

Comments on 4-derivative scalar theory in 4 dimensions

A.A. Tseytlin¹

*Theoretical Physics Group, Blackett Laboratory
Imperial College London, SW7 2AZ, U.K.*

Abstract

We review and elaborate on some aspects of the classically scale-invariant renormalizable 4-derivative scalar theory $L = \phi \partial^4 \phi + g(\partial\phi)^4$. Similar models appear, e.g., in the context of conformal supergravity or in the description of crystalline phase of membranes. Considering this theory in Minkowski signature we suggest how to define Poincare-invariant scattering amplitudes by assuming that only massless oscillating (non-growing) modes appear as external states. In such shift-symmetric interacting theory there are no IR divergences despite the presence of $1/q^4$ internal propagators. We discuss how non-unitarity of this theory manifests itself at the level of the one-loop massless scattering amplitude.

¹Also on leave from the Institute for Theoretical and Mathematical Physics (ITMP) and Lebedev Institute.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	One-loop effective action and beta-function	5
3	Scattering amplitudes	7
3.1	2-derivative formulation	7
3.2	One-loop scattering amplitude	9
3.3	(Non)unitarity	12
4	Concluding remarks	15
A	Basic one-loop integrals	17

1 Introduction

Despite its apparent non-unitarity the $\phi\Box^2\phi$ theory for a dimensionless scalar ϕ in 4 dimensions attracted attention in the past [1, 2, 3]) and also recently (see, e.g., [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]).

Focussing on the free theory may not be particularly illuminating as an interpretation of the theory may depend on allowed interactions and types of observables considered.¹ Here we will focus on the following classically scale invariant renormalizable theory of a real dimension 0 scalar with the Euclidean action

$$S = \int d^4x L_4, \quad L_4 = (\partial^2\phi)^2 + g(\partial^m\phi\partial_m\phi)^2. \quad (1.1)$$

Here g is dimensionless coupling (we assume $g > 0$ for the Euclidean action to be positive).² While this may be “unnatural”, similar fine tuned (low-dimensional) models appear in the description of the crystalline phase of membranes (see, e.g., [15, 16, 17]).³

¹One may wonder if problems of the free theory (related to higher time derivatives and non-positivity of the energy) may be cured by a special choice of initial conditions or assuming propagation in a non-trivial curved background [7] but the main issue is what happens at the interaction level (cf. [14]).

²We will be assuming that a (quadratically divergent) coefficient of the 2-derivative term $(\partial\phi)^2$ that is “induced” if the model (1.1) is regularized using a dimensionfull cutoff is fine-tuned to 0 after the renormalization. Below we will use dimensional regularization in which power divergences do not appear and thus (1.1) is renormalizable without 2-derivative term.

³The free energy of a membrane is $\int d^d x [T(\partial_m X^a)^2 + \kappa(\partial^2 X^a)^2 + \lambda(\partial_m X^a \partial_m X^a)^2 + \mu(\partial_m X^a \partial_n X^a)^2]$ where X^a ($a = 1, \dots, N$) is an embedding coordinate ($d = 2$ and $N = 3$ for a standard membrane). T is the tension, λ, μ are the elastic constants (Lame coefficients) and κ is the bending rigidity (the coefficient of extrinsic curvature coupling). After the crumpling transition from the elastic phase to the crystalline membrane phase one has $T \rightarrow 0$. Setting $X^a = (x^n + u^n(x), h^\alpha(x))$ and integrating over u^n one gets an effective action for the transverse coordinates h^α . In the formal limit of $N = 1$, $d = 4$ the above energy functional is the same as the Euclidean action for (1.1).

The 4-derivative scalar model (1.1) appears also in the context of extended conformal supergravity [18, 19, 20, 21] as a natural partner of the Weyl graviton (see also [22, 23, 6]). It also appears as a part of the effective action for the integrated 4d conformal anomaly [24, 25] (with ϕ interpreted as a conformal factor of the 4d metric). Related to the fact that the conformal supergravity may be interpreted as (the logarithmically divergent part of) an induced action from $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM theory, one can get a similar scalar action by considering the Maxwell theory in the background of the complex local coupling $\tau = C + ie^{-\phi}$ and curved metric. Starting with $e^{-\phi}F_{mn}F^{mn} + iCF_{mn}^*F^{mn}$ and integrating out the vector field one finds that the resulting log UV divergence is proportional to the $SL(2, R)$ covariant Lagrangian [26, 27]

$$L = \frac{1}{4(\text{Im}\tau)^2} \left[\mathcal{D}^2\tau\mathcal{D}^2\bar{\tau} - 2(R_{mn} - \frac{1}{3}Rg_{mn})\nabla^m\tau\nabla^n\bar{\tau} \right] \\ + \frac{1}{48(\text{Im}\tau)^4} \left(\nabla^m\tau\nabla_m\tau\nabla^n\bar{\tau}\nabla_n\bar{\tau} + 2\nabla^m\tau\nabla_m\bar{\tau}\nabla^n\tau\nabla_n\bar{\tau} \right), \quad (1.2) \\ \mathcal{D}^2\tau \equiv \nabla^2\tau + \frac{i}{\text{Im}\tau}\nabla^m\tau\nabla_m\tau, \quad \mathcal{D}^2\bar{\tau} \equiv \nabla^2\bar{\tau} - \frac{i}{\text{Im}\tau}\nabla^m\bar{\tau}\nabla_m\bar{\tau}.$$

For $C = 0$ or $\tau = ie^{-\phi}$ this reduces in flat space to the real scalar model like (1.1).

To address the question of how to define observables in the theory (1.1) we will consider the analog of massless on-shell scattering amplitudes with the aim to see how the expected non-unitarity of the model (1.1) is reflected in the S-matrix. The subtlety of the “dipole ghost” theory with $\phi\Box^2\phi$ kinetic term ($\Box \equiv \partial^m\partial_m = -\partial_0^2 + \partial_i^2$) is that it is not a smooth limit of the “massive ghost” $\phi(\Box^2 + \mu\Box)\phi$ model which may be viewed as describing a “diagonal” combination of a standard 2-derivative massless scalar and a ghost-like massive scalar and which is thus obviously non-unitary (unless one resorts to some special prescriptions, cf. [28]). Indeed, in introducing an auxiliary field ψ so that $\phi\Box^2\phi \rightarrow 2\psi\Box\phi - \psi^2$ one may define an equivalent model $2\psi\Box\phi - \psi^2 + \mu\phi\Box\phi$ which can be diagonalised in terms of $\varphi = \phi + \mu^{-1}\psi$ and ψ as $\mu\varphi\Box\varphi - \mu^{-1}\psi(\Box + \mu)\psi$. This diagonalization becomes singular in the limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$ which is a manifestation of the fact that $\phi\Box^2\phi$ or $2\psi\Box\phi - \psi^2$ describes a “non-decomposable” system (cf. [2]).

It is interesting to note that this non-diagonalizability is lifted if one starts with the Weyl-invariant analog of the \Box^2 operator in curved space (cf. (1.2)) [19, 20]: $(\Box\phi)^2 \rightarrow \nabla^2\phi\nabla^2\phi - 2(R_{mn} - \frac{1}{3}Rg_{mn})\nabla^m\phi\nabla^n\phi$. In the case of an Einstein space background $R_{mn} = \frac{1}{4}Rg_{mn}$ (e.g. 4-sphere or AdS_4) this reduces to $\phi(\nabla^2 - \frac{1}{6}R)\nabla^2\phi$ which can be diagonalized as above in to a combination of a physical massless ∇^2 scalar and a ghost-like conformal $-\nabla^2 + \frac{1}{6}R$ scalar at the expense of introducing R^{-1} factors that are singular in the flat space limit.

Returning to the flat space case, the family of solutions of $\Box^2\phi = 0$ contains in addition to “massless” oscillating solutions of $\Box\phi = 0$ (or $\phi(x) \sim \tilde{\phi}(p)e^{ip\cdot x}$, $p^2 = 0$) also “growing” solutions $\phi(x) \sim N_n(p)x^n e^{ip\cdot x}$ (cf. also [22]). While the space of the corresponding states can not be diagonalized⁴ it appears to be consistent to define the scattering amplitudes with only the oscillating modes appearing on the external lines. The analogs of the scattering amplitudes for the growing modes are not well defined [6]: they are IR divergent and not conserving momentum (resembling scattering in an external field).

We shall thus focus on the scattering amplitudes for a subclass $\Box\phi = 0$ of the solutions of $\Box^2\phi = 0$

⁴The free “dipole ghost” theory corresponds to a non-unitary representation of the conformal group $SO(2, 4)$ [2], both in the context of a Euclidean theory and Minkowski theory; the corresponding states belong to a non-diagonalizable module.

as defining the asymptotic states. Since the internal propagators $\square^{-2} \sim \log x^2$ do not decay at large distances, the question of whether the resulting amplitudes are well defined (finite in the IR) crucially depends on type of interactions one is going to consider. This is analogous to what happens in the massless theory in 2 dimensions where also $\square^{-1} \sim \log x^2$, leading to the familiar dogma that “massless S-matrix does not exist in 2 dimensions”. This actually applies only to local non-derivative interactions while the S-matrix in a theory like $\phi \square \phi + V(\partial \phi)$ (which is invariant under the shift symmetry $\phi \rightarrow \phi + c$ and thus having only $\langle \partial_m \phi \partial_n \phi \rangle$ correlators that decay at large distances)⁵ is well defined in the IR. The same will apply to the \square^2 theory (1.1) in 4 dimensions.

