

# The metamorphosis of semi-classical mechanisms of confinement: From monopoles on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$ to center-vortices on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$

---

Canberk Güvendik,<sup>1</sup> Thomas Schaefer,<sup>1</sup> Mithat Ünsal<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27607, USA*

ABSTRACT: There are two distinct regimes of Yang-Mills theory where we can demonstrate confinement, the existence of a mass gap, and fractional theta angle dependence using a reliable semi-classical calculation. The two regimes are Yang-Mills theory on  $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^3$  with a small circle and a double-trace deformation, and Yang-Mills theory on  $T^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$  where the torus  $T^2$  is small and threaded by a 't Hooft flux. In the first case the confinement mechanism is related to self-dual monopoles, whereas in the second case self-dual center-vortices play a crucial role. These two topological objects are distinct. In particular, they have different mutual statistics with Wilson loops. On the other hand, they carry the same topological charge and action. On  $\mathbb{R} \times T^2 \times S^1$ , we are able to extrapolate both monopole regime and vortex regime to a quantum mechanical domain, where a cross-over takes place. Both sides of the cross-over are described by a deformed  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  TQFT. On  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times S^1 \times S^1$ , we derive the effective field theory of vortices from the effective theory of monopoles in the presence of a 't Hooft flux. This results from a two-stage adjoint Higgs mechanism, to  $U(1)^{N-1}$  in 3d first and a  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  EFT in 2d second. This proves adiabatic continuity of the two confinement mechanisms across dimensions and shows how monopoles and their magnetic flux transmute into center-vortices. This basic mechanism is flux fractionalization: The magnetic flux of the monopoles fractionalizes and collimates in such a way that 2d Wilson loops detect it as a center vortex.

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Semi-classics on <math>\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{large}}^2 \times S_{\text{small}}^1</math> with 't Hooft flux through <math>T^2</math></b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	't Hooft flux: Alternative implementations and energetics	5
2.2	Separation of scales and transition from 3d to 1d EFT	10
2.3	Quantum mechanical limit as a deformed TQFT	11
2.4	Monopole interaction in the QM limit	15
<b>3</b>	<b>Semi-classics on <math>\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{small}}^2 \times S_{\text{large}}^1</math> with 't Hooft flux through <math>T^2</math></b>	<b>16</b>
3.1	Overview of $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T_{\text{small}}^2$ : 2d EFT is a deformed TQFT	16
3.2	$\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{small}}^2 \times S^1$	18
3.3	Two hierarchies leading to QM, dramatic reordering (same EFT)	19
<b>4</b>	<b>Two-scale adjoint Higgs mechanism and monopole-vortex continuity: From 3d to 2d</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1	Monopole interactions and flux fractionalization	25
<b>5</b>	<b>Outlook: Metamorphosis</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>From charge-<math>N</math> 2d Abelian Higgs model to TQFT</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>An electrostatic analogy: Flux fractionalization</b>	<b>30</b>

---

## 1 Introduction

Pure Yang-Mills theory and QCD(adj) with massless or massive fermions in the adjoint representation are theories in which there exists a  $\mathbb{Z}_N^{[1]}$  1-form symmetry, or center-symmetry, and the notion of confinement is sharply characterized in terms of the Wilson loop as an order parameter. Both of these theories admit a semi-classical weak coupling description for (non-thermal) compactifications of the theory on four-manifolds such as  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  [1–6] and  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$  [7–10]. These realizations are adiabatically connected to the theory on  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . In the limit where the size of the circle or the torus are small non-perturbative effects

such as confinement, dependence on the theta angle, and the mass gap can be understood analytically.

An important challenge that arises from these studies pointed in [7] is the following: On  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$ , where the theory is guaranteed to remain center-symmetric for small  $S^1$  via either judicious boundary conditions for fermions or double-trace deformations, confinement and other non-perturbative effects are generated by the proliferation of monopole instantons or magnetic bions [1–5, 11]. On  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$  however, in the presence of a 't Hooft flux, it was shown that confinement is caused by the proliferation of center vortices on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  in a manner reminiscent of the charge- $N$  abelian Higgs model in 2d [7–10, 12]. (See also [13–17].) Remarkably, both monopole instantons and center-vortices can be viewed (in specified circumstances) as configurations with fractional topological charge and fractional action

$$Q_T = \frac{1}{N}, \quad S_0 = \frac{1}{N} S_I = \frac{8\pi^2}{g^2 N}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $S_I$  is the 4d instanton action [18–21]. However, these are physically distinct configurations, in particular, center-vortices possess a non-trivial mutual statistics with the Wilson loop [22–25], while monopoles do not. More specifically, on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$ , monopoles appear in circumstances where Polyakov loop around  $S^1$  acquires a non-trivial profile  $P_3 \propto C$  where  $C$  is clock matrix, leading to dynamical abelianization,  $SU(N) \rightarrow U(1)^{N-1}$ . In contrast, on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$ , center-vortices appear when the Polyakov loops on  $T^2$  cycles are non-commuting pairs,  $P_1 = C, P_2 = S$ , such as clock and shift matrix, and the gauge structure is reduced down to the center,  $SU(N) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_N$ .


$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1 : \quad & SU(N) \xrightarrow{P_3 \text{ adjoint Higgs}} U(1)^{N-1} && \text{monopoles, bions,} \\ \mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2 : \quad & SU(N) \xrightarrow{P_{1,2} \text{ adjoint Higgs}} \mathbb{Z}_N && \text{center vortices.} \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

Remarkably, despite the differences in the dynamics and mechanisms of confinement, the qualitative and some quantitative features of the two regimes are identical. This implies that these two semiclassical regimes may indeed be *adiabatically connected*, without any intervening phase transitions. In this paper, we show how one regime transmutes to the other with the change of parameters.

The long distance theory on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  is described as an effective field theory (EFT) based on the grand canonical description of a magnetic Coulomb gas [3], similar to Polyakov model on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  [26, 27]. We will refer to this theory as the monopole EFT. In the long-distance regime on  $\mathbb{R} \times T^2 \times S^1$ , and  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$ , in the appropriate regimes, the long distance effective theory is a  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  topological quantum field theory (TQFT) [28, 29] deformed by local topological operators [30, 31] in 1d and 2d, respectively as summarized in Fig.1. The local topological operators are center-vortices in 2d and fractional instantons in 1d. We show analytically the transition between these effective field theories:

$$\text{Monopole EFT in 3d} \implies \text{TQFT + deformation in 1d and 2d} \quad (1.3)$$

as well as the relation between monopoles on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$ , vortices on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$  and fractional instantons on  $\mathbb{R} \times T^2 \times S^1$ .



**Figure 1.** a) Regimes of  $SU(N)$  gauge theory on  $\mathbb{R} \times T^2 \times S^1$  with  $n_{12} = 1$ . For  $\min(L_{S^1}, L_{T^2}) \ll \Lambda^{-1}$ , the theory is amenable to weak coupling semi-classical treatment and continuously connected to strong coupling domain. Gauge structure is Higgsed to  $U(1)^{N-1}$  in monopole regime, and to  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  in center-vortex regime. The two are adiabatically connected, with a cross-over in between along the red line. See §.3.3. b) Construction of Ref.[32] in  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times S^1 \times S^1$  with  $n_{23} = 1$  units of 't Hooft flux.

We provide a detailed discussion of monopole-vortex continuity in two different settings. On  $\mathbb{R} \times T^2 \times S^1$  with a flux through  $T^2$  [33–35], we describe two regimes: one in which semiclassics is dictated by monopoles, and a complementary regime in which vortices play crucial role. The two regimes meet at a quantum mechanical domain, where a cross-over and dramatic rearrangement of states occur, §.3.3.

On  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$ , the most remarkable finding is the transmutation of monopoles and their magnetic flux into center-vortices.<sup>1</sup> At short distances the magnetic flux of monopole  $2\pi\alpha_i$  is spherically symmetric. Within the applicability of semi-classics and using a 't Hooft flux [33–35], we show that the magnetic flux fractionalizes and collimates into tubes of finite thickness. In the setting of 2d EFT a large Wilson loop which encircles the core of the flux tube sees it as center-vortex, their relation is topological and leads to well-know phase factor  $W(C) = e^{-i\frac{2\pi}{N}}$  if vortex is inside  $C$ , and  $W(C) = 1$  if it is outside  $C$ . In contrast, a Wilson loop measures the effect of a monopole at a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  through  $\Omega_D(x)$ , the solid angle for the oriented surface  $D$  ( $\partial D = C$ ) subtended at a point  $x$ , and this is just geometrical. We provide a detailed explanation of this phenomenon that we refer to as *flux fractionalization* in §.4.1. We also derive a 2d long-distance effective theory in terms of the degrees of freedom of the 3d effective theory, the dual photons.

<sup>1</sup>In  $d > 2$  dimensions, most of the arguments in favor of center vortex mechanism are based on numerical studies [36–43]. In the center-vortex literature, there are also models which view monopoles as junctions of center-vortices, see e.g.[44–46]. It is recently proven that proliferation of center-vortices is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for confinement in  $d > 2$  [30], while in  $d = 2$ , it is also sufficient. Our findings, in semi-classically calculable regimes of the Yang-Mills theory may provide a basis for the mixed models.

Also, starting with the classical long range Coulomb interaction between monopoles, by compactifying in the presence of a 't Hooft flux, we show that the interaction remains long ranged in the  $\mathbb{R} \times T^2 \times S^1$  with  $n_{12} = 1$ , and the theory reduces to a multi-component Coulomb gas in 1d quantum mechanical regime. While in the  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$  with  $n_{23} = 1$ , the interaction turns into the short-range classical interactions between center-vortices in 2d EFT. Despite the fact that the interaction between the center-vortices becomes short range, they still lead to confinement due to the non-trivial mutual statistics with the Wilson loops.

These results are remarkable, because they provide a unified perspective of monopole-induced confinement on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  and center-vortex-induced confinement on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$ . From the perspective of the grand-canonical ensemble of the two topological objects the Wilson loop is disordered because of the sum over the induced phase factors. Destructive interference of these phases leads to the exponential smallness of  $\langle W(C) \rangle = e^{-\text{Area}(D)T}$ . Historically, the monopole and center vortex pictures of confinement in QCD were viewed as distinct alternatives for the confinement mechanism on  $\mathbb{R}^4$  [47–49]. However, it is recently proven that center-vortex proliferation in  $d \geq 3$  is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for confinement [30], whereas in  $d = 2$ , it is both necessary and sufficient. In the present work we demonstrate that both mechanisms are realized in different semi-classical regimes of the Yang-Mills theory which are adiabatically connected to  $\mathbb{R}^4$ .

Perhaps more importantly, since both center-vortices and monopoles are realized as fractional instantons in the appropriate semi-classical limits, these results highlight the non-trivial inner structure of the 4d instanton. It is by no means a simple structureless topological lump. We may hope that these types of reliable semi-classical studies may reveal the true nature of the 4d instanton, and provide a first principle study of non-perturbative phenomena directly on  $\mathbb{R}^4$ .

**Set-up:** Throughout the paper, we study 4-dimensional  $SU(N)$  Yang-Mills (YM) theory on 4d spacetime  $M_4$ . The classical action of the theory is given by

$$S_{\text{YM}} = \frac{1}{g^2} \int \text{tr}[F(a) \wedge \star F(a)] + \frac{i\theta}{8\pi^2} \int \text{tr}[F(a) \wedge F(a)], \quad (1.4)$$

where  $a$  is the  $SU(N)$  gauge field,  $F(a) = da + ia \wedge a$  is the field strength,  $\theta$  is the topological theta angle, and  $\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int \text{tr}[F(a) \wedge F(a)] \in \mathbb{Z}$  is the instanton number. The theory has a  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  1-form symmetry [50] (called center-symmetry in the older literature) denoted by  $\mathbb{Z}_N^{[1]}$ . The 4-manifolds we consider are

$$M_4 = \mathbb{R} \times (S^1)_1 \times (S^1)_2 \times (S^1)_3 \quad \text{with} \quad (x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3) \in M_4, \quad (1.5)$$

and circle sizes  $L_1, L_2, L_3$ , which includes the limits  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  and  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$ . In §.2 and §.3, we turn on  $n_{12} = 1$  units of 't Hooft flux, and work with a symmetric  $T^2$  with  $L_1 = L_2 = L_{T^2}$ . We explore different semi-classical regimes by changing  $L_{T^2}/L_3$ . In §.4, we work with  $n_{23} = 1$  on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (S^1)_2 \times (S^1)_3$  and an asymmetric torus, and explore the dynamics by adjusting  $L_2/L_3$ .

**Note added:** During the completion of this work, we learned about Ref.[32], which uses  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$  with  $n_{23} = 1$ . Our construction in §.2 and §.3 uses  $n_{12} = 1$ , and gives a comple-

mentary perspective to monopole-vortex transmutation. Our Section. 4 and Appendix B are motivated by this work. Different from Ref.[32], we derive the 2d effective theory in terms of dual photon variables of the 3d monopole theory.

## 2 Semi-classics on $\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{large}}^2 \times S_{\text{small}}^1$ with 't Hooft flux through $T^2$

We will describe various regimes of the adiabatic continuity/cross-over diagram Fig. 1 for Yang-Mills theory. We will review the necessary ingredients of the semi-classical description on a small  $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^3$  [3, 6] and small  $T^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$  [7] as we proceed. Our goal is to connect the semi-classical theory in these two regimes through their common quantum mechanical limit in Fig.1.

Consider the theory formulated on the 4-manifold:

$$M_4 = \mathbb{R} \times \underbrace{(T^2)_{12}}_{n_{12}=1 \text{ flux}} \times (S^1)_3 \quad (2.1)$$

with the limiting cases

$$\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{large}}^2 \times S_{\text{small}}^1 \sim \mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{small}}^2 \times S_{\text{large}}^1 \sim \mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2, \quad (2.3)$$

for the large- $T^2$  and large- $S^1$  limits, respectively. Here, we assume

$$\min(L_{S^1}, L_{T^2}) \ll \Lambda^{-1}, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\Lambda^{-1}$  is the strong length scale of the Yang-Mills theory, and this guarantees a weak coupling since  $g^2 N(L_{\text{short}}) \ll 1$ . We expect that both of these regimes are adiabatically connected to the  $\mathbb{R}^4$  limit, as well as to each other since we can reproduce the non-perturbative properties such as confinement, mass gap, and the multi-branch structure of vacua. Since the theory is in the weak coupling regime provided  $\min(L_{S^1}, L_{T^2}) \ll \Lambda^{-1}$ , it may be possible to understand the "transition" or "cross-over" between these two confinement regimes by using weak coupling tools. Our goal is to explore this connection in this paper.

