

PRD 04: Modular-Lightcone Bootstrap for Holographic CFTs

Pure Thought AI Challenges

January 19, 2026

Contents

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 0.1 | 1. Problem Statement | 2 |
| 0.1.1 | Scientific Context | 2 |
| 0.1.2 | Core Question | 2 |
| 0.1.3 | Why This Matters | 2 |
| 0.1.4 | Pure Thought Advantages | 3 |
| 0.2 | 2. Mathematical Formulation | 3 |
| 0.2.1 | Conformal Block Decomposition | 3 |
| 0.2.2 | Crossing Symmetry | 3 |
| 0.2.3 | Lightcone Limit and Twist Spectrum | 3 |
| 0.2.4 | Chaos Bound and Regge Constraints | 4 |
| 0.2.5 | Large-c Expansion | 4 |
| 0.2.6 | Certificate Specification | 4 |
| 0.3 | 3. Implementation Approach | 4 |
| 0.3.1 | Phase 1: Conformal Blocks for Stress Tensor (Months 1-2) | 4 |
| 0.3.2 | Phase 2: Crossing Symmetry and Functional Method (Months 2-4) | 6 |
| 0.3.3 | Phase 3: Lightcone Limits and Twist Spectrum (Months 4-5) | 8 |
| 0.3.4 | Phase 4: Chaos Bound and Regge Constraints (Months 5-6) | 9 |
| 0.3.5 | Phase 5: Large-c Bootstrap via SDP (Months 6-8) | 10 |
| 0.3.6 | Phase 6: Certificate Generation and Export (Months 8-10) | 12 |
| 0.4 | 4. Example Starting Prompt | 14 |
| 0.5 | 5. Success Criteria | 16 |
| 0.5.1 | Minimum Viable Result (MVR) — Months 3-4 | 16 |
| 0.5.2 | Strong Result — Months 7-8 | 16 |
| 0.5.3 | Publication-Quality Result — Months 9-10 | 16 |
| 0.6 | 6. Verification Protocol | 16 |
| 0.6.1 | Automated Checks (Run After Each Phase) | 16 |
| 0.7 | 7. Resources and Milestones | 18 |
| 0.7.1 | Essential References | 18 |
| 0.7.2 | Milestone Checklist | 19 |
| 0.7.3 | Common Pitfalls | 19 |

Domain: Quantum Gravity & Particle Physics **Difficulty:** High **Timeline:** 7-10 months **Prerequisites:** Conformal field theory, AdS/CFT, modular forms, semidefinite programming, representation theory

0.1 1. Problem Statement

0.1.1 Scientific Context

The **conformal bootstrap** program, pioneered by Ferrara, Gliozzi, and Scherk (1973) and revived by Rattazzi et al. (2008), uses crossing symmetry and unitarity to constrain conformal field theories (CFTs) non-perturbatively. When combined with the **AdS/CFT correspondence** (Maldacena 1997), the bootstrap becomes a powerful tool for deriving universal properties of quantum gravity.

Large-c holographic CFTs are dual to Einstein gravity in Anti-de Sitter (AdS) space at leading order in $1/c$, where c is the central charge (proportional to N^2 in AdS/CFT gauge theory duality). The **sparse spectrum** assumption — that the lightest non-conserved operator appears only at dimension 1 — corresponds to the bulk having few light states beyond the graviton, characteristic of Einstein gravity without large higher-derivative corrections.

The **gravitational bootstrap** program asks: **What are the universal constraints on large-c, sparse-spectrum CFTs imposed by consistency alone?** Key inputs:

1. **Crossing Symmetry**: The OPE decomposition of 4-point functions must be consistent in different channels $\langle \mathcal{O}_1(x_1)\mathcal{O}_2(x_2)\mathcal{O}_3(x_3)\mathcal{O}_4(x_4) \rangle_{s\text{-channel}} = \langle \dots \rangle_{t\text{-channel}}$
2. **Modular Invariance**: Thermal correlators on $S^{d-1}S^1$ must respect $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ modular transformations
3. **Causality (Chaos Bound)**: The quantum Lyapunov exponent satisfies $L \geq 2/\pi$ (Maldacena-Shenker-Stanford bound), which translates to **Regge behavior** constraints on OPE data in the $s \rightarrow 0$ limit of the crossing equation
4. **Lightcone Limits**: As cross-ratios $z \rightarrow 0$ (lightcone), the 4-point function is dominated by operators with minimal twist $= -J$ ($=$ scaling dimension, $J =$ spin)
- **Higher-Spin Gravity**: If a large-c CFT contains **higher-spin conserved currents** (spin $J \geq 2$ beyond the stress tensor), the bulk dual is a higher-spin gravity theory (Vasiliev theory). The bootstrap can **rule out** such theories in certain parameter regions, proving that Einstein gravity is "rigid" — the unique consistent theory of massless spin-2 under holographic constraints.
- **Key Results** (from literature as benchmarks): - **3D CFT**: Universal bound $\Delta_{\text{gap}}/(d-2)/2 = 0.5$ for spin-0 gap (Heemskerk et al. 2009) - **Spin-4 current**: If spin-4 current exists, OPE coefficient bounded by c (Afkhami-Jeddi et al. 2019) - **Average null energy**: Constrains $1/c$ corrections to gravitational dynamics (Hartman et al. 2016)

0.1.2 Core Question

What are the sharp, universal bounds on: 1. **Twist gap** $\Delta_{\text{gap}} - J_{\text{max}}$ to the first non-conserved operator (excluding identity, stress tensor, higher-spin currents) 2. **OPE coefficients** of higher-spin conserved currents (if present) 3. ** $1/c$ corrections** to gravitational coupling constants in the bulk

Derived using ONLY: - Crossing symmetry + unitarity - Modular invariance (for thermal states) - Causality/chaos bound (Regge constraints) - Large-c limit ($1/c$ expansion)

No input from bulk gravity or string theory until verification!

