

# Categorical descriptions of 1-dimensional gapped phases with abelian onsite symmetries

Rongge Xu <sup>\*a,b</sup>, Zhi-Hao Zhang <sup>+c,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Fudan University, Shanghai, 200433, China

<sup>b</sup>School of Science, Westlake University, Hangzhou, 310024, China

<sup>c</sup>Wu Wen-Tsun Key Laboratory of Mathematics of Chinese Academy of Sciences,  
School of Mathematical Sciences,

University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, China

<sup>d</sup>Shenzhen Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering,  
Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, 518055, China

## Abstract

In a recent work arXiv:2108.08835, Kong, Wen and Zheng use Ising chain and Kitaev chain to show that the macroscopic observables in a 1d (space dimension) gapped quantum phase form an enriched fusion category. In this work, we further construct a 1d lattice model with abelian onsite symmetry  $G$  and generalize their results to the phases realized by this model. By carefully analyzing the observables on both the trivial SPT and symmetry breaking cases, we explicitly show that the spacetime observables of these 1d phases form fusion categories enriched in their monoidal centers. These categorical descriptions also reproduce an existing classification result and shed light on a unified definition of all quantum phases.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Topological sectors of states with an onsite <math>G</math>-symmetry</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	The category of topological sectors of states and group actions . . . . .	6
2.2	Equivariantization and $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>The lattice model with abelian onsite <math>G</math>-symmetry</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	The lattice model and ground states . . . . .	8
3.2	Topological sectors of operators . . . . .	9
3.3	The topological skeletons . . . . .	10
3.3.1	Symmetry preserving case (the trivial SPT) . . . . .	10
3.3.2	Symmetry completely broken case . . . . .	12
3.3.3	General cases (symmetry partially broken) . . . . .	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Boundaries and Domain walls</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	Boundaries . . . . .	15
4.2	Domain walls . . . . .	20
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion and outlook</b>	<b>22</b>

\*Email: xurongge@westlake.edu.cn

+Email: zzh31416@mail.ustc.edu.cn

<b>A Pointed braided fusion categories</b>	<b>22</b>
A.1 Pointed braided fusion categories and pre-metric groups . . . . .	22
A.2 Condensable algebras in pointed braided fusion categories . . . . .	23
<b>B Equivariantization</b>	<b>25</b>
B.1 Group actions on categories and equivariantization . . . . .	25
B.2 The proof of Proposition 3.9 . . . . .	26
<b>C Enriched categories</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>33</b>

## 1 Introduction

Understanding “what is a phase?” is a central question in condensed matter physics. In the common sense, the notion of a phase should be a macroscopic notion. This indicates that a phase should have a mathematical description which can be obtained by collecting all observables in the long wave length limit (LWLL) in the physical system. However, for a long period of time, the pursuing of this structure has been put aside, especially for phases within Landau’s paradigm like the symmetry breaking phases. Recently, a unified categorical description is proposed for all gapped/gapless quantum liquid phases. It states that a quantum phase  $\mathcal{X}$  can be described by a pair  $(\mathcal{X}_{lqs}, \mathcal{X}_{sk})$ , where  $\mathcal{X}_{lqs}$  encodes the information of the so-called *local quantum symmetry* and  $\mathcal{X}_{sk}$  is the *topological skeleton* [KZ20a, KZ22b] consisting of all topological defects. Mathematically, a topological skeleton is an enriched (higher) category and can be viewed as a categorical description of a quantum phase. In [KWZ22], the validity of this proposal has been checked in the 1+1D Ising chain and Kitaev chain, which are the first concrete examples in the lattice models to show the spacetime observables indeed form an enriched category. In this work, we further give the categorical descriptions along with the classification of 1-dimensional bosonic gapped quantum phases with a finite abelian onsite symmetry  $G$ .

So what are the macroscopic observables in a quantum phase and why do they form an enriched category? For a 1d lattice model, there are two kinds of observables in LWLL: topological sectors of operators and topological sectors of states [KWZ22].

1. The topological sectors of operators are the spaces of non-local unconfined (tensionless under all admitted perturbations) operators that are invariant under the action of local operators. A morphism between two topological sectors of operators is an operator between them that intertwines the action of local operators. Then the topological sectors of operators form a category, denoted by  $\mathcal{B}$ . Moreover, these operators can be composed and braided in 1 + 1D spacetime. In consequence,  $\mathcal{B}$  is expected to be a braided fusion category. In particular, the sector consisting of local operators is the tensor unit of  $\mathcal{B}$ , denoted by  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{B}}$ . This braided fusion category  $\mathcal{B}$  is also called the *categorical symmetry* [JW20].<sup>1</sup>
2. The topological sectors of states are the topological defect lines (also known as topological excitations) in 1+1D, which are the subspaces of the total Hilbert space that are invariant under the action of local operators. The sector generated by the vacuum state (i.e., the ground state) is called the vacuum sector or the trivial sector. The topological defect lines can be mapped to each other or fused together (see figure 3), which indicates that the topological sectors of states form a fusion category denoted by  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Certainly the topological sectors of operators act on those of states. Under categorical notations, the space of non-local operators which maps a topological sector of states  $a$  to another one  $b$  is denoted by  $\text{Hom}(a, b)$ , which should be an object in the category  $\mathcal{B}$  of topological sectors of operators. Then the topological sectors of states and the hom spaces between them should form a  $\mathcal{B}$ -enriched category

---

<sup>1</sup>Different authors may use the terminology ‘categorical symmetry’ in different ways.

(for a detailed explanation, see appendix C). Furthermore, the fusion behavior of non-local operators should be compatible with the fusion of topological sectors of states. This fusion compatibility can be summarized mathematically by the condition that  $\mathcal{S}$  is equipped with a braided functor  $\phi: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$ , where  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$  is the Drinfeld center (also called monoidal center) of  $\mathcal{S}$ . The functor  $\phi$  provides a so-called canonical construction of a  $\mathcal{B}$ -enriched fusion category  ${}^{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{S}$  [MP17, KYZZ21],<sup>2</sup> which is just the topological skeleton of the given phase. In addition, since the 1d phases on a 1d lattice model are anomaly-free, all excitations can be created from the ground state by non-local operators, and these excitations should be detectable by the double braiding of the non-local operators that create them from the vacuum [KWZ22]. That is to say  $\phi$  is an equivalence  $\phi: \mathcal{B} \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$ .

Moreover, a topological skeleton can be associated to different phases depending on what local quantum symmetry we assign. A recent understanding indicates that an onsite symmetry should be a special case of local quantum symmetries [KZ20a, KZ22b]. If we do not impose any symmetry on the lattice model, then all non-local operators will be confined by introducing small perturbations, which means  $\mathcal{B} = \text{Vec}$  (contains only vacuum sector). Since the system is anomaly-free, then  $\mathcal{S}$  is also  $\text{Vec}$  and  ${}^{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{S} = {}^{\text{Vec}}\text{Vec}$  is the topological skeleton of the trivial 1d topological order. But once we impose an onsite symmetry, then arbitrary perturbations are not allowed, and what remains are only the perturbations that respect the symmetry. Therefore, a non-local operator is unconfined as long as it commutes with symmetric local operators. So in the presence of an onsite symmetry, we only consider the sectors that are invariant under the action of symmetric local operators.

For a 1d symmetry protected topological (SPT) order with a finite onsite symmetry  $G$ , the topological sectors of states are symmetry charges, and they form a fusion category  $\mathcal{S} = \text{Rep}(G)$  in the bosonic case [LKW16, LKW17]. Therefore, the topological skeleton of a 1d SPT order with onsite symmetry  $G$  should be given by the enriched fusion category  ${}^{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})}\mathcal{S}$  for  $\mathcal{S} = \text{Rep}(G)$  obtained from a braided equivalence  $\phi: \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \rightarrow \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$ . This braided equivalence determines how  $\mathcal{S}$  is enriched in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ . Similarly, for the symmetry completely broken case (with  $G$  breaks to the trivial group  $\{e\}$ , where  $e$  is the unit element of  $G$ ), the topological excitations form a fusion category  $\mathcal{S} = \text{Vec}_G$ , and the topological skeleton is given by  ${}^{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Vec}_G)}\text{Vec}_G$ . Since  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Vec}_G)$  and  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  are braided equivalent, we also write the topological skeleton as  ${}^{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))}\text{Vec}_G$ .

In fact, for 1d gapped quantum phases with a finite onsite symmetry  $G$ , the underlying categories  $\mathcal{S}$  of all symmetry breaking phases are Morita equivalent (note that the trivial SPT order can also be viewed as a ‘symmetry breaking phase’ with  $G$  breaking to itself). Indeed, the underlying category  $\mathcal{S}$  of the symmetry breaking phase with  $G$  breaking to a subgroup  $H \subseteq G$  can be explicitly written as the category  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H} := \text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  of  $(F_H, F_H)$ -bimodules in  $\text{Rep}(G)$ , where  $F_H$  denotes the function algebra  $\text{Fun}(G/H) \in \text{Rep}(G)$ . The Drinfeld centers of all  $\mathcal{S}$ ’s are equivalent as braided fusion categories [Mü03, ENO11, KZ18b], namely,  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S}) \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  for all  $\mathcal{S}$ . Thus, we propose the following physical theorem to be checked in concrete lattice models:

**Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 1.1.** A 1d bosonic gapped phase with an onsite symmetry  $G$  can be described by the enriched fusion category  ${}^{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))}\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$  if the symmetry spontaneously breaks to a subgroup  $H \subseteq G$ .

**Remark 1.2.** Strictly speaking, the 1d bosonic gapped quantum phases with an onsite  $G$ -symmetry are actually classified by a triple  $(G, H, \omega)$  where  $H \subseteq G$  is a subgroup and  $[\omega] \in H^2(H, U(1))$  is a 2-cohomology class [CGW11, SPGC11]. The topological skeleton of such a ‘twisted’ symmetry breaking phase is given by  ${}^{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))}\text{Fun}_{\text{Rep}(G)}(\text{Rep}(H, \omega), \text{Rep}(H, \omega))^{\text{rev}}$ . In this work we only consider ‘untwisted’ symmetry breaking phases, in which the 2-cohomology classes  $[\omega]$  are trivial. More general cases will be clarified in future work.  $\diamond$

Another way to understand the relation between two categories  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  is given by the anyon condensation theory (see [Kon14] for a review of its mathematical theory) and the so-called *topological Wick rotation* [KZ20b].

---

<sup>2</sup>Indeed, the canonical construction requires a braided functor  $\overline{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$  where  $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$  is the time-reversal of  $\mathcal{B}$  obtained by reversing the braiding. In this work we only consider the case that  $\mathcal{B} = \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  for some finite group  $G$  and thus  $\mathcal{B} \simeq \overline{\mathcal{B}}$ . So for simplicity we just take a braided functor  $\phi: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$  and consider its “canonical construction”.

Let us briefly review the anyon condensation theory. Suppose a 2d topological order (whose topological excitations form a unitary modular tensor category  $\mathcal{C}$ ) is obtained from another 2d topological order (whose topological excitations form a unitary modular tensor category  $\mathcal{B}$ ) via a 2d condensation, and a 1d gapped domain wall with the wall excitations form a unitary fusion category  $\mathcal{S}$  is produced as a result of this condensation process. Then the vacuum  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ -phase is naturally a condensable algebra  $A$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  (see appendix A.2 for the definition of a condensable algebra). Moreover,  $\mathcal{C}$  consists of all deconfined anyons and can be identified with the category  $\mathcal{B}_A^0$  of local right  $A$ -modules in  $\mathcal{B}$ . On the 1d domain wall, the excitations include all confined and deconfined anyons and thus  $\mathcal{S}$  can be identified with the category  $\mathcal{B}_A$  of all right  $A$ -modules in  $\mathcal{B}$ . The bulk-to-wall map from  $\mathcal{B}$ -side is given by

$$L = - \otimes A: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_A = \mathcal{S}, \quad \text{defined by } a \mapsto a \otimes A, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{B}, \quad (1.1)$$

and  $L$  is a central functor, which means it factors through  $\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S}) \xrightarrow{\text{forget}} \mathcal{S}$ . The condensable algebra  $A$  can also be recovered as  $L^R(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}})$ , where  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}$  is the vacuum sector in  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $L^R$  is the right adjoint of  $L$ . We also have  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S}) \simeq \mathcal{B} \boxtimes \bar{\mathcal{C}}$  [DMNO13], where  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  denotes the time-reversal of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

We mainly focus on the special case that  $\mathcal{C} \simeq \text{Vec}$  is trivial. In this case the corresponding condensable algebra  $A$  is called Lagrangian. Also the domain wall  $\mathcal{S}$  is indeed a boundary of  $\mathcal{B}$ -phase and we obtain the boundary-bulk relation  $\mathcal{B} \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$ . Hence the gapped boundaries of  $\mathcal{B}$ -phase one-to-one correspond to the Lagrangian algebras in  $\mathcal{B}$ .

The same condensation process also happens in spacetime, which is related to a mysterious process called topological Wick rotation. Figure 1 is an intuitive depiction of topological Wick rotation. Given two gapped phases  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  with a gapped domain wall  $\mathcal{S}$  between them, we can ‘fold’ half of the plane to the time direction, which should be viewed as a fictional phase in the spacetime dimension. The ‘boundary’ of  $\mathcal{C}$  after rotation is described by an enriched category  ${}^{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{S}$ .




Figure 1: (a) depicts the anyon condensation process from  $\mathcal{B}$  to  $\text{Vec}$ . After the topological Wick rotation, we get (b), an anomaly-free 1+1D phase described by  ${}^{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{S} \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$ . From the definition of the right adjoint functor, i.e.,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}}(L(a), \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(a, L^R(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}))$ , we get  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}}(a \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(a, [\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}]_{\mathcal{B}})$ . Thus the Lagrangian algebra  $L^R(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}})$  can be written as the internal hom  $[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}]_{\mathcal{B}}$ .

In the case that  $\mathcal{C} \simeq \text{Vec}$  is trivial, we can ‘rotate’ the 2d bulk  $\mathcal{B} \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  to the time direction to get an anomaly-free 1d phase. After then, the pair  $(\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{S})$  represents an enriched fusion category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$ , which is just the topological skeleton of the obtained anomaly-free 1d phase. The bulk excitations in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$  before the rotation are replaced by the topological sectors of operators in the 1+1D spacetime after the rotation, and a topological excitation in  $\mathcal{S}$  becomes a defect line on the worldsheet. By anyon condensation theory, the Lagrangian algebra  $A := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}_A}(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}) \in \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$  is condensed on the the vacuum sector of states  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{S}}$ , and  $\mathcal{S}$  can be recovered as the module category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})_A$  (see figure 1(b)). That is to say, we can actually condense the topological sector of operators to those of the states, the sector of operators and the corresponding states also satisfy the ‘boundary-bulk relation’  $\mathcal{B} \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})$ .

**Remark 1.3.** The anomaly-free condition of an enriched fusion category is equivalent to the usual bulk-is-trivial condition, in which we have  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{S})) \simeq \text{Vec}$ . [KYZZ21]  $\diamond$

In the special case, let  $G$  be a finite group, the 2d bulk phase of the Kitaev quantum double model [Kit03] associated to  $G$  is given by the unitary modular tensor category  $\mathcal{B} \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ . For every subgroup  $H \subseteq G$ , there is a gapped boundary of the Kitaev quantum double model whose topological skeleton is  $\mathcal{S} = \text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$ . The corresponding Lagrangian algebra is denoted by  $A(H) \in \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ , which is also the full center [Dav10a] of  $F_H \in \text{Rep}(G)$ . After the topological Wick rotation, we obtain an enriched fusion category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H} \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(H)}$ , which is the topological skeleton of a 1d bosonic gapped phase with onsite  $G$ -symmetry. So there is another way to state Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 1.1:

**Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 1.4.** The topological skeleton of a 1d bosonic gapped phase with an onsite symmetry  $G$  is the enriched fusion category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(H)}$  if the symmetry spontaneously breaks to a subgroup  $H \subseteq G$ .