### 2.1 't Hooft flux: Alternative implementations and energetics

A 't Hooft flux on  $T^2$  is characterized by the gauge invariant integers  $n_{12} \in \mathbb{Z}_N$  that appear in the twisted boundary conditions. The identification of fields at  $(x_1, x_2)$ ,  $(x_1 + L_1, x_2)$  and  $(x_1, x_2 + L_2)$  is achieved by using the transition functions  $g_1(x_2), g_2(x_1)$ .

$$a(x_1 = L_1, x_2) = g_1(x_2)^\dagger a(x_1 = 0, x_2) g_1(x_2) - i g_1(x_2)^\dagger d g_1(x_2), \quad (2.5)$$

$$a(x_1, x_2 = L_2) = g_2(x_1)^\dagger a(x_1, x_2 = 0) g_2(x_1) - i g_2(x_1)^\dagger d g_2(x_1). \quad (2.6)$$

The consistency condition requires that [33]

$$g_1(L_2)^\dagger g_2(0)^\dagger = g_2(L_1)^\dagger g_1(0)^\dagger \exp\left(i \frac{2\pi}{N} n_{12}\right). \quad (2.7)$$

This label  $n_{12} \in \mathbb{Z}_N$  is the 't Hooft flux.

**Turning on an  $F_{12}$  or not:** Although not often emphasized, the way  $n_{12} \neq 0$  is achieved in order to probe low energy physics of a given theory is related to energetics [51]. The condition  $n_{12} \neq 0$  can always be achieved without turning on any chromo-magnetic field ( $F_{12} = 0$ ),<sup>2</sup> but it can also be achieved by turning on a non-vanishing abelian chromo-magnetic field ( $F_{12} \neq 0$ ) [13, 14, 51, 52]. In order to probe the low-energy theory, which one of these should one use is a matter of energetics and dynamics. In particular, in theories which are abelianized by the Polyakov loop acting as an adjoint Higgs field, the case ( $F_{12} \neq 0$ ) may be favorable. We will encounter both in the following.

In compactification of the theories on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  down to  $\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times S^1$ , the holonomy of the gauge field in the compact direction  $P_3 = e^{i \oint a_3}$  acts as a compact scalar adjoint Higgs field from the perspective of the long distance theory. Depending on the form of the  $P_3$ , this can lead to abelianization  $SU(N) \rightarrow U(1)^{N-1}$  or not. Thus, with further compactification of  $\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times S^1$  to eg.  $\mathbb{R} \times T^2 \times S^1$ , the dynamical behavior of Polyakov loop and the way 't Hooft flux is implemented ( $F_{12} \stackrel{?}{=} 0$ ) are not independent questions.

Depending on the boundary conditions, we can have a Polyakov loop  $P_3$  which is proportional to identity, or we can have  $P_3$  proportional to the clock matrix  $C$ . For example, on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$ , in the small  $S^1$  regime where  $V(P_3)$  is perturbatively calculable, we can have

$$P_3^{\text{br.}} = \omega^k \mathbf{1}_N, \quad \omega = e^{i \frac{2\pi}{N}}, \quad (2.8)$$

$$P_3^{\text{ubr}} = \omega^{\alpha/2} C_N = \omega^{\alpha/2} \text{Diag}(1, \omega, \omega^2, \dots, \omega^{N-1}), \quad \alpha = 0, 1 \text{ for } N \in (2\mathbb{Z} + 1, 2\mathbb{Z}). \quad (2.9)$$

The first one of these options takes place in pure thermal Yang-Mills at high-temperature [53], and the latter takes place in QCD(adj) with massless or light fermions endowed with periodic boundary conditions [54]. The latter can also be achieved by a double-trace deformation [3] or even with heavy adjoint fermions if  $L_3$  is small enough [55, 56].

Assume we start with  $L_{T^2} \rightarrow \infty$  as in (2.2), and consider the center-unbroken configuration (2.9). Since we want to study Yang-Mills theory, (2.9) can be accomplished either with double-trace deformation or by introducing a heavy adjoint fermion with periodic boundary conditions, and considering the small  $L_3$  limit. A deformation potential which satisfies center-stability on  $\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{large}}^2 \times S_{\text{small}}^1$  is<sup>3</sup>

$$\Delta S(P_3) = -2 \times S_{1\text{-loop}}^{\text{YM}} = 2 \times \int_{M_4} \sum_{n \geq 1}^{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor} \frac{2}{\pi^2 L_3^4} \frac{1}{n^4} |\text{tr}(P_3)^n|^2 \quad (2.10)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>We do not typically associate a chromomagnetic field with the 't Hooft flux. However, it is possible to do so. In unbroken  $SU(N)$  gauge theories, this will also give an  $n_{12}$  flux sector, but with higher energy. However, if we know theory is abelianized (say by an adjoint Higgs mechanism), then a lower energy configuration is often achieved by turning on  $F_{12} \neq 0$ . We thank Erich Poppitz for this explanation.

<sup>3</sup>The deformed theory,  $S^{\text{dYM}} = S^{\text{YM}} + \Delta S$  satisfies adiabatic continuity (absence of phase transitions) between the small  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  and  $\mathbb{R}^4$  theories. In the large- $N$  limit, one can prove by using loop equations that the deformed small  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  theory is equivalent to the theory on  $\mathbb{R}^4$  theory [3].

where  $S_{1\text{-loop}}^{\text{YM}}$  is the one-loop effective action for the Polyakov line in pure Yang-Mills theory [53]. Notice that deformation is perturbative in 't Hooft coupling  $\lambda \equiv g^2 N$  as it compensates the one-loop effect, but unsuppressed in the large  $N$  counting. It can be produced dynamically at one loop by integrating out heavy adjoint fermions. The deformation (2.10) ensures that the minimum of  $V_{1\text{-loop}}^{\text{YM}} + \Delta V$  is located at (2.9),  $P_3^{\text{ub}} \propto C$ .

Now, assume we turn on an  $n_{12} = 1$  't Hooft flux on  $T_{\text{large}}^2$ . As mentioned above, there are two possible scenarios: Constant non-abelian transition matrices  $g_1 = C$ ,  $g_2 = S$  which is associated with  $F_{12} = 0$ , or abelian transition matrices leading to  $F_{12} \neq 0$ . These two options have different energy costs. Energetically favorable one depends on the ratio of  $L_3$  and  $L_{T^2}$ .

Chromo-magnetic fluxes consistent with  $n_{12} = 1$  satisfy [52]<sup>4</sup>

$$F_{12}^{(i)} = \frac{2\pi}{L_1 L_2} H^{(i)}, \quad H^{(i)} = \text{Diag}(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) - \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{1}_N, \quad (2.11)$$

where  $H^{(i)}$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  Cartan generator. Such a configuration has a classical energy, given by

$$E_{\text{non-flat}} = \frac{1}{2g^2} \int_{T^2 \times S^1} \text{tr} \left[ \left( F_{12}^{(i)} \right)^2 \right] = \frac{L_3}{2L_1 L_2} \left( \frac{2\pi}{g} \right)^2 \left( 1 - \frac{1}{N} \right). \quad (2.12)$$

However, Yang-Mills theory with an abelian chromo-magnetic background field has a tachyonic instability on  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , originally realized by Nielsen-Olesen [57] for gluonic fields. Because of this, this configuration was dismissed as a possible ground state in Ref. [52]. However, if the theory abelianizes by a potential for the gauge holonomies, the tachyonic mode can and does disappear.<sup>5</sup> It becomes energetically favorable to work with such abelian backgrounds as argued in [51]. Notice that for large- $T^2$  with fixed 't Hooft flux  $n_{12} = 1$ , the chromo-magnetic field dilutes as  $1/\text{Area}(T^2)$ , and the classical total energy tends to zero asymptotically. Hence, as long as  $T^2$  is large enough, the ground states robustly lives in these chromo-magnetic flux sectors.

In the presence of the 't Hooft flux with non-abelian transition matrices and  $F_{12} = 0$ , the Polyakov loops around the nontrivial cycles of  $T^2$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_1(x_2) &= g_1(x_2) \mathcal{P} e^{i \int_0^{L_1} a_1(x_1, x_2) dx_1} = S, \\ P_2(x_1) &= g_2(x_1) \mathcal{P} e^{i \int_0^{L_2} a_2(x_1, x_2) dx_2} = C. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

<sup>4</sup>We thank A. Gonzalez-Arroyo and M. Garcia-Perez for discussions concerning their work [52].

<sup>5</sup>For a magnetic background field  $B = B_0(\sigma_3/2)$  in  $SU(2)$  gauge theory, the mode decomposition of the field yields the frequencies  $\omega_{k_z, n}^2 = \left( 2B_0(n + \frac{1}{2} + S_3) + k_z^2 \right)$ , which is tachyonic for  $S_3 = -1$ ,  $n = 0$  where  $k_z$  is continuous momenta [57]. However, on  $\mathbb{R} \times T^2 \times S^1$ , with  $B_0 = \frac{2\pi}{L_1 L_2}$  and with non-trivial holonomy in the  $S^1$  direction, this formula is modified to  $\omega_{k_3, n}^2(\theta_{ij}) = \left( 2B_0(n + \frac{1}{2} + S_3) + \frac{1}{L_3^2} (2\pi k_3 + (\theta_i - \theta_j))^2 \right)$  where in the center-symmetric holonomy background, minimal value of  $\theta_{ij} \sim \frac{2\pi}{N}$ . Thus, as long as center-symmetry is stable, for sufficiently large-  $(L_{T^2})^2$ , the tachyonic instability disappears. This is the working assumption in [51]. However, as  $(L_{T^2})$  gets smaller, at some point, the tachyonic (Nielsen-Olesen) instability will kick in. This is indicated by the red line in Fig. 1. This is however, not a phase transition, as the theory is formulated in finite-volume. But there is a rather dramatic rearrangement of states. We do not explore this cross-over in detail in this paper. See §3.3 for comparison of the two-sides of the crossover.



Since the classical field is gauge equivalent to  $a = 0$ , the Polyakov loops are the same as the transition functions. The flatness condition ( $F_{12} = 0$ ) requires  $P_1 P_3 = P_3 P_1$  and  $P_2 P_3 = P_3 P_2$ , and for a flat gauge field, we must have

$$P_3 = e^{2\pi i m/N} \mathbf{1}, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (2.14)$$

For this configuration there is no classical energy, but the double trace deformation (or loop correction) leads to an energy that scales with the size of  $T^2$ . This is given by

$$\Delta E_{\text{flat}} \propto \frac{L_1 L_2}{L_3^2} \frac{1}{L_3} N^2, \quad (2.15)$$

In other words, in terms of the energy cost of the two configurations on  $T^3 = (T^2)_{12} \times (S^1)_3$ , we obtain a classical energy cost for the non-flat gauge field and a one-loop energy cost for flat gauge field:

$$\Delta E_{\text{non-flat}}^{\text{cl.}} \propto \frac{N}{\lambda} \left( \frac{L_3^2}{L_1 L_2} \right) \frac{1}{L_3}, \quad \Delta E_{\text{flat}}^{1\text{-loop}} \propto N^2 \left( \frac{L_1 L_2}{L_3^2} \right) \frac{1}{L_3}, \quad (2.16)$$

where  $\lambda \equiv g^2 N$  is 't Hooft coupling. This implies that on large- $T^2 \times S^1$ , it is energetically preferable to turn on a 't Hooft flux  $n_{12} = 1$  by turning on a chromo-magnetic field. Even though a background chromo-magnetic field costs classical energy, and the cost of the flat background arises from the 1-loop effect, the background with  $F_{12} \neq 0$  is favored for large  $L_{1,2}$  energetically.

This implies that on  $T_{\text{large}}^2 \times S_{\text{small}}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ , the theory is in an abelianized regime due to non-trivial gauge holonomy (2.9). Therefore, the dynamics at distances larger than inverse  $W$ -boson mass  $(m_W)^{-1} = \frac{L_3 N}{2\pi}$  is described as an abelianized gauge theory

$$SU(N) \rightarrow U(1)^{N-1} \quad P_3 \text{ as adjoint Higgs field.} \quad (2.17)$$

Despite the fact that  $\text{tr}(P_3^k) = 0$  for  $k \neq 0 \pmod{N}$ , the zero form part of the center-symmetry  $\mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]}$  is *broken* at the perturbative level on (2.2) in an interesting way. The order parameter that realizes this breaking is  $\text{tr}(P_3^k F_{12})$ , the Polyakov loop with the insertion of  $F_{12}$ . This operator acquires a non-vanishing expectation value. In particular,

$$\left( \frac{L_1 L_2}{2\pi} \right) \text{tr} \left( P_3 F_{12}^{(i)} \right) = \omega^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (2.18)$$

We denote these  $N$  classical vacua by  $|\nu_i\rangle$ , associated with the weights of the defining representation following (2.11), and refer to them as *magnetic flux vacua*

$$\text{magnetic flux vacua : } \{ |\nu_i\rangle, i = 1, \dots, N \} \quad (2.19)$$

The theory admits monopole-instantons (which should be viewed as fractional instantons) interpolating between the perturbative vacua

$$|\nu_{i+1}\rangle \rightarrow |\nu_i\rangle, \quad . \quad (2.20)$$

The change in the chromo-magnetic flux through tunneling process is characterized by the magnetic flux of a monopole-instanton.

$$Q_{\text{mag}} = \boldsymbol{\nu}_i - \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i+1} \equiv \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (2.21)$$

The non-zero transition amplitudes

$$\langle \boldsymbol{\nu}_i | e^{-T\hat{H}_{\text{YM}}} | \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i+1} \rangle = K e^{-S_I/N + i\theta/N} \quad (2.22)$$

between the perturbative vacua leads to the restoration of  $(\mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]})_3$  center-symmetry non-perturbatively.

