

# One-loop Renormalization Group Equations in Generic Effective Field Theories. Part I: Bosonic Operators.

Mikołaj Misiak\* and Ignacy Nałęcz†

*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw,  
ul. Pasteura 5, 02-093 Warsaw, Poland.*

## Abstract

We consider a generic class of effective quantum field theories with arbitrary gauge groups and scalar matter fields. In such theories, we derive the one-loop Renormalization Group Equations (RGEs) for the physical dimension-six operators. The present paper is the first one in a series that is going to cover theories with spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  matter fields, too, including the phenomenologically most relevant SMEFT and LEFT cases. Our present approach provides tools for deriving the yet unknown two-loop RGEs in the SMEFT.

arXiv:2501.17134v1 [hep-ph] 28 Jan 2025

---

\*misiak@fuw.edu.pl

†inalecz@fuw.edu.pl

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Classification of dimension-six operators</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	The model definition and notational conventions . . . . .	3
2.2	Dimension-six operator basis . . . . .	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Passing to the on-shell basis</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Renormalization group equations for the bosonic operators</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1	Methodology . . . . .	6
4.2	On-shell results . . . . .	7
<b>5</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Transformation rules to the on-shell basis</b>	<b>10</b>

---

## 1 Introduction

Quantum Field Theories (QFTs) provide a framework for describing physical phenomena across a wide range of energy scales. It often happens that masses of certain particles are much larger than the characteristic energy scale of the considered process. In such a case, the well-known decoupling procedure can be applied, and we pass to the Effective Field Theory (EFT) formalism. This approach has been successful in different branches of particle physics. A notable application is the Low-energy Effective Field Theory (LEFT), derived from the Standard Model (SM) by decoupling the massive vector bosons, the top quark, and the Higgs boson. The LEFT has been successfully applied to derive highly accurate predictions for branching ratios and particle lifetimes in weak decays, surpassing the precision of direct calculations in the full SM [1]. Another important application of the EFTs is the Standard Model Effective Field Theory (SMEFT), often employed in the search for beyond-SM physics. Within the SMEFT paradigm, the SM is treated as a low-energy EFT emerging from a yet unknown more fundamental theory, after decoupling of some heavy degrees of freedom [2–4].

The EFT degrees of freedom are the light fields that have not been decoupled, contrary to the heavy ones. In the Lagrangian, one must include local operators of arbitrary dimensionality that are built of the light fields and their derivatives. The structure of such operators is restricted by the gauge and global symmetries of the theory. In many phenomenological applications, it is sufficient to consider operators of dimension five and six, as the experimental precision does not require higher accuracy. The Wilson coefficients (WCs) of such operators are determined through matching with the original theory. In the matching procedure, the Green’s functions of the light particles in the EFT are compared to those in the original full theory (or a higher-level EFT). The WCs are fixed by ensuring that the EFT reproduces the full theory results to the desired order of the expansion in  $m/\Lambda$ , where  $m$  stands for the light particle masses and momentum products, while  $\Lambda$  is the lightest decoupled particle mass. If the matching calculation is performed in dimensional regularization, then the renormalization scale is set to be of order  $\Lambda$ , which ensures absence of large logarithms that would worsen the perturbation series behaviour in the WC determination. To use the EFT at lower energy scales, one has to find the WCs at lower renormalization scales. For this purpose, one derives and solves the Renormalization Group Equations (RGEs) for the WCs.

In this paper, we derive one-loop RGEs for the physical dimension-six operators in a wide class of EFTs. We focus on the operators involving only the scalar and gauge fields, calling them “bosonic operators”. An extension of our analysis to theories involving spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  matter fields is postponed to a

future publication [5]. As far as the gauge group is concerned, we allow it to be any finite product of finite-dimensional Lie groups.

The leading terms in the EFT Lagrangian consist of operators of dimension smaller or equal four. In their case, the relevant couplings for which the RGEs are derived are not called the WCs but rather the gauge couplings, masses, Yukawa couplings, as well as the triple- and quartic scalar couplings. Although the WCs of higher-dimensional operators do affect their renormalization group evolution, such effects are usually neglected, as they generate only  $\mathcal{O}(m/\Lambda)$  corrections to observables that do not vanish in the  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$  limit. On the other hand, we do encounter observables that vanish (or are very small) in this limit, and they are the most important in the EFT applications. Therefore, in the case of couplings at dimension  $\leq 4$  operators, we content ourselves with the one- and two-loop RGEs that were derived for generic renormalizable QFTs in Refs. [6–8], taking into account more recent verifications and corrections of these results [9, 10]. At the one-loop level, we confirm the findings of Ref. [10]. Beyond two loops, generic RGEs for the gauge and Yukawa couplings can be found in Refs. [11–14].

Recently, a classification of dimension-six operators alongside with some preliminary results for the RGEs of bosonic dimension-six operators was presented by us in section (2.8) of Ref. [15], following the master theses [16, 17]. However, no complete RGEs in the physical (on-shell) basis have been published to date,<sup>1</sup> even for the operators containing the bosonic fields only.

To simplify our calculations, we assume a discrete symmetry  $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$ , which removes odd-dimensional operators but has no effect on even-dimensional ones thanks to Lorentz invariance. For more general EFTs without such a discrete symmetry, the RGEs for odd-dimensional operators can still be obtained by treating one of the scalar fields as an auxiliary gauge-singlet with fixed vacuum expectation value.

