

KUNS-2103

YITP-07-62

Baryons and the Chern-Simons term in holographic QCD with three flavors

Hiroyuki HATA^{a *} and Masaki MURATA^{b †}

^a*Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

^b*Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University
Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

October 2007

Abstract

We study dynamical baryons in the holographic QCD model of Sakai and Sugimoto in the case of three flavors and with special interest in the construction of the Chern-Simons (CS) term. The baryon classical solution in this model is given by the BPST instanton, and we carry out the collective coordinate quantization of the solution. The CS term should give rise to a first class constraint which selects baryon states with right spins. However, the original CS term written in terms of the CS 5-form does not work. We instead propose a new CS term which is gauge invariant and is given as an integral over a six dimensional space having as its boundary the original five dimensional spacetime of the holographic model. Collective coordinate quantization using our new CS term leads to correct baryon states and their mass formula.

*hata@gauge.scphys.kyoto-u.ac.jp

†masaki@yukawa.kyoto-u.ac.jp

1 Introduction

Among various approaches to the holographic dual of large N_c QCD, the model proposed by Sakai and Sugimoto [1, 2] is one of the most successful ones at present both theoretically and phenomenologically. This model with N_f massless quarks is constructed using the brane configuration of N_c D4-branes and N_f D8-branes in type IIA superstring theory. They analyzed the effective theory of D8-branes on the D4-brane background, which is a $U(N_f)$ Yang-Mills (YM) theory with Chern-Simons (CS) term on a curved five-dimensional background. They found that this model has massless pion as the Nambu-Goldstone boson of chiral symmetry breaking and infinite number of massive (axial-)vector mesons. It well reproduces various phenomenologically important parameters such as the masses and the couplings of the mesons. Moreover, when we truncate all the massive modes, then the effective theory is found to be the Skyrme model [3] with Wess-Zumino-Witten (WZW) term [4, 5], which is known as the effective theory of massless mesons.

The Sakai-Sugimoto model (SS-model) can also describe the baryon degrees of freedom. It has been argued that, in the AdS/CFT correspondence, a baryon is identified as a D-brane wrapped around a sphere [6]. In the SS-model, this D-brane, which is a D4-brane wrapped on S^4 in the color D4-brane background, is realized as a soliton in the effective theory of D8-brane, namely, the five dimensional YM+CS theory. Therefore, when we quantize the collective coordinates of the instanton, the baryon spectra are expected to appear as in the case of the Skyrme model [7]. In [8], explicit construction of the baryon solution in the YM+CS theory and its collective coordinate quantization were carried out in the case of $N_f = 2$ in the approximation of large 't Hooft coupling $\lambda \gg 1$ (see also [9, 10] for the construction of the solution). The baryon solution at a fixed time was found to be the BPST instanton solution [11] with its size of order $\lambda^{-1/2}$ determined by the energy balance: the curved color D4-brane background tends to shrink the instanton size, while the Coulomb self-energy from the CS term favors larger instanton. Quantization of the collective coordinates including the size of the instanton leads to the baryon spectra which agree fairly well with experiments by taking a suitable Kaluza-Klein mass scale M_{KK} of the theory.

The purpose of this paper is to extend the study of [8] to the case of three flavors, $N_f = 3$. In fact, this is not a simple problem. First, all the quarks are massless in the original SS-model, and we have to modify the model to give at least the strange quark a mass. This is absolutely necessary for the comparison of the model with experiments. Though there have appeared a number of proposals to generate quark and meson masses in the SS-model [12, 13, 14, 15], concrete calculation seems not easy at present. In this paper we focus on another problem in the $N_f = 3$ SS-model, namely, the problem associated with the CS term. As we mentioned above, the $U(1)$ part of the CS term plays an important role in giving the instanton a non-vanishing size already in the $N_f = 2$ case. On the other hand, the $SU(N_f)$ part of the CS term vanishes identically in the $N_f = 2$ case, and $N_f = 3$ is the first nontrivial place where the non-abelian part of the CS term enters the analysis of the theory.

To explain the problem of the CS term in the $N_f = 3$ SS-model, let us recall the role of the WZW term in the quantization of the collective coordinate of the $SU(3)$ rotation of the

baryon solution in the $N_f = 3$ Skyrme model [16, 17, 18, 19, 20] (the WZW term vanishes identically in the $N_f = 2$ case). In this case, there arises a first class constraint

$$J_8 = \frac{N_c}{2\sqrt{3}}, \quad (1.1)$$

where J_8 is the eighth-component of the charge of $SU(3)_J$, whose first three components (J_1, J_2, J_3) constitute the $SU(2)$ of space rotation, and the RHS, $N_c/(2\sqrt{3})$, is from the WZW term. The constraint (1.1) selects the correct baryon states with spin 1/2 for the flavor octet and those with spin 3/2 for the decuplet from the $SU(3)_J$ octet and decuplet, respectively, containing also other states with wrong spins.

In the SS-model, the CS term should play the role of the WZW term in the Skyrme model (recall that the WZW term is reproduced from the CS term in the low energy limit [1]). However, in collective coordinate quantization of the baryon solution in the SS-model with $N_f = 3$, the CS term originally proposed in [1, 2] (given as (2.4) in sec. 2) vanishes identically as we will see in sec. 3. This implies the absurd result that the constraint in the SS-model is $J_8 = 0$ instead of (1.1).

To overcome this difficulty, we propose a new CS term for the SS-model (see eq. (4.4)). Our new CS term is strictly gauge invariant, in contrast to the original CS term of [1, 2] which is not invariant under “large” gauge transformations. However, for defining our CS term, we need a fictitious sixth coordinate just as the WZW term needs the fifth coordinate. With our new CS term, we can carry out the collective coordinate quantization of the baryon solution and get the desired constraint (1.1). The two CS terms, (2.4) and (4.4), are naively the same if we use the relation $\text{tr } \mathcal{F}^3 = d\omega_5(\mathcal{A})$. The reason why the two CS terms lead to different results is that the BPST instanton solution needs two patches for describing it in the whole four-dimensional space including both the origin and the infinity, and hence the space of integration for (2.4) is not the only boundary of that for (4.4) (see appendix C for details). In this paper, we introduce the sixth dimension for our CS term simply by hand. It is interesting if this extra dimension has its origin in ten dimensions of IIA superstring theory, though this seems not so easy as we discuss in sec. 6.

This paper is organized as follows. In sec. 2, we write down our model, five dimensional $U(N_f)$ YM+CS theory in curved background, and obtain the classical solution representing a baryon. We keep N_f generic in this section, and put $N_f = 3$ in sec. 3 and later. In sec. 3, we introduce the collective coordinates into the baryon solution and obtain their lagrangian for the case $N_f = 3$. There, we find that the original CS term does not work. We also find that the WZW term obtained from this CS term in the low energy limit cannot reproduce the constraint (1.1) either. In sec. 4, we propose our new CS term and show that it leads to the constraint (1.1). Then, in sec. 5, we complete the collective coordinate quantization using our new CS term and obtain the baryon mass formula. We also make a brief comparison of this formula with experimental data, though we have to introduce the strange quark mass for more serious analyses. The final section (sec. 6) is devoted to a summary and discussions. The appendices contain various technical details. In particular, in appendices C and D, we present details concerning our new CS term.

2 SS-model with N_f flavors and the baryon solution

In this section, we recapitulate the action of the SS-model with N_f flavors and obtain its classical solution representing a baryon. Although in this paper we are eventually interested in the case of three flavors, $N_f = 3$, we keep N_f generic in this section.

2.1 The action of the SS-model

We consider the effective theory of N_f probe D8-branes in the background of N_c D4-branes [1, 2]. Discarding the dependence on the S^4 around which the D8-branes are wrapped, this effective theory is a $U(N_f)$ gauge theory in the five dimensional subspace of the world volume of the D8-branes. The $U(N_f)$ gauge field $\mathcal{A}$, which is hermitian and corresponds to the open string with both ends attached to the D8-branes, is given by

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_\mu dx^\mu + \mathcal{A}_z dz , \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ are four-dimensional Lorentz indices and z is the coordinate of the fifth-dimension. The action of the theory consists of the Yang-Mills (YM) part S_{YM} and the Chern-Simons (CS) part S_{CS} ,

$$S = S_{\text{YM}} + S_{\text{CS}} , \quad (2.2)$$

with

$$S_{\text{YM}}[\mathcal{A}] = -\kappa \int d^4x dz \, \text{tr} \left[\frac{1}{2} h(z) \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 + k(z) \mathcal{F}_{\mu z}^2 \right] , \quad (2.3)$$

$$S_{\text{CS}}[\mathcal{A}] = \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \int_{M_5} \omega_5^{U(N_f)}(\mathcal{A}) , \quad (2.4)$$

where $\mathcal{F} = d\mathcal{A} + i\mathcal{A}^2$ is the field strength, and $\omega_5^{U(N_f)}(\mathcal{A})$ is the CS 5-form defined by

$$\omega_5^{U(N_f)}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{tr} \left(\mathcal{A} \mathcal{F}^2 - \frac{i}{2} \mathcal{A}^3 \mathcal{F} - \frac{1}{10} \mathcal{A}^5 \right) . \quad (2.5)$$

In S_{YM} (2.3), κ is written by the 't Hooft coupling λ and the number of colors N_c as

$$\kappa = a\lambda N_c , \quad \left(a = \frac{1}{216\pi^3} \right) , \quad (2.6)$$

and $h(z)$ and $k(z)$ are the warp factors given by

$$h(z) = (1 + z^2)^{-1/3} , \quad k(z) = 1 + z^2 . \quad (2.7)$$

The space of integration in (2.4) (and also in (2.3)) is $M_5 = \mathbb{R} \times M_4$ with $\mathbb{R}$ for the time t and M_4 for $(\mathbf{x}, z)$. Here, we adopt the original CS term (2.4) of [1, 2]. Although we need a refinement on the definition of the CS term for the proper quantization around the baryon

solution, the present one (2.4) is sufficient for obtaining classical solutions since the equations of motion (EOM) are not affected by the redefinition of the CS term.

Let us decompose the $U(N_f)$ gauge field $\mathcal{A}$ into the $SU(N_f)$ part A and the $U(1)$ part $\hat{A}$ as

$$\mathcal{A} = A + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N_f}} \hat{A} = A^a t_a + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N_f}} \hat{A}, \quad (2.8)$$

where t_a ($a = 1, 2, \dots, N_f^2 - 1$) are the hermitian generators of $SU(N_f)$ normalized as

$$\text{tr}(t_a t_b) = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab}. \quad (2.9)$$

Using A and $\hat{A}$, the actions S_{YM} and S_{CS} read

$$S_{\text{YM}} = -\kappa \int d^4 x dz \text{tr} \left[\frac{1}{2} h(z) F_{\mu\nu}^2 + k(z) F_{\mu z}^2 \right] - \frac{1}{2} \kappa \int d^4 x dz \left[\frac{1}{2} h(z) \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 + k(z) \hat{F}_{\mu z}^2 \right], \quad (2.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{CS}} &= \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \int \left[\omega_5^{SU(N_f)}(A) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N_f}} \left(3\hat{A} \text{tr} F^2 + \frac{1}{2} \hat{A} \hat{F}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N_f}} d \left(\hat{A} \text{tr} \left(2FA - \frac{i}{2} A^3 \right) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \int \omega_5^{SU(N_f)}(A) + \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{N_f}} \epsilon_{MNPQ} \int d^4 x dz \left[\frac{3}{8} \hat{A}_0 \text{tr}(F_{MN} F_{PQ}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{3}{2} \hat{A}_M \text{tr}(\partial_0 A_N F_{PQ}) + \frac{3}{4} \hat{F}_{MN} \text{tr}(A_0 F_{PQ}) + \frac{1}{16} \hat{A}_0 \hat{F}_{MN} \hat{F}_{PQ} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4} \hat{A}_M \hat{F}_{MN} \hat{F}_{PQ} + (\text{total derivatives}) \right], \quad (2.11) \end{aligned}$$

with $M, N = 1, 2, 3, z$ and $\epsilon_{123z} = +1$. The genuine non-abelian part $\omega_5^{SU(N_f)}(A)$ is missing in the $N_f = 2$ case.

