

Anomaly non-renormalization, lattice QFT and universality of transport coefficients

Vieri Mastropietro

University of Milan, Department of Mathematics, via C. Saldini 50, 20129, Milan, Italy

Recently new methods have been introduced to investigate the non-renormalization properties of the anomalies at a non perturbative level and in presence of a lattice. The issue is relevant in a number of problems ranging from the anomaly-free construction of chiral lattice gauge theory with large cut-off to the universality properties observed in transport coefficients in condensed matter systems. A review of main results and future perspectives is presented.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Anomalies and their non-renormalization

Anomalies are the violation of classical symmetries due to quantum effects. A paradigmatic example happens in QED_4 : the chiral current associated to massless Dirac particles j_μ^5 , conserved at a classical level, verifies [1], [2]

$$\partial_\mu j_\mu^5 = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi} \varepsilon_{\mu,\nu,\rho,\sigma} F_{\mu,\nu} F_{\rho,\sigma} \quad (1)$$

where the equation has to be understood as an order by order identity in the perturbation series for correlations. A similar statement was established [3] in $d = 2$

$$\partial_\mu j_\mu^5 = \frac{e}{\pi} \varepsilon_{\mu,\nu} \partial_\mu A_\nu \quad (2)$$

A crucial anomaly property is its non-renormalization, that is the fact that it is an universal quantity independent on the interaction. The non-renormalization has the effect that the anomaly can be exactly computed; this is in sharp contrast with other physical quantities in QFT which are expressed by series expansions and can be only computed by truncation at some order. The validity of the non-renormalization property follows from delicate cancellations between graphs based on Lorentz and chiral symmetries [2]. It also requires regularizations, like the dimensional one, suitable only in a purely perturbative context.

There are derivations of the non-renormalization avoiding perturbative expansions, like the one in [4], but they essentially neglect higher orders, see [5], [6]. More rigorous derivations have been given [7] under the assumption that the gauge fields are classical smooth fields. Topological explanations hold only with classical fields [8].

B. Anomaly cancellation and universality of transport

The anomaly non-renormalization is relevant in a number of problems ranging from the construction of chiral

lattice gauge theory to the universality properties observed in transport coefficients.

One of the main features of the Standard Model of elementary particles is its renormalizability [9], [10], that is the fact that infinities can be canceled by a choice of the bare parameters appearing in the action and that the resulting perturbative expansion is order by order finite. Such basic property, absent in early theories of weak forces like the Fermi theory, is obtained, despite the bad power counting behaviour of massive gauge propagators, thanks to the Higgs mechanism. The Higgs, however, is still not sufficient to get renormalizability in the case of a chiral gauge theory due to the presence of anomalies. The massive boson propagator is

$$\frac{1}{k^2 + M^2} (\delta_{\mu\nu} + \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{M^2}) \quad (3)$$

and the second term, which is not decaying, produces a non-renormalizable degree of divergence in $d = 4$; the fermion-boson interaction have non-vanishing scaling dimension. In a non chiral gauge theory with non-vanishing gauge boson mass, Ward Identities associated to the current conservation $k_\mu \hat{j}_\mu = 0$, \hat{j}_μ the current in momentum space, ensures that the non decaying part of the propagator does not contribute to physical observables. The effective scaling dimension is the same with or without a boson mass, in particular the dimension of the fermion-boson interaction is 0. There is a reduction of the degree of divergence and, for instance, the transition in QED_4 from a massless or a massive photon is soft; renormalizability is preserved.

This argument cannot be applied if the gauge field is coupled to a chiral current, as in electroweak theory, so that the theory remains non-renormalizable, unless the anomalies cancel out. Remarkably it was shown in [11] that the lowest order contributions to the anomaly vanish if the following condition is verified

$$\sum_i Y_i^L - \sum_i Y_i^R = 0 \quad \sum_i (Y_i^L)^3 - \sum_i (Y_i^R)^3 = 0 \quad (4)$$

where $i = \nu, e, u, d$ runs over a single family, the quarks have three colors and Y_i^L, Y_i^R are the hypercharges of the L and R particles. The charges, that at a classical level can take any value, are constrained by a purely quantum effect, a fact providing a partial explanation to charge quantization without reference to grand unification.

The condition (4) is found from the lowest order computation of the anomaly, but higher orders could require extra conditions to vanish, impossible to satisfy; however the non-renormalization property ensures that such higher order contributions are vanishing, hence renormalizability is preserved. It should be stressed however that this is a purely perturbative statement as the series are expected to be divergent and even not asymptotic, at least if one considers the electroweak sector alone, due to trivality of the scalar sector, see eg [12] .

The anomaly non-renormalization manifests itself also in a physical context apparently far from high energy physics, that is the universality phenomena observed in Condensed Matter. While macroscopic properties of materials depend in general on all the microscopic details, there is a class of systems where some transport properties are universal, in particular they do not depend on the interaction between conduction electrons. A well known example is the transverse, or Hall, conductivity of two-dimensional insulating systems exposed to magnetic fields, which is equal to $\frac{ne^2}{h}$, where e is the electric charge, h is the Planck constant and n is an integer. Another example is the optical conductivity in Graphene which is experimentally found equal to [13]

$$\sigma = \frac{e^2 \pi}{h 2} \quad (5)$$

In certain cases, as in Hall systems, universality has a topological origin but in the case of Graphene, for instance, such interpretation is not possible. The universality properties in transport coefficients have been related to the non renormalization of anomalies, see e.g. [14]. Electrons in metals are non relativistic fermions, described by the Schroedinger and not by the Dirac equation; nevertheless the interaction with the lattice can produce an emerging effective description in terms of an Euclidean QFT models, in particular when the Fermi surface is point-like. This happens in Hall systems or Graphene, where there is an emerging description in terms of massive or massless QED₃ [15],[16], in Weyl semimetals described by massless QED₄ [17] and in one dimensional metals described by QED₂ [18]. Due to this fact, for instance, the universality of Hall conductivity was connected to a non-renormalization properties of the emerging QED₃ description, see e.g. [19],[20]. Note however that such explanations are based on cancellations in series expansions due to exact continuum and relativistic symmetries, which are violated by lattice effects and produce finite contributions unless extra cancellations occur. They are therefore not sufficient to fully explain universality of transport, which is observed with very high precision.

C. Effective lattice QFT and Condensed Matter

The Standard Model, at least if one considers the electroweak sector only, has presumably a non-perturbative

meaning only as an effective (Euclidean) QFT theory, as it contains the Higgs particle which is affected by the trivality problem, see e.g. [21],[22]. Therefore, it must be defined with a finite cut-off, and it is expected to be replaced by a more fundamental theory at very high energies. To be the effective QFT applicable to nature, one needs that:

1. the effect of the ultraviolet cut-off is negligible at the energy scales of the experiments;
2. gauge invariance and Ward Identities are valid with finite cut-off;
3. the fermionic masses are vanishing or very small with respect to the coupling in the same units.

The second requirement is not fulfilled by the momentum regularization typically used in Renormalization Group (RG) analysis, like the ones in [23]-[25], based on tree expansion [26], and in [27]-[29], using flow equations [30]. Ward Identities in these analysis are recovered only when cut-offs are removed, hence they are suitable only in a perturbative context and not in an effective non perturbative one. Non-perturbative constructions of QED [31] removing the momentum cut-off assumed that fermion masses are much greater than charges, so violating the third requirement.

The use of a lattice cut-off has the merit of preserving vector Ward Identities and is the more appropriate for the construction of an effective QFT. A non-perturbative control cannot however be achieved for any value of the lattice step (otherwise the continuum limit could be taken).

There is indeed an expected relation between the size of the cut-off and the renormalizability properties. In the case of a lattice version of the (non renormalizable) Fermi theory one can achieve a non-perturbative control of the theory (see below) for Ga^2 smaller than 1, if a is the lattice step and G the Fermi constant. Hence the range of validity of a lattice Fermi theory is much smaller than the energy scales of modern experiments. In contrast, an effective theory for the electroweak gauge theory could be defined with much higher cut-offs; being renormalizable with scaling dimension of the boson fermion interaction equal to zero, one expects in principle a nonperturbative control for $g^2 \log(aM)^{-1}$ smaller than 1, if g is the gauge coupling in adimensional units and M is an energy scale (for instance the mass of gauge bosons); that is a cut-off exponentially high in the inverse coupling, fulfilling the first requirement.

However, as discussed above, the renormalizability in electroweak theory is based on the reduction of scaling dimension due to the anomaly cancellation and the non-renormalization. One needs the same properties in a non perturbative context with a finite lattice. There has been an extensive search for a nonperturbative regulator for lattice chiral gauge theories, directly ensuring the validity of chiral Ward Identities under the anomaly cancellation condition, but this is a long standing unsolved problem

[32]-[40] (see e.g. [41]- [43] for reviews), and best results, regarding the $U(1)$ sector, are only valid order by order [37] or with a formal treatment of the thermodynamic limit [38].

In order to get the anomaly cancellation and the reduction of degree of divergence in lattice electroweak theory, necessary to get high cut-off, one needs to establish the cancellations of the anomaly based on the non renormalization also when symmetries are only emerging and in presence of a finite lattice. Remarkably, this is the same kind of problem one encounters for understanding the universality of transport coefficients, where lattice and interaction are surely present, like in the conductivity of graphene [44]-[48] or in Weyl semimetals [49]-[52]. It should be stressed that the cancellation of the anomalies or the universality of transport need to be really exact and not approximate, either for theoretical or experimental consistence. Such problems cannot be faced in a perturbative scheme, due to the lack of convergence and the complexity of the expansion in presence of a lattice, Indeed, even if lattice effects are often irrelevant in the RG sense, they produce finite contributions.

Recently new methods have been introduced allowing finally to prove the non-renormalization and universality of anomalies with a finite lattice and excluding nonperturbative effects, in several situations. This approach is based on rigorous Renormalization Group (RG), allowing to express quantities in terms of series converging in a finite region of the parameters, uniformly in the volume, and to take into full account the irrelevant terms in the RG sense. Non renormalization follows from the subtle interplay of emerging and lattice Ward Identities and non-perturbative decay bounds for the correlations. A review of main results and perspectives is here provided

II. NON-COMPACT MASSIVE $U(1)$ LATTICE GAUGE THEORY WITH WILSON FERMIONS

A. Functional Integral formulation

We start our analysis from a lattice $U(1)$ vector massive Gauge model. In $d = 4$ its generating functional is

$$e^{W(J, J^5, \phi)} = \int P(dA) \int P(d\psi) e^{V_c(\psi) + V_e(A+J, \psi) + B(\psi, J^5, \phi)} \quad (6)$$

where $\Lambda = [0, L]^4 \cap a\mathbb{Z}^4$, $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ $\psi_x, \bar{\psi}_x$ are Grassmann variables with antiperiodic boundary conditions, $\gamma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\gamma_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\sigma_j \\ -i\sigma_j & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\gamma_5 = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{pmatrix}$ and $\sigma_\mu^L = (\sigma_0, i\sigma)$, $\sigma_\mu^R = (\sigma_0, -i\sigma)$. The fermionic integration is

$$P(d\psi) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_\psi} \left[\prod_x d\bar{\psi}_x d\psi_x \right] e^{-S} \quad (7)$$

with e_μ unit vectors and

$$S = \frac{1}{2a} a^4 \sum_x [\bar{\psi}_x \gamma_\mu \psi_{x+e_\mu a} - \bar{\psi}_{x+e_\mu a} \gamma_\mu \psi_x + r(\bar{\psi}_x \psi_{x+e_\mu a} + \bar{\psi}_{x+e_\mu a} \psi_x - \bar{\psi}_x \psi_x)] \quad (8)$$

and

$$V_c(\psi) = \nu a^4 \sum_x \bar{\psi}_x \psi_x \quad (9)$$

is the mass counterterm. The fermionic propagator is therefore given by

$$g(x-y) = \int P(d\psi) \psi_x \bar{\psi}_y = \frac{1}{L^4} \sum_k \frac{e^{ik(x-y)}}{-i \not{k}(k) + M(k)} \quad (10)$$

with

$$\not{k}(k) = a^{-1} \sum_\mu \gamma_\mu \sin ak_\mu \quad M(k) = 2ra^{-1} \sum_\mu \sin^2 k_\mu a \quad (11)$$

and $k = \frac{2\pi}{L}(n + 1/2)$. It is also convenient to write $\psi = (\psi_L^-, \psi_R^-)$ and $\bar{\psi} = (\psi_R^+, \psi_L^+)$ where $s = L, R$ denotes the chirality.

If $A_\mu(x) : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the bosonic integration $P(dA)$ has propagator

$$g_{\mu,\nu}^A(x, y) = \frac{1}{L^4} \sum_k \frac{e^{ik(x-y)}}{|\sigma|^2 + M^2} (\delta_{\mu,\nu} + \frac{\xi \bar{\sigma}_\mu \sigma_\nu}{(1-\xi)|\sigma|^2 + M^2}) \quad (12)$$

with $\sigma_\mu(k) = i(e^{ik_\mu a} - 1)a^{-1}$.

The interaction V_e is, if $G_\mu(A + J) = a^{-1}(e^{iea(A_\mu(x) + J_\mu(x))} - 1)$

$$V_e = \frac{1}{2a} a^4 \sum_x [\bar{\psi}_x \gamma_\mu G_\mu^+ \psi_{x+e_\mu a} - \bar{\psi}_{x+e_\mu a} \gamma_\mu G_\mu^- \psi_x + r(\bar{\psi}_x G_\mu^+ \psi_{x+e_\mu a} + \bar{\psi}_{x+e_\mu a} G_\mu^- \psi_x)] \quad (13)$$

Finally the source term is $B = (\phi, \psi) + \mathcal{Z}_5(J_\mu^5, j_\mu^5)$ with

$$j_{\mu,x}^5 = \mathcal{Z}^5 \sum_s \varepsilon_s \psi_{x,s}^+ \sigma_\mu^s \psi_{x,s}^+ \quad (14)$$

with $\varepsilon_L = -\varepsilon_R = 1$ is the chiral current.

Analogously is defined a lattice massive $U(1)$ gauge theory in $d = 2$; in this case $\psi = (\psi_+, \psi_-)$, $\bar{\psi} = (\psi_+^-, \psi_-^+)$, $\gamma_0 = \sigma_1$, $\gamma_1 = \sigma_2$, $\gamma_5 = \sigma_3$

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)$$

Again $s = \pm$ denotes the chirality of the fermions.

