

# Higher obstructions to conformal boundary conditions and lattice realizations

---

Ruizhi Liu<sup>a,b</sup> Weicheng Ye<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, B3H 4R2*

<sup>b</sup>*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 2Y5*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, and Stewart Blusson Quantum Matter Institute, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z1*

*E-mail:* [rliu4@perimeterinstitute.ca](mailto:rliu4@perimeterinstitute.ca), [victoryeofphysics@gmail.com](mailto:victoryeofphysics@gmail.com)

**ABSTRACT:** Although it is long believed that vanishing of chiral central charges of a 2d conformal field theory (CFT) implies the existence of conformal boundary conditions, there are yet higher obstructions. In this paper, we focus on 2d rational CFTs, for which we identify a series of obstructions, known as higher central charges. We also discuss its implication for lattice realizations and the generalization with global symmetries.

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Gravitational anomaly and lattice regularization</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>From conformal boundary to topological interface</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Higher central charges</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Adding global symmetries</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>A proof for conformal boundary and topological interface</b>	<b>9</b>
A.1	Review of topological defects	9
A.2	Proof to theorem 1	10

---

## 1 Introduction

Gravitational anomalies are obstructions to coupling a theory with a nontrivial background metric. In the case of 2-dimensional conformal field theories (CFT), the gravitational anomaly manifests itself as the chiral central charge  $c_- = c - \bar{c}$  [1, 2], i.e., the difference between the central charges of the chiral part and the anti-chiral part of the theory<sup>1</sup>. In practice, it is related to and often measured by thermal Hall conductance  $\kappa = \frac{\pi}{6} T c_-$  [4–6] where  $T$  is the temperature. We will use the terms “gravitational anomaly” and “chiral central charge” interchangeably in the following. An important consequence of gravitational anomalies is that they are obstructions to an energy-conserving boundary condition of the field theory. In addition,  $(d+1)$ -dimensional field theories with a nontrivial gravitational anomaly cannot emerge from a  $d$ -dimensional lattice model<sup>2</sup> with a tensor-factorized Hilbert space and local interactions.

Although these statements has been known for a long time as folklore, it has been systematically studied only recently [7–9] and was proved in the 2-dimensional case in Ref. [9]. The basic ingredients in Ref. [9] will be reviewed in the next section. Despite above progress, there are still many open problems. For example, it is conjectured in Ref. [9] (see

---

<sup>1</sup>Theories with  $c_- = 0$  are said to be gravitational anomaly free or have a trivial gravitational anomaly. Besides, an alternative definition of gravitational anomaly is used in Ref. [3], where it is defined by the absence of a lattice realization. In this definition, our construction identifies higher central charge as a new indicator of gravitational anomalies.

<sup>2</sup>Through out this paper, we always assume lattice models are tensor-factorized with local interactions. We also use lattice regularizations and lattice realizations interchangeably. Moreover, by the dimension of the lattice model, we mean the spatial dimension.

also conjecture 6.3 of Ref. [10]) that the vanishing of gravitational anomaly (i.e.,  $c_- = 0$ ) in 2d CFT implies an energy-conserving boundary condition [11–14]. Furthermore, it is also natural to ask, given a field theory with vanishing gravitational anomaly, whether it is always possible to realize it as the low energy effective field theory of some lattice model.

In the present paper, we answer both of these questions negatively. Our argument is based on earlier results obtained in Ref. [9] as well as a newly developed notion called higher central charges [15–19] and Witt equivalence of chiral CFTs [10]. In summary, higher central charges can serve as an obstruction to energy-conserving boundary conditions and lattice regularizations beyond gravitational anomaly.

## 2 Gravitational anomaly and lattice regularization

This section serves as a recap of the main results of Ref. [9]. Consider a 2d CFT  $\mathcal{T} \times \bar{\mathcal{T}}$  which has  $\mathcal{T}$  (resp.  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$ ) as its chiral (resp. anti-chiral) part. Let us also denote their energy-momentum tensor by  $T(z)$  and  $\bar{T}(\bar{z})$  respectively. Assuming our theory lives on the upper half plane which has the real axis as its boundary (as in panel (a) of Fig. 1). On the real axis, the conformal boundary condition is imposed

$$T(z)|_{z \in \mathbb{R}} = \bar{T}(\bar{z})|_{\bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}} \quad (2.1)$$

The physical meaning of this boundary condition is that there is no energy flowing out of our system, i.e., conformal boundary conditions are nothing but energy-conserving boundary conditions. An immediate consequence of this boundary condition is that  $c_- = c - \bar{c} = 0$ . To wit, we note the  $TT$ -OPE

$$\begin{aligned} T(z)T(w) &= \frac{c}{2(z-w)^4} + \frac{2T(w)}{(z-w)^2} + \dots \\ \bar{T}(\bar{z})\bar{T}(\bar{w}) &= \frac{\bar{c}}{2(\bar{z}-\bar{w})^4} + \frac{2\bar{T}(\bar{w})}{(\bar{z}-\bar{w})^2} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

One computes the  $TT$ -OPE for any two points on the real axis and the boundary condition Eq. (2.1) implies  $c = \bar{c}$ . Conversely, this means a non-vanishing chiral central charge  $c_-$  obstructs conformal boundary conditions.

