

Gauge invariant effective actions for dressed fields

Kevin Falls¹

¹*Instituto de Física, Facultad de Ingeniería, Universidad de la República, J.H.y Reissig 565, 11300 Montevideo, Uruguay*
(Dated: March 11, 2025)

A new fundamental form of the path integral for theories with local symmetry is introduced. It is utilised to construct effective actions that generate correlation functions of dressed fields in Yang-Mills theories and quantum gravity. The construction entails a novel BRST symmetric gauge fixing which imposes that the on-shell correlation functions are those of gauge invariant fields. We demonstrate that the effective actions are gauge and diffeomorphism invariant respectively, with appropriate transformations for the Faddeev-Popov ghosts and Nakanishi-Lautrup fields. As a consistency check, the on-shell one-loop effective actions are shown to take the expected gauge independent form. The effective action which satisfies Zinn-Justin's master equation is also gauge invariant with the anti-fields transforming accordingly. We argue that the renormalisation group is defined modulo BRST exact terms.

	Contents		
I. Introduction	2	XII. Tree-level and one-loop analysis of $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills	16
II. Gauge transformations	3	A. Tree-level Propagators	16
A. Yang-Mills	4	B. One-loop	17
B. Gravity	5	XIII. Tree-level and one-loop analysis of gravity	19
C. General assumptions	5	A. Tree-level propagator	19
III. Dressed fields	6	B. One-loop	19
A. Representatives	6	XIV. Gauge independence	20
B. Dressing and undressing fields	7	XV. Master equation	20
C. Exchangers	7	XVI. BRST exact terms	21
D. Dynamical gauge transformations in Yang-Mills theories	8	XVII. Discussion	22
E. Dynamical gauge transformations in gravity	8	Acknowledgements	22
F. Functional derivatives	9	A. Yang-Mills theory	22
IV. Functional integral	9	1. Transform of a_μ^i	22
V. Relation to the Faddeev-Popov form	11	B. Transformation of the measure	23
VI. Landau and harmonic gauges	11	References	23
VII. BRST action for Yang-Mills	11		
VIII. BRST action for gravity	13		
IX. Symmetries	13		
A. BRST invariance	13		
B. Gauge invariance	14		
C. Diffeomorphism invariance	14		
D. Gauge Invariance of the BRST measure	14		
X. Effective action	14		
XI. Gauge and diffeomorphism invariance of the effective action	15		

I. INTRODUCTION

In quantum field theories and general relativity, the fundamental fields that describe the underlying dynamics are not directly observable. This is because they transform non-trivially under gauge transformations and diffeomorphisms, rendering them unobservable in their own right. For a classical theory this means that solutions to the equations of motion are underdetermined, even when ample initial conditions are provided. Specifically, the initial data alone cannot uniquely determine an individual solution; instead, what is fixed is an equivalence class of solutions that can be distinguished from one another by gauge transformations. To obtain fields which are in principle observable, at least for a classical theory, one can “dress” the fundamental field variables to obtain composite fields which are gauge invariant.

In the corresponding quantum theories one usually fixes the gauge to obtain a gauge fixed theory including new ghost fields which interact with the original fields [1]. The gauge fixed theory is no longer gauge invariant but does possess BRST symmetry [2, 3]. This new symmetry encodes the fact that the physical theory is independent of the gauge choice. While correlation functions of the field variables depend on the gauge, correlation functions of gauge invariant operators do not.

When choosing a gauge for a specific calculation there are some things that one can take into consideration. For example, beyond perturbation theory one has to account for Gribov copies [4] and thus the usual BRST invariant theory is not exact for typical gauge choices. One might therefore consider some gauges that do not have this problem. Unfortunately, for Yang-Mills theories, such gauges are necessarily non-linear or discontinuous [5]. Putting this issue aside, in practice gauges are often chosen to simplify a particular calculation for an observable of interest. Furthermore, one could look for an optimised choice of gauge which minimises errors [6] by studying the gauge dependence of observables.

As an alternative, to having to choose a concrete gauge, one could imagine approximation schemes where the choice of gauge is seen to cancel out of the final result, order by order in the approximation. In the context of asymptotically safe quantum gravity, such an approximation has been put forward in [7]. With some care one may be able to perform calculations without ever fixing the gauge explicitly. Indeed, this can be realised manifestly using the exact renormalisation group [8–11].

Since ultimately one is interested in computing gauge invariant operators we might ask if there is a

more direct way to compute correlation functions of a complete set of gauge invariant fields. One set of gauge invariant operators are the dressed, aka relational, fields which are obtained by a dressing process from the original field variables. The process requires a choice of dressing and results in a composite operator which is gauge invariant. For example, in general relativity the role of the dressing is played by four scalar fields constructed from the metric and/or matter fields [12–27]. Crucially they should behave such that they provide a physical coordinate system. This being the case, each event in spacetime is then uniquely labeled by the values of the four scalars. The dressing process then consists of transforming the original field variables into the physical coordinate system obtaining a composite field. An analogous dressing process can be performed for gauge theories where the role of the dressing is played by composite fields which are “dynamical” group elements. This generalises similar proposals for gauge invariant composite fields in gauge theories e.g. [28–42].

In order to compute the correlation functions of dressed fields [43–49] one can first compute correlation functions of the gauge variant fields and then from these determine the correlation functions of the dressed fields. Since the latter are composite operators, this will ultimately involve both the renormalisation of the original generating functional of correlation functions and the further renormalisation process which deals with the composite fields.

