PAPER II.A: GAUGE-COVARIANT EXPONENTIAL DECAY OF THE FLUCTUATION COVARIANCE ON $\mathbb{Z}^4$

OLIVER ODUSANYA

Abstract. We prove exponential decay of the gauge-covariant Green's function for SU(2) lattice gauge theory on $\mathbb{Z}^4$. Specifically, for the covariance operator $C_k(A) = (D_A^* D_A + m_k^2)^{-1}$ of the gauge-fixed covariant Laplacian, we establish the kernel bound $\|C_k(A;x,y)\| \le 2m_k^{-2}\exp(-c_3 m_k|x-y|)$ with $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$, both constants independent of lattice volume. The proof extends the Combes–Thomas method from the scalar Laplacian to the gauge-covariant setting, exploiting the key fact that the scalar conjugation weight commutes with the SU(2) gauge transport. As consequences, we derive first-order and higher-order derivative bounds, Lipschitz continuity, analyticity, and uniform coupling estimates for the covariance kernel. These results establish Lemmas 2a, 2c, 2d, 2e, 2f, 2g, and 2h of the Balaban lemma audit, converting 7 of the 19 open lemmas in the $\mathbb{Z}^4$ extension program and unblocking all 14 conditional lemmas in Categories 3, 5, and 6.

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.a: Complete Proofs Companion Volume* (13 proofs, 134 pages). Each proof in the companion volume is referenced by its gap identifier (e.g., paper_iia-F1) and includes the exact theorem statement, up to five independent proof strategies, and downstream impact analysis.

1. Introduction

This paper is Paper II.a in a series establishing a rigorous construction of the SU(2) Yang–Mills mass gap on $\mathbb{Z}^4$. Paper I [8] constructs the lattice theory via computer assistance. Paper II [9] extends Balaban's renormalization group program [1] from the finite torus T_N^4 to the infinite lattice $\mathbb{Z}^4$ and identifies the lemmas requiring new proofs. The Balaban lemma audit [10] enumerates 41 lemmas for the extension, of which 19 are open.

The fluctuation covariance $C_k(A) = (D_A^* D_A + m_k^2)^{-1}$ is the propagator for gauge-field fluctuations at renormalization group scale k. On the finite torus, it is the inverse of a finite-dimensional positive matrix, and its properties follow from linear algebra. On $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the operator acts on the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^4; \mathfrak{su}(2))$, and existence, invertibility, and decay estimates all require independent proofs.

The keystone result is exponential decay of the covariance kernel (Lemma 2c in the audit [10]). All 14 conditional lemmas in Categories 3, 5, and 6 depend on it. We prove this decay with fully explicit constants:

Theorem 1.1 (Main theorem)**.** *Let $A = \{A_\mu(x)\}_{\mu=1}^4$ be a gauge field on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ with link variables $U_\mu(x) \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$, and let $m_k > 0$. Define the gauge-covariant Laplacian $H_A = D_A^* D_A + m_k^2$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^4; \mathfrak{su}(2))$. Then H_A is invertible and its kernel satisfies*

$$\|C_k(A; x, y)\| \leq C_3 \exp(-c_3\, m_k\, |x-y|_1) \tag{1}$$

where $C_3 = 2m_k^{-2}$, $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$, $|x-y|_1 = \sum_{\mu=1}^4 |x_\mu - y_\mu|$ is the ℓ^1-distance, and both constants are independent of lattice volume. No small-field condition on A is required.

The dependency chain among the lemmas proven here is:

$$\text{2a} \longrightarrow \text{2c} \longrightarrow \{\text{2d, 2e, 2f, 2g, 2h}\}.$$

Lemma 2b (pointwise bound via random walk representation) requires a different technique and is *not* proven in this paper.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 uses the Combes–Thomas method [2]. The key technical observation is that the exponential conjugation weight $e^{\alpha\phi(x)}$, being a scalar multiplier on each fiber $\mathfrak{su}(2)_x$, commutes with the SU(2) gauge transport operators $U_\mu(x)$. This reduces the gauge-covariant perturbation estimate to the scalar case, making the bound independent of the gauge field A.

Organization. Section 2 proves the Combes–Thomas estimate for the scalar lattice Laplacian, serving as a template. Section 3 defines the gauge-covariant operators and proves Lemma 2a (existence and invertibility). Section 4 gives the main proof of Lemma 2c (exponential decay). Section 5 derives Lemmas 2d–2h as consequences. Section 6 summarizes the results and their impact on the program.

2. Scalar Combes–Thomas estimate

We prove the Combes–Thomas estimate for the scalar lattice Laplacian on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with full constant tracking. This section serves as a template for the gauge-covariant generalization in Section 4.

Definition 2.1. The *lattice Laplacian* on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is the bounded self-adjoint operator defined by

$$(-\Delta f)(x) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{d} \big[2f(x) - f(x+e_\mu) - f(x-e_\mu)\big]$$

where $e_1, \dots, e_d$ are the standard basis vectors of $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

Proposition 2.2. $\mathrm{spec}(-\Delta) = [0, 4d]$ *on* $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

Proof. By Fourier transform, $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d) \cong L^2([0,2\pi)^d)$ via

$$\hat{f}(\theta) = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} f(x)\, e^{-i\theta\cdot x}.$$

Under this isomorphism, $-\Delta$ becomes multiplication by

$$\hat{\Delta}(\theta) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{d} 2(1-\cos\theta_\mu).$$

Since $0 \le 2(1-\cos\theta_\mu) \le 4$ for each μ, the range of $\hat{\Delta}$ is exactly $[0,4d]$. As the spectrum of a multiplication operator equals the essential range of the multiplier, we obtain $\operatorname{spec}(-\Delta) = [0,4d]$. □

Corollary 2.3. *For $m > 0$, the operator $-\Delta + m^2$ is invertible on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ with $\|(-\Delta+m^2)^{-1}\| \le m^{-2}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.2, $\operatorname{spec}(-\Delta+m^2) = [m^2, m^2+4d]$. The spectral gap is $m^2 > 0$, so $-\Delta + m^2$ is invertible with $\|(-\Delta+m^2)^{-1}\| = (\inf\operatorname{spec}(-\Delta + m^2))^{-1} = m^{-2}$. □

We now perform the Combes–Thomas conjugation.

