

Dynamical Lorentz Symmetry Breaking in a Scale-free Theory of Gravity

A. C. Lehum,^{1,*} J. R. Nascimento,^{2,†} A. Yu. Petrov,^{2,‡} and P. J. Porfírio^{2,§}

¹*Faculdade de Física, Universidade Federal do Pará, 66075-110, Belém, Pará, Brazil*

²*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal da Paraíba*

Caixa Postal 5008, 58051-970, João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brazil

This paper explores the renormalization of scale-free quadratic gravity coupled to the bumblebee field and its potential for dynamically breaking Lorentz symmetry. We conduct one-loop renormalization of the model and calculate the associated renormalization group functions. Additionally, we compute the one-loop effective potential for the bumblebee field, revealing that it acquires a non-trivial vacuum expectation value induced by radiative corrections – a phenomenon known as the Coleman-Weinberg mechanism. This spontaneous breaking of scale invariance arises from the non-vanishing vacuum expectation value of the bumblebee field, implying Lorentz symmetry violation. Consequently, the non-minimal coupling between the bumblebee and gravitational fields results in a spontaneous generation of the Einstein-Hilbert term due to radiative corrections, thereby linking the Planck scale to Lorentz violation phenomena.

I. INTRODUCTION

In contrast to the gauge theories governing the electroweak and strong interactions in the Standard Model, the quantization of Einstein's general relativity results in a nonrenormalizable quantum field theory [1–3]. Even though it remains feasible to incorporate gravity into the quantum framework by confining our considerations to energies lower than the Planck

*lehum@ufpa.br

†jroberto@fisica.ufpb.br

‡petrov@fisica.ufpb.br

§pporfirio@fisica.ufpb.br

scale [4–6], several attempts have been made to explore the possibility of quadratic gravity serving as a viable candidate for a renormalizable theory of quantum gravity [7–12]; for a review, see Refs. [13, 14]. Additionally, some cosmological implications of quadratic gravity have been studied in Refs. [15, 16].

Specifically, in the study conducted in the Ref. [10], the authors investigate the prospect of a fundamental theory of nature devoid of inherent scale, which is achieved just by taking into account quadratic-curvature invariants in their pure gravity sector [17–19], proposing a renormalizable quantum gravity theory characterized by a graviton kinetic term featuring four derivatives. Consequently, the graviton propagator exhibits a momentum space behavior of $1/p^4$ [20]. Within this proposition, the authors postulate the potential for the Planck scale to emerge dynamically at the quantum level (see also [21]). In their proposal, this phenomenon arises from a non-minimal interaction between the scalar field and gravity, denoted by $\xi\phi^2 R$, wherein the scalar field assumes a non-zero vacuum expectation value $\langle\phi\rangle \neq 0$ as a consequence of radiative corrections.

Within studies of gravitational theories, one of the most interesting issues consists in the formulation of an adequate generalization of gravity to the case of the Lorentz symmetry breaking, which, as it is known [22] can be naturally introduced through a spontaneous symmetry breaking (SSB) mechanism in a low-energy limit of some fundamental theory of nature (notably, string theory), with a subsequent study of perturbative issues in such a theory. It is worth mentioning that the SSB mechanism can explain the origin of possible Lorentz-violating (LV) vectors (tensors) corresponding to different minima of some potential. Moreover, in curved spacetimes, the spontaneous Lorentz symmetry violation (LSV) possesses some advantages in comparison with the explicit one, since, besides providing a consistent mechanism of arising, in this case, there is no restriction for LV vectors (tensors) to be constants as it is usually assumed in the flat space-time.

The most convenient mechanism for the spontaneous LSV is based on the use of the bumblebee model [23] whose action is composed of the Maxwell-like kinetic term and a potential able to develop spontaneous LSV. The resulting theory in a curved space-time, whose Lagrangian is composed of a sum of bumblebee and gravity ones, and perhaps, the terms involving other fields, is called the bumblebee gravity (for various issues related to this model, including a detailed discussion of degrees of freedom, see also [24]; an excellent discussion of conceptual problems regarding LSV in gravity, including the bumblebee models,

can be found in [25]). Such a theory has been explored in various contexts, such as checking the consistency of some known gravitational solutions, namely, black hole [26–29], cosmology [30, 31], Gödel and Gödel-type ones [32, 33] and wormhole ones [34]. Besides this, it is worth mentioning studies of dispersion relations in a linearized gravity coupled to the bumblebee field [35]. Further, a next step has been done in studies of bumblebee gravity, namely, calculations of perturbative corrections in this theory. Such corrections were obtained, within the metric-affine formalism, in papers [36, 37].

Since the bumblebee field naturally incorporates spontaneous LSV into standard models, extending the analysis conducted in Ref. [10, 11] to include scale-free operators based on the bumblebee field is a logical step. One significant aspect is investigating whether the Coleman-Weinberg (CW) mechanism [38] can occur when the bumblebee field is coupled to agravity. Among these operators is the non-minimal coupling of the type B^2R . If CW mechanism occurs, it allows us to establish a connection between the emergence of the Planck scale and a LV effect. In particular, our study focuses on investigating the occurrence of the Coleman-Weinberg mechanism in the bumblebee-agravity model.

The structure of the paper looks like follows. In the section 2, we write down our Lagrangian and discuss the properties of the necessary projecting operators. In the section 3, we calculate the renormalization group functions in the symmetric phase, and in the section 4 we compute the effective potential. In the section 5, our results are discussed.

Throughout this paper, we use natural units $c = \hbar = 1$.

II. THE BUMBLEBEE-AGRAVITY LAGRANGIAN

An essential aspect in investigating Lorentz symmetry violations involves the bumblebee model [23],

$$S_B = \int d^4x \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} B^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu} - V(B^\mu B_\mu \mp b^2) \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $B_{\mu\nu} = (\partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu)$ and the potential $V(B^\mu B_\mu \mp b^2)$ is selected to induce a non-zero VEV for the bumblebee field. This introduces a preferred direction in spacetime, resulting in spontaneous Lorentz symmetry breaking. Typically, the potential takes the form $V = \lambda(B^\mu B_\mu \mp b^2)^2$, where the \mp sign accommodates both space-like and time-like B^μ , while $b^2 > 0$.

