

# Lie, Noether, Kosmann, and Diffeomorphism Anomalies Redux

Taeyeon Kim<sup>†</sup> and Piljin Yi<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Seoul National University,  
1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 08826, Korea*

<sup>‡</sup>*School of Physics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study,  
85 Hoegi-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 02455, Korea*

## Abstract

The Noether procedure carries an inherent ambiguity due to the necessary local extension, no longer a symmetry, of the global symmetry. The gauging should fix the ambiguity once and for all, however, and, for translations, the general covariance demands us to use the Lie derivative. We argue that, with this alone and without any further tweaking, the Noether energy-momentum  $\hat{T}$  must equal the symmetric counterpart,  $T$ , inevitably and show the equality explicitly for general tensors. For spinors, a subtlety with the Lie derivative itself enters the issue and leads us to the Kosmann lift, often unnoticed by the physics community, from which  $T = \hat{T}$  again emerges straightforwardly and in a naturally symmetric form. Finally, we address how the same Kosmann lift affects the anomaly computations and show that the diffeomorphism anomaly from the seminal paper *must be halved* while the venerable anomaly polynomials themselves stand unaffected. We discuss the ramifications of these findings.

# 1 Introduction

In this note, we come back to the age-old matter of the energy-momentum tensor, the conservation law thereof, and the (anomalous) Ward identity for the diffeomorphism, with fresh looks at what should be introductory quantum field theory material.<sup>1</sup> Our rationale for doing this is two-fold.

One is a long-standing confusion, resolved repeatedly via various different approaches in the past, over the Noether [2] energy-momentum and on-and-off appearance of the “improvement” terms [3, 4]. We will offer a simple and clarifying view on the matter, merely based on the general covariance, which offers a sensible and universal view on the nature of the Noether procedure itself. The key is how the Lie derivative must be employed for the variation, and then how the Lie derivative should act on spinors.

The other is the matter of the energy-momentum tensor of spinors and the Ward identity thereof. As the role of Lie derivative is emphasized, an obvious question to ask is how the diffeomorphism acts on spinors. We will invoke the so-called Kosmann lift [5–8] and make an inevitable generalization for spinors coupled to gauge fields, and then revisit the problem of general covariance and the energy-momentum tensors for a very general theory of fermions. All these force us to revisit the diffeomorphism anomaly and allow us to discover a subtle factor  $1/2$ , to be delineated later.

Although the Noether procedure effectively produces the conserved current related to a global and internal symmetry, the standard references leave much to be desired when it comes to the energy-momentum tensor, with various different approaches in existence. The simplest way to bypass such is often via the gauging of the symmetry in question, whereby the conserved current arises much more simply from the variation of the gauge field or of the metric. It is in fact the latter version of the currents whose conservation law elevates to the Ward identity most straightforwardly. This view is in part responsible for why, even though the classical conservation laws require the equation of motion, the Ward identity need not assume any such.

For the purpose of this note, we will distinguish the latter type of conserved current with the notation  $J$  and  $T$ , respectively to be called the gauge current and the symmetric energy-momentum tensor, to be formally distinguished from their

---

<sup>1</sup>References for these are too numerous and diverse to list, in this note we will confine ourselves to the most immediate ones for our purpose. The standard text we start with is the textbook by Weinberg [1].

Noether counterpart  $\mathbb{J}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ . For fear of potential confusion, we will also introduce the notations  $\mathbb{J} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{J}}$  and  $\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{T}}$  as the respective covariantized versions. At the end of the most naive version of the Noether procedure, an “improvement” of  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  toward  $T$  is then often invoked, although by tweaking the Noether procedure, for instance in the case of Yang-Mills field, to conform with the internal gauge symmetries,  $T = \hat{\mathbb{T}}$  can be also achieved.

In the first one-third of this note, we will dissect this general set-up with the gauging of the symmetry in question, dynamical or external, and offer a simple governing principle that would give  $\hat{\mathbb{J}} = J$  and  $\hat{\mathbb{T}} = T$ , with no extra effort. For  $T = \hat{\mathbb{T}}$ , in particular, the central ingredient is how we must use the Lie derivative for the Noether variation of matter fields,

$$\delta_\xi \Phi = \mathcal{L}_\xi \Phi , \tag{1.1}$$

for any field  $\Phi$ . Although this looks like such a natural thing to do, to begin with, we find few treatises of Noether energy-momentum under this rule, strangely enough. We need to emphasize that, although we often encounter the Lie derivative in the context of General Relativity, the operation has nothing to do with the spacetime curvatures. For instance, the simple translational isometries of the Minkowski spacetime must be written via a Lie derivative, for general tensors, if we employ a coordinate system other than the Cartesian one.

With this choice, the crucial, if somewhat trivial, observation is that the Lagrangian  $d$ -form density  $\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}$ , with the volume form  $\mathcal{V}$ , transforms as

$$\delta_\xi(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) = d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) . \tag{1.2}$$

The crux of the matter for us resides in the vanishing rest, which should be subsequently split into two mutually canceling parts, one proportional to  $T$  and the other to  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$ . From this observation, the equality of these two therefore comes about almost trivially and without resorting to the equation of motion or any other tweaking, as we will show repeatedly. Things get a little more involved when the kinetic term of the matter field involves the presence of the Levi-Civita connection explicitly, as with some higher-spin (bosonic) fields, but we show that the general idea continues to hold.

All these thoughts then force us to ask the question of how the Lie derivative

should act on fermions. Spinors can be really defined properly only after we turn to the orthonormal frames since the underlying Clifford algebra makes sense with the local Lorentz indices. The Riemannian geometry may be reformulated with the vielbein  $e^a{}_\mu$  and the spin connection  $w_\mu{}^a{}_b$ , which brings us to the Kosmann lift of the Lie derivative and its action on the local Lorentz frame and on spinors. In the middle one-third of this note, we will spend much time on the related matter and then repeat the exercise that shows  $T = \hat{\mathbb{T}}$  for spinors and offers the universal formulae for  $T$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  separately.

The Kosmann lift refers to how the Lie derivative with its natural action on tensors must be elevated to the frame bundle and to the spinor bundle. A key fact relevant for the definition and computation of the symmetric energy-momentum  $T$  is that the Lie derivative of the vielbein under a vector field  $\xi$  takes the following form

$$\delta_\xi e^a{}_\mu = \mathcal{L}_\xi e^a{}_\mu = D^{(a}\xi^{b)}e_{b\mu} . \quad (1.3)$$

On the other hand, for Noether energy-momentum  $\mathbb{T}$ , the Kosmann lift on spinors works as

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi \Psi = \xi^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi - \frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_K^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \Psi , \quad (1.4)$$

for some antisymmetric rank-2 object  $\hat{\xi}_K^{ab}$  computed from  $\xi^\mu$  and the spin connection. The same operation may also be written in a more manifestly covariant form,

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi \Psi = \xi^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu \Psi - \frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \Psi , \quad (1.5)$$

with  $\hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \equiv -D^{[a}\xi^{b]}$ , from which  $\hat{\xi}_K^{ab}$  can be read off.<sup>2</sup>

If we wish to have a globally well-defined Lie derivative, over the frame bundle and the spinor bundle, this Kosmann lift is unavoidable although, for some reason, this fact is not widely appreciated by the physics community. The alternative, which we call the vanilla Lie derivative  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi$  acts on  $e^a{}_\mu$  as if these are  $d$ -many 1-forms that are mutually unrelated, so does not treat the local Lorentz indices properly. This casual attitude extends to the spinor indices, so that,

$$\mathfrak{L}_\xi \Psi = \xi^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi . \quad (1.6)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Here we are assuming that  $\Psi$  is not coupled to other gauge fields, but later this shall be generalized to a fully covariant form with gauge fields.

In physics literature,  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi$  appears to be by far more prevalent, yet, one can already see that turning off the Kosmann lift,  $\hat{\xi}_K = 0$ , cannot be achieved covariantly, as it equates a tensor,  $\hat{\xi}_V^{ab}$ , to a connection contracted with a vector,  $\xi^\mu w_\mu^{ab}$ .

Provided that we employ the Kosmann-lifted Lie derivative,  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$ , we again find the identity  $T = \hat{\mathbb{T}}$  naturally emerging from the most general covariant Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}(\Psi, \mathcal{D}\Psi, \dots)$ , up to one-derivative on spinors but otherwise unrestricted. Surprisingly, the form of the energy-momentum tensor is even more robust than the Lagrangian in that the addition of total derivative terms to  $\mathcal{L}$  is automatically screened out by the procedure we offer. As with the bosonic cases, we neither rely on the equation of motion nor invoke any sort of “improvement” for establishing the stated identity.

Finally, this brings us to the important question of how the Kosmann lift would figure into the computation of the diffeomorphism anomalies. For this, we retrace the classic computation by Alvarez-Gaume and Witten [9], which turns out to have computed anomalies of neither  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$  nor  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi$  even though they seemingly started out with  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi = \xi^\mu \partial_\mu$  as the generator on spinors. Nevertheless, starting with  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$  as the diffeomorphism generator instead, we arrive at the same old anomaly polynomials and a modified extraction rule for the covariant anomalies.

We find that the only difference in the end due to the more sensible  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$  is a matter of the simple factor 1/2 multiplying the covariant diffeomorphism anomaly of the original computation. The same factor 1/2 proves to be necessary to put the consistent diffeomorphism anomaly on an equal footing with the more familiar gauge counterpart, as we perform the anomaly descent. We believe this very necessary numerical factor has been in effect employed on the consistent side, without being properly recognized, for decades.

In a sense, the Kosmann lift completes this venerable computation, teaching us that the diffeomorphism generator employed back then should be more sensibly interpreted as the first of two covariant pieces in (1.5) that constitutes  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$ . More importantly, our treatment puts the derivation of the anomaly polynomials on solid ground and restores the correct relationship between covariant anomaly and the commonly-quoted consistent anomaly, which strangely enough was lacking in the existing literature.

N.B. The seed for this manuscript was developed for a graduate text [10] in prepa-

ration by the senior author. We borrowed some relevant contents from this volume and condensed in Sections 2 and 4, and in turn, the contents of Sections 5 and 6 here are to be imported to the said text.

## 2 Noether Procedure Revisited

### 2.1 Noether Current and Gauge Current

Let us warm up by recalling the Noether procedure for internal rotational symmetries. The point of repeating this basic fact of life for any student of quantum field theories will become apparent at the very end of the section, which will be taken up to fix, once and for all, the more confusing story of the Noether energy-momentum in the next section.

Consider the action

$$S(\phi) = \int d^d x \mathcal{L}(\phi, \partial_\mu \phi) \quad (2.1)$$

that admits a global symmetry, i.e., an infinitesimal and position-independent shift of  $\phi$

$$\epsilon \delta_\theta \phi \equiv \delta_{\epsilon \theta} \phi = i \epsilon \theta \phi, \quad (2.2)$$

with  $\theta = \sum_C \theta^C t^C$  with Hermitian  $t^C$ 's that leaves the action invariant.

We then elevate  $\theta$  to a position-dependent one and vary the action,  $\delta_\theta \phi$ , i.e., expanding the action in linear order in  $\epsilon \delta_\theta$  then divide by  $\epsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^d x \delta_\theta \mathcal{L}(\phi, \partial_\mu \phi) &= \int \sum_\phi \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \phi} \delta_\theta \phi + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} \partial_\mu (\delta_\theta \phi) \right) \\ &= \int \sum_\phi \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \phi} - \partial_\mu \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} \right) \delta_\theta \phi - \int \partial_\mu \mathbb{J}_\theta^\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

with

$$\mathbb{J}_\theta^\mu \equiv - \sum_\phi \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} \delta_\theta \phi. \quad (2.4)$$

Turning off the position-dependence at the end and using the equation of motion we arrive at

$$\partial_\mu \mathbb{J}_\theta^\mu = 0 , \quad (2.5)$$

which is the celebrated Noether's conservation law.

## Gauge Currents

Gauging such a symmetry means introducing a gauge connection  $A = \sum_C A^C t^C$ ,

$$\partial_\mu \phi \rightarrow D_\mu \phi \equiv (\partial_\mu - \mathfrak{i}A_\mu)\phi , \quad (2.6)$$

whereby the action

$$S(\phi, A) = \int d^d x \mathcal{L}(\phi, D_\mu \phi) \quad (2.7)$$

is invariant under spacetime dependent  $\theta$ ,

$$S(\phi, A) = S(\phi + \epsilon \delta_\theta \phi, A + \epsilon \delta_\theta A) , \quad (2.8)$$

with

$$\delta_\theta \phi = \mathfrak{i}\theta \phi , \quad \delta_\theta A = d_A \theta = d\theta - \mathfrak{i}[A, \theta] . \quad (2.9)$$

This leads us to an alternate definition of the current,<sup>3</sup>

$$J_C^\mu \equiv \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta A_\mu^C} , \quad (2.11)$$

which is now conserved in the covariant sense,

$$0 = D_\mu J^\mu = \partial_\mu J^\mu - \mathfrak{i}(A_\mu J^\mu - J^\mu A_\mu) , \quad (2.12)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>We introduced the partial variation of the local functional,

$$\frac{\delta L(f, \partial f, \dots)}{\delta f} \delta f = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{L(f + \epsilon \delta f, \partial f + \epsilon \delta(\partial f), \dots) - L(f, \partial f, \dots)}{\epsilon} , \quad (2.10)$$

to be used inside the integration over  $x$ , for which we will take care not to integrate by parts freely.

with  $J^\mu \equiv \sum_C J_C^\mu t^C$ . Note that, for a minimally coupled scalar field,

$$\sum_C \theta^C J_C^\mu = \sum_C \sum_\phi \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (D_\mu \phi)} \frac{\theta^C \partial (D_\mu \phi)}{\partial A_\mu^C} = - \sum_\phi \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}(\phi, D_\mu \phi)}{\partial (D_\mu \phi)} \delta_\theta \phi = \hat{\mathbb{J}}_\theta^\mu . \quad (2.13)$$

The right hand side is nothing but the covariantized version of the Noether current. This of course reflects in part how we started the gauging process by introducing a gauge field  $A_\mu$  and contracting it against  $\mathbb{J}^\mu$ .

All of the above elevate to curved spacetime almost verbatim, with the covariantized action,

$$S(\phi) = \int d^d x \sqrt{g} \mathcal{L}(\phi, (\nabla_\mu - \mathfrak{i}A_\mu)\phi) = \int \mathcal{V} \mathcal{L}(\phi, (\nabla_\mu - \mathfrak{i}A_\mu)\phi) , \quad (2.14)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the volume form. This covariantizes  $\partial$  to  $\nabla$ , if  $\phi$  is a more general tensor field. As long as  $\delta_\theta$  does not transform the metric, nothing else changes. If one chooses to treat  $\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}$  itself as the  $d$ -form Lagrangian density, the conservation law would translate to

$$0 = d_A(J \lrcorner \mathcal{V}) , \quad (2.15)$$

where  $d_A$  is the covariantized exterior derivative. Since this  $(d-1)$ -form current naturally emerges when we start with  $\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}$ , we will use the same notation  $J$  in place of  $J \lrcorner \mathcal{V}$  as well

$$0 = d_A J , \quad (2.16)$$

from now on. The context should make the distinction unambiguous.

## How the Noether Current Equals the Gauge Current

An instructive lesson can be learned by asking if and how an automatic agreement between  $\hat{\mathbb{J}}$  and  $J$  occurs, once we gauge the action, forgetting for the moment that the gauging itself started with  $\mathbb{J}$ . When we derive the Noether current  $\mathbb{J}$  of internal symmetries, we start out with a position-dependent  $\theta$  even though such  $\theta$  transformation does not preserve the action. Instead, one says that this is a mere trick, as we will take constant  $\theta$  at the end of the day. Nevertheless, this is a little odd thing



to do when there is a perfectly sensible gauged extension of the action that would be invariant under such position-dependent  $\theta$ . Is there a better way to understand the Noether procedure from the gauged version of the theory?

For this, we start from the gauged Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}(\phi, A)$  such that

$$\delta_\theta \mathcal{L}(\phi, A) = 0 , \quad (2.17)$$

identically for position-dependent  $\theta$ , where neither the equation of motion nor an integration by parts is invoked. Then we shall split this vanishing net variation into two mutually canceling parts. One is from the transformation of  $\phi$ ,

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}(\phi, A)}{\delta \phi} \delta_\theta \phi = - \left( D_\mu \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (D_\mu \phi)} \right) \delta_\theta \phi - \partial_\mu \hat{\mathbb{J}}_\theta^\mu , \quad (2.18)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbb{J}}_\theta$  is the covariantized version of the Noether conservation law. The other, from  $\delta_\theta A$ , results in

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}(\phi, A)}{\delta A} \delta_\theta A &= \text{tr}(\delta_\theta A_\mu J^\mu) \\ &= -\text{tr}(\theta (d_A J)) + d(\text{tr}(\theta J)) , \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

also to the linear order.

The two combine to complete  $\delta_\theta$  of the action and must cancel out identically,

$$0 = \delta_\theta \mathcal{L}(\phi, A) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}(\phi, A)}{\delta \phi} \delta_\theta \phi + \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}(\phi, A)}{\delta A} \delta_\theta A , \quad (2.20)$$

even when  $\theta$  is position-dependent, since this is precisely what we mean by gauging an internal symmetry. For a scalar field minimally coupled to  $A$ , it is not difficult to see by direct computations that the respective bulk terms in (2.18) and in (2.19) cancel each other precisely.

