

# Solution to Topological Quantum: Lecture Notes and Proto-Book

Jiaqi Guo<sup>1</sup>

March 13, 2023

<sup>1</sup>Email: [guojq18@fudan.edu.cn](mailto:guojq18@fudan.edu.cn).



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction: History of Topology, Knots, Peter Tait and Lord Kelvin</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Kauffman Bracket Invariant and Relation to Physics</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Trefoil Knot and the Kauffman Bracket . . . . .	7
2.2	Abelian Kauffman Anyons . . . . .	8
2.3	Reidermeister moves and the Kauffman Bracket . . . . .	10
2.4	Jones polynomial . . . . .	13
2.5	HOMFLY Polynomial . . . . .	15
<b>I</b>	<b>Anyons and Topological Quantum Field Theories</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Particle Quantum Statistics</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1	About the Braid Group . . . . .	23
3.2	About the Symmetric Group . . . . .	24
3.3	Ising Anyons and Majorana Fermions . . . . .	26
3.4	Small Numbers of Anyons on a Sphere . . . . .	31
<b>4</b>	<b>Aharonov-Bohm Effect and Charge-Flux Composite</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1	Abelian Anyon Vacuum on a Two-Handle Torus . . . . .	37
<b>5</b>	<b>Chern-Simons Theory Basics</b>	<b>39</b>
5.1	Polyakov Representation of the Linking Number . . . . .	39
5.2	Gauge Transforming the Chern-Simons Action . . . . .	41
5.3	Winding Numbers of Groups in Manifolds . . . . .	44
5.4	Quantization of Winding Number . . . . .	46
<b>6</b>	<b>Short Digression on Quantum Gravity</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Defining Topological Quantum Field Theory</b>	<b>51</b>

<b>II</b>	<b>Anyon Basics</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Fusion and Structure of Hilbert Space</b>	<b>55</b>
8.1	Quantum Dimension . . . . .	55
8.2	Fusion and Ground State Degeneracy . . . . .	56
8.3	Consistency of Fusion Rules . . . . .	58
<b>9</b>	<b>Change of Basis and <math>F</math>-Matrices</b>	<b>59</b>
9.1	$F$ -gauge choice . . . . .	59
9.2	$F$ 's with the vacuum field $I$ . . . . .	60
9.3	Ising Pentagon . . . . .	61
9.4	Fibonacci Pentagon . . . . .	62
9.5	Pentagon and Fusion Multiplicities . . . . .	63
9.6	Gauge Change . . . . .	63
9.7	Ising $F$ -matrix . . . . .	66
<b>10</b>	<b>Exchanging Identical Particles</b>	<b>69</b>
10.1	Calculating Exchanges . . . . .	69
10.2	Ising Anyons Redux . . . . .	71
10.3	Exchanging More Particles . . . . .	71
10.4	Determinant and Trace of Braid Matrices . . . . .	77
10.5	Checking the locality constraint . . . . .	78
10.6	Enforcing the locality constraint . . . . .	80
<b>11</b>	<b>Computing with Anyons</b>	<b>83</b>
11.1	Ising Nonuniversality . . . . .	83
11.2	Brute Force Search . . . . .	85
11.3	Scaling of Kitaev-Solovay Algorithm . . . . .	85
11.4	About the Injection Weave . . . . .	86
11.5	Universal Weaving and the Injection Weave . . . . .	87
<b>III</b>	<b>Anyon Diagrammatics (in detail)</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Planar Diagrams</b>	<b>91</b>
12.1	Evaluating diagrams with $F$ -matrices . . . . .	91
12.2	Locality Principle . . . . .	92
<b>13</b>	<b>Braiding Diagrams</b>	<b>95</b>
13.1	Fibonacci Hexagon . . . . .	95
13.2	Evaluation of a Diagram . . . . .	95
13.3	Gauge transform of $R$ and Hexagon . . . . .	96

<i>CONTENTS</i>	5
13.4 Reidemeister Moves . . . . .	96



## Chapter 1

# Introduction: History of Topology, Knots, Peter Tait and Lord Kelvin





## Chapter 2

# Kauffman Bracket Invariant and Relation to Physics

### 2.1 Trefoil Knot and the Kauffman Bracket

Using the Kauffman rules, calculate the Kauffman bracket invariant of the right and left handed trefoil knots shown in Fig. 2.1. Conclude these two knots are topologically inequivalent. While this statement appears obvious on sight, it was not proved mathematically until 1914 (by Max Dehn). It is trivial using this technique!





Figure 2.1: Left and Right Handed Trefoil Knots (on the left and right respectively)

**Remark** The word “trefoil” is from the plant trifolium, or clover, which has compound trifoliate leaves.

**Answer** We try to figure out the right trefoil first:

$$\text{Right Trefoil} = A \cdot \text{Right Twist} + A^{-1} \cdot \text{Left Twist}$$


$$\begin{aligned}
&= A \left( A \text{ (trefoil)} + A^{-1} \text{ (mirror trefoil)} \right) + A^{-1} \left( A \text{ (trefoil)} + A^{-1} \text{ (mirror trefoil)} \right) \\
&= A^2 \left( A \text{ (two concentric circles)} + A^{-1} \text{ (two separate circles)} \right) + \left( A \text{ (two separate circles)} + A^{-1} \text{ (two concentric circles)} \right) \\
&\quad + \left( A \text{ (two concentric circles)} + A^{-1} \text{ (two separate circles)} \right) + A^{-2} \left( A \text{ (two circles stacked)} + A^{-1} \text{ (three circles)} \right) \\
&= A^2(Ad^2 + A^{-1}d) + (Ad + A^{-1}d^2) + (Ad + A^{-1}d^2) + A^{-2}(Ad^2 + A^{-1}d^3) \\
&= -A^{-9} + A + A^3 + A^7.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar calculation gives

$$\text{ (trefoil) } = -A^9 + A^{-1} + A^{-3} + A^{-7}.$$

We can see the mirror symmetry gives  $A \rightarrow A^{-1}$ . In other notations, we can set  $d^i \rightarrow d^{i-1}$ , then the trivial knot (i.e. a circle) give 1. Then we have

$$\text{ (trefoil) } = A^{-7} - A^5 - A^3.$$

## 2.2 Abelian Kauffman Anyons

Anyons described by the Kauffman bracket invariant with certain special values of the constant  $A$  are abelian anyons - meaning that an exchange introduces only a simple phase as shown in Fig. 2.2.

$$\text{ (crossing) } = e^{i\theta} \text{ (two parallel lines) }$$

Figure 2.2: For abelian anyons, exchange gives a phase  $e^{i\theta}$ .

- For  $A = \pm e^{i\pi/3}$  (and the complex conjugates of these values), show that the anyons are bosons or fermions respectively (i.e.,  $e^{i\theta} = \pm 1$ ).
- For  $A = \pm e^{i\pi/6}$  (and the complex conjugates of these values) show the anyons are semions (i.e.,  $e^{i\theta} = \pm i$ ). In fact these are precisely the anyons that arise for the  $\nu = 1/2$  fractional

quantum Hall effect of bosons (We will discuss this later in this book (See chapter 37). This particular phase of quantum Hall matter has been produced experimentally (Clark et al. [2020]), but only in very small puddles so far and it has not been possible to measure braiding statistics as of yet.

HINT: For (a) and (b) show first the identity shown in Fig. 2.3.

If you can't figure it out, try evaluating the Kauffman bracket invariant for a few knots with these values of  $A$  and see how the result arises.






Figure 2.3: For bosons or fermions the sign in this figure is  $+$ , for semions the sign is  $-$ .


**Answer** Using the definition of Kauffman bracket:



which means we have:



At the same time, we also have



Because exchange two particles in one certain direction gives a phase factor  $e^{i\theta}$ . Then

$$\left. \begin{array}{c} \text{ )} \\ \text{ (} \end{array} \right( = \frac{A}{e^{-i\theta} - A^{-1}} \left. \begin{array}{c} \text{ )} \\ \text{ (} \end{array} \right. .$$

So we have the equation

$$\frac{A}{e^{-i\theta} - A^{-1}} = \frac{A^{-1}}{e^{i\theta} - A} \Rightarrow e^{i\theta} = -A^3.$$

By the way, we also have

$$\left. \begin{array}{c} \text{ )} \\ \text{ (} \end{array} \right( = -\frac{A^2}{1 + A^4} \left. \begin{array}{c} \text{ )} \\ \text{ (} \end{array} \right. .$$

(a) For  $A = \pm e^{i\pi/3}$ , we have

$$e^{i\theta} = \pm 1,$$

which gives bosons for fermions. And

$$\left. \begin{array}{c} \text{ )} \\ \text{ (} \end{array} \right( = \left. \begin{array}{c} \text{ )} \\ \text{ (} \end{array} \right. ,$$

which are fermions and bosons.

(b) For  $A = \pm e^{i\pi/6}$ , we have

$$e^{i\theta} = \mp i,$$

which gives bosons for fermions. And

$$\left. \begin{array}{c} \text{ )} \\ \text{ (} \end{array} \right( = - \left. \begin{array}{c} \text{ )} \\ \text{ (} \end{array} \right. ,$$

which are semions.

## 2.3 Reidemeister moves and the Kauffman Bracket

Show that the Kauffman bracket invariant is unchanged under application of Reidemeister move of type II and type III. Thus conclude that the Kauffman invariant is an invariant of regular isotopy.




Figure 2.4: Reidemeister move of type II

**Answer** (a) The Reidemeister move of type II is given by Fig.2.4. Then according to the definition of the Kauffman bracket, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Diagram of two strands crossing} = A \text{ (crossing with A) } + A^{-1} \text{ (crossing with A^{-1})} \\
 & = A \left( A \text{ (two parallel strands)} + A^{-1} \text{ (two parallel strands with a loop)} \right) + A^{-1} \left( A \text{ (two parallel strands with a loop)} + A^{-1} \text{ (two parallel strands)} \right) \\
 & = A^2 \text{ (two parallel strands)} + \text{Diagram with a loop} + d \text{ (two parallel strands)} + A^{-2} \text{ (two parallel strands)} \\
 & = \text{Diagram of two strands crossing}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the last line we use  $d = -A^2 - A^{-2}$ . Now we can see type II is invariant.

(b) The Reidemeister move of type III is given by Fig.2.5. Then according to the definition




Figure 2.5: Reidemeister move of type III

of the Kauffman bracket, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Diagram 1} &= A \cdot \text{Diagram 2} + A^{-1} \cdot \text{Diagram 3} \\
 &= A \left( A \cdot \text{Diagram 4} + A^{-1} \cdot \text{Diagram 5} \right) + A^{-1} \left( A \cdot \text{Diagram 6} + A^{-1} \cdot \text{Diagram 7} \right) \\
 &= A^2 \cdot \text{Diagram 8} + \text{Diagram 9} + \text{Diagram 10} + A^{-2} \cdot \text{Diagram 11}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can also work out that

$$\text{Diagram 12} = A^2 \cdot \text{Diagram 13} + \text{Diagram 14} + \text{Diagram 15} + A^{-2} \cdot \text{Diagram 16}.$$

If we expand, we will find

$$\text{Diagram 17} = \text{Diagram 18}$$

trivially and

$$\text{Diagram 19} = \text{Diagram 20}$$

using

$$\text{Diagram 21} = -A^3 \left( \text{Diagram 22} \right).$$

So we have

$$\text{Diagram 23} = \text{Diagram 24}.$$

Now we can see type III is invariant. Thus we can conclude that the Kauffman invariant is an invariant of regular isotopy.

## 2.4 Jones polynomial

Let us define the Jones polynomial of an oriented knot as

$$\text{Jones}(\text{knot}) = (-A^3)^{w(\text{knot})} \text{Kauffman}(\text{knot})$$

where  $w$  is the writhe (We must first orient the knot, meaning we arrows on the strands, in order to define a writhe). Show that this quantity is an invariant of ambient isotopy - that is, it is invariant under all three Reidemeister moves.

**Answer** We first consider the regular isotopy. For type II move:

$$w \left( \text{diagram of two strands crossing twice with arrows} \right) = 1 - 1 = 0 = w \left( \text{diagram of two separate strands with arrows} \right).$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Jones} \left( \text{diagram of two strands crossing twice with arrows} \right) &= (-A^3)^w \text{Kauffman} \left( \text{diagram of two strands crossing twice with arrows} \right) \\ &= \text{Kauffman} \left( \text{diagram of two strands crossing twice with arrows} \right) = \text{Kauffman} \left( \text{diagram of two separate strands with arrows} \right) \\ &= \text{Jones} \left( \text{diagram of two separate strands with arrows} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For type III, we have

$$w \left( \text{diagram of three strands with a crossing} \right) = -1 - 1 + 1 = -1,$$

while

$$w \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \end{array} \right) = 1 - 1 - 1 = -1 = w \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} \right).$$

Since

$$\text{Kauffman} \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \end{array} \right) = \text{Kauffman} \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} \right),$$

we also have

$$\text{Jones} \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \end{array} \right) = \text{Jones} \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} \right).$$

Note here the initial direction of the lines doesn't matter, but the relative direction of the initial points and final points between two knots should be the same.

Now we can see Jones polynomial is invariant under regular isotopy. Then we consider the Reidemeister move of type I in Fig. 2.6.




Figure 2.6: Reidemeister move of type I

However:

$$w \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 1} \end{array} \right) = 1, \tag{2.1}$$

while


$$w \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 2} \end{array} \right) = 0.$$

Note that in (2.1), the direction is different from

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Diagram 3} \end{array} = -1,$$



but same as



with a  $90^\circ$  rotation. Then using

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Kauffman} \left( \text{Diagram of a crossing with a loop} \right) &= \text{Kauffman} \left( A \uparrow \right) + \text{Kauffman} \left( A^{-1} \uparrow \bigcirc \right) \\
 &= \text{Kauffman} \left( (A + A^{-1}) \uparrow \right) = -A^{-3} \text{Kauffman} \left( \uparrow \right) \\
 &= (-A^3)^\wedge \left( -w \left( \text{Diagram of a crossing with a loop} \right) \right) \text{Kauffman} \left( \uparrow \right) \\
 &= (-A^3)^\wedge \left( -w \left( \text{Diagram of a crossing with a loop} \right) \right) \text{Jones} \left( \uparrow \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

which means

$$\text{Jones} \left( \uparrow \right) = (-A^3)^\wedge \left( w \left( \text{Diagram of a crossing with a loop} \right) \right) \text{Kauffman} \left( \text{Diagram of a crossing with a loop} \right) = \text{Jones} \left( \text{Diagram of a crossing with a loop} \right).$$

So Jones polynomial is invariant of ambient isotopy.

## 2.5 HOMFLY Polynomial

The HOMFLY polynomial is a generalization of the Jones polynomial which has two variables  $X$  and  $z$  rather than just one variable. To define the HOMFLY polynomial we must first orient the strings in our knot or link (meaning we put arrows on the lines). The HOMFLY polynomial (Freyd et al. [1985]; Przytycki and Traczyk [1987]) of an oriented link is then defined in terms of two variables  $X$  and  $z$  by the two rules

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Diagram of a loop} &= \text{Diagram of a loop with arrow} = \frac{(X + X^{-1})}{z} \\
 X \text{ (crossing)} + X^{-1} \text{ (crossing)} &= z \text{ (two arcs)}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

- (a) Given the definition of the Jones polynomial in Exercise 2.4, for what value of  $X$  and  $z$  does the HOMFLY polynomial become the Jones polynomial?

- (b) Calculate the HOMFLY polynomial of the right and left handed trefoil knots (shown in Fig.2.1).

**Remark** HOMFLY is an acronym of the names of the inventors of this polynomial. Sometimes credit is even more distributed and it is called HOMFLYPT.

**Answer** (a) For simplicity, we use  $H(\text{Knot})$  to indicate the HOMFLY polynomial,  $J(\text{Knot})$  to indicate the Jones polynomial and  $K(\text{Knot})$  to refer the Kauffman polynomial. Now, if  $H(\text{Knot}) = J(\text{Knot})$ , we must have

$$X \text{ J } \left( \begin{array}{c} \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \end{array} \right) + X^{-1} \text{ J } \left( \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \end{array} \right) = z \text{ J } \left( \begin{array}{c} \frown \\ \smile \end{array} \right).$$

Left hand side gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS} &= X(-A^3)^1 K \left( \begin{array}{c} \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \end{array} \right) + X^{-1}(-A^3)^{-1} K \left( \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \end{array} \right) \\ &= -XA^3 \left( AK \left( \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right) + A^{-1} K \left( \begin{array}{c} \frown \\ \smile \end{array} \right) \right) \\ &\quad - X^{-1}A^{-3} \left( AK \left( \begin{array}{c} \frown \\ \smile \end{array} \right) + A^{-1} K \left( \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right) \right) \\ &= -(XA^4 + X^{-1}A^{-4}) K \left( \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \\ \diagup \end{array} \right) - (XA^2 + X^{-1}A^{-2}) K \left( \begin{array}{c} \frown \\ \smile \end{array} \right). \end{aligned}$$

While

$$\text{RHS} = z K \left( \begin{array}{c} \frown \\ \smile \end{array} \right),$$

So we must have

$$\begin{cases} XA^4 + X^{-1}A^{-4} = 0 \\ XA^2 + X^{-1}A^{-2} = -z \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} X = iA^{-4} \\ z = i(A^2 - A^{-2}) \end{cases}. \quad (2.3)$$

We can check in this case:

$$H \left( \begin{array}{c} \bigcirc \end{array} \right) = H \left( \begin{array}{c} \bigcirc \end{array} \right) = \frac{(X + X^{-1})}{z} = -A^2 - A^{-2} = J \left( \begin{array}{c} \bigcirc \end{array} \right).$$

So (3) is indeed the condition that HOMFLY polynomial becomes the Jones polynomial.

