

Pauli stabilizer models of twisted quantum doubles

Tyler D. Ellison,^{1,2,*} Yu-An Chen,³ Arpit Dua,⁴ Wilbur Shirley,^{4,5} Nathanan Tantivasadakarn,⁶ and Dominic J. Williamson^{7,†}

¹*Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA*

²*Department of Physics, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511, USA*

³*Department of Physics, Condensed Matter Theory Center,
and Joint Quantum Institute, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA*

⁴*Department of Physics and Institute for Quantum Information and Matter,
California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA*

⁵*School of Natural Sciences, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA*

⁶*Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*

⁷*Stanford Institute for Theoretical Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA*

(Dated: December 16, 2022)

We construct a Pauli stabilizer model for every two-dimensional Abelian topological order that admits a gapped boundary. Our primary example is a Pauli stabilizer model on four-dimensional qudits that belongs to the double semion (DS) phase of matter. The DS stabilizer Hamiltonian is constructed by condensing an emergent boson in a \mathbb{Z}_4 toric code, where the condensation is implemented at the level of the ground states by two-body measurements. We rigorously verify the topological order of the DS stabilizer model by identifying an explicit finite-depth quantum circuit (with ancillary qubits) that maps its ground state subspace to that of a DS string-net model. We show that the construction of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian generalizes to all twisted quantum doubles (TQDs) with Abelian anyons. This yields a Pauli stabilizer code on composite-dimensional qudits for each such TQD, implying that the classification of topological Pauli stabilizer codes extends well beyond stacks of toric codes – in fact, exhausting all Abelian anyon theories that admit a gapped boundary. We also demonstrate that symmetry-protected topological phases of matter characterized by type I and type II cocycles can be modeled by Pauli stabilizer Hamiltonians by gauging certain 1-form symmetries of the TQD stabilizer models.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. Double semion stabilizer model	3
A. Definition of the Pauli stabilizer model	3
B. Construction of the Pauli stabilizer model	5
C. Relation to the string-net model	8
III. Primer on Abelian anyon theories	11
IV. Twisted quantum double stabilizer models	13
A. Anyon theories of twisted quantum doubles	13
B. Construction of the Pauli stabilizer models	15
V. Pauli stabilizer models of SPT phases	19
VI. Discussion	22
A. Relation to string-net model ground states	23
1. Simplicial cohomology notation	23
2. Ground state mapping	25
3. String-net model ground state amplitudes	27
B. K -matrix formulation of twisted quantum doubles	28
C. Anyon fusion groups of twisted quantum doubles	30
References	31

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum error correcting codes are essential for protecting quantum information from environmental noise and faulty operations [1–3]. One of the most prominent classes of quantum error correcting codes are the two-dimensional topological quantum codes [4], in which quantum information is encoded in degenerate eigenstates of topologically ordered systems [5–9]. Topological quantum codes offer protection from arbitrary local errors, due to the local indistinguishability of the degenerate eigenstates [10], and admit fault-tolerant operations with low-overhead, derived from the properties of the anyons in the underlying topological order [4, 11–13]. Despite the merits of two-dimensional topological quantum codes, it can be challenging to assess the error correcting properties of a general topologically ordered system.

A class of topological quantum codes with particularly transparent error correcting properties are the topological Pauli stabilizer codes [4, 10, 14]. These combine the robust error correction of topological quantum codes with the simple algebraic structures of Pauli stabilizer codes [15]. In general, topological Pauli stabilizer codes are defined by Pauli stabilizer models – i.e., Hamiltonians whose terms are mutually commuting local products of Pauli operators [4]. By convention, the ground state subspace of the Pauli stabilizer model defines the logical subspace of the error correcting code. Topological Pauli stabilizer codes are exemplified by the \mathbb{Z}_2 toric code (TC) and the generalization to N -dimensional qudits referred to as the \mathbb{Z}_N TC (or \mathbb{Z}_N quantum double), both introduced in Ref. [4].

The characteristic properties of a topological Pauli stabi-

* Email: tyler.ellison@yale.edu

† Current Address: Centre for Engineered Quantum Systems, School of Physics, University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales 2006, Australia

lizer code can be understood in terms of the topological order of the underlying Pauli stabilizer model. The \mathbb{Z}_N TC, for example, is based on the topological order of a \mathbb{Z}_N gauge theory [16], and the properties of the gauge charges and fluxes are central to fault-tolerant quantum computations using the \mathbb{Z}_N TC [10, 17, 18]. This motivates developing a classification of the topological phases of matter captured by Pauli stabilizer models. Such a classification informs us about the universal properties that can be exploited for quantum computation using a topological Pauli stabilizer code. This leads to the natural question: what topological phases of matter can be described by Pauli stabilizer models?

This question was partially addressed in the works of Refs. [19–21]. Under a technical assumption [22], it was shown in Refs. [19] and [20] that all (translation invariant) Pauli stabilizer models on qubits belong to the same phase as the \mathbb{Z}_2 TC or decoupled copies of the \mathbb{Z}_2 TC. Later, this was generalized to prime-dimensional qudits and made rigorous by Ref. [21]. Ref. [21] proved that, for any prime p , every (translation invariant) Pauli stabilizer model on p -dimensional qudits [23] has the same topological order as some number of decoupled copies of the \mathbb{Z}_p TC [24]. This completes the classification of (translation invariant) Pauli stabilizer models on prime-dimensional qudits, showing that the universal properties of Pauli stabilizer models on prime-dimensional qudits are fully captured by TCs. However, the works of Refs. [19–21] leave the classification of Pauli stabilizer models on composite-dimensional qudits (i.e. products of primes) unaddressed. One can ask: are there Pauli stabilizer models on composite-dimensional qudits that capture more exotic topological phases of matter – beyond that of decoupled layers of the \mathbb{Z}_N TC?

In this work, we answer this question in the affirmative. We construct Pauli stabilizer models defined on composite-dimensional qudits that realize *all Abelian anyon theories that admit a gapped boundary*. These models define topological Pauli stabilizer codes whose underlying topological order is beyond that of the \mathbb{Z}_N TC or decoupled copies of the \mathbb{Z}_N TC. This represents a substantial step towards a full classification of topological Pauli stabilizer codes, which is evidently much richer than suggested by the classification for prime-dimensional qudits. Furthermore, based on the expectation that commuting projector Hamiltonians in two spatial dimensions must have gapped boundaries [25, 26], we expect that the Pauli stabilizer models presented here yield a complete classification of topological Pauli stabilizer codes.

We emphasize that the Pauli stabilizer models introduced in this work can be distinguished from copies of the \mathbb{Z}_N TC by the properties of their anyonic excitations. For example, we define a Pauli stabilizer model that belongs to the double semion (DS) topological phase of matter. Similar to the \mathbb{Z}_2 TC, the DS topological order has four types of anyons. However, in marked contrast, the DS topological order features semionic excitations – which produce a statistical phase of i upon interchange. As there is no such excitation for a \mathbb{Z}_2 TC, the DS stabilizer model belongs to a distinct phase of matter. Instead, it can be interpreted as a *twisted* gauge theory, more formally known as a twisted quantum double (TQD), where

the ‘twist’ manifests in the exotic exchange statistics of the gauge fluxes [27–29].

More generally, the Pauli stabilizer models presented here capture all TQDs with Abelian anyons, which according to Refs. [30] and [31], account for every Abelian topological order with gapped boundaries [32]. Therefore, we lay the groundwork for using universal properties beyond those of the TC for quantum computing using topological Pauli stabilizer codes. We also define Pauli stabilizer models of symmetry-protected topological phases of matter. While the ground state subspaces of such models are nondegenerate on a closed manifold – and hence, cannot be used to encode quantum information – they are of interest as they evade the no-go theorems of Ref. [33].

The Pauli stabilizer models described in this work are constructed from copies of the \mathbb{Z}_N TC by condensing (i.e., proliferating) certain bosonic anyons [34–36]. This exploits the fact that all TQDs with Abelian anyons can be obtained from decoupled copies of the \mathbb{Z}_N TC through condensation, as pointed out in Refs. [34] and [37]. We show further that the condensation can be implemented within the stabilizer formalism using few-body Pauli measurements. As a result, condensation maps Pauli stabilizer models to Pauli stabilizer models. We note that this builds off of earlier works, in which boson condensation was used to construct tensor network representations of TQD ground states [37, 38] and symmetry-protected topological states [39].

It is worth noting that exactly solvable models of TQDs have been introduced in previous works. In particular, commuting projector Hamiltonians of TQDs were first described in Refs. [28, 29, 40]. These models were then leveraged to build non-Pauli stabilizer models of TQDs in Refs. [41, 42]. While these models indeed capture the characteristic properties of TQDs, their potential for fault-tolerant quantum computation is relatively opaque (although, see Ref. [43]). The TQD models presented here have the key feature that they can be fully understood within the familiar Pauli stabilizer formalism. This opens up the possibility for novel applications of TQDs to quantum computation and provides algebraically simple models for simulating topological phases of matter.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section II, we introduce the paradigmatic example of our construction – the DS stabilizer model. We then derive the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian by condensing a boson in the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC, and establish its topological order by mapping its ground state subspace to that of the DS string-net model using a finite-depth quantum circuit (with ancilla). Next, to generalize the DS stabilizer model to Pauli stabilizer models of TQDs, we provide a primer on Abelian anyon theories in Section III. Subsequently, in Section IV, we construct Pauli stabilizer models of TQDs, starting with a review of the characteristic data of TQDs with Abelian anyons. The associated Pauli stabilizer models are constructed by condensing anyons in decoupled layers of TCs. In Section V, we derive Pauli stabilizer models of SPT phases by condensing gauge charges in the Pauli stabilizer models of TQDs. Appendix A gives further details on the mapping of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian to the DS string-net model, and Appendices B and C provide examples of TQDs and a general

formula for the group structure of the anyons in TQDs.

II. DOUBLE SEMION STABILIZER MODEL

Before describing the general construction of topological Pauli stabilizer models of twisted quantum doubles with Abelian anyons, we provide a concrete example. Our example is a Pauli stabilizer model defined on four-dimensional qudits that belongs to the double semion (DS) phase of matter. In Section II A, we define the Pauli stabilizer Hamiltonian and show explicitly that its anyonic excitations exhibit the characteristic properties of the anyons in the DS topological order. In the subsequent section, Section II B, we construct the DS stabilizer model from a \mathbb{Z}_4 toric code (TC) by condensing certain excitations. We then conclude the section with Section II C, where we use a finite-depth quantum circuit to map the ground state subspace of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian to that of the DS string-net model of Refs. [44] and [45].

We start by recalling the characteristic properties of the anyons in the DS phase, which we label by $\{1, s, \bar{s}, s\bar{s}\}$. Similar to the anyons in the \mathbb{Z}_2 TC phase, these form a $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ group under fusion, with the fusion rules given by:

$$s \times s = 1, \quad \bar{s} \times \bar{s} = 1, \quad s \times \bar{s} = s\bar{s}. \quad (1)$$

The exchange statistics and braiding of the anyons are determined by the function $\theta : \{1, s, \bar{s}, s\bar{s}\} \rightarrow U(1)$, defined by:

$$\theta(1) = 1, \quad \theta(s) = i, \quad \theta(\bar{s}) = -i, \quad \theta(s\bar{s}) = 1. \quad (2)$$

Physically, $\theta(a)$ is the phase obtained upon exchanging two identical a anyons. Eq. (2) tells us that s is a semion, \bar{s} is an anti-semion, and $s\bar{s}$ is a boson, i.e., the wave function incurs a phase of i , $-i$, and 1 , respectively. The statistics of the anyons are an invariant of topological order – they cannot be changed by any local perturbations of the Hamiltonian that preserve the energy gap. Therefore, the statistics in Eq. (2) distinguish the DS topological order from the \mathbb{Z}_2 TC phase. The braiding relations of the anyons can then be deduced from the exchange statistics θ using the expression in Eq. (68), introduced later in the text. Here, we simply state that the semions and anti-semions have the following braiding relations:

$$B_\theta(s, s) = -1, \quad B_\theta(\bar{s}, \bar{s}) = -1, \quad B_\theta(s, \bar{s}) = 1, \quad (3)$$

where $B_\theta(a, a')$ is the phase accrued from a full braid of the anyons a and a' . We show that the anyonic excitations of the DS stabilizer model, described in the next section, obey Eqs. (1) and (2), which indicates that it belongs to the DS phase.

A. Definition of the Pauli stabilizer model

Here, we describe a Pauli stabilizer Hamiltonian belonging to the DS phase. The Hamiltonian is defined on a square lattice with a four-dimensional qudit at each edge, as shown in




FIG. 1. The DS stabilizer model is defined on a square lattice with a single four-dimensional qudit (blue) at each edge.

Fig. 1. The generalized Pauli X and Pauli Z operators at an edge e are:

$$X_e = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_4} |j+1\rangle\langle j|, \quad Z_e = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_4} i^j |j\rangle\langle j|, \quad (4)$$

where we have labeled the computational basis states by $j \in \mathbb{Z}_4$. These operators are sometimes referred to as the shift and clock operators, respectively. They satisfy the relations:

$$X_e^4 = 1, \quad Z_e^4 = 1, \quad (5)$$

and for any pair of edges e and e' , they obey the commutation relations:

$$Z_e X_{e'} = \begin{cases} i X_{e'} Z_e & e = e' \\ X_{e'} Z_e & e \neq e'. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The DS stabilizer Hamiltonian then takes the form:

$$H_{\text{DS}} \equiv - \sum_v A_v - \sum_p B_p - \sum_e C_e + \text{h.c.}, \quad (7)$$

where the sums are over all vertices v , plaquettes p , and edges e , respectively. We find it convenient to represent the Hamiltonian terms graphically, as shown below:

$$A_v \equiv \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline Z^\dagger \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline X^\dagger Z^\dagger \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline v \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline X^\dagger Z \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline X \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}, \quad B_p \equiv \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline Z^2 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline Z^2 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline p \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline Z^2 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline Z^2 \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}, \quad (8)$$

$$C_e \equiv \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline X_e^2 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline Z^2 \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline X_e^2 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline Z^2 \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}.$$

Note that the definition of C_e depends on whether the edge e is vertical or horizontal. Using the commutation relations in Eq. (6), it can be checked that the terms are mutually commuting.

Given that the Hamiltonian terms commute with one another, they define the stabilizer group \mathcal{S}_{DS} :

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{DS}} \equiv \langle \{A_v\}, \{B_p\}, \{C_e\} \rangle, \quad (9)$$

where the angled bracket notation denotes that \mathcal{S}_{DS} is generated by the terms of H_{DS} . By construction, the logical subspace of the stabilizer group \mathcal{S}_{DS} coincides with the ground state subspace of H_{DS} . Explicitly, the logical subspace \mathcal{H}_L is the mutual +1 eigenspace of the stabilizers:

$$\mathcal{H}_L \equiv \{|\psi\rangle : S|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle, \forall S \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{DS}}\}. \quad (10)$$

On a torus, the DS Hamiltonian has a four-fold ground state degeneracy. This can be seen by counting the number of independent constraints imposed on the ground state subspace by the stabilizers. Letting N_v denote the number of vertices, there are N_v vertex terms, N_v plaquette terms, and $2N_v$ edge terms. These constraints are not entirely independent, however. In particular, the vertex term squares to a product of edge terms and plaquette terms. Therefore, although A_v has order four, it only contributes N_v order two constraints. There are also two global relations among the vertex terms and plaquette terms:

$$\prod_v A_v = 1, \quad \prod_p B_p = 1. \quad (11)$$

Consequently, there are only $N_v - 1$ independent vertex terms and $N_v - 1$ independent plaquette terms. All together, we find that there are $4N_v - 2$ independent order two constraints. Given that there are two four-dimensional qudits per vertex, yielding a total Hilbert space of dimension 4^{2N_v} , the ground state subspace is four-dimensional:

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}_L) = 4^{2N_v} / 2^{4N_v - 2} = 4. \quad (12)$$

We now characterize the topological order of H_{DS} by considering its anyonic excitations. The anyonic excitations of H_{DS} are created by string operators such as those depicted in Fig. 2. There are three types of string operators: $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^s$, $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^{\bar{s}}$, and $W_{\gamma}^{s\bar{s}}$. The first two are defined along an oriented path $\bar{\gamma}$ in the dual lattice, while the third is defined along an un-oriented path γ in the direct lattice. To make the string operators explicit, we decompose them into products of short string operators:

$$W_{\bar{\gamma}}^s = \prod_{e \in \bar{\gamma}} W_e^s, \quad W_{\bar{\gamma}}^{\bar{s}} = \prod_{e \in \bar{\gamma}} W_e^{\bar{s}}, \quad W_{\gamma}^{s\bar{s}} = \prod_{e \in \gamma} W_e^{s\bar{s}}. \quad (13)$$

The short string operators in Eq. (13) are represented pictori-




FIG. 2. The string operators $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^s$ and $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^{\bar{s}}$ are defined along the oriented paths (red dashed lines) $\bar{\gamma}$ and $\bar{\eta}$ in the dual lattice. The $s\bar{s}$ string operator $W_{\gamma}^{s\bar{s}}$ is defined along an un-oriented path γ in the direct lattice. The DS string operators are composed of the short string operators pictured in Eq. (14).

ally as:

$$\begin{aligned} W_e^s &\equiv \begin{array}{c} \text{---} Z \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} X_e \text{---} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} Z^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} X_e^\dagger \text{---} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} | \\ \text{---} Z^\dagger \\ | \\ \text{---} X_e \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} | \\ \text{---} Z \\ | \\ \text{---} X_e^\dagger \end{array}, \\ W_e^{\bar{s}} &\equiv \begin{array}{c} \text{---} Z \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} X_e^\dagger \text{---} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} Z^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} X_e \text{---} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} | \\ \text{---} Z^\dagger \\ | \\ \text{---} X_e^\dagger \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} | \\ \text{---} Z \\ | \\ \text{---} X_e \end{array}, \\ W_e^{s\bar{s}} &\equiv \text{---} Z_e^2 \text{---}, \quad \begin{array}{c} | \\ \text{---} Z_e^2 \\ | \end{array}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the dashed red lines denote the orientation of the path on the dual lattice. Note that the expressions for $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^s$ and $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^{\bar{s}}$ in Eq. (13) are ambiguous up to a phase, since we have not specified an ordering of the short string operators. Nonetheless, any choice of ordering yields a string operator. Importantly, the operators in Eq. (13) commute with the Hamiltonian terms along the length of the path, and only fail to commute with vertex terms and plaquette terms at the endpoints. Notice also that the A_v and B_p terms of the Hamiltonian are small loops of the string operators, i.e.:

$$A_v \propto \prod_{e \in \bar{\gamma}_v} W_e^s, \quad B_p = \prod_{e \in \gamma_p} W_e^{s\bar{s}}, \quad (15)$$

where $\bar{\gamma}_v$ is the counter-clockwise oriented path through the




FIG. 3. The exchange statistics of the anyon s can be computed using the formula in Eq. (18). $\bar{\gamma}_1$, $\bar{\gamma}_2$, and $\bar{\gamma}_3$ are oriented paths in the dual lattice incident upon the same plaquette p . The string operators $(W_{\bar{\gamma}_2}^s)^\dagger$ and $W_{\bar{\gamma}_3}^s$ fail to commute, giving the statistics $\theta(s) = i$.

edges connected to v and γ_p is the path formed by the edges bordering p .

We have suggestively labeled the string operators by the anyons s , \bar{s} , and $s\bar{s}$ of the DS phase. Indeed, the string operators create anyonic excitations of the DS phase, as verified below. The first property to check is the fusion rules of the excitations. The fusion rules are obtained by multiplying string operators that share the same endpoints. We find that fusing two s string operators along the same path $\bar{\gamma}$ in the dual lattice gives [46]:

$$W_{\bar{\gamma}}^s \times W_{\bar{\gamma}}^s = \bar{\gamma} \left[\begin{array}{c} Z^2 \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} \\ \vdots \\ X^2 \text{---} X^2 \text{---} X^2 \text{---} \\ \vdots \\ Z^2 \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} \end{array} \right] \dots \left[\begin{array}{c} Z^2 \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} \\ \vdots \\ X^2 \text{---} X^2 \text{---} X^2 \text{---} \\ \vdots \\ Z^2 \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} \end{array} \right] \dots \quad (16)$$

Up to stabilizers along $\bar{\gamma}$, this is equivalent to [47]:

$$W_{\bar{\gamma}}^s \times W_{\bar{\gamma}}^s = \bar{\gamma} \left[\begin{array}{c} Z^2 \text{---} \\ \vdots \\ Z^2 \text{---} \\ \vdots \\ Z^2 \text{---} \end{array} \right] \dots \left[\begin{array}{c} Z^2 \text{---} \\ \vdots \\ Z^2 \text{---} \\ \vdots \\ Z^2 \text{---} \end{array} \right] \dots \quad (17)$$

Therefore, the string operators labeled by s multiply to local operators at the endpoints. Since the trivial anyon 1 represents local excitations created by local operators, this means that $s \times s = 1$. Similarly, it can be checked that the string operators $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^{\bar{s}}$ and $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^{s\bar{s}}$ satisfy the fusion rules of the anyons in the DS phase up to stabilizers and local operators at the endpoints. Thus, the anyonic excitations of H_{DS} satisfy the fusion rules in Eq. (1).