To see why a nonzero  $c_-$  implies the absence of lattice regularization, we first assume that our 2d CFT with nonzero  $c_-$  can be regularized by a lattice model. However, for a lattice model with local interactions, it is always possible to impose the free boundary condition, i.e., one just removes half of the chain. It is argued in Ref. [20], a critical spin chain with free boundary condition can be described by a 2d CFT with conformal boundary condition Eq. (2.1) in the infrared (IR) limit<sup>3</sup>. A more physical way to see this is to note, conformal boundary conditions are nothing but energy-conserving boundary conditions of a CFT. At the lattice level, free boundary condition is manifestly energy-conserving, so if we assume the bulk of the chain flows to a CFT in the IR, the free boundary condition


---

<sup>3</sup>More precisely, one has to assume that the bulk of this chain can be described by some CFT, bulk correlation function satisfies cluster decomposition in the IR and a well-defined thermodynamic limit. See Ref. [20] for more details. The fermionic case is studied in Ref. [21].

must flow to a conformal boundary condition of the IR CFT. See also Ref. [22, 23] for case studies. Thus, if a 2d CFT admits a lattice regularization, then it must admit a conformal boundary condition, which corresponds to the free boundary condition in the ultraviolet (UV). Therefore it contradicts the existence of gravitational anomaly (i.e.,  $c_- \neq 0$ ).

### 3 From conformal boundary to topological interface

In this section we will focus on 2d rational CFTs. By the famous TQFT/CFT correspondence [24–28], these rational CFTs can be viewed as boundary theories of certain 3d topological quantum field theories (TQFTs). In the following, we will present a construction relating the existence of *conformal* boundary conditions of the 2d rational CFTs to the existence of *topological* boundary condition of TQFTs in the 3d bulk.



**Figure 1.** (a) A 2d CFT is defined on upper half plane  $H_+ := \{z \in \mathbb{C} | \text{Im}(z) \geq 0\}$  and the conformal boundary condition  $T(z)|_{z \in \mathbb{R}} = \bar{T}(\bar{z})|_{\bar{z} \in \mathbb{R}}$  is imposed on the real axis  $\text{Im}(z) = 0$ . The physical meaning of this boundary condition is that no energy flows outwards. (b) By folding trick, the anti-chiral degrees of freedom (DoF) are then defined on the lower half plane  $H_-$ . (c) By conformal transformation,  $H_+$  is mapped to the upper hemisphere where  $\mathcal{T}$  lives on. Similarly,  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  lives on the lower hemisphere and the conformal boundary condition is then imposed on the equator. (d) Re-apply the folding trick so that the topological interface  $S$  becomes a topological boundary.

The construction starts from the panel (a) of Fig. 1. Since the chiral degrees of freedom (DoFs) and anti-chiral DoFs are decoupled, one can always use the folding trick so that the anti-chiral theory  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  is moved from  $H_+$  to  $H_-$  (see panel (b) of Fig. 1). After the folding step, we use conformal transformation to compactify our system on a sphere, so that the chiral theory  $\mathcal{T}$  lives on the upper hemisphere and  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  lives on the lower hemisphere. The conformal boundary (i.e., the real axis in panel (b)) is mapped to the equator of the sphere  $S^2$ . Note that the chiral theory  $\mathcal{T}$  is not a well-defined 2d field theory itself<sup>4</sup>, it must be defined on the boundary of certain 3d TQFT  $\mathcal{C}$ . Similarly, anti-chiral theory  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  must be defined on the boundary of a 3d TQFT  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  (see panel (c) of Fig. 1).

However,  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  are different in general. The only way for the diagram in panel (c) to be consistent is to have a topological interface  $S$  separating  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ . This interface  $S$  must be topological because by construction, all gapless DoFs live on the sphere  $S^2$  and all DoFs in the bulk are gapped. The conformal boundary condition is hence specified by the choice of such a topological interface  $S$  and the boundary condition of  $S$  (the red line in panel (c)). This generalizes the construction in Ref. [28, 30] where  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$  are taken to be isomorphic hence it follows  $\mathcal{C} = \bar{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $S$  becomes a surface operator in theory  $\mathcal{C}$  rather than a topological interface between different theories. Since the interface  $S$  is topological,

<sup>4</sup>It is called a relative field theory in math literature, see Ref. [29] for more details.

after re-applying the folding trick, it can be viewed as the topological boundary of the theory  $\mathcal{C} \times \bar{\mathcal{C}}$ . Note that our total theory  $\mathcal{T} \times \bar{\mathcal{T}}$  can be viewed as a boundary theory of the total bulk theory  $\mathcal{C} \times \bar{\mathcal{C}}$  and each step above is actually reversible, we have obtained the following

**Theorem 1.** *The 2d RCFT  $\mathcal{T} \times \bar{\mathcal{T}}$  admits a conformal boundary condition only if its bulk TQFT  $\mathcal{C} \times \bar{\mathcal{C}}$  admits a topological boundary condition.*

In mathematical literature, if two TQFTs (labeled by  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ ) are separated by a topological interface, we say  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  are Witt equivalent [31]. Recently, the notion of Witt equivalence is generalized to strongly rational vertex operator algebras (i.e., rational chiral CFTs) in Ref. [10]. Two rational chiral CFTs are said to be (weakly) Witt equivalent if they have the same central charge and their representation categories are Witt equivalent as modular tensor categories. In this language, we found that for a 2d RCFT to admit conformal boundary condition, it is necessary that its chiral part is Witt equivalent to its anti-chiral part.

