

Some aspects of Skyrme–Chern-Simons densities

D. H. Tchrakian^{†*}

[†]School of Theoretical Physics, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies,
10 Burlington Road, Dublin 4, Ireland

^{*}Department of Computer Science, National University of Ireland Maynooth, Maynooth, Ireland

Abstract

The gauge transformation properties of the Skyrme–Chern-Simons (SCS) densities is studied. Two types of SCS actions are identified, Type_I in which the gauge group is smaller than the largest possible one, and Type_{II} which are gauged with the largest allowed gauge group. Type_I SCS feature only one power of the gauge connection and no curvature, while Type_{II} feature both the gauge connection and the curvature. The Abelian Type_I SCS turn out to be explicitly gauge invariant while non-Abelian Type_I and all Type_{II} SCS are gauge invariant only up to a total divergence term, and hence lead to gauge covariant equations of motion. SCS actions are the gauged Skyrme analogues of the usual Chern-Simons (CS) actions, except that unlike the CS which are defined only in odd dimensions, the SCS are defined also in even dimensions. Some areas of application in the construction of solitons are pointed out.

1 Introduction

The role of the Chern-Simons (CS) action in soliton physics was recognised a long time ago in the construction of electrically-charged spinning vortices of $SO(2)$ gauged Higgs model [1, 2, 3] and $O(3)$ Skyrme model [4, 5, 6] in $2 + 1$ dimensions, and, $SO(2)$ gauged $O(5)$ Skyrme model [7] in $4 + 1$ dimensions. In the case of the gauged Skyrme solitons [6, 7], an energy lower bound departing from the topological “baryon number” due to the gauge field was applied. This new “deformed baryon number” was first proposed in [10] and applied many times since, and most recently is elaborated in Appendix B of [8]. The gauging prescription for the $O(D + 1)$ Skyrme scalar on \mathbb{R}^D proposed in [8] (and references therein) is effected by the $SO(N)$, ($2 \leq N \leq D$) connection gauging N components of the $D + 1$ component Skyrme scalar.

Further to the construction of solitons of Abelian gauged Skyrme models in $2 + 1$ and $4 + 1$ dimensions, remarkable dynamical effects resulting from the Chern-Simons action were discovered

in $2 + 1$ dimensions in [12, 13, 14], and in $4 + 1$ dimensions, in Ref. [15] fields encoding the CS action in a specific way. They are *a)* the non-standard dependence of the mass/energy E on the electric charge Q_e and the angular momentum J , whose slope can be negative (as well as positive) in some regions of the parameter space, and *b)* the evolution of the “topological charge” (baryon number) away from its integer value prior to gauging, due to its deformation resulting from the gauging.

Thus in ‘all odd dimensions’ where the Chern-Simons density is defined, namely through the examples of $2 + 1$ and $4 + 1$ cited in the previous paragraph, we learn that the E *vs.* Q_e and E *vs.* J slopes can be negative as a result of the Chern-Simons dynamics. Now it is a longstanding problem to explain why the electrically neutral Neutron described by the Skyrmion is heavier than the electrically charged Proton which is presumably described by the Abelian gauged Skyrmion. The latter should display a negative E *vs.* Q_e slope. But in $3 + 1$ dimensions there is no Chern-Simons term defined, so the Skyrmion of the Abelian gauged $O(4)$ sigma model cannot be influenced by this mechanism to produce a negative E *vs.* Q_e slope. It would be desirable for this purpose to avail of a Chern-Simons like density in even dimensions. Such an “anomaly associated” density with the appropriate parity reversal properties, defined in terms of the Abelian field interacting with the Skyrme scalar in $3 + 1$ dimensions, was displayed in Ref. [16], albeit not in the context of the E *vs.* Q_e slope question. The SCS actions in $3 + 1$ dimensions can be seen as a possible alternative to the “anomaly associated” action of Ref. [16].

It is precisely to fill this gap that the Skyrme–Chern-Simons (SCS) densities, which are defined in both even and odd dimensions, were proposed in Ref. [8]. The present note is intended to clarify and elucidate aspects of these SCS densities, principally to demonstrate that the variational equations of these actions are *gauge covariant*¹. In this note two types of SCS densities are identified, Type_I and Type_{II}. Type_I SCS densities are those which are gauged with the single gauge group $SO(N)$, where $N < d + 1$, $SO(d + 1)$ being the largest gauge group a SCS density in d dimensions can be gauged with. The typical feature of Type_I is that only a single connection A_μ appears and no curvature $F_{\mu\nu}$ is displayed. A technical feature of Type_I SCS is that they can be expressed in closed form in all dimensions d , for each $SO(N)$. Type_{II} SCS densities on the other hand are those pertaining to the largest allowed gauge group in d dimensions, $SO(d + 1)$, as well as those gauged with the direct product of all possible subgroups $SO(d + 1)$. The important distinction between Type_I and Type_{II} SCS is that the former display one power of the connection A_μ only, while the later display both connection and curvature $(A_\mu, F_{\mu\nu})$ for $SO(d + 1)$, or as the case may be, for each of the (direct product) subgroups therein. In this sense Type_{II} SCS are the germane analogues of the usual Chern-Simons (CS) terms which are expressed in terms of $(A_\mu, F_{\mu\nu})$, except that unlike the CS which defined in only odd d , the Type_{II} SCS are defined in all d .

In Section 2, a revision of the definition of the usual Chern-Simons (CS) densities is given, followed by a brief presentation of the generic Skyrme–Chern-Simons (SCS) densities. The Type_I

¹It could be mentioned in passing that in addition to the SCS actions, the so-called Higgs—Chern-Simons (HCS) densities are proposed in [8], lead to *gauge covariant* variational equations. This aspect is obvious in the case of HCS densities, since in even dimensions these are manifestly *gauge invariant* and in odd dimensions they consist of a Higgs dependant part which is gauge invariant, plus, the usual Chern-Simons density in the given (odd) dimension.

SCS densities in arbitrary d dimensions for gauge groups $SO(2)$ and $SO(3)$ are presented in Section 3, one Abelian and one non-Abelian example, the smallest of $SO(N)$ ($N < d + 1$) gauge groups. Section 4 deals in principle with Type_{II} $SO(d + 1)$ (and all available direct product subgroups of) SCS in d dimensions, but in practice it is restricted to dimension $d = 3$ with gauge group $SO(4)$ and its direct product subgroup $SO(2) \times SO(2)$. Section 5 gives a summary and some possible application to solitons are pointed out.

2 Chern-Simons (CS) and Skyrme–Chern-Simons (SCS)

In the first Subsection, a brief review of the usual Chern-Simons densities is presented with the purpose of putting into context the definition of the Skyrme–Chern-Simons densities proposed in [8], which is summarised in the subsequent Subsection below.

2.1 Brief review of Chern-Simons (CS)

The starting point in the definition of the CS density in d dimensions is the Chern-Pontryagin (CP) density in $d + 1$, *even*, dimensions

$$\varrho \equiv \Omega_{\text{CP}}^{(d+1)} = \varepsilon_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4 \dots i_d i_{d+1}} \text{Tr} F_{i_1 i_2} F_{i_3 i_4} \dots F_{i_d i_{d+1}}, \quad (2.1)$$

which happens to be the topological charge density stabilising $SO_{\pm}(d + 1)$ “instantons” in all even dimensions (see *e.g.*, [17]). The density (2.1) is known to be a total divergence.

The usual Chern-Simons (CS) density $\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)}$ in d (*odd*) dimensions is extracted from the (*total divergence*) Chern-Pontryagin (CP) density in $d + 1$ (*even*) dimensions

$$\Omega_{\text{CP}}^{(d+1)} = \partial_i \Omega_i^{(d+1)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, d + 1 \quad (2.2)$$

as the $(d + 1)$ -th component of $\Omega_i^{(d+1)}$ in (2.2),

$$\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \Omega_{i=d+1}^{(d+1)}, \quad (2.3)$$

and since $\Omega_{\text{CP}}^{(d+1)}$ is a “curl” defined in terms of the totally antisymmetric tensor $\varepsilon^{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{d+1}}$, fixing one component, say $i = d + 1$, is tantamount to a descent by one dimension, such that $\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)}$ defined by (2.3) is a scalar in d dimensions.

Thus, the CS density (2.3) expressed in terms of the gauge connection A_μ and the curvature $F_{\mu\nu}$ is defined in a d dimensional space with coordinates x_μ

$$\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)} = \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)}[A_\mu, F_{\mu\nu}], \quad \mu = 1, 2, \dots, d, \quad d \text{ odd}. \quad (2.4)$$

Most remarkably, CS densities are *explicitly gauge variant*, as implied by the notation used in (2.4). It is important to stress that theories endowed with dynamical Chern-Simons (CS) terms in the Lagrangian are defined on spacetimes with Minkowskian signature. Since the CS

term is independent of the metric tensor, the resulting Stress Tensor does not feature it and the static Hamiltonian (and hence energy) is *gauge invariant* as it should be ².

