01\rangle & |10\rangle & |11\rangle \\
|00\rangle & |01\rangle & |10\rangle & |11\rangle \\
|01\rangle & |00\rangle & |11\rangle & |10\rangle \\
|00\rangle & |01\rangle & |10\rangle & |11\rangle \\
\end{array} , \tag{A4}
\]

where $v$ is the center vertex. Note that we only include the states of the $\tau_c$'s corresponds to couplings $c \in C_v$ (A3). We will discuss this choice of $C_v$ below. Now the steps works as follows:

1. Consider the virtual situation that the matter is in the state (only the state relevant to $C_v$ is shown)
This satisfies the requirements, since the state of $v$ is the reference state $|000\rangle$ and one can check that the eigenvalues of the minimal couplings are in correspondence with $|\tau_c\rangle$. For example, $|\tilde{m}\rangle$ is the $(+1)$-eigenstate of the $c_0$ coupling on the upper left blue plaquette and is the $(-1)$-eigenstate of the $c_1$ on that plaquette, which corresponds to the state $|01\rangle$ of the corresponding $\tau_{c_0}$ and $\tau_{c_1}$ shown in (A4) (Recall that we label the computational basis of $\tau_c$ as $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ corresponding to the $+1$ and $-1$ eigenvalues of $c$). Of course, this is not the only virtual matter state that satisfies the requirement, but any of such states should give the same result. See the discussion on $C_v$ below.

2. The action of $\left(g^{(0)}_P\right)^{-1}$ on $v$ is $X_0$, which maps $v$ on the virtual matter to $|100\rangle$. Also, other sites of the virtual matter are unchanged. So the virtual matter state is changed to

$$|\tilde{m}'\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} |01\rangle \cr |00\rangle \cr |11\rangle \cr |01\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \quad (A6)$$

3. Now we calculate the eigenvalues of the minimal couplings for $|\tilde{m}'\rangle$, and correspond them back to the state of $\tau_c$. The result is

$$\otimes_{e \in C_v} |\tau_{c_e}'\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} |0\rangle \cr |10\rangle \cr |11\rangle \cr |01\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A7)$$

which is defined as the result of $A_{v,g^{(0)}_P}$ acting on the state of (A4).
Note that for a minimal coupling \( c \notin C_v \) (corresponding to a state not shown in (A4)), the eigenvalues for |\( \tilde{m} \rangle \) and |\( \tilde{m}' \rangle \) are the same. This is important when we discuss the choice of \( C_v \) below.

The above steps give the result of \( A_{v,g,0}^{(0)} \) acting on a specific computation basis state. To obtain the full expression of \( A_{v,g}^{(0)} \), one needs to consider its action on all possible states for gauge DOF (that is, change the state of (A4) to any possible combinations of 0 and 1. Then one should obtain (40).

Now we discuss our choice of \( C_v \). Firstly, one can show that if we choose a different |\( \tilde{m} \rangle \) that also corresponds to (A4), then we still obtain the same (A7). Secondly, in the last step above, the eigenvalues of \( c \notin C_v \) are not changed. This is true in general for this choice of \( C_v \), and therefore \( A_{v,g} \) is well-defined. Also one can check (see (40) and (41)) that \( A_{v,g} \) on different sites commute.

Now we discuss why this choice is minimal. That is, if we delete some couplings from \( C_v \), then the above procedure will fail. Suppose we delete the \( c_2 \) in the upper left blue horizontal link in (A3). That is, we exclude the state on the horizontal blue link in (A4). Then (A5) still satisfies the requirements. In addition to that, if we modify the upper left corner from |101 to |100 in (A5), it also satisfies the requirements. However, if we use the latter choice of |\( \tilde{m} \rangle \), than the upper left plaquette of the resulting (A7) will be |11⟩ instead of |00⟩. That is, different choices of virtual matter lead to different result, so this \( C_v \) does not work.

Next, suppose we delete the \( c_0 \) in the upper left blue horizontal link in (A3). Note that in the last step, the eigenvalue of this \( c_0 \) still changes in respond to the change of the virtual state of \( v \). Then since this \( c_0 \) is not in \( C_v \), it violates the requirement that all eigenvalues of \( c \notin C_v \) is not changed.

Other deletion of elements in \( C_v \) violates the requirements in similar ways. Note that some deletion still works when calculating \( A_{v,g}^{(0)} \) but not when calculating \( A_{v,g}^{(1)} \) (we require that a single \( C_v \) works for any \( g \) around a vertex.) Therefore, the chosen \( C_v \) is minimal.

Note that this is not the only choice of \( C_v \), but other choice are essentially the same. If we require that \( A_{v,g} \) is symmetric under cyclic permutations of \( x, y, z \) axis, then there are only two possible \( C_v \) related by reflection.