In fact, the topological interface separating  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  is uniquely determined by the conformal boundary condition. This result shares the same spirit of topological holography principle, i.e., boundary physics uniquely determines the bulk. A mathematical proof of theorem 1 and the uniqueness is available in appendix A.

As a further remark, theorem 1 remains valid even if one considers fermionic (a.k.a spin) CFTs [32–35], since there is only one spin structure on disks and spheres. Besides, since the sphere equipped with the spin structure bounds the 3-dimensional ball, our construction applies without any modification.

## 4 Higher central charges

The problem of topological (hence gapped) boundary condition of (2+1)d topological order is completely characterized by the Lagrangian algebra anyon [30, 36–38]. The lack of Lagrangian algebra hence indicates a protected gapless edge theory. However, despite being complete, it is usually complicated to find the Lagrangian algebra even if it exists. Therefore, it is desirable to find some more computable quantities to characterize the existence of topological boundary conditions. For example, if the chiral central charge  $c_- \neq 0$ , then there cannot be any topological boundary condition, otherwise it would contradict the nonzero thermal Hall conductance  $\kappa = \frac{\pi^2}{3} c_- T$ , which is linear in temperature<sup>5</sup>. The mod 8 reduction of chiral central charge is determined by the anyon data, known as the Gauss-Milgram formula

$$\xi_1 := \frac{\sum_a d_a^2 \theta_a}{|\sum_a d_a^2 \theta_a|} = \exp(2\pi i \frac{c_-}{8}) \quad (4.1)$$

where  $a$  labels the type of simple anyons,  $d_a$  is the quantum dimension of anyon  $a$  and  $\theta_a$  is the U(1)-valued topological spin of anyon  $a$ , see Sec. 8.15 of Ref. [39] for a proof.

---

<sup>5</sup>The contribution from gapped modes is exponentially small for low  $T$  [6].

It is interesting to ask if the chiral central charge is the only obstruction to topological boundaries and it is known for long that the answer is no [17, 40]. Further obstructions, known as higher central charges are proposed and studied recently. They are defined as follows

$$\xi_n := \frac{\sum_a d_a^2 \theta_a^n}{|\sum_a d_a^2 \theta_a^n|} \quad (4.2)$$

It is easy to see that  $\xi_1$  is exactly equivalent to  $c_-(\text{mod } 8)$ . It is proved in Ref. [15] and advocated in [17] that

**Lemma 1** (theorem 4.4 of Ref. [15]). *If a  $(2+1)d$  topological field theory admits a topological boundary condition, then  $\xi_n = 1$  for all  $n$  satisfying  $\text{gcd}(n, N_{FS}) = 1$ , where  $N_{FS}$  is minimal positive integer such that  $\theta_a^{N_{FS}} = 1, \forall a$  (known as Frobenius-Schur exponent).*

Conversely, if  $\xi_n \neq 1$  for some  $n$  with  $\text{gcd}(n, N_{FS}) = 1$ , then this topological field theory cannot admit a topological boundary condition. Combining lemma 1 with our theorem 1, we then deduce that

**Corollary 1.** *A  $2d$  rational CFT with nontrivial higher central charge  $\xi_n \neq 1$  for some  $n$  with  $\text{gcd}(n, N_{FS}) = 1$  does not admit a conformal boundary condition.*

This corollary provides a further obstruction to conformal boundary condition beyond the gravitational anomaly  $c_-$  (or  $\xi_1$ ). Combining above theorem with the discussion in Ref. [9], i.e., a lattice regularization implies the existence of conformal boundary condition, we then obtain that

**Corollary 2.** *A  $2d$  rational CFT with nontrivial  $\xi_n$  for some  $n$  satisfying  $\text{gcd}(n, N_{FS}) = 1$  cannot emerge from a lattice model with tensor-factorized Hilbert space and local interactions.*

Our corollary 2 can be viewed as a special case of higher version of Bloch theorem [41–44]. The thermal version of Bloch theorem studied in Ref. [42] indicates that systems with nonzero thermal Hall conductivity (equivalently chiral central charge  $c_-$ ) cannot emerge from a lattice model with local interactions. Corollary 2 is a special case because we restrict us to the case of rational CFTs only while the original Bloch theorem applies to any quasi  $(1+1)d$  systems.

Our result is also valid for fermionic systems.

