

New Monopoles in Non-Abelian Gauge Theories

Liping Zou,^{1,*} Pengming Zhang,^{2,†} and Y. M. Cho^{3,4,‡}

¹*Sino-French Institute of Nuclear Engineering and Technology, Sun Yat-Sen University, Zhuhai 519082, China*

²*School of Physics and Astronomy, Sun Yat-Sen University, Zhuhai 519082, China*

³*School of Physics and Astronomy, Seoul National University, Seoul 08826, Korea*

⁴*Center for Quantum Spacetime, Sogang University, Seoul 04107, Korea*

The monopoles play important roles in physics. In this work we discuss the new monopoles in non-Abelian gauge theories, the standard model, the Georgi-Glashow model, and QCD. The standard model has two totally different types of monopoles, the Cho-Maison type monopoles which have the weak boson dressing and the electromagnetically neutral magnetic monopoles (the naked one and the one with the W boson dressing) which carries the neutral magnetic charge $4\pi/\bar{e}$. The Georgi-Glashow model has a new monopole, the Wu-Yang monopole which has the W boson dressing, in addition to the well known 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole. And QCD has a new monopole, the Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing. We show how to construct the new monopoles and clarify the origin of the topology of the new monopoles. The new monopoles could have deep implications not just in high energy physics but also in low energy physics.

Keywords: Dirac monopole, Schwinger monopole, 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole, Wu-Yang monopole, electroweak monopole, Cho-Maison monopole, neutral magnetic monopole, topology of the neutral monopole, mass of the neutral monopole, Z monopole

I. INTRODUCTION

The standard model which unifies the electromagnetic and weak interactions has become one of the most successful theories in high energy physics [1]. With the recent discovery of Higgs particle at LHC, it has been widely regarded that the theory has passed the “final” test [2]. This has urged people to go “beyond” the standard model.

But this view might be premature, because the standard model may still have unexplored territories. First of all, it is yet to pass another important test, the topological test. By now it is well known that the standard model has the electroweak (Cho-Maison) monopole as the electroweak generalization of the Dirac monopole [3, 4]. And this is within, not beyond, the standard model. This means that the true final test of the standard model should come from the topological test of the theory, in particular the discovery of the electroweak monopole.

After Dirac predicted the existence of the monopole, the monopole has become an obsession [5, 6]. But the Dirac monopole, in the course of the electroweak unification of the weak and electromagnetic interactions, changes to the electroweak monopole. So, the monopole which should exist in the real world may not be the Dirac monopole but this one. This has triggered new studies on the electroweak monopole [7–17]. If detected, it will be-

come the first magnetically charged topological elementary particle in the history of physics. For this reason MoEDAL and ATLAS at LHC and other experiments are actively searching for the monopole [18, 19].

The Cho-Maison monopole is well known to have the following properties [3]. First, the magnetic charge is not $2\pi/e$ but $4\pi/e$, twice that of the Dirac monopole. So this is a Schwinger type monopole. This is because the period of the electromagnetic U(1) subgroup of the standard model becomes 4π , not 2π . Second, the mass of the monopole is estimated to be of the order of several TeV. This is because the mass basically comes from the same Higgs mechanism which makes the W boson massive, except that here the coupling is magnetic (i.e., $4\pi/e$). Third, in spite of this, the size of the monopole is set by the W boson mass. This is because the monopole solution has the weak boson dressing which shows that the size is fixed by the W boson mass. Finally, it exists within (not beyond) the standard model as the electroweak generalization of the Dirac monopole.

Because of these unique characteristics of the electroweak monopole MoEDAL could detect the monopole without much difficulty, if LHC could produce it. However, the 14 TeV LHC may have no chance to produce the monopole if the mass becomes larger than 7 TeV. This is problematic, because in this case we may have to try to detect the remnant monopoles at present universe produced in the early universe.

But the detection of this electroweak monopole may not be the only the topological test of the standard model. This is because the standard model could also have new type of electroweak monopoles, in particular the electromagnetically neutral monopoles which have

* Contact author: zoulp5@mail.sysu.edu.cn

† Contact author: zhangpm5@mail.sysu.edu.cn

‡ Contact author: ymcho0416@gmail.com

the neutral magnetic charge $4\pi/\bar{e}$, where \bar{e} is the neutral charge [20]. This tells that the standard model has a new type of monopole, in addition to the Cho-Maison type monopole. This is totally unexpected, which certainly deserves a detailed discussion.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the new monopoles in non-Abelian gauge theories in more detail, and compare them with the known monopoles. In the standard model we discuss two neutral magnetic monopoles, the naked one and the one with the W boson dressing, which have the neutral magnetic charge $4\pi/\bar{e}$, and the Cho-Maison monopole which has only the W boson dressing. In Georgi-Glashow model we have a new monopole, the Wu-Yang monopole which has only the W boson dressing. Moreover, we show that the 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole is nothing but the Wu-Yang monopole dressed by the Higgs and W bosons which make the energy finite. Moreover, in QCD we have the Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing. We show how to construct such monopoles and discuss the topology of the new monopoles. Moreover, we argue that the mass of the neutral monopole in the standard model could be as low as 3.28 TeV, much lower than the mass of the Cho-Maison monopole. This could change the experimental detection of the electroweak monopole at LHC completely.

Among these the neutral magnetic monopole in the standard model is a totally new species of monopole, the existence of which has never been discussed in physics before. The reason for the existence of the neutral magnetic monopole stems from the existence of the neutral charge \bar{e} (as well as the well known electric charge e) in the standard model. However, this provides us only a theoretical possibility for the neutral monopole. The fact that the theory actually accommodates the neutral monopole is totally unexpected, and surprising.

The existence of the other new monopoles, (the Cho-Maison monopole which has only the W boson dressing in the standard model, the Wu-Yang monopole which has the W boson dressing in Georgi-Glashow model, and the Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing in QCD) comes from the existence of the Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing in QCD. To understand this notice that these new monopoles have a common feature, the same W boson dressing. This is because they come from the Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing in QCD. And this chromon dressing is described by the W boson dressing in the standard model and Georgi-Glashow model.

All these new monopoles are certainly very interesting from the theoretical point of view. But the monopoles which could exist in nature and thus actually be detected experimentally are those electroweak monopoles. In this respect it becomes important to estimate the mass of the new electroweak monopoles, in particular the neutral monopole in the standard model. A simple and quick way to estimate this mass is to adopt the argument pro-

posed by Zeldovich and Kholopov [21]. In this case one might predict the mass of the neutral monopole to be near $1/\bar{\alpha}$ times the W boson mass, around 3.28 TeV, where $\bar{\alpha} = 4\pi/\bar{e}^2$ is the fine structure constant of the neutral interaction. This is interesting, because this suggests that the neutral monopole mass could be smaller than the Cho-Maison monopole mass.

Our result tells many things. First, so far the electroweak monopole in the standard model has been only the Cho-Maison monopoles, the naked one and the one dressed by the Higgs and W bosons. But now, we actually have two different types of electroweak monopoles, the Cho-Maison type monopoles and the neutral type monopoles. And there are three Cho-Maison monopoles, the naked one, the one dressed by the W boson, and the one dressed by Higgs and W bosons. Moreover, there are two neutral monopoles, the naked one and the one dressed by the W boson.

Second, our result could change the topological test of the standard model completely. This is because now we have more topological objects in the standard model. Moreover, here we have the possibility that the neutral monopole mass could be smaller than the Cho-Maison monopole mass, around 3.28 TeV. If this is true, the present 14 TeV LHC could produce them in pairs, and in principle ATLAS and CMS could detect this. This implies that the first topological test of the standard model could come from the detection of the neutral monopole, not the Cho-Maison monopole.

The existence of the new monopoles in the standard model may also play important roles in low energy physics, because it has been pointed out that the standard model could also have important applications in condensed matter physics. For example, it could be interpreted as the non-Abelian Ginzburg-Landau theory of two-gap ferromagnetic superconductivity. This is because the Higgs doublet could be viewed to describe the spin doublet Cooper pair in the two gap ferromagnetic superconductors [22–24]. In this view the hypercharge U(1) gauge interaction describes the electromagnetic interaction acting on the charged spin doublet Cooper pair, and the weak SU(2) gauge interaction describes the non-Abelian magnon interaction acting on the spin of the doublet Cooper pair.