0.1.3 Why This Matters

- **Quantum Gravity Consistency**: Bootstrap bounds are **non-perturbative constraints** on any UV completion of Einstein gravity (string theory, loop quantum gravity, etc.) - **Swamp

land Program**: Certain parameter regions are **forbidden** by consistency, defining the "landscape" vs "swampland" of effective field theories - **Universality**: Bounds apply to **all** holographic CFTs (supersymmetric or not, with or without extra symmetries), revealing universal gravitational physics - **Testable Predictions**: Compare to known AdS/CFT pairs (AdS \times S, M-theory on AdS \times S, etc.) to validate bootstrap assumptions

0.1.4 Pure Thought Advantages

1. **Exact non-perturbative results**: Bootstrap bounds hold for arbitrarily large interactions, unlike perturbative quantum field theory
 2. **No bulk calculations needed**: Derive gravitational constraints purely from CFT consistency (boundary observables)
 3. **Certificates**: Extremal functionals provide **machine-checkable proofs** that certain CFTs cannot exist
 4. **Scalable**: Semidefinite programming (SDP) solvers handle 10-10 variables; parallelizable on GPUs
-

0.2 2. Mathematical Formulation

0.2.1 Conformal Block Decomposition

Consider the **stress tensor 4-point function** in a d-dimensional CFT: $\langle T(x_1)T(x_2)T(x_3)T(x_4) \rangle$

where (z, \bar{z}) are **conformal cross-ratios**: $z = x_{12}^2 x_{34}^2 / (x_{13}^2 x_{24}^2)$, $(1-z)(1-\bar{z}) = \frac{x_{14}^2 x_{23}^2}{x_{13}^2 x_{24}^2}$

OPE decomposition in the s-channel ($12 \rightarrow 34$): $\langle T(x_1)T(x_2)T(x_3)T(x_4) \rangle = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} \lambda_{TT\mathcal{O}}^2 g_{\Delta,J}^{(s)}(z, \bar{z})$

where: - $g_{\Delta,J}^{(s)}(z, \bar{z})$ is the **conformal block** for exchange of operator \mathcal{O} with dimension and spin $J - \lambda_{TT\mathcal{O}}$ is the **OPE coefficient** (3 -point function structure constant) – Sum run over * primary operators \mathcal{O} appearing in $T \times T$ OPE

Conserved currents: Stress tensor (spin-2), possible higher-spin currents (spin $J = 4, 6, 8, \dots$) $\nabla^\mu J_{\mu\mu_2\dots\mu_J} = 0 \Rightarrow \Delta_J = J + d - 2$

Non-conserved operators: Generic operators with $d/2$ (unitarity bound)

0.2.2 Crossing Symmetry

Crossing equation: The same 4-point function decomposed in different OPE channels must agree: $\sum_{\mathcal{O}} \lambda_{TT\mathcal{O}}^2 g_{\Delta,J}^{(s)}(z, \bar{z}) = \sum_{\mathcal{O}'} \lambda_{TT\mathcal{O}'}^2 g_{\Delta',J'}^{(t)}(v, u)$

where $(u, v) = (z, (1-z)(1-\bar{z}))$ are related cross-ratios.

Crossing vector: Define $\Delta_{J,J'}(z, \bar{z}) = g_{\Delta,J}^{(s)}(z, \bar{z}) - F_{d,J} g_{\Delta,J}^{(t)}(v, u)$

where $F_{d,J}$ is a spin-dependent factor from stress tensor structure. Then: $\sum_{\mathcal{O}} \lambda_{TT\mathcal{O}}^2 \vec{V}_{\Delta,J}(z, \bar{z}) = 0$

This must hold for **all** (z, \bar{z}) — infinitely many constraints on finitely many OPE coefficients!

0.2.3 Lightcone Limit and Twist Spectrum

Lightcone limit: $z \rightarrow 0$ with \bar{z} fixed. The conformal block behaves as: $g_{\Delta,J}(z, \bar{z}) \sim z^{\tau/2} \bar{z}^{\bar{\tau}/2}$ where $\tau = \Delta - J$ (twist)

Leading twist: Operators with smallest τ dominate the lightcone. For conserved currents: $\tau - J = (J + d - 2) - J = d - 2$ (universal!)

Twist gap assumption: Assume no **non-conserved** operators with $\tau < \tau_{\text{gap}}$ (except identity with $\tau = 0$). This defines a **sparse spectrum**: $\text{Spectrum} = \{\mathcal{O}, T_{\mu\nu}, J_{-J}, \dots\} \cup \{\mathcal{O} : \tau_{\mathcal{O}} \geq \tau_{\text{gap}}\}$

0.2.4 Chaos Bound and Regge Constraints

Quantum chaos bound: (Maldacena-Shenker-Stanford 2016): $\lambda L \leq \frac{2\pi}{\beta}$ (Lyapunov exponent at temperature $1/\beta$)

This bound is **saturated by Einstein gravity**. Violations would indicate faster scrambling, inconsistent with causality in the bulk.

Regge limit: $s, t \rightarrow \infty$ with s/t fixed. The crossing equation imposes : $\mathcal{G}(s,t) \sim s^{j(t)}$ where $j(t) = 1 + \frac{t}{2\pi T_H} + O(t^2)$

is the **Regge trajectory**. The chaos bound constrains the intercept $j(0)$ and slope $j'(0)$.

Implementation: Impose positivity of **averaged null energy** (ANEC) operator, which encodes causality.

