

Birdtracks of Exotic $SU(N)$ Color Structures

Thorsten Ohl 

*University of Würzburg, Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Emil-Hilb-Weg 22,
97074 Würzburg, Germany*

E-mail: ohl@physik.uni-wuerzburg.de

ABSTRACT: I introduce a systematic procedure for constructing complete and independent sets of color structures for interactions of fields transforming under exotic representations of $SU(N)$, in particular the $SU(3)$ gauge group of QCD. It uncovers errors in previous results, starting with interactions of four fields including a single sextet.

KEYWORDS: Physics Beyond the Standard Model, Effective Field Theory, Group Theory

ARXIV EPRINT: [2403.04685](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.04685)

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Colorflows	4
2.1	A Note on Notation	5
2.2	Exotic Birdtracks	5
2.3	An Example Involving Sextets and Octets	8
3	Relations Among Colorflows	10
3.1	U(1)-Ghosts	10
3.2	Spurious Colorflows	11
3.3	Redundant ϵ -Tensors	11
4	Enumerating Colorflows	12
4.1	Selection Rules	12
4.2	Combinatorics	12
4.3	Tracelessness	13
4.4	Finding Dependent Tensors	14
4.4.1	Exceptional Values of N	15
5	Revisiting the Example	15
5.1	SU(N)	16
5.2	U(N)	16
5.3	$N \rightarrow \infty$	17
6	A Catalogue of Exotic Birdtracks of SU(N)	18
6.1	Three Fields	18
6.2	Four Fields	21
6.3	Five and More Fields	25
7	Conclusions	26
A	Implementation and Interoperation	27
A.1	TANGARA	27
A.2	UFO	28

1 Introduction

Physics Beyond the Standard Model (BSM) can be searched for in nonrenormalizable interactions of Standard Model (SM) particles and in the effects of new elementary particles that are not part of the SM. Due to the current absence of evidence for the latter, most efforts have concentrated on the former, in particular on constraining the parameter space of the dimension six and higher operators in the SM Effective Field Theory (SMEFT). Nevertheless, UV complete embeddings of these nonrenormalizable interactions typically need to introduce new heavy particles. These particles can transform under more complicated irreducible representations (irreps) of the color group $SU(3)$ than the singlet, triplet and octet irreps that exhaust the repertoire of the SM.

The construction of a basis for the higher dimensional operators in an EFT involves the construction of a basis for the invariant tensors of the symmetry groups. In the case of flavor $SU(3)$, this problem has been studied already a long time ago. Classic references for invariant tensors in products of triplet and octet representations are [1–3]. Most of these results can be generalized to products of the fundamental and adjoint representations of $SU(N)$ [3, 4]. The major technical difficulty for the construction of such bases lies in the fact that these tensor algebras are not freely generated. For example, $[T^a]^i_j$ and f^{abc} are invariant tensors in the products $\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}}$ and $\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8}$, respectively, but the sum

$$[T^a]^i_j [T^b]^j_k - [T^b]^i_j [T^a]^j_k - if^{abc} [T^c]^i_k \quad (1.1)$$

of their products obviously vanishes in $\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}}$. There are many more non-trivial relations among products of invariant tensors [1–4] and a naive approach risks producing overcomplete sets.

If we want to include new exotic fields that transform under irreps other than the fundamental and adjoint, these classic results are not sufficient, of course. The case of $SU(3)$ -sextets has been studied using methods inspired by the investigations of dualities in supersymmetric field theories [5]

The next step towards a complete classification of effective interactions involving $SU(3)$ exotica has been done in [6, 7]. Their approach is based on a recursive decomposition of tensor products into irreps and a selection of $SU(3)$ -singlets in the final product. It corresponds to integrating out heavy fields in different irreps of $SU(3)$ in a top-down construction of effective Lagrangians. The tensors found by this procedure are guaranteed to be invariant, but there is a priori no guarantee that these tensors are independent and that their set is complete, as required for a systematic bottom-up exploration of BSM physics, in particular if the renormalization of these interactions is taken into account (see, e.g., [8]).

This problem appears first in four-fold tensor products, which can be decomposed in different ways, similar to s -, t - and u -channel exchanges in a top-down construction. For example, using the Clebsch-Gordan series

$$\mathbf{8} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} = \mathbf{3} \oplus \bar{\mathbf{6}} \oplus \mathbf{15} \oplus \mathbf{24} \quad (1.2a)$$

$$\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} = \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{8}_A \oplus \mathbf{8}_S \oplus \mathbf{10} \oplus \bar{\mathbf{10}} \oplus \mathbf{27} \quad (1.2b)$$

$$\mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} = \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{8} \oplus \mathbf{27}, \quad (1.2c)$$

we see that four of the invariant tensors in $\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{6}}$ can be written as contractions of tensors from $\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{6}$ and $\mathbf{8} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{6}}$ while only three can be written as contractions of tensors from $\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8}$ and $\mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{6}}$.

In general, there is no guarantee that there exists a decomposition that by itself produces a complete set. In order to arrive at a complete set, one therefore has to take the union over all possible decompositions. But while the independence of the tensors is guaranteed by construction for each decomposition alone, their union will, in general, contain dependent contributions. This need to consider all possible decompositions and to subsequently construct a basis in the union makes the approach of [6] cumbersome for the bottom-up construction of effective Lagrangians, even if these decompositions can be performed algorithmically (see, e.g., [9]).

A systematic approach is suggested by the fact that all irreps of $SU(N)$ can be constructed as subspaces of the tensor product of a suitable number of fundamental and conjugated fundamental representations \mathbf{N} and $\overline{\mathbf{N}}$ by enforcing permutation symmetries in the factors. Obviously, one can represent an arbitrary tensor product of irreps in the same way. It has been known for a long time that every invariant tensor in a product of fundamental and conjugated fundamental representations can be expressed as a product of Kronecker symbols δ^i_j and, in the case of unimodular transformations, Levi-Civita symbols $\epsilon^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}$ or $\bar{\epsilon}_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_N}$ [10–12]. Comprehensive proofs of this fact for $GL(N)$, $SL(N)$ and $SO(N)$ can be found in [12]. The proof for $GL(N)$ is elementary and the one for $SL(N)$ is not much more complicated. However, in the case of proper subgroups of $GL(N)$ and $SL(N)$, the conditions on invariant tensors are weaker and care must be taken not to overlook additional solutions. The constraints on group elements from $SO(N)$ have been implemented in [12] by Lagrange multipliers. Fortunately, this proof translates directly to the cases of $U(N)$ and $SU(N)$ by complex conjugating the matrix elements of the adjoint transformations.

Unfortunately, this result does not guarantee that the tensors constructed in this way are independent. Indeed, as described in section 3.3, tensors containing $\epsilon^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}$ and $\bar{\epsilon}_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_N}$ simultaneously can be expressed as a sum of products of Kronecker symbols. Furthermore, there are many less obvious dependencies among tensors. This is complicated by the fact that some of them are only valid for N smaller than some threshold. Examples for this will be presented in sections 3.2 and 5.

If we want to systematically construct complete and independent sets of invariant tensors, we require a computational test for the linear independence of tensors. For this purpose, I define the natural sesquilinear form

$$\mu_N(A, B) = \sum_{\substack{i_1 \dots \\ j_1 \dots}} \overline{A_{j_1 \dots}^{i_1 \dots}} B_{i_1 \dots}^{j_1 \dots} = \overline{\mu_N(B, A)} \quad (1.3)$$

on the vector space of $SU(N)$ tensors of a given rank. Generalizing an observation for products of adjoint representations of $SU(N)$ [2], all dependencies among tensors can then be found by computing the eigenvectors of this sesquilinear form with vanishing eigenvalue, as explained in section 4.4. It turns out that the number of vanishing eigenvalues can depend on N .

In this paper, I propose a general algorithm for constructing bases of invariant tensors describing interactions involving particles transforming under higher dimensional irreps of $SU(N)$. This algorithm has been implemented in the computer program TANGARA.¹ using the O’CAML [13] birdtrack libraries developed for O’MEGA [14, 15].

Section 2 briefly introduces the colorflow formalism in order to establish the notation and presents a non-trivial example that motivated the investigation presented here. Section 3 continues with a discussion of the peculiarities of $SU(N)$ colorflows that follow from the tracelessness of the generators and the invariance of Levi-Civita symbols.

Section 4 presents the novel algorithm for identifying complete and independent sets of invariant tensors. I apply it in section 5 to answer the questions posed by the example studied in section 2.3. Section 6 presents a revised catalogue for the simplest cases in detail and discusses in which cases it confirms the results of [6] and in which cases these results must be amended.

Appendix A briefly describes the program TANGARA, which has been used to obtain the results presented here. I will also discuss how to make the results available to Monte Carlo event generators and other tools for elementary particle physics.