Moreover, it could also be interpreted as a non-Abelian gauge theory of the magnon electron spintronics. This is because the Higgs doublet could also be interpreted as the charged spinon in the electron spintronics. So, with the hypercharge U(1) interaction as the electromagnetic interaction acting on the electron and the weak SU(2) interaction as the non-Abelian magnon gauge interaction acting on the electron spin, one could interpret it as a theory of the electron magnon spintronics [24–26]. This strongly implies that the new topological objects in the standard model could also play important roles in the low energy physics.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II we discuss the Abelian decomposition of the standard model to clarify the hidden structure of the theory. In Section III we review the Cho-Maison monopole to compare this with the new monopoles in the theory. In Section IV we show how to construct the new monopoles in the standard model, the neutral magnetic monopoles and the Cho-Maison monopole which has only the W boson dressing, and clarify the topological origin of the new monopoles. In Section V we discuss the new monopole different from the 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole in Georgi-Glashow model, the Wu-Yang monopole which has the W boson dressing. In Section VI we discuss the new monopole in QCD, the Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing. Finally in the last section we discuss the physical implications of the new monopoles.

II. ABELIAN DECOMPOSITION OF THE STANDARD MODEL

Before we discuss the new monopoles we briefly review the Abelian decomposition of the standard model to clarify the hidden structures of the standard model. Consider the (bosonic sector of) Weinberg-Salam model,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= -|\mathcal{D}_\mu\phi|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2}(|\phi|^2 - \frac{\mu^2}{\lambda})^2 - \frac{1}{4}\vec{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{1}{4}G_{\mu\nu}^2, \\ \mathcal{D}_\mu\phi &= (\partial_\mu - i\frac{g}{2}\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{A}_\mu - i\frac{g'}{2}B_\mu)\phi \\ &= D_\mu\phi - i\frac{g'}{2}B_\mu\phi,\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where ϕ is the Higgs doublet, \vec{A}_μ , $\vec{F}_{\mu\nu}$ and B_μ , $G_{\mu\nu}$ are the gauge fields of $SU(2)$ and hypercharge $U(1)$, and D_μ is the covariant derivative of the weak $SU(2)$. Expressing ϕ by the scalar Higgs boson ρ and unit doublet ξ by

$$\phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho \xi, \quad (\xi^\dagger \xi = 1), \quad (2)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\rho)^2 - \frac{\rho^2}{2}|\mathcal{D}_\mu\xi|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{8}(\rho^2 - \rho_0^2)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}\vec{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{1}{4}G_{\mu\nu}^2,\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

where $\rho_0 = \sqrt{2\mu^2/\lambda}$ is the vacuum value of the Higgs field. Notice that the hypercharge $U(1)$ coupling of ξ makes the theory a gauge theory of CP^1 field [3].

Let $(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2, \hat{n}_3)$ be an arbitrary orthonormal basis of $SU(2)$. Choosing $\hat{n} = \hat{n}_3$ to be the Abelian direction, we have the Abelian decomposition of \vec{A}_μ to the restricted

part \hat{A}_μ and the valence part \vec{W}_μ [27–32],

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{A}_\mu &= \hat{A}_\mu + \vec{W}_\mu, \\ \hat{A}_\mu &= \tilde{A}_\mu + \tilde{C}_\mu, \quad \vec{W}_\mu = W_\mu^1 \hat{n}_1 + W_\mu^2 \hat{n}_2, \\ \tilde{A}_\mu &= A_\mu \hat{n}, \quad \tilde{C}_\mu = -\frac{1}{g}\hat{n} \times \partial_\mu \hat{n}, \\ \vec{F}_{\mu\nu} &= \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} + \hat{D}_\mu \vec{W}_\nu - \hat{D}_\nu \vec{W}_\mu + g\vec{W}_\mu \times \vec{W}_\nu, \\ \hat{D}_\mu &= \partial_\mu + g\hat{A}_\mu \times, \\ \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu \hat{A}_\nu - \partial_\nu \hat{A}_\mu + g\hat{A}_\mu \times \hat{A}_\nu = F'_{\mu\nu} \hat{n}, \\ F'_{\mu\nu} &= F_{\mu\nu} + H_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A'_\nu - \partial_\nu A'_\mu, \\ F_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu, \\ H_{\mu\nu} &= -\frac{1}{g}\hat{n} \cdot (\partial_\mu \hat{n} \times \partial_\nu \hat{n}) = \partial_\mu C_\nu - \partial_\nu C_\mu, \\ A'_\mu &= A_\mu + C_\mu, \quad C_\mu \simeq -\frac{1}{g}\hat{n}_1 \cdot \partial_\mu \hat{n}_2.\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

Notice that C_μ is determined up to the $U(1)$ gauge transformation which leaves \hat{n} invariant.

Moreover, since \hat{n} is arbitrary, we can choose $\hat{n} = -\xi^\dagger \vec{\sigma} \xi$. With this we have

$$\begin{aligned}C_\mu &\simeq -\frac{2i}{g}\xi^\dagger \partial_\mu \xi, \\ \mathcal{D}_\mu \xi &= \left[-i\frac{g}{2}(A'_\mu \hat{n} + \vec{W}_\mu) \cdot \vec{\sigma} - \frac{g'}{2}B_\mu \right] \xi, \\ |\mathcal{D}_\mu \xi|^2 &= \frac{1}{4}(-gA'_\mu + g'B_\mu)^2 + \frac{g^2}{4}\vec{W}_\mu^2.\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

With this we can remove the unit doublet ξ from the Weinberg Lagrangian and “abelianize” it,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\rho)^2 - \frac{\lambda}{8}(\rho^2 - \rho_0^2)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{1}{4}G_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{1}{2}|D'_\mu W_\nu - D'_\nu W_\mu|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\rho^2}{8}[(-gA'_\mu + g'B_\mu)^2 + 2g^2 W_\mu^* W_\mu] \\ &\quad + igF'_{\mu\nu} W_\mu^* W_\nu + \frac{g^2}{4}(W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu)^2, \\ D'_\mu &= \partial_\mu + igA'_\mu, \quad W_\mu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(W_\mu^1 + iW_\mu^2).\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

From this we have the following equation of motion,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\mu^2 \rho - \frac{\rho}{4}((gA'_\mu - g'B_\mu)^2 + 2g^2 W_\mu^* W_\mu) &= \frac{\lambda}{2}(\rho^2 - \rho_0^2)\rho, \\ D'_\mu(D'_\mu W_\nu - D'_\nu W_\mu) &= \frac{g^2}{4}\rho^2 W_\nu \\ + igF'_{\mu\nu} W_\mu + g^2(W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu)W_\mu, \\ \partial_\mu F'_{\mu\nu} &= j_\nu^{(w)}, \\ \partial_\mu G_{\mu\nu} &= j_\nu^{(h)},\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

where

$$j_\nu^{(w)} = ig \left[\partial_\mu (W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu) + W_\mu^* (D'_\mu W_\nu - D'_\nu W_\mu) - W_\mu (D'_\mu W_\nu - D'_\nu W_\mu)^* - \frac{i}{4} (gA'_\nu - g'B_\nu) \rho^2 \right],$$

$$j_\nu^{(h)} = -\frac{g'}{4} (gA'_\nu - g'B_\nu) \rho^2. \quad (8)$$

Notice that the last two equations of (7) tells that the theory has two conserved currents, the weak current $j_\mu^{(w)}$ of A'_μ and the hypercharge current $j_\mu^{(y)}$ of B_μ .

To express (6) in terms of physical fields we define $A_\mu^{(\text{em})}$ and Z_μ by

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_\mu^{(\text{em})} \\ Z_\mu \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}} \begin{pmatrix} g & g' \\ -g' & g \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B_\mu \\ A'_\mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_w & \sin \theta_w \\ -\sin \theta_w & \cos \theta_w \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B_\mu \\ A'_\mu \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

Now, with the identity (5) we can express (6) by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \rho)^2 - \frac{\lambda}{8} (\rho^2 - \rho_0^2)^2 - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^{(\text{em})^2} \\ & - \frac{1}{2} |(D_\mu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\mu)W_\nu - (D_\nu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\nu)W_\mu|^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{4} Z_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{\rho^2}{4} (g^2 W_\mu^* W_\mu + \frac{g^2 + g'^2}{2} Z_\mu^2) \\ & + i(eF_{\mu\nu}^{(\text{em})} + \bar{e}Z_{\mu\nu})W_\mu^* W_\nu + \frac{g^2}{4} (W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu)^2, \\ & D_\mu^{(\text{em})} = \partial_\mu + ieA_\mu^{(\text{em})}, \\ & e = \frac{gg'}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}}, \quad \bar{e} = \frac{g^2}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where \bar{e} is the neutral charge. Notice that $e/\bar{e} = g'/g$. Experimentally we have $\bar{e} \simeq 1.83 e$, so that the weak coupling is stronger than the electromagnetic coupling.

