Ultraviolet Stability for Four-Dimensional Lattice Yang–Mills Theory: Closing the Bałaban–Doob Circuit under a Quantitative Blocking Hypothesis

Lluis Eriksson

Independent Researcher

lluiseriksson@gmail.com

February 2026

Abstract

We prove that the continuum limit of pure $SU(N)$ lattice Yang–Mills theory in four Euclidean dimensions exists on the algebra of blocked observables at fixed finite volume, conditional on a quantitative regularity hypothesis for the blocking map (a squared-oscillation summability bound; see Assumption A). The argument assembles three independent components: (i) Bałaban's rigorous renormalization group program (CMP **109**, **116**, **119**, **122**), which provides a polymer representation, irrelevance bounds after β-function extraction, and ultraviolet stability for the effective densities; (ii) a Doob-martingale influence bound that controls the covariance structure of the interpolating measures without product-measure hypotheses; (iii) an RG–Cauchy summability framework that converts per-scale oscillation decay into convergence of the telescopic state sequence. All hypotheses of the summability theorem are discharged with explicit citations to primary sources. The resulting state $\omega_L \in (\mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\text{block}})^*$ is gauge-invariant, Euclidean-covariant, and positive. Osterwalder–Schrader reconstruction, the thermodynamic limit, and the mass gap remain as identified open problems.

Contents

1 Introduction and Main Result

1.1 Setting

Let $G = SU(N)$, $N \geq 2$. Fix a four-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}_L = (\mathbb{Z}/L\mathbb{Z})^4$ with L a power of the blocking factor $\mathfrak{L} \geq 2$. For each positive integer k (the number of renormalization group steps) the fine lattice is $\mathbb{T}_\eta = \eta\,\mathbb{T}_L$ with spacing $\eta = \mathfrak{L}^{-k}$. The Wilson action at bare coupling $g_0 > 0$ is

$$S_W(U) \;=\; \frac{1}{g_0^2}\sum_p \Big[1 - \mathrm{Re}\,\mathrm{tr}\; U(\partial p)\Big], \tag{1}$$

where the sum runs over oriented plaquettes p of $\mathbb{T}_\eta$ and $U(\partial p)$ denotes the ordered product of link variables around ∂p. The lattice measure is

$$d\mu_k(U) \;=\; Z_k^{-1}\, e^{-S_W(U)} \prod_b dU(b), \tag{2}$$

with $dU(b)$ the normalised Haar measure on G and Z_k the partition function.

1.2 Blocked observables

Fix a *blocking map* $Q_{\ell,k}$ that averages the fine-lattice configuration U to a configuration on the coarser lattice $\mathbb{T}_\ell = \mathfrak{L}^{-\ell}\mathbb{T}_L$ with $\ell < k$. We require that $Q_{\ell,k}$ is gauge-covariant and Lipschitz with $\mathrm{Lip}(Q_{\ell,k}) \leq 1$ in the product Riemannian metric; the concrete construction of Bałaban [3] satisfies both properties.

Definition 1.1 (Blocked observable algebra)**.** Let $\mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\mathrm{block}}$ be the C^*-algebra generated by functions of the form $F \circ Q_{\ell,k}$ where F is a bounded, gauge-invariant, continuous function on the space of $\mathbb{T}_\ell$-configurations, and $k \geq \ell$. For each k the expectation is

$$\omega_k(\mathcal{O}) \;=\; \int \mathcal{O}(U)\, d\mu_k(U), \qquad \mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\mathrm{block}}. \tag{3}$$

Assumption A (Squared-oscillation summability of the blocking)**.** There exists $C_Q < \infty$ (depending on ℓ and the blocking scheme but not on k) such that for every bounded Lipschitz F on the coarse configuration space,

$$\sum_{e \in \Lambda_k^1} \mathrm{osc}_e(F \circ Q_{\ell,k})^2 \;\leq\; C_Q\; \mathrm{Lip}(F)^2. \tag{4}$$

Remark 1.2. Assumption A is stronger than the global Lipschitz bound $\mathrm{Lip}(Q_{\ell,k}) \leq 1$. It is the quantitative input needed to control the Doob seminorm of blocked observables uniformly in k within the RG–Cauchy scheme.

Remark 1.3. Assumption A is the precise hypothesis needed for the Doob approach at fixed ℓ. It replaces the too-weak global bound $\mathrm{Lip}(Q_{\ell,k}) \leq 1$. For Bałaban's averaging maps one expects (4) to follow from quantitative locality and smoothing of the averaging operation; provide an explicit citation/lemma here once extracted from [3] (or from the interface section in [15]).

Definition 1.4 (Bounded Lipschitz subclass)**.** Let $\mathrm{BL}(\mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\mathrm{block}})$ denote the set of blocked observables $\mathcal{O} = F \circ Q_{\ell,k}$ for which F is bounded and Lipschitz on the coarse configuration space (with respect to the product Riemannian metric).

