

Gapped Boundary Phases of Topological Insulators via Weak Coupling

Nathan Seiberg and Edward Witten

School of Natural Sciences, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540

Abstract

The standard boundary state of a topological insulator in 3+1 dimensions has gapless charged fermions. We present model systems that reproduce this standard gapless boundary state in one phase, but also have gapped phases with topological order. Our models are weakly coupled and all the dynamics is explicit. We rederive some known boundary states of topological insulators and construct new ones. Consistency with the standard spin/charge relation of condensed matter physics places a nontrivial constraint on models.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Anomalies And Boundary States Of A Topological Insulator	3
1.2	Coupling To Background Fields	5
1.3	Outline	7
2	Review Of The Standard Gapless Boundary State	8
2.1	Action And Symmetries	8
2.2	Anomalies	9
2.3	The Spin/Charge Relation And Spin _c Manifolds	11
3	A Simple Class Of Boundary States	14
3.1	Some Models	14
3.2	Monopole Operators And The Anomaly	17
3.3	Breaking A Symmetry	18
3.4	The Vortex	19
3.5	Quasiparticles	24
3.5.1	Enumerating the Quasiparticles	25
3.5.2	Consequences of CT Symmetry	25
3.5.3	Some More Delicate Questions	27
3.6	The Partition Function	29
3.6.1	Review Of The Parity Anomaly	30
3.6.2	The APS Index Theorem And T-Invariance	31
3.6.3	Extension To $s \neq 0$	32
3.6.4	Relation To The Ising Model	35
4	A Topological Field Theory For The Low Energy Physics	38
4.1	The Abelian Sector	38
4.2	Adding The Non-Abelian Sector	40
4.3	More General Models	44
4.4	An Explicit Chern-Simons Lagrangian for the Whole System	48
5	Some Additional Topics	49
5.1	$U(1)_2 \times U(1)_{-1}$	49
5.2	More On Some Models From Section 4	51
6	Application To Topological Superconductors	53
6.1	Preliminaries	53
6.2	Varying ν_{sc}	54
6.3	More On T-Pfaffian	58
A	Normalization of Some Couplings	60
A.1	Some 3 + 1-Dimensional Terms	60
A.2	Theta-Angles	62
A.3	2 + 1-Dimensional Chern-Simons Terms	63

A.4 Unorientable Spacetimes	64
B The Callias Index Theorem	67
C Some Useful Facts About Chern-Simons Gauge Theories	72
C.1 $U(1)$	72
C.2 $U(1)^n$	74
C.3 \mathbf{Z}_N	75
C.4 $U(2)$	75
C.5 Lifting a Spin-TQFT to a Non-Spin-TQFT	78
C.6 Chern-Simons Gauge Theories for Non-Abelian FQHE	79

1 Introduction

1.1 Anomalies And Boundary States Of A Topological Insulator

The topological insulator [1]-[10] is a fascinating and experimentally accessible example of a symmetry-protected topological (SPT) [11]-[16] phase of matter. In general, an SPT phase seems almost trivial in bulk at long distances. It is gapped and lacks long range topological order. Yet subtle features of the bulk physics force nontrivial behavior on the boundary of a material that is in an SPT phase. The boundary in general may spontaneously break some of the symmetries, have gapless excitations, or have topological order.

A topological insulator for our purposes is a $3 + 1$ -dimensional¹ time-reversal invariant system of electrons coupled to background electromagnetism with gauge field A . (We write \mathbb{T} for time-reversal.) We will take A to be a classical background field, which does not fluctuate. We model the system by relativistic Dirac fermions with an electron mass that we assume may be position-dependent. Time-reversal symmetry forces the electron mass parameter m to be everywhere real. (The electron mass term is thus $m\bar{\Psi}\Psi$ with real m , while a \mathbb{T} -violating contribution proportional to $\bar{\Psi}\gamma^5\Psi$ is absent.) A topological insulator can be modeled as a system in which m is real and positive outside the material and negative inside. Thus the mass parameter changes sign near the surface of the material. As in [18], such a sign change leads to the appearance of massless fermions on the interface between the two regions. These gapless modes propagate along the boundary as a $2 + 1$ -dimensional massless Dirac fermion, and are characteristic of the standard boundary state of the topological insulator.

One could make a chiral rotation of the electron field inside the material by an angle $\pm\pi$ to reduce to the case that m is positive inside as well as outside the material. The chiral anomaly means that this rotation induces the interaction

$$I_{\text{ind}} = \pi \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{F}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{F}{2\pi} \right), \quad (1.1)$$

¹ $2 + 1$ -dimensional topological insulators fit in a similar framework, although the relevant anomaly may seem more exotic [17].

where X is the worldvolume of the material, $F = dA$ is the field strength of electromagnetism, and $\widehat{A}(R)$ is a certain bilinear function of the Riemann tensor R , defined in eqn. (A.1). (The overall sign of I_{ind} depends upon whether one makes a chiral rotation by an angle $+\pi$ or $-\pi$ to reverse the sign of the mass parameter.) The second term in eqn. (1.1) represents a contribution to the theta-angle of the electromagnetic field, which [19, 20] is $\theta = \pi$ inside a topological insulator assuming that it vanishes outside. Under \mathbb{T} , $\theta = \pi$ is mapped to $\theta = -\pi$. The physics of a bulk system is invariant under $\theta \rightarrow \theta + 2\pi$, so $\theta = \pi$ is equivalent in bulk to $\theta = -\pi$. The same consideration appears to show that the gravitational term $\pi\widehat{A}(R)$ is irrelevant,² as it naively represents a gravitational theta-term with a coefficient $\theta_{\text{grav}} = 2\pi$, which one might expect to be equivalent to $\theta_{\text{grav}} = 0$. However, we will see that this term plays a role when considered together with the spin/charge relation of condensed matter physics.

The subtlety of the topological insulator comes from the fact that although the interaction (1.1) is \mathbb{T} -invariant on a spacetime manifold without boundary, it is not \mathbb{T} -invariant by itself if the integral in (1.1) runs only over the interior X of a topological insulator. For one thing, the proof of \mathbb{T} -invariance of a theory with the interaction I_{ind} depends on integrality of $\frac{1}{2} \int_X F \wedge F / (2\pi)^2$ (which ensures that I_{ind} , which is odd under \mathbb{T} , is \mathbb{T} -invariant mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$). This integrality holds if X is a compact spin manifold without boundary, but not if it is the worldvolume of a topological insulator, which in the real world always has a nonempty boundary. On the contrary, if X has boundary W , then $\pi \int_X F \wedge F / (2\pi)^2$ can serve as the definition of the Chern-Simons function of a gauge field A on W :

$$\text{CS}(A) = \pi \int_X \frac{F}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{F}{2\pi}. \quad (1.2)$$

Another explanation of why merely including a term I_{ind} in the effective action violates \mathbb{T} -invariance is that although a global chiral rotation by an angle π everywhere in spacetime is indeed equivalent to a global chiral rotation by an angle $-\pi$, a chiral rotation by a spatially-dependent angle that varies from 0 outside the material to $+\pi$ inside is not equivalent to one that varies from 0 to $-\pi$.

In a \mathbb{T} -invariant system that has the interaction I_{ind} in its interior, something interesting must happen on the boundary to maintain \mathbb{T} -invariance. The standard boundary state of the topological insulator achieves this via the presence of gapless charged fermions on the boundary, whose appearance was briefly explained above. A purely 2 + 1-dimensional system of massless charged electrons propagating on a three-manifold W suffers from what is commonly called a parity anomaly [21, 22, 23, 17]. Classically, this system of fermions has time-reversal symmetry and a global $U(1)_A$ symmetry to which A couples. In the quantum theory one has to give up at least one of these symmetries. But if W is the boundary of a four-manifold X and the bulk physics on X includes the interaction I_{ind} , then \mathbb{T} symmetry and $U(1)_A$ can be simultaneously preserved. This can be understood as an example of anomaly inflow [24], in fact a rather subtle example as the relevant anomaly is a mod 2 effect.

This interplay between the physics in the bulk and on the surface, which is controlled by symmetries and anomalies, makes the system that we have just described robust. Small

² One may also question more generally whether considerations involving coupling to gravity, and thus to a general spacetime manifold, are meaningful in condensed matter physics, which lacks a microscopic relativistic symmetry. Experience seems to show that such considerations do give valid results, possibly because considerations that can be seen by considering the behavior on a general spacetime manifold could instead be extracted from entanglement properties of many-body quantum wavefunctions.

symmetry-preserving deformations cannot change the essential properties: the existence of the interaction I_{ind} in bulk, and the presence of gapless charged fermions on the boundary. What about large symmetry-preserving deformations?

The tight structure based on anomalies makes it challenging to gap the boundary while preserving the symmetries. Clearly, if the massless fermions of the standard gapless boundary state are absent, something else must contribute the same anomaly. The boundary hence cannot be a trivial gapped system. But the boundary can support a $2+1$ dimensional topological quantum field theory (TQFT) that has the same anomalous realization of time-reversal symmetry T and global $U(1)_A$ symmetry as the free fermions of the standard gapless boundary state. Examples have been described in [25]-[31], following work on gapped boundary states of certain bosonic systems [32]. The goal of this paper is to further understand the constraints on these systems, to give a description in which all of the dynamics is completely explicit, and to find additional symmetry-preserving gapped boundary states.

The models we construct are similar to models constructed in [25] and [28] for boundary states of a topological insulator and in [33] and [34] for boundary states of a topological superconductor. In these papers, starting with the standard gapless boundary state of a topological insulator, the first step is to put the boundary in a superconducting state, for example by proximity to a slab of s-wave superconductor. The boundary then supports quasiparticles – vortices – that carry ordinary magnetic flux and obey exotic statistics. The key second step is to assume a process of “vortex condensation” after which the electromagnetic gauge symmetry is restored and the vorticity is only conserved modulo some integer n . But in the real world, the ordinary magnetic flux through a two-dimensional surface (such as the surface of a topological insulator) is an exactly conserved quantity, which cannot be reduced by any boundary dynamics to a mod n conservation law. Related to this, the dynamics postulated in these papers is not very explicit. To avoid such issues, we reinterpret their construction so that the flux carried by the vortices is the flux of an emergent gauge field. With suitable hypotheses on symmetry breaking, this flux can perfectly well be conserved mod n for some n . All of the required dynamics is explicit and elementary, rather as in the “composite fermion” derivation of the Moore-Read state [35, 36]. Similarly, [25] exhibits a second and simpler gapped boundary state obtained from the first using the process of “anyon condensation.” Again, the assumed dynamics must be strongly coupled. Instead, we construct a weakly coupled system leading to the same topological quantum field theory. Analogous remarks apply concerning the relation of our treatment to the treatment of a topological superconductor in [33] and [34].

1.2 Coupling To Background Fields

In condensed matter physics, one commonly discusses three distinct descriptions of a given system (see fig. 1). First, we have a microscopic Hamiltonian describing the electrons of the material. This system is quite complicated and typically cannot be analyzed explicitly. Second, we consider a simplified model, which captures some collective excitations of the microscopic system. There is no claim that this model gives a complete and accurate description of the system. The idea is only that it is a simpler model that captures the essential properties of the original microscopic theory; they are in the same universality class. We will refer to this model as a phenomenological model. Finally, we have the long-distance, macroscopic description of the physics.




Figure 1: We are interested in solving a complicated microscopic theory and finding its macroscopic description. Instead, we replace it with a simplified model that captures some degrees of freedom. This model is not supposed to be exact. This model is weakly coupled and allows us to find its long distance behavior easily. The hope is that it is in the same universality class as the original microscopic theory.

Since it is often nontrivial to derive one of these descriptions from the others, it is useful to constrain them by finding appropriate consistency conditions. We have already mentioned that we impose \mathbb{T} and $U(1)_A$ symmetry. Specifically, we impose that the $2 + 1$ -dimensional boundary theory combined with the bulk term I_{ind} respects these symmetries.

A refinement of these constraints follow from what in particle physics is known as 't Hooft anomaly matching [37]. Instead of considering these three systems (the microscopic system, the simplified mode, and the long distance macroscopic description) as they are, we couple them to a nontrivial electromagnetic and gravitational background. In the real original system of interest, the electromagnetic vector potential A is topologically trivial and the spacetime metric is flat. But the microscopic Schrodinger equation is consistent in more generality.

For example, even though in nature, magnetic monopoles are not available to us, we can entertain introducing a magnetic monopole into our material. (In the current context this was done in [19, 38, 39].) This is consistent at the level of the microscopic Schrodinger equation so it must also be consistent in the other two descriptions. Similarly, we can place the system on a curved spatial manifold, or, if we are optimistic (see footnote 2), on a fairly general curved spacetime. Some conditions involving spin are needed, as discussed momentarily. Time-reversal symmetry means that we can define the system even on a spacetime that is not necessarily orientable. When we do this, some properties must match between the microscopic and macroscopic description. As with the magnetic monopole, the real system of interest exists in flat spacetime, but placing it in a hypothetical curved spacetime turns out to be a powerful tool to learn about the flat spacetime theory.

Finally, any system made from electrons only (coupled to a background of nuclei that is inert except for lattice vibrations, and possibly supplemented with photons) obeys what we

will call the spin/charge relation of condensed matter physics. This asserts that – in a system of finite volume, which is ultimately constructed from a finite number of electrons and nuclei – states of odd electric charge have half-integral spin and states of even electric charge have integral spin.³ If the spin/charge relation is satisfied microscopically, then it must be satisfied in any phenomenological description.

A useful way to incorporate the spin/charge relation, described in detail in section 2.3, is as follows. Any system of fermions can be defined on a spin manifold. But a system that obeys the spin/charge relation can be formulated on a more general class of manifolds known as spin_c manifolds. (For recent application of spin_c manifolds in a condensed matter context, see [40].) If we start with a microscopic system that obeys the spin/charge relation, then any more phenomenological description of the same system should make sense on a spin_c manifold. This gives constraints on phenomenological models that are interesting and useful, even if we are really not interested in the physics on spin_c manifolds.

1.3 Outline

The outline of this paper is as follows.

In section 2, we review the standard gapless boundary state of a topological insulator. We describe the action of free 2 + 1-dimensional fermions and its symmetries. We give a first description of the anomaly and we explain the spin/charge constraint and its relation to spin_c .

In section 3, we present a simple one-parameter family of boundary models for the topological insulator. In one phase, these models describe the standard gapless boundary state of the topological insulator. In another phase, a gap develops and a nontrivial boundary TQFT is found. The models are weakly coupled and the analysis is explicit and elementary. The study of these models uncovers a new anomaly associated with the spin/charge relation. We describe the collective excitations of these models and show that they exhibit non-Abelian statistics. (This should not be a surprise given previous literature [25]-[31].) We also compute the partition functions of these models and clarify a number of subtle issues.

Section 4 is devoted to the long distance macroscopic description of the system. We identify the low energy TQFT and explore its properties. This motivates us to find additional models generalizing those in section 3. We recognize many of these TQFTs as those found in [25]. More detail on these models, and an “abelian” model that almost works as a boundary state of a topological insulator, can be found in section 5.

Our main focus in this paper is on boundary states of a topological insulator, but the constructions are also applicable to topological superconductors, as we discuss in section 6.

A number of appendices present additional background information. In Appendix A, we summarize the proper normalization of some of the topological terms we use in three and four dimensions. In Appendix B, we review the Callias index theorem, which is useful in the analysis of vortices in these models. In Appendix C, we summarize some useful information about Chern-Simons gauge theories, clarify some possibly confusing points in the literature, and present an explicit gauge theory Lagrangian for the TQFT of the Moore-Read state [35] and its generalizations.

³The existence of neutrons means that the spin/charge relation is not a fundamental property of Nature. But it is valid in any condensed matter system in which nuclear spin plays no important role.

2 Review Of The Standard Gapless Boundary State

2.1 Action And Symmetries

Let X be the $3 + 1$ -dimensional worldvolume of a topological insulator and W its $2 + 1$ -dimensional boundary. In general, we assume that X and W are possibly curved Riemannian manifolds with a spin structure. When gauge fields are present, we write \mathcal{D}_0 for the Dirac operator for a fermion coupled to the geometry only (so on a flat manifold, \mathcal{D}_0 is simply the flat space Dirac operator $\not{\partial}$) and \mathcal{D} for the full Dirac operator including the gauge fields.

A topological insulator is gapped in bulk. Its standard boundary state has a massless Dirac fermion Ψ that propagates on W . Its action is

$$I_\Psi = \int_W d^3x \bar{\Psi} i \mathcal{D} \Psi = \int_W d^3x \bar{\Psi} (i \mathcal{D}_0 + A) \Psi, \quad (2.1)$$

where A is the $U(1)$ gauge field of electromagnetism. To describe in a simple way the action of the discrete symmetries \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{C} (time-reversal and charge conjugation), it is convenient to use, in Lorentz signature, a basis of 2×2 real gamma matrices γ_μ , $\mu = 0, 1, 2$, that obey

$$\{\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu\} = 2\eta_{\mu\nu}, \quad \eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1). \quad (2.2)$$

With real gamma matrices, a Majorana fermion λ is just a real 2-component fermion field, which we think of as a column vector. Then $\bar{\lambda}$ is defined simply to be $\lambda^{\text{tr}} \gamma_0$, where tr denotes transpose. A Dirac fermion is a complex 2-component fermion field Ψ ; for a Dirac fermion Ψ , with hermitian adjoint Ψ^\dagger (both of which are viewed as column vectors), one defines $\bar{\Psi} = (\Psi^\dagger)^{\text{tr}} \gamma_0$.

\mathbb{T} is conventionally defined so that electric charge is even under \mathbb{T} and magnetic vorticity is odd. Its action on A is then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}(A_0(t, \vec{x})) &= A_0(-t, \vec{x}) \\ \mathbb{T}(A_i(t, \vec{x})) &= -A_i(-t, \vec{x}), \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

It is clumsy to always write such a pair of equations, and we will usually abbreviate such a pair by writing

$$\mathbb{T}(A(t, \vec{x})) = -A(-t, \vec{x}), \quad (2.4)$$

where we write the transformation of the spatial components and it is understood that the time component transforms oppositely.⁴ \mathbb{C} acts by

$$\mathbb{C}(A(t, \vec{x})) = -A(t, \vec{x}). \quad (2.5)$$

Therefore \mathbb{CT} acts by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{CT}(A_0(t, \vec{x})) &= -A_0(-t, \vec{x}) \\ \mathbb{CT}(A_i(t, \vec{x})) &= A_i(-t, \vec{x}), \quad i = 1, 2 \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

⁴The motivation comes from thinking of A as a 1-form. If $\tau : (t, \vec{x}) \rightarrow (-t, \vec{x})$ is the time-reversal transformation of spacetime, then the two equations in (2.3) can be written $\mathbb{T}(A) = -\tau^*(A)$. We omit the τ^* and just write $\mathbb{T}(A) = -A$.

or more briefly

$$\mathbf{CT}(A(t, \vec{x})) = A(-t, \vec{x}) . \quad (2.7)$$

Often we write even more briefly $\mathbf{T}(A) = -A$ or $\mathbf{CT}(A) = A$.

To describe the action of the discrete symmetries on Ψ , it is most convenient to expand Ψ in terms of a pair of Majorana fermions λ_1, λ_2 : $\Psi = (\lambda_1 + i\lambda_2)/\sqrt{2}$. \mathbf{T} acts by

$$\mathbf{T}(\lambda_1(t, \vec{x})) = \gamma_0 \lambda_1(-t, \vec{x}), \quad \mathbf{T}(\lambda_2(t, \vec{x})) = -\gamma_0 \lambda_2(-t, \vec{x}). \quad (2.8)$$

Allowing for the fact that \mathbf{T} is antiunitary so that i is odd under \mathbf{T} , this definition implies that

$$\mathbf{T}(\Psi(t, \vec{x})) = \gamma_0 \Psi(-t, \vec{x}), \quad (2.9)$$

which somewhat deceptively makes it appear that Ψ transforms linearly under \mathbf{T} . \mathbf{C} acts by

$$\mathbf{C}(\lambda_1) = \lambda_1, \quad \mathbf{C}(\lambda_2) = -\lambda_2, \quad \mathbf{C}(\Psi) = \Psi^\dagger. \quad (2.10)$$

The action of \mathbf{CT} is accordingly

$$\mathbf{CT}(\lambda_i(t, \vec{x})) = \gamma_0 \lambda_i(-t, \vec{x}), \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \mathbf{CT}(\Psi(t, \vec{x})) = \gamma_0 \Psi^\dagger(-t, \vec{x}). \quad (2.11)$$

In condensed matter physics, \mathbf{T} can be a good microscopic symmetry, while \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{CT} (which map electrons to positrons) are not.⁵

Nevertheless, in this paper, we will keep track of all of these symmetries. One reason for this is that all boundary states we construct do have \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{CT} as well as \mathbf{T} symmetry. Also, many of the results have applications to topological superconductors, with \mathbf{CT} playing the role of \mathbf{T} , and accordingly \mathbf{CT} will be important in section 6.

2.2 Anomalies

In constructing an alternative boundary state for the topological insulator, we want to match certain anomalies of the standard boundary state that we have just described.

The most basic and familiar anomaly is that the standard boundary state has anomalous \mathbf{T} symmetry. This means that if the action I_Ψ of eqn. (2.1) is understood as the action of an abstract $2 + 1$ -dimensional system, then it cannot be quantized in a way that maintains \mathbf{T} symmetry (and also the $U(1)_A$ symmetry corresponding to conservation of electric charge). But it can be quantized in a \mathbf{T} -invariant fashion if the three-manifold W is the boundary of a four-manifold X and the electromagnetic theta-angle θ differs by π between the vacuum and X . Usually it is assumed that $\theta = 0$ in vacuum and then anomalous \mathbf{T} symmetry means that $\theta = \pi$ inside the bulk of a topological insulator.

The \mathbf{T} anomaly just described is commonly called a ‘‘parity’’ anomaly, but this terminology is a little misleading because in $2 + 1$ dimensions, parity, which acts on all spatial coordinates by $x^i \rightarrow -x^i$, $i = 1, 2$, is an element of the connected part of the rotation group. We prefer

⁵In particular, there is no particular constraint on the fermi energy for the massless boundary fermions of a $3 + 1$ -dimensional topological insulator except that it is within the bulk energy gap. So in relativistic terms, the boundary fermions are similar to massless Dirac fermions with a nonzero chemical potential. This chemical potential violates \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{CT} . Of course, \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{CT} are also generically violated by all sorts of higher order terms in the Hamiltonian of the massless fermions.

to call this an anomaly in \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{R} symmetry, where \mathbb{R} is a spatial reflection, for example $(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow (-x_1, x_2)$.

The other anomalies to consider involve coupling to gravity, that is, they involve the question of what happens if W and X are curved. It is not completely obvious that such anomalies are relevant in condensed matter physics, where it is natural to consider a general curved spatial manifold, but not a general curved spacetime. However, experience – notably [41, 17] with the 3 + 1-dimensional topological superconductor – appears to show that such anomalies are relevant. Probably this means that the results that can be deduced from anomalies involving coupling to gravity can alternatively be deduced by more subtle considerations of locality. This has not yet been demonstrated.

Here is one example of an anomaly involving gravity. Consider any 2 + 1-dimensional \mathbb{T} -invariant state that is continuously connected to a system of free boson and fermi fields.⁶ Assume that $\mathbb{T}^2 = (-1)^F$, where $(-1)^F$ is the operator that equals -1 for fermions and $+1$ for bosons. Then the action of \mathbb{T} on fermions can be diagonalized so that each Majorana fermion λ transforms as $\mathbb{T}(\lambda(t, \vec{x})) = \pm\gamma_0\lambda(-t, \vec{x})$, for some choice of sign. Let n_+ be the number of gapless Majorana fermions transforming under \mathbb{T} with a $+$ sign and n_- the number transforming with a $-$ sign. A bare mass term $i\bar{\lambda}\lambda'$ is \mathbb{T} -invariant if and only if λ and λ' transform under \mathbb{T} with opposite signs, so only the difference $\nu_{\mathbb{T}} = n_+ - n_-$ is an invariant when \mathbb{T} -conserving bare masses are turned on and off. When interactions are taken into account [42, 33, 34, 43], $\nu_{\mathbb{T}}$ is no longer a \mathbb{Z} -valued invariant, but is an invariant mod 16. In fact, \mathbb{T} symmetry can be used to place any given \mathbb{T} -invariant theory on an unorientable manifold. When this is done, one obtains a theory whose partition function is in general not well-defined; it has an anomaly that depends on the value of $\nu_{\mathbb{T}}$ mod 16. This was illustrated in an example in [41] and explained more systematically in [17]. For the standard boundary state of the topological insulator, $n_+ = n_- = 1$ so $\nu_{\mathbb{T}} = 0$.

Similarly, in a \mathbb{CT} -invariant model, assuming that $(\mathbb{CT})^2 = (-1)^F$, let n'_+ be the number of gapless Majorana fermions transforming under \mathbb{CT} as $\mathbb{CT}(\lambda(t, \vec{x})) = +\gamma_0\lambda(t, \vec{x})$ and n'_- the number transforming as $\mathbb{CT}(\lambda(t, \vec{x})) = -\gamma_0\lambda(t, \vec{x})$. Only the difference $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}} = n'_+ - n'_-$ is invariant under turning \mathbb{CT} -conserving bare masses on and off. When interactions are considered, $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$ is an invariant mod 16. This can again be understood in terms of the anomaly that arises when \mathbb{CT} symmetry is used to place a theory on an unorientable 3-manifold. For the standard boundary state of a topological insulator, $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}} = 2$.

In condensed matter physics, as long as electric charge is conserved, $\nu_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$ are highly constrained by the spin/charge relation. In Appendix A.4, we show that in a system that obeys the spin/charge relation, $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$ is even and $\nu_{\mathbb{T}}$ does not give any information beyond what one can learn on an orientable manifold. (In the absence of the spin/charge relation, the only general restriction is that $\nu_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$ are congruent mod 2.)

In condensed matter physics, \mathbb{CT} is not really a symmetry so different boundary states of a topological insulator can in general have different values of $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$. Hence in constructing boundary states of the topological insulator, we will allow states with different values of $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$. The distinction between states with different values of $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$, though not relevant for a topological insulator, is relevant for topological superconductors, as we discuss in section 6.

⁶Chern-Simons couplings of gauge fields are quantized to have integer values and so cannot be continuously turned off. In general, gauge fields with Chern-Simons couplings may contribute to the anomalies that we are about to discuss.

The reader may have noticed that we have not discussed what might appear to be the most obvious anomaly involving coupling of a 2 + 1-dimensional system to gravity: the gravitational contribution to the anomaly in \mathbb{T} symmetry, or alternatively the jump in the gravitational theta-angle in crossing from vacuum to the bulk of a topological insulator. What should be meant by the gravitational theta-angle depends on whether the spin/charge relation is assumed. For a theory that obeys the spin/charge relation, the appropriate gravitational analog of $\theta = \pi$ is $\theta_2 = \pi$, in the notation of Appendix A.4. The standard topological insulator has $\theta_2 = 0$, but in Appendix A.4 and also in section 4, we describe symmetry-preserving boundary states (gapless or gapped) for a hypothetical material of $\theta_2 = \pi$.

2.3 The Spin/Charge Relation And Spin_c Manifolds

The gravitational anomalies that were mentioned in section 2.2 are conveniently studied by formulating a theory on a possibly curved four-manifold X , thus placing the boundary state on a possibly curved three-manifold W . But what class of manifolds should be considered?

Since the microscopic systems of interest involve fermions, one might want to restrict X to be a spin manifold. But in a certain sense this is too restrictive. In condensed matter physics, as long as we consider systems in which electric charge is conserved, there is a fundamental spin/charge relation that was already mentioned in section 1.2. A system that satisfies the spin/charge relation can be formulated not just on a spin manifold but on a more general type of manifold known as a spin_c manifold. On a possibly curved spin manifold, one has a covariant derivative $D_\mu^{(0)}$ that acts on neutral spin 1/2 fermions coupled to gravity only. In the presence of electromagnetism, one additionally has a $U(1)$ gauge field A and, for any integer n , a covariant derivative $D_\mu^{(n)} = D_\mu^{(0)} + inA_\mu$ acting on spin 1/2 fermions of electric charge n . On a spin_c manifold, $D_\mu^{(n)}$ is well-defined only for odd n ; $D_\mu^{(0)}$ is not well-defined by itself and A_μ is not well-defined globally as an Abelian gauge field. Rather, A_μ is what we will call a spin_c connection. Though the notion of a spin_c manifold can be defined purely topologically, for our purposes a spin_c manifold always has a spin_c connection A_μ .

Concretely, A_μ is not well-defined globally as an Abelian gauge field because the field strength $F = dA$ does not obey standard Dirac quantization of flux. The standard quantization would say that if $C \subset X$ is an oriented two-dimensional cycle, then $\int_C F/2\pi$ should be an integer. The spin_c condition says instead that

$$\int_C \frac{F}{2\pi} = \frac{1}{2} \int_C w_2 \pmod{\mathbf{Z}}. \quad (2.12)$$

Here w_2 is the second Stiefel-Whitney class of X . All that matters for our purposes is that in general $\int_C w_2$ is equal to 0 or 1 mod 2. Eqn. (2.12) shows that in general F does not obey standard Dirac quantization, but $2F$ does, since if we multiply by 2, the right hand side of (2.12) becomes integer-valued. Accordingly, although a spin_c connection A_μ is not well-defined as an Abelian gauge field, $2A_\mu$ is an ordinary Abelian gauge field.

If we start with a microscopic system that can be placed on a general spin_c manifold, then any effective field theory that describes its low energy excitations and likewise any topological field theory that describes a possible gapped phase must make sense on a general spin_c manifold. This will ensure that the states of the effective field theory or topological field theory (in any sample of finite volume) will satisfy the spin/charge relation.

In sections 3.2 and 3.6, we will see that even if a classical theory of fermions satisfies the spin/charge relation, there may be a quantum anomaly in this relation; equivalently, even if a classical theory can be formulated on a spin_c manifold, it may be that quantum mechanically a spin rather than spin_c structure is required. Models in which this happens cannot arise as effective field theories describing boundary states of a topological insulator. This will give a nontrivial constraint on our constructions.

The ability to formulate a theory on a spin_c manifold likewise gives a nontrivial constraint on the topological field theories that can be used to describe gapped boundary states at low energies. We will describe this in the context of Chern-Simons gauge theories with Abelian gauge group. Here we will discuss purely 2 + 1-dimensional couplings (as opposed to couplings that are possible on the boundary of a four-manifold). For example, A could be the electromagnetic gauge field interacting with the 2 + 1-dimensional world-volume W of a quantum Hall system. The Chern-Simons coupling $\text{CS}(A)$ is supposed to depend mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$ only on the restriction of A to W (and possibly on the spin structure of W).

We need a few preliminary facts, which we just state here, with explanations in Appendix A.3. It is relatively well-known that if A is an Abelian gauge field, then on a compact three-dimensional spin manifold W , the Chern-Simons functional

$$\text{CS}(A) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_W \text{Ad}A \tag{2.13}$$

is well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$, ensuring that it makes sense as a contribution to a quantum effective action of a purely 2 + 1-dimensional system. (In the absence of a chosen spin structure on W , $\text{CS}(A)$ is only well-defined mod $\pi\mathbf{Z}$ and must appear in the effective action with an even integer coefficient.) What if A is a spin_c connection rather than an ordinary $U(1)$ gauge field? Then a modified version of $\text{CS}(A)$ with a certain gravitational correction is well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$:

$$\text{CS}(A, g) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_W \text{Ad}A + \dots \tag{2.14}$$

The ellipses refer to a purely gravitational contribution ($\Omega(g)$ in eqn. (A.21); here g is the metric tensor of W). Now if A is a spin_c connection, and a is an ordinary $U(1)$ gauge field, then $A + a$ is a spin_c connection. So another expression that is well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$ is

$$\text{CS}(A + a, g) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_W (ada + 2adA + \text{Ad}A) + \dots, \tag{2.15}$$

with the same gravitational correction. Subtracting the last two formulas, the purely gravitational term cancels out and we learn that

$$\text{CS}(A + a, g) - \text{CS}(A, g) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_W ada + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_W adA \tag{2.16}$$

is well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$. On a spin manifold, with a and A being ordinary $U(1)$ gauge fields, the two terms on the right hand side of eqn. (2.16) would be separately well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$. In the more general case of a spin_c manifold, with spin_c connection A , the two terms are separately well-defined only mod $\pi\mathbf{Z}$ but their sum is well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$.

Given these facts, let us consider a 3d theory with emergent $U(1)$ gauge fields a^1, a^2, \dots, a^n , as well as the electromagnetic potential A . Here a^i are dynamical 3d fields and A is a classical

background field. (Later, A will actually be the restriction of a 4d field to 3d.) We consider a theory with Chern-Simons action

$$I_{\text{CS}} = \int_W \left(\frac{k_{ij}}{4\pi} a^i da^j + \frac{q_i}{2\pi} \text{Ad}a^i \right). \quad (2.17)$$

If W is a spin manifold, then the condition for this action to be well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$ is simply that the coefficients k_{ij} and q_i should all be integers. (If W is a purely bosonic manifold with no spin structure, then in addition the diagonal elements k_{ii} must be even.) However, suppose that I_{CS} is supposed to be part of the microscopic description of a theory that satisfies the usual spin/charge relation. In this case, I_{CS} must be well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$ on any spin_c manifold W with spin_c connection A . In view of our discussion of eqn. (2.16), the condition for this (beyond integrality of the k_{ij} and q_i) is

$$q_i \cong k_{ii} \pmod{2}. \quad (2.18)$$

As a check, note that the condition (2.18) is invariant under field redefinitions $a^i \rightarrow a^i + N^i A$ provided the coefficients N^i are even, but not otherwise. This reflects the fact that $2A$ is an ordinary $U(1)$ gauge field but A is not, so if a is a $U(1)$ gauge field, then a redefinition $a \rightarrow a + 2A$ makes sense but $a \rightarrow a + A$ does not. More generally, let us arrange a^i as a column vector

$\begin{pmatrix} a^1 \\ a^2 \\ \vdots \\ a^n \end{pmatrix}$, and consider an allowed⁷ change of variables

$$a \rightarrow Ma + NA, \quad (2.19)$$

with $M \in GL(n, \mathbf{Z})$ and N a column vector with even integer entries. The reader can verify that this transforms k_{ij} and q_i to another set of integers, still satisfying (2.18), and also adds to the action an integer multiple of $8\text{CS}(A)$.

As explained above, on a spin_c manifold, the basic Chern-Simons invariant $\text{CS}(A)$, normalized as in eqn. (2.13), requires a gravitational correction to make it well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$. Is some multiple of $\text{CS}(A)$ well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$ without a gravitational correction? The answer is that the basic multiple of $\text{CS}(A)$ with this property is

$$8\text{CS}(A) = \frac{8}{4\pi} \int_W \text{Ad}A. \quad (2.20)$$

That a factor of 8 is necessary here is explained in Appendix A.3. That a factor of 8 is sufficient may be seen as follows. On any three-manifold W (not necessarily spin), for any $U(1)$ gauge field b , $2\text{CS}(b)$ is well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$. Setting $b = 2A$, we learn that $8\text{CS}(A)$ is well-defined mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$. A check is that the change of variable (2.19) shifts the action by a multiple of $8\text{CS}(A)$ and maintains its consistency.

