

Exact Three-Point Functions in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Superconformal Field Theories: Integrability vs. Localization

Gwenaël Ferrando^a, Shota Komatsu^b, Gabriel Lefundes^{c,d} and Didina Serban^c

^a *Bethe Center for Theoretical Physics, Universität Bonn, Wegelerstr. 10, D-53115, Germany*

^b *CERN Department of Theoretical Physics, CERN 1211 Meyrin, Switzerland*

^c *Université Paris–Saclay, CNRS, CEA, Institut de Physique Théorique, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France and*

^d *ICTP South American Institute for Fundamental Research, IFT-UNESP, São Paulo, SP 01440-070, Brazil*

We propose an integrability approach for planar three-point functions at finite coupling in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superconformal field theories obtained by \mathbb{Z}_K orbifolds of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super Yang-Mills (SYM). Generalizing the hexagon formalism for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM, we reproduce the structure constants of Coulomb branch operators, previously obtained by supersymmetric localization as exact functions of the 't Hooft coupling. Our analysis explains the common physical origin of Fredholm kernels in integrability and localization, and hints at structures after the resummation in the hexagon formalism.

Introduction. The understanding of strongly-coupled gauge theory has advanced significantly thanks to dualities, holography and non-perturbative methods like integrability, localization and bootstrap. The paradigmatic theory in which this progress has been made is $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric Yang–Mills (SYM) in four dimensions; the most symmetric and thus the most tractable.

Studying theories with less symmetries has proven useful in testing the applicability of these methods and uncovering more general structures. Notably, there exists a broad class of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric theories with rich physical and mathematical structures (see e.g. [1–3]). Among them, \mathbb{Z}_K -orbifolds of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM [4, 5] are particularly interesting, as they have conformal invariance and integrability [6–8] despite less supersymmetries. The planar spectrum of this theory was studied extensively by integrability [9–13], and more recently, correlation functions of BPS operators (known as Coulomb-branch operators) were computed exactly using supersymmetric localization [14–20]. In the planar limit, results involving operators in the so-called twisted sector are given by Fredholm determinants of integrable Bessel operators. Surprisingly, similar expressions arise in the integrability approach to various observables of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM [21–23], such as large-charge four-point functions [24–32]. There, the Fredholm determinant arises as the partition function of magnon excitations on the worldsheet. This raises the natural question of whether the localization results for $\mathcal{N} = 2$ orbifolds can be reproduced by integrability and whether they, too, can be interpreted as the partition function.

In this Letter, we give an affirmative answer to this question by generalizing the hexagon formalism for three-point functions of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM [33] to account for orbifolding. A key challenge in this approach is handling the divergences from virtual magnons wrapping around each operator, which require systematic regularization [34, 35]. We propose a regularization using a genus-two surface (cf. [36]) and verify that it reproduces localization results up to three virtual magnons. More broadly,

$\mathcal{N} = 2$ orbifolds are an ideal setup for developing computational techniques of the hexagon formalism. In addition, our formalism can be applied to non-BPS observables in these theories, and our analysis lays the basis for future studies.

Three-point functions from localization. We consider the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ quiver gauge theory at the \mathbb{Z}_K orbifold point, where the K gauge couplings coincide. A convenient way to describe the theory is to start with $SU(KN)$ $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM and perform an orbifold projection by $\gamma = \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}_N, \rho \mathbf{1}_N \dots, \rho^{K-1} \mathbf{1}_N)$ with $\rho \equiv e^{2\pi i/K}$,

$$\gamma(A_\mu, Z)\gamma^{-1} = (A_\mu, Z), \quad \gamma(X, Y)\gamma^{-1} = \rho(X, Y), \quad (1)$$

where X, Y and Z are complex scalars and A_μ the gauge potential. After the projection, single-trace operators consist of an untwisted sector, taking the same form as in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM, and $K - 1$ twisted sectors, given by insertions of powers of γ in the trace. For instance, the untwisted and twisted BPS operators read

$$\mathcal{O}_\ell^{(0)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \text{Tr} Z^\ell(x), \quad \mathcal{O}_\ell^{(\alpha)}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \text{Tr} \gamma^\alpha Z^\ell(x). \quad (2)$$

In the spin-chain language [6, 9, 37], γ corresponds to insertion of a group element τ twisting the boundary condition. It acts on the flavor indices of the magnons over the Z vacuum as $\mathbf{1}_L \times \tau_R = \mathbf{1}_L \times (\rho, \rho^{-1}, 1, 1)_R$, see the Supplemental Material for more details. The twist τ breaks the $PSU(2|2)^2$ symmetry of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM magnons down to $PSU(2|2) \times SU(2) \times SU(2)$.

The two- and three-point functions of BPS operators were computed by localization in [14] and checked perturbatively in [38] and by supergravity in [39, 40]. The results for normalized three-point functions are

$$\frac{\langle \mathcal{O}_k^{(\alpha_1)}(x) \mathcal{O}_\ell^{(\alpha_2)}(y) \bar{\mathcal{O}}_p^{(\alpha_3)}(z) \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle \mathcal{O}_k \bar{\mathcal{O}}_k \rangle \langle \mathcal{O}_\ell \bar{\mathcal{O}}_\ell \rangle \langle \mathcal{O}_p \bar{\mathcal{O}}_p \rangle}} = \frac{\sqrt{k\ell p}}{\sqrt{KN}} \frac{C_{k,\ell,p}^{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)}}{|x - z|^{2k} |y - z|^{2\ell}}, \quad (3)$$




Figure 1. Structure constant corresponding to (3). The numbers on the sides of the pants denote the bridge lengths. The thick colored lines denote the twist insertions.

with $p = k + \ell$, $\alpha_3 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ and $g = \sqrt{g_{\text{YM}}^2 N} / 4\pi$. The structure constants $C_{k,\ell,p}^{(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)}(g)$ take a factorized form [41]

$$C_{k,\ell,p}^{(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)} = C_k^{(\alpha_1)} C_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} C_p^{(\alpha_3)}, \quad (4)$$

$$C_L^{(\alpha)} = \frac{\det(1 - s_\alpha K_L)}{\sqrt{\det(1 - s_\alpha K_{L-1}) \det(1 - s_\alpha K_{L+1})}}, \quad (5)$$

where K_{L-1} is a semi-infinite matrix with elements

$$\frac{(K_{L-1})_{mn}}{\sqrt{(2m+L)(2n+L)}} = -8 \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} \chi_g(t) J_{2m+L}(t) J_{2n+L}(t),$$

$$\chi_g(t) = e^{t/2g} / (e^{t/2g} - 1)^2. \quad (6)$$

and $s_\alpha = \sin^2 \pi \alpha / K$ is the character of the twist in the fundamental representation of $\text{SU}(2|2)$. The kernel described above coincides with the octagon kernel for the large-charge four-point functions in [27–30], with cross ratios set to particular values $\theta = \pi$, $\xi = \phi = \varphi = 0$, or $z = \bar{z} = 1$ and $\alpha = \bar{\alpha} = -1$, in the notations of [28, 30]. At weak coupling, they can be expanded as

$$C_L^{(\alpha)}(g) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(g^{2L}), \quad C_L^{(\alpha)}(0) = C_\infty^{(\alpha)}(g) = 1. \quad (7)$$

Our main result, explained below, is to reproduce the expression (5) from integrability.

Hexagon formalism for orbifold $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SCFT. In the integrability framework, the three-point function is represented pictorially as a pair of pants, which is then cut into two hexagonal tiles. The hexagon form factors were determined exactly at finite coupling through integrability [21, 22, 33]. To glue the hexagons back together, one inserts complete sets of states on edges of the hexagons (called *bridges*), as in Figure 1. The associated excitations, referred to as (virtual) *magnons*, propagate from one hexagon to the other with an exponential suppression factor that depends on their energy and the length of the bridge.

We propose that this procedure can be extended to the \mathbb{Z}_K orbifold theory by inserting powers of twists τ on bridges; see Figure 1.

To see how it works, it is convenient to decompose (4) as $C_{k,\ell,p}^{(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3)} = (\text{bridge}) \times (\text{bridge-like}) \times (\text{wrapping})$ where

$$(\text{bridge}) = \det(1 - s_{\alpha_1} K_k) \det(1 - s_{\alpha_2} K_\ell), \quad (8)$$

$$(\text{bridge-like}) = \det(1 - s_{\alpha_3} K_p),$$

while (**wrapping**) denotes the remaining factors in (4), *c.f.* (19). As we will see below, each of them comes from different configurations of magnons, see Figure 2:

- Bridge contributions come from magnons on a single bridge.
- Wrapping contributions come from contact terms among magnons on two adjacent bridges.
- Bridge-like contributions come from contact terms involving magnons on all the three bridges.

Below we sketch the computation of each contribution.