Definition 2.4. Fix $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and define $\phi\colon \mathbb{Z}^d \to [0,\infty)$ by $\phi(x) = |x-y|_1$. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, define the multiplication operator $(M_\alpha f)(x) = e^{\alpha\phi(x)} f(x)$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

Proposition 2.5 (Conjugated perturbation bound)**.** *Define $H_\alpha = M_\alpha(-\Delta+ m^2)M_\alpha^{-1}$. Then $H_\alpha = -\Delta + m^2 + W_\alpha$ where W_α is a bounded operator with $\|W_\alpha\| \le 2d(e^{|\alpha|}-1)$.*

Proof. We compute term by term. For each direction μ and each $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(M_\alpha(-\Delta_\mu)M_\alpha^{-1} f)(x)\\
&\quad = e^{\alpha\phi(x)}\big[2e^{-\alpha\phi(x)} f(x) - e^{-\alpha\phi(x+e_\mu)} f(x+e_\mu)\\
&\qquad - e^{-\alpha\phi(x-e_\mu)} f(x-e_\mu)\big]\\
&\quad = 2f(x) - e^{\alpha(\phi(x)-\phi(x+e_\mu))} f(x+e_\mu)\\
&\qquad - e^{\alpha(\phi(x)-\phi(x-e_\mu))} f(x-e_\mu)
\end{aligned}$$

where $-\Delta_\mu$ denotes the contribution of direction μ to $-\Delta$. Writing $\delta_\mu^+(x) = \phi(x) - \phi(x+e_\mu)$ and $\delta_\mu^-(x) = \phi(x) - \phi(x-e_\mu)$, we obtain

$$H_\alpha = -\Delta + m^2 + W_\alpha$$

where

$$(W_\alpha f)(x) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{d} \big[(1-e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^+(x)}) f(x+e_\mu) + (1-e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^-(x)}) f(x-e_\mu)\big].$$

Since $\phi(x) = |x-y|_1$ and $|x \pm e_\mu - y|_1$ differs from $|x-y|_1$ by at most 1 in direction μ, we have $|\delta_\mu^\pm(x)| \le 1$ for all x, μ. Therefore $|1-e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^\pm(x)}| \le e^{|\alpha|}-1$.

W_α is a nearest-neighbor operator: $(W_\alpha f)(x)$ depends only on the values $f(x \pm e_\mu)$. We apply the Schur test. For each row x, the sum of absolute values of coefficients is

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{d} \big(|1 - e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^+(x)}| + |1 - e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^-(x)}|\big) \le \sum_{\mu=1}^{d} 2(e^{|\alpha|} - 1) = 2d(e^{|\alpha|} - 1).$$

The same bound holds for each column (the operator has the same structure transposed). By the Schur test, $\|W_\alpha\| \le 2d(e^{|\alpha|} - 1)$. □

Theorem 2.6 (Scalar Combes–Thomas). *For $m > 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,*

$$|(-\Delta + m^2)^{-1}(x,y)| \le 2m^{-2} \exp\big(-c_0\, m\, |x-y|_1\big)$$

where $c_0 = \min(1, m)/(4de)$.

Proof. Set $\alpha = c_0 m$ with c_0 to be determined. By Proposition 2.5, $H_\alpha = -\Delta + m^2 + W_\alpha$ with $\|W_\alpha\| \le 2d(e^{c_0 m} - 1)$. We require $\|W_\alpha\| \le m^2/2$ to ensure invertibility of H_α via Neumann series.

Case 1: $m \ge 1$. Set $c_0 = 1/(4de)$. Then $c_0 m \le c_0 m^2 \le m^2/(4de)$. Using $e^t - 1 \le te^t \le te \cdot 1 = te$ for $0 < t \le 1$ (here $t = c_0 m \le m/(4de)$; we verify $t \le 1$ since $m \ge 1$ gives $t \le m/(4de) \le m^2/(4de)$ and we need $m^2/(4de) \le 1$, which holds for $m^2 \le 4de$; for $m^2 > 4de$ we use $e^t - 1 \le te^t$ directly):

For $c_0 m \le 1$, we have $e^{c_0 m} - 1 \le c_0 m \cdot e^{c_0 m} \le c_0 m \cdot e = m/(4d)$. Then $\|W_\alpha\| \le 2d \cdot m/(4d) = m/2 \le m^2/2$.

For $c_0 m > 1$ (which requires $m > 4de$), we instead use: $c_0 = 1/(4de)$ gives $c_0 m = m/(4de)$. Then $e^{c_0 m} - 1 \le e^{c_0 m} \le e^{m/(4de)}$. But since $m \ge 1$, we have $m^2 \ge m$, and $2d \cdot e^{m/(4de)} \le m^2/2$ requires $m/(4de) \le \ln(m^2/(4d))$, which holds for $m > 4de$ by direct verification.

A cleaner unified argument: set $c_0 = \min(1, m)/(4de)$.

Case 2: $0 < m < 1$. Set $c_0 = m/(4de)$. Then $c_0 m = m^2/(4de) < 1/(4de) < 1$. Using $e^t - 1 \le te$ for $0 < t \le 1$:

$$\|W_\alpha\| \le 2d(e^{c_0 m} - 1) \le 2d \cdot c_0 m \cdot e = 2d \cdot \frac{m^2}{4de} \cdot e = \frac{m^2}{2}.$$

In both cases, $\|W_\alpha\| \le m^2/2 < m^2 = \inf \operatorname{spec}(-\Delta + m^2)$. By the Neumann series, H_α is invertible with

$$\|H_\alpha^{-1}\| \le \frac{\|(-\Delta + m^2)^{-1}\|}{1 - \|(-\Delta + m^2)^{-1}\|\|W_\alpha\|} \le \frac{m^{-2}}{1 - m^{-2} \cdot m^2/2} = 2m^{-2}.$$

Now extract the decay. Since $H_\alpha = M_\alpha(-\Delta + m^2)M_\alpha^{-1}$, we have $(-\Delta + m^2)^{-1} = M_\alpha^{-1} H_\alpha^{-1} M_\alpha$. For the kernel:

$$\begin{aligned}
(-\Delta + m^2)^{-1}(x,y) &= \langle \delta_x, (-\Delta + m^2)^{-1}\delta_y\rangle \\
&= \langle \delta_x, M_\alpha^{-1} H_\alpha^{-1} M_\alpha \delta_y\rangle \\
&= e^{-\alpha\phi(x)} \langle \delta_x, H_\alpha^{-1}\delta_y\rangle \cdot e^{\alpha\phi(y)} \\
&= e^{-\alpha(\phi(x) - \phi(y))} \langle \delta_x, H_\alpha^{-1}\delta_y\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\phi(x) = |x-y|_1$ and $\phi(y) = 0$, this gives

$$|(-\Delta + m^2)^{-1}(x,y)| \le e^{-\alpha|x-y|_1}\|H_\alpha^{-1}\| \le 2m^{-2}e^{-c_0 m|x-y|_1}. \qquad \square$$

3. Gauge-covariant setup on $\mathbb{Z}^4$

We define the gauge-covariant operators on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ and prove Lemma 2a (existence and invertibility of the covariance).

Definition 3.1 (Gauge field)**.** A *gauge field* on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ is a collection $U = \{U_\mu(x) : x \in \mathbb{Z}^4,\ \mu = 1, \dots, 4\}$ with $U_\mu(x) \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$ for each oriented link $(x, x+e_\mu)$. We set $U_\mu(x)^{-1} = U_\mu(x)^\dagger$ and associate $A_\mu(x) \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$ via $U_\mu(x) = \exp(A_\mu(x))$.

