

Natural Anomaly Matching

Stefano Bolognesi^(1,2), Kenichi Konishi^(1,2), Andrea Luzio^(3,2),
and Matteo Orso^(1,2)

⁽¹⁾*Department of Physics “E. Fermi”, University of Pisa,
Largo Pontecorvo, 3, Ed. C, 56127 Pisa, Italy*

⁽²⁾*INFN, Sezione di Pisa, Largo Pontecorvo, 3, Ed. C, 56127 Pisa, Italy*

⁽³⁾*Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri, 7, 56127 Pisa, Italy*

stefano.bolognesi@unipi.it, kenichi.konishi@unipi.it, andrea.luzio@sns.it, m.orso1@studenti.unipi.it

Abstract

In a large class of chiral gauge theories in four dimensions it was found that certain natural assumption about the bifermion condensates leads to the infrared effective theory where the 't Hooft anomaly matching conditions are satisfied in an entirely evident fashion, without need of verifying arithmetic equations. This is due to the fact that in these systems, characterized by dynamical color (and flavor) symmetry breaking, the quantum numbers and multiplicities of the low-energy massless fermions match exactly those of the fermions in the UV theory which do not condense and remain massless, with respect to the unbroken symmetries. This means also that the stronger constraints following from the matching request of mixed anomalies involving certain generalized 1-form center symmetries, as well as some global anomalies such as Witten's $SU(2)$ anomaly, are all fully satisfied. It is the aim of this note to clarify better the working of this phenomenon (which we call Natural Anomaly Matching), correct some earlier statements made about it, and illustrate it further with a few new examples.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Natural Anomaly Matching	3
2.1	“Non-gauge-invariant condensates”	5
3	Color-Flavor Locking and dynamical Higgs phase	6
3.1	Bars-Yankielowicz (BY) model	7
3.2	Georgi-Glashow $((N_\psi, N_\chi) = (0, 1))$ model	7
3.3	An example with the $(N_\psi, N_\chi) = (2, 1)$ model	9
3.4	$SU(5)$ with $(N_\psi, N_\chi) = (1, 9)$	11
4	Infrared-free low-energy effective gauge theories	12
4.1	Dynamical Abelianization	13
4.2	Infrared-free nonAbelian color gauge group	15
5	Conclusion	16

1 Introduction

After many years of investigations [1]- [14], characteristics of the dynamics of strongly coupled (especially, chiral) gauge theories in four dimensions are gradually emerging [15]- [43]. One of the key ideas which made the recent progress possible is that of the generalized symmetries, and the possibilities of gauging some higher-form symmetries and the resulting new, mixed types of anomalies [17]- [41]. Consistency requires that such new anomalies be reproduced in the infrared appropriately, a constraint which is in general stronger than the one following from the conventional 't Hooft anomaly matching arguments [1].

Independently of, and consistently with, these exciting new developments, it was noted in our previous work [16, 33, 34, 36], that the anomaly-matching condition is sometimes satisfied totally evidently, i.e., without the need for solving any arithmetic matching equations among the anomaly coefficients. This occurs when the fermions participating in the (bi-fermion) condensates get mass dynamically, forming massive Dirac pairs, while the remaining massless fermions are identical, both in the quantum numbers and multiplicities, with respect to the unbroken symmetries, with a simple set of weakly-coupled massless fermions in the infrared.

In the color-flavor-locked dynamical Higgs phase [16, 33, 34], the latter correspond to gauge-singlet composite fermions (“baryons”). In systems with dynamical Abelianization [15, 36], instead, the low-energy massless fermions are simply the subset of the original fermions, which do not participate in the condensates and which become weakly coupled below the condensation mass scale.

In both cases, the set of massless fermions in the UV and IR have the same quantum numbers and multiplicities with respect to the surviving symmetries. Thus the anomaly-matching requirement is satisfied both for the conventional, perturbative 't Hooft anomalies and for the generalized anomalies which take into account the global structure of the symmetry groups and the possible gauging of certain 1-form center symmetries. Witten’s $SU(2)$ anomaly is also guaranteed to be preserved.

The phenomenon (which we may call Natural Anomaly Matching) looks simple and reasonable; nevertheless it was reported in [16] where a large class of chiral gauge theories have been surveyed, that in some cases the natural anomaly matching seemed to fail.

It is the aim of this work to clarify better the working of natural anomaly matching, discuss some of its characteristics, and illustrate it further with some new examples in the context of strongly-coupled tensorial chiral gauge theories.

In Sec. 2 we discuss the essential features of the natural anomaly matching. In Sec. 3 the cases of color-flavor-locked dynamical Higgs phase are illustrated by first reviewing a few well known examples, and then discussing some new examples. A few systems which might reduce dynamically to infrared-free effective gauge theories, either fully Abelian or nonAbelian, are explored in Sec. 4. Summary and conclusion are in Sec. 5.

2 Natural Anomaly Matching

Let us indicate the original (lefthanded) fermions as a set $\{\Psi\}$. Pairwise interactions among the members of $\{\Psi\}$ get strong in the infrared due to the color G_c gauge interactions. Depending on the representation of G_c to which $\{\Psi\}$ belong, the system has a global flavor symmetry group, G_f . Let us divide the full set $\{\Psi\}$ as a sum

$$\{\Psi\} = \{\Psi_0\} \oplus \{\Psi_1\}, \quad (2.1)$$

where the first group of fermions form pairwise condensation in the vacuum

$$\langle \Psi_0 \Psi_0 \rangle \sim \Lambda^3, \quad (2.2)$$

where Λ is of the order of the renormalization-group invariant mass scale of the G_c gauge theory. The vacuum expectation values (VEV) (2.2) break the color and flavor symmetries as

$$G_c \times G_f \rightarrow \tilde{G}_c \times \tilde{G}_f, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\tilde{G}_c \subset G_c, \quad \tilde{G}_f \subset (G_c/\tilde{G}_c) \times G_f, \quad (2.4)$$

and \tilde{G}_c indicate the surviving gauge group in the infrared. Namely, the low-energy theory is a \tilde{G}_c gauge theory with fermions $\{\Psi_1\}$ in various representations of \tilde{G}_f .

In (2.4) we have taken into account the possibility that the condensates (2.2) break both (part of) color and flavor symmetry groups, but leave some diagonal combination invariant, i.e., the color-flavor locking.

When the surviving color gauge interactions with \tilde{G}_c are asymptotically free, the system further evolves towards lower energies (this is known as ‘‘tumbling’’ [2]) and the fate of the symmetries depend on the dynamics of \tilde{G}_c interactions with fermions $\{\Psi_1\}$. As the problem is essentially of the same nature as the original one, we shall assume from here on that \tilde{G}_c is either trivial or infrared-free¹.

Now each pair of fermions going into the condensates $\Psi_0\Psi_0$ form together a singlet of \tilde{G}_f . In other words they do not contribute to the \tilde{G}_f^3 anomalies²

$$\text{Tr } \tilde{T}^3|_{\Psi_0} = 0, \quad \tilde{T} \subset \{T_c + T_f\}. \quad (2.5)$$

Next observe that a simply relation

$$\text{Tr } T_f^3|_{\Psi_0+\Psi_1} = \text{Tr } (T_c + T_f)^3|_{\Psi_0+\Psi_1} \quad (2.6)$$

holds for *any* generators (T_c, T_f) . To see this, use the fact that G_c is nonanomalous with the fermions $\{\Psi_0, \Psi_1\}$, and that G_f represent a nonanomalous flavor symmetry. Also all generators of $G_c = SU(N)$ are traceless. That is,

$$\text{Tr } [T_f^2 T_c]|_{\Psi_0+\Psi_1} = \text{Tr } [T_c^2 T_f]|_{\Psi_0+\Psi_1} = \text{Tr } [T_c^3]|_{\Psi_0+\Psi_1} = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

Let us now apply (2.6) to the generators T_c and T_f which enter \tilde{T} . It follows that

$$\text{Tr } T_f^3|_{\Psi_0+\Psi_1} = \text{Tr } (T_c + T_f)^3|_{\Psi_0+\Psi_1} = \text{Tr } \tilde{T}^3|_{\Psi_0+\Psi_1} = \text{Tr } \tilde{T}^3|_{\Psi_1}, \quad (2.8)$$

where (2.5) was used at the final step.