From the generating function one can obtain the correlations; in particular the 2-point function $S(x, y) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \phi_x^+ \partial \phi_y^-} W(J, J^5, \phi)|_0$, the vertex functions

$$\Gamma_\mu(z; x, y) = \frac{\partial^3 W}{\partial J_{\mu,z} \partial \phi_x \partial \bar{\phi}_y} |_0 \quad \Gamma_\mu^5(z, x, y) = \frac{\partial^3 W}{\partial J_{\mu,z}^5 \partial \phi_x \partial \bar{\phi}_y} |_0 \quad (16)$$

and the correlations

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) &= \frac{\partial^n W}{\partial J_{\mu_1, x_1} \dots \partial J_{\mu_N, x_N}} \Big|_0 \\ \Pi_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N}^5(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) &= \frac{\partial^n W}{\partial J_{\mu_1, x_1}^5 \dots \partial J_{\mu_N, x_N}} \Big|_0\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

We denote by $\widehat{S}(k), \widehat{\Gamma}_\mu(p, k), \widehat{\Gamma}_\mu^5(p, k), \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n}(p_1, \dots, p_{n-1})$ and $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n}^5(p_1, \dots, p_{n-1})$ the corresponding Fourier transforms.

The term proportional to r in (8) is the Wilson term, necessary to get avoid extra spurious degrees of freedom, that is extra poles in addition to $k = 0$ in the fermionic propagator. Its presence breaks the chiral invariance of the theory [53], $\psi_{x,s}^\pm \rightarrow e^{\pm i\alpha_s} \psi_{x,s}^\pm$; as a consequence, one has to properly choose the mass counterterm ν to get an interacting massless theory, that is such that $\widehat{S}(k)$ is diverging for $k = 0$ in the $L \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Similarly the breaking of chiral Ward Identities (see next subsection) requires that the renormalization \mathcal{Z}_5 is chosen via the request that the charge carried by the current and the axial current is the same, see [5], in the $L \rightarrow \infty$ limit

$$\lim_{k, p \rightarrow 0} \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}_\mu(p, k)}{\widehat{\Gamma}_\mu^5(p, k)} = \gamma_5 \quad (18)$$

Finally ξ is the gauge fixing parameter and M is the boson mass. The lattice formulation of the vector model (6) is non-compact, as the boson field is unbounded, but is still well defined at a non perturbative level, even if in the $L \rightarrow \infty$ limit, as shown below.

B. Ward Identities

Ward Identities (WI) associated to the total current are valid with a lattice regularization. As the functional integral is well defined, we can perform safely the change of variables, with Jacobian 1, $\psi_x \rightarrow \psi_x e^{ie\alpha_x}$ obtaining

$$W(J, J^5, \phi) = W(J + d\alpha, J^5, e^{ie\alpha}\phi)$$

and by differentiating with respect to the α_x and the external fields

$$\begin{aligned}-i \sum_\mu \sigma_\mu(p) \widehat{\Gamma}_\mu(k, p) &= e(\widehat{S}(k) - \widehat{S}(k + p)) \\ \sum_{\mu_1} \sigma_{\mu_1}(p_1 + \dots p_{n-1}) \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n}(p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}) &= 0\end{aligned}\quad (19)$$

which express the conservation of the total current.

If $r = \nu = 0$ also the chiral WI are valid, obtained via the change of variables $\psi_x \rightarrow \psi_x e^{ie\gamma_5\alpha_x}$; replacing J_μ with $J_\mu + \gamma_5 \widetilde{J}_\mu^5$ in the generating function one gets

$$\sum_{\mu_1} \sigma_{\mu_1}(p_1 + \dots p_{n-1}) \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n}^5 = 0 \quad (20)$$

where $\widetilde{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n}^5$ is the derivative with respect to \widetilde{J}_μ^5 . Similarly the WI for the chiral current ensures the non-renormalization of the electric charge associated to the total current and $\mathcal{Z}_5 = 1$.

In presence of the Wilson term $r \neq 0$ (20) is not verified; in particular one is interested in $\sum_{\mu_1} \sigma_{\mu_1}(p) \Pi_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^5$ in $d = 2$ and $\sum_{\mu_1} \sigma_{\mu_1}(p_1 + p_2) \widetilde{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3}^5(p_1, p_2)$ in $d = 4$ which are the only non vanishing cases in the continuum.

C. Independence on the ξ parameter

In the case $M \neq 0$ gauge invariance in the A fields is broken; nevertheless the validity of WI ensures that the expectations of gauge invariant observables

$$\mathcal{O}(\psi e^{ie\alpha(x)}, A + d\alpha_x) = \mathcal{O}(\psi, A) \quad (21)$$

are independent on the gauge-fixing parameter ξ , that is

$$\partial_\xi \frac{\int P(dA) \int P(d\psi) e^{V_c(\psi) + V_e(A+J, \psi)} \mathcal{O}(\psi, A)}{\int P(dA) \int P(d\psi) e^{V_c(\psi) + V_e(A+J, \psi)}} = 0 \quad (22)$$

This follows from the fact that, setting

$$\Gamma(J) = \int P(dA) \int \left[\prod_x d\psi_x d\bar{\psi}_x \right] e^{S_t(A+J, \psi)} \mathcal{O}(\psi, A + J) \quad (23)$$

with $S_t(A + J, \psi) = S(\psi) + V_c(\psi) + V_e(A + J, \psi)$, and $G_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n} = \frac{\partial^n \Gamma}{\partial J_{\mu_1, x_1} \dots \partial J_{\mu_n, x_n}} \Big|_0$ one has

$$\sum_{\mu_1} \sigma_{\mu_1} \widehat{G}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n} = 0 \quad (24)$$

Therefore

$$\partial_\xi \Gamma(J) = \frac{1}{L^4} \sum_p \partial_\xi (\widehat{g}^A(p))_{\mu, \nu}^{-1} \quad (25)$$

$$\int P(dA) A_{\mu, p} A_{\nu, -p} \int \prod d\psi_x d\bar{\psi}_x e^{S_t(A+J, \psi)} \mathcal{O}(\psi, A + J)$$

from which we get

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\xi \Gamma(J) \Big|_0 &= \frac{1}{L^4} \sum_p \widehat{g}_{\rho', \mu}^A(p) \partial_\xi (\widehat{g}^A)_{\mu, \nu}^{-1} \widehat{g}_{\nu, \rho}^A(p) \widehat{G}_{\rho, \rho'} = \\ &= \frac{1}{L^4} \sum_p \partial_\xi \widehat{g}_{\mu, \nu}^A(p) \widehat{G}_{\mu, \nu} = 0\end{aligned}\quad (26)$$

as $\partial_\xi \widehat{g}_{\mu, \nu}^A(p)$ is proportional to $\bar{\sigma}_\mu \sigma_\nu$. The same is true for any derivative with respect to J .

The ξ -independence ensures that the averages of (21) can be computed at $\xi = 0$, that is in absence of the non decaying part of the propagator.

D. Lattice chiral anomaly in the non-interacting case

In the non-interacting case $V_e = V_c = 0$ then $\sum_{\mu_1} \sigma_{\mu_1}(p) \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{5,0}$ in $d = 2$ and $\sum_{\mu_1} \sigma_{\mu_1}(p_1 + p_2) \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3}^{5,0}$ in $d = 4$ have the same value in the continuum or with a finite lattice, up to subleading terms in the momentum.

We show this using a strategy which can be generalized to the interacting case. We write the lattice fermionic propagator (10) as

$$\widehat{g}(k) = \frac{\chi(k)}{-i \not{k}} + r(k) \quad (27)$$

where $\chi(k)$ is a smooth compact support function vanishing outside a circle of radius $O(a^{-1})$ excluding the poles of $\widehat{S}(k)$ except $k = 0$ while $|r(k)| \leq C$; the first term corresponds to the propagator in the formal continuum limit with a momentum regularization while the second is an irrelevant term in the RG terminology, depending on terms which are formally vanishing in the continuum limit.

The decomposition (27) allows to write

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{5,0}(p) &= \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{5,0,a}(p) + \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2}^{5,0,b}(p) \\ \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3}^{5,0}(p_1, p_2) &= \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3}^{5,0,a}(p_1, p_2) + \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3}^{5,0,b}(p_1, p_2) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the first term is obtained replacing all propagators with $\frac{\chi(k)}{-i \not{k}}$ and the second term is a rest, containing at least an $r(k)$ term. More explicitly we have in $d = 2$

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,a} = \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \text{Tr} \frac{\chi(k)}{-i \not{k}} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \frac{\chi(k+p)}{-i \not{k} - i \not{p}} \gamma_\nu \quad (29)$$

and in $d = 4$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \rho, \sigma}^{5,0,a}(p_1, p_2) &= i \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^4} \\ \text{Tr} \frac{\chi(k)}{\not{k}} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \frac{\chi(k+p)}{\not{k} + \not{p}} \gamma_\nu \frac{\chi(k+p^2)}{\not{k} + \not{p}^2} \gamma_\sigma + [(p_1, \nu) \hookrightarrow p_2, \sigma] \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

We use now two crucial facts

1. $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,a}(p)$ is not continuous in p while $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,b}(p)$ is continuous; $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \rho, \sigma}^{5,0,a}(p_1, p_2)$ is continuous in p_1, p_2 while $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \rho, \sigma}^{5,0,b}(p_1, p_2)$ has continuous derivatives.
2. The WI for the current implies that $\sum_\nu \sigma_\nu \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0} = 0$ and $\sum_\rho \sigma_\rho \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \rho, \sigma}^{5,0} = \sum_\sigma \sigma_\sigma \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \rho, \sigma}^{5,0} = 0$

The computation of $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,a}$ and $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \rho, \sigma}^{5,0,a}$ is done using the identity

$$\frac{\chi(k)}{\not{k}} \not{p} \frac{\chi(k+p)}{\not{k} + \not{p}} = \left[\frac{\chi(k)}{\not{k}} - \frac{\chi(k+p)}{\not{k} + \not{p}} \right] + \frac{\chi(k)}{\not{k}} C(k, p) \frac{\chi(k+p)}{\not{k} + \not{p}} \quad (31)$$

with

$$C(k, p) = \not{k}(\chi^{-1}(k) - 1) - (\not{k} + \not{p})(\chi^{-1}(k+p) - 1) \quad (32)$$

The momentum cut-off violates gauge invariance, and the correction is given by the second term in the r.h.s. of (32).

Let us start considering $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,a}$ in $d = 2$; setting $\widehat{j}_0 = \widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_-$, $\widehat{j}_1 = i(\widehat{\rho}_+ - \widehat{\rho}_-)$, $\widehat{j}_0^5 = \widehat{\rho}_+ - \widehat{\rho}_-$, $\widehat{j}_1^5 = i(\widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_-)$ so that $\widehat{\rho}_\pm$ the Fourier transform of $\psi_{\pm, x}^\pm \psi_{\pm, x}^-$ and $\widehat{j}_\mu = i\varepsilon_{\mu, \nu} \widehat{j}_\nu$ ($\varepsilon_{0,1} = -\varepsilon_{1,0} = 1$), one has to consider terms of the form

$$\langle \widehat{\rho}_{\omega, p} \widehat{\rho}_{\omega, p} \rangle = \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\chi(k)}{D_\omega(k)} \frac{\chi(k+p)}{D_\omega(k+p)} \quad (33)$$

with $D_\omega(k) = -ik_0 + \omega k_1$ and $\omega = \pm$. By using (31) and the fact that $\int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \left[\frac{\chi(k)}{\not{k}} - \frac{\chi(k+p)}{\not{k} + \not{p}} \right] = 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} D_\omega(p) \langle \widehat{\rho}_{\omega, p} \widehat{\rho}_{\omega, p} \rangle &= \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{D_\omega(k)} \frac{1}{D_\omega(k+p)} \\ [D_\omega(p)\chi(k)(1 - \chi(k+p)) - D_\omega(k)(\chi(k) - \chi(k+p))] &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

By symmetry

$$\int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{D_\omega(k)^2} \chi(k)(1 - \chi(k)) = 0 \quad (35)$$

and looking to the second term we write

$$\begin{aligned} - \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{-ik_0 - \omega k_1}{|k|^2} (p_0 k_0 + p_1 k_1) \partial \chi &= -D_{-\omega}(p) \chi(k) \\ \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{k_0^2}{|k|^3} \partial \chi &= -D_{-\omega}(p) \frac{\pi}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\rho \partial \chi = \frac{D_{-\omega}(p)}{4\pi} \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

In conclusion $D_\omega(p) \langle \widehat{\rho}_{\omega, p} \widehat{\rho}_{\omega, p} \rangle = \frac{D_{-\omega}(p)}{4\pi}$, up to $O(ap^2)$, $p_\mu \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,a} = p_0 \langle (\widehat{\rho}_+ - \widehat{\rho}_-)(\widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_-) \rangle + ip_1 \langle (\widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_-)(\widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_-) \rangle = iD_+ \langle \widehat{\rho}_+ \widehat{\rho}_+ \rangle - iD_- \langle \widehat{\rho}_- \widehat{\rho}_- \rangle = i(D_- - D_+) = -2i\frac{p_1}{2\pi}$ and $p_\mu \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,a} = p_0 \langle (\widehat{\rho}_+ - \widehat{\rho}_-)i(\widehat{\rho}_+ - \widehat{\rho}_-) \rangle + p_1 \langle (\widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_-)i(\widehat{\rho}_+ - \widehat{\rho}_-) \rangle = -D_+ \langle \widehat{\rho}_+ \widehat{\rho}_+ \rangle - D_- \langle \widehat{\rho}_- \widehat{\rho}_- \rangle = -(D_- + D_+) = 2i\frac{p_0}{2\pi}$ so that

$$p_\mu \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,a} = -i\frac{\varepsilon_{\mu, \nu}}{2\pi} p_\mu \quad (37)$$

Moreover $p_\nu \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,a} = p_0 \langle (\widehat{\rho}_+ - \widehat{\rho}_-)(\widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_-) \rangle + ip_1 \langle (\widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_-)(\widehat{\rho}_+ - \widehat{\rho}_-) \rangle = iD_+ \langle \widehat{\rho}_+ \widehat{\rho}_+ \rangle - iD_- \langle \widehat{\rho}_- \widehat{\rho}_- \rangle = i(D_- - D_+) = -2i\frac{p_1}{2\pi}$; $p_\nu \widehat{\Pi}_{1, \nu}^{5,0,a} = ip_0 \langle \widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_- : \widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_- \rangle - p_1 \langle \widehat{\rho}_+ + \widehat{\rho}_- : \widehat{\rho}_+ - \widehat{\rho}_- \rangle = -D_+ \langle \widehat{\rho}_+ \widehat{\rho}_+ \rangle - D_- \langle \widehat{\rho}_- \widehat{\rho}_- \rangle = -(D_- + D_+) = 2i\frac{p_0}{2\pi}$ so that

$$p_\nu \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,a} = -i\frac{\varepsilon_{\nu, \mu}}{2\pi} p_\nu + O(ap^2) \quad (38)$$

Note that the current and the axial current are not conserved if we consider only the continuum part of the propagator (27) with momentum cut-off. On the other hand, from the lattice WI we get

$$i\sigma_\nu \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0} = \frac{\varepsilon_{\nu, \mu}}{2\pi} p_\nu + i\sigma_\nu \Pi_{\mu, \nu}^{5,0,b}(p) + O(ap^2) \quad (39)$$

We use the continuity of $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^{5,0,b}(p)$ to conclude from (39) that $i\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^{5,0,b}(0) = -\frac{\varepsilon_{\nu,\mu}}{2\pi}$; therefore so that $i\sigma_{\mu}\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^{5,0}$

$$= i\sigma_{\mu}\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^{5,0,a} + i\sigma_{\mu}\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^{5,0,a} = \frac{1}{2\pi}(\varepsilon_{\mu,\nu} - \varepsilon_{\nu,\mu}) + O(ap^2) \quad (40)$$

that is $i\sigma_{\mu}\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^{5,0} = \frac{\varepsilon_{\nu,\mu}}{\pi} + O(ap^2)$.

