

# Locally Purified Density Operators for Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases in Mixed States

Yuchen Guo,<sup>1,\*</sup> Jian-Hao Zhang,<sup>2,\*</sup> Hao-Ran Zhang,<sup>1</sup> Shuo Yang,<sup>1,3,†</sup> and Zhen Bi<sup>2,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*State Key Laboratory of Low-Dimensional Quantum Physics,*

*Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802, USA*

<sup>3</sup>*Frontier Science Center for Quantum Information, Beijing, China*

(Dated: May 20, 2024)

We propose a tensor network approach known as the locally purified density operator (LPDO) to investigate the classification and characterization of symmetry-protected topological (SPT) phases in open quantum systems. We extend the concept of injectivity, originally associated with matrix product states and projected entangled pair states, to LPDOs in  $(1+1)D$  and  $(2+1)D$  systems, unveiling two distinct types of injectivity conditions inherent in short-range entangled density matrices. Within the LPDO framework, we outline a classification scheme for decohered average symmetry-protected topological (ASPT) phases, consistent with earlier results obtained through spectrum sequence techniques. We first illustrate our framework with ASPT phases protected by fermion parity symmetry, then extend the classification of ASPT phases to a general group extension. We demonstrate examples of explicit construction of fixed-point LPDOs for ASPT phases including intrinsic ASPTs in both  $(1+1)D$  and  $(2+1)D$  systems.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Topological phases of matter have emerged as a central focus in condensed matter physics over recent decades. In particular, the revealing of long-range entanglement patterns in many-body states has become a fundamental physical mechanism for comprehending topologically ordered phases [1–3]. Furthermore, quantum states without intrinsic topological order can also bear nontrivial topological properties when systems host certain global symmetries, known as *symmetry-protected topological (SPT)* phases [4–11]. Among the prominent examples of SPT phases lies the topological insulators [12, 13], protected by both time-reversal symmetry and  $U(1)$  charge conservation symmetry.

The study of these novel phases reveals the elegant structure of many-body topology in pure states. However, the inherent exchange of energy and particles between a quantum system and its surrounding environment generally leaves the system as a mixed state. In recent years, open quantum systems have garnered considerable attention across diverse disciplines, encompassing condensed matter theory, quantum computing, and quantum information [14–21]. Exploring topological phases in mixed states provides insight into the impact of quantum decoherence and the durability of topological phases. These investigations could lead to the development of resilient quantum information processing and error correction strategies in the upcoming technological advances. Furthermore, open systems have the potential to uncover new quantum phenomena and phases

that are not observable in closed systems [22–25], thus significantly broadening our fundamental understanding of many-body topology.

An intriguing direction of research is the generalization of SPT phases within the realm of open quantum systems. A significant difference between the symmetry structure of pure states and mixed states is that mixed states can host two types of global symmetries that are referred to as *strong (exact) symmetry* (we label it  $K$  for the rest of the paper) and *weak (average) symmetry* (labeled as  $G$ ). A strong symmetry dictates that  $\rho$  remains invariant under the action of a symmetry operator  $U(k)$  solely on one side, as expressed by

$$U(k)\rho = e^{i\theta}\rho. \quad (1)$$

In fact, all symmetries within pure states can be thought of as strong symmetries. However, certain local decoherence can disrupt a part of the strong symmetry, leading to a weak symmetry in mixed states. A weak symmetry requires that  $\rho$  be not invariant under the one-side action of the symmetry but only remains invariant under the simultaneous actions of the symmetry operators  $U(g)$  on both sides, namely

$$U(g)\rho U(g)^\dagger = \rho. \quad (2)$$

The weak symmetry can be interpreted as a statistical symmetry within the ensemble of quantum channels the system navigates through.

Recently, the concept of *average symmetry-protected topological (ASPT)* phases has been a pioneering development in the field of symmetry-protected topology in mixed quantum states [26–32]. These phases in mixed states are jointly protected by strong and weak symmetries. An intriguing phenomenon revealed by a previous study[30] is the existence of possible ASPT phases that lack a pure state correspondence, which means that

\* These authors contributed equally

† shuoyang@tsinghua.edu.cn

‡ zjb5184@psu.edu



with the following graphical representation

$$\mathbb{E} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \boxed{A} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \boxed{A^*} \text{---} \end{array} . \quad (8)$$

The correlation length is determined by  $\xi = -1/\log(|\lambda_2|/|\lambda_1|)$ , where  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  denote the largest and second largest eigenvalues in magnitude, respectively, of the transfer matrix  $\mathbb{E}$ . Consequently, a finite correlation length  $\xi$  corresponds to a nondegenerate transfer matrix  $\mathbb{E}$ . Indeed, the nondegeneracy of a transfer matrix serves as an equivalent definition of the injectivity of an MPS [33, 37].

From a general perspective, in  $(1+1)D$  systems, intrinsic topological order is absent [3], leading to the categorization of gapped quantum phases into two classes: short-range correlated states and long-range correlated states. The former class is characterized by injective MPS, including trivial product states, which can be transformed into each other via finite-depth local unitary (FDLU) circuits [3]. By imposing symmetry constraints and studying the symmetry actions on MPS representation, a comprehensive characterization of the SPT phases in  $(1+1)D$  can be achieved [4, 5]. Conversely, long-range correlated states are associated with the concept of spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB). An illustrious example within this category is the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state, which can be represented by a non-injective MPS with  $D = 2$ .

### B. $(1+1)D$ Bosonic SPT: Projective representation on virtual indices

When constrained to symmetric FDLU circuits, distinct short-range correlated states manifesting nontrivial SPT order are further distinguished as different quantum phases.

In a  $(1+1)D$  system with symmetry group  $K$ , the onsite symmetry action on the physical index of the local tensor forms a linear representation of the symmetry group, expressed as

$$U(k_1)U(k_2) = U(k_1 k_2), \quad k_1, k_2 \in K. \quad (9)$$

For a symmetric MPS, the symmetry action on the physical index induces a gauge transformation  $V(k)$  on the virtual indices, depicted as

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \boxed{A} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \boxed{A^*} \text{---} \end{array} \xrightarrow{U_k} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \boxed{A} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \boxed{A^*} \text{---} \end{array} \xrightarrow{V_k^{-1}} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \boxed{A} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \boxed{A^*} \text{---} \end{array} \xrightarrow{V_k} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \boxed{A} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \boxed{A^*} \text{---} \end{array} . \quad (10)$$

With the injectivity condition, the transformation  $V(k)$  on the virtual index is uniquely determined up to a phase for a given MPS.

Applying Eq. (9) to the physical index of a local tensor induces transformations  $V(k_1)V(k_2)$  and  $V(k_1 k_2)$  on the right virtual index, respectively. As these two tensors are identical, transformations on the virtual index should be equivalent up to a  $U(1)$  phase

$$V(k_1)V(k_2) = \mu_2(k_1, k_2)V(k_1 k_2), \quad \mu_2(k_1, k_2) \in U(1). \quad (11)$$

Thus,  $V(k)$  adheres to group multiplication up to a phase factor, constituting a projective representation of the symmetry group  $K$ . Moreover, sequential application of  $U(k_3)$ ,  $U(k_2)$ , and  $U(k_1)$  results in the transformation on the virtual index as  $V(k_1)V(k_2)V(k_3)$ . Ensuring consistency via the associativity condition yields

$$\frac{\mu_2(k_1, k_2)\mu_2(k_1 k_2, k_3)}{\mu_2(k_1, k_2 k_3)\mu_2(k_2, k_3)} = 1, \quad (12)$$

indicating that  $\mu_2$  satisfies the 2-cocycle condition. We assert that  $\mu_2(k_1, k_2)$  serves as the topological invariant of  $(1+1)D$  SPT phases, which may differ by a 2-coboundary  $\eta_2(k_1, k_2)$ . Here  $\eta_2(k_1, k_2)$  arises as the image of a 1-cochain  $\mu_1(k) : K \rightarrow U(1)$  under a coboundary map

$$\eta_2(k_1, k_2) = \frac{\mu_1(k_1)\mu_1(k_2)}{\mu_1(k_1 k_2)}. \quad (13)$$

Different classes of phase structure  $\mu_2(k_1, k_2)$  correspond to different SPT phases, identified by the second group cohomology  $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2[K, U(1)]$  [8].

In summary, the symmetry action on the virtual indices of an injective MPS offers an intuitive and comprehensive approach to the classification and construction of SPT phases.

## III. LOCALLY PURIFIED DENSITY OPERATORS IN $(1+1)D$

In this section, we discuss the definition of LPDO in  $(1+1)D$  systems, representing a universal tensor network structure that is adept at describing short-range correlated density matrices.

### A. Definition of LPDO

A mixed-state density matrix  $\rho$  can be effectively represented by an MPDO as [51]

$$\rho = \sum_{\{i_j, i'_j\}} \text{Tr} \left( A^{i_1 i'_1} \dots A^{i_N i'_N} \right) |i_1 \dots i_N\rangle \langle i'_1 \dots i'_N|, \quad (14)$$

where  $A$  is a rank-4 tensor featuring two physical indices  $i$  and  $i'$ , along with two virtual indices  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  at each site

$$A = \sum_{\alpha\beta ii'} A_{\alpha\beta}^{ii'} |i\rangle\langle i'| (\alpha|\beta| = \begin{array}{c} |i\rangle \\ \boxed{A} \\ \langle i'| \end{array} \quad (15)$$

However, a general MPDO lacks the capability to accurately capture essential properties of a density matrix, such as Hermiticity and semidefinite positivity, solely through conditions imposed on local tensors. Furthermore, the entanglement structure of a mixed state is inadequately represented by the virtual indices of an MPDO, unlike the clarity achieved in the pure state case with MPS, as both quantum entanglement and classical correlation contribute to the virtual spaces. Hence, while the MPDO structure offers a compact representation and efficient algorithms for studying and simulating many-body open systems [60, 61], its ambiguous physical interpretation, particularly concerning the role of virtual indices, hampers its utility for the classification of quantum phases and topological matter in open systems.

Fortunately, a significant subclass of MPDOs exists, known as LPDOs, which exhibit a much clearer entanglement structure and can be interpreted as locally purifying a mixed state [51–53]. To elucidate further, let us commence with a pure state  $|\psi_{p\otimes a}\rangle$  belonging to the composite Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_p \otimes \mathcal{H}_a$ , taking the form of the following MPS

$$|\psi_{p\otimes a}\rangle = \cdots \text{---} \begin{array}{c} p \quad a \\ \boxed{A} \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} p \quad a \\ \boxed{A} \end{array} \text{---} \cdots, \quad (16)$$

where  $p$  denotes the physical degrees of freedom and  $a$  denotes the ancillary degrees of freedom. Subsequently, an LPDO is constructed by tracing out the ancillae  $a$ , resulting in

$$\rho = \text{Tr}_a (|\psi_{p\otimes a}\rangle\langle\psi_{p\otimes a}|). \quad (17)$$

In other words, an LPDO has an alternative graphical representation

$$\rho = \cdots \begin{array}{c} p \\ \boxed{A} \\ a \\ \boxed{A^*} \\ p \end{array} \text{---} \begin{array}{c} p \\ \boxed{A} \\ a \\ \boxed{A^*} \\ p \end{array} \text{---} \cdots, \quad (18)$$

where the inner index  $a$  is termed the ‘‘Kraus index’’ with dimension  $d_\kappa$ , which signifies the classical mixture of distinct quantum states.




FIG. 1. Transfer matrices corresponding to (a) weak injectivity in Eq. (21) and (b) strong injectivity in Eq. (30) respectively.

It is essential to note that each physical index is accompanied by a Kraus index, representing the environmental degree of freedom. Hence,  $|\psi_{p\otimes a}\rangle$  in Eq. (16) serves as a local purification of the density matrix  $\rho$  within the LPDO framework. Analogous to the well-established connection between the locality of interaction and the efficient MPS representation, achieving local purification requires locality between system and environment, ensuring that the system spins only interact with adjacent ancillae.

## B. The weak injectivity condition

In the pure state scenario discussed in Section II, non-trivial SPT phases arise from the class of short-range correlated states, or injective MPSs. These states, without symmetry constraints, can be transformed into trivial product states under FDLU circuits. Incorporating symmetries, the injectivity of the MPS yields a unique mapping from the symmetry transformation in the physical space to that on the virtual space, facilitating the classification of SPT phases in pure states. Therefore, the extension of the injective condition to LPDO becomes essential.

In our investigation, we identify two versions of the injectivity conditions linked with LPDOs, crucial for mitigating the presence of topological or long-range order phenomena that could potentially compromise the symmetry preservation inherent to ASPT phases. Within this section, our initial focus is on the weak injectivity condition, defined for the purified MPS as described in Eq. (16).

*Definition* (Weak injectivity condition) An LPDO is deemed weakly injective provided that the corresponding

purified MPS in Eq. (16) exhibits injectivity, wherein its local tensor forms an injective map

$$A_{\alpha\beta}^{p,a} : (\mathbb{C}^D)^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{d_p} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_\kappa})^{\otimes L}. \quad (19)$$

Returning to the purified MPS in Eq. (16) and leveraging the resemblance between the weak injectivity of LPDO and injectivity of MPS, one can directly illustrate that for a weakly injective LPDO, the two-point correlation function of the mixed state  $\rho$

$$\begin{aligned} C^{(1)}(i, j) &\equiv \text{Tr}(\rho O_i O_j) - \text{Tr}(\rho O_i) \text{Tr}(\rho O_j) \\ &= \langle \psi_{p \otimes a} | O_i^p O_j^p | \psi_{p \otimes a} \rangle \\ &\quad - \langle \psi_{p \otimes a} | O_i^p | \psi_{p \otimes a} \rangle \langle \psi_{p \otimes a} | O_j^p | \psi_{p \otimes a} \rangle \\ &\sim e^{-|i-j|/\xi} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

decays exponentially with distance. This necessitates that the transfer matrix

$$\mathbb{E} = \sum_{p,a} A_{\alpha^u \beta^u}^{p,a} A_{\alpha^l \beta^l}^{*p,a}, \quad (21)$$

depicted graphically in Fig. 1(a) possesses a non-degenerate spectrum, aligning with the conventional injectivity condition for the purified state.

Through the application of the weak injectivity condition, it becomes apparent that the LPDO formulated in this context can be linked bi-directionally to a trivial product state utilizing finite-depth local quantum channels. This implies that LPDOs conforming to the weak injectivity condition signify density matrices with short-range entanglement and correlations.

Firstly, it is straightforward to establish that an LPDO can be derived from a trivial product state through the utilization of a finite-depth local quantum channel. This quantum channel can be obtained by executing an FDLU circuit across both the physical and ancillary spaces, followed by the subsequent elimination of the ancillary degrees of freedom. The weak injectivity property of an LPDO implies that its purification, denoted as  $|\psi_{p \otimes a}\rangle$ , can be adiabatically connected via FDLU circuits to a trivial product state within the composite Hilbert space that encompasses both physical and ancillary degrees of freedom. This connection is succinctly expressed as:

$$|\psi_{p \otimes a}\rangle = U |0\rangle_p \otimes |0\rangle_a. \quad (22)$$

Hence, we achieve a clear and explicit construction of the quantum channel that facilitates the trajectory from the trivial product state to an LPDO.

$$\rho_{\text{LPDO}} = \text{Tr}_a (U |0\rangle_p \langle 0|_p \otimes |0\rangle_a \langle 0|_a U^\dagger). \quad (23)$$

Conversely, it is always feasible to convert a density matrix into a trivial product state applying a local amplitude damping channel [62]

$$|0\rangle\langle 0| = \left( \bigotimes_{i=1}^N \mathcal{E}_i \right) (\rho), \quad (24)$$

where the Kraus operators for  $\mathcal{E}_i$  at each site  $i$  are defined as follows

$$K_1 = |0\rangle\langle 0|, K_2 = |0\rangle\langle 1|. \quad (25)$$

In summary, weakly injective LPDOs describe density matrices entangled over short ranges, a fundamental prerequisite for decohered ASPTs.

### C. The strong injectivity condition

In essence, the presence of a weakly injective LPDO precludes the emergence of a long-range order within linear correlation functions for the density matrix. Consequently, this mechanism serves to avert conventional instances of spontaneous symmetry breaking within mixed states. However, recent studies [30, 63–65] underscore the possibility of a more subtle manifestation of symmetry-breaking patterns within mixed states. Specifically, it has been shown that it is possible to engineer mixed states exhibiting short-range entanglement, while spontaneously breaking a strong symmetry to a weak counterpart. Such intricate patterns elude detection by conventional means, such as the linear two-point correlation function for the density matrix. In order to comprehensively address symmetric mixed states, it becomes imperative to preclude the prospect of such strong-to-weak symmetry-breaking orders. Consequently, there arises the need for a stringent criterion, which we refer to as the strong injectivity condition.


