

Free energy and quark potential in Ising lattice gauge theory via cluster expansion

Malin P. Forsström* and Fredrik Viklund†

April 18, 2023

Abstract

We revisit the cluster expansion for Ising lattice gauge theory on \mathbb{Z}^d , $d \geq 3$, with Wilson action, at large but fixed inverse temperature β . We prove existence and analyticity of the free energy infinite volume limit and compute the first few terms in its expansion in powers of $e^{-\beta}$. We further analyze Wilson loop expectations and derive an estimate that shows how the lattice scale geometry of a loop is reflected in the large β asymptotics of the Wilson loop expectation. Specializing to axis parallel rectangular loops $\gamma_{T,R}$ with side-lengths T and R , we consider the limiting function

$$V_\beta(R) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{T} \log \langle W_{\gamma_{T,R}} \rangle_\beta,$$

known as the static quark potential in the physics literature. We verify existence of the limit and compute the first few terms in the expansion of $V_\beta(R)$ in powers of $e^{-\beta}$ as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed R and show that $V_\beta(R)$ is bounded in R for fixed large enough β . We also treat $-\log \langle W_{\gamma_{T,R}} \rangle_\beta / (T+R)$ as T, R tend to infinity simultaneously and give analogous estimates for the β -dependent limit.

1 Introduction

Given a lattice \mathbb{Z}^m and a choice of structure group G , a (pure) lattice gauge theory models a random discretized connection form on a principal G -bundle on an underlying discretized m -dimensional smooth manifold. More concretely, it is a Gibbs probability measure on gauge fields, i.e., G -valued discrete 1-forms σ defined on edges of the lattice. The action can be taken to be of the form $S(\sigma) = -\sum_p A_p$, where for some choice of representation ρ , $A_p = \rho(\sigma_{e_1} \sigma_{e_2} \sigma_{e_3} \sigma_{e_4})$ captures the microscopic holonomy around the plaquette p whose boundary consists of the edges e_1, \dots, e_4 . The coupling parameter β acts as the inverse temperature. In a formal scaling limit, one recovers the Yang-Mills action while the model enjoys exact gauge symmetry on the discrete level. In contrast to the corresponding continuum Yang-Mills theories, the discrete measure is immediately rigorously defined, and its analysis naturally becomes a problem of statistical mechanics. Lattice gauge theories were introduced independently by Wegner and Wilson in the 1970s [20, 21].

*University of Gothenburg, email: palo@chalmers.se

†KTH Royal Institute of Technology, email: frejo@kth.se

Despite the presence of local symmetries, lattice gauge theories can exhibit non-trivial phase structure, but one has to consider non-local observables. Given a lattice loop γ , the Wilson loop observable W_γ records the random holonomy of the gauge field as γ is traversed once. Starting with the original paper of Wilson [21], it has been argued in the physics literature that the decay rate of its expectation $\langle W_\gamma \rangle_\beta$ as the loop grows encodes information about whether or not “static quarks” are “confined” in the model, see, e.g., of [17, Sect. 3.5] for a textbook discussion. Let $\gamma_{T,R}$ be a rectangular loop with axis parallel sides and, taking its existence for granted, consider the limit

$$V_\beta(R) = - \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \log |\langle W_{\gamma_{T,R}} \rangle_\beta|.$$

The function $V_\beta(R)$ is called the static quark potential and is interpreted as the energy required to separate a static quark-antiquark pair to distance R , see, e.g., [17, Sect. 3.2]. Wilson’s criterion for quark confinement can then be formulated as follows: confinement occurs at β if and only if the energy $V_\beta(R)$ diverges as $R \rightarrow \infty$. However, except in the special case of planar theories, it seems that detailed mathematical proofs of such statements are not available in the literature, even for finite abelian G . Instead, the two phases are rigorously separated via estimates: confinement occurs at β if there exists some function $V(R)$, unbounded as $R \rightarrow \infty$, such that $\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \log |\langle W_{\gamma_{R,T}} \rangle_\beta| \leq -V(R)$, and in this case, Wilson loop expectations are said to follow the area law. If, on the other hand, there is a constant c independent of R such that $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \log |\langle W_{\gamma_{R,T}} \rangle_\beta| > c$, the Wilson loop expectations are said to follow the perimeter law. (The terminology comes from the expectation that a priori bounds of the form $e^{-cRT} \lesssim |\langle W_{\gamma_{R,T}} \rangle_\beta| \lesssim e^{-C(R+T)}$ should be essentially saturated in the two phases.) See [6] for a precise formulation of a condition for confinement, a general discussion from a probabilistic perspective, and Section 1.3 below for a brief discussion of other related work.

In this note, we consider lattice gauge theory with structure group $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ on \mathbb{Z}^m , $m \geq 3$, also known as Ising lattice gauge theory, for large β . See Section 1.1 for the precise definition. This model was first studied by Wegner [20] and can be viewed as a version of the usual Ising model on \mathbb{Z}^m where the global spin flip symmetry has been “upgraded” to a local symmetry. We use the cluster expansion to study the free energy, static quark potential, and related quantities. This classical method has been used in the past to analyze lattice gauge theories; see Section 1.3. While we only work with $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$, we believe our results can be generalized to any choice of finite structure group.

In order to state our main results we need to give some definitions.

1.1 Ising lattice gauge theory and Wilson loop expectations

Let $m \geq 3$. The lattice \mathbb{Z}^m has a vertex at each point $x \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ with integer coordinates and a non-oriented edge between each pair of nearest neighbors. To each non-oriented edge \bar{e} in \mathbb{Z}^m we associate two oriented edges e_1 and $e_2 = -e_1$ with the same endpoints as \bar{e} and opposite orientations.

Let $\mathbf{e}_1 := (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$, $\mathbf{e}_2 := (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$, \dots , $\mathbf{e}_m := (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ be oriented edges corresponding to the unit vectors in \mathbb{Z}^m .

If $v \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ and $j_1 < j_2$, then $p = (v + \mathbf{e}_{j_1}) \wedge (v + \mathbf{e}_{j_2})$ is a positively oriented 2-cell, also known as a positively oriented plaquette. We let B_N denote the set $[-N, N]^m$ of \mathbb{Z}^m , and we let V_N , E_N , and P_N denote the sets of oriented vertices, edges, and plaquettes, respectively, whose end-points are all in B_N .

We let $\Omega^1(B_N, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ denote the set of all \mathbb{Z}_2 -valued 1-forms σ on E_N , i.e., the set of all \mathbb{Z}_2 -valued functions $\sigma: e \mapsto \sigma_e$ on E_N such that $\sigma_e = -\sigma_{-e}$ for all $e \in E_N$. We write $\rho: \mathbb{Z}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $g \mapsto e^{\pi i g}$ for the natural representation of \mathbb{Z}_2 .

When $\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $p \in P_N$, we let ∂p denote the four edges in the oriented boundary of p and define

$$(d\sigma)_p := \sum_{e \in \partial p} \sigma_e.$$

Elements $\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ are referred to as *gauge field configurations*.

The Wilson action functional for pure gauge theory is defined by (see, e.g., [21])

$$S(\sigma) := - \sum_{p \in P_N} \rho((d\sigma)_p), \quad \sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

The Ising lattice gauge theory probability measure on gauge field configurations is defined by

$$\mu_{\beta, N}(\sigma) := Z_{\beta, N}^{-1} e^{-\beta S(\sigma)}, \quad \sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

Here for $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$Z_{\beta, N} = \sum_{\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, \mathbb{Z}_2)} e^{-\beta S(\sigma)}$$

is the partition function and while we only consider the probability measure for positive β , the partition function is defined for $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ when $N < \infty$. For $\beta \geq 0$, the corresponding expectation is written $\mathbb{E}_{\beta, N}[\cdot]$. Let γ be a nearest neighbor loop on \mathbb{Z}^m contained in B_N . Given $\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, the Wilson loop observable for Ising lattice gauge theory is defined by

$$W_\gamma = \rho(\sigma(\gamma)) = \prod_{e \in \gamma} \rho(\sigma(e)) = e^{\pi i \sum_{e \in \gamma} \sigma(e)}.$$

For $\beta \geq 0$, let $\langle W_\gamma \rangle_\beta$ denote the infinite volume limit

$$\langle W_\gamma \rangle_\beta := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\beta, N}[W_\gamma].$$

See, e.g., [9] for a proof of the existence of this limit.

1.2 Main results

Our first result concerns the free energy for free boundary conditions. Define for $m \geq 3$

$$\beta_0 = \beta_0(m) := 2^{-1} \log 30(m-1) + (8(m-1))^{-1} \log 2 \quad (1.1)$$

and let $|P_N^+|$ be the number of positively oriented plaquettes in the restriction of \mathbb{Z}^m to the set $[-N, N]^m$. Note that $|P_N^+| \sim \binom{m}{2} (2N)^m$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1.1 (Free energy). *Suppose $m \geq 3$ and $\operatorname{Re} \beta > \beta_0(m)$. Then*

$$F(\beta) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|P_N^+|} \log Z_{\beta, N},$$

defines an analytic function and

$$F(\beta) = \frac{2}{m-1} e^{-8(m-1)\beta} + \frac{12(m-1)-8}{2(m-1)-1} e^{-4(4(m-1)-2)\beta} + O(e^{-16(m-1)\operatorname{Re} \beta}).$$

We next consider Wilson loop expectations. Given a loop γ let $\ell := |\operatorname{supp} \gamma|$ be its length, i.e., the number of edges of γ . Further, let $\ell_c = \ell_c(\gamma)$ denote the number of pairs of non-parallel edges that are both in the boundary of some common plaquette (corners), and let $\ell_b = \ell_b(\gamma)$ denote the number of pairs (e, e') of parallel edges that are both in the boundary of some common plaquette (bottlenecks). Set

$$v_\beta := 2e^{-8(m-1)\beta} + 12(m-1)e^{-4(4(m-1)-2)\beta}.$$

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose $m \geq 3$ and $\beta > \beta_0(m)$. There exists $C < \infty$ depending only on m such that for any loop γ with length ℓ , ℓ_c corner edges, and ℓ_b bottleneck edges,*

$$\left| -\frac{1}{\ell} \log \langle W_\gamma \rangle_\beta - \left(v_\beta - 4 \frac{\ell_c + \ell_b}{\ell} e^{-4(4(m-1)-2)\beta} \right) \right| \leq C e^{-16(m-1)\beta}. \quad (1.2)$$

Notice how the lattice scale geometry of the loop enters into the estimate (1.2). Given a continuum loop, we see that the expansion is sensitive to the way the loop is embedded and discretized. For instance, the term $(\ell_c + \ell_b)/\ell$ is very different for an axis-parallel square compared to the natural discretization of the same square rotated by 45° .