On  $\mathbb{R} \times (S^1)_{\text{small}} \times (T^2)_{\text{large}}$  with  $L_{S^1} \ll \Lambda^{-1}$ , if  $L_{T^2}$  is asymptotically large, the local dynamics must be essentially the same as the theory on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$ . The effect of the 't Hooft flux insertion via the abelian chromomagnetic flux (2.11) has a relatively small effect on local dynamics. The monopoles and bions due to  $SU(N) \rightarrow U(1)^{N-1}$  are present in the system and their proliferation leads to non-perturbative effects. If  $T^2$  is very large, then, the proliferation of the monopole-instantons is mathematically equivalent to the grand canonical ensemble of a magnetic Coulomb gas in 3d. The magnetic Coulomb gas is most easily described by using abelian duality, mapping  $N-1$  photons into  $N-1$  scalars  $*d\boldsymbol{\sigma} = L_3 \frac{2\pi}{ig^2} \mathbf{F}$ . The monopole operator is easier to express in the dual language than the original description, and they are given by:

$$\mathcal{M}_i(x) = K e^{-S_m} e^{i\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(x)} e^{i\theta/N} \quad (i = 1, \dots, N), \quad S_m = \frac{S_I}{N}. \quad (2.23)$$

Now, we can write the effective field theory action associated with the magnetic Coulomb gas (See [3] for details):<sup>6</sup>

$$S_{3\text{d}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2 L_3} |d\boldsymbol{\sigma}|^2 - 2\zeta_m \sum_{i=1}^N \cos\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \frac{\theta}{N}\right). \quad (2.24)$$

This description is valid at energies lower than  $W$ -boson mass,  $m_W = \frac{2\pi}{L_3 N}$ . The inverse of  $m_W$  also indicates the length scale associated with monopole size,  $r_m = \frac{L_3 N}{2\pi}$ . It is also useful to recall that the dual photon field  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  has periodicity determined by weight lattice,  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sim \boldsymbol{\sigma} + 2\pi\boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i \in \Gamma_w$ .

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \frac{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}}{2\pi\Gamma_w}. \quad (2.25)$$

<sup>6</sup> We use the following basis [58]. Let  $\mathbf{e}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  be an  $N$ -component orthonormal basis in  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Define weights of defining representation  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_i = \mathbf{e}_i - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{e}_j$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Then,  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_i$  satisfy  $\boldsymbol{\nu}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}_j = \delta_{ij} - 1/N$ . We define  $N-1$  fundamental weights as  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j = \sum_{i=1}^j \boldsymbol{\nu}_i$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, N-1$ . These  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j$  make a nice basis for dual photons,  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sigma_i \boldsymbol{\mu}_i$ , because each  $\sigma_i \sim \sigma_i + 2\pi$  is  $2\pi$  periodic. In this basis,  $K_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_j = \min(i, j) - \frac{ij}{N}$  (called quadratic symmetric form), and in particular,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N-1} = \frac{i}{N}$ .  $K$  is the inverse of the Cartan matrix  $A_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j = 2\delta_{ij} - \delta_{i, j\pm 1}$ ,  $KA = \mathbf{1}_{N-1}$ .

This system generates a non-perturbative mass gap for the dual photon given by (setting  $\theta = 0$ )

$$\begin{aligned} m_p &= \Lambda(\Lambda N L_3)^{5/6} \sin \frac{\pi p}{N}, \quad p = 1, \dots, N-1, \\ \ell_D &= \frac{1}{m_{p=1}} = \frac{N \ell_{YM}}{(\Lambda L_3 N)^{5/6}} \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

where  $\Lambda = \ell_{YM}^{-1}$  is the strong scale of 4d Yang-Mills theory, and  $\ell_D$  is the magnetic Debye length. The small parameter  $\epsilon \equiv (\Lambda N L_3) \ll 1$  controls the semi-classical expansion on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$ .

We would like to know the effect of turning on a 't Hooft flux on this effective theory. To this end, recall that Yang-Mills theory on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  has a 1-form and 0-form symmetry that descends from 4d 1-form symmetry.

$$(\mathbb{Z}_N^{[1]})_{4d} \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}_N^{[1]})_{3d} \times \mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]} \quad (2.27)$$

In our first set-up, we turn on a two-form background field ('t Hooft flux)  $B = \frac{2\pi n_{12}}{N L_1 L_2} dx_1 \wedge dx_2$ , associated with 1-form symmetry through  $T^2$ . This modifies the 3d action with an extra topological coupling [59]

$$S_{3d} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2 L_3} |d\boldsymbol{\sigma}|^2 - \int \frac{iN}{2\pi} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N-1} \cdot d\boldsymbol{\sigma} B - 2\zeta_m \sum_{i=1}^N \cos \left( \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \frac{\theta}{N} \right). \quad (2.28)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{N-1} = \frac{1}{N} (1, 1, \dots, 1 - N)$  is a fundamental weight. The topological coupling plays a crucial role in our quantum mechanical set-up.

## 2.2 Separation of scales and transition from 3d to 1d EFT

It is useful to consider the physics of the effective field theory (EFT) on  $\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{large}}^2 \times S_{\text{small}}^1$  in two different regimes. First of all, because of the compactification, the dual photon decompose to Kaluza-Klein tower, with characteristic separations  $\frac{2\pi}{L_{T^2}}$  between the modes. We would be in QFT regime if

$$\frac{2\pi}{L_{T^2}} \ll m_{\text{gap}} \Rightarrow L_{T^2} \gg \ell_D \quad \text{3d EFT}, \quad (2.29)$$

so that the dynamics of a dense set of modes generate the non-perturbative 3d dynamics. In the opposite regime, for

$$\frac{2\pi}{L_{T^2}} > m_{\text{gap}} \Rightarrow L_{T^2} < \ell_D \quad \text{1d EFT}, \quad (2.30)$$

we can forget about the non-zero KK-modes and consider the dynamics of the zero mode of the dual photon field  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ .

Note that the scale at which quantum mechanical 1d effective field theory kicks in is not a fixed scale on  $\mathbb{R} \times T^2 \times S^1$ . The critical value  $L_{T^2}^*$  where this change occurs gets

larger and larger with decreasing  $L_3$ . We can describe the long-distance dynamics via a quantum mechanical description at  $L_{T^2} < \frac{N\ell_{\text{YM}}}{(\Lambda L_3 N)^{5/6}}$ .

**3D EFT:** As long as  $T^2$  is sufficiently large so that (2.29) is satisfied one can use the EFT (2.24) in order to determine the non-perturbative dynamics. In particular, the theta dependence of the vacuum energy density can be extracted from this description. For this purpose we have to find critical points of the potential in (2.24), which are possible sets of mean fields for the  $\sigma$  field. There are  $N$  constant critical points for  $\sigma$  field in its fundamental domain (2.25). They can be most easily found by using  $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sigma_i \mu_i$ . The potential can then be written as

$$V(\sigma_i) = -\zeta_m(e^{i\sigma_1} + \dots + e^{i\sigma_{N-1}} + e^{-i(\sigma_1 + \dots + \sigma_{N-1})} + \text{c.c.}). \quad (2.31)$$

The extrema are given by

$$\frac{\partial V}{\partial \sigma_i} = 0 \implies \sigma_i = -(\sigma_1 + \dots + \sigma_{N-1}) \pmod{2\pi} \quad \forall i. \quad (2.32)$$

The  $N$  critical points can be expressed as

$$\sigma_k^* = \frac{2\pi}{N} k \rho \in \frac{\mathbb{R}^{N-1}}{2\pi\Gamma_w}, \quad (2.33)$$

where  $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \mu_i$  is the Weyl vector. These critical points are shown in Fig. 2 for  $N = 3$ . Since  $\alpha_i \cdot \rho = 1, i = 1, \dots, N$ , the vacuum energy densities of these  $N$  branches are given by


$$\mathcal{E}_k(\theta) = -2NK e^{-S_I/N} \cos\left(\frac{\theta + 2\pi k}{N}\right). \quad (2.34)$$

Which  $k$  is the true vacuum changes depending on  $\theta$ , and the  $\theta$  dependence of the vacuum energy is given by  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{ground}}(\theta) = \min_k \mathcal{E}_k(\theta)$ .

### 2.3 Quantum mechanical limit as a deformed TQFT

In the regime  $L_{T^2} < \ell_D$  we can reduce (2.28) to quantum mechanics. For this purpose, we have to integrate out all modes except for the zero momentum mode in the Kaluza-Klein decomposition of the  $\sigma$  field.<sup>7</sup> In the present construction with abelianized gauge fields the twisted boundary conditions do not generate a classical mass for the dual photon, i.e. the classical moduli of sigma are not lifted by the  $B$  field. Instead, they generate a new topological coupling. In §.4, we will see an alternative construction in which a classical moduli is lifted and a mass for dual photon is generated. Using  $\int_{T^2} B = \frac{2\pi n_{12}}{N}$ , we see that

<sup>7</sup>We would like to thank Yuya Tanizaki and Yui Hayashi for pointing out a flaw in this section in the first version of this manuscript.



**Figure 2.** For  $SU(3)$  gauge theory, the region bordered by the weight vectors  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  is the fundamental cell of the weight lattice, and it is also the fundamental domain of  $\sigma/2\pi$  (2.25). The red marked points denote the meta-stable vacua of the  $N = 3$  theory along the Weyl vector  $\rho$  according to (2.33). These are the mean-fields (critical points) of the monopole-EFT and as one dials  $\theta$ -angle, each one will become a genuine ground state at some value of  $\theta$ . We show that these are also the metastable vacua of the quantum mechanical limit of the theory, providing adiabatic continuity between the two regimes.

(2.28) reduces to the following quantum mechanical action

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{1d} &= S_{\text{kinetic}} + S_{\text{top.coupling}} + S_{\text{monopole}}, \\
S_{1d} &= (L_1 L_2) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2 L_3} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} K_{ij} \dot{\sigma}_i \dot{\sigma}_j \right) - \frac{i n_{12}}{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \int \frac{2\pi j}{N} \dot{\sigma}_j \\
&\quad - 2\zeta_m(L_1 L_2) \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \cos \left( \sigma_j + \frac{\theta}{N} \right) + \cos \left( -(\sigma_1 + \dots + \sigma_{N-1}) + \frac{\theta}{N} \right) \right), \quad (2.35)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used  $\sigma = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \mu_j \sigma_j$ .  $K_{ij} = \mu_i \cdot \mu_j = \min(i, j) - \frac{ij}{N}$  is quadratic symmetric form, (the inverse of the Cartan matrix), and in the topological term, we used<sup>6</sup>  $\mu_i \cdot \mu_{N-1} = \frac{i}{N}$ . This is the dimensional reduction of the dual photon theory with a “topological coupling” induced by the background 2-form field  $B$ .<sup>8</sup> Note that the  $\theta$  angle appearing in the monopole operator is the theta angle of the 4d theory. In our set-up, apart from that, the topological coupling to the background  $B$ -field generates  $N - 1$  new theta angles, with values

$$\theta_j = \frac{2\pi j}{N}. \quad (2.36)$$

These new topological angles play a crucial role in what follows. In particular, let us first treat  $S_{\text{monopole}}$  as a small perturbation, which is justified in this regime. If we set it to

<sup>8</sup>The same quantum mechanical action also appears in two other QFTs. One is the compactification of  $SU(N)$  level- $k$  WZW model on  $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$  using twisted boundary conditions. The WZW term gives our topological coupling. The mass deformation of the WZW model correspond to monopole operators. The other set-up is the fermionization of this set-up. It is the  $N$ -flavor Schwinger model with a mass deformation [60], see also [61, 62].

zero, then, in the absence of  $\theta_j$ , the  $\sigma$  fields describe the motion of a particle on a  $T^{N-1}$  torus. In particular, for  $N = 2$  it describes a free particle on a circle. The Hamiltonian corresponding to  $S_{\text{kinetic}}$  in (2.35) can be determined by a Legendre transform. We find

$$\frac{H}{C} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N-1} A_{ij} p_i p_j = \sum_{j=1}^{N-2} (p_j - p_{j+1})^2 + p_1^2 + p_{N-1}^2, \quad (2.37)$$

where  $A_{ij} = \alpha_i \cdot \alpha_j = 2\delta_{ij} - \delta_{i,j\pm 1}$  is the Cartan matrix,  $C = \frac{L_3}{2L_1 L_2} \left(\frac{2\pi}{g}\right)^2$ , and  $p_i = \frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma_i}$  are the conjugate momenta. In the absence of  $\theta_j$ , this system has a unique ground state.

However, we can show that due to the additional theta angles in (2.36) the non-interacting theory has an  $N$ -fold degenerate ground state.  $S_{\text{top.coupling}}$  modifies (2.37) by the replacement  $p_j \rightarrow p_j - \theta_j$ :

$$\frac{H}{C} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N-1} A_{ij} \left( p_i - n_{12} \frac{i}{N} \right) \left( p_j - n_{12} \frac{j}{N} \right) \quad (2.38)$$

The energy spectrum of the free theory,  $E_{\{m_n\}}$ , is given in terms of  $N-1$  quantum numbers,  $\{m_n\} \in \mathbb{Z}^{N-1}$ . Diagonalizing the Hamiltonian in the presence of  $\theta_j$  we find (for  $N \geq 3$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E_{\{m_n\}}}{C} &= \sum_{j=1}^{N-2} \left[ \left( m_j - \frac{n_{12} j}{N} \right) - \left( m_{j+1} - \frac{n_{12}(j+1)}{N} \right) \right]^2 \\ &\quad + \left( m_1 - \frac{n_{12}}{N} \right)^2 + \left( m_{N-1} - \frac{n_{12}(N-1)}{N} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

For  $n_{12} = 1$ , the ground state is  $N$ -fold degenerate and the vacua are given by

$$|m_1, \dots, m_{N-1}\rangle = \{|0, \dots, 0\rangle, |0, \dots, 1\rangle, |0, \dots, 1, 1\rangle, \dots, |1, \dots, 1\rangle, \}. \quad (2.40)$$

Note that the ground state energy coincides with (2.12) as expected.

These vacua are just generalization of the free particle on a circle problem with theta angle  $\theta_1 = \pi$ . In fact, for  $N = 2$ , we have

$$E_{m_1} = \frac{C}{2} \left( m_1 - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2. \quad (2.41)$$

The vacua are two fold degenerate and given by  $m_1 = 0, 1$ . In a coordinate basis, denoting the position of the particle by  $\sigma$ , the wave functions are  $\langle \sigma | 0 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$  and  $\langle \sigma | 1 \rangle = \frac{e^{i\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ .<sup>9</sup> In the general case the coordinate space  $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$  expressions for the states in the Hilbert space are

$$\langle \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1} | m_1, \dots, m_{N-1} \rangle = e^{im_1 \sigma_1} \dots e^{im_{N-1} \sigma_{N-1}} \quad (2.42)$$

---

<sup>9</sup>It is interesting to note that the monopole operators correspond to the wave function of a particle on a torus,  $T^{N-1}$ .

