

# What is a particle-conserving Topological Superfluid?

## The fate of Majorana modes beyond mean-field theory

Gerardo Ortiz<sup>1</sup> and Emilio Cobanera<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Physics, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, Dartmouth College, 6127 Wilder Laboratory, Hanover, NH 03755, USA

E-mail: ortizg@indiana.edu

**Abstract.** We establish a criterion for characterizing superfluidity in interacting, particle-number conserving systems of fermions as topologically trivial or non-trivial. Because our criterion is based on the concept of many-body fermionic parity switches, it is directly associated to the observation of the fractional Josephson effect and indicates the emergence of zero-energy modes that anticommute with fermionic parity. We tested these ideas on the Richardson-Gaudin-Kitaev chain, a particle-number conserving system that is solvable by way of the algebraic Bethe ansatz, and reduces to a long-range Kitaev chain in the mean-field approximation. Guided by its closed-form solution, we introduce a procedure for constructing many-body Majorana zero-energy modes of gapped topological superfluids in terms of coherent superpositions of states with different number of fermions. We discuss their significance and the physical conditions required to enable quantum control in the light of superselection rules.

### 1. Introduction

Most investigations of fermionic condensed matter are based on a type of mean-field approximation popularized by Bogoliubov [1]. One recent and conspicuous example is the ten-fold way, a topological classification of fermionic systems based on three discrete — time reversal, charge conjugation, and chiral — symmetries and K-homology [2, 3]. The main reasons for the prevalence of the mean-field approximation are clear. First, it leads to a very intuitive and natural picture of fermionic systems thanks to Landau’s theory of Fermi liquids and their quasi-particles. Second, it leads to a mathematically simple Lie-algebraic formalism by which the problem of diagonalizing the Hamiltonian in Fock space becomes of polynomial complexity in the total number of degrees of freedom. And last but not least, topological invariants such as (full or partial) Chern numbers, Berry phases [4], Bott and Hopf indexes, and others are easily associated to mean-field theories and evaluated for concrete instances.

The thermodynamic state of a fermionic superfluid (or superconductor) is characterized by the *spontaneous* breaking of the global continuous  $U(1)$  symmetry related to particle-number conservation. The positive features of the mean-field approximation for fermions come at a surprising cost in the context of superfluidity (electrically neutral fermions) or superconductivity (charged fermions): the *explicit* breaking of the symmetry of particle-number conservation. However, electronic matter is composed of interacting electrons whose number is locally conserved. Whether this mismatch between models and systems being modeled matters or not is bound to depend on the physical quantities to be computed. Many calculations of

thermodynamic and transport properties of fermionic superfluids have firmly established the phenomenological success of particle-number non-conserving mean-field theories. But these successes do not imply that every experimentally accessible feature of the fermionic superfluid state is well described by breaking particle-number conservation, see for example Ref. [5].

In this paper we will set up the ground for a systematic investigation of the interplay between the mean-field topological classification of superfluid systems of fermions and more realistic models where, for closed systems, the number of fermions is conserved. Our discussion will be organized around three fundamental and interrelated questions.


- What makes a particle-number conserving fermionic superfluid/superconductor topologically trivial or non-trivial?
- What are the experimental signatures of fermionic topological superfluidity ?
- What is the fate of Majorana zero-energy modes beyond the mean-field approximation? And even more basically, what is their very meaning?

Concern with the role of particle (non-)conservation in the mean-field theory of superconductivity is as old as the theory itself [6]. We feel prompted to revisit this issue by the recent *experimental* efforts to detect and control Majorana zero-energy modes. The presence of Majorana modes has been typically considered a key mean-field manifestation of topological fermion superfluidity since the work of Ref. [7]. These quasi-particles emerge from the interplay between the existence of a topologically non-trivial vacuum and a, typically, symmetry-protected physical boundary (or defect). In recent literature, this connection goes under the name of bulk-boundary correspondence. Because of the expected resilience against decoherence and non-Abelian braiding properties, Majorana modes, or simply Majorana fermions for short, are key components of many blueprints of quantum-information processing devices. Given that either electrons or fermionic atoms are in fact locally conserved, it is imperative to investigate the conditions for the emergence of Majorana fermions and procedures for their experimental detection beyond mean field.

Our work here suggests the idea that a Majorana fermion may be quantum controlled is so deeply rooted in the mean-field picture that it might not have a natural counterpart in more realistic particle-number conserving frameworks. Briefly stated, if a zero-energy mode of a superfluid system creates a superposition of states that differ in particle number/electric charge, it may not be possible to manipulate this mode without exchanging particles with an environment, as opposed to exchanging, say, energy only. Then the question becomes whether it is possible in practice to exchange *coherently* (charged) particles with a reservoir big enough to grant the mean-field picture of the (sub)system of interest. This claim is ultimately rooted in the venerable [8], but still much investigated and debated [9], subject of superselection rules.

Our last statement requires some clarification, since it takes for granted the existence of Majorana modes for closed, hence necessarily particle-number conserving, systems. Here we will investigate whether this assumption is reasonable based on our work published in Ref. [10]. By exploiting the algebraic Bethe ansatz, we succeeded in establishing and characterizing topological superconductivity for prototypical particle number-conserving, and thus necessarily interacting, superconducting chains beyond mean-field theory. Before this work, it was not known how to test for topological fermion superfluidity in number-conserving systems. The fact that a witness based on fermionic parity switches works in spite of the conservation of particle number can be firmly established thanks to the realization of an exactly-solvable topological fermion superfluid, the Richardson-Gaudin-Kitaev (RGK) wire. Moreover, the RGK wire allows derivation of an exact topological invariant. Consequently, it follows that the fractional Josephson effect remains a signature of topological fermion superfluidity (see Fig. 1).

To summarize, in this paper we intend to convey a certain amount of caution as to what is physically possible in terms of manipulation and control of Majorana modes, and hope to



**Despite particle-conservation the Fractional Josephson effect remains  
a physical experimental signature of Topological Superfluidity**

**Figure 1.** (Left panel) Schematics of an SNS Josephson junction. (Right panel) Standard ( $2\pi$ -periodic) and fractional ( $4\pi$ -periodic) Josephson effects depicting the Josephson energy  $E_J[\Phi]$  as a function of the magnetic flux  $\Phi = \frac{\phi}{2\pi}\Phi_0$ , where  $\Phi_0$  is the superconducting flux quantum.

shed some light on this exciting field [11]. The outline is as follows. We begin in Section 2 by presenting an exactly solvable model of a particle-conserving superfluid that, as will be shown explicitly, displays topologically trivial and non-trivial phases [10]. In Section 3 we consider the problem of characterizing a particle-conserving fermionic superfluid as topologically trivial or non-trivial. This problem has been shown to have a definite answer only very recently [10]. As explained in this paper, a topological fermion superfluid (or superconductor), in addition to the global  $U(1)$  symmetry of particle-number conservation, *spontaneously* breaks the discrete  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry of fermionic parity. In Section 4 we focus on the meaning and nature of Majorana zero-energy modes in gapped, interacting many-electron systems. (One may compare to recent work based on a quasi-exactly solvable, particle-number conserving, two-leg ladder model of spinless fermions with open boundary conditions and a gapless excitation spectrum [12, 13]. The concocted Majorana-like modes are not related to total fermionic parity.) And in Section 5 we discuss the physical picture that emerges, from the standpoint of superselection rules, as far as the quantum manipulation and control of Majorana modes is concerned. We conclude in Section 6 with an outlook.