Bridge contribution. Bridge contributions come from summing over all possible numbers of magnons on a single bridge and integrating over their rapidities. Doing this for the bridge of length L and twist α gives

$$B_L^{(\alpha)} = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \prod_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{a_k=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du_k}{2\pi} e^{-L \tilde{E}_{a_k}(u_k)} \right) \mathbb{B}_n \quad (9)$$

with

$$\mathbb{B}_n \equiv \prod_{k=1}^n \left(\mu_{a_k}(u_k) T_{a_k}^{(\alpha)} \right) \prod_{i < j} H_{a_i, a_j}(u_i, u_j). \quad (10)$$

The quantities above depend on the rapidities u_k via the Zhukovsky transform defined by $x + 1/x = u/g$. $x_k = x(u_k)$ has a quadratic branch cut from $-2g$ to $2g$, and we denote $x_k^{[\pm a]} = x(u_k \pm ia/2)$ for positive integers a . Mirror kinematics, usually denoted by u^γ , corresponds to the analytic continuation $x^{[+a]}(u^\gamma) = 1/x^{[+a]}(u)$ and $x^{[-a]}(u^\gamma) = x^{[-a]}(u)$. The physical momentum $p_a(u)$ and the mirror energy $\tilde{E}_a(u)$ are given by

$$e^{ip_a} = x^{[+a]} / x^{[-a]}, \quad e^{\tilde{E}_a} = x^{[+a]} x^{[-a]} \quad (11)$$

while the measure $\mu_a(u)$ and the symmetric hexagon weight $H_{ab}(u, v)$ in the mirror kinematics are given by

$$\mu_a = \frac{1}{ig} \prod_{\epsilon=\pm} \frac{1}{x^{[\epsilon a]} - 1/x^{[\epsilon a]}} H_a \equiv \omega_a H_a, \quad (12)$$

$$H_{ab}(u_i, u_j) = \prod_{\epsilon, \delta=\pm} \frac{x_i^{[\epsilon a]} - x_j^{[\delta b]}}{x_i^{[\epsilon a]} x_j^{[\delta b]} - 1}, \quad H_a = \frac{x^{[+a]} - x^{[-a]}}{x^{[+a]} x^{[-a]} - 1}.$$

The factor $T_a^{(\alpha)}$ is the character of the twist of the corresponding bridge, τ_a^α , in the a -th antisymmetric representation of $\text{PSU}(2|2)$

$$T_a^{(\alpha)} = \text{STr}_a \tau_a^\alpha = 4a s_\alpha, \quad (13)$$

where we define the super-trace with a minus sign for bosonic states.

The partition function $B_L^{(\alpha)}$ takes the form of the so-called octagon [21, 24]. The sum over the bound states,




Figure 2. Magnon configurations responsible for different contributions. **Left: Bridge contribution.** Contributions from magnons on different bridges factorize into a product of contributions from each bridge unless the rapidities of magnons on different bridges coincide. **Middle: Wrapping contribution.** When rapidities of magnons of two adjacent bridges coincide, we will have contact terms leading to the wrapping contributions, denoted by thick black lines. **Right: Bridge-like contribution.** When magnons living on three different bridges have coinciding rapidities, new contact terms arise that lead to the bridge-like contribution, denoted by the thick black curve.

labeled by a , can be explicitly performed, leading to the the weight $\chi_g(t)$ in the Fourier representation

$$4s_\alpha \chi_g(t) = \sum_{a \geq 1} T_a^{(\alpha)} e^{ta/2g}, \quad (14)$$

which allows (9) to be rewritten [27, 28, 30] in the form

$$B_L^{(\alpha)} = \det(1 - s_\alpha K_L). \quad (15)$$

Note that $s_0 = 0$, so that this contribution is trivial for the bridge without twist.

Wrapping contribution. The hexagon form factors develop poles when the rapidities of magnons in adjacent bridges coincide. This property, known as *decoupling condition*, corresponds physically to a “magnon-antimagnon” pair – or *wrapping magnon* – decoupling from the hexagon and going to infinity, *i.e.* approaching the operator insertion points. The regularization of these singularities using the genus-two surface, discussed later in the text and in more detail in the Supplementary Material, allows to collect contact terms into a partition function of the wrapping magnons. For a given operator that contains the twists α and β and has length L , we find that the contribution of these contact terms is given by $W_L^{(\alpha+\beta)}$, with

$$\left(W_L^{(\alpha)}\right)^2 = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \prod_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{a_k=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du_k}{2\pi} e^{-L\tilde{E}_{a_k}(u)} \right) \mathbb{W}_n, \quad (16)$$

where

$$\mathbb{W}_n \equiv (-i)^n \partial_{\mathbf{v}} \text{STr} \left[\tau_{\mathbf{a}}^\alpha \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{ab}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \tau_{\mathbf{b}}^\beta \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{ab}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \right] \Big|_{\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}}, \quad (17)$$

and

$$\tau_{\mathbf{a}}^\alpha = \prod_{k=1}^n \tau_{a_k}^\alpha, \quad \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{ab}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{a_i, b_j}(u_i, v_j). \quad (18)$$

Here $\mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v)$ denotes Beisert’s scattering matrix [42–44] for mirror bound states. After taking the derivatives with respect to \mathbf{v} , the two groups of n rapidities \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are identified, and then the integrals over \mathbf{u} are performed. A similar structure arises for hexagons in the fishnet theory [45]. Importantly, the result only depends on the product of the twists and sum of the lengths of each bridge. Moreover, for untwisted operators, this contribution is absent.

Although we did not manage to evaluate (17) explicitly for arbitrary n , we conjecture that the result matches

$$\left(W_L^{(\alpha)}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{\det(1 - s_\alpha K_{L-1}) \det(1 - s_\alpha K_{L+1})}. \quad (19)$$

We verified this up to three virtual magnons, see the discussions around (24) for more details.

Bridge-like contribution. The most nontrivial contribution is the bridge-like contribution, coming from contact terms in which the rapidities of magnons on three different bridges coincide. They can be also computed using the genus-two regularization. Our analysis, explained in Supplemental Material, shows that the three magnons effectively merge, creating an excitation resembling the usual bridge magnons, with the twist given by $\tau^{\alpha_1} \tau^{\alpha_2} = \tau^{\alpha_3}$ and an effective bridge length $\ell + k = p$. The computation of the first few terms in their expansion and general arguments suggest

$$B_p^{(\alpha_3)} = \det(1 - s_{\alpha_3} K_p). \quad (20)$$

Final result. As we explain in the Supplemental Material, these contributions factorize, leading to an expression that is simply a product of all the terms. The final answer matches the localization result (4), and this is our main result. In the rest of this paper, we give more technical details.

Regularization on the genus-two surface. As mentioned earlier, we need to address the singularities of the integrand that arise when the rapidities of magnons on different bridges coincide. The importance of such singularities was highlighted in [34], where the one-magnon

contribution was explicitly evaluated. As shown there, the divergences stem from the infinite size of the mirror channels, where the virtual magnons live.

A natural way to regularize these divergences is to introduce a cut-off on the volume of these spaces. In general, the regularized singularities yield both a divergent, or volume-dependent, term proportional to the anomalous dimensions of the operators, and a finite term contributing to the structure constant. In our case, the divergent term is absent, as the dimension of our operators is protected but the finite term remains nontrivial.

A systematic evaluation of such finite contributions for arbitrary excited operators is still an open problem in the hexagon program for correlation functions in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM theory. In [35, 36], it was suggested that both the volume-dependent and finite terms for the three-point function can be controlled by considering the OPE limit of a four-point function. This can be worked out explicitly in the fishnet theory [46], where the hexagon approach to correlation functions can be derived from first principles by constructing separated variables for a non-compact, integrable spin chain [47, 48].

Here, we take a similar but slightly different approach to [35, 36] and regulate the infinite volumes by gluing two three-point functions into a genus-two surface. The genus-two surface provides a natural and physical cut-off for the square of the structure constant, whose partition function can be computed by gluing together two pairs of pants with *mirror* edges, see Figure 3.

We develop this idea in the Supplemental Material and show how the wrapping and bridge-like magnons arise from the contact terms of two and three magnons. We also explain how the factorization happens and give some examples.

Structure of the wrapping contribution. Our conjectured finite-coupling expression for the square of the wrapping contribution (19) is remarkably similar to its bridge counterpart (15). This suggests that \mathbb{W}_n can be expressed in a closer way to \mathbb{B}_n in (9), which would be ideal for checking the conjecture.

To do so, let us first consider the bridge contribution $B_L^{(\alpha)}$, given by the octagon, and take its logarithm. As shown in [22, 27, 28], the octagon can be expressed as a Fredholm Pfaffian and its logarithm admits a simple series expansion:

$$\ln B_L^{(\alpha)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \prod_{k=1}^n \sum_{a_k=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du_k}{2\pi} e^{-L\tilde{E}_{a_k}} \mathbb{C}\mathbb{B}_n, \quad (21)$$

where $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{B}_n$ denotes the ‘‘connected part’’ whose details can be found in [22, 27]. Equating this with the expansion of $\ln \det(1 - K)$ appearing in (15), we obtain an identity

$$\prod_{k=1}^n \sum_{a_k=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du_k}{2\pi} e^{-L\tilde{E}_{a_k}} \mathbb{C}\mathbb{B}_n = -s_\alpha^n \text{Tr} K_L^n. \quad (22)$$

Now, by computing the first few terms of (16), we found that the logarithm of the wrapping contribution

also admits a simple expansion,

$$2 \ln W_L^{(\alpha)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \prod_{k=1}^n \sum_{a_k=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du_k}{2\pi} e^{-L\tilde{E}_{a_k}} \mathbb{C}\mathbb{W}_n, \quad (23)$$

with

$$\mathbb{C}\mathbb{W}_n = - \left(e^{\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{E}_{a_i}} + e^{-\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{E}_{a_i}} \right) \mathbb{C}\mathbb{B}_n, \quad (24)$$

Thanks to the identity (22), this immediately implies

$$\prod_{k=1}^n \sum_{a_k=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du_k}{2\pi} e^{-L\tilde{E}_{a_k}} \mathbb{C}\mathbb{W}_n = s_\alpha^n \text{Tr} (K_{L-1}^n + K_{L+1}^n), \quad (25)$$

which gives our conjecture (19) after the exponentiation.