It is convenient to introduce the strong injectivity condition within the double space formalism. Let us assume that the spectrum decomposition of the density matrix is given by

$$\rho = \sum_k \lambda_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|. \quad (26)$$

The (unnormalized) double state for the mixed state is defined as

$$|\rho\rangle\rangle = \sum_k \lambda_k |\psi_k\rangle \otimes |\psi_k^*\rangle, \quad (27)$$

which can be graphically depicted as



$$|\rho\rangle\rangle = \dots \quad (28)$$

Utilizing the concept of the double state, the strong injectivity condition for an LPDO is defined as follows:



*Definition* (Strong injectivity condition) An LPDO is deemed strongly injective if its corresponding double state  $|\rho\rangle\rangle$  is an injective MPS, or equivalently, its local tensor given by

$$\sum_a A_{\alpha^u \beta^u}^{p,a} A_{\alpha^l \beta^l}^{*p',a} : (\mathbb{C}^D)^{\otimes 4} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{d_p})^{\otimes 2L} \quad (29)$$

forms an injective map.

The strong injectivity condition can be equivalently stated as the non-degeneracy condition concerning the following transfer matrix (as shown in Fig. 1(b))

$$\mathbb{E}^{(2)} = \sum_{p,a,p',a'} A_{\alpha^u \beta^u}^{p,a} A_{\alpha^l \beta^l}^{*p',a} A_{\alpha^u \beta^u}^{p',a'} A_{\alpha^l \beta^l}^{*p,a'}. \quad (30)$$

It implies the Rényi-2 correlation function, defined as

$$\begin{aligned} C^{(2)}(i,j) &\equiv \frac{\text{Tr}(\rho O_i O_j \rho O_i O_j) - \text{Tr}(\rho O_i \rho O_i) \text{Tr}(\rho O_j \rho O_j)}{\text{Tr}(\rho^2)} \\ &= \langle\langle \rho | O_i O_j \otimes O_i^* O_j^* | \rho \rangle\rangle \\ &\quad - \langle\langle \rho | O_i \otimes O_i^* | \rho \rangle\rangle \langle\langle \rho | O_j \otimes O_j^* | \rho \rangle\rangle \\ &\sim e^{-|i-j|/\xi'}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

decays exponentially with distance. In fact, while the Rényi-2 correlation function appears as an ordinary two-point correlation function in the double state  $|\rho\rangle\rangle$ , it manifests itself as a non-linear entity within the original density matrix representation. Contrary to the weak injective condition, which imposes no restrictions on the values of such correlation functions, the absence of strong-to-weak symmetry breaking within the mixed state requires the exponential decay of  $C^{(2)}$ . Consequently, the imposition of the strong injectivity condition becomes imperative in ensuring this decay behavior.

In summary, by imposing the two aforementioned injectivity conditions, we effectively preclude<sup>1</sup> any long-range order that could cause the breakdown of either strong or weak symmetries inherent within the LPDO. This facilitates our analysis and classification of short-range correlated mixed states while conserving both strong and weak symmetries.

#### D. Symmetries in the LPDO representations


With the weak and strong injectivity conditions established for LPDOs, we proceed to formulate the actions of

the strong and weak symmetries on the density matrix. To illustrate the distinctions between these two types of symmetries, we focus on the upper half of the LPDO as outlined in Eq. (18).

The density matrix remains invariant under the implementation of a strong (exact) symmetry  $U(k)$  on one side, characterized by the operation

$$U(k)\rho = e^{i\theta} \rho. \quad (32)$$

In essence, the action of strong symmetry is independent of the Kraus index governing the classical mixture of various components, rendering the transformation of the local tensor as




$$\text{Diagram: } \text{---} \boxed{A} \text{---} = e^{i\theta_k} \text{---} \boxed{A} \text{---} \quad (33)$$

In this context,  $U(k)$  denotes the strong symmetry action operating on the physical index, while  $V(k)$  represents the corresponding gauge transformation acting on the virtual index. The weak injectivity condition ensures the uniqueness, up to a phase factor, of  $V(k)$ , given that the symmetry action on the Kraus index is restricted to remain as the identity.

Conversely, the weak (average) symmetry  $U(g)$  requires application on both sides of a density matrix, expressed as

$$U(g)\rho U(g)^\dagger = \rho. \quad (34)$$

Thus, the symmetry action on an LPDO is visually depicted as



$$\text{Diagram: } \text{---} \boxed{A} \text{---} = e^{i\theta_g} \text{---} \boxed{A} \text{---} \quad (35)$$

In contrast to the strong symmetry scenario, in the case of weak symmetry, an additional symmetry transformation  $M(g)$  operates on the Kraus index. Moreover, the application of weak symmetry operators on both sides must maintain the invariance of the density matrix, as

<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting a subtlety in this discourse: the decay of the Rényi-2 correlators serves as a necessary condition for the absence of strong-to-weak symmetry breaking in mixed states. However, whether it suffices is not yet clear [65]. However, as we will elucidate later, the combination of these two injectivity conditions allows us to derive accurate classification data for decohered ASPT phases, particularly in dimensions  $(1+1)D$  and  $(2+1)D$ . Therefore, we conjecture that these two conditions suffice for the proposed classification framework.

depicted in the following figure

$$(36)$$

necessitating  $M(g)$  to be a unitary operator satisfying that  $M(g)^\dagger M(g) = I$ , ensuring the preservation of symmetry when applied to both sides of the density matrix.

Now, we argue that with combined weak and strong injectivity conditions, the gauge transformation  $V(g)$  on the virtual index becomes uniquely determined (up to a phase) for a given  $U(g)$ , although  $M(g)$  may not possess uniqueness. To begin with, if the LPDO is weakly injective, then  $V(g)$  is uniquely determined for fixed  $U(g)$  and  $M(g)$ . Let us assume there exist two sets of solutions for Eq. (35) corresponding to the same  $U(g)$ , denoted as  $\{M_1(g), V_1(g)\}$  and  $\{M_2(g), V_2(g)\}$ , where the representations  $V_1(g)$  and  $V_2(g)$  are linearly independent operators in the virtual space. Next, consider the simultaneous implementation of  $U(g)$  on the upper and lower sides of the LPDO, inducing a transformation  $\bar{V}(g)$  supported on the joint space of the upper and lower indices. With the strong injectivity condition ensured, such gauge transformation is also unique, leading to

$$V_1(g) \otimes V_1^*(g) = \bar{V}(g) = V_2(g) \otimes V_2^*(g), \quad (37)$$

from which we deduce that  $V_1(g) = V_2(g)$ . Consequently, the weak symmetry action on virtual indices is uniquely defined for an LPDO that satisfies both weak and strong injectivity conditions.

### E. ASPT protected by strong and weak symmetries

In this section, we aim to demonstrate that a nontrivial ASPT phase necessitates protection from both strong and weak symmetries.

#### 1. Only strong symmetry $K$

We first consider the scenario where only a strong symmetry group  $K$  is present. In this case, the classification mirrors that of pure-state SPT phases protected by the same symmetry group. Similar to the pure state case, the symmetry action  $U(k)$  on physical indices forms a linear representation of  $K$  akin to Eq. (9). Subsequently, we consider the sequential implementation of two symmetry

operations  $U(k_2)$  and  $U(k_1)$  ( $k_1, k_2 \in K$ ) on the physical index, which is equivalent to the symmetry operation  $U(k_1 k_2)$ . According to Eq. (33), these transformations yield  $V(k_1)V(k_2)$  and  $V(k_1 k_2)$  on the right virtual index, respectively. Since these resulting tensors must be identical, we deduce

$$V(k_1)V(k_2) = \mu_2(k_1, k_2)V(k_1 k_2), \quad \mu_2(k_1, k_2) \in U(1). \quad (38)$$

Furthermore, considering different orders to combine three transformations  $V(k_1)$ ,  $V(k_2)$ , and  $V(k_3)$  in the virtual index, we obtain the same consistency condition as that in Eq. (12), implying that  $\mu_2$  forms a 2-cocycle characterized by  $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2[K, U(1)]$ . Therefore, if only a strong symmetry is present, the classification of ASPT phases mirrors that of SPT phases in pure states.

However, it is crucial to note that the validity of the above classification is based on the constraint that the symmetry action  $U(k)$  can only be applied to one side of the density matrix, and the phase structures on the upper and lower virtual indices are separate and well defined individually. Continuing, we will now elucidate how the scenario changes drastically in the absence of strong symmetry and when only weak symmetry is present.

#### 2. Only weak symmetry $G$

In the scenario where a mixed state is solely protected by a weak symmetry group  $G$ , the symmetry action on the physical index still forms a linear representation of  $G$ , expressed as

$$U(g)U(h) = U(gh), \quad g, h \in G. \quad (39)$$

Now, let us apply both sides of the above equation to the physical index. Following the symmetry transformation rule delineated in Eq. (35), the former induces the transformation  $V(g)V(h)$  on the right virtual index and the transformation  $M(g)M(h)$  on the Kraus index, while the latter results in  $V(gh)$  and  $M(gh)$  on these two indices. Given that these two tensors are completely identical,  $V(g)$  and  $M(g)$  must adhere to the following conditions

$$V(g)V(h) = \nu_2(g, h)V(gh), \quad \nu_2(g, h) \in U(1) \quad (40)$$

$$M(g)M(h) = M(gh). \quad (41)$$

Here there could be a phase ambiguity for  $V$  since  $\nu_2$  on the right virtual index cancels with  $\nu_2^{-1}$  on the left side, while the transformation on the Kraus index cannot differ a phase factor. Therefore,  $V(g)$  forms a projective representation of  $G$  with the phase structure characterized by  $\nu_2$ , while  $M(g)$  forms a linear representation of  $G$  that facilitates permutation between different components within the density matrix.

However, due to the requirement that weak symmetry must be applied simultaneously to both the upper and lower sides of an LPDO to ensure its invariance, the virtual index on the lower side of the LPDO will exhibit

a conjugate phase ambiguity of  $\nu_2^{-1}$ . Specifically, when also sequentially applying  $U(h)^*$  and  $U(g)^*$  to the lower physical index, we have

$$V(g)^*V(h)^* = \nu_2(g, h)^{-1}V(gh)^*. \quad (42)$$

Consequently, the cumulative phase ambiguity on virtual indices cancels out between the upper and lower virtual legs, suggesting the absence of nontrivial ASPT states in the presence of solely weak symmetry. Another perspective on this is that the state in the double space  $|\rho\rangle\rangle$  becomes trivial since there is no projective representation on the composed virtual leg. As a result, the corresponding density matrix is also trivial.


### 3. Both strong and weak symmetries

Finally, let us illustrate that if the system is jointly protected by strong symmetry  $K$  and weak symmetry  $G$ , distinct ASPT phases can emerge, characterized by the phase structure of the entire group  $\tilde{G}$ . We would like to emphasize that, in this context, we only consider a simple case where  $\tilde{G} = K \times G$  and treat  $\tilde{G}$  as a unified entity to engage in abstract discussions regarding its phase structure. However, in subsequent sections, we will discuss a general group extension  $\tilde{G}$  from  $K$  and  $G$  and explore the intricate internal structures of  $\tilde{G}$ , particularly the complex interplay between  $K$  and  $G$ .

The group element  $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{G}$  is defined as  $\tilde{g} = (k, g)$  with  $k \in K$  and  $g \in G$ . We require that the symmetry action  $\tilde{U}(\tilde{g})$  on the physical index forms a linear representation of  $\tilde{G}$ , i.e.,

$$\tilde{U}(\tilde{g})\tilde{U}(\tilde{g}') = \tilde{U}(\tilde{g}\tilde{g}'). \quad (43)$$

The symmetry action of  $\tilde{U}(\tilde{g})$  on the physical index is depicted as



where  $\tilde{V}(\tilde{g})$  and  $\tilde{M}(\tilde{g})$  are the gauge transformations on the virtual and Kraus indices respectively. Similar to the previous argument for weak symmetry,  $\tilde{V}(\tilde{g})$  and  $\tilde{M}(\tilde{g})$  satisfy the following conditions

$$\tilde{V}(\tilde{g})\tilde{V}(\tilde{g}') = \tilde{\nu}_2(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}')\tilde{V}(\tilde{g}\tilde{g}'), \quad \tilde{\nu}_2(\tilde{g}, \tilde{g}') \in U(1) \quad (45)$$

$$\tilde{M}(\tilde{g})\tilde{M}(\tilde{g}') = \tilde{M}(\tilde{g}\tilde{g}'). \quad (46)$$

indicating that  $\tilde{V}(\tilde{g})$  forms a projective representation of  $\tilde{G}$  characterized by  $\tilde{\nu}_2 \in U(1)$  and  $\tilde{M}(\tilde{g})$  forms a linear representation of  $\tilde{G}$ .

Consider a strong symmetry operator  $\tilde{U}[(k, 1)]$  ( $k \in K$ ) acting on the upper physical index, followed by two weak symmetry operators  $\tilde{U}[(1, h)]$  and  $\tilde{U}[(1, g)]$  ( $g, h \in G$ ) acting on the physical indices on both sides sequentially. These operations are equivalent to the symmetry operation  $\tilde{U}[(k, gh)]$  on the upper physical index and only to the operation  $\tilde{U}[(1, gh)]$  on the lower physical index. On the upper side of the LPDO,  $\tilde{V}(\tilde{g})$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{V}[(1, g)]\tilde{V}[(1, h)]\tilde{V}[(k, 1)] \\ &= \tilde{\nu}_2[(1, g), (1, h)]\tilde{\nu}_2[(1, gh), (k, 1)]\tilde{V}[(k, gh)]. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Similarly,  $\tilde{V}(\tilde{g})$  on the lower side of LPDO satisfies

$$\tilde{V}[(1, g)]^*\tilde{V}[(1, h)]^* = \tilde{\nu}_2^{-1}[(1, g), (1, h)]\tilde{V}[(1, gh)]^*. \quad (48)$$

From Eqs. (47) and (48), we observe a nontrivial total phase ambiguity  $\tilde{\nu}_2[(1, gh), (k, 1)]$  remaining uncanceled on virtual indices. This suggests the potential existence of a nontrivial ASPT phase characterized by the phase structure involving both the strong and the weak symmetries.

In summary, a nontrivial ASPT order requires protection from both strong symmetry  $K$  and weak symmetry  $G$ . As we encounter a combination of weak and strong symmetry groups (potentially constituting a nontrivial extension structure), we will delve into a formalism in the following sections that treat the two groups in slightly distinct manners. This approach facilitates the manifestation of the decorated domain wall picture for ASPTs.

## IV. WARMUP: CLASSIFICATION OF $(1+1)D$ ASPT WITH STRONG FERMION PARITY SYMMETRY

As a preliminary example, we will consider systems characterized by strong  $K = \mathbb{Z}_2^f$  fermion parity symmetry and weak bosonic  $G = G_b$  symmetry. In other words, we assume that all bosonic symmetries are broken down to weak symmetry due to decoherence, while only the fermion parity symmetry remains strong. In the following section, we will extend the discussion to generalize the strong symmetry to an arbitrary abelian symmetry group  $K$ .

### A. $(1+1)D$ fermionic SPT phases: Supervector spaces and twisted boundary conditions

To begin, we briefly revisit the structure of fermionic MPS (fMPS) and the classification of SPT phases protected by symmetry groups that incorporate fermion parity symmetry  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$  in  $(1+1)D$  [66–68]. Subsequently, we



will employ analogous techniques to address fermionic LPDO (fLPDO).

The complete symmetry group of a fermionic system comprises a bosonic symmetry  $G_b$  and the fermion parity symmetry  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ , featuring a central extension of  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$  by  $G_b$  with the subsequent short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^f \rightarrow G_f \rightarrow G_b \rightarrow 1. \quad (49)$$

Such a group structure is characterized by the factor system  $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2(G_b, \mathbb{Z}_2^f)$ , subject to the 2-cocycle condition

$$\omega_2(g, h) + \omega_2(gh, l) = \omega_2(g, hl) + \omega_2(h, l) \pmod{2}. \quad (50)$$

A nontrivial  $\omega_2$  means a nontrivial group extension of  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$  by  $G_b$ .