This looks like the solution of the UV-IR anomaly matching condition. Actually, this does not in itself explain why in some chiral gauge theories we find a natural set of massless composite fermions (baryons) saturating all the anomalies, in an obvious fashion. The problem is that at the scale Λ the fermions $\{\Psi_1\}$ are strongly coupled, therefore in order to have the \tilde{G}_f symmetry properly realized at low energies, all fermions in the set $\{\Psi_1\}$ must be replaced by a set of G_c invariant ‘‘baryons’’ $\{\mathcal{B}\}$ which are weakly coupled at $\mu \lesssim \Lambda$ and which reproduce all the \tilde{G}_f anomalies due to $\{\Psi_1\}$, i.e.,

$$\text{Tr } \tilde{T}^3|_{\Psi_1} = \text{Tr } \tilde{T}^3|_{\mathcal{B}}. \quad (2.9)$$

¹Our main interest is in chiral gauge theories. In vectorlike theory our construction has not much to add to what is known about their dynamics. For instance, in the standard QCD, $\Psi_0 = \{\psi_L^i, (\psi_R^c)^i\}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N_f$, $\{\Psi_1\} = \emptyset$. $G_c = SU(3)$, $\tilde{G}_c = \emptyset$, $G_f = SU(N_f) \times SU(N_f) \times U_V(1) \times U_A(1)$, $\tilde{G}_f = SU(N_f)_V \times U_V(1)$. There are no massless fermions in the IR but the anomaly matching does not pose a problem as there are no anomalies associated with \tilde{G}_f in the UV. All anomalous symmetries are spontaneously broken.

²Below we indicate by a symbol $\text{Tr } T^3$ the symmetric trace of three generic generators $\text{Tr } (\{T^a T^b\} T^c)$ of a given algebra.

But then, a priori, this looks just the original 't Hooft's problem: there is no guarantee in general that an appropriate set of baryons saturating (2.9) exists or can be found.

What happens in certain models with a color-flavor-locked dynamical Higgs vacuum [7, 16, 33, 34] is that the VEV of the composite scalar $\Phi \sim \Psi_0 \Psi_0$ acts as a metric, which can be used to convert the color to the flavor indices. In the simplest cases where

$$\langle \Phi_a^i \rangle = \langle \Psi_0 \Psi_0 \rangle_a^i \sim \delta_a^i \Lambda^3, \quad (2.10)$$

where i is the color index in the fundamental representation, \underline{N} , of $G_c = SU(N)$, and a is an index of the flavor symmetry G_f , all color indices in Ψ_1 can be eliminated (i.e., made gauge invariant) and converted to flavor labels, in the ‘‘baryons’’ of the form,

$$\{\mathcal{B}\} \sim \Psi_1 \Psi_0 \Psi_0, \quad \Psi_1 \Psi_0^* \Psi_0^*, \quad \Psi_1 \Psi_0 \Psi_0 \Psi_0 \Psi_0, \quad \Psi_1 \Psi_0 \Psi_0 \Psi_0^* \Psi_0^*, \quad \Psi_1 \Psi_0^* \Psi_0^* \Psi_0^* \Psi_0^*, \quad (2.11)$$

and so on. Which massless baryons among (2.11) actually form, depend on the G_c representation each of Ψ_1 belongs to. Once an appropriate set of the baryons are found, which replace in the infrared all the UV fermions Ψ_1 , all the issues about perturbative and nonperturbative anomaly matching literally disappear: see Sec. 3 below for examples.

A second possible situation in which the problem (2.9) has a simple solution is when the low-energy color gauge group in (2.3) is infrared free. In those cases, the remaining massless fermions $\{\Psi_1\}$ survive in the IR, become weakly coupled, and carry all the information about the unbroken symmetry group \tilde{G}_f into the infrared. The full anomaly matching, (2.8), is again automatic. A well studied case is that of a ‘‘ $\psi\chi\eta$ ’’ model, where the system is likely to dynamically Abelianize [15, 36], somewhat analogously to what happens in many $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric gauge theories, where

$$\tilde{G}_c = \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} U_i(1) \subset G_c = SU(N). \quad (2.12)$$

In Sec. 4 we briefly review these cases, and discuss some new situation where \tilde{G}_c is infrared free but nonAbelian.

The ideas related to the Natural Anomaly Matching appeared earlier in various forms [2]-[14]; they may be ultimately traced back to the original work on tumbling and complementarity, in the context of dynamical Higgs vacua [2]. The present note is an attempt to streamline the logic under them, discuss its systematic features, the range and limit of their applications, in the light of the recent development involving the generalized symmetries and stronger form of 't Hooft anomaly-matching discussions. In fact, one of the main outcomes of the recent studies of a wide range of chiral gauge theories in four dimensions [32]- [39], is that certain ‘‘non-anomalous’’ discrete or $U(1)$ symmetries become anomalous under the gauging of the 1-form color $\mathbb{Z}_N \subset SU(N)$ center symmetry. And this, in all cases studied, is consistent with the assumption of a dynamical Higgs phase or dynamical Abelianization [36, 43], induced by some bifermion condensates. Then, under a reasonable choice of the condensates, the question of anomaly-matching (consistency check) with respect to the unbroken symmetries becomes of a simple resolution: the conventional, new and global anomalies are all UV-IR matched, manifestly.

2.1 ‘‘Non-gauge-invariant condensates’’

In chiral gauge theories, a bifermion condensate (2.2) is in general gauge-dependent. Such a condensate must eventually be understood as the VEV of a composite gauge-invariant field, implying a nonvanishing value for some of its components in a chosen gauge. This fact does

not however mean that (2.2) is either unphysical or to be excluded à priori. Quite the contrary. A gauge-noninvariant VEV (hence colored Nambu-Goldstone bosons, to be absorbed by the longitudinal components of the gauge bosons) is the essence of the Higgs mechanism. As is well known, this does not mean spontaneous breaking of a local gauge symmetry. The latter is not really a symmetry: it cannot be broken spontaneously³.

Usually, the Higgs mechanism is taught in textbooks in the context of a weakly coupled gauge theory, with a simple potential for the Higgs scalar field with nontrivial minima, i.e., its nonvanishing VEV. In the strongly-coupled chiral gauge theories we are concerned with here, the scalar field emerges as a bifermion composite by the strong gauge interactions, and is itself, in general, strongly coupled. Nevertheless, there is no essential difference from the standard Higgs mechanism (hence the name of dynamical Higgs mechanism [2]), see [32, 42] for some more discussions.

Another important aspect of a non-gauge-invariant VEV such as (2.2), which does not seem to be appreciated generally, is the following. Even though the condensate (2.2) depends on the gauge choice, its implication on the flavor symmetry breaking is a genuine, physical one. For a familiar example of this, consider the standard (minimal) Glashow-Weinberg-Salam electroweak theory with a quartic Higgs scalar potential. An accidental would-be global $SO(4)$ symmetry of the Higgs Lagrangian, present in the limit of vanishing $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge coupling, is broken spontaneously to $SO(3)$ by the Higgs scalar VEV

$$\langle \mathcal{R}\phi \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad v \neq 0, \quad (2.13)$$

(\mathcal{R} standing for the real part). The W and Z boson masses following from the Higgs kinetic term satisfy the relation

$$\rho \equiv \frac{M_W^2}{M_Z^2 \cos^2 \theta_W} = 1 + O(\alpha), \quad (2.14)$$

where $O(\alpha)$ indicates generic corrections of the order of the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge coupling constant squared. (2.14) is a physical prediction of the minimal standard model with the Higgs VEV (2.13), well met by the experiments. As is well known, this relation is a manifestation of the $SO(3) \subset SO(4)$ symmetry (known as the custodial $SU(2)$ symmetry) left unbroken by the condensate, (2.13).

