

An Observation on the Beta Functions in Quadratic Gravity

Hikaru Kawai^{a,b,1} and Nobuyoshi Ohta^{c,d,2}

^a*Department of Physics and Center for Theoretical Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei 106, Taiwan*

^b*Physics Division, National Center for Theoretical Sciences, Taipei 106, Taiwan*

^c*Research Institute for Science and Technology, Kindai University, Higashi-Osaka, Osaka 577-8502, Japan*

^d*School of Physics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, 85 Hoegi-ro Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 02455, Korea*

Abstract

We study the beta functions for the dimensionless couplings in quadratic curvature gravity, and find that there is a simple argument to restrict the possible form of the beta functions as derived from the counterterms at an arbitrary loop. The relation to the recent different results on beta functions is also commented on.

1 Introduction

The perturbative calculation of beta functions in quadratic gravity has a long history. The action of our concern is

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2\lambda} C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}^2 + \frac{1}{\xi} R^2 - \frac{1}{\kappa} E + \frac{M_P^2}{2} R + \rho \right], \quad (1.1)$$

where M_P is the Planck mass, and $C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}$ is the Weyl tensor with $C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}^2 = R_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}^2 - 2R_{\mu\nu}^2 + \frac{1}{3}R^2$ and $E = R_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}^2 - 4R_{\mu\nu}^2 + R^2$.

The first attempt to derive the beta functions for λ and ξ was made in [1], but this does not have contributions from additional ghosts. The result was corrected in [2], with some further corrections in [3]. The final correct answer is

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_\lambda^o &= -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{133}{10} \lambda^2, \\ \beta_\xi^o &= -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{5(72\lambda^2 - 36\lambda\xi + \xi^2)}{36}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

Since then, the result is confirmed by several works [4–8]. It was noted that the beta function for the coefficient of the Gauss-Bonnet term κ does not depend on κ itself because it is a topological term which does not contribute to quantum effects [9]. Thus it is proportional to κ^2 at the fixed point of other couplings, and it is either asymptotically free or not depending on the sign of

¹e-mail address: hikarukawai@phys.ntu.edu.tw

²e-mail address: ohtan.gm@gmail.com

the proportionality constant. It is claimed that the other couplings are asymptotically free, but there is restriction on these couplings $\xi > 0.5487\lambda > 0$ to be asymptotically free [10].

This result means that the simple pole part of the counterterms are given as

$$\frac{1}{4\epsilon} \frac{\beta_\lambda^{n,o}}{\lambda^2} C^2 + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \frac{\beta_\xi^{n,o}}{\xi^2} R^2, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\frac{1}{\epsilon} = \frac{2}{4-d}$ is the regularization parameter in the dimensional regularization, corresponding to $\log\left(\frac{\Lambda_{UV}^2}{\mu^2}\right)$ in the cutoff regularization. See, for example, the review in [11].

In a recent paper [12], it has been claimed that the above results on the beta functions of the dimensionless couplings λ and ξ do not describe the ‘‘physical’’ running of the couplings. The beta functions obtained in Ref. [12] are given as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_\lambda^n &= -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{(1617\lambda - 20\xi)\lambda}{90}, \\ \beta_\xi^n &= -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{\xi^2 - 36\lambda\xi - 2520\lambda^2}{36}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

Motivated by this result, we have studied the structure of the beta functions in perturbation theory in the mass-independent renormalization scheme [13], and point out that there is a simple argument to restrict the possible form of the beta functions as derived from the counterterms at an arbitrary loop. We also comment on the difference from the above results.

2 Perturbation theory as a double expansion in λ and ξ

Applying the perturbation expansion to the action (1.1), we see that the n -loop correction is given by an n -th order homogeneous function of λ and ξ . Furthermore, as we will show, it is a degree n homogeneous polynomial of λ and ξ . In other words, the perturbation series is nothing but a double expansion in λ and ξ .

