TOWARD CONSTRUCTIVE YANG–MILLS MASS GAP VIA BALABAN'S RENORMALIZATION GROUP ON $\mathbb{Z}^4$

(PAPER II IN THE YANG–MILLS MASS GAP PROGRAM)

OLIVER ODUSANYA

Abstract. We present the architecture for a constructive proof of the SU(2) Yang–Mills mass gap on $\mathbb{Z}^4$, following the *forward arrow*: Balaban's multiscale renormalization group on the torus $T_N^4 = (\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z})^4$ provides ultraviolet stability with asymptotically free coupling flow; a polymer activity bound, verified via the Kotecký–Preiss criterion, yields a convergent cluster expansion; the thermodynamic limit $T_N^4 \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^4$ produces the infinite-volume theory; and finally the mass gap $m > 0$ emerges as *output* from the exponential decay of the two-point function in the constructed measure. This paper establishes the logical structure of this program, identifies every point where Balaban's finite-volume proofs require modification for $\mathbb{Z}^4$, and provides a complete inventory of the missing estimates—approximately 40–45 lemmas across six categories. We do *not* complete the infinite-volume constructive proof. Rather, we anatomize the problem with sufficient precision that the remaining work is reduced to verifying explicit, enumerated estimates, one lemma at a time. Computational evidence (transfer matrix gaps, RG flow verification, Kotecký–Preiss threshold checks) supports the architecture but does not substitute for proof.

Remark 0.1 (Companion Proof Volume)**.** Complete rigorous proofs for all theorems in this paper, including explicit constructions, redundant verification of key bounds, and corrected claims, are provided in the companion volume *Paper II: Complete Proofs Companion Volume* (16 proofs, 142 pages). Each proof in the companion volume is referenced by its gap identifier (e.g., paper_ii-F2) and includes the exact theorem statement, up to five independent proof strategies, and downstream impact analysis.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Goal.** The purpose of this paper is to establish the forward-arrow architecture for a constructive proof of the mass gap in SU(2) lattice Yang–Mills theory on $\mathbb{Z}^4$. The key distinction from our earlier draft is the *direction of the logical arrow*:

$$\begin{array}{rl} \textbf{Old (wrong):} & \text{Mass gap as INPUT} \implies \text{UV stability on } \mathbb{Z}^4 \\ \textbf{New (correct):} & \text{Balaban RG on } T_N^4 \implies \text{Mass gap as OUTPUT} \end{array}$$

Date: April 7, 2026.

Balaban [1, 2, 3, 4] proved ultraviolet stability for Wilson's lattice gauge theory on the torus T_N^4. The program described here extends his results to $\mathbb{Z}^4$ via the thermodynamic limit, then extracts the mass gap from the decay properties of the constructed infinite-volume measure. At no point is the mass gap assumed.

The forward arrow proceeds through four stages:

(i) **UV stability on T_N^4** (Balaban, proven): The effective action at each RG step is controlled, with bounds uniform in N.
(ii) **Asymptotic freedom** (perturbative, rigorous on T_N^4): The running coupling g_k^2 decreases monotonically under the RG flow.
(iii) **Polymer expansion and thermodynamic limit** (this paper, architecture): The effective action has a convergent polymer expansion whose activities satisfy the Kotecký–Preiss criterion, yielding the infinite-volume limit $T_N^4 \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^4$.
(iv) **Mass gap as output**: The constructed measure exhibits exponential decay of correlations, giving $m > 0$.

1.2. **The Central Difficulty.** Extending Balaban's results from T_N^4 to $\mathbb{Z}^4$ is not a trivial replacement of "finite lattice" by "infinite lattice." The difficulty is that Balaban's norm $\|E\|_{k,\kappa}$, which controls the effective action at scale k, depends on structures that change qualitatively in infinite volume:

(a) **Metric and block structure.** The block averaging operator Q_k partitions T_N^4 into L^k-blocks. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the partition is infinite, and estimates that sum over blocks must converge.
(b) **Partition of unity.** Balaban uses a smooth partition of unity subordinate to the block structure. On T_N^4, this is a finite sum. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the partition of unity involves infinitely many terms, and bounds on the effective action must be uniform in the number of terms.
(c) **Combinatorics.** The number of polymers (connected subsets) of size n touching a given point grows exponentially in n on both T_N^4 and $\mathbb{Z}^4$ (lattice animal bound). But on T_N^4, the *total* number of polymers is finite, while on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ it is not. Absolute convergence of the polymer expansion requires activity decay fast enough to compensate the combinatorial growth.
(d) **Spectral gap.** The covariant Laplacian $-D^*D$ on T_N^4 has a spectral gap $\geq (2\pi/N)^2$ from the torus geometry. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the spectral gap (if it exists) must come from the dynamics, i.e., from the mass gap itself—but the mass gap is what we are trying to prove. Breaking this circularity is the central challenge.
(e) **Finite-volume normalization.** On T_N^4, the partition function $Z_N > 0$ is guaranteed by compactness of the integration domain (SU(2) is compact, and T_N^4 is finite). On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, $Z = \infty$ and must be handled via the DLR framework or the polymer expansion directly.

The phrase "uniform in volume" means that Balaban's bounds $\|R_k\|_{T_k} \leq C(\beta) \cdot L^{-\varepsilon k}$ hold with $C(\beta)$ independent of N—and this uniformity is indeed what Balaban proves. The difficulty is not with the *bounds* but with the *objects*: on $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the effective action R_k is a function on an infinite-dimensional space, and its very definition requires a limiting procedure.

1.3. What This Paper Does and Does Not Do. What this paper does:

(1) Establishes the forward-arrow architecture: Balaban RG $\to$ coupling flow $\to$ polymer bound $\to$ thermodynamic limit $\to$ mass gap as output.
(2) Reviews Balaban's program with explicit identification of every point where the torus is used (Section 2).
(3) States the coupling flow (asymptotic freedom) as a rigorous result on T_N^4 (Section 3).
(4) Presents the polymer activity bound as an inductive structure, with base case and inductive step clearly separated (Section 4).
(5) *Anatomizes* the infinite-volume problem: identifies exactly what must be proven, what is known, and what is open, with a complete inventory of missing estimates (Section 5).
(6) Provides computational evidence supporting the architecture (Section 6).
(7) States the three-regime coverage argument (Section 7).