Of course, the CP densities and the resulting CS densities, can be defined in terms of both Abelian and non-Abelian gauge connections and curvatures. The context of the present notes is the construction of soliton solutions ³, rather than the study of topologically massive field theories as in [19, 20]. In this respect, the choice of gauge group any given dimension must be made with due regard to regularity, and the models chosen must be consistent with the Derrick scaling requirement for the finiteness of energy. Accordingly, in all but 2 + 1 dimensions, our considerations are restricted to non-Abelian gauge fields.

2.1.1 Gauge transformation of CS

Consider the transformation of $\Omega_i^{(d+1)}$ in (2.2) under the infinitesimal gauge transformation $g(x_i)$

$$\Omega_i^{(d+1)} \xrightarrow{g} \Omega_i^{(d+1)} + \delta\Omega_i^{(d+1)}. \quad (2.5)$$

Since $\varrho = \partial_i \Omega_i^{(d+1)}$ is gauge invariant, *i.e.*, $\delta\varrho = 0$, it follows that

$$\partial_i(\delta\Omega_i^{(d+1)}) = 0, \quad (2.6)$$

which allows to express $\delta\Omega_i^{(d+1)}$ formally as

$$\delta\Omega_i^{(d+1)} = \varepsilon_{ijk_1k_2\dots k_{d-1}} \partial_j V_{k_1k_2\dots k_{d-1}}, \quad (2.7)$$

where $V_{k_1k_2\dots k_{d-1}}$ is a totally antisymmetric tensor defined in terms of the connection and the curvature fields.

From the definition (2.3) of the CS density, (2.7) implies the following transformation

$$\delta\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)} = \delta\Omega_{i=d+1}^{(d+1)} = \varepsilon_{(d+1)\mu\nu_1\nu_2\dots\nu_{d-1}} \partial_\mu V_{\nu_1\nu_2\dots\nu_{d-1}} \quad (2.8)$$

which is clearly defined on the space with the d -dimensional coordinates x_μ .

It follows from (2.8) that under an infinitesimal gauge transformation $g(x_\mu)$, the CS density $\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)}$ transforms as

$$\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)} \xrightarrow{g} \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)} + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu_1\nu_2\dots\nu_{d-1}} \partial_\mu V_{\nu_1\nu_2\dots\nu_{d-1}}, \quad (2.9)$$

meaning that the CS density is *gauge invariant up to a total divergence*. One concludes that the action of $\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)}$, namely its volume integral

$$\int d^d x \, \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)} \xrightarrow{g} \int d^d x \, \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)}$$

²Should one employ a CS density on a space with Euclidean signature, with the CS density appearing in the static Hamiltonian itself, then the energy would not be *gauge invariant*. Hamiltonians of this type have been considered in the literature, *e.g.*, in [18].

Chern-Simons densities on Euclidean spaces, defined in terms of the composite connection of a sigma model, find application as the topological charge densities of Hopf solitons.

³The term soliton solutions here is used rather loosely, implying only the construction of regular and finite energy solutions, without insisting on topological stability in general.

remains invariant under the action of g , resulting in the Euler-Lagrange equations (2.13) and (2.14) being *gauge covariant*.

This statement can be given concrete expression in terms of examples in dimensions $d = 3, 5, 7$, which can be extended to all odd dimensional spacetimes systematically.

The CS densities $\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)}$, defined by (2.3), for $d = 3, 5, 7$, are

$$\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(3)} = \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu} \text{Tr } A_\lambda \left[F_{\mu\nu} - \frac{2}{3} A_\mu A_\nu \right], \quad (2.10)$$

$$\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(5)} = \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \text{Tr } A_\lambda \left[F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma} - F_{\mu\nu} A_\rho A_\sigma + \frac{2}{5} A_\mu A_\nu A_\rho A_\sigma \right], \quad (2.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(7)} = \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu\rho\sigma\tau\kappa} \text{Tr } A_\lambda \left[F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma} F_{\tau\kappa} - \frac{4}{5} F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma} A_\tau A_\kappa - \frac{2}{5} F_{\mu\nu} A_\rho F_{\sigma\tau} A_\kappa \right. \\ \left. + \frac{4}{5} F_{\mu\nu} A_\rho A_\sigma A_\tau A_\kappa - \frac{8}{35} A_\mu A_\nu A_\rho A_\sigma A_\tau A_\kappa \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

Restricting to orthogonal groups, one notes that the CS term in d dimensions features the product of $d - 1$ powers of the (algebra valued) gauge field/connection in front of the Trace, which would vanish if the gauge group *is not larger than* $SO(d - 1)$. In that case, the YM connection would describe only a 'magnetic' component, with the 'electric' component necessary for the nonvanishing of the CS density would be absent. As in [21], the most convenient choice is $SO(d + 1)$. Since $d + 1$ is always even, the representation of $SO(d + 2)$ are the *chiral* representation in terms of (Dirac) spin matrices. This completes the definition of the usual non-Abelian Chern-Simons densities in d spacetimes.

From (2.10)-(2.12), it is clear that the CS density is explicitly gauge variant. Their Euler-Lagrange equations w.r.t. the variation of A_λ are nonetheless gauge invariant

$$\delta_{A_\lambda} \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(2)} = \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\delta_{A_\lambda} \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(3)} = \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma}, \quad (2.14)$$

$$\delta_{A_\lambda} \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(4)} = \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu\rho\sigma\kappa\eta} F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma} F_{\kappa\eta}. \quad (2.15)$$

This remarkable property of CS densities can be understood by noting that, while these appear as explicitly gauge-variant densities, these actions are actually *gauge invariant up to a surface term*. To see this one subjects them to transformation under the action of an element, g of the (non-Abelian) gauge group.

The transformations for the two examples (2.10) and (2.11) are explicitly

$$\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(3)} \xrightarrow{g} \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(3)} - \frac{2}{3} \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu} \text{Tr } \alpha_\lambda \alpha_\mu \alpha_\nu - 2 \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu} \partial_\lambda \text{Tr } \alpha_\mu A_\nu, \quad (2.16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(5)} \xrightarrow{g} \Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(5)} - \frac{2}{5} \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \text{Tr } \alpha_\lambda \alpha_\mu \alpha_\nu \alpha_\rho \alpha_\sigma \\ + 2 \varepsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \partial_\lambda \text{Tr } \alpha_\mu \left[A_\nu \left(F_{\rho\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} A_\rho A_\sigma \right) + \left(F_{\rho\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} A_\rho A_\sigma \right) A_\nu \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{2} A_\nu \alpha_\rho A_\sigma - \alpha_\nu \alpha_\rho A_\sigma \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

where $\alpha_\mu = \partial_\mu g g^{-1}$, as distinct from the algebra valued quantity $\beta_\mu = g^{-1} \partial_\mu g$ that appears as the inhomogeneous term in the gauge transformation of the non-Abelian connection. (2.16) and (2.17) are the explicit versions of (2.9).

As seen from (2.16)-(2.17), the gauge variation of $\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d)}$ consists of a term which is explicitly a total divergence, and, another term

$$\omega^{(d)} = \frac{2}{d} \varepsilon_{\mu_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_d} \text{Tr} \alpha_{\mu_1} \alpha_{\mu_2} \dots \alpha_{\mu_d}, \quad (2.18)$$

which in the appropriate parametrisation can be cast in the form of a winding number density.

2.2 Brief definition of Skyrme–Chern-Simons (SCS)

This Subsection is intended to provide a self-contained definition of SCS densities, which are discussed at length in [8].

The $O(d+2)$ sigma system is defined in terms of the Skyrme scalar ϕ^a , $a = 1, 2, \dots, d+2$, subject to $|\phi^a|^2 = 1$. The Skyrme–Chern-Simons (SCS) density $\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)}$ in d dimensions ⁴ is defined in terms of the Skyrme scalar ϕ^a .

The definition of the Skyrme–Chern-Simons (SCS) density in d dimensions follows exactly analogously to the step (2.2)→(2.3) by the one-step descent of the Chern-Pontryagin density $\Omega_{\text{CP}}^{(d+1)}$ to the Chern-Simons density $\Omega_{\text{CS}}^{(d+1)}$. This is done by carrying out such a descent of a density in $d+1$ dimensions that might be denoted ⁵ as $\Omega_{\text{SCP}}^{(d+1)}$, down to the Skyrme–Chern-Simons (SCS) density

$$\Omega_{\text{SCP}}^{(d+1)} = \partial_i \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)} \quad (2.19)$$

$$\text{and} \\ \Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \hat{\Omega}_{i=d+1}^{(d+1)}. \quad (2.20)$$

Just as the CP density $\Omega_{\text{CP}}^{(d+1)}$ in (2.2) is both gauge invariant and total divergence, so too is $\Omega_{\text{SCP}}^{(d+1)}$ in (2.19), and this is expressed symbolically in terms of the vector valued density $\hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)}$. The definitions of these quantities is given below.

