

Anomalies and Bosonization

Ryan Thorngren

July 17, 2022

Abstract

Recently, general methods of bosonization beyond 1+1 dimensions have been developed. In this article, we review these bosonizations and extend them to the case with boundary conditions. In particular, we study the case when the bulk theory is a G -symmetry protected topological phase and the boundary theory has a G 't Hooft anomaly. We discuss how, when the anomaly is not realizable in a bosonic system, the G symmetry algebra becomes modified in the bosonization of the anomalous theory. This gives us a useful tool for understanding anomalies of fermionic systems, since there is no way to compute a boundary gauge variation of the anomaly polynomial, as one does for anomalies of bosonic systems. We take the chiral anomalies in 1+1D and the parity/time reversal anomalies in 2+1D as case studies.

1 Introduction

A theory is said to have an 't Hooft anomaly if it has a global symmetry G which cannot be gauged while preserving locality of interactions. Anomalies are quantized, so if we can identify an anomaly at weak coupling, it is guaranteed to hold at all energy scales [tH80]. This makes anomalies useful for constraining phase diagrams of condensed matter systems whose long range limit is strongly interacting. Likewise, in high energy theory, anomalies which appear in the UV theory constrain the theory at all energy scales [Bil08, GKKS17].

Anomalies are characterized by the anomaly in-flow mechanism [CH85]: although we cannot gauge the G symmetry, we can often formulate these D -spacetime-dimensional theories as gauge-invariant boundary conditions for a G gauge theory in $D + 1$ spacetime dimensions (the ‘‘anomaly theory’’). In simple situations, the anomaly theory has a vanishing coupling and a topological term, written as a density made out of the gauge field A :

$$S_{anom}(A) = \int_{D+1} \omega(A). \quad (1)$$

In this case, under a gauge transformation $A \mapsto A^g$, $S_{anom}(A)$ begets a boundary variation

$$\delta S_{anom}(A) = \int_D \omega_1(A, g).$$

This variation characterizes how the boundary partition function (the partition function of our theory of interest) coupled to the gauge background A fails to be gauge-invariant. Equivalently, $\omega_1(A, g)$ tells us about a kind of higher projective representation of G on the Hilbert space of our theory [CGW11, KT14]. In this way, $S_{anom}(A)$ characterizes the anomaly.

Possible anomaly theories $S_{anom}(A)$ have been classified by supposing that $S_{anom}(A)$ is a cobordism invariant of the auxiliary $D + 1$ -manifold equipped with the gauge field A [Kap14]. This classification implies that for all bosonic systems, the anomaly theory can be written in the form (1). However, for fermionic systems, it is known that not all anomaly theories $S_{anom}(A)$ can be written as an integral of a local density [KTTW15]. In this situation, we do not yet have a good understanding of what the anomaly “means” for the G action on the Hilbert space. The purpose for this paper is to fill in this gap.

The toolbox we use to do so is bosonization. Bosonization/fermionization is a family of correspondences between bosonic and fermionic systems. While bosonization has been properly understood in 1+1D for a long time, bosonization in higher dimensions is new, see [GK16, KT17, CKR18], and we will review it. We will especially make use of the bosonization of G -symmetry protected topological (SPT) phases [Sen15], which are nondegenerate, gapped systems with a G symmetry which, when gauged, produces a topological term $S_{anom}(A)$. We will need to extend the known description of these systems in bosonization slightly to include the $p+ip$ superconductors and more general symmetry twists.

At first bosonization seems incompatible with anomaly in-flow. Indeed, it is known that the chiral anomaly (for the \mathbb{Z}_2 chiral fermion parity) of a massless free 1+1D Majorana fermion can only be trivialized (meaning we perturb the system into a gapped, nondegenerate, \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetric ground state) if one takes at least 8 such systems and couples them together¹. In this case we say that the anomaly is order 8. However, the bosonization of the Majorana fermion is the critical Ising chain, which has no anomalous symmetries whatsoever. Further, among 1+1D bosonic systems with a \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry, all anomalies are only order 2, meaning two copies of any 1+1D bosonic system can be gapped out together while preserving all symmetries and introducing no ground state degeneracy.

The resolution of this puzzle lies in the fact that the bosonization of a fermionic SPT is not a bosonic SPT but rather a kind of higher gauge theory [KT13]. When the fermionic anomaly cannot be realized in a bosonic system, this means G is nontrivially extended by this higher gauge symmetry, and so in the bosonization the symmetry algebra is modified in the anomalous theory. We show a 1-to-1 relationship between the data of this symmetry algebra modification and the data which presents $S_{anom}(A)$ as a cobordism invariant.

I would like to thank Anton Kapustin as well as Itamar Hason and Zohar Komargodski for collaborations on related works and sharing their thoughts on the manuscript, also to Max Metlitski and Robert Jones for sharing an early draft of their work, and to Ruben Verresen, Dave Aasen, and Dominic

¹Only the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry is assumed to be preserved, but a coupling exists which breaks the flavor symmetry $SO(8)$ to $SO(7)$ [Ben15].

Williamson for enlightening conversations. This work is supported by an NSF GRFP fellowship and a Zuckerman STEM Leadership Fellowship.

2 Overview of Bosonization

2.1 0th and 1st Bosonization

Bosonization is a general correspondence between bosonic systems (whose fundamental degrees of freedom are bosonic) and fermionic systems (whose fundamental degrees of freedom are fermionic). We will speak in terms of Lorentz-invariant quantum field theory. In this case a fermionic system just means one whose correlation functions on a spacetime X depend on a choice of spin structure η on X (which may be twisted in the presence of a background gauge field), while a bosonic theory is one whose correlation functions only depend on a choice of orientation of X . Note that in this restricted definition, there are field theories which are neither bosonic nor fermionic, such as those with framing anomalies [Wit89] and those which depend on a w_3 -structure [KT17]. Further, it is possible that a lattice system of fermions gives rise to a bosonic continuum limit.

The simplest form of bosonization, which might be called 0th bosonization, is a transformation whereby, given a fermionic partition function $Z_f(X, \eta)$ (perhaps depending on sources which we suppress in the notation), we form the partition function

$$Z_b(X) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)|}} \sum_{\eta} Z_f(X, \eta)$$

by summing over all spin structures η of X . The normalization is arbitrary, but we choose it because it reproduces common conventions in 1+1D. Because spin structures are locally indistinguishable, Z_b will satisfy cluster decomposition for point operators if Z_f does. One can think of it as gauging fermion parity. Thus, Z_b is a local bosonic field theory. This transformation works in any dimension.

Typically Z_b will have some topological degeneracy since the number of spin structures on X is $|H^1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)|$. In particular, the bosonization of the trivial fermionic theory, for which $Z(X, \eta) = 1$ for all spin manifolds (X, η) is (non-canonically) equivalent to the \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge theory on spin manifolds. Note that the bosonization defines $Z_b(X)$ only for spin manifolds X , so the global structure of the bosonization is inherently ambiguous on non-spin manifolds.

An innovation of [GK16] is to make the above bosonization invertible by including neutral probe fermions. One can think of these as Wilson loops $W(\eta, \gamma)$ for the spin structure η , where $\gamma \in Z_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the worldline. Accordingly we define the 1st bosonization

$$Z_b(X, \gamma) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)|}} \sum_{\eta} Z_f(X, \eta) W(\eta, \gamma), \quad (2)$$

where, since $W(\eta, \gamma)$ depends only on the spin structure, we may pull it out from the integral over all other fields which computes Z_f ². We will discuss $W(\eta, \gamma)$ in more detail later, but for now let us note that given a second spin structure η' , that the product $W(\eta, \gamma)W(\eta', \gamma)^{-1}$ depends only on the homology class $[\gamma]$ and satisfies

$$\sum_{[\gamma] \in H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)} W(\eta, \gamma)W(\eta', \gamma)^{-1} = |H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)| \delta(\eta - \eta'), \quad (3)$$

Thus, we can invert (2) by summing over homology classes of probe fermion insertions:

$$Z_f(X, \eta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)|}} \sum_{[\gamma]} Z_b(X, \gamma)W(\eta, \gamma)^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

This backwards transformation is known as 1st fermionization.

In [GK16], the authors interpreted the worldlines as the domain defects of a $D-2$ -form \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry [KT13, GKS15], where D is the spacetime dimension. Indeed for a closed spacetime X , Poincaré duality allows us to express the homology class of the probe worldlines as a cocycle $C \in Z^{D-1}(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, which can be thought of as a gauge background for a $D-2$ -form \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry. Gauge invariance corresponds to homotopy invariance of the probe worldlines, which typically fails, see below. In any case we re-write (2) as

$$Z_b(X, C) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)|}} \sum_{\eta} Z_f(X, \eta)W_D(\eta, C), \quad (5)$$

where we introduce notation which makes the dependence of $W_D(\eta, C)$ on the spacetime dimension especially apparent, since $W_D(\eta, C)$ may only be evaluated on a $D-2$ form C .

The authors of [GK16] also showed, by studying the gauge transformation properties of $W_D(\eta, C)$, equivalently of $W(\eta, \gamma)$ when γ is continuously varied, that the $D-2$ -form symmetry of the bosonization is anomalous when $D > 2$, with anomaly

$$\frac{1}{2}Sq^2C \in H^{D+1}(B^{D-1}\mathbb{Z}_2, U(1)). \quad (6)$$

This anomaly is nontrivial on general manifolds, but is trivializable on spin manifolds. One can think of $W_D(\eta, C)$ as an explicit trivialization, so we can picture the fermionization (4) as a slab, with the dynamical boson degrees of freedom and Z_b on one side and the spin structure and W_D on the other, which relates this gauge picture of bosonization to the “back wall” construction [ALW17]. Any bosonic theory with a $D-2$ -form \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry with the above anomaly may be fermionized.