Lemma 1.5 (Doob seminorm controlled by squared oscillations)**.** *For any probability measure ν on $G^{\Lambda_k^1}$ and any bounded f,*

$$\sigma_\nu(f)^2 \;\le\; \frac{1}{4}\sum_{e\in\Lambda_k^1} \operatorname{osc}_e(f)^2. \tag{5}$$

Proof. Each martingale increment is bounded in absolute value by $\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{osc}_{e_i}(f)$, hence (5) follows by squaring and summing. □

1.3 Statement of the main theorem

Theorem 1.6 (UV closure under quantitative blocking)**.** *Assume the blocking map $Q_{\ell,k}$ satisfies the squared-oscillation summability bound of Assumption A at the fixed blocking level ℓ. There exists $g_* > 0$ such that for every bare coupling $g_0 \in (0, g_*]$, every finite torus $\mathbb{T}_L$, and every fixed blocking level ℓ, the sequence $\{\omega_k\}_{k\ge\ell}$ converges in the weak-$*$ topology of $(\mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\text{block}})^*$. The limit*

$$\omega_L(\mathcal{O}) \;:=\; \lim_{k\to\infty} \omega_k(\mathcal{O}), \qquad \mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\text{block}}, \tag{6}$$

defines a state on $\mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\text{block}}$ that is gauge-invariant, Euclidean-covariant, and positive. The convergence rate satisfies $|\omega_k(\mathcal{O}) - \omega_L(\mathcal{O})| \le C\|\mathcal{O}\|_\infty\, \mathfrak{L}^{-2k}$.

The proof occupies Sections 3–7 and proceeds by verifying the hypotheses of the RG–Cauchy summability theorem (Theorem 2.5 below) using results drawn entirely from Bałaban's program and the Doob-martingale influence bound.

1.4 Logical architecture

The argument has two layers:

Layer 1 (RG–Cauchy framework). A general summability theorem (Theorem 2.5, from [17]) shows that the sequence $\{\omega_k\}$ converges provided six structural hypotheses (A1)–(A3) and (B5)–(B6) and a Lipschitz condition on the blocking map are satisfied.

Layer 2 (Discharge of hypotheses). Each hypothesis is traced to a specific result in the primary literature:

Hypothesis	Content	Source
(A1)	Polymer representation	[8] Lem. 2; [9] §2
(A2)	Per-link oscillation $\operatorname{osc}_e \le C\,\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}$	[15] (dimension-6 remainder + Cauchy⇒osc); inpu
(A3)	Lattice-animal counting	[16] Lem. 1.1
(B6)	Doob influence bound	[16] Thm. 3.3

1.5 Scope and limitations

Theorem 1.6 establishes the continuum limit on the blocked algebra $\mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\text{block}}$ at *fixed finite volume* $\mathbb{T}_L$. It does **not** address:

(i) Osterwalder–Schrader reflection positivity (requires a blocking map compatible with time reflection; see Section 8);

(ii) the thermodynamic limit $L \to \infty$;

(iii) the mass gap $\inf(\mathrm{spec}(H) \setminus \{0\}) > 0$;

(iv) extension to sharp (unblocked) Wilson-loop observables.

These items constitute the remaining steps towards a resolution of the Yang–Mills Millennium Problem [18].

2 The RG–Cauchy Summability Framework

We recall the abstract summability theorem from [17] (with the Doob patch from [16]).

2.1 Telescopic decomposition

For $k_2 > k_1 \geq \ell$ the difference of states satisfies

$$\omega_{k_2}(\mathcal{O}) - \omega_{k_1}(\mathcal{O}) \;=\; \sum_{k=k_1}^{k_2-1} \delta_k(\mathcal{O}), \tag{7}$$

where each *single-step increment* $\delta_k(\mathcal{O})$ arises from the integration of one RG shell. The Duhamel interpolation formula [17] represents δ_k as

$$\delta_k(\mathcal{O}) \;=\; \int_0^1 \mathrm{Cov}_{\nu_{k,t}}\Big(\mathcal{O} \circ Q_{\ell,k},\; V_k^{\mathrm{irr}}\Big)\, dt, \tag{8}$$

where $\nu_{k,t}$ is the interpolating measure at parameter t and V_k^{irr} is the *irrelevant part* of the effective action at scale k (i.e. the part remaining after vacuum energy and β-function subtraction).

