

# $U(1)_A$ axial anomaly, $\eta'$ , and topological susceptibility in the holographic soft-wall model

Floriana Giannuzzi\*<sup>1</sup> and Stefano Nicotri<sup>†1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*INFN – Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare – Sezione di Bari  
Via Orabona 4, 70125, Bari, Italy*

## Abstract

The singlet pseudoscalar sector of light mesons is investigated in the soft-wall model, a bottom-up approach to the AdS/QCD correspondence. The  $\eta'$  mass results from the mixing among the fields dual to the axial current, pseudoscalar current and the  $G\tilde{G}$  operator. The topological susceptibility is computed for any quark mass, and the Witten-Veneziano relation is obtained in the large  $N_c$  limit.

## 1 Introduction

In QCD the absence of a singlet pseudo-Goldstone boson is the well known  $U(1)_A$  problem. If the  $U(1)_A$  symmetry were spontaneously broken, a very light isosinglet pseudoscalar Goldstone boson would be generated, with a mass  $\sim \sqrt{3}m_\pi$  according to chiral perturbation theory [1]. However, although there is no conserved  $U(1)_A$  quantum number, an extra Goldstone boson is missing: the mass of the  $\eta'$  meson, the candidate for such a state, is 958 MeV [2], significantly higher than the predicted value.  $U(1)_A$  is anomalous, and the nonconservation of the singlet axial current in the chiral limit is expressed by the anomaly equation:

$$\partial_\mu J_5^\mu = i \sqrt{2n_f} \frac{\alpha_s}{8\pi} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu} \quad (1)$$

where  $n_f$  is the number of flavours,  $G_{\mu\nu}$  is the gluon field strength and  $\tilde{G}^{\mu\nu} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} G_{\alpha\beta}/2$ . In the past there have been some discussions on the way the Goldstone boson receives a mass as a result of the anomaly. 't Hooft proposed that the violation of  $U(1)_A$  is realized by instanton configurations that explicitly break the symmetry and contribute to the  $\eta'$  mass [3][4]. Different hypotheses were also put forward. In some quark models the high mass of the singlet state is caused by the possibility of annihilating into gluons [5][6]. Witten [7] and Veneziano [8] pointed out that the problem should be studied by the  $1/N_c$  expansion, and in this limit they found a relation between the  $\eta'$  mass and the pure-gauge topological susceptibility:

$$\chi_{PG} = \frac{f_\pi^2 m_{\eta'}^2}{2n_f} \quad (2)$$

---

\*floriana.giannuzzi@ba.infn.it

†nicotri@infn.it

where  $f_\pi$  is the pion decay constant (normalized such that  $f_\pi \sim 92$  MeV). Including finite quark mass, the relation becomes  $\chi = \frac{f_\pi^2}{2n_f}(m_{\eta'}^2 + m_\eta^2 - 2m_K^2)$  [8]. Witten's argument is that the singlet and octet states are degenerate in the large  $N_c$  limit, while a mass difference is produced by quark-antiquark annihilation diagrams at  $\mathcal{O}(1/N_c)$ .

The  $\eta'$  mass has been computed with chiral effective Lagrangians by including an effective term that contains the topological charge density [9][10][11]. In [12] a purely gluonic current has been studied with QCD sum rules and the mass and the residue of the lowest-lying resonance have been computed, claiming that in the  $\eta'$  wave function both quark and gluon components are present. Other QCD sum rules studies include [13][14]. The  $\eta'$  mass and decay constant have been computed in lattice QCD, see, *e.g.*, [15] and references therein.

In the last years there were studies dealing with the  $\eta'$  problem using the gauge/gravity duality. In the AdS/CFT correspondence a 4-dimensional gauge theory can be mapped to a gravity theory in the  $AdS_5 \times S_5$  space, such that gauge-invariant operators are described by proper higher-dimensional fields. Conformal symmetry requires that the mass of a field is fixed by the conformal dimension of the dual operator, and so it forces a vector field dual to a dimension-3 current to be a massless field. Hence, a global symmetry in the 4-dimensional theory becomes a gauge symmetry on the gravity side. However, since the QCD axial singlet current is not conserved, we expect that its dual field, *i.e.* the singlet axial-vector field, gets a mass. In [16] the anomalous  $U(1)$  symmetry becomes a spontaneously broken symmetry in supergravity, and the gauge field acquires a mass through the Higgs mechanism. In particular, a mass term for the gauge field dual to the  $U(1)_R$  current is generated by a 2-form in the gravity theory which is not invariant under  $U(1)_R$ . On these bases, studies of the  $U(1)_A$  problem in top-down [17][18][19] and bottom-up models [20][21][22][23] have been proposed. In [24] an axion field has been introduced in order to renormalize the anomalous conductivities, playing the role of the 2-form. In [25] anomaly related transport phenomena in the presence of a magnetic field are studied with a massive vector field dual to a nonconserved current. The mass term for the dimension-three vector field has been included by a gauge-invariant Stückelberg action. In [23] a bottom-up model is used to compute the topological susceptibility and the mass of the singlet pseudoscalar meson in the Veneziano large- $N_c$  limit. In this model the QCD  $\theta$  parameter is the source of a Ramond-Ramond (RR) bulk field, and the  $\eta'$  mass emerges by the Stückelberg mechanism [26]. The model has been used in [27] for studying glueball spectra.

This issue has not been approached in the soft-wall model [28]. Following [23] and [24], we investigate the pseudoscalar singlet sector in the soft-wall model, and compute the topological susceptibility in pure gauge and for finite quark masses, and the  $\eta'$  mass. A field dual to the  $G\tilde{G}$  operator is introduced, and its mixing with the fields dual to the  $\bar{q}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5q$  and  $\bar{q}\gamma_5q$  currents is obtained by requiring  $U(1)_A$  invariance of the Lagrangian for specific transformation rules. In this scheme, the  $\eta'$  results from coupled equations of motion containing the three  $0^{-+}$  isosinglet fields, such that its mass is increased with respect to the  $\eta$  mass by a gluonic contribution. We also show that the anomaly equation naturally arises. No mixing between  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$  has been considered. The dependence of the topological susceptibility on the quark mass is compared with lattice data and with the phenomenological prediction proposed in [29][30], and the known asymptotic behaviours are reproduced.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 the soft-wall model for chiral-symmetry breaking is reviewed, and a scalar field  $Y(x, z)$  containing the field dual to the QCD  $G\tilde{G}$  operator is introduced, contributing to the description of the singlet pseudoscalar sector. In Section 3 the model is studied in the pure-gauge limit, in which only pseudoscalar glueballs are present, and the parameters introduced through the  $Y(x, z)$  field are fixed by the coefficient of the glueball two-point function at high momentum and by the topological susceptibility. In Section 4 nonsinglet

pseudoscalar meson masses are computed, and all the remaining parameters are fixed by the pion mass, the  $\eta$  mass, and the pion decay constant. In Section 5 the holographic version of the anomaly equation is found, reproducing the relation among the involved one-point functions in QCD; the  $\eta'$  mass is also obtained, in agreement with the experimental one. In the last Section the topological susceptibility is computed for different values of the quark mass, and the Witten-Veneziano relation is found at order  $1/N_c$  in the large  $N_c$  limit.

