

A non-semisimple non-invertible symmetry

CLEMENT DELCAMP,^{1,*} EDMUND HENG,^{1,†} and MATTHEW YU^{2,‡}

¹*Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques, Bures-sur-Yvette, France*

²*Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Woodstock Road, Oxford, UK*

We investigate the action of a non-semisimple, non-invertible symmetry on spin chains, whose topological defects encode the category of modules over the Taft algebra of dimension 4. Sacrificing Hermiticity, we construct several symmetric, frustration-free, gapped Hamiltonians with real spectra and analyse their ground state subspaces. Our study reveals two intriguing phenomena. First, we identify an \mathbb{S}^1 -parametrised family of symmetric states, all of which belong to the same gapped phase with respect to the invertible subsymmetry, yet transform inequivalently under the non-semisimple symmetry. Second, we find a model where a product state and the so-called W state spontaneously break the symmetry. We further relate the indistinguishability of these two states in the infinite-volume limit to the notion that they are associated with a simple object and its projective cover, respectively, in a non-semisimple module category.

SEC. I | Introduction

Defining internal symmetry in a quantum theory through the lens of *topological defects* opens the door to generalised notions of symmetry, including some arising from *non-invertible* transformations [1, 2]. In (1+1)d, the framework of *fusion category* theory offers an axiomatisation for *finite* non-invertible symmetries [3–9]. Importantly, fusion categories are *semisimple*, which ensures that no local operators can transform one indecomposable topological line defect into a distinct one.

Given a fusion category, symmetric (bosonic) gapped phases are classified by indecomposable finite semisimple module categories over it, such that degenerate vacua on the circle are in one-to-one correspondence with simple objects in the module category [6, 10]. Given such a module category, a commuting projector Hamiltonian representing the corresponding gapped phase can be explicitly constructed within the *anyonic chain* framework [11–17]. Moreover, both ground states and symmetry operators can be efficiently parametrised in terms of *tensor networks* [15, 16, 18–22].

What happens to these results when the symmetry structure is no longer required to be non-semisimple? Do new features arise in such cases? Using the tools of [14–17, 21], we explore these questions through investigating a specific example: a symmetry encoded into the category of modules over the Taft algebra of dimension 4. This *non-semisimple tensor category* describes topological line defects that can be indecomposable and yet *reducible*, implying the existence of local operators transforming them into other indecomposable ones.

In particular, we discuss two phenomena extending the above paradigm: On the one hand, we find an \mathbb{S}^1 -parametrised family of symmetric states, which all represent the same gapped phase with respect to an invertible

symmetry, and yet transform inequivalently with respect to the non-semisimple symmetry in the sense of ref. [21]. On the other hand, we find two states spontaneously breaking the non-semisimple symmetry, which are labelled by a simple object and its *projective cover*, respectively, in a finite non-semisimple module category. We relate the existence of a map between these objects with the fact that these states are indistinguishable in the infinite volume limit, and thus provide a unique vacuum. One caveat, however, is that gapped parent symmetric Hamiltonians are generally not self-adjoint. Nonetheless, this does not preclude the possibility of finding frustration-free Hamiltonians with a *real spectrum*.

Although mathematically ubiquitous, non-semisimple categories have not received widespread attention in physics yet. They have primarily seen applications in the context of *non-rational conformal field theories* [23–27], and lattice regularisations thereof [28–33], as well as twisted *supersymmetric topological field theories* [34–36]. Recently, there has been a lot of progress in constructing three-dimensional state-sum invariants from certain non-semisimple categories [37–41], which we expect to be able to relate to our work through the scope of the *symmetry topological field theory* construction, see e.g. [2, 7, 42–53].

SEC. II | \mathbb{S}^1 -parametrised family of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry breaking states

We begin with a study of one-dimensional quantum lattice models with open boundary conditions representing gapped phases spontaneously breaking a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry.

II.A. Hamiltonians

Let Λ be a finite subset of the lattice \mathbb{Z} . To each element $i \in \Lambda$, hereafter referred to as a ‘site’, we assign a copy of the algebra $\text{Mat}_{\mathbb{C}}(2)$ of 2×2 matrices with complex numbers. We identify $\bigotimes_{i \in \Lambda} \text{Mat}_{\mathbb{C}}(2)_{\{i\}}$ with the algebra of (bounded) operators acting on the ‘microscopic’ Hilbert

* delcamp@ihes.fr

† heng@ihes.fr

‡ yum@maths.ox.ac.uk

space $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda = \bigotimes_{i \in \Lambda} \mathbb{C}^2$ of ‘spin’ degrees of freedom on Λ . Throughout this manuscript, we work in the computational basis $\mathbb{C}^2 \cong \mathbb{C}\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. As is customary, for any $i \in \Lambda$, O_i will denote the embedding of $O \in \text{Mat}_{\mathbb{C}}(2)_{\{i\}}$ into $\bigotimes_{i \in \Lambda} \text{Mat}_{\mathbb{C}}(2)_{\{i\}}$ by tensoring with the identity matrix.

Given $\xi \in \text{U}(1)$, suppose the dynamics of the spin degrees of freedom is governed by the nearest-neighbour Hamiltonian operator $\mathbb{H}(\xi)_\Lambda = -\sum_{i \in \Lambda} \mathbb{h}(\xi)_{i,i+1} : \mathcal{H}_\Lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ defined in terms of local commuting projectors

$$\mathbb{h}(\xi)_{i,i+1} := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbb{1}_i \otimes \mathbb{1}_{i+1} + \sigma^x(\xi)_i \otimes \sigma^x(\xi)_{i+1}], \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is the identity matrix and $\sigma^x(\xi) := \sqrt{\xi} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The hamiltonian $\mathbb{H}(\xi)_\Lambda$ is gapped, possesses a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry generated by $\prod_{i \in \Lambda} \sigma_i^z$ with $\sigma^z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$, and its two-dimensional ground state subspace is spanned by tensor product states $|+\xi\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$ and $|-\xi\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$, where $|\pm\xi\rangle := |0\rangle \pm \sqrt{\xi}|1\rangle$. Since $|+\xi\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$ and $|-\xi\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$ are mapped onto each other under the action of $\prod_{i \in \Lambda} \sigma_i^z$, the symmetry $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ of $\mathbb{H}(\xi)_\Lambda$ is spontaneously broken in its ground state subspace. Furthermore, it is clear that the whole S^1 -parametrised family of Hamiltonians $\{\mathbb{H}(\xi)_\Lambda \mid \xi \in \text{U}(1)\}$ represents the same spontaneously symmetry broken gapped phase with respect to the $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry generated by $\prod_{i \in \Lambda} \sigma_i^z$.

Given $\xi \in \text{U}(1)$, suppose instead that the dynamics is governed by the nearest neighbour Hamiltonian operator $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}(\xi)_\Lambda = -\sum_{i \in \Lambda} \tilde{\mathbb{h}}(\xi)_{i,i+1}$ defined in terms of local projectors (see app. A 5 for motivation)

$$\tilde{\mathbb{h}}(\xi)_{i,i+1} := \mathbb{1}_i \otimes (\sigma^+ \sigma^-)_{i+1} + \sqrt{\xi} \sigma^x(\xi)_i \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^-, \quad (2)$$

where $\sigma^+ := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\sigma^- := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Let us immediately point out the obvious fact that this Hamiltonian is *non-hermitian*. Nevertheless, its eigenvalues can be verified to be all real negative. Moreover, in spite of the local projectors not commuting with one another, this alternative Hamiltonian is *frustration-free* since the ground states minimise each local term individually. Additionally, it showcases a spectral gap. Finally, it possesses the same $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry as $\mathbb{H}(\xi)_\Lambda$, and its two-dimensional ground state subspace is also spanned by the tensor product states $|+\xi\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$ and $|-\xi\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$. Thus, for each $\xi \in \text{U}(1)$, the symmetry $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is again spontaneously broken in the ground state subspace of $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}(\xi)_\Lambda$. But, Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}(\xi)_\Lambda$ happens to have a richer symmetry structure.