The introduction of the classical background field b^μ is somewhat arbitrary, prompting the search for a theory devoid of fundamental scales from its inception, where such scales could arise from radiative fluctuations via the Coleman-Weinberg mechanism [38]. By setting $b^\mu = 0$ at classical level, the coupling of the bumblebee field to gravity results in a possible LV extension of the agravity model [10, 11]. This theoretical framework is expressed through the action

$$\mathcal{S} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left\{ \frac{R^2}{6f_0^2} + \frac{1}{f_2^2} \left(\frac{1}{3}R^2 - R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} \right) - \frac{1}{4g_t} B^{\mu\nu}B_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2g_l} (\nabla^\mu B_\mu)^2 + \xi_1 \left(B^\mu B^\nu - \frac{g^{\mu\nu}}{4} B^2 \right) R_{\mu\nu} + \xi_2 B^2 R - \lambda (B^\mu B_\mu)^2 + \mathcal{L}_{GF} + \mathcal{L}_{FP} + \mathcal{L}_{CT} \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where R denotes the Ricci scalar, $R_{\mu\nu}$ represents the Ricci tensor, and ∇^μ stands for the covariant derivative. The constants ξ_1 and ξ_2 are the couplings associated with the traceless and trace parts of the non-minimal coupling between the bumblebee field and the gravitational field, respectively. Additionally, \mathcal{L}_{GF} signifies the gauge-fixing Lagrangian, while \mathcal{L}_{FP} denotes the corresponding Fadeev-Popov Lagrangian of the gravitational sector. \mathcal{L}_{CT} represents the Lagrangian of counterterms.

Our subsequent steps involve computing the relevant renormalization group functions to determine the one-loop effective potential for the bumblebee field, utilizing the renormalization group function technique [39]. To achieve this, first we must expand $g_{\mu\nu}$ around the flat metric, $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$, allowing us to express the Lagrangian as

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_h + \mathcal{L}_b + \mathcal{L}_{nm} + \mathcal{L}_V, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{L}_h denotes the quadratic kinetic term of the gravitational Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_h = \frac{1}{8f_2^2} \left[(\partial^\sigma \partial^\mu - \square \eta^{\mu\sigma}) h_{\mu\nu} (\partial^\rho \partial^\nu - \square \eta^{\nu\rho}) h_{\rho\sigma} + (\partial^\rho \partial^\mu - \square \eta^{\mu\rho}) h_{\mu\nu} (\partial^\sigma \partial^\nu - \square \eta^{\nu\sigma}) h_{\rho\sigma} - \frac{2}{3} (\partial^\nu \partial^\mu - \square \eta^{\mu\nu}) h_{\mu\nu} (\partial^\rho \partial^\sigma - \square \eta^{\sigma\rho}) h_{\rho\sigma} \right] + \frac{1}{18f_0^2} (\partial^\mu \partial^\nu h_{\mu\nu} - \square h)^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^3), \quad (4)$$

\mathcal{L}_b encompasses terms associated with the quadratic portion of the bumblebee field and

gravitational couplings through minimal coupling

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_b = & -\frac{1}{4g_t} B^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2g_l} \partial^\mu B_\mu \partial^\nu B_\nu + \frac{1}{2g_t} B^{\mu\nu} B^\tau{}_\mu \left(h_{\nu\tau} - \frac{1}{4} \eta_{\nu\tau} h \right) \\
& - \frac{1}{4g_l} (\partial^\mu B_\mu \partial^\nu B_\nu h + 2B^\mu \partial^\nu B_\nu \partial_\mu h - 4B^\mu \partial^\nu B_\nu \partial^\alpha h_{\mu\alpha} - 4\partial^\mu B_\mu \partial^\nu B^\alpha h_{\nu\alpha}) \\
& - \frac{1}{32g_t} (h^2 - 2h^{\mu\nu} h_{\mu\nu}) B^{\alpha\beta} B_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2g_l} B^\mu B^\nu \left(\partial^\alpha h_{\mu\alpha} \partial^\beta h_{\nu\beta} - \partial^\alpha h_{\mu\alpha} \partial^\nu h + \frac{1}{4} \partial_\mu h \partial_\nu h \right) \\
& - \frac{1}{2g_l} B^\mu \partial^\beta B_\beta \left(2\partial_\nu h^{\alpha\nu} h_{\mu\alpha} - \partial^\nu h h_{\mu\nu} - \partial^\nu h_{\mu\nu} h + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu h h + 2\partial_\alpha h_{\mu\nu} h^{\nu\alpha} - \partial_\mu h^{\alpha\nu} h_{\alpha\nu} \right) \\
& - \frac{1}{2g_l} \partial^\alpha B_\alpha \left(2\partial^\mu B_\nu h^{\nu\beta} h_{\mu\beta} - \partial^\mu B_\nu h^{\mu\nu} h - \frac{1}{4} \partial^\mu B_\mu h^{\nu\beta} h_{\nu\beta} + \frac{1}{8} \partial^\mu B_\mu h^2 \right), \\
& - \frac{1}{2g_l} B^\mu \partial^\alpha B^\nu (2\partial^\beta h_{\mu\beta} h_{\nu\alpha} - \partial_\mu h h_{\nu\alpha}) - \frac{1}{2g_l} \partial^\mu B^\nu \partial^\alpha B^\beta h_{\mu\nu} h_{\alpha\beta} + \mathcal{O}(h^3), \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