As such, since position-dependent  $\theta$  truly preserves the gauged action, the two remaining total derivatives must also cancel each other. This enforces  $\text{tr}(\theta J^\mu) = \hat{\mathbb{J}}_\theta^\mu$  prior to taking the divergences, for entirely arbitrary  $\theta$ , implying  $J = \hat{\mathbb{J}}$  where  $\text{tr}(\theta \hat{\mathbb{J}}^\mu) \equiv \hat{\mathbb{J}}_\theta$ . It is important to emphasize how we neither invoked the equation of motion nor threw away a total derivative term for this comparison. The classical conservation law requires the equation of motion for either current, but the equality

of the two currents does not require one. The equality proves to be an identity.

## 2.2 Energy-Momentum

The last observation on the identity between the Noether current and the gauge current,  $\hat{\mathbb{J}} = J$ , is not something reflected in the typical text between the Noether energy-momentum  $\mathbb{T}$  and the symmetric energy-momentum  $T$  from the metric variation. Rather one often talks about how  $\mathbb{T}$  for the spacetime translation, should be “improved” toward  $T$ . Here, we illustrate how such a perceived disparity may be rectified by a simple generalization of our observation in the previous section.

Let us consider a matter action coupled to a curved spacetime by appropriately elevating the derivatives to the covariant ones,

$$\int \mathcal{V} \mathcal{L}(\cdots; g), \quad (2.21)$$

with the volume form  $\mathcal{V}$ . With such a minimal coupling to the general metric, we immediately find the energy-momentum tensor, defined from the variation of the inverse metric,

$$T_{\mu\nu} \equiv -\frac{2}{\sqrt{g}} \frac{\delta}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \int \mathcal{V} \mathcal{L}, \quad (2.22)$$

similar to the gauge current Eq. (2.11). This is clearly analogous to the gauge currents  $J$  of internal symmetries.

In the simplest example of a real scalar

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\phi, \nabla_\mu \phi; g) &= -\frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi - V(\phi) \\ \Rightarrow T_{\mu\nu} &= \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} (\nabla\phi)^2 - g_{\mu\nu} V(\phi), \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

while for Maxwell theory we find

$$\mathcal{L}(F; g) = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} \quad \Rightarrow \quad T_{\mu\nu} = F_{\mu\lambda} F_\nu{}^\lambda - \frac{1}{4} g_{\mu\nu} F^2, \quad (2.24)$$

which are all conserved, upon the equation of motion. How do they stack up against the Noether energy-momentum?

## Noether Energy-Momentum, or Not

In the flat spacetime, the time translation and the spatial translations are isometries, so the Noether procedure should generate  $d$ -many conserved currents, or collectively a tensor with two spacetime indices. We will denote the resulting Noether energy-momentum tensor as  $\mathbb{T}^\mu{}_\alpha$ . For a scalar field  $\phi$  and how  $\mathcal{L}(\phi, \partial_\mu\phi)$  is nominally affected by  $\phi(x) \rightarrow \phi(x + \epsilon\xi)$ , divided by the infinitesimal  $\epsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_\xi \mathcal{L} &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \phi} \xi^\alpha \partial_\alpha \phi + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} \partial_\mu (\xi^\alpha \partial_\alpha \phi) \\
&= \xi^\alpha \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \phi} \partial_\alpha \phi + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} (\partial_\mu \partial_\alpha \phi) \right) + (\partial_\mu \xi^\alpha) \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} \partial_\alpha \phi \\
&= \xi^\alpha \partial_\alpha \mathcal{L} + (\partial_\mu \xi^\alpha) \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} \partial_\alpha \phi .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

Since the equation of motion extremizes the action for an arbitrary variation subject to a boundary condition, this variation should also vanish on shell.

Integrating the second piece by parts, we find

$$0 = \int d^d x \delta_\xi \mathcal{L} \quad \rightarrow \quad 0 = \int d^d x \xi^\alpha \partial_\mu \left( -\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} \partial_\alpha \phi + \delta^\mu{}_\alpha \mathcal{L} \right) , \tag{2.26}$$

leading us to the Noether energy-momentum,

$$\mathbb{T}^\mu{}_\alpha \equiv -\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\partial_\mu \phi)} \partial_\alpha \phi + \delta^\mu{}_\alpha \mathcal{L} , \tag{2.27}$$

with its conservation law,

$$\partial_\mu \mathbb{T}^\mu{}_\alpha = 0 . \tag{2.28}$$

For scalars, it is easy to see that covariantized version  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}_{\mu\nu}$  of  $\mathbb{T}_{\mu\nu}$ , obtained from replacing  $\partial$  by  $\nabla$  and judicious insertions of the metric, is precisely equal to  $T_{\mu\nu}$ .

When it comes to the energy-momentum, there are more than one Noether procedure known. The one here, borrowed from the venerable text by S. Weinberg, deviates from that of the internal symmetries earlier. For instance, we dropped a total derivative term here while for the internal symmetries the conservation law itself came about from a total derivative term. In particular, note how we chose not to

transform the integration measure  $d^d x$ , contrary to some early texts on the matter. Nevertheless, we arrive at the same conventional expression for the energy-momentum tensor of a scalar field. In fact, there is a very important reasoning behind this choice as we will turn to later.

How should this generalize to fields with spin content? For the Maxwell field with

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} , \quad (2.29)$$

a blind implementation of the above, say,  $A_\mu(x) \rightarrow A_\mu(x + \epsilon\xi)$  would give the Noether energy-momentum tensor of the form

$$F^{\mu\lambda}\partial_\alpha A_\lambda - \frac{1}{4}\delta^\mu_\alpha F^2 , \quad (2.30)$$

which famously differs from the flat limit of  $T^\mu_\alpha$  and, worse, is not even gauge-invariant.

There are various remedies that remove this discrepancy, such as adding “improvement” [3, 4] term  $-\partial_\lambda(F^{\mu\lambda}A_\alpha)$  which is automatically divergence-free. Another well-known approach for correcting this oddity is to demand the ordinary gauge invariance along the middle steps, but this solution would be tailor-made for gauge theories. The real problem is how the blind Noether procedure that brought us to (2.30) is not natural, to begin with, given how it ignores the spin content of  $A_\mu$ . This simple fact gives us a different, completely universal solution to this general quandary.

### 2.3 $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$ Must Always Equal $T$

As we hinted at the end of the gauge current discussion in the previous section, much of such ambiguity about the vanilla Noether procedure originates from how we seemingly perform a position-dependent “symmetry” operation even though the latter does not preserve the action. This intermediate procedure is considered a trick in the usual Noether argument, instead, to be justified by removing the position-dependence in the end. However, since we would integrate by parts along the way, this leaves a logical possibility that the ambiguous middle step can lead to ambiguity of the form of the Noether current thus obtained.

On the other hand, after the proper gauging procedure, we have an unambiguous

form of  $\delta_\theta\phi$  that together with  $\delta_\theta A$  preserves the gauged action. This means that when we elevate the global symmetry by coupling to gauge fields, external or dynamical, the potential ambiguity of the Noether procedure is resolved. The same principle should apply to the general covariance, i.e., the translations elevated to much bigger coordinate redundancy by coupling to the metric. We find some details that differ from the above internal symmetry example, however.

For the symmetric energy-momentum tensor  $T$ , the role of  $\delta_\theta A$  is taken up by  $\delta_\xi g = \mathfrak{L}_\xi g$ , i.e., by the Lie derivative since, in curved spacetime, the “gauged” translation is nothing but the general coordinate transformation. The symmetric energy-momentum  $T$  follows from varying the metric inside the Lagrangian as

$$\frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}(\phi;g))}{\delta g^{\mu\alpha}}\delta_\xi g^{\mu\alpha} = \mathcal{V}(\nabla^\mu\xi^\alpha)T(\phi;g)_{\mu\alpha}, \quad (2.31)$$

whose integration by parts produces the divergence of  $T$  which in turn vanishes on shell because the Einstein tensor sitting on the other side of the  $g$ -equation of motion is divergence-free as a mathematical identity.

This means that the variation of matter fields is not ambiguous but should be performed also by the Lie derivative  $\mathfrak{L}$ , if the entire matter Lagrangian, now gauged, is to be inert under the position-dependent transformation. Revisiting the case of scalar fields, the other transformation gives, with  $\delta_\xi\phi = \xi^\mu\partial_\mu\phi = \xi^\mu\nabla_\mu\phi$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}(\phi;g)}{\delta\phi}\delta_\xi\phi &= \mathcal{V}\left(\xi^\alpha\nabla_\alpha\mathcal{L}(\phi;g) + (\nabla_\mu\xi^\alpha)\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}(\phi;g)}{\partial(\nabla_\mu\phi)}\nabla_\alpha\phi\right) \\ &= d(\xi\lrcorner\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}(\phi;g)) - \mathcal{V}(\nabla_\mu\xi^\alpha)\hat{\mathbb{T}}(\phi;g)^\mu{}_\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

with the covariantized  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  of the Noether energy-momentum  $\mathbb{T}$  we have computed in (2.27).

Unlike the internal symmetries, however, we have

$$\delta_\xi(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) = \mathfrak{L}_\xi(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) = d(\xi\lrcorner\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}), \quad (2.33)$$

instead of vanishing identically. Starting from this universal observation, we may split the left hand side into two parts, one from  $\delta_\xi g$  generating  $T$  while the other from  $\delta_\xi\phi$  generating a covariant version  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  of  $\mathbb{T}$ . This universal fact (2.33) then implies that

these two combined should produce

$$\frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}(\phi;g))}{\delta g^{\mu\alpha}}\delta_\xi g^{\mu\alpha} + \mathcal{V}\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}(\phi;g)}{\delta\phi}\delta_\xi\phi = d(\xi\lrcorner\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}(\phi,g)) , \quad (2.34)$$

which is possible only if

$$T(\phi;g)_{\mu\alpha} = \hat{\mathbb{T}}(\phi;g)_{\mu\alpha} . \quad (2.35)$$

This agreement for a scalar theory has been seen from explicit computations earlier, but the line of thought here suggests that the same should happen for any type of matter field as long as it is covariantly coupled to the metric.

As with the internal gauge symmetry example above, we have invoked neither an equation of motion nor an integration by parts in justifying the identity here, although for individual conservation laws one needs those. A hint for the above line of thoughts we followed to fix the Noether procedure once and for all is found in how, in (2.25) and (2.26), we did not transform the integration measure  $d^d x$  under  $\delta_\xi$ . The measure is a special case of the volume form  $\mathcal{V}$  which is in turn defined by  $g$ , once we gauge the action. As such, we must not transform it for the Noether side in general curved spacetimes, so the same should hold in the flat spacetime as well.

The key ingredient in the above reasoning is that we must use  $\delta_\xi \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_\xi$  for the position-dependent ‘‘translation’’ for the Noether procedure. For the Maxwell field, we therefore use

$$\delta_\xi F_{\alpha\beta} = \mathfrak{L}_\xi F_{\alpha\beta} = \xi^\mu \nabla_\mu F_{\alpha\beta} + (\nabla_\alpha \xi^\mu) F_{\mu\beta} + (\nabla_\beta \xi^\mu) F_{\alpha\mu} , \quad (2.36)$$

for the Noether side on properly covariantized action, with the help of  $d\mathfrak{L}_\xi = \mathfrak{L}_\xi d$ . The same would happen with Yang-Mills case as well. Starting with the usual Maxwell action  $\mathcal{L}(F;g) = -F^2/4$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}\frac{\delta\mathcal{L}}{\delta A}\delta_\xi A &= \mathcal{V}\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial F}\delta_\xi F \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}g^{\gamma\alpha}g^{\delta\beta}F_{\gamma\delta}((\nabla_\alpha\xi^\mu)F_{\mu\beta} + (\nabla_\beta\xi^\mu)F_{\alpha\mu} + \xi^\mu\nabla_\mu F_{\alpha\beta}) , \end{aligned} \quad (2.37)$$

where we performed the variation of  $F$  but kept  $g$  untouched. We can isolate the Noether current from this in two different manners.

The more conventional route is to integrate by parts the first two terms of (2.37) and throw away total derivative terms to obtain

$$\int \mathcal{V} \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta A} \delta_{\xi} A \rightarrow \int \sqrt{g} \xi^{\mu} \nabla^{\alpha} \left( F_{\alpha}^{\beta} F_{\mu\beta} - \frac{1}{4} g_{\alpha\mu} F^2 \right), \quad (2.38)$$

leading to the covariantized Noether energy-momentum of the form,

$$\hat{\mathbb{T}}_{\alpha\mu} \equiv F_{\alpha}^{\beta} F_{\mu\beta} - \frac{1}{4} g_{\alpha\mu} F^2. \quad (2.39)$$

We already see that the form of  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  equals the symmetric energy-momentum  $T$ .

Alternatively, we may rewrite the last term of (2.37), as if we are performing an integration by parts, instead to find

$$\mathcal{V} \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta A} \delta_{\xi} A = d(\xi_{\perp} \mathcal{V} \mathcal{L}) - \mathcal{V} (\nabla_{\mu} \xi^{\alpha}) \hat{\mathbb{T}}^{\mu}_{\alpha}, \quad (2.40)$$

which, combined with the universal fact (2.33), produces

$$\mathcal{V} \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta A} \delta_{\xi} A + \frac{\delta(\mathcal{V} \mathcal{L})}{\delta g^{\mu\alpha}} \delta_{\xi} g^{\mu\alpha} = d(\xi_{\perp} \mathcal{V} \mathcal{L}), \quad (2.41)$$

as advertised. Once the metric is introduced, how one performs  $\delta_{\xi}$  for fields on general manifolds should not be really a matter of choice, so the perceived ambiguity of  $\mathbb{T}$  for the Maxwell theory is pretty much an artefact of ill-conceived transformation rules. As with the gauge current example, the equality  $\hat{\mathbb{T}} = T$  does not require the equation of motion or dropping a total derivative, even though the classical conservation law would need such steps.

Even with the flat spacetime, in retrospect, the Lie derivative is unavoidable if we started with curvilinear coordinates. Except in the Cartesian coordinates, no one can claim that the shift  $\xi^{\mu}$  is constant, simply because curvilinear  $x^{\mu}$ 's behave in a very complicated manner even under the simple translational isometry. To carry out the right symmetry operation, the Lie derivative enters in an essential manner. An operation like  $A_{\mu}(x^{\alpha}) \rightarrow A_{\mu}(x^{\alpha} + \epsilon \xi^{\alpha})$  becomes nonsensical even in the Minkowski spacetime, when we regard  $A_{\mu}$  component-wise. How a position shift affects the fields should be independent of such coordinate choices and the only such operation available, curved or not, would lead to the Lie derivative.

### 3 Tensor Fields in General

The key idea behind  $\hat{\mathbb{T}} = T$  outlined in the previous section, i.e., how the variation of the metric and the variation of the matter fields must cancel each other neatly for a general covariant Lagrangian leaving behind a universal total derivative, is such a natural one. In particular, its execution for a common energy-momentum tensor for the Maxwell theory is not new [11]. The same general thought should be applicable to any matter field coupled to the metric covariantly, yielding  $\hat{\mathbb{T}} = T$ , yet the procedure for scalars and gauge fields shown in the previous section works verbatim when the matter Lagrangian does not involve the connection explicitly.

When the connection enters  $\mathcal{L}$ , i.e., when the covariant derivative rather than the partial derivative is needed in the matter action as well,  $T$  comes about only after a partial integration since the variation of the Levi-Civita connection would be written as covariant derivatives acting on the varied metric components. Only if something similar happens for  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  and only if the respective total derivatives cancel each other out identically, the idea outlined above would enforce  $\hat{\mathbb{T}} = T$  literally. Crucially, all of these should occur before we remove the derivative in  $\nabla^{(\mu}\xi^{\nu)}$  by an integration by parts.

Here we will show that this is indeed the case for Lagrangians that involve arbitrary tensor fields with up to one derivative on the matter fields. Although we dote on a tensor field of type  $\Phi_\beta^\gamma$  with one covariant index and one contravariant one, the analysis extends straightforwardly for tensors with more coordinate indices.

#### 3.1 Symmetric Energy-Momentum

We shall consider the covariantized action with at most one derivative on the field, i.e., in the form

$$\mathcal{L}(\Phi_\beta^\gamma, \nabla_\lambda \Phi_\beta^\gamma; g^{\mu\nu}, g_{\rho\sigma}) . \quad (3.1)$$

The symmetric energy-momentum follows from the variation of the matter action with respect to  $g^{\mu\nu}$ , i.e.,

$$\frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \delta g^{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{V} \left( -\frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{L} + \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \right) \delta g^{\mu\nu} , \quad (3.2)$$



and the second term includes pieces that come from the variation of the connection,

$$-\delta\Gamma^\gamma_{\lambda\beta} \left( \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla_\lambda\Phi_\beta^\sigma)}\Phi_\gamma^\sigma - \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla_\lambda\Phi_\sigma^\gamma)}\Phi_\sigma^\beta \right), \quad (3.3)$$

which will incur additional steps absent in the scalar and the gauge field cases.