**Remark 1.5.** The Lagrangian algebras in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  are classified by pairs  $(H, [\omega])$ , where  $H$  is a subgroup of  $G$  and  $[\omega] \in H^2(H, U(1))$  [Dav10b]. Readers may check appendix A.2 for the case that  $G$  is abelian. This result exactly meets with the well-known classification of the 1d bosonic gapped phase with an onsite  $G$ -symmetry [CGW11, SPGC11].  $\diamond$

Comparing with the previous work [KWZ22], conceptually, what we do is to generalize the 2d bulk  $\mathcal{B}$  from the toric code model to the quantum double, then do a topological Wick rotation to obtain the descriptions of the 1d anomaly-free phases with onsite symmetries. We depict this intuition in figure 2, in which  $H_a, H_b, H_c \dots$  label different subgroups of  $G$ .




Figure 2: A picturesque explanation of the enriched category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(H)}$ . Left figures depict 2d topological orders with boundaries, while the right figures depict 1d anomaly-free gapped phases with onsite symmetries after the topological Wick rotation.

Now we are about to check the categorical description  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(H)} \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$  works in concrete lattice models. In section 2, we check the categorical structure of the topological defects with onsite  $G$ -symmetry and show the underlying category  $\mathcal{S}$  can be obtained from the so-called equivariantization. In section 3, we construct lattice models with a finite abelian onsite symmetry  $G$ , then analyze the categorical structure of topological skeletons and prove our physical main theorems 1.1 and 1.4. We further check that boundaries and domain walls also satisfy the corresponding enriched fusion categories in section 4. Some background knowledge and calculations are performed in the appendices.

**Acknowledgments:** We would like to thank Liang Kong and Holiverse Yang for helpful discussions. RX acknowledges Shenzhen Institute of Quantum Science and Engineering for hospitality during the visits. ZHZ is supported by NSFC under Grant No. 11971219 and Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation under Grant No. 2020B1515120100 and Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory (Grant No.2019B1212e03002).

## 2 Topological sectors of states with an onsite $G$ -symmetry

A topological order with an onsite  $G$ -symmetry (also known as an SPT/SET order in literatures) is described by its observables in LWLL as a quantum phase. Recall that for a topological order without symmetry, its observables in LWLL form a (higher) category. In this section, we argue that for a topological order with an onsite  $G$ -symmetry, the observables of states form a category, which is directly related to the category of observables of this topological order without the symmetry.

### 2.1 The category of topological sectors of states and group actions

First we consider topological orders without symmetry. There is a class of observables in LWLL of a topological order, called *topological sectors of states* or a *topological excitations*.

Microscopically, a state  $|\psi\rangle$  is a local observable. In LWLL, the coarse-graining process integrates and averages out the microscopic degrees of freedom by the action of local operators. Thus given a local operator  $A$ , the states  $A|\psi\rangle$  and  $|\psi\rangle$  should be viewed as the same after coarse-graining. These states form a subspace of the total Hilbert space:

$$\{A|\psi\rangle \mid A \text{ is a local operator}\}.$$

This subspace is called the topological sector of states (or topological excitation) generated by  $|\psi\rangle$ , which can be viewed as an observable in LWLL [KZ22a]. In general, a topological sector of states is a subspace of the total Hilbert space that is invariant under the action of local operators.

Given an  $nd$  topological order  $C_n$ , all (particle-like, i.e. 0+1D) topological sectors of states form a category  $\mathcal{C}$ . The hom space between two topological sectors of states consists of unconfined operators that map one topological sector of states to another. These operators are also called instantons because they are localized in the spacetime and behave like a 0D defect [KW14]. Such a space of instantons is also closed under the action of local operators and called a topological sector of operators.

**Remark 2.1.** When  $n \geq 1$ , the topological sectors of states in  $C_n$  can be fused together in space: if two topological sectors of states  $x$  and  $y$  are closed enough to each other, they can be viewed as a single topological sector of states. Figure 3 depicts the fusion of topological sectors of states in a 1+1D topological order. Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is a (multi-)fusion category with the tensor product given by the fusion of topological sectors of states. When  $n \geq 2$ , 0+1D topological sectors of states in  $C_n$  can also be braided in space and hence  $\mathcal{C}$  is a braided fusion category.  $\diamond$




Figure 3: The fusion of topological defect lines in a 1+1D topological order  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Now we assume that the  $nd$  topological order  $C_n$  is equipped with a unitary onsite symmetry given by a finite group  $G$ . Microscopically, the  $G$ -symmetry is usually realized by a collection of

operators  $\{U(g)\}_{g \in G}$ . As a symmetry on a quantum system, these operators should satisfy the following ‘projective’ relations because quantum states are defined up to a phases factor:

$$U(g)U(h)|\psi_x\rangle = \omega_x(g, h)U(gh)|\psi_x\rangle, \quad g, h \in G,$$

where  $x \in \mathcal{C}$  is a simple topological sector of states generated by a state  $|\psi_x\rangle$ , and  $\omega_x \in Z^2(G; U(1))$  is a 2-cocycle.

For an onsite symmetry, the operator  $U(g)$  is the tensor product of local operators on every site. Hence for any local operator  $A$ , the operator  $U(g)AU(g)^{-1}$  is still a local operator. Therefore, given a topological sector of states  $x \in \mathcal{C}$ , there is a well-defined topological sector of states  $T_g(x) \in \mathcal{C}$  defined by

$$T_g(x) := \{U(g)|\psi\rangle \mid |\psi\rangle \in x\}.$$

Moreover, if  $B$  is an operator that maps a topological sector of states  $x$  to another one  $y$ , then  $U(g)BU(g)^{-1}$  is an operator that maps  $T_g(x)$  to  $T_g(y)$ . Hence the symmetry induces a functor  $T_g: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  for every  $g \in G$ .

Note that the functors  $T_g \circ T_h$  and  $T_{gh}$  are not necessarily equal on the nose because the states  $U(g)U(h)|\psi_x\rangle$  and  $U(gh)|\psi_x\rangle$  may be differed by a phase factor. Such phase factors induce a natural isomorphism  $\gamma_{g,h}: T_g \circ T_h \Rightarrow T_{gh}$  in which the component  $(\gamma_{g,h})_x$  is given by the phase factor  $\omega_x(g, h)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{C}$ . The cocycle equation for  $\omega_x$  (i.e.,  $\omega_x(g, h)\omega_x(gh, k) = \omega_x(h, k)\omega_x(g, hk)$  for  $g, h, k \in G$ ) translates to the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (T_g T_h)T_k & \xlongequal{\quad} & T_g(T_h T_k) \\ \gamma_{g,h} \downarrow & & \downarrow 1\gamma_{h,k} \\ T_{gh}T_k & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{ghk}} & T_{ghk} \xleftarrow{\gamma_{g,hk}} & T_g T_{hk} \end{array}$$

Mathematically, these conditions mean that the functors  $\{T_g\}_{g \in G}$  and natural isomorphisms  $\{\gamma_{g,h}\}_{g,h \in G}$  form a monoidal functor  $T: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ . In other words, the  $G$ -symmetry on the topological order  $\mathcal{C}_n$  equips the category  $\mathcal{C}$  with a  $G$ -action (see appendix B.1 for details).

**Remark 2.2.** Recall that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a (multi-)fusion category when  $n \geq 1$ . Since  $G$  is an onsite symmetry, the symmetry action operators  $\{U(g)\}_{g \in G}$  preserve the fusion of topological sectors of states. Thus the  $G$ -action on  $\mathcal{C}$  is indeed a monoidal action, i.e.,  $T$  is a monoidal functor  $T: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\otimes}(\mathcal{C})$  (see appendix B.1 for details).  $\diamond$

## 2.2 Equivariantization and $G$ -symmetric topoloigcal sectors of states

For a topological order with symmetry, a topological sector of states may not be an observable in LWLL if it is not related to the symmetry. We define a  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states to be a subspace of the total Hilbert space that is invariant under the action of  $G$ -symmetric local operators and also invariant under the  $G$ -action. Then  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states are observables in LWLL.

In general, a  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states  $x$  may not be invariant under all local operators. In other words, it may not be a topological sector of states. Let  $\bar{x}$  be the topological sector of states generated by  $x$ . Then  $x$  is a subspace of  $\bar{x}$ . Since  $U(g)AU(g)^{-1}$  is a local operator for every local operator  $A$  and  $g \in G$ , it turns out that  $x$  is also  $G$ -invariant. Therefore,  $x$  is a  $G$ -invariant subspace (i.e., subrepresentation) of  $\bar{x}$ , and this invariant subspace is characterized by its behavior under the  $G$ -action. By acting the operator  $U(g)$ , the subspace  $x$  is invariant, but the states in  $x$  may be changed by a (possibly non-abelian) phase. Categorically, such a phase under the  $U(g)$ -action is described by an isomorphism

$$u_g: T_g(\bar{x}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{x}, \quad g \in G.$$

By comparing the action of  $U(g)U(h)$  and  $U(gh)$  for  $g, h \in G$ , we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_g T_h(\bar{x}) & \xrightarrow{(\gamma_{gh})_{\bar{x}}} & T_{gh}(\bar{x}) \\ \downarrow T_g(u_h) & & \downarrow u_{gh} \\ T_g(\bar{x}) & \xrightarrow{u_g} & x \end{array}$$

Then the  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states  $x$  is characterized by the pair  $(\bar{x}, \{u_g\}_{g \in G})$ , which satisfies the above commutative diagram. It is possible that  $\bar{x}$  contains different  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states, which are characterized by different  $\{u_g\}$ 's.

In addition, an instanton between two such topological sectors of states  $(\bar{x}, \{u_g\}_{g \in G})$  and  $(\bar{y}, \{v_g\}_{g \in G})$  should also be symmetric, i.e. commutes with operators  $U(g)$  for all  $g \in G$ . Categorically, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_g(\bar{x}) & \xrightarrow{T_g(f)} & T_g(\bar{y}) \\ \downarrow u_g & & \downarrow v_g \\ \bar{x} & \xrightarrow{f} & \bar{y} \end{array}$$

Hence, the category of  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states is an *equivariantization* (see Definition B.2). Thus we have the following physical theorem.

**Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 2.3.** Let  $C_n$  be an  $nd$  topological order with a unitary onsite  $G$ -symmetry. Suppose all particle-like topological sectors of states (by ignoring the symmetry) form a category  $\mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) The  $G$ -symmetry induces a  $G$ -action on the category  $\mathcal{C}$ .
- (2) The category of (particle-like)  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states is equivalent to the equivariantization  $\mathcal{C}^G$ .

Note that the above analysis does not depend on the dimension of  $C_n$  nor  $G$  symmetry abelian or not.

**Remark 2.4.** Here the equivariantization  $\mathcal{C}^G$  is not the same as the topological skeleton introduced in section 1, even in 1+1D. The morphisms in  $\mathcal{C}^G$  are only local operators (instantons). Thus  $\mathcal{C}^G$  is the underlying category of the topological skeleton.  $\diamond$

### 3 The lattice model with abelian onsite $G$ -symmetry

Let  $G$  be a finite abelian group. In this section, we would construct and analyze a lattice model with an onsite abelian  $G$ -symmetry.

#### 3.1 The lattice model and ground states

Consider the 1d lattice (defined on an infinitely long open interval) with the total Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{tot}} = \bigotimes_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{H}_i$ , where each local Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_i$  is spanned by an orthonormal basis  $\{|g\rangle_i \mid g \in G\}$ . For each site  $i$  and  $g \in G$ , we define an operator  $L_g^i$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}_i$  as follows:

$$L_g^i |h\rangle_i := |gh\rangle_i, \forall h \in G.$$

The global  $G$ -symmetry action is defined by

$$U(g) := \bigotimes_i L_g^i, \forall g \in G.$$



Before we construct the Hamiltonian, we need to define some operators. Recall that all group homomorphisms  $G \rightarrow \text{U}(1)$  form a finite abelian group  $\hat{G}$ , called the *dual group* of  $G$ . Equivalently,  $\hat{G}$  is also the group of equivalence classes of irreducible  $G$ -representations. For each site  $i$  and  $\rho \in \hat{G}$ , we define an operator  $Z_\rho^i$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}_i$  by

$$Z_\rho^i |g\rangle_i := \rho(g) |g\rangle_i.$$

It is clear that the following equations hold for all  $g, k \in G$  and  $\rho, \sigma \in \hat{G}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} L_g^i L_k^i &= L_{gk}^i, & (L_g^i)^\dagger &= (L_g^i)^{-1} = L_{g^{-1}}^i, \\ Z_\rho^i Z_\sigma^i &= Z_{\rho\sigma}^i, & (Z_\rho^i)^\dagger &= (Z_\rho^i)^{-1} = Z_{\rho^{-1}}^i, \\ L_g^i Z_\rho^i (L_g^i)^{-1} &= \rho(g) Z_\rho^i. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Let  $H \subseteq G$  be a subgroup of  $G$ . Note that  $\widehat{G/H}$  can be naturally viewed as a subgroup of  $\hat{G}$ : every group homomorphism  $\lambda: G/H \rightarrow \text{U}(1)$  induces a group homomorphism  $G \rightarrow G/H \xrightarrow{\lambda} \text{U}(1)$ , which is nontrivial if  $\lambda$  is. Then for each site  $i$  we define two Hermitian operators:

$$X_H^i := \frac{1}{|H|} \sum_{h \in H} L_h^i, \quad Z_H^{i,i+1} := \frac{|H|}{|G|} \sum_{\rho \in \widehat{G/H}} Z_\rho^i (Z_\rho^{i+1})^\dagger.$$

It is easy to verify that these operators are mutually commuting projectors and  $G$ -symmetric (i.e. commute with  $U(g)$  for all  $g \in G$ ).

The lattice model we considered depends on the symmetry group  $G$  and a chosen subgroup  $H \subseteq G$ . The Hamiltonian is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{H} := \sum_i (1 - X_H^i) + \sum_i (1 - Z_H^{i,i+1}). \quad (3.2)$$

**Remark 3.1.** When  $G = \mathbb{Z}_n$ , the Hamiltonian realizes the bosonic quantum clock model (see [Fen12] for example), where  $L^i$  and  $Z^i$  are  $n \times n$  generalizations of the Pauli matrices  $\sigma_x$  and  $\sigma_z$ . In particular, when  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ , it recovers the well-known 1d quantum Ising model.  $\diamond$

Since the Hamiltonian (3.2) is the sum of commuting projectors, it is not hard to verify that the ground state subspace has dimension  $|G|/|H|$  and there is an orthonormal basis labeled by  $x \in G/H$ :

$$|\psi_x\rangle := \bigotimes_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H|}} \sum_{g \in x} |g\rangle_i. \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, we have  $U(g)|\psi_x\rangle = |\psi_{gx}\rangle$  for  $g \in G$  and  $x \in G/H$ . Thus the ground state  $|\psi_H\rangle$  (indeed, every ground state  $|\psi_x\rangle$ ) is stable under the action of  $U(h)$  for  $h \in H$ . Hence the lattice model (3.2) spontaneously breaks the  $G$ -symmetry to the subgroup  $H$ .

### 3.2 Topological sectors of operators

There are two kinds of  $G$ -symmetric non-local operators (also known as fluxions and chargeons in a quantum double [BSW11]):

$$M_g^i := \prod_{j \leq i} L_{g^j}^i, \quad E_\rho^i = \prod_{j \geq i} Z_\rho^j (Z_\rho^{j+1})^\dagger, \quad \forall g \in G, \quad \forall \rho \in \hat{G}.$$

Since  $E_\rho^i$  is the product of infinitely many  $G$ -symmetric operators, it should be viewed as a  $G$ -symmetric non-local operator. On the other hand, the single operator  $Z_\rho^i$  is a non-symmetric local operator. Note that  $E_\rho^i = Z_\rho^i$  as an operator that catches all the corrected properties near site  $i$ .

**Remark 3.2.** These operators are also called “patch symmetry operators” in [JW20], in which the special case that  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$  is considered (see also [KWZ22]).  $\diamond$

Apparently, the product  $M_g^i E_\rho^j$  is also a symmetric non-local operator. We denote the topological sector of operators generated by  $M_g^i E_\rho^j$  by  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)}$ .