We can follow a similar strategy also in $d = 4$. By using (31) one obtains (see 3.6 of [55])

$$\begin{aligned} -i(p_{1,\mu} + p_{2,\mu})\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,a} &= \frac{1}{6\pi^2}p_{1,\alpha}p_{2,\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\nu\sigma} + O(a\bar{p}^2) \\ -ip_{1,\nu}\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,a} &= \frac{1}{6\pi^2}p_{1,\alpha}p_{2,\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\sigma} + O(a\bar{p}^1) \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

with $\bar{p} = \max(|p_1|, |p_2|)$. The WI for the current $p_{1,\nu}\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^5 = 0$, that is

$$\frac{1}{6\pi^2}p_{1,\alpha}p_{2,\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\sigma} + p_{1,\nu}\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,b}(p_1, p_2) + O(a\bar{p}^2) = 0 \quad (42)$$

Using the continuous differentiability of $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,b}(p_1, p_2)$ we can expand in series and equating the coefficients

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,b}(0, 0) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,b}}{\partial p_{2,\beta}}(0, 0) = -\frac{1}{6\pi^2}\varepsilon_{\nu\beta\mu\sigma} \quad (43)$$

Similarly, $\frac{\partial\widehat{H}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,b}}{\partial p_{1,\beta}}(0, 0) = -\frac{1}{6\pi^2}\varepsilon_{\sigma\beta\mu\nu}$ so that expanding $p_{\mu} = p_{\mu}^1 + p_{\mu}^2$

$$\begin{aligned} -ip_{\mu}\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0} &= \frac{1}{6\pi^2}(p_{1,\alpha}p_{2,\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\nu\sigma} - p_{1,\alpha}p_{2,\mu}\varepsilon_{\sigma\alpha\mu\nu} \\ -p_{1,\mu}p_{2,\beta}\varepsilon_{\nu\beta\mu\sigma}) &+ O(a\bar{p}^2) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2}p_{1,\alpha}p_{2,\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\nu\sigma} + O(a\bar{p}^2) \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

The value of the anomalies with finite lattice is therefore the same as in the continuum case up to subdominant terms. The same property is true for the transport coefficients; for instance the optical conductivity in graphene is the same on the lattice or in the continuum description [54].

E. Renormalization Group analysis

Let us consider now the interacting case. In order to study the properties of anomalies, as well as other other physical quantities, we need to express the correlations in terms of expansions, which will be in general not power series. Such series are obtained by a Renormalization group analysis and are expected to be convergent at most only in certain regions of the parameters. A case in which a convergent expansion can be found is under the condition that e^2/M^2a^2 is small, see [56],[57], [58].

We start considering $W(J, J^5, 0)$, $r = 1$, (6) which can be rewritten more compactly as $\int P(dA)P(d\psi)e^{V(\psi, A+J, J^5)}$. One can integrate out the boson field reducing to a purely fermionic theory

$$\int P(dA)P(d\psi)e^{V(\psi, A+J, J^5)} = \int P(d\psi)e^{\bar{V}(\psi, J, J^5)} \quad (45)$$

with

$$\bar{V} = \sum_{l,m} a^{4(l+m)} \sum_{\underline{x}, \underline{y}} H_{l,m}(\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \prod_{i=1}^l \psi_{x_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \prod_{j=1}^m J_{y_j}^{a_i} \quad (46)$$

where $\varepsilon = \pm$, $a = 0, 5$ and $J^0 = J$. The kernels $H_{l,m}(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$ are given by *Truncated expectations* $\mathcal{E}_A^T(e^{i\varepsilon_1 e a A_{\mu_1}}; \dots)$. One can use a suitable representation of truncated expectations in terms of sum over trees, see [59]

$$\mathcal{E}_A^T(e^{i\varepsilon_1 e a A_{\mu_1}}; \dots; e^{i\varepsilon_n e a A_{\mu_n}}) = \sum_T \prod_{i,j \in T} V_{i,j} \int dp_T(s) e^{-V(s)} \quad (47)$$

with T are connected tree graphs on $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, the product $\prod_{\{i,j\} \in T}$ runs over the edges of the tree graph T , $\int dp_T(s) = 1$, $V(s)$ convex combination of $V(Y) = \sum_{i,j \in Y} V_{i,j}$, Y subsets of X , $V_{i,j} = \mathcal{E}(aA_{\mu_i}(x_i)aA_{\mu_j}(x_j))$. By using that $V(Y) \geq 0$, $V(s) \geq 0$ and $\sum_T \leq C^n n!$ we get for $e/(Ma)$ small enough

$$\|H_{l,m}\| \leq C^{l+m} 2^{(4-3l/2-m)N} \quad (48)$$

with $\|H_{l,m}\| = \frac{1}{L^4} a^{4(l+m)} \sum_{\underline{x}, \underline{y}} |H_{l,m}(\underline{x}, \underline{y})|$. Note that by using (47) one is avoiding to expand in e , what is not suitable for a non-perturbative analysis. We are then reduced to a purely fermionic theory. The fermions are however massless, so that a convergent expansion can be obtained only by a multiscale Renormalization Group analysis.

We introduce a partition of the unity $\sum_{h=-\infty}^{N+1} f_h(k) = 1$ with $f_h(k)$, $h \leq N$, a smooth compact support cut-off function non vanishing for $2^{h-1} \leq |k|_T \leq 2^{h+1}$, with $|k|_T$ the periodic norm in $[-\pi/a, \pi/a]^4$ and $2^N = 1/(10a)$. We can write the propagator as sum of propagators living at decreasing momentum scales. If $\widehat{g}^h(k) = f_h(k)\widehat{g}(k)$

$$\widehat{g}(k) = \sum_{h=-\infty}^{N+1} \widehat{g}^h(k) \quad \widehat{g}^{\leq h}(k) = \sum_{i=-\infty}^h \widehat{g}^i(k) \quad (49)$$




FIG. 1. Graphical representation of V^N ; the first term represents $\mathcal{E}_{N+1}^T(V^{(N+1)})$, the second $\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_{N+1}^T(V^{(N+1)}; V^{(N+1)})$ and so on.

By using the additivity property of Grassmann Gaussian integrals, see e.g. [60], we can write, calling $\bar{V} \equiv V^{N+1}$

$$\int P(d\psi)e^{V^{N+1}(\psi, J, J^5)} = \int P(d\psi^{(\leq N)})e^{V^N(\psi^{(\leq N)}, J, J^5)} \quad (50)$$

with $e^{V^N(\psi^{(\leq N)}, J, J^5)} = \int P(d\psi^{N+1})e^{V^{N+1}(\psi, J, J^5)}$. Again V^N is expressed by the sum of fermionic truncated expectations $V^N = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \mathcal{E}_{N+1}^T(V^{N+1}, \dots, V^{N+1})$, and this expansion can be conveniently represented in Fig.1. The effective potential V^N is sum over monomials with l ψ fields and m J-fields. One separates in V^N the part containing marginal or relevant terms from the rest and the procedure can be iterated; after the integration of the fields $\psi^N, \psi^{N-1}, \dots, \psi^{h+1}$ one obtains

$$\int P(d\psi)e^{V^{N+1}(\psi, J, J^5)} = \int P(d\psi^{(\leq h)})e^{V^h(\sqrt{Z_h}\psi^{(\leq N)}, J, J^5)} \quad (51)$$

where $P(d\psi^{(\leq h)})$ has propagator $\frac{\hat{g}^h(k)}{Z_h}$, with Z_h the wave function renormalization and the effective potential V^h is given by $V^h(\sqrt{Z_h}\psi^{(\leq h)}, J, J^5) =$

$$a^4 \sum_x (2^h \nu_h \bar{\psi}_x \psi_x + Z_h^J J_\mu \bar{\psi}_x \gamma_\mu \psi_x + Z_h^5 J_\mu^5 \bar{\psi}_x \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu \psi_x) + \sum_{l,m}^* a^{4(l+m)} \sum_{\underline{x}, \underline{y}} H_{l,m}^h(\underline{x}, \underline{y}) \prod_{i=1}^l \partial^{q_i} \psi_{x_i}^{\varepsilon_i} \prod_{j=1}^m J_{y_j} \quad (52)$$

and \sum^* is over the terms with negative dimension $D < 0$ where $D = 4 - 3l/2 - \sum_i q_i$; the first line in (52) contains the marginal or relevant terms and the second the irrelevant terms.




FIG. 2. A Gallavotti-Nicolo' tree

The effective potential V^h is expressed as sum of truncated expectations of V^{h+1} which also are sum of truncated expectations of V^{h+2} and so on; therefore iterating the graphical representation in Fig. 1 one obtains that the kernels $H_{l,m}^h$ can be written in terms of Gallavotti-Nicolo' trees [26] (see e.g. [60]), see Fig.2.

The tree expansion allows to write the kernels in terms of the running coupling constants (rcc) ν_j, Z_j^J, Z_j^5 with $h \leq j \leq N$ and in e . Such series are indeed convergent, as follows by determinant bounds for fermions and by a convenient representation for fermionic truncated expectations [59] (see also e.g.

$$[60]) \mathcal{E}_h^T(\tilde{\psi}^{(h)}(P_1); \dots; \tilde{\psi}^{(h)}(P_s)) =$$

$$\sum_T \prod_{l \in T} g^{(h)}(x_l, y_l) \int dP_T(t) \det G^{h,T}(t) \quad (53)$$

where $\psi(P)$ are monomials in the fields ψ , T is $G^{h,T}(t)$ is a $(n-s+1) \times (n-s+1)$ matrix which is bonded by Gram inequality, n the number of fields. Again avoiding the use of Feynman graphs eliminate factorials in the bounds in the bounds preventing convergence.

The running coupling constants remain small at any iteration step, provided that the counterterm ν is properly chosen, and $\nu_h \rightarrow 0$, $Z_h \rightarrow Z$, $Z_h^J \rightarrow Z^J$, $Z_h^5 \rightarrow Z^5$ as $h \rightarrow -\infty$; such limits are expressed by non trivial series expansions depending on all lattice details. The propagator can be written as

$$\hat{g}^h(k) = \frac{f^h(k)}{-i/k} + \hat{r}^h(k) \quad (54)$$

with $\hat{r}^h(k)/\hat{g}^h(k) = O(2^{h-N})$: the single scale propagator is equal to the continuum propagator up to correction.

We can write $H_{n,m}^h = H_{a,n,m}^h + H_{b,n,m}^h$ where $H_{a,n,m}^h$ includes only contributions from Z_h^J, Z_h^5 terms and from the leading part of the propagator $\frac{f^h(k)}{-i/k}$ and $H_{b,n,m}^h$ are the other terms. The outcome of the analysis is the following [55]

For $\frac{e^2}{(Ma)^2} \leq e_0$, where e_0 is constant and for a suitable ν

$$\|H_{a,l,m}^h\| \leq C^{l+m} 2^{Dh} \quad \|H_{b,l,m}^h\| \leq C^{l+m} 2^{Dh} 2^{\theta(h-N)} \quad (55)$$

with $\theta > 0$, $D = 4 - 3l/2 - m$; moreover $|Z - 1|, |Z^J - 1|, |Z^5 - 1| \leq C e^2$

The above result ensures that the expansions can be used to get non-perturbative information if $\frac{e^2}{(Ma)^2}$ is smaller than some numerical constant e_0 , independent from L ; this is the typical condition appearing in non-renormalizable theories like the Fermi theory of weak interactions in $d = 4$ (whose convergence is a corollary of the above result). The explicit value of e_0 can be deduced collecting all the numerical constants in the proof of convergence, but no attempt to optimize it has been given. The series so obtained are not power series in the coupling e ; the propagator at each scale g^h have a non trivial dependence on the coupling e , and the wave function or vertex renormalization have a dependence on the scale. Convergence ensures that physical quantities can be obtained by lowest order in this expansion with a bound on the remainder. Note the improvement in the estimate for the $H_{b,l,m}^h$ terms, which follows from the fact that only irrelevant terms in the RG sense contribute. Of course, the above expansion is not the only possible one and others can be proposed; in particular one could decompose the A_μ field in scales instead of integrating it out, and hopefully convergence up to higher cut-off is found, see below.

F. Emergent symmetries and non-renormalization of the anomaly

As a consequence of the above analysis one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{S}(k) &= \frac{1}{Z} \widehat{k} (1 + r_1) \\ G_\mu(k, p) &= \frac{Z Z^J}{Z^2} \widehat{g}(k) \gamma_\mu \widehat{g}(k + p) (1 + r_2) \\ G_\mu^5(k, p) &= \frac{Z Z^5}{Z^2} \widehat{g}(k) \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \widehat{g}(k + p) (1 + r_3)\end{aligned}\quad (56)$$

where $|r_1| \leq C(a|k|)^\theta$, $|r_2|, |r_3| \leq C(|k|^\theta + |k + p|^\theta)$, see Fig.3. The first term comes from the $H_{a,l,m}^h$ and the second from the $H_{b,l,m}^h$; the momentum dependence is due to the factor $2^{\theta(h-N)}$ in the bound. The terms r_i are small at energies far from the cut-off, that is Lorentz symmetry emerges at low energies. The fact that the dominant term is identical to the free correlation with renormalized parameters comes from the fact that all the non-irrelevant terms are quadratic in the fermions.




