

Fractionalization, topological order, and quasiparticle statistics

Masaki Oshikawa¹ and T. Senthil^{2,3}

¹*Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology
Oh-okayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8551 Japan*

²*Center for Condensed Matter Theory, Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Science
Bangalore 560 012, India*

³*Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*

(Dated: May 13, 2005)

We argue, based on general principles, that topological order is essential to realize fractionalization in gapped insulating phases in dimensions $d \geq 2$. In $d = 2$ with genus g , we derive the existence of the minimum topological degeneracy q^g if the charge is fractionalized in unit of $1/q$, irrespective of microscopic model or of effective theory. Furthermore, if the quasiparticle is either boson or fermion, it must be at least q^{2g} .

Fractionalization of quantum numbers has been a focus of condensed matter physics in recent years. It refers to the emergence of a collective excitation having fractional quantum numbers with respect to the elementary particles (such as electrons), in a strongly correlated system. The notion of fractionalization is not only fascinating in itself, but also has been related to other intriguing concepts in theoretical physics as discussed in the following.

At present, several different systems exhibit the fractionalization [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10], at least theoretically. While the details naturally depend on each model under consideration, the structure of the excitation spectrum is efficiently described in terms of a gauge theory. More precisely the excitations consist of objects that have long ranged non-local ‘statistical’ interactions with each other which may be encoded as an Aharonov-Bohm gauge interaction. This is well-known in the fractional quantum hall effect where the fractionalized quasiparticles also have fractional statistics. Similarly in the fractionalized liquids described in Refs. [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8], there are vison excitations that have long range statistical interactions with the fractionalized particles (such as the spinons in a spin liquid).

This emergent gauge structure generally implies the existence of a certain kind of order – dubbed topological order – associated with the global properties of the groundstate wavefunction [11], which is also commonly found in the above examples. A characteristic signature of the topological order is the groundstate degeneracy depending on the topology of the system. This cannot be understood as a consequence of a conventional spontaneous symmetry breaking, which is the standard mechanism behind the groundstate degeneracy. The intriguing nature and consequences of the topological order is best understood in the Fractional Quantum Hall Liquid (FQHL) [11], although some of the concepts are applicable to other systems. In the gauge theory picture, the topological degeneracy could be understood with different “vacua” corresponding to different number of vortices trapped in each “hole” of the space (such as the torus.)

However, these developments apparently leave open the question on whether there is a different way to realize fractionalization without the emergent gauge structures. As such, at this point it is also unclear whether the topological order and associated groundstate degeneracy are necessary to have fractionalization. As we are still far from the complete classification of the fractionalized phases, and many novel examples of fractionalization will likely be found in the future, these questions would be of a significant importance.

In this paper, we demonstrate that there is indeed a general and direct connection between the fractionalization and the topological order, in the specific context of systems with a fully gapped spectrum. Generalizing the gauge invariance argument presented in Ref. [12], the existence of the topological order is shown to follow just from the fractionalization, irrespective of microscopic details.

As discussed before, the known examples of the fractionalization are rather suggestive of such a universal relation. In the several examples of fractionalization (at zero magnetic field) discussed recently [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10], the degeneracy is at least q^{2g} -fold in a system on a $d = 2$ dimensional surface with genus g , if the fractionalization occurs in the unit of $1/q$. However, we must recall that the Laughlin FQHL does exhibit a groundstate degeneracy, but only q^g -fold [13, 14]. (See also Ref. [10].) We will also clarify the difference between the cases with q^{2g} -fold and q^g -fold degeneracy, which turns out to be related to the statistics of the quasiparticles. Not surprisingly, our argument is closely related to the earlier studies on the topological order in FQHL especially in Refs. [13, 14], and that in systems of anyons [15].

Now let us define the problem in a general setting. We consider a system defined by a certain microscopic Hamiltonian of interacting particles, with an exact $U(1)$ global symmetry. With the global $U(1)$ symmetry, we may assign a (fictitious) charge to each particle, with the total charge being a conserved quantity. We take the unit in which the elementary charge is unity, so that the charge

of all the particles appearing in the microscopic model are integers. We can now also introduce a (fictitious) external $U(1)$ gauge field (“electromagnetic field”) coupled to the charge. We set $\hbar = c = 1$ so that the unit flux quantum is given by 2π .