We have verified the relation (24) up to $n = 3$ by taking the derivative and traces in (17) with the help of a computer. For $n \leq 2$, the verification can be done by hand using the following partial trace identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{STr}_a \mathcal{S}_{ab}^{-1} \tau_a^\alpha \mathcal{S}_{ab} &= T_a^{(\alpha)} H_{ab} \mathbf{1}_b, \\ 2i \text{STr}_a \mathcal{S}_{ab}^{-1} \partial_u \mathcal{S}_{ab} &= k_a(u) (1 - H_{ab}) \mathbf{1}_b, \\ 2 \text{STr}_{ab} \mathcal{S}_{ab}^{-1} \partial_u \partial_v \mathcal{S}_{ab} &= p'_a(u) p'_b(v) (1 - H_{ab}), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where we define $k_a(u)$ and $p'_a(u)$ via

$$k_a \pm p'_a = -2 e^{\pm \tilde{E}_a} \mu_a, \quad (27)$$

where $H_{ab} \equiv H_{ab}(u, v)$, and we recall that $\mathcal{S}_{ab} \equiv \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v)$ is the mirror S-matrix. The indices on the super-trace indicates which spaces are traced over. For higher $n \geq 3$ more complicated multiple traces occur. However, for all n , the fundamental building blocks remain the same: p'_a , k_a and H_{ab} .

Conclusion and outlook. We generalized the hexagon formalism to the \mathbb{Z}_K orbifold $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SCFT, obtaining closed form expressions of various building blocks and reproducing localization results up to three virtual magnons (but nonperturbative in the 't Hooft coupling). A general proof seems within reach. Our findings suggest that recent progress in integrability for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM can be extended to a broader class of integrable $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SCFTs, opening numerous future directions:

- Studying the long-quiver limit of the \mathbb{Z}_K orbifold quiver $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SCFTs, discussed in e.g. [20, 49].
- Applying this method to other correlation functions in \mathbb{Z}_K -orbifold theories, e.g. three-point functions of non-BPS operators and higher-point functions.
- Investigating whether planar three-point functions away from the \mathbb{Z}_K -orbifold points can also be expressed as Fredholm determinants, which may hint at integrability beyond the orbifold point [8, 50, 51].




Figure 3. Gluing two three-point functions into a genus-two closed surface, then cutting the result on three mirror (dotted) lines to get two different pairs of pants. Each mirror cut reveals an arbitrary number of magnons (red, green and blue dots). The lengths R_ℓ , R_0 , R_k are supposed to be large so that the physical excitations are suppressed. The twist line is inserted along the mirror seam of length R_ℓ .

- Applying this method to regularize the three-point functions to other theories obtained by twisting $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM, see related works [52, 53], and in particular to theories in which the vacuum states acquire anomalous dimensions. Such a framework would help further the links between three-point functions in the hexagon formalism and the Quantum Spectral Curve approach [54], along the lines provided in [35].
- Given the simplicity of the localization result, it is worth exploring a more efficient integrability framework beyond the hexagon formalism. One possi-

bility is to directly bootstrap the decompactified string vertex [55–57].

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to B. Basso, M. Billò, A. Georgoudis, N. Gromov, S. Ekhammar, G. Korchemsky, E. Olivucci, E. Pomoni and A. Testa for insightful discussions. GL and DS thank the CNRS and ANR for support via the IRP project NP-Strong and ANR project Observables (ANR-24-CE31-7996), respectively. The work of GF is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Projektnummer 508889767. We thank CERN, ICTP-SAIFR Sao Paulo and PI Waterloo, where various stages of this project were completed, for hospitality.

-
- [1] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Monopoles, duality and chiral symmetry breaking in N=2 supersymmetric QCD, *Nucl. Phys. B* **431**, 484 (1994), [arXiv:hep-th/9408099](#).
- [2] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Electric - magnetic duality, monopole condensation, and confinement in N=2 supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory, *Nucl. Phys. B* **426**, 19 (1994), [Erratum: *Nucl.Phys.B* 430, 485–486 (1994)], [arXiv:hep-th/9407087](#).
- [3] D. Gaiotto, N=2 dualities, *JHEP* **08**, 034, [arXiv:0904.2715 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [4] S. Kachru and E. Silverstein, 4d conformal field theories and strings on orbifolds, *Physical Review Letters* **80**, 4855 (1998).
- [5] S. Gukov, Comments on ads orbifolds, *Physics Letters B* **439**, 23 (1998).
- [6] N. Beisert and R. Roiban, The Bethe ansatz for \mathbb{Z}_S orbifolds of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super Yang-Mills theory, *JHEP* **11**, 037, [arXiv:hep-th/0510209](#).
- [7] A. Solovoyov, Bethe Ansatz Equations for General Orbifolds of N=4 SYM, *JHEP* **04**, 013, [arXiv:0711.1697 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [8] A. Gadde, E. Pomoni, and L. Rastelli, Spin Chains in $\mathcal{N}=2$ Superconformal Theories: From the \mathbb{Z}_2 Quiver to Superconformal QCD, *JHEP* **06**, 107, [arXiv:1006.0015 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [9] A. Gadde and L. Rastelli, Twisted Magnons, *JHEP* **04**, 053, [arXiv:1012.2097 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] G. Arutyunov, M. de Leeuw, and S. J. van Tongeren, Twisting the Mirror TBA, *JHEP* **02**, 025, [arXiv:1009.4118 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] M. Beccaria and G. Macorini, Y-system for Z_S Orbifolds of N=4 SYM, *JHEP* **06**, 004, [Erratum: *JHEP* 01, 112 (2012)], [arXiv:1104.0883 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [12] M. de Leeuw and S. J. van Tongeren, The spectral problem for strings on twisted $AdS_5 \times S^5$, *Nucl. Phys. B* **860**, 339 (2012), [arXiv:1201.1451 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [13] T. Skrzypek, Integrability treatment of AdS/CFT orbifolds, *J. Phys. A* **56**, 345401 (2023), [arXiv:2211.03806 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] M. Beccaria, M. Billò, M. Frau, A. Lerda, and A. Pini, Exact results in a $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superconformal gauge theory at strong coupling, *JHEP* **07**, 185, [arXiv:2105.15113 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [15] M. Billò, M. Frau, A. Lerda, A. Pini, and P. Vallarino, Three-point functions in a $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superconformal gauge theory and their strong-coupling limit, *JHEP* **08**, 199, [arXiv:2202.06990 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [16] M. Billò, M. Frau, A. Lerda, A. Pini, and P. Vallarino, Strong coupling expansions in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ quiver gauge theories, *JHEP* **01**, 119, [arXiv:2211.11795 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [17] Z. Bajnok, B. Boldis, and G. P. Korchemsky, Tracy-Widom Distribution in Four-Dimensional Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theories, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 031601 (2024), [arXiv:2403.13050 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] Z. Bajnok, B. Boldis, and G. P. Korchemsky, Solving four-dimensional superconformal Yang-Mills theories with Tracy-Widom distribution, (2024), [arXiv:2409.17227 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [19] Z. Bajnok, B. Boldis, and G. P. Korchemsky, Exploring superconformal Yang-Mills theories through matrix Bessel kernels, (2024), [arXiv:2412.08732 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [20] G. P. Korchemsky and A. Testa, Correlation functions in four-dimensional superconformal long circular quivers, (2025), [arXiv:2501.17223 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [21] T. Fleury and S. Komatsu, Hexagonalization of correlation functions, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2017**, [10.1007/jhep01\(2017\)130](#) (2017).
- [22] B. Basso, F. Coronado, S. Komatsu, H. T. Lam, P. Vieira, and D.-l. Zhong, Asymptotic Four Point Functions, *JHEP* **07**, 082, [arXiv:1701.04462 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [23] B. Basso, L. J. Dixon, and G. Papathanasiou, Origin of the Six-Gluon Amplitude in Planar $N = 4$ Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 161603 (2020), [arXiv:2001.05460 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [24] F. Coronado, Perturbative four-point functions in planar $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM from hexagonalization, *JHEP* **01**, 056, [arXiv:1811.00467 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [25] F. Coronado, Bootstrapping the Simplest Correlator in Planar $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory to All Loops, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 171601 (2020), [arXiv:1811.03282 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] T. Bargheer, F. Coronado, and P. Vieira, Octagons II: Strong Coupling, (2019), [arXiv:1909.04077 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [27] I. Kostov, V. B. Petkova, and D. Serban, Determinant Formula for the Octagon Form Factor in $N=4$ Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 231601 (2019), [arXiv:1903.05038 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [28] I. Kostov, V. B. Petkova, and D. Serban, The Octagon as a Determinant, *JHEP* **11**, 178, [arXiv:1905.11467 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [29] A. V. Belitsky and G. P. Korchemsky, Octagon at finite coupling, *JHEP* **07**, 219, [arXiv:2003.01121 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [30] A. V. Belitsky and G. P. Korchemsky, Crossing bridges with strong SzegHo limit theorem, *JHEP* **04**, 257, [arXiv:2006.01831 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [31] A. V. Belitsky, Null octagon from Deift-Zhou steepest descent, *Nucl. Phys. B* **980**, 115844 (2022), [arXiv:2012.10446 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [32] I. Kostov and V. B. Petkova, Octagon with finite bridge: free fermions and determinant identities, *JHEP* **06**, 098, [arXiv:2102.05000 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [33] B. Basso, S. Komatsu, and P. Vieira, Structure Constants and Integrable Bootstrap in Planar $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM Theory, (2015), [arXiv:1505.06745 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [34] B. Basso, V. Gonçalves, and S. Komatsu, Structure constants at wrapping order, *JHEP* **05**, 124, [arXiv:1702.02154 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [35] B. Basso, A. Georgoudis, and A. K. Szeiuro, Structure Constants of Short Operators in Planar $N=4$ Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 131603 (2023), [arXiv:2207.01315 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [36] B. Basso, Structure constants of short operators in planar $\mathcal{N}=4$ SYM theory, Talk at IGST 2022.
- [37] N. Beisert, The Dilatation operator of $N=4$ super Yang-Mills theory and integrability, *Phys. Rept.* **405**, 1 (2004), [arXiv:hep-th/0407277](#).
- [38] F. Galvagno and M. Preti, Chiral correlators in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superconformal quivers, *JHEP* **05**, 201, [arXiv:2012.15792 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [39] M. Billò, M. Frau, A. Lerda, A. Pini, and P. Val-larino, Structure Constants in $N=2$ Superconformal Quiver Theories at Strong Coupling and Holography, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 031602 (2022), [arXiv:2206.13582 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [40] T. Skrzypek and A. A. Tseytlin, On AdS/CFT duality in the twisted sector of string theory on $AdS_5 \times S^5/\mathbb{Z}_2$ orbifold background, *JHEP* **03**, 045, [arXiv:2312.13850 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [41] After we presented the determinant form of the normalized structure constant (5) in [58], G. Korchemsky informed us he obtained this form independently, and it was published recently in [20].
- [42] N. Beisert, The $SU(2|2)$ dynamic S-matrix, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **12**, 945 (2008), [arXiv:hep-th/0511082](#).
- [43] N. Beisert, The Analytic Bethe Ansatz for a Chain with Centrally Extended $su(2|2)$ Symmetry, *J. Stat. Mech.* **0701**, P01017 (2007), [arXiv:nlin/0610017](#).
- [44] G. Arutyunov, M. de Leeuw, and A. Torrielli, The Bound State S-Matrix for $AdS_5 \times S^5$ Superstring, *Nucl. Phys. B* **819**, 319 (2009), [arXiv:0902.0183 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [45] G. Ferrando and E. Olivucci, unpublished.
- [46] O. Gürdöugan and V. Kazakov, New Integrable 4D Quantum Field Theories from Strongly Deformed Planar $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 201602 (2016), [Addendum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **117**, 259903 (2016)], [arXiv:1512.06704 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [47] S. Derkachov and E. Olivucci, Exactly solvable magnet of conformal spins in four dimensions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 031603 (2020), [arXiv:1912.07588 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [48] S. Derkachov and E. Olivucci, Exactly solvable single-trace four point correlators in χ CFT₄, *JHEP* **02**, 146, [arXiv:2007.15049 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [49] S. Mukhi, M. Rangamani, and E. P. Verlinde, Strings from quivers, membranes from moose, *JHEP* **05**, 023, [arXiv:hep-th/0204147](#).
- [50] E. Pomoni, R. Rabe, and K. Zoubos, Dynamical spin chains in 4D $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SCFTs, *JHEP* **08**, 127, [arXiv:2106.08449 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [51] H. Bertle, E. Pomoni, X. Zhang, and K. Zoubos, Hidden Symmetries of 4D $N=2$ Gauge Theories, (2024), [arXiv:2411.11612 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [52] B. Basso, J. Caetano, and T. Fleury, Hexagons and Correlators in the Fishnet Theory, *JHEP* **11**, 172, [arXiv:1812.09794 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [53] B. Eden, D. le Plat, and A. Spiering, Higher-rank sectors in the hexagon formalism and marginal deformations, *J. Phys. A* **57**, 475401 (2024), [arXiv:2212.03211 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [54] N. Gromov, V. Kazakov, S. Leurent, and D. Volin, Quantum Spectral Curve for Planar $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Super-Yang-Mills Theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 011602 (2014), [arXiv:1305.1939 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [55] Z. Bajnok and R. A. Janik, String field theory vertex from integrability, *JHEP* **04**, 042, [arXiv:1501.04533 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [56] Z. Bajnok and R. A. Janik, The kinematical $AdS_5 \times S^5$ Neumann coefficient, *JHEP* **02**, 138, [arXiv:1512.01471 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [57] Z. Bajnok and R. A. Janik, From the octagon to the SFT