Remark 1.3. Using the methods of the proof of Theorem 1.2, it is, in principle, straightforward to obtain estimates with higher precision in terms of the expansion in powers of $e^{-\beta}$. If higher order terms are included in (1.2), the constants of the corresponding polynomial in $e^{-\beta}$ will further depend on the lattice scale geometry of the loop.

Our next result concerns the static quark potential $V_\beta(R)$.

Theorem 1.4 (Quark potential and perimeter law). *Suppose $m \geq 3$ and $\beta > \beta_0(m)$, let $R \geq 2$ be an integer and for $T = 1, 2, \dots$ let $\gamma_{R,T}$ be a rectangular loop with side lengths R and T and axis-parallel sides. Then, if*

$$V_\beta(R) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{T} \log \langle W_{\gamma_{R,T}} \rangle_\beta,$$

it holds that

$$V_\beta(R) = 4e^{-8(m-1)\beta} + 24(m-1)e^{-4(4(m-1)-2)\beta} + O_R(1)e^{-16(m-1)\beta}. \quad (1.3)$$

By the theorem, $V_\beta(R)$ exists for all sufficiently large β and is bounded as $R \rightarrow \infty$. In this sense we obtain a proof of a strong form of the perimeter law.

Remark 1.5. It would be interesting to estimate the rate of convergence in T to $V_\beta(R)$ in Theorem 1.4.

Remark 1.6. We use the cluster expansion to prove Theorem 1.4, including the existence part. Alternatively, one could prove the existence of $V_\beta(R)$ using Griffith's second inequality to deduce subadditivity and then appeal to Fekete's lemma. However, this method would give no quantitative information as in (1.3). Moreover, it cannot be used to obtain Proposition 8.1, which shows the existence of the limit in some generality and is needed for Theorem 1.7 below.

Our next result is a version of Theorem 1.4 in the setting where the two sides of the loop grow uniformly.

Theorem 1.7. *Suppose $m \geq 3$ and $\beta > \beta_0(m)$, let $r, t \geq 1$ be integers and for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ let γ_n be an axis-parallel rectangular loop with side lengths $R_n = rn$ and $T_n = tn$. Then*

$$V_\beta := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{R_n + T_n} \log \langle W_{\gamma_n} \rangle_\beta,$$

is independent of r and t and it holds that

$$V_\beta = 4e^{-8(m-1)\beta} + 24(m-1)e^{-4(4(m-1)-2)\beta} + O(e^{-16(m-1)\beta}).$$

Note that $V_\beta = 2v_\beta + O(e^{-16(m-1)\beta})$. We have chosen to state Theorem 1.7 for a rectangle but with small modifications the proof is also valid for any fixed loop for which the proportion of corners and bottlenecks in the scaled loop tend to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and the corresponding V_β is the same.

Remark 1.8. It would be interesting to relate the confinement phase transition to analyticity properties of the functions $\beta \mapsto F(\beta)$ and $\beta \mapsto V_\beta$.

1.3 Related work and further comments

We refer to [4] for a thorough discussion of classical works on area-/perimeter law estimates in various settings, including [12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19]. Among more recent results, we mention [13], which considers the 4-dimensional $U(1)$ theory with Villain action. In the perimeter law regime, for sufficiently regular loops, it was shown that

$$\frac{C_0}{2\beta}(1 + C\beta e^{-2\pi^2\beta})(1 + o(1)) \leq -\frac{1}{|\gamma|} \log |\mathbb{E}_\beta^{Vil}[W_\gamma]| \leq \frac{C_0}{2\beta}(1 + \epsilon(\beta))(1 + o(1)),$$

where the upper bound was due to Fröhlich and Spencer [12]. Here C_0 is a constant related to the discrete Gaussian free field. The infinite volume free energy for this model was also considered in [13], and an upper bound was obtained for the “internal energy”, i.e., its derivative with respect to β .

In [5], Chatterjee studied 4-dimensional Ising lattice gauge theory. Using a resampling argument, it was proved that

$$\langle W_\gamma \rangle_\beta \leq e^{-\frac{1-\ell_c/\ell}{1+e^{-4(m-1)\beta}} 2\ell e^{-4(m-1)\beta}}. \quad (1.4)$$

(We caution that 2β in the present paper is equal to the parameter β used in [5].) This estimate is valid for all $\beta > 0$. Using (1.4), the inequalities

$$\left| \langle W_\gamma \rangle_\beta - e^{-2\ell e^{-8(m-1)\beta}} \right| \leq C e^{\frac{-2}{1+e^{-16(m-1)\beta}}} \ell e^{-8(m-1)\beta} (e^{-8\beta} + \sqrt{\ell_c/\ell}) \quad (1.5)$$

and

$$|\langle W_\gamma \rangle_\beta - e^{-2\ell e^{-8(m-1)\beta}}| \leq C_1 (e^{-8\beta} + \sqrt{\ell_c/\ell})^{C_2}$$

were obtained. The ideas introduced in [5] spurred several recent works and analogous estimates have now been given in more general settings, including for arbitrary finite structure groups and for corresponding lattice Higgs models, see [1, 3, 8, 9, 10]. The methods used in these papers produce error terms that will generally be larger than the estimate for $\langle W_\gamma \rangle$ if one does not have a relation of the type $\ell e^{-8(m-1)\beta} \ll \infty$. That is, one needs the size of the loop to tend to infinity at a rate tuned to $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. (Of course, one sees different exponents for different choices of structure group G ; this case corresponds to Ising lattice gauge theory.) As a consequence, it is not clear (to us) how to use those methods to prove a perimeter law (lower bound) estimate at fixed β or, e.g., how to analyze limits such as the one defining the quark potential. Moreover, we do not know how they can easily be modified to obtain higher precision even if the loop grows with β at an appropriate rate.

Here we take a different route and carry out the analysis based on the cluster expansion of the partition function, which provides information on $\log \langle W_\gamma \rangle_\beta$. One still needs β to be sufficiently large, but it does not need to grow with ℓ for the error bounds to be small, and the drawbacks discussed above can be circumvented. The method yields, in principle, arbitrary precision for the logarithm of the Wilson loop expectation and also allows to quantify the behavior of $\langle W_\gamma \rangle$ when $\ell e^{-8(m-1)\beta} \ll \infty$. This partly resolves one of the open problems listed in [5]. However, here we do not estimate the convergence rate in the length of the loop. Further, we mention that our results do not directly imply the results of [5] but give alternative proofs of several of the key lemmas therein.

The use of the cluster expansions in the context of lattice gauge theories context is certainly not new, see in particular Seiler's monograph [19] (and the references therein) where, e.g., perimeter law estimates to first order for large β were obtained. However, besides basic facts about the cluster expansion as presented in the recent textbook of Friedly and Velenik [11] and some results from [8, 9], our discussion is self-contained, and we carry out all the needed estimates here.

We only consider $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ in this paper. We expect that one can extend the results to any finite group $G = \mathbb{Z}_k, k \geq 3$, without much additional effort, as well as to the corresponding lattice Higgs models. It also seems plausible that, with more work, any finite G can be analyzed similarly. The cluster expansion based on vortices uses crucially that gauge field configurations can be split into discrete components. Therefore we do not expect the methods in this paper to work in the general case of compact subgroups of $U(N)$.

1.4 Acknowledgements

M.P.F. acknowledges support from the Ruth and Nils-Erik Stenbäck Foundation. F.V. acknowledges support from the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation and the Swedish Research Council. We thank Juhan Aru for interesting discussions on the topics of this paper.

2 Preliminaries

Even though we later work with $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$, in this section we allow G to be a general finite abelian group since this entails no additional work.

2.1 Notation and standing assumptions

In the rest of this paper, we assume that $m \geq 3$ is given. We define the dimension dependent constant

$$M = M(m) := 10(m - 2).$$

To simplify notation, we let

$$\begin{cases} \beta_1 = \beta_1(m) := 2^{-1} \log M \\ \beta_2 = \beta_2(m) := 4^{-1} \log 3M^2 \\ \beta_3 = \beta_3(m) := 2^{-1} \log 3M \end{cases}$$

Recalling the definition of $\beta_0(m)$ from (1.1), we note that

$$\beta_0(m) = 2^{-1} \log 3M + (8(m - 1))^{-1} \log 2 > \beta_3(m) > \beta_2(m) > \beta_1(m).$$

2.2 Discrete exterior calculus

In order to keep the presentation short, and since these definitions have appeared in several recent papers, we will refer to [9] for details on some of the basic notions of discrete exterior calculus that is useful in the present context.

- We will work with the square lattice \mathbb{Z}^m , where we assume that the dimension $m \geq 3$ throughout. We write $B_N = [-N, N]^m \cap \mathbb{Z}^m$.
- We write $C_k(B_N)$ and $C_k(B_N)^+$ for the set of unoriented and positively oriented k -cells, respectively (see [9, Sect. 2.1.2]). Note that in the introduction, we used $V_N = C_0(B_N)$, $E_N = C_1(B_N)$, and $P_N = C_2(B_N)$. An oriented 2-cell is called a *plaquette*.
- Formal sums of positively oriented k -cells with integer coefficients are called k -chains, and the space of k -chains is denoted by $C_k(B_N, \mathbb{Z})$, (see [9, Sect. 2.1.2])
- Let $k \geq 2$ and $c = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{j_1}}|_a \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x^{j_k}}|_a \in C_k(B_N)$. The *boundary* of c is the $(k - 1)$ -chain $\partial c \in C_{k-1}(B_N, \mathbb{Z})$ defined as the formal sum of the $(k - 1)$ -cells in the (oriented) boundary of c . The definition is extended to k -chains by linearity. See [9, Sect. 2.1.4].
- If $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $c \in C_k(B_N)$ is an oriented k -cell, we define the *coboundary* $\hat{\partial} c \in C_{k+1}(B_N)$ of c as the $(k + 1)$ -chain $\hat{\partial} c := \sum_{c' \in C_{k+1}(B_N)} (\partial c'[c]) c'$. See [9, Sect. 2.1.5].

- We let $\Omega^k(B_N, G)$ denote the set of G -valued (discrete differential) k -forms (see [9, Sect 2.3.1]); the exterior derivative $d : \Omega^k(B_N, G) \rightarrow \Omega^{k+1}(B_N, G)$ is defined for $0 \leq k \leq m-1$ (see [9, Sect. 2.3.2]) and $\Omega_0^k(B_N, G)$ denotes the set of closed k -forms, i.e., $\omega \in \Omega^k(B_N, G)$ such that $d\omega = 0$.
- We write $\text{supp}\omega = \{c \in C_k(B_N) : \omega(c) \neq 0\}$ for the support of a k -form ω . Similarly, we write $(\text{supp}\omega)^+ = \{c \in C_k(B_N)^+ : \omega(c) \neq 0\}$.
- A 1-chain $\gamma \in C_1(B_N, \mathbb{Z})$ with finite support $\text{supp}\gamma$ is called a *loop* if for all $e \in \Omega^1(B_N)$, we have that $\gamma[e] \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, and $\partial\gamma = 0$. We write $|\gamma| = |\text{supp}\gamma|$. (In [9] this object was called a generalized loop.)
- Let $\gamma \in C_1(B_N, \mathbb{Z})$ be a loop. A 2-chain $q \in C_2(B_N, \mathbb{Z})$ is an *oriented surface* with *boundary* γ if $\partial q = \gamma$.

