

Symmetry Topological Field Theory for Flavor Symmetry

Qiang Jia¹, Ran Luo², Jiahua Tian³, Yi-Nan Wang^{2,4,5}, and Yi Zhang⁶¹*Department of Physics, Korea Advanced Institute of Science & Technology, Daejeon 34141, Korea*²*School of Physics, Peking University*³*School of Physics and Electronic Science, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China, 200241*⁴*Center for High Energy Physics, Peking University*⁵*Peng Huanwu Center for Fundamental Theory, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China and*⁶*Kavli IPMU (WPI), UTIAS, The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8583, Japan*

(Dated: March 7, 2025)

In this Letter, we demonstrate that the Symmetry Topological Field Theory (SymTFT) associated to a Quantum Field Theory (QFT) with continuous non-abelian G -flavor symmetry is a BF -theory with gauge group G . We show that gauging G -symmetry with a flat connection yields a theory with global symmetry characterized by exchanging the conjugate variables in the quantization of BF -theory. We construct the extended operators that generate the G -flavor symmetry and the $(d-2)$ -form $\text{Rep}(G)$ -symmetry of the gauged QFT. We demonstrate that BF -theory arises as the theory characterizing G -flavor symmetry of a QFT in the AdS/CFT setup. Hooft anomalies of the G -flavor symmetry are realized as extra terms in the action.

Introduction. Since the notion of *generalized global symmetry* of quantum field theory (QFT) was initially developed in [1–6] then coined [7], tremendous efforts have been dedicated to studying this subject [8–16] with a central focus on understanding various gaugings of the generalized symmetries and their anomalies [17–20], for which *symmetry topological field theory* (SymTFT) has been a useful unifying framework [9, 21–30]. The SymTFT \mathcal{S}_G associated to a QFT \mathcal{T}_G on M_d of G -symmetry lives on $M_{d+1} \cong M_d \times [0, 1]$ with topological boundary \mathcal{B}_{top} at $x^{d+1} = 0$ and physical boundary \mathcal{B}_{phy} at $x^{d+1} = 1$, as illustrated in Figure 1. Various gaug-

Although it was proposed in [31–33] that the SymTFT of a QFT \mathcal{T}_G with G -flavor symmetry is a BF -theory with gauge group G , a proof has yet to be provided. We will present concrete derivations to establish this proposal. More importantly, there still lacks a construction of the extended operators which yields the G -flavor symmetry action:

$$U_g(\Sigma)\psi_i(x) = R(g)_{ij}\psi_j(x), \quad g \in G \quad (1)$$

for $U_g(\Sigma)$ supported on Σ and local operator $\psi(x)$ in representation R of G when Σ links x in \mathcal{T}_G . It is rather easy to see the difficulty from Figure 1: to obtain $U(\Sigma)\psi(x)$ after interval compactification, one must consider the interaction between $U(\Sigma)$ and a line operator $W(\ell)$ ending on $\psi(x)$ in \mathcal{S}_G ; however, no line operators can transform in any non-abelian fashion as in (1) under the action of a linked topological operator $U(\Sigma)$ [7]. We will resolve this conundrum by allowing non-topological extended operators in \mathcal{S}_G .

In this Letter, following the construction in [21, 34], we define the SymTFT \mathcal{S}_G of a theory \mathcal{T}_G on M_d to be a topological field theory \mathcal{S}_G on $M_{d+1} \cong M_d \times [0, 1]$, whose canonical quantization over “time-slice” M_d yields a state space that coincides with the space of partition functions of \mathcal{T}_G minimally coupled to background flat G -gauge field. We then derive that \mathcal{S}_G is the BF -theory with gauge group G . With our definition, the equivalence of gauging and Fourier transform, as observed in [7, 21], becomes transparent and is used to obtain the spaces that parametrize the operators in \mathcal{S}_G that generate either the G -flavor symmetry of \mathcal{T}_G or the dual symmetry of the gauged theory on M_d . Quite surprisingly, unlike most known cases, we find that those operators do not have to be topological, nevertheless, they yield (1) on M_d when they link in M_{d+1} with proper boundary conditions. This indicates the necessity of looking at a broader spectrum of extended operators in general SymTFT. We present an




FIG. 1. The relation between the SymTFT \mathcal{S}_G and the corresponding physical theory \mathcal{T}_G . Various boundary conditions are imposed to linked operators in \mathcal{S}_G , whose interaction yields the G -symmetry action of \mathcal{T}_G after interval compactification.

ings of \mathcal{T}_G correspond to consistently imposing Dirichlet boundary conditions (DBC) or Neumann boundary conditions (NBC) to extended operators in \mathcal{S}_G . After an interval compactification, the interaction between linked extended operators yields the G -symmetry action of \mathcal{T}_G . It is usually tacitly assumed that these extended operators are topological, meaning they remain unchanged under any deformation unless it causes them to cross each other.

example of $G = SU(2)$ and classify all possible topological boundary conditions and the resulting global symmetries. We show that BF -theory can also be derived as the SymTFT of a QFT living on the boundary in a holographic setup. Lastly, we discuss the incorporation of 't Hooft anomalies in \mathcal{S}_G that obstruct gaugings.

Partition functions from quantization of BF -theory. In the absence of 't Hooft anomaly, gauging continuous G -symmetry of \mathcal{T}_G is done schematically by coupling \mathcal{T}_G to flat gauge field A as [8, 9, 14, 21, 35, 36]:

$$Z_{\mathcal{T}_G/G}[B'] = \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(\mathcal{G})} \int \mathcal{D}A Z_{\mathcal{T}_G}[A] \exp(i\langle A, B' \rangle_{M_d}). \quad (2)$$

Here \mathcal{G} is the space of all gauge transformations of principal G -bundle $P(G, M_d)$ on M_d , $\langle A, B' \rangle_{M_d}$ is a non-degenerate gauge-invariant pairing on M_d of flat connection A of $P(G, M_d)$ and some dual field B' , and $Z_{\mathcal{T}_G}[A]$ is the partition function of \mathcal{T}_G minimally coupled to A via $A \wedge J$ for conserved current J and $Z_{\mathcal{T}_G/G}[B']$ is the partition function of the gauged theory \mathcal{T}_G/G coupled to B' . A sum over inequivalent principal G -bundles in (2) is implicitly assumed. Self-consistency of (2) requires $Z_{\mathcal{T}_G}[A]$ be invariant under gauge transformations of A . In other words, $Z_{\mathcal{T}_G}[A]$ must be a function on $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} := \mathcal{A}_{\text{flat}}/\mathcal{G}$ where $\mathcal{A}_{\text{flat}}$ is the space of all flat connections of $P(G, M_d)$.

It has long been known that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ is the space of classical solutions of non-abelian BF -theory defined on $M_{d+1} \cong M_d \times \mathbb{R}$ with action [37, 38]:

$$S_G = \int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr} B \wedge F \equiv \int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr} B \wedge D_A A \quad (3)$$

for $D_A = d - iA \wedge$ with A a connection of $P(G, M_{d+1})$ and $\text{ad}(P)$ -valued $(d-1)$ -form B . The action is invariant under both G -gauge transformations $A \rightarrow gAg^{-1} + igdg^{-1}$ and $B \rightarrow gBg^{-1}$ with $g \in \mathcal{G}$, and a shift $B \rightarrow B + D_A K$ with $\text{ad}(P)$ -valued $(d-2)$ -form K . The canonical quantization of (3) over time-slice M_d yields wave functions living in the state space $\text{Fun}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$, the space of functions on $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ [39].

The above discussions suggest viewing $Z_{\mathcal{T}_G}[A]$ as a wave function of the quantum mechanical system defined by (3), i.e. $Z_{\mathcal{T}_G}[A] \in \text{Fun}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$. Therefore the SymTFT \mathcal{S}_G of \mathcal{T}_G must be the BF -theory with action (3) by our definition, since its state space coincides with the space of $Z_{\mathcal{T}_G}[A]$. We will substantiate this one-line proof in the subsequent sections. We emphasize that since B in (3) is not the dual field B' in (2), BF -theory is not a conventional SymTFT as in e.g. [8, 14, 24, 28, 36].

Gauging as Fourier transform. Viewing $Z_{\mathcal{T}_G}[A]$ as a wave function of the quantum mechanical system defined by (3) has an extra advantage that it enables us to view (2) as changing the polarization of quantization of \mathcal{S}_G . To this end, recall that for path-connected M_d we have $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \cong \text{Hom}(\pi_1(M_d), G)/G$ where G acts on

$\phi \in \text{Hom}(\pi_1(M_d), G)$ by $g\phi(\gamma)g^{-1}$ for $\gamma \in \pi_1(M_d)$ [40]. For simplicity, we assume $\pi_1(M_d) = \mathbb{Z}$ in which case $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \text{Cl}(G)$, the set of conjugacy classes of G . By Tannaka duality [41, 42] there exists an isometry [43]:

$$L^2(\text{Cl}(G)) \stackrel{\text{T}}{\cong} L^2(G^\vee) \quad (4)$$

via Fourier transform T where G^\vee is the isomorphism classes of irreducible representations of G [44]. Therefore (2) as a Fourier transform must be equivalent to T which exchanges the conjugate variables in the canonical quantization of \mathcal{S}_G [45]. Physically, (4) implies that inequivalent B' must live in G^\vee when $\pi_1(M_d) = \mathbb{Z}$.

