Characterization and Classification of Fermionic Symmetry Enriched Topological Phases

David Aasen,1,2 Parsa Bonderson,1 and Christina Knapp1,3,4

1Microsoft Station Q, Santa Barbara, California 93106-6105 USA
2Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA
3Department of Physics and Institute for Quantum Information and Matter, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA
4Walter Burke Institute for Theoretical Physics, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

(Dated: September 24, 2021)

We examine the interplay of symmetry and topological order in 2 + 1 dimensional fermionic topological phases of matter. We define fermionic topological symmetries acting on the emergent topological effective theory described using braided tensor category theory. Connecting this to the $G_f$ fermionic symmetry of the microscopic physical system, we characterize and classify symmetry fractionalization in fermionic topological phases. We find that the physical fermion provides constraints that result in a tiered structure of obstructions and classification of fractionalization with respect to the physical fermions, the quasiparticles, and the vortices. The fractionalization of the (bosonic) symmetry $G = G_f/Z_f$ on the physical fermions is essentially the central extension of $G$ by the $Z_f^2$ fermion parity conservation that yields the fermionic symmetry $G_f$. We develop an algebraic theory of $G_f$ symmetry defects for fermionic topological phases using $G$-crossed braided tensor category theory, which describes the fusion, braiding, symmetry action, and fractionalization patterns of quasiparticles, vortices, and defects. This formalism allows us to fully characterize and classify 2 + 1 dimensional fermionic symmetry enriched topological phases with on-site unitary fermionic symmetry group $G_f$. We first apply this formalism to extract the minimal data specifying a general fermionic symmetry protected topological phase, and demonstrate that such phases with fixed $G_f$ form a group under fermionic stacking, i.e. pairing $G_f$-symmetric phases and condensing the bound pair of their physical fermions, finding agreement with existing classifications. Then we analyze general fermionic symmetry enriched topological phases and find their classification is given torsorially by the classification of the symmetry fractionalization of quasiparticles combined with the classification of fermionic symmetry protected topological phases. We illustrate our results by detailing a number of examples, including all the invertible fermionic topological phases.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Gapped quantum phases of matter may exhibit different types of topological order, which are defined independently of any symmetries and cannot be distinguished by any local observables [1, 2]. The defining properties of such topological phases are encoded globally in long-range entanglement patterns, resulting in a number of remarkable nonlocal properties including topologically protected ground state degeneracies and emergent quasiparticles with exotic exchange statistics. Imposing a symmetry on a topological phase enriches the classification by restricting, and possibly fracturing, the phase space. Regions of phase space that were adiabatically connected in the absence of symmetry, but disconnected when symmetry is imposed, may manifest distinct phases that have the same topological order, but different symmetry characteristics. In the case of trivial topological order, these new phases are symmetry protected topological (SPT) phases that may be distinguished by the nontrivial topological properties of their symmetry defects [3, 4]. When the phase has nontrivial topological order (in the absence of symmetry), it can divide into distinct symmetry enriched topological (SET) phases in the presence of symmetry (see Ref. 5, and references therein). Notably, nontrivial topological order allows the symmetry to act nontrivially on the emergent quasiparticles and even to fractionize, meaning the quasiparticles can carry symmetry quantum numbers that do not correspond to linear representations of the symmetry group. In this way, SET phases are characterized by different realizations of both symmetry fractionalization and symmetry defects.

Topological orders can be divided into two classes corresponding to whether the microscopic degrees of freedom supporting the phase are purely bosonic (e.g., spins or qubits) or whether they include fermions (e.g., electrons). Emergent coherent excitations, such as quasiparticles, of a topological phase carry emergent quantum numbers, called “topological charges,” that are conserved under local operations. Equivalence under local operations defines the notion of the topological vacuum charge $Z$, which is assigned to local (bosonic) operators and particles. Fermionic topological phases additionally include a fermionic underlying particle of the system, the physical fermion, distinguished from the (bosonic) vacuum. We denote the topological charge corresponding to the physical fermion as $\psi$. Some key consequences of having a physical fermion in the theory include: (1) fermion parity of $\psi$ is always conserved and can (in many regards) be treated as a symmetry of the system, denoted $Z_2^f$, (2) the $Z_2^f$ symmetry translates into a $Z_2$-grading on the theory distinguishing objects as quasiparticles, which have trivial braiding with $\psi$, and vortices, which have a $-1$ braiding with $\psi$ and can thus be thought of as defects of the $Z_2^f$ symmetry, and (3) the topological charge $\psi$ couples to a spin structure, which is a reference field that tracks the phases and relative minus signs associated with transport of the physical fermion around closed paths on the spacetime manifold.

Despite the ubiquity of fermionic phases in condensed matter systems and the intense interest in understanding the interplay of symmetry and topology, a general characterization and classification of fermionic topological or-
The symmetry group is given by imposing conservation of fermion parity implies the full implications arise, however, when attempting to do so. First, the global symmetry group of \((2+1)\) fermion to an emergent coherent excitation of the system.

In this work, we resolve these complications for \((2+1)D\) fermionic symmetry enriched topological (FSET) phases, developing the theory of fermionic symmetry fractionalization and the \(G^\ell\)-crossed theory for defects, which provide both characterization and classification of FSET phases. Using the categorical description of fermionic topological order through fermionic MTCs, we examine the constraints imposed by the presence of a physical fermion. Crucially, these restrict the various possible gauge transformations that are considered physical equivalences, resulting in physical differences compared to the analogous bosonic theory. For instance, the fermionic topological symmetry group is not necessarily equal to the bosonic topological symmetry group and fractionalization patterns that differ by modifications of the vorticity of local operators are inequivalent. Another important property is that the fractionalization of \(G\) symmetry on the physical fermions precisely corresponds to the particular central extension of \(G\) by \(\mathbb{Z}_2^f\) that yields the fermionic symmetry group \(G^f\). This all yields a new classification structure for symmetry fractionalization of fermionic topological phases. Moreover, finer scale structures also arise, where the fractionalization can be described in terms of the symmetry fractionalization of quasiparticles, together with the extension of fractionalization to the vortices. After developing the theory of fractionalization for fermionic topological phases, we develop the \(G^\ell\)-crossed theory, which incorporates the constraints and classification uncovered for fractionalization.

In this way, \((2+1)D\) FSET phases can be classified by finding all the possible physically inequivalent \(G^\ell\)-crossed extensions of a given fermionic topological order. Brute force solving the consistency conditions does not provide
a practical approach to this problem, except when the fermionic topological order is sufficiently simple, so we seek a similar classification scheme to that of bosonic SET phases. In order to address the classification problem, we begin with FSPT phases with $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$, solving for the topological data of all such theories. These theories are not just illustrative examples of $G^f$-crossed formalism; they play a critical role in the efficient construction of a “base theory” for any choice of $G^f$. By taking a restricted product of a $\mathbb{Z}_2^f \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ FSPT phase with a $G$ bosonic SPT phase, we can construct a FSPT phase for each symmetry action compatible with full symmetry group $\mathbb{Z}_2^f \times G$. This theory provides a base from which we can torsorially generate all remaining theories with the same symmetry action [19], including those with different $G^f$. We write the topological data of each such theory from that of the base theory and the cocycles relating them. From this, we extract a minimal set of data specifying every FSPT phase.

When two phases with the same microscopic fermions are brought together, the composite of physical fermions for the two theories condenses (is identified with the vacuum charge). Using general properties of the minimal set of data specifying each FSPT phase, we demonstrate that the set of FSPT phases with fixed $G^f$ form a group under stacking. We extract this group law to classify FSPT phases.

Combining our understanding of fermionic symmetry fractionalization and its classification, the fermionic $G^f$-crossed defect theory, and the classification of FSPT phases, we are able to provide a three stage classification of all $(2 + 1)$D FSET phases, analogous to the classification of bosonic SET phases. Noticing that parts of the symmetry action and fractionalization structure can be accounted for by stacking with FSPT phases, we recognize two perspectives for organizing the classification structure of FSET phases: the first views the fermionic theory of the quasiparticles together with the vortices as fundamental, and develops the symmetry action, fractionalization, and defectification as a $G$-symmetry extension; the second views the fermionic theory of just the quasiparticles as fundamental, and develops the symmetry action, fractionalization, and defectification as a $G^f$-symmetry extension, including the vortices at the defectification stage. The former view includes a torsorial action through gluing with bosonic SPT phases, while the latter includes a torsorial action through stacking with FSPT phases. We demonstrate through a number of explicit examples that our findings recover previously known classification results.

Previous works have classified FSPT phases using spin-cobordism [20–22], defect decoration [7, 23–25], $G$-graded tensor categories [6, 26], and by constructing topological invariants of band Hamiltonians [27]. Spin cobordism and defect decoration classifications provide a physical picture for the ground state wavefunction of a FSPT phase, but further calculation is necessary in order to determine the algebraic properties of the low energy excitations. In this work, we classify FSPT phases according to their group structure under stacking. When the group law from these other approaches is explicitly known, we demonstrate agreement with our results. Moreover, we find that the elements of the Pontryagin dual of the spin bordism group determine the complete set of data describing the algebraic theory of the FSPT phase, in the cases where the Pontryagin dual has been computed [28].

Far less progress has previously been made for FSET phases. Ref. 29 proposed to classify fermionic topological phases with symmetry by classifying their fully gauged counterparts. This relies on the one-to-one correspondence of the gauging process (equivariantization). Since it does not explicitly construct the theory with symmetry and defects, it does not provide an explicit characterization of the symmetric theory. In particular, the extraction of properties like symmetry fractionalization and defect fusion and braiding require a further difficult calculation associated with a $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$ condensation (de-equivariantization). Moreover, the classification requires a brute force solution of the pentagon and hexagon consistency conditions to determine all possible gauged theories. In practice, even when given the full data of the original topological order, this approach is only feasible for theories with very low rank. Other works address symmetry fractionalization [30] and fermionic topological order from the perspective of anomalies and bosonization [31, 32]. The fermionic state-sum approach take in Ref. 32 is complementary to the analysis here in that it is particularly useful for understanding anomalous theories, but does not yield a classification or description of defects for $(2 + 1)$D theories. Our results are in some respects more limited in scope (onsite, unitary symmetries $G$ in $(2 + 1)$D), while in others they are more general (applicable beyond FSPT phases to all FSET phases).

Our paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we review the BTC description of $(2 + 1)$D bosonic and fermionic topological order. We then incorporate symmetry in Sec. III, extending the notions of topological symmetry, symmetry action, and symmetry fractionalization to fermionic theories. Sec. IV develops the $G^f$-crossed formalism of FSET phases. We then focus on FSPT phases, deriving the minimal set of data describing all such theories in Sec. V. In Sec. VI, we combine these results to provide the full classification of FSET phases. We illustrate these concepts with explicit examples in Sec. VII, before concluding in Sec. VIII. Additional details and technical background material are relegated to the Appendices.

II. BRAIDED TENSOR CATEGORY
DESCRIPTION OF $(2 + 1)$D TOPOLOGICAL ORDER

Unitary braided tensor categories (BTCs) provide an algebraic structure that can be used to describe the universal properties of $(2 + 1)$D topological phases in the absence of symmetry, such as the anyonic fusion and braid-
ing of quasiparticles. For bosonic topological phases, the topological order is understood to be fully characterized by the chiral central charge and a unitary modular tensor category (MTC), which is a BTC with non-degenerate braiding. The MTC can also be used to construct the low-energy effective topological quantum field theory (TQFT) describing the system on arbitrary spacetime manifolds. For fermionic topological phases, the universal properties of quasiparticles are described by a super-modular tensor category (SMTC), which is a BTC with an object identified as a physical fermion that has trivial (pure-)braiding with all objects in the theory, and which has non-degenerate braiding aside from the 2-fold degeneracy implied by the physical fermion. However, this does not capture the full topological order of a fermionic topological phase; to complete the picture, one again needs the chiral central charge and a fermionic modular tensor category (FMTC), which includes the SMTC. (Actually, each SMTC has a 16-fold way of possible FMTCs extensions, and specifying the chiral central charge uniquely specifies one of these 16 FMTCs.) The extra structure encoded in the FMTC describes the universal properties of fermionic vortices, which have non-trivial braiding with the physical fermions, and their interplay with the quasiparticles. Similarly, the FMTC can be used to construct the corresponding spin TQFT describing the system, which incorporates the spin structures necessary for defining spinors on general manifolds. “Gauging” the \( Z_2 \) fermionic parity symmetry has the effect of summing over spin structures, making the order parameter fluctuating, and coupling the physical fermion to a \( Z_2 \) gauge field to make it an emergent excitation. As a result, the gauged theory is a MTC of a bosonic topological phase for which the fermion is no longer physical, but emergent. This section reviews the relevant material on BTCs and details needed in this paper. Additional details can be found in Refs. 5 and 33 (we primarily use the conventions of Ref. 5).

### A. Braided Tensor Categories

The simple objects of a BTC \( \mathcal{C} \) are topological charges associated with distinct types of quasiparticles (or other objects). In other words, they are conserved quantum numbers that cannot be altered by operations localized within a region to which they are ascribed, such as the neighborhood of a single quasiparticle. Physical states that can be related by local operations are considered topologically equivalent and not distinguished by the topological effective theory. The set of topological charges (simple objects) is assumed to be finite, and the topological effective theory. The set of topological charges is considered topologically equivalent and not distinguished by states that can be related by local operations are considered topologically equivalent and not distinguished by the physical fermion. However, this does not capture the full topological order of a fermionic topological phase; to complete the picture, one again needs the chiral central charge and a fermionic modular tensor category (FMTC), which includes the SMTC. (Actually, each SMTC has a 16-fold way of possible FMTCs extensions, and specifying the chiral central charge uniquely specifies one of these 16 FMTCs.) The extra structure encoded in the FMTC describes the universal properties of fermionic vortices, which have non-trivial braiding with the physical fermions, and their interplay with the quasiparticles. Similarly, the FMTC can be used to construct the corresponding spin TQFT describing the system, which incorporates the spin structures necessary for defining spinors on general manifolds. “Gauging” the \( Z_2 \) fermionic parity symmetry has the effect of summing over spin structures, making the order parameter fluctuating, and coupling the physical fermion to a \( Z_2 \) gauge field to make it an emergent excitation. As a result, the gauged theory is a MTC of a bosonic topological phase for which the fermion is no longer physical, but emergent. This section reviews the relevant material on BTCs and details needed in this paper. Additional details can be found in Refs. 5 and 33 (we primarily use the conventions of Ref. 5).

The fusion of charges \( a \) and \( b \) to \( c \) is denoted by \( \mathcal{C} \), where the fusion multiplicities \( N_{ab}^c \) are non-negative integers indicating the number of distinct ways that \( a \) and \( b \) can be combined to form \( c \). Associativity implies

\[
\sum_c N_{ab}^c N_{cd}^e = \sum_f N_{af}^d N_{bf}^e.
\]

There is a special charge \( \mathcal{I} \) designated as the “vacuum” or trivial charge, which has trivial fusion and braiding. The vacuum charge corresponds to local operators acting on the microscopic degrees of freedom, which do not affect the topological charges. In particular, this means it is the unique charge with \( N_{ab}^\mathcal{I} = N_{\mathcal{I}a} = \delta_{ac} \) for all \( a \).

Each topological charge \( a \) has a unique conjugate charge denoted \( \bar{a} \) such that \( a \) and \( \bar{a} \) can fuse to \( \mathcal{I} \) (in exactly one way), i.e. \( N_{ab}^{\mathcal{I}} = \delta_{\bar{a}a} = \delta_{\bar{a}a} \). It is possible, but not necessary, for charges to be self-dual, meaning \( a = \bar{a} \).

When the fusion of a topological charge \( a \) with all other charges has a unique outcome, i.e. \( a \otimes b = c \) or \( \sum_c N_{ab}^c = 1 \) for all \( b \), then \( a \) is said to be Abelian; otherwise it is non-Abelian. This terminology is correlated with the braiding properties of such objects, i.e. Abelian charges have strictly Abelian braiding with all objects, while quasiparticles carrying the same non-Abelian charge give rise to non-Abelian braiding transformations. The vacuum charge \( \mathcal{I} \) is necessarily Abelian, since \( \mathcal{I} \otimes a = a \), thus all BTCs trivially contain at least one Abelian charge. By associativity, two Abelian charges always fuse to an Abelian charge. Together with each charge having a unique conjugate charge, this implies that the collection of Abelian charges \( \mathcal{A} \) of any BTC \( \mathcal{C} \) forms a group under fusion. Including the full fusion and braiding structure, \( \mathcal{A} \) always forms a BTC which is a subcategory of \( \mathcal{C} \).

We define the quantum dimension \( d_a \) to be the largest eigenvalue of the fusion matrix \( N_{ab} \) defined as \( [N_{ab}]_{bc} = N_{ab}^c \) with \( b \) and \( c \) the matrix indices. (The Perron-Frobenius theorem guarantees \( d_a \geq 1 \) are positive real numbers.) A charge \( a \) is Abelian if and only if it has \( d_a = 1 \), while non-Abelian charges have \( d_a > 1 \). The total quantum dimension \( D \) of \( \mathcal{C} \) is given by \( D = \sqrt{\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} d_a^2} \).

The fusion of charges \( a \) and \( b \) to \( c \) is associated with a vector space \( V_{ab}^c \) with \( \dim V_{ab}^c = N_{ab}^c \), and a dual (splitting) space \( V_{cb}^{ab} \). The corresponding anyonic states and operators can be represented diagrammatically, which can often be useful for encapsulating complicated calculations in a simple way. In the diagrammatic notation, topological charges label oriented line segments and trivalent vertices describe states within these vector spaces

\[
\langle a, b; c, \mu \rangle \in V_{ab}^c = \left( \frac{d_a}{d_a d_b} \right)^{1/4} \quad (2)
\]

\[
\langle a, b; c, \mu \rangle \in V_{cb}^{ab} = \left( \frac{d_a}{d_a d_b} \right)^{1/4} \quad (3)
\]

where the fusion multiplicities \( N_{ab}^c \). The normalizations are chosen to make bending a line a unitary operation. The corresponding inner product obtained by stacking diagrams
translates into a bubble removal identity
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a} \quad \text{b} = \delta_{\mu\nu} \delta_{cc'} \sqrt{\frac{d_a d_b}{d_c}}.
\end{array}
\] (4)
and a partition of identity
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a} \quad \text{b} = \sum_{c,\mu} \sqrt{\frac{d_a}{d_a d_b}}
\end{array}
\] (5)
In the diagrammatic formalism, we can freely add and remove charge lines associated with \( \mathcal{I} \). The direction of an arrow can be reversed by changing the topological charge to its conjugate charge.

More complicated diagrams involving additional anyons are constructed by stacking trivalent vertices and connecting lines corresponding to the same topological charge. The vector spaces for larger numbers of anyons satisfy associativity of fusion
\[
V_{d}^{abc} \cong \bigoplus_e V_{e}^{ab} \otimes V_{d}^{ec} \cong \bigoplus_f V_{d}^{af} \otimes V_{f}^{bc},
\] (6)
where \( \cong \) denotes an isomorphism called an \( F \)-move, written diagrammatically as
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a} \quad \text{b} \quad \text{c} = \sum_{f,\mu,\nu} [F_{d}^{abc}]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}
\end{array}
\] (7)
The \( F \)-moves amount to changing the basis of the three-anyon splitting space; as such they correspond to unitary transformations. Unitarity fixes
\[
[(F_{d}^{abc})^{-1}]_{(f,\mu,\nu)(e,\alpha,\beta)} = [F_{d}^{abc}]_{(e,\alpha,\beta)(f,\mu,\nu)}.
\] (8)
Any combination of \( F \)-moves that begin and end with the same diagram must be equivalent; this consistency condition results in the pentagon equation for the \( F \)-symbols:
\[
\sum_{\delta} [F_{e}^{f,\alpha\delta}]_{(g,\beta,\gamma),(l,\nu,\delta)} [F_{e}^{f,\alpha\delta}][F_{e}^{f,\alpha\delta}][F_{e}^{f,\alpha\delta}]_{(h,\psi,\sigma),(k,\rho,\lambda)} [F_{k}^{f,\alpha\delta}]_{(h,\psi,\sigma),(l,\nu,\delta)} = 0
\] (9)
The corresponding diagrammatic equation is depicted in Fig. 1.

Fusion with the vacuum charge is trivial, which means vacuum lines can be freely added and removed from diagrams. This corresponds to canonical isomorphisms between \( V_{\mathcal{I}a} \otimes V_{\mathcal{I}a} \otimes \mathbb{C} \), i.e. making canonical choices of the basis state \( |\mathcal{I}, a; a\rangle \) and \( |a, \mathcal{I}; a\rangle \) (including \( |\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}\rangle \)). Physically, this can be understood as connecting the emergent effective theory’s vacuum charge and state to corresponding quantities in the physical system, i.e. local operators and states of the microscopic degrees of freedom. In terms of the \( F \)-symbols, the triviality of the vacuum charge corresponds to the condition \( F_{d}^{abc} = 1 \) when any of \( a, b, \) or \( c \) equals \( \mathcal{I} \).

The inner product together with the \( F \)-moves can be used to define a pivotal structure that allows for the bending of lines and raising or lowering legs of a fusion vertex, up to unitary transformations. Using this to with the partition of identity, we find the quantum dimensions satisfy
\[
d_a d_b = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} N_{ab}^c d_c.
\] (10)
Locality of the theory thus requires \( N_{ab}^c = N_{ba}^c \), making the fusion algebra commutative, i.e. \( a \otimes b = b \otimes a \).
Clockwise braiding exchanges correspond to the operator

\[(R^{ab})^{-1} = \begin{array}{c} b \\ a \end{array} \] (13)

where unitary requires

\[\left((R^{ab})^{-1}\right)_{\nu\mu} = [R^{ab}]^*_{\mu\nu}.\] (14)

which are depicted diagrammatically in Fig. 2. The \(F\)- and \(R\)-symbols constitute the basic data characterizing a BTC. The hexagon equations together with the condition that \(F^{abc} = I\) when any of \(a, b,\) or \(c\) equal \(I\) implies that \(R^{Ia} = R^{aI} = 1\), i.e. braiding with the vacuum charge is trivial, as it ought to be.

Unitary transformations \(\Gamma^{ab}_c\) acting on the fusion/splitting spaces \(V^{ab}_c\) and \(V^{cb}_a\) redefine the basis states as

\[|a, b, c, \mu\rangle = \sum_{\nu} \Gamma^{ab}_c|a, b, c, \nu\rangle.\] (17)

The unitary transformations define a gauge freedom of the theory. The \(F\)- and \(R\)-symbols are generally not invariant under such \textit{vertex basis gauge transformations}, but rather transform as

\[\left[\tilde{F}^{abc}_{d}\right]_{(e, \alpha, \beta)(f, \mu, \nu)} = \sum_{\alpha', \beta', \gamma'} \Gamma^{bc}_e|\alpha'\rangle\langle\beta'| \left[\Gamma^{ef}_{d}\right]_{\gamma\gamma'} \left[\tilde{F}^{abc}_{d}\right]_{(e, \alpha', \beta')(f, \mu', \nu')} \left[(\Gamma^{ef}_{d})^{-1}\right]_{\mu'\gamma'} \left[(\Gamma^{ef}_{d})^{-1}\right]_{\nu'\nu}.\] (18)

In order for braiding to be compatible with fusion, locality requires that a pair of anyons that are braided with a third and then fused together should be equivalent to first fusing the pair and braiding with the third. This equivalence can be expressed as a pair of consistency conditions known as the hexagon equations

\[
\sum_{\lambda, \gamma} [R^{ac}_d]_{\alpha, \lambda}[F^{abc}_d]_{(e, \lambda, \beta)(g, \gamma, \nu)} [R^{bc}_g]_{\gamma\mu} = \sum_{f, \sigma, \psi}[F^{abc}_d]_{(e, \alpha, \beta)(f, \sigma, \delta)}[R^{bc}_f]_{\gamma\nu}[F^{ef}_d]_{(f, \delta, \psi)(g, \mu, \nu)},
\]

(15)

\[
\sum_{\lambda, \gamma} [(R^{ac}_d)^{-1}]_{\alpha\lambda}[F^{abc}_d]_{(e, \lambda, \beta)(g, \gamma, \nu)} [(R^{bc}_g)^{-1}]_{\gamma\mu} = \sum_{f, \sigma, \psi}[F^{abc}_d]_{(e, \alpha, \beta)(f, \sigma, \delta)}[(R^{bc}_f)^{-1}]_{\gamma\nu}[F^{ef}_d]_{(f, \delta, \psi)(g, \mu, \nu)},
\]

(16)

and

\[\left[R^{ab}_{c}\right]_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{\mu'\nu'} [\Gamma^{ba}_c]_{\mu\mu'}[R^{ab}_c]_{\mu'\nu'}[\Gamma^{ca}_c]^{-1}_{\nu'\nu}.\] (19)

Theories whose basic data are related by such gauge transformations are considered equivalent theories.

In terms of the vertex basis gauge transformations, the condition \(F^{abc}_d = I\) when any of \(a, b,\) or \(c\) equals \(I\) requires that the corresponding gauge transformations are fixed, that is \(\Gamma^{Ia}_a = \Gamma^{Ia}_b = \Gamma^{Ia}_c\). The \(\Gamma^{Ia}\) gauge transformation does not change any of the basic data, because it always cancels out. However, the canonical isomorphisms between \(V^{Ia}_a\), \(V^{aI}_a\), and \(C\) indicate that we should fix \(\Gamma^{Ia}_a = 1\).

We now mention some important gauge invariant quantities. We first note that the quantum dimension is an invariant that can also be expressed in terms of...
\[ d_a = \left| [F_a^\alpha \alpha]_{I,I} \right|^{-1} = \bigcirc_a \]  

When a charge \( a \) is self-dual, i.e., \( a = \bar{a} \), the Frobenius-Schur indicator of that charge is an invariant equal to \( \kappa_a = d_a [F_a^{\alpha \alpha}]_{I,I} \), and takes values \( \kappa_a = \pm 1 \).

The topological twist of a charge \( a \) is an invariant defined by
\[ \theta_a = \theta_{\bar{a}} = \sum_{c,\mu} \frac{d_c}{d_a} [R_c^{\alpha}]_{\mu \mu} = \frac{1}{d_a} \bigcirc_a \]  

The pure braiding of charges satisfy the ribbon property, which is expressed in terms of the twists as
\[ \sum_{\lambda} [R_c^{ab}]_{\lambda \mu} [R_c^{ba}]_{\lambda \nu} = \frac{\theta_c}{\theta_a \theta_b} \delta_{\mu \nu}. \]  

Taking the quantum trace of a pure-braid yields the topological S-matrix (up to normalization), which is the invariant defined by
\[ S_{ab} = \frac{1}{D} \sum_c N_{ab}^{cb} \theta_c d_c = \frac{1}{D} a \bigcirc_b \]  

Related to these is the monodromy scalar component
\[ M_{ab} = \frac{S_{ab} S_{II}}{S_{Ia} S_{Ib}} \]  

If at least one of \( a \) or \( b \) is Abelian, we have
\[ R^{ab} R^{ba} = M_{ab} \]  

and \( M_{ab} \) is a phase. When \( M_{ae} \) is a phase for a specific choice of \( a \) and \( e \), it follows that
\[ M_{ae} M_{be} = M_{ce} \]  

for any \( b, c \) with \( N_{ab}^c \neq 0 \). If Eq. (27) holds for all \( a, b, c \) such that \( N_{ab}^c \neq 0 \), then \( e \) is Abelian.

A useful property of BTCs is that their fusion algebra can be diagonalized. More specifically, the associativity and commutativity of the fusion rules implies that the fusion matrices are simultaneously diagonalizable by a unitary matrix \( \mathbf{P} \). In this way, we can write \( N_{ab} = \mathbf{PA}^{(a)} \mathbf{P}^{-1} \), where the diagonal matrix \( [A^{(a)}]_{jk} = \lambda_j^{(a)} \delta_{jk} \) and the eigenvalues are \( \lambda_j^{(a)} = \mathbf{P}_{aj} / \mathbf{P}_{Ij} \). These eigenvalues provide the characters \( \lambda_j \) of the fusion algebra, satisfying
\[ \lambda_j^{(a)} \lambda_j^{(b)} = \sum_{c \in C} N_{ab}^{c} \lambda_j^{(c)} \]  

for each \( j \). The number of characters is equal to the number of topological charge types.

A MTC is a BTC for which the S-matrix is unitary. This is equivalent to the condition that braiding is non-degenerate, that is for every charge \( a \neq I \), there is some charge \( b \) for which \( R^{ab} R^{ba} \neq 1 \). Some important properties of MTCs include the following: The chiral central charge \( c_\perp \mod 8 \) is given by
\[ e^{i \frac{2 \pi}{8} c_\perp} = \frac{1}{D} \sum a \theta_a^2 \theta_a. \]  

The S-matrix together with \( T_{ab} = \theta_a \delta_{ab} \) provide a projective representation of the modular transformations for the system on a torus. The topological S-matrix diagonalizes the fusion algebra, that is \( \mathbf{P}_{ab} = S_{ab} \), and so there is a canonical labeling of the characters \( \lambda_b^{(a)} \) by the topological charge values \( b \in C \).

An important implication of this is that, for MTCs, if there are phase factors that satisfy the relation
\[ e^{i \phi_a} e^{i \phi_b} = e^{i \phi_c} \]
for all $a, b, c$ such that $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$, then there exists a unique Abelian topological charge $e$ such that
\[ e^{\phi_a} = M_{ae} \tag{31} \]
for all $a$. In other words, there is a bijection between the set of such phases and the set of Abelian topological charges $\mathcal{A}$.

1. Example: Toric code

One of the most well-known topological phases is the toric code, TC [34]. This model has four Abelian anyons: the vacuum charge $\mathcal{I}$, an emergent fermion $\psi$, and two Abelian bosons $e$ and $m$. The charges satisfy $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ fusion
\[ \psi \otimes e = m, \quad \psi \otimes m = e, \quad e \otimes m = \psi, \quad a \otimes a = \mathcal{I}, \tag{32} \]
The $F$-symbols are trivial, and the $R$-symbols are given by,
\[ R^{\psi \psi} = R^{e \psi} = R^{\psi m} = R^{em} = -1. \tag{33} \]
The three bosons $\mathcal{I}$, $e$, and $m$ all have trivial topological twist, while the emergent fermion $\psi$ has $\theta_\psi = -1$.

As we will see in the next section, when $\psi$ is interpreted as a physical fermion the toric code corresponds to the trivial fermionic theory.

B. Fermionic Theories

We now consider the algebraic theory that describes fermionic topological phases in the absence of symmetry. When the microscopic degrees of freedom are fermions (e.g., a superconductor), there are additional physical properties that must be incorporated in the effective topological theory, such as canonical gauge fixing, fermionic vortices, and spin structures. Two approaches to constructing the algebraic theory of the low energy excitations and spin TQFT for fermionic topological phases include using super pivotal modular tensor categories [35, 36] and using fermionic MTCs [37]. These descriptions are related by condensing a fermion [35]. In this paper, we utilize the FMTC approach and draw various results from Ref. 37.

We begin by identifying a topological charge $\psi$ in the theory that is identified as the physical fermion. The fermion has topological data
\[ \psi \otimes \psi = \mathcal{I}, \tag{34} \]
\[ F^{\psi \psi} = 1, \tag{35} \]
\[ R^{\psi \psi}_{\psi} = \theta_\psi = -1. \tag{36} \]
This forms a BTC which we denote as $\mathbb{Z}_2^\psi$ (sometimes called SVect), which will be a subcategory of any fermionic theory. (It is possible to define generalized fermionic theories in which there are multiple distinct types of fermions, as well as fermions with more complicated fusion, such as $\mathbb{Z}_{2N}$ fusion, but we will leave such theories to be explored in future work.)

The quasiparticles of a fermionic topological phase are described by a SMTC. A SMTC $\mathcal{B}$ is a BTC that contains the physical fermion $\mathbb{Z}_2^\psi$, which has trivial monodromy with all quasiparticles, so that $M_{\psi a} = 1$ for all $a \in \mathcal{B}$, and only the fermion has degenerate braiding. The last condition is equivalent to the condition that
\[ S = S_\psi \otimes \hat{S}, \tag{37} \]
where $\hat{S}_{ab} = \sqrt{2} S_{ab}$ is unitary, and
\[ S_\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{38} \]
is the $S$-matrix of $\mathbb{Z}_2^\psi$. Here, we have introduced “supersectors” of topological charge, defined to be pairs related by fusion with the physical fermion
\[ \hat{a} = \{ a, \psi \otimes a \}. \tag{39} \]
We emphasize that even though the $S$-matrix of a SMTC factorizes in this way, it is not necessarily the case that the entire category $\mathcal{B}$ can be written in the factorized form $\mathbb{Z}_2^\psi \boxtimes \hat{\mathcal{B}}$, where $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ is a MTC. In fact, there are examples for which there are no BTCs, or even FTCs with the corresponding fusion rules required for such a $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ (see Secs. VII G and VII F). On the other hand, every Abelian SMTC does factorize in this way. This follows from the more general statement that any Abelian BTC $\mathcal{A}$ that contains a fermion $\psi$ for which $\psi \otimes \psi = \mathcal{I}$, $\theta_\psi = -1$, $M_{\psi a} = 1$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ factorizes as $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi \boxtimes \hat{\mathcal{A}}$ where $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is a BTC (see Appendix B).

One might expect a SMTC could be sufficient to describe a fermionic topological phase, since it describes the quasiparticles and even contains a large amount of information about the vortices, such as the fusion rules of vortex supersectors. However, it is not sufficient to fully describe the vortices, determine the chiral central charge $c_-$ (mod 8), nor consistently assign quantum states to closed manifolds. In order to fully describe a $(2 + 1)$D fermionic topological phase, one needs to specify which FMTC describes the system. (It is, however, possible that a SMTC can be realized as an anomalous $(2 + 1)$D boundary theory of a $(3 + 1)$D theory with an appropriately matching bulk.)

The definition of a FMTC is a MTC $\mathcal{M}$ that contains the physical fermion $\mathbb{Z}_2^\psi$. As a fermionic theory, both the vacuum $\mathcal{I}$ and the physical fermion $\psi$ topological charges correspond to local microscopic degrees of freedom, whereas the same MTC describing a bosonic system would treat the charge $\psi$ as an emergent fermion. These statements have properties and implications that require explanation.
The first implication is that such a theory has a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ grading provided by braiding with $\psi$. In particular, we can write
\[ \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \mathcal{M}_1, \] where each topological charge can be ascribed a label $x \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ such that
\[ M_{\psi a} = (-1)^x, \]
and the fusion rules respect the group structure of these labels, that is
\[ a_x \otimes b_y = \bigoplus_c N_{a,b}^c \delta_{x+y \mod 2}. \]

That all objects have either $+1$ or $-1$ monodromy with the fermion follows from Eq. (27) and the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ fusion of the fermion. This grading separates the topological charges into quasiparticle $\mathcal{M}_0$ and fermionic vortices $\mathcal{M}_1$. Moreover, this $\mathbb{Z}_2$ grading is recognized as an incorporation of the $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ fermionic parity conservation “symmetry” of the system, i.e., vortices can be thought of as defects of fermionic parity that can locally detect parity via braiding. Clearly, $\hat{\mathbb{Z}}, \psi \in \mathcal{M}_0$, so we henceforth write these as $\mathcal{I}_0, \psi_0$. As with any $G$-graded fusion tensor category (FTC), the grading on the theory implies that the total quantum dimension of each sector is equal [5], i.e., $D_0 = D_1$.

Introducing the shorthand $[\psi a]_x = \psi_0 \otimes a_x$, it follows that for a FMTC
\[ S_{a \otimes b} = (-1)^x S_{a_x \otimes b_y} = (-1)^y S_{[\psi a]_x \otimes [\psi b]_y} \] and
\[ \theta_{[\psi a]_x} = (-1)^{x+1} \theta_{a_x}. \]

We now recognize that the quasiparticle sector $\mathcal{M}_0$ of any FMTC automatically satisfies the conditions to be a SMTC. Thus, we can equivalently define a FMTC to be a $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ modular extension of a SMTC. It is also true that every SMTC has a (minimal) $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ modular extension, which is a FMTC [38]. In fact, there are always exactly 16 $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ distinct modular extensions for a given SMTC [39]. This is a generalization of Kitaev’s “16-fold way” of $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ extensions of the trivial SMTC $\mathbb{Z}_2^\mathbb{Z}$ [33] to general SMTCs $\mathcal{M}_0$. The general 16-fold set of extensions of a SMTC can be obtained as a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ torsor by fermionic stacking the extensions with the 16 extensions of the trivial fermion, as will be explained in Sec. II C. These 16 FMTC extensions are distinguished by their central charge $c_\pi\mod 8$, which is actually determined entirely by the vortices
\[ e^{i \frac{\pi c_\pi}{2}} = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{a_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} d_{a_1}^2 \theta_{a_1}. \]

In light of this, we see that when a SMTC factorizes as $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi \boxtimes \mathcal{B}$, its $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ extensions are given by the FMTCs $\mathcal{K}^{(\nu)} \boxtimes \widehat{\mathcal{B}}$, where $\mathcal{K}^{(\nu)}$ with $\nu = 0, 1, \ldots, 15$ are the FMTCs in Kitaev’s 16-fold way.

Considering the vortices in a FMTC in more detail, since $\theta_{[\psi a]_0} = \theta_{a_1}$, it is possible to have $[\psi a]_1$ either unequal or equal to $a_1$, which we designate as “$v$-type” or “$\sigma$-type” vortices, respectively. The supersector of a $\sigma$-type vortex is a singleton. (Quasiparticles cannot be $\sigma$-type, since $\theta_{[\psi a]_0} = -\theta_{a_0}$. ) The set of vortices can then be split into subsets of these types $\mathcal{M}_1 = M_{t_v} \sqcup M_{\sigma}$. Applying the hexagon equations to $\sigma$-type vortices show that $F_{\psi a \otimes \psi 0} = R_{\psi 0 \otimes \psi -1}$. When $\mathcal{M}$ has $\sigma$-type vortices, all vortices are non-Abelian, and so have quantum dimension $d_{a_1} \geq \sqrt{2}$. In order to see this, we note that $a_1 \otimes b_\pi \otimes \psi_0 = a_1 \otimes b_\pi$, so the fusion channels of a $\sigma$-type vortex with any other vortex always come in pairs of quasiparticles related by fusion with the fermion, which is not possible if either vortex charge is Abelian. It can also be shown that when $\mathcal{M}$ has both $v$-type and $\sigma$-type vortices, only are $d_{a_1} \geq \sqrt{2}$, but the $\sigma$-type vortices have $d_{a_\sigma} \geq 2$. This can be seen by fermionic stacking $\mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{K}^{(1)}$, which transforms $\sigma$-type vortices into $\sigma$-type vortices and vice-versa, for which their quantum dimensions are multiplied or divided by $\sqrt{2}$, respectively.

The characters of the fusion algebra of a SMTC $\mathcal{M}_0$ can be specified in terms of the fermionic modular $S$-matrix of its FMTC extensions [37]. In this way, there is a canonical labeling of the characters $\psi^{(a_0)}$ by the supersectors $b_\pi$ of topological charges of $\mathcal{M}$. The use of supersectors should be clear, since all charges in a given supersector have the same braiding with a particular quasiparticle charge. Thus, half of these characters correspond to the quasiparticle supersectors and half correspond to the vortex supersectors (there are an equal number of such supersectors). Since we are only considering the fusion algebra of the SMTC, this statement must be independent of which of the 16 $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ extensions one chooses.

Similar to the case of MTCs (and FMTCs), it follows that, for a SMTC $\mathcal{M}_0$, if there are phase factors that satisfy the relation
\[ e^{i \phi_{a_0}} e^{i \phi_{b_0}} = e^{i \phi_{c_0}} \]
for all $a_0, b_0, c_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0$ such that $N_{a_0b_0} = 0$, then there exists a unique superAbelian supersector of topological charge $\dot{e}$ such that
\[ e^{i \phi_{a_0}} = M_{a_0 \dot{e}}. \]

for all $a_0$. (We note that $M_{a_0 \dot{e}}$ is always well-defined, since $M_{a_0 \dot{e} \sigma} = M_{a_0 [\psi e]_{a_0}}$.) Here, we define a supersector $\dot{e}$ to be superAbelian if $d_{\dot{e}} = 1$ for $e \in \mathcal{M}_0 \sqcup \mathcal{M}_\sigma$, or $d_{\dot{e}} = \sqrt{2}$ for $e \in \mathcal{M}_\sigma$. We denote the set of superAbelian supersectors of topological charges of $\mathcal{M}$ as $\dot{\mathcal{A}} = \dot{\mathcal{A}}_0 \oplus \dot{\mathcal{A}}_1$, and recognize that they form a group with multiplication given by the fusion rules. We use different font to more clearly differentiate the superAbelian supersectors from $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0 \oplus \mathcal{A}_1$ the Abelian topological charges of $\mathcal{M}$.
particular, it is possible to have $\mathcal{A}_1 = \emptyset$, while $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_1 \neq \emptyset$, since $\sigma$-type vortices may contribute to the latter, but not the former. However, it is the case that $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbb{Z}^\psi_2 \otimes \hat{\mathcal{A}}_0$, as previously noted, so we can use $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_0$ and $\mathcal{A}_0$ interchangeably.

A FMTC naturally couples to a spin structure through fermion condensation [35]. Importantly the presence of the spin structure allows for two (not independent) equivalence relations on the theory. One is that closed $\psi$-loops can be removed at the expense of a spin-structure dependent $\pm$ sign, even if the $\psi$-loop links a homologically non-trivial cycle. If the theory lives on a manifold with trivial topology, this relation has no effect; however, when the manifold has nontrivial topology, the equivalence relation forces states to be labeled by supersectors. The spin structure also ties vortices of the FMTC to non-bounding defects in the spin structure in a unique way [35]. The second relation is that the spin structure allows for local encoding of all properties of the physical fermion. The price to pay for a local encoding of the physical fermion is the theory must be enriched in super-vector spaces, and requires careful tracking of Koszul and spin-structure dependent $\pm$ signs. This subtlety can be avoided by only considering quantum states with even global fermion parity, which can be canonically identified with states assigned by the FMTC.

1. Canonical choices

Similar to the case of the vacuum charge, there are canonical choices that should be imposed as a result of interpreting the topological charge $\psi_0$ as describing a physical (local) fermion, rather than an emergent fermionic quasiparticle. Recall that, for the vacuum charge, there are canonical isomorphisms from the vector spaces $V^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{x_0}$, $\Gamma^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{x_0}$, and $\overline{V}^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{x_0}$ to the complex numbers $\mathbb{C}$, associated with the ability to freely add and remove vacuum charges. In terms of the basic data, this corresponds to fixing $F^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{[a\in \mathcal{A}_1]} = F^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{[a\in \mathcal{A}_1]} = F^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{[a\in \mathcal{A}_1]} = 1$ and $R^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{x_0} = R^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{x_0} = 1$, and restricts vertex basis gauge transformations to have $\Gamma^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{x_0} = \Gamma^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{x_0} = \Gamma^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{x_0} = 1$. Clearly, a physical fermion will not obey exactly the same conditions as vacuum, since fermion parity conservation does not allow the creation or annihilation of a single isolated fermion, and the fusion and braiding of fermions with all objects is not completely trivial. However, the connection to the microscopic degrees of freedom generates similar properties.

In a fermionic topological phase, pairs of physical fermions are viewed as equivalent to the vacuum and can be locally added and removed freely. This motivates a canonical isomorphism between $\Gamma_{x_0}^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}$ and $\mathbb{C}$, i.e. making a canonical choice of the basis state $|\psi_0, \psi_0; x_0\rangle$. This can be understood as fixing this basis state with respect to the corresponding state in the physical Hilbert space obtained by acting with the (local) creation and annihilation operators of the physical fermion.

Furthermore, we impose canonical gauge fixing of the $F$-symbols to satisfy

$$1 = F^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{[a\in \mathcal{A}_1]} = F^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{[a\in \mathcal{A}_1]} = F^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{[a\in \mathcal{A}_1]} = F^{a\in \mathcal{A}_1}_{[a\in \mathcal{A}_1]}.$$ (48)

These canonical choices for $F$-symbols are represented diagrammatically in Fig. 3. Fixing these $F$-symbols, together with the pentagon equations implies the following $F$-symbols are also fixed

$$1 = F^{[|\psi_0|,\alpha]}_{x_0} \Gamma_{a_{\alpha}} = F^{[|\psi_0|,\alpha]}_{x_0} \Gamma_{a_{\alpha}}.$$ (49)

It follows (also noting $F^{[|\psi_0|,\alpha]}_{x_0} = 1$) that the physical fermion lines can freely bend up and down where they join other lines, as shown diagrammatically in Fig. 4. We emphasize that, in contrast to the vacuum charge, not all $F$-symbols involving $\psi$ can be made trivial. For example, for $\sigma$-type vortices,

$$F^{[|\psi_\sigma|,\psi \sigma]} = F^{[|\psi_\sigma|,\psi \sigma]} = -1$$ (50)

are gauge invariant relations that follow from the consistency conditions.

In terms of vertex basis gauge transformations, respecting the canonical isomorphisms and gauge choices reduce the gauge freedom by requiring

$$1 = \Gamma^{[|\psi_0|,\alpha]}_{x_0} = \Gamma^{[|\psi_0|,\alpha]}_{x_0} = \Gamma^{[|\psi_0|,\alpha]}_{x_0} = 1$$ (51)

We note that for $\sigma$-type vortices, this implies

$$\Gamma^{[|\psi_0|,\alpha]}_{\psi \sigma} = \Gamma^{[|\psi_0|,\alpha]}_{\psi \sigma} = \Gamma^{[|\psi_0|,\alpha]}_{\psi \sigma} = \pm 1.$$ (52)

2. Example: Toric code as a trivial FMTC

We now consider the toric code as an illustrative example of a FMTC. Recall the toric code has topological charges $\mathbf{TC} = \{I, e, m, \psi\}$, whose monodromies with the fermion $\psi$ are

$$M_{x_0}^{\psi} = M_{e^\psi} = 1, \quad M_{x_0}^{\psi} = M_{m^\psi} = -1.$$ (53)

When describing a bosonic topological phase, $\psi$ is considered an emergent fermion. Reinterpreting this MTC as describing a fermionic topological phase, $\psi$ is considered the physical fermion $\psi_0$, and the topological charges are divided into quasiparticles $(I, \psi)$ and vortices $(e, m)$; we track their vorticity ($\mathbb{Z}_2^\psi$) labels by renaming the charges for the fermionic theory as

$$I \rightarrow I_0, \quad \psi \rightarrow \psi_0, \quad e \rightarrow I_1, \quad m \rightarrow \psi_1.$$ (54)
Note that the assignment of $e \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_1$ and $m \rightarrow \psi_0$ is arbitrary and these labels could be interchanged. We denote this fermionic theory as $K_{\mathcal{I}}(0) = K^{(0)}_0 \oplus K^{(0)}_1$. The topological data is inherited from the bosonic theory, and can be compactly summarized as

\begin{align}
  a_x \otimes b_y &= [a \otimes b]_{x+y} \\
  F^{a_xb_yc_z} &= 1 \\
  R^{a_xb_y} &= (-1)^{(a+x)b}.
\end{align}

where we have written $a, b, c$ to denote labels $\mathcal{I}, \psi \in \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi$ with fusion (group multiplication) denoted by $\otimes$, and $x, y, z$ to denote vorticity labels $0, 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi$ with the group operation (addition mod 2) denoted by $+$. For compactness, we have also used the associated fields $\mathbb{F}_2^\psi$ and $\mathbb{F}_2^\phi$ with elements $\{0, 1\}$, and with addition $+$ and multiplication $\cdot$ given by the standard rules for addition and multiplication of integers modulo 2. To distinguish field elements from their associated topological charges or group elements, we use the same letters in a different font, as summarized in Table I. We adopt this notation throughout the remainder of the paper.

Note that $K_{\mathcal{I}}(0)$ corresponds to the trivial fermionic theory: it has no nontrivial topological quasiparticles, i.e. $K^{(0)}_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi$, and is non-chiral, with $c_- = 0 \mod 8$. This theory describes an $s$-wave superconductor \cite{10}.

### 3. Example: Invertible FMTCs

The trivial fermionic theory $K^{(0)}$ of the previous section is just one of 16 invertible fermionic orders $K^{(\nu)}$, $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{16}$. “Invertible” refers to a theory with no nontrivial quasiparticles, that is $K^{(\nu)}_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi \times \mathbb{Z}_2^\phi$. The vortex sectors have total quantum dimension $D^{\nu}_{K_1} = 2$, corresponding to either $K^{(\nu=even)}_{1} = \{\mathcal{I}, \psi_1\}$ (Abelian theories) or $K^{(\nu=odd)} = \{\psi_1\}$ (non-Abelian theories). The Abelian theories satisfy either $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ fusion ($\nu = 0 \mod 4$) or $\mathbb{Z}_4$ fusion ($\nu = 2 \mod 4$), while the non-Abelian theories all have Ising fusion rules. The topological twists of the vortices in all of these theories are given by

\begin{equation}
  \theta^{\pm}_{\alpha} = e^{i \frac{\pi}{8} \nu},
\end{equation}

which therefore distinguishes between different theories. The chiral central charges are directly related to these and similarly given by

\begin{equation}
  c_- = \frac{\nu}{2} \mod 8.
\end{equation}

Mathematically, the invertible fermionic orders correspond to the minimal modular extensions of $\mathbb{Z}_2^\psi$, colloquially known as Kitaev’s 16-fold way \cite{33}. We present their basic data in Table II, in a gauge chosen for convenience of presentation and which satisfies the canonical fermionic gauge choices.