The coordinate representation also clarifies the role of the monopole operators. Monopole operators act as

$$\langle \tilde{m}_1, \dots, \tilde{m}_{N-1} | e^{i\sigma_n} | m_1, \dots, m_{N-1} \rangle = \delta_{\tilde{m}_1, m_1} \dots \delta_{\tilde{m}_n, m_n+1} \dots \delta_{\tilde{m}_{N-1}, m_{N-1}}. \quad (2.43)$$

We can identify these states with the magnetic flux states described on an intuitive basis in [51]. The identification and the role of the monopole are

$$\underbrace{|0, \dots, 0\rangle}_{|\nu_N\rangle} \xrightarrow{e^{i\sigma_{N-1}}} \underbrace{|0, \dots, 1\rangle}_{|\nu_{N-1}\rangle} \xrightarrow{e^{i\sigma_{N-2}}} \underbrace{|0, \dots, 1, 1\rangle}_{|\nu_{N-2}\rangle} \dots \xrightarrow{e^{i\sigma_1}} \underbrace{|1, \dots, 1\rangle}_{|\nu_1\rangle} \xrightarrow{e^{i\sigma_N}} \underbrace{|0, \dots, 0\rangle}_{|\nu_N\rangle}. \quad (2.44)$$

This shows that the  $N - 1$  topological couplings in the quantum mechanical model act as  $N - 1$  charges (like  $\pm\nu_1$ ) at infinity. In this way, tunneling happens between  $N$  perturbative ground states that share the same energy.<sup>10</sup>

**1D EFT, Hamiltonian in terms of magnetic (or electric) flux basis:** In the quantum mechanical description the easiest way to proceed to determine the spectrum is to use the tight-binding approximation. The representation (2.44) makes it clear that we can represent the monopole operators on the space of perturbative vacua as

$$e^{i\sigma_i} + \text{h.c.} : |\nu_i\rangle \langle \nu_{i+1}| + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.45)$$

The problem reduces (within Born-Oppenheimer approximation) to a particle on a circle with  $N$  degenerate harmonic minima. The tight-binding Hamiltonian is

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^N E_0 |\nu_i\rangle \langle \nu_i| - \sum_{i=1}^N K e^{-S_m - i\theta/N} |\nu_i\rangle \langle \nu_{i+1}| + \text{h.c.}, \quad (2.46)$$

where the second term describes nearest neighbors hopping between adjacent flux vacua (2.44). The first term is the zero point energy  $E_0$ , which is the  $E_{\text{non-flat}}^{\text{cl}}$  in (2.16). We can easily diagonalize the Hamiltonian (2.46) via a discrete Fourier transform:

$$|\tilde{k}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \omega^{ki} |\nu_i\rangle \quad (2.47)$$

and obtain

$$H = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \varepsilon_k(\theta) |\tilde{k}\rangle \langle \tilde{k}| \quad (2.48)$$

where  $\varepsilon_k(\theta)$  is given in (2.34). We can interpret the states  $|\tilde{k}\rangle$  as the *electric flux states*, and describe the low energy limit of quantum mechanics in terms of either magnetic or electric basis:

$$\text{Magnetic flux states} : |\nu_i\rangle \iff |\tilde{k}\rangle : \text{Electric flux states} \quad (2.49)$$

<sup>10</sup>Consider a parallel plate capacitor with charges  $Q = \pm 1$ . The energy density inside the capacitor is non-zero and outside, it is zero, hence they are unequal. Insert a pair of charges at  $\pm\infty$ , respectively,  $\mp\frac{1}{2}$ . Now, the electric energy density inside the capacitor and outside are the same. It is well-known in the context of the Schwinger model that theta angle can have a physical interpretation as charge at infinity [63]. The topological couplings  $\tilde{\theta}_j$  or equivalently, the background magnetic flux  $\nu_i$  play the same role here.

The string tensions for charge  $q$  in the regime  $-\pi < \theta < \pi$  are given by  $T_q = \varepsilon_q(\theta) - \varepsilon_q(0)$ . The Born-Oppenheimer approximation is justified because perturbative gaps are parametrically larger than the non-perturbative ones.

We observe that the vacuum structure of the theory on  $L_{T^2} \gg \ell_D$  is continuously connected to the one on  $L_{T^2} \ll \ell_D$ , and monopole continues to dictate non-perturbative dynamics even in the quantum mechanical regime.

## 2.4 Monopole interaction in the QM limit

It is interesting to note that the monopole operator is unchanged in the QM limit. The interaction between monopoles on  $\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{large}}^2 \times S_{\text{small}}^1$  or in the  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  limit is the  $1/r$  Coulomb interaction in 3d. Because the photons remain ungapped classically, the interaction of the monopoles in the quantum mechanical limit is dictated by the Coulomb interaction in 1d. Inspecting the correlation functions in the perturbative vacua on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  and in  $L_{S^1} \ll L_{T^2} \ll \Lambda^{-1}$  regimes,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{M}_i(\mathbf{x}) \mathcal{M}_j(\mathbf{0}) \rangle_{\text{free, 3d}} &= \langle e^{i\alpha_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{x})} e^{i\alpha_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\mathbf{0})} \rangle \\ \langle \mathcal{M}_i(\tau) \mathcal{M}_j(0) \rangle_{\text{free, 1d}} &= \langle e^{i\alpha_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\tau)} e^{i\alpha_j \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(0)} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (2.50)$$

we find that the interactions between monopoles in the 3d and 1d EFTs <sup>11</sup> are given by

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{x}) &= A_{ij} \left( \frac{1}{4\pi|\mathbf{x}|} \right) \\ V(\tau) &= \frac{A_{ij}}{(L_1 L_2)} \left( -\frac{1}{2}|\tau| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.51)$$

where the prefactors

$$A_{ij} = L_3 \left( \frac{2\pi}{g} \right)^2 \alpha_i \cdot \alpha_j, \quad (2.52)$$

arises from the charges of monopoles (with the normalization of kinetic term).

In other words, the monopole-monopole interaction in the quantum mechanical limit remains long-ranged to all orders in perturbation theory. The system we have is a multi-component Coulomb gas in  $d = 1$ . The effect of the monopoles and bions, as it is the case on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  is to render the dual photon massive, via magnetic Debye mechanism in 1d. If we insert an external magnetic charge into the system, its field will decay exponentially as  $\frac{1}{2\kappa} e^{-\kappa|\tau|}$  where  $\kappa \sim e^{-S_m/2}$  due to Debye screening. In fact, the natural frequencies of the quantum mechanical system  $\omega_p, = 1, \dots, N-1$  are exactly the mass spectrum of the theory (2.26) on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$ ,  $\omega_p = m_p$ . This shows that the most crucial property of the magnetic Coulomb gas remains the same in the reduction from  $d = 3$  to  $d = 1$ .

<sup>11</sup>The formula in 1d is valid at distances  $\tau \gg L_{T^2}/2\pi$ , in EFT. To get a formula which interpolates between 3d interaction and 1d interaction, we have to incorporate Kaluza-Klein modes. See also the footnote underneath (4.18).



### 3 Semi-classics on $\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{small}}^2 \times S_{\text{large}}^1$ with 't Hooft flux through $T^2$

As it is clear from (2.16) that the energy costs of having a non-flat field strength to implement  $n_{12} = 1$  unit of 't Hooft flux is proportional to  $\Delta E_{\text{non-flat}} \sim (N/\lambda)(L_3/L_{T^2})^2$ , while the cost of implementing it with a flat field strength is proportional to  $\Delta E_{\text{flat}} = N^2(L_{T^2}/L_3)^2$ . Therefore, if  $L_{T^2} \lesssim \frac{L_3}{N^{1/4}\lambda^{1/4}}$ , we have to use non-abelian transition matrices with a flat field strength to probe the vacuum of the theory. This crossover is very likely related to Nielsen-Olesen instability as mentioned in Footnote.5, but we postpone this study to future work.

Assume that  $L_3 \rightarrow \infty$  is very large. Then, our setting is

$$M_4 = \mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2 = \lim_{L_3 \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{R} \times \underbrace{(S^1)_3}_{\text{large}} \times \underbrace{T^2}_{\text{short}}. \quad (3.1)$$

The short symmetric torus has size  $L_1 = L_2 \ll \Lambda^{-1}$  and the large  $(S^1)_3$  has size  $L_3 \gg L_1$ . The semi-classical analysis below is an overview of necessary ingredients from [7].

#### 3.1 Overview of $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T_{\text{small}}^2$ : 2d EFT is a deformed TQFT

Introduce  $n_{12} = 1$  unit of 't Hooft flux along  $T^2$ . Based on the general analysis of [33], we can choose the transition functions to be  $g_1 = S$  and  $g_2 = C$  shift and clock matrices. By the relation between Polyakov loop and transition amplitude (2.13), this implies that the gauge holonomies (Polyakov loops) in the 1, 2 directions are given by

$$P_1 = S, \quad P_2 = C. \quad (3.2)$$

Therefore, the theory on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$  may be viewed as a 2d Yang-Mills theory coupled to two adjoint Higgs fields,  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  [7]. In fact, from the twisted Eguchi-Kawai reduction, we know that the twisted boundary conditions can be replaced by periodic boundary conditions, but with a modified gauge action [64, 65]. In our context, for small  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$ , this translates to the ‘‘classical potential’’

$$\text{tr}|P_1 P_2 - \omega P_2 P_1|^2, \quad \omega = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{N}}. \quad (3.3)$$

The perturbative analysis implies that, similar to the charge  $N$  abelian Higgs model in which the  $U(1)$  gauge group is reduced to  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  by the Higgs mechanism, the long distance gauge structure is reduced to  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  gauge theory,

$$SU(N) \xrightarrow{P_1, P_2 \text{ adjoint Higgs}} \mathbb{Z}_N. \quad (3.4)$$

One can think of this result as an adjoint Higgs regime induced by  $P_1$  which reduces the  $SU(N)$  gauge structure to  $U(1)^{N-1}$ , followed by a Higgs mechanism triggered by  $P_2$  which further reduces  $U(1)^{N-1}$  down to  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ ,

$$SU(N) \xrightarrow{P_1 \text{ adjoint Higgs}} U(1)^{N-1} \xrightarrow{P_2 \text{ adjoint Higgs}} \mathbb{Z}_N \quad (3.5)$$

However, since we are using a symmetric torus, the two Higgs mechanisms occur at the same energy (length) scale. There is no advantage gained here by viewing the adjoint Higgs mechanism as a two-step process. However, in the next section, we will consider an asymmetric torus. There, this perspective bears some fruits.

Because of the adjoint Higgs mechanism (3.4), the long distance theory may be described by a 2D gauge theory with gauge group  $\mathbb{Z}_N$ . Moreover, the twisted boundary conditions force all the gluons to acquire tree-level masses. We quickly recall how this happens since we will use the result in the next section too. We can express the gauge fields as

$$a = \sum a^{(\mathbf{p})} J_{\mathbf{p}}. \quad J_{\mathbf{p}} = \omega^{-p_1 p_2 / 2} C^{-p_1} S^{p_2}, \quad \mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2) \in (\mathbb{Z}_N)^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}, \quad (3.6)$$

where  $J_{\mathbf{p}}$  is a suitable Lie algebra basis, similar to what is used in the perturbative analysis of the twisted Eguchi-Kawai model [65]. Denoting the Fourier components of  $a^{(\mathbf{p})}$  by  $a^{(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{k})}$ , where  $\mathbf{k} \in (\mathbb{Z})^2$ , it is easy to show that all modes acquire non-zero masses given by

$$M_{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{k}}^2 = \left( \frac{2\pi}{NL_T^2} \right)^2 \left( (Nk_1 + p_1)^2 + (Nk_2 + p_2)^2 \right). \quad (3.7)$$

Therefore, gluons do not have any zero modes, and the lowest gluon mass is  $2\pi/NL_T^2$  [65]. The spectrum is sketched in Fig. 3 (left). What does this imply for the symmetry realizations?

Recall that in the  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$  compactification, the 1-form symmetry of the 4d theory decompose into 1-form and 0-form symmetries in 2d as

$$(\mathbb{Z}_N^{[1]})_{4d} \xrightarrow{\text{on } \mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2} (\mathbb{Z}_N^{[1]})_{2d} \times \mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]} \times (\mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]}). \quad (3.8)$$

Although the 0-form symmetries remain unbroken to all orders in perturbation theory, the 1-form part of the center symmetry is spontaneously broken, and the effective 2d theory is perturbatively a **topological  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  gauge theory**. The main question is, similar to the Polyakov model where in perturbation theory one lacks linear confinement, whether this infrared limit is stable or unstable.

Indeed, the proliferation of center-vortices leads to linear confinement. The center-vortices in 2d proliferate because they are fractional instantons with topological charge  $1/N$  and action  $S_I/N$  [22–24], hence their density in the vacuum of the theory on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is proportional to  $e^{-S_I/N}$ . Furthermore, center vortices have a non-trivial mutual statistics with the Wilson loops. Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  be the location of the center of the center-vortex, and  $C$  be the boundary of a disk  $D$ . Then, Wilson loop  $W_{\mathcal{R}}(C)$  in the  $SU(N)$  representation  $\mathcal{R}$  obeys

$$W_{\mathcal{R}}(C) = \begin{cases} \omega^k & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in D, \\ 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin D, \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

where  $k$  is the  $N$ -ality of  $\mathcal{R}$ . The center vortex plays two different roles. The first is as a symmetry generator. In particular, it is the generator of the 1-form center symmetry [50].

The second is a dynamical role, their proliferation in 2d set-up is capable of disordering the Wilson loops, as a result of the phase factors entering the relation (3.9).

The counterpart of the EFT in 2d for the center-vortex theory is a topological BF-theory deformed by local topological operators [30, 31].

$$S_{2d} = S_* + \Delta S = \frac{iN}{2\pi} \int_M \varphi da - 2\zeta_v \int_M d^2x \cos(\varphi + \theta/N). \quad (3.10)$$

Here,  $\varphi$  is a compact scalar field ( $\varphi \sim \varphi + 2\pi$ ) and  $a$  is a  $U(1)$  gauge field. The deformation  $\Delta S$  describes the proliferation of center-vortices. The parameter  $\zeta_v \sim e^{-S_I/N + i\theta/N}$  is the complex fugacity of the center-vortex gas.

