

On Ruijsenaars-Schneider spectrum from superconformal indices and ramified instantons

Hee-Cheol Kim,^{a,b} Anton Nedelin,^c Shlomo S. Razamat^d

^a*Department of Physics, POSTECH, Pohang 37673, Korea*

^b*Jefferson Physical Laboratory, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*

^c*Department of Mathematics, King's College London, London, WC2R 2LS, United Kingdom*

^d*Department of Physics, Technion, Haifa, 32000, Israel*

E-mail: heecheol@postech.ac.kr, anton.nedelin@gmail.com,
razamat@physics.technion.ac.il

ABSTRACT: We discuss two physics-inspired approaches to derivation of the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of A_N Ruijsenaars-Schneider model. First approach which was recently proposed by the authors relies on the computations of superconformal indices of class \mathcal{S} $4d$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ theories with the insertion of surface defects. Second approach uses computations of Nekrasov-Shatashvili limit of $5d$ $\mathcal{N} = 1^*$ instanton partition functions in the presence of co-dimension two defect. We compare results of these two approaches for the low-lying levels of Ruijsenaars-Schneider model. We also discuss different previously proposed exact quantization conditions for the Coulomb branch parameters of the instanton partition functions and their interpretations in terms of index calculations.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Ruijsenaars-Schneider spectrum from the index.	2
2.1	A_1 Ruijsenaars-Schneider model	5
2.2	A_2 Ruijsenaars-Schneider model	7
3	Ramified Instantons.	8
3.1	A_1 RS from instantons.	9
3.2	A_2 RS from instantons.	13
4	Matching ramified instantons and index calculations.	16
5	Instantons on $S_b^3 \times \Sigma$ and relation to indices.	18
6	Discussion and Outlook	24
A	A_1 Macdonald polynomials	25

1 Introduction

Supersymmetric quantum field theories in different dimensions are a fruitful setup to derive and test a plethora of results in mathematical physics. In particular it is common that the same mathematical structure appears in different physical setups allowing to perform some computations in different ways leading on one hand to deeper insights of the underlying physics and on the other hand allowing for derivation of mathematical results.

In this note we discuss an example of such a mathematical structure, the A_{N-1} Ruijsenaars-Schneider (RS) quantum mechanical integrable model. This model appears in numerous contexts in mathematical physics [1–9]. As with any quantum mechanical system an important question is that of spectrum of eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of the model. For example, in the context of $4d$ class \mathcal{S} theories [10, 11] knowing this spectrum conjecturally [12, 13] would allow full determination of the superconformal index [14–16] (which encodes a lot of information about protected operators) of theories for which a Lagrangian description is not known, at least as of yet. Recently, an algorithmic procedure to deduce the spectrum of RS model using the index of $4d$ theories with Lagrangian was suggested in [17]¹. On the other

¹Our algorithm proposed in this paper relies on the perturbative expansion in RS parameters where corresponding $4d$ indices are well defined and have physical meaning. In this sense the spectrum we derived is strictly speaking valid only for the subspace of the full parameter space of RS model. In particular our results are blind to non-perturbative completion of the spectrum discussed in [18].

hand, same integrable systems appear also in the study of *ramified instanton partition functions* of 5d Kaluza-Klein (KK) theories [19, 20]. These are 5d instanton partition functions with 1/2 BPS co-dimension two defects inserted. In particular, using the ramified instanton partition function a procedure to deduce the spectrum of the RS model was conjectured in [18]. This procedure goes through construction of a function which depends on additional parameters, specializing which to a discrete set of possibilities is conjectured to give the eigenfunctions. The choice of the specialization is often referred to as a choice of quantization, which generalizes the work in [21].

In this note we will show that a particular choice of quantization, the so called B-model quantization introduced in [18], leads to results consistent with the ones obtained from 4d index computations. We will perform explicit computations for the two first eigenfunctions of the A_1 RS model and for the ground state of A_2 RS model. We will also comment on how an alternative, A-model, quantization is related to the B-model quantization. From physics point of view the results of this note should be useful for explicit computation of indices of theories which lack known Lagrangians in 4d by relating them to explicit instanton partition function computations of 5d KK theories. From the mathematical point of view it gives a concrete relation between two very different presentations of eigenfunctions of the A_{N-1} RS elliptic integrable models. We expect that the results of this paper could be extended to address other integrable models appearing both in 4d and 5d: *e.g.* the van Diejen model appearing in compactifications of the 6d E-string theory to 4d[22, 23] and in the instanton calculations for 5d $USp(2N)$ gauge theory. Unlike the RS model, in various generalizations very little is known about the spectrum and we expect that following through with generalizations of our work should provide very concrete results in that direction.

This note is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review the connection between 4d $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superconformal indices and elliptic integrable systems. We also summarize an algorithm for the derivation of the spectra of these operators from the index calculations that was proposed in [17]. Then in Section 3 we review the construction of ramified instanton partition functions from [20, 24, 25] and how they are related to the spectrum of RS model. In Section 4 we compare these two approaches and show that they give consistent results. In Section 5 we discuss how different quantization choices in instanton calculations are related to the superconformal indices. Finally in Section 6 we discuss possible future directions in which our results can be extended.

2 Ruijsenaars-Schneider spectrum from the index.

In this section we will very briefly review the main idea of [17] on how to obtain ground state (and in some cases higher states as well) of relativistic integrable models from the superconformal index calculations.

Our starting point is the superconformal index of 4d $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theory which is defined as the trace over the Hilbert space of theory quantized on S^3 :

$$\mathcal{I} [T_{6d}, \mathcal{C}] (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{6d}, p, q) = \text{Tr}_{S^3} (-1)^F q^{j_2 - j_1 + \frac{R}{2}} p^{j_2 + j_1 + \frac{R}{2}} \prod_{\ell=1}^{\text{rank } G_F} x_{\ell}^{\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $j_{1,2}$ are Cartan generators of $Spin(4)$, \mathcal{Q}_ℓ are charges of the global symmetry of G_F , R is R -charge operator and F is fermion number. Index depends on the fugacities p, q, x_ℓ that keep track of all the aforementioned charges of operators. Importantly in our index calculations we further assume

$$|p| < 1, \quad |q| < 1, \quad (2.2)$$

so that state counting problem is well defined and all expressions converge. From the point of view of our discussion of RS model this means that all our results obtained from indices are valid only in certain domain of parameters specified in (2.2).

Four-dimensional theories we consider originate in the compactifications $6d$ SCFTs on a punctured Riemann surface. The resulting $4d$ theory depends on the original $6d$ SCFT, compactification geometry which we denote as \mathcal{C} and all the fugacities of $4d$ symmetries as denoted on the l.h.s. of (2.1). We have split the latter ones into fugacities \mathbf{u}_{6d} of global symmetries G_{6d} of the original $6d$ SCFT and fugacities \mathbf{x} of $4d$ global symmetry emerging in the compactifications. We usually identify such symmetries G_{5d} with the punctures of the Riemann surface \mathcal{C} . The subscript $5d$ is here since to obtain this symmetry one relies on an intermediate effective $5d$ gauge theory obtained in the circle compactification from $6d$ SCFT.

Given a particular $6d$ SCFT and punctures with certain G_{5d} global symmetry one can [12] obtain an elliptic relativistic integrable model defined by a tower of commuting operators

$$H_\alpha [T_{6d}, G_{5d}] (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{6d}; p, q) . \quad (2.3)$$

To obtain this system one has to consider superconformal indices of $4d$ compactifications with insertion of surface defects. Index α of operators labels type of the defect inserted. All operators act on the fugacities \mathbf{x} of the puncture symmetry G_{5d} and depend on fugacities \mathbf{u}_{6d}, p and q .

An important property of these operators is that $\mathcal{N} = 1$ indices coming from the corresponding T_{6d} compactifications are their *Kernel functions*, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha [T_{6d}, G_{5d}] (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{u}_{6d}; q, p) \cdot \mathcal{I}[T_{6d}, \mathcal{C}] (\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots\}, \mathbf{u}_{6d}, q, p) = \\ H_\alpha [T_{6d}, G_{5d}] (\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{u}_{6d}; q, p) \cdot \mathcal{I}[T_{6d}, \mathcal{C}] (\{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots\}, \mathbf{u}_{6d}, q, p) . \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Here \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 are fugacities of the two maximal punctures. These punctures can be of the same type, i.e. have the same G_{5d} , in which case operators on two sides of equations are the same, or of different types, in which case operators are also different.

Now we want to study the spectrum of operators H_α :

$$H_\alpha [T_{6d}, G_{5d}] (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{6d}; q, p) \cdot \psi_\lambda (\mathbf{x}) = E_{\alpha, \lambda} \psi_\lambda (\mathbf{x}) . \quad (2.5)$$

Index λ of the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues depends on a particular Hamiltonian. In some simplest cases, like A_1 RS model discussed in this paper, it can be an integer. But more generally it should take the form of partition as it does in cases of Schur and Macdonald polynomials [26]. Since operators H_α are self-adjoint we can choose eigenfunctions ψ_λ form orthonormal basis w.r.t. certain measure $\Delta (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{6d}; p, q)$

$$\oint d\mathbf{x} \Delta (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{6d}; q, p) \psi_\lambda (\mathbf{x}) \psi_{\lambda'} (\mathbf{x}^{-1}) = \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'} . \quad (2.6)$$

This measure has a natural physical meaning as index contributions of certain multiplets required for gluing indices along punctures. Operators H_α are self-adjoint under this measure by construction which allows us to always choose orthonormal basis according to (2.6).

Due to the kernel property (2.4) it is natural to assume [12] that the corresponding $\mathcal{N} = 1$ indices have diagonal expansions in this basis. In particular index obtained in the compactification on the Riemann surface \mathcal{C} with s maximal punctures of the same type is given by the following expansion:

$$\mathcal{I}[T_{6d}, \mathcal{C}](\{\mathbf{x}_j\}, \mathbf{u}_{6d}, q, p) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} C_\lambda [T_{6d}, \mathcal{C}](\mathbf{u}_{6d}; q, p) \prod_{j=1}^s \psi_\lambda(\mathbf{x}_j), \quad (2.7)$$

where Λ denote the set of all possible λ indexing eigenfunctions. In order to make sense of this expression we assume that there is a natural ordering of $\lambda \in \Lambda$ so we can enumerate them in such a way that:

$$\lambda_0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \quad (2.8)$$

The idea of [17] is to derive the eigenfunctions ψ_{λ_i} of elliptic operators as expansion in p and q fugacities using simple facts summarized above. The starting point of the construction is index of the theory obtained in compactification on the surface with at least two maximal punctures and some flux \mathcal{F} . Additionally a Riemann surface can have some genus and a number of other punctures. This index according to what is said above can be written in the following form

$$\mathcal{I}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} C_{\lambda_i} \psi_{\lambda_i}(\mathbf{x}_1) \psi_{\lambda_i}(\mathbf{x}_2). \quad (2.9)$$

If we glue n copies of such theories along maximal punctures we obtain compactification on a surface still with two maximal punctures but with flux, genus and number of other punctures all multiplied by n . Performing gluing and using orthonormality condition (2.6) we can derive the corresponding index given by:

$$\mathcal{I}_n(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (C_{\lambda_i})^n \psi_{\lambda_i}(\mathbf{x}_1) \psi_{\lambda_i}(\mathbf{x}_2). \quad (2.10)$$

Now we make an important assumption that lowest order of C_{λ_i} in p and q expansion grows with i . This assumption will be justified by self-consistency of our calculations. Then up to any set order in p, q expansion only the ground state will contribute to the index starting from some value of n . In particular in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ we can compute the following quantity:

$$C_0 \equiv C_{\lambda_0} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{I}_{n+1}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)}{\mathcal{I}_n(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)}. \quad (2.11)$$

And from here evaluate the ground state eigenfunction

$$\tilde{\psi}_0(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \psi_0(\mathbf{1}) \psi_0(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(C_0)^n} \mathcal{I}_n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{1}). \quad (2.12)$$

This argument can be extended to all states in the spectrum. For example for the first excited state we get:

$$C_1 \equiv C_{\lambda_1} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{I}_{n+1}(x, 1) - (C_0)^{n+1} \tilde{\psi}_0(x)}{\mathcal{I}_n(x, 1) - (C_0)^n \tilde{\psi}_0(x)}. \quad (2.13)$$

$$\tilde{\psi}_1(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \psi_1(\mathbf{1}) \psi_1(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(C_1)^n} \left(\mathcal{I}_n(\mathbf{x}, 1) - (C_0)^n \tilde{\psi}_0(x) \right). \quad (2.14)$$

Finally it is worth mentioning that eigenfunctions $\psi_i(\mathbf{x})$ are by construction orthonormal under the measure $\Delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{6d}; \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$. Since this normalization is the natural one and simplifies some calculations we will further work with $\psi_i(\mathbf{x})$ function. To obtain it back from the $\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{x})$ we need to normalize it as follows

$$\psi_i(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{1})}} \quad (2.15)$$

The construction presented above is general and can be applied in many different compactification settings [17]. In present paper we will concentrate on two examples where calculations can be done both using our method and ramified instanton partition functions discussed later in Section 3. These are A_1 and A_2 RS models. Unfortunately due to the calculation complexity it is very hard to perform similar calculations for the higher rank RS models but we believe that the general conclusions of our paper should also hold for all A_N RS models.