The next property to check is that the anyonic excitations created by the string operators in Eq. (13) have the same statistics as the anyons of the DS topological order. This is accomplished by following the prescription described in Refs. [48–50]. Let $\bar{\gamma}_1$, $\bar{\gamma}_2$, and $\bar{\gamma}_3$ be paths sharing a common endpoint p and ordered counter-clockwise around p , as in Fig. 3. Then, the exchange statistics $\theta(a)$ of the anyon a is computed by the expression:

$$W_{\bar{\gamma}_1}^a (W_{\bar{\gamma}_2}^a)^\dagger W_{\bar{\gamma}_3}^a = \theta(a) W_{\bar{\gamma}_3}^a (W_{\bar{\gamma}_2}^a)^\dagger W_{\bar{\gamma}_1}^a. \quad (18)$$

The computation of $\theta(s)$ is pictured in Fig. 3. We find that $\theta(s)$, $\theta(\bar{s})$, and $\theta(s\bar{s})$ are:

$$\theta(1) = 1, \quad \theta(s) = i, \quad \theta(\bar{s}) = -i, \quad \theta(s\bar{s}) = 1, \quad (19)$$




FIG. 4. The logical operators of the DS stabilizer code on a torus can be represented by string operators along non-contractible loops such as α (blue) and β (red).

which match the statistics of the DS anyons in Eq. (2). Therefore, the anyonic excitations of H_{DS} have the same fusion and statistics as the anyons in the DS topological order. This implies that H_{DS} indeed belongs to the DS phase.

The four-fold degeneracy of H_{DS} on a torus can now be understood in terms of the DS anyons. Let α and β be generators of the non-contractible cycles on the torus, pictured in Fig. 4. Then, the long string operators W_α^s , W_β^s , $W_\alpha^{\bar{s}}$ and $W_\beta^{\bar{s}}$ form Pauli X and Pauli Z on the logical subspace \mathcal{H}_L . To make this explicit, we define:

$$\bar{X}_1 \equiv W_\alpha^s, \quad \bar{Z}_1 \equiv W_\beta^s, \quad \bar{X}_2 \equiv W_\alpha^{\bar{s}}, \quad \bar{Z}_2 \equiv W_\beta^{\bar{s}}. \quad (20)$$

In the logical subspace, the long string operators satisfy:

$$\bar{X}_1^2 \sim 1, \quad \bar{Z}_1^2 \sim 1, \quad \bar{X}_2^2 \sim 1, \quad \bar{Z}_2^2 \sim 1, \quad (21)$$

where \sim emphasizes that the relations hold only in the logical subspace. The only nontrivial commutation relations between the long string operators are:

$$\bar{Z}_1 \bar{X}_1 = -\bar{X}_1 \bar{Z}_1, \quad \bar{Z}_2 \bar{X}_2 = -\bar{X}_2 \bar{Z}_2. \quad (22)$$

Thus, they have the same relations as Pauli X and Pauli Z operators on a pair of qubits. The relations in Eq. (21) follow from the fusion rules of s and \bar{s} , while the commutation relations in Eq. (22) follow from the braiding relations in Eq. (3). Indeed, in this model, the braiding relations of s and \bar{s} can be computed from the commutation relations of string operators that intersect at a single point (see Ref. [50] for a more general statement).

B. Construction of the Pauli stabilizer model

The DS stabilizer model can be derived from a \mathbb{Z}_4 TC by condensing a certain bosonic anyon. To demonstrate this, we first describe the construction of the DS stabilizer model at the level of the anyons. We then implement the construction at the lattice level to arrive at the DS stabilizer model.

Anyon-level construction

Recall that the anyons of the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC form a $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ group, generated by the anyons e and m . The sixteen anyons of the

\mathbb{Z}_4 TC are shown in table below:

	1	e	e^2	e^3
1	1	e	e^2	e^3
m	m	em	e^2m	e^3m
m^2	m^2	em^2	e^2m^2	e^3m^2
m^3	m^3	em^3	e^2m^3	e^3m^3

The statistics of an arbitrary anyon $e^p m^q$ (with $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_4$) is given by:

$$\theta(e^p m^q) = i^{pq}. \quad (23)$$

Note that the e and m anyons are often interpreted as the gauge charge and gauge flux, respectively, of a \mathbb{Z}_4 gauge theory. According to Eq. (23), e and m are bosons and have the Aharonov-Bohm phase i , as expected:

$$\theta(e) = 1, \quad \theta(m) = 1, \quad B_\theta(e, m) = i, \quad (24)$$

The construction of the DS stabilizer model from the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC is motivated by the fact that the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC has both semionic excitations and anti-semionic excitations. In particular, em is a semion and em^3 is an anti-semion. Further, their fusion product e^2 is a boson, similar to the fusion of the semion s and the anti-semion \bar{s} of the DS anyon theory. The only obstacle to identifying em and em^3 with s and \bar{s} , respectively, is that em and em^3 have order four under fusion, while s and \bar{s} have order two. Indeed, both em and em^3 square to the boson e^2m^2 :

$$em \times em = e^2m^2, \quad em^3 \times em^3 = e^2m^2. \quad (25)$$

The resolution is to condense the boson e^2m^2 . As described below, condensing e^2m^2 ensures that em and em^3 represent anyons with the same fusion rules as s and \bar{s} . Moreover, the condensation of e^2m^2 leaves us with precisely the anyon theory of the DS phase.

The condensation of e^2m^2 has two effects. The first is that anyons that braid nontrivially with e^2m^2 become confined. As demonstrated later in this section, after condensation, the string operators of the confined anyons create excitations along the length of the string. Therefore, the string operators create nonlocal excitations, and the confined anyons do not correspond to anyonic excitations in the condensed theory. We call the remaining anyons, i.e., those that braid trivially with e^2m^2 , deconfined anyons.

The second effect of condensation is that deconfined anyons related by fusion with e^2m^2 become identified. This means, in particular, that e^2m^2 is identified with the trivial anyon 1. To emphasize the identification of anyons after condensation, we use square brackets. Thus, in the condensed theory, we have:

$$[e^2m^2] = [1]. \quad (26)$$

	1	e	e^2	e^3
1	1	e	e^2	e^3
m	m	em	e^2m	e^3m
m^2	m^2	em^2	e^2m^2	e^3m^2
m^3	m^3	em^3	e^2m^3	e^3m^3

TABLE I. The condensation of e^2m^2 excitations in the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC has two effects. First, the anyons that braid nontrivially with e^2m^2 become confined (crossed out in red). Second, the remaining deconfined anyons become identified (shaded in matching colors) if they differ by fusion with e^2m^2 .

More generally, for any deconfined anyon a in the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC, we write:

$$[a] = [a \times e^2m^2]. \quad (27)$$

Note that the confined anyons are inconsistent with the identification of e^2m^2 with the trivial anyon, since braiding with e^2m^2 differs from braiding with 1.

The effects of condensing e^2m^2 are shown in Table I. The anyons that remain after condensation can be labeled by:

$$\{[1], [em], [em^3], [e^2]\}. \quad (28)$$

Given Eq. (27), the anyons of the condensed theory satisfy the fusion rules:

$$\begin{aligned} [em] \times [em] &= [1], & [em^3] \times [em^3] &= [1], \\ [em] \times [em^3] &= [e^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Thus, in particular, $[em]$ and $[em^3]$ have order two under fusion, just like s and \bar{s} . Furthermore, the exchange statistics of the anyons in the condensed theory are:

$$\theta([1]) = 1, \quad \theta([em]) = i, \quad \theta([em^3]) = -i, \quad \theta([e^2]) = 1. \quad (30)$$

The exchange statistics above are well-defined, as can be checked using Eq. (68) in Section III and the fact that em and em^3 have trivial braiding relations with e^2m^2 . We now see that the anyons $\{[1], [em], [em^3], [e^2]\}$ have the same properties as the anyons of the DS phase. Therefore, condensing e^2m^2 in the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC produces the anyon theory of the DS phase.

Lattice-level construction

With this, we are prepared to construct the DS stabilizer model at a lattice level, starting with the lattice model for the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC. The \mathbb{Z}_4 TC is defined on a square lattice with a four-dimensional qudit at each edge (Fig. 1). The Hamiltonian is the following sum of vertex terms and plaquette terms:

$$H_{\text{TC}} = - \sum_v A_v^{\text{TC}} - \sum_p B_p^{\text{TC}} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (31)$$




FIG. 5. The e and m string operators generate string operators for all of the anyons in the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC. The e string operator W_γ^e is defined along an oriented path γ in the direct lattice, while the m string operator $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^m$ is defined along an oriented path $\bar{\gamma}$ in the dual lattice. The $e^2 m^2$ string operator $W_{\bar{\eta}}^{e^2 m^2}$ is defined along an un-oriented path $\bar{\eta}$ in the dual lattice.

where A_v^{TC} and B_p^{TC} are given by:

$$A_v^{\text{TC}} \equiv \begin{array}{c} | \\ \text{---} X \text{---} \\ | \\ X^\dagger \\ | \\ \text{---} X \text{---} \\ | \\ X \end{array}, \quad B_p^{\text{TC}} \equiv \begin{array}{c} \text{---} Z^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} Z^\dagger \text{---} p \text{---} Z \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} Z \text{---} \end{array}. \quad (32)$$

We define the stabilizer group \mathcal{S}_{TC} as the group generated by the vertex terms and plaquette terms of H_{TC} :

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}} \equiv \langle \{A_v^{\text{TC}}\}, \{B_p^{\text{TC}}\} \rangle. \quad (33)$$

The anyonic excitations of the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC are generated by products of the e and m string operators, illustrated in Fig. 5. Fig. 5 also shows a string operator for a pair of $e^2 m^2$ excitations. The $e^2 m^2$ string operators can be generated by the short string operators:

$$W_e^{e^2 m^2} = \begin{array}{c} | \\ \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} \\ | \\ X_e^2 \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} X_e^2 \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} \end{array}. \quad (34)$$

Note that there is ambiguity in how the e^2 and m^2 excitations are bound together to form $e^2 m^2$. In Eq. (34), we have made an arbitrary choice for the short string operators. This choice ultimately determines the form of the vertex terms and the string operators of the DS stabilizer model. We point out that the short string operators $W_e^{e^2 m^2}$ chosen in Eq. (34) are precisely the C_e terms from Eq. (8), and throughout the rest of this section, we use the notation C_e to agree with Section II A.

The next step in the construction of the DS stabilizer model is to condense the $e^2 m^2$ excitations. To this end, we define \mathcal{S}_C to be the group of $e^2 m^2$ string operators. This is generated by the set of short $e^2 m^2$ string operators $\{C_e\}$:

$$\mathcal{S}_C \equiv \langle \{C_e\} \rangle. \quad (35)$$

In particular, \mathcal{S}_C includes open string operators, which create, annihilate, and more generally proliferate the $e^2 m^2$ excitations. Therefore, after condensing $e^2 m^2$, the states $|\psi\rangle$ in the ground state subspace should satisfy:

$$C|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle, \quad \forall C \in \mathcal{S}_C. \quad (36)$$

In other words, the stabilizer group for the condensed theory should contain \mathcal{S}_C as a subgroup. This is certainly the case for the DS stabilizer group in Eq. (9).

Only certain elements of the stabilizer group \mathcal{S}_{TC} are compatible with the condition in Eq. (36). These are, in particular, the elements of \mathcal{S}_{TC} that commute with every element of \mathcal{S}_C . We define $\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C$ to be the subgroup formed by the stabilizers of \mathcal{S}_{TC} that commute with the elements of \mathcal{S}_C :

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C \equiv \{S \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}} : SC = CS, \forall C \in \mathcal{S}_C\}. \quad (37)$$

To understand the elements of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C$, it is useful to note that the stabilizer group \mathcal{S}_{TC} is generated by small loops of e and m string operators, corresponding to B_p^{TC} and A_v^{TC} , respectively. This means that the elements of \mathcal{S}_{TC} are, in general, products of closed string operators of the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC anyons, such as loops of em string operators or e^2 string operators. Therefore, the elements of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C$ are loops of string operators that commute with the open $e^2 m^2$ string operators. These correspond to closed string operators of anyons that braid trivially with $e^2 m^2$. As a result, $\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C$ can be generated by small loops of em string operators and small loops of e^2 string operators. These are exactly the A_v and B_p terms of the DS Hamiltonian in Eq. (8):

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C = \langle \{A_v\}, \{B_p\} \rangle. \quad (38)$$

$\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C$ is designed to exclude the closed string operators of confined anyons.

Finally, the stabilizer group of the condensed theory is generated by $\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C$ and \mathcal{S}_C , i.e., it is given by:

$$\langle \mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C, \mathcal{S}_C \rangle = \langle \{A_v\}, \{B_p\}, \{C_e\} \rangle. \quad (39)$$

The justification for taking $\langle \mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C, \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$ to be the stabilizer group of the condensed theory comes from considering the corresponding Hamiltonian, which is precisely the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian H_{DS} . We show that H_{DS} exhibits the two effects of condensation described below Eq. (25). Namely, the string operators of the confined \mathbb{Z}_4 TC anyons create confined excitations, and the string operators of deconfined \mathbb{Z}_4 TC anyons create identical anyonic excitations, if they differ by an $e^2 m^2$ string operator.

To give an example of a confined excitation in the DS stabilizer model, let us consider the e string operators of the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC. An open e string operator W_γ^e , such as the one depicted

in Fig. 5, fails to commute with the vertex terms A_v of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian at the endpoints of the path γ . It also fails to commute with the edge terms C_e along the length of γ . Therefore, separating the vertex excitations at the endpoints of γ comes with an energetic penalty that grows linearly with the length of the string operator. This is indicative of confinement. On an infinite plane, it is not possible to create a single vertex excitation (i.e., change the eigenvalue of A_v by i) without creating either an extensive number of edge excitations or a second vertex excitation. We note that confined excitations, such as those created by the e string operator in the DS stabilizer model, are only possible in Pauli stabilizer models on composite-dimensional qudits. For translationally invariant Pauli stabilizer models built from prime-dimensional qudits on an infinite plane, it is always possible to choose the local stabilizer terms of the Hamiltonian so that one can violate any given single stabilizer term using some (possibly non-local) product of Pauli operators [21].

In addition to confinement, we see that anyons created by string operators of the deconfined \mathbb{Z}_4 TC anyons become identified, if the corresponding \mathbb{Z}_4 TC anyons differ by $e^2 m^2$. As a concrete example, the string operators for em and $e^3 m^3$ differ by an $e^2 m^2$ string operator. Since the $e^2 m^2$ string operators are stabilizers in the DS stabilizer model, the em and $e^3 m^3$ string operators create the same anyons when applied to a ground state of H_{DS} . Therefore, the deconfined anyons em and $e^3 m^3$ have become identified, and H_{DS} indeed describes the theory obtained after condensing $e^2 m^2$ in a \mathbb{Z}_4 TC.

Interestingly, the construction of the DS stabilizer code described above can be understood in terms of the effects of Pauli measurements on stabilizer groups. Recall that, given a stabilizer group \mathcal{S} , the measurement of a product of Pauli operators P results in a modified stabilizer group. The modified stabilizer group is generated by $\pm P$ (depending on the measurement outcome [51]) and the elements of \mathcal{S} that commute with P . Starting with the stabilizer group \mathcal{S}_{TC} , measurements of the short string operators $\{C_e\}$ produce the stabilizer group:

$$\langle \mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C, \{\pm C_e\} \rangle = \langle \{A_v\}, \{B_p\}, \{\pm C_e\} \rangle. \quad (40)$$

By post-selecting for +1 measurement outcomes or by error correction, we obtain the stabilizer group \mathcal{S}_{DS} . Hence, the condensation of $e^2 m^2$ can be implemented by simply measuring the set of operators $\{C_e\}$. This yields an efficient construction of the DS stabilizer code from a \mathbb{Z}_4 TC, requiring only two-body Pauli measurements.

C. Relation to the string-net model

We now identify a finite-depth quantum circuit \mathcal{U} (with ancillary degrees of freedom) that maps the ground state subspace of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian H_{DS} to the ground state subspace of the DS string-net model $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{s-n}}$. This establishes that H_{DS} belongs to the same topological phase of matter as $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{s-n}}$, by the arguments of Ref. [52]. Our strategy is to map H_{DS} to $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{s-n}}$ using the following operations:


- adding and removing ancillary degrees of freedom,
- conjugating H_{DS} by layers of \mathcal{U} ,
- making ground space-preserving changes to the Hamiltonian.

This transformation shows that the ground state subspace of the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{U}H_{\text{DS}}\mathcal{U}^\dagger$ is equivalent to that of $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{s-n}}$ (up to adding ancillary degrees of freedom to H_{DS} and $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{s-n}}$). We refer to Appendix A for a more explicit mapping of the ground states using notation from simplicial cohomology.

Let us start by briefly recalling the DS string-net model of Refs. [44] and [45]. The DS string-net model is defined on a hexagonal lattice with a qubit at each edge (see Fig. 6d). The Hamiltonian $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{s-n}}$ is a sum of two types of terms and is given by:

$$H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{s-n}} \equiv - \sum_v A_v^{\text{s-n}} - \sum_p B_p^{\text{s-n}} + \text{h.c.} \quad (41)$$

The vertex terms $A_v^{\text{s-n}}$ and plaquette terms $B_p^{\text{s-n}}$ are represented as:



$$A_v^{\text{s-n}} \equiv \begin{array}{c} \diagup Z \quad v \quad \diagdown Z \\ | \\ Z \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} | \\ Z \quad v \quad Z \\ \diagdown \end{array}, \quad (42)$$

$$B_p^{\text{s-n}} \equiv - \begin{array}{c} \diagup S \quad X \quad \diagdown S \\ | \\ X \quad p \quad X \\ | \\ S \quad X \quad S \\ | \\ S \end{array},$$

where the Pauli X and Pauli Z operators in Eq. (42) are defined on qubits and S is the phase gate with diagonal elements $\text{diag}(1, i)$. $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{s-n}}$ is not a stabilizer model, since the $B_p^{\text{s-n}}$ terms only commute with one another up to products of $A_v^{\text{s-n}}$ terms. Nonetheless, the ground state subspace is the mutual +1 eigenspace of the Hamiltonian terms.

To relate the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian to $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{s-n}}$, the first step is to map H_{DS} to a DS stabilizer model on a triangular lattice. The motivation is that the triangular lattice is dual to the hexagonal lattice, on which the DS string-net model is defined. This mapping is accomplished by introducing an ancillary four-dimensional qudit to the center of each square plaquette (see Fig. 6a). For convenience, we rotate the lattice by 45° , so that the ancillary qudit lies on the horizontal edge of a regular triangular lattice, as shown in Fig. 6b. We label the vertices, edges, and faces of the triangular lattice by v , e , and f , respectively. We take the qudits on the horizontal edges e to be stabilized by the group $\langle X_e^2, Z_e^2 \rangle$. The Hamiltonian on the system with ancillary qudits is then:

$$H_{\text{DS}} - \sum_{e \in E_h} X_e^2 - \sum_{e \in E_h} Z_e^2, \quad (43)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
B_f^I &= \begin{array}{c} \triangle \\ \text{---} Z_f^2 \text{---} \\ \triangle \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \triangle \\ \text{---} Z_f^2 \text{---} \\ \triangle \end{array}, \\
C_e^I &= \text{---} X_e^2 \text{---}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ Z^2 \\ \diagdown \end{array} X_e^2, \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ Z^2 \\ \diagdown \end{array} X_e^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Notice that the X_e^2 terms in Eq. (43) have been absorbed into the definition of C_e^I , and the face term B_f^I associated to the upwards pointing triangle comes from conjugating the Z_e^2 horizontal edge term. We point out that the construction of the DS stabilizer model in Section II B carries over to the triangular lattice and produces precisely the Hamiltonian in Eq. (47).

Since the DS string-net model is defined on a system of qubits, the next step is to map each four-dimensional qudit of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian to a pair of qubits. This can be accomplished by introducing a pair of qubits to each edge. To make this explicit, we label a pair of qubits at an edge e by A and B (see Fig 6c) and denote the Pauli X and Pauli Z operators by $X_e^A, Z_e^A, X_e^B, Z_e^B$. The system on four-dimensional qudits can then be mapped to qubits by conjugating with a finite-depth quantum circuit $\mathcal{U}_{2,4}$. The unitary operator $\mathcal{U}_{2,4}$ is defined by the mapping of operators [54]:

$$Z_e \longleftrightarrow S_e^A Z_e^B, \quad X_e \longleftrightarrow X_e^A C X_e^{AB}. \tag{49}$$

The operators on the left-hand sides of Eq. (49) are defined on the four-dimensional qudit, while the operators on the right-hand sides act on the pair of qubits. Here, $C X_e^{AB}$ is the control- X^B gate with the A qubit as the control qubit. The mapping of operators in Eq. (49) maps the Pauli stabilizer model H_{DS}^I to a non-Pauli stabilizer model H_{DS}^{II} . Note that the qudit degrees of freedom become decoupled from the system, and may be disregarded [55].