2.2 Classical solution representing a baryon

In this subsection, we obtain the classical solution of the SS-model representing a baryon in the $1/\lambda$ expansion by assuming that the 't Hooft coupling λ is large enough. The number of flavors N_f is kept generic, not restricted to the $N_f = 3$ case. Our solution is an extension of the $N_f = 2$ solution of [8] to a generic N_f ,^{*} and it is essentially the embedding of the $SU(2)$ BPST instanton solution to $SU(N_f)$. A nontrivial point in the $N_f \geq 3$ case is the appearance of the time component A_0 of the $SU(N_f)$ part of the gauge field, which is absent in the $N_f = 2$ case.

In order to carry out a systematic $1/\lambda$ expansion, we follow ref. [8] to rescale the coordinates $x^M = (\mathbf{x}, z)$ and the gauge field $\mathcal{A}$ as

$$x^M \rightarrow \lambda^{+1/2} x^M, \quad x^0 \rightarrow x^0,$$

^{*} The baryon solution in the $N_f = 2$ case is also analyzed in [9]. Moreover, the energy (2.26) and the size (2.27) of the solution for a generic N_f have already been obtained in [10].

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_0 &\rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0, \quad \mathcal{A}_M \rightarrow \lambda^{-1/2} \mathcal{A}_M, \\ \mathcal{F}_{MN} &\rightarrow \lambda^{-1} \mathcal{F}_{MN}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{0M} \rightarrow \lambda^{-1/2} \mathcal{F}_{0M}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.12}$$

Note that S_{CS} is invariant under this rescaling, while S_{YM} is expanded as

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\text{YM}} = & -aN_c \int d^4x dz \operatorname{tr} \left[\frac{\lambda}{2} F_{MN}^2 + \left(-\frac{z^2}{6} F_{ij}^2 + z^2 F_{iz}^2 - F_{0M}^2 \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \right] \\ & - \frac{aN_c}{2} \int d^4x dz \left[\frac{\lambda}{2} \widehat{F}_{MN}^2 + \left(-\frac{z^2}{6} \widehat{F}_{ij}^2 + z^2 \widehat{F}_{iz}^2 - \widehat{F}_{0M}^2 \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \right],\end{aligned}\tag{2.13}$$

with $i, j = 1, 2, 3$. Here, we have used (2.6) for κ . From this action, the EOM reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}D_M F_{0M} + \frac{1}{64\pi^2 a} \sqrt{\frac{2}{N_f}} \epsilon_{MNPQ} \widehat{F}_{MN} F_{PQ} \\ + \frac{1}{64\pi^2 a} \epsilon_{MNPQ} \left\{ F_{MN} F_{PQ} - \frac{1}{N_f} \operatorname{tr}(F_{MN} F_{PQ}) \right\} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) = 0,\end{aligned}\tag{2.14}$$

$$D_N F_{MN} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) = 0,\tag{2.15}$$

$$\partial_M \widehat{F}_{0M} + \frac{1}{64\pi^2 a} \sqrt{\frac{2}{N_f}} \epsilon_{MNPQ} \left\{ \operatorname{tr}(F_{MN} F_{PQ}) + \frac{1}{2} \widehat{F}_{MN} \widehat{F}_{PQ} \right\} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) = 0,\tag{2.16}$$

$$\partial_N \widehat{F}_{MN} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) = 0,\tag{2.17}$$

where (2.14) and (2.15) are the EOM for the $SU(N_f)$ part, while (2.16) and (2.17) are for the $U(1)$ part.

Let us obtain the static soliton solution of the EOM (2.14)–(2.17) corresponding to a baryon. In this paper, we want to construct the solution so that its energy is correctly obtained to next to the leading order in the $1/\lambda$ expansion. First, let us solve (2.15). For the purpose of the present paper it is sufficient to consider the leading part $D_N F_{MN} = 0$, and the solution carrying a unit baryon number is given by the embedding of the $SU(2)$ BPST instanton solution [11] in the flat four-dimensional space to $SU(N_f)$:

$$A_M^{\text{cl}}(x) = -if(\xi) g(x) \partial_M g(x)^{-1},\tag{2.18}$$

where $f(\xi)$ and $g(x)$ are given by[†]

$$f(\xi) = \frac{\xi^2}{\xi^2 + \rho^2}, \quad \xi = \sqrt{(x^M - X^M)^2},\tag{2.19}$$

$$g(x) = \begin{pmatrix} g^{SU(2)}(x) & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1}_{N_f-2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad g^{SU(2)}(x) = \frac{1}{\xi} ((z - Z)\mathbf{1}_2 + i(x^i - X^i)\tau_i) .\tag{2.20}$$

Here, $\mathbf{1}_N$ denotes the $N \times N$ identity matrix, and τ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are the Pauli matrices. The constants $X^M = (\mathbf{X}, Z)$ and ρ represent the position and the size of the instanton, respectively.

[†] We have chosen $g^{SU(2)}(x)$ (2.20) as the hermitian conjugate of $g(x)$ in ref. [8] so as to make the corresponding A_M^{cl} (2.18) carry a unit baryon number $N_B = +1$ (see (3.29)).

Notice that these constants are also rescaled as in (2.12). The field strengths of this solution are given by

$$F_{ij}^{\text{cl}} = \frac{4\rho^2}{(\xi^2 + \rho^2)^2} \epsilon_{ijk} t_k, \quad F_{iz}^{\text{cl}} = \frac{4\rho^2}{(\xi^2 + \rho^2)^2} t_i, \quad (2.21)$$

where t_i is the $SU(N_f)$ embedding of τ_i , $t_i = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \tau_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Next, the solutions to the $U(1)$ part of EOM, (2.17) and (2.16), are the same as in the $SU(2)$ case [8]. We have

$$\widehat{A}_M^{\text{cl}} = 0, \quad (2.22)$$

and

$$\widehat{A}_0^{\text{cl}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N_f}} \frac{1}{8\pi^2 a} \frac{1}{\xi^2} \left(1 - \frac{\rho^4}{(\xi^2 + \rho^2)^2} \right). \quad (2.23)$$

The present $\widehat{A}_0^{\text{cl}}$ has been chosen to be regular at the origin $\xi = 0$ and vanish at the infinity $\xi \rightarrow \infty$.

Finally, let us solve (2.14) to obtain A_0 . In the $N_f = 2$ case, the third term of (2.14) is missing, and the solution vanishing at $\xi = \infty$ is simply given by $A_0 = 0$. For a generic N_f , substituting (2.18) and (2.22) into (2.14), we have

$$D_M^2 A_0 + \frac{3}{2\pi^2 a} \frac{\rho^4}{(\xi^2 + \rho^2)^2} \left(\mathcal{P}_2 - \frac{2}{N_f} \mathbf{1}_{N_f} \right) = 0, \quad (2.24)$$

where the matrix $\mathcal{P}_2$ is $\mathcal{P}_2 = \text{diag}(1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Eq. (2.24) leads to the following nontrivial regular solution which commutes with A_M^{cl} (2.18), vanishes at the infinity, and has the same ξ -dependence as that of (2.23):

$$A_0^{\text{cl}} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2 a} \frac{1}{\xi^2} \left(1 - \frac{\rho^4}{(\xi^2 + \rho^2)^2} \right) \left(\mathcal{P}_2 - \frac{2}{N_f} \mathbf{1}_{N_f} \right). \quad (2.25)$$

The mass M of our static soliton solution is obtained by using the relation $S = - \int dt M$. Substituting the above solution into (2.13) and (2.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \kappa \int d^3 x dz \, \text{tr} \left[\frac{1}{2} (F_{MN}^{\text{cl}})^2 - \lambda^{-1} \left(\frac{z^2}{6} (F_{ij}^{\text{cl}})^2 + z^2 (F_{iz}^{\text{cl}})^2 - (F_{0M}^{\text{cl}})^2 \right) \right] - \frac{\kappa}{2} \lambda^{-1} \int d^3 x dz (\widehat{F}_{0M}^{\text{cl}})^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\kappa}{24\pi^2 a} \lambda^{-1} \epsilon_{MNPQ} \int d^3 x dz \left[\sqrt{\frac{2}{N_f}} \frac{3}{8} \widehat{A}_0^{\text{cl}} \text{tr}(F_{MN}^{\text{cl}} F_{PQ}^{\text{cl}}) + \frac{3}{4} \text{tr}(A_0^{\text{cl}} F_{MN}^{\text{cl}} F_{PQ}^{\text{cl}}) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}) \\ &= 8\pi^2 \kappa \left[1 + \lambda^{-1} \left(\frac{\rho^2}{6} + \frac{1}{320\pi^4 a^2} \frac{1}{\rho^2} + \frac{Z^2}{3} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

The contributions from the two terms, $\text{tr}(F_{0M}^{\text{cl}})^2$ and $\text{tr}(A_0^{\text{cl}} F_{MN}^{\text{cl}} F_{PQ}^{\text{cl}})$, are absent in the $N_f = 2$ case [8]. It is interesting that the mass formula (2.26) is nonetheless independent of the number

of flavors N_f . The values of ρ and Z for the stable solution is determined by minimizing M :[‡]

$$\rho^2 = \frac{1}{8\pi^2 a} \sqrt{\frac{6}{5}} , \quad Z = 0 . \quad (2.27)$$

Note that the size of the instanton is also independent of N_f . If we express this in terms of the original variable (see (2.12)), ρ^2 is rescaled as $\rho^2 \rightarrow \lambda^{+1} \rho^2$. This fact means that the size of our solution is of order $\lambda^{-1/2}$. Inserting (2.27) into (2.26), the mass of the soliton is given by

$$M = 8\pi^2 \kappa + \sqrt{\frac{2}{15}} N_c . \quad (2.28)$$

The very small size of order $\lambda^{-1/2}$ of the baryon solution implies that the higher order derivative terms in the D-brane effective action, which have been neglected in (2.3), might have important contributions as mentioned in [8]. However, we leave this issue for future study and continue analysis based on the YM action (2.3) in the rest of this paper.

3 Necessity of modifying the CS term

Having constructed the baryon classical solution in sec. 2, our next task is to carry out the quantization of the collective coordinates of the solution. However, as we mentioned in the Introduction, there arise a problem that, in the $N_f = 3$ case, the constraint (1.1) necessary for selecting the baryon states with correct spins cannot be obtained from the CS term (2.4) of [1, 2].

In this section, we first introduce the collective coordinates into our baryon classical solution (sec. 3.1), obtain the lagrangian of collective coordinates (sec. 3.2), and then explain how the CS term (2.4) fails to give the constraint (1.1) (sec. 3.3). We also show that the WZW term obtained as the low energy limit of the CS term (2.4) cannot reproduce the constraint (1.1) either (sec. 3.4). In the rest of this paper, we restrict ourselves to the three flavor case, $N_f = 3$.

3.1 Introducing the collective coordinates

We take the following moduli of the classical solution as the collective coordinates for quantization:

- $SU(3)$ orientation $W \in SU(3)$
- Size of the instanton ρ
- Position of the instanton $X^M = (\mathbf{X}, Z)$

[‡] This is equivalent to solving the sub-leading part of the EOM (2.15) and (2.17) projected on to the subspace of deformations of the solution in the ρ and Z directions.

Namely, we analyze the quantum mechanical system consisting of the above three kinds of moduli promoted to time-dependent variables $(W(t), X^M(t), \rho(t))$. Note that ρ and Z are not genuine moduli as seen from the fact that the mass (2.26) of the solution depends on them. However, as in the $N_f = 2$ case, the masses of the modes ρ and Z are much lighter than other massive modes for large λ . Therefore, we regard ρ and Z as the collective coordinates as well as W and $\mathbf{X}$.

