

The supersymmetric index in four dimensions

Leonardo Rastelli¹ and Shlomo S. Razamat²

¹ *C. N. Yang Institute for Theoretical Physics, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY
11794-3840, USA*

² *Department of Physics, Technion, Haifa, 32000, Israel*

leonardo.rastelli@stonybrook.edu, razamat@physics.technion.ac.il

Abstract

We review the calculation and properties of the supersymmetric index for four dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theories, illustrating its physical significance in several examples.

This is a contribution to the review volume “Localization techniques in quantum field theories” (eds. V. Pestun and M. Zabzine) which contains 17 Chapters available at [1]

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Definition of the index	3
2.1	Index as a trace	4
2.2	Index as a partition function	5
2.3	Computation of the index	6
3	Index of sigma models	9
4	Index of gauge theories	11
5	Index spectroscopy	16
5.1	An example	19
6	Dualities and Identities	20
6.1	Symmetries and transformations of the index	21
6.2	$\mathcal{N} = 4$ dualities	22
6.3	Seiberg dualities	23
6.4	Kutasov-Schwimmer dualities	24

7	Limits	24
7.1	Small τ limit, $\mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow 0$	24
7.2	Large τ limit, $\mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow 0$	28
7.3	Poles and residues	31
7.4	Large N limit	34
8	Other topics and open problems	35

1 Introduction

The technique of supersymmetric localization allows to compute the partition functions of several supersymmetric field theories on certain compact manifolds preserving some of the supersymmetry. In favorable cases, the procedure of localization reduces the computation of the infinite dimensional path integral to a finite dimensional integral or to a discrete sum. Many of the computable supersymmetric partition functions in dimension $d \leq 4$ are related to one another, see figure 1. The relations take two forms. First, different partition functions might be related by taking various limits of their parameters. For example, a partition function on a compact manifold can depend on the relative size of different components – sending that size to zero corresponds to computing a partition function of a theory in a lower dimension. Such limits are represented by solid lines in the figure. Second, partition functions on compact manifolds can sometimes be computed by gluing together partition functions on non-compact manifolds with prescribed boundary conditions at infinity. Different patterns of gluing of the same non-compact partition functions can lead to two different compact partition functions. For example, both the $\mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ partition function (the three-dimensional supersymmetric index) and the \mathbb{S}^3 partition function are obtained by gluing partition functions on $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{S}^1$. Such relations are denoted by dashed lines in the figure. Some of the relations indicated in the figure are well studied while for others only some partial understanding is available.¹

The main focus of this review article will be the $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ partition function, also known as the four-dimensional supersymmetric index, because it can be understood as the Witten index of the theory quantized on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$, refined by fugacities that keep track of the relevant quantum numbers. This is the simplest and arguably the most important observable in the network of partition functions shown in figure 1. For theories that admit a Lagrangian description, the four-dimensional index can be obtained by solving a simple counting problem: one enumerates (with signs) local gauge invariant operators built from elementary fields in the four dimensional theory, in the limit of vanishing coupling. By contrast, the supersymmetric index in other dimensions gets contributions from more complicated objects, such as instantons in five dimensions, monopoles in three dimensions, and local supersymmetric defects in two dimensions. The four-dimensional counting problem is efficiently encoded by a

¹This picture could be extended to a larger network of relations starting from higher dimensional theories – the \mathbb{S}^4 partition function [2] (see Contribution [3]), notably absent in figure 1, would be part of such an extended picture.




Figure 1: Different supersymmetric partition functions in dimensions 4, 3, 2 are related by limits of parameters (solid lines) and block decompositions (dashed lines). The $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ partition function (also known as the four-dimensional index) is one of the simplest and most useful partition functions.

simple matrix integral, which could be equivalently obtained by applying the recipe of supersymmetric localization to the $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ partition function. While the four-dimensional index is computationally simpler than other partition functions, its properties and the technology needed to extract physical information from it are of more universal applicability.

This review article is organized as follows. In section 2 we discuss the definition of the supersymmetric index and the prescription to compute it in any Lagrangian theory. In section 3 properties of the index of theories built from chiral fields with superpotential interactions are reviewed. In section 4 we discuss basic properties of the index of gauge theories. In section 5 we review superconformal representation theory and the way different multiplets are encoded in the index. In particular we review how to extract easily the spectrum of relevant and exactly marginal deformations. In section 6 we discuss briefly some of the mathematical properties of indices. In particular we review symmetries of the index and identities between indices of different looking theories related by dualities. In section 7 we review different physically important limits of the index. Finally, in section 8 we mention several topics not covered in detail in this review.

2 Definition of the index

There are two equivalent ways to define the supersymmetric index. It can be defined as the supersymmetric partition function on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, which depends holomorphically on two complex structure moduli (conventionally denoted p and q) and on holonomies for background gauge fields coupling to the flavor symmetries of the theory. Alternatively, it is given by an

appropriately weighted trace over the states of the theory quantized on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$. If the theory is conformal, one can use the state/operator map to interpret these states as local operators. Only in such cases it is appropriate to refer to the index as the *superconformal* index. There are many important examples of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superconformal field theories that can be reached as infrared fixed points of RG flows starting from weakly-coupled Lagrangian theories. One of the most useful properties of the index (most easily argued using its definition as a partition function) is its invariance under RG flow. This provides a powerful way to obtain the index of an IR fixed point, by performing a simple calculation in the UV.

2.1 Index as a trace

The index of a $4d$ superconformal field theory is defined as the Witten index of the theory in radial quantization. Let \mathcal{Q} be one of the Poincaré supercharges, and $\mathcal{Q}^\dagger = \mathcal{S}$ the conjugate conformal supercharge. Schematically, the index is defined as [4, 5, 6]

$$\mathcal{I}(\mu_i) = \text{Tr} (-1)^F e^{-\beta \delta} e^{-\mu_i \mathcal{M}_i}, \quad (2.1)$$

where the trace is over the Hilbert space of the theory quantized on \mathbb{S}^3 , $\delta \equiv \frac{1}{2}\{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q}^\dagger\}$, \mathcal{M}_i are \mathcal{Q} -closed conserved charges and μ_i the associated chemical potentials. Since states with $\delta > 0$ come in boson/fermion pairs, only the $\delta = 0$ states contribute, and the index is independent of β . There are infinitely many states with $\delta = 0$ – this is true even for a single short irreducible representation of the superconformal algebra, because some of the non-compact generators (some of the spacetime derivatives) have $\delta = 0$. The introduction of the chemical potentials μ_i serves both to regulate this divergence and to achieve a more refined counting.

For $\mathcal{N} = 1$, the supercharges are $\{\mathcal{Q}_\alpha, \mathcal{S}^\alpha \equiv \mathcal{Q}^{\dagger\alpha}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{\dot{\alpha}}, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}^{\dot{\alpha}} \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^{\dagger\dot{\alpha}}\}$, where $\alpha = \pm$ and $\dot{\alpha} = \pm$ are respectively $SU(2)_1$ and $SU(2)_2$ indices, with $SU(2)_1 \times SU(2)_2 = Spin(4)$ the isometry group of the \mathbb{S}^3 . The relevant anticommutators are

$$\{\mathcal{Q}_\alpha, \mathcal{Q}^{\dagger\beta}\} = E + 2M_\alpha^\beta + \frac{3}{2}r \quad (2.2)$$

$$\{\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{\dot{\alpha}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^{\dagger\dot{\beta}}\} = E + 2\tilde{M}_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\dot{\beta}} - \frac{3}{2}r, \quad (2.3)$$

where E is the conformal Hamiltonian, M_α^β and $\tilde{M}_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\dot{\beta}}$ the $SU(2)_1$ and $SU(2)_2$ generators, and r the generator of the $U(1)_r$ R-symmetry. In our conventions, the \mathcal{Q} s have $r = -1$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}$ s have $r = +1$, and of course the dagger operation flips the sign of r .

One can define two inequivalent indices, a “left-handed” index $\mathcal{I}^L(t, y)$ and a “right-

handed" index $\mathcal{I}^R(t, y)$. For the left-handed index, we pick say² $\mathcal{Q} \equiv \mathcal{Q}_-$,

$$\mathcal{I}^L(p, q) \equiv \text{Tr}(-1)^F p^{\frac{1}{3}(E+j_1)+j_2} q^{\frac{1}{3}(E+j_1)-j_2} = \text{Tr}(-1)^F p^{j_1+j_2-\frac{1}{2}r} q^{j_1-j_2-\frac{1}{2}r}, \quad \delta = E-2j_1+\frac{3}{2}r, \quad (2.4)$$

where j_1 and j_2 are the Cartan generators of $SU(2)_1$ and $SU(2)_2$. The two ways of writing the exponent of t are equivalent since they differ by a \mathcal{Q} -exact term. For the right-handed index, we pick say $\mathcal{Q} \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_-$,

$$\mathcal{I}^R(p, q) \equiv \text{Tr}(-1)^F p^{\frac{1}{3}(E+j_2)+j_1} q^{\frac{1}{3}(E+j_2)-j_1} = \text{Tr}(-1)^F p^{j_1+j_2+\frac{1}{2}r} q^{j_2-j_1+\frac{1}{2}r}, \quad \delta = E-2j_2-\frac{3}{2}r. \quad (2.5)$$

One may also introduce chemical potentials for global symmetries of the theory which commute with the supersymmetry algebra and thus conserve the index property of the trace. Such fugacities can be turned on for continuous and/or discrete symmetries as we will see in what follows.³

If the theory is *not* conformal, and is described instead by an RG flow from a free UV fixed point to an IR fixed point, one can still define the index from (2.1), evaluating the trace over the local operators at the UV fixed point, but making sure that the allowed symmetries are preserved along the flow. (In particular, the R-charge assignments must correspond to a non-anomalous R symmetry). Since the index is an RG invariant, this gives a recipe to evaluate the superconformal index of the IR fixed point. At intermediate scales on the flow, the index is interpreted as the partition function on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, or equivalently, as the trace over the states of the theory quantized on \mathbb{S}^3 .

2.2 Index as a partition function

Alternatively, the index can be defined as the supersymmetric partition function on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1_\tau$. As was argued in [8] (see also [9] any $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric theory can be put in a supersymmetric way on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1_\tau$ provided it possesses anomaly free $U(1)_r$ R symmetry. We refer to Contribution [10] for a detailed treatment and mention here only some of the salient points.

The $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1_\tau$ partition function depends holomorphically on the complex structure moduli p and q , and on the holonomies associated to flavor symmetries. It does *not* depend on gauge and superpotential couplings⁴, and is invariant under RG flow (Contribution [10]). The partition function can be evaluated by localization techniques [11, 12], and the result is the same matrix integral that we will obtain in the next subsection by enumeration of gauge invariant operators.

²Picking $\mathcal{Q} \equiv \mathcal{Q}_+$ would amount to the replacement $j_1 \leftrightarrow -j_1$, which is an equivalent choice because of $SU(2)_1$ symmetry. The same consideration applies to the right-handed index, which can be defined either choosing $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_-$ or $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_+$.

³One can consider additional generalizations of the index such as introduction of charge conjugation [7] to the trace but we will refrain from doing so here.

⁴But of course, the presence of a superpotential restricts the possible R charge assignments.

The precise equivalence of the trace formula for the index and the computation of the partition function requires a bit of care. When computing the index using the trace formula we implicitly normalize it so the vacuum (assuming it is unique) contributes +1 to the index. In particular in the large radius limit, $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ the index computed as a counting problem receives only contributions from the vacua, and assuming there is a unique vacuum (preserving certain global symmetries) the index in the limit is 1. However, while computing the partition function in the large radius limit one finds a contribution coming from the Casimir energy of the theory,

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1} \sim e^{-\tau E_{\text{Casimir}}} . \quad (2.6)$$

The trace formulation of the index and the partition function formulation thus differ by the multiplicative factor $e^{-\tau E_{\text{Casimir}}}$. The Casimir energy can be computed from the trace formulation of the index [13, 14, 15, 16],

$$E_{\text{Casimir}} = - \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{d\tau} \log \mathcal{I}(p = e^{-\tau\omega_1}, q = e^{-\tau\omega_2}, u_a = e^{im_a\tau}) \quad (2.7)$$

$$= \frac{2}{3}(a - c)(\omega_1 + \omega_2) + \frac{2}{27}(3c - 2a) \frac{(\omega_1 + \omega_2)^3}{\omega_1\omega_2}, \quad (2.8)$$

where a and c are the Weyl anomaly coefficients.

2.3 Computation of the index

By the state/operator correspondence the computation of the index of a conformal gauge theory proceeds by listing all the possible operators we can construct from modes of the fields and projecting out gauge non invariant ones. The different modes of the fields are usually called “letters” and the operators are words constructed using this alphabet.

The “letters” of an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ chiral multiplet are enumerated in table 1. We assume that in the IR the $U(1)_r$ charge of the lowest component of the multiplet ϕ is some arbitrary $r_{IR} = r$ (determined in a concrete theory by anomaly cancellation and in subtle cases a -maximization). According to the prescription we have just reviewed, the index receives contributions from the letters with $\delta_{UV} = 0$, and each letter contributes as $(-1)^F p^{j_1+j_2-\frac{1}{2}r_{IR}} q^{j_1-j_2-\frac{1}{2}r_{IR}}$ to the left-handed index and as $(-1)^F p^{j_1+j_2+\frac{1}{2}r_{IR}} q^{j_2-j_1+\frac{1}{2}r_{IR}}$ to the right-handed index. To keep track of the gauge and flavor quantum numbers, we introduce characters. We assume that the chiral multiplet transforms in the representation \mathcal{R} of the gauge \times flavor group, and denote by $\chi_{\mathcal{R}}(U, V)$, $\chi_{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}(U, V)$ the characters of \mathcal{R} and of the conjugate representation $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$, with U and V gauge and flavor group matrices respectively. All in all, the single-letter left- and right-handed indices for a chiral multiplet are [17]

$$i_{\chi(r)}^{\text{L}}(p, q, U, V) = \frac{(pq)^{\frac{1}{2}r} \chi_{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}(U, V) - (pq)^{\frac{2-r}{2}} \chi_{\mathcal{R}}(U, V)}{(1-p)(1-q)} \quad (2.9)$$

$$i_{\chi(r)}^{\text{R}}(p, q, U, V) = \frac{(pq)^{\frac{1}{2}r} \chi_{\mathcal{R}}(U, V) - (pq)^{\frac{2-r}{2}} \chi_{\bar{\mathcal{R}}}(U, V)}{(1-p)(1-q)}. \quad (2.10)$$

Letters	E_{UV}	j_1	j_2	r_{UV}	r_{IR}	δ_{UV}^L	\mathcal{I}^L	δ_{UV}^R	\mathcal{I}^R
ϕ	1	0	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	r	2	—	0	$(pq)^{\frac{1}{2}r}$
ψ	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\pm\frac{1}{2}$	0	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$r-1$	$0^+, 2^-$	$-(pq)^{\frac{2-r}{2}}$	2	—
$\partial\psi$	$\frac{5}{2}$	0	$\pm\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$r-1$	2	—	$4^+, 2^-$	—
$\square\phi$	3	0	0	$\frac{2}{3}$	r	4	—	2	—
$\bar{\phi}$	1	0	0	$-\frac{2}{3}$	$-r$	0	$(pq)^{\frac{1}{2}r}$	2	—
$\bar{\psi}$	$\frac{3}{2}$	0	$\pm\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-r+1$	2	—	$2^+, 0^-$	$-(pq)^{\frac{2-r}{2}}$
$\partial\bar{\psi}$	$\frac{5}{2}$	$\pm\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{3}$	$-r+1$	$2^+, 4^-$	—	2	—
$\square\bar{\phi}$	3	0	0	$-\frac{2}{3}$	$-r$	2	—	4	—
$\partial_{\pm\pm}$	1	$\pm\frac{1}{2}$	$\pm\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	$0^{\pm+}, 2^{\pm-}$	p, q	$0^{+\pm}, 2^{-\pm}$	p, q

Table 1: The “letters” of an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ chiral multiplet and their contributions to the index. Here $\delta^L = E - 2j_1 + \frac{3}{2}r_{UV}$ and $\delta_{UV}^R = E - 2j_2 - \frac{3}{2}r_{UV}$. A priori we have to take into account the free equations of motion $\partial\psi = 0$ and $\square\phi = 0$, which imply constraints on the possible words, but we see that in this case equations of motions have $\delta_{UV} \neq 0$ so they do not change the index. Finally there are two spacetime derivatives contributing to the index, and their multiple action on the fields is responsible for the denominator of the index, $\frac{1}{(1-p)(1-q)} = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} p^n q^m$.