## 2. Particle-number Conserving Fermionic Superfluids: The RGK chain

We now present a model, dubbed the RGK chain, introduced and solved in Ref. [10]. The RGK chain is the first example of an interacting, particle-conserving, fermionic superfluid in one spatial dimension shown to display a topologically non-trivial superfluid phase. It was designed to benchmark possible criteria of topological superfluidity in number conserving systems.


### 2.1. The Hamiltonian in position and momentum representations

The Hamiltonian of the RGK chain, in the momentum representation, is given by

$$H_{\text{RGK}} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_k^\phi} \varepsilon_k \hat{c}_k^\dagger \hat{c}_k - 8G \sum_{k, k' \in \mathcal{S}_{k+}^\phi} \eta_k \eta_{k'} \hat{c}_k^\dagger \hat{c}_{-k}^\dagger \hat{c}_{-k'} \hat{c}_{k'}, \quad (1)$$

in terms of spinless (or fully spin-polarized) fermion creation operators  $\hat{c}_k^\dagger$ , with momentum  $k$ -dependent single-particle spectrum

$$\varepsilon_k = -2t_1 \cos k - 2t_2 \cos 2k, \quad (2)$$



**Figure 2.** Functional form of the pairing interaction  $\eta(m)$  for  $L = 100$ ,  $t_1 = 1$  and  $t_2 = 0$ .

where  $t_1, t_2$  are the nearest and next-nearest neighbor hopping amplitudes, and  $G > 0$  the attractive interaction strength. The interaction strength is modulated by the potential

$$\eta_k = \sin(k/2) \sqrt{t_1 + 4t_2 \cos^2(k/2)} \quad (3)$$

odd in  $k$ ,  $\eta_k = -\eta_{-k}$ , as is characteristic of  $p$ -wave superconductivity.

The pair potential and the single-particle spectrum are connected by the simple relation

$$4\eta_k^2 = \varepsilon_k + 2t_+ \quad (t_+ = t_1 + t_2). \quad (4)$$

This property of the model is the key for achieving exact solvability. Nonetheless, their functional forms have been chosen so that they also realize a new exactly solvable model that is physically sound in position, as well as momentum, space. In position representation, we define  $c_j = L^{-1/2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_k^\phi} e^{ijk} \hat{c}_k$  for a chain of length  $L$ , measured in units of the lattice constant. We take  $\phi$ -dependent boundary conditions  $c_{j+L} = e^{i\phi/2} c_j$ . In a ring geometry, periodic boundary conditions ( $\phi = 0$ ) correspond to enclosed flux  $\Phi = 0$  and antiperiodic boundary conditions ( $\phi = 2\pi$ ) correspond to  $\Phi = \Phi_0 = h/2e$ . The resulting sets of allowed momenta  $\mathcal{S}_k^\phi$  are

$$\mathcal{S}_k^0 = \mathcal{S}_{k+}^0 \oplus \mathcal{S}_{k-}^0 \oplus \{0, -\pi\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}_k^{2\pi} = \mathcal{S}_{k+}^{2\pi} \oplus \mathcal{S}_{k-}^{2\pi}, \quad (5)$$

with

$$\mathcal{S}_{k\pm}^0 = L^{-1} \{\pm 2\pi, \pm 4\pi, \dots, \pm(\pi L - 2\pi)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}_{k\pm}^{2\pi} = L^{-1} \{\pm\pi, \pm 3\pi, \dots, \pm(\pi L - \pi)\}. \quad (6)$$

The number of momenta per sector is  $\text{Card}[\mathcal{S}_{k\pm}^\phi] = \frac{L}{2} - \delta_{\phi,0}$ , so that it totals to  $\text{Card}[\mathcal{S}_k^\phi] = L$ . After Fourier transformation, the RGK Hamiltonian in the position representation is given by

$$H_{\text{RGK}} = - \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{r=1}^2 \left( t_r c_i^\dagger c_{i+r} + \text{H.c.} \right) - 2G I_\phi^\dagger I_\phi, \quad \text{where} \quad (7)$$

$$I_\phi \equiv 2i \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{k+}^\phi} \eta_k \hat{c}_k \hat{c}_{-k} = \sum_{i>j}^L \eta(i-j) c_i c_j. \quad (8)$$

There are at least two cases in which the pairing function  $\eta(m)$  can be determined in closed form by Fourier transformation of Eq. (3). For  $t_1 = 0$  and  $t_2 \neq 0$ ,  $\eta(m) = \sqrt{t_2} \delta_{m1}$ , and so we obtain nearest-neighbor pairing only. For  $t_1 \neq 0$  and  $t_2 = 0$  instead we obtain

$$\eta(m) = \frac{(-1)^m 8\sqrt{t_1}}{\pi} \frac{m}{1 - 4m^2}, \quad \text{for } L \rightarrow \infty, \quad (9)$$

describing a long-range pairing interaction with a slow  $1/m$  decay with distance  $m = i - j$ , see Fig. 2. In general  $\eta(m)$  is a monotonically decaying function of  $m$  with  $\eta(0) = 0 = \eta(L/2)$ ,  $\eta(m) > 0$  or  $< 0$  for  $m$  odd or even, respectively.

This long-ranged pairing interaction, a main difference with the original Kitaev chain [14], allows for an exact solution beyond the mean-field approximation and a gapped spectrum in spite of the one-dimensional character of the model. As we shall see in a moment, the long-range coupling allows as well for a topologically non-trivial phase. It may also be physically relevant for chains of magnetic nanoparticles on a superconducting substrate [15, 16], which have recently been shown to support topologically protected Majorana zero-modes in the presence of a long-range coupling [17].

### 2.2. Mean-field approximation

Before we present the exact solution of the RGK chain, we would like to establish whether it displays a non-trivial topological phase in the mean-field approximation. For simplicity we consider the pairing function (9), that is,  $t_2 = 0$ . The mean-field approximation is obtained from the substitution

$$2GI_\phi^\dagger I_\phi \rightarrow \Delta^* I_\phi + \Delta I_\phi^\dagger, \quad (10)$$

with gap function

$$\Delta = 2G\langle I_\phi \rangle = e^{i\theta} |\Delta|. \quad (11)$$

Let us define Majorana fermion operators  $a_i = e^{-i\theta/2} c_i + e^{i\theta/2} c_i^\dagger$ ,  $ib_i = e^{-i\theta/2} c_i - e^{i\theta/2} c_i^\dagger$ . In terms of these degrees of freedom the mean-field Hamiltonian is

$$H_{\text{mf}} = \frac{it_1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{L-1} (b_i a_{i+1} - a_i b_{i+1}) - \frac{i}{2} \sum_{i>j}^L \Delta_{i-j} (b_i a_j + a_i b_j), \quad (12)$$

with  $\Delta_m = |\Delta| \eta(m)$ , and can be shown to display a topological phase characterized by power-law Majorana edge modes and the associated  $4\pi$ -periodic Josephson effect. Due to the long-range nature of the interaction, the wavefunction of the Majorana edge modes decays algebraically rather than exponentially in the bulk, and their energy approaches zero as a power law in  $1/L$ .