It will be instructive to compare the renormalizable model (1.1) with a similar 4d model with the standard kinetic term

$$L_2 = \phi \partial^2 \phi + \bar{g} (\partial^m \phi \partial_m \phi)^2, \quad \bar{g} = M^{-4} g, \quad (1.3)$$

which requires higher order counterterms but may be treated as an effective field theory (see, e.g., [30, 31]). Here 4d field ϕ has dimension 1 and M is a mass scale (g is dimensionless). This theory is unitary in the low-energy perturbation theory (i.e. assuming $s = E^2 < M^2$). This implies, in particular, the validity of the generalized optical theorem: the imaginary part of the one-loop 4-particle scattering amplitude will be related to (the phase-space integral of) the square of the tree level amplitude given by $A_4^{(\text{tree})} \sim \bar{g}(s^2 + t^2 + u^2)$.

The massless tree level amplitude in the theory (1.1) (constructed using the standard rules [32], i.e. by evaluating the classical action on the solution of the equations of motion for (1.1) with $\phi = \phi_{\text{in}} + \mathcal{O}(g)$, $\square \phi_{\text{in}} = 0$) will be given by the same expression as in the model (1.3) with $\bar{g} \rightarrow g$, i.e. $A_4^{(\text{tree})} \sim g(s^2 + t^2 + u^2)$. The expression for the one-loop amplitude, however, will involve not the standard $\frac{1}{q^2}$ but the $\frac{1}{q^4}$ internal propagators. As we shall see below, its imaginary part will be proportional to the first rather than second power of the tree amplitude, in conflict with the generalized optical theorem. This is, of course, hardly surprising given that restricting the external states to the massless only these are not the ones propagating on internal lines: the $\frac{1}{q^4}$ propagator effectively describes an irreducible mixture of the massless and “growing” modes.

This may be contrasted to the massive ghost theory $\phi(\square^2 + \mu \square)\phi + \dots$ with the propagator $\frac{1}{q^4 - \mu q^2} = \frac{1}{\mu} (\frac{1}{q^2} - \frac{1}{q^2 - \mu})$. Considering here the amplitudes for the massless modes only we will have both massless and massive ghost states propagating on the internal lines so cutting the internal lines will relate the imaginary part of the one-loop amplitude to tree level amplitudes of both massless and massive states (with the breakdown of unitarity related to negative norms of the ghost states).

In the “dipole ghost” model where only the massless scattering amplitudes are well defined (non-singular in the IR) we get a conflict with the optical theorem which is effectively due to inability to implement the completeness relation on the space of states.

One may still wonder if there is a possible generalization of the notion of unitarity that may still apply in this case. For example, one could try to modify (i) the prescription of summing over phase space

⁵An example [29] is the Nambu action in the static gauge (in Euclidean signature)
 $L = \sqrt{\det(\delta_{ij} + \partial_i \phi^a \partial_j \phi^a)} = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \partial^i \phi^a \partial_i \phi^a + \frac{1}{8} [(\partial^i \phi^a \partial_i \phi^a)^2 - 2(\partial_i \phi^a \partial_j \phi^a)^2] + \mathcal{O}((\partial \phi)^6)$.

of intermediate states or (ii) the Minkowski continuation of the one-loop diagram or $i\epsilon$ prescription for computing its imaginary part.

We will not be able to address this question here, limiting our goal to just computing explicitly the one-loop massless scattering amplitude in the theory (1.1) and discussing the violation of the standard version of the optical theorem.

As another indication of the difference between the theories (1.1) and (1.3) let us recall the argument [31] (see also [33]) relating the positivity of the coupling \bar{g} in (1.3) to the condition of causal (subluminal) propagation of small perturbations in the classical background $\phi_0 = u_m x^m$, $u_m = \text{const.}$. Expanding $\phi = \phi_0 + \tilde{\phi}$ we find that L_2 in (1.3) takes the form (in Minkowski signature)

$$L_2 = -K^{mn} \partial_m \tilde{\phi} \partial_n \tilde{\phi} + \mathcal{O}((\partial \tilde{\phi})^3), \quad K_{mn} = (1 - 2\bar{g}u^2)\eta_{mn} - 4\bar{g}u_m u_n. \quad (1.4)$$

The corresponding dispersion relation in momentum space ($\partial_m \rightarrow ip_m$) is

$$(1 - 2\bar{g}u^2)p^2 - 4\bar{g}(u^m p_n)^2 = 0. \quad (1.5)$$

Assuming that in perturbation theory $1 - 2\bar{g}u^2 > 0$ one concludes that to have subluminal propagation (i.e. $p_0^2 = v^2 \vec{p}^2$ with $v^2 < 1$ or $p^2 \equiv -p_0^2 + \vec{p}^2 = (1 - v^2)\vec{p}^2 \geq 0$) one should have $\bar{g} > 0$. The same argument repeated for L_4 in (1.1) gives instead of (1.4),(1.5)

$$K_{mn} = \eta_{mn}(\square - 2gu^2) - 4gu_m u_n, \quad p^2(p^2 + 2gu^2) + 4g(u^m p_n)^2 = 0. \quad (1.6)$$

Here for $g > 0$ (required for positivity of the Euclidean action in (1.1)) the subluminal $p^2 > 0$ solution may exist only if u_m is time-like ($u^2 < 0$). This suggests breakdown of causality (and related analyticity properties of S-matrix) in the theory (1.1).

Below in section 2 we shall first define the one-loop effective action and compute the corresponding beta-function in the theory (1.1) and its multi-scalar generalization. In section 3.1 we shall motivate the definition of the massless S-matrix starting with the 2-derivative action equivalent to (1.1) and then in section 3.2 compute the explicit expression for the one-loop scattering amplitude. In section 3.3 we shall review the generalized optical theorem explaining why it is valid in the standard ϕ^4 theory and also in the unitary model (1.3) but fails in its renormalizable analog (1.1). Some concluding remarks will be made in section 4.

2 One-loop effective action and beta-function

Starting with the action (1.1) one can compute the one-loop effective action for a generic background. One can then determine the renormalization of the coupling g and also find the one-loop scattering amplitudes. Setting $\phi = \varphi + \tilde{\phi}$ where φ is a classical background and expanding to quadratic order in $\tilde{\phi}$ we get (here we consider the Euclidean signature)

$$L_4 = \partial^2 \tilde{\phi} \partial^2 \tilde{\phi} - V^{mn}(\varphi) \partial_m \tilde{\phi} \partial_n \tilde{\phi} + \mathcal{O}(\tilde{\phi}^3), \quad (2.1)$$

$$V_{mn}(\varphi) = -2g(\delta_{mn} \partial^k \varphi \partial_k \varphi + 2\partial_m \varphi \partial_n \varphi). \quad (2.2)$$

Then the one-loop effective action is

$$\Gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2} \log \det \left[\partial^4 + \partial_m (V_{mn}(\varphi) \partial_n) \right]. \quad (2.3)$$

Ignoring quadratic divergence proportional to V_m^m the logarithmic one is given by [34] ($\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$)

$$(\Gamma_1)_\infty = -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \log \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} \int d^4x b_4, \quad b_4 = \frac{1}{24} V_{mn} V_{mn} + \frac{1}{48} (V_m^m)^2. \quad (2.4)$$

From (2.2) we get

$$b_4 = 5g^2 (\partial_m \varphi \partial_m \varphi)^2. \quad (2.5)$$

This divergence can be absorbed into the renormalization of the coupling: $g_b(\Lambda) - \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} 5g_b^2 \log \frac{\Lambda}{\mu} = g(\mu)$. The resulting RG equation for the renormalized coupling is⁶

$$\frac{dg}{dt} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} 5g^2, \quad t = \log \mu. \quad (2.6)$$

Thus $g \rightarrow 0$ in the IR ($\mu \rightarrow 0$) and grows in the UV. Thus the theory (1.1) with $g > 0$ (i.e. with positive Euclidean action) is similar to the standard ϕ^4 model in not being asymptotically free and thus not defined at short scales beyond the Landau pole.