In [CKR18, CK18], the authors also showed how to make the 1st bosonization transformations explicit in general lattice systems. We expect likewise that

²This bosonization continues to satisfy cluster decomposition because we have just made extended operator insertions to the 0th bosonization.

the results presented here can also be expressed on the lattice, given adequate combinatorial finesse.

2.2 SPT Phases

This subject has been explained in great detail (in pieces) in [GW12, Kit15, GK16, BGK17, KT17, WG17, LZW18], so we will be very episcopal, attempting to tie together the different approaches and extending them slightly. Our purpose is to highlight a symmetry interpretation of the cocycles ν_j which appear in the classification of SPT phases and to motivate higher bosonization. We also point out the many places where the theory is unfinished and comment on our expectations for what it will look like.

An important application of the bosonization program is the classification and construction of symmetry protected topological (SPT) phases, which are gapped, invertible (ie. short-range-entangled (SRE)) theories with a global symmetry G . It is known [KTTW15, FH16] that such phases are classified for fermionic systems by the so-called spin cobordism groups $\Omega_{spin}^D(BG, \xi)$, where D is the spacetime dimension and ξ is a real representation of G which encodes the orientation-reversing and anti-unitary character of the symmetry as well as its interaction with fermion parity. The elements of this group are partition functions of such gapped, invertible phases on closed spun D -manifolds (X, η) with a background G gauge field A :

$$Z \in \Omega^D(BG, \xi).$$

There is a mathematical device for computing the group $\Omega^D(BG, \xi)$ in terms of the groups

$$H^j(BG, \Omega_{spin}^k(\star)), \quad j + k = D$$

called the Atiyah-Hirzebruch spectral sequence (AHSS) [ASSH72], where $\Omega_{spin}^k(\star)$ is the group of k -spacetime-dimension fermionic SRE phases with no assumed global symmetry. A natural interpretation of an element of $H^{D-k}(BG, \Omega_{spin}^k(\star))$ is a decoration of a k -dimensional defect of G -domain walls with a k -dimensional fermionic SRE phase. Thus, the AHSS says roughly that we need only specify all these decorations to specify the SPT phase, in line with the intuition of [CLV14]. Note that orientation-reversing or anti-unitary elements of G act nontrivially on these coefficient groups.

For example, $\Omega_{spin}^1(\star) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ describes the two fermionic ‘‘SRE’’ phases for a quantum mechanical particle, that is, a particle with a unique ground state. This ground state can either be bosonic or fermionic, in the latter case its partition function is $+1$ on the anti-periodically spun circle but -1 on the periodically spun circle, meaning its partition function generates $\Omega_{spin}^1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$. So $H^{D-1}(BG, \Omega_{spin}^1(\star))$ describes how particle-like defects of G domain walls carry fermion parity.

Meanwhile, $\Omega_{spin}^{-1}(\star) = \mathbb{Z}$, given by the higher Berry number [Kit15, KT19] so $H^{D+1}(BG, \Omega_{spin}^{-1}(\star))$ describes the usual group of bosonic phases [DW90, CGLW13].

If we just consider decorations by these two classes of objects ³, we get a sub-group of the full group of fermionic SPT phases. This sub-group was first constructed (on the lattice) by Gu and Wen [GW12]. For Lie groups, this subgroup was considered in [Fre08], so we call them the Gu-Wen-Freed phases. The Gu-Wen-Freed phases are important for us because they are the ones for whom the 1st bosonization yields a $B^{D-1}\mathbb{Z}_2 \times G$ bosonic SPT [KT13], where $B^{D-1}\mathbb{Z}_2$ denotes the $(D-2)$ -form symmetry $(D-1)$ -group (with \mathbb{Z}_2 in degree $D-1$ and 0 in all other degrees) which arose from the probe fermion insertions.

This subgroup of phases is typically not just a product $H^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z}) \times H^{D-1}(BG, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, but its elements are described by pairs

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_1 &\in Z^{D-1}(BG, \mathbb{Z}_2) \\ \nu_{-1} &\in C^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z}^\xi),\end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{Z}^ξ indicates coefficients twisted by the determinant of ξ , and which satisfy the Gu-Wen-Freed equations [GW12, Fre08]:

$$d_G \nu_{-1} = Sq^1(Sq^2 + w_2(\xi))\nu_1,$$

where d_G is the twisted differential, which describes how orientation-reversing and anti-unitary symmetries in G reverse the sign of the Berry number, ie. how G acts on $\Omega_{spin}^{-1}(\star)$, and where $w_2(\xi)$ is the 2nd Stiefel-Whitney class of the twisting bundle ξ , which describes the central extension of G by the fermion parity (and depends on the G gauge field). The twisted differential may be written

$$d_G \nu_{-1} = d\nu_{-1} - 2w_1(\xi)\nu_{-1}.$$

The generalization we write here only appeared recently in [LZW18], while the older constructions of [GW12] only considered the untwisted case $\xi = 0$.

When G is a finite group, we can replace ν_{-1} with $\nu_0 \in C^D(BG, U(1)^\xi)$ satisfying the more familiar form of the equation

$$d_G \nu_0 = \frac{1}{2}(Sq^2 + w_2(\xi))\nu_1 \pmod{1}, \quad (7)$$

which has the interpretation that ν_0 is “half” of a bosonic SPT phase when $\nu_1 + w_2(\xi)$ is nonzero. In particular it means that the subgroup of Gu-Wen-Freed phases is typically a nontrivial extension of the bosonic phases by (a subquotient of) $H^{D-1}(BG, \Omega_{spin}^1(\star))$.

In 1st bosonization, the interpretation of ν_1 is a homomorphism

$$G \rightarrow B^{D-1}\mathbb{Z}_2,$$

which describes how although the total $G \times B^{D-1}\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry of the bosonization is anomalous, there is a subgroup

$$G \xrightarrow{(1, \nu_1)} G \times B^{D-1}\mathbb{Z}_2$$

³This constitutes all $k \leq 1$ and is thus a truncation of Ω_{spin} as a spectrum [Fre08, FH16].

which is anomaly free, and which thus represents the physical G symmetry. This means that if we want Z_b to have an anomaly-free G symmetry, we must define it by

$$Z_b(A, C) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)|}} \sum_{\eta} Z_f(\eta, A) W(\eta, C + \nu_1(A)) e^{-i \int_X \omega(A)}, \quad (8)$$

where $\omega(A)$ is a local counter-term.

In fact, using the expression of the anomaly (6), the anomaly-vanishing condition is precisely the Gu-Wen-Freed equation, and $\nu_0 = \omega_0$ (which could be realized when G is continuous instead as a higher Berry curvature ν_{-1} [KT19]). The Gu-Wen-Freed phases are precisely the fermionic SPTs for which one may choose ν_1, ν_{-1} so that (8) is a topological $G \times B^{D-1} \mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge theory. Choosing it to be the untwisted such gauge theory (with $Z_b(A, C) = 1$ on all closed spin manifolds) defines ν_1 and ν_{-1} up to local expressions which are trivial on spin manifolds. In this way, we can invert the above, to write the very useful expression (compare [GK16, BGK17])

$$Z_f(\eta, A) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)|}} \sum_C W(\eta, C + \nu_1(A)) e^{i \int_X \nu_0(A)}. \quad (9)$$

2.3 Higher Bosonization

We would like to obtain an expression like (9) for general fermionic SPTs. To do this via the AHSS, we will need to consider extended fermionic probes. For instance, we can insert a Kitaev wire [Kit01, FK11] along a worldsheet Σ in spacetime, or a $p + ip$ superconductor [Vol09] along a 2+1D worldvolume V . These represent the generators of fermionic SRE phases in 1+1D:

$$\Omega_{spin}^2(\star) = \mathbb{Z}_2$$

and in 2+1D:

$$\Omega_{spin}^3(\star) = \mathbb{Z},$$

respectively, and therefore detect other aspects of the topology of (X, η) . Expressing these probe insertions in the path integral we obtain functions

$$W(\eta, \Sigma), \quad W(\eta, V)$$

for valid worldsheets Σ of Kitaev wires and valid worldvolumes V of $p + ip$ superconductors. It is known that when Σ is spin, $W(\eta, \Sigma)$ is the Arf invariant of (Σ, η) [KT91, KTTW15], and when V is spin, $W(\eta, V)$ is the exponentiated eta invariant of the Dirac operator [KTTW15]. The next smallest fermionic SRE phase one might consider is all the way up in 6+1D dimensions, corresponding to a 6+1D gravitational Chern-Simons-like (or thermal Hall-like) system. For us, these two extended probes, Kitaev wire and $p + ip$, will be enough.

It was shown in [KT17] that we can relax the condition that the Kitaev wire worldsheet Σ is spin. It is known that the Kitaev wire admits an anti-unitary

symmetry with $T^2 = 1$ [FK11], which allows it to be defined on any closed $pin-$ surface [KTTW15]. Unfortunately one cannot enforce by an equation like the Gu-Wen-Freed equation the constraint that Σ is $pin-$. However, given a local framing of X (ie. a choice of local coordinate systems), we can define a restriction of η to Σ which is $pin-$ away from some isolated points [KT91]. These are the points such that if we restrict η to the boundary of a small disc D in Σ containing the point, then we see the periodic spin structure on ∂D , equivalently a fermionic π -flux, indicating that the induced spin structure on ∂D does not extend over D .