The denominators encode the action of the two spacetime derivatives with $\delta = 0$. Note that the left-handed and right-handed indices differ by conjugation of the gauge and flavor quantum numbers. As a basic consistency check [6], consider a single free massive chiral multiplet (no gauge or flavor indices). In the UV, we neglect the mass deformation and as always $r_{UV} = \frac{2}{3}$. In the IR, the quadratic superpotential implies $r_{IR} = 1$, and one finds $i_{r=1}^L = i_{r=1}^R \equiv 0$. As expected, a massive superfield decouples and does not contribute to the IR index.

Finding the contribution to the index of an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ vector multiplet is even easier, since the R -charge of a vector superfield W_α is fixed at the canonical value $+1$ all along the flow. For both left- and the right-handed index, the single-letter index of a vector multiplet is [4]

$$i_V(p, q, U) = \frac{2pq - p - q}{(1-p)(1-q)} \chi_{adj}(U). \quad (2.11)$$

Armed with the single-letter indices, the full index is obtained by enumerating all the words and then projecting onto gauge-singlets by integrating over the Haar measure of the gauge group. Schematically,

$$\mathcal{I}(t, y, V) = \int [dU] \prod_k \text{PE}[i_k(p, q, U, V)], \quad (2.12)$$

where k labels the different supermultiplets, and $\text{PE}[i_k]$ is the plethystic exponential of the

single-letter index of the k -th multiplet. The plethystic exponential,

$$\text{PE}[i_k(t, y, U, V)] \equiv \exp \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} i_k(p^m, q^m, V^m) \chi_{\mathcal{R}_k}(U^m, V^m) \right\}, \quad (2.13)$$

implements the combinatorics of symmetrization of the single letters, see *e.g.* [18, 19]. As usual, one can gauge fix the integral over the gauge group and reduce it to an integral over the maximal torus, with the usual extra factor arising of van der Monde determinant.

The multi-letter contribution to the index of a chiral multiplet (the plethystic exponential of its single-letter index) can be elegantly written as a product of elliptic Gamma functions [17]. For a chiral superfield in the fundamental representation \square of $SU(N_c)$, and with IR R-charge equal to r , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PE}[i_r(p, q, U)] &\equiv \prod_{i=1}^{N_c} \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}r} z_i; p, q), \\ \Gamma(z; p, q) &\equiv \prod_{k,m=0}^{\infty} \frac{1 - p^{k+1} q^{m+1} / z}{1 - p^k q^m z}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Here $\{z_k\}$, $k = 1, \dots, N_c$ are complex numbers of unit modulus, obeying $\prod_{k=1}^{N_c} z_k = 1$, which parametrize the Cartan subalgebras of $SU(N_c)$.

Similarly, the multi-letter contribution of a vector multiplet in the adjoint of $SU(N)$ combines with the $SU(N)$ Haar measure to give the compact expression [17, 20]

$$\frac{\kappa^{N-1}}{N!} \oint_{\mathbb{T}_{N-1}} \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{dz_i}{2\pi i z_i} \prod_{k \neq \ell} \frac{1}{\Gamma(z_k/z_\ell; p, q)} \cdots \quad (2.15)$$

The dots indicate that this is to be understood as a building block of the full matrix integral. Here κ is taken to be,

$$\kappa \equiv (p; p)(q; q) \quad (2.16)$$

where $(a; b) \equiv \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 - ab^k)$. Note that κ is the index of $U(1)$ free vector multiplet and we will sometimes denote $\kappa = \mathcal{I}_V$. We will often leave implicit the q and p dependence of the elliptic gamma functions, $\Gamma(z; p, q) \rightarrow \Gamma(z)$. Also, we will often use the shorthand notation

$$\Gamma(Az^{\pm 1}) \equiv \Gamma(Az)\Gamma(Az^{-1}). \quad (2.17)$$

If the gauge group of the theory has abelian factors, one can turn on FI terms. On $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}_\tau^1$ such FI terms should be quantized [21]. Indeed, on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ with sphere of radius r_3 the FI parameter ζ appears in the action as,

$$\zeta \int d^4x \sqrt{g} \left(D - \frac{2i}{r_3} A_4 \right), \quad (2.18)$$

where A_4 is the component of the gauge field along \mathbb{R} and D is the auxiliary field of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ vector multiplet. Upon compactification of \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{S}_τ^1 we have to insure that this term is invariant under large gauge transformations, $A_4 \rightarrow A_4 + \frac{1}{\tau}$. Under such a transformation,

$$\zeta \int d^4x \sqrt{g} (D - \frac{2i}{r_3} A_4) \rightarrow \zeta \int d^4x \sqrt{g} (D - \frac{2i}{r_3} A_4) + 8\pi^3 i \zeta r_3^3, \quad (2.19)$$

which implies that $\zeta = \frac{1}{4\pi^2 r_3^3} n$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The FI parameter for the $U(1)_u$ gauge factor will introduce the term u^n in the matrix integral that computes the index.

The index does not depend on any continuous coupling of the theory. However, the functional form of the superpotential restricts the possible global symmetries and hence the fugacities that the index can depend on. In turning on a certain set of fugacities, we are computing the index for all possible choices of superpotentials consistent with the symmetries associated to those fugacities.

3 Index of sigma models

We now turn to discuss basic properties of the index of some of simplest $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theories: sigma models built from chiral fields with no gauge interactions.

- *Mass terms* – Invariance along the RG flow is a basic property of the index. A simple implication is that the index for a massive theory with a single supersymmetric vacuum must be equal to 1. Let's check this fact in the theory of two chiral fields with a superpotential mass term

$$W = m Q_a Q_b. \quad (3.1)$$

As the superpotential has R-charge two, the R-charges of the two fields satisfy

$$r_a + r_b = 2. \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover there is one $U(1)$ symmetry under which the two fields are oppositely charged. Let us turn on a fugacity u for this symmetry and assign charge $+1$ to field a . From our general rules, the index of this theory is

$$\Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}r_a} u) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}(2-r_a)} u^{-1}) = \prod_{i,j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1 - (pq)^{1-\frac{1}{2}r_a} p^i q^j u^{-1}}{1 - (pq)^{\frac{1}{2}r_a} p^i q^j u} \prod_{i,j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1 - (pq)^{1-\frac{1}{2}(2-r_a)} p^i q^j u}{1 - (pq)^{\frac{1}{2}(2-r_a)} p^i q^j u^{-1}} = 1, \quad (3.3)$$

as expected.

- *F-term supersymmetry breaking* – As another degenerate example, consider the theory of a chiral field with linear superpotential, $W = \eta Q$, the Polonyi model. This model has no

supersymmetric vacuum and thus breaks supersymmetry spontaneously. The field Q has R-charge 2 and is not charged under any global symmetry. The index is

$$\Gamma(pq) = 0, \quad (3.4)$$

consistently with the absence of a supersymmetric vacuum. The vanishing the index can be traced to the presence of a fermionic letter that contributes -1 (see Table 1): this mode should be interpreted as the Goldstino of supersymmetry breaking. In general, models with spontaneous supersymmetry breaking of O’Raifeartaigh type will involve fields with R-charge two neutral under all global symmetries – resulting in a vanishing index.

- *Runaway vacuum* – We can consider a slight modification of the above model to restore the supersymmetric vacuum but at infinity in field space. We take

$$W = \eta Q + \frac{1}{2} \lambda Q^2 S. \quad (3.5)$$

The potential of this model has a minimum at zero as S goes to infinity – a runaway behavior. Indeed, the F-term equations read

$$\eta + \lambda QS = 0, \quad Q^2 = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

The vacuum is reached by taking the limit

$$Q \rightarrow 0, \quad S \rightarrow \infty, \quad QS = -\frac{\eta}{\lambda}. \quad (3.7)$$

The field Q has R-charge +2 and contributes zero to the index (because of the fermionic zero mode mentioned above), while S has R-charge -2 and contributes infinity, making the index of this model ill-defined. The divergence in the index of the S field can be traced to the existence of a bosonic zero mode, namely $\partial_{-+} \partial_{++} \phi$, which contributes in the plethystic exponential with weight 1 (see Table 1). As we will soon discuss, divergences in the index signal the appearance of flat directions. In this example, the vacuum at infinity has a flat direction since the F-term equations are projective – it is this flat direction that gives rise to the divergent contribution.

- *Non-trivial chiral ring* – Next, let us consider a superpotential of the form $W = \lambda Q^{h+1}$ for some integer h . This model has a chiral ring relation $Q^h \sim 0$. The field Q has R-charge $\frac{2}{h+1}$, it is not charged under any continuous global symmetries, but can carry charge under \mathbb{Z}_{h+1} . Let us denote by g ($g^{h+1} = 1$) the fugacity for \mathbb{Z}_{h+1} and write the index of this model as

$$\Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{1+h}} g) = \text{PE} \left[\frac{(pq)^{\frac{1}{1+h}} g - ((pq)^{\frac{1}{1+h}} g)^h}{(1-p)(1-q)} \right]. \quad (3.8)$$

Recall that the numerator in the plethystic exponential of a chiral field comes from the bosonic mode ϕ and a fermionic mode $\bar{\psi}$, while the denominator comes from the derivatives,

$\partial_{\pm\pm}$. Note that $\bar{\psi}$ contributes to the index the h th power of the contribution of ϕ with an opposite sign. This implies that the contribution of ϕ^h is cancelled by the contribution of $\bar{\psi}$, in accordance with the chiral ring relation discussed above.

4 Index of gauge theories

- *D-term supersymmetry breaking* – Let us first discuss the simplest gauge theory, $U(1)$ theory with an FI parameter ζ , which as we discussed should be integer. The index of this model is given by

$$\kappa \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi iz} z^\zeta = \kappa \delta_{\zeta,0}. \quad (4.1)$$

For non-zero FI parameter the index vanishes, signalling D-term supersymmetry breaking. As we discussed in the previous section, pairs of chiral fields with a mass term superpotential do not affect the index. The index (4.1) can then be interpreted as the index of a $U(1)$ gauge theory with any number of such pairs. Although the details of the dynamics of the model may depend on existence of such fields and on the relative values of the gauge coupling/FI term and masses, the index is always zero, capturing only the fact that supersymmetry is broken.

- *IR duality* – $\mathcal{N} = 1$ gauge theories in four dimensions exhibit a variety of remarkable properties one of which is the ubiquity of IR dualities first discussed by Seiberg [22]. A basic example is $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(2)$ gauge theory with three flavors of fundamental and anti-fundamental quarks. This theory flows in the IR to a free theory in which is given by a sigma model of the collection of the mesonic and baryonic fields. The index of this gauge theory is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_{gauge} = \kappa \oint \frac{dz}{4\pi iz} \frac{1}{\Gamma(z\pm 2)} \prod_{i=1}^3 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{6}} b u_i z^{\pm 1}) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{6}} b^{-1} v_i z^{\pm 1}). \quad (4.2)$$

Here $\prod_{i=1}^3 u_i = \prod_{i=1}^3 v_i = 1$, with these fugacities parametrizing the $SU(3)_u \times SU(3)_v$ flavor symmetry rotating the fundamental and anti-fundamental quarks, while b parametrizes the baryonic $U(1)_b$. The distinction between fundamental and anti-fundamental matter here is artificial because of the pseudo-reality of the representations and is motivated by higher rank generalizations. In particular the $SU(3)_u \times SU(3)_v \times U(1)_b$ flavor symmetry enhances to $SU(6)_t$ with $\{t_i\} = \{b u_i, b^{-1} v_i\}$. The index of the free mesons and baryons is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_{sigma} = \prod_{i < j} \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} t_i t_j). \quad (4.3)$$

If the index is to be independent of the RG flow \mathcal{I}_{gauge} should be equal to \mathcal{I}_{sigma} , which is indeed a proven mathematical fact. This identity is known as Spiridonov's beta function

identity in math literature [23]. On the sigma model side we have fifteen chiral fields but the flavor symmetry has only rank five. The remaining symmetries rotating the chiral fields are broken by the superpotential which is the Pfaffian of the antisymmetric matrix one can build from these fields. This superpotential is encoded in the index through the restriction of the fugacities to the ones of the $SU(6)_t$ symmetry.

In evaluating the index, we have used the anomaly free R-charges for the quarks, $R = \frac{1}{3}$. Mathematically, the anomaly free condition translates into a constraint on the arguments of the Gamma functions appearing in the numerator of the integrand. In this case we have,

$$\prod_{i=1}^6 ((pq)^{\frac{1}{6}} t_i) = pq. \quad (4.4)$$

Such constraints are called balancing conditions in the math literature [24].

- *Higgsing/mass deformations* – As discussed above, giving a mass to a pair of chiral fields trivializes their contribution to the index. If the theory has a dual IR description, the mass deformation corresponds to turning on a vacuum expectation value that Higgses the gauge symmetry on the other side of the duality. Let us discuss how this happens at the level of the index in a simple example. We consider theory A to be an $SU(2)$ gauge theory with four flavors. This model has an $SU(4)_u \times SU(4)_v \times U(1)_b$ flavor symmetry. Its index is given

$$\mathcal{I}_A(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, b) = \kappa \oint \frac{dz}{4\pi iz} \frac{1}{\Gamma(z^{\pm 2})} \prod_{i=1}^4 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{4}} b u_i z^{\pm 1}) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{4}} b^{-1} v_i z^{\pm 1}), \quad (4.5)$$

where the fugacities satisfy the $SU(4)$ constraint

$$\prod_{i=1}^4 u_i = \prod_{i=1}^4 v_i = 1. \quad (4.6)$$

This model enjoys an IR duality. The Seiberg dual of it is a gauge theory with same rank and same charged matter content. However the charges of the quarks under global symmetries are different, they are in the conjugate representation of the $SU(3)_u \times SU(3)_v$ flavor group. There are moreover gauge singlet fields having same charges as the mesons of the theory on side A and coupling to the mesons of the gauge theory on side B through a superpotential. The index of the theory on side B is

$$\mathcal{I}_B(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, b) = \mathcal{I}_A(\mathbf{u}^{-1}, \mathbf{v}^{-1}, b) \prod_{i,j=1}^4 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}} u_i v_j). \quad (4.7)$$

The product over the Gamma functions is the product over the singlet fields. Thanks to an identity proved by Rains [25], the indices on side A and side B coincide

$$\mathcal{I}_A = \mathcal{I}_B, \quad (4.8)$$

as expected from the duality. Again it was important here to use the anomaly free R-charges for the fields.