The groundstate is generally a complicated state in terms of the original particles. Here we assume for simplicity that there is a finite gap above the (possibly degenerate) groundstate(s). We further assume that the elementary excitations of the system are well-defined quasiparticles and quasiholes. The quasiparticle may carry a charge that is a fraction of the original unit charge, *thereby we define the fractionalization*. This definition is very natural and is independent of the concrete model or mechanism of the fractionalization, while it naturally applies to all the known cases. Let us assume that the fractional charge of the quasiparticle is p/q , where p and q are mutually prime integers.

For simplicity, let us consider a system on a $d = 2$ torus of sufficiently large size $L_x \times L_y$, for the moment. We will comment on other cases later. We define the following process as introduced in Ref. [14]. First we create a quasiparticle and its antiparticle (quasihole) out of the vacuum (groundstate) at some location, and then move the quasiparticle to $+x$ direction, so that it encircles the torus to come back to the original location and to meet the quasihole. Finally, we pair-annihilate the quasiparticle and quasihole. Here we assume that this process can be realized by a unitary time evolution operator \mathcal{T}_x with respect to a properly chosen time-dependent Hamiltonian, e.g. with a time-dependent local potential to create and drag the quasiparticle. Thus we exclude quantum “glassy” systems as proposed in Ref. [16].

Similarly, we introduce another unitary operator \mathcal{T}_y , corresponding to creation of a quasihole-quasiparticle pair and annihilation after winding in y direction. It is expected that $\mathcal{T}_{x,y}$ bring any state in the groundstate manifold state back, at least approximately, to a (possibly different) groundstate.

Next we consider an adiabatic insertion of a unit flux quantum $\Phi_0 = 2\pi$ through the “hole” of the torus, inducing an (fictitious) electric field in x -direction. This may again be realized by a time evolution in which the x -component of the vector potential is gradually increased from $A_x = 0$ to $A_x = 2\pi/L_x$ in the Hamiltonian. Thus it is represented by a unitary time-evolution operator \mathcal{F}_x . We also define a similar operator \mathcal{F}_y that corresponds to an adiabatic insertion of a unit flux quantum through the other “hole”, inducing the y -component of the vector potential. We assume that these operations do not close the gap to excitations above the groundstate manifold and thus bring any groundstate to a groundstate. In $d = 2$, it amounts to assuming the system to be an insulator, while it is a stronger assumption for $d \geq 3$. [17] (See also Ref. [18].)

Now let us consider two operations \mathcal{T}_x and \mathcal{F}_x in se-

quence. The flux insertion \mathcal{F}_x introduces the vector potential $A_x = 2\pi/L_x$, corresponding to the unit flux quantum $\Phi_0 = 2\pi$ contained in the system. As we consider the process \mathcal{T}_x in different backgrounds, let us distinguish them by denoting $\mathcal{T}_x(\Phi)$ as the “encircling” process defined above in the presence of the vector potential $A_x = \Phi/L_x$. The contained unit flux quantum does not induce the Aharonov-Bohm effect on the original particles of integral charge. However, for the quasiparticle with the fractional charge p/q , the same vector potential $A_x = 2\pi/L_x$ still gives a non-trivial Aharonov-Bohm phase $e^{2\pi ip/q}$ when the quasiparticle completes the encircling process. Thus we obtain a relation

$$\mathcal{T}_x(\Phi_0)\mathcal{F}_x \sim e^{2\pi ip/q}\mathcal{F}_x\mathcal{T}_x(0). \quad (1)$$

On the other hand, because the microscopic model is given in terms of the original particles of integral charge, any Hamiltonian with an extra unit flux quantum in the “hole” of the torus is unitary equivalent to the Hamiltonian with zero flux. Namely, the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}(\Phi_0)$ with the unit flux quantum is related to the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}(0)$ with zero flux as $\mathcal{H}(\Phi_0) = U^{-1}\mathcal{H}(0)U$, by a unitary operator U which is called as the large gauge transformation. As we have argued previously, the encircling process \mathcal{T}_x should be realized by a time evolution with respect to an appropriately chosen time-dependent Hamiltonian, again *written in terms of the original particles*. Therefore, the operator \mathcal{T} also must obey the relation

$$\mathcal{T}_x(\Phi_0) = U^{-1}\mathcal{T}_x(0)U. \quad (2)$$

Combining eqs. (1) and (2), we obtain

$$\mathcal{T}_x(0)\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x \sim e^{2\pi ip/q}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x\mathcal{T}_x(0), \quad (3)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x \equiv U\mathcal{F}_x$. In the following, for brevity \mathcal{T}_x without the argument denotes $\mathcal{T}_x(0)$, and likewise for \mathcal{T}_y .