(b) We first assign a direction to the right handed trefoil. Then the second skein relation gives:

$$XH \left( \text{right trefoil} \right) + X^{-1}H \left( \text{right trefoil with one arrow reversed} \right) = zH \left( \text{right trefoil with two arrows reversed} \right)$$

But the second term in the left hand side is a trivial know, i.e. a circle, so

$$H \left( \text{right trefoil} \right) = zX^{-1}H \left( \text{right trefoil with two arrows reversed} \right) - \frac{X^{-2}(X + X^{-1})}{z}.$$

Then:

$$XH \left( \text{right trefoil with two arrows reversed} \right) + X^{-1}H \left( \text{right trefoil with one arrow reversed} \right) = zH \left( \text{right trefoil with three arrows reversed} \right).$$

But note here the right hand side is trivial, while

$$H \left( \text{right trefoil with three arrows reversed} \right) = H \left( \text{two circles} \right) = \frac{(X + X^{-1})^2}{z^2},$$

We have

$$H \left( \text{right trefoil with two arrows reversed} \right) = X^{-1} \left( (X + X^{-1}) - X^{-1} \frac{(X + X^{-1})^2}{z^2} \right).$$

Finally:

$$\begin{aligned} H \left( \text{right trefoil} \right) &= zX^{-1}H \left( \text{right trefoil with two arrows reversed} \right) - \frac{X^{-2}(X + X^{-1})}{z} \\ &= \frac{(1 + X^2)(-1 + X(-1 + z^2))}{X^4 z}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can get for the left trefoil:

$$H \left( \text{left trefoil} \right) = -\frac{X(X^2 + 1)(X - z^2 + 1)}{z}.$$

With condition 2.3, we can also get the Jones polynomial:

$$J \left( \text{right trefoil} \right) = -((1 - i)A^{14}) + iA^{10} - A^2.$$

However, in common normalization, we always set

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Diagram 1} = \text{Diagram 2} = 1 \\
 X \quad \quad -X^{-1} \quad \quad = z \quad .
 \end{array} \tag{2.4}$$

In this case:

$$H \left( \text{Diagram 3} \right) = 2X^{-2} - X^{-4} + X^{-2}z^2.$$

Now equation 2.3 becomes

$$\begin{cases} X = A^{-1} \\ z = A^{1/2} - A^{-1/2} \end{cases} ,$$


then the standard result of Jones polynomial gives:

$$J \left( \text{Diagram 3} \right) = A + A^3 - A^4.$$

We also note the mirror symmetry of HOMFLY polynomial:

$$H(\text{Knot}; X, z) = H(\text{mirror image}; X^{-1}, z). \tag{2.5}$$

This comes from a simple observation: exchange



in 2.2 has the same effect of  $X \rightarrow X^{-1}$ . This means for the relation 2.4, the symmetry 2.5 becomes

$$H(\text{Knot}; X, z) = H(\text{mirror image}; X^{-1}, -z).$$

Another common skein relation is that

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{Diagram 1} = \text{Diagram 2} = 1 \\
 X \quad \quad +X^{-1} \quad \quad = z \quad ,
 \end{array}$$

in this case:

$$H \left( \text{Diagram} \right) = X^{-2}z^2 - 2X^{-2} - X^{-4}.$$



## Part I

# Anyons and Topological Quantum Field Theories





## Chapter 3

# Particle Quantum Statistics

### 3.1 About the Braid Group

- (a) Convince yourself geometrically that the defining relations of the braid group on  $M$  particles  $B_M$  are:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i &= \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} & 1 \leq i \leq M-2 \\ \sigma_i \sigma_j &= \sigma_j \sigma_i \text{ for } |i-j| > 1, & 1 \leq i, j \leq M-1 \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

- (b) Instead of thinking about particles on a plane, let us think about particles on the surface of a sphere. In this case, the braid group of  $M$  strands on the sphere is written as  $B_M(S^2)$ . To think about braids on a sphere, it is useful to think of time as being the radial direction of the sphere, so that braids are drawn as in Fig.3.1.




Figure 3.1: An element of the braid group  $B_3(S^2)$ . The braid shown here is  $\sigma_1 \sigma_2^{-1}$

The braid generators on the sphere still obey (3.1), but they also obey one additional identity

$$\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_{M-2} \sigma_{M-1} \sigma_{M-1} \sigma_{M-2} \dots \sigma_2 \sigma_1 = I \quad (3.2)$$

where  $I$  is the identity (or trivial) braid. What does this additional identity mean geometrically? [In fact, for understanding the properties of anyons on a sphere, (3.2) is not quite enough. We will try to figure out below why this is so by using Ising Anyons as an example.]

**Answer** The second one of (3.1) is trivial, while the first one is due to the Yang-Baxter equation. Take  $B_3$  for example, the relation  $\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_1 = \sigma_2\sigma_1\sigma_2$  equals to Fig.3.2.



Figure 3.2: The configuration of  $\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_1 = \sigma_2\sigma_1\sigma_2$ .

(b) We also take  $B_3(S^2)$  for example. Relation (3.2) now becomes

$$\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_2\sigma_1 = I,$$

here we define  $\sigma_1$  to be as Fig.3.3 shows.





Figure 3.3: The effect of  $\sigma_1$  on  $S^2$ .

Then the  $\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_2\sigma_1$  becomes Fig.3.4. This means the line can get cross the sphere and return to trivial configuration.

## 3.2 About the Symmetric Group

Show that (3.1) also hold for the generators of the symmetric group  $S_M$  on  $M$  particles, where  $\sigma_i$  exchanges particle  $i$  and  $i + 1$ . In the symmetric group we have the additional condition that  $\sigma_i^2 = 1$ . Prove the statement used in section 3.4.1 that there are only two one-dimensional representations of the symmetric group. Hint: The proof is just a few lines. Use  $\rho(\sigma_i)\rho(\sigma_j) = \rho(\sigma_i\sigma_j)$  where  $\rho$  is a representation.

Figure 3.4: Effect of  $\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_2 \sigma_1$ .

**Answer** (a) For the element in symmetric group  $S_M$ , we can write  $\sigma_i$  as  $(i, i+1)$ . Then

$$\sigma_i \sigma_j = (i, i+1)(j, j+1) = (j, j+1)(i, i+1) = \sigma_j \sigma_i, \quad |i-j| > 1,$$

is trivial. The first one gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i &= (i, i+1)(i+1, i+2)(i, i+1) \\ &= (i, i+1, i+2)(i, i+1) \\ &= (i+2, i, i+1)(i, i+1) \\ &= (i+2, i) \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} &= (i+1, i+2)(i, i+1)(i+1, i+2) \\ &= (i+2, i+1, i)(i+1, i+2) \\ &= (i, i+2, i+1)(i+1, i+2) \\ &= (i, i+2) = \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i, \end{aligned}$$

which also holds.

(b) Suppose  $\rho(\sigma_1) = c$ , which means

$$\rho(\sigma_1)\rho(\sigma_1) = c^2 = \rho(\sigma_1 \sigma_1) = \rho(I) = 1,$$

thus  $c^2 = 1$  have only two possibilities  $c = \pm 1$ . Suppose there exist  $i$ , such that  $\rho(\sigma_i) = 1$  while  $\rho(\sigma_{i+1}) = -1$ , then according to (3.1):

$$\rho(\sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i) = -1 \neq 1 = \rho(\sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i).$$

So  $\rho(\sigma_i)$  and  $\rho(\sigma_{i+1})$  have the same sign, either 1 or  $-1$ , then all  $\rho(\sigma_i)$  have the same sign. We also know any permutation can be generated by  $\sigma_i, i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ , we can see there are only two kinds of 1-d representation of  $S_M$ .

### 3.3 Ising Anyons and Majorana Fermions

The most commonly discussed type of nonabelian anyon is the Ising anyon (we will discuss this in more depth later). Ising anyons occur in the Moore-Read quantum Hall state ( $\nu = 5/2$ ), as well as in any chiral  $p$ -wave superconductor and in recently experimentally relevant so called "Majorana" systems.

The nonabelian statistics of these anyons may be described in terms of Majorana fermions by attaching a Majorana operator to each anyon. The Hamiltonian for these Majoranas is zero - they are completely noninteracting. In case you haven't seen them before, Majorana Fermions  $\gamma_j$  satisfy the anticommutation relation

$$\{\gamma_i, \gamma_j\} \equiv \gamma_i \gamma_j + \gamma_j \gamma_i = 2\delta_{ij}$$

as well as being self conjugate  $\gamma_i^\dagger = \gamma_i$ .

- (a) Show that the ground state degeneracy of a system with  $2N$  Majoranas is  $2^N$  if the Hamiltonian is zero. Thus conclude that each *pair* of Ising anyons is a two-state system. Hint: Construct a regular (Dirac) fermion operator from two Majorana fermion operators. For example,

$$c^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1 + i\gamma_2)$$

will then satisfy the usual fermion anti-commutation  $\{c, c^\dagger\} = cc^\dagger + c^\dagger c = \mathbb{1}$ . (If you haven't run into fermion creation operators yet, you might want to read up on this first!) There is more discussion of this transformation in later exercises 9.7 and 10.2.

- (b) When anyon  $i$  is exchanged clockwise with anyon  $j$ , the unitary transformation that occurs on the ground state is

$$U_{ij} = \frac{e^{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}[1 + \gamma_i \gamma_j], i < j. \quad (3.3)$$

for some real value of  $\alpha$ . Show that these unitary operators form a representation of the braid group. (Refer back to the previous problem, "About the Braid Group"). In other words we must show that replacing  $\sigma_i$  with  $U_{i,i+1}$  in (3.1) yields equalities. This representation is  $2^N$  dimensional since the ground state degeneracy is  $2^N$ .

- (c) Consider the operator

$$\gamma^{\text{FIVE}} = (i)^N \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \dots \gamma_{2N}$$

(the notation five is in analogy with the  $\gamma^5$  of the Dirac gamma matrices). Show that the eigenvalues of  $\gamma^{\text{FIVE}}$  are  $\pm 1$ . Further show that this eigenvalue remains unchanged under

any braid operation. Conclude that we actually have two  $2^{N-1}$  dimensional representations of the braid group. We will assume that any particular system of Ising anyons is in one of these two representations.

- (d) Thus, 4 Ising anyons on a sphere comprise a single 2-state system, or a qubit. Show that by only braiding these four Ising anyons one cannot obtain all possible unitary operation on this qubit. Indeed, braiding Ising anyons is not sufficient to build a quantum computer. [Part (d) is not required to solve parts (e) and (f)]
- (e) (bit harder) Now consider  $2N$  Ising anyons on a sphere (See above problem "About the braid group" for information about the braid group on a sphere). Show that in order for either one of the  $2^{N-1}$  dimensional representations of the braid group to satisfy the sphere relation, (3.2), one must choose the right abelian phase  $\alpha$  in (3.3). Determine this phase.
- (f) (a bit harder) The value you just determined is not quite right. It should look a bit unnatural as the abelian phase associated with a braid depends on the number of anyons in the system. Go back to (3.2) and insert an additional abelian phase on the right hand side which will make the final result of part (e) independent of the number of anyons in the system. In fact, there should be such an additional factor - to figure out where it comes from, go back and look again at the geometric "proof" of (3.2). Note that the proof involves a self-twist of one of the anyon world lines. The additional phase you added is associated with one particle twisting around itself. The relation between self-rotation of a single particle and exchange of two particles is a generalized spin-statistics theorem.

**Answer** We can use two Majorana fermions to construct a normal Dirac fermion by the transformation

$$c_i^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{2i-1} + i\gamma_{2i}), \quad c_i = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{2i-1} - i\gamma_{2i}),$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . We can check:

$$\begin{aligned} \{c_i, c_j^\dagger\} &= c_i c_j^\dagger + c_j^\dagger c_i = \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_{2i-1} - i\gamma_{2i})(\gamma_{2j-1} + i\gamma_{2j}) + \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_{2j-1} + i\gamma_{2j})(\gamma_{2i-1} - i\gamma_{2i}) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_{2i-1}\gamma_{2j-1} - i\gamma_{2i}\gamma_{2j-1} + i\gamma_{2i-1}\gamma_{2j} + \gamma_{2i}\gamma_{2j} + (i \leftrightarrow j, i \leftrightarrow -i)) \\ &= \delta_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the fermion number operator is given by  $\sum_{i=1}^N n_i = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i^\dagger c_i = \sum_{i=1}^N (1 + i\gamma_{2i}\gamma_{2i-1})/2$ . Obviously it is a projection operator  $n_i^2 = n_i$  so it only has eigenvalue 1 or 0, i.e. the occupied and empty state. Therefore, the ground state of the system has the degeneracy of  $2^N$  because there are  $N$  fermions.

- (b) We just need to show the map  $\sigma_i \mapsto U_{i,i+1}$  induce an isomorphism. Here we prove the

second equality first:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_i \sigma_j &\mapsto U_{i,i+1} U_{j,j+1} \\
&= \frac{e^{2i\alpha}}{2} (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}) (1 + \gamma_j \gamma_{j+1}) \\
&= \frac{e^{2i\alpha}}{2} (1 + \gamma_j \gamma_{j+1} + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_j \gamma_{j+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

While for

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_j \sigma_i &\mapsto U_{j,j+1} U_{i,i+1} \\
&= \frac{e^{2i\alpha}}{2} (1 + \gamma_j \gamma_{j+1}) (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}) \\
&= \frac{e^{2i\alpha}}{2} (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} + \gamma_j \gamma_{j+1} + \gamma_j \gamma_{j+1} \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

According to the anti-commutation relation:

$$\{\gamma_i, \gamma_j\} = 2\delta_{ij} = 0 = \gamma_i \gamma_j + \gamma_j \gamma_i \Rightarrow \gamma_i \gamma_j = -\gamma_j \gamma_i,$$

So  $\gamma_j \gamma_{j+1} \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} = -\gamma_j \gamma_i \gamma_{j+1} \gamma_{i+1} = \gamma_i \gamma_j \gamma_{j+1} \gamma_{i+1} = -\gamma_i \gamma_j \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{j+1} = \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_j \gamma_{j+1}$ . Therefore we have

$$U_{i,i+1} U_{j,j+1} = U_{j,j+1} U_{i,i+1}.$$

For the first identity:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i &\mapsto U_{i,i+1} U_{i+1,i+2} U_{i,i+1} \\
&= \frac{e^{3i\alpha}}{2\sqrt{2}} (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}) (1 + \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2}) (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}) \\
&= \frac{e^{3i\alpha}}{2\sqrt{2}} (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} + \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2} + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2}) (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

According to the anti-commutation relation:

$$\{\gamma_i, \gamma_i\} = 2\delta_{ii} = 2 = 2\gamma_i \gamma_i,$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i &\mapsto \frac{e^{3i\alpha}}{2\sqrt{2}} (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} + \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2} + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2}) (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}) \\
&= \frac{e^{3i\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}} (\gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} + \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For the second half:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} &\mapsto U_{i+1,i+2} U_{i,i+1} U_{i+1,i+2} \\
&= \frac{e^{3i\alpha}}{2\sqrt{2}} (1 + \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2}) (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}) (1 + \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2}) \\
&= \frac{e^{3i\alpha}}{2\sqrt{2}} (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} + \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2} + \gamma_{i+2} \gamma_i) (1 + \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2}) \\
&= \frac{e^{3i\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}} (\gamma_i \gamma_{i+1} + \gamma_{i+1} \gamma_{i+2}).
\end{aligned}$$

So we have checked

$$U_{i,i+1}U_{i+1,i+2}U_{i,i+1} = U_{i+1,i+2}U_{i,i+1}U_{i+1,i+2}.$$

Therefore, since  $\sigma_i$  are the generator of the braid group,  $\sigma_i \mapsto U_{i,j}$  induce an isomorphism, thus a representation.

(c) We can easily see

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma^{\text{FIVE}})^2 &= \gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_{2N}\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_{2N} \\ &= (-1)^N (-1)^{(2N-1)+(2N-2)+\cdots+1} \\ &= (-1)^N (-1)^{(2N-1+1)(2N-1)/2} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

So  $\gamma^{\text{FIVE}}$  have eigenvalue  $\pm 1$ . Next, to prove eigenvalue remains unchanged under any braid operation  $U_{i,j}$ , we consider

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{e^{i\alpha}(\mathbf{i})^N}{\sqrt{2}} [\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_i \cdots \gamma_j \cdots \gamma_{2N}, \gamma_i\gamma_j] \\ &= \frac{e^{i\alpha}(\mathbf{i})^N}{\sqrt{2}} (\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_i \cdots \gamma_j \cdots \gamma_{2N}\gamma_i\gamma_j - \gamma_i\gamma_j\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_i \cdots \gamma_j \cdots \gamma_{2N}) \\ &= \frac{e^{i\alpha}(\mathbf{i})^N}{\sqrt{2}} (\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_i \cdots \gamma_j \cdots \gamma_{2N}\gamma_i\gamma_j - (-1)^{(2N-1) \cdot 2} \gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_i \cdots \gamma_j \cdots \gamma_{2N}\gamma_i\gamma_j) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

So the eigenvalue remains unchanged. Thus the overall parity of this system is conserved, which means we have  $2^{N-1}$  dimensional Hilbert space.

(d) With four Ising anyons, we can construct two creation-annihilation operator  $c_1, c_1^\dagger, c_2, c_2^\dagger$ . We label the state by  $|n_1, n_2\rangle = |n_1\rangle \otimes |n_2\rangle$ . We have two possible parity, with parity 1, the states are  $|0, 0\rangle, |1, 1\rangle$ ; and with parity  $-1$ , the states are  $|0, 1\rangle, |1, 0\rangle$ . Although in each qubit, we have only two states, i.e. the Hilbert space should be two dimensional. This means we in fact should set  $|0, 0\rangle = (1, 0), |1, 1\rangle = (1, 0)$  for the first case and similar for the second, however, we can still use the tensor product Hilbert space in four dimensional, and for each system, we just use half of it. So we can consider the first fermion:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1^\dagger |0\rangle &= |1\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1 + i\gamma_2) |1\rangle \\ c_1^\dagger |1\rangle &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which means under basis  $|0\rangle = (1, 0), |1\rangle = (0, 1)$ , the matrix elements of  $c_1^\dagger$  are:

$$c_1^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1 + i\gamma_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

similarly:

$$c_1 = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1 - i\gamma_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\gamma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, we can specify the effect on  $U_{ij}$  on each state:

$$U_{12} |n_1, n_2\rangle = \frac{e^{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}(1 + \gamma_i \gamma_j) |n_1, n_2\rangle = \frac{e^{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}(1 + (-1)^{n_1+1} i) |n_1, n_2\rangle,$$

which means the braiding inside each pair gives an overall factor. Now consider

$$U_{23} |n_1, n_2\rangle = \frac{e^{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}(|n_1, n_2\rangle + i(-1)^{n_1} |n_1, n_2\rangle).$$

Therefore, we can see the braiding between Ising anyons, i.e.  $U_{ij}$  cannot make the unitary operation such as "magic gate" like

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta} \end{pmatrix},$$

so it cannot obtain all possible unitary operation on this qubit.

