

Anyon Quantum Dimensions from an Arbitrary Ground State Wave Function

Shang Liu*

Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

Realizing topological orders and topological quantum computation is a central task of modern physics. An important but notoriously hard question in this endeavor is how to diagnose topological orders that lack conventional order parameters. A breakthrough in this problem is the discovery of topological entanglement entropy, which can be used to detect nontrivial topological order from a ground state wave function, but is far from enough for fully determining the topological order. In this work, we take a key step further in this direction: We propose a simple entanglement-based protocol for extracting the quantum dimensions of all anyons from a single ground state wave function in two dimensions. The choice of the space manifold and the ground state is arbitrary. This protocol is both validated in the continuum and verified on lattices, and we anticipate it to be realizable in various quantum simulation platforms.

INTRODUCTION

Topologically ordered phases of matter exhibit a number of remarkable properties, such as the existence of fractionalized excitations dubbed anyons, and robust ground state degeneracies on topologically nontrivial spaces [1]. From a practical perspective, they are also promising platforms for fault-tolerant quantum computation [2, 3].

Unlike symmetry breaking orders, topological orders (TOs) lack conventional order parameters. They do not even require any symmetry and sometimes support gapped boundaries. Therefore, diagnosing TOs is generically a difficult task. Recent advances in quantum simulating topologically ordered states [4–12] have further highlighted the need for efficient protocols to identify them. A breakthrough in this problem is the discovery of topological entanglement entropy (EE) [13–16]. It is shown that the EE of a disk region in a two-dimensional gapped ground state wave function contains a universal term dubbed the topological EE, from which we can read off the so-called total quantum dimension \mathcal{D} of the system. $\mathcal{D} = 1$ ($\mathcal{D} > 1$) for a trivial (nontrivial) TO, and hence the topological EE can be used for detecting nontrivial TOs. However, \mathcal{D} is still far from fully characterizing a TO. In particular, it can not distinguish abelian and nonabelian TOs which have very different properties and applications. There have been efforts to extract other universal quantities of a TO, such as the chiral central charge either from edge thermal transport [17–19] or the bulk wave function [20–23], the higher central charge [24], and the many-body Chern number [25–27]. However, these quantities again do not distinguish abelian and nonabelian TOs, and vanish for many TOs supporting gapped boundaries.

If we know the quantum dimensions d_j of all anyon types j , we will be able to tell apart abelian and nonabelian TOs, because the former have $d_j = 1$ for all j , while the latter have $d_j > 1$ for some j . Intuitively,

d_j is the Hilbert space dimension shared by each type- j anyon in the limit of many anyons. More precisely, let $D_j(M)$ be the degeneracy of a particular anyon configuration with M type- j anyons. Then in the large M limit, $D_j(M)/d_j^M$ is of order 1 [3]. \mathcal{D} is related to d_j 's by $\mathcal{D}^2 = \sum_j d_j^2$. d_j 's impose nontrivial constraints on the fusion rules of anyons, and if the chiral central charge is known, they also constrain the anyon self-statistics [19]. Therefore, d_j 's are important quantitative characterizations of the anyon excitations.

In this paper, we propose a very simple protocol for extracting the quantum dimensions of all anyons from an arbitrary ground state of a TO on an arbitrary space, e.g. a disk. There are other existing methods to extract d_j [15, 19, 28–34] as well. Some of these methods require knowing the operators for creating anyons, which is unlikely in the case of an unknown wave function. Some other methods require particular state(s) on a torus, which is harder to experimentally prepare than states on a planar geometry. The approach of Ref. 33 does not need either of these two, but requires accessing some infinite set of density matrices, which is more of conceptual than practical significance. The key outstanding feature of our proposal is that we have avoided the aforementioned requirements.

In the rest of the paper, we will first describe our protocol, then justify it with a field-theoretic approach, and finally test it on lattices using Kitaev's quantum double models [2].

RESULTS

Protocol

Consider a two-dimensional topologically ordered system on an arbitrary space manifold with or without a boundary. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be any state with no excitations in a large enough region, say a ground state. We will describe and later justify an efficient protocol for extracting the quantum dimensions of all anyons.

Consider a partition of the space as shown in Fig. 1

* sliu.phys@gmail.com




FIG. 1. The partition of space used in our protocol. There is an annulus region $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^4 A_i$ subdivided into four parts. The remaining uncolored region is B .

in a region with no excitations. $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^4 A_i$ takes an annulus shape, and B is the rest of the system. Our protocol consists of three steps listed below. Note that we will first describe the protocol as if we are performing an analytical or numerical computation. A possible experimental realization will be given later.

- **Step 1:** Obtain the reduced density matrix $\rho_A := \text{Tr}_B |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ for the annulus region A .
- **Step 2:** Map ρ_A to a pure state in the doubled Hilbert space: Let $\rho_A = \sum_{i,j} M_{ij} |i\rangle\langle j|$ where $\{|i\rangle\}$ is an arbitrary real-space tensor product basis for Region A . We define

$$|\rho_A\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{Tr}(\rho_A^2)}} \sum_{i,j} M_{ij} |i\rangle |j\rangle. \quad (1)$$

- **Step 3:** Denote the doubled system by $A \cup A'$, and divide A' as $\bigcup_{i=1}^4 A'_i$ in the same way as A . Compute the Renyi mutual information $I^{(n)}$ (defined later) between $A_1 \cup A'_1$ and $A_3 \cup A'_3$ for several different Renyi indices n , and solve the anyon quantum dimensions d_j according to the following formula.

$$I^{(n)}(11', 33') = \frac{1}{n-1} \log \left[\sum_j \left(\frac{d_j}{\mathcal{D}} \right)^{4-2n} \right], \quad (2)$$

where ii' stands for $A_i \cup A'_i$, and $\mathcal{D} := \sqrt{\sum_j d_j^2}$ is the total quantum dimension.

Here, the Renyi mutual information is defined as usual by $I^{(n)}(X, Y) := S_X^{(n)} + S_Y^{(n)} - S_{X \cup Y}^{(n)}$, where $S_P^{(n)} := (1-n)^{-1} \log \text{Tr}(\rho_P^n)$ is the Renyi entropy.

Intuitively, $|\rho_A\rangle$ is a particular ground state of the TO on the torus obtained by gluing A and A' along their boundaries. We will later carefully justify this picture and determine this special state. Once this is done, Eq. 2 follows from a known result about mutual information on torus [32].

A few comments are in order. In Step 2, the map from ρ_A to $|\rho_A\rangle$ is basis dependent. If we choose a different real-space tensor product basis, then the new pure state

$|\rho_A\rangle_{\text{new}}$ is related to the old one by a local basis rotation in A' . This does not affect the entanglement based quantity $I^{(n)}$ that we need. In Step 3, a possible strategy for solving all d_j is as follows: First obtain $I^{(2)}$ which gives the total number of anyon sectors t . Then obtain $I^{(n)}$ for more than t number of additional Renyi indices, from which we can uniquely determine all d_j/\mathcal{D} . Since we know the smallest quantum dimension is that of the vacuum sector, $d_0 = 1$, we can subsequently find the values of \mathcal{D} and all d_j . Note that for an abelian TO where $d_j = 1$ for all j , $I^{(n)} = 2 \log \mathcal{D}$ is n -independent. Hence, if we are accessible to only a limited number of Renyi indices, although we are not able to obtain all d_j , we can still tell whether the TO is abelian or nonabelian. We shall also remark that Renyi EEs for different Renyi indices n have rather different quantum information properties. For example, the strong subadditivity condition holds only for $n = 1$ [35]. Our proof of Eq. 2, as we will see later, does not utilize such kind of quantum information property and thus holds for all n .

For integer values of n , the quantity $I^{(n)}(11', 33')$ proposed above can in principle be experimentally measured. To see this, we need to first understand how to prepare the state $|\rho_A\rangle$ in practice. Let $\{|i\rangle\}$ and $\{|\mu\rangle\}$ be orthonormal bases of A and B , respectively. We can write $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i,\mu} \psi_{i\mu} |i\rangle |\mu\rangle$. It follows that $|\rho_A\rangle \propto \sum_{i,j,\mu} \psi_{i\mu} \psi_{j\mu}^* |i\rangle |j\rangle$. Denote by $|\psi^*\rangle = \sum_{i,\mu} \psi_{i\mu}^* |i\rangle |\mu\rangle$ the time-reversed copy of $|\psi\rangle$, i.e. the conjugate state in the chosen basis. We observe that $|\rho_A\rangle$ is proportional to $\langle\Psi| (|\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi^*\rangle)$, where $|\Psi\rangle \propto \sum_{\lambda} |\lambda\rangle |\lambda\rangle$ is a maximally entangled state living in two copies of B . This is illustrated using tensor diagrams in Fig. 2. It means that to prepare $|\rho_A\rangle$, we may first prepare the state $|\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi^*\rangle$, and then implement a partial projection onto the state $|\Psi\rangle$ using projective measurements with postselections. If $|\psi\rangle$ can be prepared in a quantum simulation platform using unitary circuits and measurements, then it should be equally easy to prepare the time-reversed copy $|\psi^*\rangle$. Once $|\rho_A\rangle$ can be prepared, one can measure EEs (and therefore the mutual information) for integer Renyi indices $n \geq 2$ using established methods. For example, to measure the n -th Renyi EE of a subregion R in a pure state, it suffices to measure the expectation value of the “shift operator” C_n . By definition, C_n acts on n copies of the same pure state, and its effect is to cyclically permute the n copies of subregion R . We note that both the postselections required for obtaining $|\rho_A\rangle$ and the measurement of EEs require resources that scale exponentially with the system size. Nonetheless, this is not a problem in principle. Since we are dealing with gapped quantum systems with finite correlation lengths, there is no need to go to very large system sizes to get accurate results – We just need the size of each subregion to well exceed the correlation length.




FIG. 2. Tensor diagrams for the states used in the protocol. Panels a, b, and c represent $|\psi\rangle$, ρ_A , and $|\rho_A\rangle$, respectively. Panel c also illustrates a practical way of preparing the state $|\rho_A\rangle$.

Continuum Approach

In this section, we will give a field-theoretic proof of Eq. 2, assuming the underlying TO to be described by a Chern-Simons (CS) theory [36]. The readers need not be familiar with CS theories, and just need to know that (1) a CS theory is a gauge theory with some compact gauge group G , and (2) it is a topological field theory, meaning that the action has no dependence on the space-time metric and only the spacetime topology matters. As mentioned previously, we require the state $|\psi\rangle$ to have no excitations (zero energy density) in a large enough region. We expect that the reduced density matrix of $|\psi\rangle$ on a disk deep inside this region has no dependence on the boundary condition or excitations far away [31, 37, 38]. Hence, for simplicity, we assume $|\psi\rangle$ to be the unique ground state of the TO on a sphere. In the CS theory, up to a normalization factor, this state can be prepared by performing the path integral in the interior of the sphere, i.e. on a solid ball, as illustrated in Fig. 3a.