0.2.5 Large-c Expansion

At large central charge $c \rightarrow \infty$: $\langle TTTT \rangle = \langle TT \rangle \langle TT \rangle + \frac{1}{c}(\text{connected part}) + O(1/c^2)$

Graviton exchange (identity operator) dominates at leading order. The $1/c$ corrections encode: - Multi-graviton states - Stringy/higher-derivative corrections

Goal: Bound these corrections using bootstrap!

0.2.6 Certificate Specification

A **valid bootstrap certificate** proving an upper bound $\Delta_{\text{gap}} \leq \Delta_{\max}$ must include :

1. **Extremal Functional**: $\alpha(\Delta, J)$: - Defined on a grid (Δ_i, J_k) with values $\alpha_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$ - **Positivity**: $\alpha(\Delta, J) \geq 0$ for all $\Delta \geq \Delta_{\max}$ and all allowed spins J - **Crossing violation**: Applying α to crossing equation gives negative result $\sum_{i,k} \alpha_{ik} \vec{V}_{\Delta_i, J_k}(z_0, \bar{z}_0) < 0$ for at least one point
 2. **Numerical Precision**: - Grid spacing: $\Delta \Delta < 0.01$, $\Delta J = 2$ - SDP tolerance : $dualgap < 10^{-8}$ - Block evaluation : 100-digit precision with ‘mpmath’
 3. **Verification**: - Independent code checks positivity on denser grid - Crossing violation confirmed at 10 test points - Comparison to known CFTs (e.g., 3D Ising at $c = 0.95$) that saturate the bound
 4. **Export Format**: JSON with: - Grid points $\{(\Delta_i, J_k)\}$ - Functional values $\{\alpha_{ik}\}$ (exact rationals) - Crossing vectors evaluated at test points - Metadata : dimension d , central charge c , imposed constraints
-

0.3 3. Implementation Approach

0.3.1 Phase 1: Conformal Blocks for Stress Tensor (Months 1-2)

Goal: Compute $g_{\Delta, J}^{TT}(z, \bar{z})$ for stress tensor 4-point function $ind = 3, 4$.

```
import numpy as np
from mpmath import mp, mpf, hyp2f1
mp.dps = 100 # 100-digit precision

def conformal_block_scalar_exchange(Delta, ell, z, zbar, d=3):
    """
    Scalar (ell=0) conformal block in d dimensions.

    Uses hypergeometric function 2F1.
    """
    # Eigenvalue of quadratic Casimir
    C_Delta_ell = Delta * (Delta - d) + ell * (ell + d - 2)

    # For ell=0 (scalar), closed form:
    # g_{Delta,0}(z, zbar) ~ z^{Delta/2} F(Delta/2, Delta/2; Delta; z)
```

```

z_mp = mpf(z)
z_bar_mp = mpf(zbar)

# Split into (z, zbar) as (holomorphic, antiholomorphic)
a = Delta / 2
b = Delta / 2
c = Delta

F_z = hyp2f1(a, b, c, z_mp)
F_zbar = hyp2f1(a, b, c, z_bar_mp)

block = (z_mp ** (Delta/2)) * F_z * (z_bar_mp ** (Delta/2)) * F_zbar

return float(block)

def conformal_block_spinning(Delta, J, z, zbar, d=3):
    """
    Spinning conformal block (J > 0) via recursion.

    For large J, use recursion relation or Casimir differential equation
    :
    D g_{Delta,J} = C_{Delta,J} g_{Delta,J}

    Reference: Dolan & Osborn (2011), Kos et al. (2014)
    """
    if J == 0:
        return conformal_block_scalar_exchange(Delta, 0, z, zbar, d)

    # Use recursion from J=0 case (simplified for illustration)
    # Full implementation requires Casimir equation numerical solve

    # Placeholder: linear approximation (not accurate!)
    block_J0 = conformal_block_scalar_exchange(Delta, 0, z, zbar, d)
    correction = J * (Delta - d/2) * (z - zbar) ** J / np.math.factorial(J)

    return block_J0 + correction

def stress_tensor_4pt_block(Delta_ex, J_ex, z, zbar, d=3):
    """
    Conformal block for stress tensor 4-point function.

    T T T T block depends on external operator structure.
    Use embedding space formalism or projectors.

    Simplified: assume external operators are scalars for now.
    Full version requires tensor structure projectors.
    """
    # For stress tensor external operators, multiply by kinematic
    # prefactor
    prefactor = 1.0 # Simplified; full version has (z*zbar)^d
    dependence

    return prefactor * conformal_block_spinning(Delta_ex, J_ex, z, zbar,
                                                d)

```

```

# Test: verify identity block
def test_identity_block():
    """Identity operator (Delta=0, J=0) should give 1."""
    z, zbar = 0.3, 0.7
    block = stress_tensor_4pt_block(0, 0, z, zbar, d=3)
    assert abs(block - 1.0) < 1e-10, f"Identity block = {block},\n    expected 1"
    print("    Identity block verified")

# Test: stress tensor block
def test_stress_tensor_block():
    """Stress tensor (Delta=d, J=2) appears in T T OPE."""
    d = 3
    Delta_T = d # Stress tensor dimension
    J_T = 2

    z, zbar = 0.2, 0.8
    block = stress_tensor_4pt_block(Delta_T, J_T, z, zbar, d)

    print(f"Stress tensor block at (z={z}, zbar={zbar}): {block:.6f}")
    assert block > 0, "Block should be positive"
    print("    Stress tensor block computed")

```

Output: Grid of conformal blocks for \$(\Delta, J)\$ on \$[0, 10]\$
times
\$0, 2, 4, 6, 8\$
\$.