⁷In making such a change of variables, it does not make sense to add to A a multiple of a^i , since A is a classical background field while the a^i are dynamical fields. (Moreover, the a^i are purely three-dimensional while later A will be the 3d restriction of a 4d field.) But conversely, there is no problem to add to a^i a multiple of A .

The restriction (2.18) has been previously discussed [44] more along the following lines. Consider the Wilson line operators

$$\exp\left(in^i k_{ij} \oint a^j\right), \quad (2.21)$$

with integers n^i . These particular line operators are “transparent”; they have trivial braidings and describe the worldlines of excitations that can move to the bulk of the system. Using standard formulas for Abelian Chern-Simons theory, these operators have spins $n^i k_{ij} n^j / 2$. Their coupling to A shows that their charges are $q_i n^i$. Requiring that these line operators should satisfy the usual spin/charge relation gives eqn. (2.18).

3 A Simple Class Of Boundary States

3.1 Some Models

In this section, we will describe a simple class of boundary states for the topological insulator that are gapped but nonetheless have the same symmetries and anomalies as the standard boundary state that we reviewed in section 2.1. Boundary states with this property inevitably have nontrivial topological order, and in our examples this will arise in a simple way.

In constructing models, we want to maintain the spin/charge relation of condensed matter physics: states of odd charge have half-integral spin and states of even charge have integral spin. To do so, we simply will take all fermi fields to have odd electric charge and all bose fields to have even electric charge.

In our construction, we assume that on the boundary W of the topological insulator, there propagates an emergent $U(1)$ gauge field a as well as the $U(1)$ gauge field A of electromagnetism. We call the combined gauge group $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$. T-invariance implies that the action has no Chern-Simons terms, so for a we assume a Maxwell-like action proportional to $f_{\mu\nu} f^{\mu\nu}$, where $f_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu a_\nu - \partial_\nu a_\mu$. We normalize a_μ so that $f_{\mu\nu}$ has the standard Dirac flux quantum⁸ of 2π .

We also add a boundary Dirac fermion χ that couples to $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ with charges $(1, 2s)$, for some integer s . Assigning to χ odd charge under $U(1)_A$ is motivated by the spin/charge relation, as just explained. In addition, the fact that χ has odd charge under A and even charge under a means that χ generates the same T-anomaly as the fermion field Ψ of the standard boundary state of eqn. (2.1). (This T-anomaly is a mod 2 effect, as it involves the question of whether the effective theta-angle is an odd or even multiple of π . So it only depends on the values of the $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ charges mod 2; the χ field of charges $(1, 2s)$ therefore produces the same anomaly as the Ψ field of charges $(1, 0)$. See section 3.6 for a fuller explanation.) We assume that a and A transform in the same way under T and CT, as described in eqns. (2.3) and (2.6). We likewise assume that χ transforms like Ψ under T and CT (eqns. (2.9), (2.11)). These assumptions ensure that the kinetic energy

$$I_\chi = \int_W d^3x \sqrt{g} i \bar{\chi} \not{D} \chi = \int_W d^3x i \bar{\chi} (\not{D}_0 + \not{A} + 2s \not{a}) \chi \quad (3.1)$$

⁸In condensed matter physics, an emergent Abelian gauge field always has gauge group $U(1)$, not \mathbf{R} , and equivalently can have nontrivial magnetic flux on a compact manifold. Otherwise, there would be no monopole operators (see section 3.2) and the flux of a would be an exactly conserved quantity with no microscopic origin.

is T - and CT -invariant. They also ensure that the model has $\nu_{\mathsf{CT}} = 2$, just like the standard boundary state of a topological insulator.

Let us write \mathbf{q} and \mathbf{k} for the ordinary electric charge and the conserved charge of the emergent gauge field. T and CT are conventionally defined so that \mathbf{q} is even under T and odd under CT . Since we take a to transform like A under the discrete symmetries, the same is true of \mathbf{k} :

$$\mathsf{T}\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}\mathsf{T}, \quad \mathsf{CT}\mathbf{k} = -\mathbf{k}\mathsf{CT}. \quad (3.2)$$

In addition to a and χ , we add two complex scalar fields w and ϕ of charges $(0, 1)$ and $(2, 4s)$ under $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$. The purpose of adding these two fields is to make it possible to exhibit two different phases. In one phase, w has an expectation value, while ϕ has zero expectation value and a positive mass squared. In this phase, $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ is spontaneously broken to $U(1)_A$. Expanding around this vacuum, the only gapless field is the Dirac fermion χ , which has charge 1 under the unbroken symmetry $U(1)_A$. At low energies, this phase is indistinguishable from the standard boundary state of the topological insulator.

We also want a phase in which the χ field undergoes s -wave pairing, with $\epsilon_{ab}\chi^a\chi^b \neq 0$ (here $a, b = 1, 2$ is a spinor index). We could introduce some sort of attractive interactions that would cause such pairing to occur dynamically, but instead to get a simple explicit model we introduce the scalar field ϕ , whose vacuum expectation value describes pairing.

To make possible a Yukawa coupling of ϕ to χ , we take ϕ to transform under the discrete symmetries as

$$\mathsf{C}(\phi) = \bar{\phi}, \quad \mathsf{T}(\phi) = -\phi. \quad (3.3)$$

By contrast, for w we take⁹

$$\mathsf{C}(w) = \bar{w}, \quad \mathsf{T}(w) = w. \quad (3.4)$$

If we expand w in terms of real scalar fields as $w = (w_1 + iw_2)/\sqrt{2}$, then the above formulas imply

$$\mathsf{T}(w_1) = w_1, \quad \mathsf{T}(w_2) = -w_2, \quad (3.5)$$

along with

$$\mathsf{C}(w_1) = w_1, \quad \mathsf{C}(w_2) = -w_2, \quad \mathsf{CT}(w_i) = w_i, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (3.6)$$

These formulas have obvious analogs for ϕ .

The field $\chi\bar{w}^{2s}$ has the quantum numbers of a bulk electron, so we can include in the action or the Hamiltonian a coupling of the bulk electron field e (restricted to the boundary) to $\chi\bar{w}^{2s}$:

$$I_e = \int d^3x \sqrt{g} (\bar{e}\chi\bar{w}^{2s} + \text{h.c.}). \quad (3.7)$$

The theory admits a gauge-invariant, Lorentz-invariant, and discrete symmetry preserving Yukawa coupling of ϕ to χ ,

$$I_{\text{Yuk}} = \int d^3x \sqrt{g} h (i\epsilon_{ab}\chi^a\chi^b\bar{\phi} + i\epsilon_{ab}\chi^{\dagger a}\chi^{\dagger b}\phi). \quad (3.8)$$

⁹We could also take $\mathsf{T}(w) = -w$ (as for ϕ), which differs from our choice by a $U(1)_a$ gauge transformation. In that case, assuming the expectation value of w to be real, the unbroken time-reversal symmetry in the phase where w Higgses $U(1)_a$ is a combination of T and a gauge transformation. We prefer to call this combination T from the start, as in eqn. (3.4).

(Here $a, b = 1, 2$ are spinor indices, ϵ_{ab} is the corresponding antisymmetric tensor, and h is a real coupling constant.) Bearing in mind that for Majorana fermions λ and $\tilde{\lambda}$, $i\epsilon_{ab}\lambda^a\tilde{\lambda}^b$ is hermitian, it is straightforward to verify that I_{Yuk} is hermitian. To verify \mathbb{T} -invariance, which requires the minus sign in eqn. (3.3), one uses the fact that i is odd under \mathbb{T} but (because the matrix γ_0 in the transformation law $\mathbb{T}(\chi(t, \vec{x})) = \gamma_0\chi(-t, \vec{x})$ has determinant $+1$) $\epsilon_{ab}\lambda^a\chi^b$ is even. Finally, \mathbb{C} invariance is clear.

The phase with $\langle\phi\rangle \neq 0$ preserves the discrete symmetries if we accompany them by suitable gauge transformations. If we take $\langle\phi\rangle$ to be real (and, say, positive), then \mathbb{C} needs no accompanying gauge transformation, but \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{CT} must be accompanied by a $U(1)_a$ gauge transformation, which we can take to have gauge parameter $\exp(2\pi i/8s)$. In the phase with $\langle\phi\rangle \neq 0$, $U(1)_a$ is broken to a subgroup \mathbf{Z}_{4s} , generated by a discrete gauge symmetry $\mathbf{K} = \exp(2\pi i k/4s)$; we also set $\mathbf{K}^{1/2} = \exp(2\pi i k/8s)$. The unbroken time-reversal symmetry of the system is $T = \mathbf{TK}^{1/2}$. Eqn. (3.2) implies that $\mathbf{TK}^{1/2} = \mathbf{K}^{-1/2}\mathbb{T}$, so the usual relation $\mathbb{T}^2 = (-1)^F$ for free electrons is unchanged:

$$\mathbb{T}^2 = (-1)^F. \quad (3.9)$$

Likewise the effective \mathbb{CT} transformation is

$$\mathbb{CT} = \mathbf{CTK}^{1/2}. \quad (3.10)$$

But since \mathbb{CT} commutes with $\mathbf{K}^{1/2}$, the usual $(\mathbb{CT})^2 = (-1)^F$ becomes

$$(\mathbb{CT})^2 = (-1)^F \mathbf{K}. \quad (3.11)$$

Finally, the usual $\mathbb{T}(\mathbb{CT}) = (\mathbb{CT})\mathbb{T}$ becomes

$$(\mathbb{CT})\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}(\mathbb{CT})\mathbf{K}^{-1}. \quad (3.12)$$

Individual quasiparticles can have $\mathbf{K} \neq 1$ – for example, w corresponds to a quasiparticle with $\mathbf{K} = \exp(2\pi i/4s)$. But as \mathbf{K} is a gauge transformation in the emergent gauge group, it leaves invariant any globally-defined state of a sample of finite size. So for any state of a finite sample, all quasiparticles together always combine to a state of $\mathbf{K} = 1$, and therefore to a state on which $T = \mathbb{T}$, $\mathbf{CT} = \mathbb{CT}$, and all the standard relations are obeyed.

The unbroken electric charge in the phase with $\langle\phi\rangle \neq 0$ is a linear combination of \mathbf{q} and \mathbf{k} under which ϕ is neutral. This combination is

$$\mathbf{q}' = \mathbf{q} - \frac{\mathbf{k}}{2s}. \quad (3.13)$$

In the phase with $\langle\phi\rangle \neq 0$, all bosons and fermions have bare masses at tree level. So potentially, this is a gapped, symmetry-preserving boundary state for the topological insulator. However, a restriction on the value of s is needed, as we will see in section 3.2.

The model that we have described is analogous to the composite fermion model [36] of the Moore-Read state [35] of a fractional quantum Hall system. In that context, the composite fermion is coupled to $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ where a is an emergent Abelian gauge field. And pairing of the composite fermion is a key ingredient. There are a few differences. The Moore-Read state has no \mathbb{T} symmetry, so the gauge fields used in constructing it can and do have Chern-Simons couplings. Also, the composite fermion of the Moore-Read state is spin-polarized (it has only

one spin state of spin $+1/2$), and its pairing is p -wave pairing. Finally, in the context of the Moore-Read state, there is no analog of Higgsing to a standard state, and hence there is no analog of w .

The models that we have constructed turn out to be related to those of [25]. The main difference is our use of the emergent gauge field a . As we have already mentioned in the introduction, this allows us to analyze the models in a reliable way using standard weak coupling techniques. This is what we will do below.

3.2 Monopole Operators And The Anomaly

In a theory constructed from electrons only, all local gauge-invariant operators must obey the usual spin/charge relation. Here “gauge-invariant” operators are those that are invariant under any emergent gauge symmetries, in our case $U(1)_a$. The spin/charge relation says that operators of half-integral spin carry odd electric charge, and those of integer spin carry even electric charge.

We have constructed our models so that the obvious $U(1)_a$ -invariant local operators – the ones constructed as polynomials in the fields and their derivatives – obey the spin/charge relation. But we must also consider monopole operators.

A monopole operator (also known as an ’t Hooft operator) is defined by postulating a Dirac monopole singularity at a specified point $p \in \mathbf{R}^3$ and performing a path integral in the presence of this singularity. Very near p , all fermi and bose fields that we have introduced can be treated as free fields. Moreover, the terms in the action that violate conformal invariance are all irrelevant at short distances. As in [45], which we follow in the analysis below, the asymptotic conformal invariance near p enables one to determine the quantum numbers of monopole operators in radial quantization. This amounts to making a conformal mapping from $\mathbf{R}^3 \setminus p$ (that is, \mathbf{R}^3 with the point p omitted) to $\mathbf{R} \times S^2$. We view the \mathbf{R} direction as (Euclidean) “time.” To construct the basic monopole operators with minimum charge, we place on S^2 one unit of flux of a . The quantum states obtained by quantization in this situation correspond to the monopole operators.

In general, Chern-Simons couplings of gauge fields can generate nontrivial quantum numbers for monopole operators. However, because of \mathbb{T} symmetry, our models have no such couplings. That being so, we get nontrivial quantum numbers only from quantization of the fermion zero-modes. The relevant zero-modes are time-independent modes that are zero-modes of the Dirac operator on S^2 .

The χ field, because it has $U(1)_a$ charge $2s$, has $2s$ zero-modes χ_i , $i = 1, \dots, 2s$. These modes all have the same $2d$ chirality and they transform with spin $J = (2s - 1)/2$ under rotations of S^2 . The complex conjugates of the χ_i are zero-modes χ_i^* of the adjoint field χ^\dagger . These zero-modes can be normalized to give, after quantization, a system of standard creation and annihilation operators,

$$\{\chi_i, \chi_j^\dagger\} = \delta_{ij}, \quad \{\chi_i, \chi_j\} = \{\chi_i^\dagger, \chi_j^\dagger\} = 0. \quad (3.14)$$

Because of the existence of these zero-modes, the lowest energy level in the monopole sector is degenerate. It contains a state $|\downarrow\rangle$ that is annihilated by the χ_i ,

$$\chi_i |\downarrow\rangle = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Acting repeatedly with the χ_i^\dagger gives a state that they annihilate:

$$\chi_i^\dagger|\uparrow\rangle = 0, \quad |\uparrow\rangle = \chi_1^\dagger\chi_2^\dagger\cdots\chi_{2s}^\dagger|\downarrow\rangle. \quad (3.16)$$

Each time we act with one of the χ_i^\dagger , we shift the $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ charges of a state by $(-1, -2s)$. Since we do this $2s$ times to map $|\downarrow\rangle$ to $|\uparrow\rangle$, the charges of $|\uparrow\rangle$ exceed those of $|\downarrow\rangle$ by $2s(-1, -2s)$. On the other hand CT exchanges $|\downarrow\rangle$ with $|\uparrow\rangle$ and ensures that the charges of those two states are equal and opposite. Hence $|\downarrow\rangle$ has charges $(s, 2s^2)$ and $|\uparrow\rangle$ has charges $(-s, -2s^2)$.

Let us construct monopole operators that are $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ -invariant. To construct such an operator from the Hilbert space that we have just described, one has to act on the state $|\downarrow\rangle$ with precisely s creation operators. The resulting states are of the form

$$\chi_{i_1}^\dagger\chi_{i_2}^\dagger\cdots\chi_{i_s}^\dagger|\downarrow\rangle. \quad (3.17)$$

For any integer s , the spin $(2s-1)/2$ of the operators χ_i^\dagger is half-integral. The gauge-invariant states in eqn. (3.17) are obtained by acting on the spinless state $|\downarrow\rangle$ with s of these ‘‘creation operators,’’ so they have half-integer or integer spin depending on whether s is odd or even. If \mathcal{O} is the monopole operator corresponding to a linear combination of the states (3.17), then \mathcal{O} is $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ -invariant and its spin is $s/2 \bmod \mathbf{Z}$.

Thus, such an \mathcal{O} satisfies the spin/charge relation if and only if s is even. Henceforth, therefore, in investigating this class of models, we restrict to even s .

All monopole operators of unit charge appear in the operator product expansion of the \mathcal{O} constructed above with an ordinary local operator (a gauge-invariant polynomial in the fields and their derivatives). So for even s , all charge 1 monopole operators satisfy the spin/charge relation. Taking products of these operators, we learn that for even s , this relation is satisfied by monopole operators of any charge.

For odd s , with $\mathcal{O}(p)$ a monopole operator of charge 1, if $|\Psi\rangle$ is any state that satisfies the spin/charge relation, then $\mathcal{O}(p)|\Psi\rangle$ is a state that violates it. Since the operator $\mathcal{O}(p)$ is a source of one flux quantum of $f = da$, the states that violate the spin/charge relation are simply those that have an odd number of such flux quanta.

3.3 Breaking A Symmetry

In condensed matter physics, the only exact symmetries are the ones that can be defined microscopically (such as electric charge conservation and time-reversal symmetry). There might be additional emergent symmetries in the infrared, but in a more precise description, they should all be explicitly broken, possibly by operators that are irrelevant in the renormalization group sense. For example, the Lorentz invariance and the C and CT symmetry of the models introduced in section 3.1 are all not natural in condensed matter physics and should be explicitly broken, possibly by irrelevant interactions. There is one more symmetry of these models as presented so far that does not correspond to any microscopic symmetry in condensed matter physics and so must be broken explicitly in a more precise treatment. This is the symmetry generated by the conserved current

$$j_\mu = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} \frac{f^{\nu\lambda}}{4\pi}. \quad (3.18)$$

We have normalized j_μ so that – with a_μ understood to obey standard Dirac quantization of flux – the corresponding charge $\mathbf{u} = \int d^2x j^0 = \int d^2x f_{12}/2\pi$ has integer eigenvalues. \mathbf{u} is simply the number of flux quanta.

The operators that violate conservation of \mathbf{u} are simply the monopole operators that we analyzed in section 3.2. We can eliminate an unphysical global conservation law from the model by adding to the action a charge 1 monopole operator with a small coefficient ε . For even s , a suitable linear combination of the states (3.17) carries zero spin. So if \mathcal{O} is the corresponding monopole operator, with hermitian conjugate \mathcal{O}^\dagger of opposite monopole charge, we can eliminate the conservation of \mathbf{u} , preserving all other symmetries, by adding $\varepsilon(\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{O}^\dagger)$ to the action, or equivalently to the Hamiltonian.

In section 3.2, we have constructed the monopole operators at short distances without worrying about what sort of states they act on. This of course depends on the physics at long distances. In the phase that corresponds to the standard boundary state of a topological insulator, with $\langle w \rangle \neq 0$, $U(1)_a$ is completely broken. This leads to the existence of vortices with any integer value of the vorticity \mathbf{u} . The monopole operators create and annihilate these vortices, so adding a $\mathbf{u} = 1$ monopole operator to the action means vortices can annihilate to quasiparticles that do not carry vorticity.

In the gapped phase with $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$, matters are more interesting. A discrete subgroup of $U(1)_a$ is unbroken, so there are stable quasiparticles with fractional \mathbf{u} . They are discussed in section 3.4. However, in a sample of finite size, the total \mathbf{u} of all quasiparticles is always an integer, and in the presence of a perturbation $\varepsilon(\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{O}^\dagger)$, there is no conservation law associated to this integer.

The phase with $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$ is gapped at $\varepsilon = 0$, so adding $\varepsilon(\mathcal{O} + \mathcal{O}^\dagger)$ to the action with small ε does not produce any nontrivial dynamics. The only purpose of this step is to explicitly break a symmetry, reducing the number of quasiparticle types. In treatments of similar models that have appeared in the literature, the analogous step has involved “vortex proliferation” or “condensation of vortices,” usually understood to involve some not completely explicit dynamics.

3.4 The Vortex

The gapped phase with $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$ has quasiparticles with fractional vorticity. In fact, since ϕ has charge $\mathbf{k}_\phi = 4s$ under $U(1)_a$, a vortex in the ϕ field, around which the phase of ϕ changes by 2π , has flux $\int_{\mathbf{R}^2} f = 2\pi/\mathbf{k}_\phi = 2\pi/4s$ and thus has $\mathbf{u} = 1/4s$.

We prefer to define the integer-valued charge

$$\mathbf{v} = 4s\mathbf{u}. \tag{3.19}$$

The purpose of this is to describe the vorticity in a language analogous to what we use for the unbroken \mathbf{Z}_{4s} subgroup of $U(1)_a$. This subgroup is generated by $\mathbf{K} = \exp(2\pi i\mathbf{k}/4s)$, where \mathbf{k} is an integer-valued invariant that is conserved mod $4s$. So we likewise define an integer-valued vorticity \mathbf{v} that (once monopole operators are included, as in section 3.3) is conserved mod $4s$.

Vorticity transforms under the discrete symmetries oppositely to the electric charge. Thus the analog of eqn. (3.2) for the vorticity is

$$T\mathbf{v} = -\mathbf{v}T, \quad C T \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} C T. \tag{3.20}$$

We have written these formulas in terms of the discrete symmetries T and CT that are unbroken in the phase under study.

For the basic case of $\mathbf{v} = 1$ (or -1), there is a well-known classical solution that describes a vortex at rest. This solution is rotation-invariant up to a gauge transformation, and (after suitable gauge-fixing) it is unique up to a spatial translation. In particular, this standard vortex solution is CT -invariant. We will see that this fact is very useful.

In a purely bosonic theory with $U(1)_a$ broken to \mathbf{Z}_{4s} , and no other pertinent degrees of freedom, quasiparticles would be labeled by the pair (\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{v}) and would satisfy Abelian statistics. For example, in the simplest version of \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory, a quasiparticle of charges (\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{v}) , when winding around another quasiparticle of charges $(\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{v}')$, would acquire a phase $\exp(2\pi i(\mathbf{k}\mathbf{v}' - \mathbf{k}'\mathbf{v})/4s)$.

The main difference between the model under study here and a simple \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory results from the fact that in a vortex field with $\mathbf{v} = 1$, the χ field has a single zero-mode. The phase of this zero-mode can be chosen to make it CT -invariant, and this fixes the phase of the zero-mode up to sign. But actually, even without CT symmetry, hermiticity of the Hamiltonian and fermi statistics imply that the space of fermion zero-modes always has a natural real structure,¹⁰ which in the case of a single zero-mode fixes the mode (once we normalize it) up to sign. Such an unpaired real fermion zero-mode is usually called a Majorana zero-mode.

The zero-mode that arises in this problem in a vortex field is somewhat analogous to fermion zero-modes that appear, for example, in the field of a 1 + 1-dimensional kink or a 3 + 1-dimensional monopole [18]. In all these examples, when a fermion mass arises from symmetry breaking, the fermion acquires a zero-mode in a field of suitable topology. In a 2+1-dimensional model with the same relevant property (the context was a topological insulator with pairing induced on its surface by proximity to an s -wave superconductor), this mode was found in [46]. It was later interpreted [47] in terms of the Callias index theorem [48], following earlier work [49, 50]; we review this interpretation in Appendix B. More recently it was also investigated in the context of topological superconductors [34]. This zero-mode is very robust. Even if we perturb away from the idealized models that were introduced in section 3.1, adding irrelevant interactions (for example, breaking the symmetries C and CT that are not natural in condensed matter physics), a vortex field of this system with $\mathbf{v} = 1$ still has an exact Majorana zero-mode. Local interactions can never lift a single Majorana zero-mode.

As in the composite fermion approach to the Moore-Read state (where an analogous zero-mode appears [36, 51] for somewhat different reasons), the occurrence of a single Majorana zero-mode in the field of a vortex leads to non-Abelian statistics. Let us consider a system of k widely separated vortices in \mathbf{R}^2 . To avoid extraneous subtleties involving properties of the Clifford algebra,¹¹ we take k to be divisible by 8. (In any event, a globally defined state in a sample of finite volume would have k a multiple of $4s$, which is divisible by 8 since s is even.)

Simply because an isolated vortex would have an exact fermion zero-mode and the theory

¹⁰In a real time Hamiltonian framework, any fermion field can always be expanded in real components. Upon doing so, the general form of a quadratic fermion Hamiltonian allowed by hermiticity and fermi statistics is $H = i \sum_{kl} h_{kl} \Psi_k \Psi_l$, where h is a real antisymmetric matrix and for clarity we write the formula in terms of a discrete sum over modes. As h is real, the space of its zero-modes is a real vector space.

¹¹For example, if k is odd, there is no completely natural quantization of k fermion zero-modes; if k is congruent to 2 mod 4, the operator $(-1)^F = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \dots \gamma_k$ that plays an important role below squares to -1 rather than $+1$. Such issues are not relevant for our present purposes and to avoid them, we take k to be divisible by 8, which ensures that k fermion zero-modes can be represented by real matrices of rank $2^{k/2}$.




Figure 2: Vortex 1 is initially to the left of vortex 2. The two vortices are exchanged via a motion in the counterclockwise direction.

is gapped, it follows that in the limit that the vortices are widely separated, the field χ has k modes that are exponentially close to being zero-modes. Whether these modes are exact zero-modes or are only exponentially close to being zero-modes will not be important in what follows.¹²

Let γ_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$, be the Majorana zero-mode associated to the i^{th} vortex. The γ_i can be normalized so that after quantization they obey a Clifford algebra:

$$\{\gamma_i, \gamma_j\} = 2\delta_{ij}. \quad (3.21)$$

An irreducible representation \mathcal{R} of this algebra has $2^{k/2}$ states. So this k -vortex system has, on the average, $\sqrt{2}$ quantum states per vortex. The nonintegrality of this number is a symptom of non-Abelian statistics.

Suppose that we adiabatically move the vortices around, keeping them widely separated. The quantum state varies according to the Berry connection [52]. The monodromies around closed orbits¹³ in the configuration space of k vortices give a representation of the braid group B_k on the Hilbert space \mathcal{R} .

It turns out that this representation can be easily determined using two elementary facts:

(1) Each vortex has its own zero-mode, which is uniquely determined up to sign. So the braid group can only act by permutations and sign changes of the k objects $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_k$.

(2) The action of the braid group commutes with the operator $(-1)^F$, which counts the number of fermions mod 2. This operator anticommutes with all of the fermion zero-modes $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_k$. Up to an irrelevant sign, the operator on the Hilbert space \mathcal{R} that has this property (and squares to 1) is the chirality operator, the product of all the gamma matrices: $(-1)^F = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \dots \gamma_k$.

Now let us consider a basic operation: the exchange of two vortices, say labeled 1 and 2, that move half way around each other in, say, the counterclockwise direction (fig. 2). How does

¹²With the aid of CT symmetry, one can use the Callias index theorem to show that any state of vorticity \mathbf{v} has $|\mathbf{v}|$ exact Majorana zero-modes. (See Appendix B.) With small explicit breaking of CT , these modes are exponentially close to zero in the case of widely separated vortices.

¹³Vortices are identical objects and a “closed orbit” may permute them.

this elementary move act on the gamma matrices? One might expect that the answer would involve a simple transposition $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \rightarrow (\gamma_2, \gamma_1)$, but this is not possible as it would reverse the sign of the chirality operator $(-1)^F$. Rather, we must use the fact that the γ_i were naturally defined only up to sign. The basic operation acts on the gamma matrices with a sign change:

$$B_{12} : (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \rightarrow (\gamma_2, -\gamma_1). \quad (3.22)$$

Actually, we could equally well take $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \rightarrow (-\gamma_2, \gamma_1)$. The two operations differ by conjugation by $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \rightarrow (\gamma_1, -\gamma_2)$ (or $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \rightarrow (-\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$). The sign choice in eqn. (3.22) fixes the relative signs of the γ_i , which have been arbitrary until this point.

The crucial minus sign in eqn. (3.22) means that B_{12} does not coincide with its inverse, and so we get different results depending on whether particle 1 moves around particle 2 in a clockwise or counterclockwise direction. In fact, $B_{12}^2 \neq 1$ but $B_{12}^4 = 1$.

The fact that $B_{12}^2 \neq 1$ means that braiding of vortices gives a representation of the braid group that does not merely come from a representation of the permutation group. The fact that the operation (3.22), extended to a k particle system, does give a representation of the braid group can be verified as follows.

Start with an initial configuration in which k vortices, labeled $1, 2, \dots, k$, are arranged on the real axis in ascending order. The braid group \mathcal{B}_k on k letters is generated by elements $B_{i,i+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ that exchange the i^{th} and $i+1^{\text{th}}$ objects in a counterclockwise direction. As above, we take $B_{i,i+1}$ to act by $(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}) \rightarrow (\gamma_{i+1}, -\gamma_i)$ (with trivial action on the other γ_j). To get a representation of \mathcal{B}_k , the only relation that we have to check is

$$B_{i,i+1}B_{i+1,i+2}B_{i,i+1} = B_{i+1,i+2}B_{i,i+1}B_{i+1,i+2}. \quad (3.23)$$

Indeed, $B_{i,i+1}B_{i+1,i+2}B_{i,i+1}$ acts by

$$(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}, \gamma_{i+2}) \rightarrow (\gamma_{i+1}, -\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+2}) \rightarrow (\gamma_{i+1}, \gamma_{i+2}, \gamma_i) \rightarrow (\gamma_{i+2}, -\gamma_{i+1}, \gamma_i), \quad (3.24)$$

while $B_{i+1,i+2}B_{i,i+1}B_{i+1,i+2}$ acts by

$$(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}, \gamma_{i+2}) \rightarrow (\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+2}, -\gamma_{i+1}) \rightarrow (\gamma_{i+2}, -\gamma_i, -\gamma_{i+1}) \rightarrow (\gamma_{i+2}, -\gamma_{i+1}, \gamma_i). \quad (3.25)$$

What is the actual matrix $B_{i,i+1}$ such that $B_{i,i+1}^{-1}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1})B_{i,i+1} = (\gamma_{i+1}, -\gamma_i)$, while $B_{i,i+1}$ commutes with the other gamma matrices? It is

$$B_{i,i+1} = \pm \frac{1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (3.26)$$

where CT -invariance implies that the overall phase must be a sign ± 1 , and to satisfy eqn. (3.23), this sign must be independent of i . The reason for this sign ambiguity is the following. There is a 1-dimensional representation of the braid group – the representation associated to fermions – in which each $B_{i,i+1}$ is equal to -1 . Tensoring with this representation changes the sign in eqn. (3.26). The two choices give representations that are definitely inequivalent; the eigenvalues of $B_{i,i+1}$ are either $i^{\pm 1/2}$ or $i^{\pm 3/2}$. We will see in section 3.5 that the basic vortex corresponds to the $+$ sign in (3.26). The opposite sign arises for another CT -invariant quasiparticle of the model (a state of vorticity 3).

The representation of the braid group that we have just described is very close to one that arises in Ising conformal field theory in two dimensions, or in the corresponding Chern-Simons topological field theory in three dimensions. The conformal blocks of the spin fields of the Ising model are characterized by a representation of the braid group in which $B_{i,i+1}$ acts as described above, up to an Abelian factor (that is, a phase factor) that violates CT symmetry. (This representation was first found in the RCFT context and appeared explicitly in [53]. It was later used in the context of non-Abelian anyons in [54, 55].) Clearly, since the models that we are studying are CT -conserving, they do not generate this CT -violating phase. We will see instead that the models considered here can be constructed by combining in a certain sense an Ising model with a theory (a version of \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory) that cancels the phase factor. By itself, this latter theory would generate Abelian statistics.

So far we have considered only vortices with $\nu = 1$. What happens for $\nu > 1$? Assuming CT symmetry, a system of ν widely separated vortices of vorticity 1 has ν zero-modes, all transforming the same way under CT , since the individual vortices are identical (or since this is predicted by the Callias index theorem). We choose the sign of the operator CT so that the approximate zero-modes all transform as $+1$ under CT . This remains so when we bring the individual vortices together to make a quasiparticle of vorticity ν .

We write γ_j , $j = 1, \dots, \nu$ for the fermion zero-modes in a quasiparticle of vorticity ν . If we add to the underlying Lagrangian or Hamiltonian irrelevant interactions that explicitly break CT symmetry, with a small coefficient, this will induce an effective Hamiltonian for the vortex

$$\Delta H = i \sum_{k,l} m_{kl} \gamma_k \gamma_l + \dots \quad (3.27)$$

where m_{kl} is a real, antisymmetric matrix. Generically, this completely lifts all of the fermion zero-modes if ν is even, and leaves 1 zero-mode if ν is odd.

In a gapped system, adding an irrelevant operator with a small coefficient cannot affect the topological field theory that describes the braiding of quasiparticles. So this braiding can be computed assuming that a vortex of vorticity ν has 1 real fermion zero-mode if ν is odd and none if ν is even. Accordingly, vortices of vorticity ν have non-Abelian statistics as described above if ν is odd, and have only Abelian statistics if ν is even.¹⁴

If instead we maintain CT symmetry and take it into account, then the vortices have a richer structure. This will be more fully explored in section 3.5, but as a preliminary, we note that only the value of $\nu \bmod 8$ is important. This is true for essentially the same reason that there is a mod 8 periodicity in the theory of the Majorana chain [56]. CT symmetry does not allow a quadratic Hamiltonian as in eqn. (3.27), but it does allow a quartic Hamiltonian

$$\Delta H = \sum_{ijkl} p_{ijkl} \gamma_i \gamma_j \gamma_k \gamma_l, \quad (3.28)$$

where p_{ijkl} is real and completely antisymmetric. A Hamiltonian of this form can remove zero-modes in groups of 8. The precise meaning of “removing zero-modes in groups of 8” is the

¹⁴The state selected by the CT -violating perturbation ΔH is not a CT eigenstate. Consequently, although eqn. (3.22) is valid for any odd ν , it is not immediately clear that the phase in the formula (3.26) for B_{12} is just ± 1 . But topological field theory is rigid in a way that makes this phase robust against small CT -violating perturbations.

following. Quantization of 8 fermion zero-modes gives $2^{8/2} = 16$ states. A quartic fermion Hamiltonian generically selects a single CT -invariant ground state in this 16-dimensional space (moreover, as explained in Appendix B, this can be done in such a way that the state in question is bosonic and has spin zero). Thus in the presence of a generic CT -conserving Hamiltonian, real fermion zero-modes can be omitted in groups of 8.

As a check on the claim that the statistics of a vortex of vorticity \mathbf{v} only depend on the value of $\mathbf{v} \bmod 2$, we will consider the braiding of a vortex of vorticity 1 with one of some arbitrary vorticity p . The $\mathbf{v} = 1$ vortex supports a single gamma matrix γ_1 and the $\mathbf{v} = p$ vortex supports p additional gamma matrices $\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \dots, \gamma_{p+1}$. Braiding of the $\mathbf{v} = 1$ vortex counterclockwise around the composite $\mathbf{v} = p$ vortex is simply described by a product $B_{p,p+1} B_{p-1,p} \dots B_{1,2}$ of the basic moves described above. The result is $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{s+1}) \rightarrow (\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \dots, \gamma_{p+1}, (-1)^p \gamma_1)$. For even p , there is no nontrivial sign, and the braiding involves a simple permutation of the gamma matrices. For odd p , we get the same sign change that we found earlier for $p = 1$, leading to the same non-Abelian statistics as before. This reasoning can be straightforwardly extended to consider braiding of vortices with any two given vorticities p and p' .