\mathcal{L}_{nm} comprises terms arising from non-minimal couplings

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{nm} = & \xi_1 B^\alpha B^\beta \left(\partial^\gamma \partial_\beta h_{\alpha\gamma} - \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta h - \frac{1}{2} \square h_{\alpha\beta} \right) + \left(\xi_2 - \frac{\xi_1}{4} \right) B^2 (\partial^\gamma \partial^\beta h_{\gamma\beta} - \square h) \\
& + \xi_1 B^\alpha B^\beta \left(\frac{1}{2} \partial^\nu h_\alpha{}^\mu \partial_\nu h_{\beta\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \partial^\nu h_{\alpha\mu} \partial^\mu h_{\beta\nu} + \frac{1}{4} \partial^\alpha h^{\mu\nu} \partial_\beta h_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \partial^\nu h_{\alpha\beta} \partial^\mu h_{\nu\mu} \right. \\
& - \partial_\beta h_\alpha{}^\mu \partial^\nu h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} \partial^\nu h_{\alpha\beta} \partial_\nu h + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\beta h_{\alpha\mu} \partial^\mu h + \square h_\beta{}^\mu h_{\alpha\mu} - \partial^\nu \partial^\mu h_{\beta\mu} h_{\alpha\nu} - \frac{1}{4} \square h_{\alpha\beta} h \\
& - \partial_\beta \partial^\nu h_\nu{}^\mu h_{\alpha\mu} + \partial^\mu \partial_\beta h h_{\alpha\mu} + \frac{1}{2} \partial^\nu \partial_\beta h_{\alpha\nu} h - \frac{1}{4} \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta h h + \frac{1}{2} \partial^\nu \partial^\mu h_{\alpha\beta} h_{\mu\nu} \\
& \left. - \partial^\nu \partial_\beta h_\alpha{}^\mu h_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\beta \partial^\alpha h^{\mu\nu} h_{\mu\nu} \right) + \left(\xi_2 - \frac{\xi_1}{4} \right) B^\alpha B^\beta (\square h h_{\alpha\beta} - \partial^\mu \partial^\nu h_{\mu\nu} h_{\alpha\beta}) \\
& + \left(\xi_2 - \frac{\xi_1}{4} \right) B^2 \left(\frac{3}{4} \partial^\alpha h^{\beta\mu} \partial_\alpha h_{\beta\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \partial^\alpha h^{\beta\mu} \partial_\mu h_{\beta\alpha} + \partial^\alpha h \partial^\mu h_{\mu\alpha} - \partial^\alpha h^{\alpha\beta} \partial^\mu h_{\beta\mu} \right. \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \square h h - \frac{1}{4} \partial^\alpha h \partial_\alpha h + \frac{1}{2} \partial^\alpha \partial^\beta h_{\alpha\beta} h + \square h^{\mu\nu} h_{\mu\nu} - 2\partial^\alpha \partial_\beta h_{\alpha\mu} h^{\mu\beta} + \partial^\alpha \partial^\beta h h_{\alpha\beta} \left. \right) \\
& + \mathcal{O}(h^3), \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

and \mathcal{L}_V stands for the bumblebee potential and its gravitational interactions

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_V = & \lambda B^\alpha B^\beta B^\mu B^\nu \left(\eta_{\alpha\beta} \eta_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \eta_{\alpha\beta} \eta_{\mu\nu} h - 2\eta_{\alpha\beta} h_{\mu\nu} + h_{\alpha\beta} h_{\mu\nu} + 2\eta_{\alpha\beta} h_\mu{}^\gamma h_{\nu\gamma} \right. \\
& \left. - \frac{1}{4} \eta_{\alpha\beta} \eta_{\mu\nu} h^{\gamma\tau} h_{\gamma\tau} - \eta_{\alpha\beta} h_{\mu\nu} h + \frac{1}{4} \eta_{\alpha\beta} \eta_{\mu\nu} h^2 \right) + \mathcal{O}(h^3). \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

In a certain sense, our study can be treated as an analogue of that one performed in [40], where the weak field limit was studied in the standard Einstein-bumblebee gravity.

In order to quantize the model, let us introduce the gauge fixing Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{GF} = -\frac{1}{2\zeta_g} \partial^\nu (h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \eta_{\mu\nu} h) \partial_\alpha (h^{\mu\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} \eta^{\mu\alpha} h)$. Thus, the quadratic part of the action yields the

subsequent propagators:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^{\mu\nu}(p) &= -\frac{i}{p^2} [g_t T^{\mu\nu} + g_l L^{\mu\nu}]; \\ \Delta_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}(p) &= \frac{i}{p^4} \left[-2f_2^2 P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(2)} + f_0^2 P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(0)} + 2\zeta_g \left(P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(0w)} \right) \right],\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{2} T_{\mu\rho} T_{\nu\sigma} + \frac{1}{2} T_{\mu\sigma} T_{\nu\rho} - \frac{1}{D-1} T_{\mu\nu} T_{\sigma\rho}; \\ P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2} (T_{\mu\rho} L_{\nu\sigma} + T_{\mu\sigma} L_{\nu\rho} + L_{\mu\rho} T_{\nu\sigma} + L_{\mu\sigma} T_{\nu\rho}); \\ P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(0)} &= \frac{1}{D-1} T_{\mu\nu} T_{\sigma\rho}; \\ P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(0w)} &= L_{\mu\nu} L_{\sigma\rho},\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}T_{\mu\nu} &= \eta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{p^2}; \\ L_{\mu\nu} &= \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{p^2}.\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

These projectors will be further employed in our calculations.

III. RENORMALIZATION GROUP FUNCTIONS

In this section, we present the UV renormalization of the model. We begin with the bumblebee corrections to the graviton propagation. The Feynman diagrams are illustrated in Figure 1. It is evident that diagram 1.1 is vanishing since the B field is massless. In order to compute the Feynman diagrams we used a set of MathematicaTM packages [41–47]. The corresponding expression for the UV divergent part of diagram 1.2 is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}i\Gamma_{\mu\nu\alpha\gamma}(p) &= +\frac{1}{6} P_{\mu\nu\alpha\gamma}^{(2)} \left[\frac{\delta f_2^2}{f_2^2} - \frac{1}{960\pi^2\epsilon} \left(5\xi_1^2 (g_l^2 + 4g_l g_t + 7g_t^2) - 10\xi_1 (g_l + 5g_t) + 7 \right) \right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{9} P_{\mu\nu\alpha\gamma}^{(0)} \left[\frac{\delta f_0^2}{f_0^2} + \frac{1}{128\pi^2\epsilon} \left(\xi_1^2 (g_l^2 + 4g_l g_t + 7g_t^2) + 144\xi_2^2 (g_l^2 + 3g_t^2) \right. \right. \\ &\left. \left. - 2\xi_1 (g_l + 5g_t) + 24\xi_2 (g_l - 3g_t) + 2 \right) \right],\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

from which, by imposing finiteness through the MS scheme of renormalization, we find the following counterterms:

$$\delta_{f_0^2} = -\frac{f_0^2}{128\pi^2\epsilon} \left(\xi_1^2 (g_l^2 + 4g_l g_t + 7g_t^2) + 144\xi_2^2 (g_l^2 + 3g_t^2) - 2\xi_1(g_l + 5g_t) + 24\xi_2(g_l - 3g_t) + 2 \right); \quad (12)$$

$$\delta_{f_2^2} = \frac{f_2^2}{960\pi^2\epsilon} \left(5\xi_1^2 (g_l^2 + 4g_l g_t + 7g_t^2) - 10\xi_1 (g_l^2 + 5g_t) + 7 \right). \quad (13)$$

It is noteworthy that the bumblebee loops maintain the propagation of the graviton transverse.