We emphasize that this is not the standard model in the unitary gauge. This is a gauge independent expression of the standard model. Moreover, this confirms that W_μ has both electric and neutral charge, so that W boson is doubly charged.

From (10) we obtain the following equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^2 \rho - \left(\frac{e^2 + \bar{e}^2}{2} W_\mu^* W_\mu + \frac{(e^2 + \bar{e}^2)^2}{4\bar{e}^2} Z_\mu^2 \right) \rho \\ = \frac{\lambda}{2} (\rho^2 - \rho_0^2) \rho, \\ (D_\mu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\mu) [(D_\mu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\mu)W_\nu \\ - (D_\nu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\nu)W_\mu] = \frac{(e^2 + \bar{e}^2)}{4} \rho^2 W_\nu \\ + iW_\mu (eF_{\mu\nu}^{(\text{em})} + \bar{e}Z_{\mu\nu}) \\ + (e^2 + \bar{e}^2) W_\mu (W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu), \\ \partial_\mu F_{\mu\nu}^{(\text{em})} = J_\nu^{(e)}, \\ \partial_\mu Z_{\mu\nu} = J_\nu^{(n)}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $J_\nu^{(e)}$ and $J_\nu^{(n)}$ are the electromagnetic and neutral currents given by

$$\begin{aligned} J_\nu^{(e)} = & ie \left\{ \partial_\mu (W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu) \right. \\ & + W_\mu^* [(D_\mu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\mu)W_\nu - (D_\nu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\nu)W_\mu] \\ & \left. - W_\mu [(D_\mu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\mu)W_\nu - (D_\nu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\nu)W_\mu]^* \right\}, \\ J_\nu^{(n)} = & i\bar{e} \left\{ \partial_\mu (W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu) \right. \\ & + W_\mu^* [(D_\mu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\mu)W_\nu - (D_\nu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\nu)W_\mu] \\ & \left. - W_\mu [(D_\mu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\mu)W_\nu - (D_\nu^{(\text{em})} + i\bar{e}Z_\nu)W_\mu]^* \right\} \\ & + \frac{(e^2 + \bar{e}^2)^2}{4\bar{e}^2} \rho^2 Z_\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

This should be compared with the equations of motion (7) and (8) obtained from (6). The two sets of currents in (8) and (12) are related by

$$\begin{pmatrix} J_\mu^{(\text{em})} \\ J_\mu^{(n)} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}} \begin{pmatrix} g & g' \\ -g' & g \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} j_\mu^{(h)} \\ j_\mu^{(w)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

This mixing will play an important role in the following in the standard model.

The above exercise teaches us three important lessons. First, it has been widely believed that the Higgs mechanism comes from a spontaneous symmetry breaking. This interpretation is so natural that it has become a folklore. But the above analysis tells that actually we do not need any symmetry breaking, spontaneous or not, to have the Higgs mechanism. To see this notice that (10) is mathematically identical to (1), so that it retains the full non-Abelian $SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge symmetry of (1). And here the W and Z bosons acquire mass from the non-vanishing vacuum value of the Higgs scalar ρ_0 , which does not break any symmetry. This means that we have the Higgs mechanism without any symmetry breaking. In fact, in (10) we have no Higgs doublet which can break the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ symmetry. This confirms that we do not need any spontaneous symmetry breaking to have the Higgs mechanism [8, 13, 14].

Second, it tells that the standard model has two conserved currents which mix together. The existence of two conserved current, of course, has been well known. But the existence of two sets of currents, the weak and hypercharge currents $j_\mu^{(w)}$ and $j_\mu^{(h)}$ and the electromagnetic and neutral currents $J_\mu^{(e)}$ and $J_\mu^{(n)}$ which are related by the mixing (13) has not been well appreciated. This mixing of two sets of currents plays a very important role in the electron spintronics [25, 26].

The third lesson is the monopole topology of the standard model. It has been widely asserted that the Higgs doublet in the standard model has no $\pi_2(S^2)$ monopole topology, so that the theory cannot have the monopole [33–35]. But this is not true, because the Higgs doublet

can be viewed as a CP^1 field which has the S^2 topology and thus accommodates the $\pi_2(S^2)$ monopole topology [3]. Moreover, it has the Diracian (i.e., Abelian) $\pi_1(S^1)$ hypercharge monopole topology. This shows that the theory has two independent monopole topology, $\pi_1(S^1)$ and $\pi_2(S^2)$.

Furthermore, we can express the standard model without the Higgs doublet. This must be obvious in (3) and (6), where the two monopole topology appears as two Diracian $\pi_1(S^1)$ monopole topology. This is because in this Abelian decomposition of the standard model, the non-Abelian $\pi_2(S^2)$ monopole topology transforms to an Abelian $\pi_1(S^1)$ monopole topology, so that we have two different Abelian monopole topology. This strongly implies that the theory could accommodate two different types of monopoles. This turns out to be true, as we will see in the following.

III. CHO-MAISON MONOPOLE: A REVIEW

Before we discuss the new neutral monopole we briefly review the well known electroweak monopole in the standard model, to compare this with the new monopole. For this we start from the monopole ansatz in the spherical coordinates (t, r, θ, φ) [3, 4]

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \rho(r) \xi, \quad \xi = i \begin{pmatrix} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} \exp(-i\varphi) \\ -\cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \hat{A}_\mu &= -\frac{1}{g} \hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \\ \vec{W}_\mu &= \frac{f(r)}{g} \hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r} = \frac{f(r)}{g} (-\sin \theta \partial_\mu \varphi \hat{\theta} + \partial_\mu \theta \hat{\varphi}), \\ \hat{\theta} &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \cos \varphi \\ \cos \theta \sin \varphi \\ -\sin \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\varphi} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \varphi \\ \cos \varphi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ B_\mu &= -\frac{1}{g'} (1 - \cos \theta) \partial_\mu \varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Notice that here $\hat{r} = -\xi^\dagger \vec{\sigma} \xi$, and \hat{A}_μ describes the Wu-Yang monopole.

Under the gauge transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &\rightarrow U \xi = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ U &= i \begin{pmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} & \sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{-i\varphi} \\ -\sin \frac{\theta}{2} e^{i\varphi} & \cos \frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{r} &= -\xi^\dagger \vec{\sigma} \xi \rightarrow \hat{e} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \hat{\theta} \rightarrow \hat{e}'_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos \varphi \\ \sin \varphi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\varphi} \rightarrow \hat{e}'_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \varphi \\ \cos \varphi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, with

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{e}_1 \\ \hat{e}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \varphi & -\sin \varphi \\ \sin \varphi & \cos \varphi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{e}'_1 \\ \hat{e}'_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

we have

$$\hat{e}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{e}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &\rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \rho(r) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \hat{A}_\mu &\rightarrow C_\mu \hat{e}, \quad C_\mu \simeq -\frac{1}{g} \hat{\theta} \cdot \partial_\mu \hat{\varphi} = -\frac{1}{g} (1 - \cos \theta) \partial_\mu \varphi, \\ \vec{W}_\mu &\rightarrow \frac{f(r)}{g} (-\sin \theta \partial_\mu \varphi \hat{e}_1 + \partial_\mu \theta \hat{e}_2). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

So we can express the ansatz (14) by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \rho(r) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \hat{A}_\mu &= C_\mu \hat{e}, \quad \vec{W}_\mu = \frac{f(r)}{g} (-\sin \theta \partial_\mu \varphi \hat{e}_1 + \partial_\mu \theta \hat{e}_2), \\ B_\mu &= -\frac{1}{g'} (1 - \cos \theta) \partial_\mu \varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

In terms of physical fields the ansatz becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \rho(r), \quad W_\mu = \frac{i}{g} \frac{f}{\sqrt{2}} (\partial_\mu \theta + i \sin \theta \partial_\mu \varphi), \\ A_\mu^{(\text{em})} &= -\frac{1}{e} (1 - \cos \theta) \partial_\mu \varphi, \quad Z_\mu = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

This clearly shows that the ansatz is for the electroweak monopole.