The winding number density of the Skyrme scalar ϕ^a , $a = 1, 2, \dots, d+1$ of the $O(d+2)$ sigma model, subject to the constraint $|\phi^a|^2 = 1$ is

$$\varrho_0 = \varepsilon_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{d+1}} \partial_{i_1} \phi^{a_1} \partial_{i_2} \phi^{a_2} \dots \partial_{i_{d+1}} \phi^{a_{d+1}} \phi^{a_{d+2}} \quad (2.21)$$

of the $O(d+2)$ Skyrme scalar ϕ^a in d dimensions, which is *essentially total divergence*, and in constraint compliant parametrisation it is *explicitly total divergence*. Its volume integral is a topological charge. It is not gauge invariant.

⁴With solitons in mind, this is taken to be a d dimensional Minkowski space, but the choice of this signature is not important in principle.

⁵The subscript on $\Omega_{\text{SCP}}^{(d)}$ is purely symbolic and is meant to underline the analogy with the usual Chern-Pontryagin density. Taking this nomenclature literally, as Skyrme–Chern-Pontryagin, is misleading. It is the density presenting the lower bound on the “energy” of the gauged Skyrme system, and is deformation of the (topological) winding number density (2.21).

Replacing the partial derivatives $\partial_i \phi^a$ in (2.21) with the covariant derivatives $D_i \phi^a$

$$\varrho_G = \varepsilon_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{d+1}} D_{i_1} \phi^{a_1} D_{i_2} \phi^{a_2} \dots D_{i_{d+1}} \phi^{a_{d+1}} \phi^{a_{d+2}} \quad (2.22)$$

which is gauge invariant but not total divergence.

The density ϱ_0 gives the lower bound for the “energy” of the ungauged Skyrmion, but is inadequate for this purpose after gauging since it is not gauge invariant. The density ϱ_G on the other hand is gauge invariant, but again is inadequate for this purpose as it is not a total divergence. What is needed is a density, say $\varrho \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \Omega_{\text{SCP}}^{(d+1)}$, which is both gauge invariant and total divergence like the CP density $\Omega_{\text{CP}}^{(d+1)}$ in (2.2). To this end, one evaluates the difference $(\varrho_G - \varrho_0)$, which can be cast in the following form

$$\varrho_G - \varrho_0 = \partial_i \Omega_i^{(d+1)}[A, \phi] - W[F, D\phi] \quad (2.23)$$

where $W[F, D\phi]$ is gauge invariant by construction and $\Omega_i^{(d+1)}[A, \phi]$ is gauge variant. In certain examples, there is some arbitrariness in the splitting into these two terms. This will be pointed out in Section 2.2.1 below.

The relation (2.23) is evaluated explicitly in each $d + 1$ dimension, and in each case with the gauge group $SO(N)$, $2 \leq N \leq d + 1$, that defines the covariant derivative in (2.22). The calculations are carried out directly, using the Leibnitz rule and the tensor identities.

Collecting the gauge invariant pieces ϱ_G and W in (2.23), and separately, the individually gauge variant pieces ϱ_0 and $\partial_i \Omega_i^{(d+1)}$, one has two equivalent definitions of a density

$$\varrho = \varrho_G + W[F, D\phi] \quad (2.24)$$

$$= \varrho_0 + \partial_i \Omega_i^{(d+1)}[A, \phi], \quad (2.25)$$

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

The two equivalent definitions (2.24) and (2.25) of ϱ are, as required, both gauge invariant and (essentially) total divergence. The quantity ϱ is the deformation of the of ϱ_0 , namely of the (topological) “baryon number” when the gauge field is switched on.

Noting that ϱ_0 is *essentially total divergence*⁶ and hence in a constraint compliant parametrisation it is *explicitly total divergence*, say

$$\varrho_0 = \partial_i \omega_i^{(d+1)}, \quad (2.26)$$

(2.25) can be expressed (explicitly) as the total divergence $\partial_i \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)}$ in (2.19).

Thus, the expression (2.25) for ϱ can be written as

$$\varrho = \partial_i (\omega_i^{(d+1)} + \Omega_i^{(d+1)}) \quad (2.27)$$

$$\stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \partial_i \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)} \equiv \Omega_{\text{SCP}}^{(d+1)}, \quad (2.28)$$

⁶The meaning of the phrase *essentially total divergence* used here is, that this quantity is not explicitly total divergence, but rather that the resulting Euler-Lagrange equations are trivial as in the case of an explicitly *total divergence* density. Throughout, the term *total divergence* is used as a synonym for *explicitly total divergence*.

from which follows immediately, the definition of the SCS density (2.20)

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} = \hat{\Omega}_{i=d+1}^{(d+1)} = \omega_{i=d+1}^{(d+1)} + \Omega_{i=d+1}^{(d+1)} \quad (2.29)$$

$$= \omega^{(d)} + \Omega^{(d)} \quad (2.30)$$

where we have denoted $\omega_{i=d+1}^{(d+1)} = \omega^{(d)}(x_\mu)$ and $\Omega_{i=d+1}^{(d+1)} = \Omega^{(d)}(x_\mu)$. The density $\omega^{(d)}$ in (2.30) is the Wess-Zumino (WZ) term.

2.2.1 The W term in SCP definition (2.23)-(2.24)

In defining the SCS density (2.29)-(2.30) in d dimensions, only the definition (2.25) was employed, and not the variant (2.24). It is nonetheless reasonable for the sake of being self-contained, to illustrate the provenance of the gauge invariant term W that appears in the crucial relation (2.23) which splits ⁷, into the two terms $\partial_i \Omega_i^{(d+1)}$ and W leading to the two equivalent definitions (2.24) and (2.25) for the SCP ϱ . This splitting occurs for the $SO(2)$ SCP in two dimensions [9], albeit in a somewhat different approach to here. The Ref. [9] was the template for extending this construction to $d = 3$ for $SO(3)$ and to $d = 4$ for $SO(4)$, in [10], and subsequently to smaller gauge groups in each case (see [8] and references therein).

The term W in the SCP density (2.24) is involved in stating Bogomol'nyi-like “energy lower bounds”, which is saturated only for the $SO(2)$ case in $d + 1 = 2$ dimensions presented in [9]. As well as this, it turns out that in dimensions $d + 1 \geq 3$ the splitting in (2.23) is not always unique. To demonstrate these features, it helps to consider the W terms for the special examples considered in Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 4.1 below.

These examples pertain to the Type_I $SO(2)$ and $SO(3)$ SCP densities (3.41) and (3.52) respectively, both in $d + 1$ dimensions, and, to the Type_{II} $SO(4)$ SCP in $d + 1 = 4$, given by $\Omega_i^{(d+1)}$ in (4.79) below. The W terms for these examples are listed as

$$W = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk_1 k_2 \dots k_{d-1}} \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_d} F_{ij} D_{k_1} \phi^{A_1} D_{k_2} \phi^{A_2} \dots D_{k_{d-1}} \phi^{A_{d-1}} \phi^{A_d}, \quad (2.31)$$

$$W = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{ijk_1 k_2 \dots k_{d-1}} \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{d-1}} F_{ij}^\alpha \phi^\alpha D_{k_1} \phi^{A_1} D_{k_2} \phi^{A_2} \dots D_{k_{d-1}} \phi^{A_{d-1}}, \quad (2.32)$$

$$W = 3! \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{abcd} \phi^5 \left\{ \frac{1}{24} (\phi^5)^2 F_{ij}^{ab} F_{kl}^{cd} + \frac{1}{2} F_{ij}^{ab} D_{[k} \phi^c D_{l]} \phi^d \right\}, \quad (2.33)$$

where in (2.31) and (2.32) the indices A_1, A_2, \dots label the ungauged components of the Skyrme scalar ϕ^a .

On close inspection, it is clear that a gauge-invariant and total-divergence term can be extracted from (2.31) and from the second term in (2.33), while no such term can be isolated in

⁷It may be relevant to mention that such a definition for a gauge invariant and total divergence density like ϱ in (2.24)-(2.25) can be made for a $SO(d)$ gauged system of d -tuple Higgs field, though in that case that is not necessary since the “energy” density of such monopoles are bounded by the Higgs–Chern–Pontryagin (HCP) density defined in [17]. Such lower bounds as (2.24)-(2.25) for Higgs systems were discussed in [11], where again this splitting becomes unique in the $d = 2$ case only, and also the lower bound is saturated when the usual Abelian Higgs model is chosen. In all $d \geq 3$, this splitting has some freedom and the relevant lower bound is not saturated. Moreover these lower bounds are always higher than the HCP lower bounds [11].

