

Infinite conformal symmetry and emergent chiral (super)fields  
of topologically non-trivial configurations:  
From Yang-Mills-Higgs to the Skyrme model

Fabrizio Canfora<sup>1,2</sup>, Diego Hidalgo<sup>3</sup>, Marcela Lagos<sup>3</sup>, Enzo Meneses<sup>3</sup>, Aldo Vera<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Universidad San Sebastián, Facultad de Ingeniería, Arquitectura y Diseño, sede Valdivia,  
General Lagos 1163, Valdivia 5110693, Chile*

<sup>2</sup> *Centro de Estudios Científicos (CECS), Casilla 1469, Valdivia, Chile*

<sup>3</sup> *Instituto de Ciencias Físicas y Matemáticas,  
Universidad Austral de Chile, Casilla 567, Valdivia, Chile*

fabrizio.canfora@uss.cl, diego.hidalgo@uach.cl, marcela.lagos@uach.cl, enzo.meneses@alumnos.uach.cl, aldo.vera@uach.cl

August 18, 2022

**Abstract**

The present manuscript discusses a remarkable phenomenon concerning non-linear and non-integrable field theories in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions, living at finite density and possessing non-trivial topological charges and non-Abelian internal symmetries (both local and global). With suitable types of ansätze, one can construct infinite-dimensional families of analytic solutions with non-vanishing topological charges (representing the Baryonic number) labelled by both two integers numbers and by free scalar fields in  $(1+1)$ -dimensions. These exact configurations represent  $(3+1)$ -dimensional topological solitons hosting  $(1+1)$ -dimensional chiral modes localized at the energy density peaks. First, we analyze the Yang-Mills-Higgs model, in which the fields depend on all the space-time coordinates (to keep alive the topological Chern-Simons charge), but in such a way to reduce the equations system to the field equations of two-dimensional free massless chiral scalar fields. Then, we move to the non-linear sigma model, showing that a suitable ansatz reduces the field equations to the one of a two-dimensional free massless scalar field. Then, we discuss the Skyrme model concluding that the inclusion of the Skyrme term gives rise to a chiral two-dimensional free massless scalar field (instead of a free massless field in two dimensions as in the non-linear sigma model) describing analytically spatially modulated Hadronic layers and tubes. The comparison of the present approach both with the instantons-dyons liquid approach and with Lattice QCD is shortly outlined.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	About the new analytical solutions . . . . .	3
1.2	Notation and conventions . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Yang-Mills-Higgs theory in <math>(3 + 1)</math>-dimensions</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Conformal field theory in two dimensions from pure Yang-Mills theory . . . . .	5
2.2	Energy-momentum tensor and topological charge . . . . .	7
2.3	Semi-classical considerations . . . . .	9
2.4	Chiral conformal field theory from Yang-Mills-Higgs theory . . . . .	10
<b>3</b>	<b>Non-linear sigma model in <math>(3 + 1)</math>-dimensions</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	CFT in two dimensions from the NLSM . . . . .	12
3.2	Topological charge and energy density . . . . .	13
3.3	Conformal field theory and some semiclassical considerations . . . . .	14
<b>4</b>	<b>The Skyrme model in <math>(3 + 1)</math>-dimensions</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1	Chiral conformal field theory from the Skyrme model. Type-I: Euler ansatz for the lasagna phase . . . . .	15
4.2	Chiral conformal field theory from the Skyrme model. Type-II: Exponential ansatz for the spaghetti phase . . . . .	16
<b>5</b>	<b>Partition functions</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1	Partition function for fixed value of the Baryonic charge . . . . .	20
5.2	Partition function at finite Baryon chemical potential . . . . .	22
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusions and perspectives</b>	<b>24</b>

## 1 Introduction

It is well known that in quantum chromodynamics (QCD) color confinement is closely related to the existence of topologically non-trivial configurations (see [1–14] and references therein), while in the ultraviolet sector quarks and gluons should be liberated [15–17]. The great advances in lattice quantum chromodynamics (LQCD henceforth) [18–25] can only partially compensate the poor analytic control on such non-perturbative issues arising in the phase diagram of non-Abelian gauge theories. Therefore, many open problems would greatly benefit from the presence of explicit solutions relevant to the phase diagram of QCD. In this paper, we will present a concise list of tools, although these are also useful when analyzing different kinds of questions.

An area in which the results and tools of LQCD badly need some further analytic insights is the analysis of the phase diagram of QCD at finite (and low) temperature and with Baryon chemical potential; one of the main problematic issues being the infamous sign problem (see [26] for a detailed review). In this case, the methods of AdS/CFT are not especially effective since, only at high enough temperatures, supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory gets very close to Yang-Mills theory (see [27,28] and references therein). Moreover, besides the huge theoretical interest in achieving a deeper understanding of this region of the phase diagram, there are many situations of high phenomenological interest (such as heavy-ion collisions, quark-gluon plasma, neutron stars and so on) in which novel analytic techniques would be extremely useful to complement the available observations. Among these, one of the most relevant is the appearance of regular-shaped structures at finite

density (called nuclear pasta states; see [29–40]) and the important transport properties within them, whose numerical treatment is quite challenging [41–45].

There are two obvious ways to analyze these issues. One can either begin with the analysis of Yang-Mills theory (which is more fundamental), or one can start directly with the non-linear sigma model (NLSM) and the Skyrme model (which is the low energy limit of QCD at leading order in the large  $N_c$  't Hooft expansion [46–51]). These models, at first glance, are very different, as Yang-Mills theory is a gauge theory while the NLSM and the Skyrme model only possess global symmetries. Thus, one could think that these two possibilities should be treated with different methods. Nevertheless, we will show that it is possible to devise a unified strategy able to identify sectors of the  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensional theories that, at the same time, possess arbitrary Baryonic charge as well as an infinite-dimensional conformal symmetry. It is quite amusing that the only difference between the infinite-dimensional conformal symmetry appearing in Yang-Mills theory and the NLSM on one side, and Yang-Mills-Higgs and the Skyrme theory, on the other side, is that, in the former cases, one gets an effective two-dimensional conformal field theory (CFT) while in Yang-Mills-Higgs and the Skyrme cases, one gets a two-dimensional chiral CFT. This intriguing result could be related to the fact that the Skyrme theory is the low energy limit of QCD (and not just of Yang-Mills theory) and knows about chiral symmetry breaking. Needless to say, the possibility to use the tools of two-dimensional CFT in  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensional theories (such as Yang-Mills and Skyrme, which are the prototypes of non-linear and non-integrable field theories) open unexpected and novel perspectives on the analysis of the phase diagram at finite temperature and chemical potential.

A systematic tool to construct non-spherical hedgehog ansatz suitable to describe finite density effects that have been developed in Refs. [52–61] for the Skyrme model, and for the Einstein-Yang-Mills case in Refs. [62–64]. In the present article, we will further generalize these results to extend the space of analytical solutions (and the tools that allow obtaining relevant physical information of these systems of topological solitons defined in a  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensional finite volume) disclosing the appearance of chiral conformal degrees of freedom representing modulations of Hadronic tubes and layers. Although, in the present the paper, we will not discuss the coupling with gravity of the NLSM and Yang-Mills theories, there are already quite a few examples in the literature which shows that the current approach is convenient even when the coupling with general relativity is taken into account (see, for instance, [65–70]).

## 1.1 About the new analytical solutions

The considerable interest in constructing analytic solutions in theories with non-Abelian internal symmetries (both local and global) and non-trivial topological charges arises from the fact that in all the theories admitting topological solitons, such charges have a profound physical meaning (such as the Baryonic charge, as will be discussed in the following sections). As far as the phase diagram is concerned, it is crucial to analyze what happens when a finite amount of topological charge is forced to live within a limited spatial volume. In this case, practical analytic tools are extremely welcome due, for instance, to the sign problem. On the other hand, the common belief is that it is impossible to develop such tools for (at least) two reasons. Firstly, one necessarily has to abandon spherically symmetric ansätze for the fields. Secondly and quite generically, the requirement of a non-vanishing topological charge increases the complexity of the field equations to be solved since a non-vanishing topological density implies that there must be at least three independent degrees of freedom depending non-trivially on three different spatial coordinates in  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensions. Resuming:

1. the *departure from spherical symmetry* (generated by the presence of “a box” within which the solitons are forced to live), together with
2. the *requirement of a non-vanishing topological charge*,

reduce considerably the possibility to derive analytic results on the phase diagram of topologically non-trivial configurations of theories such as Yang-Mills, NLSM and the Skyrme model. One could reason as follows: the analytic tools of two-dimensional CFT would be handy and welcome in analyzing the phase diagram of  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensional Yang-Mills-Higgs theory (or Skyrme model) due to the difficulties analyzing it even with LQCD. Then, *why do not we assume that the main fields* (either  $A_\mu$  for Yang-Mills or  $U \in SU(2)$  for the NLSM and Skyrme theory) *only depend on one spatial coordinate and on time (so that one could hope to use some “two-dimensional CFT technologies”)?*

The answer is that such a naive approach would fail. *First of all*, the topological charge (to be defined in the following sections) would vanish identically, so that one would gain no information about the phase diagram at finite Baryon density. *Moreover*, already the head-on collision of (topologically trivial) plane waves depending on only two coordinates is intractable from the analytic viewpoint, and numerical methods must be used<sup>1</sup> (see [71–77] and references therein). Hence, at first glance, one might argue that the analytic study of dynamical processes involving solitonic configurations with non-vanishing topological charge in  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensions is not feasible.

In fact, here we will show that, from the analytic viewpoint, the above two circumstances (namely, the need to depart from spherical symmetry and the necessity to keep alive the topological charge) are an opportunity rather than an obstruction. The tools to be developed here give rise, among other things, to genuine  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensional non-homogeneous exact solutions representing spatially modulated Hadronic layers and tubes, allowing to estimate their contributions to the partition function at low temperatures and Baryon chemical potential and also to compute relevant quantities.

## 1.2 Notation and conventions

In this work, we will use the following convention. Greek indices run over the space-time dimensions with mostly plus signature, and Latin indices are reserved for those of the internal space. Also, we work in natural units, such that the Boltzmann’s constant  $k_B$ , the reduced Planck’s constant  $\hbar$ , and the speed of light  $c$  are set to one.

As we are interested in studying topological solitons at finite volume, we will use the metric of a box, which in  $(3 + 1)$ -space-time dimensions reads

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + L_r^2 dr^2 + L_\theta^2 d\theta^2 + L_\phi^2 d\phi^2 , \quad (1)$$

where  $\{r, \theta, \phi\}$  are Cartesian dimensionless coordinates whose ranges will be defined in each case,  $\{L_r, L_\theta, L_\phi\}$  are constants with dimension of length that fix the volume of the box in which the solitons are confined and  $g = -L_r^2 L_\theta^2 L_\phi^2$  will denote the metric determinant. Also we denote  $\nabla_\mu$  as the Levi-Civita covariant derivative constructed with the Christoffel symbols,  $\partial_\mu$  as the partial derivative, and the covariant derivative,  $D_\mu$ , acts as

$$D_\mu(\cdot) = \partial_\mu(\cdot) + [A_\mu, \cdot] , \quad (2)$$

with  $A_\mu$  the components of the non-Abelian connection. We will consider as internal symmetry group the  $SU(2)$  Lie group<sup>2</sup>, whose generators are

$$\mathbf{t}_k = i \sigma_k , \quad (3)$$

being  $\sigma_k$  the Pauli matrices. The matrices  $\mathbf{t}_i$  satisfy the relation

$$\mathbf{t}_i \mathbf{t}_j = -\delta_{ij} \mathbf{1}_2 - \epsilon_{ijk} \mathbf{t}_k , \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_2$  is the  $2 \times 2$  identity matrix,  $\delta_{ij}$  the Kronecker delta and  $\epsilon_{ijk}$  the totally antisymmetric Levi-Civita symbol.

<sup>1</sup>For instance, already analysis of head-on collisions of  $(1 + 1)$ -dimensional kinks, which is far simpler than Yang-Mills theory in  $(3 + 1)$  dimensions, can only be dealt numerically [78,79].

<sup>2</sup>Here we will consider the  $SU(2)$  case but the present results can be extended to the  $SU(N)$  case.

The fundamental field of the Yang-Mills theory, namely the non-Abelian connection  $A$ , splits as

$$A = A_\mu^j \mathbf{t}_j dx^\mu , \quad (5)$$

while the fundamental field of the NLSM and the Skyrme model is the scalar field  $U(x) \in SU(2)$ , so that

$$R_\mu = U^{-1} \partial_\mu U = R_\mu^j \mathbf{t}_j , \quad (6)$$

is in the  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$  algebra.

The relevant topological properties of the solutions that we will construct in this work are encoded in the Chern-Simons (CS) density (for the Yang-Mills theory) and in the Baryon charge density (for the NLSMs). These are given, respectively, by

$$\rho_{\text{CS}} = J_0^{\text{CS}} , \quad \text{where} \quad J_\mu^{\text{CS}} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \text{Tr} \left( A^\nu \partial^\rho A^\sigma + \frac{2}{3} A^\nu A^\rho A^\sigma \right) , \quad (7)$$

$$\rho_{\text{B}} = \frac{1}{24\pi^2} (U^{-1} \partial U)^3 \equiv \frac{1}{24\pi^2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \text{Tr} \{ (U^{-1} \partial^i U) (U^{-1} \partial^j U) (U^{-1} \partial^k U) \} . \quad (8)$$

The integral of the above densities over a space-like hypersurface represents the CS charge and the Baryonic charge of the corresponding configurations,

$$Q_{\text{CS}} = \int \rho_{\text{CS}} dV , \quad B = \int \rho_{\text{B}} dV . \quad (9)$$

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we study the Yang-Mills theory in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions showing that, with an appropriate ansatz, the field equations are reduced to that of a two-dimensional free massless scalar field. We also offer that the inclusion of a Higgs field converts the resulting CFT into a chiral theory. In Section 3, we move to the study of NLSM in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions, showing that the theory can be reduced to a two-dimensional CFT. In Section 4, we show that the inclusion of the Skyrme term in the NLSM defines a chiral CFT for two types of configurations describing nuclear pasta states. In Section 5, we study the phase diagram and the contribution of the partition functions of the analytic topological solitons. The final section is dedicated to conclusions.