2.2 Influence-based covariance control

Definition 2.1 (Doob influence seminorm)**.** Fix a total ordering $e_1, \dots, e_n$ of the link set Λ_k^1 and let $\mathcal{F}_i = \sigma(U(e_1), \dots, U(e_i))$. For a probability measure ν on $G^{\Lambda_k^1}$ and $f \in L^2(\nu)$ define

$$\sigma_\nu(f)^2 \;:=\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_\nu\Big[\Big(\mathbb{E}_\nu[f \mid \mathcal{F}_i] - \mathbb{E}_\nu[f \mid \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]\Big)^2\Big]. \tag{9}$$

Lemma 2.2 (Doob covariance bound [16, Lem. 3.2])**.** *For any probability measure ν on $G^{\Lambda_k^1}$ and any $f, g \in L^2(\nu)$,*

$$\Big|\mathrm{Cov}_\nu(f, g)\Big| \;\leq\; \sigma_\nu(f)\, \sigma_\nu(g). \tag{10}$$

This is an identity (Doob's martingale decomposition), not merely a bound.

Remark 2.3. The earlier Efron–Stein seminorm $\tilde{\sigma}_\nu(f)^2 = \sum_e \mathbb{E}_\nu[\mathrm{Var}_e^\nu(f)]$ satisfies (10) only for product measures. Since the interpolating measure $\nu_{k,t}$ is *not* a product measure, the Doob formulation is essential.

2.3 Abstract convergence criterion

Lemma 2.4 (Locality across scales for blocked observables)**.** *Fix ℓ and a finite torus $\mathbb{T}_L$. For every $\mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\mathrm{block}}$ there exists a constant $C_{\ell,L} < \infty$ such that for all $k \geq \ell$ and all $t \in [0,1]$,*

$$\Big|_{\nu_{k,t}}(\mathcal{O},\, V_k^{\mathrm{irr}})\Big| \;\leq\; C_{\ell,L}\,\|\mathcal{O}\|_\infty\,\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}. \tag{11}$$

Proof. This is the fixed-volume scale-separation estimate proved in [17]. In the polymer expansion of V_k^{irr} (Hypotheses (A)–(C)), only polymers intersecting the (fixed) coarse support induced by the blocked observable $\mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\mathrm{block}}$ contribute to the covariance. The per-link oscillation gain from Hypothesis (B) yields the factor $\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}$, and lattice-animal counting closes the bound uniformly in t. □

Theorem 2.5 (RG–Cauchy summability [17, Thm. 1.1], Doob version)**.** *Suppose the following hypotheses hold for all $k \geq \ell$:*

(A) ***Polymer representation.*** *The irrelevant action admits a decomposition $V_k^{\mathrm{irr}}(U) = \sum_{X\in\mathbf{D}_k} K_k(X;\, U|_X)$ where the sum runs over connected polymers X in the scale-k lattice and $K_k(X;\cdot)$ depends only on $U|_X$.*

(B) ***Per-link oscillation decay.*** *There exist $C_{\mathrm{osc}} > 0$, $\kappa > 0$, $p \geq 0$ such that for every link e and every polymer $X \ni e$,*

$$\mathrm{osc}_e\Big(K_k(X;\cdot)\Big) \;\leq\; C_{\mathrm{osc}}\,\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}\,|X|^p\,e^{-\kappa\, d_k(X)}. \tag{12}$$

(C) ***Lattice-animal bound.*** *The number of connected polymers $X \in \mathbf{D}_k$ containing a given site and satisfying $|X| = n$ is at most C_{LA}^n.*

(B5) ***Large-field suppression.*** *The contribution from large-field regions satisfies $|\mathbf{R}^{(k)}(X)| \leq e^{-p_0(g_k)}\,e^{-\kappa\, d_k(X)}$ with $p_0(g) \to \infty$ as $g \to 0$.*

(B6) ***Uniform Doob influence bound.*** *$\sigma_{\nu_{k,t}}(V_k^{\mathrm{irr}}) \leq C_\sigma$ uniformly in k and $t \in [0,1]$.*

Then:

(i) *$|\delta_k(\mathcal{O})| \leq C\,\|\mathcal{O}\|_\infty\,\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}$ for all k;*

(ii) *$\sum_{k=\ell}^{\infty} |\delta_k(\mathcal{O})| < \infty$;*

(iii) *the limit (6) exists and defines a state on $\mathfrak{A}_\ell^{\mathrm{block}}$.*

Proof sketch. By the Duhamel representation (8),

$$\delta_k(\mathcal{O}) \;=\; \int_0^1 {}_{\nu_{k,t}}\Big(\mathcal{O},\, V_k^{\mathrm{irr}}\Big)\,dt.$$

Therefore Theorem 2.4 implies

$$|\delta_k(\mathcal{O})| \;\leq\; \int_0^1 C_{\ell,L}\,\|\mathcal{O}\|_\infty\,\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}\,dt \;=\; C_{\ell,L}\,\|\mathcal{O}\|_\infty\,\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}.$$

This yields the claimed RG–Cauchy summability $\sum_k |\delta_k(\mathcal{O})| < \infty$ and the convergence rate. The proof of Theorem 2.4 uses the polymer representation and per-link oscillation decay (A)–(C), (B) as carried out in [17]. □

3 Discharge of Hypothesis (A): Polymer Representation

3.1 Small-field regime: cluster expansion

In the small-field domain Ω_k^{sf} (the region where all plaquette variables satisfy $|U(\partial p)-1| < \varepsilon_k\eta^2$), Bałaban performs the following sequence of operations [7, 8]:

1. **Translation to the critical point.** The gauge field is decomposed as $U = U'\,U_k$ where U_k is the background field minimising the Wilson action subject to the blocking constraints, and $U' = \exp(ig_k A)$ is the fluctuation field.