0.3.2 Phase 2: Crossing Symmetry and Functional Method (Months 2-4)

Goal: Formulate crossing equation as linear system; implement functional method.

```

def crossing_vector(Delta, J, z_points, zbar_points, d=3):
    """
    Compute crossing kernel vector V_{\Delta,J}(z, zbar).

    V = g^{(s)}(z, zbar) - F_{d,J} * g^{(t)}(v, u)

    where (u,v) = (z*zbar, (1-z)*(1-zbar))
    """
    vectors = []

    for z, zbar in zip(z_points, zbar_points):
        # S-channel
        g_s = stress_tensor_4pt_block(Delta, J, z, zbar, d)

        # T-channel: swap cross-ratios
        u = z * zbar
        v = (1 - z) * (1 - zbar)

        # Reconstruct z', zbar' from (u, v)
        # u = z' zbar', v = (1-z')(1-zbar')
        # Solve: z', zbar' = ...

```

```

# Simplified: use symmetry factor
F_dJ = compute_symmetry_factor(d, J) # Depends on stress tensor
structure
g_t = stress_tensor_4pt_block(Delta, J, v, u, d)

V = g_s - F_dJ * g_t
vectors.append(V)

return np.array(vectors)

def compute_symmetry_factor(d, J):
    """
    Symmetry factor relating s- and t-channel blocks.

    For stress tensor 4-point function, this is non-trivial.
    Simplified: use d-dependence only.
    """
    return (-1) ** J / (d - 1) # Placeholder

def setup_crossing_matrix(Delta_grid, J_grid, z_points, zbar_points, d=3):
    """
    Build crossing matrix: each row is V_{Delta,J} at one (z, zbar)
    point.
    """
    num_points = len(z_points)
    num_ops = len(Delta_grid) * len(J_grid)

    crossing_matrix = np.zeros((num_points, num_ops))

    idx = 0
    for Delta in Delta_grid:
        for J in J_grid:
            V = crossing_vector(Delta, J, z_points, zbar_points, d)
            crossing_matrix[:, idx] = V
            idx += 1

    return crossing_matrix

def verify_crossing_known_CFT(ope_coeffs, Delta_spectrum, J_spectrum,
z_points, zbar_points):
    """
    Verify crossing for a known CFT (e.g., generalized free field).

    ^2_{TT ,J} V_{ ,J} should be 0.
    """
    crossing_mat = setup_crossing_matrix(Delta_spectrum, J_spectrum,
z_points, zbar_points)

    residual = crossing_mat @ ope_coeffs

    maxViolation = np.max(np.abs(residual))
    print(f"Crossing violation: {maxViolation:.2e}")

```

```

assert maxViolation < 1e-8, "Crossing not satisfied!"
print("    Crossing symmetry verified")

# Test case: Generalized Free Field (GFF)
def test_gff_crossing():
    """
    Generalized free field: T T OPE contains only double-trace
    operators.

     $\{n, J\} = 2 - + 2n + J$ 
     $\sim 1/c$  (suppressed at large  $c$ )
    """
    c = 100
    Delta_phi = 1.0 # Scalar dimension

    # Double-trace spectrum
    Delta_spectrum = [2*Delta_phi + J for J in [0, 2, 4]]
    J_spectrum = [0, 2, 4]

    # OPE coefficients (1/c suppressed)
    ope_coeffs = np.array([1/c, 0.5/c, 0.3/c] * 3)

    z_points = np.linspace(0.1, 0.9, 10)
    zbar_points = np.linspace(0.1, 0.9, 10)

    verify_crossing_known_CFT(ope_coeffs, Delta_spectrum, J_spectrum,
        z_points, zbar_points)

```

0.3.3 Phase 3: Lightcone Limits and Twist Spectrum (Months 4-5)

Goal: Extract leading twist operators in $\$z$ to 0\$ limit.

```

def lightcone_expansion(correlator_func, zbar_fixed=0.5, z_values=None):
    """
    Expand correlator in lightcone limit  $z \rightarrow 0$ .
     $G(z, zbar) \sim \{ \} z^{\{-2\}} F(zbar)$ 

    Extract leading twist  $\tau_{\min}$ .
    """
    if z_values is None:
        z_values = [10**(-k) for k in range(1, 7)] #  $z = 0.1, 0.01, \dots, 10^{-6}$ 

    log_G = []
    log_z = []

    for z in z_values:
        G = correlator_func(z, zbar_fixed)
        log_G.append(np.log(G))
        log_z.append(np.log(z))

    # Fit  $\log(G) \sim (\tau_{\min}/2) * \log(z) + \text{const}$ 
    slope, intercept = np.polyfit(log_z, log_G, deg=1)

```

```

tau_min = 2 * slope

return tau_min

def impose_twist_gap(Delta_grid, J_grid, tau_gap):
    """
    Filter spectrum to impose twist gap.

    Keep only:
    - Conserved currents (      = J + d - 2)
    - Operators with      =      - J      tau_gap
    """
    d = 3 # Dimension

    allowed_ops = []

    for Delta in Delta_grid:
        for J in J_grid:
            tau = Delta - J

            # Conserved current?
            is_conserved = (abs(Delta - (J + d - 2)) < 1e-6)

            if is_conserved or tau >= tau_gap:
                allowed_ops.append((Delta, J))

    return allowed_ops

# Test: Extract identity twist
def test_lightcone_identity():
    """Identity has twist tau = 0."""
    def identity_correlator(z, zbar):
        return 1.0 # Identity contributes constant

    tau_identity = lightcone_expansion(identity_correlator)

    assert abs(tau_identity) < 1e-6, f"Identity twist = {tau_identity}, expected 0"
    print("    Identity twist = 0 extracted correctly")

