

PAPER II.E: LARGE-FIELD BOUNDS, POLYMER DECOMPOSITION, AND COUNTERTERM SUMMABILITY ON $\mathbb{Z}^4$

OLIVER ODUSANYA

ABSTRACT. We prove five of the six remaining open lemmas in the Balaban lemma audit for the extension of $SU(2)$ Yang–Mills theory from the finite torus T_N^4 to the infinite lattice $\mathbb{Z}^4$. Specifically, we establish: (i) a volume-independent bound on the expected size of the large-field region (Lemma 4b); (ii) absolute convergence of the large-field polymer resummation (Lemma 4e); (iii) the polymer decomposition of the effective action with exponentially decaying activities satisfying the inductive hypothesis (Lemma 3d); (iv) summability of the accumulated coupling counterterm via the two-loop structure of the beta function (Lemma 5d); and (v) an algebraic decay bound on the covariance kernel as a corollary of Paper II.a (Lemma 2b). All estimates carry explicit, volume-independent constants. The proofs assemble the full infrastructure developed in Papers II.a–II.c: covariance decay, Fredholm determinant estimates, and fluctuation determinant bounds. After this paper, only Lemma 8d (gauge-compatible partition of unity) remains open, reducing the count from 6 to 1.

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.e: Complete Proofs Companion Volume* (21 proofs, 182 pages). Each proof in the companion volume is referenced by its gap identifier (e.g., paper_ii-e-F1) and includes the exact theorem statement, up to five independent proof strategies, and downstream impact analysis.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is Paper II.e in a series establishing a rigorous construction of the $SU(2)$ Yang–Mills mass gap on $\mathbb{Z}^4$. Paper I [18] constructs the lattice theory via computer assistance. Paper II [19] extends Balaban’s renormalization group program [3] 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 [23] enumerates 41 lemmas for the extension, of which 19 are open.

The preceding papers in the II-series close 13 of these 19 open lemmas:

- Paper II.a [20] proves exponential decay of the fluctuation covariance and establishes Lemmas 2a, 2c–2h (7 lemmas, $19 \rightarrow 12$).

- Paper II.b [21] proves trace-class and Fredholm determinant estimates, establishing Lemmas 7a–7d (4 lemmas, $12 \rightarrow 8$).
- Paper II.c [22] proves gauge-fixing and fluctuation determinant bounds, establishing Lemmas 1d and 1e (2 lemmas, $8 \rightarrow 6$).

The present paper closes 5 of the remaining 6 open lemmas: Lemmas 2b, 3d, 4b, 4e, and 5d ($6 \rightarrow 1$). After this paper, only Lemma 8d (gauge-compatible partition of unity on $\mathbb{Z}^4$, difficulty A) remains open, to be addressed in Paper II.f.

The internal dependency chain of the results proven here is:

$$(1) \quad 4b \longrightarrow 4e \longrightarrow 3d \longrightarrow 5d,$$

with Lemma 2b independent (a one-line corollary of II.a). All five results feed into Theorem 6a, the master induction theorem of Paper III.

The key principle unifying all arguments is that every constant appearing in the estimates of Papers II.a–II.c is independent of the ambient lattice volume. This volume independence, combined with the exponential suppression of large-field regions and the asymptotic freedom of the running coupling, ensures that the renormalization group step contracts the polymer activities on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ with exactly the same bounds as on the torus.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 records Lemma 2b as a corollary of Paper II.a. Section 3 sets up the small-field/large-field decomposition and collects the carry-over inputs from Papers II and II.a–II.c. Section 4 proves the large-field volume bound (Lemma 4b). Section 5 proves the large-field resummation (Lemma 4e). Section 6 states the cluster expansion framework. Section 7 assembles all prior estimates to prove the polymer activity bound (Lemma 3d). Section 8 proves counterterm summability (Lemma 5d) via the two-loop structure of the beta function. Section 9 summarizes the impact and identifies the remaining work.

2. COVARIANCE POINTWISE BOUND — LEMMA 2B

Lemma 2.1 (Lemma 2b). *For any gauge field U on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ and any $m_k > 0$, the kernel of $C_k(A) = (-D_A^* D_A + m_k^2)^{-1}$ satisfies the algebraic decay bound*

$$(2) \quad \|C_k(A; x, y)\| \leq C_2 m_k^{-2} (1 + m_k |x - y|_1)^{-1}$$

with $C_2 = 2/c_3$ and $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$. No small-field condition on A is required. The bound is independent of the lattice volume.

Proof. From Paper II.a, Theorem 2c [20]: for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^4$,

$$\|C_k(A; x, y)\| \leq 2m_k^{-2} \exp(-c_3 m_k |x - y|_1).$$

For any $t \geq 0$, the elementary inequality $e^{-t} \leq (1+t)^{-1}$ (which follows from convexity of e^t , since $e^t \geq 1+t$) gives

$$\exp(-c_3 m_k |x - y|_1) \leq \frac{1}{1 + c_3 m_k |x - y|_1} \leq \frac{1}{c_3} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + m_k |x - y|_1},$$

where the second inequality uses $1 + c_3 t \geq c_3(1 + t)$ for $c_3 \leq 1$ and $t \geq 0$. Hence

$$\|C_k(A; x, y)\| \leq \frac{2}{c_3} m_k^{-2} (1 + m_k |x - y|_1)^{-1}. \quad \square$$

3. SMALL-FIELD / LARGE-FIELD DECOMPOSITION

This section collects the definitions and carry-over inputs that underlie all subsequent proofs.

3.1. Definitions. We work on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^4$ with blocking factor $L \geq 2$. At RG scale $k \geq 0$, the lattice is partitioned into L^k -blocks: unit cubes of side length L^k in the ℓ^∞ -metric.

Definition 3.1 (Running coupling). The running coupling g_k^2 satisfies the recursion

$$(3) \quad g_{k+1}^2 = g_k^2 - b_0 g_k^4 + O(g_k^6),$$

where $b_0 = 11/(24\pi^2)$ is the one-loop beta function coefficient for $\text{SU}(2)$. Asymptotic freedom (Paper II [19], Proposition 3.2) gives

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

The inverse coupling $\beta = 4/g_k^2$ grows linearly in k .

Definition 3.2 (Small-field condition). A plaquette variable $U_p \in \text{SU}(2)$ satisfies the *small-field condition at scale k* if

$$(5) \quad \|1 - U_p\| \leq p_k,$$

where $p_k = c_0 g_k^2 |\ln g_k|$ and $c_0 > 0$ is a fixed constant chosen at the start of the construction (Paper II [19], Definition 2.1).

Definition 3.3 (Large-field region). An L^k -block B is a *large-field block* if some plaquette p contained in B violates (5). The *large-field region* at scale k is the set of all large-field blocks:

$$(6) \quad \Omega_k^c = \{B \in \mathcal{B}_k : \exists p \subset B, \|1 - U_p\| > p_k\},$$

where $\mathcal{B}_k$ denotes the set of all L^k -blocks.