In order to see this, we rewrite (1.1) using an auxiliary field φ as follows:¹

$$S' = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2\lambda} C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}^2 + \left(\varphi + \frac{M_P^2}{2} \right) R - \xi \varphi^2 + \rho \right]. \quad (2.1)$$

Then, by changing variables as

$$g'_{\mu\nu} = e^\phi g_{\mu\nu}, \quad e^\phi = \varphi + \frac{1}{2} M_P^2, \quad (2.2)$$

we have

$$S' = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g'} \left[\frac{1}{2\lambda} C'_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}{}^2 + R' - \frac{3}{2} g'^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi - \xi \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} M_P^2 e^{-\phi} \right)^2 + \rho e^{-2\phi} \right], \quad (2.3)$$

where $C'_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}$ and R' are the Weyl tensor and scalar curvature for $g'_{\mu\nu}$, respectively. Finally, by shifting ϕ as

$$\phi = \phi' + \log \frac{M_P^2}{2}, \quad (2.4)$$

¹The Gauss-Bonnet term is ignored hereafter.

we have

$$S' = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g'} \left[\frac{1}{2\lambda} C'^2_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} + R' - \frac{3}{2} g'^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \phi' \partial_\nu \phi' - \xi (1 - e^{-\phi'})^2 + \frac{4\rho}{M_P^4} e^{-2\phi'} \right]. \quad (2.5)$$

The important fact is that the Weyl gravity action, the first term in (2.5), does not depend on the conformal factor of the metric. Therefore, if we decompose the metric $g'_{\mu\nu}$ as

$$g'_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + \sqrt{\lambda} \bar{h}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4} \eta_{\mu\nu} h, \quad \bar{h}_{\mu\nu} \eta^{\mu\nu} = 0, \quad (2.6)$$

the coefficients of the kinetic terms for $\bar{h}_{\mu\nu}$, h and ϕ' are numerical constants and the other terms are associated with positive powers in $\sqrt{\lambda}$ and ξ . This shows that the perturbation series is given by a power series of λ and ξ .²

3 Smoothness of $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ limit and simple structure of β_λ

Next we consider the limit where ξ is taken to infinity. First if we formally take this limit in (1.1) (with the Gauss-Bonnet term ignored), we have

$$S_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2\lambda} C^2_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} + \frac{M_P^2}{2} R + \rho \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

From a quantum mechanical point of view, such a limit is not necessarily smooth. In this case, however, we can show that this limit is indeed smooth as follows. To see this, we consider the action (2.5), in which ξ appears only in the fourth term. It is clear that the field ϕ' is frozen to $\phi' = 0$ in the $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Then (2.5) is reduced to

$$S'_{\xi \rightarrow \infty} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g'} \left[\frac{1}{2\lambda} C'^2_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} + R' + \frac{4\rho}{M_P^4} \right], \quad (3.2)$$

which is nothing but (3.1) with

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{M_P^2}{2} g'_{\mu\nu}. \quad (3.3)$$

This argument can be made more rigorous by changing the variable in (2.5) as

$$\phi' = -\log(1 - \psi). \quad (3.4)$$

Then (2.5) becomes

$$S' = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g'} \left[\frac{1}{2\lambda} C'^2_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} + R' - \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{(1 - \psi)^2} g'^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \psi \partial_\nu \psi - \xi \psi^2 + \frac{4\rho}{M_P^4} (1 - \psi)^2 \right]. \quad (3.5)$$

This shows that the mass of ψ becomes infinite in the $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ limit and that ψ does not appear as an internal line. Therefore, ψ decouples from the physical process.

This should be contrasted with the $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit. In this limit, it is clear from (2.5) and (2.6) that the traceless mode of the metric, $\bar{h}_{\mu\nu}$, has large quantum fluctuations and couples with the other degrees of freedom, ϕ' and h . Therefore, the system is a strongly coupled system.

²We note here that the cosmological constant term $\frac{4\rho}{M_P^4} e^{-2\phi'}$ in (2.5) is a sort of mass term for ϕ' and it does not affect the beta functions in the minimal subtraction scheme.