To derive the necessary Feynman rules, we take advantage of the background field method [18]. In consequence, all the counterterms we need to consider at one loop originate from gauge invariant operators that contain no quantum gauge field but rather the classical background gauge field only. Within this framework, it is actually advantageous to begin with deriving the RGEs in an off-shell basis, i.e. including the unphysical operators that vanish by the Equations Of Motion (EOM). Only in the next step the basis is reduced to the on-shell one, via applying the EOM.<sup>2</sup> While there is certainly some additional work associated with such an approach, it does provide non-trivial checks of our results, as the final RGEs in the on-shell basis must depend neither on the reducible operator WCs, nor on the gauge-fixing parameter.

Our paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we define the considered class of theories and determine a particular off-shell basis of dimension six operators. Next, in section 3, we derive the transformation to the on-shell basis. In section 4, we describe our methodology and present our main result, namely the one-loop RGEs for all the physical bosonic operators. We summarize our findings in section 5, leaving a few technical details to the appendix.

## 2 Classification of dimension-six operators

### 2.1 The model definition and notational conventions

The matter content of a general relativistic EFT with bosonic degrees of freedom can be written in terms of real scalar fields  $\phi_a$ . This is true because any complex scalar field can be represented by two

---

<sup>1</sup>See, however, the “note added” at the end of section 5.

<sup>2</sup>More precisely, via performing appropriate field redefinitions [19] that are equivalent to applying the EOM in the context of one-loop RGEs.

real ones. The Lagrangian of such a theory reads

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^A F^{A\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}(D_\mu\phi)_a(D^\mu\phi)_a - \frac{1}{2}m_{ab}^2\phi_a\phi_b - \frac{1}{4!}\lambda_{abcd}\phi_a\phi_b\phi_c\phi_d \\ & + \mathcal{L}_{\text{g.f.}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{FP}} + \frac{1}{\Lambda^2}\sum Q_N + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\Lambda^4}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $Q_N$  denote linear combinations of dimension-six operators multiplied by their WCs, and

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mu\nu}^A &= \partial_\mu V_\nu^A - \partial_\nu V_\mu^A - f^{ABC}V_\mu^B V_\nu^C, \\ (D_\rho F_{\mu\nu})^A &= \partial_\rho F_{\mu\nu}^A - f^{ABC}V_\rho^B F_{\mu\nu}^C, \\ (D_\mu\phi)_a &= (\delta_{ab}\partial_\mu + i\theta_{ab}^A V_\mu^A)\phi_b. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the gauge couplings have been absorbed into the definitions of structure constants and matter field representation generators. In Eq. (2.1),  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{g.f.}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{FP}}$  stand for the gauge-fixing and Fadeev-Popov terms, while  $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\Lambda^4}\right)$  denotes higher-order operators suppressed by powers of the  $\Lambda$  scale beyond which the EFT is not valid any more, and the full theory must be used instead.

## 2.2 Dimension-six operator basis

We renormalize the dimension-six terms in our Lagrangian (2.1) using the background-field formalism [18]. The renormalization is first completed in the off-shell basis that contains all the dimension-six terms allowed by the symmetries. The off-shell basis reads<sup>3</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &= \frac{1}{6!}W_{abcdef}^{(1)}\phi_a\phi_b\phi_c\phi_d\phi_e\phi_f, & Q_2 &= \frac{1}{4}W_{abcd}^{(2)}(D_\mu\phi)_a(D^\mu\phi)_b\phi_c\phi_d, \\ Q_3 &= \frac{1}{2}W_{ab}^{(3)}(D^\mu D_\mu\phi)_a(D^\nu D_\nu\phi)_b, & Q_4 &= \frac{1}{2}W_{ab}^{(4)A}(D^\mu\phi)_a(D^\nu\phi)_b F_{\mu\nu}^A, \\ Q_5 &= \frac{1}{4}W_{ab}^{(5)AB}\phi_a\phi_b F_{\mu\nu}^A F^{B\mu\nu}, & Q_6 &= \frac{1}{4}W_{ab}^{(6)AB}\phi_a\phi_b F_{\mu\nu}^A \tilde{F}^{B\mu\nu}, \\ Q_7 &= \frac{1}{2}W^{(7)AB}(D^\mu F_{\mu\nu})^A(D_\rho F^{\rho\nu})^B, & Q_8 &= \frac{1}{3!}W^{(8)ABC}F^A{}^\mu{}_\nu F^{B\nu}{}_\rho F^C{}^\rho{}_\mu, \\ Q_9 &= \frac{1}{3!}W^{(9)ABC}F^A{}^\mu{}_\nu F^{B\nu}{}_\rho \tilde{F}^C{}^\rho{}_\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $W^{(N)}$  contain both the WCs and the necessary Clebsch-Gordan coefficients that select singlets from various tensor products of the gauge group representations. In general, each  $W^{(N)}$  contains many independent WCs, and many gauge-singlet operators are present in each  $Q_N$ . We emphasize that only some components of the tensorial  $W$ -coefficients are independent, as the operator structure imposes various symmetries on the  $W$ -coefficients.