FIG. 3. Graphical representation of the second of (55); the dot represent Z^J , the first term in the r.h.s. is the renormalized vertex with two renormalized propagators, and the second is the contributions of higher order terms with at least an irrelevant term

The renormalization Z, Z^J depend on all the lattice and interaction details; however combining the Ward identities (19) we get the following identity

$$\frac{Z^J}{Z} = 1 \quad (57)$$

implying the non-renormalization of the electric charge. This is a peculiarity of the lattice regularization; with momentum regularization this would be not true.

We also choose Z^5 so that $Z^J/Z^5 = 1$, as required by the definition of the axial current. This implies that

$$\frac{Z^5 Z^J Z^J}{Z^3} = 1 \quad (58)$$

Let us consider now the three point correlation for the chiral current, which can be written

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu\sigma}^5 = \sum_{h=-\infty}^N \widehat{H}_{a,0,3}^h + \sum_{h=-\infty}^N \widehat{H}_{b,0,3}^h \quad (59)$$

where again the first term in the l.h.s. is given by marginal terms and the dominant part of the propagators, hence is given by sum of triangle graphs

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{H}_{a,0,3}^h(p_1, p_2) &= i \sum_{h_1, h_2, h_3}^* \frac{Z_{h_1}^5 Z_{h_2}^J Z_{h_3}^J}{Z_{h_1} Z_{h_2} Z_{h_3}} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^4} \\ &\text{Tr} \frac{f_{h_1}(k)}{k} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \frac{f_{h_2}(k+p)}{k+p} \gamma_\nu \frac{f_{h_3}(k+p^2)}{k+p^2} \gamma_\sigma + [(p_1, \nu) \xrightarrow{c} p_2, \sigma]\end{aligned}\quad (60)$$

where \sum_{h_1, h_2, h_3}^* means that at least one among h_1, h_2, h_3 is equal to h . In contrast, the second term is given a complicate series, containing at least an irrelevant term, see Fig.3. $\widehat{H}_{b,0,3}^h$ is not small as function of momenta; however is more regular than $\widehat{H}_{a,0,3}^h$. By (55) we see that $\Pi_{\mu\nu\sigma}^5$ is continuous as is bounded by $\sum_{h=-\infty}^N 2^h$; moreover each derivatives produces an extra 2^{-h} so that $\sum_{h=-\infty}^N \partial \widehat{H}_{b,0,3}^h$ is bounded by $\sum_{h=-\infty}^N 2^{\theta(h-N)}$ hence $\widehat{H}_{b,0,3}^h$ has continuous derivatives. In addition $Z_h \rightarrow Z, Z_h^J \rightarrow Z^J, Z_h^5 \rightarrow Z^5$ exponentially fast; performing the sum over h_1, h_2, h_3 in the first term reconstruct $\Pi_{\mu\nu\sigma}^{5,a,0}$ in (30) so that, see Fig. 3

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^5(p_1, p_2) = \frac{Z^5 Z^J Z^J}{Z^3} \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,a}(p_1, p_2) + \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,b}(p_1, p_2) \quad (61)$$

We can proceed now exactly as we did in the on interacting case in (41)-(43): even if $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,b}$ is an all order expansion, it is still differentiable in the momenta so that we can expand up to first order in the momenta. Using (58) and the fact that the first derivatives of $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,0,b}(p_1, p_2)$ are fixed by the WI for the current $\sigma_\nu \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^5 = 0$ as in (43), and using (41) we get the following result, see [61], [63].




FIG. 4. Graphical representation of (61).

If $e^2 \leq \varepsilon_0(Ma)^2$ and for a suitable ν, Z^5 , if $|p| = \max(|p_1|, |p_2|)$, $\theta > 0$

$$-ip_\mu \Pi_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}^5 = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \varepsilon_{\alpha,\beta,\rho,\sigma} p_\alpha^1 p_\beta^2 + O(a^\theta |p|^{2+\theta}) \quad (62)$$

The anomaly is therefore non-renormalized with a finite lattice and in presence of interaction with a massive $U(1)$ gauge field.

III. UNIVERSALITY OF TRANSPORT IN CONDENSED MATTER

A. Weyl semimetals

Weyl semimetals are condensed matter systems with an emerging QED₄ description [17] subject to an intense experimental study [51]. A basic model for a Weyl semimetal can be expressed in terms of fermions hopping on a lattice with suitable complex weights and a current-current interaction; the generating function is

$$e^{W(J, J^5, \phi)} = \int P(d\psi) e^{V(\psi) + A(J) + \nu N + (\psi, \phi) + (j_\mu^5(J), J^5)} \quad (63)$$

where $\psi_x^\pm = (\psi_{x,a}^\pm, \psi_{x,b}^\pm)$, $x = (x_0, \vec{x})$ with x_0 the imaginary time $x_0 \in (0, \beta)$ (antiperiodic boundary conditions) and $\vec{x} \in \Lambda$ a square lattice with step 1, that is $\vec{x} \in [0, L]^3 \cap \mathbb{Z}$. $P(d\psi) = \mathcal{D}\psi e^{S_0(\psi)}$ has propagator $\hat{g}(k) =$

$$\begin{pmatrix} -ik_0 + t_1 \sin k_1 - it_2 \sin k_2 & \eta - \cos k_1 - \cos k_2 - \cos k_3 \\ \eta - \cos k_1 - \cos k_2 - \cos k_3 & -ik_0 - (t_1 \sin k_1 - it_2 \sin k_2) \end{pmatrix} \quad (64)$$

with $\eta = 2 + \zeta$ and $t_1, t_2 > 0$; moreover V is a density-density interaction, if $\frac{1}{\beta} \int dx_0 \sum_{\vec{x} \in \Lambda} = \int dx$

$$V = \lambda \int dx dy \sum_{i,j} v(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \delta(x_0 - y_0) \psi_{x,i}^+ \psi_{x,i}^- \psi_{y,i}^+ \psi_{y,i}^- \quad (65)$$

with $v(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ a short range interaction. $A(J)$ is the source term for the current, obtained from the fermionic action $S_0(\psi)$ replacing $\psi_x^\pm \psi_{x+e_i}$ with $\psi_x^\pm (e^{J_x^i} - 1) \psi_{x+e_i}$ and replacing ∂_0 with A_0 . This choice ensures the validity of Ward Identities for the current. Finally $N = \int dx (\psi_{x,1}^+ \psi_{x,1}^- - \psi_{x,2}^+ \psi_{x,2}^-)$ and ν is a counterterm necessary to fix the chemical potential.

For $-1 < \zeta < 1$ the denominator of $\hat{g}(k)$ is vanishing in correspondence only of two points (Weyl nodes, or Fermi points) $k = p_F^\pm$, with $p_F^\pm = (0, 0, \pm \arccos \zeta)$. The relative distance between the two nodes vanishes like $\sqrt{1 - |\zeta|}$ as $|\zeta| \rightarrow 1^-$. In the vicinity of the Weyl nodes, $k \simeq p_F^\pm$, the propagator can be approximated by, if $v_F = \sqrt{1 - \zeta^2}$

$$(-ik_0 v_1^0 \sigma_1 k_1 + v_2^0 \sigma_2 k_2 + \omega v_F \sigma_3 (k_3 - p_{F,3}^\omega) + O(|k - p_F^\omega|^2))^{-1}, \quad (66)$$

with $v_1^0 = t_1, v_2^0 = t_2$. One has, depending if $\omega = \pm$, a propagator approximately given by the propagator of L or R massless Dirac fermions with an anisotropic velocity and up to subleading corrections. Finally one introduces a lattice current for the quasi-particle flow between the Weyl nodes

$$\hat{J}_{\mu,p}^5 = \frac{Z_\mu^5}{L^3} \sum_k \hat{\psi}_{k+p}^+ w_\mu^5(k, p) \hat{\psi}_k^- \quad (67)$$

with $w_\mu^5(k, p)$ a suitable kernel ensuring that $\hat{J}_{\mu,p}^5$ reduces to the chiral relativistic current at small momenta and

renormalization Z_μ^5 so that the charge is the same as the one carried by the current. Note in particular $\hat{J}_{0,p}^5$ represents the difference of densities of electrons around the Weyl points. Finally $j_\mu^5(J)$ is defined so that $j_\mu^5(0)$ is equal to (67) and invariance under the transformation $\psi^\pm \rightarrow \psi^\pm e^{\pm i e \alpha x}$, $J_\mu \rightarrow J_\mu + d_\mu \alpha$ is valid.

$\Pi_{\mu\nu\rho}^5$ is the derivative with respect to J_μ^5, J_ν, J_ρ and represents the quadratic response of the expectation of the chiral 4-current j_μ^5 with respect to the external fields. In the non-interacting case one can proceed as in §2.4 obtaining that the time variation of the difference of densities between Weyl nodes is $\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int dx E(t) \cdot B(t)$ up to an error term, collecting contributions involving a higher number of derivatives on the vector potential, which is subdominant for a vector potential slowly varying in space. The quasi-particle flow is therefore proportional to $E(t) \cdot B(t)$, with coefficient given by the value of the chiral anomaly. It is important to predict if this value is or not renormalized by interactions, in view of possible comparison with experiments.

A multiscale analysis can be performed [55], [62]. The fermionic propagator is written as $\hat{g}(k) = \hat{g}^{\geq \bar{h}}(k) + \hat{g}^{\leq \bar{h}}(k)$, where the scale \bar{h} is fixed by the condition that $v_F(k_3 - p_F^\pm) = O(|k_3 - p_F^\pm|^2)$ in the support of $f_{\bar{h}}$. In the first region k_3 has a quadratic scaling and in the second the support decouples and $\hat{g}^{\leq \bar{h}}(k)$ is disconnected in two regions around the 2 Fermi points with linear scaling: therefore we can write $\psi^{\leq \bar{h}} = \sum_{\omega=\pm 1} \psi_\omega^{\leq \bar{h}}$ and the RG analysis is in terms of Dirac fermions with anisotropic velocities. The value of the Weyl points is also modified in presence of an interaction and one has to fix the chemical potential properly choosing the counterterm ν so that their value is the same in the free and interacting case.

Even if the emerging theory is still described by massless Dirac fermions, the deviation from a relativistic theory is surely much more drastic as the one in the previous section. First the velocity is anisotropic, and one velocity is much smaller than the others; moreover the two Dirac cones are connected in the dispersion relation and the interaction only involve the densities. The result of the analysis is nevertheless that the chiral current correlation can be written in a form similar as before, for λ small uniformly in the Fermi velocity

$$\hat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^5(p_1, p_2) = \frac{Z_\mu^5 Z_\nu Z_\sigma}{Z^3 v_1 v_2 v_3} \Pi_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^{5,a,0}(\bar{p}_1, \bar{p}_2) + \tilde{H}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}^5(p_1, p_2), \quad (68)$$

where the first term is given by the triangle graph with momentum cut-off and velocities equal to 1 but computed at $\bar{p}_1 = (p_{1,0}, v_1 p_{1,1}, v_2 p_{1,2}, v_3 p_{1,3})$,

$\bar{p}_2 = (p_{2,0}, v_1 p_{2,1}, v_2 p_{2,2}, v_3 p_{2,3})$; the second term is a series of terms, which is again differentiable in the external momenta. Note that v_1, v_2, v_3 are non trivial functions of the interaction λ . Ward Identities hold so that

$$Z_\mu = v_\mu Z, \quad (69)$$

with $v_0 := 1$, and we impose $Z_\mu^5 = Z_\mu$ by a suitable choice of Z_μ^5 . We use the WI to compute the first derivative of

the correction term, so that [55], [62] the following result is obtained.

For $|\lambda| \leq \lambda_0$, with λ_0 a constant independent on v_F , for a suitable ν, \mathcal{Z}^5 we get

$$p_\mu \Pi_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}^5 = -\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \varepsilon_{\alpha,\beta,\rho,\sigma} p_\alpha^1 p_\beta^2 + O(|p|^{2+\theta}) \quad (70)$$

Despite the strong deviation from a relativistic theory due to lattice and non-relativistic terms. the quadratic response of the quasi-particle flow between the Weyl nodes, simulating the chiral anomaly, is still perfectly non-renormalized with short range interactions. This is in contrast with other quadratic responses in Weyl semimetals which show indeed interaction dependent corrections [52]. Experiments in Weyl semimetals are still not sufficiently precise to verify the non-renormalization.

B. Graphene

In Graphene the conduction electrons are described by fermions hopping in a honeycomb lattice. If Λ is a periodic triangular lattice with basis $\vec{a}_1 = \frac{1}{2}(3, \sqrt{3})$, $\vec{a}_2 = \frac{1}{2}(3, -\sqrt{3})$, the propagator is given by

$$\hat{g}(k) = \begin{pmatrix} ik_0 & -v^*(\vec{k}) \\ -v(\vec{k}) & ik_0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \quad (71)$$

where $k = (k_0, \vec{k})$ and $k_0 = \frac{2\pi}{\beta}(n_0 + \frac{1}{2})$ and $\vec{k} = \frac{n_1}{L}\vec{b}_1 + \frac{n_2}{L}\vec{b}_2$, where $\vec{b}_1 = \frac{2\pi}{3}(1, \sqrt{3})$, $\vec{b}_2 = \frac{2\pi}{3}(1, -\sqrt{3})$. Finally $v(\vec{k}) = t \sum_{i=1}^3 e^{i\vec{k}(\vec{\delta}_i - \vec{\delta}_1)} = t(1 + 2e^{-i3/2k_1} \cos \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}k_2)$, t the hopping parameter. If we take $\beta, L \rightarrow \infty$, the limiting propagator $\hat{g}(k)$ becomes singular at $k_0 = 0$ and $\vec{k} = \vec{p}_F^\pm$, where $\vec{p}_F^\pm = (\frac{2\pi}{3}, \pm \frac{2\pi}{3\sqrt{3}})$.

