

Nonabelian braid statistics versus projective permutation statistics

N. Read

Department of Physics, Yale University, P.O. Box 208120, New Haven, CT 06520-8120
(March 27, 2002)

Recent papers by Finkelstein, Galiatdinov, and coworkers [J. Math. Phys. 42, 1489, 3299 (2001)] discuss a suggestion by Wilczek that nonabelian projective representations of the permutation group can be used as a new type of particle statistics, valid in any dimension. Wilczek's suggestion was based in part on an analysis by Nayak and Wilczek (NW) of the nonabelian representation of the braid group in a quantum Hall system. We point out that projective permutation statistics is not possible in a local quantum field theory as it violates locality, and show that the NW braid group representation is not equivalent to a projective representation of the permutation group. The structure of the finite image of the braid group in a $2^{n-2}-1$ -dimensional representation is obtained.

Moore and Read [1] showed that a physical realization of nonabelian statistics (as a nonabelian representation of the braid group) was a possibility in a quantum Hall effect system. The Moore-Read state now seems likely to be the ground state in the $\nu = 5/2$ quantum Hall effect (for a review, see [2]). The nonabelian statistics was analyzed further [3,4,5], and in particular Nayak and Wilczek (NW) [3] showed that exchange of the quasiparticles by braiding can be represented using a subgroup of the rotation group $SO(n)$, acting in the spinor (projective) representation, using Clifford algebra methods. Wilczek [6] then proposed a connection with the projective representations of the permutation group, and suggested that such "projective permutation statistics" are a possibility in any space dimension. This was explored extensively in Refs. [7,8,9], where it was termed "Clifford statistics". In view of the interest in nonabelian statistics also in connection with quantum computation [10], it seems worthwhile to correct the confusion that has arisen.

To begin, consider n indistinguishable point objects in a two-dimensional plane. For generic positions, they can be projected onto a generic line in such a way that they do not coincide, and can then be labelled $1, \dots, n$ in sequence from left to right. The permutation (or symmetric) group acting on the objects is generated by the set of s_j , $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, that exchange objects j , $j+1$. The generators obey relations

$$s_j^2 = 1; \quad (1)$$

$$(s_j s_k)^3 = 1 \quad (j \neq k, j+1 \neq k); \quad (2)$$

$$s_j s_k = s_k s_j \quad (j \neq k, j+1 > k) \quad (3)$$

(where 1 denotes the identity element of the group), and this set of generators and relations defines the symmetric group on n objects S_n . It has $n!$ elements.

Similarly, the braid group B_n is generated by nearest-neighbor transpositions t_j , but now they do not square to the identity. The braid group can be defined by the relations (see e.g. [11])

$$t_j t_k t_j = t_k t_j t_k \quad (j \neq k, j+1 \neq k); \quad (4)$$

$$t_j t_k = t_k t_j \quad (j \neq k, j+1 > k); \quad (5)$$

The braid group is an infinite discrete group.

The projective representations of the symmetric group S_n can be viewed as ordinary linear representations of a covering group, that is a nontrivial central extension of S_n by $U(1)$ (or by a subgroup thereof). The central extensions of S_n by $U(1)$ are classified up to isomorphism by the cohomology group $H^2(S_n; U(1))$ which for $n \geq 4$ is \mathbb{Z}_2 [12,13,14]. Hence for $n \geq 4$ (we consider only this range from here on) there are nontrivial extensions of S_n by \mathbb{Z}_2 , which have $2 \cdot n!$ elements, and we denote one of these by \mathbb{S}_n . \mathbb{S}_n can be defined by n generators s_j ($j = 1, \dots, n-1$), z and relations [14,15]

$$z^2 = 1; \quad (6)$$

$$s_j z = z s_j; \quad (7)$$

$$s_j^2 = 1; \quad (8)$$

$$s_j s_k s_j = s_k s_j s_k \quad (j \neq k, j+1 \neq k); \quad (9)$$

$$s_j s_k = s_k s_j \quad (j \neq k, j+1 > k); \quad (10)$$

Thus z is a central element that commutes with all elements, and can be set to either $+1$ or -1 in any irreducible representation (note that we do not distinguish between the abstract generators z , s_j , t_j , s_j , etc, and their matrix representatives in a particular representation). The relations are the same as for the symmetric group, modulo factors of z . Representations in which $z = 1$ descend to linear representations of the quotient group, $\mathbb{S}_n / \langle z \rangle = S_n$, while representations in which $z = -1$ are projective representations of S_n . (The only other nontrivial double cover of S_n , not isomorphic to \mathbb{S}_n except for $n = 6$ [14], is obtained by using instead generators \tilde{s}_j which obey similar relations but with 1 in place of z in eq. (8) [14,15]. In a representation in which $z = -1$, this results from setting $\tilde{s}_j = i s_j$ for all j . These were the relations used in Ref. [6].)