- vertex — gluing and multiple wrapping, *JHEP* **06**, 058, [arXiv:1704.03633 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [58] D. Serban, Twisting the pants: integrability and the \mathbb{Z}_2 orbifold of $\mathcal{N}=4$ SYM, Talk at IGST 2024.
- [59] M. De Leeuw, B. Eden, and A. Sfondrini, Bound state scattering simplified, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 126001 (2020), [arXiv:2008.01378 \[hep-th\]](#).

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Useful properties

We collect here some properties of the dynamical factors and S-matrix for arbitrary bound states that will be used below,

$$h_{ab}(u^{2\gamma}, v^{2\gamma}) = h_{ab}(u, v), \quad h_{ab}(u^{4\gamma}, v) = \frac{1}{h_{ba}(v, u)}, \quad (28)$$

$$h_{ab}(u, v) h_{ba}(v, u) = H_{ab}(u, v), \quad H_{ab}(u^{2\gamma}, v) = \frac{1}{H_{ab}(u, v)}, \quad (29)$$

$$h_{aa}(u^{2\gamma}, u) = 1, \quad \lim_{v \rightarrow u} \frac{(v-u)}{h_{ab}(u, v)} = \frac{i \delta_{ab}}{\mu_a(u)}, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{ab}(u^{2\gamma}, v^{2\gamma}) = \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v), \quad \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u^{4\gamma}, v) = \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v^{4\gamma}) = \kappa_a \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v) \kappa_a = \kappa_b \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v) \kappa_b. \quad (31)$$

The crossing relation for the scattering matrices is given by

$$\mathcal{S}_{ab}(u^{2\gamma}, v) = \frac{1}{h_{ab}(u, v) h_{ab}(u^{2\gamma}, v)} \mathcal{C}_a {}^{t_a}(\mathcal{S}_{ab}^{-1})(u, v) \mathcal{C}_a^{-1}, \quad (32)$$

where the crossing matrix satisfies ${}^{t_a} \mathcal{C}_a = (-1)^a \mathcal{C}_a$, $\mathcal{C}_a^2 = \kappa_a = \text{diag}(-1_B, 1_F)$, $\mathcal{C}_a {}^{t_a} \mathcal{S}_{ab} \mathcal{C}_a^{-1} = \mathcal{C}_b {}^{t_b} \mathcal{S}_{ab} \mathcal{C}_b^{-1}$ and $[\mathcal{C}_a, \kappa_a] = 0$. The superscript t_a indicates the partial super-transposition in the space a . The super-transpose of an arbitrary matrix M is given in components by

$$({}^t M)_{ij} = (-1)^{f_i f_j + f_i} M_{ji}, \quad (33)$$

where f_i is the fermion number in state i . Notice that this definition implies that

$${}^{t_a}({}^{t_a} M) = \kappa_a M \kappa_a, \quad \text{Tr}_a({}^{t_a} M {}^{t_a} N) = \text{STr}_a(M \kappa_a N), \quad (34)$$

for arbitrary matrices M and N . From the crossing relation and equation (31), one deduces the ‘‘crossed unitarity’’ property

$${}^{t_a} \mathcal{S}_{ab} {}^{t_a}(\mathcal{S}_{ab}^{-1}) = H_{ab} \mathbf{1}_{ab}. \quad (35)$$

Using this relation and the observation (34), we get that for any of our twist matrices τ ,

$$\text{STr}_a \mathcal{S}_{ab} \tau_a \mathcal{S}_{ab}^{-1} = \text{STr}_a \mathcal{S}_{ab}^{-1} \tau_a \mathcal{S}_{ab} = \text{STr}_a(\tau_a) H_{ab} \mathbf{1}_b. \quad (36)$$

We also have

$$\mathcal{S}_{aa}(u, u) = \mathcal{P}^g, \quad (37)$$

where \mathcal{P}^g is the graded permutation. Mathematica experiments with the code provided in [59] suggest that the following formulas also hold,

$$2i \text{STr}_a \mathcal{S}_{ab}^{-1} \partial_u \mathcal{S}_{ab} = k_a(u) (1 - H_{ab}) \mathbf{1}_b, \quad (38)$$

$$2 \text{STr}_{ab} \mathcal{S}_{ab}^{-1} \partial_u \partial_v \mathcal{S}_{ab} = p'_a(u) p'_b(v) (1 - H_{ab}), \quad (39)$$

with p'_a and $k_a(u)$ defined through

$$k_a \pm p'_a = -2 e^{\pm \tilde{E}_a} \mu_a, \quad p_a = i \ln(x^{[-a]}/x^{[+a]}). \quad (40)$$

We leave the analytical proof of these formulas for a subsequent work.




Figure 4. Cutting open the two pairs of pants $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ into four hexagons on physical bridges of lengths $r_{\ell+k}$, r_ℓ and r_k respectively. Here, the sets of magnons \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{w} are represented by a single magnon, for simplicity.

Twists and \mathbb{Z}_K orbifolds

As discussed in the main text, the theory obtained by the \mathbb{Z}_K orbifolding of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM with gauge group $SU(NK)$ has K distinct vacua of length L

$$\mathcal{O}_L^{(\alpha)} = \text{Tr}(\gamma^\alpha Z^L), \quad \alpha = 0 \dots K-1 \quad (41)$$

where $\gamma = (\mathbf{1}_N, \rho \mathbf{1}_N, \dots, \rho^{K-1} \mathbf{1}_N)$ and $\rho = e^{2\pi i/K}$. In particular, the $\mathcal{O}_L^{(0)}$ is called “untwisted” and the other ones “twisted”. The action of γ on the other scalar fields of the original theory is:

$$\gamma(X, Y) \gamma^{-1} = \rho(X, Y), \quad (42)$$

$$\gamma(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) \gamma^{-1} = \rho^{-1}(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}), \quad (43)$$

while the covariant derivatives are left untouched and some fermions are twisted. These fields represent magnons on top of the vacua and can be written in the bi-fundamental representation of $\text{PSU}(2|2)^2$ with the magnons $(\dot{\varphi}_1, \dot{\varphi}_2, \dot{\psi}_1, \dot{\psi}_2) \times (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \psi_1, \psi_2)$,

$$X = \dot{\varphi}_1 \varphi_1, \quad \bar{X} = -\dot{\varphi}_2 \varphi_2, \quad Y = \dot{\varphi}_2 \varphi_1, \quad \bar{Y} = \dot{\varphi}_1 \varphi_2, \quad \mathcal{D}^{\beta\dot{\beta}} = \dot{\psi}^{\dot{\beta}} \psi^\beta. \quad (44)$$

One can then understand the effect of γ as sending $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \rho \varphi_1$ and $\varphi_2 \rightarrow \rho^{-1} \varphi_2$ while keeping $\dot{\varphi}$, ψ and $\dot{\psi}$ unchanged, that is, acting with a twist $(1, 1, 1, 1)_L \times \tau_R = (1, 1, 1, 1)_L \times (\rho, \rho^{-1}, 1, 1)_R$ on the magnons. This motivates us to implement the matrices γ^α in the hexagon computation as insertions of powers τ^α of the twist τ . We insert the twists in the legs between chiral $\mathcal{O}_L^{(\alpha)}$ and anti-chiral $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_L^{(\alpha)}$ operators as in Figure 1.