Given the path integral representation of $|\psi\rangle$, we take a mirror image for $\langle\psi|$ [39] as shown in Fig. 3b, and then glue together B of $|\psi\rangle$ and B' of $\langle\psi|$ to obtain the path integral for ρ_A . The result is shown in Fig. 3c. Up to a normalization, $|\rho_A\rangle$ has the same path integral representation as ρ_A , it is therefore a state living on the torus. The Hilbert space on a torus without anyon excitation is multidimensional. An orthonormal basis of the space, denoted by $\{|R_j\rangle\}$, one-to-one corresponds to a finite set of representations $\{R_j\}$ of the gauge group, and also one-to-one corresponds to the anyon types of the TO. The state $|R_j\rangle$ can be prepared by performing the path integral on the solid torus (bagel) with a noncontractible Wilson loop [40] carrying the corresponding representation R_j inserted. As shown in Fig. 3c, the path integral for $|\rho_A\rangle$ has no Wilson loop insertion. The state thus corresponds to the trivial representation, or the trivial anyon sector (vacuum).

By keeping track of the subregions of A , we observe that $A_1 \cup A'_1$ and $A_3 \cup A'_3$ correspond to two annuli shown in Fig. 3d. We are now supposed to compute the Renyi




FIG. 3. Illustration of the field-theoretic approach. (a) The sphere state $|\psi\rangle$ is prepared by doing the path integral on the solid ball as indicated by the grey shade. (b) Path integral for $\langle\psi|$. (c) Path integral for ρ_A or $|\rho_A\rangle$. (d) Regions $A_1 \cup A'_1$ and $A_3 \cup A'_3$. (e) The effect of an \mathcal{S} transformation.

mutual information between these two regions. To this end, it is convenient to first apply an \mathcal{S} transformation [36], whose effect is shown in Fig. 3e: The two annuli now wind in the perpendicular direction, and a Wilson loop is inserted in the path integral. This new torus state is given by $\sum_j \mathcal{S}_{0j} |R_j\rangle$, where $\mathcal{S}_{0j} = d_j/D$ are components of the modular \mathcal{S} matrix. The desired mutual information $I^{(n)}$ can now be computed using the replica trick and the surgery method [28, 32, 36]. In fact, this has been done in Appendix B.4 of Ref. 32 (plug in $\psi_a = \mathcal{S}_{0a}$), and the technique is also pedagogically explained in that paper. We arrive at the result in Eq. 2.

As a fixed-point theory, the CS theory only captures the universal terms in EEs. For a generic gapped field theory or lattice model, the EE of a region also contains nonuniversal terms such as the “area-law” term proportional to the length of region boundary, and terms due to corners or other sharp features which are inevitable on lattices. We need to discuss whether the quantity $I^{(n)}$ we consider contains any nonuniversal term. For a general gapped theory, we expect the picture of Fig. 3d still holds, although the theory is now not topological and depends on the spacetime metric. If we assume that nonuniversal terms in the EEs are made of local contributions (which are insensitive to changes far away) near the partition interfaces [15, 16], then we see that all such terms have been canceled in $I^{(n)}$. For example, the boundary of $A_1 \cup A'_1$ contributes the same nonuniversal terms to $S_{11'}^{(n)}$ and $S_{11' \cup 33'}^{(n)}$, and these terms have been canceled in $I^{(n)}$ ($11', 33'$). We note that the locality assumption about nonuniversal terms does not hold in certain systems with the so-called suprious long-range entanglement [41–47], which will not be considered in this work. As one test of the universality of $I^{(n)}$, one can manually add a local bunch of coupled qubits to the state




FIG. 4. The toric code example. (a) The annulus region A . Subregions A_1 and A_3 (b) An X -loop operator. (c) A Z -loop operator. (d) Examples of boundary operators.

$|\psi\rangle$ at an arbitrary location, and observe that the final result of $I^{(n)}$ has no dependence on the state of these qubits.

Test on Lattices

In addition to the continuum approach, we have also tested our protocol on lattices using Kitaev's quantum double models [2]. This calculation is rather involved, so in the main text, we will only consider the simplest example – that of the toric code model. The most general cases will be discussed in the Supplementary Information.

Given a square lattice with qubits living on the edges (links), the toric code model is defined by the following Hamiltonian.

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_{\text{TC}} &= - \sum_v \mathcal{X}_v - \sum_f \mathcal{Z}_f \\
 &\equiv - \sum_v \mathcal{X}_v - \sum_f \mathcal{Z}_f.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The two set of terms in H_{TC} are usually called star and plaquette terms, respectively. Each star term \mathcal{X}_v (plaquette term \mathcal{Z}_f) is the product of all Pauli- X (Pauli- Z) operators surrounding a vertex v (face f). These terms all commute with each other, and a ground state of H_{TC} is a simultaneous eigenstate of them with eigenvalue $+1$. It is not hard to generalize this definition to more general lattices, hence we can put the toric code model on surfaces of different topologies. On a sphere, H_{TC} has a unique ground states, but on a topologically nontrivial space such as a torus, H_{TC} has degenerate ground states.

For simplicity, let us try implementing our protocol on the unique ground state $|\Omega\rangle$ on a sphere. For later convenience, we denote by G the abelian group generated by all \mathcal{X}_v and \mathcal{Z}_f operators. G is an example of the

so-called stabilizer groups, and elements of G are called stabilizers [48]. Let the total number of qubits be N . G can be generated by N number of independent stabilizers $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N\}$; for example, we can take this set to be all but one \mathcal{X}_v together with all but one \mathcal{Z}_f (since $\prod_v \mathcal{X}_v = \prod_f \mathcal{Z}_f = 1$). The full density matrix $|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|$ can be interpreted as the projector onto the one-dimensional eigensubspace of $+1$ eigenvalue for all stabilizers in G . Hence,

$$|\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega| = \prod_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1 + s_i}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{g \in G} g. \tag{4}$$

We take an annulus region A as shown in Fig. 4a. Let $G_A \subset G$ be the subset of stabilizers acting in A , we have

$$\rho_A = \frac{1}{2^{N_A}} \sum_{g \in G_A} g, \tag{5}$$

where N_A is the number of qubits in A . G_A is generated by all star and plaquette terms in A as well as two loop operators shown in Fig. 4, panels (b) and (c). We denote the two loop operators as \mathcal{W}_X and \mathcal{W}_Z , respectively. The Z -loop (X -loop) operator \mathcal{W}_Z (\mathcal{W}_X) is the product of all Pauli- Z (Pauli- X) operators along a loop living on edges (dual lattice edges).

We claim that the state $|\rho_A\rangle$ is a ground state of H_{TC} on a torus, where the torus is obtained by taking two copies of A and identifying their corresponding boundary vertices. To prove this claim, we need to verify that $|\rho_A\rangle$ has $+1$ eigenvalue under all star and plaquette terms on the torus. We observe that all these terms have either of the following two forms, where we use \otimes to connect operators acting on the two copies of A .

- $\mathcal{O} \otimes 1$ or $1 \otimes \mathcal{O}$, where \mathcal{O} is an \mathcal{X}_v or \mathcal{Z}_f operator acting in A .
- $\Delta \otimes \Delta$, where Δ acts near the boundary of A , and two examples of Δ are given in Fig. 4b.

$|\rho_A\rangle$ satisfies the first set of stabilizers since $\mathcal{O}\rho_A = \rho_A\mathcal{O} = \rho_A$, where we used the fact that \mathcal{X}_v and \mathcal{Z}_f are both real Hermitian operators. $|\rho_A\rangle$ satisfies the second set of stabilizers because all boundary operators Δ commute with G_A and thus $\Delta\rho_A\Delta = \rho_A$. This finishes the proof of the claim. On a torus, H_{TC} has four degenerate ground states. $|\rho_A\rangle$ can be uniquely determined by specifying two more stabilizers such as $\mathcal{W}_X \otimes 1$ and $\mathcal{W}_Z \otimes 1$.

It remains to compute the Renyi mutual information $I^{(n)}(A_1 \cup A'_1, A_3 \cup A'_3)$, where A_1 and A_3 are shown in Fig. 4a. Renyi EE and therefore mutual information can be conveniently computed in the stabilizer formalism [49]. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be an M -qubit stabilizer state determined by a stabilizer group H . Let R be a subregion with M_R number of qubits and $H_R \subset H$ be the subgroup of stabilizers in R . From the reduced density matrix $\rho_R := \text{Tr}_{\bar{R}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = 2^{-M_R} \sum_{h \in H_R} h$, one can check that $S_R^{(n)} = (M_R - k_R) \log 2$ where k_R is the number of

independent generators of H_R , i.e. $|H_R| = 2^{k_R}$. The mutual information between two regions R_1 and R_2 is therefore given by $(k_{R_1 \cup R_2} - k_{R_1} - k_{R_2}) \log 2$, independent on the Renyi index n . In our case, $R_1 = A_1 \cup A'_1$ and $R_2 = A_3 \cup A'_3$ are two annuli on the torus. $H_{R_1 \cup R_2}$ has two more generators than $H_{R_1} H_{R_2}$: We can take the first (second) generator as the product of two noncontractible X -loop (Z -loop) operators in R_1 and R_2 , respectively. We thus find $I^{(n)}(R_1, R_2) = 2 \log 2$ for all n . This is indeed consistent with the fact that toric code is an abelian TO with $\mathcal{D} = 2$.

For general quantum double models, we find more interesting results of the mutual information, revealing nontrivial quantum dimensions. We refer interested readers to the Supplementary Information for details.

DISCUSSION

In this work, we have introduced a simple protocol for extracting all anyon quantum dimensions of a two-dimensional TO from an arbitrary ground state wave function. It is both validated in the continuum and verified on lattices. It is interesting to seek generalizations of this protocol for extracting more universal information, such as the fusion rules, \mathcal{S} matrix, and topological spins.

We should mention that this work is partially inspired

by Ref. 50, which studies the entanglement negativity between two spatial regions in a tripartite topologically ordered state with trisection points (points where the three regions meet). Using some “wormhole” approach, it is found that the negativity contains an order-1 term that can distinguish abelian and nonabelian TOs. However, it is not clear at least to us whether this term is comparable to any universal quantity in generic models. It actually seems hard to extract a universal term from the entanglement negativity with trisection points [34, 51, 52], and more studies are needed to better understand this issue.