2.3 A useful graph

Let \mathcal{G}_2 be the graph with vertex set $C_2(B_N)^+$ and an edge between two distinct vertices $p_1, p_2 \in C_2(B_N)^+$ if and only if $\text{supp}\hat{\partial}p_1 \cap \text{supp}\hat{\partial}p_2 \neq \emptyset$. Since any plaquette $p \in C_2(B_N)^+$ in B_N is in the boundary of at most $2(m-2)$ 3-cells, and any such 3-cell has exactly five plaquettes in its boundary that are not equal to p , it follows that there are at most $5 \cdot 2(m-2) = 10(m-2) = M$ plaquettes $p' \in C_2(B_N)^+ \setminus \{p\}$ with $\text{supp}\hat{\partial}p \cap \text{supp}\hat{\partial}p' \neq \emptyset$. Therefore it follows that each vertex in \mathcal{G}_2 has degree at most M .

2.4 Vortices

Definition 2.1 (Vortex). A closed 2-form $\nu \in \Omega_0^2(B_N, G)$ is said to be a *vortex* if $(\text{supp}\nu)^+$ induces a connected subgraph of \mathcal{G}_2 .

The set of all vortices in $\Omega^2(B_N, G)$ is denoted by Λ . We note that the definition of vortex we use here is not exactly the same as the definition used in [7, 8, 9, 10], but agrees with the definition used in [3, 5].

When $\omega, \nu \in \Omega^2(B_N, G)$, we say that ν is a vortex in ω if $\text{supp}\nu$ is a vortex that corresponds to a connected subgraph of the subgraph of \mathcal{G}_2 induced by $\text{supp}\omega$. We say that ν is a vortex in $\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, G)$ if ν is a vortex in $d\sigma \in \Omega_0^2(B_N, G)$.

Lemma 2.2 (Lemma 2.4 of [7]). *Let $\omega \in \Omega_0^2(B_N, G)$. If $\omega \neq 0$ and the support of ω does not contain any boundary plaquettes of B_N , then either $|(\text{supp}\omega)^+| = 2(m-1)$, or $|(\text{supp}\omega)^+| \geq 4(m-1) - 2$.*

In [7], we proved Lemma 2.2 only in the case $m = 4$, but since the proof for general $m \geq 2$ is analogous we do not include it here.

In Figure 1, we illustrate the only two possibilities for $(\text{supp}\omega)^+$ if $|(\text{supp}\omega)^+| = 4(m-1) - 1$ when $m = 4$. For general $m \geq 2$, the situation is analogous.







	$(\text{supp } \sigma)^+$	$(\text{supp } d\sigma)^+$	$ (\text{supp } \omega)^+ $
(a)			$2(m-1)$
(b)			$4(m-1)-2$
(c)			$4(m-1)-2$

Figure 1: The above table shows projections of the supports of the non-trivial and irreducible plaquette configurations in \mathbb{Z}^4 which has the smallest support (up to translations and rotations).

Lemma 2.3 (Lemma 4.6 in [9]). *Let $\omega \in \Omega_0^2(B_N, G)$. If the support of ω does not contain any boundary plaquettes of B_N and $|(\text{supp } \omega)^+| = 2(m-1)$, then there is an edge $e \in C_1(B_N)$ and $g \in G \setminus \{0\}$ such that*

$$\omega = d(g e). \quad (2.1)$$

If $\omega \in \Omega^2(B_N, G)$ is such that (2.1) holds for some $e \in C_1(B_N)$ and $g \in G \setminus \{0\}$, then we say that ω is a *minimal vortex around e* .

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\omega \in \Omega_0^2(B_N, G)$. If the support of ω does not contain any boundary plaquettes of B_N and $|(\text{supp } \omega)^+| = 4(m-1)-2$, then there are two distinct edges $e, e' \in C_1(B_N)$ with $(\hat{\partial}e)^+ \cap (\hat{\partial}e')^+ \neq \emptyset$ and $\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, G)$ with $(\text{supp } \sigma)^+ = \{e, e'\}$ such that $d\sigma = \omega$.*

Lemma 2.5. *Let q be an oriented surface with $\partial q = \gamma$. Further, let $\omega \in \Omega^2(B_N, G)$ be such that $d\omega = 0$ and $\omega(q) \neq 0$. Then any box which contains $\text{supp } \omega$ must intersect an edge in $\text{supp } \gamma$.*

Proof. Let B be a box that contains $\text{supp } \omega$. Since $d\omega = 0$, by the Poincaré lemma (see e.g. [9, Lemma 2.2] there is $\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, G)$ whose support is contained in B such that $d\sigma = \omega$. Moreover, we have $\omega(q) = \sigma(\gamma)$ (see e.g. [9, Section 2.4]. Consequently, if B does not intersect $\text{supp } \gamma$, then $\omega(q) = \sigma(\gamma) = 0$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\nu \in \Omega^2(B_N, G)$ satisfy $d\nu = 0$, let B be a box that contains the support of ν and let $p \in \text{supp } \nu$. Then there is at least one 1-cell in $\text{supp } \hat{\partial}p$ that is not in the boundary of B .*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that all edges in $\text{supp } \partial p$ are in the boundary of B . Then there is a 3-cell $c \in \hat{\partial} p$ that is not contained in B . Since B is a box, p must be the only plaquette in $\text{supp } \partial c$ that is in B . Since the support of ν is contained in B , it follows that

$$d\nu(c) = \sum_{p' \in \partial c} \nu(p') = \nu(p) \neq 0.$$

Since this contradicts the assumption that $d\nu = 0$, the desired conclusion follows. \square

The following lemma is elementary.

Lemma 2.7. *There is a constant C_m that does not depend on $j \geq 0$ such that*

$$|\{p \in C_2(B_N)^+ : \text{dist}(p, \gamma) = j\}| \leq C_m |\text{supp } \gamma| \max(1, j)^{m-1}.$$

Lemma 2.8. *Let $j \geq 1$, let $p \in C_0(B_N)$ and let B be a box with side lengths s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m that contains p and is such that every face of the box contains at least one point on distance at least j from p . Then $\sum_{i=1}^m s_i \geq jm/(m-1)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that the box B has corners at $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$ and (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m) , that $p = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$, and that $0 \leq x_i \leq s_i/2$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Then the assumption on B is equivalent to that

$$x_i + \sum_{k \neq i} (s_k - x_k) \geq j$$

for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Summing over i , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(x_i + \sum_{k \neq i} (s_k - x_k) \right) &\geq mj \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^m x_i + (m-1) \sum_{i=1}^m s_i - (m-1) \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \geq mj \\ &\Leftrightarrow (m-1) \sum_{i=1}^m s_i \geq mj + (m-2) \sum_{i=1}^m x_i. \end{aligned}$$

From this the desired conclusion immediately follows. \square

Lemma 2.9. *Let q be an oriented surface with $\partial q = \gamma$. Further, let $j \geq 1$, and let $\nu \in \Lambda$ be a vortex such that $\nu(q) = 1$ and $\text{dist}(\text{supp } \nu, \gamma) = j$. Then there is a constant $\hat{C}_m > 0$ such that $|\text{supp } \nu^+| \geq \hat{C}_m(j+1)$.*

Proof. Let B be the (unique) smallest box that contains the support of ν , and assume that the side lengths of B are s_1, \dots, s_m . Since $\nu(q) = 1$, it follows from Lemma 2.5 that B intersects an edge of $\text{supp } \gamma$. Consequently, there is some edge in γ whose both endpoints are contained in B . Fix one such edge e . Note that, by assumption, we have $\text{dist}(\text{supp } \nu, e) \geq j$. Since B is a minimal box containing $\text{supp } \nu$, there must be one edge on each face of the box which is contained in the boundary of some plaquette in $\text{supp } \nu$. At the same time, by Lemma 2.6, since $d\nu = 0$, no plaquette in $\text{supp } \nu$ can be in the boundary of B . This implies in particular that each plaquette in $p \in (\text{supp } \nu)^+$ must have

an edge in its boundary that is not in the boundary of B . Since for each such plaquette we must have $\text{dist}(p, e) \geq j$, it follows from Lemma 2.8 that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (s_i - 2) \geq \frac{(j+1)m}{m-1} \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^m s_i \geq \frac{(j+1)m}{m-1} + 2m.$$

Since $\omega \in \Lambda$, the set $(\text{supp } \omega)^+$ induces a connected subgraph of G_2 . Since each face of B contains at least one edge that is in the boundary of some plaquette in $(\text{supp } \omega)^+$, the desired conclusion immediately follows. \square

2.5 Vortex clusters

Recall that Λ denotes the set of vortices in $\Omega_0^2(B_N, G)$. Consider a multiset

$$\mathcal{V} = \{ \underbrace{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_1}_{n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu_1) \text{ times}}, \underbrace{\nu_2, \dots, \nu_2}_{n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu_2) \text{ times}}, \dots, \underbrace{\nu_k, \dots, \nu_k}_{n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu_k) \text{ times}} \} = \{\nu_1^{n(\nu_1)}, \dots, \nu_k^{n(\nu_k)}\},$$

where $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k \in \Lambda$ are distinct and $n(\nu) = n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu)$ denotes the number of times ν occurs in \mathcal{V} . Following [11] Chapter 3, we say that \mathcal{V} is *decomposable* if there exist non-empty and disjoint multisets $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2 \subset \mathcal{V}$ such that $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ and such that for each pair $(\nu_1, \nu_2) \in \mathcal{V}_1 \times \mathcal{V}_2$, $p_1 \in \text{supp } \nu_1$ and $p_2 \in \text{supp } \nu_2$, we have $\text{supp } \hat{\partial} p_1 \cap \text{supp } \hat{\partial} p_2 = \emptyset$. If \mathcal{V} is not decomposable, it is by definition a *vortex cluster*. We stress that a vortex cluster is unordered and may contain several copies of the same vortex. Given a vortex cluster \mathcal{V} , let us define

$$|\mathcal{V}| = \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) |(\text{supp } \nu)^+|, \quad n(\mathcal{V}) = \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu), \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp } \mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}} \text{supp } \nu.$$

For a 2-chain $q \in C_2(B_N, \mathbb{Z})$, we define

$$\mathcal{V}(q) = \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) \nu(q).$$

We write Ξ be the set of all vortex clusters of Λ .