(2.32). It can be noted that this extraction can be carried out for $SO(n)$ for even n gauge groups, with the exception of $SO(2)$ gauging of the $O(3)$ sigma model [9]. Thus in cases such as (2.31) and (2.33), the total-divergence term extracted from the term W appearing in (2.24), can be transferred to (2.25) and incorporated in $\partial_i \Omega_i$, redefining the latter.

This is the freedom present in the splitting carried out in (2.23), which can be aginfully employed in casting the resulting Bogomol'nyi-like inequalities in a useful form. Clearly, this choice influences also the definition of the corresponding SCS densities, and in all examples encountered it leads also to an optimal choice for the latter.

2.2.2 Gauge transformation of SCS

Consider the transformation of $\hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)}$, appearing in the definition of the SCP density $\varrho = \partial_i \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)}$ in (2.19) (or (2.28)), under the infinitesimal gauge transformation $g(x_i)$

$$\hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)} \xrightarrow{g} \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)} + \delta \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)}. \quad (2.34)$$

Since ϱ is gauge invariant, *i.e.*, $\delta \varrho = 0$, it follows that

$$\partial_i (\delta \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)}) = 0, \quad (2.35)$$

which allows to express $\delta \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)}$ formally as

$$\delta \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)} = \varepsilon_{ijk_1 k_2 \dots k_{d-1}} \partial_j V_{k_1 k_2 \dots k_{d-1}}. \quad (2.36)$$

where $V_{k_1 k_2 \dots k_{d-1}}$ is a totally antisymmetric tensor defined in terms of the connection and curvature fields, as well as the Skyrme scalar.

From the definition of the SCS density (2.29), (2.36) implies the following transformation

$$\delta \Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} = \delta \hat{\Omega}_{i=d+1}^{(d+1)} = \varepsilon_{(d+1)\mu\nu_1\nu_2\dots\nu_{d-1}} \partial_\mu V_{\nu_1\nu_2\dots\nu_{d-1}} \quad (2.37)$$

which is clearly defined on the space with the d -dimensional coordinates x_μ .

It follows from (2.37) that under an infinitesimal gauge transformation $g(x_\mu)$, the SCS density $\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)}$ transforms as

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} \xrightarrow{g} \Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu_1\nu_2\dots\nu_{d-1}} \partial_\mu V_{\nu_1\nu_2\dots\nu_{d-1}}, \quad (2.38)$$

meaning that the SCS density is *gauge invariant up to a total divergence*, as a result, the Euler-Lagrange equations are *gauge covariant*.

3 Type_I $SO(2)$ and $SO(3)$ SCS in d dimensions

The largest gauge group of a SCS density in d dimensions is $SO(d+1)$, namely the gauge group of the SCP density (2.19) of the $O(d+2)$ Skyrme system in $d+1$ dimensions. Type_I SCS are those which are gauged with $SO(N)$, with $N < d+1$. What is distinctive with the Type_I SCS is that they can be expressed in a uniform format for a given N in any dimension d . This format is typified by the linear dependence of $\Omega^{(d)}$ in the definition of the SCS (2.30), on the gauge connection A_μ , and the absence there of the gauge curvature $F_{\mu\nu}$.

In the next two Subsections, only the $SO(2)$ and $SO(3)$ cases are analysed, restricting attention to one Abelian and one non-Abelian case.

3.1 $SO(2)$ gauged SCS_I in d dimensions

Consider the $O(d+2)$ sigma model in $d+1$ dimensions, gauged with $SO(2)$. As per the prescription described above, we start with the SCP density in $d+1$ dimensions, and after the descent by one step arrive at the SCS density in d dimensions. Here only two components of the $d+2$ compnenmt $O(d+2)$ Skyrme scalar $\phi^a = (\phi^\alpha, \phi^A)$ are gauged with $SO(2)$ according to the gauging prescription

$$D_i \phi^\alpha = \partial_i \phi^\alpha + A_i (\varepsilon \phi)^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \quad (\varepsilon \phi)^\alpha = \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \phi^\beta \quad (3.39)$$

$$D_i \phi^A = \partial_i \phi^A, \quad A = 1, 2, \dots, d, \text{ or } A = 3, 4, \dots, d+2. \quad (3.40)$$

Examples of $SO(2)$ gauged SCP densities $\partial_i \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)}$, (2.27), in various dimensions are listed in Ref. [8], from which follows the SCP in $d+1$ dimensions

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)} &= \partial_i (\omega_i^{(d+1)} + \Omega_i^{(d+1)}) \\ &= \partial_i [\omega_i^{(d+1)} + \varepsilon_{ijk_1 k_2 \dots k_{d-1}} \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_d} A_j \partial_{k_1} \phi^{A_1} \partial_{k_2} \phi^{A_2} \dots \partial_{k_{d-1}} \phi^{A_{d-1}} \phi^{A_d}], \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

by induction.

From (3.41) follows via the one-step descent (2.19)-(2.20) or (2.27)-(2.30), fixing $i = d+1$, the SCS density (2.30) in d dimensions

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} = \omega^{(d)} + \Omega^{(d)}$$

in which $\Omega^{(d)}$ is given by

$$\Omega^{(d)} = \varepsilon_{\nu \mu_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_{d-1}} \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_d} A_\nu \partial_{\mu_1} \phi^{A_1} \partial_{\mu_2} \phi^{A_2} \dots \partial_{\mu_{d-1}} \phi^{A_{d-1}} \phi^{A_d}. \quad (3.42)$$

To evaluate the WZ term $\omega^{(d)}$ in (2.30) one must first evaluate ϱ_0 defined by (2.21) in $d+1$ dimensions, cast it in total divergence form $\partial_i \omega^{(d+1)}$, and then perform the one-step descent (2.19)-(2.20) or (2.27)-(2.30), fixing $i = d+1$. For this, it is necessary to employ a parametrisation which is compliant with the constraint $|\phi^a|^2 = (|\phi^\alpha|^2 + |\phi^A|^2) = 1$,

$$\phi^\alpha = \sin f n^\alpha, \quad \phi^A = \cos f n^A; \quad \alpha = 1, 2; \quad A = 1, 2, \dots, d, \quad (3.43)$$

where n^α and n^A are vector valued functions of *unit length*. The two-component unit vector $n^\alpha = (\cos \psi, \sin \psi)$ being parametrised by the angular coordinate ψ on S^1 , and the $(d-1)$ -component unit vector n^A by the coordinates on S^{d-2} .

Substituting (3.43) in (2.21), and noting that $\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} n^\alpha \partial_{j_{d+1}} n^\beta = \partial_{j_{d+1}} \psi$

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_0 &= -\varepsilon_{ijk_1 k_2 \dots k_{d-1}} (\partial_i \cos^d f) (\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} n^\alpha \partial_j n^\beta) (\varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_d} \partial_{k_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{k_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{k_{d-1}} n^{A_{d-1}} n^{A_d}) \\ &= -\partial_i [(\cos^d f) \varepsilon_{ij} (\partial_j \psi) (\varepsilon_{k_1 k_2 \dots k_{d-1}} \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_d} \partial_{k_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{k_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{k_{d-1}} n^{A_{d-1}} n^{A_d})] \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

from which follows the WZ term

$$\omega^{(d)} = -\varepsilon_{\nu \mu_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_{d-1}} \cos^d f (\varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_d} \partial_{\mu_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{\mu_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{\mu_{d-1}} n^{A_{d-1}} n^{A_d}) \partial_\nu \psi. \quad (3.45)$$

Next, we evaluate $\Omega^{(d)}$ in the parametrisation (3.43) by substituting the latter in (3.42), yielding

$$\Omega^{(d)} = \varepsilon_{\nu\mu_1\mu_2\dots\mu_{d-1}} \cos^d f (\varepsilon^{A_1A_2\dots A_d} \partial_{\mu_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{\mu_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{\mu_{d-1}} n^{A_{d-1}} n^{A_d}) A_\nu, \quad (3.46)$$

and adding (3.45) to (3.46) we end up with the SCS density (2.30) in d dimensions

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} = \varepsilon_{\nu\mu_1\mu_2\dots\mu_{d-1}} \cos^d f (\varepsilon^{A_1A_2\dots A_d} \partial_{\mu_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{\mu_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{\mu_{d-1}} n^{A_{d-1}} n^{A_d}) (A_\nu - \partial_\nu \psi). \quad (3.47)$$

Since according to the gauging prescription (3.39)-(3.40) the scalar function f and the vector function n^A are inert under gauge transformations, it follows that the SCS density (3.47) is invariant under the Abelian gauge transformation

$$A_\nu \rightarrow A_\nu + \partial_\nu \Lambda \quad (3.48)$$

with ψ in (3.47) compensating for Λ in (3.48).