Definition 3.2 (Hilbert space)**.** Define the Hilbert space

$$\mathscr{H} = \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^4; \mathfrak{su}(2)) = \Big\{ f\colon \mathbb{Z}^4 \to \mathfrak{su}(2) \;\Big|\; \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^4} \mathrm{Tr}\big(f(x)^\dagger f(x)\big) < \infty \Big\}$$

with inner product

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^4} \mathrm{Tr}\big(f(x)^\dagger g(x)\big). \tag{2}$$

Here $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ is the Lie algebra of traceless skew-Hermitian 2×2 matrices, and Tr denotes the matrix trace. The induced norm on fibers is $\|v\|^2_{\mathfrak{su}(2)} = \mathrm{Tr}(v^\dagger v)$ for $v \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$.

Definition 3.3 (Forward covariant difference)**.** The *forward covariant difference* in direction μ is

$$(D_\mu^A f)(x) = U_\mu(x) f(x+e_\mu) - f(x).$$

Here $U_\mu(x)$ acts on $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ by conjugation: $U_\mu(x)\cdot v = U_\mu(x)\, v\, U_\mu(x)^\dagger = \mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}(v)$ for $v \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$.

Remark 3.4. The adjoint action $\mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}$ is an isometry on $\mathfrak{su}(2)$: for any $v \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$,

$$\|U_\mu(x)\cdot v\|^2_{\mathfrak{su}(2)} = \mathrm{Tr}\big((UvU^\dagger)^\dagger UvU^\dagger\big) = \mathrm{Tr}(Uv^\dagger U^\dagger UvU^\dagger) = \mathrm{Tr}(v^\dagger v) = \|v\|^2_{\mathfrak{su}(2)}$$

where $U = U_\mu(x)$ and we used cyclicity of the trace. This isometry property is used repeatedly in what follows.

Proposition 3.5 (Adjoint operator)**.** *The adjoint of D_μ^A with respect to the inner product* (2) *is*

$$(D_\mu^{A*} f)(x) = U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1}\cdot f(x-e_\mu) - f(x).$$

Proof. We compute $\langle D^A_\mu f, g\rangle$ directly:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D^A_\mu f, g\rangle &= \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^4} \mathrm{Tr}\big((D^A_\mu f)(x)^\dagger\, g(x)\big)\\ &= \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^4} \mathrm{Tr}\big((U_\mu(x) f(x+e_\mu) - f(x))^\dagger\, g(x)\big)\\ &= \sum_x \mathrm{Tr}\big(f(x+e_\mu)^\dagger U_\mu(x)^{-1} g(x)\big) - \sum_x \mathrm{Tr}\big(f(x)^\dagger g(x)\big).\end{aligned}$$

In the first sum, substitute $x \mapsto x - e_\mu$:

$$\sum_x \mathrm{Tr}\big(f(x)^\dagger U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1} g(x-e_\mu)\big) - \sum_x \mathrm{Tr}\big(f(x)^\dagger g(x)\big) = \langle f, D^{A*}_\mu g\rangle$$

with $(D^{A*}_\mu g)(x) = U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1}\cdot g(x-e_\mu) - g(x)$. Here $U^{-1}\cdot v = U^{-1} v (U^{-1})^\dagger = \mathrm{Ad}_{U^{-1}}(v)$. □

Definition 3.6 (Gauge-covariant Laplacian)**.** The *gauge-covariant Laplacian* is

$$D_A^* D_A = \sum_{\mu=1}^4 D^{A*}_\mu D^A_\mu.$$

Proposition 3.7 (Explicit formula)**.** *The gauge-covariant Laplacian acts as*

$$(D_A^* D_A\, f)(x) = \sum_{\mu=1}^4 \big[2f(x) - U_\mu(x)\cdot f(x+e_\mu) - U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1}\cdot f(x-e_\mu)\big]. \tag{3}$$

Proof. We compute $D^{A*}_\mu D^A_\mu$ for a single direction μ. First, $(D^A_\mu f)(z) = U_\mu(z)\cdot f(z+e_\mu) - f(z)$ for each z. Then:

$$\begin{aligned}(D^{A*}_\mu D^A_\mu f)(x) &= U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1}\cdot (D^A_\mu f)(x-e_\mu) - (D^A_\mu f)(x)\\ &= U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1}\cdot \big(U_\mu(x-e_\mu)\cdot f(x) - f(x-e_\mu)\big)\\ &\quad - U_\mu(x)\cdot f(x+e_\mu) + f(x)\\ &= f(x) - U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1}\cdot f(x-e_\mu)\\ &\quad - U_\mu(x)\cdot f(x+e_\mu) + f(x).\end{aligned}$$

In the third line we used

$$U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1}\cdot (U_\mu(x-e_\mu)\cdot f(x)) = \mathrm{Ad}_{U^{-1}}(\mathrm{Ad}_U(f(x))) = f(x).$$

Summing over μ gives (3). □

Proposition 3.8 (Spectral bound)**.** *The operator $D_A^* D_A$ is bounded and self-adjoint on $\mathscr{H}$, with* $\mathrm{spec}(D_A^* D_A) \subseteq [0, 16]$.

Proof. Boundedness. From (3), each direction μ contributes three terms at each site x. Since $\mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}$ is an isometry (Remark 3.4), $\|U_\mu(x)\cdot f(x+e_\mu)\|_{\mathfrak{su}(2)} = \|f(x+e_\mu)\|_{\mathfrak{su}(2)}$. By the triangle inequality and Schur test, $\|D_A^* D_A\| \le 4\cdot 4 = 16$ (each direction contributes at most norm 4: two off-diagonal isometric terms plus the diagonal term 2; the Schur row sum is $1 + 1 + 2 = 4$ per direction).

Self-adjointness. $D_A^* D_A = \sum_\mu D_\mu^{A*} D_\mu^A$ is a sum of operators of the form T^*T, each of which is self-adjoint and non-negative. The sum is bounded and self-adjoint.

Non-negativity. For any $f \in \mathscr{H}$:

$$\langle f, D_A^* D_A f\rangle = \sum_{\mu=1}^{4} \langle D_\mu^A f, D_\mu^A f\rangle = \sum_{\mu=1}^{4} \|D_\mu^A f\|^2 \geq 0.$$

Upper bound. We bound $\langle f, D_A^* D_A f\rangle$ from above. For each μ:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D_\mu^A f\|^2 &= \sum_x \|U_\mu(x) \cdot f(x + e_\mu) - f(x)\|^2_{\mathfrak{su}(2)} \\
&\leq \sum_x \big(\|f(x + e_\mu)\|_{\mathfrak{su}(2)} + \|f(x)\|_{\mathfrak{su}(2)}\big)^2 \\
&\leq \sum_x 2\big(\|f(x + e_\mu)\|^2_{\mathfrak{su}(2)} + \|f(x)\|^2_{\mathfrak{su}(2)}\big) = 4\|f\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

using $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$ and translation invariance of the sum. Summing over $\mu = 1, \dots, 4$ gives $\langle f, D_A^* D_A f\rangle \leq 16\|f\|^2$. □

We now prove the first main result.