Let us now consider giving a mass to a pair of quarks on side A. This should give us the $SU(2)$ gauge theory with three flavors we discussed in the previous bullet. We break the flavor symmetry from $SU(3)_u \times SU(3)_v$ down to $SU(2)_u \times SU(2)_v$. This breaking of symmetry through mass terms is encoded in the index by specializing the corresponding fugacities. For example, let us turn on a mass term $mQ_1\tilde{Q}_1$. The weight of the mesonic operator $Q_1\tilde{Q}_1$ in the index before turning on the mass term is $(pq)^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1v_1$. After turning on the mass it should be pq corresponding to R-charge +2 and no other charges. Thus turning on the mass term in the index corresponds to specializing the fugacities to be

$$u_1v_1 = (pq)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (4.9)$$

We now define $u_1 = (pq)^{\frac{1}{4}}a$, $v_1 = (pq)^{\frac{1}{4}}a^{-1}$, and find from (4.6),

$$\prod_{i=2}^4 u_i = (pq)^{-\frac{1}{4}}a^{-1}, \quad \prod_{i=2}^4 v_i = (pq)^{-\frac{1}{4}}a. \quad (4.10)$$

Redefining

$$u_i \equiv \tilde{u}_{i-1}(pq)^{-\frac{1}{12}}a^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \quad v_i \equiv \tilde{v}_{i-1}(pq)^{-\frac{1}{12}}a^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad b = \tilde{b}a^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (4.11)$$

we obtain

$$\prod_{i=1}^3 \tilde{u}_i = \prod_{i=1}^3 \tilde{v}_i = 1. \quad (4.12)$$

After mass deformation, the index on side A becomes

$$\mathcal{I}_A \rightarrow \kappa \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi iz} \frac{1}{\Gamma(z^{\pm 1})} \prod_{i=1}^3 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{6}}\tilde{b}\tilde{u}_i z^{\pm 1}) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{6}}\tilde{b}^{-1}\tilde{v}_i z^{\pm 1}), \quad (4.13)$$

which coincides with (4.2) as expected.

Let us now discuss what happens on side B of the duality. Here the physics is more interesting. We gave a mass field to the meson $Q_1\tilde{Q}_1$ on side A of the duality. On side B it maps to a singlet field, M_{11} , and thus the mass deformation adds a linear term to the superpotential. The superpotential involving the field M_{11} is thus of the form

$$mM_{11} + q_1\tilde{q}_1M_{11}, \quad (4.14)$$

where q_i and \tilde{q}_i are the quarks of the side B of the duality. The F-term equation thus impose a vacuum expectation value for the meson $q_1\tilde{q}_1$. Turning such a vev Higgses the gauge $SU(2)$ gauge group and brings us to the sigma model of the previous bullet. Let us see what happens at the level of the index. The singlet M_{11} contributes to the index as $\Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}}u_1v_1)$ and thus setting the fugacities to satisfy (4.9) turns this into $\Gamma(pq)$ which is vanishing. Let us analyze carefully what happens to the $SU(2)$ integral in (4.7). The integrand here has

many poles in z . For example there are two poles coming from $\Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{4}}bu_1z^{\pm 1})$ and two poles from $\Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{4}}b^{-1}v_1z^{\pm 1})$ located at

$$z^{\pm 1} = (pq)^{\frac{1}{4}}bu_1, \quad (pq)^{\frac{1}{4}}bv_1. \quad (4.15)$$

Two of these poles are inside the z integration contour and two are outside. Note then that if we specialize the fugacities to satisfy (4.9) these four poles pinch the integration contour pairwise producing a divergence. The leading, divergent, contribution to the integral in the mass limit we consider thus comes only from two poles in the z integral. These two poles are related by Weyl symmetry in the limit and thus give the same residues. The divergence coming from the pinching is precisely canceled against the zero coming from the meson M_{11} in the mass limit. The index on side B in the limit is given then by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_B(\mathbf{u}^{-1}, \mathbf{v}^{-1}, b) &\rightarrow \\ \text{Res}_{z \rightarrow (pq)^{\frac{1}{4}}bu_1, u_1v_1 \rightarrow (pq)^{\frac{1}{2}}} &\left[\frac{1}{\Gamma(z^{\pm 2})} \prod_{i=1}^4 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{4}}bu_i z^{\pm 1}) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{4}}b^{-1}v_i z^{\pm 1}) \prod_{i,j=1}^4 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}}u_i v_j) \right] \\ &\rightarrow \prod_{i < j} \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{t}_i \tilde{t}_j), \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where $\{\tilde{t}_i\} = \{\tilde{b}\tilde{u}_i, \tilde{b}^{-1}\tilde{v}_i\}$. We thus rederived the identity for the index following from the duality of $SU(2)$ theory with three flavors to sigma model from the duality of $SU(2)$ theory with four flavors by following the RG flow triggered by mass term on one side of the duality and vev on the other side.

The general lesson to be learned here is that Higgsing gauge symmetries by vevs for gauge invariant operators manifests itself at the level of the index as reducing the number of integrals in the matrix model through the pinching procedure. In general a vev is possible when a flat direction opens up in the field space and this leads the index to have a pole. The index of the theory obtained in the IR of such an RG flow is given by the residue of the pole.

- *Spontaneously broken global symmetries* – We discussed spontaneous supersymmetry breaking above; here we will study a case of flavor symmetry breaking. The example we consider is $SU(2)$ gauge theory with two flavors, *i.e.* two fundamental and two anti-fundamental quarks. This theory has an $SU(4)$ flavor symmetry at the classical level rotating the four quarks. However, at the quantum level the model can be described in terms of the six gauge singlet chiral fields $M_{ij} = Q_i Q_j$ with a quadratic constraint $\text{Pf } M = \Lambda^4$ where Λ is the dynamical scale of the gauge theory. This dynamical superpotential breaks the $SU(4)$ symmetry down to $Sp(4)$.

Let us see what happens here at the level of the index. The gauge theory at hand can be obtained from the $SU(2)$ theory with three flavors we already considered by giving a mass to one of the flavors. Let us denote the six quarks by Q_i and rotate them with $SU(6)_t$ symmetry. We can turn on a mass term of the form mQ_1Q_2 . The theory with three flavors

has an IR dual in terms of a sigma model and the analysis is simpler to perform on that side of the duality. Here we have a collection of fifteen singlet fields with a superpotential. The field $Q_1 Q_2$ is dual to singlet M_{12} . Turning on the mass term the superpotential on the sigma model side involving field M_{12} will become schematically

$$mM_{12} + M_{12}(M_{34}M_{56} + M_{36}M_{45} - M_{35}M_{46}). \quad (4.17)$$

In particular the F term coming from M_{12} imposes the constraint we discussed above,

$$m \sim M_{34}M_{56} + M_{36}M_{45} - M_{35}M_{46}. \quad (4.18)$$

The weight of field M_{12} before turning on the linear superpotential is $(pq)^{\frac{1}{3}}t_1t_2$ and after turning it on it becomes pq . Thus in the index we need to specialize the parameters as

$$t_1t_2 = (pq)^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (4.19)$$

We parametrize the fugacities as

$$t_1 = (pq)^{\frac{1}{3}}a, \quad t_2 = (pq)^{\frac{1}{3}}a^{-1}, \quad t_{i>2} = (pq)^{-\frac{1}{6}}\tilde{t}_{i-2}, \quad \prod_{i=1}^4 \tilde{t}_i = 1. \quad (4.20)$$

Fugacities a and \tilde{t}_i parametrize $u(1)_a \times su(3)_{\tilde{t}} = su(4)$ classical symmetry of the model. Then after this specification the index of the sigma model becomes

$$\mathcal{I}_{sigma} \rightarrow \Gamma(pq) \prod_{i=1}^4 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}}a^{\pm 1}\tilde{t}_i) \prod_{i<j} \Gamma(\tilde{t}_i\tilde{t}_j). \quad (4.21)$$

This expression vanishes for generic values of \tilde{t}_j . In other words, if we insist on turning on fugacities for the classical $SU(4)$ symmetry the index vanishes indicating that there is no vacuum of the model having this symmetry. On the other hand let us further take $\tilde{t}_1 = \tilde{t}_2^{-1} \equiv c$. This also implies that $\tilde{t}_3 = \tilde{t}_4^{-1} \equiv d$. The symmetry we now parametrize is $su(2)_c \times su(2)_d \subset sp(4)$. After this specialization the index becomes

$$\mathcal{I}_{sigma} \rightarrow \Gamma(pq) \Gamma(1)^2 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}}a^{\pm 1}c^{\pm 1}) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}}a^{\pm 1}d^{\pm 1}) \Gamma(c^{\pm 1}d^{\pm 1}) = \Gamma(pq) \Gamma(1)^2 \Gamma(c^{\pm 1}d^{\pm 1}). \quad (4.22)$$

Note that the fields charged under $U(1)_a$ can form mass terms and their contribution to the index trivializes. Since $\Gamma(z)$ has a simple pole as $z \rightarrow 1$ and a simple zero as $z \rightarrow pq$, this expression diverges. We can thus summarize that unless we specialize the $SU(4)$ fugacities to parametrize an $Sp(4)$ subgroup the index vanishes and diverges otherwise. The residue of the divergence is given by

$$\Gamma(c^{\pm 1}d^{\pm 1}), \quad (4.23)$$

which is the index of the collection of the chiral fields in any given quantum vacuum of the model.

Let us consider the $SU(2)$ gauge theory with two flavors with the $Sp(4)$ flavor quantum symmetry, theory A, and some other theory with an $SU(2)_c$ flavor symmetry. which we will call theory B. Let us also assume that we can gauge in anomaly free fashion the diagonal combination of the $SU(2)_c$ symmetry of theory B and an $SU(2)$ sub-group of the $Sp(4)$ symmetry of theory A. Note that at a generic point of the moduli space of theory A operator charged under $SU(2)_c$ obtains a vev. This Higgses the $SU(2)_c$ gauge group. Careful analysis reveals that the theory in the IR is identical to theory B with an addition of two singlet fields. We denote the index of theory B by $\mathcal{I}_B(c)$ where c is fugacity for the $SU(2)_c$ symmetry. The index of the combined theory is then

$$\mathcal{I}(d, g) = \kappa^2 \oint \frac{dc}{4\pi ic} \frac{1}{\Gamma(c^{\pm 2})} \oint_c \frac{dz}{4\pi iz} \frac{1}{\Gamma(z^{\pm 2})} \Gamma(g c^{\pm 1} z^{\pm 1}) \Gamma(g^{-1} d^{\pm 1} z^{\pm 1}) \mathcal{I}_B(c). \quad (4.24)$$

One has to be careful here with the contour of integration since the poles of the index coming from the quarks of theory A sit on the unit circle. The contour can be obtained by carefully taking the mass limit from the theory with three flavors and we call it \mathcal{C} . This contour separates the sequences of poles these Gamma functions have converging to infinity and zero. Computation of this index reveals that it satisfies,

$$\mathcal{I}(d, g) = \Gamma(g^{\pm 2}) \mathcal{I}_B(d). \quad (4.25)$$

We have seen that the index of theory A vanishes except for a subset of fugacities where it diverges, and the above computation reveals that this index can be thought of as a delta function in the space of fugacities. See [26] for more details. The identity (4.25) is known as an integral inversion formula of Spiridonov-Warnaar [27].

5 Index spectroscopy

The supersymmetric index contains useful information about the protected spectrum of the theory. The index counts (with signs) short multiplets up to the equivalence relation that sets to zero sets of short multiplets that may recombine into long ones. In general, it is not possible to deduce unambiguously from the index the precise spectrum of short multiplets. However, for certain special multiplets corresponding to relevant and marginal operators, useful statements with a direct physical interpretation can be made. We will follow closely the discussion in [28].

A generic long multiplet $\mathcal{A}_{r(j_1, j_2)}^\Delta$ of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superconformal algebra is generated by the action of the four Poincaré supercharges ($\mathcal{Q}_\alpha, \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_{\dot{\alpha}}$) on a superconformal primary state, which by definition is annihilated by superconformal charges ($\mathcal{S}_\alpha, \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\dot{\alpha}}$). The multiplet is labeled by the charges (Δ, r, j_1, j_2) of the primary with respect to the dilatations, R-symmetry, and the two angular momenta respectively. The absence of negative norm states in the multiplet

imposes certain inequalities on these quantum numbers,

$$\Delta \geq 2 - 2\delta_{j_1,0} + 2j_1 - \frac{3}{2}r, \quad (5.1)$$

$$\Delta \geq 2 - 2\delta_{j_2,0} + 2j_2 + \frac{3}{2}r, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\Delta \notin \left(-\frac{3}{2}r, 2 - \frac{3}{2}r\right), \quad \text{if } j_1 = 0, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\Delta \notin \left(\frac{3}{2}r, 2 + \frac{3}{2}r\right), \quad \text{if } j_1 = 0, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\Delta \geq 2 + j_1 + j_2, \quad \text{if } j_1 \neq 0, \quad j_2 \neq 0, \quad (5.5)$$

$$\Delta \geq 1 + j_1 + j_2, \quad \text{if } j_1 = 0 \text{ or } j_2 = 0. \quad (5.6)$$

When these inequalities are saturated, some combination of the Poincaré supercharges will annihilate the primary as well, resulting in a shortened multiplet. The relevant property of these short multiplets is that they must always saturate the unitarity bound in order to be free of negative normed states, and so their conformal dimension is fixed in terms of other quantum numbers and is protected against corrections as one changes the parameters of the theory.

The possible shortening conditions of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superconformal algebra are summarized in Table 2. Note that \mathcal{D} and $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$ multiplets correspond to free fields and our general results below will not hold for them.

Shortening Conditions				Multiplet
\mathcal{B}	$\mathcal{Q}_\alpha r\rangle^{h.w.} = 0$	$j_1 = 0$	$\Delta = -\frac{3}{2}r$	$\mathcal{B}_{r(0,j_2)}$
$\bar{\mathcal{B}}$	$\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_{\dot{\alpha}} r\rangle^{h.w.} = 0$	$j_2 = 0$	$\Delta = \frac{3}{2}r$	$\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{r(j_1,0)}$
$\hat{\mathcal{B}}$	$\mathcal{B} \cap \bar{\mathcal{B}}$	$j_1, j_2, r = 0$	$\Delta = 0$	$\hat{\mathcal{B}}$
\mathcal{C}	$\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{Q}_\beta r\rangle_{\dot{\alpha}}^{h.w.} = 0$ $(\mathcal{Q})^2 r\rangle^{h.w.} = 0$ for $j_1 = 0$		$\Delta = 2 + 2j_1 - \frac{3}{2}r$ $\Delta = 2 - \frac{3}{2}r$	$\mathcal{C}_{r(j_1,j_2)}$ $\mathcal{C}_{r(0,j_2)}$
$\bar{\mathcal{C}}$	$\epsilon^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}}\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_{\dot{\beta}} r\rangle_{\alpha}^{h.w.} = 0$ $(\bar{\mathcal{Q}})^2 r\rangle^{h.w.} = 0$ for $j_2 = 0$		$\Delta = 2 + 2j_2 + \frac{3}{2}r$ $\Delta = 2 + \frac{3}{2}r$	$\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{r(j_1,j_2)}$ $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{r(j_1,0)}$
$\hat{\mathcal{C}}$	$\mathcal{C} \cap \bar{\mathcal{C}}$	$\frac{3}{2}r = (j_1 - j_2)$	$\Delta = 2 + j_1 + j_2$	$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{(j_1,j_2)}$
\mathcal{D}	$\mathcal{B} \cap \bar{\mathcal{C}}$	$j_1 = 0, -\frac{3}{2}r = j_2 + 1$	$\Delta = -\frac{3}{2}r = 1 + j_2$	$\mathcal{D}_{(0,j_2)}$
$\bar{\mathcal{D}}$	$\bar{\mathcal{B}} \cap \mathcal{C}$	$j_2 = 0, \frac{3}{2}r = j_1 + 1$	$\Delta = \frac{3}{2}r = 1 + j_1$	$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_{(j_1,0)}$

Table 2: Shortening conditions for the $SU(2, 2|1)$ superconformal algebra.