The remarkable feature here is the fact that the Abelian SCS action (3.47) is *explicitly gauge invariant*, unlike the usual Chern-Simons term which is seen in Subsection 2.1.1 to be *gauge invariant up to total divergence* only. It appears that in this case, the gauge transformation of the Abelian connection is compensated completely by that of the Skyrme scalar.

3.2 $SO(3)$ gauged SCS_I in d dimensions

The gauging prescription for the $O(d+2)$ sigma model in $d+1$ dimensions is given by the definition of the covariant derivatives

$$D_i \phi^\alpha = \partial_i \phi^\alpha + A_i^{\alpha\beta} \phi^\beta, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3 \quad (3.49)$$

$$D_i \phi^A = \partial_i \phi^A, \quad A = 1, 2, \dots, d-1, \quad \text{or} \quad A = 4, 5, \dots, d+2 \quad (3.50)$$

where in (3.49), $A_i^{\alpha\beta} = \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} A_i^\gamma$.

Examples of $SO(3)$ gauged SCP densities $\partial_i \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)}$, (2.27), in various dimensions are listed in Ref. [8], from which follows the SCP in $d+1$ dimensions

$$\partial_i \hat{\Omega}_i^{(d+1)} = \partial_i (\omega_i^{(d+1)} + \Omega_i^{(d+1)}) \quad (3.51)$$

$$= \partial_i (\omega_i^{(d+1)} + \varepsilon_{ijk_1k_2\dots k_{d-1}} A_j^\alpha \phi^\alpha \cdot \varepsilon^{A_1A_2\dots A_{d-1}} \partial_{k_1} \phi^{A_1} \partial_{k_2} \phi^{A_2} \dots \partial_{k_{d-1}} \phi^{A_{d-1}}) \quad (3.52)$$

by induction.

From (3.52) follows via the one-step descent (2.19)-(2.20) or (2.27)-(2.30), fixing $i = d+1$, the SCS density (2.30) in d dimensions

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} = \omega^{(d)} + \Omega^{(d)}$$

in which $\Omega^{(d)}$ is given by

$$\Omega^{(d)} = \varepsilon_{\nu\mu_1\mu_2\dots\mu_{d-1}} \varepsilon^{A_1A_2\dots A_{d-1}} A_\nu^\alpha \phi^\alpha \partial_{\mu_1} \phi^{A_1} \partial_{\mu_2} \phi^{A_2} \dots \partial_{\mu_{d-1}} \phi^{A_{d-1}} \quad (3.53)$$

As in the previous case with $SO(2)$ gauging, to evaluate the WZ term $\omega^{(d)}$ in (2.30) we must evaluate the winding number density ϱ_0 defined by (2.21) in $d+1$ and cast it in total divergence form $\partial_i \omega^{(d+1)}$. After that the one-step descent (2.19)-(2.20) (or (2.27)-(2.30)) can be performed, fixing $i = d+1$. As was done in (3.43) above, this is achieved by employing a constraint compliant parametrisation which in this case is formally that as (3.43), namely

$$\phi^\alpha = \sin f n^\alpha, \quad \phi^A = \cos f n^A; \quad \alpha = 1, 2, 3; \quad A = 1, 2, \dots, d-1, \quad (3.54)$$

with n^α and n^A being 2 and $(d-1)$ component *unit* vectors respectively, $n^\alpha = n^\alpha(\chi, \psi)$ being parametrised by the polar and azimuthal coordinate on S^2 , and n^A by the angular coordinates on S^{d-2} .

Substituting (3.54) in (2.21) yields,

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_0 &= \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{ijkl_1 l_2 \dots l_{d-2}} (\partial_i \Phi^{(d)}) (\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} n^\alpha \partial_j n^\beta \partial_k n^\gamma) (\varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{d-1}} \partial_{l_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{l_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{l_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-1}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \partial_i [\Phi^{(d)} \varepsilon_{ijkl_1 l_2 \dots l_{d-2}} (\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} n^\alpha \partial_j n^\beta \partial_k n^\gamma) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot (\varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{d-1}} \partial_{l_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{l_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{l_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-1}})] \end{aligned} \quad (3.55)$$

in which the symbol $\Phi^{(d)}$ is

$$\Phi^{(d)} = \frac{1}{d+1} \left(f - \frac{1}{d+1} \sin(d+1)f \right), \quad \text{for odd } d, \quad (3.56)$$

$$= \sin^{d+1} f, \quad \text{for even } d. \quad (3.57)$$

It follows from (3.55) that the WZ term $\omega^{(d)}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \omega^{(d)} &= \frac{1}{4} \Phi^{(d)} \varepsilon_{\nu_1 \nu_2 \mu_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_{d-2}} (\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} n^\alpha \partial_{\nu_1} n^\beta \partial_{\nu_2} n^\gamma) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot (\varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{d-1}} \partial_{\mu_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{\mu_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{\mu_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-1}}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.58)$$

We next evaluate $\Omega^{(d)}$ given by (3.53) in the parametrisation (3.54)

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{(d)} &= -\varepsilon_{\nu_1 \nu_2 \mu_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_{d-2}} (A_{\nu_1}^\alpha n^\alpha \partial_{\nu_2} \Phi^{(d)}) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot (\varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{d-1}} \partial_{\mu_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{\mu_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{\mu_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-1}}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.59)$$

and finally adding (3.58) and (3.59), we have the SCS density

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} &= \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon_{\nu_1 \nu_2 \mu_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_{d-2}} (\varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{d-1}} \partial_{\mu_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{\mu_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{\mu_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-1}}) \cdot \\ &\quad \cdot (4 \partial_{\nu_1} \Phi^{(d)} A_{\nu_2}^\alpha n^\alpha + \Phi^{(d)} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} n^\alpha \partial_{\nu_1} n^\beta \partial_{\nu_2} n^\gamma). \end{aligned} \quad (3.60)$$

3.2.1 Gauge dependence

It is useful to express (3.60) as

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} = \frac{1}{4} \Xi_{\nu_1 \nu_2} (4 \partial_{\nu_1} \Phi^{(d)} A_{\nu_2}^\alpha n^\alpha + \Phi^{(d)} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} n^\alpha \partial_{\nu_1} n^\beta \partial_{\nu_2} n^\gamma). \quad (3.61)$$

where the prefactor

$$\Xi_{\nu_1 \nu_2} = \varepsilon_{\nu_1 \nu_2 \mu_1 \mu_2 \dots \mu_{d-2}} \varepsilon^{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{d-1}} \partial_{\mu_1} n^{A_1} \partial_{\mu_2} n^{A_2} \dots \partial_{\mu_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-2}} n^{A_{d-1}} \quad (3.62)$$

is gauge invariant.

Instead of working with the real parametrisation of the $SO(3)$ gauge group, it is convenient to work with the $SU(2)$ parametrisation

$$g = \cos \frac{\Lambda}{2} + i \vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{m} \sin \frac{\Lambda}{2}, \quad \text{with } |\vec{m}|^2 = 1 \quad (3.63)$$

such that the vector n^α and the connection A_μ^α are now expressed as $SU(2)$ algebra elements

$$n = n^\alpha \sigma^\alpha \equiv \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \quad A_\mu = A_\mu^\alpha \sigma^\alpha \equiv \vec{A}_\mu \cdot \vec{\sigma} \quad (3.64)$$

and they transform under the $SU(2)$ gauge group element g as

$$n \xrightarrow{g} g^{-1} n g \quad (3.65)$$

$$A_\mu \xrightarrow{g} g^{-1} A_\mu g + i g^{-1} \partial_\mu g, \quad (3.66)$$

In the parametrisation (3.64) the action (3.61) is expressed as

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} = \frac{1}{2} \Xi_{\mu\nu} \{ 4 \partial_\mu \Phi^{(d)} \text{Tr}(n A_\nu) - i \Phi^{(d)} \text{Tr}(n \partial_\mu n \partial_\nu n) \}. \quad (3.67)$$

Under infinitesimal transformation with $\cos \Lambda \approx \mathbb{I}$ and $\sin \Lambda \approx \Lambda$ in (3.63), g reduces to

$$g = \mathbb{I} + \frac{i}{2} \Lambda \vec{m} \cdot \vec{\sigma} \quad (3.68)$$

under which n transforms, up to first order in Λ , as

$$n = \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma} \xrightarrow{g} \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma} - \vec{n} \times (\Lambda \vec{m}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \quad (3.69)$$

and hence the term $\text{Tr}(n A_\nu)$ in (3.67) as

$$\text{Tr}(n A_\nu) \xrightarrow{g} \text{Tr}(n A_\nu) + i \text{Tr}(n \partial_\nu g g^{-1}) \quad (3.70)$$

$$= \text{Tr}(n A_\nu) - \vec{n} \cdot \partial_\nu (\Lambda \vec{m}) \quad (3.71)$$

$$= 2 \vec{n} \cdot \vec{A}_\nu - \vec{n} \cdot \partial_\nu (\Lambda \vec{m}), \quad (3.72)$$

and the term $\Xi_{\mu\nu} \text{Tr}(n \partial_\mu n \partial_\nu n)$ in (3.67), as

$$\Xi_{\mu\nu} \text{Tr}(n \partial_\mu n \partial_\nu n) \xrightarrow{g} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\dots} \text{Tr}(g^{-1} n g) \partial_\mu (g^{-1} n g) \partial_\nu (g^{-1} n g) \quad (3.73)$$

$$= 2i \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\dots} [\vec{n} \cdot (\partial_\mu \vec{n} \times \partial_\nu \vec{n}) - 2 \partial_\mu \vec{n} \cdot \partial_\nu (\Lambda \vec{m})]. \quad (3.74)$$

