

Topological massless bosons on edges – Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for bosonic fields –

Masato Arai,^a Filip Blaschke,^{b,c} Minoru Eto^d and Norisuke Sakai^{e,f}

^a*Faculty of Science, Yamagata University,*

Kojirakawa-machi 1-4-12, Yamagata, Yamagata 990-8560, Japan

^b*Institute of Physics and Research Centre of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics,*

Faculty of Philosophy and Science, Silesian University in Opava,

Bezručovo nám. 1150/13, 746 01 Opava, Czech Republic

^c*Institute of Experimental and Applied Physics, Czech Technical University in Prague,*

Horská 3a/22, 128 00 Praha 2, Czech Republic

^d*Department of Physics, Yamagata University,*

Kojirakawa-machi 1-4-12, Yamagata, Yamagata 990-8560, Japan

^e*Research and Educational Center for Natural Sciences, Keio University,*

Hiyoshi 4-1-1, Yokohama, Kanagawa 223-8521, Japan

^f*iTHEMS, RIKEN, 2-1 Hirasawa, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*

E-mail: [arai\(at\)sci.kj.yamagata-u.ac.jp](mailto:arai@sci.kj.yamagata-u.ac.jp),

[filip.blaschke\(at\)fpf.slu.cz](mailto:filip.blaschke@fpf.slu.cz), [meto\(at\)sci.kj.yamagata-u.ac.jp](mailto:meto@sci.kj.yamagata-u.ac.jp),

[norisuke.sakai\(at\)gmail.com](mailto:norisuke.sakai@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT: It is well-known that a massless fermion on a domain wall (edge) is topological, which is ensured by the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism. We generalize it to bosons using the field-dependent kinetic function. As a particularly simple case, we consider a domain wall in five dimensions, and show that topological massless states for scalar (0-form), vector (1-form), and tensor (2-form) fields appear on a domain wall. As the wall selects chirality of localized fermions, it also selects spin of localized massless bosons. Several explicitly solvable examples are given. We consider not only (anti)BPS domain walls in non-compact extra dimension but also non-BPS domain walls in compact extra dimension.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Domain walls: A brief review	3
3	Topological states on domain walls	6
3.1	Domain wall fermions: A review on the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism	6
3.2	Domain wall scalars	8
3.3	Domain wall vectors/scalars	10
3.4	Domain wall tensors/vectors	12
4	Simple models	14
4.1	A class of calculable models	14
4.2	Sine-Gordon domain wall	15
4.3	T^4 domain wall	16
5	Non-BPS domain walls in compact extra dimension	17
5.1	Quasi solvable example	17
5.2	Phenomenological implications	19
6	Concluding remarks	21

1 Introduction

A long time ago, Jackiw and Rebbi showed that massless fermions are trapped by a topological soliton, namely a domain wall [1]. As it turns out, this property is robust since it depends on topological aspects of a given theory alone and it is otherwise insensitive to the details. This idea has become ubiquitous within a vast area of modern physics. Let us give several examples. Su, Schrieffer, and Heeger described topological kinks in polyacetylene [2]. Rubakov and Shaposhnikov [3] studied the possibility that our (3+1)-dimensional universe is embedded in higher dimensions, which is an early proposal of the so-called brane-world scenario [4–7]. The Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism naturally provides massless chiral fermions (leptons and quarks) on a domain wall (a 3-brane) in five dimensions. The left- or right-handed chirality is selected by the profile of the domain wall (kink) background solution. The mechanism has also been used to treat chiral fermions in lattice QCD, the so-called domain wall fermion, in Refs. [8–10]. Furthermore, there is an intimate connection between the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism and a topological phase of matter which is one of the highlights in the last decade. There, an interplay between topology and massless edge (surface) modes has revealed new, rich properties of matter [11, 12].

These massless modes on edges are all fermionic states. Thus, we are led to a natural question: Do topological massless bosons also appear on edges? In this paper, we answer this question in the affirmative.

We arrived at this question not under the necessity of application to some real materials. Rather, we have encountered it in our recent studies on quite different topic, the dynamical construction of brane-world scenario by topological solitons [13–18]. A necessary condition common to most brane-world models is that all Standard Model particles, except for four-dimensional gravitons, must be localized on the 3-brane. Namely, fermions, scalar and vector bosons must be localized on the 3-brane. It is desirable for a localization mechanism not to depend on details of the model. The Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism is indeed a prime example of such a mechanism, providing chiral fermions on a domain wall (3-brane) [3]. How about bosons? The Standard Model also has bosonic fields: the Higgs field and $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge bosons. Unlike fermions, however, a robust localization mechanism for bosons, especially non-Abelian Yang-Mills fields, is not widely agreed on. There were many works so far [19–43]. Among them, one of the most popular idea relies on strongly coupled dynamics: a domain wall in confining vacua. A concrete model in four spacetime dimensions was explicitly proposed [44]. Due to the so-called dual Meissner effect, (chromo)electric field cannot invade the bulk, so that massless gauge fields are confined inside the wall. This mechanism is clearly independent of the details. However, since it is based on strong coupling dynamics which is not very well understood in four let alone five dimensions, it is very hard to quantitatively deal with any physics related to massless four-dimensional gauge fields. Therefore, in practice the confinement in higher dimensions was simply assumed to take place, see for example Refs. [45–51].

Alternatively, a phenomenological model with a field-dependent kinetic term for gauge fields was considered in six spacetime dimensions [4]. One does not need to assume confinement in higher dimensions. Rather, it can be thought of as an effective description of confinement in terms of classical fields [52–58]. Hence, one can quantitatively study phenomena involving the massless four-dimensional gauge fields. A supersymmetric model has been constructed in five spacetime dimensions [59], and further developments into unified theories beyond the Standard Model followed [13–18], see also [60, 61]. A detailed study of localization by the field-dependent gauge kinetic terms was done earlier in [21], and another study for nonsupersymmetric model with/without gravity was developed in [31], see also a recent review paper [62].

In this paper, we will reanalyze the localization of massless gauge fields on a domain wall via the field-dependent gauge kinetic term from a different viewpoint where we do not need the speculative connection between it and confinement. Instead, we recognize that localization of gauge fields is very similar to the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for fermions, by looking at a simple mathematical structure which is common to gauge fields and fermions. Hence, we propose another perspective: The massless gauge fields are localized by topological reasons instead of (effective) confinement. We will call this underlying mathematical structure as Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for bosons. As we will show explicitly, the presence of massless gauge fields on a domain wall relies only on a boundary conditions. Thus, it is topological in the sense that it does not depend on precise form of the Lagrangian. Once

we recognize the massless gauge fields as topological, we will show that the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for bosons works not only vector (1-form) fields but also for scalar (0-form) and tensor (2-form) fields. There seem to be no connections between massless 0- and 2-form tensor fields and confinement in general. Furthermore, it works in any spacetime dimensions, though we will mainly consider 5 dimensions for simplicity. These facts strongly suggest that topology is more appropriate than confinement for understanding massless bosons on a domain wall. For vector bosons in four dimensions, the conventional understanding by the confinement and our proposal by topology might be closely related to each other. Furthermore, similarly to the selection of chirality of four-dimensional fermion by the wall, we will show the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism selects the spin of localized massless bosons: It selects between four-dimensional vector or scalar (tensor or vector) in the case of five-dimensional vector (tensor) bosonic fields.

Here, let us make distinctions between this paper and previous works clear. First of all, this work presents a different point of view that topology plays a main role for the localization. Admittedly, there is a partial overlap between the models we study in Sec. 4.1 and those in Ref. [31]. However, treatment of extra components of bosonic fields (elements corresponding to the direction perpendicular to the domain wall; A_y for vector fields and $\theta_{\mu y}$ for tensor fields) is clearly different. We do not take the axial gauge of $A_y = 0$ (We will explicitly show that the axial gauge is inappropriate for massless modes). This is especially important if we consider a pair of a wall and an anti-wall in a compact extra dimension since additional physical massless bosons arise from A_y and $\theta_{\mu y}$ as we will show in Sec. 5.

The organization of the paper is as follows. We briefly describe well-known facts about domain walls in Sec. 2. Topological edge states are explained in Sec. 3. In the first subsection we review the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for fermions and the rest is devoted for scalar, vector, and tensor bosonic fields. We provide several explicit models in Sec. 4. Only in Sec. 5, we consider a pair of a wall and an anti-wall with a compact extra dimension. Phenomenological implications are also discussed.

2 Domain walls: A brief review

Let us consider a scalar model in non-compact flat five-dimensional spacetime¹ ($D = 5$)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DW}} = \partial_M T \partial^M T - W_T^2, \quad (M = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4), \quad (2.1)$$

where we have expressed, for later convenience, a scalar potential $V(T) = W_T(T)^2$ in terms of a “superpotential” $W(T)$ which is an arbitrary function of a real scalar field T . Hereafter we use the notation such as

$$W_T = \frac{dW}{dT}, \quad W_{TT} = \frac{d^2W}{dT^2}. \quad (2.2)$$

We assume that there exist multiple discrete vacua satisfying $W_T = 0$. Let $T = T(y)$ be a domain wall solution which interpolates adjacent vacua at $y = \pm\infty$ (y stands for one

¹We will consider five dimensions in order to provide a brane-world model by a dynamical compactification [63]. However, one can consider more (or less) dimensions without significant changes.

of the spatial coordinates). The static equation of motion reads

$$-T'' + W_T W_{TT} = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

where the prime denotes a derivative in terms of y . Let us investigate the mass spectrum by perturbing T about the background domain wall solution as $T(y) \rightarrow T(y) + \tau(x^\mu, y)$ with τ being a small fluctuation of the scalar field. The linearized equation of motion is found as

$$(\square - \partial_y^2 + W_{TT}^2 + W_T W_{TTT}) \tau = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

where W_T, W_{TT} , and W_{TTT} should be understood as those evaluated at the domain wall solution $T = T(y)$. Hence, the mass spectrum is determined by solving the eigenvalue problem in one dimension with the n -th eigenfunction g_n corresponding to the mass squared eigenvalue m_n^2

$$(-\partial_y^2 + W_{TT}^2 + W_T W_{TTT}) g_n = m_n^2 g_n. \quad (2.5)$$

Irrespective of the details of the superpotential W , there always exists a normalizable zero mode. To see this, let us differentiate Eq. (2.3) once by y

$$(-\partial_y^2 + W_{TT}^2 + W_T W_{TTT}) T' = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

Thus, we find a solution with zero eigenvalue (apart from the normalization constant)

$$g_0 = T'. \quad (2.7)$$

The presence of this normalizable² zero mode is robust, because it is nothing but the Nambu-Goldstone zero mode associated with the spontaneously broken translational symmetry.