A more physical implication of (4) is that when $\pi_1(M_d) = \mathbb{Z}$, the parameter space of G -symmetry generators of \mathcal{T}_G must be a certain fibration over $\text{Cl}(G)$ while that of the symmetry generators of \mathcal{T}_G/G must be a certain fibration over G^\vee . Later we will construct these generators and verify they indeed satisfy such implication.

Extended operators in BF -theory. Having shown that the quantization of BF -theory reproduces the space of partition vectors of \mathcal{T}_G and encodes gauging as switching representations via Fourier transform, we go on to the construction of the extended operators in the BF -theory that later will be found to yield the G -action (1) of \mathcal{T}_G after interval compactification.

On one hand, we consider an untraced Wilson line in representation \mathbf{R} stretching between fixed points of \mathcal{B}_{top} and \mathcal{B}_{phy} :

$$W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) = \mathcal{P} \exp \left(i \int_{\ell} A_{\mathbf{R}} \right). \quad (5)$$

where $A_{\mathbf{R}}$ is in representation \mathbf{R} of G . On the other hand, for any covariantly constant section α of $\text{ad}(P)$ with a flat connection, i.e. $D_A \alpha = 0$ for certain flat A , we define the following operator:

$$U_{\alpha}(\Sigma) = \exp \left(i \int_{\Sigma} (\alpha, B) \right) \quad (6)$$

where Σ is a codimension-2 submanifold of M_{d+1} and (\cdot, \cdot) is an ad -invariant inner product of \mathfrak{g} .

However, $U_{\alpha}(\Sigma)$ is not topological. To see this, one can compute $U_{\alpha}(\Sigma)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ for which we have [46]:

$$U_{\alpha}(\Sigma)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) = \mathcal{P} \left[e^{i \int_p^1 A_{\mathbf{R}}} e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(p)} e^{i \int_0^p A_{\mathbf{R}}} \right] \quad (7)$$

when Σ is the boundary of an infinitesimal d -ball that intersects ℓ parametrized by $[0, 1]$ transversally at p . Since $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ is topological while (7) is not due to its explicit p -dependence, $U_{\alpha}(\Sigma)$ cannot be topological. Actually, no non-commutative symmetry can be generated by codimension-2 topological operators [7], and (7) is nothing but a use case of this fact.

There are a few ways to obtain p -independent actions from (7). The simplest is to let $e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(p)}$ be an element

of the center $Z(G)$ of G to make $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ a generator of the 1-form $Z(G)$ -symmetry of BF -theory. Another is to define an operator $\tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma)$ for a fixed flat connection A :

$$\tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma) = \int dg \exp \left(i \int_{\Sigma} (\tilde{\alpha}, B) \right) \quad (8)$$

where dg is the Haar measure of G and $\tilde{\alpha}$ is the parallel transport of $g\alpha(p)g^{-1}$ for a covariantly constant α at p by the holonomy of A on each local patch. The above definition is independent of the choice of p . Unlike α , we allow $\tilde{\alpha}$ to be defined up to conjugation. In other words, $e^{-i\tilde{\alpha}} \in Cl(G)$. The action of $\tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma)$ on $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ is [47]:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle &= \mathcal{P} \left[e^{i \int_p^1 A_{\mathbf{R}}} \int dg g e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(p)} g^{-1} e^{i \int_0^p A_{\mathbf{R}}} \right] \\ &= \frac{\chi_{\mathbf{R}}(e^{-i\tilde{\alpha}})}{\dim \mathbf{R}} \langle W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

for irreducible representation \mathbf{R} and Schur's lemma is applied to obtain the second line [48]. Here $\frac{\chi_{\mathbf{R}}(e^{-i\tilde{\alpha}})}{\dim \mathbf{R}}$ is the *normalized character*, which forms a basis of $L^2(Cl(G))$. Consequently, $\langle \tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle$ is topological.

Flavor symmetry and dual symmetry from BF-theory. Until now it may seem somewhat unclear why we have considered a non-topological action (7) in a topological field theory, however we will show that it leads to the desired non-abelian symmetry action (1). To see this, upon fixing $p = 0$, (7) becomes:

$$U_\alpha(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) = \mathcal{P} \left[W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(0)} \right]. \quad (10)$$

We see that not only is the p -dependence of $U_\alpha(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ turned off manually, but also we observe a striking similarity between (10) and (1). Actually, physically to let $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ stretch between \mathcal{B}_{top} and \mathcal{B}_{phy} , one has to impose DBC on A at \mathcal{B}_{top} and put a local operator $\psi(x)$ at \mathcal{B}_{phy} on which $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ ends as illustrated in Figure 2. Therefore, instead of (10), physically $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ acts on the




FIG. 2. $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ acts on the composite operator $\psi(x)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$.

composite operator $\psi(x)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$. Using (7), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} U_\alpha(\Sigma) \psi(x) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) &= \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{P} \left[\psi(x) e^{i \int_p^1 A_{\mathbf{R}}} e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(p)} e^{i \int_0^p A_{\mathbf{R}}} \right] \\ &= \mathcal{P} \left[\psi(x) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(0)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

A compactification of \mathcal{S}_G on $[0, 1]$ recovers \mathcal{T}_G by effectively sending the length of ℓ to zero [21, 24, 49]. In this limit, (11) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} U_\alpha(\Sigma) \psi(x) &= \mathcal{P} \left[\psi(x) e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(0)} \right] \\ &= e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(0)} \psi(x) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

for Σ linking x in $\mathcal{B}_{\text{phy}} \cong M_d$. Therefore we reproduce the non-abelian symmetry action on a charged local operator of \mathcal{T}_G .

Exchanging boundary conditions of $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ and of $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ gauges G -symmetry, as a consequence of which $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ generates the symmetry of \mathcal{T}_G/G after imposing DBC on B and NBC on A . Note that imposing NBC on A then letting ℓ be a closed loop necessarily makes $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ a traced Wilson loop and for simplicity we do not notationally distinguish an untraced Wilson line from a traced Wilson loop whenever the context is clear.

We see that the parameter spaces of (5) and (6) are indeed fibrations over the corresponding moduli spaces implied by (4). Concretely, we again fix $\pi_1(M_d) = \mathbb{Z}$. On one hand, the parameter of a traced $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ lives in a fibration over G^\vee whose fiber at generic $\mathbf{R} \in G^\vee$ is \mathbb{R} which parametrizes rescaling of A . On the other hand, the parameter α of $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ lives in a fibration over $Cl(G)$ whose fiber at a generic $h \in Cl(G)$ is the Cartan subalgebra of G .

To see this at an elementary level, note that for a fixed background flat A with holonomy $h \in Cl(G)$, $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ is topological given $D_A \alpha = 0$. Therefore, it must generate certain symmetry as long as $D_A \alpha = 0$. However, there is no longer a G -symmetry since the minimal coupling $A \wedge J$ turns conserved J to be covariantly conserved. Hence the question is what symmetry is generated by $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$, where α is in the fiber over h . To this end, one may view $A \wedge J$ as analogous to the Yukawa coupling, though only from the perspective of representation theory, where A plays the role of an adjoint Higgs VEV that breaks G to its commutant within G . Since $Cl(G) \cong T/W$, where T is the maximal torus of G and W is its Weyl group, the commutant of A that represents a generic h is T , which is generated by $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ where α is in the Cartan subalgebra of G as expected.

Traced $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ as generators of symmetry of \mathcal{T}_G/G fuse as:

$$W_{\mathbf{R}_1}(\ell) \times W_{\mathbf{R}_2}(\ell) = \sum_i W_{\mathbf{R}_{12i}}(\ell) \quad (13)$$

for \mathbf{R}_{12i} in the tensor product decomposition of $\mathbf{R}_1 \otimes \mathbf{R}_2$. Therefore \mathcal{T}_G/G has a $\text{Rep}(G)$ $(d-2)$ -form symmetry, whose objects fuse the same way as (13), which is a non-invertible categorical symmetry [50–53].