In the following classification, we will address fermion parity and bosonic symmetry separately. Initially, let us focus on the fermion parity symmetry. To achieve this, we need to extend the vector space used in the definition of MPS to a graded supervector space  $V$  with a direct sum form

$$V = V^0 \oplus V^1, \quad (51)$$

where the vectors in  $V^0/V^1$  exhibit even/odd fermion parity. The fermion parity of a vector  $|i\rangle$  is denoted by  $|i| \in \{0, 1\}$ . We can define a fermion parity symmetry operator  $P_f$  whose action on the vector  $|i\rangle$  is given by

$$P_f |i\rangle = (-1)^{|i|} |i\rangle, \quad (52)$$

or equivalently

$$P_f = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{bmatrix} \quad (53)$$

for the vector space in Eq. (51). The direct product of the vectors  $|i\rangle$  and  $|j\rangle$  possesses fermion parity  $|i| + |j| \pmod{2}$ . We denote the graded tensor product as

$$|i\rangle \otimes_g |j\rangle \in V \otimes_g V, \quad (54)$$


where the label  $g$  highlights the tensor product's graded structure. Due to the fermionic nature of this graded structure, we can define a fermion reordering operator as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} : V \otimes_g W &\rightarrow W \otimes_g V \\ |i\rangle \otimes_g |j\rangle &\mapsto (-1)^{|i||j|} |j\rangle \otimes_g |i\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

With these ingredients, we are ready to define fMPS. The formal definition of fMPS has the same form as that in Eq. (4), however, the vector spaces of the physical index and virtual indices are replaced by the supervectors with the graded structure. A given local tensor (as in Eq. (4)) should preserve the fermion parity symmetry, namely  $|i| = (|\beta| - |\alpha|) \pmod{2}$ . From the fermion anti-commutation relation in Eq. (55), different contracting

orders of an fMPS may exhibit additional minus signs. Fortunately, they will at most result in a global phase of the final state, provided that each local tensor has a well-defined total parity. We refer the reader to Ref. [66] for more details.

With parity-conserving local tensors alone, one can only produce an even-fermion parity state (the total fermion parity is labeled by  $n_0 \in \{0, 1\}$ ) under a periodic boundary condition (PBC). To construct fMPS with odd fermion parity, it is convenient to introduce an additional odd fermion parity tensor  $Y$  without a physical index, which serves as a fermion parity twist operator. The  $Y$  tensor can be inserted into the virtual leg at the right end of the system, as shown below



$$\text{---} \boxed{A} \text{---} \boxed{Y} \text{---} \quad (56)$$

The  $Y$  tensor has a general form,

$$Y = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} Y_{\alpha\beta} |\alpha\rangle \otimes_g |\beta\rangle, \quad (57)$$

where  $Y_{\alpha\beta} = 0$  if the total fermion parity carried by  $|\alpha\rangle$  and  $|\beta\rangle$  is even. This is enforced to guarantee that  $Y$  alters the parity on the virtual index. In essence, the  $Y$  operator anticommutes with fermion parity, namely

$$Y P_f = -P_f Y. \quad (58)$$

The simplest form of the  $Y$  tensor can be constructed as [66]

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -I & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (59)$$

We can now present the general fMPS for  $(1+1)D$  short-range entangled fermionic states

$$|\psi_f\rangle = \sum_{i_j} \text{Tr} (A^{i_1} \cdots A^{i_N} Y^{n_0}) |i_1 \cdots i_N\rangle, \quad (60)$$

where the exponent  $n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_2$  determines the fermion parity of the state. This construction yields wavefunctions that are eigenstates of the fermion parity symmetry.

Next, we move on to the consideration of the full symmetry  $G_f$  of the fMPS. The group elements can be denoted by the form  $\tilde{g} = P_f^{n_g} g$ , where  $n_g \in \mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $g \in G_b$ , and the group product rule is defined as

$$(P_f^{n_g} g) \cdot (P_f^{n_h} h) = P_f^{n_g + n_h + \omega_2(g, h)} gh. \quad (61)$$

The symmetry action on the physical index is described by


$$\tilde{U} (P_f^{n_g} g) := P_f^{n_g} U(g), \quad (62)$$

where  $U(g)$  represents the transformation associated with the bosonic symmetry. With this definition, if we require

the total symmetry action  $\tilde{U}$  to form a linear representation of  $G_f$  as Eq. (43), the transformation of the bosonic symmetry on the physical index needs to satisfy [66, 68]

$$U(g)U(h) = P_f^{\omega_2(g,h)}U(gh). \quad (63)$$

Similar to the bosonic case, the symmetry action on the physical index leads to a gauge transformation on the virtual indices



where  $\tilde{V}(\tilde{g})$ , taking the form

$$\tilde{V}(\tilde{g}) = P_f^{n_g}V(g), \quad (65)$$

is expected to be a projective representation of  $G_f$ . As the projective representation concerns both the fermion parity and the bosonic symmetry, the data for the projective representation are a bit more involved than in the bosonic case.

The next step is to discuss the interplay between bosonic symmetry  $G_b$  and fermion parity  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ . We apply two bosonic symmetry operators  $U(h)$  and  $\tilde{U}(g)$  sequentially. With Eq. (63), one can show the multiplication rule for the gauge transformation on the virtual indices now has the following form,

$$V(g)V(h) = \nu_2(g,h)P_f^{\omega_2(g,h)}V(gh), \quad (66)$$

where  $\nu_2 \in U(1)$  is a possible phase ambiguity. A  $V(g)$  operator acting on the virtual index can potentially change the fermion parity on that virtual leg. This is labeled by a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  index  $n_1(g)$  defined through the commutation relation between  $V(g)$  and  $P_f$ , namely

$$P_f V(g) = (-1)^{n_1(g)}V(g)P_f. \quad (67)$$

Specifically, when  $n_1(g) = 1$ ,  $V(g)$  switches the fermion parity on the virtual leg.

In addition, for an MPS with odd fermion parity ( $n_0 = 1$ ), applying  $U(g)$  to physical indices of all sites simultaneously will induce a pair of  $V(g)$  and  $V(g)^{-1}$  on each virtual index except at the right end of the MPS where  $Y$  is attached. For the former case,  $V(g)$  and  $V(g)^{-1}$  will be canceled out, while we are left with  $V(g)YV(g)^{-1}$  on the last virtual leg, which should be equivalent to the original state with only  $Y$  on that leg. Therefore,  $Y$  and  $V(g)$  should commute with each other up to a phase. Since the  $Y$  tensor is also a fermionic operator that alters the fermion charge on the virtual index, it has the following commutation relation with  $V(g)$ ,

$$YV(g) = (-1)^{n_1(g)}V(g)Y, \quad (68)$$

which can be explicitly derived from Eq. (55). Therefore,  $V(g)$  carries two possible topological invariants: one is the fermion parity  $n_1(g)$  in Eq. (67), and the other is the phase ambiguity  $\nu_2(g,h)$  from the sequential application of different symmetry operators on the physical index that has been defined in Eq. (66). We will discuss the consistency conditions for these two indices respectively in the following.

As for the self-consistent conditions for the fermion parity  $n_1(g)$  of the representation  $V(g)$ , we consider the simultaneous implementation of  $P_f$  from the left to each side of Eq. (66), where the left-hand side becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \text{L.H.S.} &= P_f V(g)V(h) = (-1)^{n_1(g)+n_1(h)}V(g)V(h)P_f \\ &= (-1)^{n_1(g)+n_1(h)}\nu_2(g,h)P_f^{\omega_2(g,h)}V(gh)P_f, \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

while the right-hand side is transformed into

$$\begin{aligned} \text{R.H.S.} &= P_f \nu_2(g,h)P_f^{\omega_2(g,h)}V(gh) \\ &= \nu_2(g,h)(-1)^{n_1(gh)}P_f^{\omega_2(g,h)}V(gh)P_f. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

The above relations require that the fermion parities of  $V(g)V(h)$  and  $V(gh)$  should be equal, i.e.,

$$n_1(g) + n_1(h) - n_1(gh) = 0 \pmod{2}, \quad (71)$$

which implies that  $n_1$  should be a 1-cocycle with  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  coefficient, classified by  $\mathcal{H}^1(G_b, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ .

In addition, taking the attachment  $Y^{n_0}$  into account gives the following relation

$$\begin{aligned} V(g)V(h)Y^{n_0} &= (-1)^{n_0[n_1(g)+n_1(h)]}Y^{n_0}V(g)V(h) \\ &= (-1)^{n_0[n_1(g)+n_1(h)]}\nu_2(g,h)Y^{n_0}P_f^{\omega_2(g,h)}V(gh), \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

which can also be evaluated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} V(g)V(h)Y^{n_0} &= \nu_2(g,h)P_f^{\omega_2(g,h)}V(gh)Y^{n_0} \\ &= (-1)^{n_0[n_1(gh)+\omega_2(g,h)]}\nu_2(g,h)Y^{n_0}P_f^{\omega_2(g,h)}V(gh), \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where the factor  $(-1)^{n_0\omega_2(g,h)}$  comes from the commutation between  $P_f^{\omega_2(g,h)}$  and  $Y^{n_0}$ . The above relations indicate that  $n_1$  should also be a 1-cocycle with  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  coefficient and a twisted cocycle condition, namely

$$n_0[n_1(g) + n_1(h) - n_1(gh) - \omega_2(g,h)] = 0 \pmod{2}. \quad (74)$$

For a nontrivial  $n_0$ , this twisted 1-cocycle condition has solutions if and only if  $n_0\omega_2(g,h)$  is a 2-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^2[G_b, \mathbb{Z}_2]$ . In addition, since both  $n_0$  and  $\omega_2$  take values in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ , we reach the following requirement

$$n_0\omega_2(g,h) = 0 \pmod{2}. \quad (75)$$

Finally, it is time to derive the associativity condition for three bosonic symmetry actions  $V(g)$ ,  $V(h)$ , and  $V(l)$

on virtual indices, which can be composed with the following two different orders

$$\begin{aligned} V(g)V(h)V(l) &= \nu_2(g, h)P_f^{\omega_2(g, h)}V(gh)V(l) \\ &= \nu_2(g, h)\nu_2(gh, l)P_f^{\omega_2(g, h)+\omega_2(gh, l)}V(ghl), \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V(g)V(h)V(l) &= V(g)\nu_2(h, l)P_f^{\omega_2(h, l)}V(hl) \\ &= \nu_2(h, l)(-1)^{n_1(g)\omega_2(h, l)}P_f^{\omega_2(h, l)}V(g)V(hl) \\ &= \nu_2(h, l)\nu_2(g, hl)(-1)^{n_1(g)\omega_2(h, l)+\omega_2(g, hl)}V(ghl). \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Therefore,  $\nu_2$  satisfies a twisted 2-cocycle condition of the bosonic symmetry group, namely

$$\frac{\nu_2(g, h)\nu_2(gh, l)}{\nu_2(g, hl)\nu_2(h, l)} = (-1)^{n_1(g)\omega_2(h, l)} \equiv \mathcal{O}_3(g, h, l), \quad (78)$$

which is classified by  $\nu_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2[G_b, U(1)]$  with an additional constraint that  $\mathcal{O}_3(g, h, l)$  should be a 3-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^3[G_b, U(1)]$  to guarantee the above equation to have solutions.

We summarize the consistency conditions for constructing an fMPS representation of  $(1+1)D$  SPT state. There are three topological invariants labeling different phases:

1.  $n_0 \in \mathcal{H}^0[G_b, h^2(\mathbb{Z}_2^f)] = \mathbb{Z}_2$ : Fermion parity of fMPS encoded by attachment  $Y^{n_0}$  in Eq. (60) with the condition in Eq. (75). Here,  $h^2(\mathbb{Z}_2^f) = \mathbb{Z}_2$  is the classification of  $(1+1)D$  invertible topological phases.
2.  $n_1 \in \mathcal{H}^1[G_b, h^1(\mathbb{Z}_2^f)]$ : The fermion parity of the symmetry action on virtual indices  $V(g)$  with the 1-cocycle condition in Eq. (71), or simply  $dn_1 = 0$ .
3.  $\nu_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2[G_b, U(1)]$ : The phase ambiguity of  $V(g)$  with the 2-cocycle condition in Eq. (78), or simply  $d\nu_2 = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_3$ , and the condition of  $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_3$  to be a 3-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^3[G_b, U(1)]$ .


The physical meaning of each topological invariant is as follows:  $n_0 = 1$  indicates that the corresponding fMPS with PBC has an odd fermion parity, which means that the system hosts a Kitaev Majorana chain.  $n_1(g) = 1$  indicates that the action of  $U(g)$  in a finite region leaves one complex fermion on the virtual index at each end, which is exactly the complex fermion decoration on the symmetry defects of  $G_b$ . A nontrivial  $\nu_2$  labels a bosonic SPT phase solely protected by bosonic symmetry  $G_b$ . These classification data and obstruction functions are identical to the results obtained from spectrum sequence methods [67, 68].

### B. $(1+1)D$ ASPT with strong fermion parity

Inspired by the fMPS classification of fermionic SPT states, in this section, we will construct fermionic LPDO

(fLPDO) to describe fermionic ASPTs. The formal definition of the fLPDO has the identical form of Eq. (18), however, all the vector spaces are again replaced by the supervector space with fermionic graded structure in Eq. (51). The fermion parity conservation for the local tensor is written as  $|p| = (|\beta| - |\alpha|) \bmod 2$  and  $|a| = 0$ , i.e., the Kraus index is always in even fermion parity. The physical reason lies in that the fermion parity is always kept as a strong symmetry, and thus all components of the decomposition in  $\rho$  should exhibit the same global fermion parity, which we still refer to as  $n_0$ .

Similar to the pure state case, to construct states with different fermion parities  $n_0$ , one needs to attach the symmetry twist operator  $Y^{n_0}$ , an odd fermion parity tensor without a physical index. Graphically, it is represented as



where  $Y$  is defined in the same way as Eqs. (57) and (58).

Next, we consider the total symmetry group  $G_f$ , which is a central extension of weak bosonic symmetry  $G_b$  and strong fermion parity  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$ , with a group structure characterized by  $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2[G_b, \mathbb{Z}_2^f]$ . We will discuss the consistency conditions, especially their relations and differences from those in the pure state case. The actions of bosonic symmetry on physical and virtual indices have the same form as those in Eqs. (63) and (66). However, as we have illustrated in Sec. III D, the ASPT density matrix is invariant under weak symmetry if and only if we act on the symmetry operators on both sides of the density matrix. Therefore, we must consider the simultaneous actions of  $U(h)$  and  $U(g)$  on the physical indices of upper and lower that leave  $V(g)V(h)$  on the right virtual index on the upper side and  $V^*(g)V^*(h)$  on the right virtual index on the lower side. On each of them, we get

$$\begin{aligned} V(g)V(h) &= \nu_2(g, h)P_f^{\omega_2(g, h)}V(gh) \\ V(g)^*V(h)^* &= \nu_2^{-1}(g, h)P_f^{\omega_2(g, h)}V(gh)^*, \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

then we see that the total phase ambiguity at the right virtual indices (including both upper and lower) is canceled. Consequently, the phase ambiguity of the weak symmetry group  $G_b$  itself is not a topological invariant, which is consistent with the conclusion we have already reached: there is no nontrivial ASPT state solely protected by weak symmetry.

Alternatively, we will demonstrate that as the fermion parity  $P_f$  acts as a strong symmetry and can be applied on only one side of the LPDO, the parity of  $V(g)$ , denoted as  $n_1(g)$  and defined equivalently to Eq. (67), continues to serve as a nontrivial topological invariant. This

characteristic distinguishes various ASPT phases that are jointly protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$  and  $G_b$ . To verify this, we consider the sequential implementation of  $U(h)$ ,  $U(g)$  on both sides of the density matrix, then only apply  $P_f$  on the upper side. Similar to the discussions in Eqs. (69) and (70), on the right virtual index of the upper side, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_f V(g) V(h) &= (-1)^{n_1(g)+n_1(h)} \nu_2(g, h) P_f^{\omega_2(g, h)} V(gh) P_f \\ &= (-1)^{n_1(gh)} \nu_2(g, h) P_f^{\omega_2(g, h)} V(gh) P_f, \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

while on the right virtual index of the lower side, we simply obtain

$$V(g)^* V(h)^* = \nu_2(g, h)^{-1} P_f^{\omega_2(g, h)} V(gh)^* \quad (82)$$

It is noted that the phase ambiguity is not completely canceled out when grouping the upper and lower sides together, hence the following self-consistent condition

$$n_1(g) + n_1(h) - n_1(gh) = 0 \pmod{2} \quad (83)$$

still holds. The physical interpretation of this result is rooted in the inability to exchange the fermion parity charges carried by  $V(g)V(h)$  and  $V(g)^*V(h)^*$ . This limitation arises from the fermion parity acting as a strong symmetry, where the charges of strong symmetry or the associated phase structures on the upper and lower sides must be conserved individually. Due to the same argument, the twisted 1-cocycle condition in Eq. (74) also holds, leading to the following condition for the total fermion parity  $n_0$

$$n_0 \omega_2(g, h) = 0 \pmod{2}. \quad (84)$$

On the contrary, the condition for solutions of Eq. (78) to exist no longer needs to be satisfied as the phase ambiguity of  $\nu_2(g, h)$  must be canceled out on virtual indices when applying weak symmetries simultaneously on both sides of a density matrix.