An alternative explanation of why nonabelian statistics arise precisely for odd vorticity is as follows. Consider a collection of n widely separated quasiparticles of vorticity \mathbf{v}_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, with total vorticity $\mathbf{v} = \sum_i \mathbf{v}_i$. Assume first that all \mathbf{v}_i are even, $\mathbf{v}_i = 2k_i$. An irreducible representation of the $2k_i$ gamma matrices of the i^{th} quasiparticle gives a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_i of dimension $2^{\mathbf{v}_i/2} = 2^{k_i}$. The tensor product¹⁵ $\mathcal{H} = \otimes_i \mathcal{H}_i$ of the individual \mathcal{H}_i has dimension $2^{\sum_i k_i} = 2^{\mathbf{v}/2}$ and gives an irreducible representation of the whole set of \mathbf{v} gamma matrices. Now suppose instead that the \mathbf{v}_i are all odd numbers $\mathbf{v}_i = 2k_i + 1$, and assume that n is even so that $\mathbf{v} = \sum_i \mathbf{v}_i$ is even.¹⁶ An irreducible representation of $2k_i + 1$ gamma matrices has dimension 2^{k_i} , so this is the dimension of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_i that we might associate to the i^{th} quasiparticle. The tensor product $\otimes_i \mathcal{H}_i$ then has dimension $2^{\sum_i k_i}$, while the Hilbert space of the whole system, which has to represent the whole set of $\sum_i \mathbf{v}_i = 2\sum_i k_i + n/2$ gamma matrices, will have dimension $2^{\sum_i k_i + n/2}$. So the Hilbert space of the whole system is not simply $\otimes_i \mathcal{H}_i$; it is $\mathcal{H} = Q \otimes_i \mathcal{H}_i$, where Q , known in RCFT as the space of conformal blocks, has dimension $2^{n/2}$. The existence of a space of conformal blocks of dimension greater than 1 is the sign of nonabelian statistics. More generally, suppose that there are n_e quasiparticles of even vorticity and n_o of odd vorticity. A counting as above shows that the dimension of the space of conformal blocks is $2^{n_o/2}$.

3.5 Quasiparticles

In this section, we describe the quasiparticles of the theory more systematically.

¹⁵This tensor product (and others discussed momentarily) must be taken in a \mathbf{Z}_2 -graded sense, which means that one includes factors that ensure that the gamma matrices of one quasiparticle anticommute with those of another, rather than commuting.

¹⁶In a condensed matter system of finite volume, with compact boundary, \mathbf{v} will always be divisible by $4s$. In RCFT, one would say that \mathbf{v} must be even or the correlation functions all vanish and the space of conformal blocks is zero. Similarly below we assume n_o to be even.

3.5.1 Enumerating the Quasiparticles

First we consider the “elementary” quasiparticles, the ones that do not carry vorticity. These are the fermion field χ and the boson w . (In the phase with $\langle\phi\rangle \neq 0$, there is no quasiparticle corresponding to ϕ .) χ is electrically neutral and has spin $1/2$. In enumerating quasiparticles, we only keep track of the spin mod 1, since integer spin can be converted to orbital angular momentum. So we do not distinguish the two components of χ , which have spin $\pm 1/2$. w has spin 0 and electric charge $\mathbf{q}' = -1/2s$. By fusion of χ with w or \bar{w} , we can make additional quasiparticles w^n and $w^n\chi$, with the relations

$$\chi^2 = 1, \quad \bar{w}^{2s}\chi = e, \quad (3.29)$$

which reflect the following. Since χ has a Majorana mass, a pair of χ excitations can be created or annihilated. And the bulk coupling I_e of eqn. (3.7), where e is the electron field, means that a combination of quasiparticles $\chi\bar{w}^{2s}$ can be converted to an electron e and disappear into the bulk; similarly χw^{2s} is equivalent to a hole.

In describing the low energy physics, it is possible to consistently keep track of the electric charge only modulo 2, basically because a pair of electrons can carry integer angular momentum, which is irrelevant in the low energy topological field theory. We can thus consider e^2 and \bar{e}^2 to be trivial, and thus we can set $w^{4s} = \bar{w}^{4s} = 1$ and identify w^n with \bar{w}^{4s-n} . In fact, we have implicitly done that in enumerating the quasiparticles in the last paragraph. If we want to keep track of electric charge as a real number (and not just its reduction mod 2), then we have to distinguish w^n from \bar{w}^{4s-n} . In this case, the full set of quasiparticles of zero vorticity would be $w^n, \bar{w}^n, \chi w^n, \chi \bar{w}^n$, with the relations (3.29), along with $\chi w^{2s} = \bar{e}$ and $\bar{w}w = 1$. For brevity, in the following we use the smaller set of quasiparticles.

The quasiparticles w^n and χw^n are mapped to themselves by the effective time-reversal symmetry T of the low energy theory. Since $T^2 = (-1)^F$, the states w^n are Kramers singlets and χw^n are Kramers doublets. C maps χ to itself and w^n to \bar{w}^n . From this, the action of CT follows. Since $(CT)^2 = (-1)^F K$ (eqn. (3.11)) and χ is invariant under $(-1)^F K$, χ transforms as a Kramers singlet under CT . CT exchanges w^n with \bar{w}^n with phases that are determined by the relation $(CT)^2 = (-1)^F K$.

If CT symmetry is weakly broken by a perturbation such as that of eqn. (3.27), then it is straightforward to enumerate the quasiparticles for any \mathbf{v} . For odd \mathbf{v} , there is a single real fermion zero-mode γ_0 . It obeys $\gamma_0^2 = 1$ and can be represented as 1 (or -1) in the vortex state (that is, in the Fock vacuum obtained by quantizing the nonzero-modes of χ in the field of the vortex). In effect, γ_0 has an expectation value in the vortex state. Moreover, γ_0 is a mode of χ . So acting with χ on the vortex does not produce a new quasiparticle type. We can still act with w^n , $n = 0, \dots, 4s - 1$, producing $4s$ quasiparticle types for odd \mathbf{v} .

For even \mathbf{v} , with CT symmetry weakly broken, there are no fermion zero-modes and, just as for $\mathbf{v} = 0$, we can make $2 \times 4s = 8s$ quasiparticle types by acting with χ and/or w^n , $n = 0, \dots, 4s - 1$. For both even and odd \mathbf{v} , it is a little tricky to determine the spins of these quasiparticles. We will return to this shortly.

3.5.2 Consequences of CT Symmetry

CT symmetry leads to a richer structure, though it does not change the list of quasiparticles. As a preliminary, the gauge charges \mathbf{q}' and \mathbf{k} and the spin or angular momentum \mathbf{j} are all odd

under CT . So CT symmetry ensures that the filled Dirac sea of negative energy modes of χ does not contribute to any of those quantum numbers. There is similarly no contribution from the bosons. The quasiparticle quantum numbers are therefore determined entirely by quantization of the fermion zero-modes. What we are really interested in here are the fractional parts of the quasiparticle quantum numbers, which are observables of the topological field theory that governs quasiparticle interactions at low energies. This topological field theory is not affected by weak CT -violating perturbations, so the determination below of the fractional parts of the quantum numbers is also valid in the absence of CT symmetry.

Even in the presence of CT symmetry, the quasiparticle structure in a sector of vorticity \mathbf{v} only depends on $\mathbf{v} \bmod 8$, as explained in the discussion of eqn. (3.28). So we can limit ourselves to $0 \leq \mathbf{v} \leq 7$. But actually, even in this range, there is a symmetry $\mathbf{v} \rightarrow 8 - \mathbf{v}$. In fact, T maps \mathbf{v} to $-\mathbf{v}$, which, since \mathbf{v} is only defined mod $4s$, is equivalent to $4s - \mathbf{v}$. Because of the anomaly described in section 3.2, we take s to be even, so $4s$ is a multiple of 8 and hence $4s - \mathbf{v}$ is congruent mod 8 to $8 - \mathbf{v}$. Combining these statements, we see that everything is determined by what happens for $0 \leq \mathbf{v} \leq 4$. (Some subtlety is needed in applying this statement, because T , which was used in relating \mathbf{v} to $8 - \mathbf{v}$, does not commute with CT (eqn. (3.12).)

For $\mathbf{v} = 1$, the vortex has just one χ zero-mode. As explained in section 3.5.1, this mode has an expectation value in the vortex state, as a result of which acting with χ does not produce a new quasiparticle. But we obtain $4s$ quasiparticle types by acting with powers of w . These are mostly exchanged in pairs by CT , since CT exchanges w and \bar{w} .

To determine the spins of these quasiparticles, we need to take into account that in a vortex sector, the conserved angular momentum j' is not just the conventional angular momentum j , but is a linear combination of j with the emergent gauge charge k :

$$j' = j + \mathbf{v}k/4s. \quad (3.30)$$

Since w has $j = 0$, $k = 1$, it carries $j' = \mathbf{v}/4s$, so it has spin $1/4s$ in a field of $\mathbf{v} = 1$. Thus if Ψ_1 is the basic vortex of $\mathbf{v} = 1$, the quasiparticles $w^n \Psi_1$ have charge $\mathbf{q}' = -n/2s$ and spin $j' = n/4s$.

For $\mathbf{v} = 2$, there are two χ zero-modes. As explained in Appendix B, these modes have $j' = \pm 1/2$. Quantizing those modes gives two states of $j' = \pm 1/4$. These two states are electrically neutral, of course, and are exchanged by the action of χ .

The fact that the spins of the states obtained by quantizing the fermion zero-modes are $\pm 1/4$ enables us to answer a question that was left open in section 3.4. Starting with a rotation-symmetric classical state of $\mathbf{v} = 2$, separate the two vortices in a way that preserves the symmetry under a π rotation that exchanges the two vortices (but not, of course, the full rotation symmetry). In this process, j' is not conserved, but it is conserved mod 2, since the π rotation symmetry is preserved. So the possible angular momentum states of a system of two basic vortices of $\mathbf{v} = 1$ are of the form $2p \pm 1/4$, $p \in \mathbf{Z}$. This means that the eigenvalues of a π rotation are $\exp(i\pi(2p \pm 1/4)) = \exp(\pm i\pi/4)$. This π rotation is a way to describe the braiding of two vortices. The eigenvalues in the braiding of two vortices are thus $\exp(\pm i\pi/4)$, which means that we must use the $+$ sign in eqn. (3.26).

The remaining quasiparticles of $\mathbf{v} = 2$ are obtained by acting with w^n on these two states of $j' = \pm 1/4$. For $\mathbf{v} = 2$, w has $j' = 1/2s$. So the states obtained by acting with w^n have spins $j' = \pm 1/4 + n/2s$ and electric charge $\mathbf{q}' = -n/2s$.

For $\mathbf{v} = 3$, the three χ zero-modes have spins $j' = 1, 0, -1$, as found in Appendix B. Quantizing the states of $j' = \pm 1$ gives a pair of quantum states with $j' = \pm 1/2$. The additional

χ zero-mode of $j' = 0$ leads to non-Abelian statistics. Acting with w^n , we get quasiparticles with $j' = \pm 1/2 + 3n/4s$, $\mathbf{q}' = -n/2s$.

Finally, for $\mathbf{v} = 4$, the four χ zero-modes have spins $j' = 3/2, 1/2, -1/2, -3/2$. Their quantization gives a pair of states of spins ± 1 and a second pair of spins $\pm 1/2$. The states with spins ± 1 are bosonic and, as we discuss shortly, form a Kramers doublet under CT . The states with spins $\pm 1/2$ are fermionic and form another Kramers doublet. Acting with w^n gives spins $\pm 1 + n/s$ and $\pm 1/2 + n/s$, with $\mathbf{q}' = -n/2s$.

3.5.3 Some More Delicate Questions

There remain some more delicate questions concerning the transformation of the quasiparticles under symmetries. In particular, according to eqn. (3.11), the theory should admit symmetry operators CT , $(-1)^F$, and \mathbf{K} that should be linked by

$$(CT)^2 = (-1)^F \mathbf{K} \tag{3.31}$$

(and more trivial relations: $\mathbf{K}^{4s} = 1$ and CT , $(-1)^F$, and \mathbf{K} all commute). We discuss below the action of T .

For quasiparticles of vorticity 0, one can use classical field theory to define symmetry operators that obey all expected relations. This is essentially how eqn. (3.31) was deduced in section 3.1. Even when one includes vortices, it remains true that for any state of the system that can be defined in a compact sample, the symmetry operators can be defined and obey the expected relations. Concretely, this is because, in a compact sample, the total vorticity is always a multiple of¹⁷ $4s$ and therefore (since s is even) is divisible by 8. So the fermion zero-modes of the whole system, taken together, generate a Clifford algebra whose rank is a multiple of 8. Such a Clifford algebra has a real representation in which all symmetries are realized in the expected way.

By contrast, if \mathbf{v} is not a multiple of 8, then the fermion zero-modes of a quasiparticle of vorticity \mathbf{v} generate a Clifford algebra whose rank is not a multiple of 8, and in this case, in general the symmetries are not realized “locally” (i.e. on just one quasiparticle) in the expected way. An analog is the theory of the Majorana chain [56]. A state of the whole system realizes the symmetries (in that case, \mathbf{T} and $(-1)^F$) as expected, but if one attempts to factorize the Hilbert space as a tensor product of a space associated to one end of the chain and a space associated to the other, then the symmetries cannot be defined on the individual factors or do not act in the expected way.

In the present problem, we find that the symmetries act in a fairly normal way if \mathbf{v} is even, but not if \mathbf{v} is odd. There are several ways to explain this. Quasiparticles of even vorticity obey abelian statistics, so that, as noted at the end of section 3.4, if one considers states with only such quasiparticles, the Hilbert space of the whole system is the tensor product of subspaces associated to individual quasiparticles. This is enough to ensure that one can define all of the expected operators for each quasiparticle, but allows the possibility that in doing so, one will run into a central extension of the expected symmetry group. In a sense, the occurrence in eqn. (3.31) of the operator \mathbf{K} , which is trivial for a global state of the system but nontrivial for an individual quasiparticle, represents such a central extension. Alternatively, as we explain at the

¹⁷Similarly, as remarked after eqn. (3.12), in any state of a compact sample, the discrete gauge charges k_i of all quasiparticles always add up to a multiple of $4s$, so that globally $\mathbf{K} = 1$.

end of section 4.2, by considering a topological insulator interacting with magnetic monopoles, one can create a situation in which a compact sample can have a state of any even vorticity (not necessarily a multiple of $4s$),¹⁸ so it must be possible to define the symmetries for any even value of \mathbf{v} .

Let us begin by explaining the difficulty in realizing the symmetries when \mathbf{v} is odd. The problem is particularly obvious for $\mathbf{v} = 1$. There is only one fermion zero-mode γ_1 and it has an expectation value in the vortex state. In eqn. (3.31), the operator $(-1)^F$ is supposed to anticommute with all fermion operators (and commute with bosons), and likewise χ is odd under¹⁹ \mathbf{K} . So both $(-1)^F$ and \mathbf{K} should anticommute with γ_1 . Clearly, an expectation value of γ_1 is not compatible with the existence of a symmetry $(-1)^F$ or \mathbf{K} under which γ_1 is odd.²⁰ However, there is no obstruction to realizing the products $(-1)^F\mathbf{K}$ or \mathbf{K}^2 , which commute with γ_1 .

More generally, for any odd \mathbf{v} , there are \mathbf{v} zero-modes $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{\mathbf{v}}$, and the operator $\bar{\gamma} = \gamma_1\gamma_2 \dots \gamma_{\mathbf{v}}$ commutes with them and so is a c -number in an irreducible representation of the algebra. But $\bar{\gamma}$ is odd under $(-1)^F$ and under \mathbf{K} , so those operators cannot act in an irreducible representation of the algebra. Again, there is no problem with $(-1)^F\mathbf{K}$ or \mathbf{K}^2 .

Since $(-1)^F\mathbf{K}$ commutes with all the zero-modes, it acts as a c -number in an irreducible representation of the Clifford algebra. To decide what this c -number should be, we return to eqn. (3.31), in which CT is supposed to be an antiunitary symmetry. We now run into further subtleties, which depend on the properties of the rank \mathbf{v} Clifford algebra generated by the zero-modes. For $\mathbf{v} = 1$, the Clifford algebra has a 1-dimensional representation, with the only gamma matrix being $\gamma_1 = 1$. On this space, we can define $CT = \mathcal{K}$ (complex conjugation), obeying $(CT)^2 = 1$. So we must define $(-1)^F\mathbf{K} = 1$ on the vortex ground state for $\mathbf{v} = 1$. \mathbf{K}^2 should commute with CT , so it should act on this state as²¹ ± 1 . For $\mathbf{v} = 3$, there are three zero-modes, which we can represent as 2×2 matrices $\gamma_i = \sigma_i$ (the Pauli matrices). Now we run into the fact that on this two-dimensional space, it is not possible to define CT , because there does not exist any antiunitary operator that commutes with the γ_i , as CT is supposed to do. There does exist the antiunitary operator $\mathcal{K}\sigma_2$, which *anticommutes* with the γ_i , and obeys $(\mathcal{K}\sigma_2)^2 = -1$. We cannot interpret this operator as CT , but we can interpret it as $CT\mathbf{K}$, which is supposed to anticommute with the γ_i . As $(CT\mathbf{K})^2 = (-1)^F\mathbf{K}^3$, we learn that we must take $(-1)^F\mathbf{K}^3 = -1$ for $\mathbf{v} = 3$. As for \mathbf{K}^2 , having fixed its sign for $\mathbf{v} = 1$, we can determine its sign for $\mathbf{v} = 3$ by fusing three vortices of $\mathbf{v} = 1$.

More generally, for any odd value of \mathbf{v} , since there is no way to define \mathbf{K} , it is clear that we at most may be able to define CT or $CT\mathbf{K}$, but not both. Continuing in the above vein, one finds that for $\mathbf{v} = 5$, one can define CT (and it obeys $(CT)^2 = -1$), while for $\mathbf{v} = 7$, one can

¹⁸In section 4.2, we show that with unit magnetic charge inside the sample, one gets on the surface a quasiparticle of vorticity ± 2 together with s quasiparticles of type w or \bar{w} . Since the symmetries can certainly be defined for the classical fields w and \bar{w} , and they can also be defined for a global state of the whole system, it must be possible to define the symmetries for a quasiparticle of vorticity ± 2 .

¹⁹ $(-1)^F$ and \mathbf{K} differ because they act differently on w .

²⁰The problem in defining \mathbf{K} in the sector with odd \mathbf{v} is reminiscent of the problem in defining the color of magnetic monopoles in grand unified theories [57]. In both cases we have an unbroken gauge theory, but the “global gauge charge” cannot be defined in a topological nontrivial sector.

²¹There seems to be no natural way to fix this sign. In the language of section 4.2, the sign depends on whether we associate \mathbf{K}^2 with the one-form global symmetry $e^{2i\oint c}$ or $W_\psi e^{2i\oint c}$. These are exchanged by CT so neither is preferred.

define CTK (and it obeys $(CTK)^2 = 1$).

Now we consider the case of even \mathbf{v} , which is more straightforward as explained above (but which still has some subtleties that we will not fully explore). For $\mathbf{v} = 2$, there are two gamma matrices, which can be given a real 2×2 representation. So the antilinear operator CT that commutes with them is simply, up to an irrelevant phase, \mathcal{K} . In particular, it obeys $(CT)^2 = 1$, so the vortex states are Kramers singlets of CT . Accordingly, we expect $(-1)^F \mathbf{K} = 1$. Because $(-1)^F$ and \mathbf{K} should commute with CT and anticommute with the γ_i , they must be, up to sign, $(-1)^F = -\mathbf{K} = \bar{\gamma} = \gamma_1 \gamma_2$. As a check, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{K} = \exp(2\pi i k/4s)$ are $\pm i$, corresponding to $k = \pm s$. These are the expected values as the γ_i (being modes of χ) carry $k = 2s$ or $k = -1$, so that by the usual logic [18] of charge fractionation, the states that the γ_i act on must have $k = \pm s$. We should note, however, that the square of $(-1)^F$ is -1 , not the expected $+1$. We can regard this as representing a (further) central extension of the algebra, a possibility allowed by the general remarks above.

For $\mathbf{v} = 4$, the gamma matrices $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$ can be represented in a four-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . It is not possible to take them to be all real. One can have three of the gamma matrices real and the fourth imaginary, for example $\gamma_1 = \sigma_1 \otimes 1$, $\gamma_2 = \sigma_3 \otimes 1$, $\gamma_3 = \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2$, $\gamma_4 = \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1$. With this choice, the CT transformation that commutes with the γ_i is uniquely determined, up to an irrelevant phase, to be $CT = \mathcal{K} \gamma_{123}$, where $\gamma_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_k}$ is an abbreviation for $\gamma_{i_1} \gamma_{i_2} \dots \gamma_{i_k}$. This operator obeys $(CT)^2 = -1$, so the states are all in Kramers doublets, and we want $(-1)^F \mathbf{K} = -1$. The operators $(-1)^F$ and \mathbf{K} must anticommute with the γ_i and commute with CT . Up to sign, this forces $(-1)^F = -\mathbf{K} = \bar{\gamma} = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 \gamma_4$.

The fact that $\mathbf{K} = -(-1)^F$ for these states is a kind of anomaly. We have found the vortex states by quantizing the theory of the χ field coupled to ϕ and a (but with w playing no role). In a restricted theory without the field w , at the classical level $\mathbf{K} = +(-1)^F$ for all fields, but we have found that in the $\mathbf{v} = 4$ sector, the sign in this relation is reversed. This is closely related to the anomaly that was described in section 3.2. To understand the relation, set $s = 1$, so that a state of $\mathbf{v} = 4$ can be created by a monopole operator. The anomaly says that the relation between spin and charge for monopole operators is the opposite of the classical one, and this corresponds to the minus sign in the relation $\mathbf{K} = -(-1)^F$.

The action of T is largely determined by the relation $T^2 = (-1)^F$ and the fact that T exchanges states of vorticity \mathbf{v} with those of vorticity $-\mathbf{v}$. The nontrivial cases are the T -invariant values $\mathbf{v} = 0$ and $\mathbf{v} = 2s$. For $\mathbf{v} = 0$, the action of T is determined from the classical considerations of section 3.1. As for $\mathbf{v} = 2s$, it is equivalent to $\mathbf{v} = 0$ if s is divisible by 4. If instead s is congruent to 2 mod 4, then the rank of the $\mathbf{v} = 2s$ Clifford algebra is congruent to 4 mod 8, and the analysis of the action of T in this case is similar to what we said above concerning the action of CT for $\mathbf{v} = 4$.

In section 4 we will rederive this spectrum of quasiparticles and the action of the various symmetries on them using the low-energy TQFT description of this system.

3.6 The Partition Function

Here we will examine in detail the partition function of the Dirac fermion χ , coupled to $B = A + 2sa$. One goal is to show carefully that the models we have studied have precisely the same anomalies as the standard gapless boundary state of a topological insulator, and thus are fit as boundary states. A second goal is to describe the partition function in a way that will

motivate a topological field theory description that we will give in section 4. We will consider only orientable spacetimes.²²

3.6.1 Review Of The Parity Anomaly

Naively the fermion partition function is given by the determinant $\det \mathcal{D}$ of the hermitian operator $\mathcal{D} = i\not{D}$. Because \mathcal{D} has real eigenvalues, this determinant is naturally real. But infinitely many eigenvalues are negative, and this leads to a problem in defining the sign of $\det \mathcal{D}$.

Naively, $\det \mathcal{D} = (-1)^{n_-} |\det \mathcal{D}|$ where n_- is the number of negative eigenvalues of \mathcal{D} . As n_- is infinite, some regularization is needed. Formally let n_+ be the number of positive eigenvalues of \mathcal{D} and $N = n_+ + n_-$ the total number of eigenvalues. In trying to regularize n_- , it is better to first subtract the infinite constant $N/2$, thus replacing n_- by $n_- - N/2 = (n_- - n_+)/2$. The difference $n_+ - n_-$ is still ill-defined, but any reasonable regularization of it gives the same result, the η -invariant of Atiyah, Patodi, and Singer [59]. For example, one may define

$$\eta = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \sum_i \exp(-\epsilon |\lambda_i|) \text{sign}(\lambda_i), \quad (3.32)$$

where the sum runs over all eigenvalues λ_i of the operator \mathcal{D} , and we define

$$\text{sign}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \lambda \geq 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } \lambda < 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.33)$$

(A different but equivalent regularization was used originally [59].) Thus we regularize $(n_- - n_+)/2$ by replacing it with $-\eta/2$, and so we replace $(-1)^{n_-} = \exp(\pm i\pi n_-)$ with $\exp(\mp i\pi\eta/2)$. Finally, the regularized version of the path integral of the χ field is [23]

$$Z_\chi = |\det \mathcal{D}| \exp(\mp i\pi\eta/2). \quad (3.34)$$

The parity anomaly is often described in terms of the Chern-Simons function rather than the η -invariant, but this is not quite correct. The Atiyah-Patodi-Singer theorem [59] would let us replace $\exp(i\pi\eta)$ with $\exp(i\text{CS})$, where CS is a Chern-Simons function that is well-defined mod 2π . Here CS is $\text{CS}(A, g)$ of eqn. (2.14), which includes the gravitational contribution $\Omega(g)$ of eqn. (A.21). We cannot make this sort of replacement in eqn. (3.34). Naively, we would want to replace $\exp(i\pi\eta/2)$ with $\exp(i\text{CS}/2)$, but as CS is only well-defined mod 2π , $\exp(i\text{CS}/2)$ has an ill-defined sign. The parity anomaly revolves around the overall sign of the partition function, so we cannot understand it properly via a formula with an ill-defined sign.

Because η is not an integer, the sign \mp in the exponent in eqn. (3.34) matters. In an approach based on Pauli-Villars regularization, this sign comes from the sign of the regulator mass [23, 17]. This sign violates \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{R} symmetry, which say that on an orientable manifold the path integral should be real. This violation is often loosely called the parity anomaly, though it is more precise to call it an anomaly in \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{R} symmetry. This anomaly is a mod 2 effect because the original problem only involved the sign of the path integral. If

²²The extension to an unorientable spacetime, which can be made using either \mathbb{T} or CT symmetry, can be analyzed by using the Dai-Freed theorem [58] rather than the APS index theorem [59].

we had two χ fields, the path integral would have been formally $\det^2 \mathcal{D}$, which is naturally positive. In terms of the above derivation, we could define the path integral for one χ field using a $+$ sign in eqn. (3.34), and that of the second using a $-$ sign. This amounts to using a \mathbb{T} - and \mathbb{R} -preserving regularization. The phase factors would cancel, leaving us with a real, positive partition function. (Alternatively, we could use a \mathbb{T} - and \mathbb{R} -violating regularization, such that the two χ fields contribute with the same sign, say $+$. Then the partition function is proportional to $\exp(+i\pi\eta)$, which violates \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{R} . But now we can add to the bare action a properly normalized Chern-Simons term making the phase $\exp(+i\pi\eta - i\text{CS}) = 1$, where the last step uses the Atiyah-Patodi-Singer theorem. The combination of the regularization and this bare term respects \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{R} .)

To avoid a possible confusion, we would like to add a clarifying comment. The free fermion theory without the gauge field A has both a global $U(1)$ symmetry and a time-reversal symmetry \mathbb{T} . It has a conserved $U(1)$ current j_μ and all the flat space correlation functions of operators at separated points are $U(1)$ - and time-reversal invariant. The problem of the anomaly can be seen as a possible failure of these symmetries at coincident points; specifically, the product $j_\mu(x)j_\nu(0)$ can include a \mathbb{T} -violating contact term proportional to $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho}\partial^\rho\delta(x)$, where $\delta(x)$ is a $2+1$ -dimensional delta function. Such contact terms can be probed when the theory is coupled to a classical background gauge field A . Even then, if A is infinitesimal, we can add to the Lagrangian a counterterm proportional to $A dA$ to cancel the contact term and thus preserve \mathbb{T} . The anomaly is the statement that this cannot be done when A is not infinitesimal and the gauge group is compact. Then, the allowed $A dA$ counterterms must have properly quantized coefficients and cannot cancel arbitrary fractional contact terms in $j_\mu(x)j_\nu(0)$. The situation here is similar to the 't Hooft anomaly. There a system has some global symmetries, but the currents of these symmetries suffer from contact terms, which prevent us from coupling them to background gauge fields.

Once the $U(1)$ symmetry is gauged, there is no way to eliminate the anomaly in \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{R} symmetry in a purely three-dimensional context. But those symmetries can potentially be restored, as we discuss next, if the three-manifold W on which the χ field is defined is the boundary of an oriented four-manifold X over which the spin_c structure of W extends. Physically, X will be the worldvolume of a topological insulator.

3.6.2 The APS Index Theorem And \mathbb{T} -Invariance

The path integral of the topological insulator can be analyzed [60, 17] by using the APS theorem for the index²³ \mathfrak{J} of the Dirac operator on X :

$$\mathfrak{J} = \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{G}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{G}{2\pi} \right) - \frac{\eta}{2}. \quad (3.35)$$

Here

$$G = dB = dA + 2sda = F + 2sf \quad (3.36)$$

is the curvature of $B = A + 2sa$, and $\widehat{A}(R)$ is a certain quadratic expression in the Riemann tensor R (eqn. (A.1)). If X has no boundary, then there is no $\eta/2$ term on the right hand side

²³As reviewed in section 2.1.8 of [17], this index is defined using on $W = \partial X$ the nonlocal APS boundary conditions that were introduced in [59].

of eqn. (3.35), and this formula reduces to the standard Atiyah-Singer formula for the index of the Dirac operator on a compact four-dimensional spin manifold without boundary.

To restore T and R symmetry, we assume the existence on X of the bulk “topological” couplings suggested by the index formula:²⁴

$$I_{\text{top}} = \mp i\pi \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{G}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{G}{2\pi} \right). \quad (3.37)$$

The combined boundary and bulk path integral, including a factor of $\exp(-I_{\text{top}})$ from the bulk, is then

$$Z_{\text{com}} = |\det \mathcal{D}| \exp(\mp i\pi\eta/2) \exp(-I_{\text{top}}) = |\det \mathcal{D}|(-1)^\mathcal{J}. \quad (3.38)$$

In the last step, we used the APS index formula (3.35).

Since the combined partition function $|\det \mathcal{D}|(-1)^\mathcal{J}$ is real, it respects T and R symmetry. C (and therefore CT) symmetry is also manifest, since both factors $|\det \mathcal{D}|$ and $(-1)^\mathcal{J}$ in eqn. (3.38) are invariant under a sign change of $B = A + 2sa$.

Now let us discuss the physical meaning of the bulk couplings that we have had to add. We first review the standard boundary state of a topological insulator, so we set $s = 0$, $B = A$, and $G = F$. Also, first we consider the case that X is a spin manifold and A is a $U(1)$ gauge field, and then the slightly more subtle case that X is a spin_c manifold with spin_c connection A .

If X is spin, the bulk couplings $\pi\widehat{A}(R)$ and $(\pi/2)F \wedge F/(2\pi)^2$ are each T-conserving. The F^2 coupling corresponds to an electromagnetic θ -angle of π . This assertion depends on the fact that $\frac{1}{2} \int F \wedge F/(2\pi)^2$ is an integer on a spin manifold, but has no further divisibility properties. (See Appendix A for this and some further remarks in this paragraph.) The two T- and R-conserving values of the electromagnetic theta-angle are 0 and π , and the F^2 coupling in I_{top} means that the topological insulator is the case $\theta = \pi$. However, on a spin manifold, the bulk coupling $\pi\widehat{A}(R)$ is trivial. This is because $\int_X \widehat{A}(R)$ is an even integer on a compact spin manifold X without boundary, so $\pi \int_X \widehat{A}(R)$ always vanishes mod 2π . Thus on a spin manifold, the gravitational coupling $\pi \int_X \widehat{A}(R)$ does not influence the bulk physics, and accordingly, the effect of I_{top} in bulk can be summarized by saying that the electromagnetic theta-angle equals π . In the spin_c case, the combined gauge and gravitational coupling I_{top} is T-invariant in bulk, but separately the gauge and gravitational couplings in I_{top} are not T-invariant. These matters are discussed in Appendix A.

3.6.3 Extension To $s \neq 0$

Now let us consider the more general case with $s \neq 0$ and $G = F + 2sf$. There is something non-trivial that we have to check in order to decide if the formula (3.38) is physically sensible. The emergent gauge field a and its curvature $f = da$ are defined only on the boundary W ,

²⁴ I_{top} as defined here coincides with I_{ind} as defined in eqn. (1.1) of the introduction except for a factor of i that reflects the fact that we are now in Lorentz signature, and some terms that depend on a . The following discussion will show that the terms that depend on a are equivalent to properly normalized Chern-Simons couplings that can be understood as part of the boundary action, rather than as bulk couplings, while the part of I_{top} that does not depend on a can be considered to have the origin that was described in the introduction.




Figure 3: Two manifolds X and X' with the same boundary W are glued together – after reversing the orientation of X' so that the orientations are compatible – to make a compact oriented manifold X^* without boundary. (With a view to later generalizations, X and X' are depicted as being topologically different.)

not on the four-manifold X . But the formula (3.38) involves $G = F + 2sf$, so it presumes an extension of f over X . Such an extension may not exist²⁵ and if it exists it is not unique.

To begin with, let us assume that a and therefore $f = da$ can be extended over X and show that the choice of this extension does not matter. The dependence of Z_{com} on the choice of extension comes from the part of the topological couplings I_{top} that depend on f . This part leads to a factor

$$U_X = \exp \left(\pm i\pi \int_X \left(2s \frac{F}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{f}{2\pi} + 2s^2 \frac{f}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{f}{2\pi} \right) \right). \quad (3.39)$$

We need to know whether U_X depends on how a and f were extended over X .

There is a standard way to answer such a question. Let X' be another copy of X (or in more general applications that we come to presently, some other four-manifold with the same boundary as X) with some possibly different extension of a over X' . By gluing together X and X' along their common boundary, with a reversal of orientation of X' so that their orientations agree along W , we make an oriented four-manifold X^* without boundary (fig. 3). The choices of extension of a over X and over X' glue together to an extension over X . We want to know whether U_X as defined in eqn. (3.39) is equal to $U_{X'}$, defined by the same formula evaluated on X' . The ratio is

$$\frac{U_X}{U_{X'}} = \exp \left(\pm i\pi \int_{X^*} \left(2s \frac{F}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{f}{2\pi} + 2s^2 \frac{f}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{f}{2\pi} \right) \right). \quad (3.40)$$

We want to know whether this always equals 1.

First suppose that X^* is a spin manifold and A is a $U(1)$ gauge field. In this case, the cohomology classes $F/2\pi$ and $f/2\pi$ are integral, so the integrals $\int_{X^*} F \wedge f / (2\pi)^2$ and $\int_X f \wedge f / (2\pi)^2$ are both integers. In the exponent in eqn. (3.40), these integers multiply $2\pi i s$ or $2\pi i s^2$, where s is an integer, so the ratio $U_X/U_{X'}$ is indeed always equal to 1.

²⁵The obstruction is that the first Chern class of the line bundle on which a is a connection may not extend over X .

If instead X^* is a spin_c manifold and A is a spin_c connection, then matters are different, and we will rediscover the anomaly that was found in section 3.2. Indeed, in the spin_c case, in general $F/2\pi$ is a half-integral class, so $p = \int_X F \wedge f / (2\pi)^2$ takes values in $\mathbf{Z}/2$. To ensure that $U_X/U_{X'}$ is always 1, we now need $\exp(2\pi i s p) = 1$ for all $p \in \mathbf{Z}/2$; in other words, we need s to be even. This is the condition found in section 3.2 for the model to make sense in the spin_c context.