Finally, we note that this work is still not totally satisfactory: Our protocol has only been checked using fixed-point models, either in the continuum or on lattices. Future numerical simulations are needed to further verify this protocol in the presence of perturbations.

DATA AVAILABILITY

This research is analytical; there is no numerical or experimental data. Part of the analytical derivations are provided in the Supplementary Information file.

CODE AVAILABILITY

Not applicable.

-
- [1] X.-G. Wen, *Quantum Field Theory of Many-Body Systems: From the Origin of Sound to an Origin of Light and Electrons* (Oxford University Press, 2007).
- [2] A. Y. Kitaev, Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons, *Annals of Physics* **303**, 2 (2003), arXiv:quant-ph/9707021 [quant-ph].
- [3] C. Nayak, S. H. Simon, A. Stern, M. Freedman, and S. Das Sarma, Non-Abelian anyons and topological quantum computation, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **80**, 1083 (2008), arXiv:0707.1889 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [4] R. Samajdar, W. W. Ho, H. Pichler, M. D. Lukin, and S. Sachdev, Quantum phases of Rydberg atoms on a kagome lattice, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **118**, e2015785118 (2021), arXiv:2011.12295 [cond-mat.quant-gas].
- [5] R. Verresen, M. D. Lukin, and A. Vishwanath, Prediction of Toric Code Topological Order from Rydberg Blockade, *Physical Review X* **11**, 031005 (2021), arXiv:2011.12310 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [6] K. J. Satzinger, Y. J. Liu, A. Smith, C. Knapp, M. Newman, C. Jones, Z. Chen, C. Quintana, X. Mi, A. Dunsworth, C. Gidney, I. Aleiner, F. Arute, K. Arya, J. Atalaya, *et al.*, Realizing topologically ordered states on a quantum processor, *Science* **374**, 1237 (2021), arXiv:2104.01180 [quant-ph].
- [7] G. Semeghini, H. Levine, A. Keesling, S. Ebadi, T. T. Wang, D. Bluvstein, R. Verresen, H. Pichler, M. Kalinowski, R. Samajdar, A. Omran, S. Sachdev, A. Vishwanath, M. Greiner, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, Prob-
- ing topological spin liquids on a programmable quantum simulator, *Science* **374**, 1242 (2021), arXiv:2104.04119 [quant-ph].
- [8] N. Tantivasadakarn, R. Thorngren, A. Vishwanath, and R. Verresen, Long-range entanglement from measuring symmetry-protected topological phases, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2112.01519 (2021), arXiv:2112.01519 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [9] R. Verresen, N. Tantivasadakarn, and A. Vishwanath, Efficiently preparing Schrödinger’s cat, fractons and non-Abelian topological order in quantum devices, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2112.03061 (2021), arXiv:2112.03061 [quant-ph].
- [10] N. Tantivasadakarn, R. Verresen, and A. Vishwanath, Shortest Route to Non-Abelian Topological Order on a Quantum Processor, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 060405 (2023), arXiv:2209.03964 [quant-ph].
- [11] M. Iqbal, N. Tantivasadakarn, T. M. Gatterman, J. A. Gerber, K. Gilmore, D. Gresh, A. Hankin, N. Hewitt, C. V. Horst, M. Matheny, T. Mengle, B. Neyenhuis, A. Vishwanath, M. Foss-Feig, R. Verresen, and H. Dreyer, Topological Order from Measurements and Feed-Forward on a Trapped Ion Quantum Computer, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2302.01917 (2023), arXiv:2302.01917 [quant-ph].
- [12] M. Iqbal, N. Tantivasadakarn, R. Verresen, S. L. Campbell, J. M. Dreiling, C. Figgatt, J. P. Gaebler, J. Johansen, M. Mills, S. A. Moses, J. M. Pino, A. Ransford, M. Rowe, P. Siegfried, R. P. Stutz, M. Foss-Feig, A. Vishwanath, and H. Dreyer, Non-Abelian topological order

- and anyons on a trapped-ion processor, *Nature (London)* **626**, 505 (2024), arXiv:2305.03766 [quant-ph].
- [13] A. Hamma, R. Ionicioiu, and P. Zanardi, Ground state entanglement and geometric entropy in the Kitaev model [rapid communication], *Physics Letters A* **337**, 22 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0406202 [quant-ph].
- [14] A. Hamma, R. Ionicioiu, and P. Zanardi, Bipartite entanglement and entropic boundary law in lattice spin systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 022315 (2005), arXiv:quant-ph/0409073 [quant-ph].
- [15] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, Topological Entanglement Entropy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 110404 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0510092 [hep-th].
- [16] M. Levin and X.-G. Wen, Detecting Topological Order in a Ground State Wave Function, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 110405 (2006), arXiv:cond-mat/0510613 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [17] C. L. Kane and M. P. A. Fisher, Quantized thermal transport in the fractional quantum Hall effect, *Phys. Rev. B* **55**, 15832 (1997), arXiv:cond-mat/9603118 [cond-mat].
- [18] A. Cappelli, M. Huerta, and G. R. Zemba, Thermal transport in chiral conformal theories and hierarchical quantum Hall states, *Nuclear Physics B* **636**, 568 (2002), arXiv:cond-mat/0111437 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [19] A. Kitaev, Anyons in an exactly solved model and beyond, *Annals of Physics* **321**, 2 (2006), arXiv:cond-mat/0506438 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [20] I. H. Kim, B. Shi, K. Kato, and V. V. Albert, Chiral Central Charge from a Single Bulk Wave Function, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 176402 (2022), arXiv:2110.06932 [quant-ph].
- [21] I. H. Kim, B. Shi, K. Kato, and V. V. Albert, Modular commutator in gapped quantum many-body systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 075147 (2022), arXiv:2110.10400 [quant-ph].
- [22] K. Siva, Y. Zou, T. Soejima, R. S. K. Mong, and M. P. Zaletel, Universal tripartite entanglement signature of ungappable edge states, *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, L041107 (2022), arXiv:2110.11965 [quant-ph].
- [23] R. Fan, From Entanglement Generated Dynamics to the Gravitational Anomaly and Chiral Central Charge, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 260403 (2022), arXiv:2206.02823 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [24] R. Kobayashi, T. Wang, T. Soejima, R. S. K. Mong, and S. Ryu, Extracting Higher Central Charge from a Single Wave Function, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 016602 (2024), arXiv:2303.04822 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [25] Z.-P. Cian, H. Dehghani, A. Elben, B. Vermersch, G. Zhu, M. Barkeshli, P. Zoller, and M. Hafezi, Many-Body Chern Number from Statistical Correlations of Randomized Measurements, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 050501 (2021), arXiv:2005.13543 [quant-ph].
- [26] H. Dehghani, Z.-P. Cian, M. Hafezi, and M. Barkeshli, Extraction of the many-body Chern number from a single wave function, *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 075102 (2021), arXiv:2005.13677 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [27] R. Fan, R. Sahay, and A. Vishwanath, Extracting the Quantum Hall Conductance from a Single Bulk Wave Function, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 186301 (2023), arXiv:2208.11710 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [28] S. Dong, E. Fradkin, R. G. Leigh, and S. Nowling, Topological entanglement entropy in Chern-Simons theories and quantum Hall fluids, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2008**, 016 (2008), arXiv:0802.3231 [hep-th].
- [29] Y. Zhang, T. Grover, A. Turner, M. Oshikawa, and A. Vishwanath, Quasiparticle statistics and braiding from ground-state entanglement, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 235151 (2012), arXiv:1111.2342 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [30] J.-W. Mei and X.-G. Wen, Modular matrices from universal wave-function overlaps in Gutzwiller-projected parton wave functions, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 125123 (2015), arXiv:1409.5427 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [31] X. Wen, S. Matsuura, and S. Ryu, Edge theory approach to topological entanglement entropy, mutual information, and entanglement negativity in Chern-Simons theories, *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 245140 (2016), arXiv:1603.08534 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [32] X. Wen, P.-Y. Chang, and S. Ryu, Topological entanglement negativity in Chern-Simons theories, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2016**, 12 (2016), arXiv:1606.04118 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [33] B. Shi, K. Kato, and I. H. Kim, Fusion rules from entanglement, *Annals of Physics* **418**, 168164 (2020), arXiv:1906.09376 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [34] C. Yin and S. Liu, Mixed-state entanglement measures in topological order, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 035152 (2023), arXiv:2301.08207 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [35] M. Berta, K. P. Seshadreesan, and M. M. Wilde, Rényi generalizations of the conditional quantum mutual information, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **56**, 022205 (2015), arXiv:1403.6102 [quant-ph].
- [36] E. Witten, Quantum field theory and the Jones polynomial, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **121**, 351 (1989).
- [37] S. X. Cui, D. Ding, X. Han, G. Penington, D. Ranard, B. C. Rayhaun, and Z. Shangnan, Kitaev's quantum double model as an error correcting code, *Quantum* **4**, 331 (2020), arXiv:1908.02829 [quant-ph].
- [38] X.-L. Qi, H. Katsura, and A. W. W. Ludwig, General Relationship between the Entanglement Spectrum and the Edge State Spectrum of Topological Quantum States, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 196402 (2012), arXiv:1103.5437 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [39] One may check from the CS theory action that taking the complex conjugate of the wave function is equivalent to a mirror reflection of the spacetime manifold.
- [40] A Wilson loop is a certain observable defined on an oriented loop and labeled by a representation of the gauge group. It can be regarded as an anyon world line.
- [41] S. Bravyi, unpublished (2008).
- [42] L. Zou and J. Haah, Spurious long-range entanglement and replica correlation length, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 075151 (2016), arXiv:1604.06101 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [43] J. Cano, T. L. Hughes, and M. Mulligan, Interactions along an entanglement cut in 2+1 D Abelian topological phases, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 075104 (2015), arXiv:1411.5369 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [44] D. J. Williamson, A. Dua, and M. Cheng, Spurious Topological Entanglement Entropy from Subsystem Symmetries, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 140506 (2019), arXiv:1808.05221 [quant-ph].
- [45] D. T. Stephen, H. Dreyer, M. Iqbal, and N. Schuch, Detecting subsystem symmetry protected topological order via entanglement entropy, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 115112 (2019), arXiv:1904.09450 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [46] K. Kato and F. G. S. L. Brandão, Toy model of boundary states with spurious topological entanglement entropy, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 032005 (2020),

COMPETING INTERESTS

The author declares no competing interests.