```

0.3.4 Phase 4: Chaos Bound and Regge Constraints (Months 5-6)

Goal: Implement averaged null energy constraint (ANEC) encoding chaos bound.

```

def averaged_null_energy_operator(Delta_grid, J_grid, crossing_matrix):
    """
    ANEC operator projects onto null energy conditions.

    Chaos bound      ANEC      0 (positive energy along null geodesics).

    Implement as linear constraint in bootstrap.
    """
    # ANEC is a specific linear combination of crossing vectors
    # Reference: Hartman et al. (2016)

```

```

# Simplified: impose positivity of lowest-twist scalar
anec_weights = np.zeros(len(Delta_grid) * len(J_grid))

# Weight lowest-twist scalar operators more heavily
for idx, (Delta, J) in enumerate(zip(Delta_grid, J_grid)):
    if J == 0: # Scalar
        tau = Delta
        anec_weights[idx] = np.exp(-tau) # Exponential weight
        favoring low twist

anec_constraint = anec_weights @ crossing_matrix.T

return anec_constraint

def impose_chaos_bound(optimization_problem, anec_constraint):
    """
    Add ANEC      0 constraint to SDP.
    """
    # ANEC =      _i V_i where      comes from functional
    # Require ANEC      0

    optimization_problem.add_constraint(anec_constraint >= 0)

    print("      Chaos bound (ANEC      0) imposed")

```

0.3.5 Phase 5: Large-c Bootstrap via SDP (Months 6-8)

Goal: Formulate bootstrap as semidefinite program (SDP); find extremal functional.

```

import cvxpy as cp

def large_c_bootstrap_sdp(Delta_gap, c_value, d=3):
    """
    Bootstrap search for extremal functional.

    Goal: Find      ( , J) such that:
    -      0 for all      _gap (or allowed by gap assumption)
    -      V < 0 (crossing equation violated)

    If feasible      _gap is IMPOSSIBLE (bound)
    If infeasible      _gap is allowed
    """
    # Grid
    Delta_grid = np.linspace(0, 10, 100)
    J_grid = [0, 2, 4, 6, 8]

    # Crossing matrix
    z_points = np.linspace(0.1, 0.9, 20)
    zbar_points = np.linspace(0.1, 0.9, 20)

    V = setup_crossing_matrix(Delta_grid, J_grid, z_points, zbar_points,
                               d)

    # Variables: functional
    num_ops = len(Delta_grid) * len(J_grid)
    alpha = cp.Variable(num_ops)

```

```

constraints = []

# 1. Positivity for      _gap  (excluding conserved)
for idx, Delta in enumerate(Delta_grid):
    for j_idx, J in enumerate(J_grid):
        op_idx = idx * len(J_grid) + j_idx

        tau = Delta - J
        is_conserved = (abs(Delta - (J + d - 2)) < 1e-3)

        if not is_conserved and tau >= Delta_gap:
            constraints.append(alpha[op_idx] >= 0)

# 2. Crossing equation:      V < 0 at one point (normalization)
crossing_eval = alpha @ V

# Require negative at z=0.5 point (index 10)
constraints.append(crossing_eval[10] == -1) # Normalization

# Require positive derivatives (optional regularization)
for idx in range(len(z_points) - 1):
    constraints.append(crossing_eval[idx+1] >= crossing_eval[idx] - 0.1)

# 3. ANEC constraint (chaos bound)
anec = averaged_null_energy_operator(Delta_grid, J_grid, V)
constraints.append(alpha @ anec >= 0)

# Solve
problem = cp.Problem(cp.Minimize(0), constraints)

problem.solve(solver=cp.SCS, eps=1e-8, verbose=True)

if problem.status == cp.OPTIMAL:
    return {
        'status': 'EXCLUDED',
        'functional': alpha.value,
        'crossingViolation': crossing_eval.value
    }
else:
    return {
        'status': 'ALLOWED',
        'Delta_gap': Delta_gap
    }

def binary_search_gap_bound(c_value, d=3):
    """
    Binary search for maximum allowed gap.
    """
    Delta_min, Delta_max = 0.0, 5.0
    tolerance = 0.01

    while Delta_max - Delta_min > tolerance:
        Delta_mid = (Delta_min + Delta_max) / 2

        print(f"\nTesting _gap = {Delta_mid:.3f}...")

```

```

        result = large_c_bootstrap_sdP(Delta_mid, c_value, d)

        if result['status'] == 'ALLOWED':
            Delta_min = Delta_mid # Gap is allowed, try larger
        else:
            Delta_max = Delta_mid # Gap excluded, try smaller

    print(f"\n==== Maximum allowed gap: _gap {Delta_max:.3f} ===")
    return Delta_max

# Run bootstrap
if __name__ == "__main__":
    c = 1000 # Large central charge
    d = 3

    max_gap = binary_search_gap_bound(c, d)

    print(f"Universal bound: _gap {max_gap:.3f} for c = {c}, d = {d}")

```

Expected Output: For $d=3$, literature gives $\Delta_{text{gap}} lessim (d-2) = 1$ at large c .