## 2 Model

We consider the Lagrangian introduced in [28] to study chiral symmetry breaking in a bottom-up AdS/QCD model. The 5d AdS space is characterized by the metric:

$$ds^2 = \frac{R^2}{z^2}(dt^2 - d\vec{x}^2 - dz^2), \quad (3)$$

with  $R$  the AdS curvature radius and  $z \geq 0$  the additional bulk coordinate;  $z = 0$  corresponds to the AdS boundary. We use Greek letters for Minkowski ( $4d$ ) indices, and capital letters for AdS ( $5d$ ) indices. According to the AdS/CFT correspondence, the global  $U(n_f)_L \times U(n_f)_R$  symmetry of QCD is promoted to a gauge invariance of the Lagrangian of the 5d gravity theory under  $U(n_f)_L \times U(n_f)_R$ . The 5d fields dual to the left and right currents  $\bar{q}_{L/R}\gamma^\mu T^A q_{L/R}$  are the  $p$ -forms  $A_L(x, z)$  and  $A_R(x, z)$  having  $p = 1$  and a zero 5d mass, as it results using the relation  $m_5^2 R^2 = (\Delta - p)(\Delta + p - 4)$ , where  $\Delta$  is the conformal dimension of the 4d operator. Such massless fields, dual to conserved currents, are the gauge fields of the model.  $T^A$ , with  $A = 0, \dots, n_f^2 - 1$ , are the generators of  $U(n_f)$ , with  $T^0 = \frac{1}{2n_f} I_{n_f}$  and  $\text{Tr}(T^a T^b) = \delta^{ab}/2$  for  $a, b = 1, \dots, n_f^2 - 1$ .

The left and right gauge fields are expressed as  $A_L^M(x, z) = A_L^{M,A}(x, z)T^A$ . Vector and axial-vector fields are defined by  $V = (A_L + A_R)/2$  and  $A = (A_L - A_R)/2$ , respectively. The  $\bar{q}_R q_L$  operator is dual to the 5d tachyon field  $X(x, z) = e^{i\eta^A(x,z)T^A} X_0(z) e^{i\eta^A(x,z)T^A}$ ,  $\eta^A$  describing the nine pseudoscalar mesons. We work with  $n_f = 3$  quarks, so the expectation value of  $X(x, z)$  is proportional to the identity matrix:  $X_0(z) = \sqrt{2}v_q(z) I_{n_f}$ . The covariant derivative acts on  $X(x, z)$  as:

$$D_M X = \partial_M X + i[X, V_M] - i\{X, A_M\}. \quad (4)$$

We choose the gauge  $A_5 = 0$  and split the four components  $A_\mu$  of the axial field in a transverse ( $A_\perp$ ) and a longitudinal part ( $\varphi$ ):  $A_\mu^A = A_\perp^A + \partial_\mu \varphi^A$ .

To study  $U(1)_A$ , we also include a field  $a(x, z)$  dual to the QCD operator  $Q = \frac{1}{8\pi} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu}$ .  $Q$  appears in the QCD Lagrangian through the term  $\frac{\theta}{16\pi^2} \text{Tr}(G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}^{\mu\nu})$ , with  $\theta$  a parameter. Therefore, we introduce the scalar field  $Y(x, z) = Y_0(z) e^{2ia(x,z)}$ , where  $Y_0(z)$  is the expectation value and  $a(x, z)$  is dual to the operator  $Q$  and is sourced by  $\theta$ . In top-down approaches the gluon contribution to the  $U(1)_R$  anomaly has been discussed in [16], showing that the anomaly arises because the Ramond-Ramond (RR) 2-form  $C_2$  is not invariant under the  $U(1)$  symmetry. Such idea has been reproduced in a bottom-up approach [26], where the coupling of RR form fields with the tachyon  $X$  and the axial gauge field  $A_M$  has been obtained from the Wess-Zumino action. The result involving the axion  $a$ , *i.e.* the field sourced by  $\theta$  that couples to  $G \wedge G$  on the boundary, is gauge invariant if the following transformations of the 5d fields under  $U(1)_A$

are assumed:

$$\eta^0 \rightarrow \eta^0 - \alpha \quad (5)$$

$$\varphi^0 \rightarrow \varphi^0 - \alpha \quad (6)$$

$$a \rightarrow a - V_a \alpha. \quad (7)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the gauge parameter, and  $V_a(z)$  is a potential term depending on the tachyon vev  $v_q(z)$ , such that  $V_a \rightarrow 1$  as  $z \rightarrow 0$  and  $V_a \rightarrow 0$  for  $v_q(z) \rightarrow \infty$ . This guarantees that the transformation of the  $a(x, z)$  field becomes a shift of the  $\theta$  parameter on the boundary, which is the same result of an axial rotation in QCD. We also assume that the field  $a(x, z)$  appearing in the scalar field  $Y(x, z)$  transforms as in (7) under  $U(1)_A$ . This can be understood in a phenomenological construction noticing that  $a(x, z)$  is a field comprising a term invariant under  $U(1)_A$  ( $a_P(x, z)$ ) plus a contribution proportional to the potential  $V_a(z)$  that vanishes in pure gauge:  $a(x, z) = a_P(x, z) + V_a(z)a_f(x, z)$ , with  $a_f$  transforming under  $U(1)_A$  as  $a_f \rightarrow a_f - \alpha$ . In the model without  $V_a$  the topological susceptibility is not affected by the quark mass, although it is still possible to get the mass of the  $\eta'$  by a proper set of parameters.

Assuming the transformation rule (7), a kinetic term  $|\partial(Y_0 e^{2ia})|^2$  would spoil gauge invariance of the Lagrangian. We then write the kinetic term in a gauge-invariant way as in the Wess-Zumino action [26]:

$$\mathcal{K}_a = |\partial_M Y_0(z) + 2iY_0(\partial_M a(x, z) - \eta^0(x, z)\partial_M V_a(z) - A_M^0(x, z)V_a(z))|^2. \quad (8)$$

The full Lagrangian then reads:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{k}\sqrt{g}e^{-\phi} \left[ \text{Tr} \left\{ -\frac{1}{4g_5^2}(F_L^2 + F_R^2) + |DX|^2 - m_X^2|X|^2 \right\} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{K}_a \right]. \quad (9)$$

$\phi = c^2 z^2$  is the background dilaton field, with  $c$  a mass parameter, introduced in the soft-wall model to break conformal invariance. The quadratic dependence of the dilaton has been chosen in order to get linear Regge trajectories in meson spectra [28]. From the relation between the  $5d$  field mass and the conformal dimension  $\Delta$  of the operator, the mass of the field  $X(x, z)$  is  $m_X^2 = -3R^2$ . The model with Lagrangian given by Eqs. (8) and (9) describes two simultaneous mechanisms giving mass to the axial singlet field: a Higgs mechanism in the flavour sector and a Stückelberg mechanism in the gluon sector.