2 Colorflows

We are faced with the task of efficiently computing the matrix elements of the inner product μ_N defined in (1.3). Fortunately, these are nothing but the “color factors” familiar from squared QCD scattering amplitudes. An efficient algorithm for their computation that works directly in the product of fundamental and conjugated fundamental representations has been advocated in [16]: normalize the generators as

$$\text{tr}(T^a T^b) = \delta^{ab} \tag{2.1}$$

and replace all contractions of indices in the adjoint representation by

$$[T^a]^i_j [T^a]^k_l = \delta^i_l \delta^k_j \tag{2.2a}$$

for $U(N)$ and

$$[T^a]^i_j [T^a]^k_l = \delta^i_l \delta^k_j - \frac{1}{N} \delta^i_j \delta^k_l \tag{2.2b}$$

for $SU(N)$. Then it only remains to keep track of the factors of $1/N$ and count the number of closed chains of Kronecker symbols

$$\delta^{i_1}_{i_2} \delta^{i_2}_{i_3} \dots \delta^{i_n}_{i_1} = N, \tag{2.3}$$

each contributing a factor of N to the color factor. Representating the Kronecker symbols by arrows leads to the colorflow representation where each closed loop corresponds to one factor of N in the color factor.

¹Note on the name: *Tangara* is a genus of spectacularly colored birds in the family *Thraupidae* found in South America.

This description has subsequently been developed into the comprehensive “birdtracks” approach to Lie algebras and their representations [17]. It has also been used to construct invariant tensors as building blocks for the color part of scattering amplitudes of SU(3)-triplets and octets [18–21], including implementations in computer programs [22, 23].

A shortcoming of using the rule (2.2) in the case of SU(N) is that (2.2b) does not correspond to a Feynman rule, because it must be applied to two vertices simultaneously. While this is not a problem for the evaluation of (1.3) or the color sums for complete Feynman diagrams [24], it can not be used unchanged to construct effective Lagrangians involving fields transforming according to the adjoint representation.

For the same reason, the rule (2.2b) can also not be used in the recursive algorithms that are the state of the art in perturbative calculations (see [15] and references cited therein). This obstacle has been overcome in [25], where the second term in (2.2b) is provided by a fictitious particle, called a U(1)-ghost (see section 3.1), whose sole purpose is to subtract the traces of the generators. The resulting colorflow Feynman rules can automatically be derived from traditional Feynman rules as specified, e.g., in UFO [26, 27]. This has been implemented in the recursive matrix element generator O’MEGA [14, 15] that is used in the general purpose Monte Carlo event generator WHIZARD [28].

In these colorflow Feynman rules, the couplings of the U(1)-ghost are fixed by a Ward identity to be the same as the couplings to the SU(N)-gluons [25]. Therefore, they are not a new source of independent tensors and the formalism introduced in [25] can be used in arbitrary orders of perturbation theory to construct complete and independent sets of interactions in color space.

2.1 A Note on Notation

In the calculations, I will keep $N \geq 2$ general as long as possible. This allows us to test the procedure by checking peculiarities of SU(2) and to confirm simplifications in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. Results involving the invariance of the tensors ϵ^{ijk} and $\bar{\epsilon}_{ijk}$ apply only to SU(3), of course. Nevertheless, in applications I will only be interested in SU(3) and I shall engage in *abus de langage* throughout this paper when denoting the irreps of SU(N) and U(N). Instead of spelling out the Young tableaux, I will often use the familiar dimensions of the SU(3)-irreps, as in formula (2.4) below. With the exception of the **15** and **15'**, this is unambiguous for all small representations and allows me to take advantage of an abbreviated notation for which much intuition as available among practitioners.

2.2 Exotic Birdtracks

In the colorflow representation, states in the reducible product of n fundamental representations are described by n parallel lines with arrows pointing into the diagram. The conjugated representation has the direction of the arrows reversed. As usual, the reducible representations are decomposed into irreps by imposing the permutation symmetries specified by the standard Young tableaux consisting of n boxes [17]. For a given Young tableau, one first antisymmetrizes the lines in each column and subsequently symmetrizes the lines

in each row. The normalizations are chosen such that the combined (anti)symmetrizations form a projection.

Instead of repeating the comprehensive account given in section 9.5 of [17] and in [18–20], I only list the simplest building blocks² in order to introduce the notation

$$\mathbf{3} \quad \boxed{j_1} \quad j_1 \longrightarrow i_1 \quad (2.4a)$$

$$\mathbf{6} \quad \boxed{j_1 j_2} \quad \begin{array}{c} j_1 \\ j_2 \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} i_1 \\ i_2 \end{array} \quad (2.4b)$$

$$\mathbf{8} \quad \begin{array}{c} \boxed{j_2 j_1} \\ \boxed{j_3} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} j_1 \\ j_2 \\ j_3 \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} i_1 \\ i_2 \\ i_3 \end{array} \quad (2.4c)$$

$$\mathbf{10} \quad \boxed{j_1 j_2 j_3} \quad \begin{array}{c} j_1 \\ j_2 \\ j_3 \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} i_1 \\ i_2 \\ i_3 \end{array} \quad (2.4d)$$

$$\mathbf{15} \quad \begin{array}{c} \boxed{j_3 j_1 j_2} \\ \boxed{j_4} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} j_1 \\ j_2 \\ j_3 \\ j_4 \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} i_1 \\ i_2 \\ i_3 \\ i_4 \end{array} \quad (2.4e)$$

$$\mathbf{15}' \quad \boxed{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4} \quad \begin{array}{c} j_1 \\ j_2 \\ j_3 \\ j_4 \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} i_1 \\ i_2 \\ i_3 \\ i_4 \end{array} \quad (2.4f)$$

$$\mathbf{21} \quad \boxed{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4 j_5} \quad \begin{array}{c} j_1 \\ j_2 \\ j_3 \\ j_4 \\ j_5 \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} i_1 \\ i_2 \\ i_3 \\ i_4 \\ i_5 \end{array} \quad (2.4g)$$

$$\mathbf{24} \quad \begin{array}{c} \boxed{j_4 j_1 j_2 j_3} \\ \boxed{j_5} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} j_1 \\ j_2 \\ j_3 \\ j_4 \\ j_5 \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} i_1 \\ i_2 \\ i_3 \\ i_4 \\ i_5 \end{array} \quad (2.4h)$$

$$\mathbf{27} \quad \begin{array}{c} \boxed{j_2 j_5 j_3 j_4} \\ \boxed{j_1 j_6} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} j_1 \\ j_2 \\ j_3 \\ j_4 \\ j_5 \\ j_6 \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} i_1 \\ i_2 \\ i_3 \\ i_4 \\ i_5 \\ i_6 \end{array} \quad (2.4i)$$

where the white boxes denote symmetrization and the black boxes antisymmetrization

$$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{1}{n!} \cdot \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} \sigma(1) \\ \sigma(2) \\ \vdots \\ \sigma(n) \end{array} \quad (2.5a)$$

²Note that (2.4) depicts the Young projectors described in [17], which are readily available in the birdtracks library of O'MEGA [14, 15]. We can replace these projectors by the hermitian Young projectors advocated in [19, 29], without modifying the other parts of TANGARA. In the general case, this will change some matrix elements of the inner product μ_N (1.3), but the number of vanishing eigenvalues will remain the same. There will of course be no changes at all for totally symmetric or antisymmetric representations.

$$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{(-)^{\epsilon(\sigma)}}{n!} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \sigma(1) \\ \sigma(2) \\ \vdots \\ \sigma(n) \end{array} \quad (2.5b)$$

and the two parts of the symmetrizer for i_1 and i_6 in (2.4i) are to be understood as glued together at the open boundary.

Denoting the combination of all (anti) symmetrizations and the normalization factor corresponding to a Young tableau by a grey box, the projection property can be verified by connecting the arrows

$$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array}. \quad (2.6)$$

We can make use of the fact

$$N - 1 \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \square \\ \vdots \\ \square \end{array} \right\} \cong \square \quad (2.7)$$

in $SU(N)$ to minimize the number of lines required for the adjoint representation. This makes the reality of the adjoint representation explicit and we only need two lines for describing states in the adjoint representation of $U(N)$

$$\delta^{ab} = a \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} b. \quad (2.8)$$

When computing scattering amplitudes for a $SU(N)$ gauge theory, we use a $U(1)$ -ghost [25] to subtract the trace and make the generators traceless, just as in (2.2b)

$$a \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} b - \frac{1}{N} \cdot a \cdots \cdots b. \quad (2.9)$$

By unitarity, these ghosts must appear both in internal contractions of adjoint indices and in external states when computing color sums.

The only invariant tensors in the tensor product of a representation, its conjugate and the adjoint representation are the generators $[T^a]^{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_n}_{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_n}$. It has been shown in [25] that they are expressed in the case of $SU(N)$ as

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \begin{array}{c} a \\ \vdots \\ i \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ i \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} = n \cdot \begin{array}{c} a \\ \vdots \\ i \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ i \\ \vdots \\ n \end{array}. \quad (2.10)$$

The coupling to the $U(1)$ -ghost realizes the tracelessness condition as in (2.2b). Note that, in the special cases of totally symmetric or antisymmetric states, the sum over i is equivalent to diverting only a single line to the adjoint index and multiplying the result by n , but this shortcut is invalid for mixed symmetries.