The proposal for projective permutation statistics [6] was that, as quantum mechanics welcomes the use of projective representations of symmetries, identical particles might be described by projective representations of the permutation group. Since the permutations do not refer to the topology of space (unlike the braiding operations), this proposal, if correct, could be used in any dimension

(the ordering of the particles along the line is then arbitrary). Then the operation of exchange of nearest neighbors would be represented by an element T_j acting on Hilbert space, and in the projective permutation statistics proposal, each T_j must be either s_j or s_j^{-1} , since these are the elements that project to transpositions s_j in the quotient group S_n . In particular, there is a representation of S_n of dimension $2^{[(n-1)/2]}$ (where $[x]$ denotes the largest integer $\leq x$). This coincides with the dimension of the representation of the braid group identified [1,3,4] in the Moore-Read quantum Hall state, and Wilczek [6] claimed that this representation of S_n is equivalent to the representation of the braid group obtained in Ref. [3], up to some phase factors that we will discuss in a moment. Note that the complex Clifford algebra on m generators γ_j , with relations $\gamma_j^2 = 1$, $\gamma_j \gamma_k = -\gamma_k \gamma_j$ ($j \neq k$), has dimension 2^m . For m even, the Clifford algebra is isomorphic to the algebra of matrices on a vector space of dimension $2^{m/2}$. This applies here with $m = 2[(n-1)/2]$.

The difficulty with the general proposal is that statistics of particles in quantum field theory or many-body theory must obey locality. That is, the underlying physics is presumed to be given by a local Hamiltonian containing local interactions between local fields (for example, the electrons in the quantum Hall system). The locality assumption plays a crucial role in the general rigorous analysis of particle statistics; see e.g. Refs. [16,17,18,19,20,21]. In particular, it appears that projective representations of the permutation group are explicitly ruled out (see e.g. Thm. 2.2.3c in Ch. IV of Ref. [21] for the case of relativistic theories in space dimension 3 under some technical assumptions that are relaxed by the end of Sec. IV 3.3, and Sec. IV 5 of Ref. [21] for some discussion of space dimension 2 where the braid group enters). The central step of the analysis is to move particles around continuously in spacetime, and the results depend only on the homotopy class of the path taken in configuration space. In particular, exchanges of disjoint well-separated pairs of particles must commute as the two orderings of the exchanges are homotopically equivalent, so in particular $T_j T_k = T_k T_j$ for $|j-k| > 1$, or in other words the group-theoretic commutator $T_j T_k T_j^{-1} T_k^{-1} = 1$. In the projective representations of the symmetric group, the commutator is instead ± 1 (whatever the choice of the lift, $T_j = s_j$ or s_j^{-1} , of each s_j), and so projective statistics violates locality. On the other hand, locality is not violated by braid statistics, where $T_j = t_j$ in some representation of B_n , and it is known that nonabelian braid statistics can be realized in a local theory in $2+1$ dimensions [19,18], for example in pure Chern-Simons gauge theory.

Independent of the physical requirement of locality, the difference between the commutators of generators in B_n (5) and in S_n (10) implies that a projective representation of S_n (in which $z = 1$) cannot also be a representa-

tion of the braid group B_n , in contradiction to Wilczek's claim [6]. Put another way, the image of the braid group in $U(2^{[(n-1)/2]})$ given by the representation matrices (the existence of which will be checked later) and that of S_n are not isomorphic as groups (given the way that both project to the symmetric group). (Later we will see that these two groups, though both finite, are actually of different orders.)