For the latter types of terms, a tensor  $\mathcal{C}$

$$(\mathcal{C}^{\rho\mu\nu})_{\lambda\alpha\beta} \equiv \delta^\rho_\lambda\delta^\mu_\alpha\delta^\nu_\beta + \delta^\rho_\beta\delta^\mu_\lambda\delta^\nu_\alpha - \delta^\rho_\alpha\delta^\mu_\beta\delta^\nu_\lambda \quad (3.4)$$

comes in handy, as it allows us to write

$$\delta\Gamma^\gamma_{\lambda\beta} = -\frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{C}^\rho_{(\mu\nu)})_{\lambda\beta}{}^\gamma \nabla_\rho \delta g^{\mu\nu}. \quad (3.5)$$

The same  $\mathcal{C}$  will make an appearance later for fermions as well. Here, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \delta g^{\mu\nu} \\ &= \mathcal{V} \left[ -\frac{1}{2}T_{\mu\nu} \delta g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\nabla_\rho \left[ (\mathcal{C}^\rho_{(\mu\nu)})_{\lambda\beta}{}^\gamma \delta g^{\mu\nu} \left( \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla_\lambda\Phi_\beta^\sigma)}\Phi_\gamma^\sigma - \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla_\lambda\Phi_\sigma^\gamma)}\Phi_\sigma^\beta \right) \right] \right], \quad (3.6) \end{aligned}$$

where the symmetric energy-momentum is explicitly given as

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu} &= g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{L} - 2\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial g^{\mu\nu}} + 2\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial g_{\rho\sigma}}g_{\rho\mu}g_{\sigma\nu} \\ &+ (\mathcal{C}^\rho_{(\mu\nu)})_{\lambda\beta}{}^\gamma \nabla_\rho \left( \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla_\lambda\Phi_\beta^\sigma)}\Phi_\gamma^\sigma - \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\nabla_\lambda\Phi_\sigma^\gamma)}\Phi_\sigma^\beta \right), \quad (3.7) \end{aligned}$$

in the first term with  $\delta g_{\rho\sigma} = -\delta g^{\mu\nu}g_{\mu\rho}g_{\sigma\nu}$ . Note how the other piece in (3.6), also involving  $\mathcal{C}$ , is a total derivative. As such,  $T_{\mu\nu}$  here is the symmetric energy-momentum tensor that enters the Einstein equation.

Under the infinitesimal diffeomorphism  $\delta_\xi g^{\mu\nu} = \mathfrak{L}_\xi g^{\mu\nu} = -2\nabla^{(\mu}\xi^{\nu)}$ , the variation becomes

$$\frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \delta_\xi g^{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{V} [(\nabla^\mu\xi^\nu)T_{\mu\nu} + \nabla_\rho \mathcal{S}^\rho], \quad (3.8)$$

with

$$\mathcal{S}^\rho \equiv -(\mathcal{C}^\rho_{(\mu\nu)})_{\lambda}{}^\gamma{}_\beta (\nabla^\mu \xi^\nu) \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\beta^\sigma)} \Phi_\gamma^\sigma - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\sigma^\gamma)} \Phi_\sigma^\beta \right). \quad (3.9)$$

Integrating by parts leads us to the conservation law  $\nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$  in the bulk, again consistent with the Einstein equation. Generalization to arbitrary tensor fields is straightforward. Also, the reduction to scalars and gauge fields, devoid of connection contributions, coincides with the previous section.

Below we will see that the Noether variation based on the Lie derivative of  $\Phi$  produces an expression that in part should cancel away (3.8). This will split into three parts. The universal part  $d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})$  comes about after some manipulation while, among the remainder that is supposed to cancel (3.8), one piece has  $-\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  in place of  $T$  and the other is  $-\nabla_\rho \mathcal{S}^\rho$ . The latter cancels the total derivative piece in (3.8), which enforces the identity  $T = \hat{\mathbb{T}}$ , again as anticipated, regardless of the details of the Lagrangian.

### 3.2 Noether Energy-momentum

For a tensor field  $\Phi_\beta^\gamma$ , the Noether procedure should be performed using

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\xi \Phi_\beta^\gamma &= \mathcal{L}_\xi \Phi_\beta^\gamma \\ &= \xi^\alpha \nabla_\alpha \Phi_\beta^\gamma + (\nabla_\beta \xi^\alpha) \Phi_\alpha^\gamma - (\nabla_\alpha \xi^\gamma) \Phi_\beta^\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

With the Lagrangian in the form  $\mathcal{L}(\Phi, \nabla\Phi; g)$ , we have

$$\delta_\xi \mathcal{L} \Big|_{g \text{ fixed}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \Phi_\beta^\gamma} \delta_\xi \Phi_\beta^\gamma + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\beta^\gamma)} \nabla_\lambda (\delta_\xi \Phi_\beta^\gamma), \quad (3.11)$$

which can be organized into

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\xi \mathcal{L} \Big|_{g \text{ fixed}} &= \xi^\alpha \nabla_\alpha \mathcal{L} + \nabla_\mu \xi^\alpha \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\mu \Phi_\beta^\gamma)} \nabla_\alpha \Phi_\beta^\gamma \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \Phi_\mu^\gamma} \Phi_\alpha^\gamma + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\mu^\gamma)} \nabla_\lambda \Phi_\alpha^\gamma - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \Phi_\beta^\alpha} \Phi_\beta^\mu - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\beta^\alpha)} \nabla_\lambda \Phi_\beta^\mu \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ (\nabla_\lambda \nabla_\beta \xi^\gamma + [\nabla_\beta, \nabla^\gamma] \xi_\lambda) \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\beta^\sigma)} \Phi_\gamma^\sigma - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\sigma^\gamma)} \Phi_\sigma^\beta \right), \quad (3.12)$$

after some hefty algebra.

We used the usual gymnastics on the covariant derivative, such as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^\alpha [\nabla_\lambda, \nabla_\alpha] \Phi_\beta^\gamma &= \xi^\alpha (-R^\mu_{\beta\lambda\alpha} \Phi_\mu^\gamma + R^\gamma_{\mu\lambda\alpha} \Phi_\beta^\mu) \\ &= ([\nabla_\beta, \nabla^\mu] \xi_\lambda) \Phi_\mu^\gamma - ([\nabla_\mu, \nabla^\gamma] \xi_\lambda) \Phi_\beta^\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Another such is

$$\nabla_\lambda \nabla_\beta \xi^\gamma + [\nabla_\beta, \nabla^\gamma] \xi_\lambda = \nabla_\rho \nabla_\mu \xi_\nu (\mathcal{C}^{\rho(\mu\nu)})_{\lambda}{}^\gamma{}_\beta \quad (3.14)$$

that comes about, thanks to

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\rho \nabla_\mu \xi_\nu (\mathcal{C}^{\rho(\mu\nu)})_{\lambda}{}^\gamma{}_\beta &= \frac{1}{2} ([\nabla_\lambda, \nabla_\beta] \xi^\gamma + [\nabla_\beta, \nabla^\gamma] \xi_\lambda + [\nabla^\gamma, \nabla_\lambda] \xi_\beta) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (R_{\lambda\beta}{}^\gamma{}_\alpha + R_{\beta}{}^\gamma{}_{\lambda\alpha} + R^\gamma_{\lambda\beta\alpha}) \xi^\alpha = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

by virtue of the combinatoric symmetry of the Riemann tensor.

Eventually, all of these lead to

$$\frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta \Phi_\beta^\gamma} \delta_\xi \Phi_\beta^\gamma = d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{V} \left[ (\nabla_\mu \xi^\alpha) (-\hat{\mathbb{T}}^\mu{}_\alpha) - \nabla_\rho \mathcal{S}^\rho \right]. \quad (3.16)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{S}^\rho$  is identical to its namesake in (3.8) which happens because the partial derivative with respect to the connection has a simple relation to the derivative with respect to  $\nabla\Phi$ . The unique bulk term defines the Noether energy-momentum  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}^\mu{}_\alpha$  as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbb{T}}^\mu{}_\alpha &= \delta^\mu{}_\alpha \mathcal{L} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\mu \Phi_\beta^\gamma)} \nabla_\alpha \Phi_\beta^\gamma \\ &\quad - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \Phi_\mu^\gamma} \Phi_\alpha^\gamma - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\mu^\gamma)} \nabla_\lambda \Phi_\alpha^\gamma + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \Phi_\beta^\alpha} \Phi_\beta^\mu + \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\beta^\alpha)} \nabla_\lambda \Phi_\beta^\mu \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{C}^{\rho(\mu\nu)})_{\lambda}{}^\gamma{}_\beta g_{\nu\alpha} \nabla_\rho \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\beta^\sigma)} \Phi_\gamma^\sigma - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\nabla_\lambda \Phi_\sigma^\gamma)} \Phi_\sigma^\beta \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

### 3.3 Equality of $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$ and $T$

Combining (3.8) and (3.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\xi(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) &= \frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \delta_\xi g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta \Phi_\beta^\gamma} \delta_\xi \Phi_\beta^\gamma \\ &= d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{V}(\nabla^\mu \xi^\nu)(T_{\mu\nu} - \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{\mu\nu}) + \mathcal{V}[\nabla_\rho \mathcal{S}^\rho - \nabla_\rho \mathcal{S}^\rho] , \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

which, together with the universal property of the covariant Lagrangian density  $\delta_\xi(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) = d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})$ , gives the desired identity,

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \hat{\mathbb{T}}_{\mu\nu} . \quad (3.19)$$

Note that we neither relied on the equation of motion nor threw away total derivative terms along the way.

## 4 Vielbein, Spinors, and the Kosmann Lift

Now that we have emphasized the role of the Lie derivative in the Noether procedure for the energy-momentum tensor, we need to take a step back and consider how the Lie derivative should act on objects with spacetime indices in the form of the local Lorentz index and the spinor index.

Most bosonic fields we encounter in physics are naturally tensors with coordinate indices. For example, the gauge fields are locally 1-forms, or more precisely a connection 1-form with the coordinate indices labeling its spacetime components naturally. The metric is a symmetric rank-two covariant tensor with two coordinate indices. There are additional complications for the Christoffel symbols, due to being connection for the Riemannian geometry, but one can derive the action of the Lie derivative starting from the usual Lie derivative on the metric. For other bosonic matter fields, the actions of Lie derivative are well understood.

A little more subtle is how the Lie derivative should act on geometrical objects with the local Lorentz index or with the spinor index. This is a pretty acute issue for spinors, in particular, since the Clifford algebra is written naturally in the vielbein

basis,

$$\{\gamma^a, \gamma^b\} = 2\eta^{ab} . \quad (4.1)$$

One sometimes refers to the Dirac matrices  $\gamma^\mu$  in curved spacetime, but this is merely a shorthand notation for

$$\gamma^a e_a^\mu . \quad (4.2)$$

The usual statement about covariant constant  $\gamma^\mu$ 's traces back to how  $\gamma^a$ 's are really constant matrices, modulo  $SO$  rotations.

When the local Lorentz indices and the spinor indices are thus indispensable, one must ask how the Lie derivative would handle objects equipped with these indices. In physics and mathematics literature, one can find two mutually conflicting treatments in this regard. In this intermediate section, we will take a brief detour for these; in the next section we will end up advocating what is known as the Kosmann lift for the correct version of the Lie derivative in our current context of producing the right Noether energy-momentum tensor. The rest of the section is, as noted earlier, borrowed and condensed from Ref. [10].

For the rest of this note, we take care to employ several distinct notations for the covariant derivatives, in an incremental manner, depending on up to which bundles they take into account. We start with  $\nabla_\mu$  for (co-)tangent bundles and tensor products thereof, which gives us the usual Levi-Civita connection expressed via the Christoffel symbols. The notation  $D_\mu$  is introduced when it becomes aware of the frame bundle, i.e., of the local Lorentz indices. With spinors introduced,  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  is the relevant covariant derivative in the absence of gauge connection, while  $\mathbf{D}_\mu$  is the most general one, including the gauge bundles as well. Although this may sound like a little bit of overkill, these painstaking distinctions should prove helpful for clarifying the geometry of the spinors.

## 4.1 Vielbein and the Kosmann Lift

Before we get to the matter of the Lie derivative, we shall first make a lightning review of the Cartan-Maurer formulation where the role of metric is replaced by vielbein and the Christoffel connection by the spin connection.

For this, it is useful to introduce two separate notations for the covariant derivative.  $\nabla_\mu$  is the usual one that contains the Levi-Civita connection  $\Gamma^\lambda_{\mu\nu}$  and acts on the coordinate indices. When we introduce the vielbein  $e^a_\mu$  and its inverse  $e_a^\mu$  such that

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{ab} e^a_\mu e^b_\nu, \quad g^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{ab} e_a^\mu e_b^\nu, \quad (4.3)$$

it follows

$$\nabla_\mu e^a_\nu = -w_\mu{}^a{}_b e^b_\nu \quad (4.4)$$

for some matrix-valued  $w_\mu$ . The orthonormality of the vielbein

$$g^{\mu\nu} e^a_\mu e^b_\nu = \eta^{ab} \quad (4.5)$$

implies that  $w_\mu$  is  $SO$ -valued and thus antisymmetric with respect to its two local Lorentz indices.

On the other hand, there is a natural extension of  $\nabla$  to include the action on the local Lorentz indices, to be denoted as  $D$  here, such that

$$D_\mu e^a_\nu \equiv \nabla_\mu e^a_\nu + w_\mu{}^a{}_b e^b_\nu = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Recall that the antisymmetrization of the two coordinate indices in the last vanishing equation is what leads to the usual torsion-free condition,

$$de^a + w^a{}_b \wedge e^b = 0, \quad (4.7)$$

which is the starting point of the Cartan-Maurer formulation of the Riemannian geometry.

Starting from (4.7), one can derive the explicit expression for  $\delta w$  induced by an arbitrary variation of the vielbein  $\delta e$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta w_{\lambda bc} &= - \left( \delta^\rho{}_\lambda \delta^a_{[b} e_{c]\nu} + e_{[c}{}^\rho e_{|\lambda|}^a e_{b]\nu} - e_{[b}{}^\rho \delta^a_{c]} g_{\lambda\nu} \right) D_\rho \delta e_a{}^\nu \\ &= -(\mathcal{C}^{\rho a}{}_\nu)_{\lambda[bc]} D_\rho \delta e_a{}^\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

with the same tensor  $\mathcal{C}$  defined in (3.4), some of whose coordinate indices are swapped

in favor of the local Lorentz indices. This will become useful when we derive the symmetric energy-momentum tensor from the vielbein variation in the next section.

Just as the metric can be used to raise and lower indices including those attached to  $\nabla$ , the vielbein and its inverse can be used to convert between the local Lorentz indices and the coordinate induces, provided that  $D$  is used universally as the covariant derivative. In this sense,  $D$  is the correct connection to be used when we introduce the frame bundle defined through the vielbein in addition to general tensor products of the tangent and the co-tangent bundles. As such, we can also use  $D_a$  consistently by writing

$$D_a \equiv e_a^\mu D_\mu, \quad D^a \equiv e^{a\mu} D_\mu, \quad (4.9)$$

since  $D_\mu$  commutes with  $e$ 's.  $D$  is inclusive of  $\nabla$  in the sense, for example,

$$D_a v^b = e_a^\mu D_\mu v^b = e_a^\mu e^b_\nu \nabla_\mu v^\nu, \quad (4.10)$$

etc.

Now the question is how we should extend the Lie derivative  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi$  when acting on objects with the local Lorentz indices and by inference on those with spinor indices. There appear to be two distinct choices found in the literature. These two choices differ by a local Lorentz rotation, denoted below as  $\hat{\xi}_K$ , itself determined from  $\xi$ . Since the latter is an additional gauge redundancy that arises and partially cancels out the larger number of components of  $e^a_\mu$  over  $g_{\mu\nu}$ , one may consider it a matter of choice. However, the frame bundle built up from this local Lorentz rotation is not trivial but rather glued to that of the tangent bundle, which suggests that the two may not be choices on an equal footing.

One simple-minded attempt is to take the attitude that  $e^a_\mu$  is merely a set of 1-forms with an additional label. This would lead to

$$\mathfrak{L}_\xi e^a = d(\xi \lrcorner e^a) + \xi \lrcorner de^a, \quad (4.11)$$

just as on any other 1-form. If we take this attitude, one would end up with

$$\mathfrak{L}_\xi v^a = \xi^\mu \partial_\mu v^a, \quad (4.12)$$

where  $v^a \equiv e^a_\nu v^\nu$  is a vector written in the vielbein basis, for example. This choice

$\mathfrak{L}_\xi$  treats the coordinate indices and the local Lorentz indices very differently. This together with its natural extension to the spinors is in effect the choice made in many supergravity literature. We will call it the vanilla Lie derivative in this note, for the lack of a well-established handle.

There is an alternative to  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi$ , to be denoted as  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$ , with better geometric motivation, called the Kosmann lift [5],

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_\xi e^a{}_\mu &\equiv D_\mu \xi^a - \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} e_{b\mu} = D^{(a} \xi^{b)} e_{b\mu} , \\ \mathcal{L}_\xi e_b{}^\mu &\equiv -D_b \xi^\mu + (\hat{\xi}_V)_{cb} e^{c\mu} = -D_{(b} \xi_{c)} e^{c\mu} ,\end{aligned}\tag{4.13}$$

with

$$\hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \equiv D^{[b} \xi^{a]} ,\tag{4.14}$$

which represents an additional local Lorentz rotation.