The partition function localizes to the  $N$  critical points, and is given by

$$Z(\theta) = \int D\varphi Da e^{-S} = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} e^{-\varepsilon_k \mathcal{A}_{M_2}}, \quad \varepsilon_k = -2\zeta_v \cos\left(\frac{2\pi k + \theta}{N}\right). \quad (3.11)$$

The non-degeneracy of the  $N$ -energy levels implies confinement. To see this, we need to evaluate the expectation value of the Wilson loop. One finds

$$\langle W^q(C) \rangle \sim \exp\{-(\varepsilon_{k_0+q} - \varepsilon_{k_0})\mathcal{A}\}. \quad (3.12)$$

where  $k_0$  is the ground state for a given range of the  $\theta$  angle, and  $\mathcal{A}$  is the area enclosed by  $C$ . For  $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]$ , we find the string tension associated with the charge  $q$  Wilson loop is  $T_q = \varepsilon_q - \varepsilon_0$ .

This construction provides a semi-classical realization [7] of the center vortex mechanism [36–43] in a 2d EFT. However, we also note that in  $d \geq 3$ , the proliferation of center-vortices is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for confinement as shown in [30], while proliferation of monopoles is sufficient.

### 3.2 $\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{small}}^2 \times S^1$

So far, we considered  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T_{\text{small}}^2$ . Now, we compactify an extra circle, and consider the compactification of the theory on  $\mathbb{R} \times T_{\text{small}}^2 \times (S^1)_3$ . We assume

$$L_{T^2} = L_1 = L_2 \ll L_3 \quad (3.13)$$

With this assumption, we can work with flat gauge fields to explore low energy properties. Let us first describe the classical vacua. As before, we denote the holonomy of gauge field along long  $(S^1)_3$  as  $P_3$ . The classical vacua are described by configurations of  $P_3$  that commutes with  $P_1 = S$  and  $P_2 = C$ . Since  $C$  and  $S$  can be used to form all generators of the Lie algebra of  $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ ,  $P_3$  must be proportional to identity matrix  $e^{i\alpha} \mathbf{1}$ . Since  $\det P_3 = 1$ , possible values of  $P_3 = e^{2\pi im/N} \mathbf{1}$ ,  $m = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ .

$$[P_3, C] = [P_3, S] = 0, \quad \det P_3 = 1 \quad \implies \quad P_3 = e^{2\pi im/N} \mathbf{1} \quad (3.14)$$

Let us denote these classical vacua by  $|m\rangle$ , obeying

$$P_3|m\rangle = e^{2\pi im/N}|m\rangle \quad (3.15)$$

Therefore, perturbatively,  $(\mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]})_3$  center symmetry is spontaneously broken.

If one ignores tunneling, one obtains a quantum mechanical system with  $N$  vacua. The Hamiltonian at this order is just a constant (it can be set to  $H = 0$ .) Tunneling events lift the degeneracy of the vacua, similar to (2.46)

$$H = \sum_{m=1}^N \tilde{E}_0|m\rangle\langle m| - \sum_{m=1}^N K e^{-S_v - i\theta/N}|m\rangle\langle m+1| + \text{h.c.} \quad (3.16)$$

where the zero point energy  $\tilde{E}_0$  is the  $E_{\text{flat}}^{1\text{-loop}}$  in (2.16). The effective action in this regime is the compactification of the deformed TQFT (3.10), and is given by

$$S_{1d} = \frac{iN}{2\pi} \int dt \varphi \frac{d\alpha}{dt} - 2(\zeta_v L_3 N) \cos(\varphi + \theta/N), \quad (3.17)$$

Note, however, that the states entering (3.16) and (2.46) look quite different. In the next subsection, we discuss the two regimes leading to QM more carefully.

### 3.3 Two hierarchies leading to QM, dramatic reordering (same EFT)

In the previous sections we considered two regimes in which the theory on small  $\mathbb{R} \times T^3$  with  $n_{12} = 1$  reduces to quantum mechanics. We studied  $\mathbb{R} \times T^2 \times S^1$ , with both  $T^2$  and  $S^1$  small (smaller than the Yang-Mills length scale  $\Lambda^{-1}$ ), but with opposite hierarchies of their sizes,  $L_{T^2} \ll L_{S^1}$  vs.  $L_{S^1} \ll L_{T^2}$ . Below we list the physical properties we obtained in these limits, including the Polyakov loop  $P_3$ , the field strength  $F_{12}$ , the perturbative vacua, tunnelings events, tunneling amplitudes, and the electric flux states and energies. The mapping between these two semi-classical domains is also examined in [13]. The matching of mixed anomalies with the semi-classical analysis is examined in [7, 14]. With this analysis, we mainly point out that both QM regimes are described by a  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  topological theory deformed by fractional instanton operator. The summary of these two regimes is shown in the following tables.

Regime	Mechanism	Holonomy	Field strength	Pert. vacua	States
$L_{T^2} \ll L_{S^1}$	vortices	$\text{tr}P_3 \propto e^{i\frac{2\pi}{N}m}$	$F_{12} = 0$	$\text{tr}(P_3) \propto e^{i\frac{2\pi}{N}m}$	$ m\rangle$
$L_{S^1} \ll L_{T^2}$	monopoles	$\text{tr}P_3 = 0$	$F_{12} = \frac{2\pi H^{(i)}}{gL_1 L_2}$	$\text{tr}(P_3 F_{12}) \propto e^{i\frac{2\pi}{N}i}$	$ \nu_i\rangle$

Tunnelings	Tunneling amp.	vevs	E-flux states	Energies
$ m\rangle \rightarrow  m+1\rangle$	$\text{Exp}[-8\pi^2/(g^2 N)]$	$\langle \text{tr}(P_3) \rangle = 0$	$ \tilde{q}\rangle \propto \sum_m \omega^{qm} m\rangle$	$\tilde{E}_0 + \varepsilon_k(\theta)$
$ \nu_i\rangle \rightarrow  \nu_{i+1}\rangle$	$\text{Exp}[-8\pi^2/(g^2 N)]$	$\langle \text{tr}(P_3 F_{12}) \rangle = 0$	$ \tilde{q}\rangle \propto \sum_i \omega^{qi} \nu_i\rangle$	$E_0 + \varepsilon_k(\theta)$

We also note that the interaction between vortices is short-ranged while the ones between monopoles remain long range in the quantum mechanical limit. The zero point energies  $\tilde{E}_0$  is the  $E_{\text{flat}}^{1\text{-loop}}$  and  $E_0$  is the  $E_{\text{flat}}^{\text{cl}}$  in (2.16).

In these constructions, the action of center-transformation  $U_C$  can be used to generate the sum over tunneling amplitudes,  $\text{tr}[e^{-\beta H}(U_C)^n]$  between  $|m\rangle \rightarrow |m+n\rangle$ . One can construct the partition function in the electric-flux  $k$  state by projection, or equivalently, by the Fourier transform  $Z_k = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \omega^{nk} \text{tr} e^{-\beta H}(U_C)^n$ .

Despite the dramatic change of the Polyakov loop and the field strengths as  $M_4$  is dialed from  $L_{S^1} \ll L_{T^2}$  to  $L_{T^2} \ll L_{S^1}$  there is no phase transition, but a reordering of vacua in quantum mechanics. As explained in Footnote.5, we believe that this dramatic reordering is related to Nielsen-Olesen instability [57], which in turn must be related to which one of the options in (2.16) is the lower energy configuration. For example, for  $SU(2)$  gauge theory, the frequencies in mode decomposition of gluon field with spin  $S_3 = \pm 1$  are [13]:

$$\omega_{k_3, n, S_3}^2(\theta_{12}) = \left( \frac{4\pi}{L_1 L_2} (n + \frac{1}{2} + S_3) + \frac{1}{L_3^2} (2\pi k_3 + (\theta_{12}))^2 \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}^0, k_3 \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (3.18)$$

which has a mode that can become tachyonic ( $n = 0, S_3 = -1$ ). Mainly, in the  $L_3 \ll L_{T^2}$  regime with non-trivial holonomy  $\theta_{12} = \pi$ ,  $\omega_{k_3, n, S_3}^2 > 0$ , the would-be tachyonic mode is lifted to positive values and absent, and  $F_{12} \neq 0$  background is stable. In the  $L_{T^2} \ll L_{S^1}$  regime, with  $F_{12} \neq 0$  background,  $\omega_{k_3, n=0, S_3=-1}^2(\theta_{12}) < 0$  is possible, and there is an instability. Thus, 't Hooft flux must be implemented without using chromomagnetic field. This is consistent with two different implementation of the  $n_{12} = 1$  't Hooft flux in our work.

We indicated this cross-over between the two description in Fig.1 as a red rearrangement line. The nature of the topological defects in these two regimes are different. In particular, the one in the  $|m\rangle$  basis, are tunneling events between trivial holonomy vacua  $\text{tr}(P_3) \propto e^{i\frac{2\pi}{N}m}$ . Only at the core of the center-vortex, the holonomy becomes non-trivial. The ones in the  $|\nu_i\rangle$  basis are tunneling events between nontrivial holonomy vacua, only at the core of the center-vortex, two eigenvalues of the holonomy becomes degenerate. A proper understanding of this Nielsen-Olesen cross-over between the two center-vortex regime is an open question.

Both quantum mechanical limits are described in the deep infrared by a deformed  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  TQFT in 1d. This is consistent with the idea that in the diagram Fig. 1, the  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$  regime is adiabatically connected to the  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  regime.

#### 4 Two-scale adjoint Higgs mechanism and monopole-vortex continuity: From 3d to 2d

In this section, we give a rederivation of Hayashi-Tanizaki construction on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times S^1 \times S^1$  interpolating directly from 3d to 2d [32]. The new result in this section is the 2d EFT

(4.11) in terms of dual photon variables.

It would be useful if one can recast the adjoint Higgs mechanism to generate a **parametric scale separation** between the scale for abelianization  $SU(N) \rightarrow U(1)^{N-1}$  and the scale at which  $U(1)^{N-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_N$ . Then, one can use the fields of effective field theory based on the  $U(1)^{N-1}$  gauge structure to reach the  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  gauge theory.

In the infinite volume field theory on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , this is rather standard. We can have two adjoint scalars  $(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$  with a potential favoring a non-commuting minimum, such as the clock and shift matrices, and arrange a scale separation. This will lead to an abelian theory at some high energy scale  $E_1$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  gauge theory at some lower energy scale  $E_2$ .

$$SU(N) \xrightarrow[\text{scale } E_1]{\Phi_1 \text{ adjoint Higgs}} U(1)^{N-1} \xrightarrow[\text{scale } E_2]{\Phi_2 \text{ adjoint Higgs}} \mathbb{Z}_N, \quad E_2 \ll E_1 \quad (4.1)$$

The physics on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  at low-energies  $E < E_2$  will be described by  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  gauge theory, intermediate scales  $E_2 < E < E_1$  can be described as a  $U(1)^{N-1}$  theory, and high energy  $E > E_1$  can be described in terms of the original  $SU(N)$  degrees of freedom. All of this takes place on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

In our set-ups, very often, a Polyakov loop plays the role of an adjoint Higgs field. If the Polyakov loop is non-trivial, in the sense that it has non-degenerate eigenvalues in the weak coupling domain (for example  $P = C$ , where  $C$  is the clock matrix), then it will lead to abelianization. This happens in QCD(adj), and in deformed Yang-Mills and QCD. The difference between this and the adjoint Higgs mechanism that takes place on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is that on  $\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times S^1$ , with the Polyakov loop acting as a Higgs field, the long distance theory is defined on  $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ , despite the fact that microscopic theory lives in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

Therefore, if we can construct a two-stage adjoint Higgs mechanism with non-commuting Polyakov loops  $P_3$  and  $P_2$  then we can achieve the following hierarchical structure

$$SU(N) \xrightarrow[\text{scale } L_3]{P_3 \text{ adjoint Higgs}} \underbrace{U(1)^{N-1}}_{\text{3d EFT}} \xrightarrow[\text{scale } L_2]{P_2 \text{ adjoint Higgs}} \underbrace{\mathbb{Z}_N}_{\text{2d EFT}}, \quad L_3 \ll L_2. \quad (4.2)$$

This asymmetry changes the mass spectrum for the gluonic degrees of freedom (3.7) into

$$M_{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{k}}^2 = \left(\frac{2\pi}{L_3}\right)^2 \left(k_3 + \frac{p_3}{N}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{2\pi}{L_2}\right)^2 \left(k_2 + \frac{p_2}{N}\right)^2 \quad (4.3)$$

In the limit  $L_2 \rightarrow \infty$  we observe that  $(N-1)$  gluons remain gapless in perturbation theory, and the  $W$ -bosons come in  $N$ -fold degenerate multiplets, as shown in Fig. 3. At large  $L_2$  and in the presence of an  $n_{23} = 1$  't Hooft flux, gapless gluons acquire a tiny mass  $\frac{2\pi}{NL_2}$  and the degeneracy among gluons, is lifted as described by (4.3).

In particular, the perturbative gaplessness of  $N-1$  photons is now lifted even classically (instead of non-perturbatively by monopoles) into

$$M_{p_2, k_2}^2 = \left(\frac{2\pi}{L_2}\right)^2 \left(k_2 + \frac{p_2}{N}\right)^2 \quad (4.4)$$

due to  $n_{23}$  flux. Here,  $k_2$  is Kaluza-Klein label, and  $p_2$  is the (fractional) momentum label.