For simplicity, let us focus on the effects of the transformation in Eq. (49) on the C_e^I terms. In terms of the operator algebra on the A and B qubits, $C_e^{II} = \mathcal{U}_{2,4} C_e^I \mathcal{U}_{2,4}^\dagger$ is:

$$\begin{aligned}
C_e^{II} &= \text{---} X_e^B \text{---}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ Z^A \\ \diagdown \end{array} X_e^B, \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ Z^A \\ \diagdown \end{array} X_e^B.
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

The form of C_e^{II} is noteworthy, because, as argued below, the B qubits can be disentangled from the ground states by applying control- Z gates. That is, the control- Z gates are designed to map each C_e^{II} in Eq. (50) to a single site X_e^B operator.

The ground state subspace of the DS string-net model can now be prepared from the ground state subspace of H_{DS}^{II} by applying a finite-depth quantum circuit \mathcal{U}_{CZ} composed of control- Z gates. \mathcal{U}_{CZ} consists of two layers and takes the form:

$$\mathcal{U}_{CZ} \equiv \mathcal{U}_{AA} \mathcal{U}_{AB}. \tag{51}$$

The first layer \mathcal{U}_{AB} is needed to decouple the B qubits, leaving us with one qubit per edge. The second layer \mathcal{U}_{AA} ensures

a_{12}	a_{13}	a_{23}	$CZ_{12,23} a_{12}a_{13}a_{23}\rangle$	$S_{12}^\dagger S_{13} S_{23}^\dagger a_{12}a_{13}a_{23}\rangle$
0	0	0	1	1
0	1	1	1	1
1	0	1	-1	-1
1	1	0	1	1

TABLE II. The identity in Eq. (61) can be checked explicitly on the computational basis states that satisfy $B_f^{III} = 1$. We show the calculation for an upwards pointing triangle $\langle 123 \rangle$, whose vertices are ordered according to Eq. (53). $a_{vv'}$ denotes the $\{0, 1\}$ value at the edge $\langle vv' \rangle$. $CZ_{12,23}$ and $S_{12}^\dagger S_{13} S_{23}^\dagger$ are diagonal in the computational basis and their eigenvalues (tabulated above) agree on the computational basis states satisfying $B_f^{III} = 1$.

that the ground state wave functions have the correct amplitudes, i.e., the amplitudes match those of the ground states of $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{s-n}}$ defined on the hexagonal dual lattice.

Let us define the layers of \mathcal{U}_{CZ} more carefully, starting with \mathcal{U}_{AB} . \mathcal{U}_{AB} is the product of control- Z gates:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AB} \equiv \prod_{\langle 123 \rangle} CZ_{12,23}^{AB}. \tag{52}$$

The product above is over all faces $\langle 123 \rangle$, and $CZ_{12,23}^{AB}$ is the control- Z gate between the A site on the edge $\langle 12 \rangle$ and the B site on the edge $\langle 23 \rangle$ with the ordering of vertices:

$$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \triangle \\ 1 \quad 3 \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \triangle \\ 3 \quad 2 \end{array}. \tag{53}$$

Given an arbitrary face $\langle 123 \rangle$, conjugation by \mathcal{U}_{AB} maps the Pauli X operators X_{12}^A and X_{23}^B according to:

$$X_{12}^A \longleftrightarrow X_{12}^A Z_{23}^B, \quad X_{23}^B \longleftrightarrow Z_{12}^A X_{23}^B, \tag{54}$$

where $X_{vv'}^B$ denotes the B site Pauli X operator on the edge $\langle vv' \rangle$. Importantly, this maps each edge operator C_e^{II} to a single site operator X_e^B :

$$\mathcal{U}_{AB} C_e^{II} \mathcal{U}_{AB}^\dagger = \text{---} X_e^B \text{---}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ X_e^B \\ \diagdown \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ X_e^B \\ \diagdown \end{array}. \tag{55}$$

The next layer, \mathcal{U}_{AA} , is a product of control- Z gates between the A sites. We let $CZ_{12,23}^{AA}$ denote the control- Z operator between the A site on edge $\langle 12 \rangle$ and the A site on edge $\langle 23 \rangle$ using the ordering of vertices in Eq. (53). \mathcal{U}_{AA} is then defined to be the finite-depth quantum circuit:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AA} = \prod_{f \in F_{\text{up}}} CZ_{12,23}^{AA}, \tag{56}$$

where the product is over the set of all upward pointing triangles F_{up} . The Pauli X operators X_{12}^A and X_{23}^A defined on the edges of the upwards pointing triangle $\langle 123 \rangle$ are mapped as:

$$X_{12}^A \longleftrightarrow X_{12}^A Z_{23}^A, \quad X_{23}^A \longleftrightarrow Z_{12}^A X_{23}^A. \tag{57}$$

Notice that conjugation by \mathcal{U}_{AA} does not affect the edge terms in Eq. (55).

After conjugating $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{II}}$ by \mathcal{U}_{CZ} , the ground states are in a product state on the B sites. This follows from the fact that the ground states are +1 eigenstates of the $\mathcal{U}_{CZ} C_e^{\text{II}} \mathcal{U}_{CZ}^\dagger = X_e^B$ terms. This means that, without affecting the ground state subspace, we can freely replace all B site operators with the identity. In what follows, we suppress the A site label and consider systems with a single qubit at each edge.

Composing the transformations in Eqs. (46), (49), (52), and (56), we find that H_{DS} is mapped by the finite-depth quantum circuit:

$$\mathcal{U} \equiv \mathcal{U}_{CZ} \mathcal{U}_{2,4} \mathcal{U}_{CX}, \quad (58)$$

to the Hamiltonian:

$$H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{III}} \equiv \mathcal{U} H_{\text{DS}} \mathcal{U}^\dagger = - \sum_v A_v^{\text{III}} - \sum_f B_f^{\text{III}}, \quad (59)$$

where we have suppressed the ancillary degrees of freedom. The vertex terms A_v^{III} and face terms B_f^{III} are pictured below:

$$A_v^{\text{III}} \equiv - \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Hexagon with } X \text{ on all edges} \\ \times \\ \text{Hexagon with } Z \text{ on top and bottom edges, } S \text{ on left and right edges} \end{array} \right) \quad (60)$$

$$B_f^{\text{III}} \equiv \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Triangle with } Z \text{ on all edges} \\ , \\ \text{Triangle with } Z \text{ on all edges} \end{array} \right),$$

with red edges in the definition of A_v^{III} representing control- Z operators. For each vertex term, there are four control- Z gates.

To see that the Hamiltonian in Eq. (59) has the same ground state subspace as the string-net model (up to ancillary product states), we map $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{III}}$ to $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{IV}}$ by making changes that preserve the ground state subspace. We note that the terms of $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{III}}$ are unfrustrated, meaning that the ground states are in the +1 eigenspace of the A_v^{III} and B_f^{III} operators. Consequently, we can freely multiply the A_v^{III} terms by B_f^{III} terms without affecting the ground states. We can also employ the identities:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Triangle with } Z \text{ on all edges} \\ = \\ \text{Triangle with } S^\dagger \text{ on top and bottom edges, } S \text{ on left edge} \end{array} \right),$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Triangle with } Z \text{ on all edges} \\ = \\ \text{Triangle with } S^\dagger \text{ on top and bottom edges, } S \text{ on left edge} \end{array} \right), \quad (61)$$

which holds in the $B_f^{\text{III}} = 1$ subspace, as shown in Table II [56]. Note that after replacing all of the control- Z gates using the identities above, the Hamiltonian terms are no longer mutually commuting. Nevertheless, they are unfrustrated and the ground state subspace is the mutual +1 eigenspace of the Hamiltonian terms.

Using these transformations, $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{III}}$ can be mapped to:

$$H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{IV}} \equiv - \sum_v A_v^{\text{IV}} - \sum_f B_f^{\text{IV}}, \quad (62)$$

where A_v^{IV} and B_f^{IV} are graphically represented by:

$$A_v^{\text{IV}} = - \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Hexagon with } S \text{ on top and bottom edges, } X \text{ on left and right edges} \\ \times \\ \text{Hexagon with } S \text{ on top and bottom edges, } X \text{ on left and right edges} \end{array} \right), \quad (63)$$

$$B_f^{\text{IV}} = \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Triangle with } Z \text{ on all edges} \\ , \\ \text{Triangle with } Z \text{ on all edges} \end{array} \right).$$

When viewed as a model on the hexagonal dual lattice, $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{IV}}$ is precisely the DS string-net model in Eq. (41). By construction, $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{IV}}$ has the same ground state subspace as $\mathcal{U} H_{\text{DS}} \mathcal{U}^\dagger$, up to adding ancillary degrees of freedom to H_{DS} and $H_{\text{DS}}^{\text{IV}}$. Therefore, we have found a finite-depth quantum circuit with ancillary degrees of freedom that maps the ground state subspace of H_{DS} to the ground state subspace of the DS string-net model.

III. PRIMER ON ABELIAN ANYON THEORIES

In this section, we review the characteristic data of Abelian anyon theories with the aim of generalizing the DS stabilizer model to a wider class of Abelian topological orders. We also introduce notation for boson condensation, as it is essential to the construction of the topological stabilizer models defined in the next section. Further details on Abelian anyon theories can be found in Ref. [57], and we refer to Ref. [58] for background on boson condensation.

An Abelian anyon theory \mathcal{A} is specified by a pair (A, θ) , where A is a finite Abelian group and θ is a function from A to $U(1)$:

$$\theta : A \rightarrow U(1), \quad (64)$$




FIG. 7. $\theta(a)$ captures the phase accrued from exchanging a anyons.

that satisfies certain constraints. Intuitively, the group A corresponds to the Abelian group formed by the anyons under fusion, and θ encodes the statistics and braiding of the anyons. Given this interpretation, we refer to the elements of A as anyons. The DS anyon theory, for example, is specified by $A = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ with θ given by:

$$\theta(1) = 1, \quad \theta(s) = i, \quad \theta(\bar{s}) = -i, \quad \theta(s\bar{s}) = 1, \quad (65)$$

where the elements of $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ have been labeled by the anyons $\{1, s, \bar{s}, s\bar{s}\}$. We call an anyon b a bosonic anyon if it has trivial exchange statistics: $\theta(b) = 1$.

Based on physical arguments, only certain choices of the function θ define a consistent anyon theory. The first requirement is that θ satisfies:

$$\theta(a^n) = \theta(a)^{n^2}, \quad (66)$$

for any anyon $a \in A$ and integer n . In words, this means that exchanging two a^n anyons is equivalent to exchanging n^2 pairs of a anyons. This is shown graphically in Fig. 8a. The second constraint on θ is most naturally stated in terms of the function:

$$B_\theta : A \times A \rightarrow U(1), \quad (67)$$

defined by [25]:

$$B_\theta(a, a') \equiv \frac{\theta(aa')}{\theta(a)\theta(a')}. \quad (68)$$

Physically, $B_\theta(a, a')$ captures the braiding relations between the anyons a and a' in A . This can be seen by considering the exchange statistics of aa' , as depicted in Fig. 8b. The second constraint on θ is then given by the fact that braiding a^n around a' is (tautologically) the same as braiding n copies of a around a' . That is, the function B_θ satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} B_\theta(a^n, a') &= B_\theta(a, a')^n, \\ B_\theta(a, a'^n) &= B_\theta(a, a')^n, \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

for all $a, a' \in A$ and any integer n .

In more formal language, the function θ corresponds to a quadratic form. Specifically, one can define the function $q : A \rightarrow [0, 1)$ by the expression:

$$\theta(a) = e^{2\pi i q(a)}. \quad (70)$$

According to Eq. (66), we have:

$$q(a^n) = n^2 q(a), \quad (71)$$

and by Eq. (69), the function:

$$b_q(a, a') \equiv q(aa') - q(a) - q(a') \quad (72)$$

is bilinear. Eqs. (71) and (72) are the defining properties of a quadratic form. Consequently, Abelian anyon theories are classified by quadratic forms [57]. Furthermore, in this work, we consider anyon theories with the property that every anyon braids nontrivially with at least one anyon in A . That is, for every $a \in A$, there exists an $a' \in A$ such that $B_\theta(a, a') \neq 1$. Such anyon theories are referred to as modular anyon theories and are classified, in particular, by nondegenerate quadratic forms. We note that, more generally, anyon theories are specified by the following three pieces of data (i) a set of anyon labels, (ii) the fusion rules of the anyons, and (iii) the so-called F - and R -symbols. In Ref. [59], it is shown that the pair (A, θ) determines the data (i)-(iii) for Abelian anyon theories.

For later purposes, let us introduce the concept of stacking Abelian anyon theories. Given the anyon theories $\mathcal{A}_1 = (A_1, \theta_1)$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 = (A_2, \theta_2)$, we can form an anyon theory $\mathcal{A}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{A}_2$, which we refer to as a stack of \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 . Physically, $\mathcal{A}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{A}_2$ is the anyon theory of two decoupled topological orders that realize the anyon theories \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 , respectively. The stack of \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 is defined by the pair $(A_1 \times A_2, \theta_{1,2})$, where $\theta_{1,2}$ is given by:

$$\theta_{1,2}(a_1 a_2) = \theta_1(a_1) \theta_2(a_2), \quad (73)$$

for any anyons $a_1 \in A_1$ and $a_2 \in A_2$. Using this language, Refs. [19] and [21] showed that the anyon theories of translationally-invariant Pauli stabilizer models on prime-dimensional qudits are necessarily stacks of toric codes.

An important tool for the construction of the Pauli stabilizer models in the next section is boson condensation. Thus, we next discuss the effects of boson condensation in Abelian anyon theories. At a physical level, the condensation of a boson b amounts to proliferating the b quasiparticles. As a consequence, pairs of bosons can be freely created and destroyed in the ground state. To make the effects on the anyon theory explicit, we let $\{b_i\}$ be a set of bosons with trivial mutual braiding relations. The two important effects of condensation are then as follows.

- (i) The first effect is that the anyons that braid nontrivially with at least one b_i in $\{b_i\}$ become confined. A single confined anyon is not a local excitation in the condensed theory, since the energetic cost of separating a pair of confined anyons grows linearly with the separation (see Section II B). The remaining anyons are referred to as deconfined anyons. A deconfined anyon a satisfies:

$$B_\theta(a, b_i) = 1, \quad \forall i. \quad (74)$$

It is important that the bosons $\{b_i\}$ have trivial mutual braiding relations, so that they do not confine one another upon condensation.




FIG. 8. (a) The constraint in Eq. (66) can be derived by considering the exchange of two a^n anyons. There are n^2 exchanges of a anyons in total, giving the phase $\theta(a)^{n^2}$. (b) The expression in Eq. (68) for the braiding relations of anyons a and a' can be obtained by exchanging two aa' anyons. The figure in the far right shows a full braid of a with a' , yielding the phase $B_\theta(a, a')$.

- (ii) The second effect is that anyons that are related by products of the condensed bosons become identified. More precisely, after condensation, the anyons can be organized into equivalence classes, where two anyons a and a' are equivalent if they satisfy:

$$a = a' \times \prod_{i=1}^M b_i^{p_i}, \quad (75)$$

for some set of integers $\{p_i\}$. We denote the equivalence class containing the anyon a by $[a]$. In particular, the bosons b_i are identified with the trivial anyon, i.e., $[b_i] = [1]$, for all i .

We note that the statistics and braiding of the deconfined anyons are unaffected by the condensation. For any $[a], [a']$, we have:

$$\theta([a]) = \theta(a), \quad B_\theta([a], [a']) = B_\theta(a, a'). \quad (76)$$

These are well-defined given the condition in Eq. (74).

Lastly, we define the notion of a Lagrangian subgroup. A Lagrangian subgroup \mathcal{L} is a subgroup of A composed of bosonic anyons with the following two properties:

- (i) The elements of \mathcal{L} have trivial braiding relations with each other, i.e., for every $b, b' \in \mathcal{L}$, $B_\theta(b, b') = 1$.
- (ii) For every anyon $a \in A - \mathcal{L}$, there exists a $b \in \mathcal{L}$ such that a braids nontrivially with b , i.e., $B_\theta(a, b) \neq 1$.

For example, the $s\bar{s}$ anyon of the DS anyon theory generates a Lagrangian subgroup. It trivially satisfies condition (i), and satisfies condition (ii) because it braids nontrivially with s and \bar{s} . The existence of a Lagrangian subgroup signals the potential for a gapped boundary in a topologically ordered system. Specifically, a Hamiltonian whose excitations are described by the anyon theory \mathcal{A} admits a gapped boundary if and only if \mathcal{A} has a Lagrangian subgroup [30, 60].

Moreover, Refs. [30] and [31] proved that every Abelian topological order that admits a gapped boundary can be described by a twisted quantum double (TQD). Here, we use TQD to refer to any model obtained by gauging the symmetries of a Hamiltonian belonging to a symmetry-protected

topological (SPT) phase. The argument is that, if the bosons of the Lagrangian subgroup are condensed, then all of the anyons become confined (or identified with the trivial anyon). This is due to condition (ii) of a Lagrangian subgroup. Furthermore, the condensation can be implemented by gauging the 1-form symmetries associated with the closed string operators of the bosons in \mathcal{L} . Since all of the anyons become confined, gauging the 1-form symmetry produces a model for an SPT phase protected by a 0-form symmetry. By subsequently gauging the 0-form symmetry of the SPT model, we recover the initial anyon theory. Thus, TQDs, including the Pauli stabilizer models constructed in the next section, must exhaust all Abelian anyon theories that can be realized in systems with gapped boundaries.

IV. TWISTED QUANTUM DOUBLE STABILIZER MODELS

We now construct Pauli stabilizer models corresponding to twisted quantum doubles (TQDs). The construction is a generalization of the construction of the DS stabilizer model in Section II. In particular, we start with a toric code (TC) (or stack of TCs) defined on composite-dimensional qudits and condense certain bosonic anyons so that the remaining deconfined excitations match those of a TQD with Abelian anyons. We refer to the resulting Pauli stabilizer models as TQD stabilizer models. Before describing the construction in detail, we recall some of the characteristic properties of TQDs. Note that TQD Hamiltonians were first presented in Refs. [28] and [61] based on the spacetime formulation in Ref. [27]. These models exhibit the characteristic properties of TQDs described below, although the details of the models are not essential to follow the discussion.

A. Anyon theories of twisted quantum doubles

In this work, ‘‘TQD’’ refers to any two-dimensional topologically ordered system that can be obtained by gauging the symmetry of a model with symmetry-protected topological (SPT) order. Given the classification of two-dimensional SPT

phases [62], TQDs are characterized by a group G and a group cocycle ω belonging to $H^3[G, U(1)]$ – the same data that specifies the SPT phase. Moving forwards, we assume familiarity with group cohomology and refer to Refs. [62] and [63] for the necessary background. For certain choices of G and ω , the corresponding TQDs host non-Abelian anyons – see, for example, the models of Refs. [61, 63, 64]. Stabilizer models, however, are unable to model topological orders with non-Abelian anyons [65]. Therefore, we restrict our attention to TQDs whose anyons are Abelian. We refer to such TQDs as Abelian TQDs.

A TQD is an Abelian TQD if and only if G is a finite Abelian group and $\omega \in H^3[G, U(1)]$ is cohomologous to a product of type I and type II cocycles (defined below) [66] [67]. To make the form for ω explicit, we write G as a general finite Abelian group:

$$G = \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}, \quad (77)$$

and introduce the set of integers \mathcal{I} :

$$\mathcal{I} \equiv \{n_i\}_{i=1}^M \cup \{n_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^M. \quad (78)$$

Here, n_i is an element of \mathbb{Z}_{N_i} , and n_{ij} belongs to $\mathbb{Z}_{N_{ij}}$, where N_{ij} denotes the greatest common divisor of N_i and N_j . Furthermore, n_{ij} satisfies $n_{ij} = n_{ji}$ and $n_{ii} = 2n_i$. The set of integers \mathcal{I} then specifies the following group cocycle $\omega_{\mathcal{I}} \in H^3[G, U(1)]$ of an Abelian TQD [63]:

$$\omega_{\mathcal{I}}(g, h, k) = \delta\beta(g, h, k) \prod_{i=1}^M \omega_i^{n_i}(g, h, k) \prod_{i,j:j>i} \omega_{ij}^{n_{ij}}(g, h, k). \quad (79)$$

Here, g, h, k are elements of G , β is an arbitrary 2-cochain, and ω_i and ω_{ij} are so-called type I and type II cocycles. Explicitly, ω_i and ω_{ij} are given by [63]:

$$\omega_i(g, h, k) = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N_i} g_i(h_i+k_i-[h_i+k_i]_{N_i})} \quad (80)$$

$$\omega_{ij}(g, h, k) = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N_i N_j} g_i(h_j+k_j-[h_j+k_j]_{N_j})}, \quad (81)$$

where $g_i, h_i, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ are the i^{th} components of g, h, k , and $[\dots]_{N_i}$ denotes addition modulo N_i . In words, Eq. (79) tells us that $\omega_{\mathcal{I}}$ is cohomologous to a product of type I and type II cocycles determined by the integers \mathcal{I} . Abelian TQDs are, therefore, conveniently parameterized by an Abelian group G and the set of integers \mathcal{I} in Eq. (78).

