

# Gauged Skyrme analogue of Chern-Pontryagin

D. H. Tchrakian<sup>†\*</sup>

<sup>†</sup>School of Theoretical Physics, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies,  
Burlington Road, Dublin 4, Ireland

\*Department of Computer Science, National University of Ireland Maynooth, Maynooth, Ireland

## Abstract

An analogue of the Chern-Pontryagin density for  $SO(D)$  gauged  $O(D + 1)$  Skyrme systems, referred to as Skyrme–Chern-Pontryagin (SCP) densities is known for dimensions  $D = 2, 3, 4$ . Since these are defined only through a prescription, it is necessary to extend the realisation to higher  $D$ , which is carried out here for  $D = 5$ . It is found that in  $D = 5$  there is limitation on the group gauging the Skyrmion, implying that such limitation will persist in higher dimensions. The construction of SCP densities in  $D = 2, 3, 4, 5$  is presented here in a unified notation with the aim of pointing out to possible extarpolation to all dimensions.

# 1 Introduction

Chern-Pontryagin (CP) densities are pivotal in the construction of instantons [1] on  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , and their dimensional descendants play that role for the magnetic monopoles [2] on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and the Abelian Higgs vortices [3] on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . CP densities play the same role also in higher dimensions. In even dimensions, they stabilise Yang-Mills instanton actions and in particular on  $\mathbb{R}^{4p}$  they support (anti-)self-dual instantons [4]. Their dimensional descendants are employed in constructing magnetic monopoles [5] in all odd and even dimensions.

Concerning gauged Skyrmons the situation is entirely different since Skyrme scalars are not dimensional descendants of Yang-Mills fields in higher (even) dimensions, and hence CP densities cannot be employed in the same way as for gauged Higgs fields. The approach taken here is to devise an analogue of the CP density that accommodates the Skyrme scalar in the given dimension.

The guiding principle for devising a density that can present a lower bound for the action/energy for a gauged Skyrme system is to find an analogue of the CP density, which like the latter is both *gauge invariant* and *total divergence*. This then can be exploited to establish Bogomol'nyi like action/energy lower bounds.

Formally, this density,  $\varrho^{(D)}$  in  $D$  dimensions is expressed as

$$\varrho^{(D)} = \varrho_G^{(D)} + W[F, D\phi] \quad (1.1)$$

$$= \varrho_0^{(D)} + \partial_i \Omega_i[A, \phi], \quad (1.2)$$

where

$$\varrho_0^{(D)} = \varepsilon_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D} \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_D A_{D+1}} \partial_{i_1} \phi^{A_1} \partial_{i_2} \phi^{A_2} \dots \partial_{i_D} \phi^{A_D} \phi^{A_{D+1}} \quad (1.3)$$

$$\varrho_G^{(D)} = \varepsilon_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_D} \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_D A_{D+1}} D_{i_1} \phi^{A_1} D_{i_2} \phi^{A_2} \dots D_{i_D} \phi^{A_D} \phi^{A_{D+1}} \quad (1.4)$$

and where  $\varrho_0^{(D)}$  defined by (1.3) is the *winding number density* of the  $O(D+1)$  Skyrme scalar  $\phi^A$ ,  $A = 1, 2, \dots, D+1$  in  $D$  dimensions, subject to the constraint  $|\phi^A|^2 = 1$ , and  $\varrho_G^{(D)}$  is defined by replacing all the partial derivatives in  $\varrho_0^{(D)}$  by covariant derivatives. Thus,  $\varrho_0$  is effectively a total-divergence but is not gauge-invariant, while  $\varrho_G^{(D)}$  is by construction gauge-invariant but is not total-divergence.

In (1.3) and (1.4), coordinates are labelled by lower indices, *e.g.*,  $x_i$ , and the indices labelling the  $O(D+1)$  scalars by upper indices, *e.g.*,  $\phi^A$ . Upper/lower here do not imply contravariant/covariant. This notation is used throughout.

For  $\varrho^{(D)}$  to present an energy lower bound it must be both *gauge invariant* and *total divergence*, which is achieved by constructing the gauge-invariant quantity  $W[F, D\phi]$  and the total-divergence  $\partial_i \Omega_i[A, \phi]$ . In this sense,  $\varrho$  is an analogue of the Chern-Pontryagin (CP), which is the density used in establishing action/energy lower bounds for instantons/monopoles (and vortices). In the case of instantons, this is the CP density itself, while in the case of monopoles (and vortices) it is the appropriate dimensional descendant of a CP density.

Unlike the CP density however,  $\varrho^{(D)}$  in  $D$  dimensions, prescribed by (1.1)-(1.2), is defined for gauge group  $SO(D)$ , or contractions of  $SO(D)$ . To make the prescription (1.1)-(1.2) concrete, it is necessary to define the gauging prescription and fix the notation.

The  $O(D + 1)$  Skyrme scalar is  $\phi^A$ ,  $A = 1, 2, \dots, D + 1$  is subject to

$$|\phi^A|^2 = |\phi^a|^2 + (\phi^{D+1})^2 = 1, \quad a = 1, 2, \dots, D. \quad (1.5)$$

The  $SO(D)$  gauging prescription is

$$D_i \phi^a = \partial_i \phi^a + A_i \phi^a, \quad A_i \phi^a = (A_i \phi)^b = A_i^{ab} \phi^b \quad (1.6)$$

$$D_i \phi^{D+1} = \partial_i \phi^{D+1}, \quad (1.7)$$

where

$$A_i^{ab} = -A_i^{ba} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, D; a = 1, 2, \dots, D$$

is the  $SO(D)$  gauge connection, whose curvature is

$$\begin{aligned} F_{ij}^{ab} &= \partial_{[i} A_{j]}^{ab} + (A_{[i} A_{j]})^{ab} \\ &\equiv \partial_i A_j^{ab} + A_i^{ac} A_j^{cb} - (i, j). \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

The prescription for constructing the (1.1)-(1.2) is to calculate the difference

$$\varrho_G^{(D)} - \varrho_0^{(D)} = \partial_i \Omega_i[A, \phi] - W[F, D\phi] \quad (1.9)$$

such that  $W[F, D\phi]$  is gauge invariant.

The relation (1.9) is evaluated explicitly by extracting partial derivatives until a gauge invariant quantity is isolated. In increasing dimensions, there is some arbitrariness in this splitting. The calculations are carried out directly, using the Leibnitz rule, tensor and Bianchi identities.

As stated above, the density (1.1)-(1.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho^{(D)} &= \varrho_G^{(D)} + W[F, D\phi] \\ &= \varrho_0^{(D)} + \partial_i \Omega_i[A, \phi], \end{aligned}$$

is an analogue of the Chern-Pontryagin (CP) density and can therefore be similarly exploited. It might not be unreasonable to refer to  $\varrho^{(D)}$  as a Skyrme–Chern-Pontryagin (SCP) density.