Various gaugings of \mathcal{T}_G . We now study various gaugings of \mathcal{T}_G using our prescription. To be concrete we fix $G = SU(2)$ and $\pi_1(M_d) = \mathbb{Z}$. For simplicity we use $\mathcal{G}^{(p)}$ to denote a p -form \mathcal{G} -symmetry where \mathcal{G} is not necessarily a group. In this case $G^\vee \cong \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{A} = Cl(G) \cong [0, \pi]$. The pairing between $j \in G^\vee$ and $\theta \in Cl(G)$ in Fourier transform (4), as suggested by (9), is the normalized character $\frac{\sin(2j+1)\theta}{(2j+1)\sin\theta}$ which furthermore is the Dirac pairing between topological operators with DBC. For a valid choice of boundary conditions at \mathcal{B}_{top} , the pairing between any two operators with DBC should be one [9]. Given this requirement, we find the following sets of boundary conditions at \mathcal{B}_{top} and the global symmetry

of the theory at \mathcal{B}_{phy} :

1. Impose DBC to all $W_j(\ell)$. All $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ are with NBC and generate $SU(2)^{(0)}$ symmetry of the theory at \mathcal{B}_{phy} .
2. Impose NBC to all $W_j(\ell)$. They generate $\text{Rep}(SU(2))^{(d-2)}$ symmetry of the theory at \mathcal{B}_{phy} .
3. Impose DBC to $W_j(\ell)$ with $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and to $U_0(\Sigma)$ and $U_\pi(\Sigma)$. All other operators are with NBC and generate $SO(3)^{(0)} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^{(d-2)}$ symmetry of the theory at \mathcal{B}_{phy} . This is equivalent to gauging the \mathbb{Z}_2 center of the $SU(2)^{(0)}$ symmetry.

These three sets of boundary conditions are related by gaugings as shown in Figure 3.




FIG. 3. The gaugings relating the three sets of boundary conditions for $G = SU(2)$.

A boundary condition at \mathcal{B}_{top} is equivalent to gauging $SO(3)$ in $\mathcal{T}_{SU(2)}$ does not exist. Such a gauging would have been possible if DBC were imposed to all $W_j(\ell)$ for half-integer j and all $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ for $\alpha \in (0, \pi)$. This clearly contradicts the requirement that the pairings between these operators must be one. To see this from a different point of view, note that (2) implies that gauging G' -symmetry can be done by restricting the path integral to the space of flat G' -connections $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{G'}$ which is consistent only if $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{G'}$ is a closed subspace of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Hence gauging $SO(3)$ of $\mathcal{T}_{SU(2)}$ is impossible since $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{SO(3)} \cong Cl(SO(3))$ is a \mathbb{Z}_2 folding, rather than a closed subspace, of $[0, \pi]$. On the other hand, gauging \mathbb{Z}_2 in $\mathcal{T}_{SU(2)}$ is possible since $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \cong \{0, \pi\}$ is a closed subspace of $[0, \pi]$.

BF-theory from holography. Let us revisit the derivation leading to (12). Comparing with the holographic construction in [54, 55], we see that $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ is analogous to an *asymptotic symmetry operator* acting on a Wilson line extending to the AdS boundary with *long-range gauge symmetry* in the bulk. It is thus interesting to see if the analogy can be sharpened and if *BF-theory* arises in a holographic setup.

It is well-known in $\text{AdS}_{d+1}/\text{CFT}_d$ [56, 57] that a co-

variantly conserved current J^μ at M_d is the response of $\int_{M_d} d^d x A_\mu J^\mu$ to variations of gauge field A_μ . Such minimal coupling can be obtained by calculating the holographically renormalized on-shell action [58–60] in a way that parallels the derivation in e.g. [61, 62]. For concreteness, we fix $d = 4$ where one can find the variation of the renormalized action to be [63]:

$$\delta S_{\text{ren}} = 2L^3 \int_{M_4} d^4 x \text{Tr} \delta\alpha_i \beta^i \quad (14)$$

where L is the radius of AdS_5 with boundary M_4 . The current $\langle J^i \rangle \equiv 2L^3 \beta^i$ on M_4 is thus covariantly conserved by the equation of motion $D_i \beta^i = 0$.

Physically, any bulk action defined in the neighbor of the boundary whose variation is identical to (14) must lead to the same current. To this end, we find that the variation of on-shell *BF*-action on a space homeomorphic to $M_4 \times (0, 1]$ is:

$$\delta S = \int_{M_4} d^4 x \text{Tr} \delta A_j (\tilde{B}^{rj}) \quad (15)$$

where \tilde{B} is the Hodge dual of B . Note that (15) takes the same form as (14). By the equation of motion $D_i \tilde{B}^{ri} = 0$,

we immediately see that a covariantly conserved current $\langle J^i \rangle \equiv \tilde{B}^{ri}$ arises from the variation (15), which is physically equivalent to that obtained from Yang-Mills action on the same space. In this sense, we claim that BF -theory with gauge group G can be derived to be the SymTFT of a theory on the boundary with G -flavor symmetry in the holographic setup.

Furthermore, identification of \tilde{B}^{ri} with the covariantly conserved current in a holographic setup leads to identifying (12) with the action of long-range gauge symmetry on the endpoint of a Wilson line described in [54, 55]. Moreover, since BF -theory $M_d \times (0, 1]$ leads to the same consequences regarding flavor symmetry of the theory on M_d as a theory with long-range gauge symmetry in the bulk, it must also share similar properties of the quantum gravity theory in AdS_{d+1} . To this end, note that BF -theory with gauge group G has the following properties:

1. There are no flavor symmetries;
2. An untraced Wilson line can be in any representation of G ;
3. G is compact.

They align almost trivially with the following three main conjectures on symmetries in quantum gravity [64–66], when specialized to flavor or ordinary gauge symmetry:

1. There are no global symmetries;
2. There are dynamical objects in all irreducible representations of internal gauge symmetry;
3. The gauge group is compact.

Twist terms and 't Hooft anomaly. So far, no obstruction to gauging either the $G^{(0)}$ or $\text{Rep}(G)^{(d-2)}$ symmetry has been introduced. To address this, we can add a *twist term* $I(A)$ or $I(B)$ to the action (3) to incorporate 't Hooft anomalies [67].

As an example, we consider the 5d SymTFT for 4d $SU(N_c)$ QCD with N_f fundamental quarks, which has flavor symmetry $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R \times U(1)_V$. It is known that such flavor symmetry has a 't Hooft anomaly that obstructs its gauging. In our prescription, it is encoded in the action by adding a twist term $I(A)$ to (3), which typically is proportional to the Chern-Simons term with gauge group $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R \times U(1)_V$ [68–71].

Due to the presence of $I(A)$, it is impossible to impose NBC to A . For concreteness, let the twist term be $I(A_L)$ where A_L is the background flat gauge field coupled to the conserved current of $SU(N_f)_L$. The variation of the on-shell action with respect to A_L yields an additional boundary term $\int_{M_d \times \{0\}} f(A_L) \delta A_L$, where $f(A_L)$ is the response of $I(A_L)$ to the variation of A_L . Requiring the boundary term to vanish is incompatible with the NBC of A_L since $f(A_L)$ can fluctuate on the boundary. In

other words, it is impossible to gauge $SU(N_f)_L$ -flavor symmetry in the presence of $I(A_L)$.

It will be interesting to further test our prescription against known cases with 't Hooft anomalies, e.g. 6d superconformal field theories [72–75]. In particular, it is almost trivial to incorporate 't Hooft anomalies of continuous flavor symmetry or R -symmetry in our prescription of SymTFT, since it is a bottom-up approach that does not depend on any string compactification. To this end, we note that no known top-down stringy construction of the 7d SymTFT associated to a 6d SCFT [21, 27, 76, 77] leads to twist terms that incorporate either continuous flavor symmetry or R -symmetry.

We would like to thank Meng Cheng, Sergei Gukov, Yuting Hu, Ziming Ji, Satoshi Nawata, Benjamin Sung, Yuji Tachikawa and Yehao Zhou for discussions. We would like to thank the Peng Huanwu Center for Fundamental Theory for hosting the ‘‘SymTFT workshop’’ and the hospitality. JT would like to thank the hospitality of BIMSA where some motivations of this work were initially inspired. RL, YNW and YZ are supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12175004, No. 12422503 and by Young Elite Scientists Sponsorship Program by CAST (2024QNRC001). YNW is also supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12247103. QJ is supported by National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) Grant No. RS-2024-00405629 and Jang Young-Sil Fellow Program at the Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology. JT is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12405085 and by the Natural Science Foundation of Shanghai (Grant No. 24ZR1419300). YZ is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12305077. Kavli IPMU is supported by World Premier International Research Center Initiative (WPI), MEXT, Japan.