How does this translate to the dual photon description? To answer this question, we first have to recall that the 1-form symmetry of the Yang-Mills theory on  $\mathbb{R}^4$  decomposes in the theory on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  as

$$(\mathbb{Z}_N^{[1]})_{4d} \xrightarrow{\text{on } \mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1} (\mathbb{Z}_N^{[1]})_{3d} \times \mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]}. \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]}$  is the zero form part of the center-symmetry. Ref. [66] pointed out that the gauge invariant definition of the photon field is  $F_{\mu\nu,j} = \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \omega^{jl} \text{tr}(P_3^l F_{\mu\nu})$  and dual photon is  $d\sigma_j \propto *F_{\mu\nu,j}$ . Since  $\mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]} : P_3 \rightarrow \omega P_3$ , this symmetry cyclically rotates the dual photons as  $\sigma_j \rightarrow \sigma_{j+1}$ , where we denote the photon in an  $N$ -component notation  $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N)$ . The eigenstates of  $\mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]}$  symmetry are same as mass eigenstates of the dual photon in [3]

$$\tilde{\sigma}_p = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j \omega^{jp} \sigma_j. \quad (4.6)$$

In this eigenbasis of  $\mathbb{Z}_N^{[0]}$  symmetry, the 't Hooft twisted boundary condition translates into

$$\tilde{\sigma}_p(x_0, x_1, x_2 + L_2) = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{N}p} \tilde{\sigma}_p(x_0, x_1, x_2). \quad (4.7)$$

Hence, the mode decomposition for the  $\tilde{\sigma}_p$  field can be written as (changing  $p$  to  $p_2$  for convenience)

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{p_2}(x_0, x_1, x_2) = \sum_{k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{\sigma}_{p_2, k_2}(x_0, x_1) e^{i\frac{2\pi}{L_2}(k_2 + \frac{p_2}{N})x_2}, \quad (4.8)$$

producing the same spectrum as in (4.4) from a 2d QFT perspective.


Recall that on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times S^1$  with center-stable Polyakov loop  $P_3$ , the long-distance regime is described by the partition function of an  $(N-1)$  component magnetic Coulomb gas whose action is given in (2.24). As described in (2.26), this system has a non-perturbatively induced mass gap  $m_g$ , or inverse correlation length (magnetic Debye length)  $\ell_D$ . It is important to recall that  $m_g$  is non-perturbatively small, or equivalently,  $\ell_D$  is very large. Therefore, as we compactify the theory further down to  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (S^1)_2 \times (S^1)_3$ , there are two distinct regimes of the theory because of the interplay between  $L_2$  and  $\ell_D$ . These two limits are

$$L_2 \gg \ell_D \gg L_3 \quad \text{3d EFT}, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\ell_D \gg L_2 \gg L_3 \quad \text{2d EFT}. \quad (4.10)$$

Since the 3d gauge theory is where the semi-classical monopole mechanism of confinement takes place, and the 2d  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  gauge theory is the starting point of the 2d center-vortex theory of confinement, this provides an opportunity to adiabatically connect the two.

First, note that the  $(N-1)$  dual photons always become massive. In the regime  $L_2 \gg \ell_D$  the leading order contribution to the mass gap is generated non-perturbatively



**Figure 3.** (Left) Spectrum of gluons in the presence of a two-stage adjoint Higgs mechanism based on non-commuting clock and shift matrices. No massless modes survive. (Right) Spectrum of gluons for a one-stage adjoint Higgs mechanism with the clock matrix acting as a Higgs field.  $N - 1$  massless gluons remain. In the  $L_2 \rightarrow \infty$  limit, the levels in the spectrum on the left become degenerate and we obtain the spectrum on the right.

and is due to monopole-instantons [3], and are given in (2.26). On the other hand, in the case  $L_2 \lesssim \ell_D$ , the mass gap at leading order is a classical one, generated due to the presence of the  $n_{23} = 1$  't Hooft flux.

Furthermore, due to the twisted boundary condition on the  $\sigma$  field in the  $L_2 \ll \ell_D$  regime, the  $N - 1$  continuous moduli are lifted and  $N$  discrete vacua  $\sigma_{0,k} = \frac{2\pi}{N}\rho k$  survive as the classical vacua of the theory. These are indeed the critical points of the magnetic Coulomb gas on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , and the vacuum structure of the theory remains unchanged as the origin of the mass gap changes from non-perturbative monopole induced one to a classical boundary condition induced one.

For  $L_2 \gg \ell_D$  the theory is gapped and confining because of monopoles. For  $L_2 \ll \ell_D$ , the theory is classically gapped due to 't Hooft flux, and the long distance theory is a  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  gauge theory. As we described above, this theory allows center-vortices, and effective action has to be a deformed TQFT in 2d.

The central question is how the 3d effective action (4.16) based on monopoles turns into to the deformed TQFT action in 2d? In particular, what is the precise relation between monopoles and vortices? for large  $L_2$  vs. smaller  $L_2$ ?

In the regime  $L_2 \ll \ell_D$ , dual photons have a classical mass, multiples of  $\omega = \frac{2\pi}{NL_2}$  due to the 't Hooft flux. We add the mass operator in the relevant vacuum. Dimensionally



reducing the EFT on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (S^1)_3$  down to  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (S^1)_2 \times (S^1)_3$ , we obtain

$$S_{2d} = L_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2 L_3} \left( |d\boldsymbol{\sigma}|^2 + \omega^2 \min_k \left| \boldsymbol{\sigma} - \frac{2\pi}{N} \boldsymbol{\rho} k \right|^2 \right) - 2\zeta_m \sum_{a=1}^N \cos \left( \boldsymbol{\alpha}_a \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \frac{\theta}{N} \right). \quad (4.11)$$

This is a remarkable formula that incorporates many interesting insights. In particular, the theory based on variables of abelianized  $U(1)^{N-1}$  gauge theory is equivalent, in the long distance regime, to 2d deformed  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  TQFT. To see this, we note that at large  $\omega^2$ , the ground state is localized to one of the  $N$  gapped critical points  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_k^* = \frac{2\pi}{N} k \boldsymbol{\rho}$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, N-1$  along the Weyl vector (2.33). Hence, if we use the ansatz  $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \boldsymbol{\rho} \varphi$ , this leads to a 2d field theory

$$S_{2d} = L_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{g^2 \boldsymbol{\rho}^2}{8\pi^2 L_3} \left( |d\varphi|^2 + \omega^2 \min_k \left| \varphi - \frac{2\pi}{N} k \right|^2 \right) - 2\zeta_m N \cos \left( \varphi + \frac{\theta}{N} \right). \quad (4.12)$$

The first two terms in this EFT can be recast as a  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  TQFT in the deep infrared, and the last term is just the center-vortex operator

$$S_{2d} = \frac{iN}{2\pi} \int_M \varphi da - 2\zeta_v \int_M d^2x \cos(\varphi + \theta/N), \quad (4.13)$$

where we identified  $\zeta_m L_2 N \equiv \zeta_v$  as the fugacity of the vortex gas. Note that with these steps, the monopole operator becomes

$$e^{-S_I/N} e^{i\boldsymbol{\alpha}_a \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + i\frac{\theta}{N}} \rightarrow L_2 e^{-S_I/N} e^{i\boldsymbol{\alpha}_a \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_k^* + i\frac{\theta}{N}} = L_2 e^{-S_I/N} e^{i\frac{k}{N} + i\frac{\theta}{N}}, \quad (4.14)$$

the center-vortex operator in 2d.

At low energies, the mass term forces a localization to the  $N$ -vacua. This localization changes the monopole operators to center-vortex induced term according to (4.14) in the 2d language, and we obtain the 2d partition function

$$Z_{2d}(\theta) = \sum_k e^{V_{\mathbb{R}^2} 2\zeta_v \cos\left(\frac{2\pi k + \theta}{N}\right)}, \quad (4.15)$$

of the semi-classical center-vortex theory in 2d.

We can also consider further compactification of (4.11) down to quantum mechanical limit by further compactification of the theory on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (S^1)_2 \times (S^1)_3$  by opening a new circle on one of the  $\mathbb{R}^2$  directions, say  $x_1$ . This compactification can be done trivially, by just keeping the zero KK mode of the  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  field. In this limit, we obtain (recall  $n_{23} = 1$  now), the 1d effective action:

$$S_{1d} = L_1 L_2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2 L_3} \left( |d_\tau \boldsymbol{\sigma}|^2 + \omega^2 \min_k \left| \boldsymbol{\sigma} - \frac{2\pi}{N} \boldsymbol{\rho} k \right|^2 \right) - 2\zeta_m \sum_{a=1}^N \cos \left( \boldsymbol{\alpha}_a \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} + \frac{\theta}{N} \right). \quad (4.16)$$

It is worthwhile noting that this action looks rather different from the one we obtained by the quantum mechanical reduction of the theory with  $n_{12} = 1$ , (2.35). Yet, both flow to the same deformation of the  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  TQFT.

## 4.1 Monopole interactions and flux fractionalization

How did the magnetic Coulomb gas in 3d turn into a dilute vortex gas in 2d? To answer this question, we have to understand how monopoles can generate the effects of center-vortices.

Using (4.11) we can calculate the interaction between the monopole operators in this regime. If we were to do a naive dimensional reduction of a 3d Coulomb gas down to 2d, we would find that the  $\pm 1/r$  interactions between magnetic objects become  $\mp \log(r)$  in 2d, see, for example [67, 68]. However, this is not what we expect in our set-up, which can be viewed as a *twisted dimensional reduction*. In our construction, we know that there are center vortices in 2d, and that the interaction between them must be short ranged, since all the degrees of freedom are gapped. This property is reminiscent to the distinction between global and gauged vortices, where in our setup we have to obtain the counter-part of gauged vortices, similar to gauged abelian Higgs model, see e.g. [69].

The compactification we are considering involves a 't Hooft flux, which renders dual photons massive classically. We can inspect the correlation functions of the monopoles in the perturbative vacuum on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (S^1)_2 \times (S^1)_3$  in the regime (4.10), in which the long-distance theory becomes 2d. We find

$$\langle \mathcal{M}_i(x) \mathcal{M}_j(0) \rangle_{\text{free, 2d}} = \langle e^{i\alpha_i \cdot \sigma(x)} e^{i\alpha_j \cdot \sigma(0)} \rangle. \quad (4.17)$$

Assuming that  $|x| > \frac{NL_2}{2\pi}$  where  $x$  is the separation on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , the interactions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &= \frac{A_{ij}}{L_2} \int \frac{d^2 p}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{e^{ip \cdot x}}{p^2 + \omega^2} = \frac{A_{ij}}{L_2} \frac{1}{2\pi} K_0(\omega|x|) \\ &\approx \frac{A_{ij}}{L_2} \frac{1}{4\pi} \left( \frac{NL_2}{|x|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{2\pi}{NL_2}|x|} \quad (\omega|x| \rightarrow \infty), \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$


where we have used the asymptotic behavior of the modified Bessel function in the last step.<sup>12</sup> The important point is that the interaction became short-ranged on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . This implies that the magnetic flux does not spread on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . It is localized in a range  $\omega^{-1} = \frac{NL_2}{2\pi}$ . Microscopically, recall that monopole size is  $(m_W)^{-1} = \frac{NL_3}{2\pi}$ . To summarize,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{monopole core size on } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (S^1)_2 : \quad r_m &= (m_W)^{-1} = \frac{NL_3}{2\pi} \\ \text{center - vortex size on } \mathbb{R}^2 : \quad r_v &= \frac{NL_2}{2\pi} \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

<sup>12</sup>We can also work without assuming  $|x| > (NL_2)/(2\pi)$ . In that case, we have to work with the full 3d Green function on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times S^1$  with twisted boundary condition on  $S^1$ . This requires modification of the integration as

$$\int \frac{d^2 p}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{e^{ip \cdot x}}{p^2 + (\frac{2\pi}{L_2 N})^2} \rightarrow \sum_{p_3=1}^N \sum_{k_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \int \frac{d^2 p}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{e^{ip \cdot x}}{p^2 + (\frac{2\pi}{L_2} (k_3 + \frac{p_3}{N}))^2} = \sum'_{q_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} \int \frac{d^2 p}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{e^{ip \cdot x}}{p^2 + (\frac{2\pi q_3}{NL_2})^2} \quad (4.19)$$

accounting for the Kaluza-Klein modes and the fractional momentum modes arising from the twisted compactification. In the last step, we combined the two sums into a single sum, where prime indicates the absence of zero mode at finite  $NL_2$ . Then, it becomes clear that in the limit  $NL_2 \rightarrow \infty$  or  $|x| \ll NL_2$ , we obtain 3d Coulomb interaction  $1/(4\pi|x|)$ , while at large distances we obtain an exponential fall-off  $\exp[-(2\pi)|x|/(NL_2)]$ .



**Figure 4.** (Left) A monopole centered at  $x_2^*$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (S^1)_2$  ( $(S^1)_3$  not shown). Due to the 't Hooft flux  $n_{23} = 1$  the monopole flux (which is spherically symmetric at short distances) collimates into a tube of characteristic size  $r_v$ . (Right) A Euclidean 2d observable on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  sees this flux as a center-vortex due to its statistics with Wilson loop.

We can inspect the flux emanating from a monopole centered at  $x_2^*$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (S^1)_2$ . We will assume that  $N$  is of order one.<sup>13</sup> The flux is spherically symmetric at distances much smaller than  $L_2$ . If we consider a sufficiently large  $S^2$  surrounding the monopole we find that the flux fractionalizes into two tubes.  $\nu_i$  units of magnetic flux pass through the vicinity of the North Pole, and  $-\nu_{i+1}$  units of magnetic flux thread the vicinity of the South pole, see Fig. 4. The total flux is  $\alpha_i = \nu_i - \nu_{i+1}$ , equal to the monopole charge.

Remarkably, a Euclidean observable on 2d slice  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , will see either  $\nu_{i+1}$  or  $\nu_i$  units of flux. The flux can be detected using a large Wilson loop in the fundamental representation (larger than  $NL_2/2\pi$ ). Consider a Wilson loop on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $W(C) = \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} e^{i\oint a}$ . In the abelianized theory, only the photons in the Cartan subalgebra survive and we can write it as

$$W(C) = \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} e^{i\oint a} \xrightarrow{SU(N) \rightarrow U(1)^{N-1}} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N e^{i\oint \nu_j \cdot a} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N e^{i\int_D \nu_j \cdot f}. \quad (4.21)$$

where  $f = da$  and  $C = \partial D$ . Since  $\nu_i \cdot \nu_j = \delta_{ij} - \frac{1}{N}$ , the flux  $f = 2\pi\nu_i$  (for  $x_2 > x_2^*$ ) or  $f = 2\pi\nu_{i+1}$  (for  $x_2 < x_2^*$ ) leads to

$$W(C) = e^{-i\frac{2\pi}{N}\Theta_D(x)} = \begin{cases} e^{-i\frac{2\pi}{N}} & \text{vortex} \in D, \\ 1 & \text{vortex} \notin D. \end{cases} \quad (4.22)$$

where  $\Theta_D(x)$  is the support function, which is equal to 1 for  $x \in D$  and 0 otherwise. In other words, Euclidean 2d observables see the flux emanating from the monopole as

<sup>13</sup>The reason we do so here is related to subtleties arising in the large  $N$  limit. Notice that both the microscopic size of a monopole as well the center-vortex size depends on  $N$ . This is not an accident. Even at small  $L_3, L_2$ , if  $N$  is large enough, one can no longer use weak-coupling semi-classical methods. This is intimately related to large- $N$  volume independence or (twisted) Eguchi-Kawai reduction [54, 65, 70].

a center-vortex. We refer to this phenomenon as *flux fractionalization*. The position of the monopole in the compactified direction  $x_2^*$  can be interpreted as an internal moduli parameter of the vortex.