With these definitions, the Lagrangian (9) for pseudoscalar fields, up to quadratic order in fields  $\varphi, \eta, a$ , becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \frac{R}{k}e^{-\phi} \left[ \frac{1}{4n_f g_5^2 z} (\partial_z \partial_\nu \varphi^0)^2 + \frac{1}{2g_5^2 z} (\partial_z \partial^\nu \varphi^8)^2 + \right. \\ & - \frac{2R^2 v_q^2}{n_f z^3} (\partial_z \eta^0)^2 + \frac{2R^2 v_q^2}{n_f z^3} (\partial_\nu \eta^0 - \partial_\nu \varphi^0)^2 - \frac{4R^2 v_q^2}{z^3} (\partial_z \eta^8)^2 + \frac{4R^2 v_q^2}{z^3} (\partial_\nu \eta^8 - \partial_\nu \varphi^8)^2 + \\ & \left. - \frac{2R^2}{z^3} Y_0^2 (\partial_z a - \eta^0 \partial_z V_a)^2 + \frac{2R^2}{z^3} Y_0^2 (\partial_\nu a - V_a \partial_\nu \varphi^0)^2 \right]. \quad (10) \end{aligned}$$

$R/k = N_c/16\pi^2$  and  $g_5^2 = 3/4$  are fixed from scalar meson and vector meson two-point functions [31].  $\varphi^8$  and  $\varphi^0$  are the longitudinal component of the  $A^8$  and  $A^0$  axial-vector fields, respectively;  $\eta^8$  describes the  $\eta_8$  mesons, belonging to the octet representation of  $SU(3)$ ,  $\eta^0$  describes the singlet states. We are not considering the mixing between  $\eta_8$  and  $\eta_0$ , so we identify  $\eta_8$  with the  $\eta$  and  $\eta_0$  with the  $\eta'$ . We use

$$v_q(z) = \frac{m_q}{R}z + \frac{\sigma}{R}z^3 \quad (11)$$

as in the hard-wall model [32]. This solution for  $v_q(z)$  cannot be obtained from the equation of motion coming from the Lagrangian (9), and a potential term must be added to get such a result. We assume (11) without seeking which potential can give such a dependence in the soft-wall model. As we shall see,  $v_q(z)$  in (11) is able to describe an explicit breaking of  $SU(3)_A$  symmetry by the quark mass  $m_q$ , which produces a finite mass for pseudo-Goldstone bosons, and a spontaneous symmetry breaking through the quantity  $\sigma$ , proportional to the quark condensate. Such a relation can be obtained by deriving the on-shell action with respect to  $m_q$ , getting  $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle = -\frac{N_c}{2\pi^2}\sigma$ . As in [23] we use

$$V_a(z) = e^{-v_q(z)^2}, \quad (12)$$

having the requested behaviour in the  $z \rightarrow 0$  limit. We also use

$$Y_0(z) = \frac{y_0}{R} + \frac{2y_1}{Rc^4}(e^{c^2z^2}(-1 + c^2z^2) + 1), \quad (13)$$

with asymptotic behaviour

$$Y_0(z) \xrightarrow{z \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{R} (y_0 + y_1 z^4 + \dots). \quad (14)$$

This is the solution to the equation of motion coming from the Lagrangian term  $\mathcal{L}_y = -\frac{R^3 e^{-c^2z^2}}{2kz^3} Y_0'(z)^2$ , which is included in (9).

### 3 Pure gauge

The starting point to understand pseudoscalar glueball and meson mixing in the soft-wall is the theory with no quarks. In this case the Lagrangian reads:

$$\mathcal{S}_{PG} = \frac{R}{k} \int d^5x e^{-\phi} \left[ -\frac{2R^2}{z^3} Y_0^2 (\partial_z a_P)^2 + \frac{2R^2}{z^3} Y_0^2 (\partial_\mu a_P)^2 \right]. \quad (15)$$

Pseudoscalar glueballs have been also studied in AdS/QCD frameworks by a different choice of the  $5d$  field [33][34]. The solution to the equation of motion obtained from Eq. (15) with boundary condition  $\tilde{a}_P(0) = 1^1$  and giving a finite action ( $\tilde{a}_P \xrightarrow{z \rightarrow \infty} 0$ ) is:

$$\tilde{a}_P(z) = \frac{y_0}{Y_0(z)} \Gamma \left( 2 - \frac{q^2}{4c^2} \right) U \left( -\frac{q^2}{4c^2}, -1, c^2 z^2 \right). \quad (16)$$

where  $U$  is the Tricomi confluent hypergeometric function, and  $\Gamma$  is the Riemann Gamma function. The eigenvalues are  $m_n^2 = 4c^2(n+2)$ , therefore in this model pseudoscalar glueballs are degenerate with scalar glueballs [35]. Using  $c = 388$  MeV, as obtained by fitting the  $\rho$  meson mass [28], the lightest state has mass  $m_{G_{\tilde{0}}}$  = 1.1 GeV.

The two-point correlation function is obtained in holographic framework by deriving twice the on-shell action with respect to the sources of the operator under consideration. For pseudoscalar glueballs it is given by:

$$\Pi_{aa}(q^2) = \frac{R}{k} \frac{4Y_0^2(z)e^{-c^2z^2}}{z^3} \tilde{a}'_P(z) \tilde{a}_P(z) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}. \quad (17)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>the tilde is used here according to the notation adopted in the following sections to indicate bulk-to-boundary propagators

The poles of the two-point function are located at  $q^2 = m_n^2$ , and the residues are  $R_n = \frac{R}{k} 32c^6 y_0^2 (n+1)(n+2)$ . From the relation  $R_n = m_n^4 f_n^2$  [36], we get the decay constants  $f_n^2 = \frac{R}{k} 2c^2 y_0^2 \frac{(n+1)}{(n+2)}$ .