II.B. Non-invertible symmetry

Let us reveal the existence of additional symmetry operators. Let ω_0 be a collection of linear maps $(\omega_0)_{d_1}^{d_2} : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$, with $d_1, d_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, best defined graphically via the

following tensor

$$\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \omega_0 \equiv \sum_{\substack{d_1, d_2 \in \{0, 1\} \\ b_1, b_2 \in \{0, 1\}}} d_2 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \omega_0 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} d_1 |b_2\rangle \langle b_1| \otimes |d_2\rangle \langle d_1| \quad (3)$$

such that (see app. A 3 for motivation)

$$\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} (\omega_0)_0^0 \equiv 0 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} 0 := \mathbb{1}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} (\omega_0)_0^1 \equiv 1 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} 0 := \sigma^-,$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} (\omega_0)_1^0 \equiv 0 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} 1 := 0, \quad \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} (\omega_0)_1^1 \equiv 1 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} 1 := \sigma^z.$$

Then, define the collection $\hat{\omega}_0$ of (possibly non-local) operators $(\hat{\omega}_0)_{d_1}^{d_{|\Lambda|+1}} \equiv \langle d_{|\Lambda|+1} | \hat{\omega}_0 | d_1 \rangle : \mathcal{H}_\Lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ with open boundary conditions $|d_1\rangle, |d_{|\Lambda|+1}\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^2$ via

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\omega}_0)_{d_1}^{d_{|\Lambda|+1}} &:= \sum_{d_2, \dots, d_{|\Lambda|}} (\omega_0)_{d_{|\Lambda|}}^{d_{|\Lambda|+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes (\omega_0)_{d_2}^{d_3} \otimes (\omega_0)_{d_1}^{d_2} \quad (4) \\ &\equiv \langle d_{|\Lambda|+1} | \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \omega_0 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \omega_0 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \omega_0 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \omega_0 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \omega_0 | d_1 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $(\hat{\omega}_0)_0^0$ and $(\hat{\omega}_0)_1^0$ coincide with the identity and the zero operators, respectively, while $(\hat{\omega}_0)_1^1$ gives the generator of the $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry. As such, these three operators commute with the Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}(\xi)_\Lambda$. It follows from

$$\tilde{\mathbb{h}}(\xi) \cdot [\sigma^- \otimes \mathbb{1} + \sigma^z \otimes \sigma^-] = [\sigma^- \otimes \mathbb{1} + \sigma^z \otimes \sigma^-] \cdot \tilde{\mathbb{h}}(\xi) \quad (5)$$

that the non-local operator $(\hat{\omega}_0)_1^0$ also commutes with the Hamiltonian. Moreover, any composition of these operators results in another operator commuting with the Hamiltonian. In particular, we denote by $\hat{\omega}_1$ the collection of operators defined in terms of the tensor

$$\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \omega_1 := \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \omega_0 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \sigma^z, \quad (6)$$

which is obtained by precomposing the collection of operators $\hat{\omega}_0$ with $\prod_{i \in \Lambda} \sigma_i^z$. Furthermore, notice that we have $((\hat{\omega}_0)_1^0)^2 = 0$, which implies in particular that $(\hat{\omega}_0)_1^0$ is non-invertible. Crucially, if we were to work with closed boundary conditions instead, the collection $\hat{\omega}_0$ of operators would boil down to the single operator $(\hat{\omega}_0)_0^0 + (\hat{\omega}_0)_1^1$, and would thus be redundant with respect to the $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry.

In order for the collections $\hat{\omega}_\alpha$, with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, of non-local operators to define a symmetry, one further requires

the existence of junctions of symmetry operators which themselves host vector spaces of local operators. These are provided by linear maps $\varphi_{\alpha_3}^{\alpha_1\alpha_2} : \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$, with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \{0, 1\}$, defined graphically as

$$\leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_{\alpha_3}^{\alpha_1\alpha_2} \rightarrow \equiv \sum_{d_1, d_2, d_3} d_3 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_{\alpha_3}^{\alpha_1\alpha_2} \rightarrow |d_3\rangle \langle d_1, d_2|, \quad (7)$$

for which we list below the non-vanishing entries for $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ (see app. A 2 for motivation):

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_0^{00} \rightarrow &= 1 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_0^{00} \rightarrow = 1, \\ (-1) 0 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_1^{00} \rightarrow &= 0 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_1^{00} \rightarrow = 1 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_1^{00} \rightarrow = -1, \\ (-1) 1 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_0^{11} \rightarrow &= 0 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_0^{11} \rightarrow = 1, \\ 0 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_1^{11} \rightarrow &= 0 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_1^{11} \rightarrow = 1 \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_1^{11} \rightarrow = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Together with linear maps $\tilde{\varphi}_{\alpha_3}^{\alpha_1\alpha_2} : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \{0, 1\}$, verifying

$$\leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_{\alpha_3}^{\alpha_1\alpha_2} \tilde{\varphi}_{\alpha_4}^{\alpha_1\alpha_2} \rightarrow = \delta_{\alpha_3, \alpha_4} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{C}^2}, \quad (10)$$

for every $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4 \in \{0, 1\}$, these allow us to locally fuse the non-local operators defined in eq. (4) according to

$$\leftarrow \text{circle} \omega_{\alpha_1} \rightarrow \leftarrow \text{circle} \omega_{\alpha_2} \rightarrow = \sum_{\alpha_3 \in \{0,1\}} \tilde{\varphi}_{\alpha_3}^{\alpha_1\alpha_2} \leftarrow \text{circle} \omega_{\alpha_3} \rightarrow \leftarrow \text{circle} \varphi_{\alpha_3}^{\alpha_1\alpha_2} \rightarrow. \quad (11)$$

In the appendices, we demonstrate that this fusion pattern is specific to a symmetry structure encoded into the *non-semisimple* tensor category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ of modules over the Taft algebra \mathcal{T}_4 of dimension 4 (see app. A 1).

II.C. Invariants

We claim that, for any two distinct values of the parameter $\xi \in U(1)$, states in the ground state subspace of the Hamiltonian $\mathbb{H}(\xi)_\Lambda$ transform inequivalently under the $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ symmetry in the sense of ref. [21].

Consider an arbitrary state in the ground state subspace spanned by $|+\xi\rangle^{\otimes|\Lambda|}$ and $|-\xi\rangle^{\otimes|\Lambda|}$. In general, such an arbitrary state is not a tensor product state, and it is best expressed as a tensor network state. We do so in the following way. Let ρ be a collection of vectors

$\rho_{\gamma_1}^{\gamma_2} \in \mathbb{C}^2$, with $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \{0, 1\}$, defined graphically via the following tensor¹

$$\leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow \equiv \sum_{\substack{b \in \{0,1\} \\ \gamma_2, \gamma_1 \in \{0,1\}}} \leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow |b\rangle \otimes |\gamma_2\rangle \langle \gamma_1| \quad (12)$$

such that (see app. A 5 for motivation)

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_0^0 &\equiv \leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow := |+\xi\rangle, & \rho_0^1 &\equiv \leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow := 0, \\ \rho_1^0 &\equiv \leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow := 0, & \rho_1^1 &\equiv \leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow := |-\xi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Given basis vectors $|\gamma_1\rangle, |\gamma_{|\Lambda|+1}\rangle \in \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ encoding a choice of open boundary conditions, we construct the corresponding ground state as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{|\Lambda|}} \rho_{\gamma_{|\Lambda|}}^{\gamma_{|\Lambda|+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_{\gamma_2}^{\gamma_3} \otimes \rho_{\gamma_1}^{\gamma_2} \\ &\equiv \langle \gamma_{|\Lambda|+1} | \leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow \leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow \leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow \leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow \leftarrow \text{circle} \rho \rightarrow | \gamma_1 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Any state in the ground state subspace of \mathcal{H}_Λ can be obtained via an appropriate linear combination of open boundary conditions. Now, consider acting on such a state with the collections $\tilde{\omega}_\alpha$, with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, of (possibly non-local) operators defined in eq. (4). The fact that the $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ symmetry preserves the ground state subspace implies the existence of linear maps $\phi^\alpha : \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes (\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$, with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, defined graphically as

$$\leftarrow \text{circle} \phi^\alpha \rightarrow \equiv \sum_{\substack{d \in \{0,1\} \\ \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \{0,1\}}} \leftarrow \text{circle} \phi^\alpha \rightarrow |\gamma_2\rangle \langle d, \gamma_1|, \quad (14)$$

whose non-vanishing entries are given by (see app. A 5 for motivation)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leftarrow \text{circle} \phi^0 \rightarrow &= 1 \leftarrow \text{circle} \phi^0 \rightarrow = (-2\sqrt{\xi}) \leftarrow \text{circle} \phi^0 \rightarrow = 1, \\ 0 \leftarrow \text{circle} \phi^0 \rightarrow &= 1 \leftarrow \text{circle} \phi^0 \rightarrow = (2\sqrt{\xi}) \leftarrow \text{circle} \phi^0 \rightarrow = 1, \end{aligned}$$

¹ As suggested by the notation, indices γ_1 and γ_2 are not quite on the same footing as b . One should think of the former as labelling one-dimensional blocks rather than basis vectors.

SEC. III | Breaking the non-semisimple symmetry

We study here a one-dimensional quantum lattice model whose non-semisimple $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ symmetry is spontaneously broken down to $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

III.A. Hamiltonian


In the previous section, we considered the family of (non-hermitian) Hamiltonians parametrised by $\xi \in U(1)$ defined in terms of local operators (2). It turns out that our analysis holds more generally for any $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, but we restricted to $\xi \in U(1)$ to preserve as much unitarity as possible. We now would like to consider the Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}(0)_\Lambda = -\sum_{i \in \Lambda} \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}(0)_{i,i+1}$ obtained by taking the limit $\xi \rightarrow 0$, which is defined in terms of local operators

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}(0)_{i,i+1} := \mathbb{1}_i \otimes (\sigma^+ \sigma^-)_{i+1} + \sigma_i^+ \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^- . \quad (23)$$


The Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}(0)_\Lambda$ retains much of the features of its $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}(\xi)_\Lambda$ counterparts: It is non-hermitian and the local operators do not commute with one another. Yet, it is frustration free, presents a spectral gap, and its eigenvalues can be verified to be all real negative. Moreover, it possesses the same non-invertible non-semisimple $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ symmetry. However, the ground state subspace widely differs.