If the charges of a collection of short multiplets obey certain relations, they can combine to form a long multiplet which is no longer protected. Alternatively, one can understand this recombination in reverse, as a long multiplet decomposing into a collection short multiplets as the conformal dimension of its primary hits the BPS bound. This phenomenon plays a crucial role in extracting spectral information about an SCFT from its index because the

index counts short multiplets of the theory *up to recombination*. The collective contributions to the index from short multiplets that can recombine vanishes. The recombination equations for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superconformal algebra are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{r(j_1, j_2)}^{2+2j_1-\frac{3}{2}r} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{C}_{r(j_1, j_2)} \oplus \mathcal{C}_{r-1(j_1-\frac{1}{2}, j_2)} , \\
\mathcal{A}_{r(j_1, j_2)}^{2+2j_2+\frac{3}{2}r} &\longrightarrow \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{r(j_1, j_2)} \oplus \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{r+1(j_1, j_2-\frac{1}{2})} , \\
\mathcal{A}_{\frac{2}{3}(j_1-j_2)(j_1, j_2)}^{2+j_1+j_2} &\longrightarrow \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{(j_1, j_2)} \oplus \mathcal{C}_{\frac{2}{3}(j_1-j_2)-1(j_1-\frac{1}{2}, j_2)} \oplus \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\frac{2}{3}(j_1-j_2)+1(j_1, j_2-\frac{1}{2})} .
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

\mathcal{B} multiplets can be formally treated as a special case of \mathcal{C} multiplets with unphysical spin quantum numbers,

$$\mathcal{B}_{r(0, j_2)} =: \mathcal{C}_{r+1(-\frac{1}{2}, j_2)} , \quad \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{r(j_1, 0)} =: \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{r-1(j_1, -\frac{1}{2})} . \tag{5.8}$$

Thus the discussion can be phrased entirely in terms of \mathcal{C} type multiplets.

An important example of recombination is for the long multiplet $\mathcal{A}_{0(0,0)}^{2+-\frac{3}{2}r}$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. The multiplet hits the BPS bound and splits into three short multiplets according to the third rule in (5.7),

$$\mathcal{A}_{0(0,0)}^2 \longrightarrow \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{(0,0)} \oplus \mathcal{C}_{-1(-\frac{1}{2}, 0)} \oplus \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{1(0, -\frac{1}{2})} = \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{(0,0)} \oplus (\mathcal{B}_{-2(0,0)} \oplus \bar{\mathcal{B}}_{2(0,0)}) \tag{5.9}$$

The multiplet $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{(0,0)}$ contains a conserved current, while the multiplet $\mathcal{B}_{-2(0,0)}$ contains a chiral primary \mathcal{O} of dimension three and an associated marginal F-term deformation $\int d^2\theta \mathcal{O}$. The recombination described above demonstrates the fact that a marginal operator can fail to be exactly marginal if and only if it combines with a conserved current corresponding to a broken global symmetry. This particular recombination and its implications for the space of exactly marginal deformations of an SCFT has been studied in detail in [29].

The \mathcal{C} ($\bar{\mathcal{C}}$) multiplets contribute only to the left-handed index (right-handed index), while $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ multiplets contribute to both. We restrict our attention to $\mathcal{I}^{\mathbb{L}}$ and treat $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ as a special case of \mathcal{C} with $r = \frac{2}{3}(j_1 - j_2)$. The recombination rules allow us to define equivalence classes of short representations which make identical contributions to the index,

$$\begin{aligned}
[\tilde{r}, j_2]_+ &\equiv \{ \mathcal{C}_{r(j_1, j_2)} \mid 2j_1 - r = \tilde{r}, \quad j_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \} , \\
[\tilde{r}, j_2]_- &\equiv \left\{ \mathcal{C}_{r(j_1, j_2)} \mid 2j_1 - r = \tilde{r}, \quad j_1 \in -\frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \right\} .
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

For a \mathcal{B} type multiplet, the unitarity bounds of Equation (5.1) imply that $\tilde{r} \geq -\frac{4}{3} + \frac{2}{3}j_2$, while for a \mathcal{C} multiplet they imply $\tilde{r} \geq \frac{4}{3}j_1 + \frac{2}{3}j_2$. Consequently, there are a finite number of representations in a fixed equivalence class — for fixed \tilde{r} , there is an upper limit on j_1 such that these bounds can be satisfied.

The contribution to the left-handed superconformal index from any short multiplet in a given class is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_{[\tilde{r}, j_2]_+}^L = -\mathcal{I}_{[\tilde{r}, j_2]_-}^L = (-1)^{2j_2+1} \frac{(pq)^{\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{r}+2)} \chi_{j_2}(p/q)}{(1-p)(1-q)}. \quad (5.11)$$

We define the *net degeneracy* for a given choice of (\tilde{r}, j_2) ,

$$\text{ND}[\tilde{r}, j_2] := \# [\tilde{r}, j_2]_+ - \# [\tilde{r}, j_2]_- , \quad (5.12)$$

and the extractable content of the superconformal index is encapsulated in precisely the integers $\text{ND}[\tilde{r}, j_2]$. If the index of an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SCFT is known, the net degeneracies can be systematically extracted by means of a *sieve algorithm* (see for example [28]). The most precise information about actual operators we can extract from the index comes from the equivalence classes with a small number of representatives.

The optimal case is the chiral primary operators that lie in multiplets $\mathcal{B}_{r(0, j_2)}$ and have $-2 - \frac{2}{3}j_2 < r \leq -\frac{2}{3} - \frac{2}{3}j_2$. These have $\tilde{r} \in [-\frac{4}{3} + \frac{2}{3}j_2, \frac{2}{3}j_2)$, and they are the *only representatives* of the equivalence class $[\tilde{r}, 0]_-$ for this range of \tilde{r} . Furthermore, there are no unitary representations in the corresponding class $[\tilde{r}, 0]_+$. Consequently, we can read off the exact number of such operators from the superconformal index. Specializing to $j_2 = 0$, these are precisely the relevant deformations of the SCFT. The number of such deformations is simply the coefficient of $(pq)^{-\frac{1}{2}r}(p/q)^0$ in the index after subtracting out any non-trivial $SU(2)_2$ characters at the same power of pq .

The next best case is for $\tilde{r} \in [\frac{2}{3}j_2, \frac{2}{3} + \frac{2}{3}j_2)$. Both $[\tilde{r}, j_2]_+$ and $[\tilde{r}, j_2]_-$ have only a single representative in this range, and so the index computes the difference in the number of such operators. For $j_2 = \tilde{r} = 0$ in particular, the representatives are $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{(0,0)}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{-2(0,0)}$, respectively. The cancellation between these multiplets corresponds to precisely the recombination described in the example above, and we see that the index computes

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ND}[0, 0] &= \# \mathcal{B}_{-2(0,0)} - \# \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{(0,0)} \\ &= \# \text{marginal operators} - \# \text{conserved currents} . \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

If all global flavor symmetries are broken at a generic point on the conformal manifold, then this net degeneracy will precisely capture the actual dimension of that conformal manifold. However, not all recombinations of the type discussed in the example necessarily take place, and in this case one must account for conserved currents in extracting the dimension of the conformal manifold. Again, this net degeneracy is easily computed by expanding the index to order pq and subtracting out all nontrivial characters for $SU(2)_2$.

For $\tilde{r} \geq \frac{2}{3}$, there will be several representatives that are indistinguishable to the index, and the cancellations among them do not correspond to any obvious physical phenomenon such as symmetry breaking. Thus, the most immediate spectroscopic use of the index is the analysis of relevant and marginal operators at a fixed point.

5.1 An example

As an example we discuss $SU(N)$ $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM. In $\mathcal{N} = 1$ notation we have here three adjoint chiral fields, Φ_j , with R-charge $\frac{2}{3}$ rotated by $SU(3)_t$ global symmetry. The superconformal

R-charge is that of a free field since the conformal manifold passes through the free point. The index is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_N(t, p, q) = \frac{1}{N!} \kappa^{N-1} \oint \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} \frac{dz_j}{2\pi i z_j} \prod_{j \neq k} \frac{\Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} t_1 z_j / z_k) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} t_2 z_j / z_k) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} \frac{1}{t_1 t_2} z_j / z_k)}{\Gamma(z_j / z_k)}. \quad (5.14)$$

For $N > 2$, the first few terms in the p, q expansion are

$$\mathcal{I}_N(t, p, q) = 1 + \mathbf{6}_t (pq)^{\frac{2}{3}} + \mathbf{3}_t (p+q) (pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} + (1 + \mathbf{10}_t - \mathbf{8}_t) pq + \dots \quad (5.15)$$

Following the general prescription of this section we read off the relevant operators to be $\mathbf{6}_t$ which are the six quadratic operators $\Phi_{(j)} \Phi_k$. We have also operators charged under j_2 at order $(p+q)(pq)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ which do not correspond to relevant operators. At order pq we have the marginal operators. The contribution here is $1 + \mathbf{10}_t - \mathbf{8}_t$. The generators of the global symmetry form the $\mathbf{8}_t$ which is subtracted the marginal operators are the gauge coupling and the $\mathbf{10}_t$ symmetric cubic combinations of the adjoint chirals. At a generic point on the conformal manifold the $SU(3)_t$ symmetry is broken and the dimension of it is $1 + 10 - 8 = 3$ as expected. These exactly marginal deformations are the gauge coupling, the β deformation (adding $\text{Tr} \Phi_1 \{ \Phi_2, \Phi_3 \}$ to superpotential), and the γ deformation (adding also $\text{Tr}(\Phi_1^3 + \Phi_2^3 + \Phi_3^3)$).

The case of $N = 2$ is special and there the expansion of the index coincides with (5.15) except that $\mathbf{10}_t$ term is missing. Here the conformal manifold is actually only one dimensional and corresponds to the gauge coupling. On any point of this manifold the $SU(3)_t$ symmetry is unbroken consistently with the index. The reason here two directions are missing is that a general marginal superpotential cubic in the chiral fields can be decomposed as a sum of two terms, in one of which the gauge indices are contracted with ϵ_{abc} and the other with $d_{abc} = \text{Tr} T_a \{ T_b, T_c \}$. The latter structure is non zero only for $N > 2$.

6 Dualities and Identities

Perhaps the most important application of the supersymmetric index as a test of non-perturbative dualities. Since the index is an RG invariant quantity and does not depend on the marginal couplings, it should be the same when computed for two theories flowing to the same fixed point or two different descriptions of the same conformal theory. Physical dualities translates into mathematical identities between elliptic hypergeometric integrals. Such identities are very non-trivial and give the strongest checks to date of many dualities. In several cases, these identities have already appeared in the mathematical literature, but in many others they are new – they are undoubtedly true since they can be checked to very high orders in a series expansion, but a rigorous proof is still lacking.

6.1 Symmetries and transformations of the index

Before discussing relations between indices of dual theories, it is useful to pause and consider the symmetry properties of the index of a single theory. The index is a function $\mathcal{I}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_s, p, q)$. The parameters a_i are fugacities for $U(1)$ global symmetries forming the maximal torus of the (possibly non-abelian) global symmetry. If the symmetry enhances to a non-abelian symmetry the index should be invariant under the action of the Weyl group acting on the fugacities. For example, if the a_i 's parametrize an $SU(s+1)$ symmetry, the index should be invariant under permutations of the a_i 's and under the transformation of any of the a_j as $a_j \rightarrow \frac{1}{a_1 a_2 \dots a_s}$.

We can also ask the converse question: what happens if the index is invariant under the action of certain discrete group \mathcal{W} on the flavor fugacities? There are two interesting physical possibilities. First, it might be that the flavor symmetry enhances to a non-abelian group such that \mathcal{W} serves as its Weyl group. A second physical possibility is that such a discrete symmetry signals self-duality of the theory. An example is $SU(2)$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SYM with four flavors. Here the flavour group (in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ language) is rank four, and let us parametrize it by four fugacities a_i . In $\mathcal{N} = 1$ language the index is given by

$$\mathcal{I}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = \frac{\kappa \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} t^{-2})}{2} \oint \frac{dz}{2\pi i z} \frac{\Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} t^{-2} z^{\pm 2})}{\Gamma(z^{\pm 2})} \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} t a_1^{\pm 1} a_2^{\pm 1} z^{\pm 1}) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} t a_3^{\pm 1} a_4^{\pm 1} z^{\pm 1}). \quad (6.1)$$

Here t is fugacity for a $U(1)$ symmetry related to the bigger R-symmetry of $\mathcal{N} = 2$. The flavor symmetry here enhance to $SO(8)$ and the index is manifestly invariant under the Weyl group of $SO(8)$. This group is generated by $a_i \rightarrow a_i^{-1}$ and by $a_1 \leftrightarrow a_2$, $a_3 \leftrightarrow a_4$. However, the index is also invariant under exchanging a_1 and a_3 . This is not part of $SO(8)$ Weyl symmetry and is not manifest in the integral above. This discrete symmetry is the manifestation of the self S-duality (or rather triality) that the theory enjoys. This is a strong/weak type of duality relating the same theory with different values of coupling. This invariance property of the index was proven in [30]. In fact the full discrete symmetry of the index, the one coming from Weyl of $SO(8)$ and the one coming from the duality, is the Weyl group of F_4 . We are not aware of a physical interpretation for the full F_4 symmetry – it would be nice to figure out whether there is any.

Another similar example is that of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(2)$ theory with four flavors, *i.e.* the same theory as above but without the adjoint chiral field. The theory has flavor symmetry of rank seven, the $SU(8)$ symmetry rotating the different matter fields. This theory enjoys Seiberg-duality as we already discussed, but in fact there are many more dualities as discussed in [31]. This theory in fact has 72 dual descriptions. The different descriptions correspond to the action of the Weyl group of E_7 on the fugacities. In the different duality frames the gauge structure is the same as in the original one but there are additional singlet fields and superpotentials. It was argued in [32] that taking two copies of this theory coupled through a quartic superpotential the theory is exactly self-dual and that there should be a point on the conformal manifold of this theory where the flavor symmetry is actually enhanced to E_7 .

