

Virasoro representations and fusion for general augmented minimal models

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

2006 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 39 15245

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/39/49/012>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 171.66.16.108

The article was downloaded on 03/06/2010 at 04:58

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

Virasoro representations and fusion for general augmented minimal models

Holger Eberle and Michael Flohr

Physikalisches Institut der Universität Bonn, Nußallee 12, 53115 Bonn, Germany

E-mail: eberle@th.physik.uni-bonn.de and flohr@th.physik.uni-bonn.de

Received 27 June 2006, in final form 31 October 2006

Published 21 November 2006

Online at stacks.iop.org/JPhysA/39/15245

Abstract

In this paper, we present explicit results for the fusion of irreducible and higher rank representations in two logarithmically conformal models, the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model as well as the augmented Yang–Lee model at $c_{2,5} = -22/5$. We analyse their spectrum of representations which is consistent with the symmetry and associativity of the fusion algebra. We also describe the first few higher rank representations in detail. In particular, we present the first examples of consistent rank 3 indecomposable representations and describe their embedding structure. Knowing these two generic models we also conjecture the general representation content and fusion rules for general augmented $c_{p,q}$ models.

PACS number: 11.25.Hf

1. Introduction

Logarithmic conformal field theories (logarithmic CFTs) have attracted quite a lot of attention in recent years. These theories are a generalization of standard CFT which also allows for an indecomposable action of the Virasoro modes. There are already quite a number of applications in such different fields as statistical physics (e.g. [1–4]), string theory (e.g. [5–7]) and Seiberg–Witten theory (e.g. [8]) which necessarily incorporate this generalization of CFT. See [9–13] for an introduction to the field and a more complete list of applications. Nevertheless, studying logarithmic CFTs has only just begun because we still know only few logarithmic models explicitly and the efforts to disentangle the general structure prove to be much more complicated and tedious as in ordinary CFT (see e.g. [14–19]). This paper hopes to give a considerable contribution to this ongoing effort as it presents and explicitly discusses the first examples of models with a much more complicated indecomposable structure up to rank 3.

The most prominent examples of logarithmic CFTs up to now have emerged from studying a specific series of the so-called minimal models in CFT, the $c_{p,1}$ models [13, 20–25]. As

standard minimal models these actually emerge to be trivial as they provide zero representation content. On the other hand, if one takes into account representations corresponding to an enlarged Kac table one encounters non-trivial models which include representations with indecomposable structure. This is the reason why we like to call these ‘augmented $c_{p,1}$ models’. In the point of view of the Virasoro representation theory this augmentation actually comprises representations with weights in the whole infinite Kac table. On the other hand, it has been found that these theories exhibit an enlarged triplet \mathcal{W} -algebra [26]. With respect to this enlarged symmetry algebra the representation content of this theory can be composed into a finite set of representations associated with a finite standard cell of the Kac table. In comparison to the original minimal model of central charge $c_{p,1}$ this standard cell is enlarged by a factor of 3 on either side as if it described $c_{3p,3}$.

But there is no reason not to consider a similar augmentation in the Kac table of the general $c_{p,q}$ minimal models. This paper is devoted to the study of these general augmented $c_{p,q}$ models. We will concentrate on the Virasoro representation theory here and, thus, regard an augmentation to the whole infinite Kac table. The question whether these models also exhibit an enlarged \mathcal{W} -algebra has not been answered yet, although we hope to use the findings of this paper to settle this question soon [27] (see also [28–30]). The particular example of the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model has already been studied in [31, 32], but up to this paper the precise structure of the Virasoro representations has been out of reach.

There have also been studies of Jordan cells with rank higher than 2 on the level of correlation functions and Ward identities in the CFT literature [14, 16, 17, 33–37]. However, the models and their representations discussed in this paper are the first ones where we can see explicitly how a higher rank structure appears while generating a representation as a Virasoro module from some ground states.

We want to explore the full spectrum of these augmented $c_{p,q}$ models by successively fusing representations which we already know we have to take into the spectrum. The concept of the fusion product lies at the heart of conformal representation theory and has been subject to many thorough mathematical studies (see e.g. [38–42]). It governs the representation theoretic aspects of the operator product expansion and, hence, puts severe constraints on all n -point functions in CFT. It follows that the fusion product actually dictates which set of representations of the Virasoro algebra at a certain conformal weight can be combined into a consistent CFT model. Hence, the successive application of the fusion product will actually lead us to the whole consistent representation space of the augmented $c_{p,q}$ models.

The algorithm which we use to compute these fusion products relies on the work of [20, 43]. In [43], Nahm showed that the main information characterizing a representation can be found in a small quotient space of this representation, called the special subspace, which is finite for the large class of so-called quasirational CFTs. He actually proved that the fusion of quasirational representations leads again to a finite number of quasirational representations. In [20], Gaberdiel and Kausch used the Nahm algorithm of the proof in [43] to propose a procedure how to efficiently calculate a fusion product of two quasirational representations. This procedure was successfully applied to the augmented $c_{p,1}$ models in [20]. In this paper, we present the results of fusion products which have been calculated based on the implementation of the Nahm algorithm as well as this procedure for the general $c_{p,q}$ models.

In section 2 we give a short review of this Nahm algorithm and the resulting procedure how to calculate a fusion product. We also comment on our specific computer implementation. In section 3 we shortly introduce minimal models as well as their augmented generalization. In section 4 we then discuss the easiest general augmented $c_{p,q}$ model which is not contained in the $c_{p,1}$ model series, the $c_{2,3} = 0$ model. This model exhibits a much more complicated indecomposable structure up to rank 3 in comparison to the $c_{p,1}$ models. We describe a

number of rank 2 and rank 3 representations explicitly and also discuss the representation content which is consistent with the fusion product. In section 5 we discuss a second example of general augmented $c_{p,q}$ models, the augmented Yang–Lee model at $c_{2,5} = -22/5$. We actually rediscover all crucial features observed in the $c_{2,3} = 0$ model. These two examples substantiate our conjecture of the general representation content and fusion rules for general augmented $c_{p,q}$ models given in section 6. In section 7 we conclude and also give a short outlook on the expected implications of these results. In appendix A we give the basis of states which brings L_0 into a Jordan diagonal form for the rank 3 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$. Finally, appendices B and C contain the explicit results for the fusion product calculation for both examples $c_{2,3} = 0$ and $c_{2,5} = -22/5$.

2. How to calculate fusion products

Our calculations of fusion products are based on an algorithm first developed by Nahm [43] to prove that the fusion of quasirational representations contains only finitely many quasirational subrepresentations and, hence, that the category of quasirational representations is stable. In [20], this procedure was generalized and it was shown how one can use this algorithm to get (computationally usually sufficient) constraints to fix the field content of the fusion product at a given level. Although the presentation of the algorithm is already very precise and thorough in [20], we nevertheless want to give a short summary here in order to make this paper self-contained. We will then present the specific properties of our particular implementation.

2.1. The Nahm algorithm

The nice and short presentation of the Nahm algorithm in [20] relies on the co-product formula. For a holomorphic field of conformal weight h and mode expansion

$$S(w) = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}+h} w^{l-h} S_{-l},$$

it is given by [40, 44]

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{z,\zeta}(S_n) &= \sum_{m=1-h}^n \binom{n+h-1}{m+h-1} \zeta^{n-m} (S_m \otimes \mathbb{1}) + \epsilon \sum_{l=1-h}^n \binom{n+h-1}{l+h-1} z^{n-l} (\mathbb{1} \otimes S_l) \\ &= \tilde{\Delta}_{z,\zeta}(S_n) \quad \forall n \geq 1-h \\ \Delta_{z,\zeta}(S_{-n}) &= \sum_{m=1-h}^{\infty} \binom{n+m-1}{m+h-1} (-1)^{m+h-1} \zeta^{-(n+m)} (S_m \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\ &\quad + \epsilon \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \binom{l-h}{n-h} (-z)^{l-n} (\mathbb{1} \otimes S_{-l}) \quad \forall n \geq h \\ \tilde{\Delta}_{z,\zeta}(S_{-n}) &= \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} \binom{m-h}{n-h} (-\zeta)^{m-n} (S_{-m} \otimes \mathbb{1}) \\ &\quad + \epsilon \sum_{l=1-h}^{\infty} \binom{n+l-1}{l+h-1} (-1)^{l+h-1} z^{-(n+l)} (\mathbb{1} \otimes S_l) \quad \forall n \geq h, \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon = -1$ if both S_m and the first field in the tensor product it is applied to are fermionic and $\epsilon = +1$ otherwise. Furthermore, z and ζ are the positions of the two fields of the tensor product which this fused operator is applied to. Due to the symmetry of the fusion product

there are two alternative ways of writing the co-multiplication, denoted by $\Delta_{z,\zeta}$ and $\tilde{\Delta}_{z,\zeta}$. Demanding that both $\Delta_{z,\zeta}$ and $\tilde{\Delta}_{z,\zeta}$ actually yield the same result we get the fusion space of two representations \mathcal{H}_i at positions $z_i, i = 1, 2$,

$$\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2 := (\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2) / (\Delta_{z_1, z_2} - \tilde{\Delta}_{z_1, z_2}).$$

Throughout the paper we will use \otimes_f to denote the fusion product of two representations.

In this paper, we will only look at representations w.r.t. the Virasoro algebra $\mathcal{A}(L)$ which is generated by the modes L_n of the $h(L) = 2$ Virasoro field L , the holomorphic energy-momentum tensor of conformal field theory. We need the following subalgebras:

$$\mathcal{A}_-^0(L) := \langle L_{-n} | 0 < n < h(L) \rangle$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{--}(L) := \langle L_{-n} | n \geq h(L) \rangle$$

$$\mathcal{A}_\pm(L) := \langle L_n | \pm n > 0 \rangle$$

as well as the subalgebra of words with a length of at least n ,

$$\mathcal{A}_n(L) = \left\langle \prod_{j=1}^m L_{-l_j}^{k_j} \mid \sum_{j=1}^m l_j \geq n \right\rangle.$$

The essential information about a representation \mathcal{H} is already encoded in its ‘special subspace’, the quotient space

$$\mathcal{H}^s := \mathcal{H} / (\mathcal{A}_{--}(L) \mathcal{H}).$$

We also need the filtration of \mathcal{H} given as quotient spaces

$$\mathcal{H}^n := \mathcal{H} / (\mathcal{A}_{n+1}(L) \mathcal{H}).$$

Especially for irreducible \mathcal{H} this space is equal to the set of descendants up to level n .

We want to restrict ourselves to a certain type of representations, the ‘quasirational representations’. We use the definition of a quasirational representation that it is a representation with finite special subspace. For quasirational representations of the Virasoro algebra it has been shown that [20, 43]

$$(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2)^n \subset \mathcal{H}_1^s \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^n \wedge (\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2)^n \subset \mathcal{H}_1^n \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^s. \tag{1}$$

The proof uses the following Nahm algorithm which can be shown to map every state of the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_1^i \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^j$ to a state on the respective right-hand side in (1) in a finite number of steps.

We present the algorithm only for the first equation in (1) as the other version works the same way by symmetry of the fusion product. In the following, we regard the states of the tensor product to be at positions $(z_1, z_2) = (1, 0)$. The two steps of the Nahm algorithm are then given by

(A1) A vector $\psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ is rewritten in the form

$$\psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 = \sum_i \psi_1^i \otimes \psi_2^i + \Delta_{1,0}(\mathcal{A}_{n+1}(L))(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2),$$

with $\psi_1^i \in \mathcal{H}_1^s$. This can be achieved by the following recursive procedure.

The crucial step is to use the nullvector conditions on ψ_1 to re-express it in the form

$$\psi_1 = \sum_j \psi_j^s + \sum_k \mathcal{A}_{--} \chi_k^s,$$

with $\psi_j^s, \chi_k^s \in \mathcal{H}_1^s$. We still need to get rid of the \mathcal{A}_{--} action on the χ_k^s . We use the following formula derived from the co-multiplication formula and its translation properties for $m \leq n$ [20]:

$$(L_{-m} \otimes \mathbb{1}) = \sum_{l=m}^n \binom{l-h}{m-h} \Delta_{1,0}(L_{-l}) - \epsilon \sum_{l=1-h}^{\infty} \binom{m+l-1}{m-h} (-1)^{h-m-1} (\mathbb{1} \otimes L_l) + \Delta_{1,0}(\mathcal{A}_{n+1}(L)).$$

This formula actually enables us to replace the $(L_{-m} \otimes \mathbb{1})$ action in $\mathcal{A}_{--} \chi_k^s \otimes \psi_2$ by terms where \mathcal{A}_{-}^0 or even the identity acts on the left-hand vector of the tensor product. This is true as in the range $m \leq l \leq n$ the co-multiplication $\Delta_{1,0}(L_{-l})$ is actually of the simple form $\mathcal{A}_{-}^0 \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{--}$. Now we have to take the result and repeat this procedure starting again with the re-expression of the first fields ψ_1 in the tensor product. A simple count of the strictly decreasing level of modes during the iteration shows that this algorithm has to terminate [43].

- (A2) This step has to be applied to each term of the resulting sum from step (A1) separately. The input, a resulting tensor product from (A1) $\psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 \in \mathcal{H}_1^s \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, is rewritten as

$$\psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 = \sum_t \psi_1^t \otimes \psi_2^t + \Delta_{1,0}(\mathcal{A}_{n+1}(L))(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2),$$

where now $\psi_1^t \in \mathcal{A}_{-}^0 \mathcal{H}_1^s$ and $\psi_2^t \in \mathcal{H}_2^n$.

This is achieved by repeatedly using

$$\Delta_{1,0}(L_{-l}) = (\mathbb{1} \otimes L_{-l}) + \sum_k c_k (\mathcal{A}_{-}^0 \otimes L_{-l_k})$$

for a word $L_{-l} = L_{-i_1} L_{-i_2} \cdots$ of negative Virasoro modes with level $|l|$ and constant c_k . This recursion has to finish as the Virasoro monomials L_{-l_k} are of strictly lower level $|l_k| < |l|$. This formula is just the result of the repeated use of the co-multiplication formula for a monomial of modes of the same field and for the special coordinates $(z, \zeta) = (1, 0)$.