### 2.3. Exact solution

In Ref. [10] we showed that the RGK chain is exactly solvable. To this end we re-wrote it in the algebraic form

$$H_{\text{RGK}} = 8H_\phi + \delta_{\phi,0} (\varepsilon_0 \hat{c}_0^\dagger \hat{c}_0 + \varepsilon_{-\pi} \hat{c}_{-\pi}^\dagger \hat{c}_{-\pi}) - 4t_+ S^z + C_\phi, \quad \text{with} \quad (13)$$


$$H_\phi = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{k+}^\phi} \eta_k^2 S_k^z - G \sum_{k,k' \in \mathcal{S}_{k+}^\phi} \eta_k \eta_{k'} S_k^+ S_{k'}^-, \quad (14)$$

$C_\phi = 2t_2 \delta_{\phi,0}$ ,  $S_k^z = \frac{1}{2} (\hat{c}_k^\dagger \hat{c}_k + \hat{c}_{-k}^\dagger \hat{c}_{-k} - 1)$ , and  $S_k^+ = \hat{c}_k^\dagger \hat{c}_{-k}^\dagger$  for each pair  $(k, -k)$  of pairing-active momenta. The operators  $S_k^z, S_k^\pm$  satisfy the algebra of  $\text{SU}(2)$ . It follows that

$$S^z = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{k+}^\phi} S_k^z \quad (15)$$

represents a conserved quantity,  $[H_\phi, S^z] = 0 = [H_{\text{RGK}}, S^z]$ . The relation to the total fermion number operator  $\hat{N}$  is

$$2S^z = \begin{cases} \hat{N} - (\hat{c}_0^\dagger \hat{c}_0 + \hat{c}_{-\pi}^\dagger \hat{c}_{-\pi}) - \left(\frac{L}{2} - 1\right) & \text{if } \phi = 0 \\ \hat{N} - \frac{L}{2} & \text{if } \phi = 2\pi \end{cases}. \quad (16)$$



**Figure 3.** The eigenstates  $|\Psi_N\rangle$  of  $H_{\text{RGK}}$  are constructed out of three different kinds of electrons ( $s_k = \frac{1-|\nu_k|}{2}$ ): paired, unpaired, and inactive (only for periodic boundary conditions (PBC)).

Written in this form, one immediately recognizes  $H_\phi$  as an exactly solvable pairing Hamiltonian belonging to the hyperbolic family of Richardson-Gaudin integrable models [18, 19]. Eigenstates with exactly  $2M + N_\nu$  fermions are given by

$$|\Phi_{M,\nu}\rangle = \prod_{\alpha=1}^M \left( \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{k+}^\phi} \frac{\eta_k}{\eta_k^2 - E_\alpha} \hat{c}_k^\dagger \hat{c}_{-k}^\dagger \right) |\nu\rangle, \quad (17)$$

where  $M$  is the number of fermion pairs. The state  $|\nu\rangle$  with  $N_\nu$  unpaired fermions satisfies  $S_k^- |\nu\rangle = 0$  for all  $k$ . Moreover,  $S_k^z |\nu\rangle = -s_k |\nu\rangle$ , with  $s_k = 0$  if the level  $k$  is singly-occupied or  $s_k = 1/2$  if it is empty (see Fig. 3). The corresponding energy levels are  $E_{M,\nu} = \langle \nu | H_\phi | \nu \rangle + \sum_{\alpha=1}^M E_\alpha$ , with spectral parameters  $E_\alpha$  determined by the Richardson-Gaudin (Bethe) equations


$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{k+}^\phi} \frac{s_k}{\eta_k^2 - E_\alpha} - \sum_{\beta(\neq \alpha)} \frac{1}{E_\beta - E_\alpha} = \frac{Q_\phi}{E_\alpha}, \quad (18)$$

where  $Q_\phi = 1/2G - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}_{k+}^\phi} s_k + M - 1$ .

For periodic boundary conditions ( $\phi = 0$ ), the two momenta  $k = 0, -\pi$  are not affected by the interactions and must be included separately. Then, eigenvectors of  $H_{\text{RGK}}$  are given by

$$|\Psi_N\rangle = |\Phi_{M,\nu}\rangle \otimes |n_0 n_{-\pi}\rangle, \quad (19)$$

where  $N = 2M + N_\nu + n_0 + n_{-\pi}$  is the total number of fermions and  $n_0, n_{-\pi} \in \{0, 1\}$ . See Fig. 3.



**Figure 4.** Quantum phase diagram of the RGK wire in the  $(\rho, g)$ -plane. Dashed and full lines represent the Moore-Read ( $g^{-1} = 1 - \rho$ ) and Read-Green ( $g^{-1} = 1 - 2\rho$ ) boundaries, respectively. As shown in the text, the weak-pairing phase is topologically non-trivial while the strong pairing phase is topologically trivial. The horizontal dashed arrow corresponds to the density  $\rho = 1/4$ .

#### 2.4. Quantum phase diagram

The quantum phase diagram of the RGK chain is determined from the analytical dependence of its ground energy  $\mathcal{E}_0(\rho, g)$  on the density  $\rho = N/L$  and scaled coupling strength  $g = GL/2$ . Depending on the boundary condition  $\phi$  and fermion-number parity, one should consider either  $N_\nu = 0$  or 1. For periodic boundary conditions, since the levels  $k = 0, -\pi$  decouple from the rest,  $N_\nu = 0$  for both even and odd  $N$ . If  $N$  is odd, then the unpaired particle occupies the  $k = 0$  level without blocking an active level. For antiperiodic boundary conditions the ground state has  $N_\nu = 0$  for  $N$  even, while for  $N$  odd it has  $N_\nu = 1$  with blocked level  $k_0$ . The resulting ground state energy is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_0^\phi(N) = 8 \sum_{\alpha=1}^M E_\alpha - 4t_+ M + J_{\phi,0} + \delta_{N_\nu,1}(4\eta_{k_0}^2 - 2t_+), \quad (20)$$

where  $J_{\phi,0} = \delta_{\phi,0}(\varepsilon_0 \delta_{n_0,1} + \varepsilon_{-\pi} \delta_{n_{-\pi},1})$ . In the thermodynamic limit ( $N, L \rightarrow \infty$ , such that  $\rho$  is kept constant) the energy density becomes

$$e_0 \equiv \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_0^\phi/L = -2t_+\rho - \frac{4}{g}\Delta^2 + \frac{4}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \eta_k^2 v_k^2 dk, \quad (21)$$

where the chemical potential  $\mu$  and gap function  $\Delta$  are related to the original parameters of the model by

$$\frac{2\pi}{g} = \int_0^\pi \frac{\eta_k^2}{E_k} dk, \quad \rho = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi v_k^2 dk, \quad (22)$$

$$E_k = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\eta_k^2}{2} - \mu\right)^2 + \eta_k^2 \Delta^2}, \quad v_k^2 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\eta_k^2 - 2\mu}{4E_k}. \quad (23)$$


The resulting phase diagram is shown in Fig. 4. The RGK chain is gapped for all  $g > 0$ , except for the Read-Green coupling  $g = g_c = 1/(1 - 2\rho)$  where it becomes critical in the thermodynamic limit, independently of the choice of boundary conditions  $\phi$ . This critical line defines the phase boundary separating weak from strong pairing phases, and thus is a line of

non-analyticities. At  $g_c$  a cusp develops in the second derivative of  $e_0$ , that leads to singular discontinuous behavior of the third-order derivative. Hence the transition from a weakly-paired to a strongly-paired fermionic superfluid is of third order, just like for the two-dimensional chiral  $p$ -wave superconductor [20, 21]. Which one of these two superfluid phases, if any, may be properly characterized as topologically non-trivial?

