

COMBINATORIAL DYSON-SCHWINGER EQUATIONS OF QUARTIC MATRIX FIELD THEORY

ALEXANDER HOCK  AND JOHANNES THÜRIGEN 

ABSTRACT. Matrix field theory is a combinatorially non-local field theory which has recently been found to be a non-trivial but solvable QFT example. To generalize such non-perturbative structures to other models, a more combinatorial understanding of Dyson-Schwinger equations and their solutions is of high interest. To this end we consider combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations manifestly relying on the Hopf-algebraic structure of perturbative renormalization. We find that these equations are fully compatible with renormalization, relying only on the superficially divergent diagrams which are planar ribbon graphs, i.e. decompleted dual combinatorial maps. Still, they are of a similar kind as in realistic models of local QFT, featuring in particular an infinite number of primitive diagrams as well as graph-dependent combinatorial factors.

1. INTRODUCTION

Quartic ϕ^4 matrix field theory (MFT) has proven to be an instructive case of a field theory which is at the same time non-trivial and analytically solvable [GW14, GHW19, Hoc20], related to integrable structures [BW23, GS23] and topological recursion [HW21, BHW22, BH23]. It provides a matrix representation of scalar ϕ^4 Euclidean Quantum Field Theory (QFT) on noncommutative Moyal space at the self-dual point, also known as the model of Grosse and Wulkenhaar who have proven renormalizability in $D = 4$ dimensions to all orders [GW05a, GW05b, RVTW06]. It can be viewed as the quartic *generalization* of Kontsevich's cubic matrix model [Kon92]. On the other hand, in the framework of Tensorial and Group Field Theory [Ori12, BGR13, BG14, Car13], or even more general combinatorially non-local field theory [ORT15, Thü21b], matrix field theory is the *special case* of tensor fields of rank two.

Understanding of the analytic structure of MFT relies crucially on *analytic Dyson-Schwinger equations* [GW14]. In the first place, these equations are a coupled system of infinitely many integro-differential equations derived from the formal path integral. However, they decouple when applying Ward identities [DGMR07] and a formal $1/N$ expansion. It is then possible to solve the equation for the 2-point function [GHW19, GHW20] and find all other planar correlation functions recursively [dJHW22]. While extremely successful for quartic MFT, application of this method to tensorial field theories of higher rank has turned out to be difficult despite various attempts [PS18, PPSW21, PPSTW19, Pas20].

One reason might be the much more intricate combinatorial structure at higher rank [Gur16].

On the other hand, *combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations* are a complementary way to understand correlation functions in a renormalizable QFT via recursive equations [BK06, Kre06, KvS09]. They are based on the underlying Hopf algebra \mathcal{H}_{CK} of divergent Feynman diagrams which describes perturbative renormalization of such QFT [CK98, CK00]. Since it is entirely built on the combinatorics of Feynman diagrams which is well understood in tensorial theories [Gur16, BG14], combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations might be better suited to treat such theories. In fact, Connes-Kreimer type Hopf algebras describe renormalization not only in point-like interacting QFT but much more general also in field theories with combinatorially non-local interactions [Thü21b] and can be used for explicit calculations of amplitudes [Thü21a] which match results in perturbative MFT [Hoc20]. For the case of MFT such a Hopf algebra has been first constructed in [TVT08].

MFT is the ideal testing ground for the applicability of combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations to combinatorially non-local field theories since, on the one hand, its perturbation theory is described by a Hopf algebra \mathcal{H}_{CK} and, on the other hand, we already know its non-perturbative solutions. One can therefore address the question how the two types of Dyson-Schwinger equations (analytic and combinatorial) are related and whether combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations are an appropriate tool to find non-perturbative solutions for a non-trivial QFT, as has been shown for various special models in QFT [BK01, BK06, KY08]. In particular, one a priori expects Ward identities to play a crucial role like in the path-integral setup where they are relevant for decoupling the infinite tower of analytic Dyson-Schwinger equations. In the Hopf-algebraic picture, Ward identities define Hopf ideals \mathcal{I} such that the relevant Hopf Algebra eventually is the quotient $\mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}/\mathcal{I}$ on which also the combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations usually simplify drastically [Kre06, vS07, KvS09].

Motivated by these questions we arrive at the following results about the combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations for quartic MFT. First of all, Thm. 3.7 states that there is a Hopf algebra \mathcal{H}_{CK} of four-regular ribbon graphs G of genus zero with a single boundary. This is the Hopf algebra capturing perturbative renormalization of quartic MFT [Hoc20, Thü21a]. This has already been sketched as an example in [Thü21b] but for the current purpose it is necessary to work out the details: Often ribbon graphs and combinatorial maps are understood as equivalent notions; in Prop. 3.4 we provide the more precise statement that any ribbon graph G has a unique completion \overline{G} (by connecting external edges to a new external vertex for each boundary component) which is the dual to a fully simple combinatorial map. We give the definition of the contraction G/H of a ribbon subgraph $H \subset G$ directly on the level of permutations and show that G/H is not (the decompletion of) a combinatorial map when H has components with

more than one boundary since this leads to multi-trace vertices not covered by maps. Crucially, the Hopf algebra \mathcal{H}_{CK} of MFT contains only connected ribbon graphs with single boundary such that the coproduct $\Delta : G \mapsto \sum_{H \subset G} H \otimes G/H$ is closed in \mathcal{H}_{CK} . This aspect is not completely clear in the earlier construction of [TVT08] and seems to be the reason for explicitly including ribbon graphs with multiple boundaries (coined “planar irregular”) in the Hopf algebra in [TK13], reprinted in [Tan21].

The second main result, Thm. 3.18, are the combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations for the series X^e and X^v over 2-point and 4-point ribbon graphs,

$$X^e(\alpha) = \text{---} - \alpha B_+^-(QX^e) = \text{---} - \alpha (B_+^{\text{---}} \text{---} + B_+^{\text{---}} \text{---}) (QX^e) \quad (1.1)$$

$$X^v(\alpha) = \text{---} + \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma) = \text{---}}} \alpha^{F_\Gamma} B_+^\Gamma(Q^{F_\Gamma} X^v) = \text{---} + \alpha (B_+^{\text{---}} \text{---} + B_+^{\text{---}} \text{---}) (QX^e) + \dots \quad (1.2)$$

wherein $Q = (X^e)^{-2} X^v$. While these equations have the same form as in [TK13], they differ in the definition of the grafting operator B_+ . Here we introduce a new definition¹, Def. 3.14,

$$B_+^\Gamma(H) := \sum_{\tilde{G} \in [\Gamma]_{\sim 2}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})|} \sum_{\iota \in \mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})} \frac{\tilde{G} \circ_\iota H}{\text{maxf}(\tilde{G} \circ_\iota H)}, \quad (1.3)$$

which is based on the mathematical rigorous notion of insertions $\iota \in \mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})$, Def. 3.12, according to [Bor18, Thü21b]. In particular, it is essential that this allows only insertions of ribbon graphs H in \tilde{G} for which the external structure of H properly matches the vertex structure of \tilde{G} . The expansion of B_+ in terms of ribbon graphs weighted by combinatorial factors common in the literature [Kre06] then follows as a consequence, Prop. 3.15.

Two aspects in the combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equation hint at the non-trivial structure of MFT. On the one hand, it is necessary to include the factor $1/\text{maxf}$ in the definition of B_+ due to the existence of overlapping divergences. That is, there are ribbon graphs G in the theory which have different, usually overlapping subgraphs H_1, H_2 whose contraction yields primitive ribbon graphs G/H_i , i.e. graphs without subdivergences. Their number is counted by $\text{maxf}(G)$. On the other hand, we find that there are infinitely many such primitives in the 4-point series X^v . These facts are expected to relate to a specific anomalous dimension.

For a precise statement, we use the known analytic solution of the 2-point function, Thm. 2.6 to calculate the anomalous dimension γ of quartic MFT and find in Cor. 2.9 that

$$\gamma = -\frac{1}{\pi} \arctan(\lambda\pi) \quad (1.4)$$

¹We thank Michael Borinsky for a discussion leading to this definition.

corroborating the earlier results of a dimension drop in the spectral dimension of the non-commutative Grosse-Wulkenhaar model [GHW20]. This reduction of dimension below the otherwise critical dimension of quartic MFT is why the theory avoids quantum triviality, i.e. it shows that the theory is renormalizable as an interacting Euclidean QFT.

Mathematically, the combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations are supposed to follow from the relation of the Hopf algebra to Hochschild cohomology [CK98]. In the related Hopf algebra of rooted trees, B_+ is a Hochschild 1-cocycle,

$$\Delta B_+ = B_+ \otimes \bullet + (\text{id} \otimes B_+) \Delta \quad (1.5)$$

from which recursive relations and Hopf subalgebras follow, in particular the relation

$$\Delta(c_n^\bullet) = \sum_{k=0}^n P_{n,k}^\bullet \otimes c_{n-k}^\bullet \quad (1.6)$$

with polynomials $P_{n,k}^\bullet$ of order k in the coefficients of the series $X^\bullet = \sum_{j \geq 0} \alpha^j c_j^\bullet$ for $\bullet = e, v$. These results are expected to generalize to the Hopf algebra \mathcal{H}_{CK} of divergent Feynman diagrams of a perturbatively renormalizable QFT as \mathcal{H}_{CK} relates to a Hopf algebra of decorated rooted trees, or more precisely decorated posets [Bor16]. This has been worked out in specific cases [BK06, KvS09] and it is exactly here where the above mentioned Ward identities might become relevant as the Hochschild property Eq. 1.5 can be true only on the quotient $\mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}/\mathcal{I}$ [Kre06, vS07]. However, we are not aware of a complete proof for more realistic QFTs, in particular not for MFT.

Here we revert the usual logic and start with the subalgebra structure to then determine the conditions for the Hochschild property to be true. We find that the subalgebra structure is completely independent of Hochschild cocycles and recursive relations. In particular, we prove the coproduct Eq. (1.6) in Thm. 3.21 providing also the explicit form of the polynomials $P_{n,k}^\bullet(c)$. In fact, such a formula of the coproduct also holds more generally for any monomials in $1/X^e$ and X^v as we prove in Prop. 3.23. Together with the combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations it is then straightforward to prove in Thm. 3.25 the Hochschild property Eq. (1.5) for a sum of B_+^Γ over all primitives Γ of the theory. It is however not clear whether this also holds for B_+ to any given order, that is, whether also

$$\Delta B_+^{\bullet,n} = B_+^{\bullet,n} \otimes \bullet + (\text{id} \otimes B_+^{\bullet,n}) \Delta \quad (1.7)$$

is true at any loop order n for $B_+^{\bullet,n} = \sum_{\Gamma} B_+^{\Gamma}$ summing over primitive \bullet -point ribbon graphs Γ with n faces. What we can prove in Prop. 3.26 is that this is true if and only if for any single ribbon graph $G \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}$ all primitive cographs $\tilde{G} = G/H$ have the same number of faces. Though possibly true in quartic MFT, this is however a highly non-trivial statement to show and we leave its proof, or proof of a counter example, for the future.

It is important to note that Ward identities cannot improve this situation in quartic MFT. Ward identities in the Hopf algebra are always of the type $Q_i \sim Q_j$ relating different types of monomials Q_i in the perturbative series X^\bullet of a theory related to different types of vertices [KvS09, Pri22]. However, in quartic MFT we have one type of interactions, the quartic ones, and thus only one type of divergent n -point functions next to the 2-point functions, resulting in a single $Q = (X^e)^{-2}X^v$. Thus, the known analytic Ward identities (Eq. (2.13), (2.14)) do not have a direct algebraic analogue.

Combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations in the series X^e, X^v map to analytic equations of Green's functions by the character, given by the Feynman rules Def. 2.1. In principle, this yields non-perturbative equations derived from the structure of perturbative renormalization. A proper non-perturbative treatment is challenged in the case of MFT mainly for two reasons: One is that the grafting operator consists of insertions weighted by graph-dependent combinatorial factors, in particular $\maxf(G)$, the number of maximal forests in the resulting ribbon graph G ; this means that the equation in practice has to be evaluated on each graph individually. The other reason is that there are infinitely many 4-point primitive graphs, and thus infinitely many terms in the equation for X^v ; explicit evaluation is thus only possible up to a finite number of loops. From this perspective, the question whether for any graph all primitive cographs have the same loop order seems less important since it becomes relevant only at higher loops.

These limitation of the applicability of the combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations is not specific to MFT but typical for more realistic QFTs. Given the specific structure of MFT as a non-trivial Euclidean QFT with analytic solutions existing, still one could have expected some peculiar, possibly simplifying algebraic structure. In this respect, our results so far are negative: Even though the diagrammatics are considerably simplified due to the reduction on planar ribbon graphs, the Hopf algebra and recursive equations remain of a similar level of complexity as compared to, for example, local quartic scalar field theory. Thus, it could be that perturbative series in Feynman diagrams are simply not the right starting point to reveal the analytic structure of MFT. Still, it is also possible that some crucial aspects, e.g. the right implementation of the analytic Ward identities in the algebraic language, only remain to be uncovered. We will leave this for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful to Michael Borinsky, David Broadhurst, Henry Kibler, Dirk Kreimer, Erik Panzer and David Prinz for helpful discussions. A.H. is grateful to Harald Grosse and Raimar Wulkenhaar for previous joint work on the

Grosse-Wulkenhaar model. A.H.'s work is funded by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) through a Walter-Benjamin fellowship, project number 465029630, while J.T.'s work is funded by DFG through the project "Non-perturbative group field theory from combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations and their algebraic structure", project number 418838388, and furthermore embedded in Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 2044-390685587, Mathematics Münster: Dynamics–Geometry–Structure.

2. 4-DIMENSIONAL ϕ^4 MATRIX FIELD THEORY/GROSSE-WULKENHAAR MODEL

This section reviews the developments of ϕ^4 matrix field theory (see [BGHW22] for an extended review). This theory is also known as the Grosse-Wulkenhaar model since it is a matrix representation of scalar ϕ^4 Euclidean QFT on $D = 4$ dimensional, noncommutative Moyal space at the self-dual point for which Grosse and Wulkenhaar have proven renormalizability to all orders [GW05a, GW05b, RVTW06]. We aim to minimize derivations while providing enough detail to understand how this model differs from ordinary QFT. More literature with additional details and proofs will be provided. We start with the matrix representation and refer the reader to [Wul19, Hoc20] for information about the connection between QFT on noncommutative geometry and matrix field theory. The complex analogue of the ϕ^4 matrix model with complex fields was considered and analysed in [BH22, BH23], and behaves very similar at the simplest topologies. In this article, we will just consider the hermitian case.