As we want to have the states in the fusion product which are projected to the subspace $(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2)^n$ we do not have to care about contributions $\Delta_{1,0}(\mathcal{A}_{n+1}(L))(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$. It is then easy to see that iterated application of steps (A1) and (A2) will finally yield the required result (1). This algorithm terminates in a finite number of steps as the number of modes on both fields strictly decreases when re-expressing ψ_1 in step (A1) using its nullvector condition and does not increase in step (A2).

2.2. Constraints for the fusion algebra

By (1) we know that $(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2)^n$ is actually embedded in the easily constructed space $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{H}_1^s \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^n$. Hence, we want to find the full set of constraints which describes $(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2)^n$ in \mathcal{F} .

The important idea of [20] was that one can find nontrivial constraints by applying \mathcal{A}_{n+1} to states in \mathcal{F} . We then have to use the Nahm algorithm in order to map the resulting descendant states into our ‘standard’ space \mathcal{F} . By definition these descendant states are divided out of $(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2)^n$ and, hence, are supposed to vanish. Thus, their mapping to \mathcal{F} should evaluate to zero—if we acquire non-trivial expressions this simply yields the desired constraints by imposing their vanishing.

This procedure is even improved if we use the nontrivial nullvector conditions on the second field to replace the action of certain Virasoro monomials before performing the Nahm algorithm. This introduces the information about the nullvector structure on the second representation of the tensor product into the game; the information about the nullvector structure on the first representation of the tensor product has already been used in the Nahm algorithm itself.

As we noted during our calculation it even improves the situation to include the nullvector conditions on the tensor factors in the space \mathcal{F} itself.

In the following we will denote the level n at which we perform the computation with L . Certainly, one cannot perform this calculation for all of \mathcal{A}_{L+1} . We, hence, restricted our computation to the application of Virasoro monomials:

$$\left\langle \prod_{j=1}^m L_{-l_j}^{k_j} \middle| \sum_{j=1}^m l_j = \tilde{L} \right\rangle$$

of equal level \tilde{L} . Usually we performed the calculation from $\tilde{L} = L + 1$ up to a maximal \tilde{L}_{\max} . Both L and \tilde{L}_{\max} are given for the respective calculations in the appendix.

As we are limited to the calculation of a finite number of constraints this procedure is only able to give a lower bound on the number of constraints and, hence, an upper bound on the number of states in the fusion product at that level. On the other hand, these constraints seem to be highly non-trivial such that already a very low $\tilde{L}_{\max} > L$, often even $\tilde{L}_{\max} = L + 1$, is sufficient to gain all constraints which yield representations in a consistent fusion algebra. This already worked very well in [20] for the $c_{p,1}$ model case and as we will see it also works very well in the general augmented $c_{p,q}$ model case.

Now, it is especially interesting to observe the action of positive Virasoro modes on $(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2)^L$. The positive Virasoro modes, however, induce an action

$$L_m : (\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2)^L \rightarrow (\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2)^{L-m} \quad \forall m \leq L.$$

It is important to note that L_m map to a space of respective lower maximal level. Hence, we need to construct all spaces of lower maximal level $0 \leq n < L$. To achieve this we start with $(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{H}_2)^L$ and successively impose the constraints which arise in the above-described way from the vanishing of the action of Virasoro monomials of level m with $n < m \leq L$ on \mathcal{F} .

2.3. Implementation for the $c_{p,q}$ models

We have implemented the main calculational tasks for this paper, especially the Nahm algorithm and the calculation of the constraints, in C++ using the computer algebra package GiNaC [45]. We constructed new classes for the algebraic objects fields, fieldmodes, products of fieldmodes, descendant fields as well as tensor products of fields which are the basic ingredients in this algorithm. (Some of the classes have already been used in [32].)

As GiNaC does not support factorization we used the Jordan-form package of the computer algebra system Maple in order to get the Jordan diagonal form of the L_0 matrix on the resulting space as well as the matrices of base change. This Maple calculation is performed via command-line during the run of the C++ programme.

As we will see in section 3 some irreducible representations in the general augmented $c_{p,q}$ models have more than one nullvector (two, to be precise) which are completely independent, i.e. such that none of these nullvectors can be written as a descendant of the others. Hence, it is important to include both independent nullvectors into the nullvector lists which are used for replacements in the calculation as explained above. This is needed to provide the full information about the nullvector structure of the original representations which are to be fused.

Sometimes one even needs to choose an \tilde{L}_{\max} large enough such that the second nullvector can also become effective. The special subspace, however, is nevertheless determined by the level l of the lowest nullvector:

$$\langle \psi, L_{-1}\psi, L_{-1}^2\psi, \dots, L_{-1}^{l-1}\psi \rangle.$$

Besides the fusion of two irreducible representations we also implemented the possibility of fusing an irreducible representation with a rank 2 representation. Actually, this generalization is quite straightforward. Instead of one state which generates an irreducible representation we now need two generating states. However, we have to be careful because the second generating state, the logarithmic partner, is not primary. Hence, we implemented the indecomposable action on this second generating field as additional conditions proprietary to that field (as already done in [32]). We also have to be careful to calculate the correct nullvector structure which includes besides an ordinary nullvector on the primary field the first logarithmic nullvector of the whole indecomposable representation. We have calculated these logarithmic nullvectors using the algorithm described in [32].

In order to speed up the algorithm we widely used hashing tables. This measure actually resulted in a quite equal use of computing time and memory (on a standard PC with up to 4GB memory); calculations which are on the edge of using up the memory have run times between half a day and a few days.

The performance of the implemented algorithm is, however, quite hard to benchmark as it varies very much with different input and output. Concerning the input the computing time rises with the level of the nullvectors—especially, the nullvector level of the first tensor factor is crucial. We also need much more time to compute fusion products with representations on weights that are strictly rational than corresponding ones with integer weights. And then, the performance of course depends exponentially on L as well as \tilde{L} , although the dependence on L is much stronger. Concerning the output the computational power of Maple is frequently the limiting factor if we have a large resulting L_0 matrix.

We have also checked the correct implementation of the algorithm by reproducing quite some fusion rules of the $c_{p,1}$ models given in [20]. In particular, we reproduced the Virasoro matrices for the example given in the appendix of [20]. We also noted that the algorithm is very sensitive and fragile such that only a small change in the parameters or the program yields completely unreasonable results.

In contrast to the lowest $c_{p,1}$ models we have to cover a much larger parameter space with states of higher nullvectors already for the easiest general augmented $c_{p,q}$ model, the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model. We, hence, decided to calculate the fusion of the lowest representations at $L = 6$ in order to be able to get results at the same L for a large parameter space. For the higher fusion as well as the fusion with rank 2 representations we had to reduce L . Details as well as the results are given in appendices B and C.

3. Virasoro representation theory for minimal models and their extensions

In this section we want to give a short overview about the representation theory of minimal models [46, 47] as well as the augmented $c_{p,1}$ models [20, 24].

In the following we will exclusively regard representations of the Virasoro algebra which is spanned by the modes of the (holomorphic) $h = 2$ stress–energy tensor L_n obeying

$$[L_m, L_n] = (m - n)L_{m+n} + \frac{c}{12}(m - 1)m(m + 1)\delta_{m+n,0} \quad m, n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

To any highest weight h the application of the negative Virasoro modes $L_n, n < 0$, freely generates the Verma module:

$$\mathcal{M}(h) = \{L_{-n_1} \cdots L_{-n_k} v_h | n_1 \geq \cdots \geq n_k > 0, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+\},$$

where v_h is the highest weight state to h . In order to find the irreducible or at least indecomposable representations we need to identify the largest true subrepresentations of $\mathcal{M}(h)$ which decouple from the rest of the representation and need to construct the respective factor module.

A subrepresentation can be generated from any singular vector v in $\mathcal{M}(h)$, i.e. a vector which obeys $L_p v = 0 \forall p > 0$ and which is hence a highest weight state of its own, and certainly we can also have unions of such representations. On the other hand, a subrepresentation only decouples from the rest of the representation and can hence be factored out if it consists of nullvectors, i.e. vectors which are orthogonal to all other vectors in the Fock space of states w.r.t. the natural sesquilinear Shapovalov form on this space. As long as we do not encounter any indecomposable structure in our representation singular vectors are at the same time nullvectors and generate subrepresentations which are null in a Fock space. However, the interrelation between singular vectors and nullvectors becomes much more intricate as soon as we deal with indecomposable representations.

The Kac determinant actually parameterizes the relation between conformal charges c and spectra of conformal weights $h_{r,s}$ at which we encounter nullvectors. It is hence an ingenious tool to explore interesting conformal field theories with relatively few and small representations. We are especially interested in this series of conformal field theories which emerge from the study of the Kac determinant and which, hence, exhibit a rich nullvector structure to be described below. These theories are parameterized by the conformal charges (see e.g. [47])

$$c = c_{p,q} = 1 - 6 \frac{p-q}{pq} \quad 1 \leq p, q \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where p and q do not have a common divisor; their highest weight spectrum is given by the weights in the Kac table

$$h_{r,s} = \frac{(pr - qs)^2 - (p - q)^2}{4pq} \quad 1 \leq r \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad 1 \leq s \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

An extract of the (infinite) Kac table for $c_{2,3} = 0$ is given in table 1.

The so-called minimal models are a series of such conformal field theories which manage to extract the smallest possible representation theory from the Kac table of some central charge $c_{p,q}$ by relating all weights to some standard cell $\{(r, s) | 1 \leq r < q, 1 \leq s < p\}$ subject to the relation [46, 47]

$$h_{r,s} = h_{q-r, p-s}. \quad (2)$$

All larger higher weights are related to this standard cell by the addition of integers according to the relations [46, 47]

$$\begin{aligned} h_{r,s} &= h_{r+q, s+p} \\ h_{r,s} + rs &= h_{q+r, p-s} = h_{q-r, p+s} \\ h_{r,s} + (q-r)(p-s) &= h_{r, 2p-s} = h_{2q-r, s} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

as long as they are in the bulk and not on the border or corners of this standard cell Kac table, i.e. as long as their indices do not obey $r = iq$ or $s = jp$ for some $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

These larger weights in the Kac table bulk are exactly the weights of the nullvector descendants of the highest weights in the above standard cell. To be precise we actually find




Figure 1. Nullvector embedding structure [47].

Table 1. Kac table for $c_{2,3} = 0$

	s				
	1	2	3	4	5
1	0	$\frac{5}{8}$	2	$\frac{33}{8}$	7
2	0	$\frac{1}{8}$	1	$\frac{21}{8}$	5
3	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{24}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{35}{24}$	$\frac{10}{3}$
4	1	$\frac{1}{8}$	0	$\frac{5}{8}$	2
5	2	$\frac{5}{8}$	0	$\frac{1}{8}$	1
r	$\frac{10}{3}$	$\frac{35}{24}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{24}$	$\frac{1}{3}$
7	5	$\frac{21}{8}$	1	$\frac{1}{8}$	0
8	7	$\frac{33}{8}$	2	$\frac{5}{8}$	0
9	$\frac{28}{3}$	$\frac{143}{24}$	$\frac{10}{3}$	$\frac{35}{24}$	$\frac{1}{3}$
10	12	$\frac{65}{8}$	5	$\frac{21}{8}$	1
11	15	$\frac{85}{8}$	7	$\frac{33}{8}$	2

that the maximal subrepresentation of $\mathcal{M}(h)$ for h in the bulk of the Kac table is generated by two singular vectors v_1, v_2 . The highest weight representations generated on v_1 and v_2 ; however, each contain two subrepresentations which are again both generated from two singular vectors; but actually both subrepresentations of $\mathcal{M}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{M}(v_2)$ coincide. We therefore arrive at an embedding structure or ‘embedding cascade’ of nullvectors as depicted in figure 1(b) [47, 48] whose weights are exactly the integer shifted weights appearing in the Kac table. The corresponding characters have been calculated in [49].

The irreducible representations $\mathcal{V}_{(r,s)}$ with weights $h_{r,s}$ in this standard cell and the described nullvector embedding structure have been shown to close under the following

so-called BPZ fusion rules [46]:

$$\mathcal{V}_{(r_1,s_1)} \otimes_f \mathcal{V}_{(r_2,s_2)} = \sum_{r_3=|r_1-r_2|+1, \text{step } 2}^{\min(r_1+r_2-1, 2q-r_1-r_2-1)} \sum_{s_3=|s_1-s_2|+1, \text{step } 2}^{\min(s_1+s_2-1, 2p-s_1-s_2-1)} \mathcal{V}_{(r_3,s_3)},$$

where \otimes_f denotes the fusion product. We note that the above excluded weights for $r = iq$ or $s = jp$ with $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, do not pop up in these fusion rules; they are hence simply ignored in these minimal models.

On the other hand, augmenting the theory with representations beyond this standard cell, especially with irreducible representations of the above excluded weights, has also led to the construction of consistent CFTs. These contain representations with non-trivial Jordan blocks and are thus examples of logarithmic CFTs. For the Virasoro representation theory of these models one actually needs the full Kac table to describe its different representations, subject only to relation (2).

To make the terminology more precise we will call, following [32], weights whose indices obey $r = iq$ and $s = jp$ ($i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$) ‘on the corners of the Kac table’ and weights whose indices obey (exclusively) either $r = iq$ or $s = jp$ ($i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$) ‘on the borders of the Kac table’. All other weights which already appear in the minimal models we call ‘in the bulk of the Kac table’. In table 1, the Kac table for $c_{2,3} = 0$, we have indicated the borders as areas with lighter shade and the corners as areas with darker shade; the bulk consists of the unshaded areas. Actually, it is just this inclusion of irreducible representations with weights on the corners and the border which forces us to include states of weights of the whole Kac table into the theory.