## 2 Yang-Mills-Higgs theory in $(3+1)$ -dimensions

In this section, before moving to the Yang-Mills-Higgs case (which has not been analyzed previously in the literature), we will study the Yang-Mills theory in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions reviewing the results in Ref. [80], showing how the field equations can be reduced to that of a two-dimensional free massless scalar field in  $(1+1)$ -dimensions keeping alive the topological charge. The concepts introduced here will be helpful also in the following sections, where we will show that a similar construction can also be carried out on NLSMs.

### 2.1 Conformal field theory in two dimensions from pure Yang-Mills theory

The Yang-Mills theory in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions is described by the action

$$I[A] = \frac{1}{2e^2} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \text{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}) , \quad (10)$$

where  $e$  is the Yang-Mills coupling constant, and the field strength components  $F_{\mu\nu}$  are defined in terms of the non-Abelian connection  $A_\mu$  as

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + [A_\mu, A_\nu] .$$

The field equations of the theory, obtained varying the action in Eq. (10) with respect to the fundamental field  $A_\mu$ , are

$$\nabla_\nu F^{\mu\nu} + [A_\nu, F^{\mu\nu}] = 0 , \quad (11)$$

while the energy-momentum tensor of the theory turns out to be

$$T_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{2}{e^2} \text{Tr} \left( F_{\mu\alpha} F_{\nu}^{\alpha} - \frac{1}{4} g_{\mu\nu} F_{\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta} \right). \quad (12)$$

One of the main goals of this paper is to construct a formalism able to describe how topologically non-trivial configurations react when they are forced to live within a finite box; this issue must be addressed in the finite density analysis.

The easiest way to take into account finite volume effects is to use the flat metric defined in Eq. (1), with the ranges

$$0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi, \quad 0 \leq \phi \leq \pi, \quad 0 \leq r \leq 4\pi. \quad (13)$$

The above ranges for the coordinates  $\theta$ ,  $\phi$  and  $r$  are related to the Euler angle parameterization for  $SU(2)$  valued fields.

Let us define the following  $U(x) \in SU(2)$  field

$$U = \exp \left( p\theta \frac{\mathbf{t}_3}{2} \right) \exp \left( H(t, \phi) \frac{\mathbf{t}_2}{2} \right) \exp \left( qr \frac{\mathbf{t}_3}{2} \right), \quad (14)$$

where  $p$  and  $q$  are non-vanishing integers<sup>3</sup>. The theory of Euler angles for  $SU(N)$  [81–83], tells that, when  $p$  and  $q$  are non-vanishing integers, the range of  $\theta$  (appearing in the left factor of the decomposition in Eq. (14)) and the range of  $r$  (appearing in the right factor of the decomposition in Eq. (14)) must be as in Eq. (13). As far as the central factor  $H(t, \phi)$  is concerned, there are two options. If the field  $H(t, \phi)$  satisfies periodic boundary conditions

$$H(t, \phi = 0) = H_0 = H(t, \phi = \pi), \quad (15)$$

the CS charge vanishes<sup>4</sup>. The other boundary condition for  $H(t, \phi)$  arises naturally taking into account that  $H(t, \phi)$  appears in the central factor of the Euler angles decomposition of an  $SU(2)$  element (see [81–83]),

$$H(t, \phi = 0) = 0, \quad H(t, \phi = \pi) = \pi, \quad (16)$$

or

$$H(t, \phi = 0) = \pi, \quad H(t, \phi = \pi) = 0.$$

The option here above ensures that the  $SU(2)$ -valued element  $U$  defined in Eqs. (13), (14) and (16) wraps an integer number of times around the group manifold of  $SU(2)$ ; in other words,  $U$  has a non-vanishing winding number. In this case, both the CS charge and the CS density in Eq. (7) associated with the gauge field will be non-trivial. It is well known that  $\rho_{\text{CS}}$  defined in Eq. (7) is the “non-perturbatively induced Baryonic charge” of the gauge configuration [84] (see also [85–87] and references therein).

In order to find an ansatz such that  $\rho_{\text{CS}}$  defined in Eq. (7) will be non-zero and, at the same time, the field equations can be solved analytically, one can follow Refs. [53, 54], [60–64], [80] and [88], arriving to the following form for the Yang-Mills potential

$$A_{\mu} = \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j \Omega_{\mu}^j \mathbf{t}_j, \quad U^{-1} \partial_{\mu} U = \sum_{j=1}^3 \Omega_{\mu}^j \mathbf{t}_j, \quad (17)$$

where  $H(t, \phi)$  in Eq. (14) and the  $\lambda_i$  functions in Eq. (17) are explicitly given by

$$H(t, \phi) = \arccos(G), \quad G = G(t, \phi), \quad (18)$$

$$\lambda_1(t, \phi) = \lambda_2(t, \phi) = \frac{G}{\sqrt{G^2 + \exp(2\eta)}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda(t, \phi), \quad \lambda_3(t, \phi) = 1, \quad \eta \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (19)$$

$$G(t, \phi) = \exp(3\eta) \frac{F}{\sqrt{1 - \exp(4\eta) \cdot F^2}}, \quad F = F(t, \phi). \quad (20)$$

<sup>3</sup>There will be one more restriction on  $p$  and  $q$  that will be discussed later on.

<sup>4</sup>Although the CS density can still be non-trivial.

The real parameter  $\eta$  will be fixed by requiring that the CS charge is an integer.

The option in Eq. (15) gives rise to the following boundary condition for  $F(t, \phi)$ ,

$$F(t, \phi = 0) = F_0 = F(t, \phi = \pi) . \quad (21)$$

In the latter case the CS charge vanishes. On the other hand, the option in Eq. (16), in terms of  $F(t, \phi)$ , reads

$$F(t, \phi = 0) = -\frac{\exp(-2\eta)}{\sqrt{1 + \exp(2\eta)}} , \quad F(t, \phi = \pi) = \frac{\exp(-2\eta)}{\sqrt{1 + \exp(2\eta)}} , \quad (22)$$

in order to have a non-zero CS charge. In this case both the CS charge and the CS density will be non-trivial. Then, we say that this configuration is topologically non-trivial.

The components of the gauge field can be easily computed taking into account the well known expression of the  $\Omega_\mu^j$  in the case of the Euler parameterization. Thus, explicitly,  $A_\mu$  reads

$$A_\mu = \lambda(t, \phi) \left[ \frac{\mathbf{t}_1}{2} \{-\sin(qr) dH + p \cos(qr) \sin(H) d\theta\} + \frac{\mathbf{t}_2}{2} \{\cos(qr) dH + p \sin(qr) \sin(H) d\theta\} \right] + \frac{\mathbf{t}_3}{2} [qdr + p \cos(H) d\theta] , \quad (23)$$

where

$$dH = \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} dt + \frac{\partial H}{\partial \phi} d\phi .$$

The fact that  $d\lambda \wedge dH = 0$ , together with the gradients of the coordinates  $r$ ,  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are mutually orthogonal, simplifies many of the computations. The above ansatz is the key to getting the paper's main results, and the rest is a direct computation.

With the above, the complete set of (3+1)-dimensional Yang-Mills field equations with the ansatz in Eqs. (14), (17), (18), (19) and (20) reduces to

$$\square F \equiv \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi^2} \right) F = 0 , \quad (24)$$

which corresponds to the field equation of a free massless scalar field in two dimensions.

## 2.2 Energy-momentum tensor and topological charge

A direct computation reveals that the topological density for the solution defined above is given by

$$\rho_{\text{CS}} = \frac{pq \exp(3\eta)}{16\pi^2 (1 - \exp(4\eta) F^2)^{3/2}} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} , \quad (25)$$

which is non-vanishing, as long as  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \neq 0$ . On the other hand, the energy density,  $T_{tt}$ , and the on-shell Lagrangian,  $L_{\text{on-shell}}$ , read, respectively,

$$T_{tt} = \frac{p^2}{e^2 L_\theta^2} \exp(5\eta) \cosh(\eta) \left[ \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right] , \quad (26)$$

$$L_{\text{on-shell}} = \frac{p^2}{e^2 L_\theta^2} \exp(5\eta) \cosh(\eta) \left[ \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right] . \quad (27)$$

The full energy-momentum tensor, reads

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \begin{bmatrix} T_{tt} & 0 & 0 & P_\phi \\ 0 & T_{rr} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T_{\theta\theta} & 0 \\ P_\phi & 0 & 0 & T_{\phi\phi} \end{bmatrix} ,$$

where

$$T_{rr} = \frac{p^2 L_r^2}{e^2 L_\theta^2} \exp(5\eta) \cosh(\eta) \left[ \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right] = -\frac{L_r^2}{L_\theta^2} T_{\theta\theta}, \quad (28)$$

$$T_{\phi\phi} = \frac{p^2 L_\phi^2}{e^2 L_\theta^2} \exp(5\eta) \cosh(\eta) \left[ \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right], \quad (29)$$

$$T_{t\phi} = P_\phi = \frac{2p^2 \exp(5\eta) \cosh(\eta)}{e^2 L_\theta^2} \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi}. \quad (30)$$

From the above, one can easily verify that the energy-momentum tensor is traceless;  $g^{\mu\nu} T_{\mu\nu} = 0$ , as it should be in Yang-Mills theory in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions. It is also interesting to note that if one “eliminates” the coordinates  $r$  and  $\theta$ , the resulting two-dimensional energy-momentum tensor in the  $t$  and  $\phi$  directions is still traceless (as it happens for a two-dimensional CFT). Explicitly, one can take  $T_{ab}$  defined as

$$T_{ab} = \begin{pmatrix} T_{tt} & P_\phi \\ P_\phi & T_{\phi\phi} \end{pmatrix}, \quad a, b = t, \phi,$$

as the effective energy-momentum tensor associated to the massless two-dimensional scalar field  $F$ . As it is clear from Eq. (25), the CS density associated to  $F_+ + F_-$  (where  $F_+$  and  $F_-$  are the left and right movers mode expansion defined explicitly below) is the sum of the topological charge density associated to  $F_+$  plus to one associated to  $F_-$  only for small amplitudes, namely when

$$\left| \exp(4\eta) F(t, \phi)^2 \right| \ll 1. \quad (31)$$

On the other hand, when the temperature is high enough, it is natural to expect that the thermal fluctuations of  $F(t, \phi)$  violate the above condition. That is why the CS density of these configurations (which can be interpreted as Baryonic charge density) is only well defined below a specific temperature.

The CS charge reads

$$Q_{\text{CS}} = \frac{pq \exp(3\eta)}{2} \left[ \frac{F}{\sqrt{1 - \exp(4\eta) F^2}} \right] \Bigg|_{F(t,0)}^{F(t,\pi)}. \quad (32)$$

As it has been already discussed, when  $F(t, 0) = F(t, \pi)$  the topological charge vanishes. Thus, let us consider the boundary conditions for  $F(t, \phi)$  in Eq. (22). The requirement to have an integer topological charge can be expressed as follows. Introducing the useful auxiliary function

$$\Omega(\eta, a, b) \equiv \frac{\exp(3\eta)}{2} \left[ \frac{a}{\sqrt{1 - \exp(4\eta) a^2}} - \frac{b}{\sqrt{1 - \exp(4\eta) b^2}} \right], \quad (33)$$

the topological charge reads

$$Q_{\text{CS}} = pq \cdot \Omega(\eta, a = F(t, \pi), b = F(t, 0)).$$

Taking into account the boundary conditions for  $F(t, \phi)$  in Eq. (22), the quantity  $\Omega(\eta, a = F(t, \pi), b = F(t, 0))$  can be further simplified, so that one arrives at the following expression for the topological charge

$$Q_{\text{CS}} = pq. \quad (34)$$

Consequently, in order to have integer topological charge, the number  $pq$  must be integer. Here it is worth emphasizing that, although the field equations in terms of  $F(t, \phi)$  are linear, an important non-linear effect is manifest in Eqs. (25), (32) and (31). Indeed, in order for the CS density in Eq. (25) to be everywhere well defined, one must require

$$\left| \exp(4\eta) F(t, \phi)^2 \right| \leq 1. \quad (35)$$

Since the thermal expectation value of  $F(t, \phi)^2$  grows with temperature, the condition here above implies that the partition function associated to the present family of exact solutions will be well-defined only below a certain critical temperature beyond which the CS density is not well defined anymore.