The high- $Q^2$  expansion ( $Q^2 = -q^2$ ) of the two-point function of pseudoscalar glueball operator in QCD is [36]:

$$\Pi_{QCD}(Q^2) = - \left( \frac{\alpha_s}{8\pi} \right)^2 Q^4 \left( \frac{2}{\pi^2} \log Q^2 + \mathcal{O}(Q^{-4}) \right). \quad (18)$$

Likewise, the two-point function in Eq. (17) in the limit  $Q^2 = -q^2 \rightarrow \infty$  is:

$$\Pi_{aa}(Q^2) = Q^4 \left( -\frac{N_c}{32\pi^2} y_0^2 \log Q^2 + \mathcal{O}(1) \right). \quad (19)$$

Matching the two expressions at leading order we find

$$y_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_c}} \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}. \quad (20)$$

The last relation shows that the  $Y$  field appears in the full Lagrangian at a lower order ( $\mathcal{O}(1/N_c)$ ) in the large  $N_c$  expansion with respect to the other fields, as expected [37]. It is then convenient to emphasize the  $1/N_c$  factor redefining

$$\hat{Y}_0(z) = \sqrt{N_c} Y_0(z) = \frac{\hat{y}_0}{R} + \frac{2y_1}{Rc^4} (e^{c^2 z^2} (-1 + c^2 z^2) + 1) \quad (21)$$

where  $\hat{y}_0 = \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}$ . Using  $\hat{y}_0 = \frac{1}{\pi}$ , we find for the ground state  $f_{G\tilde{G},0} = 9.8$  MeV.

Considering the candidates for these states, the pseudoscalar  $\eta(1405)$  has some features that can indicate a glueball component [38], *i.e.* it has not been produced in  $\gamma\gamma$ , it has large branching ratios in  $J/\psi$  decays and has not been seen to decay to  $\gamma\gamma$ . Some models support the hypothesis of  $\eta(1405)$  being a glueball, while lattice QCD and QCD sum rules predict masses larger than 2 GeV [14][36][39][40][41]. In [42] an argument supporting a degeneracy between scalar and pseudoscalar glueballs has been put forward. In the present model, if the mass scale  $c$  appearing in the dilaton is fixed from the  $\rho$  mass, low masses for pseudoscalar glueballs are found, and the nearest state to  $\eta(1405)$  is the first radial excitation, with  $m_{G\tilde{G},1} = 1.34$  GeV.

The topological susceptibility is the second derivative of the vacuum energy with respect to  $\theta$  at  $\theta = 0$ . It is different from zero both in pure gauge and in the theory with physical quarks, while it vanishes if there is at least a massless quark, so in this case the theory has no  $\theta$  dependence. In the AdS/QCD model its definition becomes [20]:

$$\chi_t = - \lim_{q^2 \rightarrow 0} \Pi_{aa}(q^2). \quad (22)$$

Using Eqs. (16) and (17) for  $q^2 = 0$ , in pure gauge we find

$$\chi_{PG} = \frac{1}{\pi^2} \hat{y}_0 y_1 = \frac{1}{\pi^2} \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} y_1. \quad (23)$$

From the Witten-Veneziano relation in (2), we obtain  $\chi_{PG} \sim (191 \text{ MeV})^4$ , a value confirmed by independent analyses [43][44][45][46]. In this model it corresponds to  $\hat{y}_0 = 1/\pi$  and  $y_1 = 0.041 \text{ GeV}^4$ . For the slope of the topological susceptibility at zero momentum, connected to the spin content of the proton [47], we find:

$$\chi'_{PG} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} c^2 \hat{y}_0^2 (1 - \gamma_E + \log \nu^2/c^2), \quad (24)$$

where  $\nu$  is the renormalization scale; for  $\nu = 1$  GeV, corresponding to subtracting only the  $\log \nu^2$  term, we have  $\sqrt{\chi'_{PG}} = 0.021$  GeV.

## 4 Nonsinglet pseudoscalar mesons

Let us now consider the pseudoscalar meson octet. The equations of motion for  $\varphi^8$  and  $\eta^8$  can be obtained from the Lagrangian (10):

$$\partial_z \left( \frac{v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{z^3} \partial_z \eta^8 \right) + q^2 \frac{v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{z^3} (\eta^8 - \varphi^8) = 0 \quad (25)$$

$$\partial_z \left( \frac{e^{-\phi}}{g_5^2 z} \partial_z \varphi^8 \right) + \frac{8v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{z^3} (\eta^8 - \varphi^8) = 0. \quad (26)$$

Combining the two equations, the following relation can be obtained:

$$\frac{q^2}{g_5^2} \partial_z \varphi^8 - \frac{8v_q^2}{z^2} \partial_z \eta^8 = 0. \quad (27)$$

In the Fourier space each field can be written as the product of the bulk-to-boundary propagator  $(\tilde{\varphi}^8, \tilde{\eta}^8)$  and a source, representing the boundary value of the field:

$$\varphi^8(z, q^2) = \tilde{\varphi}^8(z, q^2) \varphi_0^8(q^2) \quad (28)$$

$$\eta^8(z, q^2) = \tilde{\eta}^8(z, q^2) \eta_0^8(q^2). \quad (29)$$

Assuming  $\varphi_0^8 = \eta_0^8$ , the bulk-to-boundary propagators are solutions of Eqs. (25)-(26), with boundary conditions  $\tilde{\varphi}^8(0) = -\tilde{\eta}^8(0) = 1/\sqrt{2}$  and finiteness of the action. The first condition allows to get the same value of  $f_\pi$  as obtained from the  $1/q^2$  pole of the transverse axial-vector mesons, with the same  $\sqrt{2}$  normalization. From the on-shell action:

$$\mathcal{S}_{os} = \frac{R}{k} \int d^4q e^{-\phi} \left[ -\frac{q^2}{2g_5^2 z} (\partial_z \varphi^8) \varphi^8 + \frac{4v_q^2}{z^3} (\partial_z \eta^8) \eta^8 \right]_{z \rightarrow 0}, \quad (30)$$

the two-point functions can be computed:

$$\Pi_\eta^{88}(q^2) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{os}}{\partial \eta_0^8 \partial \eta_0^8} = \frac{R}{k} \frac{8v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{z^3} (\partial_z \tilde{\eta}^8) \tilde{\eta}^8 \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} \quad (31)$$

$$\Pi_\varphi^{88}(q^2) = \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{os}}{\partial \varphi_0^8 \partial \varphi_0^8} = -\frac{R}{k} \frac{q^2 e^{-\phi}}{g_5^2 z} (\partial_z \tilde{\varphi}^8) \tilde{\varphi}^8 \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}. \quad (32)$$

In all the numerical computations,  $z \geq \varepsilon = 0.001 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$  has been used.