Only the well-studied models up to now are contained in the series $c_{p,1}$, $p = 2, 3, \dots$ (see e.g. [9, 20–25]). But as these models do not contain any bulk in their Kac table, we do not expect them to be generic; indeed as we will see in this paper the existence of representations with weights in the Kac table bulk actually induces an even richer structure with indecomposable representations up to rank 3.

The nullvector embedding structure stays of course the same for representations corresponding to weights in the bulk. However, as already explained in [20], the nullvector embedding structure actually collapses to a string for representations with weights on the corners or on the border—as depicted in figure 1(a). It is very important to keep in mind that the nullvectors corresponding to these higher weights in figure 1 are only true nullvectors within representations that are generated as a Virasoro module from one (!) singular vector, i.e. irreducible representations. This picture changes as soon as there appears an indecomposable structure within the representation [20, 32]. Nevertheless these vectors keep their prominent role even within the higher rank representations.

For later use we need to define the notion of a ‘weight chain’ for conformal weights on the border or in the bulk. These weight chains are supposed to be a handy storage of information about the weights on successive embedding levels in the above-discussed embedding structures. A weight chain for weights on the border is a list of all weights which differ just by integers, ordered by size without multiplicity (see figure 1(a)):

$$W_{(r,p)}^{\text{border}} := \{h_{r,p}, h_{q-r,2p}, h_{r,3p}, \dots\} \quad \forall r < q,$$

$$W_{(q,s)}^{\text{border}} := \{h_{q,s}, h_{2q,p-s}, h_{3q,s}, \dots\} \quad \forall s < p.$$

To form a weight chain for weights in the bulk we take a likewise list of weights differing just by integers, ordered by size without multiplicity. Then we map this list into a list of sets; the first set just consisting of the lowest weight, then every next set consisting of the next two weights. Regarding figure 1(b) we get

$$W_{(r,s)}^{\text{bulk}} := \{h_{r,s}, \{h_{r,2p-s}, h_{q+r,p-s}\}, \{h_{r,2p+s}, h_{2q+r,s}\}, \dots\} \quad \forall r < q, s < p.$$

Table 2. Specific properties of rank 2 representations in $c_{2,3} = 0$.

	β_1	β_2	Level of log. partner	Level of first nullvector	Level of first log. nullvector	Type
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	–	–	0	2	10	A
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	–	–	0	3	9	A
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	–	–	0	4	8	A
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	–5	–	2	10	16	B
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	140/27	–	3	9	18	B
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	–700/81	–	4	8	20	B
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	1/3	–	1	2	7	C
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	–1/2	–	1	2	5	D
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	–	–5/8	2	1	7	E
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	–	5/6	2	1	5	F
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	2800/9	–	4	6	14	C
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	30800/27	1100/9	6	4	14	E
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	–420	–	3	5	10	D
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	–880	–440/3	5	3	10	F

In order to understand the generic features of augmented $c_{p,q}$ models we will study the two easiest candidates for augmented models with non-empty bulk of the Kac table in this paper, the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model with Kac table given in table 1 as well as the augmented Yang–Lee model with $c_{2,5} = -22/5$. Possible candidates for higher rank representations in the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model have already been explored in [32] by the calculation of logarithmic nullvectors. We will show that these calculations are consistent with the findings in this paper and will furthermore use these calculational tools for the explicit computation of fusion with rank 2 representations.

For the $c_{p,1}$ models it was shown that they actually have a larger \mathcal{W} algebra as symmetry algebra, the triplet algebra $\mathcal{W}(2, 2p - 1, 2p - 1, 2p - 1)$. We have strong hints that such a larger \mathcal{W} algebra is also the underlying symmetry algebra of the generic augmented $c_{p,q}$ models [27]. The effective Kac table of these theories can then again be reduced to a standard cell, which is though larger as their minimal model counterpart. The standard cell is then given by $\{(r, s) | 1 \leq r < nq, 1 \leq s < np\}$ with n usually an odd integer larger than 1, e.g. 3 for the above-mentioned triplet algebras of the $c_{p,1}$ models. In this paper, however, we want to concentrate on the pure Virasoro representation theory and, hence, do not restrict our Kac table in any way.

4. Explicit discussion of the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model

In this section, we explicitly discuss our calculations of the fusion product of representations in the $c_{2,3} = 0$ augmented model which lead us to the conjectured general fusion rules of section 6. We present examples for the newly appearing higher rank representations and also elaborate the consistency conditions for the fusion product in this case.

4.1. Higher rank representations

4.1.1. *Representations of rank 2.* Table 2 gives an overview of the specific properties of all rank 2 representations we have calculated for this model. The two parameters of the rank 2 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}$ give the lowest weight and the weight of the logarithmic partner in this representation, i.e. the weights of the two states which generate this representation. The




Figure 2. Rank 2 representations for weights on the border.

additional index will be explained when we discuss these particular representations (see p 23). Analogously, we denote an irreducible representation generated by a highest weight state of weight h by $\mathcal{V}(h)$.

The first block contains the rank 2 representations to the three different weight chains lying on the border of the Kac table, i.e. $W_{(1,2)}^{\text{border}} := \{5/8, 21/8, 85/8, \dots\}$, $W_{(3,1)}^{\text{border}} := \{1/3, 10/3, 28/3, \dots\}$ and $W_{(2,2)}^{\text{border}} := \{1/8, 33/8, 65/8, \dots\}$. Both different types of rank 2 representations are depicted in figure 2. They actually exhibit precisely the same structure as the rank 2 representations of the augmented $c_{p,1}$ models described in [20]. This has already been conjectured in [32] by the calculation of their first logarithmic nullvectors. Throughout this paper we stick to the graphical conventions of previous publications, see e.g. [20, 32]. As, e.g., in figure 2 we take black dots to denote (sub)singular vectors which are not null, crosses to denote nullvectors, horizontal arrows denote an indecomposable action (of L_0), arrows pointing upwards to denote a descendant relation and arrows pointing downwards to denote a non-trivial action of positive Virasoro modes. Furthermore, we indicate the levels on the right-hand side of each picture.

The first three representations in table 2 are the ground-state rank 2 representation visualized in figure 2(A). They exhibit an indecomposable Jordan cell already on the zeroth level. In this case the logarithmic partner state $|h; 1\rangle$ of the irreducible ground state $|h; 0\rangle$ is logarithmic primary, i.e. it is primary with the exception of an indecomposable action of L_0

$$L_0|h; 1\rangle = h|h; 1\rangle + |h; 0\rangle.$$

$|h; 0\rangle$ actually spans an irreducible subrepresentation; its first nullvector (depicted as a cross in the figure) is hence found on the level of the next weight $h + l$ in the corresponding weight chain. The descendants of $|h; 1\rangle$, however, do not form to give a nullvector at $h + l$. In order to find the first nullvector involving descendants of $|h; 1\rangle$ we have to go one weight further in the weight chain. These representations are uniquely generated by the two ground states $|h; i\rangle, i = 0, 1$; there is no need of an additional parameter to describe them.

The next three representations in table 2 are the first excited representations of these three weight chains depicted in figure 2(B). The logarithmic partner state $|h + l; 1\rangle$ lies on that level l at which we would expect the first nullvector of the ground state $|h\rangle$ if the ground state were to span an irreducible representation. Hence, the subrepresentation generated by $|h\rangle$ is not irreducible, but only indecomposable. Actually the indecomposable action of L_0 just maps $|h + l; 1\rangle$ to the singular level l descendant of $|h\rangle$ which we call $|h + l; 0\rangle$ and which normally would be the first nullvector of an irreducible h representation:

$$L_0|h + l; 1\rangle = (h + l)|h + l; 1\rangle + |h + l; 0\rangle.$$

$|h + l; 0\rangle$, on the other hand, spans an irreducible subrepresentation and yields its first nullvector on the level of the second weight after h in the weight chain, called $h + m$. In order to find




Figure 3. Rank 2 representations for weights in the bulk.

the first logarithmic nullvector we have to go even one weight further in the weight chain to $h + n$. Now, the logarithmic partner field can certainly not be logarithmic primary; but as discussed in [20] it can still be made to at least vanish under all $L_p, p > 2$. This induces one characteristic parameter $\beta = \beta_1$ in this representation due to the action of L_1 ; we take β to parameterize the following equation:

$$(L_1)^l |h + l; 1\rangle = \beta |h\rangle.$$

The structure visualized in figure 2(B) is actually thought to be the generic type of rank 2 representation for weights on the border. It should be found for every two adjacent weights in a border weight chain. As in the $c_{p,1}$ model case the representations of the type depicted in figure 2(A) can only be found for the first and hence the lowest weight of a weight chain. Furthermore, we want to stress that we can think of these rank 2 representations as being constructed by indecomposably connecting several irreducible representations. This is already suggested by figures 2(A) and (B) where the black dots represent these ‘towers of states’ which have been irreducible representations before their indecomposable connection to a rank 2 representation. Generically, these towers of states are not irreducible subrepresentations any more, but they resemble their irreducible counterparts in terms of number of states and singular vectors. This point of view has also been worked out in [20] for rank 2 representations in the augmented $c_{p,1}$ models.

We have also successfully checked for the existence of the first logarithmic nullvectors at the levels given in table 2 using the algorithm of [32]. Even the level 20 logarithmic nullvector was now accessible to our computational power due to our explicit knowledge of β .

The second block of table 2 contains the specific properties of the lowest rank 2 representations which we found for weights in the weight chain of the Kac table bulk, i.e. $W_{(1,1)}^{\text{bulk}} := \{0, \{1, 2\}, \{5, 7\}, \dots\}$. There are four different types of rank 2 representations depicted in figure 3 which appear to be a generalization of the situation on the border for the case of figure 2(B). This generalization has to take into account the more complicated embedding structure of representations with weights in the bulk—the linear picture of figure 1(a) has to be replaced by the two string twisted picture of figure 1(b). As we now have two possible nullvectors on every step of the weight chain, of which only one is rendered non-null by the existence of a logarithmic partner state of the same level, we actually also encounter

cases E and F where there is a true nullvector on a level lower than the logarithmic partner state. This is new and makes the description of these particular cases more complicated.

Let us first describe the cases C and D. Starting with the lowest weight state $|h\rangle$ the first possible nullvectors are given by the next set in the weight chain at levels l and m . In the present cases the corresponding singular descendant $|h+l; 0\rangle$ on $|h\rangle$ at the lower of these two levels l is rendered to be non-null by the existence of a logarithmic partner state $|h+l; 1\rangle$. The indecomposable action of L_0 on $|h+l; 1\rangle$ is again given by

$$L_0|h+l; 1\rangle = (h+l)|h+l; 1\rangle + |h+l; 0\rangle.$$

Furthermore, the argument of [20] still applies that due to the absence of a nullvector on $|h\rangle$ on a level lower than the Jordan cell we can transform $|h+l; 1\rangle$ by the addition of level l descendants of $|h\rangle$ such that it is annihilated by $L_p \forall p \geq 2$. Then L_1 maps $|h+l; 1\rangle$ to the unique level $l-1$ descendant of $|h\rangle$ which is annihilated by $L_p \forall p \geq 2$. As for representations with weights on the border we take the resulting one parameter $\beta = \beta_1$ to parameterize the equation

$$(L_1)^l|h+l; 1\rangle = \beta|h\rangle.$$

The second state corresponding to this set in the weight chain, the one at level m , actually stays null in the rank 2 representation. This fixes the nullvector structure on $|h\rangle$ as the embedding structure of figure 1(b) tells us that the nullvectors of the next set in the weight chain, at levels n and r , are joint descendants of the states corresponding to the previous set of weights. But as the singular state at level m is already a nullvector, the singular states at levels n and r have to be null as well. The situation is somewhat different for the descendants of the logarithmic partner as $|h+l; 1\rangle$ is the starting point of its embedding structure. The cases C and D correspond to the two possibilities of having the first logarithmic nullvector on levels r and n , respectively. There is, however, no additional nullvector at the respective other weight. Examples for the case C are $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$, for the case D are $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$. Again, the lowest representations play a special role as both cases are realized for lowest weight 0. Hence, we indicate the level of the logarithmic descendant which is promoted to be non-null as an index. It is important to note, however, that both cases are already distinguished by their different β values.

Let us turn to the cases E and F. These exhibit very much the same structure as the cases C and D. The crucial difference is the existence of a nullvector already on a level lower than the level of the logarithmic partner. This fact prevents us from applying the above argument how to describe the representation by only one parameter. The special cases of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$ can nevertheless be reduced to one parameter quite easily. As there is no non-null descendant of the lowest weight state $|0\rangle$ at level 1 the only positive Virasoro mode which can map the logarithmic partner $|2; 1\rangle$ to a non-zero state is L_2 . Hence, we take the one parameter $\beta = \beta_2$ to parameterize the equation

$$L_2|2; 1\rangle = \beta|0\rangle.$$

This behaviour is, however, not generic. We find that we need at least two parameters to describe these two kinds of rank 2 representations in general. To see this let us regard all normal ordered monomials in Virasoro modes of length m . We are able to transform $|h+m; 1\rangle$ by addition of level m descendants of $|h\rangle$ in such a way that only the application of two such Virasoro monomials does not annihilate $|h+m; 1\rangle$. In particular we have the followings.