### C. Stacking Fermionic Topological Phases

Distinct fermionic topological phases can emerge from the same type of microscopic fermions, e.g. electrons. When two such phases are brought into proximity of each other, so that the physical fermions can pass between them, a BTC description of the joint system must account for the fact that their physical fermions are the same. Mathematically, this is done for two FMTCs $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$...
and $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$ by taking their product and condensing the boson $(\psi_0^{(1)}, \psi_0^{(2)})$, where $a_{x}^{(j)} \in \mathcal{M}^{(j)}$. Essentially, this process identifies the pair of physical fermions with the vacuum in the “stacked” theory such that objects related by fusion with $(\psi_0^{(1)}, \psi_0^{(2)})$ become isomorphic. We denote the resulting FMTC $\mathcal{M}$ of the stacked fermionic phases as

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{M}^{(2)} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{M}^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{M}^{(2)}}{A[\psi_0^{(1)}, \psi_0^{(2)}]}, \quad (60)$$

where the condensate algebra object is

$$A[\psi_0^{(1)}, \psi_0^{(2)}] = (I_0^{(1)}, I_0^{(2)}) \oplus (\psi_0^{(1)}, \psi_0^{(2)}). \quad (61)$$

For a review of condensation see Ref. 41 or Appendix E for a discussion tailored to this paper. In this way, the physical fermions from each of the original phases are identified to yield the (single) physical fermion of the resulting combined phase, that is

$$\psi_0 \cong (\psi_0^{(1)}, \psi_0^{(2)}) \cong (I_0^{(1)}, I_0^{(2)}). \quad (62)$$

Condensation necessarily pairs objects of the same vorticity, i.e. quasiparticles with quasiparticles and vortices with vortices, since all opposite vorticity combinations yield confined objects (they have nontrivial braiding with the bosons in the condensate). In light of this, the definition of fermionic stacking could have been made using a product of FMTCs that are diagonal in $\mathbb{Z}_2$, using $\mathbb{Z}_{2^2}$ instead of $\mathbb{Z}$. We also note that pairing a $\sigma$-type vortex from one theory with a $\nu$-type vortex of the other will yield a $\sigma$-type vortex in the stacked theory, while pairing a $\sigma$-type vortex from one theory with a $\sigma$-type vortex of the other will split into two $\nu$-type vortices. Specifically, $(a_{\sigma}^{(1)} \cdot a_{\nu}^{(2)}) \cong a_{\sigma}$ with quantum dimension $d_{a^{(1)} a^{(2)}} = d_{a^{(1)}} d_{a^{(2)}}$, while $(a_{\sigma}^{(1)} a_{\sigma}^{(2)}) \cong a_{\sigma} \oplus a_{\sigma}'$, with $d_{a^{(1)} a^{(2)}} = d_{a^{(1)}} d_{a^{(2)}}$.

More generally, if we have $n$ fermionic topological phases in proximity, with respective physical fermions $(\psi_0^{(1)}, \cdots, \psi_0^{(n)})$, identifying the physical fermions reduces the symmetry $[\mathbb{Z}_2^n]$ to the diagonal subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Mathematically, identifying the physical fermions corresponds to condensing the bosons described by the algebra object

$$A[\psi_0^{(1)}, \cdots, \psi_0^{(n)}] = \bigoplus_{\tilde{f} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^n, |\tilde{f}| = 0} (\psi_0^{(1)})_{\tilde{f}_1} (\psi_0^{(2)})_{\tilde{f}_2} \cdots (\psi_0^{(n)})_{\tilde{f}_n}. \quad (63)$$

The constraint $|\tilde{f}| = r \cdot \bar{r} = 0 \mod 2$ guarantees the algebra object $A[\psi_0^{(1)}, \cdots, \psi_0^{(n)}]$ is bosonic, i.e., an even number of fermions appears in each term on the right hand side. After condensation, all the physical fermions have been identified, so that the resulting FMTC $\mathcal{M}$ has one physical fermion $\psi_0$. We note that condensing the algebra object $A$ is nontrivial; condensation will result in objects being confined, and possibly even split (corresponding to multiple objects in the stacked theories). The multiplication morphisms accompanying the algebra object $A$ are all isomorphic, see Appendix E. Physically, this means there is a unique (up to isomorphism)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$K^{(\nu=0 \mod 4)}$:</th>
<th>$a_x \otimes b_y = [a \otimes b]_{x+y}$, ($\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ fusion rules)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\nu = 0$ (Toric code)</td>
<td>$\nu = 8$ (3 Fermion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu = 4, 12$ (Semion × Semion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-symbols:</td>
<td>$F^{a_x b_y c_x} = 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F^{a_x b_y c_x} = 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F^{a_x b_y c_x} = (-1)^{x+y}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-symbols</td>
<td>$R^{a_x b_y} = (-1)^{(x+y)} b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^{a_x b_y} = (-1)^{(x+y)} (-1)^{(x+y)} b$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$K^{(\nu=2 \mod 4)}$:</th>
<th>$a_x \otimes b_y = [\psi^{x+y} \otimes a \otimes b]_{x+y}$, ($\mathbb{Z}_4$ fusion rules)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-symbols:</td>
<td>$F^{a_{x_1} a_{x_1} a_{x_1}} = F^{a_{x_0} a_{x_0} a_{x_0}} = 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F^{a_{x_1} a_{x_1} a_{x_1}} = \kappa (-1)^{a_{x_1} b_{x_1}} / \sqrt{2}$, $\kappa = (-1)^{(x_1^2 - 1)/8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-symbols</td>
<td>$R^{a_{x_0} a_{x_0} a_{x_0}} = (-1) e^{-i\pi x_0 / 2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^{a_{x_0} a_{x_0} a_{x_0}} = e^{-i\pi x_0 / 8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{K}^{(\nu=1 \mod 2)}$:</td>
<td>$\psi_0 \otimes \psi_0 = I_0$, $\sigma_1 \otimes \psi = \psi$, $\sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_1 = I_0 \otimes \psi_0$, (Ising fusion rules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-symbols:</td>
<td>$F^{\sigma_{x_1} a_{x_1} b_0} = F^{\sigma_{x_1} a_{x_1} b_0} = (-1)^{a_{x_1} b_{x_1}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F^{\sigma_{x_1} a_{x_1} b_0} = (-1)^{a_{x_1} b_{x_1}} / \sqrt{2}$, $\kappa = (-1)^{(x_1^2 - 1)/8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-symbols</td>
<td>$R^{\psi_0 \psi_0} = -1$, $R^{\psi_0 \sigma_1} = R^{\sigma_1 \psi_0}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TABLE II. | The invertible FMTCs $K^{(\nu)}$ of Kitaev’s 16-fold way. The notation follows the convention in Table I. |
way to identify the physical fermions. Stacking multiple fermionic phases in this way is equivalent to successively stacking them pairwise. This can be seen by observing that the stacking operation is associative and commutative, so the order one chooses for pairwise stacking does not matter.

This notion of stacking fermionic phases, i.e. taking the product and condensing physical fermion pairs, provides a natural tool for classifying fermionic topological order, even without strong interactions between the systems. Indeed, stacking can be used to generate the 16-fold way of FMTCs with the same quasiparticle sector SMTC $\mathcal{M}_0$, and we will later use the generalization of stacking to defect theories in the classification of FSET phases. In order to understand the general 16-fold way, we start by considering the invertible FMTCs $K^{(\nu)}$, i.e. Kitaev’s 16-fold way. Stacking these FMTCs reveals a $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ group structure

$$K^{(\nu)} \times K^{(\nu')} = K^{(\nu+\nu' \mod 16)}.$$  

(64)

In this case, $K^{(0)}$ is the identity element and any $K^{(\nu)}$ with $\nu$ odd is a generator of the group.

For the general 16-fold way, we consider stacking a FMTC $\mathcal{M}$ with $K^{(\nu)}$ to obtain a new FMTC

$$\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M} \times K^{(\nu)}.$$  

(65)

We note that: (1) $\mathcal{M}_0' = \mathcal{M}_0$, because $K_0^{(\nu)}$ is trivial, (2) $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}$ when $\nu \mod 16 = 0$, (3) $\nu' = [c_+ + \frac {\nu} {2}] \mod 8$, so distinct $\nu \mod 16$ yield distinct $\mathcal{M}'$, (4) $\mathcal{M} \times K^{(\nu)} \times K^{(\nu')} = \mathcal{M} \times K^{(\nu+\nu')}$, and (5) except when $\mathcal{M}$ is an invertible FMTC, there is no canonical “0” element in the set of 16 FMTCs generated this way. Thus, we see that the set of $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ extensions of a given SMTC $\mathcal{M}_0$ forms a $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$ torsor under the action of stacking with the invertible FMTCs.

III. SYMMETRY AND FRACTIONALIZATION IN FERMIonic TOPOLOGICAL PHASES

In this section, we develop the notions of topological symmetry, symmetry action, and symmetry fractionalization for fermionic topological phases, which apply to both SMTCs and FMTCs. Much of this theory is similar to the same notions for bosonic topological phases developed in Ref. 5, which we follow closely for background and notation. However, there are important distinctions that arise due to the inclusion of physical fermions in the theory, which results in a different and more intricate structure that we detail.

Topological symmetries, which are invertible maps from the emergent topological theory to itself, are constrained to leave the physical fermion fixed and preserve the canonical isomorphisms of the topological state space associated with it. Moreover, equivalences of such maps under local transformations of objects, i.e. natural isomorphism, are subject to the condition that they act completely trivially on the fermion.

Closed fermionic systems have an inherent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ fermion parity conservation, which is similar to an ordinary (bosonic) symmetry in some ways, but behaves differently in others. We have already seen that $\mathbb{Z}_2$ manifests as a grading on FMTCs that distinguishes quasiparticles from vortices. For a symmetric fermionic topological phase, there is an additional ordinary global symmetry of the system, described by a group $G$, which is sometimes called the “bosonic symmetry group.” The full fermionic symmetry group $G^f$ corresponds to a $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ central extension of $G$, which can be defined as the one for which the physical fermions have linear representations. The global symmetry action on the topological theory is given by an action of $G$ via fermionic topological symmetries.

Implementing the symmetry action on the physical Hilbert space leads to the notions of localization of the symmetry action on quasiparticles and vortices, as well as fractionalization of the symmetry. The fractionalization of the $G$ symmetry action on the physical fermion $\psi_0$ is encoded in projective phase factors

$$\eta_{\psi_0}(g, h) = (-1)^w(g, h),$$  

(66)

where $w \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is a 2-cocycle. As this corresponds to the projective representation of $G$ on the physical fermions, it is directly correlated with the choice of central extension $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times_G G$ for which the representation can be made linear (non-projective) for the physical fermions.

The equivalences of symmetry fractionalization classes is subject to the condition that action of the localized operators on the physical fermions is fixed, i.e. the vorticity of the localized operators cannot change. These constraints associated with the physical fermion modify the analysis of obstruction and classification of symmetry fractionalization, as compared to bosonic systems. For a fixed $G^f$, when unobstructed, the classification of fractionalization on the FMTC $\mathcal{M}$ is given torsorially by $H^2_{[\rho(\psi_0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0)$. Similarly, the classification for fixed $G^f$ of fractionalization on the quasiparticles described by the SMTC $\mathcal{M}_0$ is given torsorially by $H^2_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0)$.

When viewed from the perspective of extending the $G$ symmetry fractionalization patterns, from the physical fermions $\mathbb{Z}_2^\psi$ to the SMTC $\mathcal{M}_0$ describing the quasiparticles and then to the FMTC $\mathcal{M}$ describing quasiparticles and vortices, this results in tiers of obstructions and classifications that we summarize in Table III. When unobstructed, the extensions of fractionalization on the quasiparticles $\mathcal{M}_0$ to fractionalization on the full FMTC $\mathcal{M}$ including vortices is torsorially classified by $H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi)$. In terms of the classification of quasiparticle fractionalization and extensions to vortices, the classification of
fractionalization on \( \mathcal{M} \) takes the form

\[
H^2(\rho^{(0)})(G, A_0) \cong \iota_* \left( H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi) \right) \times_{\mathfrak{p}_*} \left( H^2_{(\rho^{(0)})}(G, A_0) \right).
\]

(67)

Here, \( \iota_* : H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi) \to H^2_{(\rho^{(0)})}(G, A_0) \) is the homomorphism induced by the inclusion map \( i : \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi \to A_0 \); \( \mathfrak{p}_* : H^2_{(\rho^{(0)})}(G, A_0) \to H^2_{(\rho^{(0)})}(G, \tilde{A}_0) \) is the induced homomorphism from the map \( p : A_0 \to \tilde{A}_0 \) topological charges to their supersectors; and \( \epsilon \in \mathbb{Z}^2(\text{im}(\mathfrak{p}_*), \text{im}(\iota_*)) \) indicates some central extension.

\( p_* (H^2_{(\rho^{(0)})}(G, A_0)) \) is the subgroup of \( H^2_{(\rho^{(0)})}(G, \tilde{A}_0) \) corresponding to vanishing \( \{\mathfrak{O}\} \) obstruction. In other words, it corresponds to the subset of quasiparticle fractionalization classes that can be extended to the vortices to provide fractionalization classes on the full FMTC \( \mathcal{M} \).

\( i_* (H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi)) \) is not necessarily isomorphic to \( H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi) \), as \( i_* \) may map a nontrivial element of \( H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi) \) to a trivial element of \( H^2_{(\rho^{(0)})}(G, A_0) \). This means different extensions of the quasiparticle fractionalization to vortices may actually yield the same fractionalization on the FMTC \( \mathcal{M} \).

The symmetry action \( [\rho^{(0)}] \) plays an important role in determining the structure in Eq. (67), such as \( \iota_* \). In many instances, this takes the simple form \( H^2_{(\rho^{(0)})}(G, A_0) \cong H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi) \times p_* (H^2_{(\rho^{(0)})}(G, A_0)) \), but this need not always be the case.

When we develop the theory of symmetry defects for FSET phases, we will see in Sec. VI that this structure is accounted for in a natural way in the classification of FSET phases. In particular, the \( H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi) \) factor corresponding to extending quasiparticle fractionalization to vortices is generated through fermionic stacking with \( \mathcal{G} \) FSPT phases and the \( p_* (H^2_{(\rho^{(0)})}(G, A_0)) \) factor is the quasiparticle fractionalization that is unchanged by the FSET stacking torsor action.

Ref. 42 provided closely related, but distinct definitions for categorical fermionic actions, and analysis of the obstruction and classification of fractionalization manifesting a supergroup \( (G, [w]) \). In our terminology, their definitions and analysis do not constrain equivalences of symmetry actions and fractionalization classes to be completely trivial for the physical fermion. That is, they do not require \( \gamma_{\rho^{(0)}}(g) = 1 \) on symmetry action gauge transformations nor \( \zeta_{\rho^{(0)}}(g, h) = 1 \) on the equivalences.
of fractionalization classes. These correspond to physical differences stemming from the physical nature of the fermion, and lead to important differences in the resulting classification of fractionalization, as we will explain in Sec. III.D.

While the theory of symmetry and fractionalization for fermionic topological phases that we develop applies to both SMTCs and FMTCs, a strictly (2 + 1)D fermionic topological phase is necessarily described by a FMTC. This is because the vortices are an essential part of the fermionic theory, as previously discussed. It is nonetheless useful to consider the theory for SMTCs, because when a symmetry and fractionalization can be defined on a SMTC, but cannot be extended to the corresponding FMTC, it may be viewed as anomalous. Such theories can potentially be realized as surface terminations of a (3 + 1)D topological phase, where the obstruction invariants of the (2 + 1)D surface theory match invariants of the (3 + 1)D bulk [30, 43, 44]. More specifically, we can identify the obstructions \([\mathcal{O}^a] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)\) and \([\mathcal{O}^v] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v)\) as anomalies of a surface termination that respectively match the bulk (3 + 1)D FSPT classifying elements valued in \(H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)\), describing Majorana chain decorations of tri-junctions of G-foams, and \(H^3(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)\), describing fermionic parity decorations of quad-junctions of G-foams. We also note that the obstruction to extending a quasiparticle fractionalization class due to \(w^{(0)} \notin \mathbb{C}^2(G, \mathcal{A})\), i.e. a quasiparticle fractionalization class for which \(w^{(0)}(g, h) \in \mathcal{A}_1 \neq \mathcal{A}_1\) for some \(g, h\), may correspond to an anomalous (2 + 1)D theory in which the tri-junction of \(g, h\), and \(gh\)-defect branch lines carries a Majorana zero mode. This would also necessitate a matching (3 + 1)D bulk with Majorana chain decorations of tri-junctions of G-foams.

### A. Fermionic Topological Symmetries

The topological symmetries of a BTC \(\mathcal{B}\) are invertible braided auto-equivalence maps \(\varphi : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}\) which leave all topological data invariant. We primarily focus on unitary, on-site symmetries that are space-time parity preserving, but will discuss more general types of symmetries in Sec. III.E. At the level of topological charges, an auto-equivalence map \(\varphi\) is simply a permutation, which we will often write using the shorthand

\[
\varphi(a) = a',
\]

However, arbitrary permutations are not allowed. Importantly, the vacuum \(\mathcal{I}\) topological charge must be left fixed,

\[
\varphi(\mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{I},
\]

as must all gauge invariant quantities, most notably

\[
N^c_{a'b'} = N^c_{ab}, \quad d_{a'} = d_a, \quad \theta_{a'} = \theta_a, \quad S_{a'b'} = S_{ab}.
\]

Quantities that are not gauge invariant must be left unchanged by the permutation of objects, up to a vertex basis gauge transformation. As such, the action of an auto-equivalence map on vertex basis states can be written in the form

\[
\varphi([a, b; c, \mu]) = [a', b'; c', \mu] = \sum_{\mu'} [u_{\mu'}^{a'b'}]_{\mu\mu'} [a', b'; c', \mu']
\]

where \([u_{\mu'}^{a'b'}]_{\mu\mu'}\) is a unitary vertex basis transformation that is required to leave all of the topological data invariant. Specifically, this means the transformations must satisfy

\[
\varphi \left( \left[ F_{d}^{abc} \right]_{(e, a, \beta)(f, \mu, \nu)} \right) = \left[ F_{d'}^{a'b'c'} \right]_{(e', a', \beta')(f', \mu', \nu)},
\]

\[
\varphi \left( \left[ R_{c}^{ab} \right]_{\mu\nu} \right) = \left[ R_{c'}^{a'b'} \right]_{\mu\nu} = \left[ R_{c}^{ab} \right]_{\mu\nu}.
\]

The canonical isomorphisms between \(V^a_{\mathcal{I}a}\), \(V^a_{\mathcal{I}a}\), and \(\mathcal{C}\) for general BTCs discussed in Sec. II.A require that we fix

\[
u^a_{\mathcal{I}a} = u^a_{\mathcal{I}a} = u^a_{\mathcal{I}a} = 1,
\]

for all \(a\). In the case of \(a \neq \mathcal{I}\), these are automatically implied by \(\varphi\) preserving the canonical gauge choices of \(F\)-symbols \((F_{d}^{abc} = 1\) when any of \(a, b,\) or \(c\) equals \(\mathcal{I}\)), together with imposing the condition \(u^a_{\mathcal{I}a} = 1\) reflecting the canonical identification of vacuum.

Autoequivalence maps of the form

\[
\Upsilon(a) = a,
\]

\[
\Upsilon \left( [a, b; c, \mu] \right) = \frac{\gamma_a \gamma_b}{\gamma_c} [a, b; c, \mu],
\]

where \(\gamma_a\) are phases, are called natural isomorphisms. Eq. (77) implies that we must fix \(\gamma_\mathcal{I} = 1\).

Natural isomorphisms always leave the topological data invariant, and so are considered trivial autoequivalence maps. Defining an equivalence of auto-equivalence maps related by natural isomorphism, the equivalence classes \([\varphi]\) form elements of a group denoted \(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{B})\) that we call the topological symmetry group. Multiplication in this group is given by composition: \([\varphi_3] = [\varphi_1] \cdot [\varphi_2] = [\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2]\), and can be expressed in terms of representatives of the equivalence classes by \(\varphi_3 = \kappa \circ \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2\), where \(\kappa\) is a natural isomorphism.
There is also a redundancy of natural isomorphisms in terms of how one decomposes the phases $\gamma_a$. In particular, if we instead use the phases $\tilde{\gamma}_a = \lambda_a \gamma_a$, such that the phases $\lambda_a$ satisfy $\lambda_a \lambda_b = \lambda_c$ when $N^a_{bc} \neq 0$, this defines exactly the same natural isomorphism autoequivalence map $\tilde{\gamma}$. As shown in Sec. II A, when $\mathcal{B}$ is a MTC, there is a bijection between phases that obey this property and the set of Abelian topological charges $A \subset \mathcal{B}$, given by

$$\lambda_a = M^*_a e$$

for $e \in A$.

The topological symmetries of a fermionic theory must incorporate additional conditions reflecting the physical nature of the fermion. (From here on, we only consider fermionic auto-equivalence maps.) Since the topological charge associated with the physical fermion is treated as canonical, a fermionic auto-equivalence map must leave this topological charge fixed, that is

$$\varphi(\psi_0) = \psi_0.$$  

(81)

As a direct consequence, a fermionic topological symmetry cannot change the vorticity of objects in $\mathcal{M}$, since

$$M_{\psi_0, \varphi(a_x)} = M_{\psi_0, \varphi(a_x)} = M_{\psi_0, a_x}.$$  

(82)

Thus, at the level of topological charges, we can write

$$\varphi(a_x) = a'_x$$

(83)

for some $a_x' \in \mathcal{M}_x$. Eq. (81) also implies supersectors of topological charge are permuted together, since we have

$$\varphi(\psi_0 \otimes a_x) = \psi_0 \otimes \varphi(a_x).$$

The canonical isomorphisms for fermionic theories discussed in Sec. II B 1 additionally require fermionic auto-equivalence maps to satisfy

$$u_{\psi_0}^{\psi_0} = 1,$$  

(84)

to preserve the canonical isomorphism between $\mathcal{V}_{\psi_0}^\dagger$ and $\mathcal{C}$. Enforcing the canonical gauge choices for the $F$-symbols will further require

$$1 = u_{\psi_0}^{\psi_0} u_{[\psi_0]\dagger x} u_{\psi_0}^{\psi_0} = u_{[\psi_0]\dagger x} u_{\psi_0}^{\psi_0} = u_{\psi_0}^{\psi_0} u_{[\psi_0]\dagger x} u_{\psi_0}^{\psi_0} = u_{\psi_0}^{\psi_0} u_{[\psi_0]\dagger x} u_{\psi_0}^{\psi_0}.$$  

(85)

We define the “$\psi$-fixed topological symmetry group” $\text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M})$ by forming equivalence classes of fermionic auto-equivalence maps (subject to the above conditions) under natural isomorphisms. Natural isomorphisms that satisfy Eq. (84) are constrained to have

$$\gamma_{\psi_0} = \pm 1,$$  

(86)

so this condition must be respected for the natural isomorphisms that relate fermionic auto-equivalence maps. It is clear that this forms a subgroup $\text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M}) < \text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ of the ordinary topological symmetry group, since Eq. (81) potentially reduces the number of distinct topological symmetries.

In fact, the local nature of the physical fermions requires the stricter constraint

$$\gamma_{\psi_0} = 1$$

(87)

on the natural isomorphisms that are allowed to equate different auto-equivalence maps for the physical fermion. [45] We will call such natural isomorphisms that satisfy this condition “fermionic natural isomorphisms.” This constraint can be understood from the perspective that the action of operators on the physical fermions in the emergent theory are determined by the underlying microscopic details of the physical system. The natural isomorphisms with nontrivial $\gamma_{\psi_0}$ correspond to physically nontrivial operations on the physical fermions. More specifically, a $\gamma_{\psi_0} = -1$ transformation would change the vorticity of the localized global symmetry action on the physical fermions, meaning it would create differences that are physically measurable using the fermions, and hence should not be viewed as a trivial gauge freedom. When we develop the symmetry defect theory for fermionic topological phases in Sec. IV, we will also see that such natural isomorphism change the vorticity of the symmetry defects.

Restricting fermionic natural isomorphisms to be those with $\gamma_{\psi_0} = 1$ also restricts the redundancy of natural isomorphisms in terms of how they are decomposed. In particular, for the transformations of fermionic natural isomorphisms as $\gamma_{a_x} = \lambda a_x \gamma_{a_x}$, fixing $\gamma_{\psi_0} = 1$ requires that $\lambda a_x = 1$. Through the relation in Eq. (80), this implies $\lambda a_x = M^*_a e_0$ for some $e_0 \in A_0$.

We similarly define the “fermionic topological symmetry group” $\text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M})$ by forming equivalence classes of fermionic auto-equivalence maps related by fermionic natural isomorphisms. In order to understand the difference between $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$, $\text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M})$, and $\text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M})$ in more detail, it is useful to give special attention to the auto-equivalence map

$$Q(a_x) = a_x,$$  

(88)

$$Q([a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}, \mu]) = (-1)^{\delta_{a_x} \psi_0 + \delta_{b_y} \psi_0 + \delta_{a_x + b_y} \psi_0} [a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}, \mu],$$

(89)

which corresponds to the natural isomorphism with $\gamma_{\psi_0} = -1$ and $\gamma_{a_x} = 1$ for $a_x \neq \psi_0$. Clearly, $[Q]$ is always trivial in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M})$, since it is a natural isomorphism. Whether $Q$ is a fermionic natural isomorphism, i.e. whether it can be written as a natural isomorphism that has $\gamma_{\psi_0} = 1$ and $\gamma_{a_x} \neq 1$ for certain other $a_x \neq \psi_0$, depends on $\mathcal{M}$. For example, $[Q]$ is clearly nontrivial whenever $\mathcal{M}$ has $\sigma$-type vortices. More generally, $[Q]$ is trivial in $\text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M})$ if and only if $A_1 \neq \emptyset$. This is because all partitions of $Q$ can be written as $\gamma_{a_x} = (-1)^{\delta_{a_x} \psi_0} M_{a_x e_y}$ for $e_y \in A$. When $[Q]$ is a nontrivial element of $\text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M})$, i.e. when $A_1 \neq \emptyset$, it
defines a central subgroup \( \mathbb{Z}^Q_2 \) of \( \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}) \), since \( Q^2 = 1 \)
and \( Q \) commutes with all auto-equivalence maps. It follows that \( \text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M}) \cong \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M})/\mathbb{Z}^Q_2 \) when \( |Q| \) is non
trivial, and \( \text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M}) \cong \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}) \) when \( |Q| \) is trivial.
We emphasize that these differences allow for \( \text{Aut}(\mathcal{M}) \), \( \text{Aut}^\psi(\mathcal{M}) \), and \( \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}) \) to be inequivalent for the same
FMTMC \( \mathcal{M} \).

It is useful to compute some examples to gain intuition for \( \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}) \).
For this, we consider the invertible fermionic phases \( K^{(\nu)} \) described in Sec. II B 3. When \( \nu \) is even (the Abelian theories), the auto-equivalence maps are specified by whether they leave all topological charges fixed or permute \( I_1 \leftrightarrow \psi_1 \). It is straightforward to see that we can write \( Q \) as a fermionic natural isomorphism, e.g. with \( \gamma_{I_1} = -1 \) and \( \gamma_{\psi_1} = 1 \) for \( \nu \neq I_1 \).

When \( \nu \) is odd (the non-Abelian theories), the topological charges cannot be permuted by a symmetry. However, these theories all have \( \sigma \)-type vortices, so \( Q \) is a nontrivial fermionic topological symmetry. Thus, we have shown

\[
\text{Aut}^f(K^{(\nu)}) = \mathbb{Z}_2
\]

for all \( \nu \). In contrast, \( \text{Aut}^\psi(K^{(\nu)}) = \mathbb{Z}_1 \) for \( \nu \) odd, in agreement with the analogous bosonic topological symmetry group \( \text{Aut}(\text{Ising}^{(\nu)}) = \mathbb{Z}_1 \).

For an example where the \( \psi \)-fixed topological symmetry group differs from the bosonic topological symmetry group, we consider \( \nu = 8 \). Here, the \( \text{Aut}^\psi(K^{(8)}) \cong \text{Aut}^f(K^{(8)}) = \mathbb{Z}_2 \), while the analogous bosonic topological symmetry group is distinct, \( \text{Aut}(\text{SO}(8)_1) = S_3 \).

The vortex permuting symmetry described for \( K^{(\nu)} \) with \( \nu \) even can be generalized to a nontrivial fermionic auto-equivalence for all FMTCs. Denoting this special vortex permuting symmetry by \( \mathcal{V} \), we define it to act trivially on quasiparticles and interchange vortices within a supersector, that is

\[
\mathcal{V}(a_x) = \psi_0^x \otimes a_x.
\]

It is easy to check that this permutation preserves gauge invariant quantities. For example, the topological spin satisfies \( \theta_{\mathcal{V}(a_x)} = \theta_{[\psi^x a_x]} = \theta_{a_x} \). However, the corresponding \( u \)-symbols for \( \mathcal{V} \) are nontrivial, and we write these as

\[
\mathcal{V}([a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}, \mu]) = \sum_{\mu'} [\mathcal{V}(a'_x, b'_y; c'_{x+y})]_{\mu'} \{ a'_x, b'_y; c'_{x+y}, \mu' \}
\]

and define them diagrammatically to be

\[
\text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{K}^{(\nu)}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2^\nu
\]

where \( a'_x \equiv \mathcal{V}(a_x) \). One can directly see that the \( \mathcal{V} \) defined this way will satisfy Eqs. (75) and (76), using the commutative diagrams displayed in Fig. 5.

Evaluating the diagrams in Eq. (93) and using the canonical gauge choices of Eq. (48), we have

\[
\begin{align*}
[\mathcal{V}(a'_x, b'_y; c'_{x+y})]_{\mu'} &= \sum_{\nu'} \left[ R^\psi_{a'_x b'_y} \right]^{-1}_{(b_y, \mu)[[\psi^x a_x], \nu]} \{ c'_{x+y}, \nu' \} \\
&\times R^\psi_{a x} \left[ R^\psi_{c_y} \right]^{-1}_{(x+y, \nu')(a'_x, \mu')}
\end{align*}
\]

We note that \( |\mathcal{V}|^2 = |\mathcal{V}^2| = [1] \), since

\[
\kappa(a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}) \delta_{\mu \nu} = [\mathcal{V}(a'_x, b'_y; c'_{x+y})]_{\mu'} \mathcal{V}(a_x, b_y; c_{x+y})]_{\mu}
\]

which together generate a central subgroup \( \mathbb{Z}^2_2 \) of \( \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}) \). We can now recognize that \( \mathcal{V}^{(\nu)}(K^{(\nu)}) = \mathbb{Z}_2^\nu \) for all \( \nu \).

One can similarly consider the fermionic auto-equivalence maps of a SMTC \( \mathcal{M}_0 \). All of the discussion above applies directly, except with vorticity labels always set to \( x = 0 \), and the redundancy of natural isomorphisms is given by superAbelian supersectors of charge \( \tilde{z} \in \tilde{A} \),
\[ \psi/\phi(x) = \psi(x) = a^x_x \] for equivalence classes of auto-equivalence from the permutation of supersectors to the permutation of charges. We denote such permutations of supersectors as \( \phi(x) \), depending on \( M_0 \). In particular, [\( Q \)] is trivial in \( \text{Aut}(M_0) \) if and only if it is a trivial auto-equivalence map. The invertible fermionic topological phases \( K^{(a)} \) with odd \( \nu \) are examples where [\( Q \)] is nontrivial in \( \text{Aut}(M) \), but trivial in \( \text{Aut}(M_0) \). The \( SO(3)_{4n+2} \) SMTCs described in Sec. VII G provide examples where [\( Q \)] is nontrivial in \( \text{Aut}(M_0) \).

We note that specifying how a fermionic auto-equivalence map \( \phi \) permutes the topological charges of \( M_0 \) is equivalent to specifying how it permutes the supersectors of the topological charges. This is because the quasiparticle charges in a supersector have distinct topological twist factors \( \theta_{[\psi_{\phi(x)}]} = -\theta_{a_x} \), so there is a unique lift from the permutation of supersectors to the permutation of charges. We denote such permutations of supersectors as \( \phi(x) \) or \( \phi^{(0)}(a_x) \), even when \( M_0 \) does not factorize as \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \times M_0 \). These can be defined by \( \phi(a_x) = \phi(x) \) and \( \phi^{(0)}(a_x) = \phi^{(0)}(a_x) \).

It is also useful to consider extensions of a fermionic topological symmetry of a SMTC \( M_0 \), i.e., \( \phi^{(0)}(a_x) \in \text{Aut}(M_0) \), to a fermionic topological symmetry of one of its \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) extensions \( M \), \( \phi \in \text{Aut}(M) \). For this, we introduce the restriction map \( \text{res}_{M_0} \), defined by

\[ \text{res}_{M_0}(\phi) = \phi|_{M_0} \] for equivalence classes of auto-equivalence maps. In fact, \( \text{res}_{M_0} \) is a homomorphism, so its kernel, i.e. all \( \psi \)-fixed or fermionic topological symmetries of \( M \) which act trivially on \( M_0 \), forms a normal subgroup \( \ker(\text{res}_{M_0}) \) of \( \text{Aut}(M) \).

For \( \phi^{(0)} \in \text{Aut}(M_0) \), we ask: does it even lift? We see that, if \( \ker(\text{res}_{M_0}) \neq \text{Aut}(M) \), there are \( \phi^{(0)} \) \( \notin \text{res}_{M_0}(\text{Aut}(M)) \), which cannot be extended to \( \text{Aut}(M) \). [46]

Assuming \( \phi^{(0)} \in \text{res}_{M_0}(\text{Aut}(M)) \), we can extend it to a \( \phi \in \text{Aut}(M) \), and this extension is unique up to an element of \( \ker(\text{res}_{M_0}) \). We can show that the way the extensions permute the topological charges of vortices is determined by \( \phi^{(0)} \) up to application of \( |C\rangle \) to the vortices. In order to demonstrate this, we use the fact, discussed in Sec. II, that the unitary matrix \( P \) that diagonalizes the fusion algebra of a SMTC \( M_0 \) can be expressed in terms of the S-matrix of its \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) extensions (independent of which extension). Recall that matrix indices of \( P_{a_0b_y} \) are \( a_0 \in M_0 \) and the supersectors of charges in \( M \), which we will denote as \( b_y \in M \). This implies \( P_{\phi^{(0)}(a_0)a_x} = P_{a_0b_y} \). From this we see that the permutation of supersectors of vortices by a fermionic auto-equivalence map \( \phi \) is completely determined by how it permutes the supersectors of vortices, which we will denote as \( \phi^{(0)}(a_0) \).
it permutes the quasiparticles, that is
\[
\delta \varphi(b_1)b'_1 = \sum_{a_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0} P_{a_0} \varphi(b_1) P^*_{a_0} b'_1
= \sum_{a_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0} P_{\varphi(a_0)^{-1} a_0 b_1} P^*_{a_0} b'_1
\]
shows that
\[
\hat{\varphi}(b_1) = \hat{b}_1
\]
is determined entirely by \(\varphi(0)\) and the fusion algebra of \(\mathcal{M}_0\). We next consider how \(\hat{\varphi}(b_1)\) can be lifted to \(\varphi(b_1)\). In the case of \(\sigma\)-type vortices, the supersectors are singletons, so the lift is unique (at the level of permuting topological charges). In the case of \(v\)-type vortices, the supersectors are doublets, so there is a choice to be made for the lift, but the choice is not independent for each vortex supersector. Pick an arbitrary \(v\)-type vortex \(a_v\) and make a choice of \(\varphi(a_v) = a'_v \in \tilde{a}_v\). This determines how to lift all other supersector permutations of \(v\)-type vortices \(\varphi(b_v) = b'_v \in b'_v\), since \(N_{a_v b_v}^{\varphi(a_v)} = N_{a_v b_v}^{\varphi(a_v) \varphi(b_v)}\) and the permutations of \(a_v\) and \(c_0\) are already fixed. If one instead uses the other choice \(\varphi(a_v) = a_v' \in a'_v\), then it would similarly flip the permutation of all other \(v\)-type vortices, i.e. \(\varphi(b_v) = \psi_0 \otimes a_v' \in b'_v\). We recognize this choice as an application of \([\mathcal{V}] \in \ker(\text{res}_{\mathcal{M}_0})\).

Thus, \(\ker(\text{res}_{\mathcal{M}_0})\) is composed of the topological symmetries that either leave all charges fixed or permute charges as \(a_x \mapsto [\psi^* a]_x\), the latter only applying when there are \(v\)-type vortices. From this, it is easy to see that \(\ker(\text{res}_{\mathcal{M}_0})\) is an Abelian subgroup when \(\mathcal{M}\) has no fusion multiplicities (i.e. \(N_{a_v b_v}^c \in \{0,1\}\)), since the \(w_{ab}^c\)-symbols are simply phases. We conjecture this to be generally true. For all the examples that we know, \(\ker(\text{res}_{\mathcal{M}_0}) = \mathbb{Z}_2^2\).

\[\text{B. Fermionic Global Symmetry Action}\]

We now consider a global fermionic symmetry of the physical system, i.e. the microscopic Hamiltonian, described by the group \(G^f\). For any (closed) fermionic system, fermion parity conservation is treated as a symmetry, since the fermion parity operator \((-1)^F\) always commutes with the Hamiltonian. Moreover, it commutes with all other symmetries, since they cannot change the fermionic parity of the system. In other words, fermionic parity generates a central subgroup \(\mathbb{Z}_2\) of \(G^f\). As such, \(G^f\) is a \(\mathbb{Z}_2^2\) central extension of \(G = G^f / \mathbb{Z}_2^2\), which is sometimes referred to as the “bosonic symmetry group” and considered the standard symmetry of the system. We denote the identity element of \(G\) as \(0\).

The possible central group extensions \(\mathcal{G}\) of the group \(G\) by \(\mathbb{Z}_2\) are classified by the 2nd cohomology group \(H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)\). In particular, a 2-cocycle \(w \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)\) may be used to specify the extension \(\mathcal{G} = \mathbb{Z}_2 \ltimes_w G\), where the group elements can be written as \(g = (x, g)\), for \(g \in G\), \(x \in \mathbb{Z}_2\), and \(g \in G\), with group multiplication given by
\[
g h = (x, g)(y, h) = (x + y + w(g, h), gh).
\]

Associativity of group multiplication imposes the 2-cocycle condition
\[
0 = dw(g, h, k) = w(h, k) - w(g h k) + w(g, h k) - w(g, h).
\]
Taking the quotient by 2-coboundaries, i.e. cocycles of the form \(w(g, h) = du(g, h) = u(h) - u(g h) + u(g)\), is recognizing the equivalence of group extensions that are related by relabeling the elements as \(g' = (x + u(g), g)\).

While these relabeling by coboundaries relate cocycles corresponding to equivalent group extensions, we will see that there is a finer level of distinction for symmetry fractionalization and defects, for which cocycles differing by coboundaries should be considered physically distinct. We will see that this distinction corresponds to imposing the stricter \(\gamma_{v} g \in \{+1\}\), which maps to \(u(g) = 0\) in the context of group extensions. In this case, when we refer to \(\mathcal{G}^f\) and a \(\mathbb{Z}_2^2\) central extension of \(G\), it will mean with respect to a particular 2-cocycle \(w \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)\), not the corresponding 2-cohomology class \([w] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)\).

In the case of bosonic topological phases, the action of the global symmetry group \(G\) on the emergent topological degrees of freedom \(\mathcal{B}\) is represented by a homomorphism
\[
[\rho] : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{B})
\]
from the global symmetry group to the topological symmetry group. This means the group multiplication of \(G\) is respected, i.e. \([\rho_g] \cdot [\rho_h] = [\rho_{gh}]\), with equivalences by natural isomorphisms.

In the case of fermionic topological phases, we similarly define the action of the global symmetries on the emergent topological degrees of freedom encoded in the FMTC \(\mathcal{M}\) to be given by an action
\[
[\rho] : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}),
\]
with equivalences by fermionic natural isomorphisms. While it is often suitable to require this fermionic symmetry action to be a homomorphism, a slightly less strict definition is generally permissible. We define the fermionic symmetry action \([\rho]\) to be a “\(Q\)-projective action,” by which we mean the group multiplication of \(G\) is respected up to \([Q]\), that is
\[
[Q]^{\phi(g, h)} \cdot [\rho_g] \cdot [\rho_h] = [\rho_{gh}],
\]
where associativity of group multiplication requires \(\phi \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)\). Of course, this is only different from an ordinary group action when \([Q] \neq [1]\), i.e. when \(A_1 = \emptyset\). When \(Q\) is a fermionic natural isomorphism, the \(Q\) factors are simply absorbed into the fermionic natural isomorphisms of the classes \([\rho_g]\). and this definition reduces to an ordinary homomorphism \([\rho] : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M})\).
The $Q$-projective generalization can be understood in the context of the fermionic symmetry group $G^f$ being a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ central extension of $G$ in a manner nearly identical to projective representations. In particular, when $[Q]$ is nontrivial, it must be viewed as acting nontrivially on the physical fermion. As such, the projective factors of $Q$ are only allowed if the projective action can be lifted to an ordinary group action (homomorphism) from $G^f$ to $\text{Aut}^f(M)$. Consequently, if $\phi(g,h) \neq 0$ for any $g, h \in G$, then we must have $[\phi] = [w]$. In other words, nontrivial $Q$-projective actions and the fermionic symmetry group $G^f$ are correlated. If $\phi = 0$, then the fermionic symmetry action provides no constraint on $w$.

One might wonder why the symmetry action is not instead defined to be a homomorphism $[\rho] : G \to \text{Aut}^f(M)$, as the projective $Q$ factors would be absorbed into the equivalences by natural isomorphisms (which are allowed to have nontrivial $\gamma_{Q_0}$). Indeed, this is the definition of fermionic action used in Ref. 42. Such a definition would miss important physical considerations stemming from the locality of the physical fermion and lead to different obstruction and classification results, as we will explain. If one used this definition with the extra ad hoc constraint that only natural isomorphisms with $\gamma_{Q_0} = 1$ are used for equivalences of the $\rho_g$, i.e. the equivalence classes $[\rho_g]$ are under fermionic natural isomorphism, but their multiplication is under all natural isomorphisms, it would be equivalent to the $Q$-projective action defined above.

In more detail, we denote a specific auto-equivalence map as $\rho_g \in [\rho_g]$. Equivalent representatives of $[\rho_g]$ are given by $\rho_g = \Upsilon_g \circ \rho_g$, where $\Upsilon_g$ is a fermionic natural isomorphism. In terms of representatives, $\rho_g^f$ and $\rho_h^f$ compose to $\rho_{gh}$ up to a natural isomorphism $\kappa_{gh}$, or equivalently, they compose $Q$-projectively up to a fermionic natural isomorphism $\kappa_{gh}^f$. Indeed, this is the definition of $\kappa_{gh}$.

\[
\kappa_{gh} \circ \rho_g \circ \rho_h = \kappa_{gh}^f \circ \rho_{gh} \circ \rho_h = \rho_{gh}. \tag{109}
\]

(When $[Q]$ is trivial, we require $\kappa_{gh}$ to be a fermionic natural isomorphism.) Associativity of composing $\rho_g$, $\rho_h$, and $\rho_k$ implies

\[
\kappa_{gh,k} \circ \rho_g \circ \rho_k = \kappa_{gh,k}^f \circ \rho_{gh,k} \circ \rho_k = \kappa_{gh,k}^f. \tag{110}
\]

\[
\kappa_{gh,k} \circ \rho_g \circ \kappa_{h,k} \circ \rho_k^{-1} = \kappa_{gh,k}^f \circ \rho_{gh,k} \circ \kappa_{h,k} \circ \rho_k^{-1} = \kappa_{gh,k}^f. \tag{111}
\]

This equation will play a special role in defining the obstruction to symmetry fractionalization. In this way, we can see that the property $\phi \in \mathbb{Z}_2^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ follows from the associativity of group multiplication in $\text{Aut}^f(M)$ and the fact that $[Q]$ is nontrivial in $\text{Aut}^f(M)$.

We write the global symmetry action on topological charges as

\[
\rho_g(a_x) = g_{a_x}, \tag{112}
\]

and will also use the shorthand $g = g^{-1}$. The action on fusion vertex basis states takes the form

\[
\rho_g |a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}, \mu\rangle = [U_g(\rho_{a_x}, \rho_{b_y}; \rho_{c_{x+y}})]_{\mu\mu'} |a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}, \mu'\rangle, \tag{113}
\]

where the $U_g$-symbols are required to leave the basic data of $M$ invariant

\[
\rho_g (\sum_{\mu'} [U_g(\varnothing_{a_x}, \varnothing_{b_y}; \varnothing_{c_{x+y}})]_{\mu'}) |a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}, \mu'\rangle = [U_g(\rho_{a_x}, \rho_{b_y}; \rho_{c_{x+y}})]_{\mu\mu'} |a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}, \mu'\rangle. \tag{144}
\]

\[
\rho_g ([\mathcal{R}_d^{abc}]_{(\mu', \nu'; \alpha, \beta)}(f, \mu, \nu)) = \sum_{\alpha', \beta', \mu', \nu'} [U_g(\varnothing_{a_x}, \varnothing_{b_y}; \varnothing_{c_{x+y}})]_{\alpha\alpha'} [U_g(\varnothing_{a_x}, \varnothing_{b_y}; \varnothing_{c_{x+y}})]_{\beta\beta'} [\mathcal{R}_d^{a_{\alpha}, b_{\beta}, c_{\mu}}]_{(\alpha', \beta', \nu'; \nu)} = \sum_{\mu', \nu'} [U_g(\varnothing_{a_x}, \varnothing_{b_y}; \varnothing_{c_{x+y}})]_{(\mu', \nu')} [\mathcal{R}_d^{a_{\alpha}, b_{\beta}, c_{\mu}}]_{(\mu', \nu')} = [\mathcal{R}_d^{a_{\alpha}, b_{\beta}, c_{\mu}}]_{(\mu', \nu')}. \tag{116}
\]

Note that in the above expressions, brackets with subscripts denote matrix elements. These also give the corresponding

\[
[\kappa_{gh}(a, b; c)]_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} [U_{gh}(\varnothing_{a_x}, \varnothing_{b_y}; \varnothing_{c_{x+y}})]_{\alpha\beta} [U_{gh}(\varnothing_{a_x}, \varnothing_{b_y}; \varnothing_{c_{x+y}})]_{\beta\nu}. \tag{119}
\]

The canonical isomorphisms for the vacuum fixes $U_g(\varnothing_0, \varnothing_0; \varnothing_0) = U_g(a_x, \varnothing_0; \varnothing_x) = U_g(\varnothing_0, a_x; a_x) = 1$. and similarly for the physical fermion $[\text{Eq. } (84)]$ fixes $U_g(\varnothing_0, \psi_0; \varnothing_0) = 1$. (121)
The constraints on $U_g$-symbols from the other canonical gauge choices associated with gauge fixing $F$-symbols can also be imposed or allowed to be imposed automatically by the symmetry invariance of the basic data. An important one for $\sigma$-type vortices is

$$U_g(\psi_0, a_{\bar{s}}; a_\sigma) = U_g(a_\sigma, \psi_0; a_{\bar{s}}) = \pm 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (122)

Requiring $\rho_0 = \mathbb{1}$ fixes $[U_0(a_x, b_y; c_{x+y})]_{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu}$.

The fact that $\kappa_{g,h}$ is a natural isomorphism implies it can be written as,

$$[\kappa_{g,h}(a_x, b_y; c_{x+y})]_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\beta_{\alpha_a}(g, h)\beta_{\beta_b}(g, h)}{\beta_{\gamma_c}(g, h)}\delta_{\mu\nu}$$  \hspace{1cm} (123)

where the $\beta_{\alpha_a}(g, h)$ are complex phases satisfying the constraints

$$\beta_{I_{\alpha_a}}(g, h) = \beta_{\psi_0}(g, h)^2 = 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (124)

When $[Q] = [\mathbb{1}]$, $\kappa_{g,h}$ can always be written as a fermionic natural isomorphism, and we can further require

$$\beta_{\psi_0}(g, h) = 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (125)

When $[Q] \neq [\mathbb{1}]$, we factor out $Q$, when necessary, to write the fermionic natural isomorphisms $\kappa_{g,h} = Q^{\phi(g,h)}\kappa_{g,h}$, which can be decomposed into $\beta_{\alpha_a}^\phi(g,h)$ that satisfy

$$\beta_{I_{\alpha_a}}^\phi(g, h) = \beta_{\psi_0}(g, h)^2 = 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (126)

Identical natural isomorphisms are found by shifting

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\alpha_a}(g, h) = \nu_{\alpha_a}(g, h)\beta_{\alpha_a}(g, h)$$  \hspace{1cm} (127)

as long as $\nu_{\alpha_a}(g, h)\nu_{\alpha_a}(g, h) = \nu_{\gamma_c}(g, h)$ whenever $N_{a-b'} \neq 0$. This is equivalent to the condition that

$$\nu_{\alpha_a}(g, h) = M_{\alpha_a}(\varphi(g,h))$$  \hspace{1cm} (128)

for some $\varphi(g, h) \in C^2(G, A)$. For fermionic natural isomorphisms, one can always choose a factorization with $\beta_{\psi_0}(g, h) = 1$. Then, in order to leave $\beta_{\psi_0}(g, h)$ fixed, the equivalences between factorizations of the fermionic natural isomorphisms must be further constrained to correspond to $\varphi(g, h) \in C^2(G, A_0)$. Since $\kappa_{g,0} = \kappa_{0,g} = [\mathbb{1}]$, we can use this gauge freedom to always choose

$$\beta_{\alpha_a}(0, 0) = \beta_{\alpha_a}(g, 0) = \beta_{\alpha_a}(0, g) = 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (129)

We recall that $[Q]$ is nontrivial in $\text{Aut}^f(M)$ if and only if $A_1 = \emptyset$. Thus, for $Q$-projective actions, equivalent factorizations of $\kappa_{g,h}$ into $\beta_{\alpha_a}(g, h)$ are automatically constrained to have $\varphi(g, h) \in C^2(G, A_0)$. This means $\beta_{\psi_0}(g, h)$ is fixed, though possibly nontrivial, when $[Q]$ is nontrivial. Of course, this is necessary in order for the factorizations of $\kappa_{g,h}$ into $\beta_{\alpha_a}^\phi(g, h)$ to leave $\beta_{\psi_0}(g, h) = 1$ fixed. Moreover, we see that $\beta_{\psi_0}(g, h) = (-1)^{\phi(g,h)} \in \mathbb{Z}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is a 2-cocycle when $[Q]$ is nontrivial.