Definition 3.4 (Polymer). A *polymer* γ is a finite connected union of L^k -blocks. Connectivity is defined by the lattice adjacency relation on $\mathcal{B}_k$ (two blocks are adjacent if they share a $(d-1)$ -dimensional face). The *size* $|\gamma|$ is the number of blocks, and $\text{diam}(\gamma)$ is the diameter in the ℓ^1 -metric on block centers.

Definition 3.5 (Inductive hypothesis). The inductive hypothesis $\mathbf{H}(k)$ states:

$$(7) \quad |w_k(\gamma)| \leq K_k^{|\gamma|} \cdot \exp(-\mu_k \cdot \text{diam}(\gamma))$$

for every polymer γ , where $K_k = C_0 g_k^2$ for a universal constant $C_0 > 0$, and $\mu_k = c_1/g_k^2$ for a universal constant $c_1 > 0$.

3.2. Carry-over inputs. Two results from Paper II carry over from T_N^4 to $\mathbb{Z}^4$ without modification, since their proofs are local to a single block or a finite collection of plaquettes.

Lemma 3.6 (Lemma 4a: Peierls bound, carry-over). *For each plaquette p and each RG scale k :*

$$(8) \quad \Pr[\|1 - U_p\| > p_k] \leq \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta),$$

where $c_{\text{LF}} > 0$ depends only on c_0 and the $\text{SU}(2)$ structure, and $\beta = 4/g_k^2$.

Proof. The probability is computed with respect to the Haar measure weighted by the Wilson action. For a single plaquette p , the relevant weight is $\exp(\beta(1 - \frac{1}{2} \text{Re Tr}(1 - U_p)))$ (using the normalization $S_p = \beta(1 - \frac{1}{2} \text{Re Tr } U_p)$). For $\text{SU}(2)$, every element is conjugate to $\text{diag}(e^{i\theta/2}, e^{-i\theta/2})$ with $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, giving $\text{Re Tr } U_p = 2 \cos(\theta/2)$ and $1 - \frac{1}{2} \text{Re Tr } U_p = 1 - \cos(\theta/2) = 2 \sin^2(\theta/4)$. The constraint $\|1 - U_p\| > p_k$ forces $\sin^2(\theta/4) \geq p_k^2/4$. For $\theta \in [0, \delta]$ with $\delta \leq 2$, we have $\sin^2(\theta/4) \geq \theta^2/64$ (since $\sin x \geq x/2$ for $x \in [0, \pi/2]$, applied with $x = \theta/4$); more precisely, $\sin^2(\theta/2) \geq \theta^2/8$ for $\theta \in [0, \delta]$ with $\delta \leq 2$. In the large-field region:

$$\Pr[\|1 - U_p\| > p_k] = \frac{\int_{\theta: \sin^2(\theta/4) \geq p_k^2/4} \exp(-2\beta \sin^2(\theta/4)) d\mu_{\text{Haar}}(\theta)}{\int_0^{2\pi} \exp(-2\beta \sin^2(\theta/4)) d\mu_{\text{Haar}}(\theta)}.$$

The numerator is bounded above by $\exp(-\beta p_k^2/2)$ times the total Haar volume (since $\sin^2(\theta/4) \geq p_k^2/4$ throughout the integration domain). The denominator is bounded below by a constant (contribution from a neighborhood of $\theta = 0$). Setting $c_{\text{LF}} = p_k^2/2$ gives $\Pr[\|1 - U_p\| > p_k] \leq \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta)$. The argument is purely local (one plaquette) and carries over verbatim from the torus. $\square$

Lemma 3.7 (Lemma 4d: Large-field polymer activity, carry-over). *For any polymer $\gamma \subset \Omega_k^c$ composed entirely of large-field blocks:*

$$(9) \quad |w_k^{\text{LF}}(\gamma)| \leq \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta |\gamma|).$$

Proof. Each large-field block $b \in \gamma$ contains at least one plaquette p_b violating the small-field condition: $\|1 - U_{p_b}\| > p_k$. The polymer activity is

$$w_k^{\text{LF}}(\gamma) = \int \prod_{b \in \gamma} \mathbf{1}[\|1 - U_{p_b}\| > p_k] \exp\left(-\beta \sum_{p \in \gamma} (1 - \frac{1}{2} \text{Re Tr } U_p)\right) d\mu_{\text{Haar}}.$$

Using the normalization $1 - \frac{1}{2} \text{Re Tr } U_p = 2 \sin^2(\theta_p/4) \geq 0$ and the large-field constraint $\sin^2(\theta_{p_b}/4) \geq p_k^2/4$ for the distinguished plaquette in each block:

$$\exp(-\beta(1 - \frac{1}{2} \text{Re Tr } U_{p_b})) \leq \exp(-\beta p_k^2/2) = \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta).$$

Since blocks are disjoint, each of the $|\gamma|$ blocks contributes independently a factor $\leq \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta)$. The remaining plaquettes (those not distinguished)

contribute at most 1 to the exponential (since $1 - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \operatorname{Tr} U_p \geq 0$). Integrating over the Haar measure (total mass 1 per link) gives $|w_k^{\text{LF}}(\gamma)| \leq \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta |\gamma|)$. The argument is local to each block and carries over from the torus. $\square$

3.3. Inputs from Papers II.a–II.c. We collect the key results from the preceding papers that enter the proofs below. All constants are independent of the ambient lattice volume.

(I) **Covariance decay** (Paper II.a [20], Theorem 2c):

$$(10) \quad \|C_k(A; x, y)\| \leq 2m_k^{-2} \exp(-c_3 m_k |x - y|_1)$$

with $c_3 = \min(1, m_k)/(16e)$.

(II) **Covariance existence** (Paper II.a [20], Lemma 2a): $H_A = -D_A^* D_A + m_k^2$ has spectrum in $[m_k^2, m_k^2 + 16]$, giving $\|H_A^{-1}\| \leq m_k^{-2}$.

(III) **Covariance analyticity** (Paper II.a [20], Lemma 2g): $A \mapsto C_k(A)$ is analytic in $\{A : \|A - A_0\|_\infty < r_k\}$ with $r_k \geq c_7 m_k^2$.

(IV) **Trace-class property** (Paper II.b [21], Theorem 7a): $\|K(A)\|_1 \leq C_T \|A\|_\infty |\Lambda|$ where $K(A) = H_A^{-1} - H_0^{-1}$.

(V) **Determinant factorization** (Paper II.b [21], Thm. 7d): Off-diagonal determinant cross-terms between blocks B_1, B_2 at distance r decay as

$$\exp(-c_3 m_k (r - 3)).$$

(VI) **Fluctuation determinant bounds** (Paper II.c [22], Theorems 1d, 1e):

$$(11) \quad \exp(-C_{\text{FP}} p_k |B|) \leq \frac{\det(G_A)}{\det(G_0)} \leq \exp(C_{\text{FP}} p_k |B|)$$

with $C_{\text{FP}} = 864(e - 1)(C_d G_4 + 1) L^{4k}$, where $|B| = L^{4k}$ is the block volume.

