

Lattice $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM

David Schaich, 13 October 2016

Goals of this informal and pedagogical presentation

- Focus on big-picture context and motivation
(relatively little about my own contributions)
- Basic difficulties with supersymmetry on the lattice
- How we circumvent them in four-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM
(analogous lattice systems in 2d & 3d)
- **Entry point:** [arXiv:1512.01137](https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.01137) **Review:** [arXiv:0903.4881](https://arxiv.org/abs/0903.4881)

Motivations / context for lattice supersymmetry

- **Theory: Symmetries** simplify systems \longrightarrow analytic insights
into confinement, dynamical symmetry breaking, conformality...
Lattice is new non-perturb. method to explore / refine / extend insights
- **Dualities:** Same physics from theories with different fields & interactions
Relate “electric” & “magnetic” gauge theories — Seiberg duality
Relate gauge & gravity theories — AdS/CFT duality or “holography”
Method: Conjecture & check (exploiting susy), may be extended by lattice
- **Pheno: BSM** is familiar context for susy-based model building
Relies on (dynamical) spontaneous supersymmetry breaking \longrightarrow lattice
Speculate LHC constraints prefer non-perturbative new physics?
- **Modelling:** Attempts to study everything from QCD at finite density
to non-Fermi liquids based on AdS/CFT holography
Lattice could provide new input to these efforts — validate or refine

Lattice gauge theory in a nutshell

- Non-perturbative, gauge-invariant QFT regularization, directly in d dims
- Replace continuous spacetime with finite grid of discrete sites
Work in euclidean space \longrightarrow $SO(d)_{\text{euc}}$ rotations $\Lambda_{\mu\nu}$
- One of its drawbacks: Discretization breaks Poincaré invariance
Equivalently, lattice spacing a between sites introduces UV cutoff a^{-1}
- Improves upon naive momentum cutoff by preserving hypercubic subgroup
 \longrightarrow recover full Poincaré upon removing cutoff ($a \rightarrow 0$ continuum limit)

Naive obstacle to lattice supersymmetry

- Supersymmetries extend Poincaré spacetime symmetry
- Add spinorial generators Q_α^A and $\bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}^A$ with $A = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}$
Transform under global $SU(\mathcal{N})_R$ “R” symmetry

$$\begin{aligned} [Q_\alpha^A, P_\mu] &= 0 & [Q_\alpha^A, \Lambda_{\mu\nu}] &\propto \frac{1}{4} [\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]_\alpha^\beta Q_\beta^A \\ \{Q_\alpha^A, \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}^B\} &= 2\delta^{AB} \sigma_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}^\mu P_\mu & (Q_\alpha^A)^2 &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

(Can recall $[P, P] \sim 0$; $[P, \Lambda] \sim P$; $[\Lambda, \Lambda] \sim \Lambda$;
 $\{Q_\alpha^A, Q_\beta^B\} \sim \epsilon_{AB} Z^{AB}$ central charge)

- **Lattice:** P_μ generates infinitesimal spacetime translations
 P_μ does not exist in discrete spacetime
 \implies explicit susy breaking at classical level of algebra
- **Consequence:** Relevant or marginal susy-violating operators
(typically many) no longer forbidden and have to be fine-tuned
Scalar mass and Yukawa terms make scalar fields especially problematic
(squarks from matter multiplets or extended susy, $\mathcal{N} > 1$)
- **Special case:** Can preserve closed sub-algebra for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM in 4d

$\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM in four dimensions as simplest QFT

- AdS / CFT; integrability / amplituhedron
- **Maximally supersymmetric:** Restricting to helicities ≤ 1 ,
 Q_α^A act as four ‘lowering operators’ on massless Clifford vacuum states
 [highest-weight state annihilated by all \bar{Q} in frame $(E, 0, 0, E)$]