Let H_N be the space of hermitian $N \times N$ -matrices and let $E \in H_N$ have positive eigenvalues (E plays the role of the Laplacian). Then, we define the measure on the space of matrices $M \in H_N$

$$d\mu(M) = \frac{dM \exp[-N\text{Tr}(EM^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}M^4)]}{\int_{H_N} dM \exp[-N\text{Tr}(EM^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}M^4)]}, \quad (2.1)$$

where dM is the Lebesgue measure and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the coupling constant. Moments are defined in the sense of a formal matrix model, i.e. the exponential of the interaction term $\exp[-N\text{Tr}(\frac{\lambda}{4}M^4)]$ is expanded and interchanged with the integration. We denote the moments by

$$\langle M_{a_1 b_1} \dots M_{a_n b_n} \rangle := \int_{H_N} d\mu(M) M_{a_1 b_1} \dots M_{a_n b_n}, \quad (2.2)$$

where M_{ab} are the components of the matrix $M \in H_N$. According to classical probability theory the moments decompose into cumulants (connected components) $\langle M_{a_1 b_1} \dots M_{a_n b_n} \rangle_c$ through partitions. For matrix models, more specifically, these partitions vanish unless the indices form a permutation. This observation goes essentially back to a work of Brezin, Itzykson, Parisi and Zuber [BIPZ78].

We will denote such a non-vanishing cumulant by the disjoint cycles of the permutation. Thus, it is natural to define the *correlation function* by

$$N^{2-b}G_{|a_1^1 \dots a_{n_1}^1| \dots |a_1^b \dots a_{n_b}^b|} := N^n \langle \prod_{j=1}^b \prod_{i=1}^{n_j} M_{a_i^j a_{i+1}^j} \rangle_c, \quad (2.3)$$

where a_i^j are pairwise different, b is the number of disjoint cycles and n_j the length of the j -th cycle summing up to $n = n_1 + \dots + n_b$. We call the correlation function of (2.3) a (n_1, \dots, n_b) -*point function*, which is normalised to large- N asymptotics. Each correlation function has a further genus expansion through a natural embedding into genus- g Riemann surfaces which are suppressed by N^{-2g} [tH74, BIPZ78],

$$G_{|a_1^1 \dots a_{n_1}^1| \dots |a_1^b \dots a_{n_b}^b|} =: \sum_{g=0}^{\infty} N^{-2g} G_{|a_1^1 \dots a_{n_1}^1| \dots |a_1^b \dots a_{n_b}^b|}^{(g)}. \quad (2.4)$$

All correlation functions are defined for pairwise different a_i^j , but have a well-defined limit for coinciding indices.

The dimension of a QFT can be defined through the spectral dimension of the Laplace operator, here E , in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. This operator-algebraic definition due to Weyl [Wey11] defines the dimension to be the smallest number $D \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{D/2}} \sum_{k=1}^N E_k^{-D/2-\epsilon} \quad (2.5)$$

converges for all $\epsilon > 0$, where E_k 's are the eigenvalues (spectrum) of E .

2.1. Perturbative series. In this subsection, we recall the perturbation theory for this matrix model and introduce its Feynman diagrams and their additional structure of boundary components and genus. We refer to [Hoc20, BHW21] for a comprehensive derivation and much more examples. Roughly speaking, this additional structure appears because the action

$$N \text{Tr} \left(EM^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4} M^4 \right) \quad (2.6)$$

is invariant *just* under cyclic permutations due to the cyclic invariance of the trace, whereas in ordinary QFTs the action is invariant under any permutation.

Let (E_1, \dots, E_N) be the eigenvalues of E . The covariance of the *free theory*, i.e. $\lambda = 0$, is

$$N \langle M_{a,b} M_{c,d} \rangle_{\lambda=0} = \frac{\delta_{a,d} \delta_{b,c}}{E_a + E_b},$$

which is typically called the *free propagator*. Note that the Kronecker δ 's in the free propagator are responsible for the fact that a moment (2.2) factorises into

partitions which necessarily have to form a permutation (2.3), otherwise, it will vanish.

Since we are looking at a formal matrix model, any correlation function can be computed, in principle, from Feynman rules (coming from Wick contraction together with the free propagator) applied to Feynman diagrams. The Feynman diagrams for matrix models are *ribbon graphs* which take into account cyclic ordering at a vertex. This observation goes originally back to [BIPZ78]. More formally, we define a ribbon graph to be a connected graph embedded in a Riemann surface (with genus and boundary components) such that the complement of the graph is a disjoint union of disks and any disk is adjacent to at most one boundary. These disks are called *faces*. A face is called *external* if it is adjacent to the boundary of the ribbon graph, otherwise it is called *internal*. In this article we will consider the special case of 4-valent ribbon graphs coming from the quartic interaction (2.6), i.e. all vertices of a ribbon graph have degree 4, except for the vertices ending in a boundary which are univalent. See Fig. 1 for an example with genus $g = 1$ and $b = 2$.

For a Riemann surface of genus g and b boundary components, the number of topologically non-equivalent ribbon graphs for a fixed number V of vertices is finite. In other words, the number of Feynman graphs contributing at a fixed order in perturbation theory for a fixed topology (g, b) is finite. This is easily shown by the Euler characteristic

$$\chi = -2g - b + 2 \quad (2.7)$$

together with Euler's formula

$$\chi = V - E + F, \quad (2.8)$$

where E is the number of edges and F the number of faces.




FIGURE 1. This is an example of a ribbon graph in the sense above. The Riemann surface has genus $g = 1$ and two boundary components $b = 2$, thus Euler characteristic $\chi = -2g - b + 2 = -2$. The complement of the grey ribbon graph consists of 4 external faces and one internal face, thus $F = 5$. The number of vertices is $V = 5$ and edges $E = 12$, which gives of course the same Euler characteristic $\chi = 5 - 12 + 5 = -2$.

Similar to ordinary QFT, there is a fixed external structure labelled by external momenta. In the matrix theory these momenta are eigenvalue E_n of the Laplacian E labelling all *faces* (not edges). An edge adjacent to the

faces labelled by E_n and E_m receives the weight $\frac{1}{E_n+E_m}$ coming from the free propagator Eq. (2.7). The internal faces are the loops and we have to sum over all eigenvalues, i.e. the spectrum of the Laplacian E . In summary, we find the following Feynman rules:

Definition 2.1 (Feynman rules). *Let Γ be a ribbon graph with labelled faces and ϖ be a weight defined as the product of*

- weights $\frac{1}{E_n+E_m}$ for each edge adjacent to faces labelled by E_n and E_m ,
- a factor $-\lambda$ for each 4-valent vertex,
- a factor $\frac{1}{N}$ for each internal face. Finally there is a sum over all eigenvalues E_n for each such internal face.

Example 2.2. *We take the example of Fig. 2 and obtain from the Feynman rules the contribution*

$$\varpi = \frac{1}{(E_a + E_b)^2} \frac{(-\lambda)^2}{N^2} \sum_{n,m} \frac{1}{(E_a + E_n)(E_b + E_m)}.$$




FIGURE 2. This is an example of a ribbon graph with one boundary and genus zero. It has two external faces labelled by E_a and E_b and two internal labelled by E_n and E_m . Since the ribbon graph is of genus zero, it has an embedding into the plane.

Example 2.3. *We take the example of Fig. 1. Label the left two external face by E_{a_1}, E_{a_2} and the right two by E_{b_1}, E_{b_2} . The remaining internal face is labelled by E_n . There are 4 different ways in labelling the external faces, one of them gives for instance the contribution*

$$\varpi = \frac{1}{(E_{a_1} + E_{a_2})^2 (E_{b_1} + E_{b_2})^2} \frac{(-\lambda)^5}{N} \sum_n \frac{1}{(E_{a_1} + E_n)^2 (E_{b_1} + E_n)^2 (E_n + E_n)^4}.$$

It is straightforward to show that any correlation function can be determined from the Feynman diagrams (see for instance [Hoc20]):

Proposition 2.4. *An (n_1, \dots, n_b) -point function of genus g has a perturbative expansion in ribbon graphs $G \in \mathbf{G}_{g,b}^{n_1, \dots, n_b}$ of genus g with b boundaries,*

$$G_{|a_1^1 \dots | \dots | a_{n_b}^b|}^{(g)} = \sum_{G \in \mathbf{G}_{g,b}^{n_1, \dots, n_b}} \varpi(G), \quad (2.9)$$

where the external faces attached to the j -th boundary are labelled with $E_{\alpha_j^i}$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, n_j\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, b\}$.

Remark 2.5. *The number of ribbon graphs for a given genus g , a given number of boundary components and a given number $n_1 + \dots + n_b$ of faces attached to the boundaries can be computed via topological recursion [EO07b]. The ribbon graphs considered here are dual to quadrangulations of so-called fully simple maps [BCGF21, BDBKS23], which is related to the $x - y$ duality transformation in topological recursion [EO07a, Hoc22, Hoc23, ABDB⁺22].*

The planar (genus $g = 0$) 2-point function has up to order λ^2 the expansion shown in Fig. 3 consisting of 12 graphs. If we assign to the top face the eigenvalue E_a and bottom face E_b , the 2-point function has the leading order expansion

$$G_{|ab|}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{E_a + E_b} + \frac{1}{(E_a + E_b)^2} \frac{-\lambda}{N} \sum_n \left(\frac{1}{E_a + E_n} + \frac{1}{E_b + E_n} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2).$$

In Fig. 4, we have listed all graphs contributing to the planar 4-point function up




FIGURE 3. Ribbon graphs contributing to the planar 2-point function up to second order in λ .

to the second order in λ^2 , where additional permutations permuting the external faces have to be taken into account.

For completeness, we list some known generating series for the number of Feynman diagrams (see [GF18] for some details). Let $c = \sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{1+12\lambda}-1}{6\lambda}}$ and denote $|G_{|ab|}^{(0)}|$ the generating function counting the number of Feynman diagrams contributing to the planar 2-point function at given loop order. This is

$$|G_{|ab|}^{(0)}| = \lambda c^6 + c^2 = 1 + 2(-\lambda) + 9(-\lambda)^2 + 54(-\lambda)^3 + \dots$$

Similarly, for the planar 4-point function one has

$$|G_{|abcd|}^{(0)}| = 2c^{12}\lambda^2 + c^8\lambda = -\lambda + 10(-\lambda)^2 + 90(-\lambda)^3 + 810(-\lambda)^4 + \dots$$

The convergence radius is $|\lambda| < \frac{1}{12}$ due to the definition of c . This extends to all correlation functions and any genus in this model. Resummability of the




FIGURE 4. Ribbon graphs contributing to the planar 4-point function up to second order in λ up to permutations. In total there are 10 graphs at the second order, 8 different permutations of the left and 2 of the right. The third order has already 90 contributing ribbon graphs.

genus series itself for matrix models is a very active research field and related to resurgence, but beyond the scope of this article.

In the same way one can also count the number of 1PI diagramms, that is bridgeless ribbon graphs, which are the crucial objects for renormalization (see Sec. 3). These numbers follow from the previous results using the inverse of the geometric series. Let $|\Pi_{|ab|}^{(0)}|$ be the generating function counting the number of planar 1PI 2-point graphs at given loop order and $|\Pi_{|abcd|}^{(0)}|$ for planar 1PI 4-point graphs. These are given by

$$|\Pi_{|ab|}^{(0)}| = \frac{|G_{|ab|}^{(0)}| - 1}{|G_{|ab|}^{(0)}|} = \frac{\lambda c^6 + c^2 - 1}{\lambda c^6 + c^2} = 2(-\lambda) + 5(-\lambda)^2 + 26(-\lambda)^3 + \dots \quad (2.10)$$

$$|\Pi_{|abcd|}^{(0)}| = \frac{|G_{|abcd|}^{(0)}|}{|G_{|ab|}^{(0)}|^4} = \frac{2c^{12}\lambda^2 + c^8\lambda}{(\lambda c^6 + c^2)^4} = (-\lambda) + 2(-\lambda)^2 + 14(-\lambda)^3 + \dots, \quad (2.11)$$

where $c = \sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{1+12\lambda}-1}{6\lambda}}$ implies the same radius of convergence.

2.2. Dyson-Schwinger equations and Ward identity. Unlike ordinary QFT models, the ϕ^4 matrix model (2.1) has a closed, convergent (in λ) expression for any $(n_1 + \dots + n_b)$ -point function at any genus g . This is possible due to the additional expansion in the genus which separates some part of the resummability issue apparent in QFT from renormalization.

We will focus on the explicit result of the planar 2- and 4-point function since these are the only ones directly affected by renormalization. The first step towards exact solutions are Dyson-Schwinger equations (DSE), which are in general equations between different correlation functions. The DSEs for the ϕ^4 matrix model decouple due to the genus expansion for large N and due to Ward identities. The closed DSE for the planar 2-point function was derived in [GW09] (and generalised in [Hoc20, BHW22]) based on the Ward identity derived in [DGMR07] (and generalised in [HW18]).

We recall for pedagogical reasons the DSE for the planar 2-point function in matrix basis (before applying the Ward identity), which is essentially achieved by classical methods of integration by parts:

$$G_{|ab|}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{E_a + E_b} - \frac{\lambda}{E_a + E_b} \left\{ \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{k,l=1}^N G_{|aklb|}^{(0)} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N (G_{|ab|}^{(0)} G_{|ak|}^{(0)} + G_{|ab|}^{(0)} G_{|kb|}^{(0)}) \right\}. \quad (2.12)$$

The DSE has the following graphical interpretation

where corresponds to the planar 2-point function, the straight line to the free propagator and to the planar 4-point function. A closed face in the graphical formula corresponds to a summation in (2.12) and the first separate vertex to the factor $-\lambda$.

The Ward identity is another way to relate correlation functions due to symmetry transformations under which the partition function is invariant, but neither the correlation function nor the action. From the Ward identity, one deduces (see [GW14, Hoc20, SW22, dJHW22] for details and more general formulas)

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N G_{|akpb|}^{(0)} + G_{|ab|}^{(0)} G_{|pb|}^{(0)} = -\frac{G_{|pb|}^{(0)} - G_{|ab|}^{(0)}}{E_p - E_a}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$G_{|abcd|}^{(0)} = -\lambda \frac{G_{|ab|}^{(0)} G_{|cd|}^{(0)} - G_{|ad|}^{(0)} G_{|cb|}^{(0)}}{(E_a - E_c)(E_b - E_d)}. \quad (2.14)$$

Note that these two identities lead to two further relations between the planar 4-point function and the planar 2-point function. Even more interestingly, the planar 4-point function is entirely determined by an algebraic formula from planar 2-point functions in (2.14).

Inserting the first relation (2.13) obtained from the Ward identity into the DSE (2.12), we derive the closed DSE for the planar 2-point function

$$G_{|ab|}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{E_a + E_b} - \frac{\lambda}{E_a + E_b} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \left(-\frac{G_{|pb|}^{(0)} - G_{|ab|}^{(0)}}{E_p - E_a} + G_{|ab|}^{(0)} G_{|ak|}^{(0)} \right) \right\}. \quad (2.15)$$

For finite N , the solution of the 2-point function and more fundamental correlation functions was derived in [HW21] for genus $g = 0$ and in [HW23] for genus $g = 1$. The algebraic structure behind this is *blobbed topological recursion* [BS17] a generalization of topological recursion [EO07b]. However, these theories do not play a role from renormalization perspective.

2.3. Renormalization & exact solution in 4 dimensions. More interestingly, going to a continuum limit corresponding to the 4-dimensional Moyal space, the correlation functions become well-defined after appropriate renormalization. In other words, renormalization is compatible, in a certain sense, with the exact solution already established at finite N at the level of a formal expansion.

