

Parastatistics and a secret communication challenge

Zhiyuan Wang¹

¹*Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann-Str. 1, 85748 Garching, Germany*

(Dated: December 20, 2024)

One of the most unconventional features of topological phases of matter is the emergence of quasiparticles with exotic statistics, such as non-Abelian anyons [1–4] in two dimensional systems. Recently, a different type of exotic particle statistics that is consistently defined in any dimension, called parastatistics, is also shown to be possible in a special family of topological phases [5]. However, the physical significance of emergent parastatistics still remains elusive. Here we demonstrate a distinctive physical consequence of parastatistics by proposing a challenge game that can only be won using physical systems hosting paraparticles, as passing the challenge requires the two participating players to secretly communicate in an indirect way by exploiting the nontrivial exchange statistics of the quasiparticles. The winning strategy using emergent paraparticles is robust against noise, as well as the most relevant class of eavesdropping via local measurements. This provides both an operational definition and an experimental identity test for paraparticles, alongside a potential application in secret communication.

Introduction Topological phases [2, 3, 6–9] are long-range entangled phases of matter, exhibiting fundamentally new properties compared to ordinary phases characterized by Landau’s symmetry breaking theory, and have attracted tremendous interest in the condensed matter community. A key unconventional feature of such phases is the emergence of exotic quasiparticle statistics beyond the celebrated Bose-Einstein and Fermi-Dirac statistics, which reflects the pattern of long-range entanglement [10–12] in the topologically ordered ground states. For example, non-Abelian anyonic statistics is possible in two dimensions (2D) [1–4], where spatially braiding anyons leads to a unitary evolution in the topologically degenerate states with n identical anyons, realizing a representation of the braid group B_n , and has a potential application in topological quantum computation [2, 4].

In higher spatial dimensions, it has long been believed that all point-like particles are either fermions or bosons [13–15]. There is actually a straightforward generalization of non-Abelian statistics to arbitrary spatial dimension, known as parastatistics [16], in which identical particles transform in higher dimensional representations of the symmetric group S_n (instead of the braid group B_n) under exchange of their spatial positions [17]. Although parastatistics has been considered since the dawn of quantum mechanics [18] and extensively studied by the high energy physics community in the second half of the last century [17, 19–22], it is now widely believed to be physically equivalent to ordinary particle statistics [13, 20, 22]. In other words, the theory of parastatistics, while mathematically consistent, was long thought to predict no new physical phenomena beyond what is already known from the theory of fermions and bosons.

Nevertheless, a recent paper [5] demonstrated that non-trivial paraparticles physically distinct from fermions and bosons can emerge in a special family of topological phases [5]. This is made possible through two

key insights. First, Ref. [5] formulated a second quantization theory of parastatistics that is significantly different from all previous theories, which turns out to be crucial to obtain new physical insights. Second, Ref. [5] constructed a family of exactly solvable quantum spin models hosting emergent free paraparticles, and showed that they have nontrivial exchange statistics observably different from fermions and bosons. This does not contradict the previous no-go theorems [13] on parastatistics, as the realization in condensed matter systems avoided some of their technical assumptions [5].

Despite this important progress, the physical significance of emergent parastatistics still remains elusive. In this paper we demonstrate a distinctive physical consequence of parastatistics from a quantum information theory viewpoint. Roughly speaking, we show that emergent parastatistics enable long-range communication of information by only exchanging the spatial positions of paraparticles, without either perturbing the environment, or leaving any trace of information behind. We formulate this idea by proposing a thought experiment, in the form of a challenge game, designed in a way that can only be won by topological phases hosting emergent paraparticles, as winning the challenge requires the two participating players to send a message to each other by exploiting the nontrivial exchange statistics of the quasiparticles. We illustrate the winning strategy using the 2D exactly solvable quantum spin model with emergent paraparticles constructed in Ref. [5], and show that this strategy is robust against noise, as well as the most relevant class of eavesdropping via local measurements. We also give an alternative description of the winning strategy using the more universal language of tensor category theory, based on the established fact that point-like quasiparticles in three dimensional (3D) topological phases are universally described by symmetric fusion categories (SFCs) [13–15], which shows that non-trivial paraparticles capable of winning this challenge can also emerge in a special

class of 3D topological phases.

Rules of the game The participants of the game consist of two parties: two players, who we call Alice (A) and Bob (B), and a group of Referees (R). To win the game, the two players are required to send a message to each other using a very restricted class of local operations on a common quantum many body system, and the Referees' role is to initiate the challenge and monitor the whole process of the game to prevent cheating.

Before the game starts, the players are allowed to discuss a winning strategy, and then they are required to (1) submit a locally-interacting Hamiltonian \hat{H} on a 2D or 3D lattice that has a unique, gapped, and frustration-free ground state $|G\rangle$, with a mathematical proof for uniqueness and nonzero spectral gap;

(2) choose the radius r_0 of the circles in Fig. 1, and two far separated [23] points o, s in the lattice (which are allowed to be on the boundary);

(3) experimentally prepare the ground state $|G\rangle$ for a sufficiently large system size $L \gg r_0$ [L is determined by the Referees after they receive (1) and (2)].

A few technical remarks are in order here. Gapped means that there is a uniform lower bound (independent of the system size L) on the energy difference between the first excited state and ground state of \hat{H} . Frustration-free means that \hat{H} can be written in the form $\hat{H} = \sum_i \hat{h}_i$ such that $\hat{h}_i \geq 0$ and $\hat{h}_i |G\rangle = 0$ [the players are required to present this form as a part of the proof], which is a technical requirement imposed to simplify discussion, and we relax this requirement in Methods. Furthermore, there are some additional technical requirements on \hat{H} which essentially requires that it has a well-defined thermodynamic limit and describes a gapped phase of matter, and we present these in Methods.