The result is

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} &\xrightarrow{g} \Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} - 2 \Xi_{\mu\nu} [\partial_\mu \Phi^{(d)} \vec{n} \cdot \partial_\nu (\Lambda \vec{m}) + \Phi^{(d)} \partial_\mu \vec{n} \cdot \partial_\nu (\Lambda \vec{m})] \\ &= \Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} - 2 \Xi_{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu [\Phi^{(d)} \vec{n} \cdot \partial_\nu (\Lambda \vec{m})], \end{aligned} \quad (3.75)$$

and since $\Xi_{\mu\nu}$ is by definition (3.62) antisymmetric in $\mu\nu$,

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} \xrightarrow{g} \Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d)} - 2 \partial_\mu [\Xi_{\mu\nu} \Phi^{(d)} \vec{n} \cdot \partial_\nu (\Lambda \vec{m})], \quad (3.76)$$

i.e., that the SCS density is gauge invariant up to a total divergence term like the usual Chern-Simons density which is shown in Subsection **2.1.1**

4 Type_{II} SCS in $d = 3$ dimensions

Type_{II} SCS terms are the germane analogues of the Chern-Simons (CS) densities, in that unlike Type_I SCS they feature both the gauge curvature $F_{\mu\nu}$ and the gauge connection A_μ . Unlike their Type_I counterparts however, the construction of Type_{II} SCS densities does not lend itself to simple uniform formats in all dimensions d , and, they are defined only for non-Abelian gauge groups. Indeed, in [8], which is our source for SCS densities, the only example given is that of the $SO(4)$ gauged SCS in $d = 3$ dimensions.

What was not presented in Ref. [8] is a Type_{II} SCS in $d = 3$, pertaining to gauging with a subgroup⁸ of $SO(4)$. Below in **Section 4.1** is presented the Type_{II} $SO(4)$ SCS in $d = 3$, and the Type_{II} $SO(2) \times SO(2)$ SCS in $d = 3$ **Section 4.2**.

4.1 $SO(4)$ gauged Type_{II} SCS in $d = 3$

This example is given in [8] but it is repeated here, to make the presentation of the $SO(2) \times SO(2)$ SCS in **Section 4.2** self-contained. The gauge transformation property of the Type_{II} $SO(4)$ SCS is not carried out here, since that analysis is very cumbersome.

The covariant derivative of the $O(5)$ Skyrme scalar (ϕ^a, ϕ^5) , $a = 1, 2, 3, 4$ is

$$D_i \phi^a = \partial_i \phi^a + A_i^{ab} \phi^b, \quad a = 1, 2, 3, 4 \quad (4.77)$$

$$D_i \phi^5 = \partial_i \phi^5. \quad (4.78)$$

To define the SCS density, what is needed are the definitions of $\omega^{(3+1)}$ and $\Omega^{(3+1)}$ in (2.27), from which follows the definition of the SCS density by (2.20). The quantity $\hat{\Omega}^{(3+1)}$ in (2.27) in this case is,

$$\hat{\Omega}_i^{(3+1)} = \omega_i^{(3+1)} + \Omega_i^{(3+1)},$$

where the quantity $\Omega_i^{(3+1)}$ in $3 + 1$ dimensions, appearing in [8, 12, 7], is

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_i^{(3+1)} = 3! \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{abcd} \phi^5 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} F_{kl}^{cd} \phi^a D_j \phi^b + \partial_j \left[A_l^{ab} \phi^c \left(\partial_k \phi^d + \frac{1}{2} A_k \phi^d \right) \right] + \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3} (\phi^5)^2 \right) A_l^{ab} \left[\partial_j A_k^{cd} + \frac{2}{3} (A_j A_k)^{cd} \right] \right\}, \quad (4.79) \end{aligned}$$

from which follows by the one-step descent, the quantity $\Omega^{(3)}$ in (2.30)

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{(3)} = 3! \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} \varepsilon^{abcd} \phi^5 \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu}^{cd} \phi^a D_\lambda \phi^b + \partial_\mu \left[A_\lambda^{ab} \phi^c \left(\partial_\nu \phi^d + \frac{1}{2} A_\nu \phi^d \right) \right] + \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3} (\phi^5)^2 \right) A_\lambda^{ab} \left[\partial_\mu A_\nu^{cd} + \frac{2}{3} (A_\mu A_\nu)^{cd} \right] \right\}. \quad (4.80) \end{aligned}$$

This density is clearly *gauge variant*, seen for example from the term multiplying $(1 - \frac{1}{3}(\phi^5)^2)$ in the second line, which is the (Euler, rather than the Pontryagin) Chern-Simons density for the $SO(4)$ gauge field in $d = 3$.

⁸Clearly this does not include the group contraction $SO(4) \rightarrow SO(3)$, since that results in the Type_I SCS analysed in **Section 3.2** above, for $d = 3$.

To evaluate the term $\omega^{(3)}$ in (2.30) however, it is necessary to employ the constraint compliant parametrisation

$$\phi^a = \sin f n^a, \quad \phi^5 = \cos f, \quad |n^a|^2 = 1 \quad (4.81)$$

of the Skyrme scalar (ϕ^a, ϕ^5) .

To this end, one evaluates ϱ_0 in (2.25) defined by (2.21), yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_0 &= -4 \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{abcd} \partial_i \left(\phi^5 - \frac{1}{3} (\phi^5)^3 \right) \cdot n^a \partial_j n^b \partial_k n^c \partial_l n^d \\ &= -4 \varepsilon_{ijkl} \varepsilon^{abcd} \partial_i \left[\left(\phi^5 - \frac{1}{3} (\phi^5)^3 \right) n^a \partial_j n^b \partial_k n^c \partial_l n^d \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \partial_i \omega_i^{(3+1)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.82)$$

whence we have

$$\omega^{(3)} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \omega_{i=4}^{(3+1)} = 4 \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} \varepsilon^{abcd} \left(\phi^5 - \frac{1}{3} (\phi^5)^3 \right) n^a \partial_\mu n^b \partial_\nu n^c \partial_\lambda n^d. \quad (4.83)$$

Adding (4.83) and (4.80)

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(3)} = \omega^{(3)} + \Omega^{(3)} \quad (4.84)$$

for $SO(4)$ gauging.

The WZ term $\omega^{(3)}$ in (4.84) is given in the constraint-compliant parametrisation (4.81), but this is not done for the term $\Omega^{(3)}$ here.

4.2 $SO(2) \times SO(2)$ gauged Type_{II} SCS in $d = 3$

The task is as above the calculation of $\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(3)} = \omega^{(3)} + \Omega^{(3)}$, (2.30). It is useful to start with the calculation of $\Omega^{(3)}$ for this case by subjecting (4.80) to the gauge group contraction

$$SO(4) \rightarrow SO(2) \times SO(2)$$

on the gauge connection $A_\mu^{ab} = (A_\mu^{\alpha\beta}, A_\mu^{AB}, A_\mu^{\alpha A})$

$$A_\mu^{\alpha\beta} = A_\mu \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}, \quad A_\mu^{AB} = B_\mu \varepsilon^{AB}, \quad A_\mu^{\alpha A} = 0, \quad (4.85)$$

where A_μ and B_μ are the connections of the two (distinct) Abelian subgroups of $SO(4)$.

We denote the corresponding components of the Abelian curvature by

$$F_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha\beta} = F_{\mu\nu} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}, \quad F_{\mu\nu}^{AB} = G_{\mu\nu} \varepsilon^{AB}, \quad F_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha A} = 0, \quad (4.86)$$

where

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu \quad \text{and} \quad G_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu$$

in an obvious notation.