### 3. Fermionic Parity Switches and the Fractional Josephson Effect

Reference [10] introduced a quantitative criterion for establishing the emergence of topological superfluidity in particle-number conserving, many-fermion systems. The criterion exploits the behavior of the ground state energy of a system of  $N$ , and  $N \pm 1$  particles, for both periodic and antiperiodic boundary conditions. The emergence of topological order in a superconducting wire, closed in a ring and described in mean-field, is associated with switches in the ground-state fermion parity  $\mathcal{P}(\phi)$  upon increasing the enclosed flux  $\Phi = (\phi/2\pi) \times \Phi_0$  [14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. Any spin-active superconductor, topologically trivial or not, may experience a crossing of the ground state energies for even and odd number of electrons [28, 29, 30, 31]. Regardless of spin, what matters is the number of crossings  $N_X$  between  $\Phi = 0 = \phi$  and  $\Phi = \Phi_0$ ,  $\phi = 2\pi$ . The superconductor is topologically non-trivial if  $N_X$  is odd, otherwise it is trivial.


In the many-body, number conserving, case we need to identify the relevant parity switches signaling the emergence of a topological fermion superfluid phase. Our exact solution gives us access to  $\mathcal{P}(\phi)$  only at  $\phi = 0$  and  $\phi = 2\pi$ , but this is sufficient to determine whether  $N_X$  is even or odd. Notice that odd  $N_X$  means that the flux  $\Phi$  should be advanced by  $2\Phi_0$ , rather than  $\Phi_0$ , in order to return to the initial ground state. This is the essence of the  $4\pi$ -periodic Josephson effect [14, 32].



**Figure 5.** Ground state energy differences (in units of  $t_1 \equiv 1$ , for  $t_2 = 0$ ) for even ( $N = 2M$ ) and odd ( $N = 2M \pm 1$ ) number of fermions, and with periodic ( $\phi = 0$ ) or antiperiodic ( $\phi = 2\pi$ ) boundary conditions. The odd-even difference is shown as a function of the interaction strength  $g$  for a finite system (data points, for  $N = 512$ ,  $L = 2048$ ) and in the thermodynamic limit (continuous lines). The topologically non-trivial state is entered for  $g < g_c = 2$ . Also indicated are the values of the fermion parity switches  $\mathcal{P}_N(\Phi)$  across the transition.

To identify the fermion parity switches we calculate the ground state energy  $\mathcal{E}_0^\phi(N)$  for a given number  $N$  of fermions in the chain of length  $L$ , with periodic ( $\phi = 0$ ) or antiperiodic ( $\phi = 2\pi$ ) boundary conditions, and compare  $\mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_0^\phi(N+1) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_0^\phi(N-1)$  and  $\mathcal{E}_0^{\text{even}}(\phi) = \mathcal{E}_0^\phi(N)$ , where we assumed  $N$  even. The difference (inverse compressibility)  $\chi(\phi) = \mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi) - \mathcal{E}_0^{\text{even}}(\phi)$  determines  $\mathcal{P}_N(\phi) = \text{sign } \chi(\phi)$ , so it has the opposite sign at  $\phi = 0$  and  $\phi = 2\pi$  in the





**Figure 6.** Ground state energies for even and odd number of fermions, for the finite system (left panel) and in the thermodynamic limit (right panel), illustrating the fermion parity switches  $\mathcal{P}_N(\phi)$ . Notice the special role played by the flux  $\phi^*$  at the crossing (degeneracy) point.

topologically non-trivial phase. We also find that  $\mathcal{P}_{N \in \text{even}}(\phi) = -\mathcal{P}_{N \in \text{odd}}(\phi)$  in the topologically non-trivial phase. The results, shown in Figs. 5 and 6, unambiguously demonstrate the topologically non-trivial nature of the superfluid for  $g < g_c$  — both in a finite system and in the thermodynamic limit, and without relying on any mean-field approximation.

The ground state of the odd ( $2M \pm 1$ ) system strongly depends on the boundary conditions. For periodic boundary conditions the unpaired particle always occupies the  $k_0 = 0$  level, while for the antiperiodic case it starts blocking the Fermi momentum  $k_F = k_0$  at  $g = 0$ , continuously decreasing its modulus with increasing  $g$ , up to  $k_0 = \pi/L$  at  $g_0 \sim 1.1936$  ( $\rho = 1/4$ ), corresponding to  $\mu = \Delta^2$  in the thermodynamic limit. In that limit  $\chi(\phi)$  has a particularly simple form:  $\chi(0) = -8\mu$ , and  $\chi(2\pi) = 8|\mu|$  for  $g > g_0$ .

#### 4. Many-body Majorana Zero-energy Modes

The subject of this section is conceptually rather challenging. It is convenient to begin by recalling how Majorana modes emerge within the standard mean-field framework before we tackle this problem in a many-body setting.

##### 4.1. Majorana modes in the mean-field approximation

In the mean-field description, i.e., the Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) approach, a second-quantized Hamiltonian describing a generic fermionic superfluid is [1, 33]

$$H_{\text{mf}} = \sum_{i,j=1}^L \left[ K_{ij} c_i^\dagger c_j + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{ij} c_i^\dagger c_j^\dagger + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{ij}^* c_j c_i \right], \quad (24)$$

in terms of creation/annihilation operators  $c_j^\dagger/c_j$  of a fermion ( $\{c_i, c_j^\dagger\} = \delta_{ij}$ ) in the single-particle orbital  $\phi_j$ . The labels  $i, j$  subsume arbitrary quantum numbers like position or momentum, band index, spin and orbital angular momentum, and so on. The total number of single-particle orbitals is  $L < \infty$  in the presence of infrared (volume) and ultraviolet (lattice spacing) cutoffs. In Eq. (24), the one-body kinetic energy and mean-field pairing interaction matrices

$$\mathbf{K}^\dagger = \mathbf{K}, \quad \Delta^T = -\Delta, \quad (25)$$

encode the relevant effective interactions of the superfluid system. Here  $^\dagger$  is the adjoint,  $^T$  the transpose, and  $^*$  complex conjugation of a matrix.