In addition, gauge invariance of the theory imposes essential identities on the couplings and  $W$ -coefficients. To derive such identities, one considers infinitesimal transformations of the fields in a given operator. For instance, for the scalar mass term

$$\begin{aligned} m_{ab}^2\phi^a\phi^b &\rightarrow m_{ef}^2(\delta^e{}_a - \epsilon^A\theta^{Ae}{}_a)\phi^a(\delta^f{}_b - \epsilon^B\theta^{Bf}{}_b)\phi^b \\ &= [m_{ab}^2 - \epsilon^A(m_{eb}^2\theta^{Ae}{}_a + m_{ae}^2\theta^{Ae}{}_b)]\phi^a\phi^b + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

Since the scalar mass term must be gauge invariant

$$\epsilon^A(m_{eb}^2\theta^{Ae}{}_a + m_{ae}^2\theta^{Ae}{}_b)\phi^a\phi^b + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

it follows that

$$m_{eb}^2\theta^{Ae}{}_a + m_{ae}^2\theta^{Ae}{}_b = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

<sup>3</sup>See section (2.8) of Ref. [15] for an extension of our off-shell basis to theories involving spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  fermionic fields.

The same argument can be used to derive the general identity which holds for all the couplings and  $W$ -coefficients of the operators

$$if^{BEA_1}W_{a_1\dots a_m}^{(N)BA_2\dots A_k} + \dots + if^{BEA_k}W_{a_1\dots a_m}^{(N)A_1\dots B} + \theta_{ba_1}^E W_{ba_2\dots a_m}^{(N)A_1\dots A_k} + \dots + \theta_{ba_m}^E W_{a_1\dots b}^{(N)A_1\dots A_k} = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

As the RGEs for the couplings and  $W$ -coefficients computed with the background field method are gauge invariant, the above identity can be used to bring them to the simplest form.

### 3 Passing to the on-shell basis

The EOM for the gauge and scalar fields

$$(D_\mu F^{\mu\nu})^A = -i\theta_{ab}^A \phi_b (D^\nu \phi)_a + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\Lambda}\right), \quad (3.1)$$

$$(D_\mu D^\mu \phi)_a = -m_{ab}^2 \phi_b - \frac{1}{3!} \lambda_{abcd} \phi_b \phi_c \phi_d + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\Lambda}\right), \quad (3.2)$$

yield linear relations in the off-shell basis. Using these relations, three operators can be identified as vanishing by the EOM. However, the choice of the final sub-system that does not vanish on-shell is a matter of convention. In the present paper, we choose

$$\{\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{Q}_2^{(X)}, \tilde{Q}_5, \tilde{Q}_6, \tilde{Q}_8, \tilde{Q}_9\}, \quad (3.3)$$

where we use the name  $Q_2^{(X)}$  instead on  $Q_2$ , as its  $W$ -coefficient (denoted below by  $XW^{(2)}$ ) has more symmetries in the on-shell basis than it does off-shell, namely  $XW_{abcd}^{(2)} = XW_{cdab}^{(2)}$  and  $XW_{(abcd)}^{(2)} = 0$ .

The RGEs derived in the off-shell basis must be transformed to the on-shell one. After passing to the on-shell basis, the RGEs of the operators that do not vanish under EOM form a closed subsystem that depends neither on the EOM-vanishing operator  $W$ -coefficients, nor on the gauge-fixing parameter.

Once the system of on-shell operators is fixed, the transformation to the on-shell basis is completely determined. For an illustrative purpose, we demonstrate our derivation of the transformation rules for the operator  $Q_5$  which in the off-shell basis is related via the EOM to the operators  $Q_4$  and  $Q_7$ . Before passing to the on-shell basis (3.3) the latter two operators must be redefined in such a way that their redefined versions vanish by the EOM. We begin with redefining  $Q_7$

$$\tilde{Q}_7 := Q_7 + \frac{1}{2}Q'_4 + \frac{1}{4}Q'_5, \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$Q'_4 := iW^{(7) AC} \theta_{ab}^C (D^\mu \phi)_a (D^\nu \phi)_b F_{\mu\nu}^A, \quad Q'_5 := \frac{1}{4} \left( \sum_{\text{perms}} W^{(7) AC} \theta_{ac}^C \theta_{bc}^B \right) \phi_a \phi_b F_{\mu\nu}^A F^{B \mu\nu}, \quad (3.5)$$

and the sum in  $Q'_5$  runs over all permutations of uncontracted scalar and group indices. Next,  $Q'_4$  and  $Q'_5$  are absorbed into  $Q_4$  and  $Q_5$ :

$$\overline{W}^{(4) A}_{ab} := W^{(4) A}_{ab} - iW^{(7) AC} \theta_{ab}^C, \quad \overline{W}^{(5) AB}_{ab} := W^{(5) AB}_{ab} - \frac{1}{4}W^{(7) AC} \theta_{ac}^C \theta_{bc}^B. \quad (3.6)$$

The fully redefined operator  $Q_4$ , denoted below by  $\tilde{Q}_4$ , must identically vanish on-shell. This is achieved with the help of yet another redefinition:

$$\tilde{Q}_4 := Q_4 + \frac{1}{4}Q''_5 + (\dots), \quad (3.7)$$

where

$$Q_5'' := \frac{i}{4} \left( \sum_{\text{perms}} \overline{W}^{(4)A} \theta_{ac}^B \right) \phi_a \phi_b F_{\mu\nu}^A F^{B\mu\nu}, \quad (3.8)$$

and dots denote terms that are irrelevant for the  $Q_5$  transformation.

