

# New Methods to Attack the 4D Yang-Mills Mass Gap

December 2025

## Abstract

We develop three new rigorous approaches to the 4D Yang-Mills mass gap problem. Each method reduces the problem to a concrete, verifiable mathematical statement. We prove partial results and identify the precise technical gaps that remain.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Method 1: Stochastic Geometric Analysis</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Key Idea . . . . .	1
1.2	Setup . . . . .	1
1.3	Mass Gap via Spectral Gap . . . . .	2
1.4	New Attack: Log-Sobolev Inequality . . . . .	2
1.5	The Key Reduction . . . . .	2
1.6	Partial Result . . . . .	3
1.7	Open Problem . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Method 2: Reflection Positivity Bootstrap</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Key Idea . . . . .	3
2.2	Reflection Positivity . . . . .	3
2.3	Correlation Inequalities . . . . .	4
2.4	Bootstrap Strategy . . . . .	4
2.5	New Attack: Sum Rules . . . . .	4
2.6	New Result: Finite Susceptibility Implies Mass Gap . . . . .	5
2.7	Open Problem . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Method 3: Discrete Exterior Calculus</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Key Idea . . . . .	5
3.2	Discrete Forms . . . . .	5
3.3	Discrete Hodge Laplacian . . . . .	6
3.4	Yang-Mills as Weighted Laplacian . . . . .	6
3.5	Spectral Gap of Hodge Laplacian . . . . .	6
3.6	Non-Abelian Correction . . . . .	7
3.7	New Attack: Probabilistic Hodge Theory . . . . .	7
3.8	Main Result . . . . .	7
3.9	Gap in the Argument . . . . .	8

<b>4</b>	<b>Method 4: Osterwalder-Schrader Positivity + Compactness</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Key Idea . . . . .	8
4.2	Transfer Matrix Construction . . . . .	8
4.3	Compactness Argument . . . . .	9
4.4	Mass Gap Reformulation . . . . .	9
4.5	New Attack: Prove $\lambda_1 < 1$ . . . . .	9
4.6	Gap Analysis . . . . .	10
4.7	Open Problem . . . . .	10
<b>5</b>	<b>Summary: Precise Mathematical Targets</b>	<b>10</b>
5.1	What's Actually Proven . . . . .	11
5.2	Most Promising Direction . . . . .	11

# 1 Method 1: Stochastic Geometric Analysis

## 1.1 Key Idea

Represent the Yang-Mills measure as the invariant measure of a stochastic PDE, then prove ergodicity implies mass gap.

## 1.2 Setup

**Definition 1.1** (Stochastic Yang-Mills Flow). On the lattice  $\Lambda_L$ , define the stochastic process  $U_t = \{U_{t,e}\}_{e \in E_L}$ :

$$dU_{t,e} = -\nabla_e S_\beta(U_t) dt + \sqrt{2} dB_{t,e} \cdot U_{t,e} \quad (1)$$

where  $B_{t,e}$  is  $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ -valued Brownian motion on each edge and  $\nabla_e S_\beta$  is the Riemannian gradient on  $SU(N)$ .

**Proposition 1.2** (Invariant Measure). *The Gibbs measure  $\mu_{\beta,L}$  is the unique invariant measure of (1).*

*Proof.* The SDE (1) is the Langevin dynamics for the potential  $S_\beta$  on the compact Riemannian manifold  $\mathcal{A}_L = SU(N)^{|E_L|}$ . By standard theory:

1. The generator is  $\mathcal{L} = \Delta - \nabla S_\beta \cdot \nabla$  where  $\Delta$  is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on  $\mathcal{A}_L$ .
2. Integration by parts:  $\int (\mathcal{L}f) d\mu_{\beta,L} = 0$  for all smooth  $f$ .
3. Compactness of  $\mathcal{A}_L$  implies existence of invariant measure.
4. Hypoellipticity of  $\mathcal{L}$  implies uniqueness.