In Nambu form, the Hamiltonian  $H_{\text{mf}}$  can be rewritten as

$$H_{\text{mf}} = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\phi}^\dagger H_{\text{BdG}} \hat{\phi} + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \mathbf{K}, \quad (26)$$

where the Nambu column vector of fermion operators is given by

$$\hat{\phi} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{c} \\ \hat{c}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } \hat{\phi}_j = c_j, \hat{\phi}_{L+j} = c_j^\dagger \quad (j = 1, \dots, L). \quad (27)$$

Then the BdG single-particle Hamiltonian is the  $2L \times 2L$  matrix

$$H_{\text{BdG}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{K} & \mathbf{\Delta} \\ -\mathbf{\Delta}^* & -\mathbf{K}^* \end{pmatrix} = i\mathbf{1} \otimes \Im(\mathbf{K}) + i\tau^x \otimes \Im(\mathbf{\Delta}) + i\tau^y \otimes \Re(\mathbf{\Delta}) + \tau^z \otimes \Re(\mathbf{K}), \quad (28)$$

where  $\tau^\nu$ ,  $\nu = x, y, z$ , are Pauli matrices, and  $\Re(\cdot)(\Im(\cdot))$  denotes the real (imaginary) part of the matrix  $\cdot$ .

No matter what the specific form of the matrices  $\mathbf{K}$  and  $\mathbf{\Delta}$  may be, the single-particle Hamiltonian  $H_{\text{BdG}}$  always anticommutes with the antiunitary operator

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{K}\tau^x \otimes \mathbf{1}, \quad \mathcal{C}^2 = \mathbf{1}, \quad (29)$$

of particle-hole or charge-conjugation symmetry,  $\{H_{\text{BdG}}, \mathcal{C}\} = 0$ . Here  $\mathcal{K}$  denotes complex conjugation. It follows that the single-particle energy spectrum

$$H_{\text{BdG}} \varphi_n = \epsilon_n \varphi_n, \quad \varphi_n = \begin{pmatrix} X^{(n)} \\ Y^{(n)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad n = -L, -L+1, \dots, -1, 1, \dots, L-1, L, \quad (30)$$

is symmetrically distributed around zero and so it is automatically particle-hole symmetric,  $\epsilon_n = -\epsilon_{-n}$ . In turn, the single-particle spectrum can be used to write down  $H_{\text{mf}}$

$$H_{\text{mf}} = \sum_{n>0} \epsilon_n f_n^\dagger f_n + \frac{1}{2} \left( \text{Tr} \mathbf{K} - \sum_{n>0} \epsilon_n \right) \quad (31)$$

in terms of quasi-particle operators

$$f_n^\dagger = \sum_{j=1}^L (X_j^{(n)} c_j^\dagger + Y_j^{(n)} c_j). \quad (32)$$

Assume now the existence of an *exact* zero energy mode, then it must be, at least, two-fold degenerate

$$\epsilon_1 = 0 = \epsilon_{-1}, \quad (33)$$

and the associated single-particle states,  $\varphi_1, \varphi_{-1}$ , yield the quasi-particle operators

$$f_1^\dagger = \sum_{j=1}^L X_j^{(1)} (c_j^\dagger + c_j), \quad X_j^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad f_{-1}^\dagger = \sum_{j=1}^L X_j^{(-1)} (c_j^\dagger - c_j), \quad iX_j^{(-1)} \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (34)$$

These zero-energy quasi-particles are necessarily Majorana fermions because

$$f_1^\dagger = f_1, \quad f_{-1}^\dagger = f_{-1}. \quad (35)$$

In other words, in the BdG formalism, zero-energy modes are Majorana fermions by default. Typically, in a finite-size system, Majorana quasi-particles are not exact zero-energy modes but, strictly speaking, *emerge* as such only in the thermodynamic ( $L \rightarrow \infty$ ) limit.

#### 4.2. Many-body Majorana modes beyond mean-field theory

In the BdG approximation, Majorana zero-energy modes of an open chain and the anomalous response to a flux insertion  $\Phi$ , in a ring configuration, are two related signatures of topological fermion superfluidity. Since the response to a flux insertion remains a valid test in a number-conserving system, provided the correct parity switch is computed [10], we want to show a candidate for an emergent zero-energy mode at those special flux values  $\Phi^* = \frac{\phi^*}{2\pi}\Phi_0$  where a level crossing occurs (see Fig. 6), and the fermionic superfluid is *gapped*.

To make this point more transparent, and before introducing the many-body version of the Majorana modes, let us start by setting the stage. For a given flux  $\phi$ , the coherent superposition state

$$|\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle = \frac{|\Psi_0^{N+1}\rangle + e^{i\varphi}|\Psi_0^{N-1}\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (36)$$

with  $N \in \text{even}$ , is not a stationary state of the RGK wire (eigenstate of  $H_{\text{RGK}}$ ). Rather, it satisfies

$$H_{\text{RGK}}|\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle = \mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi)|\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle + \delta\mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi)|\tilde{\Psi}_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle, \quad (37)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi) &= \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{E}_0^\phi(N+1) + \mathcal{E}_0^\phi(N-1)), \quad \delta\mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{E}_0^\phi(N+1) - \mathcal{E}_0^\phi(N-1)), \text{ and} \\ |\tilde{\Psi}_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle &= \frac{|\Psi_0^{N+1}\rangle - e^{i\varphi}|\Psi_0^{N-1}\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The very important orthogonality relation

$$\langle\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}|\tilde{\Psi}_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle = 0, \quad (39)$$

implies

$$\langle\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}|H_{\text{RGK}}|\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle = \mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi). \quad (40)$$

On the other hand, the even parity state  $|\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle = |\Psi_0^N\rangle$  is a stationary state of  $H_{\text{RGK}}$

$$H_{\text{RGK}}|\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle = \mathcal{E}_0^{\text{even}}(\phi)|\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle, \quad (41)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}_0^{\text{even}}(\phi) = \mathcal{E}_0^\phi(N)$ .

Let  $\phi^*$  denote the value of the flux such that

$$\mathcal{E}_0^{\text{even}}(\phi^*) = \mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi^*). \quad (42)$$

Any continuous path in Hamiltonian space connecting our RGK wire at flux  $\phi = 0, 2\pi$  will realize at least one such flux  $\phi^*$ . In particular, the RGK chain, as defined in  $k$ -space, is exactly solvable for arbitrary values of  $\phi$  and provides one possible interpolation. However, the values  $\phi = 0, 2\pi$  are special in that they make the position-representation of the RGK model physically appealing and local. At such a  $\phi^*$ , by definition, the following relation is exactly satisfied

$$\langle\Psi_0^{\text{even}}|H_{\text{RGK}}|\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle = \langle\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}|H_{\text{RGK}}|\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle. \quad (43)$$

We argued in Ref. [10] that at  $\phi^*$ , one can define the zero-energy modes

$$\Gamma_1 = \hat{T} + \hat{T}^\dagger, \quad \text{and} \quad i\Gamma_2 = \hat{T} - \hat{T}^\dagger, \quad (44)$$

in terms of the transition operators

$$\hat{T} = |\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle\langle\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}|, \quad \hat{T}^2 = 0, \quad \{\hat{T}, \hat{T}^\dagger\} = \hat{P}_0, \quad (45)$$

with  $\hat{P}_0 = |\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle\langle\Psi_0^{\text{even}}| + |\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle\langle\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}|$  the projector onto the lowest-energy subspace. This, in turn, implies

$$\Gamma_1^2 = \hat{P}_0 = \Gamma_2^2, \quad \text{and } \{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2\} = 0, \quad (46)$$

and, as we argue below, they are natural candidates for emergent Majorana modes. We arrive at this conclusion after taking full advantage of the level crossing-like condition that we have established for a number-conserving topological superfluid (fermion parity switches), and a particular property that only happens at  $\phi^*$ , as we explain next.