The definition (1.1) of the SCP density is suited for devising Bogomol’nyi type energy lower bounds. It has been exploited in constructing gauged Skyrme solitons: on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  in [6], on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  in [7] and on  $\mathbb{R}^4$  in [8].

The definition (1.2) of the SCP density is useful for calculating the effective “baryon number” which in the presence of the Chern-Simons term can cause this to depart from the *integer valued* topological charge. This was observed in  $2 + 1$  and  $3 + 1$  dimensional Abelian gauged  $O(3)$  and  $O(5)$  models, in [9] and [10], respectively. Not less importantly, since (1.2) can be expressed explicitly as a total divergence, it can be exploited in the definition of a Chern-Simon like density.

However, unlike the CP density which can be defined for any gauge group in any even dimension, the gauge group of the SCP density in  $D$  dimensions, prescribed by (1.1)-(1.2), is restricted to be at most  $SO(D)$ , or some subgroup of it. But unlike the the CP density which can be defined in even dimensions only, the definition of the SCP density is **not** restricted to even dimensions only and is valid in odd dimensions too.

We are now confronted with the essential question. While the definition of the CP density for any gauge group and any (even) dimension is unambiguously stated, the corresponding status of the SCP density depends on explicit construction in any given dimension, and as such (1.1)-(1.2) is a prescription. To date, this prescription was implemented only for  $D = 2, 3$  and  $4$ , and was exploited in Refs. [6], [7] and [8] respectively.

To answer this question at least partially, it is necessary to explore the prescription (1.1)-(1.2) in dimensions  $D \geq 5$ , and in the present note this carried out for dimension  $D = 5$ . This is the sole aim of the present work. In Section **2** below we present the construction of  $\varrho^{(D)}$  for  $D = 2, 3, 4$  and  $5$ , in successive Subsections. The aim is to give an as transparent as possible description of these SCP densities in a unified manner. In Section **3**, a summary and outlook is give, and the further details of the content of Section **2** are relegated to the Appendix.

## 2 Calculation

The quantity  $(\varrho_G^{(D)} - \varrho_0^{(D)})$  is calculated and cast in the prescribed form of (1.9), for  $D = 2, 3, 4$ , and  $5$  in each Subsection below, respectively.

### 2.1 $D = 2$

Using basic tensor identities,  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  given by (1.4) minus (1.3), is unpacked to give

$$\frac{1}{2}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ij} \varepsilon^{fg} \partial_j \phi^3 A_i^{fg} \equiv \varepsilon_{ij} \partial_j \phi^3 A_i, \quad (2.10)$$

which by a single application of the Leibniz rule splits in a gauge-invariant and a total divergence

$$(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \varepsilon_{ij} [2 \partial_j (\phi^3 A_i) - \phi^3 F_{ij}] , \quad (2.11)$$

from which the quantities  $W$  and  $\partial_i \Omega_i$  in (1.1) and (1.2) can be read off

$$W = \varepsilon_{ij} \phi^3 F_{ij} \quad (2.12)$$

$$\Omega_i = -2\varepsilon_{ij} \phi^3 A_j \quad (2.13)$$

Of course, in all even  $D$  the  $(D/2)$ -th CP density can be added to both (1.1) and to (1.2). preserving the CP like properties of  $\varrho^{(2)}$ . For  $D = 2$ , this is the 1-st CP density, with  $\varepsilon_{ij} F_{ij}$  being subtracted from  $W$  in (2.12) and  $2\varepsilon_{ij} A_j$  added to  $\Omega_i$  in (2.13).

### 2.2 $D = 3$

Using basic tensor identities,  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  given by (1.4) minus (1.3), is unpacked to give

$$\frac{1}{3}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \partial_k \phi^4 A_j^{fg} \left( \partial_i \phi^a + \frac{1}{2} A_i \phi^a \right) . \quad (2.14)$$

Applying the Leibniz rule, (2.14) can be written as

$$\frac{1}{3}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \partial_k \phi^4 \left( \partial_i \Omega_{ik} - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg} \right) \quad (2.15)$$

where

$$\Omega_{ik} = \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} (A_j^{fg} \phi^a). \quad (2.16)$$

The result (2.15) is of the required form (1.9) as the first term  $\partial_k \phi^4 \partial_i \Omega_{ik}$  is total divergence by virtue of the antisymmetry of  $\Omega_{ik}$ , and, the second term is gauge invariant as it stands.

From the viewpoint of the application of Bogomol'nyi inequalities however, it is expedient to modify this result by extracting the partial derivative from  $\partial_k \phi^4$  in the gauge invariant term in (2.15). Using the Bianchi identity, this results in the identity

$$\varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg} = \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \left( \phi^4 \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg} - \phi^4 D_k \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg} \right) \quad (2.17)$$

yielding the result in the desired form

$$W = \frac{3}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \phi^4 D_k \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg} \quad (2.18)$$

$$\Omega_k = 3 \phi^4 \left( \partial_i \Omega_{ik} - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg} \right). \quad (2.19)$$

Exploiting identities like (2.17) resulting from the extraction of a partial derivative are a persistent feature in achieving the desired form of  $W$  and  $\Omega_i$ , in all dimensions  $D \geq 3$ .

### 2.3 $D = 4$

Using basic tensor identities,  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  given by (1.4) minus (1.3), is unpacked to give

$$\frac{1}{4}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{fgab} \partial_l \phi^5 A_k^{fg} \left( \partial_i \phi^a \partial_j \phi^b + \partial_i \phi^a A_j \phi^b + \frac{1}{3} A_i \phi^a A_j \phi^b \right). \quad (2.20)$$

After multiple applications of the Leibniz rule and tensor identities, this can be put in the form

$$\frac{1}{4}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \partial_l \phi^5 \partial_i \Omega_{il} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{fgab} \partial_l \phi^5 \left\{ F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\phi}|^2 \Xi_{ijk}^{fgab} \right\} \quad (2.21)$$

where we have used the notation  $|\vec{\phi}|^2 = |\phi^a|^2$ , and where

$$\Omega_{il} = \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{fgab} A_k^{fg} \phi^a \left( \partial_j \phi^b - \frac{1}{2} A_j \phi^b \right), \quad (2.22)$$

and

$$\Xi_{ijk}^{fgab} = A_k^{ab} \left[ \partial_i A_j^{fg} + \frac{2}{3} (A_i A_j)^{fg} \right]. \quad (2.23)$$

Note that the  $l = 4$  component of  $\varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}\Xi_{ijk}^{fgab}$ , namely

$$\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda 4}\varepsilon^{fgab}\Xi_{\mu\nu\lambda}^{fgab}, \quad \mu = 1, 2, 3,$$

is just the (Euler-)Chern-Simons density in three dimensions.

The expressions (2.21) and (2.22) are the analogues of (2.15) and (2.16) above in the  $D = 3$  case. Again, the first term in (2.21),  $\partial_l\phi^5\partial_i\Omega_{il}$ , is a total divergence by virtue of the antisymmetry of  $\Omega_{il}$ , and the second term is manifestly gauge invariant. But the third term involving  $\Xi_{ijk}^{fgab}$  is neither gauge-invariant nor is it total-divergence. Thus, (2.21) is not of the form (1.9) as it stands. This is a feature of  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  for all  $D \geq 4$ .