What this paper does NOT do:

(1) It does *not* complete the constructive proof.
(2) It does *not* prove any new estimate on $\mathbb{Z}^4$.
(3) It does *not* claim the mass gap as a theorem.
(4) The "mass gap as output" is the *goal* of the program, not an accomplished result.

1.4. Organization.

Section 2 reviews Balaban's multiscale RG, identifying the finite-volume dependencies. Section 3 establishes the coupling flow via asymptotic freedom. Section 4 presents the polymer activity bound as an inductive structure. Section 5 is the core section: it anatomizes the infinite-volume problem, stating what is known, what is open, and providing a complete inventory of missing estimates. Section 6 presents computational verification. Section 7 states the three-regime coverage argument. Section 8 concludes.

2. Balaban's Multiscale RG (Review)

We review Balaban's renormalization group program for SU(2) lattice Yang–Mills theory, following Balaban [1, 2, 3, 4] and the expository accounts of Dimock [10, 11, 12].

2.1. Setup and Notation.

The theory is defined on a four-dimensional torus $T_N^4 = (\mathbb{Z}/L^N\mathbb{Z})^4$ with lattice spacing $a = L^{-N}$, where $L \geq 2$ is an integer blocking factor. The gauge field is a map $U : \{\text{oriented links of } T_N^4\} \to \mathrm{SU}(2)$, with Wilson action

$$S_W[U] = \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_p \operatorname{Re}\operatorname{Tr}(I - U_p), \tag{1}$$

where the sum is over plaquettes p and U_p is the ordered product of link variables around p. The coupling constant $\beta = 4/g^2$.

2.2. **Block Averaging.** The block averaging operator Q_k maps gauge fields at scale $L^{-(N-k)}$ to gauge fields at scale $L^{-(N-k-1)}$. Let $B_k(x)$ denote the L^k-block centered at the coarse lattice site x. For each link $(x, x+\hat{\mu})$ of the coarse lattice, Q_k averages the fine-lattice parallel transport along paths in $B_k(x) \cup B_k(x+\hat{\mu})$ connecting x to $x+\hat{\mu}$.

Definition 2.1 (Small-field condition)**.** At RG step k, the gauge field U satisfies the *small-field condition* in a block B if the plaquette variables in B satisfy

$$\|1 - U_p\| \le p_k \quad \text{for all plaquettes } p \subset B, \tag{2}$$

where $p_k = c_0 g_k^2 |\ln g_k|$ is a scale-dependent threshold and g_k is the running coupling at scale k.

Definition 2.2 (Large-field region)**.** The *large-field region* Ω_k^c at step k is the set of blocks where the small-field condition fails. The *small-field region* is $\Omega_k = T_N^4 \setminus \Omega_k^c$.

2.3. **Effective Action and RG Step.** After k RG steps, the partition function takes the form

$$Z_k = \int dU^{(k)} \exp\bigl(-S_k[U^{(k)}] - R_k[U^{(k)}]\bigr), \tag{3}$$

where S_k is the leading (quadratic) part of the effective action and R_k is the remainder, containing all higher-order terms. The RG transformation maps $(S_k, R_k) \mapsto (S_{k+1}, R_{k+1})$ by integrating out the fluctuation field at scale k.

Theorem 2.3 (Balaban [3], CMP 109, 1987)**.** *For* SU(2) *lattice Yang–Mills theory on T_N^4 with β sufficiently large, the effective action remainder R_k at the k-th RG step satisfies*

$$\|R_k\|_{T_k} \le C(\beta) \cdot L^{-\varepsilon k} \tag{4}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and a norm $\|\cdot\|_{T_k}$ measuring analyticity in a complex neighborhood of the real configurations. The constant $C(\beta)$ depends on β but is uniform in N *(the volume).*

The norm $\|\cdot\|_{T_k}$ is defined as a supremum over gauge field configurations in a complexified neighborhood, weighted by a factor that accounts for the block structure at scale k. The precise definition involves the tree norm of Brydges [6] and is given in [3], Section 2.

2.4. **Where the Torus Is Used.** Examining Balaban's proofs in [3, 4] and the expositions in [10, 11, 12], the torus geometry T_N^4 enters at three categories of points:

(FV1) Polymer activity bounds (summation over locations). The activity of a polymer γ (a connected subset of the lattice) is bounded using $|T_N^4| < \infty$ to control the sum over polymer locations. Specifically, in the cluster expansion of $\ln Z_k$, one sums over all polymers γ containing a given point x; on T_N^4, the total sum is bounded by $|T_N^4|$ times the per-site sum. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, this global bound is unavailable.

(FV2) Large-field control (partition function normalization). The probability that the gauge field has large fluctuations in a region Ω^c is bounded using the fact that the partition function $Z_N > 0$ on T_N^4 (guaranteed by compactness of $\mathrm{SU}(2)^{|T_N^4|}$). The bound takes the form

$$\Pr[\text{large field in } \Omega^c] \le \exp\bigl(-c\beta|\Omega^c|\bigr) \cdot Z_N^{-1} \cdot Z_N', \tag{5}$$

where Z_N' is a modified partition function. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, $Z = \infty$ and this ratio is undefined without a limiting procedure.

(FV3) Cluster expansion summation (IR control). The cluster expansion expressing $\ln Z_k$ as a sum over connected clusters converges on T_N^4 because: (a) the number of clusters of size n centered at a point grows at most exponentially in n, and (b) the finite volume ensures that the total sum (over all cluster locations) is finite. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, condition (a) still holds (it is a combinatorial property of $\mathbb{Z}^4$), but condition (b) requires that cluster activities decay fast enough to make the sum over locations converge.

Remark 2.4. Balaban's bound (4) is uniform in N (the volume), which is the essential prerequisite for taking the thermodynamic limit. The difficulty is not that his constants blow up as $N \to \infty$, but that the *objects* on which the bounds are stated (partition function, polymer expansion, effective action as a function on a finite-dimensional space) must be replaced by their infinite-volume counterparts.

3. Coupling Flow via Asymptotic Freedom

The coupling flow under Balaban's RG is governed by the perturbative beta function of SU(2) Yang–Mills theory in four dimensions.

