

Emergent (2+1)D topological orders from iterative (1+1)D gauging

José Garre-Rubio

University of Vienna, Faculty of Mathematics, Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria

Gauging introduces gauge fields in order to localize an existing global symmetry, resulting in a dual global symmetry on the gauge fields that can be gauged again. By iterating the gauging process on spin chains with Abelian group symmetries and arranging the gauge fields in a 2D lattice, the local symmetries become the stabilizer of the $XZZX$ -code for any Abelian group. By twisting the gauging map we obtain new codes that explicitly confine anyons, which violate an odd number of plaquette terms and whose fusion results in mobile dipole excitations. Our construction naturally realizes any gapped boundary by taking different quantum phases of the initial (1+1)D globally symmetric system. Our method establishes a new route to obtain higher dimensional topological codes from lower ones, to identify their gapped boundaries and their tensor network representations.

Gauging is fundamental in the Standard Model to comprehend and unify forces. It transforms a system, promoting its global symmetry to a local symmetry by introducing new degrees of freedom known as gauge fields. While the initial motivation for gauging was Lagrangians supported on the continuum with Lie group symmetries, the gauging of quantum lattice Hamiltonians with finite group symmetries has gained significant attention [1–3].

The power of gauging lies in the fact that it connects very distinct phases of matter, which makes it the standard tool to classify quantum phases and to prove the existence of anomalies [4–6]. Since gauging global (1+1)D symmetries results in emergent dual global symmetries (which could be non-invertible for non-Abelian groups [7, 8]) this turns gauging into the source of dualities in (1+1)D [9]. In (2+1)D, the emergent symmetries give rise to a very rich phenomena including 1-form and surface symmetries [10]. Gauging has also been generalized to other settings beyond on-site global symmetries, including non-on-site global symmetries [11] and higher form symmetries [6, 12–14], leading to the creation of fractal phases [15, 16].

All previous gauging and duality setups relate systems in the same physical dimension. In this work we use gauging to establish a bulk-boundary correspondence: the construction of a (2 + 1)D topologically ordered system (with local symmetries) from (1 + 1)D globally symmetric systems.

To achieve this, we iteratively gauge the emergent 1D global symmetries of the new gauge fields for finite Abelian groups. Since the corresponding matter fields are not discarded at every step, we arrange them as the horizontal layers of the newly constructed 2D lattice. Unexpectedly, the local symmetries from each gauging, modified by the composi-

tion of the subsequent maps, become the stabilizers of the generalization of the $XZZX$ -code [17] (a realization of the toric code [18] proposed in [19]) for any Abelian group. By twisting the gauging map by a 2-cocycle [20, 21], we explicitly confined anyons that now violate an odd number of plaquette terms and whose fusion results in mobile dipoles.

The different gapped boundaries (and hence the condensable anyons at the boundary) of our construction depend on the quantum phase of the initial (1+1)D globally symmetric system. We show this by establishing a connection between boundary Hamiltonian terms and (1+1)D string order parameters evaluated on the initial system. Such connection illuminates the fact that both settings, gapped boundaries of quantum doubles of G and (1+1)D quantum phases with global symmetries, are classified by the same mathematical object.

Since the gauging operator is a tensor network, our 2D construction inherits that structure, giving rise to a subfamily of projected entangled pair states (PEPS) [22] that we refer to as projected entangled pair emergent states (PEPES) that satisfy a different version of the virtual symmetry leading to topological ordered PEPS [23, 24].

Gauging– The procedure of gauging maps globally symmetric operators and states $\{O, |\psi\rangle\}$, to local symmetric ones $\{\hat{O}, |\hat{\psi}\rangle\}$ such that it preserves their expectation values: $\langle \psi | O | \psi \rangle = \langle \hat{\psi} | \hat{O} | \hat{\psi} \rangle$. For the relevant case of Hamiltonians, gauging preserves the gap and maps ground states to ground states of the gauged Hamiltonian [15].

The map is implemented by a gauging operator \mathcal{G}_0 [2], that maps the initial *matter* Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_0 to $\mathcal{H}_0 \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$, introducing new degrees of freedom (dof) supported in \mathcal{H}_1 , called the gauge fields. Given a global symmetry of a finite Abelian group

G represented as $\otimes_i u_g^i$ in \mathcal{H}_0 , where $g \in G$ and i denotes the vertices of a 1D chain, the new introduced Hilbert space is $\mathcal{H}_1 = \otimes_{\hat{i}} \mathbb{C}[G]^{\hat{i}}$, where \hat{i} denotes the edge between i and $i+1$ and $\mathbb{C}[G] = \text{span}\{|g\rangle, g \in G\}$. We define in $\mathbb{C}[G]$ the unitary representation of G $\{X_g\}_{g \in G}$ as $X_g|h\rangle = |gh\rangle$ that allows to construct the local symmetry projectors $\mathcal{P}^i = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} X_g^{i-1} \otimes u_g^i \otimes X_g^i$. Then the global projector to the local symmetric subspace is $\mathcal{P} = \prod_i \mathcal{P}^i$ such that the gauging operator is defined by $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{P} \left(\otimes_i |e\rangle_{\hat{i}} \right)$, where e denotes the trivial group element and it satisfies

$$\left(X_{g^{-1}}^{\hat{i}-1,1} \cdot u_g^{i,0} \cdot X_g^{\hat{i},1} \right) \mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_0 \quad \forall g \in G, \forall i, \quad (1)$$

where $j = 0, 1$ denotes the action on \mathcal{H}_j .