Since fermionic auto-equivalence maps related by fermionic natural isomorphisms are considered equivalent, the transformation of the symmetry action as

$$\tilde{\rho}_g = T_g \circ \rho_g$$  \hspace{1cm} (130)

is considered a gauge transformation. This transforms the $U_g$-symbols and $\beta_{\alpha_a}$ (up to their redundancy) as

$$[U_g(a_x, b_y; c_{x+y})]_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\gamma_{\alpha_a}(g, h)}{\gamma_{\beta_b}(g, h)}[U_g(a_x, b_y; c_{x+y})]_{\mu\nu},$$  \hspace{1cm} (131)

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\alpha_a}(g, h) = \frac{\gamma_{\alpha_a}(h)}{\gamma_{\beta_b}(h)}\beta_{\alpha_a}(g, h),$$  \hspace{1cm} (132)

with the constraints

$$\gamma_{I_{\alpha_a}}(g) = \gamma_{\psi_0}(g) = 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (133)

The discussion for fermionic symmetry action on FMTCs above applies directly for SMTCs by restricting the vorticity labels to $x = 0$. We denote a fermionic symmetry action on a SMTC $M_0$ as

$[\rho^{(0)}] : G \to \text{Aut}^f(M_0).$  \hspace{1cm} (134)

When $[Q]$ is a nontrivial element of $\text{Aut}^f(M_0)$, i.e. when $A_1 = \emptyset$, the action may be $Q$-projective

$$[Q]|^{\phi(g,h)} \cdot [\rho^{(0)}] \cdot [\rho^{(0)}] = [\rho^{(0)}].$$  \hspace{1cm} (135)

For SMTCs, the redundancy of factoring $\kappa^{(0)}_{g,h}$ into $\beta^{(0)}_{\alpha_a}(g,h)$ is given by $\nu_{\alpha_a}(g,h) = M_{\alpha_a}^{\psi_0}(g,h)$ where $v(g, h) \in C^2(G, \tilde{A})$ and $\tilde{A}$ is the group formed by the super-Abelian supersectors of topological charges of $M$ (recall that $\tilde{A}$ is not necessarily equal to $\tilde{A}$). This is further restricted to $v(g, h) \in C^2(G, \tilde{A}_0)$ to leave $\beta^{(0)}_{\psi_0}(g, h)$ fixed.

It is useful to analyze the extensions of a global symmetry action $[\rho^{(0)}]$ on $M_0$ to global symmetry actions $[\rho]$ on $M$. From the discussion in Sec. III A on extensions of topological symmetries of $M_0$ to those of $M$, we see that such an extension is impossible if $[\rho^{(0)}] \notin \text{im}(\text{res}_{M_0})$ for any $g$, because it does not even lift. However, even when $[\rho^{(0)}] \in \text{res}_{M_0}(\text{Aut}^f(M))$ for all $g$, there is still another possible obstruction to extending the symmetry action from $M_0$ to $M$. The obstruction and classification of extensions will significantly involve $\text{ker}(\text{res}_{M_0})$. For all examples we know, we have $\text{ker}(\text{res}_{M_0}) = \mathbb{Z}_2^2$ (and we conjecture this to be generally true), so we assume this condition here and leave a more general discussion for Appendix D.

An important aspect of the extended fermionic symmetry action $[\rho]$ is its $Q$-projective structure, as determined by the exponents $\phi(g,h)$, and we will analyze extensions
with respect to a fixed $Q$-projective structure, i.e. a fixed $\phi$. When $|\mathcal{V}| \neq |Q|$, the $Q$-projective structure is determined by $[\rho^{(0)}]$, and the extension must match, requiring that $\phi = \phi^{(0)}$. This is because $|\mathcal{V}| \neq |Q|$ implies that either $[Q] = [\mathbb{1}] = [\mathbb{1}^{(0)}]$, for which we simply have $\phi = \phi^{(0)} = 0$, or $[Q] \neq [\mathbb{1}^{(0)}]$. On the other hand, the case $|\mathcal{V}| = |Q|$ implies $A_1 = \mathbb{B}$ and $A_1 \neq \mathbb{B}$, i.e. there are only $\sigma$-type vortices, at least one of which is super-Abelian. In this case, $[Q]$ is trivial in $Aut^f(M_0)$, but non-trivial in $Aut^i(M)$, and $\ker(res_{M_0}) = \mathbb{Z}_2^0$. Thus, when $|\mathcal{V}| = |Q|$, we have $\phi^{(0)} = 0$, but potentially nontrivial $Q$-projectiveness $\phi$ for the extension.

To characterize the obstruction, we first define an arbitrary section on the image of the restriction, that is $s : res_{M_0}(Aut^f(M)) \to Aut^i(M)$, such that $res_{M_0} \circ s([\mathcal{V}]) = [\mathcal{V}^{(0)}]$. Then we define

$$O^\rho(g, h) = |Q|^{[\rho(g, h) \cdot s[\rho^{(0)}_g] \cdot s[\rho^{(0)}_h] \cdot s[\rho^{(0)}_l]^{-1} \cdot s[\rho^{(0)}_l]^{-1}].$$

(136)

Here, $\phi$ is fixed and will constrain the $Q$-projective structure of the possible extensions.

Since $[\rho^{(0)}]$ is a fermionic symmetry action and the restriction map is a homomorphism, it follows that $res_{M_0}(O^\rho(g, h)) = [\mathbb{1}^{(0)}]$, and hence $O^\rho(g, h) \in \ker(res_{M_0}) = \mathbb{Z}_2^0$. We can also see that

$$dO^\rho(g, h, k) = O^\rho(h, k) \cdot O^\rho(gh, k)^{-1} \cdot O^\rho(g, hk) \cdot O^\rho(g, h)^{-1} = [\mathbb{1}],$$

(137)

where we used the fact that $\mathbb{Z}_2^0$ is central and $d\phi = 0$.

If we had made a different arbitrary choice of section, $\hat{s} : res_{M_0}(Aut^f(M)) \to Aut^i(M)$, we would have $\hat{s}[\rho^{(0)}_g] = \xi(g)^{-1} \cdot s[\rho^{(0)}_g]$ for some $\xi(g) \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^0)$. This different choice of section would yield

$$\hat{O}^\rho(g, h) = |Q|^{[\rho(g, h) \cdot \xi(g)^{-1} \cdot s[\rho^{(0)}_g] \cdot s[\rho^{(0)}_h] \cdot s[\rho^{(0)}_l]^{-1} \cdot s[\rho^{(0)}_l]^{-1}]} \cdot \xi(h) \cdot \xi(g)^{-1} \cdot \xi(g)$$

$$= O^\rho(g, h) \cdot d\xi(g, h).$$

(138)

Since the arbitrary choice of section should not matter in the definition of an obstruction, we treat these as equivalent definitions, and define the obstruction to be the equivalence class under multiplication with 2-coboundaries $B^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^0)$. Thus, we have

$$[O^\rho] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^0),$$

(139)

which is independent of the choice of section.

In order to see that $[O^\rho]$ represents an obstruction to extending the fermionic symmetry action for a fixed $\phi$, we note that if $[\rho_g]$ is an extension of $[\rho^{(0)}_g]$, then it can be written as $[\rho_g] = \xi(g) \cdot s[\rho^{(0)}_g]$ for some $\xi(g) \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^0)$. Then we see the condition that $[\rho] : G \to Aut^i(M)$ is a $Q$-projective homomorphism with $\phi$ translates into the condition

$$O^\rho(g, h) = \xi(h) \cdot \xi^{-1}(gh) \cdot \xi(g) = d\xi(g, h).$$

(140)

This shows $[O^\rho]$ is indeed an obstruction to extending the symmetry action $[\rho^{(0)}]$ for a fixed $\phi$, as it is impossible to satisfy this equation unless $O^\rho \in B^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^0)$ is a 2-coboundary, that is unless $[O^\rho] = [\mathbb{1}]$.

It also follows from this analysis that, for any $[\rho]$ that is an extension of $[\rho^{(0)}]$ with $Q$-projective structure $\phi$, we can define another valid extension by $[\rho_g'] = [\xi] \cdot [\rho_g]$, where $[\xi] \in H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^0)$. Thus, the extensions of $[\rho^{(0)}]$ to fermionic topological symmetries with $Q$-projective structure $\phi$ on $M$ are torsorially classified by

$$H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^0).$$

(141)

### C. $H^3_{[\rho]}(G, A)$ Invariance Class of the Fermionic Symmetry Action

The fermionic symmetry action $[\rho]$ on $M$ has an associated invariant valued in $H^3_{[\rho]}(G, A)$. In the next section, we explain why this invariant is an obstruction to realizing symmetry fractionalization. Physically, the symmetry fractionalization obstruction indicates that the corresponding symmetry action on the emergent topological degrees of freedom is incompatible with the global symmetry action on the physical Hilbert space in a locality preserving manner. In mathematical parlance, the obstruction signifies a failure for the fermionic symmetry action $[\rho] : G \to Aut^i(M)$ to lift to a categorical action $\rho : G \to Aut^i(M)$. The fermionic setting mirrors the bosonic one, except that we incorporate the restricted class of fermionic topological symmetries and fermionic natural isomorphisms. The discussion follows a streamlined version of that presented in Ref. 5.

We begin by defining

$$\Omega_{\alpha_x}(g, h, k) = \beta_{\alpha_x}^{-1}(a_x)(h, k) \beta_{\alpha_x}(g, hk).$$

(142)

Eq. (110) implies

$$\Omega_{\alpha_x}(g, h, k)\Omega_{\alpha_y}(g, h, k) = \Omega_{\alpha_{x+y}}(g, h, k)$$

(143)

whenever $\alpha_{x+y} \neq 0$.

Using the relation through the characters of the fusion algebra (reviewed in Sec. II A), this indicates we can write

$$\Omega_{\alpha_x}(g, h, k) = M_{\alpha_x \Phi(g, h, k)}$$

(144)

for some $\Phi \in C^3(G, A)$.

One can directly show from the definition that $\Omega_{\alpha_x}(g, h, k)$ satisfies the cocycle-like condition

$$\Omega_{\alpha_x}^{-1}(a_x)(h, k, l)\Omega_{\alpha_x}(g, hk, l)\Omega_{\alpha_x}(g, h, k)$$

$$\Omega_{\alpha_x}(g, h, k)\Omega_{\alpha_x}(g, h, kl) = 1.$$
Translating through Eq. (144), this can equivalently be written as
\[ d\Phi = \mathcal{I}_0, \]  
(146)
where the boundary operator here includes the action on \( A \) induced by the symmetry action \([\rho]\) on topological charges. Thus, \( \Phi \in Z^3_{[\rho]}(G, A) \).

Finally, as described by Eqs. (127) and (128), we have the freedom to redefine \( \beta_{ax}(g, h) \) to \( \tilde{\beta}_{ax}(g, h) = \nu_a(g, h)\beta_{ax}(g, h) \) where
\[ \nu_a(g, h) = M_{ax, a}(g, h), \]  
(147)
for some \( v \in C^2[G, A] \). Under such redefinitions of \( \beta_{ax}(g, h) \to \tilde{\beta}_{ax}(g, h) \), one finds \( \Phi \to \bar{\Phi} = \bar{d}\Phi \). Thus, one should treat \( \tilde{\Phi} \) as equivalent when related by 3-coboundaries \( dv \in B^3_{[\rho]}(G, A) \), and define the equivalence class
\[ [\Phi] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G, A). \]  
(148)

Recall that \([Q]\) is nontrivial if and only if \( A_1 = \emptyset \). In this case, \([\Phi]\) \( \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G, A_0) \). When we have a \( Q \)-projective symmetry action (which is only the case when \([Q]\) is nontrivial), since \( \kappa_{g, h} = Q^{x_{g(h)}}\kappa_{g, h} \), we can let \( \beta_{ax}^I(g, h) = (-1)^{\phi(g, h)}\beta_{ax}(g, h) \). Then plugging this into Eq. (142), we find that \( \Omega^I_{\psi}(g, h, k) = \Omega_{\psi}(g, h, k) \) and \( \Phi^I = \bar{\Phi} \), since \( \phi \) is a 2-cocycle. The fact that \( \beta_{\psi \psi}(g, h) = 1 \) implies that \( \Omega_{\psi}(g, h, k) = \Omega_{\psi}(g, h, k) = 1 \).

Repeating the analysis for a fermionic symmetry action \([\rho^{(0)}] : G \to \text{Aut}^I(M_0) \), we replace Abelian topological charges with superAbelian supercharges and recall that \([\rho^{(0)}] \) uniquely determines \( [\rho] \) to similarly define the class
\[ [\Phi^{(0)}] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G, \hat{A}). \]  
(149)

When \([\rho']^{(I)} \) extends to a symmetry action \([\rho]\) on \( M \), we see that \([\Phi^{(0)}] = [\tilde{\Phi}] \) for the corresponding \([\Phi]\) projected onto supercharges. Similarly, when \([Q]\) is a nontrivial element of \( \text{Aut}^I(M_0) \), \( \hat{A}_1 = \emptyset \), and \([\Phi^{(0)}] \in H^3_{[\rho' \rho]}(G, \hat{A}_0) \).

We note that modifying the symmetry action by \( V \) or \( Q \) does not change \([\Phi]\) or \([\Phi^{(0)}]\). To see this in more detail, we first consider modifying a symmetry action \( \rho_G \) to
\[ \rho'_{G} = V^{x_{g}} \rho_{G}, \]  
(150)
where \( \pi : G \to \mathbb{Z}_2 \) is required to be a homomorphism, assuming \( [V] \notin \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \). From Eq. (95), we see that this yields the modified
\[ \kappa_{g, h}(a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}) = (-1)^{x \cdot \pi_{g}(a) \cdot \pi_{h}(b)} \kappa_{g, h}(a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}), \]  
(151)
which can be factorized into
\[ \beta_{ax}^I(g, h) = i^{x \cdot \pi_{g}(a) \cdot \pi_{h}(b)} \beta_{ax}(g, h). \]  
(152)
Since \( \pi \) is a homomorphism, it follows that \( \Omega_{\psi \psi}(g, h, k) = \Omega_{\psi \psi}(g, h, k) \) and \( \Phi' = \Phi \). We note that \( \beta_{\psi \psi}(g, h) = \beta_{\psi \psi}(g, h) \).

Next, we consider modifying a symmetry action \( \rho_{\bar{G}} \) to
\[ \rho_{G} = Q^{(r)} \rho_{G}, \]  
(153)
where \( r \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2) \) is not required to be a homomorphism. Since \( Q^2 = 1 \), this yields the modified
\[ \kappa_{g, h} = Q^{x_{g(h)}} \kappa_{g, h}, \]  
(154)
which can be factorized into
\[ \beta_{ax}^I(g, h) = (-1)^{x \cdot \pi_{g(h)}} \beta_{ax}(g, h). \]  
(155)
If \( r \) were a homomorphism, we would have \( \kappa_{g, h} = \kappa_{g, h} \) and \( \beta_{ax}^I(g, h) = \beta_{ax}(g, h) \). Since \( dr \) is a coboundary, it follows that \( \Omega_{\psi \psi}(g, h, k) = \Omega_{\psi \psi}(g, h, k) \) and \( \Phi' = \Phi \). We note that \( \beta_{\psi \psi}(g, h) = (-1)^{x \cdot \pi_{g(h)}} \beta_{\psi \psi}(g, h) \).

D. Fermionic Symmetry Fractionalization: Obstruction and Classification

Following the discussion in Ref. 5, symmetry fractionalization may occur when the action of the global symmetry on the physical Hilbert space exhibits localization on the low energy subspace describing the topological phase, which is the case when the symmetry acts in a locality preserving manner. In particular, let \( \Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n} \) be a ground state of the system localizing \( n \) quasiparticles, with the \( j \)-th quasiparticle carrying topological charge \( a_j \).

(To be concrete, we consider the system to be defined on a genus zero surface.) When a global symmetry acts in a unitary on-site manner (which is locality preserving), the symmetry action \( R_{\bar{G}} \) on the low energy Hilbert space acts as
\[ R_{\bar{G}} |\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n} \rangle = \prod_{j=1}^{n} U^{(j)}_{\bar{G}} \rho_{\bar{G}} |\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n} \rangle, \]  
(156)
where \( U^{(j)}_{\bar{G}} \) is a unitary operator whose support is localized in a neighborhood of the \( j \)-th quasiparticle. Here, \( \rho_{\bar{G}} \) is an operator on the physical Hilbert space that acts on the topological degrees of freedom ascribed to the states \( |\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n} \rangle \) in exactly the same way that \( \rho_{\bar{G}} \) acts on the MTC \( M \). The \( U^{(j)}_{\bar{G}} \) operators should not be confused with the \( U_{\bar{G}}(a, b; c)^{\mu\nu} \) symbols, which enter Eq. (156) through \( \rho_{\bar{G}} \).

It can then be shown that the localized symmetry operators \( U^{(j)}_{\bar{G}} \) will obey a projective-like multiplication
\[ U^{(j)}_{\bar{G}} \rho_{\bar{G}} U^{(j)}_{\bar{G}}^{-1} |\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n} \rangle = \rho_{\bar{G}} |\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n} \rangle, \]  
(157)
for projective phases $\eta_a(g, h)$. Together with Eq. (156), this implies

$$\kappa_{g, h}(a, b; c) = \frac{\eta_a(g, h)\eta_b(g, h)}{\eta_c(g, h)}.$$  (158)

Associativity of the global symmetry operators $R_g$ require these phases to satisfy

$$\eta_{g^{-1}(a)}(h, k)\eta_a(g, hk) = 1.$$  (159)

The projective phases $\eta_a(g, h)$, together with the symmetry action $\rho$, encode the fractionalization of the global symmetry, in that they can be interpreted as assignments of fractional quantum numbers of the symmetry group $G$ to the quasiparticles (topological charges) of the topological phase. However, there may be no or multiple distinct solutions to Eqs. (158) and (159).

It is worth mentioning that the equivalence of the topological symmetry action under natural isomorphism $\rho_g = Y_g\rho_g$, enter as a gauge freedom involved in writing the global symmetry operators, which physically justifies the equivalence. In particular, such a modification of the topological symmetry action can be canceled in the global symmetry action $\rho_g$ by modifying the local operators as $\tilde{U}_g^j = U_g^j Y_j g^{-1}$, where $Y_j g |\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}\rangle = \gamma_j a(g)|\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}\rangle$. The effect of this symmetry action gauge transformation on the projective phases is

$$\tilde{\eta}_a(g, h) = \frac{\gamma_a(g)}{\gamma_{a(h)}\gamma_a(g)}\eta_a(g, h).$$  (160)

In order to understand when Eqs. (158) and (159) have solutions and how to classify them, it is useful to define the phases

$$\omega_a(g, h) = \frac{\beta_a(g, h)}{\eta_a(g, h)},$$  (161)

which can be seen to obey $\omega_a(g, h)\omega_b(g, h) = \omega_{ab}(g, h)$ when $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$. (The gauge freedom associated with decomposing the $\kappa_{g, h}$ into $\beta_a(g, h)$ can be modified the $\omega_a$ phases in a correlated manner that leaves the projective phases $\eta_a$ unchanged.) It follows that

$$\omega_a(g, h) = M_{am}(g, h)$$  (162)

for some $w(g, h) \in C^2(G, A)$. In this way, Eq. (159) translates into the condition

$$\Phi(g, h, k) = \rho w(h, k) \otimes w(g, h) \otimes w(g, hk) \otimes w(g, h) = d\omega(g, h, k).$$  (163)

This condition must be satisfied for the symmetry action $\rho$ on the emergent topological theory $M$ to be compatible with the localization of the symmetry action on the physical Hilbert space. Since the right hand side of this equation is a 3-coboundary, it can only be satisfied when $\Phi$ is also a 3-coboundary. This reveals a potential obstruction to symmetry fractionalization, as there can be no solutions to Eq. (163) when $\Phi$ is not a coboundary.

When $\Phi$ is a 3-coboundary, there are solutions to Eq. (163), and hence Eq. (159). Moreover, when $w \in C^2(G, A)$ provides a solution, it is clear that

$$w'(g, h) = t(g, h) \otimes w(g, h)$$  (164)

will also provide a solution for any $t(g, h) \in Z^2_{[0]}(G, A)$, and that all solutions are obtained this way.

It remains to determine whether such solutions should be considered equivalent or distinct. For this, we recognize that, for fixed $\rho_g$, if we redefine the local operators $U_g^j$ by

$$\tilde{U}_g^j = U_g^j Z_g^j \rho_g^{-1},$$  (165)

where $Z_g^j$ are similarly localized unitary operators, then the action of $R_g$ on the low energy Hilbert space will not change as long as

$$\prod_{j=1}^n Z_g^j |\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}\rangle = |\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}\rangle.$$  (166)

Since such operators will act on the low-energy Hilbert space as

$$Z_g^j |\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}\rangle = \zeta_{a_j}(g)|\Psi_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}\rangle,$$  (167)

where $\zeta_{a_j}(g)$ are phases, this constraint becomes

$$\prod_{j=1}^n \zeta_{a_j}(g) = 1.$$  (168)

This is equivalent to the condition that these phases respect the fusion rules, i.e. $\zeta_{a_j}(g) \zeta_{a_k}(g) = \zeta_{c}(g)$ whenever $N_{ab}^c \neq 0$, which establishes the bijection

$$\zeta_a(g) = M_{a\psi}(g),$$  (169)

for some $\psi \in C^1(G, A)$. This translates into the redefinitions

$$\tilde{\eta}_a(g, h) = \frac{\zeta_a(g)}{\zeta_{a(h)}\zeta_a(g)}\eta_a(g, h),$$  (170)

and

$$\tilde{w}(g, h) = \zeta_1(h) \otimes \zeta(h) \otimes w(g, h) = d\zeta(g, h) \times w(g, h).$$  (171)

In the case of bosonic topological phases, any such redefinition of $U_g^j$ by $Z_g^j$ yields a physically equivalent description of the symmetry fractionalization, as the distinction is physically undetectable. As such, the solutions of Eq. (163) are considered equivalent when related by a
2-coboundary in $B^2_{(\rho)}(G, A)$, so the classification of symmetry fractionalization is given torsorially by $H^3_{(\rho)}(G, A)$, through the action of $t \in Z^2_{(\rho)}(G, A)$.

In order to apply this analysis to fermionic topological phases, we include the fermionic vorticity labels on topological charges and the additional constraints that result from the symmetry action applying to the physical fermions of the system. We previously argued that the natural transformations were required to act trivially on the physical fermion, that is $\psi_0 = 1$. Now we see this is additionally justified, as nontrivial $\gamma_\psi$ would modify how the symmetry acts on the physical fermions in the physical Hilbert space, and would constitute a physically observable difference. The localization of symmetry action applies similarly, except the equivalence of identifications of the local operators $U^{(j)}_\psi$ under redefinition by $Z^2_{(\rho)}$ are further constrained. In particular, we additionally require that $Z^2_{(\rho)}$ have eigenvalues $\zeta_\psi(g) = 1$ when acting on the physical fermion, as nontrivial $\zeta_\psi(g)$ would change the local operators in a manner that is physically observable using the physical fermions, as opposed to an unmeasurable gauge transformation on the emergent degrees of freedom. This translates into the condition that $\gamma \in C^1(G, A_0)$ and that the equivalence of fractionalization classes corresponds to a quotient by $B^2_{(\rho)}(G, A_0)$. On the other hand, the solutions of Eq. (163) are still given by torsorial action of $t \in Z^2_{(\rho)}(G, A_0 + A_1)$. Thus, we find that symmetry fractionalization of fermionic topological phases has the obstruction similarly given by

$$[\mathcal{O}] \in H^3_{(\rho)}(G, A).$$  

(172)

When $[\mathcal{O}] = [\mathcal{I}]$, i.e. $\mathcal{O} \in B^2_{(\rho)}(G, A)$, the obstruction vanishes and the classification of symmetry fractionalization is given torsorially by

$$Z^2_{(\rho)}(G, A_0 + A_1) \rightarrow B^2_{(\rho)}(G, A_0).$$  

(173)

Here, we write $A = A_0 + A_1$ to emphasize the difference with the term in the quotient.

This result for obstruction and classification of symmetry fractionalization in fermionic topological phases includes finer detailed structure that is important to unpack. In this regard, we first focus on the meaning of symmetry fractionalization of the physical fermion of the theory. Recall that $\kappa_{g,h}(\psi_0,\psi_0; \mathcal{I}_0) = 1$. Together with Eq. (158), this implies $\eta_{\psi_0}(g, h)^2 = 1$. Thus, we have

$$\eta_{\psi_0}(g, h) = \beta_{\psi_0}(g, h)M_{\psi_0\psi_0}(g, h) = (-1)^{w(g, h)},$$  

(174)

where the only aspect of $w(g, h)$ that enters this expression is its vorticity. In a fermionic theory which has $\gamma_\psi(g) = 1$, this is a gauge invariant quantity. Since the symmetry action leaves $\psi_0$ fixed, Eq. (159) implies the 2-cocycle condition

$$\frac{\eta_{\psi_0}(h, k)\eta_{\psi_0}(g, hk)}{\eta_{\psi_0}(gh, k)\eta_{\psi_0}(g, h)} = 1.$$  

(175)

Together, this shows

$$w \in \mathbb{Z}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2).$$  

(176)

The use of the symbol $w$ here was intentionally the same as that of the 2-cocycle that determines the fermionic symmetry group $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ describing the system. Indeed, the $G$ symmetry fractionalization of the physical fermion determines the fermionic symmetry group $G^f$. We can understand this by heuristically writing the local operators $U^{(j)}_g$ acting on a physical fermion $\psi_0$ as $U^{(j)}_g$. Then we see $U^{(j)}_g$ forms a projective representation of $G$, that is

$$U^{(j)}_gU^{(j)}_{gh} = \eta_{\psi_0}(g, h)U^{(j)}_{gh}.$$  

(177)

Projective representations of a group can generally be understood in terms of linear representations of the central extensions of that group. Specifically, this lifting is constructed by using the projective phase factors of the projective representation to define the central extension's group multiplication. The fermionic symmetry group $G^f$ is the group including fermion parity conservation, for which the physical fermions carry linear representations, as expected for local microscopic objects. In other words, the group multiplication of $G^f$ given by

$$gh = (x, g)(y, h) = (x + y + w(g, h), gh),$$  

(178)

makes $(-1)^{w(g, h)} \in B^2(G^f, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ a 2-coboundary.

It is worth emphasizing an important distinction between taking equivalences of the fermionic symmetry action by fermionic natural isomorphisms requiring $\gamma_{\psi_0}(g) = 1$ and equivalences of fermionic fractionalization classes by $B^2_{(\rho)}(G, A_0)$ (i.e. $\zeta_\psi(g, h) = 1$), as opposed to equivalences under natural isomorphisms which allow $\gamma_{\psi_0}(g) = \pm 1$ and fractionalization classes related by $B^2_{(\rho)}(G, A)$. Were we to allow equivalence under natural isomorphisms with $\gamma_{\psi_0}(g) = \pm 1$, then $\eta_{\psi_0}(g, h) = \frac{\zeta_{\psi_0}(gh)}{\zeta_{\psi_0}(g)\zeta_{\psi_0}(h)}\eta_{\psi_0}(g, h)$ would equate $w$ and $\tilde{w}$ that differ by 2-coboundaries $B^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$. Similarly, equivalence of fractionalization classes related by $B^2_{(\rho)}(G, A)$, which correspond to $\zeta_{\psi_0}(g, h) = \pm 1$, would have $\tilde{\eta}_{\psi_0}(g, h) = \frac{\zeta_{\psi_0}(gh)}{\zeta_{\psi_0}(g)\zeta_{\psi_0}(h)}\eta_{\psi_0}(g, h)$, also equating $w$ and $\tilde{w}$ that differ by $B^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$. This would yield $[w] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$ as the corresponding invariant, rather than $w \in \mathbb{Z}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$. While the possible group extensions $G^f$ are classified by $[w] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$, the fractionalization class contains a finer level of specificity with $w \in \mathbb{Z}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$. The distinction will become even more pronounced when we include symmetry defects, as $\gamma_{\psi}(g) = -1$ would change the vorticity of $g$-defects, and $\zeta_{\psi}(g) = -1$ would correspond to redefining the topological charges of $g$-defects by fusion with a vortex-valued charge. Physically, the global symmetry group labels correspond to extrinsically measurable quantities, as they are fixed with respect to some physical reference. (This is why $G$-crossed
MTCs related by Aut(G) are not considered physically equivalent. Thus, different realizations \( w \in [w] \) of the same symmetry group \( G \) correspond to isomorphic, but physically distinguishable realizations of the symmetry. Henceforth, when we refer to \( G^f \), we will mean the extension associated with a particular cocycle \( w \), not the cohomology class \([w]\), unless explicitly stated.

We can now re-examine the classification of symmetry fractionalization with respect to a specific \( G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times \mathbb{G} \). The first observation is that not all possible central extensions of the group \( G \) by \( \mathbb{Z}_2^f \) will necessarily be manifested as possible symmetry fractionalization classes. In other words, the set of possible fermion symmetry fractionalization classes for given \( M, G \), and \( \rho \) encodes a possible obstruction to realizing a particular fermionic symmetry group \( G^f \). The second observation is that the torsorial action of 2-cocycles in \( \mathbb{Z}_2^f(G, A_0 \oplus A_1) \) that have \( A_1 \)-valued elements change which \( G^f \) is manifested. Given a symmetry fractionalization class that manifests one particular \( \mathbb{Z}_2^f \) central extension of \( G \), the 2-cocycles in \( \mathbb{Z}_2^f(G, A_0 \oplus A_1) \) inform us which other \( \mathbb{Z}_2^f \) central extensions of \( G \) can also arise. When no vortex-valued 2-cocycles exist, only one possible \( G^f \) can be realized for a given symmetry action \( \rho \). We note that this condition always applies for nontrivial \( G \)-projective symmetry actions. The third observation is that for a fixed fermionic symmetry group \( G^f \), the classification of symmetry fractionalization is given by restricting to the \( A_0 \)-valued 2-cocycles, so it is torsorially classified by

\[
H^2_{\rho(0)}(G, A_0) = \frac{\mathbb{Z}_2^2(G, A_0)}{B^2_{\rho(0)}(G, A_0)}.
\]

The fourth observation is that since the group of Abelian quasiparticles factorizes as \( A_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi \times \hat{A}_0 \) (see Appendix B), this classifying cohomology group can be expressed in terms of a factor associated with the symmetry fractionalization of the quasiparticles and a factor associated with the symmetry fractionalization of vorticity.

These observations can be formalized from the perspective of extensions of symmetry fractionalization. For this, we begin by considering the physical fermion \( \mathbb{Z}_2^f \) by itself. We first note that \( \hat{A} = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \) in this case (as can be seen from the \( K^{(\nu)} \) theories). Clearly the symmetry action on \( \mathbb{Z}_2^f \) can only be trivial, with all \( U_{g} \)-symbols trivial and \( \eta_{g,h} = 1 \). We can choose \( \beta_{\psi_0}(g,h) = (-1)^f(g,h) \) for any \( f \in C^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2) \). (While it may seem natural to choose \( \beta_{\psi_0}(g,h) = 1 \) to make this a fermionic natural isomorphism, we leave this general, so that we can match it to any SMTC or MTC that contains it.) Symmetry fractionalization of the physical fermion is then classified by \( \eta_{\psi_0}(g,h) = (-1)^{w(g,h)} \), where \( w \in \mathbb{Z}_2^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f) \). This precisely corresponds to the classification of the possible fermionic symmetry groups \( G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times_w G \) through Eq. (174).

We next consider a FMTMC \( M \) with a particular fermionic symmetry action \( \rho : G \to Aut^1(M) \) that has vanishing obstruction \( [\Phi] = [\mathbb{I}] \) and pick some arbitrary fractionalization class, which we specify through \( \rho_g \) and \( \hat{\eta}_{\psi_0}(g,h) \). Writing the corresponding \( \hat{\eta}_{\psi_0}(g,h) = (-1)^{\hat{w}(g,h)} \), we can now define an obstruction to realizing the fermionic symmetry group \( G^f \) through a symmetry fractionalization class of \( M \) and \( [\rho] \) in the following way. If \( A_1 = \emptyset \), then \( \hat{w}(g,h) \) is the only possibility, so \( G^f \) is obstructed unless \( w = \hat{w} \). If \( A_1 \neq \emptyset \), \( G^f \) is obstructed unless there is a 2-cocycle \( t \in \mathbb{Z}_2^f(G, A) \) such that \( M_{\psi_t}(g,h) = (-1)^{\hat{w}(g,h) - \hat{w}(g,h)} \). To express this as an obstruction class, we pick an arbitrary Abelian vortex which we denote \( c_1 \), and define

\[
\hat{\mathcal{O}}^w(g,h,k) = d(e_1^w \otimes e_1^w)(g,h,k)
\]

\[
= e_1^w(g,k) \otimes e_1^w(h,k) \otimes e_1^w(g,h,k) \otimes e_1^w(g,h) \otimes e_1^w(g,h) \otimes e_1^w(g,h).
\]

We note that \( \hat{\mathcal{O}}^w(g,h,k) \in A_0 \), since the symmetry action preserves vorticity and \( w \), \( \hat{w} \in \mathbb{Z}_2^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f) \). It is straightforward to see that \( d\hat{\mathcal{O}}^w(g,h,k) = \mathbb{I}_0 \), hence \( \hat{\mathcal{O}}^w \in \mathbb{Z}_2^1_{\rho(0)}(G, A_0) \). To see that this object defines an obstruction to manifesting \( G^f \) for \( M \) and \( \rho \), we observe that a fractionalization class with \( \eta_{\psi_0}(g,h) \) and \( \hat{\eta}_{\psi_0}(g,h) = (-1)^{w(g,h)} \) exists if and only if there exists \( t \in \mathbb{Z}_2^f(G, A_0 \oplus A_1) \) such that \( M_{\psi_t}(g,h) = \eta_{\psi_0}(g,h) / \eta_{\psi_0}(g,h) \). These conditions are equivalent to the existence of \( t \) that has \( \hat{\mathcal{O}}^w = \mathbb{I}_0 \) and \( t(g,h) = \eta(g,h) \otimes e_1^w \otimes e_1^w \), where \( \eta(g,h) \in C^2(G, A_0) \). Combining these yields the obstruction condition

\[
\hat{\mathcal{O}}^w = d\mathcal{O}.
\]

This equation can only be satisfied when \( \hat{\mathcal{O}}^w \in B_{\rho(0)}^1(G, A_0) \), since the right hand side of the expression is a 3-coboundary. Moreover, we can see that the arbitrary choices in the definition of \( \hat{\mathcal{O}}^w \) will only change it by an element of \( B_{\rho(0)}^1(G, A_0) \). In particular, if we used a different Abelian vortex \( \hat{c}_1 \), for which \( \hat{c}_1 \otimes \hat{c}_1 = c_0 \in A_0 \), we would have

\[
\hat{\mathcal{O}}^w = d(e_1^w \otimes e_1^w) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}^w \otimes d(e_1^w \otimes e_1^w).
\]

If we used a different fractionalization class given by \( \hat{\eta}_{\psi_0}(g,h) \) with respective \( \hat{w}(g,h) \), then we would have

\[
\hat{\mathcal{O}}^w = d(e_1^w \otimes e_1^w) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}^w \otimes d(e_1^w \otimes e_1^w).
\]

Since fractionalization classes exist (by assumption) for both \( \hat{w} \) and \( \hat{w} \), i.e. they are unobstructed, it follows that \( d(e_1^w \otimes e_1^w) \in B_{\rho(0)}^3(G, A_0) \), as explained above. Thus, we form the equivalence class under fusion with 3-coboundaries to define the obstruction class \( [\hat{\mathcal{O}}^w] \in B_{\rho(0)}^3(G, A_0) \).
We can now write the obstruction to manifesting $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times_w G$ as
\[
[\mathcal{O}^w] = \begin{cases} 
(w - \tilde{w}) \in \mathbb{Z}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f) & \text{if } A_1 = \emptyset \\
[d \left( \tilde{e}_1^w \otimes \tilde{e}_1^w \right)] \in H^3_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, A_0) & \text{if } A_1 \neq \emptyset .
\end{cases}
\] (184)

When the obstruction $[\mathcal{O}^w]$ is trivial, there is a symmetry fractionalization class with $\rho$ and $\eta_\alpha(g, h)$ that manifests $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times_w G$. In this case, $\eta_\alpha(g, h) = M_{\alpha \rightarrow \alpha}(g, h)\eta_\alpha(g, h)$ with $t_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, A_0)$ also represents a symmetry fractionalization class corresponding to $w$, and all fractionalization classes corresponding to $w$ are obtained this way. As previously mentioned, for fermionic topological phases, symmetry fractionalization classes are formed by equivalence under product with 2-coboundaries in $B^2_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, A_0)$. Thus, the fermionic symmetry fractionalization classes for an unobstructed fermionic $G^f$ and action $[\rho]$ are again seen to be torsorially classified by
\[
H^2_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, A_0).
\] (185)

The obstruction defined in Eq. (184) is very similar to an obstruction defined in Ref. 42 for manifesting the group extensions corresponding to $[w]$. Our definition using equivalences with the constraints $\gamma_\psi = 1$ and $\zeta_\psi(g, h) = 1$, as explained above, whereas the definition in Ref. 42 uses equivalences that permit $\gamma_\psi = \pm 1$ and $\zeta_\psi(g, h) = \pm 1$, which consequently characterize the fermionic symmetry group by cohomology classes $[w] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$. A similar analysis using these less constrained equivalences yields the obstruction to manifesting $[w]$ given by
\[
[\mathcal{O}^w] = \begin{cases} 
[w - \tilde{w}] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f) & \text{if } A_1 = \emptyset \\
[d \left( \tilde{e}_1^w \otimes \tilde{e}_1^w \right)] \in H^3_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, A_0) & \text{if } A_1 \neq \emptyset .
\end{cases}
\] (186)

The corresponding classification of fractionalization classes manifesting $[w]$ is given torsorially by
\[
\ker \left( r_s : H^2_{[\rho]}(G, A) \rightarrow H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f) \right),
\] (187)
where $r_s$ is the map induced from the restriction $r : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ given by $a^\mathcal{A} \mapsto x$. More specifically, this is the set of cohomology classes $[\xi] \in H^2_{[\rho]}(G, A)$ such that $M_{\psi_\xi}(g, h) = (-1)^{\dim(g, h)}$ for some $u \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$. The group in Eq. (187) is generally not equivalent to $H^2_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, A_0)$. An important example of such a difference occurs for the $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ FSP phases, in particular for $M = \mathbb{K}^{(0)}$ with $\rho_1 = \mathbb{V}$, for which $\ker(r_s) = \mathbb{Z}_1$, whereas $H^2_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, A_0) = \mathbb{Z}_2$. In other words, using this classification would mistakenly identify distinct $\mathbb{Z}_2$ FSP phases, while ours distinguishes them.

The symmetry fractionalization obstruction and classification discussion for FMTCs can be directly applied to SMTCs by using the fact that the characters of the fusion algebra of $\mathcal{M}_0$ are mapped to supersectors of topological charges of (any of) its $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ extensions. In this way, we can write the results for $\mathcal{M}_0$ by making the following modifications. Symmetry fractionalization for $\mathcal{M}_0$ has the obstruction
\[
[\mathcal{O}^{(0)}] \in H^3_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, \hat{A}),
\] (188)
and when the obstruction is trivial, i.e. $[\mathcal{O}^{(0)}] = [\hat{I}]$, the classification of symmetry fractionalization is given torsorially by
\[
\frac{Z^2_{[\rho]}(G, A)}{B^2_{[\rho]}(G, A_0)}.
\] (189)

We re-emphasize that $\hat{A}$ is not necessarily equal to $A$, due to the possibility of superAbelian $\sigma$-type vortices, but $\mathcal{A}_0 = \hat{A}_0$. Again, the fractionalization class determines the fermionic symmetry group $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times_w G$ through $\eta_\alpha^{(0)}(g, h) = (-1)^{w(g,h)}$. The obstruction to manifesting a given $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times_w G$ is
\[
[\mathcal{O}^{(0)w}] = \begin{cases} 
[w - \tilde{w}] \in \mathbb{Z}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f) & \text{if } \hat{A}_1 = \emptyset \\
[d \left( \tilde{e}_1^w \otimes \tilde{e}_1^w \right)] \in H^3_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, A_0) & \text{if } \hat{A}_1 \neq \emptyset ,
\end{cases}
\] (190)

and when this obstruction is trivial, the fermionic symmetry fractionalization classes for $G^f$ and $[\rho^{(0)}]$ are torsorially classified by
\[
H^2_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, \hat{A}_0).
\] (191)

Clearly this describes the symmetry fractionalization of the quasiparticles of the fermionic topological phase.

Finally, we consider the extension of fermionic symmetry fractionalization of a SMTC $\mathcal{M}_0$ to one of its $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ extensions $\mathcal{M}$. The obstruction for such an extension under simplifying conditions was discussed in Ref. 30; we consider the general case and obtain the classification in addition to the obstruction. For this, we assume that we have a fermionic symmetry action $[\rho^{(0)}]$ on $\mathcal{M}_0$ that extends to a fermionic symmetry action $[\rho]$ on $\mathcal{M}$ (see Sec. III.B for the corresponding obstruction and classification of this symmetry action extension). We also assume $[\mathcal{O}^{(0)}]$ is trivial and pick a symmetry fractionalization class on $\mathcal{M}_0$ specified by $[\rho^{(0)}]$ and $\eta_\alpha^{(0)}(g, h)$. This choice also fixes the fermionic symmetry group $G^f$. We pick the representative action $\rho$ such that $\text{res}_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\rho_g) = \rho_g^{(0)}$ and the corresponding $\beta_\alpha^{(0)}$ such that $\beta_\alpha(g, h) = \beta_\alpha^{(0)}(g, h)$. (Note that it is possible to have valid choices of $\beta_\alpha^{(0)}$ that are not restrictions of valid choices of $\beta_\alpha^{(0)}$. This implies $\Omega_\alpha^{(0)} = \Omega_\alpha^{(0)}$ and hence $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}^{(0)}$, i.e. $M_{\alpha \rightarrow \alpha} = M_{\alpha \rightarrow \alpha}^{(0)}$. We write $w^{(0)}(g, h)$ given by $M_{w^{(0)}(g,h)} = \eta_\alpha^{(0)}(g, h)/\beta_\alpha^{(0)}(g, h)$, which satisfies $\mathcal{O}^{(0)} = dw^{(0)}$. With these choices, the symmetry
fractionalization extension problem can be expressed as determining whether there exist \( w \in C^2(G, \mathcal{A}) \) such that \( d\omega = \mathcal{O} \) and \( \tilde{w}(g, h) = w^{(0)}(g, h) \).

We proceed by defining an arbitrary section on the set of supersectors of topological charge \( \ell : \hat{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathcal{M} \), such that \( \ell(\alpha_s) = \alpha_s \). We recall that \( \hat{A}_1 \neq \hat{A}_1 \) if and only if there are \( \sigma \)-type superAbelian vortices, in which case \( \hat{A}_1 = \emptyset \). This allows for the possibility that \( w^{(0)} \in C^2(G, \hat{\mathcal{A}}) \), but \( w^{(0)} \notin C^2(G, \hat{\mathcal{A}}) \), in which case the corresponding symmetry fractionalization class on \( \mathcal{M}_0 \) cannot be extended to a symmetry fractionalization class of \( \mathcal{M} \). Thus, a necessary condition for extending the fractionalization class to \( \mathcal{M} \) is that \( w^{(0)} \in C^2(G, \hat{\mathcal{A}}) \), so that \( \ell(w^{(0)}) \in C^2(G, \hat{\mathcal{A}}) \).

When \( w^{(0)} \in C^2(G, \hat{\mathcal{A}}) \), we define
\[
\mathcal{O}^\eta(g, h, k) = \mathcal{O}(g, h, k) \otimes \ell(w^{(0)}(h, k)) \\
= \mathcal{O}(g, h, k) \otimes \ell(w^{(0)}(g, h)) \\
= \mathcal{O}(g, h, k) \otimes \ell(w^{(0)}(g, h)).
\]
We can see that \( \mathcal{O}^\eta(g, h, k) \in Z^2_G(G, Z^2_G) \), since
\[
M_{\alpha_0}\mathcal{O}^\eta(g, h, k) = M_{\alpha_0}\mathcal{O}(g, h, k)M^*_\alpha_0d m^{(0)}(g, h, k) = 1
\]
for all \( \alpha_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0 \). It is clear that \( d\mathcal{O}^\eta(g, h, k) = \mathcal{I}_0 \), and hence \( \mathcal{O}^\eta \in Z^3(G, Z^2_G) \). To see that this object defines an obstruction to extending the symmetry fractionalization to \( \mathcal{M} \), we observe that the condition \( \tilde{w}(g, h) = w^{(0)}(g, h) \) is equivalent to writing \( w(g, h) = \psi(g, h) \otimes \ell(w^{(0)}(g, h)) \) for some \( \psi(g, h) \in C^2(G, Z^2_G) \). With this, the condition \( \mathcal{O} = d\omega \) becomes the obstruction condition
\[
\mathcal{O}^\eta = dp.
\]
This can only be satisfied when \( \mathcal{O}^\eta \in B^3(G, Z^2_G) \), since the right hand side is a 3-coboundary.

We can also see that a different arbitrary choice of section \( \ell(\alpha_s) = \psi^{j(\alpha_s)} \otimes \ell(\alpha_s) \), where \( j(\alpha_s) \in \{0, 1\} \), only changes the definition by a 3-coboundary
\[
\mathcal{O}^\eta = \mathcal{O} \otimes d\ell(w^{(0)}) = \mathcal{O}^\otimes d\psi^{j(w^{(0)})},
\]
since \( \psi^{j(w^{(0)}(g, h)))} \in C^2(G, Z^2_G) \). Defining the equivalence class under product with 3-coboundaries \( B^3(G, Z^2_G) \), we have
\[
[\mathcal{O}^\eta] \in H^3(G, Z^2_G).
\]
When the obstruction \( [\mathcal{O}^\eta] \) is trivial, we find that the symmetry fractionalization class on \( \mathcal{M}_0 \) specified by \( \rho^{(0)} \) and \( \eta^{(0)}_\alpha(g, h) \) can be extended to a symmetry fractionalization on \( \mathcal{M} \) with \( \rho \). Moreover, when \( \eta^{(0)}_\alpha(g, h) \) corresponds to such an extension of the quasiparticles’ fractionalization class, we see that \( \eta^{(0)}_\alpha(g, h) = M_{\alpha_0}\eta^{(0)}_\alpha(g, h) \) with \( q \in Z^2(G, Z^2_G) \) corresponds to another such extension. The equivalences of fractionalization classes on \( \mathcal{M} \) that leave the fractionalization class on \( \mathcal{M}_0 \) fixed are given by \( q \in B^2(G, Z^2_G) \). Thus, the classification of extensions of symmetry fractionalization from \( \mathcal{M}_0 \) to \( \mathcal{M} \) is given torsorially by
\[
H^2(G, Z^2_G).
\]
Since these are extensions of the symmetry fractionalization from the quasiparticle theory to the full theory including vortices, we think of the extensions as encoding the symmetry fractionalization of the vorticity, beyond what is already encoded in the symmetry fractionalization of the quasiparticles.

We note that when the full fractionalization obstruction \( [\mathcal{O}] \) is trivial, we can provide a useful equivalent definition of \( [\mathcal{O}^\eta] \). In this case, there exists a \( w \in C^2(G, \mathcal{A}) \) such that \( d\omega = \mathcal{O} \). We use this to define a quasiparticle fractionalization corresponding to \( \tilde{w}^{(0)}(g, h) \) is guaranteed to be extendible to a fractionalization on \( \mathcal{M} \). Then we use
\[
\mathcal{O}^\eta(g, h, k) = d\ell(w^{(0)} \otimes \tilde{w}^{(0)}(g, h, k)),
\]
which is equivalent to Eq. (192), up to an element of \( B^3(G, Z^2_G) \). As such, this provides an alternative way to define the obstruction class \( [\mathcal{O}^\eta] \). We note that \( \tilde{w}^{(0)} \otimes \tilde{w}^{(0)}(g, h, k) \) is trivial, \( 0 \to Z^2_G \to \mathcal{A}_0 \to \mathcal{A}_0 \to 0 \),
where \( \psi \mapsto \psi_0 \) is the inclusion homomorphism and \( p : \alpha_s \mapsto \alpha_s \) is the homomorphism corresponding to mapping topological charges to their supersectors. This induces a long exact sequence of group cohomology
\[
\cdots \to H^1([\rho^{(0)}], G, \mathcal{A}_0) \overset{\delta_1}{\to} H^2(G, Z^2_G) \overset{i^*}{\to} H^2([\rho^{(0)}], G, \mathcal{A}_0) \overset{p^*}{\to} H^2([\rho^{(0)}], G, \mathcal{A}_0) \to \cdots.
\]
Here, \( i_* : [s] \mapsto [i(s)] \) and \( p_* : [t] \mapsto [p(t)] \) are the induced homomorphisms, and the connecting homomorphisms can be defined by \( \delta_1([b^{(0)}]) = [d\ell(b^{(0)})] \) for \( b^{(0)} \in Z^2([\rho^{(0)}], G, \mathcal{A}_0) \), and \( \delta_2([\ell^{(0)}]) = [d\ell(\ell^{(0)})] \) for \( \ell^{(0)} \in Z^2([\rho^{(0)}], G, \mathcal{A}_0) \). The properties of long exact sequences allows us to infer various relations. We also use the fact that cohomology groups are Abelian, so all their subgroups are central.

Since \( \ker(p_*) = \text{im}(i_*) \), we know
\[
H^2([\rho^{(0)}], G, \mathcal{A}_0) \overset{\text{im}(i_*)}{\sim} \text{im}(p_*).
\]
Since \( \ker(p_\ast) \) is a central subgroup of \( H^2_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) \), it follows that \( H^2_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) \) can be written as a central extension
\[
H^2_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) \cong \iota_\ast \left( H^2(G, \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi) \right) \times \varepsilon_\ast \left( H^2_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) \right),
\]
for some \( \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}^2(\text{im}(p_\ast), \text{im}(i_\ast)). \)

We see that \( p_\ast \left( H^2_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) \right) \) is a central subgroup of \( H^2_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) \), since \( \text{im}(p_\ast) = \ker(\delta_2) \). As the image of \( p_\ast \), we can interpret this subgroup as corresponding to the quasiparticle fractionalization classes which can be extended to fractionalization classes on the full FMTC. As the kernel of \( \delta_2 \), we can equivalently interpret it as the subgroup corresponding to vanishing fractionalization extension obstruction \( [\mathcal{Q}] \), by recognizing \( \delta_2 \) as the map that yields the obstruction class \( [\mathcal{Q}] \) for a given quasiparticle fractionalization class, as in Eq. (198).

We emphasize that \( i_\ast \) need not be injective, so its image is not necessarily isomorphic to \( H^2(G, \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi) \). In particular, \( i_\ast \) could map a nontrivial element of \( H^2(G, \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi) \) to a trivial element of \( H^2_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) \). This means distinct extensions of fractionalization from quasiparticles to vortices may result in equivalent fractionalization classes on the full FMTC \( \mathcal{M} \).

The fermionic symmetry action on quasiparticles \( [\rho(0)] \) determines much of this structure in the decomposition of \( H^2_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) \). Recall that \( \mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi \otimes \mathcal{A}_0 \) factorizes as a BTC, as does the corresponding group. However, the corresponding \( G \)-modules may not factorize, because of nontrivial symmetry action.