	State	Helicity	Flavor SU(4) _R
	$ \Omega_1\rangle$	1	1
	$Q_\alpha^A \Omega_1\rangle$	1/2	4
	$Q_\beta^B Q_\alpha^A \Omega_1\rangle$	0	6
	$Q_\gamma^C Q_\beta^B Q_\alpha^A \Omega_1\rangle$	-1/2	$\bar{\mathbf{4}}$
	$Q_\delta^D Q_\gamma^C Q_\beta^B Q_\alpha^A \Omega_1\rangle$	-1	1

- **Yang–Mills:** Only single super-multiplet
 Contains the gauge field A_μ , four fermions Ψ^A and six scalars Φ^{AB}
 all massless and in adjoint rep. of SU(N) gauge group
- **Action:** Usual kinetic, Yukawa, four-scalar terms; only param. is $\lambda = g^2 N$
- **Conformal:** $\beta(\lambda) = 0$ for all couplings (line of fixed points)

Topological twisting

(equivalent construction from orbifolding)

- Expand 4×4 matrix of 16 supercharges in basis of γ matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} Q_\alpha^1 & Q_\alpha^2 & Q_\alpha^3 & Q_\alpha^4 \\ \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}^1 & \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}^2 & \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}^3 & \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}^4 \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{Q}_\mu \gamma_\mu + \mathcal{Q}_{\mu\nu} \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu + \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_\mu \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 + \bar{\mathcal{Q}} \gamma_5$$

Closed susy subalgebra $\{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q}\} = 2\mathcal{Q}^2 = 0$ can be preserved on lattice

- **Observation:** Expansion mixes spacetime symmetry (along each column)
 and R symmetry (along each row)
 \implies Expanding in **integer-spin** reps of “twisted rotation group”

$$\text{SO}(4)_{tw} \equiv \text{diag} \left[\text{SO}(4)_{\text{euc}} \otimes \text{SO}(4)_R \right] \quad \text{with} \quad \text{SO}(4)_R \subset \text{SO}(6)_R$$

- Simple change of variables in flat spacetime,
 replacing spinors with anti-symmetric tensors
- **Restriction:** Need at least 2^d supercharges for expansion
 Only applicable to $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM in 4d (more possibilities in 2d & 3d)

Twisted fields and their transformations

- **Four fermions:** Majorana Ψ^A expand just like supercharges

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Psi^1 & \Psi^2 & \Psi^3 & \Psi^4 \end{pmatrix} \longrightarrow (\eta, \psi_\mu, \chi_{\mu\nu}, \bar{\psi}_\mu, \bar{\eta})$$

- **Complication:** Only have $\text{SO}(4)_R \subset \text{SU}(4)_R \simeq \text{SO}(6)_R$
 \implies Scalar fields in $\text{SO}(6)_R$ vector rep $\Phi^A \longrightarrow (B_\mu, \phi, \bar{\phi})$

- **Solution:** Combine 4 + 6 bosons in complexified gauge fields

$$\mathcal{A}_a = (A_\mu, \phi) + i(B_\mu, \bar{\phi}) \qquad \bar{\mathcal{A}}_a = (A_\mu, \phi) - i(B_\mu, \bar{\phi})$$

Similarly combine $\psi_a = (\psi_\mu, \bar{\eta})$ and $\chi_{ab} = (\chi_{\mu\nu}, \bar{\psi}_\mu)$

$$\mathcal{Q}_a = (\mathcal{Q}_\mu, \bar{\mathcal{Q}}) \text{ and } \mathcal{Q}_{ab} = (\mathcal{Q}_{\mu\nu}, \bar{\mathcal{Q}}_\mu)$$

- **\mathcal{Q} transformations:** Nilpotent ($\mathcal{Q}^2 = 0$), exchanges bosons \longleftrightarrow fermions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{A}_a &= \psi_a & \mathcal{Q} \psi_a &= 0 \\ \mathcal{Q} \chi_{ab} &= -\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{ab} & \mathcal{Q} \bar{\mathcal{A}}_a &= 0 \\ \mathcal{Q} \eta &= d & \mathcal{Q} d &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

d is bosonic auxiliary field for off-shell susy, with standard e.o.m. $d = \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a \mathcal{U}_a$

- **Discretize:** Simply replace $\mathcal{A}_a \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_a$ above,
 note geometric site / link / plaq. structure from lattice gauge trans.