To simplify notation in the rest of this paper, for $p \in C_2(B_N)^+$, $q \in C^2(B_N, \mathbb{Z})$, $i \geq 1$, and $j \geq 1$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_i &:= \{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi : n(\mathcal{V}) = i\}, \\ \Xi_{i,j} &:= \{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi : n(\mathcal{V}) = i, |\mathcal{V}| = j\}, \\ \Xi_{i,j,p} &:= \{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi : n(\mathcal{V}) = i, |\mathcal{V}| = j, p \in \text{supp } \mathcal{V}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Xi_{i,j,q} := \{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi : n(\mathcal{V}) = i, |\mathcal{V}| = j, \mathcal{V}(q) \neq 0\}.$$

Further, we let

$$\Xi_{i+} := \{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi : n(\mathcal{V}) \geq i\},$$

and define $\Xi_{i+,j}$, $\Xi_{i+,j+}$, $\Xi_{i+,j+,}$ etc. analogously. We note that the sets defined above depend on N but usually suppress this in the notation. When we want to emphasize this we write $\Xi_i(B_N)$, $\Xi_{i,j}(B_N)$, etc.

2.6 The activity

For $\beta \geq 0$ and $g \in G$ with a unitary, one-dimensional representation ρ , we set

$$\phi_\beta(g) := e^{\beta \operatorname{Re}(\rho(g) - \rho(0))}.$$

Since ρ is unitary, for any $g \in G$ we have $\rho(g) = \overline{\rho(-g)}$, and hence $\operatorname{Re} \rho(g) = \operatorname{Re} \rho(-g)$. In particular, for any $g \in G$

$$\phi_\beta(g) = e^{\beta(\operatorname{Re} \rho(g) - \rho(0))} = e^{\beta(\operatorname{Re} \rho(-g) - \rho(0))} = \phi_\beta(-g). \quad (2.2)$$

For $\omega \in \Omega^2(B_N, G)$ and $\beta \geq 0$ we define the *activity* of ω by

$$\phi_\beta(\omega) := \prod_{p \in C_2(B_N)} \phi_a(\omega(p)).$$

Note that for $\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, G)$, the Wilson action lattice gauge theory probability measure can be written

$$\mu_{\beta, N}(\sigma) = \frac{\phi_\beta(d\sigma)}{\sum_{\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, G)} \phi_\beta(d\sigma)}. \quad (2.3)$$

Moreover, in the case when $G = \mathbb{Z}^2$ for $\omega \in \Omega^2(B_N, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, we have

$$\phi_\beta(\omega) = \prod_{p \in C_2(B_N)} \phi_\beta(\omega(p)) = \prod_{p \in C_2(B_N)} e^{-2\beta \mathbb{1}(\omega(p)=1)} = e^{-2\beta \sum_{p \in C_2(B_N)} \mathbb{1}(\omega(p)=1)} = e^{-2\beta |\operatorname{supp} \omega|}.$$

We note that, by definition, if $\omega, \nu \in \Omega^2(B_N, G)$ and ν is a vortex in ω , then $\phi_\beta(\omega) = \phi_\beta(\nu)\phi_\beta(\omega - \nu)$.

We extend the notion of activity to vortex clusters $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$ by letting

$$\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) = \prod_{\nu \in \Lambda} \phi_\beta(\nu)^{n_\nu(\mathcal{V})} = e^{-4\beta |\mathcal{V}|}.$$

3 Low temperature cluster expansion

In this section we review the cluster expansion for the relevant Ising gauge theory partition functions defined on a finite box B_N . The material here is for the most part well-known. See [11] for a text book presentation for the standard Ising model and [19] for a discussion in the context of lattice gauge theories.

3.1 Ursell functions

We will work with Ursell functions corresponding to the choice of vortices as polymers and hard core interaction: two vortices are compatible if and only if their supports are disjoint. If $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \Lambda$, we write $\nu_1 \sim \nu_2$ if there is $p_1 \in (\operatorname{supp} \nu_1)^+$ and $p_2 \in (\operatorname{supp} \nu_2)^+$ such that $p_1 \sim p_2$ in \mathcal{G}_2 .

For $n \geq 1$, we let \mathcal{K}_n denote the complete graph on n vertices, and write $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_n$ if \mathcal{G} is a connected subgraph of \mathcal{K}_n . Given $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$, set

$$N_2(\mathcal{V}) = |\{\mathcal{V}' \in \Xi_2 : \mathcal{V}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}\}|.$$

Definition 3.1 (Ursell function). We define $U: \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by for each $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$ setting $U(\mathcal{V}) := 1$ if $n(\mathcal{V}) = 1$ and if $n(\mathcal{V}) \geq 2$

$$U(\mathcal{V}) := \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{V}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}: \\ \mathcal{V}' \in \Xi}} (-1)^{N_2(\mathcal{V}')}.$$
(3.1)

Note that for any $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_2$, $N_2(\mathcal{V}) = 1$ and we have

$$U(\mathcal{V}) = -1.$$

Remark 3.2. The following gives an equivalent definition of the Ursell function:

$$U(\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k\}) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{K}_k, \mathcal{G} \text{ connected}} (-1)^{|E(\mathcal{G})|} \prod_{(i,j) \in E(\mathcal{G})} \mathbb{1}(\nu_i \sim \nu_j).$$

The sum is over connected subgraphs of \mathcal{K}_k and for each such subgraph \mathcal{G} , $E(\mathcal{G})$ denotes the set of edges of \mathcal{G} .

We have the following easy bound.

Lemma 3.3. *For any $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$, we have $|U(\mathcal{V})| \leq 2^{n(\mathcal{V})}$.*

Proof. Note that $|U(\mathcal{V})|$ is bounded above by the number of connected subgraphs of $\mathcal{K}_{n(\mathcal{V})}$. Since $\mathcal{K}_{n(\mathcal{V})}$ has exactly 2^n induced subgraphs, the desired conclusion immediately follows. \square

3.2 Partition functions

The partition function for Ising lattice gauge theory viewed as a model for plaquette configurations can be written as follows:

$$Z_{\beta,N} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_0^2(B_N, G)} e^{\beta \sum_{p \in C_2(B_N)} \text{Re}(\rho(\omega(p)) - \rho(0))} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_0^2(B_N, G)} \phi_\beta(\omega).$$

See, e.g., Section 3 of [9]. This is a finite sum and the definition extends to $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$. An alternative representation for $Z_{\beta,N}$ is given by the *vortex partition function* which is defined by the following (formal) expression:

$$Z_{\beta,N}^v = \exp \left(\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi} \Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) \right),$$
(3.2)

where for $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$, we define

$$\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) := U(\mathcal{V}) \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}),$$

and U is the Ursell function as in Definition 3.1. It is not obvious that the series in the exponent of 3.2 is convergent but this follows from the next lemma, assuming $\text{Re } \beta > \beta_2(d) := \frac{1}{4} \log 30(m-2)$, and we verify below that in this case $\log Z_{\beta,N} = \log Z_{\beta,N}^v$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$. Suppose $\operatorname{Re} \beta > \beta_2(m)$. Then the series in (3.2) is absolutely convergent.*

Proof. Let $\alpha = 1/3$. We will prove that for each $\nu \in \Lambda$ we have

$$\sum_{\nu' \in \Lambda} |\phi_\beta(\nu')| e^{\alpha |\operatorname{supp} \nu'|} \mathbb{1}(\nu \sim \nu') \leq \alpha |\operatorname{supp} \nu|.$$

Given this, the conclusion follows from Theorem 5.4 of [11] choosing the function $a(\nu) := \alpha |\operatorname{supp} \nu|$. Note that since $M^2 e^{-4 \operatorname{Re} \beta} < 1/3$, we have

$$M^2 e^{-2(2 \operatorname{Re} \beta - \alpha)} < 1$$

and

$$\frac{(M^2 e^{-2(2 \operatorname{Re} \beta - \alpha)})^{2(m-1)}}{1 - M^2 e^{-2(4 \operatorname{Re} \beta - \alpha)}} \leq \alpha.$$

Then, for any $\nu \in \Lambda$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu' \in \Lambda} |\phi_\beta(\nu')| e^{\alpha |\operatorname{supp} \nu'|} \mathbb{1}(\nu \sim \nu') &= \sum_{\nu' \in \Lambda: \nu \sim \nu'} |\phi_\beta(\nu')| e^{\alpha |\operatorname{supp} \nu'|} \\ &= \sum_{\nu' \in \Lambda: \nu \sim \nu'} e^{-(2 \operatorname{Re} \beta - \alpha) |\operatorname{supp} \nu'|} \leq \sum_{p \in (\operatorname{supp} \nu)^+} \sum_{\nu' \in \Lambda: p \sim \operatorname{supp} \nu'} e^{-(2 \operatorname{Re} \beta - \alpha) |\operatorname{supp} \nu'|}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the last term, fix $p \in (\operatorname{supp} \nu)^+$ and take any $\nu' \in \Lambda$ such that $p \sim \operatorname{supp} \nu'$. Recall the definition of \mathcal{G}_2 from Section 2.3. Let \mathcal{G} be the restriction of \mathcal{G}_2 to $\{p\} \cup (\operatorname{supp} \nu')^+$. Since $\nu' \in \Lambda$ and $p \sim \operatorname{supp} \nu$, the graph \mathcal{G} is a connected, and, by definition, \mathcal{G} has at most $|(\operatorname{supp} \nu')^+| + 1$ vertices. Consequently, \mathcal{G} has a spanning path of length at most $2|(\operatorname{supp} \nu')^+| = |\operatorname{supp} \nu'|$. Since each vertex in \mathcal{G}_2 has degree at most M , the same holds for \mathcal{G} , and hence the number of such spanning paths which contains a given plaquette p is at most $M^{|\operatorname{supp} \nu'|}$. Finally, note that by Lemma 2.3, we have $|(\operatorname{supp} \nu')^+| \geq 2(m-1)$. From this it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu' \in \Lambda: \nu \sim \nu'} e^{-(2 \operatorname{Re} \beta - \alpha) |\operatorname{supp} \nu'|} &= \sum_{\nu' \in \Lambda: \nu \sim \nu'} e^{-2(2 \operatorname{Re} \beta - \alpha) |(\operatorname{supp} \nu')^+|} \\ &\leq |(\operatorname{supp} \nu)^+| \sum_{j=2(m-1)}^{\infty} (M^2 e^{-2(2 \operatorname{Re} \beta - \alpha)})^j = |(\operatorname{supp} \nu)^+| \frac{(M^2 e^{-2(2 \operatorname{Re} \beta - \alpha)})^{2(m-1)}}{1 - M^2 e^{-2(2 \operatorname{Re} \beta - \alpha)}}. \end{aligned}$$

The desired conclusion now follows from the choice of α . \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$. Suppose $\operatorname{Re} \beta > \beta_2(m)$. Then*

$$\log Z_{\beta, N} = \log Z_{\beta, N}^v = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi} \Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) \quad (3.3)$$

and is an analytic function of β .