Now, we will focus on the 4-dimensional Moyal space. The renormalized energy eigenvalues for the Laplacian E are given by the sequence

$$(E_1, \dots, E_N) = (e_1, e_2, e_2, e_3, \dots), \quad \text{where } e_k = Z \left(\frac{k}{N} + \frac{\mu_{bare}^2}{2} \right), \quad (2.16)$$

and each e_k has multiplicity k , i.e. e_1 appears once, e_2 twice etc. The constant Z is the field renormalization constant and μ_{bare} the mass renormalization constant. The largest eigenvalue e_d is the cut-off $\Lambda^2 := e_d$. renormalization is needed to perform a well-defined limit, when $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ together with $N \rightarrow \infty$. Since the eigenvalue e_k itself increases linearly in k , as well as its multiplicity, we find from (2.5) a 4-dimensional theory in the large N limit

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{D/2}} \sum_{k=1}^N E_k^{-D/2-\epsilon} &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{D/2}} \sum_{k=1}^N e_k^{-D/2-\epsilon} \cdot k \sim \sum_k k^{-D/2-\epsilon+1} < \infty \\ \Rightarrow D &= 4. \end{aligned}$$

A canonical analytic continuation of the 2-point function $G^{(0)}(z, w)$ is defined through Dyson-Schwinger equation to coincide at the points e_a , i.e. $G^{(0)}(e_a, e_b) = G_{|ab|}^{(0)}$. In this setting the Dyson-Schwinger equation for the planar 2-point function together with all renormalization constants reads [GW14]:

$$\begin{aligned} \left[z + w + \mu_{bare}^2 + \lambda \int_0^{\Lambda^2} dt \varrho_0(t) \left(ZG^{(0)}(z, t) + \frac{1}{t-z} \right) \right] ZG^{(0)}(z, w) & \quad (2.17) \\ = 1 + \lambda \int_0^{\Lambda^2} dt \varrho_0(t) \left(\frac{ZG^{(0)}(t, w)}{t-z} \right), & \end{aligned}$$

where \int is the Cauchy principle value, the measure $\varrho_0(t) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^d k \delta(t - e_k)$ and we have neglected all $\frac{1}{N^2}$ contributions.

The large N -limit can be seen as a continuum limit in which the eigenvalues e_k converge to the interval $[0, \Lambda^2]$ with fixed Λ^2 . The measure $\varrho_0(t)$ converges to $\varrho_0(t) = t$ and the renormalization constants Z and μ_{bare} obtain a dependence on the cut-off Λ such that the UV-limit $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ is well-defined on the level of correlation functions.

The exact solution of the nonlinear DSE (2.17) was derived in [GHW19] based on an idea of the 2-dimensional solution [PW20]. This was achieved by essentially using advanced complex analysis with singular integral equations theory together with Lagrange-Bürmann formula. We will state the result for the 4-dimensional case first for a more general measure $\varrho_0(t) \sim t$. Define implicitly for a given $\varrho_0(t)$

the two functions $\varrho_\lambda(t)$ and $R(t)$ via the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} R(z) &= z - \lambda z^2 \int_0^\infty \frac{dt \varrho_\lambda(t)}{(\mu^2 + t)^2(\mu^2 + t + z)}, \\ \varrho_\lambda(t) &= \varrho_0(R(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

where μ^2 is the renormalized mass. The function $\varrho_\lambda(t)$ takes the role of a λ -deformed measure with $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \varrho_\lambda(t) = \varrho_0(t)$.

Theorem 2.6 ([GHW19]). *The renormalized 2-point function of the ϕ^4 matricial QFT-model in 4 dimensions is given by*

$$G^{(0)}(a, b) = \frac{(\mu^2 + a + b) \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^\infty dt \log \left(\frac{a - R(-\frac{\mu^2}{2} - it)}{a - (-\frac{\mu^2}{2} - it)} \right) \frac{d}{dt} \log \left(\frac{b - R(-\frac{\mu^2}{2} + it)}{b - (-\frac{\mu^2}{2} + it)} \right) \right\}}{(\mu^2 + b + R^{-1}(a))(\mu^2 + a + R^{-1}(b))}, \quad (2.19)$$

where $R(t)$ is implicitly defined via (2.18).

We emphasise that this solution is exact for any Hölder continuous measure $\varrho_0(t)$ and simplifies even further on the 4-dimensional Moyal space, where $\varrho_0(t) = t$. This implies $\varrho_\lambda(t) = R(t)$ and thus

$$R(z) = z - \lambda z^2 \int_0^\infty \frac{dt R(t)}{(\mu^2 + t)^2(\mu^2 + t + z)}. \quad (2.20)$$

The solution has a closed expression in terms of a Gaussian hypergeometric function:

Theorem 2.7 ([GHW20]). *The linear integral equation (2.20) is solved by*

$$R(z) = z {}_2F_1 \left(\alpha_\lambda, 1 - \alpha_\lambda \middle| -\frac{z}{\mu^2} \right), \quad \text{where } \alpha_\lambda := \begin{cases} \frac{\arcsin(\lambda\pi)}{\pi} & \text{for } |\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{\pi}, \\ \frac{1}{2} + i \frac{\operatorname{arccosh}(\lambda\pi)}{\pi} & \text{for } \lambda \geq \frac{1}{\pi}. \end{cases} \quad (2.21)$$

An important fact is that the linear dependence of λ within the integral equation (2.18) is collected into a highly nonlinear dependence given by the arcsin-function into the coefficients of the hypergeometric function. Thus, the convergence radius turns out to be $|\lambda| < \frac{1}{\pi}$. The two functions $\varrho_\lambda = R$ and ϱ_0 have a different asymptotic behaviour. A hypergeometric function behaves like

$${}_2F_1 \left(a, 1 - a \middle| -x \right) \underset{x \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{x^a} \quad \text{for } |a| < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (2.22)$$

Together with the definition of the spectral dimension (2.5), we conclude:

Corollary 2.8 ([GHW20]). *For $|\lambda| < \frac{1}{\pi}$, the λ -deformed measure $\varrho_\lambda = R$ of four-dimensional Moyal space has effectively the spectral dimension $D_\lambda = 4 - 2 \frac{\arcsin(\lambda\pi)}{\pi}$.*

The 4-dimensional matricial ϕ^4 model admits a dimensional drop to an effective spectral dimension related to an effective spectral measure. This is revealed by resummation of the planar connected 2-point function.

From the QFT perspective, this dimension drop is the most important result. It means *that the ϕ^4 theory on 4D Moyal space is non-trivial* after degeneration into a genus expansion. In other words, it is well-defined at any (energy) scale $\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \infty$. So far, the relation of this dimensional drop to the anomalous dimension of the theory has not been studied². However, here we find that it is essentially the same:

Corollary 2.9. *The anomalous dimension γ of the field renormalization constant Z is half of the effective dimension drop of Corollary 2.8, i.e.*

$$\gamma = \lim_{\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\partial \log Z}{\partial \log \Lambda^2} = -\frac{\arctan(\lambda\pi)}{\pi}. \quad (2.23)$$

Proof. The field renormalization constant Z is given in [GHW19] as

$$Z = C_r e^{\mathcal{H}_r^\Lambda[\tau_r(\bullet)]},$$

where C_r is some finite constant, $\mathcal{H}_r^\Lambda[f(\bullet)]$ is the Hilbert transform $\mathcal{H}_r^\Lambda[f(\bullet)] = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{[0, \Lambda^2] \setminus [r-\epsilon, r+\epsilon]} \frac{dt f(t)}{t-r}$ and $\tau_r(t) = \arctan \frac{\lambda\pi t}{\operatorname{Re}(r+I(t+i\epsilon))}$ an auxiliary function. Furthermore, the function $I(x)$ is defined through $R(z)$ of Theorem 2.6 by $I(x) = -R(-\mu^2 - R^{-1}(x))$. With $I(x) \stackrel{x \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} x + \mathcal{O}(1)$, which was also shown in [GHW19], we finally find

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \lim_{\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\partial \log Z}{\partial \log \Lambda^2} = \lim_{\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \infty} -\Lambda^2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_r^\Lambda[\tau_r(\bullet)]}{\partial \Lambda^2} \\ &= \lim_{\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\Lambda^2}{\pi} \frac{\tau_r(\Lambda^2)}{\Lambda^2 - r} = \lim_{\Lambda^2 \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \frac{\lambda\pi\Lambda^2}{\operatorname{Re}(r + I(\Lambda^2 + i\epsilon))} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \lambda\pi. \end{aligned}$$

□

The difference of the factor of two between the spectral and anomalous dimension, $D_\lambda = 2(2 + \gamma)$, has an explanation in terms of the relation between ϕ_D^4 noncommutative field theory and $\phi_{d,r=2}^4$ matrix field theory: As a noncommutative QFT, the Grosse-Wulkenhaar model has space-time dimension $D = 4$. Its matrix representation Eq. (2.1) viewed as an $r = 2$ tensor (i.e. matrix) field theory [Thü21b], however, is a field theory on a $d = 2$ dimensional domain since variables are integrated with measure $\varrho(t)dt = tdt$, Eq. (2.17). The anomalous dimension is the renormalization correction to this dimension and therefore half the

²We are grateful to David Broadhurst and Michael Borinsky for raising this equation on the conference "From perturbative to non-perturbative QFT" which took place in Münster 2023

value of the dimensional drop of the spectral dimension related to the space-time dimension $D = 4$ of the non-commutative QFT.

The Landau ghost problem [LAK54], or triviality, is a fundamental problem in QFT. The Standard Model however is rescued by the discovery of asymptotic freedom coming from non-Abelian Yang-Mills theories. However, a simpler 4D QFT-model without the triviality problem is not known so far. For the ordinary scalar ϕ^4 -model, triviality was proved in $D = 4 + \epsilon$ dimensions [Aiz81, Frö82] and recently by Aizenman and Duminil-Copin in $D = 4$ [ADC21] as (marginal) triviality. Therefore, the construction and detailed understanding of the renormalization procedure of a simple, solvable and non-trivial QFT-model in four dimensions is a major task for renormalization theory.

The perturbative renormalization procedure invented by Connes and Kreimer using the algebraic structure of Hopf algebras [CK98, CK00] was applied efficiently in higher order perturbation theory [BK01]. This theory gave a new perspective on renormalization since it includes not just Zimmermann's forest formula but also other renormalization schemes into a Hopf algebra. The precise Hopf algebraic structure of the Grosse-Wulkenhaar model was claimed to be already analysed in [TK13]. We will give a more comprehensive analysis and fix the artificially included terms by the correct consideration of higher boundary structures and the correct way of contracting them.

3. HOPF ALGEBRA AND HOCHSCHILD COCYCLES

Renormalization of divergent amplitudes in perturbative QFT has an underlying Hopf-algebraic structure. One may disentangle combinatorics and analytics by considering the free algebra \mathcal{G} generated by the set of connected ribbon graphs \mathbf{G} . Then, the Feynman rules Def. 2.1 can be seen as an algebra homomorphism $\varpi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. This allows to understand correlation functions (2.9) as evaluations

$$G_{|a_1^1 \dots | \dots | a_{n_b}^b|}^{(g)} = \varpi (X_{n_1, \dots, n_b}^{(g)}) (\vec{a}^1, \dots, \vec{a}^b) \quad (3.1)$$

of formal series $X_{n_1, \dots, n_b}^{(g)} = \sum_{G \in \mathbf{G}_{g,b}} G$ in the subalgebra $\mathcal{G}_{g,b}$ generated by connected ribbon graphs with given genus g and b labelled boundaries.

Since ribbon graphs are the special case of strand graphs with two strands per edge, this is an instance of the algebra of strand graphs, the Feynman diagrams of the more general class of combinatorially non-local field theories (cNLFT). It has been shown that, like for field theory with point-like interactions, such algebras extend to Hopf algebras [Thü21b]. Thus, perturbative renormalization of matrix theory can be described by a Hopf algebra of divergent bridgeless (1PI) ribbon graphs which we detail in the following.

3.1. Feynman diagrams, ribbon graphs and maps. For precise statements we need a combinatorial definition of ribbon graphs. This is given by the notion

of a combinatorial map [GRS14, Eyn16]. The “combinatorial ribbon graph” can be defined as the dual of a combinatorial map, with vertices taken as faces of the map and vice versa.

Definition 3.1. A ribbon graph $G = (\mathcal{H}, \sigma, \alpha)$ is a triple of a finite set \mathcal{H} of half edges and two permutations $\sigma, \alpha : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ where α is an involution, including fixed points. Each cycle of σ defines a vertex and each cycle of α with two elements defines an (internal) edge. Fixed points $\alpha(h) = h$ define external edges, i.e. open half edges h . This yields a partition into internal and external half edges, $\mathcal{H}_{int} \cup \mathcal{H}_{ext}$.

This is the combinatorial definition of the above notion of embedded ribbon graphs in Sec. 2.1, more precisely, of their equivalence class under homeomorphisms. Thus, such a ribbon graph is dual to a discrete surface, more precisely to a combinatorial map:


Definition 3.2. A combinatorial map $M = (\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}^*, \sigma, \alpha)$ consists of finite sets $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}^*$ of unmarked and marked half edges and two permutations σ, α on $\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}^*$ where α is an involution without fixed points defining edges and cycles of σ define vertices and they contain at most one marked half edge $h^* \in \mathcal{H}^*$ each, also called a root. Cycles of $\phi = \sigma^{-1} \circ \alpha$ are called faces and those containing a root are boundary faces.

A map is called fully simple if any vertex belongs to at most one boundary and is incident to at most two edges which belong to the boundary.³

In this definition we have used the convention that permutation cycles define counter-clockwise orientation to vertices and faces and that half edges considered as darts pointing outward from vertices belong to the respective left face (as e.g. in [GF18]; alternatively, [Eyn16] for example defines faces on the right of their darts with clockwise orientation but vertices as counter-clockwise).


Definition 3.3. Given a combinatorial map $M = (\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}^*, \sigma, \alpha)$, there is a dual map $M_\star = (\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}^*, \sigma_\star = \alpha \circ \sigma, \alpha_\star = \alpha)$.

Duality is in fact an involution, $(M_\star)_\star = M$, due to α being an involution. However, since duality interchanges vertices and faces, for each boundary face with n vertices in M there is a boundary vertex incident to n boundary faces in the dual map M_\star . Thus, there is a different definition of boundary for dual maps: each vertex incident to a root defines a boundary in the sense that all faces incident to it belong to this boundary. Furthermore, the dual map corresponds to opposite orientation: For half-edges pointing outward from vertices one has to consider faces on the right to the half-edge they contain and vertices and faces

³This is a slight modification of the definition given in [BGF20] which excludes also peculiar cases as  which seem to be permitted in their definition, but should actually not be included.

have clockwise orientation since $\sigma_\star = \phi^{-1}$ and $\phi_\star \equiv \sigma_\star^{-1} \circ \alpha = \sigma^{-1}$. Thus one calls a map explicitly a *dual map* to account for these differences in interpretation.