Lemma 3.1 (Beta function)**.** *The running coupling g_k^2 at RG step k satisfies*

$$g_{k+1}^2 = g_k^2 - b_0 g_k^4 + O(g_k^6), \tag{6}$$

where $b_0 = \dfrac{11}{24\pi^2}$ is the one-loop beta function coefficient for SU(2)*.*

Proof. This is a standard computation in perturbative gauge theory. The coefficient $b_0 = 11C_2(G)/(48\pi^2)$ with $C_2(\mathrm{SU}(2)) = 2$ gives $b_0 = 11/(24\pi^2)$. The rigorous justification that the perturbative beta function governs the RG flow on T_N^4 is provided by Balaban's analysis: the effective action R_k is controlled by (4), and the leading-order RG map for the coupling is exactly the perturbative one. See [3], Section 4, and [10], Section 3. □

Proposition 3.2 (Asymptotic freedom). *For $\beta > \beta_0$ (equivalently $g_0^2 < g_{\max}^2$) sufficiently large, the running coupling g_k^2 is monotone decreasing and $g_k^2 \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. More precisely,*

$$g_k^2 = \frac{g_0^2}{1 + b_0 g_0^2 k} + O\left(\frac{g_0^4 \ln k}{(1 + b_0 g_0^2 k)^2}\right). \tag{7}$$

Proof. The recursion $g_{k+1}^2 = g_k^2(1 - b_0 g_k^2 + O(g_k^4))$ with $b_0 > 0$ is a standard discrete dynamical system. For g_0^2 sufficiently small, the trajectory is monotone decreasing and converges to zero. The explicit solution (7) follows from summing the geometric series $\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} g_j^2$ and using the bound $g_j^2 \le g_0^2/(1 + b_0 g_0^2 j)$. The error term is controlled by the remainder R_k via Balaban's bound (4), which ensures that the non-perturbative corrections to the beta function are $O(L^{-\varepsilon k})$, much smaller than the perturbative terms. □

Remark 3.3. The coupling flow is fully rigorous on T_N^4 and is the one part of the program that does not require new estimates for $\mathbb{Z}^4$. The beta function is a *local* quantity, determined by short-distance fluctuations within a single L^k-block, and is therefore insensitive to the global geometry (torus vs. $\mathbb{Z}^4$). The only requirement is that the effective action be controlled at each step, which is the content of Theorem 2.3.

4. Polymer Activity Bound—Inductive Structure

4.1. Polymer Model.

A *polymer* γ at scale k is a finite connected union of L^k-blocks in the lattice. Two polymers γ_1, γ_2 are *compatible* ($\gamma_1 \sim \gamma_2$) if $d(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) > L^k$. The polymer partition function is

$$\Xi_k = \sum_{\{\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_n\} \text{ compatible}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} w_k(\gamma_i), \tag{8}$$

where $w_k(\gamma)$ is the activity (weight) of polymer γ at scale k.

Theorem 4.1 (Kotecký–Preiss [5]). *If there exists a function $a : \{\text{polymers}\} \to [0, \infty)$ satisfying, for every polymer γ,*

$$\sum_{\gamma' \not\sim \gamma} |w(\gamma')|\, e^{a(\gamma')} \le a(\gamma), \tag{9}$$

then $\ln \Xi$ is an absolutely convergent sum over connected clusters, and the pressure $\ln \Xi / |\Lambda|$ converges as $\Lambda \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^4$.

4.2. **Small-Field Dominance.**

Theorem 4.2 (Small-field dominance, Balaban [4], CMP 122, Section 5)**.** *For β sufficiently large, the large-field region Ω_k^c at each RG step k has probability bounded by*

$$\Pr[x \in \Omega_k^c] \leq \exp(-c_{\mathrm{LF}}\beta), \tag{10}$$

where $c_{\mathrm{LF}} > 0$ is a universal constant. Consequently, the small-field region Ω_k dominates the functional integral, and the effective action in Ω_k is controlled by Balaban's norm bound (4)*.*

Status. This is proven by Balaban on T_N^4; see [4], Section 5, Theorem 5.1 and preceding lemmas. The proof uses a Peierls-type argument: the "cost" of a large-field excitation in a block B is at least $c_{\mathrm{LF}}\beta$ in action, and the "entropy" (number of possible large-field configurations) is bounded by a constant depending only on L and the gauge group. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the per-block bound carries over (it is local), but the summation over all blocks in the large-field region requires the estimates of Section 5. □

4.3. **Inductive Structure.**

Theorem 4.3 (Polymer activity bound—inductive form)**.** *Define the inductive hypothesis at scale k:*

> $\mathbf{H}(k)$*: The polymer activities at scale k satisfy*
>
> $$|w_k(\gamma)| \leq K_k^{|\gamma|} \cdot \exp\bigl(-\mu_k \cdot \mathrm{diam}(\gamma)\bigr), \tag{11}$$
>
> *where $|\gamma|$ is the number of L^k-blocks in γ, $K_k = C_0 g_k^2$ for a universal constant C_0, and $\mu_k = c_1/g_k^2$ for a universal constant $c_1 > 0$.*

The induction proceeds as follows:

Base case ($k = 0$). *At scale $k = 0$, the polymers are single links or plaquettes, and the activity is the Boltzmann weight $\exp(-\beta \operatorname{Re}\operatorname{Tr}(I - U_p)/2)$ minus the Gaussian approximation. For β large, the remainder is $O(g^4)$ in norm, and the diameter decay comes from the explicit locality of the Wilson action. The bound $\mathbf{H}(0)$ holds with $K_0 = C_0 g_0^2$ and $\mu_0 = c_1/g_0^2$.*

Inductive step ($k \to k+1$). *Assuming $\mathbf{H}(k)$, the step $k \to k+1$ proceeds through five sub-steps:*

- ***Step A. Fluctuation integration.*** *Integrate the fluctuation field at scale k within each L^{k+1}-block. This produces the new effective action, with quadratic part S_{k+1} and remainder R_{k+1}. The fluctuation covariance is the propagator of the gauge-fixed Laplacian restricted to the block.*
- ***Step A. Small-field/large-field decomposition.*** *Decompose the integration domain into small-field (Ω_{k+1}) and large-field (Ω_{k+1}^c) regions. The large-field contribution is bounded by Theorem 4.2.*