Therefore, the topological invariants of a  $(1+1)D$  fLPDO are

1.  $n_0 \in \mathcal{H}^0[G_b, h^2(\mathbb{Z}_2^f)] = \mathbb{Z}_2$ : The fermion parity of the fLPDO encoded by the attachment  $Y^{n_0}$  with the condition in Eq. (84);
2.  $n_1 \in \mathcal{H}^1[G_b, h^1(\mathbb{Z}_2^f)]$ : The fermion parity of the symmetry action on virtual indices  $V(g)$  with the 1-cocycle condition in Eq. (83), or  $dn_1 = 0$ , but without the coboundary constraint for  $n_1$  here in contrast to the pure-state SPT phase.

We see that the fLPDO construction gives an accurate classification of the  $(1+1)D$  ASPT phases with a strong fermion parity symmetry and a weak  $G_b$  symmetry [30] but with a much more concise interpretation through the tensor network formalism.

A crucial aspect of this construction is that the decorated domain wall structure of the ASPT states is inherently encoded in the fLPDOs. Consider the truncated symmetry operator  $U_R(g) = \prod_{i \in R} U_i(g)$ , where  $R$  denotes a connected finite region of a  $(1+1)D$  fLPDO. On the right-hand side, there will be  $V(g)$  on the upper virtual index and  $V(g)^*$  on the lower virtual index, each carrying a fermion parity  $n_1(g)$ . Moreover, since the fermion parity acts as the charge of a strong symmetry, the fermion parities of  $V(g)$  and  $V(g)^*$  are individually well defined, as charges cannot tunnel. In essence, a truncated symmetry operator  $U_R(g)$  introduces two symmetry defects on the boundary of  $R$ , each carrying a non-trivial charge of  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$  labeled by  $n_1(g)$ .

## V. $(1+1)D$ ASPT PHASES WITH GENERAL GROUP EXTENSION

In the previous section, we adopt  $K = \mathbb{Z}_2^f$  and  $G = G_b$  as an illustrative example. Generalization to arbitrary strong and weak abelian symmetry groups is the main focus of this section. Specifically, the total symmetry group  $\tilde{G}$  arises as an extension of an abelian group  $K$  with another group  $G$ , whose group structure is specified by the factor system  $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2(G, K)$  of the following short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow K \rightarrow \tilde{G} \rightarrow G \rightarrow 1. \quad (85)$$

The consistency condition of the factor system reads as

$$\omega_2(g, h) \cdot \omega_2(gh, l) = \omega_2(g, hl) \cdot \omega_2(h, l), \quad (86)$$

where  $\omega_2$  takes the value of the group element in  $K$ . Since a finite abelian group  $K$  has the general form of  $\prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{Z}_{n_j}$ , we denote the group element  $k \in K$  as  $(k_1, \dots, k_m)$  with  $k_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_j}$ , and similarly  $\omega_2 = (\omega_2^1, \dots, \omega_2^m)$ .

### A. $(1+1)D$ SPT phases with general group extension

Here, we generalize the treatment in fermionic MPS to discuss the SPT classification in  $(1+1)D$  pure states under a general group extension in Eq. (85). For the symmetry group  $K$ , we directly encode the  $K$ -charge in the graded structure of the MPS and consider the twist of the  $K$  symmetry by attaching a corresponding  $Y$  block. Implementing the  $G$  symmetry demands that each subspace on the physical index of a given  $K$ -charge be a linear representation of the symmetry  $G$ .

A  $K$ -charge is a one-dimensional linear representation of the Abelian group  $K$ , which is classified by

$$\mathcal{H}^1[K, U(1)] = K = \prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{Z}_{n_j}. \quad (87)$$



Therefore, the linear representation of  $K$  can be labeled by an  $m$ -component vector  $(k_1, \dots, k_m)$ , where  $k_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and is referred to as the  $K$ -charge.

Now we consider the SPT phases jointly protected by  $K$  and  $G$ . The group element in  $\tilde{G}$  is  $\tilde{g} = (k, g)$ , where  $k \in K, g \in G$ , with the following product rule

$$(k_1, g) \cdot (k_2, h) = [k_1 k_2 \omega_2(g, h), gh]. \quad (88)$$

A symmetry operator  $\tilde{U}(\tilde{g})$  acted on the physical index can be expanded as

$$\tilde{U}(\tilde{g}) = \hat{O}(k)U(g), \quad (89)$$

which should be a linear representation of  $\tilde{G}$  satisfying Eq. (43). Combined with Eq. (88), the symmetry actions on the physical index satisfy that

$$\hat{O}(k_1)U(g)\hat{O}(k_2)U(h) = \hat{O}[k_1 k_2 \omega_2(g, h)]U(gh), \quad (90)$$

from which we can obtain the following multiplication rules for  $\hat{O}(k)$  and  $U(g)$ . Firstly, we take  $g = h = e$  (the identity group element) and reach that the symmetry action of  $\hat{O}(k)$  on the physical index itself should form a linear representation, i.e.,

$$\hat{O}(k_1)\hat{O}(k_2) = \hat{O}(k_1 k_2). \quad (91)$$

Meanwhile, by taking  $k_1 = k_2 = e$ , it can be easily verified that  $U(g)$ , the symmetry action associated with the  $G$  group, needs to satisfy the following twisted group multiplication rules

$$U(g)U(h) = \hat{O}[\omega_2(g, h)]U(gh). \quad (92)$$

Finally, we find that the application of  $\hat{O}(k)$  and  $U(g)$  should be commutative, i.e.,

$$U(g)\hat{O}(k) = \hat{O}(k)U(g), \quad (93)$$

where we have assumed  $k_1 = h_1 = e$ .

Similar to the fermion parity case, the application of  $\tilde{U}(\tilde{g})$  on the physical index leaves  $\tilde{V}(\tilde{g})$  at the right virtual index, as shown in Eq. (64), which takes the form of

$$\tilde{V}(\tilde{g}) = \hat{O}'(k)V(g), \quad (94)$$

where the combination formulas of  $\hat{O}'(k)$  and  $V(g)$  are deduced as follows. By sequentially applying two symmetry operators  $\hat{O}(k_1)$  and  $\hat{O}(k_2)$  to the physical index, we obtain the operator  $\hat{O}'(k_1)\hat{O}'(k_2)$  on the virtual index. This should be equivalent to the application of  $\hat{O}(k_1 k_2)$  that results in  $\hat{O}'(k_1 k_2)$  on the virtual index. Therefore, we can deduce the following relation for the operator  $\hat{O}'(k)$

$$\hat{O}'(k_1)\hat{O}'(k_2) = \mu_2(k_1, k_2)\hat{O}'(k_1 k_2), \quad \mu_2 \in U(1). \quad (95)$$

Similarly, applying each side of Eq. (92) to the physical index, we are left with  $V(g)V(h)$  and  $\hat{O}'[\omega_2(g, h)]V(gh)$

on the virtual index, respectively, where the resulting tensors should be equivalent, i.e.,

$$V(g)V(h) = \nu_2(g, h)\hat{O}'[\omega_2(g, h)]V(gh), \quad \nu_2 \in U(1). \quad (96)$$

In this case, there are two phase structures  $\mu_2(k_1, k_2)$  and  $\nu_2(g, h)$  that characterize the actions of  $K$  and  $G$  respectively. Roughly speaking, they describe the SPT phases solely protected by  $K$  or  $G$ . The consistency condition for  $\mu_2(k_1, k_2)$  can be easily derived since the symmetry action on the virtual index in Eq. (95) has the same form as Eq. (11). Specifically, the following two ways to fuse the symmetry operations

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{O}'(k_1)\hat{O}'(k_2)\hat{O}'(k_3) &= \mu_2(k_1, k_2)\hat{O}'(k_1 k_2)\hat{O}'(k_3) \\ &= \mu_2(k_1, k_2)\mu_2(k_1 k_2, k_3)\hat{O}'(k_1 k_2 k_3), \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{O}'(k_1)\hat{O}'(k_2)\hat{O}'(k_3) &= \hat{O}'(k_1)\mu(k_2, k_3)\hat{O}'(k_2 k_3) \\ &= \mu_2(k_1, k_2 k_3)\mu_2(k_2, k_3)\hat{O}'(k_1 k_2 k_3) \end{aligned} \quad (98)$$

must be consistent, from which we obtain the consistency equation for  $\mu_2$ ,

$$\frac{\mu_2(k_1, k_2)\mu_2(k_1 k_2, k_3)}{\mu_2(k_1, k_2 k_3)\mu_2(k_2, k_3)} = 1. \quad (99)$$

It implies that  $\mu_2(k_1, k_2)$  is a 2-cocycle with  $U(1)$  coefficient, and  $\hat{O}'(k)$  can be a projective representation of the group  $K$  classified by the group 2-cohomology  $\mathcal{H}^2[K, U(1)]$ . Therefore,  $\mu_2(k_1, k_2)$  exactly characterizes the classification of  $(1+1)D$  SPT phases when only group  $K$  exists [4].

Before deriving the consistency condition for  $\nu_2(g, h)$ , we first focus on the interplay between  $K$  and  $G$ , which is reflected by the nonzero  $K$ -charge  $n_1(g) = [n_1^1(g), \dots, n_1^m(g)] \in \mathcal{H}^1[K, U(1)]$  carried by each  $V(g)$ . To formally define the  $K$ -charge  $n_1(g)$ , we consider the application of  $U(g)\hat{O}(k)$  and  $\hat{O}(k)U(g)$  on the physical index, and the resulting transformations on the virtual index should be equivalent up to a phase, i.e.,

$$\hat{O}'(k)V(g) = e^{i\phi(k, g)}V(g)\hat{O}'(k). \quad (100)$$

As the above relation must hold for all  $k = (k_1, \dots, k_m)$ , we can choose a specific case where only  $k_j = 1$  (generator of  $\mathbb{Z}_{n_j}$ ) while all the other elements are zero, whose symmetry action is denoted as  $\hat{O}'_j$ . Therefore, the requirement in Eq. (100) means that

$$\hat{O}'_j V(g) = \alpha_j(g)V(g)\hat{O}'_j, \quad (101)$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Recall that  $\hat{O}'(k)$  forms a projective representation of group  $K$ , the above set  $\{\hat{O}'_j\}$  is able to



generate the symmetry action for any  $k$  on the virtual index in the following way

$$\hat{O}'(k) = \beta(k) \prod_{j=1}^m \hat{O}_j'^{k_j}, \quad (102)$$

where  $\beta(k)$  is a global phase factor defined for each  $k$ , which in principle can be derived from  $\mu_2$  in Eq. (95), but its explicit form is irrelevant in this case. Specifically,  $\hat{O}_j'^{n_j} \propto \hat{O}'(e) \propto I$ , where  $e$  is the group identity element in  $K$ , resulting in the following condition for  $\alpha_j$

$$\alpha_j(g)^{n_j} = 1. \quad (103)$$

Therefore, we can define  $\alpha_j(g) = e^{i2\pi n_1^j(g)/n_j}$  with  $n_1^j(g) \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_j}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , which we refer to as “the  $K$ -charge carried by  $V(g)$ ”. In summary, the commutation relation between the symmetry actions of  $K$  and  $G$  on the virtual index reads as

$$\hat{O}'(k)V(g) = V(g)\hat{O}'(k) \prod_{j=1}^m e^{i2\pi k_j \cdot n_1^j(g)/n_j}. \quad (104)$$

Now we are ready to consider the consistency condition for the  $K$ -charge of  $V(g)$  from the mixed anomaly of  $K$  and  $G$ . Consider left-multiplying Eq. (96) with  $\hat{O}'(k)$ , from which we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{L.H.S.} &= \hat{O}'(k)V(g)V(h) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^m e^{i2\pi k_j [n_1^j(g) + n_1^j(h)]/n_j} V(g)V(h)\hat{O}'(k) \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{R.H.S.} &= \nu_2(g, h)\hat{O}'(k)\hat{O}'[\omega_2(g, h)]V(gh) \\ &= \frac{\mu_2[k, \omega_2(g, h)]}{\mu_2[\omega_2(g, h), k]} \prod_{j=1}^m e^{i2\pi k_j n_1^j(gh)/n_j} V(g)V(h)\hat{O}'(k), \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

respectively. The above constraint requires that

$$n_1^j(g) + n_1^j(h) - n_1^j(gh) = \mathcal{O}_2^j(g, h) \pmod{n_j} \quad (107)$$

for  $\forall j = 1, \dots, m$ , where the obstruction function  $\mathcal{O}_2^j$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{O}_2^j(g, h) \equiv \frac{n_j}{2\pi} \arg \frac{\mu_2[1_j, \omega_2(g, h)]}{\mu_2[\omega_2(g, h), 1_j]} \quad (108)$$

with  $1_j$  abbreviating the group element of  $K$  whose  $j$ -th element  $k_j = 1$  and all the other are zero. It implies that  $n_1(g)$  satisfies a twisted 1-cocycle condition with coefficient  $\mathcal{H}^1[K, U(1)]$ , i.e.,  $n_1 \in \mathcal{H}^1[G, \mathcal{H}^1[K, U(1)]]$ , which has solutions if and only if  $\mathcal{O}_2^j$  is a 2-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^2(G, \mathbb{Z}_{n_j})$ . In addition, we have

$$\frac{\mu_2[k, \omega_2(g, h)]}{\mu_2[\omega_2(g, h), k]} = \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \frac{\mu_2[1_j, \omega_2(g, h)]}{\mu_2[\omega_2(g, h), 1_j]} \right)^{k_j}. \quad (109)$$

Finally, let us derive the consistency condition for the phase factor system  $\nu_2$  characterizing the projective representation  $V(g)$  on virtual indices. Sequentially applying the symmetry operators  $U(l)$ ,  $U(h)$ , and  $U(g)$  on the physical index  $(g, h, l \in G)$  leaves  $V(g)V(h)V(l)$  on the right virtual index. On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V(g)V(h)V(l) &= \nu_2(g, h)\hat{O}'[\omega_2(g, h)]V(gh)V(l) \\ &= \nu_2(g, h)\nu_2(gh, l)\mu_2[\omega_2(g, h), \omega_2(gh, l)] \\ &\quad \hat{O}'[\omega_2(g, h) \cdot \omega_2(gh, l)]V(ghl); \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} V(g)V(h)V(l) &= V(g)\nu_2(h, l)\hat{O}'[\omega_2(h, l)]V(hl) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^m e^{i2\pi \omega_2^j(h, l)n_1^j(g)/n_j} \nu_2(h, l)\hat{O}'[\omega_2(h, l)]V(g)V(hl) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^m e^{i2\pi \omega_2^j(h, l)n_1^j(g)/n_j} \nu_2(h, l)\nu_2(g, hl) \\ &\quad \mu_2[\omega_2(h, l), \omega_2(g, hl)]\hat{O}'[\omega_2(h, l) \cdot \omega_2(g, hl)]V(ghl). \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

The above two formulas imply the following twisted 2-cocycle condition for the phase structure characterizing the SPT pure state protected by  $G$

$$\frac{\nu_2(g, h)\nu_2(gh, l)}{\nu_2(g, hl)\nu_2(h, l)} = \mathcal{O}_3(g, h, l) \quad (112)$$

which has solutions if and only if the obstruction function

$$\mathcal{O}_3(g, h, l) \equiv \prod_{j=1}^m e^{i2\pi \omega_2^j(h, l)n_1^j(g)/n_j} \frac{\mu_2[\omega_2(g, hl), \omega_2(h, l)]}{\mu_2[\omega_2(g, h), \omega_2(gh, l)]} \quad (113)$$

is a 3-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^3[G, U(1)]$ .