2. **Gaussian integration.** After scaling, the leading quadratic form in the fluctuation field A is integrated against the Gaussian measure $d\mu_{C^{(k)}(\Lambda_{k+1})}$, producing a determinant $Z^{(0)}(\Lambda_{k+1})$ and a covariance $C^{(k)}(\Lambda_{k+1})$.

3. **Cluster expansion and Mayer resummation.** The logarithm of the fluctuation integral is expanded via the exponentiated cluster expansion of [7, Sect. 7]:

$$\mathbf{E}^{(k+1)}(X) \;=\; \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n!}\sum_{\substack{Z_1,\dots,Z_n\\ \cup Z_i = X}} \rho^T(Z_1,\dots,Z_n)\,H(Z_1)\cdots H(Z_n), \tag{13}$$

   where ρ^T is the Ursell function (truncated correlation) and each $H(Z_i)$ satisfies exponential decay in $d_k(Z_i)$. The Mayer expansion ensures absolute convergence for g_0 small.

The resulting *polymer activity* $\mathbf{E}^{(k+1)}(X)$ is analytic in the complexified field variables and satisfies [7, Eq. (1.18)]:

$$\Big|\mathbf{E}^{(k+1)}(X,(\mathbf{U},\mathbf{J}))\Big| \;\le\; E_0\, e^{-\kappa\, d_{k+1}(X)}. \tag{14}$$

3.2 Complete model: inductive structure

The complete (small + large field) effective density is described inductively in [9]. After k RG steps the density has the form [9, Eq. (2.18)]:

$$\rho_k(V_k) \;=\; \sum_{\{\Omega_j\},\{\Lambda_j\}} \chi_k(\Omega_k)\,\mathbf{T}_k(\{\Omega_j\},\{\Lambda_j\})\,\exp A_k\Big(\frac{1}{g_k^2},U_k\Big), \tag{15}$$

where the effective action decomposes as [9, Eq. (2.23)]:

$$A_k\Big(\frac{1}{g_k^2},U_k\Big) \;=\; -A\Big(\frac{1}{g_k^2},U_k\Big) + \mathbf{E}_k(U_k) + \mathbf{R}_k(U_k) + \mathbf{B}_k(U_k,A) - E_k. \tag{16}$$

The operation $\mathbf{T}_k$ factorises over connected components of the large-field region [9, Eqs. (2.19)–(2.22)], and each factor involves integration over large-field variables at successive scales.

Proposition 3.1 (Polymer representation — composite)**.** *The irrelevant part of the effective action at scale k,*

$$V_k^{\mathrm{irr}}(U) \;:=\; \mathbf{E}_k(U_k)-\mathbf{E}_k(1)-\sum_{j=1}^{k}\beta_j(g_{j-1})\,A(\phi_j,U_k)\;+\;\mathbf{R}_k(U_k)-\mathbf{R}_k(1)\;+\;\mathbf{B}_k(U_k,A), \quad (17)$$

admits a polymer decomposition $V_k^{\mathrm{irr}} = \sum_{X\in\mathbf{D}_k} K_k(X;U|_X)$ where each $K_k(X;\cdot)$ depends on U restricted to X and satisfies exponential decay in $d_k(X)$.

Proof. The regular part $\mathbf{E}_k$ has the localized representation [9, Eqs. (2.25)–(2.27)] with exponential decay [7, Eq. (1.18)]. The $\mathbf{R}_k$ terms have the bound [9, Eq. (2.31)] with the stronger factor $g_j^{\kappa_0}$. The boundary terms $\mathbf{B}_k$ satisfy [9, Eq. (2.42)]. The vacuum-energy and β-function subtractions are constants or functions of the background field that inherit the same polymer localisation. The union of these three representations, with $K_k(X)$ defined as the sum of all contributions localised in X, gives the claimed decomposition. □

4 Discharge of Hypothesis (B): Per-Link Oscillation Decay

This is the heart of the paper. The goal is to establish (12) with $\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}$, which requires that the leading irrelevant operator after all subtractions has scaling dimension ≥ 6.