III.B. Ground state subspace


The ground state subspace of the Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}(0)_\Lambda$ is spanned by two states, namely the product state $|0\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$ and the tensor network state



where



is such that (see app. A 6 for motivation)



We recognise eq. (24) as the so-called W state [54]:

$$|W\rangle_\Lambda := \sum_{i \in \Lambda} \sigma_i^- |0\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|} , \quad (26)$$

which one can explicitly check to be a ground state of $\tilde{\mathbb{H}}(0)_\Lambda$.² It follows from $(\hat{\omega}_0)_1^0 |0\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|} = |W\rangle_\Lambda$ that the symmetry $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ is spontaneously broken down to $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ in the ground state subspace.

It is interesting to revisit certain properties of the W state from the viewpoint of this symmetry breaking pattern. Firstly, the W state cannot be parametrised as a translation invariant tensor network state with tensors of constant size for periodic boundary conditions [19, 55]. This is a fact that echoes the need to work on open boundary conditions for the $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ symmetry to be well-defined. Secondly, it was recently shown in ref. [56] that the W state cannot be the single ground state of a local Hamiltonian, and must always be accompanied by $|0\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$. In app. A 5, we relate this statement to the mathematical fact that $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ admits a non-semisimple module category with two indecomposable objects: a *simple* object and its *projective cover*, labelling the product state and the W state, respectively. In contrast to the semisimple setting, there exists non-zero maps between the simple object and the projective object. In particular, any module category containing the projective object will also have to contain the simple object, which appears as a quotient (or a sub)object.³ Thirdly, although the W state is long-range entangled, it is indistinguishable from the product state $|0\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$ in the infinite volume limit [62]. This fact is made possible by the aforementioned existence of maps between the simple and projective objects in the relevant non-semisimple module category, providing a topological local operator, namely σ_i^+ , for any $i \in \Lambda$, mapping the W state to the product state. As such, both ground states should correspond to the same infrared *vacuum* (see app. A 6). Therefore, we could argue that this module category does not label a gapped phase distinct from the trivially symmetric one, which would be consistent with the fact that the degeneracy should not be robust to perturbations [56].

SEC. IV | Discussion

In this manuscript, we set out to explore through a simple example some consequences of dropping the semisimplicity requirement in the axiomatisation of finite symmetries in (1+1)d in terms of fusion categories. First of all, we noticed that such a non-semisimple symmetry seems to be incompatible with Hermiticity of the Hamiltonian.

² At this point, it is interesting to note the resemblance between our Hamiltonian and the ferromagnetic XX model with strong magnetic transverse field, which is also a parent Hamiltonian for $|0\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$ and $|W\rangle_\Lambda$, but it is gapless [19].

³ Due to this identification, we conjecture that issues arising when dealing with periodic boundary conditions are related to the necessity to define *modified traces* when constructing topological invariants from non-semisimple tensor categories [57–61]. Without these modified traces, the quantum dimension of projective objects would be zero.

This fact was to be anticipated in light of previous instances of similar phenomena [38], and further requires open boundary conditions. Nonetheless, this did not prevent us from finding certain frustration free Hamiltonian operators with real spectra.

We examined two scenarios that extend the current paradigm for the classification of gapped symmetric phases in terms of indecomposable module categories over the symmetry category. On the one hand, we obtained a continuous family of product states that transform inequivalently under the non-semisimple symmetry, a phenomenon that cannot occur in the case of a finite semisimple symmetry. This is explained mathematically by a continuum of inequivalent semisimple (exact) module categories. On the other hand, we found a gapped model whose ground states correspond to the indecomposable objects of an indecomposable non-semisimple module category over $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$. The two states happen to be indistinguishable in the infinite volume limit, which we can trace back to one of the ground states being associated with an indecomposable object that is the *projective cover* of the other. *Dicke states* [63] that generalise the W-state also seem to be related to higher order Taft algebras in a similar vein. In fact, we expect this to be a common phenomenon in non-semisimple module categories. As such, it would also be interesting to explore the physical interpretation of non-semisimple module categories even in the context of fusion categories [64–66].

In the appendix, we explore the physical content of additional indecomposable module categories over $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$. Notably, a continuous family of fiber functors produces an S_1 -parametrised family of states, which are in the same phase as the so-called *cluster state* with respect to a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry, and yet transform inequivalently with respect to $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$. However, for this family of states, we were unable to find $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -symmetric parent Hamiltonians with real spectra.

Acknowledgments: *CD is grateful to Laurens Lootens and Alex Turzillo for useful discussions. EH is grateful for the collaborative opportunity made possible through the Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques (IHES). MY is supported by the EPSRC Open Fellowship EP/X01276X/1, and would like to thank IHES for hosting visits where part of this research was conducted.*

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Gaiotto, A. Kapustin, N. Seiberg, and B. Willett, Generalized Global Symmetries, *JHEP* **02**, 172, [arXiv:1412.5148 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [2] D. S. Freed, G. W. Moore, and C. Teleman, Topological symmetry in quantum field theory (2022), [arXiv:2209.07471 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [3] J. Frohlich, J. Fuchs, I. Runkel, and C. Schweigert, Duality and defects in rational conformal field theory, *Nucl. Phys. B* **763**, 354 (2007), [arXiv:hep-th/0607247](#).
- [4] L. Bhardwaj and Y. Tachikawa, On finite symmetries and their gauging in two dimensions, *JHEP* **03**, 189, [arXiv:1704.02330 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [5] C.-M. Chang, Y.-H. Lin, S.-H. Shao, Y. Wang, and X. Yin, Topological Defect Lines and Renormalization Group Flows in Two Dimensions, *JHEP* **01**, 026, [arXiv:1802.04445 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [6] R. Thorngren and Y. Wang, Fusion category symmetry. Part I. Anomaly in-flow and gapped phases, *JHEP* **04**, 132, [arXiv:1912.02817 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [7] L. Kong, T. Lan, X.-G. Wen, Z.-H. Zhang, and H. Zheng, Algebraic higher symmetry and categorical symmetry: A holographic and entanglement view of symmetry, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 043086 (2020).
- [8] S. Schafer-Nameki, ICTP lectures on (non-)invertible generalized symmetries, *Phys. Rept.* **1063**, 1 (2024), [arXiv:2305.18296 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [9] S.-H. Shao, What’s Done Cannot Be Undone: TASI Lectures on Non-Invertible Symmetries (2023), [arXiv:2308.00747 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] Z. Komargodski, K. Ohmori, K. Roumpedakis, and S. Seifnashri, Symmetries and strings of adjoint QCD₂, *JHEP* **03**, 103, [arXiv:2008.07567 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] A. Feiguin, S. Trebst, A. W. W. Ludwig, M. Troyer, A. Kitaev, Z. Wang, and M. H. Freedman, Interacting anyons in topological quantum liquids: The golden chain, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 160409 (2007), [arXiv:cond-mat/0612341](#).
- [12] C. Gils, E. Ardonne, S. Trebst, D. A. Huse, A. W. W. Ludwig, M. Troyer, and Z. Wang, Anyonic quantum spin chains: Spin-1 generalizations and topological stability, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 235120 (2013).
- [13] M. Buican and A. Gromov, Anyonic Chains, Topological Defects, and Conformal Field Theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **356**, 1017 (2017), [arXiv:1701.02800 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] K. Inamura, On lattice models of gapped phases with fusion category symmetries, *JHEP* **03**, 036, [arXiv:2110.12882 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [15] L. Lootens, C. Delcamp, G. Ortiz, and F. Verstraete, Dualities in One-Dimensional Quantum Lattice Models: Symmetric Hamiltonians and Matrix Product Operator Intertwiners, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 020357 (2023), [arXiv:2112.09091 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [16] L. Lootens, C. Delcamp, and F. Verstraete, Dualities in One-Dimensional Quantum Lattice Models: Topological Sectors, *PRX Quantum* **5**, 010338 (2024), [arXiv:2211.03777 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [17] L. Bhardwaj, L. E. Bottini, S. Schafer-Nameki, and A. Tiwari, Lattice Models for Phases and Transitions with Non-Invertible Symmetries (2024), [arXiv:2405.05964 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [18] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R. F. Werner, Finitely correlated states on quantum spin chains, *Communica-*