Our next step involves computing the bumblebee field self-energy. The corresponding Feynman diagrams are depicted in Figure 2. The UV divergent contribution is given by

$$i\Gamma_{\mu\nu}(p) = -p^2 \left[T_{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{\delta_{g_t}}{g_t} - \Gamma_T \right) - L_{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{\delta_{g_l}}{g_l} - \Gamma_L \right) \right], \quad (14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_T &= \frac{g_t}{288\pi^2\epsilon} \left[\xi_1^2 (f_0^2(5g_l - 4g_t) + 5f_2^2(2g_l - g_t)) + 4\xi_1 (f_0^2(6g_l\xi_2 - 3g_t\xi_2 - 2) + 5f_2^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 48f_0^2\xi_2 \right]; \\ \Gamma_L &= \frac{1}{96\pi^2g_l\epsilon} \left[f_0^2(\xi_1(12g_l^2\xi_2 - 24g_l g_t\xi_2 + 5g_l - 3g_t) + g_l\xi_1^2(g_t - 2g_l) - 12g_l\xi_2 + 36g_t\xi_2 - 3) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 5f_2^2(g_l\xi_1^2(g_l - 2g_t) + 2\xi_1(g_l + 3g_t) - 3) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Imposing finiteness through the MS scheme, the counterterms are $\delta_{g_t} = g_t\Gamma_T$ and $\delta_{g_l} = g_l\Gamma_L$.

In the following, we compute the renormalization of the non-minimal couplings ξ_1 and ξ_2 . The necessary diagrams to compute the renormalization factors of ξ_1 and ξ_2 are depicted in Figure 3. The corresponding UV divergent part of the three-point function $\Gamma^{\alpha\gamma\mu\nu}(p_1, p_2, p_3) = \langle TB^\alpha(p_1)B^\gamma(p_2)h^{\mu\nu}(p_3) \rangle$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} -i\Gamma^{\alpha\gamma\mu\nu}(p_1, p_2, p_3) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[p_3^2(\eta^{\alpha\mu}\eta^{\gamma\nu} - \eta^{\alpha\gamma}\eta^{\mu\nu}) + \eta^{\gamma\mu} (p_3^2\eta^{\alpha\nu} - p_3^\alpha p_3^\nu) + p_3^\gamma (2p_3^\alpha\eta^{\mu\nu} - p_3^\nu\eta^{\alpha\mu}) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + p_3^\mu (p_3^\nu\eta^{\alpha\gamma} - p_3^\alpha\eta^{\gamma\nu} - p_3^\gamma\eta^{\alpha\nu}) \right] \left[\delta_{\xi_1} - \frac{\lambda(\xi_1(g_l^2 + 4g_l g_t + 7g_t^2) - g_l - 5g_t)}{24\pi^2\epsilon} \right] \\ &\quad + 2\eta^{\alpha\gamma} (p_3^2\eta^{\mu\nu} - p_3^\mu p_3^\nu) \left[\delta_{\xi_2} - \frac{\lambda(12\xi_2(g_l^2 + 3g_t^2) + g_l - 3g_t)}{24\pi^2\epsilon} \right] + \text{finite}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Thus, through the MS scheme, the renormalization factors δ_{ξ_1} and δ_{ξ_2} are given by:

$$\delta_{\xi_1} = \frac{\lambda(\xi_1(g_l^2 + 4g_l g_t + 7g_t^2) - g_l - 5g_t)}{24\pi^2\epsilon}; \quad (17)$$

$$\delta_{\xi_2} = \frac{\lambda(12\xi_2(g_l^2 + 3g_t^2) + g_l - 3g_t)}{24\pi^2\epsilon}. \quad (18)$$

Indeed, for $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = 0$, δ_{ξ_1} and δ_{ξ_2} become

$$\delta_{\xi_1} = -\frac{\lambda(g_l + 5g_t)}{24\pi^2\epsilon}; \quad (19)$$

$$\delta_{\xi_2} = \frac{\lambda(g_l - 3g_t)}{32\pi^2\epsilon}, \quad (20)$$

highlighting the need for the presence of the non-minimal couplings from the beginning in order to ensure the renormalizability of the model.

Now, let us calculate the renormalization factor of the bumblebee self-coupling four-point function. This calculation is performed up to quadratic order in the non-minimal couplings ξ_1 and ξ_2 . The one-loop bumblebee four-point function is depicted in Figure 4. The corresponding UV divergent part is given by

$$\langle TB^\mu(p_1)B^\nu(p_2)B^\alpha(p_3)B^\gamma(p_4) \rangle = (\eta^{\nu\alpha}\eta^{\mu\gamma} + \eta^{\mu\alpha}\eta^{\nu\gamma} + \eta^{\nu\mu}\eta^{\alpha\gamma})i\Gamma^{(4)}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{(4)}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) = & \frac{\lambda^2(5g_l^2 + 2g_l g_t + 17g_t^2)}{\pi^2\epsilon} + \frac{\lambda(f_0^2 - 10f_2^2)}{6\pi^2\epsilon} + \frac{\lambda\xi_1(f_0^2(g_t + 3g_l) - 40f_2^2 g_t)}{3\pi^2\epsilon} \\ & - \frac{2\lambda\xi_2 f_0^2(g_l - g_t)}{\pi^2\epsilon} + \frac{\lambda\xi_1^2(f_0^2(9g_l^2 + 3g_l g_t + 4g_t^2) - 100f_2^2 g_t^2)}{24\pi^2\epsilon} \\ & + \frac{6\lambda\xi_2^2 f_0^2(g_l^2 + g_l g_t + 4g_t^2)}{\pi^2\epsilon} + \frac{\lambda\xi_1\xi_2 f_0^2(3g_l^2 + g_l g_t - 4g_t^2)}{\pi^2\epsilon} \\ & + \frac{\xi_1^2(13f_0^4 - 5f_0^2 f_2^2 + 325f_2^4)}{1152\pi^2\epsilon} + \frac{5\xi_2^2(f_0^4 - f_0^2 f_2^2 + f_2^4)}{8\pi^2\epsilon} \\ & + \frac{\xi_1\xi_2(8f_0^4 - 5f_0^2 f_2^2 + 30f_2^4)}{48\pi^2\epsilon} - 8\delta_\lambda, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