The asymptotic behavior of $v(\vec{k})$ close to the Fermi points is given by $v(\vec{p}_F^\pm + \vec{k}') \simeq 3/2t(ik'_1 \pm k'_2)$. In particular, if $\omega = \pm$, the Fourier transform of the 2-point Schwinger function close to the Fermi point \vec{p}_F^ω can be rewritten in the form: $\hat{g}(k_0, \vec{p}_F^\omega + \vec{k}') =$

$$\begin{pmatrix} -ik_0 & -v_F^0(-ik'_1 + \omega k'_2) + r_\omega \\ -v_F^0(ik'_1 + \omega k'_2) + r_\omega^* & -ik_0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1}, \quad (72)$$

where $v_F^{(0)} = 3/2t$ is the free Fermi velocity. Moreover, $|r_\omega(\vec{k}')| \leq C|\vec{k}'|^2$, for small values of \vec{k}' and for some positive constant C . Combining the two point function around the two Fermi points we get the propagator of Dirac particles in $d = 2 + 1$ up to subdominant corrections.

If $\Pi_{i,j}$ is the current-current correlation with component i, j , with i and j equal to 1 or 2, the optical conductivity is given by, in the $U = 0$ non interacting case, in the $L, \beta \rightarrow \infty$ limit

$$\sigma_i = \lim_{p_0 \rightarrow 0} \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{p_0} \Pi_{i,i}(p) = \frac{e^2}{h} \frac{\pi}{2} \quad (73)$$

Note that $\Pi_{i,i}(p)$ is an even function $\Pi_{i,i}(p) = \Pi_{i,i}(-p)$ and $\Pi_{i,i}(0) = 0$; hence σ_i is the derivative in $p = 0$ and the fact that is non vanishing is due to the fact that $\Pi_{i,i}(p)$ is not differentiable. The derivation of (73) with a finite lattice can be done by direct computation [54] or proceeding as in §2.4 writing decomposing $\Pi_{i,i}(p)$ in a non differentiable and differentiable part and using WI. The same value is found in Dirac approximation, see [68].

The optical conductivity σ_i is independent from the microscopic parameters in the non-interacting case, in particular from the hopping parameters t . Experiments show a value very close, up to experimental errors, to $\frac{e^2}{h} \frac{\pi}{2}$ [13]; this requires an explanation as interactions are rather strong and their presence is known to modify other quantities, like the Fermi velocity; which has been measured and show a strong increase due to interactions [67].

Graphene with short range interactions is described by the Hubbard model on the honeycomb lattice. The generating function of the correlation is

$$\int P(d\psi) e^{V(\psi) + B(J, \psi)} \quad (74)$$

with, if ρ_x is the density

$$V = \int dx dy v(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \delta(x_0 - y_0) \rho_x \rho_y \quad (75)$$

and $B(J, \psi) = \int dx_0 \sum_x A_0 J_0 + B_1$ with B_1 the source term for the current. Again exact WI holds and, after performing a similar RG analysis the interacting two point functions is given by, $\omega = \pm$

$$\frac{1}{Z} \begin{pmatrix} -ik_0 & -v_F(-ik'_1 + \omega k'_2) \\ -v_F(ik'_1 + \omega k'_2) & -ik_0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} (1 + R(k')), \quad (76)$$

with $k' = (k_0, \vec{k}')$, and with Z and v_F two real constants such that

$$Z = 1 + aU^2 + O(U^3), \quad v_F = \frac{3}{2}t + bU + O(U^3) \quad (77)$$

and $|R(k')| \leq C|k'|^\theta$. The effect of the interaction is to renormalize the Fermi velocity; such renormalization would be absent in a relativistic model. Moreover due to symmetries the velocity is shifted in an isotropic way. The scaling dimension is $D = 3 - l - m$ hence as in the previous case the quartic terms in the fermions are irrelevant.

It is found that $\Pi_{i,i}(p)$ in the $L, \beta \rightarrow \infty$ limit is continuous and non differentiable; by using the WI, $i \neq 0$

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \lim_{p_0 \rightarrow 0} \Pi_{ii} = 0 \quad (78)$$

and by continuity

$$\sigma_i = \lim_{p_0 \rightarrow 0} \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{p_0} (\Pi_{i,i}(p) - \Pi_{i,i}(0)) \quad (79)$$

As an outcome of the RG analysis we can decompose $\widehat{\Pi}_{i,i}(p)$, as

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{lm}(p) = \frac{Z_l Z_m}{Z^2} \langle \widehat{j}_{p,l}; \widehat{j}_{-p,m} \rangle_{0,v_F} + \widehat{R}_{lm}(p)$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle_{0,v_F}$ is the average associated to a non-interacting system with Fermi velocity v_F and is not differentiable, while $\widehat{R}_{lm}(p)$, expressed by an all order expansion, is differentiable at $p = 0$. By the lattice WI again we get relations between the bare parameters

$$Z_0 = Z, \quad Z_1 = Z_2 = v_F Z. \quad (80)$$

so that

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{lm}(p) = v_F^2 \langle \widehat{j}_{p,l}; \widehat{j}_{-p,m} \rangle_{0,v_F} + \widehat{R}_{lm}(p)$$

Note that $\widehat{\Pi}_{lm}(p)$ is even and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i = & -\frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \lim_{p_0 \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{p_0} \left[(\widehat{R}_{ii}(p_0, \vec{0}) - \widehat{R}_{ii}(0, \vec{0})) \right. \\ & \left. + (v_F^2 \langle \widehat{j}_{(p_0, \vec{0}), l}; \widehat{j}_{(-p_0, \vec{0}), m} \rangle_{0,v_F} - v_F^2 \langle \widehat{j}_{\vec{0}, l}; \widehat{j}_{\vec{0}, m} \rangle_{0,v_F}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Note that \widehat{R}_{ii} is an even function and has continuous derivatives; therefore the derivative vanishes at $p = 0$. In contrast the first term is identical to the non interacting one but with a different Fermi velocity; but as the free conductivity is independent from v_F , the final result is indeed universal and the following result is proved, see [58],[59]

For $|U| \leq U_0$, if U_0 is a suitable constant

$$\sigma_{lm} = \frac{e^2 \pi}{h} \frac{1}{2} \delta_{lm}.$$

while the Fermi velocity $v_F = 3/2t + bU + O(U^2)$.

The above result is in agreement with the observed universality of the optical conductivity in Graphene and with the increase of the velocity (for nearest neighbor interaction $b = 0.3707\dots$). It is essential to keep all the irrelevant terms due to the lattice to preserve universality.

Another manifestation of universality in planar condensed matter systems is in the Hall effect, appearing in systems with an emerging description in terms of massive Dirac fermions. A combination of RG and Ward Identities analogue to the one described above leads to the proof that universality (quantization) persist even in presence of short-ranged many body interaction [72],[73].

C. Massless bosons and higher cut-offs

The above results have been obtained with massive gauge fields or short range interactions and up to cut-offs of the order of the inverse coupling. It is of course

important to extend to the massless case and with larger cut-offs.

The model (6) with $M = 0$ can be studied by a RG analysis decomposing both the bosonic and fermionic fields. The independence from ξ still holds from the validity of Ward Identities. In $d = 3$ this analysis was done in [72] and it can be extended to the model (6) with $M = 0$. It leads to an expansion in terms of a finite set of running coupling constants, whose coefficients are finite and verify $n!$ bounds at order n . The consistency of the method relies on the fact that the running coupling constants are small for any h . In $d = 4$ in addition to Z_h, Z_h^A, e_h, ν_h , corresponding to the fermionic and bosonic wave function renormalization, the effective charge and the fermionic mass renormalization, one obtains also non-gauge invariant running coupling constants: a boson mass $2^{2h}m_h$, κ_h corresponding to quartic boson terms and R_h corresponding to non transversal quadratic boson terms. The presence of non gauge invariant couplings is related to the breaking of gauge invariance in the intermediate RG steps due to the momentum decomposition.

There is a basic difference in the analysis in the lattice model (6) with $M = 0$ and in continuum QED model with a momentum cut-off, as the one in [23] - [25] or [27],[28]. In the case with momentum cut-off the WI are violated at finite cutoff, and the flow of m_h, κ_h, R_h is controlled introducing counterterms in the bare action. This makes the momentum regularization probably non suitable for a nonperturbative approach as Ward Identities are recovered only removing the ultraviolet cut-off. With a lattice cutoff, instead, the Ward Identities are true with a finite lattice step. Moreover, they can be used to control the flow of the non gauge invariant running coupling.

The idea, see §5 and [73] - [75] is to get information on the rcc introducing a reference model. In the case of (6) with $M = 0$, the reference model is (6) itself but with boson propagator

$$g_{\mu,\nu}^A(x, y) = \frac{1}{L^4} \sum_k \chi_h(k) \frac{e^{ik(x-y)}}{|\sigma|^2 + M^2} (\delta_{\mu,\nu} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}_\mu \sigma_\nu}{|\sigma|^2}) \quad (82)$$

with $\chi_h(k)$ vanishing for $|k| \leq 2^h$. The model (6) and the reference model can be analyzed by a similar RG analysis for scales $k \geq h$, and the rcc are the same. On the other hand in the integration of the scales smaller than h in the reference model one notes that the boson fields disappear and the running coupling constants essentially stop flowing. In addition, WI are true for the reference model, even in presence of a momentum cut-off for the boson fields. The correlations of the reference model are proportional to the rcc at scale h , hence the WI imply replations between the rcc at scale h . One gets for the reference model

$$\Pi_{\mu\mu}(p) = 2^{2h}(m_h + R_\mu) \quad (83)$$

with $R_\mu = O(\varepsilon_h^2)$ if ε_h is the maximum of the rcc with scales greater than h . From the WI $\sum_\mu \sigma_\mu \Pi_{\mu\mu}(p) = 0$ one gets that $m_h = O(\varepsilon_h^2)$; that is the photon mass $2^{2h}m_h$

stays bounded and vanishes as $h \rightarrow -\infty$ without the introduction of any counterterm. A similar argument can be repeated for the other non-gauge invariant couplings κ_h, R_h , while the flow of ν_h is controlled by a suitable choice of the counterterm. Finally using the the vertex WI of the reference model we get $\sqrt{Z_h^A} e_h = e(1 + O(\varepsilon_h^2))$. Therefore the WI have the effect that the flow of e_h is driven by Z_h^A and by its flow equation one obtains, $h = N, N - 1, ,$

$$e_h^2 = \frac{e^2}{1 - \log 2 \frac{e^2}{6\pi^2} (1 + O(e^2))h} \quad (84)$$

Therefore one expects that a control of the running coupling constants if Ne^2 is smaller than some constant is obtained, that is up to exponentially high cut-off. This analysis is perturbative in the renormalized expansion; a non perturbative result requires a further decomposition of the boson fields A_μ in small and large regions, see e.g. [76], but in any case the control of the flow of the rcc is an essential prerequisite.

When the boson is massive $M \neq 0$, the second term of the boson propagator is not decaying. However using the ξ -independence one can choose $\xi = 0$ so that the boson propagator is $\frac{\delta_{\mu\nu}}{k^2 + M^2}$. One can distinguish two regions in the multiscale integration, separated by a scale $2\bar{h} = M$: for scales greater than \bar{h} the theory has a renormalizable behavior and one can repeat the same analysis sketched above for the $M = 0$ case, while in the second region the boson can be integrated out and the theory reduces to a fermionic theory quartic in the fermions described in §2, that is has a non-renormalizable behavior. One therefore expects that an exponentially high cut-off can be reached in the massive case $M \neq 0$. The argument at the basis of the anomaly non-renormalization seen above in §2.6 cannot however be applied with such exponentially high cut-off; the decomposition (61) of the current correlation in the non interacting part (with renormalized parameters) and a differentiable contribution is not anymore true, and similarly the decomposition (56) of the 2-point function in the free part (with renormalized parameters) and a subleading correction. The above decomposition are indeed peculiar to a nonrenormalizable theory. There are however examples in which the anomaly non-renormalization holds also in renormalizable cases, as in $d = 2$ model, as discussed below.

There are similarly open problems on the role of long range interactions on universality properties in condensed matter. For instance, in the case of Graphene the results in §3.3 ensures the universality in the optical conductivity in the case of short range interactions, but in several situations Graphene can be described with long range forces. In this case the analysis in [72], extending a previous study in the continuum in [77], shows that the rcc corresponding to the fermion-boson interaction is essentially not flowing $e_h \sim e$ in contrast with (84). A lowest order computation of the conductivity is in [78], where universality is still recovered, while in [79] a $1/N$ expansion is

performed finding corrections which are nevertheless still universal; a non-perturbative conclusions has not been still reached. Similarly it would be interesting to consider long range interactions in Weyl semimetals or Hall insulators.

IV. ANOMALY CANCELLATION IN A CHIRAL THEORY

A. A chiral lattice $U(1)$ Gauge theory

One of the main application of the non-renormalization of the anomalies is in the anomaly cancellation in a chiral gauge theory, like the Standard Model. We consider a lattice chiral gauge theory, given by $2N$ massless fermions in four dimensions, labeled by an index $i = 1, \dots, 2N$; we also define the indices $i_1 = 1, \dots, N$ and $i_2 = N+1, \dots, 2N$. As before the correlations are obtained as derivatives of the generating function

$$e^{W(J, J^5, \phi)} = \int P(dA) \int P(d\psi) e^{V(\psi, A, J) + V_c(\psi) + B(J^5, \psi) + (\psi, \phi)} \quad (85)$$

where the bosonic integration has propagator (12) and the fermionic propagator has propagator (10). If $V = V_1 + V_2$ we call $O_{\mu, i, s, x}^+ = \frac{1}{2} \psi_{i, s, x}^+ \sigma_\mu^s \psi_{i, s, x + e_\mu a}^-$ and $O_{\mu, i, s, x}^- = -\frac{1}{2} \psi_{i, s, x + e_\mu a}^+ \sigma_\mu^s \psi_{i, s, x}^-$, $s = L, R$, and we define

$$V_1(A, \psi, J) = a^4 \sum_{i, s, x} [O_{\mu, i, s, x}^+ G_{\mu, i, s, x}^+ + O_{\mu, i, s, x}^- G_{\mu, i, s, x}^-] \quad (86)$$

with $G_{\mu, i, s}^\pm(x) = a^{-1} (e^{\mp i a Y_i (\lambda b_{i, s} A_{\mu, x} + J_{\mu, x})} - 1)$ and $b_{i_1, L} = b_{i_2, R} = 1$, $b_{i_1, R} = b_{i_2, L} = 0$. If $J_\mu = 0$ V_1 represents the interaction; note that only the L chirality of the i_1 fermions and the R chirality of the i_2 fields interact with the boson field A_μ . Moreover

$$V_2(A, \psi, J) = \frac{r}{2} a^4 \sum_{i, x} [\psi_{i, L, x}^+ H_{\mu, i, x}^+ \psi_{i, R, x + e_\mu a}^- + \psi_{i, L, x + e_\mu a}^+ H_{\mu, i, x}^- \psi_{i, R, x}^- + \psi_{i, R, x}^+ H_{\mu, i, x}^+ \psi_{i, L, x + e_\mu a}^- + \psi_{i, R, x + e_\mu a}^+ H_{\mu, i, x}^- \psi_{i, L, x}^-] \quad (87)$$

with $H_{\mu, i, x}^\pm = a^{-1} (e^{\mp i a Y_i J_{\mu, x}} - 1)$. The mass counterterm is $V_c = \sum_i a^{-1} \nu_i a^4 \sum_x (\psi_{i, L, x}^+ \psi_{i, R, x}^- + \psi_{i, R, x}^+ \psi_{i, L, x}^-)$ and

$$B = a^4 \sum_{\mu, x} J_{\mu, x}^5 j_{\mu, x}^5 \quad j_{\mu, x}^5 = \sum_{i, s} \tilde{\varepsilon}_i \varepsilon_s Y_j Z_{i, s}^5 \psi_{x, i, s}^+ \sigma_\mu^s \psi_{x, i, s}^+ \quad (88)$$

with $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{i_1} = -\tilde{\varepsilon}_{i_2} = 1$ and $\varepsilon_L = -\varepsilon_R = 1$.