2. connect one line to one $\mathbf{8}$ and one to the other $\mathbf{8}$

$$(2.17)$$

producing the tensor³

$$[Y^{ab}]^s_t = [\overline{K}_{\mathbf{6}}^s]_{ij} [T^a]^i_k [T^b]^j_l [K_{\mathbf{6}t}]^{kl} \quad (2.18)$$

which is symmetric in the exchange $a \leftrightarrow b$ since the tensors $[\overline{K}_{\mathbf{6}}^s]_{ij}$ and $[K_{\mathbf{6}t}]^{kl}$ are symmetric in both index pairs (i, j) and (k, l) .

3. connect one line to the $\overline{\mathbf{6}}$ and the other to one of the $\mathbf{8}$ s

$$(2.19)$$

producing the tensor

$$[Z^{ab}]^s_t = [T_{\mathbf{6}}^a]^s_u [T_{\mathbf{6}}^b]^u_t - 2[Y^{ab}]^s_t \quad (2.20)$$

from which we can form two combinations,⁴ symmetric and antisymmetric in the exchange $a \leftrightarrow b$ after symmetrizing in the $\mathbf{6}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{6}}$ indices. Note that the line connecting the two $\mathbf{8}$ s is produced by the symmetrization between the factors in the products $T_{\mathbf{6}}^a T_{\mathbf{6}}^b$.

All other connections are obtained from even permutations inside the $\mathbf{6}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{6}}$ and from even or odd permutations of the two $\mathbf{8}$ s.

Thus, before adding the U(1)-ghosts, there is a single U(N) colorflow $Z_{\mathbf{A}}^{ab} = Z^{ab} - Z^{ba}$ that is antisymmetric in the two $\mathbf{8}$ s and three colorflows X^{ab} , Y^{ab} and $Z_{\mathbf{S}}^{ab} = Z^{ab} + Z^{ba}$ that are symmetric in the two $\mathbf{8}$ s. In section 5.1, we will see that going from U(N) to SU(N) by adding the required U(1)-ghosts cancels one linear combination of the symmetric flows in the special case of SU(2), but that the three symmetric flows remain independent for SU(N) with $N \geq 3$.

³In the notation of [6]

$$H^{n\ ab} = [T^a]^i_k [T^b]^j_l, \quad F^{n\ s\ t} = [\overline{K}_{\mathbf{6}}^s]_{kl} [K_{\mathbf{6}t}]^{ij},$$

where n combines the indices i, j, k, l , as in $\mathbf{27} \subset \overline{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3}$.

⁴Here [6] lists only the antisymmetric commutator

$$[T_{\mathbf{6}}^a, T_{\mathbf{6}}^b] = if^{abc} T_{\mathbf{6}}^c,$$

using $f^{abc} = i[T_{\mathbf{8}}^a]^b_c$, and not the symmetric anticommutator.

3 Relations Among Colorflows

3.1 U(1)-Ghosts

A convenient graphical algorithm for enforcing the tracelessness of the $SU(N)$ generators T_a has been introduced in [25]. Instead of subtracting the traces of the generators T_a in the color factors, U(1)-ghosts are added to the interactions to cancel the contributions of the traces. The algorithm simply amounts to replacing *each* double line representing an external state in the adjoint representation of $U(N)$ by the differences of the double line and the insertion of a U(1)-ghost

$\text{blob} \rightarrow a \longrightarrow \text{blob} \rightarrow a - \text{blob} \rightarrow \bullet \cdots a$
(3.1)

where I have represented the ghost by a dotted line and the rest of the diagram by a grey blob. A priori, this will replace each colorflow containing n external double lines by 2^n colorflows, as in (3.3) below. Typically, some of these will cancel after antisymmetrization, but remain after symmetrization (see, e.g., (3.4) and (3.5), below).

As a non-trivial example which has already been discussed in [25] in the context of the $H \rightarrow ggg$ coupling, consider the colorflow

$V_{abc}^U = \text{blob} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} b \\ \nearrow \\ \searrow \\ a \end{matrix} \rightarrow c$
(3.2)

coupling three adjoint representations of $U(N)$. Applying the rule (3.1) to the three external states results in $2^3 = 8$ colorflows

$V_{abc}^{SU} = \text{blob} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} b \\ \nearrow \\ \searrow \\ a \end{matrix} \rightarrow c - \text{blob} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} b \\ \searrow \\ \nearrow \\ a \end{matrix} \rightarrow c - \text{cyclic} + \text{blob} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} b \\ \cdots \\ \searrow \\ a \end{matrix} \rightarrow c + \text{cyclic} - N \cdot \text{blob} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} b \\ \cdots \\ \nearrow \\ a \end{matrix} \rightarrow c$
(3.3)

where the cyclic permutations of (a, b, c) in the colorflows with one or two ghosts have not been drawn separately. The factor N in front on the last colorflow arises from the closed loop remaining after replacing the double line by the U(1)-ghost on all external states. The antisymmetric combination of the V_{abc}^{SU} corresponds to the structure constants of the $SU(N)$ Lie algebra

$if_{abc} = \text{tr}(T_a [T_b, T_c]_-) = V_{abc}^{SU} - V_{acb}^{SU} = \text{blob} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} b \\ \nearrow \\ \searrow \\ a \end{matrix} \rightarrow c - \text{blob} \rightarrow \begin{matrix} b \\ \searrow \\ \nearrow \\ a \end{matrix} \rightarrow c$
(3.4)

and all U(1)-ghosts cancel, because they are symmetric. In the symmetric combination, on the other hand, the U(1)-ghosts add up

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_{abc} = \text{tr} (T_a [T_b, T_c]_+) &= V_{abc}^{\text{SU}} + V_{acb}^{\text{SU}} = \begin{array}{c} b \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \quad \quad \quad c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ a \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} b \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \quad \quad \quad c \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ a \end{array} \\
 &- 2 \cdot \begin{array}{c} b \\ \curvearrowright \\ \quad \quad \quad \bullet \cdots c \\ \curvearrowleft \\ a \end{array} - \text{cyclic} + 2 \cdot \begin{array}{c} b \\ \cdots \bullet \\ \quad \quad \quad \curvearrowright \\ \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad c \\ \quad \quad \quad \curvearrowleft \\ a \end{array} + \text{cyclic} - 2N \cdot \begin{array}{c} b \\ \cdots \bullet \\ \quad \quad \quad \cdots \cdots c \\ \quad \quad \quad \cdots \cdots \\ a \end{array} . \quad (3.5)
 \end{aligned}$$

3.2 Spurious Colorflows

The approach described in the previous subsection is straightforward for the evaluation of color factors [25], but in the present application, special care must be taken to avoid counting spurious colorflows. Indeed, the expression (3.5) does not appear to be correct for the special case of SU(2), where $d_{abc} = 0$, as can be checked directly using the Pauli matrices

$$d_{ijk}^{\text{SU}(2)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} \text{tr} (\sigma_i [\sigma_j, \sigma_k]_+) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \text{tr} (\sigma_i) \delta_{jk} = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore, it appears that in the case of SU(2), the expression (3.5) does *not* represent an independent invariant tensor, but is a complicated way of writing 0 instead.

We can confirm this expectation by noticing that, up to permutations, V_{abc} is the only possible colorflow for three adjoint representations. Thus, the symmetric and antisymmetric combinations d_{abc} and f_{abc} form a complete set. We can use the expressions (3.4) and (3.5) to compute an inner product in the vector space spanned by d_{abc} and f_{abc} by computing color sums as in [25]

$$d_{abc}^{\text{SU}} d_{abc}^{\text{SU}} = \frac{2(N^2 - 1)(N^2 - 4)}{N} \quad (3.7a)$$

$$d_{abc}^{\text{SU}} f_{abc} = 0 \quad (3.7b)$$

$$f_{abc} f_{abc} = 2N(N^2 - 1). \quad (3.7c)$$

This result is consistent with $d_{ijk}^{\text{SU}(2)} = 0$ and $f_{ijk}^{\text{SU}(2)} = \sqrt{2} \epsilon^{ijk}$. Of course, the same result is obtained using the rule (2.2b) directly without the use of U(1)-ghosts.

Therefore, we must be aware of the fact that a naive application of the colorflow rules [25] for SU(N) might produce sums of colorflows that are, for special values of N , just a complicated way of writing 0 and don't enlarge the basis. In section 4.4, I will describe a general algorithm for finding such redundancies.