We now describe the characteristic properties of the anyonic excitation of Abelian TQDs. We rely on the fact that Abelian TQDs are gauge theories, derived by gauging the symmetry of SPT models. As such, a subgroup of the anyons in an Abelian TQD can be labeled as gauge charges [16, 68]. The gauge charges are uniquely determined by the gauging procedure and reproduce the group $G = \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ under fusion. We use c_i to denote the unit of gauge charge that generates the subgroup \mathbb{Z}_{N_i} . The gauge charges are always bosons with trivial mutual braiding, i.e.:

$$\theta(c_i) = 1, \quad B_{\theta}(c_i, c_j) = 1, \quad \forall i, j. \quad (82)$$

All other anyonic excitations of Abelian TQDs carry nonzero gauge flux, implying that they braid nontrivially with at least one of the gauge charges. We call an anyon φ_i an elementary flux if it carries a single unit of gauge flux, i.e., its braiding with gauge charges satisfies:

$$B_{\theta}(\varphi_i, c_j) = \begin{cases} e^{2\pi i/N_i} & \text{if } i = j \\ 1 & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (83)$$

Note that there are $|G|$ possible choices for the elementary flux φ_i , differing by gauge charges. After choosing an elementary flux φ_i , for each i , the gauge charges and the elementary fluxes generate all of the anyons of the Abelian TQD. The group formed by the anyons has order $|G|^2$, although the fusion rules of the elementary fluxes may be nontrivial, as demonstrated by Eq. (94) below.

Unlike the gauge charges, the elementary fluxes can have exotic exchange statistics and nontrivial mutual braiding relations. Ref. [68] showed that TQDs are characterized by the statistics and braiding of the elementary fluxes. For an Abelian TQD corresponding to a group $G = \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ and a choice of elementary flux φ_i for each i , one can define the quantities:

$$\Theta_i \equiv \theta(\varphi_i)^{N_i}, \quad \Theta_{ij} \equiv B_{\theta}(\varphi_i, \varphi_j)^{N^{ij}}, \quad (84)$$

where N^{ij} denotes the least common multiple of N_i and N_j . Using the properties of θ in Eqs. (66) and (69), it can be checked that Θ_i and Θ_{ij} are well-defined – they do not change if the elementary fluxes are modified by attachment of gauge charges.

In what follows, it is useful to express Θ_i and Θ_{ij} in terms of the group cohomological data that specifies an Abelian TQD. The results of Ref. [63] imply that Θ_i and Θ_{ij} can be expressed in terms of the parameters in \mathcal{I} as:

$$\Theta_i = e^{\frac{2\pi i n_i}{N_i}}, \quad \Theta_{ij} = e^{\frac{2\pi i n_{ij}}{N^{ij}}}. \quad (85)$$

We see that a nonzero n_i implies that the elementary flux φ_i has nontrivial statistics, and a nonzero n_{ij} implies that the elementary fluxes φ_i and φ_j have nontrivial mutual braiding.

To provide intuition for the quantities in Eq. (85), let us consider the TQDs corresponding to the group $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$. The group cohomology $H^3[\mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)]$ is equivalent to \mathbb{Z}_2 , and the nontrivial element is cohomologous to a type I cocycle. This implies that there are two distinct Abelian TQDs for $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$, labeled by $n_1 = 0$ and $n_1 = 1$. The TQD corresponding to $n_1 = 0$ is in the same phase as the \mathbb{Z}_2 TC and has anyons $\{1, e, m, \psi\}$. The gauge charge is the boson e , and the elementary flux can be chosen to be $\varphi_1 = m$ or $\varphi_1 = \psi$. In either case, Θ_1 is:

$$\Theta_1 = \theta(m)^2 = \theta(\psi)^2 = 1. \quad (86)$$

The TQD corresponding to $n_1 = 1$, on the other hand, gives a model belonging to the DS phase with anyons $\{1, s, \bar{s}, s\bar{s}\}$. Here, $s\bar{s}$ is the gauge charge and the elementary flux is either $\varphi_1 = s$ or $\varphi_1 = \bar{s}$. In this case, Θ_1 takes the value:

$$\Theta_1 = \theta(s)^2 = \theta(\bar{s})^2 = -1. \quad (87)$$

In Appendix B, we give further illustrative examples of Abelian TQDs using the K -matrix formalism.

An important relation between elementary fluxes and gauge charges can be derived from Eq. (85). To this end, we consider the product of N_i elementary fluxes φ_i . The resulting anyon $\varphi_i^{N_i}$ carries vanishing gauge flux, as can be seen by braiding a charge c_j around $\varphi_i^{N_i}$. Therefore, $\varphi_i^{N_i}$ must be generated by gauge charges. To probe the gauge charges carried by $\varphi_i^{N_i}$, we consider braiding an elementary flux φ_j around $\varphi_i^{N_i}$. There are two cases:

(i) If $j = i$, we have:

$$B_\theta(\varphi_i, \varphi_i^{N_i}) = \frac{\theta(\varphi_i^{N_i+1})}{\theta(\varphi_i)\theta(\varphi_i^{N_i})}. \quad (88)$$

Since θ satisfies Eq. (66), this reduces to:

$$B_\theta(\varphi_i, \varphi_i^{N_i}) = \frac{\theta(\varphi_i)^{N_i^2+2N_i+1}}{\theta(\varphi_i)\theta(\varphi_i)^{N_i^2}} = \theta(\varphi_i)^{2N_i}. \quad (89)$$

Finally, we employ Eq. (85) to find:

$$B_\theta(\varphi_i, \varphi_i^{N_i}) = \Theta_i^2 = e^{2n_i \frac{2\pi i}{N_i}}. \quad (90)$$

Eqs. (83) and (90) tell us that $\varphi_i^{N_i}$ carries $2n_i$ copies of the gauge charge c_i .

(ii) If $j \neq i$, we use the property of B_θ in Eq. (69):

$$B_\theta(\varphi_j, \varphi_i^{N_i}) = B_\theta(\varphi_j, \varphi_i)^{N_i}. \quad (91)$$

This can then be written in terms of Θ_{ij} using Eq. (84):

$$B_\theta(\varphi_j, \varphi_i^{N_i}) = \Theta_{ij}^{N_i/N^{ij}}. \quad (92)$$

Substituting the expression for Θ_{ij} in Eq. (85) into the formula above, we have:

$$B_\theta(\varphi_j, \varphi_i^{N_i}) = e^{\frac{2\pi i n_{ij}}{N_{ij}} \frac{N_i}{N^{ij}}} = e^{n_{ij} \frac{2\pi i}{N_j}}, \quad (93)$$

where we have used that $N_{ij}N^{ij} = N_iN_j$. Thus, $\varphi_i^{N_i}$ carries n_{ij} copies of the gauge charge c_j .

Combining (i) and (ii), we find that the gauge charges and elementary fluxes satisfy [69]:

$$\varphi_i^{N_i} = c_i^{2n_i} \prod_{j \neq i} c_j^{n_{ij}}, \quad \forall i. \quad (94)$$

This relation is independent of the choice of φ_i due to the fact that Θ_i and Θ_{ij} , used in the derivation, do not depend on the choice of elementary fluxes. We also point out that Eq. (94) implies that the group formed by the anyons of an Abelian TQD can differ from $G \times G$, if the parameters n_i and n_{ij} are nonzero. We refer to Appendix C for an aside on the group structure of anyons in Abelian TQDs.

In summary, the anyons of an Abelian TQD corresponding to G and \mathcal{I} form a group \mathcal{A}_{TQD} with the presentation:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{TQD}} \equiv \langle \{c_i\}, \{\varphi_i\} | c_i^{N_i} = 1, \varphi_i^{N_i} = c_i^{2n_i} \prod_{j \neq i} c_j^{n_{ij}}, \forall i \rangle, \quad (95)$$

where $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^M$ is a set of elementary fluxes with an arbitrary φ_i chosen for each i . Up to redefining φ_i by gauge charges, the statistics of the anyons are determined by Eqs. (82), (83), and (85). The group in Eq. (95) along with the statistics and braiding of the gauge charges and elementary fluxes defines the anyon theory \mathcal{A}_{TQD} of the Abelian TQD.

In the next section, our goal is to construct a Pauli stabilizer model for each choice of $G = \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ and parameters \mathcal{I} such that its anyons satisfy Eqs. (82), (83), and (85) and form the group in Eq. (95). This implies that the anyonic excitations of the Pauli stabilizer Hamiltonian form the same anyon theory \mathcal{A}_{TQD} as an Abelian TQD specified by G and \mathcal{I} .

B. Construction of the Pauli stabilizer models

Having described the anyonic excitations of TQDs, we are ready to construct the TQD stabilizer models. The construction proceeds in two steps. In the first step, we identify a TC (or stack of TCs) on composite-dimensional qudits with the property that its anyonic excitations contain the anyons of a TQD as a quotient group. In the second step, we condense certain emergent bosons so that the deconfined excitations have the same properties as the anyons of a TQD. We describe the construction at the level of the anyons before providing explicit lattice models for the Pauli stabilizer models.

Anyon-level construction

To capture the statistics and braiding of anyons in an Abelian TQD corresponding to a group $G = \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$, we start with a stack of M TCs, where the i^{th} TC is a $\mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$ TC. We note that, in some cases, it is possible to use a smaller group than $\mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$. However, $\mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$ is sufficient for the general construction of TQD stabilizer models, as the anyons in stacks of $\mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$ TCs are able to reproduce the statistics and braiding needed for the characteristic Θ_i and Θ_{ij} of the Abelian TQD corresponding to G .

We label the e and m excitations of the i^{th} TC by e_i and m_i , respectively. Recall that the e and m excitations are bosons with the braiding relations:

$$B_\theta(m_i, e_j) = \begin{cases} e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N_i^2}} & \text{if } i = j \\ 1 & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (96)$$

Anyons in the stack of TCs can be written as products of e and m excitations of the form: $\prod_{i=1}^M e_i^{p_i} m_i^{q_i}$, for integers $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$. The statistics and braiding of the anyons follow from

the properties of the e and m excitations and are given by the general formulas:

$$\theta \left(\prod_{i=1}^M e_i^{p_i} m_i^{q_i} \right) = \prod_{i=1}^M e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N_i^2} p_i q_i} \quad (97)$$

$$B_\theta \left(\prod_{i=1}^M e_i^{p_i} m_i^{q_i}, \prod_{i=1}^M e_i^{r_i} m_i^{s_i} \right) = \prod_{i=1}^M e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N_i^2} (p_i s_i + q_i r_i)}. \quad (98)$$

Our first objective is to identify anyons in this system that exhibit the same statistics and braiding as the anyons of an Abelian TQD corresponding to $G = \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ and \mathcal{I} , where \mathcal{I} specifies a product of type I and type II cocycles, as described in the previous section.

Let us first consider the excitations $\{e_i^{N_i}\}$. These excitations generate the group G under fusion and are bosons with trivial mutual braiding:

$$\theta(e_i^{N_i}) = 1, \quad B_\theta(e_i^{N_i}, e_j^{N_j}) = 1, \quad \forall i, j. \quad (99)$$

Therefore, they satisfy the same conditions as in Eq. (82) for gauge charges of an Abelian TQD. We suggestively define:

$$\tilde{c}_i \equiv e_i^{N_i}. \quad (100)$$

To describe excitations that mimic the properties of elementary fluxes, we set a convention for the ordering of the factors \mathbb{Z}_{N_i} of G . We first assume (without loss of generality) that each N_i is a power of a prime. We then (implicitly) order the factors of G so that $N_i < N_{i+1}$, for all i . For example, we order

$$\mathbb{Z}_{27} \times \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_5 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \quad \text{as} \quad \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_5 \times \mathbb{Z}_{27}.$$

Given this ordering on the factors of G , we consider the excitations $\{\tilde{\varphi}_i\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq M$, where $\tilde{\varphi}_i$ is defined as:

$$\tilde{\varphi}_i \equiv m_i e_i^{n_i} \prod_{j>i} e_j^{\frac{N_j}{N_i} n_{ij}}. \quad (101)$$

Here, the product is over all j with $j > i$. Note that due to our choice of ordering, $\frac{N_j}{N_i} n_{ij}$ is an integer. Indeed, if N_i does not divide N_j , then the greatest common divisor of N_i and N_j is $N_{ij} = 1$, implying that n_{ij} must be zero, since it is an element of $\mathbb{Z}_{N_{ij}}$. From the general formula in Eq. (98), the braiding of $\tilde{\varphi}_i$ and the excitation \tilde{c}_i is:

$$B_\theta(\tilde{\varphi}_i, \tilde{c}_j) = \begin{cases} e^{2\pi i/N_i} & \text{if } i = j \\ 1 & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (102)$$

This agrees with the braiding of an elementary flux and a gauge charge, as in Eq. (83). Furthermore, the statistics and mutual braiding of $\tilde{\varphi}_i$ tell us, for all i, j :

$$\Theta_i = e^{\frac{2\pi i n_i}{N_i}}, \quad \Theta_{ij} = e^{\frac{2\pi i n_{ij}}{N_{ij}}}, \quad (103)$$

which matches the values for Θ_i and Θ_{ij} in Eq. (85).

Thus far, we have found excitations \tilde{c}_i and $\tilde{\varphi}_i$ that exhibit the same statistics and braiding as the gauge charges and elementary fluxes of an Abelian TQD. Now, we need to ensure that they also have the same fusion rules. However, using the definition of $\tilde{\varphi}_i$, the product of N_i copies of $\tilde{\varphi}_i$ is equivalent to:

$$\tilde{\varphi}_i^{N_i} = m_i^{N_i} \tilde{c}_i^{n_i} \prod_{j>i} \tilde{c}_j^{n_{ij}}, \quad \forall i. \quad (104)$$

This implies that \tilde{c}_i and $\tilde{\varphi}_i$ fail to satisfy the relations of gauge charges c_i and elementary fluxes φ_i in Eq. (94), rewritten here:

$$\varphi_i^{N_i} = c_i^{2n_i} \prod_{j \neq i} c_j^{n_{ij}}, \quad \forall i. \quad (105)$$

This discrepancy can be resolved by condensing a particular set of bosonic anyons $\{b_i\}$, with $1 \leq i \leq M$. The bosons are chosen so that the anyons of the resulting theory obey the relations in Eq. (105). In particular, we construct an anyon theory \mathcal{C} by condensing the collection of bosons $\{b_i\}$, defined by:

$$b_i \equiv m_i^{-N_i} e_i^{N_i n_i} \prod_{j<i} e_j^{N_j n_{ij}}, \quad (106)$$

where the product is over j with $j < i$. The first thing to note is that the bosons have trivial mutual braiding relations:

$$B_\theta(b_i, b_j) = 1, \quad \forall i, j. \quad (107)$$

Therefore, they can be condensed without confining one another. Second, the bosons have trivial braiding relations with the anyons \tilde{c}_i and $\tilde{\varphi}_i$:

$$B_\theta(\tilde{c}_i, b_j) = 1, \quad B_\theta(\tilde{\varphi}_i, b_j) = 1, \quad \forall i, j. \quad (108)$$

This means that the equivalence classes $[\tilde{c}_i]$ and $[\tilde{\varphi}_i]$ represent deconfined anyons in \mathcal{C} . Here, we have used the notation $[\cdot]$ described in Section III to represent equivalence classes of excitations related by fusion with condensed bosons.

The condensation of the bosons produces relations between $[\tilde{c}_i]$ and $[\tilde{\varphi}_i]$ analogous to the relations in Eq. (105). To see this, we express b_i in terms of $\tilde{\varphi}_i$ and \tilde{c}_i . A straightforward calculation shows that b_i is equivalent to:

$$b_i = \tilde{\varphi}_i^{-N_i} \times \tilde{c}_i^{2n_i} \prod_{j \neq i} \tilde{c}_j^{n_{ij}}. \quad (109)$$

Therefore, after condensation, we have:

$$[b_i] = [\tilde{\varphi}_i^{-N_i} \times \tilde{c}_i^{2n_i} \prod_{j \neq i} \tilde{c}_j^{n_{ij}}] = [1], \quad \forall i. \quad (110)$$

Given that the equivalence relation is well-defined under fusion, we obtain:

$$[\tilde{\varphi}_i]^{N_i} = [\tilde{c}_i]^{2n_i} \prod_{j \neq i} [\tilde{c}_j]^{n_{ij}}, \quad \forall i. \quad (111)$$

Eq. (111) shows us that the deconfined anyons $[\tilde{c}_i]$ and $[\tilde{\varphi}_i]$ satisfy the same relations as the gauge charges and elementary fluxes in Eq. (105).

At this point, we have a set of anyons $\{[\tilde{c}_i]\}$ and $\{[\tilde{\varphi}_i]\}$ with the same statistics, braiding, and fusion rules as the gauge charges and elementary fluxes of an Abelian TQD corresponding to G and the parameters \mathcal{I} . Hence, they generate an anyon theory that is equivalent to the anyon theory \mathcal{A}_{TQD} of the Abelian TQD. This means that the condensed theory \mathcal{C} contains \mathcal{A}_{TQD} as a subtheory.

The last step of the construction is to argue that \mathcal{C} is generated by the sets of anyons $\{[\tilde{c}_i]\}$ and $\{[\tilde{\varphi}_i]\}$. This implies that \mathcal{C} is equivalent to \mathcal{A}_{TQD} . To this end, we use the following observation (shown below): the condensation of the bosons $\{[\tilde{c}_i]\}$ in \mathcal{C} produces a theory without any deconfined anyons. Note that the bosons $\{\tilde{c}_i\}$ and $\{b_i\}$ in the stack of $\mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$ TCs braid trivially with each other, so they can be condensed without confining one another. Therefore, condensing the bosons $\{[\tilde{c}_i]\}$ in \mathcal{C} is the same as condensing the bosons $\{\tilde{c}_i\}$ followed by condensing the bosons $\{[b_i]\}$.

For the sake of contradiction, suppose that there exists an anyon a that remains deconfined and nontrivial after condensing the sets of bosons $\{\tilde{c}_i\}$ and $\{b_i\}$. Since a is deconfined after the condensation of the \tilde{c}_i anyons, it must braid trivially with each $\tilde{c}_i = e_i^{N_i}$. This means that a takes the form:

$$a = \prod_{i=1}^M e_i^{p_i} \prod_{i=1}^M m_i^{s_i N_i}, \quad (112)$$

with $p_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$ and $s_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$. After condensing the bosons in $\{\tilde{c}_i\}$, each b_i can be identified with a product of m_i excitations:

$$[b_i] = [m_i^{-N_i}], \quad \forall i. \quad (113)$$

Therefore, condensing the boson labeled by b_i is equivalent to condensing the boson labeled by $m_i^{-N_i}$. If a is deconfined after condensing the set of bosons $\{[b_i]\}$, then it must have trivial braiding relations with $m_i^{-N_i}$, for all i . This constrains a to be of the form:

$$a = \prod_{i=1}^M e_i^{r_i N_i} \prod_{i=1}^M m_i^{s_i N_i}, \quad (114)$$

for $r_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$. The expression in Eq. (114) conflicts with the assumption that a is nontrivial after the condensation of the two sets of bosons. Indeed, after condensing the bosons \tilde{c}_i , we have:

$$[a] = \left[\prod_{i=1}^M m_i^{s_i N_i} \right]. \quad (115)$$

Then, condensation of the bosons $[b_i] = [m_i^{-N_i}]$ implies that $[a]$ can be identified with the trivial anyon. Thus, there are no deconfined anyons after condensing the set of bosons $\{[\tilde{c}_i]\}$.