-
- [1] M. G. Alford and J. March-Russell, New order parameters for nonAbelian gauge theories, *Nucl. Phys. B* **369**, 276 (1992).
 - [2] M. G. Alford and J. March-Russell, Discrete gauge theories, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **5**, 2641 (1991).
 - [3] M. G. Alford, K.-M. Lee, J. March-Russell, and J. Preskill, Quantum field theory of nonAbelian strings and vortices, *Nucl. Phys. B* **384**, 251 (1992), arXiv:hep-th/9112038.
 - [4] Z. Nussinov and G. Ortiz, A symmetry principle for topological quantum order, *Annals of Physics* **324**, 977 (2009).
 - [5] A. Kapustin and R. Thorngren, Higher Symmetry and Gapped Phases of Gauge Theories, *Prog. Math.* **324**, 177 (2017), arXiv:1309.4721 [hep-th].
 - [6] A. Kapustin and N. Seiberg, Coupling a QFT to a TQFT

- and Duality, JHEP **04**, 001, arXiv:1401.0740 [hep-th].
- [7] D. Gaiotto, A. Kapustin, N. Seiberg, and B. Willett, Generalized Global Symmetries, JHEP **02**, 172, arXiv:1412.5148 [hep-th].
- [8] J. Kaidi, K. Ohmori, and Y. Zheng, Kramers-Wannier-like Duality Defects in (3+1)D Gauge Theories, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 111601 (2022), arXiv:2111.01141 [hep-th].
- [9] J. Kaidi, K. Ohmori, and Y. Zheng, Symmetry TFTs for Non-invertible Defects, Commun. Math. Phys. **404**, 1021 (2023), arXiv:2209.11062 [hep-th].
- [10] D. R. Morrison, S. Schafer-Nameki, and B. Willett, Higher-Form Symmetries in 5d, JHEP **09**, 024, arXiv:2005.12296 [hep-th].
- [11] L. Bhardwaj and S. Schäfer-Nameki, Higher-form symmetries of 6d and 5d theories, JHEP **02**, 159, arXiv:2008.09600 [hep-th].
- [12] L. Bhardwaj, L. E. Bottini, S. Schafer-Nameki, and A. Tiwari, Non-invertible higher-categorical symmetries, SciPost Phys. **14**, 007 (2023), arXiv:2204.06564 [hep-th].
- [13] L. Bhardwaj and S. Schafer-Nameki, Generalized charges, part I: Invertible symmetries and higher representations, SciPost Phys. **16**, 093 (2024), arXiv:2304.02660 [hep-th].
- [14] L. Bhardwaj and S. Schafer-Nameki, Generalized Charges, Part II: Non-Invertible Symmetries and the Symmetry TFT, arXiv (2023), arXiv:2305.17159 [hep-th].
- [15] L. Bhardwaj, D. Pajer, S. Schafer-Nameki, A. Tiwari, A. Warman, and J. Wu, Gapped Phases in (2+1)d with Non-Invertible Symmetries: Part I, arXiv (2024), arXiv:2408.05266 [hep-th].
- [16] L. Bhardwaj, S. Schafer-Nameki, A. Tiwari, and A. Warman, Gapped Phases in (2+1)d with Non-Invertible Symmetries: Part II, arXiv (2025), arXiv:2502.20440 [hep-th].
- [17] C. Córdova and K. Ohmori, Anomaly Obstructions to Symmetry Preserving Gapped Phases, arXiv (2019), arXiv:1910.04962 [hep-th].
- [18] C. Córdova and K. Ohmori, Anomaly Constraints on Gapped Phases with Discrete Chiral Symmetry, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 025011 (2020), arXiv:1912.13069 [hep-th].
- [19] L. Bhardwaj, M. Bullimore, A. E. V. Ferrari, and S. Schafer-Nameki, Anomalies of Generalized Symmetries from Solitonic Defects, SciPost Phys. **16**, 087 (2024), arXiv:2205.15330 [hep-th].
- [20] F. J. Burnell, T. Devakul, P. Gorantla, H. T. Lam, and S.-H. Shao, Anomaly inflow for subsystem symmetries, Phys. Rev. B **106**, 085113 (2022), arXiv:2110.09529 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [21] E. Witten, AdS / CFT correspondence and topological field theory, JHEP **12**, 012, arXiv:hep-th/9812012.
- [22] L. Kong, T. Lan, X.-G. Wen, Z.-H. Zhang, and H. Zheng, Algebraic higher symmetry and categorical symmetry – a holographic and entanglement view of symmetry, Phys. Rev. Res. **2**, 043086 (2020), arXiv:2005.14178 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [23] D. Gaiotto and J. Kulp, Orbifold groupoids, JHEP **02**, 132, arXiv:2008.05960 [hep-th].
- [24] F. Apruzzi, F. Bonetti, I. n. García Etzebarria, S. S. Hosseini, and S. Schafer-Nameki, Symmetry TFTs from String Theory, Commun. Math. Phys. **402**, 895 (2023), arXiv:2112.02092 [hep-th].
- [25] M. van Beest, D. S. W. Gould, S. Schafer-Nameki, and Y.-N. Wang, Symmetry TFTs for 3d QFTs from M-theory, JHEP **02**, 226, arXiv:2210.03703 [hep-th].
- [26] D. S. Freed, G. W. Moore, and C. Teleman, Topological symmetry in quantum field theory, arXiv (2022), arXiv:2209.07471 [hep-th].
- [27] F. Apruzzi, Higher form symmetries TFT in 6d, JHEP **11**, 050, arXiv:2203.10063 [hep-th].
- [28] J. Kaidi, E. Nardoni, G. Zafrir, and Y. Zheng, Symmetry TFTs and anomalies of non-invertible symmetries, JHEP **10**, 053, arXiv:2301.07112 [hep-th].
- [29] F. Baume, J. J. Heckman, M. Hübner, E. Torres, A. P. Turner, and X. Yu, SymTrees and Multi-Sector QFTs, Phys. Rev. D **109**, 106013 (2024), arXiv:2310.12980 [hep-th].
- [30] M. Cvetič, R. Donagi, J. J. Heckman, M. Hübner, and E. Torres, Cornering Relative Symmetry Theories, arXiv (2024), arXiv:2408.12600 [hep-th].
- [31] T. D. Brennan and Z. Sun, A SymTFT for Continuous Symmetries, arXiv (2024), arXiv:2401.06128 [hep-th].
- [32] A. Antinucci and F. Benini, Anomalies and gauging of U(1) symmetries, arXiv (2024), arXiv:2401.10165 [hep-th].
- [33] F. Bonetti, M. Del Zotto, and R. Minasian, SymTFTs for Continuous non-Abelian Symmetries, arXiv (2024), arXiv:2402.12347 [hep-th].
- [34] E. Witten, Geometric Langlands From Six Dimensions, arXiv preprint (2009), arXiv:0905.2720 [hep-th].
- [35] L. Bhardwaj, L. E. Bottini, L. Fraser-Taliente, L. Gladden, D. S. W. Gould, A. Platschorre, and H. Tillim, Lectures on generalized symmetries, Phys. Rept. **1051**, 1 (2024), arXiv:2307.07547 [hep-th].
- [36] S. Schafer-Nameki, ICTP lectures on (non-)invertible generalized symmetries, Phys. Rept. **1063**, 1 (2024), arXiv:2305.18296 [hep-th].
- [37] G. T. Horowitz, Exactly Soluble Diffeomorphism Invariant Theories, Commun. Math. Phys. **125**, 417 (1989).
- [38] M. Blau and G. Thompson, Topological Gauge Theories of Antisymmetric Tensor Fields, Annals Phys. **205**, 130 (1991).
- [39] J. C. Baez, An Introduction to Spin Foam Models of BF Theory and Quantum Gravity, Lect. Notes Phys. **543**, 25 (2000), arXiv:gr-qc/9905087.
- [40] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu, *Foundations of differential geometry. Vol I* (Interscience Publishers, a division of John Wiley & Sons, New York-London, 1963) pp. xi+329.
- [41] T. TANNAKA, Über den Dualitätssatz der nichtkommutativen topologischen Gruppen, Tohoku Mathematical Journal, First Series **45**, 1 (1939).
- [42] N. Tatsuuma, A duality theorem for locally compact groups, Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University **6**, 187 (1967).
- [43] A. Joyal and R. Street, An introduction to tannaka duality and quantum groups, in *Category Theory*, edited by A. Carboni, M. C. Pedicchio, and G. Rosolini (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1991) pp. 413–492.
- [44] See SM1 for a short review of useful facts about Tannaka duality.
- [45] S. Bates and A. Weinstein, *Lectures on the Geometry of Quantization*, Berkeley mathematics lecture notes (American Mathematical Society, 1997).
- [46] See SM2 for the details.
- [47] See SM2 for the details.
- [48] C. Cordova, K. Ohmori, and T. Rudelius, Generalized