In order to derive the lagrangian of these collective modes, we approximate the slowly moving soliton by the static solution of the last section with $X^\alpha = (X^M, \rho)$ and the $SU(3)$ orientation W made time-dependent. Thus, the $SU(3)$ gauge field is assumed to be of the form[§]

$$\begin{aligned} A_M(t, x) &= W(t) A_M^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t)) W(t)^{-1} , \\ A_0(t, x) &= W(t) A_0^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t)) W(t)^{-1} + \Delta A_0(t, x) , \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $A_M^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t))$ is the BPST instanton solution (2.18) with time-dependent X^α . The $U(1)$ part of the gauge field, $\hat{A}_M(x, t)$ and $\hat{A}_0(x, t)$, are given simply by (2.22) and (2.23), respectively, with X^α made time-dependent:

$$\hat{A}_M(x, t) = 0 , \quad \hat{A}_0(x, t) = \hat{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t)) . \quad (3.2)$$

The extra term $\Delta A_0(x, t)$ in (3.1) for A_0 is introduced so that the EOM of A_0 , namely, the Gauss law constraint (2.14), is satisfied for the present gauge field with time-dependent moduli.[¶] Let us see how ΔA_0 is determined. For $A(x, t)$ of (3.1), we find that

$$F_{MN} = W(t) F_{MN}^{\text{cl}} W(t)^{-1} , \quad (3.3)$$

$$F_{0M} = W(t) \left(\dot{X}^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial X^\alpha} A_M^{\text{cl}} - D_M^{\text{cl}} \Phi - D_M^{\text{cl}} A_0^{\text{cl}} \right) W(t)^{-1} , \quad (3.4)$$

where $\Phi(t, x)$ is defined by

$$\Phi(t, x) = W(t)^{-1} \Delta A_0 W(t) - i W(t)^{-1} \dot{W}(t) . \quad (3.5)$$

Then, (2.14) implies

$$D_M^{\text{cl}} \left(\dot{X}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial X^N} A_M^{\text{cl}} + \dot{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} A_M^{\text{cl}} - D_M^{\text{cl}} \Phi \right) = 0 , \quad (3.6)$$

and the problem of determining ΔA_0 has been reduced to that of solving (3.6) for Φ .

[§] Here, we adopt a different way of introducing the collective coordinate of $SU(3)$ rotation from that of ref. [8]. The gauge field (3.1) in this paper and the corresponding one (4.2) in [8] (extended to the $N_f = 3$ case) are related through the gauge transformation by $Y(t, x)$ defined by $-iY^{-1}\dot{Y} = \Delta A_0$. The variable V in ref. [8] and W in this paper are related by $V(t, x) = Y(t, x)W(t)$.

[¶] The general principle of introducing the time-dependent collective coordinates into a classical solution is that the EOM of the collective coordinates ensure the field theory EOM. In gauge theories, this requirement is automatically satisfied except for the EOM of A_0 . For A_0 we have to add an extra term to ensure its EOM by hand. We would like to thank S. Sugimoto, T. Sakai and S. Yamato for discussions on this matter.

The solution to (3.6) is given as the sum of three terms, $\Phi = \Phi_X + \Phi_\rho + \Phi_{SU(3)}$, each of which depends on the time derivative of the corresponding collective coordinate. The determination of the solution Φ is explained in appendix A of ref. [8] in the case of $N_f = 2$. In the present $N_f = 3$ case, Φ_X and Φ_ρ remain the same as in the $N_f = 2$ case, $\Phi_X = -\dot{X}^N A_N^{\text{cl}}$ and $\Phi_\rho = 0$, and we have only to solve $D_M^{\text{cl}} D_M^{\text{cl}} \Phi_{SU(3)} = 0$. Derivation of $\Phi_{SU(3)}$ is explained in appendix A, and we find that Φ in the $N_f = 3$ case is

$$\Phi(t, x) = -\dot{X}^N(t) A_N^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t)) + \chi^a(t) \Phi_a(x; X^\alpha(t)) , \quad (3.7)$$

where $\Phi_a(x; X^\alpha(t))$ ($a = 1, \dots, 8$) are given by (A.14) in terms of $u^a(\xi)$ of (A.12), and $\chi^a(t)$ are arbitrary. In order to relate $\chi^a(t)$ to $W(t)$, we impose the condition,^{||}

$$\Delta A_0(t, x) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad z \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (3.8)$$

Then, since we have $\Phi_a(x) \rightarrow t_a$ and $A_M^{\text{cl}}(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain

$$\chi^a(t) = -2i \text{tr}(t_a W(t)^{-1} \dot{W}(t)) . \quad (3.9)$$

Summarizing, we find that F_{0M} is given by

$$F_{0M} = W(t) \left(\dot{X}^N F_{MN}^{\text{cl}} + \dot{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} A_M^{\text{cl}} - \chi^a D_M^{\text{cl}} \Phi_a - D_M^{\text{cl}} A_0^{\text{cl}} \right) W(t)^{-1} , \quad (3.10)$$

where we have used $(\partial/\partial X^N) A_M^{\text{cl}} = -\partial_N A_M^{\text{cl}}$. The $SU(3)$ part of the gauge field 1-form $A(t, x)$ (3.1) is concisely expressed as

$$A(t, x) = (A^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t)) + \Phi(t, x) dt)^{W(t)} , \quad (3.11)$$

where A^V is the gauge transform of A by $V(t, x) \in SU(3)$:

$$A^V = V(A - id)V^{-1} . \quad (3.12)$$

Since the $U(1)$ part $\hat{A}(x, t)$ is simply given by (3.2), the formula (3.11) is extended to the whole $\mathcal{A} = A + \hat{A}$ as

$$\mathcal{A}(t, x) = (\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t)) + \Phi(t, x) dt)^{W(t)} . \quad (3.13)$$

3.2 Lagrangian of the collective coordinates

The lagrangian L of the collective coordinates $X^\alpha(t) = (\mathbf{X}(t), Z(t), \rho(t))$ and $W(t)$ is obtained as $S_{\text{YM}} + S_{\text{CS}} = \int dt L$ by substituting (3.3) and (3.10) into S_{YM} (2.13):**

$$L = -M + aN_c \int d^3x dz \text{tr}(F_{0M}^2 - (F_{0M}^{\text{cl}})^2) + L_{\text{CS}}$$

^{||} The condition (3.8) with $z \rightarrow +\infty$ only may look strange. In fact, $\Delta A_0(t, x)$ of (3.1) and hence $A_0(t, x)$ itself does not tend to zero in the other limit $z \rightarrow -\infty$ since $g(x) \rightarrow \text{diag}(-1, -1, 1) \neq \mathbf{1}_3$ in this limit. Eq. (3.8) should be regarded as a consequence of the condition $\bar{A}_0(t, x) \rightarrow 0$ ($\xi \rightarrow \infty$) requesting that the gauge field $\bar{A}_0$ in the patch containing the infinity $\xi = \infty$ be regular there. See appendix C.1.

** In obtaining the last expression of (3.14), we have carried out the integration-by-parts for the term $\text{tr}(\mathcal{O}_M D_M^{\text{cl}} A_0^{\text{cl}})$ with $\mathcal{O}_M = \dot{X}^\alpha (\partial/\partial X^\alpha) A_M^{\text{cl}} - D_M^{\text{cl}} \Phi$ to change it into $-\text{tr}(A_0^{\text{cl}} D_M^{\text{cl}} \mathcal{O}_M)$, which vanishes due to (3.6). The surface term can be dropped since we have $A_0^{\text{cl}} \sim 1/\xi^2$ and $\mathcal{O}_M \sim 1/\xi^3$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$.

$$= -M + aN_c \int d^3x dz \operatorname{tr} \left(\dot{X}^N F_{MN}^{\text{cl}} + \dot{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} A_M^{\text{cl}} - \chi^a D_M^{\text{cl}} \Phi_a \right)^2 + L_{\text{CS}} , \quad (3.14)$$

where L_{CS} is defined by

$$S_{\text{CS}}[\mathcal{A}] - S_{\text{CS}}[\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}] = \int dt L_{\text{CS}} . \quad (3.15)$$

Performing the integrations over $(\mathbf{x}, z)$, we get

$$L = -M_0 + \frac{m_X}{2} \dot{\mathbf{X}}^2 + L_Z + L_\rho + L_{\rho W} + L_{\text{CS}} , \quad (3.16)$$

where L_Z , L_ρ and $L_{\rho W}$ are given by

$$L_Z = \frac{m_Z}{2} \left(\dot{Z}^2 - \omega_Z^2 Z^2 \right) , \quad (3.17)$$

$$L_\rho = \frac{m_\rho}{2} \left(\dot{\rho}^2 - \omega_\rho^2 \rho^2 \right) - \frac{K}{m_\rho \rho^2} , \quad (3.18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\rho W} &= m_\rho \rho^2 \left(\frac{1}{8} \sum_{a=1}^3 (\chi^a)^2 + \frac{1}{16} \sum_{a=4}^7 (\chi^a)^2 \right) , \\ &= 2 \mathcal{I}_1(\rho) \sum_{a=1}^3 \left[\operatorname{tr}(-iW^{-1} \dot{W} t_a) \right]^2 + 2 \mathcal{I}_2(\rho) \sum_{a=4}^7 \left[\operatorname{tr}(-iW^{-1} \dot{W} t_a) \right]^2 , \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

with the various quantities defined as follows:

$$M_0 = 8\pi^2 \kappa , \quad (3.20)$$

$$m_X = m_Z = \frac{m_\rho}{2} = 8\pi^2 \kappa \lambda^{-1} = 8\pi^2 a N_c , \quad (3.21)$$

$$\omega_Z^2 = \frac{2}{3} , \quad \omega_\rho^2 = \frac{1}{6} , \quad (3.22)$$

$$K = \frac{N_c m_\rho}{40\pi^2 a} = \frac{2}{5} N_c^2 , \quad (3.23)$$

$$\mathcal{I}_1(\rho) = \frac{1}{4} m_\rho \rho^2 , \quad \mathcal{I}_2(\rho) = \frac{1}{8} m_\rho \rho^2 . \quad (3.24)$$

The expressions of M_0 , $m_{X,Z,\rho}$, $\omega_{Z,\rho}^2$ and $Q \equiv K/m_\rho$ are the same as in the $SU(2)$ case [8]. The ratio of the moments of inertia, $\mathcal{I}_2(\rho)/\mathcal{I}_1(\rho) = 1/2$, is due to the powers 1 and $1/2$ of $f(\xi)$ in $u^a(\xi)$ (A.12) for $a = 1, 2, 3$ and $a = 4, \dots, 7$, respectively.

3.3 The CS term (2.4)

Let us evaluate the CS term (2.4) for the configuration (3.13) to see the dependence on the collective coordinates $W(t)$ and $X^\alpha(t)$. Using the formulas of ω_5 which are summarized in appendix B, we get (the superscript $U(3)$ on ω_5 will be omitted for simplicity),

$$\omega_5(\mathcal{A}) = \omega_5((\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}} + \Phi dt)^W)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \omega_5(\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}} + \Phi dt) + \frac{1}{10} \text{tr}(-iW^{-1}\dot{W}dt)^5 + d\alpha_4(-iW^{-1}\dot{W}dt, \mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}} + \Phi dt) \\
&= \omega_5(\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}) + 3 \text{tr}(\Phi dt (\mathcal{F}^{\text{cl}})^2) + d\beta(\Phi dt, \mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}) + d\alpha_4(-iW^{-1}\dot{W}dt, \mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}) \\
&= \omega_5(\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}) + 3 \text{tr}(\Phi dt (F^{\text{cl}})^2) + d\beta(\Phi dt, A^{\text{cl}}) + d\alpha_4(-iW^{-1}\dot{W}dt, A^{\text{cl}}) , \tag{3.25}
\end{aligned}$$

where β and α_4 are given in (B.4) and (B.2). In obtaining the last expression, we have used that $\widehat{A}_M^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t)) = \widehat{F}_{MN}^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t)) = 0$.