To render (2.21) to the form (1.9), namely consisting of a gauge invariant density  $W$  and a total divergence, the partial derivative  $\partial_l$  from the gauge-variant term in (2.21) must be extracted using the Bianchi identities. But as above in  $D = 3$ , it is expedient to extract this partial derivative also from the gauge-invariant term <sup>1</sup>.

For the gauge-invariant term this is implemented by

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}\partial_l\phi^5\{F_{ij}^{fg}\phi^a D_k\phi^b\} &= \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}\left\{\partial_l\left[\phi^5 F_{ij}^{fg}\phi^a D_k\phi^b\right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. -\phi^5\left[F_{ij}^{fg}D_k\phi^a D_l\phi^b + \frac{1}{8}|\vec{\phi}|^2 F_{ij}^{fg}F_{kl}^{ab}\right]\right\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

and for the gauge-variant term by

$$\varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}|\vec{\phi}|^2\partial_l\phi^5\Xi_{ijk}^{fgab} = \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}\left\{\partial_l\left(|\vec{\phi}|^2\phi^5\Xi_{ijk}^{fgab}\right) + \frac{1}{4}(\phi^5 - \frac{1}{3}(\phi^5)^3)F_{ij}^{ab}F_{kl}^{cd}\right\}. \quad (2.25)$$

Applying the identities (2.24) and (2.25), (2.21) is cast in the required form (1.9) with

$$W = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}\phi^5\left[F_{ij}^{fg}D_k\phi^a D_l\phi^b + \frac{1}{12}(\phi^5)^2 F_{ij}^{fg}F_{kl}^{ab}\right] \quad (2.26)$$

$$\Omega_l = \phi^5\left(\partial_i\Omega_{il} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}\left[F_{ij}^{fg}\phi^a D_k\phi^b + \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{3}(\phi^5)^2\right)\Xi_{ijk}^{fgab}\right]\right), \quad (2.27)$$

which are the  $D = 4$  analogues of  $W$  and  $\Omega_i$ , (2.18) and (2.19) in  $D = 3$ , it being understood that the indices  $(i, a)$  run over  $(1, 2, 3)$  in (2.18)-(2.19) while here they run over  $(1, 2, 3, 4)$  in (2.26)-(2.27).

## 2.4 D=5

Using basic tensor identities,  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  given by (1.4) minus (1.3), is unpacked to give

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{5}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) &= \varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}\partial_m\phi^6 A_l^{fg}\left(2\partial_i\phi^a\partial_j\phi^b\partial_k\phi^c + 3\partial_i\phi^a\partial_j\phi^b A_k\phi^c \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2\partial_i\phi^a A_j\phi^b A_k\phi^c + \frac{1}{2}A_i\phi^a A_j\phi^b A_k\phi^c\right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>This is convenient from the viewpoint of applying Bogomol'nyi type inequalities.

After multiple applications of the Leibniz rule and tensor identities, (2.28) can be put in the form analogous to its  $D = 4$  counterpart (2.21)

$$\frac{1}{5}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \partial_m \phi^6 \partial_i \Omega_{im} - \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \partial_m \phi^6 \left\{ F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b D_l \phi^c + |\vec{\phi}|^2 \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} \right\} \quad (2.29)$$

where

$$\Omega_{im} = 2\varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} A_l^{fg} \phi^a (\partial_j \phi^b \partial_k \phi^c + \partial_j \phi^b A_k \phi^c + \frac{2}{3} A_j \phi^b A_k \phi^c) \quad (2.30)$$

and

$$\Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} = A_k^{ab} \left[ \left( \partial_l \phi^c + \frac{2}{3} A_l \phi^c \right) \partial_i A_j^{fg} + \frac{2}{3} \left( \partial_l \phi^c + \frac{3}{4} A_l \phi^c \right) (A_i A_j)^{fg} \right], \quad (2.31)$$

$\Omega_{im}$  in (2.30) being the  $D = 5$  analogue of (2.22), and  $\Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc}$  in (2.31) the  $D = 5$  analogue of  $\Xi_{ijk}^{fgab}$  in (2.23), in  $D = 4$ .

Again, the first term  $\partial_m \phi^6 \partial_i \Omega_{im}$  in (2.29) is a total divergence and the second term is manifestly gauge invariant, while the third term involving  $\Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc}$  is neither gauge invariant nor total divergence. Thus, to cast (2.29) in the required form consisting of a gauge invariant part  $W$  and a total derivative, the partial derivative  $\partial_m$  must be extracted from this term by using the Bianchi identities. As in  $D = 3$  and  $4$ , it is expedient to extract  $\partial_m$  also from the gauge invariant term in (2.29).

Extracting the partial derivative  $\partial_m$  from the gauge invariant term in (2.29) results in the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \partial_m \phi^6 F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b D_l \phi^c &= \\ &= \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \left\{ \partial_m \left[ \phi^6 F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b D_l \phi^c + \frac{1}{12} (\phi^6)^3 F_{ij}^{fg} F_{kl}^{ab} \phi^c \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \phi^6 \left[ F_{ij}^{fg} D_k \phi^a D_l \phi^b D_m \phi^c - \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 - \frac{4}{3} (\phi^6)^2 \right) F_{ij}^{fg} F_{kl}^{ab} D_m \phi^c \right] \right\}. \quad (2.32) \end{aligned}$$

This expression is the  $D = 5$  analogue of (2.24) in  $D = 4$ , which likewise splits up in a gauge invariant and a total divergence part.

Extracting the partial derivative  $\partial_m$  from the gauge variant term in (2.29), one has

$$\varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \partial_m \phi^6 |\vec{\phi}|^2 \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} = \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \left\{ \partial_m \left[ \left( \phi^6 - \frac{1}{3} (\phi^6)^3 \right) \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} \right] - \left( \phi^6 - \frac{1}{3} (\phi^6)^3 \right) \partial_m \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} \right\}, \quad (2.33)$$

which is the  $D = 5$  analogue of (2.25) in  $D = 4$ .

The question now is, does the divergence in the second term in (2.33) result in a gauge invariant quantity as was the case in (2.25), in the  $D = 4$ ?

The answer is found by calculating the divergence

$$\varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \partial_m \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} = \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \left[ F_{ij}^{fg} F_{kl}^{ab} D_m \phi^c - 4 (A_i A_j)^{fg} (A_k A_l)^{ab} A_m \phi^c \right], \quad (2.34)$$

which consists of a gauge invariant term, and the gauge variant term

$$\varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}(A_iA_j)^{fg}(A_kA_l)^{ab}A_m\phi^c. \quad (2.35)$$

The conclusion is that unlike in  $D \leq 4$ , in  $D = 5$  it is not possible to express  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  in terms of a gauge invariant quantity  $W$  and a total divergence  $\partial_i\Omega_i$  as in (1.9) for  $SO(5)$  gauging. One expects that this conclusion holds also in dimensions  $D \geq 5$  for  $SO(D)$  gauging.