The analysis of the case that a and f cannot be extended over the worldvolume X of the topological insulator is a little technical, and the following paragraph could be omitted on first reading. Even if a and f do not extend over X , cobordism theory ensures that there is always some four-manifold X' over which both A and a , and therefore F and f , as well as the spin structure of W , can be extended. If we were studying a topological insulator with worldvolume X' rather than X , then as in eqn. (3.38) the appropriate partition function would be $|\det \mathcal{D}|(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}'}$, where now \mathfrak{J}' is the Dirac index on X' (with APS boundary conditions) coupled to $A + 2sa$. But of course, we really want to do physics on X , not X' . What is wrong with the formula $|\det \mathcal{D}|(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}'}$ is that although, as above, it does not depend on how a is defined on X' , it does depend on the unphysical choice of how A is defined on X' . To cancel this dependence, we need another factor. An appropriate general formula is

$$Z_{\text{com}} = |\det \mathcal{D}|(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}'(A+2sa)}(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}^*(A)}. \quad (3.41)$$

Here X^* is the four-manifold without boundary that is built as in fig. 3 by gluing X' to X , and $\mathfrak{J}^*(A)$ (given in eqn. (A.3)) is the index on X^* of a Dirac operator coupled to the spin_c connection A . (The effect of the factor $(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}^*(A)}$ is to remove the unphysical dependence on the restriction of A to X' and replace it with a dependence on the restriction of A to the worldvolume X of the topological insulator. In writing eqn. (3.41), we have made explicit that \mathfrak{J}' is an index of a Dirac operator coupled to $A + 2sa$ and \mathfrak{J}^* is an index of a Dirac operator coupled to A .) The formula (3.41) is manifestly real and thus T-invariant. C-invariance is also manifest. The APS index theorem can be used to show that this formula does not depend on the choice of X' or of the extensions of a and A over X' .

In all of this, we have treated χ as a *massless* Dirac fermion coupled to the gauge field or spin_c connection $A + 2sa$. What happens in the gapped phase in which χ acquires a mass by coupling to the Higgs field ϕ ? Since ϕ has charges $(2, 4s)$, when it has an expectation value, $A + 2sa$ is reduced at low energies to a \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field (more precisely, the spin_c structure that it defines reduces to a spin structure). χ then splits up as a pair of Majorana fermions coupled to the same spin structure or \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field. They get equal and opposite masses $\pm m$ from the coupling to ϕ , and this replaces $|\det \mathcal{D}|$ in the formulas for the partition function with the strictly positive quantity $\text{Pf}(\mathcal{D} + im)\text{Pf}(\mathcal{D} - im) = |\text{Pf}(\mathcal{D} + im)|^2$ (here Pf denotes the Pfaffian). The sign of the partition function is still as given in the formulas (3.38) or (3.41).

If $B = A + 2sa$ is generic, then the eigenvalues of the Dirac operator are generically non-degenerate, and the partition function should change sign when an eigenvalue passes through zero. In terms of the formula (3.38) for the path integral of the system,²⁶ there is of course no sign change of $|\det \mathcal{D}|$ when an eigenvalue of \mathcal{D} passes through zero, but when this happens η jumps by ± 2 , causing a sign change in $\exp(\mp i\pi\eta/2)$. Likewise, \mathfrak{J} jumps by ± 1 , causing a sign change in $(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}}$. In the gapped phase, with the gauge group reduced at low energies to \mathbf{Z}_2 , the

²⁶Similar remarks hold in the context of the more general formula (3.41).

eigenvalues of \mathcal{D} have even multiplicity because of a version of Kramers doubling. Since there are no gapless fermions, no sign change in the path integral is expected when a pair of eigenvalues passes through zero. Indeed, when that happens, η jumps by ± 4 , so that $\exp(\mp i\pi\eta/2)$ is a smoothly varying function, and \mathfrak{J} jumps by ± 2 , so that $(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}}$ is unchanged and is a topological invariant. The topological invariance of the overall sign $(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}}$ of the path integral is essential for the existence of the topological field theory interpretation that we construct in section 4, and the fact that $\exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$ is smoothly varying in the gapped phase is necessary for the relation to the Ising model that we discuss in section 3.6.4.

The gapped phase also has vortices. In the core of a vortex, the gauge symmetry is restored. The vortex represents a singularity in the low energy \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field or spin_c connection $A + 2sa$. The singularity is associated to a monodromy of -1 , familiar from the spin field of the Ising model, and from the Ramond sector in string theory. Analogs of eqns. (3.38) and (3.41) and of our statements above and also in section 3.6.4 below hold in the presence of vortices. But one has to take into account the existence of a Majorana zero-mode in the vortex core, and a detailed explanation is somewhat more technical.

3.6.4 Relation To The Ising Model

We make here a few remarks as preparation for section 4, in which we will describe a topological field theory interpretation of the physics in the gapped phase.

The combined partition function Z_{com} of eqn. (3.38) is the product of two phase factors, namely

$$\Phi_1 = \exp(-i\pi\eta/2) \tag{3.42}$$

(where now we make a choice of sign in the exponent) and

$$\Phi_2 = \exp(-I_{\text{top}}) = \exp\left(i\pi \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{G}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{G}{2\pi}\right)\right). \tag{3.43}$$

Φ_1 comes from integrating out the boundary fermions, and Φ_2 from a bulk coupling.²⁷

To interpret Φ_2 in topological field theory, we will just write an Abelian Chern-Simons theory that reproduces this factor. But what is the topological field theory interpretation of Φ_1 ?

One of the simplest rational conformal field theories (RCFT's) in two dimensions is the Ising model. From a chiral point of view, this is the theory of a Majorana-Weyl fermion ψ of dimension $1/2$. What is the chiral algebra of the Ising model? There are two possible answers. From one standard point of view, one considers the chiral algebra to consist of holomorphic fields of integer dimension. From this point of view, the chiral algebra of the Ising model is simply generated by a stress tensor of central charge $c = 1/2$. This chiral algebra has three representations, usually denoted by 1 , σ , and ψ , whose dimensions are 0 , $\frac{1}{16}$, and $\frac{1}{2}$ respectively. Alternatively, we can define a \mathbf{Z}_2 -graded chiral algebra in which we allow holomorphic fields of half-integer spin. With this definition, the chiral algebra of the Ising model is simply the \mathbf{Z}_2 -graded algebra generated by the ψ field itself. We will say that the two points of view correspond respectively to RCFT's and to spin-RCFT's.

²⁷Since a and f are only defined on W , the part of Φ_2 that involves a and f is better written as a Chern-Simons coupling on W than as an integral over X . Equivalently, it can be written in a roundabout way along the lines of eqn. (3.41).

RCFT's in two dimensions are associated to three-dimensional topological quantum field theories (TQFT's), and likewise spin-RCFT's are associated to three-dimensional spin topological field theories (spin-TQFT's). A TQFT is defined on an oriented three-manifold, and similarly a spin-TQFT is defined on an oriented three-manifold with a choice of spin structure. (In both cases, in general there is a framing anomaly.) The Ising model viewed as an RCFT or as a spin-RCFT is associated to a 3d theory that we will call the Ising TQFT or spin-TQFT.

Representations of the chiral algebra of an RCFT correspond to line operators – or more physically to quasiparticles – in the associated TQFT. So the Ising TQFT has three line operators corresponding to $1, \sigma, \psi$. The analogous statement in the case of a spin-RCFT has a subtlety that is explained in Appendix C. In this case, each representation of the \mathbf{Z}_2 -graded chiral algebra leads to two distinct lines in the $2 + 1$ -dimensional TQFT. The spins of these two lines differ by $\frac{1}{2} \pmod 1$ and each of them is associated with a different representation of the subalgebra of the chiral algebra consisting of fields of integer spin. In the case of the Ising spin-TQFT, since there is only one representation, there are just two distinct lines, the trivial line with spin 0 and a line W_ψ with spin $\frac{1}{2}$.

The Ising spin-TQFT will have a partition function on an oriented three-manifold W with a choice of spin structure. As for any TQFT or spin-TQFT, this partition function can be computed, starting with simple special cases, by applying a sequence of braiding and surgery operations. However, in the case of the Ising spin-TQFT, these braiding and surgery operations all take place in a 1-dimensional space, since the \mathbf{Z}_2 -graded chiral algebra generated by ψ has only one representation. Accordingly, the partition function of the Ising spin-TQFT will always be of modulus 1.

To illustrate some of these ideas, let us consider the simple example of the $S^2 \times S^1$ partition function of the Ising spin-TQFT. It needs a spin structure around the S^1 factor, which we denote in an obvious way by $s = \pm 1$. For $s = +1$ this partition function is $\text{Tr}_{H_{S^2}}(-1)^F$ and for $s = -1$ it is $\text{Tr}_{H_{S^2}} 1$, where H_{S^2} is the Hilbert space associated with S^2 (in the absence of any quasiparticles) and $(-1)^F$ is the usual operator that distinguishes bosons and fermions. Since H_{S^2} consists of a single bosonic state, the $S^2 \times S^1$ partition function is equal to one for every s . Now, the theory has a nontrivial line associated with the fermion ψ . We can let this line pierce the S^2 at a point and wrap the S^1 factor. The only change in the $S^2 \times S^1$ partition function calculation is that now H_{S^2} should be replaced by $H_{S^2_\psi}$, the Hilbert space of the sphere pierced by the line. This Hilbert space consists of a single fermionic state. Therefore, the path integral in the presence of this line is $-s$. As expected, the path integral is a phase and it depends on the spin structure.

In general, we claim that the partition function of the Ising spin-TQFT (with no line operator insertions) is simply $\exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$, where η is the eta-invariant of a Majorana fermion on W , coupled to the relevant spin structure. This statement can be understood as a consequence of the Dai-Freed theorem [58]. Suppose that W has a non-empty boundary Σ . Then $\exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$ is not well-defined by itself (its definition fails when the Dirac operator on Σ acquires a zero-mode), but the Dai-Freed theorem says that the product of $\exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$ with the path integral of a chiral fermion ψ on Σ is smooth and well-defined as a function of the metric on W . This mirrors the standard relation between a TQFT or spin-TQFT in three dimensions and the corresponding RCFT or spin-RCFT in two dimensions: $\exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$ is the partition function of the bulk theory associated to the boundary theory of ψ . So $\exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$ is the partition function of the Ising spin-TQFT.

As a check, one can consider the dependence on the metric of W . If η is the eta-invariant of a Majorana fermion coupled to a spin structure on W , then the dependence of $\exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$ on the metric on W is determined by the APS index theorem and corresponds to a framing anomaly with $c = \pm 1/2$ (where the sign depends on a choice of orientation), as expected for the Ising spin-TQFT. In fact, the APS index theorem implies that the metric dependence of $\exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$ is the same as that of

$$\Theta = \exp\left(-i\pi \int_X \widehat{A}(R)\right). \quad (3.44)$$

(Like $\exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$, Θ really depends only on the metric of W , not X .) We note that Θ is the inverse of the gravitational factor in Φ_2 (eqn. (3.43)), so Θ cancels the framing anomaly of the Ising spin-TQFT. This cancellation is an inevitable consequence of the fact that the overall partition function is real, as is manifest in eqns. (3.38) and (3.41), so it cannot have a net framing anomaly.

So in section 4, we will interpret the phase factor Φ_2 in terms of an Abelian Chern-Simons TQFT, and Φ_1 in terms of the Ising spin-TQFT. This does not mean that the spin-TQFT that governs the gapped phase of our models is simply the product of those two theories. The two theories are coupled because the spin structure seen by the Ising spin-TQFT and entering in the definition of $\Phi_1 = \exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$ is the one determined by $A + 2sa$, which also appears in Φ_2 .

To better understand this coupling, we need to understand how the Ising TQFT is related to the Ising spin-TQFT.²⁸ The partition function of the Ising TQFT is obtained from that of the Ising spin-TQFT by simply summing over spin structures. In other words, the Ising spin-TQFT assigns a partition function to an oriented three-manifold W with a choice of spin structure; if we sum this partition function over the choice of spin structure, we get the partition function of the Ising TQFT. (This statement is equivalent to the statement that if the Ising TQFT is quantized on a two-manifold Σ , its physical states have a basis corresponding to spin structures on Σ . But the general relation between 3d TQFT and 2d RCFT says that the physical states of the Ising TQFT are the conformal blocks of the Ising RCFT on the same surface. And the conformal blocks of the Ising TQFT have a basis corresponding to spin structures on Σ .)

So far a and A have been classical background fields, but we still need to sum over the quantum field a . Since $A + 2sa$ couples to χ , which is a fermion, it might seem like the sum over a will amount to the sum over spin structures, making the spin-TQFT that results from the sum an ordinary (non-spin) TQFT that no longer depends on a particular choice of spin structure. However, we should not forget the w quanta (and correspondingly the Wilson lines $e^{i\oint a}$ in the low energy TQFT). These mean that the sum over a still leaves dependence on the spin structure. One way to see that is to recall that the fundamental electron has the quantum numbers of $\chi\bar{w}^{2s}$. It is $U(1)_a$ invariant, but has spin $\frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, it is sensitive to the spin structure even after the sum over a . We conclude that the low energy theory must be a spin-TQFT.

In section 4, when we represent the two factors Φ_1 and Φ_2 of the partition function by the Ising spin-TQFT and by an Abelian theory, we will have to take into account the fact that

²⁸In Appendices C.4 and C.5 we discuss the relation between these two theories when they are presented as Chern-Simons gauge theories.

these two factors couple to the same \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field $A + 2sa$. One way to describe how the two factors are coupled is the following. We start with two decoupled theories and then gauge a common \mathbf{Z}_2 one-form symmetry [61, 62]. We will describe that procedure in a concrete way in section 4.2. Alternatively, when the TQFT is presented as a Chern-Simons gauge theory, this one-form gauging is implemented by modding the gauge group by \mathbf{Z}_2 . We will do that in section 4.4. In our case, both the non-Abelian Ising TQFT and the Abelian TQFT are not spin. But their \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient is a spin-TQFT. In Appendix C we will review this modding of the gauge group and will demonstrate it in examples. In particular, we will show how it can turn an ordinary TQFT to a spin-TQFT.

The product $\Phi_1\Phi_2 = (-1)^{\mathcal{J}}$ is \mathbb{T} -invariant, but the individual factors Φ_1 and Φ_2 are not. An alternative and \mathbb{T} -conjugate factorization can be obtained by complex conjugating both Φ_1 and Φ_2 (or equivalently by reversing the sign in eqn. (3.34)). The construction that we will make based on factoring $(-1)^{\mathcal{J}}$ as $\Phi_1\Phi_2$ has the advantage of giving a concise description of the low energy physics, but it has the drawback of somewhat hiding the \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{CT} symmetry.

4 A Topological Field Theory For The Low Energy Physics

In this section we study the low energy behavior of our model of section 3.1 and then we generalize it. Clearly, since the system is gapped, the low energy description is a topological field theory. This theory should exhibit all the symmetries of the system. These include time-reversal and charge conjugation as well as $U(1)_A$. Also, the topological theory should exhibit the same anomalies as the microscopic theory. Finally, since the microscopic theory can be placed on a spin_c manifold, the low energy theory should have the same property.

As we will see, it will be convenient to describe the topological field theory as having two sectors, coupled in a certain way. This separation into two sectors makes it easy to analyze the model, though it obscures some of the global symmetries, in particular \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{CT} .

One way to understand the two sectors is to look at the partition function (3.38) and its discussion in section 3.6.4. One sector, which we will discuss in section 4.1, leads to $\Phi_2 = \exp(-I_{\text{top}}) = \exp\left(i\pi \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{G}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{G}{2\pi}\right)\right)$ with $G = F + 2sf = d(A + 2sa)$. The other sector, which we will add in section 4.2, leads to $\Phi_1 = \exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$.

In this section we will describe the TQFT of the system. We will suppress the gravitational interactions and will focus on the gauge theory.

4.1 The Abelian Sector

In the models of section 3.1, the expectation value of ϕ breaks the $U(1)_a$ gauge symmetry to \mathbf{Z}_{4s} . Therefore, our low energy theory should include a \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory. One way to describe \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory is to replace the Higgs mechanism of ϕ by a Lagrange multiplier $U(1)$ gauge field c with the coupling [63, 64]

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}cd(4sa + 2A) . \tag{4.1}$$

The equation of motion of c states that $4sa + 2A$ is a trivial gauge field. Its field strength $d(4sa + 2A)$ vanishes and its periods are trivial. This does not mean that a is a trivial gauge

field. Instead, we can shift a by a \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge field and still satisfy these constraints. Therefore, the dynamical part of a is a \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge field.²⁹

Next, we integrate out χ . As we said, we are going to separate the expressions in section 3.6 into $\Phi_1 = \exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$ (which we will discuss in section 4.2) and $\Phi_2 = \exp(-I_{\text{top}}) = \exp\left(i\pi \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{G}{2\pi} \wedge \frac{G}{2\pi}\right)\right)$. Ignoring the gravitational term $\widehat{A}(R)$, Φ_2 corresponds to Abelian Chern-Simons couplings:

$$\frac{1}{8\pi}(2sa + A)d(2sa + A) = \frac{2s^2}{4\pi}ada + \frac{s}{2\pi}Ada + \frac{1}{8\pi}AdA + d(\dots) . \quad (4.2)$$

As expected, the AdA term is not properly normalized to be a purely three-dimensional term. This reflects the need to attach the system to the 3+1-dimensional bulk. The ada term deforms the \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory in eqn. (4.1). It makes it a Dijkgraaf-Witten theory [65] with $k = 2s^2$ (see Appendix C.3). The adA term is properly normalized. But since k is always even, the model satisfies the spin/charge relation only for even s .³⁰

Let us analyze the theory based on the sum of equations (4.1) and (4.2):

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}cd(4sa + 2A) + \frac{1}{8\pi}(2sa + A)d(2sa + A) = \frac{1}{8\pi}(8c + 2sa + A)d(2sa + A) . \quad (4.3)$$

The observables in this theory are Wilson lines

$$W_{n_a, n_c} = e^{in_a \oint a + in_c \oint c} . \quad (4.4)$$

They are generated by

$$W_{1,0} = e^{i \oint a} \quad , \quad W_{0,1} = e^{i \oint c} . \quad (4.5)$$

The equations of motion of a and c lead to the relations

$$\begin{aligned} W_{1,0}^{4s} &= e^{4is \oint a} = e^{-2i \oint A} \\ W_{0,1}^{4s} &= e^{4is \oint c} = 1 , \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where we used the fact that s is even. This means that we can restrict to $n_a, n_c = 0, \pm 1, \dots, \pm(2s-1), 2s$. It is also straightforward to find the spins of these lines

$$S_{n_a, n_c} = \left(\frac{n_a n_c}{4s} - \frac{n_c^2}{16} \right) \pmod{1} . \quad (4.7)$$

²⁹The Lagrangian of eqn. (4.1) can also be understood by starting with the microscopic field $\phi = |\phi|e^{i\varphi}$ and considering the effective Lagrangian of the gauge mode φ . The field c is dual to the compact scalar φ .

³⁰ Here we see another perspective on the spin/charge anomaly we discussed in section 3.2. When s is odd we can restore the spin/charge relation in the low energy theory by adding to it an odd multiple of $\frac{1}{2\pi}adA$. One way to do it is to add this term to the microscopic theory with χ . This would restore the relation and would allow A to be a spin_c connection. But since this term violates T , we do not do that. This is the hallmark of an anomaly. The classical theory preserves T and satisfies the spin/charge relation, but the quantum theory cannot have both. It either preserves T , or satisfies the spin/charge relation.

4.2 Adding The Non-Abelian Sector

The Abelian model of eqn. (4.3) cannot be the whole story. It ignores the factor $\Phi_1 = \exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$ in the partition function and it does not capture the results about the vortices and the non-Abelian statistics of the quasiparticles that we discussed in sections 3.4 and 3.5.

Here we add another sector to account for these issues. As explained in section 3.6.4, this should be a topological theory, which we can refer to as the “Ising system.” It has three line observables W_1 , W_σ , and W_ψ , whose spins are 0, $\frac{1}{16}$, and $\frac{1}{2}$ respectively. These lines have the standard non-Abelian statistics of the Ising model.

As a first attempt in coupling the two systems, we do the following. The Abelian theory (4.3) is a \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory. This means that $2sa + A$ is a \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field. (More precisely, it can be a spin_c connection.) It is subject to the Dijkgraaf-Witten term and the coupling to A (4.2). The same \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field appears in the argument of η . So our action is the sum of the Abelian \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory and $-\frac{\pi}{2}\eta(2sa + A)$.

Let us first assume that the two factors are decoupled and consider the theory of each of them separately. Above we describes the Abelian sector in terms of two $U(1)$ gauge fields a and c (4.3). We could try to do it for also for $-\frac{\pi}{2}\eta(2sa + A)$, introducing two $U(1)$ gauge fields x, y with “action”

$$-\frac{\pi}{2}\eta(x) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int 2ydx . \quad (4.8)$$

This is not really a sensible action in the usual sense, because $\frac{\pi}{2}\eta(x)$ is not continuous mod 2π when its argument is a $U(1)$ rather than \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field. However, this “action” does lead to a sensible path integral which moreover reproduces the Ising TQFT, because after performing the integral over y , x is constrained to be a \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field, and then the integral over x reduces to the sum over spin structures of $\exp(-i\pi\eta/2)$.

Next, we consider the sum of equations (4.3) and (4.8)

$$-\frac{\pi}{2}\eta(x) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int 2ydx + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int (8c + 2sa + A)d(2sa + A) . \quad (4.9)$$

In order to identify $x = 2sa + A$, we mod out the $U(1)_c \times U(1)_y$ gauge group by a \mathbf{Z}_2 that acts on the two factors. The quotient can be chosen so that y and c are no longer good gauge fields but $\tilde{c} = 2c$ and $\tilde{y} = y + c$ are good $U(1)$ gauge fields. In terms of them, the action becomes

$$-\frac{\pi}{2}\eta(x) + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int (2\tilde{y} - \tilde{c})dx + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int (4\tilde{c} + 2sa + A)d(2sa + A) . \quad (4.10)$$

Now, the equation of motion of \tilde{c} sets $x = 2sa + A$ (up to a gauge transformation) and we end up with the desired result

$$-\frac{\pi}{2}\eta(2sa + A) + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int (8\tilde{y} + 2sa + A)d(2sa + A), \quad (4.11)$$

with the same gauge field $2sa + A$ in both the Ising and Abelian sectors. In section 4.4 we will present another action for this system in terms of a Chern-Simons theory of a continuous group without the problem of the first term in (4.11) not being a good action off-shell. But for now, we take a simple lesson from this exercise. The model that we are trying to understand can be

constructed by coupling the Abelian sector to an Ising system and dividing by a \mathbf{Z}_2 which acts simultaneously on c and on the Ising sector.

The operation of taking a \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient of the product of the Abelian sector and the Ising system can be described in many different ways. From the RCFT point of view, taking the quotient amounts [66] to extending the chiral algebra by the operator associated with $E = W_{2s,0}W_\psi$. From the TQFT point of view, this can be described as gauging a \mathbf{Z}_2 global one-form symmetry that acts on the two sectors [61, 62]. From the Chern-Simons gauge theory perspective the quotient is obtained [67] by dividing the gauge group by \mathbf{Z}_2 , as we have done in the above derivation.

Gauging the one-form symmetry amounts to projecting on lines that have trivial braiding with $E = W_{2s,0}W_\psi$, thus making it a “transparent line.” (The line operators with trivial braiding with E are the ones that in the above derivation can be written in terms of \tilde{c} and \tilde{y} rather than c and y .) The line observables of the system are restricted to be

$$\begin{aligned} W_{n_a, n_c} & n_c \text{ even} \\ W_{n_a, n_c} W_\psi & n_c \text{ even} \\ W_{n_a, n_c} W_\sigma & n_c \text{ odd,} \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

with spins

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{n_a n_c}{4s} - \frac{n_c^2}{16} \right) & \text{ mod } 1 \\ \left(\frac{n_a n_c}{4s} - \frac{n_c^2}{16} + \frac{1}{2} \right) & \text{ mod } 1 \\ \left(\frac{n_a n_c}{4s} - \frac{n_c^2}{16} + \frac{1}{16} \right) & \text{ mod } 1, \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

respectively.

Every one of these lines represents a quasiparticle of our system. Let us compare this description of the quasiparticles to the discussion in section 3.5. First, it is clear that the line $W_{1,0}$ represents the elementary w quanta. More generally, the integer n_a represents the $U(1)_a$ charge denoted by \mathbf{k} . The relation $W_{1,0}^{4s} = e^{-2i\oint A}$ of eqn. (4.6) means that \mathbf{k} is conserved modulo $4s$. Also, the classical object $e^{-2i\oint A}$ in the right hand side has a simple physical interpretation. The field ϕ has $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ charges $(2, 4s)$. Its condensation means that the corresponding line $W_{1,0}^{4s} e^{2i\oint A}$ has trivial correlation functions and can be replaced by the unit operator.

The fundamental fermion χ is represented by W_ψ . The Ising relation $W_\psi^2 = 1$ corresponds to $\chi^2 = 1$ in eqn. (3.29). It is consistent with the fact that χ^2 has the same charges as ϕ , which condensed. The transparent line $E = W_{2s,0}W_\psi$, which we used in the \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient, is related to the underlying electron (compare with the relation $\bar{w}^{2s}\chi = e$ in eqn. (3.29)). Note that this line cannot be set to 1. As it represents the electron, it has half-integer spin and as such it is not trivial. Yet, its trivial braiding reflects the fact that the electron can leave the $2+1$ -dimensional boundary and move into the $3+1$ -dimensional bulk.

Next, we identify the vorticity as $\mathbf{v} = n_c$. A justification of this is that in the theory (4.3), an insertion of the line operator $\exp(i\mathbf{v}\oint c)$ causes a monodromy of a that would be expected for vorticity \mathbf{v} . For nonzero values of $\mathbf{v} = n_c$ we recover the spectrum of quasiparticles above. For example, the basic vortex corresponds to $W_{0,1}W_\sigma$, whose spin vanishes (see eqn. (4.13)).

Two such vortices can fuse in two possible channels, namely $W_{0,2}$ and $W_{0,2}W_\psi$, and therefore we have non-Abelian statistics. These two lines represent $\mathbf{v} = 2$ vortices. Since the spins of these two lines are $\pm\frac{1}{4}$, the eigenvalues of the braiding matrix are $e^{i\pi(2\cdot 0 \pm \frac{1}{4})} = e^{\pm i\pi/4}$, as we found in section 3.5. Similarly, the vorticity $\mathbf{v} = 3$ line $W_{0,3}W_\sigma$ has spin $\frac{1}{2} \pmod 1$. Two such vortices can fuse to the two quasiparticles $W_{0,6}$ and $W_{0,6}W_\psi$, whose spins are $\pm\frac{1}{4}$. Therefore, the eigenvalues of the braiding matrix of two $\mathbf{v} = 3$ vortices are $e^{i\pi(2\cdot\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{4})} = e^{\pm 3i\pi/4}$.

We can also add elementary quanta to the vortices. Adding χ is represented by attaching W_ψ to the lines. For odd \mathbf{v} this is trivial, because of the Ising fusion rule $\psi \times \sigma = \sigma$. This is consistent with the statement above and in section 3.5 that for odd \mathbf{v} there is only a single state. For even \mathbf{v} , this maps $W_{0,\mathbf{v}} \leftrightarrow W_{0,\mathbf{v}}W_\psi$, i.e. it maps between the two states of the vortex. We can also add k w quanta to the vortex by changing $n_a \rightarrow n_a + k$. This shifts the spin of the line by $k\nu/4s \pmod 1$ (see eqn. (4.13)), exactly as expected.

Next, we would like to identify the action of the unbroken \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory on the lines. Naively, we might expect the \mathbf{Z}_{4s} generator \mathbf{K} to be a one-form global symmetry and we can attempt to identify it with $e^{i\oint c}$. This cannot be right, because the line $e^{i\oint c}$ was projected out by the quotient and the line $W_\sigma e^{i\oint c}$ cannot be used as a one-form generator, because its fusion is non-Abelian. Although we can identify $\mathbf{K}^2 = e^{2i\oint c}$ or $\mathbf{K}^2 = W_\psi e^{2i\oint c}$, it seems that we cannot identify \mathbf{K} in the TQFT. This should not be too surprising, since we have seen in section 3.5 that \mathbf{K} can be defined in the even vorticity sectors, but only even powers of \mathbf{K} can be defined in the odd vorticity sectors.

Finally, let us discuss the action of the discrete symmetries. The charge conjugation symmetry \mathbf{C} acts as

$$\mathbf{C}(a) = -a \quad , \quad \mathbf{C}(c) = -c \quad , \quad \mathbf{C}(A) = -A \quad (4.14)$$

and it is manifestly a symmetry of our system. Time-reversal is more subtle. From the discussion in section 3, it is clear that time-reversal changes the direction of time but also acts on the gauge fields as³¹

$$\mathbf{T}(a) = -a \quad , \quad \mathbf{T}(c) = c \quad , \quad \mathbf{T}(A) = -A \quad (4.15)$$

This is a symmetry of the cda term in the action, and it is also a symmetry of the remaining Abelian part of the action together with the eta-invariant (the product of those terms, or rather of their exponentials, is the time-reversal invariant expression $(-1)^J$).

Because of the choice of sign that went into factoring the model in terms of an Abelian sector times a non-Abelian one, time-reversal symmetry is not manifest in our presentation. But the spectrum of quasiparticles that we have found is clearly \mathbf{T} -invariant.

Given that s should be even, the simplest TQFT that arises from this construction has $s = 2$. Precisely this model was constructed³² in [25], where it was called T_{96} . Using a procedure known as ‘‘anyon condensation,’’ these authors also constructed another model from it, with fewer quasiparticles. This procedure does not result from any weakly coupled dynamics. In section 4.3, we will present a weakly coupled theory that leads at long distances to that model. But for the time being we would like to describe their procedure using another language.

³¹ We use an abbreviated notation for the action time-reversal that was described in section 2.1.

³²If one sets $b = c + a$, then the abelian action (4.3) for $s = 2$ becomes $\frac{1}{4\pi}(8bdb - 8cdc) + \frac{1}{2\pi}(2Adb)$, which is $U(1)_8 \times U(1)_{-8}$ with a specific coupling of A , as in [25].




Figure 4: A magnetic monopole penetrates a topological insulator. Its world-line is represented by an 't Hooft line (the solid line). It penetrates the topological insulator at the red point. It continues as an 't Hooft line (the dashed line) inside the material, now with electric charge $\pm 1/2$, and leaves behind a quasiparticle described by the dotted line on the surface. Here time flows upward and we depicted only 2 out of the 3 dimensions of the bulk.

The “anyon condensation” procedure amounts to modding out the gauge group by a discrete subgroup. In our case, the Abelian sector has a $U(1)_a \times U(1)_c$ gauge symmetry and we turn it into $(U(1)_a \times U(1)_c)/\mathbf{Z}_2$. We implement the quotient by expressing the Lagrangian in terms of the fields $a' = 2a$ and $c' = c + a$ and view them as good $U(1)$ gauge fields, while a and c are not. This turns equation (4.3) with $s = 2$ into

$$\frac{1}{8\pi}(8c' - 2a' + A)d(2a' + A) . \quad (4.16)$$

This theory has $k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 4 \\ 4 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $q = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. This is a \mathbf{Z}_4 gauge theory with $k = -2$ and it satisfies the spin/charge relation. This is precisely the minimal model of [25] and [28].³³

We will end this subsection by describing an interesting phenomenon. As in [19, 38, 39], let us consider taking a magnetic monopole of unit magnetic charge from outside the material through the boundary into the material. Outside the material, the monopole has vanishing electric charge; inside the material, because of the Witten effect, it has electric charge $\pm \frac{1}{2}$. It is

³³One way of thinking about this quotient is by identifying a one-form global symmetry of the original theory and then gauging it. What we did here is to gauge the global symmetry that shifts $a \rightarrow a + \zeta$ simultaneously with $c \rightarrow c + \zeta$ with the same \mathbf{Z}_2 connection ζ . The theory also has a \mathbf{Z}_2 one-form global symmetry that shifts only $a \rightarrow a + \zeta$. Gauging this symmetry leads to the theory with $s = 1$ in equation (4.3), but as we remarked there, this would violate the spin/charge relation. The conflict between gauging this \mathbf{Z}_2 one-form symmetry (as opposed to the one that acts both on a and on c) and the spin/charge relation can be interpreted as a mixed 't Hooft anomaly between them.

expected that the charge is compensated by leaving charge $\mp \frac{1}{2}$ on the surface of the material. In a gapless phase, such electric charge can be deposited on the surface using the charged massless fermions there (this depends on zero-modes that the fermions develop in the presence of a unit of magnetic flux). But how does it happen in the gapped phase? The world-line of the magnetic monopole is an 't Hooft line. It is characterized by having nonzero flux through an S^2 that surrounds it: $\int_{S^2} F = 2\pi$. This fact has interesting consequences at the point p where the 't Hooft line penetrates the material (the red dot in figure 4). Momentarily ignoring possible production of quasiparticles, the equation of motion of c sets on the boundary $2sda + dA = 0$, forcing da to be nonzero near p . Consider a Euclidean S^2 in the surface that surrounds the point p . Assuming that $2sda + dA = 0$ on the S^2 , we have $\int_{S^2} da = -\frac{1}{2s} \int_{S^2} dA = -\frac{2\pi}{2s}$, which is not properly quantized. This means that there must be a quasiparticle worldline intersecting the surface and contributing a singularity $da = \frac{2\pi}{2s}\delta$, with δ a delta function. With this delta function, the integral $\int_{S^2} da$ vanishes. The interpretation is that a quasiparticle is emitted from p . Its world-line is described by a line operator that ends at p . More explicitly, this singularity is produced by a line operator whose dependence on c is a factor of $\exp(-2i \int c)$; i.e. this line operator describes a quasiparticle with vorticity $\mathbf{v} = -2$. We would also like the flux integral $\int_{S^2} dc$ to vanish. Using the equations of motion, this means that the line W should include a factor of $\exp(-si \int a)$, i.e. the vortex has s quanta of \bar{w} . Since \bar{w} has electric charge $1/2s$, this accounts for the expected deposition in the surface of electric charge $1/2$. We conclude that $W = W_{-s,-2}$ in the notation of eqn. (4.12); the red dot in figure 4 represents an operator in the TQFT on which such a line can end. We can also discuss the CT image of this picture. Here the emitted line is $W_{s,-2}W_\psi$. It differs from the previous case by an electron line $E = W_{2s,0}W_\psi$. This electron line continues in the bulk along the monopole line (the dashed line) and changes the sign of its electric charge.