The purpose of this paper is to write down a generating functional for the dressed correlation functions directly. The key idea is to use a specific gauge fixing condition that ensures that the fields coincide with the dressed fields. This leads naturally also to a different view point: we can view these gauges as providing the defining, although implicit, fundamental form of the path integral for any choice of complete gauge fixing. More specifically, if we insist that we have chosen a single representative, from each equivalence class of fields under gauge transformations, then we implicitly define a dressing and hence a dressed field. Therefore there is a correspondence between a choice of gauge and a choice of dressing. This is only formal in the sense that in practice one may want to explicitly choose the gauge or explicitly choose the dressing.

Therefore we have different motivations for our formalism. On the one hand, if one is interested in a particular dressed field, we can compute the correlation functions of that field directly within perturbation theory, for example. Another application is to keep the dressing unspecified and just use its properties (i.e. its transformation law), treating the

choice as an unphysical gauge condition. Observables do not depend on the gauge, so we can endeavour to compute observables without ever fixing the gauge at any stage. Such observables include scattering amplitudes, quantum corrections to classical observables [48], as well as scaling dimensions of gauge invariant operators [50].

As we shall see, our effective actions enjoy gauge and diffeomorphism invariance respectively, in addition to the usual BRST symmetry. Thus, we expect renormalised actions to maintain these powerful symmetries if a symmetric regulator is chosen. The price to pay is that the gauges are non-linear and thus we can expect that the renormalisation process is quite complex and that the simple tree-level form of the BRST invariant action will be deformed once quantum corrections are taken into account. On the other hand BRST exact terms in the effective action are redundant; meaning they can be removed by a field redefinition.

Our approach is quite orthogonal to the geometrical Vilkovisky-DeWitt approach [51–57]. In particular we do not seek a gauge or parameterisation independent effective action. In the end all effective actions generate the correlation of some field variables and there is no “unique” choice for such a set of variables. Our philosophy seeks an elegant way to express the freedom to parameterise gauge theories and to exploit this freedom as much as possible.

We also do not attempt to split the field into a “physical part” and a “gauge part” to achieve gauge invariance invariance as was the idea of [58]. Instead we exploit a non-linear gauge fixing which achieves gauge invariance without the use of a background field [59]. A gauge invariant gauge fixing seems like a contradiction it is not since our gauge fixing indeed breaks gauge invariance. However, the breaking terms can be absorbed into the source and those the gauge is broken by a non-vanishing source.

In section II we discuss gauge transformations in Yang-Mills and gravity and fix our conventions. Adopting a condensed notation, we will largely be able to treat gauge transformations in Yang-Mills and diffeomorphisms in gravity in a single frame work. In section III we discuss the construction and properties of dressed fields and three kinds dynamical gauge transformations (where by dynamical we mean that they depend on the field variables), which we call dressing fields, undressing fields and exchangers. The relationships amongst each of these fields and to the gauge variant dressed fields is detailed. In the end of the section we derive useful expressions which are obtained by taking functional derivatives both with respect to the fields and with respect to the gauge parameters. In particular

we obtain the general expression for the functional derivative of the fields transformed by a dynamical gauge transformation. In section IV we write down our fundamental form of the functional integral using dressing fields to write the gauge condition. The transformation law for the measure is derived by demanding that the path integral is independent of the gauge. The relation to the Faddeev-Popov form of the functional integral is discussed in section V. Two examples of dressing fields are given in section VI corresponding to Landau gauge in Yang-Mills and harmonic gauge in gravity. In section VII we construct a BRST invariant bare action for Yang-Mills based on our form of the path integral introducing ghosts and Nakanishi-Lautrup fields. An analogous BRST action is given for gravity in section VIII. In section IX we discuss the symmetries of the actions showing that, along side BRST symmetry, we have gauge and diffeomorphism invariance. In section X we consider the generating functionals of connected correlation functions and the effective action and show that when can obtain correlation functions of dressed fields from these functionals. We then show that the effective actions are gauge and diffeomorphism invariant respectively in section XI. The tree-level propagators and on-shell one-loop effective action are studied in section XII for Yang-Mills and in section XIII for gravity. Sections XIV and XV recall some known results relating to gauge independence of the functional integral and the master equation for the effective action. Section XVI demonstrates that BRST exact terms, i.e. those related to the choice of gauge, can be removed by a field reparameterisation. In section XVII we end the paper with a short discussion. In appendix A we collect some result we need for Yang-Mills and in appendix B we give details relating to the transformation of the measure.

II. GAUGE TRANSFORMATIONS

Here we will work in a general setup so we can treat both diffeomorphism invariance of general relativity and the gauge invariance of Yang-Mills. This will also allow us to see how structures emerge in general, by only using that the gauge transformations form a group. We denote the fields by ϕ^a where a is a DeWitt index and so includes the indices which label the components and the continuous spacetime coordinates x^μ in a single label. A repeated DeWitt index implies a sum over the indices and an integral over spacetime. Lower case latin letters from the start of the alphabet, a, b, c etc., are DeWitt indices for the fields. As two ex-

amples we take the fields ϕ^a to be the gauge fields in Yang-Mills $\phi^a = a_\mu^i(x)$ and the metric in gravity $\phi^a = g_{\mu\nu}(x)$. Therefore, in the case of Yang-Mills¹ $J_a\phi^a = \int_x J_i^\mu(x)a_\mu^i(x)$ and in the case of gravity $J_a\phi^a = \int_x J^{\mu\nu}(x)g_{\mu\nu}(x)$. We can include matter fields in the components of ϕ^a also, however, for simplicity we treat all components ϕ^a as bosons. Furthermore, we will treat gauge invariance and diffeomorphism invariance separately. It should be obvious that we can generalise to the case of the standard model plus gravity with appropriate sign changes for fermions and having both symmetries present. At times we use ‘‘gauge transformations’’ to also mean diffeomorphisms; it should be clear from the context when we are referring specifically to Yang-Mills and when we are being inclusive.