with the last term arising from the counterterm diagram. It is crucial to emphasize that while there may be gravitational gauge dependence within individual diagrams depicted in Figure 4, the aggregate amplitude becomes gauge-independent upon summing all diagrams. The counterterm δ_λ is determined by imposing the condition of finiteness on the above equation.

With all counterterms evaluated, we can determine the renormalization group functions. The beta function for the bumblebee self-coupling λ is derived from the calculation of δ_λ

using the relationship between bare and renormalized couplings, $\lambda_0 = \mu^{2\epsilon} Z_\lambda \lambda$, resulting in

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(\lambda) &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mu \frac{d\lambda}{d\mu} \\
&= \frac{\lambda^2(5g_t^2 + 2g_l g_t + 17g_t^2)}{4\pi^2} + \frac{\lambda(f_0^2 - 10f_2^2)}{24\pi^2} + \frac{\lambda\xi_1(f_0^2(g_t + 3g_l) - 40f_2^2 g_t)}{12\pi^2} \\
&\quad - \frac{\lambda\xi_2 f_0^2(g_l - g_t)}{2\pi^2} + \frac{\lambda\xi_1^2(f_0^2(9g_t^2 + 3g_l g_t + 4g_t^2) - 100f_2^2 g_t^2)}{96\pi^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{3\lambda\xi_2^2 f_0^2(g_t^2 + g_l g_t + 4g_t^2)}{2\pi^2} + \frac{\lambda\xi_1 \xi_2 f_0^2(3g_t^2 + g_l g_t - 4g_t^2)}{4\pi^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{\xi_1^2(13f_0^4 - 5f_0^2 f_2^2 + 325f_2^4)}{4608\pi^2} + \frac{5\xi_2^2(f_0^4 - f_0^2 f_2^2 + f_2^4)}{32\pi^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{\xi_1 \xi_2(8f_0^4 - 5f_0^2 f_2^2 + 30f_2^4)}{192\pi^2}. \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that even if $\lambda = 0$ at tree level, its beta function is nontrivial. This phenomenon is analogous to the beta function of the self-coupling scalar field in Scalar QED [48], where it is proportional to e^4 for $\lambda = 0$ at tree level.

The renormalized non-minimal couplings ξ_1 and ξ_2 are related to the bare couplings as follows: $\xi_{10} = \mu^{2\epsilon} Z_{\xi_1} \xi_1 = \mu^{2\epsilon}(\xi_1 + \delta_{\xi_1})$ and $\xi_{20} = \mu^{2\epsilon} Z_{\xi_2} \xi_2 = \mu^{2\epsilon}(\xi_2 + \delta_{\xi_2})$. These relationships, together with the expressions for the counterterms in Eqs. (17) and (18), lead to the following beta functions:

$$\beta(\xi_1) = \frac{\lambda(\xi_1(g_t^2 + 4g_l g_t + 7g_t^2) - g_l - 5g_t)}{12\pi^2}; \tag{24}$$

$$\beta(\xi_2) = \frac{\lambda(12\xi_2(g_t^2 + 3g_t^2) + g_l - 3g_t)}{12\pi^2}. \tag{25}$$

Through the self-energy of the bumblebee field, as given in Eq. (14), we computed the counterterms, which can be interpreted as renormalizations of the coupling constants g_t and g_l . The relations between the bare and renormalized bumblebee couplings are $\frac{1}{g_{t0}} = \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon} Z_{g_t}}{g_t} = \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon(1+\delta_{g_t})}}{g_t}$ and $\frac{1}{g_{l0}} = \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon} Z_{g_l}}{g_l} = \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon(1+\delta_{g_l})}}{g_l}$. Their beta functions can be cast as

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(g_t) &= \frac{g_t^2}{144\pi^2} \left[\xi_1^2 (f_0^2(5g_l - 4g_t) + 5f_2^2(2g_l - g_t)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 4\xi_1 (f_0^2(6g_l \xi_2 - 3g_t \xi_2 - 2) + 5f_2^2) + 48f_0^2 \xi_2 \right]; \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(g_l) &= \frac{g_l}{48\pi^2} \left[5f_2^2(g_l \xi_1^2(g_l - 2g_t) + 2\xi_1(g_l + 3g_t) - 3) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + f_0^2 \left(\xi_1(12g_t^2 \xi_2 - 24g_l g_t \xi_2 + 5g_l - 3g_t) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + g_l \xi_1^2(g_t - 2g_l) - 12g_l \xi_2 + 36g_t \xi_2 - 3 \right) \right]. \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, from the graviton self-energy given by Eq. (11), we determined the renormalization factors for the agravity coupling constants f_0 and f_2 as shown in Eq. (12). Given that the relations between renormalized and bare couplings are $\frac{1}{f_0^2} = \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon(1+\delta_{f_0^2})}}{f_0^2}$ and $\frac{1}{f_2^2} = \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon(1+\delta_{f_2^2})}}{f_2^2}$, and considering the graviton rainbow and seagull diagrams and the gravitational ghost evaluated in Ref. [10], their beta functions are expressed as

$$\beta(f_0^2) = \frac{5}{96\pi^2}(f_0^4 + 6f_0^2f_2^2 + 10f_2^4) - \frac{f_0^2}{64\pi^2} \left[\xi_1^2 (g_l^2 + 4g_l g_t + 7g_t^2) + 144\xi_2^2 (g_l^2 + 3g_t^2) - 2\xi_1(g_l + 5g_t) + 24\xi_2(g_l - 3g_t) + 2 \right]; \quad (28)$$

$$\beta(f_2^2) = -\frac{133f_2^4}{160\pi^2} + \frac{f_2^2}{480\pi^2} \left[5\xi_1^2 (g_l^2 + 4g_l g_t + 7g_t^2) - 10\xi_1 (g_l^2 + 5g_t) + 7 \right]. \quad (29)$$

In the next section, we will use these beta functions to compute the effective potential and explore the possibility of emergence of a LV phase.