## 2.3 Semi-classical considerations

Let us remind the usual mode expansion of the solutions of Eq. (24). These can be written as

$$F_+ = \phi_0^+ + v_+ \left( \frac{t}{L_\phi} + \phi \right) + \sum_{n \neq 0} \left( a_n^+ \sin \left[ n \left( \frac{t}{L_\phi} + \phi \right) \right] + b_n^+ \cos \left[ n \left( \frac{t}{L_\phi} + \phi \right) \right] \right), \quad (36)$$

$$F_- = \phi_0^- + v_- \left( \frac{t}{L_\phi} - \phi \right) + \sum_{n \neq 0} \left( a_n^- \sin \left[ n \left( \frac{t}{L_\phi} - \phi \right) \right] + b_n^- \cos \left[ n \left( \frac{t}{L_\phi} - \phi \right) \right] \right), \quad (37)$$

where, as usual,  $F_+$  refers to the left movers and  $F_-$  to the right movers ( $v_\pm$  and  $\phi_0^\pm$  being integration constants, which must satisfy three constraints that will be discussed below). Hence, the most general topologically non-trivial configuration of the present sector arises replacing  $F = F_+ + F_-$  into Eqs. (14), (17), (18), (19) and (20). In order to have a clear physical picture of the composition of solutions, it is convenient to choose  $a_n^\pm$  and  $b_n^\pm$  in such a way that

$$\tilde{F}(t, \phi = 0) = \tilde{F}(t, \phi = \pi) = 0,$$

where  $\tilde{F}(t, \phi)$  is the part of  $F = F_+ + F_-$  coming from the sum over the integers  $n$  in Eqs. (36) and (37). Therefore, the topological charge in Eq. (32) is non-zero when

$$v_+ - v_- \neq 0.$$

In particular,  $v_\pm$  and  $\phi_0^\pm$  in Eqs. (36) and (37) must be chosen as

$$\begin{aligned} F(t, \phi = 0) &= \phi_0^+ + \phi_0^- + (v_+ + v_-) \frac{t}{L_\phi} = \frac{\exp(-2\eta)}{\sqrt{1 + \exp(2\eta)}} \\ \Rightarrow v_+ + v_- &= 0, \quad \phi_0^+ + \phi_0^- = \frac{\exp(-2\eta)}{\sqrt{1 + \exp(2\eta)}}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} F(t, \phi = \pi) &= \frac{\exp(-2\eta)}{\sqrt{1 + \exp(2\eta)}} + (v_+ - v_-) \pi = -\frac{\exp(-2\eta)}{\sqrt{1 + \exp(2\eta)}} \\ \Rightarrow v_- &= \frac{\exp(-2\eta)}{\pi \sqrt{1 + \exp(2\eta)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

At a classical level, this is the most straightforward choice of boundary conditions since it identifies which terms are responsible for the topological charge and which are not.

At the semi-classical level, it is very tempting to introduce creation and annihilation operators quantization corresponding to the above mode-expansion, as it is usually done in quantising a free two-dimensional scalar field. However, there are some intriguing differences.

First, in Eqs. (36) and (37), any term in the expansion corresponds to an exact solution of the  $(3+1)$ -dimensional Yang-Mills equations and not just to a solution of the linearized field equations. Therefore, the Bosonic quantum operators  $\alpha_n^+$ ,  $(\alpha_m^+)^\dagger$  and  $\alpha_n^-$ ,  $(\alpha_m^-)^\dagger$  (which are annihilation and creation operators for the left and right movers, satisfying the obvious commutation relations; see [89]) create exact solutions of the semiclassical Yang-Mills equations. This situation should be compared with the usual case in which, given a particular solution of the  $(3+1)$ -dimensional Yang-Mills equations, the small fluctuations (both at classical and quantum level) around the given classical configurations are solutions of the linearized field equations (while are not solutions of the exact field equations, unless, of course, the theory is just a free theory).

Second, the constant terms  $\phi_0^\pm$  as well as the linear terms in  $t$  and  $\phi$  play an important role. According to Refs. [84–87], the topological charge can be interpreted as the Baryonic charge of the configuration. If this interpretation is accepted, when the topological charge is odd, the configuration is a Fermion, while when it is even, the configuration is a Boson. This observation has no consequences for the operators  $(\alpha_n^\pm, (\alpha_{n'}^\pm)^\dagger)$  since these operators are Bosonic (due to the

corresponding classical solutions do not contribute to the topological charge). On the other hand, the creation and annihilation operators associated with the solution's linear part create a Boson or a Fermion depending on whether the topological charge is even or odd. Hence, it is tempting to quantize  $\phi_0^\pm$  and  $v_\pm$  with commutators or anticommutators depending on the value of the topological charge.

## 2.4 Chiral conformal field theory from Yang-Mills-Higgs theory

Now we will show that the construction presented above can be directly generalized to the Yang-Mills-Higgs theory, but with the notable difference that, this time, the theory is reduced to a chiral CFT in  $(1+1)$ -dimensions instead of just a CFT.

The Yang-Mills-Higgs theory in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions is defined by the action

$$I[A, \varphi] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left( \frac{1}{2e^2} \text{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}) + \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}(D_\mu \varphi D^\mu \varphi) \right). \quad (40)$$

Here  $\varphi$  is the Higgs field in the adjoint representation, and the covariant derivative  $D_\mu$  has been defined in Eq. (2). Varying the action with respect to the fields  $A_\mu$  and  $\varphi$  we obtain the field equations of the Yang-Mills-Higgs theory

$$\nabla_\nu F^{\mu\nu} + [A_\nu, F^{\mu\nu}] + \frac{e^2}{4} [\varphi, D^\mu \varphi] = 0, \quad (41)$$

$$D_\mu D^\mu \varphi = 0. \quad (42)$$

On the other hand, the energy-momentum tensor is

$$T_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{2}{e^2} \text{Tr} \left( F_{\mu\alpha} F_\nu^\alpha - \frac{1}{4} g_{\mu\nu} F_{\alpha\beta} F^{\alpha\beta} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left( D_\mu \varphi D_\nu \varphi - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} D_\alpha \varphi D^\alpha \varphi \right). \quad (43)$$

In order to construct analytical solutions of the Yang-Mills-Higgs theory in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions we will use as a starting point the same ansatz for the  $U$  field and the connection  $A_\mu$  introduced for the case without the Higgs contribution, namely Eqs. (14) and (17). Now, for the Higgs field we must consider the following general form

$$\varphi = \sum_{j=1}^3 f_j(r) h^j(t, \phi) \mathbf{t}_j, \quad (44)$$

where  $f_j$  and  $h_j$  are functions to be found.

A good choice for the functions introduced above that allows to reduce significantly the field equations of the Yang-Mills-Higgs system is the following

$$h_1(t, \phi) = \frac{a}{b} h(t, \phi), \quad h_3(t, \phi) = a \cot(H(t, \phi)) \frac{h(t, \phi)}{\lambda(t, \phi)}, \quad \lambda_3 = 1, \quad (45)$$

$$f_1(r) = b \cos(qr) f_3(r), \quad f_2(r) = a \sin(qr) f_3(r), \quad f_3(r) = f_0 r, \quad (46)$$

where we have defined

$$h_2(t, \phi) := h(t, \phi), \quad \lambda_1(t, \phi) = \lambda_2(t, \phi) := \lambda(t, \phi),$$

being  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $f_0$  arbitrary constants.

In fact, it is direct to check that Eqs. (44), (45) and (46), together with Eqs. (14) and (17), reduce the complete set of Yang-Mills-Higgs equations to the following decoupled partial differential equations

$$\square H = \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi^2} \right) H = 0, \quad \square h = \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi^2} \right) h = 0, \quad \square \lambda = \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi^2} \right) \lambda = 0,$$

together with

$$\left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial t}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial \phi}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{L_\phi} \frac{\partial H}{\partial \phi}\right) \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{L_\phi} \frac{\partial H}{\partial \phi}\right) = 0, \quad (47)$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial t}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial \phi}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{L_\phi} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \phi}\right) \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{L_\phi} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \phi}\right) = 0, \quad (48)$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left(\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \phi}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{L_\phi} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \phi}\right) \left(\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{L_\phi} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \phi}\right) = 0. \quad (49)$$

Additionally, from the Yang-Mills equations the following first order non-linear equation emerges

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t} + \tan(H)\lambda(1 - \lambda^2) \frac{\partial H}{\partial t} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \lambda = \pm \frac{\cos(H)}{\sqrt{\exp(2\lambda_0) + \cos^2(H)}}, \quad (50)$$

that fixes the function  $\lambda$  in terms of  $H$  (here  $\lambda_0$  is constant). Hence, the constraint here above reduces the number of chiral modes to two.

Summarizing, with the ansatz presented above, the complete set of field equations of the Yang-Mills-Higgs theory has been reduced to the field equations of three chiral massless scalar fields in  $(1+1)$ -dimensions plus a non-linear constraint between two of them. Consequently, these families of exact solutions with non-vanishing topological charge are labelled by two integers ( $p$  and  $q$ , which determine the topological charge in Eq. (34)) and two chiral massless fields in  $(1+1)$ -dimensions (namely  $H$  and  $h$ ), since  $\lambda$  depends on  $H$  as in Eq. (50). Quite interestingly, the inclusion of the Higgs field leads to two-dimensional chiral massless modes (instead of massless modes).

The energy density  $T_{00}^{(1)}$  of the above solutions takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} T_{00}^{(1)} &= \frac{(1 + e^{2\lambda_0})}{2} \left( \csc^2(H) \left[ a^2 f_0^2 r^2 h^2 \cot^2(H) + \frac{e^{4\lambda_0} p^2 \sin^4(H)}{e^2 L_\phi^2 (e^{2\lambda_0} + \cos^2(H))^3} \right] \left( (\partial_t H)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} (\partial_\phi H)^2 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + a^2 f_0^2 r^2 \csc^2(H) \left( (\partial_t h)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} (\partial_\phi h)^2 \right) + \frac{a^2 f_0^2}{L_r^2} h \csc^2(H) \left[ h - 4L_r^2 r^2 \cot(H) \partial_t H \partial_t h \right] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where  $\partial_t$  and  $\partial_\phi$  stand for derivative, respectively, with respect to  $t$  and  $\phi$  and the field equations have been used in order to reduce the last term. Here it is worth to note the following fact: at a first glance, because the ansatz reduces the complete set of Yang-Mills-Higgs field equations to a set of linear decoupled equations (one for  $H$  and one for  $h$ ), one could suspect that perhaps the above configurations of Yang-Mills-Higgs theory are, after all, gauge equivalent to Abelian non-interacting configurations. However, if this would be the case, then the energy-density (which is gauge-invariant) should also be the energy density of two decoupled chiral massless modes (which is quadratic in the fields, satisfies linear equations and only contains kinetic terms of the chiral fields). In the present case, the above expression for the energy density clearly manifests non-linear interactions between the two main degrees of freedom  $H$  and  $h$ .

On the other hand, the CS density becomes

$$\rho_{\text{CS}} = -\frac{1}{16\pi^2} pq \sin(H) \frac{\partial H}{\partial \phi}. \quad (52)$$

Integrating in the ranges defined in Eq. (13), the topological charge turns out to be  $Q_{\text{CS}} = pq$ , where we have used the following boundary conditions

$$H(t, \phi = \pi) = 0, \quad H(t, \phi = 0) = \pi.$$

### 3 Non-linear sigma model in $(3+1)$ -dimensions

Here and in the following sections, we will discuss the NLSM and the Skyrme model in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions in the  $SU(2)$  case, which is more relevant than Yang-Mills-Higgs theory as far as the low energy phase diagram of QCD. Hence, the

primary variable will be an  $SU(2)$ -valued scalar field  $U$ . We will analyze how one can construct in these non-integrable theories an infinite-dimensional family of exact solutions labelled by two integers, as well as by a free massless scalar field in two dimensions keeping alive the topological charge, which (in this case as well) can be interpreted as the Baryonic charge. The key technical point is to find a suitable ansatz which, on the one hand, depends on all the four space-time coordinates (for the topological density to be non-vanishing) and, at the same time, reduces the field equations to the field equations of a free massless scalar field in two dimensions. The high physical interest in the NLSM can be quickly explained, considering its many relevant physical applications. In particular, as far as the present paper is concerned, the model is related to the low energy limit of QCD and Pion's dynamics (see [5, 6] and references therein). Thus, the current approach can provide an infinite family of topologically non-trivial solutions allowing the explicit computation of critical physical quantities (which would be impossible to obtain from perturbation theory). In fact, in many situations of physical interest (especially at finite Baryon density), both perturbation theory and even the powerful tools of LQCD may fail (see [90–92] and references therein).

The action of the  $SU(2)$ -NLSM in  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensions is

$$I[U] = \frac{K}{4} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \text{Tr} (R^\mu R_\mu) , \quad (53)$$

where  $K$  is the coupling constant of the NLSM and  $R_\mu$  has been defined in Eq. (6). It is worth emphasizing that the NLSM only possesses global symmetry and is not classically conformal invariant in  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensions (unlike Yang-Mills theory). Nevertheless, despite the enormous differences between these two theories, an approach similar to the one described in the previous section also works in the present case. The field equations obtained varying the action in Eq. (53) with respect to the  $U$  field are

$$\nabla_\mu R^\mu = 0 , \quad (54)$$

and the energy-momentum tensor of the model is

$$T_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{K}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ R_\mu R_\nu - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R^\alpha R_\alpha \right] . \quad (55)$$

### 3.1 CFT in two dimensions from the NLSM

We will use the metric in Eq. (1) whose ranges for the coordinates can be determined in a similar way as in Eq. (13) (where the theory of Euler angles came into play). Let us define the following  $U(x) \in SU(2)$

$$U = \exp \left( p \theta \frac{\mathbf{t}_3}{2} \right) \exp \left( r \frac{\mathbf{t}_2}{4} \right) \exp \left( F(t, \phi) \frac{\mathbf{t}_3}{2} \right) , \quad (56)$$

where  $p$  is a non-vanishing integer (there will be one more restriction to be discussed later on). The theory of Euler angles for  $SU(N)$  [81–83] tells that the range of  $\theta$  (appearing in the left factor of the decomposition in Eq. (56)) and the range of  $r$  (appearing in the central factor of the decomposition in Eq. (56)) must be

$$0 \leq \theta \leq \pi , \quad 0 \leq r \leq 2\pi . \quad (57)$$

One can also consider the range of the coordinate  $\phi$  as

$$0 \leq \phi \leq 2\pi . \quad (58)$$

As far as the exponent in the right factor (namely  $F(t, \phi)$ ) is concerned, there are again two options. If the field  $F(t, \phi)$  satisfies periodic boundary conditions then the topological charge of the  $SU(2)$ -valued scalar field  $U$  vanishes (although the topological density in Eq. (8) can still be non-trivial). The other boundary condition for  $F(t, \phi)$  arises naturally taking into account two facts. First of all, one has to require that physical observables (built from traces of product

of the  $SU(2)$ -valued field  $U$  and its derivatives) such as the energy-momentum tensor should be periodic in  $\phi$  and this requirement *does not imply* that  $F(t, \phi)$  itself is periodic. Secondly,  $F(t, \phi)$  appears in the right factor of the Euler angles decomposition of an  $SU(2)$  element (see, for instance, Refs. [81–83])

$$F(t, \phi = 0) - F(t, \phi = 2\pi) = \pm 8q\pi, \quad (59)$$

where  $q$  is a non-vanishing integer. The option here above ensures that the  $SU(2)$  valued element  $U$  defined in Eqs. (56) and (59) wraps an integer number of times around the group manifold of  $SU(2)$  (in other words,  $U$  has a non-vanishing winding number). In this case, the topological charge and the topological density associated with  $U$  will be non-trivial. Also, in the present section, the term “topologically non-trivial” refers to configurations with  $\rho_B \neq 0$ : the reason is that configurations with vanishing total Baryonic charge but non-vanishing  $\rho_B$  still describe non-trivial interacting configurations with both regions having positive and negative charge densities.

