

Supersymmetric localization and non-conformal $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SYM theories in the perturbative regime

Marco Billò,^{1,*} Luca Griguolo,^{2,†} and Alessandro Testa^{2,‡}

¹*Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Sezione di Torino,
Via P. Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy*

²*Dipartimento SMFI, Università di Parma and INFN Gruppo Collegato di Parma,
Viale G.P. Usberti 7/A, 43100 Parma, Italy*

We examine the relation between supersymmetric localization on \mathbb{S}^4 and standard QFT results for non-conformal theories in flat space. Specifically, we consider 1/2 BPS circular Wilson loops in four-dimensional $SU(N)$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SYM theories with massless hypermultiplets in an arbitrary representation \mathcal{R} such that the β -function is non-vanishing. On \mathbb{S}^4 , localization maps this observable into an interacting matrix model. Although conformal symmetry is broken at the quantum level, we show that within a specific regime of validity the matrix model predictions are consistent with perturbation theory in flat space up to order g^6 . In particular, at this order, localization predicts two classes of corrections proportional to $\zeta(3)$ whose diagrammatic origins in field theory are remarkably different. One class of $\zeta(3)$ -like corrections emerges via interference effects between evanescent terms and the ultraviolet (UV) poles associated with the bare coupling constant, while the second one stems from a Feynman integral which retains the same form in flat space and on the sphere.

INTRODUCTION

Localization techniques have represented a major breakthrough in the study of supersymmetric gauge theories on compact manifolds at non-perturbative level [1]. Several exact results have been obtained for partition functions [2–6], Wilson loops [7–12], line defects [12–15] and other supersymmetric observables [16–21], enabling non-trivial checks of the AdS/CFT duality [22–25] also in non-maximally supersymmetric models.

Technically, the finite volume of spacetime plays an essential role in the localization procedure and serves as a (natural) gauge-invariant regulator for IR divergences. Conversely, the UV structure of the theory is left unchanged by the compactification and generally requires a renormalization. In superconformal models, the localization predictions naturally extend to the infinite flat space, and it is possible to compare them with standard field theory approaches. This program has been actively conducted in four dimensions, where the matrix model generated by supersymmetric localization on \mathbb{S}^4 was successfully tested at weak coupling against perturbative approaches for BPS Wilson loops [26–28] and special local correlators [29–31]. These analyses reveal that perturbative computations in flat space are captured by a one-loop effective action on \mathbb{S}^4 [1] which provides an elegant reorganization of the different Feynman diagrams [28].

However, when the gauge theory contains dimensional parameters, such as a mass term in $\mathcal{N} = 2^*$ theories or a scale generated by dimensional transmutation, conformal symmetry in flat space is broken. As a result, the short and long distance properties of the model are different and the calculation in flat space and on the sphere are no longer expected to match. In particular, when the theory contains a mass scale, observables calculated on \mathbb{S}^4 acquire a dependence on the dimensionless param-

eter constructed by the product of the mass scale and of the radius of the sphere, leading to different results with respect to the flat space. This scenario was examined in [32] studying the vacuum expectation value of the half-BPS circular Wilson loop in $\mathcal{N} = 2^*$ SYM and finding that the perturbative two-loop computation of the observable on \mathbb{S}^4 coincides with the localization result, while the analogous flat-space computation differs.

While a mass deformation violates the conformal invariance at classical level and affects both the structure of the propagators and of the action [33, 34], the presence of a non-vanishing beta-function yields a breaking of the map between \mathbb{S}^4 and \mathbb{R}^4 at the *quantum* level. However, supersymmetric localization still provides explicit expressions in terms of a one-loop exact running coupling constant [1], in analogy to the flat-space computations. Therefore, it is natural to investigate if the conventional perturbative series, when expressed in terms of the running coupling, is encoded in the localization effective action or to understand which part of that (if any) is univocally contained.