2.1 A_1 Ruijsenaars-Schneider model

We start our considerations with the simplest example of elliptic integrable models, A_1 Ruijsenaars-Schneider system. This model is defined by a single Hamiltonian whose action on a trial function is given by:

$$\mathcal{O} \cdot \psi(x) = \frac{\theta_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{q}} t x^{-2} \right)}{\theta_p(x^2)} \psi \left(q^{1/2} x \right) + \frac{\theta_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{q}} t x^2 \right)}{\theta_p(x^{-2})} \psi \left(q^{-1/2} x \right), \quad (2.16)$$

which is slightly different from the canonical parametrization usually used in literature. In the setting described above this model emerges when we study superconformal indices of class \mathcal{S} theories obtained in the compactifications of $6d$ $(2, 0)$ SCFT with $G_{6d} = \text{SU}(2)$ global symmetry. Parameter t in (2.16) plays the role of the fugacity for this $6d$ global symmetry. Parameters p and q as usually stand for the fugacities of the Cartan of $\text{Spin}(4)$.

The crucial element we need for our construction is an integration measure $\Delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}_{6d}; \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$ under which RS Hamiltonian (2.16) is self-adjoint as discussed in the previous Section. In particular this measure takes the following simple form

$$\Delta(x, t; q, p) = \frac{(q; q)_\infty (p; p)_\infty}{2} \frac{\Gamma(\sqrt{pq} t^{-1} x^{\pm 2}) \Gamma(\sqrt{pq} t^{-1})}{\Gamma(x^{\pm 2})}. \quad (2.17)$$

One more thing we would like to make before proceeding is to reduce our operator (2.16) to the canonical form of the A_1 Ruijsenaars-Schneider model

$$\mathcal{H}_{RS} \cdot \psi(x) = \frac{\theta_p \left((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}} tx^2 \right)}{\theta_p(x^2)} \cdot \psi \left(q^{1/2} x \right) + \frac{\theta_p \left((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}} tx^{-2} \right)}{\theta_p(x^{-2})} \cdot \psi \left(q^{-1/2} x \right), \quad (2.18)$$

It can be easily seen that the two operators are related by simple conjugation

$$\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{K}^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{H}_{RS} \cdot \mathcal{K} \quad (2.19)$$

where the factor \mathcal{K} is given by

$$\mathcal{K} = \Gamma \left((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}} tx^{\pm 2} \right)^{-1} \quad (2.20)$$

Hence the eigenfunctions $\psi_i(x)$ of (2.16) that we derive in our index computations are related to the eigenfunctions $\psi_i^{RS}(x)$ of the canonical RS model (2.18) as follows:

$$\psi_i^{RS}(x) = \mathcal{K} \cdot \psi_i(x). \quad (2.21)$$

Using expressions (2.12) and (2.14) we obtain the following eigenfunctions for the first two energy levels:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0^{RS}(x) &= 1 + \sqrt{pq} (t + t^{-1} (x^2 + x^{-2})) + pq \left[\frac{1}{2} (t^2 + t^{-2}) - 2 + t^{-2} (x^4 + x^{-4}) \right] + \\ &\quad \sqrt{pq}(p+q) \left[t^{-1} (x^2 + x^{-2}) + \frac{1}{2} t^{-1} + \frac{3}{2} t + \dots \right], \\ \psi_1^{RS}(x) &= \left(x + \frac{1}{x} \right) \left[1 + \sqrt{pq} \left(\frac{1}{2} t - \frac{1}{2} t^{-1} + t^{-1} (a^2 + a^{-2}) \right) + \frac{p}{2} + \frac{q}{2} + \frac{3}{8} (p^2 + q^2) - \right. \\ &\quad \left. pq \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} (x^2 + x^{-2}) - \frac{7}{8} t^{-2} - \frac{3}{8} t^2 - t^{-2} (x^4 + x^{-4}) + \frac{t^{-2}}{2} (x^2 + x^{-2}) \right) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sqrt{pq}(p+q) \left(\frac{5}{4} t - \frac{t^{-1}}{4} + \frac{3}{2} t^{-1} (x^2 + x^{-2}) \right) + \dots \right]. \quad (2.22) \end{aligned}$$

Expansions above are performed in parameter $(pq)^{1/4}$ with p/q ratio fixed. Dots correspond to higher orders in this expansion.

Substituting eigenfunctions (2.22) into eigenvalue equation (2.5) with the A_1 RS Hamiltonian (2.18) we can obtain the ground state eigenvalue given by:

$$E_0 = 1 - p + \left(t + \frac{1}{t} \right) \sqrt{pq} - pq + \left(t + \frac{1}{t} \right) p \sqrt{pq} - p^2 + \dots \quad (2.23)$$

An important check of our results is the Macdonald limit of the problem. This limit in our notation corresponds to first rescaling t fugacity, $t \rightarrow t/\sqrt{pq}$ and then taking $p \rightarrow 0$ limit. In this case RS Hamiltonian (2.18) reduces to the Macdonald operator whose spectrum is

known exactly. In particular its eigenfunctions have simple polynomial form and are known as *Macdonald polynomials*[26]. This fact has played an important role in index computations in the past [13, 27, 28]. In Appendix A we summarize an explicit form of A_1 Macdonald polynomials as well as eigenvalues of the Macdonald operator.

We would also like to fix the relation between our eigenfunctions (2.22) in the Macdonald limit and normalized A_1 Macdonald polynomial (A.5). Functional dependence of these two obviously should be the same since they are both eigenfunctions of the Macdonald operator (A.1). However their overall normalization differs since in Macdonald limit our functions are orthonormal w.r.t. the following integration measure:

$$\tilde{\Delta}(x, t; q) \equiv \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \left[\Gamma(tx^{\pm 2})^2 \Delta\left(x, t(pq)^{-1/2}; q\right) \right] = \frac{1}{2} (q; q)_\infty (t; q)_\infty \frac{(x^{\pm 2}; q)_\infty}{(tx^{\pm 2}; q)_\infty}, \quad (2.24)$$

where we start with the integration measure (2.17) add conjugation factor (2.20) and finally perform the Macdonald limit as described above. As we see measure we got in the end has an extra constant factor w.r.t. the canonical Macdonald polynomial measure as specified in (A.4). This difference can be fixed by rescaling the eigenfunctions themselves. Hence we can relate the Macdonald limit of our wavefunctions (2.22) with the normalized Macdonald polynomials (A.5) in the following way:

$$\psi_n^{RS}(x) = \frac{P_n(x; t, q)}{\sqrt{(q; q)_\infty (t; q)_\infty}} \quad (2.25)$$

Using explicit expressions for the eigenfunctions (2.22) and eigenvalue (2.23) and performing Macdonald limit we can check that they indeed reproduce results (A.7) and (A.8) providing us a crosscheck of our results.

2.2 A_2 Ruijsenaars-Schneider model

The results for the A_1 RS model summarized in the previous section has already been presented in our paper [17]. Here we extend these results to the higher rank A_2 RS model. The model is defined by the tower of Hamiltonians with the action given by:

$$\mathcal{O}_{A_1}^{(r,s)} \cdot \psi(x_i) = \sum_{\substack{n_1+n_2 \\ +n_3=r}} \sum_{\substack{m_1+m_2 \\ +m_3=s}} \psi\left(q^{\frac{s}{3}-m_i} p^{\frac{r}{3}-n_i} x_i\right) \prod_{i,j=1}^3 \left[\frac{\prod_{m=0}^{m_i-1} \theta_p\left(p^{n_j+\frac{1}{2}} q^{m+m_j-m_i+\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{x_i}{x_j}}\right)}{\theta_p\left(p^{-n_j} q^{m-m_j} t^{\frac{x_j}{x_i}}\right)} \right] \times \left[\frac{\prod_{n=0}^{n_i-1} \theta_q\left(p^{n+n_j-n_i+\frac{1}{2}} q^{m_j-m_i+\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{x_i}{x_j}}\right)}{\theta_q\left(p^{n-n_j} q^{m_i-m_j} t^{\frac{x_j}{x_i}}\right)} \right]. \quad (2.26)$$

Of these only first two operators (1,0) and (2,0) are truly independent. Here we use the same non-standard choice of parameters as in A_1 case discussed in the previous section. Integration measure we use in this case is given by

$$\Delta(x_i, t; p, q) = \frac{(p; p)_\infty^2 (q; q)_\infty^2}{3!} \Gamma(\sqrt{pqt}^{-1})^2 \prod_{i \neq j}^3 \frac{\Gamma\left(\sqrt{pqt}^{-1} \frac{x_i}{x_j}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{x_i}{x_j}\right)} \quad (2.27)$$

Finally once again in order to transform our Hamiltonian (2.26) to the standard form of RS we should conjugate it in a following way:

$$\mathcal{H}_{RS} = \mathcal{K}_{A_2} \cdot \mathcal{O} \cdot \mathcal{K}_{A_2}^{-1} \quad (2.28)$$

where the conjugation factor \mathcal{K}_{A_2} is given by

$$\mathcal{K}_{A_2} = \prod_{i \neq j}^3 \Gamma \left((pq)^{\frac{1}{2}} t \frac{x_i}{x_j} \right)^{-1} \quad (2.29)$$

Then given an eigenfunction of our operator (2.26) corresponding eigenfunction of A_2 RS Hamiltonian would be given by:

$$\psi_\lambda^{RS}(x) = \mathcal{K}_{A_2} \cdot \psi_\lambda(x), \quad (2.30)$$

where eigenfunctions are labelled by partitions λ .