Another example is the Bars-Yankielowicz (BY) model reviewed below, in Sec. 3.1. The bifermion VEV (3.7) is a gauge-dependent expression, but the reduction of the flavor symmetry

$$SU(N+4) \times U(1) \rightarrow SU(N) \times SU(4) \times U(1) \quad (2.15)$$

implied by it, is a gauge-independent conclusion about the physics of this model.

The lesson to be drawn is that even though a gauge-non-invariant VEV (elementary or composite), commonly used in the literature, does not mean spontaneous breaking of a gauge symmetry, it can imply spontaneous breaking of a *flavor* symmetry.

3 Color-Flavor Locking and dynamical Higgs phase

In this section we illustrate and discuss the idea of color-flavor-locking and natural anomaly matching with some examples. In particular, chiral $SU(N)$ gauge theories with matter chiral fermions in the representation,

$$N_\psi \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \oplus N_\chi \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bar{\square} \\ \hline \end{array} \oplus n \bar{\square}, \quad (3.1)$$

³Indeed, Elitsur's theorem [45] should not be understood as something that excludes the Higgs mechanism.

where

$$n = N_\psi(N + 4) - N_\chi(N - 4) , \quad (3.2)$$

have been studied in [16], for $(N_\psi, N_\chi) = (1, 0), (2, 0), (3, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2), (0, 3), (2, 1), (1, 1), (1, -1)$. We review a few well-known cases, correct some statements made in [16], and add a few more examples.

Though we are not going to review here in detail, the idea of color-flavor locking and dynamical Higgs phase for these classes of chiral gauge theories have recently found a theoretical support from the analyses of the global structure of the symmetry group, and gauging of the 1-form center symmetries and new, mixed type anomalies [32]- [35].

3.1 Bars-Yankielowicz (BY) model

The best known example is the BY model ($\psi\eta$ model) discussed in [4]- [7], [33]. The matter fermions are

$$\psi^{\{ij\}} , \quad \eta_i^B , \quad B = 1, 2, \dots, N + 4 , \quad (3.3)$$

or

$$\square\square \oplus (N + 4)\bar{\square} . \quad (3.4)$$

The (continuous) symmetry of this model is

$$SU(N)_c \times SU(N + 4)_f \times U(1) , \quad (3.5)$$

where $U(1)$ is an anomaly-free combination of $U_\psi(1)$ and $U_\eta(1)$, with

$$Q_\psi : \quad N + 4 , \quad Q_\eta : \quad -(N + 2) . \quad (3.6)$$

A color-flavor locked dynamical Higgs phase [7, 15, 33], is characterized by

$$\langle \psi^{\{ij\}} \eta_i^B \rangle = c \Lambda^3 \delta^{jB} , \quad j, B = 1, 2, \dots, N , \quad (3.7)$$

in which the symmetry is reduced to

$$SU(N)_{cf} \times SU(4)_f \times U'(1) . \quad (3.8)$$

The candidate massless baryons are:

$$B^{[AB]} = \psi^{ij} \eta_i^A \eta_j^B , \quad A, B = 1, 2, \dots, N , \quad (3.9)$$

antisymmetric in $A \leftrightarrow B$, and

$$B^{[AC]} = \psi^{ij} \eta_i^A \eta_j^C , \quad A = 1, 2, \dots, N , \quad C = N + 1, \dots, N + 4 . \quad (3.10)$$

See Table 1.

3.2 Georgi-Glashow $((N_\psi, N_\chi) = (0, 1))$ model

In the case of the Georgi-Glashow model studied in [2, 6–8, 10, 15], the matter fermions are

$$\chi_{[ij]} , \quad \tilde{\eta}^{Bj} , \quad B = 1, 2, \dots, (N - 4) , \quad (3.11)$$

or

$$\bar{\square} \oplus (N - 4)\square . \quad (3.12)$$

	fields	$SU(N)_{\text{cf}}$	$SU(4)_{\text{f}}$	$U'(1)$
UV	ψ	$\square \square$	$\frac{N(N+1)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	1
	η_i^A	$\square \square \oplus \square$	$N^2 \cdot (\cdot)$	-1
	η_i^C	$4 \cdot \square$	$N \cdot \square$	$-\frac{1}{2}$
IR	$B^{[AB]}$	\square	$\frac{N(N-1)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	-1
	$B^{[AC]}$	$4 \cdot \square$	$N \cdot \square$	$-\frac{1}{2}$

Table 1: Color-flavor locked phase in the BY model. A or B stand for $A, B = 1, 2, \dots, N$, C the rest of the flavor indices. After the pair, (ψ and the symmetric part of η_i^A), form a massive Dirac particle and decouple, the rest of the fermions in the UV and in the IR are identical.

The (continuous) symmetry is

$$SU(N)_c \times SU(N-4)_f \times U(1), \quad (3.13)$$

where the anomaly free $U(1)$ charge is

$$\chi: \quad N-4; \quad \tilde{\eta}^{Bj}: \quad -(N-2). \quad (3.14)$$

It was pointed out [7] that this system may develop a condensate of the form

$$\langle \chi_{[ij]} \tilde{\eta}^{Bj} \rangle = \text{const } \Lambda^3 \delta_i^B, \quad i, B = 1, 2, \dots, N-4. \quad (3.15)$$

The symmetry is broken to

$$SU(N-4)_{\text{cf}} \times U'(1) \times SU(4)_c. \quad (3.16)$$

Assume that the massless baryons are:

$$B^{\{AB\}} = \chi_{[ij]} \tilde{\eta}^{iA} \tilde{\eta}^{jB}, \quad A, B = 1, 2, \dots, (N-4); \quad (3.17)$$

the saturation of all of the anomalies associated with the remaining flavor group $SU(N-4)_{\text{cf}} \times U'(1)$ is manifest in Table 2.

It is interesting to note a few new features here with respect to the BY model discussed in the previous section. The first is that the color-flavor locking here involves only a subgroup of color $SU(N)$, due to the fact that the flavor group $SU(N-4)$ is smaller than the color gauge group. Only the subgroup $SU(N-4) \subset SU(N)$ of the strong gauge group⁴ can be locked with the flavor symmetry. The pairs $\{\chi_{i_1 j_1}, \text{antisymm. part of } \tilde{\eta}^{A, i_1}\}$ as well as the pair $\{\chi_{i_1 j_2}, \tilde{\eta}^{A, i_2}\}$ condense and become massive Dirac fermions. The $SU(4)_c \subset SU(N)$ gauge interactions remain asymptotically free. The only massless fermions $\chi_{i_2 j_2}$ charged in $SU(4)_c$, being self-adjoint and strongly coupled, can condense and get massive on its own. The massive ‘‘meson’’ made of $\chi_{i_2 j_2}$ pair can be thought of as a toy model version of the dark matter, very weakly coupled to the ‘‘visible sector’’, made of the massless fermions $B^{\{AB\}}$ of the low-energy effective theory.