0.3.6 Phase 6: Certificate Generation and Export (Months 8-10)

Goal: Export extremal functional as machine-checkable certificate.

```

import json

def export_bootstrap_certificate(alpha_functional, Delta_grid, J_grid,
                                  crossing_matrix, output_file='bootstrap_cert.json'):
    """
    Export extremal functional as JSON certificate.
    """

    # Convert to exact rationals where possible
    alpha_rational = [float(x) for x in alpha_functional] # Simplified

    # Crossing evaluation
    crossing_eval = alpha_functional @ crossing_matrix

    certificate = {
        'metadata': {
            'dimension': 3,
            'central_charge': 1000,
            'bound': '_gap upper bound',
            'certificate_version': '1.0'
        },
        'grid': {
            'Delta_grid': Delta_grid.tolist(),
            'J_grid': J_grid
        },
        'functional': {
            'alpha_values': alpha_rational,
            'positivity_check': all(x >= -1e-8 for x in alpha_rational)
        }
    }

    with open(output_file, 'w') as f:
        json.dump(certificate, f)

```

```

},
'crossingViolation': {
    'values': crossing_eval.tolist(),
    'maxViolation': float(np.max(crossing_eval)),
    'negativePointExists': any(x < -1e-6 for x in
        crossing_eval)
},
'verification': {
    'functionalPositive': all(x >= -1e-8 for x in
        alpha_rational),
    'crossingNegative': any(x < -1e-6 for x in crossing_eval)
}
}

with open(output_file, 'w') as f:
    json.dump(certificate, f, indent=2)

print(f"      Certificate exported to {output_file}")

def verify_bootstrap_certificate(cert_file):
    """
    Independent verification of bootstrap certificate.
    """
    with open(cert_file, 'r') as f:
        cert = json.load(f)

    print("==== Bootstrap Certificate Verification ====\n")

    # 1. Check functional positivity
    alpha = np.array(cert['functional']['alpha_values'])
    assert cert['functional']['positivity_check'], "Functional not
        positive!"
    print("      Functional is positive on allowed region")

    # 2. Check crossing violation
    crossing = np.array(cert['crossingViolation']['values'])
    assert cert['crossingViolation']['negative_point_exists'], "No
        crossing violation!"
    print(f"      Crossing violated (max = {cert['crossingViolation'][
        'maxViolation']:.2e}))")

    # 3. Recompute crossing matrix (independent check)
    Delta_grid = np.array(cert['grid']['Delta_grid'])
    J_grid = cert['grid']['J_grid']

    z_test = [0.3, 0.5, 0.7]
    zbar_test = [0.4, 0.6, 0.8]

    V_test = setup_crossing_matrix(Delta_grid, J_grid, z_test, zbar_test
        )
    crossing_recomputed = alpha @ V_test

    assert any(x < -1e-6 for x in crossing_recomputed), "Crossing
        verification failed!"
    print("      Independent crossing check passed")

    print("\n==== ALL VERIFICATIONS PASSED ====")

```

```
    return True
```

0.4 4. Example Starting Prompt

```
You are a theoretical physicist implementing the conformal bootstrap for
large-c holographic CFTs.
Your task is to derive sharp universal bounds on the twist gap using
ONLY crossing symmetry,
unitarity, and causality      NO input from bulk gravity or string theory
.

OBJECTIVE: Find the maximum twist gap  _gap   for stress tensor 4-point
function in d=3 CFT
at large central charge c >> 1, proving Einstein gravity is constrained
by consistency alone.

PHASE 1 (Months 1-2): Conformal Block Computation
- Implement conformal blocks g_{ ,J}(z, zbar) for stress tensor
exchange using:
  * Casimir differential equation (Dolan-Osborn 2011 recursion)
  * Hypergeometric functions for scalar exchange (J=0)
  * Recursion relations for spinning blocks (J > 0)
- Test cases:
  * Identity block ( =0, J=0): verify g_{0,0} = 1
  * Stress tensor block ( =d, J=2): compute at z=0.3, zbar=0.7
- Grid: [0, 10] with spacing 0.1, J {0, 2, 4, 6, 8}
- Precision: 100-digit arithmetic via 'mpmath' to avoid accumulation
errors

PHASE 2 (Months 2-4): Crossing Symmetry
- Formulate crossing equation:
  - {TT ,J} [g^{(s)}(z,zbar) - F_{d,J} g^{(t)}(v,u)] = 0
- Build crossing kernel matrix V_{ ,J}(z_i, zbar_i) for 20 20 grid of
(z, zbar) points
- Verify crossing for known CFTs:
  * Generalized free field (GFF): double-trace spectrum with ~ 1/c
  * 3D Ising CFT (c ~ 0.95): check against numerical bootstrap data
- Expected: Crossing residual < 10^{-8} for valid theories

PHASE 3 (Months 4-5): Lightcone OPE and Twist Gap
- Extract leading twist in z 0 limit:
  G(z, zbar) ~ z^{\_min /2} F(zbar)
- Identify conserved currents:
  * Identity ( = 0)
  * Stress tensor ( = d-2 = 1 for d=3)
  * Higher-spin currents ( = d-2 if present)
- Impose gap assumption: no non-conserved operators with < _gap
- Filter spectrum: keep only _gap + J (twist _gap )

PHASE 4 (Months 5-6): Chaos Bound (Causality)
- Implement averaged null energy condition (ANEC):
  d T_{ } 0 (averaged energy along null geodesics)
- This encodes chaos bound _L 2 / via Regge theory
- Add as SDP constraint: _i ANEC_i 0 where _i is functional
- Reference: Hartman et al. (2016) "Causality Constraints in Conformal
Field Theory"
```

PHASE 5 (Months 6-8): Bootstrap SDP

- Formulate as semidefinite program (SDP):
 - Variables: functional (ϕ, J) on grid
 - Constraints:
 1. $\phi = 0$ for $J = 0$ (excluding conserved currents)
 2. $\phi < 0$ at one normalization point (crossing violation)
 3. ANEC constraint (chaos bound)
- Solve with CVXPY using SCS or MOSEK solver (tolerance 10^{-8})
- Binary search on $_gap$: if SDP feasible $_gap$ excluded; if infeasible $_gap$ allowed
- Expected result: $_gap \approx 1.0$ for $d=3$, $c \approx 0.05$ (matches literature)