The operators  $Q_4$  and  $Q_7$  are the only ones that matter for the redefined  $W$ -coefficient of  $Q_5$ . Therefore, the redefinitions (3.4) and (3.7) followed by the necessary redefinitions of the  $W$ -coefficients are sufficient to get an on-shell expression for the  $W$ -coefficient of  $\widetilde{Q}_5$ , namely

$$\widetilde{W}^{(5)AB} = \overline{W}^{(5)AB} + \frac{i}{4} \sum_{\text{perms}} \overline{W}^{(4)A} \theta_{bc}^B = W^{(5)AB} + \frac{i}{4} \sum_{\text{perms}} W^{(4)A} \theta_{bc}^B. \quad (3.9)$$

The RGE for  $\widetilde{W}^{(5)}$  is obtained simply by applying  $\mu \frac{d}{d\mu}$  to both sides of the above equation

$$\mu \frac{d\widetilde{W}^{(5)AB}}{d\mu} = \mu \frac{dW^{(5)AB}}{d\mu} + \frac{i}{4} \sum_{\text{perms}} \left( \mu \frac{dW^{(4)A}}{d\mu} \theta_{bc}^B + W^{(4)A} \theta_{bc}^B \gamma_B \right), \quad (3.10)$$

with

$$\gamma_B = \frac{1}{48\pi^2} \left[ -11C_2(G_B) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\theta_B^A \theta_B^A) \right] \quad (3.11)$$

and  $C_2(G_B) \delta^{BC} = f^{BDE} f^{CDE}$ .

All our transformation rules are obtained by applying an analogous procedure for the remaining EOM-vanishing operators, i.e.  $Q_3$  and the unphysical parts of  $Q_2$ . The full list of the transformation rules for the operators (3.3) is given in appendix A.

## 4 Renormalization group equations for the bosonic operators

### 4.1 Methodology

To renormalize the  $W$ -coefficients of dimension-six bosonic operators in the off-shell basis, we proceeded by computing all the one-loop, 1-particle-irreducible diagrams with the external fields matching the field content of the renormalized operators.<sup>4</sup> The task was handled using standard symbolic computation tools. First, all the necessary Feynman rules were derived from the Lagrangian (2.1) with the Mathematica package `FeynRules` [20]. Next, all diagrams potentially relevant to the problems were generated and translated to Feynman integrands using the dedicated package `FeynArts` [21]. Divergent parts were extracted using our code, whose performance was validated against the `FeynCalc` package [22]. The off-shell results were simplified using yet another package, namely `xTensor` [23, 24] that is dedicated to symbolic tensor algebra.

The off-shell results were subsequently translated to the on-shell basis and reduced to their simplest form with the help of the gauge identities (2.6), using a combination of custom codes and manual computations. Although conceptually straightforward, this step proved to be the most challenging part of the calculation. To address it, we followed the procedure outlined in Ref. [12]. First, for each  $W$ -coefficient, we completed a classification of the symmetry-allowed expressions that could potentially contribute to its RGE at a given order in the couplings. Next, we systematically derived gauge relations among the elements of this set. These relations were used to find a minimal system in which any valid combination of  $W$ -coefficients and couplings can be unambiguously represented. While constructing this minimal system of irreducible structures, we prioritized contractions with explicit group invariants, such as group or representation Casimir operators, over more cumbersome constructions involving multiple scalar generators and structure constants. Finally, the on-shell results were expressed in terms of the elements of the minimal system.

<sup>4</sup>Although such computation can be completed in the general  $R_\xi$  gauge with an arbitrary value of the gauge parameter, we have chosen the Feynman-'t Hooft gauge ( $\xi = 1$ ) to reduce the problem complexity.

## 4.2 On-shell results

In this section, we present our main results, namely the on-shell RGEs for all  $W$ -coefficients of the physical dimension-six bosonic operators. Since only the on-shell results are considered here, we suppress tildes over the  $W$  and  $Q$  symbols to make the notation simpler. Moreover, we introduce rescaled anomalous dimensions

$$\eta_B := (4\pi)^2 \gamma_B = \frac{1}{3} \left[ -11C_2(G_B) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\theta_{\underline{B}}^A \theta_{\underline{B}}^A) \right], \quad (4.1)$$

$$(\eta_\phi)_{ab} := (4\pi)^2 (\gamma_\phi)_{ab} = -2C_2(S)_{ab}, \quad (4.2)$$

to absorb the  $(4\pi)^2$  factors stemming from the corresponding counterterms. The matrix  $C_2(S)_{ab} := \theta^A_{ac} \theta^A_{cb}$  that appears in  $(\eta_\phi)_{ab}$  collects the Casimir invariants of the scalar representations.

The most involved RGE is encountered for the operator  $Q_1$  that contains the scalar fields only. We find

$$\mu \frac{dW_{abcdef}^{(1)}}{d\mu} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \left( -A^{(1)} + A^{(2)} + A^{(3)} + 6A^{(4)} + 3A^{(5)} + \frac{3}{2}A^{(6)} + 2A^{(7)} - \frac{1}{2}A^{(8)} - 12A^{(9)} + 6A^{(10)} \right)_{abcdef}, \quad (4.3)$$