We summarize the consistency conditions for the construction of an MPS for  $(1+1)D$   $\tilde{G}$ -symmetric SPT state: There are three topological invariants to label different phases:

1.  $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2[K, U(1)]$ : different SPT phases solely protected by the symmetry  $K$  with the 2-cocycle condition in Eq. (99), or simply  $d\mu_2 = 0$ .
2.  $n_1 \in \mathcal{H}^1[G, \mathcal{H}^1[K, U(1)]]$ : the  $K$ -charge carried by the projective representation  $V(g)$  on virtual indices, labeling different SPT phases jointly protected by  $K$  and  $G$ , with the twisted 1-cocycle condition in Eq. (107), or simply  $dn_1 = \mathcal{O}_2$ , together with the condition that  $\mathcal{O}_2^j$  in Eq. (108) is a 2-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^2[G, \mathbb{Z}_{n_j}]$  and the constraint in Eq. (109).
3.  $\nu_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2[G, U(1)]$ : different SPT states protected by  $G$  exclusively with the twisted 2-cocycle condition in Eq. (112), or simply  $d\nu_2 = \mathcal{O}_3$ , and the condition that  $\mathcal{O}_3$  in Eq. (113) is a 3-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^3[G, U(1)]$ .

The obstructions in Eq. (108) and (113) mean that for nontrivial  $\omega_2$  some  $n_1$  and  $\mu_2$  may not be well defined as long as these conditions are not satisfied, from which some nontrivial intrinsic ASPT phases may emerge to be introduced later.

### B. Classification of ASPT in $(1+1)D$ systems

In this section, we provide the classification data for ASPTs protected by a strong symmetry  $K$  and a weak symmetry  $G$ , allowing a possible non-trivial extension characterized by  $\omega_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2(G, K)$ .

In this case, the symmetry actions for the total group on the physical and virtual indices still take the forms of  $\tilde{U}(\tilde{g}) = \hat{O}(k)U(g)$  and  $\tilde{V}(\tilde{g}) = \hat{O}'(k)V(g)$  ( $\tilde{g} = (k, g)$ , where  $k \in K$  and  $g \in G$ ), respectively. Similar to the fLPDO case, the phase ambiguity  $\mu_2(k_1, k_2)$  for the strong symmetry  $K$ , as defined in Eq. (95), should be conserved at each side of the density matrix since the applications of  $U(k)$  on different sides are independent. Therefore, the 2-cocycle condition generated from the consistency of fusing three symmetry actions on the virtual index  $\hat{O}'(k_1)\hat{O}'(k_2)\hat{O}'(k_3)$  remains, namely

$$\frac{\mu_2(k_1, k_2)\mu_2(k_1k_2, k_3)}{\mu_2(k_1, k_2k_3)\mu_2(k_2, k_3)} = 1, \quad (114)$$

characterizing different ASPT phases exclusively protected by the strong symmetry  $K$ .

As for the weak symmetry  $G$ , the corresponding symmetry actions on the physical and virtual index satisfy Eqs. (92) and (96). However, different from the strong symmetry  $K$  that can be applied only on one side, a weak symmetry operator  $U(g)$  must be simultaneously applied to both sides of the density matrix to guarantee its invariance under symmetry transformation. Applying two symmetry operators  $U(h)$  and  $U(g)$  sequentially to the physical indices on both sides, we obtain  $V(g)V(h)$  and  $V(g)^*V(h)^*$  on the virtual index of the upper and lower sides, respectively. According to Eq. (96), we have the following relation of the operator  $V(g)$  acting on the virtual indices as

$$\begin{aligned} V(g)V(h) &= \nu_2(g, h)\hat{O}'[\omega_2(g, h)]V(gh), \\ V(g)^*V(h)^* &= \nu_2(g, h)^{-1}\hat{O}'[\omega_2(g, h)]^*V(gh)^*, \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

where  $\nu_2(g, h)$  is a  $U(1)$  phase. Similar to the discussion of the fermion parity case, the total phase ambiguity on the virtual indices is canceled from the upper and lower sides, indicating that  $\nu_2$  is not a topological invariant characterizing distinct ASPT phases. In other words, if there is only weak symmetry, we cannot have any non-trivial ASPT density matrix. As a consequence, we do not have to worry about the coboundary condition for  $\hat{O}_3$  to promise a solution for the twisted cocycle condition of  $\nu_2$  in Eq. (112).

Finally, let us consider the  $K$ -charge  $n_1(g) = [n_1^1(g), \dots, n_1^m(g)] \in \mathcal{H}^1[K, U(1)]$  carried by each  $V(g)$

defined in Eq. (104) to explore the interplay between strong and weak symmetries. As  $K$  is a strong symmetry, the  $K$ -charge of  $V(g)$  cannot tunnel between the upper and lower spaces and must be conserved on each side. Consider the sequential application of two weak symmetry operators  $U(h)$  and  $U(g)$  on an LPDO, followed by the application of a strong symmetry operator  $\hat{O}(k)$  only on the upper side, which (similar to Eqs. (105) and (106)) leaves on the virtual space the following transformation

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{O}'(k)V(g)V(h) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^m e^{i2\pi k_j [n_1^j(g) + n_1^j(h)]/n_j} V(g)V(h)\hat{O}'(k) \\ &= \frac{\mu_2[k, \omega_2(g, h)]}{\mu_2[\omega_2(g, h), k]} \prod_{j=1}^m e^{i2\pi k_j n_1^j(gh)/n_j} V(g)V(h)\hat{O}'(k), \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

on the upper side. The two lines are the result of two ways of combining and permuting the three operators. On the lower side, the transformation is simply  $V(g)^*V(h)^*$ . We see that the total phase ambiguity after grouping the upper and lower virtual indices is not canceled. The consistency condition for the two lines in Eq. (116) indicates the following condition

$$n_1^j(g) + n_1^j(h) - n_1^j(gh) = \mathcal{O}_2^j(g, h) \pmod{n_j} \quad (117)$$

with

$$\mathcal{O}_2^j(g, h) \equiv \frac{n_j}{2\pi} \arg \frac{\mu_2[1_j, \omega_2(g, h)]}{\mu_2[\omega_2(g, h), 1_j]} \quad (118)$$

and

$$\frac{\mu_2[k, \omega_2(g, h)]}{\mu_2[\omega_2(g, h), k]} = \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \frac{\mu_2[1_j, \omega_2(g, h)]}{\mu_2[\omega_2(g, h), 1_j]} \right)^{k_j}. \quad (119)$$

We summarize the consistency conditions for constructing an LPDO of  $(1+1)D$   $\tilde{G}$ -symmetric ASPT state. There are two topological invariants to label different phases:

1.  $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2[K, U(1)]$ : the ASPT phases solely protected by the strong symmetry  $K$  with the 2-cocycle condition in Eq. (114), or simply  $d\mu_2 = 0$ .
2.  $n_1 \in \mathcal{H}^1[G, \mathcal{H}^1[K, U(1)]]$ : the ASPT phases jointly protected by the strong and weak symmetries, with a 1-cocycle condition in Eq. (117), or simply  $dn_1 = \mathcal{O}_2$ , together with the condition that  $\mathcal{O}_2^j$  in Eq. (118) is a 2-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^2[G, \mathbb{Z}_{n_j}]$  and the constraint in Eq. (119).

There is no coboundary condition for  $\hat{O}_3$  as that for pure-state SPT.

At first glance, it might seem that the classification of ASPT phases protected by  $\tilde{G}$  is simpler than that of pure-state SPT phases protected by the same symmetry group,

where both  $K$  and  $G$  are strong, because the latter has one more topological invariant. However, we will see that this is not always the case, as the twisted 2-cocycle condition for  $\nu_2$  in Eq. (112) imposes more restrictions on  $n_1$  and  $\omega_2$ , i.e.,  $\hat{O}_3$  should be a 3-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^3[G, U(1)]$ . To be more specific, for a nontrivial group extension labeled by  $\omega_2 \neq 0$ , certain  $n_1(g)$  may not be well defined if Eq. (112) may have no solution. In contrast, for ASPT phases where  $G$  is a weak symmetry, the constraint of Eq. (112) no longer holds. Therefore, such a choice of nontrivial  $n_1$ , which may disrupt the coboundary condition, is legitimate. In this case, the ASPT phase has no pure-state SPT counterpart and is referred to as an intrinsic ASPT phase. We note that a necessary condition for the emergence of intrinsic ASPT phases is a nontrivial group extension characterized by  $\omega_2$  in the short exact sequence in Eq. (85).

In the following sections, we will provide two examples of explicit LPDO constructions for ASPTs whose weak and strong symmetries belong to the same group  $K = \mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$  while their group extensions are different.

### C. Example: decohered Haldane phase in $(1+1)D$ systems

When  $K = \mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$  have trivial group extension, the ASPT phase is a descendant of the pure state SPT protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry, namely the cluster state. We begin with the  $(1+1)D$  cluster state whose Hamiltonian is

$$H = - \sum_i^N \left( \sigma_i^z \tau_{i+1/2}^x \sigma_{i+1}^z + \tau_{i-1/2}^z \sigma_i^x \tau_{i+1/2}^z \right), \quad (120)$$

where  $N$  is the number of sites. In this model, there are two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  degrees of freedom  $\sigma_i$  and  $\tau_{i+1/2}$  at the site  $i$ , each carrying a linear representation of one of  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ 's. The ground state of this model follows the decorated domain wall construction [9], i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &= \frac{1}{2^{N/2}} \sum_{\{\sigma_i\}} |\cdots \uparrow_\sigma \rightarrow_\tau \uparrow_\sigma \rightarrow_\tau \uparrow_\sigma \leftarrow_\tau \downarrow_\sigma \leftarrow_\tau \uparrow_\sigma \cdots\rangle \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{2^{N/2}} \sum_{\{\sigma_i\}} |\psi_{\{\sigma_i\}}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

where  $\tau$ -spin excitations are positioned at the domain walls of  $\sigma$  spins.  $\prod_i \sigma_i^x$  and  $\prod_i \tau_{i+1/2}^x$  define two global  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetries of the system. Specifically,  $\prod_i \sigma_i^x$  map two states with the same domain wall configurations but opposite  $\sigma$  spins to each other, while  $\prod_i \tau_{i+1/2}^x$  stabilizes each state  $|\psi_{\{\sigma_i\}}\rangle$  with eigenvalue 1 under PBC, i.e.,

$$\prod_i \tau_{i+1/2}^x |\psi_{\{\sigma_i\}}\rangle = |\psi_{\{\sigma_i\}}\rangle. \quad (122)$$

This state can be represented by an injective MPS with  $D = 2$  (not normalized)

$$\begin{array}{cc} \begin{array}{c} |\uparrow\rangle |\rightarrow\rangle \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ 0 \quad 0 \\ \text{A} \\ 0 \quad 1 \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} |\uparrow\rangle |\leftarrow\rangle \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ 0 \quad 1 \\ \text{A} \\ 1 \quad 1 \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} |\downarrow\rangle |\leftarrow\rangle \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ 1 \quad 0 \\ \text{A} \\ 1 \quad 0 \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} |\downarrow\rangle |\rightarrow\rangle \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ 1 \quad 1 \\ \text{A} \\ 1 \quad 1 \end{array} \end{array}, \quad (123)$$

whose symmetry action can be depicted as

$$\begin{array}{c} \sigma_x \\ \text{A} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \sigma_x \quad \text{A} \quad \sigma_x \end{array}, \quad (124)$$

and

$$\begin{array}{c} \tau_x \\ \text{A} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \tau_x \quad \text{A} \quad \tau_x \end{array}, \quad (125)$$

which demonstrates that the  $(1+1)D$  cluster state belongs to a nontrivial SPT phase characterized by the projective representation on virtual indices.

In the following, we assume that one of the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetries, namely  $G = \{1, g\}$  with  $U(g) = \prod_i \sigma_i^x$ , becomes weak, while the other  $K = \{1, k\}$  with  $\hat{O}(k) = \prod_i \tau_{i+1/2}^x$  remains strong. We consider the following mixed state

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_i |\psi_{\{\sigma_i\}}\rangle \langle \psi_{\{\sigma_i\}}|, \quad (126)$$

which is the incoherent superposition of different components in the cluster state. From the above discussion, it can easily be verified that  $\prod_i \tau_{i+1/2}^x$  is a strong symmetry, while  $\prod_i \sigma_i^x$  acts as a weak symmetry as it exchanges states with opposite  $\sigma$  configurations. In a sense, Eq. (126) is a fixed-point density matrix for the ASPT phase, as the weak degrees of freedom are completely classical in this density matrix.

Now we propose a general construction of the LPDO representation for such a mixed state, i.e., we start from the MPS representation  $A_0$  for the pure state  $|\psi\rangle = \sum_k \sqrt{\lambda_k} |\psi_k\rangle$ , then the corresponding mixed state  $\rho = \sum_k \lambda_k |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k|$  can be expressed by the following LPDO

tensor

$$\begin{array}{c} p \\ \alpha \quad \beta \\ a_l \quad a_r \end{array} A = \begin{array}{c} p \\ \alpha \quad \beta \\ a_l \quad a_r \end{array} A_0 \delta_{\alpha, a_l} \delta_{\beta, a_r}, \quad (127)$$

With this construction, the LPDO representation for Eq. (126) reads as

$$\begin{array}{cc} \begin{array}{c} |\uparrow\rangle \quad |\rightarrow\rangle \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ 0 \quad 0 \\ 0 \quad 0 \end{array} A = 1 & \begin{array}{c} |\uparrow\rangle \quad |\leftarrow\rangle \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ 0 \quad 1 \\ 0 \quad 1 \end{array} A = 1 \\ \begin{array}{c} |\downarrow\rangle \quad |\leftarrow\rangle \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ 1 \quad 0 \\ 1 \quad 0 \end{array} A = 1 & \begin{array}{c} |\downarrow\rangle \quad |\rightarrow\rangle \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ 1 \quad 1 \\ 1 \quad 1 \end{array} A = 1 \end{array}, \quad (128)$$

with the following symmetry actions

$$\begin{array}{c} \sigma_x \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ 0 \quad 0 \end{array} A = \begin{array}{c} X \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ X \quad 0 \end{array} A, \quad (129)$$

and

$$\begin{array}{c} \tau_x \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ 0 \quad 0 \end{array} A = \begin{array}{c} Z \\ \sigma \quad \tau \\ Z \quad 0 \end{array} A. \quad (130)$$

Here  $Z$  on virtual indices in Eq. (130) just plays the role of counting the  $K$ -charge, i.e.,  $\hat{O}'(k)$  in Eq. (104), while  $X$  on virtual indices in Eq. (129) carries a nontrivial  $K$ -charge  $n_1 = 1$ , labeling the nontrivial ASPT phase jointly protected by  $K = \mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ . As the pure-state SPT counterpart of this ASPT phase, i.e., with the same symmetry structure  $\tilde{G} = K \times G$  but both  $K$  and  $G$  are strong, is just the well-known Haldane phase, we denote our constructed ASPT phase as the decohered Haldane phase.

Moreover, we demonstrate that every ASPT phase with a pure-state SPT counterpart under the same sym-

metry group  $\tilde{G}$  can be constructed using the LPDO formalism outlined in Eq. (127), starting from an MPS representing the corresponding SPT phase. This construction ensures that the resulting ASPT density matrix retains exactly the same topological invariants as those of the original MPS.

In the case of the strong symmetry action  $U(k)$ , the transformations on the MPS virtual indices adopt a diagonal form, merely attaching certain phases to different virtual subspaces. These transformations are directly translated to the LPDO virtual indices. As there is no need for operations on the Kraus indices in Eq. (127) since not only they should not be permuted, but also no additional phases need to be added to the tensor, the representation adheres faithfully to the strong symmetry action described in Eq. (33). On the contrary, weak symmetry transformations acting on the virtual indices of the MPS, denoted as  $V(g)$ , may yield a nontrivial  $K$ -charge. Consequently,  $V(g)^{-1}$  and  $V(g)$  should be mapped to both the virtual and Kraus indices in Eq. (127). Additionally, an optional transformation  $M$  may be applied to the Kraus indices to rectify any undesired phase induced by  $V(g)^{-1}$  and  $V(g)$ , consistent with the weak symmetry transformation described in Eq. (35).

It is noteworthy that in both scenarios, the projective representation on the virtual indices of the LPDO remains identical to that of the original MPS. This ensures the preservation of the same set of topological invariants, namely  $n_0 \in \mathcal{H}^2[K, U(1)]$  and  $n_1 \in \mathcal{H}^1[G, \mathcal{H}^1[K, U(1)]]$ . Therefore, our LPDO framework in Eq. (127) can be effectively used to construct any ASPT phase that possesses a pure-state SPT counterpart.