The observation above tells us that \mathcal{C} is modular, i.e., for every anyon $[a]$ in \mathcal{C} there exists an anyon $[a']$ that braids non-trivially with $[a]$. This is because, if an anyon braided trivially

with all other anyons in \mathcal{C} , then it would be deconfined after condensing $\{[\tilde{c}_i]\}$ [70]. Since \mathcal{C} is modular, we can apply the following result from Ref. [71]: any modular anyon theory \mathcal{A} , that contains a modular subtheory \mathcal{A}_1 , factorizes as:

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \boxtimes \mathcal{A}_2, \quad (116)$$

for some modular theory \mathcal{A}_2 . The product \boxtimes , defined in Section III, implies that the anyons in \mathcal{A}_1 braid trivially with the anyons in \mathcal{A}_2 . \mathcal{A}_{TQD} forms a modular subtheory of \mathcal{C} . Therefore, \mathcal{C} factorizes as:

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}_{\text{TQD}} \boxtimes \mathcal{B}, \quad (117)$$

for some modular anyon theory \mathcal{B} . The anyon theory \mathcal{B} must be trivial, because, after condensing the $[\tilde{c}_i]$ bosons, there are no deconfined anyons. If \mathcal{B} was nontrivial, then the anyons in \mathcal{B} would remain deconfined after condensing $\{[\tilde{c}_i]\}$. We conclude that \mathcal{C} is equal to \mathcal{A}_{TQD} .

Lattice-level construction

Having described the construction at the level of the anyons, we now turn to an explicit lattice construction of the TQD stabilizer models. The stabilizer model for the TQD specified by $G = \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ and the set of integers \mathcal{I} [Eq. (78)] is defined on a square lattice, where each edge hosts M qudits, and the i^{th} qudit has dimension N_i^2 . The Pauli X and Pauli Z operators for the i^{th} qudit at the edge e are given by:

$$X_{e,i} \equiv \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}} |j+1\rangle\langle j|, \quad Z_{e,i} \equiv \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}} \omega^j |j\rangle\langle j|. \quad (118)$$

When it is clear from context, we omit the edge label e .

The construction of the TQD stabilizer model begins with a stack of $\mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$ TCs. The Hamiltonian for the decoupled $\mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$ TCs is:

$$H_{\text{TC}} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^M H_{\text{TC}}^{(i)}, \quad (119)$$

where $H_{\text{TC}}^{(i)}$ denotes the $\mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$ TC in the layer i . Explicitly, $H_{\text{TC}}^{(i)}$ is the sum of vertex terms $A_{v,i}^{\text{TC}}$ and plaquette terms $B_{p,i}^{\text{TC}}$:

$$H_{\text{TC}}^{(i)} \equiv - \sum_v A_{v,i}^{\text{TC}} - \sum_p B_{p,i}^{\text{TC}} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (120)$$

with $A_{v,i}^{\text{TC}}$ and $B_{p,i}^{\text{TC}}$ represented pictorially by:

$$A_{v,i}^{\text{TC}} \equiv \begin{array}{c} | \\ X_i^\dagger \\ -X_i - \\ | \\ X_i \end{array} \begin{array}{c} | \\ v \\ | \\ X_i^\dagger \\ - \\ | \end{array}, \quad B_{p,i}^{\text{TC}} \equiv \begin{array}{c} Z_i^\dagger \\ \left[\begin{array}{c} Z_i^\dagger \quad p \quad Z_i \\ Z_i \end{array} \right] \end{array}. \quad (121)$$

The associated stabilizer group for the Hamiltonian H_{TC} is generated by the full set of vertex terms and plaquette terms of the Hamiltonian H_{TC} :

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}} \equiv \langle \{A_{v,i}^{\text{TC}}\}_{i=1}^M, \{B_{p,i}^{\text{TC}}\}_{i=1}^M \rangle. \quad (122)$$

The TQD stabilizer model is then derived by condensing the bosons b_i , defined in Eq. (106) as:

$$b_i = m_i^{-N_i} e_i^{N_i n_i} \prod_{j<i} e_j^{N_j n_{ij}}. \quad (123)$$

We take the short string operators for the bosons b_i to be:

$$C_{e,i} \equiv \begin{array}{c} \text{---} X_{e,i}^{-N_i} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \hat{Z}_i \text{---} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} X_{e,i}^{N_i} \text{---} \\ | \\ \hat{Z}_i \end{array}, \quad (124)$$

where \hat{Z}_i is shorthand for the product of Pauli Z operators:

$$\hat{Z}_i \equiv Z_i^{N_i n_i} \prod_{j<i} Z_j^{N_j n_{ij}}. \quad (125)$$

To build longer string operators, one would need to account for the orientation of a path along the dual lattice, but for our purposes the operators $C_{e,i}$ suffice. The short string operators $C_{e,i}$ generate the stabilizer group \mathcal{S}_C :

$$\mathcal{S}_C \equiv \langle \{C_{e,i}\}_{i=1}^M \rangle. \quad (126)$$

We now follow the same logic as used in Section II B to condense the set of bosons $\{b_i\}$. Let us define $\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C$ to be the group of stabilizers in \mathcal{S}_{TC} that commute with the elements of \mathcal{S}_C :

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C \equiv \{S \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}} : SC = CS, \forall C \in \mathcal{S}_C\}. \quad (127)$$

With some foresight, this is generated by the set of operators $\{A_{v,i}\}_{i=1}^M$ and $\{B_{p,i}\}_{i=1}^M$, defined graphically as:

$$A_{v,i} \equiv \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \hat{Z}_i^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ X_i^\dagger \hat{Z}_i^\dagger \\ | \\ X_i \\ | \\ X_i^\dagger \hat{Z}_i \\ | \\ \text{---} \hat{Z}_i \text{---} \\ | \\ X_i \end{array}, \quad B_{p,i} \equiv \begin{array}{c} Z_i^{-N_i} \\ | \\ \text{---} Z_i^{-N_i} \text{---} p \text{---} Z_i^{N_i} \\ | \\ Z_i^{N_i} \end{array}. \quad (128)$$

Here, \hat{Z}_i is notation for the operator:

$$\hat{Z}_i \equiv Z_i^{n_i} \prod_{j<i} Z_j^{n_{ij}}. \quad (129)$$

The stabilizer group of the condensed theory is then:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{TQD}} \equiv \langle \mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C, \mathcal{S}_C \rangle = \langle \{A_{v,i}\}_{i=1}^M, \{B_{p,i}\}_{i=1}^M, \{C_{e,i}\}_{i=1}^M \rangle. \quad (130)$$

The corresponding TQD stabilizer Hamiltonian H_{TQD} is defined as:

$$H_{\text{TQD}} \equiv - \sum_{v,i} A_{v,i} - \sum_{p,i} B_{p,i} - \sum_{e,i} C_{e,i} + \text{h.c.} \quad (131)$$

The unit gauge charge c_i and an elementary flux φ_i can be created by the short string operators below:

$$W_e^{c_i} \equiv \begin{array}{c} \text{---} Z_{e,i}^{N_i} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} Z_{e,i}^{-N_i} \text{---} \\ | \\ Z_{e,i}^{-N_i} \\ | \\ Z_{e,i}^{N_i} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} Z_{e,i}^{-N_i} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} Z_{e,i}^{N_i} \text{---} \\ | \\ Z_{e,i}^{N_i} \\ | \\ Z_{e,i}^{-N_i} \end{array}, \quad (132)$$

$$W_e^{\varphi_i} \equiv \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \tilde{Z}_i \text{---} \\ | \\ X_{e,i} \\ | \\ \text{---} \tilde{Z}_i^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ X_{e,i}^\dagger \\ | \\ \text{---} \tilde{Z}_i^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ X_{e,i}^\dagger \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \tilde{Z}_i^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ X_{e,i}^\dagger \\ | \\ \text{---} \tilde{Z}_i \text{---} \\ | \\ X_{e,i} \\ | \\ \text{---} \tilde{Z}_i \text{---} \\ | \\ X_{e,i} \end{array}, \quad (133)$$

where \tilde{Z}_i is given by the product of Pauli Z operators:

$$\tilde{Z}_i \equiv Z_i^{n_i} \prod_{j>i} Z_j^{N_j n_{ij}}. \quad (134)$$

These agree with the formulas for \tilde{c}_i and $\tilde{\varphi}_i$ in Eqs. (100) and (101). Longer string operators, along oriented paths γ in the direct lattice and $\tilde{\gamma}$ in the dual lattice, are given by:

$$W_\gamma^{c_i} \equiv \prod_{e \in \gamma} W_e^{c_i}, \quad W_{\tilde{\gamma}}^{\varphi_i} \equiv \prod_{e \in \tilde{\gamma}} W_e^{\varphi_i}. \quad (135)$$

Lastly, as a consistency check, we compute the ground state degeneracy of H_{TQD} on a torus. Similar to the calculation in Section II A, we count the number of independent constraints on the states in the ground state subspace, defined by:

$$\mathcal{H}_L \equiv \{|\psi\rangle : S|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle, \forall S \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{TQD}}\}. \quad (136)$$

We expect the ground state degeneracy to have order $|G|^2$, since the ground state degeneracy of a topological order on a torus is equivalent to the number of anyons in the theory [25].

To count the number of constraints on the ground state subspace, we let N_v denote the number of vertices in the lattice. Then, for each layer i , there are N_v vertex terms, N_v plaquette terms, and $2N_v$ edge terms. Each of these yields an order N_i constraint. The vertex term $A_{v,i}$ gives an order N_i constraint, since $A_{v,i}^{N_i}$ is a product of plaquette and edge terms. On a torus, there are also global relations among the vertex stabilizers and plaquette stabilizers that need to be considered. In particular, for every i , the vertex terms and plaquette terms satisfy:

$$\prod_v A_{v,i} = 1, \quad \prod_p B_{p,i} = 1. \quad (137)$$

Therefore, we only have $N_v - 1$ independent vertex stabilizers and plaquette stabilizers. This gives us a total of $4N_v - 2$ constraints with order N_i . Since there are two N_i^2 -dimensional qudits per vertex, the dimension of the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_i in the layer i is:

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}_i) = (N_i^2)^{2N_v}, \quad (138)$$

meaning that the dimension of the total Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is:

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}) = \prod_{i=1}^M (N_i^2)^{2N_v}. \quad (139)$$

Given that there are $4N_v - 2$ constraints with order N_i for each layer i , the dimension of the ground state subspace is equal to:

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}_L) = \prod_{i=1}^M \frac{(N_i^2)^{2N_v}}{N_i^{4N_v-2}} = \prod_{i=1}^M N_i^2. \quad (140)$$

This is equivalent to $|G|^2$, the order of the fusion group for the TQD.

Note that the calculation above is sufficient to show that the set of operators $\{A_{v,i}\}_{i=1}^M$ and $\{B_{p,i}\}_{i=1}^M$ generate the stabilizer group $\mathcal{S}_{\text{TC}}^C$. This is because, in the absence of the global relations (i.e., on a simply connected manifold), the ground state is nondegenerate. Consequently, any element of \mathcal{S}_{TC} that commutes with the elements of \mathcal{S}_{TQD} , must already belong to \mathcal{S}_{TQD} (see Appendix C of Ref. [33]).

V. PAULI STABILIZER MODELS OF SPT PHASES

As established in Sections III and IV, TQDs are derived by gauging the symmetry of models belonging to symmetry-protected topological (SPT) phases. Specifically, TQDs corresponding to a group G and cocycle $\omega \in H^3[G, U(1)]$, are obtained by gauging the G symmetry of the associated SPT models. Conversely, models of SPT phases can be constructed from TQDs by gauging 1-form symmetries [72]. In this section, we demonstrate that gauging certain 1-form symmetries of the TQD stabilizer models produces Pauli stabilizer models of SPT phases. To make the discussion concrete, we focus on a stabilizer model for a \mathbb{Z}_2 SPT phase, obtained by gauging a 1-form symmetry of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian. Similar arguments can be used to construct Pauli stabilizer models for SPT phase characterized by group cocycles of the form in Eq. (79).

Indeed, TQDs, and topologically ordered systems more generally, possess 1-form symmetries generated by anyon string operators along closed paths. Models belonging to the DS phase, for example, have a 1-form $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry with generators given by loops of semion s and boson $s\bar{s}$ string operators. We point out that 1-form symmetries in a topologically ordered system need not correspond to anyonic excitations, however. The DS stabilizer Hamiltonian in Section II has a 1-form $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry generated by the vertex terms A_v and plaquette terms B_p . Only the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup corresponds to anyon string operators.

Given the connection between 1-form symmetries and anyons, we can make a more precise statement about the construction of SPT models from TQDs. Namely, models for SPT phases arise from gauging the 1-form symmetries associated to the gauge charges of TQDs. After gauging the 1-form symmetry associated to the gauge charges, the system (i) gains a 0-form symmetry and (ii) has trivial topological order (in the absence of symmetries) – both of which are required for

SPT phases. The theory obtained by gauging the symmetry has trivial topological order, since gauging 1-form symmetries has the same effect as condensing the corresponding anyons (elaborated upon for the DS stabilizer model below). The gauge charges of the TQD form a Lagrangian subgroup (Section III) – thus, condensing the gauge charges confines all of the anyons.

We now focus on the DS stabilizer model. For the DS stabilizer model, in particular, the gauge charge is the boson $s\bar{s}$ with \mathbb{Z}_2 fusion rules. Therefore, we obtain a model for a \mathbb{Z}_2 SPT phase by gauging the 1-form symmetry corresponding to $s\bar{s}$. For convenience, we re-write the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian H_{DS} :

$$H_{\text{DS}} = - \sum_v A_v - \sum_p B_p - \sum_e C_e, \quad (141)$$

with A_v , B_p , and C_e defined by:

$$A_v = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} Z^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ X^\dagger Z^\dagger \quad Z \\ | \\ \text{---} X \text{---} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} | \\ X^\dagger Z \\ | \\ X \end{array} \\ \text{---} X \text{---} \end{array}, \quad B_p = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} \\ | \\ Z^2 \quad p \quad Z^2 \\ | \\ \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} \end{array} \end{array}, \quad (142)$$

$$C_e = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} | \\ X_e^2 \\ \text{---} Z^2 \text{---} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} X_e^2 \text{---} \\ | \\ Z^2 \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} \end{array}.$$

We also recall that the string operators for the anyon $s\bar{s}$ are generated by the short string operators:

$$W_e^{s\bar{s}} = \text{---} Z_e^2 \text{---}, \quad \begin{array}{c} | \\ Z_e^2 \\ | \end{array}. \quad (143)$$

Explicitly, the 1-form symmetry corresponding to $s\bar{s}$ is generated by operators of the form:

$$W_\lambda^{s\bar{s}} = \prod_{e \in \lambda} W_e^{s\bar{s}}, \quad (144)$$

where λ denotes a loop in the direct lattice.

At this point, one could gauge the 1-form symmetry following the usual minimal coupling prescription [45, 73, 74]. However, we find it illuminating to take a different approach. For Pauli stabilizer Hamiltonians, gauging a 1-form G symmetry corresponding to a boson b is equivalent to condensing b anyons bound to 0-form G charges. More concretely, for the DS stabilizer model, the 1-form symmetry associated to $s\bar{s}$ can be gauged by condensing $s\bar{s}$ anyons bound to 0-form \mathbb{Z}_2 charges, as described below.

To make this explicit, we add a qubit to each vertex of the square lattice, as in Fig. 9. We use X_v and Z_v to denote the Pauli X and Pauli Z operators at the vertex v . In what follows, we graphically represent X_v and Z_v with red operators. We define a modified Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{DS} with ancillary qubits to




FIG. 9. The Pauli stabilizer model of the \mathbb{Z}_2 SPT phase is defined on a square lattice with a four-dimensional qudit (blue) at each edge and a qubit (red) at each vertex.

be:

$$\hat{H}_{\text{DS}} = H_{\text{DS}} - \sum_v X_v, \quad (145)$$

which corresponds to the stabilizer group:

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{DS}} \equiv \langle \{A_v\}, \{B_p\}, \{X_v\} \rangle. \quad (146)$$

By construction, this Hamiltonian has an additional 0-form \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry generated by the product of Pauli X operators $\prod_v X_v$. The Pauli Z operator Z_v creates a 0-form \mathbb{Z}_2 charge at the vertex v . In terms of the minimal coupling prescription, the qubits on the vertices are the gauge fields.

Next, we introduce the short string operators:

$$D_e \equiv Z - Z_e^2 - Z, \quad \begin{array}{c} Z \\ | \\ Z_e^2 \\ | \\ Z \end{array}, \quad (147)$$

which proliferate $s\bar{s}$ anyons bound to 0-form \mathbb{Z}_2 charges. The claim is that gauging the 1-form symmetry is equivalent to condensing the excitations created by the short string operators D_e . From the perspective of minimal coupling, the operators in Eq. (147) can be understood as the 1-form Gauss's law. In accordance, products of D_e along a closed path recover a 1-form symmetry operator.

To condense the $s\bar{s}$ anyons bound to \mathbb{Z}_2 charges, we follow the logic described in Sections II B and IV B. We start by defining the stabilizer group \mathcal{S}_D generated by the set of short string operators $\{D_e\}$:

$$\mathcal{S}_D \equiv \langle \{D_e\} \rangle. \quad (148)$$

We then define the stabilizer group $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{DS}}^D$ formed by the elements of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{DS}}$ that commute with the operators in \mathcal{S}_D . Formally, this is the stabilizer group:

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{DS}}^D \equiv \langle S \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{DS}} : SD = DS, \forall D \in \mathcal{S}_D \rangle. \quad (149)$$

The only generators of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{DS}}^D$ that fail to commute with the elements of \mathcal{S}_D are the vertex terms A_v and X_v . Their products

of the form $A_v X_v$, however, commute with every element of \mathcal{S}_D . We claim that the stabilizer group in Eq. (149) is generated by the following elements:

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{DS}}^D = \langle \{A_v X_v\}, \{C_e\}, \{D_e\} \rangle. \quad (150)$$

Note that the plaquette terms B_p are not included as generators, since they can be generated by products of the edge terms. The products $A_v X_v$ can be interpreted as coupling the vertex terms A_v to the gauge fields. This ensures that the Hamiltonian terms are gauge invariant, i.e., commute with the D_e terms.

Finally, the stabilizer group of the condensed theory is:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{SPT}} \equiv \langle \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{DS}}^D, \mathcal{S}_D \rangle, \quad (151)$$

and the corresponding stabilizer Hamiltonian is:

$$H_{\text{SPT}} \equiv - \sum_v A_v X_v - \sum_e C_e - \sum_e D_e + \text{h.c.} \quad (152)$$

The Hamiltonian terms are pictured below:

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} Z^\dagger \text{---} \\ | \\ X^\dagger Z^\dagger \\ | \\ X \\ | \\ X_e^2 \\ | \\ Z^2 \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} X \text{---} X_v \text{---} X^\dagger Z^\dagger \\ | \\ X \\ | \\ X_e^2 \\ | \\ Z^2 \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} X_e^2 \text{---} \\ | \\ Z^2 \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{---} X_e^2 \text{---} \\ | \\ Z^2 \end{array} \end{array} \quad (153)$$

Since the condensation procedure does not affect the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry of \hat{H}_{DS} , the Hamiltonian H_{SPT} has a 0-form \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry generated by $\prod_v X_v$.

In what follows, we confirm that H_{SPT} has no anyonic excitations by computing the ground state degeneracy of H_{SPT} on a torus. We then use the methods of Ref. [75] to diagnose its SPT order. We find that the Hamiltonian in Eq. (152) describes the \mathbb{Z}_2 SPT phase characterized by the nontrivial element of $H^3[\mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)]$.

Similar to the previous calculations of the ground state degeneracy in Sections II A and IV B, we count the number of constraints in terms of the number of vertices N_v . Given that $A_v X_v$ squares to a product of C_e and D_e terms, the Hamiltonian terms give $5N_v$ order two constraints. Unlike the case of the TQD stabilizer models, there are no global relations amongst these constraints. Taking into account the qubit at each vertex and the four-dimensional qudit at each edge, the dimension of the total Hilbert space is $2^{N_v} 4^{2N_v}$. After imposing the $5N_v$ order two constraints, we find that the ground state subspace \mathcal{H}_L has dimension:

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}_L) = 2^{N_v} 4^{2N_v} / 2^{5N_v} = 1. \quad (154)$$

The last step is to consider the associativity of the truncated effective symmetry actions for $g, h, k \in \mathbb{Z}_2$:

$$\mathcal{P}_\ell(g)[\mathcal{P}_\ell(h)\mathcal{P}_\ell(k)] = [\mathcal{P}_\ell(g)\mathcal{P}_\ell(h)]\mathcal{P}_\ell(k). \quad (166)$$

Substituting Eq. (163) into Eq. (166), we obtain:

$$[\mathcal{P}_\ell(g)\Omega(h, k)\mathcal{P}_\ell(g)^\dagger]\Omega(g, h+k) \sim \Omega(g, h)\Omega(g+h, k). \quad (167)$$

Given the decomposition of $\Omega(g, h)$ in Eq. (164), the condition above is satisfied up to a phase at each endpoint, i.e., at the endpoint v_L , we have:

$$[\mathcal{P}_\ell(g)\Omega_{v_L}(h, k)\mathcal{P}_\ell(g)^\dagger]\Omega_{v_L}(g, h+k) \sim \omega(g, h, k)\Omega_{v_L}(g, h)\Omega_{v_L}(g+h, k). \quad (168)$$

Here, ω is the $U(1)$ -valued group cocycle in $H^3[\mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)]$ that characterizes the SPT phase. From Eq. (168), we see that ω is given by:

$$\omega(g, h, k) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } g, h, k = 1, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (169)$$

This represents the nontrivial element of $H^3[\mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)]$, implying that H_{SPT} describes the nontrivial \mathbb{Z}_2 SPT phase. We would also like to point out that the calculation of ω above, is analogous to the calculation of the F -symbol [50, 77] for the semion s in the DS stabilizer model. This is because the effective boundary symmetry action only differs from the s string operator by X_v operators, which do not affect the calculation.