No escape from these conclusions can be found in a remark by Wilczek [6] that in the quantum Hall example, the projective statistics is combined with anyonic phase factors, $e^{2\pi i \theta}$ in a T_j . If this is taken to mean that the physical exchanges T_j act in a tensor product of the $2^{[(n-1)/2]}$ dimensional representation of S_n as above, with an abelian representation of the braid group $t_j = e^i$ for some real i , so $T_j = s_j t_j$, then it is clear that this does not affect the noncommutation of disjoint exchanges, $T_j T_k T_j^{-1} T_k^{-1} = 1$. (A special case is $e^i = i$, discussed earlier.) These generators clearly obey the relations (reintroducing z for convenience)

$$z^2 = 1; \quad (11)$$

$$z s_j = s_j z; \quad (12)$$

$$s_j s_k s_j = s_k s_j s_k \quad (|j-k| = 1); \quad (13)$$

$$s_j s_k = s_k s_j \quad (|j-k| > 1); \quad (14)$$

The existence of representations $T_j = s_j$ of these relations implies their consistency, and hence the existence of a nontrivial central extension \mathcal{B}_n of the braid group, defined abstractly by the generators z, s_j and the above relations. Any of the four groups mentioned earlier, S_n, B_n, S_n , or \mathcal{B}_n can be obtained from \mathcal{B}_n by imposing additional relations $s_j^2 = z, z = 1$, both of these, or $s_j^2 = 1$, respectively. Similarly, if $t_j^{(1)}$ and $t_j^{(2)}, j = 1, \dots, n-1$, are two representations of the braid group B_n , then $t_j = t_j^{(1)} t_j^{(2)}$ gives another one. In particular, $t_j^{(2)} = e^i$ (for all j) is a one-dimensional representation, and so a continuum of distinct representations of the same dimension can be found for each choice of $t_j^{(1)}$'s. In quantum Hall effect systems, such abelian tensor factors are common, as there is a contribution to T_j from the charge degrees of freedom, which produces a θ that depends on the filling factor.

If one considers representations modulo phase factors, then this distinction between the commutators (5), (10) cannot be made. This is the notion of isomorphism of groups modulo scalars, in contrast to the usual isomorphism we have been invoking so far. Isomorphism modulo scalars amounts to isomorphism of the images of the group(s) in the projective linear group $PGL(N) = GL(N)/GL(1)$, or since we are considering unitary representations, $PU(N) = U(N)/U(1)$. However, isomorphism modulo scalars is generally too weak a property to use in quantum physics. That is because we must keep track of interference between processes that correspond

to distinct group operations, and the phases involved may be relative phases that affect such interference. That is, we are interested in more than just the representation of a group. For example, S_n has two one-dimensional representations, one in which $s_j = +1$, one in which $s_j = -1$, corresponding to Bose and Fermi statistics, respectively. Modulo scalars, these are isomorphic, but linearly (and physically) they are not.

We now examine the construction of NW [3] to find the structure of their braid group representation of dimension $2^{(n-1)/2} = 2^{n/2-1}$ (we consider only n even from here on; there are similar results for n odd). Essentially the same construction, based on the Temperley-Lieb (TL) algebra specialized to the Ising model, was obtained much earlier by Jones [22]. See also Ref. [23]. NW deduce most of its properties from the properties of conformal blocks of spin fields in the Ising model, as in Ref. [1]. The central idea is that each object corresponds to an orthogonal direction in real n -dimensional Euclidean space R^n , and the elementary transpositions T_j correspond to a rotation π by $\pi/2$ in the plane spanned by objects $j, j+1$, acting in one of the two inequivalent spinor representations of dimension $2^{n/2-1}$ of the covering group $\text{Spin}(n)$ of $\text{SO}(n)$, up to a j -independent phase factor as just discussed: $T_j = e^{i\pi/2} \pi_j$. Clearly these operations have the effect of permuting the n axes (if we ignore the direction along each axis), and thus do project to the action of the permutation group as desired. Each rotation can be defined as $\pi_j = \exp[i(\pi/2)e_{j,j+1}]$, where $e_{j,k}$ ($j < k$) is the element of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(n)$ that generates a rotation in the jk plane, acting here in the chosen spinor representation. Since the generators $e_{j,k}$ for disjoint pairs $j_1 k_1, j_2 k_2$ commute, and this remains true in any representation including the spinors (there are no nontrivial central extensions of any semisimple Lie algebra!), the π_j 's commute, $\pi_j \pi_k \pi_j^{-1} \pi_k^{-1} = 1$ for $|j - k| > 1$. Hence there is no difficulty with locality of the proposal of Ref. [3], and so far it is consistent with the claim that the π_j 's form a linear representation of the braid group, with $t_j = \pi_j$. It remains to check the other relation (4).