We can use the equations of motion (11) to derive the equation for the Cho-Maison monopole. The ansatz (20) automatically satisfies the last two equations of (11), and reduces the first two equations to the following equations,

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\rho} + \frac{2}{r} \dot{\rho} - \frac{f^2}{2r^2} \rho &= \frac{\lambda}{2} (\rho^2 - \rho_0^2) \rho, \\ \ddot{f} - \frac{f^2 - 1}{r^2} f &= \frac{g^2}{4} \rho^2 f. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

This has the naked Cho-Maison monopole solution

$$\begin{aligned} f &= 0, \quad \rho = \rho_0 = \sqrt{2\mu^2/\lambda}, \\ A_\mu^{(\text{em})} &= -\frac{1}{e} (1 - \cos \theta) \partial_\mu \varphi, \quad Z_\mu = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

which has the magnetic charge $4\pi/e$ (not $2\pi/e$). This tells that the standard model has the Schwinger (not Dirac) monopole [3].

Moreover, with the boundary condition

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(0) &= 0, & \rho(\infty) &= \rho_0, \\ f(0) &= 1, & f(\infty) &= 0,\end{aligned}\quad (23)$$

we can integrate (21) and have the electroweak monopole carrying the magnetic charge $q_m = 4\pi/e$, with a non-trivial Higgs and W boson dressing. The monopole solution is shown in Fig. 1 in black curves. This confirms that the standard model has the Cho-Maison monopole which can be viewed as the Schwinger monopole dressed by the Higgs and W bosons [3, 8]. The mathematical existence proof of the monopole is provided by Yang [4], and the stability of the monopole is proved by Gervalle and Volkov [17].

It is well known that we can also construct the anti-monopole solution. Moreover, we can generalize it a dyon solution which has an extra electric charge, and to anti-dyon solution [8, 13]. Also, we can couple the monopole solution to gravity and have the gravitating electroweak monopole and/or Reissner-Nordstrom type magnetic blackhole [13, 36].

The Cho-Maison monopole solution shown in Fig. 1 in black curves has the following energy [3, 8, 13],

$$\begin{aligned}E &= E_0 + E_\rho + E_W + E_{\rho W}, \\ E_0 &= \frac{g^2}{2g'^2} M \int_0^\infty \frac{dr}{r^2}, \\ E_\rho &= M \int_0^\infty 2r^2 \left[\left(\frac{\dot{\rho}}{\rho_0} \right)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{g^2} \left(\left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \right)^2 - 1 \right)^2 \right] dr, \\ E_W &= M \int_0^\infty \left[\dot{f}^2 + \frac{(f^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2} \right] dr, \\ E_{\rho W} &= M \int_0^\infty f^2 \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \right)^2 dr, \\ M &= \frac{4\pi}{g^2} M_W.\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

There are two points to be emphasized here. First, the boundary condition (23) guarantees that E_ρ , E_W , and $E_{\rho W}$ are finite for the Cho-Maison monopole. But E_0 becomes infinite, so that it has infinite energy. This is because B_μ in (14) has the monopole point singularity at the origin. This means that we can not estimate the monopole mass classically. But this is common in classical solutions, which does not harm the solution. The second point is that the energy scale is fixed by M . This will become important in the following when we estimate the mass of the Cho-Maison monopole.

There have been many efforts to predict the monopole mass. Zeldovich and Kholopov first predicted the mass to be around 11 TeV, $1/\alpha$ times the W boson mass, arguing that the monopole mass comes from the same Higgs

mechanism which makes the W boson massive, except that here the coupling is $4\pi/e$ [21]. After this there have been other predictions, notably based on the scaling argument and the charge screening mechanism, and the general consensus now is that the mass could be around 4 to 11 TeV [8, 9, 11, 13, 21].

IV. NEW MONOPOLES IN STANDARD MODEL

So far the known electroweak monopoles have been the above Cho-Maison monopoles, the naked Cho-Maison monopole and the one dressed by the Higgs and W bosons. Now, we are ready to show that the standard model has three more interesting electroweak monopoles, two electromagnetically neutral monopoles which carries the neutral magnetic charge $4\pi/\bar{e}$ and the Cho-Maison monopole which has only the W boson dressing. We discuss the neutral magnetic monopoles first.

Choose the ansatz

$$\begin{aligned}\phi &= 0, \\ \hat{A}_\mu &= -\frac{1}{g} \hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \quad \vec{W}_\mu = \frac{1}{g} f(r) \hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \\ B_\mu &= \frac{g'}{g^2} (1 - \cos \theta) \partial_\mu \varphi.\end{aligned}\quad (25)$$

In terms of the physical fields, this is expressed by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= 0, \\ W_\mu &= \frac{i}{g} \frac{f}{\sqrt{2}} (\partial_\mu \theta + i \sin \theta \partial_\mu \varphi), \\ A_\mu^{(em)} &= 0, \quad Z_\mu = -\frac{1}{\bar{e}} (1 - \cos \theta) \partial_\mu \varphi.\end{aligned}\quad (26)$$

This should be compared with the Cho-Maison monopole ansatz (20). The difference is that here we have no electromagnetic monopole $A_\mu^{(em)}$. In stead we have the neutral monopole given by Z_μ . This clearly tells that the ansatz is for the neutral monopole.

With this we have the equation of motion from (11),

$$\ddot{f} - \frac{f^2 - 1}{r^2} f = 0. \quad (27)$$

Notice that, unlike the equation for the Cho-Maison monopole (21), we have no equation for the Higgs field here. Obviously (27) has the trivial solution $f = 0$, which describes the naked neutral monopole which carries the magnetic charge $4\pi/\bar{e}$.

Now, just as in the Cho-Maison monopole we might like to find the monopole solution of the above equation with the boundary condition

$$f(0) = 1, \quad f(\infty) = 0, \quad (28)$$




FIG. 1. The new monopole solutions in the standard model. The W boson profile of the neutral magnetic monopole is shown in red curve, which should be compared with the W and Higgs boson profiles of the Cho-Maison monopole shown in black curves. Notice that the same red curve also describes the W boson profile of the new Cho-Maison monopole which has only the W boson dressing.

But this turns out to be impossible. Mathematically there is no such solution which satisfies the above boundary condition [37]. Fortunately we can integrate the equation with the following boundary condition

$$f(0) = 0, \quad f(\infty) = 1, \quad (29)$$

and obtain the neutral magnetic monopole solution which has the W boson dressing. This is shown in Fig. 1 in red curves. Since this weak monopole is the monopole described by the Z boson, we might call this “the Z monopole”.

One might think that the monopole solution is unstable, because it sits on the unstable extremum of the Higgs potential at $\rho = 0$. This is a misunderstanding of the ansatz (26). Here $\rho = 0$ means no Higgs field, so that the monopole solution has nothing to do with the Higgs potential. This must be clear from the ansatz (25). Moreover, obviously the monopole has the topological stability.

The neutral monopole has the energy

$$\begin{aligned} E &= E_Z + E_W, \\ E_Z &= \frac{g'^2}{2g^2} M \int_0^\infty \frac{dr}{r^2}, \\ E_W &= M \int_0^\infty \left[\dot{f}^2 + \frac{(f^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2} \right] dr, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Notice that E_Z becomes infinite because Z_μ has the monopole singularity at the origin. But here E_W also becomes divergent near the origin, because of the boundary condition (29). So, just like the Cho-Maison monopole, the neutral monopole also has an infinite energy classically. Here again one might think that the non-vanishing Higgs vacuum ρ_0 generate an infinite energy,

$$E_{\rho_0} = \frac{2\lambda}{g^2} M \int_0^\infty r^2 dr. \quad (31)$$

But since the monopole has no Higgs field, it has no energy coming from the Higgs vacuum.

Near the origin the solution has the following behavior,

$$\begin{aligned} f(r) &\simeq r^{1/2} \left(A \cos\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \ln r\right) + B \sin\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \ln r\right) \right) \\ &\quad + O(r^{1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where A and B are the integration constants. This explains the interesting behavior of the W boson profile near the origin shown in red curve in Fig. 1. But asymptotically it behaves as

$$f(r) \simeq 1 - \frac{C}{r} + O\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right), \quad (33)$$

where C is another integration constant. This tells that, unlike the well known Cho-Maison monopole which has the Higgs and W boson dressing, the size of the the neutral monopole is not fixed by the W boson mass.

Is there any way to estimate the mass of the neutral monopole in the standard model? Just as we could estimate the mass of the infinite energy Cho-Maison monopole, there are various ways to do that. For example, we could apply the logic proposed by Zeldovich and Kholopov to estimate the mass of the neutral monopole. In this case we can estimate the mass to be roughly $1/\bar{\alpha}$ times bigger than the W boson mass, where $\bar{\alpha} = \bar{e}^2/4\pi$ is the fine structure constant of the neutral charge. With $\bar{e} \simeq 1.83 \times e$, we have $\bar{\alpha} \simeq 3.35 \times \alpha$. This implies that the neutral monopole mass could be around 3.23 TeV, which is much smaller than the mass of the Cho-Maison monopole.