However, this limitation is not an obstacle for exploiting the prescription (1.3)-(1.4) to construct solitons in  $D$  dimensions, or SCS anomalies in  $D - 1$  dimensions, as long as the gauge connection is not the full  $SO(D)$  connection but rather a contraction thereof. In that case the gauge variant term (2.35) vanishes, rendering (2.34) gauge invariant, whence (2.33) becomes

$$\varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}\partial_m\phi^6|\vec{\phi}|^2\Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} = \varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}\left\{\partial_m\left[\phi^6\left(1-\frac{1}{3}(\phi^6)^2\right)\Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc}\right] - \frac{1}{4}\phi^6\left(1-\frac{1}{3}(\phi^6)^2\right)F_{ij}^{fg}|_{kl}^{ab}D_m\phi^c\right\}, \quad (2.36)$$

Applying (2.33) and (2.36) to (2.29),  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  can be expressed in terms of  $W$  and  $\partial_i\Omega_i$  as prescribed by (1.9) with

$$W = \varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}\phi^6\left[F_{ij}^{fg}D_k\phi^aD_l\phi^bD_m\phi^c + \frac{5}{12}(\phi^6)^2F_{ij}^{fg}F_{kl}^{ab}D_m\phi^c\right] \quad (2.37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_m = \phi^6\partial_i\Omega_{im} - \varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}\phi^6\left[F_{ij}^{fg}\phi^aD_k\phi^bD_l\phi^c + \frac{1}{12}(\phi^6)^2F_{ij}^{fg}F_{kl}^{ab}\phi^c \right. \\ \left. + \left(1-\frac{1}{3}(\phi^6)^2\right)\Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc}\right] \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

which are the  $D = 5$  analogues of the  $D = 4$  expressions (2.26) and (2.27) for  $W$  and  $\Omega_i$ , with however a subtle difference. While in (2.26)-(2.38) the index  $i$  and index  $a$  run over  $(1, 2, 3, 4)$ , here in (2.37)-(2.38) the index  $i$  runs over  $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ , but the index  $a$  runs over whatever values are dictated by the given contraction of  $SO(5)$  chosen, except  $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ .

### 3 Summary and outlook

The new result in this study is the implementation of the prescription (1.1)-(1.2) for the SCP in  $D = 5$ . To give as systematic as possible presentation, this has been presented in a unified manner together with all so far known implementations, in  $D = 2, 3$  and  $4$ .

While in  $D = 2, 3$  and  $4$  the prescription is achieved for gauge group  $SO(D)$ , it is found that in  $D = 5$  there is a limitation, to some subgroup of  $SO(D)$ . It can be surmised that such a limitation will apply to all higher  $D > 5$ .

How important is this limitation depends on, to what applications is the SCP density to be applied. If the application be to the construction of a  $SO(D)$  gauged Skyrminion in  $D$  dimensions, this limitation is indeed an obstacle. But such solitons can be constructed for an subgroup of  $SO(D)$ . But this is perhaps not the most important application of SCP.



By far the most important application SCP comes from the prescription (1.2). Since (1.2) is *essentially* total divergence (and *explicitly* total divergence in constraint-compliantparametrisation) it can be formally expressed as

$$\varrho^{(D)} = \partial_i(\omega_i^{(D)} + \Omega_i) , \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, D . \quad (3.39)$$

Since (3.39) is also gauge invariant, a Chern-Simons like density can be defined in *one dimension lower*, in  $d = D - 1$  “spacetime”,

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \omega_{i=D}^{(D)} + \Omega_{i=D} \quad (3.40)$$

in which  $\omega_{i=D}^{(D)}$  here is the Wess-Zumino term. The density  $\Omega_{\text{SCS}}$  in (3.40) referred to as the Skyrme–Chern-Simons (SCS) density [11, 12] defined in  $D_1$  “spacetime” dimensions. That the equations of motion of (3.40) are gauge invariant can be demonstrated exactly as in the case of the Chern-Simons density, since (1.2) (or (3.39)) is gauge-invariant and total-derivative like the Chern-Pontryagin (CP) density.

Apart from its intrinsic value, the example  $D = 5$  is of particular interest in that it can yield SCS densities in  $D - 1 = 4$  spacetime in the same spirit as the anomalies introduced in Ref. [14], with application to baryon number decay [15].

## Acknowledgements

The question whether the prescription (1.1)-(1.2) for the SCP density can be realised beyond  $D = 4$  was emphasised by V. A. Rubakov (R.I.P.). The present study is aimed to resolving this question. I am very grateful to my colleague Eugen Radu for having read the manuscript carefully, and to him and to Francisco Navarro-Lerida for valuable discussions on these topics.

# References

- [1] A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, A. S. Schwartz and Y. S. Tyupkin, Phys. Lett. B **59** (1975), 85-87 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(75)90163-X
- [2] G. 't Hooft, ‘Magnetic Monopoles in Unified Gauge Theories,’ Nucl. Phys. B **79** (1974), 276-284 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(74)90486-6  
A. M. Polyakov, ‘Particle Spectrum in Quantum Field Theory,’ JETP Lett. **20** (1974), 194-195 PRINT-74-1566 (LANDAU-INST).
- [3] H. B. Nielsen and P. Olesen (1973) ‘Vortex-line models for dual strings,’ Nuclear Physics **B** (1973), 45–61 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(73)90350-7
- [4] D. H. Tchrakian, Phys. Lett. B **150** (1985), 360-362 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(85)90994-3
- [5] T. Tchrakian, J. Phys. A **44** (2011), 343001 doi:10.1088/1751-8113/44/34/343001 [arXiv:1009.3790 [hep-th]].
- [6] K. Arthur, D. H. Tchrakian and Y. s. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996), 5245-5258 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.54.5245  
F. Navarro-Lerida, E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, ‘Effect of Chern-Simons dynamics on the energy of electrically charged and spinning vortices,’ Phys. Rev. D **95** (2017) no.8, 085016 [arXiv:1612.05835 [hep-th]].  
F. Navarro-Lérida and D. H. Tchrakian, ‘Vortices of  $SO(2)$  gauged Skyrmons in 2 + 1 dimensions,’ Phys. Rev. D **99** (2019) no.4, 045007 [arXiv:1812.03147 [hep-th]].
- [7] K. Arthur and D. H. Tchrakian, Phys. Lett. B **378** (1996), 187-193 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(96)00343-7 [arXiv:hep-th/9601053 [hep-th]].  
B. M. A. G. Piette and D. H. Tchrakian, ‘Static solutions in the U(1) gauged Skyrme model,’ Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000), 025020 [arXiv:hep-th/9709189 [hep-th]].  
E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, ‘Spinning U(1) gauged skyrmions,’ Phys. Lett. B **632** (2006), 109-113 [arXiv:hep-th/0509014 [hep-th]].  
Y. Brihaye, B. Kleihaus and D. H. Tchrakian, ‘Dyon - Skyrmon lumps,’ J. Math. Phys. **40** (1999), 1136-1152 doi:10.1063/1.532793 [arXiv:hep-th/9805059 [hep-th]].  
Y. Brihaye, V. A. Rubakov, D. H. Chrakian and F. Zimmerschied, ‘A simplified model for monopole catalysis of nucleon decay,’ Theor. Math. Phys. **128** (2001), 1140-1154 [arXiv:hep-ph/0103228 [hep-ph]].  
Y. Brihaye, D. Y. Grigoriev, V. A. Rubakov and D. H. Tchrakian, ‘An extended model for monopole catalysis of nucleon decay,’ Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003), 034004 [arXiv:hep-th/0211215 [hep-th]].
- [8] Y. Brihaye, V. Paturyan, D. H. Tchrakian and B. M. A. G. Piette, J. Math. Phys. **42** (2001), 4669-4683 doi:10.1063/1.1396636 [arXiv:hep-th/0010111 [hep-th]].  
F. Navarro-Lerida, E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, ‘ $SO(2)$  gauged Skyrmons in 4 + 1 dimensions,’ Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.12, 125014 [arXiv:2003.05899 [hep-th]].  
F. Navarro-Lerida, E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, ‘On the effects of the Chern-Simons term in an Abelian gauged Skyrme model in  $d = 4 + 1$  dimensions,’ Phys. Lett. B **814** (2021), 136083 [arXiv:2010.04093 [hep-th]].
- [9] F. Navarro-Lérida, E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, Phys. Lett. B **791** (2019), 287-292 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.02.011 [arXiv:1811.09535 [hep-th]].