3.3 Redundant ϵ -Tensors

In the case of matching dimension $N = \delta_m^m$ and rank n of ϵ and $\bar{\epsilon}$, the tensor algebra of the δ_i^j , $\epsilon^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n}$ and $\bar{\epsilon}_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_n}$ is not freely generated. Indeed, introducing the *generalized Kronecker* δ symbol

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_n}^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n} &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} (-1)^{\varepsilon(\sigma)} \delta_{\sigma(j_1)}^{i_1} \delta_{\sigma(j_2)}^{i_2} \dots \delta_{\sigma(j_n)}^{i_n} \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} (-1)^{\varepsilon(\sigma)} \delta_{j_1}^{\sigma(i_1)} \delta_{j_2}^{\sigma(i_2)} \dots \delta_{j_n}^{\sigma(i_n)} = \det \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{j_1}^{i_1} & \delta_{j_2}^{i_1} & \dots & \delta_{j_n}^{i_1} \\ \delta_{j_1}^{i_2} & \delta_{j_2}^{i_2} & \dots & \delta_{j_n}^{i_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \delta_{j_1}^{i_n} & \delta_{j_2}^{i_n} & \dots & \delta_{j_n}^{i_n} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.8)
\end{aligned}$$

there is the relation $\forall n = N \in \mathbf{N}$ with $N \geq 2$:

$$\epsilon^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n} \bar{\epsilon}_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_n} = \delta_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_n}^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n}, \quad (3.9)$$

which follows from antisymmetry and the choice of normalization $\epsilon^{12 \dots n} = 1 = \bar{\epsilon}_{12 \dots n}$ alone. Contracting k indices in the relation (3.9), we find $\forall k, n, N \in \mathbf{N}$ with $0 \leq k \leq n = N \geq 2$:

$$\epsilon^{m_1 \dots m_k i_{k+1} \dots i_n} \bar{\epsilon}_{m_1 \dots m_k j_{k+1} \dots j_n} = k! \delta_{j_{k+1} j_{k+2} \dots j_n}^{i_{k+1} i_{k+2} \dots i_n}. \quad (3.10)$$

Because the left hand side of (3.9) is the most concise description of the $n!$ terms on the right hand side, it is tempting to keep it in the basis. On the other hand, replacing the left hand side immediately by the right hand side is the most symmetric evaluation rule possible and I will adopt it, including the rules (3.10) obtained by contracting pairs of indices.

4 Enumerating Colorflows

Having identified all the dependencies, I can now describe the algorithm for constructing a basis for the invariant tensors in products of irreps of $SU(N)$ and $U(N)$.

4.1 Selection Rules

Since all external states must be connected to the corresponding number of incoming or outgoing colorflow lines, not all products of irreps can contain invariant tensors. We start by counting the number of boxes in the Young diagrams corresponding to the representations of particles and those of antiparticles. These correspond to the overall number of incoming and outgoing lines, respectively. They must be equal for $U(N)$ and can only differ by νN with $\nu \in \mathbf{Z}$ for $SU(N)$. If $\nu < 0$, the tensor contains exactly $|\nu|$ factors of $\epsilon^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}$ and iff $\nu > 0$, there are ν factors of $\bar{\epsilon}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}$. According to the conventions described in section 3.3, $\epsilon^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}$ and $\bar{\epsilon}_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N}$ must not appear in the same tensor.

4.2 Combinatorics

Having established the number of ϵ s or $\bar{\epsilon}$ s required, we can proceed by drawing *all* arrows starting at particles or ϵ s and ending at antiparticles or $\bar{\epsilon}$ s. Since all lines starting at a particle or ending at an antiparticle obey symmetrization and antisymmetrization conditions given by the Young tableau describing the irrep, we can avoid double counting equivalent colorflows. For this, we proceed with the following algorithm:

1. create a list S of starting points of lines (adjoints, products of fundamental representations and ϵ s). Adjoints and fundamental representations are represented by an integer identifying the external state. Factors in products of fundamental representations are represented by this integer and a second integer identifying the factor. Similarly for ϵ , but we must treat all ϵ as indistinguishable below.
2. create a list E of endpoints of lines (adjoints, products of conjugate representations and $\bar{\epsilon}$ s)
3. compute all permutations of E
4. filter out colorflows with at least one line looping back to the same state
5. keep only one representative of the equivalence classes under permutations of factors belonging to the same external states:
 - (a) demand that endpoints belonging to the same external state appear only in an order forming a standard Young tableau for the Young diagram describing the state
 - (b) for the starting points belonging to the same external state demand that the endpoints they are connected to appear only the order just described
6. symmetrize and antisymmetrize in identical external states
7. apply the Young projection operators

Due to the subsequent filtering that I will describe in section 4.4, it is less important to avoid accidental double counting than it is to produce all colorflows. In particular, step 5 could be skipped without affecting the final result. It just speeds up the subsequent search for independent tensors, because it keeps the matrices used in section 4.4 substantially smaller. This implies that the soundness of optimizations in step 5 can be checked for moderately sized irreps by verifying that the constructed sets of independent invariant tensors are the same with and without performing this step.

4.3 Tracelessness

The tracelessness of the $SU(N)$ generators is then enforced either by

- adding $U(1)$ ghosts to the colorflows as described in section 3.1 or by
- using the prescription (2.2b) in the evaluation of the inner product μ_N .

Both approaches produce exactly the same result.

4.4 Finding Dependent Tensors

Since all terms in the sum for $\mu_N(A, A)$ are positive by construction (1.3), the sesquilinear form μ_N induces an inner product and a norm on the vector space \mathcal{V} of invariant tensors of a given rank

$$\|A\|_N = \sqrt{\mu_N(A, A)} \geq 0 \quad (4.1a)$$

$$\|A\|_N = 0 \iff A = 0 \quad (4.1b)$$

and it is not degenerate

$$\forall B \in \mathcal{V} : \mu_N(B, A) = 0 \iff A = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

The form μ_N can be employed to generalize a calculation [2] for small products of adjoint representations of $SU(3)$: given a complete, but not necessarily linearly independent, set of $n \geq \dim(\mathcal{V})$ tensors

$$\mathcal{T} = \{T^i\}_{i=1, \dots, n} \subseteq \mathcal{V}, \quad (4.3)$$

we can expand every tensor $A \in \mathcal{V}$ as

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i T^i, \quad (4.4)$$

although this expansion will not be unique, in general. The inner product

$$\mu_N(A, B) = \langle a, M(N, \mathcal{T})b \rangle \quad (4.5)$$

can then be expressed by the natural sesquilinear form

$$\langle a, b \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{a}_i b_i \quad (4.6)$$

on \mathbf{C}^n and the self-adjoint matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$

$$M^{ij}(N, \mathcal{T}) = \mu_N(T^i, T^j) = \overline{M^{ji}(N, \mathcal{T})} \quad (4.7)$$

which depends on the number of colors N and the set \mathcal{T} . The condition (4.2) now reads

$$\forall i : \sum_{j=1}^n M^{ij}(N, \mathcal{T}) a_j = 0 \iff A = 0 \quad (4.8)$$

and we find that the linear relations among elements of \mathcal{T} are just the eigenvectors of the matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ corresponding to vanishing eigenvalues. Conversely, the number of independent invariant tensors is given by the rank r_N of the matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$. The rank r_N is independent of the set \mathcal{T} of invariant tensors used to compute $M(N, \mathcal{T})$, as long as it is complete. The orthogonal projector $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{T})$ on the subspace of \mathbf{C}^n spanned by the eigenvectors corresponding to positive eigenvalues depends on \mathcal{T} , but the orthogonal projector P_N on the corresponding subspace of \mathcal{V} does not.

Since $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ is a finite and self-adjoint $n \times n$ -matrix, it is always possible to compute r_N and P_N for any chosen value of N . This task is simplified by the observation that $\mu_N(A, B) = 0$, if A and B have different symmetries under permutations of the indices. Thus the matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ assumes a block diagonal form, if the elements of \mathcal{T} are chosen to be symmetric or antisymmetric under permutations of the indices. In the colorflow basis, $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ will also be real symmetric, simplifying the calculation further. There is the option to construct a basis of invariant tensors that are mutually orthogonal with respect to μ_N . Unfortunately, except for the simplest cases, the real eigenvalues and eigenvectors can only be computed after fixing a value for N . The resulting real numbers are then not very illuminating. Therefore, one should rather use P_N only to eliminate dependent tensors and to choose a linearly independent set $\{T^i\}_{i=1, \dots, r_N}$ that is computationally convenient, but not necessarily orthonormal with respect to μ_N .

4.4.1 Exceptional Values of N

The rule (2.2) guarantees that all matrix elements $M^{ij}(N, \mathcal{T})$ are polynomials in N . Thus the characteristic polynomial has the form

$$\det(M(N, \mathcal{T}) - \lambda \mathbf{1}) = \sum_{i=0}^d p_i(N) \lambda^i = \sum_{i=c_N+1}^d p_i(N) \lambda^i \quad (4.9)$$

with polynomials $\{p_i\}_{i=0, \dots, d}$ in N as coefficients. The corank c_N of the matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$, i.e. the number of eigenvectors with vanishing eigenvalue, is the multiplicity of the root of the characteristic polynomial at $\lambda = 0$. For a given N , this is the number of consecutive $p_i(N)$ starting from $p_0(N)$ that vanish simultaneously

$$c_N = \max_i \{\forall j \leq i : p_j(N) = 0\} . \quad (4.10)$$

As a polynomial in N , p_i either vanishes for all N or has at most $\deg(p_i)$ positive real roots, where $\deg(p)$ denotes the degree of p . Thus there can be at most a finite number of exceptional values of N , where the rank and corank of $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ are not constant and additional relations among invariant tensors appear. In particular

$$\exists r_\infty, \hat{N} : \forall N > \hat{N} : r_N = r_\infty , \quad (4.11)$$

i.e. there is a maximum N above which the rank r_N no longer changes.