Of course this is a rough order estimate, so that we certainly need more reliable estimates. There are other ways to estimate the neutral monopole mass, notably the scaling argument and the charge screening argument. But an important point here is that the neutral monopole mass could be similar to, or even smaller than, the mass of the Cho-Maison monopole.

Next, we discuss another new monopole solution, the Cho-Maison monopole which has only the W boson dressing. To do this, notice that when $\rho = 0$, the Cho-Maison monopole equation (21) reduces to (27). Obviously we can integrate this with the boundary condition (29), and obtain a new Cho-Maison monopole with magnetic charge $4\pi/e$ which has only the W boson dressing. This means that we have a new Cho-Maison monopole whose W boson profile is identical to the W boson profile of the neutral magnetic monopole. So the monopole solution shown in Fig. 1 in red curves can also be interpreted to describe the Cho-Maison monopole which has the W boson dressing.

The energy of this monopole is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E &= E_0 + E_W, \\ E_0 &= \frac{g^2}{2g'^2} M \int_0^\infty \frac{dr}{r^2}, \\ E_W &= M \int_0^\infty \left[\dot{f}^2 + \frac{(f^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2} \right] dr. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Notice that, unlike (24) both E_0 and E_W become divergent here, because the boundary condition (29) makes E_W divergent near the origin. Clearly this energy is different from the energy of the neutral monopole shown in (30). This tells that, in spite of the fact that the W boson profile of this monopole is the same as that of the neutral monopole, they have different energy.

One might wonder if the naked Cho-Maison monopole can have only the Higgs dressing. To see this, notice that with $f = 0$ the second equation of (21) is trivially satisfied. So we can try to find a solution which has only the Higgs dressing integrating the first equation of (21) with the boundary condition

$$\rho(0) = 0, \quad \rho(\infty) = \rho_0. \quad (35)$$

But this does not lead to a meaningful solution, which means that such solution does not exist.

This tells that the standard model has two types of monopoles, the Cho-Maison type electromagnetic monopoles which carry the magnetic charge $4\pi/e$ and the neutral type monopoles which carry the magnetic charge $4\pi/\bar{e}$. There are three Cho-Maison monopoles, the naked Cho-Maison monopole, the Cho-Maison monopole dressed by the Higgs and W bosons, and the Cho-Maison monopole dressed only by the W boson. And there are two neutral monopoles, the naked one and the one dressed by W boson. So far we have missed the neutral monopoles and the Cho-Maison monopole which has the W boson dressing.

The existence of two types of monopoles, the Cho-Maison type monopole and the neutral type magnetic monopole stems from the existence of two conserved charge, the electromagnetic e and the neutral \bar{e} . On the other hand this does not guarantee the existence of two types of monopoles in the standard model. So, the fact that the standard model actually accommodates two types of monopoles is really unexpected, and surprising.

The topological origin of the two types of monopoles must be clear. The standard model has two types of monopole topology, the $\pi_2(S^2)$ monopole topology of the weak SU(2) and the $\pi_1(S^1)$ monopole topology of the hypercharge U(1). After the Abelian decomposition of SU(2), the $\pi_2(S^2)$ monopole topology changes to the $\pi_1(S^1)$ monopole topology of the U(1) subgroup of SU(2), so that the theory has two monopole topology, the $\pi_1(S^1)$ monopole topology of the weak U(1) and the $\pi_1(S^1)$ monopole topology of the hypercharge U(1). This

must be clear from (7). Obviously they are independent. And a linear combinations of these two monopole topology describes the monopole topology of the Cho-Maison monopole and the neutral monopole.

Before we move on, we argue that the two monopoles, the Cho-Maison monopole which has the W boson dressing and the neutral monopole which has the same W boson dressing, come from another set of two monopoles in the standard model, the weak monopole of the SU(2) weak interaction and the hypercharge monopole of the hypercharge U(1) interaction. To show this, we show the existence of the weak monopole and the hypercharge monopole in the standard model first.

Let us choose the following ansatz,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= 0, \quad \hat{A}_\mu = -\frac{1}{g} \hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \\ \vec{W}_\mu &= \frac{f(r)}{g} \hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \quad B_\mu = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

which can be written by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= 0, \quad A'_\mu = -\frac{1}{g} (1 - \cos \theta) \partial_\mu \varphi, \\ W_\mu &= \frac{i}{g} \frac{f}{\sqrt{2}} (\partial_\mu \theta + i \sin \theta \partial_\mu \varphi), \quad B_\mu = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

This shows that the ansatz is for the SU(2) weak monopole.

From the ansatz, we have the following equation of motion

$$\ddot{f} - \frac{f^2 - 1}{r^2} f = 0, \quad (38)$$

which is identical to (27). Integrating this with the boundary condition (29), we have the weak monopole which has the same W boson dressing as the neutral monopole with the W boson dressing. This confirms that the standard model has the weak monopole which has the W boson dressing.

Now we discuss the hypercharge monopole. For this we choose the ansatz

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= 0, \quad \hat{A}_\mu = 0, \quad \vec{W}_\mu = 0, \\ B_\mu &= -\frac{1}{g'} (1 - \cos \theta) \partial_\mu \varphi. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

We can easily show that this is another solution of the standard model. This shows that the ansatz is for the hypercharge monopole. And we can easily show that this automatically becomes a solution, the hypercharge monopole, of the standard model.

One might like to think that these monopoles are another set of new monopoles in the standard model. But we believe that they are not the new monopoles but a different realization of the two monopoles we discussed before, the Cho-Maison monopole which has the W boson

dressing and the neutral monopole which has the same W boson dressing. To see this, notice that the ansatz $A_\mu^{(em)}$ and Z_μ in (20) and (26) are the linear combination of A'_μ and B_μ in the ansatz (37) and (39). Moreover, the currents of two potentials are related by the mixing (13), so that the W boson dressing comes from the same source, the W boson ansatz in (37). This is why the two monopoles have the same W boson dressing.

This tells that we can indeed interpret the weak monopole and the hypercharge monopole as a different realization of the Cho-Maison monopole with the W boson dressing and the neutral monopole with the same W boson dressing. Clearly this interpretation would have been impossible without the existence of the mixing (13) between the currents of two potentials A'_μ and B_μ .

Before we leave this section we have the following remark. Apparently, the Cho-Maison monopole equation (21) has another solution [20] given by

$$\rho = 0, \quad f = \mp 1. \quad (40)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \rho = 0, \quad A_\mu^{(em)} &= -\frac{1}{e}(1 - \cos \theta)\partial_\mu \varphi, \\ W_\mu &= \mp \frac{i}{g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\partial_\mu \theta + i \sin \theta \partial_\mu \varphi), \quad Z_\mu = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

This is the naked Cho-Maison monopole (22) which has an extra W_μ part which has exactly the form of the Wu-Yang monopole potential [27, 28, 38]. So one might wonder if this solution could be interpreted as the naked Cho-Maison monopole which has an extra Wu-Yang type monopole coming from the W boson. But this may not be a correct interpretation, because the Wu-Yang type potential of the W boson in (41) does not become a solution by itself, without the naked Cho-Maison monopole. To see this, we choose the ansatz which describes the Wu-Yang type potential made of the W boson,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi = 0, \quad \hat{A}_\mu &= 0, \\ \vec{W}_\mu &= \frac{1}{g}(-\sin \theta \partial_\mu \varphi \hat{e}_1 + \partial_\mu \theta \hat{e}_2), \\ B_\mu &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

In terms of physical fields the ansatz becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \rho = 0, \quad W_\mu &= \frac{i}{g} \frac{f}{\sqrt{2}}(\partial_\mu \theta + i \sin \theta \partial_\mu \varphi), \\ A_\mu^{(em)} &= 0, \quad Z_\mu = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

However, this does not become a solution of the equation of motion (11).

Moreover, according to (24) the energy of the solution (41) is given by the energy of the naked Cho-Maison monopole. This tells that the Wu-Yang type potential made of the W boson in (41) does not generate any extra energy. This suggests that (41) describes the naked

Cho-Maison monopole, so that it may not be viewed a new solution from the physical point of view.

Our analysis in this section strongly implies the existence of a new neutral topological monopole which could have mass around 3.28 TeV. And this is within the standard model. This could change our understanding of the standard model drastically.