Proof. The set $\Omega_0^2(B_N, G)$ is in bijection with the set of subsets of Λ with the property that the vortices in each subset have pairwise disjoint supports (see, e.g., [9, Lemma 2.12]). Therefore, we can write

$$Z_{\beta, N} = \sum_{\Lambda' \subset \Lambda} \phi_\beta(\Lambda') \prod_{\{\nu, \nu'\} \subset \Lambda'} \mathbb{1}(\nu \not\sim \nu')$$

and this holds for any choice of β . On the other hand, if $\operatorname{Re} \beta > \beta_2(m)$, we can apply Proposition 5.3 of [11] to see that the right-hand side in the last display equals $\log Z_{\beta,N}^v$ as defined in (3.2). \square

We now assume β is real, and when $\beta > \beta_2$ we write $Z_{\beta,N}$ also for the vortex partition function. We wish to express the Wilson loop expectation using the logarithm of the partition function. For this, we fix a loop γ and an oriented surface q such that $\gamma = \partial q$ and recall the following fact, see [9, Section 3].

Lemma 3.6. *Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$. Let $\beta \geq 0$ and let q be an oriented surface with $\partial q = \gamma$. Then for all N such that $q \subset B_N$*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta,N}[W_\gamma] = Z_{\beta,N}^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_0^2(B_N, G)} \phi_\beta(\omega) \rho(\omega(q)).$$

Consider now the weighted vortex partition function

$$Z_{\beta,N}[q] = \exp \left(\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi} \Psi_{\beta,q}(\mathcal{V}) \right), \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\Psi_{\beta,q}(\mathcal{V}) := U(\mathcal{V}) \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) \rho(\mathcal{V}(q)).$$

The series on the right-hand side is absolutely convergent when $\beta > \beta_2(m)$ by the proof of Lemma 3.4 since $|\rho(\mathcal{V}(q))| = 1$ for each $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.5, using [11, Proposition 5.3], replacing the weight $\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})$ by $\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) \rho(\mathcal{V}(q))$, we have

$$\log Z_{\beta,N}[q] = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega_0^2(B_N, G)} \phi_\beta(\omega) \rho(\omega(q)).$$

Proposition 3.7. *Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$. Let $\beta > \beta_2(m)$ and let q be an oriented surface with $\partial q = \gamma$. Then for all N such that $\operatorname{supp} q \subset B_N$,*


$$-\log \mathbb{E}_{\beta,N}[W_\gamma] = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi} (\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta,q}(\mathcal{V})) = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi} U(\mathcal{V}) \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) (1 - \rho(\mathcal{V}(q))). \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. Using Lemma 3.6 and then Lemma 3.5 and (3.4) we conclude that


$$\log \mathbb{E}_{\beta,N}[W_\gamma] = \log \frac{Z_{\beta,N}[q]}{Z_{\beta,N}},$$

which is what we wanted to prove. \square


Remark 3.8. Notice that Proposition 3.7 implies that $\mathbb{E}_{\beta,N}[W_\gamma] \in (0, 1]$ when $\beta > \beta_2(m)$. This fact is not clear from the start since $W_\gamma \in \{-1, 1\}$ for every $\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. The positivity of $\mathbb{E}_{\beta,N}[W_\gamma]$ was pointed out in [5] and proved there as a consequence of duality. Here we obtain the conclusion as a result of convergence of the cluster expansion.




(A) A vortex cluster \mathcal{V} which consists of four minimal vortices $\nu^1, \nu^2, \nu^3 = \nu^4$ around the red edges.



(B) The graph \tilde{G} .



(C) The graph \tilde{T} .



(D) The graph \mathcal{G}_V .

Figure 2: In the above figure, we illustrate the graphs \tilde{G} , \tilde{T} , and \mathcal{G}_V for a vortex cluster \mathcal{V} (illustrated in Figure 2A).

4 The number of vortex clusters

This section contains the basic combinatorial estimates that are needed in order to control the cluster expansions later on.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $k \geq 1$ and let $p \in C_2(B_N)^+$. Then*

$$|\Xi_{1,k,p}| \leq M^{2k-1}.$$

Proof. Let $\{\nu\} \in \Xi_{1,k,p}$ and let \mathcal{P} be the set of all paths in \mathcal{G}_2 that starts at p and has length $2|(\text{supp } \nu)^+| - 1 = 2k - 1$. Since each vertex in \mathcal{G}_2 has degree at most $10(m-2) = M$, we have $|\mathcal{P}| \leq M^{2k-1}$.

For $\{\nu\} \in \Xi_{1,k,p}$, let G_ν be the subgraph of \mathcal{G}_2 induced by the set $(\text{supp } \nu)^+$. Then G_ν is connected, and hence G_ν has a spanning path $T_\nu \in \mathcal{P}$ of length $2|(\text{supp } \nu)^+| - 1$ which starts at p . Since the map $\nu \mapsto T_\nu$ is an injective map from $\Xi_{1,k,p}$ to \mathcal{P} and $|\mathcal{P}| \leq M^{2k-1}$, the desired conclusion immediately follows. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let $k' \geq 1$ and let $p_0 \in C_2(B_N)^+$. Then*

$$|\Xi_{1+,k',p_0}| \leq (3M)^{2k'-1}.$$

Proof. Fix $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k',p_0}$ and define $k := n(\mathcal{V})$. Let $\nu^1, \dots, \nu^k \in \mathcal{V}$ be a fixed enumeration of the vortices of \mathcal{V} (allowing repetition), that is, for each $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$, we have

$$|\{j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\} : \nu^j = \nu\}| = n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu).$$

Consider the graph \tilde{G} with vertex set $\{1, 2, \dots, n(\mathcal{V})\}$ and an edge between distinct vertices i and j if $\nu^i \sim \nu^j$ (see Figure 2B). Since $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$, the graph \tilde{G} is connected, and hence it has a spanning tree. Let \tilde{T} be the restriction of \tilde{G} to this spanning tree (see

Figure 2C). For each edge (j, j') in \tilde{T} , fix $p_{j,j'} \in (\text{supp } \nu^j)^+$ and $p_{j',j} \in (\text{supp } \nu^{j'})^+$ with $p_{j,j'} \sim p_{j',j}$.

Next, consider the graph $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{V}$ (see Figure 2D) with vertex set (p, j) , where $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n(\mathcal{V})\}$ and $p \in (\text{supp } \nu^j)^+$, and an edge between two distinct vertices (p, j) and (p', j') if $p \sim p'$ in \mathcal{G}_2 , and either

- $j = j'$, or
- $j \sim j'$ in \tilde{T} , and $\{p, p'\} = \{p_{j,j'}, p_{j',j}\}$.

Then, by definition, the graph $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{V}$ is connected, and for each $j' \in \{1, 2, \dots, n(\mathcal{V})\}$, the restriction of $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{V}$ to the vertices (p, j) with $j = j'$ is also connected. As a consequence, $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{V}$ has a spanning path $P_\mathcal{V}$ of length $2k' - 1$ which is such that each edge $((p, j), (p', j'))$ with $j \neq j'$ is traversed at most twice. Without loss of generality, we can assume that the labelling $\nu^1, \nu^2, \dots, \nu^k$ is such that the index of each ν^j reflects the order in which it appears in this path, and that the path starts in $(p_0, 1)$. Note that the mapping $\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_\mathcal{V}$ is injective.

Let \mathcal{G} be the graph with vertex set $C_2(B_N)^+ \times \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and an edge between two distinct vertices (p, j) and (p', j') if and only if $p \sim p'$ in \mathcal{G}_2 . Note that $\mathcal{G}_\mathcal{V}$ is a subgraph of \mathcal{G} , and hence $P_\mathcal{V}$ is a path in \mathcal{G} . We will obtain an upper bound on $|\Xi_{1^+, k', p_0}|$ by giving an upper bound on the size of a set \mathcal{P} that contains all paths that are equal to $P_\mathcal{V}$ for some $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, k', p_0}$. To this end, let \mathcal{P} be the set of all paths in \mathcal{G} that starts at $(p_0, 1)$, has length $2k' - 1$, and that is such that the edges of the path satisfy the following. If the (directed) edge $((p, j), (p, j'))$ is in the path, then

- if $j' > j$, then j' is the smallest integer greater than j that has not been visited before, and
- if $j' < j$, then the edge $((p, j'), (p, j))$ has already been used in the path.

Then $P_\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{P}$. Since each vertex in \mathcal{G}_2 has degree at most M , it follows that $|\mathcal{P}| \leq (3M)^{2k'-1}$. Since the mapping from $\Xi_{1^+, k', p_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ given by $\mathcal{V} \mapsto P_\mathcal{V}$ is injective, this shows that

$$|\Xi_{1^+, k', p_0}| \leq |\mathcal{P}| \leq (3M)^{2k'-1}$$

as desired. \square

5 Estimates for the cluster expansion

Throughout this section, we assume that γ is a simple loop, and that q is an oriented surface with $\partial q = \gamma$. Recall that we use the notation $\ell = |\gamma|$. Recall also that ℓ_c denotes the number of corners of γ , i.e., pairs of non-parallel edges in γ that are both in the boundary of some common plaquette, similarly recall that ℓ_b denotes the number of bottlenecks in γ , i.e., pairs (e, e') of parallel edges in γ that are both in the boundary of some common plaquette. We assume $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ from now on.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\beta > \beta_3(m)$. Then*

$$0 \leq \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_1} (\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta,q}(\mathcal{V})) - \ell H(\gamma) \leq D_1 \ell e^{-16(m-1)\beta},$$

where

$$H(\gamma) = e^{-8(m-1)\beta} + \left(6(m-1) - \frac{2\ell_c - 2\ell_b}{\ell}\right) e^{-4(4(m-1)-2)\beta}$$

and $D_1 = O_\beta(1)$ and given explicitly below in (5.6).

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\beta > \beta_3(m)$. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{2+}} \left| \Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta,q}(\mathcal{V}) \right| \leq D_2 \ell e^{-16\beta(m-1)}.$$

where $D_2 = O_\beta(1)$ and given explicitly below in (5.9).

Proposition 5.3. *Let $\beta > \beta_3(m)$, let $k \geq 1$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k+}} \left| \Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta,q}(\mathcal{V}) \right| \\ & \leq 4D_3 \ell \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^i \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \max(1, j)^{m-1} (3Me^{-2\beta})^{2\max(k, 2(m-1)k + \hat{C}_m(j+1))}. \end{aligned}$$

where $D_3 = O_\beta(1)$ and given explicitly below in (5.1).