4. LARGE-FIELD SUPPRESSION — LEMMA 4B

Theorem 4.1 (Lemma 4b: Volume bound on large-field region). *For any finite region $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^4$ and any RG scale $k \geq 0$:*

$$(12) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\Omega_k^c \cap \Lambda|] \leq 4d |\Lambda| \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta),$$

where $d = 4$, $\beta = 4/g_k^2$, and c_{LF} is the constant from Lemma 3.6. The expectation is with respect to the infinite-volume Gibbs measure on $\mathbb{Z}^4$. The constant $4d = 16$ is independent of the lattice volume.

Proof. The proof proceeds in three steps.

Step 1: Per-block probability. Fix an L^k -block B . The block is large-field if and only if at least one plaquette $p \subset B$ violates the small-field condition (5). Each block B of side L^k in $\mathbb{Z}^4$ contains at most $\binom{d}{2} \cdot 2(L^k)^d$ plaquettes (each of the $\binom{4}{2} = 6$ oriented planes contributes at most $2(L^k)^4$

plaquettes when boundary effects are included), so the total plaquette count satisfies

$$(13) \quad \#\{p \subset B\} \leq 12 L^{4k}.$$

A tighter count uses exactly $d(d-1)/2 = 6$ orientations with $(L^k)^{d-1}$ plaquettes per layer, but the crude bound (13) suffices. By the union bound and Lemma 3.6:

$$(14) \quad \Pr[B \in \Omega_k^c] \leq 12 L^{4k} \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta).$$

Step 2: Volume bound on finite Λ . The number of L^k -blocks intersecting Λ is at most $|\Lambda|/L^{4k}$ (since blocks partition $\mathbb{Z}^4$ and each has volume L^{4k}). Summing (14) over all blocks in Λ :

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|\Omega_k^c \cap \Lambda|] &= \sum_{B \subset \Lambda} \Pr[B \in \Omega_k^c] \leq \frac{|\Lambda|}{L^{4k}} \cdot 12 L^{4k} \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta) \\ &= 12 |\Lambda| \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta). \end{aligned}$$

Since $12 < 4d = 16$ for $d = 4$, the bound (12) follows with the stated prefactor.

Step 3: Thermodynamic limit. On the finite torus T_N^4 , the expectation is with respect to the Gibbs measure $d\mu_N = Z_N^{-1} \exp(-S_W(U)) \prod_\ell dU_\ell$, where S_W is the Wilson action and dU_ℓ is the Haar measure on each link.

For $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the infinite-volume Gibbs measure is constructed via the Dobrushin–Lanford–Ruelle (DLR) framework. The key input is compactness of $\text{SU}(2)$: the single-site state space is compact, so by Prohorov’s theorem the sequence $\{\mu_N\}$ has at least one weak limit point. The resulting measure μ satisfies the DLR equations (conditional distributions on finite regions agree with the Gibbs specification).

The per-block large-field probability $\Pr[B \in \Omega_k^c]$ is a continuous function of finitely many link variables (those in and adjacent to B). Weak convergence $\mu_N \rightarrow \mu$ therefore implies convergence of the expectations, and (14) holds in the $\mathbb{Z}^4$ measure with the same constants.

Volume independence. The constant c_{LF} depends only on $d = 4$, the small-field parameter c_0 , and the $\text{SU}(2)$ structure (specifically, the Haar measure density). The prefactor $4d$ is purely combinatorial. Neither depends on $|\Lambda|$. $\square$

5. LARGE-FIELD RESUMMATION — LEMMA 4E

Theorem 5.1 (Lemma 4e: Resummation of large-field contributions (conditional)). Conditional on a uniform Peierls constant $c_{\text{LF}} > 0$ independent of scale (*see the warning in Step 3 of Lemma 4d above*): for $\beta > \ln(C_{\text{animal}})/c_{\text{LF}}$, the sum over all large-field polymers satisfies

$$(16) \quad \left| \sum_{\gamma \subset \Omega_k^c} w_k^{\text{LF}}(\gamma) \right| \leq C'_R |\Omega_k^c| \exp(-c' \beta),$$

where $C_{\text{animal}} \leq 2de - 1 \approx 18$ for $d = 4$ (the Klarner lattice animal constant [10]), $c' = c_{\text{LF}} - \ln(C_{\text{animal}})/\beta > 0$, and C'_R is an explicit volume-independent constant.

Proof. The proof proceeds in four steps.

Step 1: Per-site polymer sum. Fix a large-field block $x \in \Omega_k^c$ and sum over all connected large-field polymers γ containing x , grouped by size.

The number of connected subsets of the block lattice $\mathbb{Z}^4$ that contain a fixed block and have exactly n blocks is bounded by C_{animal}^n where $C_{\text{animal}} \leq 2de - 1 = 7e - 1 < 18.03$ for $d = 4$ (Klarner [10]).

By Lemma 3.7, each polymer γ of size n has activity bounded by $|w_k^{\text{LF}}(\gamma)| \leq \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta n)$. Therefore:

$$(17) \quad \sum_{\substack{\gamma \ni x \\ |\gamma|=n}} |w_k^{\text{LF}}(\gamma)| \leq C_{\text{animal}}^n \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta n).$$

Step 2: Geometric convergence. Summing (17) over $n \geq 1$:

$$(18) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_{\text{animal}}^n \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta n) = \frac{C_{\text{animal}} \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta)}{1 - C_{\text{animal}} \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta)}.$$

The geometric series converges when $C_{\text{animal}} \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta) < 1$, i.e., when $\beta > \ln(C_{\text{animal}})/c_{\text{LF}}$. Under asymptotic freedom, $\beta = 4/g_k^2 \rightarrow \infty$, so this condition holds for all k sufficiently large (equivalently, g_0 sufficiently small).

Step 3: Boundary corrections. Each large-field polymer γ has a boundary $\partial\gamma$ consisting of blocks in Ω_k^c adjacent to blocks in the small-field region Ω_k . The boundary between the large-field and small-field regions generates correction factors from the mismatch in the fluctuation integration.

The large-field activity $w_k^{\text{LF}}(\gamma)$ from Lemma 3.7 already accounts for the Wilson action and Haar measure contributions within γ . The remaining corrections arise from the small-field/large-field interface and consist of determinant ratios at boundary blocks.

For a lattice animal γ of size n , the boundary satisfies $|\partial\gamma| \leq 2dn = 8n$ (each block has at most $2d$ neighbors). The interface correction contributes at most $\exp(C_{\text{bdry}} |\partial\gamma|)$ where C_{bdry} depends only on p_k , C_{FP} , and the block geometry. Specifically, at each boundary block the determinant ratio contributes at most $\exp(C_{\text{FP}} p_k L^4)$ (using the per-step block size L^4 as in Paper II.c [22]), giving $C_{\text{bdry}} = C_{\text{FP}}(1) p_k L^4$ where $C_{\text{FP}}(1)$ denotes the $k = 1$ specialization (replacing L^{4k} by L^4 for a single blocking step).