- symmetry breaking scales and weak gravity conjectures, *JHEP* **11**, 154, arXiv:2202.05866 [hep-th].
- [49] D. S. Freed and C. Teleman, Relative quantum field theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **326**, 459 (2014), arXiv:1212.1692 [hep-th].
- [50] J. Frohlich, J. Fuchs, I. Runkel, and C. Schweigert, Kramers-Wannier duality from conformal defects, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 070601 (2004), arXiv:cond-mat/0404051.
- [51] J. C. Y. Teo, T. L. Hughes, and E. Fradkin, Theory of Twist Liquids: Gauging an Anyonic Symmetry, *Annals Phys.* **360**, 349 (2015), arXiv:1503.06812 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [52] M. Barkeshli, P. Bonderson, M. Cheng, and Z. Wang, Symmetry Fractionalization, Defects, and Gauging of Topological Phases, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 115147 (2019), arXiv:1410.4540 [cond-mat.str-el].
- [53] L. Bhardwaj and Y. Tachikawa, On finite symmetries and their gauging in two dimensions, *JHEP* **03**, 189, arXiv:1704.02330 [hep-th].
- [54] D. Harlow and H. Ooguri, Constraints on Symmetries from Holography, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 191601 (2019), arXiv:1810.05337 [hep-th].
- [55] D. Harlow and H. Ooguri, Symmetries in quantum field theory and quantum gravity, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **383**, 1669 (2021), arXiv:1810.05338 [hep-th].
- [56] J. M. Maldacena, The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 231 (1998), arXiv:hep-th/9711200.
- [57] E. Witten, Anti-de Sitter space and holography, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 253 (1998), arXiv:hep-th/9802150.
- [58] M. Bianchi, D. Z. Freedman, and K. Skenderis, How to go with an RG flow, *JHEP* **08**, 041, arXiv:hep-th/0105276.
- [59] M. Bianchi, D. Z. Freedman, and K. Skenderis, Holographic renormalization, *Nucl. Phys. B* **631**, 159 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0112119.
- [60] K. Skenderis, Lecture notes on holographic renormalization, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19**, 5849 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0209067.
- [61] D. Marolf and S. F. Ross, Boundary Conditions and New Dualities: Vector Fields in AdS/CFT, *JHEP* **11**, 085, arXiv:hep-th/0606113.
- [62] O. DeWolfe and K. Higginbotham, Generalized symmetries and 2-groups via electromagnetic duality in *AdS/CFT*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 026011 (2021), arXiv:2010.06594 [hep-th].
- [63] See SM3 for derivation.
- [64] C. W. Misner and J. A. Wheeler, Classical physics as geometry: Gravitation, electromagnetism, unquantized charge, and mass as properties of curved empty space, *Annals Phys.* **2**, 525 (1957).
- [65] J. Polchinski, Monopoles, duality, and string theory, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **19S1**, 145 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0304042.
- [66] T. Banks and N. Seiberg, Symmetries and Strings in Field Theory and Gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 084019 (2011), arXiv:1011.5120 [hep-th].
- [67] A. Antinucci, F. Benini, and G. Rizi, Holographic Duals of Symmetry Broken Phases, *Fortsch. Phys.* **72**, 2400172 (2024), arXiv:2408.01418 [hep-th].
- [68] B. Zumino, CHIRAL ANOMALIES AND DIFFERENTIAL GEOMETRY: LECTURES GIVEN AT LES HOUCHES, AUGUST 1983, in *Les Houches Summer School on Theoretical Physics: Relativity, Groups and Topology* (1983) pp. 1291–1322.
- [69] L. Alvarez-Gaume and P. H. Ginsparg, The Structure of Gauge and Gravitational Anomalies, *Annals Phys.* **161**, 423 (1985), [Erratum: *Annals Phys.* 171, 233 (1986)].
- [70] J. A. Harvey, TASI 2003 lectures on anomalies (2005) arXiv:hep-th/0509097.
- [71] A. Bilal, Lectures on Anomalies, arXiv (2008), arXiv:0802.0634 [hep-th].
- [72] J. J. Heckman, D. R. Morrison, and C. Vafa, On the Classification of 6D SCFTs and Generalized ADE Orbifolds, *JHEP* **05**, 028, [Erratum: *JHEP* 06, 017 (2015)], arXiv:1312.5746 [hep-th].
- [73] K. Ohmori, H. Shimizu, Y. Tachikawa, and K. Yonekura, Anomaly polynomial of general 6d SCFTs, *PTEP* **2014**, 103B07 (2014), arXiv:1408.5572 [hep-th].
- [74] J. J. Heckman, D. R. Morrison, T. Rudelius, and C. Vafa, Atomic Classification of 6D SCFTs, *Fortsch. Phys.* **63**, 468 (2015), arXiv:1502.05405 [hep-th].
- [75] J. J. Heckman and T. Rudelius, Top Down Approach to 6D SCFTs, *J. Phys. A* **52**, 093001 (2019), arXiv:1805.06467 [hep-th].
- [76] C. Lawrie, X. Yu, and H. Y. Zhang, Intermediate defect groups, polarization pairs, and noninvertible duality defects, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 026005 (2024), arXiv:2306.11783 [hep-th].
- [77] J. Tian and Y.-N. Wang, A Tale of Bulk and Branes: Symmetry TFT of 6D SCFTs from IIB/F-theory, arXiv (2024), arXiv:2410.23076 [hep-th].
- [78] M. Grossman and R. Katz, *Non-Newtonian Calculus: A Self-contained, Elementary Exposition of the Authors' Investigations ...* (Lee Press, 1972).
- [79] A. S. Cattaneo, P. Cotta-Ramusino, A. Gamba, and M. Martellini, The Donaldson-Witten invariants in pure 4-D QCD with order and disorder 't Hooft - like operators, *Phys. Lett. B* **355**, 245 (1995), arXiv:hep-th/9502110.
- [80] M. Martellini and M. Zeni, The BF formalism for Yang-Mills theory and the 't Hooft algebra, in *2nd International Conference on Quark Confinement and the Hadron Spectrum* (1996) pp. 199–202, arXiv:hep-th/9610090.
- [81] A. S. Cattaneo, P. Cotta-Ramusino, F. Fucito, M. Martellini, M. Rinaldi, A. Tanzini, and M. Zeni, Four-dimensional Yang-Mills theory as a deformation of topological BF theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **197**, 571 (1998), arXiv:hep-th/9705123.
- [82] I. R. Klebanov and E. Witten, AdS / CFT correspondence and symmetry breaking, *Nucl. Phys. B* **556**, 89 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9905104.

SM1: Fourier Transform and Tannaka Duality

The abelian story. Locally compact abelian groups, e.g. discrete abelian groups \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{Z}_n , \mathbb{Q} with discrete topology or \mathbb{R}^n for any n and $U(1)$ with standard topology, play significant roles in the study of generalized global symmetries.

The Pontryagin dual \widehat{G} of a locally compact abelian group G is defined as the set of continuous group homomorphisms (characters χ) from G to $U(1)$

$$\widehat{G} = \text{Hom}(G, U(1)),$$

which turns out to be locally compact, abelian and isomorphic to the set of isomorphism classes of complex irreducible representations of G . Gauging a theory with global symmetry G leads to another theory with dual symmetry \widehat{G} . The manipulation on partition functions is based on the Fourier transformations between the space of square-integrable functions $L^2(G)$ and $L^2(\widehat{G})$

$$\mathcal{F} : L^2(G) \rightarrow L^2(\widehat{G}) \quad (16)$$

$$f \mapsto \mathcal{F}[f] : \chi \mapsto \int_G f(g) \chi(g) dg, \quad (17)$$

with the inverse map \mathcal{F}^{-1} given by

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1} : L^2(\widehat{G}) \rightarrow L^2(G) \quad (18)$$

$$\phi \mapsto \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\phi] : g \mapsto \int_{\widehat{G}} \phi(\chi) \chi(g) d\chi, \quad (19)$$

where dg denotes the Haar measure on G and $d\chi$ is the correctly normalized Haar measure on \widehat{G} . In the case of discrete domains, the above integral descends to summation.

Tannaka duality for compact nonabelian groups. For a non-abelian compact group G , the set of all its finite dimensional complex representations $\text{Rep}(G)$ furnishes a monoidal category rather than a group. There is a forgetful functor (a.k.a fiber functor)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F} : \text{Rep}(G) &\rightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{C}} \\ (\pi_V, V) &\mapsto V, \end{aligned}$$

which maps the representation (π_V, V) to its underlying vector space and homomorphism φ between two representations (π_V, V) and (π_W, W) is mapped to the homomorphism between vector spaces $\mathfrak{F}(\varphi) : V \rightarrow W$. The set of all natural transformations from \mathfrak{F} to \mathfrak{F} is an algebra denoted as $\text{End}(\mathfrak{F})$. Tannaka's theorem [41] states that the set of all monoidal self-conjugate natural transformations $\mathfrak{T}(G)$ is a closed subgroup of $\text{End}(\mathfrak{F})$ and G is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{T}(G)$ as topological groups by the canonical map

$$\begin{aligned} \pi : G &\rightarrow \mathfrak{T}(G) \\ g &\mapsto \pi(g), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

note that $\pi(g)$ can be thought of as a natural transformation whose components are just the linear transformations $\pi_V(g)$ on each V .