It is an astounding and powerful result (due to all the analytic non-perturbative tools that will become available) that, despite the non-integrable character of the NLSM in (3+1)-dimensions, the complete set of NLSM field equations in Eq. (54) corresponding to the ansatz in Eq. (56) reduce to the field equation of a free massless scalar field in two dimensions keeping alive the topological charge density

$$\left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi^2} \right) F(t, \phi) = 0. \quad (60)$$

### 3.2 Topological charge and energy density

With the ansatz in Eq. (56) the topological density and topological charge, respectively, read

$$\rho_B = -\frac{p}{32\pi^2} \sin\left(\frac{r}{2}\right) \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi}, \quad (61)$$

$$B = -\frac{p}{8\pi} [F(t, \phi = 2\pi) - F(t, \phi = 0)] = \pm pq. \quad (62)$$

It is worth noting that the topological charge density in Eq. (61) has a non-trivial profile depending both on  $r$  and on  $\phi$ . The maximum of  $\rho_B$  are located at  $r = \pi$  and at the values of  $\phi$  such that  $\partial F/\partial \phi$  is maximum: in three spatial dimensions these two conditions identify a line. As long as  $\partial F/\partial \phi \neq 0$ , the topological density is non-zero. Note that the topological density is a linear function of  $F(t, \phi)$ , different from the Yang-Mills case presented in the previous section.

The energy density reads

$$T_{00}^\sigma = \frac{K}{8} \left[ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{L_r^2} + \frac{4p^2}{L_\theta^2} \right) + \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right], \quad (63)$$

then the total energy is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E^\sigma &= \int \sqrt{-g} dr d\theta d\phi T_{00}^\sigma, \\ &= \Gamma^\sigma + \Psi^\sigma \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \left( \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where

$$\Gamma^\sigma = \frac{K\pi^3 L_\phi}{8L_r L_\theta} (L_\theta^2 + 4p^2 L_r^2), \quad \Psi^\sigma = \frac{K\pi^2 L_r L_\theta L_\phi}{4}. \quad (65)$$

On the other hand, the on-shell action becomes

$$I_{\text{on-shell}}^\sigma[F] = -\frac{K}{8} \int \sqrt{-g} dr d\theta d\phi \left[ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{L_r^2} + \frac{4p^2}{L_\theta^2} \right) - \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (66)$$

It is important to note that the energy does not grow linearly with the topological charge, as can be seen from Eqs. (62) and (63). This fact indicates that these solutions describe interacting systems (as otherwise, the energy would be linear in the topological charge).

### 3.3 Conformal field theory and some semiclassical considerations

The usual mode expansion of the solutions of Eq. (60) is of course the same as in the previous section in Eqs. (36) and (37), where  $F_+$  refers to the left movers and  $F_-$  to the right movers ( $v_{\pm}$  and  $\phi_0^{\pm}$  being integration constants which must satisfy three constraints which will be discussed below). Hence, the most general topologically non-trivial configuration of the present sector arises replacing,  $F = F_+ + F_-$ , in Eqs. (36) and (37) into Eq. (56).

Also, in the present case, the most natural choice corresponds to take  $a_n^{\pm}$  and  $b_n^{\pm}$  in such a way that

$$\tilde{F}(t, \phi = 0) = \tilde{F}(t, \phi = 2\pi) = 0 ,$$

where  $\tilde{F}(t, \phi)$  is the part of  $F = F_+ + F_-$  coming from the sum over the integers  $n$  in Eqs. (36) and (37). Therefore  $B$  in Eq. (62) is non-zero when  $v_+ - v_- \neq 0$ . Also,  $v_{\pm}$  in Eqs. (36) and (37) must be chosen as

$$F(t, \phi = 0) = \phi_0^+ + \phi_0^- + (v_+ + v_-) \frac{t}{L_{\phi}} \quad \Rightarrow \quad v_+ + v_- = 0 , \quad (67)$$

$$F(t, \phi = 2\pi) = \phi_0^+ + \phi_0^- + (v_+ - v_-) 2\pi \quad \Rightarrow \quad v_+ - v_- = 4q . \quad (68)$$

Unlike what happens in the Yang-Mills case, here there is no constraint on  $\phi_0^+ + \phi_0^-$ . Hence, the topological charge is

$$B = pq .$$

At the classical level, this is the most straightforward possible choice of boundary conditions since it allows to identify the terms in the expansion modes responsible for the topological charge and which are not. However, plenty of different options will be discussed in forthcoming papers.

Also, in the present case, the semi-classical quantization of these configurations corresponds to the quantization of the free massless scalar field  $F(t, \phi)$  with the boundary conditions described above to have a non-vanishing topological charge. However, as discussed in the previous sections, some interesting differences exist.

First, in Eqs. (36) and (37) any term in the expansion corresponds to an exact solution of the  $(3+1)$ -dimensional NLSM field equations and not just to a solution of the linearized field equations. Therefore, the Bosonic quantum operators  $\alpha_n^+$ ,  $(\alpha_m^+)^{\dagger}$  and  $\alpha_n^-$ ,  $(\alpha_m^-)^{\dagger}$  (which are annihilation and creation operators for the left and right movers, satisfying the obvious commutation relations, see [89]) are quantum operators which create exact solutions of the semiclassical NLSM field equations.

Second, the constant terms  $\phi_0^{\pm}$  as well as the linear terms in  $t$  and  $\phi$  play an important role as these are associated to classical solutions which carry the topological charge (while the modes satisfying periodic boundary conditions do not contribute to the topological charge). Thus, depending on whether  $B$  is odd or even, one should quantize the modes associated to the linear terms in the expansion of  $F$  as Fermionic or Bosonic. Hence, when  $B$  is odd,  $F$  has a component which should be considered as an emergent Fermionic field.

## 4 The Skyrme model in $(3+1)$ -dimensions

A very natural question is: *does the Skyrme term spoil the remarkable relation discussed in the previous section between the simplest two-dimensional CFT and a non-integrable theory in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions at finite Baryon density in topologically non-trivial sectors?* The importance of the Skyrme model lies in the fact that the NLSM in flat space-time does not admit static topologically non-trivial soliton solutions with finite energy, known as Derrick's scale argument [93]. The Skyrme term is introduced to get around this problem and stabilize the soliton (Skyrmion).

The obvious physical relevance of finite density effects arises from the difficulties in providing cold and dense nuclear matter as a function of baryon number density with a good analytic understanding. The non-perturbative nature of low energy

QCD prevents (the very complex and interesting structure of) its phase diagram from being described in detail (see [94–99] and references therein): this is the reason why researchers in this area mainly use numerical and lattice approaches. In particular, a very intriguing part in the QCD phase diagram, which appears at finite baryon density,<sup>5</sup> is related to the appearance of ordered structures (similar to the Larkin–Ovchinnikov–Fulde–Ferrell phase [108]). These ordered structures at finite density are, by now, a well-established feature (see, for instance, [109–111], and references therein). These are just some of the reasons why it is mandatory to shed more light on these issues with theoretical tools, as often even the numerical approaches are not effective with high topological charges.

Here we will show that the Skyrme term discloses a remarkable phenomenon: namely, the present construction still works (with precisely the same ansatz) but now, when the Skyrme coupling is non-zero, instead of a two-dimensional CFT, one gets a two-dimensional chiral CFT: namely, either left or right movers must be eliminated. This new result is likely to be related to the fact that the Skyrme model includes the effects of the low energy limit of QCD so that the Skyrme model knows, somehow, about chiral symmetry breaking.

The Skyrme action is given by

$$I[U] = \frac{K}{4} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \text{Tr} \left( R_\mu R^\mu + \frac{\lambda}{8} [R_\mu, R_\nu] [R^\mu, R^\nu] \right),$$

where  $K$  and  $\lambda$  are positive coupling constants.<sup>6</sup> The field equations of the model are obtained varying the last action with respect to the  $U$  field, we get

$$\nabla^\mu \left( R_\mu + \frac{\lambda}{4} [R^\nu, [R_\mu, R_\nu]] \right) = 0, \quad (69)$$

being these three non-linear coupled second-order partial differential equations.

The energy-momentum tensor reads

$$T_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{K}{2} \text{Tr} \left( R_\mu R_\nu - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R_\alpha R^\alpha + \frac{\lambda}{4} \left( g^{\alpha\beta} [R_\mu, R_\alpha] [R_\nu, R_\beta] - \frac{1}{4} g_{\mu\nu} [R_\alpha, R_\beta] [R^\alpha, R^\beta] \right) \right). \quad (70)$$

The topological density and charge are defined in Eqs. (8) and (9). Now, we will study two types of analytical configurations that will lead to a chiral CFT. The description of the box is based on the metric given in Eqs. (1), (57) and (58).

#### 4.1 Chiral conformal field theory from the Skyrme model. Type-I: Euler ansatz for the lasagna phase

We will consider, once again, the matter field ansatz in Eq. (56). When one plugs Eq. (56) into the Skyrme equations in Eq. (69), the field equations reduce to

$$\left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi^2} \right) F = 0, \quad (71)$$

$$\left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 = \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{L_\phi} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right) \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{L_\phi} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right) = 0. \quad (72)$$

As in the NLSM and Yang-Mills cases, the first equation describes the simplest Bosonic CFT in two dimensions. Thus, from Eq. (71)  $F = F_+ + F_-$  (where  $F_\pm$  represent the contributions of the left and right movers). However, Eq. (72) can be satisfied only by killing either  $F_+$  or  $F_-$ . Hence, we still get a two-dimensional CFT, but this time it is a chiral CFT. Once again, this result is a huge analytic achievement as the field equations have been reduced exactly, keeping alive the topological density, to the field equations of a free massless chiral scalar field in  $(1+1)$ -dimensions. Also, the topological charge is the same as in the NLSM case defined in Eq. (62).

<sup>5</sup>See [100–107] and references therein, for the construction of non-homogeneous condensates at finite density in chiral perturbation theory.

<sup>6</sup>The parameters  $K$  and  $\lambda$  are related to the meson decay coupling constant  $F_\pi$  and the Skyrme coupling  $e$  via  $F_\pi = 2\sqrt{K}$  and  $K\lambda e^2 = 1$ , where  $F_\pi = 141\text{MeV}$  and  $e = 5.45$ .

In this case, the energy density is given by

$$T_{00}^{(2)} = \frac{K}{8} \left[ \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{1}{L_r^2} + \frac{4p^2}{L_\theta^2} \right) + \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right] + \frac{K\lambda}{32L_r^2L_\theta^2} \left[ \frac{p^2}{4} + \left( \frac{1}{4}L_\theta^2 + p^2L_r^2 \sin^2 \left( \frac{r}{2} \right) \right) \left( \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right) \right], \quad (73)$$

so that, the expression for the energy becomes

$$E^{(2)} = \int \sqrt{-g} dr d\theta d\phi T_{00}^{(2)} = \Gamma^{(2)} + \Psi^{(2)} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \left( \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right), \quad (74)$$

where

$$\Gamma^{(2)} = \frac{K\pi^3 L_\phi}{32L_r L_\theta} (4L_\theta^2 + p^2(\lambda + 16L_r^2)), \quad \Psi^{(2)} = \frac{K\pi L_\phi}{64L_r L_\theta} (\pi L_\theta^2(\lambda + 16L_r^2) + 8p^2\lambda L_r^2). \quad (75)$$

As in the NLSM, the energy does not grow linearly with the topological charge, implying the presence of interactions between particles. Also, the topological charge density is linear in  $F(t, \phi)$  instead of non-linear, as in the Yang-Mills case presented in the previous sections. These configurations describe modulated nuclear lasagna layers in which the periodic part in the mode expansion of the field  $F(t, \phi)$  (which does not carry topological charge) represents the modulations in the  $\phi$ -direction, while the linear part is responsible for the “bare lasagna”; namely, the lasagna without modulations which have been analyzed in [112] and [113]). Figure 1 shows the energy density of two lasagna-type configurations, one with modulation and the other without modulation. It is worth emphasizing that it is also necessary to introduce a cut-off in the computation of the (semi)classical partition function because the Skyrme theory is an effective low-energy model. We will detail this point in the next section.