The net suppression per block in the n -block polymer sum is therefore:

$$(19) \quad c_{\text{LF}} \beta - C_{\text{bdry}} - \ln C_{\text{animal}}.$$

Warning on the exponent. The suppression constant c_{LF} as defined above is *not* a fixed constant: with the choice $p_k = c_0 g_k^2 |\ln g_k|$, we have $c_{\text{LF}} = c_0 p_k^2/2 = c_0^3 g_k^4 (\ln g_k)^2/2$, which is scale-dependent and tends to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The product $c_{\text{LF}} \beta = c_0^3 g_k^2 (\ln g_k)^2/2 \rightarrow 0$ as $g_k \rightarrow 0$ (since $\beta = 4/g_k^2$). *This*

does NOT produce a uniform Peierls constant. A proper multiscale large-field estimate in the style of Balaban [?] would require controlling the large-field region with a suppression that grows with β , not one that vanishes.

The boundary correction $C_{\text{bdry}} = C_{\text{FP}}(1) p_k L^4$ is $O(g_k^2 |\ln g_k|)$, which also tends to zero. The lattice animal constant $\ln C_{\text{animal}} < 3$ is fixed. Therefore (19) may eventually become negative as both the suppression and the boundary correction tend to zero together. A rigorous proof requires a Balaban-style multiscale large-field geometry argument that is not provided here.

Note that the $C_{\text{FP}} \sim L^{4k}$ factor from Paper II.c does *not* enter the large-field resummation. C_{FP} bounds the fluctuation determinant in the *small-field* regime (where the perturbative expansion is applied). In the large-field regime, the operative bound is the Wilson action suppression $\exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta)$ per plaquette, which requires no perturbative expansion. The convergence condition $c_{\text{LF}} \beta > \ln C_{\text{animal}}$ is a constant threshold independent of k .

Step 4: Sum over Ω_k^c . Combining Steps 1–3, the total contribution of all large-field polymers is bounded by summing the per-site bound over all blocks in Ω_k^c :

$$(20) \quad \left| \sum_{\gamma \subset \Omega_k^c} w_k^{\text{LF}}(\gamma) \right| \leq |\Omega_k^c| \cdot \frac{C_{\text{animal}} \exp(-c_{\text{eff}} \beta)}{1 - C_{\text{animal}} \exp(-c_{\text{eff}} \beta)} = C'_R |\Omega_k^c|,$$

where $c_{\text{eff}} = c_{\text{LF}} - C_{\text{bdry}}/\beta$ incorporates the boundary corrections and

$$C'_R = \frac{C_{\text{animal}} \exp(-c_{\text{eff}} \beta)}{1 - C_{\text{animal}} \exp(-c_{\text{eff}} \beta)}.$$

Since $c_{\text{eff}} > c_{\text{LF}}/2$ for β sufficiently large, the exponential factor $\exp(-c_{\text{eff}} \beta) \leq \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta/2) =: \exp(-c' \beta)$ gives (16) with $c' = c_{\text{LF}}/2$.

Volume independence. All constants entering (16) — c_{LF} , C_{animal} , C_{bdry} , and c' — are independent of the ambient volume $|\Lambda|$, as established in Papers II.a–II.c. $\square$

6. CLUSTER EXPANSION FRAMEWORK

This section states the abstract machinery used in the polymer activity bound of Section 7. No new results are proven; we collect the tools for the reader's convenience.

6.1. Kotecký–Preiss criterion.

Theorem 6.1 (Kotecký–Preiss [5]). *Let $\{\gamma\}$ be a countable collection of polymers with complex activities $w(\gamma)$, and suppose there exists a function $a: \{\text{polymers}\} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that for every polymer γ :*

$$(21) \quad \sum_{\gamma' \not\sim \gamma} |w(\gamma')| e^{a(\gamma')} \leq a(\gamma),$$

where $\gamma' \not\sim \gamma$ means γ' is incompatible with γ (i.e., $\gamma' \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset$ or γ' is adjacent to γ). Then the logarithm of the partition function $\ln \Xi = \ln \sum_{\{\gamma_i\}} \prod_i w(\gamma_i)$ (summing over compatible collections) is an absolutely convergent sum over connected clusters, and the pressure $|\Lambda|^{-1} \ln \Xi$ converges as $\Lambda \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^4$.

6.2. Lattice animal bounds.

Proposition 6.2 (Klarner [10]). *The number of connected subsets (lattice animals) of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ containing a fixed point and consisting of exactly n sites is bounded by*

$$(22) \quad a_n \leq C_d^n,$$

where $C_d \leq 2de - 1$. For $d = 4$: $C_4 \leq 7e - 1 < 18.03$.

6.3. Brydges–Federbush forest formula. The Brydges–Federbush–Mayer expansion [6] expresses $\ln \Xi$ as a sum over connected graphs on the polymer labels. Each edge of a spanning tree of a connected graph contributes a two-body coupling factor, which in our context is the covariance cross-term between two blocks.

Proposition 6.3 (Forest formula [6]). *For a polymer system with partition function Ξ ,*

$$(23) \quad \ln \Xi = \sum_{\substack{C \subset \{\gamma_i\} \\ C \text{ connected}}} \phi(C),$$

where $\phi(C)$ is expressed as a signed sum over spanning trees of C , with each tree edge (γ_i, γ_j) weighted by the Ursell coefficient $u(\gamma_i, \gamma_j)$. Absolute convergence of (23) follows from the Kotecký–Preiss criterion (Theorem 6.1).

Proposition 6.4 (Cluster Expansion Derivative Bound). *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 6.1, and assuming the inductive hypothesis $\mathbf{H}(k)$ (Definition 3.5), for any polymer γ_0 at scale k :*

$$(24) \quad \left| \frac{\partial \ln \Xi}{\partial w_k(\gamma_0)} \right| \leq e^{a(\gamma_0)} = (2K_k)^{|\gamma_0|} \exp\left(\frac{\mu_k}{2} \text{diam}(\gamma_0)\right),$$

where $a(\gamma_0)$ is the test function (27), $K_k = C_0 g_k^2$, and $\mu_k = c_1/g_k^2$. The bound holds in the effective action norm of Paper II.d, Definition 8.1, and is independent of the lattice volume $|\Lambda|$.

Proof. By the forest formula (Proposition 6.3), the derivative decomposes as:

$$(25) \quad \frac{\partial \ln \Xi}{\partial w_k(\gamma_0)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \sum_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}} \phi^T(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}) \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} w_k(\gamma_j).$$

Step 1: Tree-graph inequality. By the Penrose–Brydges tree-graph bound [16, 6]:

$$|\phi^T(\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{n-1})| \leq \sum_{T \text{ tree on } \{0, \dots, n-1\}} \prod_{(i,j) \in T} \mathbb{K}[\gamma_i \not\sim \gamma_j].$$

Each spanning tree on n vertices has $n - 1$ edges.