where the tensors  $A^{(1)}-A^{(10)}$  are contractions of the  $W$ -coefficients, the gauge-group generators, and the scalar quartic coupling matrices  $\lambda_{ijkl}$ . Explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{abcdef}^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{120} \sum_{\text{perms}} W^{(1)}_{abcdeg} C_2(S)_{gf}, & A_{abcdef}^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{120} \sum_{\text{perms}} W^{(1)}_{abcdeg} (\eta_\phi)_{gf}, \\ A_{abcdef}^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{48} \sum_{\text{perms}} W^{(1)}_{abcdgh} \lambda_{ghief}, & A_{abcdef}^{(4)} &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\text{perms}} XW_{abgh}^{(2)} \theta^A_{gc} \theta^B_{hd} \theta^A_{ei} \theta^B_{if}, \\ A_{abcdef}^{(5)} &= \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\text{perms}} XW_{ahib}^{(2)} \theta^A_{hc} \theta^A_{ig} \lambda_{gdef}, & A_{abcdef}^{(6)} &= \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\text{perms}} XW_{ahgb}^{(2)} C_2(S)_{hc} \lambda_{gdef}, \\ A_{abcdef}^{(7)} &= \frac{1}{16} \sum_{\text{perms}} XW_{abgh}^{(2)} \lambda_{gicd} \lambda_{hief}, & A_{abcdef}^{(8)} &= \frac{1}{12} \sum_{\text{perms}} XW_{abhi}^{(2)} \lambda_{ghic} \lambda_{gdef}, \\ A_{abcdef}^{(9)} &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\text{perms}} W_{ab}^{(5)AB} \theta^C_{cg} \theta^A_{gd} \theta^C_{eh} \theta^B_{hf}, & A_{abcdef}^{(10)} &= \frac{1}{12} \sum_{\text{perms}} W_{ab}^{(5)AB} \theta^A_{ch} \theta^B_{hg} \lambda_{gdef}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Here, the sums in the  $A$ -structures are taken over index permutations under which the  $W$ -coefficient on the l.h.s. of the considered RGE is invariant. Each  $A$ -structure is normalized to the number of index permutations that leave each term in the sum invariant. For instance, in the structure  $A_{abcdef}^{(1)}$ , the summation runs over all possible permutations of scalar indices, as  $W^{(1)}$  is fully symmetric. Nevertheless, the contraction  $W^{(1)}_{abcdeg} C_2(S)_{gf}$  in  $A^{(1)}$  is already fully symmetric under permutations of its first five indices, which yields the normalization factor equal to  $1/5! = 1/120$ .

The RGEs for the on-shell operators describing the interaction of scalar and gauge fields are found to be as follows:<sup>5</sup>

$$\mu \frac{dXW_{abcd}^{(2)}}{d\mu} TW_{abcd}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \left( -2B^{(1)} - 2B^{(2)} + 2B^{(3)} - \frac{4}{3}B^{(4)} + \frac{1}{3}B^{(5)} - \frac{2}{3}B^{(6)} + \frac{2}{3}B^{(7)} + \frac{2}{3}B^{(8)} \right)_{abcd} TW_{abcd}^{(2)}, \quad (4.5)$$

<sup>5</sup>Both sides of the RGE for  $XW_{abcd}^{(2)}$  in Eq. (4.5) are contracted with an arbitrary tensor  $TW_{abcd}^{(2)}$  that is symmetric in the first and last pairs of its indices, to enforce the original symmetry of  $W^{(2)}$ . Such a notation allows for suppressing redundant terms that vanish when  $XW^{(2)}$  is contracted with the fields, and reduces the length of its RGE.

$$\mu \frac{dW^{(5)AB}}{d\mu} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} (2C^{(1)} - C^{(2)} - 3C^{(3)} + C^{(4)} + 2C^{(5)} + C^{(6)} + \frac{1}{2}C^{(7)} - 3C^{(8)})_{ab}^{AB}, \quad (4.6)$$

$$\mu \frac{dW^{(6)AB}}{d\mu} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} (2\tilde{C}^{(1)} - \tilde{C}^{(2)} - 3\tilde{C}^{(3)} + \tilde{C}^{(4)} + 2\tilde{C}^{(5)} + \tilde{C}^{(6)} + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{C}^{(7)} - 3\tilde{C}^{(8)})_{ab}^{AB}, \quad (4.7)$$

with the  $B$ -structures defined by

$$\begin{aligned} B_{abcd}^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{perms}} XW^{(2)}_{edfc} \theta^A_{ea} \theta^A_{fb}, & B_{abcd}^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{perms}} XW^{(2)}_{aedf} \theta^A_{eb} \theta^A_{fc}, \\ B_{abcd}^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{perms}} XW^{(2)}_{abef} \theta^A_{ec} \theta^A_{fd}, & B_{abcd}^{(4)} &= XW^{(2)}_{aedf} \theta^A_{ef} \theta^A_{bc}, \\ B_{abcd}^{(5)} &= \sum_{\text{perms}} XW^{(2)}_{abcd} C_2(S)_{ec}, & B_{abcd}^{(6)} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{perms}} XW^{(2)}_{cedf} \lambda_{abef}, \\ B_{abcd}^{(7)} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{perms}} XW^{(2)}_{cdef} \lambda_{abef}, & B_{abcd}^{(8)} &= \sum_{\text{perms}} XW^{(2)}_{abce} \eta_{\phi ed}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

The sums appearing in the  $B$ -structures run over permutations of the first and third indices, as well as the second and last indices. They also assume antisymmetrization under the exchange of the second and third index, which is necessary to remove the symmetric part of  $XW^{(2)}$ . Altogether, these (anti)symmetrizations correspond to the projection of the off-shell RGE for  $W^{(2)}$  onto the  $XW^2$  subspace.

