Referee Report

Computational homological methods for integrable field theories

arXiv:2607.12142

Summary and overall assessment

This paper develops an explicit computational implementation of the homological description of two-dimensional integrable field theories obtained from four-dimensional semi-holomorphic Chern–Simons theory. Its main mathematical input is a family of continuous strong deformation retracts from the divisor-twisted Dolbeault complexes

$$(\Omega^{0,\bullet}(\mathbb{CP}^1, L_D), \bar{\partial})$$

to their cohomology. The authors give integral formulas for the inclusion, projection, and contracting homotopy in all three possible degree ranges: $\deg D \geq 0$, $\deg D = -1$, and $\deg D \leq -2$. Theorems 3.1–3.3 state the resulting retracts, while Lemma 3.4 asserts their compatibility with the degree -1 pairing defined by a meromorphic one-form. These formulas are the central new computational tool of the paper.

The second part applies these retracts to the four-dimensional Chern–Simons data associated with

$$\omega = \frac{(\alpha - \widetilde{\alpha})^2 (z-1)(z+1)}{(z-\alpha)^2 (z-\widetilde{\alpha})^2}\, dz.$$

For the prescribed zero splitting and pole boundary conditions, the relevant divisor degrees are -2, -1, and 0. The homological perturbation lemma therefore produces explicit retracts for both the singular complex $\mathcal{L}(X)$ and the boundary-condition complex $\mathcal{F}(X)$. The transferred field complex is found in equation (4.18), with differential $\ell_1' = 2d_\Sigma^+ d_\Sigma^-$. The recursive homotopy-transfer formulas then simplify to comb-shaped trees. Proposition 4.3 evaluates all contributions to the cyclic Maurer–Cartan action, separating odd and even arities, and equations (4.47)–(4.53) resum the result to the principal chiral model kinetic term and a Wess–Zumino term for the formal group-valued field $g = e^\phi$. Finally, Section 4.4 evaluates the transferred morphism and shows that the resulting on-shell connection is gauge equivalent to the familiar PCM+WZ Lax connection (4.55).

This is a worthwhile contribution. The paper does not propose a new integrable model; its novelty is instead the conversion of an abstract homological existence result into formulas that can actually be used. In particular, the all-degree Dolbeault kernels, their organization into cyclic transfer data, and the simultaneous derivation of the action and Lax connection are useful advances over the implicit construction in the earlier work cited as BSV2. The distinction from Alfonsi et al. is also meaningful: here the Lax connection is intended to emerge from the transferred quasi-isomorphism rather than being supplied as input. The work should be of interest to the mathematical high-energy and integrability communities.

The overall chain of the calculation is coherent, and the final PCM+WZ coefficients pass important consistency checks. Nevertheless, several points needed for the headline statements are presently absent or proved too tersely. Most importantly, the infinite homotopy-transfer series and the theorem about gauge classes of Maurer–Cartan elements are used without the complete filtration required by the cited result. In addition, portions of the proof of the new strong deformation retracts and their cyclic compatibility are only asserted by analogy, even though these are the main mathematical results. The physical identification also needs a precise account of its perturbative, local, and generally complex scope. I therefore recommend a substantial revision before publication.

Recommendation

Major revision. I regard the explicit transfer construction as novel and potentially publishable. My recommendation is not based on a lack of interest in the result, but on gaps in the hypotheses and presentation of the central argument. The filtration issue affects whether the nonlinear L_∞ expressions and the gauge-equivalence step are defined. The abbreviated Appendix leaves essential parts of Theorems 3.1–3.3 and Lemma 3.4 insufficiently documented. Finally, the paper currently identifies a local formal action with the PCM+WZ model without specifying the real slice, global Wess–Zumino data, or conventional coupling normalization. All of these matters appear repairable without changing the main strategy.

Major comments

1. **A complete formal or analytic setting is required for the nonlinear transfer.**

   Sections 2.1 and 2.3 correctly describe the L_∞ formulation as perturbative, but this qualification is not converted into a precise mathematical setting later. Equations (4.22)–(4.24) recursively define infinitely many Taylor components, equation (4.47) is an infinite Maurer–Cartan series, and equations (4.48)–(4.52) resum power series in ad_ϕ into exponentials. Section 4.4 then invokes a result asserting that an L_∞ morphism induces a map on gauge-equivalence classes of Maurer–Cartan elements. The cited framework assumes a complete descending filtration and places Maurer–Cartan elements in its first filtered piece. No filtration, completion, or small-field convergence domain is specified for $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$, $\mathcal{F}(X)$, $\mathcal{L}(\Sigma)$, or $\mathcal{L}(X)$.

