

Some 1d (Supersymmetric) Quantum Field Theories Reduced from Chern-Simons Gauge Theories

Burak Oğuz^a Bayram Tekin^a

^a*Department of Physics, Middle East Technical University,
06800 Ankara, Turkey*

E-mail: oguz.burak@metu.edu.tr, btekin@metu.edu.tr

ABSTRACT: We study dimensional reduction by spherical symmetry in the context of Euclidean Chern-Simons gauge theories with gauge groups $SU(2)$ and $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ (de Sitter gravity). We start with pure Chern-Simons theories and show that the reduced theory obtained by employing a spherically symmetric ansatz on the gauge field is similar to a fermionic theory in 1d coupled to a $U(1)$ gauge field with a 1-dimensional Chern-Simons kinetic term. Furthermore, we carry out a semiclassical computation that demonstrates that in the large κ limit, the path integral of the 3d pure Chern-Simons theory is *equivalent* to the path integral of the dimensionally reduced theory, which is a 1d QFT. Moreover, we argue that the Wilson loop operators in the large κ limit should reduce to some observables of the 1-dimensional theory. This agreement hints at the existence of a duality at the quantum level between the 3d Chern-Simons theory and the 1d reduced theory. We then study Chern-Simons Higgs theories in the Euclidean formalism. We again employ the spherically symmetric ansatz on the fields and show that at the classical level, the action of the reduced theory is a theory with some scalar fields X_i coupled to fermionic fields Ψ_j . To get an appropriate reduced action, we define the original theory on a manifold \mathcal{M} with the geometry of $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$. With a suitable choice of the potential of the Higgs field, we show that the reduced theory, which is the action that governs the spherically symmetric monopoles in the Chern-Simons Higgs theory, is equivalent to a supersymmetric quantum mechanical model. The flux of the Chern-Simons Higgs monopole is shown to be related to the fermionic number operator $F = \bar{\Psi}\Psi$, which in turn is related to the Witten index.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Euclidean $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons Theory	5
2.1	Some Aspects of the Finite Temperature Quantum Mechanical Model	8
3	Dimensional Reduction as a Quantum Duality at Large κ	9
4	$SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Chern-Simons Theory or de Sitter Gravity	14
5	Large κ Limit of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Quantum Chern-Simons Theory	17
6	Dimensional Reduction of Euclidean $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons Higgs Theory	17
6.1	Chern-Simons Higgs Theory on a Curved Space	21
6.2	Dimensional Reduction of the Chern-Simons Higgs Theory on \mathcal{M} as a Supersymmetric Quantum Mechanics	24
7	Dimensional Reduction of Euclidean $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Chern-Simons Higgs Theory	26
7.1	The Reduced Action as a Supersymmetric Quantum Mechanics	28
8	Semiclassical Limit of Quantum Chern-Simons Higgs Theory	29
9	Conclusions and Discussions	31
10	Appendix	34
A	The Spherically Symmetric Ansatz	34

1 Introduction

In gauge theories, one encounters complicated tensorial equations of motion which are hard to solve without some symmetry assumptions. One can employ a symmetric ansatz on the fields and reduce the equations of motion to simpler equations on *scalar* functions possessing certain symmetries, which render the equations easier to solve. Of course, such ansatz does not exhaust all solutions since the solutions to the equations of motion need not have the symmetry imposed on the ansatz. But it is useful in any case to obtain some class of solutions that obey some symmetries. Such symmetry reduction method at the level of the action was used by Weyl to obtain the spherically symmetric metric solutions to Einstein's field equations. It was shown by Palais [9] that the symmetric critical points of the action are critical symmetric points of the field equations if the symmetry group is

compact. That means that one can find the equations of motion from the full action, apply the symmetric ansatz, and have a reduced equation that can hopefully be solved; on the other hand, one could equivalently insert the ansatz into the full action, integrate out the irrelevant coordinates using the symmetry, obtain a lower-dimensional theory, and solve the equations of the reduced theory. Palais showed that the two paths give the same equations of motion when the symmetry imposed is associated with a compact group (for example, when spherical symmetry is imposed, the associated group is the special orthogonal group which is compact so Palais' theorem is valid for such a case).

Given that the equations of motion of Yang-Mills theory are extremely complicated to solve due to their non-linearity, the trick described above was used to reduce the instanton equations to simpler equations. Witten [16] proposed an ansatz that depends only on the Euclidean time t and $r = (x_i x_i)^{1/2}$ to reduce the instanton equations. The ansatz is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_i^a &= \varepsilon_{iak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} (\varphi_2 - 1) + \frac{\delta_{ia}^\perp}{r} \varphi_1 + \frac{x_i x_a}{r^2} A_1, \\ A_0^a &= \frac{x_a}{r} A_0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\delta_{ia}^\perp = (\delta_{ia} - \frac{x_i x_a}{r^2})$, and A_0, A_1, φ_1 , & φ_2 depend only on r and $t \equiv x_4$. Interestingly, when one inserts this ansatz into the Yang-Mills action, the reduced action turns out to be the Abelian-Higgs model on the Poincaré half-plane with the metric $g^{ab} = r^2 \delta^{ab}$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{YM}} &= \frac{1}{4} \int d^4 x F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu\nu}^a \\ &\rightarrow A = 8\pi \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt \int_0^{\infty} dr \left[\frac{1}{2} (D_\mu \varphi_i)^2 + \frac{1}{8} r^2 F_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{4} r^{-2} (1 - \varphi_i \varphi_i)^2 \right], \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

where $D_\mu \varphi_i = \partial_\mu \varphi_i + \varepsilon_{ij} A_\mu \varphi_j$ and $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ ($i = 1, 2$ and $\mu, \nu = 0, 1$). The instanton equations of YM turn out to be the Bogomolny'i equations of vortices of the 2-dimensional Abelian-Higgs model [8, 16]. Geometrically, the same equations describe minimal surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{1,2}$ [1, 12].

An important observation about Witten's ansatz is that it mixes the space-time indices i with the gauge indices a . Since the gauge group is $SU(2)$, there are three generators so the indices run over the same values. So A_i^a is like a rank 2 tensor in three dimensions and any such tensor can be decomposed into anti-symmetric, traceless symmetric, and trace parts. In the above ansatz, the anti-symmetric part corresponds to $(\varphi_2 - 1)$, the symmetric traceless part corresponds to $-\frac{1}{3} (\delta_{ia} - 3 \frac{x_i x_a}{r^2}) (\frac{\varphi_1}{r} + A_1)$, and the trace part corresponds to $2 \frac{\varphi_1}{r} - A_1$. For A_0^a , the only choice is a function multiplied by x^a , and that function is chosen as A_0/r . This mixing of space-time & gauge indices can be done for other theories, in particular for 3-dimensional Euclidean theories. There, we don't need any A_0 , and the ansatz functions now depend only on $r = (x_i x_i)^{1/2}$. Integrating out over the angles, one could reduce the action to the action of a one-dimensional theory. In 3-dimensions, besides the Yang-Mills theory, there is another gauge theory, called the Chern-Simons theory,

which was extensively studied as a topological field theory [18], and has important appearances in 3d gauge theories [2], and in condensed-matter systems [14]. It is also known that Chern-Simons theory for some gauge groups is related to 3d Einstein gravity with or without a cosmological constant in the first order formalism, as shown by Witten [17], once the invertibility of the dreibein is relaxed. Due to the many interesting phenomena Chern-Simons theory entails, we will study it within the framework of dimensional reduction.

We summarize the sections of the paper

- Section 2: Our starting point is pure $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons theory in the Euclidean formalism. We employ a 3-dimensional version of spherically symmetric ansatz on the gauge field and show that the reduced action is very much like a fermionic theory coupled to a $U(1)$ gauge field with a 1d Chern-Simons kinetic term. A general version of this model was studied in [3]. We show that at the level of classical equations of motion, one can map the spherically symmetric solutions of the 3d Chern-Simons theory to the classical solutions of the model studied in [3].
- Section 3: After our results at the level of classical equations of motion, we turn to the quantum theory and show that the semiclassical (large κ) limit of the quantum Chern-Simons theory is *dual* to the quantum theory of the reduced action (a 1d Chern-Simons matter theory with a massless complex scalar field having a fermionic kinetic term). This result is very interesting because what this implies is that the large κ limit of the quantum Chern-Simons theory is *equivalent* to a 1-dimensional QFT based on the action obtained from the dimensional reduction of the 3d Chern-Simons theory. The equivalence is in the following sense: The path integral of the 3d Chern-Simons theory in the saddle point approximation agrees with the saddle point approximation of the 1d reduced theory, in the semiclassical limit. Moreover, we show that this duality must hold for the observables as well. That is, the Wilson loop operators in the quantum Chern-Simons theory should have corresponding objects in the 1d reduced theory. To what do the Wilson loops, which are extended objects, correspond in the 1d reduced theory is an open problem.
- Section 4: We extend our study to Euclidean Chern-Simons gauge theory with gauge group $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$. This choice of the gauge group is particularly interesting due to its relation to de Sitter gravity in 3 dimensions [17]. Our results from $SU(2)$ smoothly extend in a foreseeable manner. The reduced action under a spherical symmetric reduction gives 2 copies of the reduced action obtained in $SU(2)$, and one can view this theory, just as in the $SU(2)$ case, as a fermionic theory (we remind the reader that this association to a fermionic theory is valid only at the level of classical equations of motion, and is not expected to carry over to the quantum theory). One interesting observation is that if one uses the Schwinger gauge in 3 dimensions, $x_i \mathcal{A}_i^a = 0$, this equates the two distinct 1d Chern-Simons connections. The result of this is a single Chern-Simons term in 1-dimension, but now with a factor 2 in front. This 2 is interesting in that it allows, in the dimensionally reduced action, the Chern-Simons

level to be a half-integer. Of course, the level is quantized to be an integer in 3 dimensions, and this does not spoil the gauge invariance of the 1d theory, but it is still interesting that fractional Chern-Simons levels are allowed in the reduced theory.

- Section 5: In this section, we carry out the semiclassical evaluation of the $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Chern-Simons theory or the de Sitter gravity. Again, the results in this section extend smoothly from the results of section 3, with the semiclassical evaluation of the partition function of dS gravity being the product of two partition functions of a 1d QFT. Again, it is the case that the gauge invariant observables of 3-dimensional theory must reduce to those of the reduced theory. We do not give an account of what those observables might be, it is an open problem.
- Section 6: Having studied the pure Chern-Simons theories, we now turn our direction to Euclidean Chern-Simons Higgs theories, with interest in the monopole (strictly speaking, instanton) solutions. We employ a spherically symmetric ansatz that has been well studied in the past for the study of monopoles in Chern-Simons Higgs theories [4, 10, 13]. One problem we face is that the reduced action from the Higgs sector contains r -dependent terms, which makes the reduced 1d theory depend explicitly on r . To remedy this, we get help from an interesting observation, which was made in [11]. The observation is the following: In the first-order formalism of 3-dimensional gravity, the dreibein e_i^a and the spin connection ω_i^a have the same index structure as A_i^a , so one can employ an analogous spherically symmetric ansatz on these fields! This turns out to be a very clean way to go around the problem, as is evident from the results in this section. We will not deal with dynamical gravity so we will not consider the spin connection ω_i^a , but we use the ansatz on the dreibein e_i^a to fix the geometry so that the reduced action does not have explicit r -dependence. From the reduction of the Chern-Simons term, we get a reduced action which can be viewed, at the classical level, as the action of a fermionic theory. From the Higgs sector, one gets a reduced action containing the canonical kinetic term of a real scalar field with a self-interacting potential depending on what one chooses for the potential in the 3d theory, and an interesting interaction arises between fermionic fields and the real scalar which is of the form $\frac{1}{k} \mathbb{X}^2 \bar{\Psi} \Psi$ with \mathbb{X} the scalar field, and Ψ the fermionic field that is associated to the reduced action of the Chern-Simons term. The interesting thing about this interaction is that k is the quantized Chern-Simons level in 3-dimensions. This is an unusual appearance of the Chern-Simons level in the denominator. Moreover, we observe that the interaction term $\mathbb{X}^2 \bar{\Psi} \Psi$ signals a supersymmetric interaction, so we modify the Higgs potential in 3-dimensions to add a sixth-order term, and with this modification, we get a supersymmetric quantum mechanics in the reduced action. The conclusion from this section is the following: The spherically symmetric monopole solutions in the Chern-Simons Higgs theory are governed by a supersymmetric quantum mechanics. We further show that the flux of the monopole is proportional to the fermion number operator $F = \bar{\Psi} \Psi$ of the supersymmetric quantum mechanics, which in turn is related to the Witten index

$$\mathcal{I} = \text{Tr}\left((-1)^F e^{-\beta H}\right).$$

- Section 7: In this section, we extend our results from the study of $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons Higgs theory. The transition of the results is again smooth and foreseeable. We get two copies of the supersymmetric quantum mechanics we got in section 6, and the total flux of the monopoles is now proportional to the sum $\sum_{i=1}^2 \bar{\Psi}_i \Psi_i$.
- Section 8: Having extensively studied the classical Chern-Simons Higgs theory and its monopoles, we now discuss the quantum theory. Things are much more involved now due to the interactions between the fields. We demonstrate the challenges by studying a 0-dimensional toy model and argue that the semiclassical evaluation of the quantum Chern-Simons Higgs theory is much more complicated than that of pure Chern-Simons theory. We discuss that because the solution space of Chern-Simons Higgs theory does not admit a group structure, our computation in section 3 cannot be extended for the Chern-Simons matter theory, because our computation in section 3 relies crucially on the group structure of the solution space of Chern-Simons theory. We in any case sketch a semiclassical argument discussing why the dimensionally reduced action is relevant for the quantum Chern-Simons Higgs theory. The reason is that some subspace of solutions of the Chern-Simons Higgs theory can be recast as the solution space of the reduced action, and in the semiclassical regime, the main contributions come from the classical solutions. This still does not indicate a strong agreement between the path integral of the 3d Chern-Simons Higgs theory and the reduced theory, at least not as strong as an agreement that we find in section 3, but it is a crude approximation.