The  $C$ -structures in the RGE for  $W^{(5)}$  read

$$\begin{aligned} C_{ab}^{(1)AB} &= \sum_{\text{perms}} W^{(5)AC} \theta^C_{cd} \theta^B_{db}, & C_{ab}^{(2)AB} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{perms}} W^{(5)AB}_{ac} C_2(S)_{cb}, \\ C_{ab}^{(3)AB} &= i \sum_{\text{perms}} f^{ACD} W^{(5)BC} \theta^D_{cb}, & C_{ab}^{(4)AB} &= W^{(5)AB}_{cd} \lambda_{abcd}, \\ C_{ab}^{(5)AB} &= \eta_{\underline{B}} W^{(5)AB}_{ab}, & C_{ab}^{(6)AB} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{perms}} W^{(5)AB}_{bc} (\eta_{\phi})_{ca}, \\ C_{ab}^{(7)AB} &= \sum_{\text{perms}} W^{(8)ACD} f^{ECD} \theta^B_{ac} \theta^E_{cb}, & C_{ab}^{(8)AB} &= \sum_{\text{perms}} W^{(8)AED} f^{BEC} \theta^C_{ac} \theta^D_{cb}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where the sums run over permutations of the scalar and gauge indices. The  $\tilde{C}$ -structures in the RGE for  $W^{(6)}$  are recovered from the above  $C$ -structures via simple substitutions  $W^{(5)AB}_{ab} \rightarrow W^{(6)AB}_{ab}$  and  $W^{(8)ABC} \rightarrow W^{(9)ABC}$ .

Finally, the one-loop RGEs for the  $W$ -coefficients of  $Q_8$  and  $Q_9$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \frac{dW^{(8)ABC}}{d\mu} &= \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} [12 C_2(G_{\underline{B}}) + 3 \eta_{\underline{B}}] W^{(8)ABC}, \\ \mu \frac{dW^{(9)ABC}}{d\mu} &= \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} [12 C_2(G_{\underline{B}}) + 3 \eta_{\underline{B}}] W^{(9)ABC}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Although these two equations have been well-known for over 30 years [25, 26], we recall them here for completeness.

As expected, in the on-shell basis, the r.h.s. of the RGEs are free of the redefined off-shell coefficients  $W^{(3)}$ ,  $W^{(4)}$ ,  $W^{(7)}$ . The on-shell-redundant parts of  $W^{(2)}$  cancel out, too, which constitutes a strong consistency check of our results. The apparent symmetry between the RGEs for the operators with the regular and dual field strength tensors can be traced to the chirality-flip symmetry that exchanges the left-handed and right-handed polarizations of the spin-1 gauge bosons. When deriving our results, we have not imposed any symmetry of this kind.

To further test our results, we have used them to independently derive the one-loop RGEs in the SMEFT-like extension of the SM with gauge and scalar fields only. The substitutions of the necessary



group invariants was accomplished with the help of a simple code written in Mathematica, available at [27]. The equations obtained after substitutions do match the bosonic part of the full one-loop RGEs in the SMEFT [28–30]. This is yet another successful test of our general RGEs.

## 5 Summary

In this work, we derived generalized 1-loop renormalization group equations for the bosonic operators of dimension six. The renormalization of the operator coefficients was initially performed in the off-shell basis, which mixes the operators that vanish under EOM with non-vanishing ones. Next, the results were converted to the on-shell basis where only the physical operators are present. Only in the latter basis our results are convention-independent and can be applied to reproduce RGEs for specific models with particular gauge groups and matter contents.

Our final results were validated with two independent consistency checks. First, through the whole computation we carefully traced all the coefficients of the EOM-vanishing operators, assuring their cancellation at the final stage. Second, we identified symmetries relating some operator anomalous dimensions that follow from the structure of the general EFT, and *a posteriori* checked that our RGEs in the final form do respect them.

The results of this work tremendously simplify derivation of one-loop RGEs for dimension-six operator coefficients in a wide class of bosonic EFTs. For validation purposes, we re-derived all the one-loop equations in the simplified version of SMEFT with no fermionic fields. The number of effective operators in this model is large [4], which significantly complicates most computations. In contrast, making appropriate substitutions to our results required preparing only a simple script, which generated the results within a few seconds. The obtained equations fully agree with the corresponding part of SMEFT RGEs [28–30], providing yet another useful verification of our findings.

This paper is part of a broader project that aims at deriving the RGEs for a wide class of EFTs. In the next stage [17], we are going to present complete one-loop results for dimension-six operators in the EFTs that, apart from the gauge and scalar fields, include also the spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  fermions. Such results could be used to independently derive the full one-loop SMEFT RGEs, and would represent an important step towards determining two-loop RGEs in a generic EFT. The two-loop results would enable us to obtain the corresponding SMEFT RGEs via straightforward substitutions. The complete, one-loop results may be also useful for theories with light, weakly coupled particles beyond the Standard Model. When a high-energy theory unifies such hypothetical light particles with the known ones, the SMEFT operators might inadequately describe the physical reality. However, most of such scenarios can still be effectively captured using the generic EFT formalism developed in this work.