To understand the structure of the representation of the braid group of dimension $2^{n/2-1}$ given by $t_j = \pi_j$, it is useful first to consider the geometry of the group of rotations by $\pi/2$ about the axes in R^n in more detail. This amounts to studying the group generated by elements $u_j = \exp[i(\pi/2)e_{j,j+1}]$, where this time $e_{j,k}$ act in the defining n -dimensional representation of $\text{SO}(n)$. The operation u_1 , for example, sends the point with coordinates $(x_1; \dots; x_n)$ to $(-x_2; x_1; x_3; \dots; x_n)$. The group generated by the u_j 's can be seen to be the set of all permutations of x_1, \dots, x_n , together with sign changes, but with the condition that an even permutation is combined with an even number of sign changes, and an odd permutation with an odd number of sign changes. If the latter condition is dropped, we obtain the group of all permutations and sign changes, which is generated by all

reflections in the diagonals $x_j = x_k$ ($1 \leq j < k \leq n$) and in the coordinate planes $x_j = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. This is therefore a Coxeter group, denoted B_n [24] [it is the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{so}(2n+1)$ and $\mathfrak{sp}(2n)$]. It can be described by generators and relations, but we will not need these here. There is a subgroup of index 2, which we denote B_n^+ , consisting of the elements that are proper rotations, and it is exactly the group generated by the u_j 's. B_n is a semidirect product of S_n with the group of sign changes $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$, and has order $2^n n!$. Its rotation subgroup B_n^+ has order $2^{n-1} n!$, and is an extension of S_n by $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^{n-1}$, but not a semidirect product (that is, there is no S_n subgroup of B_n^+ that projects onto S_n under the quotient map $B_n^+ \rightarrow B_n^+ / (\mathbb{Z}_2)^{n-1} = S_n$). Finally, the cover $\text{Spin}(n)$ of $\text{SO}(n)$, and the inclusion of B_n^+ in $\text{SO}(n)$, induce a double cover \mathbb{B}_n^+ (there is a similar double cover \mathbb{B}_n of B_n). \mathbb{B}_n^+ , which has order $2^n n!$, is almost the group we need. It is generated by the lifts of the u_j 's, and the irreducible representations of dimension $2^{n/2-1}$ of $\text{Spin}(n)$ induce representations of the same dimension of \mathbb{B}_n^+ , which can also be viewed as projective representations of B_n^+ . To find the order of the image of \mathbb{B}_n^+ in the irreducible spinor representations, we note that, for $n \geq 6$, the only normal subgroups of $\text{Spin}(n)$ are contained in its center, which is \mathbb{Z}_4 ($n=2$ odd), $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ ($n=2$ even), so the kernel of the map $\mathbb{B}_n^+ \rightarrow U(2^{n/2-1})$ must also be contained in the center of $\text{Spin}(n)$. Hence the order of the image of \mathbb{B}_n^+ is the same as the order of \mathbb{B}_n^+ , within a factor of 2 or 4. For $n = 4$, $\text{Spin}(4) = \text{SU}(2) \times \text{SU}(2)$, and the irreducible spinor representations do not faithfully represent the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(4)$, so the factor could be larger.