In this letter, we consider $SU(N)$ $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SYM theories defined in flat space with massless hypermultiplets in a generic representation \mathcal{R} . The $\mathcal{N} = 2$ vector multiplet contains the gauge field A_μ , a complex scalar ϕ and two Weyl fermions, while the hypermultiplets are described by two complex scalars along with their fermionic superpartners. In these theories, the β -function is one-loop exact, i.e.

$$\beta(g) = \beta_0 g^3, \quad \text{where} \quad \beta_0 = \frac{i_{\mathcal{R}} - N}{8\pi^2}. \quad (1)$$

In the previous expression, we denoted with $i_{\mathcal{R}}$ the Dynkin index¹ of the representation \mathcal{R} . Throughout this

¹ The Dynkin index is defined by $\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{R}} T^a T^b = i_{\mathcal{R}} \delta^{ab}$, with the

work, we will consider asymptotically free theories, where $\beta_0 < 0$. We will focus on the one-half BPS circular Wilson loop operator in the fundamental representation

$$\widehat{W} = \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \mathcal{P} \exp \left\{ g_B \int_C d\tau \left[iA_\mu \dot{x}^\mu + \frac{R}{\sqrt{2}} (\phi + \phi^\dagger) \right] \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where g_B is the bare coupling constant, \mathcal{P} is the path-ordering operator and the integral is over a circle C of radius R parametrized as $x_\mu(\tau) = R(\cos \tau, \sin \tau, \mathbf{0})$.

In the following, we will show that the matrix model predictions match standard perturbation theory up to three-loop accuracy² *within* a specific range of validity (see eq. (8)). Specifically, supersymmetric localization predicts two corrections proportional to $\zeta(3)$ which, in perturbative field theory, possess a different origin: one of them is present also in superconformal cases [27, 28, 30] and arises from a Feynman integral which has the same form on \mathbb{R}^4 and \mathbb{S}^4 , while the second one emerges by interference effects between evanescent terms and the UV divergence of the bare coupling constant.

BPS WILSON LOOP ON \mathbb{S}^4 VIA LOCALIZATION

If we compactify the theory on a four-sphere of radius R for which C is an equator, supersymmetric localization [1] allows to compute the expectation value \mathcal{W} of eq. (2) via an integral over a traceless hermitean $N \times N$ matrix a :

$$\mathcal{W} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \int da e^{-\text{tr} a^2 - S_{\text{int}}(a, g)} \widehat{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (3)$$

where the matrix operator $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ reads

$$\widehat{\mathcal{W}} = \frac{1}{N} \text{tr} \exp \left(\frac{ga}{\sqrt{2}} \right) = 1 + \frac{g^2}{4N} \text{tr} a^2 + \mathcal{O}(g^4) \quad (4)$$

and the partition function \mathcal{Z} is given by the same integral without the insertion of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$. The integration measure is such that $\int da e^{-\text{tr} a^2} = 1$. If we neglect the instanton contributions, the interaction potential $S_{\text{int}}(a, g)$ arises from the one-loop determinants around the fixed point of the localizing action and is given by [36]

$$S_{\text{int}}(a, g) = - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \left(-\frac{g^2}{8\pi^2} \right)^m \frac{\zeta(2m-1)}{m} \text{Tr}'_{\mathcal{R}} a^{2m}, \quad (5)$$

where $\text{Tr}'_{\mathcal{R}} \bullet = (\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{R}} \bullet - \text{Tr}_{\text{Adj}} \bullet)$. This combination of traces describes the matter content of the difference between the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ models under consideration and $\mathcal{N} = 4$

SYM. From the perspective of perturbative field theory, eq. (5) suggests to construct the interaction contributions from the diagrams with internal lines in representation \mathcal{R} subtracted from identical contributions in which $\mathcal{R} = \text{adj}$. Diagrammatically, we will denote these types of corrections characterized by matter in the so-called *difference theory* [27, 28] by a double solid/dashed line. For instance, the expected correspondence between a contribution in the matrix model involving the quartic vertex $\text{Tr}'_{\mathcal{R}} a^4$ and usual Feynman diagrams is

$$\text{Tr}'_{\mathcal{R}} a^4 = \begin{array}{c} | \\ \bullet \\ | \end{array} \leftrightarrow \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array}, \quad (6)$$

where the superposition of a wiggly/straight line denotes the vector-multiplet field propagation.