Stability of the domain wall background is ensured by topology. When a static configuration T is a function of y , we can derive the well-known Bogomol'nyi completion form for the energy density \mathcal{E} as

$$\mathcal{E} = T'^2 + W_T^2 = (T' \mp W_T)^2 \pm 2T'W_T \geq \pm 2W'. \quad (2.8)$$

This Bogomol'nyi inequality is useful by choosing the upper (lower) sign for $W' > 0$ ($W' < 0$). It is saturated by solutions of the so-called BPS equation

$$T' = \pm W_T. \quad (2.9)$$

We call the upper sign the BPS while the lower sign the antiBPS.³ Tension of the domain wall is finite since we have assumed a boundary condition with $T' = \pm W_T \rightarrow 0$ as $|y| \rightarrow \infty$.

²Since we are interested in finite tension walls it follows that the zero mode is normalizable.

³ The BPS solution often has the underlying supersymmetry. Namely the system allowing the BPS solution can usually be embedded into a supersymmetric theory and the BPS solution preserves a part of supersymmetry.

It is straightforward to verify that any solution of the BPS equation solves the full EOM (2.3). Tension of the BPS domain wall reads

$$\sigma = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \mathcal{E} = 2 |W(T(+\infty)) - W(T(-\infty))|. \quad (2.10)$$

This is a topological quantity. To see this, let us define a conserved current by⁴

$$j^\alpha = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta W(T), \quad (\alpha, \beta = 0, y). \quad (2.11)$$

Then the topological charge q reads

$$q = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy j^0 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dy \partial_y W(T) = W(T(+\infty)) - W(T(-\infty)). \quad (2.12)$$

After appropriately normalized, we find that the (anti)BPS domain wall has the topological charge $(-)$ 1.

If the background configuration is a BPS or an antiBPS solution rather than a general solution of field equation in Eq. (2.3), we can obtain more precise informations as follows. Using the BPS equation $T' = W_T$, the eigenvalue equation (2.5) can be rewritten as

$$\text{BPS : } Q^\dagger Q g_n = m_n^2 g_n, \quad (2.13)$$

where we have introduced 1st order differential operators

$$Q = -\partial_y + W_{TT}(T(y)), \quad Q^\dagger = \partial_y + W_{TT}(T(y)). \quad (2.14)$$

Similarly, for the antiBPS solution ($T' = -W_T$), the eigenvalue equation can be rewritten as

$$\text{antiBPS : } Q Q^\dagger g_n = m_n^2 g_n. \quad (2.15)$$

The Hamiltonians $Q^\dagger Q$ and $Q Q^\dagger$ are semi-positive definite, so there are no tachyonic instabilities. It is interesting to note that the above system of equations constitutes a supersymmetric quantum mechanics [64] (SQM). The SQM superpotential $\mathcal{X}(y)$ is defined as

$$Q = -\partial_y + \mathcal{X}'. \quad (2.16)$$

In this case of scalar field T for the BPS domain wall, the SQM superpotential \mathcal{X} is related to the ‘‘superpotential’’ W in the $D = 5$ field theory Lagrangian (2.1) as

$$\mathcal{X}(y)|_{(\text{anti})\text{BPS}} = \pm \frac{1}{2} \log W_T(T(y))^2. \quad (2.17)$$

By using the (anti)BPS equation, the translational zero mode g_0 can be expressed as

$$g_0(y)|_{(\text{anti})\text{BPS}} = W_T(T(y)). \quad (2.18)$$

We emphasize that the SQM form is valid for the translational zero mode only if the domain wall satisfies the BPS equation.

⁴ We temporarily disregard the Lorentz invariance in four-dimensional world volume of the domain wall by treating the time direction x^0 separately from spatial directions x^1, x^2, x^3 .

3 Topological states on domain walls

3.1 Domain wall fermions: A review on the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism

In addition to scalar fields in \mathcal{L}_{DW} , let us consider a five-dimensional Dirac fermion Ψ in the form

$$\mathcal{L}_F = i\bar{\Psi}\Gamma^M\partial_M\Psi - \mathcal{M}(T)\bar{\Psi}\Psi. \quad (3.1)$$

The gamma matrices in $D = 5$ are related to those in $D = 4$ by $\Gamma^\mu = \gamma^\mu$ and $\Gamma^4 = i\gamma_5$. The field-dependent ‘‘mass’’ $\mathcal{M}(T)$ is just a coupling function of scalar fields multiplying the term quadratic in fermion fields. It becomes a $5D$ fermion mass only when it is a constant and independent of any fields. We assume that the function $\mathcal{M}(T)$ is real. When considering the Kaluza-Klein decomposition to (infinitely many) $4D$ components, there is no reason for massless $4D$ fermions to exist with a generic $\mathcal{M}(T)$, except for the well-known Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism [1]. The mechanism ensures the existence of massless fermions localized on a domain wall, and works in both even and odd dimensions. The masslessness of the fermion resulting from the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism is stable against small deformations of parameters. In this sense, the Jackiw-Rebbi fermion is topological.

To see how the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism works, let us investigate mass spectra of the fermion around the domain wall background $T(y)$.⁵ We assume that asymptotic values of $\mathcal{M}(T(y = \pm\infty))$ at left and right infinity are non zero and have opposite sign, as in the typical kink-like configuration, see Fig. 1.

$$\mathcal{M}(T(y = -\infty)) \times \mathcal{M}(T(y = +\infty)) < 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Let us call this as the gap condition. Linearized equations of motion for fermionic fluctuations Ψ (using the same character Ψ for the small fluctuation) reads

$$i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu\Psi - \gamma_5\partial_y\Psi - \mathcal{M}\Psi = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Let us define a ‘‘Hamiltonian’’

$$H_5 = -\gamma_5\partial_y - \mathcal{M}. \quad (3.4)$$

A normalizable zero eigenstate of $H_5|0\rangle = 0$ can be easily found by multiplying γ_5 from left and considering eigenstates of $\gamma_5|\pm\rangle = \pm|\pm\rangle$ for which it holds

$$\mathcal{Q}|- \rangle = 0, \quad \mathcal{Q}^\dagger|+ \rangle = 0, \quad (3.5)$$

where the \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{Q}^\dagger operators are defined by

$$\mathcal{Q} = -\partial_y + \mathcal{M}(y), \quad \mathcal{Q}^\dagger = \partial_y + \mathcal{M}(y). \quad (3.6)$$

In the coordinate representation these states reads

$$\langle y|- \rangle \equiv f_0(y) = e^{\int^y d\lambda \mathcal{M}(T(\lambda))}, \quad \langle y|+ \rangle \equiv \tilde{f}_0(y) = e^{-\int^y d\lambda \mathcal{M}(T(\lambda))}, \quad (3.7)$$

⁵Here we do not restrict ourselves to the (anti)BPS domain wall. The background can be non-BPS.




Figure 1: The field-dependent “mass” $\mathcal{M}(T(y))$ and the associated topological edge states (fermion zero modes). The solid curves are $\mathcal{M} = \pm \left(\tanh y + \frac{1}{10} e^{-y^2/100} \sin y \right)$, and the broken red curves correspond to the mode functions of the fermion zero modes.

up to normalization constants. Since the domain wall connects different vacua with opposite sign for $\mathcal{M}(T(y = -\infty))$ and $\mathcal{M}(T(y = +\infty))$ as in Eq. (3.2), $\mathcal{M}(T(y))$ must vanish at a finite value of y , usually around the center of the domain wall. When $\mathcal{M}(T(y))$ increasingly (decreasingly) goes across zero, the right(left)-handed fermion is localized on the domain wall, see Fig. 1. This property does not depend on any details of the solution, and it is the heart of the Jackiw-Rebbi model [1]. In terms of a modern terminology, the massless fermion is often called the topological edge state [11].

Let us make our statement clearer. Hereafter, we use the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for fermions for the following meaning. *When the field dependent “mass” $\mathcal{M}(T)$ defined in Eq. (3.1) satisfies the gap condition given in Eq. (3.2), either left- or right-handed massless fermion appears around a point where \mathcal{M} vanishes.* The chirality of the massless fermion is determined by the sign of the asymptotic value $\mathcal{M}(y = +\infty)$: Left-handed for $\mathcal{M}(y = +\infty) < 0$, and right-handed for $\mathcal{M}(y = +\infty) > 0$. We also define topological particles as those massless particles that remain massless under continuous deformations of parameters, and are not explained by symmetry reasons such as a spontaneously broken rigid symmetry. The domain wall fermion is a typical topological particle⁶ which does not disappear against any continuous changes without violating the gap condition given in Eq. (3.2).

For later uses, let us give a complete analysis for the mass spectra. Firstly, we decompose Ψ into Ψ_L and Ψ_R which are the eigenstates of γ_5 as $\gamma_5 \Psi_L = -\Psi_L$ and $\gamma_5 \Psi_R = \Psi_R$. We find

$$i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi_R = \mathcal{Q} \Psi_L, \quad i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi_L = \mathcal{Q}^\dagger \Psi_R. \quad (3.8)$$

⁶ For completeness, let us briefly mention here another known physical reason to ensure masslessness of a fermion: the Nambu-Goldstone (NG) fermion [65, 66] as a result of the spontaneously broken rigid fermionic symmetry such as supersymmetry. The masslessness of the NG fermion is stable against small deformations of parameters, protected by a symmetry reason. In contrast, instead of symmetry, the domain wall fermion realized by the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism is protected by a topological reason.