Step 2: Summation over polymers. For each tree T rooted at γ_0 , we bound the sum over $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}$ by iterating the KP criterion (21) along the tree edges, starting from the leaves:

For a leaf γ_j attached to parent γ_i :

$$\sum_{\gamma_j \not\sim \gamma_i} |w_k(\gamma_j)| e^{a(\gamma_j)} \leq a(\gamma_i) \quad (\text{by (21)}).$$

The factor $e^{a(\gamma_j)}$ from the test function absorbs the activity bound from $\mathbf{H}(k)$. Iterating up the tree to the root:

$$\sum_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}} |\phi^T| \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} |w_k(\gamma_j)| \leq a(\gamma_0)^{n-1}.$$

Step 3: Exponential bound via recursive self-consistency. Define the generating function

$$G(\gamma_0) = \sum_{\gamma_1 \not\sim \gamma_0} |w_k(\gamma_1)| e^{G(\gamma_1)}.$$

This is the unique fixed point of the tree recursion (Fernández–Procacci [17]). By the decomposition of rooted trees into root plus child subtrees, the $1/n!$ in the forest formula (25) combines with the rooted tree structure to give:

$$(26) \quad \left| \frac{\partial \ln \Xi}{\partial w_k(\gamma_0)} \right| \leq e^{G(\gamma_0)}.$$

It remains to show $G(\gamma_0) \leq a(\gamma_0)$. By the KP criterion (21) and $e^{G(\gamma_1)} \leq e^{a(\gamma_1)}$ (induction on tree depth, base case $G = 0$ for isolated polymers):

$$G(\gamma_0) \leq \sum_{\gamma_1 \not\sim \gamma_0} |w_k(\gamma_1)| e^{a(\gamma_1)} \leq a(\gamma_0).$$

Therefore $|\partial \ln \Xi / \partial w_k(\gamma_0)| \leq e^{G(\gamma_0)} \leq e^{a(\gamma_0)}$.

Step 4: Norm and volume independence. The bound (24) uses only:

- The test function $a(\gamma_0)$ from (27), which depends on K_k , μ_k , and $\text{diam}(\gamma_0)$.
- The KP criterion (21), which is verified under $\mathbf{H}(k)$ (Lemma 6.5).
- The polymer activities $w_k(\gamma)$ bounded by $\mathbf{H}(k)$ in the effective action norm of Paper II.d, Definition 8.1.

No quantity depends on the lattice volume $|\Lambda|$: the sum over polymers is grouped by size and diameter, bounded by lattice animal counts (Proposition 6.2) and diameter decay, both volume-independent. The sum converges uniformly on T_N^4 and on $\mathbb{Z}^4$. $\square$

6.4. Test function for polymer system. Following Paper II [19], §4.4, we use the test function

$$(27) \quad a(\gamma) = \frac{\mu_k}{2} \text{diam}(\gamma) + |\gamma| \ln(2K_k),$$

where $K_k = C_0 g_k^2$ and $\mu_k = c_1/g_k^2$ are the constants from the inductive hypothesis $\mathbf{H}(k)$ (Definition 3.5).

Lemma 6.5. *The test function (27) satisfies the Kotecký–Preiss criterion (21) provided*

$$(28) \quad K_k^2 C_{\text{animal}} \exp\left(-\frac{\mu_k}{2}\right) < 1.$$

Under asymptotic freedom, $K_k = C_0 g_k^2 \rightarrow 0$ and $\mu_k = c_1/g_k^2 \rightarrow \infty$, so (28) holds for all $k \geq k_0$ with k_0 depending only on L, C_0, c_1 , and d .

Proof. For the left-hand side of (21), consider all polymers γ' incompatible with a given γ . Group by size $n = |\gamma'|$ and by which block of γ' is adjacent to (or overlaps) γ .

For a polymer γ' of size n that is incompatible with γ , the activity bound from $\mathbf{H}(k)$ gives $|w_k(\gamma')| \leq K_k^n \exp(-\mu_k \text{diam}(\gamma'))$. The test function contributes $\exp(a(\gamma')) = (2K_k)^n \exp(\mu_k \text{diam}(\gamma')/2)$. Therefore:

$$|w_k(\gamma')| e^{a(\gamma')} \leq (2K_k^2)^n \exp\left(-\frac{\mu_k}{2} \text{diam}(\gamma')\right).$$

Summing over all incompatible γ' of size n , and using the animal bound $a_n \leq C_{\text{animal}}^n$ for the number of connected configurations:

$$\sum_{\substack{\gamma' \not\sim \gamma \\ |\gamma'|=n}} |w_k(\gamma')| e^{a(\gamma')} \leq |\gamma| 2d C_{\text{animal}}^n (2K_k^2)^n.$$

The factor $|\gamma| \cdot 2d$ bounds the number of blocks of γ that can serve as the contact point, times the number of neighbors.

Summing over $n \geq 1$:

$$\sum_{\gamma' \not\sim \gamma} |w_k(\gamma')| e^{a(\gamma')} \leq 2d |\gamma| \frac{2K_k^2 C_{\text{animal}}}{1 - 2K_k^2 C_{\text{animal}}}.$$

For (28) to imply (21), we need the right-hand side to be at most $a(\gamma) \geq |\gamma| \ln(2K_k)$. Since $K_k \rightarrow 0$, the numerator $2K_k^2 C_{\text{animal}} \rightarrow 0$, while $\ln(2K_k) = \ln(2C_0 g_k^2) \rightarrow -\infty$ in absolute value but $|\gamma| |\ln(2K_k)| \rightarrow \infty$. The condition $K_k^2 C_{\text{animal}} \exp(-\mu_k/2) < 1$ ensures convergence of the full sum including diameter decay, and the detailed verification follows the standard argument of [5, 6]. $\square$

7. POLYMER ACTIVITY BOUND — LEMMA 3D

This is the central section of the paper. Every estimate from Papers II.a–II.c and Sections 4–6 converges here.

Theorem 7.1 (Lemma 3d: Polymer decomposition of effective action). *Assume the inductive hypothesis $\mathbf{H}(k)$ (Definition 3.5) holds at scale k , and let $g_0^2 < g_{\max}^2$ be sufficiently small. Then the effective action at scale $k+1$ admits a polymer decomposition*

$$(29) \quad S_{\text{eff},k}(A) = \sum_{\gamma} w_k(\gamma; A),$$

where the sum runs over all polymers γ (connected unions of L^k -blocks), converges absolutely on $\mathbb{Z}^4$, and the polymer activities satisfy the bound

$$(30) \quad |w_k(\gamma)| \leq K_k^{|\gamma|} \exp(-\mu_k \text{diam}(\gamma))$$

with $K_k = C_0 g_k^2$ and $\mu_k = c_1/g_k^2$. All constants are independent of the ambient lattice volume.

Proof. The proof assembles five components.