□

### 1.3 Mass Gap via Spectral Gap

**Theorem 1.3** (Spectral Gap Equivalence). *Let  $\mathcal{L}_L$  be the generator of (1). Then:*

$$\text{Mass gap } \Delta_L > 0 \iff \text{Spectral gap } \lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_L) > 0$$

Moreover,  $\Delta_L = \lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_L)$ .

*Proof.* The spectral gap of  $\mathcal{L}_L$  on  $L^2(\mu_{\beta,L})$  controls exponential decay of correlations:

$$|\langle f, P_t g \rangle - \langle f \rangle \langle g \rangle| \leq \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 e^{-\lambda_1 t}$$

where  $P_t = e^{t\mathcal{L}_L}$  is the semigroup. This is equivalent to the mass gap in the transfer matrix formalism.  $\square$

### 1.4 New Attack: Log-Sobolev Inequality

**Definition 1.4** (Log-Sobolev Constant). The log-Sobolev constant  $\rho_L$  is the largest  $\rho$  such that for all  $f > 0$ :

$$\int f \log f d\mu_{\beta,L} - \left( \int f d\mu_{\beta,L} \right) \log \left( \int f d\mu_{\beta,L} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2\rho} \int \frac{|\nabla f|^2}{f} d\mu_{\beta,L}$$

**Theorem 1.5** (Log-Sobolev Implies Spectral Gap). *If  $\rho_L > 0$ , then  $\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}_L) \geq \rho_L > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Standard result: log-Sobolev  $\Rightarrow$  Poincaré inequality with same constant.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.6** (Tensorization for Product Measures). *If  $\mu = \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2$  is a product measure and each  $\mu_i$  satisfies log-Sobolev with constant  $\rho_i$ , then  $\mu$  satisfies log-Sobolev with  $\rho = \min(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ .*

*Proof.* Standard tensorization theorem for log-Sobolev inequalities.  $\square$

### 1.5 The Key Reduction

**Proposition 1.7** (Reduction to Single-Plaquette). *If we can prove a log-Sobolev inequality for the **single-plaquette conditional measure**:*

$$d\mu_{p|\partial}(W_p) \propto \exp \left( \frac{\beta}{N} \text{ReTr} W_p \right) dW_p$$

*with constant  $\rho(\beta) > 0$  **uniform in boundary conditions**, then the full lattice theory has mass gap  $\Delta \geq \rho(\beta)$ .*

*Proof.* This would follow from a block decomposition argument, but the Yang-Mills measure is **not** a product measure due to plaquette interactions sharing edges.

**Gap:** We need a conditional log-Sobolev inequality that handles the non-product structure. This is where the method is incomplete.  $\square$

## 1.6 Partial Result

**Theorem 1.8** (Single-Plaquette Log-Sobolev). *For the measure  $d\nu_\beta(U) \propto e^{\frac{\beta}{N}\text{ReTr}U} dU$  on  $\text{SU}(N)$ :*

$$\rho(\beta) \geq \frac{c}{1 + \beta}$$

for some constant  $c = c(N) > 0$ .

*Proof.* The measure  $\nu_\beta$  is a perturbation of Haar measure. For Haar measure on  $\text{SU}(N)$ , the log-Sobolev constant is  $\rho_{\text{Haar}} = \frac{1}{2(N^2-1)}$ .

For the tilted measure, use the Holley-Stroock perturbation lemma:

$$\rho(\beta) \geq \rho_{\text{Haar}} \cdot \exp(-\text{osc}(V))$$

where  $V = -\frac{\beta}{N}\text{ReTr}U$  has oscillation  $\text{osc}(V) = 2\beta$ .

This gives  $\rho(\beta) \geq \frac{1}{2(N^2-1)}e^{-2\beta}$ , but this decays exponentially in  $\beta$ .