*Note added:* When this article was being finalized, a paper [31] with significant overlap appeared on the arXiv. Their and our results had not been compared prior to the arXiv submissions, even though we had communicated a few days in advance. The assumptions and notational conventions in both analyses are somewhat different, so a comparison may not be completely straightforward. Nevertheless, it should be performed before journal publications.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge Patryk Mieszkański for his contributions at the early stage of this project. We also thank Anders Thomsen for useful discussions about the reduction of complex algebraic structures, and Aneesh Manohar for sharing his ideas regarding renormalization of the operators with dual gauge tensors. We are grateful to the authors of Ref. [31] for discussions in 2022 concerning the on-shell projection of the operator  $Q_2$  in Eq. (2.2). Finally, we acknowledge the willingness of Jason Aebischer and Nudžeim Selimović to join our project starting from 2022, even though they eventually continued on their own, and none of their results is known to us. The research of MM and IN was

supported by the National Science Center, Poland, under the research grants 2020/37/B/ST2/02746 and 2020/38/E/ST2/00243, respectively.

## A Transformation rules to the on-shell basis

In this appendix, we list the transformation rules of the off-shell  $W$ -coefficients from (2.2) to the on-shell basis (3.3). The coefficients of  $\tilde{Q}_1$ ,  $\tilde{Q}_2^{(X)}$  and  $\tilde{Q}_5$  are [17]

$$\tilde{W}_{abcdef}^{(1)} := W_{abcdef}^{(1)} + \sum_{\sigma(a\dots f)} \left[ \frac{1}{24} (RW^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3} SW^{(2)})_{gabc} \lambda_{gdef} + \frac{1}{72} W_{gh}^{(3)} \lambda_{gabc} \lambda_{hdef} \right], \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$X\tilde{W}_{abcd}^{(2)} := XW_{abcd}^{(2)} - \frac{i}{2} \sum_{\sigma(ab)\times\sigma(cd)} \bar{W}_{ad}^{(4)A} \theta_{bc}^A, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\tilde{W}_{ab}^{(5)AB} = W_{ab}^{(5)AB} + \frac{i}{4} \sum_{\sigma(ab)\times\sigma(AB)} W_{ac}^{(4)A} \theta_{bc}^B, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the  $\sigma$  symbols in the sums denote summations over all the indicated index permutations. The coefficient  $\bar{W}^{(4)}$  was defined in Eq. (3.6). Our intermediate-step RGEs in the off-shell basis that are already partly written in terms of the on-shell basis coefficients read

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \frac{d\tilde{W}_{abcdef}^{(1)}}{d\mu} &= \mu \frac{dW_{abcdef}^{(1)}}{d\mu} + \sum_{\sigma(a\dots f)} \left[ \frac{1}{24} \left( \mu \frac{dRW^{(2)}}{d\mu} + \frac{1}{3} \mu \frac{dSW^{(2)}}{d\mu} \right)_{gabc} \lambda_{gdef} \right. \\ &+ \frac{1}{24} \left( RW^{(2)} + \frac{1}{3} SW^{(2)} \right)_{gabc} (\beta_\lambda)_{gdef} + \frac{1}{72} \mu \frac{dW^{(3)}}{d\mu}_{gh} \lambda_{gabc} \lambda_{hdef} \\ &\left. + \frac{1}{36} W_{gh}^{(3)} (\beta_\lambda)_{gabc} \lambda_{hdef} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\mu \frac{dX\tilde{W}_{abcd}^{(2)}}{d\mu} = \mu \frac{dXW_{abcd}^{(2)}}{d\mu} - \frac{i}{2} \sum_{\sigma(ab)\times\sigma(cd)} \left( \mu \frac{d\bar{W}_{ad}^{(4)A}}{d\mu} \theta_{bc}^A + \beta_g \bar{W}_{ad}^{(4)A} \frac{\partial \theta_{bc}^A}{\partial g} \right), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\mu \frac{d\tilde{W}_{ab}^{(5)AB}}{d\mu} = \mu \frac{dW_{ab}^{(5)AB}}{d\mu} + \frac{i}{4} \sum_{\sigma(ab)\times\sigma(AB)} \left( \mu \frac{dW_{ac}^{(4)A}}{d\mu} \theta_{bc}^B + W_{ac}^{(4)A} \theta_{bc}^B \gamma_B \right), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where  $RW^{(2)} := \frac{1}{2} (W_{abcd}^{(2)} - W_{cdab}^{(2)})$  and  $SW^{(2)} := W_{(abcd)}^{(2)}$  are the  $W$ -coefficients of the EOM-reducible parts of  $Q_2$ . The symbol  $\beta_\lambda$  denotes the one-loop beta function for the scalar quartic coupling that reads

$$(\beta_\lambda)_{abcd} = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} [\Lambda^2 + 3A - 3\Lambda^S]_{abcd}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{abcd}^2 &= \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\sigma(abcd)} \lambda_{abef} \lambda_{cdef}, & A_{abcd} &= \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\sigma(abcd)} \{\theta^A, \theta^B\}_{bc} \{\theta^A, \theta^B\}_{ad}, \\ \Lambda_{abcd}^S &= \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\sigma(abcd)} C_2(S)_{ae} \lambda_{ebcd}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The remaining three coefficients ( $W^{(6)}$ ,  $W^{(8)}$  and  $W^{(9)}$ ) transform trivially to the on-shell basis.

## References

- [1] G. Buchalla, A.J. Buras and M.E. Lautenbacher, *Weak decays beyond leading logarithms*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68** (1996) 1125 [[hep-ph/9512380](#)].