It is straightforward to generalize this discussion to the analog of the model (1.1) with several scalar fields ϕ^a , $a = 1, \dots, N$. For $N > 1$ there are two independent quartic invariants, i.e. (1.1) is generalized to (cf. footnote 3)

$$L = \partial^2 \phi^a \partial^2 \phi^a + g_1 (\partial^n \phi^a \partial_n \phi^a)^2 + g_2 (\partial^n \phi^a \partial^m \phi^a) (\partial_n \phi^b \partial_m \phi^b). \quad (2.7)$$

For $N = 1$ this reduces to (1.1) with $g = g_1 + g_2$. Setting $\phi_a = \varphi_a + \tilde{\phi}_a$ as in (2.1) gives for the quadratic action (which generalizes (2.1),(2.2))

$$L = \partial^2 \tilde{\phi}_a \partial^2 \tilde{\phi}_a - V_{mn}^{ab}(\varphi) \partial_m \tilde{\phi}_a \partial_n \tilde{\phi}_b + O(\tilde{\phi}^3), \quad (2.8)$$

$$V_{mn}^{ab} = -2g_1 (\delta_{ab} \delta_{mn} \partial^k \varphi_c \partial_k \varphi_c + 2\partial_m \varphi_{(a} \partial_n \varphi_{b)}) - 2g_2 (\delta_{ab} \partial_m \varphi_c \partial_n \varphi_c + \delta_{mn} \partial^k \varphi_a \partial_k \varphi_b + \partial_m \varphi_{(b} \partial_n \varphi_{a)}).$$

In particular, $(V^{ab})_m^m = -2g_1 (4\delta_{ab} \partial^m \varphi_c \partial_m \varphi_c + 2\partial^m \varphi_a \partial_m \varphi_b) - 2g_2 (\delta_{ab} \partial^m \varphi_c \partial_m \varphi_c + 5\partial^m \varphi_a \partial_m \varphi_b)$. The coefficient of the logarithmic divergence in (2.4) is, in general,

$$b_4 = \frac{1}{24} V_{mn}^{ab} V_{mn}^{ab} + \frac{1}{48} (V^{ab})_m^m (V^{ab})_n^n, \quad (2.9)$$

so that the resulting beta-functions for g_1 and g_2 are found to be⁷

$$\frac{dg_1}{dt} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \left[2(N + \frac{7}{6})g_1^2 + (N + \frac{17}{3})g_1 g_2 + \frac{1}{12}(N + 15)g_2^2 \right], \quad (2.10)$$

$$\frac{dg_2}{dt} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \left[\frac{2}{3}g_1^2 + \frac{10}{3}g_1 g_2 + \frac{1}{6}(N + 21)g_2^2 \right]. \quad (2.11)$$

⁶The same beta-function was found in [16] and in [10].

⁷These are in agreement with expressions in with [16] after setting there $d = N$, $D = 4$ and $g_1 = 4v - u$, $g_2 = 4u$ where u and v are the two couplings in [16] (accounting also for the 1/2 normalization of the quadratic term in [16]). Higher-loop renormalization of similar membrane models was discussed in [17].

For $N = 1$ these equations imply (2.6) for $g = g_1 + g_2$.

The beta-functions in (2.10),(2.11) have no zeroes if g_1 and g_2 are positive and, in general, no common zeroes so that both g_1 and g_2 are not asymptotically free, i.e. run to a Landau pole singularity in the UV. It may be of interest to consider a supersymmetric generalization of the model (2.7) (cf. [21]) to see if in this case the corresponding RG equations may have non-trivial fixed-point solutions.

3 Scattering amplitudes

Let us now consider the theory (1.1) in Minkowski space and address the issue of how to compute the corresponding scattering amplitudes. One possible strategy is to compute the effective action and then evaluate it on a classical solution with appropriate asymptotic (or $g \rightarrow 0$) behaviour.

As was mentioned in the Introduction, while the $\square^2 \phi = 0$ equation admits both oscillating and growing solutions, only the former can be used as asymptotic ones as otherwise the analogs of the scattering amplitudes will be IR divergent [6]. The restriction to oscillating modes as external states follows naturally from the “2-derivative” formulation of the model (1.1) that we shall discuss first.

3.1 2-derivative formulation

Let us start with the Lagrangian

$$L(\phi, \psi) = 2\psi \square^2 \phi - \psi^2 + g(\partial^m \phi \partial_m \phi)^2, \quad (3.1)$$

from which the \square^2 model (1.1) follows upon integrating out the dimension 2 field ψ . The two theories (1.1) and (3.1) are equivalent as long as we do not introduce sources for ψ , i.e. consider only observables built out of the dimension 0 scalar ϕ . The S-matrix found from (3.1) and restricted to the ϕ -sector only should thus be the same as the one found from (1.1).

The model (3.1) is a special case of the one for $\Phi_\alpha = (\psi, \phi)$ with the Lagrangian

$$L = h_{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\alpha \square \Phi_\beta + m_{\alpha\beta} \Phi_\alpha \Phi_\beta + V(\partial\Phi), \quad (3.2)$$

where the constant matrix $h_{\alpha\beta}$ is not positive definite (has (1,-1) signature) and $m_{\alpha\beta}$ is degenerate, so that the kinetic operator $h_{\alpha\beta} \square + m_{\alpha\beta}$ is not diagonalizable.

If we add to (3.1) an extra term $\mu \phi \square \phi$ (so that integrating out ψ gives $\phi \square^2 \phi + \mu \phi \square \phi$) we get a model where the kinetic operator can be diagonalized as

$$2\psi \square \phi - \psi^2 + \mu \phi \square \phi + V(\partial\phi) = \mu \varphi \square \varphi - \mu^{-1} \psi \square \psi - \psi^2 + V(\partial\varphi - \mu^{-1} \partial\psi), \quad \varphi = \phi + \mu^{-1} \psi. \quad (3.3)$$

It thus describes a diagonal combination of a physical massless scalar and a massive ghost that are mixed in the interaction potential. Focussing just on the massless sector of the S-matrix here is not justified a priori. The “non-diagonal” model (3.1) should not, however, be seen as a limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$ of the “diagonal”

model (3.3) as this limit is singular.⁸ Thus the non-unitarity of the “dipole ghost” model should be analysed separately.⁹

Let us first address the question of which are the natural asymptotic states in the model (3.1). The equations of motion following from (3.1) read

$$\square\phi - \psi = 0, \quad \square\psi - 2g\partial^m(\partial_m\phi(\partial\phi)^2) = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

To compute, e.g., tree-level S-matrix we may solve the classical equations of motion with some “in” boundary condition, evaluate the action on this solution and expand in powers on “in” fields. Starting with the free-theory solution with non-zero $\psi_0 = \psi_{\text{in}} = \int d^4p \delta(p^2) \tilde{\psi}_{\text{in}}(p) e^{ip\cdot x}$, $\square\psi_{\text{in}} = 0$, we get for ϕ

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_0 &= \int d^4p \delta(p^2) N_n(p) x^n e^{ip\cdot x}, \quad \square^2\phi_0 = 0, \quad \partial_n\phi_0 = \int d^4p \delta(p^2) [N_n(p) + ip_n N_m(p) x^m] e^{ip\cdot x}, \\ \square\phi_0 &= 2i \int d^4p \delta(p^2) N^n(p) p_n e^{ip\cdot x} = \psi_{\text{in}}, \quad 2iN^n(p)p_n \equiv \tilde{\psi}_{\text{in}}(p) \neq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Since $\partial_n\phi_0$ contains a growing part, the resulting tree-level scattering amplitude with ψ_{in} -legs determined from the action $g \int d^4x (\partial\phi_0)^4$ (cf. (3.1)) will not be well defined (in particular, there will be no usual momentum conservation [6] like in scattering in some non-translationally invariant background).

We should thus assume that ψ should not have a non-trivial free-theory part, i.e. that the asymptotic field configuration should be the purely-oscillating solution for ϕ :

$$\psi_0 = 0, \quad \phi_0 = \phi_{\text{in}}, \quad \square\phi_{\text{in}} = 0, \quad \phi_{\text{in}}(x) = \int d^4p \delta(p^2) \tilde{\phi}_{\text{in}}(p) e^{ipx}. \quad (3.6)$$

Then the resulting solution of (3.4) will be

$$\phi = \phi_{\text{in}} - \square^{-1}\psi, \quad \psi = 2g\square^{-1}\partial_m(\partial_m\phi_{\text{in}}(\partial\phi_{\text{in}})^2) + \mathcal{O}((\partial\phi_{\text{in}})^5). \quad (3.7)$$

Plugging this back into (3.1) will give

$$L = g(\partial\phi_{\text{in}})^4 + \mathcal{O}((\partial\phi_{\text{in}})^6), \quad (3.8)$$

which is of course the same as what we get by starting directly with the \square^2 theory (1.1) with the oscillating mode ($\square\phi_{\text{in}} = 0$) as an asymptotic state.

⁸One may rescale the fields φ and ψ by $\mu^{-1/2}$ and $\mu^{1/2}$ respectively getting $L' = \varphi'\square\varphi' - \psi'\square\psi' - \mu^2\psi'^2 + g\mu^{-2}[\partial(\varphi' - \psi')]^4$ and then take the limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$ and $g \rightarrow 0$ keeping $g' = g\mu^{-2}$ fixed (we thank J. Donoghue for this remark). However, this theory can not be viewed as a smooth limit of the original $(\square\phi)^2 + g(\partial\phi)^4$ theory where g was non-zero. Indeed, setting $\mu = 0$ we get $L' = \varphi'\square\varphi' - \psi'\square\psi' + g'[\partial(\varphi' - \psi')]^4 = u\square v + g'(\partial u)^4$, $u = \varphi' - \psi'$, $v = \varphi' + \psi'$. The same model is found directly from (3.1) by taking the scaling limit $\phi = \mu^{-1/2}\phi'$, $\psi = \mu^{1/2}\psi'$, $g = \mu^2g'$, $\mu \rightarrow 0$ that removes the ψ^2 term: $L' = 2\psi'\partial^2\phi' + g'(\partial\phi')^2$. Introducing the source terms $j_{\phi'}\psi' + j_{\psi'}\phi'$ and observing that integrating out ψ' gives the delta-function of $2\partial^2\phi' - j_{\phi'}$ one finds that the generating function contains only the quartic interaction term, i.e. all quantum corrections in this theory vanish. This is a reflection of the fact that in the original theory $g \rightarrow 0$ in this limit.