As we mentioned in the Introduction, the dependences of the CS term (2.4) on the collective coordinates, in particular, on $W(t)$ cancel out among the last three terms of (3.25). This is seen as follows. First, note that, in the term $3 \text{tr}(\Phi dt (F^{\text{cl}})^2)$, we have $(F^{\text{cl}})^2 = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{P}_2 \text{tr}(F^{\text{cl}})^2$ and

$$\text{tr}(\Phi \mathcal{P}_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \chi^8(t) , \tag{3.26}$$

where we have used (3.7), (A.14) and

$$\mathcal{P}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} t_8 + \frac{2}{3} \mathbf{1}_3, \quad t_8 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.27}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \int_{M_5=\mathbb{R} \times M_4} 3 \text{tr}(\Phi dt (F^{\text{cl}})^2) = \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \int dt \chi^8(t) \int_{M_4} \text{tr}(F^{\text{cl}})^2 = \frac{N_c}{2\sqrt{3}} \int dt \chi^8(t), \tag{3.28}$$

where we have used that our classical solution has a unit baryon number (=instanton number):

$$N_B = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{M_4} \text{tr}(F^{\text{cl}})^2 = 1. \tag{3.29}$$

Evaluation of $\int d\beta$ and $\int d\alpha_4$ are similar and easier. We have, using $(A^{\text{cl}})^3 \rightarrow (-igdg^{-1})^3 \propto \mathcal{P}_2$ and $F^{\text{cl}}(x) \sim 1/\xi^4$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times M_4} d\beta(\Phi dt, A^{\text{cl}}) &= \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times M_4} d\alpha_4(-iW^{-1}\dot{W}dt, A^{\text{cl}}) \\
&= \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \frac{i}{4\sqrt{3}} \int dt \chi^8(t) \int_{\partial M_4} \text{tr}(-igdg^{-1})^3 = -\frac{N_c}{4\sqrt{3}} \int dt \chi^8(t), \tag{3.30}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used another expression of (3.29):

$$\frac{-i}{24\pi^2} \int_{S^3} (-igdg^{-1})^3 = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{P}_2. \tag{3.31}$$

From (3.28) and (3.30), we find that the sum of the contributions of the three terms in (3.25) cancels out as announced:^{††}

$$S_{\text{CS}}[\mathcal{A}] = S_{\text{CS}}[\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}]. \tag{3.32}$$

^{††} The CS term (2.4) becomes more involved if we adopt the way of introducing the collective coordinate of $SU(3)$ rotation by the variable $V(t, x)$ given in ref. [8]. In this case, we can show that the terms linear in $\chi^a(t)$ are missing from (2.4).

Namely, L_{CS} (3.15) vanishes:

$$L_{\text{CS}} = 0 . \quad (3.33)$$

3.4 WZW term

In ref. [1], they showed that the Skyrme action including the WZW term can be correctly reproduced as the low energy limit of the action (2.2) of holographic QCD. In particular, the WZW term comes from the CS term of (2.4) and is given by

$$S_{\text{WZW}} = \frac{N_c}{240\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times M_4} \text{tr} L^5 , \quad (3.34)$$

where the left-current 1-form L is defined by

$$L = -i U(t, \mathbf{x}, z) dU(t, \mathbf{x}, z)^{-1} , \quad (3.35)$$

with

$$U(t, \mathbf{x}, z) = \text{P exp} \left(i \int_{-\infty}^z dz' \mathcal{A}_z(t, \mathbf{x}, z') \right) . \quad (3.36)$$

In this WZW term, the coordinate z plays the role of the fifth dimension with $z = \infty$ corresponding to the real four dimensional space-time $(t, \mathbf{x})$.

In this subsection, we will show that this WZW term (3.34) cannot reproduce the desired constraint (1.1) either. This is, of course, consistent with the result of the last subsection. Inserting (3.1) into (3.36), we have

$$U(t, \mathbf{x}, z) = W(t) U_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}, z) W(t)^{-1} , \quad (3.37)$$

where U_{cl} is given, using $\mathcal{A}_z^{\text{cl}}(x) = \mathbf{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} / (\xi^2 + \rho^2)$, by

$$U_{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}, z) = \text{P exp} \left(i \int_{-\infty}^z dz' \mathcal{A}_z^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}, z') \right) = \exp \left(i H(r, z) \hat{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} \right) , \quad (3.38)$$

with

$$H(r, z) = \frac{r}{\sqrt{r^2 + \rho^2}} \left(\arctan \frac{z}{\sqrt{r^2 + \rho^2}} + \frac{\pi}{2} \right) . \quad (3.39)$$

We omit other collective coordinates than $W(t)$ here for simplicity.

For U of (3.37), we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 &= W \left[U_{\text{cl}}(-iW^{-1}\dot{W})U_{\text{cl}}^{-1} + iW^{-1}\dot{W} \right] W^{-1} , \\ L_M &= W L_M^{\text{cl}} W^{-1} , \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

and accordingly,

$$\text{tr} L^5 = 5 \text{tr} \left(-iW^{-1}\dot{W} dt \left[(R_M^{\text{cl}} dx^M)^4 - (L_M^{\text{cl}} dx^M)^4 \right] \right) . \quad (3.41)$$

Here, L^{cl} and R^{cl} are given by (3.35) with U replaced by U_{cl} and U_{cl}^{-1} , respectively. We can show generically that, for U_{cl} of spherically symmetric form (3.38) with an arbitrary $H(r, z)$ not restricted to (3.39),

$$(R_M^{\text{cl}} dx^M)^4 = (L_M^{\text{cl}} dx^M)^4 = 0, \quad (3.42)$$

and hence the WZW term of (3.34) vanishes totally.

4 New CS term

As we saw in the last section, the CS term (2.4) cannot reproduce the constraint (1.1) necessary for selecting baryon states with correct spins. Another and potential problem about the CS term (2.4) is that it is not strictly a gauge invariant quantity. Indeed, it is not invariant under “large” gauge transformations (see (B.1)). Therefore, the physics can depend on the choice of gauge.

To overcome these problem, we here propose another CS term for the holographic QCD (2.2). The construction is quite parallel with that of the WZW term in the Skyrme model [4, 5]. We introduce a new and fictitious sixth coordinate s which takes values in the interval $[0, 1]$, and consider a six dimensional spacetime M_6 with coordinates $(t, x^M, s) = (t, \mathbf{x}, z, s)$ (see fig. 1). The subspace of $s = 0$ is the boundary of M_6 and it is the original five dimensional spacetime $M_5 = \mathbb{R} \times M_4$ where the YM action S_{YM} (2.3) is defined. Accordingly, the gauge




Figure 1: The space M_6 . The boundary $s = 0$ is the original five dimensional spacetime M_5 .

field on M_6 has the s -component and is now a function of the coordinates $(t, x, s) = (t, \mathbf{x}, z, s)$,

$$\mathcal{A}(t, x, s) = \mathcal{A}_0(t, x, s)dt + \mathcal{A}_M(t, x, s)dx^M + \mathcal{A}_s(t, x, s)ds, \quad (4.1)$$

and it is required to satisfy the following condition:

$$\mathcal{A}(t, x, s = 0) = \mathcal{A}(t, x), \quad (\text{except the } s\text{-component } \mathcal{A}_s). \quad (4.2)$$

Following the case of the WZW term [19], we take as the space M_6 in the baryon sector the direct product $M_6 = D_2 \times M_4$; D_2 is the two dimensional disc for (t, s) and M_4 is for $(\mathbf{x}, z)$. On D_2 , t is the angle coordinate and s the radial one, with $s = 0$ and $s = 1$ corresponding to the boundary and the center, respectively (see fig. 2). Namely, we regard the space of t as S^1




Figure 2: The space D_2 for (t, s) is a two dimensional disc with angle coordinate t and radial one $1 - s$ ($s = 0$ and $s = 1$ are the boundary and the center of the disc, respectively).

by identifying $t = +\infty$ and $t = -\infty$. In this case, the gauge field on M_6 must respect the fact that $s = 1$ is a point on D_2 and satisfy conditions including

$$\mathcal{A}(t, x, s = 1) = t\text{-indep.} \quad . \quad (4.3)$$

With the above extension to the six dimensional spacetime M_6 , our new CS term is given by

$$S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}} = \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \int_{M_6} \text{tr } \mathcal{F}^3, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) = d\mathcal{A} + i\mathcal{A}^2$ is the field strength on M_6 having also the s -component. The ambiguity in the six dimensional extension (4.4) is an integer times 2π and hence does not affect $\exp iS_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}$, as in the case of the WZW term.

Since we have

$$\text{tr } \mathcal{F}^3 = d\omega_5(\mathcal{A}) \quad , \quad (4.5)$$

and $\partial M_6 = M_5$, our new CS term (4.4) may seem merely an equivalent rewriting of the original one (2.4). This is indeed the case in the topologically trivial sector without baryons. In the baryon sector, however, due to the fact that we need two patches for expressing the BPST instanton on $M_4 (\simeq S^4)$, M_5 is not the only boundary of M_6 for gauge non-invariant quantities such as ω_5 . For this reason, our new CS term can differ from the original one in the sector with baryons. (The baryon configuration on M_6 given in this section is for the patch containing the origin $\xi = 0$. See appendix C for the construction of baryon configurations in both the patches.)

For the collective coordinate quantization of baryon using our new CS term, we extend the gauge field (3.13) defined on M_5 to M_6 as

$$\mathcal{A}(t, x, s) = (\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}(x, s; X^\alpha(t, s)) + \Phi(t, x, s)dt + \Psi(t, x, s)ds)^{W(t, s)} \quad . \quad (4.6)$$

Compared with (3.13), the various quantities, including $\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}$ and the collective coordinates (W, X^α) , are extended to depend also on s , and that a new term, Ψds , has been added. These

extensions should be done so as to satisfy the conditions (4.2) and (4.3). The details of the extensions are described in appendix C, and we here explain only a part necessary for the arguments in this section. First, the s -dependence of $\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}(x, s)$ should be introduced only in the time component $\mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}$ in such a way that the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x, s = 0) = \mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x) , \quad \mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x, s = 1) = 0 , \quad [\mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x, s), g(x)] = 0 . \quad (4.7)$$

The s -dependence of $\mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x, s)$ can be quite arbitrary so long as these conditions are satisfied (there is no EOM for $s \neq 0$), and the other components $\mathcal{A}_M^{\text{cl}}(x)$ on M_6 should not have the explicit s -dependence and be the same as on M_5 . The second condition of (4.7) ensures that $S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}[\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}]$ reproduces the same Coulomb self-energy of the baryon solution as that from the original CS term $S_{\text{CS}}[\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}]$ ($S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}[\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}]$ is reduced to the difference of $S_{\text{CS}}[\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}]$ at $s = 0$ and $s = 1$, and the latter vanishes due to the second condition of (4.7)). The third condition of (4.7), stating that $\mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x, s)$ be spanned by $\mathbf{1}_3$ and t_8 , will become necessary when we discuss the two patches in appendix C. Other s -dependent quantities appearing in (4.6) should of course coincide with the original ones on M_5 at $s = 0$:

$$W(t, s = 0) = W(t) , \quad X^\alpha(t, s = 0) = X^\alpha(t) , \quad \Phi(t, x, s = 0) = \Phi(t, x) . \quad (4.8)$$

We have to introduce the Ψds term in (4.6) in order to make the s -component of the gauge field in the patch containing the infinity $\xi = \infty$ be regular and vanish there (see the end of appendix C.2).