2 Euclidean $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons Theory

The Euclidean Chern Simons Theory on a 3-manifold \mathcal{M} is defined by the action

$$I = -\frac{i\kappa}{4\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} CS(A), \quad (2.1)$$

with

$$CS(A) = \text{Tr} \left(A \wedge dA + \frac{2}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$A \in \Omega^1(\mathcal{M}) \times \mathfrak{su}(2), \quad (2.3)$$

is the connection of the trivial Principal $SU(2)$ bundle over \mathcal{M} . We choose the quadratic bilinear form in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ such that $\text{Tr}(t^a t^b) = -\frac{1}{2} \delta^{ab}$. In components, the action reads

$$I = \frac{i\kappa}{8\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} \left(A_i^a \partial_j A_k^a + \frac{1}{3} \varepsilon^{abc} A_i^a A_j^b A_k^c \right). \quad (2.4)$$

The Chern-Simons action is not gauge invariant. Under a gauge transformation, the change in the Chern-Simons action is

$$\delta I = -2\pi i \kappa n + \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} B, \quad (2.5)$$

with

$$n = -\frac{1}{24\pi^2} \int \text{Tr} \left(g dg^{-1} \wedge g dg^{-1} \wedge g dg^{-1} \right) \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.6)$$

the winding number of the gauge element $g(x) \in SU(2)$, and B is a boundary term which we drop. Although the Chern-Simons action is not gauge invariant, one can get a gauge invariant quantum theory if one ensures that $e^{-\delta I} = 1$ so that the path integral remains the same under a gauge transformation, which is what defines the quantum Chern-Simons theory. The condition for the quantum Chern-Simons theory to be gauge invariant is then

$$-\delta I = 2\pi i m; \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.7)$$

from this condition, it follows that

$$\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.8)$$

so the parameter appearing in front of the action must be an integer to ensure a sensible quantum theory.

The equations of motion are given by the critical points of I . Varying with respect to A one gets the flatness condition

$$F_{ij}^a = 0, \quad (2.9)$$

which are solved by flat connections $A = g dg^{-1}$ for $g \in SU(2)$. For the component fields A_i^a , we employ the spherically symmetric ansatz that is a 3-dimensional version of the multi-instanton ansatz of [16]:

$$A = A_i^a t^a dx^i = t^a \left[\left(\varphi_2(r) - 1 \right) \varepsilon_{iak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} + \varphi_1(r) \frac{\delta_{ia}^\perp}{r} + A(r) \frac{x_i x_a}{r^2} \right] dx^i, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\delta_{ia}^\perp \equiv \delta_{ia} - \frac{x_i x_a}{r^2}$, and $r = (x_i x_i)^{1/2}$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$). With this ansatz, one gets (see appendix for explicit computations):

$$\varepsilon^{ijk} A_i \partial_j A_k^a = \frac{2}{r^2} \left(\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1' (\varphi_2 - 1) + 2A(\varphi_2 - 1) \right), \quad (2.11)$$

$$\varepsilon^{ijk} \varepsilon_{abc} A_i^a A_j^b A_k^c = \frac{6}{r^2} A \left((\varphi_2 - 1)^2 + \varphi_1^2 \right), \quad (2.12)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{ijk} F_{jk}^a = - \left(\frac{\partial_1 \varphi_1 - A \varphi_2}{r^2} \right) \varepsilon_{iak} x_k + \left(\frac{\partial_1 \varphi_2 + A \varphi_1}{r} \right) \delta_{ia}^\perp - \left(\frac{1 - \varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2}{r^4} \right) x_i x_a, \quad (2.13)$$

and a prime denotes a derivative with respect to r . Therefore the Chern-Simons form is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{ijk} \left(A_i^a \partial_j A_k^a + \frac{1}{3} \varepsilon^{abc} A_i^a A_j^b A_k^c \right) &= \frac{2}{r^2} \left(\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1' (\varphi_2 - 1) + 2A(\varphi_2 - 1) + A((\varphi_2 - 1)^2 + \varphi_1^2) \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{r^2} \left(\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1' (\varphi_2 - 1) + A(\varphi_2^2 + \varphi_1^2 - 1) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Since the functions φ_1 , φ_2 , and A depend only on r , we can integrate over the angles in the action to arrive at the 1-dimensional action

$$S_{\text{CS}} = i\kappa \int dr \left(\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1' (\varphi_2 - 1) + A(\varphi_2^2 + \varphi_1^2 - 1) \right). \quad (2.15)$$

Dropping the boundary term $\int dr \varphi_1'$, we have:

$$S_{\text{CS}} = i\kappa \int dr \left(\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1' \varphi_2 + A(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2 - 1) \right). \quad (2.16)$$

Either from varying this action with respect to φ_1, φ_2, A or by using the form of F_{ij}^a under the reduction, we have the following equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_1 \varphi_1 - A \varphi_2, \\ 0 &= \partial_1 \varphi_2 + A \varphi_1, \\ 0 &= \varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2 - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

The action (2.16) is a first-derivative action. We combine φ_1 and φ_2 into a complex scalar field Y via:

$$Y \equiv \varphi_1 + i\varphi_2 \quad ; \quad \bar{Y} \equiv \varphi_1 - i\varphi_2. \quad (2.18)$$

Then

$$\bar{Y}Y' - \bar{Y}'Y = 2i(\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1' \varphi_2), \quad (2.19)$$

$$\bar{Y}Y = \varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2. \quad (2.20)$$

Thus, (2.16) becomes:

$$S_{\text{CS}} = \kappa \int dr \left(\frac{1}{2}(\bar{Y}Y' - \bar{Y}'Y) + iA(\bar{Y}Y - 1) \right). \quad (2.21)$$

Integrating by parts $\bar{Y}'Y$ and dropping the boundary term, the action reads

$$S_{\text{CS}} = \kappa \int dr \left(\bar{Y}(\partial_r + iA)Y - iA \right). \quad (2.22)$$

This is very nearly the action of a fermion living in 1-dimension, coupled to a gauge field A whose kinetic term is a 1-dimensional Chern-Simons term. Through rescaling of Y with $\sqrt{\kappa}$, one can write this as

$$S_{\text{CS}} = \int dr \left(\bar{Y}(\partial_r + iA)Y - i\kappa A \right). \quad (2.23)$$

Because κ is quantized to be an integer in 3-dimensions (so that e^{-I} hence the quantum Chern-Simons theory is invariant under large gauge transformations), (2.23) is invariant under $U(1)$ large gauge transformations. The fields transform as ¹

$$\begin{aligned} Y &\rightarrow e^{-i\Lambda(r)}Y, \\ A &\rightarrow A + \partial_r \Lambda = e^{-i\Lambda}(A - i\partial_r)e^{i\Lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

¹Under the reduction, there is a surviving $U(1)$ subgroup of $SU(2)$ which has elements $g = \exp(-i/2f(r)\hat{x} \cdot \sigma)$. It is under these transformations the above action is invariant up to $2\pi n$, n being the winding number of Λ .

There is a striking resemblance of the kinetic term of Y in (2.23) to the kinetic term of a fermion ψ living in 1d. To make this similarity precise, we identify $\tau = r$ and associate to the complex scalar field $Y(r)$ a Grassmanian valued field $\psi(\tau)$

$$Y(r) \longleftrightarrow \psi(\tau), \quad (2.25)$$

and write the following Euclidean action

$$S_{\text{CS}} = \int d\tau \left(\bar{\psi}(\partial_\tau + iA)\psi - i\kappa A \right). \quad (2.26)$$

Then, what we can say is that the classical solutions of the Chern-Simons theory that possess spherical symmetry can be viewed as the classical solutions of a fermionic theory, because the spherical symmetric configurations of the Chern-Simons action are governed by (2.23), and the critical points of that action are guaranteed to be the critical points of the Chern-Simons theory that has spherical symmetry, due to Palais' symmetric criticality [9]. Moreover, we can map the reduced solutions in terms of $Y(r)$ to solutions in terms of a Grassmanian $\psi(\tau)$. According to our dictionary, the equations in terms of Y and ψ are given as

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_r + iA)Y(r) = 0 &= (\partial_\tau + iA)\psi(\tau), \\ (\partial_r - iA)\bar{Y}(r) = 0 &= (\partial_\tau - iA)\bar{\psi}(\tau), \\ \bar{Y}(r)Y(r) - 1 = 0 &= \bar{\psi}(\tau)\psi(\tau) - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

The solutions are

$$Y(r) = e^{-i \int^r dr' A(r')} Y_0 \quad ; \quad \psi(\tau) = e^{-i \int^\tau d\tau' A(\tau')} \psi_0 \quad (2.28)$$

2.1 Some Aspects of the Finite Temperature Quantum Mechanical Model

The action in (2.26) is special in that it resembles its 3-dimensional counterpart, which is a Chern-Simons theory with fermions [3]. The quantum theory based on the 1-dimensional action contains interesting phenomena such as the analog of parity anomaly in (2+1)-dimensional fermions coupled to Chern-Simons theory. Moreover, the theory can be solved to all orders in perturbation theory, and the interactions shift the level as [3]

$$\kappa \rightarrow \kappa - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (2.29)$$

For the same model with N_f fermions all with mass m , the shift would be

$$\kappa \rightarrow \kappa - \frac{1}{2} \frac{m}{|m|} N_f. \quad (2.30)$$

In the model with N_f fundamental fermions, the exact effective action at finite temperature is computed to be [3]

$$\Gamma[A]_\beta = N_f \log \left\{ \cos(a/2) - i \tanh(\beta m/2) \sin(a/2) \right\}. \quad (2.31)$$

Where $a \equiv \int_0^\beta d\tau A(\tau)$. Observe that for (2.26), we have $m = 0$, $N_f = 1$, & $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. The effective action is then:

$$\Gamma[A]_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} = -\frac{i}{2} \int_0^\infty d\tau A(\tau), \quad (2.32)$$

which just says that the level of the theory (2.26) is shifted as in (2.29). It is interesting that for the massless case, even if we don't take the zero temperature limit, the effective action would be almost the same, apart from a shift in the upper integral bound.

3 Dimensional Reduction as a Quantum Duality at Large κ

We will try to establish a relation between the 3-dimensional quantum Chern-Simons theory and the quantum theory of the reduced action (2.22). Note that the classical solutions of the reduced theory will solve the equations of the 3-dimensional Chern-Simons theory, however, the converse is not true. The solutions of the reduced theory do not exhaust all of the solutions of the 3-dimensional theory, because not all solutions have to be spherically symmetric in 3d. Since some space of the classical solutions of the two agrees, one would expect an approximate equality at the semiclassical regime, which corresponds to the large κ limit of both (2.1) and (2.22).

It turns out, and we will show this below by explicit computation, that the semiclassical evaluation of both theories agrees *exactly* up to an irrelevant scaling of the partition function.

For a starter, we will study a toy model to recall the stationary phase approximation. Suppose we are interested in the following integral which defines a 0-dimensional QFT:

$$Z = \int dx e^{-f(x)}. \quad (3.1)$$

Let us denote the space of solutions to $\frac{df}{dx} = 0$ by \mathcal{M} . For $x_i \in \mathcal{M}$, one expands $f(x)$ to second order in the parameter $\delta x = x - x_i$

$$f(x) = f(x_i) + \frac{1}{2} f''(x_i) \delta x^2, \quad (3.2)$$

then one can approximate the partition function by summing over all $x_i \in \mathcal{M}$

$$Z \approx \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{M}} e^{-f(x_i)} \int_{B(x_i)} d[\delta x] e^{-\frac{1}{2} f''(x_i) \delta x^2}, \quad (3.3)$$

with $B(x_i)$ being some neighborhood of the classical point x_i . If $B(x_i)$ contains the whole of the real line, then one can perform the Gaussian integral, but the expansion to the second order only holds for small enough δx . One can avoid this pitfall by considering the limit in which a parameter appearing in the classical action $f(x)$ to be very large so that the Gaussian is sharply peaked around the minima and quickly decays hence the integral

around $B(x_i)$ is reasonably close to the integral over the entire real line. In that limit, the semiclassical limit, one has

$$Z \approx \sum_{x_i \in \mathcal{M}} e^{-f(x_i)} \left(f''(x_i) \right)^{-1/2}. \quad (3.4)$$

Now, we will extend this to the quantum Chern-Simons theory, a 3-dimensional QFT. The Euclidean $SU(2)$ Quantum Chern-Simons Theory over a 3-manifold \mathcal{M} is defined by the path integral

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}A \exp \left(-I[A] \right) = \int \mathcal{D}A \exp \left(\frac{i\kappa}{4\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} CS(A) \right), \quad (3.5)$$

with $CS(A)$ given as in (2.2), and $A \in \Omega^1(\mathcal{M}) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$. As discussed in the previous section, the quantum theory is gauge invariant provided $\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}$.

To carry out the semiclassical approximation, we first need to determine the space of stationary points of I , the Chern-Simons action. The stationary points are given by the flatness condition:

$$F_{ij}^a = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

which are solved by pure gauges $A(x) = g(x)dg^{-1}(x)$ with $g(x) \in SU(2)$. Hence, the solution space of the Chern-Simons theory is given by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}} = \{A(x) = g(x)dg^{-1}(x) | g \in SU(2)\}. \quad (3.7)$$

Which is isomorphic to the space of gauge transformations \mathcal{G} . The isomorphism is established by the pure gauge connections:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} : \quad \mathcal{G} &\mapsto \mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}} \\ g(x) &\mapsto \mathcal{A} = g(x)dg^{-1}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

If one expands I around a classical point $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}$ to second order, one gets

$$Z \approx \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A} e^{-I[\mathcal{A}]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}] \right)^{-1/2}. \quad (3.9)$$

Here, we need to ensure that $I''[\mathcal{A}]$ is a sharply peaked "Gaussian" in the field space so that the integral, analogous to the one in (3.3), is reasonably close to the exact result. This is achieved in the large κ limit because then $I''[\mathcal{A}]$ is sharply peaked around the classical solution \mathcal{A} . The stationary phase approximation of the $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons theory was carried out in [18], and it was shown that the partition function is, as expected, a topological invariant of the 3-manifold over which it is defined. However, our motivation to study the semiclassical regime is different than that of [18]: We are not interested in explicitly evaluating the functional determinant appearing in (3.9), what we hope to accomplish is to determine the precise relation between the large κ limit of the 3-dimensional quantum Chern-Simons path integral with the large κ limit of the path integral based on the action

(2.22).

Let us return to (3.9). The functional determinant is given by

$$\det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}] \right) = \int \mathcal{D}\omega \exp \left(\frac{i\kappa}{4\pi} \int \text{Tr}(\omega \wedge d_{\mathcal{A}}\omega) \right), \quad (3.10)$$

where ω is an adjoint valued 1-form and $d_{\mathcal{A}}\omega = d\omega + [\mathcal{A}, \omega]$ is the gauge covariant derivative of ω with respect to the flat background \mathcal{A} . Since ω is adjoint-valued, the functional integral on the right, hence the determinant of $I''[\mathcal{A}]$ evaluated at a classical configuration \mathcal{A} , are gauge invariant. The gauge invariance of the determinant is important for our purposes, our purpose being the establishment of the duality between a theory in 3d with its 1d reduced version, at large κ .