As we have mentioned, the standard model has yet to pass the final test, the topological test. But it has generally believed that this topological test should come from the experimental confirmation of the Cho-Maison monopole. The problem with this is that it is not clear that the present 14 TeV LHC could produce it or not, since the mass has been guessed to be 4 to 10 TeV [8–14]. However, if the new neutral monopole has the mass around 3.28 TeV, energetically there is no problem for the present LHC to produce this monopole. And in this case ATLAS and/or CMS could in principle detect it. If so, the first topological test of the standard model could come from the detection of this monopole, not the Cho-Maison monopole.

V. NEW MONOPOLE IN GEORGI-GLASHOW MODEL

It is instructive to compare the above monopoles in the standard model to the 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole in Georgi-Glashow model. Consider the Georgi-Glashow Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{GG} = -\frac{1}{2}(D_\mu \vec{\Phi})^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4}(\vec{\Phi}^2 - \frac{\mu^2}{\lambda})^2 - \frac{1}{4}\vec{F}_{\mu\nu}^2, \quad (44)$$

where $\vec{\Phi}$ is the Higgs triplet. With

$$\vec{\Phi} = \rho \hat{n}, \quad \vec{A}_\mu = \hat{A}_\mu + \vec{W}_\mu, \quad (45)$$

we have the Abelian decomposition of the Georgi-Glashow Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{GG} &= -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \rho)^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4}(\rho^2 - \frac{\mu^2}{\lambda})^2 - \frac{1}{4}\hat{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}(\hat{D}_\mu \vec{W}_\nu - \hat{D}_\nu \vec{W}_\mu)^2 - \frac{g^2}{2}\rho^2(\vec{W}_\mu)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{g}{2}\hat{F}_{\mu\nu} \cdot (\vec{W}_\mu \times \vec{W}_\nu) - \frac{g^2}{4}(\vec{W}_\mu \times \vec{W}_\nu)^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \rho)^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4}(\rho^2 - \rho_0^2)^2 - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}|D'_\mu W_\nu - D'_\nu W_\mu|^2 - g^2 \rho^2 W_\mu^* W_\mu \\ &\quad + igF'_{\mu\nu} W_\mu^* W_\nu + \frac{g^2}{4}(W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}_\mu &= \partial_\mu + g\hat{A}_\mu \times, \quad D'_\mu = \partial_\mu + igA'_\mu, \\ \rho_0 &= \sqrt{\mu^2/\lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

This clearly shows that the theory can be viewed as a Abelian gauge theory which has the charged vector field W_μ as a source.

To compare the Georgi-Glashow Lagrangian with the Weinberg Lagrangian of the standard model, notice that when we switch off the hypercharge gauge interaction, the Weinberg Lagrangian (6) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \rho)^2 - \frac{\lambda}{8}(\rho^2 - \rho_0^2)^2 - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^2 - \frac{g^2}{8}\rho^2 A_\mu'^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{2}|D'_\mu W_\nu - D'_\nu W_\mu|^2 + \frac{g^2}{4}W_\mu^* W_\mu \\ & + igF'_{\mu\nu}W_\mu^* W_\nu + \frac{g^2}{4}(W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

This is almost identical to the above Georgi-Glashow Lagrangian (46), except that in (48) the Abelian potential A'_μ of SU(2) has the extra interaction with the Higgs scalar which generates the mass to A'_μ .

From the Lagrangian (46) we have the equation of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^2 \rho - 2g^2 \rho W_\mu^* W_\mu &= \lambda(\rho^2 - \rho_0^2)\rho, \\ D'_\mu(D'_\mu W_\nu - D'_\nu W_\mu) &= g^2 \rho^2 W_\nu + igF'_{\mu\nu} W_\mu \\ &\quad - g^2(W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu)W_\mu, \\ \partial_\mu F'_{\mu\nu} &= ig\partial_\mu(W_\mu^* W_\nu - W_\nu^* W_\mu) + ig[W_\mu^*(D'_\mu W_\nu \\ &\quad - D'_\nu W_\mu) + (D'_\mu W_\nu - D'_\nu W_\mu)^* W_\mu]. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Notice that here A'_μ and W_μ have two independent equations of motion.

To discuss the 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole we choose the ansatz,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\Phi} &= \rho(r) \hat{r}, \quad \hat{A}_\mu = -\frac{1}{g}\hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \\ \vec{W}_\mu &= \frac{1}{g}f(r) \hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \rho(r), \quad A'_\mu = -\frac{1}{g}(1 - \cos \theta)\partial_\mu \varphi, \\ W_\mu &= \frac{i}{g} \frac{f(r)}{\sqrt{2}}(\partial_\mu \theta + i \sin \theta \partial_\mu \varphi). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

This should be compared to the ansatz (20). Clearly they become identical when we identify A'_μ as $A_\mu^{(em)}$ in the absence of Z_μ .

With the ansatz we have the following equation for the monopole

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\rho} + \frac{2}{r}\dot{\rho} - 2\frac{f^2}{r^2}\rho &= \lambda(\rho^2 - \rho_0^2)\rho, \\ \ddot{f} - \frac{f^2 - 1}{r^2}f &= g^2 \rho^2 f, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Again, this should be compared to the equation of motion (21) for the Cho-Maison monopole. They are almost identical.

Obviously, (52) has the solution

$$\rho = \rho_0, \quad f = 0, \quad (53)$$

or

$$\rho = \rho_0, \quad \hat{A}_\mu = -\frac{1}{g}\hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \quad \vec{W}_\mu = 0. \quad (54)$$

This is precisely the Wu-Yang monopole [27, 28, 38, 39]. This confirms that the Georgi-Glashow model has the Wu-Yang monopole as a solution. But notice that this has an infinite energy.

We can make the energy finite with the W boson dressing, integrating (52) with the boundary condition

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(0) &= 0, \quad \rho(\infty) = \bar{\rho}_0, \\ f(0) &= 1, \quad f(\infty) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

and obtain the 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole which has a finite energy. The solution is shown in Fig. 2 in black curves.

The energy of the 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E &= E_\rho + E_W + E_{\rho W}, \\ E_\rho &= 4\pi \int_0^\infty \left[\frac{r^2}{2}\dot{\rho}^2 + \frac{r^2\lambda}{4}(\rho^2 - \rho_0^2)^2 \right] dr, \\ E_W &= \frac{4\pi}{g^2} \int_0^\infty \left[\dot{f}^2 + \frac{(f^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2} \right] dr, \\ E_{\rho W} &= 4\pi \int_0^\infty f^2 \rho^2 dr, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Notice that the boundary condition $f(0) = 1$ is crucial to make the solutions regular at the origin and make the energy finite. This shows that the tHooft-Polyakov monopole is nothing but the Wu-Yang monopole which has the Higgs and W boson dressing which makes the energy finite.

Moreover, in the Bogomol'nyi-Prasad-Sommerfield (BPS) limit $\lambda = 0$, the equation (52) reduces to the following equation

$$\dot{\rho} \pm \frac{f^2 - 1}{gr^2} = 0, \quad \dot{f} \pm g\rho f = 0. \quad (57)$$

This has the analytic solution

$$\rho = \rho_0 \coth(g\rho_0 r) - \frac{1}{gr}, \quad f = \frac{g\rho_0 r}{\sinh(g\rho_0 r)}, \quad (58)$$

which describes the analytic Prasad-Sommerfield monopole [40]. And we can generalize the 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole to the dyon and anti-dyon.




FIG. 2. The new monopole solutions in Georgi-Glashow model. The black curves represent the well known 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole, and the blue curve represents the Wu-Yang monopole which has the W boson dressing.

Now, we show that the Georgi-Glashow model (just like the standard model) has another interesting new monopole solution. To see this, notice that (52) has another solution given by

$$\rho = 0, \quad f = -1, \quad (59)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= 0, \quad \hat{A}_\mu = -\frac{1}{g} \hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \\ \vec{W}_\mu &= -\frac{1}{g} \hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Moreover, when $\rho = 0$, the 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole equation (52) reduces to

$$\ddot{f} - \frac{f^2 - 1}{r^2} f = 0. \quad (61)$$

This is identical to the equation (27) we have discussed above in the standard model.

This tells that we now have a new monopole solution in Georgi-Glashow model. Indeed, integrating (61) with the boundary condition (29) we obtain the Wu-Yang monopole which has only the W boson dressing. This is shown in Fig. 2 in blue curves. This tells that the Georgi-Glashow model also admits a new type of monopole solution.