Using  $De = 0$  and defining

$$\hat{\xi}_K^{ab} \equiv \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} - \xi^\lambda \omega_\lambda{}^{ab} ,\tag{4.15}$$

the same can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_\xi e^a{}_\mu &= \xi^\lambda D_\lambda e^a{}_\mu + D_\mu \xi^\lambda e^a{}_\lambda - \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} e_{b\mu} \\ &= \xi^\lambda \nabla_\lambda e^a{}_\mu + \nabla_\mu \xi^\lambda e^a{}_\lambda - \hat{\xi}_K^{ab} e_{b\mu} = \mathfrak{L}_\xi e^a{}_\mu - \hat{\xi}_K^{ab} e_{b\mu} ,\end{aligned}\tag{4.16}$$

etc. The last expression tells us that this Kosmann lift is an extension of the vector field  $\xi$ , a section of the tangent bundle, to the frame bundle as

$$\xi = \xi^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} \quad \rightarrow \quad \xi^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} - \hat{\xi}_K^{ab} \mathbf{J}_{ab} ,\tag{4.17}$$

where  $\mathbf{J}_{ab}$  is the generator of the local Lorentz rotation.

This gives, in particular,

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi v^a = \xi^b D_b v^a - \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} v_b = (\mathfrak{L}_\xi v)^a e^a{}_\mu + D^{(b} \xi^{a)} v_b ,\tag{4.18}$$



with the last piece distinguishing the two versions of the Lie derivatives. The special nature of the Kosmann lift resides here, in fact. Imagine a pair of Killing vectors  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ . Even if one insists on using the vielbein as the basis, we find that

$$[\mathcal{L}_\xi, \mathcal{L}_\zeta] = \mathcal{L}_{[\xi, \zeta]} , \quad (4.19)$$

under the Kosmann lift. In this sense, the Kosmann lift is the natural extension of the Lie derivative on (co-)tangent bundles to the frame bundle that respects both the general covariance and the commutator algebra among isometries.

## 4.2 Kosmann Lift on Spinors

All of these have one more step to go for the spinor bundle as well. The covariant derivative, for example, would be extended to

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu = D_\mu + \frac{1}{4} w_{\mu ab} \gamma^{ab} , \quad (4.20)$$

such that the Dirac operator is  $\gamma^a e_a^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu$ . In particular, the requisite property

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu(\gamma^a) = [\mathcal{D}_\mu, \gamma^a] = 0 \quad (4.21)$$

emerges naturally with this  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ , with the action of  $D_\mu$  on the orthonormal indices undone by the commutator against  $w_{\mu ab} \gamma^{ab}/4$ .

The covariant derivative inside the Dirac operator is sometimes written as

$$\partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4} w_{\mu ab} \gamma^{ab} \quad (4.22)$$

which, for example, appears naturally as a covariantized conjugate momentum in the supersymmetric non-linear sigma models. When  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  acts directly on spinors, with no other spacetime index, the two are identical. Although this is a matter of choice, the latter can easily become cumbersome for more general computation, since it would not annihilate  $\gamma^{a\prime}$ s.

Since the spinor bundle is built upon the frame bundle, the Kosmann lift of the vielbein implies a particular extension of the Lie derivative to spinors as well. It is not difficult to work out the action by noting that a spinor can generate antisymmetric

tensors in the local Lorentz frame  $\bar{\Psi}\gamma^{a\dots b}\Psi$ . This results in,<sup>4</sup>

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi\Psi \equiv \xi^\mu\mathcal{D}_\mu\Psi - \frac{1}{4}\hat{\xi}_V^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\Psi = \xi^\mu\partial_\mu\Psi - \frac{1}{4}\hat{\xi}_K^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\Psi, \quad (4.23)$$

which is in accord with (4.17), and also leads to the transformation of the spin connection as

$$\delta_\xi w = d_w\hat{\xi}_V + \xi\lrcorner\mathcal{R} = d_w\hat{\xi}_K + \mathfrak{L}_\xi w, \quad (4.24)$$

where  $d_w$  is the covariant exterior differential

$$d_w\hat{\xi} \equiv d\hat{\xi} + w\hat{\xi} - \hat{\xi}w \quad (4.25)$$

acting on  $\hat{\xi}$  that denotes either of the two matrix-valued 1-forms,  $\hat{\xi}_V$  and  $\hat{\xi}_K$ .

A big advantage of the local Lorentz indices over the coordinate index is how the Dirac matrices  $\gamma^a$ , which are constant and also  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ -covariantly constant, are also inert under  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi(\gamma^a) = 0, \quad (4.26)$$

which can be understood from how the rotation by  $\hat{\xi}_V$  acts twice, once by rotation the local Lorentz index and once more by commutator action against  $-\hat{\xi}_V^{ab}\gamma_{ab}/4$ . The two cancel each other out, for the same reason as how the spin connections in  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  do not rotate  $\gamma^a$  in the end.

### 4.3 A Look-Back on the Vanilla Lie Derivative

The Kosmann lift is the natural extension of vector fields on  $\mathcal{M}_d$ , a section of the tangent bundle thereof, to the frame bundle. On the other hand, if one is merely interested in reaching the right Lie derivative structures for tensors with coordinate indices only, the rotation of the orthonormal indices by  $-\hat{\xi}_K$  may appear extraneous

---

<sup>4</sup>The same was also independently discovered in the physics side on and off with one of the earliest such due to Jackiw and Manton [12]. For later literature with a nod to Kosmann plus more physics-friendly presentations, readers are referred to Refs. [13, 14], albeit with different spinor conventions than ours, and also to Ref. [15]. More recent examples where the Kosmann lift for spinors and vielbeins was employed crucially for various physics applications may be found, for instance, in Refs. [16–18].

and even irrelevant. This rotation will drop out eventually, one would think, if all such orthonormal indices and spinor indices are contracted away leaving behind the coordinate indices only.

As such, we seem to have an option of dropping  $\hat{\xi}_K$  in (4.17), reverting back to  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi$ ,

$$\delta'_\xi e^a \equiv \mathfrak{L}_\xi e^a = \xi \lrcorner de^a + d(\xi^a) , \quad (4.27)$$

and similarly,

$$\delta'_\xi \Psi \equiv \mathfrak{L}_\xi \Psi = \xi^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi , \quad \delta'_\xi w \equiv \mathfrak{L}_\xi w , \quad (4.28)$$

where we treat the spinor indices and the orthonormal indices as mere extra labels for these multi-component functions and 1-forms. Needless to say,

$$\mathfrak{L}_\xi(\gamma^a) = \xi^\mu \partial_\mu(\gamma^a) = 0 \quad (4.29)$$

holds naturally. This is the choice often found in many physics contexts, especially in the supergravity texts.

Recall that this transformation can arise as a result from a passive transformation  $\tilde{x}(x) = x - \epsilon \xi(x)$  with  $\epsilon \ll 1$ . The local coordinate transformation needs to make sense only locally, chart by chart, and is thus not intended to extend to the entire manifold. At first sight, there appears to be no reason not to use this vanilla Lie derivative  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi$  when it comes to such passive and local coordinate transformations. On the other hand, the  $SO$  structure of the orthonormal frames is eventually tied to the tangent indices with  $De^a = 0$ , so that the spin connection cannot be independent of the Levi-Civita connection.

This tells us that although the above vanilla Lie derivative  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi$  is available locally, it won't generally extend to the entire manifold. One place where we can see this most clearly is (4.15). Turning off the Kosmann lift means  $\hat{\xi}_K^{ab} = 0$  which translates to the condition,

$$\xi^\lambda w_\lambda{}^{ab} = -D^{[a} \xi^{b]} . \quad (4.30)$$

This equates the covariant expression on the right to a non-covariant one on the left, which signals that the vanilla Lie derivative  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi$  on spinor can be neither ex-

tended covariantly beyond an immediate local neighborhood nor defined in a frame-independent manner.

Another fatal problem with this transformation in the physics context is how a diffeomorphism preserves the Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}$  up to a total derivative  $\sim d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})$ , so that the statement that a theory is generally covariant always relies on Stokes' theorem. In order to argue the total derivative away, either on a compact spacetime or via appropriately vanishing boundary condition, we should be able to extend the transformation on individual fields everywhere on the manifold. If a transformation of a field fails to extend beyond an immediate neighborhood, the use of Stokes' theorem becomes a little strange, so the very statement that  $\delta'_\xi$  generates a symmetry of an action principle does not make much sense.

With the  $SO$  rotation by  $\hat{\xi}_K$ , on the other hand, the Kosmann-lifted Lie derivative  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$  may be glued between overlapping local neighborhoods and would make sense globally, as long as the vector field  $\xi$  being used is defined globally. What we will find in the next section is that this Kosmann lift also offers a clear advantage that allows us to arrive at a sensible energy-momentum tensor, both in the Noether side  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  and also in its geometric counterpart  $T$  and that eventually  $T = \hat{\mathbb{T}}$  emerges naturally on par with the case of bosonic fields.

## 5 Spinors with the Kosmann Lift

Let us now turn to the question of the energy-momentum and the conservation law for theories involving spinors, for which the vielbein and the spin connection are indispensable. We will consider a general Lorentz-invariant Lagrangian density of type

$$\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L} = d^d x \det(e^a_\mu) \mathcal{L}(\Psi, \mathcal{D}\Psi; e) , \quad (5.1)$$

with  $\gamma^a$ 's, which are both constant and  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$ -covariantly constant, understood for the construction of  $\mathcal{L}$ . We shall consider its variation under  $\delta_\xi$  or  $\delta'_\xi$ . Either way, the net variation is again a total derivative

$$d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) . \quad (5.2)$$

The question comes down to how we should split these into two mutually-canceling parts, and to what forms of these energy-momentum tensors,  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  and  $T$ , emerge naturally depending on the choice between the two versions of the Lie derivative.

One central fact is how the Kosmann-lift of the Lie derivative on the vielbein involves symmetric combinations in that

$$\delta_\xi e^a{}_\mu = \mathcal{L}_\xi e^a{}_\mu = D^{(b}\xi^a)e_{b\mu} , \quad \delta_\xi e_b{}^\mu = \mathcal{L}_\xi e_b{}^\mu = -D_{(b}\xi_{c)}e^{c\mu} . \quad (5.3)$$

Given this, the variation of the vielbein and the spin connection would yield

$$\sim (\mathcal{L}_\xi e_b{}^\mu)(-T^b{}_\mu) = D_{(b}\xi_{c)}T^{bc} \quad (5.4)$$

in the end, with symmetric tensor  $T^{bc}$  emerging naturally for any  $\mathcal{L}(\Psi, \mathcal{D}\Psi; e)$ . This is entirely analogous to how  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi g^{\mu\nu} = -(\nabla^\mu \xi^\nu + \nabla^\nu \xi^\mu)$  enters crucially as in

$$\sim (\mathfrak{L}_\xi g^{\mu\nu})(-T_{\mu\nu}/2) = \nabla^{(\mu} \xi^{\nu)} T_{\mu\nu} \quad (5.5)$$

for any Lagrangian involving scalars and tensors.

For both, the conservation law involves a symmetric energy-momentum tensor, signaling that the closest analog of  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi g^{\mu\nu}$  resides in the Kosmann-lifted Lie derivative on the vielbein  $\mathcal{L}_\xi e_b{}^\mu$ . Also, the same quantity will appear as the source term for the Einstein equation. Eventually, we will see that the Kosmann lift naturally brings us to the conservation law of this symmetric energy-momentum tensor, with no ‘‘improvement’’ involved, regardless of whether we follow a Noether procedure or vary the vielbein. This should be compared to the vanilla Lie derivative of the vielbein, say,

$$\delta'_\xi e_b{}^\mu = \mathfrak{L}_\xi e_b{}^\mu = \xi^\nu \partial_\nu e_b{}^\mu - (\partial_\nu \xi^\mu) e_b{}^\nu , \quad (5.6)$$

which exhibits no obvious combinatoric property. The analog of  $-T^b{}_\mu$  multiplying this version would not elevate to a symmetric tensor when the lower coordinate index is raised to an upper local Lorentz index.

## 5.1 Symmetric Energy-Momentum Tensor $T^{ab}$

Since the covariant derivative  $D$  is compatible with both the coordinate indices and the local Lorentz indices, we will use  $D$  in place of  $\nabla$  even when only coordinate indices are present, from now on. On spinors, on the other hand, we will insist on the notation  $\mathcal{D}$  to emphasize the spinor indices yet to be contracted away. Needless to say, these covariant derivatives are defined with respect to the unperturbed vielbein.

Let us consider a Dirac field  $\Psi$  and the action in the form

$$\mathcal{L}(\Psi, \mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi, \bar{\Psi}, \mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi}; e_a^\nu), \quad (5.7)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi}$  is a shorthand notation for  $(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)^\dagger \gamma^0$  in the Lorentzian signature. The symmetric energy-momentum follows from the variation of the matter action with respect to  $e_a^\nu$ , i.e.,

$$\frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta e_a^\nu} \delta e_a^\nu = \mathcal{V} \left( -e_a^\nu \mathcal{L} + \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta e_a^\nu} \right) \delta e_a^\nu, \quad (5.8)$$

and the second term includes pieces that come from the variation of the connection,

$$\frac{1}{4} \delta w_{\lambda bc} \left( \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)} \gamma^{bc} \Psi - \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{bc} \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi})} \right), \quad \delta w_{\lambda bc} = -(\mathcal{C}^{\rho a}{}_\nu)_{\lambda[bc]} D_\rho \delta e_a^\nu, \quad (5.9)$$

with the same tensor  $\mathcal{C}$  defined in (3.4), now written with both the local Lorentz indices,  $a, b, \dots$  and the coordinate indices,  $\rho, \nu, \dots$ .

After much manipulation, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta e_a^\nu} \delta e_a^\nu \\ &= \mathcal{V} \left[ -\Sigma^a{}_\nu \delta e_a^\nu - \frac{1}{4} D_\rho \left[ (\mathcal{C}^{\rho a}{}_\nu)_{\lambda[bc]} \delta e_a^\nu \left( \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)} \gamma^{bc} \Psi - \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{bc} \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi})} \right) \right] \right], \quad (5.10) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Sigma^a{}_\nu \equiv e_a^\nu \mathcal{L} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial e_a^\nu} - \frac{1}{4} (\mathcal{C}^{\rho a}{}_\nu)_{\lambda[bc]} D_\rho \left( \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)} \gamma^{bc} \Psi - \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{bc} \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi})} \right). \quad (5.11)$$

Let us split the tensor  $\Sigma$  into

$$\Sigma^{ab} = T^{ab} + \Sigma^{[ab]} , \quad (5.12)$$

where the symmetric part is now called  $T^{ab}$ , suggestively.

Now, let us finally specialize the variation to that of the infinitesimal diffeomorphism with the Kosmann lift,  $\delta e_a^\nu \rightarrow \delta_\xi e_a^\nu = \mathcal{L}_\xi e_a^\nu = -D_{(a}\xi_{b)}e^{b\nu}$ . The variation reduces to

$$\frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta e_a^\nu} \delta_\xi e_a^\nu = \mathcal{V} [(D_a \xi_b) T^{ab} + D_\rho \mathcal{U}^\rho] , \quad (5.13)$$

with the symmetric parts only, which implies the conservation law

$$D_a T^{ab} = 0 , \quad (5.14)$$

upon integrating by parts and throwing away the two total derivative terms. This motivates us to identify  $T^{ab}$  as the energy-momentum tensor. The analog of  $\mathcal{S}$  found in (3.8) is

$$\mathcal{U}^\rho = -\frac{1}{2} D_{(\mu} \xi_{\nu)} \left( \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\nu \Psi)} \gamma^{\rho\mu} \Psi - \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{\rho\mu} \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\nu \bar{\Psi})} \right) . \quad (5.15)$$

**What does  $\Sigma^{[ab]}$  do?**

A puzzling left-over from the above is the antisymmetric part  $\Sigma^{[ab]}$ . It enters via the general variation of the vielbein, but drops out by the time we specialize to the diffeomorphism variation,  $\delta_\xi e_a^\nu$ , provided that we use the Kosmann lift for  $\delta_\xi e_a^\nu = \mathcal{L}_\xi e_a^\nu$ . There is no conservation law on this quantity unlike the symmetric part  $T^{ab}$ .

On the other hand, the general variation with respect to the vielbein in the presence of the Einstein-Hilbert action produces the Einstein equation,

$$G_{ab} = 8\pi G_N T_{ab} . \quad (5.16)$$

The symmetric property of the Einstein tensor on the left again projects  $\Sigma^{[ab]}$  out

from the Einstein equation, but this seemingly implies extra equation,

$$0 = \Sigma^{[ab]} , \quad (5.17)$$

which would be strange. Thankfully, the structure of  $\Sigma^{[ab]}$  has a very special form.

Recall how the local Lorentz symmetry that rotates the orthonormal indices is much like an internal gauge symmetry, needed to match the different numbers of components between the metric and the vielbein. This is represented by a position-dependent  $SO$  matrix, say  $e^L$ , acting on orthonormal indices and by inference on spinor indices. With arbitrary anti-symmetric matrix  $L_{ab}$ , we find immediately,

$$L_{ab}\Sigma^{[ab]} = \left( \frac{\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}}{\partial\Psi} - \mathcal{D}_\lambda \frac{\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda\Psi)} \right) \delta_L\Psi + \delta_L\bar{\Psi} \left( \frac{\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}}{\partial\bar{\Psi}} - \mathcal{D}_\lambda \frac{\bar{\partial}\mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda\bar{\Psi})} \right) , \quad (5.18)$$

from the point-wise invariance of  $\mathcal{L}$  under the local Lorentz transformation. This immediately signals that this quantity vanishes on-shell classically, so that (5.17) does not incur a new equation of motion.

However, this may not suffice since we could imagine quantizing matter fields in the presence of the classical gravity, whereby we should find

$$G_{ab} = 8\pi G_N \langle T_{ab} \rangle , \quad (5.19)$$

which leaves behind a condition of the vanishing expectation value  $\langle \Sigma^{[ab]} \rangle = 0$ . Is this automatic at quantum level, as with the classical counterpart? What comes to the rescue is again the local Lorentz symmetry.