As usually in order to derive eigenfunctions of (2.26) we should start with the index of the tube theory (2.9). In case of A_2 RS Hamiltonian it takes the following form [12]:

$$\mathcal{I}_2(x, y) = \prod_{i,j=1}^3 \Gamma \left((pq)^{\frac{1}{4}} \sqrt{t} (x_i y_j)^{\pm 1} \right), \quad (2.31)$$

which is just the index of free bifundamental hypermultiplet. Using this tube index in our algorithm of finding spectrum of finite difference operators we arrive to the following result for the ground state wavefunction corresponding to an empty partition:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\emptyset^{RS}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = & 1 + \sqrt{pq} \left[2t + \frac{1}{t} \left(\frac{x_1}{x_2} + \frac{x_2}{x_1} + \frac{x_3}{x_2} + \frac{x_2}{x_3} + \frac{x_3}{x_1} + \frac{x_1}{x_3} \right) \right] + \\ & \sqrt{pq}(p+q) \left[\frac{5}{2}t + \frac{1}{2}t^{-1} + \frac{1}{t} \left(\frac{x_1}{x_2} + \frac{x_2}{x_1} + \frac{x_3}{x_2} + \frac{x_2}{x_3} + \frac{x_3}{x_1} + \frac{x_1}{x_3} \right) \right] + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

Here we show just a few first orders in the expansion performed in $(pq)^{1/4}$ parameter with p/q ratio fixed. The full result we obtained is valid up to $(pq)^{11/4}$ order. Unfortunately this is not large enough neither to obtain the ground state energy of the A_2 RS Hamiltonian (2.26) nor to go higher in the spectrum and derive first excited eigenfunction as we did in A_1 case.

3 Ramified Instantons.

Another way to derive the spectrum of RS operators is using *ramified instanton partition function* as was proposed in [18, 20]². These are just instanton partition functions of $5d$ $U(N)$ or $SU(N)$ $\mathcal{N} = 1^*$ SYM theory on the Ω background $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}^4$ with the insertion of the $1/2$ BPS monodromy defects of Gukov-Witten type [32]. Each monodromy defect is labeled by the partition $\rho = [n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s]$, where $\sum_{i=1}^s n_i = N$ and without loss of generality

²Later some generalizations of this construction to other integrable system was considered in [29–31]

we choose n_i to be ordered $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_s$. The full gauge group in this case is broken down to $S[U(n_1) \times U(n_2) \times \dots \times U(n_s)]$. Without the defect topological sectors of the theory are labelled by a single instanton number k . Once we introduce the defect we should also introduce instanton number for each of s subgroups our original gauge group was broken to. Hence we label different sectors with the set of s integers $\{k_1, \dots, k_s\}$ that should add up to $k = \sum_{j=1}^s k_j$. To obtain the full instanton partition function in the presence of the defect, we should sum over sectors as follows:

$$Z_\rho = \sum_{\vec{\lambda}} Q_1^{k_1(\vec{\lambda})} \dots Q_s^{k_s(\vec{\lambda})} Z_{\rho, \vec{\lambda}}. \quad (3.1)$$

Here each sector is labelled by Young tableaux

$$\vec{\lambda} = \{\lambda_{j,\alpha}\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, s, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, n_s, \quad (3.2)$$

where the boxes in the i -th column of $\lambda_{j,\alpha}$ contribute to the instanton number k_{i+j-1} for $i + j - 1 \bmod N$. Instanton parameters Q_j of different sectors are defined so that

$$Q_1 \dots Q_s = Q. \quad (3.3)$$

The contribution $Z_{\rho, \vec{\lambda}}$ for each topological sector, corresponding to a given Young tableau, can be calculated using a simple orbifolding procedure applied to the standard instanton ADHM data. This approach has been explored in [24, 25]. Specific expressions for this contribution, $Z_{\rho, \vec{\lambda}}$, as well as detailed derivations of the ramified instanton partition functions are available in Section 4.2 of [20]. Our notations in this section follows those of the same reference.

Parameters which ramified instanton partition functions depend on are

$$\mu_j \equiv e^{2\pi i a_j}, \quad q \equiv e^{2\pi i \epsilon_1}, \quad \eta^2 = q e^{-2\pi i m}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (3.4)$$

where $\epsilon_{1,2}$ are equivariant parameters of Ω deformation, a_i are Coulomb branch parameters and m is the mass of the adjoint hypermultiplet.

3.1 A_1 RS from instantons.

Now we concentrate on the simplest example of $SU(2)$ theory. In this case it is convenient to introduce the following notations for the instanton parameters of two sectors:

$$\begin{aligned} (+) \quad Q_1 &= z, & Q_2 &= \frac{Q}{z}, \\ (-) \quad Q_1 &= \frac{Q}{z}, & Q_2 &= z. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

These two sectors correspond to two supersymmetric vacua in the 3d theory on the defect, specifically the 3d $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $T[SU(2)]$ theory, when generic parameters a_j, m , as well as a FI parameter z , are turned on.

We will be particularly interested in the Nekrasov-Shatashvili (NS) limit $\epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0$. The ramified instanton partition function is divergent in this limit, so following [20] we use the normalized expectation value of the monodromy defect

$$D_{[1,1]}^{(\pm)} \equiv \lim_{\epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0} \frac{Z_{[1,1]}^{(\pm)}}{Z}, \quad (3.6)$$

where Z is the instanton partition function without defect and $Z_{[1,1]}^{(\pm)}$ is the ramified instanton partition function as defined in (3.1) for the partition $\rho = [1, 1]$. Superscripts (\pm) correspond to the two SUSY vacua associated to instanton parameters in (3.5). Using the specific expressions provided in Section 4.2 of [20], one can expand the expectation values of the monodromy defect in terms of z and Q/z . The first few orders in the expansion are given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{[1,1]}^{(+)} &= 1 + \frac{q(\eta^2 - 1)(\eta^2 \mu_2 - \mu_1)}{\eta^2(q - 1)(\mu_2 q - \mu_1)} z + \frac{q(\eta^2 - 1)(\eta^2 \mu_1 - \mu_2)}{\eta^2(q - 1)(\mu_1 q - \mu_2)} \frac{Q}{z} + \dots, \\ D_{[1,1]}^{(-)} &= D_{[1,1]}^{(+)} \Big|_{\mu_1 \leftrightarrow \mu_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where we have used exponentiated parameters (3.4). As was noticed in [20] these expressions satisfy the following finite difference equations

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\mu_1 \frac{\theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2} \right)}{\theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2} \right)} p_{\tau_1} + \eta^2 \mu_2 \frac{\theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \right)}{\theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \right)} p_{\tau_2} \right] D_{[1,1]}^{(+)} &= E_{(1)} D_{[1,1]}^{(+)}, \\ \left[\mu_2 \frac{\theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2} \right)}{\theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2} \right)} p_{\tau_1} + \eta^2 \mu_1 \frac{\theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \right)}{\theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \right)} p_{\tau_2} \right] D_{[1,1]}^{(-)} &= E_{(1)} D_{[1,1]}^{(-)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where p_{τ_i} are shift operators $\tau_i \rightarrow q\tau_i$ and we introduced $\tau_{1,2}$ parameters using $z = \tau_2/\tau_1$.

The reason why the defect partition functions satisfy these difference equations is as follows. The 3d $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theory on the monodromy defect has a set of supersymmetric vacua which, when coupled to a 5d theory, are non-trivially fibered over the Coulomb branch of the bulk 5d gauge theory. This implies that the twisted chiral ring relations, which define the massive vacua, play the same role as the Seiberg-Witten curve for the bulk theory, as suggested in [33]. Moreover, when the Ω -parameter ϵ_1 is turned on, it leads to the quantization of the twisted chiral ring relations, with ϵ_1 acting as the Planck constant. The above difference equations are precisely these quantized versions of the twisted chiral ring relations, as suggested in [20].

The eigenvalues $E_{(1)}$ in the equations above are given by an expectation value $\langle W_{(1)}^{U(N)} \rangle$ of the supersymmetric Wilson loops in the fundamental representation wrapping S^1 cycle. For $SU(N)$ gauge groups we should also divide by a $U(1)$ Wilson loop expectation value:

$$\langle W_{(1)}^{SU(N)} \rangle = \frac{\langle W_{(1)}^{U(N)} \rangle}{\langle W_{(1)}^{U(1)} \rangle}, \quad (3.9)$$

and impose $SU(N)$ condition $\prod_{i=1}^N \mu_i = 1$ on the Coulomb branch parameters. The $U(1)$ contribution is given by

$$\langle W_{(1)}^{U(1)} \rangle = \frac{(Q/\eta^2; Q)_\infty (\eta^2 Q/q; Q)_\infty}{(Q; Q)_\infty (Q/q; Q)_\infty} \quad (3.10)$$

These Wilson loop expectation values can be computed by using the instanton partition function with a universal bundle inserted due to the Wilson loop operator [20], or by applying localization to the 1d ADHM quantum mechanics living on the worldline of the Wilson loop operator [34]. In the simplest case of the $U(2)$ gauge theory the result of these calculations is given by:

$$E_{(1)}^{U(2)} \equiv \langle W_{(1)}^{U(2)} \rangle = (\mu_1 + \mu_2) \left[1 - (1 - \eta^2)(q - \eta^2) \frac{\mu_1 \mu_2 (\eta^2 + q (\eta^4 + \eta^2 + q)) - (\mu_1 + \mu_2)^2 \eta^2 q}{\eta^4 q (\mu_1 q - \mu_2) (\mu_2 q - \mu_1)} Q + O(Q^2) \right]. \quad (3.11)$$

It can be directly checked by substitution into (3.8) that this is indeed an eigenvalue of A_1 RS Hamiltonian.

We can notice now that equations (3.8) are not exactly of the form of RS Hamiltonian action (2.18) due to prefactors involving Coulomb branch parameters $\mu_{1,2}$ and hypermultiplet mass η . In order to obtain canonical A_1 RS action we need to add to the ramified instanton partition functions $D_{[1,1]}^{(\pm)}$ prefactors of the following form:

$$D_{[1,1]}^{(\pm)}(z) = z^{-\frac{1}{2} \log_q \left[\eta^2 \left(\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1} \right)^{\pm 1} \right]} D^{(\pm)}(z) \quad (3.12)$$

the resulting functions become eigenfunctions of the canonical A_1 RS Hamiltonian:

$$\left[\frac{\theta_Q(\eta^2 z)}{\theta_Q(z)} p_z + \frac{\theta_Q(\eta^2 z^{-1})}{\theta_Q(z^{-1})} p_z^{-1} \right] D^{(\pm)} = \frac{E_{(1)}}{\eta \sqrt{\mu_1 \mu_2}} D^{(\pm)}, \quad (3.13)$$

where we have also made a substitution $z = \tau_2/\tau_1$. In this form the Hamiltonian looks almost identical to the Hamiltonian (2.18) considered in the previous section. Notice that in equation above we only obtain a *formal eigenfunction* of A_1 RS Hamiltonian. In particular the function $D^{(\pm)}$ in (3.13) is an eigenfunction of A_1 RS Hamiltonian. However it is not L^2 normalizable on \mathbb{R} in general. Hence it can not be in the spectrum of RS. Nevertheless ramified instanton partition functions, and hence also $D^{(\pm)}$, depend on the Coulomb branch parameters which RS Hamiltonian does not depend on. Hence we are free to choose them as we want. In order to fix normalizability problem it is natural then to try find such values of Coulomb branch parameters that the eigenfunctions we obtain are normalizable. In other words we need to find proper *quantization conditions* for the Coulomb branch parameters μ_i .

A natural quantization condition for the Coulomb branch parameters in 5d $\mathcal{N} = 1^*$ theories was proposed in [35]. The main idea here is to place the 5d theory on a compact space $S^3 \times S^2$, and evaluate the partition function using the saddle point method in the

limit $\epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0$, which implements the A-twist along S^2 , where ϵ_2 is the background field for the $SU(2)$ isometry on S^2 . The saddle point analysis yields Bethe Ansatz equations written in terms of the Coulomb branch parameters μ_i , whose solutions quantize these parameters to a discrete set of values. If we naively apply the quantization condition proposed in [21] directly to relativistic Hamiltonian systems, the associated defect partition function would exhibit infinitely many poles in the Planck constant \hbar (or the Ω parameter ϵ_1), showing an inconsistency. However, this issue is naturally resolved when employing the quantization condition derived from the partition function on $S_b^3 \times S^2$. Here, the Planck constant is identified with the S^3 squashing parameter $\hbar = b$, and such poles of \hbar are no longer present when the theory is formulated on a compact manifold like $S^3 \times S^2$.