## D. Intrinsic ASPT in $(1+1)D$ systems

In the above case of the decohered Haldane phase, the total symmetry group is the direct product of strong and weak symmetries, i.e.,  $\tilde{G} = K \times G$ . In other words, the group structure  $\omega_2$  is trivial, which means that the right-hand side of Eq. (112) is equal to 1 and the twisted 2-cocycle condition degrades to the conventional one shown in Eq. (12), consistent with the fact that the decohered Haldane phase has a pure-state SPT correspondence.

On the other hand, our LPDO construction is also suitable for describing the intrinsic ASPT state that does not have a pure-state SPT counterpart [30]. To construct an intrinsic ASPT phase, we need to consider a nontrivial group extension labeled by  $\omega_2$ . We can still adopt  $K = \mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ , but with a nontrivial extension to the  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  symmetry, i.e.,

$$1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow 1. \quad (131)$$

It is known that there is no nontrivial SPT phase for  $(1+1)D$  pure states protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  since  $\mathcal{H}^2[\mathbb{Z}_4, U(1)] = 1$ , while we can construct an intrinsic ASPT phase jointly protected by strong  $K = \mathbb{Z}_2$  and weak  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetries.

Since the decorated domain wall structure of this intrinsic ASPT phase mirrors that of the direct product symmetry class, the fixed-point density matrix can assume precisely the same form as the density matrix expressed in Eq. (126). However, it is important to note that the symmetry action must differ in this context. Specifically, the strong symmetry action  $\hat{O}(k) = \prod_i \tau_{i+1/2}^x$  remains unchanged, while the weak symmetry becomes  $U(g) = \prod_i \sigma_i^x e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}(1-\tau_{i+1/2}^x)}$ . It can be easily verified that

$$U(g)U(g) = \hat{O}(k)U(1), \quad (132)$$

indicating the group structure is  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  and the group extension is nontrivial.

Now the implementation of symmetry action  $U(k)$  leaves each component in Eq. (126) an additional phase,

$$\prod_i \sigma_i^x e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}(1-\tau_{i+1/2}^x)} |\psi_{\{\sigma_i\}}\rangle = e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}N_{\text{DW}}} |\psi_{\{\sigma_i\}}\rangle, \quad (133)$$

where  $N_{\text{DW}}$  is the number of domain walls in configurations  $\{\sigma_i\}$ . It means that  $U(g)$  is not a symmetry action for the original cluster state in Eq. (121) any longer. However, the density matrix in Eq. (126) should remain unchanged under the simultaneous implementation of  $U(g)$  on both sides, i.e.,

$$U(g)\rho U(g)^\dagger = \rho, \quad (134)$$

where the additional phase will be canceled out. Therefore,  $U(g)$  defined above is indeed a weak symmetry for the density matrix  $\rho$ .

Now we will see how the two symmetries are consistent within an LPDO representation and the projective representation of the two symmetries is constructed. We can utilize the same tensor given in the last section while defining new symmetry operations. For simplicity, we denote  $R = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}(1-\tau^x)}$ . The symmetry action of  $K$  in Eq. (130) remains unchanged, while the new symmetry transformation of  $G$  on the local tensor can be derived as

$$, \quad (135)$$

with an additional transformation on the Kraus index being  $M = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}(1-ZZ)}$  (viewed from down to up).

Similar to the previous case,  $X$  on virtual indices in Eq. (135) carries a nontrivial  $K$ -charge  $n_1 = 1$ , labeling the nontrivial ASPT phase jointly protected by  $K = \mathbb{Z}_2$

and  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ , while the additional  $M$  does not affect the topological invariants as the related phase structure should be canceled out under simultaneous implementation of weak symmetry on both sides. We highlight that in this case, Eq. (112) for pure-state SPT becomes

$$1 = \frac{\nu_2(g, g)\nu_2(1, g)}{\nu_2(g, 1)\nu_2(g, g)} = \prod_{j=1}^m e^{i2\pi\omega_2^j(g, g)n_1^j(g)/n_j} = -1, \quad (136)$$

which obviously has no solution. Therefore, we have constructed an intrinsic ASPT phase that does not correspond to any pure-state SPT phase, which has the same fixed point as the decohered Haldane phase but with different symmetry actions and group structures.

## VI. GENERALIZATION TO $(2+1)D$ SYSTEMS

Previous studies in the literature focusing on the structure or application of LPDO are mainly restricted to  $(1+1)D$  systems. In this section, we first generalize the definition and construction of LPDO to two spatial dimensions, then provide the classification of ASPT phases protected by exact fermion parity symmetry.

### A. Construction of LPDO in $(2+1)D$ systems

In  $(2+1)D$ , a pure quantum state with area law entanglement on an arbitrary lattice  $\Gamma$  can be represented by a projected entangled pair state (PEPS) [40–42], whose bulk-edge correspondence provides a natural formalism for studying the emergence of topological order from the structure of local tensors [45–48].

A PEPS defined by a rank-5 tensor with one physical index and four virtual indices is

$$, \quad (137)$$


where  $i$  is a  $d$ -dimensional physical index, and  $\{\tau_j\}$  are the virtual indices with dimension  $D$ .

An area-law entangled mixed state  $\rho$  can generally be represented by a projected entangled pair density operator (PEPDO). On a specific lattice site  $i$ , a PEPDO is defined as a rank-6 tensor with two physical indices and four virtual indices

$$. \quad (138)$$



Similar to the  $(1+1)D$  cases, there exists a large class of PEPDO that also admits a locally purified form, which we refer to as  $(2+1)D$  LPDO. It is obtained by starting from a pure state in the combined Hilbert space of physical and ancillary degrees of freedom,  $|\psi_{p\otimes a}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_p \otimes \mathcal{H}_a$ , with the following PEPS form with bond dimension  $D$




$$|\psi_{p\otimes a}\rangle = \dots \quad (139)$$

and then tracing out the ancilla Hilbert space. The corresponding density matrix  $\rho$  is

$$\rho = \text{Tr}_a (|\psi_{p\otimes a}\rangle \langle \psi_{p\otimes a}|). \quad (140)$$

The local tensor of LPDO on a lattice site has the following graphical representation



$$\rho = \dots \quad (141)$$

where the contracted index  $a$  is referred to as the Kraus index.

### B. Weak and strong injectivity

For pure states, injective PEPS has no intrinsic long-range entanglement or long-range order, while nontrivial topological order or SSB phases are described by a more involved class of PEPS satisfying the MPO-injectivity condition [44, 49, 50].

An injective PEPS is also characterized by its local conditions. Consider an arbitrary region  $R$  with boundary  $\partial R$ , then a PEPS is injective if the map

$$A_R : (\mathbb{C}^D)^{\otimes |\partial R|} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{d_p})^{\otimes |R|} \quad (142)$$

is injective, where  $A_R$  is obtained by contracting the tensors within the region  $R$ . Similar to the  $(1+1)D$  case, the injectivity of PEPS can exclude the existence of any topological order or any long-range order defined by [49, 69]

$$C(i, j) = \langle \psi | O_i O_j | \psi \rangle - \langle \psi | O_i | \psi \rangle \langle \psi | O_j | \psi \rangle \sim e^{-|i-j|/\xi}. \quad (143)$$

Here, we point out that the inverse direction remains an open problem. In principle, the correlation length  $\xi$  in the  $(2+1)D$  systems is characterized by a  $(1+1)D$  transfer matrix  $\mathbb{T}$  (shown in Fig. 2(b)) obtained by contracting the double tensor  $\mathbb{E}$  (shown in Fig. 2(a)) for an entire row or column, whose dimension scales exponentially with the system length scale  $N$ . The existence of SSB requires the spectrum of  $\mathbb{T}$  to be gapless, i.e.,  $\Delta \sim 1/N$  [69], to trigger a long-range correlation length  $\xi \sim 1/\Delta \sim N$ , a property that cannot be directly written on the local tensors. Therefore, it is difficult to claim the exact existence of a long-range order for a non-injective PEPS.

Now we generalize the injectivity condition to LPDO in  $(2+1)D$  systems.

*Definition* An LPDO in  $(2+1)D$  systems is weakly injective if the corresponding purified PEPS in Eq. (139) with the local tensor

$$A_{\{\tau_j\}}^{p,a} : (\mathbb{C}^D)^{\otimes |\partial R|} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{d_p} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d_a})^{\otimes |R|} \quad (144)$$

is injective. An LPDO is strongly injective if the corresponding double state  $|\rho\rangle\rangle$  with the local tensor

$$\sum_a A_{\{\tau_j^u\}}^{p,a} A_{\{\tau_j^l\}}^{*p',a} : (\mathbb{C}^D)^{\otimes 2|\partial R|} \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^{d_p})^{\otimes 2|R|} \quad (145)$$

is injective.

Similar to the  $(1+1)D$  case, weak injectivity excludes the existence of long-range order in the linear two-point correlation function

$$C^{(1)}(i, j) \equiv \text{Tr}(\rho O_i O_j) - \text{Tr}(\rho O_i) \text{Tr}(\rho O_j) \sim e^{-|i-j|/\xi} \quad (146)$$

guaranteed by a finite gap in the transfer matrix  $\mathbb{T}$  composed by the double tensor  $\mathbb{E}$  shown in Fig. 2(c), while strong injectivity excludes the existence of long-range order in the Rényi-2 two-point correlation function

$$C^{(2)}(i, j) \equiv \frac{\text{Tr}(\rho O_i O_j \rho O_i O_j) - \text{Tr}(\rho O_i \rho O_i) \text{Tr}(\rho O_j \rho O_j)}{\text{Tr}(\rho^2)} \sim e^{-|i-j|/\xi'} \quad (147)$$

determined by the transfer matrix  $\mathbb{T}$  from the double tensor  $\mathbb{E}$  shown in Fig. 2(d). In summary, regardless of spatial dimension, a short-range entangled LPDO should be injective in both senses to ensure that there is no topological order or long-range order in the density matrix.

### C. Symmetry in the LPDO representation

In  $(2+1)D$ , the graphical representation of the symmetry operator  $U(k)$  on a square lattice PEPS is given




FIG. 2. Transfer Matrix of PEPS. (a) Double tensor  $\mathbb{E}$  for a single site. (b) Transfer matrix  $\mathbb{T}$  after contracting an entire column of  $\mathbb{E}$ . (c) Double tensor for weak injectivity in Eq. (144). (d) Double tensor for strong injectivity in Eq. (145).

by [49]

$$\text{Diagram (148)} \quad (148)$$

Here the circle of  $B$  operators is combined to be a matrix product operator (MPO)  $V(k)$  acting on all virtual indices of the PEPS. The explicit form is given by

$$V(k) = \sum_{\{\tau_j, \tau'_j\}} \text{Tr} \left( \prod_{j=1}^4 B_{\tau_j \tau'_j} \right) |\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \tau_4\rangle \langle \tau'_1, \tau'_2, \tau'_3, \tau'_4|, \quad (149)$$

where  $B_{\tau_j \tau'_j}$  is a  $D \times D$  matrix defined on the virtual index with the following form

$$B_k = \sum_{\tau \tau' \alpha \beta} (B_k)^{\alpha \beta}_{\tau \tau'} |\tau\rangle \langle \alpha| (\beta) \langle \tau'|, \quad (150)$$

where  $|\tau\rangle$  and  $|\tau'\rangle$  are vectors applied on the virtual index of PEPS, while  $|\alpha\rangle$  and  $|\beta\rangle$  are internal indices of the MPO  $V(k)$ . In particular, the injectivity of PEPS requires that  $V(1) = \mathbb{I}^{\otimes 4}$ , i.e., a trivial MPO for  $g = 1$ , from which one can also demonstrate the uniqueness of  $V(l)$  for  $k \neq 1$  (up to a phase), while those with intrinsic topological order or SSB will have nontrivial  $V(1)$  [50].

Next, let us consider the strong and weak symmetry actions on the upper side of an LPDO. A strong symmetry  $U(k)$  does not induce transformations in the Kraus

index, whose graphical descriptions are as follows

$$\text{Diagram (151)} \quad (151)$$

promising that the density matrix is invariant if we only apply a strong symmetry on one side of the density matrix. Here, the transformation on the virtual indices  $V(k)$  is still an MPO constructed from  $B(k)$  as in Eq. (149). Similar to the  $(1+1)D$  case, the weak injectivity condition of an LPDO guarantees the uniqueness (up to a phase) of  $V(k)$  since the actions on the physical and Kraus indices are fixed.

On the other hand, the graphical representation of the weak symmetry  $U(g)$  on an LPDO is

$$\text{Diagram (152)} \quad (152)$$


where  $M(g)$  is an additional unitary operator acting on the Kraus index. Similar to the  $(1+1)D$  case, due to the nontrivial  $M(g)$  action on the Kraus index, the density matrix  $\rho$  is not invariant if we apply a weak symmetry on one side of the density matrix, while  $\rho$  is invariant only if we apply weak symmetry operators on both sides of the density matrix, meaning that  $M(g)^\dagger M(g) = I$  forms

a unitary representation. Furthermore, strong and weak injectivity conditions can jointly promise that  $V(g)$  is unique (up to a phase) for a given  $U(g)$ , although maybe  $M(g)$  is not, through an argument identical to the  $(1+1)D$  case.

#### D. $(2+1)D$ SPT with fermion parity symmetry

In this section, we review the classification of  $(2+1)D$  pure SPT states in terms of PEPS representation [70] for both bosonic and fermionic systems.


For bosonic SPT states, the on-site symmetry action  $U(k)$  is shown in Eq. (148). We sequentially apply two weak symmetry operators  $U(k_2)$  and  $U(k_1)$  that will leave two surrounding MPOs  $B(k_2)$  and  $B(k_1)$ , which are essentially the same as applying the symmetry operator  $U(k_1 k_2)$  leaving a surrounding MPO  $B(k_1 k_2)$ . This equivalence leads to the following composition rule of  $B(k)$  as



$$(153)$$


where  $\lambda_\alpha$  and  $\lambda_\beta$  are the fusion tensor on virtual indices to project out the redundant virtual degree of freedom for the MPO  $V(k_1)V(k_2)$ , and  $\lambda(k_1, k_2) \in U(1)$ .

Subsequently, we consider the sequential application of three symmetry operators to the physical index:  $U(k_3)$ ,  $U(k_2)$ , and  $U(k_1)$ , which is essentially the same as applying  $U(k_1 k_2 k_3)$ . There are different orders concerning the fusion rule of the MPO tensor  $B(k)$  that result in a phase ambiguity of the fusion tensor  $\lambda_\beta$ , namely



$$(154)$$

where  $\nu_3(k_1, k_2, k_3) \in U(1)$ . For simplicity, we abbreviate the above graph by a  $F$ -symbol as



$$(155)$$


Toward the consistency condition of the phase factor  $\nu_3$ , we should further consider the sequential applications

of four symmetry operators,  $U(k_4)$ ,  $U(k_3)$ ,  $U(k_2)$ , and  $U(k_1)$ . Different  $F$ -moves play the role of altering the fusion ordering of the MPO operators  $B(k_4)$ ,  $B(k_3)$ ,  $B(k_2)$ , and  $B(k_1)$  on the virtual indices that finally return to the original fusion order, as depicted by a pentagon equation in Fig. 3. It indicates that the phase ambiguity of the fusion tensor  $\lambda_\beta$  satisfies a 3-cocycle condition, namely

$$\frac{\nu_3(k_1, k_2, k_3)\nu_3(k_1, k_2 k_3, k_4)\nu_3(k_2, k_3, k_4)}{\nu_3(k_1 k_2, k_3, k_4)\nu_3(k_1, k_2, k_3 k_4)} = 1. \quad (156)$$


Therefore, the different  $(2+1)D$  bosonic SPT states represented by PEPS are classified by a 3-cocycle  $\nu_3 \in \mathcal{H}^3[G, U(1)]$ .