- For $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$, we find the two parameters $\beta_1 = 30800/27$ and $\beta_2 = 1100/9$ parameterizing

$$(L_1)^6|7; 1\rangle = \beta_1|1\rangle \quad (L_1)^3L_3|7; 1\rangle = \beta_2|1\rangle.$$

$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$ has been parameterized in such a way that the monomials $(L_1)^6$ and $(L_1)^3 L_3$ are the only ones with a non-trivial action on $|7; 1\rangle$. This yields the following mappings of single Virasoro modes:

$$\begin{aligned} L_1|7; 1\rangle &= \frac{11}{729} \left(\frac{857}{2} L_{-5} - 473 L_{-4} L_{-1} - 721 L_{-3} L_{-2} + \frac{4279}{12} L_{-3} L_{-1}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{809}{2} L_{-2}^2 L_{-1} - \frac{1295}{12} L_{-2} L_{-1}^3 \right) |1\rangle \\ L_2|7; 1\rangle &= 0 \\ L_3|7; 1\rangle &= \frac{275}{324} (L_{-1}^3 + 12 L_{-2} L_{-1} - 24 L_{-3}) |1\rangle \\ L_p|7; 1\rangle &= 0 \quad \forall p \geq 4. \end{aligned}$$

- For $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$, the two parameters are $\beta_1 = -880$ and $\beta_2 = -440/3$ parameterizing

$$\begin{aligned} (L_1)^5|7; 1\rangle &= \beta_1|2\rangle \\ (L_1)^2 L_3|7; 1\rangle &= \beta_2|2\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the following mappings of single Virasoro modes:

$$\begin{aligned} L_1|7; 1\rangle &= \frac{5}{17} \left(-\frac{143}{3} L_{-4} + \frac{44}{3} L_{-3} L_{-1} + \frac{49}{3} L_{-2}^2 - 6 L_{-2} L_{-1}^2 \right) |2\rangle \\ L_2|7; 1\rangle &= 0 \\ L_3|7; 1\rangle &= -\frac{20}{3} (L_{-1}^2 - \frac{3}{2} L_{-2}) |2\rangle \\ L_p|7; 1\rangle &= 0 \quad \forall p \geq 4. \end{aligned}$$

In both cases L_3 maps $|h+m; 1\rangle$ to a multiple of the unique descendant of $|h\rangle$ on the level $l-1$, which is annihilated by $L_p \forall p \geq 2$.

We conjecture that it actually suffices to have two parameters in order to characterize rank 2 representations of types E and F. As we have a nullvector already on the lower level l this unique state on the level $m-1$, which is annihilated by $L_p \forall p \geq 2$, is a descendant of this nullvector. Hence, we want to lift the restrictions by incorporating one further non-zero mapping, the mapping by $L_{m-(l-1)}$ to the unique state on the level $l-1$ which is annihilated by $L_p \forall p \geq 2$, in order to ensure that we do not map into pure descendants of the lower nullvector. This is, indeed, equivalent to demanding that the application of all normal ordered positive Virasoro monomials of length m annihilates $|h+m; 1\rangle$ except for L_1^m and $L_1^{l-1} L_{m-(l-1)}$.

Again, we want to stress that also these rank 2 representations can be thought of to be constructed by an indecomposable connection of several (to be precise four) irreducible representations. As for the rank 2 representations on the border the former irreducible representations are signified by the black dots in the corresponding figures 3(C)–(F).

For all bulk rank 2 representations listed in table 2, we were able to see the level of the first logarithmic nullvector already in the calculated fusion spectrum. We also confirmed this lowest logarithmic nullvector using the algorithm of [32]. It is remarkable to see that for the bulk rank 2 representations $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_i$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_i$, $i = 5, 7$, we encounter the first nullvectors already on lower levels than the ones proposed in [32]. However, the solutions in [32] are given for general β ; it is only for the special β s in table 2 that we encounter solutions even on lower levels.

4.1.2. Representations of rank 3. Representations of rank 3 only appear for weights in the bulk. In the following we will discuss the three lowest examples explicitly.

$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$. Although we only encounter a rank 3 indecomposable structure in this representation, we nevertheless need four states to generate it. We will see that this is necessary and natural by two different ways of visualizing the nullvector structure of $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$.




Figure 4. Two ways to visualize $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$.

The first way starts with the Jordan diagonalization of the representation and is shown in figure 4(G_1). We have two ground states $|0; i\rangle, i = 0, 1$, at level 0 which are interrelated by the rank 2 indecomposable action of L_0 :

$$L_0|0; 1\rangle = |0; 0\rangle \quad L_0|0; 0\rangle = 0.$$

On level 1, the level of the first possible nullvector on $|0; i\rangle$, the Jordan cell is enhanced to rank 3:

$$\begin{aligned} L_0|1; 2\rangle &= |1; 2\rangle + |1; 1\rangle \\ L_0|1; 1\rangle &= |1; 1\rangle + |1; 0\rangle \\ L_0|1; 0\rangle &= |1; 0\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

A further fourth state of weight 1 decouples in the L_0 action,

$$L_0|1; 3\rangle' = |1; 3\rangle',$$

but this seeming decoupling is deceiving as the singular descendant of $|0; 1\rangle$ is actually composed of the sum of the Jordan cell state $|1; 1\rangle$ and the ‘decoupling’ state $|1; 3\rangle'$; indeed the action of L_{-1} on $|0; i\rangle, i = 0, 1$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L_{-1}|0; 0\rangle &= |1; 0\rangle \\ L_{-1}|0; 1\rangle &= |1; 1\rangle + |1; 3\rangle'. \end{aligned}$$

The further nullvector structure is also depicted in figure 4(G_1). We were able to calculate all states up to level 6 explicitly. The total number of states is also attainable for level 7, but in an indirect way via the second view on this representation to be discussed below. We give a list of the total number of states in table 3; we split the number according to the position of the state in the Jordan cell, which we also call the ‘Jordan level’ of that state in the cell (following [9] the enumeration starts with 0). For example, for level 5 there are four rank 3 Jordan cells, one additional rank 2 Jordan cell plus the four which are subcells of a rank 3 cell as well as six additional single eigenvalues.

Now we find one nullvector on level 2, the singular descendant $L_{-2}|0; 0\rangle$. This nullvector has two singular descendants on levels 5 and 7 which are also nullvectors of $|1; 0\rangle = L_{-1}|0; 0\rangle$ due to the bulk embedding structure. The ‘decoupling’ state $|1; 3\rangle'$ generates an irreducible representation with null singular vectors on levels 5 and 7. These vectors as well as their

Table 3. Number of states for $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$.

Level	Number of states			Total number of state	New null subrepresentations
	Jordan level 0	Jordan level 1	Jordan level 2		
0	1	1	–	2	–
1	2	1	1	4	–
2	3	1	1	5	1
3	5	2	2	9	–
4	8	3	3	14	–
5	11	5	4	20	2
6	17	7	6	30	–
7	23?	11?	8?	42?	2

descendants are the only nullvectors up to level 7. We do not yet encounter a logarithmic nullvector up to this level.

In a second way of visualizing this representation we can actually view it as an indecomposable combination of rank 2 representations whose structure is given in much the same way as in figure 2(A); we only have to replace the two lowest black dots by the two rank 2 representations $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$ and the higher by $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$. Surprisingly, we can also put $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ in a likewise form with the lower two black dots replaced by $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$ and the higher with $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$. A mathematical more precise notion of this procedure is that of an extension of a representation by another. The case of general rank two indecomposable representations, so-called staggered modules, is described in this way in [22] as an extension of an irreducible highest weight representation by another. This construction generalizes to extensions of a staggered module by another. One can read off these two Virasoro staggered modules from our data, but this is, at least on the level of Virasoro representations, not unique. Indeed, it appears that $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ can be viewed as an extension of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$ by $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$ or as an extension of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$ by $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$. A detailed analysis of this extension structure along the lines set out in [22] is beyond the scope of our paper. However, let us see how this comes about on the lowest levels of the rank 3 representation.

We choose the setup for the lowest levels as depicted in figure 4G₂: we have two separate rank 2 representations with lowest states $|0; 0\rangle$ and $|0; 1\rangle$, respectively. $|0; 0\rangle$ has a logarithmic partner at level 1, called m_1 , to its singular descendant $m_0 := L_{-1}|0; 0\rangle = |1; 0\rangle$. Likewise, $|0; 1\rangle$ has a logarithmic partner at level 1, called m_3 , to its singular descendant $m_2 := L_{-1}|0; 1\rangle = |1; 1\rangle + |1; 3\rangle'$. Furthermore, both representations are connected by the indecomposable L_0 action on $|0; 1\rangle$. This directly promotes to the indecomposable action of L_0 on their L_{-1} descendants

$$L_0 m_0 = |1; 0\rangle \quad L_0 m_2 = |1; 2\rangle + |1; 0\rangle$$

as well as the consistent L_1 action

$$L_1 m_0 = 0 \quad L_1 m_2 = 2|0; 0\rangle.$$

Now we still have to check whether we can find m_1 and m_3 which fit this setup. We express m_1 and m_3 as linear combinations of the level 1 states $|1; j\rangle$, $j = 1, 2, 3$ and impose the following conditions and parameters:

- $L_0 m_1 = m_1 + m_0$,
- $L_1 m_1 = \xi_1 |0; 0\rangle$,
- $L_0 m_3 = m_3 + m_2 + r m_1 + s m_0$,
- $L_1 m_3 = \xi_2 |0; 1\rangle + \xi_3 |0; 0\rangle$.

We find that s and ξ_3 are actually irrelevant parameters which can be set to 0 using the residual freedom. r and ξ_2 are functions of ξ_1 . Hence, there is one free parameter in this representation. It is most useful to just express r in terms of ξ_1 and then study the relation between ξ_1 and ξ_2 as these parameters are the defining parameters of the rank 2 representations we started with. The relation is given by

$$(12\xi_1 + 1)(12\xi_2 + 1) = 25.$$

There are only two solutions which fit the bulk rank 2 spectrum discussed above; they also seem to be the most natural ones:

$$\xi_1 = \xi_2 = -\frac{1}{2} \quad \xi_1 = \xi_2 = \frac{1}{3}.$$

These two solutions exactly give the lower level rank 2 representations which we proposed above to be the two lower dots in the figure 2(A) like setup. In order to get the respective representation corresponding to the higher dot of figure 2(A) we just have to count the number of states and compare these. As this higher rank 2 representation only ‘fills up’ states which would be null in a pure rank 2 setting, but are not null in this rank 3 setting (e.g. $L_{-2}|0; 1\rangle$), we do not need any further parameters to describe this representation.

Therefore, there is only the one additional parameter r besides the parameters of the ingredient rank 2 representations, which we need to describe $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$, which is given in terms of ξ_1 :

$$r = \frac{-25}{12\xi_1 + 1}.$$

Finally, we still need to explain how to determine the number of states for level 7 (as in table 3). If we want to use the total number of states to determine this higher black dot in the above setting, we can decide this question knowing the total number of states of $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ up to level 5 ($\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$ already differ at their third level). But then, we can in turn easily use this setting in order to determine the number of states for any higher level.

$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})$. The rank 3 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2)$ looks much the same as the previous one. Due to the nullvector at level 1 which appears at a lower level than the final rank 3 structure we have to take some more care in fixing the freedom.

There are again two ways to decompose this rank 3 representation into rank 2 representations. Either we find twice $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$ or twice $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$.

$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{5})$. The rank 3 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$ is the only higher rank 3 representation which was accessible to our calculations up to that level at which the rank 3 structure appears. From our knowledge of the other towers of representations it should nevertheless be fair to conjecture that most of the generic features of rank 3 representations in these $c_{p,q}$ models are already visible in this example.

In table 4, we list the number of states as calculated. We have also included the basis of states which brings L_0 into a Jordan diagonal form in appendix A.

Again we find two ways to visualize the embedding structure. The Jordan diagonalization of L_0 gives an embedding structure of the form depicted in figure 5H₁. As the situation is even more complicated as for $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ we have labelled the states according to the indexed basis which is chosen by the computer and listed in appendix A. We can see that both singular vectors on n_0 , i.e. n_4 at level 1 and n_{23} at level 2, are incorporated into rank 2 Jordan cells. But nevertheless we do not encounter a first rank 3 cell until level 5. The first vector of this rank 3 Jordan cell, n_{16} , which is a true eigenvector, is given by the joint singular vector on n_4 and n_{23} . As in the $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ case there is a vector at level 5 which seems to decouple




Figure 5. Two ways to visualize $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$.

Table 4. Number of states for $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$.

Level	Number of states			Total number of state	New null subrepresentations
	Jordan level 0	Jordan level 1	Jordan level 2		
0	1	–	–	1	–
1	1	1	–	2	–
2	2	2	–	4	–
3	3	3	–	6	–
4	5	5	–	10	–
5	8	7	1	16	–

from the representation. But again this decoupling in terms of the L_0 action is deceiving as this vector is a sum of descendants of n_5 and n_{24} (see appendix A for the explicit expressions). Hence, as for $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ this rank 3 representation needs four generating states.

As a second way to visualize this representation, we conjecture that we can construct this representation by an indecomposable combination of the four rank 2 representations $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$, twice $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 12)$ assembled as in figure 2(B); as before we replace the black dots in figure 2(B) by the respective rank 2 representations. The picture that emerges is depicted in figure 5(H₂). What are the hints at such a deconstruction of $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$? First of all we find that

$$L_1 n_5 = -\frac{1}{2} n_0.$$

This equation reproduces the defining β parameter of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$. Hence, the two lowest generating states of $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$, n_0 and n_5 , generate a tower of states which resembles the rank 2 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$. The only difference to a true subrepresentation $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$ is that the usual first nullvector on n_0 , $n_{23} = L_{-2} n_0$, is rendered non-null by its inclusion into

an indecomposable rank 2 cell with

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 n_{23} &= 2n_{23} \\ L_0 n_{24} &= 2n_{24} + n_{23}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

In the $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ case, we have seen an example that the indecomposable connection of two rank 2 cells of the same type of rank 2 representation produces a rank 3 cell and a seemingly decoupling further state. But this is exactly the structure we discover in this case at level 5—a rank 3 cell,

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 n_{16} &= 2n_{16} \\ L_0 n_{17} &= 2n_{17} + n_{16} \\ L_0 n_{18} &= 2n_{18} + n_{17}, \end{aligned}$$

as well as a seemingly decoupling state n_{70} . Hence, we conjecture that n_{23} and n_{24} are actually both the lower generators of towers of states which both resemble $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$, but which are indecomposably connected according to equation (4). This structure up to level 5 is in perfect agreement with the total count of states given in table 4. Unfortunately, we cannot say anything about the embedding structure or the count of states for higher levels and, thus, the inclusion of the fourth rank 2 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 12)$ is highly conjectural. It is only lead by the intuition that in any rank 2 structure the first nullvectors on the true eigenstate have to have non-null corresponding states on the side of the logarithmic partner due to the non-degeneracy of the Shapovalov form.