The energy of the new monopole is given by

$$E = \frac{4\pi}{g^2} \int_0^\infty \left[\dot{f}^2 + \frac{(f^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2} \right] dr, \quad (62)$$

which contains the infinite energy of the singularity of the Wu-Yang monopole at the origin. Notice that here again $\rho = 0$ of the solution means no Higgs field, so that we do not have to worry about the stability of the solution or the Higgs vacuum energy.

The existence of the new monopole in Georgi-Glashow model, the Wu-Yang monopole dressed by the W boson, is also completely unexpected.

VI. CHROMONIC MONOPOLE IN QCD

So far we have shown the existence of new types monopoles in the standard model and Georgi-Glashow model. This is not accidental. The non-Abelian gauge theories have similar non-Abelian structure which allows this. To show this we now discuss a new monopole solution in QCD.

It has been well known that QCD has the Wu-Yang monopole [38, 39]. We can generalize this to obtain a new Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing. To understand this we make the Abelian decomposition of the SU(2) QCD,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{A}_\mu &= \hat{A}_\mu + \vec{X}_\mu, \\ \hat{A}_\mu &= A_\mu \hat{n} - \frac{1}{g} \hat{n} \times \partial_\mu \hat{n}, \quad (A_\mu = \hat{n} \cdot \vec{A}_\mu), \\ \vec{X}_\mu &= X_\mu^1 \hat{n}_1 + X_\mu^2 \hat{n}_2, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

and express the QCD Lagrangian by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{QCD} &= -\frac{1}{4} \vec{F}_{\mu\nu}^2 \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{RCD} - \frac{1}{4} (\hat{D}_\mu \vec{X}_\nu - \hat{D}_\nu \vec{X}_\mu)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{g}{2} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu} \cdot (\vec{X}_\mu \times \vec{X}_\nu) - \frac{g^2}{4} (\vec{X}_\mu \times \vec{X}_\nu)^2 \\ &= -\frac{1}{4} (F_{\mu\nu} + H_{\mu\nu} + X_{\mu\nu})^2 - \frac{1}{4} (\hat{D}_\mu \vec{X}_\nu - \hat{D}_\nu \vec{X}_\mu)^2, \\ \mathcal{L}_{RCD} &= -\frac{1}{4} \hat{F}_{\mu\nu}^2, \\ H_{\mu\nu} &= -\frac{1}{g} \hat{n} \cdot (\partial_\mu \hat{n} \times \partial_\nu \hat{n}) = \partial_\mu C_\nu - \partial_\nu C_\mu, \\ X_{\mu\nu} &= g \hat{n} \cdot (\vec{X}_\mu \times \vec{X}_\nu). \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

This tells that the QCD can be viewed as the restricted QCD (RCD) made of the restricted potential \hat{A}_μ which has the chromon \vec{X}_μ as the colored source.

The Lagrangian (64) gives us the following equation of motion for SU(2) QCD,

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_\mu (F_{\mu\nu} + H_{\mu\nu}) \\ &= -g \hat{n} \cdot [\vec{X}_\mu \times (\hat{D}_\mu \vec{X}_\nu - \hat{D}_\nu \vec{X}_\mu) + \partial_\mu (\vec{X}_\mu \times \vec{X}_\nu)], \\ &\quad \hat{D}_\mu (\hat{D}_\mu \vec{X}_\nu - \hat{D}_\nu \vec{X}_\mu) \\ &= g (F_{\mu\nu} + H_{\mu\nu} + X_{\mu\nu}) \hat{n} \times \vec{X}_\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

This should be compared with the well-known QCD equation of motion

$$D_\mu \vec{F}_{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (66)$$

Remarkably, (65) decomposes the QCD equation (66) to two separate equations, the one for the nuron A_μ and the one for the chromon \vec{X}_μ .




FIG. 3. The new monopole solution in QCD, the Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing. The black curve represents the chromon profile, and the red curve represents the chromon profile f in log scale.

Notice that the first equation of (65) for the nuiron is very much like the Maxwell's equation in QED. And the second equation for the chromon confirms that it becomes a colored source of the restricted potential \hat{A}_μ . This strongly implies that the nuiron A_μ plays the role of “the photon” in QCD, but the chromon \vec{X}_μ plays the role of the colored source of QCD which could be interpreted as the constituent gluon [27, 28].

To obtain a new monopole solution, we choose the ansatz

$$\hat{A}_\mu = -\frac{1}{g}\hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \quad \vec{X}_\mu = -\frac{1}{g}f(r)\hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \quad (67)$$

and have the following equation from (65)

$$\ddot{f} - \frac{f^2 - 1}{r^2} f = 0. \quad (68)$$

Obviously this has the solution

$$f = 0. \quad (69)$$

or

$$\hat{A}_\mu = -\frac{1}{g}\hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r}, \quad \vec{X}_\mu = 0. \quad (70)$$

This, of course, is precisely the Wu-Yang monopole [27, 28, 38, 39].

We can easily show that this Wu-Yang monopole is nothing but the Dirac monopole embedded in QCD. To show this, notice that under the gauge transformation

$$\hat{r} \rightarrow \hat{e} = U\hat{r} = \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta \cos \varphi \\ \sin \theta \sin \varphi \\ \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (71)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_\mu &= -\frac{1}{g}\hat{r} \times \partial_\mu \hat{r} \rightarrow C_\mu \hat{e}, \quad \vec{X}_\mu \rightarrow 0, \\ C_\mu &\simeq -\frac{1}{g}\hat{\theta} \cdot \partial_\mu \hat{\varphi} = -\frac{1}{g}(1 - \cos \theta)\partial_\mu \varphi, \\ \hat{\theta} &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \cos \varphi \\ \cos \theta \sin \varphi \\ -\sin \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\varphi} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \varphi \\ \cos \varphi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

This is precisely the Dirac monopole trivially embedded in QCD. This confirms that the Wu-Yang monopole is nothing but the Dirac monopole embedded in the SU(2) QCD.

We can generalize this Wu-Yang monopole solution. Solving (68) with the boundary condition

$$f(0) = 0, \quad f(\infty) = 1, \quad (73)$$

we obtain a new monopole solution in QCD, the Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing. This is shown in Fig. 3. The energy of the new monopole is given by

$$E = \frac{4\pi}{g^2} \int_0^\infty \left[\dot{f}^2 + \frac{(f^2 - 1)^2}{2r^2} \right] dr, \quad (74)$$

which becomes infinite.

VII. DISCUSSION

In this paper we have discussed the new monopole solutions in the standard model, the Georgi-Glashow model, and QCD. So far, it has been thought that there is only one type of electroweak monopole in the standard model, the Cho-Maison monopole. But in this paper we have shown that there are actually two types electroweak monopoles, the Cho-Maison type monopoles which have the magnetic charge $4\pi/e$ and the neutral type magnetic monopoles which have the magnetic charge $4\pi/\bar{e}$. We have shown that there are three different Cho-Maison monopoles, the naked one, the one which has the Higgs and W boson dressing, and the one which has only the W boson dressing. Moreover, we have shown that there are two neutral monopoles, the naked one and the one which has the W boson dressing.

The existence of two types of monopoles stems from the fact that the standard model has two conserved charges, the electric charge e and the neutral charge \bar{e} . This, of course, does not guarantee the existence of two types of monopoles in the standard model. So the fact that the theory actually accommodates two types of monopoles is really remarkable.

We have also shown that the two types of monopoles in the standard model, the Cho-Maison monopole and

the neutral monopole, can also be represented by two sets of new monopoles, the weak monopole of (36) and the hypercharge monopole of (39). This comes from the fact that the two monopoles come from two U(1) gauge groups, the weak U(1) subgroup of SU(2) and the hypercharge U(1) of the standard model. This must be clear from the Lagrangian (6).

In the Georgi-Glashow model, we have shown that there are three monopoles, the naked Wu-Yang monopole, the Wu-Yang monopole which has the Higgs and W boson dressing, and the Wu-Yang monopole which has only the W boson dressing. And we have shown that the well known 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole is nothing but the Wu-Yang monopole which has the Higgs and W boson dressing, which regularizes the point singularity of the monopole and makes the energy finite.

In QCD we have shown that there are two monopoles, the naked Wu-Yang monopole and the Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing.

The new monopoles among these are the two neutral magnetic monopoles (the naked one and the one with the W boson dressing) and the Cho-Maison monopole which have the W boson dressing in the standard model, the Wu-Yang monopole which has the W boson dressing in the Georgi-Glashow model, and the Wu-Yang monopole which has the chromon dressing in QCD. So far, these monopoles have escaped our attention.

The new monopoles are all very interesting, but the most unexpected ones are the neutral magnetic monopoles in the standard model. Clearly they are a totally new type of monopoles whose existence has never been suggested in physics before.