Let us calculate our new CS term (4.4) for the baryon configuration with collective coordinates given by (4.6). We will find that the result is just what is necessary for reproducing the constraint (1.1). For this purpose, we first consider $\mathcal{F}$ for $\mathcal{A} + \delta\mathcal{A}$ with $\delta\mathcal{A} = \Phi dt + \Psi ds$, and expand it in powers of $\delta\mathcal{A}$:

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A} + \delta\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) + D\delta\mathcal{A} + i(\delta\mathcal{A})^2 , \quad (4.9)$$

with $D\delta\mathcal{A} = d\delta\mathcal{A} + i(\mathcal{A}\delta\mathcal{A} + \delta\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A})$. This leads to

$$\text{tr } \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A} + \delta\mathcal{A})^3 = \text{tr } \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A})^3 + 3 d \text{tr} \left(\delta\mathcal{A} \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A})^2 + \delta\mathcal{A} (D\delta\mathcal{A}) \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{A}) \right) , \quad (4.10)$$

where we have used that $(\delta\mathcal{A})^3 = (D\delta\mathcal{A})(\delta\mathcal{A})^2 = D\mathcal{F} = 0$ and $D^2\delta\mathcal{A} = i[\mathcal{F}, \delta\mathcal{A}]$. Using the gauge invariance of $S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}$ and the formula (4.10), $S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}$ for (4.6) is evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}[\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}} + \Phi dt + \Psi ds)^W] - S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}[\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}] &= \frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \int_{M_6} 3 d \text{tr} \left(\delta\mathcal{A} (\mathcal{F}^{\text{cl}})^2 + \delta\mathcal{A} (D^{\text{cl}}\delta\mathcal{A}) \mathcal{F}^{\text{cl}} \right) \\ &= \frac{N_c}{8\pi^2} \int_{M_5} \text{tr} (\Phi dt (F^{\text{cl}})^2) = \frac{N_c}{2\sqrt{3}} \int dt \chi^8(t), \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

where we have used that, on M_5 with $s = 0$, $\delta\mathcal{A} = \Phi dt$, $\delta\mathcal{A} (D^{\text{cl}}\delta\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and $\widehat{F}_{MN}^{\text{cl}} = 0$. The last equality is nothing but (3.28). Eq. (4.11) implies that L_{CS} (3.15) for our new CS term (4.4) is

$$L_{\text{CS}} = \frac{N_c}{2\sqrt{3}} \chi^8(t) = \frac{N_c}{\sqrt{3}} \text{tr} (-iW(t)^{-1} \dot{W}(t) t_8) . \quad (4.12)$$

This L_{CS} is the same as that appears in the collective coordinate quantization of the $SU(3)$ Skyrme model [16, 17, 18, 19, 20], and leads to the desired condition (1.1) (see the next section).

We should add a comment on the derivation of (4.11). We mentioned above that M_5 is not the only boundary of M_6 for gauge non-invariant quantities. Fortunately, $\text{tr}(\delta\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{F}^{\text{cl}})^2 + \delta\mathcal{A}(D^{\text{cl}}\delta\mathcal{A})\mathcal{F}^{\text{cl}})$ is gauge invariant since every constituent, $\delta\mathcal{A}$, $D^{\text{cl}}\delta\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{\text{cl}}$, transforms covariantly under the gauge transformation. Therefore, we do not need to consider two patches for describing the instanton. On the other hand, if we repeat the calculation of (4.11) by first using the formula (4.5), we indeed need two patches since ω_5 is not gauge invariant, and obtain the same result as (4.11). Details of the calculation are given in appendix C.

5 Quantization of the collective coordinates

In secs. 3.1 and 3.2, we introduced the collective coordinates into the baryon solution and obtained their lagrangian (3.16) except the last term L_{CS} (3.15) from the CS term. In this section, by adopting the new CS term (4.4) and hence L_{CS} given by (4.12), we will complete the collective coordinate quantization to obtain the baryon spectra in the three-flavor model of holographic QCD.

5.1 Hamiltonian

Let us start with the lagrangian of the collective coordinates (3.16) with L_{CS} given by (4.12). This lagrangian differs from the standard collective coordinate lagrangian of $SU(3)$ Skyrme model in that there are L_Z and L_ρ terms and in that the moments of inertia, $\mathcal{I}_1(\rho)$ and $\mathcal{I}_2(\rho)$, depends on the dynamical variable ρ . However, the quantization is straightforward and we obtain the following hamiltonian of the system (we drop the center-of-mass coordinate $\mathbf{X}(t)$):

$$H = M_0 + H_Z + H_\rho + H_{\rho W} , \quad (5.1)$$

with

$$H_Z = -\frac{1}{2m_Z}\partial_Z^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_Z\omega_Z^2 Z^2 , \quad (5.2)$$

$$H_\rho = -\frac{1}{2m_\rho}\frac{1}{\rho^\eta}\partial_\rho(\rho^\eta\partial_\rho) + \frac{1}{2}m_\rho\omega_\rho^2\rho^2 + \frac{K}{m_\rho\rho^2} , \quad (5.3)$$

$$H_{\rho W} = \frac{1}{2\mathcal{I}_1(\rho)}\sum_{a=1}^3(J_a)^2 + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{I}_2(\rho)}\sum_{a=4}^7(J_a)^2 . \quad (5.4)$$

This system must be supplemented with the constraint (1.1) coming from the fact that χ^8 appears only in L_{CS} (4.12) in the lagrangian (3.16). Here, we have taken the representation of diagonalizing Z and ρ . In (5.4), J_a is the charge of the right $SU(3)_J$ transformation on W :

$$[J_a, W] = W t_a, \quad [J_a, J_b] = i f_{abc} J_c . \quad (5.5)$$

The present system has an invariance only under the $SU(2)$ subgroup of $SU(3)_J$, which is the group of rotation in the $\mathbf{x}$ -space spanned by (J_1, J_2, J_3) . Besides this, our system has the full invariance under the $SU(3)_I$ flavor transformation. The charge I_a of $SU(3)_I$ satisfies

$$[I_a, W] = -t_a W, \quad [I_a, I_b] = if_{abc} I_c, \quad [I_a, J_b] = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

Since the relation $I = WJW^{-1}$ holds for $I = I_a t_a$ and $J = J_a t_a$, we have $\text{tr } I^2 = \text{tr } J^2$ and $\text{tr } I^3 = \text{tr } J^3$. Therefore, the representation of $SU(3)_I$ and $SU(3)_J$ must be the same.

The first term of (5.3) is chosen so that it is hermitian with respect to the inner-product $(f, g) = \int_0^\infty d\rho \rho^\eta f^*(\rho)g(\rho)$. In the $N_f = 2$ case of [8], we had $\eta = 3$ since we identified ρ and W as the radial coordinate and the orientation, respectively, of the part of the instanton moduli space $\mathbb{R}^4/\mathbb{Z}_2$ with line element $(\delta s)^2 = \rho^2 \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(-iW^{-1}\delta W)^2 + (\delta\rho)^2$. In the present $N_f = 3$ case, it is natural to put $\eta = 8$. However, we leave η generic until we compare our result on the baryon spectra with experimental data.

5.2 Baryon mass formula

Let us solve the Schrödinger equation of our collective coordinate system to obtain the spectra. First, we consider the hamiltonian $H_\rho + H_{\rho W}$ by taking the (p, q) representation for the two $SU(3)$, $SU(3)_J$ and $SU(3)_I$. For a state in this representation and with spin j , we have

$$\sum_{a=1}^8 (J_a)^2 = \frac{1}{3} (p^2 + q^2 + pq + 3(p+q)), \quad (5.7)$$

$$\sum_{a=1}^3 (J_a)^2 = j(j+1), \quad (5.8)$$

and the ρ part of the hamiltonian $H_\rho + H_{\rho W}$ becomes

$$H_\rho^{\text{tot}} = -\frac{1}{2m_\rho} \frac{1}{\rho^\eta} \partial_\rho (\rho^\eta \partial_\rho) + \frac{1}{2} m_\rho \omega_\rho^2 \rho^2 + \frac{K'}{m_\rho \rho^2}, \quad (5.9)$$

where K' is the sum of K and the contribution from $H_{\rho W}$:

$$K' = \frac{N_c^2}{15} + \frac{4}{3} (p^2 + q^2 + pq + 3(p+q)) - 2j(j+1). \quad (5.10)$$

The first term $N_c^2/15$ is the sum of $K = (2/5)N_c^2$ and $-N_c^2/3$ coming from $-(J_8)^2/(2\mathcal{I}_2(\rho))$ with J_8 given by (1.1).

Now we consider solving the Schrödinger equation

$$H_\rho^{\text{tot}} \psi(\rho) = E_{\rho W} \psi(\rho). \quad (5.11)$$

This equation is reduced via

$$\psi(\rho) = e^{-z/2} z^\beta v(z), \quad (5.12)$$

with

$$z = m_\rho \omega_\rho \rho^2, \quad \beta = \frac{1}{4} \left(\sqrt{(\eta - 1)^2 + 8K'} - (\eta - 1) \right), \quad (5.13)$$

to a confluent hypergeometric differential equation for $v(z)$:

$$\left\{ z \frac{d^2}{dz^2} + \left(2\beta + \frac{\eta + 1}{2} - z \right) \frac{d}{dz} + \left(\frac{E_{\rho W}}{2\omega_\rho} - \beta - \frac{\eta + 1}{4} \right) \right\} v(z) = 0. \quad (5.14)$$

A normalizable regular solution to (5.14) exists only when $E_{\rho W}/(2\omega_\rho) - \beta - (\eta + 1)/4 = n_\rho = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Namely, the energy eigenvalues are given by

$$E_{\rho W} = \omega_\rho \left(2n_\rho + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\eta - 1)^2 + 8K'} + 1 \right). \quad (5.15)$$

The eigenvalues of the Z part hamiltonian H_Z (5.2) are simply those of a harmonic oscillator:

$$E_Z = \omega_Z \left(n_Z + \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (n_Z = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots), \quad (5.16)$$

Adding (5.15) and (5.16), the baryon mass formula in the present model is finally given by

$$M = M_0 + \sqrt{\frac{(\eta - 1)^2}{24} + \frac{K'}{3}} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} (n_\rho + n_Z + 1). \quad (5.17)$$

In the above arguments, N_c was arbitrary and we had not imposed the constraint (1.1) on the states specified by (p, q) and j . Putting $N_c = 3$, the constraint (1.1),

$$J_8 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, \quad (5.18)$$

implies that (p, q) must satisfy

$$p + 2q = 3 \times (\text{integer}). \quad (5.19)$$

The allowed states with smaller (p, q) satisfying the constraints (5.19) and (5.18) as well as their K' values are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (p, q) = (1, 1), \quad j = \frac{1}{2}, \quad K' &= \frac{111}{10}, \quad (\text{octet}) \\ (p, q) = (3, 0), \quad j = \frac{3}{2}, \quad K' &= \frac{171}{10}, \quad (\text{decuplet}) \\ (p, q) = (0, 3), \quad j = \frac{1}{2}, \quad K' &= \frac{231}{10}, \quad (\text{anti-decuplet}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

5.3 Comparison with experimental data

The present three-flavor holographic QCD model is not a realistic one since all the quarks are massless. It does not make much sense to compare seriously the obtained baryon spectrum (5.17) with experimental data unless we add at least to the strange quark a mass to break the $SU(3)_I$ symmetry (see refs. [12, 13, 14, 15] for attempts to introduce quark masses in the SS-model). Below we will make comparison of our baryon mass formula (5.17) with the observed spectra of baryons. However, we keep our analysis very short for this reason.

From (5.17) with $\eta = 8$, the mass difference between the octet and the decuplet baryons with the same (n_ρ, n_Z) , and that between the octet and the anti-decuplet are given in units of M_{KK} as follows:

$$M_{10} - M_8 = 0.386208 , \quad (5.21)$$

$$M_{10^*} - M_8 = 0.724987 . \quad (5.22)$$

The value of $M_{10} - M_8$ is much smaller (nearly 64%) than the corresponding value ($M_{l=3} - M_{l=1} = 0.600$) in the $N_f = 2$ case [8]. Therefore, the favored value of M_{KK} for realizing the experimental data $M_{10}^{\text{exp}} - M_8^{\text{exp}} = (1232 - 940)\text{MeV} = 292\text{MeV}$ of low-lying non-strange baryons is

$$M_{KK} = 756\text{MeV} . \quad (5.23)$$

This is smaller than $M_{KK} = 949\text{MeV}$ determined from the ρ meson mass [1, 2], but is large than $M_{KK} \simeq 500\text{MeV}$ in the $N_f = 2$ case [8]. The dependence of the mass formula (5.17) on (n_ρ, n_Z) is the same as in the $N_f = 2$ case (see eq. (5.31) of ref. [8]). Therefore, (5.17) with M_{KK} given by (5.23) predicts heavier masses for the excited baryon states than in [8], though the comparison with experimental data is not so bad. Finally, adopting the value (5.23) for M_{KK} , eq. (5.22) for the anti-decuplet predicts

$$M_{10^*} - M_8 = 548\text{MeV} . \quad (5.24)$$

This is close to the experimental value $M_{10^*}^{\text{exp}} - M_8^{\text{exp}} = (1530 - 940)\text{MeV} = 590\text{MeV}$ obtained using the reported Θ^+ mass of 1530 MeV [21]. Of course, we cannot take this result seriously due to the lack of strange quark mass in our model.