(e) (Unsolved!) With  $\sigma_i \mapsto U_{i,i+1}$ , the relation (3.2) can be written as:

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2N-1} U_{i,i+1} = \prod_{i=1}^{2N-1} U_{i,i+1}^\dagger$$

because  $U_{i,i+1}$  is a unitary transformation(which can be checked by its definition easily). Then according to its definition:

$$e^{i(2N-1)\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^{2N-1} (1 + \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}) = e^{-i(2N-1)\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^{2N-1} (1 - \gamma_i \gamma_{i+1}).$$

Let's list the above identity with small  $N$ . For  $N = 1$ :

$$e^{i\alpha}(1 + \gamma_1 \gamma_2) = e^{-i\alpha}(1 - \gamma_1 \gamma_2).$$

If  $\gamma_1 \gamma_2$  have eigenvalue  $-i$ , i.e. with parity 1, then  $\alpha = \pi/4$ , if  $\gamma_1 \gamma_2$  have eigenvalue  $i$ , i.e. with parity  $-1$ , then  $\alpha = 3\pi/4$ .

For  $N = 2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS} &= e^{i3\alpha}(1 + \gamma_1 \gamma_2)(1 + \gamma_2 \gamma_3)(1 + \gamma_3 \gamma_4) \\ &= e^{i3\alpha}(1 + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 + \gamma_2 \gamma_3 + \gamma_1 \gamma_3 + \gamma_3 \gamma_4 + \gamma_2 \gamma_4 + \gamma_1 \gamma_4 + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 \gamma_4) \\ \text{RHS} &= e^{-i3\alpha}(1 - \gamma_1 \gamma_2)(1 - \gamma_2 \gamma_3)(1 - \gamma_3 \gamma_4) \\ &= e^{-i3\alpha}(1 - \gamma_1 \gamma_2 - \gamma_2 \gamma_3 + \gamma_1 \gamma_3 - \gamma_3 \gamma_4 + \gamma_2 \gamma_4 - \gamma_1 \gamma_4 + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 \gamma_4). \end{aligned}$$

This is an over-determined equation, we just need the condition that



For  $N = 3$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{LHS} &= e^{i5\alpha}(1 + \gamma_1\gamma_2)(1 + \gamma_2\gamma_3)(1 + \gamma_3\gamma_4)(1 + \gamma_4\gamma_5)(1 + \gamma_5\gamma_6) \\
&= e^{i3\alpha}(1 + \gamma_1\gamma_2 + \gamma_2\gamma_3 + \gamma_1\gamma_3 + \gamma_3\gamma_4 + \gamma_2\gamma_4 + \gamma_1\gamma_4 + \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_4)(1 + \gamma_4\gamma_5)(1 + \gamma_5\gamma_6) \\
&= 1 + \gamma_1\gamma_2 + \gamma_2\gamma_3 + \gamma_1\gamma_3 + \gamma_3\gamma_4 + \gamma_2\gamma_4 + \gamma_1\gamma_4 + \gamma_3\gamma_5 + \gamma_2\gamma_5 + \gamma_1\gamma_5 + \gamma_4\gamma_5 \\
&\quad + \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_4 + \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_4\gamma_5 + \gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_4\gamma_5 + \gamma_1\gamma_3\gamma_4\gamma_5 + \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_5 \\
&\quad + \gamma_5\gamma_6 + \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_5\gamma_6 + \gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_5\gamma_6 + \gamma_1\gamma_3\gamma_5\gamma_6 + \gamma_3\gamma_4\gamma_5\gamma_6 + \gamma_2\gamma_4\gamma_5\gamma_6 + \gamma_1\gamma_4\gamma_5\gamma_6 \\
&\quad + \gamma_3\gamma_6 + \gamma_2\gamma_6 + \gamma_1\gamma_6 + \gamma_4\gamma_6 \\
&\quad + \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_4\gamma_5\gamma_6 + \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_4\gamma_6 + \gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_4\gamma_6 + \gamma_1\gamma_3\gamma_4\gamma_6 + \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_6
\end{aligned}$$

If we only consider the  $\gamma^{\text{FIVE}}$  term:

$$e^{i(2N-1)\alpha}(1 + (-i)^N \gamma^{\text{FIVE}}) = e^{-i(2N-1)\alpha}(1 + (i)^N \gamma^{\text{FIVE}}),$$

which means

$$\alpha = \frac{\pi}{4} \frac{N}{2N-1}$$

for even parity, and

$$\alpha = \frac{\pi}{4} \frac{N+2}{2N-1}$$

for odd parity.

This isn't over. I will be back.

### 3.4 Small Numbers of Anyons on a Sphere

On the plane, the braid group of two particles is an infinite group (the group of integers describing the number of twists!). However, this is not true on a sphere.

First review the problem "About the Braid Group" about braiding on a sphere.

- (a) Now consider the case of two particles on a sphere. Determine the full structure of the braid group. Show it is a well known finite discrete group. What group is it?
- (b) (Harder) Now consider three particles on a sphere. Determine the full structure of the braid group. Show that it is a finite discrete group. [Even Harder] What group is it? It is "well known" only to people who know a lot of group theory. But you can google to find information about it on the web with some work. It may be useful to list all the subgroups of the group and the multiplication table of the group elements.
- (c) Suppose we have two (or three) anyons on a sphere. Suppose the ground state is two-fold degenerate (or more generally  $N$ -fold degenerate for some finite  $N$ ). Since the braid group is discrete, conclude that no type of anyon statistics can allow us to do arbitrary  $SU(2)$  (or  $SU(N)$ ) rotations on this degenerate ground state by braiding.

**Answer** We have only one generator  $\sigma_1$  and the equation (3.2) tells us that

$$\sigma_1^2 = I$$

which means that  $B_2(S^2) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ .

(b) Since this is a finite group, every element have a finite order. So the simplest way is to apply an element as many times as possible to feel the group structure. Consider  $\sigma_1$  (same as  $\sigma_2$ ) first, as the Fig.3.4 shows.




Figure 3.5: The action of a series of  $\sigma_1$ .

From continuous deformation, we can see

$$\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^{-2} = \sigma_1^{-2} = \sigma_2^2.$$


Thus,

$$\sigma_1^3 = \sigma_1^{-1}, \quad \sigma_1^4 = I.$$

So we have found three subgroups:

$$\{I\}, \{I, \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2\}, \{I, \sigma_1, \sigma_1^2, \sigma_1^{-1}\}, \{I, \sigma_2, \sigma_2^2, \sigma_2^{-1}\}.$$

Now we try other elements. We try the scheme (this is arbitrary) that apply  $\sigma_1$  first, then  $\sigma_2$ , then  $\sigma_1$ , then  $\sigma_2 \dots$  to get identity. This is from relation (3.1). For simplicity, we call  $\sigma_1 \sigma_2 = a, \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_1 = x$ . Then we try to list all elements:



We have 12 group elements:  $\{I, a^i, a^i x\}, i = 1, \dots, 5$ . We can list its group multiplication table and gives:

	1	$a$	$a^2$	$a^3$	$a^4$	$a^5$	$x$	$ax$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$
1	1	$a$	$a^2$	$a^3$	$a^4$	$a^5$	$x$	$ax$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$
$a$	$a$	$a^2$	$a^3$	$a^4$	$a^5$	1	$a^5x$	$x$	$ax$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$
$a^2$	$a^2$	$a^3$	$a^4$	$a^5$	1	$a$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$	$x$	$ax$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$
$a^3$	$a^3$	$a^4$	$a^5$	1	$a$	$a^2$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$	$x$	$ax$	$a^2x$
$a^4$	$a^4$	$a^5$	1	$a$	$a^2$	$a^3$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$	$x$	$ax$
$a^5$	$a^5$	1	$a$	$a^2$	$a^3$	$a^4$	$ax$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$	$x$
$x$	$x$	$ax$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$	$a^3$	$a^4$	$a^5$	1	$a$	$a^2$
$ax$	$ax$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$	$x$	$a^2$	$a^3$	$a^4$	$a^5$	1	$a$
$a^2x$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$	$x$	$ax$	$a$	$a^2$	$a^3$	$a^4$	$a^5$	1
$a^3x$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$	$x$	$ax$	$a^2x$	1	$a$	$a^2$	$a^3$	$a^4$	$a^5$
$a^4x$	$a^4x$	$a^5x$	$x$	$ax$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$	$a^5$	1	$a$	$a^2$	$a^3$	$a^4$
$a^5x$	$a^5x$	$x$	$ax$	$a^2x$	$a^3x$	$a^4x$	$a^4$	$a^5$	1	$a$	$a^2$	$a^3$

This is closed and we can see it is generated by  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2$ , which it is actually  $B_3(S^2)$ . Actually, we can also prove it in an algebraic way. Here using the definition of  $a, x$ , we have

$$\sigma_1 = a^{-1}x, \quad \sigma_2 = x^{-1}a^2.$$

Then the group representation is given by

$$B_3(S^2) \cong \langle a, x | x^2 = a^3, x^{-1}ax = a^{-1} \rangle.$$

We can also see

$$a^6 = x^2a^3 = x(xa^3x^{-1})x = xa^{-3}x = x^{1-2+1} = I.$$

This subgroup  $\mathbb{Z}_6$  generate by  $a$  is a normal subgroup because  $xa^nx^{-1} = a^{-n}$ . Besides, the quotient group gives

$$B_3(S^2)/\mathbb{Z}_6 \cong \langle x | x^2 = I \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_2,$$

which means it is order 12.

Now let's look at its group structure. It is non-trivial subgroups are

$$\{1, a^3\}, \{1, a^2, a^4\}, \{1, a^i, i = 1, \dots, 5\}, \{1, a^3, x, a^3x\}, \{1, a^3, ax, a^4x\}, \{1, a^3, a^2x, a^5x\}.$$

It is the well known ZS-metacyclic group of order 12, which is also the dicyclic group  $\text{Dic}_3$ . The dicyclic group is defined by:

$$\text{Dic}_n = \langle a, x | a^{2n} = I, x^2 = a^n, x^{-1}ax = a^{-1} \rangle,$$

which is exactly our case. It is called metacyclic group because it has a cyclic normal subgroup  $N$ , such that the quotient  $G/N$  is also cyclic. In this case,  $B_3(S^2)$  has the normal subgroup  $\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_3, \mathbb{Z}_6$ , and  $B_3(S^2)/\mathbb{Z}_6 \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ . Also, it can be written as

$$B_3(S^2) = \mathbb{Z}_3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_4$$

from its subgroups.

An interesting fact is that for  $n \geq 4$ ,  $B_n(S^2)$  is infinite[GG13], but the element  $\sigma_1\sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{n-1}$  still have order  $2n$ .

(c) For  $n$ -fold degeneracy, we should consider  $n$ -dimensional representation of the braid group. In two particle case, all two dimensional representation of  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  are similar to  $\{I_2, \sigma_z\}$ , which means the  $SU(2)$  rotation is not allowed. For three particle case, we have

$$12 = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 2^2 + 2^2,$$

which means we have four 1 dimensional irreducible representation and two 2 dimensional representation. Non of them can cover all  $SU(2)$  rotations. For  $n \geq 4$ ,  $B_4(S^2)$  is infinite and may allow  $SU(2)$  rotations.

Now let's try to figure out the irreducible representation of  $B_3(S^2)$ . First, its conjugacy classes are given by:

$$c_1 = \{1\}, c_2 = \{2, 6\}, c_3 = \{3, 5\}, c_4 = \{4\}, c_5 = \{7, 9, 11\}, c_6 = \{8, 10, 12\}.$$

Then from its subgroups and the great orthogonality theorem, we can get its character table:

	$c_1$	$c_2$	$c_3$	$c_4$	$c_5$	$c_6$
$\lambda_1$	1	1	1	1	1	1
$\lambda_2$	1	1	1	1	-1	-1
$\lambda_3$	1	-1	1	-1	i	-i
$\lambda_4$	1	-1	1	-1	-i	i
$\lambda_5$	2	-1	-1	2	0	0
$\lambda_6$	2	1	-1	-2	0	0

For the rep  $\lambda_5$ , it is orthogonal lifted from  $S_3$ , which means the representation of its generators are given by:

$$a \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -\sqrt{3} \\ \sqrt{3} & -1 \end{pmatrix}, b \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and another representation is quaternionic representation:

$$a \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\pi/3} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\pi/3} \end{pmatrix}, b \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$



## Chapter 4

# Aharonov-Bohm Effect and Charge-Flux Composite

### 4.1 Abelian Anyon Vacuum on a Two-Handle Torus

Using similar technique as in section 4.3, show that the ground state vacuum degeneracy on a two handle torus is  $m^2$  for a system of abelian anyons with statistical angle  $\theta = \pi p/m$  for integers  $p$  and  $m$  relatively prime. Hint: Consider what the independent nontrivial cycles are on a two-handled torus and determine the commutation relations for operators  $T_i$  that take anyon-antianyon pairs around these cycles.

**Answer** There are four kinds of non-trivial loop in a genus-2 surface, as the Fig. 4.1 below shows.




Figure 4.1: Nontrivial loops on genus-2 surface.

This time, we cannot use only one complex number to label the state, since  $T_1$  and  $T_4$  don't commute. We call

$$T_1|\alpha, \beta\rangle = e^{i\alpha}|\alpha, \beta\rangle; \quad T_4|\alpha, \beta\rangle = e^{i\beta}|\alpha, \beta\rangle.$$

Now we can repeat the same deduction in section 4.3. The commutator gives

$$T_2 T_1 = e^{-2i\theta} T_1 T_2; \quad T_3 T_4 = e^{-2i\theta} T_4 T_3$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_1(T_2|\alpha, \beta\rangle) &= e^{2i\theta} T_2 T_1 |\alpha, \beta\rangle = e^{2i\theta} e^{i\alpha} (T_2|\alpha, \beta\rangle) \\ T_4(T_3|\alpha, \beta\rangle) &= e^{2i\theta} T_3 T_4 |\alpha, \beta\rangle = e^{2i\theta} e^{i\beta} (T_3|\alpha, \beta\rangle). \end{aligned}$$

Now, for  $T_2$  we have  $m$  basis states:

$$|\alpha, \beta\rangle, |\alpha + 2\pi p/m, \beta\rangle, \dots, |\alpha + 2\pi(m-1)p/m, \beta\rangle.$$

However, this time, each state of these is a new "generator" for  $T_3$ , for example

$$|\alpha + 2\pi p/m, \beta\rangle \rightarrow |\alpha + 2\pi p/m, \beta + 2\pi p/m\rangle \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |\alpha + 2\pi p/m, \beta + 2\pi(m-1)p/m\rangle.$$

So there are totally  $m^2$  basis states for a genus 2 surface. For genus  $g$  surface, the GSD is  $m^g$ .



## Chapter 5

# Chern-Simons Theory Basics

### 5.1 Polyakov Representation of the Linking Number

Consider a link made of two strands,  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ . Consider the double line integral

$$\Phi(L_1, L_2) = \frac{\epsilon_{ijk}}{4\pi} \oint_{L_1} dx^i \oint_{L_2} dy^j \frac{x^k - y^k}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^3}$$

- (a) Show that  $\Phi$  is equal to the phase accumulated by letting a unit of flux run along one strand, and moving a unit charged particle along the path of the other strand.
- (b) Show that the resulting phase is the topological invariant known as the linking number - the number of times one strand wraps around the other, see section 2.6.2.

This integral representation of linking was known to Gauss.

**Answer** (a) According to the text, the path integral of the system is given by:

$$Z = \sum_{\text{paths } \{\mathbf{x}(t)\}} \int \mathcal{D}a_\mu \exp \left( \frac{i}{\hbar} S_{CS} + \frac{iq}{\hbar} \int d\ell^\alpha a_\alpha \right).$$

Integrate out  $a_\mu$ , we get a phase

$$\sum_{\text{paths } \{\mathbf{x}(t)\}} e^{iS_0/\hbar} e^{i\theta W(\text{paths})}.$$

We want to prove that

$$2\pi\Phi(L_1, L_2) \propto \theta W(L_1, L_2).$$

In this case, the path dependent terms is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int \mathcal{D}a_\mu \exp \left[ \frac{i}{\hbar} \oint_{L_1} d\ell_1^\alpha a_\alpha \right] \exp \left[ \frac{i}{\hbar} \oint_{L_2} d\ell_2^\alpha a_\alpha \right] e^{iS_{CS}/\hbar}. \\ &\equiv \int \mathcal{D}a_\mu W_1 W_2 e^{iS_{CS}/\hbar}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $W_1, W_2$  denote the Wilson loop. The EOM we have got in the text is

$$j^\alpha = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \partial_\beta a_\gamma.$$

In Lorenz gauge, the solution is obtained in classical electrodynamics:

$$a_\alpha(x) = \int d^3y \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{\partial^\beta j^\gamma(y)}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|}.$$

In this case, the flux is

$$j_a^\alpha = \oint_{L_a} dx_a^\alpha \delta(x - x_a(t)),$$

then

$$a_\alpha(x) = \sum_{a=1}^2 \oint_{L_a} dx_a^\beta \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \frac{(x - x_a)^\rho}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_a|^3}.$$

Therefore, the phase is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \langle W_1 W_2 \rangle \\ &= \exp(i S_{CS}[a_\alpha(x)]) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{i}{2\hbar} \oint_{L_1} dx^i \oint_{L_2} dy^j \epsilon_{ijk} \frac{x^k - y^k}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^3}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{\hbar} \Phi(L_1, L_2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

(b) Consider this two strands case. Using Stokes' theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \oint_{L_1} dx^i \oint_{L_2} dy^j \epsilon_{ijk} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_k} \left( \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \oint_{L_1} dx^i \int_{\Sigma(L_2)} d^2y_i \nabla^2 \left( \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|} \right) \\ &= \oint_{L_1} dx^i \int_{\Sigma(L_2)} d^2y_i \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\Sigma(L_2)$  is an arbitrary surface bounded by  $L_2$ . Using the limit definition of  $\delta$  function:

$$\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_\epsilon(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{(2\pi\epsilon)^{3/2}} e^{-(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})^2/\epsilon}.$$

Parameterize the  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  region, we have

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_{L_1} dx^i(t) \epsilon_{ijk} n^j \dot{n}^k,$$


where

$$\dot{n}^i = \frac{dn^i}{dt},$$

and  $n^i$  is the normal vector along the surface  $\Sigma(L_2)$ . Note here the integral is equal to  $d\mathbf{x} \cdot (\mathbf{n} \times \dot{\mathbf{n}})$ , which means the volume of the parallelepiped spanned by  $d\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{n}, \dot{\mathbf{n}}$ , as Fig.5.1 shows.

Therefore due to  $\mathbf{n} \perp \dot{\mathbf{n}}$  in this two loop case, we have

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_{L_1} \epsilon d\theta = \epsilon,$$

Figure 5.1: The geometric meaning of  $\Phi$ .

where  $\epsilon = 1$  or  $-1$  depend on the relative direction whether  $d\mathbf{x}$  is in the same direction as  $\mathbf{n} \times \dot{\mathbf{n}}$ . In the case of Fig. 5.1,  $\epsilon = 1$  according to the right handed rule. This is exactly the definition using the sign of the crossing:  $(\epsilon(L_1) + \epsilon(L_2))/2$ .