Eliminating Ψ_R (Ψ_L), we reach the following equations

$$\left(\square + \mathcal{Q}^\dagger \mathcal{Q}\right) \Psi_L = 0, \quad \left(\square + \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{Q}^\dagger\right) \Psi_R = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Thus, the physical spectra for $\Psi_{L,R}$ are determined by solving the 1D eigenvalue problems

$$\mathcal{Q}^\dagger \mathcal{Q} f_n = M_n^2 f_n, \quad \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{Q}^\dagger \tilde{f}_n = M_n^2 \tilde{f}_n. \quad (3.10)$$

We again encounter a 1D SQM problem with the superpotential $\mathcal{Q} = -\partial_y + \mathcal{Y}'(y)$ given in (3.6),

$$\mathcal{Y}(y) = \int^y d\lambda \mathcal{M}(T(\lambda)). \quad (3.11)$$

We would like to emphasize that this formula is correct regardless of whether the background solution is (anti)BPS or non-BPS. This is in contrast to the fluctuation of T field given in Eq. (2.13) or (2.15) which are valid only for the (anti)BPS background solution. As before, the 1D Hamiltonians are semi-positive definite, so that there are no tachyonic modes. Furthermore, due to the SQM structure, Ψ_L and Ψ_R share the identical mass spectra except for possible zero modes, in accord with the fact that any modes with a nonvanishing mass consist of both chiralities in even dimensions.

We will now turn to massless bosons in subsequent sections.

3.2 Domain wall scalars

Contrary to fermions, the protection mechanism for masslessness of scalar fields is not known⁷ except for the symmetry reason associated with the spontaneously broken rigid symmetry with a continuous parameter, namely the Nambu-Goldstone boson. For example, we found in Sec. 2 a normalizable scalar zero mode on the domain wall background, whose existence is ensured by the spontaneously broken translational symmetry.

Guided by the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for fermions, one might be tempted to try considering a real scalar field Φ whose coupling function for quadratic term is given by the same field-dependent “mass” $\mathcal{M}(T)$ as in Eq. (3.1):

$$\mathcal{L}_S = \frac{1}{2} \partial_M \Phi \partial^M \Phi - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{M}(T)^2 \Phi^2, \quad (3.12)$$

in addition to the Lagrangians (2.1). Since $\mathcal{M}(T)^2 \Phi^2$ is semi-positive definite, Φ remains inert as $\Phi = 0$, when T takes the domain wall configuration as a solution of the equation of motion. Since the 1D eigenvalue problem for the fluctuation of Φ on this background has a positive definite potential, $\mathcal{M}(T(y))^2$, it is obvious that there are only massive modes. This illustrates that the naive attempt does not work for bosons.

We now wish to propose a mechanism for a topological scalar boson, namely a model with a massless scalar mode whose existence is insensitive to change of parameters. Instead

⁷We are aware of the fact that supersymmetry combined with the chiral symmetry can protect the masslessness of the scalar particle accompanied by the massless fermion [64, 67, 68]. This idea has been extremely popular and productive, though it may be regarded as somewhat indirect.

of tuning a scalar potential, we turn to use a nonlinear kinetic term with a field-dependent kinetic function. Let us assume the following simple Lagrangian in addition to \mathcal{L}_{DW} :

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \beta(T)^2 \partial_M \Phi \partial^M \Phi. \quad (3.13)$$

A field-dependent ‘‘coupling’’ $\beta(T)$ is a function of the scalar field T multiplying the term quadratic in $\partial_M \Phi$. This form is inspired by nonlinear kinetic function for gauge and form fields, which are described in subsequent sections. One can characterize absence of a potential for Φ as a result of a ‘‘shift’’ symmetry $\Phi \rightarrow \Phi + \text{constant}$. We do not consider a mixed term like $g(T) \partial_M T \partial^M \Phi$ in this paper, since adding it is a large deformation in the sense that it changes topology. Alternatively, one can forbid it by imposing the parity $\Phi \rightarrow -\Phi$.

Vacuum condition is $\Phi = \text{const.}$ and $W_T = 0$. As before, we assume that there are several discrete vacua. Then, T has a nontrivial domain wall configuration whereas $\Phi = \text{const.}$ as a background solution. As for the mass spectra of fluctuations on the background domain wall solution, the linearized equation for the T field is unchanged from Eq. (2.4). Therefore, a normalizable translational zero mode always exists with the mode function $T'(y)$ and the massless effective field $\tau_0(x^\mu)$ in 4D, i.e. $\tau(x^\mu, y) = T'(y) \tau_0(x^\mu)$.

In the rest of this subsection, we will study mass spectra of the scalar field Φ . The linearized equation for small fluctuation Φ is given by (we will use the same notation Φ for the fluctuation):

$$\partial_M (\beta(T)^2 \partial^M \Phi) = 0. \quad (3.14)$$

First of all, we introduce a canonically normalized field φ

$$\Phi = \frac{\varphi}{\sqrt{2\beta}}. \quad (3.15)$$

This nonlinear field redefinition transforms Eq. (3.14) into

$$\left(\square + D^\dagger D \right) \varphi = 0, \quad (3.16)$$

where we defined

$$D = -\partial_y + \mathcal{Z}'(y), \quad D^\dagger = \partial_y + \mathcal{Z}'(y), \quad (3.17)$$

with a 1D SQM superpotential

$$\mathcal{Z}(y) = \frac{1}{2} \int^y d\lambda \frac{d}{d\lambda} \log \beta(T(\lambda))^2 = \frac{1}{2} \log \beta(T(y))^2. \quad (3.18)$$

Note that this is valid for any background solutions since we have not used the (anti)BPS equation. Thus, we have obtained another 1D eigenvalue problem with the SQM structure

$$D^\dagger D h_n = \mu_n^2 h_n, \quad (3.19)$$

Unlike the fermionic case, the super partner DD^\dagger is absent in the problem.

The solution with zero eigenvalue is unique and is given by

$$h_0(y) = e^{\int^y d\lambda \mathcal{Z}'(\lambda)} = e^{\mathcal{Z}(y)} = \beta(T(y)). \quad (3.20)$$

This is a normalizable physical state whenever $\beta(T(y))$ is square integrable. Since its existence is stable against small changes of parameters in the nonlinear kinetic function β , the massless scalar boson is topological. As is clear from the derivation, it is not the NG boson for the spontaneously broken rigid symmetry such as translation. We observe that the 1D eigenvalue problem for mass spectra of scalar field becomes identical to that of fermion by identifying the function $\mathcal{Z}'(y) = d \log \beta(T(y))/dy$ in the operator D with $\mathcal{Y}'(y) = \mathcal{M}(T(y))$ in the operator \mathcal{Q}

$$\mathcal{Y}'(y) = \mathcal{M}(T(y)) \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{Z}'(y) = \frac{d \log \beta(T(y))}{dy}. \quad (3.21)$$

We assume that the function $\mathcal{Z}'(y)$ goes across zero as $\mathcal{M}(y)$ in Fig. 1. Namely, the function $\mathcal{Z}'(y)$ satisfies the gap condition as in the fermion case in Eq. (3.2)

$$\mathcal{Z}'(y = -\infty) \times \mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) < 0. \quad (3.22)$$

In the present case of scalar field, we have to choose $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) < 0$ for h_0 to be normalizable.⁸ In the opposite case with $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) > 0$, there are no normalizable massless modes.

We now come to a highlight of this work. We define the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for bosons as follows: *When the field-dependent ‘‘coupling’’ $\beta(T)$ defined in Eq. (3.13) satisfies the gap condition given in Eq. (3.22), a localized massless scalar boson appears and is localized around a point where $d\beta(T(y))/dy$ vanishes.* Similarly to the fermion case, the massless boson is stable against any continuous changes which do not violate the gap condition (3.22) for β'/β . In short, the massless scalar field in Eq. (3.20) is a topological edge state which is supported by the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for bosons.

3.3 Domain wall vectors/scalars

In this section we consider (1-form) gauge fields. We consider a gauge invariant Lagrangian similar to \mathcal{L}_0 in Eq. (3.13),

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = -\beta(T)^2 \mathcal{F}_{MN} \mathcal{F}^{MN}. \quad (3.23)$$

Here, we only consider an Abelian gauge field \mathcal{A}_M with the field strength $\mathcal{F}_{MN} = \partial_M \mathcal{A}_N - \partial_N \mathcal{A}_M$ just for simplicity, but it is straightforward to extend the following results to Yang-Mills fields [17].

As was explained in the Introduction, the Lagrangian (3.23) is a model for the localized gauge fields on domain walls in the brane-world-scenario. To localize gauge fields on topological defects like domain walls, it was recognized that the confining phase is needed

⁸ A weaker boundary condition is allowed for normalizability. The asymptotic value of \mathcal{Z}' can vanish, for instance $\mathcal{Z}'(y) \sim -\alpha/y$, $\alpha > 1/2$ for $y \rightarrow \infty$, instead of a nonvanishing constant $\mathcal{Z}'(y = \infty) < 0$. This weaker condition is also valid for \mathcal{M} in Eq. (3.2) for fermions.

in the bulk, and a toy model in four spacetime dimensions was explicitly proposed [44]. The field-dependent kinetic term for gauge fields was considered together with further explicit toy model in six spacetime dimensions [4], and an explicit model has been constructed in five spacetime dimensions [59]. Another study for nonsupersymmetric model with/without gravity was developed in [31]. The coefficient β in Eq. (3.23) can be considered as an inverse of the position dependent gauge coupling after the scalar field T takes a nontrivial y -dependent values as the background. Bulk with $\beta = 0$ implies infinitely large gauge coupling, which is a semiclassical realization of the confining vacuum [52–58]. Due to the so-called dual Meissner effect, (chromo)electric field cannot invade the bulk, so that massless gauge fields are confined inside a finite region (for us it is inside the domain wall) where β is not zero.

Leaving aside the above qualitative interpretation of the model based on a somewhat speculative intuition of confinement in dimensions higher than four, we will now focus on the underlying mathematical structure of the localization mechanism inherent in the model (3.23). It is very close to the model of topological massless scalar fields in Sec. 3.2. Namely, *the massless gauge field is a topological edge state which is supported by the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for bosons*. In order to see the relation clearly, let us investigate the mass spectrum of the gauge field about the domain wall background $T(y)$. Firstly, we need to fix unphysical gauge degree of freedom. The most popular gauge choice is the axial gauge $\mathcal{A}_y = 0$, see for example Refs. [31, 59]. However, one should be careful to deal with a possible normalizable zero mode in \mathcal{A}_y , since, if it exists, it is gauge invariant and cannot be gauged away. Therefore, one cannot fully remove $\mathcal{A}_y(x, y)$ before confirming the absence of normalizable zero modes. To clarify this point, we have developed a new gauge fixing condition recently by adding the following gauge fixing term [18, 60, 61]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{GF}} = -\frac{2}{\xi}\beta(T)^2 \left[\partial_\mu \mathcal{A}^\mu - \frac{\xi}{\beta(T)^2} \partial_y (\beta(T)^2 \mathcal{A}_y) \right]^2, \quad (3.24)$$

where ξ is an arbitrary gauge fixing parameter. We call this the extended R_ξ gauge [18].