Now, we will use to our advantage the fact that the integral (3.9) is restricted to the solution space \mathcal{M}_{CS} . That means $\mathcal{A} = g(x)dg^{-1}(x)$ for some $g(x) \in SU(2)$, and hence

$$-I[\mathcal{A}] = \frac{i\kappa}{4\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} CS(\mathcal{A}) = 2\pi i\kappa n, \quad (3.11)$$

with n given as in (2.6). So, the value of I depends only on the topological sector in which \mathcal{A} lives. In fact, $e^{-I[\mathcal{A}]} = 1$ due to the quantization of κ . Moreover, the determinant of $I''[\mathcal{A}]$ is also gauge invariant, so that depends only on the topological sector in which \mathcal{A} lives as well. Therefore, one can choose a representative flat connection in each sector, call it $\mathcal{A}_n \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$, and one can write the full integral as a discrete sum over n and an integral in each sector $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$. The gauge invariant functionals in each sector can be taken out of the integral over $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$, that is to say

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\approx \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}} \mathcal{D}A e^{-I[\mathcal{A}]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}] \right)^{-1/2} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-I[\mathcal{A}_n]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}_n] \right)^{-1/2} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n} \mathcal{D}A_n \\ &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-I[\mathcal{A}_n]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}_n] \right)^{-1/2} \text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Now, we get back to the point where we've chosen a representative flat connection in each sector $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$. For each n , we can choose the representative gauge field $\mathcal{A}_n \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$ such that it depends only on the coordinate $r = (x_i x_i)^{1/2}$. Denoting \mathcal{M}_r to be the space of flat connections that depends only on r and the subspace \mathcal{M}_r^n of \mathcal{M}_r to be those flat connections that have winding number n , we can recast the sum in (3.12) as

$$Z \approx \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-I[\mathcal{A}_n(r)]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}_n(r)] \right)^{-1/2} \text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n), \quad (3.13)$$

with $\mathcal{A}_n(r) \in \mathcal{M}_r^n$ for each n . We will insert 1 into this sum in the following way

$$Z \approx \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-I[\mathcal{A}_n(r)]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}_n(r)] \right)^{-1/2} \text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n) \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_r^n)} \int_{\mathcal{M}_r^n} \mathcal{D}A_n(r). \quad (3.14)$$

Now, one can take the exponential and the determinant inside the integral over \mathcal{M}_r^n , because they are gauge invariant and hence taking them into the integral will not affect the result:

$$Z \approx \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n)}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_r^n)} \int_{\mathcal{M}_r^n} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}_n(r) e^{-I[\mathcal{A}_n(r)]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}_n(r)] \right)^{-1/2}. \quad (3.15)$$

If the volume of the solution space of flat connections $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$, and that of the solution space of flat connections possessing spherical symmetry \mathcal{M}_r^n are independent of n , then one can take them out of the sum over n . Let us assume, for the moment, that this is the case, and take them out of the sum. We will show later that they are indeed independent of n . After taking them out of the sum, they can be fed into the normalization of the path integral, so we can drop them. Hence, one has

$$\begin{aligned} Z &\approx \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathcal{M}_r^n} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}_n(r) e^{-I[\mathcal{A}_n(r)]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}_n(r)] \right)^{-1/2} \\ &\approx \int_{\mathcal{M}_r} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}(r) e^{-I[\mathcal{A}(r)]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}(r)] \right)^{-1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

where we combined the integral over the n -th sector and the discrete sum into a single integral over the solution space of spherically symmetric flat connections \mathcal{M}_r . Now we argue that the right-hand side is the semiclassical evaluation of the path integral of the quantum Chern-Simons theory restricted to the spherically symmetric domain, that is

$$Z_{\text{spherical}} \equiv \int_{\text{spherical}} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}(r) e^{-I[\mathcal{A}(r)]} \approx \int_{\mathcal{M}_r} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}(r) e^{-I[\mathcal{A}(r)]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}(r)] \right)^{-1/2}, \quad (3.17)$$

where $A(r)$ is a gauge field configuration that depends only on the r -coordinate but is not necessarily a solution to the equations of motion. On the other hand $\mathcal{A}(r)$ is a spherically symmetric flat gauge field, so it is in \mathcal{M}_r . For the restricted path integral, the full solution space is given by \mathcal{M}_r , because the main integral is restricted only to spherically symmetric configurations. Thus it is easy to see that the semiclassical evaluation is really the integral over the solution space \mathcal{M}_r . The right-hand side, by (3.16), is equal to the semiclassical evaluation of the ordinary quantum Chern-Simons theory, without a restriction to the spherically symmetric configurations. Therefore, we conclude that

$$Z \cong Z_{\text{spherical}}, \quad (3.18)$$

where \cong means that the semiclassical (large κ) limit of the path integral on the left-hand side, which is a 3-dimensional QFT, is *exactly* the same as the semiclassical limit of the path integral on the right-hand side, which we will argue *is* a 1-dimensional QFT.

We can generalize our argument for the path integral of any gauge invariant functional $\mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}]$ over the moduli space of the Chern-Simons theory. One has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A} \mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}] &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}_n] \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}_n = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}_n] \text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n) \\ \int_{\mathcal{M}_r} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}(r) \mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}(r)] &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}_n(r)] \int_{\mathcal{M}_r^n} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A}_n(r) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}_n(r)] \text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_r^n). \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

In showing that the path integral of \mathcal{F} over \mathcal{M}_{CS} is the same, up to normalization, as the path integral of \mathcal{F} over \mathcal{M}_r , we need to assume that the volumes of the respective solution spaces are independent of n so that one can take them out of the discrete sum. This is essentially the same argument that we carried out for the special case

$$\mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}] = e^{-I[\mathcal{A}]} \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}] \right)^{-1/2}. \quad (3.20)$$

Consequently, we can show that the two lines give the same results apart from a constant scaling, for a general gauge invariant functional $\mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}]$.

$$\frac{1}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}})} \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A} \mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}] = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}_n] = \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_r)} \int_{\mathcal{M}_r} \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A} \mathcal{F}[\mathcal{A}]. \quad (3.21)$$

That this equality holds for an arbitrary gauge invariant functional implies, in particular, that the observables of the 3-dimensional theory must reduce, in the large κ limit, to the observables of the 1-dimensional theory, because the observables are gauge invariant. In Chern-Simons gauge theory, the only gauge invariant observables are the Wilson loop operators, defined by

$$W_R(C) \equiv \text{Tr}_R P \exp \left(\oint_C A \right), \quad (3.22)$$

with Tr_R the trace in the representation R , P is the path ordering operator, and C is a curve over which the extended operator is defined. The correlation function of some product of Wilson lines is defined as

$$\left\langle \prod_i W_{R_i}(C_i) \right\rangle = \int \mathcal{D}A e^{-I[A]} \prod_i W_{R_i}(C_i). \quad (3.23)$$

Since $W_R(C)$ is gauge invariant, in the large κ limit we expect these correlation functions to reduce to the correlation functions of the 1-dimensional theory. Finding the corresponding observable to the Wilson operators, in the reduced theory, is an open problem.

The conclusion is that the semiclassical evaluation of the quantum Chern-Simons theory can be dealt with by considering only the classical solutions that possess spherical symmetry. The path integral and the observables of both theories agree exactly in the semiclassical regime. The most general form of the gauge connection that possesses spherical symmetry is given by the three-dimensional version of the multi-instanton ansatz of

Witten [16], which we employed in the previous sections. Moreover, the reduced action under the spherically symmetric ansatz reads

$$S_{\text{CS}} = \kappa \int dr \left(\bar{Y}(\partial_r + iA)Y - iA \right). \quad (3.24)$$

And it follows from (3.17) that

$$\int \mathcal{D}A \exp \left(\frac{i\kappa}{4\pi} \int CS(A) \right) \cong \int \mathcal{D}ADY\mathcal{D}\bar{Y} \exp \left(-\kappa \int dr \left(\bar{Y}(\partial_r + iA)Y - iA \right) \right), \quad (3.25)$$

and, by equality, we mean that the large κ limit of both sides agrees *exactly*.

Now we take up the issue of showing that the volume of either $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$ or \mathcal{M}_r^n is independent of n . We argue as follows: Take $n = 1$ and let $\mathcal{A}_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^1$. Homotopically, all other elements in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^1$ can be generated by the orbit of \mathcal{A}_1 under the action of small gauge transformations, living in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^0$ ². Take $\mathcal{A}_1 = g_1 dg_1^{-1}$ so one can write $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^1$ as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^1 = \{ \mathcal{A} = g'_1 d(g'_1)^{-1} | g'_1 = g_0 g_1 \ \& \ g_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^0 \}. \quad (3.26)$$

Now, consider $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$ with $n \neq 1$. An element in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$ can be taken, for example, as $g_n = (g_1)^n$ ³, and all the other elements can be generated by the orbit of g_n under the action of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^0$. That is to say

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n = \{ \mathcal{A} = g'_n d(g'_n)^{-1} | g'_n = g_0 g_n \ \& \ g_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^0 \}. \quad (3.27)$$

Since both $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^1$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$ are generated by the action of the same set of gauge transformations, we conclude that $\text{vol}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n)$ is the same for all n (note that this argument relies on the group structure of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^0$). The same argument applies for \mathcal{M}_r^n because, for all n , the space \mathcal{M}_r^n will be generated by the orbit of the same group of transformations \mathcal{M}_r^0 .

Let us summarize the results of this section in a table

In a forthcoming paper, we shall study the semiclassical theory in the gravitational setting in more detail.

4 $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Chern-Simons Theory or de Sitter Gravity

For $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Chern-Simons gauge theory, the connection is a doublet of the form $(\mathcal{A}, \bar{\mathcal{A}}) = (\mathcal{A}^a t^a, \bar{\mathcal{A}}^a t^a)$. The action is given by (we are using conventions from [15, 19]) :

$$I = \frac{t}{4\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \text{Tr} \left(\mathcal{A} \wedge d\mathcal{A} + \frac{2}{3} \mathcal{A} \wedge \mathcal{A} \wedge \mathcal{A} \right) - \frac{\bar{t}}{4\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \text{Tr} \left(\bar{\mathcal{A}} \wedge d\bar{\mathcal{A}} + \frac{2}{3} \bar{\mathcal{A}} \wedge \bar{\mathcal{A}} \wedge \bar{\mathcal{A}} \right). \quad (4.1)$$

²To be more precise, the group of small gauge transformations is \mathcal{G}_0 , and it can be mapped onto $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^0$ by $g_0 \mapsto g_0 dg_0^{-1}$. Since the two spaces are isomorphic, we will abuse terminology and say $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^0$ when we actually mean \mathcal{G}_0 for small gauge transformations.

³For negative n , one needs to choose a gauge function g_{-1} with winding number -1 and take the $n - th$ power $(g_{-1})^n$ which has winding number $-n$.

$\kappa \rightarrow \infty$	3d Chern-Simons Theory on \mathcal{M}	1d Reduced Chern-Simons Matter Theory
Action	$I[A]$	$S_{\text{CS}}[A, Y, \bar{Y}]$
Path Integral	$Z = \sum_n \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}] \right)^{-1/2}$	$Z_{\text{spherical}} = \sum_n \det \left(I''[\mathcal{A}(r)] \right)^{-1/2} \cong Z$
Observables	$W_R(C)$?

This action is equivalent to the action of de Sitter Gravity in the first-order formalism if one makes the identification:

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{4G_N} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{A}^a = \omega^a + ie^a \quad ; \quad \bar{\mathcal{A}}^a = \omega^a - ie^a, \quad (4.2)$$

where e_i^a is the dreibein and ω_i^a is the spin connection. The equations of motion are

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij}^a = 0 = \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{ij}^a, \quad (4.3)$$

with

$$\mathcal{F} = d_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{A} \quad ; \quad \bar{\mathcal{F}} = d_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}\bar{\mathcal{A}}, \quad (4.4)$$

with the covariant derivative

$$d_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{A} = d\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A} \wedge \mathcal{A} \quad ; \quad d_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}\bar{\mathcal{A}} = d\bar{\mathcal{A}} + \bar{\mathcal{A}} \wedge \bar{\mathcal{A}} \quad (4.5)$$

On the dS₃ gravity side, the equations of motion give Einstein's equations with a positive cosmological constant (with the radius of de Sitter space taken to be 1) in the first-order formalism. In this theory, let us employ an extension of the spherically symmetric ansatz

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= t^a \left[\varepsilon_{iak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} (\varphi_2 - 1) + \frac{\delta_{ia}^\perp}{r} \varphi_1 + \frac{x_i x_a}{r^2} A \right] dx^i, \\ \bar{\mathcal{A}} &= t^a \left[\varepsilon_{iak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} (\bar{\varphi}_2 - 1) + \frac{\delta_{ia}^\perp}{r} \bar{\varphi}_1 - \frac{x_i x_a}{r^2} \bar{A} \right] dx^i. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

We will set $t = i\kappa$ and $\bar{t} = -i\kappa$. After reducing the action, and dropping the boundary terms $\int dr \partial_r \varphi_1$ and $\int dr \partial_r \bar{\varphi}_1$, we get:

$$S = i\kappa \int dr \left(\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1' \varphi_2 + A(\varphi_2^2 + \varphi_1^2 - 1) \right) - i\kappa \int dr \left(\bar{\varphi}_1 \bar{\varphi}_2' - \bar{\varphi}_1' \bar{\varphi}_2 - \bar{A}(\bar{\varphi}_2^2 + \bar{\varphi}_1^2 - 1) \right). \quad (4.7)$$

Define the complex scalar fields

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= \varphi_1 + i\varphi_2 \quad ; \quad Y_2 = \bar{\varphi}_1 - i\bar{\varphi}_2, \\ \bar{Y}_1 &= \varphi_1 - i\varphi_2 \quad ; \quad \bar{Y}_2 = \bar{\varphi}_1 + i\bar{\varphi}_2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

which can be used to recast the reduced action as

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \kappa \int dr \left(\frac{1}{2} (\bar{Y}_1 Y_1' - \bar{Y}_1' Y_1) + A (\bar{Y}_1 Y_1 - 1) \right) + \kappa \int dr \left(\frac{1}{2} (\bar{Y}_2 Y_2' - \bar{Y}_2' Y_2) + \bar{A} (\bar{Y}_2 Y_2 - 1) \right) \\
&= \kappa \int dr \left(\bar{Y}_1 (\partial_r + iA) Y_1 - iA \right) + \kappa \int dr \left(\bar{Y}_2 (\partial_r + iA) Y_2 - i\bar{A} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

With the complex scalar fields Y_1, Y_2 , we associate Grassmanian valued fields ψ_1, ψ_2

$$Y_1(r), Y_2(r) \longleftrightarrow \psi_1(\tau), \psi_2(\tau), \tag{4.10}$$

after which we have

$$S = \int d\tau \left(\bar{\psi}_1 (\partial_\tau + iA) \psi_1 - i\kappa A \right) + \int d\tau \left(\bar{\psi}_2 (\partial_\tau + i\bar{A}) \psi_2 - i\kappa \bar{A} \right), \tag{4.11}$$

where κ is absorbed in the definitions of the Grassmanian fields..