For the prove in the general case, you can refer to [RN11].

## 5.2 Gauge Transforming the Chern-Simons Action

Make the gauge transform Eq. 5.13 on the Chern-Simons action 5.9 and show that it results in the change 5.15. Note that there will be an additional term that shows up which is a total derivative and will therefore vanish when integrated over the whole manifold  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Answer** We first give the transformation rule of the general Chern-Simons action. Under the gauge transformation:

$$da_\mu \rightarrow d(U^{-1}dU + U^{-1}a_\mu U) = dU^{-1} \wedge dU + dU^{-1} \wedge a_\mu U + U^{-1}da_\mu U - U^{-1}a_\mu \wedge dU.$$

Using  $dU^{-1} = -U^{-1}dU \wedge U^{-1}$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} da_\mu &\rightarrow -U^{-1}dU \wedge U^{-1} \wedge dU - U^{-1}dU \wedge U^{-1} \wedge a_\mu U + U^{-1}da_\mu U - U^{-1}a_\mu \wedge dU \\ &= -U^{-1}dU \wedge a_\mu + U^{-1}da_\mu U - U^{-1}a_\mu \wedge dU. \end{aligned}$$

Under this transformation, consider the difference

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{tr}(a'_\mu \wedge da'_\mu) - \text{tr}(a_\mu \wedge da_\mu) \\ &\rightarrow \text{tr}[(U^{-1}dU + U^{-1}a_\mu U) \wedge (-U^{-1}dU \wedge a_\mu + U^{-1}da_\mu U - U^{-1}a_\mu \wedge dU) - a_\mu \wedge da_\mu] \\ &= \text{tr}[-(U^{-1}dU)^2 \wedge a'_\mu - U^{-1}a_\mu U \wedge U^{-1}dU \wedge a'_\mu + U^{-1}dU \wedge U^{-1}da_\mu U + U^{-1}a_\mu U \wedge U^{-1}da_\mu U \\ &\quad - U^{-1}dU \wedge U^{-1}a_\mu U \wedge U^{-1}dU - U^{-1}a_\mu U \wedge U^{-1}a_\mu U \wedge U^{-1}dU - a_\mu \wedge da_\mu] \\ &= \text{tr}[-(U^{-1}dU)^2 \wedge (a'_\mu + U^{-1}a_\mu U) - U^{-1}a_\mu U \wedge U^{-1}dU \wedge (a'_\mu + U^{-1}a_\mu U) + U^{-1}dU \wedge U^{-1}da_\mu U]. \end{aligned}$$

The second term gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{2}{3} \text{tr}(a'_\mu{}^3 - a_\mu^3) \\
&= \frac{2}{3} \text{tr}[(U^{-1}dU + U^{-1}a_\mu U)^3 - a_\mu^3] \\
&= \text{tr} \left[ \frac{2}{3} (U^{-1}dU)^3 + 2(U^{-1}dU)^2 \wedge U^{-1}a_\mu U + 2U^{-1}dU \wedge (U^{-1}a_\mu U)^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

So the two terms gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{tr} \left( a'_\mu \wedge da'_\mu + \frac{2}{3} a'_\mu{}^3 \right) - \text{tr} \left( a_\mu \wedge da_\mu + \frac{2}{3} a_\mu^3 \right) \\
&= \text{tr} \left\{ \frac{2}{3} (U^{-1}dU)^3 + (U^{-1}dU)^2 \wedge (U^{-1}a_\mu U - a'_\mu) - U^{-1}a_\mu U \wedge U^{-1}dU \wedge (U^{-1}a_\mu U - a'_\mu) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + U^{-1}dU \wedge U^{-1}da_\mu U \right\} \\
&= -\frac{1}{3} \text{tr}(U^{-1}dU)^3 + \text{tr} [U^{-1}dU \wedge (U^{-1}da_\mu U - U^{-1}dU \wedge U^{-1}a_\mu U)] \\
&= -\frac{1}{3} \text{tr}(U^{-1}dU)^3 + \text{tr} [d(U^{-1}a_\mu U \wedge U^{-1}dU)].
\end{aligned}$$

So we have:

$$S_{CS} \rightarrow S_{CS} + \frac{k}{4\pi} \int_M d \text{tr}(U^{-1}a_\mu U \wedge U^{-1}dU) - \frac{k}{12\pi} \int_M \text{tr}((U^{-1}dU)^3). \quad (5.1)$$

Now, we can specify that  $M = S^3$ , therefore, the second term vanishes because  $S^3$  is closed. Then we consider the third term. Suppose  $G = SU(2) \cong S^3$ , then we consider a function  $U : S^3 \rightarrow S^3$ :

$$(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \mapsto (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4).$$

Then we can use complex numbers  $z = x_1 + ix_2, w = x_3 + ix_4$  to characterize them. We can see  $U$  can be expressed as:

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} z & -w \\ \bar{w} & \bar{z} \end{pmatrix}, |z|^2 + |w|^2 = 1.$$

Noting that  $\mu = U^{-1}dU$  is the Maurer-Cartan form and  $\text{tr}(\mu \wedge \mu \wedge \mu)/6$  is the left-invariant volume form of  $SU(2)$ , so the third term is propotional to the mapping degree of  $U$ , which indicate that it is an integer! Now let's start our proof.

The Maurer-Cartan form  $U^{-1}dU$  can be parametrized as:

$$U^{-1}dU = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{z}dz + wd\bar{z} & -\bar{z}dw + wd\bar{z} \\ -\bar{w}dz + zd\bar{w} & \bar{w}dw + zd\bar{z} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The condition  $|z|^2 + |w|^2 = 1$  gives

$$\bar{w}dw + zd\bar{z} = -(\bar{z}dz + wd\bar{w}).$$

If we call the basis  $T^i \equiv \sigma^i/2$ , and call  $\alpha \equiv -\bar{z}dw + wd\bar{z}$ , then we have:

$$U^{-1}dU = (\alpha - \bar{\alpha})T^1 + i(\alpha + \bar{\alpha})T^2 + 2(\bar{z}dz + wd\bar{w})T^3 \equiv a_i T^i \in \mathfrak{su}(2),$$

which means the Maurer-Cartan form  $U^{-1}dU$  is an element of  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$  Lie algebra. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{tr}(U^{-1}dU)^3 &= a^a \wedge a^b \wedge a^c \mathrm{tr}(T^a T^b T^c) \\
&= a^a \wedge a^b \wedge a^c \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{tr}([T^a, T^b] + \{T^a, T^b\})T^c \\
&= \frac{1}{2} a^a \wedge a^b \wedge a^c \mathrm{tr} \left[ \left( i\epsilon^{abc} T^d + \frac{\delta^{ab}}{2} \right) T^c \right] \\
&= \frac{i}{2} \epsilon^{abd} a^a \wedge a^b \wedge a^c = \frac{3i}{2} a^1 \wedge a^2 \wedge a^3.
\end{aligned}$$

In terms of  $z$  and  $w$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{tr}(U^{-1}dU)^3 &= \frac{3i}{2} (\alpha - \bar{\alpha}) \wedge i(\alpha + \bar{\alpha}) \wedge 2(\bar{z}dz + wd\bar{w}) \\
&= 6(wd\bar{z} - \bar{z}dw) \wedge (zd\bar{w} - \bar{w}dz) \wedge (\bar{z}dz + wd\bar{w}) \\
&= 6(wd\bar{z} \wedge d\bar{w} \wedge dz + \bar{z}dw \wedge dz \wedge d\bar{w}) \\
&\stackrel{\substack{z=x_1+ix_2 \\ w=x_3+ix_4}}{=} -12i[(x_3 + ix_4)dx_1 \wedge dx_2 \wedge (dx_3 - idx_4) - (x_1 - ix_2)dx_3 \wedge dx_4 \wedge (dx_1 + idx_2)] \\
&= 12 \sum_{i=1}^4 (-1)^i x_i dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_4 \\
&\quad -12i[dx_1 \wedge dx_2 \wedge (x_3 dx_3 + x_4 dx_4) - (x_1 dx_1 + x_2 dx_2) \wedge dx_3 \wedge dx_4].
\end{aligned}$$

But use

$$|z|^2 + |w|^2 = 1 \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^4 x_i dx_i = 0 \Rightarrow x_1 dx_1 + x_2 dx_2 = -(x_3 dx_3 + x_4 dx_4),$$

which means

$$\mathrm{tr}(U^{-1}dU)^3 = 12 \sum_{i=1}^4 (-1)^i x_i dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{dx}_i \cdots \wedge dx_4 = 12U^* \tilde{\omega}.$$

Where  $\tilde{\omega}$  is the volume form of  $S^3$ ,  $U^*$  is the pull back of  $U$ . So according to the definition of mapping degree:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{k}{12\pi} \int_{S^3} \mathrm{tr}(U^{-1}dU)^3 &= \frac{k}{\pi} \int_{S^3} U^* \tilde{\omega} \\
&= \frac{k}{\pi} \deg U \cdot \int_{S^3} \tilde{\omega} \\
&= \frac{k}{\pi} \deg U \int_{D^4} 4dy^1 \wedge dy^2 \wedge dy^3 \wedge dy^4 \\
&= 2\pi k \deg U.
\end{aligned}$$

Call  $\deg U = \nu \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we finally arrive our goal:

$$S_{CS} \rightarrow S_{CS} + 2\pi\nu k.$$

Furthermore, we can argue that the level  $k$  **must** be an integer in order for the partition function to be well-defined. Because  $a'_\mu$  and  $a_\mu$  are connected by the **gauge** transformation, which means the partition function should not change:

$$e^{iS[a_\mu]} \stackrel{!}{=} e^{iS[a'_\mu]} \Rightarrow S[a_\mu] = S[a'_\mu] + 2k\pi, k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

This gives  $k \cdot \deg U \in \mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow k \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

### 5.3 Winding Numbers of Groups in Manifolds

Consider the mapping of  $U(x) \in SU(2) \rightarrow S^3$ . Construct an example of a map with winding number  $n$  for arbitrary  $n$ . I.e., find a representative of each group element of  $\Pi_3(SU(2))$  (See note 17).

**Answer** Let's construct a kind of famous map: the hedgehog ansatz. This is a map with spherical symmetry:

$$U_H(r) = \exp(iF(r)\hat{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \in SU(2),$$

Here  $F(r)$  is an arbitrary function about  $r$ . In nucleon theory, this ansatz correspond to the pion field with spherical symmetry:

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}(r) = F_\pi F(r)\hat{\mathbf{r}},$$

as the Fig.5.2 shows, so this map is called the hedgehog ansatz.




Figure 5.2: The hedgehog ansatz, the figure shows the diagram presentation of  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  field, the length of the arrow is proportional to  $F(r)$ .

Now we try to determine the boundary condition of  $F(r)$ . We know  $SU(2) \cong S^3 = \mathbb{R}^3 \cup \{\infty\}$ , we can set  $U(|\mathbf{x}| \rightarrow \infty) = \mathbb{1}$  (this means the field becomes vacuum at the infinity physically), then we have

$$F(\infty) = 0.$$

We can then expand  $U_H$ :

$$U_H(r) = \cos F(r) \mathbb{1} + i \sin F(r) \hat{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma},$$

which means  $F$  is actually the azimuthal angle of the group space. At the origin, our field cannot have any ‘out-pointing’ component, due to continuity. Therefore, our boundary condition must impose that  $\sin F(0) = 0$ , which implies

$$F(0) = n\pi, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

With these two boundary condition, we can actually calculate the topological charge, i.e. the additional term in the gauge transformation (5.1) of  $S_{CS}$ :

$$\mathcal{B} \equiv \text{tr}((U^{-1}dU)^3) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2 r^2} F'(r) \sin^2(F(r)),$$

and the integration gives:

$$\begin{aligned} B[U_H] &\equiv \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \epsilon_{ijk} \int d^3x \text{tr}((U^{-1}dU)^3) \\ &= -\frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty F'(r) \sin^2 F dr \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sin 2F - F \right] \Big|_{r=0}^{r \rightarrow \infty} = n \in \mathbb{Z}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Of course, we can also use the geometry method to compute  $B$ . Note that  $S^3$  can be parameterized by three angles  $(F, \Theta, \Phi)$ , and  $B$  is the winding number of the map, which means we just need to pull back the normalized volume element on  $S^3$  to the real space. The volume form of  $S^3$  in  $\mathbb{R}^4$  is given by

$$d\Omega = \sin^2 F \sin \Theta dF \wedge d\Theta \wedge d\Phi,$$

and the integration gives

$$\int d\Omega = \int_0^\pi \sin^2 F dF \int_0^\pi \sin \Theta d\Theta \int_0^{2\pi} d\Phi = 2\pi^2,$$

i.e. the normalized volume form is

$$d\hat{\Omega} = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \sin^2 F \sin \Theta dF \wedge d\Theta \wedge d\Phi.$$

Then we define the pull back to be:

$$\begin{cases} F \rightarrow F(r) \Rightarrow dF = F' dr \\ \Theta \rightarrow \theta \\ \Phi \rightarrow \phi, \end{cases},$$

then the integral in real space equals to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\tilde{\Omega} = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int_{\infty}^0 F' \sin^2 F dr \int_0^{\pi} \sin \theta d\theta \int_0^{2\pi} d\Phi,$$

which will also give (5.2).

## 5.4 Quantization of Winding Number

Let us consider the manifold  $S^3$  which we consider as  $\mathbb{R}^3$  plus a point at infinity. Consider the gauge transform function defined

$$U(\mathbf{x}) = \exp \left( \frac{i\pi N \mathbf{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{x}|^2 + R^2}} \right)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  is a point in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  represents the Pauli matrices with  $R$  an arbitrary length scale. Show the winding number Eq. 5.16 gives the integer  $N$ . Why does  $N$  need to be an integer here?

**Answer** We can just repeat our calculation in our last calculation again. To throw away  $N$ , we consider  $B[U_1 U_2]$ . Write it down:

$$B[U_1 U_2] = \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \epsilon_{ijk} \int d^3x \operatorname{tr}(U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger \partial_i (U_1 U_2) \partial_j (U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger) \partial_k (U_1 U_2)).$$

where we have used the identity  $(U_1 U_2)^\dagger \equiv U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger$ . (Noting that  $U$  is unitary, we can use  $U^\dagger$  instead of  $U^{-1}$ ). Expanding the traced part out yields

$$\begin{aligned} & U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger (\partial_i U_1) U_2 (\partial_j U_2^\dagger) U_1^\dagger (\partial_k U_1) U_2 && \text{term 1} \\ & + U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger (\partial_i U_1) U_2 (\partial_j U_2^\dagger) U_1^\dagger \textcolor{red}{U_1 (\partial_k U_2)} && \text{term 2} \\ & + \cancel{U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger (\partial_i U_1) U_2 U_2^\dagger (\partial_j U_1^\dagger) (\partial_k U_1) U_2} && B[U_1] \\ & + U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger (\partial_i U_1) U_2 U_2^\dagger (\partial_j U_1^\dagger) U_1 (\partial_k U_2) && \text{term 4} \\ & + U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger \textcolor{red}{U_1 (\partial_i U_2) (\partial_j U_2^\dagger) U_1^\dagger (\partial_k U_1) U_2} && \text{term 5} \\ & + U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger \cancel{U_1 (\partial_i U_2) (\partial_j U_2^\dagger) U_1^\dagger U_1 (\partial_k U_2)} && B[U_2] \\ & + U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger U_1 (\partial_i U_2) U_2^\dagger (\partial_j U_1^\dagger) (\partial_k U_1) U_2 && \text{term 7} \\ & + U_2^\dagger U_1^\dagger U_1 (\partial_i U_2) U_2^\dagger (\partial_j U_1^\dagger) \textcolor{red}{U_1 (\partial_k U_2)}. && \text{term 8} \end{aligned}$$

Now we can integrate by part, for example, the red term in term 2 gives  $U_1 (\partial_k U_2) \rightarrow -(\partial_k U_1) U_2$ , which cancels term 1. Similarly, term 7 cancels term 8. Finally, in term 5 we can integrate by parts three times, which cancels term 4. Which means we have the additive property

$$B[U_1 U_2] = B[U_1] + B[U_2].$$

Then we can see

$$B[U(\mathbf{x})] = B[U_1(\mathbf{x})^N] = N B[U_1(\mathbf{x})],$$



where

$$U_1(\mathbf{x}) = \exp\left(\frac{i\pi\mathbf{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{x}|^2 + R^2}}\right).$$

Then we try to compute  $B[U_1]$ . Expand first:

$$U_1(\mathbf{x}) = \cos\left(\frac{i\pi|\mathbf{x}|}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{x}|^2 + R^2}}\right) \mathbb{1} + i \sin\left(\frac{i\pi|\mathbf{x}|}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{x}|^2 + R^2}}\right) \mathbf{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}.$$

Where  $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{x}/|\mathbf{x}|$ . We also embed the base space  $S^3$  into  $\mathbb{R}^4$  like before, while this time, we can use the coordinate

$$y^0 \equiv \cos\left(\frac{i\pi|\mathbf{x}|}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{x}|^2 + R^2}}\right), \quad \mathbf{y} = \sin\left(\frac{i\pi|\mathbf{x}|}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{x}|^2 + R^2}}\right) \mathbf{n}.$$

Then

$$U_1 \equiv y^0 \mathbb{1} + \mathbf{y} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma},$$

with the condition  $(y^0)^2 + \mathbf{y}^2 = 1$ . The winding number clearly doesn't depend on the coordinate, we can use the point  $y^0 = 1$ , i.e. the north pole to evaluate  $B$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}[U_1] &= \text{tr}((U_1^{-1} dU_1)^3) = \text{tr}[(i d\mathbf{y} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})^3] \\ &= i^3 3! \text{tr}(\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_3) dy^1 \wedge dy^2 \wedge dy^3 \\ &= 12 dy^1 \wedge dy^2 \wedge dy^3. \end{aligned}$$

Then the integration over  $\mathbb{R}^3$  gives

$$B[U_1] = \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \times 12 \times 2\pi^2 = 1.$$

Finally, we can see

$$B[U(\mathbf{x})] = NB[U_1] = N.$$

Besides, at the infinity, we have

$$U(\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \infty) = \exp(i\pi N \mathbf{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}),$$

which should be independent of  $\mathbf{n}$  (or more physically,  $U \rightarrow \mathbb{1}$ ), which means  $\sin(N\pi) = 0$ , thus  $N$  must be an integer.