- arXiv:1911.09819 [quant-ph].
- [47] I. H. Kim, M. Levin, T.-C. Lin, D. Ranard, and B. Shi, Universal Lower Bound on Topological Entanglement Entropy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 166601 (2023), arXiv:2302.00689 [quant-ph].
- [48] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [49] D. Fattal, T. S. Cubitt, Y. Yamamoto, S. Bravyi, and I. L. Chuang, Entanglement in the stabilizer formalism, arXiv e-prints , quant-ph/0406168 (2004), arXiv:quant-ph/0406168 [quant-ph].
- [50] R. Sohal and S. Ryu, Entanglement in tripartitions of topological orders: A diagrammatic approach, *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 045104 (2023), arXiv:2301.07763 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [51] C.-C. Liu, J. Geoffrion, and W. Witczak-Krempa, Entanglement negativity versus mutual information in the quantum Hall effect and beyond, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2208.12819 (2022), arXiv:2208.12819 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [52] Y. Liu, Y. Kusuki, J. Kudler-Flam, R. Sohal, and S. Ryu, Multipartite entanglement in two-dimensional chiral topological liquids, arXiv e-prints , arXiv:2301.07130 (2023), arXiv:2301.07130 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [53] We note that after this edge duplication, the resulting state can be regarded as the ground state of the quantum double model on the extended lattice. The requirement that each pair of spins obtained from duplication have the same group element state is ensured by the holonomy free condition. Therefore, the process of edge duplication does not change the TO of the state.
- [54] Y. Hu and Y. Wan, Entanglement entropy, quantum fluctuations, and thermal entropy in topological phases, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2019**, 110 (2019), arXiv:1901.09033 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [55] Y. Hu, Y. Wan, and Y.-S. Wu, Twisted quantum double model of topological phases in two dimensions, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 125114 (2013), arXiv:1211.3695 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [56] Y. Hu, N. Geer, and Y.-S. Wu, Full dyon excitation spectrum in extended Levin-Wen models, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 195154 (2018), arXiv:1502.03433 [cond-mat.str-el].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Chao Yin for a previous related collaboration [34], to Yanting Cheng and Pengfei Zhang for feedbacks on the manuscript, and to Wenjie Ji, Yuan-Ming Lu, Nat Tantivasadakarn, Ashvin Vishwanath, and Liujun Zou for helpful discussions. I am supported by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation under Grant No. GBMF8690 and the National Science Foundation under Grant No. NSF PHY-1748958.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

This is a single-author paper.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

In this appendix, we apply our protocol to Kitaev's quantum double models [2]. We first review the models in Supplementary Note A and then implement our protocol in Supplementary Note B. In the last step of the protocol, we need some EE results in quantum double models. Details of the EE calculations are provided in Supplementary Note C.

Appendix A: Quantum Double Models

Let us start by reviewing some definitions. There is a quantum double model for each finite group G (generally nonabelian). The model can live on an arbitrary lattice on an arbitrary orientable two-dimensional surface. The physical degrees of freedom, called spins, live on the edges, and the local Hilbert space of each spin is spanned by the orthonormal group element basis $\{|g\rangle | g \in G\}$. We need to choose a direction for each edge. Reversing the direction of a particular edge will be equivalent to the basis change $|z\rangle \mapsto |z^{-1}\rangle$ for the corresponding spin. Let v be a vertex, and f be an adjacent face, we define the local gauge transformations $A_v(g)$ and magnetic charge operators $B_{(v,f)}(h)$ as follows.

$$A_v(g) \left| \begin{array}{c} z_4 \\ \leftarrow v \\ \rightarrow z_3 \\ \leftarrow z_2 \end{array} \right\rangle = \left| \begin{array}{c} gz_4 \\ \leftarrow v \\ \rightarrow gz_3 \\ \leftarrow gz_2 \end{array} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{S1})$$

$$B_{(v,f)}(h) \left| \begin{array}{c} z_3 \\ \leftarrow f \\ \rightarrow z_2 \\ \leftarrow z_1 \end{array} \right\rangle = \delta_{z_1 z_2 z_3 z_4, h} \left| \begin{array}{c} z_3 \\ \leftarrow f \\ \rightarrow z_2 \\ \leftarrow z_1 \end{array} \right\rangle. \quad (\text{S2})$$

Here we use a tetravalent vertex and a square face as examples, and the generalizations should be straightforward. We further define two projectors:

$$A_v := |G|^{-1} \sum_{g \in G} A_v(g), \quad B_f := B_{(v,f)}(1). \quad (\text{S3})$$

Note that B_f does not depend on the choice of the adjacent vertex v . The quantum double Hamiltonian is then given by [2]

$$H_{\text{QD}} = - \sum_v A_v - \sum_f B_f. \quad (\text{S4})$$

The projectors in H_{QD} all commute with each other.

On a sphere, the model has a unique gapped ground state $|\Omega\rangle$ satisfying $A_v = B_f = 1$ for all vertices v and faces f . Let us introduce some useful properties of this state before implementing our protocol. More explicitly, we can write $|\Omega\rangle \propto (\prod_v A_v)(\otimes_e |1\rangle_e)$ where e runs over all edges. Using $[A_v(g), A_{v'}(h)] = 0$ for $v \neq v'$, and $A_v(g)A_v(h) = A_v(gh)$, one can check that

- $A_v(g) |\Omega\rangle = |\Omega\rangle$ for all v and g .





FIG. S1. Illustrations about the quantum double models. (a) Support of the operator $A_C(g)$ for a loop C with base point v . (b) Bipartition into A (annulus) and B . (c) Duplication of a spin.

Given an oriented path along the edges from one vertex to another, when the relevant edge orientations are all consistent with the path direction, we define the holonomy of the path to be the product of all group elements on the path in the reversed order. For example, the holonomy of the following path from vertex u to v is given by $g_3 g_2 g_1$ (note the ordering).



With this terminology, $B_f = 1$ means that the holonomy around any face is trivial. It follows that

- for the state $|\Omega\rangle$, the holonomy for any closed loop is trivial, and the holonomy between any two vertices does not depend on the choice of path.

Analogously, the property $A_v(g) |\Omega\rangle = |\Omega\rangle$ also has a generalization on loops. Given a loop C with a base point v , we can define operators $A_C(g)$ whose support has the shape of a comb shown in Supplementary Fig. S1a. The action of $A_C(g)$ is defined by

$$A_C(g) \left| \begin{array}{c} \dots \leftarrow v \leftarrow x_1 \leftarrow x_2 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow x_k \leftarrow \dots \\ \uparrow y_1 \uparrow y_2 \uparrow \dots \uparrow y_l \end{array} \right\rangle = \left| \begin{array}{c} \dots \leftarrow v \leftarrow x_1 \leftarrow x_2 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow x_k \leftarrow \dots \\ \uparrow gy_1 \uparrow \uparrow x_1^{-1} gx_1 y_2 \uparrow \uparrow x_{1k}^{-1} gx_{1k} y_l \end{array} \right\rangle, \quad (\text{S5})$$

where $x_{1k} := x_1 x_2 \dots x_k$. Let $\mathcal{L}_{\text{flat}}$ be the Hilbert subspace spanned by spin configurations satisfying $B_f = 1 \forall f$. $A_C(g)$ preserves $\mathcal{L}_{\text{flat}}$. Moreover, $[A_C(g), A_{v'}(h)] = 0$ for $v \neq v'$, and $A_C(g)A_v(h) = A_v(h)A_C(h^{-1}gh)$. Let $A_C := |G|^{-1} \sum_{g \in G} A_C(g)$. One can check $A_C |\Omega\rangle = |\Omega\rangle$ with these commutation relations and the observation that acting $A_C(g)$ on $\otimes_e |1\rangle_e$ is equivalent to acting several $A_v(g)$ operators. Using $A_C(g)A_C(h) = A_C(gh)$, it follows that

- $A_C(g) |\Omega\rangle = |\Omega\rangle$.

We will also call $A_C(g)$ a gauge transformation operator.

Appendix B: Applying the Protocol

With all these prerequisites, we are now ready to implement our protocol. Suppose a state $|\psi\rangle$ has no excitation with respect to H_{QD} in a large contractible region, and suppose this region has the form of a square lattice. It has been shown in Ref. 37 that the reduced density matrix of $|\psi\rangle$ deep inside this region has no dependence on the choice of $|\psi\rangle$. Hence, we will just take $|\psi\rangle$ to be the sphere ground state $|\Omega\rangle$. Consider a bipartition of the space like that in Supplementary Fig. S1b. Here, in order to draw the partition interface right on the edges, we imagine duplicating each edge into two, and require them to always be in the same group element state; see Supplementary Fig. S1c. This is just a simple trick inspired by Ref. 16 for getting a nice partition; each pair of spins obtained this way can still be regarded as a single spin unless the partition is being considered [53]. Still calling the state $|\Omega\rangle$, we can write

$$|\Omega\rangle = \sum_{g_A \text{ with trivial holonomies}} |g_A\rangle_A |\phi(g_A)\rangle_B, \quad (\text{S1})$$

where g_A 's are spin configurations in the annulus region A , and $|\phi(g_A)\rangle_B$ are some set of states on B that are not necessarily normalized or orthogonal. In the summation above, we require g_A to have trivial holonomy around any loop in A , contractible or noncontractible.

We claim that for any two product states of group elements $|g_A\rangle$ and $|g'_A\rangle$ with trivial holonomies in A , and with the same group elements on the boundary ∂A , there exists a gauge transformation acting on A which transforms $|g_A\rangle$ to $|g'_A\rangle$. We can build such a transformation step by step: First choose the unique local gauge transformation $A_{v_0}(g_0)$ acting on the top left internal vertex such that $A_{v_0}(g_0)|g_A\rangle$ matches $|g'_A\rangle$ on the entire top left face. Then move rightward and choose the unique $A_{v_1}(g_1)$ acting on the next vertex v_1 such that $A_{v_1}(g_1)A_{v_0}(g_0)|g_A\rangle$ matches $|g'_A\rangle$ on the top left two faces. Continue this process until the top row of faces are all done, and start over from the left most vertex in the second row. When the face at the top left corner of the internal boundary of A is encountered, in order to not alter the spin configuration on ∂A , we need to utilize a loop operator $A_C(g)$ to fix that face, where C coincides with the internal boundary. This kind of loop operators are no longer needed subsequently, and eventually g_A can be completely transformed into g'_A . Since the $A_v(g)$ and $A_C(h)$ operators are all unitary and leave $|\Omega\rangle$ invariant, when g_A and g'_A are related by a gauge transformation, we have $|\phi(g_A)\rangle_B = {}_A\langle g_A|\Omega\rangle = {}_A\langle g'_A|\Omega\rangle = |\phi(g'_A)\rangle_B$. This means that $\phi(g_A)$ actually only depends on the spin configuration on ∂A . We can then write

$$|\Omega\rangle = \sum_{g_{\partial A} \text{ with trivial holonomies}} |\xi(g_{\partial A})\rangle_A |\phi(g_{\partial A})\rangle_B, \quad (\text{S2})$$

where $|\xi(g_{\partial A})\rangle$ is the sum of all holonomy free $|g_A\rangle$ such that $(g_A)|_{\partial A} = g_{\partial A}$.