To illustrate this duality of maps, consider the combinatorial map corresponding to the fish graph in MFT:



One can explicitly define $M = (\mathcal{H} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 2', 6', 7'\}, \mathcal{H}^* = \{1'\}, \sigma, \alpha)$ with the cycles of σ and α


$$\mathcal{C}(\sigma) = (1'2)(2'63)(6'7)(187')(45) \quad (3.3)$$

$$\mathcal{C}(\alpha) = (1'1), (2'2)(35)(48)(6'6)(7'7), \quad (3.4)$$

such that the faces are

$$\mathcal{C}(\phi) = \mathcal{C}(\sigma^{-1} \circ \alpha) = (1234)(5678)(7'6'2'1') \quad (3.5)$$


and $(7'6'2'1')$ is the boundary since $1'$ is the single root of M . Then the dual $M_\star = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}^*, \mathcal{C}(\sigma_\star) = (4321)(8765)(1'2'6'7'), \alpha)$ can be pictured as



While labels are on the left of half edges in M , they have to be on the right in the dual M_\star in order for dual edges to carry the same labels, $\alpha_\star = \alpha$. In M_\star , the vertex $(1'2'6'7')$ corresponds to the boundary and all faces, i.e. cycles of $\phi_\star = \sigma^{-1}$, except for (45) are thus external faces.

That boundary faces of maps become vertices in the dual map is different to physics where QFT Feynman diagrams have open external edges. The usual MFT ribbon graph is therefore the *decompletion* of a dual combinatorial map with respect to its boundary vertices, that is the object obtained by deleting all boundary vertices and incident half-edges. In the example (3.6), decomposition

of M_\star yields the fish ribbon graph



$$\equiv (\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}, (4321)(8765), (1)(2)(35)(48)(6)(7)) \quad (3.7)$$

From this perspective, one can even give meaning to the ribbon graph $G = (\emptyset, \sigma, \alpha)$ as an open edge “—” being the unique decomposition of the dual map

$$\overline{G} = M_\star = (\mathcal{H} = \{2'\}, \mathcal{H}^* = \{1'\}, (1'2'), (1'2')) \cong 1' \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ | \\ 2' \end{array} \quad (3.8)$$

which is the dual to $M \cong \begin{array}{c} 2' \\ | \\ 1' \end{array}$. Thus, a ribbon graph in the combinatorial sense of Def. 3.1 is a combinatorial map upon *completion* of external half-edges and vertices:

Proposition 3.4. *Every ribbon graph G has a unique completion \overline{G} which is a combinatorial map dual to a fully simply map.*

Proof. Let $G = (\mathcal{H}, \sigma, \alpha)$ be a ribbon graph with $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} \cup \mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}} \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise \overline{G} is Eq. (3.8)). We define the *completion* $\overline{G} = (\overline{\mathcal{H}}, \overline{\mathcal{H}}^*, \overline{\sigma}, \overline{\alpha})$ in the following way:

It is straightforward to promote the open half edges $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}$ to full edges by doubling them with a set $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{ext}} \cong \mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}$ such that $\overline{\mathcal{H}} \cup \overline{\mathcal{H}}^* = \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{H}'_{\text{ext}}$ and redefining the edge involution for every $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}$ to $\overline{\alpha}(h) := h' \in \mathcal{H}'_{\text{ext}}$. To construct a boundary vertex for each boundary, consider the cycles of $\sigma^{-1} \circ \alpha$ which contain external half-edges $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}$. There is one such cycle for each boundary of G . One flips the orientation of these cycles and restricts them to \mathcal{H}_{ext} (that is deletes all half edges in \mathcal{H}_{int}), yielding cycles $\mathcal{C}(\alpha \circ \sigma)|_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}}$. Finally, one maps each $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}$ in these cycles to their partner $h' = \overline{\alpha}(h) \in \mathcal{H}'_{\text{ext}}$. The resulting cycles on $\mathcal{H}'_{\text{ext}}$ define the boundary vertices, marked by all $h' \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}^* = \overline{\alpha}(\mathcal{H}^*)$. Extending $\mathcal{C}(\sigma)$ by these cycles defines $\mathcal{C}(\overline{\sigma})$ and thus $\overline{\sigma}$.

This construction uniquely defines a dual combinatorial map since $\overline{\alpha}$ is an involution without fixed points, $\overline{\sigma}$ a permutation, and roots designate boundary vertices. By construction, every external face is incident to exactly two external edges (since the boundary vertex cycles are constructed to mirror the boundary external faces of G thereby closing them along two new edges). This means that in the dual map \overline{G}_\star a vertex at a boundary face is incident to two boundary edges part of only that boundary. This is the defining property of a fully simple map, Def. 3.2. Thus, \overline{G} is dual to a fully simple map. \square

Full understanding of the relation of ribbon graphs as occurring in MFT to combinatorial maps finally allows for a straightforward definition of (external) *faces* of a ribbon graph G :

Definition 3.5. *Let G be a ribbon graph and $\overline{G} = (\overline{\mathcal{H}}, \overline{\mathcal{H}}^*, \overline{\sigma}, \overline{\alpha})$ its completion. A face of G is a cycle of $\overline{\sigma}^{-1} \circ \overline{\alpha}$. A face is external iff it contains an $h \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}$,*

or equivalently iff it is incident to a boundary vertex in \overline{G} . Otherwise it is an internal face. We denote the number of internal faces F_G .

It follows that each connected component $j = 1, \dots, b$ of the boundary of \overline{G} has n_j external faces which is the degree of the respective boundary vertex. In contrast, in the corresponding ribbon graph G the external edges are open and thus there is only a single cycle of $\sigma^{-1} \circ \alpha$ for each boundary component. In the following we will denote in set of connected ribbon graphs \mathbf{G} the subset of those with genus g and b boundaries with lengths $\vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_b)$ as

$$\mathbf{G}_{g,b}^{n_1, \dots, n_b} := \{G \in \mathbf{G} \mid g_G = g, b_G = b \text{ with external faces } \vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_b)\}. \quad (3.9)$$

The subset of bridgeless such ribbon graphs, also called *one-particle irreducible* (1PI) in physics, is ${}^{1\text{PI}}\mathbf{G}_{g,b}^{n_1, \dots, n_b}$. Finally, we denote a subset of ribbon graphs with vertices of specific types v_1, v_2, \dots as $\mathbf{G}(v_1, v_2, \dots)$, for example $\mathbf{G}(\times)$ for the four-valent diagrams of quartic MFT.

There are several diagrams isomorphic under relabelling but we can choose a canonical labelling in our case for simplicity. In general, a map is considered as the equivalence class of isomorphic relabellings [Eyn16]. In field theory, however, we are always dealing with open diagrams where external face labels are fixed. In the case of ribbon graphs, this allows to canonically choose a representative of this equivalence class in the following way: Denote the unique external half-edge belonging to the external face of momentum p_1 as $1 \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}}$. Define all vertices as cycles with subsequent labels, $\mathcal{C}(\sigma^{-1}) = (1234)(5678)\dots$. Finally, starting with the first vertex, define edges by involutions from the half edge with the lowest possible label to the lowest next possible one, e.g. in the example Eq. (3.7), first $\alpha(3) = 5$ and next $\alpha(4) = 8$, and repeat with yet unpaired half-edges of the next vertex. In this way we obtain a canonical, ordered labelling for any ribbon graph.

3.2. Hopf algebra of perturbative renormalization. The central operation in perturbative renormalization is to identify certain subgraphs $H \subset G$ and their counterpart, that is the *contraction* G/H . While this operation is rather intricate to define on the level of combinatorial maps, it is straightforward for ribbon graphs as defined in Def. 3.1 since these are a special case of 2-graphs with two strands at each edge [Thü21b]. For these, the concept of contraction can be directly imported from the 2-graph definition:

Definition 3.6. $H = (\mathcal{H}', \sigma', \alpha')$ is a ribbon subgraph of $G = (\mathcal{H}, \sigma, \alpha)$, write $H \subset G$, iff $\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H}$, $\sigma' = \sigma$ and the set of pairs of α' is a subset of those of α .

Then, contraction $G/H = (\mathcal{H}_{G/H}, \sigma_{G/H}, \alpha_{G/H})$ is defined as shrinking the edges of H in G , that is

- $\mathcal{H}_{G/H} = \mathcal{H}'_{\text{ext}}$, internal half edges of the subgraph are deleted,
- $\mathcal{C}(\sigma_{G/H}) = \mathcal{C}(\alpha' \circ \sigma)|_{\mathcal{H}_{G/H}}$ where the restriction to $\mathcal{H}_{G/H}$ means deleting all other elements in the cycles $\mathcal{C}(\alpha' \circ \sigma)$,
- and $\alpha_{G/H} = \alpha|_{\mathcal{H}_{G/H}}$.

According to this definition following the convention of [Bor18], the notion of subgraph refers to a graph possibly with several connected components, covering all the vertices of the original graph G . In this sense, one might also call it a *decomposition* of G .

Crucially, each connected component of the subgraph H is shrunk to a single vertex in G/H with the vertex structure given by its boundary. To this end, one obtains the vertex cycles of $\sigma_{G/H}$ from the boundaries of H , i.e. the inverted cycles of $\sigma^{-1} \circ \alpha'$. Only one cycle for each boundary component is needed which is why no completion is necessary here.

For example, contracting the above fish diagram yields a single quartic vertex

$$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 8 \\ \bullet \\ 3 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 4 \\ \bullet \\ 5 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \bullet \\ 6 \end{array} / \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 8 \\ \bullet \\ 3 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 4 \\ \bullet \\ 5 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \bullet \\ 6 \end{array} \cong (\{1, 2, 6, 7\}, (1267), \text{id}) \cong \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \bullet \\ 6 \end{array} \quad (3.10)$$

Contracting a ribbon graph within itself yields its external structure, the *residue*

$$\text{res} : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^*, \quad G \mapsto G/G. \quad (3.11)$$

where we denote \mathbf{R}^* the set of ribbon graphs with only external edges, i.e. with $\alpha = \text{id}$, and $\mathbf{R} \subset \mathbf{R}^*$ the subset of those with single connected components, that is just single vertices.

Note, however, that a component of H may still have several boundary components. This would lead to several σ cycles in G/H which, from a physics' point of view, constitute a single vertex (as there is a single coupling parameter associated with it). For example,

$$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 4 \\ \bullet \\ 3 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 8 \\ \bullet \\ 5 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \bullet \\ 6 \end{array} \cong (\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}, (4321)(8765), (25)(47)) \quad (3.12)$$

has two boundaries

$$\mathcal{C}(\sigma^{-1} \circ \alpha) = (1267)(3485) \quad (3.13)$$

such that also its residue

$$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 4 \\ \bullet \\ 3 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 8 \\ \bullet \\ 5 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \bullet \\ 6 \end{array} / \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ 2 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 4 \\ \bullet \\ 3 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 8 \\ \bullet \\ 5 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 7 \\ \bullet \\ 6 \end{array} \cong (\{1, 3, 6, 8\}, (16)(38), \text{id}) \cong \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ 3 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 6 \\ \bullet \\ 8 \end{array} \quad (3.14)$$

has two cycles in σ even though it represents a single vertex in the physics' sense. Such so-called *multi-trace* vertices are not properly included in the standard definition of combinatorial maps Def. 3.1 but the recent more general definition of 2-graphs [Thü21b] would be necessary to cover these cases; for the current purpose the framework of combinatorial maps is sufficient, though, as we will deal only with connected diagrams with one boundary component as explained in the following.

Contraction gives rise to the general notion of a coproduct

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{G}} : G \mapsto \sum_{H \subset G} H \otimes G/H, \quad (3.15)$$

which defines a coalgebra that can be extended to a Hopf algebra [Bor18, Thü21b]. However, for renormalization one is not interested in any subgraphs but specifically in the subclass of Feynman diagrams which are superficially divergent and 1PI (i.e. bridgeless) [Kre98, CK98].

In the quartic matrix theory, the superficial degree of divergence ω^{sd} of a diagram G of genus g_G with $V_G^{(4)}$ four-valent-vertices and boundaries $j = 1, \dots, b_G$ of lengths $\vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_{b_G})$ is given by [Hoc20]

$$2\omega^{\text{sd}}(G) = D - \frac{D-2}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{b_G} n_j + (D-4)V_G^{(4)} - D(2g_G + b_G - 1), \quad (3.16)$$

where we have included not just four-valent but also two-valent vertices, the latter with a vertex weight $\omega(\bullet) = 1$ cancelling the dependence on their number $V_G^{(2)}$. The four-valent vertices come with a weight $\omega(\times) = 4 - D$ such that they are relevant in $D > 4$ and marginal in $D = 4$ where

$$2\omega^{\text{sd}}(G) = 4 - \sum_{j=1}^{b_G} n_j - 4(2g_G + b_G - 1). \quad (3.17)$$

Thus, ω^{sd} can be non-negative only for ribbon graphs $G \in \mathbf{G}_{0,1}^{n_1}$, i.e. with $g_G = 0$ and $b_G = 1$, for which

$$\omega^{\text{sd}}(G) = \frac{4 - n_1}{2} \quad (3.18)$$

As a consequence, only $\vec{n} = (2)$ and $\vec{n} = (4)$ point functions need renormalization. In particular, $\vec{n} = (2, 2)$ point functions are convergent, including for example the diagram (3.12). Accordingly, the renormalization Hopf algebra has to be generated only by ribbon graphs of genus zero with a single boundary.

Theorem 3.7 (Connes-Kreimer Hopf algebra of $D = 4$ quartic MFT). *Let*

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}} = \langle {}^{1\text{PI}}\mathbf{G}_{0,1}^2(\times) \cup {}^{1\text{PI}}\mathbf{G}_{0,1}^4(\times) \rangle \quad (3.19)$$

be the \mathbb{Q} -algebra freely generated by the set of connected, bridgeless ribbon graphs of genus zero and a single boundary with $n = 2$ or $n = 4$ external faces and vertices of degree 4. With multiplication m given by disjoint union, this is a unital commutative algebra with unit $u : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}, q \mapsto q\mathbb{1}$ where $\mathbb{1}$ is the empty ribbon graph.

Let π be the projection deleting all bivalent vertices in a ribbon graph and define

$$\Delta : \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}, \quad G \mapsto \sum_{\substack{H \subset G \\ H \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}}} H \otimes \pi(G/H). \quad (3.20)$$

This coproduct together with the counit

$$\epsilon : \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}, \quad G \mapsto \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } G \in \mathbf{R}^* \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (3.21)$$

further defines on \mathcal{H}_{CK} the structure of a coassociative counital coalgebra, as well as a bialgebra.

Finally, there is a unique inverse S to the identity $\text{id} : G \mapsto G$,

$$S * \text{id} = \text{id} * S = u \circ \epsilon \quad (3.22)$$

with respect to the convolution product

$$\phi * \psi := m \circ (\phi \otimes \psi) \circ \Delta \quad (3.23)$$

of automorphisms $\phi, \psi : \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}$. This turns \mathcal{H}_{CK} into a Hopf algebra.