In the case where \( [\rho(0)] \) factorizes so that it only acts nontrivially on the \( \mathcal{A}_0 \) sector, i.e., \( \rho(0)(G, \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi) \) to a trivial element of \( H^2_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) \). This means distinct extensions of fractionalization from quasiparticles to vortices may result in equivalent fractionalization classes on the full FMTC \( \mathcal{M} \).

For a more general action \( [\rho(0)] \), we can analyze \( \text{im}(i_\ast) \cong H^2(G, \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi)/\ker(i_\ast) \) by examining the kernel \( \ker(i_\ast) = \text{im}(\delta_1) \). From the definition of the connecting homomorphism, we see that we see that the elements of \( \ker(i_\ast) \) take the form
\[
[\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{h})] = \left[ \rho^\psi_{[\mathbf{g}]} \left( \ell(b(0)(\mathbf{h})) \right) \otimes \ell \left( \rho^\psi_{[\mathbf{g}]}(b(0)(\mathbf{h})) \right) \right],
\]
with \( b(0) \in \mathcal{Z}^1_{[\rho(0)]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) \). Here, we have defined \( n_{[\mathbf{g}]} \) by
\[
\rho^\psi_{[\mathbf{g}]} \left( \ell(a_0) \right) = \psi_{[\mathbf{g}]}(a_0) \otimes \ell \left( \rho^\psi_{[\mathbf{g}]}(a_0) \right). \]

When \( G = 2 \), \( \ker(i_\ast) \) is always trivial, and hence \( \text{im}(i_\ast) \cong H^2(G, \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi) \). This can be seen through the following properties. \( b(0) \in \mathcal{Z}^1_{[\rho(0)]}(2, \mathcal{A}_0) \) gives the following constraint that \( \rho^\psi_{[\mathbf{g}]}(b(0)(1)) ) = \mathcal{B}^\psi(1) \). \([\rho(0)]\) being a topological symmetry requires \( \theta_{\ell(b(0)(1))} = \theta_{\rho^\psi_{[\mathbf{g}]}(b(0)(1))} = \left(-1\right)^{n_1(b(0)(1))} \theta_{\ell(\rho^\psi_{[\mathbf{g}]}(b(0)(1)))} \). We can always make a convenient choice of lift that satisfies \( \ell(a_0) = \ell(a_0) \), e.g., choose \( \ell(a_0) = (I_0, a_0) \). Combined with the fact that \( \theta_0 = \theta_0 \), this implies \( n_1(b(0)(1)) = 0 \), and hence \( \ker(i_\ast) = \{I_0 \} \), as claimed.

1. Example: Invertible FMTCs

In the case of invertible FMTCs \( K^{(c)} \), the quasiparticle sector is simply \( K^{(c)} = \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi \) and \( \text{Aut}(K^{(c)}) = \text{ker}([\mathcal{Q}] \to [V]) \to \mathcal{M}_0 \). The symmetry action on \( \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi \) is trivial and can always be extended (i.e. \( [O] = [1] \)) to a symmetry action on \( K^{(c)} \). For this example, the symmetry fractionalization extension problem from \( \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi \) to \( \mathcal{M} \) and from \( \mathcal{M}_0 \) to \( \mathcal{M} \) are the same. It is useful to consider \( \nu \) even and odd separately.

In the case of \( \nu \) even, the symmetry action on \( K^{(c)} \) takes the form \( \rho_\mathbf{g} = [V]^{\pi_0}(V) \), where \( \pi: G \to \mathbb{Z}_2 \) is a homomorphism. We analyze this with the representative auto-equivalence maps \( \rho_\mathbf{g} = [V]^{\pi_0}(V) \) for \( V \) defined in Eq. (93). For this, we can choose \( \beta_{\psi\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) = 1 \) and \( \beta_\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) = \pi^{\mathbf{h}}(\pi^{\mathbf{h}}) \). As discussed, the symmetry fractionalization classes of \( \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi \) encoded in \( \eta_{\psi\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) = (-1)^{\mathbf{w}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h})} \) correspond to the \( w \in \mathcal{Z}^2(G, \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi) \) characterizing the fermionic symmetry group \( G^\dagger = \mathcal{Z}_2^\psi \times_G W \). The symmetry fractionalization obstruction \( \mathcal{O} = I_0 \) is trivial. It is straightforward to check that \( \eta_{\psi\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) = \pi^{\mathbf{h}}(\pi^{\mathbf{h}}) \) describes a fractionalization class and has \( \mathbf{w}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}) = 0 \). Consequently, we can choose \( \mathbf{w} = 0 \), \( e_1 = I_1 \), and \( \ell(I_1) = I_1 \), and find the obstruction is
\[
\mathcal{O}^{\psi}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}) = \mathcal{O}^{\psi}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}) = d(I_1)(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}) = (\psi(I_1) \otimes I_1)^{w(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h})} = \psi_{\mathbf{h}}^{\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}).
\]
where \( \rho_\beta = [\Theta]^r(g) \), where \( r(g) \in C^1(G, Z_2) \) is not required to be a homomorphism. We analyze this with the representative auto-equivalence maps \( \rho_\beta = [\Theta]^r(g) \), which have \( \kappa_{g,h} = \Theta^{dr}(g,h) \). When \( r \in H^1(G, Z_2) \), i.e. the action is a homomorphism, it follows that \( \kappa_{g,h} = 1 \) and we could choose \( \beta_{\alpha_1}(g,h) = 1 \). More generally, \( \beta_{\alpha_1}(g,h) = (-1)^{dr}(g,h) \delta_{\alpha_1} \). The symmetry fractionalization obstruction \( \Theta = I_0 \) is trivial. Since we are required to have \( \beta_{\alpha_1}(g,h) = (-1)^{dr}(g,h) \) in this case, we have a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-projective action with \( \phi = \text{dr} \). Even though \( \rho_{\beta}^0 = \mathbb{I} \), in order to match \( \beta_{\alpha_1} \) of the extension, we must have \( \beta_{\alpha_1}(g,h) = (-1)^{dr}(g,h) \) and \( \phi = \text{dr} \). Since \( A_1 = \emptyset \), \( \Theta^w = w - \text{dr} \), which also demonstrates the requirement that \( w = \text{dr} \). Thus, fractionalization for \( K^{(\beta)} \) and \( \rho \) only exists for \( G^G = Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2) \) with \( w = \text{dr} \). The obstruction for extending fractionalization is \( \Theta^w(g,h,k) = I_0 \), so fractionalization is torsorially classified by \( H^2(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \), with corresponding

\[
\eta_{\alpha_1}(g,h) = (-1)^w(g,h) \delta_{\alpha_1}(-1)^{\pi}(g,h),
\]

where \( w = \text{dr} \) and \( \rho(g,h) = \psi^w(g,h) \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)^w \). Thus, we see the symmetry action \( \rho \) is classified by \( C^1(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \), the fermionic symmetry group \( G^G = Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2) \) is fixed by the symmetry action to be \( w = \text{dr} \), and the fractionalization of vortices (represented by \( \psi \)) is classified torsorially by \( H^2(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \). We note that \( C^1(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \cong H^1(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \times B^2(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \), where \( H^1(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \) is the classification for fixed \( \phi \) and the \( B^2(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \) factor is the classification of \( \phi = \text{dr} \). Since \( w = \phi \), one can also think of \( G^G \) as classified by \( B^2(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \) in this way.

2. Example: FMTCs with trivial symmetry action on the quasiparticles

In the case of a general FMTC \( M \) with symmetry that acts trivially on the quasiparticles, the fractionalization analysis is very similar to that of the invertible fermionic topological phases. The trivial symmetry action on \( M_0 \) will be represented by \( \rho_\beta^0 = \mathbb{I} \), which can always be extended to a symmetry action on \( M \), since \( [\rho]^0 = \mathbb{I} \). We will assume that \( \ker(\text{res}_{M_0}) = Z^2_\mathbb{Z} \), but if more general examples exist, it is a straightforward generalization. It is convenient to divide the FMTCs into three classes based on whether \( A_1 \) and \( A_3 \) are empty.

We first consider FMTCs with \( A \neq \emptyset \). In this case, \( \hat{A} = \hat{A}_1 \). The extended symmetry action on \( M \) takes the form \( \rho_\beta = [\Theta]^r(g) \), where \( \pi \in H^1(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \) is a homomorphism. We analyze this with the representative \( \rho_\beta = [\Theta]^r(g) \), in which case we can choose \( \beta_{\alpha_1}(g,h) = 1 \) and \( \beta_{\alpha_1}(g,h) = i^{x}(g) \cdot \pi(h) \). It follows that \( \Theta^0 = I_0 \) and \( \Phi = I_0 \).

One possible fractionalization class on \( M_0 \) is given by \( \eta_{\alpha_1}(g,h) = 1 \), corresponding to the trivially extended fermionic symmetry group. Consequently, we can choose \( \tilde{w} = 0 \) and an arbitrary \( \tilde{e}_1 \in \hat{A}_1 \) to find the vanishing obstruction

\[
\Theta^0 = d(\tilde{e}_1^0) = I_0.
\]

Thus, \( M_0 \) with trivial symmetry action can manifest all possible fermionic symmetry groups \( G^G = Z^2_\mathbb{Z} \times \pi \). For fixed \( w \), the fractionalization classes on \( M_0 \) are classified by \( H^2(G, \hat{A}_0) \), with

\[
\eta_{\alpha_1}(g,h) = M_{\alpha_1}(g,h),
\]

\[
w(g,h) = v(g,h) \otimes \eta_{\alpha_1}(g,h),
\]

where \( v \in C^2(G, \hat{A}_0) \) and \( v \in C^2(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \) such that \( dv(g,h,k) = dp(g,h,k) = \psi^w(g,h,k) \).

Finally, we note that \( \Theta^0 = I_0 \), so that \( \Theta^w = w - \text{dr} \), which demonstrates the requirement that \( w = \text{dr} \). Thus, fractionalization is torsorially classified by \( H^2(G, Z^2_\mathbb{Z}) \).
Next, we consider FMTCs with $A_1 = \emptyset$ and $A_1 \neq \emptyset$. In this case, we assume $[Q] = [V]$, so the extended symmetry action on $M$ takes the form $[\rho_g] = [Q]^{r(g)}$, where $r \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is a homomorphism. (Were it the case that $[Q] \neq [V]$, it would be straightforward to perform the analysis with $[\rho_g] = [Q]^{r(g)}[V]^{-r(g)}$.) We analyze this with the representative $\rho_g = Q^{r(g)}$, in which case we can choose $\beta_{a_0}(g, h) = -1^{dr(g,h)\delta_{a_0}}$. Even though $\rho_g = 1$, must choose $\beta(0)$ to match the extension, so we choose $\beta_{a_0}(g, h) = -1^{dr(g,h)\delta_{a_0}}$. It follows that $\mathcal{O}^{0\nu} = I_0$ and $\Phi = I_0$.

One possible fractionalization class on $M_0$ is given by $\eta_{a_0}(g, h) = (-1)^{r(g,h)\delta_{a_0}}$. Consequently, we can choose $\tilde{w} = \text{dr}$ and an arbitrary $\tilde{e}_1 \in A_1$ to find the vanishing obstruction

$$\mathcal{O}^{0\nu \tilde{w}} = d(e_1^{dr(g,h)\tilde{x}_1}) = I_0.$$  (216)

Thus, $M_0$ with trivial symmetry action can manifest all possible fermionic symmetry groups $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^d \times_w G$ with $w \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

For fixed $w$, the fractionalization classes on $M_0$ are classified by $H^2(G, \hat{A}_0)$, with

$$\eta_{a_0}(g, h) = (-1)^{dr(g,h)\delta_{a_0}} M_{a_0 w}(g, h),$$  (217)

$$\mathcal{O}^{0\nu}(g, h) = \nu^{0}(g, h) \otimes e_1^{w(g,h)} + dr(g,h),$$  (218)

where $\nu(0) \in Z^2(G, \hat{A}_0)$.

For the full FMTC $M$, we similarly have one of the possible fractionalization classes given by $\eta_{a_0}(g, h) = (-1)^{dr(g,h)\delta_{a_0}}$, and so can choose $\tilde{w} = \text{dr}$. However, since $A_1 = \emptyset$, the obstruction is given by

$$\mathcal{O}^w = w - \text{dr}.$$  (219)

In other words, $[\rho_g] = [Q]^{r(g)}$ requires $w = \text{dr}$.

From the perspective of extension from $M_0$, since $A_1 = \emptyset$, we must impose the restriction $w(0) \in C^2(G, \hat{A}_0)$ in order to be able to extend the fractionalization to $M$. This similarly requires $w = \text{dr}$. Writing elements of $A_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2^d \times \hat{A}_0$ as $a_0 = (a_0^{(w)}, \hat{a}_0)$, we choose the lift from $\hat{A}_0$ to $A_0$ to be $\hat{a}(0) = (I_0, \hat{a}_0)$. From this, we can compute the obstruction

$$\mathcal{O}^{0\nu}(g, h, k) = d(e_1^{w(0)})(g, h, k) = I_0.$$  (220)

Thus, we find that fractionalization on $M_0$ only exists when $w = \text{dr}$. The extension of fractionalization from $M_0$ to $M$ for $w = \text{dr}$ is torsionally classified by $H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d)$, and the full fractionalization by $H^2(G, A_0) = H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d) \times H^2(G, \hat{A}_0)$. The corresponding projective phases are

$$\eta_{a_0}(g, h) = (-1)^{dr(g,h)\delta_{a_0}} M_{a_0 w}(g, h),$$  (221)

$$\mathcal{O}^{0\nu}(g, h, k) = d(e_1^{w(0)})(g, h, k),$$  (222)

where $w \in Z^2(G, A_0)$ and $p \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d)$.

Finally, we consider FMTCs with $A_1 = \emptyset$ and $A_1 \neq \emptyset$. In this case, $[Q] \neq [V]$, so the extended symmetry action on $M$ takes the form $[\rho_g] = [V]^{r(g)}$, where $r \in H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d)$ is a homomorphism. We analyze this with the representative $\rho_g = V^{r(g)}$, in which case we can choose $\beta_{a_0}(g, h) = 1$ and $\beta_{a_0}(g, h) = i^{r(g,h)\pi(h)}$. It follows that $\mathcal{O}^{0\nu} = I_0$ and $\Phi = I_0$.

One possible fractionalization class on $M_0$ is given by $\eta_{a_0}(g, h) = 1$, so we can choose $\tilde{w} = 0$. However, since $A_1 = \emptyset$, the obstruction is given by

$$\mathcal{O}^{0\nu w} = w.$$  (223)

In other words, this case requires $w = 0$. For this, the fractionalization classes on $M_0$ are classified by $H^2(G, \hat{A}_0)$, with

$$\eta_{a_0}(g, h) = M_{a_0 w}(g, h),$$  (224)

where $w(0) \in Z^2(G, \hat{A}_0)$.

For the full FMTC $M$, we have one of the possible fractionalization classes given by $\eta_{a_0}(g, h) = i^{r(g,h)\pi(h)}$, and so we choose $\tilde{w} = d0$. Since $A_1 = \emptyset$, the obstruction is also given by

$$\mathcal{O}^w = w,$$  (225)

so $w = 0$ is again required.

From the perspective of extension from $M_0$, since $A_1 = \emptyset$, this similarly requires $w = 0$. Writing elements of $A_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2^d \times \hat{A}_0$ as $a_0 = (a_0^{(w)}, \hat{a}_0)$, we choose the lift from $\hat{A}_0$ to $A_0$ to be $\hat{a}(0) = (I_0, \hat{a}_0)$. From this, we can compute the obstruction

$$\mathcal{O}^{0\nu}(g, h, k) = d(e_1^{w(0)})(g, h, k) = I_0.$$  (226)

Thus, we find that fractionalization on $M_0$ and $M$ with $[\rho_g(0)] = [1]$ only exists when $w = 0$. The extension of fractionalization from $M_0$ to $M$ is torsionally classified by $H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d)$, and the full fractionalization by $H^2(G, A_0) = H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d) \times H^2(G, \hat{A}_0)$. The corresponding projective phases are

$$\eta_{a_0}(g, h) = i^{r(g,h)\pi(h)} M_{a_0 w}(g, h),$$  (227)

$$w = (p, w(0)),$$  (228)

where $w \in Z^2(G, A_0)$ and $p \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d)$.

For this case, it is easy to repeat the analysis for the slightly nontrivial symmetry action $[\rho_g] = Q^{r(g)}$ with extension $\rho_g = Q^{r(g)}\pi(g)$. The result is fractionalization on $M_0$ and $M$ only exists when $w = \text{dr}$, and is classified by $H^2(G, A_0) = H^2(G, \hat{A}_0) \times H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d)$, with the corresponding projective phases

$$\eta_{a_0}(g, h) = (-1)^{dr(g,h)\delta_{a_0}} M_{a_0 w}(g, h),$$  (229)

$$\eta_{a_0}(g, h) = (-1)^{dr(g,h)\delta_{a_0}} i^{r(g,h)\pi(h)} M_{a_0 w}(g, h),$$  (230)

$$w = (p, w(0)),$$  (231)

where $w(0) \in Z^2(G, \hat{A}_0)$, $w \in Z^2(G, A_0)$, and $p \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d)$. 
E. Locality Preserving Symmetries

The discussion and analysis of symmetry and fractionalization in this section so far has focused on unitary on-site symmetries. However, the notions of symmetry localization and fractionalization are similar for “locality preserving” symmetries, which preserve the locality of operators in the sense that operators that act non-trivially on disjoint regions of the system remain disjoint after they are acted on by the symmetry [5]. As such, the analysis can be adapted to apply to more general locality preserving symmetries, including space and time reflecting symmetries [3, 47, 48] and translational symmetries [49]. For our purposes, a symmetry is time-reversing if and only if it is anti-unitary.

For a global symmetry group $G$, we can designate space and time reflecting symmetries via a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ grading on $G$. We denote the corresponding homomorphisms as

$$p(g) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g \text{ is spatial parity preserving} \\ 1 & \text{if } g \text{ is spatial parity reflecting} \end{cases},$$

$$q(g) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g \text{ is not time-reversing} \\ 1 & \text{if } g \text{ is time-reversing} \end{cases}. \tag{232}$$

In order to apply this to a topological phase, we require a generalization of the topological symmetry group that also includes space and time reflecting auto-equivalences on a BTC $\mathcal{B}$. We write the full group of quantum symmetries of the topological theory as

$$\text{Aut}(\mathcal{B}) = \bigsqcup_{p,q \in \mathbb{Z}_2} \text{Aut}_{q,p}(\mathcal{B}), \tag{234}$$

where $\text{Aut}_{0,0}(\mathcal{B}) = \text{Aut}(\mathcal{B})$ is the usual on-site, unitary topological symmetry group. We can make similar definitions of $\text{Aut}^\psi$ and $\text{Aut}^\dagger$ for $\psi$-fixed and fermionic topological symmetries, respectively.

It is simple to write the transformation of certain gauge invariant quantities under such generalized topological symmetries. For this, we define

$$s = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (p+q) \text{ mod } 2 = 0 \\ * & \text{if } (p+q) \text{ mod } 2 = 1 \end{cases}, \tag{235}$$

which gives complex conjugation when the space-time reflection parity of a symmetry is odd. Then for a generalized auto-equivalence map $\varphi$, we have

$$\varphi(a) = a', \tag{236}$$

$$N_{a'b'} = N_{ab}, \tag{237}$$

$$d_{a'} = d_a, \tag{238}$$

$$\theta_{a'} = \theta_{a}^{s(\varphi)}, \tag{239}$$

$$S_{a'b'} = S_{ab}^{s(\varphi)}. \tag{240}$$

We will not duplicate a detailed description of the transformations on the full topological data in this paper, but such details can be found in Refs. 5, 47, and 48. We simply comment that the modifications for locality preserving symmetries all directly apply to the case of fermionic topological phases with the incorporation of the fermionic constraints and conditions discussed earlier in this section. We highlight some properties of the space-time reflecting symmetries that will be useful.

Applying the symmetry fractionalization analysis produces the same results with the modification of Eq. (159) to

$$\frac{K^{\psi(g)}\eta_{\phi^{-1}}(a)(h, k)K^{\psi(g)}\eta_a(g, hk)}{\eta_c(gh, k)\eta_a(g, h)} = 1, \tag{241}$$

where $K$ is the complex conjugation operator. Since $S_{a'b'} = S_{ab}^{s(\varphi)}$, and hence

$$K^{\psi(g)}M_{\rho_{\phi^{-1}}(e)}K^{\psi(g)} = \begin{cases} M_{a\rho_{\phi}(b)} & \text{for } p(g) = 0 \\ M_{a\rho_{\phi}(b)}^{-1} & \text{for } p(g) = 1 \end{cases}, \tag{242}$$

the map into the cohomological classifying structure through the characters of the fusion algebra yields the same coboundary operator when $p(g) = 0$ (even if $q(g) = 1$), and incorporates the symmetry action of $g$ on $\mathcal{A}$-valued cochains with an additional topological charge conjugation, i.e. $\eta_c = \rho_{\phi}(b)$ for $b \in C^n(G, \mathcal{A})$, when $p(g) = 1$. For example, the coboundary operation on $w$ when $p(g) = 1$ becomes

$$d_{w}(g, h, k) = \rho_{\phi}(\overline{w}(h, k)) \otimes \overline{w}(gh, k) \otimes w(g, hk) \otimes \overline{w}(g, h). \tag{243}$$

This yields obstructions and classifying cohomology groups that are defined exactly as before for $p(g) = 0$ and with this modified coboundary operator for $p(g) = 1$.

A couple important modifications to the form of gauge transformations include the modification to the transformation of $U$-symbols under vertex basis gauge transformations, which becomes

$$\left[ U_k(a, b; c) \right]_{\mu'\nu'} = \sum_{\mu''\nu''} [\Gamma_{k_c}^{k_b k_a} \mu'' \nu'' ] \left[ U_k(a, b; c) \right]_{\mu''\nu''} \left[ (\Gamma_{c}^{ab})^{-1} \right]_{\nu'\mu'}, \tag{244}$$

and $\eta$ under symmetry action gauge transformations, which becomes

$$\bar{\eta}_c(g, h) = \frac{\gamma_c(gh)}{K^{\psi(g)}\gamma_c(h)K^{\psi(g)}\gamma_c(g)} \eta_c(g, h). \tag{245}$$

We now turn to the two important examples of $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ time-reversal and space-reflection symmetries, which have important invariants that can occur for fermionic topological phases.
1. Time-reversal symmetry and fermionic Kramers degeneracy

In Ref. 5, $\mathbb{Z}_2^T$ time-reversal symmetry in bosonic topological phases was analyzed using this symmetry action and fractionalization formalism. For topological charges with the property $a = T^a$, the quantity

$$\eta^T_{a} = \eta_a(T, T) = \pm 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (246)

was shown to be an invariant that could be identified as the “local $T^{2n}$” value ascribed to $a$. This invariant is associated with local Kramers degeneracies [12]. Among other properties for $a = T^a$, it was shown in Ref. 5 that $\theta_a = \pm 1$ and if there is a topological charge $b$ such that $N^b_{a T_b}$ is odd, then $\eta^T_{a} = \theta_a$.

For fermionic systems with $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^T$, we can continue to use the above invariant for $a = T^a x$. In particular, $\eta^T_{\psi_0} = \pm 1$ since $\psi_0 = T\psi_0$, which corresponds to the physical fermions having $T^2 = (-1)^F$, and the corresponding fermionic symmetry groups $G^T = \mathbb{Z}_2^T \times \mathbb{Z}_2^T$ and $G^T = \mathbb{Z}_2^T \times \mathbb{Z}_2^T$, respectively.

There is a similar notion of local fermionic Kramers degeneracy for topological charges with the property $a_x = \psi_0 \otimes T_{ax} = T[\psi_0]_x$ [44, 50, 51]. For charges $a_x = T[\psi_0]_x$, we consider an invariant defined by

$$\eta^T_{a_x} = F_{a_x}[\psi_0][\psi_0] \eta_a(T, T).$$  \hspace{1cm} (247)

For fermionic theories, we can use the canonical gauge choice $F_{a_x}[\psi_0][\psi_0] = 1$, but we will leave this term unfixed to make the role of the canonical isomorphism explicit. This quantity was also written in Ref. 32, though its properties were not analyzed. We will show that it is, in fact, invariant under vertex basis and symmetry action gauge transformations, and that

$$\eta^T_{a_x} = (\eta^T_{\psi_0})^{-1} = \pm \sqrt{\eta^T_{\psi_0}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (248)

where $\eta^T_{\psi_0} = \pm 1$, since $\psi_0 = T\psi_0$. When the physical fermion have $T^2 = (-1)^F$, that is $\eta^T_{\psi_0} = -1$, this indicates $\eta^T_{a_x} = \pm i$.

For charges $a_x = T[\psi_0]_x$, we also have the property

$$\theta^2_{a_x} = (-1)^{x+1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (249)

so this requires $\theta_{a_x} = -\theta_{[\psi_0]_x} = \pm i$ for quasiparticles and $\theta_{a_x} = \theta_{[\psi_0]_x} = \pm 1$ for vortices. This follows from the transformation of topological twists under time-reversing symmetry $\theta_{ax} = \theta^*_{a_x}$ and the ribbon property of braiding [Eq. (23)].

We now check the gauge invariance of $\eta^T_{a_x}$ under vertex basis gauge transformations, which is given by

$$\tilde{\eta}^T_{a_x} = \frac{\Gamma^a_{a_x}[\psi_0][\psi_0]}{\Gamma^a_{\psi_0}[\psi_0][\psi_0]} \eta^T_{a_x} = \frac{1}{\Gamma^a_{\psi_0}[\psi_0][\psi_0]} \eta^T_{a_x}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (250)

Here, we have written $\Gamma^a_{\psi_0}[\psi_0][\psi_0]$ explicitly to highlight the fact that the canonical fermionic gauge constraint $\Gamma^a_{\psi_0}[\psi_0][\psi_0] = 1$ is necessary for this to be gauge invariant.

Similarly, we check the symmetry action gauge transformations, which are given by

$$\tilde{\eta}^T_{a_x} = \frac{\gamma_{a_x}(T) \gamma_{\psi_0}(T)}{\gamma_{[\psi_0]_x}(T) \gamma_{a_x}(T)} \eta^T_{a_x} = \frac{1}{\gamma_{[\psi_0]_x}(T) \gamma_{a_x}(T)} \eta^T_{a_x}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (251)

Again, we have written $\gamma_{\psi_0}(T)$ explicitly to highlight the fact that the canonical fermionic gauge constraint $\gamma_{\psi_0}(g) = 1$ is necessary for this to be gauge invariant. It also shows that if we were to allow $\gamma_{\psi_0}(g) = \pm 1$, then $\eta^T_{a_x}$ would only be well-defined up to an overall sign.

In order to show Eq. (248), we need the following properties. From the pentagon equation, we have

$$F_{a_x}[\psi_0][\psi_0] = F_{a_x}[\psi_0][\psi_0].$$  \hspace{1cm} (252)

The transformation of $F$-symbols under a time-reversing (anti-unitary) symmetry yields

$$\rho_T \left( F_{a_x}[\psi_0][\psi_0] \right) = \left( F_{a_x}[\psi_0][\psi_0] \right)^*,$$  \hspace{1cm} (253)

$$= U_T \left( T_{a_x} \psi_0, \psi_0 \right) U_T \left( T[\psi_0]_x, \psi_0 \right) U_T \left( T[\psi_0]_x, \psi_0 \right) F_{a_x}[\psi_0][\psi_0].$$

Here, we used the canonically fixed $U_T(\psi_0, \psi_0; I_0) = 1$. The natural isomorphism $\kappa_T, T$ requires

$$\frac{1}{\kappa_T T(a_x, \psi_0; [\psi_0]_x)} = \frac{\eta_{a_x}(T, T)}{\eta_{[\psi_0]_x}(T, T)} = \frac{\eta_{[\psi_0]_x}(T, T)}{\eta_{a_x}(T, T)} = \frac{1}{\kappa(T, T)} \eta_{a_x}(T, T) \eta_{[\psi_0]_x}(T, T).$$  \hspace{1cm} (254)

Eq. (241) for a time-reversing symmetry becomes

$$\eta_{a_x}(T, T) = \eta_{[\psi_0]_x}(T, T).$$  \hspace{1cm} (255)

Using $a_x = T[\psi_0]_x$, Eqs. (252) and (254) yield $\eta^T_{a_x} = \eta^T_{[\psi_0]_x}$, while Eqs. (253) and (255) yield $\eta^T_{a_x} = (\eta^T_{[\psi_0]_x})^{-1}$. These combine to give Eq. (248).

2. Space-reflection fermionic fractionalization invariant

In Ref. 48, $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$ space-reflection symmetry in bosonic topological phases was analyzed using this symmetry action and fractionalization formalism. Analyzing the configuration with two quasiparticles of charge $a$ and $\bar{a}$ pair-produced from vacuum that are located opposite each other across the reflection axis, it was shown that for $a = T^a \bar{a}$, the quantity

$$\eta^r_a = U_r(a, \bar{a}; T) \eta_a(r, r) = \pm 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (256)

is an invariant, analogous to $\eta^T_{a}$ for time-reversal. Such charges must also have $\theta_a = \pm 1$.

For fermionic systems with $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^2$, we can similar use this invariant for $a_x = T_{ax}$. In particular, $\eta^r_{\psi_0} = \pm 1$ since $\psi_0 = T^a \psi_0$ and $U_r(\psi_0, \psi_0; I_0) = 1$, which corresponds to the physical fermions having $r^2 = (\pm 1)^F$, and the
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corresponding fermionic symmetry groups \( G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times \mathbb{Z}_2^f \) and \( G^t = \mathbb{Z}_4^{2t}, \) respectively.

We can also define a quantity analogous to the fermionic Kramers invariant when \( a_x = \psi_0 \otimes r a_x = r[\bar{\psi} a]_x \) by

\[
\eta^f_{a_x} = U_r(a_x, [\bar{\psi} a]_x, \psi_0) \eta_{a_x}(r, r),
\]

(257)

where we are considering the pair of topological charge \( a_x \) and \([\bar{\psi} a]_x \) located opposite each other across the reflection axis. We show that it is, in fact invariant under vertex basis and symmetry action gauge transformations, and that

\[
\eta^f_{a_x} = -\eta^f_{\bar{a}_x} = \pm \sqrt{\eta^f_{\psi_0}},
\]

(258)

where \( \eta^f_{\psi_0} = \pm 1, \) since \( \psi_0 = r \bar{\psi}_0. \) When the physical fermions have \( r^2 = (-1)^F, \) that is \( \eta^f_{\psi_0} = -1, \) this indicates \( \eta^f_{a_x} = \pm i. \)

For charges \( a_x = r[\bar{\psi} a]_x, \) we also have the property

\[
\theta^2_{a_x} = (-1)^{x+1},
\]

(259)

so this requires \( \theta_{a_x} = -\theta_{[\bar{\psi} a]_0} = \pm i \) for quasiparticles and \( \theta_{a_1} = \theta_{[\bar{\psi} a]_1} = \pm 1 \) for vortices. This follows from the transformation of topological twists under space-reflection symmetry \( \theta_{a_x} = \theta^a_x \) and the ribbon property of braiding [Eq. (23)].

We now check the gauge invariance of \( \eta^f_{a_x} \) under vertex basis gauge transformations, which is given by

\[
\tilde{\eta}^f_{a_x} = \Gamma^r_{\bar{a}_x, a_x} \gamma_{\psi_0}(r) = \eta^f_{a_x}.
\]

(260)

Similarly, we check the symmetry action gauge transformations, which are given by

\[
\tilde{\eta}^f_{a_x} = \frac{\gamma_{a_x}(r) \gamma_{\bar{a}_x} (r)}{\gamma_{\psi_0} (r)} \frac{1}{\gamma_{a_x} (r) \gamma_{a_x} (r)} = \frac{1}{\gamma_{\psi_0} (r)} \eta^f_{a_x}.
\]

(261)

We have written \( \gamma_{\psi_0}(r) \) explicitly here to highlight the fact that the canonical fermionic gauge constraint \( \gamma_{\psi_0}(g) = 1 \) is necessary for this to be gauge invariant; if we were to allow \( \gamma_{\psi_0}(g) = \pm 1, \) then \( \eta^f_{a_x} \) would only be well-defined up to an overall sign.

In order to show Eq. (258), we need the following properties. The transformation of \( R \)-symbols under a spatial-reflection symmetry yields

\[
\rho_r \left( R^a_{\psi_0} a \right) = U_r(\bar{\psi} a_x, r a_x; \psi_0) U_r(\bar{\psi} a_x, \psi_0) R^a_{\psi_0} r a \left[ \bar{\psi} a \right]_x = (R^a_{\psi_0} a \right) \right)^{-1}.
\]

(262)

The natural isomorphism \( \kappa_{r, r} \) requires

\[
\frac{1}{\kappa_{r, r} (a_x, [\bar{\psi} a]_x; \psi_0)} = \eta_{\psi_0} (r, r) \eta_{a_x} (r, r)\eta_{[\bar{\psi} a]_x} (r, r) = U_r(\bar{\psi} a_x, \psi_0) U_r(a_x, [\bar{\psi} a]_x; \psi_0).
\]

(263)

\( \eta_{r a_x} (r, r) = \eta_{a_x} (r, r)\). (264)

Using \( a_x = r[\bar{\psi} a]_x, \) Eqs. (262) and (264), together with the ribbon equation and transformation of topological twists, yields \( \eta^f_{a_x} = -\eta^f_{[\bar{\psi} a]_x}, \) while Eqs. (263) and (264)

\( (\eta^f_{a_x})^2 = \eta^f_{\psi_0}. \) These combine to give Eq. (258).

\section{IV. Symmetry Defects in Fermionic Topological Phases}

In this section, we describe the algebraic theory of symmetry defects in a fermionic topological phase whose quasiparticles are described by the SMTC \( \mathcal{M}_0 \) and vortices by \( \mathcal{M}_1, \) collectively described by the fermionic MTC \( \mathcal{M}. \)

Thus far we have described how the global symmetries act on the topological states, captured by \( \mathcal{M}, \rho, U, \) and \( \eta. \) Now we incorporate symmetry defects into our theory. These correspond to topological charges which carry labels \( g \in G \) indicating that they are \( g \)-defects. Correspondingly, we will need to extend all of the topological data \((F, R, U, \) \) and \( \eta)\) to these point defects. This data will be subject to several consistency conditions. In the bosonic case, these are the extensions the pentagon equation [Eq. (9)] and generalizations of the hexagon equations [Eqs. (15-16)] for BTCs. It is not always possible to solve these \( G \)-crossed consistency conditions; each symmetry fractionalization class has a “defectification obstruction” \( [\mathcal{O}] \in H^4 (G, U(1))\) that must vanish in order to extend to a full defect theory [17]. Fermionic defectification has additional constraints associated with the physical fermion. We first review the bosonic case, before introducing the necessary modifications for the fermionic setting.

\subsection{A. \( G \)-crossed BTCs}

We begin by reviewing the definition of a \( G \)-crossed BTC, without requiring that it correspond to either a bosonic or fermionic topological phase. In general, one can view a \( G \)-crossed BTC as the extension of a BTC with specified symmetry action and fractionalization to a theory of symmetry defects. We first pick a BTC \( B \) and a symmetry group \( G, \) and then incorporate the symmetry defects.

Then fusion structure of the symmetry defects is given by a \( G \)-graded FTC

\[
\mathcal{B}_G = \bigoplus_{g \in G} \mathcal{B}_g.
\]

such that \( \mathcal{B}_0 = \mathcal{B}. \) For a group element \( g \in G, \) there may be topologically distinct \( g \)-defects, which are given by the simple objects \( a \in \mathcal{B}_g. \) It is useful to explicitly denote the symmetry group label of defects by writing
the topological charges as \( a_g \). The \( G \)-grading does not alter any of the defining properties of a FTC, but simply introduces the additional constraint that the fusion rules are \( G \)-graded, meaning

\[
d_g \otimes b_h = \bigoplus_{c_{gh} \in B_{gh}} N_{a_g b_h}^{c_{gh}} c_{gh}
\]  

(266)

Similar to quasiparticles, defect fusion is associative, with associativity isomorphism given by the \( F \)-symbols,

\[
\sum f_{hk \mu \nu} [F_{dghk}] (c_{gh}, \alpha, \beta)(f_{hk \mu \nu})
\]  

(267)

The \( F \)-symbols must again satisfy the pentagon equation (Eq. 9). The fusion rules of defects generally do not need to be commutative, though the fusion rules of the \( B_0 \) are necessarily commutative, since it is a BTC.

In principle, the \( G \)-graded extension does not need to be faithful, meaning \( B_{gh} \) is not required to be non-empty for all \( g \), as long as the fusion rules of defects are nonetheless consistent. When the grading is not faithful, the non-empty sectors correspond to a subgroup \( H < G \), which defines a faithfully \( H \)-extended subcategory.

Next, we incorporate the symmetry action, which enters through the \( G \)-crossed braiding transformations of symmetry defects, which generalizes the ordinary notion of braiding. For this, we introduce the shorthand notations

\[
\bar{g} = g^{-1},
\]

(268)

\[
\bar{g} h = ghg,
\]

(269)

\[
\bar{h} = \rho_g (h) \in B_{ghg},
\]

(270)

where \( \rho \) acting on \( B_0 \) is a representative of the symmetry action \( \rho : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(B) \), and the possible extensions of the action to the symmetry defects will be determined by imposing consistency conditions that we will discuss.

On the spatial manifold, a \( g \)-defect is the endpoint of a \( g \)-symmetry branch line. We can picture the corresponding worldline of a \( g \)-defect as the termination of a \( g \)-branch worldsheet. This is represented for a fusion vertex in Fig. 6.

In the diagrammatic formalism, we leave the defect branch sheets implicit and assume they emanate from the lines labeled by defect topological charges back into the page. With this picture in mind, we see that when a \( h \)-defect line passes in front of an object, it acts on that object with the \( h \)-symmetry action (see Fig. 6). Thus, we define the \( G \)-crossed braiding operator diagrammatically as

\[
R^{a_g b_h} = \ .
\]

(271)

The operator \( R^{a_g b_h} \) provides an isomorphism between the vector space \( V_{c_{gh} \bar{a}_g} \) and \( V_{a_g b_h} \). We note that this implies \( \bar{a}_g = a_g \).

Resolving \( R^{a_g b_h} \) in the basis of the fusion spaces, we find the diagrammatic definition of the \( R \)-symbol given by

\[
\sum_\nu [R^{a_g b_h}]_{\mu \nu}.
\]

(272)

The inverse \( G \)-crossed braiding operator is defined in the obvious manner.

The symmetry action on vertex basis states, i.e. the \( U_k \)-symbols, is generated by sliding defect lines over the vertices

\[
\sum_\nu [U_k(a_g, b_h; c_{gh})]_{\mu \nu}.
\]

(273)

On the other hand, the symmetry fractionalization \( \eta \)-symbols are generated by sliding defect lines under vertices

\[
\eta_{x_k}(g, h) \]

(274)

Note that these sliding moves are trivial in a BTC (where all objects are \( 0 \)-defects). It should be clear that...
The heptagon equations that enforce consistency of $G$-crossed braiding with fusion. For convenience we have left the group labels implicit in figure. In the left panel, they are given by $a_g, b_h, c_k, d_{ghk}, e_{gk}, f_{gh}$, and $g_{ghk}$. In the right panel, they are $a_G, b_h, c_k, d_{ghk}, e_{gk}, f_{gh}$, and $g_{ghk}$.

$U_k(a, b, c)$ corresponds to the symmetry action on $B$, while $\eta_{e,g}(g, h)$ corresponds to the symmetry fractionalization projective phases of $B$.

The ability to freely remove 0-branch sheets and $I_0$-lines allows us to fix

$$[U_0(a_g, b_h; c_{gh})]_{\mu \nu} = \delta_{\mu \nu} \tag{275}$$

$$[U_k(a_g, I_0, b_h)]_{\mu \nu} = [U_k(0, b_h; b_h)]_{\mu \nu} = \delta_{\mu \nu} \tag{276}$$

$$\eta_{I_0}(g, h) = \eta_{I_0}(0, h) = \eta_{I_0}(g, 0) = 1. \tag{277}$$

$$\frac{\eta_{e,g}(k, l)\eta_{e,h}(k, l)}{\eta_{e,gh}(k, l)} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \left[ U_k(a_g, b_h; c_{gh})^{-1} \right]_{\alpha \beta} [U_1(k_{ag}, b_h; k_{gh})^{-1}]_{\alpha \beta} [U_k(a_g, b_h; c_{gh})]_{\mu \nu} \tag{278}$$

where $\kappa_{g,h}$ is the natural isomorphism that matches the representative symmetry actions $\kappa_{g,h} \circ \rho_{g} \circ \rho_{h} = \rho_{gh}$. Eqs. (278) and (279) are the natural generalizations of Eqs. (119), (158), and (159), extended to the symmetry defects.

Consistency of the $R$-symbols with $F$, $U$, and $\eta$-symbols results in the heptagon equations for counterclockwise braids

$$\sum_{\lambda, \gamma} \left[ R_{e,gk}^{ac} \right]_{\lambda \alpha} \left[ F_{dghk}^{a_{eg}b_{eh}} \right]_{(e_{gk},\lambda,\beta), (g_{ghk},\gamma,\nu)} \left[ R_{g_{ghk}}^{bc} \right]_{\gamma \mu} = \sum_{f_{gh}, \sigma, \delta, \eta, \psi} \left[ F_{dghk}^{a_{e}b_{eh}} \right]_{(e_{gk},\alpha,\beta), (f_{gh},\delta,\sigma)} \left[ U_k(a_g, b_h; f_{gh}) \right]_{\delta \eta} \left[ R_{dghk}^{f_{gh}c_{eh}} \right]_{\sigma \psi} \left[ F_{dghk}^{e_{gk}b_{eh}} \right]_{(f_{gh},\eta,\psi), (g_{ghk},\nu,\mu)}, \tag{280}$$

and for clockwise braids

$$\sum_{\lambda, \gamma} \left[ R_{e,gk}^{ac} \right]^{-1} \left[ F_{dghk}^{a_{eg}b_{eh}} \right]_{(e_{gk},\lambda,\beta), (g_{ghk},\gamma,\nu)} \left[ R_{g_{ghk}}^{bc} \right]^{-1} = \sum_{f_{gh}, \sigma, \delta, \psi} \left[ F_{dghk}^{a_{e}b_{eh}} \right]_{(e_{gk},\alpha,\beta), (f_{gh},\delta,\sigma)} \eta_{e,h}(g, h) \left[ R_{dghk}^{f_{gh}c_{eh}} \right]^{-1} \left[ F_{dghk}^{e_{gk}b_{eh}} \right]_{(f_{gh},\delta,\psi), (g_{ghk},\nu,\mu)}. \tag{281}$$

The heptagon equations are depicted diagrammatically in Fig. 7. Clearly the heptagon equations are generalizations of the hexagon equations for BTCs, now including the nontrivial step of sliding a charge line over or under a vertex.

The pentagon and heptagon equations only admit...
solutions when the defectification obstruction $[\mathcal{O}] \in H^3(G, U(1))$ vanishes \cite{17}. The explicit form of this obstruction is only known in special cases, for instance when the symmetry action does not permute topological charges \cite{5}. When the obstruction vanishes, the defectification classes for $G$-crossed extensions of a BTC with a specified symmetry action and fractionalization class are torsorially classified by $H^3(G, U(1))$.

The $N$, $F$, $R$, $G$, $\rho$, $U$, and $\eta$, subject to the consistency conditions, constitute the basic data of a $G$-crossed BTC, which we denote as $\mathcal{B}_G$. Similar to BTCs, different sets of basic data can represent the same $G$-crossed BTC if they are related by gauge transformations. The vertex basis gauge transformations reviewed for BTCs generalize in the natural way to defect theories. In particular, if we define

$$
|a_g,b_h;\tilde{c}_{gh},\mu\rangle = \sum_{\mu'} \left[ \Gamma_{gh}^{a_g,b_h} \right]_{\mu'\mu} |a_g,b_h;\tilde{c}_{gh},\mu'\rangle, \quad (282)
$$

then the $F_\ast$, $R_\ast$, $U_\ast$, and $\eta$-symbols transform as

$$
\tilde{\eta}_c(g,h) = \eta_c(g,h).
$$

The gauge transformations must also respect the canonical isomorphisms associated with the vacuum charge, which fixes

$$
\Gamma_{a_g^0}^{a_0} = \Gamma_{b_{\tilde{a}^0}}^{b_{\tilde{a}^0}} = \Gamma_{\tilde{a}_0^0}^{\tilde{a}_0^0}. \quad (287)
$$

There is another type of gauge transformation associated with the symmetry action being modified by a natural isomorphism $\Upsilon$, i.e. $\tilde{\rho}_g = \Upsilon \circ \rho_g$, extending the notion of equivalence defined in Eq. (78). The symmetry action gauge transformation acts on the basic data according to

$$
\tilde{F}_{dghk}^{a_g,b_h,c_k} = \gamma_{dghk}^{a_g,b_h,c_k} F_{dghk}^{a_g,b_h,c_k}, \quad (288)
$$

$$
\tilde{R}_{cgh}^{a_g,b_h} = \gamma_{cgh}^{a_g,b_h} R_{cgh}^{a_g,b_h}, \quad (289)
$$

$$
\tilde{U}_k(a_g,b_h;\tilde{c}_{gh}) = \gamma_{cgh}^{a_g,b_h}(k) U_k(a_g,b_h;\tilde{c}_{gh}), \quad (290)
$$

$$
\eta_c(g,h) = \frac{\gamma_{cgh}(g)}{\gamma_{cgh}(h)} \eta_c(g,h). \quad (291)
$$

Preserving the canonical isomorphisms associated with the vacuum charge and ensuring that the trivial symmetry $0$ acts completely trivially fixes

$$
\gamma_{0^0}(h) = \gamma_{0^0}(0) = 1. \quad (292)
$$

When the basic data of two $G$-crossed BTCs are related through the application of vertex basis and symmetry action gauge transformations, they are considered equivalent theories.

Another type of equivalence that can be considered is when two $G$-crossed BTCs can be related by relabeling the topological charges. Mathematically, any relabeling of objects constitutes an isomorphism of $G$-crossed BTCs. However, relabelings that change the symmetry group labels are not a physical equivalence. This is because the symmetry group elements are extrinsically measurable quantities, which can be viewed as fixed with respect to some physical reference. Thus, two $G$-crossed BTCs that are related by relabelings of the form $a_g \mapsto a'_g$ are considered physically equivalent.

We note for later use that, for a $G$-crossed BTC with topological charge $e_0$ that satisfies $e_0 \otimes e_0 = \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0$ and $e_0 = e_0$ for all $g \in G$, it follows that monodromy with all other topological charges obeys

$$
(M_{a_g e_0})^2 = U_g(e_0, e_0; \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0). \quad (293)
$$

The monodromy is generally invariant under vertex basis gauge transformations, that is $\tilde{M}_{a_g e_0} = M_{a_g e_0}$. On the other hand, it is generally not invariant under symmetry action gauge transformations, as

$$
\tilde{M}_{a_g e_0} = \gamma_{e_0}(g) M_{a_g e_0}. \quad (294)
$$

We can also see that

$$
M_{a_g e_0} M_{b_h e_0} = \eta_{e_0}(g,h) M_{a_g e_0}, \quad (295)
$$

when $N_{a_b} \neq 0$.
B. $G^f$-crossed SMTCs

In order for a $G$-crossed BTC $B_G^X$ to characterize a bosonic SET phase with symmetry group $G$, the only additional condition required is that $B_0$ is the MTC describing the quasiparticles of the topological phase. The modularity of $B_0$ implies that its $G$-crossed extensions have $G$-crossed modularity, which allows the full defect theory to be consistently defined on arbitrary manifolds.

A fermionic SET (FSET) phase with fermionic symmetry group $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times_w G$ can similarly be characterized by a $G$-crossed BTC $M_G^X$ by imposing additional conditions that follow from the incorporation of a physical fermion. As these conditions do not modify the pentagon conditions that follow from the incorporation of a physical fermion, the symmetry action and fractionalization must be conserved accordingly. The extension of the symmetry action and fractionalization from the FSET phase to the SMTC $M_0,0 \bigoplus M_{1,0} = M$ is subject to the obstructions and classification detailed in Sec. III.

While it may provide a locally consistent algebraic theory of symmetry defects of a fermionic system, the theory described thus far may have pathologies that prevent it from providing a consistent theory for a strictly $(2+1)$D FSET phase. For example, it may not provide a consistent description of the theory on arbitrary surfaces and $G$-symmetry may need to be broken in order to gauge the $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$. These pathologies may be viewed as additional types of obstructions for strictly $(2+1)$D FSET phases. Theories that can be defined with nontrivial obstructions are viewed as anomalous, and we expect that at least some of the pathologies can be remedied via anomaly inflow by treating the anomalous theory as a description of a $(2+1)$D boundary of a $(3+1)$D fermionic topological phase with matching quantum invariants, as can be done with other obstructions. We will leave a detailed exploration of anomalous theories for future work, and focus here on defining the non-anomalous theory.

As discussed in Sec. II B, the vortices must necessarily be included to describe a strictly $(2+1)$D fermionic topological phase. Moreover, it must be possible to gauge the $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ fermion parity conservation. Extending these properties to a $G^f$-crossed SMTC $M_G^\times$ is equivalent to requiring that it be a $G$-crossed extension of a FMTC $M$, subject to the previously discussed fermionic constraints.

In this case, there is no nontrivial dependence on $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ for the symmetry action, fractionalization, or defectification; the $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ only enters as an extension of the $G$-grading to $G^f$-grading on the $G$-crossed theory, given by braiding with the physical fermion, as we will explain. As we will focus on the non-anomalous $(2+1)$D theories, we will define a $G^f$-crossed SMTC to be a $G$-crossed FMTC, with the understanding that a more general definition applies for anomalous theories.