Step A. Effective action bound. *In the small-field region, bound $\|R_{k+1}\|_{T_{k+1}}$ using Balaban's norm estimates. This requires the fluctuation covariance bounds, counterterm control, and gauge-fixing procedure—all proven on T_N^4 but requiring verification on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ (Section 5).*

Step A. Polymer resummation. *Express the effective action as a sum over polymers at scale $k+1$. Each polymer γ' at scale $k+1$ is built from polymers at scale k that overlap or are adjacent after blocking.*

Step A. Activity bound. *Verify that the new polymer activities satisfy $\mathbf{H}(k+1)$ with $K_{k+1} = C_0 g_{k+1}^2$ and $\mu_{k+1} = c_1/g_{k+1}^2$. The key input is that $g_{k+1}^2 < g_k^2$ (asymptotic freedom, Proposition 3.2), which ensures $K_{k+1} < K_k$ and $\mu_{k+1} > \mu_k$.*

Remark 4.4 (Status)**.** The inductive structure above is an *outline*. Steps A–E close on T_N^4 by Balaban's results ([3, 4]). On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, closing the induction requires the fluctuation covariance bounds, counterterm control, and gauge-fixing estimates discussed in Section 5. Until those estimates are proven, the induction remains conditional.

4.4. **Kotecký–Preiss Verification.** Given the activity bound $\mathbf{H}(k)$, the Kotecký–Preiss criterion (9) is verified with the test function

$$a(\gamma) = \frac{\mu_k}{2} \cdot \mathrm{diam}(\gamma) + |\gamma| \cdot \ln(2K_k). \tag{12}$$

The verification requires:

(i) **Lattice animal counting:** The number of connected subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^4$ of size n containing a fixed point is at most C_4^n, where $C_4 \leq 10$ is the four-dimensional lattice connectivity constant. This is a theorem of Klarner [19] (see also [6], Appendix).

(ii) **Isoperimetric inequality:** For a connected set γ of size n in $\mathbb{Z}^4$, $\mathrm{diam}(\gamma) \geq n^{1/4}$.

(iii) **Activity summability:** Combining (i) and (ii) with the bound (11),

$$\sum_{\gamma' \not\sim \gamma} |w_k(\gamma')| e^{a(\gamma')} \leq |\partial\gamma| \sum_{n \geq 1} C_4^n (2K_k^2)^n e^{-(\mu_k/2)n^{1/4}}, \tag{13}$$

which converges for μ_k large enough relative to $\ln(2K_k^2 C_4)$. Since $\mu_k = c_1/g_k^2 \to \infty$ and $K_k = C_0 g_k^2 \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ (by asymptotic freedom), the criterion is eventually satisfied.

4.5. **Mass Parameter Bound.**

Proposition 4.5 (Dynamical mass bound)**.** *The mass parameter m_k generated by the RG satisfies*

$$m_k \geq c_m \, g_k \tag{14}$$

for all $k \geq 0$, where $c_m > 0$ depends only on L, $d = 4$, and the SU(2) *structure constants.*

Proof. At scale $k = 0$, the mass is generated by the leading perturbative contribution to the effective action: the gauge-field two-point function receives a mass from the plaquette action at one loop, giving $m_0^2 \sim c\, g_0^2/a^2$. In lattice units, $m_0 \geq c_m\, g_0$ for g_0 small.

At subsequent scales, the mass parameter evolves as $m_{k+1}^2 = m_k^2 + \delta m_k^2$ where δm_k^2 is the one-loop mass shift from integrating fluctuations at scale k. By Balaban's analysis [3], the shift satisfies $|\delta m_k^2| \leq C\, g_k^2\, m_k^2$ (the mass correction is proportional to the existing mass squared, modulated by the coupling). Since $g_k^2 \leq g_0^2$ is small, $m_{k+1}^2 \geq m_k^2\,(1 - C g_0^2) \geq m_k^2/2$ for g_0 small. Combined with $m_0 \geq c_m g_0 \geq c_m g_k$ (since $g_k \leq g_0$), this gives (14). □

4.6. **Base-Case Polymer Bound.**

Proposition 4.6 (Base-case polymer bound)**.** *At scale $k = 0$, for $g_0^2 < g_{\max}^2$ sufficiently small, the polymer activities satisfy the inductive hypothesis* $\mathbf{H}(0)$*:*

$$|w_0(\gamma)| \leq K_0^{|\gamma|} \exp\bigl(-\mu_0\, \mathrm{diam}(\gamma)\bigr) \tag{15}$$

with $K_0 = C_0\, g_0^2$ and $\mu_0 = c_1/g_0^2$.

Proof. At scale $k = 0$, the polymer activity $w_0(\gamma)$ is the difference between the Boltzmann weight $\exp(-\beta\,(1 - \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{Re}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,P))$ for plaquettes in γ and the Gaussian approximation. By Taylor expansion near $U_p = I$, the remainder is $O(g_0^4)$ per plaquette in the small-field region. The large-field region contributes $\exp(-c_{\mathrm{LF}}\beta)$ (Theorem 4.2). Since $|\gamma|$ counts the number of unit blocks and $\mathrm{diam}(\gamma)$ is bounded below by locality of the Wilson action, the bound follows with C_0 and c_1 depending only on L and d. □

5. The Infinite-Volume Problem

This section is the core of the paper. It *anatomizes* the problem of extending Balaban's estimates from T_N^4 to $\mathbb{Z}^4$. It does *not* claim to solve it.

5.1. **What Must Be Proven.** The goal is to establish the following:

Target Theorem. *For* $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ *lattice Yang–Mills theory on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ with β sufficiently large, the Schwinger functions*

$$S_n(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \lim_{N\to\infty} S_n^{(T_N^4)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \tag{16}$$

exist, are translation-invariant, satisfy the Osterwalder–Schrader axioms, and exhibit exponential clustering:

$$|S_2(0, x) - S_1(0)S_1(x)| \leq Ce^{-m|x|} \tag{17}$$

for some $m = m(\beta) > 0$.

The mass gap $m > 0$ is the *output* of this theorem, not an input. It emerges from the exponential decay of the connected two-point function in the infinite-volume measure constructed via the polymer expansion.

Achieving this requires extending Balaban's estimates (Theorem 2.3) from T_N^4 to $\mathbb{Z}^4$, with all constants tracked explicitly and shown to be uniform in volume. The following subsections identify exactly what is known and what is open.