To study the mass spectra, let us consider small fluctuations A_M around the domain wall background and we define a canonically normalized fields in five spacetime dimensions, which will make the analogy to the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism most explicit

$$\mathcal{A}_M = \frac{A_M}{2\beta(T)}. \quad (3.25)$$

Then the linearized equations of motion in the generalized R_ξ gauge are given by [18]:

$$\left[\eta^{\mu\nu} \square - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\xi} \right) \partial^\mu \partial^\nu + \eta^{\mu\nu} D^\dagger D \right] A_\nu = 0, \quad (3.26)$$

$$\left(\square + \xi D D^\dagger \right) A_y = 0. \quad (3.27)$$

We again encounter D and D^\dagger defined in Eq. (3.17). However, not only $D^\dagger D$ but also DD^\dagger comes into play, unlike the case of the scalar field. Thus, the 1D eigenvalue problem

for mass spectra exhibits the 1D SQM structure in precise analogy with the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for fermions

$$D^\dagger D h_n = \mu_n^2 h_n, \quad DD^\dagger \tilde{h}_n = \mu_n^2 \tilde{h}_n. \quad (3.28)$$

As before, the eigenvalue spectra of $D^\dagger D$ and DD^\dagger coincide except for zero eigenvalue. We observe that the massive modes of A_y are unphysical, since their masses depend on the gauge-fixing parameter ξ , and will be cancelled by the ghost fields with the same mass. However, $n = 0$ is special. Eq. (3.27) shows that the zero mode $A_y^{(n=0)}$ of A_y is just a massless scalar field. The gauge fixing parameter ξ disappears from Eq. (3.27), so that A_y of $n = 0$ is not a gauge-dependent degree of freedom. The observation that the normalizable zero mode of A_y can be physical scalar field is missed in many previous works using $\mathcal{A}_y = 0$ gauge. For the zero mode $n = 0$ of A_μ , Eq. (3.26) reduces to the linearized equation for the massless photon in the usual covariant gauge.

The mode functions with the zero eigenvalue are explicitly given by

$$h_0(y) = \beta(T(y)), \quad \tilde{h}_0(y) = \frac{1}{\beta(T(y))}. \quad (3.29)$$

Thus, as in the scalar case, the physical massless gauge field appears on the domain wall whenever $\beta(T(y))$ is square integrable. This is the case when the gap condition Eq. (3.22) is satisfied with $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) < 0$. On the other hand, $\tilde{h}_0(y)$ is not normalizable, as long as we consider noncompact space $-\infty < y < \infty$. Hence A_y does not supply a physical massless scalar field. Up to this point, the final result turns out to be the same as that obtained in the axial gauge $\mathcal{A}_y = 0$. However, there are two other possibilities.

The first possibility is that the gap condition in Eq. (3.22) is satisfied with $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) > 0$. Then the physical massless field localized on the domain wall is scalar, since $\beta(T(y))^{-1}$ is square integrable. In this case, the massless vector field becomes unphysical because it is no longer normalizable. Thus, the spin of massless bosons is determined by the sign of the asymptotic value of the function $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty)$: The massless boson is vector if $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) < 0$ or is scalar if $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) > 0$, similarly to the selection of chirality in the case of the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for fermions.

Another possibility is to consider compact space such as the circle for the extra dimension y . We will discuss this possibility in Sec. 5.

3.4 Domain wall tensors/vectors

Let us now consider a two-form field in five dimensions with the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \beta(T)^2 \mathcal{H}_{MNL} \mathcal{H}^{MNL}. \quad (3.30)$$

Here, we consider a two-form field $\theta_{MN} = -\theta_{NM}$ with a field strength $\mathcal{H}_{MNL} = \partial_M \theta_{NL} + \partial_L \theta_{MN} + \partial_N \theta_{LM}$. The above Lagrangian is invariant under the gauge transformation $\theta_{MN} \rightarrow \theta_{MN} + \partial_M \Lambda_N - \partial_N \Lambda_M$, where Λ_M is an arbitrary $U(1)$ gauge field. To fix the gauge and clarify unphysical degrees of freedom, we choose to add the following gauge-fixing

terms⁹

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{GF}} = \frac{6}{\xi} \beta(T)^2 \left(\partial_\mu \theta^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\xi}{\beta(T)^2} \partial_y (\beta(T)^2 \theta^\nu{}_y) \right)^2 - \frac{6}{\eta} \beta(T)^2 (\partial_\mu \theta^\mu{}_y)^2. \quad (3.31)$$

Similarly to the generalized R_ξ gauge employed in the previous section, these terms are devised in such a way as to eliminate the mixing terms between extra-dimensional and four-dimensional components. Notice that we have two independent gauge-fixing parameters, namely ξ and η .

Let us investigate mass spectra of fluctuation fields of θ_{MN} around the domain wall background. In terms of the canonically normalized fields

$$\theta_{\mu\nu} = \frac{h_{\mu\nu}}{\beta(T)}, \quad \theta_{\mu y} = \frac{B_\mu}{\sqrt{12} \beta(T)} \quad (3.32)$$

the linearized equations of motion read

$$\left[\eta^{\mu\rho} \eta^{\nu\sigma} \square + \eta^{\mu\sigma} \partial^\rho \partial^\nu + \eta^{\nu\rho} \partial^\sigma \partial^\mu + \frac{2}{\xi} \eta^{\nu\sigma} \partial^\mu \partial^\rho + \eta^{\mu\rho} \eta^{\nu\sigma} D^\dagger D \right] h_{\rho\sigma} = 0, \quad (3.33)$$

$$\left[\eta^{\mu\nu} \square - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \partial^\mu \partial^\nu + \xi \eta^{\mu\nu} D D^\dagger \right] B_\nu = 0. \quad (3.34)$$

Thus, no new 1D eigenvalue problems arise as the differential operators D and D^\dagger are the same as for scalar (zero-form) and vector (one-form) fields.

Similarly to the vector fields, existence of physical massless modes is guaranteed by the gap condition in Eq. (3.22). Namely, the spin of the physical massless bosons is determined by the sign of the asymptotic value of the function $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty)$: Only the tensor field $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ has a zero mode if $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) < 0$ since $\beta(T(y))$ is square integrable, whereas only the vector field $\theta_{\mu y}$ has a zero mode if $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) > 0$ since $\beta^{-1}(T(y))$ is square integrable.

Let us consider the case of $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) < 0$, where we have the massless mode $h_{\mu\nu}^{(0)}$. From the four-dimensional point of view of effective field theory, the massless mode can be understood as a scalar field via a duality,

$$\partial_\mu h_{\nu\rho}^{(0)} + \partial_\rho h_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} + \partial_\nu h_{\rho\mu}^{(0)} = \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial^\sigma \phi, \quad (3.35)$$

where ϕ is a massless scalar. On the other hand, the massive states $h_{\mu\nu}^{(n)}$ can be interpreted as massive vector fields, whereas all the massive states in the second tower $B_\mu^{(n)}$ are unphysical as their masses are proportional to ξ .

In contrast, if $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) > 0$, the normalizable zero mode $B_\mu^{(0)}$ now exists. It is easy to see that $B_\mu^{(0)}$ acts as a gauge field under y -independent gauge transformations of θ_{MN} and, therefore, there is a localized $U(1)$ gauge field in the spectrum.

In the case of $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) < 0$ (β being square integrable), the spectrum of localized particles for two-form field is a massless dual scalar ϕ and a tower of massive vector fields dual to $h_{\mu\nu}^{(n \neq 0)}$. This spectrum is identical to the spectrum for one-form field ($A_y^{(0)}$ and $A_\mu^{(n \neq 0)}$) in the case of $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) > 0$ ($1/\beta$ being square integrable), as shown in the previous section.

⁹ Similar analysis but in the different gauge $\theta_{\mu y} = 0$ was done in [31]. However, it will turn out that this gauge fixing misses the possibility of appearance of massless modes in the $\theta_{\mu y}$ component.

Similarly, if $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) > 0$ for two-form field, we have the spectrum of a massless gauge field $B_\mu^{(0)}$ and a tower of massive vector fields dual to $h_{\mu\nu}^{(n \neq 0)}$, which precisely coincides with the spectrum ($A_\mu^{(0)}$ and $A_\mu^{(n \neq 0)}$) for one-form in the case of $\mathcal{Z}'(y = +\infty) < 0$.

This correspondence can be easily understood via on-shell duality between two-forms and one-forms in five dimensions. Indeed, if we look at the full equation of motion

$$\partial_M (\beta^2 \mathcal{H}^{MNL}) = 0, \quad (3.36)$$

we can solve it by setting

$$\mathcal{H}_{MNL} = \beta^{-2} (\varepsilon_{MNL PQ} \mathcal{F}^{PQ}), \quad (3.37)$$

where $\mathcal{F}^{PQ} = \partial^P \mathcal{A}^Q - \partial^Q \mathcal{A}^P$ and \mathcal{A}_M is some gauge field. Note that the Bianchi identity

$$\varepsilon^{MNL PQ} \partial_N \mathcal{H}_{LPQ} = 0 \quad (3.38)$$

translates into the equation of motion for the gauge field, i.e. $\partial_M (\beta^{-2} \mathcal{F}^{MN}) = 0$ which is the same equation of motion as in the previous section but it comes with β^{-2} in place of β^2 .

4 Simple models

4.1 A class of calculable models

As we have stressed so far, there are no strong constraints for both $\mathcal{M}(T)$ and $\beta(T)$. However, it is extremely convenient to choose a particular form in order to gain a calculability even in the case of non-BPS background solution. One of the simplest example we choose is

$$\mathcal{M}(T) = \epsilon_F W_{TT}(T), \quad \beta(T) = W_T(T)^{\epsilon_B}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\epsilon_{B,F}$ is either $+1$ or -1 . With the choice of $\mathcal{M}(T)$, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DW}} + \mathcal{L}_F$ is close to the Wess-Zumino SUSY model in $D = 4$. However, it is not our intention to stick to genuine supersymmetric models in five spacetime dimensions. Instead, we only use the model to gain calculability hoping to get general qualitative features in a simple and transparent manner without being constrained by supersymmetry.