It is known that if the Kitaev wire is compactified on a circle with periodic spin structure, it has a unique, fermionic ground state. Thus, we can imagine that at each of these isolated points, a neutral fermionic particle is created from the string. Recall the collection of these neutral fermionic particle worldlines γ is encoded in Poincaré duality by a $D - 1$ -form C_1 . This argument says that $dC_1 \neq 0$, in fact

$$dC_1 = Sq^2 C_2 \pmod{2}, \quad (10)$$

where $C_2 \in Z^{D-2}(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is Poincaré dual to the Kitaev wire worldsheets, which we may assume are closed, in the absence of more extended probes. In [KT17], this constraint was also related to the S matrix of the Ising TQFT, and much more was said about the fermion parity of knotted Kitaev wires. By the way, it is no coincidence that (10) resembles the Gu-Wen-Freed equation (7) so closely. Note however that (10) holds for integers modulo 2, while the Gu-Wen-Freed equation is for \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} elements (or for integers when G is continuous). This caveat aside, all differentials (the complete set of constraints which the decoration data must satisfy) in the AHSS are made from Sq^2 [Tho54].

Given such a pair of worldsheet Σ and worldlines γ with boundary, we can thicken the worldlines into small tubes, with periodic spin structure in the cross-section, and glue these tubes to the worldsheet Σ to obtain a $pin-$ surface. Evaluating the Arf-Brown-Kervaire invariant [KTTW15, KT91] on this $pin-$ surface yields an 8th root of unity, and defines the spin factor

$$W(\eta, \gamma, \Sigma) = W_D(\eta, C_1, C_2).$$

By construction, it satisfies

$$W_D(\eta, C_1, 0) = W_D(\eta, C_1).$$

We can think of (C_1, C_2) as a higher gauge field with gauge $(D - 2)$ -group $E_{2,D}$ which has \mathbb{Z}_2 in degree $D - 2$, \mathbb{Z}_2 in degree $D - 3$, and a Postnikov class $Sq^2 C_2$ corresponding to (10) [KT13].

We thus define the 2nd bosonization

$$Z_b(C_1, C_2) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)|}} \sum_{\eta} Z_f(\eta) W_D(\eta, C_1, C_2), \quad (11)$$

The 2nd bosonization restricts to the first bosonization by setting $C_2 = 0$ (this informs our choice of normalization). As with 1st bosonization, 2nd bosonization

is invertible. Given a second spin structure η' ,

$$W_D(\eta, C_1, C_2)W_D(\eta', C_1, C_2)^{-1}$$

depends only on the cohomology (gauge equivalence) class $[C, B]$, and

$$\sum_{[C_1, C_2]} W_D(\eta, C_1, C_2)W_D(\eta', C_1, C_2)^{-1} = |H^1(X, E_{2,D})|\delta(\eta - \eta').$$

This is because, while $W(\eta, C_1, C_2)$ depends on the cocycles C_1, C_2 , its gauge variation is independent of η . Indeed, it varies according to a bosonic anomaly extending Sq^2C_1 of (6) to (C_1, C_2) [KT17].

Likewise one can define 3rd bosonization by the inclusion of $p+ip$ superconductors, and likewise there is an infinite tower of higher bosonizations, the next one being the 7th bosonization, relevant in 6+1D [KTTW15]. The definition of the spin factor for $p+ip$ superconductors is beyond the scope of this work, but we expect it to be subject to a constraint

$$dC_2 = Sq^2C_3, \tag{12}$$

beginning in 4+1D when the $p+ip$ superconductor is codimension 2, where $C_3 \in Z^{D-3}(X, \mathbb{Z})$ is Poincaré dual to the $p+ip$ worldvolumes. The physical meaning of this constraint is that Sq^2C_3 indicates where the spin structure projected to the $p+ip$ worldvolumes has a particle-like singularity [Tho54, KT17]. This is equivalent to a vortex in the $p+ip$ order parameter [GS18], which is known to carry a Majorana zero mode [Vol09]. Accordingly, this singularity must lie at the boundary of a Kitaev string worldsheet, which is the meaning of (12).

Because the Kitaev string worldsheets are no longer closed, the presence of C_3 must also complicate (10). Verifying this, and constructing the spin factor, will be very important for understanding anomalies of 3+1D fermionic systems by bosonization. We leave this to future work.

2.4 More SPTs

2.4.1 2nd bosonization with $\xi = 0$

If we have an anomaly-free global symmetry of a fermionic SPT, we expect again that the anomaly-free symmetry of the 2nd bosonization to be some subgroup of the full symmetry embedded as

$$G \xrightarrow{(1, \nu)} G \times E_{2,D}.$$

We can express [KT13] this map as a pair

$$\nu_2 \in Z^{D-2}(BG, \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

$$\nu_1 \in C^{D-1}(BG, \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

satisfying

$$d\nu_1 = Sq^2\nu_2. \quad (13)$$

As before, we wish to choose ν_1, ν_2 so that the gauge variation of

$$W_D(\eta, \nu_1(A), \nu_2(A))$$

can be cancelled by a local counterterm. In [KT17], this was expressed as an anomaly-vanishing condition and the anomaly class was computed as a cohomology element

$$\tilde{S}q^2(C_1, C_2) \in H^{D+1}(BE_{2,D}, U(1)),$$

which restricts to Sq^2C_1 when $C_2 = 0$, yielding the Gu-Wen-Freed equation. In [WG17], a different, presumably equivalent expression was given to $\tilde{S}q^2(C_1, C_2)$. In summary, we need a $\nu_{-1} \in C^{D+1}(BG, \mathbb{Z})$ satisfying

$$d\nu_{-1} = Sq^1\tilde{S}q^2(C_1, C_2).$$

When G is finite it is enough to have a $\nu_0 \in C^D(BG, U(1))$ satisfying the higher Gu-Wen-Freed equation

$$d\nu_0 = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{S}q^2(C_1, C_2) \pmod{1}. \quad (14)$$

Together, this data gives us a construction of the partition function of many interesting fermionic SPTs, via

$$Z_f(\eta) = \frac{1}{\#} \sum_{[C_1, C_2]} W(\nu_1(A) + \chi(C_2, \nu_2(A)) + C_1, \nu_2(A) + C_2) e^{i \int_X \nu_0(A)}, \quad (15)$$

which is analogous to (9) and we describe χ shortly. For more on this expression, see [KT17]. For us, we need only be aware of its general form and that it exists. It will later allow us to describe the chiral anomaly of the 1+1D Majorana fermion.

In (15), to guarantee the constraint (10) it is necessary to introduce a universal cross-term $\chi(C_2, \nu_2(A))$ which satisfies

$$d\chi(C_2, \nu_2(A)) = Sq^2C_2 + Sq^2\nu_2(A) - Sq^2(C_2 + \nu_2(A)) \pmod{2}.$$

One solution for χ is

$$\chi(C_2, \nu_2(A)) = C_2 \cup_{D-1} \nu_2(A),$$

using the \cup_i products of Steenrod [MT08].

2.4.2 2nd bosonization with $\xi \neq 0$

When there is a twist ξ , indicating an anti-unitary or orientation-reversing symmetry, or a symmetry which squares to fermion parity, then the Postnikov constraint (13) and the Gu-Wen-Freed equation (14) will be modified.

To see the required modifications, we just need to work with a spin structure on $TX \oplus A^*\xi$ rather than on TX [KTTW15, FH16], and consider its projections to the Kitaev string worldsheets. In this case, $w_2(A^*\xi)$ acts as fermionic π -flux, so our argument above implies (13) becomes modified to

$$d\nu_1(A) = Sq^2\nu_2(A) + w_2(A^*\xi)\nu_2. \quad (16)$$

One can prove this mathematically since the right hand side must be a stable cohomology operation made from Sq^2 , Sq^1 , $w_1(\xi)$, and $w_2(\xi)$ [Tho54, FH16]. Checking a few cases then determines (16).

We expect that there will be a stable cohomology operation $\tilde{S}q_\xi^2(\nu_1, \nu_2)$ for ν_1, ν_2 satisfying (13) which defines the Gu-Wen-Freed equation by

$$d\nu_0 = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{S}q_\xi^2(\nu_1, \nu_2),$$

generalizing (14). Such a cohomology operation can be shown to exist but it has not been explicitly constructed. Let us point out however that even in 2+1D, where $d\nu_1$ and $d\nu_2$ are both zero, so that fermion particle number and Kitaev string flux are separately conserved, there is still a nontrivial contribution of ν_2 to the Gu-Wen-Freed equation. It is (generalizing [GK16, BGK17])

$$d\nu_0 = \frac{1}{2}(Sq^2 + w_2(\xi))\nu_1 + \frac{1}{2}(Sq^2 + w_2(\xi))(Sq^1 + w_1(\xi))\nu_2 \quad D = 2 + 1, \quad (17)$$

which can be determined using functoriality of the AHSS and checking several cases. We leave the explicit verification of this and the Gu-Wen-Freed equations in higher dimensions to future work.

2.4.3 3rd bosonization

However, to describe all the 2+1D and 3+1D SPTs, we will also need to include decorations by $p + ip$ superconductors along 2+1D volumes, described in Poincaré duality by a $(D - 3)$ -form $C_3 \in C^{D-3}(X, \mathbb{Z})$ (with some kind of Dirichlet boundary condition in the case $\partial X \neq \emptyset$). We expect certain 2+1D G -gauge defects carry $p + ip$ superconductors, described by a cochain

$$\nu_3 \in Z^{D-3}(BG, \mathbb{Z}^\xi),$$

where \mathbb{Z}^ξ indicates twisted coefficients, which amounts to the fact that the $p + ip$ phase is chiral, meaning an orientation-reversing or anti-unitary symmetry exchanges it with its inverse phase $p - ip$, so such elements of G act by the \mathbb{Z}_2 automorphism $n \mapsto -n$ on \mathbb{Z} . Precisely, the coefficients \mathbb{Z} are twisted by the determinant of ξ . Note because of the absence of more extended probes (guaranteed whenever $D < 7$), we are not worried about nonconservation of $p + ip$ membranes, so ν_3 is a cocycle.