6 Summary and discussions

In this paper, we studied baryons in the SS-model with three flavors. The baryon solution is given by an $SU(3)$ embedding of the BPST instanton solution with small size of order $\lambda^{-1/2}$, and we carried out the collective coordinate quantization of the baryon solution. Although our analysis is quite parallel with the previous one for the two flavor case [8], the three flavor case is the first nontrivial place where the non-abelian part of the CS term should play a critical role of giving the constraint which selects baryons with correct spins. We found that the original CS term (2.4) given in terms of the CS 5-form does not work, and proposed another CS term (4.4) by introducing the fictitious sixth coordinate s . These two CS terms are naively

equivalent, but they are different ones in the baryon sector which cannot be described only by one patch. In fact, we found that our new CS term leads to the desired constraint. Using our new CS term, we completed the collective coordinate quantization and obtained the baryon mass formula (5.17). The N - Δ mass difference favors the value of M_{KK} which is larger than that in the $SU(2)$ case [8] but is smaller than that determined by the ρ meson mass [1, 2]. Of course, serious comparison of our mass formula with experimental data is meaningless since all the quarks are massless in the present model.

We finish this paper by discussing remaining problems in the three flavor SS-model, especially concerning the CS term. First is the origin of the sixth coordinate s for expressing our CS term (4.4). In this paper, the coordinate s was introduced simply by hand just like the fifth coordinate in the WZW term. However, recall that the original CS term (2.4) has been obtained from the following coupling:

$$S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{D8}} = \frac{1}{48\pi^3} \int_{D8} C_3 \text{tr } \mathcal{F}^3, \quad (6.1)$$

where the integration is over the D8-brane, and C_3 is RR 3-form of the D4-brane background. Eq. (6.1) vanishes identically if we consider only A_0 and A_M ($M = 1, 2, 3, z$) on $D8$ depending only on (t, x^M) . Therefore, in ref. [1], they adopted (2.4) which is obtained from (6.1) by carrying out the integration-by-parts using the formula (4.5), discarding the surface term, and then using $1/(2\pi) \int_{S^4} dC_3 = N_c$. It would be interesting if we could directly relate our CS term (4.4) with (6.1) and find a “physical origin” of the sixth coordinate s . We cannot, however, adopt (6.1) itself instead of our (4.4) for a number of reasons. For example, if we allow a gauge field component other than A_0 and A_M for (6.1), it must be contained also in the YM action S_{YM} .

The second problem is on the reproducibility of chiral anomaly in QCD in the presence of the background gauge field defined by $A_{L/R}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty/-\infty} A(t, \mathbf{x}, z)$. The chiral anomaly is correctly reproduced from the original CS term (2.4) using the gauge transformation property (B.1) of $\omega_5(\mathcal{A})$ [1]. On the other hand, if we adopt our new CS term $S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}$ (4.4), anomaly seems not to arise at all since (4.4) is strictly gauge invariant. A quick remedy to this problem is to add to $S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}$ the following boundary term

$$\Delta S_{\text{CS}} = -\frac{N_c}{24\pi^2} \left(\int_{Z_+} - \int_{Z_-} \right) \omega_5(\mathcal{A}), \quad (6.2)$$

where the integration region $Z_{\pm}$ is the $z = \pm\infty$ boundary of M_6 . Note that ΔS_{CS} vanishes in the absence of the background gauge fields $A_{L/R}$ since we have $Z_+ = Z_-$ in this case. The modified CS term $S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}} + \Delta S_{\text{CS}}$ reproduces the chiral anomaly at least in the sector without baryons. It would be desirable to find a more concise definition of the CS term which can reproduce both the constraint (1.1) and the chiral anomaly.

Finally, for serious comparison of our result, in particular, the baryon mass formula (5.17), with experiments, we have to redo the analysis by introducing the strange quark mass. This is the most important subject for the three flavor SS-model.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank T. Eguchi, A. Miwa, T. Sakai, S. Seki, S. Sugimoto, S. Terashima and S. Yamato for valuable discussions. We also thank the Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics at Kyoto University. Discussions during the YITP workshop YITP-W-07-05 on “String Theory and Quantum Field Theory” were useful to complete this work. The work of H. H. was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) No. 18540266 from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS).

A Determination of $\Phi(t, x)$

In this appendix, we solve (3.6) to obtain Φ (3.7) in the $SU(3)$ case. We essentially follow appendix A of [8]. Let us decompose Φ into three parts, each of which depends on the time derivative of one of the three kinds of collective coordinates:

$$\Phi = \Phi_X + \Phi_\rho + \Phi_{SU(3)} . \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Then, (3.6) is reduced to the following three equations:

$$D_M^{\text{cl}} \left(\dot{X}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial X^N} A_M^{\text{cl}} - D_M^{\text{cl}} \Phi_X \right) = 0 , \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$D_M^{\text{cl}} \left(\dot{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} A_M^{\text{cl}} - D_M^{\text{cl}} \Phi_\rho \right) = 0 , \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$D_M^{\text{cl}} D_M^{\text{cl}} \Phi_{SU(3)} = 0 . \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Solutions to eqs. (A.2) and (A.3) are the same as in the $SU(2)$ case of [8]:

$$\Phi_X = -\dot{X}^M A_M^{\text{cl}} , \quad \Phi_\rho = 0 . \quad (\text{A.5})$$

To solve (A.4), it is convenient work in the singular gauge, namely, the gauge where the BPST solution is singular at the origin but is regular at the infinity. Let us specify the quantities in the singular gauge by attaching the overline on the corresponding one in the regular gauge. The BPST solution in the singular gauge is related to (2.18) in the regular gauge via the gauge transformation by $g(x)^{-1}$,

$$\overline{A}_M^{\text{cl}}(x) = g(x)^{-1} (A^{\text{cl}}(x) - i\partial_M) g(x) = -i(1 - f(\xi)) g(x)^{-1} \partial_M g(x) . \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Since $\Phi_{SU(3)}$ transforms covariantly under the gauge transformation, we have

$$\overline{\Phi}_{SU(3)}(t, x) = g(x; X(t))^{-1} \Phi_{SU(3)}(t, x) g(x; X(t)) , \quad (\text{A.7})$$

and eq. (A.4) in the singular gauge is

$$\overline{D}_M^{\text{cl}} \overline{D}_M^{\text{cl}} \overline{\Phi}_{SU(3)} = 0 . \quad (\text{A.8})$$

This equation is reduced, by assuming the form

$$\overline{\Phi}_{SU(3)} = u^a(\xi)t_a , \quad (\text{A.9})$$

and using the properties $\partial_M \overline{A}_M^{\text{cl}} = 0$ and $(x - X)^M \overline{A}_M^{\text{cl}} = 0$, to the following differential equation for each $u^a(\xi)$:

$$\frac{1}{\xi^3} \frac{d}{d\xi} \left(\xi^3 \frac{d}{d\xi} u^a(\xi) \right) = C_a \frac{(1 - f(\xi))^2}{\xi^2} u^a(\xi) , \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where C_a is defined in terms of the structure constant f_{abc} of $SU(3)$ by $4 \sum_{c=1}^3 \sum_{d=1}^8 f_{acd} f_{bcd} = \delta_{ab} C_a$, and it is given concretely by

$$C_a = \begin{cases} 8 & (a = 1, 2, 3) \\ 3 & (a = 4, 5, 6, 7) \\ 0 & (a = 8) \end{cases} . \quad (\text{A.11})$$

The solution to (A.10) regular at $\xi = 0$ is

$$u^a(\xi) = \begin{cases} f(\xi) & (a = 1, 2, 3) \\ f(\xi)^{1/2} & (a = 4, 5, 6, 7) \\ 1 & (a = 8) \end{cases} , \quad (\text{A.12})$$

up to a multiplicative constant for each u^a . Back to the regular gauge, we find that the general solution to (A.4) is

$$\Phi_{SU(3)}(t, x) = \chi^a(t) \Phi_a(x; X^\alpha(t)) , \quad (\text{A.13})$$

with Φ_a given by

$$\Phi_a(x; X^\alpha(t)) = u^a(\xi) g(x; X(t)) t_a g(x; X(t))^{-1} , \quad (\text{A.14})$$

and $\chi^a(t)$ being arbitrary functions of t only. Note that $X^\alpha = (X^M, \rho)$ in $u^a(\xi)$ is also made time-dependent.

If we had solved (A.4) in the regular gauge by assuming (A.9) for $\Phi_{SU(3)}$, we would have obtained (A.10) with $1 - f$ replaced by f . However, its solutions are divergent either at $\xi = 0$ or at $\xi = \infty$.

B Formulas of ω_5

Here, we summarize the formulas related with $\omega_5(\mathcal{A})$ (2.5) (the gauge group can be arbitrary). First, under the gauge transformation $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^V = V(\mathcal{A} - id)V^{-1}$, we have

$$\omega_5(\mathcal{A}^V) = \omega_5(\mathcal{A}) + \frac{1}{10} \text{tr} L^5 + d\alpha_4(L, \mathcal{A}) , \quad (\text{B.1})$$

with $\alpha(L, \mathcal{A})$ defined by

$$\alpha_4(L, \mathcal{A}) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[L (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{F} + \mathcal{F}\mathcal{A} - i\mathcal{A}^3) + \frac{i}{2} L\mathcal{A}L\mathcal{A} - iL^3\mathcal{A} \right], \quad (L = -iV^{-1}dV) . \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Second, the change of $\omega_5(\mathcal{A})$ under an arbitrary infinitesimal deformation $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} + \delta\mathcal{A}$ is

$$\omega_5(\mathcal{A} + \delta\mathcal{A}) = \omega_5(\mathcal{A}) + 3 \text{tr}(\delta\mathcal{A}\mathcal{F}^2) + d\beta(\delta\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) + O((\delta\mathcal{A})^2) , \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where $\beta(\delta\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ is

$$\beta(\delta\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) = \text{tr} \left[\delta\mathcal{A} \left(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}\mathcal{F} - \frac{i}{2}\mathcal{A}^3 \right) \right] . \quad (\text{B.4})$$

C Another derivation of (4.11)

In this appendix, we present another way of deriving the result of (4.11): We reduce (4.4) to surface integrations by using (4.5), but taking into account that M_5 is not the unique boundary of M_6 for $\omega_5(\mathcal{A})$. For this purpose, we first define the gauge fields on the two patches in M_5 (appendix C.1) and in M_6 (appendix C.2). Rederivation of (4.11) is done in appendix C.3.