Fourier transformations. Due to the compactness of G , the algebra $\text{End}(\mathfrak{F})$ is simply isomorphic to $\prod_{\lambda \in G^\vee} \text{End}(V_\lambda)$ [43], where G^\vee denotes isomorphism classes of complex irreducible representations of G . For $\lambda \in G^\vee$, we use (π_λ, V_λ) to denote its representation map and the representation vector space. The dimension of V_λ is $d_\lambda < \infty$, necessarily. Each $\text{End}(V_\lambda)$ is a Hilbert space endowed with a norm $\|A\|^2 := d_\lambda \text{tr}(A^* A)$, and $\prod_{\lambda \in G^\vee} \text{End}(V_\lambda)$ is made into a Hilbert space by the Hilbert sum $\sum_{\lambda \in G^\vee}^{\text{Hilbert}} \text{End}(V_\lambda)$. The Fourier transformation \mathcal{F} is defined as

$$\mathcal{F} : L^2(G) \rightarrow \sum_{\lambda \in G^\vee}^{\text{Hilbert}} \text{End}(V_\lambda) \quad (21)$$

$$f \mapsto \mathcal{F}[f]_\lambda = \int_G f(g) \pi_\lambda(g) dg \quad (22)$$

and the inverse transformation is given as

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1} : \sum_{\lambda \in G^\vee}^{\text{Hilbert}} \text{End}(V_\lambda) \rightarrow L^2(G) \quad (23)$$

$$u \mapsto \mathcal{F}^{-1}[u] : g \mapsto \sum_{\lambda \in G^\vee} \text{tr}(u_\lambda \pi_\lambda(g)^{-1}) d_\lambda. \quad (24)$$

Furthermore, if we want to restrict the transformation \mathcal{F} on $L^2(Cl(G))$ (this is isomorphic to the subspace of square integrable class functions), then

$$\pi_\lambda(g)\mathcal{F}[f]_\lambda = \mathcal{F}[f]_\lambda\pi_\lambda(g), \quad (25)$$

for all $g \in G$ and by Schur's lemma the component map $\mathcal{F}[f]_\lambda$ must be scalar multiplication on V_λ . We denote the scalar by $\mathbb{T}[f](\lambda)$, then

$$\mathbb{T}[f](\lambda) = \frac{1}{d_\lambda} \int_G f(g)\chi_\lambda(g)dg, \quad (26)$$

where $\chi_\lambda(g) = \text{tr}(\pi_\lambda(g))$ is the character of (π_λ, V_λ) . \mathbb{T} defines the Fourier transformation on class functions

$$\mathbb{T} : L^2(Cl(G)) \longrightarrow L^2(G^\vee), \quad (27)$$

with the inverse transformation \mathbb{T}^{-1} given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}^{-1} : L^2(G^\vee) &\rightarrow L^2(Cl(G)) \\ \phi &\mapsto \mathbb{T}^{-1}[\phi] : g \mapsto \sum_{\lambda \in G^\vee} \phi(\lambda)\overline{\chi_\lambda(g)}d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Here \mathbb{T} is the Fourier transform in (4) and \mathbb{T}^{-1} is its inverse.

SM2: Extended Operators in Non-abelian BF -theory and the Induced Flavor Symmetry Action

In this appendix we construct operators $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ and $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ in BF -theory that project to symmetry and charged operators on \mathcal{B}_{phy} respectively and prove (7), that is $U_\alpha(\Sigma)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ is non-topological in the bulk M_{d+1} . We further prove the invariance of $\langle U_\alpha(\Sigma)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle$ under the gauge and the shift transformations and comment on possible ways to obtain genuine topological actions in BF -theory.

The non-topological and topological operators We claim the following operator to be the one that leads to non-abelian G -flavor symmetry action after interval compactification:

$$U_\alpha(\Sigma) = \exp\left(i \int_\Sigma (\alpha, B)\right). \quad (28)$$

Here $B \in \Omega^{d-1}(M_{d+1}, \text{ad}(P))$ where $\text{ad}(P)$ is the adjoint bundle over M_{d+1} associated to the principal G -bundle and Σ is a $(d-1)$ -dimensional submanifold of M_{d+1} . The bracket (\cdot, \cdot) is an ad-invariant inner product on \mathfrak{g} such that $(a, b) = (\text{ad}_g a, \text{ad}_g b) \in \Omega^{d-1}(M_{d+1}, \mathbb{R})$. We require α be a covariantly constant section of $\text{ad}(P)$ with respect to some flat connection A , i.e. there exists A with $F = D_A A = 0$ such that $D_A \alpha = 0$. The non-topological nature of $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ will be made clear in a moment.

$U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ is nevertheless gauge invariant under $A \rightarrow A' = gAg^{-1} + igdg^{-1}$, $B \rightarrow B' = gBg^{-1} \equiv \text{ad}_g B$. Under such gauge transformation we have $\alpha \rightarrow \text{ad}_g \alpha$. Therefore we have:

$$U_\alpha(\Sigma) \rightarrow \exp\left(i \int_\Sigma (\text{ad}_g \alpha, \text{ad}_g B)\right) = \exp\left(i \int_\Sigma (\alpha, B)\right) \quad (29)$$

due to ad-invariance of (\cdot, \cdot) .

The other type of operators we consider is the open Wilson line in representation \mathbf{R} of G stretching between a point on \mathcal{B}_{top} and a local operator $\psi(x)$ on \mathcal{B}_{phy} charged under G :

$$W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) = \mathcal{P} \exp\left(i \int_\ell A_{\mathbf{R}}\right). \quad (30)$$

We note that this is an open Wilson line which is not traced.

The action of $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ on $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ Now we are ready to prove (7) in the main text. The action of $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ on $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ when Σ links ℓ in M_{d+1} is:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle U_\alpha(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle &= \int \mathcal{D}B \mathcal{D}A \exp\left(i \int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(B \wedge F)\right) \exp\left(i \int_\Sigma (\alpha, B)\right) \mathcal{P} \exp\left(i \int_\ell A_{\mathbf{R}}\right) \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}B \mathcal{D}A \exp\left(i \int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(B \wedge (F + \alpha \delta_\Sigma))\right) \mathcal{P} \exp\left(i \int_\ell A_{\mathbf{R}}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where in the second line $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ is absorbed into the original BF -action using a δ -function support δ_Σ over Σ . We look for a shift $A \rightarrow A - \kappa$ for which:

$$F \rightarrow d(A - \kappa) - i(A - \kappa) \wedge (A - \kappa) = F - (D_A \kappa + i\kappa \wedge \kappa). \quad (32)$$

and require $D_A \kappa + i\kappa \wedge \kappa = \alpha \delta_\Sigma$ in order to cancel the extra $\alpha \delta_\Sigma$ in the second line of (31). Note that we have assumed that $\mathcal{D}A$ is invariant under the shift of A .

To simplify (31) we let Σ be the boundary $(d-1)$ -sphere S^{d-1} of a d -ball B^d with infinitesimal radius r_Σ that intersects ℓ transversally at p , see Figure 4. We place p at the center of B^d and define the following differential form




FIG. 4. A local patch of $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ linking $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ near $p \in [0, 1]$.

with δ -function support:

$$\mathcal{H}(r, \Sigma) = H(r - r_\Sigma) \delta(z - p) dz, \quad H(r - r_\Sigma) = \begin{cases} 0, & r > r_\Sigma \\ 1, & r \leq r_\Sigma \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

where z is local coordinate describing the direction in M_{d+1} normal to B^d and r is radial direction of B^d . Clearly we have $d\mathcal{H}(r, \Sigma) = \delta(r - r_\Sigma) \delta(z - p) dr dz \equiv \delta_\Sigma$. Let $\kappa = \alpha \mathcal{H}(r, \Sigma)$, we have:

$$D_A \kappa = (D_A \alpha) \mathcal{H}(r, \Sigma) + \alpha \delta_\Sigma \text{ and } \kappa \wedge \kappa \propto dz \wedge dz = 0. \quad (34)$$

Thus under $A \rightarrow A - \kappa$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(B \wedge (F + \alpha \delta_\Sigma)) &\rightarrow \int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(B \wedge (F - (D_A \alpha) \mathcal{H}(r, \Sigma))) = S_{BF} - \int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(B \wedge D_A \alpha) \mathcal{H}(r, \Sigma) \\ &= S_{BF} - \int_{M_d} \text{Tr}(B \wedge D_A \alpha) H(r - r_\Sigma) \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where $M_d = M_{d+1}|_{z=0}$. Since $\int_{M_d} \text{Tr}(B \wedge D_A \alpha) H(r - r_\Sigma) \propto r_\Sigma^d$ (for well-behaved B and α), (31) becomes:

$$\langle U_\alpha(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle = \int \mathcal{D}B \mathcal{D}A \exp\left(i \int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(B \wedge F)\right) \mathcal{P} \exp\left(i \int_\ell (A_{\mathbf{R}} - \kappa_{\mathbf{R}})\right) = \langle \mathcal{P} \exp\left(i \int_\ell (A_{\mathbf{R}} - \kappa_{\mathbf{R}})\right) \rangle \quad (36)$$

in the $r_\Sigma \rightarrow 0$ limit. Since (36) holds also as an operator equation, we will drop the outmost angle bracket from now on.