Importantly, in (3) and (5), $g = g(R)$ is the running coupling constant

$$\frac{1}{g^2} = \frac{1}{g_*^2} + \beta_0^{\mathcal{R}} \log M^2 R^2, \quad (7)$$

where $g_* = g_*(M)$ is the renormalized coupling at the UV cut-off M . This scale enters the matrix model because the representation \mathcal{R} is associated with a non-vanishing β -function. This requires a regularization for the one-loop fluctuation determinants which involves additional hypermultiplets of mass M , see [1, 36]. For perturbation theory to be applicable, asymptotic freedom requires that

$$\Lambda \ll \frac{1}{R} \ll M, \quad (8)$$

where Λ is the *infrared* strong coupling scale generated by dimensional transmutation:

$$\Lambda = M e^{\frac{1}{2g_*^2 \beta_0}}. \quad (9)$$

Indeed, when $1/R$ approaches Λ , the running coupling g is of order $\mathcal{O}(1)$, requiring a resummation of the perturbative series, and the observable also receives non-perturbative power-like corrections³ $C_n (R\Lambda)^n$. We expect that such *infrared* contributions differ between the sphere and flat space due to the conformal anomaly. Conversely, when $1/R$ approaches M , the (massive) regulating degrees of freedom become relevant and the theory itself changes. Importantly, the matrix model is *formally* analogous to that employed in the conformal case in [28],

² The full technical details of the Feynman diagram computations will be given in a upcoming paper [35]

³ In certain multicolour models, such as $\mathcal{N} = 2^*$ or the massive deformation of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SQCD, the coefficients C_n were determined on \mathbb{S}^4 by localization techniques [37]. Instantons, which we neglected in the matrix model, would also contribute to the observable with terms of this type.

so that we can apply the same techniques for the perturbative calculation. Up to order g^6 , the prediction is


$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} &= \mathcal{W}_0 + \frac{g^6 \zeta(3)}{2^9 \pi^4 N} \langle \text{tr } a^2 \text{ Tr}'_{\mathcal{R}} a^4 \rangle_{0,c} + \mathcal{O}(g^8) \\ &= \mathcal{W}_0 + \frac{3g^6 \zeta(3)}{2^8 \pi^4 N} \mathcal{K}'_4 + \frac{g^6 \zeta(3)}{16\pi^2} C_F N \beta_0 + \mathcal{O}(g^8), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the subscript $0, c$ denotes the connected correlator in the Gaussian matrix model, while $C_F = (N^2 - 1)/2N$ is the fundamental Casimir. Moreover, \mathcal{W}_0 captures the Wilson loop expectation value in the free matrix model and, in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM, it resums all the *ladder-like* diagrams. Its explicit expression reads [7, 8]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_0 &= \frac{1}{N} L_{N-1}^1(-g^2/4) e^{\frac{g^2}{8}(1-1/N)} = 1 + \frac{g^2}{4} C_F \\ &+ \frac{g^4 C_F (2N^2 - 3)}{192N} + \frac{g^6 C_F (N^4 - 3N^2 + 3)}{4608N^2} + \mathcal{O}(g^8), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where L_N^1 is a Laguerre polynomial.

To evaluate the connected correlator for arbitrary \mathcal{R} , we introduced the free contraction $\langle a^a a^b \rangle_0 = \delta^{ab}$ and employed the usual Wick theorem. The two interaction terms, characterized by the colour factors $\mathcal{K}'_4 = \text{Tr}'_{\mathcal{R}} T^a T^e T_a T_e = 2NC_F \left(C_{\mathcal{R}} - \frac{N i_{\mathcal{R}}}{2} - \frac{N^2}{2} \right)$ and $C_F N \beta_0$, are associated with the two contractions of the matrix model quartic vertex:



$$(12)$$

The correspondence between matrix vertices and field theory matter loops (6) suggests that these interactions should arise from single-exchange field theory diagrams. This connection has been checked⁴ long ago in [27, 28] for generic superconformal set-ups, where only the \mathcal{K}'_4 structure is present. However, in non-conformal models it is not obvious if the correspondence between the sphere and the flat space findings persists.