Many other examples of the color-flavor locking and consequent Natural Anomaly Matching (identical sets of massless fermions in the UV and IR, with respect to all the surviving

⁴We assume here that $N \geq 6$.

	fields	$SU(N-4)_{\text{cf}}$	$U'(1)$	$SU(4)_c$
UV	$\chi_{i_1 j_1}$	$\overline{\square}$	N	$\frac{(N-4)(N-5)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$
	$\chi_{i_1 j_2}$	$4 \cdot \square$	$\frac{N}{2}$	$(N-4) \cdot \overline{\square}$
	$\chi_{i_2 j_2}$	$\frac{4-3}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	0	$\overline{\square}$
	$\tilde{\eta}^{A, i_1}$	$\square \oplus \overline{\square}$	$-N$	$(N-4)^2 \cdot (\cdot)$
	$\tilde{\eta}^{A, i_2}$	$4 \cdot \square$	$-\frac{N}{2}$	$(N-4) \cdot \square$
IR	$B^{\{AB\}}$	$\square \square$	$-N$	$\frac{(N-4)(N-3)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$

Table 2: Color-flavor locking in the $(0, 1)$ model. The color index i_1 or j_1 runs up to $N-4$ and the rest is indicated by i_2 or j_2 .

symmetries) have been discussed in [16], see Tables given there, for the models $(N_\psi, N_\chi) = (1, 0), (2, 0), (3, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2), (0, 3), (2, 1), (1, 1), (1, -1)$.

In a few cases, it was noted that the natural anomaly matching appeared to fail. In order to point out the reason why it did, let us consider a particular model (the $(2, 1)$ model) below, and see how the introduction of an appropriate set of baryons allowed by (2.11) restores the natural anomaly matching. An analogous consideration allows to eliminate all the difficulties found (and some errors made) in [16].

3.3 An example with the $(N_\psi, N_\chi) = (2, 1)$ model

One of the models in which the natural anomaly matching seemed to fail was the $(2, 1)$ model, an $SU(N)$ theory with fermions,

$$\psi^{\{ij\}, m}, \quad \chi_{[ij]}, \quad \eta_j^B, \quad m = 1, 2, \quad B = 1, 2, \dots, N+12, \quad (3.18)$$

or

$$2 \square \square \oplus \overline{\square} \oplus (N+12) \overline{\square}. \quad (3.19)$$

The symmetries of the theory are

$$SU(N)_c \times SU(2)_\psi \times SU(N+12)_\chi \times U(1)^2. \quad (3.20)$$

The two $U(1)$'s are anomaly-free combinations of $U_\psi(1)$, $U_\chi(1)$, $U_\eta(1)$, which can be taken as

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(1) : \quad & \psi \rightarrow e^{i\frac{\alpha}{2(N+2)}} \psi, \quad \eta \rightarrow e^{-i\frac{\alpha}{N+12}} \eta; \\ U_2(1) : \quad & \psi \rightarrow e^{i\frac{\beta}{2(N+2)}} \psi, \quad \chi \rightarrow e^{-i\frac{\beta}{N-2}} \chi. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

A possibility is that a (partial) color-flavor locked condensate develops [16]:

$$\langle \psi^{\{ij\}, 1} \eta_j^B \rangle = c \Lambda^3 \delta^{iB}, \quad i, B = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (3.22)$$

where the direction of the $SU(2)_\psi$ breaking is arbitrary. Let us assume that $\langle \psi \chi \rangle = 0$.

The IR symmetry of the model is

$$SU(N)_{\text{cf}} \times SU(12)_f \times \tilde{U}(1) \times \hat{U}(1) \times \check{U}(1), \quad (3.23)$$

where $\tilde{U}(1)$ is the unbroken combination of $U_1(1)$ and $U_2(1)$ with charges

$$Q_\psi = 1, \quad Q_\chi = -\frac{N-8}{N-2}, \quad Q_\eta = -1. \quad (3.24)$$

$\hat{U}(1)$ and $\check{U}(1)$ are generated respectively by

$$\hat{Q} = Q_{\psi\eta} + \frac{N-8}{2(N+2)(N+12)} \left[\mathbb{1}_N \quad -\frac{N}{12} \mathbb{1}_{12} \right], \quad (3.25)$$

where the second term acts only on the η fields, and

$$\check{Q} = Q_{\psi\eta} + \frac{N-8}{2(N+2)(N+12)} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.26)$$

with the second term acting only on ψ 's. $Q_{\psi\eta}$ is the generator of the anomaly-free combination of $U_\psi(1)$ and $U_\eta(1)$, with charges, $\frac{1}{2(N+2)}$ for ψ and $-\frac{1}{N+12}$ for η , respectively.

By assuming the candidate massless baryons:

$$B^{[CD],1} = \psi^{\{ij\},1} \eta_i^C \eta_j^D, \quad (3.27)$$

$$\hat{B}^{A_1 B_1} = \psi^{\{ij\},2} \overline{\{\psi^{\{ki,1\}} \eta_k^{A_1}\}} \overline{\{\psi^{\{\ell j,1\}} \eta_\ell^{B_1}\}}, \quad (3.28)$$

and

$$\tilde{B}^{A_1, A_2} = \chi_{ij} \{\psi^{\{ik\},1} \eta_k^{A_1}\} \{\psi^{\{\ell j\},1} \eta_\ell^{A_2}\}, \quad (3.29)$$

the natural anomaly matching is seen to work perfectly well, see Table 3⁵.

	fields	$SU(N)_{\text{cf}}$	$SU(12)$	$\tilde{U}(1)$	$\hat{U}(1)$	$\check{U}(1)$
UV	$\psi^{\{ij\},1}$		$\frac{N(N+1)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	1	$\frac{1}{2(N+2)}$	$\frac{1}{N+12}$
	$\psi^{\{ij\},2}$		$\frac{N(N+1)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	1	$\frac{1}{2(N+2)}$	$\frac{10}{(N+2)(N+12)}$
	$\chi_{[ij]}$		$\frac{N(N-1)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	$-\frac{N-8}{N-2}$	0	0
	$\eta_i^{B_1}$		$N^2 \cdot (\cdot)$	-1	$-\frac{1}{2(N+2)}$	$-\frac{1}{N+12}$
	$\eta_i^{B_3}$	$12 \cdot$	$N \cdot$	-1	$-\frac{N+4}{24(N+2)}$	$-\frac{1}{N+12}$
IR	$\hat{B}^{[A_1 B_1]}$		$\frac{N(N+1)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	1	$\frac{1}{2(N+2)}$	$\frac{10}{(N+2)(N+12)}$
	$\tilde{B}^{[A_1 B_1]}$		$\frac{N(N-1)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	$-\frac{N-8}{N-2}$	0	0
	$B^{[A_1 B_1],1}$		$\frac{N(N-1)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	-1	$-\frac{1}{2(N+2)}$	$-\frac{1}{N+12}$
	$B^{[A_1 B_3],1}$	$12 \cdot$	$N \cdot$	-1	$-\frac{(N+4)}{24(N+2)}$	$-\frac{1}{N+12}$

Table 3: Single CF locking (3.22) in the (2, 1) model. A_1, B_1 stand for the flavor indices up to N ; B_3 the last 12. The natural anomaly matching is manifest, after the pair $\{\psi^{\{ij\},1}$, the symmetric part of $\eta_i^{B_1}\}$ forms a massive Dirac fermion and decouple.

⁵The problem noted in [16] was due to an erroneous assumption that all massless baryons should be composites made of three fermions, i.e., only of the type, (3.27).

3.4 $SU(5)$ with $(N_\psi, N_\chi) = (1, 9)$

A nontrivial new example of color-flavor locked dynamical Higgs phase can be found in the context of a tensorial chiral gauge theory. The matter fermions are $\psi^{\{ij\}}$ and $\chi_{[ij]}^c$, ($c = 1, 2, \dots, 9$) in symmetric and (anti-)antisymmetric 2-index tensor representations,

$$\square\square \oplus 9 \overline{\square}. \quad (3.30)$$

The classical symmetry group is

$$SU(9) \times U(1)_\psi \times U(1)_\chi, \quad (3.31)$$

with a non-anomalous combination of the two $U(1)$ groups being

$$U(1)_{\psi\chi} : \quad \psi \rightarrow e^{27i\alpha}\psi, \quad \chi \rightarrow e^{-7i\alpha}\chi, \quad \alpha \in [0, 2\pi) \quad (3.32)$$

The implication of the presence of higher-form symmetries and associated generalized 't Hooft anomalies, has been studied systematically in the context of large classes of chiral gauge theories [32]- [38]. Only recently these analyses have been extended to tensorial models such as this one [41, 44].