Proof. As shown in [Thü21b], ribbon graphs are the subset of 2-graphs, also called strand graphs, with two strands at each edge and whose vertex graphs are polygons. Restricting to vertex degree four the vertex graphs are 4-gons. Since \mathcal{H}_{CK} is generated by ribbon graphs with single boundary of length $n = 2$ or $n = 4$, contraction yields ribbon graphs with vertices which have as vertex graphs 2-gons or 4-gons. However, the resulting bivalent vertices on the right in the coproduct Δ are deleted by the projection π .⁴ Furthermore, contraction does not change the boundary and preserves the genus of a ribbon graph. Together this means that \mathcal{H}_{CK} is contraction closed, i.e. any ribbon graph resulting of the contraction of two ribbon graphs in \mathcal{H}_{CK} is element of \mathcal{H}_{CK} itself. Thus, according to Thm. 5.1 in [Thü21b] \mathcal{H}_{CK} is a Hopf algebra because it is a contraction-closed subalgebra of the Hopf algebra of 2-graphs. \square

The relevance of the Connes-Kreimer Hopf algebra for renormalization lies in the fact that the coinverse S induces a group structure on the set of algebra homomorphisms $\phi, \psi : \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ to any unital commutative algebra \mathcal{A} , e.g. an algebra of Feynman amplitudes and Green's functions. To this end one extends the convolution product to $\phi * \psi := m_{\mathcal{A}} \circ (\phi \otimes \psi) \circ \Delta$. It is then straightforward to check that $S^\phi := \phi \circ S$ defines an inverse element to ϕ . This inverse is the crucial part in the definition of counter terms subtracting the divergent part of a Feynman amplitude [Kre98, CK98].

Remark 3.8. *The Connes-Kreimer Hopf algebra of Thm. 3.7 in essence is the same as the one of [TVT08] for the Grosse-Wulkenhaar model. There, ribbon graphs with $(g, b) = (0, 1)$ are called planar “regular” while those with $b > 1$ are coined planar “irregular”. Furthermore, the coproduct is defined with respect to subgraphs which are “shrinkable” with respect to the given set of residues, i.e. their*

⁴For the purpose of renormalization, e.g. in the BPHZ momentum scheme [Thü21a], it is in fact necessary to keep the bivalent vertices to account for the right number of propagators. The necessary map Δ without projection π is then a coaction on the left \mathcal{H}_{CK} -comodule algebra which includes ribbon graphs with bivalent vertices.

external structure must be of the 4-gon or 2-gon vertex type. The crucial step in the proof is then to show for coassociativity the possibility to insert planar regular graphs into each other in such a way that again a planar regular graph results. This is the analogue to contraction completeness in our proof. However, they allow the possibility to insert graphs also in different ways but show that there exist the right (cyclic) insertion to prove coassociativity [TVT08]. However, challenges in the definition of Dyson-Schwinger equations are addressed in [TK13] by allowing to insert planar irregular graphs into single-trace vertices, see e.g. Fig. 9 therein.

Contrary, this is not possible with our mathematically rigorous definitions here and, as we show in the following, it is also not necessary for a consistent definition of combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations. With the proper definition of ribbon graphs 3.1 consistent with combinatorial maps, residues are fixed in a unique way (3.11) and always have to match the structure of vertices in contraction and insertion operations.

3.3. Combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations. Dyson-Schwinger equations directly determine the Green's functions of a QFT. Here we want to focus on the planar 2- and 4-point function or the 4D quartic matrix theory which need renormalization. Their corresponding combinatorial perturbative series

$$X^e = \text{---} \text{---} \sum_{\substack{G \in \text{1PI} \mathbf{G}_{0,1}^2(\text{---}) \\ \text{res}(G) = \text{---}}} \alpha^{F_G} G = \text{---} \text{---} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha^j c_j^e \quad (3.24)$$

$$X^v = \text{---} \text{---} + \sum_{\substack{G \in \text{1PI} \mathbf{G}_{0,1}^4(\text{---}) \\ \text{res}(G) = \text{---}}} \alpha^{F_G} G = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \alpha^j c_j^v. \quad (3.25)$$

are element of the Connes-Kreimer Hopf algebra \mathcal{H}_{CK} . Therein, the parameter α counts the number of faces F_G which is the analogue to the number of loops in point-like interacting field theories. For the quartic theory this is a trivial redefinition of the quartic coupling $\alpha = \lambda$. More generally, for a single k -valent interaction the Euler formula yields

$$F = E - V + 2 - 2g - b = \frac{k-2}{2}V - \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^b n_j - 1 \right) - (2g + b - 1) \quad (3.26)$$



using the handshake relation $2E = kV - \sum_j n_j$. For given boundary and genus this is an affine relation in the number of vertices V . For $k = 4$ one has simply $F = V + \text{cons}$, in particular with $(g, b) = (0, 1)$ it is $F = V$ for $n_1 = 2$ and $F = V - 1$ for $n_1 = 4$.



Combinatorial Dyson-Schwinger equations rely on the fact that divergent diagrams can be constructed iteratively by inserting divergent diagrams into each

other. In this way one may obtain all elements in the series X^e, X^v . To this end, the starting point are primitive diagrams, i.e. those which do not contain any divergent subgraphs in \mathcal{H}_{CK} :

Definition 3.9. *A ribbon graph $G \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}$ is called primitive if there exists no ribbon subgraph $H \subsetneq G$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}} \setminus \mathbf{R}^*$.*


While there is only one kind of primitive 2-point diagrams in quartic MFT, there are infinitely many primitive 4-point diagrams:

Lemma 3.10 (primitive 2-point diagrams). *The tadpole diagrams  and  are the only primitive superficially divergent ribbon graphs with $\vec{n} = (2)$.*

Proof. A 1PI 2-point graph can be written in the form  or  (which is not necessarily unique). The two vertices (2- and 4-valent vertex) correspond to a not necessarily connected 2-point subgraphs and a 4-point subgraph, respectively. A 2-point subgraph has superficial degree of divergence $\omega^{\text{sd}} = 2$. It is either not primitive, than it has a primitive subgraph or it is primitive. The same hold for the 4-point subgraph where the superficial degree of divergence is $\omega^{\text{sd}} = 0$. \square

Lemma 3.11 (primitive 4-point diagrams). *There are infinitely many primitive divergent ribbon graphs with $\vec{n} = (4)$.*

Proof. The following series is an infinite series of primitive 4-point graphs:


(3.27)

This series of 4-point graphs has no 1PI subgraph in the Connes-Kreimer Hopf algebra, i.e. there is no 2- or 4-point subgraph. Note that there are 1PI 6-point subgraphs which however do not belong to the Connes-Kreimer Hopf algebra since there superficial degree of divergence is $\omega^{\text{sd}} = -2$. To have 4-point subgraphs, the graph needs to be 3-cut irreducible, where all three cuts are not allowed to be at a vertex at a external leg. It is easy to see that the constructed class of 4-point graphs does not obey this property. \square

The main ingredient to the combinatorial DSE is the grafting operator B_+ which acts as a weighted insertion of one graph into another one. To insert a ribbon graph H into another ribbon graph \tilde{G} the external structure of \tilde{G} has to match the vertex structure of H . We follow [Thü21b] generalized from [Bor18] defining this vertex structure as the *skeleton* of the ribbon graph, given by the projection deleting all internal edges

$$\text{skl} : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^*, (\mathcal{H}, \sigma, \alpha) \mapsto (\mathcal{H}, \sigma, \text{id}). \quad (3.28)$$

Only when residue of H and skeleton of \tilde{G} agree one can choose a specific identification of them to insert H into \tilde{G} :

Definition 3.12. Let H, \tilde{G} be ribbon graphs and $\iota : \text{res}(H) \rightarrow \text{skl}(\tilde{G})$ an isomorphism on \mathbf{R}^* . The insertion of H into \tilde{G} according to ι is

$$\tilde{G} \circ_{\iota} H := (\mathcal{H}_H, \sigma_H, \alpha) \quad (3.29)$$

where

$$\alpha = \begin{cases} \iota^{-1} \circ \alpha_{\tilde{G}} \circ \iota & \text{on } \mathcal{H}_{\text{res}(H)} \\ \alpha_H & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.30)$$

and we denote the set of possible insertions, i.e. isomorphisms ι , $\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})$.

The set of possible insertions factorizes into automorphisms of the structure of each vertex and permutations of vertices of the same kind. For ribbon graphs, vertices have the structure of polygons and their automorphisms are cyclic permutations:

Lemma 3.13. Let H, \tilde{G} be ribbon graphs with $\text{res}(H) \cong \text{skl}(\tilde{G})$, i.e. it is possible to insert H into \tilde{G} . Then

$$\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G}) \cong \text{Aut}(\text{res}(H)) \cong \text{Aut}(\text{skl}(\tilde{G})) = \prod_{k \geq 2} \text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)}) \times \prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{G}}} \text{Aut}(v) \quad (3.31)$$

There are k automorphisms for a k -valent vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{G}} = \mathcal{C}(\sigma_{\tilde{G}})$ which is a cycle of $\sigma_{\tilde{G}}$ with k elements. There are $V_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)}!$ permutations of the $V_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)} = |\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)}|$ vertices in \tilde{G} of degree k . In particular,

$$|\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})| = \prod_{k \geq 2} |\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)})| \prod_{v \in \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{G}}} |\text{Aut}(v)| = \prod_{k \geq 2} V_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)}! k^{V_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)}}. \quad (3.32)$$

Proof. The set of isomorphisms between $\text{res}(H)$ and $\text{res}(\tilde{G})$ is isomorphic to the set of automorphisms on either of the two exactly because they are isomorphic (otherwise $\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G}) = \emptyset$). Since $\text{res}(\tilde{G}) \in \mathbf{R}^*$ is a union of graphs with single vertices, its automorphism group factorizes accordingly. \square

The insertion of ribbon graphs H with edge-structure, that is $\text{res}(H) = \bullet\text{---}\bullet$, needs a special treatment. Our definition of insertions demands a matching $\text{res}(H) \cong \text{skl}(\tilde{G})$ and thus bivalent vertices in \tilde{G} to allow for edge-diagram insertions. Such bivalent vertices are not present in the graphs of the series X^e, X^v . Still, we have to include the possibility to insert 2-point graphs to obtain all relevant graphs by insertion. To cover this, let us define the projection

$$\pi : \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_{k > 2} \quad (3.33)$$

which contracts (in the usual graph-theoretic sense) all bivalent vertices, $\bullet\text{---}\bullet \mapsto \text{---}$. This yields an equivalence relation \sim_2 identifying all diagrams G, G' for which $\pi(G) = \pi(G')$ and accordingly an equivalence class $[G]_{\sim_2} = [G']_{\sim_2}$. Using this, we can define the properly weighted insertion operator which allows arbitrary many edge insertions on each edge:



Definition 3.14. *The grafting operator is the map*

$$B_+ : \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}} \times \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}, (H, \Gamma) \mapsto B_+^\Gamma(H)$$

linear in both arguments and defined by

$$B_+^\Gamma(H) := \sum_{\tilde{G} \in [\Gamma]_{\sim_2}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})|} \sum_{\iota \in \mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})} \frac{\tilde{G} \circ_\iota H}{\text{maxf}(\tilde{G} \circ_\iota H)}, \quad (3.34)$$

wherein $\text{maxf}(G)$ is the number of subgraphs $H \subsetneq G$ in \mathcal{H}_{CK} such that G/H is primitive (corresponding to “maximal G -forests” in the language of Zimmermann’s forest formula [Zim69]).

Note that only subgraphs $H \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}$ are counted to obtain maxf . For example, the ribbon graph of Eq. (3.12) is a ribbon subgraph  \subset  but having two boundaries it is not in \mathcal{H}_{CK} . For this reason⁵ $\text{maxf}(\text{---} \circ \text{---}) = 2$ in MFT in contrast to local scalar QFT where the sunrise diagram has three maximal forests.




The grafting operator has an expansion in the ribbon graphs which result from the insertions summed over in the definition. Thereby, some insertions turn out to be redundant and can be divided out. We follow the literature [Kre06] for the notation of the resulting combinatorial factors:






Proposition 3.15. *The grafting operator B_+ has an expansion*

$$B_+^\Gamma(H) = \sum_{\tilde{G} \in [\Gamma]_{\sim_2}} \frac{1}{(\tilde{G}|H)|H|_\vee} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}} \frac{\text{bij}(\tilde{G}, H, G)}{\text{maxf}(G)} G, \quad (3.35)$$

where the weight factors are defined as follows [Kre06]:

- $(\tilde{G}|H)$ is the number of insertion places for H in \tilde{G} .

⁵In [TK13] this example is also given after Def. 4.3 therein. However, based on the Hopf algebra construction of [TVT08], the contraction of  \subset  is allowed. The authors argue that the reason to exclude this case from $\text{maxf}(\text{---} \circ \text{---})$ is only that the resulting contracted graph would be non-planar (which is actually wrong, the point is rather that contraction of  leads to a multi-trace vertex, Eq. (3.14)).

In the end, this wrong conception of allowed ribbon subgraphs and maxf in [TK13] seems to be the reason why the Dyson-Schwinger equations do not work out without including “planar irregular” graphs such as  in the Hopf algebra. Specifically, the authors calculate $\text{maxf}(\text{---} \circ \text{---}) = 2$ in Eq. (6.7) of [TK13] though the fish-type ribbon subgraph is not  but  \subset  which should not be in \mathcal{H}_{CK} and thus $\text{maxf}(\text{---} \circ \text{---}) = 1$. As a consequence, they come to the conclusion that  and, more generally, all planar irregular ($g = 0, b > 1$) ribbon graphs should be included in the Hopf algebra. However, this does not only lead to a Hopf algebra which is not the one renormalizing MFT; it is also inconsistent because this extended Hopf algebra is not contraction closed. That is, contraction of planar irregular ribbon graphs, $b > 1$, leads to b -fold multi-trace vertices which are still not part of that extended Hopf algebra.

- $|H|_{\vee}$ is the number of distinct graphs H which are equal upon removal of the external edges.
- $\mathbf{bij}(\tilde{G}, H, G)$ is the number of “non-equivalent” bijections between $\text{res}(H)$ and $\text{skl}(\tilde{G})$ such that G is obtained by insertion.

Proof. Let H, \tilde{G} be ribbon graphs with $\text{res}(H) \cong \text{skl}(\tilde{G})$. One can partition the set of insertions according to the resulting ribbon graphs G ,

$$\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G}) = \bigoplus_{G \in \mathbf{G}} \mathcal{I}_G(H, \tilde{G}), \quad \mathcal{I}_G(H, \tilde{G}) = \{\iota \in \mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G}) \mid \tilde{G} \circ_{\iota} H = G\}, \quad (3.36)$$



where, as always here, each G is canonically labelled as described in the end of Sec. 3.1 (otherwise one would have to identify graphs which are identical upon relabelling). Now let $H, \tilde{G} \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}$. Then, for any $\iota \in \mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})$ also $G = \tilde{G} \circ_{\iota} H \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}$ such that

$$B_+^{\Gamma}(H) = \sum_{\tilde{G} \in [\Gamma]_{\sim_2}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})|} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}} \frac{|\mathcal{I}_G(H, \tilde{G})|}{\text{maxf}(G)} G. \quad (3.37)$$

There are some parts in the factorization of $\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})$ according to Lemma 3.13 which are not sensitive to the insertion outcome $G = \tilde{G} \circ_{\iota} H$. One type is permutations of single-vertex components of $H = \prod_i H_i$. If there are j_k vertex components $H_1 = \dots = H_{j_k} \in \mathbf{R}$ of the same type k (here degree $k = 2$ or $k = 4$), then the resulting graph G does not depend on the $j_k!(V_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)} - j_k)!$ permutations how they are inserted. Thus one can factor them also in $|\mathcal{I}_G(H, \tilde{G})|$ and define the number of relevant permutations in the denominator surviving after cancellation with the denominator in Eq. (3.37) as

$$(\tilde{G}|H) = \prod_{k \geq 2} \frac{|\text{Aut}(\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)})|}{j_k!(V_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)} - j_k)!} = \binom{V_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)}}{j_k} \quad (3.38)$$

For $k = 2$, this definitions in fact differs from the literature, e.g. [Kre06], since the definitions here allow edges insertions only in bivalent vertices which are summed in the overall sum over $\tilde{G} \in \Gamma$ in B_+^{Γ} .