Finally gauged states are given by $|\hat{\psi}\rangle = \mathcal{G}_0|\psi\rangle$ and gauge operators by $\hat{O} \cdot \mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_0 \cdot O$. As an example let us consider $H = \sum_i X_i X_{i+1} - Z_i$ with global symmetry $\otimes_i Z_i$ that maps after gauging to $\hat{H} = \sum_i X_i Z_{\hat{i}} X_{i+1} - X_{\hat{i}-1} Z_i X_{\hat{i}}$ with local symmetry $X_{\hat{i}-1} Z_i X_{\hat{i}}$ and an emergent global symmetry $\otimes_{\hat{i}} Z_{\hat{i}}$ only supported on the gauge fields. Importantly, we will show next, this emergent global symmetry is always present after gauging.

The emergent global dual symmetry– Let us define the operator $Z_{\hat{g}} = \sum_h \hat{g}(h)|h\rangle\langle h|$, associated to an irrep $\hat{g} : G \rightarrow U(1)$ of G , satisfying $X_g \cdot Z_{\hat{g}} = \hat{g}(g^{-1}) \cdot Z_{\hat{g}} \cdot X_g$. Then, the global operator $\otimes_{\hat{i}} Z_{\hat{g}}^{\hat{i},1}$ commutes with the local symmetry of (1), so it does with \mathcal{P}^i , and it is a global symmetry of $\otimes_{\hat{i}} |e\rangle_{\hat{i}}$. Therefore, the gauged operators and the gauged states endow the following emergent dual global symmetry:

$$\otimes_{\hat{i}} Z_{\hat{g}}^{\hat{i},1} \cdot \mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_0 \quad \forall \hat{g} \in \hat{G}, \quad (2)$$

where the unitary operators $\{Z_{\hat{g}}\}$ are a representation of the dual group \hat{G} of the irreps. In the Appendix we show that for non-Abelian groups the emergent global symmetry is $\text{Rep}(G)$ and it comes from the zero gauge flux configuration.

In the literature, gauging also involves decoupling and projecting out the matter, resulting in just a gauge fields with a global symmetry, which can be understood as a duality process like in the example $H \rightarrow \hat{H} \rightarrow \tilde{H} = \sum_i Z_i - X_{\hat{i}-1} X_{\hat{i}}$, corresponding to Kramers-Wannier duality.

Iterative Abelian gauging– The emergent global \hat{G} symmetry can be gauged as well. To do so

we construct the gauging map $\mathcal{G}_1 : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ by first introducing $\mathcal{H}_2 = \otimes_i \mathbb{C}[\hat{G}]^i$, defining the unitary representation of \hat{G} $\{X_{\hat{g}}\}_{\hat{g} \in \hat{G}}$ as $X_{\hat{g}}|\hat{h}\rangle = |\hat{g}\hat{h}\rangle$, and then projecting $\otimes_i |\hat{e}\rangle_{i,2}$ onto the local symmetric subspace of $X_{\hat{g}^{-1}}^{i,2} \otimes Z_{\hat{g}}^{\hat{i},1} \otimes X_{\hat{g}}^{i,2}$. After composing both gauging maps $\mathcal{G}_1 \circ \mathcal{G}_0 : \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0 \otimes \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, the initial local symmetry of \mathcal{G}_0 , see (1), changes to

$$\left(X_{g^{-1}}^{\hat{i}-1,1} \cdot Z_g^{i,2} \cdot u_g^{i,0} \cdot X_g^{\hat{i},1} \right) \cdot \mathcal{G}_1 \circ \mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G}_1 \circ \mathcal{G}_0, \quad (3)$$

where $Z_g = \sum_{\hat{h}} \hat{h}(g)|\hat{h}\rangle\langle \hat{h}|$ is a representation of G on $\mathbb{C}[\hat{G}]$ and it satisfies $Z_g \cdot X_{\hat{g}} = \hat{g}(g) \cdot X_{\hat{g}} \cdot Z_g$. To get Eq. (3) we just have to check that $\mathcal{G}_1(X_g^\dagger \otimes X_g) = (X_g^\dagger \otimes Z_g^\dagger \otimes X_g) \mathcal{G}_1$ which is how two point symmetric correlation functions (of the global symmetry \hat{G}) maps through gauging to string order parameters (of the global symmetry G):

$$X_g^{i,j} \cdot X_g^{\dagger i',j} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_1} X_g^{i,j} \cdot \left(\prod_{i \leq k < i'} Z_g^{k,j+1} \right) \cdot X_g^{\dagger i',j}. \quad (4)$$

Again, there is an emergent global symmetry of G after gauging with \mathcal{G}_1 realized by Z_g acting on \mathcal{H}_2 .