⁹This means, in particular, that discussions [28] of the issue of (non)unitarity of $R + R^2$ type gravity and similar models with massive ghosts may not directly apply to the present case.




Figure 1: One-loop scattering amplitude.

The corresponding massless 4-particle scattering amplitude is then the same as in the $\phi\Box\phi$ theory (1.3)

$$A_4^{(\text{tree})} \sim g(s^2 + t^2 + u^2), \quad (3.9)$$

$$s = -(p_1 + p_2)^2, \quad t = -(p_1 + p_4)^2, \quad u = -(p_1 + p_3)^2, \quad p_i^2 = 0, \quad \sum_i p_i = 0.$$

Since the “mixed” (ϕ, ψ) amplitudes are also IR-singular one may hope that the “restricted” massless S-matrix (the one in the oscillating ϕ -sector only) constructed by the standard rules starting with (3.1) may somehow be consistent on its own.¹⁰

3.2 One-loop scattering amplitude

The procedure of defining massless S-matrix in the ϕ -sector can be extended to loop level. To illustrate that the loop scattering amplitudes for the massless ϕ -particles in the theory (1.1) with derivative interactions do not have IR divergences at small virtual momenta (despite the fact that internal propagators are $1/q^4$) here we will explicitly compute the one-loop 4-point scattering amplitude.

The one-loop amplitude can be found from (2.3) by expanding to the 4-th order in the background field $\varphi = \varphi_{\text{in}}$ with $\Box\varphi_{\text{in}} = 0$ so that external momenta are subject to $p_i^2 = 0$, i.e.

$$\Gamma_1 \rightarrow \int d^4x \int \frac{d^4p_1}{(2\pi)^4} \dots \frac{d^4p_4}{(2\pi)^4} e^{ix \cdot \sum_i p_i} A_4(p_1, \dots, p_4) \tilde{\varphi}_{\text{in}}(p_1) \dots \tilde{\varphi}_{\text{in}}(p_4). \quad (3.10)$$

Expanding Γ_1 in (2.3) to the relevant V^2 order we get¹¹

$$\Gamma_1^{(4)} = -\frac{1}{4} \text{Tr} \left[\Box^{-2} \partial_m (V^{mn} \partial_n) \Box^{-2} \partial_k (V^{kr} \partial_r) \right] \rightarrow \quad (3.11)$$

$$A_4 \sim \mathcal{V}^{mn}(p_1, p_2) \mathcal{V}^{kr}(p_3, p_4) \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{(p+q)_m q_n (p+q)_k q_r}{(p+q)^4 q^4} (2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}\left(\sum_i p_i\right), \quad (3.12)$$

¹⁰Note that in terms of the original 4-derivative formulation (1.1) this implies, in particular, that the external \Box^{-2} propagators are to be cut off. If we define the tree-level S-matrix as the classical action evaluated on classical solution with “in” asymptotic conditions [32] we set $\Box^k \phi + V'(\phi) = j = \Box^k \phi_{\text{in}}$, $\phi = \phi_{\text{in}} + \Box^{-k} V'(p_{\text{in}}) + \dots$ (where $k = 1$ or 2) and then plug this into the action. That will give just $\sim V(\phi_{\text{in}})$ so cutting off the external legs is realized automatically if the source is for ϕ itself.

¹¹We shall first use the Euclidean formulation (treating the external momenta as complex satisfying $p_i^2 = 0$) and rotate to the Minkowski signature with real p_i only after computing the loop integrals. Note that here there is no one-loop 2-point function correction as the corresponding diagram is quadratically divergent and thus can be set to zero in dimensional regularization that we shall use below.

where $p \equiv p_1 + p_2 = -(p_3 + p_4)$ and \mathcal{V}_{mn} are given by the (2.2) with the φ_{in} factors stripped off, i.e.

$$\mathcal{V}_{mn}(p_1, p_2) \rightarrow 2g(\delta_{mn}p_1 \cdot p_2 + p_{1m}p_{2n} + p_{2n}p_{1m}), \quad p_1^2 = p_2^2 = 0. \quad (3.13)$$

The integral in (3.12) is thus IR finite and contains the same log UV divergence as in (2.4).¹²

Renormalizing g in the sum of the tree (3.9) and the one-loop (3.12) amplitudes we will find that the latter will have the following structure ($s + t + u = 0$)

$$A_4 \sim g^2 \left[(s^2 + t^2 + u^2) \log\left(-\frac{s}{\mu^2}\right) + s^2 F\left(\frac{s}{t}\right) \right], \quad (3.14)$$

where μ is a renormalization scale. As the classical theory (1.1) is scale-invariant (g is dimensionless) the one-loop amplitude scales as s^2 like the tree-level one in (3.9). Our aim is to compute (3.14) explicitly and then see how it indicates a breakdown of perturbative unitarity in this theory.

From (3.13) we get (using $p_1^2 = p_2^2 = 0$ and ignoring the $2g$ factor)

$$\mathcal{V}^{mn}(p_1, p_2)(p_1 + p_2 + q)_m q_n \rightarrow 2p_1 \cdot q p_2 \cdot q + p_1 \cdot p_2 (p_1 + p_2 + q)^2 - 2(p_1 \cdot p_2)^2. \quad (3.15)$$

Using (3.12), (3.15) and the notation

$$p = p_1 + p_2 = -p_3 - p_4, \quad p^2 = 2p_1 \cdot p_2 = 2p_3 \cdot p_4, \quad (3.16)$$

we get the following expression for the momentum-dependent factor X_4 in the amplitude

$$A_4 \sim g^2 X_4, \quad X_4 = \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{K(p_1, p_2, q) K(p_3, p_4, q)}{(p+q)^4 q^4}, \quad (3.17)$$

$$K(p_1, p_2, q) \equiv 2p_1 \cdot q p_2 \cdot q + \frac{1}{2}p^2(p+q)^2 - \frac{1}{2}p^4. \quad (3.18)$$

It is straightforward to compute the integral in (3.17) in Euclidean signature using dimensional regularization. After evaluating the momentum contractions in (3.17) we find

$$\begin{aligned} X_4 = & 4(p_1 \cdot p_2)^4 I(2, 2) - 4(p_1 \cdot p_2)^3 I(1, 2) + (p_1 \cdot p_2)^2 I(0, 2) \\ & - 8(p_1 \cdot p_2)^2 p_1^k p_2^l I_{kl}(2, 2) + 4(p_1 \cdot p_2) p_1^k p_2^l I_{kl}(1, 2) + 4p_1^i p_2^j p_3^k p_4^l I_{ijkl}(2, 2), \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

where the basic integrals $I(n, m)$, $I_{kl}(n, m)$, $I_{ijkl}(n, m)$ are defined in Appendix. Using $p_1 \cdot p = p_1 \cdot p_2 = -\frac{1}{2}s$, $p^2 = 2p_1 \cdot p_2 = -s$, $t = -2p_1 \cdot p_4$, $u = -2p_1 \cdot p_3$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & - 8(p_1 \cdot p_2)^2 p_1^k p_2^l I_{kl}(2, 2) + 4(p_1 \cdot p_2) p_1^k p_2^l I_{kl}(1, 2) \\ & = -\frac{1}{2}s^4 [A_1(2, 2) + A_2(2, 2)] I(2, 2) - \frac{1}{2}s^3 [A_1(1, 2) + A_2(1, 2)] I(1, 2), \\ & 4p_1^i p_2^j p_3^k p_4^l I_{ijkl}(2, 2) = \frac{1}{4} \left[s^4 B_1(2, 2) + 4s^4 B_2(2, 2) + s^2 (s^2 + t^2 + u^2) B_3(2, 2) \right] I(2, 2), \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

¹²For large q we get $\int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{(q+p)^4} q_i q_j q_k q_r \rightarrow (\delta_{ij}\delta_{kr} + \delta_{ij}\delta_{kr} + \delta_{ij}\delta_{kr}) \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{q^4} + \dots$ and that leads to the UV divergence proportional to the combination $2V^{mn}V_{mn} + (V_k^k)^2$ as in (2.9).

where the expressions for $A_k(n, m)$ and $B_k(n, m)$ are given in Appendix. Then (3.19) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} X_4 = & \frac{1}{4}s^4 I(2, 2) + \frac{1}{2}s^3 I(1, 2) + \frac{1}{4}s^2 I(0, 2) \\ & - \frac{1}{2}s^4 [A_1(2, 2) + A_2(2, 2)] I(2, 2) - \frac{1}{2}s^3 [A_1(1, 2) + A_2(1, 2)] I(1, 2) \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \left[s^4 B_1(2, 2) + 4s^4 B_2(2, 2) + s^2(s^2 + t^2 + u^2) B_3(2, 2) \right] I(2, 2) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