The path-ordered integral on the RHS of (36) can be evaluated using geometric integration to be [78]:

$$\begin{aligned}
U_\alpha(\Sigma)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) &= \lim_{\Delta z \rightarrow 0} \prod_{z_i} \exp(i(A_{\mathbf{R}}(z_i) - \kappa_{\mathbf{R}}(z_i))\Delta z) \\
&= \lim_{\Delta z \rightarrow 0} \prod_{z_i > p} \exp(iA_{\mathbf{R}}(z_i)\Delta z) \times \exp(-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(z)\delta(z-p)\Delta z) \times \prod_{z_i < p} \exp(iA_{\mathbf{R}}(z_i)\Delta z) \\
&= \mathcal{P} \left[\exp\left(i \int_p^1 A_{\mathbf{R}}\right) \exp(-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(p)) \exp\left(i \int_0^p A_{\mathbf{R}}\right) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

for a partition $\{z_i\}$ of $\ell \cong [0, 1]$ and $\Delta z = \max_i |z_{i+1} - z_i|$. Therefore (7) is proved. It is immediately seen from (37) that $U_\alpha(\Sigma)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ cannot be topological since the RHS depends explicitly on p . This implies that $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ itself cannot be topological since $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ is and it is impossible that the linking of two topological operators leads to a non-topological outcome.

Fixing $z_p = 0$, (37) becomes:

$$U_\alpha(\Sigma)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) = \mathcal{P} \left[\exp\left(i \int_0^1 A_{\mathbf{R}}\right) \exp(-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(0)) \right] = W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(0)}. \tag{38}$$

By the construction illustrated in Figure 2 of the main text, after an interval compactification on $[0, 1]$, (38) leads to the sought-after non-abelian G -flavor symmetry action on a local operator $\psi(x)$ at $z = 1$.

Gauge invariance of $\langle U_\alpha(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle$. Though the invariance of $\langle U_\alpha(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle$ under $A \rightarrow A' = gAg^{-1} + igdg^{-1}$, $B \rightarrow B' = gBg^{-1} \equiv \text{ad}_g B$ is immediate, it is well-known that BF -theory also enjoys a shift gauge symmetry $B \rightarrow B' = B + D_A K$ for $K \in \Omega^{n-2}(M_{d+1}, \mathfrak{g})$ hence we would like to check if $\langle U_\alpha(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle$ is invariant under such shift (with suitable K). To this end, we will check if the following equation holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle U_\alpha(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle &= \int \mathcal{D}B \mathcal{D}A \exp\left(i \int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(B \wedge F)\right) \mathcal{P} \exp\left(i \int_\ell (A_{\mathbf{R}} - \kappa_{\mathbf{R}})\right) \\
&= \int \mathcal{D}B \mathcal{D}A \exp\left(i \int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}((B + D_A K) \wedge F)\right) \mathcal{P} \exp\left(i \int_\ell (A_{\mathbf{R}} - \kappa_{\mathbf{R}})\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

A necessary condition for the above equation to hold is to require:

$$\int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(D_A K \wedge F) = 0. \tag{40}$$

Due to Bianchi identity $D_A F = 0$, we have:

$$\int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(D_A K \wedge F) = \int_{M_{d+1}} d\text{Tr}(K \wedge F) = \int_{\partial M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(K \wedge F). \tag{41}$$

Requiring $K|_{\partial M_{d+1}} = 0$ implies that $\int_{M_{d+1}} \text{Tr}(D_A K \wedge F) = 0$ hence $\langle U_\alpha(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle$ is invariant under $B \rightarrow B' = B + D_A K$.

Topological action in BF -theory. It is clear that $U_\alpha(\Sigma)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ fails to be topological due to its explicit dependence on p . Therefore, in order obtain a topological action one may try to remove the p -dependence from (37).

The most economic way to do so is to let $e^{-\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(p)}$ commutes with all elements of G so that $e^{-\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(p)}$ in the middle of the path-ordered exponential can be factored out. This restricts $e^{-\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(p)}$ to be a constant in the center $Z(G)$ of G . In this case $U_\alpha(\Sigma)$ generates nothing but the 1-form $Z(G)$ -symmetry of BF -theory.

Another way to remove p -dependence is to define an operator $\tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma)$ for a fixed flat connection A :

$$\tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma) = \int dg \exp\left(i \int_\Sigma (\tilde{\alpha}, B)\right) \tag{42}$$

where dg is the Haar measure of G and $\tilde{\alpha}$ is the parallel transport of $g\alpha(p)g^{-1}$ for a covariantly constant α at p by the holonomy of A . The above definition is independent of the choice of p . Unlike α , we allow $\tilde{\alpha}$ to be defined up to conjugation. In other words, $e^{-i\tilde{\alpha}} \in Cl(G)$. The action of $\tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma)$ on $W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell)$ is:

$$\tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma)W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) = \mathcal{P} \left(e^{i \int_p^1 A_{\mathbf{R}}} \left(\int dg g e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(p)} g^{-1} \right) e^{i \int_0^p A_{\mathbf{R}}} \right) \tag{43}$$

where dg is the Haar measure of G . For irreducible \mathbf{R} , we have by Schur's lemma [48]:

$$\int d\mu g e^{-i\alpha_{\mathbf{R}}(p)} g^{-1} = \frac{\chi_{\mathbf{R}}(e^{-i\alpha(p)})}{\dim \mathbf{R}} \times \mathbb{I}_{\dim \mathbf{R} \times \dim \mathbf{R}} \quad (44)$$

where the group volume is normalized as $\int d\mu = 1$. Therefore, after taking VEV (43) becomes:

$$\langle \tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma) W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle = \frac{\chi_{\mathbf{R}}(e^{-i\alpha(p)})}{\dim \mathbf{R}} \langle W_{\mathbf{R}}(\ell) \rangle \quad (45)$$

the RHS of which is manifestly independent of p since $e^{-i\alpha(p)}$ at different p all live in the same conjugacy class of G . The operator $\tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma)$ can be expressed alternatively as

$$\tilde{U}_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\Sigma) = \int \mathcal{D}g(\Sigma) \mathcal{D}\varphi(\Sigma) \exp \left(i \int_{\Sigma} (\text{ad}_g \alpha, B + D_A \varphi) \right) \quad (46)$$

where α is a \mathfrak{g} -valued constant and we introduce two auxiliary fields, G -valued function $g(\Sigma)$ and $\text{ad}(P)$ -valued $(d-2)$ -form $\varphi(\Sigma)$, both supported on Σ . This formulation is manifestly invariant under the gauge transformations $A \rightarrow gAg^{-1} + igdg^{-1}$ and $B \rightarrow gBg^{-1}$ if we assume the measure $\mathcal{D}g$ and $\mathcal{D}\varphi$ are invariant. It is also invariant under the gauge transformation $B \rightarrow B + D_A K$ since one can absorb K into the auxiliary field φ . The equivalence between the two formulations can be shown as follows. Integrating out φ yields a delta function $\delta(D_A(\text{ad}_g \alpha))$ on Σ . It restricts $g(\Sigma)$ to configurations where $\text{ad}_g \alpha$ is a covariantly constant section with respect to a fixed A . Further integrating over $g(\Sigma)$ sums over all such covariantly constant sections and one recovers (42) up to a normalization constant.

SM3: BF -Theory as SymTFT from Holography

It is interesting to look for other approaches leading to BF -action as the bulk SymTFT action that governs the 0-form global G -symmetry of the physical theory \mathcal{T}_G on the boundary. It was pointed out in [33] that a BF -action can be obtained on the boundary of AdS_{d+1} with Yang-Mills theory in the bulk. The derivation requires decoupling of a kinetic term $B \wedge \star B$ for an auxiliary field B from the Yang-Mills action on AdS_{d+1} written in the first-order $BFYM$ form [79–81]. However, naively taking the $g \rightarrow 0$ limit of the $BFYM$ action results in the following action [81]:

$$S = \int \text{Tr} B \wedge F + \frac{1}{2} D\eta \wedge \star D\eta \quad (47)$$

with Stückelberg field η to account for the correct number of degrees of freedom rather than the BF -action. Therefore one has to be careful when deriving the bulk BF -action via holography. In this section, we will derive that the SymTFT of \mathcal{T}_G is a BF -theory using AdS/CFT more rigorously.

Our derivation relies on one of the earliest observations in AdS/CFT that when AdS_{d+1} theory has a gauge group G , the group G is a global symmetry group of the theory on the boundary and the currents of the boundary theory couple to the bulk gauge fields as $A_a J^a$, $a = 1, \dots, \dim(G)$ [56, 57], in other words there is the following term in the generating function:

$$\int d^d x A_{\mu} J^{\mu}. \quad (48)$$

In the absence of anomalies, the bulk theory must be invariant under gauge transformation $\delta A = D\lambda$, thus the above boundary coupling must be invariant as well, i.e. we have:

$$0 = \delta \int d^d x A_{\mu} J^{\mu} = - \int d^d x \lambda D_{\mu} J^{\mu} \quad (49)$$

for arbitrary λ . Therefore the current J^{μ} on the boundary is covariantly conserved in the presence of the gauge field A , which becomes a conserved current when A is totally decoupled.