In the following, we generalize the PEPS construction and classification of  $(2+1)D$  SPT states to fermionic systems for the simplest  $G_f = G_b \times \mathbb{Z}_2^f$  symmetry, i.e., the total symmetry group is the direct product of two subgroups, or equivalently, the trivial extension  $\omega_2$ . First of all, similar to the  $(1+1)D$  case, we should define every physical and virtual index in a supervector space with a graded structure in Eq. (51), and the symmetry action on the physical index is also given by Eq. (62) and (63). Next, by two sequential applications of  $U(h)$  and  $U(g)$  ( $g, h \in G_b$ ), the composition rule of  $B(g)$  should be




$$(157)$$

Similar to the bosonic case, we then consider three sequentially applied symmetry operators,  $U(k)$ ,  $U(h)$ , and  $U(g)$ , which is essentially the same as applying  $U(ghk)$ . Therefore, we can define a phase ambiguity  $\nu_3$  for the bosonic symmetry  $G_b$  from two equivalent fusion orders as in the following



$$(158)$$

where  $\nu_3(g, h, k) \in U(1)$ , or depicted with the  $F$ -symbol as



$$(159)$$

The consistency condition for  $\nu_3$  will be discussed later.




FIG. 3. Pentagon equation of the  $F$ -move defined in Eq. (155).

For fermionic systems, the boundary MPO can carry a nonzero fermion parity  $n_1(g)$ , defined as

$$P_f^{\otimes 4} V(g) = (-1)^{n_1(g)} P_f^{\otimes 4} V(g). \quad (160)$$

Following the composition of the fermionic boundary MPO in Eq. (157), we obtain a fermion parity conservation as

$$n_1(g) + n_1(h) - n_1(gh) = 0 \pmod{2}. \quad (161)$$

Furthermore, the conservation of the fermion parity of the  $B_g$  operators leaves an ambiguity: the fermion parity of  $\lambda_\alpha(g, h)$  and  $\lambda_\beta(g, h)$  should be even in total, but they can be both even or odd individually. We label one of them, e.g., that of  $\lambda_\beta(g, h)$ , by  $n_2(g, h)$  and the red dots in Eq. (159), defined as

$$\begin{array}{c} \cdots \text{---} (P_f) \text{---} \cdots \\ \cdots \text{---} (P_f) \text{---} \cdots \end{array} \left\langle \begin{array}{c} \lambda_\beta \\ \lambda_\beta \end{array} \right\rangle \text{---} (P_f) \text{---} \cdots = (-1)^{n_2(g, h)} \begin{array}{c} \cdots \text{---} \left\langle \begin{array}{c} \lambda_\beta \\ \lambda_\beta \end{array} \right\rangle \text{---} \cdots \end{array}. \quad (162)$$

By left-applying  $P_f^{\otimes 3}$  to both sides of Eq. (158), we obtain another fermion parity conservation as

$$n_2(g, h) + n_2(gh, k) = n_2(g, hk) + n_2(h, k) \pmod{2}. \quad (163)$$

Finally, we discuss the consistency condition of phase ambiguity  $\nu_3$ . Similar to the bosonic case, we consider the sequential applications of four symmetry operators, namely  $U(l)$ ,  $U(k)$ ,  $U(h)$ , and  $U(g)$ . We further take several  $F$ -moves to alter the fusion ordering of the MPO operators  $B(l)$ ,  $B(k)$ ,  $B(h)$ , and  $B(g)$  on the virtual indices and then back to the original ordering, there will be a super-pentagon equation as illustrated in Fig. 4. In particular, in the left-bottom corner of Fig. 4, the exchange of two fusion tensors leads to an additional fermion sign:  $(-1)^{n_2(g, h)n_2(k, l)}$ . Gathering everything together, the phase ambiguity  $\nu_3$  of the  $F$ -move should satisfy a twisted 3-cocycle condition, namely

$$\frac{\nu_3(g, h, l)\nu_3(g, hl, k)\nu_3(h, l, k)}{\nu_3(gh, l, k)\nu_3(g, h, lk)} = (-1)^{n_2(g, h)n_2(l, k)}, \quad (164)$$

which requires  $(-1)^{n_2(g, h)n_2(l, k)}$  to be a 4-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^4[G_b, U(1)]$ .

We summarize the PEPS classification and topological invariants of  $(2+1)D$  fermionic SPT phases:

1.  $n_1 \in \mathcal{H}^1[G_b, h^2(\mathbb{Z}_2^f)]$ : fermion parity of the boundary MPO  $B(g)$  for bosonic symmetry with the 1-cocycle condition in Eq. (161).
2.  $n_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2[G_b, h^1(\mathbb{Z}_2^f)]$ : fermion parity of the fusion tensor  $\lambda_\beta$  of the boundary MPOs  $B(g)$  with the 2-cocycle condition in Eq. (163), together with the re-




FIG. 4. Super-Pentagon equation of the  $F$ -move defined in Eq. (159). The move in the left-bottom corner depicts an exchange of two fusion tensors, which may lead to a fermion sign.

quirement that  $(-1)^{n_2(g,h)n_2(l,k)}$  be a 4-coboundary in  $\mathcal{H}^4[G_b, U(1)]$ .

3.  $\nu_3 \in \mathcal{H}^3[G_b, U(1)]$ : phase ambiguity of the  $F$ -moves of the fusion tensors with the twisted 3-cocycle condition in Eq. (164).

We emphasize that each set of classification data ( $n_1$  and  $n_2$ ) obtained from the PEPS construction implies a distinct decorated domain wall configuration. When a truncated symmetry operator  $U_\Gamma(g) = \prod_{j \in \Gamma} U_j(g)$  is applied within a finite region  $\Gamma$ , it induces an MPO  $B_g$  on the boundary of  $\Gamma$ , where the total fermion parity is characterized by  $n_1(g)$ . Alternatively, if we define fermionic injective PEPS within the finite region  $\Gamma$  under an open boundary condition, a global symmetry transformation  $U(g)$  corresponds to the MPO  $B_g$  is acted on the boundary MPS defined on  $\partial\Gamma$ . In particular, when  $n_1(g) = 1$ , the MPO  $B_g$  twists the total fermion parity of the boundary MPS, indicating the presence of a Kitaev Majorana chain on  $\partial\Gamma$ .

Then we apply a truncated symmetry operator  $U_\Gamma(g) = \prod_{j \in \Gamma} U_j(g)$  within a finite regime  $\Gamma$ , and similarly, another truncated symmetry operator  $U_{\Gamma'}(h)$  within another finite regime  $\Gamma'$ . At the junction  $\partial\Gamma \cap \partial\Gamma'$ , where the boundary MPOs  $B_g$  and  $B_h$  intersect, there ex-

ists a fusion rule specific to these boundary MPOs, i.e.,

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} B_g \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} B_h \text{---} \end{array} \rightarrow \lambda_\beta \text{---} B_{gh} \text{---} \quad (165)$$

and the fermion parity of the fusion tensor  $\lambda_\beta$  is labeled by  $n_2(g, h)$ . This means that there might be a complex fermion decorated at the junction of the symmetry domain walls  $\partial\Gamma \cap \partial\Gamma'$ .

#### E. $(2+1)D$ ASPT with strong fermion parity symmetry

Now we turn to studying the ASPT phases protected by strong symmetry  $K$  and weak symmetry  $G$ . We discuss a simplest but physically relevant example with a strong  $K = \mathbb{Z}_2^f$  fermion parity symmetry and a weak  $G = G_b$  symmetry, with trivial extension  $G_b \times \mathbb{Z}_2^f$ .

First, we consider the fermion parity of the  $B_g$  operator (labeled by  $n_1(g)$ ) with the definition in Eq. (160). Because the fermion parity  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$  is a strong symmetry, the fermion parity of  $B_g$  on the upper and lower sides of the  $(2+1)D$  LPDO are well defined individually and the complex fermion cannot tunnel between two sides. We



sequentially apply  $U(h)$  and  $U(g)$  on the physical indices ( $g, h \in G_b$ ) that is equivalent to the application of  $U(gh)$ , according to Eq. (152), there must be an MPO fusion defined in Eq. (157) on each nearby virtual index, which implies the following 1-cocycle condition for the fermion parity conservation of the MPO  $B(g)$ , namely

$$n_1(g) + n_1(h) + n_1(gh) = 0 \pmod{2}. \quad (166)$$

Furthermore, for fermionic systems, each fusion tensor  $\lambda_\beta(g, h)$  can carry a nonzero fermion parity labeled by  $n_2(g, h)$  as defined in Eq. (162), where the fermion parity conservation of the  $F$ -move gives the following 2-cocycle condition

$$n_2(g, h) + n_2(gh, k) = n_2(g, hk) + n_2(h, k) \pmod{2}. \quad (167)$$

On the contrary, the phase ambiguity of  $F$ -move demonstrated in Eq. (154) at the upper and lower sides of an LPDO have to be canceled, i.e., there is no phase ambiguity of  $F$ -move. This is consistent with the  $(1+1)D$  case that there is no nontrivial ASPT state solely protected by weak symmetry. Therefore, we do not need to care about the condition of  $\nu_3$  in Eq. (164) discussed for pure state SPT, as the weak symmetry  $G_b$  must be applied simultaneously to the upper and lower sides of an LPDO and all the phase ambiguity will be canceled out.

We summarize the LPDO classification of  $(2+1)D$  ASPT phases with a strong  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$  fermion parity and a weak  $G_b$  symmetry. The topological invariants of these ASPT states are

1.  $n_1 \in \mathcal{H}^1(G_b, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ : Fermion parity of the  $B_g$  operator satisfying the 1-cocycle condition in Eq. (166);
2.  $n_2 \in \mathcal{H}^2(G_b, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ : Fermion parity of the fusion tensor  $\lambda_\beta$  satisfying the 2-cocycle condition in Eq. (167), but without the coboundary condition as in the pure state case.

We note that there is no obstruction of the above data. In particular, each  $n_2$  data such that  $(-1)^{n_2(g, h)n_2(l, k)}$  is a nontrivial 4-cocycle in  $\mathcal{H}^4[G_b, U(1)]$  corresponds to an intrinsic ASPT state.

Similar to the fermion SPT pure states, we can also extract the decorated domain wall patterns directly from the classification data: a nontrivial  $n_1$  labels a fermionic ASPT state with Majorana chain decoration on the  $G_b$  domain wall, and a nontrivial  $n_2$  labels a fermionic ASPT state with complex fermion decoration on the junction of the  $G_b$  domain wall.

### F. Example: $(2+1)D$ intrinsic ASPT

In this section, we provide an example illustrating the tensor construction of an intrinsic ASPT phase in  $(2+1)D$  systems. Our approach is guided by the decorated domain wall picture [9] and integrates the intrinsic ASPT

density matrix proposed for the  $(1+1)D$  systems in the previous section.

We start our discussion from the construction of a nontrivial spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  SPT phase protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_2^A \times \mathbb{Z}_2^B \times \mathbb{Z}_2^C$  symmetry defined on a honeycomb lattice, where spins are positioned on both plaquettes and vertices. To be more specific, we assign spins  $A$  and  $B$  to two inequivalent sets of sites on the honeycomb lattice, while  $C$  spins are placed on the plaquettes, as shown in Fig. 5. The three  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetries are defined as  $\hat{O}_A = \prod_i \sigma_{i_A}^x$ ,  $\hat{O}_B = \prod_i \sigma_{i_B}^x$ , and  $\hat{O}_C = \prod_i \sigma_{i_C}^x$ , respectively. The wavefunction comprises an equal-weight superposition of all possible  $C$ -spin configurations, each attached by a nontrivial  $(1+1)D$  SPT state protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_2^A \times \mathbb{Z}_2^B$  along the domain walls of  $C$  spins (solid lines in Fig. 5 (a)), while the rest vertices form a trivial symmetric product state (dashed lines in Fig. 5 (a)).

The tensor network structure for this model is shown in Fig. 5 (b), where there are four types of tensors. Each vertex  $A$  or  $B$  is associated with a rank-4 tensor  $\mathbb{T}_{A/B}$  featuring three virtual indices connecting neighboring vertices and a physical index. Meanwhile, each plaquette  $C$  is represented by a rank-7 tensor  $\mathbb{T}_C$  with six virtual indices linking surrounding edges and a physical index. Additionally, we place a rank-4 tensor  $\mathbb{T}_D$  on each edge with four virtual indices connecting neighboring vertices  $A$ ,  $B$ , and two adjacent plaquettes  $C$ . The tensor elements for these four types of tensors are shown in Fig. 5 (c). In particular, the Hadamard gate  $H$  is placed on the domain walls to generate the  $(1+1)D$  cluster state (together with the delta function on each vertex), while the  $J$  matrix facilitates the construction of the product symmetric state  $|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle \sim |\rightarrow\rangle$ . This construction effectively illustrates its nontrivial topological properties by examining the symmetry actions on the domain wall structure. When a  $\mathbb{Z}_2^C$  operator is applied to a single plaquette, flipping the  $C$  spin, it induces a Pauli  $X$  action on each virtual index of  $\mathbb{T}_C$ . Consequently, the neighboring  $\mathbb{T}_D$  tensors experience exchange between  $J$  and  $H$ , reflecting a deformation in the domain wall structure.

Next, we proceed to the construction of intrinsic ASPT in  $(2+1)D$  systems. In this case, we retain the quantum superpositions of different  $C$ -spin configurations, while the cluster chain on the domain walls of  $C$  spins is replaced by the intrinsic  $(1+1)D$  SPT density matrix proposed in the previous section. The symmetries associated with  $B$  and  $C$  spins remain strong, while the symmetry action on  $A$  spins is defined as  $U_A = \prod_i \sigma_{i_A}^x e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}(1-\sigma_{i_B}^x)}$ , becoming a weak symmetry. Similarly, the symmetry actions  $\hat{O}_B$  and  $U_A$  form the group extension

$$1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^B \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_4^{A,B} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2^A \rightarrow 1 \quad (168)$$

with  $U_A^2 = \hat{O}_B$ . Consequently, the total symmetry group is defined as  $\mathbb{Z}_2^C \times \mathbb{Z}_4^{A,B}$ .

As for the tensor construction, we note that all quantum superpositions of  $A$ -spin configurations are replaced by classical mixture, which means that the tensors




FIG. 5. Tensor construction of intrinsic ASPT phase in  $(2+1)D$  systems protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_2^C \times \mathbb{Z}_4^{A,B}$ . (a) Honeycomb Lattice and domain wall of  $C$  spins. (b) Tensor structure for  $(2+1)D$  SPT phase. (c) Tensor elements for  $(2+1)D$  SPT phase. (d) Tensor elements for  $(2+1)D$  intrinsic ASPT phase. Here,  $T_{B/C/D}$  remain unchanged, while  $T_A$  possesses an extra Kraus index.

$T_{B/C/D}$  remain unchanged and  $T_A$  is replaced by the one depicted in Fig. 5 (d), i.e., with one extra Kraus index. It can be easily verified that on the domain walls of  $C$  spins, there is a corresponding  $(1+1)D$  intrinsic ASPT state protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_4^{A,B}$  symmetry, while on other vertices, we are left with a maximally mixed state  $|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|_A + |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|_A$  on  $A$  spins that is weakly symmetric and a product state  $|\uparrow\rangle_B + |\downarrow\rangle_B \sim |\rightarrow\rangle_B$  that is strongly symmetric. Therefore, our construction yields an intrinsic ASPT phase protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_2^C \times \mathbb{Z}_4^{A,B}$  symmetry in  $(2+1)D$  systems because there is no  $(1+1)D$  nontrivial SPT phase protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  symmetry. As a result, we cannot obtain a corresponding  $(2+1)D$  SPT phase protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$  with the same decorated domain wall structure.

## VII. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we demonstrate that LPDOs provide systematic tensor network representations of ASPT phases in mixed quantum states, protected by the collaboration of a strong symmetry and a weak symmetry in the  $(1+1)D$  and  $(2+1)D$  systems.

We introduce short-range correlated LPDOs charac-

terized by two distinct injectivity conditions: strong injectivity and weak injectivity. Weak injectivity ensures that the LPDO can be locally transformed into a trivial product state using local quantum channels and prohibits the existence of long-range linear correlation functions of any local operators. Strong injectivity, on the other hand, ensures the absence of long-range Rényi-2 correlation functions of any local operators. Taking advantage of these injectivity conditions, we reproduce the full classification of the  $(1+1)D$  ASPT phases for generic symmetry groups. Additionally, we present explicit LPDO forms for  $(1+1)D$  ASPT density matrices, including an intrinsic  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  ASPT state lacking a pure state realization.