There is, however, one further way of looking at the situation. Let us regard the fusion equation

$$\mathcal{V}(1/3) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5) = \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5).$$

But as described before we can also view $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$ as a combination of four towers of states which resemble their irreducible counterparts in terms of numbers of states and singular vectors but which are indecomposably connected to form $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$. In this case, we can think of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$ as being constructed by indecomposably connecting $\mathcal{V}(1)$, twice $\mathcal{V}(5)$ as well as $\mathcal{V}(12)$. But the fusion of its single constituents should be consistent with the fusion of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$ itself. Therefore, inspecting the fusion rules (the first two calculated, see appendix B, the third inferred from the fusion rules of section 6)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(1/3) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1) &= \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \\ \mathcal{V}(1/3) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5) &= \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5) \\ \mathcal{V}(1/3) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(12) &= \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 12), \end{aligned}$$

we are again led to the conjecture that we can build $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$ by indecomposably connecting $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$, twice $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 12)$.

A similar inspection of the fusion equation

$$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) = \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$$

leads to the conjecture that we can also construct $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$ by indecomposably connecting $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$, twice $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 15)$. This is also in perfect agreement with the total count of states up to the accessible level 5 and, furthermore, a nice generalization of the $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ case, which can also be constructed out of rank 2 representations in two ways; indeed, as in the $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ case $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$ can be viewed as an extension either of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$ by $\mathcal{R}(2, 5)$ or as an extension of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$ by $\mathcal{R}(1, 5)$ —a detailed analysis of this more precise mathematical description is, however, again beyond the scope of this paper.

Let us have an explicit view at the embedding of the lowest rank 2 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$ which is a bit more tricky this time. For the non-trivial action of the positive Virasoro modes on the new state n_{24} at level 2 we find (after removal of some residual freedom)

$$L_1 n_{24} = 3n_5 \quad L_2 n_{24} = -\frac{17}{12}n_0. \quad (5)$$

This state n_{24} is the logarithmic partner of the n_0 descendant $n_{23} = L_{-2}n_0$. From the description of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$, we are used to these two states spanning the lowest Jordan cell. But the non-trivial mapping of L_1 in equation (5) is in clear contradiction to $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$ having a first nullvector and, hence, no state at level 1. Furthermore, we do not recover the correct β value in equation (5). But we have forgotten to take into account that due to the absence of this nullvector on level 1 the level 2 singular vector has shifted to

$$n'_{23} = n_{23} - \frac{3}{2}n_4.$$

The correct logarithmic partner to n'_{23} is given by

$$n'_{24} = n_{24} + \frac{9}{8}n_4 - \frac{3}{2}n_5.$$

Indeed, if we calculate the action of the positive Virasoro modes for n'_{24} we find the desired properties:

$$L_1 n'_{24} = 0 \quad L_2 n'_{24} = \frac{5}{6}n_0.$$

$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{7})$. Although the rank 3 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)$ is not accessible to our computational power, we can nevertheless tackle its decomposition in the same way as the last method in the preceding case. For this argument, we take the appearances of $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)$ for granted as conjectured in appendix B. Then looking at the fusion equation

$$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) = \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)$$

we conjecture that $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)$ can be constructed by indecomposably connecting the four rank 2 representations $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$, twice $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5, 12)$. Similarly, looking at

$$\mathcal{V}(1/3) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3) = \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3),$$

we can think of $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)$ to be composed of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$, twice $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5, 15)$.

4.2. Explicit calculation of the fusion products

We have calculated the fusion products of a large variety of representations in the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model. To do this, we have used the Nahm algorithm described in section 2 to determine the fusion product of irreducible and rank 1 representations with themselves as well as with the lowest lying and first excited rank 2 representations. In order to show that the fusion algebra indeed closes, we have used the symmetry and associativity of the fusion product and calculated the fusion of higher rank representations. We have also used these conditions in order to perform consistency checks as described in the following subsection. The results itself are listed in appendix B.

In section 6, we sketch a generalization of the BPZ and $c_{p,1}$ fusion rules which is applicable to all augmented $c_{p,q}$ models and, hence, also describes the fusion of this model in a unifying way. But as these general rules look quite complex it is also possible to find simplified versions for the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model, e.g.

$$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathcal{W}(1/3|i) = \mathcal{W}(-1/24|i),$$

where $\mathcal{W}(h|i)$ signifies the i th element in the weight chain starting with h .

4.3. Consistency of fusion products

A consistent fusion product has to obey two main properties, symmetry and associativity. We have used both these properties for consistency checks of the chosen spectrum and the performed calculation as well as for the determination of the fusion product of higher rank representations.

The main implication of this consistency, however, is the absence of an irreducible representation of weight $h = 0$ in the spectrum, call it $\mathcal{V}(0)$. The representation $\mathcal{V}(0)$ would be endowed with nullvectors on levels 1 and 2 and would, hence, only consist of the one ground state. Performing the Nahm algorithm of section 2, we get the following fusion products:

$$\mathcal{V}(0) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(0) = \mathcal{V}(0) \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{V}(0) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(h) = 0 \quad \forall h \in \left\{ \frac{5}{8}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{-1}{24}, \frac{33}{8}, \frac{10}{3}, \frac{21}{8}, 2, 1, 7, 5 \right\}. \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, using just equations (7) and the fusion rules of appendix B we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{V}(0) \otimes_f (\mathcal{V}(2) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2))) &= (\mathcal{V}(0) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(0)) \oplus (\mathcal{V}(0) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)) \\ &= \mathcal{V}(0) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(0) \end{aligned}$$

as well as by associativity at

$$\begin{aligned} ((\mathcal{V}(0) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)) &= 0 \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

(Similar equations can be obtained involving the other $\mathcal{V}(h)$ with h from (7).) This argument thus implies

$$\mathcal{V}(0) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(0) = 0.$$

But this is in clear contradiction to (6). Fortunately, however, $\mathcal{V}(0)$ completely decouples from the rest of the fusion (as one can see in appendix B). Hence, the contradiction is easily solved by simply excluding $\mathcal{V}(0)$ from the spectrum.

On the other hand, the representations $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$ contain a state with weight 0 which generates a subrepresentation $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$. This subrepresentation is indecomposable but neither is it irreducible nor does it exhibit any higher rank behaviour. Let us emphasize that it is only physically meaningful as a subrepresentation because it needs the embedding into the rank 2 representation in order not to have nullvectors at both levels 1 and 2.¹ But, nevertheless, being a subrepresentation of a representation in the spectrum it is part of the spectrum, too. Similarly, the representations $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$ contain a rank 1 subrepresentation $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$. However, looking at the fusion rules which we calculate for these two rank 1 representations (see appendix B), especially

$$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2 \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(h) = \mathcal{V}(h) \quad \forall h \in \left\{ \frac{5}{8}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{-1}{24}, \frac{33}{8}, \frac{10}{3}, \frac{21}{8}, 2, 1, 7, 5 \right\},$$

we see that the situation is after all not really too bad: $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$ behaves much more like the true vacuum representation as the expected $\mathcal{V}(0)$ (only regard the behaviour in (7)), it simply acts as the monoidal unit for the fusion product.

We now want to present one nice example how to use the symmetry and associativity of the fusion product in order to determine the higher rank fusion. Let us assume that we already know the fusion of irreducible representations with themselves as well as with rank 2 representations,

¹ Without its embedding in a higher rank structure the collection of all Virasoro descendants on an $h = 0$ state certainly is a valid representation, the Verma module, but the subrepresentations generated by the two nullvectors at level 1 and 2 do not have any physical relevance and need to be factored out.

i.e. the results we actually calculated using the Nahm algorithm (see appendix B). Then we start off with

$$((\mathcal{V}(1/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/3)) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)) = \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3).$$

Using associativity we can also calculate

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{V}(1/8) \otimes_f ((\mathcal{V}(1/3) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)))) &= (\mathcal{V}(1/8) \otimes_f (\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3))) \\ &= 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus (\mathcal{V}(1/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we can use the symmetry as well as the associativity once more to get

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{V}(1/3) \otimes_f (\mathcal{V}(1/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3))) &= (\mathcal{V}(1/3) \otimes_f (2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8))) \\ &= 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24). \end{aligned}$$

By comparison we thus arrive at already two new higher rank fusion products

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \\ = 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(1/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \\ = 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24). \end{aligned}$$

The complete list of the higher rank fusion products which we calculated is given in appendix B.

5. Explicit discussion of the augmented Yang–Lee model

Unfortunately, a complete exploration of the low-lying spectrum of the next easiest general augmented model, the augmented Yang–Lee model at $c_{2,5} = -22/5$, is not yet possible due to limitations on the computational power. Nevertheless, we were able to compute most of the crucial features which we observed in the fusion of the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model, including the lowest rank 2 and rank 3 representations as well as the absence of irreducible representations corresponding to the original minimal model. We also give some examples of fusion products which confirm the general fusion rules conjectured in section 6. The explicit results are listed in appendix C.

The Kac table of $c_{2,5} = -22/5$ is depicted in table 5. We encounter two bulk weight chains

$$\begin{aligned} W_{(1,1)}^{\text{bulk, YL}} &:= \{\{0\}, \{1, 4\}, \{7, 13\}, \dots\} \\ W_{(2,1)}^{\text{bulk, YL}} &:= \left\{ \left\{ -\frac{1}{5} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{9}{5}, \frac{14}{5} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{44}{5}, \frac{54}{5} \right\}, \dots \right\} \end{aligned}$$

as well as five border weight chains

$$\begin{aligned} W_{(1,2)}^{\text{border, YL}} &:= \left\{ \frac{11}{8}, \frac{27}{8}, \frac{155}{8}, \dots \right\} \\ W_{(2,2)}^{\text{border, YL}} &:= \left\{ \frac{27}{40}, \frac{187}{40}, \frac{667}{40}, \dots \right\} \\ W_{(3,2)}^{\text{border, YL}} &:= \left\{ \frac{7}{40}, \frac{247}{40}, \frac{567}{40}, \dots \right\} \\ W_{(4,2)}^{\text{border, YL}} &:= \left\{ -\frac{1}{8}, \frac{63}{8}, \frac{95}{8}, \dots \right\} \\ W_{(5,1)}^{\text{border, YL}} &:= \left\{ \frac{2}{5}, \frac{27}{5}, \frac{77}{5}, \dots \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and a chain $\{-9/40, 91/40, 391/40, \dots\}$ of weights on the corners. In table 6, we present all rank 2 representations which we found in our sample calculations (see appendix C) as well as their defining parameters. This is indeed the complete spectrum of lowest rank 2 representations to be expected according to the general considerations of section 6.

Table 5. Kac table for $c_{2,5} = -22/5$.

	s				
	1	2	3	4	5
1	0	$\frac{11}{8}$	4	$\frac{63}{8}$	13
2	$-\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{27}{40}$	$\frac{14}{5}$	$\frac{247}{40}$	$\frac{54}{5}$
3	$-\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{7}{40}$	$\frac{9}{5}$	$\frac{187}{40}$	$\frac{44}{5}$
4	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	1	$\frac{27}{8}$	7
5	$\frac{2}{5}$	$-\frac{9}{40}$	$\frac{2}{5}$	$\frac{91}{40}$	$\frac{27}{5}$
6	1	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0	$\frac{11}{8}$	4
r 7	$\frac{9}{5}$	$\frac{7}{40}$	$-\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{27}{40}$	$\frac{14}{5}$
8	$\frac{14}{5}$	$\frac{27}{40}$	$-\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{7}{40}$	$\frac{9}{5}$
9	4	$\frac{11}{8}$	0	$-\frac{1}{8}$	1
10	$\frac{27}{5}$	$\frac{91}{40}$	$\frac{2}{5}$	$-\frac{9}{40}$	$\frac{2}{5}$
11	7	$\frac{27}{8}$	1	$-\frac{1}{8}$	0
12	$\frac{44}{5}$	$\frac{187}{40}$	$\frac{9}{5}$	$\frac{7}{40}$	$-\frac{1}{5}$
13	$\frac{54}{5}$	$\frac{247}{40}$	$\frac{14}{5}$	$\frac{27}{40}$	$-\frac{1}{5}$
14	13	$\frac{63}{8}$	4	$\frac{11}{8}$	0

Table 6. Specific properties of rank 2 representations in $c_{2,5} = -22/5$.

	β_1	β_2	Level of log. partner	Level of first nullvector	Level of first log. nullvector	Type
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(11/8, 11/8)$	-	-	0	2	18	A
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(27/40, 27/40)$	-	-	0	4	16	A
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2/5, 2/5)$	-	-	0	5	15	A
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7/40, 7/40)$	-	-	0	6	14	A
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/8, -1/8)$	-	-	0	8	12	A
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	$3/5$	-	1	4	13	C
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_{13}$	$-3/2$	-	1	4	7	D
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 4)_7$	0	$231/50$	4	1	13	E
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 4)_{13}$	0	$231/25$	4	1	7	F
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 9/5)_9$	$-42/125$	-	2	3	11	C
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 9/5)_{11}$	$21/50$	-	2	3	9	D
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 14/5)_9$	$21/125$	$21/50$	3	2	11	E
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 14/5)_{11}$	$-126/625$	$-63/125$	3	2	9	F

As in the $c_{2,3} = 0$ model case the lowest border rank 2 representations, given in the first block of table 6, do not need a further parameter for characterization. Their structure is again represented by figure 2(A).