- tions in *Mathematical Physics* **144**, 443 (1992).
- [19] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, Matrix product state representations, *Quant. Inf. Comput.* **7**, 401 (2007), [arXiv:quant-ph/0608197](#).
- [20] L. Lootens, C. Delcamp, and F. Verstraete, Entanglement and the density matrix renormalisation group in the generalised Landau paradigm (2024), [arXiv:2408.06334 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [21] J. Garre-Rubio, L. Lootens, and A. Molnár, Classifying phases protected by matrix product operator symmetries using matrix product states, *Quantum* **7**, 927 (2023), [arXiv:2203.12563 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [22] A. Molnar, A. R. de Alarcón, J. Garre-Rubio, N. Schuch, J. I. Cirac, and D. Pérez-García, Matrix product operator algebras I: representations of weak Hopf algebras and projected entangled pair states (2022), [arXiv:2204.05940 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [23] H. G. Kausch, Symplectic fermions, *Nucl. Phys. B* **583**, 513 (2000), [arXiv:hep-th/0003029](#).
- [24] M. R. Gaberdiel, An Algebraic approach to logarithmic conformal field theory, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **18**, 4593 (2003), [arXiv:hep-th/0111260](#).
- [25] J. Fuchs, On non-semisimple fusion rules and tensor categories (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0602051](#).
- [26] J. Fuchs, C. Schweigert, and C. Stigner, From non-semisimple Hopf algebras to correlation functions for logarithmic CFT, *J. Phys. A* **46**, 494008 (2013), [arXiv:1302.4683 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [27] T. Creutzig and D. Ridout, Logarithmic Conformal Field Theory: Beyond an Introduction, *J. Phys. A* **46**, 4006 (2013), [arXiv:1303.0847 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [28] V. Pasquier and H. Saleur, Common Structures Between Finite Systems and Conformal Field Theories Through Quantum Groups, *Nucl. Phys. B* **330**, 523 (1990).
- [29] H. Saleur, Enlarged Symmetries of Spin Chains and Loop Models, *PoS Solvay*, 013 (2007).
- [30] N. Read and H. Saleur, Associative-algebraic approach to logarithmic conformal field theories, *Nucl. Phys. B* **777**, 316 (2007), [arXiv:hep-th/0701117](#).
- [31] N. Read and H. Saleur, Enlarged symmetry algebras of spin chains, loop models, and S-matrices, *Nucl. Phys. B* **777**, 263 (2007), [arXiv:cond-mat/0701259](#).
- [32] A. M. Gainutdinov, H. Saleur, and I. Y. Tipunin, Lattice W-algebras and logarithmic CFTs, *J. Phys. A* **47**, 495401 (2014), [arXiv:1212.1378 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [33] J. Belletête and A. M. Gainutdinov and J. L. Jacobsen and H. Saleur and R. Vasseur, On the correspondence between boundary and bulk lattice models and (logarithmic) conformal field theories, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50**, 484002 (2017).
- [34] T. Creutzig, T. Dimofte, N. Garner, and N. Geer, A QFT for non-semisimple TQFT, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **28**, 161 (2024), [arXiv:2112.01559 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [35] N. Garner, Vertex operator algebras and topologically twisted Chern-Simons-matter theories, *JHEP* **08**, 025, [arXiv:2204.02991 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [36] A. Arabi Ardehali, D. Gang, N. J. Rajappa, and M. Sachi, 3d SUSY enhancement and non-semisimple TQFTs from four dimensions (2024), [arXiv:2411.00766 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [37] N. Geer, A. D. Lauda, B. Patureau-Mirand, and J. Sussan, A Hermitian TQFT from a non-semisimple category of quantum $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules, *Letters in Mathematical Physics* **112**, [10.1007/s11005-022-01570-x](#) (2022).
- [38] N. Geer, A. D. Lauda, B. Patureau-Mirand, and J. Sussan, Non-semisimple Levin–Wen models and Hermitian TQFTs from quantum (super)groups, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **109**, e12853 (2024), [arXiv:2208.14566 \[math.QA\]](#).
- [39] Francesco Costantino and Matthew Harper and Adam Robertson and Matthew B. Young, Non-semisimple topological field theory and \tilde{Z} -invariants from $\mathfrak{osp}(1|2)$ (2024), [arXiv:2407.12181 \[math.QA\]](#).
- [40] F. Iulianelli, S. Kim, J. Sussan, and A. D. Lauda, Universal quantum computation using Ising anyons from a non-semisimple Topological Quantum Field Theory (2024), [arXiv:2410.14860 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [41] A. Hofer and I. Runkel, Modular functors from non-semisimple 3d TFTs (2024), [arXiv:2405.18038 \[math.QA\]](#).
- [42] L. Kong, X.-G. Wen, and H. Zheng, Boundary-bulk relation in topological orders, *Nuclear Physics B* **922**, 62 (2017).
- [43] W. Ji and X.-G. Wen, Categorical symmetry and non-invertible anomaly in symmetry-breaking and topological phase transitions, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 033417 (2020).
- [44] W. Ji and X.-G. Wen, A unified view on symmetry, anomalous symmetry and non-invertible gravitational anomaly (2021), [arXiv:2106.02069 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [45] A. Chatterjee and X.-G. Wen, Symmetry as a shadow of topological order and a derivation of topological holographic principle, *Phys. Rev. B* **107**, 155136 (2023), [arXiv:2203.03596 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [46] S.-J. Huang and M. Cheng, Topological holography, quantum criticality, and boundary states (2023), [arXiv:2310.16878 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [47] S.-J. Huang, Fermionic quantum criticality through the lens of topological holography (2024), [arXiv:2405.09611 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [48] Y.-Z. You, Z. Bi, A. Rasmussen, K. Slagle, and C. Xu, Wave function and strange correlator of short-range entangled states, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 247202 (2014).
- [49] R. Vanhove, M. Bal, D. J. Williamson, N. Bultinck, J. Haegeman, and F. Verstraete, Mapping topological to conformal field theories through strange correlators, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 177203 (2018).
- [50] F. Apruzzi, F. Bonetti, I. n. García Etxebarria, S. S. Hosseini, and S. Schafer-Nameki, Symmetry TFTs from String Theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **402**, 895 (2023), [arXiv:2112.02092 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [51] J. Kaidi, K. Ohmori, and Y. Zheng, Symmetry TFTs for Non-invertible Defects, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **404**, 1021 (2023), [arXiv:2209.11062 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [52] J. Kaidi, E. Nardoni, G. Zafrir, and Y. Zheng, Symmetry TFTs and anomalies of non-invertible symmetries, *JHEP* **10**, 053, [arXiv:2301.07112 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [53] C. Delcamp and N. Ishtiaque, Symmetry topological field theory and non-abelian Kramers-Wannier dualities of generalised Ising models (2024), [arXiv:2408.06074 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [54] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062314 (2000).
- [55] P. Klimov, R. Sengupta, and J. Biamonte, On Translation-Invariant Matrix Product States and advances in MPS representations of the W -state (2023), [arXiv:2306.16456 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [56] L. Gioia and R. Thorngren, W state is not the unique ground state of any local Hamiltonian (2023),

arXiv:2310.10716 [cond-mat.str-el].

- [57] N. Geer, B. Patureau-Mirand, and V. Turaev, Modified quantum dimensions and re-normalized link invariants, *Compositio Mathematica* **145**, 196–212 (2009).
- [58] Geer, Nathan and Kujawa, Jonathan and Patureau-Mirand, Bertrand, Generalized trace and modified dimension functions on ribbon categories, *Selecta Mathematica* **17**, 453 (2011).
- [59] A. F. F. Orozco and A. M. Gainutdinov, Module traces and hopf group-coalgebras, arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.01122 (2018).
- [60] M. De Renzi, A. M. Gainutdinov, N. Geer, B. Patureau-Mirand, and I. Runkel, 3-Dimensional TQFTs from non-semisimple modular categories, *Selecta Math.* **28**, 42 (2022), arXiv:1912.02063 [math.GT].
- [61] M. De Renzi, A. M. Gainutdinov, N. Geer, B. Patureau-Mirand, and I. Runkel, Mapping class group representations from non-semisimple TQFTs, *Commun. Contemp. Math.* **25**, 2150091 (2023), arXiv:2010.14852 [math.GT].
- [62] P. Naaijken, *Quantum spin systems on infinite lattices*, Vol. 933 (Springer, 2017) arXiv:1311.2717 [math-ph].
- [63] R. H. Dicke, Coherence in spontaneous radiation processes, *Phys. Rev.* **93**, 99 (1954).
- [64] P. Etingof, R. Kinser, and C. Walton, Tensor algebras in finite tensor categories, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2021**, 18529 (2021).
- [65] E. Heng, Coxeter quiver representations in fusion categories and Gabriel’s theorem, *Sel. Math., New Ser.* **30**, 42 (2024), id/No 67.
- [66] B. Elias and E. Heng, *Classification of finite type fusion quivers*, Preprint, arXiv:2404.09714 [math.RT] (2024) (2024).
- [67] E. J. Taft, The Order of the Antipode of Finite-dimensional Hopf Algebra, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **68**, 2631 (1971).
- [68] M. Sweedler, *Hopf Algebras*, Mathematics lecture note series (W.A. Benjamin, 1969).
- [69] S. Montgomery, *Hopf algebras and their actions on rings* (Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, 1993).
- [70] S. Dascalescu, C. Nastasescu, and S. Raianu, *Hopf algebras: An Introduction* (CRC Press, 2000).
- [71] C. Kassel, *Quantum Groups* (Springer Science, 2012).
- [72] P. Etingof and V. Ostrik, *Finite tensor categories* (2003), arXiv:math/0301027 [math.QA].
- [73] P. Etingof, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik, *Tensor categories*, Vol. 205 (American Mathematical Soc., 2016).
- [74] M. Mombelli, Module categories over pointed hopf algebras, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **266**, 319 (2010).
- [75] A. García Iglesias and J. I. Sánchez, On the computation of Hopf 2-cocycles with an example of diagonal type, *Glasgow Mathematical Journal* **65**, 141–169 (2023).
- [76] H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Persistent entanglement in arrays of interacting particles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 910 (2001).
- [77] J. Fuchs, I. Runkel, and C. Schweigert, TFT construction of RCFT correlators I: partition functions, *Nuclear Physics B* **646**, 353 (2002).
- [78] J. Fuchs and C. Stigner, *On Frobenius algebras in rigid monoidal categories* (2009), arXiv:0901.4886 [math.CT].