In the rest of this section, we will focus on the BPS domain wall which satisfies $T' = W_T(T)$. The case of antiBPS domain wall is straightforward, and nonBPS cases will be studied in Sec. 5. The translational NG boson is given in Eq. (2.18).

The normalizable fermionic zero mode given in Eq. (3.7) reads

$$f_0(y)|_{\text{BPS}} = e^{\epsilon_F \int^y d\lambda W_{TT}(T(\lambda))} = W_T(T(y))^{\epsilon_F}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\tilde{f}_0(y)|_{\text{BPS}} = e^{-\epsilon_F \int^y d\lambda W_{TT}(T(\lambda))} = W_T(T(y))^{-\epsilon_F}, \quad (4.3)$$

where we have used the BPS equation. Thus, when $\epsilon_F = +1(-1)$, the left-handed (right-handed) massless fermion appears on the domain wall. Interestingly, the normalizable

mode functions for the NG boson (2.18) coincides with that of the topological fermion. This is due to the SUSY-like structure in $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DW}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{F}}$. Namely, the normalizable bosonic and fermionic zero mode can be regarded as “supersymmetric” partners.

The bosonic solutions with zero eigenvalue in Eq. (3.29) for the choice of β in Eq. (4.1) read

$$h_0(y)|_{\text{BPS}} = W_T(T(y))^{\epsilon_B}, \quad \tilde{h}_0(y)|_{\text{BPS}} = W_T(T(y))^{-\epsilon_B}, \quad (4.4)$$

where we have not used the BPS equation. Thus, when $\epsilon_B = +1$, there exist a massless scalar Φ , vector A_μ , and a tensor $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ gauge field on the domain wall for $\mathcal{L}_{0,1,2}$, respectively. On the other hand, when $\epsilon_B = -1$, no normalizable zero modes exist for \mathcal{L}_0 , and a scalar A_y and vector $\theta_{\mu y}$ massless modes appears for $\mathcal{L}_{1,2}$, respectively. Although there is no obvious hint of supersymmetry between the nonlinear kinetic function in Lagrangians $\mathcal{L}_{0,1,2}$, and \mathcal{L}_{DW} or \mathcal{L}_{F} , the mode function of the topological bosons turn out to coincide with those of the translational NG boson and the topological massless fermion. The only link that one can find is the SQM structure common to all these fields in the case of the BPS background solution. The mass spectra coincide not only for the massless mode but also for all the massive Kaluza-Klein states, since the 1D SQM superpotentials which determine the mass spectra are common to all fields for the BPS domain wall, i.e.

$$\mathcal{X}(y)|_{\text{BPS}} = \mathcal{Y}(y)|_{\text{BPS}} = \mathcal{Z}(y)|_{\text{BPS}} = \frac{1}{2} \log W_T(T(y))^2. \quad (4.5)$$

4.2 Sine-Gordon domain wall

The simplest example is the sine-Gordon model with the superpotential

$$W(T) = \frac{\Lambda^3}{g^2} \sin \frac{g}{\Lambda} T. \quad (4.6)$$

The BPS domain wall solutions satisfying $T' = W_T$ are given by

$$T(y) = \frac{\Lambda}{g} \left(2 \arctan e^{\Lambda y} - \frac{\pi}{2} + 2n\pi \right) \rightarrow \begin{cases} \left(-\frac{\pi}{2} + 2n\pi \right) \frac{\Lambda}{g} & y \rightarrow -\infty \\ \left(\frac{\pi}{2} + 2n\pi \right) \frac{\Lambda}{g} & y \rightarrow \infty \end{cases}. \quad (4.7)$$

For these solutions, we have

$$W_T(T(y)) = \frac{\Lambda^2}{g} \text{sech } \Lambda y, \quad W_{TT}(T(y)) = -\Lambda \tanh \Lambda y. \quad (4.8)$$

There are another set of the BPS solutions given by

$$T(y) = \frac{\Lambda}{g} \left(2 \arctan e^{-\Lambda y} + \frac{\pi}{2} + 2n\pi \right) \rightarrow \begin{cases} \left(\frac{3\pi}{2} + 2n\pi \right) \frac{\Lambda}{g} & y \rightarrow -\infty \\ \left(\frac{\pi}{2} + 2n\pi \right) \frac{\Lambda}{g} & y \rightarrow \infty \end{cases}. \quad (4.9)$$

For these solutions, we have

$$W_T(T(y)) = -\frac{\Lambda^2}{g} \text{sech } \Lambda y, \quad W_{TT}(T(y)) = -\Lambda \tanh \Lambda y. \quad (4.10)$$

The fact that $W_{TT}(T(y))$ goes across 0 once ensures presence of the topological massless states.

Since the background is BPS, all the 1D SQM superpotentials agree. Therefore, the mass spectra are determined only by W_{TT} in the operator $Q = -\partial_y + W_{TT}(T(y))$. The corresponding SQM Hamiltonians for both BPS solutions are given by

$$Q^\dagger Q = -\partial_y^2 + \Lambda^2 (2 \tanh^2 \Lambda y - 1), \quad QQ^\dagger = -\partial_y^2 + \Lambda^2. \quad (4.11)$$

We have $Q^\dagger Q = Q^\dagger Q$ and $QQ^\dagger = QQ^\dagger$ for $\epsilon_F = +1$, while $Q^\dagger Q = QQ^\dagger$ and $QQ^\dagger = Q^\dagger Q$ for $\epsilon_F = -1$. Similarly, we also have $D^\dagger D = Q^\dagger Q$ and $DD^\dagger = QQ^\dagger$ for $\epsilon_B = +1$, while $D^\dagger D = QQ^\dagger$ and $DD^\dagger = Q^\dagger Q$ for $\epsilon_B = -1$. Therefore, there exist a unique discrete bound state, which is nothing but the normalizable zero mode for $\epsilon_F = \epsilon_B = +1$,

$$g_0 = f_0 = h_0 \propto W_T \propto \operatorname{sech} \Lambda y. \quad (4.12)$$

For the other choice of $\epsilon_{F,B}$, one should replace f_0 (h_0) by \tilde{f}_0 (\tilde{h}_0). There are no other discrete states both in the $Q^\dagger Q$ and QQ^\dagger sectors. All the massive modes are continuum states (scattering in the bulk) given as

$$f_k = Q^\dagger e^{iky} = (ik - \Lambda \tanh \Lambda y) e^{iky}, \quad (4.13)$$

$$\tilde{f}_k = e^{iky}, \quad (4.14)$$

with the mass square

$$m(k)^2 = k^2 + \Lambda^2. \quad (4.15)$$

4.3 T^4 domain wall

Our second example is the T^4 domain wall in the model with cubic super potential

$$W(T) = \frac{\Lambda^2}{g} T - \frac{g}{3} T^3. \quad (4.16)$$

The BPS domain wall solution is given by

$$T(y) = \frac{\Lambda}{g} \tanh \Lambda y. \quad (4.17)$$

For this background, we have

$$W_T(T(y)) = \frac{\Lambda^2}{g} \operatorname{sech}^2 \Lambda y, \quad W_{TT}(T(y)) = -2\Lambda \tanh \Lambda y. \quad (4.18)$$

The factor 2 appears compared to the sine-Gordon model. The factor 2 corresponds to the number of the localized modes as we will see below.

As before, it is enough to investigate $Q^\dagger Q$ and QQ^\dagger because the background is BPS. We have

$$Q^\dagger Q = -\partial_y^2 + 2\Lambda^2 (3 \tanh^2 \Lambda y - 1), \quad QQ^\dagger = -\partial_y^2 + 2\Lambda^2 (\tanh^2 \Lambda y + 1). \quad (4.19)$$

There is unique normalizable zero mode in the $\mathcal{Q}^\dagger \mathcal{Q}$ sector

$$f_0 \propto W_T \propto \text{sech}^2 \Lambda y. \quad (4.20)$$

Also there exist a massive discrete state

$$f_1 \propto \mathcal{Q}^\dagger \text{sech} \Lambda \propto \tanh \Lambda y \text{sech} \Lambda y, \quad (4.21)$$

$$\tilde{f}_1 \propto \text{sech} \Lambda y. \quad (4.22)$$

All the other states are continuum states (scattering in the bulk).

5 Non-BPS domain walls in compact extra dimension

5.1 Quasi solvable example

So far, we have only considered models with flat non-compact extra dimension. In this section we will study physical spectra about the domain walls in compact extra dimension. For simplicity, we consider the extra dimension to be S^1 with a radius R . Unlike the non compact case, all the mode functions are, of course, normalizable if they are regular. Since the profile function $T(y)$ should be periodic, the background solution has to be non-BPS which includes both BPS and antiBPS domain walls.

To be concrete, let us again consider the sine-Gordon model with the superpotential given in Eq. (4.6). A non-BPS solution with multiple domain walls is known [69] as

$$T(y) = \frac{\Lambda}{g} \text{am} \left(\frac{\Lambda}{k} y, k \right), \quad (5.1)$$

where $\text{am}(x, k)$ denotes the Jacobi amplitude function with a real parameter k . Since T can be regarded as an angular variable with periodicity $2\pi\Lambda/g$, we can identify the compactification radius R as

$$2\pi R = \frac{4k K(k)}{\Lambda}, \quad (5.2)$$

where $K(k)$ is the complete elliptic integral of the first kind. The solution has BPS and antiBPS domain walls alternatively sitting at anti-podal points of S^1 . Namely, the BPS domain wall sits at the origin $y = 0$ whereas the antiBPS domain wall sits at $y = \pi R$. The background solutions with $k < 1$ and $k > 1$ are qualitatively quite different ($k = 1$ corresponds to either BPS or antiBPS), see Fig. 2. $|gT/\Lambda|$ never goes across $\pi/2$ for the $k > 1$ case, whereas it monotonically increases (decreases) for the $k < 1$ case.