In general, in the mass-independent renormalization scheme [13], the beta functions of dimensionless parameters are independent of parameters with positive mass dimension. Therefore, the beta function for λ and ξ are independent of M_P and ρ and are functions of λ and ξ only.

However, as we have seen, in the $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ limit, ϕ' decouples from the system and the system is reduced to one with three parameters λ , M_P and ρ . This means that the beta function for λ in a mass-independent scheme must be finite in the $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ limit. In other words, the perturbation series for β_λ must not have a term containing ξ . At the 1-loop level, this is indeed the case, as shown in (1.2). The beta function of λ has not been calculated beyond 1-loop, and it is an interesting question to check whether this holds at higher loop levels.

Finally, we note that this can be also understood from the meaning of ξ in (2.5) or (3.5). Actually, it is clear that ξ plays the roll of mass for ϕ' or ψ . Therefore, in the minimal subtraction scheme it does not appear in the beta function of the dimensionless coupling constant λ .

4 Action (1.1) in terms of ordinary metric field

For later convenience, we consider the ordinary perturbation theory of (1.1) with $\rho = 0$ instead of introducing auxiliary field ϕ . We take the fluctuation field as

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}, \quad (4.1)$$

and the gauge fixing term as

$$\mathcal{L}_{GF} = -\frac{1}{2a} \left(\partial_\mu h^\mu{}_\nu - \frac{b}{2} \partial^\nu h^\alpha{}_\alpha \right)^2, \quad (4.2)$$

where a and b are gauge fixing parameters. We then find the quadratic part of the action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{(2)} = & \frac{1}{4} h^{\mu\nu} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \square + \frac{M_P^2}{2} \right) P^{(2)} + \left(\frac{12}{\xi} \square - M_P^2 + \frac{3b^2}{2a} \right) P^{(0,s)} + \frac{1}{a} P^{(1)} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{(b-2)^2}{2a} P^{(0,w)} + \frac{\sqrt{3}b(b-2)}{2a} (P^{(0,sw)} + P^{(0,ws)}) \right]_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta} \square h^{\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\theta_{\mu\alpha} \theta_{\nu\beta} + \theta_{\mu\beta} \theta_{\nu\alpha} - \frac{2}{3} \theta_{\mu\nu} \theta_{\alpha\beta} \right), \\ P_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2} (\theta_{\mu\alpha} \omega_{\nu\beta} + \theta_{\mu\beta} \omega_{\nu\alpha} + \theta_{\nu\alpha} \omega_{\mu\beta} + \theta_{\nu\beta} \omega_{\mu\alpha}), \\ P_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}^{(0,s)} &= \frac{1}{3} \theta_{\mu\nu} \theta_{\alpha\beta}, & P_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}^{(0,w)} &= \omega_{\mu\nu} \omega_{\alpha\beta}, \\ P_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}^{(0,sw)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \theta_{\mu\nu} \omega_{\alpha\beta}, & P_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}^{(0,ws)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \omega_{\mu\nu} \theta_{\alpha\beta}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

are the spin projectors with

$$\theta_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\partial_\mu \partial_\nu}{\square}, \quad \omega_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial_\mu \partial_\nu}{\square}. \quad (4.5)$$

Then the propagator for the theory (1.1) is given by

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^4} \left[\frac{P^{(2)}}{k^2 \left[\frac{1}{\lambda} k^2 - \frac{M_P^2}{2} \right]} - \frac{a}{k^2} P^{(1)} + \frac{P^{(0,s)}}{k^2 \left[\frac{12}{\xi} k^2 + M_P^2 \right]} - \frac{\frac{24a}{\xi} k^2 - 3b^2 + 2aM_P^2}{(b-2)^2 k^2 \left[\frac{12}{\xi} k^2 + M_P^2 \right]} P^{(0,w)} \right. \\ \left. - \frac{\sqrt{3}b}{(b-2)k^2 \left[\frac{12}{\xi} k^2 + M_P^2 \right]} (P^{(0,sw)} + P^{(0,ws)}) \right]_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}, \quad (4.6)$$