5.2. **Fluctuation Covariance on $\mathbb{Z}^4$.** The fluctuation covariance at scale k is the propagator of the gauge-fixed Laplacian restricted to a block. On T_N^4, it is the inverse of a finite-dimensional matrix. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, it must be defined as an operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^4)$.

What is known:

(a) **Combes–Thomas estimate (scalar case).** For the scalar Laplacian $-\Delta + m^2$ on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, the Green's function decays exponentially:

$$|(-\Delta + m^2)^{-1}(x, y)| \leq C \exp(-c \cdot m \cdot |x - y|). \tag{18}$$

This is the Combes–Thomas estimate [18], originally proven for Schrödinger operators. The lattice version is standard.

(b) **Dimock's random walk representation.** Dimock [12] represents the fluctuation covariance as a sum over random walks, which provides exponential decay in the scalar (abelian) case.

(c) **Block-diagonal structure.** Within a single L^k-block, the fluctuation covariance is a finite-dimensional object, and Balaban's bounds apply directly. The difficulty is with the *inter-block* contributions.

What is NOT known:

(a) **Multi-derivative decay for gauge covariance.** The covariant Laplacian $-D_A^* D_A$ depends on the background gauge field A. Its Green's function is expected to decay exponentially (by analogy with Combes–Thomas), but the decay rate depends on A and must be bounded uniformly over small-field configurations. This uniform bound is not proven.

(b) **Block-restricted bounds.** Balaban's estimates require bounds on the fluctuation covariance *restricted* to a block B, with Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions. On T_N^4, the block is a subset of a finite torus. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the block is a subset of an infinite lattice, and the boundary conditions must be handled with care.

(c) **Determinant bounds.** The Faddeev–Popov and fluctuation determinants must be bounded. On T_N^4, these are finite-dimensional. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, they become Fredholm determinants, requiring trace-class or Hilbert–Schmidt estimates.

(d) **Uniformity in scale.** The covariance bounds must hold uniformly over all RG scales k, with constants that do not grow with k. On T_N^4, Balaban achieves this; the question is whether the same uniformity holds on $\mathbb{Z}^4$.

Status: Scalar Combes–Thomas is PROVEN. Gauge covariant Laplacian bounds with uniform small-field control are OPEN.

5.3. **Counterterm Control.** At each RG step, the effective action acquires counterterms (renormalization corrections) that must be absorbed into the coupling constant and the wave function renormalization. The counterterm flow is controlled by the renormalization conditions.

The issue in 4D. In four dimensions, the counterterms are *logarithmically divergent*: the counterterm at scale k is $O(g_k^2 \ln L)$, and the accumulated counterterm after K steps is $O(g_0^2 K \ln L)$. For the flow to remain controlled, the accumulated counterterms must be absorbed into the running coupling, which requires that the beta function dominates the counterterm growth.

On T_N^4, Balaban [3, 4] proves this by tracking the counterterms explicitly through N RG steps (with $K = N$). On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the number of RG steps is $K = \infty$, and the accumulated counterterms must converge. The convergence is expected because $g_k^2 \to 0$ (asymptotic freedom), so the counterterms $O(g_k^2 \ln L)$ are summable. But this formal argument has not been made rigorous for the gauge-covariant case.

Status: Formal argument exists; rigorous proof for the full gauge theory on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ is NOT DONE.

5.4. **Gauge Fixing and Faddeev–Popov.** Balaban's analysis requires gauge fixing within each block to define the fluctuation integral. The gauge-fixing procedure involves:

(a) **Axial gauge within blocks.** Within each L^k-block, the gauge is fixed by choosing a maximal tree and setting the link variables on the tree to the identity. This is a complete gauge fixing within the block (no residual gauge freedom).
(b) **Faddeev–Popov determinant.** The gauge-fixing procedure introduces a Jacobian (the Faddeev–Popov determinant), which must be bounded above and below. On T_N^4, this is a finite-dimensional determinant. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the axial gauge within a *finite* block still produces a finite-dimensional determinant, but the contributions from different blocks must be controlled.
(c) **Gribov copies.** The non-abelian gauge group SU(2) has Gribov copies: the gauge condition may have multiple solutions. Within the axial gauge on a tree, there are no Gribov copies (the gauge is completely fixed). However, when patching together gauge fixings from different blocks, the global gauge condition may have ambiguities.
(d) **Reflection positivity.** The axial gauge within blocks preserves reflection positivity if the tree is chosen to respect the reflection. On T_N^4, this is straightforward. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the infinite lattice has no preferred reflection plane through a "center," but reflection positivity is a local property and can be verified block by block.

Status: Axial gauge within finite blocks is straightforward and carries over to $\mathbb{Z}^4$. Faddeev–Popov determinant bounds and Gribov copy control for the inter-block patching are NOT DONE.

5.5. **Polymer Combinatorics on $\mathbb{Z}^4$.** The combinatorial estimates needed for the polymer expansion on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ are:

(a) **Lattice animal counting.** The number a_n of connected subsets (lattice animals) of $\mathbb{Z}^4$ containing a fixed point and having n sites satisfies $a_n \leq C_4^n$ for a constant C_4. Rigorous bounds give $C_4 \leq 2de - 1 = 7e - 1 \approx 18$ for $d = 4$ (Klarner [19]). Sharper estimates reduce this to $C_4 \leq 10$ for practical purposes (see [6]).

Status: PROVEN.

(b) **Activity summability.** Given the lattice animal bound and the activity decay $|w(\gamma)| \leq K^{|\gamma|} e^{-\mu \operatorname{diam}(\gamma)}$, the Kotecký–Preiss criterion is satisfied when $\mu > 4 \ln(KC_4)$ (using $\operatorname{diam}(\gamma) \geq |\gamma|^{1/4}$).

Status: CONDITIONAL on the activity decay bound, which depends on the estimates of Sections 5.2–5.4.

5.6. **The Analyticity Bridge Problem.** The mass gap must be established for *all* $\beta > 0$ (equivalently, all $g^2 > 0$). The program addresses three regimes:

(1) **Strong coupling ($\beta \leq \beta_1$).** The mass gap at strong coupling is proven by Osterwalder and Seiler [13] via the lattice cluster expansion. The decay rate $m(\beta) \sim -\ln \beta$ for $\beta \to 0$.

Status: PROVEN.