Gauge transformations can be specified by a set of parameters \mathfrak{g}^α where, as the transformations depend on the point in spacetime, α is also a DeWitt index (as are the other greek letters from the start of the alphabet β, γ etc.). The field transformed by a gauge transformation with parameters \mathfrak{g}^α is denoted by $\mathfrak{g}_*\phi^a$. By $\mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{h}^\alpha$ we denote the new parameters which result after the operation of group multiplication of two elements with parameters \mathfrak{g}^α and \mathfrak{h}^α . The parameters of the inverse transformation are given by

$$\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\alpha \equiv (\mathfrak{g}^{-1})^\alpha \quad (2.1)$$

As such

$$\mathfrak{g}_*\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\alpha = \mathbf{1}^\alpha \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathbf{1}^\alpha$ are the values of the parameters for the identity group element such that $\mathbf{1}_*\phi^a = \phi^a$. Since the transformations form a group we have associativity

$$(\mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{h})_*\phi^a = \mathfrak{g}_*(\mathfrak{h}_*\phi), \quad (2.3)$$

so we can omit the brackets, i.e.

$$(\mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{h})_*\phi^a \equiv \mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{h}_*\phi^a \equiv \mathfrak{g}_*(\mathfrak{h}_*\phi). \quad (2.4)$$

We shall often refer to a set of gauge transformation parameters \mathfrak{g}^α as simply a gauge transformation since the former specify the latter.

Let’s now see how things work for Yang-Mills and for gravity.

A. Yang-Mills

For $SU(N)$ invariant Yang-Mills theories an element of the group can be represented by a matrix

$$\mathbf{G}(\mathfrak{g}) = e^{i\mathfrak{g}^i \mathfrak{t}_i} \quad (2.5)$$

which is parameterised by \mathfrak{g}^i and we reserve i, j, k etc. for the indices that label the generators \mathfrak{t}_i . We use bold face for the matrices which have the same dimensions as the group elements and use upper case latin letters I, J, K etc. to label their components e.g. $(\mathbf{G})_{IJ}$. Since the group acts locally we have that $\mathfrak{g}^\alpha = \mathfrak{g}^i(x)$ are the parameters. So α stands for both the index i and the continuous spacetime coordinates x^μ . From (2.5) we note that, for Yang-Mills, the parameters of the identity are zero $\mathbf{1}^\alpha = \mathbf{1}^i(x) = 0$ and the parameters of the inverse are $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^i(x) = -\mathfrak{g}^i(x)$. We can normalise the generators of the group \mathfrak{t}_i by

$$\text{tr } \mathfrak{t}_i \mathfrak{t}_j = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij}. \quad (2.6)$$

The indices i, j and k are raised and lowered using the Killing metric δ_{ij} which is simply the Kronecker delta (so we won’t need to worry about the position of these indices or the positions of the indices I, J and K for that matter). As standard we define the structure constants of the Lie algebra f^{ijk} by

$$[\mathfrak{t}_i, \mathfrak{t}_j] = i f^{ijk} \mathfrak{t}_k \quad (2.7)$$

where it follows that the coefficients f^{ijk} are totally antisymmetric. For $SU(N)$ theories we have that

$$\text{tr } \mathfrak{t}_i = 0. \quad (2.8)$$

The product $\mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{h}^\alpha$ is defined via

$$\mathbf{G}(\mathfrak{g})\mathbf{G}(\mathfrak{h}) = \mathbf{G}(\mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{h}). \quad (2.9)$$

More explicitly this implies

$$i\mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{h}^i \mathfrak{t}_i = \log(e^{i\mathfrak{g}^i \mathfrak{t}_i} e^{i\mathfrak{h}^i \mathfrak{t}_i}), \quad (2.10)$$

which in turn implies

$$\mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{h}^i = -2i \text{tr} \mathfrak{t}_i \log(e^{i\mathfrak{g}^j \mathfrak{t}_j} e^{i\mathfrak{h}^k \mathfrak{t}_k}), \quad (2.11)$$

which we can evaluate using the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula. In practice we will make use of the simpler identity

$$\begin{aligned} e^{i\mathfrak{g}^j \mathfrak{t}_j} e^{-i\mathfrak{g}^j \mathfrak{t}_j} &= (e^F(\mathfrak{g}))^{ik} \mathfrak{t}_k \\ &= \mathfrak{t}_k (e^{-F(\mathfrak{g})})^{ki}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

with

$$(F(\mathfrak{g}))^i_k := f^{ijk} \mathfrak{g}^j, \quad (2.13)$$

¹ Here and throughout $\int_x \equiv \int d^4x$ denotes the integral over spacetime.

which we prove in appendix A (note that although $F(\mathfrak{g})$ is a matrix we don't write it in bold since it does not have the dimensions of \mathbf{G}). Since $F(\mathfrak{g})$ is anti-symmetric

$$O(\mathfrak{g}) = e^{F(\mathfrak{g})} \quad (2.14)$$

is an orthogonal matrix, which we used to reach the second line in (2.12).