We can also ask whether there are interesting properties of the index involving manipulations of both the flavor fugacities and the superconformal fugacities p and q . A simple example is as follows. One can consider assigning different anomaly free R-charges to the fields by mixing a given R-symmetry with the flavor symmetry. For example give a flavor symmetry $U(1)_a$ we can redefine the R-symmetry to be $R \rightarrow R + sq_a$ with q_a being the charge under $U(1)_a$. At the level of the index this transformation corresponds to

$$R \rightarrow R + sq_a \Rightarrow \mathcal{I}(a, p, q) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}((pq)^{\frac{s}{2}}a, p, q). \quad (6.2)$$

Let us consider shifting flavor fugacity a to $q^{\tilde{s}}p^s a$. When s and \tilde{s} are the same this is just a redefinition of the R-charge. From the definition of the index the shift in a amounts to

$$\mathcal{I} = \text{Tr}(-1)^F p^{j_1+j_2+\frac{r}{2}} q^{j_2-j_1+\frac{r}{2}} a^{q_a} \rightarrow \text{Tr}(-1)^F p^{j_1+j_2+\frac{r}{2}+sq_a} q^{j_2-j_1+\frac{r}{2}+\tilde{s}q_a} a^{q_a}. \quad (6.3)$$

To interpret this expression as an index we can redefine

$$\hat{r} = r + (s + \tilde{s})q_a, \quad \hat{j}_1 = j_1 + \frac{s - \tilde{s}}{2}q_a. \quad (6.4)$$

In particular for $s \neq \tilde{s}$ this breaks Lorentz symmetry and does not make sense as a pure 4d index. However, such a transformation might make sense as an index of a coupled 4d-2d system. A simple example is the following important identity of the index of a chiral field,

$$\mathcal{I}^{(R)}(pa) = \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{R}{2}}pa) = \theta((pq)^{\frac{R}{2}}a; q) \mathcal{I}^{(R)}(a). \quad (6.5)$$

The index on the right-hand side can be interpreted as an index of chiral field in four dimensions coupled to a Fermi (0, 2) multiplet in two dimensions. Similarly we have

$$\mathcal{I}^{(R)}(p^{-1}a) = \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{R}{2}}p^{-1}a) = \frac{1}{\theta((pq)^{\frac{R}{2}}p^{-1}a; q)} \mathcal{I}^{(R)}(a). \quad (6.6)$$

Here the right hand side is a chiral field in four dimensions coupled to a chiral (0, 2) field in two dimension. Such a transformation of the index will become important while discussing indices in presence of surface defects [33, 34, 35] and we will comment on this more in what follows.

6.2 $\mathcal{N} = 4$ dualities

A basic example of a duality implying a non-trivial mathematical identity is the S-duality between $SO(2n+1)$ $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM and $USp(2n)$ $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM. We use an $\mathcal{N} = 1$ language with the three adjoint chiral multiplets having R-charge $\frac{2}{3}$. Then the index of the $SO(2n+1)$ model is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_{so} = \kappa^n \prod_{i=1}^3 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}}t_i) \frac{1}{2^n n!} \oint \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{dz_i}{2\pi i z_i} \prod_{i < k} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^3 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}}t_j z_i^{\pm 1} z_k^{\pm 1})}{\Gamma(z_i^{\pm 1} z_k^{\pm 1})} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\prod_{j=1}^3 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}}t_j z_i^{\pm 1})}{\Gamma(z_i^{\pm 1})}, \quad (6.7)$$

while for the $USp(2n)$ model we get

$$\mathcal{I}_{sp} = \kappa^n \prod_{i=1}^3 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} t_i) \frac{1}{2^n n!} \oint \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{dz_i}{2\pi i z_i} \prod_{i < k} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^3 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} t_j z_i^{\pm 1} z_k^{\pm 1})}{\Gamma(z_i^{\pm 1} z_k^{\pm 1})} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\prod_{j=1}^3 \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{3}} t_j z_i^{\pm 2})}{\Gamma(z_i^{\pm 2})}. \quad (6.8)$$

Fugacities t_j parametrize $SU(3)_t$ symmetry rotating the three adjoint chirals. We have decomposed the $SU(4)$ R-symmetry of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ to $U(1)$ R-symmetry of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ and $SU(3)_t$. For $n = 1$ and $n = 2$ the $SO(2n + 1)$ and $USp(2n)$ algebras are isomorphic⁵ and there is a simple change of integration variables making the two expressions above manifestly the same.⁶ For $n > 2$, one can check that the two expressions coincide to very high orders in a series expansion in fugacities, but no proof is available yet except in certain degeneration limits [36].

6.3 Seiberg dualities

Seiberg dualities are the basic examples of IR dualities – two theories flowing to the same fixed point. The simplest example is of an $SU(N)$ gauge theory with N_f on side A being equivalent to $SU(N_f - N)$ gauge theory with N_f flavors, conjugate representation of the flavor group, and a bunch of gauge singlet fields dual to the mesons of side A on side B. The index of side A is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_{N_f}^{N_f}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, b) = \kappa^{N-1} \frac{1}{N!} \oint \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{dz_i}{2\pi i z_i} \prod_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{\Gamma(z_i/z_j)} \prod_{i=1}^{N_f} \prod_{j=1}^N \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{N_f-N}{2N_f}} b u_i z_j) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{N_f-N}{2N_f}} v_i z_j^{-1} b^{-1}). \quad (6.9)$$

Here \mathbf{u} , \mathbf{v} , and b are parametrizing the $SU(N_f)_u \times SU(N_f)_v \times U(1)_b$ global symmetry of the theory. on side B we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_{N_f-N}^{N_f}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, b) &= \left(\prod_{i,j=1}^{N_f} \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{N_f-N}{N_f}} u_i v_j) \right) \kappa^{N_f-N-1} \frac{1}{(N_f-N)!} \oint \prod_{i=1}^{N_f-N-1} \frac{dz_i}{2\pi i z_i} \prod_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{\Gamma(z_i/z_j)} \\ &\prod_{i=1}^{N_f} \prod_{j=1}^{N_f-N} \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{N}{2N_f}} b^{\frac{N}{N_f-N}} u_i^{-1} z_j) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{N}{2N_f}} v_i^{-1} z_j^{-1} b^{-\frac{N}{N_f-N}}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

Duality implies that the two indices above should be equal and indeed it was shown by Rains that they are [25]. The proof is rather non trivial but in section 7 we will discuss a proof for a certain limit of the parameters.

⁵The global form of the gauge group is inessential here – the spectrum of local gauge-invariant operators captured by the index depends only on the gauge algebra.

⁶The two root systems define dual lattices in n dimensions. In $n = 1, 2$ there is a linear transformation taking one into the other (line dual to line, and square dual to square), while for $n > 2$ there is not.

6.4 Kutasov-Schwimmer dualities

Let us give yet another example of duality which implies a mathematical identity of indices yet to be proven rigorously. The example is that of Kutasov-Schwimmer dualities where in addition to N_f flavors of fundamental matter of $SU(N)$ gauge group one introduces two, or one, adjoint fields. The superpotentials for the adjoint fields follow *ADE* classification,

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_k &: && \text{Tr } X^{k+1}, && && && (6.11) \\
 D_{k+2} &: && \text{Tr } X^{k+1} + \text{Tr } XY^2, && && && \\
 E_6 &: && \text{Tr } X^4 + \text{Tr } Y^3, && E_7 &: && \text{Tr } X^3Y + \text{Tr } Y^3, && E_8 &: && \text{Tr } X^5 + \text{Tr } Y^3.
 \end{aligned}$$

These superpotentials fix the R-charge assignments for the adjoint fields. Dual descriptions are known in the A , D , [37, 38, 39] and E_7 [40] cases. The dual has gauge group of $SU(\alpha N_f - N)$ with α depending on the superpotential for the adjoint matter,

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_k &: && \alpha = k, && && && (6.12) \\
 D_{k+2} &: && \alpha = 3k, && && && \\
 E_7 &: && \alpha = 30. && && &&
 \end{aligned}$$

One also has to introduce a variety of singlet fields coupled through a superpotential to gauge singlet operators on the dual side. For details the reader is referred to [41]. One can write down the corresponding identities for the supersymmetric indices, see *e.g.* [17], and check that they are true in series expansion in fugacities or in certain limits such as large N . However no proof is known to date.

We have focussed on the simplest representative examples of dualities and there are many more, see the discussion in [42, 43]. The mathematics of these identities is a very active area of research, see *e.g.* [44, 24, 45, 46] for reviews.

7 Limits

In previous sections we have discussed how the index encodes information about four-dimensional physics. Upon taking appropriate limits, the index can also be related to physical quantities in other spacetime dimensions. We will discuss here the two most natural limits of this kind.

7.1 Small τ limit, $\mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow 0$

We consider taking all the fugacities to 1. This limit in the partition function language corresponds to taking the limit of the size of \mathbb{S}^1 to zero. Since the index and the partition function differ only by the $e^{-\tau E_{Casimir}}$ factor the two coincide in the limit. Moreover it was

argued on general grounds that in this limit the index has generically the following divergent behavior [47]

$$\mathcal{I}(\tau \rightarrow 0) = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1}(\tau \rightarrow 0) = e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{3} \frac{1}{\tau}(a-c)} \times \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{S}^3}. \quad (7.1)$$

This asymptotic behavior can be corrected by subleading power-law terms in τ when the theory has moduli spaces on the circle [14, 48].⁷ Let us discuss how this comes about in detail in a particular example.⁸

• *Dimensional reduction of the index of a chiral field* – Let us make the relation between the geometry and the index a bit more precise. We compute the partition function on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ with radii r_3 and r_1 , twisted by fugacities for various global symmetries. Equivalently, after a change of variables it can be thought of as a partition function on $\mathbb{S}_b^3 \times \tilde{\mathbb{S}}^1$ with the fugacities responsible for the geometric twisting absorbed in the geometry [51]. Here \mathbb{S}_b^3 is the squashed sphere. We can compute the index as a partition function by first reducing the theory on $\tilde{\mathbb{S}}^1$ of finite radius, and then computing the $3d$ partition function of the resulting $3d$ theory, including all the KK modes on the $\tilde{\mathbb{S}}^1$. The fugacities corresponding to flavor symmetries can be thought of as couplings to background gauge fields along the \mathbb{S}^1 direction. The gauge fields along the \mathbb{S}^1 have the meaning of real mass parameters for global symmetries in three dimensions. In addition, as we go once around the \mathbb{S}^1 , we should rotate the \mathbb{S}^3 along the Hopf fiber by an angle depending on the fugacities p and q . This has the effect of changing the geometry. As discussed in [51], there is a change of coordinates, where the metric becomes that of an $\mathbb{S}_b^3 \times \tilde{\mathbb{S}}^1$, where the $\tilde{\mathbb{S}}^1$ factor is rotated on the \mathbb{S}_b^3 base. The parameters are related by

$$p = e^{-2\pi b \frac{\tilde{r}_1}{r_3}} \quad ; \quad q = e^{-2\pi b^{-1} \frac{\tilde{r}_1}{r_3}}, \quad \tilde{r}_1 = \frac{2}{b + b^{-1}} r_1. \quad (7.2)$$

This procedure leads to the action used in [51] to compute the supersymmetric partition function on \mathbb{S}_b^3 . Then, we can write the $4d$ index as coming from a theory on \mathbb{S}_b^3 , with an infinite tower of KK modes. We refer the reader to the references above and to appendix B of [21] for more details.

For a free chiral field (of R-charge R and charged under a $U(1)_u$ symmetry) we are interested in rewriting the index in the following form,

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1}^{(R)}(p, q, u) \propto \prod_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{Z}^{(R)}(\omega_1, \omega_2, m + \frac{n}{\tilde{r}_1}), \quad (7.3)$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{S}_b^3}$ is the \mathbb{S}_b^3 partition function of a chiral field depending on the squashing parameter,

⁷However, in certain non-generic situations even the leading behavior is modified, see [14] for a careful discussion. Perhaps the simplest example that exhibits this non-generic behavior is the ISS model [49] (see also [50] for a discussion of the index of this theory).

⁸We follow here the discussion in appendix B of [21].

real mass for $U(1)_u$, and the R-charge,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{S}_b^3} &= \Gamma_h(\omega R + \sum_a m_a e_a; \omega_1, \omega_2), \\ \Gamma_h(z; \omega_1, \omega_2) &= e^{\frac{\pi i}{2\omega_1\omega_2} \left((z-\omega)^2 - \frac{\omega_1^2 + \omega_2^2}{12} \right)} \prod_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{1 - e^{\frac{2\pi i}{\omega_1}(\omega_2 - z)} e^{\frac{2\pi i \omega_2 \ell}{\omega_1}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{\omega_2} z} e^{-\frac{2\pi i \omega_1 \ell}{\omega_2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

The parameters on the two sides in (7.3) are related as

$$u = e^{2\pi i \tilde{r}_1 m}, \quad p = e^{2\pi i \tilde{r}_1 \omega_1}, \quad q = e^{2\pi i \tilde{r}_1 \omega_2}, \quad \omega = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_1 + \omega_2). \quad (7.5)$$

On the left-hand side we have the $4d$ index of a chiral superfield, and on the right-hand side the product over $3d$ \mathbb{S}_b^3 partition functions of the KK modes on $\tilde{\mathbb{S}}^1$. The inverse radius of $\tilde{\mathbb{S}}^1$, $1/\tilde{r}_1$, plays the role of a real mass coupled to the KK momentum.