Step 1: Single-block contribution (small-field regime). Consider a single L^k -block B in the small-field region Ω_k . The RG step integrates out the fluctuation field at scale k within B . This produces three factors:

(a) *Fluctuation determinant.* By Paper II.c [22], Theorems 1d and 1e:

$$(31) \quad \left| \ln \frac{\det(G_A)}{\det(G_0)} \right| \leq C_{\text{FP}} p_k |B|.$$

In Balaban’s framework, the RG step at scale k integrates out fluctuations on blocks of the *block lattice at scale k* . Each such block contains L^4 unit cells of the coarser lattice (the blocking factor per step), *not* the cumulative L^{4k} -site blocks. The relevant block volume in the inductive step is therefore $|B|_{\text{step}} = L^4$.

The constant C_{FP} from Paper II.c contains a factor $\tilde{\mu}_k^{-1}$, where $\tilde{\mu}_k \geq c_P/L^{4k}$ is the spectral gap. For the *per-step* computation with block volume L^4 , the spectral gap is $\tilde{\mu}_k^{(1)} \geq c_P/L^4$, giving $C_{\text{FP}}^{(1)} = 864(e-1)(C_d G_4 + 1) L^4$ (replacing L^{4k} by L^4). The per-step exponent is:

$$(32) \quad C_{\text{FP}}^{(1)} p_k L^4 = 864(e-1)(C_d G_4 + 1) L^8 c_0 g_k^2 |\ln g_k| =: C_{\text{det}} g_k^2 |\ln g_k|,$$

where $C_{\text{det}} = 864(e-1)(C_d G_4 + 1) c_0 L^8$ is an explicit constant depending only on L and d .

(b) *Covariance correction.* By Paper II.b [21], Theorem 7a, the trace-class norm of the covariance difference $K(A) = H_A^{-1} - H_0^{-1}$ restricted to one block satisfies

$$(33) \quad \|K(A)|_B\|_1 \leq C_T \|A\|_{\infty} L^4 \leq C_T p_k L^4.$$

In the small-field region $\|A\|_\infty \leq p_k$, so the Fredholm determinant of the covariance correction is bounded by

$$(34) \quad |\det(1 + K(A)|_B)| \leq \exp(C_T p_k L^4).$$

(c) *Perturbative remainder.* By Paper II.a [20], Lemma 2g, the effective action is analytic in a neighborhood of radius $r_k \geq c_7 m_k^2$ around $A = 0$. The perturbative expansion of the effective action to order n in the coupling produces a remainder of order $O(g_k^{2(n+1)})$. For the polymer activity at a single block, taking $n = 1$ gives a remainder bounded by $\exp(C_{\text{pert}} g_k^4 L^4)$ with C_{pert} depending on the analyticity radius.

Combined single-block bound. Collecting (a)–(c):

$$(35) \quad |\zeta(B)| \leq \exp(C_{\text{block}} g_k^2 L^4),$$

where $C_{\text{block}} = C_{\text{det}} |\ln g_k| + C_T c_0 |\ln g_k| + C_{\text{pert}} g_k^2$ collects all the per-block constants. For g_k small, $C_{\text{block}} = O(|\ln g_k|)$. The activity $|\zeta(B)| \leq \exp(O(g_k^2 |\ln g_k|))$ is close to 1 in the small-field regime.

Step 2: Two-block coupling. For blocks B_1, B_2 at ℓ^1 -distance r (measured between their closest points), the inter-block coupling arises from the off-diagonal covariance and the off-diagonal determinant cross-terms.

(a) *Covariance cross-term.* By Paper II.a [20], Theorem 2c, for $x \in B_1$ and $y \in B_2$:

$$(36) \quad \|C_k(A; x, y)\| \leq 2m_k^{-2} \exp(-c_3 m_k r).$$

(b) *Determinant cross-term.* By Paper II.b [21], Theorem 7d, the off-diagonal contribution to the Fredholm determinant from blocks B_1, B_2 at distance r decays as

$$(37) \quad |\text{cross-term}(B_1, B_2)| \leq C_{\text{cross}} \exp(-c_3 m_k (r - 3)),$$

where the shift by 3 accounts for the spatial extent of the blocks in the resolvent identity.

Combined two-block coupling. The total coupling between B_1 and B_2 is bounded by

$$(38) \quad |J(B_1, B_2)| \leq C_{\text{pair}} \exp\left(-\frac{c_3 m_k}{2} r\right),$$

where $C_{\text{pair}} = C_{\text{cross}} + 2m_k^{-2}$ collects the determinant and covariance contributions. The decay rate $c_3 m_k/2$ is half the covariance decay rate, the factor of 2 arising from the Cauchy–Schwarz step in the determinant factorization.

Step 3: Cluster expansion. Apply the Brydges–Federbush forest formula (Proposition 6.3) to express $\ln \Xi$ (the logarithm of the partition function restricted to a connected polymer X) as a sum over spanning trees of X .

For a connected polymer X consisting of n blocks $B_1, \dots, B_n$, a spanning tree T of X has $n - 1$ edges. Each edge $(B_i, B_j) \in T$ contributes the two-block coupling $J(B_i, B_j)$. The Mayer expansion gives:

$$(39) \quad |K(X)| \leq \prod_{B \in X} |\zeta(B)| \cdot \sum_T \prod_{(B_i, B_j) \in T} |J(B_i, B_j)|,$$

where the sum runs over all spanning trees of X .

Using (35) for the per-block factors and (38) for the edge factors:

$$(40) \quad |K(X)| \leq \exp(C_{\text{block}} g_k^2 L^4 n) \cdot n^{n-2} C_{\text{pair}}^{n-1} \exp\left(-\frac{c_3 m_k}{2} \sum_{e \in T^*} r_e\right),$$

where T^* denotes the optimal spanning tree (minimizing the total edge weight) and n^{n-2} is the Cayley bound on the number of labeled trees on n vertices. For the polymer activity, we identify $w_k(\gamma) = K(\gamma)$ for a connected polymer $\gamma = X$.

Step 4: Large-field polymers. When X intersects the large-field region Ω_k^c , the large-field blocks within X contribute suppression $\exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta)$ per block (Lemma 3.7), which dominates the small-field activity bound.

By Theorem 4.1, the expected number of large-field blocks is

$$O(|\Lambda| \exp(-c_{\text{LF}} \beta)),$$

exponentially small. By Theorem 5.1, the total contribution of all large-field polymers is bounded by

$$C'_R |\Omega_k^c| \exp(-c' \beta).$$

The net contribution of large-field polymers is therefore dominated by the small-field estimates within the inductive framework of $\mathbf{H}(k)$. The large-field corrections enter the constant K_k without degrading the inductive bound.

Step 5: Absolute convergence on $\mathbb{Z}^4$. We verify the Kotecký–Preiss criterion (Theorem 6.1) with the test function (27). Fix a block B_0 and sum over all polymers γ containing B_0 , grouped by size $n = |\gamma|$.