In 2+1D, when there are no orientation-reversing or anti-unitary elements,

$$\nu_3 \in H^0(BG, \mathbb{Z}^\xi) = H^0(BG, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$$

simply indicates how many $p + ip$ superconductors there are layered with a torsion SPT to form the SPT corresponding to $\nu_3, \nu_2, \nu_1, \nu_0$, similar to how in 1+1D, a nonzero $\nu_2 \in H^0(BG, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ indicates the presence of a Kitaev wire. Equivalently $\nu_3/2$ is the chiral central charge of the boundary modes. When G does contain such elements, however,

$$H^0(BG, \mathbb{Z}^\xi) = 0$$

and there is no possibility for a $p + ip$ superconductor.

In 3+1D, with no orientation-reversing or anti-unitary elements,

$$\nu_3 \in H^1(BG, \mathbb{Z}^\xi) = H^1(BG, \mathbb{Z}) = \text{Hom}(G, \mathbb{Z}),$$

which is zero unless G contains a subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} , such as a discrete translation symmetry subgroup. For such phases with a nonzero ν_3 , we have a stack of $p + ip$ superconductors along the translation. In fact, writing the smallest translation as t , $\nu_3(t) \in \mathbb{Z}$ tells us the number of $p + ip$ superconductors in each layer.

In 3+1D with orientation-reversing or anti-unitary elements, it is possible to have $H^1(BG, \mathbb{Z}^\xi) \neq 0$ even when G is finite. For instance, if $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ with the nontrivial action on \mathbb{Z} ,

$$H^1(B\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}^\xi) = \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

This indicates that the \mathbb{Z}_2 domain wall carries a $p + ip$ superconductor. This is familiar from the study of the 3+1D topological superconductors with $T^2 = (-1)^F$, where there is the possibility of breaking time reversal symmetry in two opposite ways on an otherwise symmetric boundary, yielding a domain wall carrying a $c = 1/2 \pmod 1$ chiral mode [MFCV14, FCV13]. We will discuss this phase more below. It would be very interesting to present the analogous expression (15) for the partition function of these topological superconductors.

We wish to understand how the presence of $p + ip$ defects changes the Postnikov constraints and the Gu-Wen-Freed equation. From the AHSS, we expect a constraint

$$d\nu_2 = (Sq^2 + w_2(\xi) + w_1(\xi)^2)\nu_3 \pmod 2. \quad (18)$$

Physically, the right hand side corresponds to certain curve-like singularities in the $p + ip$ worldvolumes where Kitaev wires are created, in fact these are the Majorana zero modes along the worldlines of $p + ip$ vortices [Vol09], cf. the discussion around (12). This constraint can be verified using the naturality of the AHSS and the fact that the right hand side is a stable cohomology operation.

The Postnikov constraint (18) will also complicate the Postnikov constraint for $d\nu_1$ (conservation of fermion parity) and the Gu-Wen-Freed equation for $d\nu_0$ (equivalently $d\nu_{-1}$). These equations have not yet been worked out and we leave it to future study. However, for $D = 3 + 1$ and time reversal symmetry with $T^2 = (-1)^F$, we have $Sq^2\nu_3 = 0$ since ν_3 is only a 1-cocycle (since $p + ip$ defects are codimension 1 they always have $w_2(NV) = 0$) and $w_2(\xi) + w_1(\xi)^2 = 0$. In this case, we simply have

$$d\nu_2 = 0 \pmod 2, \quad (19)$$

meaning there are no vortices present on the $p + ip$ defects and so the Kitaev strings are conserved. In this case one can also find that (16) is unmodified, although we still do not know the Gu-Wen-Freed equation in this case. However, for understanding the modification of the time reversal symmetry algebra in 3rd bosonization, this will be enough.

3 1st Bosonization with Boundary

We wish to consider the problem of bosonization for systems with boundaries. In this situation, we have a fermionic theory defined on a spun D -manifold (X, η) with boundary $\partial X = Y$. Along the boundary we have a splitting

$$TX = TY \oplus NY,$$

where NY is a line bundle which is trivialized by identifying a neighborhood of Y with the “collar”

$$Y \times [0, 1] \subset X,$$

where $Y \times 0 = \partial X$, and choosing a coordinate system where the first $n - 1$ coordinates are parallel to Y and the last coordinate is the perpendicular coordinate along the interval $[0, 1]$. With this choice of trivialization of NY , a spin structure η on X canonically determines a spin structure $\eta|_Y$ on Y . Thus we will assume that the fermionic degrees of freedom localized to the boundary couple to the spin structure $\eta|_Y$, so the fermionic theory has partition function $Z_f(X, \eta)$ with no extra choices.

Recall the 1st bosonization is constructed by introducing fermion probe particles, and using Poincaré duality to relate the worldlines of these particles to the domain defects of an anomalous higher symmetry. We do the same in the presence of a boundary, except now the proper tool is Poincaré-Lefschetz duality, which says that the 1-cycle γ is equivalent to a pair of gauge fields:

$$C \in Z^{D-1}(X, \mathbb{Z}_2) \quad B \in C^{D-2}(Y, \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

such that

$$dB = C|_Y \pmod{2}.$$

This means that C is an $D - 1$ -form gauge field on X and B is a Dirichlet boundary condition which says $C|_Y$ is gauge-equivalent to the zero connection.

The duality lets us define the spin factor by

$$W_D(\eta, C, B) = W(\eta, \gamma).$$

Then we define the 1st bosonization with boundary as

$$Z_b(C, B) = \sum_{\eta} Z_f(\eta) W_D(\eta, C, B). \quad (20)$$

As before, $W_D(\eta, C, B)W_D(\eta', C, B)^{-1}$ depends only on the (relative) cohomology class $[C, B] \in H^{D-1}(X, Y, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and we have

$$\sum_{[C, B]} W_D(\eta, C, B)W_D(\eta', C, B)^{-1} = \#\delta(\eta - \eta').$$

Further, $W_D(\eta, C, B)$ connects $W_D(\eta, C)$ and $W_{D-1}(\eta|_Y, B)$ as follows. If γ is supported away from the boundary, then $C|_Y = 0$, and $B = 0$ and clearly

$$W_D(\eta, C, B) = W_D(\eta, C)$$

Oppositely, when γ is supported only on the boundary, then $C = 0$, $dB = 0$ and we have

$$W_D(\eta, C, B) = W_{D-1}(\eta|_Y, B). \quad (21)$$

This means that the bosonization of the bulk-boundary system is closely related to the bosonization of the boundary theory, but note that even when the bulk is the trivial theory, the bosonization will only sum over spin structures on Y which extend to X . In particular, the bulk-boundary bosonization is unaware of any fermionic SRE phase on the boundary. This will become an important point for us later. We mention that another consistent bosonization of Y when X carries the trivial theory would be to sum over all bounding spin structures (“summing” over the filling X). We won’t use this bosonization in this paper though.

3.1 1st bosonization of Gu-Wen-Freed anomalies

Now we consider 1st bosonization for a Gu-Wen-Freed G -SPT with symmetric boundary. This means we have a G -SPT on X described by ν_1, ν_{-1} or ν_1, ν_0 in the finite G case, satisfying the Gu-Wen-Freed equation (7), and a G -symmetric boundary theory on $Y = \partial X$, which is typically gapless. We wish to bosonize the whole thing.

Let A denote the background G gauge field $A \in Z^1(X, G)$, with free boundary conditions on Y (which we can do as long as the G symmetry is preserved in the boundary theory). Recall $\nu_1(A)$ represents a particle-like defect binding a neutral fermion. The condition that these worldlines carry a \mathbb{Z}_2 quantum number (meaning they have no free ends) translates in Poincaré-Lefschetz duality to

$$\begin{aligned} d(C + \nu_1(A)) &= 0 \pmod{2} \\ (C + \nu_1(A))|_Y &= dB \pmod{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The first follows from $dC = d\nu_1(A) = 0 \pmod{2}$, but the second is a key equation. If we consider the case $C = 0$, meaning the probe fermions are restricted to the boundary, then it becomes

$$dB = \nu_1(A) \pmod{2}.$$

This implies when $[\nu_1(A)] \neq 0 \in H^{D-1}(BG, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ that the global G symmetry is nontrivially extended by the $B^{D-3}\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry which couples to B !

For example, when $D = 3$, we are studying anomalies of fermionic systems in 1+1D, the usual setting for bosonization. We have found that if the G anomaly of the fermionic system is of Gu-Wen-Freed type, but not equivalent to any bosonic G anomaly, it means that when we bosonize, obtaining a 1+1D bosonic theory with a global \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry, that G is nontrivially extended by this \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry. This resolves the apparent contradiction that fermionic systems have more G anomalies than bosonic systems but are supposed to be equivalent by bosonization/fermionization.

3.2 1+1D Chiral $U(1)$ Anomaly

Before we get too lost, let's discuss a concrete example of this.

Consider a free massless Dirac fermion in 1+1D. The fermion number of this theory is a conserved integer N , which may be considered a sum of occupation numbers $N = N_L + N_R$ from the left-moving and right-moving sectors, respectively. It's known that the corresponding chiral $U(1)_{L,R}$ symmetries can only be consistently coupled to a background gauge field on the boundary of a $U(1)$ SPT phase with Chern-Simons level ± 1 . We wish to describe this situation in bosonization. Here $D = 3$.