When the Referees receive all above (1)-(3), they mathematically verify the proof, and experimentally check that $|G\rangle$ is prepared correctly, by verifying that $\langle G | \hat{h}_i | G \rangle = 0$ for all i . Then Alice and Bob are led to separate rooms, and the Referees randomly pick two numbers $a, b \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and give them to Alice and Bob, respectively, who do not know each other's number. The goal for the players is to gain information about each other's number through a restricted set of local operations on the physical system they have prepared, as described below.

Once the game starts, any form of direct communication between the players are prohibited. Throughout the game, Alice and Bob are confined in separate rooms, where the only access to the outside world is through local unitary operations and measurements on a common physical system, restricted to their respective circle areas, as shown in Fig. 1a. When the game starts at $t = 0$, the state of the physical system is initialized to be $|\Psi(0)\rangle = |G\rangle$, the ground state prepared by the players, and Alice's circle starts at the special point o , while




FIG. 1: Illustration of the game process. The two circles have radius r_0 defined by the players. During the game the Referees move the two circles along their respective paths to complete an exchange of positions. The two far separated points o, s are chosen by the players, while the two paths are chosen by the Referees.

Bob's circle starts at the other special point s , as shown in Fig. 1b. Then the Referees select the two paths shown in Fig. 1, and slowly move the two circles along their respective paths simultaneously, ensuring that the two circles remain far apart at all times. Throughout the process, the Referees frequently check the local ground state condition $\langle G | \hat{h}_i | G \rangle = 0$ everywhere beyond the two circle areas to make sure that the players are not cheating by leaving any trace of information behind. If at any moment, the Referees detect an excitation beyond the circle areas, the challenge fails. The game ends at $t = T$ in the configuration shown in Fig. 1d, when the two circles complete an exchange of positions. After this, the Referees move both circles out of the system and perform one last check of the local ground state condition $\langle G | \hat{h}_i | G \rangle = 0$ everywhere. If this final check is passed, the Referees ask Alice about b , and ask Bob about a , and the players win if they both answer correctly.

What can the players do to win the game? They can create some excitations inside their respective circle areas and make measurements on them, but throughout the experiment they are obliged to move the excitations to follow the circle movement, and clean up whatever excitations inside the circles before the game ends at $t = T$, to make sure that the Referees cannot detect an excitation anywhere beyond the circle areas at any time. At first glance, the challenge appears insurmountable under such restrictive conditions, as the players need to communicate some information without either leaving a trace behind, or sending any physical particles to each other as information carriers. Nevertheless, we will see that it is possible to succeed if the ground state $|G\rangle$ hosts some

emergent quasiparticles with non-trivial exchange statistics. The players can create such quasiparticles at $t = 0$, and encode their numbers in the internal state of the quasiparticles. Then they move the quasiparticles following the circle movement, and right before the game ends at $t = T$, the quasiparticles have exchanged their positions, inducing a unitary rotation on the internal states of the quasiparticles, which the players can measure. We will see that some information can be sent this way if the exchange statistics is nontrivial. In the following, we illustrate this winning strategy in detail, using emergent paraparticles in the 2D exactly solvable model introduced in Ref. [5], which we briefly review below.

The exactly solvable quantum spin model with emergent paraparticles [5] This model describes a strongly interacting quantum spin system on a 2D lattice, and with a suitable open boundary condition as shown in Fig. 2, the model Hamiltonian \hat{H} has a unique, gapped, and frustration-free ground state $|G\rangle$. Importantly, this system hosts emergent paraparticles. Below, we give a simplified description of their key physical properties:

- (1) The state space. In general, an excited state of \hat{H} with n identical paraparticles is denoted as $|G; i_1^{a_1} i_2^{a_2} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle$. Here i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n are the positions of the paraparticles, and we assume that they are mutually different [24]. The numbers $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ label the *internal states* of the paraparticles, where $m \geq 2$ is an integer called the quantum dimension of the paraparticle. When the positions i_1, \dots, i_n are fixed, there are m^n linearly independent internal states, spanning a m^n -dimensional subspace which we denote as $\mathcal{H}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n}$.
- (2) Topological degeneracy. The internal states of the paraparticles cannot be accessed using any local measurements when all particles are far away from the boundary and from each other. Formally, this means that any local operator \hat{O} is diagonal in the subspace $\mathcal{H}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n}$

$$\langle G; i_1^{b_1} \dots i_n^{b_n} | \hat{O} | G; i_1^{a_1} \dots i_n^{a_n} \rangle = C_{i_1 \dots i_n}^O \prod_{j=1}^n \delta_{a_j b_j}, \quad (1)$$

where $C_{i_1 \dots i_n}^O$ is a constant. Eq. (1) implies that states in $\mathcal{H}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n}$ are topologically degenerate in energy [25].

- (3) Particle movements. There exists a local unitary operator $\hat{U}_{i_k j_k}$ that moves the particle at position i_k to a nearby position j_k , for any $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$:

$$\hat{U}_{i_k j_k} |G; i_1^{a_1} \dots i_k^{a_k} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle = |G; i_1^{a_1} \dots j_k^{a_k} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle. \quad (2)$$

- (4) Exchange statistics. Here we focus on the case $n = 2$ which is enough for our purpose; the generalization to arbitrary number of paraparticles is straightforward and is given in Methods. For any $i \neq j$, \mathcal{H}_{ij} must be equal to \mathcal{H}_{ji} , since both describe the subspace of excited states of two identical paraparticles at positions i and j . Therefore the two different basis $\{|G; i^a j^b\rangle | 1 \leq a, b \leq m\}$ and $\{|G; j^b i^a\rangle | 1 \leq a, b \leq m\}$ must be related by a

unitary transformation:

$$|G; i^a j^b\rangle = \sum_{a', b'} R_{ab}^{b' a'} |G; j^{b'} i^{a'}\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where the four-index tensor $R_{ab}^{b' a'}$ (called the R -matrix) must satisfy the Yang-Baxter equation (12) so that Eq. (3) can be consistently generalized to any number of particles [5]. Every R -matrix defines a type of parastatistics [5]. There are many different types of parastatistics that can emerge in condensed matter systems, and the one in the original 2D solvable model in Ref. [5] has quantum dimension $m = 4$ and an R -matrix whose nonzero elements are given by

$$R_{ab}^{b' a'} = -1, \text{ if } (b', a') = \begin{pmatrix} 43 & 12 & 24 & 31 \\ 21 & 34 & 42 & 13 \\ 14 & 41 & 33 & 22 \\ 32 & 23 & 11 & 44 \end{pmatrix}_{ab}, \quad (4)$$

where we use 43 as a shorthand for (4, 3) and similarly for others.