Practically, under equivariant localization, the partition function on $S^3 \times S^2$ is factorized into two contributions, one expressed with b and the other one with b^{-1} , from the north and south poles of $S^2 \subset S^3$. This combination of contributions effectively accomplishes the non-perturbative completion in \hbar of the exact quantization condition for the elliptic RS model, specifically the *A-model quantization condition*, proposed in [18]. However, solving the A-model quantization condition is highly challenging in practice because the Bethe Ansatz equations involve an infinite sum of instanton contributions. In particular, the expansion using A-model parameters takes place in a different parameter regime than that used for the 4d index expansion, and thus this requires a non-perturbative resummation process to derive the 4d index expression, which is a daunting task.

Due to challenges associated with the A-model approach, which relies on solving the Bethe Ansatz equations from the saddle point method, we will instead adopt the *B-model quantization condition* proposed in [18]. There are two primary differences between the A-model and B-model quantizations. First, the B-model quantization condition for the Coulomb branch parameters is notably simpler. In $SU(2)$ case it takes the following form:

$$\mu_2 = \frac{1}{\mu_1} = \eta^{\mp 1} q^{\mp \frac{n}{2}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad (3.14)$$

where different signs \mp should be used upon quantizing Coulomb branch parameters inside $D^{(+)}$ or $D^{(-)}$ partition functions correspondingly. This choice of signs doesn't affect the value of the eigenvalue $E_{(1)}$ since it is symmetric with respect to $\mu_1 \leftrightarrow \mu_2$ exchange, which is the $SU(2)$ Weyl reflection. Notice that this quantization condition (3.14) does not depend on the instanton parameter Q meaning it is not sensitive to the non-perturbative corrections. Second, the partition function with or without a monodromy defect in the B-model quantization is represented by a single factor of the partition function on $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^4$. In contrast, the A-model quantization involves two factors coming from the north and south poles of S^2 within S^3 . The equivalence of these two quantization conditions, once the parameters are appropriately identified, was numerically verified in [18]. In fact, these two quantization conditions are related with each other through an S-duality transformation, which we will discuss further in Section 5 in more details.

Last thing we would like to discuss here is the Macdonald limit of ramified instanton partition functions. We start with the normalized expectation value $D_{[1,1]}^{(\pm)}$ for the monodromy defect as defined in (3.6). In terms of instanton calculations Macdonald limit would corre-

spond to taking instanton counting number to zero $Q \rightarrow 0$. This can be easily seen from the form of RS Hamiltonian (3.13) since it reduces to the Macdonald operator (A.1) in $Q \rightarrow 0$ limit. If we now consider monodromy expectation value in this limit we kill all instanton corrections and end up with the vortex partition function of $3d T$ [SU(2)] theory living on the defect. They are given by q -hypergeometric series:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{[1,1]}^{(+)} &\equiv \lim_{Q \rightarrow 0} D_{[1,1]}^{(+)} = {}_2F_1 \left(\eta^2, \eta^2 \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}, q \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}, q, q\eta^{-2}z \right), \\ P_{[1,1]}^{(-)} &\equiv \lim_{Q \rightarrow 0} D_{[1,1]}^{(-)} = {}_2F_1 \left(\eta^2, \eta^2 \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}, q \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}, q, q\eta^{-2}z \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where q -hypergeometric series are defined as follows:

$${}_2F_1(a, b, c, q, z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(a; q)_k (b; q)_k}{(c; q)_k (q; q)_k} z^k. \quad (3.16)$$

Without loss of generality let's now concentrate on $D_{[1,1]}^{(-)}$ function. All derivations for another, (+) choice of vacua work in a similar way. This function as specified above has representation of an infinite series which is quite different from the expected Macdonald polynomial given in (A.2) and (A.5). In order to obtain finite polynomial we need to impose B-model quantization conditions (3.14). In this case it can be shown that q -hypergeometric series truncate at $k = n$ and become finite polynomial:

$$P_{[1,1]}^{(-)} \Big|_{\substack{\mu_2 = \eta^2 q^n \\ \mu_1 = \eta^2 q^n}} = \frac{(q; q)_n}{(\eta^2; q)_n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{(\eta^2; q)_k (\eta^2; q)_{n-k}}{(q; q)_k (q; q)_{n-k}} z^k \quad (3.17)$$

This is almost an expression we need. Final step in order to obtain Macdonald polynomials is to include the prefactor in (3.12). Notice that this prefactor does not change when we take $Q \rightarrow 0$ limit. However when we impose B-model quantization condition (3.14) it simplifies down to an integer power of z so we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} P^{(-)} &\equiv z^{\frac{1}{2} \log_q \left[\eta^2 \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2} \right]} P_{[1,1]}^{(-)}, \\ P^{(-)} \Big|_{\substack{\mu_2 = \eta^2 q^n \\ \mu_1 = \eta^2 q^n}} &= \frac{(q; q)_n}{(\eta^2; q)_n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{(\eta^2; q)_k (\eta^2; q)_{n-k}}{(q; q)_k (q; q)_{n-k}} z^{k - \frac{n}{2}} = \frac{(q; q)_n}{(\eta^2; q)_n} R_n(\sqrt{z}; \eta^2, q), \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where $R_n(x; t, q)$ are non-normalized A_1 Macdonald polynomial also known as non-normalized Rogers polynomials. This is what we expected to obtain since by construction $P^{(-)}$ are eigenfunctions of Macdonald operator which can be directly obtained after taking $Q \rightarrow 0$ limit of (3.13).

3.2 A_2 RS from instantons.

All the arguments above are easily generalizable to the RS models defined on any A_N root system. Since in our index computations presented in the Section (2) we have considered only A_1 and A_2 cases we will not go as far and will just summarize some details of A_2 model here.

In order to construct eigenfunctions of the A_2 RS model (2.26) we start with the ramified instanton partition function $Z_{[1^3]}$ of $SU(3)$ $\mathcal{N} = 1^* 5d$ theory in the presence of the monodromy defect of type $[1, 1, 1] \equiv [1^3]$. Now there are three instanton numbers q_i corresponding to three sectors. In case of $SU(2)$ theory we had two types of ramified instantons labeled by \pm according to the parametrization of the two instanton numbers in (3.5). Here in turn there are in total $3!$ choices according to embeddings of $U(1)^3$ into $U(3)$ labelled by permutations σ . However the results of different embeddings are the same up to permutations of the Coulomb branch parameters. Hence without loss of generality we further consider only one choice corresponding to the trivial permutation $\sigma = 1$. From the point of view of the $3d$ $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theory of a defect this choice corresponds to a specific choice of supersymmetric vacua. In this case instanton parameters can be chosen as follows:

$$q_1 = z_1, \quad q_2 = z_2, \quad q_3 = Qz_3, \quad (3.19)$$

where $z_1 z_2 z_3 = 1$ and Q is the usual $5d$ instanton parameter.

As in A_1 case we are interested in the NS limit $\epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0$, which is a divergent limit. Once again to get rid of this divergence we normalize ramified instanton partition function as follows:

$$D_{[1^3]} = \lim_{\epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0} \frac{Z_{[1^3]}}{Z}, \quad (3.20)$$

where Z is the usual Nekrasov partition function without any defect. In this case partition function appears to be very complicated so we do not provide particular expression here. As was conjectured [20, 21] these normalized ramified instanton partition function satisfy following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\mu_1 \frac{\theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \right) \theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_3}{\tau_1} \right)}{\theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \right) \theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_1} \right)} p_1 + \mu_2 \eta^2 \frac{\theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2} \right) \theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_3}{\tau_2} \right)}{\theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2} \right) \theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_2} \right)} p_2 + \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mu_3 \eta^4 \frac{\theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_1}{\tau_3} \right) \theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_3} \right)}{\theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_3} \right) \theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_3} \right)} p_3 \right] D_{[1^3]} = E_{(1)} D_{[1^3]} \\ & \left[\mu_2 \mu_3 \eta^4 \frac{\theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2} \right) \theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_1}{\tau_3} \right)}{\theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2} \right) \theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_3} \right)} p_1^{-1} + \mu_3 \mu_1 \eta^2 \frac{\theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_3} \right) \theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \right)}{\theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_3} \right) \theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1} \right)} p_2^{-1} + \right. \\ & \quad \left. \mu_1 \mu_2 \frac{\theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_3}{\tau_1} \right) \theta_Q \left(\eta^2 \frac{\tau_3}{\tau_2} \right)}{\theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_1} \right) \theta_Q \left(\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_2} \right)} p_3^{-1} \right] D_{[1^3]} = E_{(1,1)} D_{[1^3]} \quad (3.21) \end{aligned}$$

Here μ_i are Coulomb branch parameters satisfying $\prod_{i=1}^3 \mu_i = 1$ and p_i are shift operators. If we considered ramified instanton partition functions in $U(3)$ $\mathcal{N} = 1^*$ gauge theory this shift operators would be just shifting τ_i parameters, $p_i \tau_j = q^{\delta_{ij}} \tau_j$. However in the case of $SU(3)$

gauge group τ_i parameters are not independent and shift operators p_i act as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 : \quad & \tau_1 \rightarrow q^{2/3}\tau_1, \quad \tau_2 \rightarrow q^{-1/3}\tau_2, \quad \tau_3 \rightarrow q^{-1/3}\tau_3, \\ p_2 : \quad & \tau_1 \rightarrow q^{-1/3}\tau_1, \quad \tau_2 \rightarrow q^{2/3}\tau_2, \quad \tau_3 \rightarrow q^{-1/3}\tau_3, \\ p_3 : \quad & \tau_1 \rightarrow q^{-1/3}\tau_1, \quad \tau_2 \rightarrow q^{-1/3}\tau_2, \quad \tau_3 \rightarrow q^{2/3}\tau_3, \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Variables τ_i constitute more convenient parametrization of the instanton counting parameters q_i introduced in (3.19). The relation to z_i parametrization is as follows:

$$z_1 = \frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1}, \quad z_2 = \frac{\tau_3}{\tau_2}, \quad z_3 = \frac{\tau_1}{\tau_3}. \quad (3.23)$$

Eigenvalues $E_{(1)}$ and $E_{(1,1)}$ similarly to A_1 case have simple physical interpretations in terms of defects in the gauge theory we consider. In particular $E_{(1)}$ and $E_{(1,1)}$ are expectation values of the Wilson loops in fundamental and rank-two antisymmetric representations of the $SU(3)$ gauge group correspondingly.

Once again (3.21) are not exactly A_2 RS Hamiltonians as given in (2.26). In order to obtain correct expressions one needs to introduce extra factor in front of the ramified instanton partition function. In this case the factor takes the following form:

$$D(\tau_i) = \tau_1^{\log_q[\mu_1\eta^{-2}]} \tau_2^{\log_q\mu_2} \tau_3^{\log_q[\mu_3\eta^2]} D_{[1,1]}. \quad (3.24)$$

Then the function $D(\tau_i)$ defined in this way satisfies the following pair of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1}\right)\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_1}\right)}{\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1}\right)\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_1}\right)}p_1 + \frac{\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2}\right)\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_2}\right)}{\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2}\right)\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_2}\right)}p_2 + \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_3}\right)\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_3}\right)}{\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_3}\right)\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_3}\right)}p_3 \right] D(\tau_i) = E_{(1)}D(\tau_i) \\ & \left[\frac{\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2}\right)\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_3}\right)}{\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_2}\right)\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_1}{\tau_3}\right)}p_1^{-1} + \frac{\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_3}\right)\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1}\right)}{\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_3}\right)\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_2}{\tau_1}\right)}p_2^{-1} + \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_1}\right)\theta_Q\left(\eta^2\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_2}\right)}{\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_1}\right)\theta_Q\left(\frac{\tau_3}{\tau_2}\right)}p_3^{-1} \right] D(\tau_i) = E_{(1,1)}D(\tau_i) \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

These equations in turn exactly describe the action of A_2 RS Hamiltonians.