5 Revisiting the Example

We can now return to the example of the four-fold product $\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{6}}$ from section 2.3 and compute the matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ for the colorflows

$$\mathcal{T} = \{X, Y, Z_S, Z_A\} . \quad (5.1)$$

5.1 SU(N)

We compute for the colorflows $\mathcal{T}_S = \{X, Y, Z_S\}$ that are symmetric in the two adjoint factors

$$\mu_N(X, X) = \frac{1}{2}N^2(N+1)C_F \quad (5.2a)$$

$$\mu_N(Y, Y) = \frac{1}{4}(N^3 + 2N^2 - 2)C_F \quad (5.2b)$$

$$\mu_N(Z_S, Z_S) = \frac{1}{2}(N^3 + 2N^2 - 4)C_F \quad (5.2c)$$

$$\mu_N(X, Y) = \mu_N(Y, X) = \frac{1}{2}NC_F \quad (5.2d)$$

$$\mu_N(X, Z_S) = \mu_N(Z_S, X) = N(N+1)C_F \quad (5.2e)$$

$$\mu_N(Y, Z_S) = \mu_N(Z_S, Y) = \frac{1}{2}(N^2 - 2)C_F \quad (5.2f)$$

and for the antisymmetric colorflow $\mathcal{T}_A = \{Z_A\}$

$$\mu_N(Z_A, Z_A) = \frac{1}{2}N^2(N+2)C_F, \quad (5.3)$$

where the quadratic Casimir operator in the fundamental representation appears as a common factor. It takes the value

$$C_2(F) = C_F = \frac{N^2 - 1}{N} \quad (5.4)$$

in the normalization (2.1).

All products of the symmetric and antisymmetric colorflows vanish, of course. The eigenvalues of the real symmetric matrix

$$M(N, \mathcal{T}_S) = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_N(X, X) & \mu_N(X, Y) & \mu_N(X, Z_S) \\ \mu_N(Y, X) & \mu_N(Y, Y) & \mu_N(Y, Z_S) \\ \mu_N(Z_S, X) & \mu_N(Z_S, Y) & \mu_N(Z_S, Z_S) \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.5)$$

can be computed numerically for arbitrary values of N . As illustrated in figure 1, they are all positive for $N > 2$, but one eigenvalue vanishes for SU(2). It corresponds to the relation

$$X = Z_S. \quad (5.6)$$

Thus we have found an invariant tensor that vanishes for SU(2), but is independent for SU(N) with $N \geq 3$, similarly to the d_{ijk}^{SU} discussed in section 3.2.

5.2 U(N)

By construction, only positive coefficients can appear in the results for U(N). Indeed, we compute

$$\mu_N(X, X) = \frac{1}{4}N^2C \quad (5.7a)$$




Figure 1. Eigenvalues of the matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ in (5.5) for $SU(N)$ as a function of N , divided by the asymptotic scaling N^4 .

$$\mu_N(Y, Y) = \frac{1}{2}N(N+1)C \quad (5.7b)$$

$$\mu_N(Z_S, Z_S) = \frac{1}{2}(N^2 + N + 2)C \quad (5.7c)$$

$$\mu_N(X, Y) = \mu_N(Y, X) = \frac{1}{2}C \quad (5.7d)$$

$$\mu_N(X, Z_S) = \mu_N(Z_S, X) = NC \quad (5.7e)$$

$$\mu_N(Y, Z_S) = \mu_N(Z_S, Y) = \frac{1}{2}(N+1)C, \quad (5.7f)$$

where the common factor is now $C = N(N+1)$, and

$$\mu_N(Z_A, Z_A) = \frac{1}{2}N^2(N+2)C_F \quad (5.8)$$

for \mathcal{T}_S and \mathcal{T}_A respectively. It is not surprising that the result for $\mu_N(Z_A, Z_A)$ is the same for $U(N)$ and $SU(N)$, because the $U(N)$ -ghosts cancel in the antisymmetric case, but not in the symmetric case. As illustrated in figure 2, all eigenvalues are positive for $N \geq 2$, but only one non-vanishing eigenvalue survives in the abelian limit $U(1)$. It can be written

$$X + Y + 2Z_S \quad (5.9)$$

and the orthogonal combinations vanish.

5.3 $N \rightarrow \infty$

The coefficients of the leading powers of N agree for $U(N)$ and $SU(N)$. This was to be expected, because the difference in (2.2) vanishes in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$.




Figure 2. Eigenvalues of the matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ in (5.5) for $U(N)$ as a function of N , divided by the asymptotic scaling N^4 .

It is easy to see that, unless two colorflows A and B are related by a permutation symmetry, their inner product $\mu_N(A, B)$ contains fewer closed chains (2.3) than $\mu_N(A, A)$ or $\mu_N(B, B)$. Therefore the off-diagonal elements of the matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ will scale with a smaller power of N for $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ will asymptotically become diagonal. This is indeed the case

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{M(N, \mathcal{T})}{N^4} \right) = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.10)$$

and the two larger eigenvalues will approach $N^4/2$, while the smaller will approach $N^4/4$. In the case of the two smaller eigenvalues, the asymptotic behaviour is already reached for small values of N , as illustrated in figures 1 and 2. This asymptotic behaviour is compatible with the observations made in section 4.4.1, of course.

6 A Catalogue of Exotic Birdtracks of $SU(N)$

The method described in section 4 can be used to prepare a catalogue of bases of invariant tensors. In this section, I compare the results with the catalogue presented in [6].

6.1 Three Fields

Table 1 lists the results for the three-fold products presented in table I of [6]. They confirm the latter with two exceptions:

	n_ϵ	n_\uparrow	r_3	remarks
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{6}}$	0	2	1	CG: $\mathbf{6} \subset \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3}$
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	0	2	1	$[T^a]^i_j$
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	0	3	1	$[T^a]^s_u$
$\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	0	3	2	f_{abc}, d_{abc} (but $r_2 = 1$)
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{10}}$	0	3	1	CG: $\mathbf{10} \subset \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6}$
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{15}}$	0	4	2	CG: $\mathbf{15} \subset \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6}$ (6.1)
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{15}'}$	0	4	1	CG: $\mathbf{15}' \subset \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6}$ (6.2)
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3}$	1	0	1	totally antisymmetric
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	1	1	1	(6.3)
$\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{10}$	1	2	1	antisymmetric (6.4)
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{15}}$	1	2	1	(6.5a)
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{15}$	1	2	1	(6.6)
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6}$	2	0	1	totally symmetric
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{15}$	2	1	1	(6.7)
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{27}$	2	2	1	(6.8)
$\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{27}$	2	2	1	(6.9)

Table 1. Invariant tensors in three-fold products of irreps of SU(3), ordered in increasing numbers of epsilons n_ϵ , arrows n_\uparrow and rank r_3 , the number of independent colorflows for $N = 3$. This extends table I of [6].

1. $\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{15}}$: due to the mixed symmetry of the $\mathbf{15}$, there is a second invariant tensor that is symmetric⁵ in the two factors $\mathbf{6}$

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{6} \\ \mathbf{6} \end{array} \rightarrow \mathbf{15} \pm \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{6} \\ \mathbf{6} \end{array} \rightarrow \mathbf{15} \quad (6.1)$$

the method described in section 4.4 to confirms that $r_N = 2$ and that the symmetric and antisymmetric combinations do not vanish for any number of colors $N \geq 2$, because $\mu_N = N^2(N+2)C_F/4$ for both.

2. $\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{15}'}$: the authors of [6] did not include the single invariant tensor

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{6} \\ \mathbf{6} \end{array} \rightarrow \mathbf{15}' \quad (6.2)$$

⁵The discarding of a symmetric contribution probably originates in the formula “ $\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} = \overline{\mathbf{6}}_S \oplus \mathbf{15}_A \oplus \mathbf{15}'_S$ ” in equation (1) of [6], taken from table 24 of [30]. It appears to suggest that the $\mathbf{15}$ in this decomposition is totally antisymmetric. However, the Young diagrams

$$\square \otimes \square = \square \oplus \square \oplus \square$$

demonstrate that this is not the case.

in their catalogue, maybe because it is just a trivial symmetric Clebsch-Gordan coefficient.

To further illustrate the colorflow formalism, I also show the remaining non obvious colorflows from table 1 involving one or two ϵ s. Some results will be used in section 6.2.

- $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{8}$: there is only one invariant tensor

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{8} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathbf{3} \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \mathbf{6} \\ \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ \bar{\epsilon} \end{array}, \quad (6.3)$$

because the antisymmetric ϵ must not be connected twice to the symmetric $\mathbf{6}$. This is the colorflow representation of the formula (A15) of [6].