Since the above solution is non-BPS, the (anti)BPS equation $T' = \pm W_T$ is not satisfied. Therefore, mass spectra of the translational NG bosons, the topological fermions, and the topological bosons split. Let us start with the fluctuation of T . Several light modes are explicitly known as

$$g_0 \propto \text{dn} \left(\frac{\Lambda y}{k}, k \right), \quad m_0^2 = 0, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\hat{g}_0 \propto \text{cn} \left(\frac{\Lambda y}{k}, k \right), \quad \hat{m}_0^2 = \frac{1 - k^2}{k^2} \Lambda^2, \quad (5.4)$$

$$g_2 \propto \text{sn} \left(\frac{\Lambda y}{k}, k \right), \quad m_2^2 = \frac{\Lambda^2}{k^2}. \quad (5.5)$$




Figure 2: Non-BPS domain wall solutions with the BPS and antiBPS walls at $y = 0$ and πR in the sine-Gordon model. The left-most column shows the background configuration gT/Λ , and the other three columns show mode functions of the small fluctuations for the case of $\epsilon_{F,B} = +1$. In the figures, only the half period is shown. The case of $\epsilon_{F,B} = -1$ can be obtained by exchanging (f_0, h_0) by $(\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{h}_0)$.

Note that $g_0 = T'$ is a genuine translational Nambu-Goldstone mode which is exactly massless. On the other hand, \hat{g}_0 is quasi Nambu-Goldstone mode which corresponds to the relative distance (so-called radion). It is tachyonic for $k > 1$ while it is massive for $k < 1$. The reason why the quasi zero mode is lifted is that unlike for g_0 there is no symmetric reasoning for relative distance moduli. One can also say that the lifting proves that the translational zero modes (genuine translational NG and relative distance moduli) are not topologically protected. If they were topological, both g_0 and \hat{g}_0 would have remained as massless. These mode functions are depicted in the 2nd column from the left of Fig. 2.

Next, let us see the fermions. We chose the coupling function $\mathcal{M}(T)$ for fermions as

$$\mathcal{M}(T) = \epsilon_F W_{TT}(T). \quad (5.6)$$

Then, normalizable zero modes can be explicitly found as

$$f_0 \propto e^{\epsilon_F \int^y d\lambda W_{TT}(T(\lambda))} = \left[\text{dn} \left(\frac{\Lambda y}{k}, k \right) - k \text{cn} \left(\frac{\Lambda y}{k}, k \right) \right]^{-\epsilon_F}, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\tilde{f}_0 \propto e^{-\epsilon_F \int^y d\lambda W_{TT}(T(\lambda))} = \left[\text{dn} \left(\frac{\Lambda y}{k}, k \right) - k \text{cn} \left(\frac{\Lambda y}{k}, k \right) \right]^{\epsilon_F}. \quad (5.8)$$

As is well known, f_0 is localized around the BPS domain wall at $y = 0$ while \tilde{f}_0 is around the antiBPS domain wall at $y = \pi R$ for $\epsilon_F = +1$, see the third column from left of Fig. 2. (The mode functions of zero modes are exchanged for $\epsilon_F = -1$.) They are normalizable since the extra dimension is compact. Note that unlike the translational NG bosons, both f_0 and \tilde{f}_0 remain as genuine massless modes since they are topological.

Finally, let us see the gauge bosons for the case

$$\beta(T) = W_T(T)^{\epsilon_B}. \quad (5.9)$$

We find the exact normalizable zero modes for the topological bosons as

$$h_0 \propto \beta = W_T^{\epsilon_B} = \text{cn} \left(\frac{\Lambda y}{k}, k \right)^{\epsilon_B}, \quad (5.10)$$

$$\tilde{h}_0 \propto \beta^{-1} = W_T^{-\epsilon_B} = \text{cn} \left(\frac{\Lambda y}{k}, k \right)^{-\epsilon_B}. \quad (5.11)$$

When $k > 1$, $\text{cn}(x, k)$ never goes across 0. Therefore, both h_0 and \tilde{h}_0 are normalizable. The mode function h_0 for the zero mode of A_μ is localized at the domain walls at $y = 0$ and πR while \tilde{h}_0 for A_y is localized between them when $\epsilon_B = +1$. If $\epsilon_B = -1$, the localized positions of h_0 and \tilde{h}_0 are exchanged. When $k < 1$, $\text{cn}(x, k)$ goes across 0. Therefore \tilde{h}_0 (h_0) is singular and non-normalizable for $\epsilon_B = +1$ ($\epsilon_B = -1$). We show h_0 and \tilde{h}_0 for $\epsilon_B = +1$ in the right-most column of Fig. 2.

5.2 Phenomenological implications

As is shown in Fig. 2, the localization positions of the topological fermions and topological bosons are sharply different. Interestingly, h_0 (\tilde{h}_0) for $\epsilon_B = +1$ ($\epsilon_B = -1$) have non-zero support around both the BPS and antiBPS domain walls. This leads to several interesting consequences. Before going to explain this, however, one should be careful about the mode functions: h_0 and \tilde{h}_0 are the mode functions of the redefined fields φ , A_μ , A_y , $h_{\mu\nu}$ and B_μ . The mode functions for the original fields Φ , \mathcal{A}_M and θ_{MN} are those divided by β , see Fig. 3.

$$h_0 \rightarrow \frac{h_0}{2\beta} = \text{const.}, \quad \tilde{h}_0 \rightarrow \frac{\tilde{h}_0}{2\beta} \propto \beta^{-2} = W_T^{-2\epsilon_B}. \quad (5.12)$$

In the following, we choose the background solution with $k > 1$ which is not afflicted by the problem like non-normalizability of mode functions. For phenomenology in the brane-world scenario, let us concentrate on the (1-form) gauge field in the following. Suppose that the fermion is charged under the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry with unit charge. The covariant derivative is given by $\mathcal{D}_M \Psi = (\partial_M + i\mathcal{A}_M) \Psi$. We find the gauge interactions of massless fermions as

$$\begin{aligned} \int dy \bar{\Psi} \Gamma^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu \Psi &\ni \int dy \left(f_0^2 \bar{\psi}_L^{(0)} \gamma^\mu \left(\partial_\mu + i \frac{h_0}{2\beta} A_\mu^{(0)} \right) \psi_L^{(0)} + \tilde{f}_0^2 \bar{\psi}_R^{(0)} \gamma^\mu \left(\partial_\mu + i \frac{h_0}{2\beta} A_\mu^{(0)} \right) \psi_R^{(0)} \right) \\ &= \bar{\psi}_L^{(0)} \gamma^\mu \left(\partial_\mu + i e_4 A_\mu^{(0)} \right) \psi_L^{(0)} + \bar{\psi}_R^{(0)} \gamma^\mu \left(\partial_\mu + i e_4 A_\mu^{(0)} \right) \psi_R^{(0)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

where we have used the fact that h_0 is proportional to β as $h_0 = 2e_4\beta$ with

$$e_4^{-2} = 4 \int_0^{2\pi R} dy \beta^2. \quad (5.14)$$




Figure 3: The mode functions of the topological bosons for the non-canonical fields $\Phi, \mathcal{A}_M, \theta_{MN}$ around the non-BPS domain wall solution. The case of $\epsilon_B = 1(-1)$ is shown in the left (right) panel.

It is important to notice that the effective gauge coupling e_4 is universal. It is also independent of the fermion mode functions. Hence, the low energy effective theory is a vector-like gauge theory such as QED or QCD in which the left and right handed fermions are coupled with the gauge field with the same strength. In order to have a chiral gauge theory like the Standard Model in our framework, we have to consider the infinitely separated limit $R = \infty$ ($k = 1$). This situation is in accord with the usual notion of domain wall fermion in lattice gauge theories.

In contrast to the gauge interactions in four-dimensions, we have an interesting non-universality for the coupling of massless scalar coming from A_y . The induced Yukawa-type coupling of the scalar $A_y^{(0)}$ is given as

$$\int dy \bar{\Psi} \Gamma^y \mathcal{D}_y \Psi \ni -g_L A_y^{(0)} \bar{\psi}_L^{(0)} \gamma_5 \psi_L^{(0)} - g_R A_y^{(0)} \bar{\psi}_R^{(0)} \gamma_5 \psi_R^{(0)}. \quad (5.15)$$

where we used the fact that $\tilde{h}_0 = 2\tilde{e}_4\beta^{-1}$ as

$$\tilde{e}_4^{-2} = 4 \int_0^{2\pi R} dy \beta^{-2}. \quad (5.16)$$

and defined

$$g_L \equiv \int_0^{2\pi R} dy f_0^2 \frac{\tilde{h}_0}{2\beta} = \int_0^{2\pi R} dy \frac{\tilde{e}_4 f_0^2}{\beta^2}, \quad (5.17)$$

$$g_R \equiv \int_0^{2\pi R} dy \tilde{f}_0^2 \frac{\tilde{h}_0}{2\beta} = \int_0^{2\pi R} dy \frac{\tilde{e}_4 \tilde{f}_0^2}{\beta^2}. \quad (5.18)$$

Now, we find that $g_{L(R)}$ plays a role of effective Yukawa coupling for scalar field $A_y^{(0)}$. Firstly, since f_0 (\tilde{f}_0) and \tilde{h}_0 are separately localized at different positions as shown in Figs. 2,3 for $\epsilon_B = 1$, the overlap integrals for $g_{L(R)}$ are exponentially small. This can help to explain smallness of the Yukawa couplings for the first and second generation of

quarks and leptons [70]. Secondly, the scalar field $A_y^{(0)}$ can play a role of the Higgs field [71, 72]. If $A_y^{(0)}$ enjoys a non-zero vacuum expectation value (VEV), it immediately means the fermions get masses. Since the Higgs field is originated as the extra-dimensional gauge field, it is natural to expect that quadratic divergences are suppressed thanks to the gauge symmetry in the original five-dimensional Lagrangian as advocated by the gauge-Higgs unification scenario [73]. In order to verify if $A_y^{(0)}$ actually gets non-zero VEV, one must examine an effective potential due to quantum corrections such as fermion loop correction. We hope to report it in a separate work.

The results in this section are obtained by using a very special simplified model in order to be able to compute mode functions and other quantities in a closed form. However, we wish to stress that all the qualitative features should be valid even if we choose more general functions for the coupling functions such as $\mathcal{M}(T)$ and $\beta(T)$. We only need to use a numerical method to obtain various quantities in the general setting.