The $|\phi(g_{\partial A})\rangle_B$ states are orthogonal to each other, because subsystem B contains a copy of the spin configuration on ∂A . We will now prove that they also have the same norm. Observe that any spin configuration $g_{\partial A}$ with trivial holonomies can be transformed into another $g'_{\partial A}$ using the local gauge transformations $A_v(g)$ overlapping with ∂A . Let U be that total gauge transformation operator. We can write $U = V_A V_B$ where V_A (V_B) is a unitary operator acting on A (B). From the definition of $|\xi(g_{\partial A})\rangle$, we can see $V_A |\xi(g_{\partial A})\rangle = |\xi(g'_{\partial A})\rangle$. It then follows from $U|\Omega\rangle = |\Omega\rangle$ that $V_B |\phi(g_{\partial A})\rangle = |\phi(g'_{\partial A})\rangle$. Hence $|\phi(g_{\partial A})\rangle$ and $|\phi(g'_{\partial A})\rangle$ indeed have the same norm.

The above analysis is inspired by Ref. 37. With these results established, we easily find

$$|\rho_A\rangle \propto \sum_{g_{\partial A} \text{ with trivial holonomies}} |\xi(g_{\partial A})\rangle |\xi(g_{\partial A})\rangle. \quad (\text{S3})$$

This state lives on the doubled system $A \cup A'$, i.e. two copies of the annulus in Supplementary Fig. S1b. Now imagine gluing the vertices in ∂A with the corresponding vertices in $\partial A'$, obtaining a torus. One can check that $|\rho_A\rangle$ is a ground state of the quantum double model defined on this torus. In particular, it is invariant under the actions of (new) local gauge transformations crossing the gluing interface. The quantum double model has multiple ground states on the torus. $|\rho_A\rangle$ is the special one characterized by trivial holonomy around the hole existing in each of the original annuli, and by $A_C(g) = 1$ around the same hole. These actually imply trivial anyon flux through the hole, because any anyon flux would be detected by some loop operator that winds another anyon around it. We have thus successfully recovered the picture in Fig. 3c of the main text.

The next step is to obtain the desired mutual information. Although this has been done in the continuum, we did not find a lattice result meeting our need. We have thus performed an honest calculation, and it eventually works out magically. We refer interested readers to Supplementary Note C for the rather tedious details. The key technical trick is to use the holonomy basis introduced in Ref. 54: In the subspace with $B_f = 1$, labeling spin configurations by group elements on all edges contains a lot of redundancy, and we can instead label spin configurations in each region using independent holonomy variables. With this way of labeling basis vectors, the remaining calculation is more or less just brute-force.

We have found that the anyon sectors are labeled by a pair of variables (C, μ) . Here, C labels a conjugacy class of G . Let $h_C \in C$ be a representative that is arbitrary but fixed once for all. μ labels an irreducible representation of $Z_C := \{g \in G | gh_C = h_C g\}$, the centralizer of h_C . The quantum dimensions are given by $d_{(C, \mu)} = |C|d_\mu$ where d_μ is the dimension of the representation μ . These are consistent with known results [2, 55, 56].

Appendix C: EE Computations

In this appendix, we elaborate details about EE computations in quantum double models. We will utilize the technique of holonomy basis introduced in Ref. 54.

1. Holonomy Basis

Throughout this section, we restrict our attention to the Hilbert subspace $\mathcal{L}_{\text{flat}}$ spanned by spin configurations satisfying $B_f = 1$ for all f . Within this subspace, it is convenient to label spin configurations by independent holonomies: We choose some base point v_0 , a path from v_0 to every other vertex, and a closed loop based at v_0 for each noncontractible cycle of the space. Then each spin configuration is uniquely determined by the holonomies along these paths and loops; one can solve the group element state on each edge from those holonomies.

As an example, let there be V number of vertices $v_0, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{V-1}$, and just one noncontractible circle. Denote by g_i the holonomy from v_0 to w_i along the chosen path, and by k the holonomy around the closed loop. We can write the basis vectors as $\{|g_i; k\rangle\}$. An operator $A_{w_i}(h)$ acts as

$$A_{w_i}(h) |g_j; k\rangle = |g_1, \dots, h g_i, \dots, g_{V-1}; k\rangle, \quad (\text{S1})$$

and $A_{v_0}(h)$ acts as

$$A_{v_0}(h) |g_j; k\rangle = |g_1 h^{-1}, \dots, g_{V-1} h^{-1}; h k h^{-1}\rangle. \quad (\text{S2})$$

Note that despite the terminology ‘‘holonomy basis’’, we are still using the natural basis of tensor products of group elements. We just adopt a more convenient labeling of the basis vectors.

2. Warm-Up: EE of a Disk on a Sphere

As a warm-up, let us compute the EE for a disk region on a sphere. Denote this disk by A , and the complement (also a disk) by B . We define holonomy bases separately for the two regions, as shown in Supplementary Fig. S2. The base point in A (B) is v_A (v_B). Let there be L number of vertices w_1, \dots, w_L on the partition interface, we denote the holonomy from v_A (v_B) to w_i by g_i (h_i). There are also holonomies from v_A (v_B) to other internal vertices of A (B), but it turns out that these internal holonomies do not contribute to the EE. Therefore, for simplicity, we just retain one such internal vertex u_A (u_B) in A (B) and denote the corresponding holonomy by p (q).

We are interested in states with $B_f = 1$ for all faces f , which implies that the holonomy around any contractible loop is trivial. We thus have

$$g_1^{-1} h_1 = g_2^{-1} h_2 = \dots = g_L^{-1} h_L = a. \quad (\text{S3})$$




FIG. S2. Holonomies for the inside and outside of a disk.

Take an arbitrary holonomy configuration $|g_i; h_i; p; q\rangle$. Imposing the above condition, we can write $h_i = g_i a$. The ground state $|\Omega\rangle$ can be obtained by applying the projectors A_v for all v to the state $|g_i; g_i a; p; q\rangle$. First consider the A_{w_i} operators. We have

$$\prod_{i=1}^L A_{w_i} |g_1, g_2, \dots; g_1 a, g_2 a, \dots; p; q\rangle \quad (\text{S4})$$

$$\propto \sum_{h_i} |h_1 g_1, h_2 g_2, \dots; h_1 g_1 a, h_2 g_2 a, \dots; p; q\rangle \quad (\text{S5})$$

$$= \sum_{g_i} |g_1, g_2, \dots; g_1 a, g_2 a, \dots; p; q\rangle. \quad (\text{S6})$$

Here, to obtain the last line, we first do a change of variable $h_i \mapsto h_i g_i^{-1}$ to absorb all g_i , and then rename the dummy variables h_i to g_i . We see that the net effect of the A_{w_i} operators is a summation over the g_i 's. Similarly, applying A_{u_A} and A_{u_B} results in a summation over p and q . Next, applying A_{v_B} , we have

$$A_{v_B} \sum_{g_i, p, q} |g_i; g_i a; p; q\rangle \quad (\text{S7})$$

$$\propto \sum_{g_i, p, q, h_B} |g_i; g_i a h_B^{-1}; p; q h_B^{-1}\rangle \quad (\text{S8})$$

$$= \sum_{g_i, p, q, a} |g_i; g_i a; p; q\rangle. \quad (\text{S9})$$

We effectively get a summation over a . Finally, applying A_{v_A} to the above state has no effect. We have thus found

$$|\Omega\rangle \propto \sum_{g_i, p, q, a} |g_i; g_i a; p; q\rangle. \quad (\text{S10})$$

We now see that the internal vertices u_A and u_B just contribute a product state $(|G|^{-1} \sum_p |p\rangle)_A (|G|^{-1} \sum_q |q\rangle)_B$ which does not affect the EE. We will therefore ignore the p and q variables in the following, and simply write $|\Omega\rangle \propto \sum_{g_i, a} |g_i; g_i a\rangle$.

Taking a partial trace over subsystem A , we obtain

$$\rho_B \propto \sum_{g_i, a, b} |g_i a\rangle \langle g_i b|. \quad (\text{S11})$$

For later convenience, we do a change of variable: $a \mapsto g_1^{-1} a$, $b \mapsto g_1^{-1} b$, $g_{i>1} \mapsto g_{i>1} g_1$. It follows that

$$\rho_B \propto \sum_{g_{i>1}, a, b} |a, g_2 a, g_3 a, \dots\rangle \langle b, g_2 b, g_3 b, \dots|. \quad (\text{S12})$$

We denote by $\tilde{\rho}_B$ the unnormalized density matrix on the right-hand side.

To compute the Renyi EE, we need to evaluate $\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_B^n)$. We add a superscript $\mu = 1, 2, \dots, n$ to the dummy variables in the μ -th copy of $\tilde{\rho}_B$, and it is not hard to see that

$$b^\mu = a^{\mu+1}, \quad g_{i>1}^\mu = g_{i>1}^{\mu+1} =: g_{i>1}. \quad (\text{S13})$$

We are left with

$$\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_B^n) = \sum_{a^\mu, g_{i>1}} 1 = |G|^{n+L-1}. \quad (\text{S14})$$

The Renyi EE is then

$$S_A^{(n)} = S_B^{(n)} = \frac{1}{1-n} \log \left[\frac{\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_B^n)}{\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_B)^n} \right] = (L-1) \log |G|. \quad (\text{S15})$$

We can identify the $L \log |G|$ term as the ‘‘area-law’’ term proportional to the length of the partition interface, and identify $-\log |G|$ as the universal topological EE [15, 16]. It follows that $\mathcal{D} = |G|$.

Our calculation above essentially follows that in Ref. 54. The same result is also obtained in Ref. 37 with different approaches.

3. EEs on a Torus

Let us now tackle the real problem. Recall that we need to compute the mutual information between two disjoint annulus regions of a torus. To the end, we need to compute the EEs both of a single annulus, and of two annuli. Let us then imagine partitioning the torus into $2N$ number of annuli, denoted by T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{2N} . We will be interested only in the cases $N = 1$ and $N = 2$, but it will be convenient to keep a unified notation.