The evaluation of the limit $w - 2 \equiv \frac{d-4}{2} \rightarrow 0$ gives for this s -channel amplitude¹³

$$X_4 = -\frac{1}{96(2\pi)^2} \left[(13s^2 + t^2 + u^2) \left[\frac{1}{w-2} + \log(-s) + \gamma_E - \log(4\pi) \right] - \frac{1}{3}(32s^2 + 5t^2 + 5u^2) \right] . \quad (3.22)$$

Symmetrizing in s, t, u we get for the full one-loop amplitude

$$\begin{aligned} A_4 \sim g^2 X_4^{(\text{sym})} = & -\frac{g^2}{96(2\pi)^2} \left[15(s^2 + t^2 + u^2) \left[\frac{1}{w-2} + \log(-s) + \gamma_E - \log(4\pi) - \frac{14}{15} \right] \right. \\ & \left. + (13t^2 + u^2 + s^2) \log \frac{t}{s} + (13u^2 + s^2 + t^2) \log \frac{u}{s} \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Here the coefficient of the UV divergent term agrees with (2.4),(2.5) (extra factor of $\frac{1}{2}$ is related to $\frac{1}{w-2} = \frac{2}{d-4} \rightarrow 2 \log \Lambda$). The divergence is absorbed into the renormalization of g in tree-level amplitude (3.9). The coefficient of the “tree-level” combination $s^2 + t^2 + u^2$ is then scheme-dependent. After the renormalization we get the first term in (3.23) in the form $\sim (s^2 + t^2 + u^2) \log(-\frac{s}{\mu^2})$ as anticipated in (3.14).

Note that in the familiar massless $\phi \square \phi + g\phi^4$ theory the corresponding result for the s -channel one-loop amplitude in Fig. 1 is proportional to (cf. (A.3))

$$I(1, 1) \Big|_{w \rightarrow 2} = -\frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{w-2} + \log(-s) + \gamma_E - \log(4\pi) - 2 \right] . \quad (3.24)$$

Let us also compare the expression (3.23) to the one-loop amplitude in the perturbatively unitary but non-renormalizable analog (1.3) of the model (1.1). Here the one-loop massless amplitude is given by the same expression as in (3.17) but with the standard $1/q^2$ propagators:

$$A_4 \sim \bar{g}^2 X_4 , \quad X_4 = \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{K(p_1, p_2, q) K(p_3, p_4, q)}{(p+q)^2 q^2} . \quad (3.25)$$

Using (A.3)–(A.6) instead of (3.21) the counterpart of (3.21) then reads¹⁴

$$\begin{aligned} X_4 = & \frac{1}{4}s^4 I(1, 1) + \frac{1}{2}s^3 I(0, 1) + \frac{1}{4}s^2 I(-1, 1) \\ & - \frac{1}{2}s^4 [A_1(1, 1) + A_2(1, 1)] I(1, 1) - \frac{1}{2}s^3 [A_1(0, 1) + A_2(0, 1)] I(0, 1) \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \left[s^4 B_1(1, 1) + 4s^4 B_2(1, 1) + s^2(s^2 + t^2 + u^2) B_3(1, 1) \right] I(1, 1) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

¹³Note that $4\frac{t^3+u^3}{s}$ can be written using $t+u = -s$ as $-4(t^2 - tu + u^2)$. It is useful to recall that for the di-gamma function $\psi_0(z) = \text{PolyGamma}[0, z]$ one has $\psi_0(n + \frac{1}{2}) = -\gamma_E - 2 \log 2 + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{2k-1}$.

¹⁴Note that here the arguments of the integrals $I(n, m)$ and $A_i(n, m)$, $B_i(n, m)$ are shifted by 1 compared to (3.21).

Taking the limit $w \rightarrow 2$ gives for the s -channel and symmetrized in s, t, u amplitudes (cf. (3.22))

$$X_4 = -\frac{1}{960(2\pi)^2} \left(s^2(41s^2 + t^2 + u^2) \left[\frac{1}{w-2} + \log(-s) + \gamma_E - \log(4\pi) \right] - \frac{1}{15} s^2 [1301s^2 - 23(t^2 + u^2)] \right), \quad (3.27)$$

$$X_4^{(\text{sym})} = -\frac{1}{960(2\pi)^2} \left([41(s^4 + t^4 + u^4) + 2(s^2t^2 + s^2u^2 + t^2u^2)] \left[\frac{1}{w-2} + \log(-s) + \gamma_E - \log(4\pi) \right] + t^2(41t^2 + u^2 + s^2) \log \frac{t}{s} + u^2(41u^4 + s^2 + t^2) \log \frac{u}{s} - \frac{1}{15} [1301(s^4 + t^4 + u^4) - 46(s^2t^2 + u^2t^2 + u^2s^2)] \right). \quad (3.28)$$

The expression (3.28) can be simplified using that $s^4 + t^4 + u^4 = 2(s^2t^2 + s^2u^2 + t^2u^2) = \frac{1}{2}(s^2 + t^2 + u^2)^2$ and finally we get (cf. (3.23))

$$A_4 \sim \bar{g}^2 X_4^{(\text{sym})} = -\frac{\bar{g}^2}{960(2\pi)^2} \left[21(s^2 + t^2 + u^2)^2 \left[\frac{1}{w-2} + \log(-s) + \gamma_E - \log(4\pi) - \frac{213}{5} \right] + t^2(41t^2 + u^2 + s^2) \log \frac{t}{s} + u^2(41u^4 + s^2 + t^2) \log \frac{u}{s} \right]. \quad (3.29)$$

The UV divergence here scales as 8-th power of momentum so that to cancel it one needs a new counterterm $\sim (\partial\partial\phi)^4$ to be added to the action (1.3).

The imaginary part of the amplitude (3.29) comes from $\log(-s) \rightarrow \log|s| + i\pi$ and thus has the same structure as the square $(s^2 + t^2 + u^2)^2$ of the tree-level amplitude (3.9). This is in agreement with the generalized optical theorem (see, e.g., [35]): Im part of one-loop amplitude should be found by multiplying two tree-level amplitudes and summing over intermediate on-shell states with the standard phase space measure $\sim \int d^4q \delta(q^2)$. This is of course the same conclusion that one reaches in the standard $\phi\Box\phi + g\phi^4$ theory (cf. (3.24)).

This suggests that the optical theorem directly related to unitarity should fail in the 4-derivative model (1.1) where the imaginary part of (3.23) is proportional to the tree level amplitude (3.9) itself rather than its square (this fact is directly related to its renormalizability). We shall elaborate on this unitarity issue in the next subsection.

3.3 (Non)unitarity

The unitarity of the standard $\phi\Box\phi + g\phi^4$ theory manifests itself in the relation between the imaginary part of the corresponding one-loop amplitude (3.24) coming from¹⁵

$$\log(-s) \rightarrow \log|s| + i\pi, \quad (3.30)$$

and the square of the (constant) tree-level amplitude, i.e. in the generalized optical theorem.

The same applies also to the $\phi\Box\phi + \bar{g}(\partial\phi)^4$ theory (1.3). While the s^2 growth of the corresponding tree level amplitude (3.9) is indicating a conflict with unitarity at large energies, this theory is unitary in perturbation theory at small enough energies $s < M^2$ [30, 31]. An indication of this is that the imaginary

¹⁵After continuation to Minkowski $(-+++)$ signature $s = -(p_1 + p_2)^2$ is the c.o.m. energy that should be positive.

part of the one-loop scattering amplitude (3.29) is proportional to the square of the tree-level amplitude (3.9) (see also below).

At the same time, the imaginary part of the one-loop scattering amplitude (3.23) in the scale-invariant $\phi\Box^2\phi + g(\partial\phi)^4$ theory with dimensionless coupling is proportional to the first power of the tree-level amplitude (3.9) suggesting violation of the generalized optical theorem.