To obtain (48), we start with the Yang-Mills action in AdS_{d+1} and focus on $d = 4$ for concreteness:

$$S_{YM} = \int d^5 x \sqrt{-g} \left(-\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} \right). \quad (50)$$

The equations of motion for S_{YM} are:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta^{ij} (\partial_i \partial_r A_l - i [A_i, \partial_r A_l]) &= 0, \\ \left(\frac{3}{r} + \partial_r\right) \partial_r A_l + \frac{L^4}{r^4} \eta^{ik} (\partial_i F_{kl} - i [A_i, F_{kl}]) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where the AdS₅ boundary is at $r \rightarrow \infty$ and L is the AdS length scale. In the gauge $A_r = 0$, the solution to the EOM can be expanded as:

$$A_i(\vec{x}, t, r) = \alpha_i(\vec{x}, t)L + \gamma_i(\vec{x}, t)\frac{L^5 \log r}{r^2} + \beta_i(\vec{x}, t)\frac{L^5}{r^2} + \dots \quad (52)$$

similar to what has been done in [82] for scalar field and in [61, 62] for abelian gauge field. Here (\vec{x}, t) is the coordinate of the AdS boundary and the fields $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$ are all Lie-algebra valued and α_i and β_i are independent modes. The first equation of (51) implies that β_i should satisfy

$$\eta^{ij} (\partial_i \beta_j - iL [\alpha_i, \beta_j]) = 0 \quad (53)$$

to the leading order in r . We define the 4D connection and the field strength as follows

$$a_i(\vec{x}, t) = L\alpha_i(\vec{x}, t), \quad f_{ij}(\vec{x}, t) = \partial_i a_j - \partial_j a_i - i [a_i, a_j] \quad (54)$$

and the covariant derivative $\mathcal{D}_i = \partial_i - i [a_i, \cdot]$. One can show that β_i must satisfy the following equation:

$$\eta^{ij} \mathcal{D}_i \beta_j = \mathcal{D}^i \beta_i = 0. \quad (55)$$

In other words, we have $\mathcal{D} \star \beta = 0$ where $\beta := \beta_i dx^i$ is a 1-form on the AdS₅ boundary. From the first equation of (51), we can further solve γ_i as:

$$\gamma_i(\vec{x}, t) = \frac{1}{2L} \eta^{jk} \mathcal{D}_j f_{ki} \quad (56)$$

which means that γ_i is not an independent mode.

Now we are ready to study the variation of S_{YM} with respect to A , i.e. δS_{YM} . For this variation, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{YM} &= \delta_A \left(\int d^5 x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} \right] \right) \\ &= \int d^5 x \sqrt{-g} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (\partial_\mu \delta A_\nu - \partial_\nu \delta A_\mu - i \delta A_\mu A_\nu - i A_\mu \delta A_\nu + i \delta A_\nu A_\mu + i A_\nu \delta A_\mu) F^{\mu\nu} \right) \\ &= \int d^5 x \partial_\mu (\sqrt{-g} [-\text{Tr} \delta A_\nu F^{\mu\nu}]) + \int d^5 x \text{Tr} \delta A_\nu D_\mu F^{\mu\nu} \\ &= -\frac{R^3}{L^3} \int d^4 x \text{Tr} \delta A_i F_{rj} g^{rr} g^{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where in the last step we use equations of motion in the bulk and Stokes' theorem to turn the bulk action into an action on the boundary of AdS₅ at large cut-off R of r -direction. Here the r -index is not summed over. Evaluating δS_{YM} at the solution to (51), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{YM} &= 2L^3 \int d^4 x \text{Tr} \delta \alpha_i \beta^i - L^3 (1 - 2 \log R) \int d^4 x \text{Tr} \delta \alpha_i \gamma^i \\ &= 2L^3 \int d^4 x \text{Tr} \delta \alpha_i \beta^i - \frac{L^2}{2} (1 - 2 \log R) \int d^4 x \text{Tr} \delta \alpha^i \mathcal{D}^j f_{ji} \\ &= 2L^3 \int d^4 x \text{Tr} \delta \alpha_i \beta^i + \frac{L^2}{2} (1 - 2 \log R) \int d^4 x \text{Tr} (\mathcal{D}^j \delta \alpha^i) f_{ji} \\ &= 2L^3 \int d^4 x \text{Tr} \delta \alpha_i \beta^i + \frac{L}{2} (1 - 2 \log R) \int d^4 x \text{Tr} f_{ij} \delta f^{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where in the last step we use the fact that $\delta f = \mathcal{D}\delta a$ and $a = L\alpha$ as already stated in (54). The second term of (58) which diverges logarithmically as $R \rightarrow \infty$, is to be cancelled by the variation of the following counter term on the AdS boundary:

$$S_{\text{ct}} = L \int d^4x \left(-\frac{1}{g^2(R)} \text{Tr} f_{ij} f^{ij} \right) \quad (59)$$

for the choice $\frac{1}{g^2(R)} = \frac{1}{2} - \log R$ (see [62] for treatment of abelian field). Such a choice of S_{ct} ensures that both $S_{YM} + S_{\text{ct}}$ and $\delta(S_{YM} + S_{\text{ct}})$ are finite. In particular, we have:

$$\delta S_{\text{tot}} = \delta(S_{YM} + S_{\text{ct}}) = 2L^3 \int d^4x \text{Tr} \delta\alpha_i \beta^i. \quad (60)$$

Therefore, the response of the source α_i on the boundary is:

$$\langle J^i(\vec{x}, t) \rangle = \frac{\delta S_{\text{tot}}}{\delta\alpha_i} = 2L^3 \beta^i. \quad (61)$$

By (55) it is immediate to see that $J^i(\vec{x}, t)$ is a covariantly conserved current on the AdS boundary when coupled to background G -gauge field α_i . By the argument around (49), we conclude that the boundary theory must have global G -symmetry.

We note that the above derivation leading to (60) is totally in parallel with the derivation in [62] for $U(1)$ gauge theory in AdS₅ and the consequential $U(1)$ current on the AdS boundary. The main difference is that in the abelian case we have $DJ = dJ = 0$ hence the current is not only covariantly conserved, but is indeed conserved.

Looking back at the derivation leading to (61), it is clear in retrospect that what really matters is the existence of a covariantly conserved current as the response of varying a source in certain boundary action (60). Therefore one may ask if there exists a different bulk theory the variation of whose action is identical to δS_{tot} . Such a bulk theory would lead to the same covariantly conserved current on the boundary and hence is indistinguishable from Yang-Mills on AdS if we care about only the global symmetry of the boundary theory. Moreover, such a theory does not have to be defined on AdS as long as the boundary of the space on which it is defined is isomorphic to the AdS boundary.

Let us stick with the above AdS₅ example and consider a non-abelian BF -theory defined on $M_4 \times (0, 1]$ homeomorphic to the neighborhood of AdS₅ boundary which is isomorphic to $M_4 \times \{1\}$. For this BF -theory, we have:

$$\delta S = \delta \left(\int \text{Tr} B \wedge F \right) = \int d^5x \text{Tr} \left(\delta \tilde{B}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} + \tilde{B}^{\mu\nu} D_\mu \delta A_\nu \right) = \int d^5x \text{Tr} \left(\delta \tilde{B}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} - D_\mu \tilde{B}^{\mu\nu} \delta A_\nu + \partial_\mu (\tilde{B}^{\mu\nu} \delta A_\nu) \right) \quad (62)$$

where $\tilde{B} = *B$ is the Hodge dual of B . Applying the EOM of A and B (or \tilde{B}) similar to what we did in the derivation of (61), we have:

$$\delta S = \int d^5x \partial_\mu \text{Tr} (\tilde{B}^{\mu\nu} \delta A_\nu) = \int d^4x \text{Tr} \tilde{B}^{ri} \delta A_i. \quad (63)$$

Therefore, the variation of S with respect to A_i results in a current on M_4 :

$$\langle J^i(\vec{x}, t) \rangle = \frac{\delta S}{\delta A_i} = \tilde{B}^{ri} \quad (64)$$

and the EOM $D_i \tilde{B}^{ri} = 0$ ensures that J is covariantly conserved.

Comparing (63) with (60), it is immediate to see that the variation of BF -action and that of Yang-Mills action near M_4 both lead to identical physical consequences, i.e. the existence of a covariantly conserved current on M_4 as the response of variation. Rather than taking the weak coupling limit of Yang-Mills or $BFYM$ on AdS, we obtain BF -action without auxiliary η field as the theory whose variation is identical to (60) hence leading to the same current on the boundary. We claim that it is in this sense that BF -theory arises as the SymTFT in the bulk that governs the global G -symmetry of the physical theory on the boundary. This concludes our holographic derivation of BF -theory being the SymTFT of global G -symmetry.