Consider the commutators

$$\begin{aligned} [H_{\text{RGK}}, \Gamma_1] &= \delta\mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi^*) (|\tilde{\Psi}_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle\langle\Psi_0^{\text{even}}| - |\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle\langle\tilde{\Psi}_0^{\text{odd}}|), \\ [H_{\text{RGK}}, \Gamma_2] &= i \delta\mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi^*) (|\tilde{\Psi}_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle\langle\Psi_0^{\text{even}}| + |\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle\langle\tilde{\Psi}_0^{\text{odd}}|). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

At this particular flux  $\phi^*$ , the energy difference  $\delta\mathcal{E}_0^{\text{odd}}(\phi^*)$  scales to zero in the infinite size (thermodynamic) limit (at constant density  $\rho = N/L$ ). We do not know the way it scales to zero but we speculate that it decays in an algebraic fashion as opposed to exponentially by comparison with the mean-field result, which can be determined quite accurately. The operators  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \equiv \Gamma_{1,2}$  are the simplest possible candidates for emergent zero modes that combine all of the available quantitative information.

Since the modes  $\Gamma_{1,2}$  would be zero modes of a ring configuration, generated by a flux insertion, they are not expected to be localized. By analogy to the basic Kitaev wire in a ring configuration, these Majorana modes generated by a flux insertion are delocalized. On the other hand, had we used open boundary conditions, instead of a ring (flux) configuration, we would expect these modes to be in some appropriate sense localized on the edges of the wire [34]; however, our RGK wire is neither exactly solvable in this case nor it is clear how the exact solvability condition for the other boundary conditions could help to determine localization. It is important to realize that  $\Gamma_{1,2}$  connect the even and odd parity sectors; their actions, for instance, on the coherent ground state  $|\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle$  are

$$\Gamma_1|\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle = |\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle, \quad \Gamma_2|\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle = i|\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle, \quad (48)$$

showing that the Majorana operators can realize states that seem to violate a charge superselection rule. The parity operator, on the other hand,

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}} = i\Gamma_2\Gamma_1 = |\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle\langle\Psi_0^{\text{even}}| - |\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle\langle\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}|, \quad \hat{\mathcal{P}}|\Psi_0^{\text{even,odd}}\rangle = \pm|\Psi_0^{\text{even,odd}}\rangle, \quad (49)$$

does not connect the odd and even sectors.

Notice that the algebra of the  $\Gamma_{1,2}$  zero modes is not the main issue at stake, since such an algebra could be obtained in other systems with ground-state degeneracies. However, there are additional reasons to claim that the interacting  $\Gamma_{1,2}$  modes are the modes that evolve into the standard Majorana modes in the mean-field approximation. First, there is the role of flux insertion in the construction of the modes, characteristic of topological fermion superfluidity. Second, the specific form of the  $\hat{T}$  operator immediately shows that the  $\Gamma_{1,2}$  modes anticommute with fermionic parity, and this is one of the key properties of Majorana modes. Lastly, the modes rely on *coherent* superpositions of states with a different number of particles, which is also unique to Majorana physics.

In summary, the operators  $\Gamma_{1,2}$  suggest a simple way in which zero energy modes, which, in addition, are non-number-conserving, might emerge in a number-conserving topological fermionic superfluid. Their emergence raises an important question: Is it really possible to prepare and manipulate experimentally coherent superpositions of states with different particle numbers such as  $|\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle$ ? This is of utmost importance, since if it is not possible, because of superselection rules, a message one could get from our number conserving analysis is that it is not viable to physically manipulate Majorana modes for quantum information purposes.

## 5. Preparation and Manipulation of Majoranas: The Superselection Viewpoint

Topologically non-trivial  $p$ -wave superconducting chains, that is, systems modeled by the Majorana chain of Kitaev or the RGK wire of this paper for example, are systems of great interest in experimental quantum information processing. Their ground-state subspace, being two-fold degenerate and separated from the quasi-particle continuum by an energy gap, has the potential to encode a single qubit. The natural basis of this subspace would consist of the state with no Bogoliubov quasi-particles (the vacuum of the system) and a second state obtained by applying a (generalized) Majorana mode localized on either end of the chain to this vacuum. Since these states differ in their fermionic parity, a symmetry that cannot be explicitly broken, at least the degeneracy of this subspace is expected to be resilient to decoherence by the environment. Finally, the operators that connect these states, the Majorana modes, are (presumably, for the RGK chain) localized in position space [34]. Hence, the setup seems good and ripe for quantum manipulation and control. What is it to be learned from incorporating particle-number conservation into the picture?

Models like the RGK chain demonstrate the consistency between the requirements of topological non-triviality and a ground-state subspace with a basis that has a definite fermionic number (as opposed to just definite fermionic parity): The vacuum has some fixed number of fermions, and the “topologically degenerate” state has one more or less fermion. This result is encouraging since it shows that fermionic parity switches, as a criterion for topological fermion superfluidity, survive beyond the mean-field approximation. But it also shows this:

**Encoding a qubit in the ground-state subspace of a  $p$ -wave superconducting wire, and its control, require that *particular coherent superpositions of states differing in particle number should be physically/experimentally realizable.***

There are however good reasons, and even mathematical proofs sometimes, for believing such coherent superpositions do not in fact represent physical states. This is the subject of superselection rules.

Let us begin by recalling the best established aspects of superselection rules. The traditional pieces of the subject are lucidly described in Ref. [8], and recent views are summarized in Ref. [9]. In the standard approach to superselection rules, the systems under consideration are taken to conserve the physical quantity that is argued to be superselected.

Consider for concreteness a system of spin-1/2 fermions

$$\{c_{i,\sigma}, c_{j,\sigma'}\} = 0, \quad \{c_{i,\sigma}, c_{j,\sigma'}^\dagger\} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}, \quad (50)$$

with total spin angular momentum operators

$$S^\nu = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger (\tau^\nu)_{\sigma\sigma'} c_{j,\sigma'} \quad (\nu = x, y, z). \quad (51)$$

Since the unitary map  $e^{i\theta S^z}$  induces the following transformation

$$e^{i\theta S^z} c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger e^{-i\theta S^z} = e^{i\theta/2} c_{j,\sigma}^\dagger, \quad (52)$$

the (Slater determinant) basis of many-body states

$$c_{j_1, \sigma_1}^\dagger \cdots c_{j_N, \sigma_N}^\dagger |0\rangle \quad (53)$$

( $|0\rangle$  is the Fock vacuum) is such that states with  $N$  even are unchanged by a  $2\pi$  rotation, while states with  $N$  odd are changed by a  $e^{i\pi} = (-1)$  factor.