With dynamical gravity present, classical or quantum, a natural expectation is that the diffeomorphism anomalies cancel out one way or another. At quantum level, this is an obvious requirement since otherwise the quantization itself is in danger. Less noticed is that the same is needed for the above semiclassical Einstein equation as well, since the Einstein tensor is divergence-free as a mathematical identity which makes sense only if the right hand side is also divergence-free. In turn this translates to how the local Lorentz symmetry is anomaly-free.

The measure of the fermions in the path integral must be therefore by itself invariant under the local Lorentz rotation, or, if not, the anomalous phase should be canceled by some anomaly inflow. Recall how the dynamical fields are dummy



variables to be integrated over, so that

$$\int [D\Psi \dots] e^{iS(\Psi, \dots)} = \int [D(\Psi + \epsilon \delta\Psi) \dots] e^{iS(\Psi + \epsilon \delta\Psi, \dots)} \quad (5.20)$$

for any  $\delta$ . The invariance of the  $\Psi$ -measure by itself, or possibly together with an inflow contribution, will enforce

$$0 = \langle L_{ab} \Sigma^{[ab]} \rangle, \quad (5.21)$$

bringing us back to the desired vanishing of  $\langle \Sigma^{[ab]} \rangle$ .

## 5.2 Noether Energy-Momentum $\hat{\mathbb{T}}^\mu_\alpha$

For a Dirac field  $\Psi$ , the Noether procedure is to be performed using

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\xi \Psi &= \xi^\alpha \mathcal{D}_\alpha \Psi + \frac{1}{4} (D_\rho \xi_\sigma) \gamma^{\rho\sigma} \Psi, \\ \delta_\xi \bar{\Psi} &= \xi^\alpha \mathcal{D}_\alpha \bar{\Psi} - \frac{1}{4} (D_\rho \xi_\sigma) \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{\rho\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

again with all gauge fields coupled to  $\Psi$  making their natural appearances in  $\mathcal{D}$  as well, as we noted at the head of this section.

With the Lagrangian in the form  $\mathcal{L}(\Psi, \mathcal{D}\Psi, \bar{\Psi}, \mathcal{D}\bar{\Psi}; e)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\xi \mathcal{L} \Big|_{e \text{ fixed}} &= \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial \bar{\Psi}} \delta_\xi \Psi + \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)} \mathcal{D}_\lambda (\delta_\xi \Psi) + \delta_\xi \bar{\Psi} \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial \bar{\Psi}} + \mathcal{D}_\lambda (\delta_\xi \bar{\Psi}) \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi})} \\ &= \xi^\alpha \mathcal{D}_\alpha \mathcal{L} + \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)} \left( \xi^\alpha [\mathcal{D}_\lambda, \mathcal{D}_\alpha] \Psi + \frac{1}{4} (D_\lambda D_\rho \xi_\sigma) \gamma^{\rho\sigma} \Psi \right) \\ &\quad + \left( \xi^\alpha [\mathcal{D}_\lambda, \mathcal{D}_\alpha] \bar{\Psi} - \frac{1}{4} (D_\lambda D_\rho \xi_\sigma) \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{\rho\sigma} \right) \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi})} + (D_\mu \xi^\alpha) \mathcal{K}^\mu_\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}^\mu_\alpha &\equiv \frac{1}{4} \left( \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial \bar{\Psi}} \gamma^\mu_\alpha \Psi - \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu_\alpha \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial \bar{\Psi}} + \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)} \gamma^\mu_\alpha \mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi - \mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu_\alpha \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi})} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\mathcal{D}_\mu \Psi)} \mathcal{D}_\alpha \Psi + \mathcal{D}_\alpha \bar{\Psi} \frac{\bar{\partial} \mathcal{L}}{\partial (\mathcal{D}_\mu \bar{\Psi})}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.24)$$

The commutator  $[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}]$  acting on  $\Psi, \bar{\Psi}$  can be moved to  $\xi$  as

$$\begin{aligned}\xi^\alpha[\mathcal{D}_\lambda, \mathcal{D}_\alpha]\Psi &= \xi^\alpha\left(\frac{1}{4}R_{\rho\sigma\lambda\alpha}\gamma^{\rho\sigma}\Psi\right) = \frac{1}{4}([D_\rho, D_\sigma]\xi_\lambda)\gamma^{\rho\sigma}\Psi \\ \xi^\alpha[\mathcal{D}_\lambda, \mathcal{D}_\alpha]\bar{\Psi} &= \xi^\alpha\left(-\frac{1}{4}R_{\rho\sigma\lambda\alpha}\bar{\Psi}\gamma^{\rho\sigma}\right) = -\frac{1}{4}([D_\rho, D_\sigma]\xi_\lambda)\bar{\Psi}\gamma^{\rho\sigma}.\end{aligned}\quad (5.25)$$

The term involving second derivatives of  $\xi$  can be reduced as

$$2D_{[\rho}D_{\sigma]}\xi_\lambda + D_\lambda D_{[\rho}\xi_{\sigma]} = D_\kappa D_\mu \xi_\nu \cdot 2\delta_{[\rho}^\kappa \delta_{\sigma]}^{\mu} \delta_{\lambda}^{\nu)}, \quad (5.26)$$

by virtue of the symmetry of the Riemann tensor, i.e.,

$$D_\kappa D_\mu \xi_\nu \left(2\delta_{[\rho}^\kappa \delta_{\sigma]}^{\mu} \delta_{\lambda}^{\nu]} + \delta_{\lambda}^\kappa \delta_{[\rho}^\mu \delta_{\sigma]}^{\nu)}\right) = \frac{1}{2}(R_{\rho\sigma\lambda\alpha} + R_{\sigma\lambda\rho\alpha} + R_{\lambda\rho\sigma\alpha})\xi^\alpha = 0. \quad (5.27)$$

All of these lead to

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\xi \mathcal{L} \Big|_{e \text{ fixed}} &= \xi^\alpha \mathcal{D}_\alpha \mathcal{L} + (D_\mu \xi^\alpha) \mathcal{K}^\mu{}_\alpha \\ &+ \frac{1}{4}(2D_{[\rho}D_{\sigma]}\xi_\lambda + D_\lambda D_{[\rho}\xi_{\sigma]}) \left( \frac{\bar{\delta} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)} \gamma^{\rho\sigma} \Psi - \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{\rho\sigma} \frac{\bar{\delta} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi})} \right),\end{aligned}\quad (5.28)$$

and eventually, we end up with

$$\frac{\bar{\delta}(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta\Psi} \delta_\xi \Psi + \delta_\xi \bar{\Psi} \frac{\bar{\delta}(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta\bar{\Psi}} = d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{V} \left[ (D_\mu \xi^\alpha)(-\hat{\mathbb{T}}^\mu{}_\alpha) - D_\rho \mathcal{U}^\rho \right], \quad (5.29)$$

where the Noether energy-momentum is explicitly given as

$$\hat{\mathbb{T}}^\mu{}_\alpha = \delta^\mu{}_\alpha \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{K}^\mu{}_\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \delta^\mu_{(\lambda} g_{\sigma)\alpha} D_\rho \left( \frac{\bar{\delta} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)} \gamma^{\rho\sigma} \Psi - \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{\rho\sigma} \frac{\bar{\delta} \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi})} \right), \quad (5.30)$$

and  $\mathcal{U}^\rho$  is the same as in (5.13).

### 5.3 Equality of $\hat{T}$ and $T$

Combining (5.13) and (5.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\xi(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) &= \frac{\delta(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta e_a^\nu} \delta_\xi e_a^\nu + \frac{\bar{\delta}(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta \bar{\Psi}} \delta_\xi \bar{\Psi} + \delta_\xi \bar{\Psi} \frac{\bar{\delta}(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})}{\delta \bar{\Psi}} \\ &= d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{V}(D_a \xi_b)(T^{ab} - \hat{T}^{ab}) + \mathcal{V}[D_p \mathcal{U}^p - D_p \mathcal{U}^p] ,\end{aligned}\quad (5.31)$$

which, again with the universal property of the covariant Lagrangian density,  $\delta_\xi(\mathcal{V}\mathcal{L}) = d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V}\mathcal{L})$ , gives the desired identity,

$$T^{ab} = \hat{T}^{ab} ,\quad (5.32)$$

even though this may not be obvious from the respective expressions. Again we neither relied on the equation of motion nor threw away total derivative terms along the way.

### 5.4 Free Dirac Field

The Lagrangian for the free Dirac field is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}} = -i\bar{\Psi}\gamma^a e_a^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu \Psi - im\bar{\Psi}\Psi .\quad (5.33)$$

We may use the democratic form of Lagrangian for the free Dirac field

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}'_{\text{Dirac}} &= \mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}} + \frac{i}{2} D_\mu (\bar{\Psi}\gamma^\mu \Psi) \\ &= -\frac{i}{2} (\bar{\Psi}\gamma^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu \Psi - \mathcal{D}_\mu \bar{\Psi}\gamma^\mu \Psi) - im\bar{\Psi}\Psi ,\end{aligned}\quad (5.34)$$

but it turns out that either way we end up with the same energy-momentum tensor  $T = \hat{T}$ .

Starting from (5.33), we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}^{\mu\nu} &= \frac{i}{4} \bar{\Psi} [\gamma^{\mu\nu}, \gamma^\lambda] \mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi - i\bar{\Psi}\gamma^\mu \mathcal{D}^\nu \Psi = i\bar{\Psi}\gamma^{[\mu} g^{\nu]\lambda} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi - i\bar{\Psi}\gamma^\mu \mathcal{D}^\nu \Psi \\ &= -i\bar{\Psi}\gamma^{(\mu} \mathcal{D}^{\nu)} \Psi ,\end{aligned}\quad (5.35)$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \delta^\mu_{(\lambda} \delta^{\nu}_{\sigma)} D_\rho \left( \frac{\vec{\partial} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)} \gamma^{\rho\sigma} \Psi - \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{\rho\sigma} \frac{\vec{\partial} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi})} \right) \\
&= -\frac{\mathbb{i}}{4} D_\rho [\bar{\Psi} (\gamma^\mu \gamma^{\rho\nu} + \gamma^\nu \gamma^{\rho\mu}) \Psi] \\
&= -\frac{\mathbb{i}}{2} (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^{(\mu} \mathcal{D}^{\nu)} \Psi + \mathcal{D}^{(\nu} \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{\mu)} \Psi) + \frac{\mathbb{i}}{2} g^{\mu\nu} (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^\rho \mathcal{D}_\rho \Psi + \mathcal{D}_\rho \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\rho \Psi) . \quad (5.36)
\end{aligned}$$

Although the three pieces of  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  in (5.30) are not in the democratic form individually, their sum for  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  proves to be,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathbb{T}}^{ab} &= \eta^{ab} \left( -\frac{\mathbb{i}}{2} (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu \Psi - \mathcal{D}_\mu \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \Psi) - \mathbb{i} m \bar{\Psi} \Psi \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\mathbb{i}}{2} (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^{(a} \mathcal{D}^{b)} \Psi - \mathcal{D}^{(b} \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{a)} \Psi) , \quad (5.37)
\end{aligned}$$

where we came back to the orthonormal indices.

Something similar happens with  $T^{ab} = \Sigma^{(ab)}$  from  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}}$ . Three contributing pieces are all non-democratic but the last piece in (5.11) reduces, upon the symmetrization of the two surviving indices,

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{4} (\mathcal{C}^{\rho(ab)})_{\lambda[cd]} D_\rho \left( \frac{\vec{\partial} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \Psi)} \gamma^{cd} \Psi - \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{cd} \frac{\vec{\partial} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}}}{\partial(\mathcal{D}_\lambda \bar{\Psi})} \right) \\
&= -\frac{\mathbb{i}}{2} (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^{(a} \mathcal{D}^{b)} \Psi + \mathcal{D}^{(b} \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{a)} \Psi) + \frac{\mathbb{i}}{2} \eta^{ab} (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^c \mathcal{D}_c \Psi + \mathcal{D}_c \bar{\Psi} \gamma^c \Psi) , \quad (5.38)
\end{aligned}$$

which induces the same expression as  $T$  above. In the end, we find an expression for the latter obeying

$$T^{ab} = \hat{\mathbb{T}}^{ab} \quad (5.39)$$

identically, as was earlier claimed on the general ground.

If we started with the democratic  $\mathcal{L}'_{\text{Dirac}}$ , the first two contributing pieces for  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}'$  and  $T'$  would be democratic to begin with, respectively, while the last pieces involving the  $\mathcal{C}$ -tensor would vanish identically for both  $T'$  and  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}'$ . These differences in the

middle steps remarkably lead to

$$(T')^{ab} = T^{ab} = \hat{\mathbb{T}}^{ab} = (\hat{\mathbb{T}}')^{ab} , \quad (5.40)$$

despite  $\mathcal{L}'_{\text{Dirac}} \neq \mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}}$ . This comes about in part thanks to how the content of the total derivatives,  $D_\rho(\mathcal{U}')^\rho$  and  $D_\rho\mathcal{U}^\rho$ , also shift between the two choices.

Note how, here, the equality  $T = \hat{\mathbb{T}}$  is seen by separate and explicit computations of the respective formulae as well. As noted at the head of the section, this means that the invariance of the Dirac action holds under the combined action of the Kosmann lift  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$  on the vielbein and the generalized Kosmann transformation  $\delta_\xi$  on the spinor, confirming that they form a symmetry of the action that make sense globally.

## 5.5 Generalized Kosmann with Gauge Fields

Before we proceed further, there is one additional ingredient we need to mull over. Spinors in field theory are often in some representations of gauge groups, carrying additional internal indices. Under this vanilla Lie derivative, the addition of the gauge field does not change the action on spinors; we merely need to remember that the gauge fields  $\mathcal{A}$  should transform by  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$  as well, and at least locally this suffices to guarantee the general covariance of the Dirac action, for example. The question is if and how this situation changes once we adopt the Kosmann lift. What we mean by the general covariance of the matter action is itself at stake.

Let us set our notation for the gauge sector first. From now on, we will employ the anti-hermitian notation,

$$\mathcal{A} = -\mathfrak{i}A , \quad \Theta = -\mathfrak{i}\theta \quad (5.41)$$

so that

$$\delta_\Theta^{\text{gauge}}\Psi = -\Theta\Psi , \quad \delta_\Theta^{\text{gauge}}\mathcal{A} = d\Theta + [\mathcal{A}, \Theta] \quad (5.42)$$

and the covariant derivative,

$$\mathbf{D}_\mu = \mathcal{D}_\mu + \mathcal{A}_\mu = D_\mu + \mathcal{A}_\mu + \frac{1}{4}w_{\mu ab}\gamma^{ab} . \quad (5.43)$$

Under the Kosmann-lifted diffeomorphism,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\xi \Psi &= \xi^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu \Psi - \frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_{ab} \gamma_{ab} \Psi = \mathcal{L}_\xi \Psi , \\ \delta_\xi \mathcal{A}_\mu &= \xi^\nu \partial_\nu \mathcal{A}_\mu + (\partial_\mu \xi^\nu) \mathcal{A}_\nu = \mathfrak{L}_\xi \mathcal{A}_\mu\end{aligned}\tag{5.44}$$

the free Dirac action from

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}} = -\mathfrak{i} \bar{\Psi} \gamma^a e_a^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu \Psi - \mathfrak{i} m \bar{\Psi} \Psi ,\tag{5.45}$$

now equipped with the gauge-covariant derivative, is invariant in the same sense that (5.33) is invariant under the vanilla Lie derivative.

Being a section of the relevant vector bundle as well as a section of the spinor bundle, on the other hand, the question of how we glue the local sections for  $\Psi$  across overlapping patches with regard to the gauge indices enters the Lie derivative also. An alternative transformation rule for the diffeomorphism, augmented by gauge transformation by  $\Theta = -(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{A})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\delta}_\xi \Psi &\equiv \left( \mathcal{L}_\xi + \delta_{-(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{A})}^{\text{gauge}} \right) \Psi = \xi^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu \Psi - \frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_{ab} \gamma_{ab} \Psi , \\ \hat{\delta}_\xi \mathcal{A}_\mu &\equiv \left( \mathfrak{L}_\xi + \delta_{-(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{A})}^{\text{gauge}} \right) \mathcal{A}_\mu = \xi^\nu \mathcal{F}_{\nu\mu}\end{aligned}\tag{5.46}$$

accommodates the latter need on equal footing with the spin indices.<sup>5</sup>

Since the difference between  $\delta_\xi$  and  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$  is a gauge transformation, local in the sense of a given coordinate patch, the local covariance of the Dirac action holds equally. In addition, the latter action makes sense globally as well, which leads to

$$\hat{\delta}_\xi (\mathcal{V} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}}) = d(\xi \lrcorner \mathcal{V} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}}) .\tag{5.47}$$

Henceforth, we will refer to the latter transformation rule  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$  on spinors and gauge fields as the generalized Kosmann lift.