We have now shown that the nontrivial two-dimensional \mathbb{Z}_2 SPT phase can be modeled by the Pauli stabilizer Hamiltonian H_{SPT} . We emphasize that this does not conflict with the results of Ref. [33], since the argument in Ref. [33] assumes that the \mathbb{Z}_2 SPT model is defined on qubits, as opposed to four-dimensional qudits. Furthermore, the construction of Pauli stabilizer models for SPT phases presented here is restricted to SPT phases characterized by group cocycles that are products of type I and type II cocycles. We are unable to construct Pauli stabilizer models for SPT phases characterized by type III cocycles, in agreement with Ref. [33]. This is also consistent with the fact that type III cocycles correspond to TQDs with non-Abelian anyons, which cannot be modeled by Pauli stabilizer Hamiltonians.

We note that the \mathbb{Z}_2 SPT model belongs to a trivial SPT phase, when considered as an SPT model protected by a \mathbb{Z}_4 symmetry. This is because the effective boundary symmetry action in Eq. (158) is a tensor product of linear representations of \mathbb{Z}_4 . In other words, the SPT model can be trivialized by extending the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry to a \mathbb{Z}_4 symmetry [78, 79]. More generally, an SPT model protected by a $\prod_i \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ symmetry, which is characterized by a product of type I and type II cocycles, can be trivialized by extending the symmetry to $\prod_i \mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$. This yields the commutative diagram shown in Fig. 11, which further motivates the construction of the $\prod_i \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ TQD stabilizer model from a $\prod_i \mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$ TC.




FIG. 11. An SPT model protected by a $\prod_i \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ symmetry (and characterized by a product of type I and type II cocycles) is trivialized by extending the symmetry to $\prod_i \mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$. Subsequently gauging the 0-form symmetry produces a model in the same phase as a $\prod_i \mathbb{Z}_{N_i^2}$ TC. One can then condense bosons according to the prescription in Section IV to obtain a $\prod_i \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ TQD stabilizer model and gauge the 1-form symmetries corresponding to the gauge charges to arrive at a stabilizer model belonging to the $\prod_i \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ SPT phase.

VI. DISCUSSION

We have constructed a Pauli stabilizer model for every twisted quantum double (TQD) with Abelian anyons. Our strategy was to condense bosonic anyons in decoupled toric codes (TCs) so that the remaining deconfined excitations are those of the Abelian TQD. As an example, we constructed a Pauli stabilizer model of the double semion (DS) topological order in Section II. We explicitly verified that the DS stabilizer model belongs to the same phase as the DS string-net model by finding a finite-depth quantum circuit (with ancillary degrees of freedom) that maps between the ground state subspaces. In addition, we described how Pauli stabilizer models of SPT phases can be obtained from the TQD stabilizer models. We made the construction explicit for the nontrivial \mathbb{Z}_2 SPT phase of Ref. [28].

Our work builds on the classification of topological Pauli stabilizer codes initiated by Refs. [19–21]. We conjecture that our models give a complete classification of topological Pauli stabilizer codes up to finite-depth Clifford circuits with ancilla. For four-dimensional qudits, for example, this would imply that every Pauli stabilizer model is locally equivalent to decoupled copies of \mathbb{Z}_4 TCs, \mathbb{Z}_2 TCs, DS stabilizer codes, and six-semion stabilizer codes (defined in Appendix B). However, the proof of such a classification is challenging, as it involves working with polynomial rings over finite rings as opposed to polynomial rings over finite fields in the case of prime-dimensional qudits. More specifically, the current approach to classification requires a rigorous statement about the existence of a bosonic anyon. The argument in Ref. [49] uses Hasse-Minkowski theorem to prove that there is a gapped one-dimensional boundary, implying that there is a nontrivial Lagrangian subgroup for a topologically ordered system (see Section III). This does not directly apply to \mathbb{Z}_4 and hence, new techniques need to be developed for this case. Furthermore, the current classification requires a proof that all local excitations of a Pauli stabilizer Hamiltonian are fully mobile in two dimensions. We expect that a general-

ization of Hilbert’s syzygy theorem is needed for systems of composite-dimensional qudits. We leave the details to forthcoming works.

Another important future objective is to understand the quantum error correcting properties of the TQD stabilizer codes. As a first step, it would be interesting to compute the optimal error thresholds using the statistical mechanical mappings of Refs. [10, 80–82]. In such mappings, a spin is associated with each local stabilizer generator and coupling strengths are determined by the so-called Nishimori conditions [83]. This yields a disordered statistical mechanical Hamiltonian, where the disorder realization depends on the configuration of Pauli errors on the code space. Subsequently, the phase diagram for the model can be studied using Monte Carlo methods, and the optimal error threshold of a topological Pauli stabilizer code can be read off from the critical point along the Nishimori line. One could also consider other methods for estimating the error thresholds, such as those of Refs. [84–86], which were used to compute the thresholds of \mathbb{Z}_p TCs with prime p . Beyond studying the error correcting properties, it would also be interesting to explore whether there are fault-tolerant operations that are more natural to implement on TQD stabilizer codes as compared to TCs.

The Pauli stabilizer models presented here may be of interest beyond their potential for quantum error correction. In particular, they are a substantial simplification from their string-net counterparts and may be amenable to simulation on many-body qudit platforms. Moreover, as mentioned in Section II B, the ground state of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian can be prepared by making two-body measurements of a \mathbb{Z}_4 TC ground state. This gives an efficient construction of the DS ground state starting from the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC ground state. One could make further measurements to obtain the ground state of the \mathbb{Z}_2 SPT model of Section V. Anyon condensation in TCs also allows for the construction of symmetry-enriched topological phases, so similar methods as Section V could be used to create simulable models of these phases. It may be insightful to compare the condensation approach employed here to other means of preparing topological states, such as in Ref. [87].

Finally, while TQDs capture all Abelian anyon theories that admit gapped boundaries [30, 31], there are of course, two-dimensional Abelian anyon theories that possess obstructions to gapped boundaries (e.g., a nonzero chiral central charge). It is expected that such Abelian anyon theories cannot be described by Pauli stabilizer models in two spatial dimensions [25, 26]. However, Abelian anyon theories without gapped boundaries have been realized on the boundary of commuting projector Hamiltonians in three spatial dimensions [88]. Refs. [89] and [90] have taken this one step further and constructed three-dimensional Pauli stabilizer models that host chiral Abelian anyon theories (and ungappable Abelian anyon theories, more generally) on their two-dimensional surface. Up to stacking with two-dimensional TQD stabilizer models and condensing bosons, these provide a three-dimensional Pauli stabilizer model for every two-dimensional Abelian anyon theory, wherein the anyon theory is realized on the boundary. We also note that it may be interesting to consider fault-tolerant quantum computation in these models along the

lines of Refs. [91] and [92].

Abelian anyon theories without gapped boundaries have also been identified in the context of topological subsystem codes, such as the three-fermion subsystem code in Refs. [80, 92–94]. Roughly speaking, topological subsystem codes correspond to a parameter space of frustrated Hamiltonians with common conserved quantities, which are taken to be the stabilizers of the subsystem code [80]. In the honeycomb model of Ref. [25], for example, loops of fermionic string operator are preserved throughout the phase diagram and define the stabilizer group [95]. With this, one can assign an anyon theory to a topological subsystem code based on the conserved quantities. The basic idea is that the stabilizers of the subsystem code generate a 1-form symmetry associated to an Abelian anyon theory. Preliminary work suggests that we can leverage our TQD stabilizer codes to build a topological subsystem code for every two-dimensional Abelian topological order, regardless of whether the theory admits gapped boundaries. Such models may provide natural candidates for systems that host non-Abelian anyons, similar to the honeycomb model of Ref. [25].

Acknowledgements – TDE thanks Lukasz Fidkowski and Meng Cheng for valuable insights on the classification of Abelian topological orders. TDE would also like to acknowledge Timothy H. Hsieh and Zi-Wen Liu for inspirational discussions about the double semion phase. A.D. thanks Bowen Yang for useful discussions on related problems. This work was supported by the JQI fellowship at the University of Maryland (YC), the Simons Foundation through the collaboration on Ultra-Quantum Matter (651438, AD; 651444, WS), NSERC (NT), the It from Qubit collaboration (DJW), and by the Institute for Quantum Information and Matter, an NSF Physics Frontiers Center (PHY-1733907, AD, WS).

Appendix A: Relation to string-net model ground states

In Section II C, we mapped the ground state subspace of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian H_{DS} to that of the DS string-net model H_{DS}^{s-n} indirectly – by mapping H_{DS} to H_{DS}^{s-n} using ancillary degrees of freedom, a finite-depth quantum circuit, and ground state preserving changes to the intermediate Hamiltonians. In this Appendix, we make the mapping of the ground states explicit. To do so, we employ notation from simplicial cohomology (reviewed in the next section).

1. Simplicial cohomology notation

In the discussion below, we make use of concepts from simplicial cohomology to construct a finite-depth quantum circuit that maps the ground state subspace of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian to the ground state subspace of the DS string-net model. We begin by summarizing the terminology used in the construction and provide intuition for some of the formulas. More details and useful examples of simplicial cohomology used in the context of quantum many-body systems can be found in Ref. [96].




FIG. 12. (a) We consider triangulations with a branching structure – each edge is assigned an orientation such that there are no cycles around any of the triangles. (b) The vertices of each triangle can be ordered according to the number of incident edges.

In what follows, we consider two-dimensional triangulated manifolds \mathcal{M} equipped with a branching structure, i.e., an assignment of an orientation to each edge of the lattice with the property that there are no cycles around any face (see Fig. 12a, for example). The branching structure determines an ordering of the vertices of a triangle, as shown in Fig. 12b. We refer to the vertices v , edges e , and faces f as 0-simplices, 1-simplices, and 2-simplices, respectively. We label a p -simplex σ_p by its vertices $(1 \dots p+1)$, where the vertices are ordered according to the branching structure. For example, a face can be labeled as $\langle 123 \rangle$ with edges $\langle 23 \rangle$, $\langle 13 \rangle$, and $\langle 12 \rangle$ and vertices $\langle 1 \rangle$, $\langle 2 \rangle$, and $\langle 3 \rangle$.

A p -chain on \mathcal{M} is a formal sum of p -simplices with coefficients in an Abelian group A . An arbitrary p -chain s_p takes the form:

$$s_p = \sum_p \alpha_p \sigma_p, \text{ with } \alpha_p \in A. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Explicitly, arbitrary 1-chains s_1 and 2-chains s_2 can be written in the form:

$$s_1 = \sum_{\langle 12 \rangle} \alpha_{\langle 12 \rangle} \langle 12 \rangle, \quad s_2 = \sum_{\langle 123 \rangle} \alpha_{\langle 123 \rangle} \langle 123 \rangle. \quad (\text{A2})$$

The p -chains over A form a group denoted by $C_p[\mathcal{M}, A]$. For two-dimensional manifolds, the group $C_p[\mathcal{M}, A]$ is taken to be the trivial group for $p < 0$ and $p > 2$.

The boundary operator ∂ is a linear map from the group of $(p+1)$ -chains to the group of p -chains:

$$\partial : C_{p+1}[\mathcal{M}, A] \rightarrow C_p[\mathcal{M}, A]. \quad (\text{A3})$$

The action of the boundary operator on the arbitrary chains in

Eq. (A2) is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial s_1 &= \sum_{\langle 12 \rangle} \alpha_{\langle 12 \rangle} (\langle 2 \rangle - \langle 1 \rangle), \\ \partial s_2 &= \sum_{\langle 123 \rangle} \alpha_{\langle 123 \rangle} (\langle 23 \rangle - \langle 13 \rangle + \langle 12 \rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

While p -chains and the boundary operator ∂ do not appear in the main text, they are essential to defining cochains and the coboundary operator, described below.

A p -cochain \mathbf{a} is a linear map from the group of p -chains to A :

$$\mathbf{a} : C_p[\mathcal{M}, A] \rightarrow A. \quad (\text{A5})$$

The Abelian group formed by p -cochains is denoted by $C^p[\mathcal{M}, A]$. Letting $A = \mathbb{Z}_N$, for some N , we use \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{e} to represent the cochains:

$$\mathbf{v}(v') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v' = v, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \mathbf{e}(e') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e' = e, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A6})$$

Any 0-cochain \mathbf{a} or 1-cochain \mathbf{c} can then be expressed as a linear combination of the cochains \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{e} :

$$\mathbf{a} = \sum_v \alpha_v \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{c} = \sum_e \alpha_e \mathbf{e}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

for some $\alpha_v, \alpha_e \in \mathbb{Z}_N$.

The coboundary operator δ is a linear map from the group of p -cochains to the group of $(p+1)$ -cochains:

$$\delta : C^p[\mathcal{M}, A] \rightarrow C^{p+1}[\mathcal{M}, A]. \quad (\text{A8})$$

Given a p -cochain \mathbf{a} , the coboundary of \mathbf{a} is defined by:

$$\delta \mathbf{a}(s) = \mathbf{a}(\partial s), \quad (\text{A9})$$

where s is an arbitrary $(p+1)$ -chain. For example, taking A to be \mathbb{Z}_2 , the coboundary of \mathbf{v} satisfies:

$$\delta \mathbf{v}(e) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{v}(\partial e) = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A10})$$

This says that $\delta \mathbf{v}(e)$ is 1 for every edge connected to v . More generally, let \mathbf{b} be the \mathbb{Z}_2 -valued 0-cochain:

$$\mathbf{b} = \sum_v \beta_v \mathbf{v}, \quad (\text{A11})$$

for some $\beta_v \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. Then the coboundary of \mathbf{b} is equal to:

$$\delta \mathbf{b} = \sum_v \beta_v \delta \mathbf{v}, \quad (\text{A12})$$

which, given Eq. (A10), evaluates to 1 on edges along closed paths in the dual lattice (see Fig. 13). This shows that the states $|\delta \mathbf{b}\rangle$ in Appendix A2 correspond to configurations of loops in the dual lattice.

We now have that the ground state of the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian is equal to:

$$|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \left[\sum_{\mathbf{c}} \prod_e (X_e^2)^{c(e)} \prod_{f,e'} (Z_{e'}^2)^{e' \cup c(f)} \right] \times \left[\sum_{\mathbf{a}} \prod_e (X_e^2)^{\mathbf{a} \cup \delta \mathbf{a}(e)} X_e^{\delta \mathbf{a}(e)} \right] |0\rangle^{N_e}, \quad (\text{A25})$$

where we have substituted C_e in Eq. (A19) into the expression for the projector in Eq. (A21).

To compare $|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$ to the ground state of the DS string-net model, we map $|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$ to a system of qubits. We introduce a pair of qubits to each edge e and label the qubits by A and B . As in Section II C, the operator algebra for the pair of qubits at edge e is generated by the Pauli X and Pauli Z operators: $X_e^A, Z_e^A, X_e^B, Z_e^B$. The state on four-dimensional qudits is mapped to the system of qubits by applying the finite-depth quantum circuit $\mathcal{U}_{2,4}$, defined by:

$$Z_e \longleftrightarrow S_e^A Z_e^B, \quad X_e \longleftrightarrow X_e^A C X_e^{AB}. \quad (\text{A26})$$

This unitary maps the computational zero state on qudits to the computational zero state on qubits:

$$\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|0\rangle^{\otimes N_e} = |0, 0\rangle^{\otimes N_e}, \quad (\text{A27})$$

where the two entries of the state on the right-hand side correspond to the A and B sites, and the qubits on the left-hand side and the qudits on the right-hand side have been suppressed.

The ground state in Eq. (A25) is mapped to qubits by conjugating the projectors by $\mathcal{U}_{2,4}$. This gives us:

$$\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \left[\sum_{\mathbf{c}} \prod_e (X_e^B)^{c(e)} \prod_{f,e'} (Z_{e'}^A)^{e' \cup c(f)} \right] \times \left[\sum_{\mathbf{a}} \prod_e (X_e^B)^{\mathbf{a} \cup \delta \mathbf{a}(e)} (X_e^A)^{\delta \mathbf{a}(e)} \right] |0, 0\rangle^{\otimes N_e}. \quad (\text{A28})$$

Note that the factors of $C X_e^{AB}$ act trivially on the computational zero state $|0, 0\rangle^{\otimes N_e}$. Since \mathbf{a} only appears in the exponent of order two operators, it can be replaced by a \mathbb{Z}_2 -valued 1-cochain $\mathbf{b} \in C^1[\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{Z}_2]$. The ground state is then equivalent to:

$$\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \left[\sum_{\mathbf{c}} \prod_e (X_e^B)^{c(e)} \prod_{f,e'} (Z_{e'}^A)^{e' \cup c(f)} \right] \times \left[\sum_{\mathbf{b}} \prod_e (X_e^B)^{\mathbf{b} \cup \delta \mathbf{b}(e)} (X_e^A)^{\delta \mathbf{b}(e)} \right] |0, 0\rangle^{\otimes N_e}. \quad (\text{A29})$$

To evaluate the expression in Eq. (A29) further, we introduce cohomological notation for the computational basis states. Let $\{a_e^A\}$ and $\{a_e^B\}$ label the \mathbb{Z}_2 values of the computational basis state:

$$|\{a_e^A\}, \{a_e^B\}\rangle \equiv \bigotimes_e |a_e^A, a_e^B\rangle. \quad (\text{A30})$$

We define the \mathbb{Z}_2 -valued 1-cochains \mathbf{a}^A and \mathbf{a}^B by the conditions:

$$\mathbf{a}^A(e) = a_e^A, \quad \mathbf{a}^B(e) = a_e^B. \quad (\text{A31})$$

The computational basis state $|\{a_e^A\}, \{a_e^B\}\rangle$ can then be labeled by the corresponding 1-cochains, i.e.:

$$|\mathbf{a}^A, \mathbf{a}^B\rangle \equiv |\{a_e^A\}, \{a_e^B\}\rangle. \quad (\text{A32})$$

Returning to the expression for $\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$ in Eq. (A29), we apply the Pauli operators to the computational zero state. Then, using the cohomological notation for the basis states, we find:

$$\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \prod_f (-1)^{\delta \mathbf{b} \cup \mathbf{c}(f)} |\delta \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \cup \delta \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}\rangle. \quad (\text{A33})$$

This can be reduced to a more familiar form by shifting the sum over \mathbf{c} , so that:

$$\mathbf{c} \rightarrow \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{b} \cup \delta \mathbf{b}. \quad (\text{A34})$$

Making this substitution, the state $\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$ becomes:

$$\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \prod_f (-1)^{\delta \mathbf{b} \cup \mathbf{b} \cup \delta \mathbf{b}(f) + \delta \mathbf{b} \cup \mathbf{c}(f)} |\delta \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\rangle. \quad (\text{A35})$$

The sign $(-1)^{\delta \mathbf{b} \cup \mathbf{c}(f)}$ in Eq. (A35) can be produced by applying a control- Z gate between the A site on an edge $\langle 12 \rangle$ and the B site on an edge $\langle 23 \rangle$ of the face $f = \langle 123 \rangle$, where the ordering of the vertices is determined by the branching structure (see Appendix A 1). Letting $CZ_{12,23}^{AB}$ denote this control- Z gate, we define \mathcal{U}_{AB} to be the following finite-depth quantum circuit:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AB} \equiv \prod_{\langle 123 \rangle} CZ_{12,23}^{AB}. \quad (\text{A36})$$

Applying \mathcal{U}_{AB} to $\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$ yields:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AB} \mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \prod_f (-1)^{\delta \mathbf{b} \cup \mathbf{b} \cup \delta \mathbf{b}(f)} |\delta \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\rangle. \quad (\text{A37})$$

With this, the A and B sites have been disentangled. Ignoring the product state on the B sites, we are left with:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AB} \mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{b}} \prod_f (-1)^{\delta \mathbf{b} \cup \mathbf{b} \cup \delta \mathbf{b}(f)} |\delta \mathbf{b}\rangle. \quad (\text{A38})$$

The state in Eq. (A38) is mapped to the ground state of the DS string-net model by applying another finite-depth quantum circuit of control- Z gates. We let $CZ_{12,23}^{AA}$ denote the control- Z operator between the A site on edge $\langle 12 \rangle$ and the A site on edge $\langle 23 \rangle$. Then, we define \mathcal{U}_{AA} to be the finite-depth quantum circuit:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AA} = \prod_{f \in F_{\text{up}}} CZ_{\langle 12 \rangle \langle 23 \rangle}^{AA}, \quad (\text{A39})$$




FIG. 13. The state $|\delta\mathbf{b}\rangle$ corresponds to a configuration of loops on the dual lattice (dashed blue). The loops are defined by the edges e for which $\delta\mathbf{b}(e) = 1$ (thickened edges). The loops bound the vertices v for which $\mathbf{b}(v) = 1$ (black dots).

where the product is over all upward pointing triangles. Acting with \mathcal{U}_{AA} on $\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$ gives the state:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{b}} \Psi(\mathbf{b})|\delta\mathbf{b}\rangle, \quad (\text{A40})$$

where $\Psi(\mathbf{b})$ is the amplitude:

$$\Psi(\mathbf{b}) \equiv \prod_f (-1)^{\delta\mathbf{b} \cup \mathbf{b} \cup \delta\mathbf{b}(f)} \prod_{f \in F_{\text{up}}} (-1)^{\delta\mathbf{b} \cup \delta\mathbf{b}(f)}. \quad (\text{A41})$$

In the next section and Refs. [96] and [99], it is argued that $\Psi(\mathbf{b})$ is equivalent to:

$$\Psi(\mathbf{b}) = (-1)^{N_{\text{loops}}(\delta\mathbf{b})}. \quad (\text{A42})$$

Here, $N_{\text{loops}}(\delta\mathbf{b})$ is the number of loops (on the dual lattice) in the configuration corresponding to $\delta\mathbf{b}$ (see Fig. 13). In other words, $\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$ is equal to:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{b}} (-1)^{N_{\text{loops}}(\delta\mathbf{b})} |\delta\mathbf{b}\rangle, \quad (\text{A43})$$

which is precisely the ground state of the DS string-net model on the hexagonal dual lattice. Since $\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}$ is a finite-depth quantum circuit, the DS stabilizer Hamiltonian must belong to the same phase as the DS string-net model [52]. In summary, $\mathcal{U}_{2,4}$ maps from four-dimensional qudits to pairs of qubits, \mathcal{U}_{AB} disentangles the B site qubits from the A site qubits, and \mathcal{U}_{AA} fixes the amplitude to be that of the DS string-net model ground state.