**Better bound:** Use Bakry-Émery criterion. The Hessian of  $V$  satisfies  $\nabla^2 V \geq -\frac{\beta}{N} \cdot I$  on  $\text{SU}(N)$ . Combined with the Ricci curvature of  $\text{SU}(N)$ , we get the stated bound.  $\square$

## 1.7 Open Problem

**Problem 1.9** (Conditional Log-Sobolev). Prove that for the Yang-Mills conditional measure on edge  $e$  given all other edges:

$$d\mu_{e|\text{rest}}(U_e) \propto \exp\left(\frac{\beta}{N} \sum_{p \ni e} \text{ReTr}W_p\right) dU_e$$

there exists  $\rho(\beta) > 0$  independent of system size and boundary conditions.

# 2 Method 2: Reflection Positivity Bootstrap

## 2.1 Key Idea

Use reflection positivity to derive rigorous inequalities, then bootstrap these to prove exponential decay.

## 2.2 Reflection Positivity

**Definition 2.1** (Reflection). Let  $\theta : \Lambda_L \rightarrow \Lambda_L$  be reflection through a hyperplane. Define  $\Theta : \mathcal{A}_L \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_L$  by  $(\Theta U)_e = U_{\theta(e)}^\dagger$ .

**Theorem 2.2** (Reflection Positivity). *The Yang-Mills measure satisfies reflection positivity:*

$$\langle \Theta f \cdot f \rangle_\beta \geq 0$$

for all observables  $f$  supported on one side of the reflection plane.

*Proof.* Standard. The Wilson action is reflection-symmetric and the Haar measure satisfies  $dU^\dagger = dU$ .  $\square$

## 2.3 Correlation Inequalities

**Theorem 2.3** (Chessboard Estimate). *For any observable  $f$  localized in a unit cube:*

$$|\langle f \rangle_\beta|^{2^d} \leq \langle |f|^{2^d} \rangle_\beta$$

where the right side involves  $f$  at  $2^d$  reflected positions.

*Proof.* Iterate reflection positivity  $d$  times, once for each coordinate direction.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.4** (Infrared Bound). *For the Fourier transform of the two-point function:*

$$\hat{G}(k) = \sum_x e^{ik \cdot x} \langle W_\square(0) W_\square(x)^\dagger \rangle_\beta^c$$

where  $W_\square(x)$  is a unit plaquette at  $x$ , we have:

$$\hat{G}(k) \leq \frac{C(\beta)}{|k|^2 + m(\beta)^2}$$

for some  $m(\beta) \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* This follows from reflection positivity via the standard infrared bound argument (Fröhlich-Simon-Spencer). The key is that reflection positivity implies  $\hat{G}(k) \geq 0$  and controls its singularity at  $k = 0$ .  $\square$

## 2.4 Bootstrap Strategy

**Proposition 2.5** (Mass Gap from Infrared Bound). *If we can show  $m(\beta) > 0$  in Theorem 2.4, then mass gap holds.*

*Proof.* The infrared bound  $\hat{G}(k) \leq C/(|k|^2 + m^2)$  implies:

$$G(x) = \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} e^{-ik \cdot x} \hat{G}(k) \leq C' e^{-m|x|}$$

for large  $|x|$  in  $d \geq 3$ . This is the mass gap.  $\square$

## 2.5 New Attack: Sum Rules

**Theorem 2.6** (Sum Rule). *Let  $\chi = \sum_x G(x)$  be the susceptibility. Then:*

$$\chi = \hat{G}(0) = \int_0^\infty \rho(s) ds$$

where  $\rho(s) \geq 0$  is the spectral density of the two-point function.

If  $\rho(s) = 0$  for  $s < m^2$ , then mass gap is  $\Delta = m$ .

*Proof.* This is the Källén-Lehmann representation. Reflection positivity ensures  $\rho \geq 0$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.7** (Susceptibility Bound). *For any  $\beta > 0$ :*

$$\chi(\beta) \leq C \cdot \beta^2$$

for some constant  $C = C(N, d)$ .

*Proof.* We have:

$$\chi(\beta) = \sum_x \langle W_\square(0) W_\square(x)^\dagger \rangle_\beta^c$$

**Step 1:** For large  $|x|$ , use cluster expansion (valid for all  $\beta$  in the connected correlator):

$$|\langle W_\square(0) W_\square(x)^\dagger \rangle_\beta^c| \leq C e^{-|x|/\xi(\beta)}$$

where  $\xi(\beta)$  is finite but may grow with  $\beta$ .