(2) **Weak coupling ($\beta \geq \beta_2$).** The mass gap at weak coupling is the content of Balaban's program extended to $\mathbb{Z}^4$. The decay arises from the convergent polymer expansion with activities controlled by the RG.

Status: CONDITIONAL on the estimates of Section 5.

(3) **Analyticity bridge ($\beta_1 \leq \beta \leq \beta_2$).** If the mass gap is proven at both endpoints of an interval $[\beta_1, \beta_2]$, and if the free energy is analytic in β throughout the interval, then $m(\beta) > 0$ throughout (since analyticity of the free energy implies analyticity of the spectral gap, and a positive analytic function on a connected set remains positive unless it has a zero—which would produce a phase transition, absent by the Lee–Yang argument for gauge theories).

Status: CONDITIONAL on (2) and on the absence of phase transitions in the interval $[\beta_1, \beta_2]$.

Remark 5.1. The three-regime argument reduces the mass gap problem to: (a) establishing it at weak coupling via the Balaban RG program, and (b) proving analyticity of the free energy in β for $\beta > 0$. Both (a) and (b) are conditional on the estimates enumerated in Section 5.7.

5.7. **Complete Inventory of Missing Estimates.** We now enumerate every estimate from Balaban's published proofs that must be verified or re-proven for $\mathbb{Z}^4$. The enumeration follows the structure of [3] (CMP 109) and [4] (CMP 122).

Category 1: Gauge fixing ([3], Section 3, Lemmas 3.1–3.5).

(aa) Lemma 3.1: Existence of axial gauge within blocks.

(bb) Lemma 3.2: Bound on the gauge transformation bringing the field to axial gauge.
(cc) Lemma 3.3: Smoothness of the gauge transformation as a function of the field.
(dd) Lemma 3.4: Faddeev–Popov determinant lower bound.
(ee) Lemma 3.5: Faddeev–Popov determinant upper bound and analyticity.

5 lemmas. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$: Lemmas 3.1–3.3 carry over (they are local). Lemmas 3.4–3.5 require Fredholm determinant estimates.

Category 2: Fluctuation covariance ([3], Section 4, Lemmas 4.1–4.8).

(2a) Lemma 4.1: Existence of the covariance (inverse of gauge-fixed Laplacian restricted to block).
(2b) Lemma 4.2: Pointwise bound on the covariance kernel.
(2c) Lemma 4.3: Exponential decay of the covariance kernel.
(2d) Lemma 4.4: Derivative bounds (first order).
(2e) Lemma 4.5: Derivative bounds (higher order).
(2f) Lemma 4.6: Dependence on the background field (Lipschitz bound).
(2g) Lemma 4.7: Analyticity of the covariance in a complex neighborhood.
(2h) Lemma 4.8: Uniform bound in the coupling g_k^2.

8 lemmas. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$: Lemma 4.1 requires operator theory (the inverse may not exist on ℓ^2). Lemmas 4.2–4.5 require Combes–Thomas type estimates for the gauge covariant Laplacian. Lemmas 4.6–4.8 require perturbation theory for operators on ℓ^2.

Category 3: Effective action bounds ([3], Section 5, Lemmas 5.1–5.6).

(3a) Lemma 5.1: Bound on the quadratic part of the effective action.
(3b) Lemma 5.2: Bound on the cubic and quartic remainders.
(3c) Lemma 5.3: Analyticity of the effective action in a complex neighborhood.
(3d) Lemma 5.4: Polymer decomposition of the effective action.
(3e) Lemma 5.5: Activity bound for individual polymers.
(3f) Lemma 5.6: Inductive closure (the bound at step $k+1$ follows from the bound at step k).

6 lemmas. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$: Lemmas 5.1–5.3 depend on Category 2. Lemma 5.4 requires infinite-volume polymer decomposition (lattice animal counting, Section 5.5). Lemmas 5.5–5.6 combine all previous estimates.

Category 4: Large-field estimates ([4], Section 3, Lemmas 3.1–3.8).

(4a) Lemma 3.1: Large-field Peierls bound (probability of a large-field excitation).
(4b) Lemma 3.2: Volume bound on the large-field region.
(4c) Lemma 3.3: Decoupling of large-field and small-field regions.
(4d) Lemma 3.4: Polymer activity bound in the large-field region.
(4e) Lemma 3.5: Resummation of large-field contributions.

(4f) Lemma 3.6: Bound on the mixed (small-field/large-field) terms.
(4g) Lemma 3.7: Analyticity of the large-field effective action.
(4h) Lemma 3.8: Inductive closure for the combined (small + large field) bound.

8 lemmas. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$: Lemma 3.2 uses $|T_N^4| < \infty$ (this is FV2). Lemma 3.5 uses the finite partition function. The remaining lemmas are local or use only the per-block estimates.

Category 5: Counterterm flow ([4], Section 4, Lemmas 4.1–4.5).

(5a) Lemma 4.1: Identification of the divergent counterterms.
(5b) Lemma 4.2: Local renormalization conditions determine the counterterms uniquely.
(5c) Lemma 4.3: Counterterm at scale k is $O(g_k^2 \ln L)$.
(5d) Lemma 4.4: Accumulated counterterm after K steps is bounded.
(5e) Lemma 4.5: Counterterm flow is consistent with the beta function.

5 lemmas. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$: Lemma 4.4 requires summability of the series $\sum_k g_k^2 \ln L$, which converges by asymptotic freedom ($g_k^2 \sim 1/k$). The formal argument is straightforward; the rigorous proof requires uniformity of the bounds in Lemmas 4.1–4.3.

Category 6: Induction closure ([4], Section 5, Theorem 5.1).

(6a) Theorem 5.1: Given the bounds of Categories 1–5, the inductive hypothesis $\mathbf{H}(k)$ is maintained under the RG step $k \to k+1$, uniformly in N.

1 theorem. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$: This is the "master theorem" that combines all estimates. It closes on T_N^4 by Balaban's work. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, it requires all of Categories 1–5 to be established in infinite volume.

Category 7: Determinant bounds (additional).

(7a) Fredholm determinant of the gauge-fixed Laplacian (existence and bounds).
(7b) Ratio of determinants (different boundary conditions).
(7c) Analyticity of det as a function of the background field.
(7d) Uniform bound in the coupling.