Regularization on the genus-two surface

In this section we outline the regularization procedure for the three-point function. As described in the main text, we begin by gluing two pair of pants along three long legs of lengths r_k , r_ℓ and r_p associated to the operators $\mathcal{O}_k^{(\alpha_1)}$, $\mathcal{O}_\ell^{(\alpha_2)}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_p^{(\alpha_3)}$, respectively. Next, we compute the resulting genus-two surface by cutting it open into two pairs of pants with mirror magnons, like in Figure 3. Now, the lengths $R_\ell = r_\ell + r_p$, $R_0 = r_\ell + r_k$, $R_k = r_k + r_p$ serve as regulators for the volume of the mirror channels. We have to sum over an arbitrary number of these magnons on each cut. We recover the square of the three-point function in the limit $r_j \rightarrow \infty$.

The object we compute can be written schematically as

$$\left(C_{k,\ell,p}^{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)} \right)^2 = \sum_{n_u, n_v, n_w \geq 0} \mathcal{C}_{(n_u, n_v, n_w)} \quad (45)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{(n_u, n_v, n_w)} = \frac{1}{n_u! n_v! n_w!} \lim_{r_j \rightarrow \infty} \int d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} d\mathbf{w} \mu(\mathbf{u}) \mu(\mathbf{v}) \mu(\mathbf{w}) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}(\mathbf{u}) - k \tilde{E}(\mathbf{w})} \text{STr} \left(\tau_{\mathbf{u}}^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \tau_{\mathbf{w}}^{\alpha_1} \bar{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \right),$$

where n_u, n_v, n_w denote the numbers of magnons in the sets $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$. The twists $\tau_{\mathbf{u}}^{\alpha_2}$ and $\tau_{\mathbf{w}}^{\alpha_1}$ are inserted for the magnons on the bridge of length ℓ and k , respectively. We can now think of the mirror pair of pants as asymptotic three-point functions, each of which can be cut into two hexagons by splitting the rapidities in all the possible ways between the two hexagons, as shown in Figure 4. This can be written schematically as

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \sum_{\substack{\beta_u \cup \bar{\beta}_u = \mathbf{u} \\ \beta_v \cup \bar{\beta}_v = \mathbf{v} \\ \beta_w \cup \bar{\beta}_w = \mathbf{w}}} w_{R_\ell}(\beta_u, \bar{\beta}_u) w_{R_0}(\beta_v, \bar{\beta}_v) w_{R_k}(\beta_w, \bar{\beta}_w) \mathcal{H}(\beta_v^{4\gamma}, \beta_w^{2\gamma}, \beta_u) \mathcal{H}(\bar{\beta}_u^{4\gamma}, \bar{\beta}_w^{2\gamma}, \bar{\beta}_v), \quad (46)$$

where $\beta_u = (u_{i_1}, \dots, u_{i_{|\beta_u|}})$ and the indices are ordered: $i_1 < \dots < i_{|\beta_u|}$. When all the magnons are on the same mirror edge, the hexagon weights $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})$ are given by

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u}) = (-1)^{\mathfrak{f}} \left(\prod_{i < j} h(u_i, u_j) \right) (\dots \mathcal{S}_{23} \mathcal{S}_{13} \mathcal{S}_{12}), \quad (47)$$

where \mathfrak{f} is a grading factor that we do not need to specify. The crossings 2γ or 4γ of the rapidities that appear in (46) account for moving some of the magnons to other mirror edges. The transition factors w_R account for the moves of magnons from one hexagon to the other. They include a phase factor and a product of scattering matrices that represent the magnon reordering necessary for the partitioning. For instance, $w_{R_\ell}(\beta, \bar{\beta})$ is given by

$$w_{R_\ell}(\beta, \bar{\beta}) = (-1)^{|\bar{\beta}|} \prod_{u_j \in \bar{\beta}} e^{i\bar{p}(u_j) r_\ell} \prod_{\substack{u_j \in \bar{\beta}, u_k \in \beta \\ j < k}} \mathbb{S}(u_j, u_k) = (-1)^{|\bar{\beta}|} \prod_{u_j \in \bar{\beta}} e^{-i\bar{p}(u_j) r_{\ell+k}} \prod_{\substack{u_j \in \bar{\beta}, u_k \in \beta \\ j > k}} \mathbb{S}(u_k, u_j), \quad (48)$$

with $\mathbb{S}(u, v) = S_0(u, v) \mathcal{S}(u, v) \otimes \mathcal{S}(u, v)$, with $S_0(u, v) = h(u, v)/h(v, u)$ and $\mathcal{S}(u, v)$ the scalar factor and Beisert's PSU(2|2) scattering matrix respectively, all in mirror kinematics. Furthermore, $\tilde{p}_a(u) = g \left(x^{[a]} - \frac{1}{x^{[a]}} + x^{[-a]} - \frac{1}{x^{[-a]}} \right)$ denotes the mirror momentum. Transitioning from one hexagon to the other can be done in two different ways, for example the magnons \mathbf{u} in the left pants in Figure 4 can transition from the upper left hexagon to the lower left hexagon either through the bridge of length r_ℓ or through the one of length $r_{\ell+k}$. When $R_\ell = r_\ell + r_{\ell+k}$ is finite, the equivalence of the two type of transitions in (48) is insured by the Bethe equations.

Below, we will choose either of the two forms of the transition factor depending on what we find more convenient for the large-volume limit, keeping in mind that they are equivalent.

Details of the computation

In this section we will compute the different contributions of the virtual magnons to the square of the structure constant. Let us first briefly explain the origin of the various factors.

- *Bridge contributions.* Summing over configurations with all magnons on the same seam yields the squares of the bridge contributions,

$$\sum_{n_u=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(n_u, 0, 0)} = \left(B_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} \right)^2, \quad \sum_{n_v=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(0, n_v, 0)} = 1, \quad \sum_{n_w=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(0, 0, n_w)} = \left(B_k^{(\alpha_1)} \right)^2. \quad (49)$$

- *Wrapping contributions.* Hexagons have singularities when magnons sitting on two different mirror edges have coinciding rapidities and bound-state indices. Some of these singularities give rise to contact terms which we call wrapping contributions. They are contained in the configurations with the same number of magnons on two different mirror seams (see Figure 7)

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(n, n, 0)} = \left(W_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} \right)^2, \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(0, n, n)} = \left(W_k^{(\alpha_1)} \right)^2, \quad (50)$$

or more generally

$$\sum_{n_u, n_v=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(n_u, n_v, 0)} = \left(W_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} B_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} \right)^2, \quad \sum_{n_v, n_w=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(0, n_v, n_w)} = \left(W_k^{(\alpha_1)} B_k^{(\alpha_1)} \right)^2, \quad \sum_{n_w, n_u=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(n_u, 0, n_w)} = \left(B_k^{(\alpha_1)} B_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} W_p^{(\alpha_3)} \right)^2. \quad (51)$$




Figure 5. Cutting mirror pants into hexagons along a physical bridge of length r_ℓ and transporting excitations from one hexagon to another. An orientation is needed to define the transport factors for the magnons moving from a hexagon to the other. A magnon with momentum $\tilde{p}(u)$ gets a factor $e^{i\tilde{p}(u)r_\ell}$ when it crosses the bridge of length r_ℓ in the direction of the arrow, as in right pair of pants, and $e^{-i\tilde{p}(u)r_\ell}$ when it moves against them, as for the left one.

- *Bridge-like contributions.* The decoupling singularities also give rise to a contribution that looks like a regular bridge contribution with effective bridge length p . They come from contact terms where magnons excitations in three different channels coincide, and thus are contained in the configurations with the same number of magnons in all three mirror edges, as in Figure 8. We have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(n,n,n)} \supset \left(B_p^{(\alpha_3)} \right)^2. \quad (52)$$

a) Bridge

One-magnon bridge contribution. Let us start by considering the configuration with one single magnon u in the mirror seam with length R_ℓ gluing the two mirror pair of pants in Figure 3. Using (45), this is equal to

$$\mathcal{C}_{(1,0,0)} = \lim_{r_\ell \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du}{2\pi} \mu_a(u) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_a(u)} \text{STr}_a \left(\tau_a^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{G}(u) \bar{\mathcal{G}}(u) \right) \quad (53)$$

with $\mathcal{G}(u)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(u)$ represented in Figure 5. The transition factor $e^{-i\tilde{p}_a(u)r_\ell}$ appears when a magnon crosses from the upper to the lower hexagon on the left pair of pants $\mathcal{G}(u)$, while $e^{i\tilde{p}_a(u)r_\ell}$ appears when a magnon crosses from the upper to the lower hexagon on the right pair of pants, $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(u)$.