It turns out that the action of the \mathbb{Z}_5 center of the color $SU(5)$ symmetry on the fermions can be compensated by the $U(1)_{\psi\chi}$ transformation with

$$\alpha = \frac{2\pi}{5}k; \quad k = 1, \dots, 5, \quad (3.33)$$

showing that the symmetry of the model is actually,

$$SU(5)_c \times \frac{SU(9) \times U(1)_{\psi\chi}}{\mathbb{Z}_5 \times \mathbb{Z}_9}; \quad (3.34)$$

it also possesses a color-flavor locked 1-form \mathbb{Z}_5 symmetry ⁶

The consequences of (anomalies in) *gauging this 1-form center symmetry* can be analyzed by a now well established fashion. Among others, one finds that $U(1)_{\psi\chi}$ transformation (3.32) induces an anomalous variation in the 4D effective action ⁷,

$$\delta S_{UV}^{4D} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} 264375 \int_{\Sigma_4} \alpha (B_c^{(2)})^2 = 10575 \alpha n; \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_5 \neq 0, \quad (3.35)$$

where the the 1-form gauge field tensor $B_c^{(2)}$ carries a fractional 't Hooft flux,

$$\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{\Sigma_4} (B_c^{(2)})^2 = \frac{n}{25}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_5. \quad (3.36)$$

The anomaly (the breaking) of $U(1)_{\psi\chi}$ found in the UV theory requires that the IR theory correctly reflects it. Among other possibilities, here let us consider the possibility that $U(1)_{\psi\chi}$ symmetry is broken by a bifermion condensate. In the model (3.30) the most attractive bifermion channel is the one with two χ fermions forming the fundamental representation,

$$\overline{\square} \otimes \overline{\square} = \square \oplus \dots \quad (3.37)$$

⁶An analogue of the \mathbb{Z}_N center symmetry in the pure $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theory, which can be used, by considering the Polyakov loop in the Euclidean formulation, as a criterion of confinement / Higgs phase. Analogously, \mathbb{Z}_9 is the diagonal center symmetry in $SU(9) \times U(1)_{\psi\chi}$.

⁷This is sometimes called as a mixed anomaly, more specifically, a mixed $[U(1)_{\psi\chi}] - [\mathbb{Z}_5]^2$ anomaly.

Let us assume that in the vacuum the color $SU(5)$ is locked with the subgroup $SU(5) \subset SU(9)_\chi$:

$$\epsilon^{ijklm} \langle \chi_{jk}^A \chi_{\ell m}^9 \rangle \propto \delta^{iA} \neq 0, \quad A = 1, 2, \dots, 5, \quad \langle \psi \chi \rangle = 0, \quad (3.38)$$

where the choice in the direction of the $SU(4) \subset SU(9)$ breaking, is arbitrary. The symmetry (3.34) is broken to

$$SU(5)_{cf} \times SU(3) \times U(1) \times U(1)', \quad (3.39)$$

where $U(1) \times U(1)'$ are two $U(1)$ symmetries unbroken by the condensate, (3.38). The color-flavor locking (3.38) means that the first 5 flavor indices, $A = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ of χ_{jk}^A act as the antifundamental $\bar{5}$ of the color-flavor locked $SU(5)$. Let us then indicate (for simplicity of writing) the bifermion composite dynamical scalar (3.38) as

$$(\chi\chi)_A^i \sim \epsilon^{ijklm} \chi_{jk}^A \chi_{\ell m}^9. \quad (3.40)$$

The massless baryons we expect in the infrared are

$$B^{\{A_1 A_2\}} = \psi^{\{ij\}} \overline{(\chi\chi)_{A_1}^i} \overline{(\chi\chi)_{A_2}^j}; \quad (3.41)$$

$$\hat{B}_{[A_1 A_2], A} = \chi_{[ij]}^A (\chi\chi)_{A_1}^i (\chi\chi)_{A_2}^j, \quad (3.42)$$

(where the indices A, A_1, A_2 run up to 5, forming

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \quad (3.43)$$

of the flavor $SU(5) \subset SU(9)$); and

$$\hat{B}_{[A_1 A_2], B} = \chi_{[ij]}^B (\chi\chi)_{A_1}^i (\chi\chi)_{A_2}^j, \quad (3.44)$$

where the indices A_1, A_2 run up to 5, $B = 6, 7, 8$.

Note that, à priori, finding the solution of the anomaly matching requirement with respect to the unbroken symmetry group (3.39) (including its global structures, not explicitly shown there) with the known UV fermions (the upper half of Table 4), would have been a formidable task. The solution, which can be just read off Table 4, shows the power of the Natural Anomaly Matching mechanism.

4 Infrared-free low-energy effective gauge theories

In the previous section systems in color-flavor-locked dynamical Higgs phase have been studied, where the natural anomaly matching is seen at work. Another possibility is that the system is dynamically reduced to a low-energy effective gauge theory which is infrared free, either fully Abelian, or with some nonAbelian gauge subgroup. In both these cases, the massless fermions in the low-energy effective theory are the subset of the UV fermions, which do not participate in the condensates and remain massless. They become weakly coupled at low energies. We first briefly review the $\psi\chi\eta$ model ($(N_\psi, N_\chi) = (1, 1)$) as an example of the systems which dynamically Abelianize, and subsequently discuss the possibility of a more general, infrared-free low energy action characterized by a nonAbelian gauge group, in the context of the model, $(N_\psi, N_\chi) = (1, 9)$.

	fields	$SU(5)_{\text{cf}}$	$SU(3)$	$U(1)$	$U(1)'$
UV	$\psi^{\{ij\}}$		$15 \cdot (\cdot)$	0	3
	$\chi_{[ij]}^A$		$50 \cdot (\cdot)$	-3	-7
	$\chi_{[ij]}^B$	$3 \cdot$	$10 \cdot \square$	4	7
	$\chi_{[ij]}^9$		$10 \cdot (\cdot)$	3	7
IR	$B^{\{A_1 A_2\}}$		$15 \cdot (\cdot)$	0	3
	$\hat{B}_{[A_1 A_2], A}$		$40 \cdot (\cdot)$	-3	-7
	$\hat{B}_{[A_1 A_2], B}$	$3 \cdot$	$10 \cdot \square$	4	7

Table 4: CF locking (3.38) and the natural anomaly matching in the (1, 9) model. The index A (and $A_{1,2}$) run up to 5; the index B runs over $B = 6, 7, 8$. The totally antisymmetric parts of $\chi_{[ij]}^A$ and $\chi_{[ij]}^9$ pair up to condense, form a massive Dirac fermion, and decouple. The rest of the UV fermions are completely matched by the three types of baryons in the IR, in their quantum numbers. Any conventional as well as generalized anomaly matching is automatic.