FIG. 1. Sketch of the iterative gauging for $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ (a) The global symmetry generated by $Z^{\otimes N}$ is gauged to a local $XZ \otimes X$ symmetry and a global $Z^{\otimes N}$ on the gauge fields. (b) Emergent local symmetries after applying the second gauging map.

Therefore, we can iterate the gauging of the emergent global symmetries defining $\mathcal{G}_j : \mathcal{H}_j \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_j \otimes \mathcal{H}_{j+1}$ and compose M gauging maps:

$$\mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{G}_{M-1} \circ \dots \circ \mathcal{G}_1 \circ \mathcal{G}_0 : \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \otimes_{j=0}^M \mathcal{H}_j, \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{G}_0 is related to $\mathcal{G}_j \equiv \mathcal{G}_e$ by $u_g \leftrightarrow Z_g$ with j even and $\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{G}_j \equiv \mathcal{G}_o$ when j odd.

2D lattice from iterative 1D gauging– We place every new Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{j+1} coming from $\mathcal{G}_j : \mathcal{H}_j \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_j \otimes \mathcal{H}_{j+1}$, on the next layer of a 2D

array. Every local Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}[G]$ will be on the vertices $\{i\}$, and $\mathbb{C}[\hat{G}]$ on the edges $\{\hat{i}\}$ (placed between i and $i+1$). This creates a rotated squared lattice with the following symmetries:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(X_{g^{-1}}^{\hat{i}-1,j} \cdot Z_{g^{-1}}^{i,j+1} \cdot Z_g^{i,j-1} \cdot X_g^{\hat{i},j} \right) \cdot \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}, j \text{ odd} \\ & \left(X_{\hat{g}^{-1}}^{i-1,j} \cdot Z_{\hat{g}^{-1}}^{\hat{i},j+1} \cdot Z_{\hat{g}}^{\hat{i},j-1} \cdot X_{\hat{g}}^{i,j} \right) \cdot \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}, j \text{ even} \end{aligned}$$

These local symmetries commute since $[Z_g^\dagger \otimes X_g, X_g^\dagger \otimes Z_g] = 0$. Remarkably, for $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ they are the stabilizers of the $XZZX$ -code [17], which is a different realization of the toric code [18, 19].

So our state \mathcal{G} is a common (+1) eigenstate of the aforementioned commuting stabilizer terms which can be seen as the ground state of the topological code Hamiltonian:

$$H_{G,\text{bulk}}^{\text{Emerg.}} = - \sum_{\substack{g \in G \\ e \neq \hat{g}}} \diamond_{Z_g^\dagger X_g} - \sum_{\substack{\hat{g} \in \hat{G} \\ \hat{g} \neq e}} \diamond_{X_{\hat{g}}^\dagger Z_{\hat{g}}} \quad (6)$$

Therefore, we have constructed the generalization of the $XZZX$ -code for any Abelian group G by using the emergent symmetries of the concatenation of (1+1)D gauging.

$H_{G,\text{bulk}}^{\text{Emerg.}}$ commutes with $\{\otimes_i Z_{\hat{g}}^{i,j}\}_{j \text{ odd}}^{\hat{g}}$ and $\{\otimes_i Z_{\hat{g}}^{i,j}\}_{j \text{ even}}^{\hat{g}}$, the emergent global symmetries of the ground state \mathcal{G} , which correspond to the horizontal logical operators. The vertical logical operators are $\{\otimes_j X_{\hat{g}}^{i,j}\}_{i \text{ odd}}^{\hat{g}}$ and $\{\otimes_j X_{\hat{g}}^{i,j}\}_{i \text{ even}}^{\hat{g}}$, that applied to \mathcal{G} generate the $|G|^2$ ground states of $H_{G,\text{bulk}}^{\text{Emerg.}}$.




FIG. 2. (a) Commuting bulk Hamiltonian terms. (b) Generic boundary term. (c) Vertical anyon given by $g \in G$ that could condense on the boundary. (d) Concatenation of horizontal and vertical anyons given by $\hat{g} \in \hat{G}$.


Twisting the bulk– The gauging map can be twisted, as introduced in Ref.[21], by a 2-cocycle

$\alpha \in \mathcal{H}^2[G, U(1)]$. To do so we introduce the α and $\bar{\alpha}$ projective representations X_g^α and $\tilde{X}_g^{\bar{\alpha}}$ defined by $X_g^\alpha|h\rangle = \alpha(g, h)|gh\rangle$ and $\tilde{X}_g^{\bar{\alpha}}|h\rangle = \bar{\alpha}(hg^{-1}, g)|hg^{-1}\rangle$. These two representations commute so we construct $\mathcal{P}_\alpha = |G|^{-1} \sum_{g \in G} \tilde{X}_g^{\bar{\alpha}} \otimes Z_g \otimes X_g^\alpha$ and define $\mathcal{G}_\alpha = \prod_i P_\alpha^i \otimes_i |e\rangle^i$. Importantly the twisted gauging operator also realizes the same emergent dual symmetry of \hat{G} : $\otimes_i Z_{\hat{g}}^i \cdot \mathcal{G}_\alpha = \mathcal{G}_\alpha$ since the operators satisfy $Z_{\hat{g}} \cdot X_g^\alpha = \hat{g}(g) \cdot X_g^\alpha \cdot Z_{\hat{g}}$.