Another type cancellations is redundant automorphisms in $\text{Aut}(v)$ for a given vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{G}}$: If a component H_i has automorphisms in $\text{Aut}(\text{res}(H_i))$ which are equivalent upon insertion, these yield always the same graph G and can thus be factored out in $|\mathcal{I}_G(H, \tilde{G})|$. Again, for a single-vertex component $H_i = \text{res}(H_i) \in \mathbf{R}$ of degree k all k cyclic permutations give the same result. But also $H_i \notin \mathbf{R}$ may have such symmetries (e.g. the $k = 2$ cyclic permutations of  are equivalent, or two of the $k = 4$ cyclic permutations of ). These symmetries are the automorphisms of the ribbon graphs themselves since there are no internal

automorphisms. Thus we define for $H = \prod_i H_i$ the relevant factor

$$|H|_\vee = \prod_i |H_i|_\vee = \frac{|\text{Aut}(\text{res}(H))|}{|\text{Aut}(H)|}. \quad (3.39)$$

The number of “non-equivalent” bijections $\mathbf{bij}(\tilde{G}, H, G)$ is then exactly the number of the subset of all insertions of H into \tilde{G} which yield G with both types of trivial factors described factored out

$$\mathbf{bij}(\tilde{G}, H, G) = \frac{|\mathcal{I}_G(H, \tilde{G})|}{|\text{Aut}(H)| \prod_{k \geq 2} j_k! (V_{\tilde{G}}^{(k)} - j_k)!} \quad (3.40)$$

Then the statement follows by cancelling these factors in Eq. (3.37). \square

Example 3.16. Let $\tilde{G} = \text{---} \times \text{---}$ and $H = \text{---} \times \text{---} \times \text{---}$. Then $(\tilde{G}|H) = \binom{2}{1} = 2$, that is inserting $\text{---} \times \text{---}$ on the left (l) or the right (r) vertex of \tilde{G} . Furthermore, $|H|_\vee = |\text{---} \times \text{---}|_\vee \cdot |\text{---} \times \text{---}|_\vee = 1 \cdot 2$, i.e. inserting $\text{---} \times \text{---}$ either horizontally (h) as it is or rotated 90 degrees vertically (v). Thus,

$$B_+^{\text{---} \times \text{---}}(\text{---} \times \text{---}) = \frac{1}{2 \cdot 2} \sum_{i=l,r} \sum_{j=h,v} \left(\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \text{---} \times \text{---} \\ \frac{1}{2} \text{---} \times \text{---} \end{array} \right)_{ij} \quad (3.41)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \left(\text{---} \times \text{---} + \text{---} \times \text{---} + \text{---} \times \text{---} \right) \quad (3.42)$$

since $\max(\text{---} \times \text{---}) = 2$. Analogously,

$$B_+^{\text{---} \times \text{---}}(\text{---} \times \text{---}) = \frac{1}{4} \left(\text{---} \times \text{---} + \text{---} \times \text{---} + \text{---} \times \text{---} \right) \quad (3.43)$$

Since $B_+^\Gamma(\text{---} \times \text{---}) = B_+^\Gamma(\text{---} \times \text{---})$ in general, we can combine this for $c_1^v = \text{---} \times \text{---} + \text{---} \times \text{---}$ to

$$B_+^{c_1^v}(c_0^v c_1^v) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{---} \times \text{---} + \text{---} \times \text{---} + \text{---} \times \text{---} + \text{---} \times \text{---} + \text{---} \times \text{---} + \text{---} \times \text{---} \right) = \frac{1}{2} c_2^v \quad (3.44)$$

Lemma 3.17. Let $G \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}$ with k faces. Then the number of internal edges I_G and vertices V_G are

$$I_G = \begin{cases} 2k - 1, & \text{for } \text{res}(G) = \text{---} \times \text{---} \\ 2k, & \text{for } \text{res}(G) = \text{---} \times \text{---} \end{cases}, \quad V_G = \begin{cases} k, & \text{for } \text{res}(G) = \text{---} \times \text{---} \\ k + 1, & \text{for } \text{res}(G) = \text{---} \times \text{---} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Use Euler’s formula $\chi = 2 - 2g - n = V - E + F$. For $G \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}$ we have $\chi_G = 2 - 1 = 1$. The result follows since $E_G = I_G + 4 = \frac{4V_G + 4}{2}$ for $\text{res}(G) = \text{---} \times \text{---}$, and $E_G = I_G + 2 = \frac{4V_G + 2}{2}$ for $\text{res}(G) = \text{---} \times \text{---}$. \square

Combining the definitions of primitive graphs and the grafting operator yields the combinatorial DSE in the renormalization Hopf algebra:

Theorem 3.18. *Let $Q = \frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2}$, where the inverse is symbolically understood as geometric series $\frac{1}{X^e} = 1 + (- - X^e) + (- - X^e)^2 + \dots$. Then, the system of combinatorial DSEs is*

$$X^e \equiv X^{-}(\alpha) = - - \alpha B_+^{-}(QX^e) = - - \alpha(B_+^{-} \text{ with loop} + B_+^{-} \text{ with loop}) (QX^e) \quad (3.45)$$

$$X^v \equiv X^{\times}(\alpha) = \times + \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma) = \times}} \alpha^{F_\Gamma} B_+^\Gamma(Q^{F_\Gamma} X^v) = \times + \alpha(B_+^\Gamma \text{ with loop} + B_+^\Gamma \text{ with loop}) (QX^e) + \dots \quad (3.46)$$

where the set of primitive 4-point graphs is infinite.

Proof. The proof follows from the definitions and the Lemmata above. Each graph in X^e and X^v is either a primitive or can be constructed from insertions into primitive graphs. The primitive graphs for the 2-point function are proven in Lemma 3.10. Furthermore, it is shown in Lemma 3.11 that the set of primitive 4-point graphs is infinite.

The weight $1/|\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})|$ in the definition of B_+^Γ , Def. 3.14, exactly cancels multiplicities arising from the argument $Q^{F_\Gamma} X^\bullet$. According to Lemma 3.17 this argument has a factor X^v for each 4-valent vertex in Γ and a factor $1/X^e$ for each edge in $\tilde{G} \in \Gamma$ without bivalent vertices. Since these factors multiply commutatively, each monomial occurs with a multiplicity $V_{\tilde{G}}^{(2)}! V_{\tilde{G}}^{(4)}!$. Furthermore, each individual connected component H occurs in X^v and X^e in $|H|_\vee$ rotated ways which however yield the same graph under B_+^Γ . Together with Lemma 3.13 and Prop. 3.15 this shows cancellation of multiplicities from the argument $Q^{F_\Gamma} X^\bullet$ with $|\mathcal{I}(H, \tilde{G})|$ in the denominator of B_+^Γ .

Additional multiplicities arise if a ribbon graph G results from different insertions, modulo the symmetries just discussed; since only insertions into primitive diagrams are allowed, these are exactly the number of subgraphs $H \subset G$ with primitive cograph G/H and this is cancelled by $1/\max f$ in the definition of B_+^Γ . \square

3.4. Subalgebra of loop orders. An important property in the renormalization Hopf algebra is the subalgebra structure. For the 4D MFT model, the subalgebra will be studied in details which takes an important part in revealing the complexity of renormalizing this model. The following Proposition provides the subalgebra structure on the perturbative series.

Proposition 3.19. *Let $\bullet \in \{-, \times\} \equiv \{e, v\}$. Then, the following holds*

$$\Delta(X^\bullet) = \sum_{k \geq 0} X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^k \otimes c_k^\bullet \quad (3.47)$$

Proof. The Connes-Kreimer Hopf algebra considered here is a special case of the Hopf algebra of 2-graphs in [Thü21b]. This implies the so-called central identity

[Thü21b, Thm. 4.6] which translates into our setting by the following. Note that we consider the $D = 4$ MFT with 4-valent vertices. The renormalization Hopf algebra is $\mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}} = \langle {}^{1\text{PI}}\mathbf{G}_{0,1}^2(\times) \cup {}^{1\text{PI}}\mathbf{G}_{0,1}^4(\times) \rangle$. Then the central identity reads

$$\Delta(X^\bullet) = \sum_{\text{res}(G)=\bullet} \frac{(X^v)^{V_G}}{(X^e)^{I_G}} \otimes G \quad (3.48)$$

where $\bullet \in \{-, \times\} \equiv \{e, v\}$ and V_G, I_G is the number of vertices or internal edges of G , respectively. These are expressed in the loop order k according to Lemma 3.17. The central identity (3.48) implies further that at each loop order k and for any graph in the perturbative series X^\bullet the same factor appears on the left of the coproduct. Upon factorization this yields $\sum_{\text{res}(G)=\bullet, F_G=k} G = c_k^\bullet$ on the right. This derives the desired coproduct formulas. \square

Example 3.20. Consider the coproduct of two-loop 2-point graphs. To save space we write out only the reduced part $\tilde{\Delta}(G) = \Delta(G) - G \otimes \text{res}(G) - \text{skl}(G) \otimes G$:

$$\tilde{\Delta} \begin{pmatrix} \text{---} \circ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circ \text{---} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \times & 0 & \times & 0 \\ \times & \text{---} \circ \text{---} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \times & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \times \\ 0 & 0 & \times & \times \end{pmatrix} \cdot_{\otimes} \begin{pmatrix} \text{---} \circ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \circ \text{---} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.49)$$

Here we use a matrix notation with product \cdot_{\otimes} referring to a matrix product in which the coefficients multiply as tensor product. Furthermore we have distinguished the ribbon graphs on the right-hand side of the coproduct by indicating the new vertices resulting from non-trivial contraction by white vertices. Summing the rows, we find

$$\tilde{\Delta}(c_2^e) = c_1^v \otimes c_1^e + c_0^v c_1^e \otimes c_1^e = (c_1^v + c_0^v c_1^e) \otimes c_1^e = P_{2,1}^e \otimes c_1^e \quad (3.50)$$

with a degree-2 polynomial $P_{2,1}^e = c_1^v + c_0^v c_1^e \otimes c_1^e$ on the left of the coproduct.

For fixed loop order, the left of the coproduct is always a polynomial in the loop coefficients c_n^e or c_n^v which we can give explicitly:

Theorem 3.21. The coproduct of c_n^\bullet for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\bullet \in \{-, \times\} \equiv \{e, v\}$ is given by

$$\Delta(c_n^\bullet) = \sum_{k=0}^n P_{n,k}^\bullet \otimes c_{n-k}^\bullet, \quad (3.51)$$

where $P_{n,k}^\bullet$ are polynomials of loop order k in the generators c_i^v, c_j^e of the form:
For $0 < k < n$ we have

$$P_{n,k}^v = \sum_{j=0}^k Q_{n-k+1,j}^v Q_{2(n-k),k-j}^e \quad (3.52)$$

$$P_{n,k}^e = \sum_{j=0}^k Q_{n-k,j}^v Q_{2(n-k)-1,k-j}^e, \quad (3.53)$$

where

$$Q_{k,j}^v := \sum_{l_1+\dots+l_k=j} c_{l_1}^v \dots c_{l_k}^v$$

$$Q_{k,j}^e := \sum_{1s_1+2s_2+\dots+js_j=j} \frac{(s_1+\dots+s_j+k-1)!}{s_1!\dots s_j!(k-1)!} \prod_{i=1}^j (c_i^e)^{s_i}.$$

The trivial cases are $P_{n,n}^\bullet(c) = c_n^\bullet$ and $P_{n,0}^\bullet(c) = \text{skl}(c_n^\bullet)$.

Proof. Take the coproduct formula of Proposition 3.19 and restrict to a fixed n loop order. Thus, we directly get the form of (3.51) with $P_{n,k}^\bullet$ the k 'th loop order.

We define the following restriction to the k -loop order of an arbitrary perturbative series Y by $(Y)_k$. Then, from (3.47) we conclude

$$\Delta(c_n^e) = \sum_{k=0}^n \underbrace{\left(\frac{(X^v)^{n-k}}{(X^e)^{2(n-k)-1}} \right)_k}_{P_{n,k}^e} \otimes c_{n-k}^e, \quad (3.54)$$

$$\Delta(c_n^v) = \sum_{k=0}^n \underbrace{\left(\frac{(X^v)^{n-k+1}}{(X^e)^{2(n-k)}} \right)_k}_{P_{n,k}^v} \otimes c_{n-k}^v. \quad (3.55)$$

This amounts to compute the following coefficients

$$Q_{k,j}^v := ((X^v)^k)_j, \quad Q_{k,j}^e := \left(\frac{1}{(X^e)^k} \right)_j,$$

where again, the index j restricts to the j th loop order. The coefficient $Q_{k,j}^v$ is straightforwardly given by [BK06]

$$Q_{k,j}^v = \sum_{l_1+\dots+l_k=j} c_{l_1}^v \dots c_{l_k}^v.$$

The coefficient $Q_{k,j}^e$ is slightly more involved but generalizing [BK01] we can still derive it explicitly via Faa di Bruno's formula:

$$Q_{k,j}^e = [\alpha^j] \frac{1}{(X^e)^k} = \frac{1}{j!} \frac{\partial^j}{\partial \alpha^j} \frac{1}{(X^e)^k}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{j!} \sum_{1s_1+2s_2+\dots+j s_j=j} \frac{j!}{s_1! \dots s_j!} \frac{\partial^{s_1+\dots+s_j}}{\partial x^{s_1+\dots+s_j}} \frac{1}{(1-x)^k} \Big|_{x=0} \prod_{i=1}^j \left(\frac{1}{i!} \frac{\partial^i X^e}{\partial \alpha^i} \right)^{s_i} \\
&= \sum_{1s_1+2s_2+\dots+j s_j=j} \frac{(s_1 + \dots + s_j + k - 1)!}{s_1! \dots s_j! (k-1)!} \prod_{i=1}^j (c^e)^{s_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Inserting the explicit formula of $Q_{k,j}^v$ and $Q_{k,j}^e$ into (3.54) and (3.55) finishes the proof. \square

Example 3.22. *Let us consider $n = 4$ loop coefficient of the vertex series X^v . We get for $k = 3$*