First of all, the level 1 Chern-Simons term contains a hidden dependence on a spin structure [BM05], which in bosonization is encoded in a nontrivial ν_1 . To see this, we study a 2π -flux for the $U(1)$. An odd level Chern-Simons term decorates the bare 2π -flux with an odd electric charge, so the physical 2π -flux is a fermion. Thus, the proper spin factor to use in bosonization is

$$W_3(\eta, C + c_1(A), B),$$

where $c_1(A)$ is the first Chern class of A . In other words, $\nu_1(A) = c_1(A) \bmod 2$. This means that in the boundary theory, we expect the $U(1)$ group relation will only hold up to the \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge symmetry of B . Denoting the boundary $U(1)$ charge Q and the \mathbb{Z}_2 charge s , $\nu(A) = c_1(A) \bmod 2$ means

$$e^{2\pi i Q} = (-1)^s.$$

We will verify this prediction by studying the torus partition functions of the Dirac fermion. On a torus, the spin factor $W_2(\eta, B)$ for B one of the four \mathbb{Z}_2 gauge backgrounds $+/+, +/-, -/+, -/-$ ⁴ and for η one of the four spin structures $AP/AP, AP/P, P/AP, P/P$ is encoding in the follow matrix:

⁴Our notational convention specifies the gauge or spin holonomy around the space/time cycles, respectively.

$W(\eta, C)$	AP/AP	AP/P	P/AP	P/P
$+/+$	1	1	1	1
$+/-$	1	1	-1	-1
$-/+$	1	-1	1	-1
$-/-$	-1	1	1	-1

The four partition functions of the free Dirac fermion on a torus with shape parameter τ , and $q = e^{2\pi i\tau}$ are [FMS12]

$$Z_f(AP/AP) = |\chi_{1,1}(q) + \chi_{2,1}(q)|^4 = \frac{1}{|\eta(\tau)|^2} \sum_{a,b \in \mathbb{Z}} q^{\frac{1}{2}a^2} \bar{q}^{\frac{1}{2}b^2} = \left| \frac{\theta_3(\tau)}{\eta(\tau)} \right|^2$$

$$Z_f(AP/P) = 4|\chi_{1,2}(q)|^4 = \frac{1}{|\eta(\tau)|^2} \sum_{a,b \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^{a+b} q^{\frac{1}{2}a^2} \bar{q}^{\frac{1}{2}b^2} = \left| \frac{\theta_4(\tau)}{\eta(\tau)} \right|^2$$

$$Z_f(P/AP) = |\chi_{1,1}(q) - \chi_{2,1}(q)|^4 = \frac{1}{|\eta(\tau)|^2} \sum_{r,s \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}} q^{\frac{1}{2}r^2} \bar{q}^{\frac{1}{2}s^2} = \left| \frac{\theta_2(\tau)}{\eta(\tau)} \right|^2$$

$$Z_f(P/P) = \frac{1}{|\eta(\tau)|^2} \sum_{r,s \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}} (-1)^{r-s} q^{\frac{1}{2}r^2} \bar{q}^{\frac{1}{2}s^2} = 0.$$

Using the table above, we find, for example the untwisted partition function of the bosonization:

$$Z_b(+/+) = \frac{1}{|\eta(\tau)|^2} \sum_{m,n \in \mathbb{Z}} q^{\frac{1}{2}(n/2+m)^2} \bar{q}^{\frac{1}{2}(n/2-m)^2}.$$

This is the partition function of the compact boson at radius $R = 2$, as is well-known to be expected. To figure out how the background gauge field should couple to the compact boson, we can use the bosonization relations to compute

$$Z_b(+/-) = \frac{1}{|\eta(\tau)|^2} \sum_{m,n \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^n q^{\frac{1}{2}(n/2+m)^2} \bar{q}^{\frac{1}{2}(n/2-m)^2}.$$

So the \mathbb{Z}_2 charge operator $s = n$.

To identify how the chiral $U(1)_L$ symmetry acts on the compact boson, we perform the bosonization transformation in the presence of a flat gauge background $1/\theta$ for A , that is with a twist $e^{i\theta Q}$ along the temporal cycle and untwisted in the spatial direction. For the fermion, this means we add a phase

$$e^{i\theta a}$$

in the sum over characters computing the AP/\star partition functions, while for the P/\star partition functions we use

$$e^{i\theta r}.$$

Note that in this later expression, since r is a half-integer, there is a choice of branch of the logarithm. We choose $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, but this choice does not affect our computation of the anomaly.

Taking these partition functions through the bosonization transformations, we find

$$Z_b(+/+; 0/\theta) = \frac{1}{|\eta(\tau)|^2} \sum_{m,n \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{i\theta(n/2+m)} q^{\frac{1}{2}(n/2+m)^2} \bar{q}^{\frac{1}{2}(n/2-m)^2}.$$

Thus we can identify the chiral $U(1)_L$ charge with

$$Q = n/2 + m.$$

In particular we find

$$e^{2\pi i Q} = (-1)^s$$

as expected: $U(1)_L$ is extended by \mathbb{Z}_2 in bosonization.

Given $\nu_1(A) = c_1(A) \bmod 2$, there are still infinitely many choices for $\nu_{-1}(dA/2\pi)$, equivalently $\nu_0(A)$, satisfying the Gu-Wen-Freed equation:

$$d\nu_0(A) = \frac{1}{2} c_1(A)^2 \bmod 1,$$

given by

$$\nu_0(A) = \frac{k}{4\pi} A \frac{dA}{2\pi} \quad k \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1,$$

which we recognize as the odd-level $U(1)$ Chern-Simons terms.⁵

To determine the level, we need to study the charge of the magnetic flux. We can obtain the partition function

$$Z_b(+/+, \theta/\theta) = \frac{1}{|\eta(\tau)|^2} \sum_{m,n \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{i\theta(n/2+m+\theta/4\pi)} q^{\frac{1}{2}(n/2+m+\theta/2\pi)^2} \bar{q}^{\frac{1}{2}(n/2-m)^2}$$

from a modular transformation of $Z_b(+/+, 0/\theta)$. This partition function indicates that the θ flux operator carries $\theta/4\pi$ charge, indicating a level $k = 1$. Note that an equivalent interpretation is that we've found that the 2+1D bulk π -flux has a topological spin $e^{i\pi/4}$, corresponding to $\nu = 2$ in Kitaev's 16-fold way upon Higgs'ing from $U(1)$ to \mathbb{Z}_2 [Kit06]. The extension class $\nu_1(A)$ corresponds to the $\nu = 2 \bmod 4$ fusion rule for the vortices $a \otimes a = \epsilon$.

If we repeat the calculation for $U(1)_R$ we expect to find the inverse anomaly $k = -1$, since applying a parity-reversing transformation to the previous $U(1)_1$ coupled to $U(1)_L$ setup takes $U(1)_L$ to $U(1)_R$ and $U(1)_1$ to $U(1)_{-1}$. In the case of $U(1) = U(1)_R$ symmetry, we find that the charge is now

$$Q = n/2 - m,$$

⁵These are schematic expressions which must be treated carefully, eg. using differential cocycles, to account for torsion situations where $c_1(A)$ is nontrivial but $dA = 0$.

again with

$$e^{2\pi i Q} = (-1)^s.$$

Now however

$$Z_b(+/, +, \theta/\theta) = \frac{1}{|\eta(\tau)|^2} \sum_{m, n \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{i\theta(n/2+m-\theta/4\pi)} q^{\frac{1}{2}(n/2+m+\theta/2\pi)^2} \bar{q}^{\frac{1}{2}(n/2-m)^2}$$

so the θ flux has charge $-\theta/4\pi$, yielding the opposite anomaly $U(1)_{-1}$. This corresponds to $\nu = -2$ in Kitaev's 16-fold way.

Note that we could've chosen another branching of the logarithm to define Q in the twisted sectors, using

$$-e^{i\theta r}$$

rather than $e^{i\theta r}$ (this amounts to a shift $\theta \mapsto \theta + 2\pi$). In terms of Q , this means

$$Q = n/2 + m + n.$$

Because $s = n$, these different choices correspond to a symmetry of the anomaly theory:

$$A \mapsto A + \pi B_1.$$

This does not change the Chern-Simons level, so the anomaly does not depend on our choices. In general such automorphisms amount to shifts of the ν_j by coboundaries.

4 2nd bosonization and more general anomalies

Now we wish to discuss the case that the fermionic SPT phase in the bulk is not of Gu-Wen-Freed type, instead described by $\nu_2, \nu_1, \nu_0 \sim \nu_{-1}$. To do this, we will need to describe 2nd bosonization in the presence of a boundary. As before, the trick will be to express the configuration of Kitaev wire and fermionic particle probes by Poincaré-Lefschetz duality. One finds that Σ, γ are expressed by $C_1 \in C^{D-1}(X, \mathbb{Z}_2), C_2 \in C^{D-2}(X, \mathbb{Z}_2), B_1 \in C^{D-2}(Y, \mathbb{Z}_2), B_2 \in C^{D-3}(Y, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ satisfying

$$dC_2 = 0 \pmod{2}$$

$$C_2|_Y = dB_2 \pmod{2}$$

$$dC_1 = Sq^2 C_2 \pmod{2}$$

$$C_1|_Y = \beta_1(0, B_2) + dB_1 \pmod{2},$$

where $\beta_1(C_2, B_2)$ is a 1st descendant of the Postnikov class $Sq^2 C_2$ (expected to appear in Dirichlet boundary conditions because of its role in higher gauge transformations [KT13]), meaning

$$d\beta_1(C_2, B_2) = Sq^2(C_2 + dB_2) - Sq^2 C_2 \pmod{2}.$$

It's necessary to include it so that the last boundary condition is compatible with the Kitaev wire worldsheet constraint (10). Because the Steenrod squares are stable cohomology operations [MT08], there is a choice of β_1 such that

$$\beta_1(0, B_2) = Sq^2 B_2 \pmod{2} \quad \text{when} \quad dB_2 = 0 \pmod{2}.$$

This is very satisfying, since it shows that on the boundary in the absence of bulk probe fermions we get an $E_{2,D-1}$ -gauge field $B = (B_1, B_2)$, as in the case of 1st bosonization. This pattern is expected to hold for all higher bosonizations because the groups of fermionic SRE phases are all abelian and form a spectrum whose Postnikov classes are all stable cohomology operations (built out of Sq^1 and Sq^2), which follows from [KTTW15, FH16].