- $\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{10}$: the only invariant tensor is antisymmetric in the two factors $\mathbf{8}$ due to the $\bar{\epsilon}$

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{8} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathbf{10} \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \bar{\epsilon} \\ \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ \mathbf{8} \end{array}. \quad (6.4)$$

- $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{15}}$: it is easier to see that there is indeed only one inequivalent colorflow by looking at the conjugate $\overline{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{15}$ instead: there must be exactly one ϵ to saturate all lines and one of the lines entering this $\bar{\epsilon}$ must be connected to the only line of the $\mathbf{15}$ that is not symmetrized

$$\begin{array}{c} \overline{\mathbf{3}} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathbf{8} \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \mathbf{15} \\ \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ \bar{\epsilon} \end{array}. \quad (6.5a)$$

All other contributions are then uniquely determined by symmetry. With the opposite order of symmetrization and antisymmetrization in the original $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{15}}$


$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{3} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathbf{8} \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \overline{\mathbf{15}} \\ \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ \epsilon \end{array}. \quad (6.5b)$$

it is not immediately obvious that


$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{3} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathbf{8} \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \overline{\mathbf{15}} \\ \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ \epsilon \end{array}. \quad (6.5c)$$

is equivalent after applying the Young projector⁶ for the $\overline{15}$. However, the method described in section 4.4 confirms that $r_N = 1$ in both cases.

- $3 \otimes \overline{6} \otimes 15$: the single invariant tensor looks very similar to (6.5a)



- $6 \otimes 8 \otimes 15$: this needs two $\bar{\epsilon}$ and their lines must avoid the symmetrization of the 15 .



Note that all other ways of inserting the 8 can be obtained by exchanging the $\bar{\epsilon}$ s and the lines ending at them. Since the combinatorics is already not completely obvious, the method described in section 4.4 has been helpful for confirming the result $r_N = 1$.

- $6 \otimes \overline{6} \otimes 27$: here is again only one way to saturate all antisymmetric lines ending in the $\bar{\epsilon}$ s



with the symmetrizer of the pair of outer lines wrapping around, as in (2.4i). En passant we note that this graphical representation makes it is obvious that there can be no $3 \otimes \overline{3} \otimes 27$.

- $8 \otimes 8 \otimes 27$: the symmetry in the adjoint two factors is obvious



with the symmetrizer of the pair of outer lines wrapping around again.

6.2 Four Fields

Table 2 lists the results for the four-fold products presented in table II of [6]. In this case, a more substantial fraction is not confirmed by the new results:

⁶The hermitian Young projectors advocated in [18, 19] make both variants equally complicated.

	n_ϵ	n_\uparrow	r_3	remarks
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$	0	3	2	
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	0	3	2	(6.10)
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$	0	4	3	1 anti-, 2 symmetric
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	0	4	4	sections 2.3, 5.1
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{10}}$	0	3	1	CG: $\mathbf{10} \subset \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3}$
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{15}}$	0	4	2	CG: $\mathbf{15} \subset \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6}$
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$	1	1	1	(6.11)
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	1	1	2	
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$	1	2	1	(6.12)
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	1	2	2	1 anti-, 1 symmetric
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	1	2	3	(6.13)
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6}$	2	0	1	symmetric
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	2	1	2	(6.17)

Table 2. Invariant tensors in four-fold products of irreps of SU(3), ordered in increasing numbers of epsilons n_ϵ , arrows n_\uparrow and rank r_3 , the number of independent colorflows for $N = 3$. This extends table II of [6].

1. $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$: here [6] reports two additional invariant tensors. However, there are only two ways to insert a gluon into the Clebsch-Gordan coefficient $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$. Thus there is only one invariant tensor in $\mathbf{3} \otimes_{\text{S}} \mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$ and one in $\mathbf{3} \otimes_{\text{A}} \mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{8} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \mathbf{3} \longrightarrow \quad \mathbf{6} \pm \mathbf{3} \longrightarrow \quad \mathbf{8} \\ \nwarrow \quad \nearrow \\ \mathbf{3} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{8} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \mathbf{3} \longrightarrow \quad \mathbf{6} \\ \nwarrow \quad \nearrow \\ \mathbf{3} \end{array} . \quad (6.10)$$

They can be expressed as combinations of $K_6 T_3$ and $K_6 T_6$. The other two tensors in table II of [6], $L\bar{J}$ and QV , both contain $\epsilon^{i_1 i_2 k} \bar{\epsilon}_{j_1 j_2 k} = \delta_{j_1}^{i_1} \delta_{j_2}^{i_2} - \delta_{j_2}^{i_1} \delta_{j_1}^{i_2}$ and are therefore redundant, as described in section 3.3.

2. $\mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8}$: one symmetric tensor is missing in [6]. This has been discussed at length in sections 2.3 and 5.1.
3. $\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$: the only independent invariant tensor is antisymmetric

$$\begin{array}{c} \bar{\mathbf{6}} \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \mathbf{3} \longrightarrow \quad \bar{\mathbf{3}} \\ \nwarrow \quad \nearrow \\ \bar{\mathbf{3}} \\ \downarrow \\ \mathbf{3} \\ \downarrow \\ \epsilon \end{array} \quad (6.11)$$

4. $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$: since each leg of the $\bar{\mathbf{6}}$ must be connected to a different $\mathbf{3}$ or $\mathbf{6}$, there

is again only one independent invariant tensor and it is antisymmetric

$$(6.12)$$

5. $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8}$: there are two invariant tensors antisymmetric in the factors $\mathbf{8}$ and one symmetric. Up to permutations of the external $\mathbf{8}$ s, there are three different ways to connect the $\bar{\epsilon}$ to the other external states: to both the $\mathbf{3}$ and the $\mathbf{6}$

$$(6.13a)$$

to the $\mathbf{6}$ only

$$(6.13b)$$

and to the $\mathbf{3}$ only

$$(6.13c)$$

The colorflow (6.13c) is antisymmetric in the two $\mathbf{8}$ s, while (6.13a) and (6.13b) contain both symmetric and antisymmetric contributions. These three colorflows correspond to the invariant tensors

$$A_{is}^{ab} = \bar{\epsilon}_{ij_1k} [T^a]^k_l [T^b]^l_{j_2} [K_{\mathbf{6}s}]^{j_1j_2} \quad (6.14a)$$

$$B_{is}^{ab} = \bar{\epsilon}_{j_1kl} [T^a]^k_i [T^b]^l_{j_2} [K_{\mathbf{6}s}]^{j_1j_2} \quad (6.14b)$$

$$C_{is}^{ab} = \bar{\epsilon}_{ikl} [T^a]^k_{j_1} [T^b]^l_{j_2} [K_{\mathbf{6}s}]^{j_1j_2} \quad (6.14c)$$

Due to the presence of $\bar{\epsilon}$, the matrix (4.7) can only be computed for $N = 3$

$$M(3, \{A, B, C\}) = \begin{pmatrix} 7 & 4 & -3 \\ 4 & 8 & 4 \\ -3 & 4 & 7 \end{pmatrix} \cdot 16 \quad (6.15)$$

and has the eigenvalues 0, 160 and 192. The eigenvector for the eigenvalue 0 is $(1, -1, 1)^T$ and corresponds to the relation

$$A - B + C = 0, \quad (6.16)$$

revealing that one symmetric and one antisymmetric tensor is redundant. The corresponding row in table II of [6] lists six invariant tensors: three of mixed symmetry, two antisymmetric and one symmetric. Therefore there are three non-trivial relation among them, that can again be found using the method of section 4.4.

6. $\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{8}$: the only two independent invariant tensors are combinations of permutations of

$$(6.17)$$

which can be viewed as the three ways to insert a gluon into the only invariant tensor in $\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6}$. The invariant tensors are

$$A_{s_1 s_2 s_3}^a = [T^a]^k_{i_1} \bar{\epsilon}_{i_2 i_3 k} \bar{\epsilon}_{j_1 j_2 j_3} [K_{\mathbf{6} s_1}]^{i_1 j_1} [K_{\mathbf{6} s_2}]^{i_2 j_2} [K_{\mathbf{6} s_3}]^{i_3 j_3}, \quad (6.18)$$

its cyclic permutations in $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$ and their linear combinations. The non-cyclic permutations are trivially related by the antisymmetry of the $\bar{\epsilon}$ s. The sum of the cyclic permutations are

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{s_1 s_2 s_3}^a + A_{s_2 s_3 s_1}^a + A_{s_3 s_1 s_2}^a \\ &= \left([T^a]^k_{i_1} \bar{\epsilon}_{i_2 i_3 k} + [T^a]^k_{i_2} \bar{\epsilon}_{i_3 i_1 k} + [T^a]^k_{i_3} \bar{\epsilon}_{i_1 i_2 k} \right) \times \\ & \quad \bar{\epsilon}_{j_1 j_2 j_3} [K_{\mathbf{6} s_1}]^{i_1 j_1} [K_{\mathbf{6} s_2}]^{i_2 j_2} [K_{\mathbf{6} s_3}]^{i_3 j_3} \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

and the term in the parenthesis vanishes by the tracelessness of the generators T^a

$$[T^a]^k_{i_1} \bar{\epsilon}_{i_2 i_3 k} + [T^a]^k_{i_2} \bar{\epsilon}_{i_3 i_1 k} + [T^a]^k_{i_3} \bar{\epsilon}_{i_1 i_2 k} = [T^a]^k_{i_1} \bar{\epsilon}_{i_2 i_3 k} \epsilon^{i_1 i_2 i_3} = 2 \operatorname{tr} T^a = 0. \quad (6.20)$$

Therefore only two combinations of the A are independent. The tensors A correspond to the $ST_{\mathbf{6}}$ tensors in table II of [6]. The WX tensors are linear combinations of these, as can be seen by gluing the conjugate of (6.1) to (6.7) at the $\mathbf{15}$.