This algebra between \mathcal{T}_x and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x$ is identical to that of the magnetic translation group, which we call as the magnetic algebra. By our assumptions, both of these operators map a groundstate to a groundstate. We thus immediately see that the groundstates must be q -fold degenerate, with the same reasoning as was used in Refs. [14, 15]. Our argument so far is essentially contained in Ref. [12], where the q -fold groundstate degeneracy of a FQH liquid is derived based on the gauge invariance. In this paper, we shall present a more systematic discussion to demonstrate that the degeneracy is topology-dependent, and that the degeneracy is also affected by quasiparticle statistics.

For the other direction y , we obtain a corresponding relation

$$\mathcal{T}_y\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_y \sim e^{2\pi ip/q}\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_y\mathcal{T}_y. \quad (4)$$

Apparently, now we obtain two sets of the magnetic algebra, which would imply a q^2 -fold degeneracy on the

torus. However, as it should not apply to the Laughlin state where the degeneracy is known to be only q -fold, we have to examine more carefully the interplay between eqs. (3) and (4).

\mathcal{F}_x introduces the vector potential only in the x direction, to which \mathcal{T}_y is insensitive. Thus, with the large gauge transformation combined, we have $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x \mathcal{T}_y = \mathcal{T}_y \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x$ and likewise for $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_y$ and \mathcal{T}_x . Therefore, we can take the basis in the groundstate subspace so that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x$ and \mathcal{T}_y are both diagonalized. Let the simultaneous eigenstate (among the groundstates) of them be $|f_x, t_y\rangle$ with f_x and t_y denoting the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x$ and \mathcal{T}_y respectively. By applying \mathcal{T}_x to this state, one obtains a new groundstate belonging to a different eigenvalue $f_x e^{-2\pi i p/q}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x$ because

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x(\mathcal{T}_x |f_x, t_y\rangle) = f_x e^{-2\pi i p/q} (\mathcal{T}_x |f_x, t_y\rangle) \quad (5)$$

follows from eq. (3). By repeated applications of \mathcal{T}_x , one can obtain at least q different groundstates as announced.

Similarly, we can apply $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_y$ to $|f_x, t_y\rangle$ to obtain q -fold degenerate groundstates belonging to different eigenvalues of \mathcal{T}_y . The question now is whether these two procedures give different set of groundstates. It depends on whether (or how) the application of \mathcal{T}_x changes the eigenvalue of \mathcal{T}_y . This boils down to the commutation relation between \mathcal{T}_x and \mathcal{T}_y , which actually reflects the statistics of the quasiparticle. The (Abelian) anyonic statistic is characterized by a statistical angle θ , so that an exchange of two identical particles gives rise to the phase factor $e^{-i\theta}$. In Refs. [14, 15] it was pointed out

$$\mathcal{T}_x^{-1} \mathcal{T}_y^{-1} \mathcal{T}_x \mathcal{T}_y = e^{-i2\theta}. \quad (6)$$

This is because the left-hand side corresponds to world-lines of the two quasiparticles forming two linked loops in the space-time, as illustrated in Figs. 4 and 5 in Ref. [14].

Let us first consider the simple case of either bosonic ($\theta = 0$) or fermionic ($\theta = \pi$) statistics, for which \mathcal{T}_x and \mathcal{T}_y commute from eq. (6). Thus, applying \mathcal{T}_x does not change the eigenvalue t_y of \mathcal{T}_y while it changes the eigenvalue of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x$. Therefore, in this case, one can obtain q different eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x$ by successively applying \mathcal{T}_x , for each of q different eigenvalues of \mathcal{T}_y that is obtained by application of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_y$. Thus, there are at least q^2 -fold degenerate groundstate corresponding to the different set of eigenvalues. In particular, when $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_y$ commute, the degeneracy deduced from the above set of algebra is q^2 .