The gauge transformation of the fields $\mathfrak{g}_* \phi^a$ is given by the action of the group element $\mathbf{G}(\mathfrak{g})$ on the field. In the case that $\phi^a = a_\mu^i(x)$, writing $\mathfrak{a}_\mu = a_\mu^i \mathbf{t}_i$, we have that

$$\mathfrak{g}_* \mathfrak{a}_\mu = \mathbf{G}(\mathfrak{g}) \mathfrak{a}_\mu \mathbf{G}^{-1}(\mathfrak{g}) + i \mathbf{G}(\mathfrak{g}) \partial_\mu \mathbf{G}^{-1}(\mathfrak{g}) \quad (2.15)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mathfrak{g}_* a_\mu^k = a_\mu^i (e^{F(\mathfrak{g})})^{ik} + \partial_\mu \mathfrak{g}^i (e^{F(\mathfrak{g})})^{ik}, \quad (2.16)$$

as we show in Appendix A 1. One can then check that the associativity property (2.3) holds.

B. Gravity

For diffeomorphisms $\mathfrak{g}_* \phi^a$ denotes the *push forward* and the parameters are the functions $\mathfrak{g}^\alpha = \mathfrak{g}^\mu(x)$ which define the diffeomorphism as a map between manifolds. We recall that as a map \mathfrak{g} goes between two manifolds, $\mathfrak{g} : \mathcal{M}_x \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_y$, and the inverse as a map $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ goes the other way, $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} : \mathcal{M}_y \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_x$. Then the push forward \mathfrak{g}_* takes a geometric object on \mathcal{M}_x , e.g. a scalar $\sigma(x)$, and “pushes it forward” onto \mathcal{M}_y to obtain a geometric object on \mathcal{M}_y e.g. $\mathfrak{g}_* \sigma(y) = \sigma(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(y))$. For diffeomorphisms we can also define the pull back as the inverse $\mathfrak{g}^* = \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_*$ which takes a geometric object on \mathcal{M}_y e.g. a scalar $\tau(y)$ and “pulls it back” onto \mathcal{M}_x e.g. $\mathfrak{g}^* \tau(x) = \tau(\mathfrak{g}(x))$. Using push forwards as the gauge transformations rather than pull backs is simply a convention.

We then define $\mathfrak{g}_* \mathfrak{h}^\alpha$ as the composition of the maps

$$\mathfrak{h}_* \mathfrak{g}^\mu(x) = \mathfrak{h}^\mu(\mathfrak{g}(x)), \quad (2.17)$$

which satisfies the requirement of associativity (2.3), e.g. for a scalar we require that $(\mathfrak{h}_* \mathfrak{g})_* \sigma(x) = \mathfrak{h}_*(\mathfrak{g}_* \sigma(x))$ which holds since $(\mathfrak{h}_* \mathfrak{g})_* \sigma(x) = \sigma(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(x)))$ and $\mathfrak{h}_*(\mathfrak{g}_* \sigma(x)) = \mathfrak{h}_*(\sigma(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(x))) = \sigma(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(x)))$.

For diffeomorphisms the gauge parameters of the identity are $\mathbf{1}^\mu(x) = x^\mu$ and the inverse $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\mu(x)$ satisfies

$$\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\mu(\mathfrak{g}(x)) = x^\mu, \quad \mathfrak{g}^\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(x)) = x^\mu. \quad (2.18)$$

Note that in addition to tensors on a manifold, which map from spacetime to some “data”, we can consider geometric objects, such as events or world lines, which take some data and map it into space-time e.g. an event maps to a point with coordinates $x^\mu(\mathcal{P})$ where \mathcal{P} is some data that uniquely fixes the coordinates $x^\mu(\mathcal{P})$ of the event i.e. \mathcal{P} specifies the point physically. A push forward then acts on the coordinates of an event as $\mathfrak{g}_* x^\mu(\mathcal{P}) = \mathfrak{g}^\mu(x(\mathcal{P})) \equiv y^\mu(\mathcal{P})$. As such we see that (2.17) conforms to treating the gauge parameters as coordinates of events in terms of how other parameters acts on them via \mathfrak{h}_* . We note that if we would use the convention of pull backs as the gauge transformation then associativity would require us to define

$$\mathfrak{h}^* \mathfrak{g}^\mu(x) = \mathfrak{g}^\mu(\mathfrak{h}(x)) \quad (2.19)$$

which conforms to treating each component $\mathfrak{g}^\mu(x)$ as a scalar and is not as intuitive as (2.17), hence our choice of convention. The price of our convention of using push forwards is a relative minus sign between small gauge transformations and Lie derivatives which we will see later.

If we take the field to be the metric $\phi^a = g_{\mu\nu}(x)$, then the push forward is given by

$$\mathfrak{g}_* g_{\mu\nu}(x) = \frac{\partial \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\rho(x)}{\partial x^\mu} \frac{\partial \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\lambda(x)}{\partial x^\nu} g_{\rho\lambda}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(x)), \quad (2.20)$$

which is the general expression for a push forward of a rank (0, 2)-tensor.

C. General assumptions

Generalising our two examples we will assume that the transformed $\mathfrak{g}_* \phi^a$ is affine

$$\mathfrak{g}_* \phi^a = T^a{}_b[\mathfrak{g}] \phi^b + T^a[\mathfrak{g}]. \quad (2.21)$$

as will be the case for standard parameterisations of the fields in Yang-Mills and gravity, exemplified by the gauge field and the metric. For our examples the coefficients $T^a{}_b[\mathfrak{g}]$ and $T^a[\mathfrak{g}]$ can be read off from the transformation laws (2.16) and (2.20). Viewed as a matrix $T^a{}_b[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}]$ is the inverse of $T^a{}_b[\mathfrak{g}]$, i.e.

$$T^a{}_b[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] T^b{}_c[\mathfrak{g}] = \delta_c^a, \quad T^a{}_b[\mathfrak{g}] T^b{}_c[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] = \delta_c^a, \quad (2.22)$$

where δ_c^a is a product of a Dirac delta and the identity on the field space, while

$$T^a[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] = -T^a{}_b[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] T^b[\mathfrak{g}]. \quad (2.23)$$

When $\phi^a = a_\mu^i(x)$ we note that the inverse $T^a{}_b[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}]$ is also transpose of $T^a{}_b[\mathfrak{g}]$ i.e. it is an orthogonal matrix.