## Chapter 6

# Short Digression on Quantum Gravity



## Chapter 7

# Defining Topological Quantum Field Theory



## Part II

# Anyon Basics





## Chapter 8

# Fusion and Structure of Hilbert Space

### 8.1 Quantum Dimension

Let  $N_{ab}^c$  be the fusion multiplicity matrices of a TQFT

$$a \times b = \sum_c N_{ab}^c c$$

meaning that  $N_{ab}^c$  is the number of distinct ways that  $a$  and  $b$  can fuse to  $c$ . (In many, or even most, theories of interest all  $N$ 's are either 0 or 1).

The quantum dimension  $d_a$  of a particle  $a$  is defined as the largest eigenvalue of the matrix  $[N_a]_b^c$  where this is now thought of as a two dimensional matrix with  $a$  fixed and  $b, c$  the indices.

Show that

$$d_a d_b = \sum_c N_{ab}^c d_c.$$


We will prove this formula algebraically in Chapter 17. However there is a simple and much more physical way to get to the result: Imagine fusing together  $M$  anyons of type  $a$  and  $M$  anyons of type  $b$  where  $M$  gets very large and determine the dimension of space that results. Then imagine fusing together  $a \times b$  and do this  $M$  times and then fuse together all the results.

**Answer** We first consider the fusion of  $M$  anyons of type  $a$ , as the Fig.8.1 shows. Suppose the final result is  $a_{M-1}$ , then the dimension of fusing  $M$  anyons of type  $a$  to get  $a_f$  is:

$$\dim(a_{M-1}) = \sum_{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{M-2}} N_{aa}^{a_1} N_{a_1 a}^{a_2} \dots N_{a_{M-2} a}^{a_{M-1}} = [(N_a)^{M-1}]_a^{a_{M-1}}.$$

Similarly, the fusion of  $M$  anyons of type  $b$  gives

$$\dim(b_{M-1}) = [(N_b)^{M-1}]_b^{b_{M-1}}.$$

Figure 8.1: Fusion of  $M$  anyons of type  $a$ .

Then the fusion of  $a_{M-1}$  and  $b_{M-1}$  gives


$$\dim(a_{M-1} \times b_{M-1}) = \sum_{a_{M-1} b_{M-1}} [(N_b)^{M-1}]_b^{b_{M-1}} [(N_a)^{M-1}]_a^{a_{M-1}} N_{a_{M-1} b_{M-1}}^{c_{M-1}}.$$

In large  $M$  limit, we have

$$\dim(a_{M-1} \times b_{M-1}) \sim (d_b d_a)^{M-1}.$$

However, if we fuse  $a, b$  first to give  $c$ , then fuse  $M$  anyons of type  $c$ , as the Fig.8.2 shows, we get

$$\dim(c_{M-1}) = [(N_{ab}^c N_c)^{M-1}]_c^{c_{M-1}} N_{ab}^c \sim (N_{ab}^c d_c)^{M-1} = \dim(a_{M-1} \times b_{M-1}).$$

Figure 8.2: Fuse  $a, b$  first to give  $c$ , then fuse  $M$  anyons of type  $c$ .

So we have

$$d_a d_b = \sum_c N_{ab}^c d_c.$$

## 8.2 Fusion and Ground State Degeneracy

To determine the ground state degeneracy of a 2-manifold in a  $2 + 1$  dimensional TQFT one can cut the manifold into pieces and sew back together. One can think of the open "edges" or connecting tube-ends as each having a label given by one of the particle types (i.e., one of the anyons) of the theory. Really we are labeling each edge with a basis element of a possible Hilbert space. The labels on two tubes that have been connected together must match (label  $a$  on one

tube fits into label  $\bar{a}$  on another tube.) To calculate the ground state degeneracy we must keep track of all possible ways that these assembled tubes could have been labeled. For example, when we assemble a torus as in Fig.8.3, we must match the quantum number on one open end to the (opposite) quantum number on the opposite open end. The ground state degeneracy is then just the number of different possible labels, or equivalently the number of different particle types.




Figure 8.3: Surgering the twice punctured sphere into a torus. This is the gluing axiom in action. Note that we are implicitly assuming the system is trivial in the “time” direction, which we assume to form a circle  $S^1_{\text{time}}$ .

For more complicated 2-d manifolds, we can decompose the manifold into so-called pants diagrams that look like Fig.8.4. When we sew together pants diagrams, we should include a factor of the fusions multiplicity  $N_{ab}^c$  for each pants which has its three tube edges labeled with  $a, b$  and  $\bar{c}$ .




Figure 8.4: A three-times punctured sphere is known as a “pair of pants”.

- Write a general formula for the ground state degeneracy of an  $M$ -handled torus in terms of the  $N$  matrices.
- For the Fibonacci anyon model, find the ground state degeneracy of a 4-handled torus.
- Show that in the limit of large number of handles  $M$  the ground state degeneracy scales as  $\sim \mathcal{D}^{2M}$  where  $\mathcal{D}^2 = \sum_a d_a^2$ .

**Answer**

### 8.3 Consistency of Fusion Rules

Show by using commutativity and associativity of fusion along with identity (8.1)

$$N_{ab}^c = N_{\bar{a}\bar{b}}^{\bar{c}}, \quad (8.1)$$

that no anyon theory can have a particle  $a$  such that  $a \times a = a$  meaning  $a$  fuses to  $a$  to form only  $a$  and nothing else.

**Answer** Suppose there is a theory that  $a \times a = a$  and  $a \neq I$ , then consider the process of fusing  $a, a$  and  $\bar{a}$ . We can simply, we can set the fusion rule between  $a, \bar{a}$  is

$$a \times \bar{a} = I + c_1 + \cdots + c_n. \quad (8.2)$$

As the Fig.8.5 shows, if we fuse  $a \times a = a$  first, then fuse  $a \times \bar{a}$ , we will get  $I + c_1 + \cdots + c_n$  finally. However, if we change the order of fusion, fuse  $a \times \bar{a}$  first and get  $I + c_1 + \cdots + c_n$ , then fuse  $a$ , we will get

$$a \times \bar{a} = a + a \times c_1 + \cdots + a \times c_n.$$




Figure 8.5: The fusion of  $a, a, \bar{a}$ .

In order to get the same result, we know that  $\{a, a \times c_1, \cdots, a \times c_n\}$  must be a permutation of  $\{I, c_1, \cdots, c_n\}$ , which means  $a \times c_i$  **cannot have multiple fusion channels** because each fusion channel have at least one result. Furthermore, in first case, we have  $I$  in the final result, so  $\exists i$ , s.t.  $c_i = \bar{a}$ . Now the rule that  $a \times c_i$  cannot have multiple fusion channel contradicts with (8.2), so no anyon theory can have a particle  $a$  such that  $a \times a = a$ .

## Chapter 9

# Change of Basis and $F$ -Matrices

### 9.1 $F$ -gauge choice

- (a) Explain why in the Fibonacci theory,  $[F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau}$  is gauge independent but  $[F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{I\tau}$  is gauge dependent.
- (b) Explain why in the Ising theory is  $[F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma}$  is gauge independent, but  $[F_\psi^{\sigma\psi\sigma}]_{\sigma\sigma}$  is gauge dependent.

**Answer** (a) In Fibonacci theory, consider the process  $\tau, \tau, \tau$  fuse to  $\tau$ . We have:

$$\begin{pmatrix} |0\rangle \\ |1\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{II} & [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{I\tau} \\ [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} & [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |0'\rangle \\ |1'\rangle \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau & \tau & \tau \\ & \diagdown & \diagup \\ & I & \\ & \diagup & \diagdown \\ \tau & & \end{array} = |0\rangle, \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \tau & \tau & \tau \\ & \diagdown & \diagup \\ & \tau & \\ & \diagup & \diagdown \\ \tau & & \end{array} = |1\rangle.$$

Now we consider a gauge transformation on the vertices. According to the transformation rule of  $F$ , if the on one vertex, the gauge transformation is given by:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a & b & \\ & \diagdown & \diagup \\ & c & \end{array} = u_c^{ab} \begin{array}{ccc} a & \sim b & \\ & \diagdown & \diagup \\ & c & \end{array},$$

then

$$[\tilde{F}_e^{abc}]_{df} = \frac{u_e^{af} u_f^{bc}}{u_d^{ab} u_e^{dc}} [F_e^{abc}]_{df}.$$

Also note that if one of the upper legs is the identity, we typically do not allow a gauge transform of this type of vertex, i.e.

$$u_\tau^{I\tau} = 1.$$

Then

$$[\tilde{F}_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} = \frac{u_\tau^{\tau\tau} u_\tau^{\tau\tau}}{u_\tau^{\tau\tau} u_\tau^{\tau\tau}} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} = [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau},$$

which means  $[F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau}$  is gauge independent. But for

$$[\tilde{F}_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{I\tau} = \frac{u_\tau^{\tau\tau} u_\tau^{\tau\tau}}{u_I^{\tau\tau} u_\tau^{\tau\tau}} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{I\tau} = u_\tau^{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{I\tau},$$

which means  $[F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{I\tau}$  is gauge dependent.

(b) For Ising, the case is the same:

$$[\tilde{F}_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma} = \frac{u_\sigma^{\psi\sigma} u_\sigma^{\sigma\psi}}{u_\sigma^{\psi\sigma} u_\sigma^{\sigma\psi}} [F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma} = [F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma},$$

which means  $[F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma}$  is gauge independent. While

$$[\tilde{F}_\psi^{\sigma\psi\sigma}]_{\sigma\sigma} = \frac{u_\psi^{\sigma\sigma} u_\sigma^{\psi\sigma}}{u_\sigma^{\sigma\psi} u_\psi^{\sigma\sigma}} [F_\psi^{\sigma\psi\sigma}]_{\sigma\sigma} = \frac{u_\sigma^{\psi\sigma}}{u_\sigma^{\sigma\psi}} [F_\psi^{\sigma\psi\sigma}]_{\sigma\sigma},$$

which means  $[F_\psi^{\sigma\psi\sigma}]_{\sigma\sigma}$  is gauge dependent. Note that  $u_c^{ab} \neq u_c^{ba}$  in general.


## 9.2 $F$ 's with the vacuum field $I$

Explain why  $[F_e^{aIc}]_{ac} = [F_d^{abI}]_{db} = [F_e^{Ibc}]_{be} = 1$ .

**Answer** We first prove  $[F_e^{aIc}]_{ac}$  is gauge invariant:

$$[\tilde{F}_e^{aIc}]_{ac} = \frac{u_e^{ac} u_c^{Ic}}{u_a^{aI} u_e^{ac}} [F_e^{aIc}]_{ac} = [F_e^{aIc}]_{ac}.$$

Then draw the tree:



we can see the identity can be omitted, which means they are actually the same process, namely

$$[F_e^{aIc}]_{ac} = 1.$$

For  $[F_d^{abI}]_{db}$ ,  $[F_e^{Ibc}]_{be}$ , the argument is the same.

### 9.3 Ising Pentagon

Consider a system of Ising anyons. Given the fusion rules,  $F_w^{xyz}$  will be a 2 by 2 matrix in the case of  $x = y = z = w = \sigma$  (given by Eq. 9.4) and is simply a scalar otherwise. One might hope that these scalars can all be taken to be unity. Unfortunately this is not the case. By examining the pentagon equation, Eq. 9.7 in the case of  $a = b = c = \sigma$  and  $d = f = \psi$  show that taking the scalar to always be unity is not consistent. Show further that choosing  $[F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma} = -1$  (and leaving the other scalars to be unity) allows a consistent solution of the pentagon for  $a = b = c = \sigma$  and  $d = f = \psi$ .

**Answer** We give the pentagon identity:

$$[F_e^{fcd}]_{gl}[F_e^{abl}]_{fk} = \sum_h [F_g^{abc}]_{fh}[F_e^{ahd}]_{gk}[F_k^{bcd}]_{hl}.$$

with  $a = b = c = \sigma$  and  $d = f = \psi$ , we have:

$$[F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma} \cdot [F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{\psi k} = \sum_h [F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{\psi h}[F_\sigma^{\sigma h\psi}]_{\sigma k}[F_k^{\sigma\sigma\psi}]_{h\sigma}.$$

However, for process  $F_\sigma^{\sigma h\psi}$ , we must have  $h = \psi$  because if  $h = \sigma$ ,  $\sigma \times \sigma = I + \psi$ , while  $(I + \psi) \times \psi$  cannot give  $\sigma$ . So

$$[F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma} \cdot [F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{\psi k} = [F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{\psi\psi}[F_\sigma^{\sigma\psi\psi}]_{\sigma k}[F_k^{\sigma\sigma\psi}]_{\psi\sigma}.$$

For the term  $F_\sigma^{\sigma\psi\psi}$ , the only possible  $k$  is  $k = I$  because  $\psi \times \psi = I$ . In this case:

$$\text{LHS} = [F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma} \cdot [F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{\psi I} = [F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}},$$

while

$$\text{RHS} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot [F_\sigma^{\sigma\psi\psi}]_{\sigma I} \cdot [F_I^{\sigma\sigma\psi}]_{\psi\sigma}.$$

If we choose  $[F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma} = [F_\sigma^{\sigma\psi\psi}]_{\sigma I} = [F_I^{\sigma\sigma\psi}]_{\psi\sigma}$  (because  $F_I^{\sigma\sigma\psi}, F_\sigma^{\sigma\psi\psi}$  are also scalar), the equality cannot hold, which means that taking the scalar to always be unity is not consistent.

Now, if we leave the scalar  $F_I^{\sigma\sigma\psi}, F_\sigma^{\sigma\psi\psi}$  to be unity and choose  $[F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma} = -1$ , then

$$\text{LHS} = [F_\sigma^{\psi\sigma\psi}]_{\sigma\sigma} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}},$$

while

$$\text{RHS} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot [F_\sigma^{\sigma\psi\psi}]_{\sigma I} \cdot [F_I^{\sigma\sigma\psi}]_{\psi\sigma} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = \text{LHS},$$

which is consistent, thus allowing a consistent solution of the pentagon for  $a = b = c = \sigma$  and  $d = f = \psi$ .

## 9.4 Fibonacci Pentagon

In the Fibonacci anyon model, there are two particle types which are usually called  $I$  and  $\tau$ . The only nontrivial fusion rule is  $\tau \times \tau = I + \tau$ . With these fusion rules, the  $F$ -matrix is completely fixed up to a gauge freedom (corresponding to adding a phase to some of the kets). If we choose all elements of the  $F$ -matrix to be real, then the  $F$ -matrix is completely determined by the pentagon up to one sign (gauge) choice. Using the pentagon equation determine the  $F$ -matrix. (To get you started, note that in Fig. 9.7 the variables  $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h$  can only take values  $I$  and  $\tau$ . You only need to consider the cases where  $a, b, c, d$  are all  $\tau$ ).

If you are stuck as to how to start, part of the calculation is given in Nayak et al. [2008].

**Answer** Before we look at the pentagon identity, consider the only nontrivial matrix  $F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}$ :

$$F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau} = \begin{pmatrix} (F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau})_{II} & (F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau})_{I\tau} \\ (F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau})_{\tau I} & (F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau})_{\tau\tau} \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} F_{00} & F_{01} \\ F_{10} & F_{11} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can choose this basis transform to be unitary and real, i.e.

$$\begin{pmatrix} F_{00}^2 + F_{01}^2 & F_{00}F_{10} + F_{01}F_{11} \\ F_{10}F_{00} + F_{11}F_{01} & F_{10}^2 + F_{11}^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now we consider the case  $a = b = l = f = c = d = g = k = \tau$ , while  $e = I$ , this gives

$$[F_I^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} [F_I^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} = [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} [F_I^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} + [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} [F_I^{\tau I\tau}]_{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{I\tau}.$$

However, we know  $F_I^{\tau\tau\tau} = F_I^{\tau I\tau} = 1$  because in the second case, one of the upper indice is the identity. This gives

$$1 = F_{11}^2 + F_{10}F_{01}.$$

Now with

$$F_{10}^2 + F_{11}^2 = 1,$$

we have  $F_{10} = F_{01}$ , which means we also have

$$F_{00}^2 = F_{11}^2 = 1 - F_{01}^2.$$

Now we take  $a = b = c = d = \tau$ , and choose  $e = f = g = k = l = \tau$ , which gives

$$(F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau})^2 = (F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau})_{\tau\tau}^2 (F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau})_{\tau\tau} + (F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau})_{\tau I} (F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau})_{\tau\tau} (F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau})_{I\tau},$$

i.e.

$$F_{11}^2 = F_{11}^3 + F_{01}^2 = F_{11}^3 + 1 - F_{11}^2.$$

This equation have three roots:  $F_{11} = 1$ ,  $F_{11} = (\sqrt{5} + 1)/2$  or  $F_{11} = (-\sqrt{5} + 1)/2$ . According to the reality condition and  $F_{01}^2 = 1 - F_{11}^2$ , the second root is ruled out.



Finally we choose  $e = f = k = \tau$ , while  $g = l = I$ , we can see

$$F_{00} = F_{01}^2.$$

Now with  $F_{00}^2 = F_{11}^2$ , the root  $F_{11} = 1$  can be also excluded. So we finally have

$$F_{00} = -F_{11} = \frac{\sqrt{5} - 1}{2},$$

while  $F_{01} = F_{10} = F_{00}^{1/2}$  for one gauge, i.e.

$$F_{\tau}^{\tau\tau\tau} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{-1} & \phi^{-1/2} \\ \phi^{-1/2} & -\phi \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\phi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$  is the golden ratio.

## 9.5 Pentagon and Fusion Multiplicities

Consider the case of Appendix 9.5.3 where there are fusion multiplicities  $N_{ab}^c > 1$ . Write the generalization of the pentagon equation Eq. 9.7.

**Answer** With  $N_{ab}^c > 1$ , the  $F$  matrix between these three anyons are given by:

$$= \sum_{h, \alpha, \beta} [F_g^{abc}]_{(f\mu\nu)(h\alpha\beta)} [F_e^{ahd}]_{(g\beta)(k\beta)} [F_k^{bcd}]_{(h\alpha)(l\alpha)}.$$

Then the pentagon diagram looks like Fig.9.1.