In QCD, the first term in the large  $Q^2 = -q^2$  expansion of the two-point function of the longitudinal component of the axial-vector current is [48]<sup>2</sup>:

$$\psi_5(Q^2) \xrightarrow{Q^2 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{3}{16\pi^2} 4m_q^2 \left( 1 + \frac{11}{3} \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right) Q^2 \log Q^2 + \mathcal{O}(Q^{-2}). \quad (33)$$

In the soft-wall model the leading order result agrees with the QCD one:

$$\Pi_\varphi^{88}(Q^2) \xrightarrow{Q^2 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{3}{16\pi^2} 4m_q^2 Q^2 \log Q^2 + \mathcal{O}(Q^2). \quad (34)$$

With the parameters  $m_q = 3.7 \text{ MeV}$ ,  $m_s = 59.5 \text{ MeV}$ , and  $|\langle \bar{q}q \rangle| = (0.281 \text{ GeV})^3$ , we find  $m_\pi = 139 \text{ MeV}$  (mass of nonsinglet pseudoscalar meson when the quark mass is  $m_q$ ),  $m_{\eta_8} = 548$

<sup>2</sup>An additional  $1/2$  factor has been included to take into account the definition of the axial field used here, with  $\text{Tr}(T^a T^b) = \delta^{ab}/2$ .



MeV (mass of nonsinglet pseudoscalar meson when the quark mass is  $m_s$ ). Using the spectral representation

$$\Pi_\varphi^{88}(q^2) = \sum_n \frac{m_n^4 f_n^2}{m_n^2 - q^2} + P_2(q^2), \quad (35)$$

where  $P_2(x)$  is a polynomial of degree two, we find  $f_{0,q} = 92.3$  MeV and  $f_{0,s} = 103$  MeV, with  $f_{0,s}/f_{0,q} = 1.12$ . For  $m_q = 0$ , the pion-decay constant is

$$f_\pi^2 = \frac{R e^{-\phi}}{k g_5^2 z} (\partial_z \tilde{\varphi}^8) \tilde{\varphi}^8 \Big|_{z=0} = (91.6 \text{ MeV})^2. \quad (36)$$

The Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner mass formula  $2m_q |\langle \bar{q}q \rangle| = m_\pi^2 f_\pi^2$  is then numerically fulfilled. The Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner relation has been recovered in the hard-wall model in [32], and a similar derivation also holds in the soft-wall model.

## 5 Singlet pseudoscalar mesons

If  $a(x, z) = 0$ ,  $\eta^0(x, z)$  and  $\eta^8(x, z)$  satisfy the same equation of motion with the same boundary conditions, then singlet and nonsinglet states have the same mass. If  $a(x, z) \neq 0$ ,  $\eta^0(x, z)$  and  $a(x, z)$  are coupled, while the equations for  $\eta^8(x, z)$  do not change.

The equations of motion for  $a, \varphi^0, \eta^0$  are:

$$\partial_z \left( \frac{v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{n_f z^3} \partial_z \eta^0 \right) + q^2 \frac{v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{n_f z^3} (\eta^0 - \varphi^0) + \frac{\hat{Y}_0^2 e^{-\phi}}{N_c z^3} (\partial_z V_a) (\partial_z a - \eta^0 \partial_z V_a) = 0 \quad (37)$$

$$\partial_z \left( \frac{e^{-\phi}}{2n_f g_5^2 z} \partial_z \varphi^0 \right) + \frac{4v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{n_f z^3} (\eta^0 - \varphi^0) + \frac{4\hat{Y}_0^2 e^{-\phi}}{N_c z^3} V_a (a - \varphi^0 V_a) = 0 \quad (38)$$

$$\partial_z \left( \frac{\hat{Y}_0^2 e^{-\phi}}{z^3} (\partial_z a - \eta^0 \partial_z V_a) \right) + q^2 \frac{\hat{Y}_0^2 e^{-\phi}}{z^3} (a - \varphi^0 V_a) = 0. \quad (39)$$

A combination of the three equations gives:

$$\frac{4v_q^2}{n_f z^3} \partial_z \eta^0 - \frac{q^2}{2n_f g_5^2 z} \partial_z \varphi^0 + \frac{4\hat{Y}_0^2}{N_c z^3} V_a (\partial_z a - \eta^0 \partial_z V_a) = 0. \quad (40)$$

The last equation can be also obtained by requiring the gauge-fixing condition  $A_5(q, z) = 0$ .

The on-shell action reads:

$$\mathcal{S}_{os} = \frac{R}{k} \int d^4 q e^{-\phi} \left( \frac{-q^2}{4n_f g_5^2 z} (\partial_z \varphi^0) \varphi^0 + \frac{2v_q^2}{n_f z^3} (\partial_z \eta^0) \eta^0 + \frac{2\hat{Y}_0^2}{N_c z^3} (\partial_z a - \eta^0 \partial_z V_a) a \right) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} \quad (41)$$

where we have used  $\partial_z \varphi^0 = \partial_z \eta^0 = a = 0$  for  $z \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, after deriving the on-shell action with respect to the sources  $\eta_0^0, \varphi_0^0, a_0$  of the fields in the Fourier space, the two-point correlation functions are:

$$\Pi_\eta^{00} = \frac{R}{k} \frac{4v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{n_f z^3} (\partial_z \tilde{\eta}^0) \tilde{\eta}^0 \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} \quad (42)$$

$$\Pi_\varphi^{00} = -\frac{R}{k} \frac{q^2 e^{-\phi}}{2n_f g_5^2 z} (\partial_z \tilde{\varphi}^0) \tilde{\varphi}^0 \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} \quad (43)$$

$$\Pi_{aa} = \frac{R}{k} \frac{4\hat{Y}_0^2 e^{-\phi}}{N_c z^3} (\partial_z \tilde{a} - \tilde{\eta}^0 \partial_z V_a) \tilde{a} \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} \quad (44)$$



where  $\tilde{\eta}^0, \tilde{\varphi}^0, \tilde{a}$  are the bulk-to-boundary propagators (BTBP), such that  $\eta^0 = \tilde{\eta}^0 \eta_0^0$ ,  $\varphi^0 = \tilde{\varphi}^0 \varphi_0^0$ ,  $a = \tilde{a} a_0$ . In the definition of  $\Pi_{aa}$ , the two-point function of the  $G\tilde{G}$  operator, the second term has been included in order to get a renormalized quantity, namely without a contact term and giving a finite topological susceptibility at small and large  $m_q$ . The BTBPs can be obtained by solving Eqs. (37)-(39) after the sources have been factored out, assuming they are equal, with boundary conditions  $-\tilde{\eta}^0 = \tilde{\varphi}^0 = \tilde{a} = 1/\sqrt{2}$  at  $z = \varepsilon$ , and  $\partial_z \tilde{\eta}^0 = \partial_z \tilde{\varphi}^0 = \tilde{a} = 0$  for  $z \rightarrow \infty$ .