For example, let us consider the abelian Chern-Simons theory  $U(1)_2 \times U(1)_{-4}$ , corresponding to following  $K$ -matrix,

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & -4 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.3)$$

all anyons are abelian hence  $d_a^2 = 1$  for any  $a$ . The boundary theory of this theory is described by (chiral) Luttinger liquid with following action

$$S = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int d^2x \partial_x \phi_i (K_{ij} \partial_t \phi_j - V_{ij} \partial_x \phi_j) \quad (4.4)$$

where  $V_{ij}$  is a non-universal matrix encoding the velocity of these chiral waves. This boundary theory contains two chiral bosons with opposite chirality, hence  $c = \bar{c} = 1$  and  $c_- = c - \bar{c} = 0$ . Thus this model has no thermal Hall conductance. However, this model has  $\xi_3 = -1$  while  $N_{FS} = 8$ , by lemma 1, the bulk  $U(1)_2 \times U(1)_{-4}$  Chern-Simons theory does not admit a topological boundary condition, hence the chiral Luttinger liquid described by Eq. (4.4) cannot be gapped by local perturbations. Besides, by theorem 1 and corollary 2, the chiral Luttinger liquid Eq. (4.4) does not admit a conformal boundary condition and lattice regularization.

At first glance one might think the absence of lattice regularization is due to the nonzero Hall conductance. As for any charge vector  $\vec{t} = (a, b)$  where  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have electric Hall conductance (in natural units  $\hbar = e = k_B = 1$ )

$$\sigma_H = \frac{1}{2\pi} \vec{t} \cdot (K^{-1} \vec{t}) = \frac{1}{8\pi} (2a^2 - b^2) \neq 0, \quad \forall a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (4.5)$$


However, this is not the case. The absence of lattice regularization is still true even if one breaks the global  $U(1)$  symmetry explicitly, e.g. by coupling the FQHE system to an s-wave superconductor. Since an s-wave superconductor is described by a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -BF theory [45], it is in the same phase as toric code (TC). This allows us to introduce  $U(1)$ -breaking perturbations in Eq. (4.4). However, as is shown in Ref. [15] that higher central charges are multiplicative under stacking of topological phases, thus  $U(1)_2 \times U(1)_{-4} \times \text{TC}$  still has  $\xi_3 = -1$  since toric code admits a topological boundary so it has trivial higher central charges. Thus, we recover the results in Ref. [40]. Our results indicate, even with the  $U(1)$ -breaking perturbations, the perturbed chiral Luttinger liquid still does not admit a lattice realization.

## 5 Adding global symmetries


Next, we discuss RCFTs enriched by global symmetries. We will focus on invertible symmetries labeled by a group  $G$ . Thus, besides conformal symmetry, we can require the boundary condition to preserve  $G$ -symmetry as well. By preserving  $G$ -symmetry, we mean that the boundary can absorb the  $G$ -symmetry defects<sup>6</sup>. It is natural to expect that the bulk TQFT admits  $G$ -symmetry as well. We also assume that the global symmetry on boundary symmetry extends to a global symmetry in the bulk TQFT. For finite group  $G$ , this is rigorously proved in Ref. [47], we expect it to hold for continuous symmetry as well. Suppose our 2d RCFT admit a  $G$ -symmetric conformal boundary, we again employ the folding (or doubling) trick. As before, the boundary condition  $D$  gives rise to a unique topological interface inside the 3d bulk. However, we note that in the doubling procedure, one copy of the symmetry defect gets orientation-reversed (see northern hemisphere of Fig. 3). By assumption, the boundary condition  $D$  remains invariant if we push the defects to the boundary (i.e., the equator in Fig. 3). Since the topological interface in the bulk

---

<sup>6</sup>In Ref.[46], this is known as strong-symmetric boundary conditions, see Fig. 2. The weak boundary condition means bulk symmetry defect can end on boundary topologically. For invertible symmetries they coincide.



**Figure 2.** For a theory defined on a disk, the (strongly) symmetric boundary  $D$  can absorb symmetry defect labeled by  $g \in G$ .



**Figure 3.** As is argued in previous sections,  $D$  uniquely determines a topological interface in the 3d bulk (the yellow surface). The boundary symmetry defect also extends to a bulk symmetry defect (the orange surface) and can be absorbed by pushing it to the boundary.

is uniquely determined by the boundary condition  $D$ , it is also invariant under the fusion with symmetry defects. After applying folding trick again, we obtain that

**Theorem 2.** *For a 2d RCFT with global symmetry  $G$  to admit a  $G$ -symmetric conformal boundary conditions, it is necessary for its bulk to admit  $G$ -symmetric topological boundary.*

As a remark, this theorem should be valid even for non-invertible symmetries as long as one considers strongly symmetric boundaries for RCFTs. Besides, the introduction of spin structure does not modify the construction, so theorem 2 automatically holds for fermionic CFTs.

For an application, we consider  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ . In Ref. [48], a particular class of free boson CFTs with non-anomalous  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry is studied. These CFTs can be gapped (hence its bulk TFT admit a gapped boundary) by adding local perturbations if we forget the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetry. However, it cannot be gapped if we restrict to  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetric local perturbations. This suggests its bulk TQFT does not admit a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetric topological boundary condition. Hence by theorem 2, this  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetric CFTs do not admit conformal boundary conditions while preserving  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -symmetry.

We also note that if these CFTs admit a lattice regularization<sup>7</sup>, then the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  cannot act in an on-site way. If  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -action is on-site, by the same argument used in Ref. [9] (reviewed in Sec. 2), the free boundary condition would simultaneously preserve conformal symmetry and  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry in the IR limit, a contradiction. Thus, in these models (if exist), this

<sup>7</sup>Currently, we do not have an explicit construction for them. But from a field-theoretic point of view, there is no obstruction since it can be gapped after forgetting  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ , in particular chiral central charge and all higher central charges must vanish.

non-anomalous  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry cannot act in an on-site way. This suggests that there should be more obstructions for a symmetry to be on-site beyond anomalies.