When  $L_2$  is asymptotically large, then, the a monopole at position  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  with flux (charge)  $2\pi\alpha_j$  is detected by abelian Wilson loop with charge  $\nu_i$  as

$$W_i(C) = e^{i\nu_i \oint a} = e^{i\nu_i \int_D f} = e^{i\frac{1}{2}\nu_i\alpha_j\Omega_D(x)} = e^{i\frac{1}{2}(\delta_{ij} - \delta_{i,j+1})\Omega_D(x)} \quad (4.23)$$

where  $\Omega_D(x)$  is the solid angle for the oriented surface  $D(\partial D = C)$  subtended at a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . For an asymptotically large area  $A$ , filling a plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , the solid angle is equal to half the solid angle of a sphere. If  $x$  is below  $C$  the solid angle is  $2\pi$ , hence

$$\lim_{D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2} W_i(C) = e^{i\pi(\delta_{ij} - \delta_{i,j+1})} \quad (4.24)$$

Then, in the grand-canonical ensemble of monopoles, it is the sum over these phases that generate the area law of confinement on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . The main point is that in both the monopole and center-vortex regimes, these phases are present, and *both* are sourced by monopoles, and lead to the area law of confinement.

## 5 Outlook: Metamorphosis

By itself the BPST instanton on  $\mathbb{R}^4$  is a rather simple object. It is a self-dual field configuration, with action localized in a lump with a smooth action density. The size of the lump is a moduli parameter.

On  $(S^1)_3 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ , where the  $S^1$  is small and has a center-symmetric holonomy, the lump fractionalizes into  $N$  monopole-instantons with action  $\frac{S_I}{N}$  and there are long-range interactions between them. The proliferation of these  $N$  monopole-instantons generates a mass gap (magnetic Debye length  $\ell_D$ ) as well as confinement and fractional theta dependence. These phenomena take place in a semi-classically calculable regime on  $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ , which is adiabatically connected to  $\mathbb{R}^4$ . More generally, in QCD-like theories with fermions, magnetic bions (magnetically charged monopole-antimonopole clusters) lead to confinement and mass gap.

On  $(S^1)_3 \times (S^1)_2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$  with a 't Hooft flux  $n_{23} = 1$ , and with  $L_3 \ll L_2 \ll \ell_D$ , we find that at large distances on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  monopoles transmute to 2d center-vortices. These vortices have short-range interaction, and non-trivial mutual statistics with the Wilson loop due to flux fractionalization. Hence, vortices lead to confinement and fractional theta dependence in a semi-classically calculable regime on  $T^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ .

Upon further compactification of the center-vortex theory (monopole EFT) to quantum mechanics on small  $T^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ , center-vortices (monopoles) become 1d instantons with short (long) range interaction interpolating between the  $N$ -perturbative vacua. This leads to confinement (as one can deduce from correlators of Polyakov loops) and fractional theta dependence.

Given that all these scenarios are based on the internal structure of the 4D instantons when probed by semi-classical fluxes or Polyakov lines, it is natural to ask whether one can extend these ideas more directly to the four-dimensional theory.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Antonio Gonzalez-Arroyo, Margarita Garcia Perez, Yuya Tanizaki, Yui Hayashi, David Wandler, Erich Poppitz, Aleksey Cherman, and Mendel Nguyen for useful discussions. The work is supported by U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics under Award Number DE-FG02-03ER41260.

## A From charge- $N$ 2d Abelian Higgs model to TQFT

Consider the charge- $N$  Abelian Higgs model with Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2e^2}|f_{12}|^2 + |(\partial_\mu + iNa_\mu)\Phi|^2 + \lambda(|\Phi|^2 - v^2)^2 - \frac{i\theta}{2\pi}f_{12}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

In the classical vacuum,  $\Phi = ve^{i\xi}$ . In the following we set  $v = 1$ , and ignore the fluctuations of the modulus. The kinetic term for the scalar field can be expressed as

$$|\partial_\mu\xi + Na_\mu|^2. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We can dualize this Lagrangian by introducing a vector field  $B_\mu$  and writing an auxiliary Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{aux}} = \frac{1}{4}B_\mu^2 + i\epsilon_{\mu\nu}B_\mu(\partial_\nu\xi + Na_\nu). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Integrating out  $B$  first amounts to setting  $B_\mu = 2i\epsilon_{\mu\nu}(\partial_\nu\xi + Na_\nu)$  and we recover the original Lagrangian, (A.2). Instead, if we integrate out  $\xi$  first, we obtain  $\epsilon_{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu B_\mu = 0$ . Hence, we set  $B_\mu = \frac{1}{2\pi}\partial_\mu\varphi$  where  $\varphi$  is a  $2\pi$  periodic field. In terms of the dual variable  $\varphi$  the Lagrangian can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2e^2}|da|^2 + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}|d\varphi|^2 + \frac{iN}{2\pi}\varphi da - \frac{i\theta}{2\pi}f_{12}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The dual theory has a  $U(1)$  gauge field, but there is no field which is charged under this  $U(1)$ . Therefore, the gauge field only enters via its field strength. It is known in the context of the standard abelian Higgs model that the effect of the gauge field is to generate a mass term for  $\varphi$  [63], and that the IR theory is gapped. However, in the charge- $N \geq 2$  Abelian Higgs model the IR theory is not completely trivial. At this stage, we can proceed in two different ways, leading to overlapping and complementary results.

In the low energy limit  $\frac{E}{e} \ll 1$  or equivalently,  $e \rightarrow \infty$ , we can drop the gauge kinetic term. The classical equation of motion for the gauge field  $a$  leads to the constraint  $d\varphi = 0$ ,

i.e.  $\varphi$  becomes non-dynamical. To all orders in perturbation theory, the effective 2d theory at large distances is the topological  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  gauge theory (TQFT). The action of the  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  TQFT can be expressed as [28, 29]

$$S_* = \frac{iN}{2\pi} \int_M \varphi da, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The fundamental question at this stage, then, is whether this infrared limit is stable or unstable. We will see that with the inclusion of non-perturbative effects (instantons, which are vortices in this set-up) is crucial in this context.

Before answering this question, we note that in the TQFT limit the theory no longer contains the mass of the  $\varphi$  fluctuations. In order to establish the relation with the statistical field theory that describes the vacuum of the model, it is useful to keep the fluctuating massive scalars in the IR description.

We can keep the mass of the scalar  $\varphi$  using the following procedure. Since there is no charged matter field in the dual description, the appearance of the gauge field is through the field strength  $f = da$ . If we view the theory on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  as the decompactification limit of the theory on some  $M_2$ , we can replace the integral over  $a$  with an integral over  $f$  with the inclusion of a sum over all flux sectors, i.e.  $\int Da \rightarrow \int Df \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta(\nu - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int f)$ . The latter integral can further be replaced with  $\int Df \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{in \int f}$  by using the Poisson resummation formula. As a result, we can integrate out  $f$  at a finite value of  $e^2$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int Da \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2e^2} \int |f|^2 + \frac{i}{2\pi} N \int \varphi f + \frac{i}{2\pi} \theta \int f \right] \\ &= \int Df \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2e^2} \int |f|^2 + \frac{iN}{2\pi} \int \left( \varphi + \frac{\theta + 2\pi n}{N} \right) f \right] \\ &= C \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{e^2 N^2}{4\pi^2} \int \min_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \varphi + \frac{\theta + 2\pi n}{N} \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where  $C$  is a constant. Therefore, the dual Lagrangian to all orders in perturbation theory takes the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} |d\varphi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^2 N^2}{4\pi^2} \min_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \varphi + \frac{\theta + 2\pi n}{N} \right)^2, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

i.e.  $\varphi$  is free massive scalar. Within the fundamental domain of  $\varphi$ , the theory has  $N$  minima. Setting  $\theta = 0$  these minima are located at

$$\varphi_* = \frac{2\pi n}{N}, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The massive theory, (A.7), in the deep infrared, reduces to TQFT. Indeed, the minima (A.8) are consistent with the TQFT action, for which the equation of motion of  $a$  yields  $d\varphi = 0$ , and the possible values of  $\varphi$  are given by the same set of discrete points.

The inclusion of vortices amounts to deforming (A.5) or (A.7) as

$$S = \frac{iN}{2\pi} \int_M \varphi da - 2\zeta_v \int_M \cos(\varphi + \theta/N) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$S = \int_M \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} |d\varphi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_\varphi^2 \text{“}\varphi^2\text{”} - 2\zeta_v \int_M \cos(\varphi + \theta/N), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where the mass term  $m_\varphi^2 \text{“}\varphi^2\text{”}$  has to be understood as in (A.7) and we shifted  $\varphi$  to have the  $\theta$  angle in the vortex term.

There is however, a disadvantage to working with the deformed TQFT. This EFT does not account for the interaction between vortices, and treats them as non-interacting. This is justified because the interaction deduced from (A.10) by inspecting the vortex-vortex correlators is:

$$\langle e^{i\varphi(x)} e^{\pm i\varphi(0)} \rangle_{\text{free}} = e^{-V(x)} \implies V(x) \sim \pm K_0(m_\varphi |x|) \sim \pm e^{-m_\varphi |x|} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

The TQFT limit corresponds to  $m_\varphi \rightarrow \infty$ , and the interactions does indeed disappear. However, in our story, in order to explain how the long-range interaction between monopoles transmutes to the short-range interaction among vortices, it is very important to keep track of the interactions. More generally, it is useful to keep track of the interactions between topological configurations when we map the Euclidean vacuum structure of a theory to statistical field theory.


## B An electrostatic analogy: Flux fractionalization

In the case of  $SU(N)$  gauge theory Hayashi and Tanizaki pointed out that the relation between monopoles in a 't Hooft flux background and center-vortices can be mapped to an electro-static problem [32]. Here, we detail the simplest realization of this to  $SU(2)$  gauge theory in detail. The goal is to point out that the potential becomes short range, exponentially decaying away from the chain. This is in agreement with our findings (4.18) obtained by evaluating monopole-correlators in  $n_{12} = 1$  background.

Consider an infinite line array of alternating charges,  $\pm$ , separated from each other by the spacing  $L_2$ . We can compute the electrostatic potential (in cylindrical coordinates) at position  $\vec{\rho} \equiv (x_0, x_1)$  and  $x_2$ . Let us position  $\pm$  charges at  $(x_2^* + 2L_2 k, (x_2^* + 2L_2(k + \frac{1}{2})))$ , respectively, and shift the coordinates such that  $x_2^* = 0$  for convenience.<sup>14</sup>

This is an interesting problem, because each type of charge array ( $\pm$ ) individually produces a  $\mp \log \rho$  term at large distances. But of course, due to the alternating charges, we expect  $V(\rho, x_2) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\rho \rightarrow \infty$ . But the question is how does the potential decay exactly,

<sup>14</sup>In the microscopic theory, the  $+$  charge comes from the BPS monopole and  $-$  charge arises from KK monopoles, both with  $Q_T = \frac{1}{2}$  topological charge, and  $e^{i\frac{\theta}{2}}$  theta angle dependence. It is important to note that  $-$  charge is *not* an anti-monopole. In the case of a general  $SU(N)$  group twisted boundary condition imply the presence of a chain of monopoles  $\dots \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_N \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_N \dots$  repeating indefinitely, each monopole with  $e^{i\frac{\theta}{N}}$  theta dependence.



**Figure 5.** (Left) An alternating array of  $\pm$  charges. The potential evaluated at  $\rho, x_2$  decays exponentially for large  $\rho$  as  $e^{-\frac{2\pi}{2L_2}\rho}$ . (Right) The flux of a charged particle collimates into a tube of thickness  $2L_2/2\pi$ . The fractionalized flux gives a contribution  $W(C) = e^{i\pi}$  to a Wilson loop on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , leading to area law of confinement on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$ .

algebraically or exponentially? In the analysis in the bulk of the paper, we reduced the 3d Coulomb gas EFT down to a deformed TQFT in 2d. This implies that the fall-off must be exponential. We would like to see that the exponential decay of the potential emerges from a sum of the type  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{Q_k}{|r-r_k|}$ .

The potential at some  $(\rho, x_2)$  can be written as

$$V(\rho, x_2) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(x_2 - 2L_2k)^2 + \rho^2}} - \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(x_2 - 2L_2(k + \frac{1}{2}))^2 + \rho^2}}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Clearly,  $V(\rho, x_2)$  is periodic with period  $2L_2$  in the  $x_2$  direction, and  $V(\rho, x_2) = V(\rho, -x_2)$ . Therefore, we can Fourier expand  $V(\rho, x_2)$  in the orthogonal eigenbasis  $\{\cos(\frac{2\pi}{2L_2}mx_2), m = [0, \infty)\}$  as

$$V(\rho, x_2) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} V_m(\rho) \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{2L_2}mx_2\right). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

The Fourier coefficients  $V_m(\rho)$  tells us how each mode behaves as a function of  $\rho$ , and can be found via inverse transform

$$\begin{aligned} V_m(\rho) &= \frac{1}{2L_2} \int_{-L_2}^{+L_2} dx_2 V(\rho, x_2) \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{2L_2}mx_2\right), \\ &= \frac{1}{2L_2} (1 - (-1)^m) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx_2 \frac{1}{4\pi\sqrt{(x_2)^2 + \rho^2}} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{2L_2}mx_2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$



Remarkably, the Fourier coefficient of the zero mode  $m = 0$  vanishes, as well as all even modes,  $m \in 2\mathbb{Z}^+$ . We could have anticipated this easily because the potential at  $x_2 = L_3/2 + L_3\mathbb{Z}$  must vanish at any  $\rho$  by symmetry. For  $m \in 2\mathbb{Z}^+ + 1$ , we obtain the Fourier coefficients

$$V_m(\rho) = \frac{1}{2\pi L_2} K_0 \left( \frac{2\pi}{2L_2} m\rho \right). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

This implies that the potential has the form

$$V(\rho, x_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi L_2} \sum_{m=1,3,\dots} K_0 \left( \frac{2\pi}{2L_2} m\rho \right) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi}{2L_2} m x_2 \right), \quad (\text{B.5})$$

At short distances, close to the cores of monopoles, this potential behaves as  $\pm 1/r$  as it should. At long distances, all the modes decay exponentially fast for  $\rho > \frac{2L_2}{2\pi}$ . Even the slowest decaying mode falls off as  $e^{-\frac{2\pi}{2L_2}\rho}$ . This is the same result as we obtained in (4.18) from field theory.