We expand our LPDO construction of ASPT phases to  $(2+1)D$  open quantum systems, where we define the strong and weak injectivity conditions of  $(2+1)D$  LPDOs. Similar to the  $(1+1)D$  cases, weak injectivity signifies short-ranged linear correlation functions of any local operator, while strong injectivity implies short-ranged Rényi-2 correlation functions of any local operator. As a representative case, we investigate the classification of ASPT states protected by a strong  $\mathbb{Z}_2^f$  symmetry and a weak bosonic  $G_b$  symmetry. Our exploration is ended by the explicit construction of a  $(2+1)D$  intrinsic ASPT

phase on the honeycomb lattice protected by  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$  symmetry without any pure-state counterpart.

We emphasize that our approach not only reproduces previous classification results of ASPT phases, but also offers a clearer and more concise formalism with the symmetry action directly embedded in the local tensor. This formulation naturally reveals the picture of decorated domain walls within the LPDO construction. Moreover, our method provides a systematic approach to constructing tensor network representations of ASPT phases for those with pure-state counterparts, with a novel example of intrinsic ASPT phases.

We end this work with some open questions:

1. *Fixed-point tensor of intrinsic ASPT phases:* In this work, we have laid out some general methods to construct fixed-point tensors for ASPT phases with pure-state SPT correspondence. However, despite several examples that have already been proposed in this work, the way to construct the fixed-point tensor for general intrinsic ASPT is still missing. One possible approach could involve constructing the fixed-point tensor of an SPT state within the double state formalism. However, the challenge lies in utilizing the conditions of Hermiticity and positivity to convert this tensor back into an LPDO. This line of investigation holds the potential to deepen our understanding of the structure of quantum phases in doubled space, shedding light on the underlying mechanisms of intrinsic ASPT phases.
2. *Boundary anomaly of ASPT states:* The extension of the 't Hooft anomaly from global symmetry to mixed states remains an unresolved issue [71, 72]. Here, our primary focus lies in tensor network states with periodic boundary conditions. Leveraging the LPDO con-

structions of ASPT states developed in this work, we can delve into the boundary physics of these states by placing the LPDO on systems with open boundary conditions.

3. *Topologically ordered mixed states:* In this work, our focus has been restricted to injective LPDOs when we explore the construction and classification of fixed-point tensors for ASPT states. However, an intriguing avenue for future research lies in investigating LPDO tensor network states with topological order by gauging our injective LPDO in  $(2+1)D$ . Specifically, an interesting question to explore is the distinction between gauging weak symmetry and gauging strong symmetry, which has the potential to deepen our understanding of topological orders in mixed states [73].

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Meng Cheng, Ke Ding, Sung-Sik Lee, Zhu-Xi Luo, Ruben Verresen, Chong Wang, Xiao-Gang Wen, Yichen Xu, and Carolyn Zhang for stimulating discussions. Y. Guo, H.-R. Zhang, and S. Yang are supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) (Grant No. 12174214 and No. 92065205) and the Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology (Project 2021ZD0302100). J.-H. Zhang and Z. Bi are supported by the startup fund from the Pennsylvania State University.

*Note* – During the completion of this work, we were aware of an independent work [74] which also addresses the tensor network formalism of mixed-state symmetry-protected topological phases.

- 
- [1] Michael A. Levin and Xiao-Gang Wen, “String-net condensation: A physical mechanism for topological phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 045110 (2005).
  - [2] Alexei Kitaev and John Preskill, “Topological entanglement entropy,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 110404 (2006).
  - [3] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Local unitary transformation, long-range quantum entanglement, wave function renormalization, and topological order,” *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 155138 (2010).
  - [4] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Classification of gapped symmetric phases in one-dimensional spin systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 035107 (2011).
  - [5] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Complete classification of one-dimensional gapped quantum phases in interacting spin systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 235128 (2011).
  - [6] Michael Levin and Zheng-Cheng Gu, “Braiding statistics approach to symmetry-protected topological phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 115109 (2012).
  - [7] Ashvin Vishwanath and T. Senthil, “Physics of Three-Dimensional Bosonic Topological Insulators: Surface-Deconfined Criticality and Quantized Magnetoelectric Effect,” *Phys. Rev. X* **3**, 011016 (2013).
  - [8] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, Zheng-Xin Liu, and Xiao-Gang Wen, “Symmetry protected topological orders and the group cohomology of their symmetry group,” *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 155114 (2013).
  - [9] Xie Chen, Yuan-Ming Lu, and Ashvin Vishwanath, “Symmetry-protected topological phases from decorated domain walls,” *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 3507 (2014).
  - [10] Chong Wang, Andrew C. Potter, and T. Senthil, “Classification of Interacting Electronic Topological Insulators in Three Dimensions,” *Science* **343**, 629–631 (2014).
  - [11] T. Senthil, “Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases of Quantum Matter,” *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **6**, 299–324 (2015).
  - [12] M Zahid Hasan and Charles L Kane, “Colloquium: topological insulators,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 3045 (2010).
  - [13] Xiao-Liang Qi and Shou-Cheng Zhang, “Topological insulators and superconductors,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, 1057–1110 (2011).
  - [14] Heinz-Peter Breuer and Francesco Petruccione,

*The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2007).

- [15] Ángel Rivas and Susana F. Huelga, *Open Quantum Systems: An Introduction*, 1st ed. (Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012).
- [16] Marco Cattaneo, Gabriele De Chiara, Sabrina Maniscalco, Roberta Zambrini, and Gian Luca Giorgi, “Collision models can efficiently simulate any multipartite markovian quantum dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 130403 (2021).
- [17] Anthony W. Schlimgen, Kade Head-Marsden, LeeAnn M. Sager, Prineha Narang, and David A. Mazziotti, “Quantum simulation of open quantum systems using a unitary decomposition of operators,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 270503 (2021).
- [18] Hirsh Kamakari, Shi-Ning Sun, Mario Motta, and Austin J. Minnich, “Digital quantum simulation of open quantum systems using quantum imaginary-time evolution,” *PRX Quantum* **3**, 010320 (2022).
- [19] Yuchen Guo and Shuo Yang, “Quantum error mitigation via matrix product operators,” *PRX Quantum* **3**, 040313 (2022).
- [20] Zhenyu Cai, Ryan Babbush, Simon C. Benjamin, Suguru Endo, William J. Huggins, Ying Li, Jarrod R. McClean, and Thomas E. O’Brien, “Quantum error mitigation,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **95**, 045005 (2023).
- [21] Yuchen Guo and Shuo Yang, “Noise effects on purity and quantum entanglement in terms of physical implementability,” *npj Quantum Inform.* **9**, 11 (2023).
- [22] Ulrich Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems*, 4th ed. (WORLD SCIENTIFIC, 2012).
- [23] E. M. Kessler, G. Giedke, A. Imamoglu, S. F. Yelin, M. D. Lukin, and J. I. Cirac, “Dissipative phase transition in a central spin system,” *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 012116 (2012).
- [24] Stefan Walter, Andreas Nunnenkamp, and Christoph Bruder, “Quantum synchronization of a driven self-sustained oscillator,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 094102 (2014).
- [25] Hans Keßler, Phatthamon Kongkhambut, Christoph Georges, Ludwig Mathey, Jayson G. Cosme, and Andreas Hemmerich, “Observation of a dissipative time crystal,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 043602 (2021).
- [26] Caroline de Groot, Alex Turzillo, and Norbert Schuch, “Symmetry Protected Topological Order in Open Quantum Systems,” *Quantum* **6**, 856 (2022).
- [27] Ruochen Ma and Chong Wang, “Average symmetry-protected topological phases,” *Phys. Rev. X* **13**, 031016 (2023).
- [28] Jong Yeon Lee, Yi-Zhuang You, and Cenke Xu, “Symmetry protected topological phases under decoherence,” (2022), [arXiv:2210.16323](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.16323).
- [29] Jian-Hao Zhang, Yang Qi, and Zhen Bi, “Strange Correlation Function for Average Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases,” (2022), [arXiv:2210.17485](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.17485).
- [30] Ruochen Ma, Jian-Hao Zhang, Zhen Bi, Meng Cheng, and Chong Wang, “Topological Phases with Average Symmetries: the Decohered, the Disordered, and the Intrinsic,” (2023), [arXiv:2305.16399](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.16399).
- [31] Jian-Hao Zhang, Ke Ding, Shuo Yang, and Zhen Bi, “Fractonic higher-order topological phases in open quantum systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **108**, 155123 (2023).
- [32] Ruochen Ma and Alex Turzillo, “Symmetry protected topological phases of mixed states in the doubled space,” (2024), [arXiv:2403.13280](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.13280).
- [33] Román Orús, “A practical introduction to tensor networks: Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states,” *Ann. Phys. NY* **349**, 117–158 (2014).
- [34] Jacob C Bridgeman and Christopher T Chubb, “Hand-waving and interpretive dance: an introductory course on tensor networks,” *J. Phys. A-Math. Theor.* **50**, 223001 (2017).
- [35] J. Ignacio Cirac, David Pérez-García, Norbert Schuch, and Frank Verstraete, “Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states: Concepts, symmetries, theorems,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **93**, 045003 (2021).
- [36] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, D. Perez-Garcia, and J. I. Cirac, “Criticality, the area law, and the computational power of projected entangled pair states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 220601 (2006).
- [37] D. Pérez-García, F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, “Matrix product state representations,” *Quantum Info. Comput.* **7**, 401–430 (2007).
- [38] F. Verstraete, V. Murg, and J.I. Cirac, “Matrix product states, projected entangled pair states, and variational renormalization group methods for quantum spin systems,” *Adv. Phys.* **57**, 143–224 (2008).
- [39] Ulrich Schollwöck, “The density-matrix renormalization group in the age of matrix product states,” *Ann. Phys. NY* **326**, 96–192 (2011), January 2011 Special Issue.
- [40] Norbert Schuch, Michael M. Wolf, Frank Verstraete, and J. Ignacio Cirac, “Computational complexity of projected entangled pair states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 140506 (2007).
- [41] D. Pérez-García, F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, “Peps as unique ground states of local hamiltonians,” *Quantum Info. Comput.* **8**, 650–663 (2008).
- [42] Norbert Schuch, Ignacio Cirac, and David Pérez-García, “Peps as ground states: Degeneracy and topology,” *Ann. Phys.* **325**, 2153–2192 (2010).
- [43] Frank Pollmann, Ari M. Turner, Erez Berg, and Masaki Oshikawa, “Entanglement spectrum of a topological phase in one dimension,” *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 064439 (2010).
- [44] Norbert Schuch, David Pérez-García, and Ignacio Cirac, “Classifying quantum phases using matrix product states and projected entangled pair states,” *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 165139 (2011).
- [45] J. Ignacio Cirac, Didier Poilblanc, Norbert Schuch, and Frank Verstraete, “Entanglement spectrum and boundary theories with projected entangled-pair states,” *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 245134 (2011).
- [46] Norbert Schuch, Didier Poilblanc, J. Ignacio Cirac, and David Pérez-García, “Topological order in the projected entangled-pair states formalism: Transfer operator and boundary hamiltonians,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 090501 (2013).
- [47] S. Yang, L. Lehman, D. Poilblanc, K. Van Acoleyen, F. Verstraete, J. I. Cirac, and N. Schuch, “Edge theories in projected entangled pair state models,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 036402 (2014).
- [48] Shuo Yang, Thorsten B. Wahl, Hong-Hao Tu, Norbert Schuch, and J. Ignacio Cirac, “Chiral projected entangled-pair state with topological order,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 106803 (2015).
- [49] Dominic J. Williamson, Nick Bultinck, Michael Mariën, Mehmet B. Şahinoğlu, Jutho Haegeman, and Frank



- Verstraete, “Matrix product operators for symmetry-protected topological phases: Gauging and edge theories,” *Phys. Rev. B* **94**, 205150 (2016).
- [50] Mehmet Burak Şahinoğlu, Dominic Williamson, Nick Bultinck, Michaël Mariën, Jutho Haegeman, Norbert Schuch, and Frank Verstraete, “Characterizing topological order with matrix product operators,” *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **22**, 563–592 (2021).
- [51] F. Verstraete, J. J. García-Ripoll, and J. I. Cirac, “Matrix product density operators: Simulation of finite-temperature and dissipative systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 207204 (2004).
- [52] Michael Zwolak and Guifré Vidal, “Mixed-state dynamics in one-dimensional quantum lattice systems: A time-dependent superoperator renormalization algorithm,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 207205 (2004).
- [53] Gemma De las Cuevas, Norbert Schuch, David Pérez-García, and J Ignacio Cirac, “Purifications of multipartite states: limitations and constructive methods,” *New J. Phys.* **15**, 123021 (2013).
- [54] A. H. Werner, D. Jaschke, P. Silvi, M. Kliesch, T. Calarco, J. Eisert, and S. Montangero, “Positive tensor network approach for simulating open quantum many-body systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 237201 (2016).
- [55] Song Cheng, Chenfeng Cao, Chao Zhang, Yongxiang Liu, Shi-Yao Hou, Pengxiang Xu, and Bei Zeng, “Simulating noisy quantum circuits with matrix product density operators,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 023005 (2021).
- [56] Yuchen Guo and Shuo Yang, “Locally purified density operators for noisy quantum circuits,” (2023), [arXiv:2312.02854](#).
- [57] Yuchen Guo and Shuo Yang, “Scalable quantum state tomography with locally purified density operators and local measurements,” (2023), [arXiv:2307.16381](#).
- [58] Wen jun Li, Kai Xu, Heng Fan, Shi ju Ran, and Gang Su, “Efficient quantum mixed-state tomography with unsupervised tensor network machine learning,” (2023), [arXiv:2308.06900](#).
- [59] Giacomo Torlai, Christopher J. Wood, Atithi Acharya, Giuseppe Carleo, Juan Carrasquilla, and Leandro Aolita, “Quantum process tomography with unsupervised learning and tensor networks,” *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 2858 (2023).
- [60] Jian Cui, J. Ignacio Cirac, and Mari Carmen Bañuls, “Variational matrix product operators for the steady state of dissipative quantum systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 220601 (2015).
- [61] Kyungjoo Noh, Liang Jiang, and Bill Fefferman, “Efficient classical simulation of noisy random quantum circuits in one dimension,” *Quantum* **4**, 318 (2020).
- [62] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [63] Jong Yeon Lee, Chao-Ming Jian, and Cenke Xu, “Quantum criticality under decoherence or weak measurement,” *PRX Quantum* **4** (2023), 10.1103/prxquantum.4.030317.
- [64] Pablo Sala, Sarang Gopalakrishnan, Masaki Oshikawa, and Yizhi You, “Spontaneous strong symmetry breaking in open systems: Purification perspective,” (2024), [arXiv:2405.02402](#).
- [65] Leonardo A. Lessa, Ruochen Ma, Jian-Hao Zhang, Zhen Bi, Meng Cheng, and Chong Wang, “Strong-to-weak spontaneous symmetry breaking in mixed quantum states,” (2024), [arXiv:2405.03639](#).
- [66] Nick Bultinck, Dominic J. Williamson, Jutho Haegeman, and Frank Verstraete, “Fermionic matrix product states and one-dimensional topological phases,” *Phys. Rev. B* **95**, 075108 (2017).
- [67] Qing-Rui Wang and Zheng-Cheng Gu, “Towards a Complete Classification of Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases for Interacting Fermions in Three Dimensions and a General Group Supercohomology Theory,” *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 011055 (2018).
- [68] Qing-Rui Wang and Zheng-Cheng Gu, “Construction and Classification of Symmetry-Protected Topological Phases in Interacting Fermion Systems,” *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 031055 (2020).
- [69] Manuel Rispler, Kasper Duivenvoorden, and Norbert Schuch, “Long-range order and symmetry breaking in projected entangled-pair state models,” *Phys. Rev. B* **92**, 155133 (2015).
- [70] Nick Bultinck, Dominic J Williamson, Jutho Haegeman, and Frank Verstraete, “Fermionic projected entangled-pair states and topological phases,” *J. Phys. A-Math. Theor.* **51**, 025202 (2017).
- [71] Leonardo A. Lessa, Meng Cheng, and Chong Wang, “Mixed-state quantum anomaly and multipartite entanglement,” (2024), [arXiv:2401.17357](#).
- [72] Zijian Wang and Linhao Li, “Anomaly in open quantum systems and its implications on mixed-state quantum phases,” (2024), [arXiv:2403.14533](#).
- [73] Tyler Ellison and Meng Cheng, “Towards a classification of mixed-state topological orders in two dimensions,” (2024), [arXiv:2405.02390](#).
- [74] Hanyu Xue, Jong Yeon Lee, and Yimu Bao, “Tensor network formulation of symmetry protected topological phases in mixed states,” (2024), [arXiv:2403.17069](#).