   This is a hypothesis gap rather than a merely stylistic omission. A clean solution would be to introduce a formal parameter t, replace ϕ by $t\phi$, work over formal power series, and use the t-adic filtration. The authors could then state explicitly that every infinite sum, exponential, finite gauge transformation, and gauge-class assertion is interpreted in the resulting complete filtered algebra. Alternatively, if an analytic statement is intended, estimates proving convergence and closure under the relevant maps are needed. The former option seems much more natural and consistent with the rest of the manuscript. The status of the cyclic pairing and completed projective tensor products under this completion should also be stated. Once this is done, the abstract and conclusion should consistently describe the result as a formal or perturbative equivalence near the trivial field.

   The same clarification should distinguish two uses of the homological perturbation lemma. The linear perturbation series for the bicomplex truncates because the Dolbeault degree is only 0 or 1, as explained below equation (4.11). This finite truncation does not by itself justify the subsequent infinite nonlinear homotopy-transfer and Maurer–Cartan series.

2. **The proofs of the explicit retracts and cyclic compatibility need to be completed.**

   Theorems 3.1–3.3 and Lemma 3.4 carry most of the paper's mathematical novelty, so their proofs should be commensurate with that role. Before proving the identities, the authors must verify that the two chartwise formulas for each h_D actually define a global L_D-valued form. In particular, the relation $h_D(\zeta)_0 = z^{\deg D} h_D(\zeta)_\infty$ on the overlap, smooth extension across the omitted points, and convergence of the integrals are not shown. This omission is logically relevant in Lemma A.10: the argument uses $H^0(\mathbb{CP}^1, L_D) = 0$ to conclude that $h_D i_D = 0$, but this conclusion presupposes that $h_D i_D$ is a global section. A change of variables between z' and $w' = 1/z'$ appears to supply the required gluing identity and should be included in all three degree cases.

The nonnegative-degree case is treated in some detail in Lemmas A.4–A.6. By contrast, the proof of the negative-degree homotopy identity in Lemma A.9 is reduced to one sentence saying that the same argument applies with a different weight. This is precisely the case in which the weighted Koppelman formula works differently: the weight

$$\left(\frac{1+\bar{z}z'}{1+|z|^2}\right)^{-1-\deg D}$$

is antiholomorphic in the first variable and holomorphic in the second, whereas the positive-degree weight has the opposite behavior. The projection $i_D p_D$ must now arise from the $\bar{\partial}_z W$ term in (A.1), while other terms cancel or vanish. The manuscript should show this calculation, including the boundary estimate at infinity and the signs that yield

$$i_D p_D = \mathrm{id} + \bar{\partial} h_D + h_D \bar{\partial}$$

in the authors' convention. The continuity of the resulting operators on the stated locally convex spaces should also be demonstrated or supported by a precise mapping theorem for the singular Cauchy operator, together with the needed seminorm and chart-at-infinity estimates. Continuity is used later when the retracts are tensored with spaces of fields via completed projective tensor products, so it is part of the result rather than an incidental adjective.

There is also a scope inconsistency in the phrase "for all divisors." The charts in Section 2.2 are chosen with p_0, p_∞ outside $\mathrm{supp}(\omega)$, and the formulas for ψ_0^D and ψ_∞^D evaluate $z(p')$ and $w(p')^{-1}$. For an arbitrary divisor D containing one of the chart points, those expressions are not defined. The authors should either choose chart points outside $\mathrm{supp}(D)$ separately for each D and explain the dependence of the retract on that choice, or restrict the theorem to the divisors supported on (ω) that are actually used in the field-theory construction.

The proof of Lemma 3.4 is similarly incomplete. In case (b), item (2) is left to a "similar argument" and the essential adjointness identity in item (3) is said to follow by "mimicking case (a)." The relevant kernels are no longer the same unweighted Cauchy kernel. The proof should explicitly use the transpose relation between the complementary weights, justify the interchange of the two singular integrals, track the graded sign, and verify the required decay. This is not optional detail: Lemma 3.4 is what permits the cyclic structure to transfer and hence underlies the action calculation in Section 4.3.