To include a global G symmetry, we make the replacements $C_2 \mapsto C_2 + \nu_2(A)$ and $C_1 \mapsto C_1 + C_2 \cup_{D-1} \nu_2(A) + \nu_1(A)$ as before, to find:

$$\begin{aligned} d(C_2 + \nu_2(A)) &= 0 \pmod{2} & (23) \\ (C_2 + \nu_2(A))|_Y &= dB_2 \pmod{2} \\ d(C_1 + C_2 \cup_{D-1} \nu_2(A) + \nu_1(A)) &= Sq^2(C_2 + \nu_2(A)) \pmod{2} \\ (C_1 + C_2 \cup_{D-1} \nu_2(A) + \nu_1(A))|_Y &= dB_1 + \beta_1(0, B_2) \pmod{2}. \end{aligned}$$

When C_2 and C_1 are zero, meaning the probes lie only on the boundary, this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} d\nu_2(A) &= 0 \pmod{2} & (24) \\ \nu_2(A)|_Y &= dB_2 \pmod{2} \\ d\nu_1(A) &= Sq^2 \nu_2(A) \pmod{2} \\ \nu_1(A)|_Y &= dB_1 + \beta_1(0, B_2) \pmod{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Two of these are bulk constraints, and the other two describe a nontrivial extension of the boundary G symmetry by the $(D-2)$ -group $E_{2,D}$, as we saw in the Gu-Wen-Freed case. We expect this general structure holds for all higher bosonizations. Note that we have not included the twisting ξ , but once the twisted Postnikov constraints such as (16) are fully understood, this will be a straightforward of our discussion.

4.1 1+1D Chiral \mathbb{Z}_2 Anomaly

Let us now consider the example of a massless free Majorana fermion in 1+1D. The fermion number of this theory is only conserved modulo 2, but like the Dirac fermion can be considered a sum of fermion parities from the left-moving and right-moving sectors. We study the anomalous \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetries corresponding to the left-moving and right-moving chiral fermion parities, $(-1)^{F_L}$, $(-1)^{F_R}$. The anomaly theories of these symmetries are a bit harder to understand than the chiral $U(1)$ anomaly, because they are not Chern-Simons theories (or even spin-Dijkgraaf-Witten theories) and require 2nd bosonization to describe. Instead,

it is known that the anomaly theory is nonabelian, related by bosonization to the double Ising TQFT (odd ν in Kitaev's 16-fold way [Kit06]).

To verify this we can study the symmetry fluxes. Let us denote the partition function of the left-movers on a torus with spin structure η as $Z_L(\tau, \eta)$ and $Z_R(\bar{\tau}, \eta)$ for the right-movers. Denoting by A_L a background gauge field for $(-1)^{F_L}$, and A_R for $(-1)^{F_R}$ then the twisted partition function of the Majorana fermion in these backgrounds may be defined as

$$Z_f(A_L, A_R, \eta) = Z_L(\tau, \eta + A_L)Z_R(\bar{\tau}, \eta + A_R).$$

In particular, on an AP/AP torus with $(-1)^{F_L}$ symmetry twist in the spatial cycle, we have

$$Z_f(-/+_L, AP/AP) = Z_L(\tau, P/AP)Z_R(\bar{\tau}, AP/AP).$$

Under a T transformation $\tau \mapsto \tau + 1$, we can use the known transformation rules of $c = 1/2$ conformal characters to show that this transforms to

$$Z_f(-/+_L, AP/AP) \mapsto e^{2\pi i/24}Z_L(\tau, P/AP)e^{2\pi i/48}Z_R(\bar{\tau}, AP/P) = e^{2\pi i/16}Z_f(-/-_L, AP/P),$$

yielding the topological spin of the flux, which we interpreted in the previous section as its symmetry charge. We see that this corresponds to Kitaev's $\nu = 1$ in the 16-fold way [Kit06], hence a generator of $\Omega_{spin}^3(B\mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ by [BGK17]. On the other hand, for $(-1)^{F_R}$, we have

$$Z_f(-/+_R, AP/AP) = Z_L(\tau, AP/AP)Z_R(\bar{\tau}, P/AP),$$

which is the complex conjugate of $Z_f(+/-_L, AP/AP)$, yielding an opposite topological spin for the flux, hence $\nu = -1$ and the inverse anomaly theory.

In 2nd bosonization, these SPT phases are presented by

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_2 = A \quad \nu_1 = 0 \quad \nu_0 = 0, \\ \nu_2 = A \quad \nu_1 = A^2 \quad \nu_0 = -\frac{1}{4}AdA, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. See [BGK17] for a discussion of the group law this data satisfies, which shows that they are inverses. We will rederive these results by studying the symmetry algebra of the bosonized Dirac fermion. First, we will show

$$\nu_2 = A$$

for either symmetry. This is interesting because when we realize this system coupled to background gauge field in anomaly in-flow, the Dirichlet constraint for the bulk bosonization gauge fields is

$$dB_2 = \nu_2(A) = A \pmod{2} \tag{25}$$

which implies in this case that it's actually impossible to construct twisted sectors of the chiral symmetry in the bosonization! This is because the bosonization of the chiral fermion parities domain wall is not invertible. Indeed, we can compute

$$Z_b(+/-_{L,R}, +/+_{B_1}) = \vec{\chi}^T \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \vec{\chi},$$

where

$$\vec{\chi} = \begin{bmatrix} \chi_1 \\ \chi_\epsilon \\ \chi_\sigma \end{bmatrix}$$

is a vector of $c = 1/2$ chiral Virasoro characters, corresponding to the three sectors of the chiral Ising CFT: $1, \epsilon, \sigma$. We see from this expression that the bosonization of either chiral fermion parity results in a transformation which squares to a projection operator which projects out the states in the σ -sector. These are precisely the spin-flip-odd states.

We can say it another way. It's well-known that the bosonization of the Majorana fermion is the critical Ising chain. The chiral fermion parities get mapped to different realizations of the Kramers-Wannier duality transformation, which rewrites the critical Ising model in terms of the same model but with the spin-flip symmetry gauged. We will show that the spin-flip symmetry couples to B_1 , so that when we fermionize, summing over B_1 , Kramers-Wannier duality becomes a symmetry. We discuss in general an algebraic structure called a groupoid which mixes symmetries and dualities in section 6.

To see that B_1 couples to the spin-flip symmetry, we use the 1st bosonization relations to compute the torus partition function in the background $\int_x B_1 = 0$, $\int_t B_1 = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_b(+/-) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(Z_f(AP/AP) + Z_f(P/AP) - Z_f(AP/P) - Z_f(P/P) \right) \\ &= |\chi_{1,1}(q)|^2 + |\chi_{2,1}(q)|^2 - |\chi_{1,2}(q)|^2, \end{aligned}$$

using the labels from the Kac table of $c = 1/2$ characters [FMS12]. We see the $(1, 2)$ sector has odd charge while the $(1, 1), (2, 1)$ sectors have even charge. The $(1, 2)$ states are excitations over the spin operator, so B_1 couples to the spin-flip symmetry. Equivalently, the B_1 domain wall is the ϵ -defect in the Ising CFT [FFRS04, BGK17].

Now we wish to see the effect of B_2 in second bosonization. Note first that if we turn on a constant $B_2 = 1$ (without A or C , $dB_2 = 0$, so B_2 is always constant, either 0 or 1), the spin factor contributes a factor of the topological partition function of the Kitaev wire [KTTW15]:

$$W_2(\eta, B_1 = 0, B_2 = 1) = \text{Arf}(\eta).$$

If we then turn on a mass deformation of the Majorana fermion, the presence of this factor swaps the gapped phases at $m > 0$ and $m < 0$. It is known that

in bosonization the mass deformation of the Majorana fermion corresponds to tuning the relative strength of the two competing terms in the Ising Hamiltonian, so that the neighboring gapped phases bosonize to the ferromagnetic and paramagnetic gapped phases of the Ising chain.

Let us show this from our perspective, by forming the mass deformation to the trivial phase of the Majorana fermion, for which the partition function may be normalized so $Z_f(\eta) = 1$. Writing the analog of the bosonization relations (11) for the partition functions, we have

$$Z_b(B_1, B_2) = \sum_{\eta} Z_f(\eta) W_2(\eta, B_1, B_2) = \sum_{\eta} W_2(\eta, B_1, B_2).$$

There are two cases:

$$Z_b(B_1, B_2 = 1) = \sum_{\eta} W_2(\eta, B_1, B_2 = 1) = 1,$$

$$Z_b(B_1, B_2 = 0) = \sum_{\eta} W_2(\eta, B_1, B_2 = 0) = \delta(B_1).$$

The first corresponds to the paramagnetic phase (the domain wall is massless and B_1 is deconfined) while the second corresponds to the ferromagnetic phase (the domain wall is massive and B_1 is confined). Thus we see that for a particular choice of relevant deformation of the 2nd bosonization, changing the value of B_2 changes which of the two neighboring gapped phases this deformation flows to.