The expression on the right hand side of (7.3) as it stands is divergent and needs to be properly regularized and defined. Moreover one needs to be careful to include the Casimir energy in the definition of the partition function in four dimensions. Concretely, the twisted partition function of the chiral field on $\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^1}^{(0)}(p, q, u) = e^{\mathcal{I}_0} \Gamma(u; p, q). \quad (7.6)$$

Here we chose to take R charge to be zero for simplicity with non trivial R charge easily reintroduced by mixing in the flavor symmetry. The factor $e^{\mathcal{I}_0}$ relates the two different natural normalizations. It is computed in [13],

$$\tilde{r}_1^{-1} \mathcal{I}_0 = \frac{1}{4} \left(r^{-1} \frac{d}{dr} (r \Gamma_0(e^{2\pi r i m}; e^{2\pi r i \omega_1}, e^{2\pi r i \omega_2})) \right) \Big|_{r=0}, \quad (7.7)$$

where $\Gamma_0(z; p, q)$ is the so called single particle index, defined by

$$\Gamma(u; p, q) = \exp \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \Gamma_0(z^n; p^n, q^n) \right] \rightarrow \Gamma_0(z; p, q) = \frac{z - pqz^{-1}}{(1-p)(1-q)}. \quad (7.8)$$

Using the fact that Γ_0 has a simple pole at $r = 0$ and a vanishing constant term in the expansion around $r = 0$, equation (7.7) leads to

$$\mathcal{I}_0 = \frac{\pi i \tilde{r}_1 (m - \omega) (2m(m - 2\omega) + \omega_1 \omega_2)}{6\omega_1 \omega_2}. \quad (7.9)$$

Next we compute the right-hand side of (7.3),

$$\prod_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{Z}^{(0)}(\omega_1, \omega_2, m + \frac{n}{\tilde{r}_1}) = \prod_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \Gamma_h(m + \frac{n}{\tilde{r}_1}; \omega_1, \omega_2). \quad (7.10)$$

The infinite product over n here diverges, since for large n the hyperbolic Gamma functions approach a divergent exponential behavior,

$$\begin{aligned} \log (\Gamma_h (\omega R + \rho(\sigma) + \tau(\mu + s \mu_o))) &= \\ \text{sign}(\tau(\mu_o)) \frac{\pi i}{2\omega_1\omega_2} \left([\omega(R-1) + \rho(\sigma) + \tau(\mu + s \mu_o)]^2 - \frac{\omega_1^2 + \omega_2^2}{12} \right) &+ \mathcal{O}(e^{-\alpha s}), \end{aligned} \quad (7.11)$$

We can regularize this divergence using zeta-function regularization ($\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^s = \zeta(-s)$)⁹

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\text{sign}(n) \frac{\pi i}{2\omega_1\omega_2} \left((m + \frac{n}{\tilde{r}_1} - \omega)^2 - \frac{\omega_1^2 + \omega_2^2}{12} \right)} &\longrightarrow \\ \exp(\Delta) \equiv \exp \left(\frac{i\pi (2m(3m\tilde{r}_1 + 1) - 2(1 - 6m\tilde{r}_1)\omega + \tilde{r}_1(\omega_1^2 + \omega_2^2 + 3\omega_1\omega_2))}{12\tilde{r}_1\omega_1\omega_2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (7.12)$$

The precise statement of (7.3) is then the following equality

$$e^{\mathcal{I}_0} \Gamma(u; p, q) = e^{-\Delta} \prod_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[e^{-\text{sign}(n) \frac{\pi i}{2\omega_1\omega_2} \left((m + \frac{n}{\tilde{r}_1} - \omega)^2 - \frac{\omega_1^2 + \omega_2^2}{12} \right)} \Gamma_h \left(m + \frac{n}{\tilde{r}_1}; \omega_1, \omega_2 \right) \right]. \quad (7.13)$$

The infinite product on the right-hand side is now well-defined, and in fact by using (7.4) and (2.14) it can be written as a product of two elliptic Gamma functions,

$$\Gamma(u; p, q) = e^{-\Delta - \mathcal{I}_0} \frac{\Gamma(e^{2\pi i \frac{m}{\omega_1}}; e^{2\pi i \frac{\omega_2}{\omega_1}}, e^{-2\pi i \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_1 \omega_1}})}{\Gamma(e^{2\pi i \frac{m-\omega_1}{\omega_2}}; e^{-2\pi i \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_1 \omega_2}}, e^{-2\pi i \frac{\omega_1}{\omega_2}})}. \quad (7.14)$$

This equality is discussed in [52]. It is sometimes viewed as an indication of an $SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ structure. Taking the $3d$ limit by sending \tilde{r}_1 to zero, we decouple the massive KK modes on the $\tilde{\mathbb{S}}^1$. The only term surviving the limit on the right-hand side of (7.13) has $n = 0$, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\tilde{r}_1 \rightarrow 0} \left[\Gamma(e^{2\pi i \tilde{r}_1 (\omega R + m)}; e^{2\pi i \tilde{r}_1 \omega_1}, e^{2\pi i \tilde{r}_1 \omega_2}) e^{\frac{\pi i}{6\omega_1\omega_2\tilde{r}_1} (m - \omega(1-R))} \right] &= \\ \Gamma_h(\omega R + m; \omega_1, \omega_2). \end{aligned} \quad (7.15)$$

Note that the divergent factor is after turning on flavor fugacity and going to unsquashed sphere, $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \frac{1}{2\pi}i$ and $\tilde{r}_1 = \tau$,

$$e^{\frac{\pi i}{6\omega_1\omega_2\tilde{r}_1} \omega(1-R)} = e^{\frac{\pi^2}{3\tau}(1-R)} = e^{-\frac{16\pi^2}{3\tau}(a-c)}, \quad (7.16)$$

in agreement with (7.1) since the anomalies of the chiral field are given by

$$a = \frac{1}{32}(9(R-1)^3 - 3(R-1)), \quad c = \frac{1}{32}(9(R-1)^3 - 5(R-1)), \quad a - c = \frac{1}{16}(R-1). \quad (7.17)$$

⁹ Here we defined $\text{sign}(n=0) = -1$.

• *Reduction of gauge theories* – We can also consider the limit of small τ for gauge theories. We will not review this in detail here, and only mention the salient features. Up to the divergent factor appearing in (7.1), and its generalization when flavor fugacities are present, the matrix model for the index reduces to the matrix model [53] used to compute \mathbb{S}_b^3 partition function of the dimensionally reduced theory [54, 55, 56, 21]. Two comments are in order. First, the theories in four dimensions might have classical symmetries which are anomalous in the quantum theory. When reducing the theory on a circle a superpotential is produced which explicitly breaks these symmetries [21]. In the partition this manifests itself as a lack of real mass parameter for the symmetry which is anomalous in four dimension. These superpotentials are extremely important to understand what physics IR dualities in four dimensions reduce to in three dimensions. Second, in certain cases [48, 14] the three dimensional partition function in (7.1) is by itself divergent. Such examples include reductions of $SO(N)$ gauge theories with $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry and $SU(N)$ gauge theories with $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetry. We refer the reader to Contribution [57] for details of the \mathbb{S}_b^3 partition function.

7.2 Large τ limit, $\mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow 0$

In this limit the radius of \mathbb{S}^3 is much smaller than the radius of the circle and we effectively compactify the theory to quantum mechanics on a circle. The supersymmetric index in this limit computes the usual Witten index of the resulting quantum mechanics, that is the number of supersymmetric vacua. More concretely,

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{S}^3 \times \mathbb{S}_\tau^1 \rightarrow \infty} \rightarrow e^{-\tau E_{\text{Casimir}}} \#_{\text{vacua}}. \quad (7.18)$$

In particular since in the index we strip off the Casimir energy contribution it computes in the limit just the number of supersymmetric vacua. However, often a given theory might have a moduli space of vacua and the limit will diverge. In some examples we can keep some of the flavor fugacities which will regulate this divergence and give a finite result.

For τ large,¹⁰

$$p, q \rightarrow 0. \quad (7.19)$$

We assume implicitly that the index we obtain is finite in the limit because we have enough flavor fugacities to lift the degeneracy of the moduli space (this is not always possible). The fugacities p and q couple to charges $j_2 \pm j_1 + \frac{1}{2}r$. Setting these fugacities to zero is well defined if for all states contributing to the index $j_2 \pm j_1 + \frac{1}{2}r \geq 0$. Let us assume that this is the case and soon we will discuss several examples. Then, the states which contribute to the index satisfy

$$j_2 \pm j_1 + \frac{1}{2}r = 0, \quad \rightarrow \quad j_1 = 0 \quad j_2 = -\frac{1}{2}r. \quad (7.20)$$

¹⁰This limit has also been considered in [42].

Moreover, since states contributing to the index satisfy $E - 2j_2 - \frac{3}{2}r = 0$ we also get that $E = \frac{1}{2}r$. Now, from unitarity,

$$E \pm 2j_1 + \frac{3}{2}r \geq 0, \quad E \pm 2j_2 - \frac{3}{2}r \geq 0, \quad (7.21)$$

which imply that the states contributing to the limit we discuss have all charges vanishing,

$$E = r = j_1 = j_2 = 0. \quad (7.22)$$

Such states parametrize vacua of the model, *i.e.* the moduli space, as expected. Again, for the index to be well defined we will have to keep some of the flavor fugacities under which the operators contributing to the limit are charged.

Let us discuss the limit for a free chiral field. The limit is well defined if the R-charge is between zero and two. For R-charge vanishing the index is $\frac{1}{1-u}$ where u is fugacity for the $U(1)$ symmetry rotating the chiral. The index is give just by powers of the scalar component. This is the case when we can give a vacuum expectation value to the scalar parametrizing the moduli space, which will also break the $U(1)_u$ symmetry. For $r > 0$ but less than two the index is 1. For $r = 2$ it becomes $1 - u^{-1}$. Note that R-charge two is outside the unitarity bounds for free chiral and thus there is no physical meaning for this result. However, such an R-charge would be acceptable for a gauge non-invariant chiral matter field in gauge theory.

We now give a more interesting example. Pure $SU(N)$ SYM has N vacua, however it also has a discrete R symmetry. To define the index we need continuous R symmetry and thus we will not discuss this example but rather turn on flavors. Consider $SU(N)$ SQCD with N_f flavors. The standard choice of anomaly R-charge is $\frac{N_f - N}{N_f}$ for all the matter fields. This choice keeps all the flavor symmetry manifest. Our limit is well defined here. The limit of $p, q \rightarrow 0$ in this case is trivial, the index is 1 meaning that only the vacuum in the origin of field space satisfies (7.22). However, we can change the choice of R-charges keeping the condition for R-charges to be anomaly free,

$$\sum R_i + \sum \tilde{R}_i = 2N_f - 2N. \quad (7.23)$$

For example, let us assign N quarks and N anti-quarks R-charge zero, and the remaining matter R-charge one. The anomaly free condition above is satisfied. Taking our limit the index becomes

$$\mathcal{I}^{(N)}(\{t, \tilde{t}\}_{i=1}^N) = \frac{1}{N!} \oint \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{dz_i}{2\pi i z_i} \prod_{i \neq j} (1 - z_i/z_j) \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{1 - t_i z_i} \frac{1}{1 - \tilde{t}_i z_i^{-1}}. \quad (7.24)$$

Note that N_f does not appear here anymore and there is no condition on fugacities t_i, \tilde{t}_i . This integral can be easily computed to give

$$\mathcal{I}^{(N)}(\{t, \tilde{t}\}_{i=1}^N) = (1 - \prod_{i=1}^N t_i \tilde{t}_i) \frac{1}{1 - \prod_{i=1}^N t_i} \frac{1}{1 - \prod_{i=1}^N \tilde{t}_i} \prod_{i,j=1}^N \frac{1}{1 - t_i \tilde{t}_j}. \quad (7.25)$$

This can be easily understood. The product is the product over the mesonic operators surviving the limit parametrizing a slice of the moduli space. The second and third terms are the baryon and the anti-baryon. The first term is an obvious constraint on this moduli space. We see that the index captures neatly a slice of the moduli space of the theory. This is equivalent to the so called Hilbert series of this slice (for discussion of Hilbert series see for example [58, 59]). We can ask how this limit behaves under Seiberg duality. On side B of the duality we will have $SU(N_f - N)$ theory with N_f quarks/anti-quarks and gauge singlets dual to the mesons. The dual quarks in this case have again R-charges zero and one in our case, now N have R-charge 1 and $N_f - N$ R-charge zero. The mesons which survive the limit have R-charge zero and R-charges two. Note that as we said above the latter cannot be physical because of the violation of unitarity bounds. The index of the dual theory is

$$\left[\prod_{i,j=1}^N \frac{1}{1 - t_i \tilde{t}_j} \prod_{i,j=N+1}^{N_f} (1 - t_i^{-1} \tilde{t}_j^{-1}) \right] \times \mathcal{I}^{(N_f-N)} \left(\left\{ \frac{(\prod_{k=1}^{N_f} t_k)^{\frac{1}{N_f-N}}}{t_i}, \frac{(\prod_{k=1}^{N_f} \tilde{t}_k)^{\frac{1}{N_f-N}}}{\tilde{t}_i} \right\}_{i=N+1}^{N_f} \right). \quad (7.26)$$

We can now plug in the result from (7.25) for $\mathcal{I}^{(N_f-N)}$ and

$$\prod_{k=1}^{N_f} \tilde{t}_k \prod_{k=1}^{N_f} t_k = 1, \quad (7.27)$$

from anomaly cancelation to obtain that the above is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\prod_{i,j=1}^N \frac{1}{1 - t_i \tilde{t}_j} \prod_{i,j=N+1}^{N_f} (1 - t_i^{-1} \tilde{t}_j^{-1}) \right] \times (1 - \prod_{i=N+1}^{N_f} t_i^{-1} \tilde{t}_i^{-1}) \quad (7.28) \\ & \frac{1}{1 - \prod_{k=1}^{N_f} t_k \prod_{i=N+1}^{N_f} t_i^{-1}} \frac{1}{1 - \prod_{k=1}^{N_f} \tilde{t}_k \prod_{i=N+1}^{N_f} \tilde{t}_i^{-1}} \prod_{i,j=N+1}^{N_f} \frac{1}{1 - t_i^{-1} \tilde{t}_j^{-1}} = \\ & \frac{1}{1 - \prod_{k=1}^N t_k} \frac{1}{1 - \prod_{k=1}^N \tilde{t}_k} (1 - \prod_{i=1}^N t_i \tilde{t}_i) \prod_{i,j=1}^N \frac{1}{1 - t_i \tilde{t}_j}, \end{aligned}$$

in agreement with (7.25).

Note that naively it is important in the gauge theory for the limit to be well defined to have the R-charges of all the chiral fields to be between zero and two. However, even if some of the charges of chirals are outside of this region the limit might be well behaved. Consider for example giving R-charge zero to $N_f + N$ chiral fields and R-charge two to $N_f - N$. This is an anomaly free R-charge. Assuming that $N_f + N$ is even, we might split the choice above equally between the quarks and anti-quarks, that is giving R-charge zero to $\frac{N_f+N}{2}$ flavors. In such a case the R-charges of the dual theory are one for $\frac{N_f+N}{2}$ flavors and -1 for $\frac{N_f-N}{2}$. Thus although naively the limit of the matter is singular from the duality we know that the limit for the gauge invariant operators has to be well defined.

In summary, the p, q to zero limit captures protected information associated to a certain submanifold of the moduli space of the theory. The precise submanifold is determined by the choice of the R-charges. One can in principle consider other limits on fugacities coupling to combinations of charges which for a given model are non-negative for states contributing to the index. However since the index gets contributions from fermions and bosons in conjugate representations the index would usually get contributions from both negatively and positively charged objects unless the limit is for an R-symmetry. In certain cases the information captured in this limit is equivalent to the Hilbert series of the moduli space. An example is given by [60] the limit of the index of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theories corresponding to genus zero Riemann surfaces in class \mathcal{S} terminology [61]. See also [62, 63, 64] for the $3d$ variants of such limits.

7.3 Poles and residues

The index is a meromorphic function of the fugacities and in general has numerous poles. Let us assume the index has a behavior of the following form,

$$\mathcal{I}_0(a_1, a_2, \dots) = \frac{\mathcal{I}_1(a_1, a_2, \dots)}{1 - a_1}, \quad (7.29)$$

where a_i are some fugacities and we assume \mathcal{I}' has no zeros or poles at $a_1 = 1$. From the trace interpretation of the index we deduce that there is a bosonic operator in the theory, \mathcal{O} , with charges such that it contributes with weight a_1 to the index. Moreover, any power of this operator also contributes to the index. The pole at $a_1 = 1$ corresponds to computing the index while giving weight 1 to \mathcal{O} . Putting it differently, we consider turning on only fugacities for symmetries consistent with giving a vacuum expectation value for \mathcal{O} . It is thus natural to interpret the residue of the pole as the index of the theory obtained as the IR fixed point of an RG flow triggered by vacuum expectation value for \mathcal{O} .