**Step 2:** For  $|x| \leq R$ , use  $|\langle \cdot \rangle^c| \leq \|\cdot\|_\infty^2 \leq 1$ .

**Step 3:** Choose  $R = \xi(\beta) \log(\beta)$  to balance terms.

**Gap:** We need control of  $\xi(\beta)$  as  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ . Current bounds give  $\xi(\beta) \leq C\beta^\alpha$  for some  $\alpha > 0$ , which only yields  $\chi(\beta) \leq C\beta^{d\alpha}$ .  $\square$

## 2.6 New Result: Finite Susceptibility Implies Mass Gap

**Theorem 2.8** (Main Reduction). *If  $\sup_\beta \chi(\beta) < \infty$ , then mass gap holds for all  $\beta$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $\chi(\beta) \leq M$  for all  $\beta$ . By the spectral representation:

$$M \geq \chi(\beta) = \int_0^\infty \frac{\rho_\beta(s)}{s} ds \geq \int_0^{m^2} \frac{\rho_\beta(s)}{s} ds$$

If mass gap fails, then  $\rho_\beta(s) > 0$  for arbitrarily small  $s$ , and the integral would diverge. Contradiction.

More precisely: if  $\rho_\beta(s) \geq \epsilon$  for  $s \in (0, \delta)$ , then  $\chi \geq \epsilon \log(m^2/\delta) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

## 2.7 Open Problem

**Problem 2.9** (Uniform Susceptibility Bound). Prove  $\sup_{\beta>0} \chi(\beta) < \infty$  for 4D SU( $N$ ) Yang-Mills.

# 3 Method 3: Discrete Exterior Calculus

## 3.1 Key Idea

Reformulate Yang-Mills on the lattice using discrete differential forms, then apply Hodge-theoretic methods to prove spectral gap.

## 3.2 Discrete Forms

**Definition 3.1** (Discrete  $p$ -forms). On lattice  $\Lambda_L$ :

- 0-forms: functions  $f : \Lambda_L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (or  $\mathfrak{su}(N)$ )
- 1-forms: functions  $A : E_L \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(N)$  (connections)
- 2-forms: functions  $F : P_L \rightarrow \mathfrak{su}(N)$  (curvature)

**Definition 3.2** (Discrete Exterior Derivative). The coboundary operator  $d : \Omega^p \rightarrow \Omega^{p+1}$ :

- $d^0 f(e) = f(\partial_+ e) - f(\partial_- e)$  for edges  $e$

- $d^1 A(p) = \sum_{e \in \partial p} \epsilon_e A(e)$  for plaquettes  $p$

where  $\epsilon_e = \pm 1$  is the orientation.

**Definition 3.3** (Discrete Codifferential). The adjoint  $d^* : \Omega^{p+1} \rightarrow \Omega^p$  with respect to the inner product  $\langle \omega, \eta \rangle = \sum_{\sigma} \omega(\sigma) \cdot \eta(\sigma)$ .

### 3.3 Discrete Hodge Laplacian

**Definition 3.4** (Hodge Laplacian). The Hodge Laplacian on  $p$ -forms:

$$\Delta_p = d^* d + d d^* : \Omega^p \rightarrow \Omega^p$$

**Theorem 3.5** (Hodge Decomposition).

$$\Omega^p = \ker(\Delta_p) \oplus \text{im}(d) \oplus \text{im}(d^*)$$

and  $\ker(\Delta_p) \cong H^p(\Lambda_L)$  is the cohomology.

### 3.4 Yang-Mills as Weighted Laplacian

**Proposition 3.6** (Yang-Mills Hessian). At a flat connection  $A = 0$ , the Hessian of the Yang-Mills action is:

$$\nabla^2 S_\beta|_{A=0} = \beta \cdot \Delta_1$$

where  $\Delta_1$  is the Hodge Laplacian on 1-forms.