Imagine now trying to prepare a coherent superposition like

$$\alpha_1 |0\rangle + \alpha_2 c_{j, \sigma}^\dagger |0\rangle \quad (\alpha_{1,2} \in \mathbb{C}). \quad (54)$$

The best established superselection rule, known as the boson/fermion or univalence superselection rule [8], states that such coherent superpositions are not physical or physically realizable. While results such as

$$\alpha_1 |0\rangle + \alpha_2 c_{j, \sigma}^\dagger |0\rangle \xrightarrow{e^{i2\pi S^z}} \alpha_1 |0\rangle - \alpha_2 c_{j, \sigma}^\dagger |0\rangle \quad (55)$$

are not quite enough to completely prove the superselection rule, an appeal to the time-reversal operation  $\hat{\Theta} = U\mathcal{K}$  (with  $U$  a unitary operator associated to the spin-1/2 of the fermions), and its resulting defining relation

$$\hat{\Theta}^2 = (-1)^{2\mathcal{J}} = (-1)^{\hat{N}}, \quad (56)$$

with  $\mathcal{J}$  the spin of the representation of rotations induced by  $S^\nu$  on states  $|\Psi_N\rangle$  with  $N$  and only  $N$  fermions, i.e.,  $\hat{N}|\Psi_N\rangle = N|\Psi_N\rangle$ , completes the proof [8]. Incidentally, Eq. (56) explains why fermionic parity cannot be explicitly broken in systems of fermions.

Let us rephrase these arguments in the context of the Majorana modes of the RGK chain. Two consecutive applications of the time-reversal operation  $\hat{\Theta}$  should leave any physical ray unchanged. Consider the coherent superpositions

$$|\Psi_\pm\rangle = \frac{|\Psi_0^{\text{even}}\rangle \pm e^{i\vartheta} |\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (57)$$

If one applies time-reversal twice to  $|\Psi_\pm\rangle$  it implies that

$$\hat{\Theta}^2 |\Psi_\pm\rangle = |\Psi_\mp\rangle, \quad (58)$$

therefore, not leaving the ray  $|\Psi_\pm\rangle$  invariant. Consequently, the Wick-Wightman-Wigner boson/fermion superselection rule [35], applied to the coherent superposition  $|\Psi_\pm\rangle$  indicates that there is no physical observable that can measure the relative phase  $e^{i\vartheta}$  between the even (bosonic) and odd (fermionic) sectors. Then, Hermitian operators connecting those sectors, such as  $\Gamma_{1,2}$ , are not measurable. Since parity  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  does not connect the even and odd sectors it could, in principle, be measurable. However, notice from Eq. (49) that parity  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  requires preparation of the coherent superposition  $|\Psi_0^{\text{odd}}\rangle$ , Eq. (36).

## 6. Conclusions and Outlook

In this paper we presented a criterion for characterizing interacting, particle-number conserving fermionic superfluids as topologically trivial or non-trivial [10]. Our criterion combines the many-body ground-state energies of systems with  $N$ ,  $N - 1$  and  $N + 1$  fermions, computed for both periodic and anti-periodic boundary conditions, into an observable with the interpretation of an inverse compressibility that keeps track of switches in fermionic parity as the phase  $\phi$  specifying twisted boundary conditions evolves from  $\phi = 0$  (periodic boundary conditions) to

$\phi = 4\pi$ , passing through  $\phi = 2\pi$  (antiperiodic boundary conditions). The behavior of this inverse compressibility in the thermodynamic limit dictates the topologically trivial or non-trivial character of the superfluid phase in question. The experimental signature, directly related to this test of topological non-triviality beyond mean-field, is the  $4\pi$ -periodic Josephson effect.[10]

Realizing an exactly-solvable, particle-number conserving, minimal generalization of the Majorana chain of Kitaev has helped enormously to clarifying what is entailed by the notion of a topological superfluid beyond the mean-field approximation. In particular, because of its Bethe ansatz solution, we were able to investigate our criterion for topological non-triviality very explicitly in the Richardson-Gaudin-Kitaev (RGK) wire. Notice that “minimal generalization” implies that the number-conserving wire should be gapped inside the various superfluid phases. This explains why the pairing interaction in the RGK chain must be long-range, while the complete integrability condition merely tweaks the particular shape of this interaction. By the Mermin-Wagner (or Coleman in field theory) theorem, compact, continuous symmetries cannot be spontaneously broken in one dimension, for systems with finite-range interactions. Our RGK wire escapes this general result by violating this last condition, and so manages to display a true gap in the thermodynamic limit associated to the spontaneous, but not explicit as in mean-field approaches, breaking of particle-number conservation and the presence of long-range order.

On general grounds, one expects that fermionic parity switches should be affected by zero-energy modes of Majorana character. Stimulated by our findings we introduced in Section 4, and provided a physical meaning to, the concept of many-body Majorana zero-energy modes. We believe we have managed to reasonably show that our zero-energy modes, beyond mean-field, should indeed be thought of as Majorana modes. Three are the reasons behind our claim. First, even though they emerge in a particle-number conserving system, our many-body Majorana modes do not conserve particle number. Second, they satisfy the Majorana algebra and, perhaps even more importantly, they precisely anticommute with fermionic parity. And third, it is possible to argue, partly because they anticommute with fermionic parity, that our many-body Majorana modes should evolve into the corresponding mean-field modes of Section 4.1.

Let us now discuss the issue of quantum manipulation and control of Majorana modes. It is convenient to recall briefly the importance of the Majorana chain from the viewpoint of quantum information processing. One could, in principle, encode a single qubit since the ground-state energy level is two-fold degenerate. However, this is not sufficient. What is important is that this subspace is resilient to errors characterized by quasi-local operators quadratic in fermions, and those errors preserve fermionic parity. On the other hand, the ground-state degeneracy of the Majorana chain with open boundaries is associated to the spontaneous breaking of fermionic parity. In general, knowing which symmetry is responsible for the degeneracy makes it simple to lift: just break the responsible symmetry explicitly. However, this is not simple for fermionic parity. Quasi-local fermionic operators that fail to commute with fermionic parity, must also necessarily fail to commute with each other at long distances (think for example of the creation and annihilation operators in real space, and products of three creation and annihilation operators, etc.). Hence, because of the interplay between locality and fermionic statistics, it is not possible to break fermionic parity explicitly for a closed system.

As explained in Section 5 we believe that the traditional theory of superselection rules enforces restrictive constraints to the idea that zero-energy modes of fermion superfluids anticommute with fermionic parity may be quantum manipulated. The problem in short is that fermionic parity is a superselected symmetry, for at least two reasons. First, there is the relations between fermionic parity and the square of the physical time-reversal operation. Second, there is the relation between fermionic parity and electric charge, a quantity that is superselected due to Gauss law [8]. Incidentally, the fact the fermionic parity is superselected in a closed system explains from a different point of view why it cannot be explicitly broken.