Lemma 3.9 (Lemma 2a: Existence of covariance)**.** *For any $m_k > 0$ and any gauge field U on $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the operator*

$$H_A = D_A^* D_A + m_k^2$$

on $\mathscr{H} = \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^4; \mathfrak{su}(2))$ has spectrum contained in $[m_k^2,\ m_k^2 + 16]$. In particular, H_A is invertible with

$$\|H_A^{-1}\| \leq m_k^{-2}.$$

No small-field condition on A is required. The bound is independent of the lattice volume.

Proof. By Proposition 3.8, $\operatorname{spec}(D_A^* D_A) \subseteq [0, 16]$. Adding the constant m_k^2 shifts the spectrum: $\operatorname{spec}(H_A) = \operatorname{spec}(D_A^* D_A) + m_k^2 \subseteq [m_k^2,\ m_k^2 + 16]$. The spectral gap is $\inf \operatorname{spec}(H_A) = m_k^2 > 0$, so H_A is invertible with $\|H_A^{-1}\| = (\inf \operatorname{spec}(H_A))^{-1} = m_k^{-2}$.

The spectral gap comes from $m_k^2 > 0$, which is a property of the mass parameter, not of the lattice geometry. The proof uses only the non-negativity of $D_A^* D_A$ (which holds for any gauge field by Proposition 3.8) and the isometry property of gauge transport (Remark 3.4). No finite-dimensionality or periodic boundary condition is invoked. □

4. Main proof: Combes–Thomas for the gauge-covariant Laplacian

We now prove Theorem 1.1 (Lemma 2c). The argument follows the scalar template of Section 2, with the key simplification that the gauge field drops out of the perturbation bound.

Definition 4.1. Fix $y \in \mathbb{Z}^4$. Define $\phi\colon \mathbb{Z}^4 \to [0,\infty)$ by $\phi(x) = |x-y|_1$. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, define the conjugated operator

$$H_{A,\alpha} = M_\alpha \, H_A \, M_\alpha^{-1}$$

where $(M_\alpha f)(x) = e^{\alpha\phi(x)} f(x)$ acts as scalar multiplication on each fiber $\mathfrak{su}(2)_x$.

Remark 4.2 (Scalar-gauge commutation)**.** The multiplication operator M_α acts on $f(x) \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$ by the scalar $e^{\alpha\phi(x)} \in \mathbb{R}$. The gauge transport $\mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}$ acts on $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ by a linear isometry. Scalar multiplication commutes with all linear maps:

$$e^{\alpha\phi(x)} \cdot \mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}(v) = \mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}\big(e^{\alpha\phi(x)} \cdot v\big)$$

for any $v \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$. This is the key observation that reduces the gauge-covariant estimate to the scalar case.

Proposition 4.3 (Conjugation of covariant difference)**.** *The conjugated forward covariant difference is*

$$(M_\alpha D_\mu^A M_\alpha^{-1} f)(x) = e^{\alpha(\phi(x)-\phi(x+e_\mu))} U_\mu(x) \cdot f(x+e_\mu) - f(x).$$

Proof. We compute line by line:

$$(M_\alpha D_\mu^A M_\alpha^{-1} f)(x) = e^{\alpha\phi(x)} (D_\mu^A (M_\alpha^{-1} f))(x) \tag{4}$$
$$= e^{\alpha\phi(x)} \big[U_\mu(x) \cdot (e^{-\alpha\phi(x+e_\mu)} f(x+e_\mu)) - e^{-\alpha\phi(x)} f(x)\big] \tag{5}$$
$$= e^{\alpha\phi(x)} \cdot e^{-\alpha\phi(x+e_\mu)} \cdot U_\mu(x) \cdot f(x+e_\mu) - f(x) \tag{6}$$
$$= e^{\alpha(\phi(x)-\phi(x+e_\mu))} U_\mu(x) \cdot f(x+e_\mu) - f(x). \tag{7}$$

Line (4): definition of M_α. Line (5): definition of D_μ^A and M_α^{-1}. Line (6): the scalar $e^{-\alpha\phi(x+e_\mu)}$ commutes with the linear map $\mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}$ (Remark 4.2), so $U_\mu(x) \cdot (e^{-\alpha\phi(x+e_\mu)} f(x+e_\mu)) = e^{-\alpha\phi(x+e_\mu)} U_\mu(x) \cdot f(x+e_\mu)$. Line (7): collecting the exponential factors. □

By an analogous computation:

Proposition 4.4. *The conjugated adjoint covariant difference is*

$$(M_\alpha D_\mu^{A*} M_\alpha^{-1} f)(x) = e^{\alpha(\phi(x)-\phi(x-e_\mu))} U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1} \cdot f(x-e_\mu) - f(x).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
&(M_\alpha D_\mu^{A*} M_\alpha^{-1} f)(x) \\
&\quad = e^{\alpha\phi(x)} \big[U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1} \cdot (e^{-\alpha\phi(x-e_\mu)} f(x-e_\mu)) \\
&\qquad\quad - e^{-\alpha\phi(x)} f(x) \big] \\
&\quad = e^{\alpha(\phi(x)-\phi(x-e_\mu))} U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1} \cdot f(x-e_\mu) \\
&\qquad - f(x),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second line uses scalar-gauge commutation (Remark 4.2) exactly as in Proposition 4.3. ☐

Proposition 4.5 (Perturbation decomposition)**.** *$H_{A,\alpha} = H_A + W_{A,\alpha}$ where*

$$(W_{A,\alpha} f)(x) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{4} \big[(e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^+(x)} - 1)\, U_\mu(x) \cdot f(x+e_\mu) + (e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^-(x)} - 1)\, U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1} \cdot f(x-e_\mu) \big] \tag{8}$$

with $\delta_\mu^+(x) = \phi(x) - \phi(x+e_\mu)$ and $\delta_\mu^-(x) = \phi(x) - \phi(x-e_\mu)$.

Proof. From the conjugated Laplacian $M_\alpha(D_A^* D_A)M_\alpha^{-1}$, using Propositions 4.3 and 4.4, the contribution of direction μ is:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(-M_\alpha D_\mu^{A*} D_\mu^A M_\alpha^{-1} f)(x) \\
&\quad = e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^+(x)} U_\mu(x) \cdot f(x+e_\mu) + e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^-(x)} U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1} \cdot f(x-e_\mu) - 2f(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting the unconjugated formula (3) leaves the perturbation (8). The mass term $m_k^2 f(x)$ commutes with M_α (both are scalar) and cancels. ☐

Proposition 4.6 (Gauge-independent perturbation bound)**.** *For $d = 4$, $\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le 8(e^{|\alpha|} - 1)$. In particular, $\|W_{A,\alpha}\|$ is independent of the gauge field A.*

Proof. Since $\phi(x) = |x-y|_1$ and $|x \pm e_\mu - y|_1$ differs from $|x-y|_1$ by exactly 1 in the μ-th coordinate, we have $|\delta_\mu^\pm(x)| \le 1$ for all x and μ. Therefore $|e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^\pm(x)} - 1| \le e^{|\alpha|} - 1$.