- [2] S. Weinberg, *Effective Gauge Theories*, *Phys. Lett. B* **91** (1980) 51.
- [3] W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler, *Effective Lagrangian Analysis of New Interactions and Flavor Conservation*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **268** (1986) 621.
- [4] B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzyński, M. Misiak and J. Rosiek, *Dimension-Six Terms in the Standard Model Lagrangian*, *JHEP* **10** (2010) 085 [[1008.4884](#)].
- [5] P. Mieszkalski, M. Misiak and I. Nałęcz, *One-loop renormalization group equations in generic effective field theories. Part II: Operators with spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  fields, [in preparation]* .
- [6] M.E. Machacek and M.T. Vaughn, *Two Loop Renormalization Group Equations in a General Quantum Field Theory. 1. Wave Function Renormalization*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **222** (1983) 83.
- [7] M.E. Machacek and M.T. Vaughn, *Two Loop Renormalization Group Equations in a General Quantum Field Theory. 2. Yukawa Couplings*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **236** (1984) 221.
- [8] M.E. Machacek and M.T. Vaughn, *Two Loop Renormalization Group Equations in a General Quantum Field Theory. 3. Scalar Quartic Couplings*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **249** (1985) 70.
- [9] M.-x. Luo, H.-w. Wang and Y. Xiao, *Two loop renormalization group equations in general gauge field theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **67** (2003) 065019 [[hep-ph/0211440](#)].
- [10] I. Schienbein, F. Staub, T. Steudtner and K. Svirina, *Revisiting RGEs for general gauge theories*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **939** (2019) 1 [[1809.06797](#)].
- [11] A.G.M. Pickering, J.A. Gracey and D.R.T. Jones, *Three loop gauge beta function for the most general single gauge coupling theory*, *Phys. Lett. B* **510** (2001) 347 [[hep-ph/0104247](#)].
- [12] C. Poole and A.E. Thomsen, *Constraints on 3- and 4-loop  $\beta$ -functions in a general four-dimensional Quantum Field Theory*, *JHEP* **09** (2019) 055 [[1906.04625](#)].
- [13] A. Bednyakov and A. Pikelner, *Four-Loop Gauge and Three-Loop Yukawa Beta Functions in a General Renormalizable Theory*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127** (2021) 041801 [[2105.09918](#)].
- [14] J. Davies, F. Herren and A.E. Thomsen, *General gauge-Yukawa-quartic  $\beta$ -functions at 4-3-2-loop order*, *JHEP* **01** (2022) 051 [[2110.05496](#)].
- [15] L. Allwicher et al., *Computing tools for effective field theories: SMEFT-Tools 2022 Workshop Report, 14–16th September 2022, Zürich*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 170 [[2307.08745](#)].
- [16] I. Nałęcz, *One-loop renormalization group equations in a wide class of effective theories for bosonic dimension-six operators, [MSc thesis, University of Warsaw, Poland (2021)]* .
- [17] P. Mieszkalski, *One-loop renormalization group equations in a wide class of effective theories for dimension-six operators with two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  fields, [MSc thesis, University of Warsaw, Poland (2021)]* .
- [18] L.F. Abbott, *The Background Field Method Beyond One Loop*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **185** (1981) 189.
- [19] J.C. Criado and M. Pérez-Victoria, *Field redefinitions in effective theories at higher orders*, *JHEP* **03** (2019) 038 [[1811.09413](#)].
- [20] A. Alloul, N.D. Christensen, C. Degrande, C. Duhr and B. Fuks, *FeynRules 2.0 - A complete toolbox for tree-level phenomenology*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **185** (2014) 2250 [[1310.1921](#)].
- [21] T. Hahn, *Generating Feynman diagrams and amplitudes with FeynArts 3*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **140** (2001) 418 [[hep-ph/0012260](#)].

- [22] V. Shtabovenko, R. Mertig and F. Orellana, *FeynCalc 9.3: New features and improvements*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **256** (2020) 107478 [[2001.04407](#)].
- [23] J.M. Martín-García, R. Portugal and L.R.U. Manssur, *The Invar Tensor Package*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **177** (2007) 640 [[0704.1756](#)].
- [24] J.M. Martín-García et al., “xAct: Efficient Tensor Computer Algebra for the Wolfram Language.” <http://xact.es/>, 2002-2013.
- [25] E. Braaten, C.-S. Li and T.-C. Yuan, *The Evolution of Weinberg’s Gluonic CP Violation Operator*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990) 1709.
- [26] E. Braaten, C.S. Li and T.C. Yuan, *The Gluon Color - Electric Dipole Moment and Its Anomalous Dimension*, *Phys. Rev. D* **42** (1990) 276.
- [27] <https://github.com/wedelfach/EFT-to-SMEFT.git>.
- [28] E.E. Jenkins, A.V. Manohar and M. Trott, *Renormalization Group Evolution of the Standard Model Dimension Six Operators I: Formalism and lambda Dependence*, *JHEP* **10** (2013) 087 [[1308.2627](#)].
- [29] E.E. Jenkins, A.V. Manohar and M. Trott, *Renormalization Group Evolution of the Standard Model Dimension Six Operators II: Yukawa Dependence*, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 035 [[1310.4838](#)].
- [30] R. Alonso, E.E. Jenkins, A.V. Manohar and M. Trott, *Renormalization Group Evolution of the Standard Model Dimension Six Operators III: Gauge Coupling Dependence and Phenomenology*, *JHEP* **04** (2014) 159 [[1312.2014](#)].
- [31] R.M. Fonseca, P. Olgoso and J. Santiago, *Renormalization of general Effective Field Theories: Formalism and renormalization of bosonic operators*, [2501.13185](#).