Figure 1: Energy density with and without modulation of nuclear lasagna configurations with Baryonic charge  $B = 6$ . For both cases we have set  $K = \lambda = L_r = L_\theta = L_\phi = 1$ ,  $p = 3$ ,  $q = 2$  and  $\phi_0 = 0$ . Left: nuclear lasagna without modulation where  $a_i = b_i = 0$ . Right: snapshot at  $t=0$  of nuclear lasagna with a modulation in the  $\phi$  direction where the non-null modulation coefficients were set as  $a_1 = -a_3 = b_1 = b_2 = 0.1$ .

## 4.2 Chiral conformal field theory from the Skyrme model. Type-II: Exponential ansatz for the spaghetti phase

This time for the  $U$  field we adopt the standard (exponential) parameterization of an element of  $SU(2)$ , that is

$$U^{\pm 1}(x^\mu) = \cos(\alpha)\mathbf{1}_2 \pm \sin(\alpha)n^i \mathbf{t}_i, \quad (76)$$



where

$$\begin{aligned} n^1 &= \sin \Theta \cos \Phi, & n^2 &= \sin \Theta \sin \Phi, & n^3 &= \cos \Theta, \\ \alpha &= \alpha(x^\mu), & \Theta &= \Theta(x^\mu), & \Phi &= \Phi(x^\mu), & n^i n_i &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

From Eq. (8) it follows that the topological charge density takes the following general form

$$\rho_B = -\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \sin^2 \alpha \sin \Theta \, d\alpha \wedge d\Theta \wedge d\Phi. \quad (78)$$

Hence, in order to have topologically non-trivial configurations we must demand that  $d\alpha \wedge d\Theta \wedge d\Phi \neq 0$ . On the other hand, as we want to construct analytical solutions, it is necessary to have a good ansatz that significantly reduces the Skyrme field equations. Considering the approach developed in [58, 59] lead to the following

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \alpha(r), & \Theta &= Q\theta, & \Phi &= F(t, \phi), \\ Q &= 2v + 1, & v &\in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

It is a direct computation to verify that, by replacing the ansatz defined in Eqs. (77) and (79) into the Skyrme field equations, one gets the following system of equations

$$\left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi^2} \right) F = 0, \quad (80)$$

$$\left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 = \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{L_\phi} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right) \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{L_\phi} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right) = 0, \quad (81)$$

$$\alpha'' - \frac{Q^2 (L_r^2 - \lambda \alpha'^2) \sin(2\alpha)}{2 (L_\theta^2 + Q^2 \lambda \sin^2(\alpha))} = 0. \quad (82)$$

Once again, the ansatz in Eqs. (77) and (79) discloses many remarkable simplifications. Not only the equation for  $\alpha$  decouples from  $F$  (when  $F$  satisfies Eqs. (80) and (81)) but it can be also reduced to a simple quadrature

$$\frac{d\alpha}{dr} = \pm \eta(\alpha, E_0), \quad \eta(\alpha, E_0) = \left[ \frac{L_\theta^2}{L_\theta^2 + Q^2 \lambda \sin^2(\alpha)} \left( E_0 - \frac{Q^2 L_r^2}{2 L_\theta^2} \cos(2\alpha) \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (83)$$

where  $E_0$  is an integration constant to be fixed by analyzing the boundary conditions:

$$F(t, \phi = 0) - F(t, \phi = 2\pi) = 2p\pi, \quad (84)$$

and

$$\alpha(2\pi) - \alpha(0) = m\pi, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

In fact, by integrating Eq. (83) and considering the above boundary conditions we get to the following equation for  $E_0$ ,

$$\pm m \int_0^\pi \frac{1}{\eta(\alpha, E_0)} d\alpha = 2\pi.$$

From the above condition, it is clear that, for large  $m$ , the integration constant  $E_0$  scales as  $m^2$

$$E_0 = m^2 \xi_0, \quad \xi_0 > 0,$$

where  $\xi_0$  (which can also be interpreted as an integration constant) does not depend on  $m$  for large  $m$ .

Moreover, in this case, Eq. (80) describes the simplest Bosonic CFT in two dimensions. Thus, from Eq. (80)  $F = F_+ + F_-$  but, once again, Eq. (81) can be satisfied only by killing either  $F_+$  or  $F_-$ . Thus, as in the last case, we still get a chiral massless scalar field in  $(1+1)$ -dimensions. We stress the very intriguing phenomenon of the appearance of chiral

modes without the presence of any actual edge. These chiral modes are “hosted” by the Hadronic tubes<sup>7</sup>: hence these configurations describe modulated nuclear spaghetti configurations. Indeed, the linear part in the mode expansion of the field  $F(t, \phi)$  is responsible for the “bare spaghetti”, namely, the nuclear spaghetti without modulations along the axis which have been analyzed in [112] and [113]. On the other hand, the periodic part in the mode expansion of the field  $F(t, \phi)$  (which does not carry topological charge) represent the modulations of the tubes in the  $\phi$ -direction.

The energy density is given by

$$T_{00}^{(3)} = \frac{K}{2} \left\{ \frac{\alpha'^2}{L_r^2} + \left[ \frac{Q^2}{L_\theta^2} + \left( \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right) \sin^2(Q\theta) \right] \sin^2(\alpha) \right\} \quad (85)$$

$$+ \frac{K\lambda}{2} \left\{ \frac{Q^2}{L_\theta^2} \sin^2(Q\theta) \sin^2(\alpha) \left( \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right) + \frac{\alpha'^2}{L_r^2} \left[ \frac{Q^2}{L_\theta^2} + \sin^2(Q\theta) \left( \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right) \right] \right\} \sin^2(\alpha),$$

then, the total energy is given by

$$E^{(3)} = \int \sqrt{-g} dr d\theta d\phi T_{00}^{(3)},$$

$$= \Gamma^{(3)} + \Psi^{(3)} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \left[ \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial F}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right], \quad (86)$$

where

$$\Gamma^{(3)} = \frac{mK\pi^2 L_\phi}{L_r L_\theta} \int_0^\pi d\alpha \Omega(\alpha, m, Q), \quad \Psi^{(3)} = \frac{mK\pi L_\phi}{4L_r L_\theta} \int_0^\pi d\alpha \tilde{\Omega}(\alpha, m, Q),$$

and

$$\Omega(\alpha, m, Q) = \eta(\alpha, E_0) (L_\theta^2 + \lambda Q^2 \sin^2(\alpha)) + \frac{L_r^2 Q^2}{\eta(\alpha, E_0)} \sin^2(\alpha), \quad (87)$$

$$\tilde{\Omega}(\alpha, m, Q) = \eta(\alpha, E_0) \lambda L_\theta^2 \sin^2(\alpha) + \frac{\sin^2(\alpha)}{\eta(\alpha, E_0)} L_r^2 (L_\theta^2 + \lambda Q^2 \sin^2(\alpha)), \quad (88)$$

while the topological charge density reads

$$\rho_B = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} (\sin^2(\alpha)\alpha') (\sin(Q\theta)) (\partial_\phi F) dr \wedge d(Q\theta) \wedge d\phi. \quad (89)$$

Note that the positions of the maximum of  $\rho_B$  are located at

$$Q\theta = \frac{\pi}{2} + N\pi, \quad \sin^2(\alpha) = 1,$$

( $N$  being an integer) and at the values of  $r$  and  $\phi$  such that both  $\sin^2(\alpha)\alpha'$  and  $\partial_\phi F$  have maximum. In three spatial dimensions these three conditions identify isolated points, and the same happens for the energy density of these configurations (as we mentioned above). Taking into account the boundary conditions satisfied by  $\alpha$  and  $F$  one arrives at the following value of the Baryonic charge:

$$B = mp.$$

It is important to emphasize that both the energy density and the topological charge density depend on all the three spatial coordinates: to the best of the authors' knowledge, these are the first analytic examples of solitons crystals in which both the energy density and the Baryon density manifest a genuine three-dimensional behaviour. Figure 2 shows the energy density of two spaghetti-type configurations, one with modulation and the other without modulation.

<sup>7</sup>This can be seen as follows: the local maxima of the energy density (see Eq. (85) here below), which coincides with the maximum of the topological density, is found in the center of the tubes, where  $\sin^2(\alpha)\sin^2(Q\theta) = 1$ . The chiral massless modes have their support around these points. On the other hand, when  $\sin^2(\alpha)\sin^2(Q\theta) = 0$  the contribution of the chiral modes to the energy density vanishes.




Figure 2: Energy density with and without modulation of nuclear spaghetti configurations with Baryonic charge  $B = 6$ . For both cases we have set  $K = \lambda = L_r = L_\theta = L_\phi = 1$ ,  $p = 1$ ,  $m = 6$ ,  $q = 5$ , and  $\phi_0 = 0$ . Left: nuclear spaghetti without modulation where  $a_i = b_i = 0$ . Right: snapshot at  $t = 0$  of nuclear spaghetti with a modulation in the  $\phi$ -direction where the non-null modulation coefficients were set as  $a_1 = -a_3 = b_1 = b_2 = 0.1$ .

## 5 Partition functions

This section will discuss the semi-classical partition function associated with some of the families of topologically non-trivial configurations constructed in the previous sections. The wording “semi-classical partition functions” in this section refers to the following: all the exact solutions described previously are characterized both by *some discrete labels* (which determine the Baryonic charge) and (for any possible choice of the discrete labels) by a *massless chiral field*  $F$  in  $(1+1)$ -dimensions (or two chiral massless fields in the Yang-Mills-Higgs case). The classical partition functions will include a sum of

$$e^{-\beta(E - \mu_B B)},$$

(where  $E$  is the energy of the solution and  $B$  is the Baryonic charge) over all the possible discrete labels and (for any choice of the discrete labels) over the chiral massless field  $F$  satisfying the boundary conditions defined in the previous sections corresponding to the given choice of discrete labels.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, we can take advantage of the fact that the massless chiral field  $F$  satisfies a linear equation. This allows to “promote” the classical partition function over  $F$  to a “semi-classical” partition function by quantizing the massless chiral degree of freedom  $F$  in the obvious way.<sup>9</sup>

We will focus mainly on the Skyrme theory since it is more directly relevant as far as the low temperatures phase diagram is concerned (being the Skyrme theory, the low energy limit of QCD at leading order in the ’t Hooft expansion). The relations with the instantons-dyons liquid approach [114–117] will be shortly analyzed. A complete treatment of the quantum partition functions associated with these families should include (for any member of these families) the other possible fluctuations (such as small perturbations of the other two degrees of freedom of the Skyrme model and not just of  $F$ ). Unfortunately, this task would involve the computation of functional determinants in  $(3+1)$ -dimensional backgrounds, which depend explicitly on time and spatial coordinates: such a computation can be done neither analytically nor numerically. However, it is worth emphasizing that it is already a quite remarkable fact that one of the modes (namely  $F$ ) can be quantized exactly. Moreover, the comparison with [114–117] here below clearly shows that the partition function to be defined in the following sections captures much relevant information.

<sup>8</sup>The main difference between the Yang-Mills-Higgs and Skyrme cases is that in the former, two chiral modes contribute to the total energy, while in the latter, only one.

<sup>9</sup>A more detailed treatment of the partition functions associated with these families will appear in future publications.

Schematically, the contribution of the current families of exact solutions to the partition function  $Z$  is

$$Z \approx \sum_{\substack{\text{over all the} \\ \text{solutions} \\ \text{of the family}}} \exp[-\beta (E_{\text{Cl. Sol.}} - \mu_B B_{\text{Cl. Sol.}})] ,$$

where the sum is over all the solutions of the given family.<sup>10</sup> Here  $E_{\text{Cl. Sol.}}$  is the total energy of a classical solution,  $B_{\text{Cl. Sol.}}$  is the Baryonic charge of the configuration,  $\beta$  is the inverse of the temperature  $T$ , and  $\mu_B$  is the Baryon chemical potential.

In particular, for the lasagna phase constructed from the Euler representation and for the spaghetti phase constructed from the exponential representation in the Skyrme model, the expressions for  $E_{\text{Cl. Sol.}}$  in Eqs. (74) and (86) can be written, respectively, as

$$E_{\text{Cl. Sol.}}^{(2)} := E^{(2)} = \tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)} + \Psi^{(2)} \int_0^{2\pi} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right] d\phi , \quad (90)$$

where

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)} = \Gamma^{(2)} + \frac{64\pi q^2}{L_\phi^2} \Psi^{(2)} ,$$

and

$$E_{\text{Cl. Sol.}}^{(3)} := E^{(3)} = \tilde{\Gamma}^{(3)} + \Psi^{(3)} \int_0^{2\pi} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right] d\phi , \quad (91)$$

where

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{(3)} = \Gamma^{(3)} + \frac{4\pi p^2}{L_\phi^2} \Psi^{(3)} .$$

Here  $\{\Gamma^{(2)}, \Psi^{(2)}\}$  and  $\{\Gamma^{(3)}, \Psi^{(3)}\}$  have been defined, respectively, in Eqs. (74) and (86), and  $\tilde{F}$  is the part of  $F$  coming from the sum over the integers  $n$  in Eqs. (36) and (37). It is important to remember that the linear terms in Eqs. (90) and (91) that comes from the modes expansion of the function  $F$  must be non-zero in order to have a non-vanishing topological charge.

## 5.1 Partition function for fixed value of the Baryonic charge

In the following, we will focus on the nuclear lasagna phase, which is slightly simpler to analyze than the spaghetti phase, using as starting point Eq. (90). The reason is that the total and free energies associated with Hadronic tubes depend on inverse elliptic functions, while the ones of Hadronic layers depend on functions which are polynomial in the physically relevant variables (so that these are easier to handle). On the other hand, the qualitative low-temperature behaviour for large Baryonic charges is similar in both cases.