Viewing $G^f$-crossed theories as $G$-crossed SMTCs, we only keep the vorticity labels on topological charges, and drop the dependence of $\rho$, $U$, $\eta$, and $\gamma$, letting

$$\rho(x,g) \to \rho_g, \quad U(x,g)(a_g,b_k) \to U_g(a_g,b_k), \quad \eta_c((x,g),(y,h)) \to \eta_c(g,h), \quad \gamma_b((x,g)) \to \gamma_b(g).$$

The equivalences of fermionic theories under vertex basis and symmetry action gauge transformations are again constrained to reflect the physical nature of the fermion, as in Eqs. (51) and (87), which imposes the conditions

$$\Gamma_{x,g} = 1, \quad \gamma_{\psi}(g) = 1.$$

The properties discussed in Sec. III are incorporated for the fermionic symmetry action and fractionalization applying to the FMTC sector $M_{0,0} \bigoplus M_{1,0}$. In particular, $G^f$ and $\eta_{\psi}(g,h)$ are correlated through the rela-
We note that even though \( w \in \mathbb{Z}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f) \), the fermionic symmetry group \( G^f \) is defined such that \( \eta_{\psi_0}(g, h) = (-1)^w(g, h) \). (306)

We previously discussed the possibility of having \( G \)-crossed BTCs that are mathematically isomorphic, but physically inequivalent, in the context of relabeling topological charges. In particular, relabeling topological charges always gives an isomorphism, but it is only considered a physical equivalence when the symmetry group labels are left fixed by the relabeling. Thus, a simple class of relabelings that are not physical equivalences is obtained by applying the nontrivial elements of \( \text{Aut}(G) \) to the symmetry group labels. The notion of relabeling isomorphisms and equivalences extends to \( G^f \)-crossed SMTCs, even though the \( \mathbb{Z}_2^f \) is not treated on the same footing as \( G \). Since \( G^f \) is the fermionic symmetry group, relabelings that change the \( \mathbb{Z}_2^f \) labels are not physical equivalences. When the \( \mathbb{Z}_2^f \) labels are changed by a relabeling isomorphism, one must also apply a transformation that changes the corresponding vorticity (monodromy with the physical fermion) of the defects to match their new labels.

More concretely, at the level of groups, \( G \) and \( G^f \) are considered equivalent \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) extensions of \( G \), with corresponding \( w \) and \( w' \), when \( w = w' + du \) for some \( u \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2) \). These equivalences correspond to the group isomorphisms given by \( g \mapsto g' = (x + u(g), g) \). We note that it is also possible to have inequivalent central extensions that are nonetheless isomorphic groups, but the corresponding isomorphisms involve nontrivial permutations of the \( G \) labels.

We can directly translate the central extension group equivalences into isomorphisms between \( G^f \)-crossed SMTCs and \( G^f \)-crossed SMTCs that are not physical equivalences. For this, we replace all \( g \)-labels on the topological charges according to the isomorphism between the groups

\[
a_g = a_{(x, g)} \mapsto a_{g'} = a_{(x + u(g), g)}.
\] (308)

The change in vorticity implies that the monodromy with the physical fermion must change by \((-1)^u(g)\) to satisfy Eq. (308), i.e.

\[
M_{\psi_0a_{(x, g)}} = (-1)^x \mapsto M_{\psi_0a_{(x + u(g), g)}} = (-1)^{x + u(g)}.
\] (309)

This can only be implemented by a symmetry action transformation with

\[
\gamma_{\psi_0}(x, g) = (-1)^u(g).
\] (310)

We emphasize that such a transformation changes the theory in an observable way, in particular the gauge invariant quantity \( M_{\psi_0a_{(x, g)}} \), changes, so it is not permitted as a fermionic symmetry action gauge transformation for the purposes of physical equivalences of theories.

Combining Eqs. (308) and (310), we have an isomorphism that modifies the basic data as
\begin{align}
N_{\alpha_1\beta_1}^{G_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}')} &= N_{\alpha_1\beta_1}^{G_{\mathcal{M}}}, \\
F^{a_{\mathcal{F}'}b_{\mathcal{F}'}c_{\mathcal{F}}} &= F^{a_{\mathcal{F}'}b_{\mathcal{F}'}c_{\mathcal{F}}}, \\
R^{\alpha_{\mathcal{F}'}b_{\mathcal{F}'}c_{\mathcal{F}}}_{\alpha'_{\mathcal{F}}b'_{\mathcal{F}}c'_{\mathcal{F}}} &= (\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{F}'), \\
\left[ U^{\mathcal{F}}_{\mathcal{F}}(a_{\mathcal{F}'}, b_{\mathcal{F}'}; c_{\mathcal{F}'}) \right] &= (-1)^{\psi_{\mathcal{F}'}} U^{\mathcal{F}}_{\mathcal{F}}(a_{\mathcal{F}'}, b_{\mathcal{F}'}; c_{\mathcal{F}'})\eta_{\mathcal{F}'},
\end{align}

It is easy to see this yields \( \psi_{\mathcal{F}'}(g', h') = (-1)^{w(g,h)+ \psi_{\mathcal{F}'}(g,h)} \) and, hence, \( w' = w + du \), as intended. Thus, for every \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTC for a given \( w \), we have an isomorphic \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTC with \( w' = w + du \) and \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \).

Finally, we note that vertex basis and symmetry action gauge transformations pull through the \( \mathcal{U} \)-isomorphism so that the gauge equivalence of \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed theories translates into gauge equivalence of \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed after applying the \( \mathcal{U} \)-isomorphism. Moreover, there is special set of \( \mathcal{U} \)-isomorphisms which leave \( w \) unchanged, given by \( u \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2) \), so that \( du = 0 \), i.e. \( u \) is a homomorphism. When \( |\mathcal{V}| = |\mathcal{Q}| \) for \( \mathcal{M} \), such a \( \mathcal{U} \)-isomorphism on \( \mathcal{M}_{G^{\mathcal{F}'}} \) can be realized by stacking with a FSPT phase that has symmetry action \( \rho_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{U}^{u}(g) \). This isomorphism cannot be realized by stacking with a FSPT phase when \( |\mathcal{V}| \neq |\mathcal{Q}| \).

D. Combining, Gluing, and Stacking Defect Theories

There are several simple ways of generating new defect theories from two known defect theories. The product of a \( G_1 \)-crossed BTC \( B^{(1)} \times G_1 \) and a \( G_2 \)-crossed BTC \( B^{(2)} \times G_2 \) is a \( G \)-crossed BTC

\[
B^{(G)} = B^{(1)} \times G_1 \otimes B^{(2)} \times G_2,
\]

with \( G = G_1 \times G_2 \) and \( B = B^{(1)} \otimes B^{(2)} \). This describes the combination of two systems that have their own symmetries and essentially do not interact. Either or both of the original theories can be fermionic, and there will be two distinct types of fermions if both theories are fermionic.

One way of producing a new \( G \)-crossed BTC from two \( G \)-crossed BTCs is by “gluing” them so the topological charges of the two theories are constrained to carry the same symmetry group label, which is to say taking a \( G \)-diagonal product of the theories

\[
B^{(G)} = B^{(G)} \times G \otimes B^{(G)} \times G = B^{(G)} \times G \otimes B^{(G)} \times G \left| \left( a^{(1)}_G, a^{(2)}_G \right) \right.,
\]

which has \( B = B^{(1)} \otimes B^{(2)} \). This describes the combination of two systems that have a shared symmetry, but are otherwise not interacting. If \( B^{(G)}_{\mathcal{M}} \) is a \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTC and \( B^{(2)}_G \times G \) is a \( G \)-crossed MTC, their glued theory will be a \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTC. In principle, one can glue together a \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTC and a \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTC along \( G \) if \( G_1 = G_2 = G \), or along \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \) if \( G^{\mathcal{F}'}_1 = G^{\mathcal{F}'}_2 = G^{\mathcal{F}'} \) to obtain a theory with two distinct types of fermions.

In order to combine two \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTCs into a \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTC with a single type of physical fermion, we use the fermionic stacking procedure described in Sec. IIC for FMTCs, and extend it to the \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed theories. For this, we take a \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-diagonal product of two \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTCs and condense the bound pair of physical fermions of the two theories. This produces a \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTC

\[
\mathcal{M}_G^{\mathcal{F}'} = \mathcal{M}^{(G)}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}^{(G)}_2 = \frac{\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}^{(2)}_1}{\mathcal{M}^{(2)}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}^{(1)}_2},
\]

which has \( \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{M}^{(2)} \). The condensation enforces the diagonal pairing of vorticity labels, we nonetheless include it in the diagonal product for emphasis. In this way, the stacked theories are required to have the same fermionic symmetry group \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \), i.e. they have the same \( \eta_{\mathcal{F}'} \). We note that if \( \mathcal{M}^{(2)} = K^{(0)} \), this generates a new \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-crossed SMTC for the same FMTC \( \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^{(1)} \).

V. \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \)-CROSSED FSPT PHASES

Beyond being the simplest examples of topological phases in the presence of symmetry, SPT phases play an important role in the classification of SET phases. In this section, we generate the minimal set of data specifying a FSPT phase, which will be utilized in the next section to classify all FSPT phases. Additionally, we present explicit formulas for the full set of topological data. The results of this section have overlap with previous works \([6, 21, 25, 26]\). Notably, we extend the results of Refs. 6 and 26 to include nontrivial \( G^{\mathcal{F}'} \), and also provide the complete topological data describing vortices and defects.

Recall that the trivial fermionic theory \( K^{(0)} \) has four topological charges, with quasiparticle sector

\[
K^{(0)}_0 = \{ \mathcal{L}_0, \psi_0 \},
\]
corresponding to the two local particles common to all fermionic theories, and vortex sector
\[ \mathbf{K}^{(0)}_g = \{I_1, \psi_1\}. \] (320)

In contrast, the trivial bosonic MTC has a single topological charge \( C = \{I\} \). As a result, FSPT phases exhibit a richer structure than their bosonic counterparts. While the bosonic SPT phases for fixed symmetry group \( G \) are only distinguished by their \( H^3(G, U(1)) \) defectification classes, FSPT phases can differ in their fermionic symmetry group \( \mathcal{G}^f \) (i.e. the fractionalization class of the physical fermion), their symmetry action on vortices, and their vortex fractionalization class.

We begin by reviewing bosonic SPT phases, the \( G \)-crossed extensions of \( C = \{I\} \). We then turn to FSPT phases, the \( \mathcal{G}^f \)-crossed extensions of the trivial fermionic theory \( \mathbf{K}^{(0)} \). Before considering theories with general symmetry, we first focus on the simplest case of \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \), corresponding to \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \) and \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_4 \). We present the basic data of these theories in Tables IV-VII, along with their group structure. These theories illustrate key differences in comparison to the analogous bosonic classification of \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-crossed extensions of the toric code.

To extend to general \( G \), we combine the topological data of the \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) theories and a bosonic SPT phase to construct a “base theory” for each choice of symmetry action \( \pi \) and full symmetry group \( \mathcal{G}^f \). Our approach extends the Ising pullback developed in Ref. 6 and 26 to construct bona fide \( \mathcal{G}^f \)-crossed theories for \( \mathbf{K}^{(0)} \). These base theories are not the most general \( \mathcal{G}^f \)-crossed FSPT phases, but they provide a base from which we can generate all other theories with the same symmetry action. By exploiting the torsorial nature of the \( G \)-crossed classification, we can write the complete topological data of each such theory in terms of the base theory and the cocycles relating them [19]. This result is surprising, as it collapses the highly nontrivial consistency conditions of general \( \mathcal{G}^f \)-crossed FSPT phases onto the much simpler set of consistency conditions for: (1) a bosonic \( G \)-crossed SPT phase, (2) a \( \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-crossed FSPT phase, and (3) an \( H^4(G, U(1)) \)-valued obstruction. Finally, we use this torsor method to define equivalence relations on FSPT phases, thereby systematizing the relabeling redundancy generally present in the \( G \)-crossed formalism.

A. Bosonic SPT Phases

Bosonic SPT phases can be described by \( G \)-crossed extensions of the trivial theory \( C = \{I\} \), whose topological data is fully specified by a cohomology class \( [\alpha] \in H^3(G, U(1)) \). We will denote the bosonic SPT as \( \text{SPT}^G_G[\alpha] \). Each \( C_g \)-sector has one simple object, denoted
\[ C_g = \{I_g\}. \] (321)

and fusion rules given by group multiplication,
\[ I_g \otimes I_h = I_{gh}. \] (322)

The topological data may be specified using a representative \( \alpha \) of the cohomology class \([\alpha]\), that is, a normalized 3-cocycle \( \alpha \in Z^3(G, U(1)) \). In a particular gauge choice, the data may be written as [5]
\[ F^I_g F^I_h = \alpha(g, h, k), \] (323)
\[ R^I_g = 1, \] (324)
\[ U_k(I_g, I_h, I_{gh}) = \frac{\alpha(g, k, \bar{k}h)}{\alpha(g, h, \bar{k}g, k)}, \] (325)
\[ \eta_k(g, h) = \frac{\alpha(g, \bar{k}k, h)}{\alpha(g, h, \bar{k}g, k)}. \] (326)

Bosonic SPT phases torsorially classify the defectification classes of \( G \)-crossed theories. We can obtain a theory \( C_{G'}^G \) from another theory \( C_G^G \) with the same symmetry action and fractionalization class by gluing in \( \text{SPT}^G_G[\alpha] \), i.e. taking the \( G \)-diagonal product, such that
\[ C_{G'}^G = \text{SPT}^G_G[\alpha] \boxtimes \text{SPT}^G_G[\alpha]. \] (327)

The basic data of \( C_{G'}^G \) is given by a product of the data of \( C_G^G \) and \( \text{SPT}^G_G[\alpha] \). As each theory independently satisfies the pentagon and hexagon equations, the new theory automatically satisfies the \( G \)-crossed consistency conditions.

Lastly, we note that bosonic SPT phases satisfy a group structure under gluing
\[ \text{SPT}^G_G[\alpha_1] \boxtimes \text{SPT}^G_G[\alpha_2] = \text{SPT}^G_G[\alpha_1 \alpha_2] \] (328)
where we have used the multiplicative group law in \( H^3(G, U(1)) \).

We therefore see that bosonic SPT phases provide the \( H^3(G, U(1)) \) part of the torsorial \( G \)-crossed classification. Gluing in a nontrivial bosonic SPT phase to a \( G \)-crossed BTC generates a \( G \)-crossed BTC with the same symmetry action and fractionalization class and different defectification class, up to the relabeling redundancy.

B. FSPT Phases with \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \)

We now consider FSPT phases with on-site unitary \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) symmetry. There are two \( \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \) extensions of \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \): the trivial extension given by \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \), and the nontrivial \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_4 \) extension.

1. \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \)

FSPT phases with \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \) have two possible symmetry actions: trivial (no topological charge permutation) or nontrivial (vortex permutation \( \rho_1 = \psi \)). As
We can parameterize the fractionalization classes by vortex symmetry fractionalization is classified torsorially by obstructed (which will be the case here), the defectification fractionalization class, one needs to solve the pentagon equation. Recall from Sec. IIID1 that for a fixed $q$, the permuting symmetry action.

There are four such theories, parameterized by $q(1,1)$. The gauge invariant quantity $\eta$ distinguishes these four theories by even integers $n \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$ to the four theories given in Table IV. This assignment corresponds to the invariant $T^2(a,1) = (-1)^q(-1)^{q(1,1)} = e^{i\pi n}$. Stacking these theories labeled this way is additive modulo 8 in this label, forming a $Z_4$ subgroup of the $Z_8$ classification of FSPT phases with $Z_2$ symmetry.

In order to specify the topological data of these theories, we first choose a symmetry action given by a group homomorphism $[\rho]: Z_2 \rightarrow \text{Aut}(K^{(0)}) = Z_2$. The possible choices are classified by $H^1(Z_2, Z_2^\times) = Z_2$. The next piece of data is to choose a pattern of symmetry fractionalization. Recall from Sec. IIIID1 that for a fixed $G$, the vortex symmetry fractionalization obstruction $\Theta^0$ is given by $\psi^{n \omega \omega' \omega''}$. In this case, $\Theta^0$ is trivial, implying the vortex symmetry fractionalization is classified torsorially by $[\sigma] \in H^2(Z_2, Z_2^\times) = Z_2$. There are two vortex symmetry fractionalization classes corresponding to $q(1,1) = Z_2$ or $\psi_0$. Given a symmetry action and vortex symmetry fractionalization class, one needs to solve the pentagon and heptagon equations, which is possible only when the $H^3(G, U(1))$ defectification obstruction vanishes. If obstructed (which will be the case here), the defectification will be classified torsorially by $H^3(Z_2, U(1)) = Z_2$. Thus, we expect eight distinct theories, for which we now provide the explicit detail.

First consider theories with trivial symmetry action. We can parameterize the fractionalization classes by $q(1,1) = \psi^{q(1,1)}$, (329)

where $q \in Z^2(Z_2, F_2)$. We then need to solve the pentagon and heptagon equations. When the symmetry action does not permute topological charges, Ref. 5 gave explicit expressions for the defectification obstruction and the complete topological data of the $G$-crossed extensions. Evaluating the expression for the defectification obstruction in the present case yields the only nontrivial element given by

$\Theta(1,1,1,1) = R^{q(1,1)\eta_{1,1}}(1,1) = (-1)^q R^{q(1,1)\eta_{1,1}}(1,1)$, (330)

so we can write the obstruction as

$\Theta = (-1)^q \eta_{1,1}$. (331)

This $\Theta$ is a coboundary, for which a solution to $d\chi = \Theta$ is given by

$\chi(1,1,1,1) = (-1)^q \eta(1,1)$, (332)

where $s \in F_2$ parameterizes the two distinct defectification classes coming from $H^3(Z_2, U(1)) = Z_2$. We produce a complete set of solutions to the pentagon and heptagon equations in Table IV. We show below that all solutions are physically distinct $G^I$-crossed SMTCs and distinguished by a particular gauge invariant quantity. With foresight, we will label these four theories by even integers $n \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$ as indicated in Table V.

When the symmetry action permutes topological charges, we solve the pentagon and heptagon equations explicitly, rather than solving for the obstruction objects. We find that for $G^I = Z_2^2 \times Z_2$ there are four solutions to the $G$-crossed consistency conditions. This agrees with the expectation from $H^2(Z_2, F_2) = Z_2$ and $H^3(Z_2, U(1)) = Z_2$. We show below that they can be distinguished by a particular gauge invariant quantity. Their topological data is presented in Table VI, and parameterized by an odd integer $n \in \{1, 3, 5, 7\}$.

The eight FSPT phases with $G^I = Z_2^2 \times Z_2$ have a $Z_8$ structure under stacking [5, 14, 15]. This group structure can be seen by computing the quantity

$T^2(a_{x,g}) = \theta^2_{a_{x,g}} [\eta a_{x,g}] (g, g)$, (333)

which is gauge-invariant for $G = Z_2$. Under stacking, $T^2$ of a given defect sector of the condensed theory corresponds to the product of $T^2$ from the same sector for the two stacked theories. This is a consequence of the fact that the condensed theory inherits the braiding of the parent (product) theory, since the theory acts trivially on $\psi_{0,0}$. The $T^2$ eigenvalues of the eight theories take the form

$T^2(a_{x,1}) = i^{-n} e^{i\pi n}$, (334)

where $n$ are the integers we have assigned to the various theories. The gauge invariant quantity $T^2(a_{x,g})$ distinguishes all eight $Z_2$ FSPT phases. One can check that the gauge invariant quantities are additive under stacking and, hence, we see the $Z_8$ group structure emerge,

$$\left[K^{(0)}_{Z_2^2 \times Z_2} \cdot n \cdot \eta \cdot K^{(0)}_{Z_2^2 \times Z_2} \cdot n' \cdot \eta \right]_{Z_2^2 \times Z_2} = \left[K^{(0)}_{Z_2^2 \times Z_2} \cdot n \cdot \eta \right]_{Z_2^2 \times Z_2} \cdot n' \mod 8$$.

(335)
TABLE VI. FSPT phases with $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ and nontrivial symmetry action. There are four theories, parameterized by an odd integer $n \in \{1, 3, 5, 7\}$.

In summary, for $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, there are four distinct FSPT phases with trivial symmetry action, and four more with nontrivial symmetry action. We have also shown that there is a $\mathbb{Z}_8$ classification (consistent with previous works [5, 14, 18]) and have parameterized the theories according to this integer. We remark that sending $n \rightarrow n + 4$ changes in the nontrivial bosonic SPT phase in $H^3(\mathbb{Z}_2, U(1))$, and applying the $u$-isomorphism of Sec. IV C with $u(1) = 1$ leaves $w = 0$ unchanged, but sends $n \rightarrow -n$.

2. $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_4^f$

We now classify FSPT phases with $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_4^f$. In this case, we use a nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ extension of the on-site symmetry group $G^f$. The extension is given by the nontrivial $w \in Z^2(\mathbb{Z}_2, Z_2)$, whose only non-zero element is $w(1,1) = 1$.

In this language, one of the $\mathbb{Z}_4^f$ generators is given by $\bar{g} = (0,1)$, and the rest of the elements are given by

$\bar{g}^2 = (0,1)^2 = (0+0+w(1,1),1+1) = (1,0)$,

$\bar{g}^3 = (0,1) \cdot (1,0) = (0+1+w(1,0),1+0) = (1,1)$,

$\bar{g}^4 = (1,0)^2 = (1+1+w(0,0),0+0) = (0,0)$.

Below we present the data for theories with trivial symmetry action. For nontrivial symmetry action, the vortex symmetry fractionalization obstruction $\mathcal{O}^f = \psi^{\pi i w}$ is a nontrivial 3-cocycle (not a coboundary), so there are no solutions to the pentagon and heptagon equations, as can also be confirmed directly.

For trivial symmetry action, the vortex symmetry fractionalization classes are torsorially classified by $H^2(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_4^f)$. This can be parameterized as

$q(1,1) = \psi^{\bar{g}(1,1)}$,  \hspace{1cm} (337)

where $q \in \mathbb{F}_2$ denotes whether the 2-cocycle is trivial ($q(1,1) = 1$) or nontrivial ($q(1,1) = \psi$). The defectification obstruction vanishes, $\mathbb{O}(g,h,k,l) = 1$, hence the remaining data can be parameterized by the 3-cocycle $X$, whose only nontrivial element is

$X(1,1,1) = (1,1,1) = (1,1,1) = e^{i\pi n/4}$, \hspace{1cm} (338)

Thus, we have four candidate theories parameterized by $(m,q(1,1)) \in \mathbb{F}_2 \times \mathbb{F}_2$, specifying the vortex fractionalization and defectification classes, respectively.

Noting that $w = \alpha_w$, the topological data of these theories are given by [5]

$\alpha_{x,y} \otimes b_{y,h} = [\alpha_{x,y}][b_{y,h}]$,  \hspace{1cm} (339)

$F^{x,y}_w b_{y,h} \cdot \alpha_{x,\tilde{y}} = (-1)^{\tilde{y}} [\alpha_{x,y} + w(g,h)] \cdot \alpha_{x,\tilde{y}}$,  \hspace{1cm} (340)

$R^{\alpha_{x,y}, b_{y,h}} = (-1)^{\tilde{y} x + y}$,  \hspace{1cm} (341)

$U_k(a_{x,y} b_{y,h}) = X(g,h,k)^{-1}$,  \hspace{1cm} (342)

$\eta_{x,y} = (-1)^{q(g,h)+e w(g,h)} X(g,h,k)^{-1}$,  \hspace{1cm} (343)
corresponding to four solutions of the pentagon and heptagon equations. However, these naively distinct theories can be identified by relabeling the topological charges, as we now explain.

Relabeling the objects as
\[ a_{x,g} \rightarrow a'_{x,g} = [\psi^* a]_{x,g} \]  
identifies the theories \( q(1,1) \rightarrow q'(1,1') = \psi \otimes q(1,1) \). We note that this relabeling is permitted because it changes charges by a \( \psi_0 \) value (not a vortex value), and has trivial \( G \) dependence, i.e. it is just a relabeling of the vortices of \( K^{(0)} \). To see this makes the claimed identification of theories, note that the relabeling modifies the fusion rules as
\[ a'_{x,g} \otimes b'_{y,h} = [\psi^w(g,h)q(g,h)ab']_{x+y+w(g,h),gh}, \]  
indicating that
\[ q(g,h) \rightarrow q'(g,h) = q(g,h)\psi^w(g,h). \]  
(346)

The rest of the topological data can be made to match using a vertical basis gauge transformation. Thus, the two naively different vortex symmetry fractionalization classes are actually identical.

Similarly, relabeling the objects as
\[ a_{x,g} \rightarrow a'_{x,g} = [\gamma g]_{x,g}, \]  
with \( \gamma(0) = I \) and \( \gamma(1) = \psi \), identifies \( m \rightarrow m' = m + 1 \). This is an allowed relabeling because it changes charges by a \( \psi_0 \) value (not a vortex value), and has trivial \( \mathbb{Z}_4 \) dependence, i.e. it leaves \( \mathcal{G}^4 \)-sectors fixed. The equivalence of theories can be seen using Sec. IV of Ref. 10; the relabeled theory has an SPT\( _G \) glued into it with
\[ \alpha(g,h,k) = M_{[s(g,h)]w(g,h)s}(k) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } g = h = k = 1 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \]  
(348)

Thus \( \alpha \) is the nontrivial element of \( H^2(\mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)) \), indicating the defectification class has shifted. The rest of the topological data can be made to match using vertex basis and symmetry action gauge transformations.

The relabelings above equate the four candidate theories to represent a single \( \mathbb{Z}_4^2 \) SPT phase, whose data is given in Table VII in a convenient gauge. These results agree with those obtained using defect decoration \([7]\) and spin-cobordism classification \([21, 52]\).

3. Comparison to \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \) Extensions of the Toric Code

Recall that gauging fermion parity promotes the trivial fermionic theory \( K^{(0)} \) to the toric code bosonic MTC TC,

\[ I_0 \rightarrow I, \quad \psi_0 \rightarrow \psi, \quad I_1 \rightarrow e, \quad \psi_1 \rightarrow m. \]  
(349)

It is instructive to compare the classification of FSPT phases with \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \) to the analogous bosonic classification of \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-extensions of the toric code, which was computed as an example in Refs. 14 and 5 (though the latter reference did not identify the relabelings that equate the \( \mathfrak{w}(1,1) = e \) and \( m \) fractionalization classes, as well as their corresponding defectification classes).

The first difference between the bosonic and fermionic classifications is that bosonic theories are classified with respect to a fixed symmetry action, while FSPT phases reference a fixed fermionic symmetry group \( \mathcal{G}^4 \). The next significant departure is the number of distinct theories. The relevant cohomology groups appearing in the bosonic classification of toric code with \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \) are

\[ H^2_{[\psi]}(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 & \rho_1 \text{ trivial,} \\ \mathbb{Z}_1 & \rho_1 \text{ nontrivial,} \end{cases} \]  
(350)

and \( H^3(\mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_2 \). Thus, there are naively 10 different \( G \)-crossed theories, eight with trivial symmetry action and two with nontrivial symmetry action. However, there are relabelings that equate some of the theories with trivial symmetry action. For the \( \mathfrak{w}(1,1) = \psi \) fractionalization class, the relabelings \( a'_1 = e \otimes a_1 \) or \( a'_1 = m \otimes a_1 \) (together with gauge transformations) equate its two defectification classes. For the \( \mathfrak{w}(1,1) = e \) and \( m \) fractionalization classes, relabeling the quasiparticles \( e \leftrightarrow m \) equates the two fractionalization classes and a relabeling \( a'_1 = \psi \otimes a_1 \) can be used to equate their corresponding defectification classes, so all four theories are equivalent. Thus, there are actually four physically distinct SET phases with trivial symmetry action and two with nontrivial action for TC with \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) symmetry. In contrast, there were eight distinct \( \mathbb{Z}_4^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \) FSPT phases, four with trivial symmetry action and four with nontrivial action; and there was one \( \mathbb{Z}_4^2 \) FSPT phase, which had trivial symmetry action.

Comparing to the corresponding \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \) SET and FSPT phases, we see that the \( \mathbb{Z}_4^2 \) FSPT phase corre-
sponds to the bosonic $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed TC with trivial symmetry action and $\mathbf{w}(1, 1) = e$ and $m$ symmetry fractionalization. The identification of these four bosonic $G$-crossed theories as one SET phase is precisely the same identification of the four naive $\mathbb{Z}^4_2$-crossed theories as one FSPT phase, so these match up exactly.

On the other hand, the $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ FSPT phases correspond to the remaining bosonic $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed TC theories, with important differences. The first is that the $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed theories with trivial symmetry action and $\mathbf{w}(1, 1) = \psi$ fractionalization class do not have an allowed relabeling that equates the two defectification classes. The relabeling that allowed such a relation for the bosonic $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed TC theories would map to a vortex-valued relabeling for the corresponding fermionic theory. In other words, a relabeling equating the FSPT defectification classes would actually involve changing the $G^f$ sectors $(0, 1) \leftrightarrow (1, 1)$, which is not a permissible equivalence of fermionic theories. The second difference is for the theories with nontrivial symmetry action. For the bosonic theories, there is only one distinct fractionalization class, whereas the FSPT phases have fractionalization classified by $H^2(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}^2_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2$. This difference is due to the fact that $\mathbf{w}(1, 1) = \psi$ is related to $\mathbf{w}(1, 1) = I$ for the bosonic theories by a coboundary $dz$, where $z(1) = e$ or $m$. This coboundary maps to a vortex-valued coboundary for the fermionic theory, which is not a permissible equivalence, as explained in Sec. III.D.

Lastly, we note that stacking $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed extensions of toric code and condensing $(\psi, \psi)$ does not admit a consistent group structure for the bosonic theories, as is clear by comparison with the fermionic results. This reflects the fact that $(\psi, \psi)$ has no additional physical significance compared to the many other condensable bosons in the stacked theory. The physical fermion $\psi_0$ is a local particle, thus condensing a bound pair does not require strong interactions between the stacked theories. In contrast, the fermion $\psi$ of the toric code is an emergent quasiparticle and generally will require strong interactions for its bound pairs to form a condensate. As such, while stacking provides a natural tool for classifying fermionic topological order, it plays no special role for understanding the structure of the analogous bosonic theories.

C. General $G$ FSPT Phases

We now turn to general symmetry group $G$ to generate representatives of all FSPT phases. Our results rely on three key developments: (1) the efficient construction of the topological data for a particular $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times G$ FSPT phase given the data of a bosonic SPT phase and a $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ FSPT phase; (2) a method of torsorially generating the data of all theories with the same symmetry action (and possibly distinct $G^f$) given the data of any one theory in that classification; and (3) a systematicatization of the relabeling redundancy for FSPT phases. For (2), the data of the torsored theory is subject to a relative obstruction, which must vanish in order for the torsored $F$-symbols to satisfy the pentagon equation. Using these developments, we are able to produce the basic data of all $G^f$-crossed FSPT phases. The next section will describe the classification of $G^f$-crossed FSPT phases into a group structure under stacking.

1. All Your Base Theories

The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-symmetric invertible fermionic theories are not just illustrative examples of the $G^f$-crossed formalism; they play a critical role in the efficient construction of a $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times G$ FSPT “base theory.” This base theory is formed through a restricted product of a $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ FSPT phase with a $G$-symmetric bosonic SPT phase. Our approach extends the Ising pullbacks developed in Ref. 6 and 26 to construct bona fide $G^f$-crossed SMTCs. While we focus here on FSPT phases, this method can also be applied to all invertible fermionic orders $K^{(\nu)}$, as we do in Secs. VIIIB and VIIIC.

We begin by recalling that the trivial fermionic theory has topological symmetry group $\text{Aut}^0(\mathbf{K}^{(0)}) = \mathbb{Z}_2$, so that the global symmetry action for a $G^f$ FSPT phase is specified by a group homomorphism $\rho : G \to \mathbb{Z}_2$, given by

$$\rho_g = \gamma^\pi(g),$$

where $\gamma$ is the vortex-permuting symmetry action described in Sec. III.B. To construct a base theory with $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times G$ and symmetry action $\rho$, we use a restricted product

$$\mathcal{E}_{G, \pi} = \left[ \mathbf{K}^{(0)}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2} \right] \boxtimes \mathcal{SPT}_G^{[1]}_{\mathbf{S}_\pi}.$$

where $[\mathbf{K}^{(0)}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2}]_1$ is the generator of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ classification of $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ FSPT phases [see Eq. (335)]. $\mathcal{SPT}_G^{[1]}$ is trivial bosonic SPT phase, and the restriction is to the topological charges specified by

$$\mathbf{S}_\pi = \{ (a, \pi(g), T_g) \}.$$

We have fixed these choices of initial fermionic and bosonic SPT phases for specificity, but the method will apply equally well for more general choices, e.g. $1 \to n$ and $[1] \to [\alpha]$. The restriction to $\mathbf{S}_\pi$ defines a subcategory of the full $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times G$-crossed product theory $[\mathbf{K}^{(0)}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2}]_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{SPT}_G^{[1]}$. This subcategory is seen to be a $\mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times G$-crossed SMTC.

The topological data of $\mathcal{E}_{G, \pi}$ can be inferred from the product structure by multiplying the $F$, $R$, $U$, and $\rho$-symbols given in Table VI with the corresponding bosonic SPT phase data given in Sec. VA. For convenience, we use the shorthand

$$a_g \equiv a_{x, g} \equiv (a_{x, \pi(g)}, T_g).$$
With this notation, we see that the defect sectors are given by

$$[B_{G,x}]_g = \begin{cases} \{I_g, \psi_g\} & \text{if } \pi(g) = 0 \\ \{\sigma_g\} & \text{if } \pi(g) = 1 \end{cases}$$

(355)
i.e., $\pi(g)$ specifies whether we retain the Abelian or non-Abelian defects of the full product theory. The symmetry action on the topological charges can be succinctly written as

$$\rho_h(a_g) = \psi_{0}^\times \pi(h) \otimes a_{h^g}.$$  

(356)
Here, we note that conjugating by $h$ is the same as conjugating by $h$ and that $\psi_0 \otimes \sigma_g = \sigma_g$. The fusion rules are given by

$$a_g \otimes b_k = [a \otimes b]_{g^k},$$

(357)
with $a \otimes b$ inherited from the Ising fusion category. From this, we see that these fusion rules imply that the resulting theory has $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times G$ grading. The $F$, $R$, $U$- and $\eta$-symbols of $B_{G,x}$ are

$$F_{d,\psi}^{a,b,c} = \left[ F_{d,\psi}^{a,b}(x) \right]_{c \pi(d)} F_{\psi}(x)$$

(358)
$$R_{\psi}^{a,b} = R_{\psi}^{a,b}(x)$$

(359)
$$U_h(a_g, b_k; c_{g,h}) = U_h(a_g, b_k; c_{g,h})$$

(360)
$$\eta_{c_e}(g, h) = \eta_{c_e}(g, h)$$

(361)
where the $F$-, $R$-, $U$- and $\eta$-symbols on the right hand sides of these equations are those of $\mathbb{K}^{(0)}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^f \times \mathbb{Z}_2^f}$ and we use the shorthand $\pi(g) \equiv (x, \pi(g))$. Note that each base theory is fully specified by the external symmetry group $G$ and the symmetry action $\pi$.

2. Torsorial generation of all FSPT phases

The base theories described above are not the most general $G^f$-crossed FSPT phases. However, they provide a base from which we can generate all remaining FSPT phases with the same symmetry action. By exploiting the torsorial nature of the $G$-crossed classification, we can write the topological data of each such theory from that of the base theory and the cocycles relating them. This result is surprising, as it collapses the highly nontrivial consistency conditions of all symmetric invertible FSPT phases onto a much simpler set of consistency conditions.

The torsor method introduced in Ref. 19 maps the basic data of a $G$-crossed theory $C_{G}^\times$ to a theory $\hat{C}_{G}^\times$ related by a 2-cocycle $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{\mathbb{R}}(G; \mathcal{A})$ and 3-cochain $\chi \in C^3(G, U(1))$; $\chi$ is not independent of $\tau$, but rather chosen so that the $F$-symbols of the torsored theory satisfy the pentagon equation. In particular, $C_{G}^\times$ and $\hat{C}_{G}^\times$ have the same symmetry action on $C_0$, but distinct fractionalization and defectification classes related by $t$ and $\chi$, respectively. Denoting the map by a functor

$$F_{t,\chi}: C_{G}^\times \to \hat{C}_{G}^\times,$$

(362)
we refer to $C_{G}^\times$ as the “pre-torsored theory” and $\hat{C}_{G}^\times$ as the “torsored theory.” We denote quantities in $C_{G}^\times$ as $\hat{C}_{G}^\times$, with the exception of the topological charge labels which are unchanged by the torsor action.

In the context of FSPT phases, we assume $G = K^{(0)}$. In this case, we can write $t(g, h) = p(g, h) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{\mathbb{R}}(G; \mathcal{A})$, where $p(g, h) \in C^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$ with the vorticity label $\varepsilon(g, h) \in \mathbb{Z}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$, so that

$$p_c = p \otimes \mathcal{I}_c = \psi_0^\times \otimes \mathcal{I}_0^f.$$  

(363)
(In this way, we can think of $A = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times \mathbb{Z}_2^f$.) Torsoring in the 2-cocycle $p_c$ to a $G^f$-crossed theory $\hat{M}_{G}^\times$ modifies the defect fusion rules as

$$a_g \hat{\otimes} b_k = p_c(g, h) \otimes (a_g \otimes b_k).$$

(364)
Crucially, this implies the torsor action modifies the fermionic symmetry group from $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times G$ to $\hat{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times \mathbb{R} G$ specified by

$$\hat{w} = w + \epsilon.$$  

(365)
We argue below that a general $G^f$ FSPT phase can be obtained by applying the torsor functor to one of the $\mathbb{Z}_2^f \times G$-crossed base theories $B_{G,x}$ of Eq. (352), which is to say it takes the form

$$F_{\tau,\chi}(B_{G,x}).$$  

(366)
In this way, a general $G^f$ FSPT phase can be represented by the triple

$$\left(\chi, p, \pi\right)_w,$$

(367)
where we have defined $\chi \in C^3(G, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ through

$$\chi = e^{i2\pi\chi},$$

(368)
and used $p \in C^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ as defined in Eq. (363), in order to better match existing conventions in the literature. We have written $w$ separately, because classification will be given with respect to a fixed $G^f$. The remainder of this section summarizes the results of Ref. 19 in the context of FSPT phases, to justify representing a general FSPT phase by Eq. (367).

Tracking the modification of the defect fusion rules [Eq. (364)] fixes the relation between fusion multiplicities of the torsored theory to those of the pre-torsored theory,

$$\hat{N}_{a^g b_k} = N_{a^g b_k} e^{i\varepsilon(g, h) \otimes c_{g}}.$$  

(369)
The 2-cocycle condition
\[ \mathbf{s}(h, k) \otimes \mathbf{t}(gh, k) \otimes \mathbf{t}(g, hk) \otimes \mathbf{t}(g, h) = \mathbf{I}_0 \] (370)
implies that the fusion rules are associative. The fusion/splitting spaces of \( \hat{C}_G \) are similarly modified as
\[ V_{c_{gh}}^{a_{gh} b_{gh}} \cong V_{c_{gh}}^{\mathbf{t}(g, h) a_{gh} b_{gh}} \cong V_{c_{gh}}^{a_{gh} b_{gh}} \] (371)

Other valid choices for the isomorphisms between fusion spaces of \( \hat{M}_G \) and \( M_G \) can be related by a braid.

The data of the torsored theory can be calculated explicitly in terms of the data of the pre-torsored theory by introducing an explicit isomorphism between \( \hat{C}_G \) and \( \hat{C}_G \). Diagrammatically, we write [53]
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\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} , \quad (372)
\end{array} \]
where the right-most diagram introduces a shorthand to simplify the diagrams. Diagrams on the right of \( \cong \) are defined according to the pre-torsored theory \( C_G \), and we indicate the “phantom” lines that disappear when passing to the left-hand side of the expression using green lines. We note that every FSPT is fusion multiplicity-free and so will not include the fusion multiplicity labels in this subsection.

Using this notation, the \( F \)-moves of \( \hat{M}_G \) are given by
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} = \sum_{f_{gh}} \left[ \mathbf{F}_{d_{gh}}^{a_{gh} b_{gh} c_{gh}} \right]_{e_{gh} f_{gh}} \cdot \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} , \quad (373)
\end{array} \]
where the sum runs over all charges with the specified group label and the nontrivial elements are those obeying the new fusion rules. We determine the \( F \)-symbols from the \( M_G \) data using the isomorphism of Eq. (372). Matching the phantom \( t \) lines on both sides of the equation requires an additional operation which we write as
\[ X_{g, h, k} = \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} . \quad (374)
\]
We call the extra operator the “cocycleator” – it is an isomorphism
\[ X_{g, h, k} = \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} , \quad (375)
\]
diagrammatically defined by
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
 a \\
 b \\
 c \\
 d
\end{array}
\end{array} , \quad (376)
\]
Note that we can leave the topological charge labels on the left side implicit as they are determined by the group labels on \( X \).

The complex coefficients \( X(g, h, k) \in C^3(G, U(1)) \) are chosen so that \( F \)-symbols of the torsored theory satisfy the pentagon equation. This defines a relative obstruction to generating the theory \( \hat{M}_G \) from the unobstructed theory \( M_G \). Here, the torsored theory is unobstructed when \( X \) is a solution to
\[ dX = O_r(t)^{-1} \] (377)
where \( d \) is the usual coboundary operator, i.e.,
\[ dX(g, h, k, l) = \frac{X(h, k, l)X(g, h, k)X(g, h, k)}{X(g, h, k)X(g, h, k)X(g, h, k)X(g, h, k)} . \quad (378) \]
\( O_r(t) \) is the relative obstruction [19, 53, 54], which for FSPT phases is given by
\[ O_r(t)(g, h, k, l) = \eta_{\theta(t, k, l)}^R (\mathbf{s}(h, k), \mathbf{s}(h, k), \mathbf{s}(h, k), \mathbf{s}(h, k)) . \quad (379) \]
The \( \bar{F} \)-symbols of the torsored theory can be written in terms of the data of the pre-torsored theory by evaluating the diagrams in Eq. (374). The general expression can be found in Ref. 19; for FSPT phases it is given by
where \( c'_{gh} = \tilde{t} (g, h) \otimes c_{gh}, f'_{jk} = \tilde{t} (h, k) \otimes f_{jk}, d'_{gh} = \tilde{s} (h, k) \otimes d_{gh}, t' = \tilde{s} (g, h) \otimes \tilde{t} (g, h) \otimes d_{gh}, d''_{gh} = \tilde{t} (g, h) \otimes \tilde{s} (h, k) \otimes d_{gh}, \) and \( d'''_{gh} = \tilde{t} (g, h) \otimes d_{gh}. \)

In order to determine the remaining topological data of the torsored theory, we need to relate the symmetry action on the topological charges of the torsored theory to that of the pre-torsored theory. This is given by

\[
\hat{k} a_g = \hat{\rho}_k (a_g) = k^q (g, \tilde{k}) \otimes \rho_k (a_g)
\]

where

\[
q (g, h) = \tilde{t} (g, h) \otimes t (h, \tilde{h} g h)
\]

and \( \hat{\rho}_k (a_{x, 0}) = \rho_k (a_{x, 0}) \), as expected, since the torsor method changes the fractionalization class while leaving the symmetry action on the \( g = 0 \) sector unchanged. Note that \( q \) can be vortex-valued when \( w (g, h) \neq w (h, g) \).

Ref. 19 presents diagrammatic expressions for the \( R \)-, \( U \)-, and \( \eta \)-symbols of the torsored theory analogous to Eq. (374) for the \( F \)-symbols. Here we summarize the result of evaluating these expressions for FSPT phases. The \( \hat{R} \)-symbols can be written as

\[
\hat{R}_{c_{gh}} = R'_{c_{gh}} F_{c_{gh}} q_{g,h} c_{gh} \left( F_{c_{gh}}^{q_{g,h} a_{b'h}} \right)^{-1} e_{c_{gh}} a_g
\]

where \( a'_{gh} = \tilde{t} (g, h) \otimes a_g, c'_{gh} = \tilde{t} (h, \tilde{h} g h) \otimes c_{gh}, \) and \( c''_{gh} = \tilde{t} (g, h) \otimes c_{gh}. \)

The \( \hat{U} \)-symbols can be written explicitly as

\[
\hat{U}_k (a_g, b_{gh}; c_{gh}) = \frac{\chi (g, k, \tilde{k} h k) U_k \left( a'_{gh} b'_{gh}; c''_{gh} \right) U_k \left( k \alpha (k, \tilde{k} g k, \tilde{k} h k), c''_{gh}, c'_{gh} \right) U_k \left( \alpha (h, k), \tilde{s} (q (h, k)) \right)}{\chi (g, h, k) \chi (k, \tilde{k} g k, \tilde{k} h k) U_k \left( a'_{gh} b'_{gh}; c''_{gh} \right) U_k \left( k \alpha (k, \tilde{k} g k, \tilde{k} h k), c''_{gh}, c'_{gh} \right) U_k \left( \alpha (h, k), \tilde{s} (q (h, k)) \right)}
\]

where \( a'_{gh} = \tilde{q} (g, k) \otimes a_g, b'_{gh} = \tilde{q} (h, k) \otimes b_g, c'_{gh} = \tilde{q} (g, k) \otimes c_{gh}, c''_{gh} = \tilde{q} (g, h) \otimes c_{gh}, c''_{gh} = \tilde{q} (g, k) \otimes c''_{gh}, \) and \( c''_{gh} = \tilde{q} (g, k) \otimes c''_{gh}. \)

The explicit expression for the \( \hat{\eta} \)-symbols is

\[
\hat{\eta}_0 (g, h) = \frac{\chi (g, \tilde{k} g k, \tilde{k} h k) \chi (g, \tilde{k} g k, \tilde{k} h k) \eta_{a_k} (g, h)}{\chi (g, h, \tilde{k} g k, \tilde{k} h k) \chi (g, \tilde{k} g k, \tilde{k} h k) \eta_{a_k} (g, h)}
\]

where \( a'_{gh} = \tilde{q} (g, k) \otimes a_k, a''_{gh} = \tilde{q} (h, k) \otimes a_k, \) and \( a''_{gh} = \tilde{q} (g, h) \otimes a_k. \) We point out that,

\[
\hat{\eta}_{a_{x, 0}} (g, h) = \eta_{a_{x, 0}} (g, h) M_{a_{x, 0}} (g, h).
\]

Note that \( \chi \) appears in Eqs. (380)-(385) in precisely the same way as the 3-cocycle \( a \in Z^3 (G, U(1)) \) in the topological data of a bosonic SPT phase \( \text{SPT}_G^{[a]} \) in Eqs. (323)-
Therefore, it follows that shifting $X \to \alpha X$ is equivalent to gluing in a bosonic SPT phase

$$F_{\alpha} \alpha X = \text{SPT}_G \mathbb{Z}^2 \boxtimes F_{\alpha} X,$$

where $\alpha X$ denotes multiplication in $C^3(G, \mathbb{Z}^2)$. Thus, the most general classification of $K$ is given by $\rho: K \to \text{Aut} \left( \mathbb{Z}^2 \right)$, with $\mathbb{Z}^2$ the subset of cochain triples, and so we only consider those that classify FSPT phases.

Finally, we extract a minimal set of data needed to specify a FSPT phase. We first pick a symmetry action $\rho: G \to \text{Aut} \left( \mathbb{Z}^2 \right)$, with $\mathbb{Z}^2$ the subset of cochain triples, and so we only consider those that classify FSPT phases. The symmetry action is determined by a group homomorphism $\pi: \pi \in H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}^V)$. The symmetry action on objects in $K$ is given by $\rho_p(a_x) = \psi^\pi x \otimes a_x$. Thus, the choice of symmetry action uniquely fixes the base theory $B_{G,\pi}$ to which we apply the torsor functor. Next, we specify the vortex symmetry fractionalization class relative to the base theory through the 2-cocycle $t \in Z^2(G, A)$. Writing $t = \psi^w$, the cocycle condition for $t$ presented in Eq. (370) becomes

$$d \psi = \psi^a w,$$

with $a \in C^2(G, \mathbb{Z}^V)$. This is the simplest example of a $[\psi^w]$ obstruction presented in Eq. (184) and computed for the present case in Eq. (205). Lastly, we specify the defectification class with

$$d \chi = O_T(p_w).$$

The classification of $G$-crossed MTCs guarantees the torsor method generates the topological data of every FSPT phase. It follows that the most general $G$-crossed FSPT phase $\mathcal{F}_{\psi^w, X}(B_{G,\pi})$ can be parameterized by the triple

$$\left( \chi, p, \pi \right)_w.$$  

In the next section, we will generate the group law of $G$-crossed FSPT phases for fixed $w$ using general properties of the torsor method. Before doing so, we account for the relabeling redundancy in the triples mentioned above.

### 3. Equivalence relations

Naively distinct $G$-crossed FSPT theories may be equivalent under certain conditions. For example, we saw that any two bosonic SPT phases whose topological data are related by a 3-coboundary are equivalent. This produces the equivalence relation

$$(\chi, p, \pi)_w \sim (\chi + dv, p, \pi)_w$$

where $v \in C^2(G, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$. More generally, the cohomological classification of $G$-crossed theories can be reduced due to relabelings, as discussed in Sec. IV. As the torsor method presented above utilizes this classification, not all of the FSPT theories generated by the formulas of the previous sections are necessarily distinct. Rather, some of these theories can be identified using generalized versions of the relabeling equivalences encountered for $G = \mathbb{Z}^I$ FSPT phases in Sec. V.B.2.

Relabeling topological charges within a fixed $g$-sector will always result in a physically equivalent theory representing the same FSPT phase, possibly with a distinct cataloging of topological data. The goal here is to understand how the triple of cochains $(\chi, p, \pi)_w$, which label a representative of every FSPT phase, are related under such relabelings. Consequently, we only need to consider the relabelings which preserve the set of admissible cochain triples. Within each $g$-sector, the relabeling can be either trivial (sending $a_g \to a_g$), or nontrivial (sending $a_g \to \psi^g_a a_g$). Thus, we recognize a relabeling as a $\psi^g_a$-valued 1-cochain \( z \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}^2) \), sending $a_g \to [\delta(g)] a_g$. We require that the relabeling does not interchange the vacuum and physical fermion, implying the 1-cochain is normalized. Moreover, we require the relabeling to preserve the set of cochain triples, and so we only consider the subset

$$\mathcal{X} \subset C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}^2) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Y} \subset C^1(\mathbb{Z}^I, \mathbb{Z}^2).$$

Such normalized 1-cochains can be lifted to normalized $C^1(\mathbb{Z}^I, \mathbb{Z}^2)$ through the maps $g \mapsto (x, g)$ and $x \mapsto (x, g)$, respectively. Both types of relabelings can be physically motivated. The relabeling $\mathcal{X}$ is the standard relabeling we expect from the vortex symmetry fractionalization classification discussed in Sec. III. The relabeling $\mathcal{Y}$ can be understood as saying that it should not matter which vortex in $K$ we label as $I_1$. The goal now is to develop the equivalence relations which appear in the (generalized) cohomology theory that classify FSPT phases, which we discuss in Sec. VIA. For a fixed $G$, since the FSPT phases are labeled by triples $(\chi, p, \pi)_w$, this amounts to saying when two triples are related by a relabeling of the corresponding theory, up to vertex basis and fermionic symmetry action gauge transformations.