Appendix B: Discussion on the minimal coupling terms for \( 1 \rightarrow Z_2^{\text{sq}} \rightarrow G \rightarrow Z_2^{\text{glp}} \rightarrow 1 \)

Here we discuss the choice of the \( c_0 \) coupling in Eq. (70). first we notice that

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{c}_0 \\
Z \\
Z\dagger \\
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
Z & \dagger \\
\dagger & Z \\
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{c}_1 \\
\dagger \\
\dagger \\
\end{bmatrix} = Z^2
\]

(B1)

are valid coupling terms invariant under \( G \), which are just the usual coupling terms in the pure global and pure subsystem case, respectively. However, in this mixture of global and system symmetry, \( c_0 \) is not a good choice for the following reason. Suppose we use \( c_0 \) and \( c_1 \) in \( H_n \) instead. Then the couplings satisfy the relation

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
-\tilde{c}_1 \\
\tilde{c}_0 \\
\end{bmatrix} = 1.
\]

(B2)

In our gauging process, this corresponds to a flux operator. However, unlike the flux on a square plaquette and tube, this "flux" does not have a non-contractible geometry. So the above relation should be interpreted as unnecessary redundancy of the couplings rather than something that allows curvature to be inserted in the resulting gauge connection. To avoid this redundancy, we defined the coupling \( c_0 \) that drops out the part of \( \tilde{c}_1 \) that can be obtained from \( c_0 \):

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{c}_0 \\
\tilde{c}_1 \\
\end{bmatrix} = +1 \iff \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{c}_0 \\
\tilde{c}_1 \\
\end{bmatrix} = +1, \begin{bmatrix}
c_0 \\
\end{bmatrix} = +1
\]

(B3)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{c}_0 \\
\tilde{c}_1 \\
\end{bmatrix} = +i \iff \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{c}_0 \\
\tilde{c}_1 \\
\end{bmatrix} = -1, \begin{bmatrix}
c_0 \\
\end{bmatrix} = +1
\]

(B4)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{c}_0 \\
\tilde{c}_1 \\
\end{bmatrix} = -1 \iff \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{c}_0 \\
\tilde{c}_1 \\
\end{bmatrix} = +1, \begin{bmatrix}
c_0 \\
\end{bmatrix} = -1
\]

(B5)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{c}_0 \\
\tilde{c}_1 \\
\end{bmatrix} = -i \iff \begin{bmatrix}
\tilde{c}_0 \\
\tilde{c}_1 \\
\end{bmatrix} = -1, \begin{bmatrix}
c_0 \\
\end{bmatrix} = -1
\]

(B6)
which is equivalent to what we defined in the text.

1. Another choice of the couplings

Here we discuss another choice of the minimal couplings for the $1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{sub}} \rightarrow G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^{\text{glo}} \rightarrow 1$ model which reproduces exactly the Hamiltonian of the fractonic hybrid X-Cube code in $[51]$ upon gauging (except the zero-flux projectors, which only change some excitation energies and can be dropped in this Abelian case).

The spirit behind this choice is the same as in Sec. IV and Sec. III. First we split the local Hilbert space into a tensor product of “subsystem” and “global” part, then put a projector on the “global” part at a special “reference corner” of the plaquette (here we choose the upper left corner) to decide the operation on the rest of the operator. Nevertheless, we can do this by splitting the matter qudit into two qubits

\begin{align}
|0\rangle & \mapsto |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\
|1\rangle & \mapsto |0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle \\
|2\rangle & \mapsto |1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\
|3\rangle & \mapsto |1\rangle \otimes |1\rangle.
\end{align}

(B7) (B8) (B9) (B10)

Then $q^{(0)}_P$ acts as $XI$ on each site of $P$, which allows us to regard the first qubit as the “subsystem” charge and the second as the “global” charge. The minimal couplings can then be constructed similar to the previous two cases as

\begin{equation}
H_n = -J_0 \sum_{\text{plaquettes}} c_0 - J_1 \sum_{\text{links}} c_1 + \text{H.c.},
\end{equation}

(B11)

\begin{equation}
c_0 := \begin{pmatrix}
Z[0] & ZI \\
ZI & Z[1]
\end{pmatrix},
\end{equation}

(B12)

\begin{equation}
c_1 := IZ
\end{equation}

(B13)

We can proceed our gauging procedure on the original cubic lattice as in Sec. IV and Sec. III, with a nontrivial choice of the support $C_v$ (that is, not simply $C_v = \{ c \mid v \in \text{supp } c \}$) when we do the systematical construction of $A_{v,g}$.

In the approach of Ref. [51], they avoid the nontrivial choice of $C_v$ by introducing diagonal couplings on the lattice:

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
\end{array}
\end{equation}

(B14)

In this way, our one-step gauging process (with the systematical construction of $A_{v,g}$ using the trivial choice $C_v = \{ c \mid v \in \text{supp } c \}$ and reference state $|00\rangle$) gives exactly the $A_{v,g}$ presented in Ref. [51] in the unitary gauge. Moreover, the fluxes constructed using our gauging process will be the same as theirs except for the additional zero-flux projectors. This implies that in the exactly solvable limit, we reproduce the ground state and excitations pattern exactly.

For the semidirect product of the global and subsystem symmetries do not suffer the complication and our construction reproduces the gauge transformation defined in Ref. [42]. W. Shirley, K. Slagle, and X. Chen, SciPost Phys. 4, 10 (2017).
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