Eq. (40) reproduces the anomaly equation in this model. From the on-shell action we compute the one-point functions:

$$\langle J_A \rangle = \left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{os}}{\partial \varphi_0^0} \right|_{\text{sources} \rightarrow 0} = -\frac{R}{k} \frac{q^2 e^{-\phi}}{4n_f g_5^2 z} (\partial_z \varphi^0) \tilde{\varphi}^0 \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} \quad (45)$$

$$\langle J_5 \rangle = \left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{os}}{\partial \eta_0^0} \right|_{\text{sources} \rightarrow 0} = \frac{R}{k} \frac{2v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{n_f z^3} (\partial_z \eta^0) \tilde{\eta}^0 \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} \quad (46)$$

$$\langle J_{G\tilde{G}} \rangle = \left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{os}}{\partial a^0} \right|_{\text{sources} \rightarrow 0} = \frac{R}{k} \frac{2\hat{Y}_0^2 e^{-\phi}}{N_c z^3} (\partial_z a - \eta^0 \partial_z V_a) \tilde{a} \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} \quad (47)$$

which are related by the  $z \rightarrow 0$  limit of Eq. (40):

$$-\langle J_5 \rangle + \langle J_A \rangle + \langle J_{G\tilde{G}} \rangle = 0. \quad (48)$$

Notice that the singlet axial current has been defined as  $J_A^\mu = \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 T^0 \psi$ , with  $T^0 = \frac{1}{2n_f} I_{n_f}$ .

Let us redefine the pseudoscalar glueball field in a gauge-invariant way as

$$w(z) = (a(z) - \eta^0(z) V_a(z)) / \sqrt{2}, \quad (49)$$

in analogy with QCD, where the relevant parameter is  $\bar{\theta} = \theta + \arg \det M$ , where  $M$  is the quark mass matrix [43]. At  $n_f = 0$  or at large  $m_q$ ,  $w(z)$  is the pure-gauge pseudoscalar glueball solution, as it can be seen from Fig. 1.




Figure 1: Bulk-to-boundary propagator of the field  $a_P(z)$  in pure gauge (PG) at  $q^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$  (solid grey line); BTBP of  $w(z)$  defined in Eq. (49), at  $q^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$  and for the indicated values of the quark mass. At large quark masses  $w(z)$  approaches the pure-gauge solution in Eq. (16).

With the parameters used in Sections 3 and 4, we find that the mass of the first pole of the two-point correlation functions is  $m_{\eta'} = 958 \text{ MeV}$  for  $m_q = 59.5 \text{ MeV}$ , while in the chiral limit it is  $m_{\eta'} = 903 \text{ MeV}$ . In the 1 – 2.3 GeV mass range there are many resonances, generated by the

meson-gluon mixing, with masses: 1.14 GeV, 1.37 GeV, 1.57 GeV, 1.75 GeV, 1.91 GeV, 2.05 GeV, 2.15 GeV, 2.24 GeV. According to the way the singlet state is constructed in this model, the mass of the first pole approaches the mass of the lightest glueball for high quark masses, as Fig. 2 shows.




Figure 2: Squared mass ( $\text{GeV}^2$ ) of the octet ground state, of the ground state and first radial excitation of the singlet field versus the quark mass ( $\text{GeV}$ ).

Seven  $0^{-+}$  states with isospin 0 are listed in the Particle Data Group compilation, *i.e.*  $\eta$ ,  $\eta'$ ,  $\eta(1295)$ ,  $\eta(1405)$ ,  $\eta(1475)$ ,  $\eta(1760)$  (not established),  $\eta(2225)$  (not established), and one state with unknown isospin, *i.e.*  $X(1835)$  (not established). According to this model, all higher-mass states can be radial excitations of  $\eta'$ , comprising quark and gluon components. However, a thorough analysis of pseudoscalar-meson spectroscopy should require the inclusion of a mass difference between strange and up/down quarks, and the  $\eta_0$ - $\eta_8$  mixing.

## 6 Topological susceptibility

The topological susceptibility  $\chi_t$  in the full theory with quarks is:

$$\chi_t = -\Pi_{aa}(q^2 = 0), \quad (50)$$

with  $\Pi_{aa}(q^2)$  defined in Eq. (44).

In the chiral limit, the Witten-Veneziano relation can be obtained both in the  $N_c \rightarrow \infty$  and in the  $n_f/N_c \rightarrow 0$  limits [49]. The parameters involved in this model scale as:  $R/k \sim \mathcal{O}(N_c)$ ,  $m_{\eta'} \sim \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N_c})$  or  $m_{\eta'} \sim \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n_f/N_c})$ , while the others are  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ . By expanding Eqs. (37)-(40) in  $1/N_c$  for  $q^2 = m_{\eta'}^2$  one finds at lowest order:

$$\partial_z \left( \frac{v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{n_f z^3} \partial_z (\tilde{\eta}^0)_0 \right) = 0 \quad (51)$$

$$\partial_z \left( \frac{e^{-\phi}}{2n_f g_5^2 z} \partial_z (\tilde{\varphi}^0)_0 \right) + \frac{4v_q^2 e^{-\phi}}{n_f z^3} ((\tilde{\eta}^0)_0 - (\tilde{\varphi}^0)_0) = 0 \quad (52)$$

$$\partial_z \left( \frac{\hat{Y}_0^2 e^{-\phi}}{z^3} (\sqrt{2} \partial_z (\tilde{w})_0 + \partial_z (\tilde{\eta}^0)_0 V_a) \right) = 0. \quad (53)$$

$$\frac{m_{\eta'}^2}{2n_f g_5^2 z} \partial_z (\tilde{\varphi}^0)_0 = \frac{4\hat{Y}_0^2}{N_c z^3} V_a (\sqrt{2} \partial_z (\tilde{w})_0 - \partial_z (\tilde{\eta}^0)_0 V_a), \quad (54)$$

where the subscript 0 of  $(\tilde{\varphi}^0)_0$ ,  $(\tilde{\eta}^0)_0$  and  $(\tilde{w})_0$  means that they are the zeroth-order ( $\mathcal{O}(1)$ ) solutions to the equations of motion. The first equation tells us that  $(\tilde{\eta}^0)_0$  is constant. The second and third equations are decoupled, in particular the first one coincides with the equation of motion of the nonsinglet field in the chiral limit at  $q^2 = 0$ , while the second coincides with the equation of motion of the pseudoscalar glueball in pure gauge at  $q^2 = 0$ . Then, after multiplying both sides of the last equation by  $R/ke^{-\phi}/\sqrt{2}$  and taking the limit  $z \rightarrow 0$ , from Eqs. (36) and (50), it results:

$$\frac{m_{\eta'}^2 f_\pi^2}{2n_f} = \chi_{PG}. \quad (55)$$

which is the Witten-Veneziano relation.