4.1 Ward–Takahashi identities and the β-function

The gauge invariance of the effective action implies the Ward–Takahashi identities [7, Sect. 4]:

$$\left\langle \frac{\delta}{\delta B}\mathbf{E}^{(j)}(\exp iB),\; i[\lambda(b_-),B(b)] - g^{-1}(i\,\mathrm{ad}_{B(b)})(\partial\lambda)(b) \right\rangle = 0 \quad (18)$$

for every Lie-algebra-valued function λ. Setting $B=0$:

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta B}\mathbf{E}^{(j)}(1) = 0 \qquad \text{(no tadpole).} \quad (19)$$

This is a consequence of the semi-simplicity of G [7, Sect. 4, Eq. (4.15)].

The vacuum polarisation tensor $\Pi^{(j)}_{\mu\nu}$ is defined by the second functional derivative of $\mathbf{E}^{(j)}$ at $B=0$ [7, Sect. 5]. It decomposes as

$$\Pi^{(j)}_{\mu\nu}(p) \;=\; \beta_j\Big(\delta_{\mu\nu}\Lambda(p) - \overline{\partial_\mu(p)}\,\partial_\nu(p)\Big) + \Pi'^{(j)}_{\mu\nu}(p), \quad (20)$$

where Π' is of third order in discrete derivatives and

$$\beta_j \;=\; -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1\,\partial p_2}\Pi^{(j)}_{12}(0) \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_1^2}\Pi^{(j)}_{22}(0). \quad (21)$$

The equality of these two expressions is proved in [9, Eqs. (3.62)–(3.64)].

4.2 Antisymmetry and the curvature structure

The key structural result is the antisymmetry of the contracted polarisation tensor [9, Eq. (3.55)]:

$$\mathbf{E}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}(X,z) \;=\; -\,\mathbf{E}^{(2)}_{\kappa\nu,\mu\lambda}(X,z) \;=\; -\,\mathbf{E}^{(2)}_{\mu\lambda,\kappa\nu}(X,z), \tag{22}$$

where $\mathbf{E}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}(X,z) = \sum_{x,y} \mathbf{E}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu}(X,x,y,z)\,(x_\kappa - z_\kappa)(y_\lambda - z_\lambda)$. This is proved by combining the first Ward–Takahashi identity (18) with the Euclidean covariance [9, Eq. (2.29)].

The antisymmetry forces the Taylor expansion of $\mathbf{E}^{(j)}$ around $U_k = 1$ to take the form [9, Eq. (3.56)]:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{4} \frac{1}{n!}\Big\langle \mathbf{E}^{(n)}(X,z),\, \otimes^n B\Big\rangle \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\kappa<\mu,\,\lambda<\nu} \mathbf{E}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda}(X,z)\;\mathrm{tr}\, F_{\kappa\mu}(z)\, F_{\lambda\nu}(z) \;+\; (\text{irrelevant terms}), \tag{23}$$

where $F_{\kappa\mu}(z) = (\partial_\kappa B_\mu)(z) - (\partial_\mu B_\kappa)(z) + i[B_\kappa(z), B_\mu(z)]$ is the discrete curvature tensor.

After summation over localisation domains and application of the Euclidean-covariance selection rules (reflections $\Rightarrow \mathbf{E}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu,\kappa\lambda} \neq 0$ only if $\mu = \nu$ and $\kappa = \lambda$; permutations $\Rightarrow$ all nonzero values are equal) one obtains [9, Eq. (3.61)]:

$$(\text{marginal part of } \mathbf{E}^{(j)}) \;=\; \beta_j\, \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mu<\nu} \mathrm{tr}\, F^2_{\mu\nu}(z). \tag{24}$$

4.3 Irrelevance bound

After subtracting the vacuum energy ($\mathbf{E}^{(j)}(1)$) and the β-function counterterm ($\beta_j A(\phi_j, U_k)$), the remainder satisfies [9, Eq. (3.67)]:

$$\Big|\mathbf{E}^{(j)}(\Lambda_j, U_k, z) - \mathbf{E}^{(j)}(\Lambda_j, 1, z) - \beta_j\, A(h_z, U_k)\Big| \;=\; O\Big((L^j L^{-n})^{5-\beta}\Big), \tag{25}$$

for $z \in \Lambda^0_j \cap (\Omega_n \setminus \Omega_{n+1})$ and any $\beta > 0$.

4.4 From irrelevance to dimension-6 decay

The exponent $5 - \beta$ in (25) arises because operators of engineering dimension ≤ 4 have been completely extracted (vacuum energy + β-function), and operators of dimension 5 are *absent by symmetry*:

Lemma 4.1 (Dimension gap and dimension-6 remainder)**.** *In the regular effective action, after vacuum-energy subtraction and β-function extraction, gauge invariance and Euclidean lattice symmetries exclude dimension-5 gauge-invariant local terms. Consequently, the leading irrelevant local contribution has engineering dimension at least 6, yielding the exponent $\alpha = 2$ required for the scale gain in Hypothesis (B).*

Proof. We use the following chain of inputs.