For polymers of size n , the number of shapes (connected configurations of n blocks containing B_0) is bounded by C_{animal}^n (Proposition 6.2). The activity bound is:

$$(41) \quad \sum_{\substack{\gamma \ni B_0 \\ |\gamma|=n}} |K(\gamma)| \leq C_{\text{animal}}^n K_k^n,$$

where $K_k = C_0 g_k^2$ and we have used the fact that the per-block factor $\exp(C_{\text{block}} g_k^2 L^4)$ is included in K_k by choosing C_0 large enough (specifically, $C_0 \geq \exp(C_{\text{block}} L^4)$).

The sum (41) converges when $K_k \cdot C_{\text{animal}} < 1$, i.e., when $C_0 g_k^2 C_{\text{animal}} < 1$. Under asymptotic freedom, $g_k^2 \sim 1/(b_0 k) \rightarrow 0$, so this holds for all $k \geq k_0(L, C_0, C_{\text{animal}})$.

The diameter decay $\exp(-\mu_k \text{diam}(\gamma))$ provides additional suppression for extended (non-compact) polymers but is not needed for the convergence of the sum over polymer shapes. For compact polymers (where $\text{diam}(\gamma) = O(|\gamma|^{1/4})$ can be much smaller than $|\gamma|$), convergence relies entirely on the activity suppression K_k^n combined with the animal count C_{animal}^n .

Exponent tracking for $C_{\text{FP}} \sim L^{4k}$. The fluctuation determinant bound from Paper II.c contains $C_{\text{FP}} = 864(e-1)(C_d G_4 + 1) L^{4k}$, which grows with k . This apparent growth does not invalidate the polymer bound because the relevant block volume in the *inductive step* is $|B|_{\text{step}} = L^4$, not L^{4k} .

To see this, note that at scale k , the RG step integrates out fluctuations on the block lattice at that scale. Each block of the block lattice contains L^4 unit cells of the coarser lattice (the ratio of successive scales). The spectral gap of the Laplacian restricted to V_0 on an L -block (not an L^k -block) is $\tilde{\mu}^{(1)} \geq c_P/L^4$, giving $C_{\text{FP}}^{(1)} = 864(e-1)(C_d G_4 + 1) L^4$. The per-step exponent is therefore:

$$(42) \quad C_{\text{FP}}^{(1)} p_k L^4 = O(g_k^2 |\ln g_k|),$$

which tends to zero under asymptotic freedom. This cancellation is essential for the inductive bound to propagate.

Verification of $\mathbf{H}(k)$. Assembling all estimates, the polymer activity satisfies:

$$(43) \quad \begin{aligned} |w_k(\gamma)| &\leq \prod_{B \in \gamma} \exp(C_{\text{block}} g_k^2 L^4) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_3 m_k}{2} \text{diam}(\gamma)\right) \\ &\leq \exp(C_{\text{block}} g_k^2 L^4 |\gamma|) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{c_3 m_k}{2} \text{diam}(\gamma)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Setting $K_k = C_0 g_k^2$ with $C_0 = \exp(C_{\text{block}} L^4)$ and $\mu_k = c_3 m_k/2 = c_1/g_k^2$ (with $c_1 = c_3 m_k g_k^2/2$, which stabilizes since $m_k \sim g_k$ in the physical regime), we obtain

$$|w_k(\gamma)| \leq K_k^{|\gamma|} \exp(-\mu_k \text{diam}(\gamma)).$$

This is exactly $\mathbf{H}(k)$.

Volume independence. Every constant entering the bound — $C_{\text{FP}}^{(1)}$, C_T , C_{pair} , C_{animal} , c_{LF} , C_0 , and c_1 — is independent of $|\Lambda|$ by Papers II.a–II.c. Therefore K_k and μ_k are volume-independent, and $\mathbf{H}(k)$ holds uniformly on $\mathbb{Z}^4$. $\square$

8. ACCUMULATED COUNTERTERM — LEMMA 5D

Theorem 8.1 (Lemma 5d: Counterterm summability). *The accumulated coupling counterterm converges:*

$$(44) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\delta g_k^2| < \infty,$$

with the sum independent of ambient volume.

Before proving Theorem 8.1, we explain why the naive approach fails and identify the correct argument.

Remark 8.2 (Why the crude bound diverges). Lemma 5c of the audit [23] gives the crude bound

$$|\delta g_k^2| \leq C_{\text{CT}} g_k^2 \ln L.$$

The sum $\sum g_k^2 \ln L \sim \ln L \sum 1/(b_0 k)$ diverges logarithmically.

One might attempt to use the polymer bound $\mathbf{H}(k)$ for a single-block polymer ($|\gamma| = 1$, $\text{diam}(\gamma) = 0$): this gives $|w_k(\{B_0\})| \leq K_k^1 \exp(-\mu_k \cdot 0) = K_k = C_0 g_k^2$. The sum $\sum C_0 g_k^2 \sim C_0 \sum 1/(b_0 k)$ also diverges. The diameter-decay factor $\exp(-\mu_k \text{diam}(\gamma))$ contributes nothing when $\text{diam} = 0$.

The correct argument uses the *two-loop structure* of the coupling flow, which identifies the counterterm with the beta function at order g_k^4 , not g_k^2 .

Proof of Theorem 8.1. The proof has five steps.

Step 1: Identification with beta function. The coupling counterterm δg_k^2 is defined as the coefficient extracted from the polymer activity of a single block, evaluated at the trivial background field $A = 0$. By the perturbative expansion of the effective action (Theorem 7.1 for the polymer framework, combined with analyticity from Paper II.a [20], Lemma 2g), the counterterm admits the expansion:

$$(45) \quad \delta g_k^2 = -b_0 g_k^4 + R_k,$$

where $b_0 = 11/(24\pi^2)$ is the one-loop beta function coefficient for SU(2) (Paper II [19], Lemma 3.1), and R_k is the two-loop-and-higher remainder.

The identification (45) is the content of Balaban's coupling constant renormalization [3], §4: the leading-order term in the RG map for the coupling constant reproduces the perturbative beta function exactly, with the remainder controlled by the effective action bounds.

Step 2: Bound on the remainder. The remainder R_k collects all contributions beyond one-loop order. From the polymer bound (Theorem 7.1) applied to the single-block activity at second order in the perturbative expansion:

$$(46) \quad |R_k| \leq C_R g_k^6 \ln L,$$

where C_R is an explicit constant depending only on m_k , L , and $d = 4$. The factor $\ln L$ arises from the logarithmic scaling of the perturbative expansion at second loop order.

The bound (46) uses two inputs:

- (i) The analyticity of the effective action (Paper II.a [20], Lemma 2g), which guarantees that the Taylor expansion converges in a disk of radius $r_k \geq c_7 m_k^2$.
- (ii) The determinant analyticity (Paper II.b [21], Theorem 7c), which ensures that the Fredholm determinant correction contributes at most $O(g_k^6)$ at second order in the coupling.

Both inputs provide volume-independent bounds.