Before giving the proofs of Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2, we need several auxiliary results.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\beta > \beta_1(m)$, let $p \in C_2(B_N)^+$, and let $k \geq 1$. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1,k+,p}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| \leq \frac{M^{2k-1} e^{-4\beta k}}{1 - M^2 e^{-4\beta}}.$$

Proof. Fix any $j \geq k$. Note that for all $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1,j,p}$, we have $|\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| = e^{-4\beta|\mathcal{V}|} = e^{-4\beta j}$. Using Lemma 4.1, we thus obtain

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1,k+,p}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| = \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1,j,p}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| = \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} |\Xi_{1,j,p}| e^{-4\beta j} \leq \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} M^{2j-1} e^{-4\beta j}.$$

Since $Me^{-2\beta} < 1$, the desired conclusion immediately follows. \square

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\beta > \beta_3(m)$, let $p \in C_2(B_N)^+$, and let $k' \geq 1$. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k'+,p}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| \leq \frac{(3M)^{2k'-1} e^{-4\beta k'}}{1 - 9M^2 e^{-4\beta}}.$$

Proof. Fix any $j \geq k'$. Note that for all $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,j,p}$, we have

$$|\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| = e^{-4\beta|\mathcal{V}|} = e^{-4\beta j}.$$

Using Lemma 4.2, we thus obtain

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k'+,p}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| = \sum_{j=k'}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,j,p}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| = \sum_{j=k'}^{\infty} |\Xi_{1+,j,p}| e^{-4\beta j} \leq \sum_{j=k'}^{\infty} (3M)^{2j-1} e^{-4\beta j}.$$

Since $3Me^{-2\beta} < 1$, the desired conclusion follows by evaluating the above geometric sum. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\beta \geq 0$. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1,2(m-1),q}} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) = \ell e^{-8(m-1)\beta}.$$

Proof. Let $\{\nu\} \in \Xi_{1,2(m-1)}$. Then $\phi_\beta(\nu) = e^{-8(m-1)\beta}$. By Lemma 2.3, we have $\nu(q) \neq 1$ if and only if ν is a minimal vortex around some edge $e \in \gamma$. Combining these observations, the conclusion immediately follows. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\beta \geq 0$. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1,2(m-1)-2,q}} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) = (6(m-1)\ell - 2\ell_c - 2\ell_b) e^{-4(4(m-1)-2)\beta}.$$

Proof. Let $\nu \in \Lambda$ be such that $|(\text{supp } \nu)^+| = 4(m-1) - 2$. Then $\phi_\beta(\nu) = e^{-4(4(m-1)-2)\beta}$. By Lemma 2.4, there is $\sigma \in \Omega^1(B_N, G)$ such that $d\sigma = \nu$ and $(\text{supp } \sigma)^+ = \{e_1, e_2\}$, where e_1 and e_2 are distinct edges and $(\hat{\partial}e_1)^+ \cap (\hat{\partial}e_2)^+ \neq \emptyset$. Since

$$\nu(q) = \sigma(\gamma) = \sum_{e \in \gamma} \sigma(e),$$

and $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$, it follows that

$$\nu(q) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\text{supp } \gamma \cap \{e_1, e_2\}| = 1 \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

From this it follows that $\nu(q) \neq 1$ if and only if one of the following hold.

- (i) The edges e_1 and e_2 are parallel (see Figure 1(b)), and exactly one of e_1 and e_2 are in $\text{supp } \partial q = \text{supp } \gamma$.
- (ii) The edges e_1 and e_2 are not parallel (see Figure 1(c)), and exactly one of e_1 and e_2 are in $\text{supp } \partial q = \text{supp } \gamma$.

Noting that there is exactly $2(m-1)\ell - 2\ell_b$ distinct $\nu \in \Lambda$ with $|(\text{supp } \nu)^+| = 4(m-1) - 2$ such that (i) holds, and exactly $4(m-1)\ell - 2\ell_c$ distinct $\nu \in \Lambda$ with $|(\text{supp } \nu)^+| = 4(m-1) - 2$ such that (ii) holds, the conclusion immediately follows. \square

Lemma 5.8. *Let $\beta > \beta_3(m)$, and let $k, k' \geq 1$. Then*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k, k'+, q}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| \leq D_3 \ell \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \max(1, j)^{m-1} (3M e^{-2\beta})^{r_m(j, k, k')},$$

where

$$r_m(j, k, k') := \max(k', 2(m-1)k, 2(m-1)(k-1) + \hat{C}_m(j+1)),$$

$$D_3 := \frac{4C_m(m-1)}{3M(1-9M^2e^{-4\beta})}, \quad (5.1)$$

and C_m was defined in Lemma 2.7 and \hat{C}_m was defined in Lemma 2.9.

Proof. Note first that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k, k'+, q}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k, k'+, q} \\ \text{dist}(\text{supp } \mathcal{V}, \gamma) = j}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})|. \quad (5.2)$$

If $\nu \in \Lambda$, then, by Lemma 2.2, we have $|(\text{supp } \nu)^+| \geq 2(m-1)$, and hence if $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$, then $|(\text{supp } \nu)^+| \geq 2(m-1)$ for each $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$. At the same time, by Lemma 2.9, if $\nu \in \Lambda$ is such that $\text{dist}(\text{supp } \nu, \gamma) = j$ then $|(\text{supp } \nu)^+| \geq \hat{C}_m(j+1)$. From this it follows that $|\mathcal{V}| \geq \max(2(m-1)k, 2(m-1)(k-1) + \hat{C}_m(j+1))$. Consequently,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k, k'+, q} \\ \text{dist}(\text{supp } \mathcal{V}, \gamma) = j}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{p \in C_2(B_N)^+ : \\ \text{dist}(p, \gamma) = j}} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k, r(j)^+, p}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})|. \quad (5.3)$$

For each $j \geq 0$, by using Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 5.5, we find that

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in C_2(B_N)^+ : \\ \text{dist}(p, \gamma) = j}} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k, r(j)^+, p}} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| \leq C_m \ell \max(1, j)^{m-1} \cdot \frac{(3M)^{2r_m(j, k, k')-1} e^{-4\beta r_m(j, k, k')}}{1 - 9M^2 e^{-4\beta}}.$$

Summing over all $j \geq 0$, and combining the resulting inequality with (5.2) and (5.3), we obtain the desired conclusion. \square

Remark 5.9. Note that Lemmas 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 5.8 remain valid for complex β , assuming $\text{Re } \beta > \beta_3(m)$. Indeed, the proofs work verbatim replacing β by $\text{Re } \beta$.

We are now ready to give the proof of Proposition 5.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Note first that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_1} (\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta, q}(\mathcal{V})) = \sum_{\{\nu\} \in \Xi_1} U(\{\nu\}) \phi_\beta(\nu) (1 - \rho(\nu(q))) = 2 \sum_{\{\nu\} \in \Xi_1 : \nu(q)=1} \phi_\beta(\nu). \quad (5.4)$$

Using Lemma 2.2, we get

$$\sum_{\{\nu\} \in \Xi_1 : \nu(q)=1} \phi_\beta(\nu) = \sum_{\{\nu\} \in \Xi_{1, 2(m-1), q}} \phi_\beta(\nu) + \sum_{\{\nu\} \in \Xi_{1, 4(m-1)-2, q}} \phi_\beta(\nu) + \sum_{\{\nu\} \in \Xi_{1, 4(m-1)+, q}} \phi_\beta(\nu). \quad (5.5)$$

Applying Lemma 5.8 with $k = 1$ and $k' = 4(m-1)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k,k'+,q}} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) &\leq D_3 \ell \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \max(1, j)^{m-1} (3Me^{-2\beta})^{2 \max(4(m-1), \hat{C}_m(j+1))} \\ &= D_1 \ell e^{-16(m-1)\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$D_1 := D_3 e^{16(m-1)\beta} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \max(1, j)^{m-1} (3Me^{-2\beta})^{2 \max(4(m-1), \hat{C}_m(j+1))} \quad (5.6)$$

and we see that $D_1 = O_\beta(1)$. At the same time, by combining Lemma 5.6 and Lemma 5.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\{\nu\} \in \Xi_{1,2(m-1),q}} \phi_\beta(\nu) + \sum_{\{\nu\} \in \Xi_{1,4(m-1)-2,q}} \phi_\beta(\nu) \\ = \ell e^{-8(m-1)\beta} + (6(m-1)\ell - 2\ell_c - 2\ell_b) e^{-4(4(m-1)-2)\beta} = \ell H(\gamma). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Combining (5.4), (5.5), and (5.7), we obtain the desired conclusion. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Note first that given $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$, we have $\rho(\mathcal{V}(q)) \neq 1$ if and only if $\rho(\mathcal{V}(q)) = -1$ and hence $\mathcal{V}(q) \neq 0$. This implies in particular that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{2+}} \Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta,q}(\mathcal{V}) = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{2+}} U(\mathcal{V}) \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) (1 - \rho(\mathcal{V}(q))) = 2 \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{2+,1+,q}} U(\mathcal{V}) \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}).$$

Consequently, using Lemma 3.3 and the definition of U , we find that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{2+}} |\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta,q}(\mathcal{V})| \leq \sum_{k \geq 2} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k,1+,q}} |U(\mathcal{V})| \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) \cdot 2 \leq 2 \sum_{k \geq 2} 2^k \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k,1+,q}} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}). \quad (5.8)$$

Since by Lemma 5.8, for any $k \geq 2$, we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k,1+,q}} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) \leq D_3 \ell \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \max(1, j)^{m-1} (3Me^{-2\beta})^{2 \max(2(m-1)k, 2(m-1)(k-1) + \hat{C}_m(j+1))}.$$

If we let

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 &:= 2D_3 e^{16(m-1)\beta} \\ &\sum_{k \geq 2} 2^k \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \max(1, j)^{m-1} (3Me^{-2\beta})^{2 \max(2(m-1)k, 2(m-1)(k-1) + \hat{C}_m(j+1))} \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

then $D_2 = O_\beta(1)$, and we are done. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.3. By Lemma 2.2, without loss of generality, we can assume that $k \geq 2(m-1)$.