C.1 Baryon configurations on the two patches in M_5

First of all, we need two patches for describing the baryon solution (BPST solution) in the whole of $M_4 (\simeq S^4)$ including both the origin $\xi = 0$ and the infinity $\xi = \infty$ [22]. Let $M_4^{(0)}$ and $M_4^{(\infty)}$ be the patches containing the origin and the infinity, respectively, separated by the boundary B ; $M_4 = M_4^{(0)} + M_4^{(\infty)}$ and $\partial M_4^{(0)} = -\partial M_4^{(\infty)} = B$ (see fig. 3). In the patch $M_4^{(0)}$,




Figure 3: The space $M_4 (\simeq S^4)$ for $x^M = (\mathbf{x}, z)$ in the baryon sector consists of two patches, $M_4^{(0)}$ and $M_4^{(\infty)}$, which are separated by the boundary B .

we adopt the BPST solution A_M^{cl} (2.18), while in the other patch $M_4^{(\infty)}$ we use $\overline{A}_M^{\text{cl}}$ (A.6) in

the singular gauge. These two are related via the $SU(2)$ gauge transformation by $g(x)^{-1}$. The time-components of the solution, $\widehat{A}_0^{\text{cl}}$ (2.23) and A_0^{cl} (2.25), are common between the two patches since they are $SU(2)$ invariant, and they are indeed regular both at the origin and the infinity. Summarizing, the $U(3)$ classical solutions, $\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}(x)$ in $M_4^{(0)}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}}(x)$ in $M_4^{(\infty)}$, are related as a whole via the gauge transformation by $g(x)^{-1}$:

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}}(x) = (\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}})^{g(x)^{-1}}(x) = g(x)(\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}(x) - id)g(x)^{-1} . \quad (\text{C.1})$$

The baryon configuration $\mathcal{A}(t, x)$ with collective coordinates on $M_5^{(0)} = \mathbb{R} \times M_4^{(0)}$ is given by (3.13). As seen from the arguments in appendix A, the corresponding one, $\overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x)$, on $M_5^{(\infty)} = \mathbb{R} \times M_4^{(\infty)}$ is given by^{‡‡}

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x) = \mathcal{A}^{W(t)g(x; X(t))^{-1}W(t)^{-1}}(t, x) = (\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t)) + \overline{\Phi}(t, x)dt)^{W(t)} , \quad (\text{C.2})$$

with

$$\overline{\Phi}(t, x) = g(x; X(t))(\Phi(t, x) - i\partial_0)g(x; X(t))^{-1} = -\dot{X}^N(t)\overline{A}_N^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t)) + \sum_{a=1}^8 \chi^a(t)u^a(\xi)t_a . \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Note that all the components of $\overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x)$ vanish sufficiently fast at the infinity $\xi = \infty$. In particular, we have $\overline{A}_0(t, x) = \mathcal{O}(1/\xi^2)$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ due to that $u^a(\xi) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(1/\xi^2)$ for all a . Therefore, our $\overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x)$ is indeed well-defined on $M_4^{(\infty)}$ containing the infinity.

C.2 Baryon configurations on M_6

Then, we have to extend the baryon configurations on $M_5 = M_5^{(0)} + M_5^{(\infty)}$ to $M_6 = D_2 \times M_4 = M_6^{(0)} + M_6^{(\infty)}$ with $M_6^{(0/\infty)} = D_2 \times M_4^{(0/\infty)}$ for our new CS term (4.4). Recall that D_2 is the disc with angle coordinate t and radial one s , and $s = 0$ and $s = 1$ correspond to the circumference and the center of the disc, respectively (fig. 2).

The baryon configuration $\mathcal{A}(t, x, s)$ (4.1) on $M_6^{(0)} = D_2 \times M_4^{(0)}$ must satisfy the condition (4.2) at $s = 0$. In addition, it must respect the fact that $s = 1$ is a point on D_2 and satisfy the conditions including (4.3). Concretely, $\mathcal{A}(t, x, s)$ is given by (4.6) in terms of s -dependent collective coordinates $(W(t, s), X^\alpha(t, s))$ as well as $\Phi(t, x, s)$ and $\Psi(t, x, s)$ which satisfy the conditions (4.8) at $s = 0$ and the following ones at $s = 1$ necessary for $s = 1$ to be a point on D_2 :

$$\mathcal{O}(t, x, s = 1) = t\text{-indep.}, \quad \partial_s \mathcal{O}(t, x, s)|_{s=1} = 0, \quad (\mathcal{O} = W, X^\alpha, \Phi, \Psi), \quad (\text{C.4})$$

As we explained below (4.6), the classical configuration $\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}$ in (4.1) is given by $\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}(x, s) = \mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x, s)dt + \mathcal{A}_M^{\text{cl}}(x)dx^M$ with s -dependent $\mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x, s)$ satisfying the condition (4.7).

^{‡‡} Note that the gauge transformation $\mathcal{A}^V = V(\mathcal{A} - id)V^{-1}$ on $\mathcal{A}$ has the property $\mathcal{A}^{V_1 V_2} = (\mathcal{A}^{V_2})^{V_1}$.

The baryon configuration $\overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x, s)$ on the other patch $M_6^{(\infty)} = D_2 \times M_4^{(\infty)}$, which is as an extension of (C.2), is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x, s) &= \mathcal{A}^{W(t,s)g(x;X(t,s))^{-1}W(t,s)^{-1}}(t, x, s) \\ &= (\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}}(x, s; X^\alpha(t, s)) + \overline{\Phi}(t, x, s)dt + \overline{\Psi}(t, x, s)ds)^{W(t,s)} .\end{aligned}\quad (\text{C.5})$$

This extension should satisfy

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x, s=0) = \overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x), \quad \overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x, s=1) = t\text{-indep.}, \quad \overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x, s) \xrightarrow[\xi \rightarrow \infty]{} 0 . \quad (\text{C.6})$$

The precise meaning of the third condition is that $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ tends to zero faster than $\mathcal{O}(1/\xi)$. The classical configuration $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}}$ in (C.5) is given by $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}}(x, s) = \mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x, s)dt + \overline{\mathcal{A}}_M^{\text{cl}}(x)dx^M$ in terms of the same $\mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}}(x, s)$ as in $\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}(x, s)$ on $M_6^{(0)}$. Owing to the third condition of (4.7), eq. (C.1) continues to hold on M_6 :

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}}(x, s) = (\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}})^{g(x)^{-1}}(x, s) = g(x)(\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}(x, s) - id)g(x)^{-1} . \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Note that the following relations hold:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\Phi}(t, x, s) &= g(x; X(t, s))^{-1}(\Phi(t, x, s) - i\partial_0)g(x; X(t, s)) , \\ \overline{\Psi}(t, x, s) &= g(x; X(t, s))^{-1}(\Psi(t, x, s) - i\partial_s)g(x; X(t, s)) .\end{aligned}\quad (\text{C.8})$$

Our $S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}$ is independent of the details of extending the various quantities into M_6 . In particular, $\Phi(t, x, s)$ and $\Psi(t, x, s)$ for $s \neq 0$ are subject to no restrictions of the Gauss law constraint, and hence they are not uniquely determined. An example of $\Phi(t, x, s)$ and $\Psi(t, x, s)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(t, x, s) &= -\dot{X}^N(t, s)A_N^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t, s)) \\ &\quad - 2i \sum_{a=1}^8 u^a(\xi) \text{tr} [t_a W(t, s)^{-1} \partial_0 W(t, s)] g(x; X(t, s)) t_a g(x; X(t, s))^{-1} ,\end{aligned}\quad (\text{C.9})$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(t, x, s) &= -\partial_s X^N(t, s)A_N^{\text{cl}}(x; X^\alpha(t, s)) \\ &\quad - 2i \sum_{a=1}^8 u^a(\xi) \text{tr} [t_a W(t, s)^{-1} \partial_s W(t, s)] g(x; X(t, s)) t_a g(x; X(t, s))^{-1} .\end{aligned}\quad (\text{C.10})$$

The corresponding $\overline{\Phi}(t, x, s)$ and $\overline{\Psi}(t, x, s)$ are obtained from (C.9) and (C.10), respectively, by replacing A_N^{cl} with $\overline{A}_N^{\text{cl}}$ and removing $g(x; X(t, s))$. Note that we have $\overline{A}_s(t, x, s) = \mathcal{O}(1/\xi^2)$ ($\xi \rightarrow \infty$) for the present $\overline{\Psi}$.

C.3 Rederivation of (4.11)

Having finished the preparation, let us turn to the evaluation of $S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}$ (4.4) by reducing it to surface integrations. Taking $\mathcal{A}(t, x, s)$ (4.6) and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x, s)$ (C.5) as the gauge field on $M_6^{(0)}$ and

$M_6^{(\infty)}$, respectively, and using that $\partial M_6^{(0)} = M_5^{(0)} + D_2 \times B$ and $\partial M_6^{(\infty)} = M_5^{(\infty)} - D_2 \times B$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M_6} \text{tr} (\mathcal{F}^3 - (\mathcal{F}^{\text{cl}})^3) &= \int_{M_5^{(0)}} (\omega_5(\mathcal{A}) - \omega_5(\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}})) + \int_{M_5^{(\infty)}} (\omega_5(\overline{\mathcal{A}}) - \omega_5(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}})) \\ &\quad + \int_{D_2 \times B} \left[(\omega_5(\mathcal{A}) - \omega_5(\overline{\mathcal{A}})) - (\omega_5(\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}) - \omega_5(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}})) \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Then, recall (3.32), stating that the original CS term (2.4) does not depend on the collective coordinates at all. In quite the same manner, calculation in the singular gauge leads to

$$\int_{M_5=M_5^{(0)}+M_5^{(\infty)}} (\omega_5(\overline{\mathcal{A}}) - \omega_5(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}})) = 0 . \quad (\text{C.12})$$

Using this and the formula (B.1) with $V = Wg^{-1}W^{-1}$ relating $\omega_5(\overline{\mathcal{A}}) = \omega_5(\mathcal{A}^{Wg^{-1}W^{-1}})$ and $\omega_5(\mathcal{A})$, eq. (C.11) is rewritten into

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M_6} \text{tr} (\mathcal{F}^3 - (\mathcal{F}^{\text{cl}})^3) &= \int_{\partial M_6^{(0)}=M_5^{(0)}+D_2 \times B} \left[(\omega_5(\mathcal{A}) - \omega_5(\overline{\mathcal{A}})) - (\omega_5(\mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}}) - \omega_5(\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{cl}})) \right] \\ &= - \int_{\partial M_6^{(0)}=M_5^{(0)}+D_2 \times B} \left\{ \frac{1}{10} \text{tr} [L^5 - (-igdg^{-1})^5] + d[\alpha_4(L, \mathcal{A}) - \alpha_4(-igdg^{-1}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}})] \right\} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.13})$$

where L is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L &= -iWgW^{-1}d(Wg^{-1}W^{-1}) \\ &= -iW[g(W^{-1}dW)g^{-1} - W^{-1}dW + gdg^{-1}]W^{-1} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.14})$$

Precisely speaking, $g = g(x; X^M)$ explicitly written in (C.13) and that appearing in L (C.14) are different ones: the former is from the classical solution and has a constant and arbitrary instanton position X^M , while the latter has (t, s) -dependent position $X^M(t, s)$. However, we do not need to distinguish the two since the instanton position can be absorbed by the shift of x^M (note that the origin $\xi = 0$, the infinity $\xi = \infty$ and the boundary B are defined in terms of the relative coordinate $(x - X)^M$.)

First, let us confirm that we can safely discard the exact term $d[\alpha_4(L, \mathcal{A}) - \alpha_4(-igdg^{-1}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}})]$ in (C.13). A possible dangerous term at the origin $\xi = 0$ on $M_5^{(0)}$ is $\text{tr} L^3 \mathcal{A}$ with $L \Rightarrow W(-ig\partial_M g^{-1}dx^M)W^{-1} \sim 1/\xi$ and $\mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_0 dt \sim \xi^0$. Taking this into account and putting the boundary $\partial M_4^{(0)}$ of infinitesimal radius $\xi = \epsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{M_5^{(0)}+D_2 \times B} d[\alpha_4(L, \mathcal{A}) - \alpha_4(-igdg^{-1}, \mathcal{A}^{\text{cl}})] \\ &= \int dt \int_{\partial M_4^{(0)}} \text{tr} \left\{ (W(-ig\partial_M g^{-1}dx^M)W^{-1})^3 \mathcal{A}_0 - (-ig\partial_M g^{-1}dx^M)^3 \mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}} \right\} \\ &= \int dt \int d\Omega_3 \text{tr} \left[t_8 (\Phi + iW^{-1}\dot{W}) \right] = 0 , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.15})$$

where we have used $W^{-1}\mathcal{A}_0W = \mathcal{A}_0^{\text{cl}} + \Phi + iW^{-1}\dot{W}$ obtained from (3.13), and $(-ig\partial_M g^{-1}dx^M)^3 \sim (1/\xi)^3 \mathcal{P}_2 \xi^3 d\Omega_3$ with $\mathcal{P}_2$ given by (3.27). The last equality leading to zero is due to (3.7) and that $g(x)$ commutes with t_8 .