$$\mathcal{U}_a(n) \rightarrow G(n) \mathcal{U}_a(n) G^\dagger(n + \hat{\mu}_a) \qquad \psi_a(n) \rightarrow G(n) \psi_a(n) G^\dagger(n + \hat{\mu}_a)$$

$$\bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(n) \rightarrow G(n + \hat{\mu}_a) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(n) G^\dagger(n) \qquad \eta(n) \rightarrow G(n) \eta(n) G^\dagger(n)$$

$$\chi_{ab}(n) \rightarrow G(n + \hat{\mu}_a + \hat{\mu}_b) \chi_{ab}(n) G^\dagger(n)$$

A_4^* lattice and its S_5 point group symmetry

- Need five links symmetrically spanning four dimensions $\longrightarrow A_4^*$
 4d analog of 2d triangular lattice – non-orthogonal, degenerate
 Obtain from dimensional reduction with symmetric constraint $\sum_a \partial_a = 0$

- **S_5 point group symmetry:** S_5 irreps match those of $\text{SO}(4)_{tw}$
 Related by orthogonal 5×5 matrix P : ($P^T = P^{-1}$)

$$\begin{pmatrix} \psi_\mu \\ \bar{\eta} \end{pmatrix} = P_{\{\mu,5\}a} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_a \end{pmatrix} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} \chi_{\mu\nu} \\ \bar{\psi}_\mu \end{pmatrix} = P_{\mu a} P_{\{\nu,5\}b} \begin{pmatrix} \chi_{ab} \end{pmatrix}$$

(Explicit form of P on next page...)

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}} & -\frac{3}{\sqrt{12}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{20}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{20}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{20}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{20}} & -\frac{4}{\sqrt{20}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (\widehat{e}_a)_\mu \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \end{pmatrix}$$

Supersymmetric lattice action

- **Twisted action:** S is manifestly \mathcal{Q} -supersymmetric

$$S = \int d^4x \frac{N}{2\lambda} \text{Tr} \left[\mathcal{Q} \left(\chi_{ab} \mathcal{F}_{ab} + \eta \overline{\mathcal{D}}_a \mathcal{A}_a - \frac{1}{2} \eta d \right) - \frac{N}{8\lambda} \epsilon_{abcde} \chi_{ab} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_c \chi_{de} \right]$$

$\mathcal{Q}S = 0$ follows from $\mathcal{Q}^2 \cdot = 0$ and Bianchi identity $\epsilon_{abcde} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_c \mathcal{F}_{de} = 0$

- **Expand:** Apply \mathcal{Q} and integrate out auxiliary field d (implicit trace):

$$S = \int d^4x \frac{N}{2\lambda} \left[-\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{ab} \mathcal{F}_{ab} + \frac{1}{2} (\overline{\mathcal{D}}_a \mathcal{A}_a)^2 - \chi_{ab} \mathcal{D}_{[a} \psi_{b]} - \eta \overline{\mathcal{D}}_a \psi_a - \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_{abcde} \chi_{ab} \overline{\mathcal{D}}_c \chi_{de} \right]$$

- As for \mathcal{Q} transformations, lattice action just replaces $\mathcal{A}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_a$
(also $\int d^4x \rightarrow \sum_n$ and $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_{\text{lat}}$ with factor of $\det P_{\mu\nu} = 1/\sqrt{d+1}$)

Remarkable analytic consequences

- **Exact symmetries:** gauge invariance + \mathcal{Q} + S_5
- Moduli space preserved to all orders in lattice perturbation theory
→ no scalar potential induced by radiative corrections
- β function vanishes at one loop in lattice perturbation theory
- Real-space RG blocking transformations preserve \mathcal{Q} and S_5
⇒ One log tuning to recover all symmetries (\mathcal{Q}_a and \mathcal{Q}_{ab}) in continuum
- Can present last if time permits...