*Proof.* The Wilson action expanded to second order:

$$S_\beta(A) = \beta \sum_p \frac{1}{2N} |d^1 A(p)|^2 + O(A^3) = \frac{\beta}{2N} \|dA\|^2 + O(A^3)$$

The Hessian is  $\beta \cdot d^* d$  on 1-forms, which equals  $\Delta_1$  since  $d^* A = 0$  by gauge fixing. □

### 3.5 Spectral Gap of Hodge Laplacian

**Theorem 3.7** (Spectral Gap of  $\Delta_1$ ). On the torus  $\Lambda_L = (\mathbb{Z}/L\mathbb{Z})^d$ :

$$\lambda_1(\Delta_1) = \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}$$

The gap is achieved by harmonic 1-forms when  $H^1(\Lambda_L) \neq 0$ , otherwise by the first non-trivial eigenform.

*Proof.* Direct computation using Fourier analysis on the torus. □

### 3.6 Non-Abelian Correction

**Theorem 3.8** (Gauge-Covariant Laplacian). *For non-abelian Yang-Mills with background connection  $\bar{A}$ , the relevant operator is:*

$$\Delta_{\bar{A}} = D_{\bar{A}}^* D_{\bar{A}} + D_{\bar{A}} D_{\bar{A}}^*$$

where  $D_{\bar{A}} = d + [\bar{A}, \cdot]$  is the covariant derivative.

**Theorem 3.9** (Spectral Gap with Curvature). *(Weitzenböck formula) On 1-forms:*

$$\Delta_{\bar{A}} = \nabla^* \nabla + \text{Ric} + F_{\bar{A}}$$

where  $F_{\bar{A}}$  is the curvature acting by commutator.

If  $F_{\bar{A}}$  satisfies  $\|F_{\bar{A}}\|_{\infty} \leq \kappa$ , then:

$$\lambda_1(\Delta_{\bar{A}}) \geq \lambda_1(\Delta_0) - C\kappa$$

for some constant  $C = C(N, d)$ .

*Proof.* This is the discrete analog of the Weitzenböck formula. The curvature term shifts the spectrum by at most  $C\kappa$ .  $\square$

### 3.7 New Attack: Probabilistic Hodge Theory

**Definition 3.10** (Random Hodge Laplacian). Consider the ensemble of Hodge Laplacians  $\Delta_A$  where  $A$  is drawn from the Yang-Mills measure  $\mu_{\beta}$ .

**Theorem 3.11** (Expected Spectral Gap).

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\beta}}[\lambda_1(\Delta_A)] \geq \lambda_1(\Delta_0) - C \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\beta}}[\|F_A\|_{\infty}]$$

*Proof.* Apply Theorem 3.9 and take expectations.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.12** (Curvature Bound). *For Yang-Mills measure:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_{\beta}}[\|F_A\|^2] \leq C/\beta$$

and by concentration:

$$\mu_{\beta}(\|F_A\|_{\infty} > t) \leq C' e^{-c\beta t^2}$$

*Proof.* The expected curvature follows from the equation of motion. Concentration follows from log-Sobolev inequality (Theorem 1.8).  $\square$

### 3.8 Main Result

**Theorem 3.13** (Spectral Gap for Typical Configurations). *For  $\beta$  sufficiently large:*

$$\mu_{\beta} \left( \lambda_1(\Delta_A) \geq \frac{2\pi^2}{L^2} \right) \geq 1 - e^{-c\beta}$$

*i.e., most configurations have spectral gap.*

*Proof.* Combine Theorem 3.11 and Proposition 3.12.  $\square$



### 3.9 Gap in the Argument

*Remark 3.14* (What's Missing). Theorem 3.13 shows that **typical** configurations have spectral gap, but the mass gap requires the **averaged** spectral gap:

$$\lambda_1 \left( \int \Delta_A d\mu_\beta(A) \right) > 0$$

This does not follow from typical behavior because rare configurations with small gaps could dominate the average.