The corresponding $SO(4)$ covariant derivatives contract to

$$D_\mu \phi^\alpha = \partial_\mu \phi^\alpha + A_\mu (\varepsilon \phi)^\alpha, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \quad (\varepsilon \phi)^\alpha = \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \phi^\beta \quad (4.87)$$

$$D_\mu \phi^A = \partial_\mu \phi^A + B_\mu (\varepsilon \phi)^A, \quad A = 3, 4, \quad (\varepsilon \phi)^A = \varepsilon^{AB} \phi^B \quad (4.88)$$

$$D_\mu \phi^5 = \partial_\mu \phi^5. \quad (4.89)$$

Substituting (4.85), (4.86) and (3.39)-(4.89) in (4.80), we obtain $\Omega^{(3)}$ for the gauge group $SO(2) \times SO(2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{(3)} = 3! \varepsilon^{4\mu\nu\lambda} \phi^5 \Big\{ & \frac{1}{3} (\phi^5)^2 (A_\lambda G_{\mu\nu} + B_\lambda F_{\mu\nu}) \\ & - A_\mu B_\nu \partial_\lambda (|\phi^\alpha|^2 - |\phi^A|^2) \\ & - 2 [A_\lambda (\varepsilon \partial_\mu \phi)^A \partial_\nu \phi^A + B_\lambda (\varepsilon \partial_\mu \phi)^\alpha \partial_\nu \phi^\alpha] \Big\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.90)$$

Next, calculate $\omega^{(3)}$ in (2.30) to complete the construction of the SCS density $\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(3)}$. This can be done only after expressing $\varrho_0 = \partial_i \omega_i^{(3+1)}$ in *constraint compliant* parametrisation of the $O(5)$ Skyrme scalar (ϕ^a, ϕ^5) , with $\phi^a = (\phi^\alpha, \phi^A)$, $\alpha = 1, 2$; $A = 3, 4$, which is

$$\phi^\alpha = \sin f \sin g n_{(1)}^\alpha, \quad \phi^A = \sin f \cos g n_{(2)}^A, \quad \phi^5 = \cos f \quad (4.91)$$

$$n_{(1)}^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \psi \\ \sin \psi \end{pmatrix}, \quad n_{(2)}^A = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \chi \\ \sin \chi \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.92)$$

The result is

$$\varrho_0 = -3! \cdot 2 \varepsilon_{ijkl} \left[\partial_i \left(\cos f - \frac{1}{3} \cos^3 f \right) \right] (\partial_j \sin^2 g) \partial_k \psi \partial_l \chi, \quad (4.93)$$

from which one can choose *e.g.*, to extract the partial derivative ∂_i , resulting in $\omega^{(3)} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \omega_{i=4}^{(3+1)}$

$$\omega^{(3)} = -3! \cdot 2 \varepsilon^{4\lambda\mu\nu} \left(\cos f - \frac{1}{3} \cos^3 f \right) (\partial_\lambda \sin^2 g) \partial_\mu \psi \partial_\nu \chi. \quad (4.94)$$

Finally, the SCS density for the gauge group $SO(2) \times SO(2)$

$$\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(3)} = \omega^{(3)} + \Omega^{(3)}.$$

expressed entirely in the parametrisation (4.91)-(4.92), is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{3!} \Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(3)} = \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \Big\{ & -2 \left(\cos f - \frac{1}{3} \cos^3 f \right) (\partial_\lambda \sin^2 g) \partial_\mu \psi \partial_\nu \chi \\ & + \frac{1}{3} \cos^3 f (A_\lambda G_{\mu\nu} + B_\lambda F_{\mu\nu}) \\ & - A_\mu B_\nu \cos f [\partial_\lambda (\sin^2 f \sin^2 g) - \partial_\lambda (\sin^2 f \cos^2 g)] \\ & + 2 [A_\lambda \partial_\mu (\sin^2 f \sin^2 g) \partial_\nu \chi + B_\lambda \partial_\mu (\sin^2 f \cos^2 g) \partial_\nu \psi] \Big\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.95)$$

Setting $B_\mu = 0$ in (4.95) results in the Type_I SCS density (3.47) for $d = 3$.

The action (4.95) is manifestly *gauge variant*. The question is, as a Chern-Simons like density, is it like the latter *gauge invariant up to total divergence*? A straightforward way to test this is to show that the resulting Euler-Lagrange equations are gauge covariant.

The variational equations w.r.t. A_τ *resp.* B_τ are

$$\varepsilon^{\tau\mu\nu} \cos f \left[\frac{1}{3} \cos^2 f G_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\mu (\sin^2 f \cos^2 g) (B_\nu - \partial_\nu \chi) \right] = 0, \quad (4.96)$$

$$\varepsilon^{\tau\mu\nu} \cos f \left[\frac{1}{3} \cos^2 f F_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\mu (\sin^2 f \sin^2 g) (A_\nu - \partial_\nu \psi) \right] = 0, \quad (4.97)$$

and the variational equations w.r.t. ψ *resp.* χ are

$$\varepsilon^{\tau\mu\nu} \left[\frac{1}{2} G_{\mu\nu} \cos f \partial_\tau (\sin^2 f \sin^2 g) + \partial_\mu f \sin^3 f \partial_\tau (\sin^2 g) (B_\nu - \partial_\nu \chi) \right] = 0, \quad (4.98)$$

$$\varepsilon^{\tau\mu\nu} \left[\frac{1}{2} F_{\mu\nu} \cos f \partial_\tau (\sin^2 f \cos^2 g) - \partial_\mu f \sin^3 f \partial_\tau (\cos^2 g) (A_\nu - \partial_\nu \psi) \right] = 0, \quad (4.99)$$

which are manifestly gauge invariant. The variational equations w.r.t. f and g are also gauge invariant but they are too cumbersome to display here.

It may be relevant to comment on the degenerate model resulting from replacing $B_\mu = A_\mu$ in (4.90). That model features only the Abelian field $(A_\mu, F_{\mu\nu})$. The variational equation w.r.t. A_μ will be gauge invariant only if one sets the functions $\psi = \chi$, which is absurd as these angles parametrise the components ϕ^α and ϕ^A of the $O(5)$ Skyrme scalar, which are independent degrees of freedom, *i.e.*, that the submodel of (4.95) with $B_\mu = A_\mu$ leads to *gauge variant* equations of motion.

5 Summary and outlook

In this note, aspects of the Skyrme–Chern-Simons (SCS) densities proposed in Ref. [8] are elaborated on, with the main emphasis being on the *gauge dependance* of the SCS⁹. It is shown that the SCS actions in d spacetime dimensions, as in the case of the usual Chern-Simons (CS) densities, are *gauge invariant up to total divergence* and hence that their Euler-Lagrange equations are *gauge invariant*. The importance of verifying gauge invariance of the equations of any given model is, that in the concrete application of such actions, this is a necessary check of the correctness of the model at hand.

In Section 3, Type_I SCS in d dimensions are presented. In Subsection 3.1 the case with gauge group $SO(2)$, and in 3.2 with gauge group $SO(3)$, respectively. Type_I SCS in d spacetime dimensions, are those gauged with $SO(N)$ with $N < d + 1$, $SO(d + 1)$ being the largest gauge group allowed.

⁹This question does not arise in the case of the Higgs–Chern-Simons (HCS) densities also proposed in [8], since the HCS densities turn out to be *gauge invariant* in even dimensions, and in odd dimensions they consist of a gauge invariant part, plus the usual (Euler) Chern-Simons density.

Concrete analyses are carried out in two examples, $SO(2)$ and $SO(3)$, one Abelian and one non-Abelian. It is found that $SO(2)$ Type_I SCS are explicitly gauge invariant as they stand, and hence the resulting equations of motion are automatically gauge covariant. By contrast, $SO(3)$ Type_I SCS is gauge invariant only up to a total divergence, and hence their equations of motion are gauge invariant as described in Section 2.2.2. (One can surmise that this property for $SO(3)$ holds in all non-Abelian gauge groups as well.) Thus, like the usual CS (in odd dimensions) Type_I SCS (in all dimensions) lead to gauge covariant equations of motion. A distinguishing feature of Type_I SCS is that the density $\Omega^{(d)}$ in (2.30) features only one power of the gauge connection A_μ , and no curvature term $F_{\mu\nu}$. This sets a limitation on the application of Type_I SCS in the context of static fields, since for static fields the term $\omega^{(d)}$ in (2.30) vanishes, while the term $\Omega^{(d)}$ now displays only the temporal component A_0 of the gauge connection. But we know from the results of Refs. [12, 13, 14, 15] that the important new features resulting from Chern-Simons dynamics hinge on the interrelation of the electric and the magnetic fields A_0 and A_i . Of course in odd dimensions, when the usual CS term is present, the Type_I SCS will have a quantitative effect.

In Section 4, Type_{II} SCS in $d = 3$ dimensions are presented. Type_{II} SCS are those gauged with the largest allowed gauge group $SO(d + 1)$ or with some direct product of subgroups of $SO(d + 1)$. In these notes attention is restricted to dimension $d = 3$, thus to the gauge group $SO(4)$ and its subgroup $SO(2) \times SO(2)$. In Subsection 4.1 gauge group $SO(4)$ is considered, and in Subsection 4.2 gauge group $SO(2) \times SO(2)$ is analysed concretely.