## 6 Discussion

In this paper, we identified higher obstructions for 2d RCFT to admit a conformal boundary condition or a lattice regularization. This disproves the widely believed conjecture that vanishing of gravitational anomaly should imply a conformal boundary condition [9, 10]. However, these higher obstructions, known as higher central charges are now only defined for rational CFTs and local expressions for these quantities are still lacking. By a local expression, we mean that expressing higher central charges by certain correlation functions or OPEs. It will be interesting to find such expressions and extend the definition of higher central charges to irrational CFTs or even general 2d QFTs.

We also discussed the case if the conformal boundary is required to preserve global internal symmetries. It turns out in certain examples [48] the  $G$ -symmetric conformal boundary conditions can be absent even if there is no  $G$ -anomaly or gravitational anomaly. This suggests some subtle generalization of “mixed gravitational- $G$  anomaly” in these examples. We also point out the method to detect such “mixed  $G$ -gravitational anomaly” in Ref. [48] is extremely complicated. It is natural to ask if there is a  $G$ -enriched version of higher central charges<sup>8</sup>, which should be easier to compute.

Besides, it is shown in Ref. [17] that there is a Galois action on space of rational CFTs, under which a higher central charge of a CFT is exactly the chiral central charge of its Galois conjugate CFT. Besides, these authors also showed that a topological boundary of 3d TQFT remains topological after Galois action. It is interesting to see if similar argument can be extended to the symmetry-enriched cases. For example, it is shown in Ref. [50] that under some mild conditions, the Galois action in 3d TQFT preserve all the global symmetries (e.g., 0-form, 1-form or 2-group symmetries). It is intriguing to extend this result to boundary CFTs.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would acknowledge Jinmin Yi, Theo Johnson-Freyd for carefully reading and improving the draft. We also thank Wenjun Niu, Lukas Müller, Zi-yue Wang for helpful discussions. Especially, we thank Chen Li for drawing Fig. 1. Research at Perimeter Institute is supported in part by the Government of Canada through the Department of Innovation, Science and Industry Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. This research is also supported by the Simons Collaboration on Global Categorical Symmetries through Simons Foundation grant 888996.

---

<sup>8</sup>In the case of fermionic theories and  $G = \text{U}(1)$ , certain obstructions known as higher Hall conductivities are proposed in Ref. [18, 49]. We will not discuss them here.

## A A proof for conformal boundary and topological interface

In this appendix, we provide a more rigorous proof to theorem 1 used in the main text. In mathematics, chiral halves of 2d conformal field theories are described by vertex operator algebras (VOAs). See e.g. Ref. [51, 52] for its definition. We do not need this definition explicitly through out this appendix. Following that convention, below we will identify a chiral CFT with a vertex operator algebra  $\mathcal{V}$ , and we will denote  $\bar{\mathcal{V}}$  for its orientation-reversal.

### A.1 Review of topological defects

First let us review the definition of conformal defects and topological defects, following Ref. [53]. For two *full* CFTs, the conformal defect between them is defined as

$$(T_1(z) - \bar{T}_1(\bar{z}))|_D = (T_2(z) - \bar{T}_2(\bar{z}))|_D \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $D$  is the defect. The physical meaning of conformal defect is that the component of energy-momentum tensor normal to the defect  $D$  is continuous across  $D$ . In the case  $T_2(z) = 0 = \bar{T}_2(\bar{z})$  (i.e., the second theory is empty), this definition reduces to conformal boundary of the first theory. In particular, if we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_1(z)|_D &= T_2(z)|_D \\ \bar{T}_1(z)|_D &= \bar{T}_2(z)|_D \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

then the defect  $D$  is said to be topological. To gain some intuition, defects satisfying Eq. (A.2) commute with infinitesimal diffeomorphisms (generated by energy-momentum tensor!). As a consequence, one can deform the topological defect  $D$  inside the correlators without changing the value of correlators as long as  $D$  does not cross any operator insertions.

In particular, we note that if both theories are chiral, i.e.,  $\bar{T}_1 = 0 = \bar{T}_2$ , then a conformal defect is automatically topological. For the case of theorem 1, this means a conformal boundary condition of  $\mathcal{V}_1 \otimes \bar{\mathcal{V}}_2$  is equivalent to a topological defect between  $\mathcal{V}_1$  and  $\mathcal{V}_2$  by folding trick. This can happen, for example  $\mathcal{V}_2$  can be obtained by orbifolding  $\mathcal{V}_1$  (known as half gauging in Ref. [54]). It is conjectured in Ref. [10] there is a topological defect separating  $\mathcal{V}_1$  and  $\mathcal{V}_2$  if and only if they are related by orbifold construction.