Let us recall the general argument relating the unitarity of the S-matrix to the generalized optical theorem [35] (see also [36]). Given $S = 1 + iT$, taking the matrix element of the unitarity relation $-i(T - T^\dagger) = T^\dagger T$ between the two 2-particle states of massless particles $\langle 1, 2|T|3, 4 \rangle = A_4(p_1, \dots, p_4) \delta^{(4)}(\sum_i p_i)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} & -i[A_4(p_1, p_2 \rightarrow p_3, p_4) - A_4^*(p_3, p_4 \rightarrow p_1, p_2)] \\ &= \sum_n \prod_{i=1}^n \int \frac{d^4 q_i}{(2\pi)^4} \delta(q_i^2) A_4(p_1, p_2 \rightarrow q_1, \dots, q_n) A_4^*(p_3, p_4 \rightarrow q_1, \dots, q_n) (2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}(p_1 + p_2 - \sum_{i=1}^n q_i). \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

In the present case of the one-loop diagram in Fig.1 with $n = 2$ internal propagators the r.h.s. of (3.31) should come from “cutting” the propagators in $\int d^4 q \frac{1}{q^2(q+p)^2} = \int d^4 q_1 \int d^4 q_2 \frac{1}{q_1^2 q_2^2} \delta^{(4)}(p - q_1 - q_2)$ using

$$2 \operatorname{Im} \frac{1}{q^2 - i\epsilon} = \frac{2i\epsilon}{(q^2 + \epsilon^2)^2} \rightarrow 2\pi i \delta(q^2). \quad (3.32)$$

In the standard ϕ^4 theory the tree-level amplitude is just a momentum-independent constant and one can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \operatorname{Im} A_4^{(one-loop)}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) &= \int d\Pi(q_1) \int d\Pi(q_2) \\ &\times A_4^{(tree)}(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) A_4^{(tree)}(q_1, q_2, p_3, p_4) (2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}(p_1 + p_2 - q_1 - q_2), \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

where $\int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} 2\pi \delta(q^2) \theta(q^0) \equiv \int d\Pi(q) = \int \frac{d^3 \vec{q}}{(2\pi)^3 2|\vec{q}|}$. Indeed, from¹⁶ $\int \frac{d^4 q}{q^2(q+p)^2} \rightarrow \int d^4 q \delta(q^2) \delta((q+p)^2)$ using the c.o.m. frame where $p = p_1 + p_2 = (p^0, 0, 0, 0) = \sqrt{s}$ we get for the imaginary part¹⁷

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^4 q \frac{1}{(q^2 - i\epsilon)((q+p)^2 - i\epsilon)} &\rightarrow \int d^4 q \delta(q^2) \delta((q+p)^2) \\ &\rightarrow 4\pi \int dq^0 \int d|\vec{q}| |\vec{q}|^2 \frac{\delta(q^0 - |\vec{q}|)}{2|\vec{q}|} \delta((p^0)^2 - 2p^0 q^0) \rightarrow \pi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

and this should match the constant Im part of (3.24).

The same argument applies in the case of the $\phi\Box\phi + \bar{g}(\partial\phi)^4$ theory: rotating the one-loop amplitude (3.25) to the Minkowski signature with $i\epsilon$ prescription for the propagators and using the cutting rule

¹⁶Note that in continuing from the Euclidean to Minkowski signature we get an extra i factor from $\int dq^0 \rightarrow i \int dq^0$. In general, one has $\frac{1}{q^2 - i\epsilon} = \text{P} \frac{1}{q^2} + i\pi \delta(q^2)$ so that the imaginary part of the one-loop diagram comes from both $-\pi^2 \delta(q^2) \delta((q+p)^2)$ and the principal value product $\text{P} \frac{1}{q^2} \text{P} \frac{1}{(q+p)^2}$ but they give similar contributions. We thank R. Roiban for a clarifying discussion of this point.

¹⁷The positivity of q^0 follows here from positivity of p^0 .

(3.32) we get in the c.o.m. frame

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d^4q \delta(q^2) \delta((q+p)^2) K(p_1, p_2, q) K(p_3, p_4, q) \\ & \rightarrow \frac{1}{4} \int dq^0 \int d^3\vec{q} \delta(q^0 - |\vec{q}|) \delta(q^0 - \frac{1}{2}p^0) K(p_1, p_2, q) K(p_3, p_4, q) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

In the c.o.m. frame with $p_1 = (\frac{1}{2}p^0, \vec{p}_1)$, $p_2 = (\frac{1}{2}p^0, -\vec{p}_1)$, $p_3 = (\frac{1}{2}p^0, \vec{p}_1)$, $p_4 = (\frac{1}{2}p^0, -\vec{p}_1)$ corresponding to forward scattering ($t = 0$, $s = -u$) this reduces to the imaginary part of the one-loop amplitude in (3.27)¹⁸ as found according to (3.30). On the other hand, eq.(3.35) has the form of the phase space integral (3.33) of the product of the corresponding tree-level amplitudes (3.9).

In the $\phi \square^2 \phi + g(\partial\phi)^4$ theory the unitarity of the massless S-matrix may not be expected a priori as we consider only massless ($\square\phi = 0$) states on the external lines but have $1/q^4$ instead of $1/q^2$ internal propagators (implying that effectively there are more virtual “states” than just massless ones). The argument leading to the generalized optical theorem (3.33) uses the insertion of a complete set of states ($1 = \sum | \dots \rangle \langle \dots |$) between the T -matrix and its conjugate. This would effectively mean summing also over the “growing” modes (or ψ -states in (3.1)) but the corresponding tree-level amplitudes are not well defined.

To see the problem with checking the optical theorem more explicitly we need to define the Minkowski-space analog of the $\square^{-2} \sim \log x^2$ or its formal Fourier image $1/q^4$. A natural starting point is the 2-derivative formulation (3.1): if we formally replace there $\square \rightarrow \square + i\epsilon$ (or $q^2 \rightarrow q^2 - i\epsilon$) that will be equivalent, upon integrating out the auxiliary field ψ , to the following prescription for the internal propagators

$$\frac{1}{q^4} \rightarrow \frac{1}{(q^2 - i\epsilon)^2} . \quad (3.36)$$

This prescription turns out to be consistent with the one used in a similar 4-derivative vector model in [3]. The suggestion there was that the Fourier image of $\square^{-2} \sim \log(-\mu^2 x^2 + i\epsilon)$ should be defined as¹⁹

$$\square^{-2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{(q^2 - a^2 - i\epsilon)^2} + i\pi \log \frac{a^2}{\mu^2} \delta^{(4)}(q) , \quad a \rightarrow 0 . \quad (3.37)$$

In the present theory (1.1) with only derivative-dependent interactions the contact $\delta^{(4)}(q)$ term in (3.37) drops out of the Feynman diagrams and thus we end up with the same prescription as in (3.36). From (3.36) we then find the following analog of the standard cut discontinuity relation (3.32)

$$\frac{1}{(q^2 - i\epsilon)^2} - \frac{1}{(q^2 + i\epsilon)^2} = \frac{4i\epsilon q^2}{[(q^2)^2 + \epsilon^2]^2} \rightarrow -2\pi i \delta'(q^2) , \quad \delta'(q^2) \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial q^2} \delta(q^2) , \quad (3.38)$$

where we used that $\delta(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\epsilon}{x^2 + \epsilon^2} \Big|_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0}$, $\delta'(x) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \frac{2\epsilon x}{(x^2 + \epsilon^2)^2} \Big|_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0}$. Note that (3.38) is the same as the q^2 derivative of (3.32). Using (3.38) in the general expression for one-loop amplitude (3.12) we will get (in

¹⁸Integrating $[K(p_1, p_2, q)]^2$ where $K(p_1, p_2, q) = 2p_1 \cdot q p_2 \cdot q - \frac{1}{2}p^2(p+q)^2 - \frac{1}{2}p^4$ (cf. (3.18)) over \vec{q} one is to use that $\int d^3\vec{q} q_i q_j (\dots) = \frac{1}{3} \int d^3q |\vec{q}|^2 \delta_{ij} (\dots)$ and similar relation for $\int d^3\vec{q} q_i q_j q_k q_l (\dots)$.

¹⁹The parameter a here is needed [3] to define the relevant distribution. This prescription was claimed in [3] to be consistent with causality and Wick rotation.

the case of forward scattering)

$$\mathcal{V}_{ij}(p)\mathcal{V}_{kr}(-p) \int d^4q d^4q' \delta^{(4)}(q+p-q') q_j q_r \frac{\partial}{\partial q^2} \delta(q^2) q'_i q'_k \frac{\partial}{\partial q'^2} \delta(q'^2) . \quad (3.39)$$

Having the derivatives of delta-functions instead of delta-functions as in (3.31),(3.32) precludes one from going through the same steps as in the standard proof of the optical theorem.²⁰

4 Concluding remarks

The four-derivative model (1.1) considered in this paper has no mass parameters and thus is distinguished by its classical scale invariance. It is different from the Pais-Uhlenbeck type [41, 14] models $L = \phi(\square - m_1^2)(\square - m_2^2)\phi + \dots$ that can be diagonalized into a system of a physical and ghost-like massive fields with the latter carrying negative energy; once interactions are included, here the production of ghosts is expected, in general, to lead to a violation of unitarity.

Writing the quadratic part of (1.1) in the 2-derivative form (3.1) demonstrates that the corresponding non-diagonalizable system has a non-positive Hamiltonian density ($H = 2p_\psi p_\phi + \psi^2 + \dots$). Whether that leads to a problem may depend on a type of interactions considered [14]. That brings in, in particular, the question about the sign of the coupling g in (1.1). The Euclidean path integral is well defined for $g > 0$ (when the action is non-negative); its direct continuation to Minkowski signature assuming²¹ $t_E = -ix^0$ gives $e^{-S_E} = e^{iS_M}$ where $S_M = \int d^4x L$, $L = [(\partial_0^2 - \partial_i^2)\phi]^2 + g[(\partial_0\phi)^2 - (\partial_i\phi)^2]^2$. Thus in contrast to the familiar cases of 2-derivative theories here the signs of both the kinetic and the interaction terms are not reversed (i.e. the Minkowski-space Lagrangian is also positive if $g > 0$).