The fermionic 2-point function is $S_{i, s, s'}(x, y)$ is the derivative with respect to $\phi_{i, s, x}^+, \phi_{i, s', y}^-$ of W , the vertex function $\Gamma_{\mu, i, s}(z, x, y)$ is the derivative respect to $J_{\mu, z}, \phi_{i, s, y}^+, \phi_{i, s, y}^-$ and the chiral vertex $\Gamma_{\mu, i, s}^5(z, x, y)$ is the derivative respect to $J_{\mu, z}^5, \phi_{i, s, y}^+, \phi_{i, s, y}^-$. The three current vector VVV and axial AVV correlations are

$$\Pi_{\mu, \nu, \rho}^{VVV}(z, y, x) = \frac{\delta^3 \mathcal{W}_\Lambda}{\delta J_{\mu, z} \delta J_{\nu, y} \delta J_{\rho, x}} \Big|_0 \quad (89)$$

and $\Pi_{\mu,\nu,\rho}^{AVV}(z,y,x) = \frac{\partial^3 \mathcal{W}}{\partial J_{\mu,z}^5 \partial J_{\nu,y} \partial J_{\rho,x}} \Big|_0$. Again by performing the change of variables $\psi_{i,s,x}^\pm \rightarrow \psi_{i,s,x}^\pm e^{\pm i Y_i \alpha_x}$ we get

$$W(J, J^5, \phi) = W(J + d_\mu \alpha, J^5, e^{i Y \alpha} \phi) \quad (90)$$

where $J + d_\mu \alpha$ is a shorthand for $J_{\mu,x} + d_\mu \alpha_x$ and $e^{i Y \alpha} \phi$ is a shorthand for $e^{\pm i Y_i \alpha_x} \phi_{i,s,x}^\pm$; by differentiating we get the WI

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mu_1} \sigma_{\mu_1} (p_1 + \dots p_{n-1}) \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n}^{VVV} (p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}) &= 0 \\ \sum_{\mu} \sigma_{\mu} (p) \widehat{\Gamma}_{\mu, i, s}^{\Lambda} (k, p) &= Y_i (\widehat{S}_{i, s, s}(k) - \widehat{S}_{i, s, s}(k+p)) \quad (91) \\ \sum_{\nu} \sigma_{\nu} (p_1) \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu, \rho}^{AVV} (p_1, p_2) &= \sum_{\rho} \sigma_{\rho} (p_2) \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \nu, \rho}^{AVV} (p_1, p_2) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

The mass counterterms ν_i has to be chosen so that the 2-point correlations are singular at $k = 0$, that is the fermionic dressed mass is vanishing and the renormalizations $\mathcal{Z}_{i,s}^5$ is chosen to ensure that

$$\lim_{k,p \rightarrow 0} \frac{\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mu, i, s}^5(p, k)}{\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mu, i, s}^5(p, k)} = \varepsilon_s \quad (92)$$

ensuring that the vector and axial part of the current of each particle carry the same charge. The total current coupled to A_μ is

$$j_\mu^T = \sum_{i_1} Y_{i_1} \psi_{i_1, L, x}^+ \sigma_\mu^L \psi_{i_1, L, x}^- + \sum_{i_2} Y_{i_2} \psi_{i_2, R, x}^+ \sigma_\mu^R \psi_{i_2, R, x}^- \quad (93)$$

and the axial and vector part of the current is

$$j_\mu^{T, V} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i Y_i j_{\mu, i, x} \quad j_\mu^{T, A} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i Y_i \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i j_{\mu, i, x}^5 \quad (94)$$

with $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{i_1} = -\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{i_2} = 1$, $j_{\mu, i, x} = \bar{\psi}_{i, x} \gamma_\mu \psi_{i, x}$, $j_{\mu, i, x}^5 = \bar{\psi}_{i, x} \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu \psi_{i, x}$ and $\psi_{i, x} = (\psi_{i, L, x}^-, \psi_{i, R, x}^-)$, $\psi_{i, x}^+ = (\psi_{i, R, x}^+, \psi_{i, L, x}^+)$. Note the chiral nature of the theory, as in the current the fermion with different chirality have different charges.

In the formal continuum limit the action reduces to $\int dx \{ F_{\mu, \nu} F_{\mu, \nu} +$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i_1} [\psi_{i_1, L, x}^+ \sigma_\mu^L (\partial_\mu + \lambda Y_{i_1} A_\mu) \psi_{i_1, L, x}^- + \psi_{i_1, R, x}^+ \sigma_\mu^R \partial_\mu \psi_{i_1, R, x}^-] \\ \sum_{i_2} [\psi_{i_2, R, x}^+ \sigma_\mu^R (\partial_\mu + \lambda Y_{i_2} A_\mu) \psi_{i_2, R, x}^- + \psi_{i_2, L, x}^+ \sigma_\mu^L \partial_\mu \psi_{i_2, L, x}^-] \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

Note that the R fermions of kind i_1 and the L fermions of kind i_2 decouple and are fictitious, non interacting degrees of freedom, which are convenient to introduce in view of the lattice regularization [32]. If $N_1 = N_2 = 4$ (85) is a lattice regularization of the U(1) sector of the Standard Model with no Higgs and massless fermions; in this case $i_1 = (\nu_1, e_1, u_1, d_1)$ are the left handed components and $i_2 = (\nu_2, e_2, u_2, d_2)$ the right handed of the leptons and quarks.

B. Anomaly cancellation

In the non-interacting case the anomaly is the sum of the anomalies of the particles weighted by $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_{i, s}$, that is up to $O(a^\theta |p|^{2+\theta})$ terms

$$-i p_\mu \Pi_{\mu, \rho, \sigma}^{AVV, 0} = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \varepsilon_{\alpha, \beta, \rho, \sigma} p_\alpha^1 p_\beta^2 \left[\sum_{i_1} Y_{i_1}^3 - \sum_{i_2} Y_{i_2}^3 \right] \quad (96)$$

which, under the anomaly cancellation condition $[\sum_{i_1} Y_{i_1}^3 - \sum_{i_2} Y_{i_2}^3] = 0$ is vanishing (p to subleading terms. In the case of the U(1) sector of the Standard-Model, this condition is verified. Indeed the physical values $Y_{\nu_1} = Y_{e_1} = -1$, $Y_{u_1} = Y_{d_1} = 1/3$, $Y_{\nu_2} = 0$, $Y_{e_2} = -2$, $Y_{u_2} = 4/3$, $Y_{d_2} = -2/3$ corresponding to the electric charges $e(0, -1, 2/3, -1/3)$ verify the condition.

The issue is if the anomaly cancels under the same condition in presence of interaction. Higher order corrections could require other conditions to vanish, impossible to verify. The interacting theory can be analyzed via a multiscale analysis similar to the one for the vector model in §2. One first integrate the A_μ field and then perform a multiscale analysis for the Grassmann variables: after integrating $\psi^N, \dots, \psi^{h+1}$ one gets

$$e^{W(J, J^5)} = \int P_{Z_h} (d\psi^{(\leq h)}) e^{V^{(h)}(\sqrt{Z_h} \psi^{(\leq h)}, J, J^5)} \quad (97)$$

with $P_{Z_h} (d\psi^{(\leq h)})$ with propagator $\widehat{g}_i^{(\leq h)}(k) =$

$$\chi_h(k) \left(\sum_{\mu} \gamma_0 \widetilde{\gamma}_\mu^h a^{-1} i \sin(k_\mu a) + a^{-1} \widetilde{\gamma}_0^h \sum_{\mu} (1 - \cos k_\mu a) \right)^{-1} \quad (98)$$

with

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_0^h = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Z_{h, L, i} I \\ Z_{h, R, i} I & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \widetilde{\gamma}_j^h = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i Z_{h, L, i} \sigma_j \\ -i Z_{h, R, i} \sigma_j & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (99)$$

and $V^{(h)}(\sqrt{Z_h} \psi, J, J^5) = RV^h +$

$$\begin{aligned} a^4 \sum_x \sum_{i, s} [\nu_{h, s} 2^h \sqrt{Z_{h, L, i} Z_{h, R, i}} (\psi_{i, L, x}^+ \psi_{i, R, x}^- + \psi_{i, R, x}^+ \psi_{i, L, x}^-) + \\ + Z_{i, s, h}^J J_{\mu, x} \psi_{i, s, x}^+ \sigma_\mu^s \psi_{i, s, x}^- + \varepsilon_s \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Z_{i, s, h}^5 J_{\mu, x}^5 \psi_{i, s, x}^+ \sigma_\mu^s \psi_{i, s, x}^-] \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

and RV^h is sum of monomials of l fields with $4 - 3/2l - q - m < 0$. The interaction produces a different wave function renormalizations depending on the type of particles and on the chirality; again in the limit $h \rightarrow \infty$ one gets for a proper ν_i that $\nu_{i, h} \rightarrow 0$, $Z_{i, s, h} \rightarrow Z_{i, s}$, $Z_{i, s, h}^J \rightarrow Z_{i, s}^J$, $Z_{i, s, h}^5 \rightarrow Z_{i, s}^5$ with $Z_{i, s}$, $Z_{i, s}^J$, $Z_{i, s}^5$ depending on i, s and all the lattice details. In particular the wave function and the vertex renormalizations depend on the type of the particle and from its chirality.

The current correlations can be written as

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \rho, \sigma}^{AVV} (p_1, p_2) = \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \rho, \sigma}^{AVV, a} (p_1, p_2) + \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu, \rho, \sigma}^{AVV, b} (p_1, p_2) \quad (101)$$

where $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}^{AVV,b}(p_1, p_2)$ with continuous derivatives and $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}^{AVV,a}$ containing only the dominant part of the propagator and marginal terms

$$\sum_{j,i,s} \sum_{\substack{h_1 \\ h_2, h_3}} \widetilde{\varepsilon}_j \varepsilon_s Y_j^3 \frac{Z_{h_1,j,s}^5}{Z_{H_1,j,s}} \frac{Z_{h_2,j,s}^J}{Z_{h_2,j,s}} \frac{Z_{h_3,j,s}^J}{Z_{h_3,j,s}} \quad (102)$$

$$\int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^4} \text{Tr} \frac{f_{h_1}(k)}{i\sigma_\mu^s k_\mu} i\sigma_\mu^s \frac{f_{h_2}}{i\sigma_\mu^s (k_\mu + p_\mu)} i\sigma_\nu^s \frac{f_{h_3}}{i\sigma_\mu^s (k_\mu + p_\mu^2)} (i\sigma_\rho^s)$$

Note the presence of the factors $\frac{Z_{h_1,j,s}^5}{Z_{h_1,j,s}}$ and $\frac{Z_{h,j,s}^J}{Z_{h,j,s}}$ depending on the particle and chiral index. The two-point and vertex correlations are given by $\widehat{S}_{i,s,s}(k) = \frac{1}{Z_{i,s} - i\sigma_\mu^s k_\mu} (1 + r_1(k))$, $\Gamma_{\mu,i,s}(k, p) =$

$$\frac{ZZ_{i,s}^J}{Z_{i,s}^2} \frac{1}{-i\sigma_\mu^s k_\mu} i\sigma_\mu^s \frac{1}{-i\sigma_\mu^s (k_\mu + p_\mu)} [1 + r_2(p, k)] \quad (103)$$

with $r_1 = O((a|k|)^\theta)$ and $r_2 = O(a^\theta(|k|^\theta + |k+p|^\theta))$ we get

$$\frac{Z_{i,s}^J}{Z_{i,s}} = 1 \quad (104)$$

By choosing $Z_{i,s}^5$ imposing $Z_{i,s}^J/Z_{i,s}^5 = 1$ and using that the limit is reached exponentially fast we get

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}^{AVV}(p_1, p_2) = \left(\sum_i \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_i^3 \right) \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}^{5,0,a}(p_1, p_2) + \widehat{R}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}^{AVV,b}(p_1, p_2) \quad (105)$$

with $\widehat{R}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}^{AVV,b}(p_1, p_2)$ with continuous derivatives. Proceeding as in §2.6 using the WI (91) one proves therefore the following, see [56],[80], [81].

For $|\lambda| \leq \lambda_0(Ma)$, it is possible to find ν_i , $Z_{i,s}^5$ continuous functions in λ such that the AVV correlation verifies

$$\sum_\mu \sigma_\mu(p_1 + p_2) \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}^5(p_1, p_2) = \sum_{\mu,\nu} \varepsilon_{\alpha,\beta,\rho,\sigma} \frac{1}{2\pi^2} p_\alpha^1 p_\beta^2 \left[\sum_{i_1} Y_{i_1}^3 - \sum_{i_2} Y_{i_2}^3 \right] + r_{\rho,\sigma}(p_1, p_2) \quad (106)$$

with $|r(p_1, p_2)| \leq Ca^\theta \bar{p}^{2+\theta}$, $\bar{p} = \max(|p_1|, |p_2|)$.

The vanishing of the anomaly holds therefore up to cut-off of the order of the inverse coupling under the same condition as in the continuum, up to subleading corrections.