## References

- [1] M. Unsal, “Abelian duality, confinement, and chiral symmetry breaking in QCD(adj),” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** (2008) 032005, [arXiv:0708.1772 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [2] M. Unsal, “Magnetic bion condensation: A New mechanism of confinement and mass gap in four dimensions,” *Phys. Rev.* **D80** (2009) 065001, [arXiv:0709.3269 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [3] M. Unsal and L. G. Yaffe, “Center-stabilized Yang-Mills theory: Confinement and large N volume independence,” *Phys. Rev.* **D78** (2008) 065035, [arXiv:0803.0344 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [4] M. Shifman and M. Unsal, “QCD-like Theories on  $R(3) \times S(1)$ : A Smooth Journey from Small to Large  $r(S(1))$  with Double-Trace Deformations,” *Phys. Rev.* **D78** (2008) 065004, [arXiv:0802.1232 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [5] N. M. Davies, T. J. Hollowood, and V. V. Khoze, “Monopoles, affine algebras and the gluino condensate,” *J. Math. Phys.* **44** (2003) 3640–3656, [arXiv:hep-th/0006011 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [6] E. Poppitz, “Notes on Confinement on  $R^3 \times S^1$ : From Yang-Mills, Super-Yang-Mills, and QCD (adj) to QCD(F),” *Symmetry* **14** no. 1, (2022) 180, [arXiv:2111.10423 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [7] Y. Tanizaki and M. Ünsal, “Center vortex and confinement in Yang–Mills theory and QCD with anomaly-preserving compactifications,” *PTEP* **2022** no. 4, (2022) 04A108, [arXiv:2201.06166 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [8] Y. Tanizaki and M. Ünsal, “Semiclassics with ’t Hooft flux background for QCD with 2-index quarks,” *JHEP* **08** (2022) 038, [arXiv:2205.11339 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [9] Y. Hayashi, Y. Tanizaki, and H. Watanabe, “Semiclassical analysis of the bifundamental QCD on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$  with ’t Hooft flux,” *JHEP* **10** (2023) 146, [arXiv:2307.13954 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] Y. Hayashi and Y. Tanizaki, “Semiclassics for the QCD vacuum structure through  $T^2$ -compactification with the baryon-’t Hooft flux,” [arXiv:2402.04320 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] E. Poppitz, T. Schäfer, and M. Ünsal, “Continuity, Deconfinement, and (Super) Yang-Mills Theory,” *JHEP* **10** (2012) 115, [arXiv:1205.0290 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [12] Y. Hayashi, Y. Tanizaki, and H. Watanabe, “Non-supersymmetric duality cascade of QCD(BF) via semiclassics on  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times T^2$  with the baryon-’t Hooft flux,” [arXiv:2404.16803 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [13] E. Poppitz and F. D. Wandler, “Gauge theory geography: charting a path between semiclassical islands,” *JHEP* **02** (2023) 014, [arXiv:2211.10347 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] A. A. Cox, E. Poppitz, and F. D. Wandler, “The mixed 0-form/1-form anomaly in Hilbert space: pouring the new wine into old bottles,” *JHEP* **10** (2021) 069, [arXiv:2106.11442 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [15] M. M. Anber and E. Poppitz, “Multi-fractional instantons in  $SU(N)$  Yang-Mills theory on the twisted  $\mathbb{T}^4$ ,” *JHEP* **09** (2023) 095, [arXiv:2307.04795 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [16] M. Yamazaki, “Relating ’t Hooft Anomalies of 4d Pure Yang-Mills and 2d  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^{N-1}$  Model,” *JHEP* **10** (2018) 172, [arXiv:1711.04360 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [17] M. Yamazaki and K. Yonekura, “From 4d Yang-Mills to 2d  $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^{N-1}$  model: IR problem and confinement at weak coupling,” *JHEP* **07** (2017) 088, [arXiv:1704.05852 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] T. C. Kraan and P. van Baal, “Periodic instantons with nontrivial holonomy,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B533** (1998) 627–659, [arXiv:hep-th/9805168 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [19] T. C. Kraan and P. van Baal, “Monopole constituents inside  $SU(n)$  calorons,” *Phys. Lett.* **B435** (1998) 389–395, [arXiv:hep-th/9806034 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [20] K.-M. Lee and C.-h. Lu, “ $SU(2)$  calorons and magnetic monopoles,” *Phys. Rev.* **D58** (1998) 025011, [arXiv:hep-th/9802108 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [21] K.-M. Lee and P. Yi, “Monopoles and instantons on partially compactified D-branes,” *Phys. Rev.* **D56** (1997) 3711–3717, [arXiv:hep-th/9702107 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [22] A. Gonzalez-Arroyo and A. Montero, “Selfdual vortex - like configurations in  $SU(2)$  Yang-Mills theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **442** (1998) 273–278, [arXiv:hep-th/9809037](#).
- [23] A. Montero, “Study of  $SU(3)$  vortex - like configurations with a new maximal center gauge fixing method,” *Phys. Lett. B* **467** (1999) 106–111, [arXiv:hep-lat/9906010](#).
- [24] A. Montero, “Vortex configurations in the large  $N$  limit,” *Phys. Lett. B* **483** (2000) 309–314, [arXiv:hep-lat/0004002](#).
- [25] A. Gonzalez-Arroyo, “On the fractional instanton liquid picture of the Yang-Mills vacuum and Confinement,” [arXiv:2302.12356 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] A. M. Polyakov, “Compact Gauge Fields and the Infrared Catastrophe,” *Phys. Lett.* **B59** (1975) 82–84.
- [27] A. Polyakov, *Gauge Fields and Strings (Mathematical Reports)*, CRC Press, 1 ed., 9, 1987.
- [28] T. Banks and N. Seiberg, “Symmetries and Strings in Field Theory and Gravity,” *Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 084019, [arXiv:1011.5120 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [29] A. Kapustin and N. Seiberg, “Coupling a QFT to a TQFT and Duality,” *JHEP* **04** (2014) 001, [arXiv:1401.0740 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [30] M. Nguyen, T. Sulejmanpasic, and M. Ünsal, “Phases of theories with  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  1-form symmetry and the roles of center vortices and magnetic monopoles,” [arXiv:2401.04800 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [31] A. Cherman, T. Jacobson, and M. Neuzil, “Universal Deformations,” *SciPost Phys.* **12** no. 4, (2022) 116, [arXiv:2111.00078 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [32] Y. Hayashi and Y. Tanizaki, “Unifying Monopole and Center Vortex as the Semiclassical Confinement Mechanism,” [arXiv:2405.12402 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [33] G. ’t Hooft, “A Property of Electric and Magnetic Flux in Nonabelian Gauge Theories,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B153** (1979) 141–160.
- [34] G. ’t Hooft, “Aspects of Quark Confinement,” *Phys. Scripta* **24** (1981) 841–846.
- [35] P. van Baal, “Some Results for SU(N) Gauge Fields on the Hypertorus,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **85** (1982) 529.
- [36] L. Del Debbio, M. Faber, J. Greensite, and S. Olejnik, “Center dominance and Z(2) vortices in SU(2) lattice gauge theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **55** (1997) 2298–2306, [arXiv:hep-lat/9610005](#).
- [37] L. Del Debbio, M. Faber, J. Giedt, J. Greensite, and S. Olejnik, “Detection of center vortices in the lattice Yang-Mills vacuum,” *Phys. Rev. D* **58** (1998) 094501, [arXiv:hep-lat/9801027](#).
- [38] M. Engelhardt, K. Langfeld, H. Reinhardt, and O. Tennert, “Interaction of confining vortices in SU(2) lattice gauge theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **431** (1998) 141–146, [arXiv:hep-lat/9801030](#).
- [39] C. Alexandrou, M. D’Elia, and P. de Forcrand, “The Relevance of center vortices,” *Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl.* **83** (2000) 437–439, [arXiv:hep-lat/9907028](#).
- [40] C. Alexandrou, P. de Forcrand, and M. D’Elia, “The Role of center vortices in QCD,” *Nucl. Phys. A* **663** (2000) 1031–1034, [arXiv:hep-lat/9909005](#).
- [41] P. de Forcrand and M. D’Elia, “On the relevance of center vortices to QCD,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999) 4582–4585, [arXiv:hep-lat/9901020](#).
- [42] P. de Forcrand and M. Pepe, “Center vortices and monopoles without lattice Gribov copies,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **598** (2001) 557–577, [arXiv:hep-lat/0008016](#).
- [43] N. Sale, B. Lucini, and J. Giansiracusa, “Probing center vortices and deconfinement in SU(2) lattice gauge theory with persistent homology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107** no. 3, (2023) 034501, [arXiv:2207.13392 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [44] J. Greensite, “The Confinement problem in lattice gauge theory,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **51** (2003) 1, [arXiv:hep-lat/0301023](#).
- [45] S. Deldar and S. M. Hosseini Nejad, “Center vortices as composites of monopole fluxes,” *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1701** no. 1, (2016) 100004, [arXiv:1503.04459 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [46] L. E. Oxman, “4D ensembles of percolating center vortices and monopole defects: The emergence of flux tubes with N -ality and gluon confinement,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** no. 3, (2018) 036018, [arXiv:1805.06354 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [47] G. ’t Hooft, “On the phase transition towards permanent quark confinement,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **138** (1978) 1–25.
- [48] J. M. Cornwall, “Quark Confinement and Vortices in Massive Gauge Invariant QCD,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **157** (1979) 392–412.
- [49] H. B. Nielsen and P. Olesen, “A Quantum Liquid Model for the QCD Vacuum: Gauge and Rotational Invariance of Domained and Quantized Homogeneous Color Fields,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **160** (1979) 380–396.
- [50] D. Gaiotto, A. Kapustin, N. Seiberg, and B. Willett, “Generalized Global Symmetries,” *JHEP* **02** (2015) 172, [arXiv:1412.5148 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [51] M. Ünsal, “Strongly coupled QFT dynamics via TQFT coupling,” *JHEP* **11** (2021) 134, [arXiv:2007.03880 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [52] M. García Pérez, A. González-Arroyo, and M. Okawa, “Spatial volume dependence for 2+1 dimensional SU(N) Yang-Mills theory,” *JHEP* **09** (2013) 003, [arXiv:1307.5254 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [53] D. J. Gross, R. D. Pisarski, and L. G. Yaffe, “QCD and Instantons at Finite Temperature,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **53** (1981) 43.
- [54] P. Kovtun, M. Unsal, and L. G. Yaffe, “Volume independence in large N(c) QCD-like gauge theories,” *JHEP* **06** (2007) 019, [arXiv:hep-th/0702021 \[HEP-TH\]](#).
- [55] A. Cherman, M. Shifman, and M. Unsal, “Bose-Fermi cancellations without supersymmetry,” *Phys. Rev.* **D99** no. 10, (2019) 105001, [arXiv:1812.04642 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [56] M. Unsal and L. G. Yaffe, “Large-N volume independence in conformal and confining gauge theories,” *JHEP* **08** (2010) 030, [arXiv:1006.2101 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [57] N. K. Nielsen and P. Olesen, “An Unstable Yang-Mills Field Mode,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **144** (1978) 376–396.
- [58] L. Frappat, P. Sorba, and A. Sciarrino, *Dictionary on Lie algebras and superalgebras*. Academic Press (London), 2000. <https://hal.science/hal-00376660>.
- [59] Y. Tanizaki and M. Unsal, “Modified instanton sum in QCD and higher-groups,” *JHEP* **03** (2020) 123, [arXiv:1912.01033 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [60] T. Misumi, Y. Tanizaki, and M. Ünsal, “Fractional  $\theta$  angle, ’t Hooft anomaly, and quantum instantons in charge- $q$  multi-flavor Schwinger model,” *JHEP* **07** (2019) 018, [arXiv:1905.05781 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [61] Y. Tanizaki and T. Sulejmanpasic, “Anomaly and global inconsistency matching:  $\theta$ -angles,  $SU(3)/U(1)^2$  nonlinear sigma model,  $SU(3)$  chains and its generalizations,” *Phys. Rev.* **B98** no. 11, (2018) 115126, [arXiv:1805.11423 \[cond-mat.str-el\]](#).
- [62] Y. Kikuchi and Y. Tanizaki, “Global inconsistency, ’t Hooft anomaly, and level crossing in quantum mechanics,” *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2017** (2017) 113B05, [arXiv:1708.01962 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [63] S. R. Coleman, “More About the Massive Schwinger Model,” *Annals Phys.* **101** (1976) 239.
- [64] A. Gonzalez-Arroyo and M. Okawa, “A Twisted Model for Large  $N$  Lattice Gauge Theory,” *Phys. Lett.* **120B** (1983) 174–178.
- [65] A. Gonzalez-Arroyo and M. Okawa, “The Twisted Eguchi-Kawai Model: A Reduced Model for Large  $N$  Lattice Gauge Theory,” *Phys. Rev.* **D27** (1983) 2397.
- [66] A. Cherman and E. Poppitz, “Emergent dimensions and branes from large- $N$  confinement,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94** no. 12, (2016) 125008, [arXiv:1606.01902 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [67] M. M. Anber, E. Poppitz, and M. Unsal, “2d affine xy-spin model/4d gauge theory duality and deconfinement,” *JHEP* **04** (2012) 040, [arXiv:1112.6389 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [68] M. M. Anber, S. Collier, E. Poppitz, S. Strimas-Mackey, and B. Teeple, “Deconfinement in  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  super Yang-Mills theory on  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1$  via dual-Coulomb gas and ”affine” XY-model,” *JHEP* **11** (2013) 142, [arXiv:1310.3522 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [69] N. S. Manton and P. Sutcliffe, *Topological solitons*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- [70] T. Eguchi and H. Kawai, “Reduction of Dynamical Degrees of Freedom in the Large N Gauge Theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48** (1982) 1063.