- [10] F. Navarro-Lerida, E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, Phys. Lett. B **814** (2021), 136083 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2021.136083 [arXiv:2010.04093 [hep-th]].
- [11] D. H. Tchrakian, “Higgs-and Skyrme–Chern–Simons densities in all dimensions,” J. Phys. A **48** (2015) no.37, 375401 [arXiv:1505.05344 [hep-th]].
- [12] D. H. Tchrakian, “Some aspects of Skyrme–Chern–Simons densities,” J. Phys. A **55** (2022) no.24, 245401 [arXiv:2111.13097 [hep-th]].
- [13] D. H. Tchrakian, “Topologically stable lumps in  $SO(d)$  gauged  $O(d+1)$  sigma models in  $d$  dimensions:  $d = 2,3,4$ ,” Lett. Math. Phys. **40** (1997), 191-201
- [14] E. Witten, “Global Aspects of Current Algebra,” Nucl. Phys. B **223** (1983), 422-432
- [15] C. G. Callan, Jr. and E. Witten, “Monopole Catalysis of Skyrminion Decay,” Nucl. Phys. B **239** (1984), 161-176

## A Details of the calculation

The  $O(D+1)$  Skyrme scalar is  $\phi^A$ ,  $A = 1, 2, \dots, D+1$  is subject to

$$|\phi^A|^2 = |\phi^a|^2 + (\phi^{D+1})^2 = 1, \quad a = 1, 2, \dots, D. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The  $SO(D)$  gauging prescription is

$$D_i \phi^a = \partial_i \phi^a + A_i \phi^a, \quad A_i \phi^a = (A_i \phi)^b = A_i^{ab} \phi^b \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$D_i \phi^6 = \partial_i \phi^{D+1}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$A_i^{ab} = -A_i^{ba}$   $i = 1, 2, \dots, D$ ;  $a = 1, 2, \dots, D$  is the  $SO(D)$  gauge connection, whose curvature is

$$\begin{aligned} F_{ij}^{ab} &= \partial_{[i} A_{j]}^{ab} + (A_{[i} A_{j]})^{ab} \\ &\equiv \partial_i A_j^{ab} + A_i^{ac} A_j^{cb} - (i, j). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

For  $D = 5$  the winding number density is

$$\varrho_0 = \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{abcdef} \partial_i \phi^a \partial_j \phi^b \partial_k \phi^c \partial_l \phi^d \partial_m \phi^e \phi^d \quad (\text{A.5})$$

which is *total divergence* and *not gauge invariant*, and replacing the partial derivatives  $\partial_i \phi^a$  in (A.5) with the covariant derivatives  $D_i \phi^a$

$$\varrho_G = \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{abcdef} D_i \phi^a D_j \phi^b D_k \phi^c D_l \phi^d D_m \phi^e \phi^d \quad (\text{A.6})$$

which is gauge invariant but *not total divergence* but is *gauge invariant*<sup>2</sup>

The task is to calculate

$$\varrho_G - \varrho_0 = \partial_i \Omega_i[A, \phi] - W[F, D\phi] \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where  $W[F, D\phi]$  is gauge invariant by construction and  $\Omega_i[A, \phi]$  is gauge variant. (In increasing dimensions, there is some arbitrariness in the splitting into these two terms.)

The relation (A.7) is evaluated explicitly with gauge group  $SO(5)$ , that defines the covariant derivative in (A.2). The calculations are carried out directly, using the Leibnitz rule and the tensor identities.

Collecting the gauge invariant pieces  $\varrho_G$  and  $W$  in (A.7), and separately, the individually gauge variant pieces  $\varrho_0$  and  $\partial_i \Omega_i$ , one has two equivalent definitions of a density

$$\varrho = \varrho_G + W[F, D\phi] \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$= \varrho_0 + \partial_i \Omega_i[A, \phi], \quad (\text{A.9})$$

which is adopted as the definition for the density  $\varrho \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \Omega_{\text{SCP}}^{(d+1)}$  presenting a lower bound on the “energy” in the same way as does the usual CP density.

---

<sup>2</sup>For all other  $D = 4, 3, 2$ , the simpler versions of (A.5) and (A.6) are obvious.

## First step

Using the tensor dentity

$$V^b \varepsilon^{a_1 a_2 a_3 \dots a_D} = V^{a_1} \varepsilon^{b a_2 a_3 \dots a_D} + V^{a_2} \varepsilon^{a_1 b a_3 \dots a_D} + V^{a_3} \varepsilon^{a_1 a_2 b \dots a_D} + V^{a_D} \varepsilon^{b a_2 a_3 \dots a_{D-1}} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

in  $D$  dimensions, it can be seen that the quantities  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  in dimensions  $D = 2, 3, 4, 5$  reduce to

$$\frac{1}{2}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ij} \varepsilon^{fg} \partial_j \phi^3 A_i^{fg} \equiv \varepsilon_{ij} \partial_j \phi^3 A_i \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$\frac{1}{3}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \partial_k \phi^4 A_j^{fg} \left( \partial_i \phi^a + \frac{1}{2} A_i \phi^a \right) \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$\frac{1}{4}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{fgab} \partial_l \phi^5 A_k^{fg} \left( \partial_i \phi^a \partial_j \phi^b + \partial_i \phi^a A_j \phi^b + \frac{1}{3} A_i \phi^a A_j \phi^b \right) \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{5}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \partial_m \phi^6 A_l^{fg} & \left( 2\partial_i \phi^a \partial_j \phi^b \partial_k \phi^c + 3\partial_i \phi^a \partial_j \phi^b A_k \phi^c \right. \\ & \left. + 2\partial_i \phi^a A_j \phi^b A_k \phi^c + \frac{1}{2} A_i \phi^a A_j \phi^b A_k \phi^c \right) \quad (\text{A.14}) \end{aligned}$$

The second step is to treat each case  $D = 2, 3, 4, 5$  separately in a unified manner.