The procedure of the previous subsections that led to the energy-momentum tensor becomes slightly more involved, but one arrives at a straightforward generalization

---

<sup>5</sup>Note that the modified transformations are now fully covariant. Such covariant combination for  $\mathcal{A}_\mu$  in the conventional setting without the Kosmann lift was previously identified in Ref. [19].

of the end result (5.37),

$$\begin{aligned}
T^{ab} = \hat{\mathbb{T}}^{ab} = \eta^{ab} & \left( -\frac{i}{2} (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu \Psi - \mathbf{D}_\mu \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \Psi) - im \bar{\Psi} \Psi \right) \\
& + \frac{i}{2} (\bar{\Psi} \gamma^{(a} \mathbf{D}^{b)} \Psi - \mathbf{D}^{(b} \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{a)} \Psi) , \tag{5.48}
\end{aligned}$$

with the covariant derivative upgraded from the purely gravitational  $\mathcal{D}$  to the gauged  $\mathbf{D}$ . As noted several times, the equality  $T^{ab} = \hat{\mathbb{T}}^{ab}$ , computed by independent computations on par with the previous subsections, comes about from the general covariance of the action (5.47) and vice versa.

## 6 Diffeomorphism Anomalies

Now that we have understood how the Kosmann lift of the diffeomorphism is essential when it comes to the energy-momentum tensor of spinors, a natural follow-up question is what we should do about the Ward identity. At the most naive level, the latter asserts that the divergence of the energy-momentum tensor must have a vanishing expectation value. With chiral field content, however, the Ward identity can easily fail and the quantity that replaces the zero on the other side is called the consistent diffeomorphism anomaly.

The derivation of such anomalies is rather involved but, needless to say, the precise transformation rules of various fields would enter centrally. The primary examples for which the anomaly arises are Weyl fermions, yet, we hardly hear of the Kosmann lift mentioned in related physics literature. We wish to clear up this odd situation by going back some forty years and retracing the steps more carefully.

In the end, we will find that the venerable anomaly polynomials are safely reproduced, despite the generalized Kosmann lift and, in a sense to be clarified below, thanks to the generalized Kosmann lift. However, the dictionary that extracts the covariant diffeomorphism anomalies from the anomaly polynomial turns out to be faulty and an additional factor 1/2 is needed. This also affects the consistent anomaly similarly, since the usual Wess-Zumino consistency and the subsequent anomaly descent are homogeneous processes whose anomaly polynomials and the overall multiplicative constant can only be fixed by the covariant side. It is likely that in most literature this factor 1/2 is ignored or even swept under the rug by the time the discussion

reached the consistent side.

Recall how the diffeomorphism anomaly of spinors with chiral couplings is computed in two steps. First, we compute the quantity known as the covariant anomaly. Let us denote this quantity as  $G_{\text{diff}}^{\text{cov}}$ . One way to deal with the latter is to mimic Fujikawa's path integral viewpoint [20] and compute

$$G_{\text{diff}}^{\text{cov}} = \text{Tr}(\Gamma \hat{\delta}_\xi) \quad (6.1)$$

as a regulated functional trace. One of the main lessons we learned in the previous section is that  $\delta_\xi$  should be the generalized version of Kosmann-lifted diffeomorphism. Our convention for the chirality operator  $\Gamma$  is

$$\Gamma \equiv (-i)^n \gamma^1 \cdots \gamma^{d=2n} , \quad (6.2)$$

in the Euclidean signature, although this detail enters our discussion explicitly only for the computation in the Appendix.

The regulated functional trace

$$\text{Tr}(\Gamma \hat{\delta}_\xi) = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left[ \Gamma e^{-\beta((i\gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a)^2 - \beta^{-1} \hat{\delta}_\xi)} \right] \Big|_{\xi\text{-linear}} \quad (6.3)$$

can then be either computed by the Heat Kernel expansion or recast as the Euclidean path integral of this supersymmetric quantum mechanics with periodic boundary conditions on the fermions, as is well known. We will take the former methodology for actual computation down the road.

A well-known fact is that the covariant anomaly in general is not really the anomalous variation of the effective action, also known as the consistent anomaly,

$$\hat{\delta}_\xi W \neq \text{Tr}(\Gamma \hat{\delta}_\xi) . \quad (6.4)$$

$\hat{\delta}_\xi W$  is the physical quantity that appears on the right hand side of the anomalous Ward identity. However, also well known is that the anomaly polynomial we find from the right hand side determines the left hand side via a procedure called the anomaly descent,

$$\hat{\delta}_\xi W \leftrightarrow \text{Tr}(\Gamma \hat{\delta}_\xi) . \quad (6.5)$$



Only because the cancelation of the covariant anomalies on the right implies the cancellation of the consistent ones on the left, and vice versa, we usually do not strain to distinguish the two objects.

The effective action  $W$  is entirely a functional of the metric (and the gauge fields). Once we arrive at  $W$ , no fermions reside there anymore, so there is no need for the Kosmann lift. The Wess-Zumino consistency condition is far simpler in the coordinate basis, where the effect of  $\hat{\xi}_K$  would be washed out entirely. This Wess-Zumino consistency conditions for diffeomorphisms were addressed fully by Bardeen and Zumino [21], who discovered that a naive anomaly descent using only the rotational part of the diffeomorphism automatically solves the full consistency condition that involves the translational parts as well. As noted already, however, this standard process for the consistent anomaly does not address the overall normalization and the anomaly polynomial, so the covariant anomaly enters here and fixes everything in conjunction with the consistent side.

## 6.1 The Legacy Computation

As such, the place where the Kosmann lift should have entered was the computation of the covariant diffeomorphism anomaly, or the functional traces such as (6.3). In Ref. [9], on the other hand, the authors seemingly started with

$$\delta'_\xi \Psi = \xi^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi \tag{6.6}$$

as a generator of the diffeomorphism, which we already argued against on the basis of how it lacks a global definition. Have they computed the anomaly

$$\text{Tr}(\Gamma \delta'_\xi) = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left[ \Gamma e^{-\beta((i\gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a)^2 - \beta^{-1} \delta'_\xi)} \right] \Big|_{\xi\text{-linear}}, \tag{6.7}$$

under this illegal local coordinate transformation?

On a closer inspection, however, one can see that at some point of the computation  $\delta'_\xi$  is replaced by its covariantized version

$$\xi^\mu \partial_\mu \quad \Rightarrow \quad \xi^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu . \tag{6.8}$$

With the bad behavior of  $\delta'_\xi$  beyond local patches, there would have been no practical

alternative, sans the Kosmann lift. Furthermore, even though this is not stated explicitly in Ref. [9], the real computation proceeded with a further shifted operator

$$\Delta_\xi \equiv \xi^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu + \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_\mu \xi^\mu), \quad (6.9)$$

with the new additive piece  $\nabla_\mu \xi^\mu/2$  if we rephrase it as a functional trace.

The shift was implicit in the actual computation by the time they recast the problem as a path integral of certain supersymmetric quantum mechanics. When we connect this path integral back to the canonical side, operators are naturally normal-ordered in the end, which translates to the replacement

$$\xi^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{1}{2}(\xi^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu + \mathbf{D}_\mu \xi^\mu) = \xi^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu + \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_\mu \xi^\mu). \quad (6.10)$$

This essential shift was emphasized later by Fujikawa [22]. On the path integral side, this normal ordering can also be understood from how the measure of the path integral must be built from the eigen-modes, weighted by volume factor,  $(\det g)^{1/4} \psi_j$ . The latter combination is sometimes referred to as “half-density” spinor [23].

The same can be seen also easily from the operator realization of the functional trace. It comes from how operators sandwiched by eigenfunctions would be expressed,

$$\langle \psi_j | \mathcal{O} | \psi_k \rangle = \int d^d x \sqrt{g} \psi_j^\dagger \mathcal{O} \psi_k = \int d^d x (g^{1/4} \psi_j)^\dagger \mathcal{O}' (g^{1/4} \psi_k), \quad (6.11)$$

where the precise realization of  $\mathcal{O}'$  as differential operator would differ from how we usually view the abstract  $\mathcal{O}$  if the latter act on  $g^{1/4}$  nontrivially. In the above case,  $\mathbf{D}$  would annihilate  $g^{1/4}$ , yet the Lie derivative that motivated  $\xi^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu$  does affect the metric factor. One can thus see that this line of thought results in the shift by  $(\nabla_\mu \xi^\mu)/2$ .

This series of substitutions resulted in

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\Gamma \Delta_\xi) &= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left[ \Gamma e^{-\beta((i\gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a)^2 - \beta^{-1} \Delta_\xi)} \right] \Big|_{\xi\text{-linear}} \\ &= \int P_{d+2}(\mathbb{R}_\beta^\alpha + 2\pi i(-\nabla_\beta \xi^\alpha + \nabla^\alpha \xi_\beta); \mathcal{F}) \Big|_{\xi\text{-linear}} \\ &= \int P_{d+2}(\mathbb{R}_\beta^\alpha + 4\pi i(-\nabla_\beta \xi^\alpha); \mathcal{F}) \Big|_{\xi\text{-linear}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

for some anomaly polynomial  $P_{d+2}$  and the curvature 2-form,

$$\mathbb{R}_\beta{}^\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}R^\alpha{}_{\beta\mu\nu}dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu . \quad (6.13)$$

We use the antisymmetric nature of  $\mathbb{R}_{\beta\alpha}$  for the last step in (6.12).

Here we are using a slightly nonconventional form of the Riemann curvature that has a close parallel to the Yang-Mill curvature, in that

$$\mathbb{R} = d\mathbb{F} + \mathbb{F} \wedge \mathbb{F} , \quad (6.14)$$

with the Christoffel symbol packaged into a connection 1-form [21]

$$\mathbb{F}_\beta{}^\alpha \equiv -\Gamma^\alpha{}_{\mu\beta} dx^\mu . \quad (6.15)$$

Nominally,  $\mathbb{F}$  is  $GL(d)$ -valued, even though, component-wise,  $\mathbb{R}$  is the same old Riemann curvature, as noted above.

One might think that, for the pure gravitational cases, the difference between  $\xi^\mu\partial_\mu$  and  $\xi^\mu\mathcal{D}_\mu$  part of  $\xi^\mu\mathbf{D}_\mu$  is a local Lorentz transformation, thus the substitution is harmless. However, since the very presence of the diffeomorphism anomaly implies the anomalous local Lorentz transformation, the substitution is hardly innocuous. Besides, the difference,  $-\xi^\mu w_{\mu ab}\gamma^{ab}/4$ , is not even a valid gauge function. It appears that the classic result in Ref. [9] is neither for the naive  $\delta'_\xi$  nor for the generalized Kosmann lift  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$ .

## 6.2 Generalized Kosmann Comes to the Rescue

The difference between the generalized Kosmann lift  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$  on spinors and the above  $\xi^\mu\mathcal{D}_\mu$  looks more sensible, on the other hand, with

$$\hat{\delta}_\xi\Psi - \xi^\mu\mathbf{D}_\mu\Psi = -\frac{1}{4}\hat{\xi}_V^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\Psi . \quad (6.16)$$

The difference is covariant and a special form of a local Lorentz transformation with  $-\hat{\xi}_V^{ab} = D^{[a}\xi^{b]}$ . Recall from the previous section how this transformation rule  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$  with gauge fields included in  $\mathcal{D}$  as well preserves the action when it is invoked along with the Kosmann lift  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$  on the vielbein and on the spin connection. In retrospect, the covariant diffeomorphism anomaly should have been computed with this operator  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$

as the generator.

As noted already, in performing the relevant functional trace, the same should be viewed as

$$\hat{\delta}_\xi((\det g)^{1/4}\Psi) - \Delta_\xi((\det g)^{1/4}\Psi) = -\frac{1}{4}\hat{\xi}_V^{ab}\gamma_{ab}((\det g)^{1/4}\Psi), \quad (6.17)$$

where we kept the common notation  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$  for its natural generalization to the “half-density” spinors, with the relevant shift already evident via the same shift in  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$ . The operator  $\Delta_\xi$  is therefore better understood as part of  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$ , or as a combination of the proper diffeomorphism that starts from  $\mathcal{L}_\xi$  and acts on the “half-density” spinor and an additional local Lorentz transformation of  $\sim -\hat{\xi}_V$ .

We must recompute the covariant diffeomorphism anomaly

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\text{diff}}^{\text{cov}}(\xi) &= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left( \Gamma e^{-\beta \mathcal{Q}} \hat{\delta}_\xi \right) \\ &= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left( \Gamma e^{-\beta \mathcal{Q}} \left[ \Delta_\xi - \frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \right] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

from scratch. The first piece was already computed by Alvarez-Gaume and Witten, so it falls upon us to compute the second, additional piece. In view of how we advocated the generalized Kosmann lift, the question comes down to how this additional piece would have figured into the computation in Ref. [9].

For instance, the difference due to  $-\hat{\xi}_V^{ab}\gamma_{ab}/4$  as in

$$\text{Tr} \left[ \Gamma e^{-\beta((i\gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a)^2 + \beta^{-1} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab}/4)} \right] \Big|_{\xi\text{-linear}} \quad (6.19)$$

starts out at a negative power of  $\beta$ ,

$$\sim \frac{1}{\beta} \int (d\xi) \wedge \text{tr}(\dots), \quad (6.20)$$

where  $\xi$  is treated as 1-form and the ellipsis is a sum of wedge products of  $(d/2 - 1)$ -many curvature 2-forms,  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$ . The Bianchi identities for the curvature 2-form implies  $d[\text{tr}(\dots)] = 0$ , so that this term vanishes upon integration by parts on a compact spacetime or with vanishing asymptotic boundary condition on the curvatures.

The question is therefore what happens to  $\beta^0$  terms that come about due to  $-\hat{\xi}_V^{ab}\gamma_{ab}/4$  part of  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$ . This computation, when attacked directly, is substantially more involved than the conventional computation of the covariant anomaly. In Appendix A, we will take a  $d = 4$  example and make such brute-force evaluations for an illustration of what kinds of computations are involved.

On the other hand, it turns out that there is a far simpler way to evaluate (6.19), relying on a general property of the functional trace by noting the vanishing identity,

$$0 = \text{Tr} \left( \Gamma e^{-\beta \mathcal{Q}} [(\gamma_b \xi^b)(\gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a) + (\gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a)(\gamma_b \xi^b)] \right), \quad (6.21)$$

by virtue of  $\Gamma \gamma_a + \gamma_a \Gamma = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{Q} = -(\gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a)^2$ , and the cyclic property of  $\text{Tr}$ . As with any such formal argument, the last cyclic property is something we need to be wary of in the functional setting; nevertheless, it will hold, given sufficiently nice boundary conditions. It follows immediately from  $\{\gamma_b \xi^b, \gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a\} = 2\Delta_\xi - \hat{\xi}_V^{ab}\gamma_{ab}$  that

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} (\Gamma e^{-\beta \mathcal{Q}} \Delta_\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \times \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left( \Gamma e^{-\beta \mathcal{Q}} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \right), \quad (6.22)$$

for the above functional traces, either on a compact manifold or with a physical boundary condition that enforces a fast asymptotic vanishing of the field strengths.

The quantity of interest (6.18) is a linear combination of the two sides of this equality with the additional factors of 1 and  $-1/2$ , respectively,

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left( \Gamma e^{-\beta \mathcal{Q}} \hat{\delta}_\xi \right) = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left( \Gamma e^{-\beta \mathcal{Q}} \left[ \Delta_\xi - \frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \right] \right), \quad (6.23)$$

which brings us immediately to

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\text{diff}}^{\text{cov}}(\xi) &= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} \left( \Gamma e^{-\beta \mathcal{Q}} \hat{\delta}_\xi \right) = \frac{1}{2} \times \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \text{Tr} (\Gamma e^{-\beta \mathcal{Q}} \Delta_\xi) \\ &= \int P_{d+2}(\mathbb{R}_\beta^\alpha + 2\pi i(-\nabla_\beta \xi^\alpha); \mathcal{F}) \Big|_{\xi\text{-linear}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.24)$$

in the end, with  $2\pi i$  replacing  $4\pi i$  of (6.12) but for precisely the same old anomaly polynomial  $P_{d+2}$ .

It is important to note that none of these affect the anomaly polynomials, which are the most important and most widely used results of Ref. [9]. These venerable

anomaly polynomials stand uncorrected, despite the generalized Kosmann lift, or in retrospect, more properly justified thanks to the generalized Kosmann lift.

### 6.3 Kosmann for Other Chiral Fields

The most general form of the anomaly polynomial is [9]

$$P_{d+2}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{R}) \wedge_{\mathbf{r}} \text{ch}_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{F}) \Big|_{(d+2)\text{-form}} \quad (6.25)$$

with the A-roof genus  $\mathbb{A}$  from the spinor bundle. On the right, we used the curvature 2-form in its Cartan-Maurer form  $\mathcal{R}$ , yet this can be easily translated to  $\mathbb{R}$  inside the traces. The Chern classes  $\text{ch}$ 's arise from vector bundles in representations  $\mathbf{r}$  of some gauge groups, of which the chiral fields in question are also sections. The simplest context we worked on so far assumed that these vector bundles are all associated with internal gauge symmetries.

For more general chiral fields, we would find additional  $\text{ch}(\mathcal{R})$ 's among the latter factors. Rarita-Schwinger field,  $\Psi_a$ , for example, carries an extra local Lorentz index that is contracted with a Dirac matrix in the Lagrangian,

$$\sim \bar{\Psi}_a \gamma^{abc} \mathcal{D}_b \Psi_c , \quad (6.26)$$

so it is natural to take the local Lorentz index instead of the coordinate one. As such after taking into account the usual “traceless” condition  $\gamma^a \Psi_a = 0$ , it is natural to expect that the anomaly polynomial would arise from

$$\mathbb{A}(\mathcal{R}) \wedge (\text{ch}_{\text{def}}(\mathcal{R}) - 1) \wedge_{\mathbf{r}} \text{ch}_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{F}) . \quad (6.27)$$

Let us concentrate on this example and see how the Kosmann lift again enters the covariant anomaly computation and produces an answer on par with the spinor case of the previous subsection.