All new monopoles have a common denominator, the same W boson and/or the chromon profile given by the equation (68). This is because all of them stem from the chromonic monopole in QCD, the pure SU(2) gauge interaction which exists in all three theories. So the chromonic monopole in QCD becomes the backbone of all these new monopoles. This is remarkable.

The standard model has really remarkable features. Obviously it is one of the most successful theory in high energy physics. And now we know that it has many interesting monopoles. This is almost surreal. What is the reason that the standard model has such interesting monopoles? This appears mysterious.

The reason is that the standard model has two monopole topology, the SU(2) monopole topology $\pi_2(S^2)$ and the hypercharge U(1) monopole topology $\pi_1(S^1)$. And after the Abelian decomposition they transform to two $\pi_1(S^1)$ monopole topology, the $\pi_1(S^1)$ monopole topology of the weak U(1) subgroup of SU(2) and the $\pi_1(S^1)$ monopole topology of the hypercharge U(1). And a combination of the two monopole topology provides the monopole topology of the new solutions.

In fact, the weak U(1) monopole topology describes the topology of the weak monopole which has the W boson dressing, and the U(1) hypercharge monopole topology describes the hypercharge monopole. And the electromagnetic and neutral combinations of these two topology describe the topology of the Cho-Maison monopole and the neutral monopole. So, we can explain the monopole topology of all these solutions with the two monopole topology of the standard model. This tells that it is not mysterious that the standard model has these new monopoles.

One might ask if these new monopoles are stable. Obviously they have the topological stability. But one might like to know if they are also dynamically stable. It has been proved that the Cho-Maison monopole is dynamically stable [17]. It would be interesting to see if one can also prove the dynamical stability of the neutral monopole in the standard model.

The importance of the standard model may not be limited to high energy physics. It has been argued that it could also play important roles in condensed matter physics. This is because it could be viewed as the non-Abelian Ginzburg-Landau theory of two-gap ferromagnetic superconductivity [22–24].

Moreover, the standard model could also describe the magnon electron spintronics. This is because the Higgs doublet could be interpreted as the charged spinon which describes the electron in electron spintronics. So, with the hypercharge U(1) as the electromagnetic U(1) and the non-Abelian SU(2) as the magnon gauge interaction which acts on the electron spin, we could view the theory as the theory of the electron magnon spintronics [24–26].

Our result in this paper shows that it gives us another surprise that it could also accommodate two types of different monopoles. This strongly implies that the above new monopoles in the standard model could also play important roles in low energy physics. This suggests that the theory may still have hidden territories yet to be explored.

Finally we emphasize that the Abelian decomposition of the non-Abelian gauge theory has played the central role for us to find these new monopole solutions [27–32]. Without this it would have been almost impossible to find them. Moreover, the Abelian decomposition allowed us to clarify the topological structure of the standard model which justifies the existence of the new monopoles.

The details of the monopoles and new aspects of the standard model will be discussed in a separate paper [41].

Acknowledgments

We sincerely thank Yisong Yang for sharing the existence proof of the neutral magnetic monopole with us. LZ and PZ are supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (No. 2024YFE0109802) and National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant

No. 12175320 and No. 12375084). YMC is supported in part by the President's Fellowship Initiative of Chinese Academy of Science (Grant No. 2025PD0115), the National Research Foundation of Korea funded by Ministry

of Science and Technology (Grant 2022-R1A2C1006999), and by Center for Quantum Spacetime, Sogang University, Korea.

-
- [1] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19**, 1264 (1967).
 - [2] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. **B716**, 1 (2012); S. Chatrchyan et al. (CMS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. **B716**, 30 (2012); T. Aaltonen et al. (CDF and D0 Collaborations), Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 071804 (2012).
 - [3] Y. M. Cho and D. Maison, Phys. Lett. **B391**, 360 (1997); W.S. Bae and Y.M. Cho, J. Kor. Phys. Soc. **46**, 791 (2005).
 - [4] Yisong Yang, Proc. Roy. Soc. **A454**, 155 (1998). See also Yisong Yang, *Solitons in Field Theory and Non-linear Analysis* (Springer Monographs in Mathematics), (Springer-Verlag) 2001.
 - [5] P.A.M. Dirac, Phys. Rev. **74**, 817 (1948).
 - [6] B. Cabrera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1378 (1982).
 - [7] S. Chen, D. Zu, and M. Cai, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **358**, 10 (2009).
 - [8] Kyoungtae Kimm, J.H. Yoon, and Y.M. Cho, Euro. Phys. J. **C75**, 67 (2015); Kyoungtae Kimm, J.H. Yoon, S.H. Oh, and Y.M. Cho, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A31**, 1650053 (2016).
 - [9] J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos, and T. You, Phys. Lett **B756**, 29, (2016); N.E. Mavromatos and V. Motsou, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A35**, 2030012 (2020).
 - [10] S. Arunasalam and A. Kobakhidze, Euro. Phys. J. **C77**, 444 (2017).
 - [11] F. Blaschke and P. Benes, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **073B03** (2018).
 - [12] N.E. Mavromatos and S. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. **D97**, 261802 (2018); Universe **5**, 8 (2019); J. Alexandre and N.E. Mavromatos, Phys. Rev. **D100**, 096005 (2019).
 - [13] Y.M. Cho, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. **A377**, 0038 (2019).
 - [14] Pengming Zhang, Liping Zou, and Y.M. Cho, Euro. Phys. J. **C80**, 280 (2020).
 - [15] P. De Fabritiis and J.A. Helayel-Neto, Euro. Phys. J. **C81**, 788 (2021).
 - [16] P.Q. Hung, Nucl. Phys. **B962**, 115278 (2021); J. Ellis, P.Q. Hung, and N.E. Mavromatos, Nucl. Phys. **B969**, 115468 (2021).
 - [17] R. Gervalle and M. Volkov, Nucl. Phys. **B984**, 115937 (2022); Nucl. Phys. **B987**, 116112 (2023).
 - [18] B. Acharya et al. (MoEDAL Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 061801 (2017); Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 021802 (2019); Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 071801 (2021).
 - [19] ATLAS Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 261803 (2012); Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 031802 (2020).
 - [20] Y.M. Cho, arXiv:2511.21174 [hep-ph], to be published.
 - [21] Y. Zeldovich and M. Kholopov, Phys. Lett. **B79**, 239 (1978).
 - [22] Y.M. Cho and Franklin H. Cho, Phys. Lett. **A472**, 128793 (2023).
 - [23] Y.M. Cho and Franklin H. Cho, Ann. Phys. **460**, 169573 (2024).
 - [24] Y.M. Cho and Franklin H. Cho, arXiv:2506.07318 [cond-mat.supr-con], submitted to Phys. Rev. **B**.
 - [25] Y.M. Cho and Franklin H. Cho, arXiv:2506.21850 [cond-mat.supr-con], to be published.
 - [26] Franklin H. Cho, Y.M. Cho, Pengming Zhang, and Liping Zou, arXiv:2509.12988 [cond-mat.supr-con], submitted to Ann. Phys.
 - [27] Y.M. Cho, Phys. Rev. **D21**, 1080 (1980).
 - [28] Y.M. Cho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46**, 302 (1981); Phys. Rev. **D23**, 2415 (1981).
 - [29] L. Faddeev and A. Niemi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1624 (1999); Phys. Lett. **B449**, 214 (1999).
 - [30] S. Shabanov, Phys. Lett. **B458**, 322 (1999); **B463**, 263 (1999); H. Gies, Phys. Rev. **D63**, 125023 (2001).
 - [31] R. Zucchini, Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. **1**, 813 (2004).
 - [32] K. Kondo, S. Kato, A. Shibata, and T. Shinohara, Phys. Rep. **579**, 1 (2015).
 - [33] S. Coleman, *Aspects of Symmetry*, Cambridge University Press, (Cambridge, UK), 1985.
 - [34] T. Vachaspati and M. Barriola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1897 (1992).
 - [35] M. Barriola, T. Vachaspati, and M. Bucher, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 1819 (1994).
 - [36] Y.M. Cho, Sang-Woo Kim, and Seung Hun Oh, arXiv:2408.05531 [hep-th], to be published.
 - [37] Yisong Yang, private communication.
 - [38] Y.M. Cho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 1115 (1980).
 - [39] T.T. Wu and C.N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 3845 (1975).
 - [40] M.K. Prasad and C.M. Sommerfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 760 (1975); B. Julia and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 2227 (1975).
 - [41] Liping Zou, Pengming Zhang, and Y.M. Cho, to be published.