- (5) Creation and annihilation of paraparticles. With the open boundary condition shown in Fig. 2, paraparticles can be locally created at the corners o, s . More precisely, there exists unitary operators $\hat{U}_{o,a}, \hat{U}'_{s,a}$ localized around o, s , respectively, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}_{o,a} |G; i_1^{a_1} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle &= |G; o^a i_1^{a_1} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle, \\ \hat{U}'_{s,a} |G; i_1^{a_1} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle &= |G; i_1^{a_1} \dots i_n^{a_n} s^a\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Since unitary processes are reversible, one can also annihilate paraparticles at o, s using $\hat{U}_{o,a}^\dagger, \hat{U}'_{s,a}^\dagger$, respectively.

- (6) Measurement of the internal state. When a paraparticle is close to either o or s , one can measure its internal state locally: there exist observables \hat{O}_o, \hat{O}'_s localized around o, s , respectively, satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{O}_o |G; i_1^{a_1} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle &= a_1 |G; i_1^{a_1} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle, \text{ if } i_1 = o, \\ \hat{O}'_s |G; i_1^{a_1} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle &= a_n |G; i_1^{a_1} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle, \text{ if } i_n = s. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Note that if we instead have $i_k = o$ for some $k > 1$ (or $i_k = s$ for some $k < n$), then we need to use a basis transformation in Eq. (15) to swap i_k all the way to the front (back) before applying Eq. (6) to compute $\langle \hat{O}_o \rangle$ (or $\langle \hat{O}'_s \rangle$). We will see an example soon in Eq. (7).

All these facts can be derived from the exact solution of this model in Ref. [5], as we show in Methods. We emphasize that in order to win the challenge, it is crucial to have two special points o and s in the lattice where a single paraparticle can be created and measured using local operations, and these are the two points the players choose at which they begin and end their journey. In Fig. 3, o and s are chosen to be at the intersection between two different types of gapped boundaries of this model, as we explain in more detail in Methods. Alternatively, with this topological phase it is also possible




FIG. 2: Illustration of the winning strategy using emergent paraparticles. o and s are chosen to be the intersection points between two different types of gapped boundaries, where a paraparticle can be locally created and measured. The dashed lines represent the paths traversed by the circles, along which the players have applied unitary operators \hat{U}_{ij} in Eq. (2).

to win the challenge in a geometry without a boundary, where the ground state $|G\rangle$ has some point-like defects at o, s , which also allow a paraparticle to be locally created and measured, as we illustrate in Methods.

Winning strategy with emergent paraparticles We now detail the strategy that ensures success in the challenge. The pregame preparation is done using the 2D solvable model mentioned above: the players submit the model Hamiltonian \hat{H} , choose o, s as in Fig. 2, prepare its ground state $|G\rangle$, and let the Referees verify. After the game starts and the players obtain their numbers from the Referees, they use the following strategy to win, as illustrated in Fig. 2:

- (a) At $t = 0$, Alice applies $\hat{U}_{o,a}$ to create a paraparticle with internal state a at o , and similarly Bob applies $\hat{U}'_{s,b}$ at s . The state of the whole system is $|\Psi(0)\rangle = |G; o^a s^b\rangle$;
- (b) Throughout the game process, Alice and Bob move their paraparticles along the paths using \hat{U}_{ij} in Eq. (2), closely following the circle movement;
- (c) When the exchange is complete, the state evolves to

$$|\Psi(T)\rangle = |G; s^a o^b\rangle = \sum_{a', b'} R_{ab}^{b'a'} |G; o^{b'} s^{a'}\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where we use Eq. (3). Then Alice and Bob measure \hat{O}'_s and \hat{O}_o in Eq. (6) and obtain a' and b' , respectively, after which the state collapses into $|G; o^{b'} s^{a'}\rangle$. Finally, Alice and Bob annihilate their paraparticles using $\hat{U}'_{s,a'}$ and $\hat{U}_{o,b'}$, respectively, so that the Referees cannot detect any excitations anywhere after they leave the game.

According to the R -matrix in Eq. (4), the measurement results a', b' are definite, and importantly, knowing b and b' completely determines a , and similarly, knowing a and a' completely determines b [26]. For example, if Alice has $(a, a') = (2, 3)$, then she searches in the second row of the matrix for the column that has $a' = 3$. This turns out to be the fourth column, so she determines that $b = 4$ and

$b' = 1$. This allows the players to win the game with a 100% success rate.

This winning strategy demonstrates a clear physical distinction between paraparticles and ordinary fermions or bosons with an internal symmetry, such as color or flavor. The statistics of the latter can also be described by Eq. (3), but with $R_{ab}^{b'a'} = \pm \delta_{a'a} \delta_{b'b}$. With such an R -matrix, Alice will simply obtain $a' = a$ and Bob will obtain $b' = b$, which contains no information about each other's number, and therefore cannot win the game with a probability better than pure guessing.

Robustness against noise and eavesdropping Importantly, the above winning strategy using emergent paraparticles is robust against noise, which is a consequence of Eq. (1). More precisely, the susceptibility to local noise decays exponentially as $e^{-l/\xi}$, where l is the minimal distance between the paraparticles and the boundary. This means that even when noise is present, the above strategy still has a high chance of success that is independent of the system size L . Eq. (1) also implies the robustness against the most physically relevant class of eavesdropping via local measurements: when both players are in the bulk, a thief cannot obtain any information about the players' numbers a and b using any local measurements on the system, even including measurements at o, s or inside the circle areas.