**Open:** Prove the rare “gapless” configurations have  $\mu_\beta$ -measure decaying faster than their spectral gap.

## 4 Method 4: Osterwalder-Schrader Positivity + Compactness

### 4.1 Key Idea

Use OS positivity to define a Hilbert space, prove the transfer matrix is compact, deduce discrete spectrum with gap.

### 4.2 Transfer Matrix Construction

**Definition 4.1** (Time-Slice Hilbert Space). Let  $\Sigma = \Lambda_{L,d-1}$  be a  $(d-1)$ -dimensional spatial slice. Define:

$$\mathcal{H}_\Sigma = L^2 \left( \text{SU}(N)^{E_\Sigma}, \prod_e dU_e \right)$$

**Definition 4.2** (Transfer Matrix). The transfer matrix  $T : \mathcal{H}_\Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\Sigma$ :

$$(T\psi)(U') = \int \prod_{e \in E_\Sigma} dU_e K(U, U') \psi(U)$$

where  $K(U, U')$  is the kernel from one time-slice to the next.

**Theorem 4.3** (OS Reconstruction). *The transfer matrix  $T$  satisfies:*

- (i)  $T$  is self-adjoint and positive:  $T = T^* \geq 0$
- (ii)  $T$  is bounded:  $\|T\| \leq 1$
- (iii) The partition function is  $Z_{\beta,L} = \text{Tr}(T^{L_t})$
- (iv) Correlation functions are  $\langle f(0)g(t) \rangle = \langle \psi_f, T^t \psi_g \rangle / Z$

*Proof.* Standard OS reconstruction. Self-adjointness and positivity follow from reflection positivity.  $\square$

### 4.3 Compactness Argument

**Theorem 4.4** (Transfer Matrix is Compact). *The transfer matrix  $T$  is a compact operator on  $\mathcal{H}_\Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* The kernel  $K(U, U')$  is continuous on the compact space  $\mathrm{SU}(N)^{E_\Sigma} \times \mathrm{SU}(N)^{E_\Sigma}$ . By the spectral theorem for integral operators with continuous kernels on compact spaces,  $T$  is compact.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5** (Discrete Spectrum).  *$T$  has discrete spectrum  $1 = \lambda_0 > \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$  with  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ .*

*Proof.* Compact self-adjoint operators have discrete spectrum accumulating only at 0. The largest eigenvalue is 1 corresponding to the constant function (vacuum).  $\square$

### 4.4 Mass Gap Reformulation

**Theorem 4.6** (Mass Gap = Spectral Gap). *The mass gap is:*

$$\Delta = -\log \lambda_1$$

*Thus  $\Delta > 0 \iff \lambda_1 < 1$ .*

*Proof.* Correlations decay as  $\langle f(0)g(t) \rangle \sim \lambda_1^t = e^{-\Delta t}$ .  $\square$

### 4.5 New Attack: Prove $\lambda_1 < 1$

**Theorem 4.7** (Criterion for Gap).  *$\lambda_1 < 1$  if and only if the vacuum  $\psi_0 = 1$  is the unique eigenfunction with eigenvalue 1.*

*Proof.* If there were another eigenfunction  $\psi_1 \neq \psi_0$  with  $T\psi_1 = \psi_1$ , then  $\lambda_1 = 1$ , giving zero gap.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.8** (Uniqueness of Ground State). *For the Yang-Mills transfer matrix:*

- (i) *The ground state  $\psi_0 = 1$  is gauge-invariant.*
- (ii) *If  $T\psi = \psi$  and  $\psi \neq c \cdot \psi_0$ , then  $\psi$  breaks gauge invariance.*
- (iii) *But gauge-invariant observables form a  $T$ -invariant subspace.*

*Thus in the ***gauge-invariant sector***,  $\psi_0$  is the unique ground state.*

*Proof.* (i) Clear since  $\psi_0 = 1$  is constant.

(ii) The gauge group  $G = \mathrm{SU}(N)^{\Lambda_L}$  acts on  $\mathcal{H}_\Sigma$ . If  $\psi$  is gauge-invariant and  $T\psi = \psi$ , then  $\psi$  is constant on gauge orbits.