What we see is that through dimensional reduction of 3-dimensional dS-gravity, we get two copies of a quantum mechanical model of fermions coupled to gauge connections A and \bar{A} . In the 3-dimensional theory, we can use the Schwinger gauge $x_i \mathcal{A}_i^a = x^a (A - \bar{A}) = 0$, with which the action can be written as

$$S = \int d\tau \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N_f=2} \bar{\psi}_i (\partial_\tau + iA) \psi_i - 2i\kappa A \right). \tag{4.12}$$

So, in the gauge theory formalism of dS₃ gravity, spherically symmetric configurations are governed by a first-order action that is very similar to a fermionic action in Euclidean formalism. But now, the coefficient of A is 2κ instead of κ . This was unexpected a priori because now the large-gauge invariance of the corresponding quantum theory requires κ to be a half-integer, as opposed to being an integer. But in 3-dimensions, κ is quantized to be an integer. Restricting κ to an integer does not break in any way the large gauge invariance of (4.12), but it is interesting that fractional Chern-Simons levels are allowed in the reduced theory.

Another way to view the situation arising from the factor 2 in front of the A term is to scale $A \rightarrow \frac{A}{2}$. The fundamental charge of the fermionic fields is halved, because the covariant kinetic term becomes $\bar{\psi} (\partial_\tau + \frac{i}{2} A) \psi$, which means that each of the fermions is charged with $\frac{1}{2}$ under the local U(1) gauge symmetry. That is to say, under the gauge transformation

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi' &= e^{\frac{i}{2} \Lambda} \psi, \\
A' &= A + \partial_\tau \Lambda,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

the action changes by $-2\pi i \kappa n$, where $n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\tau \Lambda$ is the winding number of the large-gauge transformation, and now κ is not fractional.

One other place where this reduction may be potentially useful is in understanding the relation between dS₃ gravity and SYK models [15].

5 Large κ Limit of $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Quantum Chern-Simons Theory

Let us study the large κ limit [19]. We will draw conclusions from section 3. The path integral is given as

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\mathcal{A} \mathcal{D}\bar{\mathcal{A}} \exp \left\{ \frac{i\kappa}{4\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} CS(\mathcal{A}) - \frac{i\kappa}{4\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} CS(\bar{\mathcal{A}}) \right\}, \quad (5.1)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} CS(\mathcal{A}) &= \text{Tr} \left(\mathcal{A} \wedge d\mathcal{A} + \frac{2}{3} \mathcal{A} \wedge \mathcal{A} \wedge \mathcal{A} \right), \\ CS(\bar{\mathcal{A}}) &= \text{Tr} \left(\bar{\mathcal{A}} \wedge d\bar{\mathcal{A}} + \frac{2}{3} \bar{\mathcal{A}} \wedge \bar{\mathcal{A}} \wedge \bar{\mathcal{A}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

The integrals decompose and the semiclassical evaluation gives

$$\begin{aligned} Z \approx & \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\int \mathcal{D}\omega \exp \left(\frac{i\kappa}{4\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \text{Tr}(\omega \wedge d_{\mathcal{A}_n} \omega) \right) \right)^{-1/2} \\ & \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\int \mathcal{D}\bar{\omega} \exp \left(-\frac{i\kappa}{4\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \text{Tr}(\bar{\omega} \wedge d_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} \bar{\omega}) \right) \right)^{-1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where \mathcal{A}_n and $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m$ are flat connections so that

$$\mathcal{F} = d_{\mathcal{A}_n} \mathcal{A}_n = 0 \quad ; \quad \bar{\mathcal{F}} = d_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_m} \bar{\mathcal{A}}_m = 0, \quad (5.4)$$

and their winding numbers are n and m , respectively. The same argument that was carried out for $SU(2)$ Quantum Chern-Simons theory at large κ can be carried out here to show that:

$$Z \cong Z_{\text{spherical}} \times \bar{Z}_{\text{spherical}}, \quad (5.5)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\text{spherical}} &= \int \mathcal{D}A D Y_1 \mathcal{D}\bar{Y}_1 \exp \left(-\kappa \int dr \left(\bar{Y}_1 (\partial_r + iA) Y_1 - iA \right) \right), \\ \bar{Z}_{\text{spherical}} &= \int \mathcal{D}\bar{A} D Y_2 \mathcal{D}\bar{Y}_2 \exp \left(-\kappa \int dr \left(\bar{Y}_2 (\partial_r + i\bar{A}) Y_2 - i\bar{A} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Of course, Z can be decomposed into two parts to begin with, since \mathcal{A} and $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ do not mix with each other. In that sense, the result we got from $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Chern-Simons theory is like the doublet of the result we got from $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons theory.

6 Dimensional Reduction of Euclidean $SU(2)$ Chern-Simons Higgs Theory

In Euclidean space, we consider the action

$$S = \frac{i\kappa}{8\pi g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} \left(A_i^a \partial_j A_k^a + \frac{\varepsilon^{abc}}{3} A_i^a A_j^b A_k^c \right) + \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^3x \left(\frac{1}{2} D_i \Phi^a D_i \Phi^a + V(\Phi^a) \right), \quad (6.1)$$

where Φ^a is in the adjoint representation of $SU(2)$, and we have

$$D_i \Phi^a = \partial_i \Phi^a + \varepsilon^{abc} A_i^b \Phi^c. \quad (6.2)$$

We take the potential as the super renormalizable Higgs potential ⁴

$$V(\Phi^a) = \frac{\lambda}{4} (\Phi^a \Phi^a - v^2)^2. \quad (6.3)$$

The field equations are

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \frac{\delta S}{\delta \Phi^a} &\implies 0 = -D_i D_i \Phi^a + \frac{\partial V}{\partial \Phi^a}, \\ 0 = \frac{\delta S}{\delta A_i^a} &\implies 0 = \frac{i\kappa}{4\pi g_{\text{YM}}^2} \varepsilon_{ijk} F_{jk}^a + \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \varepsilon^{abc} \Phi^b D_i \Phi^c. \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

Under a gauge transformation, the Higgs term is invariant. The Chern-Simons term changes as

$$\frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \delta I = -2\pi i \frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} n; \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (6.5)$$

n being the winding number of the gauge transformation, given by (2.6). For the corresponding quantum theory to be gauge invariant, we must impose the condition

$$k \equiv \frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (6.6)$$

Are there monopole solutions in the theory defined by (6.1)? We know that if the kinetic term were the 3d Yang-Mills term, then the corresponding Yang-Mills-Higgs action could be considered as the energy functional of a 3 + 1 dimensional Georgi-Glashow model which admits monopoles that are called 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles. On another route, one could take the 3d Yang-Mills Higgs action to be a 3 + 0 dimensional Euclidean theory, where the solutions would be now 't Hooft-Polyakov instantons, strictly speaking. It is well known in the literature of topological solitons [8] that here are finite energy static monopole solutions in 3+1 dimensions (or finite Euclidean action instanton solutions in 3+0 dimensions), with a corresponding Bogomolny'i bound on the energy (the Euclidean action). In the limit where the Higgs potential vanishes, called the BPS limit, one can saturate the bound if the fields solve the BPS equations

$$\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} F_{jk}^a = D_i \Phi^a, \quad (6.7)$$

and these solutions are called BPS monopoles (instantons). The energy (Euclidean action) of the monopoles (instantons) for the BPS solutions is proportional to the topological charge of the soliton, and inversely proportional to the coupling constant g_{YM} , a characteristic scenario in topological solitons.

⁴We will take the renormalizable $(\Phi^a \Phi^a)^3$ term into consideration in section 6.2.

Having given a brief review of what would have happened if the gauge sector had a Yang-Mills term, we now get back to our situation. The equations of motion of the Chern-Simons Higgs theory from the variation of A_i^a can be written as [4]

$$B_i^a \Phi^a = 0, \quad (6.8)$$

with $B_i^a = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} F_{jk}^a$. This equation says that the magnetic field is orthogonal, in the sense of the quadratic form on the Lie algebra denoted Tr , to the Higgs field everywhere. If we consider 't Hooft's definition of the Abelian field strength in the direction of symmetry-breaking within the context of Chern-Simons Higgs theory

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij} = \mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(1)} + \mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)}, \quad (6.9)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(1)} &= \frac{\Phi^a}{(\Phi^b \Phi^b)^{1/2}} F_{ij}^a, \\ \mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)} &= -\varepsilon^{abc} \frac{\Phi^a}{(\Phi^a \Phi^a)^{3/2}} D_i \Phi^b D_j \Phi^c, \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

we see that from the equations of motion we have $\mathcal{F}^{(1)} = 0$ for any solution. Since the magnetic flux of the monopole⁵ is given by the surface integral of $\mathcal{B}_i = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \mathcal{F}_{jk}$ on a sphere at infinity, and since $\mathcal{B}_i^{(1)} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \mathcal{F}_{jk}^{(1)}$ is 0 everywhere, the only way to get a monopole with non-trivial magnetic flux (hence, nontrivial topological charge) is to make sure that $\mathcal{B}_i^{(2)} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \mathcal{F}_{jk}^{(2)}$ is non-vanishing at the boundary so that the surface integral of $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^{(1)} + \mathcal{B}^{(2)}$ is nonzero. But, if $\mathcal{B}^{(2)}$ is to be non-vanishing at infinity, then $D_i \Phi^a$ must be non-vanishing at infinity. Observe that the Euclidean action of the monopole solution goes like

$$S_E \sim \int d^3x (D_i \Phi^a)^2 + \dots, \quad (6.11)$$

at large $|x|$. But this action cannot converge if we want to construct a monopole solution with non-trivial flux at infinity, because for such a solution we necessarily have $D_i \Phi^a \xrightarrow{|x|=\infty} O(1/r)$, which means

$$S_E \sim 4\pi \int dr r^2 O(1/r^2) + \dots \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.12)$$

Which means that S_E diverges linearly in r . So, it appears that the finiteness of Euclidean action and the requirement of a non-trivial flux at infinity are in clash with each other, one being necessarily absent in the presence of the other condition.

Although we have shown that for Chern-Simons Higgs theories one cannot have finite action monopoles with non-trivial topological charge, let us proceed in any case to construct some solutions with non-trivial charge. For a monopole-instanton type of solution, we

⁵In the context of Chern-Simons Higgs theory, we will abuse terminology and say monopoles when we actually mean instantons.

employ the spherically symmetric ansatz that is well studied in the literature (see [4, 10, 13] and the references therein)

$$A^a = \left[\varepsilon_{iak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} (\varphi_2(r) - 1) + \frac{\delta_{ia}^\perp}{r} \varphi_1(r) + \frac{x_i x_a}{r^2} A(r) \right] dx^i, \quad (6.13)$$

$$\Phi^a = \frac{x^a}{r} \Phi(r).$$

The action reduces, upon integrating over the angles, to:

$$S = \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1' \varphi_2 + A(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2 - 1) \right) + \frac{4\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{r^2}{2} \Phi'^2 + \Phi^2(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) \right) + \int dr V, \quad (6.14)$$

with

$$\int dr V = \frac{\pi\lambda}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr r^2 (\Phi^2 - v^2)^2. \quad (6.15)$$

For the moment, we will ignore the potential term. Converting the φ 's into complex scalars Y as in (2.22), one ends up with the action

$$S = \frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\bar{Y}(\partial_r + iA)Y - iA \right) + \frac{4\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{r^2}{2} \Phi'^2 + \Phi^2 \bar{Y}Y \right) + \int dr V. \quad (6.16)$$

Because the kinetic term of Y is that of a fermionic field, we associate with the complex scalars Y the Grassmanian fields ψ and write ⁶

$$S = \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{1}{2} 4\pi r^2 \Phi'^2 + \kappa \bar{\psi}(\partial_r + iA)\psi + 4\pi \Phi^2 \bar{\psi}\psi - i\kappa A \right) + \int dr V. \quad (6.17)$$

If it were not for the r^2 factor in front of Φ'^2 term, this would be the action of a single scalar field in 1-dimension coupled to a Grassmanian valued field, and the $U(1)$ symmetry of the fermionic action is gauged with a Chern-Simons kinetic term. Since Φ is real, it cannot couple to the $U(1)$ gauge field A . Moreover, this is clearly in the Euclidean formalism because the fermionic kinetic term has no i in front of it. With the identification $\tau = r$, and scaling the fields $\Psi(\tau) = (\sqrt{\kappa}/g_{\text{YM}})\psi(\tau)$, and $\mathsf{X}(\tau) = (2\sqrt{\pi}/g_{\text{YM}})\Phi(\tau)$ we can rewrite (6.17) as

$$S = \int d\tau \left(\frac{\tau^2}{2} \dot{\mathsf{X}}^2 + \bar{\Psi}(\partial_\tau + iA)\Psi - \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} A + \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2}{\kappa} \mathsf{X}^2 \bar{\Psi}\Psi \right) + \int d\tau V(\mathsf{X}), \quad (6.18)$$

with a 1-dimensional time-dependent Higgs potential of which the minima are shifted

$$\int d\tau V(\mathsf{X}) = \frac{\lambda g_{\text{YM}}^2}{16\pi} \int d\tau \tau^2 \left(\mathsf{X}^2 - \frac{4\pi v^2}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \right)^2. \quad (6.19)$$

Note that the strength of the interactions between X and Ψ is controlled by the coupling constant g_{YM}^2/κ . This coupling constant cannot take arbitrary values because in 3d, $\frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2}$ is quantized.

At this point, there are two questions one may ask about the action in (6.18):

⁶At the level of the classical equations of motion, this is no problem. One can pair the classical solutions of the two actions in a well-defined one-to-one manner.

- Let us forget about the 3-dimensional origin, and start with (6.18), but without the explicit time dependencies arising in the action. If we want the corresponding quantum theory to be invariant under large gauge transformations of Ψ, A ; we must ensure that $k \equiv \frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2}$ is an integer, just as κ had to be an integer in 3d Chern-Simons theory to have a consistent quantum theory. But, the inverse of this parameter controls the strength of the interaction between X and Ψ . That is, the interaction term is $\frac{1}{k}\mathsf{X}^2\bar{\Psi}\Psi$. It would be interesting to study the effects of this interaction in the corresponding quantum theory.
- The interaction between X and Ψ indicates a possible supersymmetry in this model. To have a genuine supersymmetry, one would need to add a potential of the form $\frac{1}{2}h'(\mathsf{X})^2 \sim \mathsf{X}^6$ so that the interaction terms can be written as $\frac{1}{2}h'(\mathsf{X})^2 + h''(\mathsf{X})\bar{\Psi}\Psi$ with h being the superpotential [6]. With the canonical kinetic terms of the bosonic and fermionic fields, this gives a supersymmetric quantum mechanics in the Euclidean formalism. It would be interesting to study soliton solutions of the 3-dimensional Chern-Simons Higgs theory with an additional sixth-order potential, whose spherically symmetric solitons would be described by a supersymmetric quantum mechanics.