Therefore, the new pentagon identity is now given by:

$$[F_e^{fcd}]_{(g\nu)(l\nu)} [F_e^{abl}]_{(f\mu\nu)(k\alpha\beta)} = \sum_h [F_g^{abc}]_{(f\mu\nu)(h\alpha\beta)} [F_e^{ahd}]_{(g\beta)(k\beta)} [F_k^{bcd}]_{(h\alpha)(l\alpha)}. \quad (9.1)$$

## 9.6 Gauge Change

- (a) (i) Confirm that the  $F$ -matrix transforms under gauge change as indicated in Eq. 9.8.
- (ii) Show that a solution of the pentagon equation remains a solution under any gauge transformation.
- (b) (Harder) Now consider the case of Appendix 9.5.3 where there are fusion multiplicities  $N_{ab}^c > 1$ .
  - (i) Analogous to (a.i) Confirm Eq. 9.9.
  - (ii) Analogous to (a.ii) show that a solution of the pentagon equation remains a solution under any gauge transformation. (You will need to solve problem 9.5 first!)




Figure 9.1: Pentagon Identity with fusion multiplicity.

**Answer** (a.i) Under gauge transformation

$$\begin{array}{c} a \quad b \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ c \end{array} = u_c^{ab} \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \sim \\ c \end{array},$$

the original tree transforms like:

$$\begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagup \\ d \quad e \end{array} \rightarrow u_d^{ab} u_e^{dc} \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagup \\ \sim \quad \sim \\ d \quad e \end{array},$$

$$\begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ f \quad e \end{array} \rightarrow u_f^{bc} u_e^{af} \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \sim \quad \sim \\ f \quad e \end{array}.$$

Therefore, the  $F$  matrix transforms like:

$$u_d^{ab} u_e^{dc} \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagup \\ d \quad e \end{array} = \sum_f [F_e^{abc}]_{df} u_f^{bc} u_e^{af} \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \sim \quad \sim \\ f \quad e \end{array},$$

Namely

$$[\tilde{F}_e^{abc}]_{df} = \frac{u_e^{af} u_f^{bc}}{u_d^{ab} u_e^{dc}} [F_e^{abc}]_{df}.$$

(a.ii) Under gauge transformation, the LHS of the pentagon identity transforms as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS} &= [F_e^{fcd}]_{gl} [F_e^{abl}]_{fk} \\ &\rightarrow [\tilde{F}_e^{fcd}]_{gl} [\tilde{F}_e^{abl}]_{fk} \\ &= \frac{u_e^{ak} u_k^{bl} u_l^{cd}}{u_f^{ab} u_g^{cf} u_e^{dg}} [F_e^{abl}]_{fk} [F_e^{cdf}]_{gl}, \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RHS} &= \sum_h [F_g^{abc}]_{fh} [F_e^{ahd}]_{gk} [F_k^{bcd}]_{hl} \\ &\rightarrow \sum_h \frac{u_e^{ak} u_k^{bl} u_l^{cd}}{u_f^{ab} u_g^{cf} u_e^{dg}} [F_g^{abc}]_{fh} [F_e^{adh}]_{gk} [F_k^{bcd}]_{hl}. \end{aligned}$$

We can see now  $\text{LHS} = \text{RHS}$ , which means a solution of the pentagon equation remains a solution under any gauge transformation.

(b.i) If there are fusion multiplicities  $N_{ab}^c > 1$ , the original tree transforms like:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagup \\ \mu \quad d \quad e \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \nu \end{array} &\rightarrow \sum_{\mu', \nu'} (u_d^{ab})_{\mu\mu'} (u_e^{dc})_{\nu\nu'} \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagup \\ \mu' \quad d \quad e \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \nu' \end{array}, \\ \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagup \\ e \quad f \quad \alpha \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \beta \end{array} &\rightarrow \sum_{\alpha', \beta'} (u_f^{bc})_{\alpha\alpha'} (u_e^{af})_{\beta\beta'} \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagup \\ e \quad f \quad \alpha' \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \beta' \end{array}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the  $F$  matrix transforms like:

$$\sum_{\mu', \nu'} (u_d^{ab})_{\mu\mu'} (u_e^{dc})_{\nu\nu'} \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagup \\ \mu' \quad d \quad e \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \nu' \end{array} = \sum_{f, \alpha', \beta'} [F_e^{abc}]_{(d\mu\nu)(f\alpha\beta)} (u_f^{bc})_{\alpha\alpha'} (u_e^{af})_{\beta\beta'} \begin{array}{c} a \quad b \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagup \\ e \quad f \quad \alpha' \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \beta' \end{array},$$

Namely

$$[\tilde{F}_e^{abc}]_{(d\mu'\nu')(f\alpha'\beta')} = \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \mu, \nu} ([u_d^{ab}]^{-1})_{\mu'\mu} ([u_e^{dc}]^{-1})_{\nu'\nu} [F_e^{abc}]_{(d\mu\nu)(f\alpha\beta)} [u_e^{af}]_{\beta\beta'} [u_f^{bc}]_{\alpha\alpha'}.$$

(b.ii) In this case, for pentagon identity (9.1) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS} &= [F_e^{fcd}]_{(g\nu)(l\nu)} [F_e^{abl}]_{(f\mu\nu)(k\alpha\beta)} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{(u_e^{ak})_{\beta\beta'} (u_k^{bl})_{\alpha\alpha'} u_l^{cd} (u_e^{fl})_{\nu\nu'}}{(u_f^{ab})_{\mu'\mu} (u_e^{fl})_{\nu'\nu} (u_g^{cf})_{\nu\nu'} u_e^{dg}} [F_e^{abl}]_{(f\mu'\nu')(k\alpha'\beta')} [F_e^{cdf}]_{(g\nu')(l\nu')} \\ &= \frac{(u_e^{ak})_{\beta\beta'} (u_k^{bl})_{\alpha\alpha'} u_l^{cd}}{(u_f^{ab})_{\mu'\mu} (u_g^{cf})_{\nu\nu'} u_e^{dg}} [F_e^{abl}]_{(f\mu'\nu')(k\alpha'\beta')} [F_e^{cdf}]_{(g\nu')(l\nu')}, \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{RHS} &= \sum_h [F_g^{abc}]_{(f\mu\nu)(h\alpha\beta)} [F_e^{ahd}]_{(g\beta)(k\beta)} [F_k^{bcd}]_{(h\alpha)(l\alpha)} \\
&\rightarrow \sum_h \frac{(u_g^{ah})_{\beta\beta'} (u_h^{bc})_{\alpha\alpha'} (u_e^{ak})_{\beta\beta'} u_k^{hd} (u_k^{bl})_{\alpha\alpha'} u_l^{cd}}{(u_f^{ab})_{\mu\mu'} (u_g^{cf})_{\nu\nu'} u_e^{dg} (u_g^{ah})_{\beta\beta'} (u_h^{bc})_{\alpha\alpha'} u_k^{dh}} [F_g^{abc}]_{(f\mu\nu)(h\alpha\beta)} [F_e^{ahd}]_{(g\beta)(k\beta)} [F_k^{bcd}]_{(h\alpha)(l\alpha)} \\
&= \sum_h \frac{(u_e^{ak})_{\beta\beta'} (u_k^{bl})_{\alpha\alpha'} u_l^{cd}}{(u_f^{ab})_{\mu\mu'} (u_g^{cf})_{\nu\nu'} u_e^{dg}} [F_g^{abc}]_{(f\mu\nu)(h\alpha\beta)} [F_e^{ahd}]_{(g\beta)(k\beta)} [F_k^{bcd}]_{(h\alpha)(l\alpha)} = \text{LHS}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the multiplicity index, you can refer to Fig.9.1. Therefore, a solution of the pentagon equation with multiplicity remains a solution under any gauge transformation.

## 9.7 Ising $F$ -matrix

[Hard] As discussed in the earlier problem, “Ising Anyons and Majorana Fermions” (Ex, 3.3), one can express Ising anyons in terms of Majorana fermions which are operators  $\gamma_i$  with anticommutations  $\{\gamma_i, \gamma_j\} = 2\delta_{ij}$ . As discussed there we can choose any two Majoranas and construct a fermion operator

$$c_{12}^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1 + i\gamma_2)$$

then the corresponding fermion orbital can be either filled or empty. We might write this as  $|0_{12}\rangle = c_{12}|1_{12}\rangle$  and  $|1_{12}\rangle = c_{12}^\dagger|0_{12}\rangle$ . The subscript 12 here meaning that we have made the orbital out of Majoranas number 1 and 2. Note however, that we have to be careful that  $|0_{12}\rangle = e^{i\phi}|1_{21}\rangle$  where  $\phi$  is a gauge choice which is arbitrary (think about this if it is not obvious already).

Let us consider a system of 4 Majoranas,  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4$ . Consider the basis of states

$$\begin{aligned}
|a\rangle &= |0_{12}0_{34}\rangle \\
|b\rangle &= |0_{12}1_{34}\rangle \\
|c\rangle &= |1_{12}0_{34}\rangle \\
|d\rangle &= |1_{12}1_{34}\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

rewrite these states in terms of basis of states

$$\begin{aligned}
|a'\rangle &= |0_{41}0_{23}\rangle \\
|b'\rangle &= |0_{41}1_{23}\rangle \\
|c'\rangle &= |1_{41}0_{23}\rangle \\
|d'\rangle &= |1_{41}1_{23}\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Hence determine the  $F$ -matrix for Ising anyons. Be cautious about fermionic anticommutations:  $c_x^\dagger c_y^\dagger = -c_y^\dagger c_x^\dagger$  so if we define  $|1_x 1_y\rangle = c_x^\dagger c_y^\dagger |0_x 0_y\rangle$  with the convention that  $|0_x 0_y\rangle = |0_y 0_x\rangle$  then we will have  $|1_x 1_y\rangle = -|1_y 1_x\rangle$ . Note also that you have to make a gauge choice of some phases (analogous to the mentioned gauge choice above). You can choose  $F$  to be always real.

**Answer**



## Chapter 10

# Exchanging Identical Particles

### 10.1 Calculating Exchanges

- (a) Use Eq. 10.1 to confirm Eq. 10.11
- (b) Use Eq. 10.1 to confirm Eq. 10.7
- (c) Confirm the braiding relation  $\hat{\sigma}_1 \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1 = \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1 \hat{\sigma}_2$  in both cases. What does this identity mean geometrically. See exercise 3.1.

**Answer** (a) Eq.10.1 is given by:

$$\hat{\sigma}_2 |c; f\rangle = \sum_{g,z} [F_f^{aaa}]_{cg} R_g^{aa} [(F_f^{aaa})^{-1}]_{gz} |z; f\rangle.$$

For Ising anyons, the  $F$  matrix is given by:

$$F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = [F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]^{-1},$$

and the  $R$  matrix is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} R_I^{\sigma\sigma} &= e^{-i\pi/8}, \\ R_{\psi}^{\sigma\sigma} &= e^{i3\pi/8}. \end{aligned}$$

So we have directly

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma}_2 |I; \sigma\rangle &= \sum_g ([F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{Ig} R_g^{\sigma\sigma} [(F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma})^{-1}]_{gI} |I; \sigma\rangle + [F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{Ig} R_g^{\sigma\sigma} [(F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma})^{-1}]_{g\psi} |\psi; \sigma\rangle) \\ &= ([F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{II} R_I^{\sigma\sigma} [(F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma})^{-1}]_{II} + [F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{I\psi} R_{\psi}^{\sigma\sigma} [(F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma})^{-1}]_{\psi I}) |I; \sigma\rangle \\ &\quad + ([F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{II} R_I^{\sigma\sigma} [(F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma})^{-1}]_{I\psi} + [F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{I\psi} R_{\psi}^{\sigma\sigma} [(F_{\sigma}^{\sigma\sigma\sigma})^{-1}]_{\psi\psi}) |\psi; \sigma\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (e^{-i\pi/8} + e^{i3\pi/8}) |I; \sigma\rangle + \frac{1}{2} (e^{-i\pi/8} - e^{i3\pi/8}) |\psi; \sigma\rangle \\ &= \frac{e^{i\pi/8}}{\sqrt{2}} (|I; \sigma\rangle - i |\psi; \sigma\rangle). \end{aligned}$$

For the second basis vector this is the same:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}_2|\psi; \sigma\rangle &= \sum_g ([F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{\psi g} R_g^{\sigma\sigma} [(F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma})^{-1}]_{gI} |I; \sigma\rangle + [F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma}]_{\psi g} R_g^{\sigma\sigma} [(F_\sigma^{\sigma\sigma\sigma})^{-1}]_{g\psi} |\psi; \sigma\rangle) \\ &= \frac{e^{i\pi/8}}{\sqrt{2}} (-i|I; \sigma\rangle + |\psi; \sigma\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\hat{\sigma}_2 \begin{pmatrix} |I; \sigma\rangle \\ |\psi; \sigma\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \frac{e^{i\pi/8}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ -i & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |I; \sigma\rangle \\ |\psi; \sigma\rangle \end{pmatrix},$$

i.e.

$$\hat{\sigma}_2 = \frac{e^{i\pi/8}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ -i & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

(b) For Fibonacci Anyons, the non-trivial  $F$  matrix is given by:

$$F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{-1} & \phi^{-1/2} \\ \phi^{-1/2} & -\phi^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]^{-1}.$$

For  $|0\rangle = |I; \tau\rangle$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}_2|0\rangle &= (F_{00'} R_I^{\tau\tau} [F^{-1}]_{0'0} + F_{01'} R_\tau^{\tau\tau} [F^{-1}]_{10})|0\rangle \\ &\quad + (F_{00'} R_I^{\tau\tau} [F^{-1}]_{0'1} + F_{01'} R_\tau^{\tau\tau} [F^{-1}]_{1'1})|1\rangle \\ &= \phi^{-1} e^{4\pi i/5} |0\rangle + \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} |1\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

and for  $|1\rangle = |\tau; \tau\rangle$ , the procedure is the same:

$$\hat{\sigma}_2|1\rangle = \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} |0\rangle - \phi^{-1} |1\rangle.$$

For the single state  $|N\rangle = |\tau; I\rangle$ , the  $F$  matrix is just a number, which means

$$\hat{\sigma}_2|N\rangle = R_\tau^{\tau\tau}|N\rangle = e^{3\pi i/5}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\hat{\sigma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{3\pi i/5} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \phi^{-1} e^{4\pi i/5} & \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} \\ 0 & \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} & -\phi^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

(c) In first case:

$$\hat{\sigma}_1 \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1 = \frac{e^{-i\pi/8}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1 \hat{\sigma}_2.$$

In the second case

$$\hat{\sigma}_1 \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\pi i/5} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\phi^{-1} e^{\pi i/5} & \phi^{-1/2} \phi^{-4\pi i/5} \\ 0 & \phi^{-1/2} \phi^{-4\pi i/5} & \phi^{-1} e^{i\pi/5} \end{pmatrix} = \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1 \hat{\sigma}_2.$$

Geometrically, this means the Yang-Baxter Equation.



## 10.2 Ising Anyons Redux

In exercise 3.3 we introduced a representation for the exchange matrices for Ising anyons which, for three anyons, would be of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}_1 &= \frac{e^{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}(1 + \gamma_1\gamma_2) \\ \hat{\sigma}_2 &= \frac{e^{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}(1 + \gamma_2\gamma_3)\end{aligned}$$

where the  $\gamma$  's are Majorana operators defined by

$$\{\gamma_i, \gamma_j\} \equiv \gamma_i\gamma_j + \gamma_j\gamma_i = 2\delta_{ij}$$

with  $\gamma_i = \gamma_i^\dagger$ .

Show that the exchange matrices in Eq. 10.11 are equivalent to this representation. How does one represent the  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  state of the Hilbert space in this language? The answer may not be unique.

**Answer** In this case, we first write

$$\hat{\sigma}_1 = e^{-i\pi/8} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix} = e^{i\pi/8} e^{-i\pi/4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix} = \frac{e^{i\pi/8}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1-i & 0 \\ 0 & i+1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we have directly  $\alpha = \pi/8$  and

$$\gamma_1\gamma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma_2\gamma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For example, if we take

$$\gamma_1 = \sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma_2 = -\sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma_3 = \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

we can the the result. In this case, the creation operator is

$$c_{12}^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1 + i\gamma_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and we have:

$$\begin{aligned}c_{12}^\dagger|0\rangle &= |1\rangle \\ c_{12}^\dagger|1\rangle &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

## 10.3 Exchanging More Particles

- Consider a system of 4 identical Ising anyons. Use the  $F$  - and  $R$ -matrices to calculate the braid matrices  $\hat{\sigma}_1, \hat{\sigma}_2$ , and  $\hat{\sigma}_3$ . (You should be able to check your answer using the Majorana representation of exercise 3.3.)
- (Harder) Consider a system of 4 identical Fibonacci anyons. Use the  $F$  and  $R$ -matrices to calculate the braid matrices  $\hat{\sigma}_1, \hat{\sigma}_2$ , and  $\hat{\sigma}_3$ .

**Answer** (a) For four  $\sigma$  anyons, we have two kinds of results:  $I$  or  $\psi$ . Each type have two possibilities, for example we have  $|0; \psi\rangle \equiv |I; \psi\rangle$  and  $|1; \psi\rangle = |\psi; \psi\rangle$ , as the Fig.10.1 shows.






Figure 10.1: Fusing channel of four identical Ising anyons.


We just need to figure out the effect of  $\hat{\sigma}_3$ . Take  $|0; \psi\rangle$  as example, we first change into basis that the third  $\sigma$  and fourth  $\sigma$  fuse first:



Then braiding gives



For the second case:



Then braiding gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\sigma}_3 \begin{array}{c} \sigma \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \psi \quad \sigma \quad \psi \end{array} &= [F_{\psi}^{\psi\sigma\sigma}]_{\sigma I} R_I^{\sigma\sigma} \begin{array}{c} \sigma \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \psi \quad \psi \quad I \end{array} \\
 &= e^{-i\pi/8} \begin{array}{c} \sigma \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \quad \sigma \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \psi \quad \sigma \quad \psi \end{array}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This means we have

$$\hat{\sigma}_3 \begin{pmatrix} |0; \psi\rangle \\ |1; \psi\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{3\pi i/8} |0; \psi\rangle \\ e^{-i\pi/8} |1; \psi\rangle \end{pmatrix},$$

i.e.

$$\hat{\sigma}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{3\pi i/8} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\pi/8} \end{pmatrix}.$$

If we try  $|0; I\rangle, |1; I\rangle$ , we will get the same result. In Majorana representation, we can see

$$\hat{\sigma}_3 = \frac{e^{i\pi/8}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1+i & 0 \\ 0 & 1-i \end{pmatrix} = \frac{e^{i\pi/8}}{\sqrt{2}} (1 + \gamma_3 \gamma_4),$$

with  $\gamma_3 = \sigma_3$ , we have

$$\gamma_4 = \begin{pmatrix} i & \\ & i \end{pmatrix},$$

which satisfies the condition  $\{\gamma_i, \gamma_j\} = 2\delta_{ij}$ . So for the full space, in the order  $|0; I\rangle, |1; I\rangle, |0; \psi\rangle, |1; \psi\rangle$ , we have

$$\hat{\sigma}_{1,\text{full}} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_1 & \\ & \hat{\sigma}_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_{2,\text{full}} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_2 & \\ & \hat{\sigma}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_{3,\text{full}} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_3 & \\ & \hat{\sigma}_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

(b) With four  $\tau$ , we have 5 possibilities, as the Fig.10.2 shows.