For example, in the case of Ising model (minimal model  $\mathcal{M}_{3,4}$ ), In this case  $\mathcal{V}_1 \simeq \mathcal{V}_2$  and This model contains 3 primaries, denoted by  $1, \sigma, \epsilon$ . The topological defects correspond to global symmetry of the (chiral) theory and they are precisely Verlinde lines in this case (labeled by primaries). It is also known that in Ising model, its conformal boundary states are Cardy states, which are labeled by primaries as well. So they are in one-to-one correspondence, as is claimed.

As another example, we can look at the 3-state Potts model [55] (minimal model  $\mathcal{M}_{5,6}$  in  $D$ -series [56]). This model has 8 conformal boundary states [57] while it has 8 (simple) topological defects [55].


A further example is boson at radius  $R = \frac{n}{m}R_{s.d.}$  where  $R_{s.d.}$  is the self-dual radius and  $m, n$  are coprime positive integers. In this case, the moduli space of conformal boundary states is given by [58]

$$\mathcal{M} = S^3 / (\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n) \quad (\text{A.3})$$


This coincides with the topological defects obtained in Ref. [59].

## A.2 Proof to theorem 1

In the language of vertex operator algebras (VOA), primary fields appear as (twisted) modules of VOAs. Given a topological defect  $D$  between two strongly rational VOAs  $\mathcal{V}_1$  and  $\mathcal{V}_2$ . This gives rise to a wrapping operation, denoted by  $F_D$ . Note that there is no divergences during shrinking since  $D$  is a topological defect.



**Figure 4.** Wrapping the local primary field  $\phi(z)$  in  $\mathcal{V}_1$  by a topological defect  $D$ . Shrinking the defect gives rise to a new local field  $F_D(\phi)$  in  $\mathcal{V}_2$ , which is generally not simple in  $\text{Rep}(\mathcal{V}_2)$ .



**Figure 5.** The functor  $F_D$  is (lax) monoidal, in the sense that the last arrow above does not need to be isomorphism.

We also need to include twisted modules (a.k.a twisted sectors). Twisted modules are created by primary operators attached to a topological line defect (see Fig. 6, where primary  $\sigma$  is attached to line defect  $D_3$ ).


The wrapping construction is generalized to so-called lasso operation in Ref. [60] for twisted sectors, see Fig. 6. Importantly, one has to fix the choice of the junction  $v \in \text{Hom}(D_3 \otimes D_2, D_1 \otimes D_2)$  where  $\otimes$  means fusion of defects<sup>9</sup>.

One can see the lasso operation is also monoidal by a similar argument used before.

To summarize, we showed that

**Lemma 2.** *Given two strongly rational VOA  $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2$  and a topological defect  $D$  between them, the functor  $F_D : \text{Rep}(\mathcal{V}_1) \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathcal{V}_2)$  constructed above is (lax) monoidal.*

<sup>9</sup>In the untwisted case, there is only one canonical choice for the junction such that  $v = \text{id}_D \in \text{Hom}(D, D)$ . This is also what we have assumed so far.



**Figure 6.** The action of topological defect  $D_2$  on the twisted sector  $\mathcal{H}_{D_3}$ . The action may bring the states to another twisted sector  $\mathcal{H}_{D_1}$ .

Mathematically, it is well known that a monoidal functor can be viewed as a bimodule. Let us write  $\mathcal{C}_i = \text{Rep}(\mathcal{V}_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , then  $F_D$  becomes a  $(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)$ -bimodule. Recall that in Ref. [61] it is shown that  $\text{Rep}(\mathcal{V}_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  are modular tensor categories, which give the bulk TQFT by Reshetikhin-Turaev construction. The physical meaning of  $F_D$  as a  $(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2)$ -bimodule is that it labels a topological interface between these two bulk TQFTs [31]. Note that this bimodule (equivalently interface) depends only on the topological defect  $D$  (or the conformal boundary condition in the main text). Given the defect  $D$  it is uniquely determined. Thus we complete the proof of theorem 1.

## References

- [1] I.H. Kim, B. Shi, K. Kato and V.V. Albert, *Chiral Central Charge from a Single Bulk Wave Function*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128** (2022) 176402 [[2110.06932](#)].
- [2] R. Fan, *From Entanglement Generated Dynamics to the Gravitational Anomaly and Chiral Central Charge*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129** (2022) 260403 [[2206.02823](#)].
- [3] L. Kong and X.-G. Wen, *Braided fusion categories, gravitational anomalies, and the mathematical framework for topological orders in any dimensions*, *arXiv e-prints* (2014) [arXiv:1405.5858](#) [[1405.5858](#)].
- [4] C.L. Kane and M.P.A. Fisher, *Quantized thermal transport in the fractional quantum Hall effect*, *Phys. Rev. B* **55** (1997) 15832 [[cond-mat/9603118](#)].
- [5] M. Banerjee, M. Heiblum, V. Umansky, D.E. Feldman, Y. Oreg and A. Stern, *Observation of half-integer thermal Hall conductance*, *Nature* **559** (2018) 205 [[1710.00492](#)].
- [6] A. Kapustin and L. Spodyneiko, *Thermal Hall conductance and a relative topological invariant of gapped two-dimensional systems*, *Phys. Rev. B* **101** (2020) 045137 [[1905.06488](#)].
- [7] K. Jensen, E. Shaverin and A. Yarom, *'t Hooft anomalies and boundaries*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2018** (2018) 85 [[1710.07299](#)].
- [8] R. Thorngren and Y. Wang, *Anomalous symmetries end at the boundary*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2021** (2021) 17 [[2012.15861](#)].