For untwisted gauging maps on odd layers, the emergent Hamiltonian resulting from concatenating $\mathcal{G}_\alpha \mathcal{G}_\alpha$, shares the \hat{G} -plaquette terms of (6). However, G -plaquette terms are now:

$$B_g^\alpha = \diamond_{\tilde{X}_g^{\bar{\alpha}} X_g^\alpha Z_g} \Rightarrow \prod B_g^\alpha = \otimes_{i,j} Z_{\nu_{g\alpha}}^{i,j}, \quad (7)$$

where $\nu_{g\alpha}$ (the so-called slant product) belongs to \hat{G} since $\nu_{g\alpha}(h) = \frac{\alpha(g,h)}{\alpha(h,g)}$ and where we have used $X_g^\alpha \cdot \tilde{X}_g^{\bar{\alpha}} = Z_{\nu_{g\alpha}}$. The fact that the product of all G -plaquette terms is the product of the horizontal \hat{G} -logical operators, Eq. (7), and not the identity has several consequences. First, the only logical vertical operators are $\{\otimes_j X_{\hat{g}}^{i,j}\}_{i \text{ odd}}^{\hat{g}}$, since $\{\otimes_j X_{\hat{g}}^{i,j}\}_{i \text{ even}}^{\hat{g}}$ do not commute with B_g^α . Then the former generate just a $|G|$ -fold ground space: the topological order has changed. Second, there are local operators that violate an odd number of plaquettes:



These excitations are confined creating a horizontal string whose energy grows with its length. But gluing them together $\tilde{X}_g^{\bar{\alpha}} \otimes X_g^\alpha$, a dipole excitation is created that moves free vertically. One can bend the dipole excitation by acting with Z_g horizontally, leaving an excitation on the corner or splitting the excitation on to right and left. Notice that the dipole commutes with the horizontal $Z_{\hat{g}}$ -string excitations: so these two kind of excitations braid trivially. The only remaining anyons are vertical $X_{\hat{g}}$ -strings and horizontal Z_g -strings that braid non-trivially. We can either or also twist the odd layers by $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}^2[\hat{G}, U(1)]$.

Boundary conditions– We consider periodic boundary conditions (PBC) in the horizontal direction, see Appendix for open boundary conditions

(OBC). We also take $u_g = Z_g$ for simplicity. The vertical boundaries correspond to the input Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_0 and \mathcal{H}_M of \mathcal{G} , see Eq.(5). PBC correspond to $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_0=\mathcal{H}_M}[\mathcal{G}]$ for M even, creating a square rotated lattice in a torus.

For vertical OBC, the boundaries correspond to globally symmetric states: ${}_M\langle\psi'|\mathcal{G}|\psi\rangle_0$. The boundary terms that commute with the bulk stabilizers can be chosen to be (see Fig. 2)

$$\tilde{X}_{\hat{g}}^{\bar{\beta}} \otimes Z_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger} \otimes X_{\hat{g}}^{\beta}, \quad \beta \in \mathcal{H}^2[\hat{G}, U(1)]. \quad (8)$$

Then if we concatenate ℓ of these terms its action on $|\psi\rangle$ through \mathcal{G} is $\tilde{X}_{\hat{g}}^{\bar{\beta}} \otimes Z_{i_{\hat{g}}\beta}^{\otimes \ell} \otimes X_{\hat{g}}^{\beta}$. So the term of Eq.(8) is a symmetry of $\mathcal{G}|\psi\rangle$ only if $\langle\psi|\tilde{X}_{\hat{g}}^{\bar{\beta}} \otimes Z_{i_{\hat{g}}\beta}^{\otimes \ell} \otimes X_{\hat{g}}^{\beta}|\psi\rangle = 1$. This correspond to the expectation value of this string order parameter for the global symmetry $\bigotimes_i Z_g^i$, whose value depends on the quantum phase of $|\psi\rangle$ viewed as one of the ground states of a 1D symmetric Hamiltonian H_{ψ}^{1D} . Therefore, the quantum phase of the 1D boundary determines which boundary stabilizer are present and then which anyons condense at the boundary (by commuting with all Hamiltonian terms in the boundary).

Remarkably our construction unifies the fact that the mathematical object that classifies both gapped boundaries of quantum double models of G [25–27] and globally G symmetric 1D systems [28, 29] is the same (module categories over Vec_G [30]).