FIG. 1: Schematic representation of configuration space. The circles are three gauge orbits with every pair of points the same circle being related by a gauge transformation, which we exemplify in the orbit on the left. Picking a section corresponds to choosing one point on each orbit to be the representative which are denoted by the solid points and labelled as $\hat{\phi}$, $\hat{\phi}'$ and $\hat{\phi}''$. In the middle orbit we show the action of the dressing field $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]$ (portrayed by the bold arrow) which takes a point ϕ (unfilled circle) to its representative such that $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]_*\phi = \hat{\phi}[\phi]$.

III. DRESSED FIELDS

In gauge theories only gauge invariant composite operators are observable. Consequently, as we have said, the fields ϕ^a are not themselves observables. However, by adopting a “physical” gauge condition the fields will be equal to dressed fields $\hat{\phi}^a$ when the condition applies. Moreover when expressed in terms of unconstrained fields ϕ^a the dressed fields $\hat{\phi}^a[\phi]$ are gauge invariant functionals of the latter i.e. $\hat{\phi}^a[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = \hat{\phi}^a[\phi]$. In this section we will develop the treatment of dressed fields within our formalism. It can then be applied to the construction of a functional integral, which in turn is the foundation of our effective actions.

There are two points of view we can adopt towards dressed fields. From a more technical point of view we can see them as being the outcome of a particular gauge fixing procedure. From a more physical perspective, we can think of them as relational or dressed observables that we can measure at least in the classical sense. From this point of view they represent a gauge invariant relation between a gauge variant field and a gauge variant dressing [60]. For the case of gravity the dressing is understood as a system of clocks and rods which form a physical coordinate system able to locate objects and define directions. Importantly, in a field theoretic formalism these coordinates are functionals of the fields themselves. Transforming the metric into this co-

ordinate system we get the dressed metric that is diffeomorphism invariant and hence physically well defined. The dressed metric therefore depends on the fields that are used to construct the clocks and rods. These fields can be constructed from matter fields, from the metric itself, or from both. In gauge theories one can think of the dressing as a generalisation of a voltmeter that can measure a physical voltage difference taking into account all effects of the meter itself. Thus essentially the dressing is the “gauge” or measuring device that allows one to read off from its dial the “value of gauge field” in a gauge theory; hence the name “gauge theory” fits nicely when understood this way.

A. Representatives

Let us start from the technical side. We consider the space of all field histories \mathcal{H}_ϕ which has ϕ^a as coordinates. Then we identify a choice of gauge with choice of a section of \mathcal{H}_ϕ when viewed as a fibre bundle. More specifically, we can break up the space \mathcal{H}_ϕ into equivalence classes of configurations under gauge transformations. Any two configurations ϕ and $\mathfrak{g}_*\phi$ that are related by a gauge transformation \mathfrak{g} are in the same equivalence class $\phi \sim \mathfrak{g}_*\phi$. The equivalence classes are the fibres of the fibre bundle, known as gauge orbits, and the base space is the space of orbits i.e. each equivalence class is a point in the base space. Picking a section means we pick one and only one history from each and every gauge orbit. A nice analogy is to think of each orbit as a constituency in a representative democracy and each representative being the elected member of parliament. Each field configuration that lies in the section is the representative of the orbit to which it belongs. The choice of section is therefore analogous to the election of one member of parliament from every constituency who is doing the job of representing each of their constituents i.e. each ϕ^a such that $\phi^a \sim \hat{\phi}^a$. For any choice of section a dressed field, understood as a functional $\hat{\phi}^a[\phi]$, is the map from the field configuration ϕ^a to its representative. Let us call $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]$ the gauge transformation that takes ϕ^a to its representation then, by this definition,

$$\hat{\phi}^a[\phi] = \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]_*\phi^a. \quad (3.1)$$

A schematic of three gauge orbits with a choice of section is given in figure 1 with the orbits displayed as circles and black dots displaying the position of the representative in each of the orbits. The placement of the representatives is arbitrary from the technical point of view. Therefore as a purely technical device the function $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]$ need not be a nice




FIG. 2: A graphical proof of the transformation law for the dressing field $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$: we can apply first $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ to $\mathfrak{g}_*\phi$ and then apply $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]$, as on the rhs, corresponding to following the route of the two black transformations. Alternatively we can apply $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi]$ to $\mathfrak{g}_*\phi$, as on the lhs, corresponding to the single transformation in grey.




FIG. 3: Schematic representation of the action of the dressing and undressing fields $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]$ and $\mathfrak{G}[\phi]$ respectively expressed in equations (3.1) and (3.4).

smooth function since any choice of a section is permissible. However, we will need that $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]$ are suitably differentiable. Moving within an orbit, we have that

$$\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{g}}, \quad (3.2)$$

which again follows from the definition that we pick a section. A graphical proof of this law is given in figure 2. It also follows, as was mentioned, that the dressed field $\hat{\phi}^a[\phi]$ is a gauge invariant functional of the field ϕ^a which we can show in a few steps

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\phi}^a[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] &= \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi]_*\mathfrak{g}_*\phi^a \\ &= \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_*\mathfrak{g}_*\phi^a \\ &= \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]_*\phi^a \\ &= \hat{\phi}^a[\phi]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Indeed this is just the statement that each field in the same equivalence class has the same representative.