Symmetric fusion category description So far we have presented a specific physical system in 2D with emergent paraparticles that can pass the challenge. In principle, the 2D solvable model can be generalized to 3D, and the simple description of emergent paraparticles in Eqs. (1-6) are still valid, and the winning strategy is essentially the same. Instead of giving another exactly solvable model, here we give a universal description of a family of physical systems in 3D that can pass this challenge using the language of tensor category theory. This analysis is based on the established fact that point-like quasiparticles in 3D topological phases are universally described by SFCs [13–15], and it is known that any SFC can be realized by some exactly solvable quantum spin models in 3D [14, 15, 27].

The SFC description of the winning strategy is based on the following space-time diagram:

$$= R_{ab}^{b'a'} \sigma \bar{\sigma}, \quad (8)$$

where σ represents a special type of topological quasiparticle, with $\bar{\sigma}$ being its antiparticle. In this case the players need to prepare a state with topological quasiparticles σ and $\bar{\sigma}$ at positions o and s , respectively, which can still be the unique and gapped ground state of a locally-interacting (but not translationally invariant) Hamiltonian that qualifies the requirement of the game, as shown

in Methods. Importantly, we assume that the quasiparticles have fusion rules of the form

$$\sigma \times \psi = m \sigma, \quad \psi \times \bar{\sigma} = m \bar{\sigma}, \quad (9)$$

where m is the quantum dimension of ψ . [Indeed, it is straightforward to show that the first one in Eq. (9) implies the second.] Eq. (9) implies that ψ can be locally created and measured in the vicinity of σ or $\bar{\sigma}$, and the tensor $R_{ab}^{b'a'}$ in Eq. (8) defines the statistics of the paraparticle ψ in the sense of Eq. (3). Indeed, Eq. (8) exactly describes the winning strategy similar to that depicted in Fig. 2, in which at $t = 0$ Alice creates a paraparticle with internal state a in the vicinity of σ , and meanwhile Bob creates a paraparticle with internal state b in the vicinity of $\bar{\sigma}$; at $t = T$ when the exchange process is over, Alice measures the internal state of her paraparticle in the vicinity of $\bar{\sigma}$ and obtains a' , and then fuse her paraparticle into $\bar{\sigma}$, and meanwhile Bob performs similar operations in the vicinity of σ and obtains b' . As long as $R_{ab}^{b'a'}$ is not of the trivial product form $R_{ab}^{b'a'} = p_{a'a}q_{b'b}$, some information can be transferred between Alice and Bob, and by using multiple identical layers of the same system, the players can transfer more information to each other, thereby arbitrarily enhancing the chance of winning. We therefore conclude that a gapped ground state $|G\rangle$ described by an SFC \mathcal{C} can win the challenge if \mathcal{C} has fusion rules of the form (9) such that the R -matrix defined by Eq. (8) is nontrivial. A more detailed analysis along with examples of such kind of SFCs will be presented in a separate paper [28]. In particular, the special type of paraparticle defined by the R -matrix in Eq. (4) can appear in an SFC of this kind.

Discussion We have presented a secret communication challenge game that physically distinguishes paraparticles from ordinary fermions and bosons. In a nutshell, emergent parastatistics in topological phases enable long-range communication of information between the two players by only exchanging their spatial positions, without either perturbing the environment, or leaving any trace of information behind. Such a winning strategy using parastatistics is robust against any local noise and eavesdropping, which cannot be achieved using ordinary fermions or bosons. We can therefore use this challenge game as a criterion for non-trivial parastatistics.

Finally, we discuss some potential future directions. While winning the challenge in 3D unambiguously demonstrates the existence of non-trivial parastatistics, in 2D, it is possible that some special types of non-Abelian anyons can also succeed the challenge. It is therefore interesting to ask if it is possible to design some additional challenge in order to distinguish between paraparticles and anyons in 2D. Another interesting direction is to experimentally implement this challenge game and its winning strategy using systems that host emergent parastatistics. The first critical step would be engineering such a system and preparing its ground state.

The latter can potentially be achieved by generalizing the recent topological quantum state preparation protocol [29, 30] involving measurements and feedforward to quantum double ground states based on an exotic class of solvable groups [31]. Furthermore, it is interesting to generalize the challenge game and its winning strategy to quantum many body systems at finite temperature. In 2D, there is no topological order at finite temperature [32–35]. In 3D, however, some nontrivial features of topological order persist at finite temperature, such as having a nonzero topological entanglement entropy [36]. Successfully achieving this challenge at finite temperatures is crucial for experimentally observing emergent parastatistics. Additionally, this could highlight a non-trivial feature of finite-temperature topological order and its potential application in quantum information.

We thank Alexei Kitaev, J. Ignacio Cirac, Meng Cheng, Kaden Hazzard, Norbert Schuch, Chong Wang, Dominic Else, Sung-Sik Lee, Tao Shi, and Xiaoqi Sun for discussions. This work is supported by the Munich Quantum Valley (MQV), which is supported by the Bavarian state government with funds from the Hightech Agenda Bayern Plus.