## Second step

It is convenient to express (A.12)-(A.14) formally as

$$-\frac{1}{D}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \partial_n \phi^{D+1} (\omega_n^{(1)} + \omega_n^{(2)}) \quad (\text{A.15})$$

in which  $\omega_n^{(1)}$  is encoded with terms like  $A_i \phi^a$  *exclusively*, and  $\omega_n^{(2)}$  by a *mixture* of terms like  $A_i \phi^a$  and  $\partial_i \phi^a$ .

### A.1 $D = 2$

That (A.11) splits up in a total divergence term and a gauge invariant term is seen immediately. Applying the Leibnitz rule once, (A.11) can be immediately be expressed as

$$\frac{1}{2}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \varepsilon_{ij} \left[ \partial_j (\phi^3 A_i) - \frac{1}{2} \phi^3 F_{ij} \right], \quad (\text{A.16})$$

consisting of a total divergence and a gauge invariant term.

## A.2 $D = 3$

In this case

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_k^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} A_j^{fg} A_i \phi^a \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} (A_{[i} A_{j]})^{fg} \phi^a\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.17})$$

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_k^{(2)} &= \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} A_j^{fg} \partial_i \phi^a \\ &= \partial_i \Omega_{ik} - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \phi^a \partial_{[i} A_{j]}^{fg}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.18})$$

where, (A.17) has resulted from using the identity (A.10) for  $D = 3$  and  $\Omega_{ik}$  in (A.18) is defined as

$$\Omega_{ik} = \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} (A_j^{fg} \phi^a). \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Thus adding  $\omega_k^{(1)}$  and  $\omega_k^{(2)}$  as in (A.15), which are now given by (A.17) and (A.18), results in

$$\frac{1}{3}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \partial_k \phi^4 \left[ \partial_i \Omega_{ik} - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg} \right] \quad (\text{A.20})$$

which consists of a part that is gauge invariant, and a total divergence term which is gauge variant, as seen in

$$\frac{1}{3}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \partial_k [\phi^4 \partial_i \Omega_{ik}] - \frac{1}{2} \partial_k \phi^4 \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

or alternatively,

$$\frac{1}{3}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \partial_k \left[ \phi^4 \partial_i \Omega_{ik} - \frac{1}{2} \phi^4 \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \phi^4 D_k \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg} \quad (\text{A.22})$$

$$\equiv \partial_k \Omega_k + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk} \varepsilon^{fga} \phi^4 D_k \phi^a F_{ij}^{fg}, \quad (\text{A.23})$$

in the second line of which the vector valued density  $\Omega_k$  is precisely the  $D = 3$  case of  $\Omega_i$  appearing in (1.2).

## A.3 $D = 4$

According to the notation in (A.15),  $\omega_l^{(1)}$  and  $\omega_l^{(2)}$  can be read from (A.13) as,

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_l^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{3} \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{fgab} A_k^{fg} A_i \phi^a A_j \phi^b \\ &= \frac{1}{3} \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{fgab} (A_i A_j)^{fg} \left( 3\phi^a A_k \phi^b + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\phi}|^2 A_k^{ab} \right), \quad |\vec{\phi}|^2 = |\phi^a|^2\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.24})$$

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_l^{(2)} &= \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{fgab} A_k^{fg} \partial_i \phi^a D_j \phi^b \\ &= \partial_i \Omega_{il}^{(1)} + \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{fgab} \partial_i A_j^{fg} \phi^a D_j \phi^b - \omega_l^{(a)} - \omega_l^{(b)}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.25})$$

where

$$\Omega_{il}^{(1)} = \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} A_k^{fg} \phi^a D_j \phi^b. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

The quantities  $\omega_l^{(a)}$  and  $\omega_l^{(b)}$  in (A.25) are calculated to give

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_l^{(a)} &= \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} A_k^{fg} \phi^a \partial_i A_j \phi^b \\ &= -\varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} \partial_i A_j^{fg} \left( \phi^a A_k \phi^b + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\phi}|^2 A_k^{ab} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_l^{(b)} &= \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} A_k^{fg} \phi^a A_j \partial_i \phi^b \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \Omega_{il}^{(2)} + \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} \left[ \partial_i A_j^{fg} \left( \phi^a A_k \phi^b + \frac{1}{4} |\vec{\phi}|^2 A_k^{ab} \right) - (A_i A_j)^{fg} \phi^a \partial_k \phi^b \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

the density  $\Omega_{il}^{(2)}$  being

$$\Omega_{il}^{(2)} = \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} A_k^{fg} \phi^a A_j \phi^b. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

The analogue of the density  $\Omega_{ik}$  (A.19) for  $D = 3$ , can be denoted as

$$\Omega_{il} = (\Omega_{il}^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2} \Omega_{il}^{(2)}) = \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} A_k^{fg} \phi^a \left( \partial_j \phi^b - \frac{1}{2} A_j \phi^b \right). \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Substituting (A.27) and (A.28) in (A.25),  $\omega_l^{(2)}$  is

$$\omega_l^{(2)} = \partial_i \Omega_{il} + \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} \left\{ \partial_i A_j^{fg} D_k \phi^b + (A_i A_j)^{fg} \phi^a \partial_k \phi^b + \frac{1}{4} |\vec{\phi}|^2 \partial_i A_j^{fg} A_k^{ab} \right\}. \quad (\text{A.31})$$

Adding (A.24) and (A.31) yields  $(\omega_l^{(1)} + \omega_l^{(2)})$ , and contracting this with  $\partial_l \phi^5$ , we have  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  as per (A.15)

$$\frac{1}{4} (\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \partial_l \phi^5 \partial_i \Omega_{il} + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} \partial_l \phi^5 \left\{ F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\phi}|^2 A_k^{ab} \left[ \partial_i A_j^{fg} + \frac{2}{3} (A_i A_j)^{fg} \right] \right\} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

where in the 4-th component of the second term inside the chain brackets can be identified with the Chern-Simons density in three dimensions.

The expression (A.32) for  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  is at the same stage as that of its  $D = 3$  counterpart (A.20), but unlike the former, it is not yet a sum of a total-divergence and gauge invariant term.