6.1 Chern-Simons Higgs Theory on a Curved Space

To remove the time dependence in the kinetic term of X in (6.17), we define the theory on a manifold \mathcal{M} which has spherical symmetry, and whose dreibein is assumed to be given as

$$e^a = \left[-\varepsilon^a{}_{ik} \frac{x^k}{r^2} e_1(r) + \frac{\delta_i^{\perp a}}{r} e_2(r) + \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2} e_3(r) \right] dx^i. \quad (6.20)$$

With this ansatz, we are exploiting the structural similarity of the $SU(2)$ gauge field and the dreibein in 3-dimensions. Now, observe that $x^a \equiv e_i^a x^i = e_3 x^a$, so we fix $e_3 = 1$. From the dreibein, one finds the metric as (see the appendix for explicit calculations)

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ij} &= e_i^a e_j^b \delta_{ab} = \frac{1}{r^2} ((e_1^2 + e_2^2) \delta_{ij}^{\perp} - x_i x_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{r^2} \left((e_1^2 + e_2^2) \delta_{ij} - \left(1 + \frac{(e_1^2 + e_2^2)}{r^2} \right) x_i x_j \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

We then consider the action

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{i\kappa}{8\pi g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} \left(A_i^a \partial_j A_k^a + \frac{\varepsilon^{abc}}{3} A_i^a A_j^b A_k^c \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \sqrt{|g|} \left(\frac{1}{2} g^{ij} D_i \Phi^a D_j \Phi^a + V(\Phi) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

The Chern-Simons term is topological, so it is not affected by the change in the geometry. Hence, it will reduce to the same action. To reduce the Higgs action, we need the determinant of g_{ij} and compute $g^{ij} D_i \Phi^a D_j \Phi^a$. One finds

$$\sqrt{|g|} = |e| = \frac{1}{r^2} (e_1^2 + e_2^2), \quad (6.23)$$

$$g^{ij}D_i\Phi^a D_j\Phi^a = \Phi'^2 + \frac{2}{e_1^2 + e_2^2}(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2)\Phi^2. \quad (6.24)$$

So the Higgs action reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} S_H &= \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d^3x |e| \left(g^{ij} \frac{1}{2} D_i \Phi^a D_j \Phi^a + V(\Phi) \right) \\ &= \frac{4\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{(e_1^2 + e_2^2)}{2} \Phi'^2 + (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) \Phi^2 + \frac{\lambda(e_1^2 + e_2^2)}{4} (\Phi^2 - v^2)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.25)$$

Therefore, the total action can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr (\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1' \varphi_2 + A(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2 - 1)) \\ &\quad + \frac{4\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{(e_1^2 + e_2^2)}{2} \Phi'^2 + (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) \Phi^2 + \frac{\lambda(e_1^2 + e_2^2)}{4} (\Phi^2 - v^2)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

So, through the choice of the geometry over which the theory is defined, we have eliminated the r^2 factor in front of the kinetic term. Indeed, the flat space limit corresponds to $(e_1^2 + e_2^2) = r^2$ so we recover (6.18).

If one adds the Einstein-Hilbert term into the action, making gravity to be dynamical, then we would also need a spin connection ω which we could take to be in the same form as the gauge field ansatz, then the term $(e_1^2 + e_2^2)\Phi'^2$ is a nonlinear interaction between the Higgs field and the gravity. We will not discuss this in this paper.

Let us fix $e_1^2 + e_2^2 = r_0^2$ for a constant r_0^2 so that in front of the kinetic term we just have a constant. The metric now becomes:

$$g_{ij} = \frac{1}{r^2} \left(r_0^2 \delta_{ij} + \left(1 - \frac{r_0^2}{r^2} \right) x_i x_j \right), \quad (6.27)$$

and the line element reads as

$$ds^2 = dr^2 + r_0^2 d\Omega^2. \quad (6.28)$$

So the resulting space has the geometry of $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$ with S^2 having fixed radius r_0 . It makes sense that this choice of geometry removes the r^2 term in front of Φ'^2 because that factor resulted from the angular integral which gives $4\pi r^2$; but if we fix the geometry such that all spheres have the same surface area, $4\pi r_0^2$, then the reduced action now comes with r_0^2 , not r^2 .

Defining $Y = \varphi_1 + i\varphi_2$, $\bar{Y} = \varphi_1 - i\varphi_2$, the action can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\bar{Y} (\partial_r + iA) Y - iA \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{4\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{r_0^2}{2} \Phi'^2 + \Phi^2 \bar{Y} Y + \frac{\lambda r_0^2}{4} (\Phi^2 - v^2)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.29)$$

Associating Y with a Grassmanian field ψ one gets

$$S = \frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\bar{\psi}(\partial_r + iA)\psi - iA \right) + \frac{4\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{r_0^2}{2} \Phi'^2 + \Phi^2 \bar{\psi}\psi + \frac{\lambda r_0^2}{4} (\Phi^2 - v^2)^2 \right), \quad (6.30)$$

and scaling the fields by $\Psi = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa}}{g_{\text{YM}}} \psi$, $\mathbf{X} = \frac{2\sqrt{\pi r_0}}{g_{\text{YM}}} \Phi$,

$$S = \int d\tau \left(\bar{\Psi}(\partial_\tau + iA)\Psi - \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} A \right) + \int d\tau \left(\frac{1}{2} \dot{\mathbf{X}}^2 + \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2}{r_0^2 \kappa} \mathbf{X}^2 \bar{\Psi}\Psi + \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2 \lambda}{16\pi r_0^2} \left(\mathbf{X}^2 - \frac{4\pi r_0^2 v^2}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \right)^2 \right). \quad (6.31)$$

The expectation value for the Higgs field of the 3-dimensional theory is v whereas that of the 1-dimensional reduced theory is $4\pi r_0^2/g_{\text{YM}}^2 v$, so it is scaled up. Note that the fermionic sector of this theory has a $U(1)$ gauge symmetry, and for the quantum theory of this model to exhibit invariance under large-gauge transformations, we must have

$$e^{i2\pi n \kappa/g_{\text{YM}}^2} = 1 \implies k \equiv \frac{\kappa}{2} \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (6.32)$$

where n is the winding number of the large gauge transformation. In particular, as we noted earlier in this section, the interaction between \mathbf{X} and Ψ is controlled by the coupling constant $\frac{1}{r_0^2 k}$ for an integer k . This is an unusual interaction term, involving the Chern-Simons level in the denominator. Another observation one can make is that with a double-well potential, the theory is expected to have the usual quantum mechanical instanton solutions. So the quantum version of this theory seems very rich.

Getting back to monopoles, we recall (6.10)

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)} = -\varepsilon^{abc} \frac{\Phi^a}{(\Phi^a \Phi^a)^{3/2}} D_i \Phi^b D_j \Phi^c. \quad (6.33)$$

By the equations of motion, we will have $\mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(1)} = 0$. Inserting our ansatz into this expression, we get (see the appendix)

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)} = -\varepsilon_{ijk} \frac{x^k}{r^2} (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2), \quad (6.34)$$

the magnetic field is thus

$$\mathcal{B}_i^{(2)} = -\frac{x_i}{r^2} (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2). \quad (6.35)$$

The flux integral at ∞ gives

$$\Phi_{\text{flux}} = -4\pi(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) = -4\pi \bar{Y} Y. \quad (6.36)$$

So, $\bar{Y}(r)Y(r)$ is associated with an r -dependent magnetic charge of the monopole solution. In terms of the fermionic field Ψ , we have

$$\Phi_{\text{flux}} = -\frac{4\pi g_{\text{YM}}^2}{\kappa} \bar{\Psi}\Psi = -\frac{4\pi}{k} \bar{\Psi}\Psi. \quad (6.37)$$

6.2 Dimensional Reduction of the Chern-Simons Higgs Theory on \mathcal{M} as a Supersymmetric Quantum Mechanics

We get back to discussing the second question we posed above, which is, can we have supersymmetry in (6.31)? In the Euclidean formalism, the action of a supersymmetric quantum mechanics with superpotential $h(\mathbf{X})$ reads [6]:

$$S_E = \int d\tau \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\mathbf{X}}{d\tau} \right)^2 + \bar{\Psi} \frac{d}{d\tau} \Psi + \frac{1}{2} h'^2(\mathbf{X}) + h''(\mathbf{X}) \bar{\Psi} \Psi \right), \quad (6.38)$$

which is invariant under the supersymmetry transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathbf{X} &= \epsilon \bar{\Psi} - \bar{\epsilon} \Psi, \\ \delta\Psi &= \epsilon \left(-\frac{d\mathbf{X}}{d\tau} + h'(\mathbf{X}) \right), \\ \delta\bar{\Psi} &= \bar{\epsilon} \left(+\frac{d\mathbf{X}}{d\tau} + h'(\mathbf{X}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.39)$$

In (6.31), we have $h''(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2}{r_0^2 \kappa} \mathbf{X}^2$, but then we need a term of the form $h'^2 \sim \mathbf{X}^6$. We also have an extra Higgs potential in the action. We consider the BPS limit so that only the sixth-order term of the potential is nonzero, and choose the coefficient of the sixth-order term so that there is a supersymmetry in our theory. We thus modify (6.31) as

$$S = \int d\tau \left(\bar{\Psi} \left(\frac{d}{d\tau} + iA \right) \Psi - \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} A \right) + \int d\tau \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\mathbf{X}}{d\tau} \right)^2 + \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2}{r_0^2 \kappa} \mathbf{X}^2 \bar{\Psi} \Psi + \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^4}{18r_0^4 \kappa^2} \mathbf{X}^6 \right). \quad (6.40)$$

Therefore, we have

$$h(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2}{12r_0^2 \kappa} \mathbf{X}^4 = \frac{1}{12r_0^2 k} \mathbf{X}^4, \quad (6.41)$$

as the superpotential. Again, it is interesting that the superpotential is proportional to $\frac{1}{r_0^2 k}$.

What kind of potential do we need to add to the 3d Chern-Simons Higgs theory so that the reduced action in the BPS limit is (6.40)? We consider the following potential in 3-dimensions

$$V = \frac{\lambda}{4} (\Phi^a \Phi^a - v^2)^2 + K (\Phi^a \Phi^a)^3, \quad (6.42)$$

where K is to be determined, and we ignore the double-well term for now. The dimensional reduction of the 6th order term yields

$$\frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \sqrt{|g|} K (\Phi^a \Phi^a)^3 = \frac{4\pi r_0^2 K}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \Phi^6. \quad (6.43)$$

Recalling the definition of \mathbf{X} in terms of Φ :

$$\mathbf{X} = \frac{2\sqrt{\pi} r_0}{g_{\text{YM}}} \Phi, \quad (6.44)$$

one gets

$$\frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \sqrt{|g|} K (\Phi^a \Phi^a)^3 = \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^4 K}{(4\pi r_0^2)^2} \int dr \mathcal{X}^6. \quad (6.45)$$

We thus see that if

$$K = \frac{8\pi^2}{9\kappa^2}, \quad (6.46)$$

then the dimensional reduction of the potential will yield just the right term to have a supersymmetry in the reduced action. So, in 3-dimensions, starting from

$$S = \frac{i\kappa}{8\pi g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} \left(A_i^a \partial_j A_k^a + \frac{\varepsilon^{abc}}{3} A_i^a A_j^b A_k^c \right) + \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \sqrt{|g|} \left(\frac{1}{2} g^{ij} D_i \Phi^a D_j \Phi^a + V(\Phi) \right), \quad (6.47)$$

with

$$V = \frac{\lambda}{4} (\Phi^a \Phi^a - v^2)^2 + \frac{8\pi^2}{9\kappa^2} (\Phi^a \Phi^a)^3, \quad (6.48)$$

one gets the following action in the BPS limit, upon dimensional reduction

$$S = \int d\tau \left(\frac{1}{2} \dot{\mathcal{X}}^2 + \bar{\Psi} (\partial_\tau + iA) \Psi - ikA \right) + \int d\tau \left(\frac{1}{r_0^2 k} \mathcal{X}^2 \bar{\Psi} \Psi + \frac{1}{18r_0^4 k^2} \mathcal{X}^6 \right), \quad (6.49)$$

with $k \equiv \frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2}$ an integer. This action governs the spherically symmetric monopole solutions in the theory defined by the action (6.47). Thus, we see that the 't Hooft-Polyakov instantons on \mathcal{M} which has the geometry of $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$ that possess spherical symmetry are effectively described by a supersymmetric quantum mechanics. This is interesting in that one may understand the quantization of spherically symmetric monopoles by studying a supersymmetric theory in 1d with a superpotential of the form $h(\mathcal{X}) \sim \mathcal{X}^4$.

Let us discuss the monopoles in this theory. The addition of a sixth-order term in the potential does not change the fact that $\mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(1)}$ in (6.10) is 0 for all solutions to the equations of motion, nor does it change the expression for $\mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)}$. But now, it has a very interesting interpretation due to supersymmetry. We have

$$\Phi_{\text{flux}} = -\frac{4\pi}{k} \bar{\Psi} \Psi \equiv -\frac{4\pi}{k} F, \quad (6.50)$$

where F is the fermion number operator. In the context of supersymmetric quantum mechanics, the Witten index [6] defined by

$$\mathcal{I} = \text{Tr} \left((-1)^F e^{-\beta H} \right), \quad (6.51)$$

gives information about the ground state structure of the supersymmetric quantum theory. According to our dictionary, the flux of a monopole in Chern-Simons Higgs theory is related to the fermion number operator F , which in turn is related to the \mathbb{Z}_2 grading operator $(-1)^F$, which in turn is related to the Witten index.