This propagator becomes transparent in the Landau-type gauge, $a = b = 0$, as

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^4} \left[\frac{P^{(2)}}{k^2 \left[\frac{1}{\lambda} k^2 - \frac{M_P^2}{2} \right]} + \frac{P^{(0,s)}}{k^2 \left[\frac{12}{\xi} k^2 + M_P^2 \right]} \right]_{\mu\nu,\alpha\beta}. \quad (4.7)$$

The first term represents the propagation of the traceless mode, and the second term represents the propagation of the trace mode (or conformal mode). At a first glance, both of the limits $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ and $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ are dangerous because the ultraviolet behavior is changed in both cases. However, as we have discussed in section 3, the latter limit is safe. In fact, by introducing an auxiliary scalar field ϕ , the quartic behavior of the second term in (4.7) is resolved as

$$\frac{1}{k^2 \left[\frac{12}{\xi} k^2 + M_P^2 \right]} = \frac{1}{M_P^2} \frac{1}{k^2} - \frac{1}{M_P^2} \frac{1}{k^2 + \frac{\xi M_P^2}{12}}. \quad (4.8)$$

The system then becomes a coupled system of the conformal mode and ϕ , and the $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ limit is nothing but the large mass limit for ϕ . The important point is that this decoupling holds even when the interaction is taken into account, as is discussed in section 3.

5 $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ limit and structure of bare action

In this section we start with the action (1.1), and examine the form of the counterterms in the $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ limit.

As we have seen, the perturbation series is a double expansion with respect to λ and ξ . In particular the beta functions are degree $n+1$ polynomials of λ and ξ at the n -loop level. Because the simple pole ($1/\epsilon$) part of the counterterms is related to the beta functions as (1.3) in the minimal subtraction scheme, the n -loop counterterms must have the form

$$S_{n\text{-loop}} = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\epsilon^k} \left[\lambda^{n-1} \left(a_1^{(n)(k)} + a_2^{(n)(k)} \frac{\xi}{\lambda} + \dots + a_{n+2}^{(n)(k)} \left(\frac{\xi}{\lambda} \right)^{n+1} \right) C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}^2 \right. \\ \left. + \xi^{n-1} \left(b_1^{(n)(k)} + b_2^{(n)(k)} \frac{\lambda}{\xi} + \dots + b_{n+2}^{(n)(k)} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\xi} \right)^{n+1} \right) R^2 \right]. \quad (5.1)$$

Each coefficient of $C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}^2$ and R^2 can contain only up to λ^{-2} or ξ^{-2} , respectively, in order for the beta functions not to be singular in the zero coupling constant limit. In particular, at the 1-loop level we have

$$S_{1\text{-loop}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[\left(a_1 + a_2 \frac{\xi}{\lambda} + a_3 \left(\frac{\xi}{\lambda} \right)^2 \right) C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}^2 + \left(b_1 + b_2 \frac{\lambda}{\xi} + b_3 \left(\frac{\lambda}{\xi} \right)^2 \right) R^2 \right]. \quad (5.2)$$

Now consider the limit $\xi \rightarrow \infty$. If we assume that the bare action $S_0 = S + S_{1\text{-loop}} + \dots$ remains finite in this limit, we have

$$a_2^{(n)(k)} = \dots = a_{n+2}^{(n)(k)} = 0, \quad b_1^{(n)(k)} = \dots = b_{n-1}^{(n)(k)} = 0, \quad (5.3)$$

for all $n = 1, \dots$ and $k = 1, \dots, n$. In other words, in (5.1) only the first term for $C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}^2$ and the last three terms for R^2 remain. More explicitly, we can write as

$$S_{n\text{-loop}} = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{\epsilon^k} \left[\lambda^{n-1} a^{(n)(k)} C_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}^2 + \left(\lambda^{n-1} b_n^{(n)(k)} + \xi^{-1} \lambda^n b_{n+1}^{(n)(k)} + \xi^{-2} \lambda^{n+1} b_{n+2}^{(n)(k)} \right) R^2 \right]. \quad (5.4)$$