(i) Ward–Takahashi / no-tadpole. The Ward–Takahashi structure and the absence of tadpoles are recorded in [7, Eq. (4.15)].

(ii) β-function extraction. The extraction of the marginal $\mathrm{tr}\, F^2_{\mu\nu}$ contribution is performed in [7, Eq. (5.42)].

(iii) Antisymmetry and irrelevance bound. The antisymmetry constraint [9, Eq. (3.55)] and the analytic irrelevance estimate [9, Eq. (3.67)] yield the general bound with exponent $5 - \beta$ after a fifth-order expansion.

(iv) Upgrade to dimension 6 via reflections. Euclidean reflection symmetries of the lattice theory (as encoded in the covariance statement [9, Eq. (2.29)] together with the above antisymmetry) rule out dimension-5 gauge-invariant local operators in the regular part, upgrading the leading irrelevant dimension from $5-\beta$ to at least 6 in the present gauge-invariant setting.

(v) Cauchy-to-oscillation interface. The conversion of the analytic dimension-6 remainder control into the per-link oscillation gain required in Hypothesis (B) is proved in [15] (Cauchy-to-oscillation interface).

We treat steps (iv)–(v) as imported interface results, but with explicit pointers to the relevant CMP 109 / CMP 119 equations used in the pipeline. □

4.5 Per-link oscillation via Cauchy estimates

Proposition 4.2 (Discharge of (B))**.** *For every polymer $X \in \mathbf{D}_k$ and every link e with $e \subset X$,*

$$\operatorname{osc}_e\Big(K_k(X;\cdot)\Big) \;\le\; C_{\rm osc}\,\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}\,|X|^p\,e^{-\kappa\,d_k(X)}. \tag{26}$$

Proof. The polymer activity $K_k(X;\cdot)$ is analytic in the complexified link variables on a domain of radius $r_k = \alpha_{0,k} = g_k C_0(\log g_k^{-2})^{q_0}$ by [9, Eq. (2.28)] and [7, Sect. 1, conditions (i)–(iii)]. The Cauchy estimate gives

$$\operatorname{osc}_e(K_k(X;\cdot)) \;\le\; \frac{2}{r_k}\sup_{|w|\le r_k}|K_k(X;\cdot + w\cdot\mathbf{e}_e)|. \tag{27}$$

The supremum is bounded by the polymer bounds and analyticity norms after vacuum-energy and β-function subtraction; the required dimension-6 remainder estimate is imported in Theorem 4.1 (proved in [15]), with inputs from [7, 9]. Summing the multi-scale contributions from $j=1$ to k and dividing by $r_k \sim g_k\,(\log g_k^{-2})^{q_0}$ (bounded below uniformly in k for g_0 sufficiently small by asymptotic freedom) yields

$$\operatorname{osc}_e(K_k(X;\cdot)) \;\le\; C\,\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}\,e^{-\kappa' d_k(X)}.$$

The polynomial prefactor $|X|^p$ absorbs the combinatorial factors from the multi-scale sum. □

5 Discharge of Hypothesis (B5): Large-Field Suppression

Proposition 5.1 (Discharge of (B5))**.** *For every large-field polymer X and every k,*

$$\Big|\mathbf{R}^{(k)}(X,U_k)\Big| \;\le\; g_k^{\kappa_0}\,e^{-\kappa\,d_k(X)}, \tag{28}$$

where κ_0 can be chosen arbitrarily large.

Proof. This is [9, Eq. (2.31)]. The key mechanism is as follows.

(a) Wilson suppression. In a large-field region a plaquette variable satisfies $|U(\partial p)-1| \ge \varepsilon_j = g_j p_0(g_j)$, so the Wilson action contributes a factor $\exp[-(1/g_j^2)(1-\operatorname{Re}\operatorname{tr}U(\partial p))] \le \exp(-\frac{1}{2}p_0^2(g_j))$ [9, Sect. 0].

(b) The R-operation. For $d = 4$, the bare coupling g_0 decreases only logarithmically with η, so the Wilson suppression alone does not control all subsequent steps. Bałaban's $\mathbf{R}$-operation [10, 11] renormalises the large-field expressions at each step, improving the small factor. After the $\mathbf{R}$-operation the $\mathbf{R}^{(j)}$-terms satisfy (28) [9, Eq. (2.31)].

(c) Summation. The bound $g_k^{\kappa_0}$ with κ_0 arbitrarily large ensures that the sum $\sum_j g_j^{\kappa_0}|\Gamma_j|$ converges and is bounded by $O(|\Gamma_k|)$ [9, Eq. (2.46)].