The traditional view on superselection rules has, however, been challenged from time to time.

Aharonov and Susskind [36] were the first to emphatically assert that there are no superselection rules in non-relativistic quantum mechanics. Their argument, adapted to our particle-conserving topological fermion superfluid, requires the introduction of a *suitable designed environment* that couples to our system and acts as a reference system. In that way, they would claim that it is possible to measure the phase  $e^{i\theta}$  relative to that environment represented by a reference state. In other words, by suitably coupling our RGK wire to a reservoir that allows for interchange of fermions, simultaneously violating the conservation of fermionic parity, one could potentially generate a many-body Majorana zero-energy mode.

Regardless, we would like to point out that it will be, *at least*, extremely hard to achieve such a level of coherence experimentally in, for instance, solid state nanowires. The computational power of Majorana braiding is rooted in its non-Abelian, dynamically generated, properties that follow simply from its algebra and the existence of an excitation energy gap.

## Acknowledgements

We acknowledge illuminating discussions with Tony Leggett, Manny Knill, and Babak Seradjeh.

## References

- [1] J.-P. Blaizot and G. Ripka, *Quantum Theory of Finite Systems* (The MIT Press, Cambridge, 1986), Chap. 3.
- [2] S. Ryu, A. P. Schnyder, A. Furusaki, and A. W. W. Ludwig, *New J. Phys.* **12**, 065010 (2010).
- [3] A. Kitaev, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1134**, 22 (2009).
- [4] S. Deng, G. Ortiz, and L. Viola, *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 205414 (2013).
- [5] J. von Delft and D. C. Ralph, *Physics Reports* **345**, 61 (2001).
- [6] Two lucid references from the early literature are Y. Nambu, *Phys. Rev.* **117**, 648 (1960), and H. J. Lipkin, *Ann. Phys.* **9**, 272 (1960).
- [7] N. Read and D. Green, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 10267 (2000).
- [8] A. S. Wightman, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **110 B**, 751 (1995).
- [9] S. D. Bartlett, T. Rudolph, and R. W. Spekkens, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **79**, 555 (2007).
- [10] G. Ortiz, J. Dukelsky, E. Cobanera, C. Eсеbbag, and C. W. J. Beenakker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 267002 (2014).
- [11] Similar caution, focused on the uncritical use of the mean-field approximation, has been raised by Tony Leggett. See for instance: A. J. Leggett in *Doing Physics: A Festschrift For Thomas Erber*, pp. 173-183, (IIT Press, Chicago, 2011); see also a recent talk in <http://people.physics.illinois.edu/Leggett/MZM.pdf>.
- [12] F. Iemini, L. Mazza, D. Rossini, R. Fazio, and S. Diehl, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 156402 (2015).
- [13] N. Lang and P. Büchler, *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 041118(R) (2015).
- [14] A. Yu. Kitaev, *Phys. Usp.* **44** (suppl.), 131 (2001).
- [15] T.-P. Choy, J. M. Edge, A. R. Akhmerov, and C. W. J. Beenakker, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 195442 (2011).
- [16] S. Nadj-Perge, I. K. Drozdov, B. A. Bernevig, and A. Yazdani, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 020407 (2013).
- [17] F. Pientka, L. I. Glazman, and F. von Oppen, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 155420 (2013).
- [18] J. Dukelsky, S. Pittel, and G. Sierra, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 643 (2004).
- [19] G. Ortiz, R. Somma, J. Dukelsky, and S. M. A. Rombouts, *Nuc. Phys. B* **707**, 421 (2005).
- [20] S. M. A. Rombouts, J. Dukelsky, and G. Ortiz, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 224510 (2010).
- [21] S. Lerma H., S. M. A. Rombouts, J. Dukelsky, and G. Ortiz, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 100503(R) (2011).
- [22] A. Keselman, L. Fu, A. Stern, and E. Berg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 116402 (2013).
- [23] C. W. J. Beenakker, J. M. Edge, J. P. Dahlhaus, D. I. Pikulin, S. Mi, and M. Wimmer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 037001 (2013).
- [24] J. D. Sau and E. Demler, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 205402 (2013).
- [25] A. Haim, A. Keselman, E. Berg, and Y. Oreg, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 220504 (2014).
- [26] F. Crépin and B. Trauzettel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 077002 (2014).
- [27] C. W. J. Beenakker, arXiv:1407.2131.
- [28] A. Sakurai, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **44**, 1472 (1970).
- [29] A. V. Balatsky, I. Vekhter, and J.-X. Zhu, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 373 (2006).
- [30] W. Chang, V. E. Manucharyan, T. S. Jespersen, J. Nygård, and C. M. Marcus, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 217005 (2013).
- [31] E. J. H. Lee, X. Jiang, M. Houzet, R. Aguado, C. M. Lieber, and S. De Franceschi, *Nature Nanotech.* **9**, 79 (2014).
- [32] K. Sengupta, I. Žutić, H.-J. Kwon, V. M. Yakovenko, and S. Das Sarma, *Phys. Rev. B* **63**, 144531 (2001).



[33] E. Cobanera and G. Ortiz, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 155125 (2015).

[34] The existence of an edge/boundary state or mode relies on the concept of localization. The latter depends on the algebraic language with respect to which the many-body state is assumed to be localized. In our particular case, Majoranas should be localized with respect to the position label  $j$  defining the edge. While in the case of non-interacting systems it is straightforward to define a *single-particle* edge/boundary state, it is not obvious how to define a *many-body* one. We next propose two totally equivalent ways to establishing the presence of a localized many-body edge/boundary state.

To realize a many-body (zero-energy) edge state it is necessary to have degenerate (in energy) states. Suppose that we have two degenerate ground states  $|\Psi_1\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_2\rangle$ . The degeneracy may be exact in a finite system or it may become exact only in the thermodynamic limit. In the latter case, it is necessary that the energy of the two states involved converges in some appropriate way with the system size  $L$ .

Compute the reduced density matrices ( $\alpha = 1, 2$ )

$$\text{Tr}_{\bar{\Omega}_j} [|\Psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\Psi_\alpha|] = \rho_\alpha(j), \quad (59)$$

where  $\text{Tr}_{\bar{\Omega}_j}$  is the partial trace over the complement of the set of position-localized subsystems  $\Omega_j = \{1, 2, \dots, j, L-j, \dots, L-1, L\}$ . If

$$\rho_1(j) \doteq \rho_2(j), \quad (60)$$

where the equivalence refers to (exponential or power-law) convergence in  $j$ , with maximum absolute value at the boundaries and decaying towards zero in the bulk, then there exists a localized state in each boundary in that particular, i.e., position, language. An equivalent statement is that there exists a unitary operator  $U_{1L}^\dagger$  acting only on sites 1 and  $L$  that connects the two degenerate ground states

$$U_{1L}^\dagger |\Psi_1\rangle \doteq |\Psi_2\rangle. \quad (61)$$

[35] G. C. Wick, A. S. Wightman, and E. P. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **88**, 101 (1952).

[36] Y. Aharonov and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **155**, 1428 (1967).