APP. A | Category theoretic underpinnings

We present in these appendices the mathematical formalism underlying our study, and exploit this formalism to prove the results enunciated in the main text. Even though we specialise to the case of the Taft algebra, most of the constructions presented in these appendices hold much more generally.

A.1. Taft algebra \mathcal{T}_4

Let \mathcal{T}_4 be the *Taft Hopf algebra* of dimension 4 [67], also known as Sweedler’s Hopf algebra [68], which is the lowest dimensional Hopf algebra that is both non-commutative and non-cocommutative.⁴ As an associative algebra, it is

$$\mathcal{T}_4 = \mathbb{C}\langle x, g \mid x^2 = 0, g^2 = 1, xg = -gx \rangle. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The comultiplication $\Delta : \mathcal{T}_4 \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_4 \otimes \mathcal{T}_4$ and counit $\epsilon : \mathcal{T}_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(g) &= g \otimes g, & \Delta(x) &= x \otimes 1 + g \otimes x, \\ \epsilon(g) &= 1, & \epsilon(x) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

respectively, which provide the coalgebraic structure. Finally, the antipode $S : \mathcal{T}_4 \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_4$ defined by

$$S(g) = g, \quad S(x) = xg \quad (\text{A3})$$

endows the resulting bialgebra with its Hopf algebraic structure. Notice, in particular, that $S^2 \neq \text{id}$. Loosely, we can think of \mathcal{T}_4 as a minimal non-semisimple extension of the group algebra $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}]$ by $\mathbb{C}[x]/\{x^2 = 0\}$. Throughout these appendices, we employ Sweedler’s sumless notation for coalgebraic structures, e.g. $\Delta(x) \equiv x_{(1)} \otimes x_{(2)}$.

A.2. Tensor category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$

Let us construct the tensor category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ of left modules over the Taft algebra \mathcal{T}_4 . Given the associative algebra structure (A1), let us begin by listing the *indecomposable* modules over \mathcal{T}_4 . Firstly, there are two *simple* one-dimensional modules:

$$S_0 = \mathbb{C}\{w_1\} \quad \text{w/} \quad \begin{cases} x \cdot w_1 = 0 \\ g \cdot w_1 = w_1 \end{cases},$$

which plays the role of the *trivial* module, and

$$S_1 = \mathbb{C}\{v_1\} \quad \text{w/} \quad \begin{cases} x \cdot v_1 = 0 \\ g \cdot v_1 = -v_1 \end{cases}.$$

⁴ For a brief review of Hopf algebra theory, see e.g. [69–71].

Using Sweedler's sumless notation, one writes $\lambda(k) = k_{(-1)} \otimes k_{(0)}$, for every $k \in K$. More explicitly, given a choice of basis $\{k_b\}_b$, $b = 0, \dots, \dim_{\mathbb{C}} K - 1$, one writes $\lambda(k_{b_1}) = \sum_{b_2} \lambda_{b_1}^{b_2} \otimes k_{b_2}$, where $\lambda_{b_1}^{b_2} \in \mathcal{T}_4$ is not necessarily a basis vector. In this notation, the coassociativity of the coaction translates into

$$\Delta(\lambda_{b_1}^{b_3}) = \sum_{b_2} \lambda_{b_1}^{b_2} \otimes \lambda_{b_2}^{b_3}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

Given a finite subset Λ of the lattice \mathbb{Z} , one defines the microscopic Hilbert space of the system to be $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda} = \bigotimes_{i \in \Lambda} \text{Forg}(K)$. From ref. [15, 16], we know that the action of $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ on this Hilbert space is provided by the data of module endofunctors in $(\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4))_{\text{vec}}^{\vee} \simeq \text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$. Concretely, given $(\varrho : \mathcal{T}_4 \rightarrow \text{End}(V)) \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \omega : K \otimes V &\rightarrow V \otimes K \\ k \otimes v &\mapsto (k_{(-1)} \cdot v) \otimes k_{(0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A12})$$

In components, it reads

$$k_{b_1} \otimes v_{d_1} \mapsto \sum_{b_2} (\lambda_{b_1}^{b_2} \cdot v_{d_1}) \otimes k_{b_2} = \sum_{b_2, d_2} \varrho(\lambda_{b_1}^{b_2})_{d_1}^{d_2} v_{d_2} \otimes k_{b_2},$$

where $\{v_d\}_d$, $d = 0, \dots, \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V - 1$, is a choice of basis for V . Introducing the notation⁷

$$\omega_{d_1}^{d_2} := \sum_{b_1, b_2} \varrho(\lambda_{b_2}^{b_1})_{d_1}^{d_2} k_{b_2} \otimes k_{b_1}^*, \quad (\text{A13})$$

the action of $\varrho : \mathcal{T}_4 \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$ in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ on \mathcal{H}_{Λ} with open boundary conditions $v_{d_1}, v_{d_{|\Lambda|+1}} \in V$ is defined to be

$$\sum_{d_2, \dots, d_{|\Lambda|}} \omega_{d_{|\Lambda|}}^{d_{|\Lambda|+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{d_2}^{d_3} \otimes \omega_{d_1}^{d_2}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

This operator can be expressed as a tensor network of the form (4) by defining the following tensor:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \circlearrowleft \omega \\ \downarrow \end{array} &\equiv \sum_{\substack{d_1, d_2 \\ b_1, b_2}} \begin{array}{c} b_2 \\ \uparrow \\ \circlearrowleft \omega \\ \downarrow \\ b_1 \end{array} \leftarrow d_1 \leftarrow d_2 \leftarrow k_{b_2} \otimes k_{b_1}^* \otimes v_{d_2} \otimes v_{d_1}^* \\ &\equiv \sum_{\substack{d_1, d_2 \\ b_1, b_2}} \varrho(\lambda_{b_2}^{b_1})_{d_1}^{d_2} k_{b_2} \otimes k_{b_1}^* \otimes v_{d_2} \otimes v_{d_1}^*. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A15})$$

Let us consider an explicit example. Let $K = \mathbb{C}\{1, y\}$ with $\lambda : K \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_4 \otimes K$ such that $\lambda(y) = x \otimes 1 + g \otimes y$. One can explicitly check that λ is coassociative and counital so that K has the structure of a left \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule. Now

choose the object in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ to be the projective object P_0 defined previously. Applying the definitions, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \omega : y \otimes v_0 &\mapsto v_1 \otimes 1 + v_0 \otimes y \\ y \otimes v_1 &\mapsto -v_1 \otimes y \end{aligned}. \quad (\text{A16})$$

Making the identifications $v_d \equiv |d\rangle$ and $k_b \equiv |b\rangle$, for every $b, d \in \{0, 1\}$, one exactly recovers the symmetry operators defined in the main text with components (IIB). Similarly, the simple object S_1 yields the symmetry operator $\prod_{i \in \Lambda} \sigma_i^z$, while P_1 produces the composition of the symmetry operators associated with P_0 and S_1 , respectively, as predicted by the monoidal structure of $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$. Interestingly, the fact that for three choices of open boundary conditions, the symmetry operator labelled by P_0 boils down to the identity operator, $\prod_{i \in \Lambda} \sigma_i^z$, and the zero operator, respectively, is explained by the fact that P_0 fits into the short exact sequence (A4).