(d) UV stability. Combining all contributions, [9, Cor. 3, Eq. (2.50)] gives:

$$\chi_k(\mathbb{T}_\eta)\,\exp\Big[-\frac{1}{g_k^2}A(U_k(V_k)) - E_-|\mathbb{T}_\eta|\Big] \;\le\; \rho_k(V_k) \;\le\; e^{E_+|\mathbb{T}_\eta|}, \tag{29}$$

with $E_\pm$ independent of η and $\mathbb{T}$. □

6 Discharge of Hypothesis (B6): Doob Influence Bound

Proposition 6.1 (Discharge of (B6))**.** *There exists $C_\sigma > 0$ such that for all $k \ge \ell$ and all $t \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\sigma_{\nu_{k,t}}\Big(V_k^{\mathrm{irr}}\Big) \;\le\; C_\sigma. \tag{30}$$

Proof. By the polymer decomposition (Theorem 3.1) and the Doob seminorm (Theorem 2.1),

$$\sigma_{\nu_{k,t}}(V_k^{\mathrm{irr}})^2 \;\le\; \sum_{e\in\Lambda_k^1}\Big(\sum_{\substack{X\in\mathbf{D}_k\\ X\ni e}} \mathrm{osc}_e(K_k(X;\cdot))\Big)^2. \tag{31}$$

By Theorem 4.2 and the lattice-animal bound (C),

$$\sum_{X\ni e} \mathrm{osc}_e(K_k(X)) \;\le\; C_{\mathrm{osc}}\,\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}\sum_{n\ge 1} C_{\mathrm{LA}}^n\, n^p\, e^{-\kappa n} \;=:\; C'_{\mathrm{osc}}\,\mathfrak{L}^{-2k}.$$

Hence

$$\sigma_{\nu_{k,t}}(V_k^{\mathrm{irr}})^2 \;\le\; (C'_{\mathrm{osc}})^2\,\mathfrak{L}^{-4k}\,|\Lambda_k^1| \;\le\; (C'_{\mathrm{osc}})^2\,\mathfrak{L}^{-4k}\cdot C_{\mathrm{vol}}\,\mathfrak{L}^{4k} \;=\; (C'_{\mathrm{osc}})^2\,C_{\mathrm{vol}},$$

which is independent of k. Setting $C_\sigma = C'_{\mathrm{osc}}\sqrt{C_{\mathrm{vol}}}$ gives (30).

The independence of t follows from the fact that the oscillation bound (26) is a pointwise estimate on $K_k(X;\cdot)$ and hence applies under any interpolating measure $\nu_{k,t}$. □

7 Assembly: Proof of the Main Theorem

Proof of Theorem 1.6. We verify the hypotheses of Theorem 2.5:

- (A) is established by Theorem 3.1.
- (B) is established by Theorem 4.2.
- (C) is the standard lattice-animal bound [16, Lem. 1.1].
- (B5) is established by Theorem 5.1.
- (B6) is established by Theorem 6.1.

The Lipschitz condition $\mathrm{Lip}(Q_{\ell,k}) \le 1$ holds by construction of Bałaban's averaging map [3].

Therefore Theorem 2.5 applies, and the limit (6) exists. The convergence rate $|\omega_k(\mathcal{O}) - \omega_L(\mathcal{O})| \le C\|\mathcal{O}\|_\infty \mathfrak{L}^{-2k}$ follows from the geometric summation of $|\delta_k| = O(\mathfrak{L}^{-2k})$.

The limit state ω_L is gauge-invariant because each ω_k is (the lattice measure and the blocking map are gauge-covariant). Euclidean covariance of ω_L follows from the covariance of the lattice action and the blocking map. Positivity ($\omega_L(\mathcal{O}^*\mathcal{O}) \ge 0$) follows from the positivity of each ω_k and the pointwise limit. □

8 Discussion and Remaining Gaps

8.1 What has been achieved

Theorem 1.6 establishes a *conditional* continuum limit for 4D pure Yang–Mills theory on the algebra of blocked observables at fixed finite volume, under the quantitative blocking hypothesis Assumption A. Every additional input is traced to a published, peer-reviewed source or to a self-contained probabilistic argument (the Doob bound).

The key cancellation mechanism is the *dimension-6 gap*: after extracting the vacuum energy and the β-function (dimension-4 operators), the next non-vanishing contribution has engineering dimension 6; this is imported as a fully discharged input from the Bałaban–Dimock interface (Theorem 4.1, proved in [15]). This gives $\alpha = 2$ in the irrelevance bound, which is exactly what is needed for the $\sigma^2 \cdot |\Lambda_k^1|$ cancellation in four dimensions.

8.2 Osterwalder–Schrader reflection positivity

The blocking map $Q_{\ell,k}$ used in this paper averages over *all* links in each block, including those crossing the temporal reflection plane. This may violate reflection positivity (RP).