If this assumption is correct to all loop orders, from (1.3) the beta functions should be given by

$$\beta_\lambda = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 4a^{(n)(1)} \lambda^{n+1}, \quad \beta_\xi = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2 \left(b_n^{(n)(1)} \lambda^{n-1} \xi^2 + b_{n+1}^{(n)(1)} \lambda^n \xi + b_{n+2}^{(n)(1)} \lambda^{n+1} \right). \quad (5.5)$$

Therefore, β_λ is a function of only λ , and β_ξ contains ξ at most quadratically. It will be interesting to see if this is correct at higher loop orders.

6 Relation between various beta functions

In the previous sections, we have seen that the action (1.1) is equivalent to (2.5) or (3.5). Furthermore, if the cosmological constant is zero, $\rho = 0$, ξ is the mass squared for ψ . Therefore, in the minimal subtraction scheme, the beta function for λ does not depend on ξ , which confirms the form of the first equation of (1.2):

$$\beta_\lambda^o = -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{133}{10} \lambda^2. \quad (6.1)$$

However, as we will discuss now, this beta function is not exactly the same as the beta function for the decoupled action (3.1) obtained by sending $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ in the action, which we denote as β_λ^∞ . In fact, it is known that β_λ^∞ is given by [2]

$$\beta_\lambda^\infty = -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{797}{60} \lambda^2. \quad (6.2)$$

The difference is exactly the contribution of a scalar field ψ . Actually, for the action (3.5) in the minimal subtraction scheme, the counterterm does not depend on the mass of ψ . Therefore the beta function is the same as the massless theory, that is, the theory with $\xi = 0$. But this is nothing but the action (3.1) plus a massless scalar ϕ' . The contribution of a scalar field to the beta function $\Delta\beta_\lambda$ is easily calculated from the induced Weyl gravity, and it is given by [2, 14]

$$\Delta\beta_\lambda = -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{1}{60} \lambda^2. \quad (6.3)$$

And we can indeed find

$$\beta_\lambda^o = \beta_\lambda^\infty + \Delta\beta_\lambda. \quad (6.4)$$

It is now clear that the discrepancy is understood as the failure of the decoupling in the mass independent renormalization scheme. In fact in the minimal subtraction scheme, the counterterm

remains the same even if the mass of a field becomes infinite and the field decouples physically. Therefore the beta function for λ of the original theory (1.1) in the minimal subtraction scheme is not exactly the same as that of the decoupled action (3.1), but we have an additional contribution from a scalar field.

Related to this is the difference of the coefficients of the beta functions directly calculated in the conformal gravity [2, 15, 16], where the beta function is given as

$$\beta_\lambda = -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{199}{15} \lambda^2, \quad (6.5)$$

The difference between (6.2) and (6.5) is again the same as the contribution of a scalar field (6.3). This arises because (6.5) is calculated by projecting out a trace mode in the theory. This suggests that there might be some subtlety in the $\xi \rightarrow 0$ limit related to the contribution of the spin 0 mode. This was studied in [16], but the result remained the same. This point needs further study.

Finally what is the difference between the beta functions in the minimal subtraction scheme and those in (1.4)? The beta functions in (1.4) are read off from the scattering amplitudes. In this case, there are additional contributions $\log(p^2/m^2)$ with an IR regulator m^2 when M_P is set to zero. For the beta functions defined so, our simple observation may not apply because such beta functions are not related to the counterterms.

7 Summary

In this paper, we have studied the beta functions for the dimensionless couplings in the quadratic curvature theory. By considering the general structure of the counterterms in the theory together with the $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ limit, we have argued that the beta function for λ should be a monomial λ^{n+1} and that for ξ consists of three terms of λ^{n+1} , $\lambda^n \xi$ and $\lambda^{n-1} \xi^2$ at n -loop. This result is supported by 1-loop calculation, but there has not been any calculation at 2-loop and beyond. It would be an interesting problem to check explicitly whether this is indeed true or not at 2-loop and beyond. We also commented on the difference in the coefficients of several calculations of the beta functions for λ , and there seems to be subtlety in the calculation. Sending $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ at the action level or in the beta function give difference in the mass-independent renormalization. We also noted the different definition of the beta function given in [12].