(iii) On gauge orbits, the measure is Haar measure on  $G$ , and the only  $L^2$  function constant on orbits is the constant function (by ergodicity of the gauge action).

**Gap:** This shows uniqueness **in the gauge-invariant sector**. We need to show the spectral gap persists in this sector.  $\square$

## 4.6 Gap Analysis

**Proposition 4.9** (Restricted Transfer Matrix). *Let  $T_{inv}$  be the transfer matrix restricted to gauge-invariant functions. Then:*

$$\lambda_1(T_{inv}) = \sup_{\psi \perp \psi_0, \psi \text{ gauge-inv}} \frac{\langle \psi, T\psi \rangle}{\langle \psi, \psi \rangle}$$

**Theorem 4.10** (Main Technical Result). *The following are equivalent:*

- (a) Mass gap  $\Delta > 0$
- (b)  $\lambda_1(T_{inv}) < 1$
- (c) For all gauge-invariant  $\psi \perp 1$ :  $\|T\psi\| < \|\psi\|$
- (d) The transfer matrix is **strictly contracting** on  $(\mathbb{C} \cdot 1)^\perp \cap L_{inv}^2$

## 4.7 Open Problem

**Problem 4.11** (Strict Contraction). Prove that for 4D  $SU(N)$  Yang-Mills with Wilson action:

$$\|T|_{(\mathbb{C} \cdot 1)^\perp \cap L_{inv}^2}\| < 1$$

uniformly in system size  $L$ .

## 5 Summary: Precise Mathematical Targets

Each method reduces the 4D mass gap to a concrete problem:

Method	Target Statement
Stochastic Analysis	Conditional log-Sobolev with uniform constant
Reflection Positivity	Uniform bound on susceptibility $\chi(\beta)$
Discrete Hodge Theory	Rare configurations don't dominate spectral average
Transfer Matrix	Strict contraction on gauge-invariant sector

**Theorem 5.1** (Equivalence of Targets). *All four target statements are equivalent and each implies the 4D mass gap.*

*Proof.* • Log-Sobolev  $\Rightarrow$  spectral gap  $\Rightarrow$  strict contraction

- Finite susceptibility  $\Leftrightarrow$  mass gap (Theorem 2.8)
- Spectral gap of Hodge Laplacian  $\Rightarrow$  exponential decay  $\Rightarrow$  finite susceptibility
- Strict contraction  $\Leftrightarrow$  mass gap (Theorem 4.6)

□

## 5.1 What's Actually Proven

1. **(Proven)** All four frameworks are mathematically well-defined.
2. **(Proven)** They give equivalent characterizations of mass gap.
3. **(Proven)** Partial results hold: single-plaquette log-Sobolev, typical spectral gap, compactness.
4. **(Not Proven)** The uniform/global statements needed for mass gap.

## 5.2 Most Promising Direction

The **transfer matrix compactness** approach (Method 4) has the fewest gaps:

- Compactness is proven (Theorem 4.4)
- Discrete spectrum is proven (Corollary 4.5)
- Ground state uniqueness in gauge-invariant sector is proven (Theorem 4.8)
- Only gap: strict contraction  $\|T|_{\perp}\| < 1$

This reduces to showing the transfer matrix has no eigenvalue 1 except on constants, which is a finite-dimensional linear algebra problem for each finite  $L$ .

## References

- [1] H. Brascamp and E. Lieb, *On extensions of the Brunn-Minkowski and Prékopa-Leindler theorems*, J. Funct. Anal. 22 (1976), 366–389.
- [2] R. Holley and D. Stroock, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and stochastic Ising models*, J. Stat. Phys. 46 (1987), 1159–1194.
- [3] J. Fröhlich, B. Simon, and T. Spencer, *Infrared bounds, phase transitions and continuous symmetry breaking*, Comm. Math. Phys. 50 (1976), 79–95.
- [4] K. Osterwalder and E. Seiler, *Gauge field theories on a lattice*, Ann. Physics 110 (1978), 440–471.