First consider numerical Monte Carlo importance sampling,

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int [d\mathcal{U}_a][d\overline{\mathcal{U}}_a][d\Psi] \mathcal{O} e^{-S}$$

Numerical complications \longrightarrow improved action

- Exact zero modes and flat directions must be regulated
- **Complexification complication 1:** $U(N)$ gauge invariance
 $U(N) = SU(N) \otimes U(1)$ but $U(1)$ only decouples in continuum
- **Complication 2:** $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{U}_a = \psi_a \implies \mathcal{U}_a \in \mathfrak{gl}(N, \mathbb{C})$ (links in algebra)
 Need $\mathcal{U}_a = \mathbb{I}_N + a\mathcal{A}_a + \mathcal{O}(a^2)$ for continuum limit,
 \longrightarrow stabilize by soft susy-breaking scalar potential

$$\delta S = \frac{N}{2\lambda_{\text{lat}}}\mu^2 \sum_a \left(\frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} [\mathcal{U}_a \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a] - 1 \right)^2$$

Lifts $SU(N)$ flat directions and bosonic zero modes

- **Susy breaking:** Automatically vanishes as $\mu^2 \rightarrow 0$
 Monitor \mathcal{Q} Ward identity violations $\langle \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{O} \rangle \neq 0$: action and $\mathcal{Q} [\eta\mathcal{U}_a\bar{\mathcal{U}}_a]$
- Flat directions in $U(1)$ sector seem especially problematic
 Include all constant $U(1)$ shifts of x -independent fields, even if $S \neq 0$,
 while $SU(N)$ flat dirs restricted to supersymmetric vacua with $S = 0$
- **$U(1)$ sector:** Impose constraint on plaquette determinant to regulate
 Can be implemented as \mathcal{Q} -exact moduli space condition:

$$\eta\bar{\mathcal{D}}_a\mathcal{U}_a \longrightarrow \eta \left(\bar{\mathcal{D}}_a\mathcal{U}_a + G \sum_{a \neq b} [\det \mathcal{P}_{ab} - 1] \mathbb{I}_N \right)$$

Modifies e.o.m. for auxiliary field $d = \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a\mathcal{U}_a + 2G\text{Re} \sum_{a < b} (\det \mathcal{P}_{ab} - 1) \mathbb{I}_N$

- **Improved action:** Ward identity violations $\langle \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{O} \rangle \propto (a/L)^2$
 \longrightarrow effective $\mathcal{O}(a)$ improvement

Ongoing numerical investigations

- **Static potential:** From $r \times T$ Wilson loops $W(r, T) \propto \exp[-V(r)T]$
 Coulombic with perturbative $C = \lambda/(4\pi)$ at weak couplings $\lambda \leq 4/\sqrt{5}$
 Currently carrying out tree-level-improved analysis,

$$V(r) \longrightarrow V(r_I), \quad \frac{1}{r_I^2} \equiv 4\pi^2 G(r_\mu) = 4\pi^2 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\exp(ir \cdot k)}{4 \sum_{\mu=1}^4 \sin^2(k \cdot \hat{e}_\mu/2)}$$

- **Scaling dimensions:** For Konishi and SUGRA ($20'$) operators
 $\sum_I \text{Tr} [\Phi^I(x)\Phi^I(x)] \longrightarrow \sum_a \text{Tr} [\phi_a(n)\phi_a(n)] - \text{vev}$
 Preliminary finite-size scaling and MCRG $\gamma_m \sim 3\lambda/(4\pi^2)$
 Complication: Mixing with $SO(4)_R$ -singlet part of $20'$

Long-distance effective action of the lattice theory

- **Question:** Does full quantum lattice theory produce $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM
in continuum limit (flowing to IR $1/L \rightarrow 0$)