Let us consider a fixed value of the Baryonic charge  $B$  in Eq. (62) and let us turn off, momentarily, the Baryon chemical potential  $\mu_B$ .

In order to avoid very long algebraic expressions we will consider  $q = p$  (since this choice keeps the essential features of the problem). As for fixed values of the discrete label  $p$  these configurations are characterized by a massless chiral field  $F$  in two dimensions, the contribution  $Z_p$  of the present family to the Skyrme partition function is

$$Z_p(\beta) = \int DF \mathcal{Z}_F = \int DF \exp \left\{ -\beta E_{\text{Cl. Sol.}}^{(2)} \right\} , \quad \mathcal{Z}_F = \exp \left\{ -\beta E_{\text{Cl. Sol.}}^{(2)} \right\} , \quad (92)$$

where  $E_{\text{Cl. Sol.}}^{(2)}$  have been defined in Eq. (90) (the case of Hadronic tubes, defined by the energy in Eq. (91), has a similar qualitative behaviour). The path integral over the massless chiral field can be done in the usual way taking into account

<sup>10</sup>Here the sum over all the solutions of the family means a sum over  $p$ ,  $q$  and  $\tilde{F}$ .

the obvious quantization (see, for instance, [89]) of the mode expansion for  $F$  (here, we will consider the total Baryonic charge to be even to avoid complications with Grassmann variables associated to  $\phi_0^-$  and  $v_-$ ):

$$F_- = \phi_0^- + v_- \left( \frac{t}{L_\phi} - \phi \right) + \sum_{n \neq 0} \left( a_n^- \sin \left[ n \left( \frac{t}{L_\phi} - \phi \right) \right] + b_n^- \cos \left[ n \left( \frac{t}{L_\phi} - \phi \right) \right] \right). \quad (93)$$

The corresponding semi-classical partition function for the Hadronic layers (with fixed discrete labels) reads:

$$Z_p(\beta) = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \delta(n) \exp \left[ -\beta \left( \tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)} + \Psi^{(2)} n \right) \right], \quad (94)$$

where the integer  $n$  comes from the quantization of the Hamiltonian,  $\int_0^{2\pi} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial t} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{L_\phi^2} \left( \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \phi} \right)^2 \right] d\phi$ , of the massless chiral mode and  $\delta(n)$  is the corresponding degeneracy (related to the number partition). Taking into account Eq. (75), one can rewrite  $\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}$  and  $\Psi^{(2)}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)} &= \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 p^2 + \Sigma_3 p^4, & \Psi^{(2)} &= \Sigma_4 + \Sigma_5 p^2, & \Sigma_1 &= \frac{K\pi^3 L_\theta L_\phi}{8L_r}, \\ \Sigma_2 &= \frac{K\pi^3}{32L_r L_\theta L_\phi} (\lambda + 16L_r^2)(L_\phi^2 + 32L_\theta^2), & \Sigma_3 &= \frac{8K\pi^2 L_r \lambda}{L_\theta L_\phi}, & \Sigma_4 &= \frac{K\pi^2 L_\theta L_\phi}{64L_r} (\lambda + 16L_r^2), & \Sigma_5 &= \frac{K\lambda\pi L_r L_\phi}{8L_\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

The above is useful to separate the terms which depend on the discrete labels (which are proportional to  $\Sigma_2$ ,  $\Sigma_3$  and  $\Sigma_5$ ) from the terms which do not depend on any discrete label of the family (which are proportional to  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_4$ ). Note that the partition function in Eq. (94), when  $p \neq q$ , will be given by

$$Z_{p,q}(\beta) = \exp \left[ -\beta \left( \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 \frac{(L_\phi^2 p^2 + 32L_\theta^2 q^2)}{(L_\phi^2 + 32L_\theta^2)} + \Sigma_3 p^2 q^2 \right) \right] \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \delta(n) \exp \left[ -\beta \left( (\Sigma_4 + \Sigma_5 p^2) n \right) \right].$$

Now, in our case (with  $p = q$ ), Eq. (94) can be written as

$$Z_p(\beta) = \exp \left[ -\beta \left( \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 p^2 + \Sigma_3 p^4 \right) \right] \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \delta(n) \exp \left[ -\beta \left( (\Sigma_4 + \Sigma_5 p^2) n \right) \right]. \quad (96)$$

These results are similar to the usual two-dimensional chiral CFT with the difference that, in the sum over  $n$ , the inverse temperature  $\beta$  has been rescaled by  $(\Sigma_4 + \Sigma_5 p^2)$ . If  $p$  is fixed, then the result is the usual chiral massless bosons partition function with rescaled temperature  $\beta_r := (\Sigma_4 + \Sigma_5 p^2) \beta$ . However, beware that we also have to sum over the label  $p$ . Such a partition function can also be written as

$$\zeta(z) \sim \exp \left( -\beta \left( \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 p^2 + \Sigma_3 p^4 \right) \right) \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \delta(n) \exp(-\beta_r n), \quad (97)$$

where  $\delta(n)$  is the degeneracy of the energy level  $n$  which can be easily obtained (for large  $n$ ) using the Hardy-Ramanujan-Cardy formula. The fundamental formula for the asymptotic growth of the partitions  $\delta(n)$  was found long time ago by Hardy and Ramanujan in Ref. [118]: for  $n \gg 1$  we get

$$\delta(n) \sim \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}} \frac{\exp \left( \pi \sqrt{\frac{2n}{3}} \right)}{n}. \quad (98)$$

Such discrete label  $n$  represents *exact excitation energies*<sup>11</sup> (related to the “quanta” of modulations either of the Hadronic layers or of the Hadronic tubes) over “bare” lasagna or spaghetti configurations. Looking at Eq. (93), the “bare” Euler or Exponential configurations (which have been discussed previously in the literature, see [58–60], [112, 113] and references

<sup>11</sup>We use the expression “exact excitation energies”, since these chiral modes are not only “small excitations” on top of Hadronic tubes or layers but, in fact, *these configurations are exact solutions of the full Skyrme field equations*. On the other hand, in the usual cases, one can only study small fluctuations around topological solitons as *solutions of the linearized field equations around that solitons*.

therein) possess  $a_n = 0 = b_n$  while  $v_- \neq 0$  (and fixed by the boundary condition to have integer Baryonic charge). Since Skyrme theory is the low energy limit of QCD, it is natural to introduce a cut-off  $\Delta$  on the sum over  $n$ : such a  $\Delta$  can be interpreted as the scale beyond which the Skyrme model is not a good description anymore. Therefore, instead of Eq. (97), we will consider the following expression:

$$\zeta_\Delta(z) \sim \exp(-\beta(\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 p^2 + \Sigma_3 p^4)) \sum_{n=1}^{\Delta} \delta(n) \exp(-\beta_r n). \quad (99)$$

The  $\Delta$  depends, in general, both on the temperature and the chemical potential:  $\Delta = \Delta(T, \mu_B)$ . Although we have been unable to find in the literature a widely accepted expression for the cut-off  $\Delta = \Delta(T, \mu_B)$  as function of  $T$  and  $\mu_B$ , in the following subsection, we will show that reasonable choices of  $\Delta$  provide with analytic results in qualitative agreement both with the available lattice data [119] as well as with different analytical approach [114].

## 5.2 Partition function at finite Baryon chemical potential

In order to get the full contribution of the present family to the semi-classical Skyrme partition function with non-vanishing Baryon chemical potential  $\mu_B$  one also has to sum over  $p$ , since  $p$  determines the Baryon charge  $B = p^2$  (remember that we have considered for simplicity  $q = p$ ). In this way, we get

$$Z^* = \sum_{p=-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp(-\beta(\Sigma_1 + (\Sigma_2 - \mu_B)p^2 + \Sigma_3 p^4)) \sum_{n=1}^{\Delta} \delta(n) \exp(-\beta_r n) \\ \Leftrightarrow Z^* = \sum_{n=1}^{n_{\max}} \sum_{p=-\infty}^{+\infty} \delta(n) \exp(-\beta(\Sigma_1 + (\Sigma_2 - \mu_B)p^2 + \Sigma_3 p^4)) \exp(-\beta(\Sigma_4 + \Sigma_5 p^2)n), \quad n_{\max} = \Delta(T, \mu_B). \quad (100)$$

The above double sum is clearly convergent since it is possible to exchange the order of the sums. As we will see below, the cut-off  $n_{\max} = \Delta(T, \mu_B)$  can be fixed in such a way to achieve a qualitative agreement with the description of LQCD for the phase diagram. Note that, unlike what happens in LQCD, in the present approach the inclusion of the Baryon chemical potential is not harmful.

It is worth emphasizing the intriguing similarities of the present partition function with the semi-classical partition functions computed using the ‘‘Poisson duality’’ and the instanton-dyon liquid approach in SUSY Yang-Mills theory (see [114–117] and references therein). Let us consider first the case in which  $\frac{L_r}{L_\phi}$  is very small ( $\frac{L_r}{L_\phi} \ll 1$ ) so that  $\Sigma_3$  can be neglected (see Eq. (95)). In this case (which corresponds to a box which is much longer in the  $\phi$ -direction than in the  $r$ -direction), if one analyzes Eq. (11) at page 5 of Ref. [114], one can see that the label  $k$  (and the corresponding sum) of  $Z_{inst}$  in that reference is analogous to the sum over  $n$  in Eq. (100) in the present approach, as  $k$  appears linearly in the exponent of  $Z_{inst}$  as  $n$  in Eq. (100). On the other hand, the label  $n$  of  $Z_{inst}$  (and the corresponding sum) in Eq. (11) of Ref. [114] is analogous to our topological sums over  $p$  since the label  $n$  appears quadratically in the exponent of  $Z_{inst}$  of Ref. [114], as  $p$  in our case. The only two relevant differences between the present expressions and  $Z_{inst}$  are the following. *First*, in the sum in Eq. (11) of Ref. [114] there is the factor  $(\beta/g^2)(k^3/\beta M)^3$  where  $M$  is defined below Eq. (11) of Ref. [114] while in our case we have the degeneracy factor  $\delta(n)$ . The factor arises from the one-loop effects around the instantons and can be computed explicitly thanks to the powerful results made available by SUSY, which are basic building blocks in the approach introduced in [115, 116]. However, in the low energy/temperature limit of QCD, there is no SUSY, so the computations of one-loop effects are far more complicated. It is worth reminding that each term in the expansion in Eq. (93) corresponds to an exact solution of the Skyrme field equations (with energy and Baryon densities depending on all the three spatial coordinates in a non-trivial way), so that, for any fixed  $n$  in Eq. (100), one should compute the corresponding 1-loop determinant around this non-trivial non-supersymmetric background. This fact, together with the lack of SUSY, makes the computation of this 1-loop determinant unfeasible in our case. *Second*,

in the present approach, we have introduced a cut-off on the sum over  $n$  as the Skyrme model is not valid anymore at very high temperature/energies while SUSY Yang-Mills theory is well behaved in the UV. Despite these differences, we find the similarities between the two approaches quite striking. On the other hand, if  $\frac{L_r}{L_\phi}$  is not very small, then the thermodynamical behavior of present families of topologically non-trivial configurations will deviate from the predictions of the instanton-dyon liquid approach (when the adimensional parameter  $\frac{L_r}{L_\phi}$  plays a key role). The very rich but quite complicated phase diagram associated to these families will be analyzed in a future publication.

The idea of the present section is to provide sound pieces of evidence that the families of topologically non-trivial configurations constructed in the previous sections have a reasonable thermodynamical behaviour. In order to get an idea of the thermodynamical behaviour of these modulated topological solitons, we can approximate the sums in Eq. (100) by integrals (in the limit in which  $\frac{L_r}{L_\phi} \ll 1$  so that  $\Sigma_3$  can be neglected: see Eq. (95)), arriving at the following formula

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{GP}(\tilde{\mu}_B, T) &= \exp(-\beta\Sigma_1) \int_1^{\Delta(T, \mu_B)+1} dn \delta(n) \exp(-\beta\Sigma_4 n) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dp \exp(-p^2\beta(\Sigma_5 n - \tilde{\mu}_B) - \beta\Sigma_3 p^4) \\ &= \frac{\exp(-\beta\Sigma_1)}{2\sqrt{\Sigma_3}} \int_1^{\Delta(T, \mu_B)+1} dn \delta(n) \exp\left(\beta \left[ \frac{(n\Sigma_5 - \tilde{\mu}_B)^2}{8\Sigma_3} - \Sigma_4 n \right]\right) \sqrt{n\Sigma_5 - \tilde{\mu}_B} K_{1/4}\left(\frac{\beta(n\Sigma_5 - \tilde{\mu}_B)^2}{8\Sigma_3}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

where  $\tilde{\mu}_B := \mu_B - \Sigma_2$ ,  $K_n(z)$  denotes the modified Bessel function of the second kind, and  $\delta(n)dn$  gives the number of states with energies between  $n$  and  $n + dn$ . Note that the condition  $\Sigma_2 + \Sigma_5 > \mu_B$  must be fulfilled. Also, we have introduced a +1 in the upper integration limit of  $n$  for numerical analysis reasons.