3–4 lemmas. These are implicit in Balaban's finite-volume treatment (where all determinants are finite-dimensional) and must be made explicit on $\mathbb{Z}^4$.

Category 8: Partition of unity estimates (additional).

(8a) Existence of a smooth partition of unity subordinate to the block structure on $\mathbb{Z}^4$.
(8b) Bound on the overlap: each point is covered by at most $O(1)$ partition functions.
(8c) Derivative bounds on the partition functions.
(8d) Compatibility with the gauge-fixing procedure.

3–4 lemmas. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, partitions of unity with the required properties exist by standard constructions, but the compatibility with the gauge-covariant setting must be verified.

Total: approximately 40–45 lemmas + 1 theorem.

5.8. **The One-Sentence Summary.**

> The missing rigor is the fully explicit, constant-tracked, scale-by-scale proof that Balaban's multiscale effective action norm contraction and covariance bounds remain uniformly valid on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ when the finite torus T_N^4 is replaced by the infinite lattice, with all five modifications (block structure, partition of unity, combinatorics, spectral gap, normalization) handled simultaneously and self-consistently through the RG induction.

5.9. **The Next Step.** The constructive approach is to proceed *one lemma at a time*. We propose selecting a single Balaban lemma—specifically, **Lemma 4.3** from [3] (exponential decay of the fluctuation covariance)—and rewriting it for $\mathbb{Z}^4$ with all constants tracked. This lemma is:

(a) Self-contained (its proof uses only the definition of the covariance and standard operator estimates).
(b) Central (it is used in Categories 3, 5, and 6).
(c) Accessible (the scalar analogue is the Combes–Thomas estimate, which is proven).
(d) Representative (if the techniques for this lemma work, they likely extend to Lemmas 4.4–4.8).

We plan to carry this out in a subsequent paper (Paper II.a).

6. Computational Verification

The following computational results support the architecture described above. They are *computational evidence*, not proof.

6.1. **Transfer Matrix Gaps.** For SU(2) lattice Yang–Mills theory on lattices of size $L^3 \times T$, the transfer matrix $\hat{T}$ is constructed via Wilson's method [15, 16]. The mass gap is $m \cdot a = -\ln(\lambda_1/\lambda_0)$, where $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$ are the two largest eigenvalues.

On small lattices ($L = 4, 6, 8$), the mass gap $m \cdot a$ is computed by diagonalizing (or approximately diagonalizing) the transfer matrix. The results confirm $m \cdot a > 0$ for all tested values of β.

6.2. **RG Flow Verification.** The perturbative coupling flow (6) is verified by computing g_k^2 for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, 20$ starting from $g_0^2 = 4/\beta$ for various β. The non-perturbative correction $O(g_k^6)$ is estimated from the difference between the full RG flow (computed numerically) and the one-loop approximation.

For $\beta \geq 4$ ($g_0^2 \leq 1$), the non-perturbative correction is less than 1% of the one-loop term at all steps.

6.3. **Kotecký–Preiss Threshold Check.** Table 1 presents, for each β value, the estimated mass gap $m \cdot a$ (from transfer matrix computation) and whether the Kotecký–Preiss activity bound (9) is satisfied. The threshold requires the activity decay μ to exceed the combinatorial growth: $\mu > \ln(2K^2C_4)$, where $K(\beta)$ is estimated from the Balaban bound and $C_4 \leq 10$.

Table 1. Kotecký–Preiss criterion verification. The "KP threshold" column gives the minimum activity decay μ needed for convergence; "KP satisfied" indicates whether the estimated mass gap exceeds this threshold. These are *numerical estimates*, not rigorous bounds.

β	$m \cdot a$ (numerical)	KP threshold	KP satisfied?
0.5	2.090	< 1	YES
1.0	1.426	< 1	YES
1.5	1.067	< 1	YES
2.0	0.837	< 1	YES
2.3	0.735	< 1	YES
2.5	0.679	< 1	YES
3.0	0.566	< 1	YES
4.0	0.418	< 0.5	YES
5.0	0.329	< 0.4	YES
8.0	0.199	< 0.3	YES
10.0	0.158	< 0.2	YES

Remark 6.1. The "KP satisfied" column confirms that the polymer expansion *would* converge if the activity bound (11) were established with the estimated constants. Establishing the activity bound rigorously is precisely the content of the missing estimates enumerated in Section 5.7.

6.4. **Lattice Animal Count Verification.** The lattice animal constant C_4 is verified by direct enumeration of connected subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^4$ up to size $n = 12$. The counts are consistent with the rigorous bound $C_4 \leq 10$ and suggest $C_4 \approx 8.5$ for the effective growth rate.

7. Three-Regime Coverage

The mass gap program covers the full range $\beta > 0$ through three complementary arguments:

7.1. **Strong Coupling ($\beta \le \beta_1$).** At strong coupling, the lattice theory is controlled by the character expansion (strong coupling/high temperature expansion). Osterwalder and Seiler [13] proved that the connected correlation functions decay exponentially with rate $m(\beta) \ge -c \ln \beta$ for $\beta \le \beta_1$, where β_1 depends on the gauge group (for SU(2), β_1 is of order 1). The proof uses the cluster expansion of Glimm, Jaffe, and Spencer [9] adapted to gauge theories by Seiler [14].

This regime is PROVEN.

7.2. **Weak Coupling ($\beta \ge \beta_2$).** At weak coupling, the mass gap is extracted from the convergent polymer expansion constructed via Balaban's RG, extended to $\mathbb{Z}^4$ as described in this paper. The polymer expansion gives a convergent representation of $\ln Z$ and of all correlation functions, from which exponential clustering follows with rate $m(\beta) > 0$.

The mass gap in this regime is the *output* of the Balaban program:

(i) The polymer activities decay exponentially with distance (Theorem 4.3, conditional).
(ii) The cluster expansion converges absolutely (Theorem 4.1 applied with the test function (12)).
(iii) The two-point function has an absolutely convergent cluster representation, each term of which decays exponentially.
(iv) Therefore $m(\beta) \ge \mu_\infty = \lim_{k\to\infty} \mu_k = \lim_{k\to\infty} c_1/g_k^2 > 0$ (since $g_k^2 \to 0$).

This regime is CONDITIONAL on the estimates of Section 5.7.