Plugging these building blocks in (53), we get

$$\mathcal{C}_{(1,0,0)} = \lim_{r_\ell \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du}{2\pi} \mu_a(u) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_a(u)} T_a^{(\alpha_2)} \left(1 - e^{-i\tilde{p}_a(u)r_\ell} - e^{i\tilde{p}_a(u)r_\ell} + 1 \right) = 2 \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du}{2\pi} e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_a(u)} \mathbb{B}_1 \quad (54)$$

with $T_a^{(\alpha)} = \text{STr} \tau_a^\alpha = 4as_\alpha$. When r is large, the two middle terms in (54) oscillate rapidly and their contributions are thus suppressed when integrated. Notice that we get *twice* the one-magnon bridge contribution, as expected since we are computing the square of the structure constant.

Multi-magnon bridge contributions. This argument extends almost straightforwardly to $\mathcal{C}_{(n,0,0)}$, with n excitations on one seam and none on the other two.

$$\mathcal{C}_{(n,0,0)} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n!} \int d\mathbf{u} \mu(\mathbf{u}) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}(\mathbf{u})} \sum_{\substack{\alpha \cup \bar{\alpha} = \mathbf{u} \\ \beta \cup \bar{\beta} = \mathbf{u}}} (-1)^{|\bar{\alpha}| + |\bar{\beta}|} e^{-i(\tilde{p}(\bar{\alpha}) - \tilde{p}(\bar{\beta}))r_\ell} h_{<}(\alpha) h_{<}(\bar{\alpha}) h_{>}(\beta) h_{>}(\bar{\beta}) \cdots, \quad (55)$$

where

$$h_{<}(\beta) = \prod_{\substack{u_j, u_k \in \beta \\ j < k}} h_{a_j, a_k}(u_j, u_k), \quad h_{>}(\beta) = \prod_{\substack{u_j, u_k \in \beta \\ j > k}} h_{a_j, a_k}(u_j, u_k), \quad H(\beta) = h_{<}(\beta) h_{>}(\beta), \quad (56)$$

and the dots stand for a super-trace of a product of S-matrices that contains no decoupling poles. In the limit $r_\ell \rightarrow \infty$, the only terms that survive are those where there are no exponential factors left. This corresponds to situations where




Figure 6. Distribution of two magnons on opposite sides of the first pair of pants, according to (60).

the left and right octagons are mirror images of one another, *i.e.* $\alpha = \beta$. In those cases, the S-matrices simply cancel and the super-trace trivially reduces to $\text{STr} \prod_{k=1}^n \tau_{a_k}^{\alpha_2} = \prod_{k=1}^n T_{a_k}^{(\alpha_2)}$. The sum then becomes

$$\mathcal{C}_{(n,0,0)} = \frac{1}{n!} \prod_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{a_k=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du_k}{2\pi} \mu_{a_k}(u_k) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_{a_k}(u)} T_{a_k}^{(\alpha_2)} \right) \sum_{\beta \cup \bar{\beta} = \mathbf{u}} H(\beta) H(\bar{\beta}) \quad (57)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n!} \prod_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{a_k=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du_k}{2\pi} e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_{a_k}(u)} \right) \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} \mathbb{B}_m \mathbb{B}_{n-m}. \quad (58)$$

We recognize the last line of the equation above as the n -th order term in the expansion of $(B_\ell^{(\alpha_2)})^2$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(n,0,0)} = (B_\ell^{(\alpha_2)})^2. \quad (59)$$

The situation is obviously similar for the other bridges, and we obtain (49).

b) Wrapping

One-wrapping contribution. As was explained before, the decoupling poles are responsible for the wrapping contributions. The simplest configurations for which they appear involve two magnons in different mirror seams, such as $\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,0)}$ where one magnon is on the seam of length ℓ and the other that of length 0. In the following, we describe how the regularization of these poles generates the wrapping contributions. According to our prescription, we begin by cutting the pairs of pants $\mathcal{G}(u, v)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{G}}(u, v)$ into hexagons, as shown in Figure 6,

$$\mathcal{G}(u, v) = \frac{\kappa_a \mathcal{S}_{ba}(v, u) \kappa_a}{h_{ab}(u, v)} - e^{i\tilde{p}_b(v)r_\ell} - e^{-i\tilde{p}_a(u)r_\ell} + e^{i(\tilde{p}_b(v) - \tilde{p}_a(u))r_\ell} \frac{\kappa_a \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v) \kappa_a}{h_{ba}(v, u)}, \quad (60)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{G}}(u, v) = \frac{\kappa_a \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v) \kappa_a}{h_{ba}(v, u)} - e^{-i\tilde{p}_b(v)r_\ell} - e^{i\tilde{p}_a(u)r_\ell} + e^{i(\tilde{p}_a(u) - \tilde{p}_b(v))r_\ell} \frac{\kappa_a \mathcal{S}_{ba}(v, u) \kappa_a}{h_{ab}(u, v)}. \quad (61)$$

The next step is to compute $\text{STr}_{ab} \tau_a \mathcal{G}(u, v) \tau_b^0 \bar{\mathcal{G}}(u, v)$. Taking the trace with the help of (36), we see that all diagonal terms (the ones in which the exponential factors cancel) are equal to $T_a^{(\alpha_2)} T_b^{(0)} = 0$. For the other one-wrapping contributions, corresponding to $\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,0)}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{(0,1,1)}$, we would get $T_a^{(\alpha_1)} T_b^{(0)} = 0$ and $T_a^{(\alpha_2)} T_b^{(\alpha_1)}$ respectively. Therefore, the diagonal terms do not give any contribution to $\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,0)}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{(0,1,1)}$, whereas for $\mathcal{C}_{(1,0,1)}$, they contribute to the $B_\ell^2 B_k^2$ part of (51).

For the remaining terms, we want to perform the integral over v by closing the integration contours in the upper or lower half-plane. The choice of half-plane is dictated by the behavior of the factors $e^{\pm i\tilde{p}_b(v)r_\ell}$, with $\tilde{p}_b(v) \sim 2v$ at large v . Due to the presence of the decoupling poles, the integrals are only well defined if the u and v contours do not intersect. Throughout this Supplemental Material, we choose to set $\text{Im } u = +\epsilon$ for with small positive ϵ and $\text{Im } v = 0$, as well as $\text{Im } w = -\epsilon$ for magnons on the third mirror edge, see below. We stress that the final results do not depend on the ordering we choose for the contours, provided we keep the same for all the computations. When




Figure 7. Different distributions of magnons that potentially contribute to $\mathcal{C}_{(2,2,0)}$.

computing the integrals over v by residues the main contribution will be from the decoupling pole at $(v, b) = (u, a)$. These contributions are what we call *contact terms*. The integrand might contain other poles in the complex plane at positions $v = v_*$ but their contribution will be weighted by $e^{-|\text{Im } \tilde{p}_b(v_*)| r_\ell}$, and will be suppressed when $r_\ell \rightarrow \infty$.

It becomes clear then that the only surviving contact term will be

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{(1,1,0)} &= \lim_{r_\ell \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a,b=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du dv}{(2\pi)^2} \mu_a(u) \mu_b(v) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_a(u) + i(\tilde{p}_b(v) - \tilde{p}_a(u)) r_\ell} \frac{\text{STr}_{ab} \tau_a^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v) \tau_b^0 \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v)}{h_{ba}^2(v, u)} \\ &= \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du}{2\pi} e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_a(u)} (-i \partial_v \text{STr}_{ab} \tau_a^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v) \tau_b^0 \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v)) \Big|_{v \rightarrow u}. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

For the last equality, we have used (30) and the fact that the terms where the v derivative acts outside the super-trace are zero, since $\text{STr}_{ab} \tau_a^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v) \tau_b^0 \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v) \Big|_{v \rightarrow u} = \text{STr}_{ab} \tau_a^{\alpha_2+0} \mathbf{1}_b = 0$. This explains in particular why there are no volume-dependent corrections in the wrapping terms, which would come from the derivative acting on the exponential factor depending on r 's. All the discussion above can be adapted for the other pairings as well.

Multi-wrapping contributions. It is clear from the discussion above that the configurations with magnons on two out of the three seams contain many terms, and we claim that they resum to (51). However, in order to isolate the wrapping contributions, without any bridge contributions, it is enough to consider configurations with the same number n of magnons on two seams. The wrapping contributions then come from the unique term in which we must perform n of the $2n$ integrals, thus identifying the two sets of n rapidities (see Figure 7c)). Namely, for $\mathcal{C}_{(n,n,0)}$,

$$\mathcal{C}_{(n,n,0)} \supset \lim_{r_\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(n!)^2} \int d\mathbf{u} d\mathbf{v} \mu(\mathbf{u}) \mu(\mathbf{v}) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}(\mathbf{u}) + i(\tilde{p}(\mathbf{v}) - \tilde{p}(\mathbf{u})) r_\ell} \frac{H(\mathbf{u}) H(\mathbf{v})}{h_{\mathbf{b}\mathbf{a}}^2(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u})} \text{STr} \prod_{k=1}^n \tau_{a_k} \left(\prod_{i,j=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{a_i, b_j}(u_i, v_j) \right)^2, \quad (63)$$

where we have used the Yang–Baxter equation and unitarity to simplify the matrix part. Using the property (30) we can perform the integration in the v_k 's by closing the integration contours in the upper half-plane and picking the residues at some decoupling poles. We point out that two rapidities v_i and v_k cannot decouple to the same rapidity u_j . This happens because of presence of the factor $H(\mathbf{v})$ in the numerator and because the trace vanishes when two (b_i, v_i) and (b_k, v_k) are equal to the same (a_j, u_j) . There are thus $n!$ ways of identifying the $u_j = v_k$ and all of them are equivalent because the integrand is completely symmetric in the u_j 's and, separately, in the v_k 's. The final result is

$$\mathcal{C}_{(n,n,0)} \supset \frac{1}{n!} \prod_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{a_k=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du_k}{2\pi} e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_{a_k}(u_k)} \right) \mathbb{W}_n \implies \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_{(n,n,0)} \supset \left(W_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} \right)^2, \quad (64)$$

where

$$\mathbb{W}_n \equiv \text{STr} \prod_{k=1}^n \tau_{a_k}^\alpha (-i \partial_{v_k}) \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{a_i, b_j}(u_i, v_j) \right) \prod_{k=1}^n \tau_{b_k}^0 \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{S}_{a_i, b_j}(u_i, v_j) \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{v} \rightarrow \mathbf{u}}. \quad (65)$$

Clearly, a similar computation applies to $\mathcal{C}_{(n,0,n)}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{(0,n,n)}$.