- Need symmetry-preserving real-space RG blocking transformation
 $a \rightarrow a' = 2a$ with possible rescaling of non-compact variables:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}'_a(n) &= \xi \mathcal{U}_a(n) \mathcal{U}_a(n + \hat{a}) & \bar{\mathcal{U}}'_a(n) &= \xi \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(n + \hat{a}) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(n) \\ d'(n) &= d(n) & \eta'(n) &= \eta(n) \\ \psi'_a(n) &= \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{U}'_a(n) = \xi [\psi_a(n) \mathcal{U}_a(n + \hat{a}) + \mathcal{U}_a(n) \psi_a(n + \hat{a})] \\ \chi'_{ab}(n) &= \frac{\xi^2}{2} \left[\bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(n + \hat{a} + 2\hat{b}) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_b(n + \hat{a} + \hat{b}) + \bar{\mathcal{U}}_b(n + 2\hat{a} + \hat{b}) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(n + \hat{a} + \hat{b}) \right] \chi_{ab}(n) \\ &+ \xi^2 \left[\bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(n + \hat{a} + 2\hat{b}) \chi_{ab}(n + \hat{b}) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_b(n) + \bar{\mathcal{U}}_b(n + 2\hat{a} + \hat{b}) \chi_{ab}(n + \hat{a}) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(n) \right] \\ &+ \frac{\xi^2}{2} \chi_{ab}(n + \hat{a} + \hat{b}) \left[\bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(n + \hat{b}) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_b(n) + \bar{\mathcal{U}}_b(n + \hat{a}) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(n) \right] \end{aligned}$$

- Including $\eta \rightarrow \eta + c\mathbb{I}_N$ and U(1) ghost number, symmetries allow only
 $\mathcal{Q} \text{Tr} [\Psi f(\mathcal{U}, \bar{\mathcal{U}}, d)]$, $\mathcal{Q} \{ \text{Tr} [\eta] \text{Tr} [f(\mathcal{U}, \bar{\mathcal{U}}, d)] \}$ and existing \mathcal{Q} -closed term

- Most general renormalizable action (coefficients unconstrained by \mathcal{Q}):

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}} &\sim \mathcal{Q} \text{Tr} \left[\alpha_1 \chi_{ab} \mathcal{F}_{ab} + \alpha_2 \eta \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a \mathcal{U}_a - \frac{\alpha_3}{2} \eta d \right] - \frac{\alpha_4}{4} \epsilon_{abcde} \text{Tr} [\chi_{de} \bar{\mathcal{D}}_c \chi_{ab}] \\ &+ \beta \mathcal{Q} \left\{ \text{Tr} [\eta \mathcal{U}_a \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a] - \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} [\eta] \text{Tr} [\mathcal{U}_a \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

- “ β ” term lifts moduli space \implies perturbatively forbidden ([arXiv:1408.7067](https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.7067))
(at non-perturbative level, may need to tune $\beta \rightarrow 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}} &\sim \frac{N\alpha_1}{2\lambda} \left[-\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{ab} \mathcal{F}_{ab} - \chi_{ab} \mathcal{D}_{[a} \psi_{b]} + \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} d \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a \mathcal{U}_a - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \eta \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a \psi_a - \frac{\alpha_3}{2\alpha_1} d^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\alpha_4}{4\alpha_1} \epsilon_{abcde} \chi_{de} \bar{\mathcal{D}}_c \chi_{ab} \right] \end{aligned}$$

- Rescale $\chi \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_4}} \chi$; $\psi \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_4}{\alpha_1}} \psi$; $\eta \rightarrow \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_4}} \eta$; $d \rightarrow \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2} d$ and $\lambda \rightarrow \alpha_1 \lambda$:

$$S_{\text{eff}} \sim -\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{ab} \mathcal{F}_{ab} - \chi_{ab} \mathcal{D}_{[a} \psi_{b]} + d \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a \mathcal{U}_a - \eta \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a \psi_a - \frac{\alpha_1 \alpha_3}{2\alpha_2^2} d^2 - \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_{abcde} \chi_{de} \bar{\mathcal{D}}_c \chi_{ab}$$

- Finally e.o.m. for auxiliary field is now $d = \frac{\alpha_2^2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_3} \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a \mathcal{U}_a$, so

$$S_{\text{eff}} \sim -\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{ab} \mathcal{F}_{ab} - \chi_{ab} \mathcal{D}_{[a} \psi_{b]} + \frac{\alpha_2^2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_3} \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\mathcal{D}}_a \mathcal{U}_a)^2 - \eta \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a \psi_a - \frac{1}{4} \epsilon_{abcde} \chi_{de} \bar{\mathcal{D}}_c \chi_{ab}$$