We look at the simpler, final state  $I$  first. Call

$$|0; I\rangle \equiv \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ I \quad \tau \quad I \end{array}, \quad |1; I\rangle \equiv \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad I \end{array}.$$

For  $\hat{\sigma}_1$ , it is trivial:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\sigma}_1 |0; I\rangle &= R_I^{\tau\tau} |0; I\rangle = e^{-4\pi i/5} |0; I\rangle, \\
 \hat{\sigma}_1 |1; I\rangle &= R_{\tau}^{\tau\tau} |1; I\rangle = e^{3\pi i/5}.
 \end{aligned}$$




Figure 10.2: Fusing channel of four identical Fibonacci anyons.

So

$$\hat{\sigma}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-4\pi i/5} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{3\pi i/5} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For  $\hat{\sigma}_2$ , it is same as the original one, i.e.

$$\hat{\sigma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{-1}e^{4\pi i/5} & \phi^{-1/2}e^{-3\pi i/5} \\ \phi^{-1/2}e^{-3\pi i/5} & -\phi^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For  $\hat{\sigma}_3$ :

$$\hat{\sigma}_3|0; I\rangle = \hat{\sigma}_3 F_I^{I\tau\tau} \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ I \quad I \quad I \quad I \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ I \end{array} = R_I^{\tau\tau}|0; I\rangle = e^{-4\pi i/5}|0; I\rangle,$$

while

$$\hat{\sigma}_3|1; I\rangle = \hat{\sigma}_3 F_I^{\tau\tau\tau\tau} \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ I \quad I \quad I \quad I \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ I \end{array} = R_I^{\tau\tau}|0; I\rangle = e^{3\pi i/5}|0; I\rangle.$$

So

$$\hat{\sigma}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-4\pi i/5} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{3\pi i/5} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now we consider the subspace with final result  $\tau$ . We call

$$\begin{aligned}
 |0; \tau\rangle &\equiv \text{diagram with 4 blue lines, all labeled } \tau, \text{ crossing twice} \\
 |-1; \tau\rangle &\equiv \text{diagram with 4 blue lines, all labeled } \tau, \text{ crossing twice, with a dotted line labeled } I \text{ on the left} \\
 |1; \tau\rangle &\equiv \text{diagram with 4 blue lines, all labeled } \tau, \text{ crossing twice, with a dotted line labeled } I \text{ on the right}
 \end{aligned}$$

Then for  $\hat{\sigma}_1$ , the result is trivial, i.e.

$$\hat{\sigma}_1 \begin{pmatrix} |-1; \tau\rangle \\ |0; \tau\rangle \\ |1; \tau\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} R_I^{\tau\tau} |-1; \tau\rangle \\ R_\tau^{\tau\tau} |0; \tau\rangle \\ R_\tau^{\tau\tau} |1; \tau\rangle \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \hat{\sigma}_1 = \text{diag}(e^{-4\pi i/5}, e^{3\pi i/5}, e^{3\pi i/5}).$$

For  $\hat{\sigma}_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\sigma}_2 |0; \tau\rangle &= ([F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} R_\tau^{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} + [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} R_I^{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{I\tau}) |0; \tau\rangle \\
 &\quad + ([F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} R_\tau^{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} + [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} R_I^{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{II}) |-1; \tau\rangle \\
 &= -\phi^{-1} |0; \tau\rangle + \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} |-1; \tau\rangle.
 \end{aligned}$$

This is same as the case with two  $\tau$ s, so we also have

$$\hat{\sigma}_2 |-1; \tau\rangle = \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} |0; \tau\rangle + \phi^{-1} e^{4\pi i/5} |1; \tau\rangle.$$

For  $|1; \tau\rangle$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\sigma}_2 |1; \tau\rangle &= \hat{\sigma}_2 F_I^{\tau\tau\tau} \text{ (diagram with } I \text{ on the right)} \\
 &= R_\tau^{\tau\tau} \text{ (diagram with } I \text{ on the left)} \\
 &= e^{3\pi i/5} |1; \tau\rangle.
 \end{aligned}$$

So for  $\hat{\sigma}_2$ , the result is same as  $|N\rangle, |0\rangle, |1\rangle$ , i.e. in order  $|-1; \tau\rangle, |0; \tau\rangle, |1; \tau\rangle$ ,  $\hat{\sigma}_2$  is given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{-1} e^{4\pi i/5} & \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} & 0 \\ \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} & -\phi^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{3\pi i/5} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now we look at  $\hat{\sigma}_3$ . Same process gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\sigma}_3|0;\tau\rangle &= \hat{\sigma}_3 \left( \begin{array}{cc} \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \end{array} & + [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \text{---} \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \end{array} \end{array} \right) \\
&= [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} R_\tau^{\tau\tau} \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \end{array} + [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} R_I^{\tau\tau} \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \text{---} \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \end{array} \\
&= [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} R_\tau^{\tau\tau} \left( \begin{array}{cc} \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \end{array} & + [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \text{---} \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \end{array} \end{array} \right) \\
&\quad + [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} R_I^{\tau\tau} \left( \begin{array}{cc} \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \end{array} & + [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{II} \begin{array}{c} \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \text{---} \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \quad \tau \end{array} \end{array} \right) \\
&= ([F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} R_\tau^{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} + [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} R_I^{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{I\tau}) |0;\tau\rangle \\
&\quad + ([F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau\tau} R_\tau^{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} + [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{\tau I} R_I^{\tau\tau} [F_\tau^{\tau\tau\tau}]_{II}) |1;\tau\rangle \\
&= -\phi^{-1} |0;\tau\rangle + \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} |1;\tau\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Which change  $|-1;\tau\rangle$  to  $|1;\tau\rangle$  just as in  $\hat{\sigma}_2$  case. We can directly write:

$$\hat{\sigma}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{3\pi i/5} & & \\ & -\phi^{-1} & \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} \\ & \phi^{-1/2} e^{-3\pi i/5} & \phi^{-1} e^{4\pi i/5} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, in the order  $|0;I\rangle, |1;I\rangle, |-1;\tau\rangle, |0;\tau\rangle, |1;\tau\rangle$ , the braid matrices are

$$\hat{\sigma}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-4\pi i/5} & & & & \\ & e^{3\pi i/5} & & & \\ & & e^{-4\pi i/5} & & \\ & & & e^{3\pi i/5} & \\ & & & & e^{3\pi i/5} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\sigma}_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{-1}e^{4\pi i/5} & \phi^{-1/2}e^{-3\pi i/5} & & & \\ \phi^{-1/2}e^{-3\pi i/5} & -\phi^{-1} & & & \\ & & \phi^{-1}e^{4\pi i/5} & \phi^{-1/2}e^{-3\pi i/5} & \\ & & \phi^{-1/2}e^{-3\pi i/5} & -\phi^{-1} & \\ & & & & e^{3\pi i/5} \end{pmatrix}, \\
\hat{\sigma}_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{-4\pi i/5} & & & & \\ & e^{3\pi i/5} & & & \\ & & e^{3\pi i/5} & & \\ & & & -\phi^{-1} & \phi^{-1/2}e^{-3\pi i/5} \\ & & & \phi^{-1/2}e^{-3\pi i/5} & \phi^{-1}e^{4\pi i/5} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{10.1}
\end{aligned}$$

## 10.4 Determinant and Trace of Braid Matrices

Consider a system of  $N$ -identical anyons with a total Hilbert space dimension  $D$ . The braid matrix  $\hat{\sigma}_1, \hat{\sigma}_2, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{N-1}$  are all  $D$ -dimensional. Show that each of these matrices has the same determinant, and each of these matrices has the same trace. Hint: This is easy if you think about it right!

**Answer** For the determinant, we just use the defining relation

$$\det(\hat{\sigma}_1 \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1) = \det(\hat{\sigma}_1)^2 \cdot \det(\hat{\sigma}_2) = \det(\hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1 \hat{\sigma}_2) = \det(\hat{\sigma}_1) \cdot \det(\hat{\sigma}_2)^2,$$

which means

$$\det \hat{\sigma}_1 = \det \hat{\sigma}_2 = \dots.$$

For the trace, say  $\hat{\sigma}_i$  which braids  $a_i, a_{i+1}$ , we can use the  $F$  matrix to change the basis that  $a_i$  and  $a_{i+1}$  fuse directly together, apply  $\hat{\sigma}_i$ , then use  $F^{-1}$  to change the basis back. Note that this is actually a similarity transformation, which preserves trace, we know that

$$\text{tr}(\hat{\sigma}_i) = \sum_c m_c^i R_c^{aa},$$

where  $m_c^i$  is the multiplicity of  $c$  appears in the diagrams. Now the important thing is that, the braiding between  $c$  and  $a_1$  only involves a factor:

$$\begin{array}{c} a_1 \dots a_i \quad a_{i+1} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \quad c \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \dots \end{array} \propto \begin{array}{c} a_i \quad a_{i+1} \dots a_1 \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \quad c \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \dots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} a_1 \quad a_2 \dots a_{i+1} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \quad c \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \dots \end{array},$$

which means  $m_c^i = m_c^1$ , so

$$\text{tr}(\hat{\sigma}_i) = \text{tr}(\hat{\sigma}_1) = \dots.$$

## 10.5 Checking the locality constraint

(Easy) Consider Fig.10.3 The braid on the left can be written as  $\hat{b}_3 = \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1^2 \hat{\sigma}_2$ .

- (a) For the Fibonacci theory with  $a = \tau$  check that the matrix  $\hat{b}_3$  gives just a phase, which is dependent on the fusion channel  $c$ . I.e., show the matrix  $\hat{b}_3$  is a diagonal matrix of complex phases. Show further that these phases are the same as the phase that would be accumulated for taking a single  $\tau$  particle around the particle  $c$ .
- (b) Consider the same braid for the Ising theory with  $a = \sigma$ . Show again that the result is a  $c$ -dependent phase.




Figure 10.3: The locality constraint of  $a, a, a$ .




Figure 10.4: The locality constraint of  $a, a, a, a$ .

(Hard) Consider the braid shown on the left of Fig.10.4. The braid can be written as  $\hat{b}_4 = \hat{\sigma}_3 \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1^2 \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_3$ .

- (c) Consider Ising anyons where  $a = \sigma$ , Use the  $F$  and  $R$ -matrices to calculate  $\hat{\sigma}_3$  (See exercise 10.3.a). Since the fusion of three  $\sigma$  anyons always gives  $c = \sigma$ , calculate  $\hat{b}_4$ , show this is a phase times the identity matrix, and show that the phase matches the phase of taking a single  $\sigma$  all the way around another  $\sigma$ .
- (d) Consider Fibonacci anyons with  $a = \tau$ , Use the  $F$  and  $R$ -matrices to calculate  $\hat{\sigma}_3$ . (See exercise 10.3.b). Check that  $\hat{b}_4$  is a diagonal matrix of phases. Check the phases match the two possible phases accumulated by wrapping a single  $\tau$  all the way around a single particle  $c$  which can be  $I$  or  $\tau$ .



**Answer** (a) For Fibonacci anyons, these two braiding operators are given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{3\pi i/5} & & \\ & e^{-4\pi i/5} & \\ & & e^{3\pi i/5} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{3\pi i/5} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \phi^{-1}e^{4\pi i/5} & \phi^{-1/2}e^{-3\pi i/5} \\ 0 & \phi^{-1/2}e^{-3\pi i/5} & -\phi^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Direct calculation gives

$$\hat{b}_3 = \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1^2 \hat{\sigma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i/5} & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & e^{-4\pi i/5} \end{pmatrix},$$

which is a diagonal matrix of complex phases. Note that in this process,  $c$  only have two possibilities, i.e.  $I, \tau$ , and the final result  $f$  corresponds  $I, \tau$ , we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{b}_3|N\rangle &= (R_I^{c\tau})^2 = (R_I^{\tau\tau})^2 = e^{-8\pi i/5} = e^{2\pi i/5}, \\ \hat{b}_3|0\rangle &= (R_\tau^{c\tau})^2 = (R_\tau^{I\tau})^2 = 1, \\ \hat{b}_3|1\rangle &= (R_\tau^{c\tau})^2 = (R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2 = e^{6\pi i/5} = e^{-4\pi i/5}. \end{aligned}$$

So these phases are the same as the phase that would be accumulated for taking a single  $\tau$  particle around the particle  $c$ .

(b) For Ising anyons, the two braiding operators are given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_1 = e^{-i\pi/8} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_2 = \frac{e^{i\pi/8}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ -i & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Direct calculation gives

$$\hat{b}_3 = \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1^2 \hat{\sigma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \\ & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Which indicates that actually  $(R_\sigma^{\psi\sigma})^2 = \hat{b}_3|1\rangle = -1$ .

(c) For Ising anyons, we have already calculate that

$$\hat{\sigma}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{3\pi i/8} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\pi/8} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\hat{b}_4 = \hat{\sigma}_3 \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1^2 \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_3 = e^{3\pi i/4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

which is a phase times the identity matrix. We know that four Ising anyons can only fusion to  $\psi$ , so the phase must equals to  $(R_\psi^{\sigma\sigma})^2 = (e^{3\pi i/8})^2 = e^{3\pi i/4}$ , which is exactly the case.

(d) According to our calculation result (10.1):

$$\hat{b}_4 = \hat{\sigma}_3 \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1^2 \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_3 = \text{diag}(e^{2\pi i/5}, e^{2\pi i/5}, e^{-4\pi i/5}, e^{-4\pi i/5}, 1).$$

This is actually the case:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{b}_4|0; I\rangle &= \hat{b}_4|1; I\rangle = (R_I^{\tau\tau})^2 = e^{2\pi i/5}, \\ \hat{b}_4|-1; I\rangle &= \hat{b}_4|0; I\rangle = (R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2 = e^{-4\pi i/5}, \\ \hat{b}_4|1; I\rangle &= (R_\tau^{I\tau})^2 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

## 10.6 Enforcing the locality constraint

The locality constraint shown in Fig.10.3 turns out to be extremely powerful. In this exercise we will use this constraint to (almost) derive the possible values for the  $R$ -matrix for Fibonacci anyons given the known  $F$ -matrix.

Consider an anyon theory with Fibonacci fusion rules and Fibonacci  $F$  matrix as in Eq. 9.2.

- (a) (Easy) Confirm the locality constraint shown in Fig.10.3 (see also Fig. 10.4) given the values of  $R$  given in Eq. 10.2. Make sure to confirm the equality for all three cases  $f = I, c = \tau$  and  $f = \tau, c = I$  and  $f = \tau, c = \tau$ .

Note that on the left of Fig. 10.16 is the braiding operation  $\hat{O} = \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1 \hat{\sigma}_1 \hat{\sigma}_2$ . whereas the operation on the right is  $\sigma^2$ .

- (b) Show that the locality constraint of Fig.10.3 would also be satisfied by

$$R_I^{\tau\tau} \rightarrow -R_I^{\tau\tau} \quad R_\tau^{\tau\tau} \rightarrow -R_\tau^{\tau\tau}$$

It will turn out (See \*\*\* below) that this additional solution is spurious, as there are other consistency conditions it does not satisfy.

- (c) In addition to right and left handed Fibonacci anyons and the two additional spurious solutions provided by Eq. 10.14, there are four additional possible sets of  $R$ -matrices that are consistent with the  $F$ -matrices of the Fibonacci theory given the locality constraint of Fig. 10.16. These additional solutions are all fairly trivial. Can you guess any of them?

If we cannot guess the additional possible  $R$ -matrices, we can derive them explicitly (and show that no others exist). Let us suppose that we do not know the values of the  $R$ -matrix elements  $R_I^{\tau\tau}$  and  $R_\tau^{\tau\tau}$ .

- (d) For the case of  $f = I$  and  $c = \tau$  show that Fig. 10.16 implies

$$[R_\tau^{\tau\tau}]^4 = [R_I^{\tau\tau}]^2$$

- (e) (Harder) For the case of  $f = \tau$  we have a two-dimensional Hilbert space spanned by the two values of  $c = I$  or  $c = \tau$ . Any linear operator on this Hilbert space should be a 2 by 2 matrix. Thus the locality constraint Eq. 10.16 is actually an equality of 2 by 2 matrices. Derive this equality.

- (f) Use this result, in combination with Eq. 10.15 to find all possible  $R$  matrices that satisfy the locality constraint. You should find a total of eight solutions. Six of these are spurious as we will see in section 13.3.

The calculation you have just done is equivalent to enforcing the so-called hexagon condition which we will discuss in section 13.3 below.

**Answer** (a) As we have checked before:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{b}_3|N\rangle &= (R_f^{c\tau})^2 = (R_I^{\tau\tau})^2 = e^{-8\pi i/5} = e^{2\pi i/5}, \\ \hat{b}_3|0\rangle &= (R_f^{c\tau})^2 = (R_\tau^{I\tau})^2 = 1, \\ \hat{b}_3|1\rangle &= (R_f^{c\tau})^2 = (R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2 = e^{6\pi i/5} = e^{-4\pi i/5},\end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$\hat{b}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i/5} & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & e^{-4\pi i/5} \end{pmatrix}.$$

(b) From the Fig.10.3, we can see that  $\tau$  braids around  $f$  twice, which means the result will always be  $(R_f^{c\tau})^2$ . So it is invariant under the transformation  $R_f^{c\tau} \rightarrow -R_f^{c\tau}$ .

(c) A fairly trivial guess is that


$$R_\tau^{I\tau} = R_\tau^{\tau I} = 1.$$

This can be checked by the hexagon identity using  $F_\tau^{\tau\tau I} = F_I^{\tau\tau\tau} = 1$ .

(d) We have already figure out that the right part of Fig.10.3 is:

$$\hat{b}_3|N\rangle = (R_I^{\tau\tau})^2.$$

While the left part of Fig.10.3 is

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}_2\hat{\sigma}_1\hat{\sigma}_1\hat{\sigma}_2|N\rangle &= \hat{\sigma}_2\hat{\sigma}_1\hat{\sigma}_1\hat{\sigma}_2 F_I^{\tau\tau\tau} \\ &= \hat{\sigma}_2\hat{\sigma}_1\hat{\sigma}_1 R_\tau^{\tau\tau} \\ &= R_\tau^{\tau\tau} \hat{\sigma}_2\hat{\sigma}_1\hat{\sigma}_1|N\rangle \\ &= (R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^3 \hat{\sigma}_2|N\rangle = (R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^4.\end{aligned}$$


So without knowing the exact value of  $R_\tau^{\tau\tau}$  and  $R_I^{\tau\tau}$ , we can give the relation  $(R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^4 = (R_I^{\tau\tau})^2$  directly from the locality constraints.