The assumption of $g > 0$ leads, however, to the presence of unstable classical solutions. Indeed, let us consider for simplicity just spatially constant backgrounds $\phi = \phi(x^0)$ for which $L = \ddot{\phi}^2 + g\dot{\phi}^4 = \dot{v}^2 + gv^4$, $v = \dot{\phi} \equiv \partial_0\phi$. For $g > 0$ this describes an inverted anharmonic oscillator with solutions blowing up in finite time. To avoid this singular behaviour one is thus to choose $g < 0$. Interestingly, the resulting quantum 4d theory is asymptotically free for $g < 0$ (cf. (2.6)) and is thus well defined at short distances.²²

Our main focus in this paper was on demonstrating that given that the scattering amplitudes are well defined for the massless oscillating modes only, the generalized optical theorem and thus the perturbative unitarity that it follows from is violated in the theory (1.1) at the one-loop level (regardless the sign of g). One may wonder if the unitarity issue may somehow be resolved beyond the perturbation theory or by adding extra interactions that may modify the $\frac{1}{q^4}$ propagator at quantum loop level (cf. [28]).

One may also explore a possibility that the S-matrix for the dimension 0 scalar field is not the right observable in this model. For example, one may conjecture that these dimension 0 particles are always

²⁰In particular, it is not clear which particular modification of the standard phase space measure these $\frac{\partial}{\partial q^2}\delta(q^2)$ factors may be effectively equivalent to.

²¹We use $t_E = -it_0$ instead of the conventional $t_E = +it_0$ to preserve the positive sign of the “kinetic” term in S_M .

²²Note that the question about the sign of g is not relevant in perturbation theory. Also, the above discussion does not apply to the perturbatively unitary effective theory (1.3) where $\bar{g} > 0$ is implied by the causality condition as discussed in the Introduction.

“confined”, i.e. do not appear as asymptotic states but may still participate in interactions with other fields (like gravity) through virtual loops.

One may also attempt to interpret the \square^2 theory as a limit of a ghost-free non-local theory (cf. [37, 38]). For example, starting with $L = \phi \square \frac{e^{\epsilon \square} - 1}{\epsilon} \phi + g(\partial\phi)^4$ where ϵ has dimension of $(\text{length})^2$ one may consider the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank R. Roiban for useful comments and suggestions. We also acknowledge discussions with S. Kuzenko, R. Metsaev, K. Mkrtchyan, A. Smilga and A. Tokareva. We are also grateful to R. Percacci for pointing out a mistake in eq.(3.20) in the original version and to J. Donoghue for raising a number of important issues. This work was supported by the STFC grant ST/T000791/1.

A Basic one-loop integrals

To reduce (3.17) to basic integrals in dimensional regularization (see, e.g., [39]) we may use the standard relations

$$A^{-n}B^{-m} = \frac{\Gamma(m+n)}{\Gamma(m)\Gamma(n)} \int_0^1 dx x^{n-1}(1-x)^{m-1} [xA + (1-x)B]^{-n-m}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\int \frac{d^{2w}q}{(2\pi)^{2w}} (q^2 + 2P \cdot q + M^2)^{-\alpha} = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha-w)}{(4\pi)^w \Gamma(\alpha)} (M^2 - P^2)^{-\alpha+w}, \quad d = 2w, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and $\int_0^1 dx x^{a-1}(1-x)^b = \frac{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}$. In our case: $A = (q+p)^2$, $B = q^2$, $\alpha = n+m$, $(1-x)B + xA = q^2 + 2xp \cdot q + xp^2$, $P = xp$, $M^2 = xp^2$ so we get

$$I(n, m) \equiv \int \frac{d^{2w}q}{(2\pi)^{2w}} \frac{1}{((q+p)^2)^n (q^2)^m} = \frac{(p^2)^{w-n-m}}{(4\pi)^w} \frac{\Gamma(w-n)\Gamma(w-m)\Gamma(n+m-w)}{\Gamma(n)\Gamma(m)\Gamma(2w-n-m)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We need also the following generalizations of (A.3) (cf. [40] for $n = m = 1$)¹

$$I_{ij}(n, m) = \int \frac{d^{2w}q}{(2\pi)^{2w}} \frac{q_i q_j}{((q+p)^2)^n (q^2)^m} = \left[A_1(n, m) p_i p_j + \frac{1}{2} A_2(n, m) p^2 \delta_{ij} \right] I(n, m), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$A_1(n, m) = \frac{(w-m+1)(w-m)}{(2w-m-n+1)(2w-m-n)}, \quad A_2(n, m) = \frac{(w-m)(w-n)}{(2w-m-n+1)(2w-m-n)(m+n-w-1)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} I_{ijkl}(n, m) &= \int \frac{d^{2w}q}{(2\pi)^{2w}} \frac{q_i q_j q_k q_l}{((q+p)^2)^n (q^2)^m} = \left[B_1(n, m) p_i p_j p_k p_l \right. \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} B_2(n, m) p^2 (\delta_{ij} p_k p_l + \delta_{ik} p_j p_l + \delta_{il} p_k p_j + \delta_{jk} p_i p_l + \delta_{jl} p_k p_i + \delta_{kl} p_i p_j) \\ &\left. + \frac{1}{4} B_3(n, m) p^4 (\delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{il} \delta_{kj}) \right] I(n, m), \quad (\text{A.5}) \end{aligned}$$

$$B_1(n, m) = \frac{(w-m+3)(w-m+2)(w-m+1)(w-m)}{(2w-m-n+3)(2w-m-n+2)(2w-m-n+1)(2w-m-n)},$$

$$B_2(n, m) = \frac{(w-m+2)(w-m+1)(w-m)(w-n)}{(2w-m-n+3)(2w-m-n+2)(2w-m-n+1)(2w-m-n)(n+m-w-1)}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$B_3(n, m) = \frac{(w-n+1)(w-n)(w-m+1)(w-m)}{(2w-m-n+3)(2w-m-n+2)(2w-m-n+1)(2w-m-n)(n+m-w-1)(n+m-w-2)}.$$

¹These follow, e.g., by integrating over the Feynman parameter the expression for $\int \frac{d^{2w}q}{(2\pi)^{2w}} (q^2 + 2P \cdot q + M^2)^{-\alpha} q_i \dots q_k$.

References

- [1] N. Nakanishi, “Remarks on the dipole-ghost scattering states,” *Phys. Rev. D* **3** (1971), 1343-1346.
A. Gavielides, T. K. Kuo and S. Y. Lee, “On the Ghost Problem of Quantum Field Theories with Higher Derivatives,” *Phys. Rev. D* **13** (1976), 2912.
K. S. Stelle, “Classical Gravity with Higher Derivatives,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **9** (1978), 353-371.
H. Narnhofer and W. E. Thirring, “The Taming of the Dipole Ghost,” *Phys. Lett. B* **76** (1978), 428.
B. G. Englert, J. Karkowski and J. M. Rayski, “Conditions on classical sources for a quantum scalar field with higher order derivatives”, *Phys. Lett. B* **83** (1979), 399-402.
D. Zwanziger, “The Lesson of a Soluble Model of Quantum Electrodynamics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **17** (1978), 457.
A. Z. Capri, G. Grubl and R. Kobes, “Fock space construction of the massless dipole field”, *Annals Phys.* **147** (1983), 140.
W. Heidenreich, “Group theory of the dipole ghost” *J. Math. Phys.* **25** (1984), 376-379.
M. Flato and C. Fronsdal, “How the BRST Invariance of QED Is Induced From the Underlying Singleton Field Theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **189** (1987), 145-148.
V. O. Rivelles, “Triviality of higher derivative theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **577** (2003), 137-142 [hep-th/0304073].
- [2] B. T. Binengar, “On the state space of the dipole ghost,” *Lett. Math. Phys.* **8** (1984), 149
- [3] E. D’Emilio and M. Mintchev, “A gauge model with confinement in four dimensions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **89** (1980), 207-210. “A Nonperturbative Approach to the Infrared Behavior in Physical Charged Sectors of Gauge Theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **27** (1983), 1840
- [4] M. Eastwood and T. Leistner, “Higher symmetries of the square of the Laplacian,” *IMA Vol. Math. Appl.* 144 (Springer, New York, 2008) 319. [arXiv:0610610 [math.DG]]
E. Joung and K. Mkrtchyan, “Partially-massless higher-spin algebras and their finite-dimensional truncations,” *JHEP* **01** (2016), 003 [arXiv:1508.07332].
- [5] C. Brust and K. Hinterbichler, “Free \square^k scalar conformal field theory,” *JHEP* **02** (2017), 066 [arXiv:1607.07439].
X. Bekaert and M. Grigoriev, “Higher order singletons, partially massless fields and their boundary values in the ambient approach,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **876** (2013), 667-714 [arXiv:1305.0162].
- [6] T. Adamo, S. Nakach and A. A. Tseytlin, “Scattering of conformal higher spin fields,” *JHEP* **07** (2018), 016 [arXiv:1805.00394].
S. Nakach, “Conformal Higher Spins and Scattering Amplitudes,” PhD thesis, doi:10.25560/66029
- [7] G. W. Gibbons, C. N. Pope and S. Solodukhin, “Higher Derivative Scalar Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) no.10, 105008 [arXiv:1907.03791].
- [8] M. Romoli and O. Zanusso, “Different kind of four-dimensional brane for string theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) no.12, 126009 [arXiv:2110.05584].
- [9] L. Boyle and N. Turok, “Cancelling the vacuum energy and Weyl anomaly in the standard model with dimension-zero scalar fields,” [arXiv:2110.06258].
- [10] M. Safari, A. Stergiou, G. P. Vacca and O. Zanusso, “Scale and conformal invariance in higher derivative shift symmetric theories,” *JHEP* **02** (2022), 034 [arXiv:2112.01084].
- [11] A. Stergiou, G. P. Vacca and O. Zanusso, “Weyl covariance and the energy momentum tensors of higher-derivative free conformal field theories,” *JHEP* **06** (2022), 104 [arXiv:2202.04701].
H. Osborn and A. Stergiou, “ C_T for non-unitary CFTs in higher dimensions,” *JHEP* **06** (2016), 079 [arXiv:1603.07307].
- [12] A. Chalabi, C. P. Herzog, K. Ray, B. Robinson, J. Sisti and A. Stergiou, “Boundaries in Free Higher Derivative Conformal Field Theories,” [arXiv:2211.14335].