Thus, we are left with the first term of (C.13). The integrand can in fact be rewritten into an exact form:

$$-\frac{1}{10} \text{tr} \left[L^5 - (-igdg^{-1})^5 \right] = d \text{tr} (\mathcal{O}_A + \mathcal{O}_B) , \quad (\text{C.16})$$

with $\mathcal{O}_A$ and $\mathcal{O}_B$ given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_A &= -\frac{i}{2}(-iW^{-1}dW) \left[(-igdg^{-1})^3 - (-ig^{-1}dg)^3 \right] , \\ \mathcal{O}_B &= -\frac{i}{2}(-iW^{-1}dW) \left[g(-iW^{-1}dW)g^{-1}(-igdg^{-1})^2 - g^{-1}(-iW^{-1}dW)g(-ig^{-1}dg)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2}(-igdg^{-1})(-iW^{-1}dW)(-igdg^{-1}) + \frac{1}{2}(-ig^{-1}dg)(-iW^{-1}dW)(-ig^{-1}dg) \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.17})$$

$$(\text{C.18})$$

The $\mathcal{O}_B$ term containing only two $-igdg^{-1}$ can be safely dropped. However, the $\mathcal{O}_A$ term with $(-igdg^{-1})^3 \sim 1/\xi^3$ near the origin $\xi = 0$ needs careful treatment like (C.15). Another way to evaluate $\int_{M_5^{(0)} + D_2 \times B} d\mathcal{O}_A$ is to note that $d\mathcal{O}_A = 0$ holds on $M_5^{(0)}$ since we have

$$(-ig\partial_M g^{-1}dx^M)^4 = (-ig^{-1}\partial_M g dx^M)^4 = 0 \quad \text{on } M_4 , \quad (\text{C.19})$$

for a spherically symmetric $g(x)$ of (2.20) (c.f., (3.42)), and $(-iW^{-1}dW)^2 = 0$ on M_5 which is a surface with $s = 0$. Using this fact, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M_5^{(0)} + D_2 \times B} d \text{tr} \mathcal{O}_A &= \int_{\{s=0\} \times B} \text{tr} \mathcal{O}_A = \text{tr} \left\{ \int dt (-iW(t)^{-1}\dot{W}(t)) (-i) \int_{B=S^3} (-igdg^{-1})^3 \right\} \\ &= \frac{24\pi^2}{\sqrt{3}} \int dt \text{tr} \left[t_8 (-iW(t)^{-1}\dot{W}(t)) \right] , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.20})$$

where we have used (3.31) and (3.27). This implies our previous result (4.11).

D WZW term from $S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}}$

In this appendix, we see how the WZW term is correctly reproduced from our new CS term (4.4) in the low energy limit. We start with a configuration $\mathcal{A}(t, x, s)$ in M_6 which vanish at the infinity $\xi = \infty$, and therefore at $z = \pm\infty$ (this configuration is not necessarily a baryon configuration). For carrying out the expansion in terms of the modes in the z -space, we move to the $\mathcal{A}_z = 0$ gauge via the gauge transformation by

$$V(t, \mathbf{x}, z, s) = \text{P exp} \left(i \int_{-\infty}^z dz' \mathcal{A}_z(t, \mathbf{x}, z', s) \right) . \quad (\text{D.1})$$

The gauge field $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ ($\alpha = 0, 1, 2, 3, s$) in the $\mathcal{A}_z = 0$ gauge satisfies the following boundary condition (we use the same symbol $\mathcal{A}$ for the gauge field in the $\mathcal{A}_z = 0$),

$$\mathcal{A}_\alpha(t, x, s) \rightarrow \begin{cases} -iU(t, \mathbf{x}, s)\partial_\alpha U(t, \mathbf{x}, s)^{-1} & (z \rightarrow +\infty) \\ 0 & (z \rightarrow -\infty) \end{cases}, \quad (\text{D.2})$$

with $U(t, \mathbf{x}, s)$ given by

$$U(t, \mathbf{x}, s) = \text{P exp} \left(i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \mathcal{A}_z(t, \mathbf{x}, z, s) \right). \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Therefore, we can mode expand $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ as

$$\mathcal{A}_\alpha(t, x, s) = -iU(t, \mathbf{x}, s)\partial_\alpha U(t, \mathbf{x}, s)^{-1} \times \psi_+(z) + (\text{massive modes}), \quad (\text{D.4})$$

where $\psi_+(z)$ is the zero-mode given in [1]:

$$\psi_+(z) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan z \rightarrow \begin{cases} 1 & (z \rightarrow +\infty) \\ 0 & (z \rightarrow -\infty) \end{cases}. \quad (\text{D.5})$$

Then, let us calculate our CS term (4.4) for the gauge field (D.4) by discarding the contribution from the massive modes. First, the field strengths are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\alpha\beta} &= \partial_\alpha \mathcal{A}_\beta - \partial_\beta \mathcal{A}_\alpha + i [\mathcal{A}_\alpha, \mathcal{A}_\beta] \\ &= i [-iU\partial_\alpha U^{-1}, -iU\partial_\beta U^{-1}] \psi_+(\psi_+ - 1) + (\text{massive modes}), \\ \mathcal{F}_{z\alpha} &= \partial_z \mathcal{A}_\alpha = -iU\partial_\alpha U^{-1} \times \frac{d}{dz} \psi_+(z) + (\text{massive modes}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

and using this we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr } \mathcal{F}^3 &= \frac{6}{2^3} \text{tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{F}_{\gamma\delta} \mathcal{F}_{z\kappa}) \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\kappa} d^6 x \\ &= 3 \text{tr}(-iU dU^{-1})^5 \times [\psi_+(z)(\psi_+(z) - 1)]^2 \frac{d\psi_+(z)}{dz} dz + (\text{massive modes}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

The z -integration of (D.7) is trivially carried out and we finally get the desired result:

$$S_{\text{CS}}^{\text{new}} = \frac{N_c}{240\pi^2} \int \text{tr}(-iU(t, \mathbf{x}, s)dU(t, \mathbf{x}, s)^{-1})^5 + (\text{contribution from massive modes}). \quad (\text{D.8})$$

Note that this WZW term is different from the WZW term of [1], (3.34) with (3.35) and (3.36), in the definition of the Skyrme field U in terms of $\mathcal{A}_z$ and in that the extra fifth coordinate is s in the present WZW term, while it is z in (3.34). However, in the topologically trivial sector without baryons, these two WZW terms are equivalent since they anyhow are determined by the Skyrme field at the boundary, namely, by $\text{P exp} \left(i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \mathcal{A}_z(t, \mathbf{x}, z) \right)$.

Let us consider the Skyrme field (D.3) for our WZW term in the baryon sector. In the baryon sector, the gauge field $\overline{\mathcal{A}}(t, x, s)$ (C.5) in the singular gauge satisfies the condition $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow 0$ ($\xi \rightarrow \infty$).^{*} Adopting

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}}_z(t, x, s) = W(t, s) \overline{A}_z^{\text{cl}}(x) W(t, s)^{-1} , \quad (\text{D.9})$$

as $\mathcal{A}_z$ in (D.3) (we ignore other collective coordinates than W), we have

$$U(t, \mathbf{x}, s) = W(t, s) U^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}) W(t, s)^{-1} , \quad (\text{D.10})$$

with U^{cl} defined by (c.f., [23])

$$U^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}) = \text{P exp} \left(i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz \overline{A}_z^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}, z) \right) . \quad (\text{D.11})$$

Plugging (D.10) with s -dependent U^{cl} into (D.8) also leads to the same result, eq. (4.11), as of course it should. Concrete expressions of the various quantities are

$$\overline{A}_z^{\text{cl}}(x) = \left(\frac{1}{\xi^2 + \rho^2} - \frac{1}{\xi^2} \right) (\mathbf{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}) , \quad (\text{D.12})$$

and

$$U^{\text{cl}}(\mathbf{x}) = \exp \left(-i \overline{H}(r) \hat{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} \right) , \quad (\text{D.13})$$

with

$$\overline{H}(r) = \pi \left(1 - \frac{r}{\sqrt{r^2 + \rho^2}} \right) . \quad (\text{D.14})$$

Note that $\overline{H}(r)$ has the same behavior as that of the corresponding function of the Hedgehog solution in the Skyrme model [23]; $\overline{H}(r=0) = \pi$ and $\overline{H}(r \rightarrow \infty) = \mathcal{O}(1/r^2)$. In any case, what is important for reproducing (4.11) is that the collective coordinate of the $SU(3)$ rotation, W , depends on the extra coordinate of the WZW term as well as on t . This is not satisfied in (3.37) where the extra coordinate is z .

References

- [1] T. Sakai and S. Sugimoto, “Low energy hadron physics in holographic QCD,” Prog. Theor. Phys. **113**, 843 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0412141].
- [2] T. Sakai and S. Sugimoto, “More on a holographic dual of QCD,” Prog. Theor. Phys. **114**, 1083 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0507073].
- [3] T. H. R. Skyrme, “A Nonlinear field theory,” Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **260**, 127 (1961).

^{*} On the other hand, $\mathcal{A}(t, x, s)$ in the regular gauge does not vanish at $\xi = \infty$ since $\Delta A_0(t, x) \nrightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow -\infty$. See the footnote above eq. (3.8).

- [4] J. Wess and B. Zumino, “Consequences of anomalous Ward identities,” *Phys. Lett. B* **37**, 95 (1971).
- [5] E. Witten, “Global Aspects Of Current Algebra,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **223**, 422 (1983).
- [6] E. Witten, “Baryons and branes in anti de Sitter space,” *JHEP* **9807**, 006 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9805112].
- [7] G. S. Adkins, C. R. Nappi and E. Witten, “Static Properties Of Nucleons In The Skyrme Model,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **228**, 552 (1983).
- [8] H. Hata, T. Sakai, S. Sugimoto and S. Yamato, “Baryons from instantons in holographic QCD,” [arXiv:hep-th/0701280v2].
- [9] D. K. Hong, M. Rho, H. U. Yee and P. Yi, “Chiral dynamics of baryons from string theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 061901 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0701276].
- [10] D. K. Hong, M. Rho, H. U. Yee and P. Yi, “Dynamics of Baryons from String Theory and Vector Dominance,” *JHEP* **0709**, 063 (2007) [arXiv:0705.2632 [hep-th]].
- [11] A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, A. S. Shvarts and Yu. S. Tyupkin, “Pseudoparticle solutions of the Yang-Mills equations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **59**, 85 (1975).
- [12] K. Hashimoto, T. Hirayama and A. Miwa, “Holographic QCD and pion mass,” *JHEP* **0706**, 020 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0703024].
- [13] N. Evans and E. Threlfall, “Quark Mass in the Sakai-Sugimoto Model of Chiral Symmetry Breaking,” arXiv:0706.3285 [hep-th].
- [14] O. Bergman, S. Seki and J. Sonnenschein, “Quark mass and condensate in HQCD,” arXiv:0708.2839 [hep-th].
- [15] A. Dhar and P. Nag, “Sakai-Sugimoto model, Tachyon Condensation and Chiral symmetry Breaking,” arXiv:0708.3233 [hep-th].
- [16] E. Guadagnini, “Baryons As Solitons And Mass Formulae,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **236**, 35 (1984).
- [17] P. O. Mazur, M. A. Nowak and M. Praszalowicz, “SU(3) Extension Of The Skyrme Model,” *Phys. Lett. B* **147**, 137 (1984).
- [18] M. Chemtob, “Skyrme Model Of Baryon Octet And Decuplet,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **256**, 600 (1985).
- [19] S. Jain and S. R. Wadia, “Large N Baryons: Collective Coordinates Of The Topological Soliton In SU(3) Chiral Model,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **258**, 713 (1985).
- [20] A. V. Manohar, “Equivalence Of The Chiral Soliton And Quark Models In Large N,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **248**, 19 (1984).

- [21] W. M. Yao *et al.* [Particle Data Group], “Review of particle physics,” J. Phys. G **33**, 1 (2006).
- [22] T. Eguchi, P. B. Gilkey and A. J. Hanson, “Gravitation, Gauge Theories And Differential Geometry,” Phys. Rept. **66**, 213 (1980).
- [23] M. F. Atiyah and N. S. Manton, “SKYRMIONS FROM INSTANTONS,” Phys. Lett. B **222**, 438 (1989).