- [9] S. Hellerman, D. Orlando and M. Watanabe, *Quantum Information Theory of the Gravitational Anomaly*, *arXiv e-prints* (2021) arXiv:2101.03320 [2101.03320].
- [10] S. Möller and B.C. Rayhaun, *Equivalence Relations on Vertex Operator Algebras, II: Witt Equivalence and Orbifolds*, *arXiv e-prints* (2024) arXiv:2410.18166 [2410.18166].
- [11] J. Cardy, *Boundary Conformal Field Theory*, *arXiv e-prints* (2004) hep [hep-th/0411189].
- [12] J. Fröhlich, J. Fuchs, I. Runkel and C. Schweigert, *Duality and defects in rational conformal field theory*, *Nuclear Physics B* **763** (2007) 354 [hep-th/0607247].
- [13] A. Recknagel and V. Schomerus, *Boundary conformal field theory*, in *Boundary Conformal Field Theory and the Worldsheet Approach to D-Branes*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, p. 121–189, Cambridge University Press (2013).
- [14] L. Li, C.-T. Hsieh, Y. Yao and M. Oshikawa, *Boundary conditions and anomalies of conformal field theories in 1 +1 dimensions*, *Phys. Rev. B* **110** (2024) 045118 [2205.11190].
- [15] S.-H. Ng, A. Schopieray and Y. Wang, *Higher Gauss sums of modular categories*, *arXiv e-prints* (2018) arXiv:1812.11234 [1812.11234].
- [16] S.-H. Ng, E.C. Rowell, Y. Wang and Q. Zhang, *Higher central charges and Witt groups*, *arXiv e-prints* (2020) arXiv:2002.03570 [2002.03570].
- [17] J. Kaidi, Z. Komargodski, K. Ohmori, S. Seifnashri and S.-H. Shao, *Higher central charges and topological boundaries in 2+1-dimensional TQFTs*, *SciPost Physics* **13** (2022) 067 [2107.13091].
- [18] R. Kobayashi, *Symmetry-preserving boundary of (2 + 1)D fractional quantum Hall states*, *Phys. Rev. Research* **4** (2022) 033137 [2203.08156].
- [19] R. Kobayashi, T. Wang, T. Soejima, R.S.K. Mong and S. Ryu, *Extracting Higher Central Charge from a Single Wave Function*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132** (2024) 016602 [2303.04822].
- [20] D. Friedan and A. Konechny, *Infrared properties of boundaries in one-dimensional quantum systems*, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2006** (2006) 03014 [hep-th/0512023].
- [21] P. Boyle Smith and D. Tong, *Boundary RG flows for fermions and the mod 2 anomaly*, *SciPost Physics* **10** (2021) 010 [2005.11314].
- [22] I. Affleck, M. Oshikawa and H. Saleur, *Boundary critical phenomena in the three-state Potts model*, *Journal of Physics A Mathematical General* **31** (1998) 5827 [cond-mat/9804117].
- [23] K. Ohmori and Y. Tachikawa, *Physics at the entangling surface*, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2015** (2015) 04010 [1406.4167].
- [24] E. Witten, *Quantum Field Theory and the Jones Polynomial*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **121** (1989) 351.
- [25] D.C. Cabra and G.L. Rossini, *Explicit Connection Between Conformal Field Theory and 2+1 Chern-Simons Theory*, *Modern Physics Letters A* **12** (1997) 1687 [hep-th/9506054].
- [26] E. Witten, *Five-brane effective action in M-theory*, *Journal of Geometry and Physics* **22** (1997) 103 [hep-th/9610234].
- [27] K. Gawedzki, *Conformal field theory: a case study*, *arXiv e-prints* (1999) hep [hep-th/9904145].