For B_n^+ , it is easy to show that setting $t_j = u_j$ does satisfy relation (4) defining the braid group B_n . To study the other groups explicitly, we resort to Clifford algebra methods. The reducible spinor representation of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$, of dimension $2^{n/2}$, can be naturally constructed as a representation of the even part of a complex Clifford algebra on n generators by setting $e_{j,k} = i\gamma_j \gamma_k$. The representation splits into two irreducibles of dimension $2^{n/2-1}$ (this is also the structure of the Temperley-Lieb algebra in the Ising model [22], and of a full Clifford algebra on only $n-1$ generators, which Jones constructs [22]). $\text{Spin}(n)$ and its center (and hence \mathbb{B}_n^+ , by a similar argument to that in the previous paragraph) act faithfully in the $2^{n/2-1}$ -dimensional representation. We find $\gamma_j = (1 + \gamma_j \gamma_{j+1})/2$ [23]. It is then easy to verify that setting $t_j = \gamma_j$, relation (4) is satisfied. The center of $\text{Spin}(n)$ is contained in \mathbb{B}_n^+ . It includes the elements $U = \frac{1}{2} \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \dots \gamma_n = 1/2 \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \dots \gamma_n$ and $\gamma_j^4 = 1$. For $n=2$ odd, $U^2 = 1$, and U generates the center $= \mathbb{Z}_4$ of $\text{Spin}(n)$. The two irreducible components are distinguished by the values $U = i, -i$. In these cases, \mathbb{Z}_4 and hence the whole of \mathbb{B}_n^+ are represented faithfully in the $2^{n/2-1}$ -dimensional representations, and hence the image

of B_n has order $2^{n-1} n!$. For $n=2$ even, $U = 1$, and the center of $\text{Spin}(n)$ is $\{1, U\}$; $U = 1$ in one irreducible component, $U = -1$ in the other, and the reverse for $-U$. Hence for $n \geq 8$ the image of \mathbb{B}_n^+ (and of B_n) is $\mathbb{B}_n^+ = Z_2$ for some Z_2 in either component, and has order $2^{n-1} n!$. For $n = 4$, one finds [22] that $\mathbb{B}_3 = \mathbb{B}_4^+$ in the two components, and the image of \mathbb{B}_4^+ and B_4 is isomorphic to \mathbb{B}_3^+ (\mathbb{B}_n^+ for n odd is defined the same way as for n even) of order $2^3 \cdot 3! = 48$. Finally, for all even $n \geq 4$, the center of the even part of the Clifford algebra is generated by U , and the center of \mathbb{B}_n^+ is the same as that of $\text{Spin}(n)$.

Our conclusion for the order of the finite group generated by the images ρ_j of the t_j 's in these irreducible representations agrees with the analysis by Jones, who showed that the image of B_n in $\text{PU}(2^{n-1})$ has order $2^{n-2} n!$ for $n \geq 6$, and 24 for $n = 4$ (see Thm. 5.2 in Ref. [22]). This is consistent with our results since passing to the projective group involves division by the center (the center of \mathbb{B}_3^+ is Z_2).

For comparison, the symmetric group S_n can be viewed as the Coxeter group A_{n-1} [24] [the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{su}(n)$]. As such it is generated by reflections (representing the s_j 's) in the hyperplanes $x_j = x_{j+1}$ in \mathbb{R}^n , and this represents it as a subgroup of $O(n)$. As all the generators leave the points on the line $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_n$ fixed, the reflections can be restricted to the orthogonal hypersurface $\sum_j x_j = 0$, and so generate a subgroup of $O(n-1)$. $O(n-1)$ has an irreducible projective spinor representation [or linear representation of its double cover $\text{Pin}(n-1)$] of dimension 2^{n-2} , in which the lift of a reflection in any hyperplane is represented by a linear combination of generators of a Clifford algebra on $n-1$ generators. The lifts ρ_j^0, z_j^0 to $\text{Pin}(n-1)$ of s_j ($j = 1, \dots, n-1$) then generate \mathbb{B}_n . In terms of the Clifford algebra (for convenience we will continue to use the Clifford algebra associated with \mathbb{R}^n), the explicit expressions are $\rho_j^0 = (\rho_j - \rho_{j+1})/\sqrt{2}$ (these elements generate a full Clifford algebra on $n-1$ generators), and the anticommutation of ρ_j^0, ρ_k^0 for $j \neq k > 1$ follows [14]. This is not the construction proposed in Ref. [3] for the braiding operations. If an abelian factor e^i is tensored into each ρ_j^0 , then the image of \mathbb{B}_n in $U(2^{n-2})$ is again a finite group if $\pi/2$ is rational. Even if this finite group happens to have the same order as \mathbb{B}_n^+ , it has a different structure, as we have already shown.