There are also two foundational points in Appendix A. Theorem A.1 integrates over ∂R and applies Stokes's theorem while assuming only that R is a bounded open subset. A smooth or piecewise smooth boundary hypothesis is needed. In the distributional identity following equation (A.3), the displayed differential is inconsistent with the preceding formula; the factor should involve $d\bar{z} - d\bar{z}'$ rather than $dz - d\bar{z}'$. The authors should correct the statement and normalization. The "estimation lemma" invoked in the proof of Lemma A.5 is not stated or cited; the required boundary estimate should be written explicitly.

3. **The algebraic and physical input must be specified more precisely.**

   The manuscript assumes a Lie algebra with a nondegenerate invariant bilinear form. The cyclic structure, several rearrangements in Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 4.3, and the Wess–Zumino three-form require a symmetric invariant form. The authors should state that the input is a finite-dimensional quadratic Lie algebra, or explicitly list the weaker hypotheses that suffice. To use $g = e^{\phi}$ as a group-valued field and discuss finite gauge transformations, they must also identify an integrating Lie group and the category (real, complex, or formal) in which the exponential is taken.

   For arbitrary complex α and $\widetilde{\alpha}$, both the overall factor $(\alpha - \widetilde{\alpha})^2$ and

   $$\kappa = \frac{\alpha\widetilde{\alpha} - 1}{\alpha - \widetilde{\alpha}}$$

   are complex, so equation (4.53) is generally a complexified sigma-model action. If a real PCM+WZ theory is intended, the paper should give a real form of the Lie algebra, reality conditions on the spectral data, and a parameter-by-parameter map to the conventional kinetic coupling and Wess–Zumino level. If only the complexified classical model is intended, this should be said plainly. It is also worth noting that the restrictions in Section 4.1 exclude $\kappa = \pm 1$: $\kappa = 1$ would require $(\alpha+1)(\widetilde{\alpha}-1) = 0$, while $\kappa = -1$ would require $(\alpha-1)(\widetilde{\alpha}+1) = 0$. Thus the chiral WZW endpoints are not included in the stated family, despite being natural limiting cases.

   Finally, $g = e^{\phi}$ and the extension $\widehat{g}(t) = e^{t\phi}$ describe an exponential neighborhood of the identity. They do not cover general topological sectors of the group-valued field. The usual Wess–Zumino functional also depends on an extension and, for compact targets in the quantum theory, on level quantization. The local homological calculation is perfectly meaningful, but the authors should explicitly identify equation (4.53) as the perturbative expansion of the PCM+WZ action on this chart, and either discuss the global completion or declare it beyond the scope of the result.

4. **The central all-orders action reduction is too compressed to be independently checkable.**

   Equations (4.22)–(4.27) give a plausible and useful collapse of the homotopy-transfer trees. The crucial next step is equation (4.37), where three families of terms, with nontrivial binomial coefficients and two types of perturbed projection, become a single expression with coefficient $(n + 1)!$. The text says only that Lemma 4.1 is applied repeatedly. Since every subsequent coefficient in Proposition 4.3 and the PCM/WZ resummation depends on this equality, the paper should supply the missing combinatorial derivation. At minimum, the ranges of all sums should be stated, the equality should be declared for $n \geq 2$, and the cases $n = 2$ and $n = 3$ should be written out as checks before the general induction.

   The proof of Proposition 4.3 is also short relative to the strength of the result. The polynomial integral identity used after equation (4.42) should be proved or derived carefully and should be stated for $N \geq 1$, not $N \geq 0$: at $N = 0$ the displayed integrand contains a negative power and multiplying an undefined integral by N is not a valid statement. The application itself has positive N. It would help to explain which polynomial and which value of N produce each of the two final constants. The uses of Fubini's theorem in Lemma 4.1 should be accompanied by a short integrability argument for the Cauchy kernel on the compact spectral curve.

With these additions, the action calculation would be convincing. As written, the endpoint agrees with the expected model, but too much of the coefficient-sensitive calculation is hidden in phrases such as "applied repeatedly" and "from which the result follows."

5. **The Lax identification should be checked directly and made global on the spectral curve.**

   The indirect argument in Section 4.4 is elegant: the transferred Maurer–Cartan element is related by the g_2 gauge transformation to the included connection $i(L)$. Subject to the filtration issue in comment 1, this gives the desired gauge-class statement. Two additions would materially strengthen it.