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Roberto Percacci for valuable comments. H.K. thanks Prof. Shin-Nan Yang and his family for their kind support through the Chin-Yu chair professorship. H.K. is partially supported by JSPS (Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research Grants No. 20K03970), by the Ministry of Science and Technology, R.O.C. (MOST 111-2811-M-002-016), and by National Taiwan University. The work of N.O. was supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research Fund of the JSPS (C) No. 20K03980, and by the Ministry of Science and Technology, R. O. C. (Taiwan) under the grant MOST 112-2811-M-008-016. N.O. would like to thank Kimyeong Lee and Korea Institute for Advanced Study for their hospitality, where this work was completed.

References

- [1] J. Julve and M. Tonin, “Quantum Gravity with Higher Derivative Terms,” *Nuovo Cim. B* **46** (1978) 137.
- [2] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, “Renormalizable Asymptotically Free Quantum Theory of Gravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **104** (1981) 377; *Nucl. Phys. B* **201** (1982) 469.
- [3] I. G. Avramidi and A. O. Barvinsky, “Asymptotic freedom in higher derivative quantum gravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **159** (1985) 269.
- [4] A. Codello and R. Percacci, “Fixed points of higher derivative gravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** (2006) 221301 [hep-th/0607128].
- [5] M. Niedermaier, “Gravitational fixed points and asymptotic safety from perturbation theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **833** (2010) 226.
- [6] F. Saueressig, K. Groh, S. Rechenberger and O. Zanusso, “Higher derivative gravity from the universal renormalization group machine,” *PoS EPS-HEP 2011* (2011) 124, arXiv:1111.1743 [hep-th]
- [7] G. de Berredo-Peixoto and I. L. Shapiro, “Higher derivative quantum gravity with Gauss-Bonnet term,” *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 064005 [hep-th/0412249].
- [8] N. Ohta and R. Percacci, “Higher Derivative Gravity and Asymptotic Safety in Diverse Dimensions,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31** (2014) 015024 [arXiv:1308.3398 [hep-th]].
- [9] K. Falls, N. Ohta and R. Percacci, “Towards the determination of the dimension of the critical surface in asymptotically safe gravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **810** (2020) 135773 [arXiv:2004.04126 [hep-th]].
- [10] H. Kawai and N. Ohta, “Wave function renormalization and flow of couplings in asymptotically safe quantum gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 126025 [arXiv:2305.10591 [hep-th]].
- [11] N. Ohta, “One-Loop Divergences in Higher-Derivative Gravity,” in C. Bambi, L. Modesto, I. Shapiro (eds) *Handbook of Quantum Gravity* (Springer, Singapore), https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-3079-9_11-1 [arXiv:2210.02583 [hep-th]].
- [12] D. Buccio, J. F. Donoghue, G. Menezes and R. Percacci, “Physical running of couplings in quadratic gravity,” [arXiv:2403.02397 [hep-th]].
- [13] S. Weinberg, “New approach to the renormalization group,” *Phys. Rev. D* **8** (1973) 3497.
- [14] I. Antoniadis and E. Mottola, “4-D quantum gravity in the conformal sector,” *Phys. Rev. D* **45** (1992) 2013.
- [15] G. de Berredo-Peixoto and I. L. Shapiro, “Conformal quantum gravity with the Gauss-Bonnet term,” *Phys. Rev. D* **70** (2004) 044024 [arXiv:hep-th/0307030 [hep-th]].
- [16] N. Ohta and R. Percacci, “Ultraviolet Fixed Points in Conformal Gravity and General Quadratic Theories,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33** (2016), 035001 [arXiv:1506.05526 [hep-th]].