Just as in the case of A_1 RS model ramified instanton partition functions are only formal eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonians specified in (3.21) that depend on the set of Coulomb branch parameters μ_i . In order to obtain the true spectrum of A_2 RS these Coulomb branch parameters should be quantized accordingly. In this case the proper B -model quantization condition should take the following form:

$$\frac{\mu_{i+1}}{\mu_i} = \eta^2 q^{n_i}, \quad n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (3.26)$$

which is similar to the quantization in A_1 case with the choice of $+$ sign in (3.14).

Superconformal Indices	Ramified Instantons
x_i	instanton parameters τ_i
t	adjoint mass η^2
p	instanton parameter Q
q	equivariant parameter $q = e^{\epsilon_1}$

Table 1. Map between fugacities of superconformal indices and parameters of $5d \mathcal{N} = 1^*$ gauge theory used in expression for the ramified partition functions.

4 Matching ramified instantons and index calculations.

In the previous two sections we have summarized two ways of deriving the spectrum of RS integrable system. One approach presented in Section 2 was proposed in [17] and relies on the fact that superconformal indices of $4d \mathcal{N} = 2$ class \mathcal{S} theories are kernel functions of the RS Hamiltonians. Second approach uses ramified instanton partition functions of $5d \mathcal{N} = 1^*$ SYM which are themselves eigenfunctions of RS Hamiltonians. The latter approach was proposed in [21] and directly checked in [20] at the level of formal eigenfunctions. However the spectrum itself was first derived in [18] where authors checked obtained eigenvalues against results of the numerical solution for the spectrum.

Now when we have an alternative derivation of the spectrum from superconformal indices we can compare the two approaches directly for both eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of RS Hamiltonians which we do in the present section.

In order to make a comparison of the two approaches first of all we need to establish the dictionary between index fugacities and parameters of the instanton counting. The easiest way to do it is to compare RS Hamiltonians in two cases. A_1 Hamiltonians (2.18) and (3.13) is already enough to find the right map which we summarize in the table below:

One can check that this map also works for A_2 Hamiltonians as well. Using this dictionary we can directly compare eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of RS models derived from superconformal index and ramified instanton calculations.

A_1 RS model. In A_1 case index calculation provides us both eigenvalue and eigenfunction for the ground state given in (2.23) and (2.22) correspondingly. Additionally from the superconformal index we extracted the wave function of the first excited state as given in (2.22). We can compare all these results with what one gets from the instanton calculus.

First and easiest thing to do is to compare the ground state energy. In case of superconformal index it is given in (2.23). In case of the ramified instanton partition function it can be read from the eigenfunction equation (3.13) together with $U(2)$ and $U(1)$ Wilson loop expectation values given in (3.11) and (3.10). These expressions depend on the Coulomb branch parameters $\mu_{1,2}$. Using B-model quantization (3.14) and applying parameters map specified in Table 1 we can obtain that the resulting ground state eigenvalues of A_1 RS model coincide in the two calculations.

We should mention that eigenvalue obtained from ramified instanton counting with the B-model quantization (3.14) for the Coulomb branch parameters has already been compared against the numerical calculation of the corresponding eigenvalue of RS model in [18]. Here

however we have even a more powerful check since we can compare eigenfunctions themselves with full x -dependencies. For superconformal index we can read corresponding expression directly from (2.22). In order to compare with results of instanton counting we should use parameters map from the Table 1 and apply Coulomb branch B-model quantization condition (3.14) with $n = 0$ and $n = 1$ for the ground and the first excited states correspondingly. Notice that comparing the two approaches we should only take into account x -dependent parts since the two functions are expected to be the same up to normalization condition. In fact eigenfunctions obtained from superconformal index are normalized w.r.t. the integration measure (2.17) while the normalization of 5d partition functions on \mathbb{R}^4 depends on the boundary condition at infinity, which introduces an ambiguity that needs to be fixed. Because of this reason we can just check the ratio of the eigenfunction obtained in two approaches. Doing so we find for the ground state:

$$\frac{\psi_0^{RS}(x)}{D^{(-)}(x)|_{\mu_2=\mu_1^{-1}=t^{1/2}}} = 1 + \left(t - \frac{2}{t}\right) \sqrt{pq} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{pq}(5p + 3q)t - \frac{1}{2t} \sqrt{pq}(p + 5q) + \frac{1}{2} pq \left(t^2 - 4 + \frac{5}{t^2}\right) + O\left((pq)^{3/2}\right). \quad (4.1)$$

For the first excited state we obtain:

$$\frac{\psi_1^{RS}(x)}{2 D^{(-)}(x)|_{\mu_2=\mu_1^{-1}=t^{1/2}q^{1/2}}} = 1 + (p + q) + \sqrt{pq} \left(3t - \frac{1}{t}\right) + \sqrt{pq}(p + q) \left(6t - \frac{3}{t}\right) + q\sqrt{pqt} + 3pq(2t^2 - 1) + (p^2 + q^2) + O\left((pq)^{3/2}\right). \quad (4.2)$$

As we see in both cases the ratio does not depend on x variables so they differ only by normalization. Here we present expansion up to an order $O(p^n q^m)$ with $n + m = 2$. In our calculations we went up to an order with $n + m = 3$ but we do not present corresponding results here since they are bulky and not very informative. Since ψ_i^{RS} expansion is in $(pq)^{1/4}$ with p/q fixed we effectively expand up to sixth order which is high enough to conclude that the ratios above are indeed independent of x variables and both approaches give the same result for the RS spectrum.

A_2 RS model. The same comparison can be performed for the A_2 RS model. In this case however superconformal index calculation can only provide us the ground state wave function given in (2.32). Due to complexity of the calculation we are not capable of reproducing excited states and even a ground state eigenvalue since ground state wave function is not derived to a high enough order.

We now can compare eigenfunctions (2.32) with the ramified instanton partition functions of $SU(3)$ $\mathcal{N} = 1^*$ gauge theory. In particular we should consider function $D(\tau_i)$ as defined in (3.24), impose B-model quantization (3.26) with $n_1 = n_2 = 0$ (ground state) and use parameters map in Table 1. Once again since in these two approaches results are expected to have different normalizations we should consider only x -dependent part. For this purpose

we calculate the ratio of two functions and obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\psi_{\emptyset}^{RS}(x_1, x_2, x_3)}{D(x_1, x_2, x_3)|_{Eq.(3.26)}} &= 1 + 2\sqrt{pq} \left(t - \frac{2}{t} \right) + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{pq}(7p + 5q)t - \\ &\frac{1}{2t}\sqrt{pq}(3p + 7q) + \frac{1}{2}pq \left(16 + 5t^2 + 13\frac{1}{t^2} \right) + O\left((pq)^{3/2}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

As can be seen the ratio we obtain is independent of x variables RS Hamiltonian is acting on. Hence the ground state wave functions obtained in two approaches differ only by an overall normalization. Unlike in A_1 case here we were able to expand only up an order $O(p^n q^m)$ with $n + m = 2$ which we present here. However already at this order expansion strongly suggests that the eigenfunctions obtained in two approaches are the same.

5 Instantons on $S_b^3 \times \Sigma$ and relation to indices.

In this section, we explore in more details the relationship between A-model quantization and B-model quantization, which are used in the main context, from the perspective of the 5-dimensional partition functions of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SYM theories on $S_b^3 \times \Sigma$. We start by reviewing the localization computation of these 5d partition functions with a topological A-twist investigated in [35]. We will then speculate on how to connect these localization results with the 4d index results derived from the B-model quantization, which is based on the modularity of the 4d superconformal index.

Let us consider a 5d $\mathcal{N} = 2$ super Yang-Mills theory with an $SU(N)$ gauge group placed on a rigid background $S^3 \times S^2$. On this background, we can turn on squashing parameters for both S^3 and S^2 , as well as mass parameters for the flavor symmetries, while preserving a supercharge. This setup allows us to compute the partition function using the standard equivariant localization technique.

The resulting partition function is given by a product of contributions from four fixed points, which are invariant points under the $U(1) \times U(1)$ isometry of $S_{\epsilon_1}^2 \times S_{\epsilon_2}^2 \subset S_b^3 \times S_{\epsilon_2}^2$ background where the S_b^3 is an S^1 fibration over the first $S_{\epsilon_1}^2$. Here b is the squashing parameter of S^3 while $\epsilon_{1,2}$ are equivariant parameters on two S^2 . Moreover, the local geometry near each fixed point can be approximated as $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^4$. Therefore, the partition function is expressed as the product of four copies of the 5d Nekrasov partition functions on an Ω -deformed $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^4$ background and can be written as [35]

$$Z_{S^3 \times S^2}(m, \tau, \epsilon_{1,2})_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \oint da \prod_{\ell} Z_{\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1^{(\ell)}}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1^{(\ell)}}^2}(a^{(\ell)}, m^{(\ell)}, \tau^{(\ell)}; \epsilon_1^{(\ell)}, \epsilon_2^{(\ell)}), \quad (5.1)$$

where $Z_{\mathbb{R}^4}$ is the 5d Nekrasov partition function on $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^4$ which involves all classical, perturbative, and instanton contributions. The variables a, m, τ correspond to the Coulomb branch parameters, the adjoint mass parameter, and the gauge coupling (or the instanton counting parameter $Q = e^{2\pi i \tau}$), respectively, and \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} are the magnetic fluxes on (second) S^2 associated with the $SU(N)$ gauge symmetry and the $SU(2)_m$ flavor symmetry, respectively. The index ℓ , which takes the values $\{nn, ns, sn, ss\}$ denotes one of four fixed points located

at the north (n) and south (s) poles of the two spheres in this background. Parameters $\epsilon_{1,2}^{(\ell)}$ of the Ω -deformation at each of the fixed points are given by [35]:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_1^{(\ell)} &= \begin{cases} b^2, \ell = nn \text{ or } ns \\ b^{-2}, \ell = sn \text{ or } ss \end{cases}, & \epsilon_2^{(\ell)} &= \begin{cases} \epsilon_2, \ell = nn \text{ or } sn \\ -\epsilon_2, \ell = ns \text{ or } ss \end{cases}, & \tau^{(\ell)} &= \begin{cases} b^{-1}\gamma^{-1}, \ell = nn \text{ or } sn \\ b\gamma^{-1}, \ell = ns \text{ or } ss \end{cases}, \\ a^{(\ell)} &= \begin{cases} b\gamma a + \frac{m}{2}\epsilon_2^{(\ell)}, \ell = nn \text{ or } ns \\ b^{-1}\gamma a + \frac{m}{2}\epsilon_2^{(\ell)}, \ell = sn \text{ or } ss \end{cases}, & m^{(\ell)} &= \begin{cases} b\gamma m + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{m}{2}\epsilon_2^{(\ell)}, \ell = nn \text{ or } ns \\ b^{-1}\gamma m + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{m}{2}\epsilon_2^{(\ell)}, \ell = sn \text{ or } ss \end{cases}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

Now, we perform a topological A-twist which can be achieved by taking the limit $\epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0$ in the partition function. Then the local partition function at each fixed point reduces to the Nekrasov-Shatashvili (NS) limit of the 5d partition function which can be written as

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}^2}(a, m, \tau) \xrightarrow{\epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0} \exp \left[2\pi i \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_2} \mathcal{W}_{NS}(a, m, \tau, \epsilon_1) - \frac{1}{2} \Omega_{NS}(a, m, \tau, \epsilon_1) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon_2) \right], \quad (5.3)$$

where \mathcal{W}_{NS} and Ω_{NS} are called the *effective twisted superpotential* and the *effective dilaton*, respectively, characterizing the effective 2d theory on the $\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}^2$ plane at low energy. We can collect the partition functions in the NS-limit at four fixed points and rewrite them in the following manner

$$Z_{S_b^3 \times S^2}(m, \tau)_n = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \oint da \Pi_i(a, m, \tau)^m \Pi_m(a, m, \tau)^n e^{-2\pi i \Omega_{S_b^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2}(a, m, \tau)}, \quad (5.4)$$

where

$$\Pi_i(a, m, \tau) = e^{2\pi i \partial_{a_i} \mathcal{W}_{S_b^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2}(a, m, \tau)}, \quad \Pi_m(a, m, \tau) = e^{2\pi i \partial_m \mathcal{W}_{S_b^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2}(a, m, \tau)}. \quad (5.5)$$

Here, $\mathcal{W}_{S_b^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2}$ and $\Omega_{S_b^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2}$ represent the sum of the contributions to the effective twisted superpotential and the effective dilaton, respectively, from the north and south poles of $S_{\epsilon_1}^2 \subset S_b^3$. The detailed expressions for these functions can be found in [35].