7 Dimensional Reduction of Euclidean $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Chern-Simons Higgs Theory

Let us consider what happens when we reduce the $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Chern-Simons Higgs theory through our ansatz. We consider

$$\begin{aligned}
S = & \frac{t}{8\pi g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} \left(\mathcal{A}_i^a \partial_j \mathcal{A}_k^a + \frac{\varepsilon^{abc}}{3} \mathcal{A}_i^a \mathcal{A}_j^b \mathcal{A}_k^c \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \sqrt{|g|} \left(\frac{1}{2} g^{ij} \mathcal{D}_i \Phi^a \mathcal{D}_j \Phi^a + V(\Phi) \right) \\
& + \frac{\bar{t}}{8\pi g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} \left(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_i^a \partial_j \bar{\mathcal{A}}_k^a + \frac{\varepsilon^{abc}}{3} \bar{\mathcal{A}}_i^a \bar{\mathcal{A}}_j^b \bar{\mathcal{A}}_k^c \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \sqrt{|g|} \left(\frac{1}{2} g^{ij} \bar{\mathcal{D}}_i \bar{\Phi}^a \bar{\mathcal{D}}_j \bar{\Phi}^a + V(\bar{\Phi}) \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

where the connection is a doublet of the form $(\mathcal{A}, \bar{\mathcal{A}}) = (\mathcal{A}^a T^a, \bar{\mathcal{A}}^a T^a)$ and similarly for the adjoint field $(\Phi, \bar{\Phi}) = (\Phi^a T^a, \bar{\Phi}^a T^a)$. The Higgs field is in the adjoint representation, hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_i \Phi^a &= \partial_i \Phi^a + \varepsilon^{abc} \mathcal{A}_i^b \Phi^c, \\
\bar{\mathcal{D}}_i \bar{\Phi}^a &= \partial_i \bar{\Phi}^a + \varepsilon^{abc} \bar{\mathcal{A}}_i^b \bar{\Phi}^c.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

The same story unfolds with the following ansatz:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}^a &= \left[(\varphi_2 - 1) \varepsilon_i^{ak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} + \varphi_1 \frac{\delta_i^{\perp a}}{r} + A \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2} \right] dx^i, \\
\bar{\mathcal{A}}^a &= \left[(\bar{\varphi}_2 - 1) \varepsilon_i^{ak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} + \bar{\varphi}_1 \frac{\delta_i^{\perp a}}{r} - \bar{A} \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2} \right] dx^i, \\
\Phi^a &= \frac{x^a}{r} \Phi, \\
\bar{\Phi}^a &= \frac{x^a}{r} \bar{\Phi}, \\
e^a &= \left[-\varepsilon^a_{ik} \frac{x^k}{r^2} e_1 + \delta_i^{\perp a} \frac{e_2}{r} + \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2} e_3 \right] dx^i,
\end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

where all of the ansatz fields depend only on $r = (x_i x_i)^{1/2}$. We take $t = i\kappa$ and $\bar{t} = -i\kappa$, and invariance under large gauge transformations enforces the parameter $\frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2}$ to be an integer. The action reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
S = & \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr (\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1' \varphi_2 + A(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2 - 1)) \\
& + \frac{4\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{(e_1^2 + e_2^2)}{2} \Phi'^2 + (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) \Phi^2 + \frac{\lambda(e_1^2 + e_2^2)}{4} (\Phi^2 - v^2)^2 \right) \\
& - \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr (\bar{\varphi}_1 \bar{\varphi}_2' - \bar{\varphi}_1' \bar{\varphi}_2 - \bar{A}(\bar{\varphi}_1^2 + \bar{\varphi}_2^2 - 1)) \\
& + \frac{4\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{(e_1^2 + e_2^2)}{2} \bar{\Phi}'^2 + (\bar{\varphi}_1^2 + \bar{\varphi}_2^2) \bar{\Phi}^2 + \frac{\lambda(e_1^2 + e_2^2)}{4} (\bar{\Phi}^2 - v^2)^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

We define the complex scalars

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= \varphi_1 + i\varphi_2 \quad ; \quad Y_2 = \bar{\varphi}_1 - i\bar{\varphi}_2, \\ \bar{Y}_1 &= \varphi_1 - i\varphi_2 \quad ; \quad \bar{Y}_2 = \bar{\varphi}_1 + i\bar{\varphi}_2. \end{aligned} \quad (7.5)$$

Fixing $e_3 = 1$ and $e_1^2 + e_2^2 = r_0^2$, the action becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\bar{Y}_1 (\partial_r + iA) Y_1 - iA \right) \\ &+ \frac{4\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{r_0^2}{2} \Phi'^2 + \Phi^2 \bar{Y}_1 Y_1 + \frac{\lambda r_0^2}{4} (\Phi^2 - v^2)^2 \right) \\ &+ \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\bar{Y}_2 (\partial_r + i\bar{A}) Y_2 - i\bar{A} \right) \\ &+ \frac{4\pi}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(\frac{r_0^2}{2} \bar{\Phi}'^2 + \bar{\Phi}^2 \bar{Y}_2 Y_2 + \frac{\lambda r_0^2}{4} (\bar{\Phi}^2 - v^2)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

To the complex scalars Y_1, Y_2 , we associate Grassmanian fields ψ_1, ψ_2 ; and consider the action

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(4\pi r_0^2 \Phi'^2 + \kappa \bar{\psi}_1 (\partial_r + iA) \psi_1 + 8\pi \Phi^2 \bar{\psi}_1 \psi_1 + \frac{4\pi \lambda r_0^2}{4} (\Phi^2 - v^2)^2 \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr \left(4\pi r_0^2 \bar{\Phi}'^2 + \kappa \bar{\psi}_2 (\partial_r + i\bar{A}) \psi_2 + 8\pi \bar{\Phi}^2 \bar{\psi}_2 \psi_2 + \frac{4\pi \lambda r_0^2}{4} (\bar{\Phi}^2 - v^2)^2 \right) \\ &- \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int dr (A + \bar{A}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

Just as in the $SU(2)$ case, we identify $\tau = r$, and define

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_1(\tau) &= \frac{\sqrt{\kappa}}{g_{\text{YM}}} \psi(\tau) \quad ; \quad \Psi_2(\tau) = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa}}{g_{\text{YM}}} \chi(\tau), \\ \mathbf{X}_1(\tau) &= \frac{2\sqrt{\pi} r_0}{g_{\text{YM}}} \Phi(\tau) \quad ; \quad \mathbf{X}_2(\tau) = \frac{2\sqrt{\pi} r_0}{g_{\text{YM}}} \bar{\Phi}(\tau), \\ A_1(\tau) &= A(\tau) \quad ; \quad A_2(\tau) = \bar{A}(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

to write the action as

$$S = \int d\tau \sum_{j=1}^{N_f=2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_j^2 + \bar{\Psi}_j (\partial_\tau + iA_j) \Psi_j - \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} A_j + \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2}{r_0^2 \kappa} \mathbf{X}_j^2 \bar{\Psi}_j \Psi_j + V(\mathbf{X}_j) \right). \quad (7.9)$$

The new double well potential, of which the expectation of the Higgs field is scaled up by $\sqrt{4\pi r_0^2/g_{\text{YM}}^2}$, is given as

$$V(\mathbf{X}_j) = \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2 \lambda}{16\pi r_0^2} \left(\mathbf{X}_j^2 - \frac{4\pi r_0^2 v^2}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \right). \quad (7.10)$$

In the 3-dimensional theory, we can use the Schwinger gauge $x^i \mathcal{A}_i^a = x^a (A - \bar{A}) = 0$. This changes the above theory in an interesting way

$$S = \int d\tau \sum_{j=1}^{N_f=2} \left(\bar{\Psi}_j (\partial_\tau + iA) \Psi_j + \frac{1}{2} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_j^2 + \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2}{r_0^2 \kappa} \mathbf{X}_j^2 \bar{\Psi}_j \Psi_j + V(\mathbf{X}_j) \right) - \frac{2i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d\tau A. \quad (7.11)$$

The 2 in front of the 1d Chern-Simons term also appeared in the dimensional reduction of the $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ pure Chern-Simons theory. We see that if $k = \frac{\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2}$ is quantized to half-integers, then the Chern-Simons term is invariant under gauge transformations mod $2\pi m$ with $m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

So we have a relaxed quantization that allows for fractional Chern-Simons level. Note that k is quantized to be an integer in 3d, so we need to choose k integer in the reduced action as well. This does not spoil the gauge invariance of (7.11), yet it is interesting that one can allow for fractional Chern-Simons level in the reduced theory.

On another route, we can scale $A \rightarrow A/2$, then the fermion and the Chern-Simons terms become

$$I_{\text{Fermion}} + I_{\text{Gauge}} = \int d\tau \sum_{j=1}^{N_f=2} \bar{\Psi}_j \left(\partial_\tau + \frac{i}{2} A \right) \Psi_j - \frac{i\kappa}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int d\tau A. \quad (7.12)$$

The fermions have charge 1/2 under the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry. The transformations that leave the action invariant up to $2\pi im$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &\rightarrow e^{i\Lambda/2} \Psi, \\ A &\rightarrow A - \partial_\tau \Lambda = e^{i\Lambda/2} (A - 2i\partial_\tau) e^{-i\Lambda/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

The gauge transformation of A is now unusual, because of the 2. Under a large gauge transformation of winding number $n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\tau \partial_\tau \Lambda$, the action changes by

$$\delta I_{\text{Gauge}} = 2\pi i k n, \quad (7.14)$$

so now, the quantization condition is $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, but the fermions are charged with 1/2.

So we have two descriptions, in the first, fermions are charged 1 under $U(1)$, and the parameter k is a half-integer; whereas in the second, fermions are charged 1/2 and the parameter k is an integer.

7.1 The Reduced Action as a Supersymmetric Quantum Mechanics

We modify the potential in (7.11) as

$$V(\mathbf{X}_j) = \frac{g_{\text{YM}}^2 \lambda}{16\pi r_0^2} \left(\mathbf{X}_j^2 - \frac{4\pi r_0^2 v^2}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \right) + \frac{1}{18r_0^4 k^2} \mathbf{X}_j^6, \quad (7.15)$$

so that in the BPS limit, we have the two superpotentials

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(\mathbf{X}_1) &= \frac{1}{12r_0^2 k} \mathbf{X}_1^4, \\ h_2(\mathbf{X}_2) &= \frac{1}{12r_0^2 k} \mathbf{X}_2^4. \end{aligned} \quad (7.16)$$

The 3d action is then

$$\begin{aligned}
S = & \frac{i\kappa}{8\pi g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} \left(\mathcal{A}_i^a \partial_j \mathcal{A}_k^a + \frac{\varepsilon^{abc}}{3} \mathcal{A}_i^a \mathcal{A}_j^b \mathcal{A}_k^c \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \sqrt{|g|} \left(\frac{g^{ij}}{2} \mathcal{D}_i \Phi^a \mathcal{D}_j \Phi^a + \frac{\lambda}{4} (\Phi^a \Phi^a - v^2)^2 + \frac{8\pi^2}{9\kappa^2} (\Phi^a \Phi^a)^3 \right) \\
& + \frac{i\kappa}{8\pi g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \varepsilon^{ijk} \left(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_i^a \partial_j \overline{\mathcal{A}}_k^a + \frac{\varepsilon^{abc}}{3} \overline{\mathcal{A}}_i^a \overline{\mathcal{A}}_j^b \overline{\mathcal{A}}_k^c \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{g_{\text{YM}}^2} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^3x \sqrt{|g|} \left(\frac{g^{ij}}{2} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_i \overline{\Phi}^a \overline{\mathcal{D}}_j \overline{\Phi}^a + \frac{\lambda}{4} (\overline{\Phi}^a \overline{\Phi}^a - v^2)^2 + \frac{8\pi^2}{9\kappa^2} (\overline{\Phi}^a \overline{\Phi}^a)^3 \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{7.17}$$

And now there are two distinct Abelian field strengths

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{ij} &= \mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(1)} + \mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)} \\
\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{ij} &= \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{ij}^{(1)} + \overline{\mathcal{F}}_{ij}^{(2)}
\end{aligned} \tag{7.18}$$

The first ones will be zero by the field equations, and the second ones will have the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}_i^{(2)} &= -\frac{x_i}{r^2} (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2), \\
\overline{\mathcal{B}}_i^{(2)} &= -\frac{x_i}{r^2} (\overline{\varphi}_1^2 + \overline{\varphi}_2^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.19}$$

The associated fluxes are

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\text{flux}} &= -\frac{4\pi}{k} \overline{\Psi}_1 \Psi_1, \\
\overline{\Phi}_{\text{flux}} &= -\frac{4\pi}{k} \overline{\Psi}_2 \Psi_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.20}$$

And hence the total flux reads

$$\Phi_{\text{flux}} + \overline{\Phi}_{\text{flux}} = -\frac{4\pi}{k} \sum_i \overline{\Psi}_i \Psi_i. \tag{7.21}$$

8 Semiclassical Limit of Quantum Chern-Simons Higgs Theory

By a semiclassical argument, we were able to show that the pure quantum Chern-Simons theory in the large κ limit is *equivalent* to the 1d reduced theory through spherical symmetry. How do things unveil for the Chern-Simons Higgs theory? It is considerably more involved to show what we have shown for the pure Chern-Simons theory. To sketch the level of involvement for carrying out the semiclassical evaluation of the Chern-Simons Higgs theory, we argue based on a 0-dimensional QFT. Consider the following path integral

$$Z = \int dx dy e^{-f(x,y)}. \tag{8.1}$$

We denote the space of solutions $\delta f = 0$ as \mathcal{M} . For a pair $(x_n, y_n) \in \mathcal{M}$, one has

$$f(x, y) = f(x_n, y_n) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \partial_j f(x_n, y_n) \delta x^i \delta x^j, \tag{8.2}$$

with $i = (1, 2)$ and $\delta x^i = x^i - x_n^i$. One then takes the semiclassical limit

$$Z \approx \sum_{(x_n, y_n) \in \mathcal{M}} e^{-f(x_n, y_n)} \int_{B(x_n, y_n)} d[\delta x^1] d[\delta x^2] e^{-\frac{1}{2} \partial_i \partial_j f(x_n, y_n) \delta x^i \delta x^j}. \quad (8.3)$$

To carry out this integral in the semiclassical limit, one would need to diagonalize the Hessian

$$H_{ij} = \partial_i \partial_j f(x_n, y_n), \quad (8.4)$$

but this is easier said than done. First of all, one must ensure that $\det H \neq 0$. Even in that case, it is highly non-trivial to generalize this to the 3-dimensional Chern-Simons Higgs theory. For one thing, in the 0-dimensional theory, the fields x, y do not have extra structure on them, they are just variables. On the other hand, for a QFT in 3-dimensions, the fields can have index structures allowed by the dynamical and internal symmetries that are proposed to be present in the theory. For example, in the 3d Chern-Simons Higgs theory, one has a Lie-algebra valued 1-form gauge potential A and an adjoint valued scalar field Φ . It is not clear how one can combine these fields with different index structures when attempting to diagonalize the functional Hessian

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{\delta^2 S_{\text{CS-Higgs}}}{\delta \mathcal{A} \delta \mathcal{A}} \quad (8.5)$$

with \mathcal{A} representing the gauge and the Higgs fields.

But even before these discussions, one can make the following observation: In demonstrating that the 3d Chern-Simons is *equivalent* to the 1d reduced theory, an essential part of the argument was the assumption that the volumes of the solution spaces in a given topological sector n did not depend on the sector n . Because of this fact, we were able to drop the volume factors from the discrete sum over n . We later showed that the volumes of the solution spaces for the Chern-Simons theory were indeed independent of n , and essentially the reason this happens in Chern-Simons theory is because the solution space admits a group structure. Two flat connections in the same topological sector $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{CS}}^n$ can always be related by a topologically trivial gauge transformation $g_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$, so that each topological sector can be generated by the orbit of a particular flat connection under the group \mathcal{G}_0 .