4.1 Dynamical Abelianization

The $\psi\chi\eta$ model (the (1, 1) model in the classification (3.1)) is an $SU(N)$ theory with fermions

$$\psi^{\{ij\}}, \quad \chi_{[ij]}, \quad \eta_i^A, \quad A = 1, 2, \dots, 8, \quad (4.1)$$

in the representation,

$$\square\square \oplus \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \bar{\square} \\ \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array} \oplus 8 \bar{\square}. \quad (4.2)$$

The symmetry of the $\psi\chi\eta$ model is found to be ⁸

$$G = \frac{SU(N) \times U(1)_{\psi\chi} \times \tilde{U}(1) \times SU(8)}{\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_{8/N^*}}. \quad (4.3)$$

The two anomaly-free $U(1)$ groups can be taken as

$$\tilde{U}(1): \quad \psi \rightarrow e^{2i\alpha}\psi, \quad \chi \rightarrow e^{-2i\alpha}\chi, \quad \eta \rightarrow e^{-i\alpha}\eta, \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$U(1)_{\psi\chi}: \quad \psi \rightarrow e^{i\frac{N-2}{N^*}\beta}\psi, \quad \chi \rightarrow e^{-i\frac{N+2}{N^*}\beta}\chi, \quad \eta \rightarrow \eta, \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$N^* = \text{GCD}(N+2, N-2) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha, \beta \in (0, 2\pi). \quad (4.6)$$

The system is asymptotically free, the first coefficient of the beta function being,

$$b_0 = \frac{1}{3} [11N - (N+2) - (N-2) - 8] = \frac{9N-8}{3}. \quad (4.7)$$

⁸ \mathbb{Z}_N division takes care of the fact that $\mathbb{Z}_N = SU(N) \cap \tilde{U}(1)$, whereas \mathbb{Z}_{8/N^*} arises from the intersection of $U(1)_{\psi\chi} \times \tilde{U}(1) \times SU(8)$, see Eq. (2.10) of [36].

Such a β function suggests that the system is very strongly coupled in the infrared: we certainly expect that something nontrivial occurs dynamically. To understand the fate of the symmetries in this model has long remained a puzzle⁹.

It was proposed that a bifermion condensate in the adjoint representation

$$\langle \psi^{ik} \chi_{kj} \rangle = \Lambda^3 \begin{pmatrix} c_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & c_N \end{pmatrix}_j^i, \quad \langle \psi^{ij} \eta_j^A \rangle = 0, \quad (4.8)$$

$$c_n \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \sum_n c_n = 0, \quad c_m - c_n \neq 0, \quad m \neq n, \quad (4.9)$$

(with no other particular relations among c_j 's) forms, inducing dynamical Abelianization of the color gauge group

$$SU(N) \rightarrow U(1)^{N-1}. \quad (4.10)$$

The full symmetry is broken as

$$SU(N) \times \frac{SU(8)_f \times \tilde{U}(1) \times U(1)_{\psi\chi}}{\mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_{8/N^*}} \rightarrow \frac{\prod_{\ell=1}^{N-1} U(1)_\ell \times SU(8)_f \times \tilde{U}(1)}{\prod_{\ell=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{Z}_\ell \times \mathbb{Z}_N \times \mathbb{Z}_2}, \quad (4.11)$$

where

$$\mathbb{Z}_N = U(1)_{N-1} \cap \tilde{U}(1) = SU(N) \cap \tilde{U}(1). \quad (4.12)$$

For details see [36]. The anomaly matching can be read off from Table 5. The massless fermions

	fields	$SU(8)$	$\tilde{U}(1)$
UV	ψ	$\frac{N(N+1)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	$\frac{N(N+1)}{2} \cdot (2)$
	χ	$\frac{N(N-1)}{2} \cdot (\cdot)$	$\frac{N(N-1)}{2} \cdot (-2)$
	η^A	$N \cdot \square$	$8N \cdot (-1)$
IR	ψ^{ii}	$N \cdot (\cdot)$	$N \cdot (2)$
	η^A	$N \cdot \square$	$8N \cdot (-1)$

Table 5: Full dynamical Abelianization in the $\psi\chi\eta$ model. The nondiagonal components of $\psi^{\{ij\}}$ and $\chi_{[ij]}$ fields pair up to form the condensates, (4.8); all the remaining fermions remain massless and become the infrared degrees of freedom.

in the infrared are shown again in Table 6, where their quantum numbers with respect to the weak $\prod_{\ell=1}^{N-1} U(1)_\ell \subset SU(N)$ are also shown.

These assumptions have been carefully examined against the possible generalized anomalies [18]- [31] arising from the gauging of the color flavor locked \mathbb{Z}_N symmetry shown in (4.3) and (4.4), in [36]. Most significantly, the latter gives rise to an anomalous variation of the 4D effective action

$$-\frac{4N^2}{N^*} \delta A_{\psi\chi}^{(0)} \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{\Sigma_4} (B_c^{(2)})^2, \quad (4.13)$$

where $\delta A_{\psi\chi}^{(0)} = \beta$ is the $U_{\psi\chi}(1)$ variation (4.5) and the 2-form $B_c^{(2)}$ fields introduced to gauge the 1-form CF locked \mathbb{Z}_N symmetry carry a fractional 't Hooft fluxes

$$\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{\Sigma_4} (B_c^{(2)})^2 \in \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{N^2}. \quad (4.14)$$

⁹The option that the system confines, with no global symmetry breaking and with some massless ‘‘baryons’’ saturating the 't Hooft anomalies, was judged not plausible [11, 12]. Recent efforts to understand this system [15, 16] have eventually led to the idea of dynamical Abelianization [36, 43].

	fields	$U(1)_1$	$U(1)_2$	\dots	$U(1)_{N-1}$	$SU(8)$	$\tilde{U}(1)$	$U(1)_{\text{an}}$
ψ	ψ^{11}	1	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$	\dots	$\frac{2}{\sqrt{2N(N-1)}}$	(\cdot)	2	1
	ψ^{22}	-1	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$	\dots	$\frac{2}{\sqrt{2N(N-1)}}$	(\cdot)	2	1
	ψ^{33}	0	$-\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}$	\dots	$\frac{2}{\sqrt{2N(N-1)}}$	(\cdot)	2	1
	\vdots				\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
	ψ^{NN}	0	0	\dots	$-\frac{2(N-1)}{\sqrt{2N(N-1)}}$	(\cdot)	2	1
η	η_1^a	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}$	\dots	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2N(N-1)}}$	\square	-1	0
	η_2^a	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}$	\dots	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2N(N-1)}}$	\square	-1	0
	η_3^a	0	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$	\dots	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2N(N-1)}}$	\square	-1	0
	\vdots					\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
	η_N^a	0	0	\dots	$\frac{N-1}{\sqrt{2N(N-1)}}$	\square	-1	0
π	$\tilde{\phi} \sim (\psi\chi)_1^1$	0	0	\dots	0	(\cdot)	0	0

Table 6: Massless fermions in the infrared in the $\psi\chi\eta$ model and their charges with respect to the unbroken symmetry groups. The massless NG boson carries no charges with respect to the unbroken symmetries. The two (nonanomalous and anomalous) $U(1)$ symmetries $\tilde{U}(1)$ and $U(1)_{\text{an}}$ which are not affected by the $\psi\chi$ condensate are defined in (4.4) and in Eq. (2.7) of [36].

Therefore $U_{\psi\chi}(1)$ symmetry becomes anomalous, whereas the other $U(1)$ symmetry, $\tilde{U}(1)$ (see (4.4)), as well as $SU(8)$, are not affected by the gauging of the CF locked \mathbb{Z}_N . These results appear to fully support the assumption of the dynamical Abelianization of the system [36].

4.2 Infrared-free nonAbelian color gauge group

The $SU(5)$ tensorial gauge theory with fermions $\psi^{\{ij\}}$ and $\chi_{[ij]}^c$, ($c = 1, 2, \dots, 9$) in representations,

$$\square\square \oplus 9 \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array}. \quad (4.15)$$

with classical symmetries

$$SU(9) \times U(1)_\psi \times U(1)_\chi, \quad (4.16)$$

has been discussed in Sec. 3.4, to illustrate a nontrivial example of color-flavor locking (3.38), the consequent dynamical Higgs phase, and Natural Anomaly Matching.

It is possible, instead, that the system goes through dynamical Abelianization, as in the $\psi\chi\eta$ model of the previous section, via condensate of the form,

$$\langle \psi^{ik} \chi^A \rangle_{kj} \propto \begin{bmatrix} c_1 & & & \\ & c_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & c_N \end{bmatrix}_j^i, \quad \langle \chi\chi \rangle = 0, \quad (4.17)$$

such that the gauge symmetry is broken as ($N = 5$)

$$SU(N) \rightarrow U(1)^{N-1}. \quad (4.18)$$

The analysis in this case is similar to the one made in Sec 4.1.