-
- [1] Gregory Moore and Nicholas Read, “Nonabelions in the fractional quantum Hall effect,” Nucl. Phys. B **360**, 362–396 (1991).
 - [2] Alexei Kitaev, “Fault-tolerant quantum computation by anyons,” Ann. Phys. **303**, 2–30 (2003).
 - [3] Alexei Kitaev, “Anyons in an exactly solved model and beyond,” Ann. Phys. **321**, 2–111 (2006).
 - [4] Chetan Nayak, Steven H Simon, Ady Stern, Michael Freedman, and Sankar Das Sarma, “Non-Abelian anyons and topological quantum computation,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 1083–1159 (2008).
 - [5] Zhiyuan Wang and Kaden R A Hazzard, “Particle exchange statistics beyond fermions and bosons,” arXiv:2308.05203 (2023).
 - [6] Xiao-Gang Wen, “Topological orders in rigid states,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **4**, 239–271 (1990).
 - [7] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Local unitary transformation, long-range quantum entanglement, wave function renormalization, and topological order,” Phys. Rev. B **82**, 155138 (2010).
 - [8] Xiao Gang Wen, “Colloquium: Zoo of quantum-topological phases of matter,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **89** (2017), 10.1103/RevModPhys.89.041004.
 - [9] Maissam Barkeshli, Parsa Bonderson, Meng Cheng, and Zhenghan Wang, “Symmetry fractionalization, defects, and gauging of topological phases,” Phys. Rev. B **100**, 115147 (2019).
 - [10] Michael Levin and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Detecting Topological Order in a Ground State Wave Function,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110405 (2006).
 - [11] Alexei Kitaev and John Preskill, “Topological Entanglement Entropy,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110404 (2006).
 - [12] Yi Zhang, Tarun Grover, Ari Turner, Masaki Oshikawa,

- and Ashvin Vishwanath, “Quasiparticle statistics and braiding from ground-state entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 235151 (2012).
- [13] Sergio Doplicher, Rudolf Haag, and John E Roberts, “Local observables and particle statistics I,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **23**, 199–230 (1971); “Local observables and particle statistics II,” **35**, 49–85 (1974).
- [14] Tian Lan, Liang Kong, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Classification of (3+1)D Bosonic Topological Orders: The Case When Pointlike Excitations Are All Bosons,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 21074 (2018).
- [15] Tian Lan and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Classification of 3 + 1D Bosonic Topological Orders (II): The Case When Some Pointlike Excitations Are Fermions,” *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 21005 (2019).
- [16] H S Green, “A Generalized Method of Field Quantization,” *Phys. Rev.* **90**, 270–273 (1953).
- [17] Robert H Stolt and John R Taylor, “Correspondence between the first- and second-quantized theories of paraparticles,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **19**, 1–19 (1970).
- [18] Wolfgang Pauli, “Exclusion principle and quantum mechanics,” in *Nobel Lect. Phys. 1942–1962* (Elsevier Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1946) pp. 27–43.
- [19] Huzihiro Araki, “On the Connection of Spin and Comutation Relations between Different Fields,” *J. Math. Phys.* **2**, 267–270 (1961).
- [20] O W Greenberg and A M L Messiah, “Selection Rules for Parafields and the Absence of Para Particles in Nature,” *Phys. Rev.* **138**, B1155—B1167 (1965).
- [21] P V Landshoff and Henry P Stapp, “Parastatistics and a unified theory of identical particles,” *Ann. Phys.* **45**, 72–92 (1967).
- [22] K Drühl, R Haag, and J E Roberts, “On parastatistics,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **18**, 204–226 (1970).
- [23] For example, we can require that the distance between o and s is at least half of the system size.
- [24] If not, then the exclusion statistics of the paraparticles have to be taken into account [5]. This is unnecessary for our discussion here, since we never move two paraparticles to the same position in this paper.
- [25] In a general topological phase, Eq. (1) only holds up to a small correction of order $O(e^{-l/\xi})$, where ξ is the correlation length of $|G\rangle$ and l is the minimal distance between the paraparticles (and the boundary). Consequently, the topological degeneracy in energy generally also has a small splitting up to $O(e^{-l/\xi})$. In this solvable model, however, we can tune the model parameters such that $\xi = 0$, and this small correction exactly vanishes.
- [26] Indeed, this R -matrix is an example of a perfect tensor, i.e. if we group any two indices of the R -matrix as input, and the other two as output, the resulting matrix we get is unitary (it is an invertible classical gate in our case). This allows the players to obtain complete information about each other’s number by inverting this matrix.
- [27] Chenchang Zhu, Tian Lan, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Topological nonlinear σ -model, higher gauge theory, and a systematic construction of 3 + 1D topological orders for boson systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 45105 (2019).
- [28] Z Wang, “The parastatistics challenge: generalizations and a tensor categorical analysis,” unpublished.
- [29] Nathanan Tantivasadakarn, Ashvin Vishwanath, and Ruben Verresen, “Hierarchy of Topological Order From Finite-Depth Unitaries, Measurement, and Feedforward,” *PRX Quantum* **4**, 20339 (2023).
- [30] Mohsin Iqbal, Nathanan Tantivasadakarn, Ruben Verresen, Sara L Campbell, Joan M Dreiling, Caroline Figgatt, John P Gaebler, Jacob Johansen, Michael Mills, Steven A Moses, Juan M Pino, Anthony Ransford, Mary Rowe, Peter Siegfried, Russell P Stutz, Michael Foss-Feig, Ashvin Vishwanath, and Henrik Dreyer, “Non-Abelian topological order and anyons on a trapped-ion processor,” *Nature* **626**, 505–511 (2024).
- [31] Robert B Howlett and I Martin Isaacs, “On groups of central type,” *Math. Zeitschrift* **179**, 555–569 (1982).
- [32] Claudio Castelnovo and Claudio Chamon, “Entanglement and topological entropy of the toric code at finite temperature,” *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 184442 (2007).
- [33] Eric Dennis, Alexei Kitaev, Andrew Landahl, and John Preskill, “Topological quantum memory,” *J. Math. Phys.* **43**, 4452–4505 (2002).
- [34] Zohar Nussinov and Gerardo Ortiz, “A symmetry principle for topological quantum order,” *Ann. Phys. (N. Y.)* **324**, 977–1057 (2009).
- [35] Zohar Nussinov and Gerardo Ortiz, “Sufficient symmetry conditions for Topological Quantum Order,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 16944–16949 (2009).
- [36] Claudio Castelnovo and Claudio Chamon, “Topological order in a three-dimensional toric code at finite temperature,” *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 155120 (2008).
- [37] Matthew B Hastings, “Solving gapped Hamiltonians locally,” *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 85115 (2006).
- [38] If the energy band of the paraparticles have a nonzero Chern number, then the system will be in a chiral topological phase. This can be very interesting to study in its own right, however, chiral topological phases must have gapless boundary, and therefore do not qualify the requirement of the game in a geometry with boundary, such as that shown in Fig. 2. It is also believed that the ground state of chiral topological phases cannot be frustration free, which makes our discussion harder.
- [39] N Bultinck, M Mariën, D J Williamson, M B Şahinoğlu, J Haegeman, and F Verstraete, “Anyons and matrix product operator algebras,” *Ann. Phys. (N. Y.)* **378**, 183–233 (2017).
- [40] Alexei Kitaev and Liang Kong, “Models for Gapped Boundaries and Domain Walls,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **313**, 351–373 (2012).
- [41] Sergey B Bravyi and A Yu Kitaev, “Quantum codes on a lattice with boundary,” *arXiv Prepr. quant-ph/9811052* (1998).
- [42] Steven H Simon, *Topological quantum* (Oxford University Press, 2023).