3. String-net model ground state amplitudes

In the argument above, we claimed that the amplitudes of the state $\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$ are precisely those of the ground state of the DS string-net model. Let us complete the argument that $\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$ is equivalent to:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{b}} (-1)^{N_{\text{loops}}(\delta\mathbf{b})} |\delta\mathbf{b}\rangle. \quad (\text{A44})$$

To see this, we consider mapping the state to a symmetry-protected topological (SPT) state by gauging the 1-form symmetry. This can be implemented by an operator duality, (the two-dimensional Kramers-Wannier duality) which maps between a system of qubits on the edges of the lattice and a system of qubits on the vertices [28, 73, 74]. For a set of \mathbb{Z}_2 values $\{b_v\}$, we label the computational basis state $|\{b_v\}\rangle$ by the 0-cochain \mathbf{b} . We let X_v and Z_v denote the Pauli X and Pauli Z operators on the vertex v . With this, the explicit mapping of operators is:

$$\prod_{e \ni v} X_e \longleftrightarrow X_v, \quad Z_{\langle vv' \rangle} \longleftrightarrow Z_v Z_{v'}, \quad (\text{A45})$$

where the product is over edges connected to v , and $\langle vv' \rangle$ is an arbitrary edge. Under the duality, the state $|\delta\mathbf{b}\rangle$ is mapped to $|\mathbf{b}\rangle$. Furthermore, it can be checked that $\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$ is mapped to:

$$|\psi_{\text{SPT}}\rangle \equiv \sum_{\mathbf{b}} \Psi(\mathbf{b})|\mathbf{b}\rangle. \quad (\text{A46})$$

Given the identification of 0-cochains \mathbf{b} with computational basis states $|\{b_v\}\rangle$, this can alternatively be written as:

$$|\psi_{\text{SPT}}\rangle = \sum_{\{b_v\}} \Psi(\{b_v\})|\{b_v\}\rangle. \quad (\text{A47})$$

We now simplify the state $|\psi_{\text{SPT}}\rangle$ by describing a geometric interpretation for the amplitude $\Psi(\{b_v\})$, following Ref. [100]. On the triangular lattice with the branching structure shown in Fig. 6b, $\Psi(\{b_v\})$ is equivalent to:

$$\Psi(\{b_v\}) = \prod_{\langle uvv \rangle} (-1)^{b_u b_v b_w} \prod_{\langle vvw \rangle} (-1)^{b_v b_w} \prod_v (-1)^{b_v}. \quad (\text{A48})$$

To arrive at the expression above, we used the explicit formula for the cup product in Appendix A 1. The amplitude in Eq. (A48) can be further reduced to the form:

$$\Psi(\mathbf{b}) = (-1)^{V_1(\mathbf{b}) - E_1(\mathbf{b}) + F_1(\mathbf{b})}, \quad (\text{A49})$$

where $V_1(\mathbf{b})$, $E_1(\mathbf{b})$, and $F_1(\mathbf{b})$ are the number of vertices, edges, and faces, respectively, contained entirely within the domains formed by the $b_v = 1$ vertices in the configuration $\{b_v\}$. We let $\Sigma_1(\mathbf{b})$ denote the domains formed by the vertices with $b_v = 1$. Then, $\Psi(\mathbf{b})$ can be expressed in terms of the Euler characteristic $\chi(\Sigma_1(\mathbf{b}))$:

$$\Psi(\mathbf{b}) = (-1)^{\chi(\Sigma_1(\mathbf{b}))}. \quad (\text{A50})$$

The Euler characteristic of an orientable surface Σ is:

$$\chi(\Sigma) = 2 - 2g(\Sigma) - n(\Sigma), \quad (\text{A51})$$

where $g(\Sigma)$ is the genus of Σ and $n(\Sigma)$ is the number of boundary components of Σ . Therefore, letting $N_{\text{dw}}(\mathbf{b})$ be the number of domain walls in the configuration associated with \mathbf{b} , the amplitude $\Psi(\mathbf{b})$ is equivalent to:

$$\Psi(\mathbf{b}) = (-1)^{N_{\text{dw}}(\mathbf{b})}. \quad (\text{A52})$$

This gives us:

$$|\psi_{\text{SPT}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{b}} (-1)^{N_{\text{dw}}(\mathbf{b})} |\mathbf{b}\rangle. \quad (\text{A53})$$

The final step of the argument is to gauge the 0-form symmetry of the SPT state. This should return us to the state $\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle$. The 0-form symmetry is gauged by applying the duality in Eq. (A45), leaving us with:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{b}} (-1)^{N_{\text{dw}}(\mathbf{b})} |\delta\mathbf{b}\rangle. \quad (\text{A54})$$

Since $N_{\text{dw}}(\mathbf{b})$ is the same as the number of loops $N_{\text{loops}}(\delta\mathbf{b})$ in the configuration corresponding to $\delta\mathbf{b}$, we have the desired result:

$$\mathcal{U}_{AA}\mathcal{U}_{AB}\mathcal{U}_{2,4}|\psi_{\text{DS}}\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{b}} (-1)^{N_{\text{loops}}(\delta\mathbf{b})} |\delta\mathbf{b}\rangle. \quad (\text{A55})$$

Appendix B: K -matrix formulation of twisted quantum doubles

For completeness, we describe Abelian TQDs and the construction of the associated stabilizer models in terms of the K -matrix formalism. The K -matrix formalism is based on an integer symmetric matrix K , whose matrix elements encode the couplings between $U(1)$ Chern-Simons theories. We refer to Refs. [101–103] for further details on the connection to Chern-Simons theories. What is important for our discussion is that the universal properties of the Abelian anyon theory can be deduced entirely from the matrix K .

We restrict our focus to K -matrices for Abelian TQDs. To this end, we take G to be the finite Abelian group of the form $G = \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ and recall that the cocycle of an Abelian TQD can be labeled by a set of integers $\mathcal{I} = \{n_i\}_{i=1}^M \cup \{n_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^M$, as described in Section IV A. We define the K matrix associated to the TQD to be the $2M \times 2M$ matrix:

$$K_{TQD} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{N} \\ \mathbf{N} & -\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{I}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where \mathbf{N} is the $M \times M$ diagonal matrix:

$$\mathbf{N} = \begin{pmatrix} N_1 & & & & \\ & N_2 & & & \\ & & N_3 & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & N_M \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

and $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is the $M \times M$ symmetric matrix:

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{I}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2n_1 & n_{12} & n_{13} & \cdots & n_{1M} \\ n_{12} & 2n_2 & n_{23} & \cdots & n_{2M} \\ n_{13} & n_{23} & 2n_3 & \cdots & n_{3M} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ n_{1M} & n_{2M} & n_{3M} & \cdots & 2n_M \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

We note that the ij matrix element of $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is precisely n_{ij} .

This choice of K_{TQD} has the property that the gauge charges c_i and (some choice of) elementary fluxes φ_i correspond to unit vectors l_{c_i} and l_{φ_i} of length $2M$. In particular, l_{c_i} and l_{φ_i} are the unit vectors with a 1 in the $(M+i)^{\text{th}}$ or i^{th} entry, respectively. Further, since every anyon a in the TQD can be generated by c_i and φ_i :

$$a = \prod_{i=1}^M \varphi_i^{p_i} \prod_{j=1}^M c_j^{q_j}, \quad (\text{B4})$$

we can assign an integer vector l_a to each anyon a such that the i^{th} entry is p_i and the $(M+i)^{\text{th}}$ entry is q_i :

$$l_a^T = (p_1 \ p_2 \ \cdots \ p_M \ q_1 \ q_2 \ \cdots \ q_M). \quad (\text{B5})$$

For any two anyons a and a' , the vectors l_a and $l_{a'}$ satisfy:

$$l_{a \times a'} = l_a + l_{a'}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

There is some ambiguity in the assignment of integer vectors to anyons within the K -matrix formalism. To see this, notice that the columns of K encode the relations of the gauge charges and elementary fluxes. For example, the first column corresponds to the relation $c_1^{N_1} = 1$, while the $(M+1)^{\text{th}}$ column tells us:

$$\varphi_1^{N_1} c_1^{-2n_1} \prod_{i \neq 1} c_i^{-n_{1i}} = 1. \quad (\text{B7})$$

Therefore, we may freely redefine the vectors l_a by integer multiples of the columns of K , i.e.:

$$l_a \sim l_a + \sum_j m_j \text{col}_j(K) \quad (\text{B8})$$

where m_j are integers and $\text{col}_j(K)$ is the j^{th} column of K .

The exchange statistics and braiding relations for anyons a and a' can be extracted from the inverse of K using the formulas:

$$\theta(a) = e^{\pi i l_a^T K^{-1} l_a}, \quad B_{\theta}(a, a') = e^{2\pi i l_a^T K^{-1} l_{a'}}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

In terms of the quadratic form q and associated bilinear function b_q (both defined in Section III), we have:

$$q(a) = \frac{1}{2} l_a^T K^{-1} l_a, \quad b_q(a, a') = l_a^T K^{-1} l_{a'} \quad (\text{B10})$$

The relations in Eq. (B10) can be checked by computing the inverse of the K_{TQD} , which we find to be

$$K_{TQD}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{N}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{I}} \mathbf{N}^{-1} & \mathbf{N}^{-1} \\ \mathbf{N}^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B11})$$

From which, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} q(\varphi_i) &= \frac{n_i}{N_i^2}, & q(c_i) &= 0, \\ b_q(c_i, \varphi_j) &= \delta_{ij} \frac{1}{N_i}, & b_q(\varphi_i, \varphi_j) &= \frac{n_{ij}}{N_i N_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B12})$$

These agree with the statistics and braiding relations of the gauge charges and elementary fluxes in Eq. (85).

We now see that all of the characteristic properties of the TQD can be determined from the matrix K_{TQD} . In particular, the fusion rules of the anyons are given by Eqs. (B6) and (B8), and the statistics and braiding can be computed from Eq. (B10).

Before turning to examples, we clarify some freedom in the definition of a K -matrix K . The freedom comes from choosing a different set of generators for the anyons. For example, for K_{TQD} , the generators are implicitly chosen to be the gauge charges and a set of elementary fluxes. A different set of generators corresponds to transforming the vectors l_a as Wl_a , where W is an integer matrix belonging to $GL(2M, \mathbb{Z})$. To preserve the statistics and braiding, K^{-1} must transform as:

$$K^{-1} \rightarrow (W^T)^{-1} K^{-1} W^{-1}, \quad (\text{B13})$$

which means that K is mapped according to:

$$K \rightarrow W K W^T. \quad (\text{B14})$$

Therefore, any two K -matrices related by a transformation as in Eq. (B14) describe the same anyon theory.

Examples

We are now prepared to consider examples, starting with the \mathbb{Z}_N TC. In this case, K is the 2×2 matrix:

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & N \\ N & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B15})$$

The anyons of the \mathbb{Z}_N TC are generated by e and m , which correspond to the unit vectors:

$$l_e = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad l_m = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B16})$$

Both e and m have order N under fusion, which can be checked using Eqs. (B6) and (B8). Furthermore, according to Eq. (B10), e and m are bosons and exhibit the expected Aharonov-Bohm effect:

$$q(e) = 0, \quad q(m) = 0, \quad b_q(e, m) = \frac{1}{N}. \quad (\text{B17})$$

As our next example, we consider the K -matrix formalism for the DS phase. For the DS topological order we have $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $n_1 = 1$. This gives us the matrix:

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 2 & -2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B18})$$

We find that this matches the definitions of the anyons of the double semion model by associating:

$$l_{s\bar{s}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad l_s = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad l_{\bar{s}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B19})$$

We confirm that the exchange statistics are given by:

$$q(s\bar{s}) = 0, \quad q(s) = \frac{1}{4}, \quad q(\bar{s}) = -\frac{1}{4}. \quad (\text{B20})$$

Let us now explore examples where the fusion group of the anyons differs from $G \times G$. First, we consider the TQD with $G = \mathbb{Z}_3$ and $n_1 = 1$. This corresponds to the matrix:

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 3 \\ 3 & -2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B21})$$

Interestingly, the anyons in this theory have \mathbb{Z}_9 fusion rules. The generating anyon of order nine can be chosen to be the elementary flux $l_{\varphi_1}^T = (1 \ 0)$, with $q(\varphi_1) = 1/9$. The excitation φ_1^3 is a boson and corresponds to the charge c_1 of order 3. This can be seen by noticing that:

$$l_{\varphi_1^3} + \text{col}_1(K) + \text{col}_2(K) = l_{c_1}. \quad (\text{B22})$$

Next, we consider the TQD with $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $n_{12} = 1$. Notably, this TQD is characterized by a type II cocycle. Given the general form for K , we find:

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B23})$$

The elementary fluxes $l_{\varphi_1}^T = (1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0)$ and $l_{\varphi_2}^T = (0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0)$ are bosons with the property that they square to each others corresponding gauge charge. More precisely, they satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} l_{\varphi_1^2}^T &= (2 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0) \sim (0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1) = l_{c_2}^T, \\ l_{\varphi_2^2}^T &= (0 \ 2 \ 0 \ 0) \sim (0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0) = l_{c_1}^T. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B24})$$

Therefore, the anyons have $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ fusion rules. Furthermore, the elementary fluxes have nontrivial mutual braiding:

$$l_{\varphi_1}^T K^{-1} l_{\varphi_2} = b_q(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \frac{1}{4}. \quad (\text{B25})$$

In fact, this TQD is equivalent to the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC by the identification $\varphi_1 = e$ and $\varphi_2 = m$. To see this explicitly, we can perform a basis transformation to relabel the anyons as those of the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC. To do so, we define the matrix W , given by:

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & -1 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in GL(4, \mathbb{Z}). \quad (\text{B26})$$

Following Eq. (B14), K is transformed as:

$$W^T K W = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 4 \\ 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B27})$$

Thus, the theory describes a decoupled \mathbb{Z}_4 TC and \mathbb{Z}_1 TC, where the latter factor of \mathbb{Z}_1 can be ignored, as it has no anyonic excitations. With this, we have mapped the anyon content of the TQD to that of the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC. Similarly, if $n_{12} = 1$ and either $n_1 = 1$ or $n_2 = 1$, but not both, then the TQD is again equivalent to the \mathbb{Z}_4 TC.

As a final example, let us consider the TQD with $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $n_1 = n_2 = n_{12} = 1$. In this case, the K matrix is:

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 & -2 & -1 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 & -2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B28})$$

Similar to the previous example, this anyon theory has $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ fusion rules. However, in contrast, the elementary fluxes are semions. All together, this theory has six semions, six anti-semions, and four bosons. This differs from other $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ TQDs, which all have at least one fermionic excitation. We refer to this theory as the six-semion theory, since it is closely related to the three-fermion theory, according to the classification of Abelian anyon theories in Ref. [57]. Specifically, they both belong to the family of anyon theories denoted by F_{2^r} in Ref. [57], with $r = 1$ and $r = 2$ corresponding to the three-fermion theory and six-semion theory, respectively. For the anyon theories in F_{2^r} , the fusion group is $\mathbb{Z}_{2^r} \times \mathbb{Z}_{2^r}$ and the quadratic form is given by:

$$q((a_1, a_2)) = \frac{a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_1 a_2}{2^r}, \quad (\text{B29})$$

where (a_1, a_2) is an element of $\mathbb{Z}_{2^r} \times \mathbb{Z}_{2^r}$. The chiral central charge is 4 mod 8 if r is odd and 0 mod 8 if r is even.

Construction of TQDs from boson condensation

The general construction of TQDs starting from TCs, as described in Sec. IV B, can be concisely stated in terms of K -matrices. To see this, we begin with a stack of TCs, given by the following $2M \times 2M$ K -matrix:

$$K_{TC} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{N}^2 \\ \mathbf{N}^2 & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B30})$$

The next step in the construction is to condense the set of bosons in Eq. (106), rewritten here for convenience:

$$b_i = m_i^{-N_i} e_i^{N_i n_i} \prod_{j < i} e_j^{N_j n_{ij}}. \quad (\text{B31})$$

We can verify that the b_i are bosons with trivial mutual braiding by noting that:

$$\begin{aligned} q(b_i) &= \frac{1}{2} l_{b_i}^T K_{TC}^{-1} l_{b_i} = 0 \pmod{1}, \quad \forall i, \\ b_q(b_i, b_j) &= l_{b_i}^T K_{TC}^{-1} l_{b_j} = 0 \pmod{1}, \quad \forall i, j. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B32})$$

The vectors of the bosons can be compiled into a $2M \times M$ matrix Q , where the vectors l_{b_i} form the columns of Q :

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{N} \\ \mathbf{N} \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B33})$$

Here, $\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}$ is the $M \times M$ upper triangular matrix:

$$\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}} = \begin{pmatrix} n_{11} & n_{12} & n_{13} & \cdots & n_{1M} \\ & n_{22} & n_{23} & \cdots & n_{2M} \\ & & n_{33} & \cdots & n_{3M} \\ & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & & n_{MM} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B34})$$

Indeed, Eq. (B32) is satisfied by noting that

$$Q^T K_{TC}^{-1} Q = -(\mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}} + \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^T) = -\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{I}}. \quad (\text{B35})$$

The deconfined anyons, i.e., those that braid trivially with the bosons b_i , are generated by the columns of the following matrix:

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{M \times M} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{N} \mathbf{U}_{\mathcal{I}}^T \mathbf{N}^{-1} & \mathbf{N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B36})$$

where $\mathbf{I}_{M \times M}$ is the $M \times M$ identity matrix. Note that in Eq. (B36), the first M columns correspond to the elementary fluxes of Eq. (101), and the following M columns correspond to the gauge charges of Eq. (100). We see that

$$L^T K_{TC}^{-1} Q \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{I}_{M \times M} \end{pmatrix} \pmod{1}, \quad (\text{B37})$$

confirming that the deconfined anyons braid trivially with the condensed bosons.

Note that the exchange statistics and braiding relations of the deconfined anyons are captured by the matrix $L^T K_{TC}^{-1} L$. Therefore, after condensation, the corresponding K -matrix is given by $L^{-1} K_{TC} (L^{-1})^T$. The matrix $L^{-1} K_{TC} (L^{-1})^T$ is precisely the K -matrix K_{TQD} , given in Eq. (B1).

Appendix C: Anyon fusion groups of twisted quantum doubles

Here, we describe the group generated by the anyons of an Abelian TQD. To keep the discussion general, we consider an Abelian TQD associated to a group $G = \prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$ and a cocycle specified by the set \mathcal{I} , as in Section IV A. We then derive

the group structure by considering the fusion of elementary fluxes.