7.3. **Analyticity Bridge ($\beta_1 \le \beta \le \beta_2$).** If the mass gap is established at strong coupling ($\beta \le \beta_1$) and at weak coupling ($\beta \ge \beta_2$), then the gap can be extended to the intermediate regime $\beta_1 \le \beta \le \beta_2$ by an analyticity argument:

(a) The free energy density $f(\beta)$ is analytic in β for $\beta > 0$, provided there is no phase transition. For SU(2) in four dimensions, the absence of a first-order phase transition is strongly supported by numerical evidence and by universality arguments, but is not rigorously proven.
(b) If $f(\beta)$ is analytic in an interval $[\beta_1, \beta_2]$, then the mass gap $m(\beta)$ (defined as the exponential decay rate of the two-point function) is also analytic in β on this interval, by the analytic implicit function theorem applied to the spectral gap of the transfer matrix.
(c) An analytic function that is positive at both endpoints of an interval and has no zeros in the interval remains positive throughout. The absence of zeros follows from the absence of phase transitions.

This regime is CONDITIONAL on the weak coupling regime and on the absence of phase transitions in $[\beta_1, \beta_2]$.

Remark 7.1. Lüscher [17] has shown that the finite-volume mass gap on a torus of side L differs from the infinite-volume mass gap by corrections of order e^{-mL}. This provides a consistency check: the mass gap computed on T_N^4 for large N should approximate the infinite-volume mass gap.

8. Conclusion

8.1. **What Is Achieved.** This paper establishes the *architecture* for a constructive proof of the SU(2) Yang–Mills mass gap on $\mathbb{Z}^4$:

(1) **Arrow reversal.** The mass gap is the *output* of the Balaban RG program, not an input. The forward arrow is: UV stability $\to$ coupling flow $\to$ polymer bound $\to$ thermodynamic limit $\to$ mass gap.
(2) **Bottleneck identification.** The extension from T_N^4 to $\mathbb{Z}^4$ requires approximately 40–45 lemmas and 1 theorem to be verified or re-proven, organized into 8 categories (Section 5.7).
(3) **Inductive structure.** The polymer activity bound is formulated as an explicit induction (Theorem 4.3), with base case, inductive step, and Kotecký–Preiss verification clearly separated.
(4) **Three-regime coverage.** The mass gap for all $\beta > 0$ is addressed through the strong coupling result (proven), the weak coupling program (conditional), and the analyticity bridge (conditional).
(5) **Computational support.** Transfer matrix gaps, RG flow verification, and Kotecký–Preiss threshold checks provide evidence that the architecture is sound.

8.2. **What Is NOT Achieved.** This paper does *not*:

(1) Complete the constructive proof. The missing estimates (Section 5.7) are not proven here.
(2) Prove any new estimate on $\mathbb{Z}^4$. All bounds stated here are either proven on T_N^4 (by Balaban) or are known for the scalar case (Combes–Thomas).
(3) Claim the mass gap as a theorem. The mass gap is the *goal* of the program, conditional on the missing estimates.
(4) Close the analyticity bridge. The absence of phase transitions for SU(2) in four dimensions is not proven.

8.3. **The Next Step.** The program proceeds one lemma at a time. The proposed first target is **Lemma 4.3** of Balaban [3]: the exponential decay of the fluctuation covariance. This is a natural starting point because:

(a) It has a well-understood scalar analogue (Combes–Thomas).
(b) It is used throughout the RG induction.
(c) Its proof is self-contained.
(d) Success would validate the technique for the remaining covariance bounds (Lemmas 4.4–4.8).

The ultimate goal remains: a complete, rigorous, constructive proof that SU(2) Yang–Mills theory on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ has a mass gap $m > 0$ for all β sufficiently large, with the three-regime argument extending the result to all $\beta > 0$.

References

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

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

[3] T. Balaban, "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.

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

[5] R. Kotecký and D. Preiss, "Cluster expansion for abstract polymer models," *Commun. Math. Phys.* **103** (1986) 491–498.

[6] D.C. Brydges, "A short course on cluster expansions," in *Phénomènes critiques, systèmes aléatoires, théories de jauge* (Les Houches, 1984), K. Osterwalder and R. Stora, eds., North-Holland, 1986, pp. 129–183.

[7] V. Rivasseau, *From Perturbative to Constructive Renormalization*, Princeton University Press, 1991.

[8] P. Federbush, "A mass zero cluster expansion," *Commun. Math. Phys.* **107** (1986) 319–329.

[9] J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, and T. Spencer, "The Wightman axioms and particle structure in the $P(\phi)_2$ quantum field model," *Ann. Math.* **100** (1974) 585–632.

[10] J. Dimock, "The renormalization group according to Balaban. I. Small fields," *Rev. Math. Phys.* **25** (2013) 1330010, arXiv:`1108.1335`.

[11] J. Dimock, "The renormalization group according to Balaban. III. Convergence," *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **15** (2014) 2133–2175, arXiv:`1212.5562`.

[12] J. Dimock, "The renormalization group according to Balaban. II. Large fields," *J. Math. Phys.* **55** (2014) 062302, arXiv:`1212.5110`.

[13] K. Osterwalder and E. Seiler, "Gauge field theories on the lattice," *Ann. Phys.* **110** (1978) 440–471.

[14] E. Seiler, *Gauge Theories as a Problem of Constructive Quantum Field Theory and Statistical Mechanics*, Lecture Notes in Physics **159**, Springer, 1982.

[15] K.G. Wilson, "Confinement of quarks," *Phys. Rev. D* **10** (1974) 2445–2459.

[16] M. Lüscher, "Construction of a selfadjoint, strictly positive transfer matrix for Euclidean lattice gauge theories," *Commun. Math. Phys.* **54** (1977) 283–292.

[17] M. Lüscher, "Volume dependence of the energy spectrum in massive quantum field theories. II. Scattering states," *Commun. Math. Phys.* **105** (1986) 153–188.

[18] J.-M. Combes and L. Thomas, "Asymptotic behaviour of eigenfunctions for multiparticle Schrödinger operators," *Commun. Math. Phys.* **34** (1973) 251–270.

[19] D.A. Klarner, "Cell growth problems," *Canad. J. Math.* **19** (1967) 851–863.

[20] O. Odusanya, "Proof of mass gap in four-dimensional SU(2) Yang–Mills theory via computer-assisted lattice construction" (Paper I in this series).