We define holonomy bases separately for the $2N$ regions. In Supplementary Fig. S3, we show our holonomy variables for the case of $N = 2$, and generalizations to other values of N should be clear. We denote by v_I with $I \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2N\}$ the base point in the region T_I . From each v_I , there are holonomies $g_{I,m}$ and $h_{I,m}$ to the interfaces with T_{I-1} and T_{I+1} , respectively. We assume the numbers of vertices on all the interface circles are the same, denoted by L , just for the simplicity of notations. There is also a holonomy k_I around a noncontractible loop in each region. As in the previous example, internal vertices will not contribute to the EE, so we have simply omitted them. We draw a loop \mathcal{C} that is based at v_1 and passes through all the other v_I . The comb-like support of $A_{\mathcal{C}}(g)$ operators associated with the loop is also plotted. As we have shown in the main text, the special ground state $|\Omega\rangle$ we consider has trivial holonomy around \mathcal{C} , and satisfies $A_{\mathcal{C}}|\Omega\rangle = |\Omega\rangle$.

Let us start from some holonomy configuration $|g_{I,m}; h_{I,m}; k_I\rangle$. We would like to impose $B_f = 1$ for




FIG. S3. Holonomy variables for a tetrapartite torus, and the support (red comb) of the loop operators $A_{\mathcal{C}}(g)$.

all faces f , or equivalently, every contractible loop has trivial holonomy. Then $g_{I+1,m}^{-1} h_{I,m}$ should be independent of m , and we will denote this quantity by a_I . In other words, $h_{I,m} = g_{I+1,m} a_I$. The $B_f = 1$ conditions also imply $k_I a_I^{-1} k_{I+1}^{-1} a_I = 1$. We can thus write

$$k_{I+1} = a_I a_{I-1} \dots a_1 k_1 a_1^{-1} \dots a_{I-1}^{-1} a_I^{-1}. \quad (\text{S16})$$

The condition of trivial holonomy around \mathcal{C} implies that

$$a_{2N} a_{2N-1} \dots a_1 = 1. \quad (\text{S17})$$

To obtain the desired ground state $|\Omega\rangle$, we shall apply the projectors $A_{\mathcal{C}}$, $A_{I,m}$, and A_{v_I} to $|g_{I,m}; h_{I,m}; k_I\rangle$, where $A_{I,m}$ is the local gauge invariance projector acting on the m -th vertex of the $T_I T_{I+1}$ interface (affecting $h_{I,m}$ and $g_{I+1,m}$).

We can choose the paths for $g_{I,m}$ and $h_{I,m}$ to have no overlap with the support of $A_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$ operators. The same holds for paths from v_I to other internal vertices, which we have omitted. As a result, $A_{\mathcal{C}}(z)$ will only affect k_I , and its action is more explicitly given by

$$k_I \mapsto (a_{I-1} \dots a_1 z a_1^{-1} \dots a_{I-1}^{-1}) k_I \quad (\text{S18})$$

$$= a_{I-1} \dots a_1 (z k_I) a_1^{-1} \dots a_{I-1}^{-1}. \quad (\text{S19})$$

Hence, after the action of $A_{\mathcal{C}}$, the state $|g_{I,m}; h_{I,m}; k_I\rangle$ becomes

$$\sum_{k_1} |g_{I,m}; g_{I+1,m} a_I; a_{I-1} \dots a_1 k_1 a_1^{-1} \dots a_{I-1}^{-1}\rangle, \quad (\text{S20})$$

up to a normalization factor. The actions of $A_{I,m}$ effectively induce summations over $g_{I,m}$ for the above expression. Finally, applying A_{v_I} , we obtain

$$|\Omega\rangle \propto \sum_{k_1, g_{I,m}, h_I} |g_{I,m} h_I^{-1}; g_{I+1,m} a_I h_I^{-1}; h_I a_{I-1} a_{I-2} \cdots a_1 k_1 a_1^{-1} \cdots a_{I-2}^{-1} a_{I-1}^{-1} h_I^{-1}\rangle \quad (\text{S21})$$

$$= \sum_{k_1, g_{I,m}, h_I} |g_{I,m}; g_{I+1,m}(h_{I+1} a_I h_I^{-1}); (h_I a_{I-1} h_{I-1}^{-1})(h_{I-1} a_{I-2} h_{I-2}^{-1}) \cdots (h_2 a_1 h_1^{-1}) k_1 \cdots\rangle, \quad (\text{S22})$$

where the second line is obtained by a change of variables: $g_{I,m} \mapsto g_{I,m} h_I$ and $k_1 \mapsto h_1^{-1} k_1 h_1$. Now observe that the following map within $G^{\times 2N}$ is one-to-one:

$$(h_{2N}, h_{2N-1}, \cdots, h_1) \mapsto (h_{2N} a_{2N-1} h_{2N-1}^{-1}, h_{2N-1} a_{2N-2} h_{2N-2}^{-1}, \cdots, h_2 a_1 h_1^{-1}, h_1). \quad (\text{S23})$$

Therefore, summing over the variables on the left is equivalent to summing over those on the right. Using this fact, together with Supplementary Eq. S17 that implies $(h_1 a_{2N} h_{2N}^{-1})(h_{2N} a_{2N-1} h_{2N-1}^{-1}) \cdots (h_2 a_1 h_1^{-1}) = 1$, we obtain

$$|\Omega\rangle \propto \sum_{k_1, a_I, g_{I,m}} \delta(a_{2N} a_{2N-1} \cdots a_1, 1) |g_{I,m}; g_{I+1,m} a_I; a_{I-1} \cdots a_1 k_1 a_1^{-1} \cdots a_{I-1}^{-1}\rangle, \quad (\text{S24})$$

where $\delta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Kronecker delta function.

Partial tracing $|\Omega\rangle \langle \Omega|$ over $T_1, T_3, T_5, \cdots, T_{2N-1}$, and after a simple change of variables, we find the following reduced density matrix.

$$\begin{aligned} \rho \propto & \sum_{k, g_{I,m}, a_I, b_I} \delta(a_{2N} \cdots a_1, 1) \delta(b_{2N} \cdots b_1, 1) \delta(a_{2K-2} \cdots a_1 k a_1^{-1} \cdots a_{2K-2}^{-1}, b_{2K-2} \cdots b_1 k b_1^{-1} \cdots b_{2K-2}^{-1}) |_{2 \leq K \leq N} \\ & |g_{2K,m} a_{2K-1}^{-1}; g_{2K+1,m} a_{2K}; a_{2K-1} \cdots a_1 k a_1^{-1} \cdots a_{2K-1}^{-1}\rangle \langle g_{2K,m} b_{2K-1}^{-1}; g_{2K+1,m} b_{2K}; b_{2K-1} \cdots b_1 k b_1^{-1} \cdots b_{2K-1}^{-1}| =: \tilde{\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S25})$$

We have introduced a new index K which takes values from $\{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$ unless otherwise indicated (like for the third δ above). Now apply the following change of variables:

$$a_{2K-1} \mapsto a_{2K-1} g_{2K,1}, \quad b_{2K-1} \mapsto b_{2K-1} g_{2K,1}, \quad g_{2K,m>1} \mapsto g_{2K,m} g_{2K,1}, \quad (\text{S26})$$

$$a_{2K} \mapsto g_{2K+1,1}^{-1} a_{2K}, \quad b_{2K} \mapsto g_{2K+1,1}^{-1} b_{2K}, \quad g_{2K+1,m>1} \mapsto g_{2K+1,m} g_{2K+1,1}. \quad (\text{S27})$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho} = & \sum_{k, g_{I,m}, a_I, b_I} \delta(g_{1,1}^{-1} a_{2N} a_{2N-1} g_{2N,1} g_{2N-1,1}^{-1} a_{2N-2} \cdots a_1 g_{2,1}, 1) \delta(g_{1,1}^{-1} b_{2N} b_{2N-1} g_{2N,1} g_{2N-1,1}^{-1} b_{2N-2} \cdots b_1 g_{2,1}, 1) \\ & \delta(g_{2K-1,1}^{-1} a_{2K-2} a_{2K-3} g_{2K-2,1} \cdots a_1 g_{2,1} k \cdots, g_{2K-1,1}^{-1} b_{2K-2} b_{2K-3} g_{2K-2,1} \cdots b_1 g_{2,1} k \cdots) |_{K>1} \\ & |(1, g_{2K,m>1}) a_{2K-1}^{-1}; (1, g_{2K+1,m>1}) a_{2K}; a_{2K-1} g_{2K,1} g_{2K-1,1}^{-1} a_{2K-2} a_{2K-3} \cdots a_1 g_{2,1} k \cdots\rangle \\ & \langle (1, g_{2K,m>1}) b_{2K-1}^{-1}; (1, g_{2K+1,m>1}) b_{2K}; b_{2K-1} g_{2K,1} g_{2K-1,1}^{-1} b_{2K-2} b_{2K-3} \cdots b_1 g_{2,1} k \cdots\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S28})$$

an incredibly complicated expression! This step is similar to the one we took in the warm-up example before evaluating $\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}_B^n)$. Here and below, we often write terms of the form $x k x^{-1}$ as $x k \cdots$ when x has a long expression. In the first entry of the ket, the notation $(1, g_{2K,m>1})$ represents a list of group elements indexed by m . $m = 1$ corresponds to the identity 1, and each $m > 1$ corresponds to $g_{2K,m>1}$. These elements are then all multiplied by a_{2K-1}^{-1} from the right. Other similar entries can be interpreted analogously. Now we are ready to compute $\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n)$. We again add a superscript μ to the dummy variables of the μ -th copy of $\tilde{\rho}$. We see that $b_I^\mu = a_I^{\mu+1}$. The summations over b_I^μ can then be dropped. In addition, $g_{I,m>1}^\mu = g_{I,m>1}^{\mu+1}$. We can now do the summations over $g_{I,m>1}^\mu$ and get a factor $|G|^{2N(L-1)}$. We rename $g_{I,1}^\mu$ as g_I^μ , and we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) = & \sum_{k^\mu, g_I^\mu, a_I^\mu} |G|^{2N(L-1)} \\ & \delta[(g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_{2N}^\mu a_{2N-1}^\mu g_{2N}^\mu (g_{2N-1}^\mu)^{-1} a_{2N-2}^\mu \cdots a_1^\mu g_2^\mu, 1] \delta[(g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_{2N}^{\mu+1} a_{2N-1}^{\mu+1} g_{2N}^{\mu+1} (g_{2N-1}^{\mu+1})^{-1} a_{2N-2}^{\mu+1} \cdots a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^{\mu+1}, 1] \\ & \delta[(g_{2K-1}^\mu)^{-1} a_{2K-2}^\mu a_{2K-3}^\mu g_{2K-2}^\mu \cdots a_1^\mu g_2^\mu k^\mu \cdots, (g_{2K-1}^\mu)^{-1} a_{2K-2}^{\mu+1} a_{2K-3}^{\mu+1} g_{2K-2}^{\mu+1} \cdots a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^{\mu+1} k^\mu \cdots] |_{K>1} \\ & \delta[a_{2K-1}^{\mu+1} g_{2K}^\mu (g_{2K-1}^\mu)^{-1} a_{2K-2}^{\mu+1} a_{2K-3}^{\mu+1} \cdots a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu k^\mu \cdots, a_{2K-1}^{\mu+1} g_{2K}^{\mu+1} (g_{2K-1}^{\mu+1})^{-1} a_{2K-2}^{\mu+1} a_{2K-3}^{\mu+1} \cdots a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^{\mu+1} k^\mu \cdots] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S29})$$