Let $\varrho_{V_1} : \mathcal{T}_4 \rightarrow \text{End}(V_1)$ and $\varrho_{V_2} : \mathcal{T}_4 \rightarrow \text{End}(V_2)$ be two indecomposable objects in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$. By the definition of the coalgebraic structure of \mathcal{T}_4 and eq. (A11), the intertwining map $\varphi_{V_3}^{V_1 V_2} : V_1 \otimes V_2 \rightarrow V_3$, for any indecomposable $V_3 \in V_1 \otimes V_2$, satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{b_2, d_2, d_4} (\varphi_{V_3}^{V_1 V_2})_{d_2 d_4}^{d_5} \varrho_{V_1}(\lambda_{b_1}^{b_2})_{d_1}^{d_2} \varrho_{V_2}(\lambda_{b_2}^{b_3})_{d_3}^{d_4} \\ &= \sum_{d_2, d_4} (\varphi_{V_3}^{V_1 V_2})_{d_2 d_4}^{d_5} (\varrho_{V_1} \otimes \varrho_{V_2})(\Delta(\lambda_{b_1}^{b_3}))_{d_1 d_3}^{d_2 d_4} \\ &= \sum_{d_6} \varrho_{V_3}(\lambda_{b_1}^{b_3})_{d_6}^{d_5} (\varphi_{V_3}^{V_1 V_2})_{d_1 d_3}^{d_6}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A17})$$

from which the following tensor network identity follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \omega_{V_1} \\ \circlearrowleft \\ \downarrow \omega_{V_2} \\ \uparrow \end{array} = \sum_{V_3 \in V_1 \otimes V_2} \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \varphi_{V_3}^{V_1 V_2} \\ \circlearrowleft \\ \rightarrow \varphi_{V_3}^{V_1 V_2} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \omega_{V_3} \\ \circlearrowleft \\ \downarrow \omega_{V_3} \\ \uparrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \varphi_{V_3}^{V_1 V_2} \\ \circlearrowleft \\ \rightarrow \varphi_{V_3}^{V_1 V_2} \end{array}. \quad (\text{A18})$$

Specialising to $K = \mathbb{C}\{1, y\}$ as defined above and choosing $V_1 = V_2 = P_0$, V_3 can either be P_0 or P_1 . In light of the previous identifications, the above equality then boils down to eq. (8).

Now that we have explained how $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ acts on the microscopic Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda} = \bigotimes_{i \in \Lambda} \text{Forg}(K)$, where K is any object in $\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$, we are left to construct linear operators $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\Lambda}$ that commute with this action. Let $\psi : K^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow K^{\otimes 2}$ be a morphism in $\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$. By definition, $\text{Forg}(\psi)$ acts on $\text{Forg}(K)^{\otimes 2}$. Assigning the two copies of $\text{Forg}(K)$ to sites i and $i+1$ in Λ , respectively, we denote by $\mathfrak{h}_{i, i+1}$ the embedding of $\text{Forg}(\psi)$ into \mathcal{H}_{Λ} . One finally constructs a Hamiltonian operator $\mathbb{H}_{\Lambda} = -\sum_{i \in \Lambda} \mathfrak{h}_{i, i+1}$. The fact that \mathbb{H}_{Λ} commutes with the symmetry follows from the fact that, as a map in $\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$, ψ commutes with the coaction of \mathcal{T}_4 . In app. A 7, we explain how to obtain the Hamiltonians considered in the main text within this framework.

⁷ Notice that we are transposing some indices for the need of our presentation.

A.4. Algebra objects in $\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$

Given a symmetry fusion category, it is understood that symmetric gapped phases are labelled by indecomposable (finite semisimple) module categories over it [6, 10]. In that spirit, we are interested in the classification of *exact* indecomposable module categories over $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$. In ref. [74], it was demonstrated how these could be constructed from the data of so-called *right \mathcal{T}_4 -simple left \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule algebras*.

By definition, a left \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule algebra \mathcal{A} is an algebra in Vec , together with a left \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule structure, such that the coaction λ is an algebra homomorphism. In other words, these are *algebra objects* in $\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ [72]. Moreover, a left \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule algebra K is said to be *right \mathcal{T}_4 -simple* whenever the only right \mathcal{T}_4 -ideal J of K with the property that $\lambda(J) \subset \mathcal{T}_4 \otimes K$, is the trivial ideal. We review below the classification of the resulting right \mathcal{T}_4 -simple left \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule algebras as established in ref. [74].

We distinguish two types of right \mathcal{T}_4 -simple left \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule algebras. On the one hand, we have the group algebras $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}/1\mathbb{Z}] \cong \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}] = \mathbb{C}\langle h \mid h^2 = 1 \rangle$, which are semisimple. On the other hand, for any $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$, one defines

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(1, \xi) &= \mathbb{C}\langle y \mid y^2 = \xi \cdot 1 \rangle, \\ \mathcal{A}(2, \xi) &= \mathbb{C}\langle y, h \mid y^2 = \xi \cdot 1, h^2 = 1, yh = -hy \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A19})$$

together with the comodule structure λ provided by

$$\lambda(h) = g \otimes h, \quad \lambda(y) = x \otimes 1 + g \otimes y. \quad (\text{A20})$$

Let us analyse this latter type in some detail. First of all, $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)$ and $\mathcal{A}(2, \xi)$ are non-semisimple if and only if $\xi = 0$. As a matter of fact $\mathcal{A}(2, 0)$ is the Taft algebra \mathcal{T}_4 itself, whereas $\mathcal{A}(1, 0)$ is the left coideal subalgebra of \mathcal{T}_4 generated by x . Let us suppose that $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. Clearly $\mathcal{A}(2, 0)$ and $\mathcal{A}(2, \xi)$ are not isomorphic as algebras. However, $\mathcal{A}(2, \xi)$ can be realised as a twisted version of $\mathcal{A}(2, 0)$.

Let $\beta_\xi : \mathcal{T}_4 \otimes \mathcal{T}_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the function such that $\beta_\xi(1, g) = \beta_\xi(g, 1) = \epsilon(g)$, $\beta_\xi(1, x) = \beta_\xi(x, 1) = \epsilon(x)$, $\beta_\xi(x, x) = \xi$ and

$$\beta_\xi(x^{a_1} g^{a_2}, x^{a_3} g^{a_4}) := (-1)^{a_2 a_3} \beta_\xi(x^{a_1}, x^{a_3}), \quad (\text{A21})$$

for every $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \{0, 1\}$. One can verify that β_ξ satisfies the following condition

$$\beta_\xi(a_{(1)}, b_{(1)}) \beta_\xi(a_{(2)} b_{(2)}, c) = \beta_\xi(b_{(1)}, c_{(1)}) \beta_\xi(a, b_{(2)} c_{(2)}),$$

for every $a, b, c \in \mathcal{T}_4$, which is the defining property of a *Hopf 2-cocycle*. Moreover, given $\xi, \xi' \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ such that $\xi \neq \xi'$, one can verify that the Hopf 2-cocycles β_ξ and $\beta_{\xi'}$ of \mathcal{T}_4 are inequivalent, in the sense that there is no *convolution unit* θ of the dual of \mathcal{T}_4 such that $\beta_{\xi'}(a, b)$ is equal to

$$\theta(a_{(1)}) \theta(b_{(1)}) \beta_\xi(a_{(2)}, b_{(2)}) \theta^{-1}(a_{(3)} b_{(3)}),$$

for every $a, b \in \mathcal{T}_4$ [75].

One can use the Hopf 2-cocycle β_ξ to define a twisted multiplication rule for the algebra $\mathcal{A}(2, 0)$ via its \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule structure according to

$$a \cdot_{\beta_\xi} b := \beta_\xi(a_{(-1)}, b_{(-1)}) a_{(0)} \cdot b_{(0)}, \quad (\text{A22})$$

for every $a, b \in \mathcal{A}(2, 0)$. The defining property of β_ξ ensures that this multiplication rule is associative. One can easily verify that $\mathcal{A}(2, 0)$ equipped with the twisted multiplication rules \cdot_{β_ξ} is indeed isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}(2, \xi)$. Interestingly, even though β_ξ and $\beta_{\xi'}$ are inequivalent Hopf 2-cocycles for $\xi \neq \xi'$, the resulting algebras (in Vec) are isomorphic. Similarly, twisting the multiplication rule of $\mathcal{A}(1, 0)$ by β_ξ results in an algebra isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)$.

At this point, it is interesting to note that the functions β_ξ , for every $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, also define group 2-cocycles that can be used to define twisted multiplication rules for the group algebra $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}] = \mathbb{C}\langle x, g \mid x^2 = 1 = g^2 \rangle$, resulting in a twisted group algebra that is isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}(2, \xi)$. However, for every $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, these group 2-cocycles all fall within the same cohomology class.

In the following, we compute the exact indecomposable module categories over $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ associated with the algebra objects in $\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ listed above.

A.5. Module categories over $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$

Every exact indecomposable module category \mathcal{M} over $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ is equivalent to the category of left modules $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$ over one of the right \mathcal{T}_4 -simple left \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule algebras \mathcal{A} constructed above, such that the module structure of $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$ is provided by the \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule structure of \mathcal{A} [74].⁸ Most importantly, $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(n, \xi))$ and $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(n', \xi'))$ are equivalent as $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -module categories if and only if $n = n'$ and $\xi = \xi'$, which can be traced back to β_ξ and $\beta_{\xi'}$ being inequivalent Hopf 2-cocycles as long as $\xi \neq \xi'$ [74]. Therefore, the algebra objects listed in app. A 4 classify the exact indecomposable module categories [72, 74].