Given $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$, if $\rho(\mathcal{V}(q)) \neq 1$ then $\rho(\mathcal{V}(q)) = -1$ and $\mathcal{V}(q) \neq 0$. This implies in particular that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k+}} |\Psi(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_q(\mathcal{V})| &= \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k+}} U(\mathcal{V}) \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) (1 - \rho(\mathcal{V}(q))) \\ &= 2 \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k+,q}} U(\mathcal{V}) \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) \leq 2 \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k+,q}} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) 2^{n(\mathcal{V})}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

where the last inequality follows by using Lemma 3.3 and the definition of U . Now note that we can write

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, k^+, q}} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) 2^{n(\mathcal{V})} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^i \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{i, k^+, q}} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}). \quad (5.11)$$

Combining (5.10) and (5.11) and using Lemma 5.8, we obtain the desired conclusion. \square

6 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\operatorname{Re} \beta > \beta_0(m)$ and let $p_0 \in \bigcap_{N \geq 1} C_2(B_N)^+$. Then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\log Z_{\beta, N}}{|C_2(B_N)^+|} - \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p_0}(B_N)} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} \right| = 0$$

locally uniformly in the half-plane $\operatorname{Re} \beta > \beta_0(m)$.

Proof. Write $\Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p_0} = \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p_0}(B_N)$. By Lemma 3.5 (using also Lemma 2.2), we have

$$\log Z_{\beta, N} = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi} \Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) = \sum_{p \in C_2(B_N)^+} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 2(m-1)^+, p}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|}.$$

Let $j \geq 2(m-1)$ be arbitrary. Note that we, without loss of generality, can assume that N is large enough to ensure that $\operatorname{dist}(p_0, \partial B_N) > j$. Applying Lemma 5.5 with $k' = \max(2(m-1), j)$, using also Remark 5.9, it follows that for any $p \in C_2(B_N)$, we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, j^+, p}} \frac{|\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})|}{|\mathcal{V}|} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k, j^+, p}} \frac{|\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})|}{|\mathcal{V}|} \leq \varepsilon(\beta, m, j), \quad (6.1)$$

where

$$\varepsilon(\beta, m, j) := \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k \max(2(m-1)k, j)^{-1} (3Me^{-2\operatorname{Re} \beta})^{2\max(2(m-1)k, j)}}{3M(1 - 9M^2e^{-4\operatorname{Re} \beta})}$$

and we note that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon(\beta, m, j) = 0$$

uniformly on compact subsets of the halfplane $\operatorname{Re} \beta > \beta_0(m)$. Now fix some $p \in C_2(B_N)^+$ with $\operatorname{dist}(p, \partial B_N) > j$. Since $\operatorname{dist}(p_0, \partial B_N) > j$ and $\operatorname{dist}(p, \partial B_N) > j$, for each $i < j$ there is a bijection $\Xi_{1^+, i, p_0} \rightarrow \Xi_{1^+, i, p}$ which maps each $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, i, p_0}$ to a translation of \mathcal{V} in $\Xi_{1^+, i, p}$. Consequently,

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} - \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, j^+, p}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p_0}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} - \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, j^+, p_0}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|},$$

and hence

$$\left| \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} - \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p_0}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} \right| \leq 2\varepsilon(\beta, m, j).$$

Finally, we note that there is a constant C'_m such that

$$\{p \in C_2(B_N)^+ : \text{dist}(p, \partial B_N) \leq j\} \leq C'_m j N^{m-1}. \quad (6.2)$$

We now combine the above observations as follows. By (6.1) and (6.2), we have

$$\left| \log Z_{\beta, N} - \sum_{\substack{p \in C_2(B_N)^+ : \\ \text{dist}(p, \partial B_N) > j}} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} \right| \leq C'_m j N^{m-1} \varepsilon(\beta, m, 1).$$

Using (6.1), it follows that

$$\left| \log Z_{\beta, N} - \sum_{\substack{p \in C_2(B_N)^+ : \\ \text{dist}(p, \partial B_N) > j}} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p_0}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} \right| \leq 2\varepsilon(\beta, m, j) |C_2(B_N)^+| + C'_m j N^{m-1} \varepsilon(\beta, m, 1).$$

Again using (6.1) and (6.2), we get

$$\left| \log Z_{\beta, N} - |C_2(B_N)^+| \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p_0}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} \right| \leq 2\varepsilon(\beta, m, j) |C_2(B_N)^+| + 2C'_m j N^{m-1} \varepsilon(\beta, m, 1).$$

Dividing both sides by $|C_2(B_N)^+|$ and letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, we finally obtain

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\log Z_{\beta, N}}{|C_2(B_N)^+|} - \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p_0}} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} \right| \leq 2\varepsilon(\beta, m, j)$$

and this bound is decreasing in $\text{Re } \beta > \beta_0$. Since j was arbitrary, the desired conclusion follows. \square

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\text{Re } \beta > \beta_0(m)$ and let $p \in \bigcap_{N \geq 1} C_2(B_N)^+$. Then*

$$F_N(\beta) = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, 1^+, p_0}(B_N)} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|}$$

converges as $N \rightarrow \infty$ locally uniformly in the half-plane $\text{Re } \beta > \beta_0(m)$.

Proof. Let $k' \geq 1$. Then we can write

$$F_N(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{k'-1} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, j, p_0}(B_N)} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} + \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1^+, k', p_0}(B_N)} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|}.$$

Note that if $j \leq N$, then we have $\Xi_{1+,j,p_0}(B_N) = \Xi_{1+,j,p_0}(B_j)$. At the same time, using Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k'+,p_0}(B_N)} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} \right| &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k'+,p_0}(B_N)} \left| \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} \right| = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k'+,p_0}(B_N)} |U(\mathcal{V})\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})/|\mathcal{V}|| \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k'+,p_0}(B_N)} 2^{n(\mathcal{V})} \frac{|\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})|}{|\mathcal{V}|} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k,k'+,p_0}(B_N)} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})|/k', \end{aligned}$$

Note that by definition, we have $\Xi_{k,k'+,p_0}(B_N) = 0$ if $k' < k$. Consequently,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{k,k'+,p_0}(B_N)} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})|/k' \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+, \max(k,k'), p_0}(B_N)} |\phi_\beta(\mathcal{V})|/k'$$

Using Lemma 5.5 and Remark 5.9, we thus obtain the upper bound

$$\left| \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k'+,p_0}(B_N)} \frac{\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})}{|\mathcal{V}|} \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k \frac{(3M)^{2 \max(k,k')-1} e^{-4 \operatorname{Re} \beta \max(k,k')}}{1 - 9M^2 e^{-4 \operatorname{Re} \beta}} = o_{\operatorname{Re} \beta, k'}(1).$$

Note in particular that this upper bound does not depend on N , is decreasing in $\operatorname{Re} \beta$, and tends to zero as $k' \rightarrow \infty$. From this the desired conclusion immediately follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. As in Lemma 6.2, write $F_N(\beta) = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,1+,p_0}(B_N)} \Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})/|\mathcal{V}|$. For each N , by Lemma 3.5 this is an analytic function in $\operatorname{Re} \beta > \beta_0(m)$ which by Lemma 6.2 converges locally uniformly as $N \rightarrow \infty$ to a limiting function which is also analytic. By Lemma 6.1, $\log Z_{\beta,N}$ also converges locally uniformly to the same limit. On the other hand, if $q = 1 \cdot p$ then, using Lemma 5.6, we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1,2(m-1),p}(B_N)} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1,2(m-1),q}} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) = 4e^{-8(m-1)\beta}, \quad (6.3)$$

for all N sufficiently large. Similarly, using Lemma 5.7, we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1,2(m-1)-2,p}(B_N)} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1,2(m-1)-2,q}(B_N)} \phi_\beta(\mathcal{V}) = (24(m-1) - 16)e^{-4(4(m-1)-2)\beta}. \quad (6.4)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5, and Remark 5.9 we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+, (m-1) \max(4,2k)+, p}(B_N)} |\Psi_\beta(\mathcal{V})| \quad (6.5)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^k (3M)^{2(m-1) \max(4,2k)-1} e^{-4 \operatorname{Re} \beta (m-1) \max(4,2k)}}{1 - 9M^2 e^{-4 \operatorname{Re} \beta}}. \quad (6.6)$$

for all N . We conclude by combining (6.3), (6.4), and (6.5). \square

7 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By combining Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2, we obtain

$$-(D_1 + D_2)\ell e^{-16(m-1)\beta} \leq \ell H(\ell) + \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi} (\Psi_{\beta,q}(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta}(\mathcal{V})) \leq D_2 \ell e^{-16\beta(m-1)}.$$

Using Proposition 3.7, the proof is complete. \square

8 Proof of Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.7

The main tool in the proofs of Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.7 is the following proposition.

Proposition 8.1. *Let $\beta > \beta_3(m)$. Further, let $(R_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(T_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be non-decreasing sequences of positive integers such that $\max\{R_n, T_n\} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For each $n \geq 1$, let γ_n be a rectangular loop with axis-parallel sides with lengths R_n and T_n , respectively, and with one corner at the origin. Then the following limit exists*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\log \mathbb{E}_{\beta,N}[W_{\gamma_n}]}{|\gamma_n|}.$$

Proof. For each $n \geq 1$, let q_n be an oriented surface with $\partial q_n = \gamma_n$.

Recall that, by Proposition 3.7, we have

$$-\log \mathbb{E}_{\beta,N}[W_{\gamma_n}] = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi} (\Psi_{\beta}(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta,q_n}(\mathcal{V})).$$

By Proposition 5.3, using Ginibre's inequality for the existence of limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ (see, e.g., [9, Section 4]), it follows that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \geq 1} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\gamma_n|} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k+}} |\Psi_{\beta}(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta,q_n}(\mathcal{V})| = 0.$$

Consequently, the desired conclusion will follow if we can show that for each fixed $k \geq 1$, the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\gamma_n|} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k}} (\Psi_{\beta}(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta,q_n}(\mathcal{V})) \quad (8.1)$$

exists.