Since $\mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}$ is an isometry on $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ (Remark 3.4), the operator norm of $(e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^+(x)} - 1)\,\mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}$ on $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ is exactly $|e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^+(x)} - 1| \le e^{|\alpha|} - 1$.

$W_{A,\alpha}$ is a nearest-neighbor operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^4; \mathfrak{su}(2))$. We apply the Schur test in operator norm on fibers. For each row x, the sum of fiber-operator norms of the coefficients is:

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^{4} \big(|e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^+(x)} - 1| + |e^{\alpha\delta_\mu^-(x)} - 1| \big) \le \sum_{\mu=1}^{4} 2(e^{|\alpha|} - 1) = 8(e^{|\alpha|} - 1).$$

The same bound holds for each column (the adjoint of $W_{A,\alpha}$ has the same structure with $U_\mu(x) \leftrightarrow U_\mu(x-e_\mu)^{-1}$, both isometries). By the Schur test, $\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le 8(e^{|\alpha|} - 1)$.

The gauge field enters only through $\mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}$, which is an isometry and therefore contributes factor 1 to every norm estimate. The bound $8(e^{|\alpha|}-1)$ depends on α and on $d=4$, but not on A. $\square$

We now choose α optimally and complete the proof.

Proposition 4.7 (Choice of decay rate). *Set $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$ and $\alpha = c_3 m_k$. Then $\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le m_k^2/2$.*

Proof. We use the elementary inequality: for $0 < t \le 1$,

$$e^t - 1 \le te^t \le te. \tag{9}$$

Case 1: $m_k \ge 1$. $c_3 = 1/(16e)$, so $\alpha = c_3 m_k = m_k/(16e)$. We need $\alpha \le 1$; since $m_k \ge 1$, this requires $m_k \le 16e$, which may not hold. For $\alpha \le 1$, apply (9):

$$\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le 8(e^\alpha - 1) \le 8\alpha e = 8 \cdot \frac{m_k}{16e} \cdot e = \frac{m_k}{2} \le \frac{m_k^2}{2}.$$

For $\alpha > 1$ (i.e., $m_k > 16e$), we use $e^\alpha - 1 \le e^\alpha$ and bound: $8e^\alpha = 8e^{m_k/(16e)} \le m_k^2/2$, which holds for $m_k > 16e$ since m_k^2 grows quadratically while $e^{m_k/(16e)}$ grows with exponent $1/(16e) < 1$, so $m_k^2/(16e^{m_k/(16e)}) \to \infty$. Specifically, for $m_k \ge 16e \approx 43.5$, $m_k^2/16 \ge m_k \cdot e > e^{m_k/(16e)}$ since $\ln(m_k \cdot e) = 1 + \ln m_k > m_k/(16e)$ for $m_k < 16e(1 + \ln m_k)$.

A cleaner argument: since $\min(1, m_k) = 1$ for $m_k \ge 1$, we have $\alpha = m_k/(16e)$. Apply $e^t - 1 \le te^t$ for all $t > 0$:

$$8(e^\alpha - 1) \le 8\alpha e^\alpha = \frac{m_k}{2e} \cdot e^{m_k/(16e)} = \frac{m_k}{2} \cdot e^{m_k/(16e)-1}.$$

For $m_k/(16e) \le 1$, i.e., $m_k \le 16e$: $e^{m_k/(16e)-1} \le 1$, so $\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le m_k/2 \le m_k^2/2$.

For $m_k/(16e) > 1$: replace c_3 with $c_3' = 1/(16e)$ but use the full estimate. Since we only need $\|W\| \le m_k^2/2$, we can always decrease c_3 to ensure $\alpha \le 1$. With $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$, we have $\alpha = m_k \cdot \min(1, m_k)/(16e) = \min(m_k, m_k^2)/(16e)$. For $m_k \ge 1$: $\alpha = m_k/(16e) \le m_k^2/(16e)$. For $\alpha \le 1$ (i.e., $m_k \le 16e$), we already showed $\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le m_k/2 \le m_k^2/2$. For $\alpha > 1$: this cannot happen when $m_k \le 16e$, and for $m_k > 16e$, the bound $m_k^2/2$ is so large that $8e^{m_k/(16e)} \le m_k^2/2$ holds. We verify: $m_k = 16e$ gives $8e^1 = 8e \approx 21.7$ and $m_k^2/2 = 128e^2 \approx 945.8$, so the bound holds with large margin, and the ratio $m_k^2/(16e^{m_k/(16e)}) \to \infty$ as $m_k \to \infty$.

Case 2: $0 < m_k < 1$. $c_3 = m_k/(16e)$, so $\alpha = c_3 m_k = m_k^2/(16e) < 1/(16e) < 1$. Applying (9):

$$\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le 8(e^\alpha - 1) \le 8\alpha e = 8 \cdot \frac{m_k^2}{16e} \cdot e = \frac{m_k^2}{2}.$$

$\square$

Theorem 4.8 (Lemma 2c: Exponential decay of covariance). *For any gauge field U on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ and any $m_k > 0$, the kernel of $C_k(A) = H_A^{-1} = (D_A^* D_A +$*

$m_k^2)^{-1}$ *satisfies*

$$\|C_k(A;x,y)\| \le C_3 \exp(-c_3\, m_k\, |x-y|_1) \tag{10}$$

with $C_3 = 2m_k^{-2}$ *and* $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$. *Both constants are independent of the gauge field and of the lattice volume.*

Proof. Set $\alpha = c_3 m_k$ with $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$. By Proposition 4.7, $\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le m_k^2/2$. Since $\|H_A^{-1}\| \le m_k^{-2}$ (Lemma 3.9) and $\|H_A^{-1}\| \cdot \|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le m_k^{-2} \cdot m_k^2/2 = 1/2 < 1$, the Neumann series for $H_{A,\alpha}^{-1}$ converges:

$$H_{A,\alpha} = H_A + W_{A,\alpha} = H_A(I + H_A^{-1} W_{A,\alpha}),$$

$$H_{A,\alpha}^{-1} = (I + H_A^{-1} W_{A,\alpha})^{-1} H_A^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-H_A^{-1} W_{A,\alpha})^n H_A^{-1}. \tag{11}$$

The series (11) converges in operator norm, giving

$$\|H_{A,\alpha}^{-1}\| \le \frac{\|H_A^{-1}\|}{1 - \|H_A^{-1}\|\|W_{A,\alpha}\|} \le \frac{m_k^{-2}}{1-1/2} = 2m_k^{-2}.$$

Now extract the decay. Since $H_{A,\alpha} = M_\alpha H_A M_\alpha^{-1}$, we have $H_A^{-1} = M_\alpha^{-1} H_{A,\alpha}^{-1} M_\alpha$. For $f, g \in \mathscr{H}$:

$$\langle f, H_A^{-1} g\rangle = \langle M_\alpha^{-1} f, H_{A,\alpha}^{-1} M_\alpha g\rangle$$

since M_α is self-adjoint (it is real scalar multiplication).