On the other hand, in the Laughlin state at filling fraction $1/q$ where q is odd, the quasiparticles are known to carry the fractional charge $1/q$ ($p = 1$ in the previous notation) [1], and to exhibit anyonic fractional statistics with the statistical angle $\theta = \pi/q$. [19] In this case, because of eq. (6), we obtain

$$\mathcal{T}_y(\mathcal{T}_x |f_x, t_y\rangle) = t_y e^{2\pi i/q} (\mathcal{T}_x |f_x, t_y\rangle). \quad (7)$$

Thus, combined with eq. (5), an application of \mathcal{T}_x induces the change in both the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x$ and \mathcal{T}_y as

$$(f_x, t_y) \rightarrow (f_x e^{-2\pi i/q}, t_y e^{2\pi i/q}). \quad (8)$$

This allows the possibility that the groundstate degeneracy on the torus to be smaller than q^2 . This could happen if

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_y \sim e^{-2\pi i/q} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_y \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_x, \quad (9)$$

when acting on the groundstate subspace. In this case, because the application of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_y$ induces exactly the same change of the eigenvalues in eq. (8), we can generate only q different set of eigenvalues.

In fact, eq. (9) is exactly what holds in the Laughlin state. As pointed out in Ref. [14], because the quasiparticles and holes in the Laughlin state can be identified with a ‘‘vortex’’ with unit flux quantum, the encircling process \mathcal{T}_x actually introduces a unit flux quantum threading the ‘‘hole’’ of the torus, as \mathcal{F}_y does. Thus eq. (9) follows. Actually, it means that $\mathcal{T}_{x,y}$ can be identified with $\mathcal{F}_{y,x}$ as far as their action in the groundstate subspace is concerned. Thus the two algebras eqs. (3) and (4) are indeed reduced to a single magnetic algebra, leaving only the q -fold degeneracy. On the other hand, if the statistical angle θ does not match the fractional charge of the quasiparticles, we should have a larger degeneracy. When the quasiparticle statistics is non-Abelian, the exact counting is more complicated. Nevertheless, the minimum q -fold degeneracy still holds because eq. (3) is based on the fractionalized charge and should not depend on the statistics. The detailed discussion of the non-Abelian case is deferred to a separate publication.

The above discussion can be generalized to a two dimensional system on the surface with genus g , for which there are g pairs of intersecting elementary nontrivial cycles. We can define the flux insertion (plus the appropriate large gauge transformation) operator $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_c$ and the quasiparticle winding operator \mathcal{T}_c for each cycle c . Picking one cycle from each pair, we have a set of g non-intersecting cycles so that the operators for the different cycles commute. Thus, for any (Abelian or non-Abelian) statistics of the quasiparticles, we have g independent magnetic algebras acting on the groundstate subspace and thus the groundstate degeneracy must be at least q^g . If the quasiparticle is either boson or fermion, we can utilize $2g$ set of magnetic algebras and the degeneracy must be at least q^{2g} .

The close relation between the insertion of the unit flux quantum and trapped vortices was emphasized previously in the \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge theory description of a fractionalized phase. [4] The adiabatic flux insertion $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_c$ was also used to relate topologically degenerate groundstates in the FQHL. [11, 14] The present argument suggests that these structures are rather universal in fractionalized systems.

Our argument could also be generalized to dimensions $d \neq 2$. Although our understanding of the topological order is still incomplete for $d \geq 3$, our argument implies a groundstate degeneracy in a gapped fractionalized system defined on a geometry with a nontrivial fundamental group. This suggests that the topological order is essential also in $d \geq 3$.

On the other hand, the situation is quite different in $d = 1$, where the “polyacetylene” type fractionalization [20] is known to occur in a conventional ordered phase with a spontaneous breaking of the translation symmetry. Our argument applied to $d = 1$ just requires the groundstate on a ring to be degenerate, as there is no higher topology. The degeneracy can be understood as a consequence of the spontaneous symmetry breaking of the conventional type, rather than due to any “topological” order. For $d \geq 2$, our argument reveals that the groundstate degeneracy indeed depends on the topology, implying the topological order. The present observation could help clarifying the profound difference in the fractionalization between $d = 1$ and $d \geq 2$.