The first type of relabeling sends,

$$a_{x,g} \to [\delta(g)] a_x \quad (395)$$

and can modify the symmetry fractionalization and defectification classes by a coboundary. In Ref. 19, it was shown that such a relabeling is equivalent to a torsor $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda,z}$ with

$$\mathcal{Z}_3(g, h, k) = \eta \delta(g, h) \delta(h, k) \mathcal{Z}_3(g, h)$$

where we have used that $\mathcal{Y}$ is valued in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Writing $\mathcal{Y}(g) = \psi^g(g)$, we find

$$\mathcal{Z}_3 = (-1)^{w(x)+x \cdot d} \cdot \mathcal{Z}_3.$$  

We can also pull the relabeling equivalence into the function, yielding an equivalence of functors under $\mathcal{Y}(g)$ relabelings given by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\delta, \mathcal{Z}_3} \circ \mathcal{F}_{\psi^w, X} = \mathcal{F}_{\psi^w, \lambda \cdot \mathcal{Z}_3}.$$  

(398)
We can now use this relation to indicate when two theories are equivalent, that is
\[(\chi, p, \pi)_w \sim (\chi + \frac{1}{2}(dz_1 p + w \cup z + z \cup dz), p + dz, \pi)_w.\]

We remark that even if \(d_z = I_0\), the relabeling can result in a nontrivial modification of the defectification class, given by the 3-cocycle \(\frac{1}{2}w \cup z\). Notice we can account for the asymmetry by using that \([w \cup z] = [z \cup w] = w \cup z + d(w \cup z)\). In particular, such a relabeling is only nontrivial when \(G^f\) is a nontrivial \(\mathbb{Z}_2\) extension of \(G\).

The second type of relabeling sends
\[a_{x, g} \rightarrow y'(x)a_{x, g}.\]

There are only two options for \(y'\), either it is trivial, or \(y'(1) = \psi_0\). This relabeling is related to the fact that every FMTC has the vortex permuting symmetry \(a_z \rightarrow \psi_0 a_z\). One can again pull back the relabeling identifications from Ref. 19 on the torsor functor, and, after applying the gauge transformation \(g^{a_{x, g}, b_y, h}_{c \times y \times w(g, b), gh} = (-1)^{x \cdot y}\), find
\[(\chi, p, \pi)_w \sim (\chi + \frac{1}{2}(w \cup_1 p), p + w, \pi)_w.\]

Notice that this equivalence relation is trivial when \(w\) is trivial.

Gathering these results, we can denote equivalence classes of \(G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times_w G\) FSPT phases
\[[\chi, p, \pi]_w\]
defined by the relations in Eqs. (393), (399), and (401). In the following section, we classify \([\chi, p, \pi]_w\) under fermionic stacking. This classification can be interpreted as defining a generalized cohomology [55].

### VI. CLASSIFICATION OF FERMIONIC SYMMETRY ENRICHED TOPOLOGICAL PHASES

We present the \(G^f\)-crossed classification of FSET phases. We first derive the group \(G^{(3,2,1)}\) formed by FSPT phases under fermionic stacking, making contact with previous results obtained using alternate formalisms. We then explain how this group fits into the multi-stage torsorial classification of FSET phases. We emphasize similarities and differences to the bosonic case, elucidating how the additional obstructions and associated torsors appearing for symmetric fermionic topological phases (Table III) can be absorbed into the richer structure of FSPT phases compared to their bosonic counterparts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(G^{(3,2,1)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G^{(3)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G^{(3,2)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G^{(2)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G^{(1)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G^{(2,1)})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE VIII.** Classifying groups appearing in Sec. VI A for \(G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times_w G\) FSPT phases. The superscript indices on \(G\) indicate which cochains are used to describe the corresponding group elements. Each group is a function of the fermionic symmetry group \(G^f\), so depends on the specified \(G\) and \(w\). |

### A. Classification of FSPT Phases

In this section, we show that fermionic stacking FSPT phases is an Abelian operation that results in a group structure on the classification of fermionic theories analogous to (yet more complicated than) the \(H^3(G, U(1))\) torsorial structure of bosonic theories under stacking bosonic SPT phases. Using the parameterization of \(G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times_w G\) FSPT phases by equivalence classes of the triples \([\chi, p, \pi]_w\) defined in Eq. (402), we derive the fermionic stacking relation
\[\left[\chi, p, \pi\right]_w = \left[\chi', p', \pi'\right]_w \mathcal{G}[\chi'', p'', \pi'']_w = \left[\chi' + \chi'' + \lambda(p', \pi'; p'', \pi''), p' + p'' + \pi' + \pi''\right]_w\]
for some 3-cochain \(\lambda \in C^3(G, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})\) that is subject to a consistency condition reported in Eq. (421). We show the triples \([\chi, p, \pi]_w\) form the group of FSPT phases \(G^{(3,2,1)}\), with group operation Eq. (403). We show the group \(G^{(3,2,1)}\) takes a universal form given by,
\[G^{(3,2,1)} \cong G^{(3)} \times_{\xi(3,2,1)} \left(G^{(2)} \times_{\xi(2,3)} G^{(1)}\right)\]
where \(G^{(3)}, G^{(2)}\), and \(G^{(1)}\) are various classifying groups which can be used to understand \(G^{(3,2,1)}\), see Table VIII for their interpretations. We determine the central extension \(\xi(3,2,1)\) in several cases and \(\xi(2,1)\) in all cases using condensation.

We first discuss general properties of \([\chi, p, \pi]_w\). In Sec. VI A 1, we assume Eq. (403) and prove that it defines group multiplication for the group \(G^{(3,2,1)}\) of \(G^f\).
FSPT phases. The following Secs. VI A 2–VI A 4 build up to Eq. (403) by considering a nested structure of subgroups. We summarize the classifying groups appearing in this section in Table VIII in the order in which they are encountered. The notation we use is meant to convey the relevant \(n\)-cochains participating in the specified group. For example, elements of \(G^{(3,2,1)}\) are labeled by 3-, 2-, and 1-\(\text{cochains, indicated by the superscript } (3,2,1).\) We will use the same convention throughout this section, so that, for example if only 2- and 1-\(\text{cochains participate in a particular group, we will denote the group by } G^{(2,1)}.\) The simplest subgroup \(G^{(3)}\) corresponds to the equivalence classes \([\chi, 0, 0]_w\) of the FSPT phases that differ from the identity \((0, 0, 0)\) by gluing in a bosonic SPT phase. These theories form a subgroup of \(G^{(3,2)},\) the group of FSPT phases \([\chi, \rho, 0]_w\) with trivial symmetry action, which in turn forms a subgroup of \(G^{(3,2,1)}\). As condensation is commutative by definition, all subgroups are Abelian and

\[
G^{(3)} \subset G^{(3,2)} \subset G^{(3,2,1)}. \tag{405}
\]

At each step, we define the group under consideration by specifying its elements and group multiplication, and relate it to the group from the previous step of the calculation.

When deriving the group multiplication of \(G^d\) FSPT phases, we need to fix the 2-cocycle \(w \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d)\) defining \(G^d\), rather than just the cohomology class \([w] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d)\). As noted in Sec. IV C, while 2-cocycles \(w\) and \(w'\) related by a coboundary define isomorphic groups \(G^d \cong G^{d'}\), extending the isomorphism to the \(G^d\)-crossed SMTCs can result in physically inequivalent theories. It is therefore important to work with fixed \(w\), for example, when demonstrating the existence of an identity element in the classifying group.

Next, we collect several properties of the triple of cochains specifying a \(G^d\) FSPT phase. The previous section demonstrated that every \(G^d\) FSPT phase can be parameterized by a triple of cochains

\[
(\chi, \rho, \pi)_w \in C^3(G, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \times C^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d) \times Z^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d), \tag{406}
\]

where

\[
\rho = v^\pi \in Z^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d), \tag{407}
\]

\[
p_w = \psi_0^p \otimes I_1^w \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d), \tag{408}
\]

\[
\chi = e^{2\pi i \rho} \in C^3(G, U(1)). \tag{409}
\]

Written in this way, the group structure of the triple of cochains is additive. The cochains are subject to the conditions

\[
d\pi = 0, \tag{410}
\]

\[
d\rho = \pi \cup w, \tag{411}
\]

\[
d\chi = 0, (\psi_0^p \otimes I_1^w, \pi)^{-1}. \tag{412}
\]

Here, we have explicitly included the symmetry action dependence in \(O_r\), as we will use combinations of \(O_r\) that involve distinct symmetry actions. Recall that this data specifies the \(G^d\)-crossed SMTC relative to a base theory \(B_{G, \pi} = (0, 0, \pi)_0\) through an application of the torsor functor

\[
(\chi, \rho, \pi)_w = F_{p_w, \pi}(B_{G, \pi}), \tag{413}
\]

using the torsor method of Ref. 19 (reviewed in Sec. VC 2) with the relative vortex symmetry fractionalization class \(p_w\) and relative defectification class \(\chi\). Explicitly evaluating the obstructions for these, we find

\[
O_r(\psi_0^p \otimes I_1^w, \pi) = e^{2\pi i \rho} \cup p + w \cup \pi \cup (p \cup \pi) \cup (p \cup \pi) \cup w. \tag{414}
\]

These triples of cochains labeling FSPT theories can be sorted into equivalence classes

\[
[\chi, \rho, \pi]_w \tag{415}
\]

defined by the equivalence relations of Sec. VC 3:

\[
(\chi, \rho, \pi)_w \sim (\chi + d\nu, \rho, \pi)_w \tag{416}
\]

\[
\sim (\chi + \frac{1}{2} (d\nu \cup w \cup z \cup z \cup dz, p + dz, \pi)_w \tag{417}
\]

\[
\sim (\chi + \frac{1}{2} \nu \cup w, p, p + w, \pi)_w, \tag{418}
\]

for \(z \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^d)\) and \(v \in C^2(G, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})\). Note that there are no equivalence relations on \(\pi\), as changing the symmetry action would be physically detectable.

1. FSPT phases form a group via stacking

We first assume that Eq. (403) is true and use general properties of condensation (reviewed in Appendix E) to show that this stacking relation is a group operation on the equivalence classes of FSPT theories with fixed \(w\). For this, we need to show that the operation maps FSPT theories back to FSPT theories, that the operation is associative, that there is an identity element, and that each element has an inverse. Associativity of stacking follows from the fact that there is a unique way to identify physical fermions when multiple theories are stacked, as discussed in Sec. IV D; we relegate the more technical details of this to Appendix F. By definition, stacking is also commutative.

We now check that stacking two FSPT theories yields an FSPT theory by verifying that the right hand side of Eq. (403) satisfies the conditions of FSPT triples. Eq. (410) is immediate, since \(d(\pi' + \pi'') = d\pi' + d\pi'' = 0\). Eq. (411) is shown by

\[
d(\rho' + \rho'' + \pi' \cup \pi'') = d\rho' + d\rho'' = (\pi' + \pi'') \cup w, \tag{419}
\]

where the details of this calculation are deferred to Appendix F. By definition, stacking is also commutative
which uses the fact that \( d(\pi' \cup \pi'') = 0 \). For Eq. (412), we must impose a consistency condition on the 3-cochain \( \lambda \). As with \( \chi \), we define both an additive and multiplicative version of \( \lambda \), related by
\[
y = e^{i2\pi\lambda} \in C^3(G, U(1)).
\]
Then, Eq. (412) implies that \( d\lambda = d\chi - d\chi'' \), which is equivalent to requiring that \( y \) satisfy
\[
dy = \frac{O_r(\psi_0^p \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{\pi'}, \pi')O_r(\psi_0^\pi \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{\pi'}, \pi')}{O_r(\psi_0^{p+\pi+\pi' \cup \pi''} \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{\pi'}, \pi')}. \tag{421}
\]
This determines \( y \), and hence \( \lambda \), up to a 3-cocycle. In Sec. VI A 4, we comment further on \( y \). Thus, the stacked theory is indeed a FSPT theory, when Eq. (421) is satisfied.

Next, we check that \([0, 0, 0]_w\) acts as the identity element under stacking. It is easy to see that for this to be true, Eq. (403) would require \( \lambda'(p', \pi'; 0, 0) \) to be a 3-cocycle. On the other hand Eq. (421) only implies that \( \lambda(p', \pi'; 0, 0) \) is a 3-cocycle, so a stronger constraint is needed. We derive such a constraint explicitly by computing the condensation in the fermionic stacking
\[
(\chi, p, \pi)_w \psi (0, 0, 0)_w, \tag{422}
\]
using the techniques reviewed in Appendix E. The explicit topological data for the \((0, 0, 0)_w\) FSPT theory can be obtained from the torsor method, and is found to be
\[
a_g \otimes b_h = [ab]_{gh}, \tag{423}
\]
\[
F^{a_g}b_h=c_i = (-1)^{a \cdot w(h, k)}, \tag{424}
\]
\[
R^{a_g}b_h = (-1)^{(a+\pi+x \cdot w(g, h)) \cdot h}, \tag{425}
\]
\[
U_{k}(a_g, b_h) = (-1)^{a \cdot [w(h, k) + w(k, \bar{k})h k]}, \tag{426}
\]
\[
\eta_{c_i}(g, h) = (-1)^{w(g, h) \cdot c}. \tag{427}
\]
We pick a representative set of simple objects of the condensed theory given by \( \mathcal{G}_g = \{a_g, \mathcal{I}_g\} \). One can check that each such objects braids trivially with the condensate, and that the representative set \( \{\mathcal{G}_g\} \) is in one-to-one correspondence with the set of simple objects of the \((\chi, p, \pi)_w\) FSPT theory. One can also check that the \( \mathcal{G}_g \) have identical fusion rules to the \( a_g \). From the above data, we see that by restricting to the representative charges \( \mathcal{I}_g \), the \( F_- \), \( R_- \), \( U_- \), and \( \eta \)-symbols from the \((0, 0, 0)_w\) theory are all equal to 1. As such, the topological data of the condensed theory are identical to that of the \((\chi, p, \pi)_w\) theory, and thus
\[
(\chi, p, \pi)_w \psi (0, 0, 0)_w = (\chi, p, \pi)_w. \tag{428}
\]
Finally, we show that every FSPT theory \([\chi, p, \pi]_w\) has an inverse theory \([\chi, p, \pi]_w^{-1}\), which we defined by the representative
\[
(\chi, p, \pi)_w^{-1} = (-\chi - \lambda(p, \pi; p + \pi + \pi, \pi), p + \pi + \pi, \pi)_w, \tag{429}
\]
which also satisfies the conditions in Eqs. (410), (411), and (412) necessary to represent a valid FSPT phase. The first condition, \( d\lambda = 0 \) is immediately satisfied. The second condition, \( d(p + (\pi + \pi)) = \pi + \pi \) is satisfied by using the fact that \( d(\pi + \pi) = 0 \). The third condition,
\[
d(\chi y(p, \pi; p + \pi + \pi, \pi, \pi))^{-1}
\]
\[
= (d\chi)^{-1}(dy(p, \pi; p + \pi + \pi, \pi))^{-1}
\]
\[
= O_r(\psi_0^p \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{\pi'}, \pi')O_r(\psi_0^\pi \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{\pi'}, \pi')O_r(\psi_0^{p+\pi+\pi} \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{\pi'}, \pi')^{-1}
\]
\[
= O_r(\psi_0^p \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{\pi'}, \pi')^{-1}. \tag{430}
\]
This follows from Eq. (421) and the fact that \( O_r(\mathcal{I}_1^{\pi'}, 0) = 1 \). Then, using Eq. (403), we have
\[
[\chi, p, \pi]_w \psi (\chi, p, \pi)_w = [0, 0, 0]_w. \tag{431}
\]
Hence, every theory \((\chi, p, \pi)_w\) has an inverse given by Eq. (429).

It follows that fermionic stacking of FSPT theories forms an Abelian group \( G^{(3, 2, 1)} \). We now establish Eq. (403) is indeed the structure provided by fermionic stacking FSPT theories.

### 2. FSPT phases with trivial symmetry action and relative fractionalization class

Consider the FSPT phases
\[
[\chi, 0, 0]_w = \text{SPT}^{[\chi]}_G \boxtimes [0, 0, 0]_w, \tag{432}
\]
that differ from the identity \([0, 0, 0]_w\) by a bosonic SPT phase \( \text{SPT}^{[\chi]}_G \) where \([\chi] \in H^3(G, U(1)) \) (recall \( \chi = e^{i2\pi\chi} \)). It is straightforward to check that this triple satisfies Eqs. (410), (411), and (412). The topological data of \([\chi, 0, 0]_w\) is given by that of \([0, 0, 0]_w\) multiplied by the appropriate \( \chi \) factors of \( \text{SPT}^{[\chi]}_G \). Stacking such a FSPT theory with a general FSPT theory thus yields
\[
[\chi + \chi', p, \pi]_w = [\chi, p, \pi]_w \psi [\chi', 0, 0]_w \tag{433}
\]
\[
= \text{SPT}^{[\chi']}_G \boxtimes [\chi, p, \pi]_w. \tag{434}
\]
We can verify this following a nearly identical line of arguments to the paragraph following Eq. (422), except the topological data of the \([\chi', 0, 0]_w\) theory introduces the corresponding \( \chi' \) factors of \( \text{SPT}^{[\chi']}_G \).

In particular, this implies
\[
[\chi', 0, 0]_w \psi [\chi'', 0, 0]_w = [\chi' + \chi'', 0, 0]_w. \tag{435}
\]

Therefore, the set of equivalence classes of the \([\chi, 0, 0]_w\) FSPT theories form a subgroup \( G^{(3)} \) of \( G^{(3, 2, 1)} \).

In the absence of the equivalence relation Eq. (417), the set \( \{[\chi, 0, 0]_w\} \) is in one-to-one correspondence
with bosonic SPT phases, and thus forms the group $H^3(G, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$. However, fermionic degrees of freedom impose additional equivalences that change this result. In particular, applying Eq. (417) with $z \in Z^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ equates

$$[0, 0, 0]_w = \left[ \frac{1}{2} w \cup z, 0, 0 \right]_w. \quad (436)$$

Thus, even though $\text{SPT}^{[-1]^{w}}_G$ may be a nontrivial bosonic SPT phase, it can be trivialized by the fermionic degrees of freedom. The group $G^{(3)}$ is given by the quotient

$$G^{(3)} = \frac{H^3(G, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})}{\text{im}(\frac{1}{2}w)}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (437)

Here, we define the map

$$\left[ \frac{1}{2} w \cup : H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2) \to H^3(G, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}), \quad (438)$$

$z \mapsto \left[ \frac{1}{2} w \cup z \right] \right.$. \hspace{1cm} (439)

The group $G^{(3)}$ has multiplication inherited from $H^3(G, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$.

Lastly, as $G^{(3)} \leq G^{(3,2,1)}$, we can place $G^{(3,2,1)}$ into a short exact sequence,

$$0 \to G^{(3)} \to G^{(3,2,1)} \to G^{(2,1)} \to 0, \quad (440)$$

where the quotient group

$$G^{(2,1)} = \frac{G^{(3,2,1)}}{G^{(3)}}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (441)

is given by FSPT phases modulo bosonic SPT phases. The notation of $G^{(2,1)}$ indicates that its elements consist of equivalence classes of 1- and 2-cochains $[\pi, p]_w$, where each representative $(\pi, p)_w$ admits an $X$ satisfying Eq. (412). We centralize the group operation of $G^{(2,1)}$ in Sec. VI.A.4. The central extension in Eq. (440) is specified by an element of $Z^2(G^{(2,1)}, G^{(3)})$ that can be determined by $\lambda$.

3. FSPT phases with trivial symmetry action

The next class of FSPT phases we consider are those with trivial symmetry action, but possibly nontrivial vortex fractionalization class, that is $\{[\chi, p, 0]_w\}$. With fixed $G^I$ determined by $w \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, these theories are determined by the 2-cocycle $p \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and a 3-cochain $X \in C^3(G, U(1))$ satisfying $[56]

$$dX = \Theta (\psi_0^p \otimes \mathcal{I}_w^0, 0)^{-1} = (-1)^{p\cup p + p \cup w}. \quad (442)$$

Equivalently, $dX = \frac{1}{2}(p \cup p + p \cup w)$.

Stacking two FSPT phases with trivial symmetry action necessarily results in a theory with trivial symmetry action

$$[\chi, p, 0]_w = [\chi', p', 0]_w \oplus [\chi'', p'', 0]_w, \quad (443)$$

as the resulting symmetry action of the condensed theory is inherited from the product of the symmetry actions of the parent theories. Therefore, these theories form a subgroup $G^{(3,2)}$ of $G^{(3,2,1)}$. We specify $G^{(3,2)}$ by solving for $p$ and $X$ in terms of $p'$, $p''$, $X'$, $X''$. The condensation calculation proceeds as follows. (1) We pick a representative set of simple objects from which we can compute the fusion rules, thereby determining $p$. (2) We specify the fusion spaces for our representative objects, from which we can determine $X$ by computing the $F$-symbol of the stacked theory. Our calculation extends the condensation calculation of Ref. 6 to include all possible $G^I$.

For (1), we take our representative set of simple objects to be

$$\overline{a}_g = \overline{a}_{x,g} \equiv (a_{x,g}, x_{x,g}),$$ \hspace{1cm} (444)

where the right side is written in terms of the objects of the stacked theories. The fusion rules follow from

$$\overline{a}_g \otimes \overline{b}_k = (a_g \otimes b_k, \mathcal{I}_g \otimes \mathcal{I}_k) \quad (445)$$

$$= (\left[\psi^0(p, h)_0 a b \mathcal{I}_{g}, \psi^0(p', (h')_0 a b \mathcal{I}_{g}\right] \quad (446)$$

$$\equiv \left[\psi^0(p, h)_0 + p', (h')_0 a b \mathcal{I}_{g}\right],$$ \hspace{1cm} (447)

where the last step uses $(\psi_0^0(p, h), \psi_0^0(p', h')) \equiv (\psi_0^0(p, h) + p', \mathcal{I}_0)$ to transform the second line into a representative simple object, i.e., into the form of Eq. (444). Therefore, we see that

$$p = p' + p''.$$

For (2), we need to pick a representative of the fusion space, and then compute the $F$-symbol, from which we can extract $X$. We take

$$F^0_g (p, e, i) \mathcal{X}_e \equiv \chi'(g, h, k) \mathcal{X}''(g, h, k)$$

$$\times (-1)^{5}(p'(g, h) + p''(g, h)) \quad (450)$$

where again we have used that $(\psi_0^0(p, h), \psi_0^0(p', h')) \equiv (\psi_0^0(p, h) + p', \mathcal{I}_0)$. Now we can compute the $F$-symbol of the condensed theory using the techniques described in Appendix E. By direct computation, one finds

$$F^0_g (p, e, i) \equiv \chi'(g, h, k) \mathcal{X}''(g, h, k)$$

\hspace{1cm} (449)
In order to extract $X$ from Eq. (450), we need to write the condensed theory as a torsor of a base theory, recalling that $(\chi, p, \pi)_w = F_{\rho_x, \pi}(BG, \pi)$. To recognize the $F$-symbol as one resulting from the torsor method, we apply the vortex basis gauge transformation [6]

$$\Gamma^{\tilde{a}_x} = (-1)^{3(3+\tilde{a})} p''(g, h) p''(g, h)$$

(451)

and use the relation

$$d(p'') = (-1)p'' \cup p'''.$$

(452)

Together, these transform the $F$-symbol to

$$\tilde{F}_{\tilde{a}_x, \tilde{a}_0} = \chi'(g, h, k) \chi''(g, h, k) (1)p'' \cup p''(g, h, k) \times (-1)^{3(p'(g, h, k) \cup p''(g, h, k) + w(g, h, k))},$$

(453)

corresponding to the torsored $F$-symbol for $F_{\psi', \psi''} \circ \Delta \chi'(g, k, g) \chi''(g,h,k)(1)p'' \cup p''(g, h, k)$

The classification of $G$-crossed MTCs by their symmetry fractionalization class and defectification class implies that gauge transformations exist to translate the $R$, $U_-$, and $\eta$-symbols into the form given by the torsor method.

Thus, we conclude that

$$[\chi', p', 0]_w = \tilde{\chi}'(\gamma'', p'', 0)_w$$

$$= [\chi' + \chi'' + \frac{1}{2} p' \cup_1 p'', p' + p'', 0]_w.$$  

(454)

This implies

$$\lambda(p', 0; p'', 0) \sim \frac{1}{2} p' \cup_1 p''$$

(455)

where the equivalence is up to a 3-coboundary. We note that the right hand side of Eq. (454) is not strictly symmetric in $p'$ and $p''$, but it is up to a coboundary, i.e.

$$p' \cup_1 p'' = p'' \cup_1 p' + d(p' \cup_2 p''),$$

so it is consistent with commutativity of stacking. It is straightforward to check that this $\lambda$ satisfies Eq. (421) for this case, given Eq. (442).

Finally, while Eq. (454) fully specifies $G^{(3,2)}$, we can further understand the group structure by noting that $p$ and $w$ fix $X$ up to an element of $G^{(3)}$. Therefore, we can consider the subgroup

$$G^{(3,2)} = G^{(2)} \circ H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^w),$$

(457)

consisting of the vortex symmetry fractionalization classes with trivial symmetry action, for which the defectification obstruction vanishes. Mathematically, $G^{(2)}$ is the set of 2-cocycles for which $\mathcal{O}_{\psi}(\psi_0^w \otimes \mathbb{I}_n, 0)$ is a coboundary. In Ref. 57, $G^{(2)}$ was denoted $BH^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. We can place the group $G^{(3,2)}$ into a short exact sequence given by,

$$0 \to G^{(3)} \to G^{(3,2)} \to G^{(2)} \to 0.$$  

(458)

The central extension here is specified by an element of $Z^2(G^{(2)}, G^{(3)})$ that can be determined by $\lambda$.

4. General FSPT phases

We now consider stacking two general FSPT phases

$$[\chi, p, \pi]_w = [\chi', p', \pi']_w \otimes [\chi'', p'', \pi'']_w.$$  

(459)

To derive $[\chi, p, \pi]_w$, it is helpful to break the group law into simpler pieces. First, we compute the quotient groups $G^{(1)} \equiv G^{(3,2,1)}/G^{(3,2)}$ and $G^{(2,1)} \equiv G^{(3,2,1)}/G^{(3)}$, which determine part of the structure of $G^{(3,2,1)}$. To completely specify the group, we need a general formula for $\eta$. Ref. 28 provided such a solution when $w = 0$, which we quote below. However, we lack an explicit closed form expression for $\eta$ in the case of general $w$.

The first quotient $G^{(3,2,1)}/G^{(3,2)}$ is the group of FSPT phases modulo FSPT phases with trivial symmetry action. This is the set of unobstructed symmetry actions, i.e. $\rho_\pi = \psi^{\pi}(g)$ with $\pi \in H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^w)$, for which there exist $p$ and $X$ such that $dp = \pi \cup w$ and $dX = \mathcal{O}_\pi(\psi_0^w \otimes \mathbb{I}_n, \pi)$. We denote the set of unobstructed symmetry actions by $G^{(1)}$. Now consider two unobstructed symmetry actions $\pi'$ and $\pi''$. To determine $\pi$, we simply look at how the symmetry acts on the quasiparticle and vortex sectors of the condensed theory. Again working with the representatives $(a_x, 0, \mathcal{I}_x, 0)$ of the post-condensation charges $\tilde{a}_x, 0$, we have

$$\rho_\pi((a_x, 0, \mathcal{I}_x)) = (\rho_\pi(a_x), \rho_\pi(\mathcal{I}_x)) = ([\psi^{\pi'}(g)]_x, [\psi^{\pi''}(g)]_x) = (\psi^{\pi'}(g) \cdot \psi^{\pi''}(g) \cdot x \otimes a_x, \mathcal{I}_x).$$

(460)

From this, we see that $\rho_\pi = \psi^{\pi'}(g) \cdot \psi^{\pi''}(g)$, and thus

$$\pi = \pi' + \pi''.$$  

(461)

Clearly $d \pi = d \pi' + d \pi'' = 0$. Hence,

$$G^{(3,2,1)}/G^{(3,2)} \equiv G^{(1)} \subset H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^w).$$

(462)

We also note that $G^{(3,2,1)}/G^{(3,2)} = G^{(2,1)}/G^{(2)}$.

Determining the 2-cochain $\rho$ requires a bit more work. In Sec. III D 1 we observed that symmetry fractionalization classes of $K^{(0)}$ are completely determined by

$$\rho_\pi = \psi^{\pi}(g),$$

(463)

$$U_\pi(a_x, b_y) = (-1)^{\pi(g) \cdot (a + x) \cdot y},$$

(464)

$$\eta_{a_x}(g, h) = i^{\pi(g) \cdot \pi(h) \cdot (a + x) \cdot w(g, h)}.$$  

(465)

These three pieces of data determine the symmetry fractionalization class of $K^{(0)}$; moreover, this standardizes the presentation of the data so that we can readily extract differences of symmetry fractionalization classes.

We now determine $p$ by computing the vortex symmetry fractionalization class of the condensed theory. The initial topological data coming from condensation will not be of the form Eq. (464) and (465), but rather it
will differ by a suitable symmetry action gauge transformation. We again use the representative simple objects \( a_x \). The fusion space of the condensed theory is represented by \( \overline{\mathcal{V}}_{\text{[(\rho g)ax gly]}} \). With the representative fusion spaces, we can compute the symmetry action \( \rho_g \). Up to isomorphism, the symmetry action \( \rho_g \) is given by \( \rho_g \otimes \rho_g \). However, \( \rho_g \otimes \rho_g \) will not, in general, take representative topological charges to representative topological charges. Hence, additional \((\psi_0, \psi_0)\) isomorphisms must be introduced in order to relate the resulting topological charges back to the representatives.

Thus, we define \( \rho_g \) on the trivalent fusion spaces \( \overline{\mathcal{V}}_{\text{[(\rho g)ax gly]}} \) by the diagrammatic equation

\[
\rho_g(\overline{a_x} \overline{b_y}) = U_g(\mathcal{S} a_x, \mathcal{S} b_y) U^\dagger_g(\mathcal{S} I_x, \mathcal{S} I_y) \rho_g(\overline{a_x} \overline{b_y} \rho_g \otimes \rho_g) \delta_{\psi_0, \psi_0}(\psi_0, \psi_0) \pi(x) \pi(y) \rho_g(\overline{a_x} \overline{b_y}),
\]

where the additional \((\psi_0, \psi_0)\) correspond to the isomorphisms needed in order to remain within the set of representative objects of the condensed theory. We take the \((\psi_0, \psi_0)\) strands to the right in order to match our condensation conventions in App. E. The prefactors appear due to the parent symmetry actions. We can compute \( \rho_g \) through the relation Eq. (113) by evaluating the diagram on the right hand side of Eq. (466). The explicit form is not particularly illuminating; however, after applying a symmetry action gauge transformation given by

\[
\gamma_{\mathcal{P}x}(g) = (-1)^{a+\pi''}(g) \delta_{\pi'(g) + 1}(\pi''(g)),
\]

we obtain

\[
\overline{U}_g(a_x, b_y) = (-1)^{a+\pi'} \delta_{\pi'(g)},
\]

which takes the form of Eq. (464). The \( \eta \)-symbols of the condensed theory can be computed once we define the braiding

\[
\rho_g(\overline{a_x}) \rho_g(\overline{b_y}) = U_g(\mathcal{S} a_x, \mathcal{S} b_y) U^\dagger_g(\mathcal{S} I_x, \mathcal{S} I_y) \rho_g(\overline{a_x} \overline{b_y} \rho_g \otimes \rho_g) \delta_{\psi_0, \psi_0}(\psi_0, \psi_0) \pi(x) \pi(y) \rho_g(\overline{a_x} \overline{b_y}),
\]

where \( \rho_g \) is defined in Eq. (E10) of Appendix E. We also introduced an additional isomorphism given by the unlabeled line after the braid so that the braid takes representative simple objects to representative simple objects. The unlabeled line is given by \( (\psi_0'^0(g) \times \pi''(g) \times \pi'(g), \psi_0'') \).

Using this definition of the braid, one can explicitly compute \( \eta_{\mathcal{P}x}(g, h) \) using Eq. (274) to find,

\[
\overline{U}_{\mathcal{P}x}(g, h) = \eta_{\mathcal{P}x}(g, h) \eta_{\mathcal{P}x}''(g, h).
\]

Note that the simple product of \( \eta \)-symbols appearing on the right hand side is due to the gauge we have chosen in Eq. (464) for the \( U \)-symbols of the parent theory, in particular \( U_g(a_x, \psi_0) = 1 \). We can now insert Eq. (465) into Eq. (467), and apply the symmetry action gauge transformation Eq. (467), to find,

\[
\overline{U}_{\mathcal{P}x}(g, h) = \pi(\mathcal{G})(\mathcal{G})(-1)^{\delta_{\psi_0, \psi_0}(\psi_0, \psi_0) \pi(x) \pi(y) \rho_g(\overline{a_x} \overline{b_y})},
\]

where

\[
p = p' + p'' + \pi' \cup \pi''.
\]

In deriving this, we have used the property

\[
\pi(\mathcal{G})(\mathcal{G}) = \pi(\mathcal{G})(\mathcal{G}) \pi(x) \pi(y) \rho_g(\overline{a_x} \overline{b_y}),
\]

which appears due to the ratio of three \( \eta \)-symbols. Thus, we see that Eq. (472) provides the value of \( p \) under stacking, up to equivalences. Note that the right hand side is independent of \( w \) and agrees with Eq. (448) when \( \pi' = \pi'' = 0 \). The asymmetry can be accounted for by the fact that \( p \) is identified under \( \mathbb{Z}_2^\psi \)-valued coboundaries, and that

\[
d((\pi' \cup \pi'') = (\pi' \cup \pi'') \cup \pi').
\]

Our result agrees with the independent calculation done in Ref. 6 for \( w = 0 \), but our calculation shows it applies to the more general scenario of nontrivial \( w \).

The set of unobstructed symmetry actions and vortex fractionalization classes \( \{(p, \pi)_w\} \) form the group

\[
\frac{\mathcal{G}(3,2,1)}{\mathcal{G}(3)} \equiv \mathcal{G}(2,1),
\]

with group multiplication given by

\[
(p', \pi') \times (p'', \pi'') = (p' + p'' + \pi' \cup \pi'') \cup (\pi' + \pi'').
\]

We can describe \( \mathcal{G}(2,1) \) as a central extension in the short exact sequence

\[
0 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(3,2) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(3,2,1) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(3,2,1),
\]

with the extension class determined by \( \mathcal{U} \). Equivalently, \( \mathcal{G}(2,1) = \mathcal{G}(2) \times \mathcal{G}(2,1) \mathcal{G}(1) \) with \( \mathcal{Z}(2,1) = \mathcal{U} \). The extension class is universal, in the sense that it makes no reference to \( G \).
Lastly, we discuss the addition of the 3-cocycles. The 3-cocohains $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ can, in principle, be computed from the associator of the theory after condensation of the paired fermions. However, this is a tedious calculation for the general case. Nevertheless, by looking at the definition of the $F$-symbol of the condensed theory, given in Eq. (E14), we can make two observations: (1) we see that $\mathcal{X}'$ and $\mathcal{X}''$ appear multiplicatively in $F$, and therefore $\mathcal{X}$, since they appear multiplicatively in $F'$ and $F''$ (see Eq. (380)), and (2) the remaining data determining $F$ from condensation only involves $F$- and $R$-symbols from the parent theories that involve at least one $\psi$ strand. Therefore, $\mathcal{Y}$ is independent of $\mathcal{X}'$ and $\mathcal{X}''$, justifying why in Eq. (403) we write $\lambda(p', \pi'; p'', \pi'')$. We also comment that this is consistent with the generalized cohomology viewpoint of SPT phases (see, for example, Ref. 58, and references therein).

Recall that under stacking the set \{(p, \pi)\} forms the quotient group $G^{(2,1)}\cong G^{(3,2,1)}/G^{(3)}$. Therefore, the group of FSPT phases $G^{(3,2,1)}$ can be written as a central extension in the short exact sequence

$$0 \to G^{(3)} \to G^{(3,2,1)} \to G^{(2,1)} \to 0. \quad (478)$$

The 2-cocycle $\varepsilon_{(3,2,1)}$ in $Z^2(G^{(2,1)}, G^{(3)})$ determining the central extension is defined from $\mathcal{Y}$ through the relation

$$\mathcal{X} \sim \mathcal{X}'\mathcal{X}''\mathcal{Y}(p', \pi'; p'', \pi''), \quad (479)$$

where equivalence is up to coboundaries. Recall that this relation combined with Eq. (412), imposes Eq. (421).

The condensation calculation required to move beyond Eq. (479) to find an explicit expression for $\mathcal{Y}$ when $\pi$ is nontrivial is challenging and we do not pursue it here. However, when $w = 0$, the total obstruction dramatically simplifies to

$$d\mathcal{X} = O(\psi_0^p \otimes \mathbb{I}_0, \pi)^{-1} = (-1)^{p_1+p_2}. \quad (480)$$

In this case, Ref. 28 provided a solution explicitly determining the group law using the Pontryagin dual of the spin bordism group. Here, we report their results in the context of $G^a$-crossed theories. More explicitly, we compute $d\mathcal{X} = d[y\mathcal{X}\mathcal{X}']$ to find

$$d\mathcal{Y} = (-1)^{p_1+p_4+p_3+p_5+p_6+p_7+p_8+p_9+p_10+p_11+p_12+p_13}. \quad (481)$$

One can check that a solution is given by [28]

$$\mathcal{Y} = (-1)^{p_1+p_4+p_3+p_5+p_6+p_7+p_8+p_9+p_10+p_11+p_12+p_13}. \quad (482)$$

Note that the sign of the square root can be flipped by multiplying by the (possibly nontrivial) 3-cocycle $(-1)^{p_1+p_4+p_3+p_5+p_6+p_7+p_8+p_9+p_10+p_11+p_12+p_13}$. Hence, when $w = 0$, we have the full group multiplication classifying FSPT phases given by

$$[\mathcal{X}', p', \pi']_0 \times [\mathcal{X}', p', \pi']_0 = \mathcal{X}' + \lambda(p', \pi'; p'', \pi'') \left[ p' + p'' + \pi' \cup \pi'' \right] + \frac{1}{4} \pi' \cup \pi'' \cup \pi'''. \quad (483)$$

with

$$\lambda(p', \pi'; p'', \pi'') = \frac{1}{2} \left[ p' \cup \pi'' + (p' + p'') \cup \pi' \cup \pi'' + \pi' \cup (\pi' \cup \pi'' \cup \pi''') + \frac{1}{4} \pi' \cup \pi'' \cup \pi'''. \quad (484)$$

In Appendix G, we verify that Eq. (482) satisfies Eq. (481), following Ref. 28. In Appendix H, we show that Eq. (482) recovers the results of Sec. VB. It is straightforward to extract $\varepsilon_{(3,2,1)}$ from $\lambda$, and verify it takes a universal form which does not reference $G$.

### B. Classification of FSET Phases

We now classify $(2+1)$D FSET phases with on-site unitary symmetry using the fermionic $G^a$-crossed defect theory developed in Sec. IV. The classification of FSET phases is analogous to that of bosonic SET phases, but with a richer structure deriving from the physical nature of the fermion. We have already seen manifestations of this richer structure when analyzing fermionic symmetry fractionalization and FSET phases. For FSET phases, we synthesize the obstruction and classification structures that we developed for fermionic symmetry and fractionalization in Sec. III with the FSET obstruction and classification structure that we analyzed in Sec. VIA in the context of the $G_a$-crossed SMTC formalism. These classification structures can be tiered and partitioned in various ways, but we will focus on two natural presentations: the first in terms of quasiparticle and vortex fractionalization and bosonic defectification with torsor action by gluing SPT phases, and the second in terms of quasiparticle fractionalization and fermionic defectification with torsor action by stacking FSET phases. Before describing the FSET classification in more detail, we review the classification of $(2+1)$D bosonic SET phases with on-site unitary symmetry. All three classifications
The classification of bosonic SET phases \cite{5} begins by specifying a \( \text{MTC} \ \mathcal{C} \) that describes the quasiparticles of the topological phase (without symmetry), a global symmetry group \( G \) of the system, and a symmetry action \( \rho : G \to \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C}) \). Though this is often the starting point for classification, we can also include the choice of symmetry action in the classification. As these symmetry actions are homomorphisms, they are classified by \( H^1(G, \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})) \). Each \( \rho \) defines an invariant \( [\Phi] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A}) \) corresponding to a possible obstruction to localizing the symmetry action [see Eq. (172)]. When the fractionalization obstruction \( [\Phi] \) vanishes, symmetry fractionalization can occur and is torsorially classified by \( H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A}) \). Each fractionalization class, specified by \( \rho \) (including the \( U \)-symbols) and the \( \eta \)-symbols, defines an invariant \( [0] \in H^4(G, U(1)) \) corresponding to a possible obstruction to extending the theory to include symmetry defects, as described by a \( G \)-crossed MTC. When the defectification obstruction \( [0] \) vanishes, defect theories can be obtained, i.e., solutions to the pentagon and heptagon consistency equations exist. When unobstructed, the extensions of the MTC with a given symmetry action and fractionalization class to \( G \)-crossed MTCs are then torsorially classified by \( H^3(G, U(1)) \). This classification accounts for equivalences of \( G \)-crossed MTCs under vertex basis and symmetry action gauge transformations. The \( H^3(G, U(1)) \)-torkan can be generated by gluing \( G \)-SPT phases, which are classified by \( [\alpha] \in H^3(G, U(1)) \), to the \( G \)-crossed MTC.

Ref. 19 constructed an explicit torsor functor of \( H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A}) \) and \( H^3(G, U(1)) \) acting on \( G \)-crossed BTCs that yield the transformation of the complete topological data. These torsor functors allows us to explicitly see how the equivalences by coboundaries in the fractionalization and defectification classification enter the \( G \)-crossed theory through relabeling of the defects’ topological charges by 1-cochain relabelings, together with vertex basis and symmetry action gauge transformations.

The classification by \( H^1(G, \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})) \), \( H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A}) \), and \( H^3(G, U(1)) \) generally does not have a group structure simply obtained from the product of these three groups, as there can be complicated transformations that feed up the structure sequence. Moreover, nontrivial obstructions will break the \( H^1(G, \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})) \), \( H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A}) \), and \( H^3(G, U(1)) \) classifying group structure in the sense that only a subset of possible symmetry actions may permit fractionalization and only a subset of possible fractionalization classes may permit defectification. In fact, these unobstructed subsets are not guaranteed to form subgroups of the respective classifying groups.

Another way the cohomology group classification structure may be broken is through the equivalence of theories via relabeling topological charges. Naïvely different \( G \)-crossed MTCs related torsorially by nontrivial \( H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A}) \) and \( H^3(G, U(1)) \) elements, may actually be equivalent (up to gauge transformations) through a relabeling of the topological charges of quasiparticles and/or defects that leave the \( G \) labels fixed. As mentioned above, some defect relabelings are already built into the \( H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A}) \) classification structure as \( G \)-cochain relabelings of defects correspond to the coboundaries \( B^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A}) \) in the quotient of the fractionalization classification. However, there can be relabeling equivalences that are not captured by these; for example, nontrivial 1-cocycles, which correspond to trivial 2-coboundaries, may produce a nontrivial change in the defectification.

---

**Table IX. Summary of the multi-stage torsorial classifications of \((2+1)D\) SET phases described in Sec. VI.B.** The first column reviews the classification of bosonic SET phases, while the second and third columns describe two complementary perspectives on classifying FSET phases: (a) viewing the FMTC as fundamental, including the vortices from the beginning; and (b) viewing the SMTMC as fundamental and vortices as \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) symmetry defects that are introduced during defectification. The three stages of building up the SET structure are (1) defining the symmetry action on the initial data, (2) define symmetry fractionalization, and (3) extend these to a full theory of symmetry defects. At each stage of the classification, one first calculates the obstructions, which are defined in terms of the previously specified data; when the obstructions vanish, the step can be achieved and the resulting equivalence classes of theories are torsorially classified by the corresponding groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bosonic</th>
<th>Fermionic FMTC</th>
<th>Fermionic SMTC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial data</td>
<td>MTC ( \mathcal{C} ), ( G )</td>
<td>( \text{FMTC} \ \mathcal{M}, \ G^\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{Z}_2^3 \times_w G )</td>
<td>( \text{SMTC} \ \mathcal{M}_0, \ G^\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{Z}_2^3 \times_w G )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetry action</td>
<td>( [\rho] )</td>
<td>( [\rho] )</td>
<td>( [\rho]^{(0)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsor: ( H^1(G, \text{Aut}(\mathcal{C})) )</td>
<td>Torsor: ( H^1(G, \text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})) )</td>
<td>Torsor: ( H^1(G, \text{Aut}(\mathcal{M}_0)) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractionalization</td>
<td>( [\eta, \rho] )</td>
<td>( [\eta, \rho] )</td>
<td>( [\eta^{(0)}, \rho^{(0)}] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruction: ( [\Phi] )</td>
<td>Obstructions: ( [\Phi] ), ( [\Phi^w] )</td>
<td>Obstructions: ( [\Phi^{(0)}] ), ( [\Phi^{(0)w}] )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsor: ( H^2_{[\rho]}(G, \mathcal{A}) )</td>
<td>Torsor: ( H^2_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) )</td>
<td>Torsor: ( H^2_{[\rho^{(0)}]}(G, \mathcal{A}_0) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defectification</td>
<td>( \mathcal{M}_{G^\mathcal{U}}^\mathcal{X} )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{M}_{G^\mathcal{U}}^\mathcal{X} )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{M}_{G^\mathcal{U}}^\mathcal{X} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruction: ( [0] )</td>
<td>Obstruction: ( [0] )</td>
<td>Obstruction: ( [0^w] ), ( [\Phi^w] ), ( [0] )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torsor: ( H^3(G, U(1)) )</td>
<td>Torsor: ( H^3(G, U(1)) ) (SPT gluing)</td>
<td>Torsor: ( \mathcal{Z}_{16}, \ G^{(3,2,2)} ) (FSPT stacking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
class; additionally, relabelings of the quasiparticles’ topological charges may change the fractionalization class.

The classification of $(2 + 1)$D FSET phases begins by specifying a FMTC $\mathcal{M}$ that describes the quasiparticles and vortices of the fermionic topological phase and a global fermionic symmetry group $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times_w G$ of the system, where $w \in \mathbb{Z}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Next, we specify a fermionic symmetry action $\rho : G \to \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M})$. Recall that the fermionic action can be $\mathbb{Q}$-projective when $\mathcal{O}$ is nontrivial, i.e. when $A_1 = \emptyset$, and that when the action has nontrivial $\mathbb{Q}$-projective structure, it is correlated with $w$. Thus, we fix the $\mathbb{Q}$-projective structure (since we have already chosen $G^f$) and find that the corresponding possible fermionic symmetry actions are torsorially classified by $H^1(G, \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}))$.

Identical to the bosonic case, each $[\rho]$ defines an invariant $\mathcal{O} \in H^1_{[\rho]}(G, A)$ corresponding to a possible obstruction to localizing the symmetry action. When $\mathcal{O}$ vanishes, the $G$ symmetry can be fractionalized. However, the fractionalization classes are correlated with $w$ through $\eta = (-1)^w$ [see Eq. (174)], and there is another invariant $\mathcal{O}^w$ corresponding to a possible obstruction of fractionalization manifesting with the particular fermionic symmetry group $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times_w G$ [see Eq. (184)]. When $\mathcal{O}^w$ vanishes, the $G$ symmetry can fractionalize in a manner consistent with the fermionic symmetry group $G^f$ specified by $w$. In this case, symmetry fractionalization for fixed $G^f$ and $[\rho]$ is torsorially classified by $H^2_{[\rho]}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}_0)$.

The final step is to extend to a $G^f$-crossed SMTC $\mathcal{M}^\times_{G^f}$ that describes the symmetry defects. The symmetry action and fractionalization structure on $\mathcal{M}$ is all directly incorporated in $\mathcal{M}^\times_{G^f}$ through the subset of $\rho$, $U$-symbols, and $\eta$-symbols of $\mathcal{M}^\times_{G^f}$ that act on $\mathcal{M}$. The remaining structure comes from completing the defect theory, which means satisfying the pentagon and heptagon consistency conditions. Since non-anomalous $G^f$-crossed SMTCs are $G$-crossed FMTCs, the consistency conditions are exactly the same for bosonic and fermionic $G$-crossed theories. The important distinctions between bosonic versus fermionic enters through constraints and equivalences on the theories. This allows us to translate our knowledge about obstruction and classification of $G$-crossed MTCs (bosonic SET phases) to provide an understanding of obstruction and classification of $G^f$-crossed SMTCs. In particular, we see that the differences have already been incorporated in the symmetry action and fractionalization structure. Identical to the bosonic case, the fractionalization class, specified by $\rho$, $U$-symbols, and $\eta$-symbols acting on $\mathcal{M}$, defines the defectification obstruction $[0] \in H^4(G, U(1))$. When $[0]$ vanishes, defect theories can be obtained, i.e. solutions to the pentagon and heptagon consistency equations exist. When unobstructed, the extensions of the FMTC $\mathcal{M}$ with $G^f$ symmetry and a given fermionic symmetry action and fractionalization class to $G^f$-crossed SMTCs are then torsorially classified by $H^3(G, U(1))$. This classification includes the equivalences of $G^f$-crossed SMTCs under fermionic vertex basis and symmetry action gauge transformations that respect the canonical isomorphism associated with the physical fermions, i.e. the equivalences are restricted as compared to the bosonic SET phases. As with the bosonic case, this $H^3(G, U(1))$-torsor is generated by gluing (bosonic) $G$-SPT phases to the $G^f$-crossed SMTCs. The torsor functor of Ref. 19 generates the theories related by $H^2_{[\rho]}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}_0)$ and $H^3(G, U(1))$ torsor actions.

Thus, for FSET phases with fermionic symmetry group $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times_w G$, there is a $H^1(G, \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}))$, $H^2_{[\rho]}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}_0)$, and $H^3(G, U(1))$ classification structure. As in the case of bosonic SET phases, nontrivial obstructions can (partially) break this classifying group structure, as can equivalences given by relabeling topological charges, both of which can result in non-group subsets of this structure. In the FSET case, we recall that the allowed relabelings must leave the $G^f$ labels fixed; in particular, relabelings that change the vorticity ($\mathbb{Z}_2$ label) are not physical equivalences. For FSPT phases, where $\text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{Z}_2$, and $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2^0$, we saw that the obstructions and equivalences conspired to combine this tiered cohomology group classification structure into a single classifying group $G(0, 2, 1)$ under the fermionic stacking operation.