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{4,3}^v &= \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2=3 \\ l_i \geq 0}} c_{l_1}^v c_{l_2}^v + \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2=2 \\ l_i \geq 0}} c_{l_1}^v c_{l_2}^v \sum_{1s_1=1} (c_1^e)^{s_1} \frac{(s_1+1)!}{s_1! 1!} \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2=1 \\ l_i \geq 0}} c_{l_1}^v c_{l_2}^v \sum_{1s_1+2s_2=2} (c_1^e)^{s_1} (c_2^e)^{s_2} \frac{(s_1+s_2+1)!}{s_1! s_2! 1!} \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2=0 \\ l_i \geq 0}} c_{l_1}^v c_{l_2}^v \sum_{1s_1+2s_2+3s_3=3} (c_1^e)^{s_1} (c_2^e)^{s_2} (c_3^e)^{s_3} \frac{(s_1+s_2+s_3+1)!}{s_1! s_2! s_3! 1!} \\
&= 2c_0^v c_3^v + 2c_1^v c_2^v + (2c_0^v c_2^v + (c_1^v)^2) 2c_1^e + 2c_0^v c_1^v (2c_2^e + 3(c_1^e)^2) \\
&+ (c_0^v)^2 (2c_3^e + 6c_1^e c_2^e + 4(c_1^e)^3).
\end{aligned}$$

For $k = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{4,2}^v &= \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2+l_3=2 \\ l_i \geq 0}} c_{l_1}^v c_{l_2}^v c_{l_3}^v + \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2+l_3=1 \\ l_i \geq 0}} c_{l_1}^v c_{l_2}^v c_{l_3}^v \sum_{1s_1=1} (c_1^e)^{s_1} \frac{(s_1+3)!}{s_1! 3!} \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2+l_3=0 \\ l_i \geq 0}} c_{l_1}^v c_{l_2}^v c_{l_3}^v \sum_{1s_1+2s_2=2} (c_1^e)^{s_1} (c_2^e)^{s_2} \frac{(s_1+s_2+3)!}{s_1! s_2! 3!} \\
&= 3(c_0^v)^2 c_2^v + 3c_0^v (c_1^v)^2 + 3(c_0^v)^2 c_1^v \cdot 4c_1^e + (c_0^v)^2 (4c_2^e + 10(c_1^e)^2).
\end{aligned}$$

For $k = 1$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{4,1}^v &= \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2+l_3+l_4=1 \\ l_i \geq 0}} c_{l_1}^v c_{l_2}^v c_{l_3}^v c_{l_4}^v + \sum_{\substack{l_1+l_2+l_3+l_4=0 \\ l_i \geq 0}} c_{l_1}^v c_{l_2}^v c_{l_3}^v c_{l_4}^v \sum_{1s_1=1} (c_1^e)^{s_1} \frac{(s_1+5)!}{5!} \\
&= 4(c_0^v)^3 c_1^v + 6(c_0^v)^4 c_1^e.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives the polynomials in the coproduct of c_4^v ,

$$\Delta(c_4^v) = \sum_{k=0}^4 P_{4,k}^v(c) \otimes c_{4-k}^v.$$

Proposition 3.23. *Let us denote by $(Y)_k$ the k th order of some perturbative series Y . Let $f(X^v, X^e)$ be some monomial of X^v and $\frac{1}{X^e}$, then the more general Hopf subalgebra structure holds*

$$\Delta(f(X^v, X^e)) = \sum_k f(X^v, X^e) \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^k \otimes f(X^v, X^e)_k.$$

Proof. By assumption $f(X^v, X^e)$ has the form $\frac{(X^v)^{n_1}}{(X^e)^{n_2}}$ for some $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Note that the trivial zero'th order is given by one, or more precisely $\left(\frac{(X^v)^{n_1}}{(X^e)^{n_2}} \right)_0 = (\text{X})^{n_1}$.

The proof essentially follows from Proposition 3.19 and the fact that a tensor space behaves under a product in the algebra as

$$(a \otimes b)(c \otimes d) = (ac \otimes bd).$$

This means that the coproduct of a product of graphs $G = G_1 G_2$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(G) &= \Delta(G_1 G_2) = \Delta(G_1) \Delta(G_2) = \sum_{k_1} (a_{k_1} \otimes G_1 / a_{k_1}) \sum_{k_2} (b_{k_2} \otimes G_2 / b_{k_2}) \\ &= \sum_{k_1, k_2} a_{k_1} b_{k_2} \otimes G_1 / a_{k_1} G_2 / b_{k_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Extrapolating this to any m -folded product of graphs $G = G_1 \dots G_m$ together with Proposition 3.19 proves the assertion for any monomial of the form $f(X^v, X^e) = \frac{(X^v)^{n_1}}{(X^e)^{n_2}}$, where $\frac{1}{X^e}$ is understood as the geometric series $\frac{1}{X^e} = 1 + (- - X^e) + (- - X^e)^2 + \dots$. Performing the computation on the level of coefficients can be very ugly, but it is for instance performed for some specific Hopf algebras in [BK06]. \square

One specific example of this proposition is of primary interest, which the coproduct of the argument of the grafting operator in the combinatorial DSE. This reads

Lemma 3.24. *Let $\bullet \in \{\text{X}, -\}$. The coproduct of $X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n$ reads*

$$\Delta \left(X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n \right) = \sum_k X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{n+k} \otimes \left[X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n \right]_k$$

Proof. Insert $X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n$ into Proposition 3.23 and the left hand side of the coproduct summarises as $X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^k = X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{n+k}$. \square

3.5. Hochschild 1-cocycle. The Hochschild 1-cocycle property is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.21 by acting with the coproduct on the Dyson-Schwinger equation

Theorem 3.25. *The grafting operator is Hochschild 1-cocycle, i.e.*

$$\Delta B_+ = B_+ \otimes \bullet + (\text{id} \otimes B_+) \Delta \quad (3.56)$$

where $B_+ = \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma)=\bullet}} B_+^\Gamma$ with fixed $\bullet \in \{-, \times\}$ and B_+^Γ acts on $Q^{F_\Gamma} X^\bullet$ with F_Γ

the number of faces of the primitive graph Γ .

Proof. From the combinatorial DSE (3.45) and (3.46) we have

$$X^\bullet = \bullet \pm \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma)=\bullet}} B_+^\Gamma \left(X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{F_\Gamma} \right).$$

Let now the identity (3.56) act on $X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n$. The lhs reads

$$\Delta \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma)=\bullet}} B_+^\Gamma \left(X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{F_\Gamma} \right) = \Delta X^\bullet = \sum_k X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^k \otimes c_k^\bullet.$$

The first term on the rhs of (3.56) reads

$$\sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma)=\bullet}} B_+^\Gamma \left(X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{F_\Gamma} \right) \otimes \bullet = X^\bullet \otimes \bullet.$$

The second term reads by Lemma 3.24

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{id} \otimes \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma)=\bullet}} B_+^\Gamma) \Delta \left(X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{F_\Gamma} \right) \\ &= (\text{id} \otimes \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma)=\bullet}} B_+^\Gamma) \left(\sum_k X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{F_\Gamma+k} \otimes \left[X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{F_\Gamma} \right]_k \right) \\ &= \sum_{k,n} X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{n+k} \otimes \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma)=\bullet \\ F_\Gamma=n}} B_+^\Gamma \left(\left[X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n \right]_k \right) \\ &= \sum_{l \geq 1} X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^l \otimes c_l^\bullet, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used

$$\sum_n \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma)=\bullet \\ F_\Gamma=n}} B_+^\Gamma \left(\left[X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n \right]_k \right) = c_{n+k}^\bullet \quad (3.57)$$

since the primitive graph is of loop order n and the inserted graph of loop order k we have to sum over all n, k to generate c_{n+k} due to the combinatorial DSE (3.45) and (3.46). \square

Theorem 3.25 is stated in a slightly weaker way than it is generally stated in the literature, see for instance [Kre06, KvS09]. The stronger statement in literature is that already the operator $B_+^{\bullet, n}$ satisfies the Hochschild 1-cocycle property, which is defined by

$$B_+^{\bullet, n} := \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma) = \bullet \\ F_\Gamma = n}} B_+^\Gamma. \quad (3.58)$$

The difference to Theorem 3.25 is that $B_+^{\bullet, n}$ of (3.58) has fixed loop order $F_\Gamma = n$ of all primitive graphs Γ , whereas Theorem 3.25 has an additional sum over n on top.

However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no satisfactory proof in literature that already (3.58) satisfies the Hochschild 1-cocycle property. It is even worse, in the literature where it is claimed to be proved a further extension is claimed to hold, namely that already B_+^Γ satisfies the Hochschild 1-cocycle property for an individual primitive graph Γ . This statement is definitely not true. We emphasise that this not only fails in our ϕ^4 Connes-Kreimer Hopf algebra, but it also fails in several other Connes-Kreimer Hopf algebras, see for instance [Kre06, (101) and (105)] different primitive generate the same graphs.

The Hochschild 1-cocycle property of (3.58) is a desirable property due to further understanding of the structure of the Connes-Kreimer Hopf algebra. For this reason, we provide an equivalent statement to the statement that (3.58) is Hochschild:

Proposition 3.26. *Let $B_+^{\bullet, n}$ be as in (3.58). Then, $B_+^{\bullet, n}$ satisfies the Hochschild 1-cocycle property, that is*

$$\Delta B_+^{\bullet, n} = B_+^{\bullet, n} \otimes \bullet + (\text{id} \otimes B_+^{\bullet, n}) \Delta \quad (3.59)$$

acting on $\left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2}\right)^n X^\bullet$, if and only if for each single graph $G \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}$ all primitive cographs have the same loop number.

Proof. Let us construct the following sub-series generated by the insertion into primitives of a fixed loop order n , that is

$$X^{\bullet, n} := B_+^{\bullet, n} \left(\left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n X^\bullet \right) = \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma) = \bullet \\ F_\Gamma = n}} B_+^\Gamma \left(\left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n X^\bullet \right) \quad (3.60)$$

where we have by linearity $X^\bullet = \sum_n X^{\bullet,n}$. Assuming that the Hochschild 1-cocycle property holds for $B_+^{\bullet,n}$, we can derive the coproduct of $X^{\bullet,n}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta X^{\bullet,n} &= \Delta B_+^{\bullet,n} \left(\left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n X^\bullet \right) \\ &= B_+^{\bullet,n} \left(\left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n X^\bullet \right) \otimes \bullet + (\text{id} \otimes B_+^{\bullet,n}) \Delta \left(\left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n X^\bullet \right) \\ &= X^{\bullet,n} \otimes \bullet + (\text{id} \otimes B_+^{\bullet,n}) \left(\sum_k X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{n+k} \otimes \left[X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n \right]_k \right) \\ &= X^{\bullet,n} \otimes \bullet + \sum_k X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^{n+k} \otimes (X^{\bullet,n})_{n+k}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that k starts from 0 and there is no contribution for negative k since $(X^{\bullet,n})_l$ is the l loop order of $X^{\bullet,n}$ which is zero for $l \leq n$. Summing over n yields the coproduct of X^\bullet (Proposition 3.19). Now, the only primitives on the rhs of the tensor product need to be of loop order n , since by definition (3.60) all primitives in $X^{\bullet,n}$ are at loop n . Any graph with higher loop order than n has already a nontrivial inserted graph. Thus assuming Hochschild for $B_+^{\bullet,n}$, the reduced coproduct of each single graph $G \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{CK}}$ (let say it is contained in $X^{\bullet,n}$) has just primitives at loop order n , and all primitive cographs have the same loop order n .

Now, we want to prove the converse. Let us assume that for each graph in \mathcal{H}_{CK} all primitive cographs have the same loop order. Let $\mathbf{G}_{\text{co-}n}$ be the set of single graphs where all primitive cographs have just loop order n . We define

$$\tilde{X}^{\bullet,n} = \sum_{\substack{G \in \mathbf{G}_{\text{co-}n} \\ \text{res}(G) = \bullet}} G.$$

By linearity, we have $X^\bullet = \sum_n \tilde{X}^{\bullet,n}$. Note also that a graph contained in $\tilde{X}^{\bullet,n}$ must be different of any graph in $\tilde{X}^{\bullet,m}$ for $n \neq m$ since they have different coproducts. By the central identity [Thü21b, Thm. 4.6] we have

$$\Delta \tilde{X}^{\bullet,n} = \tilde{X}^{\bullet,n} \otimes \bullet + \sum_k X^\bullet \left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^k \otimes (\tilde{X}^{\bullet,n})_k,$$

where $k \geq n$. Next note that $(X^{\bullet,n})_n$ and $(\tilde{X}^{\bullet,n})_n$ just consists of all primitives of loop order n , i.e.

$$(X^{\bullet,n})_n = (\tilde{X}^{\bullet,n})_n = \sum_{\substack{\Gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\Gamma) = \bullet \\ F_\Gamma = n}} \gamma,$$

from which one conclude inductively by the coproduct formula that $X^{\bullet,n} = \tilde{X}^{\bullet,n}$. The central identity of $\tilde{X}^{\bullet,n}$ becomes therefore an equivalent statement to the Hochschild 1-cocycle property of $X^{\bullet,n}$.

□

Proposition 3.26 and its proof discuss the property of $B_+^{\bullet,n}$ being Hochschild 1-cocycle which comes together with an additional explicit decomposition of the combinatorial perturbation series into sub-series $X^{\bullet,n}$

$$X^\bullet = \sum_n X^{\bullet,n}, \quad X^{\bullet,n} := \sum_{\substack{\gamma \text{ primitive} \\ \text{res}(\gamma) = \bullet \\ F_\gamma = n}} B_+^\gamma \left(\left(\frac{X^v}{(X^e)^2} \right)^n X^\bullet \right).$$

Thus if $B_+^{\bullet,n}$ is Hochschild, the perturbation series X^\bullet splits into a direct sum of $X^{\bullet,n}$. The perturbation series $X^{\bullet,n}$ is built by insertions of graphs into primitive graphs just of loop number n . Since there are infinitely many loop orders where primitive graphs occur for X^v (Lemma 3.11), we find infinitely many sub-series $X^{v,n}$ where each consists of infinitely many graphs. It seems quite remarkable that any graph of a renormalizable QFT should have primitive cographs just with constant loop number. However, it seems to be believed for the ordinary ϕ^4 QFT, QED and gauge theories in general [Kre06]. In the core Hopf algebra [KvS09] this statement is certainly true since all primitive graphs have the same loop number, that is one.

However, to the best of our knowledge this question has never been studied in details. Prop. 3.26 provides therefore a new point of view which might help to give rigorous proofs that $B_+^{\bullet,n}$ is Hochschild plus a new conjectured algebraic structure for a renormalizable QFT.

Similar questions have been studied considering the poset and lattice structure of subdivergencies in QFT [FGB05, Ber15, Bor16]. Local ϕ^3 and ϕ^4 scalar QFT are known to have a lattice structure, whereas the ϕ^6 theory has not. Furthermore, [Bor16] shows further for ϕ^3 and the 4-point function in ϕ^4 -theory this lattice is semimodular which yields a grading both in loop number and complete forests. Despite this, it is not possible to conclude that for each graph there are only primitive cographs with the same loop number. This structure (if it is true) would be a further algebraic structure compatible with the lattice structure. Hopefully, similar methods might allow to tackle also the question if (and which) renormalizable QFT consists of graphs which have primitive cographs with a constant loop number.

REFERENCES

- [ABDB⁺22] A. Alexandrov, B. Bychkov, P. Dunin-Barkowski, M. Kazarian, and S. Shadrin. A universal formula for the $x - y$ swap in topological recursion. 12 2022, 2212.00320.
- [ADC21] M. Aizenman and H. Duminil-Copin. Marginal triviality of the scaling limits of critical 4D Ising and ϕ_4^4 models. *Ann. Math*, 194:163–235, 2021, 1912.07973. doi:10.4007/annals.2021.194.1.3.
- [Aiz81] M. Aizenman. Proof of the triviality of ϕ_d^4 field theory and some mean field features of Ising models for $d > 4$. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 47:1–4, 1981. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.47.1.