Throughout this paper we have assumed the system to have a finite gap. However, the topological order can exist also in gapless systems [4], which we have not yet analyzed. It might be interesting to extend our argument to gapless cases. Although the concept of the groundstate degeneracy itself becomes subtle, the (quasi-)degenerate groundstates may be identified separately from the gapless excitations for example by examining the finite-size scaling carefully.

To summarize, we have derived a topological degeneracy, which indicates the presence of a topological order, in a general (gapful) fractionalized system in $d = 2$. The magnitude of the degeneracy is also related to the statistics of the fractionalized quasiparticles. It is also notable that the simple trick of the flux insertion together with the gauge invariance leads to the rather strong statement, to be added to existing applications [13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24]. Comparing with the “momentum counting” type applications [13, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24] of the flux insertion, the present argument is more powerful in the sense that it can be applied to various topologies, to show the degeneracy is indeed topological. The “momentum counting” arguments can be applied only to a cylinder or a torus, and thus by itself does not indicate whether the derived degeneracy is topological one or due to a conventional order. On the other hand, the operator \mathcal{T}_c needed in the present argument is introduced in a hand-waving way, and thus makes the argument considerably less rigorous than the “momentum counting” ones.

This work was initiated during 2003 Summer Workshop at Aspen Center for Physics, “Competing orders and quantum criticality” in which both of the authors

participated, and extended while M. O. attended the 2004 “Exotic order and criticality in quantum matter” program at Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, UC Santa Barbara (supported in part by NSF Grant PHY99-07949). M. O. thanks the participants of the “Exotic” program at KITP, and Claudio Chamon for very useful comments. In particular, we are grateful to Grégoire Misguich for correcting the initial confusion on the anyon statistics. M.O. is supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, and a 21st Century COE Program at Tokyo Institute of Technology “Nanometer-Scale Quantum Physics”, both from MEXT of Japan. TS acknowledges support from NSF Grant No. DMR-0308945, funding from the NEC Corporation, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and an award from the The Research Corporation.

-
- [1] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983).
 - [2] A. Yu. Kitaev, Ann. Phys. **303**, 2 (2003).
 - [3] N. Read and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1773 (1991); X. G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 2664 (1991).
 - [4] T. Senthil and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 7850 (2000); Phys. Rev. B **63**, 134521 (2001).
 - [5] R. Moessner and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1881 (2001).
 - [6] G. Misguich, D. Serban, and V. Pasquier, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 137202 (2002).
 - [7] L. Balents, M. P. A. Fisher, and S. M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 224412 (2002).
 - [8] O. I. Motrunich and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 277004 (2002).
 - [9] O. I. Motrunich, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 115108 (2003).
 - [10] M. Freedman, C. Nayak, K. Shtengel, K. Walker, and Z. Wang, Ann. Phys. **310**, 428 (2004).
 - [11] X.-G. Wen, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **B5**, 1641 (1991).
 - [12] Y.-S. Wu, Y. Hatsugai, and M. Kohmoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 659 (1991).
 - [13] R. Tao and Yong-Shi Wu, Phys. Rev. B **30**, R1097 (1984).
 - [14] X.-G. Wen and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 9377 (1990).
 - [15] X.-G. Wen, E. Dagotto, and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. B **42**, 6110 (1990).
 - [16] C. Chamon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 040402 (2005).
 - [17] M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 236401 (2003); **91**, 109901(E) (2003).
 - [18] A. Paramekanti and A. Vishwanath, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 245118 (2004).
 - [19] B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 1583 (1984).
 - [20] W. P. Su, J. R. Schrieffer, and A. J. Heeger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 1698 (1979).
 - [21] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. B **23**, R5632 (1981).
 - [22] M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1535 (2000).
 - [23] M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3370 (2000); T. Senthil, S. Sachdev, and M. Vojta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 216403 (2003).
 - [24] M. B. Hastings, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 104431 (2004); Europhys. Lett. **70**, 824 (2005)