To render it to that form one extracts the partial derivative  $\partial_l$  in (A.32). The gauge-invariant term yields

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} \partial_l \phi^5 \{ F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b \} &= \varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab} \left\{ \partial_l \left[ \phi^5 F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \phi^5 \left[ F_{ij}^{fg} D_k \phi^a D_l \phi^b + \frac{1}{8} |\vec{\phi}|^2 F_{ij}^{fg} F_{kl}^{ab} \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.33})$$

and the gauge-variant term yields

$$\varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}|\vec{\phi}|^2\partial_l\phi^5\left\{A_k^{ab}\left[\partial_iA_j^{fg}+\frac{2}{3}(A_iA_j)^{fg}\right]\right\}=\varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}\left\{\partial_l\left[|\vec{\phi}|^2\phi^5A_k^{ab}\left(\partial_iA_j^{fg}+\frac{2}{3}(A_iA_j)^{fg}\right)\right]+\frac{1}{4}(\phi^5-\frac{1}{3}(\phi^5)^3)F_{ij}^{ab}F_{kl}^{cd}\right\}\quad(\text{A.34})$$

one turns up with the final result in the required form

$$\frac{1}{4}(\varrho_G-\varrho_0)=\partial_l\Omega_l+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}\phi^5\left\{F_{ij}^{fg}D_k\phi^aD_l\phi^b+\frac{1}{12}(\phi^5)^2F_{ij}^{fg}F_{kl}^{ab}\right\}\quad(\text{A.35})$$

where the vector valued density  $\Omega_l$  is given by

$$\Omega_l=\phi^5\partial_i\Omega_{il}+\varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}\left\{\frac{1}{2}\phi^5F_{ij}^{fg}\phi^aD_k\phi^b+\frac{1}{4}\left(\phi^5-\frac{1}{3}(\phi^5)^3\right)A_k^{fg}\left[\partial_iA_j^{ab}+\frac{2}{3}(A_iA_j)^{ab}\right]\right\}\quad(\text{A.36})$$

which is precisely the  $D=4$  case of  $\Omega_i$  appearing in (1.2).

## A.4 D=5

According to the notation in (A.15),  $\omega_l^{(1)}$  and  $\omega_l^{(2)}$  can be read from (A.14) as,

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_m^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}A_l^{fg}A_i\phi^aA_j\phi^bA_k\phi^c \\ &= -2\varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}(A_iA_j)^{fg}A_l\phi^c\left(\phi^aA_k\phi^b+\frac{1}{4}|\vec{\phi}|^2A_k^{ab}\right)\end{aligned}\quad(\text{A.37})$$

and

$$\omega_m^{(2)}=\partial_i\Omega_{im}^{(1)}-\varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}\partial_iA_j^{fg}\phi^a(2D_k\phi^bD_l\phi^c-\partial_l\phi^cA_k\phi^b)-\omega_m^{(a)}-3\omega_m^{(b)}-4\omega_m^{(c)}\quad(\text{A.38})$$

where

$$\Omega_{im}^{(1)}=\varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}A_l^{fg}\phi^a(2D_j\phi^bD_k\phi^c-\partial_j\phi^bA_k\phi^c)\quad(\text{A.39})$$

and

$$\omega_m^{(a)}=\varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}A_k^{fg}\phi^a(3\partial_l\phi^b+4A_l\phi^b)\partial_iA_j\phi^c\quad(\text{A.40})$$

$$\omega_m^{(b)}=\varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}A_k^{fg}\phi^a\partial_l\phi^bA_j\partial_i\phi^c\quad(\text{A.41})$$

$$\omega_m^{(c)}=\varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}A_k^{fg}\phi^aA_l\phi^bA_j\partial_i\phi^c\quad(\text{A.42})$$

Here,  $\omega_m^{(a)}$ ,  $\omega_m^{(b)}$  and  $\omega_m^{(c)}$  must be calculated individually, as was done above for in the  $D=4$  case above for  $\omega_l^{(a)}$  and  $\omega_l^{(b)}$  in (A.27) and (A.28) respectively.

The results of these calculations are listed here:

$$\omega_m^{(a)}=\varepsilon_{ijklm}\varepsilon^{fgabc}\partial_iA_j^{fg}\left(\phi^aA_k\phi^b+\frac{1}{2}|\vec{\phi}|^2A_k^{ab}\right)(3\partial_l\phi^c+4A_l\phi^c)\quad(\text{A.43})$$



$$\omega_m^{(b)} = \frac{1}{3} \partial_i \Omega_{im}^{(2)} + \frac{2}{3} \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \left\{ -\partial_i A_j^{fg} \partial_l \phi^c \left( \phi^a A_k \phi^b + \frac{1}{4} |\vec{\phi}|^2 A_k^{ab} \right) + (A_i A_j)^{fg} \phi^a \partial_k \phi^b \partial_l \phi^c \right\} \quad (\text{A.44})$$

where

$$\Omega_{im}^{(2)} = \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} A_l^{fg} \phi^a \partial_j \phi^b A_k \phi^c \quad (\text{A.45})$$

and

$$\omega_m^{(c)} = \frac{1}{3} \partial_i \Omega_{im}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{3} \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \left\{ -\partial_i A_j^{fg} A_l \phi^c \left( 3\phi^a A_k \phi^b + |\vec{\phi}|^2 A_k^{ab} \right) + (A_i A_j)^{fg} \partial_l \phi^c \left( 3\phi^a A_k \phi^b + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\phi}|^2 A_k^{ab} \right) \right\} \quad (\text{A.46})$$

where

$$\Omega_{im}^{(3)} = \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} A_l^{fg} \phi^a A_j \phi^b A_k \phi^c \quad (\text{A.47})$$

Substituting (A.43), (A.44) and (A.46) into (A.38)

$$\omega_m^{(2)} = \partial_i \Omega_{im} - 2\varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \left\{ \partial_i A_j^{fg} \left[ \phi^a D_k \phi^b D_l \phi^c + \frac{1}{2} |\vec{\phi}|^2 A_k^{ab} \left( \partial_l \phi^c + \frac{2}{3} A_l \phi^c \right) \right] + (A_i A_j)^{fg} \left[ \phi^a \partial_k \phi^b (\partial_l \phi^c + 2 A_l \phi^c) + \frac{1}{3} |\vec{\phi}|^2 A_k^{ab} \partial_l \phi^c \right] \right\} \quad (\text{A.48})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{im} &= \Omega_{im}^{(1)} - \Omega_{im}^{(2)} - \frac{4}{3} \Omega_{im}^{(3)} \\ &= 2\varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} A_l^{fg} \phi^a (\partial_j \phi^b \partial_k \phi^c + \partial_j \phi^b A_k \phi^c + \frac{1}{3} A_j \phi^b A_k \phi^c) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.49})$$

in which  $\Omega_{im}^{(1)}$ ,  $\Omega_{im}^{(2)}$  and  $\Omega_{im}^{(3)}$  are given in (A.39), (A.45) and (A.47) respectively, and  $\Omega_{im}$  is the  $D = 5$  analogue of  $\Omega_{il}$  given by (A.30) in  $D = 4$ .