FIG. 4: A graphical proof of the transformation law for the undressing field $\mathfrak{G}^\alpha[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = \mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{G}^\alpha[\phi]$: we can apply first $\mathfrak{G}^\alpha[\phi]$ to $\hat{\phi}$ and then apply \mathfrak{g} , as on the rhs, corresponding to following the route of the two black transformations. Alternatively we can apply $\mathfrak{G}^\alpha[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi]$ to $\hat{\phi}$, as on the lhs, corresponding to the single transformation in grey.

B. Dressing and undressing fields

The more physical point of view is to think of $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}^\alpha[\phi]$ as fields that dress the gauge variant fields ϕ^a to form dressed fields. Thus we call composite fields $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}^\alpha[\phi]$ with the transformation law (3.2) *dressing fields*. The inverses $\mathfrak{G}^\alpha[\phi]$ are called the *undressing fields* since they transform the dressed field back to the gauge variant field

$$\mathfrak{G}[\phi]_*\hat{\phi}^a[\phi] = \phi^a. \quad (3.4)$$

Figure 3 shows a schematic representations of (3.1) and (3.4). By definition the undressing field $\mathfrak{G}^\alpha[\phi]$ transforms as

$$\mathfrak{G}^\alpha[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = \mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{G}^\alpha[\phi]. \quad (3.5)$$

A graphical proof of (3.5) is given in figure 4.

From the physical point of view a dressing field is chosen explicitly as the first step to find the form of the dressed fields. In the more abstract point of view of an arbitrary section is chosen and the dressing field is chosen implicitly. One might imagine that given a particular observable one is trying to compute that there is an optimal choice of dressing field which reduces the complexity of the calculation.

C. Exchangers

Dressing and undressing fields are types of dynamical gauge transformation, where the transformation parameters depend on the fields, which are distinguished by their respective transformation laws (3.2) and (3.5). We define an *exchanger* as dynamical gauge transformation $\mathfrak{E}[\phi]$ which trans-

forms as²

$$\mathfrak{E}[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = \mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{E}[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{g}}. \quad (3.6)$$

Note that the inverse of an exchanger $\hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\phi]$ is also an exchanger i.e.

$$\hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = \mathfrak{g}_*\hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{g}}. \quad (3.7)$$

Exchangers can be understood as covariant gauge transformations since they transform the field into a composite operator $\mathfrak{E}[\phi]_*\phi$ that transforms as the field does

$$\mathfrak{E}[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi]_*\mathfrak{g}_*\phi = \mathfrak{g}_*\mathfrak{E}[\phi]_*\phi \quad (3.8)$$

Let us explain why we call them exchangers. First we note that they provide a diffeomorphism of \mathcal{H}_ϕ , i.e. a field reparameterisation, defined by

$$\phi^a \rightarrow E^a[\phi] \equiv \hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\phi]_*\phi^a \quad (3.9)$$

This diffeomorphism of \mathcal{H}_ϕ maps points in the same equivalence class to each other. Furthermore this map commutes with gauge transformations i.e. $E^a[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = \mathfrak{g}_*E^a[\phi]$ such that the same transformation \mathfrak{g}_* relates configurations before and after applying the field reparameterisation. In particular the diffeomorphism (3.9) maps each representative $\hat{\phi}^a$ to another configuration in the same equivalence class and hence performs the analogy of a general election. Therefore

$$\hat{\phi}^a = E^a[\hat{\phi}] = \hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\hat{\phi}]_*\hat{\phi}^a \quad (3.10)$$

is a new dressed field $\hat{\phi}^a = \hat{\phi}^a[\phi]$ given by

$$\hat{\phi}^a[\phi] = \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\phi]_*\phi \quad (3.11)$$

which we can write in terms of a new dressing field

$$\hat{\phi}^a[\phi] = \hat{\mathfrak{H}}[\phi]_*\phi \quad (3.12)$$

given by

$$\hat{\mathfrak{H}}[\phi] = \hat{\mathfrak{G}}^\alpha[\mathfrak{E}[\phi]_*\phi] = \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\phi] \quad (3.13)$$

where we have used (3.2) to reach the second equality. Indeed using both (3.7) and (3.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathfrak{H}}^\alpha[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] &= \hat{\mathfrak{G}}^\alpha[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] \\ &= \hat{\mathfrak{G}}^\alpha[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_*\mathfrak{g}_*\hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{g}} \\ &= \hat{\mathfrak{G}}^\alpha[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{g}} \\ &= \hat{\mathfrak{H}}^\alpha[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{g}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

which is the transformation law for a dressing field. Moreover, we can construct all exchangers out of a dressing and undressing field by

$$\mathfrak{E}[\phi] = \mathfrak{H}[\phi]_*\hat{\mathfrak{G}}^\alpha[\phi]. \quad (3.15)$$

In summary, given one choice of a section, corresponding to some choice of dressing field, we can use the exchanger to exchange the dressing field for another and hence change the choice of section i.e. choose a different set of representatives. Thus exchangers are isomorphic to changing our choice of gauge and hence will play a role in determining the conditions for gauge independence in the next section.

D. Dynamical gauge transformations in Yang-Mills theories

Returning to our examples, for Yang-Mills theories $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}$ do not take values in the gauge group in its matrix representation. We can consider the *group dressing fields*

$$\mathbf{D}[\phi] = \mathbf{G}_{\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]} \quad (3.16)$$

which transform as

$$\mathbf{D}[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = \mathbf{D}[\phi]\mathbf{G}_{\hat{\mathfrak{g}}}. \quad (3.17)$$

So, while the dressing fields $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]$ transforms in a non-linear fashion in Yang-Mills, the group dressing field $\mathbf{D}[\phi]$ transforms linearly. Later we will use a DeWitt notation where the components of the group dressing fields are denoted by $D^\alpha[\phi]$. In practice we will use the group dressing fields to construct our gauge fixing action.