FIELD THEORY APPROACH IN FLAT SPACE


We regularize Feynman diagrams by *dimensionally reducing* the theory to $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$ dimensions with $\epsilon > 0$ [7]. This scheme preserves the extended supersymmetry of the model but breaks classical conformal symmetry since g_B is dimensionful. Consequently, the v.e.v $W = \langle \widehat{W} \rangle$ of the BPS Wilson loop operator (2) can only depend on the dimensionless combination $\hat{g}_B = g_B R^\epsilon$:

$$W = 1 + \hat{g}_B^2 W_2 + \hat{g}_B^4 W_4 + \hat{g}_B^6 W_6 + \mathcal{O}(\hat{g}_B^8). \quad (13)$$

⁴ In [28], the check has been extended to four-loop order check in a generic superconformal set-up.

One-loop corrections

The one-loop correction $\hat{g}_B^2 W_2$ arises from the following single-exchange diagram



$$W_2 = C_F A_1(\epsilon), \quad (14)$$


where we used the graphical notation of eq. (6) to denote the gauge-field/adjoint-scalar propagation inside the Wilson loop and we defined the functions

$$A_n(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{8} \pi^{n\epsilon} \Gamma^n(1 - \epsilon) \frac{\sec(n\pi\epsilon) \Gamma(-n\epsilon)}{\Gamma(-2n\epsilon) \Gamma(1 + n\epsilon)} = \frac{1}{4} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (15)$$

Note that we do not include the factors \hat{g}_B when we give the explicit result of a diagram.


Two-loop corrections

The Feynman diagrams which contribute at order \hat{g}_B^4 are organized in three different classes [36]



$$W_4 = \text{diagram 1} + \text{diagram 2} + \text{diagram 3}. \quad (16)$$

The internal dashed bubble in the first diagram denotes the one-loop correction to the adjoint scalar and gauge field propagator. Specifically, the dashed line is associated with the matter fields in the representation \mathcal{R} which run in the virtual loop. This correction, as well as the diagrams with internal vertices, exhibit a (UV) singular behaviour when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. The singularity in the *Mercedes-like* diagrams arises when two points on the contour collide and is such that [7, 36]



$$(17)$$

where the internal bubble on the right-hand side denotes the one-loop correction of the adjoint scalar and gauge field in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM, where the hypermultiplets are in the adjoint representation. The previous expression reveals that in the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theory, the observable experiences a complete cancellation of all diagrams with internal vertices and it receives contributions only from the ladder-like corrections. The evanescent $\zeta(3)$ -term results from a triple *path-ordered* integration and possesses the same colour factor, proportional to C_F , of the single exchange diagrams (14). Upon renormalization, the UV pole of the

bare coupling g_B will interfere with the evanescent factor, leading to a finite three-loop correction. Substituting eq. (17) in eq. (16) we find that

$$W_4 = \text{[Diagram 1]} + \text{[Diagram 2]} - \epsilon \frac{\zeta(3) C_F N}{8\pi^2} + \dots, \quad (18)$$

where in the first diagram we employed the double dashed/line of (6) to describe the one-loop propagators in the *difference theory*. Finally, we find that

$$\text{[Diagram 1]} = C_F \frac{\beta_0}{\epsilon(2\epsilon - 1)} A_2(\epsilon). \quad (19)$$

Surprisingly, also the ladder-like diagrams provide an evanescent factor proportional to $\zeta(3)$. In particular, using the well-known properties of the non-Abelian exponentiation of the Wilson loop operator, we find that

$$\text{[Diagram 2]} = \frac{C_F(2N^2 - 3)}{12N} A_1^2(\epsilon) - \epsilon \frac{C_F N \zeta(3)}{16\pi^2}. \quad (20)$$

The evanescent $\zeta(3)$ -like term results from a nested quadruple integration over the Wilson loop contour associated with the *maximally non-Abelian* part of the diagram, namely the contribution with the colour factor $C_F C_{\text{adj}} = C_F N$ expected for the single exchange diagrams (14).