6 Concluding remarks

Fermionic topological edge (surface) states are well known in a vast area of modern physics from high energy physics to condensed matter physics. These fermionic topological states on domain walls are robust and are ensured by the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism [1]. In this paper, we showed that bosonic topological edge states also appear on the domain wall by a quite similar mechanism which we call the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism for bosons. We explicitly showed that it universally works for scalar (0-form), vector (1-form), and tensor (2-form) bosonic fields. They are topological, since their presence only relies on boundary condition. For localization of vector fields, it has been argued that confinement phenomenon is necessary [4, 59, 63]. But it is difficult to show the confinement mechanism especially in higher-dimensional field theory. On the contrary, the result of this work offers another explanation related to topology. One of the advantages is that it can be applied not only for vector but also scalar and antisymmetric tensor fields, and we can be sure that it works in any spacetime dimensions.

An interesting feature of the Jackiw-Rebbi mechanism is that for fermions, the domain wall in five dimensions selects four-dimensional chirality. On the other hand, for four-dimensional bosons it selects spin. For vector (tensor) fields, it selects between four-dimensional vector or scalar (tensor or vector). This can only be seen with the appropriate gauge-fixing terms in Eqs. (3.24) and (3.31).

We also gave explicit models in Sec. 4 which are useful to see general qualitative features in a simple and transparent manner. Furthermore, we studied massless particles around the non-BPS background with a pair of a wall and anti-wall in compact extra dimension in Sec. 5. There, we manifestly showed that the translational zero modes, topological fermionic edge modes, and topological bosonic edge modes have all different mode functions as is shown in Fig. 2. We also pointed out possible phenomenological uses of our results. The universality of gauge charges is automatically satisfied, large hierarchy problem of fermion masses of the Standard Model would naturally be resolved, and A_y would play a role of the Higgs field as in usual gauge Higgs unification models.

There are several interesting directions for further studies. In this paper we restricted ourselves in five spacetime dimensions just for ease of presentation. If we go to higher dimensions than five, higher antisymmetric tensor (form) fields can appear. We should examine how the selection rules by the domain wall is generalized. We can also consider other solitons like vortex and monopole whose co-dimensions are higher than one. As is the case of domain wall, localization of topological fermions are well known. We will study whether it is true for bosons or not. On the other hand, it is also very interesting to go to lower dimensions. If our bosonic topological states are found in a real material, it is an indirect proof of localization of all the Standard Model particles on a domain wall. Apart from the brane-world perspective, it might be interesting for revealing new properties of topological matters. The domain wall fermions are known to be important in lattice QCD, so we also wonder if the topological localization mechanism of bosons plays some role for improving computer simulations of lattice QCD.

We have presented a formalism for massless topological edge states localized on topological defects such as domain walls. It is interesting to consider possible microscopic dynamical mechanisms underlying our formalism. We note that there have been a number of interesting studies producing edge states, although they are quantum theories in lower dimensions. One such example is provided by the confinement mechanism due to the condensation of magnetic bions [74] in QCD on $R^3 \times S^1$. Another example is the Valence-Bond-Solid (VBS) of quantum antiferromagnet [75]. In both cases, degenerate discrete vacua arise automatically which allow domain wall to appear [76, 77]. Inside the domain wall, “quarks” are liberated. More intriguing aspect of these phenomena is a reinterpretation in terms of the discrete version of anomaly inflow [78]. The anomaly matching can provide powerful constraints valid even at strong coupling [79, 80], because of the topologically robust nature of anomaly inflow¹⁰. It is an interesting direction of future research to see if some dynamical mechanisms similar to these quantum phenomena may be obtained as microscopic dynamical realizations of the topological edge states in our formalism.

Acknowledgements

M. E. thanks to Hidenori Fukaya and Yu Hamada for discussions. M. E. also thanks the Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics at Kyoto University. Discussions during the YITP workshop YITP-W-18-05 on “Progress in Particles Physics 2018” were useful to complete this work. This work is supported in part by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI) Grant Numbers No. 16H03984 (M. E.), and 18H01217 (N. S.). This work is also supported in part by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT)-Supported Program for the Strategic Research Foundation at Private Universities “Topological Science” (Grant No. S1511006) (N. S.), and also by MEXT KAKENHI Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas “Discrete Geometric Analysis for Materials Design” No. JP17H06462 (M. E.) from the MEXT of Japan. This work was also supported by the Albert Einstein

¹⁰ We thank Tin Sulejmanpasic for pointing out possible relations of our formalism to magnetic bion condensation, VBS of quantum magnet and anomaly inflow.

Centre for Gravitation and Astrophysics financed by the Czech Science Agency Grant No. 14-37086G (F. B.) and by the program of Czech Ministry of Education Youth and Sports INTEREXCELLENCE Grant number LTT17018 (F. B.). F. B. was an international research fellow of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, and was supported by Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows, Grant Number 26004750.

References

- [1] R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, “Solitons with Fermion Number $1/2$,” *Phys. Rev. D* **13**, 3398 (1976). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.13.3398
- [2] W. P. Su, J. R. Schrieffer and A. J. Heeger, “Solitons in polyacetylene,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 1698 (1979). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.42.1698
- [3] V. A. Rubakov and M. E. Shaposhnikov, “Do We Live Inside a Domain Wall?,” *Phys. Lett.* **125B**, 136 (1983). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(83)91253-4
- [4] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, “The Hierarchy problem and new dimensions at a millimeter,” *Phys. Lett. B* **429**, 263 (1998) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00466-3 [hep-ph/9803315].
- [5] I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, “New dimensions at a millimeter to a Fermi and superstrings at a TeV,” *Phys. Lett. B* **436**, 257 (1998) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00860-0 [hep-ph/9804398].
- [6] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, “A Large mass hierarchy from a small extra dimension,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3370 (1999) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.3370 [hep-ph/9905221].
- [7] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, “An Alternative to compactification,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 4690 (1999) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.4690 [hep-th/9906064].
- [8] D. B. Kaplan, “A Method for simulating chiral fermions on the lattice,” *Phys. Lett. B* **288**, 342 (1992) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(92)91112-M [hep-lat/9206013].
- [9] Y. Shamir, “Chiral fermions from lattice boundaries,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **406**, 90 (1993) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(93)90162-I [hep-lat/9303005].
- [10] V. Furman and Y. Shamir, “Axial symmetries in lattice QCD with Kaplan fermions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **439**, 54 (1995) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(95)00031-M [hep-lat/9405004].
- [11] M. Z. Hasan and C. L. Kane, “Topological Insulators,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 3045 (2010) doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.82.3045 [arXiv:1002.3895 [cond-mat.mes-hall]].
- [12] X. L. Qi and S. C. Zhang, “Topological insulators and superconductors,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **83**, no. 4, 1057 (2011) doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.83.1057 [arXiv:1008.2026 [cond-mat.mes-hall]].
- [13] M. Arai, F. Blaschke, M. Eto and N. Sakai, “Matter Fields and Non-Abelian Gauge Fields Localized on Walls,” *PTEP* **2013**, 013B05 (2013) doi:10.1093/ptep/pts050 [arXiv:1208.6219 [hep-th]].
- [14] M. Arai, F. Blaschke, M. Eto and N. Sakai, “Stabilizing matter and gauge fields localized on walls,” *PTEP* **2013**, no. 9, 093B01 (2013) doi:10.1093/ptep/ptt064 [arXiv:1303.5212 [hep-th]].

- [15] M. Arai, F. Blaschke, M. Eto and N. Sakai, “Non-Abelian Gauge Field Localization on Walls and Geometric Higgs Mechanism,” *PTEP* **2017**, no. 5, 053B01 (2017) doi:10.1093/ptep/ptx047 [arXiv:1703.00427 [hep-th]].
- [16] M. Arai, F. Blaschke, M. Eto and N. Sakai, “Grand Unified Brane World Scenario,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, no. 11, 115033 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.115033 [arXiv:1703.00351 [hep-th]].
- [17] M. Arai, F. Blaschke, M. Eto and N. Sakai, “Localized non-Abelian gauge fields in non-compact extra-dimensions,” arXiv:1801.02498 [hep-th].
- [18] M. Arai, F. Blaschke, M. Eto and N. Sakai, “Localization of the Standard Model via the Higgs mechanism and a finite electroweak monopole from non-compact five dimensions,” *PTEP* **2018**, no. 8, 083B04 (2018) doi:10.1093/ptep/pty083 [arXiv:1802.06649 [hep-ph]].
- [19] G. R. Dvali, G. Gabadadze and M. A. Shifman, “(Quasi)localized gauge field on a brane: Dissipating cosmic radiation to extra dimensions?,” *Phys. Lett. B* **497**, 271 (2001) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(00)01329-0 [hep-th/0010071].
- [20] A. Kehagias and K. Tamvakis, “Localized gravitons, gauge bosons and chiral fermions in smooth spaces generated by a bounce,” *Phys. Lett. B* **504**, 38 (2001) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(01)00274-X [hep-th/0010112].
- [21] S. L. Dubovsky and V. A. Rubakov, “On models of gauge field localization on a brane,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **16**, 4331 (2001) doi:10.1142/S0217751X01005286 [hep-th/0105243].
- [22] K. Ghoroku and A. Nakamura, “Massive vector trapping as a gauge boson on a brane,” *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 084017 (2002) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.084017 [hep-th/0106145].
- [23] E. K. Akhmedov, “Dynamical localization of gauge fields on a brane,” *Phys. Lett. B* **521**, 79 (2001) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(01)01176-5 [hep-th/0107223].
- [24] I. I. Kogan, S. Mouslopoulos, A. Papazoglou and G. G. Ross, “Multilocalization in multibrane worlds,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **615**, 191 (2001) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(01)00424-2 [hep-ph/0107307].
- [25] H. Abe, T. Kobayashi, N. Maru and K. Yoshioka, “Field localization in warped gauge theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 045019 (2003) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.67.045019 [hep-ph/0205344].
- [26] M. Laine, H. B. Meyer, K. Rummukainen and M. Shaposhnikov, “Localization and mass generation for nonAbelian gauge fields,” *JHEP* **0301**, 068 (2003) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2003/01/068 [hep-ph/0211149].
- [27] N. Maru and N. Sakai, “Localized gauge multiplet on a wall,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **111**, 907 (2004) doi:10.1143/PTP.111.907 [hep-th/0305222].
- [28] B. Batell and T. Gherghetta, “Yang-Mills Localization in Warped Space,” *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 025022 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.025022 [hep-th/0611305].
- [29] R. Guerrero, A. Melfo, N. Pantoja and R. O. Rodriguez, “Gauge field localization on brane worlds,” *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 086004 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.086004 [arXiv:0912.0463 [hep-th]].
- [30] W. T. Cruz, M. O. Tahim and C. A. S. Almeida, “Gauge field localization on a dilatonic deformed brane,” *Phys. Lett. B* **686**, 259 (2010). doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.02.064