We should mention that the statistics described by representations of the group \mathbb{B}_n^+ discussed here cannot describe particles in more than two space dimensions, because the exchanges T_j do not obey (even up to a phase) the well-known conditions $T_j^2 = 1$ that are required [16, 21] in higher dimensions.

There are also other examples of quantum Hall systems with nonabelian braid statistics, with no obvious relation

to Clifford algebras. In the sequence of quantum Hall states, labelled by $k = 1, 2, \dots$, constructed in Ref. [25], the braiding of the quasiparticles is the same as that of Wilson lines in $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons gauge theory of level k , up to tensoring by an abelian representation. It is known that the image of the braid group in $U(N)$ (for certain N) in these cases is finite for $k = 1, 2, 4$ (abelian for $k = 1$), and dense in $SU(N)$ for all other k [26]. Therefore in general, study of the statistics involves the braid group, and not a finite group.

To conclude, we have pointed out that the image of the braid group in any $2^{[n-1]=2^1}$ -dimensional representation is not isomorphic to the nontrivial double cover of the symmetric group, even if an abelian representation of the braid group is tensored with the latter. Projective permutation statistics is not consistent with locality, but the physical examples in quantum Hall states are described by the braid group and are consistent with locality. In the case of the quasiparticles in the Moore-Read state, the statistics is nonetheless related to Clifford algebras.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Zhenghan Wang and Jürg Frohlich for helpful communications. This work was supported by the NSF under grant no. DMR-98-18259.

-
- [1] G. Moore and N. Read, Nucl. Phys. B 360, 362 (1991); N. Read and G. Moore, Prog. Theor. Phys. (Kyoto) Supp. 107, 157 (1992).
 - [2] N. Read, Physica B 298, 121 (2001) [[cond-mat/0011338](#)].
 - [3] C. Nayak and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. B 479, 529 (1996).
 - [4] N. Read and E. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B 54, 16864 (1996).
 - [5] N. Read and D. Green, Phys. Rev. B 61, 10267 (2000).
 - [6] F. Wilczek, hep-th/9806228.
 - [7] J. B. Laughlin, D. R. Finkelstein, A. G. Aulautdinov, and H. Saller, J. Math. Phys. 42, 1489 (2001).
 - [8] D. R. Finkelstein and A. A. G. Aulautdinov, J. Math. Phys. 42, 3299 (2001).
 - [9] A. A. G. Aulautdinov, hep-th/0201052.
 - [10] M. H. Freedman, A. Kitaev, M. J. Larsen, and Z. Wang, quant-ph/0101025.
 - [11] Y.-S. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 2103 (1984).
 - [12] C. A. Weibel, Introduction to Homological Algebra (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1994), Secs. 6.6, 6.9.
 - [13] R. Dijkgraaf, hep-th/9912101.
 - [14] P. N. Hoare and J. F. Humphreys, Projective Representations of the Symmetric Groups (Oxford University, Oxford, 1992).
 - [15] M. Hamermesh, Group Theory and Its Application to Physical Problems (Dover, New York, 1989), p. 468.
 - [16] S. Doplicher, R. Haag, and J. E. Roberts, Commun. Math. Phys. 13, 1 (1969); 15, 173 (1969); 23, 199 (1971); 35, 49 (1974).
 - [17] D. Buchholz and K. Fredenhagen, Commun. Math. Phys. 84, 1 (1982).

- [18] K . Fredenhagen, K . H . Rehren, and B . Schroer, Commun. Math. Phys. 125, 201 (1989).
- [19] J. Frohlich and F. Gabbiani, Rev. Math. Phys. 2, 251 (1990); J. Frohlich and P. A. Marchetti, Nucl. Phys. B 356, 533 (1991).
- [20] S. Doplicher and J. E. Roberts, Commun. Math. Phys. 131, 51 (1990).
- [21] R. Haag, Local Quantum Physics: Fields, Particles, Algebras (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1992).
- [22] V. F. R. Jones, in Geometric Methods in Operator Algebras, ed. H. Araki and E. G. Effros (Wiley, New York, 1986).
- [23] D. A. Ivanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 268 (2001).
- [24] J. E. Humphreys, Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990).
- [25] N. Read and E. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B 59, 8084 (1999).
- [26] M. Freedman, M. Larsen, and Z. Wang, quant-ph/0001108; math.GT/0103200 (see end of Sec. 4).