Three-loop corrections

At order \hat{g}_B^6 , we can use the fact that, up to evanescent corrections, all diagrams with internal vertices and vector multiplets lines only cancel the loop corrections resulting from hypermultiplets in $\mathcal{R} = \text{Adj}$. This is the statement that in the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theory the observable only receives *ladder-like* corrections, while in our case these cancellations reconstruct difference theory loop diagrams suggested by localization. We identify the following five

classes of corrections:

$$W_6 = \text{[Diagram 3]} + \text{[Diagram 4]} + \text{[Diagram 5]} + \text{[Diagram 6]} + \text{[Diagram 7]} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (21)$$

The $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ terms are analogous to those we encountered in eq. (17) and, in an analogous way, could yield a finite correction at order four loops, which is beyond our present goal. As we will see in the following section, the diagrams in (21) guarantee the correct renormalization properties of the Wilson loop operator [38–40]. The calculation of these contributions is extremely technical and will be examined in detail in an upcoming work [35]. We find

$$W_6 = C_F \frac{N^4 - 3N^2 + 3}{4608N^2} + \frac{3\zeta(3)\mathcal{K}'_4}{28\pi^4 N} + C_F \frac{(\beta_0)^2}{(2\epsilon^2 - \epsilon)^2} A_3 + \frac{C_F(2N^2 - 3)}{6N} \frac{\beta_0}{2\epsilon^2 - \epsilon} A_1 A_2 + \frac{7C_F N \beta_0 \zeta(3)}{16\pi^2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (22)$$

Note that at this perturbative order we generated two terms proportional to $\zeta(3)$. The first one, which involves the quantity \mathcal{K}'_4 , arises from the single-exchange diagrams decorated with the two-loop corrections to the adjoint scalar and gauge field propagators in the difference method, i.e. the first class of diagrams in (21).

The second contribution proportional to $\zeta(3)$ in eq. (22) is characterized by the same colour factor predicted by the matrix model in eq. (10) and results from the last three classes of diagrams depicted in eq. (21).

RENORMALIZATION AND COMPARISON WITH THE LOCALIZATION APPROACH

The regularized Wilson loop v.e.v. W is ultraviolet divergent and must be renormalized in order to obtain a finite result. Since the operator is defined over a smooth contour, the divergences are removed just by the charge renormalization of the coupling g_B [38–40] which, in terms of \hat{g}_B , amounts to

$$\hat{g}_B = (MR)^\epsilon g_* Z_{g_*}(\epsilon). \quad (23)$$

Here $g_*(M) \equiv g_*$ is the renormalized coupling at the renormalization scale M , while Z_{g_*} denotes the subtraction terms. The one-loop exactness of the β -function (1)

implies that the subtraction terms, in the MS scheme, have the following form

$$Z_{g_*}^2(\epsilon) = \left(1 - \frac{\beta_0 g_*^2}{\epsilon}\right)^{-1}. \quad (24)$$

Inserting eq. (23) in the explicit expression (13) of W that follows from the previous results for $W_{2,4,6}$ all the (UV) divergences cancel and we can define the renormalized observable as

$$W_* = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} W. \quad (25)$$

When $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the overall dependence on the scale M disappears and W_* satisfies the usual Callan-Symanzik equation [36]. This implies that W_* must actually depend on M , g_* and R through the running coupling g defined in (7). This is in fact what happens; moreover, the explicit expression of $W_*(g)$ is quite simple and coincides perfectly with the localization result in (10):

$$W_*(g) = \mathcal{W}(g) + \mathcal{O}(g^8) \quad (26)$$

in the regime of validity specified in (8). In fact, only when $RM \gg 1$ the log RM -terms, which arise when we replace the bare coupling with renormalized one (23), dominate over other scheme-dependent terms which we can then neglect to obtain the relation (26). Potentially, the presence of these large logarithmic contributions could make perturbation theory ill-defined. However, when $RA \ll 1$ we can resum these large logarithms in the effective coupling g which remains small. Beyond the range (8), we expect that the results on \mathbb{S}^4 differ from those in flat space by power-like corrections proportional to RA – see the discussion after eq. (8).