The above perspective on classifying FSET phases treated the FMTC describing quasiparticles and vortices as fundamental, with the torsor action by the classifying cohomology groups relating different FSET phases. Another perspective is to treat the SMTC describing quasiparticles as more fundamental, and structure the classification using extensions from the SMTC to the FMTC together with fermionic stacking with FSPT phases. This generates a picture in which defectification is viewed as the extension of the SMTC to a $G^f$-crossed defect theory, i.e. $\mathbb{Z}_2$ vortices are thought of as fermionic symmetry defects. In this approach, one starts by specifying a SMTC $\mathcal{M}_0$ describing the quasiparticles of the fermionic topological phase with a fermionic symmetry group $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times_w G$. Then the first step is to choose a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ minimal modular extension to a FMT $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \mathcal{M}_1$, where such extensions are classified torsorially by $\mathbb{Z}_{16}$. Next, we specify a fermionic symmetry action on the quasiparticle sector $[\rho^{[0]}] : G \to \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}_0)$. Again, this can potentially be $\mathbb{Q}$-projective when $\mathcal{O}$ is nontrivial, i.e. when $A_1 = \emptyset$. When the $\mathbb{Q}$-projective structure $\phi$ is nontrivial, it is correlated with $w$. Fixing $\phi$, the possible fermionic symmetry actions on quasiparticles are classified torsorially by $H^1(G, \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}_0))$. Each symmetry action $[\rho^{[0]}]$ defines an invariant $[\mathcal{O}] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$ corresponding to a possible obstruction to extending $[\rho^{[0]}]$ to a fermionic symmetry action $[\rho]$ on $\mathcal{M}$ [see Eq. (139)]. (For $A_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $A_1 = \emptyset$, $[\rho^{[0]}]$ will not have $\mathbb{Q}$-projective structure, but $[\rho]$ can, so we fix a possibly nontrivial $\phi$ in this case as well.) When $[\mathcal{O}]$ vanishes, the symmetry action can be extended to $\mathcal{M}$ and such extensions are classified torsorially by $H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$.

The next stage of the classification is symmetry frac-
tionalization. Each symmetry action \([\rho(0)]\) defines an invariant \([\mathcal{O}(0)] \in H_3^{(0)}(G, \tilde{A})\) corresponding to a possible obstruction of localizing the symmetry action on quasiparticles. When \([\mathcal{O}(0)]\) vanishes, the \(G\) symmetry can be fractionalized on \(\mathcal{M}_0\). In this case, another invariant \([\mathcal{O}(0)_w]\) is a possible obstruction of fractionalization manifesting with the particular fermionic symmetry group \(\mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times w G\) [see Eq. (190)]. When \([\mathcal{O}(0)_w]\) vanishes, the \(G\) symmetry can fractionalize on quasiparticles in a manner consistent with the fermionic symmetry group \(\mathcal{G}^f\) specified by \(w\). In this case, the symmetry fractionalization on \(\mathcal{M}_0\) for fixed \(\mathcal{G}^f\) and \([\rho(0)]\) is torsorially classified by \(H_2^{(0)}(G, \tilde{A}_0)\).

Assuming a choice \([\rho]\) that extends \([\rho(0)]\) to a fermionic action on \(\mathcal{M}\), we can consider the extension of symmetry actions from \(\mathcal{M}_0\) to \(\mathcal{M}\). As before, \([\rho]\) defines an invariant \([\mathcal{O}'] \in H_1^{(0)}(G, A)\) corresponding to a possible obstruction to localizing the symmetry action on \(\mathcal{M}\). When \([\mathcal{O}']\) vanishes, the symmetry action on \(\mathcal{M}\) can be fractionalized, and we can consider another invariant \([\mathcal{O}'(0)]\) defined by \([\rho]\) and the fractionalization class on \(\mathcal{M}_0\), specified by \([\rho(0)]\) and \([\eta(0)]\), which corresponds to a possible obstruction to extending the fractionalization class from the quasiparticles to the vortices [see Eq. (196)]. When \([\mathcal{O}']\) vanishes, the fractionalization class specified by \([\rho(0)]\) and \([\eta(0)]\) on \(\mathcal{M}_0\) can be extended to a fractionalization class \(\rho\) and \(\eta\) on \(\mathcal{M}\).

Such extensions are classified torsorially by \(H_2^{(2)}(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v)\).

The relation between \(H_2^{(2)}(G, A_0)\), \(H_2^{(2)}(G, A_0)\), and \(H_2^{(2)}(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v)\) was shown to be

\[
H_2^{(2)}(G, A_0) \cong i_* \left( H_2^{(2)}(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v) \right) \times \pi_* \left( H_2^{(2)}(G, A_0) \right).
\]

Here, \(\pi_* \left( H_2^{(2)}(G, A_0) \right)\) is the subgroup of \(H_2^{(2)}(G, A_0)\) corresponding to the quasiparticle fractionalization classes that have vanishing \([\mathcal{O}']\), i.e. the ones that can extend to \(\mathcal{M}\). The homomorphism \(i_*\) is the induced inclusion of the classifying group of extensions of fractionalization from quasiparticles to vortices into the classifying group of fractionalization on \(\mathcal{M}\). We note that \(i_* \left( H_2^{(2)}(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v) \right)\) is not necessarily isomorphic to \(H_2^{(2)}(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v)\), since the inclusion allows some of the extension classes to be related to each other by coboundaries in \(B_2^{(2)}(G, A_0)\). It is, however, a central subgroup of \(H_2^{(2)}(G, A_0)\), where the central extension is indicated by some \(\varepsilon\).

The final step of extending to the full defect theory described by \(\mathcal{G}^f\)-crossed SMTCs is identical to before, with the possible defectification obstruction \([0] \in H^4(G, U(1))\) that must vanish for a defect theory to exist. However, we now see that the fermionic symmetry action and fractionalization has additional structure coming from the extension from the SMTC \(\mathcal{M}_0\) to the FMTC \(\mathcal{M}\), and that the structure associated with extensions can be introduced through fermionic stacking with \(\mathcal{G}^f\) FSPT phases. More specifically, we notice that for FSPT phases the classifying cohomology groups are \(H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v), H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v), \) and \(H^3(G, U(1))\). As mentioned, this structure actually combines for FSPT phases into a single classifying group

\[
G^{(3,2,1)} \cong G^{(3)} \times \epsilon(2,1) \left( G^{(2)} \times \epsilon(2,1) \mathbb{C}^{(1)} \right),
\]

where \([G^{(1)}] \triangleleft H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v)\) is the subgroup corresponding to symmetry actions that are unobstructed (for fractionalization and defectification); \([G^{(2)}] \triangleleft H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v)\) is the subgroup corresponding to fractionalization classes for which the defectification obstruction vanishes (sometimes denoted \(BH^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)\)); and \([G^{(3)}] \cong H^3(G, U(1))\) corresponds to gluing bosonic SPT phases, up to fermionic equivalences. These match up with the classification and torsors associated with extending the fermionic symmetry action from quasiparticles to vortices, extending the symmetry fractionalization from quasiparticles to vortices, and defectification.

Combining these observations, we can restructure the torsorial classification of \(\mathcal{G}^f\) FSET phases to be given in terms of \(H^1(G, \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}_0)), \pi_* \left( H_2^{(2)}(G, A_0) \right) \triangleleft H^2(\mathcal{M}_0, G, \tilde{A}_0)\), and \(G^{(3,2,1)}\). In this approach, the torsorial action of \(G^{(3,2,1)}\) is introduced by stacking the \(\mathcal{G}^f\) FSET phases with \(\mathcal{G}^I\) FSPT phases. In other words, we first introduce and classify the symmetry action and fractionalization on the SMTC \(\mathcal{M}_0\), and then the defectification step involves not just the introduction of \(G\) defects, but of \(\mathcal{G}^f\) defects, including vortices. This classification structure is again subject to the effects of obstructions and equivalences, though some of these are already incorporated. For example, we can see that the subgroup \([G^{(2)}] \triangleleft H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v)\) is the same when the FSPT gluing tor- sors on \(\mathcal{M}\) to a general \(\mathcal{G}^f\) FSET. To see this, we can consider the torsor action of \(p \in \mathbb{Z}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v)\) on a general (unobstructed) \(\mathcal{G}^f\)-crossed SMTC. The relative obstruction is found to be

\[
\mathcal{O}_r(p) = (-1)^{p \cdot \partial_p + w \cdot \partial_p}.
\]

From this, we see that

\[
\mathcal{O}_r(p') = \mathcal{O}_r(p) \mathcal{O}_r(p')(-1)^{p \cdot p' \cdot \partial_p + \partial_{p'}}
\]

\[
= \mathcal{O}_r(p) \mathcal{O}_r(p')d(-1)^{p \cdot p \cdot p'}.
\]

Additionally, for \(d \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v)\), we have

\[
\mathcal{O}_r(d) = (-1)^{d \cdot z_d \cdot d + w \cdot l_d}
\]

\[
= d(-1)^{z_d \cdot l_d + w \cdot z}.
\]

In terms of equivalence classes related by coboundaries, we thus see that \(\mathcal{O}_r\) defines a map \([p] \mapsto [\mathcal{O}_r(p)]\), which is a homomorphism \([\mathcal{O}_r] : H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v) \rightarrow H^4(G, U(1))\). As such, the subset of fractionalization extensions for which the defectification obstruction \([0]\) vanishes corresponds to the subgroup \(\ker [\mathcal{O}_r] = G^{(2)} \triangleleft H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^v)\).
VII. EXAMPLES

We now classify several example FSET phases. We begin with the invertible FMTCs $K^{(\nu)}$. We build off of the analysis in Sec. III D1 to include defectification. As these phases have trivial quasiparticle sector, they are completely classified by their stacking with FSPT phases. We first illustrate this by focusing on $\nu$ odd theories with $Z_2$ symmetry in Sec. VII A, for which we recover the $Z_8$ torsorial classification described in Sec. V B 1. We then treat the general case with $G$ symmetry for $\nu$ odd in Sec. VII B and for $\nu$ even in Sec. VII C.

The next set of theories we consider are FMTCs $M = K^{(\nu)} \boxtimes M_0$ (Sec. VII E). When the $G$ symmetry factorizes, the product structure allows us to analyze the sectors individually, building off the results of the classification of invertible fermionic phases and bosonic MTCs. While $M$ describes many FMTCs, including all those containing a $K^{(\nu)}$ subcategory, there are several notable exceptions. In Sec. VII F we examine the theories $\text{Ising}^{(\nu)} \times Z_{2}^{(n+1/2)}$ with $Z_2$ charge conjugation symmetry as an example of significant physical interest, due to their description of a number of non-Abelian fractional quantum Hall phases. We then analyze the FMTC SO(3)$_{4n+2}$ and its minimal modular extension SU(2)$_{4n+2}$ in Sec. VII G. These theories are notable in that the symmetry $Q$ acts nontrivially on the quasiparticle sector. We use this example to compute all the obstructions appearing in Table III.

A. $K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}$ with $Z_2$ Symmetry

In this section we consider the $G^f = Z_{2}^{f} \times Z_{2}$ extensions of $K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}$. The FMTCs $K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}$ are invertible fermionic phases with trivial quasiparticle sector $K^{(\nu=\text{odd})} = \{\lambda_0, \psi_0\}$ and vortex sector $K^{(\nu=\text{odd})} = \{\sigma_1\}$. Their full data is given in the bottom panel of Table II. We compare and contrast the fermionic classification with the analogous bosonic classification of $Z_2$ extensions of $\text{Ising}^{(\nu)}$. For the purpose of comparison, we take $w = 0$; we examine the general case in the next section.

For $w = 0$, the symmetry action is an ordinary group homomorphism $[\rho] : Z_{2} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}) = Z_{2}^Q$. It is convenient to specify the symmetry action by $\rho_{Z} = Q^{\tau(\rho)}$ where $\pi \in H^1(Z_{2}, Z_{2}^Q) = Z_{2}$ (we use $\pi$ to emphasize that in this section we are working with a 1-cocycle, rather than a 1-cochain as in Sec. III D1). In Sec. III D 1 we saw that the symmetry fractionalization obstruction vanishes, and that the symmetry fractionalization is torsorially classified by $\varphi \in H^2(Z_{2}, Z_{2}^Q)$ is given by $\varphi(1, 1) = \psi_0$. The generator of $H^2(Z_{2}, Z_{2}^Q)$ is given by $\varphi(1, 1) = \psi_0$. Writing $\varphi = \psi_0^p$ allows us to write the defectification obstruction as $\mathcal{O}(p) = (-1)^{p+1}$. The obstruction vanishes as we can write $d\mathcal{X} = 0$ for the 3-cochain whose only nontrivial element is given by

$$\mathcal{X}(1, 1, 1) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } \varphi(1, 1) = 0 \\ +i & \text{if } \varphi(1, 1) = 1 \end{cases}$$

Thus we see that there are eight $Z_{2}^{f} \times Z_{2}$ extensions of $K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}$ corresponding to the possible combinations of the symmetry actions $\pi$, fractionalization classes $\varphi$, and defectifications $\mathcal{X}$.

The topological data for four of these theories can be found using the torsor method. We begin with $K^{(\nu=\text{odd})} \boxtimes \text{SPT}_{Z_{2}}^{[b]}$, and then use the four possible torsors specified by the four combinations of $\varphi$ and $\mathcal{X}$. The remaining theories are found using the isomorphism given in Ref. 5. The main difference is that $\text{Aut}(\text{Ising}^{(\nu)}) = Z_{2}$, and so the symmetry action is always trivial. This stems from the fact that both $U_1(\psi, \psi; \mathcal{I})$ and $\gamma_{2}(1)$ are unconstrained in the bosonic theory. Consequently there are only two symmetry fractionalization classes, $\varphi(1, 1) = \mathcal{I}$ of $\psi$ and two defectifications classes associated with $H^2(Z_{2}, U(1)) = Z_{2}$. Thus the $n = \text{even}$ and $n = \text{odd}$ rows of the eight theories appearing in Table X collapse onto one another, resulting in only four distinct bosonic theories.
B. \(K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}\) with \(G\) Symmetry

We now consider general \(G^f\) extensions of \(K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}\). The topological symmetry group and symmetry action were found in Sec. III D 1 to be
\[
\text{Aut}^f(K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}) = \mathbb{Z}_2^f \times \mathbb{Z}_2^Q \quad (493)
\]
\[
\rho_g = Q^e(g), \quad (494)
\]
for \(r \in C^1(G, Z_2^f)\). The projective action fixes the \(U\)-symbols on the trivial sector to be
\[
U_g(\sigma_1, \psi_0; \sigma_1) = U_g(\psi_0, \sigma_1; \sigma_1) = U_g(\sigma_1, \psi_0; \sigma_0) = (-1)^r(g). \quad (495)
\]
Symmetry fractionalization was also covered in Sec. III D 1, with \([\Phi]\) vanishing, \(\eta\)-symbols given by
\[
\eta_{\alpha}(g,h) = (-1)^{\nu p(g,h) + d \nu (g,h)} \cdot \delta_{\alpha, \varphi}, \quad (496)
\]
and \([\Phi^w]\) fixing
\[
w = dr. \quad (497)
\]
To incorporate symmetry defects, we construct a simple base theory by taking the direct product of the trivial bosonic SPT phase \(\text{SPT}^f_G\) with \(K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}\). The topological charges of the \((x, g)\) sectors are given by,
\[
M_{0,g} = \{I_{0,g}, \psi_{0,g}\} \quad M_{1,g} = \{\sigma_{1,g}\}
\]
The \(F\)- and \(R\)-symbols can be determined by the product structure, and the \(U\)- and \(\eta\)-symbols are trivial (corresponding to trivial symmetry action). We generate the remaining theories with trivial symmetry action using the torsor method. The symmetry fractionalization is completely determined by
\[
[p] \in H^2(G, Z_2^\psi). \quad (498)
\]
Letting \(p \in [p]\) be a representative of the cohomology class and using Ref. 19, the relative obstruction valued in \(H^3(G, U(1))\) is given by
\[
O_{\nu}(g, h, k, l) = R^{p(k,l)p(g,h)}. \quad (499)
\]
As the symmetry action on \(\psi_0\) is trivial and \(p(g, h) \in Z_2^\psi\), the relative obstruction can be succinctly written as
\[
O_{\nu} = (-1)^{p_{\kappa, p}}. \quad (500)
\]
Since the product theory \(K^{(\nu=\text{odd})} \boxtimes \text{SPT}^f_G\) is unobstructed, the relative obstruction is in fact equal to the total obstruction. If the theory is unobstructed, meaning that there exists an \(X \in C^3(G, U(1))\) such that \(dX = (-1)^{p_{\kappa, p}}\), then one can read off all topological data of the torsored theory using the expressions in Ref. 19. This generates all possible \(Z_2^f \times G\) extensions of \(K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}\) with trivial symmetry action.

We can generate theories with non-trivial symmetry action using the \(\nu\)-isomorphism described in Sec. IV C. For \(u \in C^1(G, Z_2^q)\), the \(\nu\)-isomorphism modifies the symmetry action
\[
\rho_g \rightarrow \rho_g \cdot Q^{u(g)}. \quad (501)
\]
In order for the isomorphic theory to have the symmetry action described by Eq. (494) we must have \(u = r\). This isomorphism also modifies the topological data as described in Sec. IV C, such that
\[
K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}_{u(g)} = \{I_{u(g),g}, \psi_{u(g),g}\} \quad (502)
\]
\[
K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}_{[1+u(g)],g} = \{\sigma_{[1+u(g)],g}\}. \quad (503)
\]
As pointed out in Sec. IV C, we see that such an isomorphism changes \(w \rightarrow w + du\). Our initial theory had \(w = 0\) and so the resulting theory will have \(w = du\). Moreover, if \(du = 0\) so that \(u \in H^1(G, Z_2^q)\), we see that \(w\) is unchanged.

Finally, we remark that since \(K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}\) has trivial quasiparticle sector, all \(G^f\) extensions with fixed \(w\) are torsorially related by stacking with FSPT phases. Stacking with FSPT phases with trivial symmetry action generates all symmetry fractionalization and defectification classes for fixed symmetry action. Stacking with a FSPT phase with nontrivial symmetry action \(\pi \in H^2(G, Z_2^q)\) changes the symmetry action by sending \(r \rightarrow r + \pi\). Thus we see that the set of \(G^f\)-crossed extensions of \(K^{(\nu=\text{odd})}\) split into subsets which are invariant under stacking with FSPT phases. As noted at the end of Sec. III D 1, these subsets are labeled by \(C^1(G, Z_2^q)/Z^1(G, Z_2^q) \cong B^2(G, Z_2^q)\), corresponding to the possible choices of \(w\).

C. \(K^{(\nu=\text{even})}\) with \(G\) Symmetry

In this section, we generate all the topological data for \(\nu = \text{even}\) theories with \(G^f = Z_2^f \times G\). We do so using a hybrid of the zesting procedure of Ref. 59 and the torsor method of Ref. 19, reviewed in Sec. V C 2. The former maps between braided theories, while we have already seen that the latter maps between \(G\)-crossed extensions.

The basic observation is that applying torsors with \(p \in H^2(G^f, Z_2^q)\) and \(X \in C^3(G^f, U(1))\), to a given \(G^f\)-crossed extension of \(K^{(\nu)}\) can modify the FMTC (change \(\nu\)) in addition to the defect theory. We comment at the end of this section how this procedure can be extended to general \(G^f\).

We begin from a \(Z_2^f \times G\) FSPT phase \(K^{(0)}_{u} \boxtimes \text{SPT}^f_G\) and torsor by the 2-cocycle
\[
\tilde{\psi}((x, g), (y, h)) = \psi_{x, y}^{\nu(x+1)/2} \quad (504)
\]
for an even integer \(\nu \in 2\mathbb{Z}/16\mathbb{Z}\). Note that \(e^{i\pi\nu/2} \in Z_2\) determines whether or not this 2-cocycle is nontrivial.
The $\mathbb{Z}_2^t$ subcategory has $\mathbb{Z}_4$ fusion rules if $\nu/2$ is odd, and $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ fusion rules otherwise. This cocycle corresponds to the relative obstruction invariant

$$[0, (\tilde{p})] = [(-1)^{\tilde{p}^t \tilde{p}}] \in H^4(\mathbb{Z}_2, G, U(1)). \quad (505)$$

The condition $dX = 0, (\tilde{p})$ has a solution

$$X((x, g), (y, h), (z, k)) = \beta^{2x \cdot y \cdot z} \quad (506)$$

for $\beta = e^{i\pi \nu/8}$, so there is no relative obstruction. After applying the torsor $\mathcal{F}_{X, \tilde{p}}$, followed by a natural isomorphism

$$\gamma_{a, x, g}(y, h) = \beta^{x \cdot y}. \quad (507)$$

one finds a $\mathbb{Z}_2^t \times G$-crossed extension of $K^{(\nu)}$. This additional fermionic natural isomorphism is required so that, for example, the $\mathbb{Z}_2^t$ subcategory is a FMTC, not a $\mathbb{Z}_2^s$-crossed BTC. Thus, Eqs. (504), (505), and (507) specify the mapping

$$K^{(0)}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^t \times G} \overset{\gamma_{a, x, g}}{\longrightarrow} K^{(\nu)}_{\mathbb{Z}_2^t \times G} \quad (508)$$

The $F$-symbols of thetorsored theory are given by

$$[R_{a, b, c}^{a', b', c'}]_{d, e, f} = [R_{a, b, c}^{a', b', c'}]_{d, e, f} [F_{a, b, c}^{d, e, f}][F_{a', b', c'}^{d, e, f}]^{-1} [F_{a, b, c}^{d, e, f}]^{-1} [F_{a', b', c'}^{d, e, f}]^{-1} X(g, h, k), \quad (511)$$

where $c'_{gh} = \tilde{p}(g, h) \otimes c_{gh}$, $f'_{gh} = \tilde{p}(h, k) \otimes f_{gh}$, $a'_g = \tilde{p}(g, h) \otimes a_g$, $d'_{ghk} = \tilde{p}(g, h, k) \otimes d_{ghk}$, and $d''_{ghk} = \tilde{p}(g, h, k) \otimes d_{ghk}$. The remaining topological data is

$$\hat{U}_k(a_g, b_h; c_{gh}) = U_k\left(\tilde{p}(g, h), c_{gh}\right) \frac{\gamma_{a_g}(k) \gamma_{b_h}(k)}{\gamma_{c_{gh}}(k)} = U_k\left(a_g, b_h; c_{gh}\right) \frac{\text{Ref. 19}}{\gamma_{c_{gh}}(k)}, \quad (513)$$

where $c'_{gh} = \tilde{p}(g, h) \otimes c_{gh}$. On the right we have simplified the expressions, so that we can see the resulting data is actually that of a $G$-crossed FMTC. We remind the reader that $\nu$ completely parameterizes the torsor transformation in Eqs. (504)-(507).

To extend this approach to general $G^t$, we need a 2-cocycle $\tilde{p}$ that takes the form of Eq. (504) when evaluated on the $\mathbb{Z}_2^t$ subgroup of $G^t$. Once this 2-cocycle is specified, we can calculate the relative obstruction

$$[0, (\tilde{p})] = [(-1)^{\tilde{p}^t \tilde{p} + \tilde{w} \cdot \tilde{p}}] \in H^4(G^t, U(1)) \quad (515)$$

where $\tilde{w}((x, g), (y, h)) = w(g, h)$. Lastly, one needs to find a 3-cochain $X$ and natural isomorphism $\tilde{Y}$ satisfying:

$$dX = (-1)^{\tilde{p} + \tilde{w} \cdot \tilde{p}} \quad (516)$$

$$R^{a_{(0, a)}, b_{(1, b)}} = e^{i\pi \nu/8} \gamma_{a_{(0, a)}, b_{(1, b)}}((1, 0)) \quad (517)$$

$$M^{\psi_{(0, a)}}, a_{(1, b)} = -1 = -\gamma_{\psi_{(0, a)}}, a_{(1, b)}((1, 0)) \quad (518)$$

The second two constraints ensure the torsor maps to the correct FMTC. Hence, on the $\mathbb{Z}_2^s$ subgroup, $\gamma_{a_g}(k)$ is generally given by Eq. (507). More generally, $\gamma_{\psi_{(0, a)}}, a_{(1, b)}((x, g)) = 1$ in order for $M^{\psi_{(0, a)}}, a_{(1, b)} = (-1)^{\tilde{w}}$ to
be satisfied in the torsored theory, equivalently, $\Upsilon$ must be a fermionic natural isomorphism with respect to $G^I$. Additionally, we need the $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ subcategory to have trivial $U$- and $\eta$-symbols, implying,
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{X}(g, h, k) = \frac{\gamma_{a_0}(k)\gamma_{b_0}(k)}{\gamma_{c_0}(k)},
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{X}(g, h, k) = M_{\rho(g, h), c_0} \frac{\gamma_{c_0}(gh)}{\gamma_{c_0}(h)\gamma_{c_0}(g)}
\end{equation}
whenever $g, h, k \in \mathbb{Z}_2^f$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{a_0 b_0}$ is non-zero. Which one can check are satisfied using Eqs. (517) and (518). More generally, in order to get a $G$-crossed FMTC we require,
\begin{equation}
\frac{\mathcal{X}(g, h, k)}{\mathcal{X}(g, h, k')} = \frac{\gamma_{a_0}(k)\gamma_{b_0}(k)\gamma_{c_0}(k')}{\gamma_{c_0}(k)\gamma_{c_0}(k')},
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\frac{\mathcal{X}(g, h, k)}{\mathcal{X}(g', h', k)} = \frac{M_{\rho(g, h), c_0} \gamma_{c_0}(gh)\gamma_{c_0}(g')}{M_{\rho(g', h'), c_0} \gamma_{c_0}(h'g)\gamma_{c_0}(gh')},
\end{equation}
where $g' = g \circ (x, 0)$, $h' = h \circ (y, 0)$, and $k' = k \circ (z, 0)$, where $g, h, k \in G^I$ and $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}_2^f$ are arbitrary, and $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{a_0 b_0}$ is non-zero. The high degree of constraints, along with the relatively simple looking obstruction, suggest this may be a tangible problem which we leave open for future work.

\section{D. FMTCs with trivial $G$ Symmetry}

In this example, we consider the defectification of a FMTC $\mathcal{M}$ with $G$ acting trivially on the quasiparticles. In Sec. IIIID2 we considered the fractionalization aspect of this problem. We found that when $A_1 = \emptyset$, that $|w| = 0$. When $A_1 \neq \emptyset$, and symmetry action given by $\rho_{g^1} = \psi^{\pi(g)}$, with $\pi \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$, we found that $[\mathcal{O}^\nu] = [\mathcal{O}^\gamma] = \psi^{\eta(w)}$. Which is identical to the obstruction obtained for FSPTs. We saw that the symmetry fractionalization is classified canonically by the direct product,
\begin{equation}
H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f) \times H^2(G, \hat{\mathcal{A}}_0)
\end{equation}
for a fixed $w$.

We now turn to the to the defectification aspect of the problem. We first construct a base theory which has $[\rho_{g}] = [1]$. In Ref. 5 the complete set of defectification data for a $G$-crossed extension of a MTC was provided, including an explicit formula for the total obstruction $[\mathcal{O}(w)]$. When the total obstruction vanishes, Ref. 5 provided all topological data for the the $G$-crossed extensions with trivial symmetry action. We can repurpose this data for the FMTCs considered here. Letting $w \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f) \times H^2(G, \hat{\mathcal{A}}_0)$, and using the gauge of Ref. 5, we have
\begin{equation}
U_k(a_x, o, b_y, a_c; e_{c+y}, o) = 1,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\beta_{c, a, o}(g, h) = 1,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\emptyset = 0,
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\eta_{c, a, o}(g, h) = M_{c, a, o, w(g, h)}.
\end{equation}
The symmetry fractionalization class is completely specified by $w$.

One can check that when $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the canonical gauge choices, so does the data provided by Ref. 5. The resulting $G^I$-crossed extension of $\mathcal{M}$ has
\begin{equation}
(-1)^w(g, h) = \eta_{\psi, o}(g, h) = M_{\psi, o, w(g, h)}.
\end{equation}
Additional $G^I$-crossed extensions can be found by applying the $u$-isomorphism of Sec. IV C with $u \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$. If $Q$ is non-trivial (equivalently, $A_1 = \emptyset$), then applying the $u$-isomorphism results in the $Q$ projective action with $[\rho_g] = [Q]^{u(g)}$ and $w = \phi = du = d\rho$. Theories with non-trivial $\nu$-symmetry can be found by stacking with FSPTs that have non-trivial $\nu$-symmetry on the base theory. FSPTs that have non-trivial vortex symmetry fractionalization will account for the $H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$ factor of Eq. (523), while different FSPT defectifications will account for the different possible defectification classes related by bosonic SPTs. Thus the classification of $G^I$-crossed FMTCs with trivial symmetry action on $\mathcal{M}_0$ is given by $H^2(G, \hat{\mathcal{A}}_0)$ and $G^{[3,2,1]}(G^I)$.

\section{E. FMTCs $\mathcal{M} = K^{(\nu)} \boxtimes \hat{\mathcal{M}}_0$ with factorized $G$ Symmetry}

As noted in Sec. II, when a SMTC has the factorized form $\mathcal{M}_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2^c \boxtimes \hat{\mathcal{M}}_0$, where $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_0$ is a MTC, the corresponding $G^I$ extensions are the FMTCs $\mathcal{M} = K^{(\nu)} \boxtimes \hat{\mathcal{M}}_0$. We note that any FMTC containing a $K^{(\nu)}$ subcategory is of this form due to the factorization of MTCs [60]. In fact, the vast majority of SMTCs and FMTCs take this form.

The fermionic topological symmetry groups associated with SMTCs and FMTCs of this form have subgroups where the topological symmetry acts independently on the two sectors, such that
\begin{equation}
\text{Aut}(\hat{\mathcal{M}}_0) < \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}_0)
\end{equation}
\begin{equation}
\mathbb{Z}_2^c \times \text{Aut}(\hat{\mathcal{M}}_0) < \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M}).
\end{equation}
(Recall $\text{Aut}^f(K^{(\nu)}) = \mathbb{Z}_2^c$.) When the fermionic symmetry action on $\mathcal{M}_0$ takes the form $\rho_{g^0} = 1 \boxtimes \rho_{g^0}$, its extensions to $\mathcal{M}$ similarly take the factorized form $\rho_g = \rho_{g^0}^{K^{(\nu)}} \boxtimes \tilde{\rho}_{g^0}$, that is
\begin{equation}
[\rho] : G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^c \times \text{Aut}(\hat{\mathcal{M}}_0).
\end{equation}
In this case, the symmetry enrichment is easy to analyze in terms of the two individual sectors, so we can use the analysis given for fermionic invertible phases $K^{(v)}$ in this paper and the analysis for the bosonic MTCs given in Ref. 5 (and reviewed in this paper). The analysis for more general symmetry actions on such FMTCs depends on the particulars of the example, so we restrict our attention to the factorized form in this subsection.

When the fermionic symmetry action factorizes, the resulting fermionic symmetry fractionalization also factorizes. The fractionalization obstruction is simply the combination of that of the fermionic invertible phase $K^{(v)}$ and the bosonic MTC $\tilde{M}_0$. In particular, whether the fermionic symmetry group $G_1 = Z_2^2 \times_w G$ can be manifested is determined entirely by whether it can be manifested for $K^{(v)}$. When unobstructed, the classification of symmetry fractionalization on $\mathcal{M}$ for a given $G_1^I$ is given torsorially by

$$H^2_{[\rho]}(G, A_0) = H^2(G, Z_2^2) \times H^2_{[\rho]}(G, A_0).$$

The defectification obstruction is similarly given by the product of those of the fermionic invertible phase $K^{(v)}$ and the bosonic MTC $\tilde{M}_0$. The resulting classification of the unobstructed $G_1^I$-crossed FMTCs for a fixed fermionic symmetry action is given torsorially by $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, A_0)$ and $H^3(G, U(1))$, up to relabelings. From the fermionic stacking perspective (which cycles through fermionic symmetry actions related by $Z_2^2$), the $G_1^I$-crossed FMTCs classification is given torsorially by $H^2_{[\rho]}(G, A_0)$ and $G^{(3,2,1)}(G')$.

The data for the $G_1^I$-crossed FMTCs can be generated from the data of $K^{(v)}$ and $\tilde{M}_0$ by gluing together theories as

$$\mathcal{M}^{G_1^I} = K^{(v)} \times \tilde{M}_0^{G_1^I}.$$ (533)

All of the possible $G_1^I$-crossed extensions (for $[\rho^{(0)}] = [\rho^{(0)}]$) are generated in this way.

**F. Ising$^{(v)}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ Charge Conjugation Symmetry**

We next consider the FMTC

$$\mathcal{M} = \text{Ising}^{(v)} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{(n+1/2)},$$ (534)

with $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The topological charges are labeled $(a, j)$ such that $a \in \{I, \sigma, \varepsilon\}$ and $j \in \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, 7\}$. The physical fermion corresponds to

$$\psi_0 \equiv (\varepsilon, 4),$$ (535)

which carries electron charge. The SMTC $\mathcal{M}_0$ describes the quasiparticles of various topological phases, including the Moore-Read Pfaffian [61], anti-Pfaffian [62, 63], $T$- or PH-Pfaffian [47, 64], etc. states, which include candidate descriptions of the fractional quantum Hall state at 5/2 filling. The topological charges of $\mathcal{M}$ satisfy fusion rules

$$(a, j) \otimes (b, k) = (a \otimes b, [j + k]),$$ (536)

where the square brackets denote addition modulo 8. The $F$- and $R$-symbols are determined by the product structure. The first factor of the product is the Ising theory, whose data is presented in the third panel of Table II. The $F$- and $R$-symbols of the $\mathbb{Z}_2^{(n+1/2)}$ theory are

$$F^{jkl} = e^{\frac{i\pi j + l + k}{8} L} L^{j+k,l},$$ (537)

$$R^{jkl} = e^{\frac{i\pi}{8} (n + \frac{1}{2}) j k} L^{k,j},$$ (538)

where the factors $L$ are vertex basis gauge transformations, which we take to be

$$L^{j,k} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } (j, k) \in \{(5, 4), (7, 4)\} \\ +1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$ (539)

These gauge transformations are required in order for the topological data of the product theory to satisfy the canonical gauge choices made in Sec. II1.

The choice of $(\varepsilon, 4)$ as the physical fermion determines the quasiparticle and vortex sectors:

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \{(I, 2j), (\sigma, 2j + 1), (\varepsilon, 2j) : j \in \mathbb{Z}_4\},$$ (540)

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \{(I, 2j + 1), (\sigma, 2j), (\varepsilon, 2j + 1) : j \in \mathbb{Z}_4\}.$$ (541)

Notice that $R^{ij} = e^{\frac{i\pi}{8} (n + \frac{1}{2}) j^2}$, from which we see that $\mathcal{M}_1$ is an emergent boson while $\mathcal{M}_0$ is an emergent fermion.

We now consider $\text{Aut}^4(\mathcal{M})$. First, we know that $\mathcal{Q}$ is trivial since $\mathcal{M}_1$ has Abelian vortices. Next, we know that there is a nontrivial vortex symmetry $\mathcal{V}$ since $\mathcal{M}$ is a FMTC; the $U$-symbols of $\mathcal{V}$ are defined in Eq. (94). Additionally, $\mathcal{M}$ has a charge conjugation symmetry $\mathcal{C}$, whose action on the topological charges is defined as

$$\mathcal{C}(a, j) = (a, j) \equiv (a, [-j]).$$ (542)

The $U$-symbols are given by [5]

$$U_{\mathcal{C}}((a, j), (b, k); (c, [j + k])) = (-1)^{nk},$$ (543)

where $n_k = 1$ if $k = 2, 6$ and is zero otherwise (equivalently $n_k = k(k + 1)/2$). Therefore we have

$$\text{Aut}^4(\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{Z}^\mathcal{V}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}^\mathcal{C}_2.$$ (544)

The nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}^\mathcal{V}_2$ symmetry can be generated post defectification by stacking with the FSPT phase with nontrivial symmetry action. As this has been investigated in previous examples, we focus here on the charge conjugation symmetry $G = \mathbb{Z}^\mathcal{C}_2$, which we are encountering for the first time.
Fixing $G = \mathbb{Z}_2^3$, the nontrivial charge conjugation symmetry action has $\rho_1 = C$. It is straightforward to check that $\kappa_{1,1} = 1$, allowing us to choose $\beta_{(a,j)}(1,1) = 1$. Therefore the nontrivial $\eta$-symbols are given by

$$\eta_{(a,j)}(1,1) = M^*_{(a,j),w}(1,1),$$

(545)

where $w \in H^2_{[\rho]}(\mathbb{Z}_2^3, \mathcal{A})$ and $A = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_8$. The cocycle condition simplifies to $w(1,1) = 1$, i.e. the 2-cocycles are labeled by the charge conjugation invariant Abelian topological charges $(\mathcal{I}, 0)$, $(\epsilon, 0)$, $(\mathcal{I}, 4)$ or $(\epsilon, 4)$. Correspondingly $H^2_{[\rho]}(\mathbb{Z}_2^3, \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_8) = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. Hence the nontrivial charge conjugation symmetry action has four symmetry fractionalization classes, torsorially classified by $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$.

We now consider the defect theory. There are six charge-conjugation defects, one per charge-conjugation-invariant topological charge in $\mathcal{M}$ [see Eq. (542)]

$$\mathcal{M}^C = \{(\mathcal{I}, 4j), (\sigma, 4j), (\epsilon, 4j) : j \in \mathbb{Z}_2\}.$$

Some of the defect fusion properties can be extracted through a quantum dimension counting argument. Recall that for a $G$-crossed extension of a MTC $\mathcal{C}$, the total quantum dimensions of all defect sectors are equal: $D^2_{\mathcal{C}^0} = D^2_{\mathcal{C}^g}$ [6]. For the case at hand, $D^2_{\mathcal{M}_0} = 32$, providing a strong constraint on the quantum dimension of the defects. We can bound each defect’s quantum dimension by counting its zero modes. Consider pair-creating a topological charge $(a,j)$ and its inverse $(a,j)$ from the vacuum, braiding $(a,j)$ around a charge conjugation defect, and fusing the resulting $C((a,j)) = (a,j)$ with its partner. Any topological charges appearing in the fusion product $(a,j) \otimes C((a,j)) = (a,j) \otimes (a,j)$ are potential zero modes of the defect. In the case of Abelian charges $(a = \mathcal{I} \text{ or } \epsilon)$, the unique fusion channel $(\mathcal{I}, 2j)$ must be a defect zero mode. Therefore, each defect is invariant under fusion with $(a,j)$ for $j \in 2\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}$, and thus has quantum dimension at least 4. Using the charges $(\sigma, j)$, a similar argument indicates that the charges $(\epsilon, 2j)$ are also potential (no longer guaranteed) zero modes. However, we see that we cannot have each defect invariant under fusion with $(\epsilon, j)$ for $j \in 2\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}$ as well, as this would imply all six defects have quantum dimension of at least $\sqrt{8}$, which would mean $D^2_{\mathcal{M}_1} \geq 6 \cdot \sqrt{8}^2 > D^2_{\mathcal{M}_0}$.

Labeling the defects as

$$X_{(a,j)} = (a,j) \otimes X_{(0,0)},$$

(547)

invariance under fusion with $(\mathcal{I}, 2j)$ implies

$$X_{(a,j)} = X_{(a,j+2)},$$

(548)

from which we can read off the fusion rules with topological charges

$$(a,j) \times X_{(b,k)} \cong X_{(a \oplus b, j+k)},
\quad X_{(a,j)} \otimes (b,k) \cong X_{(a \oplus b, j+k)}.$$

(549, 550)

Fusion of $X_{(0,0)}$ with itself can be written as

$$X_{(0,0)} \otimes X_{(0,0)} \cong t(1,1) \otimes \bigoplus_j (\mathcal{I}, 2j)$$

(551)

where $t \in H^2_{[\rho]}(\mathbb{Z}_2^3, \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_8)$. There are four choices for $t$, parameterized by $t(1,1) \in \{(\mathcal{I}, 0), (\epsilon, 0), (\mathcal{I}, 4), (\epsilon, 4)\}$. Choosing $t(1,1) = (\mathcal{I}, 0)$ or $(\mathcal{I}, 4)$ results in the same fusion ring, as does choosing $t(1,1) = (\epsilon, 0)$ or $(\epsilon, 4)$.

We now compute a subset of the defectification data. We do this by building one set of defectification data from which we obtain all others using the torser method. Fortunately, the bosonic MTC version of $\mathcal{M}$ is the product theory $\text{Ising}^{(\nu)} \times \mathbb{Z}_8^{(n+1/2)}$. The product structure allows us to construct a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed extension of $\mathcal{M}$ by taking the restricted product of a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-crossed extension of each factor. In particular we have,

$$\mathcal{M}_2^\times = \left[\text{Ising}^{(\nu)}\right]_2^\times \boxtimes \left[\mathbb{Z}_8^{(n+1/2)}\right]_2^\times$$

(552)

and identify $(\epsilon, 4) \in \mathcal{M}_{0,0}$ as the physical fermion to obtain the fermionic theory. All of the data for a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ extension of $\text{Ising}^{(\nu)}$ was presented in Ref. 5, which also worked out much of the data for $\mathbb{Z}_8^{(n+1/2)}$. The monodromy of a defect $X_{(a,j)}$ with the physical fermion is

$$M_{X_{(a,j)},(\epsilon,4)} = M_{(a,j), (\epsilon,4)} M_{X_{(0,0)}, (\epsilon,4)} = (-1)^4 M_{a,\epsilon},$$

(553)

allowing us to identify the vorticity of the defects. If we let $\left[\text{Ising}^{(\nu)}\right]_2^\times = \text{Ising}^{(\nu)} \boxtimes \text{SPT}^{[1]}_2$, then

$$\mathcal{M}_{0,1} = \{X_{(\mathcal{I}, 2j)}, X_{(\sigma, 2j+1)}, X_{(\epsilon, 2j)}\},$$

(554)

$$\mathcal{M}_{1,1} = \{X_{(\mathcal{I}, 2j+1)}, X_{(\sigma, 2j)}, X_{(\epsilon, 2j+1)}\},$$

(555)

Applying the $u$-isomorphism with $u(1) = 1$ interchanges these two defect sectors resulting in a physically distinct theory. Since $du = 0$, we can also realize this isomorphism by stacking with a FSPT phase that has nontrivial symmetry action. Thus we see that for fixed symmetry action $\rho_1 = C$ we have four symmetry fractionalization classes and two defectification classes ($H^3(\mathbb{Z}_2^3, \mathbb{U}(1)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$). By changing $\rho_1 \rightarrow \nu \rho_1$ we find eight additional distinct theories. These sixteen theories split into two generations of eight theories related by stacking with FSPT phases with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry.

G. $\text{SO}(3)_{4n+2}$ and $\text{SU}(2)_{4n+2}$ with $G$ Symmetry

In this example we consider the SMTC $\mathcal{M}_0 = \text{SO}(3)_{4n+2}$ and its minimal modular extension $\mathcal{M} = \text{SU}(2)_{4n+2}$. This example is particularly interesting as $Q$ acts non-trivially on the quasiparticle sector $\mathcal{M}_0$. We compute all the obstructions listed in Table III, before turning to defectification.
We provide the minimal data required to classify symmetry action, fractionalization, and defectification of the theories $\mathcal{M}_0 = \text{SO}(3)_{4n+2}$ and $\mathcal{M} = \text{SU}(2)_{4n+2}$; the complete list of topological data is given in Ref. 65. The topological charges are given by

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, 2n + 1\},$$

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, \cdots, 2n + \frac{1}{2} \right\},$$

with quantum dimensions and topological spins

$$d_j = \sin \left(\frac{2j + 1}{4n + 4}\right) \pi / \sin \left(\frac{\pi}{4n + 4}\right)$$

and

$$\theta_j = e^{i2\pi \frac{j(j+1)}{4n+2}}.$$ (558)

We see that only the vacuum charge $I_0 = 0$ and the fermion $\psi_0 = 2n + 1$ are Abelian. In particular, $\psi_0 \otimes j = (2n+1)-j$ implies there is a single $\sigma$-type object given by the vortex $n + 1/2$. Recall from Sec. III that the presence of a $\sigma$-type object implies that $G^f \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times G$ (w is a coboundary).

Our first step is to compute $\text{Aut}^f(\text{SO}(3)_{4n+2})$. As all charges $j \in \mathcal{M}_0$ have distinct topological spin, we immediately see that there are no charge-permuting topological symmetries and the only potentially nontrivial automorphism is $Q$. While Sec. III A tells us that $A_1 = \emptyset$ implies $Q$ is non-trivial, it is helpful to explicitly verify that $Q$ cannot be trivialized by a fermionic natural isomorphism $\Upsilon^f$. From

$$\Upsilon^f \circ Q([n, n; n]) = \gamma_n |n, n; n\rangle,$$ (560)

$$\Upsilon^f \circ Q([n, \psi; n + 1]) = -\gamma_{n+1}^{-1} |n, \psi; n + 1\rangle,$$ (561)

we see that in order for $\Upsilon^f$ to trivialize $Q$, we would need to simultaneously satisfy $\gamma_n = \gamma_{n+1} = 1$ and $\gamma_{n+1} = \gamma_{n+1}$. As these constraints are incompatible, $Q$ must be non-trivial and

$$\text{Aut}^f(\text{SO}(3)_{4n+2}) = \mathbb{Z}_2^Q.$$ (562)

We next choose a fermionic symmetry action on $\mathcal{M}_0$

$$\rho^{(0)} : G \to \text{Aut}^f(\text{SO}(3)_{4n+2}).$$ (563)

All possible $\rho^{(0)}$ correspond to $Q$-projective homomorphisms, which can be parameterized by

$$\rho^{(0)}_g = Q^{(g)}$$ (564)

for $g \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^Q)$. The $Q$-projective symmetry action satisfies $[Q^{(g)}] \otimes [\rho^{(0)}] = [\rho^{(0)}_g]$. It follows that $\kappa_{g,h} = Q^{(g,h)}$, hence $\beta_{a_+(g,h)} = (-1)^{\delta_{a_+(g,h)}}, \kappa_{a_+(g,h)} = 1$, and $\beta_{a_+(g,h)} = 1$. This will show the fermionic symmetry group will have $w = dr$ and hence with respect to fixed $w$, $\rho^{(0)}$ is classified torsorially by $H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^Q)$.

To fractionize $\rho^{(0)}$, we need to check that the obstruction $[\Phi^{(o)}] \in H^3_{[\rho]}(G, \tilde{A})$ vanishes [see Eq. (188)]. This follows from $\tilde{A} = \tilde{T}$. Similarly, the obstruction $[\Phi^{(0)}]_{\rho}$ vanishes as $w = dr$ [see Eq. (190)].

Considering now the FMTC $\mathcal{M}$, we compute the fermionic topological symmetry group $\text{Aut}^f(\text{SU}(2)_{4n+2})$. We already saw that $Q$ is non-trivial on the quasiparticle sector, and thus $Q$ is non-trivial on the full FMTC. The vortex topological spins indicate that the only potential permutation of charges is given by $j \to \psi_0 \otimes j$; this permutation is in fact non-trivial and corresponds to $\mathcal{V}$. Therefore,

$$\text{Aut}^f(\text{SU}(2)_{4n+2}) = \mathbb{Z}_2^\mathcal{V} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^Q.$$ (565)

Note that $\text{Aut}^f(\text{SU}(2)_{4n+2}) = \text{Aut}^f(\text{SU}(2)_{4n+2}) / \mathbb{Z}_2^Q = \mathbb{Z}_2^\mathcal{V}$.

To check whether the symmetry action $\rho^{(0)}$ extends to the full FMTC, we must show that $[O^\rho]$ vanishes [see Eq. (136)]. We compute the obstruction by picking a section $s : \text{res}_{\mathcal{M}_0}(\text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M})) \to \text{Aut}^f(\mathcal{M})$, which is generically parametrized as $s[\rho^{(0)}] = [\mathcal{V}^w \circ [Q^\rho]^w]$, where $w \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\mathcal{V})$. One finds $[\rho^{(0)}] = [\mathcal{V}^w]$, which is obviously a coboundary, and thus every $Q$-projective symmetry action on $\text{SO}(3)_{4n+2}$ extends to a $Q$-projective symmetry action on $\text{SU}(2)_{4n+2}$.

In general, a fermionic symmetry action on $\text{SU}(2)_{4n+2}$ can be specified by a normalized 1-cochain $r \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\mathcal{V})$ and a group homomorphism $\pi \in H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\mathcal{V})$ as

$$\rho_g = \mathcal{Q}^g \circ \mathcal{V}^\pi(g).$$ (566)

The group homomorphism $\pi$ is the torsor associated with vanishing $[O^\rho]$ (see Eq. (141)). Similar to $\rho^{(0)}$, we have $[Q^{dr(g,h)}] \cdot [\rho_g] \cdot [\rho_h] = [\rho_{gh}]$, reflecting the $Q$-projective symmetry action. One can check that $\kappa_{g,h}(a_x, b_y; c_{x+y}) = (-1)^{\delta_{a_x, b_y} + \delta_{a_x+y, c_{x+y}}} \cdot dr(g,h) \cdot (-1)^{\pi(g) \cdot \pi(h) \cdot \pi^x}$, $\beta_{a_+(g,h)} = (-1)^{\delta_{a_+(g,h)} \cdot dr(g,h) \cdot \pi(g) \cdot \pi(h) \cdot \pi^-}$, $\kappa_{a_+(g,h)} = (-1)^{\pi(g) \cdot \pi(h) \cdot \pi^-}$, and $\beta_{a_+(g,h)} = (-1)^{\pi(g) \cdot \pi(h) \cdot \pi^-}$.