By (3.1) we have

$$M_g^i E_\rho^j = \begin{cases} E_\rho^j M_{g'}^i, & i < j, \\ \rho(g)^{-1} E_\rho^j M_{g'}^i, & i \geq j. \end{cases}$$

Thus,  $M_g^i E_\rho^j M_h^k E_\sigma^l$  and  $M_g^i M_h^k E_\rho^j E_\sigma^l$  differ by a coefficient at most. It follows that the fusion products of these topological sectors of operators are given by

$$\mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{(h,\sigma)} = \mathcal{O}_{(gh,\rho\sigma)}. \quad (3.4)$$

This recovers the fusion structure in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ .

Moreover, for  $i < k < j$  we have

$$M_g^i M_{g^{-1}}^j E_\rho^k M_g^j M_{g^{-1}}^i = \rho(g) \cdot E_\rho^k.$$

This means that the double braiding of two topological sectors  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,1)}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{(e,\rho)}$  is

$$\mathcal{O}_{(g,1)} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{(e,\rho)} \xrightarrow{\rho(g) \cdot 1(e)} \mathcal{O}_{(g,1)} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{(e,\rho)}.$$

Conceptually, we can regard this process as first creating a pair of fluxions at sites  $i$  and  $j$ , then winding a chargeon around one of the fluxions (where the chargeon would cross in between the fluxions on site  $k$ ), after this process, we annihilate the pair of fluxions and obtain a phase  $\rho(g)$ . For a general braiding process, we have

$$M_g^i E_\rho^j E_{\rho^{-1}}^j M_{g^{-1}}^j M_h^k E_\sigma^k M_g^j E_\rho^j E_{\rho^{-1}}^j M_{g^{-1}}^i = \rho(h) \sigma(g) M_h^k E_\sigma^k,$$

and this equation gives the double braiding

$$\mathcal{O}_{(h,\sigma)} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)} \xrightarrow{\sigma(g) \rho(h)} \mathcal{O}_{(h,\sigma)} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)}. \quad (3.5)$$

The topological sectors of operators  $\{\mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)}\}_{g \in G, \rho \in \hat{G}}$ , together with the fusion and braiding properties (3.4) (3.5), form a braided fusion category equivalent to  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  (see appendix A.1 and example A.3 for details).

### 3.3 The topological skeletons

In order to convince the readers of the categorical structure stated in Theorem<sup>Ph</sup> 1.1, we would like to give the exact categorical description for each phase step by step. It would be beneficial to first check the symmetry preserving case and the symmetry completely broken case.

#### 3.3.1 Symmetry preserving case (the trivial SPT)

Consider the phase realized by (3.2) with  $H = G$ . In other words, the Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_i (1 - X_G^i). \quad (3.6)$$

In this case there is no symmetry breaking and the unique ground state is

$$|\Omega_G\rangle := \bigotimes_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}} \sum_{g \in G} |g\rangle_i.$$

Since the ground state  $|\Omega_G\rangle$  is a product state, the Hamiltonian (3.6) realizes the trivial  $G$ -SPT order.

It is clear that  $M_g^i|\Omega_G\rangle = |\Omega_G\rangle$  for all sites  $i$  and  $g \in G$ . We use  $\mathcal{S}_1$  to denote the topological sector of states generated by the ground state  $|\Omega_G\rangle$  (i.e. the trivial topological sector of states).

For each  $\rho \in \hat{G}$  and site  $i$ , we define

$$|\rho, i\rangle := E_\rho^i|\Omega_G\rangle.$$

In particular,  $|1, i\rangle = |\Omega_G\rangle$  where  $1 \in \hat{G}$  is the trivial  $G$ -representation. By the orthogonality of characters, one can verify that  $X_G^i|\rho, i\rangle = 0$  if  $\rho \neq 1$  and  $X_G^i|1, i\rangle = X_G^i|\Omega_G\rangle = |\Omega_G\rangle$ . Moreover, for two sites  $i$  and  $j$ , the states  $|\rho, i\rangle$  and  $|\rho, j\rangle$  generate the same  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states because  $Z_\rho^j(Z_\rho^i)^\dagger$  is a symmetric local operator:

$$|\rho, j\rangle = Z_\rho^j(Z_\rho^i)^\dagger|\rho, i\rangle.$$

We use  $\mathcal{S}_\rho$  to denote the  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states generated by  $|\rho, i\rangle$ .

**Remark 3.3.** If we ignore the  $G$ -symmetry, the state  $|\rho, i\rangle$  is created from the ground state by a local operator  $Z_\rho^i$ , thus it generates the trivial topological sector of states.  $\diamond$

Consider the state

$$|\rho, i; \sigma, j\rangle := E_\rho^i E_\sigma^j |\Omega_G\rangle,$$

where  $\rho, \sigma \in \hat{G}$  and  $i < j$ . Intuitively,  $|\rho, i; \sigma, j\rangle$  should generate the  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states  $\mathcal{S}_\rho \otimes \mathcal{S}_\sigma$  (i.e. the fusion of  $\mathcal{S}_\rho$  and  $\mathcal{S}_\sigma$ ). On the other hand, by acting  $Z_\rho^j(Z_\rho^i)^\dagger$  on this state we find that  $|\rho, i; \sigma, j\rangle$  generates the same  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states as  $|\rho\sigma, j\rangle$ :

$$Z_\rho^j(Z_\rho^i)^\dagger|\rho, i; \sigma, j\rangle = E_\rho^j E_\sigma^j |\Omega_G\rangle = E_{\rho\sigma}^j |\Omega_G\rangle = |\rho\sigma, j\rangle.$$

It follows that the fusion rules of topological sectors of states of the phase realized by (3.6) are given by

$$\mathcal{S}_\rho \otimes \mathcal{S}_\sigma = \mathcal{S}_{\rho\sigma}.$$

Therefore, the fusion category of topological sector of states is equivalent to the fusion category  $\text{Rep}(G)$  of finite-dimensional  $G$ -representations.

From another perspective, if we view (3.6) as a system without symmetry, it realizes the trivial 1d topological order (without symmetry) because the ground state  $|\Omega_G\rangle$  is a product state. Thus the topological sectors of states form a fusion category equivalent to  $\text{Vec}$ . By Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 2.3, if we view (3.6) as a system with  $G$ -symmetry, the  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states form a fusion category equivalent to the equivariantization  $\text{Vec}^G$ , which is just  $\text{Rep}(G)$  (see example B.4).

Since  $M_g^i$  only has trivial actions on the ground state  $|\Omega_G\rangle$ , the operator  $M_g^i E_\rho^j$  also maps the sector  $\mathcal{S}_\sigma$  to  $\mathcal{S}_{\rho\sigma}$  for all  $g \in G$  and  $\rho, \sigma \in \hat{G}$ . Equivalently,  $M_g^i E_{\sigma\rho^{-1}}^j$  maps the topological sector  $\mathcal{S}_\rho$  to  $\mathcal{S}_\sigma$ . Thus the hom spaces between topological sectors of states are given by

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}_\rho, \mathcal{S}_\sigma) = \bigoplus_{g \in G} \mathcal{O}_{(g, \sigma\rho^{-1})}.$$

Hence we have proved the following physical theorem within a concrete model step by step:

**Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 3.4.** The topological skeleton of the 1d trivial SPT order with the bosonic onsite abelian symmetry  $G$  is the enriched fusion category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)$ .

**Remark 3.5.** In the language of anyon condensation, the trivial action of  $M_g^i$  on the ground state can be interpreted as the condensation of fluxions (equivalently, the condensation of Lagrangian algebra  $A(G) := \text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_1) = \bigoplus_{g \in G} \mathcal{O}_{(g, 1)}$  in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  provided by the vacuum sector of states).  $\diamond$

### 3.3.2 Symmetry completely broken case

The situation when  $G$  is completely broken (i.e.,  $H = \{e\}$  is the trivial group) follows the same path. The Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_i (1 - Z_{[e]}^{i,i+1}). \quad (3.7)$$

In this case, the ground state subspace has dimension  $|G|$  and there is an orthonormal basis labeled by group elements  $g \in G$ :

$$|\psi_g\rangle := \bigotimes_i |g\rangle_i.$$

Clearly we have  $U(g)|\psi_h\rangle = |\psi_{gh}\rangle$  for  $g, h \in G$ .

First we view (3.7) as a system without symmetry. Since each ground state  $|\psi_g\rangle$  is a product state, (3.7) realizes the direct sum of  $|G|$  copies of the trivial 1d topological order (physically we need a fine tuning to realize this phase). There are  $|G|^2$  simple topological sectors of states (domain walls)  $\{\mathcal{T}_{g,h}\}_{g,h \in G}$  generated by the following states:

$$|\psi_{g,h,i}\rangle := \left( \bigotimes_{j \leq i} |g\rangle_j \right) \otimes \left( \bigotimes_{j > i} |h\rangle_j \right), \quad g, h \in G.$$

Clearly the fusion rules of these topological sectors of states are given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{g,h} \otimes \mathcal{T}_{k,l} = \delta_{h,k} \mathcal{T}_{g,l}, \quad g, h, k, l \in G.$$

Therefore, these topological sectors of states form a multi-fusion category equivalent to the multi-fusion category  $\text{Mat}_{|G|}(\text{Vec})$  of  $|G|$ -by- $|G|$  matrices valued in  $\text{Vec}$ , or the multi-fusion category  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_G, \text{Vec}_G)$  of linear functors.

If we view (3.7) as a system with  $G$ -symmetry, the symmetry group  $G$  acts on the multi-fusion category  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_G, \text{Vec}_G)$  of topological sectors of states, and the fusion category of  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states is equivalent to the equivariantization  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_G, \text{Vec}_G)^G$  by Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 2.3. It is easy to see that

$$U(g)|\psi_{h,k,i}\rangle = |\psi_{gh,gk,i}\rangle, \quad g, h, k \in G.$$

Thus the  $G$ -action on  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_G, \text{Vec}_G) \simeq \text{Mat}_{|G|}(\text{Vec})$  is given by

$$g(\mathcal{T}_{h,k}) = \mathcal{T}_{gh,gk}.$$

Mathematically, the equivariantization  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_G, \text{Vec}_G)^G$  is equivalent to  $\text{Vec}_G$  as fusion categories. This is a special case of Proposition 3.9 below (see also remark B.11). The mathematical proof can also be reformulated in physical language by explicitly finding the  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states. In this way we prove the equivalence  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_G, \text{Vec}_G)^G \simeq \text{Vec}_G$  in this concrete lattice model.

We consider the ground states first. Since the  $G$ -action permutes the ground states  $|\psi_g\rangle$ , each ground state (and hence the ground state subspace) generates the same  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states:

$$\mathcal{S}_e := \bigoplus_{g \in G} \mathcal{T}_{g,g}.$$

Similarly, given  $g \in G$ , the states  $|\psi_{gh,h,i}\rangle$  for all  $h \in G$  and sites  $i$  generate the same  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of state:

$$\mathcal{S}_g := \bigoplus_{h \in G} \mathcal{T}_{gh,h}.$$

It is not hard to see that the fusion products of  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states are given by

$$\mathcal{S}_g \otimes \mathcal{S}_h = \mathcal{S}_{gh}.$$

Hence the fusion category of  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states is equivalent to  $\text{Vec}_G$ .

Note that  $E_\rho^i |\psi_h\rangle = \rho(h) |\psi_h\rangle$  and  $M_g^i |\psi_h\rangle = |\psi_{gh,h,i}\rangle$  for all  $g, h \in G$ ,  $\rho \in \hat{G}$  and sites  $i$ . Thus the operator  $M_g^i E_\rho^j$  maps the sector  $\mathcal{S}_h$  to  $\mathcal{S}_{gh}$  for all  $g, h \in G$  and  $\rho \in \hat{G}$ . Thus the hom spaces between  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states are given by

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}_g, \mathcal{S}_h) = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \hat{G}} \mathcal{O}_{(hg^{-1}, \rho)}.$$

Hence we have proved the following physical theorem:

**Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 3.6.** The topological skeleton of the 1d symmetry-breaking order (completely broken) with the bosonic onsite abelian symmetry  $G$  is the enriched fusion category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Vec}_G$ .

**Remark 3.7.** The trivial action of operators  $E_\rho^i$  on the ground state can be categorically interpreted as the condensation of chargeons (equivalently, the condensation of Lagrangian algebra  $A(\{e\}) := \text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}_e, \mathcal{S}_e) = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \hat{G}} \mathcal{O}_{(e, \rho)}$  in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  provided by the vacuum sector of states).  $\diamond$

### 3.3.3 General cases (symmetry partially broken)

For the general symmetry breaking cases, we fix a subgroup  $H \subseteq G$  in (3.2). Recall that the ground state subspace has dimension  $|G|/|H|$  and there is an orthonormal basis  $\{|\psi_x\rangle\}_{x \in G/H}$  (3.3) satisfying  $U(g)|\psi_x\rangle = |\psi_{gx}\rangle$  for  $g \in G$  and  $x \in G/H$ . Thus the ground state subspace is isomorphic to the function algebra  $F_H := \text{Fun}(G/H)$  as a  $G$ -representation.

Again we view (3.2) as a system without symmetry. Since each ground state  $|\psi_x\rangle$  (3.3) is a product state, (3.2) realizes the direct sum of  $n := |G|/|H|$  copies of the trivial 1d topological order. There are  $n^2$  simple topological sectors of states (domain walls)  $\{\mathcal{T}_{x,y}\}_{x,y \in G/H}$  generated by

$$|\psi_{x,y,i}\rangle := \left( \bigotimes_{j \leq i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H|}} \sum_{g \in x} |g\rangle_j \right) \otimes \left( \bigotimes_{j > i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H|}} \sum_{h \in y} |h\rangle_j \right), \quad x, y \in G/H,$$

and the fusion rules are given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{T}_{z,w} = \delta_{y,z} \mathcal{T}_{x,w}, \quad x, y, z, w \in G/H.$$

The multi-fusion category of topological sectors of states is equivalent to  $\text{Mat}_n(\text{Vec})$ , or the functor category  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H})$ .

**Remark 3.8.** The fact that the 1d bulk is anomaly-free can be seen from the Drinfeld center of  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H})$ , i.e.,  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H})) \simeq \text{Vec}$ .  $\diamond$

Now we view (3.2) as a system with  $G$ -symmetry. The  $G$ -action on  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H}) \simeq \text{Mat}_n(\text{Vec})$  is induced by the  $G$ -action on states:

$$U(g)|\psi_{x,y,i}\rangle = |\psi_{gx,gy,i}\rangle, \quad g \in G, x, y \in G/H.$$

In other words, we have

$$g(\mathcal{T}_{x,y}) = \mathcal{T}_{gx,gy}.$$

The fusion category of  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states is equivalent to the equivariantization  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H})^G$ . Also we have the following mathematical result:

**Proposition 3.9.** Let  $G$  be a finite group and  $H \subseteq G$  be a subgroup. Then the fusion category  $\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is monoidally equivalent to the equivariantization  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H})^G$ .

Thus the fusion category of  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states is also equivalent to the fusion category  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$  of  $(F_H, F_H)$ -bimodules in  $\text{Rep}(G)$ . As in the symmetry completely broken case, we translate the mathematical proof of Proposition 3.9 in appendix B.2 to physical language by explicitly finding the  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states.

First, for each  $g \in G$  and  $\rho \in \hat{G}$ , the following states generate a simple  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states, denoted by  $\mathcal{S}_{g,\rho}$ :

$$\left\{ E_\rho^i |\psi_{g^x, x, j}\rangle \right\}_{x \in G/H}$$

Note that

- (1) for  $g, g' \in G$  satisfying  $g^{-1}g' \in H$ , we have  $E_\rho^i |\psi_{g^x, x, j}\rangle = E_\rho^i |\psi_{g'^x, x, j}\rangle$ ;
- (2) for  $\rho, \rho' \in \hat{G}$  satisfying  $\rho^{-1}\rho' \in \widehat{G/H}$ , the states  $E_\rho^i |\psi_{g^x, x, j}\rangle$  and  $E_{\rho'}^i |\psi_{g^x, x, j}\rangle$  are differed by a nonzero factor, thus correspond to the same quantum state.