Methods

Technical requirements on the Hamiltonian \hat{H} In the following we give all the technical requirements on the Hamiltonian \hat{H} of the physical system that the players are allowed to use to win the challenge. Essentially, we want to formulate the condition that \hat{H} has a well-defined thermodynamic limit and describes a gapped phase of matter. For convenience, we add the requirement of translational invariance, but it should be possible to relax this requirement to allow gapped phases with spatial disorder. Formally, the requirements on \hat{H} are:

(a) \hat{H} is required to be translationally invariant except at the two special points o and s chosen by the players, i.e., \hat{H} should be of the form $\hat{H} = \sum_i \hat{h}_i$, where \hat{h}_i and \hat{h}_j should be related by a translation unless one of i and j is close to either o or s ;

(b) \hat{H} is allowed to have an open boundary condition, which can be freely chosen by the players; however, we require that the boundary can be divided into a finite number of connected regions, each region S is described by a specific boundary type [i.e. the boundary Hamiltonian in S has the form $\sum_{i \in S} \hat{h}'_i$, where \hat{h}'_i is allowed to differ from the bulk Hamiltonian \hat{h}_i , but for any $i, j \in S$ (with $i, j \notin \{o, s\}$), \hat{h}'_i and \hat{h}'_j should be related by a translation].

(c) \hat{H} has a unique, gapped, and frustration-free ground state $|G\rangle$;

We emphasize that the frustration-free condition in (c) applies to the whole system, including at the boundary (if any) and the special points o, s . For example, if open boundary condition is used, the condition (c) requires that both the bulk Hamiltonian \hat{h}_i and the boundary terms \hat{h}'_i are positive semidefinite and annihilate the unique, gapped ground state $|G\rangle$.

Relaxing the frustration free condition As we mentioned earlier, the requirement that the ground state is frustration free can be relaxed. To this end we use an important theorem by Hastings [37] which claims that if a locally interacting Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \sum_i \hat{h}_i$ has a unique, gapped ground state $|G\rangle$, then it is approximately frustration free, meaning that \hat{H} can alternatively be written as $\hat{H} = E_0 + \sum_i \hat{h}'_i$, where E_0 is the ground state energy, and \hat{h}'_i is localized around i with subexponentially decaying tails, satisfying $\hat{h}'_i \geq 0$, and $\hat{h}'_i |G\rangle = 0$ for all i . In this way, the Referees can still prevent cheating by monitoring $\langle G | \hat{h}'_i | G \rangle = 0$ beyond the circle areas throughout the game, and the players can still manage to localize their quasiparticles inside the circle areas, if they choose r_0 to be far greater than the correlation length of the system.

Some technical details about the 2D solvable model with emergent paraparticles In the following we present more details on the 2D solvable model constructed in Ref. [5],

and derive the properties in Eqs. (1-6) from the exact solution of this model, using the second quantization formalism of parastatistics [5]. The Hamiltonian \hat{H} of this model has an extensive number of local conserved quantities, similar to Kitaev's honeycomb model [3], and the ground state $|G\rangle$ of \hat{H} lies in the so-called zero-vortex sector Φ_0 in which every local conserved operator has minimal eigenvalue. In the zero vortex sector, \hat{H} can be exactly mapped to a free parparticle Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}' = - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle, 1 \leq a \leq m} (J_{ij} \hat{\psi}_{j,a}^+ \hat{\psi}_{i,a}^- + \text{h.c.}) - \sum_l \mu_l \hat{n}_l, \quad (10)$$

where the summation is over all neighboring sites of the underlying 2D lattice. We do not show this 2D lattice structure as it is unimportant for our discussions. $\hat{\psi}_{i,a}^\pm$ are parparticle creation (+) and annihilation (-) operators satisfying the generalized second quantization commutation relations [5]

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}_{i,a}^- \hat{\psi}_{j,b}^+ &= \sum_{cd} R_{bd}^{ac} \hat{\psi}_{j,c}^+ \hat{\psi}_{i,d}^- + \delta_{ab} \delta_{ij}, \\ \hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+ \hat{\psi}_{j,b}^+ &= \sum_{cd} R_{ab}^{cd} \hat{\psi}_{j,c}^+ \hat{\psi}_{i,d}^+, \\ \hat{\psi}_{i,a}^- \hat{\psi}_{j,b}^- &= \sum_{cd} R_{dc}^{ba} \hat{\psi}_{j,c}^- \hat{\psi}_{i,d}^-, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where we have $\hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+ = (\hat{\psi}_{i,a}^-)^\dagger$ in this model. The tensor $R_{cd}^{ab} = {}^a \boxed{R}_d^b$ satisfies the Yang-Baxter equation