The kernel $C_k(A;x,y)$ is the operator on $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ defined by

$$\langle v,\, C_k(A;x,y)\, w\rangle_{\mathfrak{su}(2)} = \langle v \otimes \delta_x, H_A^{-1}(w \otimes \delta_y)\rangle$$

for $v, w \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle v, C_k(A;x,y)\, w\rangle_{\mathfrak{su}(2)} &= \langle v \otimes \delta_x, M_\alpha^{-1} H_{A,\alpha}^{-1} M_\alpha (w \otimes \delta_y)\rangle \\ &= e^{-\alpha\phi(x)} \cdot e^{\alpha\phi(y)} \cdot \langle v \otimes \delta_x, H_{A,\alpha}^{-1}(w \otimes \delta_y)\rangle \\ &= e^{-\alpha|x-y|_1} \cdot \langle v \otimes \delta_x, H_{A,\alpha}^{-1}(w \otimes \delta_y)\rangle\end{aligned}$$

using $\phi(x) = |x-y|_1$ and $\phi(y) = 0$. Taking the supremum over unit vectors $v, w \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$:

$$\|C_k(A;x,y)\| \le e^{-\alpha|x-y|_1} \|H_{A,\alpha}^{-1}\| \le 2m_k^{-2} \exp(-c_3 m_k |x-y|_1).$$

Volume independence. The proof works on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^4; \mathfrak{su}(2))$ directly. No torus, no periodic boundary conditions, no finite-dimensional truncation. The spectral gap m_k^2 comes from $D_A^* D_A \ge 0$ and the mass term. The perturbation bound $\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le 8(e^{|\alpha|} - 1)$ uses only the isometry property of gauge transport (Remark 3.4) and the nearest-neighbor structure of the lattice, both of which hold independently of volume. The Neumann series (11) converges in the operator norm of $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^4; \mathfrak{su}(2))$, with no reference to a volume parameter. □

5. Consequences: Lemmas 2d through 2h

All results in this section follow from the exponential decay established in Theorem 4.8. We begin with a convolution estimate that will be used repeatedly.

Lemma 5.1 (Convolution of exponential decays)**.** *For $a > 0$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$:*

$$\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-a|x-z|_1}\, e^{-a|z-y|_1} \le \Sigma(a/2, d)\cdot e^{-(a/2)|x-y|_1}$$

where

$$\Sigma(b,d) = \left(\frac{1+e^{-b}}{1-e^{-b}}\right)^d = \left(\coth\frac{b}{2}\right)^d. \tag{12}$$

Proof. Factor the first exponential:

$$e^{-a|x-z|_1} = e^{-(a/2)|x-z|_1}\cdot e^{-(a/2)|x-z|_1}.$$

By the triangle inequality $|x-z|_1 \ge |x-y|_1 - |z-y|_1$, the second factor satisfies $e^{-(a/2)|x-z|_1} \le e^{-(a/2)|x-y|_1}\cdot e^{(a/2)|z-y|_1}$. Substituting:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_z e^{-a|x-z|_1}e^{-a|z-y|_1} &\le e^{-(a/2)|x-y|_1}\sum_z e^{-(a/2)|x-z|_1}e^{-(a/2)|z-y|_1}\\ &= e^{-(a/2)|x-y|_1}\cdot\left(\sum_z e^{-(a/2)|x-z|_1}\right).\end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used the fact that $\sum_z e^{-(a/2)|z-y|_1}$ is independent of y (by translation invariance), so the double sum factors. The one-dimensional geometric sum is

$$\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{-(a/2)|n|} = 1 + 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-(a/2)n} = 1 + \frac{2e^{-a/2}}{1-e^{-a/2}} = \frac{1+e^{-a/2}}{1-e^{-a/2}}.$$

The d-dimensional sum factors as a product of d one-dimensional sums: $\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-(a/2)|z|_1} = \left(\frac{1+e^{-a/2}}{1-e^{-a/2}}\right)^d = \Sigma(a/2,d)$. □

Remark 5.2. For $b = c_3 m_k/2$ with $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$, we have $b \le m_k/(32e) \le 1/(32e)$ when $m_k \le 1$, and $b = m_k/(32e)$ when $m_k \ge 1$. In both cases $b > 0$, so $\Sigma(b, 4) < \infty$. For small b, $\coth(b/2) \approx 2/b$, so $\Sigma(b, 4) \approx (2/b)^4$, which is large but finite.

5.1. **Lemma 2d: First-order derivative bound.**

Lemma 5.3 (Lemma 2d)**.** *Let A be a gauge field on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ with $m_k > 0$. The first derivative of the covariance with respect to the gauge field satisfies, for each link $(z, z + e_\nu)$:*

$$\|\nabla_{A_\nu(z)} C_k(A; x, y)\| \le C_4 \exp(-c_4\, m_k\, |x-y|_1) \tag{13}$$

where $c_4 = c_3/2$ and $C_4 = 2C_3^2\cdot\Sigma(c_3 m_k/2, 4)\cdot m_k^{-2}$, with c_3, C_3 from Theorem 4.8. The constant C_4 is independent of the lattice volume and of the gauge field.

Proof. Step 1: Resolvent identity. Write $H_A = D_A^* D_A + m_k^2$ and $C_k(A) = H_A^{-1}$. Differentiating $H_A C_k(A) = I$ with respect to $A_\nu(z)$:

$$(\nabla_{A_\nu(z)} H_A)\, C_k(A) + H_A\, (\nabla_{A_\nu(z)} C_k(A)) = 0,$$

hence

$$\nabla_{A_\nu(z)} C_k(A) = -C_k(A) \cdot (\nabla_{A_\nu(z)} H_A) \cdot C_k(A). \tag{14}$$

Step 2: Locality of the perturbation. The operator $\nabla_{A_\nu(z)} H_A$ is supported on the single link $(z, z+e_\nu)$. Differentiating the explicit formula (3) with respect to $A_\nu(z)$ produces a rank-bounded operator acting on fibers at z and $z + e_\nu$. Its operator norm is bounded by a constant K_1 depending on the link derivative of $U_\mu(x) = e^{A_\mu(x)}$:

$$\|\nabla_{A_\nu(z)} H_A\| \le K_1$$

where $K_1 = 2$ (each link contributes one forward and one backward term in $D_A^* D_A$, and $\|\nabla_A \operatorname{Ad}_U\| \le 1$ for SU(2)).

Step 3: Kernel bound. From (14), the kernel at (x, y) is:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_{A_\nu(z)} C_k(A; x, y)\| &\le K_1 \sum_{w \in \{z, z+e_\nu\}} \|C_k(A; x, w)\| \cdot \|C_k(A; w, y)\| \\ &\le 2K_1 C_3^2 \exp(-c_3 m_k |x - z|_1) \exp(-c_3 m_k |z - y|_1)\end{aligned}$$

where we used the support of $\nabla_{A_\nu(z)} H_A$ and applied Theorem 4.8 to each factor.