- [31] A. E. R. Chumbes, J. M. Hoff da Silva and M. B. Hott, “A model to localize gauge and tensor fields on thick branes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 085003 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.085003 [arXiv:1108.3821 [hep-th]].
- [32] C. Germani, “Spontaneous localization on a brane via a gravitational mechanism,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 055025 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.055025 [arXiv:1109.3718 [hep-ph]].
- [33] T. Delsate and N. Sawado, “Localizing modes of massive fermions and a $U(1)$ gauge field in the inflating baby-skyrmion branes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 065025 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.065025 [arXiv:1112.2714 [gr-qc]].
- [34] W. T. Cruz, A. R. P. Lima and C. A. S. Almeida, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, no. 4, 045018 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.045018 [arXiv:1211.7355 [hep-th]].
- [35] A. Herrera-Aguilar, A. D. Rojas and E. Santos-Rodriguez, “Localization of gauge fields in a tachyonic de Sitter thick braneworld,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, no. 4, 2770 (2014) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2770-1 [arXiv:1401.0999 [hep-th]].
- [36] Z. H. Zhao, Y. X. Liu and Y. Zhong, “ $U(1)$ gauge field localization on a Bloch brane with Chumbes-Hof da Silva-Hott mechanism,” *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no. 4, 045031 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.045031 [arXiv:1402.6480 [hep-th]].
- [37] C. A. Vaquera-Araujo and O. Corradini, “Localization of abelian gauge fields on thick branes,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, no. 2, 48 (2015) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3251-2 [arXiv:1406.2892 [hep-th]].
- [38] G. Alencar, R. R. Landim, M. O. Tahim and R. N. Costa Filho, “Gauge Field Localization on the Brane Through Geometrical Coupling,” *Phys. Lett. B* **739**, 125 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.10.040 [arXiv:1409.4396 [hep-th]].
- [39] G. Alencar, R. R. Landim, C. R. Muniz and R. N. Costa Filho, “Nonminimal couplings in Randall-Sundrum scenarios,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no. 6, 066006 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.066006 [arXiv:1502.02998 [hep-th]].
- [40] G. Alencar, I. C. Jardim, R. R. Landim, C. R. Muniz and R. N. Costa Filho, “Generalized nonminimal couplings in Randall-Sundrum scenarios,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, no. 12, 124064 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.124064 [arXiv:1506.00622 [hep-th]].
- [41] G. Alencar, C. R. Muniz, R. R. Landim, I. C. Jardim and R. N. Costa Filho, “Photon mass as a probe to extra dimensions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **759**, 138 (2016) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.05.062 [arXiv:1511.03608 [hep-th]].
- [42] G. Alencar, “Hidden conformal symmetry in Randall-Sundrum 2 model: Universal fermion localization by torsion,” *Phys. Lett. B* **773**, 601 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.09.014 [arXiv:1705.09331 [hep-th]].
- [43] Z. H. Zhao and Q. Y. Xie, “Localization of $U(1)$ gauge vector field on flat branes with five-dimension (asymptotic) AdS_5 spacetime,” *JHEP* **1805**, 072 (2018) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2018)072 [arXiv:1712.09843 [hep-th]].
- [44] G. R. Dvali and M. A. Shifman, “Domain walls in strongly coupled theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **396**, 64 (1997) Erratum: [*Phys. Lett. B* **407**, 452 (1997)] doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(97)00808-3, 10.1016/S0370-2693(97)00131-7 [hep-th/9612128].
- [45] M. V. Libanov and S. V. Troitsky, “Three fermionic generations on a topological defect in extra dimensions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **599**, 319 (2001) [hep-ph/0011095].

- [46] J. M. Frere, M. V. Libanov and S. V. Troitsky, “Three generations on a local vortex in extra dimensions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **512**, 169 (2001) [hep-ph/0012306].
- [47] J. M. Frere, M. V. Libanov and S. V. Troitsky, “Neutrino masses with a single generation in the bulk,” *JHEP* **0111**, 025 (2001) [hep-ph/0110045].
- [48] J. M. Frere, M. V. Libanov, E. Y. Nugaev and S. V. Troitsky, “Fermions in the vortex background on a sphere,” *JHEP* **0306**, 009 (2003) [hep-ph/0304117].
- [49] R. Davies, D. P. George and R. R. Volkas, “Standard model on a domain-wall brane?” *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 124038.
- [50] J. E. Thompson and R. R. Volkas, “SO(10) domain-wall brane models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 125016.
- [51] B. D. Callen and R. R. Volkas, “Fermion masses and mixing in a 4+1-dimensional SU(5) domain-wall brane model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 056004.
- [52] J. B. Kogut and L. Susskind, “Vacuum Polarization and the Absence of Free Quarks in Four-Dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **9**, 3501 (1974). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.9.3501
- [53] R. Friedberg and T. D. Lee, “Fermion Field Nontopological Solitons. 1.,” *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 1694 (1977). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.15.1694
- [54] R. Friedberg and T. D. Lee, “Fermion Field Nontopological Solitons. 2. Models for Hadrons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 1096 (1977). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.16.1096
- [55] R. Friedberg and T. D. Lee, “QCD and the Soliton Model of Hadrons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **18**, 2623 (1978). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.18.2623
- [56] R. Fukuda, “String-Like Phase in Yang-Mills Theory,” *Phys. Lett.* **73B**, 305 (1978) Erratum: [*Phys. Lett.* **74B**, 433 (1978)]. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(78)90521-X
- [57] R. Fukuda, “Derivation of Dielectric Model of Confinement in QCD,” arXiv:0805.3864 [hep-th].
- [58] R. Fukuda, “Stability of the vacuum and dielectric model of confinement in QCD,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **24**, 251 (2009). doi:10.1142/S0217732309030035
- [59] K. Ohta and N. Sakai, “Non-Abelian Gauge Field Localized on Walls with Four-Dimensional World Volume,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **124**, 71 (2010) Erratum: [*Prog. Theor. Phys.* **127**, 1133 (2012)] doi:10.1143/PTP.124.71 [arXiv:1004.4078 [hep-th]].
- [60] N. Okada, D. Raut and D. Villalba, “Domain-Wall Standard Model and LHC,” arXiv:1712.09323 [hep-ph].
- [61] N. Okada, D. Raut and D. Villalba, “Aspects of Domain-Wall Standard Model,” arXiv:1801.03007 [hep-ph].
- [62] Y. X. Liu, “Introduction to Extra Dimensions and Thick Braneworlds,” doi:10.1142/9789813237278-0008 arXiv:1707.08541 [hep-th].
- [63] G. R. Dvali and M. A. Shifman, “Dynamical compactification as a mechanism of spontaneous supersymmetry breaking,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **504**, 127 (1997) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(97)00420-3 [hep-th/9611213].
- [64] E. Witten, “Dynamical Breaking Of Supersymmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **188** (1981) 513.
- [65] P. Fayet and J. Iliopoulos, “Spontaneously Broken Supergauge Symmetries and Goldstone Spinors,” *Phys. Lett.* **51B**, 461 (1974). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(74)90310-4

- [66] L. O’Raifeartaigh, “Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking for Chiral Scalar Superfields,” Nucl. Phys. B **96**, 331 (1975). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(75)90585-4
- [67] S. Dimopoulos and H. Georgi, “Softly Broken Supersymmetry and SU(5),” Nucl. Phys. B **193**, 150 (1981). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(81)90522-8
- [68] N. Sakai, “Naturalness in Supersymmetric Guts,” Z. Phys. C **11**, 153 (1981). doi:10.1007/BF01573998
- [69] N. Maru, N. Sakai, Y. Sakamura and R. Sugisaka, “Simple SUSY breaking mechanism by coexisting walls,” Nucl. Phys. B **616**, 47 (2001) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(01)00435-7 [hep-th/0107204].
- [70] N. Arkani-Hamed and M. Schmaltz, “Hierarchies without symmetries from extra dimensions,” Phys. Rev. D **61**, 033005 (2000) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.61.033005 [hep-ph/9903417].
- [71] Y. Hosotani, “Dynamical Mass Generation by Compact Extra Dimensions,” Phys. Lett. **126B**, 309 (1983). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(83)90170-3
- [72] Y. Hosotani, “Dynamical Gauge Symmetry Breaking as the Casimir Effect,” Phys. Lett. **129B**, 193 (1983). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(83)90841-9
- [73] H. Hatanaka, T. Inami and C. S. Lim, “The Gauge hierarchy problem and higher dimensional gauge theories,” Mod. Phys. Lett. A **13**, 2601 (1998) doi:10.1142/S021773239800276X [hep-th/9805067].
- [74] M. Unsal, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 065001 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.065001 [arXiv:0709.3269 [hep-th]].
- [75] N. Read and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1694 (1989). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.62.1694
- [76] M. M. Anber, E. Poppitz and T. Sulejmanpasic, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 2, 021701 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.021701 [arXiv:1501.06773 [hep-th]].
- [77] T. Sulejmanpasic, H. Shao, A. Sandvik and M. Unsal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, no. 9, 091601 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.091601 [arXiv:1608.09011 [hep-th]].
- [78] Z. Komargodski, T. Sulejmanpasic and M. Ünsal, Phys. Rev. B **97**, no. 5, 054418 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.97.054418 [arXiv:1706.05731 [cond-mat.str-el]].
- [79] T. Sulejmanpasic and Y. Tanizaki, Phys. Rev. B **97**, no. 14, 144201 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.97.144201 [arXiv:1802.02153 [hep-th]].
- [80] Y. Tanizaki and T. Sulejmanpasic, Phys. Rev. B **98**, no. 11, 115126 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.98.115126 [arXiv:1805.11423 [cond-mat.str-el]].