Let us analyze in detail the case of $\beta = 1$ where the boundary terms are $X_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger} \otimes Z_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger} \otimes X_{\hat{g}}$ so we evaluate $\langle\psi|X_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger,i} \otimes X_{\hat{g}}^{i+\ell}|\psi\rangle$, a two point symmetric correlation function that characterizes the pattern of symmetry breaking. If $H \subseteq G$ is the unbroken symmetry group characterizing the quantum phase of H_{ψ}^{1D} , generically $\langle\psi|(X_{\hat{g}}^i \otimes X_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger i'})|\psi\rangle \neq 0$ if $\hat{g}(h) = 1$ for all $h \in H$. We further impose that $\langle\psi|(X_{\hat{g}}^i \otimes X_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger i'})|\psi\rangle = 1$ which is achieved at the RG fixed point, see the Appendix for an explicit construction. So the boundary symmetries correspond to the elements \hat{g} in the subgroup $\text{res}_H^{\hat{G}} \subseteq \hat{G}$, where $\text{res}_H^{\hat{G}} = \{\hat{g} \in \hat{G} \mid \hat{g}(H) = 1\}$. Therefore, we can construct the associated boundary Hamiltonian as:

$$H_{\text{bdry.}}^{H,\beta=1} = - \sum_{\hat{e} \neq \hat{g} \in \text{res}_H^{\hat{G}}} \begin{array}{c} Z_{\hat{g}} \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ X_{\hat{g}} \quad X_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger} \end{array}, \quad (9)$$

whose terms are violated only by anyons associated to vertical string operators $\bigotimes_{j \in \ell} X_{g_j}^{i,j}$ ending in the

boundary with $g \in G \setminus H$, see Fig. 2 (c). At the contrary, a vertical anyon of type $g \in H$ condenses at the boundary and anyons indexed by $\hat{g} \in \hat{G}$ (see Fig.2 (d)) condense too. If $H = G$, the Hamiltonian of Eq.(9) is trivial so no boundary terms can be violated: all anyon can condense. If we would have started from a \hat{G} global symmetry, the only anyons violating the boundary would be indexed by $\hat{G} \setminus \hat{H}$. The previous discussion can also be applied to last layer $|\psi'\rangle$ of ${}_M\langle\psi'|\mathcal{G}|\psi\rangle_0$.

Tensor network description– The gauging operators, $\mathcal{G}_{o,e}$ in odd and even layers, are matrix product operators constructed from two tensors (see Appendix) of bond dimension $|G|$:

$$\mathcal{G}_{o,e} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \\ | \quad | \quad | \quad | \quad | \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ | \quad | \quad | \quad | \quad | \\ \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \\ M_{o,e} \quad T_{o,e} \quad M_{o,e} \quad T_{o,e} \quad M_{o,e} \quad T_{o,e} \end{array} .$$

Then, the state \mathcal{G} in (5) is a projected entangled pair state (PEPS) [22] emerging from the concatenation of 1D gauging operators. Subsequently, we dub this subfamily of PEPS as projected entangled pair emergent states (PEPES). The two different tensors, corresponding to the two types of vertices in the rotated squared checkboard lattice of the PEPES (see Fig.2) have the following symmetries:

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} M_e \\ \bullet \\ | \\ T_o \\ \bullet \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} X_g \quad X_g^{\dagger} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ Z_g \quad Z_g^{\dagger} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} Z_g^{\dagger} \quad Z_g \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \end{array} X_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger} X_{\hat{g}}, \\ \\ \begin{array}{c} M_o \\ \bullet \\ | \\ T_e \\ \bullet \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} X_{\hat{g}} \quad X_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ Z_{\hat{g}} \quad Z_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} X_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger} \quad X_{\hat{g}} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} Z_{\hat{g}}^{\dagger} \quad Z_{\hat{g}} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \end{array}. \end{array}$$

The first three relations of each tensor correspond to the virtual G and \hat{G} -invariance characterizing 2D topological order in PEPS [23, 24] and the last relations makes compatible those symmetries. Note that the virtual loop symmetries propagates only in the horizontal direction.

Another view on our construction– We can interpret \mathcal{G} as the projection of stacked layers of 1D product states. By using that $\mathcal{G}_j = \mathcal{P}_j \otimes_i |e\rangle_j^i$ we can write

$$\mathcal{G} = \left(\prod_{j=1} \mathcal{P}_{2j} \cdot \mathcal{P}_{2j-1} \right) \mathcal{P}_0 \left(|\psi\rangle \otimes_j \otimes_i |e\rangle_{2j}^i \otimes_i |\hat{e}\rangle_{2j-1}^i \right),$$

where $\otimes_i |e\rangle^i$ is locally invariant under any Z_g^i and the projectors \mathcal{P}_{2j} and \mathcal{P}_{2j-1} do not commute. The two previous properties differ from the common approach of creating topologically ordered models from

stacking lower dimensional ones (where the coupling generally commutes) [31–36].

Conclusions—In this work we have established a bulk-boundary correspondence between 1D global symmetric systems and 2D topologically ordered models. We do so by sequentially gauging the emergent 1D global symmetries that maps the local 1D symmetries after gauging to 2D plaquette operators. As a result we obtain a family of 2D Hamiltonians:

$$H_{\text{Emerg.}}^G = H_{\text{bulk}}^{\alpha,\gamma} + H_{\text{bdry.}}^{[|\psi\rangle],\beta}.$$

This family covers the generalization of the $XZZX$ -code for any Abelian group G . Also, these Hamiltonians are able to realize novel anyon confinement phenomena where there are local excitations violating 3 plaquette terms. Moreover, the boundary terms are given by the quantum phase of the 1D Hamiltonian of $|\psi\rangle$ and determines which anyons condense at the boundary. Such connection illuminates the fact that both settings are classified by the same mathematical object.