- [13] D. Buccio and R. Percacci, “Renormalization group flows between Gaussian fixed points,” JHEP **10** (2022), 113 [arXiv:2207.10596].
- [14] A. Smilga, “Classical and quantum dynamics of higher-derivative systems,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **32** (2017) no.33, 1730025 [arXiv:1710.11538].
T. Damour and A. Smilga, “Dynamical systems with benign ghosts,” Phys. Rev. D **105** (2022) no.4, 045018 [arXiv:2110.11175].
- [15] F. David and E. Guitter, “Crumpling Transition in Elastic Membranes: Renormalization Group Treatment,” EPL **5** (1988), 709.
J. A. Aronovitz and T. C. Lubensky, “Fluctuations of Solid Membranes,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **60** (1988), 2634-2637.
- [16] M. J. Bowick and A. Travesset, “The Statistical mechanics of membranes,” Phys. Rept. **344** (2001), 255-308 [arXiv:cond-mat/0002038].
- [17] O. Coquand, D. Mouhanna and S. Teber, “Flat phase of polymerized membranes at two-loop order,” Phys. Rev. E **101** (2020) no.6, 062104 [arXiv:2003.13973].
S. Metayer, D. Mouhanna and S. Teber, “Flat polymerized membranes at three-loop order,” [arXiv:2210.04309].
- [18] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo and B. de Wit, “Extended Conformal Supergravity,” Nucl. Phys. B **182** (1981), 173-204
- [19] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, “One Loop Beta Function in Conformal Supergravities,” Nucl. Phys. B **203** (1982), 157-178
- [20] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, “Conformal supergravity,” Phys. Rept. **119** (1985), 233-362
- [21] S. M. Kuzenko, “Non-compact duality, super-Weyl invariance and effective actions,” JHEP **07** (2020), 222. [arXiv:2006.00966].
I. L. Buchbinder and S. M. Kuzenko, “Nonlocal Action for Supertrace Anomalies in Superspace of $N = 1$ Supergravity,” Phys. Lett. B **202** (1988), 233-237.
D. Butter, B. de Wit, S. M. Kuzenko and I. Lodato, “New higher-derivative invariants in $N=2$ supergravity and the Gauss-Bonnet term,” JHEP **12** (2013), 062 [arXiv:1307.6546].
- [22] N. Berkovits and E. Witten, “Conformal supergravity in twistor-string theory,” JHEP **08** (2004), 009 [arXiv:hep-th/0406051].
- [23] M. Beccaria, S. Nakach and A. A. Tseytlin, “On triviality of S-matrix in conformal higher spin theory,” JHEP **09** (2016), 034 [arXiv:1607.06379].
- [24] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, “Conformal Anomaly in Weyl Theory and Anomaly Free Superconformal Theories,” Phys. Lett. B **134** (1984), 187.
R. J. Riegert, “A Nonlocal Action for the Trace Anomaly,” Phys. Lett. B **134** (1984), 56-60
- [25] Z. Komargodski and A. Schwimmer, “On Renormalization Group Flows in Four Dimensions,” JHEP **12** (2011), 099 [arXiv:1107.3987].
- [26] H. Osborn, “Local couplings and $Sl(2, R)$ invariance for gauge theories at one loop,” Phys. Lett. B **561** (2003), 174-182 [arXiv:hep-th/0302119].
- [27] I. L. Buchbinder, N. G. Pletnev and A. A. Tseytlin, ““Induced” $N=4$ conformal supergravity,” Phys. Lett. B **717** (2012), 274-279 [arXiv:1209.0416].
- [28] T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, “Finite Theory of Quantum Electrodynamics,” Phys. Rev. D **2** (1970), 1033-1048.
E. Tomboulis, “Renormalizability and Asymptotic Freedom in Quantum Gravity,” Phys. Lett. B **97** (1980), 77-80.
S. W. Hawking and T. Hertog, “Living with ghosts,” Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002), 103515 [arXiv:hep-th/0107088].

- B. Grinstein, D. O’Connell and M. B. Wise, “The Lee-Wick standard model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008), 025012 [arXiv:0704.1845].
- P. D. Mannheim, “Solution to the ghost problem in fourth order derivative theories,” *Found. Phys.* **37** (2007), 532-571 [arXiv:hep-th/0608154].
- A. Salvio and A. Strumia, “Quantum mechanics of 4-derivative theories,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) no.4, 227 [arXiv:1512.01237].
- M. Raidal and H. Veermäe, “On the Quantisation of Complex Higher Derivative Theories and Avoiding the Ostrogradsky Ghost,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **916** (2017), 607-626 [arXiv:1611.03498].
- D. Anselmi and M. Piva, “A new formulation of Lee-Wick quantum field theory,” *JHEP* **06** (2017), 066 [arXiv:1703.04584]. “Perturbative unitarity of Lee-Wick quantum field theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) no.4, 045009 [arXiv:1703.05563].
- A. Strumia, “Interpretation of quantum mechanics with indefinite norm,” *MDPI Physics* **1** (2019) no.1, 17-32 [arXiv:1709.04925].
- A. Salvio, “Quadratic Gravity,” *Front. in Phys.* **6** (2018), 77 [arXiv:1804.09944].
- J. F. Donoghue and G. Menezes, “Unitarity, stability and loops of unstable ghosts,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) no.10, 105006 [arXiv:1908.02416].
- [29] S. Dubovsky, R. Flauger and V. Gorbenko, “Solving the Simplest Theory of Quantum Gravity,” *JHEP* **09** (2012), 133 [arXiv:1205.6805]. “Effective String Theory Revisited,” *JHEP* **09** (2012), 044 [arXiv:1203.1054].
- [30] S. Weinberg, “The Quantum theory of fields. Vol. 1: Foundations,” Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [31] A. Adams, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dubovsky, A. Nicolis and R. Rattazzi, “Causality, analyticity and an IR obstruction to UV completion,” *JHEP* **10** (2006), 014 [arXiv:hep-th/0602178].
- [32] D. G. Boulware and L. S. Brown, “Tree Graphs and Classical Fields,” *Phys. Rev.* **172** (1968), 1628-1631.
I. Y. Arefeva, L. D. Faddeev and A. A. Slavnov, “Generating Functional for the S- Matrix in Gauge Theories,” *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **21** (1974), 311-321.
- [33] M. Carrillo Gonzalez, C. de Rham, V. Pozsgay and A. J. Tolley, “Causal effective field theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) no.10, 105018 [arXiv:2207.03491].
- [34] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, “Renormalizable asymptotically free quantum theory of gravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **201** (1982), 469-49. “Higher-derivative quantum gravity: one-loop counterterms and asymptotic freedom,” Lebedev Inst. preprint 70 (1981).
“<https://cds.cern.ch/record/128959/files/CM-P00067563.pdf>”
- [35] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, “An Introduction to quantum field theory,” Addison-Wesley, 1995.
M. D. Schwartz, “Quantum Field Theory and the Standard Model,” Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [36] L. Buoninfante, “Contour prescriptions in string-inspired nonlocal field theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) no.12, 126028 [arXiv:2205.15348].
- [37] L. Buoninfante, “Ghost and singularity free theories of gravity,” [arXiv:1610.08744].
- [38] A. S. Koshelev and A. Tokareva, “Unitarity of Minkowski nonlocal theories made explicit,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) no.2, 025016 [arXiv:2103.01945].
- [39] V. A. Smirnov, “Feynman integral calculus,” Springer, 2006.
- [40] G. Leibbrandt, “Introduction to the Technique of Dimensional Regularization,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **47** (1975), 849
- [41] A. Pais and G. E. Uhlenbeck, “On Field theories with nonlocalized action,” *Phys. Rev.* **79** (1950), 145-165