- [BCGF21] G. Borot, S. Charbonnier, and E. Garcia-Failde. Topological recursion for fully simple maps from ciliated maps. 6 2021, 2106.09002.
- [BDBKS23] B. Bychkov, P. Dunin-Barkowski, M. Kazarian, and S. Shadrin. Generalised Ordinary vs Fully Simple Duality for n-Point Functions and a Proof of the Borot–Garcia-Failde Conjecture. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 402(1):665–694, 2023, 2106.08368. doi:10.1007/s00220-023-04732-7.
- [Ber15] M. Berghoff. Wonderful compactifications in quantum field theory. *Communications in Number Theory and Physics*, 9:477–547, 2015. doi:10.4310/CNTP.2015.v9.n3.a2 10.4310/CNTP.2015.v9.n3.a2.
- [BG14] J. Ben Geloun. Renormalizable Models in Rank $d \geq 2$ Tensorial Group Field Theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 332:117–188, 2014, 1306.1201. doi:10.1007/s00220-014-2142-6.
- [BGF20] G. Borot and E. Garcia-Failde. Simple maps, Hurwitz numbers, and Topological Recursion. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 380(2):581–654, 2020, 1710.07851. doi:10.1007/s00220-020-03867-1.
- [BGHW22] J. Branahl, H. Grosse, A. Hock, and R. Wulkenhaar. From scalar fields on quantum spaces to blobbed topological recursion. *J. Phys. A*, 55(42):423001, 2022, 2110.11789. doi:10.1088/1751-8121/ac9260.
- [BGR13] J. Ben Geloun and V. Rivasseau. A Renormalizable 4-Dimensional Tensor Field Theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 318:69–109, 2013, 1111.4997. doi:10.1007/s00220-012-1549-1.
- [BH22] J. Branahl and A. Hock. An irregular spectral curve for the generation of bipartite maps in topological recursion. *to appear in Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré D Comb. Phys. Interact.*, 4 2022, 2204.05181.
- [BH23] J. Branahl and A. Hock. Complete Solution of the LSZ Model via Topological Recursion. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 401(3):2845–2899, 2023, 2205.12166. doi:10.1007/s00220-023-04702-z.
- [BHW21] J. Branahl, A. Hock, and R. Wulkenhaar. Perturbative and Geometric Analysis of the Quartic Kontsevich Model. *SIGMA*, 17:085, 2021, 2012.02622. doi:10.3842/SIGMA.2021.085.
- [BHW22] J. Branahl, A. Hock, and R. Wulkenhaar. Blobbed Topological Recursion of the Quartic Kontsevich Model I: Loop Equations and Conjectures. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 393(3):1529–1582, 2022, 2008.12201. doi:10.1007/s00220-022-04392-z.
- [BIPZ78] E. Brezin, C. Itzykson, G. Parisi, and J. B. Zuber. Planar diagrams. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 59:35, 1978. doi:10.1007/BF01614153.
- [BK01] D. J. Broadhurst and D. Kreimer. Exact solutions of Dyson-Schwinger equations for iterated one loop integrals and propagator coupling duality. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 600:403–422, 2001, hep-th/0012146. doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(01)00071-2.
- [BK06] C. Bergbauer and D. Kreimer. Hopf algebras in renormalization theory: Locality and Dyson-Schwinger equations from Hochschild cohomology. *IRMA Lect. Math. Theor. Phys.*, 10:133–164, 2006, hep-th/0506190. doi:10.4171/028-1/4.
- [Bor16] M. Borinsky. Algebraic lattices in QFT renormalization. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 106(7):879–911, 2016, 1509.01862. doi:10.1007/s11005-016-0843-9.
- [Bor18] M. Borinsky. *Graphs in Perturbation Theory: Algebraic Structure and Asymptotics*. Springer Theses Recognizing Outstanding Ph.D. Research. Springer International Publishing, 2018, 1807.02046. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-03541-9.
- [BS17] G. Borot and S. Shadrin. Blobbed topological recursion: properties and applications. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, 162(1):39–87, 2017, 1502.00981. doi:10.1017/S0305004116000323.

- [BW23] G. Borot and R. Wulkenhaar. A short note on BKP for the Kontsevich matrix model with arbitrary potential. 6 2023, 2306.01501.
- [Car13] S. Carrozza. *Tensorial methods and renormalization in Group Field Theories*. Springer Cham, 2013, 1310.3736. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-05867-2.
- [CK98] A. Connes and D. Kreimer. Hopf algebras, renormalization and noncommutative geometry. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 199:203–242, 1998, hep-th/9808042. doi:10.1007/s002200050499.
- [CK00] A. Connes and D. Kreimer. Renormalization in quantum field theory and the Riemann-Hilbert problem. 1. The Hopf algebra structure of graphs and the main theorem. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 210:249–273, 2000, hep-th/9912092. doi:10.1007/s002200050779.
- [DGMR07] M. Disertori, R. Gurau, J. Magnen, and V. Rivasseau. Vanishing of beta function of non commutative Φ_4^4 theory to all orders. *Phys. Lett.*, B649:95–102, 2007, hep-th/0612251. doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.04.007.
- [dJHW22] J. de Jong, A. Hock, and R. Wulkenhaar. Nested Catalan tables and a recurrence relation in noncommutative quantum field theory. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré D Comb. Phys. Interact.*, 9(1):47–72, 2022, 1904.11231. doi:10.4171/aihpd/113.
- [EO07a] B. Eynard and N. Orantin. Topological expansion of mixed correlations in the hermitian 2-matrix model and x–y symmetry of the fg algebraic invariants. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 41(1):015203, dec 2007. doi:10.1088/1751-8113/41/1/015203.
- [EO07b] B. Eynard and N. Orantin. Invariants of algebraic curves and topological expansion. *Commun. Num. Theor. Phys.*, 1:347–452, 2007, math-ph/0702045. doi:10.4310/CNTP.2007.v1.n2.a4.
- [Eyn16] B. Eynard. *Counting Surfaces*, volume 70 of *Progress in Mathematical Physics*. Springer, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-3-7643-8797-6.
- [FGB05] H. Figueroa and J. M. Gracia-Bondia. Combinatorial Hopf algebras in quantum field theory. I. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 17:881, 2005, hep-th/0408145. doi:10.1142/S0129055X05002467.
- [Frö82] J. Fröhlich. On the triviality of $\lambda\phi_d^4$ theories and the approach to the critical point in $d \geq 4$ dimensions. *Nucl. Phys.*, B200:281–296, 1982. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(82)90088-8.
- [GF18] E. Garcia-Failde. *On discrete surfaces: Enumerative geometry, matrix models and universality classes via topological recursion*. PhD thesis, Bonn U., Math. Inst., 2018, 2002.00316.
- [GHW19] H. Grosse, A. Hock, and R. Wulkenhaar. Solution of all quartic matrix models. 2019, 1906.04600.
- [GHW20] H. Grosse, A. Hock, and R. Wulkenhaar. Solution of the self-dual Φ^4 QFT-model on four-dimensional Moyal space. *JHEP*, 01:081, 2020, 1908.04543. doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2020)081.
- [GRS14] R. Gurau, V. Rivasseau, and A. Sfondrini. Renormalization: an advanced overview. *arXiv*, 2014, 1401.5003.
- [GS23] H. Grosse and A. Sako. Integrability of Φ^4 Matrix Model as N -body Harmonic Oscillator System. 8 2023, 2308.11523.
- [Gur16] R. Gurau. *Random Tensors*. Oxford University Press, 2016. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198787938.001.0001.
- [GW05a] H. Grosse and R. Wulkenhaar. Power counting theorem for nonlocal matrix models and renormalization. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 254:91–127, 2005, hep-th/0305066. doi:10.1007/s00220-004-1238-9.

- [GW05b] H. Grosse and R. Wulkenhaar. Renormalisation of ϕ^4 -theory on noncommutative \mathbb{R}^4 in the matrix base. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 256:305–374, 2005, hep-th/0401128. doi:10.1007/s00220-004-1285-2.
- [GW09] H. Grosse and R. Wulkenhaar. Progress in solving a noncommutative quantum field theory in four dimensions. 2009, 0909.1389.
- [GW14] H. Grosse and R. Wulkenhaar. Self-dual noncommutative ϕ^4 -theory in four dimensions is a non-perturbatively solvable and non-trivial quantum field theory. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 329:1069–1130, 2014, 1205.0465. doi:10.1007/s00220-014-1906-3.
- [Hoc20] A. Hock. *Matrix Field Theory*. PhD thesis, U. Munster, 2020, 2005.07525.
- [Hoc22] A. Hock. On the x - y Symmetry of Correlators in Topological Recursion via Loop Insertion Operator. 1 2022, 2201.05357.
- [Hoc23] A. Hock. A simple formula for the x - y symplectic transformation in topological recursion. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 194:105027, 2023, 2211.08917. doi:10.1016/j.geomphys.2023.105027.
- [HW18] A. Hock and R. Wulkenhaar. Noncommutative 3-colour scalar quantum field theory model in 2D. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 78(7):580, 2018, 1804.06075. doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-6042-3.
- [HW21] A. Hock and R. Wulkenhaar. Blobbed topological recursion of the quartic Kontsevich model II: Genus=0. 3 2021, 2103.13271.
- [HW23] A. Hock and R. Wulkenhaar. Blobbed topological recursion from extended loop equations. 1 2023, 2301.04068.
- [Kon92] M. Kontsevich. Intersection theory on the moduli space of curves and the matrix Airy function. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 147:1–23, 1992. doi:10.1007/BF02099526.
- [Kre98] D. Kreimer. On the Hopf algebra structure of perturbative quantum field theories. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 2:303–334, 1998, q-alg/9707029. doi:10.4310/ATMP.1998.v2.n2.a4.
- [Kre06] D. Kreimer. Anatomy of a gauge theory. *Annals Phys.*, 321:2757–2781, 2006, hep-th/0509135. doi:10.1016/j.aop.2006.01.004.
- [KvS09] D. Kreimer and W. D. van Suijlekom. Recursive relations in the core Hopf algebra. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 820:682–693, 2009, 0903.2849. doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2009.04.025.
- [KY08] D. Kreimer and K. Yeats. Recursion and Growth Estimates in Renormalizable Quantum Field Theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 279:401–427, 2008, hep-th/0612179.
- [LAK54] L. D. Landau, A. A. Abrikosov, and I. M. Khalatnikov. On the removal of infinities in quantum electrodynamics (in russ.). *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 95:497–500, 1954.
- [Ori12] D. Oriti. The microscopic dynamics of quantum space as a group field theory. In *Foundations of Space and Time*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2012, 1110.5606.
- [ORT15] D. Oriti, J. P. Ryan, and J. Thürigen. Group field theories for all loop quantum gravity. *New J. Phys.*, 17:023042, 2015, 1409.3150. doi:10.1088/1367-2630/17/2/023042.
- [Pas20] R. Pascalie. A Solvable Tensor Field Theory. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 110:925–943, 2020, 1903.02907. doi:10.1007/s11005-019-01245-0.
- [PPSTW19] R. Pascalie, C. I. Perez-Sanchez, A. Tanasa, and R. Wulkenhaar. On the large N limit of Schwinger-Dyson equations of a rank-3 tensor field theory. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 60:073502, 2019, 1810.09867. doi:10.1063/1.5080306.
- [PPSW21] R. Pascalie, C. I. Perez-Sanchez, and R. Wulkenhaar. Correlation functions of $U(N)$ -tensor models and their Schwinger-Dyson equations. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Comb. Phys. Interact.*, 8:377–458, 2021, 1706.07358. doi:10.4171/AIHPD/107.

- [Pri22] D. Prinz. Gauge Symmetries and Renormalization. *Math. Phys. Anal. Geom.*, 25(3):20, 2022, 2001.00104. doi:10.1007/s11040-022-09423-8.
- [PS18] C. I. Perez-Sanchez. The Full Ward-Takahashi Identity for Colored Tensor Models. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, A6:1133, 2018, 1608.08134.
- [PW20] E. Panzer and R. Wulkenhaar. Lambert-W solves the noncommutative Φ^4 -model. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 374:1935–1961, 2020, 1807.02945. doi:10.1007/s00220-019-03592-4.
- [RVTW06] V. Rivasseau, F. Vignes-Tourneret, and R. Wulkenhaar. Renormalization of non-commutative ϕ^4 -theory by multi-scale analysis. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 262:565–594, 2006, hep-th/0501036. doi:10.1007/s00220-005-1440-4.
- [SW22] J. Schürmann and R. Wulkenhaar. An algebraic approach to a quartic analogue of the kontsevich model. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, page 1–25, 2022. doi:10.1017/S0305004122000366.
- [Tan21] A. Tanasa. *Combinatorial Physics: Combinatorics, Quantum Field Theory, and Quantum Gravity Models*. Oxford University Press, 2021. doi:10.1093/oso/9780192895493.001.0001.
- [tH74] G. 't Hooft. A Planar Diagram Theory for Strong Interactions. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 72:461, 1974. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(74)90154-0.
- [Thü21a] J. Thürigen. Renormalization in combinatorially non-local field theories: the BPHZ momentum scheme. *SIGMA*, 17:094, 2021, 2103.01136. doi:10.3842/SIGMA.2021.094.
- [Thü21b] J. Thürigen. Renormalization in combinatorially non-local field theories: the Hopf algebra of 2-graphs. *Math Phys Anal Geom*, 24(2):19, 2021, 2102.12453. doi:10.1007/s11040-021-09390-6.
- [TK13] A. Tanasa and D. Kreimer. Combinatorial Dyson–Schwinger equations in non-commutative field theory. *J. Noncommut. Geom.*, 7(1):255–289, 2013, 0907.2182. doi:10.4171/jncg/116.
- [TVT08] A. Tanasa and F. Vignes-Tourneret. Hopf algebra of non-commutative field theory. *Journal of Noncommutative Geometry*, 2:125, 2008, 0707.4143. doi:10.4171/JNCG/17.
- [vS07] W. D. van Suijlekom. Renormalization of gauge fields: A Hopf algebra approach. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 276(3):773–798, 2007, hep-th/0610137. doi:10.1007/s00220-007-0353-9.
- [Wey11] H. Weyl. Ueber die asymptotische verteilung der eigenwerte. *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, 1911:110–117, 1911. URL <http://eudml.org/doc/58792>.
- [Wul19] R. Wulkenhaar. *Quantum field theory on noncommutative spaces*, pages 607–690. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-29597-4_11.
- [Zim69] W. Zimmermann. Convergence of Bogoliubov’s method of renormalization in momentum space. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 15:208–234, 1969.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
 ANDREW WILES BUILDING, WOODSTOCK ROAD, OX2 6GG, OXFORD, UNITED KINGDOM
e-mail: alexander.hock@maths.ox.ac.uk

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT DER WESTFÄLISCHEN WILHELMS-UNIVERSITÄT, EINSTEIN-
 STR. 62, 48149 MÜNSTER, GERMANY, *e-mail*: johannes.thuerigen@uni-muenster.de