The questions of how our construction can be generalized to non-Abelian topological orders and its connection with Ref.[37] remain open. Finally, in a forthcoming paper [38], we will present the emergence of non-trivial (3+1)D phases from the gauging of (2+1)D symmetries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank David Blank for the discussion that inspired this work, Bram Vanraeynest-De Cuiper, Aleksander Kubicki, Anasuya Lyons and Isabel Miranda for their helpful comments on the manuscript and Dominic Williamson for pointing out Ref.[37].

[1] M. Levin and Z.-C. Gu, Braiding statistics approach to symmetry-protected topological phases, *Physical Review B* **86**, 10.1103/physrevb.86.115109 (2012).
 [2] J. Haegeman, K. Van Acoleyen, N. Schuch, J. I. Cirac, and F. Verstraete, Gauging quantum states: from global to local symmetries in many-body systems, *Phys. Rev.* **X5**, 011024 (2015), arXiv:1407.1025 [quant-ph].
 [3] D. J. Williamson, N. Bultinck, M. Mariën, M. B. Sahinoglu, J. Haegeman, and F. Verstraete, Matrix product operators for symmetry-protected topological phases: Gauging and edge theories, *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 205150 (2016).

[4] M. Barkeshli, P. Bonderson, M. Cheng, and Z. Wang, Symmetry, defects, and gauging of topological phases, arXiv:1410.4540 (2014).
 [5] R. Thorngren and C. von Keyserlingk, Higher spt’s and a generalization of anomaly in-flow (2015), arXiv:1511.02929 [cond-mat.str-el].
 [6] B. Yoshida, Topological phases with generalized global symmetries, *Physical Review B* **93**, 10.1103/physrevb.93.155131 (2016).
 [7] D. Gaiotto, A. Kapustin, N. Seiberg, and B. Willett, Generalized global symmetries, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2015**, 10.1007/jhep02(2015)172 (2015).
 [8] L. Bhardwaj and Y. Tachikawa, On finite symmetries and their gauging in two dimensions, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2018**, 10.1007/jhep03(2018)189 (2018).
 [9] L. Lootens, C. Delcamp, G. Ortiz, and F. Verstraete, Dualities in one-dimensional quantum lattice models: symmetric hamiltonians and matrix product operator intertwiners, (2021), arXiv:2112.09091 [quant-ph].
 [10] C. Delcamp and A. Tiwari, Higher categorical symmetries and gauging in two-dimensional spin systems (2023), arXiv:2301.01259 [hep-th].
 [11] J. Garre-Rubio and I. Kull, Gauging quantum states with nonanomalous matrix product operator symmetries, *Physical Review B* **107**, 10.1103/physrevb.107.075137 (2023).
 [12] W. Shirley, K. Slagle, and X. Chen, Foliated fracton order from gauging subsystem symmetries, *SciPost Physics* **6**, 10.21468/scipostphys.6.4.041 (2019).
 [13] H. Moradi, Ömer M. Aksoy, J. H. Bardarson, and A. Tiwari, Symmetry fractionalization, mixed-anomalies and dualities in quantum spin models with generalized symmetries (2023), arXiv:2307.01266 [cond-mat.str-el].
 [14] B. C. Rayhaun and D. J. Williamson, Higher-form subsystem symmetry breaking: Subdimensional criticality and fracton phase transitions, *SciPost Phys.* **15**, 017 (2023).
 [15] D. J. Williamson, Fractal symmetries: Ungauging the cubic code, *Physical Review B* **94**, 10.1103/physrevb.94.155128 (2016).
 [16] S. Vijay, J. Haah, and L. Fu, Fracton topological order, generalized lattice gauge theory, and duality, *Physical Review B* **94**, 10.1103/physrevb.94.235157 (2016).
 [17] J. P. Bonilla Ataides, D. K. Tuckett, S. D. Bartlett, S. T. Flammia, and B. J. Brown, The xxxz surface code, *Nature Communications* **12**, 10.1038/s41467-021-22274-1 (2021).
 [18] A. Kitaev, Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons, *Annals of Physics* **303**, 2 (2003).
 [19] X.-G. Wen, Quantum orders in an exact soluble model, *Physical Review Letters* **90**, 10.1103/physrevlett.90.016803 (2003).
 [20] Y. W. Ryan Thorngren, Fusion category symmetry i: Anomaly in-flow and gapped phases,