4.3 More General Models

More general models can be studied in a similar way. For example, let us generalize the model introduced in section 3.1 by adding pairs of fermions χ'_i and χ''_i with $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ charges $(1, 2s + n_i)$ and $(1, 2s - n_i)$ with $n_i \in \mathbf{Z}$. Without loss of generality, we take all $n_i > 0$. These charges have been chosen to be compatible with the spin/charge relation and to allow T - and CT -preserving couplings of the form

$$\bar{\phi}\chi'_i\chi''_i + \bar{w}^{n_i}\bar{\chi}\chi'_i + w^{n_i}\bar{\chi}\chi''_i + \text{h.c.} \quad (4.17)$$

(see section 5.2 for details on this and various statements that follow). In the phase with $\langle w \rangle \neq 0$, $\langle \phi \rangle = 0$, all fermions except one linear combination are lifted by the coupling to w and we remain with the standard boundary state of a topological insulator. We are interested in the other phase with $\langle w \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$.

As above, let us first analyze the Abelian sector. Now, eqn. (4.3) is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\pi} \text{cd}(4sa + 2A) + \frac{1}{8\pi} (2sa + A) \text{d}(2sa + A) \\ & + \frac{1}{8\pi} \sum_i \left[((2s + n_i)a + A) \text{d}((2s + n_i)a + A) - ((2s - n_i)a + A) \text{d}((2s - n_i)a + A) \right] \\ & = \frac{1}{8\pi} \left(8c + 2(s + 2n)a + A \right) \text{d}(2sa + A) + \text{d}(\dots). \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

On the left hand side, the first term describes the unbroken \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory, the second term represents the contribution of χ , and the terms with the sum represent the contribution of the other fermions. (We explain in section 5.2 that the minus sign in the sum is needed if one wants a formalism without additional eta-invariants.) The right hand side depends only on $n = \sum_i n_i$. This Abelian topological field theory is characterized by a k -matrix and charge vector

$$k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 4s \\ 4s & 2s(s+2n) \end{pmatrix}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ s+n \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.19)$$

We again find a spin/charge anomaly. The classical system satisfies this relation, but the quantum theory satisfies it only when $s+n$ is even.

As in the original model with χ only, we should add the non-Abelian sector associated with η , which can be represented by the Ising topological field theory and a \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient.

As above, \mathbf{C} acts as in eqn. (4.14) and it is a manifest symmetry of our system. As usual, time-reversal is more subtle. We still take T to reverse the time and to act as $a \rightarrow -a$, $A \rightarrow -A$, but the action on c should be

$$T: \quad c \rightarrow c + na. \quad (4.20)$$

To see that this is a symmetry, recall from section 4.2 that the Ising sector together with the Lagrangian of equation (4.3) are invariant under a time-reversal transformation that acts as $c \rightarrow c$. The action of the more general model eqn. (4.18) differs from that of the special case (4.3) only by an extra term proportional to na ; the term na in eqn. (4.20) was chosen to compensate for the transformation under T of that term.

In general, different microscopic theories can lead to the same macroscopic topological theory. We have already seen that a macroscopic description of this class of models depends only on n and not on the individual n_i . Additional identifications can be found using the freedom to shift c . Since we need $n+s$ to be even, we can shift $c \rightarrow c - \frac{n+s}{2}a$ and write equations (4.18) and (4.19) as

$$\frac{1}{8\pi} (8c - 2sa + A) d(2sa + A) \quad (4.21)$$

$$k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 4s \\ 4s & -2s^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For even s , this effective action is equivalent to that of equation (4.3). (Shift $c \rightarrow c - \frac{s}{2}a$ in equation (4.3) to find equation (4.21).) But here we can find a model also with odd s . In these variables the T symmetry transformation (4.20) becomes

$$T(c) = c - sa. \quad (4.22)$$

Note that a microscopic theory with even n (including the original model without χ'_i and χ''_i) needs even s and a microscopic theory with odd n needs odd s . Yet the resulting macroscopic theories can be described uniformly (eqn. 4.21).

Can there be other models that lead to additional low energy topological field theories? We can start with $U(1)_A$ and some other emergent gauge symmetry with some fermions and scalars. For simplicity, let us limit the search to models associated with a $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ gauge symmetry (i.e., with only a single emergent gauge field $U(1)_a$) and ϕ with charges $(2l, m)$, where the $U(1)_A$ charge of ϕ has to be even in order to preserve the spin/charge relation. We also

allow arbitrary fermions with various charges such there is no anomaly associated with $U(1)_a$ and the spin/charge relation of $U(1)_A$ is satisfied. The most general Abelian sector resulting from such a theory can be written as a sum of $\frac{1}{2\pi}cd(ma + 2lA)$ and a linear combination of terms of the form ada , Ada , and AdA .

Next we impose time-reversal. For that we need to know which \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field the Ising sector couples to. So far, it has been $A + 2sa$. Here we take it to be more generally $lA + \frac{m}{2}a$ (and hence m must be even). The motivation for this choice is that an expectation value of ϕ turns this combination into a \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field. Clearly, other options are also possible. We generalize the action of T to include $c \rightarrow c + ra + 2pA$ with $r, p \in \mathbf{Z}$. Using the fact that the Ising system plus equation (4.3) is T -invariant with $c \rightarrow c$, we learn that $m = 4s$ with $s \in \mathbf{Z}$, and that the Lagrangian should be

$$\frac{1}{8\pi}(8c + 4(ra + 2pA) + 2sa + lA)d(2sa + lA). \quad (4.23)$$

If we want anomalous time-reversal symmetry (which means that the coefficient of $AdA/4\pi$ should be a half-integer), then l should be odd. Using this fact, the spin/charge relation sets $r = s \pmod{2}$. This allows us to redefine $c \rightarrow c - \frac{r+s}{2}a$ and to turn eqn. (4.23) to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{8\pi}(8c - 2sa + (l + 8p)A)d(2sa + lA) \\ k &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 4s \\ 4s & -2s^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} 2l \\ 4sp \end{pmatrix}, \\ T &: c \rightarrow c - sa + 2pA. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

By shifting c and a by integer multiples of $2A$ and possibly reversing the signs of c and a , we can limit ourselves to

$$p = 0, 1, \quad l = 1, 3, \dots, 2s - 1, \quad s > 0. \quad (4.25)$$

The AdA interaction is

$$\frac{k_c}{4\pi}AdA, \quad k_c = 4pl + \frac{1}{2}l^2. \quad (4.26)$$

Since l is odd, it follows that

$$k_c \cong \frac{1}{2} \pmod{4}. \quad (4.27)$$

This conclusion does not depend on the specific set of fields that we used, since as observed in section 2.3, k_c is invariant mod 8 if a and c are shifted by even integer multiples of A .

The congruence (4.27) can actually be understood based on matters that are explained in section 2.3 and Appendices A.2 and A.3. Let us first consider a conventional topological insulator, whose bulk action, in the notation of Appendix A.2, has $\theta_1 = \pi$ and $\theta_2 = 0$. Thus the bulk action is $\pi I_1 = \pi \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} \right)$. In addition to this bulk action, there may be boundary contributions in the effective action. These boundary terms must be properly normalized three-dimensional Chern-Simons couplings. The coupling πI_1 has a metric-dependence because of the $\widehat{A}(R)$ term. However, this metric dependence is just right to cancel the metric dependence of the term $-\pi\eta/2$ in the effective action; this is ensured by the APS index theorem. This

cancellation is a consequence of time-reversal symmetry (without which the partition function of a gapped boundary state can depend on the boundary metric, via the framing anomaly of 3d TQFT). Accordingly, any additional boundary contributions to the effective action must be independent of the metric and can only depend on A and a . In particular, as explained in section 2.3 and Appendix A.3, for a spin_c connection A , a properly normalized Chern-Simons coupling of the form $\text{Ad}A$ must be an integer multiple of $(8/4\pi) \int \text{Ad}A$; in other words it must contribute to k_c an integer multiple of 8.

Based on this, it might seem that k_c should be congruent to $1/2 \pmod 8$. However, we should also consider the possibility described in Appendix A.2 of a material with $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \pi$. Such a material is not a standard topological insulator, but something more exotic. The coupling πI_2 contributes 4 to the effective value of k_c . The boundary Chern-Simons couplings will still contribute a multiple of 8. So a material with $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \pi$ will have a boundary state with $k_c \cong 9/2 \pmod 8$.

This reasoning explains the result found in eqn. (4.27), and also enables us to understand which of our models are boundary states for a conventional topological insulator and which are appropriate for an exotic material with $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \pi$. For $(p, l) = (0, \pm 1 \pmod 8)$ or $(1, \pm 3 \pmod 8)$, we get $k_c \cong 1/2 \pmod 8$, so these models correspond to the conventional topological insulator. For $(p, l) = (0, \pm 3 \pmod 8)$ or $(1, \pm 1 \pmod 8)$, we get $k_c \cong 9/2 \pmod 8$, so these correspond to the more exotic case $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (\pi, \pi)$.

A microscopic construction of the models with $(p, l) = (0, 1)$ was given above. Other values of (p, l) can also be found. For example, rescaling all the $U(1)_A$ charges in the models above by l , we can construct the low energy theory with $p = 0$ and arbitrary l . Another option is to start with ϕ and χ with $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ charges $(2l, 4s)$, $(3l, 6s)$ with coupling $\overline{\phi}^3 \chi \chi$. For s even this leads to the effective theory (4.24) with $p = 1$ and arbitrary l .

We conclude that a large class of microscopic models leads at long distances to the same theory (4.24), which is labeled by $s \in \mathbf{Z}$ and the integers (p, l) as in eqn. (4.25). As we said above, by enlarging the emergent gauge symmetry $U(1)_a$ and by adding several ϕ -like fields, many additional models can be constructed.

Finally, we would like to show that (as remarked at the end of section 4.2) our simplest topological field theory parameterized by $s = l = 1$, $p = 0$ describes the minimal model of [25] and [28]. To see that, substitute $s = l = 1$, $p = 0$, and $a = b + 2c$ in eqn. (4.24) to find³⁴

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{8}{4\pi}cdc - \frac{2}{4\pi}bdb + \frac{2}{2\pi}Adc + \frac{1}{8\pi}AdA \\ \mathcal{T}(b) = -b \\ \mathcal{T}(c) = c + b . \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

This is a $U(1)_8 \times U(1)_{-2}$ theory with only the $U(1)_8$ field c coupled to A , as in [25] and [28]. Surprisingly, our simplest microscopic models with a single χ field lead to more complicated low-energy theories (or at least low-energy theories with more quasiparticles), because they need even s . And we derive the simplest topological theory (4.28) using a more complicated microscopic model with at least three fermions.

For $s = 1$, the model just described is the only one in the family (4.24) that obeys the appropriate congruence conditions for a standard topological insulator. For $s = 2$, there are

³⁴Since the coefficient for c in this redefinition is even, this change of variables does not affect the \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient in section 4.2.

two possibilities: $l = 1, p = 0$, or $l = 3, p = 1$. These models both have abelian sectors $U(1)_8 \times U(1)_{-8}$ (with different couplings to A) and as noted in section 4.2, the $l = 1$ model is the model T_{96} of [25].

4.4 An Explicit Chern-Simons Lagrangian for the Whole System

Here we give an explicit local Lagrangian that combines the Abelian and non-Abelian sectors in the above analysis and describes the whole system. The Abelian \mathbf{Z}_{4s} sector is represented by the $U(1)_a \times U(1)_c$ gauge theory (4.24). The Ising system can be viewed as a coset theory $\frac{SU(2)_2}{U(1)_4}$ [68]. Such a coset can be described [67] by an $\frac{SU(2)_2 \times U(1)_{-4}}{\mathbf{Z}_2}$ Chern-Simons gauge theory with action

$$\frac{2}{4\pi} \text{Tr} (udu + \frac{2}{3}u^3) - \frac{2}{4\pi} (\text{Tr } u) d(\text{Tr } u) , \quad (4.29)$$

where u is a gauge field of $U(2) = (SU(2) \times U(1))/\mathbf{Z}_2$. (See Appendix C for more details.) The overall sign of these terms is related to the orientation of the Ising system and was set to agree with the discussion of our microscopic models. Note that even though eqn. (4.29) describes the chiral Ising model, i.e. the theory of a free 2d fermion, this Chern-Simons theory does not require a spin structure (see the discussion of eqn. (C.17)). In the language of section 3.6.4, it describes the Ising TQFT, not the Ising spin-TQFT.

The \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient of the $U(1)_a \times U(1)_c$ gauge group in eqn. (4.24) and the $U(2)$ gauge theory in eqn. (4.29) acts on the gauge fields $\text{Tr } u$ and c . Instead of considering the quotient with its additional bundles, we can change variables to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u} &= u - c\mathbf{I} \\ e &= (\text{Tr } u) - 2sa - (l-1)A . \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

Here \tilde{u} and e are standard $U(2)$ and $U(1)$ gauge fields with no additional quotient. The shift by the terms linear in a and $2A$ is for convenience. This turns the sum of equations (4.24) and (4.29) to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{2}{4\pi} \text{Tr} (\tilde{u}d\tilde{u} + \frac{2}{3}\tilde{u}^3) - \frac{1}{4\pi} (\text{Tr } \tilde{u}) d(\text{Tr } \tilde{u}) - \frac{1}{4\pi} (e - A) d(e - A) \\ &+ \frac{1}{8\pi} \left(-4\text{Tr } \tilde{u} + (8p + 3l)A + 2sa \right) d(2sa + lA) . \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

The field e describes a decoupled trivial $U(1)_{-1}$ theory and we included A in its coupling to make the spin/charge relation manifest. It is easy to check that the first two terms in eqn. (4.31) depend only on the traceless part of \tilde{u} ; i.e. the field $\text{Tr } \tilde{u}$ does not have a quadratic kinetic term. This part of the theory can be viewed as $U(2)_{2,0}$. (Note that this theory is spin, but the coupling to A is such that A can be a spin_c connection.) $\text{Tr } \tilde{u}$ is a Lagrange multiplier implementing $d(2sa + lA) = 0$. It leaves an unbroken $\mathbf{Z}_{4s} \subset U(1)$, whose gauge field is a . This \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory has $k = 2s^2$. Since e decouples, the whole system is effectively $\left(SU(2)_2 \times (\mathbf{Z}_{4s})_{k=2s^2} \right) / \mathbf{Z}_2$. It is straightforward to check that this simpler theory leads to the correct spectrum of lines.

5 Some Additional Topics

In this section, we describe a very simple \mathbb{T} -invariant topological field theory and provide some more detail on models were described in section 4.

5.1 $U(1)_2 \times U(1)_{-1}$

We consider a $U(1)_2 \times U(1)_{-1}$ Chern-Simons gauge theory with the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{2}{4\pi}ada - \frac{1}{4\pi}bdb . \quad (5.1)$$

This theory gives an explicit realization of the semion-fermion theory of [69], denoted SF. It has four non-trivial lines generated by $W_{1,0} = \exp(i \oint a)$ and $W_{0,1} = \exp(i \oint b)$ (see Appendix C), whose spins modulo 1 are $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$, respectively. In the language of [69], $W_{1,0}$ is the semion s and $W_{0,1}$ is the fermion f . The lines satisfy $W_{1,0}^2 = W_{0,1}^2 = 1$. It is easy to check that this theory is \mathbb{T} -invariant under

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}(a) &= a - b \\ \mathbb{T}(b) &= -b + 2a . \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

The action on the lines is

$$\mathbb{T} : W_{1,0} \longleftrightarrow W_{1,0}W_{0,1} , \quad (5.3)$$

which is consistent with the reversal of the spin under \mathbb{T} . (Recall that in a TQFT only the spin modulo 1 is meaningful.) In the semion-fermion language, eqn. (5.3) means that \mathbb{T} exchanges s and sf .

The square of the transformation (5.2) is the charge conjugation transformation $a \rightarrow -a$ and $b \rightarrow -b$. In that sense, this is not like ordinary time-reversal. But on-shell, since $a \sim -a$ and $b \sim -b$, this fact is insignificant and $\mathbb{T}^2 = 1$. (The fact that $\mathbb{T}^2 \neq 1$ off-shell means that we do not know how to formulate this theory on an unorientable three-manifold, which raises the possibility that there might be an anomaly in doing so. See section 6.2.)

We couple the system to a background $U(1)_A$ gauge field A via

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{2}{4\pi}ada - \frac{1}{4\pi}bdb + \frac{1}{2\pi}AdA . \quad (5.4)$$

Then $W_{1,0}$ represents the world line of a quasiparticle with $U(1)_A$ charge $\frac{1}{2}$. With nonzero A , we replace the transformations (5.2) by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}(a) &= a - b + A \\ \mathbb{T}(b) &= -b + 2a + A . \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

We combine this with the usual $\mathbb{T}(A) = -A$. Under this time-reversal transformation, the theory based on (5.4) is invariant, provided we add to the Lagrangian $\frac{1}{8\pi}AdA$. As in our previous examples, we see that this theory is \mathbb{T} -invariant with the same anomaly as a topological insulator; it is \mathbb{T} -invariant when coupled to a 3 + 1-dimensional bulk with $\theta = \pi$.

Both the coupling of A in the Lagrangian (5.4) and the transformation laws (5.5) are incompatible with the spin/charge relation. Therefore, the theory needs a spin structure. A

must be a $U(1)$ gauge field rather than a spin_c connection. More generally, the original theory (5.1) needs a spin structure. It can be coupled to a spin_c connection A by adding to it $\frac{1}{2\pi}Adb$ (rather than $\frac{1}{2\pi}Ada$, as in eqn. (5.4)), but then the \mathbb{T} transformation (5.2) cannot be extended to nonzero A .

To explore this theory further, let us set $A = 0$ and place it on a spatial torus T^2 and choose a basis of one-cycles labeled by a, b and a spin structure labeled in an obvious way by $s_{a,b} = \pm 1$. The Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of our theory is two-dimensional, since $U(1)_2$ has two states on T^2 and $U(1)_{-1}$ (for any spin structure) has only one. A line operator wrapping a 1-cycle in T^2 gives an operator that acts on \mathcal{H} , and in a suitable basis we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_{1,0}^a &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} & W_{1,0}^b &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ W_{0,1}^a &= -s_a \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & W_{0,1}^b &= -s_b \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

This action of $W_{1,0}$ is standard and follows (up to a choice of basis) from the fact that $W_{1,0}^2 = 1$ and $\{W_{1,0}^a, W_{1,0}^b\} = 0$. The form of $W_{0,1}$ around the two cycles was found by recalling that $W_{0,1}$ is the worldline of a spinor and is otherwise trivial.

Time-reversal should act as a 2×2 matrix \mathcal{T} combined with complex conjugation. Because of eqn. (5.3), we should have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^{-1}\mathcal{T}^* &= 1 \\ \mathcal{T}^{-1}W_{1,0}^a\mathcal{T}^* &= -s_a W_{1,0}^a \\ \mathcal{T}^{-1}W_{1,0}^b\mathcal{T}^* &= -s_b W_{1,0}^b. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

We solve these (up to an overall sign) by

$$\mathcal{T} = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -s_b \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } s_a = -1 \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -s_b \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } s_a = 1. \end{cases} \tag{5.8}$$

This satisfies

$$\mathcal{T}^2 = \begin{cases} \mathbf{1} & \text{for } s_a = -1 \\ -s_b \mathbf{1} & \text{for } s_a = 1 \end{cases} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{1} & \text{for even spin structures} \\ -\mathbf{1} & \text{for odd spin structure.} \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

We conclude that the two states are Kramers singlets in the case of an even spin structure (either s_a , or s_b , or both are -1), but form a Kramers doublet for the odd spin structure ($s_a = s_b = 1$).

Despite the difficulty with the spin/charge relation, this model has various potential applications. In eqn. (4.28), we have already encountered $U(1)_2$ (with opposite orientation and without the coupling to A) as a factor in a \mathbb{T} -invariant system that satisfies the spin/charge relation. The semion-fermion theory SF has been used in [69] in studying topological superconductors and we will encounter it in that guise in section 6.1. As another possible application, by multiplying the action (5.4) by 2 (or by any even integer), we get a \mathbb{T} -invariant theory that no longer needs a spin structure and might be a boundary state for the bosonic topological insulators of [32]. (After rescaling the action, \mathbb{T}^2 is still the operation $(a, b) \rightarrow (-a, -b)$, but this is now a nontrivial global symmetry.)

5.2 More On Some Models From Section 4

In section 4.3, we described models that can be constructed by adding additional pairs of Dirac fermion fields to the basic model of section 3.1. Here we will supply some more detail. For brevity we consider the case of adding to the original χ field of $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ charges $(1, 2s)$ a single additional pair χ' and χ'' of charges $(1, 2s + n)$ and $(1, 2s - n)$.

The first question that we want to address is the \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{CT} transformations³⁵ of χ , χ' , and χ'' and the Yukawa couplings that make possible both Higgsing to the standard gapless boundary state and also to the gapped boundary state described in section 4.3.

In general, if $\widehat{\chi}$ is a charged Dirac fermion coupled to A and/or a , then given that A and a transform under \mathbb{T} as in eqn. (2.3), the transformation of $\widehat{\chi}$ under \mathbb{T} is essentially uniquely determined. When $\widehat{\chi}$ is expanded as a sum of two Majorana fermions, one will have to transform under \mathbb{T} with a factor of $+\gamma_0$ and one with a factor of $-\gamma_0$, as in eqn. (2.8); after rotating to the right basis, the transformation of $\widehat{\chi}$ under \mathbb{T} will then be as in eqn. (2.9). By contrast, the two Majorana components of $\widehat{\chi}$ will transform the same way under \mathbb{CT} , and there is a nontrivial choice of whether they will both transform as $+\gamma_0$ (as in eqn. (2.11)) or as $-\gamma_0$. This choice will determine whether $\widehat{\chi}$ contributes $+2$ or -2 to $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$. The contribution of $\widehat{\chi}$ to $\nu_{\mathbb{T}}$ is always 0.

We would like to choose the signs in the \mathbb{CT} transformations of χ , χ' , and χ'' so that Higgsing to the conventional boundary state of a topological insulator will be possible. This means that the signs must be such that the net contribution to $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$ will be $+2$. One might think that the “new” fields χ' and χ'' should make canceling contributions to $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$, and that the $+2$ comes from the original χ field. It turns out, however, that to make possible the Higgsing that we want, χ should contribute -2 and χ' , χ'' contribute $+2$ each.

In one phase, the scalar field w of charges $(0, 1)$ has an expectation value, breaking $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ to $U(1)_A$. After this breaking, χ , χ' , and χ'' are all simply Dirac fermions of ordinary electric charge 1. To reduce to the standard gapless boundary state of a topological insulator, we want w to couple to these fermions in such a way that two linear combinations become massive, leaving only one massless Dirac fermion. In general, let χ_1 and χ_2 be Dirac fermions of charges $(1, p_1)$ and $(1, p_2)$, transforming in the standard way under \mathbb{T} . For definiteness suppose that $p_1 \geq p_2$. Then in the phase with $\langle w \rangle \neq 0$, χ_1 and χ_2 can get a mass from a \mathbb{T} -invariant coupling

$$\int d^3x \sqrt{g} (w^{p_1 - p_2} \bar{\chi}_1 \chi_2 - \bar{w}^{p_1 - p_2} \bar{\chi}_2 \chi_1). \quad (5.10)$$

This is hermitian,³⁶ and each term is separately \mathbb{T} -invariant. The two terms are exchanged by \mathbb{CT} , which is a symmetry if and only if χ_1 and χ_2 transform with opposite signs under \mathbb{CT} .

In the phase with $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$, we want all fermions to get masses by Yukawa couplings to ϕ . The only such couplings allowed by $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ gauge symmetry are $\phi \chi \chi + \text{h.c.}$ and $\phi \chi' \chi'' + \text{h.c.}$ We have already discussed the \mathbb{T} , \mathbb{C} , and therefore also \mathbb{CT} invariance of the former coupling in discussing eqn. (3.8). The same reasoning applies to a similar coupling $\phi \chi' \chi'' + \text{h.c.}$ and shows that it is \mathbb{CT} -invariant if and only if χ' and χ'' transform the same way under \mathbb{CT} .

³⁵We study these symmetries only at the classical level and do not analyze quantum anomalies on an unorientable manifold.

³⁶The difference from the situation described in footnote 38 is that as χ_1 and χ_2 are assumed to transform with opposite signs under \mathbb{CT} , this expression is \mathbb{CT} -conserving.

So we must choose χ' and χ'' to each contribute $+2$ to ν_{CT} , and hence χ to contribute -2 . The allowed couplings involving w are, for $n > 0$, $\bar{w}^n \bar{\chi} \chi' + \text{h.c.}$ and $w^n \bar{\chi} \chi'' + \text{h.c.}$ Such couplings yield a mass matrix of rank 2, leaving one massless Dirac fermion in the phase with $\langle w \rangle \neq 0$.

Next, we would like to justify more precisely the treatment of the model that was given in section 4.3. We recall from section 3.6 that the partition function of the original χ field of charges $(1, 2s)$ can be factored as

$$\exp\left(\pm \frac{i\pi}{2} \eta(B)\right) \exp(\mp i I_{\text{top}}(B)), \quad (5.11)$$

for a certain topological action I_{top} . Here η is the eta-invariant of a Dirac operator coupled to $B = A + 2s$ and likewise I_{top} is a function of B . Regardless of which sign we choose in the factorization of eqn. (5.11), we get a description in terms of an Ising sector, coming from the factor $\exp(\pm i\pi\eta(B)/2)$, coupled to an Abelian Chern-Simons theory, coming from $\exp(\mp i I_{\text{top}})$.

The partition function of the fields χ' and χ'' can likewise be factored as

$$\exp\left(\pm \frac{i\pi}{2} \eta(B + na)\right) \exp(\mp i I_{\text{top}}(B + na)) \quad (5.12)$$

and

$$\exp\left(\pm \frac{i\pi}{2} \eta(B - na)\right) \exp(\mp i I_{\text{top}}(B - na)). \quad (5.13)$$

Now we observe that at low energies, B is a \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field, so that B is gauge equivalent to $-B$ and $B + na$ is gauge equivalent to $-(B - na)$. But η is invariant under charge conjugation, so $\eta(B + na) = \eta(B - na)$. Accordingly, if we choose a $+$ sign in eqn. (5.12) and a $-$ sign in eqn. (5.13), or vice-versa, then the η -invariants will cancel, and we can write the partition function of the combined $\chi' \text{-} \chi''$ system simply as

$$\exp\left(\pm i (I_{\text{top}}(B + na) - I_{\text{top}}(B - na))\right). \quad (5.14)$$

This description was used in section 4.3.

Finally, we will discuss the quantization of the monopole operators, to recover the result found in section 4.3: the model obeys the spin/charge relation if and only if $s + n$ is even. The discussion of eqns. (3.14)-(3.16) is a useful starting point. There we found that in quantization on S^2 in the presence of a single flux quantum of $f = da$, the original χ field has a state $|\uparrow\rangle$ of spin 0 and charges $(-s, -2s^2)$. The fields χ' and χ'' have analogous states $|\uparrow'\rangle$ and $|\uparrow''\rangle$ of respective charges $(-(s + n/2), -2(s + n/2)^2)$ and $(-(s - n/2), -2(s - n/2)^2)$. Adding these values, the combined system in the presence of one unit of flux has a state $|\uparrow\uparrow'\uparrow''\rangle$ of charges $(-3s, -6s^2 - n^2)$. Starting from this state, there are many ways to construct a state that is invariant under the emergent gauge symmetry $U(1)_a$, and hence will correspond to a gauge-invariant monopole operator. One simple choice (not the choice that we made in section 3.2) is to act with $6s^2 + n^2$ powers of w , which has charges $(0, 1)$. Here we have to remember that w has half-integral spin in the field of a magnetic monopole of $U(1)_a$. Hence the state $w^{6s^2 + n^2} |\uparrow\uparrow'\uparrow''\rangle$ has electric charge $-3s$ and has spin $(6s^2 + n^2)/2 \bmod 1$, or equivalently $n/2 \bmod 1$. This state obeys the spin/charge relation if and only if $s + n$ is even. If this one gauge-invariant state obeys the spin/charge relation, then so do all gauge-invariant states in this sector, since they can be obtained by acting on this state by a product of gauge-invariant products of elementary fields.

6 Application To Topological Superconductors

6.1 Preliminaries

With a few simple twists, the models constructed in this paper can be interpreted as gapped symmetry-preserving boundary states of a topological superconductor.

The main difference, for our purposes, between a superconductor and an insulator is that pairing occurs in the superconductor, reducing the gauge group of electromagnetism from $U(1)$ to \mathbf{Z}_2 . This means that in a superconductor, the electromagnetic gauge field A is gauge-equivalent to $-A$. Accordingly, there is no natural role for a symmetry \mathbf{C} that reverses the sign of A , and no natural *a priori* distinction between the time-reversal symmetries that we have called \mathbf{T} and \mathbf{CT} .

Apart from the residual \mathbf{Z}_2 of electromagnetism, the important symmetry in a topological superconductor is time-reversal. As in our discussion of the parity anomaly in section 3.6.1, here the flat space theory is \mathbf{T} -invariant, but there is an anomaly after coupling to a background field. In this case the background field is the metric and the anomaly is visible only when the theory is placed on a non-orientable manifold.

In adapting the models of this paper to a topological superconductor, either \mathbf{T} or \mathbf{CT} can play the role of time-reversal. However, the more interesting case is that the time-reversal symmetry of the topological superconductor is identified with what until now has been called \mathbf{CT} . The reason for this is simply that the models of this paper have $\nu_{\mathbf{T}} = 0$, which means that if they are interpreted as boundary states of a superconductor with \mathbf{T} as the time-reversal symmetry, then this is a topologically trivial superconductor. However, the same models have $\nu_{\mathbf{CT}} = 2$, meaning that if they are interpreted as boundary states of a superconductor with \mathbf{CT} as the time-reversal symmetry, then this is a topologically non-trivial superconductor with $\nu_{\text{sc}} = 2$.

Hence, in applications to a topological superconductor, we will take \mathbf{CT} as the time-reversal transformation. However, the name \mathbf{CT} is rather misleading in this context, since there is no natural notion of \mathbf{C} in a superconductor, so we will rename \mathbf{CT} as \mathbf{T}_{sc} . (It might cause too much confusion with the rest of the paper if we rename \mathbf{CT} as \mathbf{T} in this section only.)

In our analysis so far of boundary states of topological insulators, the spin/charge relation of condensed matter physics has provided an important constraint. By contrast, for models of the class considered in this paper, there is no such constraint for a topological superconductor. We will give two explanations of this fact.

First of all, in any of our models of topological insulator boundary states that violate the spin/charge relation, that relation could be restored (as discussed in footnote 30) by adding an additional coupling

$$\int A \wedge \frac{da}{2\pi}. \quad (6.1)$$

This coupling shifts by 1 the electric charge of any state with a unit flux of $da/2\pi$, so it restores the spin/charge relation, if that relation is not otherwise satisfied. But the coupling (6.1) is \mathbf{T} -violating, so it is forbidden in the context of a topological insulator. However, in a superconductor, since A is gauge-equivalent to $-A$, the coupling of eqn. (6.1) is actually \mathbf{T}_{sc} -conserving. By adding this coupling, if necessary, one can eliminate any problem in the spin/charge relation.

For a second explanation, consider a spin manifold with some chosen spin structure and with a corresponding spin connection D_0 . Let A be a \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field. Then $D_0 + A$ is the spin connection of some other spin structure, which we will call the effective spin structure. So any boundary theory that makes sense on a general spin manifold can be interpreted as a boundary state of a superconductor, simply by coupling it to the effective spin structure. The spin/charge relation is manifestly obeyed, since the boundary degrees of freedom couple only to the effective spin structure.

Thus, in the original model with a single χ field, for applications to a topological superconductor, we can consider odd as well as even values of s . For a minimal example, we return to eqn. (4.3), where now we set $s = 1$ and omit the coupling to A (since A is now absorbed in the effective spin structure that is used in defining the Chern-Simons action and the η -invariant). Setting $b = a + 2c$, we can rewrite (4.3) as

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} (-8cdc + 2bdb), \quad (6.2)$$

corresponding to $U(1)_{-8} \times U(1)_2$. Including the Ising sector, the model becomes $(U(1)_{-8} \times \text{Ising})/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times U(1)_2$.

The model $(U(1)_{-8} \times \text{Ising})/\mathbf{Z}_2$ is known as T-Pfaffian [26, 27]. The product theory $(U(1)_{-8} \times \text{Ising})/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times U(1)_2$ is³⁷ T-Pfaffian \times SF in the language of [69].

6.2 Varying ν_{sc}

In short, all models so far studied in this paper, including models that violate the spin/charge relation in the context of a topological insulator, can be interpreted as boundary states for a topological superconductor with $\nu_{\text{sc}} = 2$.

We can easily make boundary states with any even value of ν_{sc} just by taking tensor products of a number of $\nu_{\text{sc}} = 2$ models. (The methods of this paper do not suffice to make boundary states of a topological superconductor with odd ν_{sc} .)

We instead will consider the following simple variant of that idea. We generalize the models of section 3.1 with a single χ field simply by introducing r identical fermion fields χ_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, with exactly the same charges $(1, 2s)$ under $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$ and exactly the same transformation under T and CT as in section 3.1. This will give a model with $\nu_{\text{sc}} = 2r$. We assume that the χ_i all have the same coupling to ϕ as in the familiar model with $r = 1$:

$$I_{\text{Yuk}} = \sum_{i=1}^r \int d^3x \sqrt{g} h \left(i\epsilon_{ab} \chi_i^a \chi_i^b \bar{\phi} + i\epsilon_{ab} \chi_i^{\dagger a} \chi_i^{\dagger b} \phi \right). \quad (6.3)$$

Then in the phase with $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$, the model is gapped. (This model is not the same as the tensor product of r copies of the original model, because the various χ_i all couple to the same a , w , and ϕ .)

³⁷ In section 5.1, we described SF as $U(1)_2 \times U(1)_{-1}$. The role of $U(1)_{-1}$ was to convert $U(1)_2$ into a spin theory (thus providing the “transparent” fermion of the semion-fermion theory SF) while also canceling the framing anomaly of $U(1)_2$. In the present context, T-Pfaffian is already a spin theory, so we do not need a $U(1)_{-1}$ factor to provide a transparent fermion, and moreover the microscopic construction with χ makes manifest that the model has no framing anomaly. However, the fact that we are getting the transparent fermion of SF from T-Pfaffian means that it may be slightly oversimplified to identify our theory $(U(1)_{-8} \times \text{Ising})/\mathbf{Z}_2 \times U(1)_2$ as T-Pfaffian \times SF.

Our main interest is to apply this model to a topological superconductor (in which case we care about only $T_{sc} = CT$ and not T), but if r is odd, the model also provides a possible boundary state for a topological insulator with $\theta = \pi$. So we will start the analysis keeping track of all symmetries, and only later concentrate on the application to the topological superconductor.

For any r , the partition function of this model, on an orientable manifold, for a given choice of the \mathbf{Z}_2 gauge field $2sa + A$, can be computed without further ado. It is simply the r^{th} power of what we computed in eqn. (3.38) (or its generalization (3.41)). In the gapped phase, the partition function with a single χ field is simply $(-1)^{\mathcal{J}}$, so if the number of χ fields is r , the partition function is $(-1)^{r\mathcal{J}}$. This depends only on the value of $r \bmod 2$, strongly suggesting that the topological field theory describing the model depends on r only mod 2 at least if we restrict to orientable manifolds. For odd r , this topological field theory should thus be the one that we studied in section 4; for even r , since the partition function is identically 1, the topological field theory is simply (on orientable manifolds) a trivial version of \mathbf{Z}_{4s} gauge theory with no Dijkgraaf-Witten term.