The integral in Eq. (101) cannot be computed exactly. Since we have to evaluate it numerically, we can consider the following generalized form of  $\delta(n)$ . For this section, let us consider a modified expression of Eq. (98), as follows

$$\delta(n) \sim \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}} \frac{\exp\left(\sqrt{\frac{2n}{3}}\pi\right)}{(n^a + b^2)}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \quad (102)$$

The original formula in Eq. (98) recovers by setting  $a = 1$  and  $b = 0$ . Substituting Eq. (102) into Eq. (101), we get

$$Z_{GP}(\tilde{\mu}_B, T) \approx \frac{\exp\left(-\beta\Sigma_1 + \sqrt{\frac{2n}{3}}\pi\right)}{8\sqrt{3}} \int_1^{\Delta(T, \mu_B)+1} dn f(n, \mu_B), \quad (103)$$

where

$$f(n, \mu_B) = \frac{\sqrt{n\Sigma_5 - \tilde{\mu}_B}}{\sqrt{\Sigma_3}(n^a + b^2)} \exp\left(\beta \left[ \frac{(n\Sigma_5 - \tilde{\mu}_B)^2}{8\Sigma_3} - \Sigma_4 n \right]\right) K_{1/4}\left(\frac{\beta(n\Sigma_5 - \tilde{\mu}_B)^2}{8\Sigma_3}\right). \quad (104)$$

By considering the expansion  $L_r/L_\phi \ll 1$ , the last function reduces to

$$f(n, \mu_B) \approx \frac{2\sqrt{\pi}e^{-n\beta\Sigma_4}}{(n^a + b^2)\sqrt{\beta(\tilde{\mu}_B - n\Sigma_5)}}, \quad \text{as } \Sigma_3 \ll 1. \quad (105)$$

The partition function in Eq. (103) with the expansion  $\Sigma_3 \ll 1$  allows one to extract different thermodynamical properties of the present families of “dressed topological solitons”: we will compare the results obtained from the above partition function with the available numerical results from LQCD. Before doing that, we should note that the explicit dependency on the temperature in the limit of integration through the cut-off  $\Delta(T, \mu_B)$  can also be considered as a modification in the Hamiltonian with additional explicitly  $T$ -dependent terms. As it was shown by Gorenstein and Yang [120], this kind of modification produces specific changes in some thermodynamics functions. At finite chemical potential, a generalization of the solution of Gorenstein and Yang modifies the entropy  $S$  and the internal energy  $U$  as [121]

$$S'(V, T, \Delta(T, \mu_B)) \equiv S(V, T, \Delta(T, \mu_B)) - \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial T} \left( \frac{\partial A}{\partial \Delta} \right)_{V, T}, \quad (106)$$

$$U'(V, T, \Delta(T, \mu_B)) \equiv U(V, T, \Delta(T, \mu_B)) - T \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial T} \left( \frac{\partial A}{\partial \Delta} \right)_{V, T}, \quad (107)$$

where  $A(V, T)$  is identified with the free energy obtained from the standard formula

$$A(\mu_B, T, V) = -T \log Z_{GP}(\mu_B, T, V). \quad (108)$$

All the other thermodynamics functions are unchanged and can be found from  $A(\mu_B, T, V)$  using the standard thermodynamics relations. In order to compare our simulations with LQCD, we are particularly interested in computing the pressure

$$P = - \left( \frac{\partial A}{\partial V} \right)_T, \quad (109)$$

with  $V = 8\pi^3 L_r L_\theta L_\phi$  being the finite volume. In the limit of a  $T$ -independent Hamiltonian the last term in Eq. (106) has to be zero, so that the standard expressions of the statistical mechanics are recovered.

As it is well known, perturbative QCD calculations should describe, at extremely high temperatures and chemical potential, the quarks and gluons degrees of freedom: the quark-gluon plasma. To make our results comparable with perturbative QCD computations, at those energies, we will also add to the pressure and entropy the perturbative terms, to order  $g^2$ , computed in the perturbative QCD approach [122, 123], given by

$$S'(V, T, \Delta(T, \mu_B)) = S(V, T, \Delta(T, \mu_B)) - \frac{\partial \Delta}{\partial T} \left( \frac{\partial A}{\partial \Delta} \right)_{V, T} + \left( \frac{\pi^2(7N_c N_f + 4N_g)}{45} - \frac{N_g(4N_c + 5N_f)}{144} g^2 \right) T^3, \quad (110)$$

$$P = - \left( \frac{\partial A}{\partial V} \right)_T + \left( \frac{\pi^2(7N_c N_g + 4N_g)}{180} - \frac{N_g(4N_c + 5N_f)}{576} g^2 \right) T^4, \quad (111)$$

where  $g$  is the coupling constant of QCD,  $N_g = (N_c^2 - 1)$ ,  $N_c$  is the number of colors, and  $N_f$  is the number of flavors.

A possible choice of the cut-off  $\Delta(T, \mu_B)$  at a fixed chemical potential that allows comparing closely our results to LQCD data is

$$\Delta(T, \mu_B) = 0.050 \times \log (0.712 - 2.148T + 0.294T^2 + 79.971T^{-1} + 14.254T^{-2} + 25.413e^{-1.605T}), \quad (112)$$

where we have fixed  $\mu_B = 0.1$ . In the present case the temperature has energy units (our energy unit is 100MeV as it is common in QCD), so that the first term inside the logarithmic is dimensionless, the second coefficient has inverse energy units [ $2.148 \times (100\text{MeV})^{-1}$ ], and so on. On the other hand, it would be nice to determine the precise functional form of  $\Delta(T, \mu_B)$  from first principles: we hope to come back on this interesting issue in a future publication. In the meantime, our aim is only to show that the partition function associated to the configurations described in the previous sections can be relevant as simple choices of  $\Delta(T, \mu_B)$  and give rise to good qualitative agreement with LQCD.

Now, one of the primary thermodynamic observables that we compute is the pressure  $P$  according to the formula in Eq. (110). With the expression of  $\Delta(T, \mu_B)$  here above, the starting value for  $P/T^4$  at  $T_{in} \equiv 0.480$  is given by  $P_{in}/T_{in}^4 = 0.942$ . The results at different values of  $T$  are shown in Fig. 3. The comparison of this plot can be made with those from Refs. [124–126]. Another crucial thermodynamic observable of our interest is the entropy  $S$  related to the pressure by basic thermodynamics relations. The starting point of the entropy at  $T_{in} = 0.480$  is  $S_{in}/T_{in}^3 = 1.679$ . The entropy per unit of  $T^3$  is shown in Fig. 3.

Clearly, these plots exhibit good qualitative agreement with the results of LQCD of those references. We will come back on a more detailed analysis of the low temperature behavior of the present topologically non-trivial configurations in a future publication.

## 6 Conclusions and perspectives

In the present work, we constructed exact and topologically non-trivial solutions of the Skyrme and Yang-Mills-Higgs theory at finite Baryon density in  $(3+1)$  dimensions. These analytic configurations are characterized both by two discrete






Figure 3: Plots of the pressure normalized by  $T^4$  and the entropy normalized by  $T^3$  as functions of the temperature  $T$ . We run our simulations with the values  $\mu_B = 0.1$ ,  $V = 1$ ,  $N_g = N_c^2 - 1$ ,  $N_c = 3$ ,  $N_f = 2$ ,  $g = 0.1$ ,  $a = 1$ ,  $b = 0$ .

labels (determining the Baryonic charge) and by a massless chiral field  $F$  in  $(1 + 1)$  dimensions (in the Yang-Mills-Higgs case, there are two chiral massless modes). Physically, the chiral massless modes characterize exact excitations on top of Hadronic layers and tubes. Thus, non-trivial modes of  $F$  represent either Hadronic tubes which are not homogeneous along the axis of the tubes or Hadronic layers, which are not homogeneous in the directions tangent to the layers themselves. In other words, the chiral massless modes hosted in the topologically non-trivial configurations constructed in the previous sections represent “exact excitations” since these chiral modes are not only “small excitations” on top of Hadronic tubes or layers but, *these configurations are exact solutions of the full Skyrme field equations with non-trivial topological density (the same is true in the Yang-Mills-Higgs case)*. This situation should be compared with the usual circumstances when one can only study small fluctuations around topological solitons as *solutions of the linearized field equations around that solitons*. Hence, these are the first exact analytic examples describing ordered arrays of  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensional topological solitons with non-trivial inhomogeneities. In the case of the Skyrme model, the plots of the energy and Baryon densities of the two types of solutions show that these configurations are appropriate to describe inhomogeneous nuclear pasta states, where chiral modes modulate the tubes and layers.

From the technical viewpoint, the fact that the present approach can reduce the complete set of field equations of the Skyrme model in  $(3+1)$ -dimensions to the equation of a massless chiral field in  $(1+1)$ -dimensions (keeping alive the Baryonic charge) open the remarkable possibility to use tools from CFT in  $(1 + 1)$ -dimensions to analyze the low-temperature behaviour of QCD. We have discussed the semi-classical grand canonical partition function associated with one of the present families. We have calculated (by approximating the partition function of the Hadronic layer with a suitable one-dimensional integral) the pressure and the entropy, obtaining an excellent qualitative agreement with results from LQCD. Our results also allow discussing out-of-equilibrium features in the low energy limit of QCD in  $(3 + 1)$ -dimensions using the well-established tools of two-dimensional CFT (see [127] and references therein). We will analyze these issues in a future publication.

## Acknowledgments

F. C. has been funded by Fondecyt Grant No. 1200022. M. L. is funded by FONDECYT post-doctoral Grant No. 3190873. A.V. is funded by FONDECYT post-doctoral Grant No. 3200884. The Centro de Estudios Científicos (CECs) is funded by the Chilean Government through the Centers of Excellence Base Financing Program of ANID.

## References

- [1] J. Greensite, *An Introduction to the Confinement Problem* (Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 821), Springer, 2011.
- [2] G. Ripka, *Dual Superconductor Models of Color Confinement* (Lecture Notes in Physics, 639, 2004).
- [3] N. Manton and P. Sutcliffe, *Topological Solitons*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007).
- [4] A. Balachandran, G. Marmo, B. Skagerstam, A. Stern, *Classical Topology and Quantum States*, World Scientific (1991).
- [5] M. Shifman, “*Advanced Topics in Quantum Field Theory: A Lecture Course*” Cambridge University Press, (2012).
- [6] M. Shifman, A. Yung, “*Supersymmetric Solitons*” Cambridge University Press, (2009).
- [7] E. J. Weinberg, *Classical Solutions in Quantum Field Theory*, Cambridge, 2012.
- [8] H. Nielsen and P. Olesen, Nucl. Phys. B144, 376 (1978).
- [9] A. Chodos, R. Jaffe, K. Johnson, C. Thorne, V. Weisskopf, Phys. Rev. D9, 3471 (1974); *ibid.* D10, 2599 (1974).
- [10] G. t’Hooft, *Gauge Fields with Unified Weak, Electromagnetic and Strong Interactions*, proceedings of the 1975 High-Energy Particle Physics Divisional Conference of EPS, Palermo (1975).
- [11] S. Mandelstam, Phys. Reports C23, 245 (1976).
- [12] A. Di Giacomo, JHEP 02, 208 (2021).
- [13] H. Pagels, E. Tomboulis, Nucl. Phys. B143, 485 (1978).
- [14] G. t’Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B79, 276 (1974); A. M. Polyakov, JETP Lett. 20, 194 (1974).
- [15] N. Cabibbo and G. Parisi, Phys. Lett. 59 B, 67 (1975).
- [16] D. J. Gross, F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 30, 1343 (1973).
- [17] H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 30, 1346 (1973).
- [18] M. G. Alford, A. Kapustin, and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. D 59, 054502 (1999), arXiv:hep-lat/9807039 [hep-lat].
- [19] J. B. Kogut and D. K. Sinclair, Phys. Rev. D66, 014508 (2002), arXiv:hep-lat/0201017; Phys. Rev. D 66, 034505 (2002), arXiv:hep-lat/0202028; Phys. Rev. D70, 094501 (2004), arXiv:hep-lat/0407027 [hep-lat].
- [20] S. R. Beane, W. Detmold, T. C. Luu, K. Orginos, M. J. Savage, A. Torok, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 082004 (2008), arXiv:0710.1827 [hep-lat].
- [21] W. Detmold, M. J. Savage, A. Torok, S. R. Beane, T. C. Luu, K. Orginos, A. Parreno, Phys. Rev. D78, 014507 (2008), arXiv:0803.2728 [hep-lat].
- [22] W. Detmold, K. Orginos, M. J. Savage, A. Walker-Loud, Phys. Rev. D 78, 054514 (2008), arXiv:0807.1856 [hep-lat].
- [23] W. Detmold and B. Smigielski, Phys. Rev. D84, 014508 (2011), arXiv:1103.4362 [hep-lat].
- [24] W. Detmold, K. Orginos, and Z. Shi, Phys. Rev. D 86, 054507 (2012), arXiv:1205.4224 [hep-lat].
- [25] G. Endrodi, Phys. Rev. D 90, 094501 (2014), arXiv:1407.1216 [hep-lat].