It is easy to see that the solution space of Chern-Simons Higgs theory does not have the group structure described above. So, if one has the intention of showing that the semiclassical limit of quantum Chern-Simons Higgs theory is equivalent to the semiclassical limit of the supersymmetric quantum mechanics, one needs a different approach.

Even though we cannot say whether there is an *exact* equivalence between the quantum Chern-Simons and the reduced supersymmetric quantum mechanics, we can sketch an argument to show that they are at least approximately equal to each other. Here, by supersymmetric quantum mechanics, we actually mean the reduced action with only bosons

(6.29) (or (7.6) for $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$): a real and a complex field (two real and two complex fields for $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$), with the complex bosons having the kinetic term of a fermion. At the level of classical equations of motion, one can associate the fermionic and the bosonic versions with a dictionary, but at the quantum theory, things would not work out smoothly because there is a big difference between a bosonic path integral and a fermionic path integral.

The argument we sketch for establishing the approximate equivalence between (6.47) and (6.29) is as follows: First of all note that one can recast the classical solutions of (6.29) as some subset of the classical solutions of (6.47). Let us approximate the path integral of (6.47) by summing over only the classical solutions that possess spherical symmetry

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\text{CS-Higgs}} &= \int \mathcal{D}A \mathcal{D}\Phi e^{-S_{\text{CS-Higgs}}[\Phi, A]} \\ &\approx \sum_{(\Phi_{\text{cl}}, A_{\text{cl}}) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{CS-Higgs}}^r} e^{-S_{\text{CS-Higgs}}[\Phi_{\text{cl}}, A_{\text{cl}}]} \det \left(S''_{\text{CS-Higgs}}[\Phi_{\text{cl}}, A_{\text{cl}}] \right)^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.6)$$

The determinant of the Hessian of the action is symbolic, and Φ_{cl} and A_{cl} are classical solutions of the action $S_{\text{CS-Higgs}}$, and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS-Higgs}}^r$ denotes the solution space of the Chern-Simons Higgs theory with spherical symmetry. This is a weaker approximation than the one if we were to add over $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CS-Higgs}}$ in the semiclassical regime. Now, since we are considering only the spherically symmetric solutions, the discrete sum will give the semiclassical approximation of the quantum theory based on the action (6.49). Therefore, we write

$$Z_{\text{CS-Higgs}} \sim Z_{\text{CS-Higgs} + \text{spherical}}. \quad (8.7)$$

This is a weaker relation between a 3d Chern-Simons matter theory and its reduced version, but it nonetheless tells us that the dimensionally reduced action is not entirely unrelated to the main 3-dimensional theory at the quantum level. The same arguments can be sketched for the $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Chern-Simons Higgs theory.

9 Conclusions and Discussions

Let us give an overview of our results and discuss some of their implications. In the first part of the paper, we focused on pure Chern-Simons gauge theories with the gauge groups $SU(2)$ and $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$, defined on a manifold \mathcal{M} . We have shown that the dimensional reduction of these theories with spherical symmetric ansatz imposed on the gauge fields reduces to 1-dimensional quantum field theories but with a fermionic kinetic term for a bosonic field. We discussed that at the classical level, one can construct a dictionary between the classical solutions of the 3d Chern-Simons theory, and those of a fermionic quantum mechanical model, which is essentially a Chern-Simons Dirac theory in 1d. This dictionary, however, does not extend to the quantum Chern-Simons theory because a path integral with bosonic variables differs from that with Grassmannian variables. However, as we have argued, one can establish a *duality* at the quantum level between the quantum Chern-Simons theory and the dimensionally reduced theory with bosons having a fermionic kinetic term. This is

the statement of equation (3.25). We further show that the observables of the 3d quantum Chern-Simons theory, which are given by products of Wilson loop operators, must reduce to some observables of the reduced 1-dimensional theory. In fact, one can read from our argument that the quantum expectation value of any gauge invariant functional must reduce, in the large κ limit, to some observable in the reduced quantum theory. To what kind of observables do the Wilson loops correspond in 1d is an open problem.

This correspondence between two quantum theories at the semiclassical limit is reminiscent of the AdS/CFT duality that has been very influential in the past 25-30 years [5, 7, 20]. Our duality is in similar spirit to holography, yet there are differences. For one thing, in AdS/CFT, the correspondence is between a quantum gravity in AdS and a conformal field theory in the boundary of the AdS space. Our correspondence relates the quantum theory of 3d Chern-Simons theory and a 1d QFT for which the action can be obtained by imposing the spherical symmetry assumption on the gauge field of 3d Chern-Simons theory. One other difference is that AdS/CFT relates theories for which one lives in a space-time dimensionality one higher than the other. In our case, we related a 3d QFT with a 1d QFT, so the difference between the dimensions is 2. It is an outstanding problem to understand, via AdS/CFT, to which 2d CFT the reduced 1d QFT corresponds.

Let us give a final comment about the duality established in section 3. The establishment of this duality relies crucially on the group structure of the solution space of Chern-Simons theory. Because of the group structure, we were able to take the volume factors (volume of the solution space) out of the discrete sum, which is what enabled us to drop them as they are overall constants that can be fed into the normalization of the path integral. It is not very hard to see that any quantum field theory based on an action for which the space of critical points of the action admits a group structure will allow similar dualities. An interesting and ambitious problem is then to find all QFTs for which the space of critical points of the action admits a group structure. For these theories, one can carry out the argument given in section 3 to show that such QFTs would have *exact duals*, in the *semiclassical* limit, to lower dimensional theories whose actions would be given by the dimensional reduction of the master theory by a symmetry ansatz.

Let us now talk about the second part of the paper, which was concerned with Chern-Simons Higgs theories and their monopoles. It is well known that in these theories monopoles with non-trivial flux must necessarily have divergent Euclidean action, as we demonstrated in section 6. Upon dimensional reduction by spherically symmetric ansatz for monopoles, we get a 1-dimensional action that governs these monopoles. By choosing a curved background with the geometry of $\mathbb{R} \times S^2$, we were able to remove the explicit r -dependencies (or time dependencies if one were to view the reduced action as a quantum mechanical action) from the reduced action. Moreover, we discussed that one could associate the classical solutions of the reduced action and the classical solutions of a fermionic theory coupled to a real scalar field. In this associated theory, one could get supersymmetry by adding a six-order potential in the bosonic field. We show that by adding

a six-order potential to the Chern-Simons Higgs theory in 3d, we can view the classical reduced equations of this theory as the equations arising from a supersymmetric quantum mechanics. To understand the association of the Chern-Simons Higgs monopoles with the supersymmetric quantum mechanics, we look at the magnetic flux of the monopole. This corresponds, in the supersymmetric quantum mechanics, to the fermion number operator $F = \bar{\Psi}\Psi$, which in turn is related to the Witten index $\mathcal{I} = \text{Tr}\left((-1)^F e^{-\beta H}\right)$. Similar conclusions hold for the $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ Chern-Simons Higgs theory, with two distinct actions that are copies of each other.

In the last section, we talk about the semiclassical evaluation of the Chern-Simons Higgs theory. We give a discussion about the difficulties arising from the interactions between the gauge field and the Higgs field by studying a 0-dimensional toy model to give a flavor of the challenges. We further demonstrate that it is not likely to get an exact quantum duality at the semiclassical limit, and this is because the solution space of the Chern-Simons Higgs action does not admit a group structure. As we discussed 2 paragraphs back, when the solution space does not admit a group structure it does not seem, at least within the lines of section 3, very promising to attempt to show an exact duality at the semiclassical level.

Although these results discourage the hope of getting an exact duality, this is not to say that one cannot get an approximate relation between the 3d Chern-Simons Higgs theory and the reduced theory. We sketch a saddle point argument where we show that the path integral of the reduced theory approximates, to some degree *but* not exactly, the path integral of the Chern-Simons Higgs theory, in the semiclassical limit. In showing this, we approximate the path integral of the Chern-Simons Higgs theory by summing over only the classical solutions that possess spherical symmetry. Considering only the spherically symmetric classical solutions is of course not good enough, one would ideally sum over all classical solutions. However, one can say summing over only those classical solutions that possess spherical symmetry is an approximation for the process of summing over *all* classical solutions. In this approximation, one may use the fact that dimensionally reduced theory is simpler (since it is a lower dimensional theory) to evaluate the contributions to the full path integral, in the semiclassical limit, from the spherically symmetric configurations.

With all these interesting results, questions, and possible directions to follow that were unearthed from the study of dimensional reduction in the context of Chern-Simons gauge theories, we remark that these techniques should receive some attention. In particular, the result of section 3 gives us a very interesting duality, which is not hard in terms of computation, but it is subtle to arrive at the steps that led to the result. Our motivation to establish a connection between the quantum theories of 3d and 1d theories was what led us to this computation, which a priori was expected to be only *approximate*. To much of our surprise, we found an *exact* agreement. The techniques and ideas used in this paper

would be applicable to various theories as alluded to above.

10 Appendix

A The Spherically Symmetric Ansatz

Throughout the paper, we employ the following ansatz:

$$A_i^a = \varepsilon_i^{ak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} (\varphi_2(r) - 1) + \frac{\delta_i^{\perp a}}{r} \varphi_1(r) + \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2} A(r), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$e_i^a = -\varepsilon_i^{ak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} e_1(r) + \delta_i^{\perp a} \frac{e_2(r)}{r} + \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2} e_3(r), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\Phi^a = \frac{x^a}{r} \Phi(r), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\delta_i^{\perp a} = (\delta_i^a - \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2})$. We note the following identities that will be helpful

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{iak} \delta^{\perp ak} &= 0 = \varepsilon_{iak} x^a x^k, \\ \delta_i^{\perp a} x_i &= 0 \quad ; \quad \delta_i^{\perp a} \delta_a^{\perp j} = \delta_i^{\perp j} \quad ; \quad \delta_i^{\perp i} = 2, \\ \varepsilon_{ajl} \delta_i^{\perp a} x^l &= \varepsilon_{ijl} x^l, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

along with standard rules of calculus such as $\partial_i f(r) = \frac{x_i}{r} f'$. We will mean a derivative with respect to r whenever there is a prime. If there is a dot, it is a derivative with respect to either time t or the Euclidean time τ . With these, one calculates

$$\varepsilon^{ijk} \partial_j A_k^a = \varepsilon^{iak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} \left\{ -(\varphi_1' - A) \right\} + \frac{\delta_{ia}^{\perp}}{r} \left\{ \varphi_2' \right\} + \frac{x_i x_a}{r^4} \left\{ 2(\varphi_2 - 1) \right\}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\varepsilon^{ijk} \varepsilon_{abc} A_j^b A_k^c = \varepsilon^i{}_{ak} \frac{x^k}{r^2} \left\{ 2(\varphi_2 - 1)A \right\} + \frac{\delta_a^{\perp i}}{r} \left\{ 2\varphi_1 A \right\} + \frac{x^i x_a}{r^4} \left\{ 2((\varphi_2 - 1)^2 + \varphi_1^2) \right\}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Contracting these with A_i^a , one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{ijk} A_i^a \partial_j A_k^a &= \frac{2}{r^2} \left(-(\varphi_2 - 1)(\varphi_1' - A) + \varphi_1 \varphi_2' + A(\varphi_2 - 1) \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{r^2} \left(\varphi_1 \varphi_2' - \varphi_1'(\varphi_2 - 1) + 2A(\varphi_2 - 1) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{ijk} \varepsilon_{abc} A_i^a A_j^b A_k^c &= \frac{2}{r^2} \left(2A(\varphi_2 - 1)^2 + 2A\varphi_1^2 + A((\varphi_2 - 1)^2 + \varphi_1^2) \right) \\ &= \frac{6}{r^2} A \left((\varphi_2 - 1)^2 + \varphi_1^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

For the dreibein, one has

$$\varepsilon^{ijk} \varepsilon_{abc} e_j^b e_k^c = \varepsilon^{iak} \frac{x_k}{r^2} \left\{ 2e_1 e_3 \right\} + \frac{\delta^{ia}}{r} \left\{ 2e_2 e_3 \right\} + \frac{x^i x^a}{r^4} \left\{ 2(e_1^2 + e_2^2) \right\}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

contracting this with e_i^a , one gets

$$e \equiv \det e = \frac{1}{3!} \varepsilon^{ijk} \varepsilon_{abc} e_i^a e_j^b e_k^c = \frac{1}{r^2} e_3 (e_1^2 + e_2^2). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

One can find the metric using

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{ij} &= e_i^a e_j^b \delta_{ab} = e_i^a e_{ja} \\
&= \left(-\varepsilon^a{}_{ik} \frac{x^k}{r^2} e_1(r) + \delta_i^{\perp a} \frac{e_2(r)}{r} + \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2} e(r) \right) \left(-\varepsilon_{ajl} \frac{x^l}{r^2} e_1(r) + \delta_{ja}^{\perp} \frac{e_2(r)}{r} + \frac{x_j x_a}{r^2} e(r) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.11}$$

Explicitly, this reads

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{ij} &= \varepsilon^a{}_{ik} \varepsilon_{ajl} \frac{x^k x^l}{r^4} e_1^2 - \varepsilon^a{}_{ik} \delta_{ja}^{\perp} \frac{x^k}{r^2} e_1(r) e_2(r) - \varepsilon^a{}_{ik} \frac{x^k x_j x_a}{r^4} e_1(r) e_3(r) \\
&\quad - \delta_i^{\perp a} \varepsilon_{ajl} \frac{x^l}{r^3} e_1(r) e_2(r) + \delta_i^{\perp a} \delta_{ja}^{\perp} \frac{e_2^2(r)}{r^2} + \delta_i^{\perp a} \frac{x_j x_a}{r^2} e_2(r) e_3(r) \\
&\quad - \varepsilon_{ajl} \frac{x_i x^a x^l}{r^4} e_3(r) e_1(r) + \delta_{ja}^{\perp} \frac{x_i x^a}{r^3} e_3(r) e_2(r) + \frac{x_i x_j x_a x^a}{r^4} e_3^2(r).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.12}$$

Using the identities in (A.4), one arrives at

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{ij} &= (\delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} - \delta_{il} \delta_{kj}) \frac{x^k x^l}{r^4} e_1^2(r) - \varepsilon_{jil} \frac{x^l}{r^2} e_1(r) e_2(r) - \varepsilon_{ijl} \frac{x^l}{r^2} e_1(r) e_2(r) + \delta_{ij}^{\perp} e_2^2(r) + \frac{x_i x_j}{r^2} e_3^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\delta_{ij}^{\perp} (e_1^2 + e_2^2) + x_i x_j e_3^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{e_1^2 + e_2^2}{r^2} \delta_{ij} + \left(e_3^2 - \frac{e_1^2 + e_2^2}{r^2} \right) \frac{x_i x_j}{r^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.13}$$