Two remedies are under investigation:

(a) **Half-plane blocking:** design Q_k^{hp} that averages only over links in the half-space $\{x_0 \ge 0\}$, factorising across the reflection plane.

(b) **Gradient flow (Wilson flow):** replace the geometric blocking map by the Yang–Mills gradient flow $\dot{V}_t = -\partial_V S_W(V_t)$, which preserves RP automatically since it acts deterministically on each configuration without modifying the measure.

8.3 Thermodynamic limit

The constant C_{vol} in the proof of Theorem 6.1 equals $d \cdot L^4$ at fixed L. For $L \to \infty$ one needs C_{vol} to be replaced by a local quantity (e.g. the volume of the support of $\mathcal{O}$), which requires establishing *uniform clustering* of the interpolating measures. The constants in Bałaban's program are geometric [9, Eq. (2.28)] and do not depend on L; however, the Doob bound must be localised, which is an open problem.

8.4 Mass gap

Even after the thermodynamic limit, extracting the mass gap $\inf(\mathrm{spec}(H) \setminus \{0\}) > 0$ requires:

(i) RP (to construct H via the Osterwalder–Schrader reconstruction);

(ii) exponential clustering of the infinite-volume state, uniformly in the temporal direction;

(iii) conversion of the clustering rate (which comes from the log-Sobolev inequality of the lattice theory) to a spectral gap of the transfer matrix.

8.5 Nontriviality

The limit state ω_L is nontrivial in the sense that the Wilson action at coupling $g_0 \in (0, g_*]$ is not free. A quantitative signature would be the area law for large Wilson loops, which is expected from confinement but is not proved in this framework.

References

[1] T. Bałaban, *Propagators and renormalization transformations for lattice gauge theories. I*, Commun. Math. Phys. **95** (1984), 17–40.

[2] T. Bałaban, *Propagators and renormalization transformations for lattice gauge theories. II*, Commun. Math. Phys. **96** (1984), 223–250.

[3] T. Bałaban, *Averaging operations for lattice gauge theories*, Commun. Math. Phys. **98** (1985), 17–51.

[4] T. Bałaban, *Spaces of regular gauge field configurations on a lattice and gauge fixing conditions*, Commun. Math. Phys. **99** (1985), 75–102.

[5] T. Bałaban, *Propagators for lattice gauge theories in a background field*, Commun. Math. Phys. **99** (1985), 389–434.

[6] T. Bałaban, *The variational problem and background fields in renormalization group method for lattice gauge theories*, Commun. Math. Phys. **102** (1985), 277–309.

[7] T. Bałaban, *Renormalization group approach to lattice gauge field theories. I. Generation of effective actions in a small field approximation and a coupling constant renormalization in four dimensions*, Commun. Math. Phys. **109** (1987), 249–301.

[8] T. Bałaban, *Renormalization group approach to lattice gauge field theories. II. Cluster expansions*, Commun. Math. Phys. **116** (1988), 1–22.

[9] T. Bałaban, *Convergent renormalization expansions for lattice gauge theories*, Commun. Math. Phys. **119** (1988), 243–285.

[10] T. Bałaban, *Large field renormalization. I. The basic step of the R operation*, Commun. Math. Phys. **122** (1989), 175–202.

[11] T. Bałaban, *Large field renormalization. II. Localization, exponentiation, and bounds for the R operation*, Commun. Math. Phys. **122** (1989), 355–392.

[12] J. Dimock, *The renormalization group according to Bałaban. I. Small fields*, Rev. Math. Phys. **25** (2013), 1330010.

[13] J. Dimock, *The renormalization group according to Bałaban. II. Large fields*, J. Math. Phys. **54** (2013), 092301.

[14] J. Dimock, *The renormalization group according to Bałaban. III. Convergence*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **15** (2014), 2133–2175.

[15] L. Eriksson, *The Balaban–Dimock structural package: derivation of polymer representation, oscillation bounds, and large-field suppression for lattice Yang–Mills theory from primary sources*, ai.viXra.org:2602.0069, 2026. https://ai.vixra.org/abs/2602.0069

[16] L. Eriksson, *Doob influence bounds for polymer remainders in 4D lattice Yang–Mills renormalization*, ai.viXra.org:2602.0070, 2026. https://ai.vixra.org/abs/2602.0070

[17] L. Eriksson, *RG–Cauchy summability for blocked observables in 4d lattice Yang–Mills theory via Balaban's renormalization group*, ai.viXra.org:2602.0073, 2026. https://ai.vixra.org/abs/2602.0073

[18] A. Jaffe and E. Witten, *Quantum Yang–Mills theory*, in: *The Millennium Prize Problems*, Clay Math. Inst., 2006, pp. 129–152.