There are three more products that have been left out of table II of [6]

1. $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{10}}$: there is only one colorflow and it is totally symmetric.
2. $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{15}}$: there is one symmetric and one antisymmetric colorflow, corresponding to $\mathbf{15} \subset \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6}$ and $\mathbf{15} \subset \overline{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \mathbf{6}$.
3. $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{8}$: the two independent colorflows are just like (6.17), with one of the $\bar{\epsilon}$ s removed and all $\mathbf{6}$ s replaced by $\mathbf{3}$ s. Again, only two combinations of mixed permutation symmetry in the $\mathbf{3}$ are independent: the sum of the cyclic permutations of

$$A_{i_1 i_2 i_3}^a = [T^a]^k_{i_1} \bar{\epsilon}_{i_2 i_3 k}, \quad (6.21)$$

vanishes again by (6.20).

	n_ϵ	n_\uparrow	r_3	remarks
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$	0	4	4	
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	0	4	5	but $r_2 = 4$
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	0	5	8	but $r_2 = 6$
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$	1	0	3	
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6}$	2	0	2	
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$	2	0	3	
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6}$	2	1	3	
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8}$	2	2	10	4 anti-, 6 symmetric
$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6}$	3	0	3	
$\mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$	3	0	6	

Table 3. Invariant tensors in five-fold products of irreps of $SU(3)$, ordered in increasing numbers of epsilons n_ϵ , arrows n_\uparrow and rank r_3 , the number of independent colorflows for $N = 3$, cf. table III of [6].

I can confirm the remaining results of [6] for the four-fold products and only use this opportunity to clarify permutation symmetries:

- $\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$: there are two independent colorflows and they are linear combinations of the invariant tensors listed in [6].
- $\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$: there are one antisymmetric and two symmetric invariant tensors. This agrees with [6], since $\delta_{t_1}^{s_1} \delta_{t_2}^{s_2}$ contains both a symmetric and an antisymmetric contribution.
- $\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$: there is one symmetric and one antisymmetric invariant tensor. This is compatible with [6], except for obvious typos in the indices of the $K\bar{J}$ term.
- $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{6}$: since each $\bar{\epsilon}$ must be connected with both $\mathbf{6}$ s, the only colorflow is symmetric.

6.3 Five and More Fields

Table III of [6] sketches a catalogue of invariant tensors in five-fold products of irreps of $SU(3)$. Since a complete catalogue can easily be produced with the program TANGARA together with MATHEMATICA [31], I only count them in table 3 and refrain from presenting a graphical representation and a detailed discussion.

There are again products involving adjoint representations in table 3 for which the number of independent invariant tensors changes when going from $SU(2)$ to $SU(3)$. As a curiosity, table 4 displays the number of independent invariant tensors in products of n adjoint representations of $SU(N)$ for different values of N . The products in this table contain no exotic irreps and the results for r_3 can already be found in [2, 3]. The values of r_3 and r_∞ for $n = 6$ are given in the caption of table 6 in [18], where they have been derived using purely combinatorial arguments.

n	r_2	r_3	r_4	r_5	r_6	r_7	\cdots	r_∞
3	1	2	2	2	2	2	\cdots	2
4	3	8	9	9	9	9	\cdots	9
5	6	32	43	44	44	44	\cdots	44
6	15	145	245	264	265	265	\cdots	265

Table 4. The rank r_N of the matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ of colorfactors (4.7), i.e. the number of independent invariant tensors, in the product of n adjoint representations of $SU(N)$ for $2 \leq N \leq 7$.

An inspection of table 4 suggests a curious pattern for the products of $n \geq 3$ adjoints of $SU(N)$

$$r_n = r_{n-1} + 1 \tag{6.22a}$$

$$\forall N \geq n : r_N = r_n. \tag{6.22b}$$

The considerations in section 4.4.1 show that the limit r_∞ in (4.11) exists, but they are not sufficient to show that $r_\infty = r_n$. I don't know if there is a deeper reason for, a general proof or even a practical application of (6.22).

7 Conclusions

I have presented a systematic construction of complete and independent sets of invariant tensors in products of irreducible representations of $SU(N)$. This construction is algorithmic and has been implemented in the computer code TANGARA. There is no fundamental limit on the size of the irreps and the number of factors. However, there are practical limits since the computational complexity of the most straightforward unoptimized algorithms grows combinatorially.

In section 6, I have compared the results of the new algorithm to a catalogue of invariant tensors published previously [6]. There are several discrepancies and I explain for each case in detail why the new result is the correct one.

The study of invariant tensors in products of representations larger than the **10** appears at the moment to be more of mathematical than phenomenological interest. But section 6.2 also lists six examples of colorflows involving only four triplets, sextets or octets, where previous published results are wrong. Three of these contain only a single sextet and another one a single pair. These are of immediate phenomenological interest for the study of BSM models containing such particles.

Nothing precludes the application of the method to other Lie algebras that appear in more exotic BSM models, such as $SO(N)$. For an implementation in TANGARA, only the underlying birdtrack library must be extended to support undirected lines.

```

$ tangara_tool -s '8 *S 8 * 6 * ~6'

0: [(1) * [1>2; 2>1; 3.0>4.0; 3.1>4.1]]
1: [(1) * [1>2; 2>4.0; 3.0>1; 3.1>4.1];
   (1) * [1>4.0; 2>1; 3.0>2; 3.1>4.1]]
2: [(1) * [1>4.0; 2>4.1; 3.0>1; 3.1>2]]

colorfactors[n_] :=
{ { (1/2)*n^4+(1/2)*n^3-(1/2)*n^2-(1/2)*n,
  n^3+n^2-n-1
  ,
  (1/2)*n^2-(1/2)
  },
{ n^3+n^2-n-1
  ,
  (1/2)*n^4+n^3-(1/2)*n^2-3*n+2/n,
  (1/2)*n^3-(3/2)*n+1/n
  },
{ (1/2)*n^2-(1/2)
  ,
  (1/2)*n^3-(3/2)*n+1/n
  ,
  (1/4)*n^4+(1/2)*n^3-(1/4)*n^2-n+(1/2)/n } }

```

Figure 3. TANGARA command line parameters and output: colorflows of invariant tensors in the symmetric tensor product $\mathbf{8} \otimes_S \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$ and their colorfactor matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$.

```

SU(2): rank = 2

eval(1) = (3*(31 + Sqrt[321]))/8 = 18.3
eval(2) = (3*(31 - Sqrt[321]))/8 = 4.9
eval(3) = 0 = 0.

SU(3): rank = 3

eval(1) = (10*(17 + Sqrt[73]))/3 = 85.2
eval(2) = (10*(17 - Sqrt[73]))/3 = 28.2
eval(3) = 18 = 18.

```

Figure 4. MATHEMATICA [31] output for the rank r_N and the eigenvalues of the colorfactor matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ in figure 3 for SU(2) and SU(3).

A Implementation and Interoperation

A.1 tangara

The algorithm of section 4 has been implemented in the computer program TANGARA. As illustrated in figures 3 and 5, the program is given a tensor product, optionally with a representation of the permutation symmetry groups of identical factors, and computes a list \mathcal{T} of candidates for a complete and independent set of invariant tensors together with

```

$ tangara_tool -s '8 *A 8 * 6 * ~6'

0: [ ( 1)*[1>2; 2>4.0; 3.0>1; 3.1>4.1];
      (-1)*[1>4.0; 2>1; 3.0>2; 3.1>4.1] ]

colorfactors[n_] :=
{ { (1/2)*n^4+n^3-(1/2)*n^2-n } }

```

Figure 5. TANGARA command line parameters and output: colorflows of invariant tensors in the antisymmetric tensor product $\mathbf{8} \otimes_A \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$ and their colorfactor matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$.

the matrix $M(N, \mathcal{T})$ of colorfactors (4.7).

Note that colorflows representing the invariant tensors do *not* contain the Young projectors nor the ghosts, because these can be added trivially by other programs using this output as input. As can be seen in figure 3, TANGARA lists the colorflows from section 2.3 in the order $\{X, Z_S, Y\}$ and normalizes them in such a way that the coefficients are integers with the smallest modulus possible. This normalization is fixed, but the order of the colorflows is not guaranteed to be the same for different versions of TANGARA. The chosen normalization is the most convenient one, since it directly corresponds to the graphical representation of colorflows, as in section 6. Conceptually, the normalization $\mu_N(T, T) = 1$ might appear to be more satisfactory, but it would require dividing by square roots of polynomials in N and make the output much more complicated.

The matrix of colorfactors is accompanied by a short script that computes the rank r_N , the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors using MATHEMATICA [31]. The output is shown in figure 4 without the eigenvectors. The computed eigenvectors can then be used to eliminate dependent tensors from the set \mathcal{T} . The script does not try to make a recommendation for a canonical or “best” choice of independent invariant tensors, since mutually excluding goals are bound to enter into this decision. Optionally, if the colorflows contain no ϵ s, the N -dependence of the eigenvalues can be plotted for illustration, as shown in figures 1 and 2.