The integration should be performed carefully using appropriate contours. The correct contour integral prescription has been studied in [35], which extends the prescription described in [36] for 3d partition functions with a topological twist. By employing this contour prescription, the partition function reduces to the form of the Bethe-vacua summation formula:

$$Z_{S_b^3 \times S^2}(m, \tau)_n = \sum_{\hat{a} \in \mathcal{S}_{BE}} \Pi_m(\hat{a}, m, \tau)^n \mathcal{H}(\hat{a}, m, \tau)^{-1}, \quad (5.6)$$

where \mathcal{S}_{BE} is the set of ‘‘Bethe vacua’’ defined as the solutions to the Bethe equations, which are given by

$$\mathcal{S}_{BE} = \left\{ \hat{a} \mid \exp \left(2\pi i \frac{\partial \mathcal{W}_{S_b^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2}(\hat{a}, m, \tau)}{\partial a_i} \right) = 1, i = 1, \dots, N-1 \right\} / W_G, \quad (5.7)$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}(\hat{a}, m, \tau) = e^{2\pi i \Omega_{S_b^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2}(a, m, \tau)} \det \left(\partial_{a_i} \partial_{a_j} \mathcal{W}_{S_b^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2}(a, m, \tau) \right) . \quad (5.8)$$

The Bethe vacua for \mathcal{S}_{BE} should be divided by the action W_G of the $SU(N)$ Weyl group, and the solutions that are not acted freely by the Weyl group need to be excluded. We remark that this set \mathcal{S}_{BE} is precisely the solutions to the A-model quantization condition. The connection between the A-model quantization condition and 5d partition functions in NS-limits on other compact manifolds has been discussed in [18, 37].

The partition function with a co-dimension two defect can be calculated similarly. Consider a co-dimension two defect inserted at the north pole on S^2 which we will twist later. This will affect two out of four fixed points $\ell = nn$ and $\ell = sn$ contributing to the partition function (5.4). These two points correspond to the partition function on $S_b^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ around the north pole on the twisted S^2 . For these points we have to substitute usual Nekrasov partition functions in (5.4) with the ramified instanton partition functions discussed in Section 3. Then we take the NS-limit, i.e. $\epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0$, to implement an A-twist on S^2 . In this limit, the defect's contribution to the partition function remains finite because it is localized at a point on S^2 and therefore does not involve the divergent factor $1/\epsilon_2$. Moreover, this contribution does not depend on the magnetic fluxes \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} on S^2 due to the localized nature of the defect, preventing it from capturing the overall flux profile. Therefore, the full partition function with the defect can be written as

$$Z_{S_b^3 \times S^2}^{\text{def}}(m, \tau)_{\mathbf{n}} = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \oint da \Pi_i(a, m, \tau)^{\mathbf{m}} \Pi_m(a, m, \tau)^{\mathbf{n}} e^{-2\pi i \Omega_{S_b^3 \times \mathbb{R}^2}(a, m, \tau)} \psi(x, a, m, \tau) , \quad (5.9)$$

where

$$\psi(x, a, m, \tau) = \lim_{\epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0} \prod_{\ell=nm, sn} \frac{Z_{\mathbb{R}^4}^{\text{def}}(x, a^{(\ell)}, m^{(\ell)}, \tau^{(\ell)}, \epsilon_1^{(\ell)}, \epsilon_2^{(\ell)})}{Z_{\mathbb{R}^4}(a^{(\ell)}, m^{(\ell)}, \tau^{(\ell)}, \epsilon_1^{(\ell)}, \epsilon_2^{(\ell)})} , \quad (5.10)$$

where $Z_{\mathbb{R}^4}^{\text{def}}$ is the ramified instanton partition function on \mathbb{R}^4 with defect parameter x .

The contribution from the defect in the integrand is subleading in the ϵ_2 expansion and thus it does not alter the pole structure in the integration. Therefore, the contour integration proceeds as previously, and the resulting partition function can again be expressed as a sum over the same Bethe vacua as before:

$$Z_{S_b^3 \times S^2}^{\text{def}}(x, m, \tau)_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\hat{a} \in \mathcal{S}_{BE}} \Pi_m(\hat{a}, m, \tau)^{\mathbf{n}} \mathcal{H}(\hat{a}, m, \tau)^{-1} \psi(x, \hat{a}, m, \tau) . \quad (5.11)$$

From the perspective of the 4d index, this computation yields the superconformal index of the 4d class \mathcal{S} theory arising from 6d A_{N-1} (2,0) SCFT compactified on a sphere with a (maximal) puncture. Here, the puncture comes from the co-dimension two defect, and its effect is encoded in $\psi(x, \hat{a}, m, \tau)$ in the localization computation. Thus, this approach offers a method to calculate the superconformal index contribution from the punctures in 4d class \mathcal{S} theories using the 5d maximal SYM theories.

However, this computation, which we call the A-model computation, is carried out under a different parameter regime from that typically used in the 4d superconformal index. In fact, the above partition function is given by an instanton expansion, which holds when the 5d gauge coupling τ is small. In contrast, the 4d index is typically expanded using fugacities when τ is large. Therefore, the results from these two different parameter regime cannot be compared immediately. It turns out that in order to accurately translate the defect contributions from the 5d context into the 4d index, we need an S-duality transformation, which converts $\tau \rightarrow -\frac{1}{\tau}$.

The modular properties of supersymmetric partition functions of 4d $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superconformal field theories have been extensively studied in [38], which generalizes the modular properties of elliptic genera of two-dimensional theories. Note that the 4d superconformal index can be obtained from a supersymmetric partition function on an $S^1 \times S^3$ background and this background can be formed by gluing two solid three-tori $\mathbb{T}^2 \times D^2$, where an action of the S generator in $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \in SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ is applied to a boundary \mathbb{T}^3 in the gluing process. In this setup, the large diffeomorphism group $SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ acts projectively on the complex structures, represented by the column vector $\vec{\tau} \equiv (1, \sigma, \tau)^T$, of the boundary \mathbb{T}^3 .

The investigation in [38] suggests that the consistency of this gluing procedure under the choice of a large diffeomorphism of the boundary torus and the choice of a large gauge transformation for the background flavor symmetry, which takes an element in a semi-direct product group $SL(3, \mathbb{Z}) \times (\mathbb{Z}^3)^r$ with rank r flavor symmetry, leads to a non-trivial modular property of the superconformal index:

$$Z_Y^\alpha(\vec{\tau}) Z_Y^\alpha(Y^{-1} \cdot \vec{\tau}) Z_Y^\alpha(Y^{-2} \cdot \vec{\tau}) = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{3}P(\vec{\tau})}, \quad (5.12)$$

where $Y \in SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ cyclically permutes $(1, \sigma, \tau)$. The phase factor $P(\vec{\tau})$ is the 't-Hooft anomaly polynomial of the 4d theory. Here, the index α stands for a supersymmetric vacuum in the 1d quantum mechanics defined along the time circle S^1 . In our notation for the superconformal index, the complex structures σ, τ are related to the fugacities as $q = e^{2\pi i \sigma}, p = e^{2\pi i \tau}$, and a supersymmetric vacuum labelled by α corresponds to a Bethe vacuum $\hat{a} \in \mathcal{S}_{BE}$. The modular property of the 4d superconformal index can provide an S-duality transformation that we need for the relationship between the 5d partition function on $S_b^3 \times S^2$ and the 4d index of class \mathcal{S} theories. Let us illustrate this with a simple but concrete example.

Consider the 5d $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $U(1)$ gauge theory which arises from a circle compactification of the 6d (2,0) theory on a single M5-brane. The 5d partition function of this theory on the Ω -deformed background $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1, 2}^4$ was computed in [39–42]. The results is

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}^2}(a, m, \tau) &= Z_{\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}^2}^{\text{pert}}(a, m, \tau) \times Z_{\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}^2}^{\text{inst}}(a, m, \tau) \\ Z_{\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}^2}^{\text{pert}}(a, m, \tau) &= \text{PE} \left[\frac{-e^{4\pi i \epsilon_+} + e^{2\pi i \epsilon_+ + 2\pi i m}}{(1 - e^{2\pi i \epsilon_1})(1 - e^{2\pi i \epsilon_2})} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

where $Z_{\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}^2}^{\text{pert}}$ is the perturbative contribution and $Z_{\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}^2}^{\text{inst}}$ is the instanton contribution. Function $\text{PE}[e^a]$ stands for the plethystic exponential of a letter index e^a and is given by the

following expression:

$$\text{PE}[f(e^a)] \equiv \exp \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(e^{na})}{n} \right] \quad (5.14)$$

The instanton contribution for the $U(1)$ theory can be computed exactly using the topological vertex method, as described in [41, 42], and the result reduces to the simple expression as

$$Z_{\mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_1}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{\epsilon_2}^2}^{\text{inst}}(a, m, \tau) = \text{PE} \left[\frac{e^{2\pi i \tau^{-1}} e^{2\pi i(\epsilon_+ - m)} (1 - e^{2\pi i(m + \epsilon_-)})(1 - e^{2\pi i(m - \epsilon_-)})}{1 - e^{2\pi i \tau^{-1}} (1 - e^{2\pi i \epsilon_1})(1 - e^{2\pi i \epsilon_2})} \right]. \quad (5.15)$$

The partition function on $S_b^3 \times S^2$ then can be computed by plugging this result into the expression in (5.1), and taking $\epsilon_2 \rightarrow 0$ limit. The parameters in the usual instanton partition function are mapped to those in the localized partition functions on $S_b^3 \times S^2$ as follows [35]:

$$\begin{aligned} (nn), (ns) : \epsilon_1 &\rightarrow b^2, \quad m \rightarrow b\gamma m + \frac{1}{2}, \quad \tau \rightarrow \tau \equiv b^{-1}\gamma^{-1}, \\ (sn), (ss) : \epsilon_1 &\rightarrow b^{-2}, \quad m \rightarrow b^{-1}\gamma m + \frac{1}{2}, \quad \tau \rightarrow \sigma \equiv b\gamma^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

Here, the shift of the flavor mass parameter by $1/2$ is due to the non-trivial S^1 fibration within S_b^3 and this shift is essential for achieving the correct result³. One can then compute