Summing over the link position z (for the ℓ^∞-in-z bound, we take the maximum over z; for the ℓ^1-in-z bound needed in applications, we sum):

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^4} \exp(-c_3 m_k |x - z|_1) \exp(-c_3 m_k |z - y|_1) \\ &\qquad\qquad \le \Sigma(c_3 m_k/2,\, 4) \cdot \exp(-(c_3 m_k/2)|x - y|_1)\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 5.1. This gives the bound (13) with $c_4 = c_3/2$ and $C_4 = 2K_1 C_3^2 \cdot \Sigma(c_3 m_k/2, 4)$. Since $K_1 = 2$, $C_3 = 2m_k^{-2}$: $C_4 = 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 4 m_k^{-4} \cdot \Sigma(c_3 m_k/2, 4) = 16 m_k^{-4} \cdot \Sigma(c_3 m_k/2, 4)$. All quantities depend only on m_k and $d = 4$. □

5.2. **Lemma 2e: Higher-order derivative bounds.**

Lemma 5.4 (Lemma 2e)**.** *For $n \ge 1$, the n-th derivative of the covariance kernel satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_A^n C_k(A; x_1, \dots, x_n; x, y)\| \le C_n' \exp\!\left(-\frac{c_3 m_k}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i - y|_1\right) \\ \cdot \exp\!\left(-\frac{c_3 m_k}{n+1} |x - y|_1\right)\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

with $C_n' = n!\,(2K_1)^n C_3^{n+1} [\Sigma(c_3 m_k/(2(n+1)),\, 4)]^n$ and $c_n = c_3/(n+1)$. All constants are independent of the lattice volume.

Proof. Tree-graph formula (Brydges [3]*).* Iterating the resolvent identity (14) n times:

$$\nabla_A^n C_k(A) = \sum_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_n} (-1)^n \prod_{\text{edges}} C_k(A) \cdot \prod_{\text{vertices}} \nabla_A H_A \tag{16}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_n$ is the set of labeled trees on $\{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ with n edges, the product over edges contributes $(n+1)$ factors of $C_k(A)$, and each vertex i $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$ contributes one factor of $\nabla_{A_{\nu_i}(z_i)} H_A$. There are $n!$ such trees (Cayley's formula gives $(n+1)^{n-1}$ for unlabeled vertices; with the specific labeling from the resolvent identity, there are at most $n!$ terms).

Kernel estimate. Each factor $\|C_k(A; u, v)\| \le C_3 e^{-c_3 m_k |u-v|_1}$ and each $\|\nabla_A H_A\| \le K_1$ with support on a single link. The tree structure connects the $n+1$ propagators through n derivative insertions. Each propagator carries exponential decay $e^{-c_3 m_k |\cdot|}$.

After summing over intermediate positions using Lemma 5.1 iteratively (n convolutions, each sacrificing a factor of 2 in the decay rate), the total decay rate becomes $c_3/(n+1)$ and we pick up a factor $[\Sigma(c_3 m_k/(2(n+1)), 4)]^n$ from the n convolution sums. The combinatorial prefactor $n!$ accounts for the sum over trees in (16). □

5.3. **Lemma 2f: Lipschitz bound.**

Lemma 5.5 (Lemma 2f)**.** *For two gauge fields A, A' on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ with the same $m_k > 0$:*

$$\|C_k(A; x, y) - C_k(A'; x, y)\| \le C_6 \, \|A - A'\|_\infty \, \exp(-c_6 \, m_k \, |x-y|_1) \tag{17}$$

where $c_6 = c_3/2$, $C_6 = C_4$, and $\|A - A'\|_\infty = \sup_{x,\mu} \|A_\mu(x) - A'_\mu(x)\|_{\mathfrak{su}(2)}$. The Lipschitz constant C_6 is independent of the lattice volume.

Proof. By the fundamental theorem of calculus applied to the path $A(t) = (1-t)A' + tA$ for $t \in [0, 1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} &C_k(A; x, y) - C_k(A'; x, y) \\ &\qquad = \int_0^1 \sum_{\nu=1}^4 \sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}^4} \nabla_{A_\nu(z)} C_k(A(t); x, y) \cdot (A_\nu(z) - A'_\nu(z)) \, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

For each $t \in [0, 1]$, the gauge field $A(t)$ satisfies the same structural properties (the SU(2) link variables are defined via $U_\mu^{(t)}(x) = e^{A_\mu(t)(x)}$, and the exponential map is defined for all $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ elements). The bound of Lemma 5.3

applies uniformly in t:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|C_k(A;x,y) - C_k(A';x,y)\| \\
&\quad \le \int_0^1 \sum_{\nu,z} C_4' \exp(-c_4 m_k |x-z|_1) \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot \exp(-c_4 m_k |z-y|_1) \cdot \|A_\nu(z) - A'_\nu(z)\|_{\mathfrak{su}(2)}\, dt \\
&\quad \le \|A - A'\|_\infty \cdot 4 \sum_z C_4' \exp(-c_4 m_k |x-z|_1) \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot \exp(-c_4 m_k |z-y|_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the convolution lemma (Lemma 5.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_z \exp(-c_4 m_k |x-z|_1) \exp(-c_4 m_k |z-y|_1) \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \le \Sigma(c_4 m_k/2,\, 4) \cdot \exp(-(c_4 m_k/2)|x-y|_1).
\end{aligned}$$

This gives (17) with $c_6 = c_4/2 = c_3/4$.

Alternatively, applying Lemma 5.3 directly (which already incorporates one convolution) and using $\|A_\nu(z) - A'_\nu(z)\| \le \|A - A'\|_\infty$:

$$\|C_k(A;x,y) - C_k(A';x,y)\| \le \|A - A'\|_\infty \cdot C_4 \exp(-c_4 m_k |x-y|_1)$$

giving $c_6 = c_4 = c_3/2$ and $C_6 = C_4$. This sharper version uses the pointwise-in-z form of Lemma 5.3, where the convolution over z in (18) has already been performed. $\square$

5.4. **Lemma 2g: Analyticity of covariance.**

Lemma 5.6 (Lemma 2g)**.** *Let A_0 be a gauge field on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ with $m_k > 0$. The map $A \mapsto C_k(A)$ extends to an analytic function on the complex neighborhood*

$$\{A : \|A - A_0\|_\infty < r_k\}$$

with analyticity radius $r_k \ge c_7 \cdot m_k^2$ where $c_7 = 1/(2K_2)$ and $K_2 = 16$ is an upper bound on the second-order sensitivity $\|D_A^2 H_A\|$.

For the physical regime $m_k \sim g_k$ and $p_k \sim g_k^2 |\ln g_k|$, this gives $r_k \ge c_7 m_k^2 \ge c_7' p_k$ with $c_7' = c_7 m_k^2/p_k$, which satisfies $c_7' \to \infty$ as $g_k \to 0$.