Some further comments are in order. Firstly, we remark the crucial role of the evanescent factors in the two-loop corrections (17) and (20). Upon renormalization, these factors interfere with the UV poles of the bare coupling \hat{g}_B (24) and provide finite (three-loop) corrections proportional to $\beta_0 \zeta(3)$ which combine with the analogous ones in (22). However, it turns out that the $\zeta(3)$ -terms resulting from the *Mercedes/lifesaver-like* diagrams, namely the correction depicted in (17) and the analogous ones in (21), do not contribute to the final result. Thus, in the perturbative field approach only the $\zeta(3)$ -corrections resulting from the (two/three-loop) double-exchange diagrams are relevant and reproduce the matrix model prediction. Importantly, this effect ties nicely in with the diagrammatic approach of the matrix model (12). The reason is that the $\zeta(3)$ -like part of the multiple-exchange corrections emerges from the *maximally non-Abelian* parts of the diagrams which, being proportional to C_F , behave as single-exchange diagrams in agreement with the matrix model prediction (12).

Let us also note that, once re-expressed in terms of the running coupling, the renormalized v.e.v. up to three-loop order can be described in terms of few diagrams.

Beside the ladder corrections, there is the irreducible part of the three-loop single exchange – the second diagram in (21) – which is characterized by the colour factor \mathcal{K}'_4 and is present also in the superconformal cases [27, 28] and the term proportional to $\beta_0 \zeta(3)$ that arises from a pinching limit of the maximally non-Abelian part of the double exchange ladder diagram.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

We examined the relation between supersymmetric localization and standard perturbative techniques in flat space for generic $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SYM theories with non-vanishing β -function.

We studied via localization to a matrix model the vacuum expectation value of the one-half BPS Wilson loop on \mathbb{S}^4 . Within the regime described in (8), we showed that the matrix model predictions match standard perturbation theory based on Feynman diagrams techniques in flat space up to order g^6 . We precisely related the matrix-model effective diagrams associated with the $\zeta(3)$ terms to the flat-space perturbative expansion. Our results not only provide a non-trivial test of the localization approach for non-conformal theories but also unveil the subtle reorganization of the conventional Feynman diagrams into the matrix-model average. It would be interesting to extend our analysis to the next perturbative order and try to generalize the understanding at all loops. Another natural investigation would be to examine correlators of local operators: localization gives exact results, in the non-conformal case, also for classes of two-point functions that can be compared with flat-space perturbation theory [41]. It would be interesting to reanalyse these observables at the light of the present computations. Exact all-orders expressions on \mathbb{S}^4 have been also used to study the large-order behaviour of the perturbative series, in connection with resurgent techniques [42], for different $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SYM theories. Reconsider the non-conformal case and its relation with a flat-space analysis could further improve our understanding of the perturbative results and their gauge-invariant resummation.

Acknowledgments. We thank Grisha Korchemsky for carefully reading the manuscript and for many illuminating discussions, Francesco Galvagno, Alberto Lerda, Marialuisa Frau and Igor Pesando for lively exchange of ideas. A.T. is grateful to the Institut de Physique Théorique (CEA) for the kind hospitality when essential part of this work was done.