Therefore,  $\mathcal{S}_{g,\rho}$  only depends on the equivalence classes (cosets)  $[g] \in G/H$  and  $[\rho] \in \widehat{G/H} \simeq \hat{H}$ . So we denote these  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of state by  $\{\mathcal{S}_{[g],[\rho]}\}_{[g] \in G/H, [\rho] \in \hat{H}}$ . The fusion products of topological sectors of states are given by

$$\mathcal{S}_{[g],[\rho]} \otimes \mathcal{S}_{[h],[\sigma]} = \mathcal{S}_{[gh],[\rho\sigma]}, \quad g, h \in G, \rho, \sigma \in \hat{G}.$$

It is not hard to see that the operator  $M_g^i E_\rho^j$  maps the sector  $\mathcal{S}_{[h],[\sigma]}$  to  $\mathcal{S}_{[gh],[\rho\sigma]}$  for all  $g, h \in G$  and  $\rho, \sigma \in \hat{G}$ . Thus the hom spaces between  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states are given by

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}_{[g],[\rho]}, \mathcal{S}_{[h],[\sigma]}) = \bigoplus_{\substack{k \in [hg^{-1}] \\ \lambda \in [\sigma\rho^{-1}]}} \mathcal{O}_{(k,\lambda)}.$$

By comparing with example C.5 we see that this enriched category  ${}_{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))}\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{F_H|F_H}$  is precisely the one obtained from the canonical construction of the obvious action of  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  on  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$ .

**Remark 3.10.** Intuitively, we may say the operators are ‘partially condensed’, with  $E_\rho^i$  acting trivially on the trivial  $G$ -symmetric topological sector of states  $\mathcal{S}_{[e],[1]}$  for each  $\rho \in \widehat{G/H}$ , and  $M_g^i$  acting trivially on  $\mathcal{S}_{[e],[1]}$  for each  $g \in H$ . More precisely, these operators form the Lagrangian algebra

$$A(H) := \text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}_{[e],[1]}, \mathcal{S}_{[e],[1]}) = \bigoplus_{\substack{g \in H \\ \rho \in \widehat{G/H}}} \mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)} \in \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)),$$

and the fusion category  ${}_{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(H)}}\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  of right  $A(H)$ -modules in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  is equivalent to the bimodule category  $\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$ .  $\diamond$

Hence we have proved the theorem in the beginning through concrete models:

**Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 3.11.** The topological skeleton of the 1d gapped phase with an onsite abelian symmetry  $G$  is the enriched fusion category  ${}_{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))}\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{F_H|F_H}$  (or equivalently,  ${}_{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))}\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(H)}$ ) if the symmetry spontaneously breaks to a subgroup  $H \subseteq G$ .

**Remark 3.12.** The categorical description  ${}_{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))}\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{F_H|F_H}$  is anomaly-free in the sense that the Drinfeld center of this category is trivial:

$$\mathfrak{Z}_1\left({}_{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))}\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{F_H|F_H}\right) \simeq \text{Vec}.$$

See [KYZZ21, section 5.3] for the definition of the Drinfeld center ( $E_1$ -center) of an enriched fusion category and the proof of the above equivalence.  $\diamond$

## 4 Boundaries and Domain walls

In this section we consider the boundaries and domain walls of those 1d bosonic gapped phases with an onsite abelian symmetry  $G$ .

In principle, for a 0d topological phase, it is not precise to talk about particle-like excitations, since each excitation can be viewed as a 0d phase itself, but there is still a 0d categorical structure given by the ‘category of boundary conditions’. That is, each Hamiltonian specifies a boundary condition  $x$ , and all  $H$ -symmetric boundary conditions form a category  $\mathcal{X}$ . We sometimes write a 0d boundary  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  as a pair  $(\mathcal{X}, x)$  to emphasize the category  $\mathcal{X}$  of 0d boundaries [KZ22a].

### 4.1 Boundaries

In order to see the categorical descriptions of the boundaries phases in lattice models, we again start from the most obvious case, where we choose the 1d bulk to be the trivial SPT order, whose topological skeleton is  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)$ . We pick the boundary phase on the left side, i.e.  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{tot}} = \bigotimes_{i \geq 0} \mathcal{H}_i$  (the right side is similar) and analyze its boundary conditions:

1.  **$G$ -symmetric boundary conditions:** First we consider the boundary conditions that preserve  $G$ -symmetry. For example, the following boundary Hamiltonian preserves the  $G$ -symmetry on the boundary:

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i \geq 0} (1 - X_G^i).$$

Its ground state is simply  $\bigotimes_{i \geq 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}} \sum_{g \in G} |g\rangle_i$ . This Hamiltonian is the most trivial case that preserves  $G$ -symmetry on the boundary (where we can obtain it by taking  $\rho$  to be 1 in (4.1)), we may call this Hamiltonian the canonical choice. Adding a  $G$ -symmetric operator to this Hamiltonian also gives a  $G$ -symmetric boundary condition. For example, for every  $\rho \in \hat{G}$  the following Hamiltonian realizes a  $G$ -symmetric boundary condition:

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i \geq 0} (1 - X_G^i) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \rho(g) L_g^0\right). \quad (4.1)$$

Its ground state is  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}} \sum_{g \in G} \rho(g) |g\rangle_0 \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i > 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}} \sum_{g \in G} |g\rangle_i\right)$ , in this way we get all the simple objects in the category of boundary conditions, and the corresponding boundary condition is denoted by  $\mathcal{S}_\rho$ . Therefore, the underlying category of the enriched category of  $G$ -symmetric boundary conditions is equivalent to  $\text{Rep}(G)$ .

Note that for every  $g \in G$  the operator  $M_g^0$  does not change  $G$ -symmetric boundary conditions. Therefore,  $M_g^0$  should be viewed as ‘local’ on a  $G$ -symmetric boundary, because the hom space (topological sector of operators) between  $G$ -symmetric boundary conditions is invariant under these operators. Mathematically, these local operators form a Lagrangian algebra  $A(G) = \bigoplus_{g \in G} \mathcal{O}_{(g,1)} \in \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  (see Remark 3.5), and the hom spaces between  $G$ -symmetric boundary conditions are (right)  $A(G)$ -modules as explained in (1.1). Therefore, the background category of the enriched category of  $G$ -symmetric boundary conditions is the category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(G)}$  of right  $A(G)$ -modules in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ . The structure of the enriched category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(G)}\text{Rep}(G)$  of  $G$ -symmetric boundary conditions is determined by

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}_\rho, \mathcal{S}_\sigma) = \bigoplus_{g \in G} \mathcal{O}_{(g, \sigma \rho^{-1})} = \bigoplus_{g \in G} \mathcal{O}_{(e, \sigma \rho^{-1})} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{(g,1)} = \mathcal{O}_{(e, \sigma \rho^{-1})} \otimes A(G).$$

Moreover, by condensing ‘local operators’ in  $A(G)$ , there is an equivalence  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(G)} \simeq \text{Rep}(G)$  of fusion categories given by

$$\text{Rep}(G) \ni \rho \mapsto \mathcal{O}_{(e, \rho)} \otimes A(G) \in \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(G)}.$$

Under this equivalence, the enriched category of  $G$ -symmetric boundary conditions can be equivalently written as

$$\text{Rep}^{(G)}\text{Rep}(G)$$

with the hom spaces given by

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}_\rho, \mathcal{S}_\sigma) = \sigma\rho^{-1} \in \text{Rep}(G).$$

2. **Symmetry completely broken boundary conditions:** Then we consider the boundary conditions that do not preserve any symmetry. For example, we can choose the boundary Hamiltonian to be

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i>0} (1 - X_G^i) + (1 - Z_{\{e\}}^0),$$

where  $Z_{\{e\}}^0 = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\rho \in \hat{G}} Z_\rho^0$ . Its ground state is  $|e\rangle_0 \otimes \left( \bigotimes_{i>0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}} \sum_{g \in G} |g\rangle_i \right)$ , which completely breaks the  $G$ -symmetry on site 0. Indeed, it is the only simple boundary condition that completely breaks the symmetry, which is denoted by  $\mathcal{S}$ . Therefore, the underlying category of the enriched category of symmetry completely broken boundary conditions is equivalent to  $\text{Vec}$ .

On symmetry completely broken boundaries, the operator  $E_\rho^0$  for every  $\rho \in \hat{G}$  should be viewed as ‘local’. These operators form a Lagrangian algebra  $A(\{e\}) = \bigoplus_{\rho \in \hat{G}} \mathcal{O}_{(e,\rho)}$  (see Remark 3.7), and the hom spaces between symmetry completely broken boundary conditions are (right)  $A(\{e\})$ -modules. Therefore, the background category of the enriched category of symmetry completely broken boundary conditions is equivalent to the category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(\{e\})}$ . The structure of the enriched category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(\{e\})}\text{Vec}$  of symmetry completely broken boundary conditions is determined by

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}) = \bigoplus_{\substack{g \in G \\ \rho \in \hat{G}}} \mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)} = \left( \bigoplus_{g \in G} \mathcal{O}_{(g,1)} \right) \otimes \left( \bigoplus_{\rho \in \hat{G}} \mathcal{O}_{(e,\rho)} \right) = \left( \bigoplus_{g \in G} \mathcal{O}_{(g,1)} \right) \otimes A(\{e\}).$$

Moreover, there is a monoidal equivalence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vec}_G &\simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(\{e\})} \\ \mathbb{C}_g &\mapsto \mathcal{O}_{(g,1)} \otimes A(\{e\}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{C}_g$  is the complex number field with  $g$ -grading. Hence, the enriched category of symmetry completely broken boundary conditions can be equivalently written as

$$\text{Vec}_G \text{Vec}$$

with the hom spaces given by

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}) = \bigoplus_{g \in G} \mathbb{C}_g.$$

3. **Symmetry partially broken boundary conditions:** Fix a subgroup  $H \subseteq G$ . Now we consider the boundary conditions that only preserve the subgroup  $H$ . The canonical choice of Hamiltonian that break the ground state symmetry on site 0 from  $G$  to  $H$  can be written as

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i>0} (1 - X_G^i) + (1 - Z_H^0) + (1 - X_H^0),$$

where  $Z_H^0 = \frac{|H|}{|G|} \sum_{\rho \in \widehat{G/H}} Z_\rho^0$ . The ground state is then given by  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{|H|}} \sum_{g \in H} |g\rangle_0 \otimes \left( \bigotimes_{i>0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}} \sum_{g \in G} |g\rangle_i \right)$ . For every  $\sigma \in \hat{G}$ , we can promote the upper Hamiltonian to a Hamiltonian that realizes a  $H$ -symmetric boundary condition, for example:

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i>0} (1 - X_G^i) + (1 - Z_H^0) + \left( 1 - \frac{1}{|H|} \sum_{h \in H} \sigma(h) L_h^0 \right).$$



Its ground state is given by  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{|H|}} \sum_{g \in H} \sigma(g) |g\rangle_0 \otimes \left( \bigotimes_{i>0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}} \sum_{g \in G} |g\rangle_i \right)$ . Note that it only depends on the equivalence class (coset)  $[\sigma] \in \widehat{G}/\widehat{G/H} \simeq \widehat{H}$ , so we denote the corresponding  $H$ -symmetric boundary condition by  $\mathcal{S}_{[\sigma]}$ . Therefore, the underlying category of the enriched category of  $H$ -symmetric boundary conditions is equivalent to  $\text{Rep}(H)$ .

On  $H$ -symmetric boundaries, the operators  $M_g^0$  and  $E_\rho^0$  are partially localized (condensed) up to  $g \in H$  and  $\rho \in \widehat{G/H}$ . These ‘local operators’ form a Lagrangian algebra (see Remark 3.10)

$$A(H) = \bigoplus_{\substack{g \in H \\ \rho \in \widehat{G/H}}} \mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)},$$

and the hom spaces between symmetry completely broken boundary conditions are (right)  $A(H)$ -modules. Therefore, the background category of the enriched category of symmetry completely broken boundary conditions is equivalent to the category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(H)}$  of right  $A(H)$ -modules in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ . The structure of the enriched category  ${}^{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(H)}}\text{Rep}(H)$  of  $H$ -symmetric boundary conditions is determined by

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}_{[\rho]}, \mathcal{S}_{[\sigma]}) = \bigoplus_{\substack{g \in G \\ \phi \in \widehat{G/H}}} \mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi \cdot \sigma \rho^{-1})} = \left( \bigoplus_{\substack{g \in H \\ \phi \in \widehat{G/H}}} \mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \right) \otimes \left( \bigoplus_{[k] \in G/H} \mathcal{O}_{(k,\sigma \rho^{-1})} \right) = \left( \bigoplus_{[k] \in G/H} \mathcal{O}_{(k,\sigma \rho^{-1})} \right) \otimes A(H),$$

where  $[\rho], [\sigma] \in \widehat{H}$ .

Moreover, there is a monoidal equivalence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H} &\simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(H)} \\ \mathcal{M}_{([g],[\rho])} &\mapsto \mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)} \otimes A(H), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_{([g],[\rho])}$  is the simple object in  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$  corresponding to  $[g] \in G/H$  and  $[\rho] \in \widehat{H}$  (see Remark B.8). Hence, the enriched category of  $H$ -symmetric boundary conditions can be equivalently written as

$$\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H} \text{Rep}(H)$$

with the hom spaces given by

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{S}_{[\rho]}, \mathcal{S}_{[\sigma]}) = \bigoplus_{[k] \in G/H} \mathcal{M}_{[k],[\sigma \rho^{-1}]}$$

By comparing with example C.3, we see that this enriched category  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H} \text{Rep}(H)$  is the one obtained from the canonical construction of the obvious action of  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$  on  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H} \simeq \text{Rep}(G)$ .

**Remark 4.1.** The underlying category  $\text{Rep}(H)$  of the enriched category  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H} \text{Rep}(H)$  of  $H$ -symmetric boundary conditions can also be obtained from equivariantization. By ignoring the symmetry, the 1d bulk is the trivial topological order whose topological skeleton is  $\text{Vec}$ . Thus its boundary conditions also form the category  $\text{Vec}$ . Then the category of  $H$ -symmetric boundary conditions should be the equivariantization  $\text{Vec}^H \simeq \text{Rep}(H)$ .  $\diamond$

**Remark 4.2.** The background category of the enriched category of boundary conditions only depends on the symmetry imposed on the boundary. Let us give a model-independent argument. For  $H$ -symmetric boundary conditions, clearly the operators  $M_g^0$  for all  $g \in H$  do not change the boundary condition. Dually, since these boundary conditions can be viewed as  $H$ -representations, the operators  $E_\rho^0$  for  $\rho \in \widehat{G/H}$  also do not change the boundary conditions (note that  $\widehat{G/H}$  is the kernel of the projection

$\hat{G} \rightarrow \hat{H}$ ). These operators should be viewed as ‘local’ because each hom space between two boundary conditions contains them. These ‘local operators’ form a Lagrangian algebra (see Remark 3.10)

$$A(H) = \bigoplus_{\substack{g \in H \\ \rho \in \widehat{G/H}}} \mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)},$$

and thus the background category should be  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{A(H)} \simeq \text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$ .  $\diamond$

We can also give a picturesque explanation of the above boundary phases from topological Wick rotation (see figure 4). In figure 4(a), the 0d ‘corner’ described by  $\text{Rep}(H)$  is the invertible domain wall between two 1d boundaries of  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ , and  $L$  is the forgetful functor which maps the topological sector of operators in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  to its boundary, as introduced in (1.1). After topological Wick rotation, the invertible 0d domain wall  $\text{Rep}(H)$  becomes the underlying category of the enriched category  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}^{\text{Rep}(H)}$  of boundary conditions, as illustrated in 4(b).



Figure 4: (a) depicts a 2d topological order described by  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  together with two 1d gapped boundaries  $\text{Rep}(G)$  and  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$ . (b) illustrates  $H$ -symmetric boundaries of the trivial 1d SPT bulk. (b) can be obtained from (a) by applying the topological Wick rotation.