E. Dynamical gauge transformations in gravity

For diffeomorphisms the dressing fields transform as a collection of four scalars $\mathfrak{G}^\alpha = \hat{\mathfrak{G}}^{\hat{\mu}}(x)$ such that

$$\hat{\mathfrak{G}}^{\hat{\mu}}(x)|_{\phi \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_*\phi} = \hat{\mathfrak{G}}^{\hat{\mu}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(x)). \quad (3.18)$$

The $\hat{\mu}$ index is therefore not a spacetime index but an index that labels four scalars. The undressing fields $\mathfrak{G}^\alpha = \mathfrak{G}^\mu(\hat{x})$ transform as the coordinates of “events”

$$\mathfrak{G}^\mu(\hat{x})|_{\phi \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_*\phi} = \mathfrak{g}^\mu(\mathfrak{G}^\mu(\hat{x})). \quad (3.19)$$

In particular $\mathfrak{G}^\mu(\hat{x})$ are the coordinates of the points where the four scalars take the values $\hat{x}^{\hat{\mu}}$. The exchangers transform as dynamical diffeomorphisms [61]

$$\hat{\mathfrak{E}}^\mu(x)|_{\phi \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_*\phi} = \mathfrak{g}(\hat{\mathfrak{E}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}(x))), \quad (3.20)$$

² For gravity such dynamical diffeomorphisms have been introduced in [61].

with left and right composition.

In order to have a common notation with Yang-Mills we will write the dressing fields in gravity as $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}^\alpha = D^{\hat{\mu}}(x)$ and also use a hatted index in the DeWitt notation so that

$$\hat{\mathfrak{G}}^{\hat{\alpha}}[\phi] = D^{\hat{\alpha}}[\phi] = D^{\hat{\mu}}(x)[\phi]. \quad (3.21)$$

This introduces some redundancy in our notation since we have two symbols for dressing fields in gravity. Roughly speaking we use $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}^{\hat{\alpha}}[\phi]$ to stress that it is a dynamical gauge transformation while developing the formalism and $D^{\hat{\alpha}}[\phi]$ in the context of the BRST invariant action, which is used in practice and where the role is the same as $\mathbf{D}[\phi]$ in Yang-Mills.

F. Functional derivatives

One purpose treating gauge transformations in terms of the parameters, which are themselves composite fields, is that we can take functional derivatives with respect to the parameters. Hence we have that

$$\frac{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\alpha}{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\beta} = \delta_\beta^\alpha, \quad (3.22)$$

where for Yang-Mills

$$\delta_\beta^\alpha = \delta(x-y)\delta_j^i, \quad (3.23)$$

with $\delta(x-y)$ and δ_j^i denoting the Dirac delta and Kronecker delta respectively. Similarly, for gravity

$$\delta_\beta^\alpha = \delta(x-y)\delta_\nu^\mu. \quad (3.24)$$

Now we can take functional derivatives with respect to the fields ϕ^a and with respect to the parameters \mathfrak{g}^α . Moreover the parameters can depend on the fields when they are dressing fields, undressing fields or exchangers. Here we will derive some useful results which can be used in these cases.

Let's define

$$T_\alpha^a[\mathfrak{g}, \phi] := \frac{\delta(\mathfrak{g}_* \phi^a)}{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\alpha} \quad (3.25)$$

and

$$T_\alpha^a[\phi] := T_\alpha^a[\mathbf{1}, \phi] \quad (3.26)$$

For gravity, when the field is the metric,

$$T_\alpha^a[\phi] \epsilon^\alpha = -\mathcal{L}_\epsilon g_{\mu\nu} = -\nabla_\mu^{(g)} \epsilon_\nu - \nabla_\nu^{(g)} \epsilon_\mu \quad (3.27)$$

is minus the Lie derivative of the metric with $\nabla_\mu^{(g)}$ denoting the covariant derivative compatible with

the metric (the minus is due to the fact that we have chosen to use the push forward as the gauge transformation rather than the pull back). While for Yang-Mills we have that

$$T_\alpha^a[\phi] \epsilon^\alpha = \partial_\mu \epsilon^i + f^{ijk} a_\mu^j \epsilon^k \equiv \nabla_\mu^{(A)} \epsilon^i, \quad (3.28)$$

with $\nabla_\mu^{(a)}$ denoting the gauge covariant derivative. Now consider

$$\mathfrak{h}_* \phi^a = \mathfrak{h}_* \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_* \mathfrak{g}_* \phi^a \quad (3.29)$$

taking a functional derivative with respect to \mathfrak{h} and then setting $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{g}$ we find that

$$T_\alpha^a[\mathfrak{g}, \phi] = U_\alpha^\beta[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] T_\beta^a[\mathfrak{g}_* \phi] \quad (3.30)$$

where

$$U_\gamma^\alpha[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] := \left. \frac{\delta \mathfrak{h}_* \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\alpha}{\delta \mathfrak{h}^\gamma} \right|_{\mathfrak{h}=\mathfrak{g}} \quad (3.31)$$

and therefore

$$T_\alpha^a[\mathfrak{g}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_* \phi] = U_\alpha^\beta[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] T_\beta^a[\phi] \quad (3.32)$$