The rest of this subsection is devoted to discussing some of the other terms that appear when $n = 2$. We focus on those shown in Figures 7a) and 7b) for the case of $\mathcal{C}_{(2,2,0)}$. In the first case, where we all the magnons are in the upper hexagons, the contribution from the form factors and twists is

$$\frac{H_{u_1 u_2} H_{v_1 v_2}}{\prod_{j,k=1}^2 H_{u_j v_k}} \text{STr} [\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_2} \tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2} (\mathcal{S}_{u_1 u_2} \mathcal{S}_{v_1 u_2} \mathcal{S}_{v_2 u_2} \mathcal{S}_{v_1 u_1} \mathcal{S}_{v_2 u_1} \mathcal{S}_{v_2 v_1}) \tau_{v_1}^0 \tau_{v_2}^0 (\mathcal{S}_{v_1 v_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 u_1})]. \quad (66)$$

Using unitarity and crossed unitarity (35), this simply reduces to

$$\left(H_{a_1 a_2}(u_1, u_2) T_{a_1}^{(\alpha_2)} T_{a_2}^{(\alpha_2)} \right) \left(H_{b_1 b_2}(v_1, v_2) T_{a_1}^{(0)} T_{a_2}^{(0)} \right) = 0. \quad (67)$$

The analogous contribution to $\mathcal{C}_{(0,2,2)}$ vanishes as well, whereas the one for $\mathcal{C}_{(2,0,2)}$ gives part of the expansion of $B_\ell^2 B_k^2$, exactly as in the $n = 1$ case treated above. In the situation of Figure 7b), we have

$$\frac{h_{u_2 u_1} h_{v_1 v_2}}{H_{u_1 v_1} h_{v_2 u_2}^2 h_{v_1 u_2} h_{v_2 u_1}} \text{STr} [\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_2} \tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2} (\mathcal{S}_{v_1 u_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_2}) \tau_{v_1}^0 \tau_{v_2}^0 (\mathcal{S}_{v_1 v_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 u_1})]. \quad (68)$$

We need to perform the integral in v_2 by picking the double pole at $v_2 = u_2$. As before, the terms in which the derivative acts on the scalar part vanish. Indeed, using $\mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, u) = \mathcal{P}_{ab}$ the expression above becomes proportional to

$$\text{STr} [\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_2} \tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{v_1 u_1} \tau_{v_1}^0 \tau_{u_2}^0 \mathcal{S}_{v_1 u_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 u_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 u_1}] = \text{STr} [\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_2} \tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2+0} \mathcal{S}_{v_1 u_1} \tau_{v_1}^0 \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_1}] = 0. \quad (69)$$

For the first equality we have used Yang–Baxter and unitarity and for the second we used the fact that the trace in the space b_2 associated to the rapidity v_2 vanishes. A similar argument holds when the derivative acts on $\mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_2}$ or on $\mathcal{S}_{v_1 v_2}$. If it acts, for instance, on the first $\mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_2}$, we get

$$\frac{1}{H_{u_1 v_1}} \text{STr} [\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_2} \tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2+0} \mathcal{S}_{v_1 u_1} (\partial_2 \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_2}) \mathcal{P}_{u_2 v_2} \tau_{v_1}^0 \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_1}] = \frac{1}{H_{u_1 v_1}} \text{STr} [\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{v_1 u_1} \tau_{v_1}^0 \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_1}] \text{STr} [\tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2+0} (\partial_2 \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_2}) \mathcal{P}_{u_2 v_2}] \quad (70)$$

$$= T_{a_1}^{(\alpha_2)} T_{b_1}^{(0)} \times \text{STr} [\tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2+0} (\partial_2 \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_2}) \mathcal{P}_{u_2 v_2}] = 0. \quad (71)$$

If the derivative acts on the other instance of $\mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_2}$, the same result holds. Again, the analogous contribution to $\mathcal{C}_{(0,2,2)}$ vanishes as well, whereas the one for $\mathcal{C}_{(2,0,2)}$ gives part of the expansion of $(B_k^{(\alpha_1)} B_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} W_p^{(\alpha_3)})^2$.

c) Bridge-like contribution

One-magnon bridge-like contribution. There is another type of contact terms coming from identifying magnons in the three mirror bridges of a hexagon, $(u_i, a_i) = (v_j, b_j) = (w_k, c_k)$. We consider below the simplest case $\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}$. From the previous discussions, we understand that the configurations that survive at large r 's are those where pairs of magnons on opposite edges are transported through the same leg. Some of them are depicted in Figure 8. The first configuration evaluates to

$$\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(1)} = \lim_{r_{\ell+k} \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a,b,c=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du dv dw}{(2\pi)^3} \mu_a(u) \mu_b(v) \mu_c(w) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_a(u) - k \tilde{E}_c(w) + i(\tilde{p}_c(w) - \tilde{p}_a(u)) r_{\ell+k}} h_{ac}(u^{4\gamma}, w) h_{ba}(v^{4\gamma}, u) \\ \times h_{ca}(w^{2\gamma}, u) h_{bc}(v^{4\gamma}, w^{2\gamma}) \text{STr}_{abc} \tau_a^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{ac}(u^{4\gamma}, w) \tau_c^{\alpha_1} \mathcal{S}_{ca}(w^{2\gamma}, u) \mathcal{S}_{ba}(v^{4\gamma}, u) \mathcal{S}_{bc}(v^{4\gamma}, w^{2\gamma}). \quad (72)$$

Using the crossing property (32) of the S-matrix, we can bring the previous expression to the form

$$\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(1)} = \lim_{r_{\ell+k} \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a,b,c=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du dv dw}{(2\pi)^3} \mu_a(u) \mu_b(v) \mu_c(w) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_a(u) - k \tilde{E}_c(w) + i(\tilde{p}_c(w) - \tilde{p}_a(u)) r_{\ell+k}} \\ \times \frac{h_{ca}(w^{2\gamma}, u)}{h_{ab}(u, v) h_{cb}(w^{2\gamma}, v) h_{ca}(w, u)} \text{STr}_{abc} \tau_a^{\alpha_2} \kappa_c \mathcal{S}_{ac}(u, w) \kappa_c \tau_c^{\alpha_1} \mathcal{S}_{ca}(w^{2\gamma}, u) \mathcal{S}_{ba}(v, u) \mathcal{S}_{bc}(v, w^{2\gamma}). \quad (73)$$




Figure 8. Three three-magnon configurations giving rise to the bridge-like contribution $\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2, 3$. The configurations rotated by 180° contribute the same amount. The pairs of magnons (u, w) , (u, v) and (w, v) are transported through the legs of lengths r_{l+k} , r_ℓ and r_k respectively.

Now we perform the integral over u by deforming the contour in the lower half-plane and picking the residue at $(a, u) = (b, v)$. Using $\mathcal{S}_{aa}(u, u) = \mathcal{P}^g$ and unitarity, the super-trace simplifies and the result is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(1)} = - \lim_{r_{\ell+k} \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{b,c=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{dv dw}{(2\pi)^2} \mu_b(v) \mu_c(w) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_b(v) - k \tilde{E}_c(w) + i(\tilde{p}_c(w) - \tilde{p}_b(v))r_{\ell+k}} \frac{1}{h_{cb}(w, v)} \text{STr}_{bc} \tau_b^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{bc}(u, w) \tau_c^{\alpha_1}. \quad (74)$$

Then, performing the integral over v by closing the contour in the lower half-plane and picking the pole in $(b, v) = (c, w)$, we arrive at

$$\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(1)} = - \sum_{c=1}^{\infty} T_c^{(\alpha_3)} \int \frac{dw}{2\pi} e^{-(\ell+k)\tilde{E}_c(w)} \mu_c(w). \quad (75)$$

When we computed the integral over u , we should have also picked the residue of the apparent double pole at $(a, u) = (c, w)$. However, one can use (26) to show that it vanishes.

There are other configurations that contribute. Two of them are obtained from the one we have already considered by bringing down either the pair (u, v) or the pair (v, w) on the left pair of pants, see Figure 8. The first one produces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(2)} &= \lim_{r_{\ell+k} \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{a,b,c=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du dv dw}{(2\pi)^3} \mu_a(u) \mu_b(v) \mu_c(w) e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_a(u) - k \tilde{E}_c(w) + i(\tilde{p}_c(w) - \tilde{p}_a(u))r_{\ell+k} + i(\tilde{p}_b(v) - \tilde{p}_a(u))r_\ell} \\ &\quad \times \frac{\text{STr}_{abc} \tau_a^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{ab}(u, v) \tau_c^{\alpha_1} \mathcal{S}_{ac}(u, w)}{h_{ab}(v, u) h_{ca}(w, u)} = \sum_{c=1}^{\infty} T_a^{(\alpha_3)} \int \frac{du}{2\pi} e^{-(\ell+k)\tilde{E}_a(u)} \mu_a(u), \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

where we computed the integrals over v and w by closing the contours in the upper half-plane and picking the residues of the simple decoupling poles at $(b, v) = (a, u)$ and $(c, w) = (a, u)$. The second configuration yields the same result,

$$\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(3)} = \mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(2)} = -\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(1)}. \quad (77)$$

The last three non-vanishing configurations can be obtained graphically by rotating the previous three by 180° , hence they are equal to those we have previously computed. Summing up the six non-zero configurations we obtain indeed the first non-trivial term in the expansion of $\left(B_p^{(\alpha_3)}\right)^2$,

$$\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)} = 2 \left(\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(1)} + \mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(2)} + \mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(3)} \right) = 2 \mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(2)} = 2 \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \int \frac{du}{2\pi} e^{-\ell \tilde{E}_a(u)} \mathbb{B}_1 \Big|_{\ell \rightarrow \ell+k}. \quad (78)$$

By inspection, these are the only non-vanishing terms where the three rapidities can be identified. Other terms with non-coinciding rapidities can be studied in the same way as in the previous sections and are contained in either $\left(B_k^{(\alpha_1)} W_\ell^{(\alpha_2)}\right)^2$ or $\left(B_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} W_k^{(\alpha_1)}\right)^2$.