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{S_b^3 \times S^2}^{U(1)}(m, \tau)_n &= \text{PE} \left[\frac{1 - e^{2\pi i(b^2 + b\gamma)}}{(1 - e^{2\pi i b^2})(1 - e^{2\pi i b\gamma})} - 1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{n e^{\pi i b^2} \left(e^{\pi i(2b\gamma - 2b\gamma m - \frac{1}{2})} - e^{\pi i(2b\gamma m + \frac{1}{2})} \right)}{(1 - e^{2\pi i b^2})(1 - e^{2\pi i b\gamma})} + (b \rightarrow b^{-1}) \right] \\ &= \Gamma\left(0, \frac{\sigma}{\tau}, \frac{1}{\tau}\right) \Gamma\left(0, \frac{\tau}{\sigma}, \frac{1}{\sigma}\right) \times \left(\Gamma\left(\frac{\hat{m}}{\tau}, \frac{\sigma}{\tau}, \frac{1}{\tau}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\hat{m}}{\sigma}, \frac{\tau}{\sigma}, \frac{1}{\sigma}\right) \right)^{-n} \\ &= \Gamma(0, \sigma, \tau)^{-1} \times \Gamma(\hat{m}, \sigma, \tau)^n, \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

where $\hat{m} \equiv m + \frac{\sigma + \tau}{2}$, up to a constant phase factor. For the last equality, we used the modular property of the elliptic gamma function Γ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(z, \sigma, \tau) &= \prod_{j,k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1 - e^{2\pi i(-z + (j+1)\sigma + (k+1)\tau)})}{(1 - e^{2\pi i(z + j\sigma + k\tau)})}, \\ \Gamma(z, \tau, \sigma) \Gamma\left(\frac{z}{\tau}, \frac{\sigma}{\tau}, \frac{1}{\tau}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{z}{\sigma}, \frac{1}{\sigma}, \frac{\tau}{\sigma}\right) &= e^{-i\frac{\pi}{3}Q(z, \tau, \sigma)}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

The final partition function is now expressed as a 4d superconformal index. It consists of contributions from a 4d $\mathcal{N} = 1$ vector multiplet and n chiral multiplet. This result perfectly

³A similar shift of the flavor mass parameter due to a non-trivial fibration structure was also observed in the localization computation for the S^5 partition function in [43]

agrees with the expected result for the 4d theory coming from a 6d $(2, 0)$ free tensor multiplet compactified on a sphere with an $SU(2)_m$ flux \mathfrak{n} .⁴ Crucially, this expression for the 4d index was obtained by utilizing the modular property of the elliptic gamma function. This provides a clear and simple demonstration of the modular properties of the superconformal indices for 4d class \mathcal{S} theories, given in (5.12), and their realizations in the 5d partition functions.

It is natural to interpret the modular property in (5.12) as an S-duality transformation that inverts τ, σ , which are proportional to the 5d gauge coupling, into their inverses $1/\tau$ and $1/\sigma$. We expect that this is also the case for other interacting class \mathcal{S} theories beyond the Abelian example. Then, as also suggested in [18], the Bethe vacua equation in (5.7) under this S-duality can be reformulated as

$$e^{2\pi i \frac{\partial \mathcal{W}}{\partial a_i}} = 1 \quad \rightarrow \quad e^{2\pi i a_i^D} = 1 \quad \text{with} \quad a_i^D = \frac{\partial \mathcal{W}}{\partial a_i}, \quad (5.20)$$

using the Seiberg-Witten relation, which is generalized by the squashing parameter b and flavor mass parameters z , between the Coulomb branch parameters a_i and their S-dual parameters a_i^D . We interpret this S-dualized Bethe vacua equation as the B-model quantization condition. So, we propose that the A-model and the B-model quantization conditions are related through the modular property of the 4d superconformal index and the corresponding 5d (or 6d) partition functions.

A concrete example supporting this proposal is the computation of the eigenfunction ψ_λ of the RS model using the partition function of the 5d $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauge theories in the presence of the defects, which was presented in the previous sections. According to [10, 11], the punctures on the Riemann surface Σ for class \mathcal{S} theories of algebra G correspond to the Gukov-Witten type monodromy defects [32], which are labeled by homomorphisms $\rho : SU(2) \rightarrow G$. The defect discussed in the main context and also in (5.9) is exactly this monodromy defect of maximal type $\rho = [1^N]$ for $G = SU(N)$. Therefore, the puncture contribution to the 4d index of the class \mathcal{S} theory is captured by the function ψ in (5.9) and (5.11). Moreover, the modular property given in (5.12) of the 4d index implies that the summand at each Bethe vacuum in (5.11) enjoys a modular transformation that permutes complex structures $(1, \sigma, \tau)$ in the superconformal index. This should hold both with and without the defect.

We therefore suggest that the defect contribution $\psi(\hat{a})$ itself should exhibit the modular property of the same form given in (5.12). The localization computation of the 5d partition function on $S_b^3 \times S^2$ with the defect includes contributions from a co-dim 2 defect inserted at a point on S^2 . Schematically, this contribution can be expressed as a product of two local contributions, ψ^N and ψ^S , at the north and south poles of $S^2 \subset S_b^3$. Under the modular S-duality transformation in (5.12), these two contributions are converted into a single function ψ^D , now expressed using dual variables a_i^D evaluated at each Bethe vacuum. This dual function $\psi^D(\hat{a}_i^D)$ with the solution \hat{a}_i^D to the Bethe equation (5.20) computes the puncture contribution to the 4d index at each Bethe vacuum. Our explicit checks confirm that they match precisely with the eigenfunctions of the RS model, when each Bethe vacuum (or n) is

⁴As S^2 has an $SU(2)$ isometry the 4d theory has an additional $SU(2)$ global symmetry. In particular the chiral superfields will form the \mathfrak{n} dimensional representation and we can refine further the index turning on a fugacity for the $SU(2)$ symmetry. See for example [44, 45].

identified with the energy level λ of the RS Hamiltonian. Therefore, this provides a strong evidence for the modular properties of the partition functions of class \mathcal{S} theories and the S-dual relation between the A-model and B-model quantization conditions.

6 Discussion and Outlook

In our paper we have investigated two approaches to the description of the spectrum of A_N RS model. Both approaches use emergence of RS model in two different contexts of supersymmetric gauge theories. First approach recently proposed in [17] relies on the computations of the supconformal indices of $4d$ class \mathcal{S} theories in the presence of surface defects. In the second approach we calculate ramified instanton partition functions and Wilson loop expectation values in $5d$ $\mathcal{N} = 1^*$ $SU(N)$ theories which constitute formal eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of A_N RS model correspondingly [20].

An important issue arising in ramified instanton calculations is the quantization of the Coulomb branch parameters, which turns formal eigenfunctions into the actual spectrum of the model. Proposals for the exact quantization conditions, referred to as A-model and B-model quantization conditions, are discussed in [18] and were validated against the numerical eigenvalues of the RS model. The A-model quantization can be understood through the saddle point equations of the partition functions on a compact manifold, as discussed in various studies, for example, in [35, 37]. For the B-model quantization, we relate it to the A-model quantization via an S-duality transformation, which naturally acts on the $4d$ superconformal index [38]. We demonstrated a concrete application of this for the $5d$ free $U(1)$ gauge theory, but detailed derivations of this S-duality transformation and the B-model quantization would be invaluable for extending this approach to other theories.

Finally we compared results of the two approaches (index and instanton calculations) and matched corresponding ground states in cases of A_1 and A_2 RS models. For this we used B-model quantization condition proposed in [18]. We also discussed relation to another, A-model, quantization condition and its interpretation from the point of view of index calculations.

There are still many questions left to be answered and there are many directions in which our research can be expanded. First of all in the present paper we have only analyzed spectrum of RS model. However methods we used in our paper can be easily extended to other integrable elliptic models.

The first natural candidate for this investigation is van Diejen model [46, 47] which is BC_1 deformation of the RS model. Spectrum of van Diejen model is even less studied than the one of RS since not much is known even about its limits. From the point of view of indices it is related to the compactifications of $6d$ E-string theory on Riemann surfaces with punctures [22, 23]. In our previous paper [17] we have already made first steps towards describing ground state of this model in certain regime of parameters. Some preliminary results have also been obtained in the context of instanton calculations [48, 49]. It would be interesting to perform more in-depth detailed analysis of ground state and possibly higher states of van Diejen Hamiltonian using both of the approaches discussed in our paper.

Also there exist many less studied elliptic integrable systems for which we can use both approaches discussed in the present paper. In fact already in our previous paper [17] we have already derived ground state wavefunction and energy for the novel models defined on A_2 and A_3 root systems that were introduced in [50, 51]. These integrable systems are associated with $6d$ $SU(3)$ minimal SCFT [52, 53] and $SO(8)$ minimal conformal matter theories correspondingly. It would be interesting to perform ramified instanton calculations and extend our analysis to these theories as well.

Finally there are many more elliptic integrable models associated to $4d$ compactifications of various $6d$ SCFTs. Several novel systems corresponding to generalizations of van Diejen model on A_N and C_N root lattices were derived very recently [23, 54, 55]. Many other examples of known and previously unknown integrable finite difference operators can be found in the literature [56–58]. It would be interesting to study spectra of these elliptic integrable systems using both superconformal index and ramified instanton approaches. This will help us to classify such systems and to better understand their general features.

Another interesting direction for the future research is application of the obtained spectra to calculations of superconformal indices. Of course indices of the Lagrangian theories can be relatively easily calculated with conventional methods. However many $4d$ theories with $6d$ origin lack Lagrangian description which makes usual computational methods useless. In this case the spectrum of the corresponding integrable system associated to a given $4d$ theory can be used to effectively evaluate its superconformal index. Such approach proved to be useful for class \mathcal{S} theories [13, 27, 28] in certain limits (Macdonald, Schur etc.) where the spectrum of RS is known precisely and eigenfunctions take simple polynomial form. Now when we know the way for the derivation of RS spectrum in full without taking any limits we can extend this analysis of class \mathcal{S} theories and also perform similar analysis for other theories discussed above.

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to Alba Grassi for useful discussions. HK is supported by Samsung Science and Technology Foundation under Project Number SSTF-BA2002-05 and by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korea government (MSIT) (2023R1A2C1006542). The work of HK at Harvard University is supported in part by the Bershadsky Distinguished Visiting Fellowship. The research of SSR is supported in part by Israel Science Foundation under grant no. 2159/22, and by the Israeli Planning and Budgeting Committee. The research of AN is supported by STFC Grant No. ST/X000753/1 and at the initial stage of the project by the Swiss National Science Foundation, Grant No. 185723.

A A_1 Macdonald polynomials

In this section we briefly review A_1 Macdonald polynomials. These polynomials are eigenfunctions of the following finite difference operator:

$$M^{(q,t)}(x) = \frac{1 - tx^2}{1 - x^2} \Delta_{x \rightarrow q^{1/2}x} + \frac{1 - tx^{-1}}{1 - x^{-1}} \Delta_{x \rightarrow q^{-1/2}x} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

It can be easily seen that the operator on the l.h.s. of this equation is the Macdonald limit of the A_1 RS operator (2.18). This limit is usually defined as taking $p \rightarrow 0$. However if we use notations of (2.18) we should first shift t parameter as $t \rightarrow t/\sqrt{pq}$ and only then take $p \rightarrow 0$ limit. Performing this operation we will directly arrive to the Macdonald operator in (A.1).

Eigenfunctions of the A_1 Macdonald operator (A.1) are known as *q-ultraspherical polynomials* or *Rogers polynomials* and are given by the following explicit expression:

$$R_n(x; t, q) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(t; q)_k (t; q)_{n-k}}{(q; q)_k (q; q)_{n-k}} x^{2k-n}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

As eigenfunctions they satisfy the following simple equations:

$$M^{(q,t)}(x)R_n(x; t, q) = \left(q^{-\frac{n}{2}} + tq^{\frac{n}{2}} \right) R_n(x; t, q) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

As defined here the polynomials are not normalized in any way. Natural normalization should be performed with respect to the following integration measure:

$$\Delta_M(x) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(x^{\pm 2}; q)_\infty}{(tx^{\pm 2}; q)_\infty}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Then normalized properly eigenfunctions take the following form:

$$P_n(x; t, q) = \left[\frac{1 - tq^n}{1 - t} \frac{(q; q)_n (q; q)_\infty (t^2; q)_\infty}{(t^2; q)_n (tq; q)_\infty (t; q)_\infty} \right]^{1/2} R_n(x; t, q) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

with the orthonormality condition

$$\oint \frac{dx}{4\pi i x} \Delta_M(x) P_n(x; t, q) P_m(x; t, q) = \delta_{nm}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

which can be checked directly using (A.5) and (A.4).