An immediate question is how the Kosmann-lifted Lie derivative acts on such a higher-spin chiral field. Starting from the earlier observation in (4.18),

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi} v^a = \xi^c D_c v^a - \hat{\xi}^{ac} v_c \quad (6.28)$$

and using the Leibniz rule, we arrive at

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi u_b = \xi^c D_c u_b + u^c \hat{\xi}_{Vcb} = \xi^c D_c u_b - \hat{\xi}_{Vbc} u^c. \quad (6.29)$$

This means that on the Rarita-Schwinger field, the (generalized) Kosmann acts as

$$\hat{\delta}_\xi \Psi_a = \xi^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu \Psi_a + \delta_{\hat{\xi}_V}^{\text{local Lorentz}} \Psi_a = \left( \xi^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu - \frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_V^{bc} \gamma_{bc} \right) \Psi_a - \hat{\xi}_{V^a}{}^b \Psi_b \quad (6.30)$$

where  $\mathbf{D}$  now includes the spin connection acting on the 1-form orthonormal index of  $\Psi_a$  as well.

Once we write out the translation operator this way, it is clear that  $\hat{\delta}_\xi$  acting on the Rarita-Schwinger field is equipped with the additional local Lorentz rotation on the lower orthonormal index of  $\Psi_a$  by the amount of  $\Theta = \hat{\xi}_V$ . We remind the readers of the convention (5.42) in use for gauge transformations. The covariant anomaly computation due to this additional part of the translation operator would then proceed exactly the same way as with other internal gauge sectors,<sup>6</sup> so that the shift of the curvature

$$\mathcal{R}_{ab} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_{ab} + 2\pi i \hat{\xi}_{Vab} \quad (6.31)$$

occurs inside  $\text{ch}_{\text{def}}(\mathcal{R})$  when the latter contributes to the covariant anomaly.

Using  $\hat{\xi}_{Vab} = -D_{[a} \xi_{b]} = (-D_a \xi_b + D_b \xi_a)/2$ , and translating back to the coordinate basis, this effectively gives

$$\mathbb{R}_\alpha{}^\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_\alpha{}^\beta + 2\pi i (-\nabla_\alpha \xi^\beta) \quad (6.32)$$

for all instances of the Riemann curvature 2-forms in the anomaly polynomial. This allows

$$G_{\text{diff}}^{\text{cov}}(\xi) = \int P_{d+2}(\mathbb{R}_\beta{}^\alpha + 2\pi i (-\nabla_\beta \xi^\alpha); \mathcal{F}) \Big|_{\xi\text{-linear}}, \quad (6.33)$$

for Rarita-Schwinger field as well, with  $P_{d+2}$  computed from (6.27).

For (anti-)chiral tensors in  $d = 4k + 2$ , say,  $B$  and  $H = dB + \dots$ , the computation

---

<sup>6</sup>We skip this more straightforward part of the computation, which originates from Ref. [9], closely modeled after the Fujikawa computation of the axial anomaly. We quote the same for the discussion in the next subsection, as well.

of the covariant anomaly should proceed similarly. In Ref. [9], the problem was recast by starting from a field constructed from a tensor product of a spinor and an additional Weyl spinor. Although this tensor product is equivalent to not only  $B$  and  $H$  but includes other differential forms, the latter are not chiral and thus deemed harmless for the anomaly computation. This means that all that changes is again a matter of an extra factor in the relevant characteristic class,

$$- \mathbb{A}(\mathcal{R}) \wedge \frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{ch}_{\text{Weyl spinor}}(\mathcal{R}) \wedge_{\mathbf{r}} \mathfrak{ch}_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathcal{F}) \quad (6.34)$$

where the half originates from the reality of  $B$  and  $H$  and the overall sign from the bosonic nature of these chiral fields. The additional Weyl spinor index acts much like a gauge index, and is rotated, by virtue of the Kosmann lift, under a local Lorentz gauge transformation of  $\Theta = \hat{\xi}_V$ . This, combined with the spinor computation of the previous subsection, again leads us to the universal shift of the curvature as in (6.33).

One should note how the necessary shift of the Riemann curvature in these additional  $\mathfrak{ch}(\mathcal{R})$  contributions emerges entirely from the Kosmann lift. In other words, when it comes to the anomaly contribution from these  $\mathfrak{ch}(\mathcal{R})$  due to higher spin content, it is not that the Kosmann lift halves the naive expectations from  $\Delta_\xi$ , but oppositely, the necessary shift that computes the covariant anomaly would occur only if one chooses to invoke the Kosmann lift.

Conventionally, on the other hand, such a shift of the curvature 2-form was engineered by instituting a rotation of the additional index, e.g., 1-form index of  $\Psi_\mu$ , by  $\nabla_\mu \xi_\nu - \nabla_\nu \xi_\mu$ . Note how the latter differs, again, from the effect encoded in the vanilla Lie derivative  $\mathfrak{L}_\xi$  on  $\Psi_\mu$ . On par with the case of spinors, this choice again incurs an additional factor 2, relative to the Kosmann, so in this sense, we again find that the same factor 1/2 reduction relative to the result of Ref. [9] is necessary for higher spin chiral fields as well.

## 6.4 Consistent from Covariant

In the past, such a factor 1/2 has been noticed: Ref. [23] discusses various alternative translational operators, among which are  $\delta_{cov}$  and  $\delta_{sym}$ . In our notations, the former equals  $\xi^\mu \mathbf{D}_\mu$ , while the latter was motivated as a combination of  $\delta_{cov}$  and a local Lorentz rotation so that its action on the vielbein produces a naturally symmetric energy-momentum tensor  $T$ . Recalling the general discussion in the header of Section



5, it should be obvious this latter requirement would enforce  $\delta_{sym} = \mathcal{L}_\xi$  on the vielbein, so the computation that starts from  $\delta_{sym}$  would eventually lead to a covariant anomaly with the same factor 1/2 relative to that of  $\delta_{AGW}$ , again in their notation.

What remained unclear was whether these various choices, regarded as different combinations of diffeomorphisms and local Lorentz rotations, are merely equivalent representations of the same physical phenomenon; as long as one is interested in cancelation of the gravitational anomalies, such a universal factor 1/2 depending on the precise operator chosen, may seem innocuous. However, what really appears in physical Ward identity and in the anomalous effective action is the consistent anomaly, the normalization of which is a serious matter since in string theory, for example, such anomalies are often canceled by inflows from some definite topological couplings.

In particular, the consistent anomaly [24–26] for diffeomorphism is compactly written in the coordinate basis with the curvature 2-form  $\mathbb{R}$  [21], with the local Lorentz index absent. This means that for this side, there is no ambiguity from the local Lorentz symmetry mixing in, and there has to be a unique answer that sits on the right side of the diffeomorphism Ward identity. The covariant anomaly should be considered only as an intermediate step toward the consistent anomaly, on the other hand, which supplies the anomaly polynomial and the normalization, so an unambiguous question emerges to ask which version of the various purported covariant anomalies makes sense by the time we reached the consistent side.

The general connection between the two sides is originally from Ref. [21], both for gauge anomalies and their diffeomorphism cousin, although it did not fix this crucial normalization for the latter we seek here. With our unambiguous motivation in favor of the Kosmann lift, we expect that the covariant anomaly (6.33) we computed should lead to the generally anticipated consistent anomaly with the right coefficient. In this last part, we will revisit consistent diffeomorphism anomaly and show that the numerical factor we found for the covariant side under the Kosmann transfers to the consistent side and how the resulting normalization fits precisely the general anomaly descent and thus the anomaly inflow mechanism.

Let us start by recalling how this went for gauge anomalies which are generally less cumbersome. The anomaly polynomial  $P_{d+2}(\mathcal{F})$  with gauge field strength 2-forms

$\mathcal{F}$  is determined in the process of computing the covariant anomaly

$$G^{\text{cov}} = \int P_{d+2}(\mathcal{F} + 2\pi\text{i}\Theta) \Big|_{\Theta\text{-linear}} \quad (6.35)$$

with the gauge function  $\Theta$  [9]. The normalization of  $P_{d+2}$  itself is tied to  $(d+2)$ -dimensional Atiyah-Singer index formulae. The anomaly descent, with the same  $P_{d+2}(\mathcal{F})$ ,

$$P_{d+2}(\mathcal{F}) = d\mathbf{w}_{d+1}^{(0)}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}), \quad \delta_{\Theta}\mathbf{w}_{d+1}^{(0)}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}) = d\mathbf{w}_d^{(1)}(\Theta; \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}), \quad (6.36)$$

isolates the consistent anomaly,

$$G \equiv \delta_{\Theta}W(\mathcal{A}) = 2\pi\text{i} \int \mathbf{w}_d^{(1)}(\Theta; \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}), \quad (6.37)$$

with  $2\pi\text{i}$  inherited from that of the covariant anomaly, on the other hand. The two sides famously reconcile as [21]

$$G^{\text{cov}}(\Theta; \mathcal{F}) = G(\Theta; \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}) + d_{\mathcal{A}}\Theta \circ (-2\pi\text{i}\mathcal{K}) \quad (6.38)$$

via the introduction of the Bardeen-Zumino current  $\mathcal{K}$ , also determined by the same  $P_{d+2}(\mathcal{F})$ .

Here we shall accept these well-known facts and adapt the spirit to the case of diffeomorphism. When we turn to the diffeomorphism anomaly, many of these conclusions survive in the end, despite how various middle steps cannot be the same given that the transformation involved is primarily translational,

$$\delta_{\xi}\mathbb{F} = \mathcal{L}'_{\xi}\mathbb{F} + \delta_{-\partial\xi}^{GL(d)}\mathbb{F}, \quad \delta_{-\partial\xi}^{GL(d)}\mathbb{F} \equiv d_{\mathbb{F}}(-\partial\xi), \quad (6.39)$$

where  $-\partial\xi$  represents a  $GL(d)$  matrix,  $-\partial_{\beta}\xi^{\alpha}$ , playing the role of the gauge function  $\Theta$ . Here,  $\mathcal{L}'_{\xi}$  treats  $\mathbb{F}_{\beta}^{\alpha}$  as if it is a collection of 1-forms and ignores the other  $GL(d)$  indices,  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . The ‘‘gauge’’ transformation of the  $GL(d)$  connection  $\mathbb{F}_{\beta}^{\alpha}$  occurs almost as an afterthought.

A nontrivial fact is that despite this very distinct action of the diffeomorphism, the consistent anomaly is given by the naive  $GL(d)$  anomaly descent [21],

$$G_{\text{diff}}(\xi; \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) \equiv \delta_{\xi}W(\mathbb{F}; \mathcal{A}) = 2\pi\text{i} \int \mathbf{w}_d^{(1)}(-\partial\xi; \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) \quad (6.40)$$

as if the translational action  $\mathcal{L}'_\xi$  was absent. Although we wrote  $2\pi\mathfrak{i}$  as the multiplicative coefficient in line with general anomaly descent, the consistent side is incapable of determining either this overall coefficient or even the anomaly polynomial. The aim is to see that this  $2\pi\mathfrak{i}$  is precisely inherited from the same in the covariant side (6.33).

In other words, we wish to show that, with a Bardeen-Zumino current  $\mathbb{K}$  to be shown explicitly below,

$$G_{\text{diff}}^{\text{cov}}(\xi) = G_{\text{diff}}(\xi; \Gamma, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) + \delta_\xi \Gamma \circ (-2\pi\mathfrak{i}\mathbb{K}) , \quad (6.41)$$

in the general manner as in (6.38), with aforementioned  $G_{\text{diff}}$  and

$$G_{\text{diff}}^{\text{cov}}(\xi) = \int P_{d+2}(\mathbb{R}_\beta^\alpha + 2\pi\mathfrak{i}(-\nabla_\beta \xi^\alpha); \mathcal{F}) \Big|_{\xi\text{-linear}} . \quad (6.42)$$

All quantities, including  $\mathbb{K}$ , are derived from a common anomaly polynomial  $P_{d+2}(\mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F})$ .

The additional factor  $1/2$ , thanks to the generalized Kosmann lift, is essential for the matching down to numbers; we will take time to trace through the relation between the two versions of the diffeomorphism anomalies. In the end we will find, the Bardeen-Zumino current here is again a pure gauge-type, now with respect to the naive  $GL(d)$ , and can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{K} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbb{R}} \mathbf{w}_{d+1}^{(0)}(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) , \quad (6.43)$$

where  $d\mathbf{w}_{d+1}^{(0)}(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) = P_{d+2}(\mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) - P_{d+2}(0; \mathcal{F})$  as is familiar from the anomaly descent. In turn, the same  $\mathbf{w}_{d+1}^{(0)}$  produces the consistent anomaly above via

$$\mathbf{w}_d^{(1)}(\Omega; \Gamma, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) \equiv \text{tr} \left( \Omega \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma} \mathbf{w}_{d+1}^{(0)}(\Gamma, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) \right) , \quad (6.44)$$

for an arbitrary  $GL(d)$ -valued  $\Omega$ , equivalent to the usual descent mechanism along the diffeomorphism side.

A key that allows us to do this is how  $-\nabla_\alpha \xi^\beta$  that enters  $G_{\text{diff}}^{\text{cov}}(\xi)$  but differs from its counterpart  $-\partial_\alpha \xi^\beta$  for the anomaly descent, may be recast as

$$-\nabla_\alpha \xi^\beta = -\partial_\alpha \xi^\beta + \xi \lrcorner \Gamma_\alpha{}^\beta , \quad (6.45)$$

with  $\mathbb{F}$  considered as a matrix-valued 1-form. Starting with this and after some manipulations using the anomaly descent algebra, we may rewrite  $G_{\text{diff}}^{\text{cov}}(\xi)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\text{diff}}^{\text{cov}}(\xi) &= G_{\text{diff}}(\xi; \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) + (\mathcal{L}'_{\xi} \mathbb{F} + d_{\mathbb{F}}(-\partial\xi)) \circ (-2\pi\mathfrak{i}\mathbb{K}) \\ &\quad + 2\pi\mathfrak{i} \int \mathbf{w}_d^{(1)}(\xi \lrcorner \mathbb{F}; \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) + 2\pi\mathfrak{i} (\mathcal{L}'_{\xi} \mathbb{F} - d_{\mathbb{F}}(\xi \lrcorner \mathbb{F})) \circ \mathbb{K} , \end{aligned} \quad (6.46)$$

where we used (6.38) strictly for  $GL(d)$  and the claimed form of  $G_{\text{diff}}$  twice, once with  $\Theta \rightarrow -\partial\xi$  and one more time with  $\Theta \rightarrow \xi \lrcorner \mathbb{F}$ .

The first line on the right of (6.46) is precisely the desired right hand side of (6.41), so the task boils down to how the remainders in the second line cancel out among themselves. With the identity

$$(\mathcal{L}'_{\xi} \mathbb{F} - d_{\mathbb{F}}(\xi \lrcorner \mathbb{F}))_{\alpha}{}^{\beta}{}_{\mu} = \xi^{\lambda} \mathbb{R}_{\alpha}{}^{\beta}{}_{\lambda\mu} , \quad (6.47)$$

the unwanted second line of (6.46) organizes into

$$2\pi\mathfrak{i} \int \mathbf{w}_d^{(1)}(\xi \lrcorner \mathbb{F}; \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) + 2\pi\mathfrak{i} (\xi \lrcorner \mathbb{R}) \circ \mathbb{K} = 2\pi\mathfrak{i} \int \xi \lrcorner' \mathbf{w}_{d+1}^{(0)}(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{R}; \mathcal{F}) , \quad (6.48)$$

where the contraction  $\lrcorner'$  is understood to be limited to  $\mathbb{F}$  and  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Although  $\mathbf{w}_{d+1}^{(0)}$  makes frequent appearances in the descent mechanism, it does so only as mathematical middle steps. If one tries to evaluate it with  $d$ -dimensional connections and curvatures inserted,  $\mathbf{w}_{d+1}^{(0)} = 0$  identically since it is a  $(d+1)$ -form in the  $d$ -dimensional spacetime. The vector  $\xi$  is also  $d$ -dimensional, so the contraction against it does not affect the fact that (6.48) vanishes identically. This concludes the demonstration of how the consistent anomaly is connected to the covariant one in the usual manner, (6.41).

In particular, the numerical factor  $2\pi\mathfrak{i}$  of the covariant diffeomorphism anomaly is inherited by the consistent one. With  $4\pi\mathfrak{i}$  in place of  $2\pi\mathfrak{i}$ , say, for the chiral spinor contribution as in (6.12), one would have found an odd situation where the descent of diffeomorphism comes with a factor 2 larger coefficient than other gauge symmetries. In particular, the same factor 2 would have entered between the local Lorentz anomaly and the diffeomorphism anomaly. This odd situation is happily avoided, again thanks to the generalized Kosmann lift.

## 7 Summary

We have explored various corners of the energy-momentum tensors and the Ward identities thereof, with the Lie derivative proving to be the centerpiece of all these investigations.

The first half of the note is devoted to the question of the Noether procedure itself, starting from an age-old statement that the naive procedure must be augmented by the improvement term to agree with the symmetric energy-momentum tensor. There are also literatures that “prove” how the two agree with each other, in contrast, sometimes leaving us bewildered. We offer a simple and universal view on the matter which shows how the Noether energy-momentum and the symmetric energy-momentum are two sides of a single coin, so to speak.