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{c} a & b \\ \boxed{R} \\ c & d \end{array} &= \delta \begin{array}{c} a & b \\ | & | \\ c & d \end{array}, & \begin{array}{c} a & b & c \\ \boxed{R} & & | \\ & \boxed{R} & | \\ d & e & f \end{array} &= \begin{array}{c} a & b & c \\ | & \boxed{R} & \\ \boxed{R} & & | \\ d & e & f \end{array}, & (12) \\ R^2 &= \mathbb{1}, & R_{12} R_{23} R_{12} &= R_{23} R_{12} R_{23}. \end{aligned}$$

and therefore defines a representation of the symmetric group S_n . We will see soon that R_{ab}^{cd} defines the exchange statistics of the paraparticles created by $\hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+$ in the sense of Eq. (3). The tunneling constants J_{ij} and the chemical potential μ_l in Eq. (10) are derived from some free parameters in the original quantum spin model. In this paper we assume that these parameters are chosen such that the paraparticles have a topologically trivial band structure with a nonzero band gap [38], with the ground state $|G\rangle$ being the parparticle vacuum, satisfying $\hat{\psi}_{i,a}^- |G\rangle = 0$ everywhere. This guarantees that the model satisfies all the requirements of the game, as $|G\rangle$ is unique, gapped, and frustration-free, all of which can be rigorously proved using the exact solution [5]. The Referees can monitor the local ground state condition simply by measuring the local conserved quantities along with the parparticle number operators $\{\hat{n}_l\}$ (which are

mapped to local operators in the original quantum spin model).

The exact mapping from the strongly interacting quantum spin Hamiltonian \hat{H} to the free paraparticle Hamiltonian \hat{H}' in Eq. (10) is achieved via the generalized Jordan-Wigner transformation introduced in Ref. [5]. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the operator $\hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+$ is a matrix product string operator [39] connecting the site i to the corner o . When acting on the zero-vortex sector, $\hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+$ creates a paraparticle with internal state a at position i , and importantly, it does not change any local property of the system anywhere far from site i . This is due to the fundamental fact that the string operator is not locally detectable, and its action on the zero-vortex sector does not depend on its exact geometric shape (i.e. its path can be continuously deformed), only on its endpoints. This means, in particular, that if Alice and Bob hold paraparticles inside their circle areas, the Referee will not be able to detect anything abnormal using local measurements anywhere beyond the circle areas. Paraparticles can also be locally created at the corner s [5], as illustrated in Fig. 3b. This is because $\hat{W}_{bc}|G\rangle = \delta_{bc}|G\rangle$, where \hat{W}_{bc} is the string operator connecting o and s , leading to $\hat{\psi}_{j,b}^+|G\rangle = \sum_c \hat{\psi}_{j,c}^+ \hat{W}_{cb}|G\rangle = \hat{\psi}_{j,b}'^+|G\rangle$, where $\hat{\psi}_{j,b}'^+$ is an alternative creation operator connecting site j to the corner s . Therefore, one can use $\hat{\psi}_{s,b}'^+$ to locally create a paraparticle at the corner s .

The above second quantization formulation directly leads to the simple description of emergent paraparticles presented in Eqs. (1-6), and we give their relation below: (1) The basis states for the n -particle subspace $\mathcal{H}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n}$ are defined as

$$|G; i_1^{a_1} i_2^{a_2} \dots i_n^{a_n}\rangle = \hat{\psi}_{i_1, a_1}^+ \hat{\psi}_{i_2, a_2}^+ \dots \hat{\psi}_{i_n, a_n}^+ |G\rangle. \quad (13)$$

(2) Topological degeneracy of $\mathcal{H}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n}$ directly follows from the fact that the paraparticle created by the string operator $\hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+$ is a topological excitation with quantum dimension m , and Eq. (1) holds for topologically degenerate states in general.

(3) Paraparticles can be moved using local unitaries of the form $\hat{U}_{ij} = e^{i\Delta t(\hat{e}_{ij} + \hat{e}_{ji})}$, where $\hat{e}_{ij} \equiv \sum_{a=1}^m \hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+ \hat{\psi}_{j,a}^-$ are paraparticle tunneling operators (in the original spin model description, both \hat{U}_{ij} and \hat{e}_{ij} act on a certain path connecting i and j). Eq. (2) follows from

$$\hat{U}_{ij} \hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+ \hat{U}_{ij}^\dagger = \hat{\psi}_{j,a}^+, \quad \hat{U}_{ij} \hat{\psi}_{j,a}^+ \hat{U}_{ij}^\dagger = \hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+, \quad \forall a, \quad (14)$$

which can be derived using Eq. (11).

(4) Exchange statistics in Eq. (3) follows from the definition in Eq. (13) and the second line of Eq. (11). In the n -particle subspace $\mathcal{H}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n}$, Eq. (3) generalizes to

$$|G; \dots i_k^{a_k} i_{k+1}^{b_k} \dots\rangle = \sum_{a', b'} R_{ab}^{b' a'} |G; \dots i_{k+1}^{b'_k} i_k^{a'_k} \dots\rangle, \quad (15)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, n-1$, where \dots collectively denotes other labels that are unaffected by the exchange. Eq. (15)

completely determines the basis transformation between $\mathcal{H}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_n}$, where j_1, \dots, j_n is a permutation of i_1, \dots, i_n , since any permutation can be written as a composition of a finite sequence of neighboring swaps of the form in Eq. (15).

(5) The local unitary operators $\hat{U}_{o,a}$, $\hat{U}'_{s,a}$ in Eq. (5) can be constructed as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}_{o,a} &= e^{i\Delta t(\hat{\psi}_{o,a}^+ + \hat{\psi}_{o,a}^-)}, \\ \hat{U}'_{s,a} &= e^{i\Delta t(\hat{\psi}'_{s,a}^+ + \hat{\psi}'_{s,a}^-)}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

for a suitable Δt such that $\hat{U}_{o,a}|G\rangle = \hat{\psi}_{o,a}^+|G\rangle$. Note that both are unitary and localized around o, s , respectively.