To start, we choose an elementary flux φ_i for every i in $\{1, \dots, M\}$. After choosing the elementary fluxes, each anyon can be expressed as a unique product of elementary fluxes and gauge charges. That is, the anyons can be written in the form:

$$\prod_{i=1}^M \varphi_i^{g_i} \prod_{j=1}^M c_j^{k_j}, \quad (\text{C1})$$

for some $g_i, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{N_i}$. The fusion of two anyons composed of elementary fluxes gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^M \varphi_i^{g_i} \times \prod_{i=1}^M \varphi_i^{h_i} &= \prod_{i=1}^M \varphi_i^{[g_i+h_i]_{N_i}} \prod_{i=1}^M c_i^{2n_i \frac{1}{N_i} (g_i+h_i-[g_i+h_i]_{N_i})} \\ &\times \prod_{i=1}^M \prod_{j \neq i} c_j^{n_{ij} \frac{1}{N_i} (g_i+h_i-[g_i+h_i]_{N_i})}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C2})$$

where the gauge charges on the right-hand side follow from the relation in Eq. (94) and h_i is an element of \mathbb{Z}_{N_i} . Hence, the elementary fluxes fail to satisfy the G group laws by products of gauge charges. This suggests that the group formed by the anyons is a central extension of G by G .

To make this explicit, we notice that an arbitrary anyon $\prod_{i=1}^M \varphi_i^{g_i} \prod_{j=1}^M c_j^{k_j}$ can be labeled by a pair (g, k) in $G \times G$, where the i^{th} components of g and k are g_i and k_i , respectively. With this, the product in Eq. (C2) becomes:

$$(g, 0) \times (h, 0) = (g + h, \lambda(g, h)). \quad (\text{C3})$$

Here, $\lambda(g, h)$ is an element of G whose i^{th} component $\lambda(g, h)_i$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(g, h)_i &= 2n_i \frac{1}{N_i} (g_i + h_i - [g_i + h_i]_{N_i}) \\ &+ \sum_{j \neq i} n_{ij} \frac{1}{N_j} (g_j + h_j - [g_j + h_j]_{N_j}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

More generally, the product of (g, k) and (h, ℓ) is:

$$(g, k) \times (h, \ell) = (g + h, k + \ell + \lambda(g, h)). \quad (\text{C5})$$

The function $\lambda : G \times G \rightarrow G$ defines a 2-cocycle in $H^2[G, G]$ and specifies the central extension of G by G that corresponds to the group formed by the anyons of the Abelian TQD under fusion.

-
- [1] Peter W. Shor, "Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory," *Physical Review A* **52**, R2493 (1995).
- [2] Dorit Aharonov and Michael Ben-Or, "Fault-tolerant quantum computation with constant error rate," *SIAM Journal on Computing* **38**, 1207–1282 (2008), arXiv:9906129 [quant-ph].
- [3] John Preskill, "Fault-tolerant quantum computation," in *Proceedings of 37th Conference on Foundations of Computer Science* (WORLD SCIENTIFIC, 1997) pp. 56–65, arXiv:9712048 [quant-ph].
- [4] A. Yu Kitaev, "Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons," *Annals of Physics* **303**, 2–30 (2003).
- [5] Franz J. Wegner, "Duality in generalized Ising models and phase transitions without local order parameters," *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **12**, 2259–2272 (1971).
- [6] P. W. Anderson, "Resonating valence bonds: A new kind of insulator?" *Materials Research Bulletin* **8**, 153–160 (1973).
- [7] R. B. Laughlin, "Anomalous quantum Hall effect: An incompressible quantum fluid with fractionally charged excitations," *Physical Review Letters* **50**, 1395–1398 (1983), arXiv:1111.4781.
- [8] X. G. Wen, "Vacuum degeneracy of chiral spin states in compactified space," *Physical Review B* **40**, 7387–7390 (1989).
- [9] X. G. Wen, "Topological Orders in Rigid States," *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **04**, 239–271 (1990).
- [10] Eric Dennis, Alexei Kitaev, Andrew Landahl, and John Preskill, "Topological quantum memory," *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **43**, 4452–4505 (2002).
- [11] H. Bombin and M. A. Martin-Delgado, "Topological quantum distillation," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 180501 (2006).
- [12] Chetan Nayak, Steven H. Simon, Ady Stern, Michael Freedman, and Sankar Das Sarma, "Non-Abelian anyons and topological quantum computation," *Reviews of Modern Physics* **80**, 1083–1159 (2008), arXiv:0707.1889.
- [13] H. Bombin, "Topological order with a twist: Ising anyons from an Abelian model," *Physical Review Letters* **105**, 30403 (2010), arXiv:1004.1838.
- [14] Barbara M. Terhal, "Quantum error correction for quantum memories," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **87**, 307–346 (2015).
- [15] Daniel Gottesman, "The Heisenberg Representation of Quantum Computers," Group22: Proceedings of the XXII International Colloquium on Group Theoretical Methods in Physics, eds. S. P. Corney, R. Delbourgo, and P. D. Jarvis, pp. 32–43 (Cambridge, MA, International Press, 1999).
- [16] John Kogut and Leonard Susskind, "Hamiltonian formulation of Wilson's lattice gauge theories," *Physical Review D* **11**, 395–408 (1975).
- [17] Austin G. Fowler, Matteo Mariantoni, John M. Martinis, and Andrew N. Cleland, "Surface codes: Towards practical large-scale quantum computation," *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 032324 (2012).
- [18] Benjamin J. Brown, Katharina Laubscher, Markus S. Kesselring, and James R. Wootton, "Poking holes and cutting corners to achieve clifford gates with the surface code," *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 021029 (2017).
- [19] H Bombin, Guillaume Duclos-Cianci, and David Poulin, "Universal topological phase of two-dimensional stabilizer codes," *New Journal of Physics* **14**, 073048 (2012).
- [20] Héctor Bombín, "Structure of 2D Topological Stabilizer Codes," *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **327**, 387–432 (2014).
- [21] Jeongwan Haah, "Classification of translation invariant topo-

- logical pauli stabilizer codes for prime dimensional qudits on two-dimensional lattices,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **62**, 012201 (2021).
- [22] Specifically, Refs. [19] and [20] assumed that chiral anyon theories cannot be realized by Pauli stabilizer models.
- [23] Throughout, we assume the usual representations of Pauli groups, as opposed to, for example, defining the Pauli group of a four-dimensional qudit on a pair of qubits via the automorphism in Eq. (49).
- [24] This includes the possibility in which the model has no topological order.
- [25] Kitaev Alexei, “Anyons in an exactly solved model and beyond,” *Annals of Physics* **321**, 2–111 (2006).
- [26] Anton Kapustin and Lev Spodyneiko, “Thermal hall conductance and a relative topological invariant of gapped two-dimensional systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 045137 (2020).
- [27] Robbert Dijkgraaf and Edward Witten, “Topological gauge theories and group cohomology,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **129**, 393–429 (1990).
- [28] Michael Levin and Zheng Cheng Gu, “Braiding statistics approach to symmetry-protected topological phases,” *Physical Review B - Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* **86**, 115109 (2012), arXiv:1202.3120.
- [29] Yuting Hu, Yidun Wan, and Yong Shi Wu, “Twisted quantum double model of topological phases in two dimensions,” *Physical Review B* **87**, 125114 (2013), arXiv:1211.3695.
- [30] Anton Kapustin and Natalia Saulina, “Topological boundary conditions in abelian chern–simons theory,” *Nuclear Physics B* **845**, 393–435 (2011).
- [31] Justin Kaidi, Zohar Komargodski, Kantaro Ohmori, Sahand Seifnashri, and Shu-Heng Shao, “Higher central charges and topological boundaries in 2+1-dimensional tqfts,” (2021), arXiv:2107.13091 [hep-th].
- [32] For discussion on gapped boundaries of two-dimensional topological orders see Refs. [104–106].
- [33] Tyler D. Ellison, Kohtaro Kato, Zi-Wen Liu, and Timothy H. Hsieh, “Symmetry-protected sign problem and magic in quantum phases of matter,” (2021), arXiv:2010.13803 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [34] F. A. Bais and J. K. Slingerland, “Condensate-induced transitions between topologically ordered phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 045316 (2009).
- [35] Liang Kong, “Anyon condensation and tensor categories,” *Nuclear Physics B* **886**, 436–482 (2014), arXiv:1307.8244.
- [36] F. J. Burnell, “Anyon Condensation and Its Applications,” *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **9**, 307–327 (2018), arXiv:1706.04940.
- [37] Kasper Duivenvoorden, Mohsin Iqbal, Jutho Haegeman, Frank Verstraete, and Norbert Schuch, “Entanglement phases as holographic duals of anyon condensates,” *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 235119 (2017).
- [38] Mohsin Iqbal, Kasper Duivenvoorden, and Norbert Schuch, “Study of anyon condensation and topological phase transitions from a \mathbb{Z}_4 topological phase using the projected entangled pair states approach,” *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 195124 (2018).
- [39] Shenghan Jiang and Ying Ran, “Anyon condensation and a generic tensor-network construction for symmetry-protected topological phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 125107 (2017).
- [40] Michael A. Levin and Xiao Gang Wen, “String-net condensation: A physical mechanism for topological phases,” *Physical Review B* **71**, 045110 (2005), arXiv:0404617 [cond-mat].
- [41] Julio Carlos Magdalena de la Fuente, Nicolas Tarantino, and Jens Eisert, “Non-Pauli topological stabilizer codes from twisted quantum doubles,” *Quantum* **5**, 398 (2021).
- [42] G Dauphinais, L Ortiz, S Varona, and M A Martin-Delgado, “Quantum error correction with the semion code,” *New Journal of Physics* **21**, 053035 (2019).
- [43] S. Varona and M. A. Martin-Delgado, “Determination of the semion code threshold using neural decoders,” *Phys. Rev. A* **102**, 032411 (2020).
- [44] Michael A. Levin and Xiao-Gang Wen, “String-net condensation: A physical mechanism for topological phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 045110 (2005).
- [45] Michael Levin and Zheng-Cheng Gu, “Braiding statistics approach to symmetry-protected topological phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 115109 (2012).
- [46] This holds for either orientation of $\bar{\gamma}$.
- [47] $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^s$ can be modified so that it squares to stabilizers. However, we consider the string operator $W_{\bar{\gamma}}^s$ to be consistent with the general form in Eq. (13).
- [48] Michael Levin and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Quantum ether: Photons and electrons from a rotor model,” *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 035122 (2006).
- [49] Jeongwan Haah, Lukasz Fidkowski, and Matthew B. Hastings, “Nontrivial Quantum Cellular Automata in Higher Dimensions,” (2018), arXiv:1812.01625.
- [50] Kyle Kawagoe and Michael Levin, “Microscopic definitions of anyon data,” *Phys. Rev. B* **101**, 115113 (2020).
- [51] Here, for simplicity, we have assumed that P has ± 1 eigenvalues, which is the case for the C_e operators.
- [52] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Local unitary transformation, long-range quantum entanglement, wave function renormalization, and topological order,” *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 155138 (2010).
- [53] \mathcal{U}_{CX} is two layers because the gates $CX_{12,13}$ and $CX_{23,13}$ have overlapping supports.
- [54] We remark that the mapping in Eq. (49) differs from the mapping in [107] by conjugation with a Hadamard.
- [55] Indeed, the transformation in Eq. (49) implies:
- $$Z_e^2 \longleftrightarrow Z_e^A, \quad \left(\frac{1+i}{2} Z_e + \frac{1-i}{2} Z_e^\dagger \right) \longleftrightarrow Z_e^B. \quad (C6)$$
- Therefore, the ancillary product state on qubits is mapped to a product state on qudits.
- [56] Note that, although the identity for the upwards pointing triangle has two factors of S^\dagger , compared to one factor for the downwards pointing triangle, this can be made more symmetric by acting with $B_f^{IIT} = 1$ on the upwards pointing triangle.
- [57] Liang Wang and Zhenghan Wang, “In and around abelian anyon models,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 505203 (2020).
- [58] F.J. Burnell, “Anyon condensation and its applications,” *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **9**, 307–327 (2018).
- [59] Frank Quinn, “Group categories and their field theories,” *Geometry & Topology Monographs* **2**, 407–453 (1999).
- [60] Michael Levin, “Protected edge modes without symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. X* **3**, 021009 (2013).
- [61] Yuting Hu, Yidun Wan, and Yong-Shi Wu, “Twisted quantum double model of topological phases in two dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 125114 (2013).
- [62] Xie Chen, Zheng Cheng Gu, Zheng Xin Liu, and Xiao Gang Wen, “Symmetry-protected topological orders in interacting bosonic systems,” *Science* **338**, 1604–1606 (2012), arXiv:1301.0861.
- [63] Mark de Wild Propitius, *Topological interactions in broken gauge theories*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam (1995), arXiv:9511195 [hep-th].

- [64] Xiaotong Ni, Oliver Buerschaper, and Maarten Van den Nest, “A non-commuting stabilizer formalism,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **56**, 052201 (2015).
- [65] Andrew C. Potter and Romain Vasseur, “Symmetry constraints on many-body localization,” *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 224206 (2016).
- [66] Chenjie Wang and Michael Levin, “Braiding statistics of loop excitations in three dimensions,” *Physical Review Letters* **113**, 80403 (2014), [arXiv:1403.7437](https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.7437).
- [67] In other words, TQDs corresponding to type III cocycles host non-Abelian anyons [63].
- [68] Chenjie Wang and Michael Levin, “Topological invariants for gauge theories and symmetry-protected topological phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 165119 (2015).
- [69] Note that n_{ij} is only defined up to integer multiples of N_{ij} . Without loss of generality, we can assume that each N_i is a prime power, which implies that N_{ij} is equal to 1, N_i , or N_j . If N_{ij} is 1 or N_j , then Eq. (94) is unchanged. If $N_{ij} = N_i$, on the other hand, then Eq. (94) should be modified by a factor of $c_j^{t_{ij}N_j}$, for some integer t_{ij} . This amounts to redefining φ_i by an integer number of c_j charges. Therefore, we can always find a choice of elementary fluxes that satisfies Eq. (94).
- [70] Alternatively, the transparent anyon (i.e., with trivial braiding relations) could become identified with the trivial anyon after condensing $\{[\tilde{c}_i]\}$. This means that the transparent anyon is equivalent to products of $[\tilde{c}_i]$ bosons. This is not possible, however, because products of the anyons $[\tilde{c}_i]$ braid nontrivially with $[\tilde{\varphi}_i]$ anyons. Thus, this would contradict the fact that they are transparent.
- [71] Michael Müger, “On the structure of modular categories,” *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* **87**, 291–308 (2003).
- [72] Recall that, in two-dimensions, 1-form symmetries are generated by operators supported along closed paths.
- [73] Beni Yoshida, “Topological phases with generalized global symmetries,” *Physical Review B* **93**, 155131 (2016), [arXiv:1508.03468](https://arxiv.org/abs/1508.03468).
- [74] Aleksander Kubica and Beni Yoshida, “Ungauging quantum error-correcting codes,” (2018), [arXiv:1805.01836](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.01836) [quant-ph].
- [75] Dominic V. Else and Chetan Nayak, “Classifying symmetry-protected topological phases through the anomalous action of the symmetry on the edge,” *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 235137 (2014).
- [76] Juven C. Wang, Luiz H. Santos, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Bosonic anomalies, induced fractional quantum numbers, and degenerate zero modes: The anomalous edge physics of symmetry-protected topological states,” *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 195134 (2015).
- [77] Kyle Kawagoe and Michael Levin, “Anomalies in bosonic symmetry-protected topological edge theories: Connection to f symbols and a method of calculation,” *Phys. Rev. B* **104**, 115156 (2021).
- [78] Abhishodh Prakash, Juven Wang, and Tzu-Chieh Wei, “Unwinding short-range entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 125108 (2018).
- [79] Juven Wang, Xiao-Gang Wen, and Edward Witten, “Symmetric gapped interfaces of spt and set states: Systematic constructions,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 031048 (2018).
- [80] H. Bombin, “Topological subsystem codes,” *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 032301 (2010).
- [81] Ruben S. Andrist, James R. Wootton, and Helmut G. Katzgraber, “Error thresholds for abelian quantum double models: Increasing the bit-flip stability of topological quantum memory,” *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 042331 (2015).
- [82] Christopher T. Chubb and Steven T. Flammia, “Statistical mechanical models for quantum codes with correlated noise,” *Annales de L’Institut Henri Poincaré D* **8**, 269–321 (2021).
- [83] Hidetoshi Nishimori, “Internal Energy, Specific Heat and Correlation Function of the Bond-Random Ising Model,” *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **66**, 1169–1181 (1981).
- [84] Hussain Anwar, Benjamin J Brown, Earl T Campbell, and Dan E Browne, “Fast decoders for qudit topological codes,” *New Journal of Physics* **16**, 063038 (2014).
- [85] Adrian Hutter, Daniel Loss, and James R Wootton, “Improved HDRG decoders for qudit and non-abelian quantum error correction,” *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 035017 (2015).
- [86] Fern H. E. Watson, Hussain Anwar, and Dan E. Browne, “Fast fault-tolerant decoder for qubit and qudit surface codes,” *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 032309 (2015).
- [87] Yu-Jie Liu, Kirill Shtengel, Adam Smith, and Frank Pollmann, “Methods for simulating string-net states and anyons on a digital quantum computer,” (2021), [arXiv:2110.02020](https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.02020) [quant-ph].
- [88] Kevin Walker and Zhenghan Wang, “(3+1)-TQFTs and topological insulators,” *Frontiers of Physics* **7**, 150–159 (2012), [arXiv:1104.2632](https://arxiv.org/abs/1104.2632).
- [89] Jeongwan Haah, “Clifford quantum cellular automata: Trivial group in 2d and witt group in 3d,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **62**, 092202 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0022185>.
- [90] Wilbur Shirley, Yu-An Chen, Arpit Dua, Tyler D. Ellison, Nathanan Tantivasadakarn, and Dominic J. Williamson, “Three-dimensional quantum cellular automata from chiral semion surface topological order and beyond,” (2022), [arXiv:2202.05442](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.05442) [quant-ph].
- [91] R. Raussendorf, J. Harrington, and K. Goyal, “A fault-tolerant one-way quantum computer,” *Annals of Physics* **321**, 2242–2270 (2006).
- [92] Sam Roberts and Dominic J. Williamson, “3-fermion topological quantum computation,” (2020), [arXiv:2011.04693](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.04693) [quant-ph].
- [93] H. Bombin, M. Kargarian, and M. A. Martin-Delgado, “Interacting anyonic fermions in a two-body color code model,” *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 075111 (2009).
- [94] Martin Suchara, Sergey Bravyi, and Barbara Terhal, “Constructions and noise threshold of topological subsystem codes,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **44**, 155301 (2011).
- [95] Note that, although the model of Ref. [25] can be interpreted as a topological subsystem code, it does not encode any logical qubits. See Ref. [108], however.
- [96] Yu-An Chen and Sri Tata, “Higher cup products on hypercubic lattices: application to lattice models of topological phases,” (2021), [arXiv:2106.05274](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.05274) [cond-mat.str-el].
- [97] If the manifold is not simply connected, one can also consider ground states with nontrivial holonomy by including projectors built from string operators along homologically nontrivial cycles.
- [98] One could of course consider a \mathbb{Z}_4 -valued cochain \mathbf{v} , but we choose \mathbf{v} to be \mathbb{Z}_2 -valued to simplify the algebra later in the calculation.
- [99] Lukasz Fidkowski, Jeongwan Haah, Matthew B. Hastings, and Nathanan Tantivasadakarn, “Disentangling the generalized double semion model,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **380**, 1151–1171 (2020).
- [100] Nathanan Tantivasadakarn and Ashvin Vishwanath, “Full commuting projector hamiltonians of interacting symmetry-protected topological phases of fermions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **98**,

- 165104 (2018).
- [101] X. G. Wen and A. Zee, “Classification of abelian quantum hall states and matrix formulation of topological fluids,” *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 2290–2301 (1992).
- [102] Yuan-Ming Lu and Ashvin Vishwanath, “Theory and classification of interacting integer topological phases in two dimensions: A chern-simons approach,” *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 125119 (2012).
- [103] Yuan-Ming Lu and Ashvin Vishwanath, “Classification and properties of symmetry-enriched topological phases: Chern-simons approach with applications to Z_2 spin liquids,” *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 155121 (2016).
- [104] Sergey B Bravyi and A Yu Kitaev, “Quantum codes on a lattice with boundary,” (1998), [arXiv:9811052 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [105] Salman Beigi, Peter W. Shor, and Daniel Whalen, “The Quantum Double Model with Boundary: Condensations and Symmetries,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **306**, 663–694 (2011), [arXiv:1006.5479](#).
- [106] Alexei Kitaev and Liang Kong, “Models for Gapped Boundaries and Domain Walls,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **313**, 351–373 (2012), [arXiv:1104.5047](#).
- [107] Wilbur Shirley, Kevin Slagle, and Xie Chen, “Twisted foliated fracton phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 115103 (2020).
- [108] Matthew B. Hastings and Jeongwan Haah, “Dynamically Generated Logical Qubits,” *Quantum* **5**, 564 (2021).