PHASE 6 (Months 8-10): Certificate and Extremal Functional

- Extract extremal functional $*(\phi, J)$ from SDP dual
- Verify:
 - * Positivity: $*(\phi, J) \geq -10^{-8}$ for all allowed operators
 - * Crossing violation: $* V < -10^{-6}$ at normalization point
- Export JSON certificate:
 - * Grid $\{J_i, J_k\}$
 - * Functional values $\{\phi_{ik}\}$
 - * Crossing kernel evaluated at 10 test points
- Independent verification script: recompute crossing violation from certificate

SUCCESS CRITERIA:

- **MVR (Months 3-4)**: Conformal blocks computed, crossing verified for GFF, lightcone limit extracted (identity twist = 0 confirmed)
- **Strong (Months 7-8)**: Universal bound $_gap \approx 1.0 \pm 0.05$ reproduced from literature, extremal functional exported, ANEC constraint imposed
- **Publication (Months 9-10)**: New bound with higher-spin currents included, comparison to known AdS/CFT examples ($N=4$ SYM), certificate verified independently

VERIFICATION PROTOCOL:

1. Conformal blocks: compare to Kos et al. (2014) Table 1 for $d=3$ scalar exchange
2. Crossing: GFF with $c=100$ should satisfy crossing to 10^{-8}
3. Chaos bound: verify ANEC $\phi = 0$ for all positive-energy states
4. Literature comparison: $_gap$ bound for $d=3$ matches Heemskerk et al. (2009)
5. AdS/CFT check: known holographic CFTs (e.g., $N=4$ SYM at large N) respect the bound

EXPORT:

- 'bootstrap_certificate.json': Extremal functional and bound proof
- 'conformal_blocks.h5': Precomputed blocks for $[0, 10], J \in \{0, 2, 4, 6, 8\}$
- 'bootstrap_module.py': Reusable code for crossing equations, SDP setup

This is a PURE THOUGHT challenge: use ONLY CFT consistency constraints. NO input from bulk gravity, string theory, or supersymmetry until final validation.

0.5 5. Success Criteria

0.5.1 Minimum Viable Result (MVR) — Months 3-4

Deliverable: Working conformal block code and crossing verification.

- **Specific Metrics**: 1. **Conformal Blocks**: - Scalar blocks ($J=0$) match literature (Kos et al. 2014) to 10^{-10} – *Spinning blocks* ($J = 2, 4, 6, 8$) computed via recursion, validated on test cases
- 2. **Crossing Symmetry**: - GFF crossing verified: residual $\lesssim 10^{-8}$ for $c = 100 - 3D$ using crossing checked against Stress tensor twist = $d - 2$ confirmed
- 3. **Lightcone Extraction**: - Identity twist = 0 extracted correctly (error $\lesssim 10^{-6}$) – Stress tensor twist = $d - 2$ confirmed

Certificate: Conformal blocks exported to HDF5, crossing matrix stored as numpy array.

0.5.2 Strong Result — Months 7-8

Deliverable: Universal twist gap bound with extremal functional.

- **Specific Metrics**: 1. **Bootstrap Bound**: - $\text{gap} \approx 1.0 \pm 0.05$ for $d=3, c \rightarrow \infty$ (matches literature) - Extremal functional $\star(\cdot, J)$ extracted from SDP
 - 2. **Chaos Bound**: - ANEC constraint imposed and verified - Comparison to Regge theory predictions
 - 3. **Code Quality**: - SDP solves in $\lesssim 10$ minutes on laptop (MOSEK or SCS) - Grid spacing $\Delta J = 0.05$ ($100 \times$ denser than MVR)
 - 4. **Validation**: - Known holographic CFTs ($N=4$ SYM, ABJM) respect the bound
- **Certificate**: JSON with extremal functional, independent verification script passes all checks.

0.5.3 Publication-Quality Result — Months 9-10

Deliverable: Novel bounds with higher-spin currents, comparison to AdS/CFT.

- **Specific Metrics**: 1. **Novel Contribution**: - Bound on OPE coefficients of spin-4,6,8 currents (if present) - Exclusion region in (c, gap, J) parameter space - Proof that certain higher-spin theories are ruled out
 - 2. **Comprehensive Analysis**: - $d=2,3,4$ dimensions analyzed - Large- c expansion: bounds on $1/c$ corrections to gravitational couplings - Modular invariance constraints included (thermal correlators)
 - 3. **Validation**: - Comparison to all known holographic CFTs (10+ examples) - Numerical precision: SDP dual gap $\lesssim 10^{-10}$ – *Formal proof*: extremal functionals satisfies all constraints
 - 4. **Publication Targets**: - *Journal of High Energy Physics* (conformal bootstrap) - *Physical Review D* (holography and quantum gravity) - *SciPost Physics* (open access for reproducibility)
- **Certificate**: Complete database of bounds for $d=2,3,4$ with extremal functionals; Lean/Isabelle formalization of key theorems (stretch goal).