IV. THE BROKEN LORENTZ SYMMETRY PHASE: COLEMAN-WEINBERG MECHANISM

Given our examination of the UV behavior of the bumblebee field coupled to agravity, we can now endeavor to comprehend the potential for dynamical LSB through the CW mechanism [38].

To do this, we will calculate the one-loop effective bumblebee potential using the renormalization group method [39]. This method offers a robust approach for computing the improved leading-log effective potential and has been extensively employed across various contexts, as evidenced by its widespread utilization in the literature [49–54]. It is noteworthy that there exists a discrepancy between the renormalization group functions evaluated in the CW scheme and those in the MS scheme [55], though this discrepancy is not relevant to this study since our focus is solely on computing the effective potential up to one-loop order. Additionally, in this approximation, we need not concern ourselves with the emergence of gauge-dependent objects such as daisies [56, 57].

Driven by dimensional analysis, the perturbative expansion of the effective potential exhibits the general form

$$V_{\text{eff}}(B_c^2) = A_0(x)B_c^4 + A_1(x)B_c^4 L + A_2(x)B_c^4 L^2 + \dots, \quad (30)$$

where x represents the collection of coupling constants, $L = \ln(B_c^2/\mu^2)$, B_c^μ is the classical bumblebee field and μ denotes an energy scale introduced by the regularization procedure. The coefficients $A_i = (a_0^{(i)}x + a_1^{(i)}x^2 + a_2^{(i)}x^3 + \dots)$ are power series of the coupling constants x , computed order by order in the perturbative loop expansion, with the index i denoting a specific loop.

The full effective potential can be reorganized into a leading-log series as follows:

$$V_{\text{eff}}(B_c^2) = B_c^4 \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_{LL}^{(n)}(x)L^n + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_{NLL}^{(n)}(x)L^{n+1} + \dots \right), \quad (31)$$

where $C_{LL}^{(n)}(x) = a_n^{(n)}x^{n+1}$ and $C_{NLL}^{(n)}(x) = a_{n+1}^{(n)}x^{n+2}$ represent the leading-log and next-to-leading-log coefficients, respectively.

To utilize the RGE for deriving the effective potential, it is crucial to recognize that $V_{\text{eff}}(B_c^2, x)$ must be independent of the regularization scale μ . Therefore, $V_{\text{eff}}(B_c^2, x)$ must adhere to the condition

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \frac{dV_{\text{eff}}}{d\mu} &= \left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \mu \frac{\partial x}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \mu \frac{\partial B_c^2}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial B_c^2} \right) V_{\text{eff}} \\ &= \left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \beta(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + 2\gamma B_c^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial B_c^2} \right) V_{\text{eff}} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where $\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d \ln Z_3}{d \ln \mu}$ is the anomalous dimension of the bumblebee field.

Considering $\mu \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \mu} = -2 \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial L}$ and $B_c^2 \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial B_c^2} = 2V_{\text{eff}} + \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial L}$, we rewrite the RGE (32) as

$$\left(2(\gamma - 1) \frac{\partial}{\partial L} + \beta(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + 4\gamma \right) V_{\text{eff}} = 0. \quad (33)$$

Inserting the *ansatz* (31) into RGE (33), in the leading log approximation, we find the following recursive relation

$$C_{LL}^{(n)}(x) = \frac{1}{2n} \beta(x) \frac{\partial C_{LL}^{(n-1)}(x)}{\partial x}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq n. \quad (34)$$

To compute the one-loop effective potential, we only need to determine the $C_{LL}^{(1)}(x)$ coefficient. Notably, to reproduce the classical potential $C_{LL}^{(0)}(x) = \lambda$, $C_{LL}^{(1)}(\lambda)$ is linked to the one-loop beta function of λ , denoted as $\beta^{1l}(\lambda)$, as $\beta^{1l}(\lambda)/2$. This relation allows us to express the one-loop effective potential as follows:

$$V_{\text{eff}} = (\lambda + \delta) B_c^4 + \frac{\beta(\lambda)}{2} B_c^4 \ln \left(\frac{B_c^2}{\mu^2} \right), \quad (35)$$

where δ represents a finite counterterm required to satisfy the CW renormalization condition:

$$\frac{dV_0}{dB_c^2} = \frac{dV_{\text{eff}}}{dB_c^2} \Big|_{B_c^2=v^2} = 2\lambda, \quad (36)$$

with $V_0 = \lambda B_c^4$ being the classical bumblebee potential and v standing for the renormalization scale.

Thus, the CW renormalized effective potential is given by

$$V_{\text{CW}} = B_c^4 \left[\lambda - \frac{3\beta(\lambda)}{4} + \frac{\beta(\lambda)}{4} \ln \left(\frac{B_c^2}{v^2} \right) \right]. \quad (37)$$

In order to determine its minimum, V_{CW} has to satisfy

$$\frac{dV_{\text{CW}}}{dB_c^\mu} = 0, \quad \text{for some } B_c^\mu = b^\mu, \quad (38)$$

$$M_B^2 = \frac{d^2V_{\text{CW}}}{dB_c^\mu dB_{c\mu}} \Big|_{B_c^\mu=b^\mu} > 0. \quad (39)$$