The structure of the lowest bulk rank 2 representations, given in the second block of table 6, is depicted in figure 3; their respective special type is given in the last column. The representations of types C and D exhibit their Jordan cell on the level of the first possible nullvector of the ground state and can thus be described by just one parameter $\beta = \beta_1$:

$$(L_1)^l |h + l; 1\rangle = \beta |h\rangle,$$

where l denotes the level of the Jordan cell. Besides this, we have $L_p|h+l; 1\rangle = 0$ for all $p \geq 2$ and, hence, all other Virasoro monomials of length l vanish applied to $|h+l; 1\rangle$.

The representations of types E and F, however, have to accommodate a first nullvector on the ground state already below the level of the Jordan cell. The same difficulties as in the $c_{2,3} = 0$ model apply. We again need two parameters β_1 and β_2 parameterizing

$$(L_1)^l|h+l; 1\rangle = \beta_1|h\rangle \quad P(L)|h+l; 1\rangle = \beta_2|h\rangle,$$

where we have taken $P(L) = L_4$ for $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 4)_7$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 4)_{13}$ as well as $P(L) = L_2L_1$ for $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 14/5)_9$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 14/5)_{11}$. All other Virasoro monomials of length l vanish applied to $|h+l; 1\rangle$. This behaviour actually confirms our conjecture of section 4.1.1 that we only need two parameters for this type of representation; furthermore, the above-presented parameterization is performed exactly in the proposed way.

Again we checked for the appearance of the lowest logarithmic nullvector using the algorithm of [32]. This could be successfully done in all cases listed in table 6. For this $c_{2,5} = -22/5$ model these nullvector calculations were actually a nice and necessary check of our proposed fusion rules as this information was usually not directly accessible in the fusion spectrum due to the computational limits on L .

As a last issue in the discussion of the augmented Yang–Lee model, we want to have a look at the irreducible representations with weights in the Kac table of the corresponding non-augmented minimal model. There are two possible representations of this kind in this model, $\mathcal{V}(h=0)$ with first nullvectors on levels 1 and 4 as well as $\mathcal{V}(h=-1/5)$ with first nullvectors on levels 2 and 3. Explicit calculations with the Nahm algorithm lead to

$$\mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/5) = \mathcal{V}(0) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/5) \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(h) = 0 \quad \forall h \in \left\{ \frac{9}{5}, \frac{14}{5}, 4 \right\}. \quad (9)$$

But again using only the equations of (9) and the fusion rules of appendix C, we arrive at the contradicting results

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f (\mathcal{V}(14/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(14/5))) \\ &= (\mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(0)) \oplus (\mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(4)) \oplus (\mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/5)) \\ & \quad \oplus (\mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(9/5)) \\ &= (\mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(0)) \oplus (\mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/5)) \end{aligned}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} ((\mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(14/5)) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(14/5)) &= 0 \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(14/5) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

which lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(0) &= 0 \\ \mathcal{V}(-1/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/5) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation applies to $\mathcal{V}(0)$. Thus, we have to discard $\mathcal{V}(0)$ and $\mathcal{V}(-1/5)$ from the spectrum.

But, with the same reasoning as in the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model case, we encounter rank 1 subrepresentations of rank 2 representations which are generated by states with weights

$h = 0$ and $h = -1/5$. We therefore have to include the four rank 1 indecomposable (but not irreducible) representations $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$, $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_4$, $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(-1/5)_2$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(-1/5)_3$ into the spectrum. $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_4$ actually acquires the role of the vacuum representation as it acts as the monoidal unit of the fusion algebra.

6. Representations and fusion product for general augmented $c_{p,q}$ models

The two generic examples of augmented $c_{p,q}$ models discussed in the preceding sections already provide a good basis to conjecture what the representation content and the fusion products of general augmented $c_{p,q}$ models should be like. In this section, we want to present a quick overview over this extrapolated representation content and fusion rules. A more detailed elaboration can be found in [50].

The generalization of the spectrum to an augmented $c_{p,q}$ model is quite straightforward. As in the two examples the spectrum comprises only irreducible representations for weights on the Kac table corners; irreducible as well as rank 2 indecomposable representations of types A and B (see figure 2) for weights on the border, and rank 2 representations of types C, D, E and F (see figure 3) as well as rank 3 representations of the form G and H (see figures 4 and 5) for weights in the Kac table bulk. The case of irreducible representations corresponding to weights in the bulk is slightly more complicated. The calculations for $c_{2,3} = 0$ and $c_{2,5} = -22/5$ (see sections 4.3 and 5) show that it is not possible to include irreducible representations corresponding to weights in the bulk which appear in the Kac table of the corresponding non-augmented minimal model $c_{p,q}$, i.e. weights in the Kac table segment $1 \leq r < q$, $1 \leq s < p$. These weights exactly correspond to the lowest weight of each bulk weight chain. As shown in the examples, the inclusion of these irreducible representations would simply violate the symmetry and associativity of the fusion product. On the other hand, the fusion of the border and corner irreducible representations produces rank 2 representations $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(h(r_1, s_1), h(r_2, s_2))_w$ which contain the lowest weights of the corresponding bulk weight chain, let it be $h(r_1, s_1)$ in this case, as a generating state. This lowest weight state even generates an indecomposable subrepresentation of $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(h(r_1, s_1), h(r_2, s_2))_w$ which does not exhibit higher rank behaviour. These special rank 1 indecomposable subrepresentations play an important role as in both examples they include the proper vacuum representation of the respective fusion ring. We conjecture that this behaviour also generalizes to the other augmented $c_{p,q}$ models. And of course, for weights in the Kac table bulk outside the segment $1 \leq r < q$, $1 \leq s < p$ one will also find corresponding irreducible representations.

One can now use the explicitly calculated fusion products for the two examples $c = 0$ and $c = -22/5$, which are listed in the appendices B and C, respectively, as the basis for conjecturing fusion rules of general augmented $c_{p,q}$ models. As an example of the possible form of such fusion rules, we want to sketch the fusion of two irreducible representations on a corner or the border.

If we describe such an irreducible representation $\mathcal{V}_{(r,s)}^i(h)$ corresponding to a conformal weight h on a corner or a border, we choose the index (r, s) with the smallest product rs . If there are two pairs with the same product, we choose the one with larger r (although this last point is mere convention and does not effect the result). Then, the fusion product for $i, j \in \{\text{corner, border}\}$ amounts to the untruncated BPZ rules:

$$\left(\mathcal{V}_{(r_1, s_1)}^i(h_1) \otimes \mathcal{V}_{(r_2, s_2)}^j(h_2)\right)_f = \sum_{r_3=|r_1-r_2|+1, \text{step } 2}^{r_1+r_2-1} \sum_{s_3=|s_1-s_2|+1, \text{step } 2}^{s_1+s_2-1} \tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{(r_3, s_3)} \Bigg|_{\text{rules}}. \quad (10)$$

On the right-hand side, however, we do not simply encounter a sum over irreducible representations again. Some of the resulting $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{(r,s)}$ are automatically combined into rank 2 or rank 3 representations. We briefly sketch the corresponding *rules* as to how to do this combination (indicated as constraints in the equation).

- (i) For (r, s) on a corner $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}_{(r,s)}$ is simply replaced by the corresponding irreducible representation $\mathcal{V}_{(r,s)}^{\text{corner}}(h(r, s))$.
- (ii) Take the set of all (r, s) on the right-hand side of (10) corresponding to weights on the border. If we find twice the same weight $h(r_1, s_1) = h(r_2, s_2)$ which is the lowest of a weight chain, these two need to be replaced by the rank 2 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(h(r_1, s_1), h(r_2, s_2))$. Then, if we find two weights $h(m_1, m_1), h(m_2, m_2)$ of the same weight chain adjacent to each other in the chain, these need to be replaced by $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(h(m_1, n_1), h(m_2, n_2))$. All other weights in this set simply form irreducible representations and are replaced by $\mathcal{V}_{(r,s)}^{\text{border}}(h(r, s))$.
- (iii) Take the set of all (r, s) on the right-hand side of (10) corresponding to weights in the bulk. If we encounter a set of four weights which correspond to the generating states of one of the two types of rank 3 representations discussed in the preceding sections we need to replace them by the rank 3 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(h(r_1, s_1), h(r_2, s_2), h(r_3, s_3), h(r_4, s_4))$.
- (iv) Rank 2 representations need two generating states. For bulk representations these consist of one weight each from two adjacent sets in the weight chain. If this set of two weights $h(r_1, s_1), h(r_2, s_2)$ contains the lowest weight of this weight chain, let it be $h(r_1, s_1)$, there are still two possible representations with this set of weights. The additional index is given by the level w of the weight in the third set of the weight chain which is not (!) the first possible nullvector on $h(r_2, s_2)$, i.e. which is not equal to $h(r_2, s_2) + r_2 s_2$. Each two weights of this form have to be replaced by the rank 2 representation $\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(h(r_1, s_1), h(r_2, s_2))_w$.
- (v) From the set of all remaining (r, s) within the bulk we find to each lowest weight $h(r_1, s_1)$ of a bulk weight chain a corresponding weight $h(r_2, s_2)$ of the second tuple of this weight chain. These form a rank 1 indecomposable representation.
- (vi) All (r, s) corresponding to weights in the bulk which have not been used up in the three preceding points have to be replaced by $\mathcal{V}_{(r,s)}(h(r, s))$.

Unfortunately, one cannot write down the fusion rules for general augmented theories in such a nice form as for the augmented $c_{p,1}$ models [20]. First of all, we do not have border representations just on one side such that a restriction to an infinite strip of the Kac table nicely promotes the first border conformal weights beyond that strip to corresponding rank 2 representations. Second, for the bulk there are simply not enough entries in the Kac table in order to uniquely label all different irreducible, rank 2 and rank 3 representations.

The fusion products including representations corresponding to conformal weights in the bulk can be extrapolated along the same lines. One can even write down fusion rules for fusion products with higher rank representations which make use of the earlier elaborated fact that all higher rank representations can be constructed by indecomposably connecting a number of representations of one rank lower.

Finally, the examples show that starting with border and corner representations the whole fusion closes without the inclusion of any irreducible or rank 1 representation corresponding to weights in the bulk. Actually, we even have a closing fusion ring of only the representations with the highest rank of the respective types (bulk, border, corner). All lower rank representations appear as subrepresentations and their fusion is determined by the fusion

of the respective higher rank representation. This explains the artificiality of, e.g., the fifth rule which originates in our wish to fuse these subrepresentations as representations in their own right.

A more detailed elaboration of this still speculative extrapolation of the calculated fusion products can be found in [50].

7. Conclusion and outlook

In this paper, we have given the explicit fusion rules for two examples of general augmented minimal models, the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ and the augmented Yang–Lee model. We have shown that these models exhibit an even richer indecomposable structure in comparison to the $c_{p,1}$ models with representations up to rank 3. We have elaborated a number of these newly appearing representations of rank 2 and 3 in detail. Especially, we have shown for some of these examples that one can construct rank 3 representations by indecomposably connecting rank 2 representations. This is a very interesting generalization of the rank 2 representation case which can be composed by indecomposably connecting several irreducible representations and, presumably, it can likewise be described by the mathematical procedure of an extension of a representation module with another along the lines of [22].

We have also shown that the fusion rule consistency conditions of symmetry and associativity actually restrict the representation spectrum—irreducible representations corresponding to weights of the original non-augmented minimal model cannot be included into the spectrum consistently. We actually find that the vacuum representation is given by an indecomposable but not irreducible rank 1 subrepresentation of a rank 2 representation. For the $c_{2,3} = 0$ model, in particular, this settles the long standing puzzle of how to construct a consistent vacuum representation and character, at least on the level of pure Virasoro representations. This has a direct impact on models with central charge $c = 0$ for several interesting physical phenomena as, e.g., percolation [31, 51–53], quenched disorder models [54, 55], or the dilute case in polymer physics [1].

These two examples already reveal a concise general structure which we think exhibits almost all of the generic structure of general augmented $c_{p,q}$ models. Accordingly, we have conjecturally sketched how to extrapolate this structure to the general representation content and fusion rules of general augmented $c_{p,q}$ models. These conjectured fusion rules still inherit much of the BPZ fusion structure. The main generalization lies in the fact that we do not interpret the BPZ fusion rules ‘minimally’ for these models. This ‘minimal’ refers to the BPZ fusion rules for the non-augmented minimal models where one takes a section over all ways of applying the untruncated BPZ rules. The augmented fusion rules allow for definitely more representation content. This is, however, in perfect accordance with and directly reduces to the already known rules for the special case of augmented $c_{p,1}$ models [20], although the general rules do not look as nicely compact as the special ones in [20].

Concerning our special example of $c_{2,3} = 0$, we actually find that the numerical results of [4], table 1, which are supposed to give the low level state content of CFT representations at $c = 0$, perfectly match our representations $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$, $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$ and $\mathcal{V}(1/3)$, respectively. Although the numerical results give only relatively few levels, we conjecture that they are correctly described by the above-mentioned $c_{2,3} = 0$ representations. Indeed, the spectrum of equation (5.1) in [4] is contained in a subalgebra of the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model which consists of representations up to rank 2 corresponding to the first column of the Kac table (i.e. $s = 1$). The characters given in equation (5.2) of [4] agree with the field content of the irreducible representations for weights $h = \frac{1}{3}, \frac{10}{3}, \dots$ and with rank 1 indecomposable

subrepresentations of rank 2 representations for integer weights $h = 0, 1, 2, 5, 7, \dots$. As the $c = 0$ theory in [4] describes a XXZ quantum spin chain, the above observations open a new and very exciting connection of logarithmic CFT to the topic of quantum spin chains which is popular not only in the field of integrable systems but also seems to have an important impact on the AdS/CFT correspondence and, hence, string theory [56, 57].