We have encountered an example of the effect of vacuum expectation values while discussing Higgsing in section 4. Let us give several additional examples. First let us consider a sigma model with two chiral fields and a superpotential

$$W = \Phi_1 \Phi_2^2. \quad (7.30)$$

We have one $U(1)_a$ global symmetry preserved by the superpotential and we choose Φ_1 to have charge -2 and Φ_2 has charge $+1$. We also assign R-charge $2R$ to Φ_1 and $1 - R$ to Φ_2 . The index of the model is given by

$$\mathcal{I}(a) = \Gamma((pq)^R a^{-2}) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1-R}{2}} a). \quad (7.31)$$

Note that the chiral ring here has the relations

$$\Phi_1 \Phi_2 \sim 0, \quad \Phi_2^2 \sim 0. \quad (7.32)$$

In particular, as we already discussed not all powers of the scalar component of Φ_2 contribute to the index, but any power of the scalar from Φ_1 appears. This index has many poles one of which is at $a = (pq)^{\frac{R}{2}}$. The operator which leads to the divergence is the scalar component of Φ_1 . The residue is given by

$$\mathcal{I}(a) \sim \frac{1}{1 - (pq)^R a^{-2}} \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \mathcal{I}_V^{-1} + O(1). \quad (7.33)$$

The index of Φ_2 becomes $\Gamma((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}}) = 1$, which is the index of a massive fields since the vacuum expectation value for Φ_1 generates a mass term for Φ_2 . The index of field Φ_1 stripping off the divergence is $\Gamma(1)' = \frac{1}{(q;q)(p;p)} = \mathcal{I}_V^{-1}$ which is the index of the Nambu-Goldstone boson corresponding to the broken $U(1)_a$ symmetry. The residue is thus just given by the index of the Nambu-Goldstone boson as expected as the theory is empty in the IR. It is thus natural to write the general relation

$$\mathcal{I}_0(a_1 \rightarrow 1) = \frac{1}{1 - a_1} \mathcal{I}_{IR}(a_2, \dots) \mathcal{I}_{Nam.-Gold.} + O(1). \quad (7.34)$$

We consider now a more involved example of a gauge theory. The theory we discuss is $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ quiver gauge theory of figure 2. The superpotential is




Figure 2: An $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ quiver gauge theory.

$$W = Q_1 \Phi_1 \tilde{Q}_1 + Q_2 \Phi_2 \tilde{Q}_2. \quad (7.35)$$

We will assign R-charge zero to the Q_i and \tilde{Q}_i fields and R-charge two to Φ_j . This model has three abelian global symmetries which we will denote by $U(1)_T \times U(1)_X \times U(1)_Y$. The different fields have the charges specified in Table 3.

	$U(1)_T$	$U(1)_X$	$U(1)_Y$	$U(1)_R$
Φ_1	-2	+2	0	2
Φ_2	-2	-2	0	2
Q_1	+1	-1	+1	0
\tilde{Q}_1	+1	-1	-1	0
Q_2	+1	+1	-1	0
\tilde{Q}_2	+1	+1	+1	0

Table 3: Abelian charges of fields.

We can consider giving a vacuum expectation value to a baryonic operator of the form $B_Q = \epsilon \cdot Q_1^2$. This will Higgs one of the $SU(2)$ gauge groups and reduce the rank of the flavor group by one. Let us analyze how this comes about from the index. The index of the model is given by,

$$\mathcal{I} = \kappa^2 \oint \frac{dz_1}{4\pi i z_1 \Gamma(z_1^{\pm 1})} \oint \frac{dz_2}{4\pi i z_2 \Gamma(z_2^{\pm 2})} \Gamma\left(\frac{pq}{T^2} X^{\pm 2} z_1^{\pm 1} z_2^{\pm 1}\right) \times \quad (7.36)$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^4 \Gamma\left(\frac{TY}{X} u_i z_1^{\pm 1}\right) \Gamma(TY X v_i^{-1} z_2^{\pm 1}) \Gamma\left(\frac{T}{YX} u_i^{-1} z_2^{\pm 1}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{TX}{Y} v_i z_1^{\pm 1}\right).$$

We have two $SU(4)$ symmetries with fugacities u_i and v_i . Baryon B_Q contributes to the index with weight $\frac{T^2 Y^2}{X^2} u_1 u_2$ where we have made a choice of the subgroup of $SU(4)_u$ under which B_Q is charged. Giving a vacuum expectation value to B_Q we set the weight of the operator to one,

$$\frac{T^2 Y^2}{X^2} u_1 u_2 = 1.$$

With this specification of parameters the field Q_1 contributes to the index as,

$$\Gamma\left(\frac{TY}{X} u_i z_1^{\pm 1}\right) \rightarrow \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{u_1 u_2}} u_i z_1^{\pm 1}\right). \quad (7.37)$$

Before the specification this field had poles in z_1 at, among others,

$$z_1 = \frac{TY}{X} u_1, \frac{TY}{X} u_2, \quad z_1 = \frac{X}{TY} u_1^{-1}, \frac{X}{TY} u_2^{-1},$$

with the former inside the unit circle and latter outside assuming that $|T| < 1$ and all other fugacities for global symmetries being phases. The integration contour thus lies between these poles. However after the specification the poles above inside and outside of the circle collide and pinch the integration contour at $z_1 = \sqrt{\frac{u_1}{u_2}}, \sqrt{\frac{u_2}{u_1}}$. This causes the integral over z_1 to diverge. The residue of this divergence is,

$$\begin{aligned}
2\kappa \text{Res}_{\frac{T^2 Y^2}{x^2} u_1 u_2 \rightarrow 1} \mathcal{I} &= \prod_{i=3}^4 \Gamma\left(\frac{u_i}{u_1}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{u_i}{u_2}\right) \prod_{i=1}^4 \Gamma(T^2 v_i u_1) \Gamma(T^2 v_i u_2) \times \\
&\kappa \oint \frac{dz_2}{4\pi i z_2 \Gamma(z_2^{\pm 2})} \Gamma\left(\frac{pq}{T^4 Y^2} \frac{1}{u_1 u_2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{u_1}{u_2}}\right)^{\pm 1} z_2^{\pm 1}\right) \prod_{i=3}^4 \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{Y^2} \frac{u_i^{-1}}{\sqrt{u_1 u_2}} z_2^{\pm 1}\right) \prod_{i=1}^4 \Gamma(T^2 Y^2 v_i^{-1} \sqrt{u_1 u_2} z_2^{\pm 1}).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.38}$$

This is the index of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(2)$ SCFT with four flavors and additional singlet fields coupled to the charged matter through a superpotential. This is exactly the matter content one would expect after giving a vacuum expectation value to baryon B_Q .

More general poles correspond to turning on vacuum expectation values to derivatives of operators and thus break explicitly Lorentz invariance. The theory in the IR is expected to have co-dimension two defects. The residue computes then an index of a theory in presence of such defects. Such flows and corresponding defects were discussed in the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ context in [33] and in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ context in [65] (see [66] for a review). The IR theory here has $4d$ degrees of freedom coupled to $2d$ ones, and the index is often expressible as some difference operator, shifting flavor fugacities by general powers of p and q , acting on the four dimensional index [33, 35, 67, 65]. This is reminiscent of the observation below (6.5).

7.4 Large N limit

The matrix models of indices of gauge theories can be simplified and explicitly evaluated in the limit of large number of colors using large N matrix model techniques (see *e.g.* [19, 4]). Let us here give a general result for the large N limit of an index of a quiver gauge theory with $U(N)$ gauge groups. We follow here the discussion and notations of [68].

We consider a quiver theory with gauge group $\prod_{a=1}^s U(N_a)_{u_a}$. Let $\{e^{\alpha_{ai}}\}_{i=1}^{N_a}$ denote the N_a eigenvalues of u_a . Then the matrix model integral (2.12) is,

$$\mathcal{I}(x) = \int \prod_{a,i} [d\alpha_{ai}] \exp \left\{ - \sum_{ai \neq bj} V_b^a(\alpha_{ai} - \alpha_{bj}) \right\}. \tag{7.39}$$

Here, the potential V is the following function

$$V_b^a(\theta) = \delta_b^a (\ln 2) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} [\delta_b^a - i_b^a(x^n)] \cos n\theta, \tag{7.40}$$

where, $i_b^a(x)$ is the total single letter index in the representation $r^a \otimes r_b$ and x stands for all the fugacities we can turn on. Writing the density of the eigenvalues $\{e^{\alpha_{ai}}\}$ at the point θ on the circle as $\rho_a(\theta)$, we reduce it to the functional integral problem,

$$\mathcal{I}(x) = \int \prod_a [d\rho_a] \exp \left\{ - \int d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \sum_{a,b} n_a n_b \rho_a(\theta_1) V_b^a(\theta_1 - \theta_2) \rho_b^\dagger(\theta_2) \right\}. \tag{7.41}$$

For large N , we can evaluate this expression with the saddle point approximation,

$$\mathcal{I}(x) = \prod_k \frac{1}{\det(1 - i(x^k))}.$$

For $SU(N)$ gauge groups instead of $U(N)$, the result is modified as follows,

$$\mathcal{I}(x) = \prod_k \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{k} \text{tr } i(x^k)}}{\det(1 - i(x^k))}. \quad (7.42)$$

Here $i(x)$ is the matrix with entries $i_b^a(x)$.

The single-trace partition function can be obtained from the full partition function,

$$\mathcal{I}_{s.t.} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \log \mathcal{I}(x^n) \quad (7.43)$$

$$= - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi(k)}{k} \log[\det(1 - i(x^k))] - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{tr } i(x^{nk})}{k} \quad (7.44)$$

$$= - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi(k)}{k} \log[\det(1 - i(x^k))] - \text{tr } i(x). \quad (7.45)$$

The second term in the summation would be absent for the $U(N)$ gauge theories. Here $\mu(n)$ is the Möbius function ($\mu(1) \equiv 1$, $\mu(n) \equiv 0$ if n has repeated prime factors and $\mu(n) \equiv (-1)^k$ if n is the product of k distinct primes) and $\varphi(n)$ is the Euler Phi function, defined as the number of positive integers less than n that are coprime to n . We have used the properties

$$\sum_{d|n} d \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) = \varphi(n), \quad \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) = \delta_{n,1}. \quad (7.46)$$

Indices in the large N limit can be used to check holographic dualities. For example the index of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM in this limit can be matched with the spectrum of fields in AdS_5 computed in supergravity [4]. The large N indices [68] of a variety of $Y_{p,q}$ models [69] were also matched with the holographic duals [70]. In general the field theory expressions in the large N limit are rather simple though the dual holographic computation can be involved, see [70]. For example, the index of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ class \mathcal{S} theories [61] of genus \mathfrak{g} is explicitly known in large N limit [60] though that simple result was not yet reproduced from the gravity side [71].

8 Other topics and open problems

There are many other interesting related topics that we could review here. We conclude with a brief mention of a few of them:

- *Holomorphic blocks* – The localization procedure leading directly to the trace-formula formulation of the index is the so called Coulomb branch localization. The computation reduces to a matrix integral over the zero modes of the vector field in the direction of \mathbb{S}_7^1 . The name comes from the fact that these components upon reduction to three dimensions become scalar components in the vector multiplet and parametrize the Coulomb branch. However, there is a different localization procedure one can employ [72, 73, 74]. The dimensional reduction of this procedure to three dimensions leads to the so called Higgs branch localization form for the index [75, 76, 77]. In this localization procedure the index can be written as a finite sum over vortex/anti-vortex partition functions which are effectively partition functions on $\mathbb{C} \times T^2$. This “holomorphic block” factorization of the partition function is extremely powerful since it connects together a priori unrelated partition functions. By gluing differently the blocks one can obtain various geometry and thus relate the supersymmetric index for example to $\mathbb{S}^2 \times T^2$ partition function. Let us mention here only the simplest example of such a factorization in the case of a free chiral field. Here we have

$$\mathcal{I}^{(R)}(a) = \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{R}{2}} a; p, q) = \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{R}{2}} a; p, pq) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{R}{2}} qa; q, pq). \quad (8.1)$$

There are many interesting results yet to be uncovered following this direction.

- *Lens space index* – As was mentioned in the introduction the supersymmetric index is a special case of a sequence of partition functions, the lens space indices $\mathbb{S}^3/\mathbb{Z}_r \times \mathbb{S}^1$ [78]. As a counting problem the lens index is computed as follows. Since the geometry involves an orbifold projection the lens index receives contributions from local operators consistent with the action of the orbifold. Let us call this sector the “untwisted” one. Let us again here give just an example of the lens index of a free chiral field in the “untwisted” sector,

$$\mathcal{I}_r^{(R)}(a) = \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{R}{2}} a; p^r, pq) \Gamma((pq)^{\frac{R}{2}} q^r a; q^r, pq). \quad (8.2)$$

On the other hand, for $r > 1$ the lens space $\mathbb{S}^3/\mathbb{Z}_r$ has a non-contractable torsion cycle, and upon quantizing the theory on this space one should consider configurations wrapping this cycle. This leads to a finite number, since the cycle is torsion, of “twisted” sectors which receive contributions from extended objects in the theory. Thus although the supersymmetric index, $r = 1$, gets contributions only from local operators, the lens index captures a much larger variety of objects. Moreover, the spectrum of the non-local objects is sensitive to the global structure of the gauge groups [79] and not just to the Lie algebras making lens indices a more refined characteristic of the physics. Taking the limit of large r the non-trivial cycle of the lens space shrinks to zero size and $\mathbb{S}^3/\mathbb{Z}_r$ becomes \mathbb{S}^2 . In this limit the lens index in four dimensions reduces to the supersymmetric index in three dimensions. The finite sum over the twisted sectors becomes an infinite sum over monopoles sectors in three dimensions. Although there

are several works studying the lens index it has been largely neglected and there are many avenues for farther research.

- *Relations to integrable models* – Finally let us mention that the supersymmetric index is closely related to quantum mechanical integrable systems. These relations come in different forms. For example the (lens) index itself can be related to partition function of two dimensional lattice integrable models [80, 81]. On the other hand, as we discussed in the previous sections, computing indices of theories in presence of surface defects amounts to acting on indices without defects with difference operators [33, 82, 65]. Such difference operators are Hamiltonians for well known Ruijsenaars-Schneider integrable systems when the theories are $\mathcal{N} = 2$ [33, 67, 83, 84, 85], and give rise to novel integrable models when one has $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry [65, 86, 87]. These relations deserve a much more thorough investigation.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Ofer Aharony, Chris Beem, Abhijit Gadde, Davide Gaiotto, Guido Festuccia, Zohar Komargodski, Nathan Seiberg, Brian Willett, Wenbin Yan for fruitful collaborations and numerous discussions on the topics reviewed here. LR is supported in part by NSF Grant PHY-1316617. SSR is a Jacques Lewiner Career Advancement Chair fellow. This research was also supported by Israel Science Foundation under grant no. 1696/15 and by I-CORE Program of the Planning and Budgeting Committee.

References

- [1] V. Pestun and M. Zabzine, eds., *Localization techniques in quantum field theory*, vol. xx. Journal of Physics A, 2016. 1608.02952.
<https://arxiv.org/src/1608.02952/anc/LocQFT.pdf>,
<http://pestun.ihef.fr/pages/LocalizationReview/LocQFT.pdf>.
- [2] V. Pestun, “Localization of gauge theory on a four-sphere and supersymmetric Wilson loops,” arXiv:0712.2824 [hep-th].
- [3] K. Hosomichi, “ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY gauge theories on S^4 ,” *Journal of Physics A* **xx** (2016) 000, 1608.02962.
- [4] J. Kinney, J. M. Maldacena, S. Minwalla, and S. Raju, “An index for 4 dimensional super conformal theories,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **275** (2007) 209–254, arXiv:hep-th/0510251.
- [5] C. Romelsberger, “Counting chiral primaries in $N = 1$, $d=4$ superconformal field theories,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B747** (2006) 329–353, arXiv:hep-th/0510060.