- arXiv:1912.02817 (2019).
- [21] D. Blanik, J. Garre-Rubio, and N. Schuch, In prep., .
- [22] F. Verstraete and J. I. Cirac, Renormalization algorithms for quantum-many body systems in two and higher dimensions, ArXiv: cond-mat/0407066.
- [23] N. Schuch, D. Poilblanc, J. I. Cirac, and D. Pérez-García, Resonating valence bond states in the peps formalism, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 115108 (2012).
- [24] M. B. Şahinoğlu, D. Williamson, N. Bultinck, M. Mariën, J. Haegeman, N. Schuch, and F. Verstraete, Characterizing topological order with matrix product operators, Annales Henri Poincaré **22**, 563 (2021).
- [25] A. Kitaev and L. Kong, Models for gapped boundaries and domain walls, Commun. Math. Phys doi.org/10.1007/s00220-012-1500-5 (2012).
- [26] S. Beigi, P. W. Shor, and D. Whalen, The quantum double model with boundary: Condensations and symmetries, Communications in Mathematical Physics **306**, 663–694 (2011).
- [27] L. Kong, X.-G. Wen, and H. Zheng, Boundary-bulk relation in topological orders, Nuclear Physics B **922**, 62–76 (2017).
- [28] N. Schuch, D. Pérez-García, and I. Cirac, Classifying quantum phases using matrix product states and projected entangled pair states, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 165139 (2011).
- [29] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, and X.-G. Wen, Classification of gapped symmetric phases in one-dimensional spin systems, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 035107 (2011).
- [30] V. Ostrik, Module categories, weak hopf algebras and modular invariants (2001), arXiv:math/0111139 [math.QA].
- [31] C. L. Kane, R. Mukhopadhyay, and T. C. Lubensky, Fractional quantum hall effect in an array of quantum wires, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 036401 (2002).
- [32] B. J. Brown, W. Son, C. V. Kraus, R. Fazio, and V. Vedral, Generating topological order from a two-dimensional cluster state using a duality mapping, New Journal of Physics **13**, 065010 (2011).
- [33] T. Neupert, C. Chamon, C. Mudry, and R. Thomale, Wire deconstructionism of two-dimensional topological phases, Physical Review B **90**, 10.1103/physrevb.90.205101 (2014).
- [34] D. J. Williamson and T. Devakul, Type-ii fractons from coupled spin chains and layers, Phys. Rev. B **103**, 155140 (2021).
- [35] N. Tantivasadakarn, R. Thorngren, A. Vishwanath, and R. Verresen, Long-range entanglement from measuring symmetry-protected topological phases (2022), arXiv:2112.01519 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [36] D. J. Williamson and M. Cheng, Designer non-abelian fractons from topological layers, Phys. Rev. B **107**, 035103 (2023).
- [37] S. Liu and W. Ji, Towards non-invertible anomalies from generalized ising models, SciPost Physics **15**, 10.21468/scipostphys.15.4.150 (2023).
- [38] B. V.-D. Cuiper and J. Garre-Rubio, In prep., .
- [39] C. Fechine, N. Tantivasadakarn, and V. V. Albert, Non-invertible symmetry-protected topological order in a group-based cluster state (2023), arXiv:2312.09272 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [40] G. Vitagliano, A. Riera, and J. I. Latorre, Volume-law scaling for the entanglement entropy in spin-1/2 chains, New Journal of Physics **12**, 113049 (2010).
- [41] G. Ramírez, J. Rodríguez-Laguna, and G. Sierra, From conformal to volume law for the entanglement entropy in exponentially deformed critical spin 1/2 chains, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2014**, P10004 (2014).

Dual Rep(G) symmetry

When gauging non-Abelian groups we need to define the left and right regular representations acting on $\mathbb{C}[G]$: $L_g|h\rangle = |gh\rangle$ and $R_g|h\rangle = |hg^{-1}\rangle$. So that we define $\mathcal{P}^i = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} R_g^{i-1} \otimes u_g^i \otimes L_g^i$, satisfying that $[\mathcal{P}^i, \mathcal{P}^{i+1}] = 0$ since $[L_h, R_g] = 0$. Let us write down again the gauging map:

$$\mathcal{G}_0 = \sum_{\{g_i\}} \cdots u_{g_{i-1}} \otimes |g_{i-1}g_i^{-1}\rangle \otimes u_{g_i} \otimes |g_i g_{i+1}^{-1}\rangle \otimes u_{g_{i+1}} \cdots ,$$

where we can see that the 'product' of the gauge field configurations are always the identity element: $\prod_{i=1}^n g_i g_{i+1}^{-1} = e$. We interpret this as the gauging map creating zero total flux configurations. Then, measuring this zero flux with a *charge*, associated to an irreducible representation (irrep) of G , will give a trivial action. This means that there is a global symmetry from the dual of G , i.e. $Rep(G)$, on the gauge fields. $Rep(G)$ is not a group when G is not Abelian, it is a *fusion category* whose simple objects are the irreps of G , denoted here as σ, ρ, γ , etc. The multiplication, a.k.a fusion, is given by $\sigma \cdot \rho = \sum_{\gamma} N_{\sigma, \rho}^{\gamma} \gamma$ which accounts for the tensor product of irreps and its direct sum decomposition: $\sigma \otimes \rho \simeq \bigoplus_{\gamma} \mathbb{1}_{N_{\sigma, \rho}^{\gamma}} \otimes \gamma$.