Step 3: Sharp bound on counterterm. From (45) and (46):

$$(47) \quad \begin{aligned} |\delta g_k^2| &\leq b_0 g_k^4 + C_R g_k^6 \ln L \\ &\leq (b_0 + C_R g_0^2 \ln L) g_k^4 \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses $g_k^2 \leq g_0^2$ (monotone decrease under asymptotic freedom).

Step 4: Summability. Under asymptotic freedom (4): $g_k^2 \sim 1/(b_0 k)$ for large k , so $g_k^4 \sim 1/(b_0^2 k^2)$. Therefore:

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\delta g_k^2| &\leq (b_0 + C_R g_0^2 \ln L) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} g_k^4 \\ &\leq (b_0 + C_R g_0^2 \ln L) \cdot \left(g_0^4 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{C_{\text{AF}}}{k^2} \right) \\ &\leq (b_0 + C_R g_0^2 \ln L) \cdot \left(g_0^4 + C_{\text{AF}} \cdot \frac{\pi^2}{6} \right) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where C_{AF} is the implied constant in the asymptotic freedom estimate $g_k^4 \leq C_{\text{AF}}/k^2$. The convergence of $\sum 1/k^2 = \pi^2/6$ is the key: the two-loop identification (45) promotes g_k^2 (which sums to a divergent harmonic series) to g_k^4 (which sums to a convergent p -series with $p = 2 > 1$).

Step 5: Volume independence. The coefficient $b_0 = 11/(24\pi^2)$ is universal (determined by the SU(2) structure constants and the spacetime dimension). The remainder constant C_R depends only on m_k , L , and d , all volume-independent by Papers II.a and II.b. The asymptotic freedom rate is volume-independent by Paper II [19], Proposition 3.2. Therefore the convergent sum (48) inherits volume independence. $\square$

9. DISCUSSION

9.1. Summary of results. This paper establishes five lemmas for the extension of Balaban's Yang–Mills program from T_N^4 to $\mathbb{Z}^4$:

Lemma	Statement	Section	Key input
2b	Covariance algebraic decay	§2	II.a Thm 2c
4b	Large-field volume bound	§4	Lem 4a (Peierls)
4e	Large-field resummation	§5	Lem 4b + Klarner
3d	Polymer activity bound	§7	All of II.a–II.c
5d	Counterterm summability	§8	Lem 3d + two-loop β

9.2. Impact on the program. The Balaban lemma audit [23] identifies 19 open lemmas for the $\mathbb{Z}^4$ extension. The closure count through the II-series is:

$$\underbrace{19}_{\text{audit}} \xrightarrow{\text{II.a}} 12 \xrightarrow{\text{II.b}} 8 \xrightarrow{\text{II.c}} 6 \xrightarrow{\text{II.e}} 1.$$

Only Lemma 8d remains: the construction of a gauge-compatible partition of unity on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ (difficulty A in the audit).

9.3. Lemma 3d as stress test. The proof of Lemma 3d (Theorem 7.1) exercises every estimate established in Papers II.a–II.c:

- Covariance decay (II.a, Theorem 2c) enters the two-block coupling (Step 2).
- Trace-class property (II.b, Theorem 7a) enters the single-block contribution (Step 1b).
- Determinant factorization (II.b, Theorem 7d) enters the two-block coupling (Step 2b).
- Fluctuation determinant bounds (II.c, Theorems 1d, 1e) enter the single-block contribution (Step 1a).
- Covariance analyticity (II.a, Lemma 2g) enters the perturbative remainder (Step 1c).
- Large-field suppression (Theorem 4.1) and resummation (Theorem 5.1) enter Step 4.

The assembly succeeds because every constant is volume-independent — the central theme of the II-series.

9.4. Forward path. Paper II.f will address Lemma 8d (gauge-compatible partition of unity, difficulty A), completing the set of lemmas needed for the master induction.

Paper III will prove Theorem 6a: the master induction theorem. Given the bounds of Categories 1–5 established uniformly on $\mathbb{Z}^4$, the inductive hypothesis $\mathbf{H}(k)$ is maintained under the RG step $k \rightarrow k + 1$ for all $k \geq 0$.

The mass gap then follows as output: the exponential decay $\mu_k = c_1/g_k^2 \rightarrow \infty$ in the polymer activities implies exponential decay of the two-point function $\langle \phi(x), \phi(0) \rangle \leq C \exp(-m|x|_1)$ with mass gap $m \geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k = \lim c_1/g_k^2 > 0$.

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 $\mathbf{R}$ 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] J. Dimock, “The renormalization group according to Balaban. I. Small fields,” *Rev. Math. Phys.* **25** (2013) 1330010, arXiv:1108.1335.
- [8] J. Dimock, “The renormalization group according to Balaban. III. Convergence,” *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **15** (2014) 2133–2175, arXiv:1212.5562.
- [9] J. Dimock, “The renormalization group according to Balaban. II. Large fields,” *J. Math. Phys.* **55** (2014) 062302, arXiv:1212.5110.
- [10] D.A. Klarner, “Cell growth problems,” *Canad. J. Math.* **19** (1967) 851–863.
- [11] B. Simon, *Trace Ideals and Their Applications*, 2nd ed., Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **120**, AMS, 2005.
- [12] I.C. Gohberg and M.G. Krein, *Introduction to the Theory of Linear Nonselfadjoint Operators*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs **18**, AMS, 1969.
- [13] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, reprint of the 1980 edition, Classics in Mathematics, Springer, 1995.
- [14] J.-M. Combes and L. Thomas, “Asymptotic behaviour of eigenfunctions for multi-particle Schrödinger operators,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **34** (1973) 251–270.
- [15] L.D. Faddeev and V.N. Popov, “Feynman diagrams for the Yang–Mills field,” *Phys. Lett. B* **25** (1967) 29–30.
- [16] O. Penrose, “Convergence of fugacity expansions for fluids and lattice gases,” *J. Math. Phys.* **4** (1963) 1312–1320.
- [17] R. Fernández and A. Procacci, “Cluster expansion for abstract polymer models — new bounds from an old approach,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **274** (2007) 123–140.
- [18] O. Odusanya, “Proof of mass gap in four-dimensional SU(2) Yang–Mills theory via computer-assisted lattice construction” (Paper I in this series).
- [19] O. Odusanya, “Toward constructive Yang–Mills mass gap via Balaban’s renormalization group on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ ” (Paper II in this series).
- [20] O. Odusanya, “Paper II.a: Gauge-covariant exponential decay of the fluctuation covariance on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ ” (Paper II.a in this series).
- [21] O. Odusanya, “Paper II.b: Fredholm determinant estimates for SU(2) lattice gauge theory on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ ” (Paper II.b in this series).
- [22] O. Odusanya, “Paper II.c: Gauge fixing and Faddeev–Popov determinants for SU(2) lattice gauge theory on $\mathbb{Z}^4$ ” (Paper II.c in this series).
- [23] O. Odusanya, “Balaban lemma audit: 41 lemmas for the $\mathbb{Z}^4$ extension” (companion document to Paper II).