- [26] J. B. Kogut, M. A. Stephanov, *The Phases of Quantum Chromodynamics*, Cambridge (2004).
- [27] J. F. Fuini, L. G. Yaffe, *JHEP* 07 (2015) 116.
- [28] P. M. Chesler, L. G. Yaffe, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 102 (2009) 211601.
- [29] D.G. Ravenhall, C.J. Pethick, J. R.Wilson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **50**, 2066 (1983).
- [30] M. Hashimoto, H. Seki, M. Yamada, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 71, 320 (1984).
- [31] C. J. Horowitz, D. K. Berry, C.M. Briggs, M. E. Caplan, A. Cumming, A. S. Schneider, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 114, 031102 (2015).
- [32] D. K. Berry, M. E. Caplan, C. J. Horowitz, G. Huber, A. S. Schneider, *Phys. Rev. C* 94, 055801 (2016).
- [33] C. O. Dorso, G. A. Frank, J. A. López, *Nucl. Phys. A*978, 35 (2018).
- [34] A. da Silva Schneider, M. E. Caplan, D. K. Berry, C. J. Horowitz, *Phys. Rev. C* 98, 055801 (2018).
- [35] M. E. Caplan, A. S. Schneider, and C. J. Horowitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 121, 132701 (2018).
- [36] R. Nandi and S. Schramm, *J. Astrophys. Astron.* 39, 40 (2018).
- [37] Z. Lin, M. E. Caplan, C. J. Horowitz, C. Lunardini, *Phys.Rev.C* 102 (2020) 4, 045801.
- [38] C.O. Dorso, A. Strachan, G.A. Frank, *Nucl.Phys.A* 1002 (2020) 122004.
- [39] C.J. Pethick, Z. Zhang, D.N. Kobyakov, *Phys.Rev.C* 101 (2020) 5, 055802.
- [40] J. A. Lopez, C. O. Dorso, G. A. Frank, *Front.Phys. (Beijing)* 16 (2021) 2, 24301.
- [41] D. G. Yakovlev, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **453**, 581–590 (2015).
- [42] C.J. Horowitz, D.K. Berry, *Phys.Rev.C* 78 (2008) 035806.
- [43] M.E. Caplan, C.R. Forsman, A.S. Schneider, *Phys.Rev.C* 103 (2021) 5, 055810.
- [44] R. Nandi, S. Schramm, *J.Astrophys. Astron.* 39 (2018) 40; *Astrophys.J.* 852 (2018) 2, 135.
- [45] H. Sonoda, G. Watanabe, K. Sato, T. Takiwaki, K. Yasuoka, T. Ebisuzaki, *Phys.Rev.C* 75 (2007) 042801.
- [46] T. Skyrme, *Proc. R. Soc. London* **A 260**, 127 (1961); *Proc. R. Soc. London* **A 262**, 237 (1961); *Nucl. Phys.* **31**, 556 (1962).
- [47] C. G. Callan Jr. and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys. B* **239** (1984) 161-176.
- [48] E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 223** (1983), 422; *Nucl. Phys.* **B 223**, 433 (1983).
- [49] A. P. Balachandran, V. P. Nair, N. Panchapakesan, S. G. Rajeev, *Phys. Rev.* **D 28** (1983), 2830.
- [50] A. P. Balachandran, A. Barducci, F. Lizzi, V.G.J. Rodgers, A. Stern, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52** (1984), 887; A.P. Balachandran, F. Lizzi, V.G.J. Rodgers, A. Stern, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 256**, 525-556 (1985).
- [51] G. S. Adkins, C. R. Nappi, E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 228** (1983), 552-566.
- [52] F. Canfora, *Phys. Rev.* **D 88**, (2013), 065028;

- [53] E. Ayon-Beato, F. Canfora, J. Zanelli, *Phys. Lett. B* **752**, (2016) 201-205.
- [54] P. D. Alvarez, F. Canfora, N. Dimakis and A. Paliathanasis, *Phys. Lett. B* **773**, (2017) 401-407.
- [55] L. Aviles, F. Canfora, N. Dimakis, D. Hidalgo, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017), 125005.
- [56] F. Canfora, M. Lagos, S. H. Oh, J. Oliva and A. Vera, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no. 8, 085003 (2018).
- [57] F. Canfora, N. Dimakis, A. Paliathanasis, *Eur.Phys.J. C* **79** (2019) no.2, 139.
- [58] F. Canfora, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, no. 11, 929 (2018); F. Canfora, S.-H. Oh, A. Vera, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) no.6, 485.
- [59] F. Canfora, M. Lagos, A. Vera, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 8, 697.
- [60] P. D. Alvarez, S. L. Cacciatori, F. Canfora, B. L. Cerchiai, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 12, 125011.
- [61] E. Ayon-Beato, F. Canfora, M. Lagos, J. Oliva and A. Vera, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, no. 5, 384 (2020).
- [62] F. Canfora, S.-H. Oh, P. Salgado-Rebolledo, *Phys.Rev.D* **96** (2017) 8, 084038.
- [63] F. Canfora, A. Gomberoff, S.-H. Oh, F. Rojas, P. Salgado-Rebolledo, *JHEP* **06** (2019) 081.
- [64] F. Canfora, S.-H. Oh, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 5, 432.
- [65] F. Canfora, N. Dimakis and A. Paliathanasis, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, no.2, 025021 (2017).
- [66] F. Canfora, A. Paliathanasis, T. Taves and J. Zanelli, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, no.6, 065032 (2017).
- [67] M. Astorino, F. Canfora, M. Lagos and A. Vera, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no.12, 124032 (2018).
- [68] F. Canfora, N. Dimakis, A. Giacomini and A. Paliathanasis, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, no.4, 044035 (2019).
- [69] F. Canfora, A. Giacomini, M. Lagos, S. H. Oh and A. Vera, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, no.1, 55 (2021).
- [70] B. Bonga, G. Dotti, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 044049 (2022).
- [71] R.P. Treat, *Nuovo Cim.A* **6** (1971) 121-128.
- [72] Sidney R. Coleman, *Phys.Lett.B* **70** (1977) 59-60.
- [73] Y Nutku, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **16** (1983) L583-L586.
- [74] K. Rajagopal, N. Turok, *Nucl. Phys. B* **375**, 299 (1992).
- [75] H. Goldberg, D. Nash, M. T. Vaughn, *Phys. Rev. D* **46**, 2585 (1992).
- [76] C. R. Hu, S. G. Matinyan, B. Muller, A. Trayanov, T. M. Gould, S. D. H. Hsu, E. R. Poppitz, *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 2402 (1995).
- [77] C. R. Hu, S. G. Matinyan, B. Muller, D. Sweet, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 3823, 1996.
- [78] P. Dorey and T. Romańczukiewicz, *Phys. Lett. B* **779**, 117-123 (2018).
- [79] T. S. Mendonça and H. P. de Oliveira, *JHEP* **09**, 120 (2015).
- [80] F. Canfora, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) 11, 1032.

- [81] S. Bertini, S. L. Cacciatori, and B. L. Cerchiai, *J. Math. Phys. (N.Y.)* 47, 043510 (2006).
- [82] S. L. Cacciatori, F. Dalla Piazza, and A. Scotti, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* 369, 4709 (2017).
- [83] T. E. Tilma and G. Sudarshan, *J. Geom. Phys.* 52, 263 (2004).
- [84] F. R. Klinkhamer, N. S. Manton, *Phys. Rev. D* 30, 2212 (1984).
- [85] S.L. Adler, *Phys. Rev.* 177, 2426–2438 (1969); J. S. Bell, R. Jackiw, *Il Nuovo Cimento A.* 60 (1): 47–61 (1969).
- [86] M. E. Shaposhnikov, G. R. Farrar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 70, 2833–2836 (1993).
- [87] V. A. Kuzmin, V. A. Rubakov, M. E. Shaposhnikov, *Phys. Lett. B* 155, 36–42 (1985).
- [88] F. Canfora, D. Flores-Alfonso, M. Lagos and A. Vera, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.12, 125002 (2021).
- [89] M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz, E. Witten, *Superstring theory (volume 1)*, Cambridge university press (1988).
- [90] N. Brambilla et al., *Eur. Phys. J. C* 74, 2981 (2014), arXiv:1404.3723 [hep-ph].
- [91] J. Smit, *Cambridge Lect. Notes Phys.* 15, 1 (2002).
- [92] C. Gatttringer and C. B. Lang, *Lect. Notes Phys.* 788, 1 (2010).
- [93] G. H. Derrick, *J. Math. Phys.* 5, 1252 (1964).
- [94] P. de Forcrand, *Simulating QCD at finite density*, PoS(LAT2009)010 [arXiv:1005.0539] [INSPIRE].
- [95] N. Brambilla et al., *QCD and Strongly Coupled Gauge Theories: Challenges and Perspectives*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 74 (2014) 2981 [arXiv:1404.3723] [INSPIRE].
- [96] Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, *Phys. Rev.* 122, 345 (1961); *Phys. Rev.* 124, 246 (1961).
- [97] K. Rajagopal and F. Wilczek, in *At the Frontier of Particle Physics/Handbook of QCD*, edited by M. Shifman (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001); arXiv:hep-ph/0011333.
- [98] M. G. Alford, J. A. Bowers, and K. Rajagopal, *Phys. Rev. D* 63, 074016 (2001).
- [99] R. Casalbuoni and G. Nardulli, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 76, 263 (2004).
- [100] M. Mannarelli, *Particles* 2, 411 (2019), arXiv:1908.02042 [hep-ph].
- [101] M. Sadzikowski, *Phys. Lett. B* 553, 45 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0210065 [hep-ph].
- [102] M. Buballa and S. Carignano, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* 81, 39 (2015), arXiv:1406.1367 [hep-ph].
- [103] S. Carignano, M. Mannarelli, F. Anzuini, and O. Benhar, *Phys. Rev. D* 97, 036009 (2018), arXiv:1711.08607 [hep-ph].
- [104] J. O. Andersen and P. Kneschke, *Phys. Rev. D* 97, 076005 (2018), arXiv:1802.01832 [hep-ph].
- [105] P. de Forcrand and U. Wenger, *Proceedings, 24th International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory (Lattice 2006): Tucson, USA, July 23-28, 2006*, PoS LAT2006, 152 (2006), arXiv:hep-lat/0610117 [hep-lat].
- [106] A. Schmitt, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.7, 074007.
- [107] G. W. Evans and A. Schmitt, [arXiv:2206.01227 [hep-th]].

- [108] A. I. Larkin, Yu. N. Ovchinnikov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 47: 1136 (1964); Sov. Phys. JETP. 20: 762; P. Fulde, R. A. Ferrell, Phys. Rev. 135: A550 (1964).
- [109] L. McLerran and R. D. Pisarski, Nucl. Phys. A796, 83 (2007); Y. Hidaka, L. D. McLerran, and R. D. Pisarski, Nucl. Phys. A808, 117 (2008); L.Y. Glozman and R. F. Wagenbrunn, Phys. Rev. D 77, 054027 (2008); D. J. Gross and A. Neveu, Phys. Rev. D 10, 3235 (1974); R. F. Dashen, B. Hasslacher, and A. Neveu, Phys. Rev. D 12, 2443 (1975); S. S. Shei, Phys. Rev. D 14, 535 (1976); J. Feinberg and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. D 56, 5050 (1997).
- [110] G. Basar and G.V. Dunne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 200404 (2008); Phys. Rev. D 78, 065022 (2008); G. Basar, G.V. Dunne, M. Thies, Phys. Rev. D 79, 105012 (2009); V. Schon and M. Thies, Phys. Rev. D 62, 096002 (2000); V. Schon and M. Thies in *At the Frontier of Particle Physics*, edited by M. Shifman (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001), Vol. 3; M. Thies, Phys. Rev. D 69, 067703 (2004); J. Phys. A 39, 12707 (2006).
- [111] B. Bringoltz, J. High Energy Phys. 03 (2007) 016; arXiv:0901.4035; D. Nickel and M. Buballa, Phys. Rev. D 79, 054009 (2009); D. Nickel, arXiv:0902.1778; F. Karbstein and M. Thies, Phys. Rev. D 75, 025003 (2007); K. Takayama, M. Oka, *Nucl. Phys. A* **551** (1993), 637-656; T. Brauner and N. Yamamoto, *JHEP* **1704**, 132 (2017); X. G. Huang, K. Nishimura and N. Yamamoto, *JHEP* **1802**, 069 (2018); M. Buballa, S. Carignano, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* 81 (2015) 39; K. Splittorff, D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 016003 (2001).
- [112] S. L. Cacciatori, F. Canfora, M. Lagos, F. Muscolino and A. Vera, *JHEP* **12** (2021), 150.
- [113] S. L. Cacciatori, F. Canfora, M. Lagos, F. Muscolino and A. Vera, *Nucl. Phys. B* **976** (2022), 115693.
- [114] A. Ramamurti, E. Shuryak and I. Zahed, “Are there monopoles in the quark-gluon plasma?,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no.11, 114028 (2018).
- [115] N. Dorey, J. High Energy Phys. 04 (2001) 008.
- [116] N. Dorey, A. Parnachev, *JHEP* 08 (2001) 059.
- [117] Y. Liu, E. Shuryak, I. Zahed, *Phys.Rev.D* 98 (2018) 1, 014023.
- [118] G. H. Hardy and S. Ramanujan, “Asymptotic formulae in combinatory analysis,” *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* **2** (1918), no. 1, 75-115.
- [119] M. Caselle, A. Nada and M. Panero, “Hagedorn spectrum and thermodynamics of SU(2) and SU(3) Yang-Mills theories,” *JHEP* **07**, 143 (2015) [erratum: *JHEP* **11**, 016 (2017)].
- [120] M. I. Gorenstein and S. N. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 5206-5212 (1995).
- [121] F. G. Gardim and F. M. Steffens, *Nucl. Phys. A* **825**, 222-244 (2009).
- [122] J. P. Blaizot, E. Iancu and A. Rebhan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 2906-2909 (1999).
- [123] J. P. Blaizot, E. Iancu and A. Rebhan, doi:10.1142/9789812795533\_0002 [arXiv:hep-ph/0303185 [hep-ph]].
- [124] M. Caselle, A. Nada and M. Panero, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no.5, 054513 (2018).
- [125] L. Giusti and M. Pepe, *Phys. Lett. B* **769**, 385-390 (2017).
- [126] S. Borsanyi, G. Endrodi, Z. Fodor, S. D. Katz and K. K. Szabo, *JHEP* **07**, 056 (2012).
- [127] D. Bernard, B. Doyon, *J.Stat.Mech.* 1606 (2016) 6, 064005.