Figure 9. Three different configurations contributing to $\mathcal{C}_{(2,1,1)} = \mathcal{C}_{(1,1,0)} \mathcal{C}_{(1,0,1)} + \mathcal{C}_{(1,0,0)} \mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}$. The first one factorizes into two wrapping magnons, the other two factorize into different contributions to the bridge \times bridge-like contribution. A factor of two arises from the exchange of u_1 and u_2 . In the two rightmost configurations, another factor of two arises from putting the bridge magnon in the lower hexagons.

Multi-magnon bridge-like contributions. We remark that although it is difficult to explicitly compute the higher bridge-like contributions, they will come from configurations which are superpositions of copies of the diagrams of Figure 8 and their rotated counterparts. As an example, consider the diagram formed by combining two copies of $\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(2)}$ in Figure 8. The hexagons together with the combinatorial factors in (45) give, after using the Yang–Baxter relation and unitarity,

$$\frac{1}{(2!)^3} \frac{H_{u_1 u_2} H_{v_1 v_2} H_{w_1 w_2}}{h_{v_1 u_1} h_{v_2 u_1} h_{v_2 u_1} h_{v_2 u_2} h_{w_1 u_1} h_{w_2 u_1} h_{w_2 u_1} h_{w_2 u_2}} \text{STr} \left[\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_2} \tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_2} \tau_{w_1}^{\alpha_1} \tau_{w_2}^{\alpha_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 w_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 w_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 w_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 w_2} \right] \quad (79)$$

There are $(2!)^2$ ways of identifying the three sets of rapidities, all of which have the same result. Choosing for example $(a_j, u_j) = (b_j, v_j) = (c_j, w_j)$, we get:

$$\frac{1}{2!} H_{u_1 u_2} \text{STr} \left[\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_2} \tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v_1} \mathcal{P}_{u_2 v_2} \mathcal{P}_{u_1 v_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 v_2} \tau_{w_1}^{\alpha_1} \tau_{w_2}^{\alpha_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 w_1} \mathcal{P}_{u_2 w_2} \mathcal{P}_{u_1 w_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 w_2} \right] = \frac{1}{2!} T_{a_1}^{(\alpha_3)} T_{a_2}^{(\alpha_3)} H_{a_1 a_2}(u_1, u_2) \quad (80)$$

In total, there are 3^2 more contributions from superposing $\mathcal{C}_{\text{up}} = \{\mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(1)}, \mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(2)}, \mathcal{C}_{(1,1,1)}^{(3)}\}$ with themselves and they all sum to (80). We can also superpose the diagrams we obtain rotating \mathcal{C}_{up} by 180° , and that we denote $\mathcal{C}_{\text{up}}^{\text{rotated}}$, with themselves to get an extra factor of two and, finally, superpose \mathcal{C}_{up} and $\mathcal{C}_{\text{up}}^{\text{rotated}}$. The result will be the square of the one magnon bridge-like contribution. This has exactly the same structure as the bridge expansion.

Cross terms and factorization

One important feature of the structure constants considered in this work is its factorization in different pieces: bridge, wrapping, and bridge-like. Although we do not have an argument that works for any number of magnons, we have some understanding of how it does occur for the lower number of magnons. It is clear that the decoupling nature of the singularities associated with wrapping and bridge-like magnons plays an important role. To illustrate this, we examine $\mathcal{C}_{(2,1,1)}$, which includes a cross term between a bridge and a bridge-like magnon. As should be clear, these cross terms arise from diagrams that are superpositions of bridges and bridge-like diagrams; see Figure 9 middle and right.

Let us concentrate on the former. We have the following contribution from hexagons:

$$\frac{h_{w^{2\gamma} u_1} h_{w^{2\gamma} u_2} h_{u_1^{2\gamma} v} h_{u_2^{2\gamma} v} h_{u_1 u_2}}{h_{w u_1} h_{v u_2} h_{v w}} \text{STr} \left[\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_2} \tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{w^{2\gamma} u_1} \mathcal{S}_{w^{2\gamma} u_2} \mathcal{S}_{w v} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 u_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_1^{2\gamma} v} \mathcal{S}_{u_2^{2\gamma} v} \tau_w^{\alpha_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 w} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 v} \right] \quad (81)$$

We can pick the pole in $v = w$ to get, after using Yang–Baxter and unitarity,

$$\frac{h_{u_1 u_2}}{h_{w u_1} h_{w u_2}} \text{STr} \left[\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_2} \tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 u_2} \tau_w^{\alpha_1} \mathcal{S}_{u_1 w} \mathcal{S}_{u_2 w} \right] \quad (82)$$

Picking now the pole at $u_1 = w$, this reduces to

$$\text{STr} [\tau_{u_1}^{\alpha_3} \tau_{u_2}^{\alpha_2}] = T_{a_2}^{(\alpha_2)} T_{a_1}^{(\alpha_3)} \quad (83)$$

which agrees with our expectation since it is clearly a piece of $(B_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} B_p^{(\alpha_3)})^2$. As explained in the last sections, a similar mechanism is responsible for the factorization between bridge and wrapping magnons, see Equation (70) for instance. Another example of factorization is Figure 9 left. There, the pair of magnons (w, u_1) and (v, u_2) don't interact and each of them generates a different wrapping contribution, yielding a piece of $(W_\ell^{(\alpha_2)} W_p^{(\alpha_3)})^2$.

Pfaffian and connected terms

In this section we remind a few facts about the expansion of the Pfaffian in cycles similar to the one in [28]. Consider the antisymmetric $2n \times 2n$ matrix K with elements

$$K_{ij}^{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} = -K_{ji}^{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i} = \frac{x_i^{[\epsilon_i]} - x_j^{[\epsilon_j]}}{x_i^{[\epsilon_i]} x_j^{[\epsilon_j]} - 1}, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n, \quad \epsilon_i, \epsilon_j = \pm. \quad (84)$$

Define

$$H_{ij} = \prod_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j = \pm} K_{ij}^{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} \quad \text{and} \quad H_i = K_{ii}^{+-}. \quad (85)$$

Here, for simplicity, we consider just the matrices for the fundamental states, $a_i = 1$, and, unlike in the main text, the indices for the matrices refer to the rapidity rather than the bound state. The Pfaffian of K can be written as

$$\text{Pf}_n(K) = \prod_{i=1}^n H_i \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} H_{ij} \quad (86)$$

Defining a cycle of length n as

$$(\text{K}_{12} \text{K}_{23} \dots \text{K}_{n1}) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\epsilon_j = \pm} \left(\prod_j \epsilon_j \right) K_{12}^{-\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2} K_{23}^{-\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3} \dots K_{n1}^{-\epsilon_n, \epsilon_1}, \quad (\text{K}_{11}) \equiv -H_1, \quad (87)$$

and using the expression of the Pfaffian as a sum over permutations, one can express the Pfaffian as sums of products of cycles (connected terms)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pf}_1(K) &= -(\text{K}_{11}), \\ \text{Pf}_2(K) &= (\text{K}_{11})(\text{K}_{22}) - (\text{K}_{12} \text{K}_{21}), \\ \text{Pf}_3(K) &= -(\text{K}_{11})(\text{K}_{22})(\text{K}_{33}) + (\text{K}_{11})(\text{K}_{23} \text{K}_{32}) + (\text{K}_{22})(\text{K}_{13} \text{K}_{31}) + (\text{K}_{33})(\text{K}_{12} \text{K}_{21}) \\ &\quad - (\text{K}_{12} \text{K}_{23} \text{K}_{31}) - (\text{K}_{13} \text{K}_{32} \text{K}_{21}). \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

A cycle is invariant over circular permutation of indices, *e.g.* $(\text{K}_{12} \text{K}_{21}) = (\text{K}_{21} \text{K}_{12})$. Taking by convention the beginning of the cycle at index 1, there will be $(n-1)!$ different cycles of length n contributing to the connected part. Since all these different cycles give the same answer after integration, it is natural to define the connected part by dividing by the combinatorial factor $(n-1)!$. The relations (88) can then be inverted to get the expression of the connected part in terms of the weights H_{ij}

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CPf}_1(K) &\equiv -(\text{K}_{11}) = H_1, \\ \text{CPf}_2(K) &\equiv -(\text{K}_{12} \text{K}_{21}) = H_1 H_2 (H_{12} - 1), \\ \text{CPf}_3(K) &\equiv \frac{1}{2} [-(\text{K}_{12} \text{K}_{23} \text{K}_{31}) - (\text{K}_{13} \text{K}_{32} \text{K}_{21})] = \frac{1}{2} H_1 H_2 H_3 (H_{12} H_{13} H_{23} - H_{12} - H_{13} - H_{23} + 2). \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$