(6) The local observables in Eq. (6) can be constructed as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{O}_o &= \sum_{a=1}^4 a \hat{\psi}_{o,a}^+ \hat{\psi}_{o,a}^-, \\ \hat{O}'_s &= \sum_{a=1}^4 a \hat{\psi}'_{s,a}^+ \hat{\psi}'_{s,a}^-. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Eq. (6) can be proved using Eq. (11) and the fact that \hat{O}_o, \hat{O}'_s are localized around o, s , respectively [5].

Remarks on the open boundary condition As we mentioned earlier, to win the challenge, the two special points o and s have to be chosen in such a way that a single paraparticle can be locally created and measured at both positions. In this model there are at least two ways to do this. The first is to use a hybrid boundary condition as shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3a, and choose o and s to be the two intersection points between the two different types of gapped boundaries of this model. It is well-known that a topological phase can have several possible gapped boundaries with distinct topological properties [40]. For example, the toric code model has two possible gapped boundaries [41], one is called a smooth boundary, where one can fuse a magnetic flux into vacuum, and a rough boundary, where one can fuse an electric charge into vacuum. These two types of gapped boundaries can be defined for more general Kitaev's quantum double model based on any finite dimensional \mathbb{C}^* -Hopf algebra. This fact also applies to our model, which is an extension of a Kitaev's quantum double model based on a special 64-dimensional Hopf algebra [5]. As shown in Fig. 3, the western and southern boundaries are rough, while the eastern and northern boundaries are smooth. If we use such a hybrid gapped boundary in the toric code model, then one can fuse a fermion into vacuum at the corners o and s , which are the intersection points between the smooth and rough boundaries. Analogously, in our model, this hybrid boundary condition allows one to fuse paraparticles into vacuum at the corners o and s , which is crucial for winning the challenge.

Winning strategy without boundary As we mentioned in the main text, for certain topological phases, it is possible to win the game on a geometry without any boundary,




FIG. 3: Properties of the emergent paraparticles in the 2D solvable model. (a) A two-particle state $|G; i^a j^b\rangle \equiv \hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+ \hat{\psi}_{j,b}^+ |G\rangle$. A paraparticle at position i with internal state a is created by $\hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+$, a string operator connecting site i to the corner o . Importantly, the Referees cannot detect the presence of such a string operator using any local measurement far from i ; (b) Paraparticles can also be locally created at s , using $\hat{\psi}_{s,b}^+$, since the string operator \hat{W}_{bc} connecting o and s (shown in dashed line) acts trivially on $|G\rangle$; (c) and (d) are analogous to (a) and (b), but in a different geometry. Here the two special points o and s are chosen to be the positions of the defects σ and $\bar{\sigma}$, respectively, where paraparticles can be locally created and measured.

such as on a sphere. Examples of this kind of topological phases include the one described by the 2D exactly solvable model discussed above, and the special family of 3D topological phases mentioned in the main text. The defining feature of this kind of topological phases is that there are quasiparticles $\sigma, \bar{\sigma}, \psi$ with fusion rules of the form in Eq. (9), such that the R -matrix defined by Eq. (8) is non-trivial. Specifically, let \hat{H}_0 be a translationally invariant Hamiltonian (defined on a 3D or 2D lattice) that realizes such a topological phase. The important trick to win the game is that, during the pregame preparation stage, the players submit a Hamiltonian of the form $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}_o^\sigma + \hat{V}_s^{\bar{\sigma}}$, where \hat{V}_o^σ is a local Hermi-

tian operator that traps a quasiparticle σ at position o , and similarly $\hat{V}_s^{\bar{\sigma}}$ traps the antiparticle $\bar{\sigma}$ at position s . This Hamiltonian \hat{H} still has a unique, gapped, and frustration free ground state $|G\rangle$, which can be constructed from the ground state $|G_0\rangle$ of \hat{H}_0 by creating a particle-antiparticle pair $\sigma\bar{\sigma}$ at o and then move $\bar{\sigma}$ to s . Therefore, \hat{H} qualifies the requirements of the game. Eq. (9) means that the paraparticle ψ can be locally created and measured in the vicinity of either σ or $\bar{\sigma}$, and in this case the paraparticle operator $\hat{\psi}_{i,a}^+$ is a string operator connecting o to site i , as illustrated in Fig. 3c and 3d, where in this case the role of the corners are played by the topological quasiparticles σ and $\bar{\sigma}$, and the relation shown in Fig. 3d can be understood as the following F -move of the fusion diagram

$$\begin{array}{c} \sigma \\ \psi \\ \bar{\sigma} \\ I_i \end{array} = \sum_{b'} [F_I^{\sigma\psi\bar{\sigma}}]_{\sigma b, \bar{\sigma} b'} \begin{array}{c} \sigma \\ \psi \\ \bar{\sigma} \\ I_i \end{array}, \quad (18)$$

where $[F_I^{\sigma\psi\bar{\sigma}}]_{\sigma b, \bar{\sigma} b'}$ is the F -matrix expressing the associativity of fusion [42]. Since it is always possible to choose a suitable gauge convention such that $[F_I^{\sigma\psi\bar{\sigma}}]_{\sigma b, \bar{\sigma} b'} = \delta_{bb'}$ [28], Eq. (18) exactly describes the relation shown in Fig. 3d—both describe the equivalence of the quantum states obtained by first creating a ψ particle with internal state b at the vicinity of either σ or $\bar{\sigma}$ and then moving it to position j .

We emphasize that with the Hamiltonian \hat{H} and the ground state $|G\rangle$, the players can win the challenge without violating any rules of the game. Importantly, the rules of the game require that, when the circles move away from the starting points o, s relative to the ground state $|G\rangle$. The topological quasiparticles $\sigma, \bar{\sigma}$ are excitations above the translationally invariant state $|G_0\rangle$, but they are already present in $|G\rangle$, and they sit still at o, s throughout the game process, so they are not extra excitations created by the players after the game has started. As described in the game protocol, during the game, the Referees monitor the system by measuring the local Hamiltonians in \hat{H} everywhere beyond the circle areas, so with this strategy they will not detect any extra excitations at o, s relative to the ground state $|G\rangle$.