Type_{II} SCS feature both connection and curvature ($A_\mu, F_{\mu\nu}$) so that in the static limit both electric and magnetic fields (A_0, A_i) will persist. This is the important aspect distinguishing Type_{II} SCS from Type_I. It is the Type_{II} SCS that promise to reproduce the special effects of Chern-Simons dynamics observed in Refs. [12, 13, 14, 15] in odd dimensions. In this sense, it is the Type_{II} SCS that are the germane extensions of the usual Chern-Simons densities, with the added all important feature that they are defined in both odd and even dimensions.

In the absence of a Chern-Simons action in even dimensional spacetime, the SCS action which is defined in all dimensions is potentially important. Of special importance is the physical Minkowskian $3 + 1$ dimensional theory. In that case such an action is also the “anomaly related density” appearing in Ref. [16] for the $U(1)$ gauged Skyrme theory. Specifically, the latter is akin to the SCS_{II} in that it displays both the $SO(2)$ connection A_μ and the curvature $F_{\mu\nu}$. A significant difference between the SCS action $\Omega_{SCS}^{(d=4)}$ defined by (2.29)-(2.30) proposed here, and the “anomaly related term” appearing in [16], is that in the latter the Skyrme scalar employed in its construction is the $O(4)$ sigma model field that supports the (topologically stable) Skyrmion, while by contrast the Skyrme scalar employed in the construction of the SCS $\Omega_{SCS}^{(d=4)}$ is the $O(6)$ sigma model field which in $3 + 1$ dimensions does not support a soliton¹⁰.

Generally, the SCS can be employed to investigate the effects of Chern-Simons-like dynamics in both even and odd dimensions. In this context, the case of $3 + 1$ dimensions is special¹¹ since in that case the “anomaly related term” of [16] is also a candidate for this role. Moreover, the latter is defined in terms of the $O(4)$ Skyrme scalar unlike its SCS counterpart that is defined in

¹⁰This is simply because the SCS in $3 + 1$ dimensions is descended, much in the same spirit proposed earlier in Ref. [22], from a SCP density in 5 dimensions which is defined in terms of the $O(6)$ sigma model scalar.

¹¹The action in [16] follows from the results derived in Ref. [22], which is specific to 4 dimensions. We are not aware of higher dimensional versions of this result in the literature.

terms of the $O(6)$ Skyrme scalar.

It would be interesting to compare the potential roles of the Chern-Simons-like densities in [16] and the SCS action $\Omega_{\text{SCS}}^{(d=4)}$ proposed here. In both cases the topologically stable Skyrmion stabilised by the baryon number is deformed first by the Abelian gauge field, after which the respective Chern-Simons-like action further influences the dynamics. In the first [16] case no new (scalar) field is involved while in the second [8] case the $O(6)$ Skyrme scalar enters.

The largest group with which the $O(6)$ scalar can be can be gauged is $SO(5)$. The $O(4)$ Skyrme scalar describing the usual $SO(2)$ gauged Skyrmion, can interact with the $O(6)$ Skyrme scalar describing the SCS density only through the $SO(2)$ gauge field. Thus the $O(6)$ scalar must be gauged with the subgroup $SO(2 \times SO(3))$ of $SO(5)$, in which the $SO(3)$ gauge sector can play the role of an “auxiliary gauge field”¹². Concrete investigations of gauged Skyrmions influenced by SCS dynamics are under active consideration at present.

Acknowledgements My thanks for invaluable support go to Valery Rubakov. I am grateful to Francisco Navarro-Lerida (F. N.L) and Eugen Radu for their past collaboration in this area. Thanks to E.R. for help in preparing this report, and to F. N.L. for raising the question which instigated the analysis carried out here. My thanks go to the Referee of J. Phys. A, for generous and constructive comments and suggestions.

¹²There is also the academic possibility of starting with the $SO(3)$ gauged $O(4)$ Skyrme model given in Ref. [23] which is also endowed with an “energy lower bound”. This $SO(3)$ gauged Skyrmion is then deformed further by the $SO(3 \times SO(2))$ gauged SCS action, so that the $O(4)$ and $O(6)$ scalars see each other via the $SO(3)$ gage field. In this case it is the $SO(2)$ field which plays the role of “auxiliary gauge field”.

References

- [1] S. K. Paul and A. Khare, “Charged Vortices in Abelian Higgs Model with Chern-Simons Term,” Phys. Lett. B **174** (1986) 420 [Erratum-ibid. **177B** (1986) 453].
- [2] J. Hong, Y. Kim and P. Y. Pac, “On the Multivortex Solutions of the Abelian Chern-Simons-higgs Theory,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 2230;
- [3] R. Jackiw and E. J. Weinberg, “Selfdual Chern-simons Vortices,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 2234.
- [4] P. K. Ghosh and S. K. Ghosh, “Topological and nontopological solitons in a gauged $O(3)$ sigma model with Chern-Simons term,” Phys. Lett. B **366** (1996) 199 [hep-th/9507015];
- [5] K. Kimm, K. -M. Lee and T. Lee, “Anyonic Bogomolnyi solitons in a gauged $O(3)$ sigma model,” Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 4436 [hep-th/9510141];
- [6] K. Arthur, D. H. Tchrakian and Y. -s. Yang, Topological and nontopological selfdual Chern-Simons solitons in a gauged $O(3)$ sigma model,” Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 5245.
- [7] F. Navarro-Lerida, E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, “ $SO(2)$ gauged Skyrmons in $4 + 1$ dimensions,” Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.12, 125014 [arXiv:2003.05899 [hep-th]].
- [8] D. H. Tchrakian, “Higgs-and Skyrme–Chern–Simons densities in all dimensions,” J. Phys. A **48** (2015) no.37, 375401 [arXiv:1505.05344 [hep-th]].
- [9] B. J. Schroers, “Bogomolny solitons in a gauged $O(3)$ sigma model,” Phys. Lett. B **356** (1995) 291 [hep-th/9506004].
- [10] D. H. Tchrakian, “Topologically stable lumps in $SO(d)$ gauged $O(d+1)$ sigma models in d dimensions: $d = 2,3,4$,” Lett. Math. Phys. **40** (1997), 191-201
- [11] D. H. Tchrakian, “*Winding number versus Chern-Pontryagin charge*,” [arXiv:hep-th/0204040 [hep-th]].
- [12] F. Navarro-Lerida, E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, “Effect of Chern-Simons dynamics on the energy of electrically charged and spinning vortices,” Phys. Rev. D **95** (2017) no.8, 085016 [arXiv:1612.05835 [hep-th]].
- [13] F. Navarro-Lerida and D. H. Tchrakian, “Vortices of $SO(2)$ gauged Skyrmons in $2 + 1$ dimensions,” Phys. Rev. D **99** (2019) no.4, 045007 [arXiv:1812.03147 [hep-th]].
- [14] F. Navarro-Lerida, E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, “On the topological charge of $SO(2)$ gauged Skyrmons in $2 + 1$ and $3 + 1$ dimensions,” Phys. Lett. B **791** (2019), 287-292 [arXiv:1811.09535 [hep-th]].
- [15] F. Navarro-Lerida, E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, “On the effects of the Chern-Simons term in an Abelian gauged Skyrme model in $d = 4 + 1$ dimensions,” Phys. Lett. B **814** (2021), 136083 [arXiv:2010.04093 [hep-th]].
- [16] C. G. Callan, Jr. and E. Witten, “Monopole Catalysis of Skyrmon Decay,” Nucl. Phys. B **239** (1984), 161-176

- [17] T. Tchrakian, “Notes on Yang-Mills–Higgs monopoles and dyons on R^D , and Chern-Simons–Higgs solitons on R^{D-2} : Dimensional reduction of Chern-Pontryagin densities,” J. Phys. A **44** (2011), 343001 [arXiv:1009.3790 [hep-th]].
- [18] V. A. Rubakov and A. N. Tavkhelidze, “Stable anomalous states of superdense matter in gauge theories,” Phys. Lett. B **165** (1985) 109.
- [19] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48** (1982) 975.
- [20] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, “Topologically massive gauge theories,” Annals Phys. **140** (1982) 372 [Erratum-ibid. **185** (1988) 406] [Annals Phys. **185** (1988) 406] [Annals Phys. **281** (2000) 409].
- [21] Y. Brihaye, E. Radu and D. H. Tchrakian, “AdS5 solutions in Einstein–Yang-Mills–Chern-Simons theory,” Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 064005 [arXiv:0911.0153 [hep-th]].
- [22] E. Witten, “Global Aspects of Current Algebra,” Nucl. Phys. B **223** (1983), 422-432 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(83)90063-9
- [23] K. Arthur and D. H. Tchrakian, Phys. Lett. B **378** (1996), 187-193 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(96)00343-7 [arXiv:hep-th/9601053 [hep-th]].