The complete source code of TANGARA will be made publicly available in the O’MEGA subdirectory of a forthcoming WHIZARD [14, 15, 28] release.

A.2 UFO

Counting the number of independent invariant tensors is an interesting exercise, but the ultimate goal is their application in the study of BSM physics. For this purpose, the results must be made available to other tools. The UFO format [26, 27] has established itself as the *lingua franca* for describing models of BSM physics to automatic computation systems that compute renormalization group running, decay rates and cross sections. The latter are subsequently used by Monte Carlo event generators to simulate scattering processes at colliders.

The building blocks for color structures specified in the current UFO format [27] are sufficient to express all possible invariant tensors describing interactions of particles transforming under the $\mathbf{3}$, $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$, $\mathbf{6}$, $\bar{\mathbf{6}}$, and $\mathbf{8}$ of SU(3), including baryon number violating terms containing ϵ^{ijk} or $\bar{\epsilon}_{ijk}$. The $\mathbf{6}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{6}}$ irreps are described in UFO by the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients $[K_{\mathbf{6}s}]^{ij}$ and $[\bar{K}_{\mathbf{6}}^s]_{ij}$ and generators $[T_{\mathbf{6}}^a]^s_t$, where the latter could have been expressed by the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients and the generators in the fundamental representation

$$[T_{\mathbf{6}}^a]^s_t = 2[\bar{K}_{\mathbf{6}}^s]_{ik}[T^a]^i_j[K_{\mathbf{6}t}]^{jk}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

All this can be translated automatically into a colorflow basis, as has been demonstrated by the implementation in O'MEGA [14, 15] and WHIZARD [28].

Replacing the arrows by pairs of summation indices and symmetrizers by Clebsch-Gordan coefficients, all colorflows connecting triplets, sextets and octets can be translated to UFO directly, using only these building blocks. For example, the colorflow (6.3) in $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{8}$ corresponds to

$$C_{ir}^a = \bar{\epsilon}_{ijk}[T^a]^j_l[K_{\mathbf{6}r}]^{kl} \quad (\text{A.2a})$$

and can be encoded in UFO as

$$\text{Epsilon}(1, -1, -2) * \text{T}(3, -1, -3) * \text{K6}(2, -2, -3), \quad (\text{A.2b})$$

taking into account that UFO has `Epsilon` and `EpsilonBar` reversed [26, 27] with respect to the convention used in this paper. Such translation can be performed directly by TANGARA and similar programs. In principle, this approach can be continued by adding dedicated Clebsch-Gordan coefficients and generators for each higher representation, where the catalogue (2.4) should suffice for all practical purposes in the foreseeable future: `K10`, `K15`, `K15prime`, `K21`, `K24`, `K27`.

An even more flexible solution would be to extend the syntax of UFO by generic particle declarations, Clebsch-Gordan coefficients and generators that accept a Young tableau as an additional argument specifying the irrep: e.g. `K[[1, 2, 3], [4]]` instead of `K15`. At the same time, one could add the option to encode interactions more concisely in a colorflow basis using only Kronecker and Levi-Civita symbols of external indices instead of the current building blocks that force the user to introduce summation indices as in (A.2b). In order to avoid a fragmentation of the UFO format [26, 27], this should be decided as a community effort for a future iteration of the format, after some experience has been gained with example implementations of concrete syntax in WHIZARD [14, 15, 28] and other programs.

Acknowledgments

I thank Manuel Kunkel for triggering this paper by asking me to count the invariant tensors in the $\mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{8} \otimes \mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$ representation of SU(3). I thank Wolfgang Kilian, Jürgen Reuter for many productive discussions on making O'MEGA more colorful. I also thank JR for useful comments on the manuscript.

This work is supported by the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research (BMBF) under contract no. 05H21WWCAA.

References

- [1] A.J. MacFarlane, A. Sudbery and P.H. Weisz, *On Gell-Mann's λ -matrices, d - and f -tensors, octets, and parametrizations of $SU(3)$* , *Commun. Math. Phys.* **11** (1968) 77.
- [2] P. Dittner, *Invariant tensors in $su(3)$* , *Commun. Math. Phys.* **22** (1971) 238.
- [3] P. Dittner, *Invariant tensors in $su(3)$. II*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **27** (1973) 44.
- [4] H.E. Haber, *Useful relations among the generators in the defining and adjoint representations of $SU(N)$* , *SciPost Phys. Lect. Notes* **21** (2021) 1 [[1912.13302](#)].
- [5] Y. Almumin, J. Baretz, E. Bryan and A. Rajaraman, *On the Calculation of Invariant Tensors in Gauge Theories*, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **54** (2023) 2 [[2009.06545](#)].
- [6] L.M. Carpenter, T. Murphy and T.M.P. Tait, *Phenomenological cornucopia of $SU(3)$ exotica*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 035014 [[2110.11359](#)].
- [7] L.M. Carpenter, T. Murphy and M.J. Smylie, *LEX-EFT: the Light Exotics Effective Field Theory*, *JHEP* **08** (2023) 050 [[2302.01344](#)].
- [8] T. Ohl, G. Ricciardi and E.H. Simmons, *D - \bar{D} mixing in heavy quark effective field theory: The Sequel*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **403** (1993) 605 [[hep-ph/9301212](#)].
- [9] C. Horst and J. Reuter, *CleGo: A package for automated computation of Clebsch-Gordan coefficients in Tensor Product Representations for Lie Algebras $A - G$* , *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **182** (2011) 1543 [[1011.4008](#)].
- [10] T.Y. Thomas, *Tensors whose components are absolute constants*, *Annals of Mathematics* **27** (1926) 548.
- [11] M.S. Knebelman, *Tensors with invariant components*, *Annals of Mathematics* **30** (1928) 339.
- [12] P.G. Appleby, B.R. Duffy and R.W. Ogden, *On the classification of isotropic tensors*, *Glasgow Mathematical Journal* **29** (1987) 185–196.
- [13] X. Leroy, D. Doligez, A. Frisch, J. Garrigue, D. Rémy, K. Sivaramakrishnan et al., *The OCaml System, Release 5.0. Documentation and User's Manual*, Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique (2022).
- [14] M. Moretti, T. Ohl and J. Reuter, *O'Mega: An Optimizing Matrix Element Generator*, [hep-ph/0102195](#).
- [15] T. Ohl, *Functional directed acyclical graphs for scattering amplitudes in perturbation theory*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 636 [[2306.02414](#)].
- [16] P. Cvitanovic, *Group theory for Feynman diagrams in non-Abelian gauge theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **14** (1976) 1536.
- [17] P. Cvitanovic, *Group Theory: Birdtracks, Lie's, and Exceptional Groups*, Princeton University Press (5, 2020).
- [18] S. Keppeler and M. Sjödal, *Orthogonal multiplet bases in $SU(N_c)$ color space*, *JHEP* **09** (2012) 124 [[1207.0609](#)].
- [19] S. Keppeler and M. Sjödal, *Hermitian Young Operators*, *J. Math. Phys.* **55** (2014) 021702 [[1307.6147](#)].
- [20] M. Sjödal and S. Keppeler, *Tools for calculations in color space*, *PoS DIS2013* (2013) 166 [[1307.1319](#)].

- [21] M. Sjödal and J. Thorén, *QCD multiplet bases with arbitrary parton ordering*, *JHEP* **11** (2018) 198 [[1809.05002](#)].
- [22] M. Sjödal, *ColorMath - A package for color summed calculations in $SU(N_c)$* , *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2310 [[1211.2099](#)].
- [23] M. Sjödal, *ColorFull - a C++ library for calculations in $SU(N_c)$ color space*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 236 [[1412.3967](#)].
- [24] F. Maltoni, K. Paul, T. Stelzer and S. Willenbrock, *Color Flow Decomposition of QCD Amplitudes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **67** (2003) 014026 [[hep-ph/0209271](#)].
- [25] W. Kilian, T. Ohl, J. Reuter and C. Speckner, *QCD in the color-flow representation*, *JHEP* **10** (2012) 022 [[1206.3700](#)].
- [26] C. Degrande, C. Duhr, B. Fuks, D. Grellscheid, O. Mattelaer and T. Reiter, *UFO - the Universal FeynRules Output*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183** (2012) 1201 [[1108.2040](#)].
- [27] L. Darmé et al., *UFO 2.0: the Universal Feynman Output format*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 631 [[2304.09883](#)].
- [28] W. Kilian, T. Ohl and J. Reuter, *WHIZARD: Simulating multi-particle processes at LHC and ILC*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1742 [[0708.4233](#)].
- [29] J. Alcock-Zeilinger and H. Weigert, *Compact Hermitian Young Projection Operators*, *J. Math. Phys.* **58** (2017) 051702 [[1610.10088](#)].
- [30] R. Slansky, *Group Theory for Unified Model Building*, *Phys. Rept.* **79** (1981) 1.
- [31] Wolfram Research, Inc., “Mathematica, Version 14.0.”