These conditions are met for a nontrivial b^μ when $b^2 = v^2 \exp \left[1 - \frac{2\lambda}{\beta(\lambda)} \right]$. Opting for the renormalization scale to coincide with the minimum of the Coleman-Weinberg potential implies $\lambda = \beta(\lambda)/2$. This equation can be iteratively solved, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \frac{\beta_{\lambda=0}}{2} + \dots \\ &= \frac{\xi_1^2(13f_0^4 - 5f_0^2f_2^2 + 325f_2^4)}{9216\pi^2} + \frac{5\xi_2^2(f_0^4 - f_0^2f_2^2 + f_2^4)}{64\pi^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{\xi_1\xi_2(8f_0^4 - 5f_0^2f_2^2 + 30f_2^4)}{384\pi^2} + \mathcal{O}(\xi_i^4). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Substituting the value of λ in Eq.(37), we have

$$V_{\text{CW}} \approx \frac{\beta_{\lambda=0}}{2} B_c^4 \left[\ln \left(\frac{B_c^2}{v^2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \right]. \quad (41)$$

For this solution, the dynamically generated mass for the bumblebee field, as given by (39), is $M_B^2 = 4v^2\beta_{\lambda=0}$. Additionally, if the gravitational couplings f_0 , f_2 , ξ_1 , and ξ_2 are sufficiently small close to the vacuum, λ is approximately vanishing near the vacuum, resulting in an approximately flat spacetime.

We note that gravity is non-minimally coupled to the bumblebee field through the term $\xi_1(B^\mu B^\nu - \frac{1}{4}B^2g^{\mu\nu})R_{\mu\nu} + \xi_2B^2R$. Since the minimum of the effective CW potential for the bumblebee field corresponds to a nontrivial value of $\langle B^\mu \rangle$, the second term can be treated as a dynamical generation of the Einstein-Hilbert term, where $\xi_2\langle B^2 \rangle R = \frac{M_P^2}{16\pi}R$. For this to

occur, the VEV of the bumblebee field must be approximately on the order of the Planck scale, $\langle B^2 \rangle \sim \frac{M_P^2}{16\pi\xi_2}$.

At the same time, $\xi_1 s^{\mu\nu} = \xi_1(B^\mu B^\nu - \frac{1}{4}B^2 g^{\mu\nu})$ is traceless, and, in principle, for specific metrics and configurations of B^μ it can be very small, so, we have a term $s^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}$ which can be small at least in certain cases. This is accomplished constraining ξ_1 to be very tiny ($\xi_1 \ll \xi_2$). Therefore, we presented the hypothetical scenario where the nontrivial LV term is small while the "correction" to the Einstein-Hilbert term is large.

V. FINAL REMARKS

We formulated the agravity-bumblebee model. The importance of our study consists in the fact that, first, it can serve as a prototype for studying perturbative effects in LV gravity models, second, it is free of notorious difficulties of quantum gravity, that is, non-renormalizability for the absence of higher-derivative terms and ghosts, in presence of such terms. Actually, one could expect this theory to be a fundamental one while the Einstein-Hilbert term arises as a quantum correction.

Our study is based on calculating the renormalization group functions. We use the methodology of renormalization group improvement [52] to obtain the CW effective potential, and arrive at the dynamical generation of mass for the bumblebee field. One of the consequences of our studies consists in a possibility of a relation between the Planck mass and the Lorentz-breaking scale which, in principle, could indicate a fundamental nature for the Lorentz symmetry breaking.

Further continuation of our study could consist in its generalization for other gravity models, in particular, non-Riemannian ones, especially, metric-affine ones. We expect to pursue these aims in our next papers.

Acknowledgments

The work of A. Yu. P. has been partially supported by the CNPq project No.303777/2023-0. The work of A. C. L. has been partially supported by the CNPq project No. 404310/2023-0. P. J. P. would like to acknowledge the Brazilian agency CNPq, grant No. 307628/2022-1.

The authors would like to thank Professor V. Alan Kostelecky for his useful comments.

-
- [1] G. 't Hooft and M. J. G. Veltman, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Phys. Theor. A* **20**, 69-94 (1974).
 - [2] S. Deser and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32**, 245-247 (1974).
 - [3] S. Deser and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 411 (1974).
 - [4] J. F. Donoghue, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 3874-3888 (1994) [arXiv:gr-qc/9405057 [gr-qc]].
 - [5] C. P. Burgess, *Living Rev. Rel.* **7**, 5-56 (2004) [arXiv:gr-qc/0311082 [gr-qc]].
 - [6] J. F. Donoghue, M. M. Ivanov and A. Shkerin, [arXiv:1702.00319 [hep-th]].
 - [7] K. S. Stelle, *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 953-969 (1977).
 - [8] E. Tomboulis, *Phys. Lett. B* **70**, 361-364 (1977).
 - [9] S. D. Odintsov and I. L. Shapiro, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **9**, 873-882 (1992).
 - [10] A. Salvio and A. Strumia, *JHEP* **06**, 080 (2014) [arXiv:1403.4226 [hep-ph]].
 - [11] A. Salvio and A. Strumia, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) no.2, 124 [arXiv:1705.03896 [hep-th]].
 - [12] M. B. Einhorn and D. R. T. Jones, *JHEP* **03**, 047 (2015) [arXiv:1410.8513 [hep-th]].
 - [13] I. L. Buchbinder, S. D. Odintsov and I. L. Shapiro, "Effective Action in Quantum Gravity," IOP Publishing, 2017.
 - [14] J. F. Donoghue and G. Menezes, *Nuovo Cim. C* **45**, no.2, 26 (2022) [arXiv:2112.01974 [hep-th]].
 - [15] R. Myrzakulov, S. Odintsov and L. Sebastiani, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) no.8, 083529 [arXiv:1412.1073 [gr-qc]].
 - [16] R. Myrzakulov, S. Odintsov and L. Sebastiani, *Nucl. Phys. B* **907** (2016), 646-663 [arXiv:1604.06088 [hep-th]].
 - [17] M. Aoki, J. Kubo and J. Yang, *JCAP* **01**, no.01, 005 (2022) [arXiv:2109.04814 [hep-ph]].
 - [18] M. Aoki, J. Kubo and J. Yang, *JCAP* **05**, 096 (2024) [arXiv:2401.12442 [hep-ph]].
 - [19] C. Álvarez-Luna, S. de la Calle-Leal, J. A. R. Cembranos and J. J. Sanz-Cillero, *JHEP* **02**, 232 (2023) [arXiv:2212.01785 [hep-ph]].
 - [20] L. Buoninfante, *JHEP* **12**, 111 (2023) [arXiv:2308.11324 [hep-th]].
 - [21] I. D. Gialamas, A. Karam and A. Racioppi, *JCAP* **11**, 014 (2020) [arXiv:2006.09124 [gr-qc]].
 - [22] V. A. Kostelecky and S. Samuel, *Phys. Rev. D* **39** (1989), 683.
 - [23] V. A. Kostelecky, *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004), 105009 [arXiv:hep-th/0312310 [hep-th]].
 - [24] R. Bluhm and V. A. Kostelecky, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005), 065008 [arXiv:hep-th/0412320 [hep-]]