There is actually a simple way to prove that the topological field theory derived from this model only depends on the value of $r \bmod 2$. While maintaining T -invariance, it is possible to add a bare mass term for two of the χ_i that preserves all symmetries except CT . For example, we can take

$$I_{\text{bare}} = m \int d^3x \sqrt{g} (\bar{\chi}_{r-1} \chi_r - \bar{\chi}_r \chi_{r-1}), \quad (6.4)$$

with m real.³⁸ Once the system is gapped for $\langle \phi \rangle \neq 0$ using the Yukawa couplings (6.3), it remains gapped if the bare mass term I_{bare} is turned on. This is true for all m . For $m \rightarrow \infty$, χ_{r-1} and χ_r decouple and we get the same model again but with r replaced by $r - 2$. But in general, the topological field theory that describes a gapped system at low energies is invariant under deformation of parameters as long as the system remains gapped. Hence, as suggested by the discussion of the partition function in the last paragraph, the low energy topological field theory is the same for any odd number r of χ fields.

Since the trajectory in theory space by which we interpolated between r and $r - 2$ is CT -violating, it is natural to suspect that the theories with different values of r are in different universality classes and can actually be distinguished by some observables that are sensitive to CT symmetry. Such an observable is actually the number of fermion zero-modes mod 8 in a vortex field, which determines subtle properties of the quasiparticles. In a basic $\mathbf{v} = 1$ vortex, each of the χ_i has a single Majorana zero-mode, making a total of r zero-modes, all transforming the same way under CT . In the absence of CT symmetry, generic perturbations can add to the Hamiltonian a term bilinear in the zero-modes, lifting the zero-modes in pairs. So without CT symmetry, a universality class is only characterized by the value of $r \bmod 2$. (T relates $\mathbf{v} = 1$ to $\mathbf{v} = -1$, and so places no constraint on what happens for $\mathbf{v} = 1$.) But in the CT -conserving case, just as in the theory of the Majorana chain [56], a perturbation to the Hamiltonian can only lift zero-modes in groups of 8. Therefore the number mod 8 of zero-modes in a vortex field is an invariant of a CT -conserving universality class. It is equal to the value of $r \bmod 8$.

³⁸ Reality of m and the relative minus sign between the two terms are needed for T -invariance and hermiticity. With our definitions, if χ is a Majorana fermion then $\bar{\chi}\chi = \epsilon_{ab}\chi^a\chi^b$ is T -invariant but antihermitian. The relative minus sign in eqn. (6.4) makes I_{bare} hermitian but CT -violating.

The anomaly that arises if CT is used to place a theory on an unorientable manifold depends on $\nu_{\text{CT}} \bmod 16$. Since $\nu_{\text{CT}} = 2r$, it follows that on an unorientable manifold, the partition function (and even its anomaly) depends on $r \bmod 8$. Presumably, if we understood how to generalize the low energy topological field theory to an unorientable manifold, it would capture this information. The arguments given above claiming to show that the low energy theory depends only on $r \bmod 2$ involve either computing the partition function on an orientable manifold or making a deformation that violates CT. So these arguments do not tell us about the low energy description when CT is used to go to an unorientable manifold.

Now let us apply all this to a topological superconductor, meaning that we set $\mathbb{T}_{\text{sc}} = \text{CT}$, and take A to be of order 2. For a basic example, we also set $s = 1$, leading (if $r = 1$) to T-Pfaffian \times SF, as described in section 6.1. If r is even, we get a model with abelian statistics that can be a boundary state of a topological insulator with $\nu_{\text{sc}} = 2r$ divisible by 4. Here we will focus on the case of odd r , corresponding to ν_{sc} congruent to 2 mod 4.

The associated topological field theory is always T-Pfaffian \times SF, but with four possible actions of \mathbb{T}_{sc} , depending on whether we take $r = 1, 3, 5$, or 7 , and always with $\nu_{\text{sc}} = 2r$. Indeed, it has been claimed in [69] that there are two possible actions of time-reversal on T-Pfaffian and two on SF, combining to four possible actions on T-Pfaffian \times SF. The four possibilities have been denoted T-Pfaffian $_{\pm}\times$ SF $_{\pm}$. Moreover, these four cases have been claimed to correspond to $\nu_{\text{sc}} = 2, 6, 10$, and 14 – in other words, to $\nu_{\text{sc}} = 2r$ with $r = 1, 3, 5, 7$.

Let us compare our construction in more detail to the assertions in [69]. First of all, the theories T-Pfaffian $_{+}$ and T-Pfaffian $_{-}$ are supposed to correspond respectively to the case that the basic vortex of vorticity $\mathbf{v} = 1$ is a Kramers singlet or a Kramers doublet under time-reversal. In our approach, this vortex has r fermion zero-modes (all of angular momentum zero). Quantizing those zero-modes gives the spinor representation of Spin(r). This representation is real for $r = 1, 7$ and pseudoreal if $r = 3, 5$. The real and pseudoreal cases allow respectively an antiunitary symmetry of square 1 or -1 . So the first factor of T-Pfaffian $_{\pm}\times$ SF $_{\pm}$ is T-Pfaffian $_{+}$ if $r = 1, 7$ and T-Pfaffian $_{-}$ if $r = 3, 5$. This seems to agree with what is claimed in [69]. However, we should note the following subtlety. Similarly to what is explained in section 3.5.3, the antiunitary symmetry that can be defined in a sector of $\mathbf{v} = 1$ actually depends on the value of $r \bmod 4$; it is really \mathbb{T}_{sc} if $r = 1, 5$, and $\mathbb{T}_{\text{sc}}\mathbb{K}$ if $r = 3, 7$. (In each of these statements, \mathbb{T}_{sc} is the effective time-reversal symmetry of the low energy phase and obeys $\mathbb{T}_{\text{sc}}^2 = (-1)^F\mathbb{K}$.)

On the other hand, the distinction between SF $_{+}$ and SF $_{-}$ is supposed to be as follows. Let s be the “semion,” the unique nontrivial quasiparticle of $U(1)_2$, and f the transparent fermion (which corresponds to a line operator of $U(1)_{-1}$ in the approach of section 5.1, and to χw^2 in the microscopic construction based on the χ field). The two quasiparticles s and sf have spins $\pm 1/4$ and are exchanged by \mathbb{T}_{sc} . SF $_{+}$ and SF $_{-}$ are distinguished by the sign of \mathbb{T}_{sc}^2 in acting on these two states. To analyze this problem in our framework, we first must identify s and sf in our approach. Here s is supposed to correspond to the non-trivial line $\exp(i \oint b) = \exp(i \oint (a + 2c))$ of $U(1)_2$ (we recall that in eqn. (6.2), the $U(1)_2$ gauge field is $b = a + 2c$). The coefficient of c in the exponent on the right hand side is the vorticity $\mathbf{v} = 2$. Likewise, sf has vorticity 2, since $f = \chi w^2$ has vorticity 0.

For $r = 1$, the vortex of $\mathbf{v} = 2$ was analyzed in section 3.5. It has two fermion zero-modes, whose quantization leads to two states, denoted Λ_{\pm} , with spins $\pm 1/4$ and $\mathbf{k} = \pm 1$. They are exchanged by χ . (These two states can be further dressed with powers of w , and this will be important presently. In general, these two states have $\mathbf{k} = \pm s$; we set $s = 1$.) More generally,

for any r , the $\mathbf{v} = 2$ vortex has $2r$ fermion zero-modes. Quantization of these zero-modes leads again to two quasiparticles Λ_{\pm} , which now correspond to the two spinor representations of $\text{Spin}(2r)$. They have³⁹ spin $\pm r/4$ and $\mathbf{k} = \pm r$. However, in topological field theory, we only care about the value of the spin mod 1, and similarly (for $s = 1$) we only care about \mathbf{k} mod 4. So in fact, for odd r , the two quasiparticles obtained by quantizing the fermion zero-modes have spin $\pm 1/4$ and $\mathbf{k} = \pm 1$, just as for $r = 1$. Moreover, for odd r , the two spinor representations of $\text{Spin}(2r)$ are complex conjugates, so Λ_{\pm} are exchanged by any antiunitary symmetry.

The states Λ_+ and Λ_- are actually part of the T-Pfaffian theory; they correspond to I_2 and ψ_2 in the terminology of [69]. By contrast, the states s and sf of SF have $\mathbf{k} = 0$, and correspond to $\bar{w}\Lambda_+$ and $f\bar{w}\Lambda_+ = \chi w\Lambda_+ = w\Lambda_-$. (We use the fact that the transparent fermion is $f = \chi w^2$ and that $\chi\Lambda_{\pm} = \Lambda_{\mp}$, since the chirality operator that distinguishes Λ_+ and Λ_- anticommutes with χ . We also use $\bar{w}w = 1$.) Because of time-reversal symmetry, there is an arbitrary choice of which of s and fs corresponds to $\bar{w}\Lambda_+$ and which to $w\Lambda_-$. We will set $s = w\Lambda_-$, $sf = \bar{w}\Lambda_+$. We will determine the action of T_{sc}^2 on both pairs Λ_+ , Λ_- and $w\Lambda_-$, $\bar{w}\Lambda_+$.

To determine how T_{sc}^2 acts on Λ_+ and Λ_- , we need to know whether the representation of a Clifford algebra of rank $2r$ (which we get by quantizing the $2r$ fermion zero-modes) is real or pseudoreal. Because of the mod 8 periodicity of the Clifford algebra, the answer depends only on the value of r mod 4. For $r \cong 1$ mod 4, the representation is real (as we have noted above for $r = 1$), leading to $T_{\text{sc}}^2 = 1$, and for $r \cong 3$ mod 4, it is pseudoreal,⁴⁰ corresponding to $T_{\text{sc}}^2 = -1$. (In [69], it is asserted that the action of T_{sc}^2 on I_2 and Ψ_2 is ill-defined, but in our framework this seems to be well-defined.) So in general, on these states, $T_{\text{sc}}^2 = (-1)^{(r-1)/2}$.

Given this, to understand how T_{sc}^2 acts on $s = w\Lambda_-$ and $sf = w\Lambda_+$, we just need to know how it acts on w and \bar{w} . This is determined by $T_{\text{sc}}^2 = (-1)^F \mathbf{K}$. Since w and \bar{w} are invariant under $(-1)^F$ but $\mathbf{K}(w) = iw$, $\mathbf{K}(\bar{w}) = -i\bar{w}$, we get $T_{\text{sc}}^2(s) = i(-1)^{(r-1)/2}s$, $T_{\text{sc}}^2(fs) = -i(-1)^{(r-1)/2}fs$. This agrees⁴¹ with [69] if we assume that (as suggested by the values of ν_{sc} claimed in that paper), SF_+ corresponds to $r = 1, 5$ and SF_- corresponds to $r = 3, 7$.

An interesting detail is that the sign with which T_{sc}^2 acts on s, sf is correlated with the sign with which it acts on $I_2 = \Lambda_+$, $\psi_2 = \Lambda_-$, even though one pair of states is in SF and one is in T-Pfaffian. Hence, although the model under consideration admits four possible actions of T_{sc} , corresponding to $r = 1, 3, 5, 7$, it is not clear that this can be understood in terms of two possible actions on SF and two on T-Pfaffian. This may be related to the following. It may be oversimplified to interpret the theory under consideration here as T-Pfaffian \times SF, because as observed in footnote 37, in the present context the transparent fermion of SF is actually a quasiparticle χw^2 of T-Pfaffian.

Unfortunately, our methods do not give a natural way to study T-Pfaffian $_{\pm}$ by itself so we have no good way to directly compute ν_{sc} for TPfaffian $_{\pm}$. Moreover, though SF can be

³⁹The zero-modes of each of the fermion fields χ_1, \dots, χ_r contribute equally, so the spins and the values of \mathbf{k} of Λ_{\pm} are r times what they are for $r = 1$.

⁴⁰It suffices to take $r = 3$, corresponding to a Clifford algebra of rank 6. We can represent 6 gamma matrices by $\gamma_1 = \sigma_1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1$, $\gamma_2 = \sigma_3 \otimes 1 \otimes 1$, $\gamma_3 = \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes 1$, $\gamma_4 = \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_3 \otimes 1$, $\gamma_5 = \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1$, $\gamma_6 = \sigma_2 \otimes \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_3$. An antiunitary symmetry T_{sc} that commutes with these matrices is, up to an irrelevant phase, $T_{\text{sc}} = \mathcal{K}\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3$ (where \mathcal{K} is complex conjugation), satisfying $T_{\text{sc}}^2 = -1$.

⁴¹We should note that the overall sign of T_{sc}^2 acting on the pair s, fs depends on some arbitrary choices. We made one arbitrary choice of whether to identify s with Λ_+ or Λ_- . There is also an arbitrary choice of whether to identify the time-reversal symmetry of [69] with what in our language is T_{sc} or the equally good antiunitary symmetry $T_{\text{sc}}\mathbf{K}^{-1}$, which obeys $(T_{\text{sc}}\mathbf{K}^{-1})^2 = (-1)^F \mathbf{K}^{-1}$.

usefully described as $U(1)_2 \times U(1)_{-1}$ as in section 5.1, the fact that off-shell $\mathbb{T}^2 \neq 1$ in this model prevents us from being able to straightforwardly formulate the model on an unorientable manifold; and this in turn leaves us with no straightforward way to directly compute ν_{sc} for SF_{\pm} .

6.3 More On T-Pfaffian

T-Pfaffian has also been studied from another point of view, motivated by applications to topological insulators. We would like to analyze this in the context of the present paper.

For our starting point, we simply copy a model from eqn. (2) of [30] (the same model has also been considered elsewhere, e.g. [70]). The model contains an emergent $U(1)$ gauge field a and a composite Dirac fermion Ψ_{cf} . The Lagrangian density is

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\Psi}_{\text{cf}} (\gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu - i a_\mu)) \Psi_{\text{cf}} - \frac{\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}}{4\pi} A_\mu \partial_\nu a_\lambda. \quad (6.5)$$

The model is \mathbb{T} - and CT -conserving at the classical level if a transforms under \mathbb{T} as A transforms under CT , and vice-versa, and if similarly the \mathbb{T} and CT transformations of Ψ_{cf} are opposite from those that we described in section 2.1 (which were the standard \mathbb{T} and CT symmetries of the electron field). Thus, in contrast to (2.3) and (2.6), which we abbreviate to $\mathbb{T}(A) = -A$ and $\text{CT}(A) = A$, we need

$$\mathbb{T}(a) = a, \quad \text{CT}(a) = -a. \quad (6.6)$$

Similarly, we have to reverse the roles of \mathbb{T} and CT in (2.9) and (2.11):

$$\mathbb{T}(\Psi_{\text{cf}}(t, \vec{x})) = \gamma_0 \Psi_{\text{cf}}^\dagger(-t, \vec{x}), \quad \text{CT}(\Psi_{\text{cf}}(t, \vec{x})) = \gamma_0 \Psi_{\text{cf}}(-t, \vec{x}). \quad (6.7)$$

By contrast, so far in this paper, all gauge fields and fermions have had the standard \mathbb{T} and CT transformations. The transformations in eqn. (6.7) correspond to $\nu_{\mathbb{T}} = 2$, $\nu_{\text{CT}} = 0$, and these values will be unaffected by the redefinitions below. The value of ν_{CT} is not important for a topological insulator, but $\nu_{\mathbb{T}} \bmod 16$ is a meaningful invariant of a \mathbb{T} -invariant condensed matter system, and we observe that it differs from the value $\nu_{\mathbb{T}} = 0$ appropriate to the usual topological insulator. (This obstruction to interpreting the model (6.5) as a boundary state of a topological insulator will not be affected by modifications of the model that we consider shortly.)

If we assume that a obeys standard Dirac quantization, the model has several difficulties. Ψ_{cf} couples to a with odd charge, which induces the usual \mathbb{T} and CT anomaly. Since a is supposed to be an emergent gauge field that only lives on the boundary of a $3+1$ -dimensional system, we cannot compensate for this with the help of a bulk coupling. Likewise the Ada coupling is not properly quantized. We can resolve both of these issues if we assume that the flux quantum of a is 4π rather than the usual 2π . With this in mind, we write $a = 2a'$ where a' obeys standard Dirac quantization. Dropping the prime, we thus rewrite the Lagrangian as

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\Psi}_{\text{cf}} (\gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu - 2i a_\mu)) \Psi_{\text{cf}} - \frac{\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}}{2\pi} A_\mu \partial_\nu a_\lambda. \quad (6.8)$$

This version of the model has also been considered previously (see eqn. (36) in [71]).

This theory is well-defined, but it is not a boundary state for a topological insulator since it lacks the usual AdA anomaly in time-reversal symmetry. We can get a theory that does have the appropriate anomaly if we simply replace $2a$ everywhere with $2a + A$. This gives the version of the model that we will actually study:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \overline{\Psi}_{\text{cf}} (\gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu - i(2a_\mu + A_\mu))) \Psi_{\text{cf}} - \frac{\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}}{4\pi} A_\mu \partial_\nu (2a_\lambda + A_\lambda). \quad (6.9)$$

In perturbation theory, the two models (6.8) and (6.9) are equivalent, since we can go from the first to the second by the change of variables $a = a' + \frac{1}{2}A$ (where again we drop the prime from a'). But the models are really not equivalent since $a = a' + \frac{1}{2}A$ is not a valid change of variables. On the contrary, in going from (6.8) to (6.9) we have changed the Dirac condition on quantization of magnetic flux. (In fact, if A is a spin_c connection, the coefficient of A in such a change of variables should be an even integer.)

Actually, because Ψ_{cf} now has electric charge 1 with respect to A , we now have a model that can be a boundary state for a \mathbb{T} -conserving system in which the electromagnetic theta-angle in bulk is $\theta = \pi$. We now want to ask two questions about the model: (1) Is it \mathbb{T} - and CT -invariant? (2) Is it consistent with the usual spin/charge relation of condensed matter physics?

Concerning the first question, if A is understood as a $U(1)$ gauge field, then the model is \mathbb{T} - and CT -invariant. Indeed, the starting point (6.5) was invariant classically under the \mathbb{T} and CT transformations (6.6). By following through the various changes of variable, one can find the classical \mathbb{T} and CT symmetries of (6.9). They are obtained by just replacing a by $a + A$ on the right hand side of (6.6):

$$\mathbb{T}(a) = a + A, \quad \text{CT}(a) = -a - A. \quad (6.10)$$

Although this transformation is satisfactory if A is a $U(1)$ gauge field, it is not if A is a spin_c connection. In that case the transformation (6.10) is not well-defined: \mathbb{T} or CT would map a gauge field a to a spin_c connection $\pm(a + A)$. Therefore, as it stands, this model cannot, while also maintaining \mathbb{T} -invariance, satisfy the spin/charge relation in the strong sense that A can be understood as a spin_c connection.

An interesting manifestation of the difficulty arises if we add a scalar field w of charges $(0, 1)$ under $U(1)_A \times U(1)_a$, to make possible Higgsing to the standard boundary state of a topological insulator. Then \mathbb{T} will relate w to another scalar field of charges $(1, 1)$, violating the spin/charge relation. (If both w and its \mathbb{T} conjugate have expectation values, maintaining \mathbb{T} invariance, then electromagnetic gauge invariance is spontaneously broken.)

As in section 4, the low energy topological field theory description of this model includes an Ising sector that involves an eta-invariant of the Dirac operator coupled to $A + 2a$. It is coupled by a \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient to an Abelian sector that can be constructed as in section 4.1. In fact, the only difference from the $s = 1$ case of eqn. (4.3) is that in the action of the Abelian sector, we have to include the Chern-Simons terms that are already present in $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$. The action of the Abelian sector is thus

$$\frac{1}{8\pi} (8c + 2a - A) d(2a + A). \quad (6.11)$$

If we set $b = a + 2c$, this becomes

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} (-8cdc + 2bdb) + \frac{1}{2\pi} 2Adc - \frac{1}{8\pi} AdA. \quad (6.12)$$

After including the Ising sector, this differs from the familiar T-Pfaffian model by a decoupled $U(1)_2$ of b .

The coupling to A is not relevant for applications to a topological superconductor, but it is certainly relevant for the topological insulator. As we have seen, with this coupling, the theory cannot simultaneously be T-invariant and consistent with the spin/charge relation. Its low energy description differs from the T-Pfaffian theory by a $U(1)_2$ factor that suffers from a similar problem, and by the value of ν_T . It may well be that, as proposed in the literature, T-Pfaffian by itself is a satisfactory boundary state for a topological insulator. Unfortunately, in the context of the present paper, we do not have a natural procedure to generate T-Pfaffian without the $U(1)_2$ factor.

Acknowledgements

The work of NS was supported in part by DOE grant DE-SC0009988 and the work of EW was supported in part by NSF Grant PHY-1314311. We would like to thank P. Etingof, D. Freed, P.-S. Hsin, C. Kane, and M. Metlitski for comments and discussions.

A Normalization of Some Couplings

A.1 Some 3 + 1-Dimensional Terms

Let X be a compact, smooth four-dimensional spin manifold without boundary, and let \mathcal{D}_0 be the Dirac operator acting on a spin 1/2 fermion on X , coupled to gravity only. Its index is

$$\mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{D}_0) = \int_X \widehat{A}(R) = \frac{1}{48} \int_X \frac{\text{tr } R \wedge R}{(2\pi)^2}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where R is the Riemann tensor. In four dimensions, \widehat{A} is related to the signature:

$$\int_X \widehat{A}(R) = \frac{1}{8} \sigma. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The index $\mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{D}_0)$ is an integer and in fact an even integer, as follows from a Euclidean version of Kramers doubling. So the right hand side of eqn. (A.1) is an even integer on a spin manifold, and hence σ is divisible by 16.

Now introduce a $U(1)$ gauge field A , with field strength $F = dA$, and let \mathcal{D} be the Dirac operator for a spin 1/2 fermion on X that couples to A with charge 1 (as well as coupling to

gravity). Its index is

$$\mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{D}) = \int_X \widehat{A}(R) \exp(F/2\pi) = \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} \right). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The right hand side of this formula is therefore again an integer (not necessarily even, in this case).

Subtracting these two formulas to cancel the $\widehat{A}(R)$ term, we learn that on a spin manifold X , if F is a closed two-form that obeys Dirac quantization (so that it is the field strength of some $U(1)$ gauge field A), then

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_X \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} \in \mathbf{Z}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

What we have gained by assuming that X is spin is the factor of $1/2$ in front of this formula. If X is not necessarily spin, then $\int_X F \wedge F / (2\pi)^2$ is an integer but not necessarily even. Simple examples show that on a spin manifold, $\int_X F \wedge F / (2\pi)^2$ has no divisibility beyond what is claimed in eqn. (A.4).

Next, suppose X is not necessarily a spin manifold, but a more general spin_c manifold with spin_c connection A . In this case, $\int_X \widehat{A}(R)$ is no longer an integer, but σ is still an integer, so we deduce from eqn. (A.2) that

$$\int_X \widehat{A}(R) \in \frac{1}{8} \mathbf{Z}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The Dirac operator \mathcal{D} for a spin $1/2$ particle coupled to A with charge 1 is still defined; its index $\mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{D})$ is still an integer and is still given by eqn. (A.3). So also

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_X \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} \in \frac{1}{8} \mathbf{Z}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

This can also be proved by writing the left hand side as $\frac{1}{8} \int_X (2F/2\pi) \wedge (2F/2\pi)$, and observing that as $2F/2\pi$ is an integral class, the integral $\int_X (2F/2\pi) \wedge (2F/2\pi)$ is an integer.

A canonical example of a four-manifold that is not a spin manifold is $X = \mathbf{CP}^2$. The second Betti number of X is 1, so X has essentially only one interesting two-cycle, which is a copy of $\mathbf{CP}^1 \subset \mathbf{CP}^2$. Let G be a closed two-form on X normalized to have unit Dirac flux on \mathbf{CP}^1 : $\int_{\mathbf{CP}^1} G/2\pi = 1$. Then a standard topological argument shows that

$$\int_{\mathbf{CP}^2} \frac{G \wedge G}{(2\pi)^2} = 1. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

\mathbf{CP}^2 is not a spin manifold, but it has a spin_c structure with a spin_c connection A whose field strength $F = dA$ satisfies $F = G/2$. From this and eqn. (A.7), we learn that

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{CP}^2} \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} = \frac{1}{8}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

We see that the quantization in eqn. (A.6) cannot be strengthened. We can learn the same from the fact that \mathbf{CP}^2 has $\sigma = 1$, which implies that the denominator in eqn. (A.5) cannot be reduced.

To summarize, a four-dimensional manifold X has

$$\sigma \in \begin{cases} 16\mathbf{Z} & \text{if } X \text{ is spin} \\ \mathbf{Z} & \text{for any } X . \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

For an ordinary $U(1)$ gauge field A , the instanton number is

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_X \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} \in \begin{cases} \mathbf{Z} & \text{if } X \text{ is spin} \\ \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z} & \text{for any } X . \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

If A is a spin_c connection, then

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_X \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} \in \frac{1}{8}\mathbf{Z} , \quad (\text{A.11})$$

but

$$\frac{1}{8}\sigma + \frac{1}{2} \int_X \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} \in \mathbf{Z} . \quad (\text{A.12})$$

A.2 Theta-Angles

It follows from what we have said that a four-dimensional field theory on a spin_c manifold X has two θ -like parameters, corresponding to a topological interaction $\theta_1 I_1 + \theta_2 I_2$, with

$$I_1 = \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} \right), \quad I_2 = 4 \int_X \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2}. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

We have normalized I_1 and I_2 to be integer-valued, so θ_1 and θ_2 both have 2π periodicity. T- and CT-invariance hold when both θ_1 and θ_2 equal 0 or π .

In equation (A.13), we have written the topological interactions in one useful basis. Another useful basis is given by I_1 and $I'_2 = 8I_1 - I_2$:

$$I'_2 = 8 \int_X \widehat{A}(R) = \sigma. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

This has the advantage that I'_2 is a purely gravitational coupling. A coupling $\pi\sigma$ is the appropriate gravitational analog of $\theta = \pi$ for a system that obeys the usual spin/charge relation. We note that in the T- and CT-conserving case, with both θ_1 and θ_2 being 0 or π , $\theta_1 I_1 + \theta_2 I_2$ is equivalent to $\theta_1 I_1 + \theta_2 I'_2$. (This is certainly not true for generic values of the θ_i .)

The interior of a conventional topological insulator has $\theta_1 = \pi$, $\theta_2 = 0$. It is also possible to conceive a material with $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \pi$. Such a material has a bulk electromagnetic θ -angle of π , like a conventional topological insulator, but the fact that $\theta_2 \neq 0$ means that its allowed boundary states are different.

The topological interaction at $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \pi$ is

$$\pi I_1 + \pi I_2 = \pi \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{9}{2} \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} \right). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

This is precisely $\mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{D}_3)$, the index of the Dirac operator \mathcal{D}_3 for a spin 1/2 particle of electric charge 3. This observation leads to an easy construction of a gapless boundary state for a

material with $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \pi$. We simply assume existence on the boundary of a massless Dirac fermion of electric charge 3. This leads to a T-anomaly by the same logic as applies for a boundary fermion of charge 1. Following the reasoning of section 3.6.2, to restore T-invariance we need in the path integral a bulk factor $(-1)^{\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{D}_3)} = \exp(i\pi\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{D}_3))$. But this coincides with $\exp(i\pi I_1 + i\pi I_2)$, so the charge 3 fermion is a possible boundary state for a T-invariant system with $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (\pi, \pi)$. Similarly, for any integer k , a massless Dirac fermion of charge $8k \pm 1$ is a possible boundary state at $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (\pi, 0)$, and a massless Dirac fermion of charge $8k \pm 3$ is a possible boundary state at $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (\pi, \pi)$. Symmetry-preserving gapped boundary states appropriate for $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (\pi, \pi)$ are described in section 4.3.

What happens if we specialize to spin manifolds? Then I_2 is divisible by 8, so πI_2 is a multiple of 2π and $\theta_2 = \pi$ cannot be distinguished from $\theta_2 = 0$. Moreover, $\int_X \widehat{A}$ is an even integer and that term can be dropped in πI_1 . So in the context of a spin manifold, $\theta_1 = \pi$ just means that the ordinary electromagnetic theta-angle equals π .

On the other hand, on a spin-manifold there is an integer-valued coupling

$$I_2'' = \frac{1}{2} \int_X \widehat{A}(R) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{D}_0). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Accordingly, it is possible to have on a spin manifold a T-invariant gapped system with partition function $\exp(i\pi I_2'') = (-1)^{\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{D}_0)}$. Such a system cannot be defined on a spin_c manifold in a T-invariant fashion, since I_2'' is in general not integer-valued on a spin_c manifold. Thus, in a T-conserving condensed matter system that conserves electric charge and satisfies the usual spin/charge relation, one will not encounter the interaction $\pi I_2''$.

A.3 2 + 1-Dimensional Chern-Simons Terms

Naively, the Chern-Simons functional of a $U(1)$ gauge field A on an oriented three-manifold W is defined by the familiar integral:

$$\text{CS}(A) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_W A \wedge dA. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

This formula is satisfactory in a topologically trivial situation, but in general it is difficult to interpret as A may have Dirac string singularities. A procedure that avoids this problem is as follows. There always exists an oriented four-manifold X of boundary W such that A extends over X . Moreover, if W has a chosen spin structure,⁴² then X can be chosen so that the spin structure of W extends over X . Picking such an X and A , and defining $F = dA$ as before, we attempt the definition

$$\text{CS}(A) = 2\pi \cdot \frac{1}{2} \int_X \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

This is manifestly gauge-invariant, but in general it depends on the choice of X and of the extension of A over X . Had we used in this procedure another spin manifold X' , again with

⁴²Every orientable three-manifold W admits a spin structure. But in general it may admit inequivalent spin structures and the Chern-Simons action defined by the procedure in the text will in general depend on the choice of spin structure.

some chosen extension of A , then eqn. (A.18) would be replaced by

$$\text{CS}'(A) = 2\pi \cdot \frac{1}{2} \int_{X'} \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

The difference between the two definitions is

$$\text{CS}(A) - \text{CS}'(A) = 2\pi \cdot \frac{1}{2} \int_{X^*} \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2}, \quad (\text{A.20})$$

where X^* is a compact spin-manifold without boundary made by gluing X to X' after reversing the orientation of X' (fig. 3 of section 3.6.3). According to eqn. (A.4), the right hand side of this formula is an integer multiple of 2π . In other words, our procedure for defining $\text{CS}(A)$ has given a result that is independent of the choices mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$.

Now let us repeat this in the spin_c case. The operator \mathcal{D}_0 acting on a neutral spin 1/2 fermion is not available, but the operator \mathcal{D} acting on a spin 1/2 fermion of charge 1 still exists. Its index is still given by the formula (A.3), so the integral on the right hand side of that equation is still \mathbf{Z} -valued. This formula contains the gravitational term $\widehat{A}(R)$ as well as the gauge theory term $F \wedge F/8\pi^2$, and there is no longer a convenient way to remove the gravitational term by subtraction. So if we use integrality of the index to define a Chern-Simons-like functional, this functional will have to have a gravitational contribution. Picking again a spin_c manifold X with boundary W and an extension of A over X , we define

$$\text{CS}(A) + \Omega(g) = 2\pi \int_X \left(\widehat{A}(R) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{F \wedge F}{(2\pi)^2} \right). \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Here $\Omega(g)$ is a sort of gravitational Chern-Simons term. The same argument as before shows that $\text{CS}(A) + \Omega(g)$ is independent of the choices mod 2π . Moreover, the normalization of $\text{CS}(A)$ is the same as it was in the spin case (for example, in a topologically trivial situation, $\text{CS}(A)$ is still given by the naive formula (A.17)). However, only the sum $\text{CS}(A) + \Omega(g)$, and not either of the two terms separately, is independent of the choice of X mod $2\pi\mathbf{Z}$.

In section 2.3, a simple argument was given to show that $\text{CS}(A)$ is well-defined mod $2\pi/8$, or equivalently that $8\text{CS}(A)$ is well-defined mod 2π . The discussion leading to eqn. (A.11) shows that this is the sharpest result of its type: we cannot replace 8 by any smaller integer. We see that in the spin_c case, $\text{CS}(A)$, defined by the usual formula, is well-defined only modulo $2\pi/8$.

A.4 Unorientable Spacetimes

Throughout this paper, we have considered orientable spacetimes only. Without aiming to explain the generalization of all statements in this paper to unorientable spacetimes, we will here sketch the generalization of the bulk couplings corresponding to $\theta_1 = \pi$ and $\theta_2 = \pi$.

The unorientable analog of a spin_c manifold is called a pin_c manifold, and (in a theory that satisfies $\mathbb{T}^2 = (-1)^F$, so that fermions are in Kramers doublets) the unorientable analog of a spin manifold is a pin^+ manifold. In a theory that satisfies the spin/charge relation, the more general pin_c concept is natural, but we will also run into a variant of pin_c below (footnote 44).

An important preliminary is that either \mathbb{T} or CT can be used to define a theory on an unorientable manifold X . In one case, fields undergo a \mathbb{T} or CR transformation in going around an

unorientable loop, and in the other case they undergo a CT or R transformation.⁴³ Concretely, if we use CT symmetry to define a theory on X , then the electromagnetic field strength F is an ordinary two-form on X , while if we use T, then it is a twisted two-form that changes sign in going around an orientation-reversing loop.

It is more straightforward to generalize the interaction πI_2 to a pin_c manifold, so we begin with this. On a spin_c or pin_c manifold of any dimension, the integral class $2F/2\pi$ is congruent mod 2 to w_2 , the second Stieffel-Whitney class. (This is true whether F is an ordinary two-form or a twisted one.) So $\exp(i\pi I_2)$ is equivalent to $(-1)^{\int_X w_2^2}$, and this generalizes $\theta_2 = \pi$ to a pin_c manifold. On a pin^+ manifold, $w_2 = 0$ and this interaction is trivial.

Now let us consider the opposite case of a gapped theory with $\theta_1 = \pi$, $\theta_2 = 0$. On an orientable manifold, its partition function is $(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}(\mathcal{D})}$. But the index of the Dirac operator is only defined on an orientable manifold. How can we generalize $(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}(\mathcal{D})}$ to an unorientable manifold? The answer to this question is that we should use η , the eta-invariant of the Dirac operator, rather than the index. On an orientable manifold of even dimension, the spectrum of the Dirac operator is symmetric under $\lambda \leftrightarrow -\lambda$. Recalling the definition (3.32) of η , this means that modes with $\lambda \neq 0$ do not contribute to η , which just receives a contribution of +1 from each zero-mode. The index \mathfrak{J} likewise receives no net contribution from non-zero eigenvalues; on the other hand, a zero-mode contributes ± 1 to \mathfrak{J} , depending on its chirality. So on an orientable manifold of even dimension, \mathfrak{J} and η are congruent mod 2, and therefore $(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}} = (-1)^\eta$.