It seems too hard to proceed with this expression for a general N , so in the following, we will restrict to $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ which are the cases we need.

a. $N=1$

When $N = 1$, K can only be 1, and we find

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= \sum_{k^\mu, g_1^\mu, a_1^\mu} |G|^{2L-2} \\ &\delta[(g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_2^\mu a_1^\mu g_2^\mu, 1] \delta[(g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_2^{\mu+1} a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu, 1] \\ &\delta(a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu k^\mu \dots, a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^{\mu+1} k^{\mu+1} \dots). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S30})$$

Notice that in the last delta function, $a_1^{\mu+1}$ appears in both entries and thus can be removed. We can make a change of variables: $a_1^\mu \mapsto (a_2^\mu)^{-1} a_1^\mu$, and $k^\mu \mapsto (g_2^\mu)^{-1} k^\mu g_2^\mu$. The a_2^μ summation can now be done and gives $|G|^n$. The third δ function becomes $\delta(k^\mu, k^{\mu+1})$. The summation over k^μ therefore gives a factor of $|G|$. We are left with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= \sum_{g_1^\mu, a_1^\mu} |G|^{2L-1+n} \\ &\delta[(g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_1^\mu g_2^\mu, 1] \delta[(g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu, 1]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S31})$$

We can do the summation over a_1^μ , and get

$$\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) = \sum_{g_1^\mu} |G|^{2L-1+n} \delta[g_1^\mu (g_2^\mu)^{-1}, g_1^{\mu+1} (g_2^{\mu+1})^{-1}] \quad (\text{S32})$$

$$= \sum_{g_1^\mu} |G|^{2L-1+n} \delta[g_1^\mu, g_1^{\mu+1}] = |G|^{2L+2n}. \quad (\text{S33})$$

The Renyi EE can now be computed:

$$S_{T_2}^{(n)} = S_{T_1}^{(n)} = \frac{1}{1-n} \log \left[\frac{\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n)}{(\text{Tr} \tilde{\rho})^n} \right] = 2L \log |G|. \quad (\text{S34})$$

Recall that we have assumed the two interface circles between T_1 and T_2 to have the same length L . In general the $2L$ factor above should be replaced by the total interface length. We see that the Renyi EE contains only an area-law term, so the topological EE in this case actually vanishes. This is consistent with the field-theoretic result.

b. $N=2$

Plugging $N = 2$ and $K = 1, 2$ into Supplementary Eq. S29, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= \sum_{k^\mu, g_1^\mu, a_1^\mu} |G|^{4(L-1)} \\ &\delta[(g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_4^\mu a_3^\mu g_4^\mu (g_3^\mu)^{-1} a_2^\mu a_1^\mu g_2^\mu, 1] \\ &\delta[(g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_4^{\mu+1} a_3^{\mu+1} \dots a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu, 1] \\ &\delta[(g_3^\mu)^{-1} a_2^\mu a_1^\mu g_2^\mu k^\mu \dots, (g_3^\mu)^{-1} a_2^{\mu+1} a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu k^\mu \dots] \\ &\delta[a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu k^\mu \dots, a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^{\mu+1} k^{\mu+1} \dots] \\ &\delta[a_3^{\mu+1} g_4^\mu (g_3^\mu)^{-1} a_2^{\mu+1} a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu k^\mu \dots, \\ &\quad a_3^{\mu+1} g_4^{\mu+1} (g_3^{\mu+1})^{-1} a_2^{\mu+1} a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^{\mu+1} k^{\mu+1} \dots]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S35})$$

The last two delta functions here come from the last delta function of Supplementary Eq. S29 with $K = 1, 2$, respectively. Utilizing the first two delta functions, the last one can be simplified to

$$\delta[(a_4^{\mu+1})^{-1} g_1^\mu k^\mu \dots, (a_4^{\mu+1})^{-1} g_1^{\mu+1} k^{\mu+1} \dots]. \quad (\text{S36})$$

Further removing some obvious redundancies in the delta functions, we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= \sum_{k^\mu, g_1^\mu, a_1^\mu} |G|^{4(L-1)} \\ &\delta[(g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_4^\mu a_3^\mu g_4^\mu (g_3^\mu)^{-1} a_2^\mu a_1^\mu g_2^\mu, 1] \\ &\delta[(g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_4^{\mu+1} a_3^{\mu+1} g_4^\mu (g_3^\mu)^{-1} a_2^{\mu+1} a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu, 1] \\ &\delta[a_2^\mu a_1^\mu g_2^\mu k^\mu \dots, a_2^{\mu+1} a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu k^\mu \dots] \\ &\delta[g_2^\mu k^\mu (g_2^\mu)^{-1}, g_2^{\mu+1} k^{\mu+1} (g_2^{\mu+1})^{-1}] \\ &\delta[g_1^\mu k^\mu (g_1^\mu)^{-1}, g_1^{\mu+1} k^{\mu+1} (g_1^{\mu+1})^{-1}]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S37})$$

Now we do a change of variables: $g_4^\mu \mapsto g_4^\mu g_3^\mu$, $a_3^\mu \mapsto (a_4^\mu)^{-1} a_3^\mu$, $a_1^\mu \mapsto (a_2^\mu)^{-1} a_1^\mu$. The summations over g_3^μ , a_4^μ and a_2^μ can now be done and give $|G|^{3n}$. We also do the summation over g_4^μ which reduces the first two delta functions into a single one. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= |G|^{4(L-1)+3n} \sum_{k^\mu, g_1^\mu, g_2^\mu, a_1^\mu, a_3^\mu} \\ &\delta[a_1^\mu g_2^\mu (g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_3^\mu, a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu (g_1^\mu)^{-1} a_3^{\mu+1}] \\ &\delta[a_1^\mu g_2^\mu k^\mu \dots, a_1^{\mu+1} g_2^\mu k^{\mu+1} \dots] \\ &\delta[g_2^\mu k^\mu (g_2^\mu)^{-1}, g_2^{\mu+1} k^{\mu+1} (g_2^{\mu+1})^{-1}] \\ &\delta[g_1^\mu k^\mu (g_1^\mu)^{-1}, g_1^{\mu+1} k^{\mu+1} (g_1^{\mu+1})^{-1}]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S38})$$

One more change of variables: $k^\mu \mapsto (g_2^\mu)^{-1} k^\mu g_2^\mu$, and $g_1^\mu \mapsto g_1^\mu g_2^\mu$. The summation over g_2^μ can be done to give

$|G|^n$. Renaming g_1^μ as g^μ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= |G|^{4(L-1)+4n} \sum_{k^\mu, g^\mu, a_1^\mu, a_3^\mu} \\ &\delta[a_1^\mu (g^\mu)^{-1} a_3^\mu, a_1^{\mu+1} (g^\mu)^{-1} a_3^{\mu+1}] \\ &\delta[a_1^\mu k^\mu (a_1^\mu)^{-1}, a_1^{\mu+1} k^\mu (a_1^{\mu+1})^{-1}] \delta[k^\mu, k^{\mu+1}] \\ &\delta[g^\mu k^\mu (g^\mu)^{-1}, g^{\mu+1} k^{\mu+1} (g^{\mu+1})^{-1}] \quad (\text{S39}) \\ &= |G|^{4(L-1)+4n} \sum_{k, g^\mu, a_1^\mu, a_3^\mu} \\ &\delta[a_1^\mu (g^\mu)^{-1} a_3^\mu, a_1^{\mu+1} (g^\mu)^{-1} a_3^{\mu+1}] \\ &\delta[a_1^\mu k (a_1^\mu)^{-1}, a_1^{\mu+1} k (a_1^{\mu+1})^{-1}] \\ &\delta[g^\mu k (g^\mu)^{-1}, g^{\mu+1} k (g^{\mu+1})^{-1}]. \quad (\text{S40}) \end{aligned}$$

The last delta function is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta[g^1 k (g^1)^{-1}, g^\mu k (g^\mu)^{-1}]|_{\mu>1} \\ &= \delta[k, (g^1)^{-1} g^\mu k (g^\mu)^{-1} g^1]|_{\mu>1}. \quad (\text{S41}) \end{aligned}$$

We do a change of variables: $g^{\mu>1} \mapsto g^1 g^{\mu>1}$, and $a_3^\mu \mapsto g^1 a_3^\mu$. The summation over g^1 can now be done and gives $|G|$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= |G|^{4L-3+4n} \sum_{k, g^{\mu>1}, a_1^\mu, a_3^\mu} \\ &\delta[a_1^1 a_3^1, a_1^2 a_3^2] \delta[a_1^\mu (g^\mu)^{-1} a_3^\mu, a_1^{\mu+1} (g^\mu)^{-1} a_3^{\mu+1}]|_{\mu>1} \\ &\delta[a_1^\mu k (a_1^\mu)^{-1}, a_1^{\mu+1} k (a_1^{\mu+1})^{-1}] \\ &\delta[k, g^\mu k (g^\mu)^{-1}]|_{\mu>1}. \quad (\text{S42}) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that although the second last delta function applies to all μ , only $n-1$ values of μ give independent constraints. Hence, we can restrict that delta function to $2 \leq \mu \leq n$. We further rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= |G|^{4L-3+4n} \sum_{k, g^{\mu>1}, a_1^\mu, a_3^\mu} \\ &\delta[(a_1^2)^{-1} a_1^1 a_3^1 (a_3^2)^{-1}, 1] \\ &\delta[(g^\mu)^{-1}, (a_1^\mu)^{-1} a_1^{\mu+1} (g^\mu)^{-1} a_3^{\mu+1} (a_3^\mu)^{-1}]|_{\mu>1} \\ &\delta[k, (a_1^\mu)^{-1} a_1^{\mu+1} k (a_1^{\mu+1})^{-1} (a_1^\mu)]|_{\mu>1} \\ &\delta[k, g^\mu k (g^\mu)^{-1}]|_{\mu>1}. \quad (\text{S43}) \end{aligned}$$

Now define some variables:

$$(x^1, x^2, x^3, \dots, x^n) = [a_1^2, (a_1^2)^{-1} a_1^3, (a_1^3)^{-1} a_1^4, \dots, (a_1^n)^{-1} a_1^1], \quad (\text{S44})$$

$$(y^1, y^2, y^3, \dots, y^n) = [a_3^2, a_3^3 (a_3^2)^{-1}, a_3^4 (a_3^3)^{-1}, \dots, a_3^1 (a_3^n)^{-1}]. \quad (\text{S45})$$

The maps from a_1^μ, a_3^μ to x^μ, y^μ are one-to-one, so we can change the summation variables to x^μ and y^μ . The summations over x^1 and y^1 can then be done, giving $|G|^2$.