\implies Only one marginal parameter may need to be tuned
to recover full continuum $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM

The other 15 \mathcal{Q}_a and \mathcal{Q}_{ab}

- Define discrete symmetries $\{R_a, R_{ab}\}$, subgroups of continuum $\text{SO}(6)_R$
Example: Continuum invariance under transformations

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_a \eta &= 2\psi_a & R_a \psi_a &= \frac{1}{2}\eta & R_a \psi_b &= -\chi_{ab} \\
 R_a \chi_{ab} &= -\psi_b & R_a \chi_{bc} &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{bcagh}\chi_{gh} & (b \neq a) \\
 R_a \mathcal{D}_a &= \mathcal{D}_a & R_a \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a &= \bar{\mathcal{D}}_a & R_a \mathcal{D}_b &= \bar{\mathcal{D}}_b & R_a \bar{\mathcal{D}}_b &= \mathcal{D}_b
 \end{aligned}$$

- Inconsistent with lattice geometry, but can define lattice analog

$$R_a \mathcal{U}_a = \mathcal{U}_a \quad R_a \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a = \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a \quad R_a \mathcal{U}_b = \bar{\mathcal{U}}_b^{-1} \quad R_a \bar{\mathcal{U}}_b = \mathcal{U}_b^{-1}$$

- Any one of $\{R_a, R_{ab}\}$ would require $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4$ and $\beta = 0$,
guaranteeing restoration of all symmetries of continuum $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM
- Qualitatively, $\mathcal{Q}_a = R_a \mathcal{Q}$ while $\mathcal{Q}_{ab} = R_{ab} \mathcal{Q}$
and the individual $\{R_a, R_{ab}\}$ are related by the S_5 point group symmetry
- Can monitor R_a violation in lattice calculation by measuring (normalized)
 $R_a \mathcal{W}_{ab} - \mathcal{W}_{ab} \sim \mathcal{U}_a(x) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_b^{-1}(x+\hat{a}) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(x+\hat{b}) \mathcal{U}_b^{-1}(x) - \mathcal{U}_a(x) \mathcal{U}_b(x+\hat{a}) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a(x+\hat{b}) \bar{\mathcal{U}}_b(x)$
- Tune parameter $\frac{\alpha_2^2}{\alpha_1 \alpha_3}$ in S_{eff} above to minimize R_a violation
when approaching long-distance continuum limit

Sign problem

- **Phase reweighting:** Can enable importance sampling Monte Carlo
using real non-negative Boltzmann factor $|\text{pf } \mathcal{D}| e^{-S_B}$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle &= \frac{1}{Z} \int [d\mathcal{U}_a][d\bar{\mathcal{U}}_a][d\Psi] \mathcal{O} e^{-S_B[\mathcal{U}_a, \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a] - \Psi^T \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{U}_a, \bar{\mathcal{U}}_a] \Psi} \\
 &= \frac{1}{Z} \int [d\mathcal{U}_a][d\bar{\mathcal{U}}_a] \mathcal{O} e^{i\alpha} |\text{pf } \mathcal{D}| e^{-S_B} = \frac{\langle \mathcal{O} e^{i\alpha} \rangle_{pq}}{\langle e^{i\alpha} \rangle_{pq}}
 \end{aligned}$$

- **Sign problem:** When the phase α fluctuates
so much that $\langle e^{i\alpha} \rangle_{pq}$ is consistent with zero
- **Numerical results:** Phase fluctuations become significant for $\lambda_{\text{lat}} \gtrsim 5$;
appear largely independent of volume (unlike finite-density QCD)
- **Strange behavior:** Phase $e^{i\alpha}$ is extremely sensitive to temporal BCs
 $e^{i\alpha} \approx 1$ with anti-periodic BCs, $\langle e^{i\alpha} \rangle_{pq} \approx 0$ with periodic BCs
Even more strangely, other observables change little for different BCs