Still another possibility, recently proposed in [38], is that the condensate of the composite $\psi\chi$ field in the adjoint representation forms, in the diagonal form (4.17), but the pattern of the gauge symmetry breaking is

$$G_C = SU(5) \rightarrow \tilde{G}_c = SU(2)_1 \times SU(2)_2 \times U(1)_1 \times U(1)_2. \quad (4.19)$$

The two unbroken $U(1)$ subgroups of $SU(5)$ may be chosen as

$$U(1)_1 : \begin{bmatrix} 2\mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} & & \\ & -\mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} & \\ & & -2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U(1)_2 : \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} & & \\ & -4\mathbf{1}_{2 \times 2} & \\ & & 6 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.20)$$

From the quantum numbers of the fermions which remain massless (see Table 7 below) it is easy to check that both $SU(2) \subset SU(5)$ (as well as the $U(1)$) factors are infrared free. Assuming $A = 9$ in (4.17), the flavor symmetry is broken as

$$G_f = SU(9) \times U(1)_{\psi\chi} \rightarrow \tilde{G}_f = SU(8) \times U(1)' \quad (4.21)$$

where $U(1)' \subset U(1)_{\psi\chi} \times SU(9)$. The fermions in the UV are decomposed as the direct sum of representations in the unbroken color and flavor group.

We are left with the fermions in the IR shown in Table 7, that reproduce all conventional 't Hooft anomalies, as well as the generalized anomalies taking into account their global structure, associated with the unbroken symmetries $\tilde{G}_c \times \tilde{G}_f$ ((4.19), (4.21)).

fields	$SU(2)_1$	$SU(2)_2$	$U(1)_1$	$U(1)_2$	$SU(8)$	$U(1)'$
$\psi^{\{ij\}}$	$\square\square$	$3(\cdot)$	4	2	$3(\cdot)$	27
$\psi^{\{IJ\}}$	$3(\cdot)$	$\square\square$	-2	-8	$3(\cdot)$	27
ψ^{55}	(\cdot)	(\cdot)	-4	12	(\cdot)	27
$\chi_{[ij]}^9$	(\cdot)	(\cdot)	-4	-2	(\cdot)	-27
$\chi_{[IJ]}^9$	(\cdot)	(\cdot)	2	8	(\cdot)	-27
$\chi_{[ij]}^c$	$8(\cdot)$	$8(\cdot)$	-4	-2	\square	-9/2
χ_{iJ}^c	$16\square$	$16\square$	-1	3	$4\square$	-9/2
$\chi_{[IJ]}^c$	$8(\cdot)$	$8(\cdot)$	2	8	\square	-9/2
χ_{i5}^c	$8\square$	$16(\cdot)$	0	-7	$2\square$	-9/2
χ_{I5}^c	$16(\cdot)$	$8\square$	3	-2	$2\square$	-9/2

Table 7: Representations and charges of the matter fermions in the IR theory with respect to the continuous gauge and flavor symmetries unbroken by the condensate. The color indices run as $i, j = 1, 2$, $I, J = 3, 4$. The multiplicities are also indicated. The fields $\psi^{iJ}-\chi_{iJ}^9$, $\psi^{i5}-\chi_{i5}^9$ and $\psi^{I5}-\chi_{I5}^9$ form massive Dirac pairs and decoupled.

5 Conclusion

In this note we revisited the idea of Natural Anomaly Matching, which was encountered earlier in the study of chiral gauge theories, and which indicated that the certain dynamical assumption

being considered (e.g., Higgs mechanism caused by color-flavor-locked bifermion condensates) was a consistent one. Here we have streamlined the logics underlining it (Sec. 2), and reviewed a few simple known examples, correcting some earlier statements, and discussed a few new applications (Sec. 3, Sec. 4). Natural Anomaly Matching works when the strong gauge interactions cause certain bifermion condensate to form, which yields dynamical Higgs phase with color-flavor locking, or brings the system into low-energy infrared-free effective gauge theories.

One of the inputs from the recent development involving the generalized (e.g., 1-form) symmetries and the idea of mixed anomalies, is the following. In many chiral gauge theories studied, these mixed anomalies indicate some sort of dynamical color gauge symmetry breaking. The hypothesis of confining vacua with no flavor symmetry breaking and saturation of the anomalies with composite gauge-invariant fermions in the IR, is found to be inconsistent [33]-[38].

Even though in general there is no way to predict exactly which bifermion condensate forms, often it is possible to make an educated guess, with the help of MAC (the maximally attractive channel) criterion [2], or by relying on the strong-anomaly argument [42]. The fact that once such a choice among few possibilities is made the anomaly-matching constraints (the proper realization of the symmetries in the infrared) are fully guaranteed, including the new, generalized mixed anomalies and global anomalies, shows that Natural Anomaly Matching is a rather powerful idea, in spite of its simple appearance.

Acknowledgments

The present work is supported by the INFN special initiative project GAST (Gauge and String Theories). We thank Jarah Evslin for useful discussions.

References

- [1] G. 't Hooft, "Naturalness, chiral symmetry, and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking", NATO Sci. Ser. B **59**, 135-157 (1980) doi:10.1007/978-1-4684-7571-5_9 [INSPIRE].
- [2] S. Raby, S. Dimopoulos and L. Susskind, "Tumbling Gauge Theories", Nucl. Phys. B **169**, 373-383 (1980) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(80)90093-0 [INSPIRE].
- [3] S. Dimopoulos, S. Raby and L. Susskind, "Light Composite Fermion", Nucl. Phys. B **173**, 208 (1980) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(80)90215-1 [INSPIRE].
- [4] I. Bars and S. Yankielowicz, "Composite quarks and leptons as solutions of anomaly constraints", Phys. Lett. B **101**, 159-165 (1981) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(81)90664-X [INSPIRE].
- [5] C. Q. Geng and R. E. Marshak, "Two Realistic Preon Models With $SU(N)$ Metacolor Satisfying Complementarity", Phys. Rev. D **35**, 2278 (1987) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.35.2278 [INSPIRE].
- [6] T. Appelquist, A. G. Cohen, M. Schmaltz and R. Shrock, "New constraints on chiral gauge theories", Phys. Lett. B **459**, 235 (1999) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(99)00616-4 [arXiv:hep-th/9904172 [hep-th]].
- [7] T. Appelquist, Z. y. Duan and F. Sannino, "Phases of chiral gauge theories", Phys. Rev. D **61**, 125009 (2000) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.61.125009 [arXiv:hep-ph/0001043 [hep-ph]].