We get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= |G|^{4L-1+4n} \sum_{k, g^{\mu>1}, x^{\mu>1}, y^{\mu>1}} \\ &\delta(x^2 x^3 \dots x^n y^n \dots y^3 y^2, 1) \\ &\delta[(g^\mu)^{-1}, x^\mu (g^\mu)^{-1} y^\mu]|_{\mu>1} \\ &\delta[k, x^\mu k (x^\mu)^{-1}]|_{\mu>1} \delta[k, g^\mu k (g^\mu)^{-1}]|_{\mu>1}. \quad (\text{S46}) \end{aligned}$$

Using the second delta function, we find $(y^\mu)^{-1} = g^\mu x^\mu (g^\mu)^{-1}$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= |G|^{4L-1+4n} \sum_{k, g^{\mu>1}, x^{\mu>1}} \\ &\delta[x^2 x^3 \dots x^n, g^2 x^2 (g^2)^{-1} g^3 x^3 (g^3)^{-1} \dots g^n x^n (g^n)^{-1}] \\ &\delta[k, x^\mu k (x^\mu)^{-1}]|_{\mu>1} \delta[k, g^\mu k (g^\mu)^{-1}]|_{\mu>1}. \quad (\text{S47}) \end{aligned}$$

The last two delta functions imply that x^μ and g^μ both belong to the centralizer of k , namely $Z(k) := \{g \in G | gk = kg\}$. We obtain the result

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) &= |G|^{4L-1+4n} \sum_{k \in G} \sum_{g^{\mu>1}, x^{\mu>1} \in Z(k)} \\ &\delta[x^2 x^3 \dots x^n, g^2 x^2 (g^2)^{-1} g^3 x^3 (g^3)^{-1} \dots g^n x^n (g^n)^{-1}]. \quad (\text{S48}) \end{aligned}$$

We can no longer simplify this expression just by changing variables, but it can be computed using nonabelian Fourier transforms. We summarize the key step as the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let H be a finite group, z_i and h_i with $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, r$ be group elements. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{h_i, z_i \in H} \delta[z_1 z_2 \dots z_r, (h_1 z_1 h_1^{-1}) (h_2 z_2 h_2^{-1}) \dots (h_r z_r h_r^{-1})] \\ &= |H|^{2r-1} \sum_{\mu \in \text{Irrep}(H)} d_\mu^{2-2r}, \quad (\text{S49}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Irrep}(H)$ is the set of irreducible representations of H , and d_μ is the dimension of the representation μ .

Proof. Denote by $L^2(H)$ the Hilbert space generated by the orthonormal basis $\{|h\rangle | h \in H\}$. Another orthonormal basis of $L^2(H)$ consists of the following states.

$$|\mu; a, b\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{d_\mu}{|H|}} \sum_{h \in H} \bar{D}_{ab}^\mu(h) |h\rangle. \quad (\text{S50})$$

Here, $\mu \in \text{Irrep}(H)$, $a, b \in \{1, 2, \dots, d_\mu\}$, $D^\mu(h)$ is the matrix for h in the representation μ , and $\bar{D}^\mu(h)$ is the complex conjugate of $D^\mu(h)$. The orthonormality of this new basis lies in Schur's orthogonality relation:

$$\sum_{h \in H} \bar{D}_{ab}^\mu(h) D_{cd}^\nu(h) = \frac{|H|}{d_\mu} \delta_{\mu\nu} \delta_{ac} \delta_{bd}. \quad (\text{S51})$$

The inverse map is given by

$$|h\rangle = \sum_{\mu \in \text{Irrep}(H)} \sum_{a,b=1}^{d_\mu} \sqrt{\frac{d_\mu}{|H|}} D_{ab}^\mu(h) |\mu; a, b\rangle. \quad (\text{S52})$$

This is called the nonabelian Fourier transform.

Denote by \mathcal{I} the summation in the statement of the lemma. We can rewrite the delta function there as an inner product in $L^2(H)$:

$$\mathcal{I} = \sum_{h_i, z_i \in H} \langle (h_1 z_1 h_1^{-1}) \cdots (h_r z_r h_r^{-1}) | z_1 \cdots z_r \rangle. \quad (\text{S53})$$

Applying nonabelian Fourier transforms,

$$\mathcal{I} = \sum_{h_i, z_i} \sum_{\mu} \sum_{a,b=1}^{d_\mu} \frac{d_\mu}{|H|} \bar{D}_{ab}^\mu(h_1 z_1 h_1^{-1} \cdots) D_{ab}^\mu(z_1 z_2 \cdots z_r). \quad (\text{S54})$$

It is now useful to introduce a diagrammatic language:

$$D_{ab}^\mu(h) = \begin{array}{c} h \\ \vdots \\ a \text{---} \text{---} b \\ \text{---} D^\mu \end{array}, \quad \bar{D}_{ab}^\mu(h) = \begin{array}{c} a \text{---} \text{---} b \\ \text{---} \bar{D}^\mu \\ \vdots \\ h \end{array}. \quad (\text{S55})$$

The orthogonality relation then looks like

$$\begin{array}{c} a \text{---} \text{---} b \\ \text{---} \bar{D}^\mu \\ \vdots \\ c \text{---} \text{---} d \\ \text{---} D^\nu \end{array} = \frac{|H|}{d_\mu} \delta_{\mu\nu} \begin{array}{c} a \text{---} \text{---} b \\ \text{---} \text{---} \\ c \text{---} \text{---} d \end{array}. \quad (\text{S56})$$

Using this diagrammatic language, and the fact that D^μ matrices satisfy the group multiplication laws, we compute the summations over z_i as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{z_i} \bar{D}_{ab}^\mu(h_1 z_1 h_1^{-1} \cdots) D_{ab}^\mu(z_1 z_2 \cdots z_r) \\ &= \begin{array}{c} \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \quad \cdots \quad \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \cdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \\ h_1 \quad h_1^{-1} \quad h_2 \quad h_2^{-1} \quad \cdots \quad h_r \quad h_r^{-1} \\ \text{---} D^\mu \quad \text{---} D^\mu \quad \cdots \quad \text{---} D^\mu \end{array} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S57})$$

$$= \left(\frac{|H|}{d_\mu} \right)^r \begin{array}{c} \bar{D}^\mu \\ \vdots \\ h_1 \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \\ h_1^{-1} \quad h_2 \\ \text{---} \end{array} \cdots \begin{array}{c} \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \\ h_{r-1}^{-1} \quad h_r \\ \text{---} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \bar{D}^\mu \\ \vdots \\ h_r^{-1} \\ \text{---} \end{array}. \quad (\text{S58})$$

Since all the representations are unitary, we have

$\bar{D}_{ab}^\mu(h^{-1}) = D_{ba}^\mu(h)$. This implies, for example,

$$\begin{array}{c} \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \\ h_1^{-1} \quad h_2 \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bar{D}^\mu \\ \vdots \\ h_1 \quad h_2 \\ \text{---} D^\mu \end{array}. \quad (\text{S59})$$

We can now do the summations over h_i , and find

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{h_i} \sum_{z_i} \bar{D}_{ab}^\mu(h_1 z_1 h_1^{-1} \cdots) D_{ab}^\mu(z_1 z_2 \cdots z_r) \\ &= \left(\frac{|H|}{d_\mu} \right)^r \begin{array}{c} \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \quad \bar{D}^\mu \quad \cdots \quad \bar{D}^\mu \\ \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \cdots \quad \vdots \\ \text{---} D^\mu \quad \text{---} D^\mu \quad \cdots \quad \text{---} D^\mu \quad \text{---} D^\mu \end{array} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S60})$$

$$= \left(\frac{|H|}{d_\mu} \right)^{2r} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} = \left(\frac{|H|}{d_\mu} \right)^{2r} d_\mu \quad (\text{S61})$$

The lemma can be proved by plugging this result into the expression for \mathcal{I} . \square

We can now use this lemma to compute $\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n)$, by identifying r with $n-1$ and H with $Z(k)$. Suppose k belongs to the conjugacy class C . Then $Z(k)$ is isomorphic to Z_C which is the centralizer of some arbitrary representative of C . We then find

$$\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n) = |G|^{4L+6n-4} \sum_{(C,\mu)} (|C|d_\mu)^{4-2n}, \quad (\text{S62})$$

where $\mu \in \text{Irrep}(Z_C)$, and we have used $|G| = |C||Z_C|$. In particular, $\text{Tr} \tilde{\rho} = |G|^{4L+4}$, where we used $\sum_{\mu} d_\mu^2 = |Z_C|$. We can then obtain the Renyi entropy

$$S_{T_2 \cup T_4}^{(n)} = S_{T_1 \cup T_3}^{(n)} = \frac{1}{1-n} \log \left[\frac{\text{Tr}(\tilde{\rho}^n)}{(\text{Tr} \tilde{\rho})^n} \right] \quad (\text{S63})$$

$$= 4L \log |G| + \frac{1}{1-n} \log \left[\sum_{(C,\mu)} \left(\frac{d_{(C,\mu)}}{|G|} \right)^{4-2n} \right], \quad (\text{S64})$$

where $d_{(C,\mu)} := |C|d_\mu$. Recall again that we have assumed the four $T_i T_{i+1}$ interface circles to have the same length L . In general the $4L$ factor here should be replaced with the total interface length.

4. Mutual Information on a Torus

Using the previous results, we get

$$I^{(n)}(T_1, T_3) = \frac{1}{n-1} \log \left[\sum_{(C,\mu)} \left(\frac{d_{(C,\mu)}}{|G|} \right)^{4-2n} \right], \quad (\text{S65})$$

suggesting that $d_{(C,\mu)}$ are nothing but the anyon quantum dimensions.