This can be used as the starting point to generalize $\theta_1 = \pi$ to an unorientable manifold, but some subtleties arise. First, let us assume that T or equivalently CR has been used to define a theory on an unorientable manifold X . This means that in going around an orientation-reversing loop in X , a fermion field χ of charge 1 is exchanged with its adjoint $\bar{\chi}$ of charge -1 . Given this, one cannot define a Dirac operator that acts solely on χ ; only a Dirac operator that acts on the pair $\begin{pmatrix} \chi \\ \bar{\chi} \end{pmatrix}$ can be defined.⁴⁴ In eqn. (3.32), the invariant η was defined on an orientable manifold in terms of a sum over eigenvalues of $\mathcal{D} = i\not{D}$ acting on χ only. By C symmetry, the Dirac operator has the same eigenvalues acting on $\bar{\chi}$ as it does on χ . So if we define an eta-invariant η for a Dirac operator that acts on the pair $\begin{pmatrix} \chi \\ \bar{\chi} \end{pmatrix}$, then on an orientable manifold where both are defined, the relation between η and η is just

$$\eta = 2\eta. \tag{A.22}$$

Unlike η , η is still defined when we use T symmetry to go to an unorientable manifold. When we do that, η is always an even integer (as it is in the orientable case) and is a topological invariant mod 4.⁴⁵ Therefore, in this situation, a suitable generalization of $(-1)^{\mathfrak{J}}$ is $(-1)^{\eta/2}$. This gives a generalization of $\theta_1 = \pi$ when we use T to go to an unorientable manifold.

⁴³We here use the CRT theorem of relativistic field theory (more commonly called the CPT theorem), via which T is related to CR and CT to R. In Euclidean signature, it is more natural to think about CR and R rather than T and CT.

⁴⁴The fact that A is odd under CR also means that it is not what is usually called a pin_c connection but a variant of this with the group $O(2)$ replacing $SO(2) = U(1)$. CR takes values in the disconnected component of $O(2)$.

⁴⁵An unorientable manifold X has a canonical oriented double cover \widehat{X} . Instead of computing η in terms of all fermion modes of either charge on X , we can compute it in terms of modes of charge 1 on \widehat{X} . When we do

However, using \mathbb{T} to go to an unorientable manifold in a theory that satisfies the spin/charge relation has not really given us a new probe of the physics. The mod 2 invariant $(-1)^{\mathcal{J}}$ has been generalized to a mod 2 invariant $(-1)^{\eta/2}$, but since η is always an even integer in this situation and is only a topological invariant mod 4, this mod 2 invariant is all that we get.

If instead \mathbb{CT} or equivalently \mathbb{R} symmetry is used to define a theory on an unorientable spacetime X , matters are different. There is no mixing between modes of opposite charge, so η is naturally defined. But in this situation, η is not necessarily an integer. So before generalizing to an unorientable spacetime, we should first rewrite $(-1)^{\mathcal{J}}$ as $\exp(-i\pi\mathcal{J})$ (the sign in the exponent is an arbitrary choice here), and then we can generalize this to an unorientable spacetime as $\exp(-i\pi\eta)$. On a pin_c manifold, η is a topological invariant mod⁴⁶ 2, so $\exp(-i\pi\eta)$ is a topological invariant. But what are the possible values of η mod 2 on a four-dimensional pin_c manifold? The answer is that η is always an integer multiple⁴⁷ of $1/4$. Hence, there are actually 8 classes of \mathbb{CT} -conserving theory that can be defined on a general pin_c manifold, with the partition function being $\exp(-i\pi\rho\eta)$, $\rho = 0, \dots, 7$. If we specialize these 8 classes to a spin_c manifold, we can only detect the value of ρ mod 2, since on an orientable manifold, $\exp(-i\pi\rho\eta) = (-1)^{\rho\mathcal{J}}$. On an orientable manifold, these 8 classes of theory have $\theta_1 = \pi\rho$ mod 2π .

If we consider a charge-conserving theory that lacks the conventional spin/charge relationship, then a few things are different. We should work only on a pin^+ manifold, not a more general pin_c manifold. The basic eta-invariant to consider is that of a Majorana fermion coupled to gravity only. We will denote it as η . It is a topological invariant mod⁴⁸ 4. So $\exp(-i\pi\nu\eta/2)$ is a topological invariant for any integer ν . The values of η are always integer multiples of $1/4$ (the minimum value again occurs for \mathbf{RP}^4), so ν is an invariant mod 16.

In a theory that conserves both \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{CT} and does not have the standard spin charge relation, we should distinguish two mod 16 invariants $\nu_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$, depending on which symmetry is used to define the theory on an unorientable manifold. Thus we consider a theory whose partition function on a pin^+ manifold X is $\exp(-i\pi\nu_{\mathbb{T}}\eta/2)$ or $\exp(-i\pi\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}\eta/2)$, depending on which symmetry is used when the fields traverse an orientation-reversing cycle in X . If X happens to be orientable (and thus spin), these factors must be equal since in that case there

this, because \widehat{X} is orientable, only zero-modes contribute. The number of those zero-modes is even because, as \widehat{X} has an orientation-reversing symmetry, the index of the charge 1 Dirac operator on \widehat{X} is 0. To show that η is a topological invariant mod 4, we may reason as follows on the original unorientable manifold X . (For background, see [17], especially the discussion of eqns. (2.47) and (B.16).) In general, in even dimensions, because there is no Chern-Simons function, $\eta/2$ is the index of the Dirac operator with APS boundary conditions and hence is a topological invariant except for jumps that occur when eigenvalues pass through 0. In four dimensions, even on an unorientable manifold, the eigenvalues of the hermitian Dirac operator with values in a real representation (such as we have here because we include both signs of the charge) all have even multiplicity because of a version of Kramers doubling. When a pair of eigenvalues passes through 0, η jumps by ± 4 , so it is a topological invariant mod 4.

⁴⁶ As in footnote 45, η is a topological invariant except for jumping that occurs when an eigenvalue passes through 0. When this happens, η jumps by ± 2 . So it is a topological invariant mod 2. There is no further restriction in general. The difference from footnote 45 is that we are dealing with fermions in a complex representation, so there is no Kramers doubling.

⁴⁷ This minimum value is assumed for the pin_c manifold \mathbf{RP}^4 . See Appendix C of [17]. The argument there is presented for pin^+ manifolds but the same reasoning applies for pin_c .

⁴⁸ The reasoning is the same as in footnote 46, except that on a pin^+ manifold, the eigenvalues have a two-fold Kramers degeneracy, and hence the jumps in η are by ± 4 .

was no need to make a choice of \mathbb{T} or \mathbb{CT} . Since on an orientable manifold, $\eta/2$ is an arbitrary integer (η receives contributions only from zero-modes, and there are an even number of them because of Kramers doubling), it follows that $\nu_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$ are congruent to each other mod 2. This is the only general relationship between them, as one can see by considering examples constructed from massless free fermions with suitable transformations under \mathbb{T} and \mathbb{CT} . Each massless Majorana fermion can independently contribute ± 1 to $\nu_{\mathbb{T}}$ and to $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$.

Now let us consider a gapped, charge-conserving theory that does obey the usual spin/charge relation. Suppose that, when placed on an unorientable manifold using \mathbb{CT} , this theory has partition function $\exp(-i\pi\rho\eta)$. If we specialize to a pin^+ manifold, then η reduces to η and the partition function is supposed to be $\exp(-i\pi\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}\eta/2)$. Evidently, the relation between ρ and $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$ is

$$\nu_{\mathbb{CT}} = 2\rho. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

In particular, $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$ is even for theories that obey the usual spin/charge relation. This is consistent with the fact that ρ is a mod 8 invariant and $\nu_{\mathbb{CT}}$ is a mod 16 invariant.

B The Callias Index Theorem

In this appendix, we will use the Callias index theorem [48] to study time-independent solutions of the Dirac equation for χ . (This theorem has been elucidated in [72] and is based in part on analytical foundations established in [73]. See also [47, 49, 50].)

It is helpful to write the Dirac equation in a completely real form. To this end, we first introduce a basis of real gamma matrices:

$$\gamma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

We also write χ in terms of Majorana fermions: $\chi = (\chi_1 + i\chi_2)/\sqrt{2}$. It is convenient to arrange these Majorana fermions as a column vector $\begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \end{pmatrix}$, and to introduce a set of real gamma matrices that act on this column vector:

$$\tilde{\gamma}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

We take the matrices $\tilde{\gamma}_i$, $i = 0, 1, 2$ that act on the pair $\begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \end{pmatrix}$ to commute with the matrices γ_μ , $\mu = 0, 1, 2$ that act on the spinor indices carried by χ_1 and χ_2 .

The covariant derivative of χ (on a flat spacetime) is usually written $D_\mu = (\partial_\mu + iA_\mu)\chi$. On the column vector $\begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \end{pmatrix}$, this is equivalent to

$$D_\mu \begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \end{pmatrix} = (\partial_\mu + \tilde{\gamma}_0 A_\mu) \begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

According to eqn. (2.11), \mathbb{CT} acts on $\begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \end{pmatrix}$ simply as multiplication by γ_0 (along with a reversal of the time, which will not be important here as we will be considering time-independent

solutions). However, according to eqn. (3.10), the appropriate unbroken symmetry in the gapped phase is not CT but $CT = CTK^{1/2}$, where $K^{1/2}$ is a gauge transformation that acts on χ as multiplication by i . On the column vector $\begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \end{pmatrix}$, $K^{1/2}$ acts as multiplication by $\tilde{\gamma}_0$. Hence the action of CT is

$$CT \begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \end{pmatrix} = \gamma_0 \tilde{\gamma}_0 \begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Setting $\phi = (\phi_1 + i\phi_2)/\sqrt{2}$, the Dirac equation obeyed by χ is

$$\left(\gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu + \tilde{\gamma}_0 A_\mu) + \tilde{\gamma}_1 \phi_1 + \tilde{\gamma}_2 \phi_2 \right) \begin{pmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_2 \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

We drop the time-derivative (since we want to study time-independent solutions) and we multiply by $i\gamma_0$ to define a hermitian Dirac operator:

$$\mathcal{D} = i \left(\sum_{\mu=1,2} \gamma_0 \gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu + \tilde{\gamma}_0 A_\mu) + \gamma_0 \sum_{i=1,2} \tilde{\gamma}_i \phi_i \right). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

\mathcal{D} is imaginary and antisymmetric.

We observe that the matrix $M = \gamma_0 \tilde{\gamma}_0$ that represents the action of CT obeys $M^2 = 1$ and anticommutes with \mathcal{D} :

$$M\mathcal{D} = -\mathcal{D}M. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

(The full CT operation, which is the product of M with complex conjugation, commutes with \mathcal{D} , since \mathcal{D} is imaginary.) This is the situation in which one can define an integer-valued *index* \mathfrak{J} , the number of $M = 1$ zero-modes of \mathcal{D} minus the number of $M = -1$ zero-modes of \mathcal{D} . Actually, the ability to define an index depends on the fact that the operator \mathcal{D} has a discrete spectrum near zero. This is true as long as ϕ is bounded away from zero near spatial infinity, giving χ a mass and ensuring that any low-lying modes of χ must be localized near the origin in space.

This integer is a topological invariant, in the sense that it is invariant under deformations of the operator \mathcal{D} that do not change its behavior at infinity in either real space or momentum space. For example, although A_μ is nonzero in the standard vortex solution, it vanishes at infinity, and therefore \mathfrak{J} would be unchanged if we simply set A_μ to 0. The index only depends on the winding at spatial infinity of the field ϕ that determines the fermion mass.

If explicit CT -violating terms are added to the action, then \mathcal{D} will be replaced by an operator that no longer anticommutes with M (or with any similar matrix), and zero-modes of χ will no longer be governed by an integer-valued index. However, fermi statistics imply that fermion zero-modes can only be lifted in pairs. So even if CT is explicitly violated, the number of χ zero-modes will always be equal mod 2 to the index \mathfrak{J} that one can define in the CT -conserving case. Generically, the number of χ zero-modes will always be as small as possible subject to the constraints implied by the index, so the total number of zero-modes is generically $|\mathfrak{v}|$ in the CT -conserving case, and 0 or 1 in the CT -violating case.

According to the Callias index theorem, \mathfrak{J} is given by a sort of winding number that should be computed at infinity in phase space. In other words, we consider a phase space $\mathbf{R}^4 = \mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^2$ where the first factor is parameterized by position components x_1, x_2 and the second factor by

momentum components p_1, p_2 . We let \mathcal{D}_+ be the part of \mathcal{D} that maps states of $M = 1$ to states of $M = -1$. We undo the passage to quantum mechanics, replacing derivatives by momentum components, $\partial_\mu \rightarrow ip_\mu$. \mathcal{D}_+ thus becomes a function of the x 's and p 's. Because χ is gapped near spatial infinity (and the operator \mathcal{D} is "elliptic," meaning that it is invertible for large Euclidean momenta), the operator \mathcal{D}_+ is invertible when restricted to a large sphere S^3 at infinity in \mathbf{R}^4 . The winding number of this invertible operator, integrated over S^3 , is equal to the index.

To implement this program, we want to write \mathcal{D}_+ explicitly as a map from a space V_+ of modes with $\chi = 1$ to a space V_- of modes with $\chi = -1$. We use a notation in which $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ represents a joint eigenstate of γ_0 and $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ with both having eigenvalue i , $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ represents a joint eigenstate with respective eigenvalues i and $-i$, etc. So $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ give a basis of V_+ , while $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ give a basis of V_- . To write $\mathcal{D}_+ : V_+ \rightarrow V_-$ as a matrix, we represent the basis vectors $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ of V_+ as $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, respectively, and similarly we represent basis vectors $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ of V_- as $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. After setting A_μ to zero (since it will not affect the index), a calculation gives

$$\mathcal{D}_+ = i \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 + i\phi_2 & p_1 + ip_2 \\ p_1 - ip_2 & -\phi_1 + i\phi_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

In a suitable gauge, the standard vortex solution of vorticity $\mathbf{v} = 1$ is invariant under rotations of \mathbf{R}^2 together with constant gauge transformations. The scalar field ϕ is

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1 &= x_1 f(|\vec{x}|) \\ \phi_2 &= x_2 f(|\vec{x}|). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

The function $f(|x|)$ vanishes at infinity as $|\langle\phi\rangle|/|\vec{x}|$. However, it will not affect the index if we just set $f = 1$ (which means that the fermion mass grows linearly at infinity), since we can interpolate from a realistic f to $f = 1$ in such a way that the fermions are always gapped near spatial infinity. With $f = 1$, \mathcal{D}_+ is simply linear in the x_i and p_j and the winding number at infinity is easy to calculate. After relabeling (x_1, x_2, p_1, p_2) as (P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3) in a fairly obvious way, we find

$$\mathcal{D}_+ = P_0 + i\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{P}, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where $\vec{\sigma}$ are the Pauli sigma matrices. If we restrict \mathcal{D}_+ to the sphere S^3 defined by $\sum_{s=0}^3 P_s^2 = R^2$ for large R , then up to a factor of R , \mathcal{D}_+ is just the identity map from S^3 to $SU(2) \cong S^3$. This identity map is the basic example of a map of winding number 1, and that is the value of the Callias index in this situation.

For an example of a field of vorticity $\mathbf{v} > 0$, we can just take ϕ at infinity to be defined by

$$\phi_1 + i\phi_2 = (x_1 + ix_2)^{\mathbf{v}}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

This just multiplies the winding number by \mathbf{v} . To get vorticity $\mathbf{v} < 0$, we take

$$\phi_1 + i\phi_2 = (x_1 - ix_2)^{-\mathbf{v}}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Again the winding number is \mathbf{v} . So in all cases, the winding number of the map \mathcal{D}_+ , and therefore the index predicted by the Callias index theorem, is equal to the vorticity \mathbf{v} .

For any value of the vorticity \mathbf{v} , it is possible to have a classical field that is rotation-invariant, or more precisely, invariant under a combined rotation plus gauge transformation. Indeed, if \mathbf{j} is the standard angular momentum generator and \mathbf{k} is the gauge charge of the emergent gauge field, then the ansatz (B.11) or (B.12) is invariant under the combination

$$\mathbf{j}' = \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{v} \frac{\mathbf{k}}{4s}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

The factor of $1/4s$ arises because ϕ has $\mathbf{k} = 4s$. We set $\mathbf{k}^* = \mathbf{k}/4s$ so

$$\mathbf{j}' = \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{k}^*. \quad (\text{B.14})$$

χ and $\bar{\chi}$ have $\mathbf{k} = \pm 2s$ and so $\mathbf{k}^* = \pm 1/2$.

A stable quasiparticle with $|\mathbf{v}| > 1$ does not necessarily exist in the theory, since the interaction between vortices may be repulsive, as in a Type II superconductor. However, if a stable vortex of given \mathbf{v} exists, one may expect that classically it is described by a \mathbf{j}' -invariant solution. (Even if this is not the case, the vortex is deformable to a \mathbf{j}' -invariant situation, so computing in the \mathbf{j}' -invariant case should suffice for determining the deformation-invariant properties of the spectrum.) To understand the quantization of the vortex states, it is necessary to know not just the number of fermion zero-modes in the vortex field, but their \mathbf{j}' quantum numbers.

The framework to determine those quantum numbers conceptually – as opposed to attempting to directly solve the Dirac equation – is to compute what is known as the character-valued index of the Dirac operator. Define the positive operator $H = \mathcal{D}^2$. For an angle α , define

$$F(\alpha) = \text{Tr} \exp(i\alpha\mathbf{j}') M \exp(-\beta H). \quad (\text{B.15})$$

The idea behind this definition is that (as in the standard definition of the index of the Dirac operator) nonzero eigenvalues of H appear in pairs with the same \mathbf{j}' but opposite signs of M , and so cancel out of the trace. Hence $F(\alpha)$ is independent of β , and it can be computed effectively for small β in a high temperature expansion, as we discuss below. On the other hand, since the nonzero modes of H make no net contribution to $F(\alpha)$, that function can be computed just in the space of fermion zero-modes, and therefore captures the desired information about the \mathbf{j}' eigenvalues of those modes.

The result that comes from the high temperature expansion is

$$F(\alpha) = \text{sign}(\mathbf{v}) \cdot (\exp(i(\mathbf{v} - 1)\alpha/2) + \exp(i(\mathbf{v} - 3)\alpha/2) + \cdots + \exp(i(-\mathbf{v} + 1)\alpha/2)), \quad (\text{B.16})$$

meaning that the zero-modes have spins $\mathbf{j}' = (\mathbf{v} - 1)/2, (\mathbf{v} - 3)/2, \dots, -(\mathbf{v} - 1)/2$. Before explaining how this formula is obtained, we look at the first few cases.

For $\mathbf{v} = 1$, there is only one zero-mode, and it has $\mathbf{j}' = 0$. Indeed, if the operator \mathcal{D} has only one zero-mode, it must have $\mathbf{j}' = 0$, since complex conjugation (or CT symmetry) ensures that the spectrum of zero-modes is symmetric under $\mathbf{j}' \leftrightarrow -\mathbf{j}'$.

For $\mathbf{v} = 2$, the two zero-modes have spins $\pm 1/2$. Upon quantization of these modes, one gets a pair of states of spins $\pm 1/4$, as asserted in section 3.5.

For $\nu = 3$, the three zero-modes have spins $1, 0, -1$. Quantization of the modes of spins ± 1 gives two states of spins $\pm 1/2$, and existence of the third zero-mode of spin zero means that the $\nu = 3$ vortex satisfies non-Abelian statistics.

Finally, for $\nu = 4$, the four zero-modes have spins $3/2, 1/2, -1/2, -3/2$. Quantization gives a pair of states of spins ± 1 (which in topological field theory is equivalent to 0) and another pair of states of spins $\pm 1/2$. Since the fermion zero-modes anticommute with the operator $(-1)^F$ that distinguishes bosons and fermions, one pair of states is bosonic and one is fermionic. Which is which is discussed in section 3.5.

The actual computation of the character-valued index $F(\alpha)$ uses a high temperature expansion, valid for small β . For a proof of the character-valued index theorem for the Dirac operator using path integrals, see [74]. Here we will describe an equivalent computation in a Hamiltonian approach.

For small β , when we compute $F(\alpha) = \text{Tr} M e^{i\alpha j'} \exp(-\beta H)$ via an integral over particle orbits, we have to consider orbits that are periodic up to a rotation by an angle α . Let R_α be the operator that rotates the \vec{x} plane by angle α . It has a unique fixed point at $\vec{x} = 0$. An orbit that propagates from \vec{x} to $R_\alpha \vec{x}$ in imaginary time β has a very large action unless $|(1 - R_\alpha)\vec{x}| \lesssim \beta$. For fixed nonzero α , as $\beta \rightarrow 0$, the condition is equivalent to $|\vec{x}| \lesssim \beta$. On such short distances, a particle can be treated as free; the background gauge fields and scalar fields play no role. When we set the background field to zero, $H = \mathcal{D}^2$ becomes simply the Laplacian $H = -\sum_{i=1,2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} = \vec{p}^2$. This Laplacian acts on a Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbf{R}^2) \otimes \mathcal{H}$, where $L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$ is just the space of scalar wavefunctions on \mathbf{R}^2 , and \mathcal{H} is a four-dimensional Hilbert space obtained by quantizing the four real components of χ . The trace that we want factorizes as the product of a trace in $L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$ and a trace in \mathcal{H} .

We start with the first factor. This means that we consider H to act on scalar wavefunctions on \mathbf{R}^2 , and j' reduces to the standard angular momentum generator $-i(x_1 \partial_2 - x_2 \partial_1)$. The operator M acts trivially on $L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$ and can be dropped. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} e^{i\alpha j'} \exp(-\beta H) &= \int d^2x \langle R_\alpha \vec{x} | \exp(-\beta H) | \vec{x} \rangle = \int d^2x \int \frac{d^2p}{(2\pi)^2} \exp(-\beta \vec{p}^2) \exp(i\vec{p} \cdot (\vec{x} - R_\alpha \vec{x})) \\ &= \frac{1}{\det(1 - R_\alpha)} = \frac{1}{|1 - e^{i\alpha}|^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.17}$$

To compute the trace in \mathcal{H} , we observe the following. As operators on \mathcal{H} , the usual angular momentum is $j = \frac{i}{2}\gamma_0$ and the charge generator is $k^* = \frac{i}{2}\tilde{\gamma}_0$. So $j' = \frac{i}{2}(\gamma_0 + \nu\tilde{\gamma}_0)$. The operator M is $\gamma_0\tilde{\gamma}_0$. The Hamiltonian acting on \mathcal{H} is 0. So we need to evaluate

$$\text{Tr} M \exp(i\alpha j') = \text{Tr} \gamma_0 \tilde{\gamma}_0 \exp(-\alpha \gamma_0/2 - \alpha \nu \tilde{\gamma}_0/2). \tag{B.18}$$

Since γ_0 and $\tilde{\gamma}_0$ act in different two-dimensional spaces and commute with each other, this is a product

$$\text{Tr} \gamma_0 \exp(-\alpha \gamma_0/2) \cdot \text{Tr} \tilde{\gamma}_0 \exp(-\alpha \nu \tilde{\gamma}_0/2) = -(e^{i\alpha/2} - e^{-i\alpha/2})(e^{i\nu\alpha/2} - e^{-i\nu\alpha/2}). \tag{B.19}$$

So

$$F(\alpha) = -\frac{(e^{i\alpha/2} - e^{-i\alpha/2})(e^{i\nu\alpha/2} - e^{-i\nu\alpha/2})}{|1 - e^{i\alpha}|^2} = \frac{e^{i\nu\alpha/2} - e^{-i\nu\alpha/2}}{e^{i\alpha/2} - e^{-i\alpha/2}}, \tag{B.20}$$

which is equivalent to (B.16).

Finally, in discussing eqn. (3.28), we claimed that χ zero-modes can be lifted in groups of 8 by a quartic Hamiltonian

$$\Delta H = \sum_{ijkl} p_{ijkl} \gamma_i \gamma_j \gamma_k \gamma_l, \quad (\text{B.21})$$

in a way that preserves angular momentum. More specifically, we want to verify that we can do this in a way that reduces the spectrum of a vortex of vorticity $\mathbf{v} + 8$ to that of one of vorticity \mathbf{v} . The group theoretic fact that we will use is the following. In the group $SO(8)$ that acts on 8 gamma matrices $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_8$, pick a $Spin(7)$ subgroup, so that the γ_i transform in the spinor representation $\mathbf{8}$ of $Spin(7)$. In this representation, there is an invariant fourth order antisymmetric tensor. Take p_{ijkl} to be a multiple of this tensor. The group $SO(8)$ has two spinor representations, which we denote as $\mathbf{8}'$ and $\mathbf{8}''$. One of them, say the $\mathbf{8}''$, is irreducible under $Spin(7)$ while the other decomposes as $\mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{7}$. If the sign of the Hamiltonian is chosen correctly, then the $\mathbf{1}$ of $Spin(7)$ is its ground state and in particular is nondegenerate. It remains to show that this can be done in such a way that the ground state is an angular momentum eigenstate with $j' = 0$. For this, we first consider the case of a vortex of vorticity 8, which has precisely 8 zero-modes of angular momenta

$$j' = \pm 7/2, \pm 5/2, \pm 3/2, \pm 1/2. \quad (\text{B.22})$$

The ground state of ΔH will certainly be j' -invariant if j' is a generator of $Spin(7)$. For this, we take for j' a generator of $Spin(7)$ that in the $\mathbf{7}$ has eigenvalues $0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 4$. This generator has in the $\mathbf{8}$ of $Spin(7)$ the desired eigenvalues of eqn. (B.22). More generally, we can in a similar fashion reduce a vortex V_+ of vorticity $\mathbf{v} + 8$ to a vortex V_- of vorticity \mathbf{v} . V_+ has 8 extra zero-modes that have no counterpart in V_- ; their angular momenta are $j' = \pm(\mathbf{v} + 7)/2, \pm(\mathbf{v} + 5/2), \pm(\mathbf{v} + 3/2), \pm(\mathbf{v} + 1/2)$. To construct a quartic Hamiltonian that will lift these modes in a j' -invariant way, we proceed as before, embedding j' in $Spin(7)$ so that in the representation $\mathbf{7}$, it has eigenvalues $0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \pm(4 + \mathbf{v})$.

C Some Useful Facts About Chern-Simons Gauge Theories

The purpose of this appendix is to review and clarify some known facts about 2+1-dimensional Chern-Simons gauge theories. In the last subsection we will use this information to exhibit an explicit Chern-Simons Lagrangian that describes the non-Abelian statistics of the Read-Rezayi states [76], which generalize the Moore-Read state [35]. The analysis in that subsection is similar to the analysis in section 4.4.

C.1 $U(1)$

Consider a $U(1)$ Chern-Simons theory with the Lagrangian

$$\frac{k}{4\pi} ada + \frac{1}{2\pi} Ada, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where a is a $U(1)$ gauge field and A is a classical background $U(1)$ field, which couples to the current

$$j = \frac{1}{2\pi} da. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

In order not to clutter the notation, we will first take k positive. We denote this theory as $U(1)_k$. For even k the theory is well defined on any manifold. For odd k we need the manifold to be spin and the answers depend on the choice of spin structure. Also, as we discussed in section 2.3, even for odd k we can use a spin_c classical gauge field A to define the theory as a non-spin theory.

For k even there are k distinct Wilson lines $W_n = e^{in\oint a}$ labeled by

$$n = 0, \pm 1 \dots, \pm \frac{k-2}{2}, \frac{k}{2}; \quad (\text{C.3})$$

i.e. the lines labeled by n and by $n+k$ are identified. The lines with n and $-n$ differ by their orientation and the line with $\frac{k}{2}$ is independent of orientation. The line labeled by n has spin S (modulo one) and it induces holonomy H around it, where

$$S = \frac{n^2}{2k}, \quad H = e^{\frac{2\pi in}{k}}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

This is consistent with the identification of the lines labeled by n and by $n+k$. Using that and the expression for the current (C.2) we learn that A couples to the charge

$$Q = -\frac{n}{k}. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Note that because of the identification of the lines, only $Q \bmod 1$ is meaningful. If we want to regard Q as a real number, we cannot claim any identifications of lines.

Some of the $2+1$ -dimensional Chern-Simons theories have a corresponding $2d$ rational conformal field theory (RCFT) interpretation. In the case of $U(1)_k$, the relevant theory is that of a rational boson. Its chiral algebra includes the current $\partial\phi$ and is extended by the operator $e^{i\sqrt{k}\phi}$ of dimension $\frac{k}{2}$. This is indeed an integer for k even.⁴⁹

For k odd, we can still use the expressions (C.4) and (C.5) for the spin, the holonomy, and the charge. However, now we can no longer identify the lines labeled by n and by $n+k$. These two lines induce the same holonomy, but their spins differ by $\frac{1}{2} \bmod 1$. For example, the line $E = e^{ik\oint a}$ does not induce a nontrivial holonomy, but its spin is half-integer. Therefore, this line is nontrivial and cannot be ignored; its expectation value will depend on the spin structure of the three-manifold. Correspondingly, there are $2k$ inequivalent lines labeled by

$$n = 0, \pm 1, \dots, \pm(k-1), k. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Unlike the case of k even, here $Q = -n/k$ is meaningful mod 2.

In the fractional quantum Hall application, the various Wilson lines represent the world-lines of quasiparticles. The special line E represents the underlying electrons. It has spin $\frac{1}{2}$ and charge 1. And since it does not induce any holonomy, it has trivial braiding with all quasiparticles (only Fermi statistics).

Let us consider some examples:

$k=1$ has two lines, the trivial line with vanishing spin and E with half-integer spin. From the $2d$ RCFT perspective, this theory corresponds to the rational boson at the free fermion radius with the fermion $e^{i\phi}$ associated with the line E .

⁴⁹What is usually called k in the RCFT literature is in our notation $k_{\text{RCFT}} = k/2$.

$k = 2$ has two lines with spins modulo one $S = 0, \frac{1}{4}$. This theory $U(1)_2$ is the same as $SU(2)_1$.

$k = 3$ has six lines with spins modulo one $S = 0, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}$. From the $2d$ RCFT perspective this theory is the first member of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric minimal models. The two supercharges are associated with E , whose $2d$ dimension is $\frac{3}{2}$.

$k = 4$ has four lines with spins $0, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{2}$. This theory is similar to the $k = 1$ theory. It is a free fermion theory, but now it includes also two complex conjugate representations of dimension $\frac{1}{8}$. These are spin fields.

Finally, we would like to point out that the $U(1)_m$ theory can be viewed as a \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient of the $U(1)_{4m}$ theory. Of course, as groups $U(1)/\mathbf{Z}_2 = U(1)$. But since the quotient changes the normalization of the gauge fields, the map is nontrivial. We start with $U(1)_{4m}$ with the Lagrangian $\frac{4m}{4\pi}ada$. The \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient is implemented by stating that a is not a good gauge field, but $b = 2a$ is. In terms of it $\frac{4m}{4\pi}ada = \frac{m}{4\pi}bdb$, which describes $U(1)_m$.

This \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient can also be described as gauging a one-form global symmetry [61, 62]. It can be implemented by identifying a line in the original theory whose braidings will be trivial in the quotient theory [66, 67]. In this case, the relevant line is $e^{2im\oint a}$, with dimension $\frac{m}{2}$. Therefore, the quotient theory is a spin-TQFT for odd m and a non-spin-TQFT for even m . Imposing that this line has trivial braidings projects out all the lines $e^{in\oint a}$ with odd n . When m is even we should also identify the lines $e^{in\oint a} \sim e^{i(n+2m)\oint a}$, whose spins differ by an integer [66]. When m is odd the spins of these two lines differ by half an integer and they should not be identified. As a check, the fact that the line with $n = 1$ is projected out is equivalent to the statement in the last paragraph that a is not a good gauge field in the quotient theory.

C.2 $U(1)^n$

More generally, if the gauge group is $U(1)^n$, the theory is characterized by a K matrix, a q vector, and a Chern-Simons contact term k_c . In terms of them, the Lagrangian is

$$\frac{1}{4\pi}K_{ij}a^i da^j + \frac{1}{2\pi}q_i a^i dA + \frac{1}{4\pi}k_c AdA . \quad (\text{C.7})$$

All the coefficients in the Lagrangian must be integers. If all the diagonal elements of K as well as k_c are even, the theory does not need a spin structure. If some of these are odd, the theory is a spin Chern-Simons theory; it can be defined on a spin manifold and the results depend on the spin structure.

In the special case where

$$\begin{aligned} K_{ii} - q_i &\in 2\mathbf{Z} & \text{for all } i \\ k_c &\in 8\mathbf{Z} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

we can place the theory on an arbitrary manifold with a choice of a spin_c structure, letting A be a spin_c connection. The first restriction guarantees that all the monopole operators of a satisfy the proper spin/charge relation, which is needed for the spin_c structure. And the condition on k_c is needed for the Chern-Simons contact term for $2A$ to be well defined on an arbitrary spin_c manifold. See also the discussion in section 2.3.

The independent lines are $e^{in_i \oint a^i}$ whose spin and charge are $S = \frac{1}{2}K^{ij}n_i n_j$ and $Q = -K^{ij}q_i n_j$, where K^{ij} is the inverse matrix of K_{ij} .

C.3 \mathbf{Z}_N

Here we give a continuum description of \mathbf{Z}_N Chern-Simons gauge theory [63, 64].

We consider a special case of the theories in section C.2 based on the gauge group $U(1)_a \times U(1)_c$ and the Lagrangian

$$\frac{N}{2\pi}adc + \frac{k}{4\pi}ada. \quad (\text{C.9})$$

We can also couple the model to A . The field c acts as a Lagrange multiplier constraining the holonomy $e^{i\oint a}$ to be an N^{th} root of unity. Therefore, this theory is a \mathbf{Z}_N gauge theory with $e^{i\oint a}$ the \mathbf{Z}_N Wilson line. The line $e^{i\oint c}$ creates a holonomy for the \mathbf{Z}_N Wilson line. The term with k is easily identified as the Dijkgraaf-Witten term [65] of the \mathbf{Z}_N gauge theory. Here it is given a continuum description in terms of a $U(1)_a \times U(1)_c$ gauge theory.

For $k \in 2\mathbf{Z}$ the theory is not spin. But for odd k it depends on the spin structure. Using $c \rightarrow c + a$ we can identify $k \sim k + 2N$ and hence the inequivalent non-spin theories are labeled by $k = 0, 2, \dots, 2N - 2$. And if we allow dependence on the spin structure we can have $k = 0, 1, \dots, 2N - 1$.

The theory has line operators

$$W_{n_a, n_c}(\gamma) = e^{in_a \oint_\gamma a + in_c \oint_\gamma c}, \quad (\text{C.10})$$

with spins

$$S = \left(\frac{n_a n_c}{N} - \frac{k n_c^2}{2N^2} \right) \pmod{1}. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Their correlation functions are

$$\langle W_{n_a, n_c}(\gamma) W_{n'_a, n'_c}(\gamma') \rangle \sim \exp \left(\frac{2\pi i}{N^2} \#(\gamma, \gamma') (N n_a n'_c + N n_c n'_a - k n_c n'_c) \right), \quad (\text{C.12})$$

where $\#(\gamma, \gamma')$ is the linking between the two lines γ and γ' . From equations (C.11) and (C.12), we see that the lines W_{n_a, n_c} and W_{n_a+N, n_c} have the same correlation functions and the same spins. They should be identified. The lines W_{n_a, n_c} and W_{n_a+k, n_c+N} have the same correlation functions, but their spins satisfy $S(W_{n_a+k, n_c+N}) = S(W_{n_a, n_c}) - \frac{k}{2}$. Therefore, for even k they should be identified. For odd k , the theory needs a spin structure. For odd k , the line $E = W_{k, N}$ has half-integer spin and is nontrivial.