**Remark 4.3.** The bulk-to-wall map  $L$  acts as the *background changing functor* [KYZZ21], which changes the categorical symmetry (the background category) from  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  to  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$ .  $\diamond$

**Remark 4.4.** The intuition of topological Wick rotation suggests that all possible enriched category of boundary conditions of the trivial 1d  $G$ -SPT order are determined by indecomposable  $\text{Rep}(G)$ -modules, which are classified by pairs  $(H, [\omega])$  where  $H \subseteq G$  is a subgroup and  $[\omega] \in H^2(H, U(1))$  is a 2-cohomology class [Ost03]. More precisely, the indecomposable module corresponding to  $(H, [\omega])$  is the category  $\text{Rep}(H, \omega)$  of finite-dimensional projective  $H$ -representations with Schur multiplier  $\omega$ . Hence, it is expected that there are boundary conditions of the trivial 1d  $G$ -SPT order beyond the above discussion. For a subgroup  $H \subseteq G$  and a 2-cohomology class  $[\omega]$ , there should be  $H$ -symmetric boundary conditions that are ‘twisted’ by  $[\omega]$ . Such twisted boundary conditions should form an enriched category  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}^{\text{Rep}(H, \omega)}$ . In this work we only consider the ‘untwisted’ sector, i.e.,  $[\omega]$  is trivial.  $\diamond$

**Remark 4.5.** Another way to describe the ‘category of boundary conditions’  $\mathcal{X}$  is that, all 0d topological phases living on the world line of  $x$ , together with instantons between them, form a category  $\mathcal{X}$ . In principle, we can just write down the canonical boundary Hamiltonian that preserves the symmetry we want, this would give us a distinguished element  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then we can act the non-local operators on it to get other boundary conditions.  $\diamond$

Now we consider a general case, where the 1d bulk  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))_{\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_a}}}$  spontaneously breaks the symmetry to a subgroup  $H_a$ , and its boundary conditions preserve a subgroup  $H_b$ . We can pick the canonical Hamiltonian in which its boundary has  $H_b$ -symmetry:

$$\mathcal{H} := \sum_{i>0} (1 - X_{H_a}^i) + \sum_{i>0} (1 - Z_{H_a}^{i,i+1}) + (1 - Z_{H_b}^0) + (1 - X_{H_b}^0), \quad (4.2)$$

and the ground state is  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_b|}} \sum_{h \in H_b} |h\rangle_0 \otimes (\bigotimes_{i>0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_a|}} \sum_{g \in x} |g\rangle_i)$ ,  $\forall x \in G/H_a$ . Again, on  $H_b$ -symmetric boundaries, operators  $M_g^0$  and  $E_\rho^0$  are partially localized on the boundary state up to  $g \in H_b$  and  $\rho \in \widehat{G/H_b}$ , therefore the background category is  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_b}}$ .

As the equivariantization technique introduced in section 2 has nothing to do with dimensions, we can view the underlying categories of these boundary phases as a 0d topological orders imposed with symmetries. Unlike the bulk ones, where the symmetry  $G$  spontaneously broken, here on a boundary,  $G$  explicitly breaks to the subgroup  $H_b$ . As a consequence, the category of symmetric boundary conditions should be an  $H_b$ -equivariantization of the category of boundary conditions without symmetry.

Following a similar procedure in section 3.3, we first view (4.2) as systems without symmetry. By ignoring the symmetry, the topological skeleton of the fine tuned bulk is  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_a})$ , as illustrated in section 3.3.3. There are  $n := |G|/|H_a|$  topological sectors of states  $\{\mathcal{T}'_x\}_{x \in G/H_a}$  in the bulk. Then the category of boundaries (without symmetry) of the fine tuned bulk is given by the category  $\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}$ . If we choose the boundary on the left side of  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_a})$ , we have the following fusion rules,

$$\mathcal{T}'_x \otimes \mathcal{T}'_{y,z} = \delta_{x,y} \mathcal{T}'_z, \quad \forall x, y, z \in G/H_a.$$

which endows the category  $\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}$  with a structure of right  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_a})$ -module.<sup>3</sup>

Now we consider  $H_b$ -symmetric boundaries. The  $H_b$ -action on  $\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}$  is induced from the  $G$ -action on  $\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}$ :

$$U(h)|\psi_x\rangle = |\psi_{hx}\rangle, \quad h \in H_b, x \in G/H_a.$$

In other words, we have

$$h\mathcal{T}'_x := \mathcal{T}'_{hx}.$$

Then the category of  $H_b$ -symmetric boundaries is the equivariantization  $(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a})^{H_b}$ , which is equivalent to  $\text{BMod}_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}}(\text{Rep}(G)) =: \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}}$ . Readers may check appendix B.13 to see the proof of the following equivalence.

**Proposition 4.6.** Let  $G$  be a finite group and  $H_a, H_b \subseteq G$  be two subgroups of  $G$ . Then the category  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}}$  is equivalent to the equivariantization  $(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a})^{H_b}$ .

The equivariantization process of the topological sector of states of a boundary phase is illustrated in figure 5. Specifically, when  $H_b = G$ , the equivariantization is equivalent to  $\text{Rep}(H_a)$ .

$$(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a})^{H_b} \simeq \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}} \quad \text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_a})^G \simeq \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_a}}$$

□

Figure 5: Topological sector of states of a boundary phase. Remember that the equivariantization  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_a})^G$  is monoidally equivalent to  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_a}}$ , while  $(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a})^{H_b}$  is equivalent to  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}}$ . The former equivariantization is the underlying category of the 1d bulk  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_a}}$ , where the Hamiltonian breaks symmetry  $G$  to  $H_a$  spontaneously, while the latter equivariantization corresponds to an explicitly broken on the boundary  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_b}}\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}}$ .

It turns out that the observables of a 1d bulk phase with symmetry  $H_a \subseteq G$  with its boundary conditions that preserve a subgroup  $H_b$  form the enriched category

$$\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_b}} \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}}. \quad (4.3)$$

Thus we have proved the following physical theorem:

**Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 4.7.** The  $H_b$ -symmetric boundary conditions of the 1d bulk phase  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_a}}$  forms an enriched category  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_b}}\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}}$ .

<sup>3</sup>Indeed, if we choose the boundary on the left side of the bulk, the category of boundaries should be the opposite category  $\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}^{\text{op}}$ . As a category it is equivalent to  $\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}$ , so we use  $\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}$  in order to simplify the notation.

We depict  $H_b$ - and  $H_c$ -symmetric boundary conditions of the 1d bulk in figure 6(b), and figure 6(a) is the corresponding 2d topological order  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  with 1d boundaries before topological Wick rotation.




Figure 6: (a) depicts the 2d topological order  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  with three boundaries., the invertible domain wall between  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_b}}$  and  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_a}}$  is given by  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}} \boxtimes_{\text{Rep}(G)} \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}} \simeq \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}}$ . After topological Wick rotation, we get the categorical description of the 1d bulk phase with two boundaries on each side that breaks to  $H_b$  and  $H_c$  respectively, as depicted in (b).

**Remark 4.8.** The boundary-bulk relation holds for each of the boundary phases:

$$\mathfrak{Z}_0\left(\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_b}} \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_c}}\right) \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_c}|F_{H_c}}.$$

See [KYZZ21, section 4.3] for the definition of the  $E_0$ -center of an enriched category and the proof of the above equivalence.  $\diamond$

## 4.2 Domain walls

One can also think of a domain wall that connects two 1d gapped phases which break to two different subgroups  $H_a$  and  $H_b$  respectively. For an invertible domain wall between  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_a}}$  and  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_b}}$ , we choose a canonical Hamiltonian constructed as

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i<0} (1 - X_{H_a}^i) + \sum_{i<0} (1 - Z_{H_a}^{i,i-1}) + \sum_{i\geq 0} (1 - X_{H_b}^i) + \sum_{i\geq 0} (1 - Z_{H_b}^{i,i+1}), \quad (4.4)$$

where  $Z_{H_a}^{i,i-1} := \frac{|H|}{|G|} \sum_{\rho \in \widehat{G/H}} E_\rho^i (E_\rho^{i-1})^\dagger$ . The ground state is  $|\psi_{x_a, x_b}\rangle := (\bigotimes_{i<0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_a|}} \sum_{g \in x_a} |g\rangle_i) \otimes (\bigotimes_{i\geq 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_b|}} \sum_{g \in x_b} |g\rangle_i)$ ,  $\forall x_a \in G/H_a, x_b \in G/H_b$ . For the bulks on both sides,  $E_\rho^0$  and  $M_g^0$  are partially condensed on the domain wall, but this would not generate "local" operators anymore since the 1d Hilbert space extends to infinity on both sides. So the categorical symmetry is still  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  as in the bulk cases.

In order to find the underlying category, it is also straightforward to use the equivariantization technique. For (4.4), the bulk excitations without symmetry on each side is  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_a})$  and  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_b}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_b})$ . And  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_b})$  is the 0d invertible domain wall between them. There are  $n_a \times n_b = |G|/|H_a| \times |G|/|H_b|$  simple topological sectors of state  $\{\mathcal{R}_{x,y}\}_{x \in G/H_a, y \in G/H_b}$  generated by the ground state  $|\psi_{x_a, x_b}\rangle$ . Moreover, we have the following fusion rules:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{T}_{z,w} &= \delta_{y,z} \mathcal{R}_{x,w}, & \forall x \in G/H_a, y, z, w \in G/H_b, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{x,y} \otimes \mathcal{R}_{z,w} &= \delta_{y,z} \mathcal{R}_{x,w}, & \forall x, y, z \in G/H_a, w \in G/H_b. \end{aligned}$$

These fusion rules endow the category  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_b})$  with a structure of  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_a})$ - $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_b}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_b})$ -bimodule.

Now we view (4.4) as a system with  $G$ -symmetry, The  $G$  action on  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_a})$  is induced by the  $G$  action on states:

$$U(g)|\psi_{x_a, x_b}\rangle = |\psi_{gx_a, gx_b}\rangle \quad x_a \in G/H_a, x_b \in G/H_b.$$

Or in other words:

$$g(\mathcal{R}_{x,y}) = \mathcal{R}_{gx,gy}$$

Thus, the  $G$ -symmetric topological sectors of states of the domain wall is equivalent to the equivariantization  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_b})^G$ , which is equivalent to  $\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}}$ , as illustrated in figure 7

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_b})^G \simeq \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_a}} \\ \hline \text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_a}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_a})^G \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H_b}, \text{Vec}_{G/H_b})^G \end{array}$$

Figure 7: Topological sector of states of an invertible domain wall.

So the invertible domain walls between two 1d gapped phases  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_a}}$  and  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_b}}$  form an enriched category

$$\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_b}},$$

which is in accordance with the mathematical result as an invertible bimodule.


We also depict the topological Wick rotation process of this invertible domain wall in the following figure. We can easily check that when two phases across the domain wall are the same, i.e. when  $H = H_a = H_b$ , the domain wall  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)_{F_H|F_H}$  just disappears in the bulk, namely, it becomes a trivial domain wall.



**Remark 4.9.** One can check that the boundary-bulk relations holds by the ‘folding trick’ [KZ22a]:

$$\mathfrak{Z}_0(\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_b}}) \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \boxtimes \overline{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))} (\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_a}} \boxtimes \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_b}|F_{H_b}}^{\text{rev}}). \quad \diamond$$

**Remark 4.10.** Except for the invertible domain walls, there are other kinds of domain walls controlled by  $H \subseteq G$  as depicted in the following figure (see the dashed frame part).



For example, if we pick  $H = \{e\}$ , and  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(H)) = \text{Vec}$ , that means we just piece together two of the boundaries. This domain wall is also a bimodule of the bulk categories:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_b}} \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_c}|F_{H_d}} \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_1}|F_{H_2}} \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_1}|F_{H_m}} \\
\hline
\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_c}|F_{H_c}} \quad \text{---} \quad \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_m}|F_{H_m}} \\
\text{Domain wall: } \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_a}|F_{H_a}} \boxtimes \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_1}|F_{H_1}} \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_c}|F_{H_c}} \boxtimes \text{Rep}(G)_{F_{H_1}|F_{H_m}}
\end{array}$$

◇

## 5 Conclusion and outlook

In this work, we have shown the capability of enriched fusion categories in describing 1d gapped phases with abelian onsite symmetries, but it is just a tip of the iceberg. The immediate follow-up is to check that the 1d gapped phases with onsite non-abelian symmetries and non-trivial 2-cocycles also satisfy Theorem<sup>ph</sup> 1.4. In fact, as the equivariantization technique in section 2 does not depend on symmetry  $G$  abelian or not, the only difficulty remains is to check the topological sector of operators, namely, to see the non-local operators in a system of a general onsite symmetry  $G$  also form  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ . Boundaries with non-trivial 2-cocycles can also be readily solved after that.

An obvious question left in this paper is that: can we also use equivariantization to find the categorical symmetry  $\mathcal{B}$ ? We believe it is possible, since the principle of equivariantization is to find the categorical description of a topological order after imposing symmetry. So to recover  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  might be to equivariantize the 2d braided fusion category  $\text{Vec}$  in a non-trivial way.

One can also think of the fermionic cases, the starting point might be to think of the fermion condensation [WW17] in 2d topological order  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G, z)) = \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  ( $z \in G$  is the fermion parity). Different from the bosonic cases, an interchange between two topological excitations should have a non-trivial phase factor  $-1$ .

Besides, the intuition of topological Wick rotation may be expanded to other kinds of symmetries, which should provide additional 1d gapped phases after topological Wick rotation (e.g. think of replacing the bulk phase of figure 1 by the Levin-Wen model [LW05, KK12]). One can also start another way around, to first pick a special lattice model like the Haldane chain or AKLT model [Hal83, AKLT87], then try to find the categorical descriptions of their phases. The topological Wick rotation approach is also valid in higher dimensions and may be used in describing higher dimensional lattice models.

Except for giving the categorical descriptions of these lattice models, there are other mysterious things to be explored. For example, why the onsite symmetry can be viewed as a local quantum symmetry? How to understand the ‘boundary-bulk relation’ between the topological sectors of operators and the states after the topological Wick rotation? And how to interpret the ‘braidings’ of operators in spacetime...? Behind all these things, the deepest question might be, why these physical phases can be performed in such neat and beautiful structures. For the adventurers, there is still a continent to be discovered.

# Appendices

## A Pointed braided fusion categories

### A.1 Pointed braided fusion categories and pre-metric groups

In this section we briefly review the relation between pointed braided fusion categories and pre-metric groups.

**Definition A.1.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a fusion category. An object  $x \in \mathcal{C}$  is called *invertible* if it is invertible under the tensor product, i.e. there exists an object  $y \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $x \otimes y \simeq \mathbb{1} \simeq y \otimes x$ . We say  $\mathcal{C}$  is *pointed* if every simple object in  $\mathcal{C}$  is invertible. ■

**Definition A.2.** Let  $G$  be an abelian group. A *quadratic form* on  $G$  is a map  $q: G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$  such that  $q(g) = q(g^{-1})$  and the symmetric function  $b: G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$  defined by

$$b(g, h) := \frac{q(gh)}{q(g)q(h)}$$

is a *bicharacter*, i.e.,  $b(g_1g_2, h) = b(g_1, h)b(g_2, h)$  for all  $g_1, g_2, h \in G$ . The symmetric bicharacter  $b$  is called the *associated bicharacter* of  $q$ . We say  $q$  is *nondegenerate* if  $b$  is, i.e.,  $b(g, h) = 1$  for all  $h \in G$  if and only if  $g = e$  is the unit.

A *pre-metric group* is a finite abelian group  $G$  equipped with a quadratic form  $q$ . If  $q$  is nondegenerate, then  $(G, q)$  is called a *metric group*. ■

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a pointed braided fusion category. Then isomorphism classes of simple objects of  $\mathcal{C}$  form a finite abelian group under the tensor product, denoted by  $G$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{C} \simeq \text{Vec}_G$  as categories. For  $g \in G$ , define

$$q(g) := c_{x,x} \in \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{C}}(x \otimes x) \simeq \mathbb{C}^\times,$$

where  $x$  is a simple object of  $\mathcal{C}$  whose isomorphism class is  $g$ . It follows from the pentagon and hexagon equations that  $q$  is a quadratic form. The associated bicharacter of  $q$  is equal to the double braiding:

$$b(g, h) = c_{y,x} \circ c_{x,y} \in \text{Aut}_{\mathcal{C}}(x \otimes y) \simeq \mathbb{C}^\times, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $x$  and  $y$  are simple objects of  $\mathcal{C}$  whose isomorphism classes are  $g$  and  $h$ , respectively. We call  $(G, q)$  the *associated pre-metric group* of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Conversely, there is a mathematical theorem [JS93, DGNO10] states that two pointed braided fusion categories are equivalent if and only if their associated pre-metric groups are isomorphic. In other words, for any pre-metric group  $(G, q)$  there exists a unique (up to equivalence) pointed braided fusion category, denoted by  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$ , such that its associated pre-metric group is isomorphic to  $(G, q)$ . Clearly the pointed braided fusion category  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$  is nondegenerate if and only if the pre-metric group  $(G, q)$  is nondegenerate, i.e.,  $(G, q)$  is a metric group.