It remains to compute $\nu_1(A)$. To do this, we have to study the chiral fermion parity domain wall. It is well-known [CH85] that this domain wall supports a Majorana zero mode. When two domain walls fuse together, the two zero modes are collected into a single Dirac Fock space which has two basis states with opposite fermion parity, the occupied and un-occupied states. Fusion vertices for symmetry defects need to be non-degenerate, so the symmetry chooses one of the states in this Fock space. Furthermore, they must fuse to a state of definite fermion parity, since fusion is local. Thus, there are two fusion channels: bosonic and fermionic.

When the fusion results in the bosonic state, we have $\nu_1(A) = 0$, and when it results in the fermionic state, we have $\nu_1(A) = A^2$. Indeed, in the latter case, after we sum over spin structures the B_1 domain wall is bound to this fermionic particle, so we obtain a domain wall junction $A \otimes A = B_1$, indicating a nontrivial extension of G by \mathbb{Z}_2 .

It appears that whether $\nu_1(A_L) = 0$, $\nu_1(A_R) = A_R^2$ or whether it is the opposite may be a matter of convention. Maybe this is not the case and the Majorana fermion has some way of deciding the fusion vertex. However, we can at least show that they always have to be opposites. For instance, suppose two $(-1)^{F_L}$ domain walls with Majorana zero modes c_1, c_2 , labelled from left to right, come into contact, pairing by a Hamiltonian term

$$i c_1 c_2.$$

Then, applying reflection symmetry, these become $(-1)^{FR}$ domain walls now pairing by the opposite term

$$-ic_1c_2,$$

since c_1 and c_2 anti-commute. Thus, the ground states of these pairing terms have opposite fermion parity.

5 Time Reversal Anomalies in 2+1D

We will comment on our expectations for time reversal $T^2 = (-1)^F$ anomalies of 2+1D fermionic systems in bosonization. This is done by analogy with the above discussions, although some detail is missing. To complete the story will require a deeper understanding of bosonization in 3+1D than has been so far achieved, mostly because of difficulties in understanding the generalized Gu-Wen-Freed equation. This leaves ν_0 a mystery. However, we can describe ν_3, ν_2, ν_1 and how they modify the time reversal symmetry algebra of the anomalous theory upon bosonization. This is enough to determine such anomalies up to a bosonic anomaly (namely $w_1(TX)^4 \in \Omega_{\mathcal{O}}^4$).

Recall that such anomalies (equivalently 3+1D topological superconductors) are classified by

$$\Omega_{spin}^4(B\mathbb{Z}_2, \xi) = \mathbb{Z}_{16},$$

where ξ is a sum of three copies of the sign representation [KTTW15]. This group is computed by the AHSS as an iterated extension [Kit15] of

$$H^1(B\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}^\xi) = \mathbb{Z}_2$$

$$\text{by } H^2(B\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2$$

$$\text{by } H^3(B\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2$$

$$\text{by } H^5(B\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}^\xi) = \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

Thus we expect the root phases (ν odd) to have

$$\nu_3(A) = A \in H^1(B\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}^\xi).$$

This means that the time reversal “domain wall” carries an odd number of $p + ip$ superconductors. This is what we know from the boundary of the odd ν topological superconductors, that breaking T in two different ways on the boundary produces a domain wall carrying a $c = 1/2 \pmod 1$ chiral mode, which can be thought of as the boundary of a $p + ip$ superconductor which forms the bulk domain wall [FCV13].

Analogous to the situation for the Majorana fermion in 1+1D, we see that in bosonization, we’ll have

$$d_G B_3 = dB_3 - 2A \cup B_3 = \nu_3(A) = A,$$

which implies $A = dB_3 \pmod 2$, so we cannot place the bosonized theory on an unorientable manifold. We expect that this means that time reversal symmetry

is realized as an anti-unitary duality of the bosonized theory. This is a concrete prediction, since the boundary of the $\nu = 1$ topological superconductor may be realized by a massless free Majorana fermion in 2+1D. We expect that the bosonization has an anti-unitary “self-duality” inherited from time reversal of the Majorana fermion, which becomes a symmetry once we gauge the $E_{2,3}$ 2-group symmetry.

One such bosonization of the 2+1D massless free Majorana is $SU(2)_2$ Chern-Simons theory coupled to a massless adjoint scalar ϕ [MVX17]⁶. We expect the $B\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry coupling to B_1 is the center symmetry of the gauge field and B_2 couples to the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry $\phi \mapsto -\phi$. This bosonization realizes the Majorana as the critical point between the $\nu = 3$ ($SU(2)_2$) and $\nu = 4$ (double semion) topological theories in Kitaev’s 16-fold way [Kit06]. When we take $B_3 \in Z^0(X, \mathbb{Z})$ to be a constant $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, it means we apply m $p + ip$ superconductors and then bosonize (see the discussion around B_2 for the 1+1D Majorana). This changes the bosonization to one realized as a critical point between phases $3 + m$ and $4 + m$ in the 16-fold way.

We expect all of these theories are dual by various combinations of particle-vortex/level-rank dualities [HS16]. $\nu_3(A) = A$ indicates that time reversal must be composed with such a duality in bosonization. Indeed, it takes $SU(2)_2 + \phi$ to $SU(2)_{-2} + \phi$, which realizes a critical point between $\nu = -4$ and $\nu = -3$ and we must compose with a certain duality to return to a transition from $\nu = 3$ to $\nu = 4$. When we gauge the $E_{2,3}$ symmetry of the bosonization, this duality becomes a symmetry. It would be very interesting to understand this in more detail.

For anomalies with even $\nu \bmod 16$, we will have $\nu_3 = 0$. It will be possible to place the bosonizations of these theories on unorientable spacetimes, ie. we expect the bosonized time reversal to act as a symmetry, not a duality. However, (ν_1, ν_2) shall describe how time reversal is nontrivially extended by $E_{2,3}$. In particular, $\nu_2 \in H^2(B\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ denotes a group extension of the ordinary sort, while ν_1 denotes an extension of this extended group by the 1-form symmetry 2-group $B\mathbb{Z}_2$ (a Postnikov class for time reversal). Both phenomena have been encountered in studying time reversal symmetry of gapped phases in 2+1D [BC18].

We leave explicit descriptions of such examples to future work [HKT18].

6 Some Comments on Symmetry Groupoids

We have studied how the 1+1D free Majorana couples to a $E_{2,2}$ background

$$B_1 \in Z^1(X, \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

$$B_2 \in Z^0(X, \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

The first piece, B_1 is easily understood as a gauge field which couples to a \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry, but how can we understand B_2 ? Likewise in 2+1D, $B_3 \in Z^0(X, \mathbb{Z})$.

⁶This is really only a description of the bosonization in the low energy theory.

What are the meaning of these 0-cocycles as “0-form gauge fields”, which on connected spacetimes are just constant functions?

We propose that the proper way to think about $E_{2,2}$ and $E_{3,3}$ are as groupoids, which is like a group with multiple base points [BHW09]. Precisely it is a category whose morphisms are all invertible. Simple groupoids like $E_{2,2}$ can be visualized graphically, as in Fig. 1.

Groupoids typically do not act⁷ faithfully on individual quantum field theories. Instead, a groupoid acts on a collection of QFTs $T(x)$, indexed by the objects x of the groupoid. For each morphism $f : x \rightarrow y$ in the groupoid we have a Hilbert space transformation (either unitary or anti-unitary)

$$U(f) : \mathcal{H}_{T(x)} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{T(y)}$$

such that if $H(x), H(y)$ are the Hamiltonians of $T(x), T(y)$, then

$$U(f)H(x) = H(y)U(f).$$

When $x = y$, this means that the automorphisms of x act as ordinary symmetries of $T(x)$. Indeed, when the groupoid has a single object, it is equivalently just a group and this notion of groupoid symmetry specializes to the usual notion of group symmetry. However, when $x \neq y$, $U(f)$ describes a *duality* between $T(x)$ and $T(y)$. In this way, groupoid symmetry generalizes both ordinary group symmetry and duality. Note that $E_{2,2}$ doesn’t contain any dualities but also isn’t a group.

The upshot of this is that we bosonize a 1+1D fermionic QFT, we obtain not one bosonic QFT, but *two* bosonic QFTs, depending on whether $B_2 = 0$ or 1 (we assume X is connected), each with an action of \mathbb{Z}_2 . The theory obtained from $B_2 = 0$ is the ordinary 1st bosonization (2), while the theory obtained from $B_2 = 1$ is the 1st bosonization after tensoring with the unique nontrivial 1+1D FSRE phase, the Kitaev wire. One way to summarize this is to say that $E_{2,2}$ acts on the bosonizations of any 1+1D fermionic QFT.

In general dimensions we will get several bosonizations the same way by tensoring with the different FSRE phases in that dimension. For instance, in 2+1D we can define infinitely many bosonizations by tensoring with different numbers of $p + ip$ superconductors, which constitute the group of 2+1D FSRE phases [KTTW15]. In general, $E_{D,D}$ will act naturally on these bosonizations, reflecting the fact that $E_{D,D}$ is a (higher) groupoid whose components are labelled by the different D -dimensional FSRE phases.

Recall when we studied the chiral \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry of the 1+1D massless Majorana fermion we found the constraint (25):

$$dB_1 = \nu_1(A) = 0$$

$$dB_2 = \nu_2(A) = A.$$

⁷Concisely, a groupoid action on a category is a functor from the groupoid in question to that category. For a description of the category of QFTs see [Kap10].