In order to increase the size of the cut-off one would like to proceed as in §3.3, and for massive bosons one needs the ξ invariance to ensure that the non decaying part of the gauge propagator is not contributing, so that there is a reduction of the degree of divergence. However such invariance is based on the WI for the current associated to the gauge field. This requires two sets of WI for the total and chiral current, but the second are violated by anomalies for generic values of the hypercharges. The

above result shows that, at least for cut-off of the order of the inverse coupling the WI for the chiral current is preserved, at least for the AVV correlation which is the dominant one in the continuum limit. This is a prerequisite condition for the construction of the $U(1)$ sector of the Standard Models up to exponentially high cut-off, as an extension of this result should possibly ensure that the contribution of the non decaying part of the boson is vanishing or at least small at higher energy scales.

V. MASSIVE $U(1)$ GAUGE THEORY IN $d = 2$

A. The lattice Sommerfeld model

Let us consider now what happens in the $d = 2$ vector model (6), see [82]. In this case the dimension is $D = 2 - l/2 - m$ corresponding to a renormalizable degree of divergence; however, if the contribution of the non decaying part of the boson propagator vanishes one passes from a renormalizable to a superrenormalizable degree of divergence (as in $d = 4$ there is a reduction from a non-renormalizable to a renormalizable behavior). In $d = 2$, however, the theory can be constructed for values of the cut-off arbitrarily large. The reduction of the degree of divergence appears in the fact that the bare parameters can be chosen independent on the cut-off; in absence of such reduction the theory is essentially equivalent to the Thirring model and the bare wave function renormalization would vanish with the cut-off. Note that such a reduction does not appear in the exact solution of the continuum version of this model [83] as a momentum regularization is used violating WIs.

Using a lattice cut-off as in (6) the ξ independence allows to choose $\xi = 0$. After the integration of the A_μ field, one obtain a purely fermionic theory with a short range interaction with range $O(1/M)$. One has to distinguish two regimes distinguished by a scale $2^{\bar{h}} = M$. In the integration of the scales higher than \bar{h} there is an improvement in the bounds due to the non locality of the interaction, similar to the one happening in the non-local Thirring model [73]-[75], [84].




FIG. 5. Decomposition of $H_{2,0}^h$

The kernels with 2 or 4 fermionic fields are dimensionally marginal or relevant; however a suitable decomposi-

tion of the kernels $H_{l,m}^h$, see Fig.5, allows to improve their scaling dimension using the non locality of the interaction, see [82]. This implies the irrelevance of all effective interactions in the RG sense and establishes the reduction of the degree of freedom; the ultraviolet cut-off can be removed with finite bare couplings.

In the integration of the scales smaller than \bar{h} the non irrelevant part of the potential has the form $\lambda \int dx dy v(x-y) j_\mu j_\mu$; in contrast with the $d = 4$ case the quartic coupling constant is marginal. However the theory can be still controlled thanks to the vanishing of the beta function, proved in [73].

The fact that in the second regime there are quartic marginal interactions causes a striking difference in the chiral correlations with respect to the $d = 4$ case. The chiral current correlation can be written as

$$\hat{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^5 = \hat{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^{5,a} + \hat{R}_{\mu\nu} \quad (107)$$

where $\hat{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^{5,a}$ contains no irrelevant terms and contains only the dominant part of the propagator (the first term in (27)) and $\hat{R}_{\mu\nu}$ is the rest. As in the non-interacting case $\hat{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^{5,a}$ is non continuous in p while $\hat{R}_{\mu\nu}$ is continuous. There is however a crucial difference with respect to the $d = 4$ case; in that case the only marginal terms were bilinear in the ψ and $\hat{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^{5,a}$ was only given by sum of triangle graphs. In $d = 2$, in contrast, the marginal terms are quartic interactions and $\hat{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^{5,a}$ is expressed by an infinite series of terms.

One cannot therefore compute explicitly $\hat{\Pi}_{\mu\nu}^{5,a}$ but has to follow a different strategy. One introduces a reference model

$$e^{W_T(J^+, J^-, \phi)} = \int P(d\psi^{(\leq N)}) \quad (108)$$

$$e^{\tilde{\lambda} \tilde{Z}^2 \tilde{\lambda} \int dx dy v(x-y) \rho_{+,x} \rho_{-,y} + \sum_\omega [\tilde{Z}^+ \int dx J_{\omega,x}^+ \rho_{\omega,x} + \tilde{Z}^- \int dx J_{\omega,x}^- \rho_{\omega,x}]} \text{ and } ip_\mu \tilde{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^5 = \frac{\tilde{Z}^+ \tilde{Z}^-}{2\pi \tilde{Z}^2} \frac{\varepsilon_{\mu\nu} p_\mu}{(1+\tau\tilde{v}(p))}$$

with $\omega = \pm$, $x \in \mathcal{R}^2$ is a continuum variable, $P(d\psi)$ is the Grassmann integration with propagator $\frac{1}{Z} \frac{\chi_N}{-i\cancel{k}}$, $\chi_N(k)$ smooth cut-off function non vanishing in $|k| \leq 2^N$, $v(x-y)$ a short range symmetric potential, $\tilde{v}(0) = 1$, $\rho_\omega = \psi_\omega^+ \psi_\omega^-$. The model can be considered as the scaling limit of the model (6) in $d = 2$ with a momentum cut-off. A similar RG analysis can be done also for this model [73]-[75], showing that there exists a suitable choice of its parameters, actually $\tilde{Z}^\pm, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{Z}$, such that the corresponding running coupling constants tend as $\hbar \rightarrow -\infty$ to the same limiting value than in the lattice model (6). This implies that the 2-point and the vertex functions of the two models coincide up to subdominant terms in the momenta, and the current correlations coincide up to terms continuous in p . The reference model is defined in the continuum with a momentum cut-off; in contrast with previous lattice models, it verifies the local chiral symmetry $\psi_{\omega,x}^\pm \rightarrow e^{\pm i\alpha_\omega} \psi_{\omega,x}^\pm$.

B. Anomaly non-renormalization

We can indeed derive Ward Identities also for the model (108) by the transformation $\psi_\omega^\pm \rightarrow e^{\pm i\alpha_\omega} \psi_{\omega,x}^\pm$. One obtains

$$D_\omega \langle \hat{\rho}_{p,\omega} \hat{\psi}_{k,\omega'}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k+p,\omega'}^- \rangle + \Delta_N(k,p) = \delta_{\omega,\omega'} \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}} [\langle \hat{\psi}_{k,\omega'}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k,\omega'}^- \rangle - \langle \hat{\psi}_{k+p,\omega'}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k+p,\omega'}^- \rangle] \quad (109)$$

where $D_\omega = -ip_0 + \omega p$, $\omega = \pm$,

$$\Delta_N = \langle \delta \hat{\rho}_{p,\omega} \hat{\psi}_{k,\omega'}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k+p,\omega'}^- \rangle \quad (110)$$

and $\delta \hat{\rho}_{p,\omega} = \int dk$

$$[(\chi_N^{-1}(k+p)-1)D_\omega(k+p) - (\chi_N^{-1}(k)-1)D_\omega(k)] \hat{\psi}_{k,\omega}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k+p,\omega}^-$$

The momentum cut-off produces the extra term Δ_N in the WI for the current and the current, which are both violated. The above identity can be also derived in perturbation theory by (31).

The correction term Δ_N , which would be not present neglecting the cut-off, is expressed by a complicated perturbative expansion; however using a detailed decomposition of the correction term, [73]-[75], [84], in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ one gets

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_N(k,p) = \tau \tilde{v}(p) D_{-\omega}(p) \langle \hat{\rho}_{p,-\omega} \hat{\psi}_{k,\omega'}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k+p,\omega'}^- \rangle$$

with $\tau = \frac{\tilde{\lambda}}{4\pi}$. Note that τ is linear in $\tilde{\lambda}$; all higher order corrections cancel. In the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ the following WI holds for the model (109)

$$-i(1 - \tau \tilde{v}(p)) p_\mu \tilde{\Gamma}_\mu(k,p) = \frac{\tilde{Z}^+}{\tilde{Z}} (\tilde{S}(k) - \tilde{S}(k+p)) \quad (111)$$

$$ip_\nu \tilde{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^5 = \frac{\tilde{Z}^+ \tilde{Z}^-}{2\pi \tilde{Z}^2} \frac{\varepsilon_{\mu\nu} p_\mu}{(1+\tau\tilde{v}(p))} \quad (112)$$

where $\mathcal{Z}^5 \tilde{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^5$ is equal to $\hat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^{5,a}$ in (107).

The parameters $\tilde{Z}^\pm, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{Z}$ are non trivial unknown functions, depending on all the details of the regularizations. However the $\tilde{Z}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{Z}^\pm$ are chosen so that the vertex and 2-point functions of the lattice and continuum model are the same; therefore the lattice WI (19) and the WI obtained in the reference model (109) must be the same and this implies a relation between such parameters

$$\frac{\tilde{Z}^+}{\tilde{Z}(1-\tau)} = 1 \quad (113)$$

In addition from the definition of \mathcal{Z}^5

$$\frac{\tilde{Z}^+}{\tilde{Z}(1-\tau)} = \mathcal{Z}_5 \frac{\tilde{Z}^-}{\tilde{Z}(1+\tau)} = 1 \quad (114)$$

from which $\mathcal{Z}_5 = (1 + \tau) \frac{\tilde{\mathcal{Z}}}{\mathcal{Z}^-}$ and, up to $O(p^2)$ terms

$$ip_\mu \tilde{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^5 = \frac{(1 - \tau)}{2\pi \mathcal{Z}^5} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu} p_\mu \quad ip_\nu \tilde{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^5 = \frac{(1 + \tau)}{2\pi \mathcal{Z}^5} \varepsilon_{\nu\mu} p_\nu \quad (115)$$

We use now the above expressions in (107). The WI imply

$$ip_\nu \hat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^5(p) = \frac{(1 + \tau)}{2\pi} \varepsilon_{\nu\mu} p_\nu + p_\nu R_{\mu,\nu}(p) = 0$$

so that $\hat{R}_{\mu,\nu}(0) = -(1 + \tau) \varepsilon_{\nu\mu} / 2\pi$ where we have used that $\hat{R}_{\mu,\nu}(p)$ is continuous. In conclusion

$$ip_\mu \hat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^5(p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} p_\mu [\tilde{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^{5,a}(p) + \hat{R}_{\mu,\nu}(p)] = \\ [(1 - \tau) \varepsilon_{\mu,\nu} - (1 + \tau) \varepsilon_{\nu,\mu}] p_\mu / 2\pi = 1/\pi \varepsilon_{\mu,\nu} p_\nu$$

that is all the dependence of the coupling disappears in the anomaly, see [83]

If $e^2 \leq e_0$ with e_0 independent on L, a , for a suitable \mathcal{Z}^5 , the correlations are given by convergent expansions and, in the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit

$$ip_\mu \hat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu}^5 = \frac{1}{\pi} \varepsilon_{\nu,\mu} p_\mu + O(|p|^{1+\theta}) \quad (116)$$

The uv cut-off can be removed in $d = 2$ $U(1)$ model with finite bare parameters in the continuum $a \rightarrow 0$ limit. The fact that the bare parameters are finite follows from the ξ -independence, and it is a consequence of the reduction of divergence degree from a renormalizable to a superrenormalizable one. The arguments at the basis of the anomaly non renormalization proof in $d = 4$ seen in §2 does not hold: the 2-point and vertex functions in presence of interaction are not equal to the free ones with renormalized parameters. Despite this fact the anomaly renormalization holds.

The above result is based on the validity of the Ward Identities in the lattice model. One could consider also the chiral model (85) in $d = 2$. In that case the anomaly in the non-interacting case cancels under the condition $\sum_{i_1} Y_{i_1}^2 - \sum_{i_2} Y_{i_2}^2$. It is therefore a natural question if the anomaly cancels also with such a condition in presence of interaction, and if the cancellation in the chiral WI would ensure the reduction of the degree of divergence and the possibility of taking the continuum limit $a \rightarrow 0$ with finite bare parameters, as in the Sommerfield model. This would provide the analogue of the construction of the $U(1)$ sector of the Standard Model with large cut-off at a non perturbative level.

C. Luttinger liquids

One dimensional metals have typically an emerging description in terms of massless Dirac fermions with a quar-

tic fermionic interaction. In this case there is a different form of universality; transport coefficients are function of the microscopic parameter but they verify universal Luttinger liquid relations. While such relations can be checked in special solvable models, they indeed are valid in a wide class of non solvable models; in particular the following relation between Drude weight D , susceptibility κ and Fermi velocity v_F can be proved:

$$\frac{D}{\kappa} = v^2. \quad (117)$$

The validity of this identity was proved in [84]-[88] using a similar strategy as in §5.1, 5.2; one performs an RG analysis of the non relativistic model and use the properties of the reference model (107). The validity of such relations is strictly connected to the non-renormalization of τ present in the WI of the reference model.

Similar ideas have been used to establish the bulk-edge correspondence in Hall insulators in presence of interaction [89]. Even when at the edge of Hall insulators there are fermions with both chiralities which interact with short range potential, the conductivity is non-renormalized.

VI. OUTLOOK

We have reviewed a new approach allowing to establish non-renormalization properties of anomalies. In contrast with previous studies, the lattice terms are fully taken into account and the results are non-perturbative, being based on convergent expansions. By such methods it was possible to establish the anomaly non-renormalization in vector $U(1)$ models and the anomaly cancellation in chiral $U(1)$ models with lattices of the order of the inverse coupling in $d = 3 + 1$, and the non-renormalization for any lattice in $d = 1 + 1$. They also allowed to prove universality in transport coefficients in several materials with short range interactions, including Weyl semimetals, graphene and Luttinger liquids.

The cancellation of the anomalies with a finite lattice is a natural starting point for the non-perturbative construction of chiral gauge models like the electroweak theory with high cut-off. Similarly the short range interaction is a starting point for understanding the universality in transport with long range Coulomb interaction in graphene or Hall insulators.

Acknowledgments I am indebted with A. Giuliani and M. Porta, my collaborators in a large part of the research reported here. The work supported by MUR (Italian Ministry of research), Grant No. PRIN201719VMAST01 and the GNFM.