The values of the topological susceptibility versus the quark mass are shown in Fig. 3. In the Appendix a way of performing such computation is described. The pure-gauge value (horizontal line in Fig. 3) is recovered in the limit  $m_q \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\chi_t \xrightarrow{m_q \rightarrow \infty} \chi_{PG}, \quad (56)$$

a result that has been numerically checked for very large  $m_q$ . At low  $m_q$ ,  $\chi_t$  follows the linear behaviour predicted in chiral perturbation theory [43] with coefficient:

$$\chi_t \xrightarrow{m_q \rightarrow 0} \frac{\langle \bar{q}q \rangle}{n_f} m_q, \quad (57)$$

as shown by the dashed line in Fig 3.




Figure 3: Topological susceptibility ( $\text{GeV}^4$ ) at different values of the quark mass ( $\text{GeV}$ ) in this holographic model (black curve); topological susceptibility in pure gauge given by Eq. (23) (horizontal grey line); expected topological susceptibility at low quark mass as in Eq. (57) (dashed cyan line); predicted topological susceptibility from Eq. (58) (dotted orange line).

The formula

$$\frac{1}{\chi_t} = \frac{1}{\chi_{PG}} + \frac{n_f}{m_q |\langle \bar{q}q \rangle|} \quad (58)$$

interpolating between the two known asymptotic behaviours was obtained in [29][30]. The calculation of  $\chi_t$  in the Appendix shows that the topological susceptibility computed in this model gets the same expression as in Eq. (58), but they do not agree numerically, as shown in Fig. 3, since a more complicated form of the second term in the right-hand side is needed to fit it. In Fig. 4 some lattice data with  $n_f = 2$  [50][51][52] are compared with  $\chi_t$  computed from Eq. (50) and from Eq. (58) with  $n_f = 2$  and  $|\langle \bar{q}q \rangle| = (0.281 \text{ GeV})^3$ . Lattice data confirm

the suppression of the topological susceptibility at decreasing quark mass. It is difficult to carry out a quantitative comparison of lattice data with Eq. (58) or with the values found in this holographic model, since uncertainties involved in lattice simulations [43] and the different values of the chiral condensate should be taken into account.




Figure 4: Lattice data from Refs. [50][51][52], and the topological susceptibility computed from Eq. (50) (solid black line) and from Eq. (58) (dashed green line), both curves at  $n_f = 2$  and  $|\langle \bar{q}q \rangle| = (0.281 \text{ GeV})^3$ . Units are GeV on the horizontal axis, and  $\text{GeV}^4$  on the vertical one.

## 7 Conclusions

We have computed the masses of singlet and nonsinglet pseudoscalar mesons in the soft-wall holographic model of QCD. We have found that the mixing of singlet states with pseudoscalar glueballs can explain the large mass of the  $\eta'$ . We have not considered the mixing between singlet and nonsinglet states with isospin zero. A holographic version of the anomaly equation has been found from the equations of motion of the involved fields. Then, we have computed the topological susceptibility as a function of the quark mass, and the Witten-Veneziano formula has also been reproduced. At small values of the quark mass the topological susceptibility is characterized by the linear behaviour predicted in chiral perturbation theory, and it has been compared with data from lattice simulations at  $n_f = 2$ . At larger quark mass the topological susceptibility does not follow the interpolating curve in Eq. (58) obtained in Refs. [29][30], since a more complicated form of the second term on the right-hand side is needed to describe the numerical data. In particular, in the present model such term diverges as  $m_q^4$  for  $m_q \rightarrow \infty$ .

The main ingredient of this model is the potential  $V_a(z)$ , characterizing the transformation rule of the glueball field in the bulk under  $U(1)_A$ . We have fixed it from the Wess-Zumino action, but different choices could be explored. The computation of the topological susceptibility shows that  $V_a(z)$  has to vanish at infinity at least as  $e^{-\phi}$  (where  $\phi$  is the dilaton).

A related issue, not discussed here, is the strong CP problem [53]. The topological term in the QCD Lagrangian, proportional to the  $\theta$  parameter, generating the gluonic contribution to the  $\eta'$  mass is not invariant under CP. This term produces a nonzero neutron electric dipole moment, which is expected to be tiny. The experimental limit is  $\theta < 10^{-10}$ . Then, a fine-tuning problem arises, trying to understand why  $\theta$  is so small, while naturally one would expect such parameter of  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ . A solution to the strong CP problem is the Peccei-Quinn mechanism. In [17] and [54] it has been proposed how the Peccei-Quinn mechanism can be implemented in a top-down and bottom-up holographic model, respectively.

## Acknowledgements

We thank P. Colangelo for helpful discussions and for pointing out unclear points and subtleties.

## A Topological susceptibility as a function of the quark mass

The topological susceptibility is found using Eqs. (44) and (50), and, from the definition (49), it reads:

$$\chi_t = - \frac{R}{k} \frac{4\hat{Y}_0^2(z)e^{-\phi(z)}}{\sqrt{2}N_c z^3} \left( \sqrt{2}\tilde{w}'(z) + V_a(z)\partial_z\tilde{\eta}^0(z) \right) \Big|_{\substack{q^2 \rightarrow 0 \\ z \rightarrow 0}}. \quad (59)$$

Eqs. (37) and (39) at  $q^2 = 0$  can be integrated obtaining:

$$\frac{4\hat{Y}_0^2(z)e^{-\phi(z)}}{\sqrt{2}N_c z^3} \left( \sqrt{2}\tilde{w}'(z) + V_a(z)\partial_z\tilde{\eta}^0(z) \right) = A_1 \quad (60)$$

$$\frac{4v_q^2(z)e^{-\phi(z)}}{n_f z^3} \partial_z\tilde{\eta}^0(z) + \sqrt{2}A_1 V_a(z) = 0, \quad (61)$$

where the integration constant is nonzero in the former case and zero in the latter, according to the behaviour of the functions at  $z \rightarrow \infty$ . One can then write:

$$-1 = \int_0^\infty dz \tilde{w}'(z) = A_1 \int_0^\infty dz \frac{e^{\phi(z)} z^3}{4} \left( \frac{N_c}{Y_0^2(z)} + \frac{n_f V_a^2(z)}{v_q^2(z)} \right), \quad (62)$$

such that  $\chi_t = -R/k A_1$ . Hence

$$\frac{1}{\chi_t} = \frac{1}{\chi_{PG}} + \frac{1}{\chi_f} \quad (63)$$

with

$$\frac{1}{\chi_f} = \frac{k}{R} n_f \int_0^\infty dz \frac{e^{\phi(z)} z^3}{4} \frac{V_a^2(z)}{v_q^2(z)}. \quad (64)$$

At small quark mass  $\chi_f$  has the linear behaviour in Eq. 57, while at large quark mass  $\chi_f \xrightarrow{m_q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{3}{\pi^2 n_f} m_q^4$ .