To fractionize $\rho$, we need to check whether $[\Phi]$ vanishes (Sec. III C). One can check by direct computation, or using the properties of cup products, that $\Omega_{\rho} = d(\tau_{\rho_{\mathcal{V}}}) = 1$, and therefore $[\Phi] = [\mathcal{I}]$. The associated symmetry fractionalization torsor is valued in $Z^3_{[\rho]}(G, \tilde{A}) / B^2_{[\rho]}(G, \tilde{A}_0) = H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^\mathcal{V})$ since $A_1 = \emptyset$ and $A_0 = \mathbb{Z}_2^\mathcal{V}$. Symmetry fractionalization is thus specified by the $\eta$-symbols $\eta_{a_+(g,h)} = M^\rho_{a_+(g,h)} \beta_{a_+(g,h)}$, and in particular,

$$\eta_{\Phi\rho}(g, h) = \beta_{\Phi\rho}(g, h) = (-1)^{dr(g,h)}.$$ (567)

Similar to before, the obstruction $[\Phi^w] \in Z^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ [see Eq. (184)] vanishes as $[w - dr] = [0]$ when $w$ is a coboundary.

We could alternatively fractionize $\rho$ (after verifying $[O^\rho]$ vanishes) by computing the obstructions to quasiparticle fractionalization $[\Phi^{(0)}]$ and $[\Phi^{(0)}_{\rho}]$, along with
the obstruction to extending fractionalization to the vortex sector $[\Phi^0]$ [see Eq. (196)]. The first two obstructions were computed above, the final obstruction vanishes as $A = \hat{f}$.

Finally, we turn to defectification. The simplest defect theory corresponds to the direct product $SU(2)_{4n+2} \times SPT^1_G$. We can generate all remaining theories from this base theory via the action of various torsors, which can change the $Q$-projective symmetry action, $\mathcal{V}$-symmetry action, fractionalization class, and defectification class. We can generate the previously-considered $Q$-projective symmetry actions by applying the $u$-isomorphism from Sec. IV C with $u = r$. This isomorphism sends $w \rightarrow w + dr$ and $\rho_g \rightarrow Q^r(g) \circ \rho_g$. The corresponding defect sectors are

$$\mathcal{M}_{r(g), g} = \{0_g, 1_g, 2_g, \ldots, (2n + 1)_g\}, \quad (568)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{[1+r(g)], g} = \left\{\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\frac{1}{2} g \\
\frac{3}{2} g \\
\vdots \\
(2n + 1) g
\end{array}\right\} \right\}. \quad (569)$$

Stacking with FSPT phases generates all distinct $\mathcal{V}$ symmetry actions, symmetry fractionalizations, and defectification classes. Altogether, with respect to a fixed $w = de$, we have a torsorial classification of the quasiparticle symmetry action by $H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^p)$ and of the FSPT stacking by $G^{(3,2,1)}(\mathbb{Z}_2^p \times_{dr} G)$.

Alternatively, one could use the torsor method with $p \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^p)$ to change the symmetry fractionalization class. The associated obstruction is $\Omega_r = (-1)^{p \cdot p d(-1)^{r \cdot p}}$, when $[\Omega_r]$ vanishes the possible defectification classes are torsorially generated by gluing in bosonic SPT phases $SPT^1_G$, $[\alpha] \in H^3(G, U(1))$. In this formulation, the torsorial classification with respect to a fixed $w = dr$ is given by $H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^p)$, $H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^p)$, and $H^3(G, U(1))$.

VIII. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we have developed the categorical description of symmetry, fractionalization, and defects for fermionic topological phases. Our fermionic symmetry fractionalization and $G^f$-crossed defect theory has provided a classification of FSET phases. We have highlighted the similarities and differences compared to the bosonic classification, and illustrated our results through a number of explicit examples. We now make contact with previous classification results obtained using other formalisms, as well as discuss possible extensions of our findings.

In Sec. V, we observed that the set of FSPT phases with $G^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^p \times G$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the elements of the Pontryagin dual of the spin bordism group computed in Ref. 28. In particular, the triples of cochains $[X, p, \eta]_w$, which provide solutions to the pentagon and heptagon equations, satisfy the same equations needed for elements in the Pontryagin dual of the spin bordism group. Physically, the algebraic data describing the FSPT phase is equivalent to the data needed to describe topological invariants of spin 3-manifolds. We also mention that elements of the Pontryagin dual of the spin bordism group can be naturally interpreted as a decorated domain wall construction for lattice realizations of FSPT phases (see, for example Ref. 7). Correspondingly, one can view the algebraic theories of the FSPT phases studied here as describing the topological data of the excitations of these lattice constructions. This correspondence provides strong evidence that the spin bordism, decorated domain wall, and $G^f$-crossed classifications of FSPT phases are all equivalent.

In Sec. III, we detailed several new obstructions associated with symmetry fractionalization. In particular, we observed that $[\Omega^p] \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^p)$ and $[\Phi^0] \in H^3(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^p)$ describe obstructions to extending the symmetry action and fractionalization, respectively, from the SMTC describing the quasiparticles to the full FMTC including the vortices, in a local manner for $(2 + 1)D$ fermionic topological phases. These obstructions can be naturally interpreted in terms of surface terminations of $(3 + 1)D$ FSPT phases with known defect decoration constructions, where $[\Omega^p]$ correspond to Majorana chain decorations of tri-junctions of $G$-foams and $[\Phi^0]$ correspond to fermion parity decorations of quad-junctions of $G$-foams. The latter surface termination had been investigated in Ref. 30, while the former appears to be previously unexplored.

Another novel possibility arises when the quasiparticle theory has fractionalization class $w^{(0)}(g, h) \in \hat{A}_1 \neq \hat{A}_1$. In this case, the extension of the fractionalization to the full FMTC is obstructed for a strictly $(2 + 1)D$ fermionic topological phase, since the fractionalization class would correspond to a superAbelian $\sigma$-type vortex (i.e. one with quantum dimension $\sqrt{2}$). In terms of defects, this anomaly suggests that the fusion of a $g$-defect with a $h$-defect into a $gh$-defect leaves behind a Majorana zero mode at the tri-junction of the defect branch lines, which clearly does not fit the standard $G^f$-crossed formalism. It would be interesting if such an anomalous theory could be realized, possibly as a surface termination of a $(3 + 1)D$ phase with non-trivial Majorana chain decorations of tri-junctions of $G$-foams.

In Sec. IV B, our discussion of $G^f$-crossed SMTCs focused on those that correspond to $G$-crossed FMTCs. More generally, one could consider locally consistent $G^f$-crossed SMTCs that cannot be written as $G$-crossed FMTCs. Simple examples of this include $G$-crossed SMTCs, i.e. leaving the vortex sector empty. However, one may imagine more complicated examples, such as ones for which the vortices have nontrivial symmetry action on the $G$ symmetry defects. Such theories are exotic, as fermion parity cannot be gauged without breaking the $G$-symmetry and mapping class group transformations on the torus may not preserve the global fermion parity. These observations indicate that such theories would rep-
resent a new type of (mixed) anomaly. Developing the algebraic theories and explicit lattice models for these various anomalous (2 + 1)D theories and the corresponding (3 + 1)D phases that host them as surface terminations is an interesting future direction.

In this paper, we provided a full classification of (2 + 1)D FSET phases when the symmetry is onsite and unitary. While the G-crossed formalism can be adapted to some of the more general locality preserving symmetries, such as translational symmetry \cite{Luitz:2018gbt}, the generalization to spacetime reflecting symmetries has remained elusive. However, the symmetry fractionalization formalism can be applied to general symmetries, including spacetime reflecting symmetries, and provides a classification of fractionalization. Since the full classification (2 + 1)D SET and FSET phases for onsite and unitary symmetries can be expressed in terms of the classifications of quasiparticle fractionalization and the classification of SPT and FSPT phases, respectively, we speculate that a similar form may enter the classification of SET and FSET phases with more general symmetries.

Finally, we note that throughout this paper we have focused on describing the local algebraic theory of symmetric fermionic topological phases. Placing the theory on a surface with nontrivial topology requires additional care, including explicitly tracking the spin structure, as well as accounting for additional equivalence relations and their corresponding reduction in the Hilbert space dimension (see discussion at the end of Sec. II B). Studying the mapping class group representations of spin manifolds with G-bundles is an interesting application we leave to future work.
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Appendix A: $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)}$ BTCs

The $\mathbb{Z}_N^{(p)}$ BTCs can have $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $N$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$ for $N$ even. Topological charges are labeled by $a = 0, 1, \ldots, N - 1$, which obey the fusion rules $a \times b = [a + b]_N$, where $[\cdot]_N$ means mod $N$. The F-symbols (in a particular choice of gauge) are

$$[F_{[a+b+c]}^{abc}]_{[a+b]_N,[b+c]_N} = e^{i \frac{2\pi}{N} a(b+c-[b+c]_N)}. \quad (A1)$$

The F-symbols are all equal to 1 when $p \in \mathbb{Z}$. For $p \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$, some of the F-symbols are equal to $-1$, in which case they cannot all be set to 1 using gauge freedom.

The R-symbols (in our choice of gauge) are

$$R_{[a+b]}^{ab} = e^{i \frac{2\pi}{N} pa^2}. \quad (A2)$$

The twist factors are $\theta_a = e^{i \frac{2\pi}{N} pa^2}$.

Appendix B: Factorization of Abelian BTCs with a Transparent Fermion

In this Appendix, we prove that any Abelian BTC $A$ containing a transparent $\mathbb{Z}_2$ fermion $\psi$ factorizes as $A = \mathbb{Z}_2^{(p)} \boxtimes \tilde{A}$, where $\tilde{A}$ is a BTC. By definition, $\psi \otimes \psi = I$, $\theta_\psi = -1$, and $M_{\psi a} = 1$ for all $a \in A$.

We begin by noting that the fusion rules of an Abelian BTC are given by group multiplication of the finite Abelian group $A$. Finite Abelian groups can be expressed as the product of finite cyclic groups $A = \prod_j \mathbb{Z}_{N_j}$, where $N_j = P_j^{\pi_j}$ for (not necessarily distinct) prime numbers $P_j$ and positive integers $\pi_j$. Restricting to the objects in one of these $\mathbb{Z}_{N_j}$, yields a subcategory $\mathbb{Z}_{N_j}^{P_j} < A$. Identifying the objects of $A$ with the group elements of $A$, we assign $j = 0$ to the subcategory containing the fermion $\psi$. The fermion’s $\mathbb{Z}_2$ fusion requires $N_0$ is even, and that $\psi$ is identified with $N_0/2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_0}^{(p_0)}$. Since the braiding of objects identified with elements of $\mathbb{Z}_{N_0}^{(p_0)}$ is given by

$$\theta_a = e^{i \frac{2\pi}{N} pa^2}, \quad (B1)$$

$$M_{ab} = e^{i \frac{2\pi}{N} pab}, \quad (B2)$$

the braiding properties of $\psi$ indicate that $N_0 = 2$ and $p_0 = 1$. This demonstrates that (the group describing) the fusion rules factorize as $A = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \tilde{A}$, where $\tilde{A} = \prod_{j=1}^k \mathbb{Z}_{N_j}$.

Showing that the BTC factorizes requires a bit more work. In order to see that the F-symbols factorize, we can note that the pentagon equation for an Abelian theory is just a 3-cocycle condition and the vertex basis gauge transformations are just factoring out 3-coboundaries, and hence the possible FTCs are classified by $H^3(A, U(1))$. There are three possible types of cocycles for such theories given in Ref. \textsuperscript{60}: type I are diagonal in $\mathbb{Z}_{N_j}$ subgroups, type II are pairwise terms between two cyclic subgroups, and type III are triple terms. The nontrivial type III F-symbols are not compatible with braiding at all (i.e. no solutions to the hexagon equations). The nontrivial type II F-symbols are not compatible with braiding when one of the two cyclic groups involved is
This can be seen by inspecting the hexagon equations, which yields independent conditions on the braiding, e.g. for \((R^{(N/2)}, 2) = 1\) and \(-1\). Finally, the type I F-symbols in the \(Z_2\) containing \(\psi\) must be trivial to be compatible with the self-statistics of the fermion. Thus, the F-symbols of \(A\) can be chosen to be completely independent of the \(Z_2^2(\hat{\psi})\), that is

\[
F^{abc} = F^{\hat{a}\hat{b}c},
\]

where we write \(a = (a, \hat{a})\), and use the shorthand \(\hat{\psi} = (1, 0)\) and \(\hat{\hat{a}} = (0, \hat{a})\). In other words, the F-symbols can be factorized as claimed.

Using these F-symbols in the hexagon equations, together with the braiding properties of \(\psi\), we find that

\[
R^{a b a} = R^{\hat{a} \hat{b} a} = -R^{\hat{a} \hat{b} a} = \pm 1.
\]

With these relations, one can focus on the generators of \(\hat{\hat{A}}\), i.e. the generators \(1, \hat{1} \in Z_N\). These braiding conditions require the generators of \(Z_N\) with \(N_1\) odd to satisfy \(R^{a b a} = 1\). For \(N_1\) even, there is freedom here to choose the generator such that \(R^{a b a} = 1\); if one inadvertently chose the generator such that \(R^{a b a} = -1\), one could simply do a relabeling \(\hat{1}^j = \psi \otimes 1_j\) to obtain the desired form. In this way, the resulting R-symbols are found to take the form

\[
R^{a b} = R^{\hat{a} \hat{b} a} = \hat{R}^{\hat{a} \hat{b} a}.
\]

Thus, the fusion rules, F-symbols, and R-symbols have been found (in a certain choice of gauge) to factorize, yielding

\[
A = Z_2^2(\hat{\psi}) \otimes \hat{\hat{A}}.
\]

Appendix C: Group Cohomology

This appendix offers a brief review of the group cohomology used in the main text. A more detailed review can be found in Ref. 67.

Let \(G\) be a finite group and \(M\) an Abelian group with group action \(\rho : G \times M \to M\). In particular, \(\rho\) satisfies

\[
\rho_g(\rho_h(a)) = \rho_{gh}(b)\]

and

\[
\rho_g(a + b) = \rho_g(a) + \rho_g(b)
\]

where \(a, b \in M\) and we have used additive notation.

Let the \(n\)-cocycles be a function from \(n\) group elements valued in \(M\). Such a function is called an ‘\(n\)-cochain’, and the set of all \(M\)-valued \(n\)-cochains is denoted \(C^n(G, M)\). The set of \(n\)-cochains also forms an Abelian group with multiplication given by

\[
[\omega + \omega'](g_1, \ldots, g_n) = \omega(g_1, \ldots, g_n) + \omega'(g_1, \ldots, g_n).
\]

The inverse of \(\omega\) is \(-\omega\) and the identity element is \(\omega(g_1, \ldots, g_n) = 0 \in M\).

The coboundary operator \(d : C^n(G, M) \to C^{n+1}(G, M)\) is defined by

\[
[d\omega](g_1, \ldots, g_{n+1}) = \rho_g(\omega(g_2, \ldots, g_n))
\]

\[
+ \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^j \omega(g_1, \ldots, g_{j-1}, g_jg_{j+1}, g_{j+2}, \ldots, g_{n+1})
\]

\[
+ (-1)^{n+1} \omega(g_1, \ldots, g_n).
\]

One can check that \(d\omega = 0 \in M\) for any \(n\)-cochain.

We can now define \(n\)-cycles using the coboundary operator \(d\). An \(n\)-cycle is given by an \(n\)-cochain \(\omega\) such that \(d\omega = 0\). The set of \(n\)-cycles is given by

\[
Z^n(G, M) = \{\omega \in C^n(G, M) : d\omega = 0\}.
\]

If an \(n\)-cochain \(\omega = d\mu\), then we say \(\omega\) is an \(n\)-coboundary. We denote the set of \(n\)-coboundaries as,

\[
B^n(G, M) = \{d\mu \in Z^n(G, M) : \mu \in C^{n-1}(G, M)\}
\]

One can check that \(B^n(G, M)\) is a normal subgroup of \(Z^n(G, M)\). The \(n\)-th cohomology group is defined as the quotient of \(Z^n(G, M)\) by \(B^n(G, M)\):

\[
H^n(G, M) = Z^n(G, M) / B^n(G, M).
\]

It is helpful to write down a few examples. A 2-cochain \(\omega \in C^2(G, M)\) is a 2-cocycle if it satisfies,

\[
\rho_g(\omega(h, k)) - \omega(gh, k) + \omega(g, hk) - \omega(g, h) = 0.
\]

A 2-cochain \(\omega \in C^2(G, M)\) is a 2-coboundary if there exists a \(\mu \in C^1(G, M)\) such that,

\[
\omega(g, h) = [d\mu](g, h) = \rho_g(\mu(h)) - \mu(gh) + \mu(g).
\]

1. Short Exact Sequences

Given three groups \(A, B,\) and \(C\), and two homomorphisms \(\alpha : A \to B\) and \(\beta : B \to C\), we say the sequence \(\alpha \xrightarrow{\beta} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C\) is exact if \(\ker \beta = \im \alpha\). A short exact sequence of Abelian groups \(A, B,\) and \(C\) is written as

\[
0 \to A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C \to 0
\]

where each homomorphism is exact. We have that \(C \cong B/A\). When the image of \(i\) is in the center of \(B\) the sequence defines a central extension. In the main text we are primarily concerned with the case where \(A, B,\) and \(C\) are Abelian groups, in which case the extension is always a central extension. To fully specify the group \(B\) in terms of \(A\) and \(C\), we need to specify the extension class \([\phi] \in H^2(C, A)\). Letting \(\phi \in [\phi]\) be a representative
2-cocycle, we can specify the group group elements of $B$ by pairs $(a, c) \in A \times C$ with group operation,
\[(a, c) \times (a', c') = (a + a' + \phi(c, c'), cc').\]  
(C11)
We have assumed $A$ is Abelian and $i(A)$ is in the center of $B$. For later use, we also note that a section of the map $f : B \to C$ is a function $s : C \to B$ such that $s \circ f = \text{id}_C$.

We first encounter short exact sequences in the context of the full symmetry group $G^l$:
\[\mathbb{Z}_2^l \to G^l \to G,\]  
(C12)
specified by the 2-cocycle $w \in H^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

2. Cup Product

The cup product is well defined when $M$ is a ring. Recall that a ring is an Abelian group with an additional multiplication operation that is associative and distributive. We will denote $\cdot$ for the additional multiplication operation, and reserve $+$ for the multiplication of the Abelian group. Our typical example will be the ring given by integers $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ with the usual addition ($+$) and multiplication ($\cdot$) laws. We will denote it $\mathbb{F}_2$. The cup product is a map of cochains:
\[\cup : C^p(G, M) \times C^q(G, M) \to C^{p+q}(G, M)\]  
(C13)
defined by,
\[\left[\omega \cup \omega'\right](g_1, \ldots, g_{p+q-1}) = (-1)^{p(q+1)} \omega(g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_q, g_{q+1}, \ldots, g_{p+q-1}) \cdot \omega'(g_1, \ldots, g_q)\]  
+ \ldots + \left[\omega \cup \omega'\right](g_1, g_2, g_3, \ldots, g_{q+1}, g_{q+2}, \ldots, g_{p+q-1}) \cdot \omega'(g_2, \ldots, g_{q+1}) \]  
\[\vdots\]
\[\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad (-1)^{q+1} \omega(g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_{p-1}, g_p g_{p+1} \ldots g_{p+q-1}) \cdot \omega'(g_{p+1}, \ldots, g_{q+p-1}).\]  
(C14)
We compute a few examples for $M = \mathbb{F}_2$:
\begin{align*}
[a^{(1)} \cup_1 b^{(2)}](g, h) &= a(gh) \cdot b(g, h) \quad \text{(C18)}
[a^{(2)} \cup_1 b^{(2)}](g, h, k) &= a(gh, k) \cdot b(g, h, k) + a(g, hk) \cdot b(h, k) \quad \text{(C19)}
[a^{(n)} \cup_n b^{(n)}](g_1, \ldots, g_n) &= a^{(n)}(g_1, \ldots, g_n) \cdot b^{(n)}(g_1, \ldots, g_n) \quad \text{(C20)}
\end{align*}
In general when $M = \mathbb{F}_2$ we have,
\[d[a \cup b] = a \cup b + b \cup a + (da) \cup_1 b + a \cup_1 db.\]  
(C21)

Appendix D: Extension of Fermionic Symmetry
Action from $M_0$ to $M$

In this appendix, we consider the extension of fermionic symmetry action from $M_0$ to $M$ in the case where $\ker\left(\text{res}_{M_0}\right) \neq \mathbb{Z}_2^l$. For this problem, it is more convenient to initially work in terms of ordinary actions (homomorphisms), extending $\rho_0$ to $\text{res}_{M_0}(\text{Aut}^\s(M))$ to $\rho : G \to \text{Aut}^\s(M)$, and then impose $\gamma(v_0) = +1$ at the end. To characterize the obstruction in this way, we first define an arbitrary section on the image of the restriction $s : \text{res}_{M_0}(\text{Aut}^\s(M)) \to \text{Aut}^\s(M)$, such that $\text{res}_{M_0} \circ s([\varphi(0)]) = [\varphi(0)]$. Then we define
\[O^\rho(g, h) = s[\rho_g(0)] \cdot s[\rho_{gh}(0)]^{-1} \cdot s[\rho_{gk}(0)]^{-1}.\]  
(D1)
Since $[\rho(0)]$ is a symmetry action and the restriction map is a homomorphism, it follows that $\text{res}_{M_0}(O^\rho(g, h)) = [\mathbb{I}(0)]$, and hence $O^\rho(g, h) \in \ker(\text{res}_{M_0})$. We can also see that
\[dO^\rho(g, h, k) = s[\rho_{gh}(0)] \cdot O^\rho(h, k) \cdot s[\rho_{gk}(0)]^{-1} \cdot O^\rho(gh, k)^{-1} \]  
\[\cdot O^\rho(g, hk) \cdot O^\rho(h, gk)^{-1} \]  
\[= O^\rho(g, h)^{-1} \cdot O^\rho(gh, k)^{-1} \]  
\[\cdot O^\rho(g, hk) \cdot s[\rho(0)] \cdot O^\rho(h, k) \cdot s[\rho(0)]^{-1} \]  
\[= [\mathbb{I}].\]  
(D2)
where the coboundary operator includes a group action through conjugation by $s[\rho(0)]$. The second equivalence is obtained by noting that $\ker(\text{res}_{M_0})$ is a normal subgroup, which is assumed to be Abelian. (As previously
discussed, \( \ker(\text{res}_{\text{M}_b}) \) is known to be Abelian for most cases of interest, e.g. when there are no fusion multiplicities, and is conjectured to generally be true.) The third equivalence follows from the definition of \( O^\rho \).

If we had made a different arbitrary choice of section, \( \hat{s} : \text{res}_{\text{M}_b}(\text{Aut}_b^V(\mathcal{M})) \to \text{Aut}_b^V(\mathcal{M}) \), we would have \( \hat{s}[\rho_b^{(0)}] = \hat{\varsigma}(g) \hat{s}[\rho_b^{(0)}] \) for some \( \hat{\varsigma}(g) \in C^1(G, \ker(\text{res}_{\text{M}_b})) \). This different choice of section would yield

\[
O^\rho(g, h) = \hat{s}[\rho_b^{(0)}] \cdot \hat{\varsigma}(g) \hat{s}[\rho_b^{(0)}]^{-1}.
\]

We note that the effect of the group action included in the coboundary operator here is also independent of the choice of section, since all the pertinent quantities are in \( \ker(\text{res}_{\text{M}_b}) \). Since the arbitrary choice of section should not matter in the definition of an obstruction, we treat these as equivalent definitions, and define the obstruction to be the equivalence class under multiplication with 2-coboundaries \( B^2_{s\rho_b^{(0)}}(G, \ker(\text{res}_{\text{M}_b})) \). Thus, we have

\[
[O^\rho] \in H^2_{s\rho_b^{(0)}}(G, \ker(\text{res}_{\text{M}_b})),
\]

which is independent of the choice of section.

In order to see that \( [O^\rho] \) represents an obstruction to extending the fermionic symmetry action, we note that if \( [\rho_b^*] \) is an extension of \( [\rho_b^{(0)}] \), then it can be written as \( [\rho_b^*] = \hat{\varsigma}(g) \hat{s}[\rho_b^{(0)}] \) for some \( \hat{\varsigma}(g) \in C^1(G, \ker(\text{res}_{\text{M}_b})) \). Then we see that the condition that \( [\rho] \) is an extension of \( [\rho_b^{(0)}] \) is an homomorphism translates into the condition

\[
O^\rho(g, h) = \hat{s}[\rho_b^{(0)}] \cdot \hat{\varsigma}(h) \hat{s}[\rho_b^{(0)}]^{-1} \cdot \hat{\varsigma}^{-1}(g) \hat{s}[\rho_b^{(0)}] \cdot \hat{\varsigma}(g) = d\hat{\varsigma}(g, h).
\]

This shows \( [O^\rho] \) is indeed an obstruction to extending the symmetry action \( [\rho_b^{(0)}] \), as it is impossible to satisfy this equation unless \( O^\rho \in B^2_{s\rho_b^{(0)}}(G, \ker(\text{res}_{\text{M}_b})) \) is a 2-coboundary, that is, unless \( [O^\rho] = [1] \).

It also follows from this analysis that, for any \( [\rho] \) that is an extension of \( [\rho_b^{(0)}] \), we can define another valid extension by \( [\rho_b^*] = [\rho_b^*] \cdot [\rho_b^{(0)}] \), where \( [\rho_b^*] \in H^2_{s\rho_b^{(0)}}(G, \ker(\text{res}_{\text{M}_b})) \). Thus, the set of extensions of \( [\rho_b^{(0)}] \) to \( \psi \)-fixed topological symmetries on \( \mathcal{M} \) is a \( H^2_{s\rho_b^{(0)}}(G, \ker(\text{res}_{\text{M}_b})) \) torsor.

Finally, in order to lift this analysis to apply to the extension of fermionic symmetry actions, we replace \( \text{Aut}_b^V(\mathcal{M}) \) with \( \text{Aut}_b^f(\mathcal{M}) \) by imposing \( \gamma_{\psi_b}(g) = 1 \) and allowing \( \mathcal{Q} \)-projective actions, when \( \mathcal{Q} \) is nontrivial.

When \( \mathcal{Q} = [1] \) (i.e. \( A_1 \neq \emptyset \)) or when \( \text{res}_{\text{M}_b}[\mathcal{Q}] \in \text{Aut}_b^f(\mathcal{M}_b) \) is nontrivial (i.e. \( A_1 = A_1 \neq \emptyset \)), the results for \( \text{Aut}_b^V(\mathcal{M}) \) lift without modification. When \( [\mathcal{Q}] \in \text{Aut}_b^f(\mathcal{M}) \) is nontrivial and \( \text{res}_{\text{M}_b}[\mathcal{Q}] = [1] \), we have \( \text{Aut}_b^f(\mathcal{M}_b) \), i.e. when \( A_1 = \emptyset \) and \( \hat{A}_1 \neq \emptyset \), this allows the freedom to change the extension \( [\rho_b^*] \) by \( [\mathcal{Q}] \mathcal{O}(g) \), where \( r(g) \in C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^Q) \). In this case, there is an extra \( C^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2^Q) \) freedom in the classification corresponding to a choice of \( \mathcal{Q} \)-projectiveness of the extension.

**Appendix E: Condensation Review**

This appendix reviews the details of topological Bose condensation necessary to verify claims in the main text. More comprehensive expositions of anyon condensation in both the mathematics and physics literature are given in Refs. 41, 69–73. The diagrammatic formalism of this appendix mostly follows that of Ref. 69; this formalism does not appear in the main text but can be used to verify all calculations described therein.

We consider a braided tensor category \( C \) that contains a boson \( b \) among its simple objects. Physically, condensing \( b \) means that we identify \( b \) with the trivial object \( I \) and solve for the resulting theory. Mathematically, we define

\[
A = I \oplus b
\]

and solve for the ‘condensed theory’ \( C/A \). Below, we define the simple objects, fusion rules, and \( F \)-symbols of \( C/A \). Although most of what we say holds more generally, we restrict our attention to bosons \( b \) which satisfy

\[
b \otimes b = I, \quad R^{bb} = 1, \quad F_b^{bb} = 1.
\]

An ‘algebra object’ refers to the pair \( (A, m) \), where \( A \in C \) is the direct sum of vacuum and condensing boson defined in Eq. (E1), and \( m \) is a co-multiplication morphism \( m : A \to A \times A \) subject to certain consistency conditions, see e.g. Ref. 69. Technically, we need a commutative Frobenius Algebra object, which requires a unit, a co-unit, a multiplication, and a comultiplication. These maps need to satisfy several consistency conditions, of which we just give a representative list here, and the interested reader can look to [72] for more details. The comultiplication is defined diagrammatically as

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\; & A & \; \\
\; & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
A & \otimes & A \\
\; & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
\; & b & \; \\
\; & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
b & + & b \\
\end{array}
\]

The dual, multiplication map \( m : A \times A \to A \) is found by reflecting the diagrams. Given that \( b = b \) and \( \kappa_b = +1 \), we do not draw arrows on the \( b \) strands. A crucial consistency condition on \( m \) is,

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\; & A & \; \\
\; & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
A & \otimes & A \\
\; & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
\; & m & \; \\
\; & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
m & + & m \\
\end{array}
\]

Using the assumptions in Eq. (E2) it is easy to check the comultiplication defined in Eq. (E3) satisfies this condition. The Frobenius algebra object is called commutative
if it further satisfies,

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
A \quad A \\
\quad m \\
\quad A
\end{array}
\end{array} = \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
A \quad A \\
\quad m \\
\quad A
\end{array}
\end{array}.
\] (E5)

Which can be easily verified using Eqs. (E3) and (E2).

The condensed theory $\mathcal{C}/A$ inherits the objects and tensor product of objects from the parent theory $\mathcal{C}$. The key difference between the theories is that some objects in $\mathcal{C}$ (namely, those related by fusion with $b$) become isomorphic in $\mathcal{C}/A$. This is written mathematically by modifying the morphisms of $\mathcal{C}/A$ so that

\[
\text{mor}_{\mathcal{C}/A}(x \to y) \cong \text{mor}_{\mathcal{C}}(x \to y \otimes A).
\] (E6)

For $f \in \text{mor}_{\mathcal{C}/A}(x \to y)$ and $g \in \text{mor}_{\mathcal{C}/A}(x' \to y')$, we define the tensor product as

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
y \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y'
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x' \quad A \\
\quad m \\
\quad A
\end{array}
\end{array} = \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
y \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y'
\end{array}
\end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x' \quad A \\
\quad m \\
\quad A
\end{array}
\end{array}.
\] (E7)

Eqs. (E1-E7) define all the basic data and operations in $\mathcal{C}/A$ in terms of that of the parent theory $\mathcal{C}$. We now use this data to compute the ‘module objects’ in $\mathcal{C}/A$, which, in somewhat of an abuse of terminology, we will refer to as the simple objects of $\mathcal{C}/A$.

A ‘module object’ $(x, \mu)$ in $\mathcal{C}/A$ is an object $x \in \mathcal{C}$, along with a collection of morphisms $\mu : x \to x \times A$ defined diagrammatically by

\[
(x, \mu) = \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y
\end{array}
\end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x' \quad A \\
\quad m \\
\quad A
\end{array}
\end{array}.
\] (E8)

and subject to the consistency condition

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x' \quad A \\
\quad m \\
\quad A
\end{array}
\end{array} = \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x' \quad A \\
\quad m \\
\quad A
\end{array}
\end{array}.
\] (E9)

Notice that the pair $(A, m)$ automatically satisfy this condition, and indeed represent the “new” vacuum; see Eq. (E4). Typically $x$ will either be a simple object which is fixed under fusion with $b$ or a direct sum of objects related by fusion with $b$. In the latter case, we often use a representative object to label the isomorphism class and the algebra object to write down the corresponding simple module object,

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y
\end{array}
\end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array} = \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}.
\] (E10)

Writing the module object in this way can often simplify calculations.

A ‘module morphism’ $f$ between objects $(x, \mu)$ and $(y, \nu)$ is given by $f \in \text{mor}_{\mathcal{C}/A}(x \to y)$ such that $[f \otimes \text{id}] \circ (x, \mu) = (y, \nu) \circ f$. Two module objects $(x, \mu)$ and $(y, \nu)$ are isomorphic if there exists an isomorphism $f : x \to y$ such that

\[
[f \otimes \text{id}] \circ (x, \mu) = (y, \nu) \circ f.
\] (E11)

In practice, it is not necessary to keep track of the whole isomorphism class of module objects, but rather a list of representatives, such as in Eq. (E10). The endomorphism algebra of a module object $(x, \mu)$ is defined as

\[
\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}/A}(x, \mu) = \{ f \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(x) : [f \otimes \text{id}] \circ (x, \mu) = (x, \mu) \circ f \}.
\] (E12)

A ‘simple’ or ‘irreducible’ module object is one whose endomorphism algebra is $\mathbb{C}$. We say the set of simple module objects $\{(x, \mu)\}$ is complete if, for every morphism $\varphi \in \text{mor}_{\mathcal{C}/A}(x \to y)$, there exists an $f_{(z, \nu)\to y} \in \text{mor}_{\mathcal{C}/A}(z \to y)$ and a $g_{x\to(z, \nu)} \in \text{mor}_{\mathcal{C}/A}(x \to z)$ such that $\varphi = \sum_{(z, \nu)} f_{(z, \nu)\to y} \circ g_{x\to(z, \nu)}$. It is sufficient to keep track of a complete set of simple module objects.

Once a complete collection of simple module objects has been specified, we can compute the fusion rules and splitting spaces of the condensed theory by solving the relations

\[
\sum_{z} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array} = \sum_{(z, \sigma)} \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
\hline
\hline
f \\
\hline
y
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}.
\] (E13)

The sum on the left is over all objects $z$ appearing in the fusion $x \otimes y$, and the sum on the right is over all simple module objects $(z, \sigma)$, and $\alpha$ is a vector in $\bigoplus_z V_x^{	au y}$. Eq. (E13) can be viewed as a set of equations determining $\alpha$. If a copy of $(z, \sigma)$ appears on the right side of Eq. (E13), then it appears in the tensor product of $(x, \mu) \otimes (y, \nu)$. If multiple linearly independent $\alpha$ satisfy Eq. (E13), then the condensed theory will have fusion multiplicity, and the fusion spaces are labeled each $\alpha$. When the condensed theory has no fusion multiplicity $\alpha$ is unique and in such cases we will not label $\alpha$ for each fusion vertex, but rather leave it implicitly determined by the surrounding simple module objects.

When the condensed theory is multiplicity free, the associators ($F$-symbols) of the condensed theory $\mathcal{C}/A$ are defined by the relation

\[
\text{Eq. E13 can be viewed as a set of equations determining } \alpha.\]
Including multiplicity indices is straightforward. The associators are completely determined by the simple module objects, the fusion vertices, and the $F$- and $R$-symbols of the parent theory $C$. One can check that this definition of the $F$-symbols satisfies the pentagon equation.

We now compute some examples relevant to the main text. A simple object in the parent theory $C$ will either be fixed under fusion with $b$ ($s \otimes b = s$), or not ($r \otimes b = r'$). These two cases correspond to two kinds of simple module objects $(x, \mu)$ in $C/A$: (1) those for which $x = r \oplus r'$; and (2) those for which $x = s$.

For case (1), there is a one-parameter family of solutions to Eq. (E9), given by

$$\sum_{(q, \delta), \mu, \nu} [F_{(w, \rho)}^{(x, \mu)(y, \nu)(z, \tau)}]_{([p, \lambda, \alpha, \beta]) ([q, \delta), \mu, \nu]} = \sum_{(q, \delta), \mu, \nu} [F_{(w, \rho)}^{(x, \mu)(y, \nu)(z, \tau)}]_{([p, \lambda, \alpha, \beta]) ([q, \delta), \mu, \nu]}.$$  \hfill (E14)

The remaining fusion rules can be inferred using the pivotal structure of the condensed theory. For example, if $(s, \alpha) \otimes (\tilde{s}, \beta) \cong (r \oplus r', \mu)$, then we also have $(\tilde{s}, \beta) \otimes (r \oplus r', \mu) \cong (s, \alpha)$. The dual objects are defined by [69]

$$\overline{(x, \mu)} \cong \bigotimes_{\mu} \bigotimes_{r} (x, \mu). \hfill (E19)$$

Finally, we remark that we are only interested in the subcategory of $C/A$ which braids trivially with $b$. All objects with nontrivial monodromy with $b$ will be confined and therefore discarded.

**Appendix F: Associativity of Stacking Fermionic Theories**

In this appendix we prove that if $(A, m)$ and $(A, m')$ are two commutative Frobenius algebra objects in $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$, then they are isomorphic. A direct consequence is that the algebra condensed in $(\mathcal{M}_{1}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{M}_{1}^{(2)} \times \mathcal{M}_{1}^{(3)} \times \mathcal{G}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{G}^{(2)} \times \mathcal{G}^{(3)})$ is isomorphic to the algebra condensed in $\mathcal{M}_{1}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{G}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{M}_{1}^{(2)} \times \mathcal{G}^{(2)} \times \mathcal{M}_{1}^{(3)} \times \mathcal{G}^{(3)}$, and thus that the resulting theories are isomorphic.

It is convenient to label topological charges in $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^n$ with elements of $\mathbb{Z}_2^n$. We will write them as vectors $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ with each $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$. The braiding and fusion are,

$$x \otimes y = x + y \mod 2, \quad R^{x,y} = (-1)^{(x \cdot y)}, \quad F^{x,y,z} = 1 \hfill (F1)$$

In the exponent we have used the dot product $(x, y) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j y_j$. For future use we note that the topological spin of an object $x$ is given by $(-1)^{x} = (-1)^{x \cdot x}$. 

We now label all commutative Frobenius algebra objects \((A, m)\) in the BTC \((\mathbb{Z}_2)\)\(^n\). A commutative Frobenius algebra object in \((\mathbb{Z}_2)\)\(^n\) consists of an object \(A \in (\mathbb{Z}_2)\)\(^n\) and a collection of multiplications \(m\). We can identify \(A\) with a subgroup \(K\) of \(\mathbb{Z}_2\)\(^n\) specifying a collection of bosons which we wish to condense:

\[
A = \bigoplus_{x \in K} \psi_1^x \psi_2^x \cdots \psi_n^x.
\]

(F2)

In order for \(x \in K\) to be a boson, we must have \((-1)^{(x,x)} = 1\). The associativity condition on the multiplication implies \(m \in Z^2(K, U(1))\). Requiring \(A\) to be a commutative algebra object additionally requires the multiplication to satisfy

\[
m_{x,y} = (-1)^{(x,y)} m_{y,x}.
\]

(F3)

We now prove that any two 2-cocycles \(m, m' \in H^2(K, U(1))\) satisfying Eq. (F3) are cohomologous. This implies that the algebra objects \((A, m)\) and \((A, m')\) are related by an isomorphism, and therefore condensing them results in isomorphic theories. We first note that the difference of any two 2-cocycles satisfying Eq. (F3) is a symmetric 2-cocycle \(m'm^{-1}\) valued in \(U(1)\). It is known that all symmetric 2-cocycles on an Abelian group valued in \(U(1)\) are cohomologous. To see this we note that \(H^2(K, U(1))\) symmetric defines an Abelian extension of \(K\) by \(U(1)\). Furthermore, equivalence classes of Abelian extensions of \(K\) by \(U(1)\) are in one-to-one correspondence with elements of \(\text{Ext}^1(K, U(1))\). As \(U(1)\) is injective, \(\text{Ext}^1(K, U(1)) = 0\), and there is only one extension of \(K\) by \(U(1)\). Thus \(H^2(K, U(1))\) symmetric = \(\mathbb{Z}_1\), meaning all 2-cocycles on \(K\) satisfying Eq. (F3) are isomorphic.

Thus we have shown that there is only one multiplication, up to isomorphism, on a commutative Frobenius algebra object \((A, m) \in (\mathbb{Z}_2)\)\(^n\). As such, when fermionic stacking, the algebra objects we condense will always be isomorphic, meaning that the condensates will be the same, up to a relabeling of topological charges and gauge transformations.

When we stack and condense fermionic theories in different orders, the algebra objects we condense are necessarily isomorphic, and so the condensates will be the same up to a relabeling of topological charges and gauge transformations. Therefore, fermionic stacking is associative. We denote the one Frobenius algebra object generated by \(n\)-fermions and its multiplication morphism (up to isomorphism) by \(A[\psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots, \psi_n]\).

**Appendix G: Verifying \(\mathcal{Y}\) for Nontrivial Symmetry Action**

We remind the reader that \(\mathcal{Y}\) in Eq. (482) must satisfy,

\[
d\mathcal{Y} = (-1)^{p \cup p'' + p' \cup (p' + p'')} \cdots \cup p' \cup p'' \cup p',
\]

(G1)

To verify \(\mathcal{Y}\) as given in Eq. (482) satisfies this relation one needs to know the following facts which we borrow from Ref. 28 (see prop. 3.2):

\[
d(p' \cup p'') = p' \cup p'' + p'' \cup p',
\]

(G2)

\[
d[(p' + p'') \cup (\pi' \cup \pi'')] = (p' + p'') \cup (\pi' \cup \pi'')
\]

(G3)

\[
\quad \quad \quad + (\pi' \cup \pi'') \cup (p' + p''),
\]

(G4)

\[
d[\pi' \cup (\pi' \cup \pi'')] = \pi' \cup (\pi' \cup \pi''),
\]

(G5)

\[
d[\pi' \cup (\pi' \cup \pi'')] = (-1)^{\pi' \cup \pi''} \pi' \cup \pi''
\]

(G6)

The last equality here might look strange and deserves some explanation. Writing \(\pi' \cup \pi''\) as an \(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}\) cochain, we need to compute

\[
d \left( \frac{1}{4} \pi' \cup \pi'' \cup \pi'' \right) = \frac{1}{4} (d\pi') \cup (\pi' \cup \pi'') + \frac{1}{4} \pi' \cup d(\pi' \cup \pi'').
\]

(G7)

By definition we have \([d\pi'](g, h) = \pi'(g) - \pi'(gh) + \pi'(h)\), which is either 0 or 2. It is exactly 2 when \(\pi'(g) = \pi'(h) = 1\), and therefore \(d\pi' = 2\pi' \cup \pi'\). Similarly one can check that \(d(\pi' \cup \pi'') = 4\pi' \cup \pi' \cup \pi'' = 0\). Putting these together one finds Eq. (G6). The asymmetry between \(\pi'\) and \(\pi''\) of Eq. (G6) can be understood by noticing that \(\delta(\pi' \cup \pi'' - \pi' \cup \pi'' \cup \pi'') = d[(-1)^{\frac{1}{2} \pi' \cup \pi''}]\), thus the two options differ by a 3-coboundary and therefore represent identical phases.

**Appendix H: Examples of the Group Law of FSPT Phases from Cochain Triples**

We revisit the \(\mathbb{Z}_8\) and \(\mathbb{Z}_4\) classifications of FSPT phases with \(G^I = \mathbb{Z}_2^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2\) and \(\mathbb{Z}_4\) using the technology presented in Sec. VIA.
1. \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^4 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \)

We can check that the results of Sec. VIA are compatible with the \( \mathbb{Z}_8 \) classification of FSPT phases with \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^4 \times \mathbb{Z} \) found in Section V B 1. Let \( \pi = \text{id} : \mathbb{Z}_2 \to \mathbb{Z}_2 \) be the nontrivial group homomorphism. We will show that

\[
[0, 0, \pi] \quad \text{(H1)}
\]

is order 8 and generates all FSPT phases with \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^4 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \). For this triple, the total obstruction given by \( \Theta(\mathcal{G}_0) = 0 \) vanishes, and so the triple given in Eq. (H1) is admissible. It follows from Eq. (482) that

\[
[0, 0, \pi]^2 = \frac{1}{2} \pi \cup (\pi \cup 1) \cup \pi + \frac{1}{4} \pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, \pi \cup \pi. \quad \text{(H2)}
\]

Stacking this theory with itself and applying Eq. (482) again, we find

\[
[0, 0, \pi]^4 = \frac{1}{2} \pi \cup \pi \cup \pi \cup 0, \quad \text{(H3)}
\]

which we recognize as the nontrivial bosonic SPT phase with \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \). To arrive at Eq. (H3) we used

\[
(\pi \cup \pi) \cup 1 (\pi \cup \pi) = 0 \ mod \ 2, \quad \text{(H4)}
\]

which can be seen from direct computation.

Finally, stacking \([0, 0, \pi]^4\) with itself again, we find

\[
[0, 0, \pi]^8 = [0, 0, 0]. \quad \text{(H5)}
\]

The data of all \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_2^4 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-graded extensions with nontriviality action can be tabulated in a relatively efficient way using the product rule to evaluate \([\pi, 0, 0]^n\):

\[
\begin{align*}
n &= 0 & [0, 0, 0] & \quad \text{(H6)} \\
n &= 1 & [0, 0, \pi] & \quad \text{(H7)} \\
n &= 2 & [(3/4)\pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, \pi \cup \pi, 0] & \quad \text{(H8)} \\
n &= 3 & [(3/4)\pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, \pi \cup \pi, \pi] & \quad \text{(H9)} \\
n &= 4 & [(1/2)\pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, 0, \pi] & \quad \text{(H10)} \\
n &= 5 & [(1/2)\pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, 0, \pi] & \quad \text{(H11)} \\
n &= 6 & [(1/4)\pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, \pi \cup \pi, 0] & \quad \text{(H12)} \\
n &= 7 & [(1/4)\pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, \pi \cup \pi, \pi] & \quad \text{(H13)}
\end{align*}
\]

One can check that the equivalence relations Eqs. (417), (417) and (418) do not relate any of these phases. In the above list, we used \( \pi \cup (\pi \cup 1) \cup \pi = \pi \cup \pi \cup \pi \).

We can also compute all the groups presented in Table VIII

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{G}^{(3, 2, 1)} &= \mathbb{Z}_8 & \quad \text{(H14)} \\
\mathcal{G}^{(3)} &= \mathbb{Z}_2 & \quad \text{(H15)} \\
\mathcal{G}^{(3, 2)} &= \mathbb{Z}_4 & \quad \text{(H16)} \\
\mathcal{G}^{(2)} &= \mathcal{G}^{(3, 2)} / \mathcal{G}^{(3)} = \mathbb{Z}_2 & \quad \text{(H17)} \\
\mathcal{G}^{(1)} &= \mathcal{G}^{(3, 2, 1)} / \mathcal{G}^{(2, 1)} = \mathcal{G}^{(2)} = \mathbb{Z}_2 & \quad \text{(H18)} \\
\mathcal{G}^{(2, 1)} &= \mathcal{G}^{(3, 2, 1)} / \mathcal{G}^{(3)} = \mathbb{Z}_4 & \quad \text{(H19)}
\end{align*}
\]

2. \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_4^4 \)

We now consider a nontrivial extension of \( G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \) by \( \mathbb{Z}_4^4 \). With

\[
w = \pi \cup \pi \quad \text{(H20)}
\]

where \( \pi(1) = 1 \) and \( \pi(0) = 0 \). This is the same scenario encountered in Sec. V B 2, and so we should anticipate \( G(\mathbb{Z}_4^4) = \mathbb{Z}_1 \). We have \( H^2(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_4^4) = \mathbb{Z}_2 \) and can define the nontrivial 2-cocycle by \( \mathbf{p} = \psi_{\mathbb{R}^4}^{\mathbb{R}^4} \). One can check that

\[
O_r(\mathcal{I}_{\pi \cup \pi}) = O_r(\psi_{\mathbb{R}^4}^{\mathbb{R}^4}) = 1. \quad \text{(H21)}
\]

Hence we have four triples satisfying given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
(0, 0, 0)_{\pi \cup \pi} & \quad \text{(H22)} \\
(1/2)\pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, \pi \cup \pi, 0)_{\pi \cup \pi} & \quad \text{(H23)} \\
(1/2)\pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, 0, 0)_{\pi \cup \pi} & \quad \text{(H24)} \\
(0, \pi \cup \pi, 0)_{\pi \cup \pi} & \quad \text{(H25)}
\end{align*}
\]

We now quotient by the equivalence relations given by Eqs. (417) and (418). If we set \( \chi(g) = \psi_{\mathbb{R}^4}^{\mathbb{R}^4} \) in Eq. (417), we find

\[
[(1/2)\pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, 0, 0]_{\pi \cup \pi} = [0, 0, 0]_{\pi \cup \pi}, \quad \text{(H26)}
\]

which identifies Eq. (H22) with Eq. (H24), and Eq. (H23) with Eq. (H25). Next we consider Eq. (418), and see that

\[
[0, \pi \cup \pi, 0]_{\pi \cup \pi} = [(1/2)\pi \cup \pi \cup \pi, 0, 0]_{\pi \cup \pi}, \quad \text{(H27)}
\]

thereby identifying Eq. (H24) with Eq. (H25). Combining the above confirms that there is only one FSPT with \( \mathcal{G}^f = \mathbb{Z}_4^4 \).

We can compute all the groups presented in Table VIII

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{G}^{(3, 2, 1)} &= \mathbb{Z}_1 & \quad \text{(H28)} \\
\mathcal{G}^{(3)} &= \mathbb{Z}_1 & \quad \text{(H29)} \\
\mathcal{G}^{(3, 2)} &= \mathbb{Z}_1 & \quad \text{(H30)} \\
\mathcal{G}^{(2)} &= \mathcal{G}^{(3, 2)} / \mathcal{G}^{(3)} = \mathbb{Z}_1 & \quad \text{(H31)} \\
\mathcal{G}^{(1)} &= \mathcal{G}^{(3, 2, 1)} / \mathcal{G}^{(2, 1)} = \mathcal{G}^{(2)} / \mathcal{G}^{(2)} = \mathbb{Z}_1 & \quad \text{(H32)} \\
\mathcal{G}^{(2, 1)} &= \mathcal{G}^{(3, 2, 1)} / \mathcal{G}^{(3)} = \mathbb{Z}_1 & \quad \text{(H33)}
\end{align*}
\]
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If generalizing to a system with multiple physical fermions \( \psi^{(i)} \), all must satisfy \( \gamma_{\psi^{(i)}} = 1 \).

We do not know an example where \( \text{res}_{M_0}(\text{Aut}^{/f}(M)) \neq \text{Aut}^{/f}(M_0) \) when topological symmetries are not space or time reflecting. However, they are ubiquitous when considering symmetries that reflect space or time. For example, when \( M \) has a space or time reflecting topological symmetry, there are no nontrivial space or time reflecting topological symmetries of \( M \otimes K^{(w)}/A[\psi^{(1)}, \psi^{(2)}] \) for \( \nu \neq 0 \) or 8, since such topological symmetries imply \( c_r = 0 \) mod 4 for a MTC.


FSPT phases with trivial symmetry action have the same total and relative obstructions, i.e., \( O_r(p_\nu, 0) = O_r(p_\nu, 0) \).


[74] At first glance, one might worry this product is not gauge-invariant. This is not a concern as the gauge has been fully determined by the assumption $F^{xbb} = 1$. 