We have also shown that the findings in this paper are in perfect agreement with the logarithmic nullvector calculations performed in [32]. Using the technique of the Nahm algorithm we have actually been able to pinpoint the precise structure of higher rank Virasoro representations in $c_{2,3} = 0$; various types of possible rank 2 representations had already been conjectured in [32].

On the other hand, the question of whether these models exhibit a larger \mathcal{W} -algebra and how the Virasoro representations combine to representations of this larger symmetry algebra still remains open. There are, however, strong hints at the existence of such an enhanced symmetry algebra coming from inspections of the corresponding representations of the modular group [27]. And even the mere fact that the Virasoro fusion rules so nicely generalize from the $c_{p,1}$ model case where we know a triplet \mathcal{W} -algebra to exist is a further good hint. This may be exemplified by the existence of a representation like $\mathcal{V}(7)$ in the $c_{2,3} = 0$ model whose fusion rules behave in just the same way as the ones of the ‘spin representation’ $\mathcal{V}_{1,p}$ in the $c_{p,1}$ models. Indeed, in the $c_{p,1}$ models this spin representation behaves roughly like a square root of the \mathcal{W} -representation.

The representations of the modular group are already very restrictive such that for e.g. $c_{2,3} = 0$ it suffices to know the field content up to level 7 in order to precisely know the full \mathcal{W} -representation. We believe that this restrictiveness together with our new knowledge of the precise structure of the Virasoro representations should lead to a consistent set of modular functions which represent the right \mathcal{W} -characters and produce the right \mathcal{W} -fusion rules. This is subject to ongoing research [27].

Acknowledgments

We are very grateful to Werner Nahm and Alexander Nichols for useful discussions. Furthermore, we would like to thank the Bonn Condensed Matter Theory Group for the kind permission to use their computer cluster. This work was supported in part by the DFG Schwerpunktprogramm no. 1096 ‘Stringtheorie’. HE acknowledges support by the Studienstiftung des Deutschen Volkes. MF is also partially supported by the European Union network HPRN-CT-2002-00325 (EUCLID).

Appendix A. Explicit Jordan diagonalization of L_0 for $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$

In this appendix, we want to present a basis of states for the lowest five levels of $\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$ which brings the L_0 matrix in a Jordan diagonal form. The basis is denoted by n_i with a running index as assigned by the computer program. Vectors which are not shown to be equal to descendants of some other vectors are understood to be generating states. These are n_0, n_5, n_{24} and n_{18} at levels 0, 1, 2 and 5, respectively. On the right-hand side, we have denoted only the Jordan block in L_0 for the respective states. Different Jordan blocks are separated by lines. All other L_0 entries are zero.

States	L_0 matrix
n_0	0
$n_4 = L_{-1}n_0$ $n_5 = 0$	1 1 1
$n_6 = L_{-1}^2n_0 = L_{-1}n_4$ $n_7 = L_{-1}n_5$	2 1 0 2
$n_{23} = L_{-2}n_0$ n_{24}	2 1 0 2
$n_8 = L_{-2}L_{-1}n_0 = L_{-2}n_4$ $n_9 = L_{-2}n_5$	3 1 0 3
$n_{25} = L_{-1}^3n_0 = L_{-1}^2n_4$ $n_{26} = L_{-1}^2n_5$	3 1 0 3
$n_{38} = (L_{-3} + L_{-2}L_{-1})n_0 = L_{-1}n_{23}$ $n_{39} = L_{-1}n_{24}$	3 1 0 3
$n_{10} = L_{-3}L_{-1}n_0 = L_{-3}n_4$ $n_{11} = L_{-3}n_5$	4 1 0 4
$n_{27} = L_{-2}L_{-1}^2n_0 = L_{-2}L_{-1}n_4$ $n_{28} = L_{-2}L_{-1}n_5$	4 1 0 4
$n_{40} = L_{-2}^2n_0 = L_{-2}n_{23}$ $n_{41} = L_{-2}n_{24}$	4 1 0 4
$n_{48} = L_{-1}^4n_0 = L_{-1}^3n_4$ $n_{49} = L_{-1}^3n_5$	4 1 0 4
$n_{56} = (2L_{-4} + 2L_{-3}L_{-1} + L_{-2}L_{-1}^2)n_0 = L_{-1}^2n_{23}$ $n_{57} = L_{-1}^2n_{24}$	4 1 0 4
$n_{16} = \frac{4655}{31758} (L_{-4}L_{-1} - L_{-3}L_{-1}^2 + \frac{5}{3}L_{-2}L_{-1}^3 - L_{-2}^2L_{-1} - \frac{1}{4}L_{-1}^5)n_0$ $n_{17} = \frac{4655}{63516} ((L_{-4} - \frac{5}{2}L_{-3}L_{-1} - L_{-2}^2 + \frac{19}{6}L_{-2}L_{-1}^2 - \frac{1}{2}L_{-1}^4)n_5 + (L_{-3} - L_{-2}L_{-1} + \frac{1}{6}L_{-1}^3)n_{24})$ n_{18}	5 1 0 0 5 1 0 0 5
$n_{29} = L_{-3}L_{-1}^2n_0 = L_{-3}L_{-1}n_4$ $n_{30} = L_{-3}L_{-1}n_5$	5 1 0 5
$n_{42} = L_{-3}L_{-2}n_0 = L_{-3}n_{23}$ $n_{43} = L_{-3}n_{24}$	5 1 0 5
$n_{50} = L_{-2}^2L_{-1}n_0 = L_{-2}^2n_4$ $n_{51} = L_{-2}^2n_5$	5 1 0 5
$n_{58} = L_{-2}L_{-1}^3n_0 = L_{-2}L_{-1}^2n_4$ $n_{59} = L_{-2}L_{-1}^2n_5$	5 1 0 5
$n_{63} = L_{-1}^5n_0 = L_{-1}^4n_4$ $n_{64} = L_{-1}^4n_5$	5 1 0 5
$n_{68} = (6L_{-5} + 6L_{-4}L_{-1} + 3L_{-3}L_{-1}^2 + L_{-2}L_{-1}^3)n_0 = L_{-1}^3n_{23}$ $n_{69} = L_{-1}^3n_{24}$	5 1 0 5
$n_{70} = (L_{-4} + \frac{1}{2}L_{-3}L_{-1} - L_{-2}^2 + \frac{1}{6}L_{-2}L_{-1}^2)n_5 - (L_{-3} - L_{-2}L_{-1} + \frac{1}{6}L_{-1}^3)n_{24}$	5

Appendix B. Explicit fusion rules for $c_{2,3} = 0$

The following table contains the results of our explicit calculations of the fusion product of irreducible and rank 1 representations with each other in the augmented $c_{2,3} = 0$ model. The first column gives the representations to be fused. Then the level L at which we calculated the new representation as well as the maximal level \tilde{L} up to which we took the corresponding constraints into account are given. The last column contains the result.

The computational power restricts the level L at which the fused representations are calculated, unfortunately quite severely for the higher representations. Hence, it was sometimes not possible to reach a high enough L to actually see the indecomposable structure of all component representations of the result. We nevertheless denoted the result as we would expect it according to the proposed fusion rules—to discern this guessed higher representations from the explicit results we indicated them by a question mark. But certainly our results are always in agreement with these possible higher rank representations up to the level L given in the table.

	L	\tilde{L}_{\max}	Fusion product
$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5/8)$	6	11	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/3)$	6	11	$\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/8)$	7	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(33/8)$	6	11	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(10/3)$	6	7	$\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	6	11	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(5/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(33/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(21/8)$
$\mathcal{V}(1/3) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/3)$	6	11	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5 \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(33/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(10/3)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7) \oplus \mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$
$\mathcal{V}(1/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/8)$	6	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	6	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(33/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(10/3)$	6	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	6	8	$\mathcal{V}(21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	6	7	$\mathcal{V}(33/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$

	L	\tilde{L}_{\max}	Fusion product
$\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(143/24)$	0	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(1, 5, 7, 15)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)?$
$\mathcal{V}(33/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(33/8)$	6	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 15)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(10/3)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5, 12)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	6	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(85/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	6	8	$\mathcal{V}(1/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(65/8)$
$\mathcal{V}(10/3) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(10/3)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5, 15)? \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3) \oplus \mathcal{V}(28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(21/8, 85/8)? \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	3	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 12)?$
$\mathcal{V}(21/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 15)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(2, 5, 7, 12)?$
$\mathcal{V}(35/24) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	3	5	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(1, 5, 7, 15)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)?$
$\mathcal{V}(2) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(33/8)$	6	8	$\mathcal{V}(33/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(10/3)$	6	7	$\mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(7)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(2)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(1)$
$\mathcal{V}(1) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(10/3)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(33/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	6	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2 \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(7) \oplus \mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\mathcal{V}(7) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(10/3)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(1/3) \oplus \mathcal{V}(28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(1/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(65/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	4	6	$\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2 \oplus \mathcal{V}(15)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1 \oplus \mathcal{V}(12)$
$\mathcal{V}(5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	3	6	$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(85/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2 \oplus \mathcal{V}(15) \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3) \oplus \mathcal{V}(28/3)$

	L	\tilde{L}_{\max}	Fusion product
$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2 \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(5/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/3)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(33/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(33/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(10/3)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(2)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(1)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(7)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$
$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/3)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(33/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(10/3)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(21/8)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(33/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(35/24)$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(1)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(2) \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	6	9	$\mathcal{V}(7) \oplus \mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$	6	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2 \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3)$

The next table lists our results for the fusion of irreducible and rank 1 representations with rank 2 representations. The notation stays as above.

	L	\tilde{L}_{\max}	Fusion product
$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	5	7	$2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	5	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	4	6	$\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}(0, 1, 2, 7)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	4	6	$2\mathcal{V}(1/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	4	7	$2\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(33/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	4	6	$\mathcal{V}(1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(65/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(65/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	4	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	4	7	$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(33/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(85/8)$

	L	\tilde{L}_{\max}	Fusion product
$\mathcal{V}(1/3) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	4	7	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	3	10	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	3	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	4	6	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \oplus \mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	5	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	4	6	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3) \oplus \mathcal{V}(28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	4	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 12)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\mathcal{V}(1/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	5	7	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	3	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)? \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	3	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	3	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	4	6	$2\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(33/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	4	7	$2\mathcal{V}(1/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	3	6	$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(33/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(85/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	3	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	4	7	$\mathcal{V}(1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(65/8)$
$\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)? \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	4	6	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	4	6	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	2	5	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	2	5	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(21/8, 85/8)?$ $\oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	3	6	$\mathcal{R}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}(2, 5, 7, 12)? \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	4	6	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	4	6	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	4	7	$2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	3	6	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	3	6	$\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\mathcal{V}(33/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	3	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	3	9	$\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	3	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(2, 5, 7, 12)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	1	9	$2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(323/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	2	10	$\mathcal{R}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(1, 5, 7, 15)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	3	9	$\mathcal{V}(1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(65/8)$

	L	\tilde{L}_{\max}	Fusion product
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	3	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	3	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	3	9	$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(33/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(85/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	2	9	$2\mathcal{V}(1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(21/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(65/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(133/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	2	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(21/8, 85/8)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	2	9	$2\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(33/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(85/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(161/8)$
$\mathcal{V}(10/3) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	2	8	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	2	8	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)? \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3) \oplus \mathcal{V}(28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 12)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)?$
$\mathcal{V}(21/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)? \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	2	8	$\mathcal{V}(5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(33/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(85/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	2	8	$\mathcal{V}(1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(65/8)$
$\mathcal{V}(2) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	6	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	6	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$
$\mathcal{V}(1) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	3	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	4	5	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5 \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \oplus \mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	4	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3) \oplus \mathcal{V}(28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$

	L	\tilde{L}_{\max}	Fusion product
$\mathcal{V}(7) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	4	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	4	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	4	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	3	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	3	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	3	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(21/8, 85/8)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	6	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5, 12)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 12)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	3	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5, 15)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 15)?$
$\mathcal{V}(5) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	3	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	3	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	3	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(21/8, 85/8)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(2, 5, 7, 12)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$ $\oplus \mathcal{V}(323/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	3	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	3	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	3	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3) \oplus \mathcal{V}(28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	3	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 15)? \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$ $\oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)?$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5, 15)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(1/3) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7, 12)? \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(10/3) \oplus \mathcal{V}(55/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5, 12)?$
$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2 \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	6	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	6	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$
$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1 \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)?$

	L	\tilde{L}_{\max}	Fusion product
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5 \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \oplus \mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3) \oplus \mathcal{V}(28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$	4	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$

In order to extract the fusion of higher rank representations we used the symmetry and associativity properties of the fusion product along the lines described in section 4.3. For these calculations we applied our explicit results of the Nahm algorithm in the form stated in the tables above. The results are listed below.

	Fusion product
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$ $\oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$ $\oplus 4\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(1, 5, 7, 15)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$ $\oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(85/8, 133/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 4\mathcal{V}(35/24)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(2, 5, 7, 12)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(28/3, 55/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$ $\oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$ $\oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	$4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(323/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(1, 5, 7, 12)$ $\oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$ $\oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(85/8, 133/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 4\mathcal{V}(35/24)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(2, 5, 7, 12)$ $\oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$

	Fusion product
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(323/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(1, 5, 7, 15)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus 4\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus 4\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5 \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$ $\oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 5)$
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5) \oplus 4\mathcal{V}(1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5 \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{V}(1/3) \oplus \mathcal{V}(28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2)$
$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7 \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2, 7)$
$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5/8)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/3)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/8)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus 4\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	$4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(21/8, 85/8)$ $\oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 4\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	$4\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	$4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$ $\oplus 8\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 4\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$	$4\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(2, 5, 7, 12)$ $\oplus 8\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(1, 5, 7, 15)$ $\oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$ $\oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$

	Fusion product
$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5/8)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/3)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/8)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$ $\oplus 4\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8)$	$4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(323/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(2, 5, 7, 12)$ $\oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(21/8, 85/8)$ $\oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 4\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_5$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$ $\oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2)$	$4\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 2, 2) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(2, 5, 7, 12) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(28/3, 55/3)$
$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(5/8)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/3)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 1/3) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(10/3, 28/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1/8)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 5/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 33/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(21/8, 85/8)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 4\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/24)$	$2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/8, 1/8) \oplus 4\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(5/8, 21/8) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(33/8, 65/8)$ $\oplus 2\mathcal{V}(-1/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(35/24) \oplus 2\mathcal{V}(143/24) \oplus \mathcal{V}(323/24)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_2$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 7) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(1/3, 10/3)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 2)_7$	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus 2\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 1, 2, 5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(2, 5, 7, 12)$

Appendix C. Explicit fusion rules for $c_{2,5} = -22/5$

In the following table we have collected the results of our explicit calculations of the fusion product of irreducible representations in the augmented $c_{2,5} = -22/5$ model. These results are certainly not complete, but mainly serve to compute the lowest higher rank representations as well as to check the proposed fusion rules on a variety of examples. The notations are as before.