- [6] C. Romelsberger, “Calculating the Superconformal Index and Seiberg Duality,” [arXiv:0707.3702](#) [hep-th].
- [7] B. I. Zwiebel, “Charging the Superconformal Index,” *JHEP* **01** (2012) 116, [arXiv:1111.1773](#) [hep-th].
- [8] G. Festuccia and N. Seiberg, “Rigid Supersymmetric Theories in Curved Superspace,” *JHEP* **1106** (2011) 114, [arXiv:1105.0689](#) [hep-th].
- [9] D. Sen, “Supersymmetry in the Space-time $R \times S^{*3}$,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B284** (1987) 201.
- [10] T. Dumitrescu, “An Introduction to Supersymmetric Field Theories in Curved Space,” *Journal of Physics A* **xx** (2016) 000, [1608.02957](#).
- [11] C. Closset and I. Shamir, “The $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Chiral Multiplet on $T^2 \times S^2$ and Supersymmetric Localization,” *JHEP* **03** (2014) 040, [arXiv:1311.2430](#) [hep-th].
- [12] B. Assel, D. Cassani, and D. Martelli, “Localization on Hopf surfaces,” *JHEP* **08** (2014) 123, [arXiv:1405.5144](#) [hep-th].
- [13] H.-C. Kim and S. Kim, “M5-branes from gauge theories on the 5-sphere,” [arXiv:1206.6339](#) [hep-th].
- [14] A. A. Ardehali, “High-temperature asymptotics of supersymmetric partition functions,” [arXiv:1512.03376](#) [hep-th].
- [15] B. Assel, D. Cassani, L. Di Pietro, Z. Komargodski, J. Lorenzen, and D. Martelli, “The Casimir Energy in Curved Space and its Supersymmetric Counterpart,” *JHEP* **07** (2015) 043, [arXiv:1503.05537](#) [hep-th].
- [16] N. Bobev, M. Bullimore, and H.-C. Kim, “Supersymmetric Casimir Energy and the Anomaly Polynomial,” *JHEP* **09** (2015) 142, [arXiv:1507.08553](#) [hep-th].
- [17] F. A. Dolan and H. Osborn, “Applications of the Superconformal Index for Protected Operators and q-Hypergeometric Identities to $N=1$ Dual Theories,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B818** (2009) 137–178, [arXiv:arXiv:0801.4947](#) [hep-th].
- [18] S. Benvenuti, B. Feng, A. Hanany, and Y.-H. He, “Counting BPS operators in gauge theories: Quivers, syzygies and plethystics,” *JHEP* **11** (2007) 050, [arXiv:hep-th/0608050](#).
- [19] O. Aharony, J. Marsano, S. Minwalla, K. Papadodimas, and M. Van Raamsdonk, “The Hagedorn / deconfinement phase transition in weakly coupled large N gauge theories,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **8** (2004) 603–696, [arXiv:hep-th/0310285](#).
- [20] A. Gadde, E. Pomoni, L. Rastelli, and S. S. Razamat, “S-duality and 2d Topological QFT,” *JHEP* **03** (2010) 032, [arXiv:0910.2225](#) [hep-th].

- [21] O. Aharony, S. S. Razamat, N. Seiberg, and B. Willett, “3d dualities from 4d dualities,” *JHEP* **07** (2013) 149, [arXiv:1305.3924 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [22] N. Seiberg, “Electric - magnetic duality in supersymmetric nonAbelian gauge theories,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B435** (1995) 129–146, [arXiv:hep-th/9411149 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [23] V. Spiridonov, “On the elliptic beta function,” *Russian Mathematical Surveys* **56:1** (2001) 185.
- [24] V. Spiridonov, “Essays on the theory of elliptic hypergeometric functions,” *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* **63 no 3** (2008) 3–72, [arXiv:0805.3135](#).
- [25] E. M. Rains, “Transformations of Elliptic Hypergeometric Integrals ,” [math/0309252](#).
- [26] V. Spiridonov and G. Vartanov, “Elliptic hypergeometric integrals and ’t Hooft anomaly matching conditions,” *JHEP* **1206** (2012) 016, [arXiv:1203.5677 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [27] V. P. Spiridonov and S. O. Warnaar, “Inversions of integral operators and elliptic beta integrals on root systems ,” *Adv. Math.* **207** (2006) 91–132, [math/0411044](#).
- [28] C. Beem and A. Gadde, “The $N = 1$ superconformal index for class S fixed points,” *JHEP* **1404** (2014) 036, [arXiv:1212.1467 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [29] D. Green, Z. Komargodski, N. Seiberg, Y. Tachikawa, and B. Wecht, “Exactly Marginal Deformations and Global Symmetries,” *JHEP* **06** (2010) 106, [arXiv:1005.3546 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [30] F. J. van de Bult, “An elliptic hypergeometric integral with $W(F_4)$ symmetry,” [arXiv:0909.4793](#).
- [31] V. P. Spiridonov and G. S. Vartanov, “Superconformal indices for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theories with multiple duals,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B824** (2010) 192–216, [arXiv:0811.1909 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [32] T. Dimofte and D. Gaiotto, “An E_7 Surprise,” *JHEP* **10** (2012) 129, [arXiv:1209.1404 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [33] D. Gaiotto, L. Rastelli, and S. S. Razamat, “Bootstrapping the superconformal index with surface defects,” *JHEP* **01** (2013) 022, [arXiv:1207.3577 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [34] D. Gaiotto and H.-C. Kim, “Surface defects and instanton partition functions,” *ArXiv e-prints* (2014) , [arXiv:1412.2781 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [35] A. Gadde and S. Gukov, “2d index and surface operators,” *Journal of High Energy Physics* **3** (2014) 80, [arXiv:1305.0266 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [36] V. Spiridonov and G. Vartanov, “Superconformal indices of $N=4$ SYM field theories,” [arXiv:1005.4196 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [37] D. Kutasov, “A Comment on duality in N=1 supersymmetric nonAbelian gauge theories,” *Phys. Lett.* **B351** (1995) 230–234, [arXiv:hep-th/9503086](#) [hep-th].
- [38] D. Kutasov and A. Schwimmer, “On duality in supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory,” *Phys. Lett.* **B354** (1995) 315–321, [arXiv:hep-th/9505004](#) [hep-th].
- [39] K. A. Intriligator and B. Wecht, “RG fixed points and flows in SQCD with adjoints,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B677** (2004) 223–272, [arXiv:hep-th/0309201](#) [hep-th].
- [40] D. Kutasov and J. Lin, “Exceptional N=1 Duality,” [arXiv:1401.4168](#) [hep-th].
- [41] D. Kutasov and J. Lin, “N=1 Duality and the Superconformal Index,” [arXiv:1402.5411](#) [hep-th].
- [42] V. P. Spiridonov and G. S. Vartanov, “Elliptic hypergeometry of supersymmetric dualities,” [arXiv:0910.5944](#) [hep-th].
- [43] V. Spiridonov and G. Vartanov, “Elliptic hypergeometry of supersymmetric dualities II. Orthogonal groups, knots, and vortices,” [arXiv:1107.5788](#) [hep-th].
- [44] V. Spiridonov, “Elliptic hypergeometric terms,” [arXiv:1003.4491](#) [math.CA].
- [45] V. Spiridonov, “Classical elliptic hypergeometric functions and their applications,” *Rokko Lect. in Math. Vol. 18, Dept. of Math, Kobe Univ.* (2005) 253–287, [arXiv:math/0511579](#).
- [46] V. Spiridonov, “Elliptic hypergeometric functions,” [arXiv:0704.3099](#).
- [47] C. Closset, T. T. Dumitrescu, G. Festuccia, and Z. Komargodski, “Supersymmetric Field Theories on Three-Manifolds,” *JHEP* **05** (2013) 017, [arXiv:1212.3388](#) [hep-th].
- [48] O. Aharony, S. S. Razamat, N. Seiberg, and B. Willett, “3d dualities from 4d dualities for orthogonal groups,” *JHEP* **1308** (2013) 099, [arXiv:1307.0511](#).
- [49] K. A. Intriligator, N. Seiberg, and S. H. Shenker, “Proposal for a simple model of dynamical SUSY breaking,” *Phys. Lett.* **B342** (1995) 152–154, [arXiv:hep-ph/9410203](#) [hep-ph].
- [50] G. Vartanov, “On the ISS model of dynamical SUSY breaking,” *Phys.Lett.* **B696** (2011) 288–290, [arXiv:1009.2153](#) [hep-th].
- [51] Y. Imamura and D. Yokoyama, “N=2 supersymmetric theories on squashed three-sphere,” *Phys. Rev.* **D85** (2012) 025015, [arXiv:1109.4734](#) [hep-th].
- [52] G. Felder and A. Varchenko, “The elliptic gamma function and $SL(3, \mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}^3$,” *ArXiv Mathematics e-prints* (1999) , [math/9907061](#).

- [53] A. Kapustin, B. Willett, and I. Yaakov, “Exact Results for Wilson Loops in Superconformal Chern- Simons Theories with Matter,” *JHEP* **03** (2010) 089, [arXiv:0909.4559 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [54] F. Dolan, V. Spiridonov, and G. Vartanov, “From 4d superconformal indices to 3d partition functions,” [arXiv:1104.1787 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [55] Y. Imamura, “Relation between the 4d superconformal index and the S^3 partition function,” [arXiv:1104.4482 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [56] A. Gadde and W. Yan, “Reducing the 4d Index to the S^3 Partition Function,” *JHEP* **1212** (2012) 003, [arXiv:1104.2592 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [57] B. Willett, “Localization on three-dimensional manifolds,” *Journal of Physics A* **xx** (2016) 000, [1608.02958](#).
- [58] J. Gray, A. Hanany, Y.-H. He, V. Jejjala, and N. Mekareeya, “SQCD: A Geometric Apercu,” *JHEP* **0805** (2008) 099, [arXiv:0803.4257 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [59] A. Hanany and N. Mekareeya, “Counting Gauge Invariant Operators in SQCD with Classical Gauge Groups,” *JHEP* **10** (2008) 012, [arXiv:0805.3728 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [60] A. Gadde, L. Rastelli, S. S. Razamat, and W. Yan, “Gauge Theories and Macdonald Polynomials,” *Commun.Math.Phys.* **319** (2013) 147–193, [arXiv:1110.3740 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [61] D. Gaiotto, “N=2 dualities,” [arXiv:arXiv:0904.2715 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [62] S. S. Razamat and B. Willett, “Down the rabbit hole with theories of class S,” [arXiv:1403.6107 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [63] S. Cremonesi, “The Hilbert series of 3d $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Yang-Mills theories with vectorlike matter,” *J. Phys.* **A48** (2015) no. 45, [455401, arXiv:1505.02409 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [64] A. Hanany, C. Hwang, H. Kim, J. Park, and R.-K. Seong, “Hilbert Series for Theories with Aharony Duals,” *JHEP* **11** (2015) 132, [arXiv:1505.02160 \[hep-th\]](#). [Addendum: *JHEP*04,064(2016)].
- [65] D. Gaiotto and S. S. Razamat, “ $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theories of class \mathcal{S}_k ,” *JHEP* **07** (2015) 073, [arXiv:1503.05159 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [66] L. Rastelli and S. S. Razamat, “The Superconformal Index of Theories of Class \mathcal{S} ,” in *New Dualities of Supersymmetric Gauge Theories*, J. Teschner, ed., pp. 261–305. 2016. [arXiv:1412.7131 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [67] L. F. Alday, M. Bullimore, M. Fluder, and L. Hollands, “Surface defects, the superconformal index and q-deformed Yang-Mills,” [arXiv:1303.4460 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [68] A. Gadde, L. Rastelli, S. S. Razamat, and W. Yan, “On the Superconformal Index of N=1 IR Fixed Points: A Holographic Check,” *JHEP* **1103** (2011) 041, [arXiv:1011.5278 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [69] S. Benvenuti, S. Franco, A. Hanany, D. Martelli, and J. Sparks, “An infinite family of superconformal quiver gauge theories with Sasaki-Einstein duals,” *JHEP* **06** (2005) 064, [arXiv:hep-th/0411264](#).
- [70] R. Eager, J. Schmude, and Y. Tachikawa, “Superconformal Indices, Sasaki-Einstein Manifolds, and Cyclic Homologies,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **18** (2014) no. 1, 129–175, [arXiv:1207.0573 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [71] D. Gaiotto and J. Maldacena, “The gravity duals of N=2 superconformal field theories,” [arXiv:arXiv:0904.4466 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [72] W. Peelaers, “Higgs branch localization of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theories on $S^3 \times S^1$,” *JHEP* **08** (2014) 060, [arXiv:1403.2711 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [73] Y. Yoshida, “Factorization of 4d N=1 superconformal index,” [arXiv:1403.0891 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [74] F. Nieri and S. Pasquetti, “Factorisation and holomorphic blocks in 4d,” *JHEP* **11** (2015) 155, [arXiv:1507.00261 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [75] S. Pasquetti, “Factorisation of N = 2 Theories on the Squashed 3-Sphere,” *JHEP* **1204** (2012) 120, [arXiv:1111.6905 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [76] C. Beem, T. Dimofte, and S. Pasquetti, “Holomorphic Blocks in Three Dimensions,” [arXiv:1211.1986 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [77] F. Benini and W. Peelaers, “Higgs branch localization in three dimensions,” *JHEP* **05** (2014) 030, [arXiv:1312.6078 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [78] F. Benini, T. Nishioka, and M. Yamazaki, “4d Index to 3d Index and 2d TQFT,” [arXiv:1109.0283 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [79] S. S. Razamat and B. Willett, “Global Properties of Supersymmetric Theories and the Lens Space,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **334** (2015) no. 2, 661–696, [arXiv:1307.4381 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [80] V. P. Spiridonov, “Elliptic beta integrals and solvable models of statistical mechanics,” *Contemp. Math.* **563** (2012) 181–211, [arXiv:1011.3798 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [81] M. Yamazaki, “New Integrable Models from the Gauge/YBE Correspondence,” *J. Statist. Phys.* **154** (2014) 895, [arXiv:1307.1128 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [82] D. Gaiotto and H.-C. Kim, “Surface defects and instanton partition functions,” [arXiv:1412.2781 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [83] M. Bullimore, M. Fluder, L. Hollands, and P. Richmond, “The superconformal index and an elliptic algebra of surface defects,” [arXiv:1401.3379](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [84] L. F. Alday, M. Bullimore, and M. Fluder, “On S-duality of the Superconformal Index on Lens Spaces and 2d TQFT,” [arXiv:1301.7486](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [85] S. S. Razamat and M. Yamazaki, “S-duality and the N=2 Lens Space Index,” *JHEP* **1310** (2013) 048, [arXiv:1306.1543](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [86] J. Yagi, “Quiver gauge theories and integrable lattice models,” *JHEP* **10** (2015) 065, [arXiv:1504.04055](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [87] K. Maruyoshi and J. Yagi, “Surface defects as transfer matrices,” [arXiv:1606.01041](#) [[hep-th](#)].