   First, the manuscript should include a direct curvature check against the Euler–Lagrange equation of (4.53). Writing $J_\pm = d_\Sigma^\pm g\, g^{-1}$ and $\Delta = \alpha - \widetilde{\alpha}$, variation of the displayed action, together with the right-current Maurer–Cartan identity, gives an equation proportional to

   $$(1+\kappa) d_\Sigma^+ J_- + (1-\kappa) d_\Sigma^- J_+ = 0.$$

   For the coefficients in (4.55), the curvature factorizes into this equation times

   $$\frac{(z-\alpha)(z-\widetilde{\alpha})}{\Delta(z^2-1)}.$$

   Displaying this elementary check would fix the light-cone signs and normalizations independently of the abstract transfer argument and would make the phrase "usual Lax connection" verifiable.

   Second, equations (4.56)–(4.66) are checked only in the z chart. The authors should either give the corresponding w-chart formulas or state explicitly why the gluing rules imply the global equality. They should also verify that $g_2 = e^{\widetilde{B}\phi}$ is a globally smooth, admissible gauge transformation in the chosen completion of $\mathcal{L}(X)$. A direct citation for the conventional PCM+WZ action and Lax normalization would be appropriate here.

6. **The novelty and range of applicability should be delineated more sharply.**

   The present example recovers a known action and a known Lax connection. The new result is the computational homological route to them. This is a legitimate contribution, but the paper should make the division between new and known ingredients more explicit. In particular, it should say exactly which transferred maps or brackets were unavailable in BSV2 and compare the actual Taylor components of the present quasi-isomorphism with the construction of Alfonsi et al., including whether the WZ coupling is an additional distinction. The final identifications should also cite standard PCM+WZ references rather than relying only on the four-dimensional Chern–Simons literature.

   The title and portions of the abstract suggest a general computational technology for integrable field theories, whereas Section 4 treats one meromorphic one-form and one set of local boundary divisors on $\mathbb{CP}^1$. The all-degree retracts are general on $\mathbb{CP}^1$, but the extension to other integrable models is presently an expectation. The authors should either outline an explicit reusable algorithm showing how the calculation changes for general zero splittings and boundary data, or moderate the broad claims. A dedicated conclusion is needed to separate the theorems proved here from proposed extensions to other meromorphic forms, other boundary conditions, and higher-dimensional topological-holomorphic theories.

Minor comments

1. In the sentence below equation (4.24), the Lie bracket does not literally preserve each input Dolbeault degree; its output degree is the sum of the input degrees. The vanishing argument is correct in spirit, but should be phrased in terms of additivity of Dolbeault degree and the fact that the homotopy vanishes on degree 0.

2. Equation (4.32) contains an unmatched closing parenthesis after $F^{\pm}_{\phi}(s^{\pm})$. In the surrounding discussion, i_0 should be i^0, $F^{\phi}_{\pm}$ should be $F^{\pm}_{\phi}$, and $s^0_{\pm}$ should be $s^{\pm}_0$.

3. In the proof of Proposition 4.3, the phrase "evaluate ℓ^2" should read "evaluate ℓ_2."

4. The notation for the Fubini–Study form in equation (4.30) is normalized to unit integral. It would be useful to say explicitly that this is a normalized volume form, since some readers use a convention differing by 2π.

5. The assertion that the maps in Theorems 3.1–3.3 are continuous should specify the topologies on the spaces of smooth sections and on their completed tensor products with forms on Σ.

6. The manuscript should consistently distinguish equality of Maurer–Cartan elements, gauge equivalence, and equality only after applying the boundary-forgetting morphism ψ. The introduction is mostly careful on this point, but a concise restatement in the conclusion would prevent overinterpretation.

7. The paper would benefit from a short table listing, for the application, the four divisors entering $\mathcal{F}(X)$ and $\mathcal{L}(X)$, their degrees, the corresponding cohomology groups, and which of the three retract formulas is used. This would make Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 substantially easier to follow.

8. There is a duplicate hyperlink destination associated with the primed restatement of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2. The theorem counters or hyperlink anchors should be adjusted.

Final assessment

The manuscript contains a solid and useful idea: explicit Dolbeault contraction data can turn the homological description of four-dimensional Chern–Simons reductions into an actual computational method. The PCM+WZ example demonstrates the promise of that idea, and the final action and Lax coefficients are internally consistent. Publication would be warranted once the authors put the nonlinear transfer in a complete formal setting, supply the missing parts of the retract and cyclicity proofs, and state precisely the local complex scope of the sigma-model interpretation. I would be willing to reassess a revised version addressing the points above.