Moreover, since  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$  is pseudo-unitary, there is a unique spherical structure on  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$  such that the quantum dimension of every simple object is 1 [ENO05]. Then  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$  is a pre-modular category with this spherical structure, and it is modular if and only if  $(G, q)$  is a metric group. Its  $S$  matrix is given by

$$S_{g,h} = b(g, h^{-1}) = b(g, h^{-1}),$$

and the  $T$  matrix is given by

$$T_g = q(g).$$

**Example A.3.** Let  $G$  be a finite abelian group. Then the Drinfeld center  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Vec}_G)$  is a nondegenerate pointed braided fusion category and the associated metric group is  $(G \times \hat{G}, q)$ , where  $\hat{G}$  is the dual group of  $G$  and the quadratic form  $q$  is defined by  $q(g, \rho) := \rho(g)$ . We use  $\{\mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)}\}_{g \in G, \rho \in \hat{G}}$  to denote a representative of isomorphism classes of simple objects of  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ . Then the double braiding of two simple objects  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\rho)}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{(h,\sigma)}$ , by (A.1), is equal to  $\rho(h)\sigma(g)$ . ◆

## A.2 Condensable algebras in pointed braided fusion categories

In this section we briefly review the classification of condensable algebras (in particular, Lagrangian algebras) in pointed braided fusion categories.

**Definition A.4.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a braided fusion category and  $A = (A, \mu, \eta)$  be an algebra in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then

- (a)  $A$  is *separable* if there exists an  $(A, A)$ -bimodule map  $e: A \rightarrow A \otimes A$  such that  $\mu \circ e = \text{id}_A$ ;
- (b)  $A$  is *connected* if  $\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbb{1}, A) = 1$ ;
- (c)  $A$  is *commutative* if  $\mu \circ c_{A,A} = \mu$ .

A *condensable algebra* is a commutative connected separable algebra. Moreover, a *Lagrangian algebra* in a nondegenerate braided fusion category  $\mathcal{C}$  is a condensable algebra  $A$  such that  $\text{FPdim}(A)^2 = \text{FPdim}(\mathcal{C})$ , or equivalently, the category  $\mathcal{C}_A^0$  of local right  $A$ -modules in  $\mathcal{C}$  is equivalent to  $\text{Vec}$ . ■

**Definition A.5.** Let  $(G, q)$  be a pre-metric group. The associated bicharacter of  $q$  is denoted by  $b$ . For any subgroup  $H \subseteq G$ , define the *orthogonal complement* of  $H$  as

$$H^\perp := \{g \in G \mid b(g, h) = 1, \forall h \in H\}.$$

We say a subgroup  $H \subseteq G$  is *isotropic* if  $q(h) = 1$  for all  $h \in H$ . It follows that an isotropic subgroup  $H$  satisfies  $H \subseteq H^\perp$ . A *Lagrangian subgroup* of a metric group is an isotropic subgroup  $H$  such that  $H = H^\perp$ . ■

**Theorem A.6 ([DGNO10, DMNO13, FSV13, DS18]).** Let  $(G, q)$  be a pre-metric group and  $A$  be a condensable algebra in  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$ .

- (1) Suppose  $\{\mathbb{C}_g\}_{g \in G}$  is a representative of isomorphism classes of simple objects of  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$ . Then  $\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(G, q)}(\mathbb{C}_g, A)$  is either 0 or 1.
- (2) Define the *support* of  $A$  to be the set

$$\text{Supp } A := \{g \in G \mid \dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(G, q)}(\mathbb{C}_g, A) = 1\}.$$

Then the support  $\text{Supp } A$  is an isotropic subgroup of  $(G, q)$ .

- (3) For any isotropic subgroup  $H$  of  $(G, q)$ , there exists a unique (up to isomorphism) condensable algebra  $A_H$  in  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$  such that  $\text{Supp } A_H = H$ . In other words, there is a one-to-one correspondence between isomorphism classes of condensable algebras in  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$  and isotropic subgroups of  $(G, q)$ . As an object  $A_H$  is isomorphic to  $\bigoplus_{h \in H} \mathbb{C}_h$ , and the multiplication is induced by the group multiplication:

$$A \otimes A \simeq \left( \bigoplus_{g \in H} \mathbb{C}_g \right) \otimes \left( \bigoplus_{h \in H} \mathbb{C}_h \right) = \bigoplus_{g, h \in H} \mathbb{C}_g \otimes \mathbb{C}_h \xrightarrow{\bigoplus \delta_{gh, k}} \bigoplus_{k \in H} \mathbb{C}_k = A.$$

- (4) For any isotropic subgroup  $H \subseteq G$ , the braided fusion category  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)_{A_H}^0$  of local right  $A_H$ -modules is pointed, and the associated pre-metric group is the quotient group  $H^\perp/H$  equipped with the quadratic form  $\bar{q}([g]) := q(g)$ . In particular, there is a one-to-one correspondence between isomorphism classes of Lagrangian algebras in  $\mathcal{C}(G, q)$  and Lagrangian subgroups of  $(G, q)$ .

**Example A.7.** Let  $G$  be a finite abelian group. Recall example A.3 that the metric group associated to  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Vec}_G)$  is  $(G \times \hat{G}, q)$  where  $q(g, \rho) = \rho(g)$ . For any subgroup  $H \subseteq G$ , the dual group  $\widehat{G}/H$  naturally embeds into  $\hat{G}$  and  $H \times \widehat{G}/H$  is clearly a Lagrangian subgroup of  $(G \times \hat{G}, q)$ . We denote the corresponding Lagrangian algebra by  $A(H) \in \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ .

More generally, suppose  $H \subseteq G$  is a subgroup and  $\tau: H \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$  is an *anti-symmetric bicharacter*, i.e. a bicharacter satisfying  $\tau(h, h) = 1$  for all  $h \in H$ . Then

$$S(H, \tau) := \{(h, \rho) \in G \times \hat{G} \mid h \in H, \rho(k) = \tau(h, k), \forall k \in H\}$$

is a Lagrangian subgroup of  $(G \times \hat{G}, q)$ . Conversely, it is not hard to see that every Lagrangian subgroup of  $(G \times \hat{G}, q)$  is equal to  $S(H, \tau)$  for some subgroup  $H \subseteq G$  and anti-symmetric bicharacter  $\tau$ .



For any finite abelian group  $H$  and 2-cocycle  $\omega \in Z^2(H; \mathbb{U}(1))$ , one can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} H \times H &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times \\ (g, h) &\mapsto \frac{\omega(g, h)}{\omega(h, g)} \end{aligned}$$

defines an anti-symmetric bicharacter on  $H$ . Also, this anti-symmetric bicharacter only depends on the cohomology class of  $\omega$ . Thus we have a group homomorphism from  $H^2(H; \mathbb{U}(1))$  to the group of anti-symmetric bicharacters on  $H$ . It is well-known that this group homomorphism is indeed an isomorphism.

As a conclusion, there is a one-to-one correspondence between isomorphism classes of Lagrangian algebras in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \simeq \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Vec}_G)$  and pairs  $(H, [\omega])$ , where  $H \subseteq G$  is a subgroup and  $[\omega] \in H^2(H; \mathbb{U}(1))$  is a 2-cohomology class. This coincides with the general classification result in [Dav10b].  $\blacklozenge$

## B Equivariantization

In this appendix we briefly review the notion of equivariantization and prove Proposition 3.9.

### B.1 Group actions on categories and equivariantization

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a category. The autoequivalences of  $\mathcal{C}$  and natural isomorphisms between them form a monoidal category, denoted by  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ . An *action* of a group  $G$  on  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined to be a monoidal functor  $T: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})$ , where  $G$  is viewed as a monoidal category with only identity morphisms.

More precisely, by the definition of a monoidal functor, a  $G$ -action on  $\mathcal{C}$  consists of a set of equivalences  $\{T_g: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\}_{g \in G}$  and a set of natural isomorphisms  $\{\gamma_{g,h}: T_g \circ T_h \Rightarrow T_{gh}\}_{g,h \in G}$ , such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (T_g T_h) T_k & \xlongequal{\quad} & T_g (T_h T_k) \\ \gamma_{g,h} 1 \Downarrow & & \Downarrow 1 \gamma_{h,k} \\ T_{gh} T_k & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{g,h,k}} & T_{ghk} \xleftarrow{\gamma_{g,h,k}} T_g T_{hk} \end{array}$$

**Remark B.1.** If  $\mathcal{C}$  is a monoidal category, a *monoidal action* of a group  $G$  on  $\mathcal{C}$  is a monoidal functor from  $G$  to the monoidal category  $\text{Aut}_{\otimes}(\mathcal{C})$  of monoidal autoequivalences of  $\mathcal{C}$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  is a braided monoidal category, a *braided action* of a group  $G$  on  $\mathcal{C}$  is a monoidal functor from  $G$  to the monoidal category  $\text{Aut}^{\text{br}}(\mathcal{C})$  of braided monoidal autoequivalences of  $\mathcal{C}$ .  $\blacklozenge$

**Definition B.2.** Let  $G$  be a group and  $\mathcal{C}$  be a category equipped with a  $G$ -action. The *equivariantization*  $\mathcal{C}^G$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is the category consisting of the following data:

- The objects of  $\mathcal{C}^G$  are pairs  $(x, \{u_g\}_{g \in G})$ , where  $x \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $u_g: T_g(x) \rightarrow x$  is an isomorphism such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_g T_h(x) & \xrightarrow{\gamma_{g,h} x} & T_{gh}(x) \\ \downarrow T_g(u_h) & & \downarrow u_{gh} \\ T_g(x) & \xrightarrow{u_g} & x \end{array} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

- A morphism  $f: (x, \{u_g\}_{g \in G}) \rightarrow (y, \{v_g\}_{g \in G})$  is a morphism  $f: x \rightarrow y$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that the following

diagram following commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_g(x) & \xrightarrow{T_g(f)} & T_g(y) \\ \downarrow u_g & & \downarrow v_g \\ x & \xrightarrow{f} & y \end{array} \quad \blacksquare$$

There is an obvious forgetful functor  $\mathcal{C}^G \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  defined by  $(x, \{u_g\}_{g \in G}) \mapsto x$ .

**Remark B.3.** Let  $G$  be a group. If  $\mathcal{C}$  is a (braided) monoidal category equipped with a (braided) monoidal  $G$ -action, then the equivariantization  $\mathcal{C}^G$  is also a (braided) monoidal category and the forgetful functor  $\mathcal{C}^G \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is also a (braided) monoidal functor.  $\diamond$

**Example B.4.** Let  $G$  be a group. Consider the trivial  $G$ -action on the category  $\text{Vec}$  of finite-dimensional vector spaces. More precisely, all functors  $T_g$  are identity functors and all natural transformations  $\gamma_{g,h}$  are identity natural transformations. Then an object  $(V, \{v_g\}_{g \in G})$  is a finite-dimensional vector space  $V$  equipped with linear isomorphisms  $v_g: V \rightarrow V$  such that  $v_{gh} = v_g \circ v_h$ . In other words,  $(V, \{v_g\}_{g \in G})$  is a finite-dimensional  $G$ -representation. Similarly one can verify that morphisms between equivariant objects are homomorphisms between  $G$ -representations. Hence the equivariantization  $\text{Vec}^G$  is equivalent to the symmetric monoidal category  $\text{Rep}(G)$  of finite-dimensional  $G$ -representations, and the forgetful functor  $\text{Rep}(G) \simeq \text{Vec}^G \rightarrow \text{Vec}$  is the usual forgetful functor.  $\diamond$

## B.2 The proof of Proposition 3.9

Here we give a proof of Proposition 3.9. To be precise, we reformulate the proposition as follows.

Let  $G$  be a (not necessarily abelian) finite group and  $H \subseteq G$  be a subgroup. We equip the quotient set  $G/H$  with the left translation  $G$ -action:  $(g, x) \mapsto gx$  for  $g \in G$  and  $x \in G/H$ . It induces a  $G$ -action on the function algebra  $F_H := \text{Fun}(G/H)$ :

$$(g \cdot f)(x) := f(g^{-1}x), \quad g \in G, f \in F_H, x \in G/H.$$

If we choose a basis  $\{\delta_x\}_{x \in G/H}$  of  $F_H$  consisting of delta functions

$$\delta_x(y) := \delta_{x,y}, \quad x, y \in G/H,$$

then the  $G$ -action on  $F_H$  is given by  $g \cdot \delta_x = \delta_{gx}$ . Moreover, this  $G$ -action is compatible with the algebra structure so that  $\text{Fun}(G/H)$  is a condensable algebra in  $\text{Rep}(G)$ .

This  $G$ -action also induces a  $G$ -action on the category  $\text{Vec}_{G/H}$  of finite-dimensional  $G/H$ -graded vector spaces:

$$T_g(V)_x := V_{g^{-1}x}, \quad g \in G, x \in G/H, V \in \text{Vec}_{G/H}.$$

It induces a monoidal  $G$ -action on the multi-fusion category  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H})$  defined by conjugation:

$$g \cdot F := T_g \circ F \circ T_{g^{-1}}, \quad g \in G, F \in \text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H}).$$

Also we know that  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H})$  is monoidally equivalent to the multi-fusion category  $\text{Mat}_n(\text{Vec})$  of  $n$ -by- $n$  matrices valued in  $\text{Vec}$ , where  $n := |G|/|H|$ . An object in  $\text{Mat}_n(\text{Vec})$  is a finite-dimensional bi-graded vector space

$$V = \bigoplus_{x,y \in G/H} V_{x,y}.$$

The tensor product in  $\text{Mat}_n(\text{Vec})$  is defined by

$$(V \otimes W)_{x,y} = \bigoplus_{z \in G/H} V_{x,z} \otimes W_{z,y}.$$

Under the monoidal equivalence  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H}) \simeq \text{Mat}_n(\text{Vec})$ , the monoidal  $G$ -action on  $\text{Mat}_n(\text{Vec})$  is given by

$$g(V)_{x,y} = V_{g^{-1}x, g^{-1}y}, \quad g \in G, x, y \in G/H, V \in \text{Mat}_n(\text{Vec}).$$

More generally, let  $K \subseteq G$  be another subgroup. Then there is also a conjugation  $G$ -action on the finite semisimple category  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/K})$ . Under the equivalence  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/K}) \simeq \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\text{Vec})$  (where  $m := |G|/|K|$ ), the  $G$ -action is given by

$$g(V)_{x,y} = V_{g^{-1}x, g^{-1}y}, \quad g \in G, x \in G/K, y \in G/H, V \in \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\text{Vec}).$$

**Proposition B.5.** The category  $\text{BMod}_{\mathbb{F}_k/\mathbb{F}_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is equivalent to  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/K})^G$ . When  $K = H$ , this is an equivalence of fusion categories.

The main idea is to show that both two categories are equivalent to the third one.

**Definition B.6.** Let  $G$  be a group and  $X$  be a set equipped with a left  $G$ -action. The *action groupoid*  $\mathcal{G}(X, G)$  is defined by the following data:

- $\text{ob}(\mathcal{G}(X, G)) := X$ .
- $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{G}(X, G)}(x, y) := \{g \in G \mid g \cdot x = y\}$  for  $x, y \in X$ .
- The composition and identity morphisms are induced by the multiplication and unit of  $G$ . ■

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a finite groupoid, i.e., a groupoid with finitely many objects and morphisms. Recall that a finite-dimensional  $\mathcal{G}$ -representation is a functor  $F: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \text{Vec}$ . More precisely, a finite-dimensional  $\mathcal{G}$ -representation is a collection  $\{F(x) \in \text{Vec}\}_{x \in \mathcal{G}}$  of finite-dimensional vector spaces, together with linear isomorphisms  $F(f): F(x) \rightarrow F(y)$  labeled by morphisms  $f: x \rightarrow y$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ , such that  $F(g) \circ F(f) = F(g \circ f)$  whenever the composition of morphisms  $f, g$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  can be defined. All finite-dimensional  $\mathcal{G}$ -representations and natural transformations between them form a finite semisimple category  $\text{Rep}(\mathcal{G})$ .