To prove this, let Θ denote the set of all translations of \mathbb{R}^m preserving the lattice. Note that for each $k \geq 1$ there are (up to translations) only finitely many vortex clusters $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi_{1+,k}$. Since, by definition, we have

$$\Psi_{\beta}(\mathcal{V}) - \Psi_{\beta,q_n}(\mathcal{V}) = U(\mathcal{V})\phi_{\beta}(\mathcal{V})(1 - \rho(\mathcal{V}(q_n))),$$

to show that the limit in (8.1) exists it is sufficient to show that for each fixed $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$, the limit

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\gamma_n|} \sum_{\tau \in \Theta} U(\tau(\mathcal{V}))\phi_{\beta}(\tau(\mathcal{V}))(1 - \rho(\tau(\mathcal{V})(q_n))) \\ &= U(\mathcal{V})\phi_{\beta}(\mathcal{V}) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\gamma_n|} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\tau \in \Theta} (1 - \rho(\tau(\mathcal{V})(q_n))) \end{aligned} \quad (8.2)$$

exists. To this end, fix $\mathcal{V} \in \Xi$. For $n \geq 1$, consider the sum

$$\sum_{\tau \in \Theta} \left(1 - \rho(\mathcal{V}(\tau^{-1}(q_n))) \right). \quad (8.3)$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that N is much greater than $|\text{supp } \mathcal{V}|$ and $|\gamma_n|$. Let B be a box with side length $|\text{supp } \mathcal{V}|$ such that the support of \mathcal{V} is contained in B . By the Poincaré lemma (see e.g. [9, Lemma 2.2]), there is a set $S = \{\sigma_\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}} \subseteq \Omega^1(B_N, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that each $\sigma_\nu \in S$ has support contained in B and satisfies $d\sigma_\nu = \nu$. Since $\partial q_n = \gamma_n$ and $d\sigma_\nu = \nu$ for each $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$, it follows from, e.g., [9, Section 2.4], that $\nu(q_n) = d\sigma_\nu(q_n) = \sigma_\nu(\gamma_n)$ for each $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$. Consequently, for any $\tau \in \Theta$, we have

$$\tau(\mathcal{V})(q_n) = \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) \tau(\nu)(q_n) = \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) \tau(\sigma_\nu)(\gamma_n).$$

In particular, it follows that $\tau \in \Theta$ only gives a non-trivial contribution to (8.3) only if $\tau(B)$ intersects $\text{supp } \gamma_n$. Consequently, to show that (8.2) exists, it suffices to show that the following limit exists.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\gamma_n|} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\substack{\tau \in \Theta: \\ \tau(B) \cap \text{supp } \gamma_n}} \left(1 - \rho\left(\sum_{\nu \in \Lambda} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) \tau(\sigma_\nu)(\gamma_n)\right) \right). \quad (8.4)$$

To this end, note first that if N sufficiently large, then the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{\tau \in \Theta: \\ \tau(B) \cap \text{supp } \gamma_n}} \left(1 - \rho\left(\sum_{\nu \in \Lambda} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) \tau(\sigma_\nu)(\gamma_n)\right) \right)$$

is independent of N .

Let $\gamma_n^1, \gamma_n^2, \gamma_n^3$, and γ_n^4 be the paths along the four sides of γ_n , where we assume that γ_n^2 and γ_n^4 have length R_n . Define

$$\Theta_{13} := \{\tau \in \Theta: \text{supp}(\gamma_n^1 + \gamma_n^3) \cap \tau(B) \neq \emptyset = \text{supp}(\gamma_n^2 + \gamma_n^4) \cap \tau(B)\}$$

and

$$\Theta_{24} := \{\tau \in \Theta: \text{supp}(\gamma_n^1 + \gamma_n^3) \cap \tau(B) = \emptyset \neq \text{supp}(\gamma_n^2 + \gamma_n^4) \cap \tau(B)\}.$$

We will now show that the following limit exists.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\gamma_n|} \sum_{\tau \in \Theta_{13}} \left(1 - \rho\left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) \tau(\sigma_\nu)(\gamma_n)\right) \right). \quad (8.5)$$

Since the number of $\tau \in \Theta$ such that $\tau(B)$ contains a corner of γ_n can be uniformly bounded from above as a function of B only, using symmetry, this implies the existence of the limit in (8.4).

To see that the limit in (8.5) exists, note first that the number of translations $\tau \in \Theta$ that contributes to the sum in (8.5) is bounded from above by $|C_2(B)| \cdot T_n$. Consequently, if $T_n/|\gamma_n| \rightarrow 0$, then the limit in (8.5) will be equal to zero. Hence, we can without loss of generality assume that T_n is larger than $2m'$ and further assume that $T_n/|\gamma_n|$ does not tend to zero. Further, we can without loss of generality assume that B is such that

$$\text{supp}(\gamma_n^1 + \gamma_n^3) \cap B \neq \emptyset = \text{supp}(\gamma_n^2 + \gamma_n^4) \cap B.$$




Figure 3: In the figure above, we illustrate the setting of the proof of Proposition 8.1. Here, the squares represent translations of the box B ; the two purple boxes differ by a translation in $\hat{\Theta}_{13}$, while the blue box cannot be written as a translation of any of the purple boxes by a translation in $\hat{\Theta}_{13}$.

i.e., that the identity transformation is in Θ_{13} .

Without loss of generality assume that γ_n^1 and γ_n^3 consists of the edges $dx_1(a_1, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $dx_1(a_1, R_n, \dots, 0)$ respectively, where $a_1 \in \{0, 1, \dots, T_n - 1\}$. Let Θ^1 consist of all translations in the first direction, and Θ^2 consist of all translations that leaves the first coordinate unaffected. With this notation, each $\tau \in \Theta$ can be uniquely decomposed as $\tau_1 \circ \tau_2$ for some $\tau_1 \in \Theta^1$ and $\tau_2 \in \Theta^2$. Let

$$\hat{\Theta}_{13}^1 := \Theta_{13} \cap \Theta^1 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Theta}_{13}^2 := \Theta_{13} \cap \Theta^2.$$

Note that if $\tau_1 \in \Theta^1$, and $\tau_2 \in \Theta^2$, then $\tau_1 \circ \tau_2 \in \Theta_{13}$ if and only if then $\tau_1 \in \hat{\Theta}_{13}^1$ and $\tau_2 \in \hat{\Theta}_{13}^2$. Note also that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\hat{\Theta}_{13}^1|/|\gamma_n^1| = 1. \quad (8.6)$$

Finally, note that if $\tau_1 \in \hat{\Theta}_{13}^1$ and $\tau_2 \in \hat{\Theta}_{13}^2$, then for each $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$ we have

$$\tau_1 \circ \tau_2(\sigma_\nu)(\gamma_n) = \tau_2(\sigma_\nu)(\gamma_n).$$

From this it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\tau \in \Theta_{13}} \left(1 - \rho \left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) \tau(\sigma_{\nu})(\gamma_n) \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{\tau_1 \in \hat{\Theta}_{13}^1} \sum_{\tau_2 \in \hat{\Theta}_{13}^2} \left(1 - \rho \left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) \tau_1 \circ \tau_2(\sigma_{\nu})(\gamma_n) \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{\tau_1 \in \hat{\Theta}_{13}^1} \sum_{\tau_2 \in \hat{\Theta}_{13}^2} \left(1 - \rho \left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) \tau_2(\sigma_{\nu})(\gamma_n) \right) \right) \\
&= |\hat{\Theta}_{13}^1| \sum_{\tau_2 \in \hat{\Theta}_{13}^2} \left(1 - \rho \left(\sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}} n_{\mathcal{V}}(\nu) \tau_2(\sigma_{\nu})(\gamma_n) \right) \right). \tag{8.7}
\end{aligned}$$

Since the sum in (8.7) is independent of n , using (8.6), it follows that the limit in (8.5) exists, and hence the desired conclusion follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. By Proposition 8.1 applied with $T_n = n$, $T_n = R$, and $\gamma_n = R_n, T_n$, the limit

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{T} \log \langle W_{\gamma_{R,T}} \rangle_{\beta} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{T} \log \mathbb{E}_{\beta,N}[W_{\gamma_{R,T}}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{2}{|\gamma_n|} \log \mathbb{E}_{\beta,N}[W_{\gamma_n}]$$

exist. Using Theorem 1.2, the desired conclusion follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7. By Proposition 8.1 applied with $R_n = Hn$ and $T_n = Ln$, the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{R_n + T_n} \log \langle W_{\gamma_n} \rangle_{\beta} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{2}{|\gamma_n|} \log \mathbb{E}_{\beta,N}[W_{\gamma_n}].$$

exists. We conclude using Theorem 1.2. \square

References

- [1] Adhikari, A., Wilson Loop Expectations for Non-Abelian Gauge Fields Coupled to a Higgs Boson at Low and High Disorder, preprint (2022).
- [2] Balian, R., Drouffe, J. M., Itzykson, C., Gauge fields on a lattice. II. Gauge-invariant Ising model, Phys. Rev. D, 11(8), (1975), 2098–2103.
- [3] Cao, S., Wilson loop expectations in lattice gauge theories with finite gauge groups, Commun. Math. Phys. 380, (2020), 1439–1505.
- [4] Chatterjee, S., Yang-Mills for Probabilists, In: Friz, P., König, W., Mukherjee, C., Olla, S. (eds) Probability and Analysis in Interacting Physical Systems. VAR75 2016. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, vol 283. Springer, Cham., (2020), 307–340.
- [5] Chatterjee, S., Wilson loop expectations in Ising lattice gauge theory, Commun. Math. Phys. 377, (2020), 307–340.
- [6] Chatterjee, S., A probabilistic mechanism for quark confinement, Commun. Math. Phys. 385, (2021), 1007–1039.
- [7] Forsström, M. P., Decay of correlations in finite abelian lattice gauge theories, Commun. in Math. Phys. (2022).

- [8] Forsström, M. P., Wilson lines in the abelian lattice Higgs model, preprint (2021).
- [9] Forsström, M. P., Lenells, J., Viklund, F., Wilson loops in finite abelian lattice gauge theories, To appear in *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilités et Statistiques* (2022).
- [10] Forsström, M. P., Lenells, J., Viklund, F., Wilson loops in the abelian lattice Higgs model, To appear in *Probability and Mathematical Physics* (2022).
- [11] Friedly, S., Velenik, Y., Statistical Mechanics of Lattice Systems, (2017).
- [12] Fröhlich, J., Spencer, T., *Massless phases and symmetry restoration in abelian gauge theories and spin systems*, Commun. Math. Phys. 83, 411–454 (1982).
- [13] Garban, C., Sepúlveda, A., Improved spin-wave estimate for Wilson loops in $U(1)$ lattice gauge theory, International Mathematics Research Notices, rnac356, (2023).
- [14] Guth, A., Existence proof of a nonconfining phase in four-dimensional $U(1)$ lattice gauge theory, Phys. Rev. D 21(8), (1980), 2291–2307.
- [15] Guth, A., Ukawa, A., Windey, P., Dual variables for lattice gauge theories anti the phase structure of $Z(N)$ systems, Phys. Rev. D 21(4), (1980), 1013–1036.
- [16] Göpfert, M., Mack, G., Proof of confinement of static quarks in 3-dimensional lattice gauge theory for all values of the coupling constant, Commun. Math. Phys. 82, 545–606 (1982).
- [17] Montway, I., Munster, G., Quantum fields on a lattice, (1994).
- [18] Osterwalder, K., Seiler, E., Gauge field theories on a lattice, Annals of Physics, 110(2), 1978.
- [19] Seiler, E. Gauge Theories as a Problem of Constructive Quantum Field Theory and Statistical Mechanics, Lecture Notes in Physics (LNP, volume 159), Springer (1982).
- [20] Wegner, F. J. Duality in Generalized Ising Models and Phase Transitions without Local Order Parameters, Journal of Mathematical Physics 12, 2259 (1971).
- [21] Wilson, K. G. Confinement of quarks, Phys. Rev. D, vol. 10, no 8 (1974), 2445 – 2459.