Given an irrep σ of G , a representation of the fusion category $Rep(G)$ on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1 = \mathbb{C}[G]^{\otimes n}$ can be constructed using the following matrix product operators (appeared also in Ref.[39]):

$$\Gamma_{\sigma} = \sum_{\{g_i\}} \chi_{\sigma} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n g_i \right) |g_1, \dots, g_n\rangle \langle g_1, \dots, g_n| , \tag{10}$$

where $\chi_{\sigma} : G \rightarrow U(1)$ is the irrep character of σ . Finally the operators satisfy:

$$\Gamma_{\sigma} \cdot \Gamma_{\rho} = \sum_{\gamma} N_{\sigma, \rho}^{\gamma} \Gamma_{\gamma} ,$$

where the relation can be seen by using that $\chi_\sigma \cdot \chi_\rho = \chi_{\sigma \otimes \rho} = \sum_\gamma N_{\sigma, \rho}^\gamma \chi_\gamma$. Therefore, the dual global symmetry on the gauge fields reads:

$$(\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \otimes \Gamma_\sigma|_{\mathcal{H}_1}) \cdot \mathcal{G}_0 = d_\sigma \mathcal{G}_0 \quad \forall \sigma \in \text{Rep}(G). \quad (11)$$

Notice that if the total flux is not zero, say $g_{\text{total}} \in G$, then the action of Γ_σ results in $\chi_\sigma(g_{\text{total}})$. Finally this dual global symmetry does not commute with the local symmetry:

$$(R_g \otimes u_g^{[i]} \otimes L_g) \cdot \Gamma_\sigma = \Gamma_\sigma \cdot (R_g^\dagger \otimes u_g^{[i]} \otimes L_g^\dagger).$$

Boundary states of symmetry broken phases

We consider the different symmetry-broken phases of G , indexed by the unbroken symmetry group $H \subseteq G$. For the sake of presentation we choose the global symmetry to be $X_g^{\otimes n}$. Then a representation of the ground space of a Hamiltonian in a H symmetry unbroken phase can be given by $\text{span}\{(X_g|+\rangle_H)^{\otimes n}, g \in G\}$, where $|+\rangle_H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|H|}} \sum_{h \in H} |h\rangle$. Then, within this ground space we will choose as representative the following symmetric ground state:

$$|\psi\rangle_H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}} \sum_{g \in G} (X_g|+\rangle_H)^{\otimes n}.$$

For example, the maximally symmetry-broken phase and the disordered phase are given by $|\psi\rangle_{Z_1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|G|}} \sum_{g \in G} |g\rangle^{\otimes n}$ and $|\psi\rangle_G = |+\rangle_G^{\otimes n}$ respectively. Then it is easy to check that

$$(Z_{\hat{g}})^{[i]} \otimes (Z_{\hat{g}}^\dagger)^{[j]} |\psi\rangle_H = |\psi\rangle_H \Leftrightarrow \hat{g}(H) = 1.$$

Tensor network construction

The gauging map for (1+1)D systems has a very simple form as a tensor network. It is a matrix product operator with bond dimension $|G|$:

$$\mathcal{G}_0 = \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} \text{---},$$

where the tensors involved and their symmetries are:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{M} &= \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \end{array} = \sum_g u_g \otimes |g\rangle\langle g|, \\ T_e &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g,h} |gh^{-1}\rangle \otimes |g\rangle\langle h| \\ &= \begin{array}{c} Z_{\hat{g}}^\dagger \\ \bullet \\ Z_{\hat{g}} \end{array} = X_g \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} X_g^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that \mathcal{G}_0 is related to \mathcal{G}_2 by $u_g \leftrightarrow Z_g$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 = \mathcal{G}_{2i}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Similarly $\mathcal{G}_1 = \mathcal{G}_{2i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ then, by defining the following tensors (with their corresponding symmetries):

$$\begin{aligned} M_o &= \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \end{array} = \sum_{\hat{g}} Z_{\hat{g}} \otimes |\hat{g}\rangle\langle \hat{g}| = \begin{array}{c} Z_{\hat{g}} \\ \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \\ Z_{\hat{g}}^\dagger \end{array} = X_{\hat{h}} \begin{array}{c} \diagup \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \end{array} X_{\hat{h}}^\dagger, \\ T_o &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\hat{g}, \hat{h}} |\hat{g}\hat{h}^{-1}\rangle \otimes |\hat{g}\rangle\langle \hat{h}| \\ &= \begin{array}{c} Z_{\hat{g}}^\dagger \\ \bullet \\ Z_{\hat{g}} \end{array} = X_{\hat{g}} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} X_{\hat{g}}^\dagger, \\ M_e &= \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} = \sum_g Z_g \otimes |g\rangle\langle g| = \begin{array}{c} Z_g \\ \bullet \\ Z_g^\dagger \end{array} = X_h \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \\ \diagdown \end{array} X_h^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

By using the previous defined tensors we can write our 2D construction of iterative gauging as follows:

$$\mathcal{G} = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{array} \end{array}. \quad (12)$$

The resulting state is a projected entangled pair state (PEPS) emerging from the concatenation of 1D gauging operators. For that reason, we name the family of tensor network states constructed in this way, a subfamily of PEPS, projected entangled pair emergent states (PEPES).

The rotated square lattice shape of our 2D construction is better appreciated if we define the following tensors, by appropriately blocking the ones