(e) Without knowing the exact value of  $R_I^{\tau\tau}, R_\tau^{\tau\tau}$ , we can just write

$$\hat{\sigma}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} R_I^{\tau\tau} & \\ & R_\tau^{\tau\tau} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{-2}R_I^{\tau\tau} + \phi^{-1}R_\tau^{\tau\tau} & \phi^{-3/2}(R_I^{\tau\tau} - R_\tau^{\tau\tau}) \\ \phi^{-3/2}(R_I^{\tau\tau} - R_\tau^{\tau\tau}) & \phi^{-1}R_I^{\tau\tau} + \phi^{-2}R_\tau^{\tau\tau} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We further know that with  $f = \tau, c = I, \tau$

$$\hat{b}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} (R_I^{\tau\tau})^2 & \\ & (R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2 \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{!}{=} \hat{\sigma}_2 \hat{\sigma}_1^2 \hat{\sigma}_2.$$

This gives three equations:

$$\begin{aligned}(R_I^{\tau\tau})^2 &= \frac{(R_I^{\tau\tau})^2(\phi R_\tau^{\tau\tau} + R_I^{\tau\tau})^2 + \phi(R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2(R_I^{\tau\tau} - R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2}{\phi^4}, \\ 0 &= \frac{(R_\tau^{\tau\tau} - R_I^{\tau\tau})(\phi(R_I^{\tau\tau})^2 R_\tau^{\tau\tau} + \phi R_I^{\tau\tau}(R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2 + (R_I^{\tau\tau})^3 + (R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^3)}{\phi^{7/2}}, \\ (R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2 &= \frac{\phi(R_I^{\tau\tau})^2(R_I^{\tau\tau} - R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2 + (R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2(\phi R_I^{\tau\tau} + R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2}{\phi^4}.\end{aligned}$$

(f) The second equation can be reduced to:

$$(R_I^{\tau\tau} - R_\tau^{\tau\tau})(R_I^{\tau\tau} + R_\tau^{\tau\tau})((R_I^{\tau\tau})^2 + \phi^{-1} R_I^{\tau\tau} R_\tau^{\tau\tau} + (R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^2) = 0.$$

We have solutions

$$\frac{R_I^{\tau\tau}}{R_\tau^{\tau\tau}} = \pm 1, e^{\pm 7\pi i/5}.$$

With  $(R_\tau^{\tau\tau})^4 = (R_I^{\tau\tau})^2$ , we have eight solutions

$$(R_I^{\tau\tau}, R_\tau^{\tau\tau}) = (\pm 1, \pm 1), (\pm 1, \mp 1), (e^{\pm i\pi/5}, e^{\mp 2\pi i/5}), (e^{\mp 4\pi i/5}, e^{\pm 3\pi i/5}).$$

We can plug these solutions into other two equation to examine these solutions are correct. The last two solutions are physical, which is the left and right handed Fibonacci anyons.

## Chapter 11

# Computing with Anyons

### 11.1 Ising Nonuniversality

The braiding matrices for Ising anyons are given by Eqs. 10.10 and 10.11. Demonstrate that any multiplication of these matrices, and their inverses will only produce a finite number of possible results. Thus conclude that Ising anyons are not universal for quantum computation. Hint: write the braiding matrices as  $e^{i\alpha}U_i$  where  $U_i$  is unitary with unit determinant, i.e., is an element of  $SU(2)$ . Then note that any  $SU(2)$  matrix can be thought of as a rotation  $\exp(i\hat{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}\theta/2)$  where here  $\theta$  is an angle of rotation  $\hat{n}$  is the axis of rotation and  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  is the vector of Pauli spin matrices.

**Answer** We are given that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}_1 &= e^{-i\pi/8} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix} = e^{i\pi/8} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\pi/4} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix} \equiv e^{i\pi/8} U_1, \\ \hat{\sigma}_2 &= \frac{e^{i\pi/8}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ -i & 1 \end{pmatrix} = e^{i\pi/8} \begin{pmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & -i/\sqrt{2} \\ -i/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix} \equiv e^{i\pi/8} U_2.\end{aligned}$$

Here  $\det U_1 = \det U_2 = 1$ . Now we can write  $U_1, U_2$  in the form of generators of  $SU(2)$ :

$$U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\pi/4} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix} = \exp(-i\pi\sigma_z/4),$$

and

$$U_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(-\pi/4) & i\sin(-\pi/4) \\ i\sin(-\pi/4) & \cos(-\pi/4) \end{pmatrix} = \exp(-i\pi\sigma_x/4).$$

Now we try to prove the group generated by  $U_1, U_2$  is finite. We can see

$$U_1 U_2 U_1^{-1} = U_3 \equiv \exp(-i\pi\sigma_y/4),$$

This is to say:

$$U_1 U_2 = U_3 U_1.$$

Now any element generated by  $U_1, U_2$  can be written in the form

$$U_2^m U_3^n U_1^k,$$

where  $0 \leq m, n, k \leq 8$ . For example:

$$U_1 U_2 U_1 = U_3 U_1^2, U_2^2 U_1 U_2 = U_2^2 U_3 U_1.$$

By listing all its elements, we can find it is a finite group of order 48. It has a normal subgroup [GAP22]

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -1+i & -1-i \\ 1-i & -1-i \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \cong SL(2, 3),$$

and

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \cong \mathbb{Q}_8,$$

and

$$\left\langle \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

Actually, the group generated by  $\langle U_1, U_2 \rangle$  is a generalization of the famous **Von Dyck group** [Sto20]. The general Von Dyck group is defined by the presentation:

$$D(l, m, n) = \langle x, y | x^l = y^m = (xy)^n = 1 \rangle.$$

This kind of group is **finite if and only if**

$$\frac{1}{l} + \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} > 1.$$

If we try to construct:

$$x \equiv U_1 U_2 U_1, \quad y \equiv U_1 U_2,$$

then we will find easily:

$$x^2 = y^3 = (xy)^4 = -\mathbb{1}_2.$$

The case  $D(2, 3, 4)$  is just  $S_4$ , and our group  $G \equiv \langle U_1, U_2 \rangle$  is actually the group extension of  $D(2, 3, 4)$ . We can construct the short exact sequence

$$\mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow G \rightarrow S_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{1},$$

which is a non-split exact sequence. As the presentation above shows, it can be considered as “double copy” of  $D(2, 3, 4) \cong S_4$ .

## 11.2 Brute Force Search

Given the braid matrices for Fibonacci anyons in Eq. 10.6 and 10.7, write a computer program for brute-force searching braids up to length 10.

Ignoring the noncomputational state  $|N\rangle$ , and ignoring the overall phase as usual, determine the closest approximation to the Hadamard gate

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Partial Answer: A braid of length 10 exists with phase-invariant distance to target  $\text{dist} \approx 0.084$

**Answer** After brute force search, the closest braiding is given by

$$U_1 = \hat{\sigma}_2^{-1} \hat{\sigma}_1^{-1} \hat{\sigma}_2^{-2} \hat{\sigma}_1^{-1} \hat{\sigma}_2^{-2} \hat{\sigma}_1^{-1} \hat{\sigma}_2^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.190983 + 0.587785i & 0.242934 + 0.747674i \\ 0.242934 + 0.747674i & -0.190983 - 0.587785i \end{pmatrix},$$

$$U_2 = \hat{\sigma}_2^{-1} \hat{\sigma}_2^{-3} \hat{\sigma}_1^{-1} \hat{\sigma}_2^{-1} \hat{\sigma}_1^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.190983 + 0.587785i & 0.242934 + 0.747674i \\ 0.242934 + 0.747674i & -0.190983 - 0.587785i \end{pmatrix}.$$

Their distances are given by:

$$\text{dist}(H, U_1) = \text{dist}(H, U_2) \approx 0.08421.$$

The mathematica code is given in the attached file.

## 11.3 Scaling of Kitaev-Solovay Algorithm

Given the discussion just above Eq. 11.8, prove Eqs. 11.8 and 11.9.

**Answer** Suppose we want to get a target gate  $U_{\text{target}}^{(0)}$ . Using brute-force search, we can get  $U_{\text{approx}}^{(0)}$  in  $t_0$  steps within the distance  $\epsilon_0$ . Then we define

$$U_{\text{target}}^{(1)} \equiv [U_{\text{approx}}^{(0)}]^{-1} U_{\text{target}}^{(0)},$$

which close to identity within distance  $\epsilon_0$ . With decomposition

$$U_{\text{target}}^{(1)} = VWV^{-1}W^{-1},$$

and  $W$  and  $V$  being unitary operations close to the identity within  $\epsilon_0^{1/2}$ , we can approximate  $U_{\text{target}}^{(0)}$  with accuracy  $\epsilon_0^{3/2}$ . Now the total length is  $5t_0$ , and by  $n$  iteration, the accuracy is

$$\epsilon = \epsilon_0^{(2/3)^n},$$

with length

$$t = 5^n t_0.$$

So for large  $n$ :

$$\ln[\log(1/\epsilon)]/\ln(3/2) \sim \ln(t)/\ln(5),$$

which means

$$t \sim \mathcal{O}\left(\log(1/\epsilon)^{\ln(5)/\ln(3/2)}\right).$$

For classical computation, the time consumed by  $n$  iteration is

$$T = 3^n T_0,$$

which means

$$T \sim \mathcal{O}\left(\log(1/\epsilon)^{\ln(3)/\ln(3/2)}\right).$$

## 11.4 About the Injection Weave

One might wonder why we choose to work with an injection weave in Fig. 11.11 which moves the red strand from the far right at the bottom all the way to the far left on the top. Show that for three Fibonacci anyons, there does not exist any injection weave that moves the (red) strand from the far right on the bottom to the middle on the top, even up to an overall phase. I.e., show that no weave exists starting on the bottom far left ending in the middle on the top whose effect on the three dimensional Hilbert space is  $e^{i\phi}\mathbb{1}_{3\times 3}$  for any phase  $\phi$ .

**Answer** Suppose such operation exists, i.e. exists any injection weave that moves the red strand from the far right on the bottom to the middle on the top, which equals to  $U = e^{i\phi}\mathbb{1}_3$ . Assume  $\hat{\sigma}_1$  appears  $m$  times in the  $U$  ( $\hat{\sigma}_1^{-1}$  contributes  $-1$  to  $m$ ) and  $\hat{\sigma}_2$  appears  $n$  times in the sequence. Note that for  $|N\rangle$ , the braiding matrix is block-diagonal, which means

$$\exp(3(m+n)\pi i/5) = \exp(i\phi),$$

i.e.

$$\phi = 3(m+n)\pi/5 + 2k\pi.$$

We can take det of eq  $U = e^{i\phi}\mathbb{1}_3$ , using  $\det \hat{\sigma}_1 = \det \hat{\sigma}_2 = e^{2\pi i/5}$ , we will have

$$\exp(2(m+n)\pi i/5) = \exp(3i\phi),$$

i.e.

$$3\phi = 2(m+n)\pi i/5 + 2k'\pi.$$

Combine two equations:

$$m+n = \frac{10}{7}(k' - 3k).$$

However, note that if  $m+n$  is an integer, it must be even according to this formula, but our operation is an odd permutation, which means  $m+n$  should be odd, contradicts. So such injection weave doesn't exist.



## 11.5 Universal Weaving and the Injection Weave

Consider injection weaves as described in Fig. 11.11. Let us assume that we can construct an injection weave of arbitrary precision. Given such an (approximately) perfect injection weave show that for any number of anyons  $N > 3$ , a weave can be constructed that performs the same unitary operation on the Hilbert space as any given braid. A more general mathematical proof of the universality of weaving is also given in Simon et al. [2006].

**Answer** Suppose there are  $N$  anyons, as the Fig. 11.1 shows.




Figure 11.1:  $N$  anyons with number 1 to  $N$ .

Any braiding can be generated by  $\hat{\sigma}_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N - 1$ . Suppose we want to perform  $\hat{\sigma}_i$ , we can view strand  $i + 2$  to  $N - 1$  as a single strand  $c$  according to locality. Then we perform the injection weave between  $i + 1, c$  and  $N$ , as the Fig. 11.2 shows. After that, we do  $\hat{\sigma}_i$  between  $i$  and the red line. Finally, we view strand  $i + 2$  (blue) to  $N$  (green) as a single strand  $c'$  and perform the inverse injection. This is a weave and has the effect of  $\hat{\sigma}_i$  purely.




Figure 11.2: The method to realize  $\hat{\sigma}_i$ , where  $1 \leq i < N - 1$ .

For  $i < N - 1$ , this scheme applies to every  $i$ , however, when  $i = N - 1$ , things gets different, we should use the scheme as the Fig. 11.3 shows.

Now that we can realize every  $\hat{\sigma}_i$ , we have proven that a weave can be constructed that performs the same unitary operation on the Hilbert space as any given braid.




Figure 11.3: The method to realize  $\hat{\sigma}_{N-1}$ .

## Part III

# Anyon Diagrammatics (in detail)




# Chapter 12

## Planar Diagrams


### 12.1 Evaluating diagrams with $F$ -matrices

Evaluate the following diagram, writing the result in terms of  $F$  's.



**Answer** Direct computation gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Diagram} = \text{Diagram} = [F_b^{a\bar{a}\bar{b}}]_{Ic} \text{Diagram} \\
 & = [F_b^{a\bar{a}\bar{b}}]_{Ic} [F_I^{\bar{b}f\bar{g}}]_{gb} \text{Diagram}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= [F_{\bar{b}}^{a\bar{a}\bar{b}}]_{Ic} [F_I^{\bar{b}f\bar{g}}]_{gb} [F_{\bar{b}}^{\bar{a}d\bar{f}}]_{cg}^* \\
&= [F_{\bar{b}}^{a\bar{a}\bar{b}}]_{Ic} [F_I^{\bar{b}f\bar{g}}]_{gb} [F_{\bar{b}}^{\bar{a}d\bar{f}}]_{cg}^*.
\end{aligned}$$


## 12.2 Locality Principle

Show that the locality principle (Fig. 12.1) is derivable from our other rules for evaluating diagrams, and is not therefore an independent assumption.





Figure 12.1: The locality, or no-transmutation, principle as in Fig. 8.7.

**Answer** Proof scheme: change every diagram into the standard basis, and use the orthogonality of the tree, such as the Eq. (12.1) below:



$$= \delta_{aa'} \delta_{bb'} \delta_{cc'} \delta_{dd'} \delta_{ee'} e. \quad (12.1)$$

Firstly, we notice that the planar diagram must have the property that each vertex can only be linked to three edges at most, because we don't allow three anyons fusion at the same time, such as  $a \times b \times c = d$ . After changing it into standard basis, we can use the orthogonality relation to eliminate the bubbles. The algorithm of changing into standard basis is as follows:

- Start from the incoming anyon.
- Travel along the right line at the bottom
- For every following vertex, choose the right path, and use the basis changing to eliminate the left path

- (d) Reach the outcoming anyon finally
- (e) Travel along the left path from the last crossing which we haven't chosen the left path
- (f) Repeat (c) to (e) for every vertex until every vertex in the diagram is traversed.

We will look at several examples. Firstly, if anything is planar diagram  $K_4$  or butterfly graph as the Fig.12.2 below shows, this is not allowed, because every vertex in  $K_4$  are linked to three edges, and there is four-valent vertex in the butterfly graph.




Figure 12.2: Planar diagram  $K_4$  and the butterfly graph.

Then we take two examples, as the Fig. 12.3 below shows.






Figure 12.3: Three examples of the algorithm.


For graph  $G_1$ :



For graph  $G_2$ :



For graph  $G_3$ :



Of course, there are more efficient route, here we just use the systematic way to demonstrate our algorithm is universal.



## Chapter 13

# Braiding Diagrams


### 13.1 Fibonacci Hexagon

Once  $F$ -matrices are defined for a TQFT, consistency of the  $R$ -matrix is enforced by the so-called hexagon equations as shown in the figure diagrammatically by Fig. 13.11. or the Fibonacci anyon theory, once the  $F$ -matrix is fixed as in Eq. 9.3, the  $R$ -matrices are defined up to complex conjugation (i.e., there is a right and left handed Fibonacci anyon theory - both are consistent). Derive these  $R$ -matrices. Confirm Eqs. 10.2 as one of the two solutions and show no other solutions exist.

**Answer**

### 13.2 Evaluation of a Diagram

Consider the following diagram: Evaluate this diagram in terms of  $R$ 's and  $F$ 's. Hint: First



reduce the diagram to that shown in exercise 12.1.

**Answer**

### 13.3 Gauge transform of $R$ and Hexagon

- (a) Confirm the gauge transform Eq. 13.3.
- (b) Show that a set of  $F$ -matrices and  $R$ -matrices satisfying the hexagon equations, Eq. 13.1 and 13.2 remains a solution after a gauge transformation. Remember that both  $R$  - and  $F$ -transform.

**Answer**

### 13.4 Reidemeister Moves

- (a) Use the  $R$ -matrix, and the completeness relationship, to derive the equivalence shown on the left of Fig. 13.9.
- (b) How does the hexagon equation imply the equivalence shown in Fig. 13.1. Hint: This is very subtle, but is almost trivial.
- (c) Use Fig. 13.1 to show the equality on the right of Fig. 13.9.
- (d) Use the result of Fig. 13.14 along with completeness and the  $R$ -matrix to demonstrate Fig. 13.10.




Figure 13.1: This move is implied by the hexagon equation. (Similar with the straight line  $f$  going under the other two, and similar if the left-to-right slope of  $f$  is negative instead of positive.).

This exercise shows that equalities like those shown in Fig. 13.9 and 13.10 are not independent assumptions but can be derived from the planar algebra and the definition of an  $R$ -matrix satisfying the hexagon.

# Bibliography

- [GAP22] *Gap – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.12.2*, The GAP Group, 2022.
- [GG13] Daciberg Lima Gonçalves and John Guaschi, *The classification of the virtually cyclic subgroups of the sphere braid groups*, Springer, 2013.
- [RN11] Renzo L Ricca and Bernardo Nipoti, *Gauss’linking number revisited*, Journal of Knot Theory and Its Ramifications **20** (2011), no. 10, 1325–1343.
- [Sto20] Orlin Stoytchev, *A Class of Efficient Presentations of Finite Simple Groups*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.05660 (2020).