The guiding principle is how, once coupled to the metric, the Lagrangian is generally covariant, meaning that it is preserved modulo a total derivative under general coordinate transformation. This in turn dictates that the position-dependent variation of the matter field must follow the Lie derivative. With this, the Lagrangian  $d$ -form density transforms universally by an exact  $d$ -form. The vanishing rest is split into two mutually canceling parts, on the other hand, one from the matter variation and the other from the spacetime variation. Each of these produces the above two types of the energy-momentum tensor, respectively, and the mutual cancelation demands the verbatim equality of the two types of energy-momentum tensors  $T = \hat{T}$  in the end.

A key fact of life to note here is that the Lie derivative is relevant in flat geometry as well, since even for simple translations the Lie derivative is unavoidable when these are expressed in a curvilinear coordinate. The Lie derivative per se has little to do with the spacetime curvature as it is a fundamental structure of all differentiable manifolds and exists prior to the introduction of the metric and the Levi-Civita connection.

This naturally brings us to the question of what should be the action of the diffeomorphism on spinors. The prevalent answer to this in the physics community, which treats spinors as if they consist of multiple scalars, is deficient if we recall how one way to motivate the Lie derivative is as a directional derivative that maps a tensor to a tensor. Unlike with tensors which can be defined once the manifold is equipped with a differential structure, spinors are inevitably tied to the frame

bundle, itself built upon the vielbein and thus upon the metric, and equipped with the spin connection naturally. Even though spinors are not tensors in the latter’s most restricted sense, a sensible definition of a Lie derivative on the spinor must map it to another spinor, or a well-defined section of the spin bundle. This eventually leads us to the Kosmann lift of the diffeomorphism, which involves the covariant derivatives not just partial derivatives.

Equipped with this Kosmann lift of the diffeomorphism, we went back to the matter of the energy-momentum tensor of spinors, where we show that a mutually agreeing pair  $T = \hat{\mathbb{T}}$  again emerges in a naturally symmetric form, without resorting to the equation of motion. Interestingly, we find that the form of  $T = \hat{\mathbb{T}}$  is more robust than the Lagrangian; without further tweaking, the same energy-momentum tensor results from two different versions of the Dirac fermion, the canonical version  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Dirac}}$  and the democratic version  $\mathcal{L}'_{\text{Dirac}}$ .

We must comment here that observations related to some of the above have appeared in past literatures, a few of them quite recent. For instance, there is known “proof” of how the Noether energy-momentum tensor equals the symmetric one, which comes about from fixing the ambiguous Noether procedure by demanding the internal gauge invariance [27]. This differs from ours in that we demand the general covariance which is far more universal. Closer in spirit to ours is Ref. [11], as noted already, where the general covariance and the Lie derivative were used to demonstrate the equality of the two energy-momentum for the Maxwell theory.

Another related work can be found in Ref. [28], which recovered the correct energy-momentum tensor  $\mathbb{T}$  by taking into account the rotating part of the Lie derivative, just as we did, although in detail the procedure is different. In particular, the latter employs the variation of the spacetime integration measure for the Noether procedure, often found in old physics literature on the subject. This last goes against our general spirit that  $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$  should arise entirely from the variation of the matter fields.

One can also find discussions of the Kosmann lift for the computation of  $\mathbb{T}$  [28–30] for Dirac fermions, if not of why the end result must always equal to the symmetric energy-momentum tensor  $T$ . We doubt that these few exhaust the relevant literature but at least they show how unsettled the subject matter has been for many long years. Finally, we introduced the notion of the generalized Kosmann lift, relevant when the spinor in question is also coupled to gauge fields as well as to the spin connection.

All of these brought us to the matter of the diffeomorphism Ward identity. Be-

cause this (generalized) Kosmann lift differs from the conventional choice, the existing computation of the diffeomorphism anomaly must be rethought from scratch, which we take up in Section 6. After recalling and clarifying a few subtleties with the existing computations, such as how the translational operator used for the computation was neither the Kosmann nor the naive version of the diffeomorphism generator, we showed how the gravitation anomaly polynomials are unaffected while the dictionary that extracts the anomaly from the latter must be modified rather simply by an additional factor of  $1/2$ .

The legacy computation [9] should be regarded as a sum of two anomalies, in retrospect, a violation of Kosmann-lifted diffeomorphism generated by  $\xi$  and a violation of a local Lorentz transformation by the amount  $-\hat{\xi}_V$ . The two happened to contribute equally to the covariant anomaly, coincidentally, and in effect doubled the answer for the former. A factor  $1/2$  reduction is needed, therefore, for the pure diffeomorphism anomaly. We also delineated how this factor  $1/2$  propagates to the consistent side and allows us to put the routine for the consistent diffeomorphism anomaly on equal footing with gauge anomalies.<sup>7</sup>

In a sense, one of the more important ramifications of the later part of this note is how the existing anomaly polynomials are now on completely solid ground, beyond the precarious middle steps in the past, thanks to the Kosmann lift. In turn, all these nooks and crannies emphasize strongly the importance of the Lie derivative for quantum fields in general, and, in particular, how the Kosmann-lifted Lie derivative is not as an optional choice but rather a necessary part of the physics dictionary for fermions.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Sangmin Lee, Kentaro Hori, Yu Nakayama, and Alessandro Tomasiello for the discussion on various aspects of this manuscript. This work is supported by a KIAS individual grant, PG005705.

---

<sup>7</sup>Although we could not scan the extensive literature on the consistent side which is by itself incapable of fixing the normalization, it is very likely that the proper normalization has been in use for decades, unknowingly, motivated by the simpler gauge anomaly side.

## A An Explicit Computation of $d = 4$ Anomaly

In this appendix, we will perform an explicit demonstration of the key identity (6.23) for the case of  $d = 4$ . We will borrow heavily from Ref. [31] for the necessary heat kernel expansion. The simple derivation thanks to (6.21) is nice and powerful, yet it fails to convey the nontrivial gymnastics underlying the equality. We offer the appendix for a more explicit demonstration of the identity (6.21) in favor of a better feeling of how things work out in detail.

The Kosmann-lift contribution to the covariant diffeomorphism anomaly is

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left[ \Gamma \left( -\frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \right) \right] = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow 0} \mathrm{Tr} \left[ \Gamma \left( -\frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \right) e^{-\beta(i\gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a)^2} \right]. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

As usual, we use the squared Dirac operator as a regulator.

$$(i\gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a)^2 = -\mathbf{D}^2 + \frac{1}{4}R - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{F}_{ab}\gamma^{ab}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Here, we will need the explicit form of the heat kernel in the coincidence limit,

$$\langle x | e^{-\beta(i\gamma^a \mathbf{D}_a)^2} | x \rangle = \frac{\sqrt{g(x)}}{(4\pi\beta)^{d/2}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(x) \beta^n, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for which we read off some relevant coefficients from Ref. [31],

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &= 1, \\ a_1 &= -\frac{1}{12}R + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu, \\ a_2 &= \frac{1}{180}R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - \frac{1}{180}R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{288}R^2 - \frac{1}{120}D^2R + \frac{1}{12}\mathcal{F}^{\mu\nu}\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{1}{24}R^{\kappa\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\lambda} - \frac{1}{24}R\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{12}D^2\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} \right) \gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{1}{8}\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{F}_{\rho\sigma} + \frac{1}{192}R^{\kappa\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu}R_{\kappa\lambda\rho\sigma} \right) \gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu\gamma^\rho\gamma^\sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

These suffice for  $d = 4$ .

Let us compute (A.1) for  $d = 4$  using the above formulae, step by step. Since we need the  $\beta \rightarrow 0$  limit, it suffices to examine only  $\beta^{-2}, \beta^{-1}, \beta^0$ -terms. First, it is



evident that  $\beta^{-2}$ -term vanishes,

$$(\beta^{-2}\text{-term}) = \int d^4x \frac{\sqrt{g}}{(4\pi)^2\beta^2} \text{tr} \left[ \Gamma \left( -\frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \right) a_0 \right] = 0, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

from the trace over spin indices, as usual.

Next up are  $\beta^{-1}$ -terms, for which we use the usual relation

$$\text{tr}(\Gamma \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\beta \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu) = \frac{-4}{\sqrt{g}} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

that we often invoke for computing Atiyah-Singer index densities, and find

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta^{-1}\text{-term}) &= \int d^4x \frac{\sqrt{g}}{(4\pi)^2\beta} \text{tr} \left[ \Gamma \left( -\frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \right) a_1 \right] \\ &= \frac{-1}{32\pi^2\beta} \int d^4x D_\alpha \xi_\beta \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Integrating by parts, we find

$$(\beta^{-1}\text{-term}) = \frac{1}{32\pi^2\beta} \int d^4x \xi_\beta \text{tr}(D_\alpha \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

by virtue of the Bianchi identity for  $\mathcal{F}$ , as was claimed in the main text.

The last and the most involved  $\beta^0$ -terms are

$$\begin{aligned} (\beta^0\text{-term}) &= \int d^4x \frac{\sqrt{g}}{(4\pi)^2} \text{tr} \left[ \Gamma \left( -\frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \right) a_2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \int d^4x D_{[\alpha} \xi_{\beta]} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{F}_{\rho\sigma}) + \frac{1}{96} R^{\kappa\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} R_{\kappa\lambda\rho\sigma} \right) g^{\alpha\mu} \epsilon^{\beta\nu\rho\sigma} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{24} \left( -R^{\kappa\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\lambda}) + R \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) - 2D^2 \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

from the following spinor trace formula

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\Gamma \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\beta \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho \gamma^\sigma) &= \frac{-4}{\sqrt{g}} \left( g^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - g^{\alpha\mu} \epsilon^{\beta\nu\rho\sigma} + g^{\beta\mu} \epsilon^{\alpha\nu\rho\sigma} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + g^{\nu\rho} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\sigma} - g^{\nu\sigma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\rho} + g^{\rho\sigma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

The first half vanishes nontrivially with the help of another identity,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{F}_{\rho\sigma}) + \frac{1}{96} R^{\kappa\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} R_{\kappa\lambda\rho\sigma} \right) g^{\alpha\mu} \epsilon^{\beta\nu\rho\sigma} \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{4} \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{F}_{\rho\sigma}) + \frac{1}{96} R^{\kappa\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} R_{\kappa\lambda\rho\sigma} \right) \frac{1}{4} g^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

checked by brute-force.

Of the surviving  $\beta^0$ -terms

$$\frac{1}{384\pi^2} \int d^4x D_\alpha \xi_\beta \left( -R^{\kappa\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\lambda}) + R \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) - 2D^2 \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} , \quad (\text{A.12})$$

the third can be manipulated via the Bianchi identity to

$$\begin{aligned} D^2 \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} &= 2D^\kappa D_\mu \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\nu}) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \\ &= 2([D^\kappa, D_\mu] + D_\mu D^\kappa) \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\nu}) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Using the combinatorial identity  $R_{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\nu} = 0$ , the second piece of (A.13) can be dropped after integration by parts

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d^4x D_\alpha \xi_\beta D_\mu D^\kappa \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\nu}) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \\ &= - \int d^4x D_\mu D_\alpha \xi_\beta D^\kappa \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\nu}) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

The other, commutator term can be simplified with the curvature tensor,

$$\begin{aligned} 2[D^\kappa, D_\mu] \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\nu}) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} &= 2 \left( -R^\lambda{}_\kappa{}^\kappa{}_\mu \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda\nu}) - R^\lambda{}_\nu{}^\kappa{}_\mu \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\lambda}) \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \\ &= \left( 2R^\lambda{}_\mu \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda\nu}) - R^{\kappa\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\lambda}) \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

bringing us to

$$\frac{1}{384\pi^2} \int d^4x D_\alpha \xi_\beta \left( R^{\kappa\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\lambda}) + R \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) - 4R^\lambda{}_\mu \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda\nu}) \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} , \quad (\text{A.16})$$

for the surviving part of (A.1) in  $d = 4$ .

Comparing this against the standard result of Alvarez-Gaume and Witten gives the desired relation,

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma \hat{\delta}_\xi) = \mathrm{Tr} \left[ \Gamma \left( \Delta_\xi - \frac{1}{4} \hat{\xi}_V^{ab} \gamma_{ab} \right) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \times \mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma \Delta_\xi) , \quad (\text{A.17})$$

as was claimed, with help from another nontrivial identity in  $d = 4$ ,

$$\left( R^{\kappa\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\kappa\lambda}) + R \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) - 4R^\lambda{}_\mu \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\lambda\nu}) \right) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = R^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\mu\nu} \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\rho\sigma}) \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} , \quad (\text{A.18})$$

also confirmed by brute-force. We performed the computation in  $d = 4$ , where the pure diffeomorphism anomaly is absent, so the end result is a mixed anomaly between the diffeomorphism and Abelian gauge transformations.

## References

- [1] S. Weinberg, “The Quantum Theory of Fields,” Cambridge University Press (1995).
- [2] E. Noether, “Invariante Variationsprobleme,” *Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Gött.* **1918**, 235 (1918).
- [3] F. J. Belinfante, “On the current and the density of the electric charge, the energy, the linear momentum and the angular momentum of arbitrary fields,” *Physica* **7**, 449 (1940).
- [4] L. Rosenfeld, “Sur le tenseur d’impulsion-énergie,” *Mém. Acad. R. Belg.* **18**, 1 (1940).
- [5] Y. Kosmann, “Dérivées de Lie des spineurs,” *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* **91**, 317 (1971).
- [6] Y. Kosmann, “Dérivées de Lie des spineurs,” *Comptes rendus Acad. Sc. Paris Sér. A* **262**, 289 (1966).
- [7] Y. Kosmann, “Dérivées de Lie des spineurs. Applications,” *Comptes rendus Acad. Sc. Paris Sér. A* **262**, 394 (1966).

- [8] Y. Kosmann, “Propriétés des dérivations de l’algèbre des tenseurs-spineurs,” *Comptes rendus Acad. Sc. Paris Sér. A* **264**, 355 (1967).
- [9] L. Alvarez-Gaume and E. Witten, “Gravitational Anomalies,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **234**, 269 (1984).
- [10] Piljin Yi, “Geometric Quantum Field Theories,” Cambridge University Press, to appear.
- [11] R. E. G. Saraví, “The electromagnetic energy-momentum tensor,” *J. Phys. A* **35**, 9199 (2002).
- [12] R. Jackiw and N. S. Manton, “Symmetries and Conservation Laws in Gauge Theories,” *Annals Phys.* **127**, 257 (1980).
- [13] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, “On the supersymmetries of Anti-de Sitter vacua,” *Class. Quantum Grav.* **16**, 2043 (1999).
- [14] J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, E. Hackett-Jones and G. Moutsopoulos, “The Killing superalgebra of ten-dimensional supergravity backgrounds,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24**, 3291 (2007).
- [15] A. Tomasiello, “Geometry of String Theory Compactifications,” Cambridge University Press (2022).
- [16] Ö. Kelekci, Y. Lozano, N. T. Macpherson and E. Ó. Colgáin, “Supersymmetry and non-Abelian T-duality in type II supergravity,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32**, 035014 (2015).
- [17] T. Jacobson and A. Mohd, “Black hole entropy and Lorentz-diffeomorphism Noether charge,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 124010 (2015) [arXiv:1507.01054 [gr-qc]].
- [18] A. Coimbra and C. Strickland-Constable, “Supersymmetric Backgrounds, the Killing Superalgebra, and Generalised Special Holonomy,” *JHEP* **11**, 063 (2016).
- [19] R. Jackiw, “Gauge-Covariant Conformal Transformation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **41**, 1635 (1978).
- [20] K. Fujikawa, “Path-Integral Measure for Gauge-Invariant Fermion Theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 1195 (1979).

- [21] W. A. Bardeen and B. Zumino, “Consistent and Covariant Anomalies in Gauge and Gravitational Theories,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **244**, 421 (1984).
- [22] K. Fujikawa, M. Tomiya, and O. Yasuda, “Comment on Gravitational Anomalies,” *Z. Phys. C* **28**, 289 (1985).
- [23] F. Bastianelli and P. V. Nieuwenhuizen, “Path Integrals and Anomalies in Curved Spacetime,” Cambridge University Press (2006).
- [24] J. Wess and B. Zumino, “Consequences of Anomalous Ward Identities,” *Phys. Lett. B* **37**, 95 (1971).
- [25] B. Zumino, “Chiral Anomalies and Differential Geometry: Lectures Given at Les Houches, August 1983,” in *Relativity, Groups and Topology II*, edited by B. S. DeWitt and R. Stora, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1984).
- [26] R. Stora, “Algebraic Structure and Topological Origin of Anomalies,” *NATO Sci. Ser. B* **115** (1984).
- [27] H. Haberzettl, “Using gauge invariance to symmetrize the energy-momentum tensor of electrodynamics,” arXiv:2406.06785.
- [28] A. Freese, “Noether’s theorems and the energy-momentum tensor in quantum gauge theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 125012 (2022).
- [29] A. D. Helfer, “Spinor Lie derivatives and Fermion stress–energies,” *Proc. R. Soc. A* **472** (2016).
- [30] R. F. Bilyalov, “Symmetric Energy-Momentum Tensor of Spinor Fields,” *Theor. Math. Phys.* **108**, 1093 (1996).
- [31] A. O. Barvinsky and G. A. Vilkovisky, “The generalized Schwinger-DeWitt technique in gauge theories and quantum gravity,” *Phys. Rep.* **119**, 1 (1985).