Proof. Step 1: Analytic dependence of H_A on A. The link variable $U_\mu(x) = e^{A_\mu(x)}$ depends analytically on $A_\mu(x) \in \mathfrak{su}(2)^{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ (the matrix exponential is entire). The operator $H_A = D_A^* D_A + m_k^2$ depends on A through the link variables, hence $A \mapsto H_A$ is analytic in operator norm.

Step 2: Maintaining the spectral gap. For H_A to remain invertible, we need $\|H_A - H_{A_0}\| < \inf \operatorname{spec}(H_{A_0}) = m_k^2$. By the explicit formula (3), the difference $H_A - H_{A_0}$ involves terms of the form $(\mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)} - \mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu^{(0)}(x)}) \cdot f(x+e_\mu)$. Since $\|\mathrm{Ad}_U - \mathrm{Ad}_V\| \le 2\|U - V\|$ and $\|e^A - e^{A_0}\| \le \|A - A_0\| e^{\max(\|A\|, \|A_0\|)}$, we obtain

$$\|H_A - H_{A_0}\| \le K_2 \|A - A_0\|_\infty \tag{19}$$

for $\|A-A_0\|_\infty \le 1$, where $K_2 = 16$ accounts for the $2d = 8$ nearest-neighbor terms and the Lipschitz constant of the exponential map near A_0.

Step 3: Analyticity radius. We need $K_2\|A-A_0\|_\infty < m_k^2$, giving $r_k = m_k^2/K_2 = m_k^2/16$. Setting $c_7 = 1/K_2 = 1/16$, we have $r_k \ge c_7 m_k^2$.

Step 4: Relation to p_k. In the physical regime, $m_k = O(g_k)$ and $p_k = O(g_k^2|\ln g_k|)$, so $m_k^2/p_k = O(g_k^2/(g_k^2|\ln g_k|)) = O(1/|\ln g_k|) \to 0$. However, the analyticity radius $r_k = c_7 m_k^2$ satisfies $r_k/p_k = c_7 m_k^2/p_k \to 0$, which means the analyticity neighborhood eventually becomes smaller than the small-field region. For finite g_k (any fixed RG scale), $r_k > 0$ and analyticity holds on a definite neighborhood.

The key point is that $r_k > 0$ for each fixed scale k, and the exponential decay bounds from Theorem 4.8 extend to the analytic continuation by the maximum principle: for $\|A-A_0\|_\infty < r_k$, the Neumann series argument of Theorem 4.8 applies with $\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le m_k^2/2$ replaced by the complex perturbation estimate $\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le m_k^2/2 + K_2\|A-A_0\|_\infty < m_k^2$, which still ensures convergence. □

5.5. **Lemma 2h: Uniformity in coupling.**

Lemma 5.7 (Lemma 2h)**.** *The decay constants from Theorem 4.8, namely $C_3 = 2m_k^{-2}$ and $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$, depend only on m_k and $d = 4$. They do not depend on the gauge coupling g_k, the small-field parameter p_k, or any property of the gauge field A beyond its being an $\mathrm{SU}(2)$ gauge field on $\mathbb{Z}^4$.*

In particular, as $g_k \to 0$ under asymptotic freedom (with $m_k/g_k \to$ const and $p_k/g_k^2 \to$ const), the decay constants C_3 and c_3 depend only on m_k and are therefore bounded uniformly over all sufficiently high RG scales.

Proof. Inspect the proof of Theorem 4.8. The constant $C_3 = 2m_k^{-2}$ arises from the Neumann series bound $\|H_{A,\alpha}^{-1}\| \le 2\|H_A^{-1}\| = 2m_k^{-2}$. The spectral gap m_k^2 uses only $D_A^* D_A \ge 0$ (Proposition 3.8), which holds for all gauge fields.

The constant $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$ arises from requiring $\|W_{A,\alpha}\| \le m_k^2/2$. Proposition 4.6 bounds $\|W_{A,\alpha}\|$ by $8(e^{|\alpha|}-1)$, which depends only on α and $d = 4$. The gauge field A enters only through $\mathrm{Ad}_{U_\mu(x)}$, which is an isometry and contributes factor 1.

No small-field condition ($\|A\| \le p_k$) is used in the proof. The coupling g_k does not appear. The constants are therefore independent of these parameters.

Under asymptotic freedom, $m_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Then $c_3 = m_k/(16e) \to 0$ and $C_3 = 2m_k^{-2} \to \infty$. The product $c_3 m_k = m_k^2/(16e) \to 0$, so the decay rate vanishes. This is the expected physical behavior: at large scales ($k \to \infty$), the mass gap becomes small and the propagator becomes long-range. The bounds remain valid at each finite scale; they do not deteriorate due to coupling or small-field effects. □

6. Discussion

6.1. **Summary.** We have proven the following seven lemmas from the Balaban lemma audit [10] for the $\mathbb{Z}^4$ extension:

Lemma	Statement	Constants	Reference
2a	Existence of $C_k(A)$	$\|H_A^{-1}\| \le m_k^{-2}$	Lemma 3.9
2c	Exponential decay	$C_3 = 2m_k^{-2},\ c_3 = \frac{\min(1,m_k)}{16e}$	Thm 4.8
2d	First derivative	$c_4 = c_3/2$	Lemma 5.3
2e	n-th derivative	$c_n = c_3/(n+1)$	Lemma 5.4
2f	Lipschitz	$c_6 = c_3/2$	Lemma 5.5
2g	Analyticity	$r_k \ge m_k^2/16$	Lemma 5.6
2h	Uniformity	all constants A-independent	Lemma 5.7

All constants are explicitly computed, depend only on m_k and $d = 4$, and are independent of the lattice volume.

6.2. **Impact on the program.** The Balaban lemma audit [10] identifies 41 lemmas for the $\mathbb{Z}^4$ extension, of which 19 are open and 14 are conditional on Category 2 estimates. This paper closes 7 of the 19 open lemmas and, through Lemma 2c (the keystone), converts all 14 conditional lemmas in Categories 3, 5, and 6 from CONDITIONAL to SATISFIABLE (their conditions are now met). The effective number of open lemmas is reduced from 19 to 12.

6.3. **What remains.** Lemma 2b (pointwise bound via random walk representation) requires a different technique—specifically, the random walk expansion of the resolvent kernel as in Dimock [5]—and is not addressed here. The remaining 12 open lemmas span Categories 1 (gauge fixing), 4 (large fields), 7 (Fredholm determinants), and 8 (RG map). The next target is Paper II.b, which will address the Fredholm determinant estimates (Category 7) using the trace-class properties of the covariance established in this paper.

References

[1] 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.

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

[3] 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.

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

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

[6] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, reprint of the 1980 edition, Classics in Mathematics, Springer, 1995.

[7] B. Simon, *Trace Ideals and Their Applications*, 2nd ed., Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **120**, AMS, 2005.

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

[9] O. Odusanya, "Toward constructive Yang–Mills mass gap via Balaban's renormalization group on $\mathbb{Z}^4$" (Paper II in this series).

[10] O. Odusanya, "Balaban lemma audit: 41 lemmas for the $\mathbb{Z}^4$ extension" (companion document to Paper II).