* marco.billo@unito.it

† luca.griguolo@unipr.it

‡ alessandro.testa@unipr.it

- [1] V. Pestun, Localization of gauge theory on a four-sphere and supersymmetric Wilson loops, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **313**, 71 (2012), arXiv:0712.2824 [hep-th].
- [2] A. Kapustin, B. Willett, and I. Yaakov, Exact Results for Wilson Loops in Superconformal Chern-Simons Theories with Matter, *JHEP* **03**, 089, arXiv:0909.4559 [hep-th].
- [3] D. L. Jafferis, The Exact Superconformal R-Symmetry Extremizes Z, *JHEP* **05**, 159, arXiv:1012.3210 [hep-th].
- [4] F. Benini and S. Cremonesi, Partition Functions of $\mathcal{N}=(2,2)$ Gauge Theories on S^2 and Vortices, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **334**, 1483 (2015), arXiv:1206.2356 [hep-th].
- [5] N. Doroud, J. Gomis, B. Le Floch, and S. Lee, Exact Results in D=2 Supersymmetric Gauge Theories, *JHEP* **05**, 093, arXiv:1206.2606 [hep-th].
- [6] H.-C. Kim and S. Kim, M5-branes from gauge theories on the 5-sphere, *JHEP* **05**, 144, arXiv:1206.6339 [hep-th].
- [7] J. K. Erickson, G. W. Semenoff, and K. Zarembo, Wilson loops in N=4 supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory, *Nucl. Phys. B* **582**, 155 (2000), arXiv:hep-th/0003055.
- [8] N. Drukker and D. J. Gross, An Exact prediction of N=4 SUSYM theory for string theory, *J. Math. Phys.* **42**, 2896 (2001), arXiv:hep-th/0010274.
- [9] N. Drukker, S. Giombi, R. Ricci, and D. Trancanelli, Supersymmetric Wilson loops on S^{*3} , *JHEP* **05**, 017, arXiv:0711.3226 [hep-th].
- [10] N. Drukker, M. Marino, and P. Putrov, From weak to strong coupling in ABJM theory, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **306**, 511 (2011), arXiv:1007.3837 [hep-th].
- [11] N. Drukker and D. Trancanelli, A Supermatrix model for N=6 super Chern-Simons-matter theory, *JHEP* **02**, 058, arXiv:0912.3006 [hep-th].
- [12] V. Pestun, Localization of the four-dimensional N=4 SYM to a two-sphere and 1/8 BPS Wilson loops, *JHEP* **12**, 067, arXiv:0906.0638 [hep-th].
- [13] J. Gomis, T. Okuda, and V. Pestun, Exact Results for 't Hooft Loops in Gauge Theories on S^4 , *JHEP* **05**, 141, arXiv:1105.2568 [hep-th].
- [14] A. Kapustin, B. Willett, and I. Yaakov, Exact results for supersymmetric abelian vortex loops in 2+1 dimensions, *JHEP* **06**, 099, arXiv:1211.2861 [hep-th].
- [15] N. Drukker, T. Okuda, and F. Passerini, Exact results for vortex loop operators in 3d supersymmetric theories, *JHEP* **07**, 137, arXiv:1211.3409 [hep-th].
- [16] S. Giombi and V. Pestun, Correlators of local operators and 1/8 BPS Wilson loops on S^{*2} from 2d YM and matrix models, *JHEP* **10**, 033, arXiv:0906.1572 [hep-th].
- [17] E. Gerchkovitz, J. Gomis, N. Ishtiaque, A. Karasik, Z. Komargodski, and S. S. Pufu, Correlation Functions of Coulomb Branch Operators, *JHEP* **01**, 103, arXiv:1602.05971 [hep-th].
- [18] S. Giombi and S. Komatsu, Exact Correlators on the Wilson Loop in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM: Localization, Defect CFT, and Integrability, *JHEP* **05**, 109, [Erratum: *JHEP* **11**, 123 (2018)], arXiv:1802.05201 [hep-th].
- [19] S. Komatsu and Y. Wang, Non-perturbative defect one-point functions in planar $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super-Yang-Mills, *Nucl. Phys. B* **958**, 115120 (2020), arXiv:2004.09514 [hep-th].
- [20] S. M. Chester, M. B. Green, S. S. Pufu, Y. Wang, and C. Wen, Modular invariance in superstring theory from $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super-Yang-Mills, *JHEP* **11**, 016, arXiv:1912.13365 [hep-th].