0.6 6. Verification Protocol

0.6.1 Automated Checks (Run After Each Phase)

```
def verify_bootstrap_implementation():
    """
    Comprehensive verification suite.
    """
```

```

"""
print("==== Bootstrap Verification Suite ====\n")

# 1. Conformal blocks
print("1. Testing Conformal Blocks")
test_identity_block()
test_stress_tensor_block()
test_block_symmetry()

# 2. Crossing symmetry
print("\n2. Testing Crossing Symmetry")
test_gff_crossing()
test_ising_crossing()

# 3. Lightcone limits
print("\n3. Testing Lightcone Limits")
test_lightcone_identity()
test_lightcone_stress_tensor()

# 4. Chaos bound
print("\n4. Testing Chaos Bound")
test_anec_positivity()

# 5. SDP convergence
print("\n5. Testing SDP Solver")
test_sdp_toy_problem()

print("\n==== ALL TESTS PASSED ====")

def test_block_symmetry():
    """Conformal blocks are symmetric under z      zbar for real cross-
       ratios."""
    z, zbar = 0.4, 0.4 # Real point
    Delta, J = 1.5, 2

    block1 = stress_tensor_4pt_block(Delta, J, z, zbar)
    block2 = stress_tensor_4pt_block(Delta, J, zbar, z)

    assert abs(block1 - block2) < 1e-10, "Block not symmetric!"
    print("      Block symmetry (z      zbar) verified")

def test_ising_crossing():
    """3D Ising CFT satisfies crossing (numerical bootstrap data)."""
    # Use known spectrum from bootstrap:      (      0.518),      (
    # 1.412)
    # OPE coefficients from literature

    Delta_sigma = 0.51815
    Delta_epsilon = 1.41267

    # Simplified: check that crossing is approximately satisfied
    # Full test requires full spectrum

    print("      3D Ising crossing check (simplified)")

```

```

def test_lightcone_stress_tensor():
    """Stress tensor has twist      = d-2."""
    d = 3
    Delta_T, J_T = d, 2

    tau_T = Delta_T - J_T
    tau_expected = d - 2

    assert abs(tau_T - tau_expected) < 1e-10, f"Stress tensor twist = {tau_T}, expected {tau_expected}"
    print(f"      Stress tensor twist      = {tau_expected} verified")

def test_anec_positivity():
    """ANEC operator should be positive for all physical states."""
    # Simplified: check that ANEC weights are reasonable
    Delta_grid = np.linspace(1, 5, 10)
    J_grid = [0, 2, 4]

    # Mock crossing matrix
    V = np.random.rand(10, len(Delta_grid) * len(J_grid))

    anec = averaged_null_energy_operator(Delta_grid, J_grid, V)

    # ANEC should be real
    assert np.all(np.isreal(anec)), "ANEC not real!"
    print("      ANEC operator constructed")

def test_sdp_toy_problem():
    """Test SDP solver on simple feasibility problem."""
    # Minimize 0 subject to x      1
    x = cp.Variable()
    constraints = [x >= 1]
    problem = cp.Problem(cp.Minimize(0), constraints)
    problem.solve()

    assert problem.status == cp.OPTIMAL, "SDP solver failed on toy problem!"
    assert x.value >= 0.99, "SDP solution incorrect!"
    print("      SDP solver working correctly")

```

Manual Checks: 1. Plot extremal functional $(, J)$ — should be smooth, positive for gap
2. Compare to literature bounds (Heemskerk 2009, Afkhami-Jeddi 2019)
3. Verify with independent code (e.g., SIMPLEBOOT, JuliBootS)

0.7 7. Resources and Milestones

0.7.1 Essential References

Conformal Bootstrap Foundations: - Ferrara, S., Gliozzi, F., & Scherk, J. (1973). "Supergauge multiplets and superfields." *Physical Review D* 8(10): 3303. - Rattazzi, R., et al. (2008). "Bounding scalar operator dimensions in 4D CFT." *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2008(12): 031.

Holographic Bootstrap: - Heemskerk, I., et al. (2009). "Holography from conformal field theory." *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2009(10): 079. - Afkhami-Jeddi, N., et al.

(2019). "Shockwaves from the operator product expansion." *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2019(3): 201.

Chaos and Causality: - Maldacena, J., Shenker, S. H., & Stanford, D. (2016). "A bound on chaos." *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2016(8): 106. - Hartman, T., et al. (2016). "Causality constraints in conformal field theory." *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2016(5): 099.

Numerical Methods: - Simmons-Duffin, D. (2015). "A semidefinite program solver for the conformal bootstrap." *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2015(6): 174. - Kos, F., Poland, D., & Simmons-Duffin, D. (2014). "Bootstrapping the O(N) vector models." *Journal of High Energy Physics* 2014(6): 091.

Software: - SDPB (Simmons-Duffin): high-precision SDP solver for bootstrap - JuliBootS (Julia implementation), PyCFTBoot (Python), Scalar Blocks (Mathematica)

0.7.2 Milestone Checklist

Month 1-2: - [] Conformal blocks implemented for d=3, verified against literature - [] Hypergeometric function evaluation to 100-digit precision - [] Recursion relations for J=2,4,6,8 working

Month 3-4: - [] Crossing matrix built for 20×20 (z, zbar) grid - [] GFF crossing verified to 10^{-8} - [] 3DIsingdata loaded and compared

Month 5-6: - [] Lightcone limit extraction automated - [] Twist gap filtering implemented - [] ANEC constraint added to SDP

Month 7-8: - [] First SDP solved: gap bound reproduced from literature - [] Extremal functional extracted - [] Binary search converges to precision 0.01

Month 9-10: - [] Higher-spin currents included in analysis - [] Bounds for d=2,3,4 computed - [] Certificate exported and verified independently - [] Comparison to AdS/CFT examples (N=4 SYM, ABJM) - [] Draft paper prepared

0.7.3 Common Pitfalls

1. **Numerical Precision**: Conformal blocks have poles/branch cuts; use high-precision arithmetic (100+ digits) to avoid catastrophic cancellation
2. **SDP Solver Tolerance**: Default tolerances (10^{-4}) are insufficient; required $\text{dualgap} < 10^{-8}$ for reliable bounds
3. **Grid Spacing**: Too coarse \rightarrow spurious bounds; too fine \rightarrow SDP intractable. Start with $\epsilon = 0.1$, refine near bound
4. **Chaos Bound Implementation**: ANEC is subtle; verify against known CFTs before using in bootstrap
5. **Crossing Kernel Symmetry**: Must respect s t channel symmetry; errors here invalidate entire bootstrap

End of PRD 04