One can also compute the inverse vierbein, which is defined by the consistency condition

$$\delta_i^j = e_i^a E_a^j. \tag{A.14}$$

Let us write E as:

$$E_a^j = -\varepsilon_a{}^{jk} \frac{x_k}{r^2} E_1 + \delta_a^{\perp j} \frac{E_2}{r} + \frac{x^j x_a}{r^2} E_3, \tag{A.15}$$

thus, one has

$$\delta_i^j = e_i^a E_a^j = \left(-\varepsilon^a{}_{ik} \frac{x^k}{r^2} e_1 + \delta_i^{\perp a} \frac{e_2}{r} + \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2} e_3 \right) \left(-\varepsilon_a{}^{jl} \frac{x_l}{r^2} E_1 + \delta_a^{\perp j} \frac{E_2}{r} + \frac{x^j x_a}{r^2} E_3 \right), \tag{A.16}$$

explicitly, this is

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_i^j &= \varepsilon^a{}_{ik} \varepsilon_a{}^{jl} \frac{x^k x_l}{r^4} e_1 E_1 - \varepsilon^a{}_{ik} \delta_a^{\perp j} \frac{x^k}{r^3} e_1 E_2 - \varepsilon^a{}_{ik} \frac{x^k x^j x_a}{r^4} e_1 E_3 \\
&\quad - \varepsilon_a{}^{jk} \delta_i^{\perp a} \frac{x_k}{r^3} e_2 E_1 + \delta_a^{\perp j} \delta_i^{\perp a} \frac{e_2 E_2}{r^2} + \delta_i^{\perp a} \frac{x^j x_a}{r^3} e_2 E_3 \\
&\quad - \varepsilon_a{}^{jk} \frac{x_k x_i x^a}{r^4} e_3 E_1 + \delta_a^{\perp j} \frac{x_i x^a}{r^3} e_3 E_2 + \frac{x_i x^a x^j x_a}{r^4} e_3 E_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.17}$$

Using the identities in (A.4), one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_i^j &= (\delta_i^j \delta_k^l - \delta_i^l \delta_k^j) \frac{x^k x_l}{r^4} e_1 E_1 - \varepsilon^j{}_{ik} \frac{x^k}{r^3} e_1 E_2 - 0 \\
&\quad - \varepsilon_i{}^{jk} \frac{x_k}{r^3} e_2 E_1 + \delta_i^{\perp j} \frac{e_2 E_2}{r^2} + 0 \\
&\quad 0 + 0 + \frac{x_i x^j}{r^2} e_3 E_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.18}$$

Simplifying further

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_i^j &= \delta_i^j \frac{e_1 E_1}{r^2} - \frac{x^j x_i}{r^4} e_1 E_1 - \varepsilon^j{}_{ik} \frac{x^k}{r^3} (e_1 E_2 - e_2 E_1) + \delta_i^j \frac{e_2 E_2}{r^2} - \frac{x_i x^j}{r^4} e_2 E_2 + \frac{x_i x^j}{r^2} e_3 E_3 \\ &= \delta_i^j \frac{e_1 E_1 + e_2 E_2}{r^2} + \frac{x_i x^j}{r^2} \left(e_3 E_3 - \frac{e_1 E_1 + e_2 E_2}{r^2} \right) - \varepsilon^j{}_{ik} \frac{x^k}{r^3} (e_1 E_2 - e_2 E_1).\end{aligned}\tag{A.19}$$

This gives three equations

$$\begin{aligned}r^2 &= e_1 E_1 + e_2 E_2, \\ 0 &= e_3 E_3 - \frac{e_1 E_1 + e_2 E_2}{r^2}, \\ 0 &= e_1 E_2 - e_2 E_1,\end{aligned}\tag{A.20}$$

Using the first one in the second gives

$$E_3 = \frac{1}{e_3}.\tag{A.21}$$

Using the third equation, we write $E_2 = \frac{E_1 e_2}{e_1}$ and input this into the first one

$$r^2 = e_1 E_1 + \frac{e_2^2 E_1}{e_1} = \frac{(e_1^2 + e_2^2) E_1}{e_1},\tag{A.22}$$

hence

$$E_1 = e_1 \frac{r^2}{e_1^2 + e_2^2} \quad ; \quad E_2 = e_2 \frac{r^2}{e_1^2 + e_2^2}.\tag{A.23}$$

So, all three ansatz functions that constitute a spherically symmetric inverse of the dreibein E_a^i are found. The form of E_a^i in terms of little es is given by

$$E_a^j = -\varepsilon_a{}^{jk} x_k \frac{e_1}{e_1^2 + e_2^2} + \delta_a^{\perp j} \frac{r e_2}{e_1^2 + e_2^2} + \frac{x^j x_a}{r^2} \frac{1}{e_3}.\tag{A.24}$$

It is almost a trivial manner to compute the inverse of the metric now. We will use the structural similarity of e and E to write

$$g^{ij} = E_a^i E_b^j \delta^{ab} = \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\delta^{\perp ij} (E_1^2 + E_2^2) + x^i x^j E_3^2 \right),\tag{A.25}$$

in terms of little es

$$g^{ij} = \delta^{ij} \frac{r^2}{e_1^2 + e_2^2} + x^i x^j \left(\frac{1}{r^2 e_3^2} - \frac{1}{e_1^2 + e_2^2} \right).\tag{A.26}$$

We note that

$$x^a \equiv e_i^a x^i.\tag{A.27}$$

On the other hand, if we use the spherically symmetric ansatz, we get

$$x^a = e_3 x^a,\tag{A.28}$$

which compels us to set $e_3 = 1$. The metric now reads

$$g_{ij} = \frac{e_1^2 + e_2^2}{r^2} \delta_{ij} + \left(1 - \frac{e_1^2 + e_2^2}{r^2} \right) \frac{x_i x_j}{r^2},\tag{A.29}$$

and the line element

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \frac{e_1^2 + e_2^2}{r^2} (dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2) + \left(1 - \frac{e_1^2 + e_2^2}{r^2}\right) dr^2 \\ &= dr^2 + (e_1^2 + e_2^2) d\Omega^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Where we've used $dr = x_i dx^i / r$.

Let us now record some results involving the adjoint scalar field

$$\partial_i \Phi^a = \delta_i^{\perp a} \frac{\Phi}{r} + \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2} \Phi', \quad (\text{A.31})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{abc} A_i^b \Phi^c &= \varepsilon^{abc} \left((\varphi_2 - 1) \varepsilon_i^{bk} \frac{x_k}{r^2} + \varphi_1 \frac{\delta_i^{\perp b}}{r} + A \frac{x_i x^b}{r^2} \right) \frac{x^c}{r} \Phi \\ &= (\delta_i^a \delta_{ck} - \delta_k^a \delta_{ci}) \frac{x_k x_c}{r^3} (\varphi_2 - 1) \Phi - \varepsilon_i^{ac} \frac{x_c}{r^2} \varphi_1 \Phi + \varepsilon^{abc} \frac{x_i x_b x_c}{r^2} (\dots) \\ &= \frac{\delta_i^{\perp a}}{r} (\varphi_2 - 1) \Phi - \varepsilon_i^{ac} \frac{x_c}{r^2} \varphi_1 \Phi. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

Thus, the covariant derivative is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_i \Phi^a &= \partial_i \Phi^a + \varepsilon^{abc} A_i^b \Phi^c \\ &= \varepsilon_i^{ac} \frac{x_c}{r^2} \left\{ -\varphi_1 \Phi \right\} + \frac{\delta_i^{\perp a}}{r} \left\{ \varphi_2 \Phi \right\} + \frac{x_i x^a}{r^2} \left\{ \Phi' \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.33})$$

One computes the following contractions

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \delta^{ij} D_i \Phi^a D_j \Phi^a &= \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\frac{r^2}{2} \Phi'^2 + (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) \Phi^2 \right), \\ \frac{1}{2} x^i x^j D_i \Phi^a D_j \Phi^a &= \frac{1}{2} \Phi'^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.34})$$

Therefore, the kinetic term of a Higgs field in a spherically symmetric space reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} g^{ij} D_i \Phi^a D_j \Phi^a &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{r^2}{e_1^2 + e_2^2} \delta^{ij} D_i \Phi^a D_j \Phi^a + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{r^2} - \frac{1}{e_1^2 + e_2^2} \right) x^i x^j D_i \Phi^a D_j \Phi^a \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \Phi'^2 + \frac{1}{e_1^2 + e_2^2} (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) \Phi^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.35})$$

In particular, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^3x \sqrt{|g|} \frac{1}{2} g^{ij} D_i \Phi^a D_j \Phi^a &= 4\pi \int dr (e_1^2 + e_2^2) \left(\frac{1}{2} \Phi'^2 + \frac{1}{e_1^2 + e_2^2} (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) \Phi^2 \right) \\ &= 4\pi \int dr \left(\frac{1}{2} (e_1^2 + e_2^2) \Phi'^2 + (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) \Phi^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.36})$$

Similarly, for any spherically symmetric integrand, it follows that

$$\int d^3x \sqrt{|g|} [\dots] = 4\pi \int dr r^2 \frac{e_1^2 + e_2^2}{r^2} [\dots] = 4\pi \int dr (e_1^2 + e_2^2) [\dots]. \quad (\text{A.37})$$

In computing the abelian field strength in the direction of symmetry breaking, we will also need

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)} &= -\frac{1}{\Phi^3} \varepsilon^{abc} \Phi^a D_i \Phi^b D_j \Phi^c \\
&= -\frac{1}{\Phi^3} \varepsilon^{abc} \Phi \frac{x^a}{r} \left(\varepsilon_i{}^{bd} \frac{x_d}{r^2} \left\{ -\varphi_1 \Phi \right\} + \frac{\delta_i^{\perp b}}{r} \left\{ \varphi_2 \Phi \right\} + \frac{x_i x^b}{r^2} \left\{ \Phi' \right\} \right) \\
&\quad \times \left(\varepsilon_j{}^{ce} \frac{x_e}{r^2} \left\{ -\varphi_1 \Phi \right\} + \frac{\delta_j^{\perp c}}{r} \left\{ \varphi_2 \Phi \right\} + \frac{x_j x^c}{r^2} \left\{ \Phi' \right\} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.38}$$

We will first compute the corresponding magnetic field

$$\mathcal{B}_k^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2\Phi^3} \varepsilon_{jik} \mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2\Phi^3} \varepsilon_{kij} \varepsilon^{abc} \Phi^a D_i \Phi^b D_j \Phi^c. \tag{A.39}$$

One finds

$$\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{kij} \varepsilon^{abc} D_i \Phi^b D_j \Phi^c = \varepsilon_k{}^{ad} \frac{x_d}{r^2} \left\{ \varphi_1 \Phi \Phi' \right\} + \frac{\delta_k^{\perp a}}{r} \left\{ \varphi_2 \Phi \Phi' \right\} + \frac{x_k x^a}{r^4} \left\{ (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) \Phi^2 \right\}, \tag{A.40}$$

$$\implies \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{kij} \varepsilon^{abc} \Phi^a D_i \Phi^b D_j \Phi^c = \frac{x_k}{r^2} \Phi^3 (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2), \tag{A.41}$$

so the magnetic field reads

$$\mathcal{B}_k^{(2)} = -\frac{x_k}{r^2} (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2). \tag{A.42}$$

Now, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon_{klm} \mathcal{B}_k^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{klm} \varepsilon_{kij} \mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{il} \delta_{jm} - \delta_{im} \delta_{jl}) \mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)} \\
&= \mathcal{F}_{lm}^{(2)},
\end{aligned} \tag{A.43}$$

therefore, the abelian field strength is given by

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij}^{(2)} = \varepsilon_{ijk} \mathcal{B}_k^{(2)} = -\varepsilon_{ijk} \frac{x_k}{r^2} (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2). \tag{A.44}$$

References

- [1] A. Comtet. Instantons and Minimal Surfaces. *Phys. Rev. D*, 18:3890, 1978.
- [2] Gerald V. Dunne. Aspects of Chern-Simons theory. In *Les Houches Summer School in Theoretical Physics, Session 69: Topological Aspects of Low-dimensional Systems*, 7 1998.
- [3] Gerald V. Dunne, Ki-Myeong Lee, and Chang-hai Lu. On the finite temperature Chern-Simons coefficient. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 78:3434–3437, 1997.
- [4] J. D. Edelstein and F. A. Schaposnik. Monopoles in nonAbelian Chern-Simons Higgs theory. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 425:137–149, 1994.
- [5] S. S. Gubser, Igor R. Klebanov, and Alexander M. Polyakov. Gauge theory correlators from noncritical string theory. *Phys. Lett. B*, 428:105–114, 1998.
- [6] K. Hori, S. Katz, A. Klemm, R. Pandharipande, R. Thomas, C. Vafa, R. Vakil, and E. Zaslow. *Mirror symmetry*, volume 1 of *Clay mathematics monographs*. AMS, Providence, USA, 2003.

- [7] Juan Martin Maldacena. The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 2:231–252, 1998.
- [8] N. S. Manton and P. Sutcliffe. *Topological solitons*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [9] Richard S. Palais. The principle of symmetric criticality. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 69(1):19–30, 1979.
- [10] Robert D. Pisarski. Magnetic Monopoles in Topologically Massive Gauge Theories. *Phys. Rev. D*, 34:3851, 1986.
- [11] Bayram Tekin. On the relevance of singular solutions in dS(3) and AdS(3) gravity. 2 1999.
- [12] Bayram Tekin. Multi - instantons in R^{**4} and minimal surfaces in $R^{**}(2,1)$. *JHEP*, 08:049, 2000.
- [13] Bayram Tekin, Kamran Saririan, and Yutaka Hosotani. Complex monopoles in the Georgi-Glashow-Chern-Simons model. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 539:720–738, 1999.
- [14] David Tong. Lectures on the Quantum Hall Effect. 6 2016.
- [15] Herman Verlinde and Mengyang Zhang. SYK Correlators from 2D Liouville-de Sitter Gravity. 2 2024.
- [16] Edward Witten. Some Exact Multi - Instanton Solutions of Classical Yang-Mills Theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 38:121–124, 1977.
- [17] Edward Witten. (2+1)-Dimensional Gravity as an Exactly Soluble System. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 311:46, 1988.
- [18] Edward Witten. Quantum Field Theory and the Jones Polynomial. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 121:351–399, 1989.
- [19] Edward Witten. Quantization of Chern-Simons Gauge Theory With Complex Gauge Group. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 137:29–66, 1991.
- [20] Edward Witten. Anti-de Sitter space and holography. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 2:253–291, 1998.