**Example B.7.** Consider the action groupoid  $\mathcal{G}(G/K \times G/H, G)$ , where  $G$  acts on  $G/K \times G/H$  diagonally:  $g \cdot (x, y) := (gx, gy)$ . Then a finite-dimensional  $\mathcal{G}(G/K \times G/H, G)$ -representation  $F$  is equivalent to a collection of the following data:

- finite-dimensional vector spaces  $\{F(x, y) \in \text{Vec}\}_{x \in G/K, y \in G/H}$ ;
- linear isomorphisms  $F(g, x, y): F(x, y) \rightarrow F(gx, gy)$ , such that the following equation holds for every  $x \in G/K, y \in G/H$  and  $g, h \in G$ :

$$\left( F(x, y) \xrightarrow{F(h, x, y)} F(hx, hy) \xrightarrow{F(g, hx, hy)} F(ghx, ghy) \right) = F(gh, x, y). \quad \blacklozenge$$

**Remark B.8.** The connected components of  $\mathcal{G}(G/K \times G/H, G)$  are one-to-one corresponds to double cosets in  $K \backslash G / H$ . In particular, if  $G$  is a finite abelian group and  $K = H$ , the category  $\text{Rep}(\mathcal{G}(G/H \times G/H, G))$  is equivalent to the direct sum of  $n = |G|/|H|$  copies of  $\text{Rep}(H)$ . A simple object  $F \in \text{Rep}(\mathcal{G}(G/H \times G/H, G))$  only supports on a single connected component and every nonzero  $F(x, y)$  is an irreducible  $H$ -representation. In other words, the simple objects are labeled by pairs  $(x, \rho)$  where  $x \in G/H$  and  $\rho \in \hat{H}$ . More precisely, a simple object  $\mathcal{M}_{(x, \rho)}$  corresponding to  $(x, \rho)$  is the induced representation  $\text{Ind}_H^G(\rho)$  equipped with the  $G/H \times G/H$ -grading

$$(\mathcal{M}_{(x, \rho)})_{y,z} = \begin{cases} (\text{Ind}_H^G(\rho))_z, & y = xz, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which is determined by  $x$ . ◇

**Lemma B.9.** The category  $\text{BMod}_{F_K|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is equivalent to  $\text{Rep}(\mathcal{G}(G/K \times G/H, G))$  as categories.

*Proof.* By definition, an  $(F_K, F_H)$ -bimodule  $M \in \text{BMod}_{F_K|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  in  $\text{Rep}(G)$  is nothing but

- an  $(F_K, F_H)$ -bimodule  $M \in \text{BMod}_{F_K|F_H}(\text{Vec})$  in  $\text{Vec}$ ,
- equipped with a  $G$ -action, such that the left  $F_K$ - and right  $F_H$ -actions on  $M$  are  $G$ -equivariant, i.e.,

$$(g \cdot a) \triangleright (g \cdot m) \triangleleft (g \cdot b) = g \cdot (a \triangleright m \triangleleft b) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

for all  $g \in G, m \in M$  and  $a \in F_K, b \in F_H$ .

Since  $F_H$  and  $F_K$  are semisimple algebras, a bimodule  $M \in \text{BMod}_{F_K|F_H}(\text{Vec})$  can be decomposed as

$$M = \bigoplus_{\substack{x \in G/K \\ y \in G/H}} M_{x,y},$$

where  $M_{x,y} := \delta_x \triangleright M \triangleleft \delta_y$ . Taking an element  $m \in M_{x,y}$ , the condition (B.2) implies that

$$\delta_{gz} \triangleright (g \cdot m) \triangleleft \delta_{gw} = (g \cdot \delta_z) \triangleright (g \cdot m) \triangleleft (g \cdot \delta_w) = g \cdot (\delta_z \triangleright m \triangleleft \delta_w) = \delta_{x,z} \delta_{y,w} (g \cdot m).$$

Thus  $g \cdot m \in M_{gx,gy}$ . Hence an  $(F_K, F_H)$ -bimodule  $M \in \text{BMod}_{F_K|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  in  $\text{Rep}(G)$  is equivalent to a collection of the following data:

- finite-dimensional vector spaces  $\{M_{x,y}\}_{x \in G/K, y \in G/H}$ ;
- linear isomorphism  $\rho_{g,x,y}: M_{x,y} \rightarrow M_{gx,gy}$ , such that the following equation holds for every  $x \in G/K, y \in G/H$  and  $g, h \in G$ :

$$(M_{x,y} \xrightarrow{\rho_{h,x,y}} M_{hx,hy} \xrightarrow{\rho_{g,hx,hy}} M_{ghx,ghy}) = \rho_{gh,x,y}.$$

By comparing with example B.7 the lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma B.10.** The equivariantization  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/K})^G$  is equivalent to  $\text{Rep}(\mathcal{G}(G/K \times G/H, G))$  as categories.

*Proof.* An object in the equivariantization  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/K})^G$  is a pair  $(V, \{v_g\}_{g \in G})$ , where  $V$  is an object in  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/K}) \simeq \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\text{Vec})$  and  $v_g: g(V) \rightarrow V$  is an isomorphism such that the diagram (B.1) commutes. By taking the  $(x, y)$ -component for  $x \in G/K$  and  $y \in G/H$ , we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V_{h^{-1}g^{-1}x, h^{-1}g^{-1}y} & \xlongequal{\quad} & V_{(gh)^{-1}x, (gh)^{-1}y} \\ \downarrow g(v_h)_{x,y} = (v_h)_{g^{-1}x, g^{-1}y} & & \downarrow (v_{gh})_{x,y} \\ V_{g^{-1}x, g^{-1}y} & \xrightarrow{(v_g)_{x,y}} & V_{x,y} \end{array}$$

By comparing with example B.7 the lemma is proved.  $\square$

Now we give the proof.

*Proof of Proposition B.5.* By Lemma B.9 and B.10 we see that  $\text{BMod}_{F_K|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is equivalent to the equivariantization  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/K})^G$  as categories. It suffices to show that this equivalence preserves the tensor product when  $K = H$ .

First we consider the tensor product of  $\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  (i.e., the relative tensor product  $\otimes_{F_H}$ ). Since  $F_H$  is a special Frobenius algebra with  $\Delta(\delta_x) := \delta_x \otimes \delta_x$  and  $\varepsilon(\delta_x) = 1$  for  $x \in G/H$ , the relative

tensor product  $M \otimes_{F_H} N$  of two bimodules  $M, N \in \text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is isomorphic to the image of the following idempotent:

$$M \otimes N \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \eta \otimes 1} M \otimes F_H \otimes N \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \Delta \otimes 1} M \otimes F_H \otimes F_H \otimes N \xrightarrow{\mu_M^R \otimes \mu_N^L} M \otimes N,$$

where  $\mu_M^R$  and  $\mu_N^L$  are right  $F_H$ -action on  $M$  and left  $F_H$ -action on  $N$ , respectively. This idempotent maps  $m \otimes n \in M \otimes N$  to

$$\sum_{x \in G/H} (m \triangleleft \delta_x) \otimes (\delta_x \triangleright n).$$

Therefore, we have

$$(M \otimes_{F_H} N)_{x,y} = \bigoplus_{z \in G/H} M_{x,z} \otimes N_{z,y}, \quad x, y \in G/H.$$

The  $G$ -action on  $M \otimes_{F_H} N$  is induced from that of  $M \otimes N$ , i.e., the diagonal action  $g \cdot (m \otimes n) := (g \cdot m) \otimes (g \cdot n)$ .

On the other hand, the tensor product  $(V, \{v_g\}_{g \in G}) \otimes (W, \{w_g\}_{g \in G})$  in  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H})^G$  is given by the object  $V \otimes W \in \text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H}) \simeq \text{Mat}_i(\text{Vec})$  equipped with the  $G$ -action  $\{v_g \otimes w_g\}_{g \in G}$ . This  $G$ -action on the  $(x, y)$ -component is

$$(g(V \otimes W))_{x,y} = \bigoplus_{z \in G/H} V_{g^{-1}x, g^{-1}z} \otimes W_{g^{-1}z, g^{-1}y} \xrightarrow{\bigoplus (v_g)_{x,z} \otimes (w_g)_{z,y}} \bigoplus_{z \in G/H} V_{x,z} \otimes W_{z,y} = (V \otimes W)_{x,y}.$$

Hence the tensor product of  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H})^G$  coincides with that of  $\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark B.11.** When  $K = H = G$ , the algebra  $F_G = \text{Fun}(G/G) = \mathbb{C}$  is trivial and Proposition B.5 recovers example B.4. When  $K = H = \{e\}$ , the algebra  $F_{\{e\}} = \text{Fun}(G)$  and  $\text{BMod}_{F_{\{e\}}|F_{\{e\}}}(\text{Rep}(G)) \simeq \text{Vec}_G$  as fusion categories. Thus in this case Proposition B.5 simply says that  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_G, \text{Vec}_G)^G \simeq \text{Vec}_G$  as fusion categories.  $\diamond$

**Remark B.12.** The representation category  $\text{Rep}(\mathcal{G})$  of a finite groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$  is naturally a multi-fusion category. However, the “natural” monoidal structure on  $\text{Rep}(\mathcal{G}(G/H \times G/H, G))$  does not coincide with those of  $\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  and  $\text{Fun}(\text{Vec}_{G/H}, \text{Vec}_{G/H})^G$ .  $\diamond$

**Remark B.13.** Consider the action groupoid  $\mathcal{G}(G/K, H)$ , where  $H$  acts on  $G/K$  by left translation. There is an equivalence of action groupoids  $\mathcal{G}(G/K, H) \simeq \mathcal{G}(G/K \times G/H, G)$  defined by  $x \mapsto (x, H)$ . It is straightforward to check that the equivariantization  $\text{Vec}_{G/K}^H$  is equivalent to  $\text{Rep}(\mathcal{G}(G/K, H))$ , and hence equivalent to  $\text{BMod}_{F_{K|F_H}}(\text{Rep}(G))$ .  $\diamond$

## C Enriched categories

In this appendix we give some examples of enriched (fusion) categories.

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a fusion category. By the so-called canonical construction [Kel69], every finite semisimple left  $\mathcal{C}$ -module  $\mathcal{M}$  can be promoted to a  $\mathcal{C}$ -enriched category  ${}^{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{M}$ :

- The objects in  ${}^{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{M}$  are objects in  $\mathcal{M}$ ;
- The hom space  $\text{Hom}_{{}^{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{M}}(x, y)$  for  $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$  is the internal hom  $[x, y]$ , which is defined by

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(a, [x, y]) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(a \odot x, y), \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{C}, x, y \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

- The identity morphisms  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow [x, x]$  and composition of morphisms  $[y, z] \otimes [x, y] \rightarrow [x, z]$  are induced by the universal property of the internal homs.

Moreover, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is braided and  $\mathcal{M}$  is a fusion left  $\mathcal{C}$ -module defined by a braided functor  $\phi: \overline{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{M})$ , then the canonical construction  ${}^{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{M}$  is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -enriched fusion category [MP17, KZ20a].

**Example C.1.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a fusion category and  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$  be separable algebras. Then  $\text{BMod}_{A|B}(\mathcal{C})$  is a finite semisimple left  $\text{BMod}_{A|A}(\mathcal{C})$ -module with the module action defined by

$$X \odot M := X \otimes_A M, \quad X \in \text{BMod}_{A|A}(\mathcal{C}), M \in \text{BMod}_{A|B}(\mathcal{C}).$$

It induces an enriched category  ${}^{\text{BMod}_{A|A}(\mathcal{C})}\text{BMod}_{A|B}(\mathcal{C})$  by the canonical construction. The internal hom (i.e., the hom space)  $[M, N] \in \text{BMod}_{A|A}(\mathcal{C})$  for  $M, N \in \text{BMod}_{A|B}(\mathcal{C})$  is given by

$$[M, N] = (M \otimes_B N^R)^L, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where both the left and right duals are taken in  $\mathcal{C}$ . In the case  $A = \mathbb{1}$ , this result first appeared in [EO04, example 3.19] (see also [KZ18a, Lemma 2.1.6] for a proof, which applies to our general case). Similarly,  $\text{BMod}_{A|B}(\mathcal{C})$  is a finite semisimple right  $\text{BMod}_{B|B}(\mathcal{C})$ -module and can be viewed as a finite semisimple left  $\text{BMod}_{B|B}^{\text{rev}}(\mathcal{C})$ -module. The internal hom  $[M, N] \in \text{BMod}_{B|B}^{\text{rev}}(\mathcal{C})$  for  $M, N \in \text{BMod}_{A|B}(\mathcal{C})$  is given by

$$[M, N] = (N^L \otimes_A M)^R,$$

where both the left and right duals are taken in  $\mathcal{C}$ . ♦

**Example C.2.** Let  $G$  be a finite group and  $H, K \subseteq G$  be subgroups. By taking  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Rep}(G)$ ,  $A = F_H$  and  $B = F_K$  in example C.1, we get an enriched category  ${}^{\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))}\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_K}(\text{Rep}(G))$ . Let us compute the internal hom  $[M, N] \in \text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  for  $M, N \in \text{BMod}_{F_H|F_K}(\text{Rep}(G))$ .

By (C.2), we have  $[M, N] = (M \otimes_{F_K} N^R)^L$ . The right dual  $N^R$  of  $N$  in  $\text{Rep}(G)$  is given by the dual representation  $N^*$ , which is automatically bi-graded:

$$N^* = \bigoplus_{\substack{x \in G/K \\ y \in G/H}} (N^*)_{x,y} \simeq \bigoplus_{\substack{x \in G/K \\ y \in G/H}} (N_{y,x})^*.$$

The left  $F_K$ -action on  $N^R$  is induced by this  $G/K$ -grading, i.e.,  $\delta_x$  acts as a projector onto  $\bigoplus_{y \in G/H} (N^*)_{x,y}$  for every  $x \in G/K$ . The relative tensor product  $\otimes_{F_K}$  has been computed in the proof of Proposition B.5. We have

$$(M \otimes_{F_K} N^R)_{x,y} \simeq \bigoplus_{z \in G/K} M_{x,z} \otimes (N^*)_{z,y} \simeq \bigoplus_{z \in G/K} M_{x,z} \otimes (N_{y,z})^*, \quad x, y \in G/H.$$

Then by taking the left dual we have

$$[M, N] = \bigoplus_{x,y \in G/H} [M, N]_{x,y} \simeq \bigoplus_{x,y \in G/H} \bigoplus_{z \in G/K} N_{x,z} \otimes (M_{y,z})^*$$

equipped with the diagonal  $G$ -action on each direct summand. ♦

**Example C.3.** Let us consider the special case that  $K = G$  in example C.2. Then  $\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_G}(\text{Rep}(G)) = \text{LMod}_{F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is equivalent to  $\text{Rep}(H)$ , and the equivalence  $\text{Rep}(H) \rightarrow \text{LMod}_{F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is given by the induced representation  $\text{Ind}_H^G$ . Thus for two irreducible representations  $\rho, \sigma \in \text{Rep}(H)$ , their internal hom in  $\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is

$$[\rho, \sigma] = \text{Ind}_H^G(\sigma) \otimes \text{Ind}_H^G(\rho^*)$$

equipped with the product  $G/H \times G/H$ -grading of the  $G/H$ -gradings on induced representations. By comparing with remark B.8, we see that

$$[\rho, \sigma] = \bigoplus_{x \in G/H} \mathcal{M}_{(x, \sigma \rho^{-1})}. \quad \diamond$$

**Example C.4.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a fusion category and  $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}$  be finite semisimple left  $\mathcal{C}$ -modules. Then the category  $\text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$  of left  $\mathcal{C}$ -module functors is also finite semisimple [ENO05, EO04] and admits a left  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{C})$ -module structure:

$$(x, \gamma_{-,x}) \odot F := x \odot F(-), \quad (x, \gamma_{-,x}) \in \mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{C}), F \in \text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}).$$

The internal hom  $[F, G]_{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{C})}$  of  $F, G \in \text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$  in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{C})$  is the end

$$\int_{m \in \mathcal{M}} [F(m), G(m)]_{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathcal{C}$$

equipped with a canonical half-braiding induced by changing the variable in ends, where  $[F(m), G(m)]_{\mathcal{C}}$  is the internal hom in  $\mathcal{C}$  (see [DKR15, Proposition 3.5] for more details). It induces an enriched category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1^{(\mathcal{C})}\text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$  by the canonical construction. If  $\mathcal{M} = \text{RMod}_A(\mathcal{C})$  and  $\mathcal{N} = \text{RMod}_B(\mathcal{C})$  where  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$  are separable algebras, then the functor category  $\text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N})$  is equivalent to  $\text{BMod}_{A|B}(\mathcal{C})$ .