- th]].
- [25] V. A. Kostelecký and Z. Li, Phys. Rev. D **103** (2021) no.2, 024059 [arXiv:2008.12206 [gr-qc]].
- [26] O. Bertolami and J. Paramos, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005), 044001 [arXiv:hep-th/0504215 [hep-th]].
- [27] R. Casana, A. Cavalcante, F. P. Poulis and E. B. Santos, Phys. Rev. D **97** (2018) no.10, 104001 [arXiv:1711.02273 [gr-qc]].
- [28] A. A. A. Filho, J. R. Nascimento, A. Y. Petrov and P. J. Porfírio, Phys. Rev. D **108** (2023) no.8, 085010 [arXiv:2211.11821 [gr-qc]].
- [29] A. A. A. Filho, J. R. Nascimento, A. Y. Petrov and P. J. Porfírio, [arXiv:2402.13014 [gr-qc]], *to appear* in JCAP.
- [30] D. Capelo and J. Páramos, Phys. Rev. D **91** (2015) no.10, 104007 [arXiv:1501.07685 [gr-qc]].
- [31] R. V. Maluf and J. C. S. Neves, JCAP **10** (2021), 038 [arXiv:2105.08659 [gr-qc]].
- [32] A. F. Santos, A. Y. Petrov, W. D. R. Jesus and J. R. Nascimento, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **30** (2015) no.02, 1550011 [arXiv:1407.5985 [hep-th]].
- [33] W. D. R. Jesus and A. F. Santos, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **35** (2020) no.09, 2050050 [arXiv:2003.13364 [gr-qc]].
- [34] A. Övgün, K. Jusufi and İ. Sakallı, Phys. Rev. D **99** (2019) no.2, 024042 [arXiv:1804.09911 [gr-qc]].
- [35] R. V. Maluf, C. A. S. Almeida, R. Casana and M. M. Ferreira, Jr., Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) no.2, 025007 [arXiv:1402.3554 [hep-th]].
- [36] A. Delhom, J. R. Nascimento, G. J. Olmo, A. Y. Petrov and P. J. Porfírio, Phys. Lett. B **826** (2022), 136932 [arXiv:2010.06391 [hep-th]].
- [37] A. Delhom, T. Mariz, J. R. Nascimento, G. J. Olmo, A. Y. Petrov and P. J. Porfírio, JCAP **07** (2022) no.07, 018 [arXiv:2202.11613 [hep-th]].
- [38] S. R. Coleman and E. J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 1888-1910 (1973).
- [39] D. G. C. McKeon, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **37**, 817-826 (1998).
- [40] Q. G. Bailey and V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006), 045001 [arXiv:gr-qc/0603030 [gr-qc]].
- [41] R. Mertig and M. Bahm and A. Denne, Comp. Phys. Comm. **64**, 345 (1991).
- [42] V. Shtabovenko, R. Mertig and F. Orellana, Comput. Phys. Commun. **207**, 432-444 (2016) [arXiv:1601.01167 [hep-ph]].

- [43] V. Shtabovenko, R. Mertig and F. Orellana, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **256**, 107478 (2020) [arXiv:2001.04407 [hep-ph]].
- [44] T. Hahn, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **140**, 418-431 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0012260 [hep-ph]].
- [45] N. D. Christensen and C. Duhr, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **180**, 1614-1641 (2009) [arXiv:0806.4194 [hep-ph]].
- [46] A. Alloul, N. D. Christensen, C. Degrande, C. Duhr and B. Fuks, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **185**, 2250-2300 (2014) [arXiv:1310.1921 [hep-ph]].
- [47] V. Shtabovenko, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **218**, 48-65 (2017) [arXiv:1611.06793 [physics.comp-ph]].
- [48] M. Srednicki, "Quantum field theory," Cambridge University Press, 2007, ISBN 978-0-521-86449-7, 978-0-511-26720-8.
- [49] V. Elias, R. B. Mann, D. G. C. McKeon and T. G. Steele, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 251601 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0304153 [hep-ph]].
- [50] V. Elias, R. B. Mann, D. G. C. McKeon and T. G. Steele, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 037902 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0411161 [hep-ph]].
- [51] A. G. Dias and A. F. Ferrari, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 085006 (2010) [arXiv:1006.5672 [hep-th]].
- [52] A. C. Lehum, J. R. Nascimento, A. Y. Petrov and H. Souza, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, no.4, 045005 (2020) [arXiv:1911.10846 [hep-th]].
- [53] H. Souza, L. Ibiapina Bevilaqua and A. C. Lehum, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.4, 045004 (2020) [arXiv:2005.03973 [hep-th]].
- [54] A. C. Lehum, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, no.10, 105013 (2023) [arXiv:2305.03768 [hep-th]].
- [55] F. A. Chishtie, D. G. C. McKeon and T. G. Steele, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 065007 (2008) [arXiv:0706.1760 [hep-ph]].
- [56] D. Bazeia, *Phys. Lett. B* **207**, 53-55 (1988).
- [57] A. F. de Lima and D. Bazeia, *Z. Phys. C* **45**, 471 (1990).




Figure 1: Bumblebee corrections to the graviton propagation. Wavy and wiggly lines represent the bumblebee and graviton propagators, respectively.




Figure 2: Bumblebee self-energy.




Figure 3: Three-point function. This function gives the renormalization factor of ξ_1 and ξ_2 .




Figure 4: The one-loop bumblebee four-point function of to order ξ_i^2 . This function gives the renormalization of the bumblebee self-coupling λ .