More concretely, given a right \mathcal{T}_4 -simple left \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule algebras \mathcal{A} , the category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$ can be equipped with an action bifunctor

$$\triangleright : \text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4) \times \text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}) \quad (\text{A23})$$

as well as a *module associator* $\triangleright F$ specified by a collection of isomorphisms

$$\triangleright F^{V_1 V_2 M} : (V_1 \otimes V_2) \triangleright M \xrightarrow{\sim} V_1 \triangleright (V_2 \triangleright M) \quad (\text{A24})$$

satisfying a *pentagon axiom*, for every $V_1, V_2 \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ and $M \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$. Given $V \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ and $M \in$

⁸ Notice that while the category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} -modules (in Vec) has the structure of a left $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -module category, the category $\text{Mod}_{\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)}(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} -modules in $\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ would have the structure of a right $\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -module category.

The module structures above also provide us with linear maps $\bar{\phi}_{M_2}^{VM_1} : M_2 \rightarrow V \triangleright M_1$ satisfying orthogonality conditions

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi_{M_2}^{VM_1}} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\bar{\phi}_{M_3}^{VM_1}} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi_{M_2}^{VM_1}} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\bar{\phi}_{M_3}^{VM_1}} \text{---} \end{array} = \delta_{M_2, M_3} \mathbb{1}_{M_2}. \quad (\text{A28})$$

For instance, consider the algebra object $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)$. By inspection, we find that the tensor (14) introduced in the main text corresponds to the linear map $\phi^\alpha \equiv \phi_{T_0 \oplus T_1}^{P_\alpha(T_0 \oplus T_1)} : P_\alpha \triangleright (T_0 \oplus T_1) \rightarrow 2 \cdot (T_0 \oplus T_1)$ with $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$ under the identification

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi_{T_{\gamma_2}}^{P_\alpha T_{\gamma_1}}} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi_{T_{\gamma_2}}^{P_\alpha T_{\gamma_1}}} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi_{T_{\gamma_2}}^{P_\alpha T_{\gamma_1}}} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi_{T_{\gamma_2}}^{P_\alpha T_{\gamma_1}}} \text{---} \end{array} \equiv \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi^\alpha} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi^\alpha} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi^\alpha} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi^\alpha} \text{---} \end{array}, \quad (\text{A29})$$

for every $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. We can now use this data, together with the isomorphism data in (A5), to explicitly compute the module associator of $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(1, \xi))$. The module associator boils to a collection of matrices of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \triangleright F_{T_{\gamma_2}}^{V_1 V_2 T_{\gamma_1}} : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}((V_1 \otimes V_2) \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}, T_{\gamma_2}) \\ \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(V_1 \triangleright (V_2 \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}), T_{\gamma_2}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A30})$$

where $\mathcal{M} \equiv \text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(1, \xi))$, $V_1, V_2 \in \{S_0, S_1, P_0, P_1\}$ and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. The fact that \mathcal{M} is semisimple implies that these determine the full data of the natural transformation $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}((V_1 \otimes V_2) \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}, -) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(V_1 \triangleright (V_2 \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}), -)$, where an application of the *Yoneda lemma* provides the inverse module associator isomorphism $\triangleright \bar{F}^{V_1 V_2 T_{\gamma_1}} : V_1 \triangleright (V_2 \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}) \xrightarrow{\sim} (V_1 \otimes V_2) \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}$. Our choice of isomorphisms identifying $V_1 \otimes V_2$ and $V_2 \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}$ with their respective decompositions into indecomposable objects provide the decompositions

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}((V_1 \otimes V_2) \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}, T_{\gamma_2}) \\ \cong \bigoplus_{V_3 \in V_1 \otimes V_2} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(V_3 \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}, T_{\gamma_2}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A31})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(V_1 \triangleright (V_2 \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}), T_{\gamma_2}) \\ \cong \bigoplus_{T_{\gamma_3} \in V_2 \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(V_1 \triangleright T_{\gamma_3}, T_{\gamma_2}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A32})$$

respectively. Together with our choice of intertwining maps $V_3 \triangleright T_{\gamma_1} \rightarrow T_{\gamma_2}$ and $V_1 \triangleright T_{\gamma_3} \rightarrow T_{\gamma_2}$, these decompositions provide bases for the hom-spaces appearing in eq. (A30). It follows that we can view the linear map defined in eq. (A30) as a matrix indexed by $V_3 \in V_1 \otimes V_2$ and $T_{\gamma_3} \in V_2 \triangleright T_{\gamma_1}$, the entries of which we refer to as $\triangleright F$ -symbols. Carrying out the computations, we recover the $\triangleright F$ -symbols computed in the main text via the identification

$$\left(\triangleright F_{T_{\gamma_2}}^{P_{\alpha_1} P_{\alpha_2} T_{\gamma_1}} \right)_{P_{\alpha_3}}^{T_{\gamma_3}} \equiv \left(\triangleright F_{T_{\gamma_2}}^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \gamma_1} \right)_{\alpha_3}^{\gamma_3}, \quad (\text{A33})$$

for every $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \{0, 1\}$.

A.6. Symmetric states

Given a finite semisimple indecomposable module category \mathcal{M} over a fusion category \mathcal{C} , vacua of the corresponding \mathcal{C} -symmetric gapped phase are in one-to-one correspondence with simple objects in \mathcal{M} [6, 10]. Moreover, representatives of the corresponding symmetric subspaces can be constructed from the data of these simple objects [14, 17]. Let us apply the same construction to exact indecomposable module categories over $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$.

Generally, let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}\{k_b\}_b$ be a right \mathcal{T}_4 -simple left \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule algebra so that $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$ is an exact indecomposable left $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -module category. Let $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{End}(M)$ with $M = \mathbb{C}\{m_c\}_c$ be an indecomposable object in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$. Introducing the notation

$$\rho_{c_1}^{c_2} := \sum_b \rho(k_b)_{c_1}^{c_2} k_b, \quad (\text{A34})$$

one defines a state in $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda := \bigotimes_{i \in \Lambda} \text{Forg}(\mathcal{A})$ with open boundary conditions $m_{c_1}, m_{c_{|\Lambda|+1}} \in V$ as

$$\sum_{c_2, \dots, c_{|\Lambda|}} \rho_{c_{|\Lambda|}}^{c_{|\Lambda|+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_{c_2}^{c_3} \otimes \rho_{c_1}^{c_2}. \quad (\text{A35})$$

This state can be expressed as a tensor network of the form (13) by defining the following tensor:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\rho} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\rho} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \equiv \sum_{b, c_1, c_2} c_2 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\rho} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\rho} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} c_1 k_b \otimes m_{c_2}^* \otimes m_{c_1} \\ \equiv \sum_{b, c_1, c_2} \rho(k_b)_{c_1}^{c_2} k_b \otimes m_{c_2}^* \otimes m_{c_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A36})$$

Repeating this procedure for every indecomposable object in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$ yields states that span a subspace of \mathcal{H}_Λ . We claim that these states are symmetric in the sense that the subspace they span is invariant under the action of the symmetry $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$, as defined in sec. A3, for every finite subset Λ of \mathbb{Z} . Indeed, let $\rho_{M_1} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{End}(M_1)$ be an indecomposable object in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\varrho : \mathcal{T}_4 \rightarrow \text{End}(V)$ be an indecomposable object in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$. By definition of the $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -module structure of $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$, the intertwining map $\phi_{M_2}^{VM_1} : V \triangleright M_1 \rightarrow M_2$, for any $M_2 \in V \triangleright M_1$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{b_2, c_2, d_2} \left(\phi_{M_2}^{VM_1} \right)_{d_2 c_2}^{c_3} \varrho(\lambda_{b_1}^{b_2})_{d_1}^{d_2} \rho_{M_1}(k_{b_2})_{c_1}^{c_2} \\ = \sum_{c_2, d_2} \left(\phi_{M_2}^{VM_1} \right)_{d_2 c_2}^{c_3} (\varrho \triangleright \rho_{M_1})(\lambda(k_{b_1}))_{d_1 c_1}^{d_2 c_2} \\ = \sum_{c_4} \rho_{M_2}(k_{b_1})_{c_4}^{c_3} \left(\phi_{M_2}^{VM_1} \right)_{d_1 c_1}^{c_4}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A37})$$

from which the following tensor network identity follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\omega_V} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\omega_V} \text{---} \\ \downarrow \end{array} \equiv \sum_{M_2 \in V \triangleright M_1} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi_{M_2}^{VM_1}} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi_{M_2}^{VM_1}} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi_{M_2}^{VM_1}} \text{---} \circlearrowleft \xrightarrow{\phi_{M_2}^{VM_1}} \text{---} \end{array}. \quad (\text{A38})$$

Together with orthogonality condition (A28), this guarantees that the subspace spanned by states labelled by every indecomposable object in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A})$ is indeed invariant under $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$. Let us now examine explicit examples:

- $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(1, 0))$: In app. A 5, we computed two indecomposable modules over $\mathcal{A}(1, 0)$, namely the simple module S and its projective cover P . On the one hand, it readily follows from the definition that the state in \mathcal{H}_Λ associated with S is $|0\rangle^{\otimes|\Lambda|}$ under the identification $1 \equiv k_0 \equiv |0\rangle$. On the other hand, choosing the projective object P , we recover the W state $|W\rangle_\Lambda$ for the choice of open boundary conditions depicted in eq. (24), under the identifications $1 \equiv |0\rangle$ and $y \equiv |1\rangle$. Note that choosing different boundary conditions results either in the product state $|0\rangle^{\otimes|\Lambda|}$ or the zero state. The fact that acting on the product state with the symmetry operator $(\widehat{\omega}_0)_1^0$ defined in the main text results in the W state is now explained by $P_0 \triangleright S \cong P$.