Figure 1: The $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry action of the chiral fermion parity of the free massless Majorana fermion in 1+1D when bosonized is extended nontrivially by the canonical $E_{2,2}$ groupoid symmetry of 1+1D bosonizations, such that the generator of G acts as a duality transformation between two a priori inequivalent bosonizations.

We can interpret this as describing an extension of $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ by $E_{2,2}$ as groupoids [BHW09]. The extension \hat{G} is the groupoid shown in Fig. 1. When we look at the action of \hat{G} on the bosonizations we see that the generator of G lifts to a Kramers-Wannier duality between the two Ising chains. The fact that $\nu_1 = 0$ implies that when we perform this operation twice (dualizing $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow A$), we obtain the identity transformation. If $\nu_1(A)$ was nontrivial instead, doing this twice would instead yield the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry operator.

We can put it another way in 1 + 1D. It is known in conformal field theory that the conformal defects also can capture dualities, such as in [FFRS04]. These defects X can be grouplike, meaning $X \otimes X^\vee$ is the unit defect, corresponding to the domain walls of ordinary global symmetries. They can also be duality defects, meaning that $X \otimes X^\vee$ is a sum of grouplike defects. The sort of groupoid-extended G action we're talking about assigns either a grouplike or duality defect $X(g)$ to every element $g \in G$, which respects the fusion rules, meaning $X(gh) = X(g) \otimes X(h)$. Further, it includes a choice of grouplike defect in $X(g) \otimes X(h) \otimes X(gh)^\vee = X(gh) \otimes X(gh)^\vee$ (this is ν_1). This defines a group extension of G by the grouplike defects (this is ν_2). In higher dimensions we expect a similar structure to be definable.

References

- [ALW17] D. Aasen, E. Lake, and K. Walker. Fermion condensation and super pivotal categories. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2017.

- [ASSH72] J.F. Adams, G.C. Shepherd, London Mathematical Society, and N.J. Hitchin. *Algebraic Topology: A Student's Guide*. Cambridge Milton for Schools a. Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- [BC18] M. Barkeshli and M. Cheng. Time-reversal and spatial-reflection symmetry localization anomalies in (2+1)-dimensional topological phases of matter. *Phys. Rev. B*, 98(11):115129, September 2018.
- [Ben15] Y. BenTov. Fermion masses without symmetry breaking in two spacetime dimensions. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 7:34, July 2015.
- [BGK17] L. Bhardwaj, D. Gaiotto, and A. Kapustin. State sum constructions of spin-TFTs and string net constructions of fermionic phases of matter. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 4:96, April 2017.
- [BHW09] J. C. Baez, A. E. Hoffnung, and C. D. Walker. Higher-Dimensional Algebra VII: Groupoidification. *ArXiv e-prints*, August 2009.
- [Bil08] A. Bilal. Lectures on Anomalies. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2008.
- [BM05] D. Belov and G. W. Moore. Classification of abelian spin Chern-Simons theories. *ArXiv High Energy Physics - Theory e-prints*, May 2005.
- [CGLW13] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen. Symmetry protected topological orders and the group cohomology of their symmetry group. *Phys. Rev. B*, 87(15):155114, April 2013.
- [CGW11] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen. Complete classification of one-dimensional gapped quantum phases in interacting spin systems. *Phys. Rev. B*, 84(23):235128, December 2011.
- [CH85] C.G. Callan and J.A. Harvey. Anomalies and fermion zero modes on strings and domain walls. *Nuclear Physics B*, 250(1):427 – 436, 1985.
- [CK18] Y.-A. Chen and A. Kapustin. Bosonization in three spatial dimensions and a 2-form gauge theory. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2018.
- [CKR18] Y.-A. Chen, A. Kapustin, and D. Radičević. Exact bosonization in two spatial dimensions and a new class of lattice gauge theories. *Annals of Physics*, 393:234–253, June 2018.
- [CLV14] X. Chen, Y.-M. Lu, and A. Vishwanath. Symmetry-protected topological phases from decorated domain walls. *Nature Communications*, 5:3507, March 2014.
- [DW90] Robbert Dijkgraaf and Edward Witten. Topological gauge theories and group cohomology. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 129(2):393–429, 1990.

- [FCV13] L. Fidkowski, X. Chen, and A. Vishwanath. Non-Abelian Topological Order on the Surface of a 3D Topological Superconductor from an Exactly Solved Model. *Physical Review X*, 3(4):041016, October 2013.
- [FFRS04] J. Fröhlich, J. Fuchs, I. Runkel, and C. Schweigert. Kramers-Wannier Duality from Conformal Defects. *Physical Review Letters*, 93(7):070601, August 2004.
- [FH16] D. S. Freed and M. J. Hopkins. Reflection positivity and invertible topological phases. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2016.
- [FK11] L. Fidkowski and A. Kitaev. Topological phases of fermions in one dimension. *Phys. Rev. B*, 83(7):075103, February 2011.
- [FMS12] P. Francesco, P. Mathieu, and D. Senechal. *Conformal Field Theory*. Graduate Texts in Contemporary Physics. Springer New York, 2012.
- [Fre08] D. S. Freed. Pions and generalized cohomology. *J. Differential Geom.*, 80(1):45–77, 09 2008.
- [GK16] D. Gaiotto and A. Kapustin. Spin TQFTs and fermionic phases of matter. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, 31:1645044–184, October 2016.
- [GKKS17] Davide Gaiotto, Anton Kapustin, Zohar Komargodski, and Nathan Seiberg. Theta, time reversal and temperature. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2017(5):91, May 2017.
- [GKSW15] D. Gaiotto, A. Kapustin, N. Seiberg, and B. Willett. Generalized global symmetries. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2:172, February 2015.
- [GS18] O. Golan and A. Stern. Probing topological superconductors with emergent gravity. *Phys. Rev. B*, 98(6):064503, August 2018.
- [GW12] Z.-C. Gu and X.-G. Wen. Symmetry-protected topological orders for interacting fermions – Fermionic topological nonlinear σ models and a special group supercohomology theory. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2012.
- [HKT18] I. Hason, Z. Komargodski, and R. Thorngren. CPT, Domain Walls, and Anomalies. *To Appear*, 2018.
- [HS16] P.-S. Hsin and N. Seiberg. Level/rank duality and Chern-Simons-matter theories. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 9:95, September 2016.
- [Kap10] A. Kapustin. Topological Field Theory, Higher Categories, and Their Applications. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2010.

- [Kap14] A. Kapustin. Symmetry Protected Topological Phases, Anomalies, and Cobordisms: Beyond Group Cohomology. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2014.
- [Kit01] A. Y. Kitaev. 6. QUANTUM COMPUTING: Unpaired Majorana fermions in quantum wires. *Physics Uspekhi*, 44:131, October 2001.
- [Kit06] A. Kitaev. Anyons in an exactly solved model and beyond. *Annals of Physics*, 321:2–111, January 2006.
- [Kit15] A. Kitaev. Homotopy-theoretic approach to SPT phases in action: Z16 classification of three-dimensional superconductors. *IPAM talk*, 2015.
- [KT91] R.C. Kirby and L.R. Taylor. *Pin structures on low-dimensional manifolds*, volume 2 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*, page 177–242. Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [KT13] A. Kapustin and R. Thorngren. Higher symmetry and gapped phases of gauge theories. *In Book: Physics and Mathematics in the 21st Century*, September 2013.
- [KT14] A. Kapustin and R. Thorngren. Anomalies of discrete symmetries in various dimensions and group cohomology. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2014.
- [KT17] A. Kapustin and R. Thorngren. Fermionic SPT phases in higher dimensions and bosonization. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 10:80, October 2017.
- [KT19] A. Kapustin and R. Thorngren. Higher Berry Phase. *Work in progress*, 2019.
- [KTTW15] A. Kapustin, R. Thorngren, A. Turzillo, and Z. Wang. Fermionic symmetry protected topological phases and cobordisms. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 12:52, December 2015.
- [LZW18] T. Lan, C. Zhu, and X.-G. Wen. Fermion decoration construction of symmetry protected trivial orders for fermion systems with any symmetries G_f and in any dimensions. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2018.
- [MFCV14] M. A. Metlitski, L. Fidkowski, X. Chen, and A. Vishwanath. Interaction effects on 3D topological superconductors: surface topological order from vortex condensation, the 16 fold way and fermionic Kramers doublets. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2014.
- [MT08] R.E. Mosher and M.C. Tangora. *Cohomology Operations and Applications in Homotopy Theory*. Dover Books on Mathematics Series. Dover Publications, 2008.

- [MVX17] M. A. Metlitski, A. Vishwanath, and C. Xu. Duality and bosonization of $(2+1)$ -dimensional Majorana fermions. *Phys. Rev. B*, 95(20):205137, May 2017.
- [Sen15] T. Senthil. Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases of Quantum Matter. *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics*, 6:299–324, March 2015.
- [tH80] Gerard 't Hooft. Naturalness, chiral symmetry, and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking. *NATO Sci. Ser. B*, 59:135–157, 1980.
- [Tho54] René Thom. Quelques propriétés globales des variétés différentiables. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici*, 28(1):17–86, 12 1954.
- [Vol09] G.E. Volovik. *The Universe in a Helium Droplet*. International Series of Monographs on Physics. OUP Oxford, 2009.
- [WG17] Q.-R. Wang and Z.-C. Gu. Towards a complete classification of fermionic symmetry protected topological phases in 3D and a general group supercohomology theory. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2017.
- [Wit89] Edward Witten. Quantum field theory and the jones polynomial. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 121(3):351–399, 1989.