- [28] J. Fuchs, I. Runkel and C. Schweigert, *TFT construction of RCFT correlators I: partition functions*, *Nuclear Physics B* **646** (2002) 353 [[hep-th/0204148](#)].
- [29] D.S. Freed and C. Teleman, *Relative quantum field theory*, *arXiv e-prints* (2012) [arXiv:1212.1692](#) [[1212.1692](#)].
- [30] A. Kapustin and N. Saulina, *Surface operators in 3d Topological Field Theory and 2d Rational Conformal Field Theory*, *arXiv e-prints* (2010) [arXiv:1012.0911](#) [[1012.0911](#)].
- [31] J. Fuchs, C. Schweigert and A. Valentino, *Bicategories for Boundary Conditions and for Surface Defects in 3-d TFT*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **321** (2013) 543 [[1203.4568](#)].
- [32] C.-T. Hsieh, Y. Nakayama and Y. Tachikawa, *Fermionic Minimal Models*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** (2021) 195701 [[2002.12283](#)].
- [33] J. Kulp, *Two more fermionic minimal models*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2021** (2021) 124 [[2003.04278](#)].
- [34] P. Boyle Smith, *Boundary States and Anomalous Symmetries of Fermionic Minimal Models*, *arXiv e-prints* (2021) [arXiv:2102.02203](#) [[2102.02203](#)].
- [35] I. Runkel, L. Szegedy and G.M.T. Watts, *Parity and spin CFT with boundaries and defects*, *SciPost Physics* **15** (2023) 207 [[2210.01057](#)].
- [36] A. Kapustin and N. Saulina, *Topological boundary conditions in abelian Chern-Simons theory*, *Nuclear Physics B* **845** (2011) 393 [[1008.0654](#)].
- [37] A. Kitaev and L. Kong, *Models for Gapped Boundaries and Domain Walls*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **313** (2012) 351 [[1104.5047](#)].
- [38] L. Kong, *Anyon condensation and tensor categories*, *Nuclear Physics B* **886** (2014) 436 [[1307.8244](#)].
- [39] P. Etingof, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych and V. Ostrik, *Tensor Categories*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, American Mathematical Society (2016).
- [40] M. Levin, *Protected Edge Modes without Symmetry*, *Phys. Rev. X* **3** (2013) 021009 [[1301.7355](#)].
- [41] H. Watanabe, *A Proof of the Bloch Theorem for Lattice Models*, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **177** (2019) 717 [[1904.02700](#)].
- [42] A. Kapustin and L. Spodyneiko, *Absence of Energy Currents in an Equilibrium State and Chiral Anomalies*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123** (2019) 060601 [[1904.05491](#)].
- [43] D.V. Else and T. Senthil, *Critical drag as a mechanism for resistivity*, *Phys. Rev. B* **104** (2021) 205132 [[2106.15623](#)].
- [44] H. Watanabe, *Bloch theorem in the presence of an additional conserved charge*, *Phys. Rev. Research* **4** (2022) 013043 [[2107.05211](#)].
- [45] T.H. Hansson, V. Oganesyan and S.L. Sondhi, *Superconductors are topologically ordered*, *Annals of Physics* **313** (2004) 497 [[cond-mat/0404327](#)].
- [46] Y. Choi, B.C. Raychaudhuri, Y. Sanghavi and S.-H. Shao, *Remarks on boundaries, anomalies, and noninvertible symmetries*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 125005 [[2305.09713](#)].
- [47] J. Kirillov, Alexander, *On  $G$ -equivariant modular categories*, *arXiv Mathematics e-prints* (2004) [math/0401119](#) [[math/0401119](#)].

- [48] C. Heinrich and M. Levin, *Criteria for protected edge modes with  $Z_2$  symmetry*, *Phys. Rev. B* **98** (2018) 035101 [[1803.00023](#)].
- [49] R. Kobayashi, T. Wang, T. Soejima, R.S.K. Mong and S. Ryu, *Higher Hall conductivity from a single wave function: Obstructions to symmetry-preserving gapped edge of  $(2+1)D$  topological order*, *arXiv e-prints* (2024) [arXiv:2404.10814](#) [[2404.10814](#)].
- [50] M. Buican and R. Radhakrishnan, *Galois orbits of TQFTs: symmetries and unitarity*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2022** (2022) 4 [[2109.02766](#)].
- [51] E. Frenkel and D. Ben-Zvi, *Vertex Algebras and Algebraic Curves*, Mathematical surveys and monographs, American Mathematical Society (2004).
- [52] J. Fuchs, C. Schweigert, S. Wood and Y. Yang, *Algebraic structures in two-dimensional conformal field theory*, *arXiv e-prints* (2023) [arXiv:2305.02773](#) [[2305.02773](#)].
- [53] J. Fröhlich, J. Fuchs, I. Runkel and C. Schweigert, *Duality and defects in rational conformal field theory*, *Nuclear Physics B* **763** (2007) 354 [[hep-th/0607247](#)].
- [54] S.-H. Shao, *What's done cannot be undone: Tasi lectures on non-invertible symmetry*, 2023.
- [55] M. Sinha, F. Yan, L. Grans-Samuelssohn, A. Roy and H. Saleur, *Lattice realizations of topological defects in the critical  $(1+1)$ -d three-state Potts model*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2024** (2024) 225 [[2310.19703](#)].
- [56] P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu and D. Sénéchal, *Modular invariance*, in *Conformal Field Theory*, (New York, NY), pp. 335–408, Springer New York (1997), [DOI](#).
- [57] I. Runkel, *Structure constants for the  $D$ -series Virasoro minimal models*, *Nuclear Physics B* **579** (2000) 561 [[hep-th/9908046](#)].
- [58] M.R. Gaberdiel and A. Recknagel, *Conformal boundary states for free bosons and fermions*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2001** (2001) 016 [[hep-th/0108238](#)].
- [59] J. Fuchs, M.R. Gaberdiel, I. Runkel and C. Schweigert, *Topological defects for the free boson CFT*, *Journal of Physics A Mathematical General* **40** (2007) 11403 [[0705.3129](#)].
- [60] C.-M. Chang, Y.-H. Lin, S.-H. Shao, Y. Wang and X. Yin, *Topological defect lines and renormalization group flows in two dimensions*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2019** (2019) 26 [[1802.04445](#)].
- [61] Y.-Z. Huang, *Vertex operator algebras, the Verlinde conjecture, and modular tensor categories*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **102** (2005) 5352 [[math/0412261](#)].