-
- [1] Adler, S. L., Axial Vector Vertex in Spinor Electrodynamics, *Phys. Rev.* 177, pp. 2426-2438 (1966)
- [2] S. L. Adler, W. A. Bardeen. Absence of higher-order corrections in the anomalous axialvector divergence equation. *Phys. Rev.* 182, 1517 (1969).
- [3] H. Georgi J. M. Rawls. Anomalies of the Axial-Vector Current in Two Dimensions *Phys. Rev. D* 3, 874 (1971)
- [4] K. Fujikawa. Path integral measure for gauge-invariant theories, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 42, 1195-1198 (1979).
- [5] S. L. Adler. Anomalies at all orders. 50 Years of Yang-Mills Theory, pp. 187-228, World Scientific (2005)
- [6] C. Kopper; B L ev eque. Regularized path integrals and anomalies: U(1) chiral gauge theory , *J. Math. Phys.* 53, 022305 (2012)
- [7] . E Seiler and I.O.Stamatescu. Lattice Fermions and θ Vacua,' *Phys. Rev. D* 25 (1982), 2177
- [8] N. K. Nielsen and B. Schroer Axial anomaly and Atiyah-Singer theorem *Nucl. Phys. B*127 493 (1977)
- [9] S. Weinberg. A Model of Leptons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 19, 1264 (1967)
- [10] G. 't Hooft. Renormalizable Lagrangians for massive Yang-Mills fields, *Nuclear Physics* 167-188 (1971)
- [11] C. Bouchiat, J. Iliopoulos,P. Meyer. An anomaly-free version of Weinberg's model, *Phys. Lett. B* 38, 519 (1972)
- [12] K. Fredenhagen, K. Rehren, E. Seiler *Quantum Field Theory:Where We Are. An Assessment of Current Paradigms in the Physics of Fundamental Phenomena*, *Lect.NotesPhys.*721:61-87,2007
- [13] R. R. Nair, P. Blake, A. N. Grigorenko, K. S. Novoselov, T. J. Booth, T. Stauber, N. M. R. Peres, and A. K. Geim. Fine Structure Constant Defines Visual Transparency of Graphene, *Science* 320, 1308 (2008).
- [14] J. Fr ohlich, B. Pedrini. New applications of the chiral anomaly, in:*Mathematical Physics 2000*, A. Fokas, A. Grigoryan, T. Kibble and B. Zegarlinski eds., Imperial College Press, London and Singapore, 947 (2000)
- [15] G.W. Semenoff. Condensed Matter Simulation of A Three-Dimensional Anomaly, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 53, 2449 (1984).
- [16] D. M. Haldane.Model for a Quantum Hall Effect without Landau Levels: Condensed-Matter Realization of the "Parity Anomaly", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 61 (1988)
- [17] H. B. Nielsen, M. Ninomiya. The Adler-Bell- Jackiw anomaly andWeyl fermions in a metal. *Phys. Lett. B*, 130, 389 (1983).
- [18] S I Tomonaga Remarks on Bloch'sMethod of Sound-Waves applied toMany-Fermion Problems". *Progress of Theoretical Physics*. Oxford University Press (OUP). 5 (4):im 544569. (1950)
- [19] S. Coleman, B. Hill No more corrections to the topological mass termin QED3 *Physics Letters B* 159, 23, 184-188 (1985)
- [20] Ishikawa K.,Matsuyama T.:Magnetic field induced multi-component QED3 and quantum Hall effect. *Z. Phys C*. 33, 4145 (1986)
- [21] J. Fr ohlich. On the triviality of $\lambda\phi^4$ theories and the approach to the critical point in $d \leq 4$ dimensions. *Nuclear Physics B*, 200, 2, 1 281-296 (1982)
- [22] M. Aizenman, H. Duminil-Copin.Marginal triviality of the scaling limits of critical 4D Ising and ϕ^4 models, *Annals ofMathematics*, 194, 163-23, (2021)
- [23] J- S. Feldman , T. R. Hurd, L. Rosen(British Columbia U.), J. D. Wright(QED: A PROOF OF RENORMALIZABILITY *Lect.Notes Phys.* 312 1-176 (1988)
- [24] Hurd T.: Soft Breaking of Gauge Invariance in Regularized Quantum Electrodynamics. *Commun.Math. Phys.* 125, 515-526 (1989) Rosen, L.,Wright, J.D.: Dimensional Regularization and Renormalization of QED. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 134, 433-446 (1990)
- [25] Hurd, T.: A Renormalization Prescription for Massless Quantum Electrodynamics. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 120, 469-79 (1989)
- [26] G. Gallavotti Renormalization theory and ultraviolet stability for scalar fields via renormalization group methods *Rev.Mod. Phys.* 57, 471 (1985)
- [27] G. Keller, C. Kopper Perturbative renormalization of QED via flow equations *Commun.Math. Phys.* 176, 193-226 (1996)
- [28] Keller, Ch. Kopper and M. Salmhofer: Perturbative Renormalization and effective Lagrangians . *Helv. Phys. Acta* 65:3252 (1991);
- [29] A. N. Efremov , R. Guida , C. Kopper. Renormalization of SU(2) Yang-Mills theory with Flow Equations *J.Math. Phys.* 58, 093503 (2017)
- [30] J. Polchinski Effective Field Theory and the Fermi Surface *arXiv*9210046
- [31] J. Dimock, T.D. Hurd A renormalization group analysis of infrared QED *J. Math. Phys.* 33, 814 (1992)
- [32] A. Borrelli, L. Maiani, G. C. Rossi, R. Sisto, M. Testa. *Phys. Lett. B*221 (1989) 360; *Nucl. Phys. B*333 (1990) 335
- [33] D. B. Kaplan. A Method for Simulating Chiral Fermions on the Lattice, *Phys. Lett. B* 288, 342 (1992).
- [34] R. Narayanan and H. Neuberger. Infinitely many regulator fields for chiral fermions, *Phys. Lett. B* 302, 62 (1993).
- [35] M. Testa. The Rome Approach to chirality. PCTP - ICTP Joint International Conference (AIJIC 97) on Recent Developments in Nonperturbative Quantum Field Theory, 114-127
- [36] M. Luscher. Abelian chiral gauge theories on the lattice with exact gauge invariance, *Nucl. Phys. B* 549 295 (1999)
- [37] M. Luscher. Lattice regularization of chiral gauge theories to all orders of perturbation theory *JHEP* 0006:028 (2000)
- [38] H. Neuberger. Noncompact chiral U(1) gauge theories on the lattice *Phys.Rev. D*63 ,014503, (2001)
- [39] D. M. Grabowska, D. B. Kaplan. Nonperturbative Regulator for Chiral Gauge Theories? *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 116, 211602 (2016)
- [40] Juven Wang, Xiao-Gang Wen. A Non-Perturbative Definition of the Standard Models *Phys. Rev. Research* 2, 023356 (2020)
- [41] M. Golterman. Lattice chiral gauge theories *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* 94 189 (2001)
- [42] E. Poppitz. Chiral lattice gauge theories via mirror-fermion decoupling; a mission impossible? *International Journal of Modern Physics A* 25, 14, pp. 2761 (2010)
- [43] A K De. Non-perturbative chiral gauge theories: an overview of a gauge non-invariant approach *Indian Journal of Physics* volume 95, pages1639-1649 (2021)
- [44] M. I. Katsnelson *Graphene*. Cambridge University Press

- (2012)
- [45] E. G. Mishchenko. Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 216801 (2007)
- [46] I. F. Herbut, V. Juricic and O. Vafek. Coulomb interaction, ipples, and the minimal conductivity of graphene, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 046403 (2008).
- [47] D. E. Sheehy and J. Schmalian, Phys. Rev. B 80, 193411 (2009).
- [48] D. L. Boyda, V. V. Braguta, M. I. Katsnelson, M. V. Ulybyshev Many-body effects on graphene conductivity: Quantum Monte Carlo Phys. Rev. B 94, 085421 (2016)
- [49] A. A. Burkov, L. Balents. Weyl Semimetal in a Topological Insulator Multilayer. Phys. Rev. Lett. 107, 127205 (2011).
- [50] D. T. Son, B. Z. Spivak. Chiral anomaly and classical negative magnetoresistance of Weyl metals. Phys. Rev. B 88, 104412 (2013).
- [51] J. Xiong et al. Evidence for the chiral anomaly in the Dirac semimetal Na₃Bi. Science 350, 6259, 413-416 (2015)
- [52] A. Avdoshkin, V. Kozii, J. E. Moore. Interactions remove the quantization of the chiral photocurrent at Weyl points, Phys. Rev. Lett. 124, 196603 (2020)
- [53] H.B. Nielsen, M. Ninomiya. A no-go theorem for regularizing chiral fermions. Physics Letters B. 105, 219 (1981)
- [54] T. Stauber, N. M. R. Peres, A. K. Geim The optical conductivity of graphene in the visible region of the spectrum Phys. Rev. B 78, 085432 (2008)
- [55] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro, M. Porta Anomaly Non-renormalization in Interacting Weyl Semimetals Comm. Math. Phys. 384, 9971060
- [56] V. Mastropietro Anomaly cancellation in the lattice effective electroweak theory J. Math. Phys. 64, 032303 (2023)
- [57] V. Mastropietro Renormalization group and Ward identities for infrared QED₄ J. Math. Phys. 48, 102303 (2007)
- [58] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro. The 2D Hubbard model on the honeycomb lattice, Comm. Math. Phys. 293, 301-346 (2010); Rigorous construction of ground state correlations in graphene: renormalization of the velocities and Ward Identities, Phys. Rev. B 79, 201403(R) (2009); Erratum, ibid 82, 199901(E) (2010)
- [59] D. Brydges. A short course on Cluster Expansions, Les Houches 1984, K. Osterwalder, R. Stora eds., North Holland Press, (1986).
- [60] V. Mastropietro: Non-perturbative renormalization, World Scientific (2008).
- [61] V. Mastropietro. Emergent Adler Bardeen theorem, JHEP 95, 2020
- [62] V. Mastropietro. Interacting Weyl semimetals on a lattice. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 47, 465003 (2014).; Weyl semimetallic phase in an interacting lattice system. J. Stat. Phys. 157, 830-854 (2014).
- [63] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro, M. Porta. Absence of interaction corrections in graphene conductivity, Phys. Rev. B 83, 195401 (2011); Universality of conductivity in interacting graphene Comm. Math. Phys., 311, 2, 317-355 (2012)
- [64] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro and M. Porta. Universality of the Hall Conductivity in Interacting Electron Systems, Comm. Math. Phys., 349, 1107-1161 (2017)
- [65] A. Giuliani, I. Jauslin, V. Mastropietro and M. Porta. Topological phase transitions and universality in the Haldane-Hubbard model, Phys. Rev. B, 94, 205139 (2016)
- [66] V. Mastropietro. Interacting Weyl semimetals on a lattice. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 47, 465003 (2014).; Weyl semimetallic phase in an interacting lattice system. J. Stat. Phys. 157, 830-854 (2014).
- [67] D. C. Elias, R. V. Gorbachev, A. S. Mayorov, S. V. Morozov, A. A. Zhukov, P. Blake, L. A. Ponomarenko, I. V. Grigorieva, K. S. Novoselov, F. Guinea A. K. Geim. Dirac cones reshaped by interaction effects in suspended graphene Nature Physics volume 7, 701704 (2011)
- [68] W. W. Ludwig, Matthew P. A. Fisher, R. Shankar, and G. Grinstein nteger quantum Hall transition: An alternative approach and exact results Andreas Phys. Rev. B 50, 7526 1994
- [69] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro, M. Porta. Absence of interaction corrections in graphene conductivity Phys. Rev. B 83, 195401 (2011); Universality of conductivity in interacting graphene Comm. Math. Phys., 311, 2, 317-355 (2012)
- [70] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro, M. Porta. Universality of the Hall Conductivity in Interacting Electron Systems Comm. Math. Phys. 349, 11071161 (2017)
- [71] A. Giuliani, I. Jauslin, V. Mastropietro, M. Porta Topological phase transitions and universality in the Haldane-Hubbard model Phys. Rev. B 94, 205139 2016
- [72] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro, M. Porta. Lattice quantum electrodynamics for graphene, Annals of Phys. 327, 461-511 (2012)
- [73] G. Benfatto V. Mastropietro Ward Identities and Chiral Anomaly in the Luttinger Liquid Communications in Mathematical Physics 258, 609-655 (2005)
- [74] V. Mastropietro. Nonperturbative Adler-Bardeen theorem, J. Math. Phys. 48, 022302 (2007)
- [75] G. Benfatto, P. Falco, V. Mastropietro. Functional Integral Construction of the Thirring model: axioms verification and massless limit Commun. Math. Phys. 273, 67-118 (2007)
- [76] V. Rivasseau From Perturbative to Constructive Renormalization Princeton University Press (1991)
- [77] J. Gonzalez, F. Guinea, M. A. H. Vozmediano Non-Fermi liquid behaviour of electrons in the half-filled honeycomb lattice (A renormalization group approach) Nucl. Phys. B424 (1994) 595-618
- [78] A. Giuliani V. Mastropietro Exact RG computation of the optical conductivity of graphene Phys. Rev. B 85, 045420 (2012)
- [79] I Herbut V Mastropietro Universal conductivity of graphene in the ultra-relativistic regime Physical Review B, vol. 87, 205445 (2013)
- [80] V. Mastropietro Anomaly cancellation condition in an effective nonperturbative electroweak theory Phys. Rev. D 103, 013009, 2021
- [81] V. Mastropietro Vanishing of the Anomaly in Lattice Chiral Gauge Theory Vieri Mastropietro Annales Henri Poincaré (2023)
- [82] V. Mastropietro Nonperturbative renormalization of the lattice Sommerfield vector model Phys. Rev. D 105, 114502, 2022
- [83] Sommerfield, CM, On the definition of currents and the action principle in field theories of one spatial dimension, Annals of Physics. 26 (1): 143. (1964)
- [84] G. Benfatto, P. Falco, and V. Mastropietro Universal Relations for Nonsolvable Statistical Models Comm. Math. Phys G. Benfatto, P. Falco, and V. Mastropietro Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 075701, 2010
- [85] G. Benfatto and V. Mastropietro. Universality Relations

- in Non-solvable Quantum Spin Chains. *J. Stat. Phys.* 138, 1084-1108 (2011).
- [86] G. Benfatto and V.Mastropietro. Drude Weight in Non Solvable Quantum Spin Chains. *J. Stat. Phys.* 143, 251-260 (2011).
- [87] V.Mastropietro, Conductivity in the Heisenberg chain with next to nearest interaction *Phys. Rev. E* 87, 042121 (2013)
- [88] G. Benfatto, V.Mastropietro, P. Falco. Universality of one-dimensional Fermi Systems, I. Response functions and critical exponents. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 330, 153-215 (2014)
- [89] V.Mastropietro and M. Porta. Multi-channel Luttinger Liquids at the Edge of Quantum Hall Systems. *Comm.Math. Phys.* 395, 1097-1173 (2022) 20