## References

- [1] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **11**, 3583-3593 (1975) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.11.3583.
- [2] P. A. Zyla *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2020**, no.8, 083C01 (2020) doi:10.1093/ptep/ptaa104.
- [3] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 8-11 (1976) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.37.8.
- [4] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rept. **142**, 357 (1986) doi:10.1016/0370-1573(86)90117-1.
- [5] N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **13**, 122-124 (1976) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.13.122.
- [6] A. De Rujula, H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. D **12**, 147-162 (1975) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.12.147.
- [7] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **156**, 269-283 (1979) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(79)90031-2.

- [8] G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B **159**, 213-224 (1979) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(79)90332-8.
- [9] S. He, M. Huang and Q. Yan, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 014003 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.014003.
- [10] M. L. Nekrasov, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 5681-5691 (1997) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.56.5681.
- [11] G. A. Christos, Phys. Rept. **116**, 251-336 (1984) doi:10.1016/0370-1573(84)90025-5.
- [12] V. A. Novikov, M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, JETP Lett. **29**, 594 (1979) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(79)90854-2.
- [13] J. P. Singh and S. D. Patel, Phys. Lett. B **791**, 249-256 (2019) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.02.048.
- [14] H. Forkel, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 054008 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.71.054008 [arXiv:hep-ph/0312049 [hep-ph]].
- [15] K. Ottnad *et al.* [ETM], Phys. Rev. D **97**, no.5, 054508 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.054508.
- [16] I. R. Klebanov, P. Ouyang and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 105007 (2002) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.105007.
- [17] F. Bigazzi, A. Caddeo, A. L. Cotrone, P. Di Vecchia and A. Marzolla, JHEP **12**, 056 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2019)056 [arXiv:1906.12117 [hep-th]].
- [18] J. L. Barbon, C. Hoyos-Badajoz, D. Mateos and R. C. Myers, JHEP **10**, 029 (2004) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/10/029 [arXiv:hep-th/0404260 [hep-th]].
- [19] J. Babington, J. Erdmenger, N. J. Evans, Z. Guralnik and I. Kirsch, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 066007 (2004) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.066007 [arXiv:hep-th/0306018 [hep-th]].
- [20] E. Katz and M. D. Schwartz, JHEP **0708**, 077 (2007) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/08/077.
- [21] T. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 126010 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.126010 [arXiv:0711.0236 [hep-ph]].
- [22] D. K. Hong and D. Kim, Phys. Lett. B **680**, 480-484 (2009) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2009.09.026 [arXiv:0904.4042 [hep-ph]].
- [23] D. Arean, I. Iatrakis, M. Jarvinen and E. Kiritsis, Phys. Rev. D **96**, no.2, 026001 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.026001 [arXiv:1609.08922 [hep-ph]].
- [24] U. Gürsoy and A. Jansen, JHEP **10**, 092 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2014)092.
- [25] A. Jimenez-Alba, K. Landsteiner and L. Melgar, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 126004 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.126004.
- [26] R. Casero, E. Kiritsis and A. Paredes, Nucl. Phys. B **787**, 98-134 (2007) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2007.07.009.
- [27] Y. Hamada, E. Kiritsis and F. Nitti, [arXiv:2007.13535 [hep-th]].
- [28] A. Karch, E. Katz, D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 015005 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.015005.

- [29] P. Di Vecchia and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B **171**, 253-272 (1980) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(80)90370-3.
- [30] H. Leutwyler and A. V. Smilga, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 5607-5632 (1992) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.46.5607.
- [31] P. Colangelo, F. De Fazio, F. Giannuzzi, F. Jugeau and S. Nicotri, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 055009 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.055009.
- [32] J. Erlich, E. Katz, D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 261602 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.261602.
- [33] A. Hashimoto and Y. Oz, Nucl. Phys. B **548**, 167-179 (1999) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00120-0.
- [34] C. Csaki, H. Ooguri, Y. Oz and J. Terning, JHEP **01**, 017 (1999) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/1999/01/017.
- [35] P. Colangelo, F. De Fazio, F. Jugeau and S. Nicotri, Phys. Lett. B **652**, 73-78 (2007) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.06.072.
- [36] G. Gabadadze, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 055003 (1998) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.58.055003 [arXiv:hep-ph/9711380 [hep-ph]].
- [37] E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2862-2865 (1998) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.2862 [arXiv:hep-th/9807109 [hep-th]].
- [38] F. E. Close, G. R. Farrar and Z. p. Li, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 5749-5766 (1997) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.55.5749.
- [39] Y. Chen, A. Alexandru, S. J. Dong, T. Draper, I. Horvath, F. X. Lee, K. F. Liu, N. Mathur, C. Morningstar and M. Peardon, *et al.* Phys. Rev. D **73**, 014516 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.73.014516.
- [40] C. J. Morningstar and M. J. Peardon, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 034509 (1999) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.60.034509.
- [41] V. Mathieu, N. Kochelev and V. Vento, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **18**, 1-49 (2009) doi:10.1142/S0218301309012124.
- [42] L. Faddeev, A. J. Niemi and U. Wiedner, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 114033 (2004) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.70.114033.
- [43] E. Vicari and H. Panagopoulos, Phys. Rept. **470**, 93-150 (2009) doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2008.10.001 [arXiv:0803.1593 [hep-th]].
- [44] L. Del Debbio, L. Giusti and C. Pica, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 032003 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.94.032003.
- [45] M. Teper, Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl. **83**, 146-150 (2000) doi:10.1016/S0920-5632(00)91608-6.
- [46] B. Alles, M. D'Elia and A. Di Giacomo, Nucl. Phys. B **494**, 281-292 (1997) [erratum: Nucl. Phys. B **679**, 397-399 (2004)] doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(97)00205-8.



- [47] S. Narison, G. M. Shore and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B **546**, 235-278 (1999) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00061-9.
- [48] S. Narison, World Sci. Lect. Notes Phys. **26**, 1-527 (1989).
- [49] L. Giusti, G. C. Rossi, M. Testa and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B **628**, 234-252 (2002) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(02)00093-7.
- [50] S. Aoki *et al.* [JLQCD and TWQCD], Phys. Lett. B **665**, 294-297 (2008) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.06.039.
- [51] T. W. Chiu *et al.* [TWQCD], Phys. Lett. B **702**, 131-134 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2011.06.070.
- [52] T. DeGrand, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.11, 114509 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.114509.
- [53] P. Di Vecchia and F. Sannino, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **129**, 262 (2014) doi:10.1140/epjp/i2014-14262-4.
- [54] P. Cox, T. Gherghetta and M. D. Nguyen, “A Holographic Perspective on the Axion Quality Problem,” JHEP **01**, 188 (2020) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2020)188.