The most interesting feature of this example is the non-identity map $P \rightarrow P$ that factors through S . This map indicates the existence of topological local operators locally turning the W state into the product state. Indeed, consider the maps $\pi : P \rightarrow S$, $m_0 \mapsto m_1$, $m_1 \mapsto 0$ and $\iota : S \rightarrow P$, $m_1 \mapsto m_1$. These can be used to locally modify the W state as follows:

$$(A39)$$

where the equality follows from the topological invariance of the local operators, at which point it becomes indistinguishable from the product state. Therefore, even though the indecomposable objects provide two distinct ground states breaking the $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ symmetry down to $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, they should correspond to the same vacuum in the infrared limit. Finally, note that one can replace the insertion of the matrices π and ι above, by a single matrix labelled by $\iota \circ \pi = \sigma^-$. The insertion of such a matrix within the tensor network amounts to acting on the W state with the physical operator $\sigma_i^+ : \mathcal{H}_\Lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$.

- $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(1, \xi))$: In app. A 5, we computed two indecomposable modules over $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)$, namely the simple modules T_0 and T_1 . It readily follows from the definitions that applying our construction to these two modules yields the product states $|+\xi\rangle^{\otimes|\Lambda|}$ and $|-\xi\rangle^{\otimes|\Lambda|}$ considered in the main text, respectively. There, we defined in eq. (12) a tensor of the form (A36) associated with $M = T_0 \oplus T_1$ so as to be able to compute the action of $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ on an arbitrary state in the invariant subspace. In light of this identification, we can now confirm that the $\triangleright F$ -symbols computed in the main text do specify the module associator of the $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -module category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(1, \xi))$. In

this context, the fact that ground states of the Hamiltonian $\widehat{H}(\xi)_\Lambda$ were found to transform inequivalently under $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ follows from the fact that the corresponding $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -module categories $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(1, \xi))$ are inequivalent.

- $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(2, \xi))$: In contrast to the two previous cases, we found a single simple module over $\mathcal{A}(2, \xi)$, for any $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. Whenever $\xi = 1$, we recognise the corresponding tensor network state as the so-called *cluster state* [76]. Although the state is here found to be $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -symmetric, it is typically defined as the unique symmetric ground state of a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -symmetric Hamiltonian. In regard to this $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ symmetry, we commented in app. A 4 that as an algebra $\mathcal{A}(2, \xi)$ is isomorphic to the group algebra $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}]$ twisted by the 2-cocycle β_ξ —here interpreted as a group cocycle. But, for $\xi \neq \xi'$, the group 2-cocycles β_ξ and $\beta_{\xi'}$ fall within the same cohomology class. Computing the local action of the symmetry $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ on the corresponding states would thus reveal that they all transform equivalently, up to gauge transformations of the action tensors. However, repeating the analysis of the main text for this example would reveal that the states transform inequivalently with respect to the $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -symmetry. Once we have established the invariant $\triangleright F$ -symbols specifying the module associator of the $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ -module category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(2, \xi))$, this follows from the fact that Hopf 2-cocycles β_ξ and $\beta_{\xi'}$ fall within distinct equivalence classes, for any $\xi \neq \xi'$.

Below, we discuss how to construct parent Hamiltonians for the aforementioned symmetric states.

A.7. Parent Hamiltonians

Given a symmetry (unitary) fusion category \mathcal{C} admitting a fibre functor and a choice of indecomposable finite semisimple \mathcal{C} -module category \mathcal{M} encoding a gapped \mathcal{C} -symmetric phase, a commuting projector Hamiltonian representing the gapped phase can be defined from the data of a Δ -separable symmetric Frobenius algebra object \mathcal{A} in \mathcal{C} such that $\text{Mod}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathcal{M}$ [14, 17]. Crucially, given an indecomposable, semisimple, unital, associative algebra in \mathcal{C} , it is always possible to endow it with a Δ -separable symmetric Frobenius structure [77, 78]. However, this procedure generally fails in the case of a finite tensor category. In our case, this failure can be traced back to the fact that the algebra object \mathcal{A} may not possess a non-zero map into the monoidal unit, which already obstructs the existence of a counit. It implies that we may not always be able to construct a gapped symmetric commuting projector self-adjoint parent Hamiltonian, but we may still be able to construct—at least in some cases—a gapped symmetric parent Hamiltonian with a real spectrum.

Let us specialise immediately to the case of $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)$ with $\xi \in \text{U}(1)$. We are looking for a parent Hamil-

tonian for the ground states labelled by the indecomposable objects in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(1, \xi))$. Following the discussion at the end of app. A 3, we can turn any morphism $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2}$ in $\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ into a local symmetric operator $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$ acting on neighbouring sites of the microscopic Hilbert space. We choose to write this morphism as a composition

$$\Delta \circ \mu : \mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(1, \xi) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2}, \quad (\text{A40})$$

where μ is the multiplication in $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)$ and $\Delta : \mathcal{A}(1, \xi) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2}$ is a morphism that remains to be determined. By definition, a morphism $\Delta : \mathcal{A}(1, \xi) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2}$ in $\text{Comod}(\mathcal{T}_4)$ consists of a morphism in Vec satisfying

$$(\text{id}_{\mathcal{T}_4} \otimes \Delta) \circ \lambda = \lambda_{\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2}} \circ \Delta, \quad (\text{A41})$$

where $\lambda_{\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2}} : \mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_4 \otimes \mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2}$, $a \otimes b \mapsto (a_{(-1)} \cdot b_{(-1)}) \otimes a_{(0)} \otimes b_{(0)}$, for every $a, b \in \mathcal{A}(1, \xi)$, endows $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2}$ with a \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule structure. We find a two-dimensional space of morphisms Δ satisfying eq. (A41) defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(1) &:= \zeta_1(1 \otimes 1) \\ \Delta(y) &:= \zeta_2(1 \otimes y) + (\zeta_1 - \zeta_2)(y \otimes 1), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A42})$$

for every $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. Now, in order to construct a *frustration free* parent Hamiltonian for the states defined in app. A 6 associated with $T_0, T_1 \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(1, \xi))$, it is sufficient to require $\mu \circ \Delta = \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2}}$, which in turn forces $\zeta_1 = 1$, while we are still free to choose ζ_2 . Requiring Δ to be *coassociative* further restricts ζ_2 to $\{0, 1\}$. Without loss of generality, we choose $\zeta_2 = 0$. Bringing everything together, let us consider the morphism $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(1, \xi)^{\otimes 2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \circ \mu : 1 \otimes 1 &\mapsto 1 \otimes 1 \\ 1 \otimes y &\mapsto y \otimes 1 \\ y \otimes 1 &\mapsto y \otimes 1 \\ y \otimes y &\mapsto \xi \cdot 1 \otimes 1 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A43})$$

We finally define the local operator $\tilde{h}(\xi)_{i, i+1}$ as the embedding of the *transpose* of $\text{Forg}(\Delta \circ \mu)$ into the microscopic Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_Λ .⁹ Under the identifications $1 \equiv |0\rangle$ and $y \equiv |1\rangle$, one recovers local operators (2), as expected. Following the same steps for $\mathcal{A}(1, 0)$, one recovers $\tilde{h}(0)_{i, i+1}$. The same strategy also produces a parent Hamiltonian for the ground state associated with the unique simple object in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{A}(2, \xi))$, for every $\xi \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, however the spectrum of this Hamiltonian does not appear to be real.

The construction provided above can also be used to justify local operators (1). We explained in app. A 6

how ground states $|\pm \xi\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$ and $|\pm \xi\rangle^{\otimes |\Lambda|}$ can be constructed from the simple modules T_0 and T_1 over $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)$, respectively. Consider instead the twisted group algebra $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}]^{\beta_\xi} = \mathbb{C}\langle h \mid h^2 = \xi \cdot 1 \rangle$, where β_ξ is treated here as a 1-coboundary of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. Since $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}]^{\beta_\xi}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{A}(1, \xi)$ as an algebra, they share the same simple modules. However, they do not possess the same \mathcal{T}_4 -comodule structure, so that the map Δ is now defined by $\Delta(1) = \frac{1}{2\xi}(\xi \cdot 1 \otimes 1 + h \otimes h)$ and $\Delta(h) = \frac{1}{2}(1 \otimes h + h \otimes 1)$. Proceeding as before, one recovers local operators (1) under the identification $1 \equiv |0\rangle$ and $h \equiv |1\rangle$.

⁹ As in eq. (A13), the transpose is merely for the need of our exposition in the main text.