Adding  $\omega_m^{(1)}$  given in (A.37), to  $\omega_m^{(2)}$  given in (A.48),

$$\omega_m^{(1)} + \omega_m^{(2)} = \partial_i \Omega_{im} - \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \left\{ F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b D_l \phi^c + |\vec{\phi}|^2 \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} \right\} \quad (\text{A.50})$$

where

$$\Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} = A_k^{ab} \left[ (\partial_l \phi^c + \frac{2}{3} A_l \phi^c) \partial_i A_j^{fg} + \frac{2}{3} (\partial_l \phi^c + \frac{3}{4} A_l \phi^c) (A_i A_j)^{fg} \right], \quad (\text{A.51})$$

so that the term

$$\varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc}$$

in (A.50) is the analogue of the term

$$\varepsilon_{ijkl}\varepsilon^{fgab}|\vec{\phi}|^2 A_k^{ab} \left[ \partial_i A_j^{fg} + \frac{2}{3}(A_i A_j)^{fg} \right]$$

appearing in the corresponding expression (A.32) in  $D = 4$ , whose component  $l = 4$  is the Chern-Simons (CS) density in 3 dimensions. As such, the  $m = 5$  component of the density (A.51) is the 4 dimensional analogue of the Chern-Simons density in 3 dimensions.

As *per* (A.15), (A.50) implies

$$\frac{1}{5}(\varrho_G - \varrho_0) = \partial_m \phi^6 \partial_i \Omega_{im} - \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \partial_m \phi^6 \left\{ F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b D_l \phi^c + |\vec{\phi}|^2 \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} \right\} \quad (\text{A.52})$$

This expression is the  $D = 5$  analogue of (A.32) in  $D = 4$ . The first term,  $\partial_m(\phi^6 \partial_i \Omega_{im})$ , is a total divergence. Inside the chain bracket the first term is gauge invariant, but the second term in front of  $|\vec{\phi}|^2$  is neither gauge invariant nor total divergence, which is unsatisfactory from the viewpoint of casting this expression in the form (A.7), in terms of a gauge invariant quantity  $W$  and a total divergence  $\partial_i \Omega_i$ . This can be effected by pulling out<sup>3</sup> the partial derivative  $\partial_m$  as was done in the  $D = 4$  case.

But this case being more complex than the  $D = 4$ , it is helpful to treat the gauge invariant term and the gauge variant term (in front of  $|\vec{\phi}|^2$ ) separately.

Pulling out  $\partial_m$  from the gauge invariant term in (A.52) results in the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \partial_m \phi^6 F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b D_l \phi^c &= \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \cdot \\ &\cdot \left\{ \partial_m \left[ \phi^6 F_{ij}^{fg} \phi^a D_k \phi^b D_l \phi^c + \frac{1}{12}(\phi^6)^3 F_{ij}^{fg} F_{kl}^{ab} \phi^c \right] \right. \\ &\left. - \phi^6 \left[ F_{ij}^{fg} D_k \phi^a D_l \phi^b D_m \phi^c + \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 - \frac{2}{3}(\phi^6)^2 \right) F_{ij}^{fg} F_{kl}^{ab} D_m \phi^c \right] \right\}. \quad (\text{A.53}) \end{aligned}$$

This expression is the  $D = 5$  analogue of (A.33) in  $D = 4$ .

Doing the same with the gauge variant term results in

$$\varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \partial_m \phi^6 |\vec{\phi}|^2 \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} = \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \left\{ \partial_m \left[ \left( \phi^6 - \frac{1}{3}(\phi^6)^3 \right) \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} \right] - \left( \phi^6 - \frac{1}{3}(\phi^6)^3 \right) \partial_m \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} \right\}, \quad (\text{A.54})$$

in which the divergence term is calculated to be

$$\varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \partial_m \Xi_{ijkl}^{fgabc} = \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} \left[ F_{ij}^{fg} F_{kl}^{ab} D_m \phi^c - 4 (A_i A_j)^{fg} (A_k A_l)^{ab} A_m \phi^c \right], \quad (\text{A.55})$$

which is the counterpart of the divergence

$$-\varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{fgab} A_k^{ab} \left[ \partial_i A_j^{fg} + \frac{2}{3}(A_i A_j)^{fg} \right] = \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{fgab} F_{ij}^{fg} F_{kl}^{ab}, \quad (\text{A.56})$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Strictly speaking this does not have to involve the first term inside the chain bracket of (A.52) since that term is gauge invariant as it stands. But we opt to do that since that results in a more useful expression for later application of Bogomol'nyi type inequalities.

in  $D = 4$ , which is gauge invariant.

The quantity

$$\Xi = \varepsilon_{ijklm} \varepsilon^{fgabc} (A_i A_j)^{fg} (A_k A_l)^{ab} A_m \phi^c \quad (\text{A.57})$$

in (A.55) is manifestly **gauge variant**. This means that in  $D = 5$ , it is not possible to cast  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  in terms of  $W$  and  $\partial_i \Omega_i$  as in (A.7), for the  $SO(D)$  gauged  $O(D+1)$  Skyrme scalar. *It may be reasonable to expect that this will be the case in all dimensions  $D \geq 5$ , at least for  $D$  odd.*

Fortunately, it is possible to cast  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  in terms of  $W$  and  $\partial_i \Omega_i$  as in (A.7), if the  $SO(5)$  gauge connection is suitably <sup>4</sup> contracted. Two such contractions are

$$SO(2) \times SO(2) \quad \text{and} \quad SO(2) \times SO(3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_i^{ab} &= (A_i^{\alpha\beta} \in so_a(2), A_i^{AB} \in so_b(2), A_i^{\alpha A}, A_i^{\alpha 5}, A_i^{A5}) \quad \alpha = 1, 2 \text{ and } A = 3, 4 \\ &\equiv (A_i^{\alpha\beta} = a_i \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}, A_i^{AB} = b_i \varepsilon^{AB}, A_i^{\alpha A} = 0, A_i^{\alpha 5} = 0, A_i^{A5} = 0) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.58})$$

while in the second case it is

$$\begin{aligned} A_i^{ab} &= (A_i^{\alpha\beta} \in so(2), A_i^{AB} \in so(3), A_i^{\alpha A}) \quad \alpha = 1, 2 \text{ and } A = 3, 4, 5 \\ &\equiv (A_i^{\alpha\beta} = a_i \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}, A_i^{AB} \in so(3), A_i^{\alpha A} = 0) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.59})$$

Thus, subject to either one of the contractions (A.58) or (A.59), the divergence term (A.55) is gauge invariant and hence  $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$  in (A.52) can be cast in the form (A.7), namely as a difference of a *total divergence* term and a *gauge invariant* term.

---

<sup>4</sup>The contractions to  $SO(2)$ ,  $SO(3)$  and  $SO(4)$  are possible but not suitable, since connections to single subgroups do not mix “electric” and “magnetic” fields.