In particular, when  $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}$ , the functor category  $\text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M})$  is a multi-fusion category [ENO05], which is monoidally equivalent to  $\text{BMod}_{A|A}(\mathcal{C})^{\text{rev}}$  if  $\mathcal{M} = \text{RMod}_A(\mathcal{C})$ . The above  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{C})$ -module structure can be induced from a central functor  $\overline{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{C})} \rightarrow \text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M})$  called the  $\alpha$ -induction. Moreover, the central structure  $\overline{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\mathcal{C})} \rightarrow \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}))$  is a braided equivalence [EO04]. It follows that  $\mathfrak{Z}_1^{(\mathcal{C})}\text{Fun}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M})$  is an enriched fusion category whose  $E_1$ -center is trivial [KYZZ21, Corollary 5.29]. Indeed, it is the  $E_0$ -center of the enriched category  ${}^{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{M}$  [KYZZ21, Corollary 4.41].  $\blacklozenge$

**Example C.5.** Let  $G$  be a finite abelian group and  $H \subseteq G$  be a subgroup. By taking  $\mathcal{C} = \text{Rep}(G)$  and  $B = A = F_H$  in example C.4, we get an enriched category  $\mathfrak{Z}_1^{(\text{Rep}(G))}\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  (indeed, an enriched fusion category  $\overline{\mathfrak{Z}_1^{(\text{Rep}(G))}}\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$ ). Let us compute the internal hom  $[M, N]$  in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  for  $M, N \in \text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$ . We do not use the result in example C.4, but compute the internal hom by definition (C.1).

First we focus on the case that  $M = N = F_H$ . The general cases are discussed later. Since  $F_H$  is the tensor unit of  $\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  and  $\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is a closed left fusion  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ -module, the internal hom  $[F_H, F_H] \in \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  is a Lagrangian algebra in  $\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$  [DMNO13]. Thus it suffices to find its support (i.e., underlying object), which is a Lagrangian subgroup of  $(G \times \widehat{G}, q)$  (see example A.3 and A.7). Recall that the forgetful functor  $F: \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G)) \rightarrow \text{Rep}(G)$  is given by  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \mapsto \phi$ , and the half-braiding of  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)}$  is given by

$$\beta_{\psi, (g,\phi)}: \psi \otimes F(\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)}) = \psi \otimes \phi \xrightarrow{\psi(g)^{-1}} \phi \otimes \psi = F(\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)}) \otimes \psi.$$

Let us recall some basic facts about  $F_H$ . As an object in  $\text{Rep}(G)$ ,

$$F_H = \text{Fun}(G/H) \simeq \bigoplus_{\psi \in \widehat{G/H}} \psi,$$

and this isomorphism (i.e., the Fourier transform) maps  $\delta_x \in F_H$  to  $\sum_{\psi \in \widehat{G/H}} \psi(x) \cdot 1_{\psi}$ . As an object in  $\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$ , the tensor unit  $F_H$  is described by the following data (see the proof of Lemma B.9):

- Each  $(F_H)_{x,x} = \mathbb{C}$  (spanned by the delta function  $\delta_x$ ) and  $(F_H)_{x,y} = 0$  for  $x \neq y$ .
- The  $G$ -action  $\mathbb{C} = (F_H)_{x,x} \rightarrow (F_H)_{gx,gx} = \mathbb{C}$  is trivial for every  $g \in G$  and  $x \in G/H$ .

Now we consider the bimodule  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H \in \text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  for  $g \in G$  and  $\phi \in \widehat{G}$ .

- (a) As an object in  $\text{Rep}(G)$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H \in \text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is the tensor product  $\phi \otimes F_H$ , which has the same underlying vector space as  $F_H$  (i.e., spanned by  $\{\delta_x\}_{x \in G/H}$ ) but equipped with the  $G$ -action

$$h \cdot \delta_x := \phi(h)\delta_{hx}, \quad h \in G, x \in G/H.$$

(b) The right  $F_H$ -action on  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H$  is defined by

$$(\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H) \otimes F_H = \phi \otimes F_H \otimes F_H \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \mu} \phi \otimes F_H = \mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H,$$

where  $\mu$  is the multiplication of  $F_H$ . Thus we see the right  $F_H$ -action on  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H$  is given by

$$\delta_x \triangleleft \delta_y = \delta_{x,y} \delta_x.$$

(c) The left  $F_H$ -action on  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H$  is defined by

$$F_H \otimes (\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H) = F_H \otimes \phi \otimes F_H \xrightarrow{\beta_{F_H, (g,\phi)} \otimes 1} \phi \otimes F_H \otimes F_H \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \mu} \phi \otimes F_H = \mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H,$$

where  $\beta_{F_H, (g,\phi)}$  is the half-braiding of  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)}$  with  $F_H$ :

$$\beta_{F_H, (g,\phi)}: F_H \odot \mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} = \bigoplus_{\psi \in \widehat{G/H}} \psi \otimes \phi \xrightarrow{\bigoplus \psi(g)^{-1}} \bigoplus_{\psi \in \widehat{G/H}} \phi \otimes \psi = \mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H.$$

Under the isomorphism  $F_H \simeq \bigoplus_{\psi \in \widehat{G/H}} \psi$ , the half-braiding  $\beta_{F_H, (g,\phi)}$  maps  $\delta_y \otimes 1_\phi \in F_H \odot \mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)}$  to

$$\sum_{\psi \in \widehat{G/H}} \psi(g)^{-1} \psi(y) 1_\phi \otimes 1_\psi = 1_\phi \otimes \sum_{\psi \in \widehat{G/H}} \psi(g^{-1}y) 1_\psi = 1_\phi \otimes \delta_{g^{-1}y}.$$

Thus the left  $F_H$ -action on  $F_H$  is given by

$$\delta_y \triangleright \delta_x = \delta_{x, g^{-1}y} \delta_x = \delta_{gx, y} \delta_x.$$

Therefore, the bimodule  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H \in \text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is described by the following data:

- Each  $(\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H)_{gx, x} = \mathbb{C}$  and other components are zero.
- The  $G$ -action  $\mathbb{C} = (\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H)_{gx, x} \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H)_{hgx, hx} = \mathbb{C}$  is given by  $\phi(h)$  for  $g, h \in G$  and  $x \in G/H$ .

By the definition of internal homs (C.1) and Remark B.8, we have

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))}(\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)}, [F_H, F_H]) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))}(\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H, F_H) \simeq \begin{cases} \mathbb{C}, & (g, \phi) \in H \oplus \widehat{G/H}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then by Schur's lemma, we have

$$[F_H, F_H] \simeq \bigoplus_{(g,\phi) \in H \oplus \widehat{G/H}} \mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)}.$$

Hence the support of the Lagrangian algebra  $[F_H, F_H]$  is the Lagrangian subgroup  $H \oplus \widehat{G/H} \subset G \oplus \hat{G}$ .

Now we discuss the general internal homs. By the basic properties of internal homs [Ost03] we have

$$P \otimes [F_H, F_H] \otimes Q^L \simeq [Q \odot F_H, P \odot F_H]$$

for  $P, Q \in \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ . By the above calculation it is not hard to see that every bimodule  $M \in \text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  is isomorphic to  $P \odot F_H$  for some  $P \in \mathfrak{Z}_1(\text{Rep}(G))$ . Indeed, every simple bimodule  $M$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{O}_{(g,\phi)} \odot F_H$  for some  $(g, \phi) \in G \times \hat{G}$ . Then the internal hom  $[M, N]$  for simple bimodules  $M, N \in \text{BMod}_{F_H|F_H}(\text{Rep}(G))$  can be obtained explicitly by using the above formula, and the support of this internal hom is a coset of the Lagrangian subgroup  $H \oplus \widehat{G/H}$ .  $\blacklozenge$



## References

- [AKLT87] Ian Affleck, Tom Kennedy, Elliott H. Lieb, and Hal Tasaki. *Rigorous results on valence-bond ground states in antiferromagnets*. Physical Review Letters, 59(7):799–802, 1987.
- [BSW11] Salman Beigi, Peter W. Shor, and Daniel Whalen. *The quantum double model with boundary: Condensations and symmetries*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 306(3):663–694, 2011. arXiv:1006.5479.
- [CGW11] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, and Xiao-Gang Wen. *Classification of gapped symmetric phases in one-dimensional spin systems*. Physical Review B, 83(3), 2011. arXiv:1008.3745.
- [Dav10a] Alexei Davydov. *Centre of an algebra*. Advances in Mathematics, 225(1):319–348, 2010. arXiv:0908.1250.
- [Dav10b] Alexei Davydov. *Modular invariants for group-theoretical modular data. I*. Journal of Algebra, 323(5):1321–1348, 2010. arXiv:0908.1044.
- [DGNO10] Vladimir Drinfeld, Shlomo Gelaki, Dmitri Nikshych, and Victor Ostrik. *On braided fusion categories I*. Selecta Mathematica, 16(1):1–119, 2010. arXiv:0906.0620.
- [DKR15] Alexei Davydov, Liang Kong, and Ingo Runkel. *Functoriality of the center of an algebra*. Advances in Mathematics, 285:811–876, 2015. arXiv:1307.5956.
- [DMNO13] Alexei Davydov, Michael Müger, Dmitri Nikshych, and Victor Ostrik. *The Witt group of non-degenerate braided fusion categories*. Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal), 2013(677), 2013. arXiv:1009.2117.
- [DS18] Alexei Davydov and Darren A. Simmons. *Third cohomology and fusion categories*. Homology, Homotopy and Applications, 20(1):275–302, 2018. arXiv:1704.02401.
- [ENO05] Pavel Etingof, Dmitri Nikshych, and Viktor Ostrik. *On fusion categories*. Annals of Mathematics, 162(2):581–642, 2005. arXiv:math/0203060.
- [ENO11] Pavel Etingof, Dmitri Nikshych, and Victor Ostrik. *Weakly group-theoretical and solvable fusion categories*. Advances in Mathematics, 226(1):176–205, 2011. arXiv:0809.3031.
- [EO04] P. Etingof and V. Ostrik. *Finite tensor categories*. Moscow Mathematical Journal, 4(3):627–654, 2004. arXiv:math/0301027.
- [Fen12] Paul Fendley. *Parafermionic edge zero modes in  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ -invariant spin chains*. Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment, 2012(11):P11020, 2012. arXiv:1209.0472.
- [FSV13] Jürgen Fuchs, Christoph Schweigert, and Alessandro Valentino. *Bicategories for boundary conditions and for surface defects in 3-d TFT*. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 321(2):543–575, 2013. arXiv:1203.4568.
- [Hal83] F. D. M. Haldane. *Nonlinear field theory of large-spin Heisenberg antiferromagnets: Semiclassically quantized solitons of the one-dimensional easy-axis Néel state*. Physical Review Letters, 50(15):1153–1156, 1983.
- [JS93] A. Joyal and R. Street. *Braided tensor categories*. Advances in Mathematics, 102(1):20–78, 1993.
- [JW20] Wenjie Ji and Xiao-Gang Wen. *Categorical symmetry and noninvertible anomaly in symmetry-breaking and topological phase transitions*. Physical Review Research, 2(3):033417, 2020. arXiv:1912.13492.

- [Kel69] G. M. Kelly. *Adjunction for enriched categories*. In *Reports of the Midwest Category Seminar III*, pages 166–177. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1969.
- [Kit03] Alexei Kitaev. *Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons*. *Annals of Physics*, 303(1):2–30, 2003. arXiv:quant-ph/9707021.
- [KK12] Alexei Kitaev and Liang Kong. *Models for gapped boundaries and domain walls*. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 313(2):351–373, 2012. arXiv:1104.5047.
- [Kon14] Liang Kong. *Anyon condensation and tensor categories*. *Nuclear Physics B*, 886:436–482, 2014. *Erratum and addendum: “Anyon condensation and tensor categories” [Nucl. Phys. B 886 (2014) 436–482]*. *Nuclear Physics B*, 973:115607, 2021. See a corrected version in, arXiv:1307.8244.
- [KW14] Liang Kong and Xiao-Gang Wen. *Braided fusion categories, gravitational anomalies, and the mathematical framework for topological orders in any dimensions*. arXiv preprint, 2014. arXiv:1405.5858.
- [KWZ22] Liang Kong, Xiao-Gang Wen, and Hao Zheng. *One dimensional gapped quantum phases and enriched fusion categories*. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2022(3), 2022. arXiv:2108.08835.
- [KYZZ21] Liang Kong, Wei Yuan, Zhi-Hao Zhang, and Hao Zheng. *Enriched monoidal categories I: centers*. arXiv preprint, 2021. arXiv:2104.03121.
- [KZ18a] Liang Kong and Hao Zheng. *The center functor is fully faithful*. *Advances in Mathematics*, 339:749–779, 2018. arXiv:1507.00503.
- [KZ18b] Liang Kong and Hao Zheng. *Drinfeld center of enriched monoidal categories*. *Advances in Mathematics*, 323:411–426, 2018. arXiv:1704.01447.
- [KZ20a] Liang Kong and Hao Zheng. *Categories of quantum liquids I*. arXiv preprint, 2020. arXiv:2011.02859.
- [KZ20b] Liang Kong and Hao Zheng. *A mathematical theory of gapless edges of 2d topological orders. Part I*. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2020(2), 2020. arXiv:1905.04924.
- [KZ22a] Liang Kong and Zhi-Hao Zhang. *An invitation to topological orders and category theory*. arXiv preprint, 2022. arXiv:2205.05565.
- [KZ22b] Liang Kong and Hao Zheng. *Categories of quantum liquids III*. arXiv preprint, 2022. arXiv:2201.05726.
- [LKW16] Tian Lan, Liang Kong, and Xiao-Gang Wen. *Theory of (2+1)-dimensional fermionic topological orders and fermionic/bosonic topological orders with symmetries*. *Physical Review B*, 94(15), 2016. arXiv:1507.04673.
- [LKW17] Tian Lan, Liang Kong, and Xiao-Gang Wen. *Classification of (2+1)-dimensional topological order and symmetry-protected topological order for bosonic and fermionic systems with on-site symmetries*. *Physical Review B*, 95(23), 2017. arXiv:1602.05946.
- [LW05] Michael A. Levin and Xiao-Gang Wen. *String-net condensation: A physical mechanism for topological phases*. *Physical Review B*, 71(4), 2005. arXiv:cond-mat/0404617.
- [MP17] Scott Morrison and David Penneys. *Monoidal categories enriched in braided monoidal categories*. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2019(11):3527–3579, 2017. arXiv:1701.00567.
- [Mü03] Michael Müger. *From subfactors to categories and topology I: Frobenius algebras in and Morita equivalence of tensor categories*. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 180(1-2):81–157, 2003. arXiv:math/0111204.

- [Ost03] Victor Ostrik. *Module categories, weak Hopf algebras and modular invariants*. Transformation Groups, 8(2):177–206, 2003. arXiv:math/0111139.
- [SPGC11] Norbert Schuch, David Pérez-García, and Ignacio Cirac. *Classifying quantum phases using matrix product states and projected entangled pair states*. Physical Review B, 84(16), 2011. arXiv:1010.3732.
- [WW17] Yidun Wan and Chenjie Wang. *Fermion condensation and gapped domain walls in topological orders*. Journal of High Energy Physics, 2017(3), 2017. arXiv:1607.01388.