- [8] Y.-L. Shi and R. Shrock, “ $A_k\bar{F}$ chiral gauge theories”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **92**, no. 10, p. 105032 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.105032 [[arXiv:1510.07663](#) [hep-th]].
- [9] Y.-L. Shi and R. Shrock, “Renormalization-Group Evolution and Nonperturbative Behavior of Chiral Gauge Theories with Fermions in Higher-Dimensional Representations”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **92**, no. 12, p. 125009 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.125009 [[arXiv:1509.08501](#) [hep-th]].
- [10] E. Poppitz and Y. Shang, “Chiral Lattice Gauge Theories Via Mirror-Fermion Decoupling: A Mission (im)Possible?”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **25**, 2761 (2010) doi:10.1142/S0217751X10049852 [[arXiv:1003.5896](#) [hep-lat]].
- [11] E. Eichten, R. D. Peccei, J. Preskill, and D. Zeppenfeld, “Chiral Gauge Theories in the $1/n$ Expansion”, *Nucl. Phys. B*, **268**, p161, (1986) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(86)90206-3 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [12] J. Goity, R. D. Peccei, and D. Zeppenfeld, “Tumbling and Complementarity in a Chiral Gauge Theory”, *Nucl. Phys. B*, **262**, 95, (1985) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(85)90065-3 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [13] L. E. Ibanez and G. G. Ross, “Discrete gauge symmetry anomalies”, *Phys. Lett. B*, **260**, pp. 291–295, (1991) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(91)91614-2 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [14] M. Shifman and M. Unsal, “On Yang-Mills Theories with Chiral Matter at Strong Coupling”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **79**, p. 105010, (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.105010 [[arXiv:0808.2485](#) [hep-th]].
- [15] S. Bolognesi, K. Konishi, and M. Shifman, “Patterns of symmetry breaking in chiral QCD”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **97**, no. 9, p. 094007, (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.094007 [[arXiv:1712.04814](#) [hep-th]].
- [16] S. Bolognesi and K. Konishi, “Dynamics and symmetries in chiral $SU(N)$ gauge theories”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **100**, no. 11, p. 114008, (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.114008 [[arXiv:1906.01485](#) [hep-th]].
- [17] A. Kapustin and N. Seiberg, “Coupling a QFT to a TQFT and Duality”, *JHEP* **04**, 001 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2014)001 [[arXiv:1401.0740](#) [hep-th]].
- [18] D. Gaiotto, A. Kapustin, N. Seiberg and B. Willett, “Generalized Global Symmetries”, *JHEP* **1502**, 172 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2015)172 [[arXiv:1412.5148](#) [hep-th]].
- [19] D. Gaiotto, A. Kapustin, Z. Komargodski and N. Seiberg, “Theta, Time Reversal, and Temperature”, *JHEP* **1705**, 091 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2017)091 [[arXiv:1703.00501](#) [hep-th]].
- [20] H. Shimizu and K. Yonekura, “Anomaly constraints on deconfinement and chiral phase transition”, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no. 10, 105011 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.105011 [[arXiv:1706.06104](#) [hep-th]].
- [21] Y. Tanizaki, Y. Kikuchi, T. Misumi and N. Sakai, “Anomaly matching for the phase diagram of massless \mathbb{Z}_N -QCD”, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no. 5, 054012 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.054012 [[arXiv:1711.10487](#) [hep-th]].
- [22] M. M. Anber and E. Poppitz, “Two-flavor adjoint QCD”, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no. 3, 034026 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.034026 [[arXiv:1805.12290](#) [hep-th]].

- [23] M. M. Anber and E. Poppitz, “Anomaly matching, (axial) Schwinger models, and high-T super Yang-Mills domain walls”, *JHEP* **1809**, 076 (2018) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2018)076 [[arXiv:1807.00093 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [24] Y. Tanizaki, “Anomaly constraint on massless QCD and the role of Skyrmions in chiral symmetry breaking”, *JHEP* **1808**, 171 (2018) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2018)171 [[arXiv:1807.07666 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [25] S. Yamaguchi, “’t Hooft anomaly matching condition and chiral symmetry breaking without bilinear condensate”, *JHEP* **1901**, 014 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2019)014 [[arXiv:1811.09390 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [26] A. Karasik and Z. Komargodski, “The Bi-Fundamental Gauge Theory in 3+1 Dimensions: The Vacuum Structure and a Cascade”, *JHEP* **1905**, 144 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2019)144 [[arXiv:1904.09551 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [27] C. Córdova and K. Ohmori, “Anomaly Constraints on Gapped Phases with Discrete Chiral Symmetry”, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.2, 025011 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.025011 [[arXiv:1912.13069 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [28] C. Córdova and K. Ohmori, “Anomaly Obstructions to Symmetry Preserving Gapped Phases”, [[arXiv:1910.04962 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [29] M. M. Anber and E. Poppitz, “Domain walls in high-T $SU(N)$ super Yang-Mills theory and QCD(adj)”, *JHEP* **1905**, 151 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2019)151 [[arXiv:1811.10642 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [30] Z. Komargodski, A. Sharon, R. Thorngren and X. Zhou, “Comments on Abelian Higgs Models and Persistent Order”, *SciPost Phys.* **6** (2019) no.1, 003 doi:10.21468/SciPostPhys.6.1.003 [[arXiv:1705.04786 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [31] Z. Wan and J. Wang, “Adjoint QCD₄, Deconfined Critical Phenomena, Symmetry-Enriched Topological Quantum Field Theory, and Higher Symmetry-Extension”, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, no. 6, 065013 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.065013 [[arXiv:1812.11955 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [32] S. Bolognesi, K. Konishi, and A. Luzio, “Gauging 1-form center symmetries in simple $SU(N)$ gauge theories”, *JHEP*, **01**, p. 048, (2020) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2020)048 [[arXiv:1909.06598 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [33] S. Bolognesi, K. Konishi, and A. Luzio, “Dynamics from symmetries in chiral $SU(N)$ gauge theories”, *JHEP*, **09**, p. 001, (2020) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2020)001 [[arXiv:2004.06639 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [34] S. Bolognesi, K. Konishi, and A. Luzio, “Probing the dynamics of chiral $SU(N)$ gauge theories via generalized anomalies”, *Phys. Rev. D*, **103**, no. 9, p. 094016, (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.094016 [[arXiv:2101.02601 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [35] S. Bolognesi, K. Konishi, and A. Luzio, “Anomalies and phases of strongly-coupled chiral gauge theories: recent developments”, *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, **37**, pp. 36, 2230014, (2022) doi:10.1142/S0217751X22300149 [[arXiv:2110.02104 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [36] S. Bolognesi, K. Konishi, and A. Luzio, “Dynamical Abelianization and anomalies in chiral gauge theories”, *JHEP*, **12**, p. 110, (2022) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2022)110 [[arXiv:2206.00538 \[hep-th\]](#)].

- [37] S. Bolognesi, K. Konishi and A. Luzio, “The \mathbb{Z}_2 anomaly in some chiral gauge theories”, JHEP **08**, 125 (2023) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2023)125 [[arXiv:2307.03822 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [38] S. Bolognesi, K. Konishi and A. Luzio, “Dynamics of strongly-coupled chiral gauge theories”, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **2531**, no.1, 012006 (2023) doi:10.1088/1742-6596/2531/1/012006 [[arXiv:2304.03357 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [39] K. Konishi, S. Bolognesi and A. Luzio, “Anomalies and Dynamics in Strongly-Coupled Gauge Theories, New Criteria for Different Phases, and a Lesson from Supersymmetric Gauge Theories”, [[arXiv:2403.15775 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [40] M. M. Anber, S. Hong and M. Son, “New anomalies, TQFTs, and confinement in bosonic chiral gauge theories”, JHEP **02**, 062 (2022) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2022)062 [[arXiv:2109.03245 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [41] M. M. Anber and S. Y. L. Chan, “2-index chiral gauge theories”, JHEP **10**, 025 (2023) doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2023)025 [[arXiv:2308.08052 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [42] S. Bolognesi, K. Konishi, and A. Luzio, “Strong anomaly and phases of chiral gauge theories”, JHEP, **08**, p. 028, (2021) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2021)028 [[arXiv:2105.03921 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [43] C. H. Sheu and M. Shifman, “Consistency of chiral symmetry breaking in chiral Yang-Mills theory with adiabatic continuity”, Phys. Rev. D **107**, no.5, 054030 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.107.054030 [[arXiv:2212.14794 \[hep-th\]](#)].
- [44] S. Bolognesi, K. Konishi, A. Luzio and M. Orso, in preparation.
- [45] S. Elitzur, “Impossibility of Spontaneously Breaking Local Symmetries”, Phys. Rev. D. **12** (12): 3978, (1975) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.12.3978 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [46] M. G. Alford, K. Rajagopal and F. Wilczek, “Color flavor locking and chiral symmetry breaking in high density QCD”, Nucl. Phys. B **537**, 443-458 (1999) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(98)00668-3 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9804403 \[hep-ph\]](#)].