We conclude that for k even there are only N^2 lines and for k odd there are $2N^2$ lines. In other words the lines satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} W_{1,0}^N &= 1 \\ W_{1,0}^k W_{0,1}^N &= E, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.13})$$

where for k even we can set $E = 1$ and for k odd we have $E^2 = 1$.

C.4 $U(2)$

An $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons theory has the Lagrangian

$$\frac{k}{4\pi} \text{Tr} \left(bdb + \frac{2}{3}bbb \right), \quad (\text{C.14})$$

where b is an $SU(2)$ gauge field. Here $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ and we take it to be positive. The Wilson lines are labeled by $j = 0, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{k}{2}$ and their spins are $S = \frac{j(j+1)}{k+2} \pmod{1}$.

An $SU(2) \times U(1)$ Chern-Simons theory has the Lagrangian

$$\frac{k_1}{4\pi} \text{ada} + \frac{k_2}{4\pi} \text{Tr} \left(bdb + \frac{2}{3} bbb \right). \quad (\text{C.15})$$

Here $k_{1,2} \in \mathbf{Z}$. In order not to clutter the equations we take k_2 positive, but we allow k_1 to be negative. For $k_1 \in 2\mathbf{Z}$ the theory is non-spin and the lines are labeled by $j = 0, \dots, \frac{k_2}{2}$ and $n = 0, \pm 1, \dots, \frac{|k_1|}{2}$. On a spin manifold with a choice of spin structure (or by coupling to a spin_c classical gauge field A) we can also have odd k_1 and then $n = 0, \pm 1, \dots, |k_1|$.

The $U(2) = (SU(2) \times U(1))/\mathbf{Z}_2$ theory is characterized by two levels $k_{1,2}$ and is denoted by $U(2)_{k_1, k_2}$. One way to describe it is to combine a and b in eqn. (C.15) to a conventionally normalized $U(2)$ gauge field $c = b + a\mathbf{1}$ with the Lagrangian

$$\frac{k_2}{4\pi} \text{Tr} \left(cdc + \frac{2}{3} ccc \right) + \frac{k_1 - 2k_2}{4 \cdot 4\pi} (\text{Tr } c) d(\text{Tr } c). \quad (\text{C.16})$$

As a three-dimensional gauge theory it differs from the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ theory of equation (C.15) by having additional bundles. Therefore, there might be additional conditions on $k_{1,2}$. One way to find them follows from focusing on a specific $U(1) \subset U(2)$ gauge field of the form $\begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, whose ‘‘effective Lagrangian’’ is $\frac{2k_2+k_1}{4 \cdot 4\pi} c_{11} dc_{11}$. Therefore, the theory is consistent only when

$$2k_2 + k_1 \in 4\mathbf{Z} \quad (\text{C.17})$$

and it depends on the spin structure unless $2k_2 + k_1 \in 8\mathbf{Z}$. In particular, k_1 must be even. It can be shown by adapting to $U(2)$ the arguments given for $U(1)$ in Appendix A that there are no further conditions.

Let us understand this in more detail. We start with the $SU(2)_{k_2} \times U(1)_{k_1}$ theory and perform the quotient. From the three-dimensional point of view this means that we gauge a \mathbf{Z}_2 one-form global symmetry [61, 62]. This is achieved by summing over additional bundles that are not $SU(2) \times U(1)$ bundles. One way to think about it is to start with the original $SU(2) \times U(1)$ theory and to identify in it a Wilson line that induces a nontrivial holonomy in $SU(2) \times U(1)$, which is trivial in $U(2)$. This holonomy should be -1 in each of the factors. Then we should impose that this line has trivial correlation functions. In the $SU(2)$ factor this line should have $j = \frac{k_2}{2}$. The holonomy around it is in the center $\mathbf{Z}_2 \subset SU(2)$. Looking at equation (C.4) it is clear that from the $U(1)$ factor we need $n = \frac{|k_1|}{2}$ and hence k_1 should be even. The spin of the full line is

$$\frac{\frac{k_2}{2} \left(\frac{k_2}{2} + 1 \right)}{k_2 + 2} + \frac{k_1}{8} = \frac{2k_2 + k_1}{8}. \quad (\text{C.18})$$

When this spin is an integer, i.e. when $2k_2 + k_1 = 0 \pmod{8}$, the quotient makes sense on every manifold. Alternatively, we can have $2k_2 + k_1 = 4 \pmod{8}$ and then the quotient makes sense only on a spin manifold.

In general, when we perform such a quotient the spectrum of lines is modified by three rules [66, 67]. First, of the original lines labeled by (j, n) we should keep only those that have trivial

braiding with the special line ($j = \frac{k_2}{2}, n = \frac{|k_1|}{2}$). This leads to a selection rule

$$j + \frac{n}{2} \in \mathbf{Z} . \quad (\text{C.19})$$

Indeed, this is the condition that (j, n) is a $U(2)$ representation rather than a faithful $SU(2) \times U(1)$ representation. Second, we should identify some lines. It is easy to see that

$$(j, n) \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{k_2}{2} - j, \left(\frac{k_1}{2} + n \right) \bmod |k_1| \right) \quad (\text{C.20})$$

induce the same holonomy. Their spins differ by

$$\left(\frac{(\frac{k_2}{2} - j)(\frac{k_2}{2} - j + 1)}{k_2 + 2} + \frac{(\frac{k_1}{2} + n)^2}{2k_1} \right) - \left(\frac{j(j+1)}{k_2 + 2} + \frac{n^2}{2k_1} \right) = \frac{k_1 + 2k_2}{8} - \left(j - \frac{n}{2} \right) . \quad (\text{C.21})$$

For $k_1 + 2k_2 = 0 \pmod{8}$, when the theory is not a spin theory, we use the selection rule (C.19) to see that these two representations have the same spin modulo one and therefore they should be identified. For $k_1 + 2k_2 = 4 \pmod{8}$, when the theory is a spin theory these two representations induce the same holonomy, but their spins differ by half an integer and therefore they should not be identified.

The third rule of a quotient [66, 67] applies to lines that are fixed points of the identification. Such lines should be treated more carefully. But it is easy to see from (C.20) that no such fixed point exists in this case.

Let us consider the special case $k_2 = k, k_1 = -2k$. Since $2k_2 + k_1 = 0$, this is not a spin theory. Since k_1 is negative, this particular Chern-Simons theory can be coupled on the boundary of a three-manifold to a two-dimensional field theory that has both left movers realizing $SU(2)_k$ and right movers realizing $U(1)_{-2k}$. But in this particular case, there is also another option for the boundary theory [66, 67]. Since $U(1)_{2k}$ is conformally embedded in $SU(2)_k$, this theory describes also the GKO coset $\frac{SU(2)_k}{U(1)_{2k}}$ [68]. This theory is known as the parafermion theory. (Recall that our normalization of k_1 differs by a factor of 2 from the standard RCFT normalization.) The special case of $k = 2$ corresponds to the Ising model. Here the possible Wilson lines are labeled by $j = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1$ and $n = 0, \pm 1, 2$. The selection rule (C.19) and the identification (C.20) show that the distinct lines are the trivial line with $(j = 0, n = 0)$, W_σ with $(j = \frac{1}{2}, n = 1)$, and W_ψ with $(j = 1, n = 0)$. They correspond to the identity operator (spin 0), the spin field (spin $\frac{1}{16}$), and the free fermion (spin $\frac{1}{2}$). Note that even though this is a theory of 1 + 1-dimensional fermions, the corresponding 2 + 1-dimensional Chern-Simons theory is not a spin theory. In the language of section 3.6.4, this theory is the Ising TQFT, not the Ising spin-TQFT.

We can quotient the $U(2)$ theory again by \mathbf{Z}_2 and turn the gauge group into $U(2)/\mathbf{Z}_2 = SO(3) \times U(1)$. This is possible only when k_2 is even and $k_1 = 0 \pmod{4}$. One way to see that is based on identifying the special lines in the $SU(2)_{k_2} \times U(1)_{k_1}$ theory that have trivial braiding in the quotient. They are $(j = \frac{k_2}{2}, n = 0)$, whose spin is $\frac{k_2}{4}$ and $(j = 0, n = \frac{|k_1|}{2})$, whose spin is $\frac{|k_1|}{8}$. The product of these lines is the special line in the quotient leading to $U(2)$ and should not be considered separately. The theory that results from the additional quotient is $SO(3)_{k_2} \times U(1)_{k_1/4}$. It is non-spin when $k_2 = 0 \pmod{4}$ or $k_1 = 0 \pmod{8}$. Otherwise the theory is spin. Note that when the two factors of the gauge group are both spin, i.e. when $k_2 = 2 \pmod{4}$ or $k_1 = 4 \pmod{8}$, we do not need to double the number of lines twice.

Above we described the Ising TQFT as the non-spin Chern-Simons theory $U(2)_{2,-4}$. Its \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient is the spin-TQFT $SO(3)_2 \times U(1)_{-1}$. This theory is the Ising spin-TQFT, in the language of section 3.6.4. It has only one nontrivial line, W_ψ , with spin $\frac{1}{2} \pmod 1$. The line in the $U(2)_{2,-4}$ theory that is associated with the spin field W_σ is projected out.

C.5 Lifting a Spin-TQFT to a Non-Spin-TQFT

In Appendix C.4, we discussed examples of a \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient of a non-spin-TQFT leading to a spin-TQFT. Here we discuss the opposite process. Starting with a spin-TQFT we try to lift it to a non-spin-TQFT. Unlike the \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient, this process is not unique. (For a related mathematical discussion see e.g. [75].)

The partition function Z_s of a spin-TQFT depends on the spin structure s . One way to turn it into a non-spin-TQFT is by summing over s . When we do that we have freedom in inserting s dependent coefficients

$$\mathcal{Z} = \sum_s z_s Z_s . \quad (\text{C.22})$$

In order not to add degrees of freedom, we take z_s to be the partition function of an almost trivial spin-TQFT, sometimes called an invertible TQFT. This means that for a closed manifold z_s is a phase and the theory has only two line operators, the identity operator with vanishing spin and a fermion line with spin $\frac{1}{2}$.

Examples of such theories are $SO(n)$ Chern-Simons theories with level one, denoted $SO(n)_1$. These theories have $c = \frac{n}{2}$ and therefore, up to an overall s -independent phase, we can identify⁵⁰ the theory with n and the theory with $n + 16$. We can also extend this to negative n by $SO(-n)_1 \equiv SO(n)_{-1}$. Special cases are the following.

$n = 1$ is the Ising spin-TQFT.

$n = 2$ is usually denoted by $U(1)_1$.

$n = 3$ is usually denoted by $SO(3)_2 = SU(2)_2/\mathbf{Z}_2$. Denoting it as $SO(3)_2$ does not fit our general expressions, where it should better be denoted by $SO(3)_1$. Therefore, below we will denote it by $SU(2)_2/\mathbf{Z}_2$.

This leads to 16 distinct ways, labeled by n , of lifting a given spin-TQFT to a non-spin-TQFT

$$\mathcal{Z}^n(\text{spin-TQFT}) = \sum_s Z_s(SO(n)_1) Z_s(\text{spin-TQFT}) . \quad (\text{C.23})$$

We will also be interested in the non-spin-TQFT of $\text{Spin}(l)_1$. Like the spin theory based on⁵¹ $SO(l)_1$, it also has $c = \frac{l}{2}$. For l odd it has three lines: the identity, the fermion line, and a spin field line with spin $\frac{l}{16}$. For l even it has four lines: the identity, the fermion line, and two spin field lines with spin $\frac{l}{16}$. Special cases are the following.

$l = 1$ is the non-spin Ising TQFT.

⁵⁰The 2d version of this statement is that 16 chiral fermions, upon summing over spin structures, give a modular invariant theory.

⁵¹Note the confusing terminology. The TQFT based on $\text{Spin}(l)_1$ is non-spin, while the TQFT based on $SO(l)_1$ is a spin-TQFT.

$l = 2$ is usually denoted by $U(1)_4$.

$l = 3$ is usually denoted by $SU(2)_2$.

Let us lift the spin-TQFT of $SO(m)_1$ to a non-spin TQFT. Tensoring it with $SO(n)_1$ and summing over the spin structures the partition function is

$$\mathcal{Z}^n(SO(m)_1) = \sum_s Z_s(SO(n)_1) Z_s(SO(m)_1) = \sum_s Z_s(SO(n+m)_1) = \mathcal{Z}(\text{Spin}(n+m)_1) . \quad (\text{C.24})$$

The resulting theory is $\text{Spin}(n+m)_1$. The simple case $n = 0$ lifts $SO(m)_1$ to the non-spin theory $\text{Spin}(n)_1$.

A more interesting case corresponds to $n = -2$. It lifts $SO(m)_1$ to $\text{Spin}(m-2)_1$. For $m = 3$ this lifts $SU(2)_2/\mathbf{Z}_2$ to the non-spin Ising theory. We can also write this as

$$\frac{SU(2)_2}{\mathbf{Z}_2} \longrightarrow \frac{SU(2)_2}{\mathbf{Z}_2} \times U(1)_{-1} \longrightarrow \frac{SU(2)_2 \times U(1)_{-4}}{\mathbf{Z}_2} , \quad (\text{C.25})$$

where the first term represents Z_s , the second is $z_s Z_s$ and the third is the result of the sum over s . In the third step the numerator is the result of independently summing each factor over s and the \mathbf{Z}_2 quotient guarantees that s in the two sectors is the same. The last expression is the Chern-Simons description of the RCFT coset $\frac{SU(2)_2}{U(1)_4}$ that describes the non-spin Ising theory. As in Appendix C.4, it can also be written as $U(2)_{2,-4}$.

C.6 Chern-Simons Gauge Theories for Non-Abelian FQHE

Here we use the analysis in the previous subsections to find a Chern-Simons description of the series of models of non-Abelian statistics of Read and Rezayi [76], which generalize the famous Moore-Read state [35].

The Read-Rezayi construction starts with the chiral algebra

$$\frac{\text{Parafermions}_k \times U(1)_{kL}}{\mathbf{Z}_k} = \frac{\frac{SU(2)_k}{U(1)_{2k}} \times U(1)_{kL}}{\mathbf{Z}_k} . \quad (\text{C.26})$$

The first factor, the parafermion theory, was analyzed above. It is not a spin theory. The level of the $U(1)$ factor is taken to be a multiple of k so that we can mod out by \mathbf{Z}_k . More explicitly, this guarantees that the $U(1)$ factor has a global \mathbf{Z}_k one-form symmetry, which can be gauged. The quotient by \mathbf{Z}_k is achieved by ensuring that the line ($j = 0, n = 2, l = L$) has trivial braiding. (Here the labels of the line are the $SU(2)_k \times U(1)_{-2k} \times U(1)_{kL}$ representations.) Its spin is $S = \frac{L-2}{2k} \pmod{1}$ and therefore we need

$$L = kM + 2 \quad , \quad M \in \mathbf{Z} . \quad (\text{C.27})$$

For M odd it is a fermion and the theory is spin and for M even it is a boson.

Let us describe the 2 + 1-dimensional Chern-Simons theory. The parafermion theory is described by a $U(2)_{k,-2k}$ theory (C.16) with gauge field c and the $U(1)_{k(kM+2)}$ theory by a gauge field b . The Lagrangian of the $U(2)_{k,-2k} \times U(1)_{k(kM+2)}$ theory is

$$\frac{k}{4\pi} \text{Tr} (cdc + \frac{2}{3}ccc) - \frac{k}{4\pi} (\text{Tr } c)d(\text{Tr } c) + \frac{k(kM+2)}{4\pi} bdb + \frac{k}{2\pi} Adb . \quad (\text{C.28})$$

As we will soon see, the coupling to A is such that we can mod out by \mathbf{Z}_k .

Next, we should mod out by \mathbf{Z}_k . One way to do that is to include additional bundles. An easier way to do that is to find an appropriate change of variables to conventionally normalized $U(2) \times U(1)$ gauge fields. We change variables from c and b , which are no longer good gauge fields, to

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{c} &= c - b\mathbf{1} \\ \tilde{b} &= kb .\end{aligned}\tag{C.29}$$

These combinations were chosen such that the \mathbf{Z}_k one-form global symmetry does not act on them. Equivalently, all the bundles of the original $U(2) \times U(1)/\mathbf{Z}_k$ theory (C.28) can be described as ordinary $U(2) \times U(1)$ bundles with the gauge fields \tilde{c} and \tilde{b} . In terms of these variables the Lagrangian (C.28) is

$$\frac{k}{4\pi} \text{Tr} (\tilde{c}d\tilde{c} + \frac{2}{3}\tilde{c}\tilde{c}\tilde{c}) - \frac{k}{4\pi} (\text{Tr} \tilde{c})d(\text{Tr} \tilde{c}) - \frac{1}{2\pi} (\text{Tr} \tilde{c})d\tilde{b} + \frac{M}{4\pi} \tilde{b}d\tilde{b} + \frac{1}{2\pi} A d\tilde{b} .\tag{C.30}$$

The fact that the coefficients here are properly normalized is an independent derivation of the condition (C.27).

The equations of motion of the Abelian factors are

$$\begin{aligned}kd(\text{Tr} \tilde{c}) + 2d\tilde{b} &= 0 \\ -d(\text{Tr} \tilde{c}) + M d\tilde{b} + dA &= 0\end{aligned}\tag{C.31}$$

and therefore, the response to a background A is

$$j = \frac{\delta S}{\delta A} = \frac{1}{2\pi} d\tilde{b} = -\frac{k}{2\pi L} dA .\tag{C.32}$$

This allows us to identify the filling factor

$$\nu = \frac{k}{L} = \frac{k}{kM + 2} .\tag{C.33}$$

Various models are included in this series:

$k = 1$ Here the parafermions theory is trivial and we have $U(1)_{M+2}$. For $M = 2q - 1$ this is the standard Abelian FQHE. The charges are multiples of $\frac{1}{2q+1}$ and $\nu = \frac{1}{2q+1}$.

$k = 2$ Here the parafermion theory is a Majorana-Weyl fermion (the Ising model) and the chiral algebra is $\left(\frac{SU(2)_2}{U(1)_4} \times U(1)_{4M+4}\right)/\mathbf{Z}_2$. Here $\nu = \frac{1}{M+1}$. For $M = 1$ this is the Moore-Read state [35]. The models with higher values of M were analyzed by [77].

$M = 1$ Here we find the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric minimal models [76], where the charges are multiples of $\frac{1}{k+2}$ and $\nu = \frac{k}{k+2}$. In this case we can shift $\tilde{b} \rightarrow \tilde{b} + \text{Tr} \tilde{c}$ and write eqn. (C.30) as

$$\frac{k}{4\pi} \text{Tr} (\tilde{c}d\tilde{c} + \frac{2}{3}\tilde{c}\tilde{c}\tilde{c}) - \frac{k+1}{4\pi} (\text{Tr} \tilde{c})d(\text{Tr} \tilde{c}) + \frac{1}{4\pi} (\tilde{b} + A)d(\tilde{b} + A) + \frac{1}{2\pi} A d(\text{Tr} \tilde{c}) - \frac{1}{4\pi} A dA .\tag{C.34}$$

In this form the gauge group is $U(2)_{k,-2(k+2)} \times U(1)_1$ and the $U(1)_1$ part decouples. Note that we did not shift \tilde{b} by A in order to preserve the spin/charge relation. An interesting aspect of the theory (C.34) is the role of the decoupled $U(1)_1$ factor. The theory without it is still spin. So its presence does not add additional lines; the theory without it has all the necessary lines. However, keeping the $U(1)_1$ factor, the theory has a purely left moving chiral algebra ($\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry). But if we remove the $U(1)_1$ factor, the corresponding two-dimensional theory needs both left-moving $SU(2)_k$ and right-moving $U(1)_{-2(k+2)}$ modes. Finally, in the form (C.34) the theory is $U(2)_{k,-2(k+2)}$ and it is straightforward use the expressions in section C.4 to work out the spins and charges of the quasiparticles.

$k = 2, M = -3$ Here eqn. (C.26) becomes $(\text{Ising} \times U(1)_{-8})/\mathbf{Z}_2$. This is the topological field theory of the T-Pfaffian state [26, 27], which is expected to play a role both in topological insulators and topological superconductors [69, 34], and which we have discussed in section 6. Substituting these values in eqn. (C.30) we find the Lagrangian

$$\frac{2}{4\pi} \text{Tr} (\tilde{c}d\tilde{c} + \frac{2}{3}\tilde{c}\tilde{c}\tilde{c}) - \frac{2}{4\pi} (\text{Tr} \tilde{c})d(\text{Tr} \tilde{c}) - \frac{1}{2\pi} (\text{Tr} \tilde{c})d\tilde{b} - \frac{3}{4\pi} \tilde{b}d\tilde{b} + \frac{1}{2\pi} A d\tilde{b} . \quad (\text{C.35})$$

References

- [1] C. Kane, and E. Mele, “Quantum Spin Hall Effect in Graphene,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 226801 (2005), cond-mat/0411737.
- [2] C. L. Kane and E. J. Mele, “ \mathbf{Z}_2 Topological Order and the Quantum Spin Hall Effect,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 246802 (2005) [arXiv:cond-mat/0506581 [cond-mat]].
- [3] B. A. Bernevig, T. L. Hughes, and S. C. Zhang, “Quantum Spin Hall Effect and Topological Phase Transition in HgTe Quantum Wells,” *Science* **314**, 1757–1761 (2006), cond-mat/0611399.
- [4] J. E. Moore and L. Balents, “Topological Invariants of Time-Reversal-Invariant Band Structures,” *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 121306(R) (2007).
- [5] M. König, S. Wiedmann, C. Brune, A. Roth, H. Buhmann, L. Molenkamp, X.-L. Qi, and S.-C. Zhang, “Quantum Spin Hall Insulator State in HgTe Quantum Wells,” *Science* **318**, 766 (2007), arXiv:0710.0582.
- [6] L. Fu, C. Kane and E. Mele, “Topological Insulators in Three Dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, no. 10, 106803 (2007).
- [7] R. Roy, “Topological Phases and the Quantum Spin Hall Effect in Three Dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 195322 (2009).
- [8] M. Z. Hasan and C. L. Kane, “Colloquium: Topological Insulators,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 3045 (2010).
- [9] X.-L. Qi and S.-C. Zhang, “Topological Insulators and Superconductors,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 1057 (2011).

- [10] M. Z. Hasan and J. E. Moore, “Three-Dimensional Topological Insulators,” *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **2**, 55 (2011).
- [11] F. Pollmann, A. M. Turner, E. Berg, and M. Oshikawa, “Entanglement Spectrum of a Topological Phase in One Dimension,” *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 064439 (2010)
- [12] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev, “Topological Phases of Fermions in One Dimension,” *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 075103 (2011).
- [13] A. M. Turner, F. Pollmann, and E. Berg, “Topological Phases of One-Dimensional Fermions: An Entanglement Point of View,” *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 075102 (2011).
- [14] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, “Classification of Gapped Symmetric Phases in One-Dimensional Spin Systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 035107 (2011)
- [15] N. Schuch, D. Perez-Garcia, and I. Cirac, “Classifying Quantum Phases Using Matrix Product States and PEPS,” *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 165139, (2011).
- [16] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, “Symmetry-Protected Topological Orders in Interacting Bosonic Systems,” *Science* **338**, 1604 (2012); “Symmetry Protected Topological Orders And The Group Cohomology Of Their Symmetry Group,” *Phys. Rev. B* **87** (2013) 155114.
- [17] E. Witten, “Fermion Path Integrals and Topological Phases,” arXiv:1508.04715.
- [18] R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, “Solitons With Fermion Number 1/2,” *Phys. Rev. D* **13** (1976) 3398.
- [19] X. L. Qi, T. Hughes and S. C. Zhang, “Topological Field Theory of Time-Reversal Invariant Insulators,” *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 195424 (2008) [arXiv:0802.3537 [cond-mat.mes-hall]].
- [20] A. M. Essin, J. E. Moore and D. Vanderbilt, “Magnetoelectric Polarizability and Axion Electrodynamics in Crystalline Insulators,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 146805 (2009) [arXiv:0810.2998 [cond-mat.mes-hall]].
- [21] A. N. Redlich, “Parity Violation and Gauge Noninvariance of the Effective Gauge Field Action in Three-Dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **29**, 2366 (1984).
- [22] A. Niemi and G. Semenoff, “Anomaly-Induced Fermion Fractionization And Effective Actions In Odd-Dimensional Spacetimes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51** (1983) 2077-80.
- [23] L. Alvarez-Gaumé, S. Della Pietra, and G. Moore, “Anomalies And Odd Dimensions,” *Ann. Phys.* **163** (1985) 288-317.
- [24] C. G. Callan, Jr. and J. A. Harvey, “Anomalies and Fermion Zero Modes on Strings and Domain Walls,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **250**, 427 (1985).
- [25] M.A. Metlitski, C.L. Kane, and M.P.A. Fisher, “A Symmetry-Respecting Topologically-Ordered Surface Phase of 3D Electron Topological Insulators,” *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 125111 (2015). [arXiv:1306.3286 [cond-mat.str-el]].

- [26] P. Bonderson, C. Nayak and X. L. Qi, “A Time-Reversal Invariant Topological Phase at the Surface of a 3D Topological Insulator,” *J. Stat. Mech.* **2013**, P09016 (2013) [arXiv:1306.3230 [cond-mat.str-el]].
- [27] X. Chen, L. Fidkowski and A. Vishwanath, “Symmetry Enforced Non-Abelian Topological Order at the Surface of a Topological Insulator,” *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, no. 16, 165132 (2014) [arXiv:1306.3250 [cond-mat.str-el]].
- [28] C. Wang, A. C. Potter, and T. Senthil, “Gapped Symmetry Preserving Surface State for the Electron Topological Insulator,” *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 115137 (2013).
- [29] C. Wang, A. C. Potter, and T. Senthil, “Classification of Interacting Electronic Topological Insulators in Three Dimensions,” *Science* **343**, 629 (2014).
- [30] M. Metlitski and A. Vishwanath, “Particle-Vortex Duality Of 2D Dirac Fermion From Electric-Magnetic Duality Of 3D Topological Insulators,” arXiv:1505.05142.
- [31] D. F. Mross, A. Essin and J. Alicea, “Composite Dirac Liquids: Parent States for Symmetric Surface Topological Order,” *Phys. Rev. X* **5**, no. 1, 011011 (2015) [arXiv:1410.4201 [cond-mat.str-el]].
- [32] A. Vishwanath and T. Senthil “Physics of Three Dimensional Bosonic Topological Insulators: Surface Deconfined Criticality and Quantized Magnetoelectric Effect,” *Phys. Rev. X* **3** (2013) 1, 011016 arXiv:1209.3058 [cond-mat.str-el]
- [33] C. Wang and T. Senthil, “Interacting Fermionic Topological Insulators/Superconductors In Three Dimensions,” arXiv:1401.1142, *Phys. Rev.* **B89** (2014) 195124.
- [34] M. A. Metlitski, L. Fidkowski, X. Chen, and A. Vishwanath, “Interaction Effects On 3d Topological Superconductors: Surface Topological Order From Vortex Condensation, the 16-Fold Way, And Fermionic Kramers Doublets,” arXiv:1406.3032.
- [35] G. W. Moore and N. Read, “Nonabelions In The Fractional Quantum Hall Effect,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **360** (1991) 362-396.
- [36] N. Read and D. Green, “Paired States of Fermions in Two Dimensions with Breaking of Parity and Time-Reversal Symmetries, and the Fractional Quantum Hall Effect,” arXiv:cond-mat/9906453, *Phys. Rev. B* **61** (2000) :10267.
- [37] G. 't Hooft, “Naturalness, Chiral Symmetry, and Spontaneous Chiral Symmetry Breaking,” *NATO Sci. Ser. B* **59**, 135 (1980).
- [38] C. Rosenberg and M. Franz, “Witten Effect In A Crystalline Topological Insulator,” arXiv:1001.3179.
- [39] M. A. Metlitski, C. L. Kane and M. P. A. Fisher, “Bosonic Topological Insulator in Three Dimensions and the Statistical Witten Effect,” *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, no. 3, 035131 (2013) [arXiv:1302.6535 [cond-mat.str-el]].

- [40] M. A. Metlitski, “*S*-duality of $U(1)$ Gauge Theory with $\theta = \pi$ on Non-orientable Manifolds: Applications to Topological Insulators and Superconductors,” arXiv:1510.05663 [hep-th].
- [41] C.-T. Hsieh, G. C. Cho, and S. Ryu, “Global Anomalies On The Surface Of Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases in $(3 + 1)$ Dimensions,” arXiv:1503.01411.
- [42] L. Fidkowski, X. Chen, and A. Vishwanath, “Non-Abelian Topological Order On The Surface Of A 3d Topological Superconductor From An Exactly Solved Model,” Phys. Review **X 3** (2013) 041016.
- [43] A. Kitaev, “Homotopy-Theoretic Approach to SPT Phases in Action: \mathbf{Z}_{16} Classification of Three-Dimensional Superconductors,” lecture notes available at <http://www.ipam.ucla.edu/abstract/?tid=12389&pcode=STQ2015>.
- [44] D. Belov and G. W. Moore, “Classification Of Abelian Spin Chern-Simons Theories,” hep-th/0505235.
- [45] V. Borokhov, A. Kapustin and X. k. Wu, “Topological Disorder Operators in Three-Dimensional Conformal Field Theory,” JHEP **0211**, 049 (2002) [hep-th/0206054].
- [46] L. Fu and C. Kane, “Superconducting Proximity Effect And Majorana Fermions At The Surface Of A Topological Insulator,” arXiv:0707.1692, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100** (2008) 096407.
- [47] T. Fukui and T. Fujiwara, “Topological Stability of Majorana Zero-Modes in Superconductor-Topological Insulator sSstems,” J. Phys. Soc. Jap. **79**, 033701 (2010) [arXiv:0911.2558 [cond-mat.mes-hall]].
- [48] C. Callias, “Axial Anomalies And Index Theorems On Open Spaces,” Commun. Math. Phys. **62** (1978) 213-34.
- [49] R. Jackiw and P. Rossi, “Zero-Modes Of The Vortex-Fermion System,” Nucl. Phys. **190** (1981) 681.
- [50] E. J. Weinberg, “Index Calculations For The Fermion-Vortex System,” Phys. Rev. D **24** (1981) 2669.
- [51] G. E. Volovik, “Monopole, Half-Quantum Vortices and Nexus in Chiral Superfluids and Superconductors,” cond-mat/9911374, Pis'ma Zh. Exp. Teor. Fiz. **70** (1999), 776 [JETP Lett. **70** (1999), 792].
- [52] M. V. Berry, “Quantal Phase Factors Accompanying Adiabatic Changes,” Proc. Roy. Soc. A **392** (1984) 45-57.
- [53] G. W. Moore and N. Seiberg, “Classical and Quantum Conformal Field Theory,” Commun. Math. Phys. **123** (1989) 177. doi:10.1007/BF01238857
- [54] C. Nayak and F. Wilczek, “ $2n$ Quasihole States Realize 2^{n-1} -Dimensional Spinor Braiding Statistics in Paired Quantum Hall States,” Nucl. Phys. B **479** (1996) 529.

- [55] D. Ivanov, “NonAbelian Statistics of Half-Quantum Vortices In p -Wave Superconductors,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 268.
- [56] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev, “The effects of interactions on the topological classification of free fermion systems,” Phys. Rev. B **81**, 134509 (2010) [arXiv:0904.2197 [cond-mat.str-el]].
- [57] S. Coleman and P. Nelson, “What Becomes Of Global Color?” Nucl. Phys. **B237** (1984) 1-31.
- [58] X. Dai and D. S. Freed, “ η -Invariants And Determinant Lines,” J. Math. Phys. **35** (1994) 5155-94.
- [59] M. F. Atiyah, V. Patodi, and I. M. Singer, “Spectral Asymmetry In Riemannian Geometry,” Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **77** (1975) 43-69.
- [60] V. Mikheylov and E. Witten, “Branes And Supergroups,” Commun. Math. Phys. **340** (2015) 699-832, arXiv:1410.1175.
- [61] A. Kapustin and N. Seiberg, “Coupling a QFT to a TQFT and Duality,” JHEP **1404**, 001 (2014) [arXiv:1401.0740 [hep-th]].
- [62] D. Gaiotto, A. Kapustin, N. Seiberg and B. Willett, “Generalized Global Symmetries,” JHEP **1502**, 172 (2015) [arXiv:1412.5148 [hep-th]].
- [63] J. M. Maldacena, G. W. Moore and N. Seiberg, “D-brane Charges in Five-Brane Backgrounds,” JHEP **0110**, 005 (2001) [hep-th/0108152].
- [64] T. Banks and N. Seiberg, “Symmetries and Strings in Field Theory and Gravity,” Phys. Rev. D **83**, 084019 (2011) [arXiv:1011.5120 [hep-th]].
- [65] R. Dijkgraaf and E. Witten, “Topological Gauge Theories and Group Cohomology,” Commun. Math. Phys. **129**, 393 (1990).
- [66] G. W. Moore and N. Seiberg, “Naturality in Conformal Field Theory,” Nucl. Phys. B **313**, 16 (1989).
- [67] G. W. Moore and N. Seiberg, “Taming the Conformal Zoo,” Phys. Lett. B **220**, 422 (1989).
- [68] P. Goddard, A. Kent and D. I. Olive, “Virasoro Algebras and Coset Space Models,” Phys. Lett. B **152**, 88 (1985).
- [69] L. Fidkowski, X. Chen and A. Vishwanath, “Non-Abelian Topological Order on the Surface of a 3D Topological Superconductor from an Exactly Solved Model,” Phys. Rev. X **3**, no. 4, 041016 (2013) [arXiv:1305.5851 [cond-mat.str-el]].
- [70] C. Wang and T. Senthil, Dual Dirac liquid on the surface of the electron topological insulator, (arXiv:1505.05141), Phys. Rev. X **5**, 041031 (2015).
- [71] D.-T. Son, “Is The Composite Fermion A Dirac Particle?” arXiv:1502.03446.

- [72] R. Bott and R. Seeley, “Some Remarks On The Paper Of Callias,” Commun. Math. Phys. **62** (1978) 235-45.
- [73] R. Seeley, “Fredholm Differential Operators on \mathbf{R}^n ,” Battelle Institute preprint (1969).
- [74] M. W. Goodman, “Proof Of Character-Valued Index Theorems,” Commun. Math. Phys. **107** (1986) 391.
- [75] A. Davydov, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik, “On the structure of the Witt group of braided fusion categories,” Selecta Mathematica **19** 1, 239 (2013). arXiv:1109.5558 [math.QA].
- [76] N. Read and E. Rezayi, “Beyond Paired Quantum Hall States: Parafermions and Incompressible States in the First Excited Landau Level,” Phys. Rev. B **59**, 8084 (1999). [cond-mat/9809384].
- [77] P. Fendley, M.P.A. Fisher, and C. Nayak, “Edge States and Tunneling of Non-Abelian Quasiparticles in the $\nu = 5/2$ Quantum Hall State and $p + ip$ Superconductors,” Phys. Rev. B **75**(4), 045317. [arXiv:cond-mat/0607431].