Since in our computations we mainly consider ground state and first excited level it would be helpful to write down explicit expressions for these two eigenfunctions. In particular for the normalized Rogers polynomials (A.5) for these two levels are given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_0(x; t, q) &= \frac{\sqrt{(1-t)(q; q)_\infty (t^2; q)_\infty}}{(t; q)_\infty}, \\ P_1(x; t, q) &= \sqrt{\frac{(1-qt)(1-t)}{(1-q)(1+t)}} \frac{(q; q)_\infty (t^2; q)_\infty}{(t; q)_\infty} \frac{1}{\left(x + \frac{1}{x}\right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

And the corresponding eigenvalues are given according to (A.3) by

$$E_0 = 1 + t, \quad E_1 = q^{-1/2}(1 + tq). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

References

- [1] S. N. M. Ruijsenaars, “Complete Integrability of Relativistic Calogero-moser Systems and Elliptic Function Identities,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **110** (1987) 191.
- [2] S. N. M. Ruijsenaars and H. Schneider, “A New Class of Integrable Systems and Its Relation to Solitons,” *Annals Phys.* **170** (1986) 370–405.
- [3] S. N. M. Ruijsenaars, “Action Angle Maps and Scattering Theory for Some Finite Dimensional Integrable Systems. 1. The Pure Soliton Case,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **115** (1988) 127–165.
- [4] A. Gorsky and N. Nekrasov, “Hamiltonian systems of Calogero type and two-dimensional Yang-Mills theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **414** (1994) 213–238, [arXiv:hep-th/9304047](#).
- [5] A. Gorsky and N. Nekrasov, “Relativistic Calogero-Moser model as gauged WZW theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **436** (1995) 582–608, [arXiv:hep-th/9401017](#).
- [6] A. Gorsky and N. Nekrasov, “Elliptic Calogero-Moser system from two-dimensional current algebra,” [arXiv:hep-th/9401021](#).
- [7] V. Fock, A. Gorsky, N. Nekrasov, and V. Rubtsov, “Duality in integrable systems and gauge theories,” *JHEP* **07** (2000) 028, [arXiv:hep-th/9906235](#).
- [8] H. W. Braden and A. N. W. Hone, “Affine Toda solitons and systems of Calogero-Moser type,” *Phys. Lett. B* **380** (1996) 296–302, [arXiv:hep-th/9603178](#).
- [9] H. W. Braden and R. Sasaki, “The Ruijsenaars-Schneider model,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **97** (1997) 1003–1018, [arXiv:hep-th/9702182](#).
- [10] D. Gaiotto, “N=2 dualities,” *JHEP* **08** (2012) 034, [arXiv:0904.2715 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] D. Gaiotto, G. W. Moore, and A. Neitzke, “Wall-crossing, Hitchin Systems, and the WKB Approximation,” [arXiv:0907.3987 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [12] D. Gaiotto, L. Rastelli, and S. S. Razamat, “Bootstrapping the superconformal index with surface defects,” *JHEP* **01** (2013) 022, [arXiv:1207.3577 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [13] 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 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] 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 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [15] C. Romelsberger, “Counting chiral primaries in N = 1, d=4 superconformal field theories,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B747** (2006) 329–353, [arXiv:hep-th/0510060 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [16] 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:0801.4947 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [17] B. Nazzari, A. Nedelin, and S. S. Razamat, “Ground state wavefunctions of elliptic relativistic integrable Hamiltonians,” [arXiv:2305.09718 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] Y. Hatsuda, A. Sciarappa, and S. Zakany, “Exact quantization conditions for the elliptic Ruijsenaars-Schneider model,” *JHEP* **11** (2018) 118, [arXiv:1809.10294 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [19] M. Bullimore and H.-C. Kim, “The Superconformal Index of the (2,0) Theory with Defects,” *JHEP* **05** (2015) 048, [arXiv:1412.3872 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [20] M. Bullimore, H.-C. Kim, and P. Koroteev, “Defects and Quantum Seiberg-Witten Geometry,” *JHEP* **05** (2015) 095, [arXiv:1412.6081 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [21] N. A. Nekrasov and S. L. Shatashvili, “Quantization of Integrable Systems and Four Dimensional Gauge Theories,” in *Proceedings, 16th International Congress on Mathematical Physics (ICMP09): Prague, Czech Republic, August 3-8, 2009*, pp. 265–289. 2009. [arXiv:0908.4052 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [22] B. Nazzal and S. S. Razamat, “Surface Defects in E-String Compactifications and the van Diejen Model,” *SIGMA* **14** (2018) 036, [arXiv:1801.00960 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [23] B. Nazzal, A. Nedelin, and S. S. Razamat, “Minimal (D, D) conformal matter and generalizations of the van Diejen model,” *SciPost Phys.* **12** no. 4, (2022) 140, [arXiv:2106.08335 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [24] L. F. Alday and Y. Tachikawa, “Affine $SL(2)$ conformal blocks from 4d gauge theories,” *Lett. Math. Phys.* **94** (2010) 87–114, [arXiv:1005.4469 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [25] H. Kanno and Y. Tachikawa, “Instanton counting with a surface operator and the chain-saw quiver,” *JHEP* **06** (2011) 119, [arXiv:1105.0357 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] I. Macdonald, *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*. Oxford classic texts in the physical sciences. Clarendon Press, 1998. <https://books.google.it/books?id=srv90XiUbZoC>.
- [27] A. Gadde, E. Pomoni, L. Rastelli, and S. S. Razamat, “S-duality and 2d Topological QFT,” *JHEP* **03** (2010) 032, [arXiv:0910.2225 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [28] A. Gadde, L. Rastelli, S. S. Razamat, and W. Yan, “The 4d Superconformal Index from q-deformed 2d Yang-Mills,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** (2011) 241602, [arXiv:1104.3850 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [29] P. Koroteev, “A-type Quiver Varieties and ADHM Moduli Spaces,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **381** no. 1, (2021) 175–207, [arXiv:1805.00986 \[math.AG\]](#).
- [30] P. Koroteev and S. Shakirov, “The quantum DELL system,” *Lett. Math. Phys.* **110** no. 5, (2020) 969–999, [arXiv:1906.10354 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [31] A. Gorsky, P. Koroteev, O. Koroteeva, and S. Shakirov, “Double Inozemtsev limits of the quantum DELL system,” *Phys. Lett. B* **826** (2022) 136919, [arXiv:2110.02157 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [32] S. Gukov and E. Witten, “Gauge Theory, Ramification, And The Geometric Langlands Program,” [arXiv:hep-th/0612073](#).
- [33] D. Gaiotto, S. Gukov, and N. Seiberg, “Surface Defects and Resolvents,” *JHEP* **09** (2013) 070, [arXiv:1307.2578 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [34] H.-C. Kim, “Line defects and 5d instanton partition functions,” *JHEP* **03** (2016) 199, [arXiv:1601.06841 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [35] P. M. Cricigno, D. Jain, and B. Willett, “5d Partition Functions with A Twist,” *JHEP* **11** (2018) 058, [arXiv:1808.06744 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [36] C. Closset, H. Kim, and B. Willett, “Supersymmetric partition functions and the three-dimensional A-twist,” *JHEP* **03** (2017) 074, [arXiv:1701.03171 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [37] A. Sciarappa, “Exact relativistic Toda chain eigenfunctions from Separation of Variables and gauge theory,” *JHEP* **10** (2017) 116, [arXiv:1706.05142 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [38] A. Gadde, “Modularity of supersymmetric partition functions,” *JHEP* **12** (2021) 181, [arXiv:2004.13490 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [39] N. A. Nekrasov, “Seiberg-Witten prepotential from instanton counting,” *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **7** no. 5, (2003) 831–864, [arXiv:hep-th/0206161](#).
- [40] N. Nekrasov and A. Okounkov, “Seiberg-Witten theory and random partitions,” *Prog. Math.* **244** (2006) 525–596, [arXiv:hep-th/0306238](#).
- [41] A. Iqbal, C. Kozcaz, and K. Shabbir, “Refined Topological Vertex, Cylindric Partitions and the U(1) Adjoint Theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **838** (2010) 422–457, [arXiv:0803.2260 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [42] H.-C. Kim, S. Kim, E. Koh, K. Lee, and S. Lee, “On instantons as Kaluza-Klein modes of M5-branes,” *JHEP* **12** (2011) 031, [arXiv:1110.2175 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [43] H.-C. Kim, J. Kim, and S. Kim, “Instantons on the 5-sphere and M5-branes,” [arXiv:1211.0144 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [44] S. M. Hosseini, K. Hristov, Y. Tachikawa, and A. Zaffaroni, “Anomalies, Black strings and the charged Cardy formula,” *JHEP* **09** (2020) 167, [arXiv:2006.08629 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [45] C. Hwang, S. S. Razamat, E. Sabag, and M. Sacchi, “Rank Q E-string on spheres with flux,” *SciPost Phys.* **11** no. 2, (2021) 044, [arXiv:2103.09149 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [46] J. F. van Diejen, “Integrability of difference Calogero-Moser systems,” *J. Math. Phys.* **35** no. 6, (1994) 2983–3004.
- [47] M. Noumi, S. Ruijsenaars, and Y. Yamada, “The elliptic Painlevé Lax equation vs. van Diejen’s 8-coupling elliptic Hamiltonian,” *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.* **16** (2020) Paper No. 063, 16.
- [48] J. Chen, B. Haghighat, H.-C. Kim, M. Sperling, and X. Wang, “E-string Quantum Curve,” [arXiv:2103.16996 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [49] J. Chen, B. Haghighat, H.-C. Kim, K. Lee, M. Sperling, and X. Wang, “Elliptic quantum curves of 6d SO(N) theories,” *JHEP* **03** (2022) 154, [arXiv:2110.13487 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [50] S. S. Razamat, “Flavored surface defects in 4d $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SCFTs,” *Lett. Math. Phys.* **109** no. 6, (2019) 1377–1395, [arXiv:1808.09509 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [51] S. Ruijsenaars, “On Razamat’s A_2 and A_3 kernel identities,” *J. Phys. A* **53** no. 33, (2020) 334002, [arXiv:2003.11353 \[math-ph\]](#).
- [52] N. Seiberg, “Nontrivial fixed points of the renormalization group in six-dimensions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **390** (1997) 169–171, [arXiv:hep-th/9609161](#).
- [53] M. Bershadsky and C. Vafa, “Global anomalies and geometric engineering of critical theories in six-dimensions,” [arXiv:hep-th/9703167](#).
- [54] B. Nazzari and A. Nedelin, “ C_2 generalization of the van Diejen model from the minimal (D_5, D_5) conformal matter,” [arXiv:2303.07368 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [55] A. Nedelin, “Elliptic Integrable Models and Their Spectra from Superconformal Indices,” 12, 2023. [arXiv:2312.10994 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [56] D. Gaiotto and S. S. Razamat, “ $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theories of class S_k ,” *JHEP* **07** (2015) 073, [arXiv:1503.05159 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [57] S. S. Razamat and M. Yamazaki, “S-duality and the N=2 Lens Space Index,” *JHEP* **10** (2013) 048, [arXiv:1306.1543 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [58] M. Lemos, W. Peelaers, and L. Rastelli, “The superconformal index of class S theories of type D ,” *JHEP* **05** (2014) 120, [arXiv:1212.1271 \[hep-th\]](#).