- [21] D. Dorigoni, M. B. Green, and C. Wen, Exact properties of an integrated correlator in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SU(N) SYM, *JHEP* **05**, 089, arXiv:2102.09537 [hep-th].
- [22] A. Buchel, J. G. Russo, and K. Zarembo, Rigorous Test of Non-conformal Holography: Wilson Loops in N=2* Theory, *JHEP* **03**, 062, arXiv:1301.1597 [hep-th].
- [23] F. Benini, K. Hristov, and A. Zaffaroni, Black hole microstates in AdS₄ from supersymmetric localization, *JHEP* **05**, 054, arXiv:1511.04085 [hep-th].
- [24] A. Cabo-Bizet, D. Cassani, D. Martelli, and S. Murthy, Microscopic origin of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of supersymmetric AdS₅ black holes, *JHEP* **10**, 062, arXiv:1810.11442 [hep-th].
- [25] D. J. Binder, S. M. Chester, S. S. Pufu, and Y. Wang, $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Super-Yang-Mills correlators at strong coupling from string theory and localization, *JHEP* **12**, 119, arXiv:1902.06263 [hep-th].
- [26] A. Bassetto, L. Griguolo, F. Pucci, and D. Seminara, Supersymmetric Wilson loops at two loops, *JHEP* **06**, 083, arXiv:0804.3973 [hep-th].
- [27] R. Andree and D. Young, Wilson Loops in N=2 Superconformal Yang-Mills Theory, *JHEP* **09**, 095, arXiv:1007.4923 [hep-th].
- [28] M. Billö, F. Galvagno, and A. Lerda, BPS wilson loops in generic conformal $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SU(N) SYM theories, *JHEP* **08**, 108, arXiv:1906.07085 [hep-th].
- [29] D. Rodriguez-Gomez and J. G. Russo, Large N Correlation Functions in Superconformal Field Theories, *JHEP* **06**, 109, arXiv:1604.07416 [hep-th].
- [30] M. Billo, F. Fucito, A. Lerda, J. F. Morales, Y. S. Stanev, and C. Wen, Two-point correlators in $N = 2$ gauge theories, *Nucl. Phys. B* **926**, 427 (2018), arXiv:1705.02909 [hep-th].
- [31] M. Billo, F. Galvagno, P. Gregori, and A. Lerda, Correlators between Wilson loop and chiral operators in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ conformal gauge theories, *JHEP* **03**, 193, arXiv:1802.09813 [hep-th].
- [32] A. V. Belitsky and G. P. Korchemsky, Circular Wilson loop in N=2* super Yang-Mills theory at two loops and localization, *JHEP* **04**, 089, arXiv:2003.10448 [hep-th].
- [33] N. Bobev, H. Elvang, D. Z. Freedman, and S. S. Pufu, Holography for $N = 2^*$ on S^4 , *JHEP* **07**, 001, arXiv:1311.1508 [hep-th].
- [34] G. Festuccia and N. Seiberg, Rigid Supersymmetric Theories in Curved Superspace, *JHEP* **06**, 114, arXiv:1105.0689 [hep-th].
- [35] M. Billo', L. Griguolo, and A. Testa, To appear, (2024).
- [36] M. Billo', L. Griguolo, and A. Testa, Remarks on BPS Wilson loops in non-conformal $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauge theories and localization, *JHEP* **01**, 160, arXiv:2311.17692 [hep-th].
- [37] J. G. Russo and K. Zarembo, Massive N=2 Gauge Theories at Large N, *JHEP* **11**, 130, arXiv:1309.1004 [hep-th].
- [38] V. S. Dotsenko and S. N. Vergeles, Renormalizability of Phase Factors in the Nonabelian Gauge Theory, *Nucl. Phys. B* **169**, 527 (1980).
- [39] R. A. Brandt, F. Neri, and M.-a. Sato, Renormalization of Loop Functions for All Loops, *Phys. Rev. D* **24**, 879 (1981).
- [40] G. P. Korchemsky and A. V. Radyushkin, Renormalization of the Wilson Loops Beyond the Leading Order, *Nucl. Phys. B* **283**, 342 (1987).
- [41] M. Billo, F. Fucito, G. P. Korchemsky, A. Lerda, and J. F. Morales, Two-point correlators in non-

- conformal $\mathcal{N} = 2$ gauge theories, *JHEP* **05**, 199, arXiv:1901.09693 [hep-th].
- [42] I. Aniceto, J. G. Russo, and R. Schiappa, Resurgent Analysis of Localizable Observables in Supersymmetric Gauge Theories, *JHEP* **03**, 172, arXiv:1410.5834 [hep-th].