	L	\tilde{L}_{\max}	Fusion product
$\mathcal{V}(11/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(11/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 4)_{13}$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(27/40)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 14/5)_{11}$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2/5)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(-9/40)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7/40)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 9/5)_9$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/8)$	7	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-9/40)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2/5, 2/5)$
$\mathcal{V}(27/40) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(27/40)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 4)_{13} \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 9/5)_9$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2/5)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/8, -1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7/40)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 14/5)_{11}$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 9/5)_9 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2/5, 2/5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-9/40)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1)$
$\mathcal{V}(2/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(11/8)$	5	7	$\mathcal{V}(-9/40)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(27/40)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/8, -1/8)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(2/5)$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 4)_7 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 9/5)_{11} \oplus \mathcal{V}(2/5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7/40)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7/40, 7/40) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-9/40)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/8)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/8, -1/8) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(27/40, 27/40)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-9/40)$	3	5	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(7/40, 7/40) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(11/8, 11/8) \oplus \mathcal{V}(-9/40)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$	5	7	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_{13} \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 14/5)_9$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(1)$	3	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 1)_{13} \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 14/5)_9$
$\mathcal{V}(7/40) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(7/40)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 4)_{13} \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 9/5)_9 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2/5, 2/5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/8)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(-1/5, 14/5)_{11}$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-9/40)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(-1/5, -1/5, 9/5, 9/5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2/5, 2/5)$
$\mathcal{V}(-1/8) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-1/8)$	3	5	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(-1/5, -1/5, 9/5, 9/5) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(0, 4)_{13}$ $\oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2/5, 2/5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-9/40)$	4	6	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 1, 1) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(-1/5, -1/5, 14/5, 14/5)$
$\mathcal{V}(-9/40) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(-9/40)$	4	5	$\mathcal{R}^{(3)}(0, 0, 4, 4) \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(3)}(-1/5, -1/5, 9/5, 9/5)$ $\oplus \mathcal{R}^{(2)}(2/5, 2/5)$
$\mathcal{V}(14/5) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(14/5)$	2	8	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_4 \oplus \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(-1/5)_2$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(-1/5)_2$	2	8	$\mathcal{V}(1) \oplus \mathcal{V}(14/5)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(-1/5)_3$	2	8	$\mathcal{V}(4) \oplus \mathcal{V}(9/5)$
$\mathcal{V}(4) \otimes_f \mathcal{V}(4)$	2	9	$\mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_4$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_1$	2	9	$\mathcal{V}(1)$
$\otimes_f \mathcal{R}^{(1)}(0)_4$	2	9	$\mathcal{V}(4)$

References

- [1] Saleur H 1992 Polymers and percolation in two dimensions and twisted $N = 2$ supersymmetry *Nucl. Phys. B* **382** 486–531 (*Preprint* [hep-th/9111007](#))
- [2] Gurarie V, Flohr M and Nayak C 1997 The Haldane–Rezayi quantum Hall state and conformal field theory *Nucl. Phys. B* **498** 513–38 (*Preprint* [cond-mat/9701212](#))
- [3] Ruelle P 2002 A $c = -2$ boundary changing operator for the Abelian sandpile model *Phys. Lett. B* **539** 172–7 (*Preprint* [hep-th/0203105](#))
- [4] Pearce P A, Rittenberg V and de Gier J 2001 Critical $Q = 1$ Potts model and Temperley–Lieb stochastic processes *Preprint* [cond-mat/0108051](#)
- [5] Gravanis E and Mavromatos N E 2001 Impulse action on D-particles in Robertson–Walker space times, higher-order logarithmic conformal algebras and cosmological horizons *Preprint* [hep-th/0106146](#)
- [6] Bakas I and Sftosos K 2002 PP-waves and logarithmic conformal field theories *Nucl. Phys. B* **639** 223–40 (*Preprint* [hep-th/0205006](#))
- [7] Lambert N, Liu H and Maldacena J 2003 Closed strings from decaying D-branes *Preprint* [hep-th/0303139](#)

- [8] Flohr M A I 2004 Logarithmic conformal field theory or how to compute a torus amplitude on the sphere *From Fields to Strings* vol 2 ed M Shifman pp 1201–56 (Preprint [hep-th/0407003](#))
- [9] Flohr M 2003 Bits and pieces in logarithmic conformal field theory *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **18** 4497–592 (Preprint [hep-th/0111228](#))
- [10] Gaberdiel M R 2003 An algebraic approach to logarithmic conformal field theory *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **18** 4593–638 (Preprint [hep-th/0111260](#))
- [11] Kawai S 2003 Logarithmic conformal field theory with boundary *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **18** 4655–84 (Preprint [hep-th/0204169](#))
- [12] Nichols A 2002 $SU(2)_k$ logarithmic conformal field theories *PhD Thesis* University of Oxford Preprint [hep-th/0210070](#)
- [13] Flohr M and Gaberdiel M R 2006 Logarithmic torus amplitudes *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **39** 1955–68 (Preprint [hep-th/0509075](#))
- [14] Flohr M A I 1998 Singular vectors in logarithmic conformal field theories *Nucl. Phys. B* **514** 523–52 (Preprint [hep-th/9707090](#))
- [15] Flohr M 2000 Null vectors in logarithmic conformal field theory Preprint [hep-th/0009137](#)
- [16] Flohr M 2002 Operator product expansion in logarithmic conformal field theory *Nucl. Phys. B* **634** 511–45 (Preprint [hep-th/0107242](#))
- [17] Flohr M and Krohn M 2006 Four-point functions in logarithmic conformal field theories *Nucl. Phys. B* **743** 276–306 (Preprint [hep-th/0504211](#))
- [18] Moghimi-Araghi S, Rouhani S and Saadat M 2001 Logarithmic conformal field theory through nilpotent conformal dimensions *Nucl. Phys. B* **599** 531–46 (Preprint [hep-th/0008165](#))
- [19] Moghimi-Araghi S, Rouhani S and Saadat M 2003 Use of nilpotent weights in logarithmic conformal field theories *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **18** 4747–70 (Preprint [hep-th/0201099](#))
- [20] Gaberdiel M R and Kausch H G 1996 Indecomposable fusion products *Nucl. Phys. B* **477** 293–318 (Preprint [hep-th/9604026](#))
- [21] Gaberdiel M R and Kausch H G 1996 A rational logarithmic conformal field theory *Phys. Lett. B* **386** 131–7 (Preprint [hep-th/9606050](#))
- [22] Rohsiepe F 1996 On reducible but indecomposable representations of the Virasoro algebra Preprint [hep-th/9611160](#)
- [23] Gaberdiel M R and Kausch H G 1999 A local logarithmic conformal field theory *Nucl. Phys. B* **538** 631–58 (Preprint [hep-th/9807091](#))
- [24] Flohr M A I 1996 On modular invariant partition functions of conformal field theories with logarithmic operators *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **11** 4147–72 (Preprint [hep-th/9509166](#))
- [25] Flohr M A I 1997 On fusion rules in logarithmic conformal field theories *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **12** 1943–58 (Preprint [hep-th/9605151](#))
- [26] Kausch H G 1991 Extended conformal algebras generated by a multiplet of primary fields *Phys. Lett. B* **259** 448–55
- [27] Eberle H, Flohr M and Nichols A (in preparation)
- [28] Carqueville N and Flohr M 2006 Nonmeromorphic operator product expansion and C_2 -cofiniteness for a family of \mathcal{W} -algebras *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **39** 951–66 (Preprint [math-ph/0508015](#))
- [29] Feigin B L, Gainutdinov A M, Semikhatov A M and Tipunin I Y 2006 Modular group representations and fusion in logarithmic conformal field theories and in the quantum group center *Commun. Math. Phys.* **265** 47–93 (Preprint [hep-th/0504093](#))
- [30] Feigin B L, Gainutdinov A M, Semikhatov A M and Tipunin I Y 2005 Kazhdan–Lusztig correspondence for the representation category of the triplet \mathcal{W} -algebra in logarithmic conformal field theory Preprint [math.qa/0512621](#)
- [31] Flohr M and Müller-Lohmann A 2006 Notes on non-trivial and logarithmic CFTs with $c = 0$ *J. Stat. Mech.* **0604** P002 (Preprint [hep-th/0510096](#))
- [32] Eberle H and Flohr M 2006 Notes on generalised nullvectors in logarithmic CFT *Nucl. Phys. B* **741** 441–66 (Preprint [hep-th/0512254](#))
- [33] Caux J S, Kogan I I and Tsvetik A M 1996 Logarithmic operators and hidden continuous symmetry in critical disordered models *Nucl. Phys. B* **466** 444–62 (Preprint [hep-th/9511134](#))
- [34] Maassarani Z and Serban D 1997 Non-unitary conformal field theory and logarithmic operators for disordered systems *Nucl. Phys. B* **489** 603–25 (Preprint [hep-th/9605062](#))
- [35] Ghezelbash A M and Karimipour V 1997 Global conformal invariance in D dimensions and logarithmic correlation functions *Phys. Lett. B* **402** 282–9 (Preprint [hep-th/9704082](#))
- [36] Rasmussen J 2004 Jordan cells in logarithmic limits of conformal field theory Preprint [hep-th/0406110](#)
- [37] Rasmussen J 2005 On conformal Jordan cells of finite and infinite rank *Lett. Math. Phys.* **73** 83–90 (Preprint [hep-th/0408029](#))

- [38] Felder G, Fröhlich J and Keller G 1989 Braid matrices and structure constants for minimal conformal models *Commun. Math. Phys.* **124** 647–64
- [39] Felder G, Fröhlich J and Keller G 1990 On the structure of unitary conformal field theory: II. Representation theoretic approach *Commun. Math. Phys.* **130** 1
- [40] Gaberdiel M 1994 Fusion in conformal field theory as the tensor product of the symmetry algebra *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **9** 4619–36 (Preprint [hep-th/9307183](#))
- [41] Lepowsky J 2005 From the representation theory of vertex operator algebras to modular tensor categories in conformal field theory *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **102** 5304–5 (Preprint [math.qa/0504311](#))
- [42] Schweigert C, Fuchs J and Runkel I 2006 Categorification and correlation functions in conformal field theory Preprint [math.ct/0602079](#)
- [43] Nahm W 1994 Quasirational fusion products *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **8** 3693–702 (Preprint [hep-th/9402039](#))
- [44] Gaberdiel M 1994 Fusion rules of chiral algebras *Nucl. Phys. B* **417** 130–150 (Preprint [hep-th/9309105](#))
- [45] Bauer C, Frink A and Kreckel R 2002 Introduction to the GiNaC framework for symbolic computation within the C++ programming language *J. Symbolic Comput.* **33** 1 (Preprint [cs.sc/0004015](#)) (the GiNaC library is available at <http://www.ginac.de>)
- [46] Belavin A A, Polyakov A M and Zamolodchikov A B 1984 Infinite conformal symmetry in two-dimensional quantum field theory *Nucl. Phys. B* **241** 333–80
- [47] Francesco P D, Mathieu P and Senechal D 1997 *Conformal Field Theory* (New York: Springer)
- [48] Feigin B L and Fuks D B 1983 Verma modules over the Virasoro algebra *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **17** 241–2
- [49] Rocha-Caridi A 1985 Vacuum vector representations of the Virasoro algebra *Vertex Operators in Mathematics and Physics* ed J Lepowsky (Berlin: Springer) p 451
- [50] Eberle H 2006 Conformal field theory between supersymmetry and indecomposable structures *PhD Thesis* University of Bonn
- [51] Watts G M T 1996 A crossing probability for critical percolation in two dimensions *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **29** L363 (Preprint [cond-mat/9603167](#))
- [52] Cardy J 2001 Lectures on conformal invariance and percolation Preprint [math-ph/0103018](#)
- [53] Flohr M A I and Müller-Lohmann A 2005 Conformal field theory properties of two-dimensional percolation *J. Stat. Mech.* **0512** P004 (Preprint [hep-th/0507211](#))
- [54] Gurarie V and Ludwig A W W 2002 Conformal algebras of 2D disordered systems *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **35** L377–84 (Preprint [cond-mat/9911392](#))
- [55] Gurarie V and Ludwig A W W 2004 Conformal field theory at central charge $c = 0$ and two dimensional critical systems with quenched disorder *From Fields to Strings* vol 2 ed M Shifman pp 1384–440 (Preprint [hep-th/0409105](#))
- [56] Minahan J A and Zarembo K 2003 The Bethe-ansatz for $N = 4$ super Yang–Mills *J. High Energy Phys.* JHEP03(2003)013 (Preprint [hep-th/0212208](#))
- [57] Beisert N, Dippel V and Staudacher M 2004 A novel long range spin chain and planar $N = 4$ super Yang–Mills *J. High Energy Phys.* JHEP07(2004)075 (Preprint [hep-th/0405001](#))