Next let's consider the identity

$$\mathfrak{g}[\phi]_* \hat{\mathfrak{g}}[\phi]_* \phi^a = \phi^a \quad (3.33)$$

where we let the $\mathfrak{g}[\phi]$ be arbitrary functionals of the fields. Taking a derivative of the above identity with respect to the fields we find that

$$T^a{}_c[\mathfrak{g}] \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_* \phi^c}{\delta \phi^b} + \frac{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\alpha}{\delta \phi^b} U_\alpha^\beta[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] T_\beta^a[\phi] = \delta_b^a, \quad (3.34)$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_* \phi^a}{\delta \phi^b} = T^a{}_c[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] \left(\delta_b^c - \frac{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\alpha}{\delta \phi^b} U_\alpha^\beta[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] T_\beta^c[\phi] \right), \quad (3.35)$$

equally, swapping \mathfrak{g} with $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ we have

$$\frac{\delta \mathfrak{g}_* \phi^a}{\delta \phi^b} = T^a{}_c[\mathfrak{g}] \left(\delta_b^c - \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^\alpha}{\delta \phi^b} U_\alpha^\beta[\mathfrak{g}] T_\beta^c[\phi] \right). \quad (3.36)$$

IV. FUNCTIONAL INTEGRAL

In this section we will construct the functional integral putting aside the issue of renormalisation. Since each choice of section is just a choice of the a representative for each equivalence class, we are at liberty to choose one without any physical effects. We can define the gauge independent functional integral by

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int d\phi \tilde{\mu}[\phi] \delta(\mathbf{1} - \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]) e^{-S[\phi]} \quad (4.1)$$

which restricts the integral to a single section. Here $S[\phi]$ is a gauge invariant action and $\tilde{\mu}[\phi]$ is a measure factor, whose properties we will determine below. These properties ensure that \mathcal{Z} is not dependent on the gauge i.e. on the choice of section. Let's note that our form of the functional integral can be seen as a specific class of gauge fixed functional integrals without the need for a FP ghost determinant. The FP ghost operator is given by

$$Q^\alpha{}_\beta[\phi] := -\frac{\delta}{\delta \mathbf{g}^\beta} (\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]_* \hat{\mathbf{g}})^\alpha \Big|_{\mathbf{g}=1} \quad (4.2)$$

$$= \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathbf{g}^\beta} (\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]_* \mathbf{g})^\alpha \Big|_{\mathbf{g}=1} \quad (4.3)$$

however when $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi] = \mathbf{1}$ then $Q^\alpha{}_\beta[\phi] = \delta^\alpha_\beta$ is the identity matrix. Hence $\delta(\mathbf{1} - \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]) \det Q^\alpha{}_\beta = \delta(\mathbf{1} - \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi])$.

As we have said, the measure factor $\tilde{\mu}[\phi]$ must transform such that \mathcal{Z} is independent of the choice of section i.e. independent of the dressing field $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]$. Finding this transformation law is a key result of this paper. It guarantees that we can equally write (4.1) as

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int d\phi \tilde{\mu}[\phi] \delta(\mathbf{1} - \hat{\mathfrak{H}}[\phi]) e^{-S[\phi]} \quad (4.4)$$

for any dressing field $\hat{\mathfrak{H}}[\phi]$ without using BRST invariance. By making a change of variables in the functional integral $\phi \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}[\phi]_* \phi$, we see that this will be the case if, for the exchanger $\mathfrak{E}[\phi] = \hat{\mathfrak{H}}[\phi]_* \hat{\mathfrak{G}}^\alpha[\phi]$, it holds that

$$d(\mathfrak{E}[\phi]_* \phi) \tilde{\mu}[\mathfrak{E}[\phi]_* \phi] = d\phi \tilde{\mu}[\phi]. \quad (4.5)$$

To see this one uses the gauge invariance of $S[\phi]$ and (3.13) which implies $\delta(\mathbf{1} - \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\mathfrak{E}[\phi]_* \phi]) = \delta(\mathbf{1} - \hat{\mathfrak{H}}[\phi])$. From (3.36) we have that

$$d(\mathfrak{E}[\phi]_* \phi) = d\phi \det T^a{}_b[\mathfrak{E}] \quad (4.6)$$

$$\times \det \left(\delta_b^a - \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{E}}^\alpha}{\delta \phi^b} U_{\alpha}{}^\beta[\mathfrak{E}] T_\beta^a[\phi] \right)$$

Then a short calculation, which we carry out in Appendix B, reveals that

$$d(\mathfrak{E}[\phi]_* \phi) = d\phi \det T^a{}_b[\mathfrak{E}] \det T^\alpha{}_\beta[\hat{\mathfrak{E}}], \quad (4.7)$$

where we define

$$T^\alpha{}_\beta[\mathbf{g}] := \frac{\delta \mathbf{g}_* \mathfrak{h}_* \hat{\mathbf{g}}^\alpha}{\delta \mathfrak{h}^\beta} \Big|_{\mathfrak{h}=1}. \quad (4.8)$$

Noting that, by the chain rule, $T^\alpha{}_\beta[\mathbf{g}]$ satisfies

$$T^\alpha{}_\beta[\mathbf{g}] T^\beta{}_\gamma[\hat{\mathbf{g}}] = \delta^\alpha_\gamma, \quad (4.9)$$

let's then introduce symmetric invertible two point functions $\gamma_{ab}[\phi]$ and $\eta_{\alpha\beta}[\phi]$ which transform as

$$\gamma_{ab}[\phi] = \gamma_{ab}[\mathbf{g}_* \phi] = T^c{}_a[\hat{\mathbf{g}}] \gamma_{cd}[\phi] T^d{}_b[\hat{\mathbf{g}}], \quad (4.10)$$

and

$$\eta_{\alpha\beta}[\mathbf{g}_* \phi] = T^\gamma{}_\alpha[\hat{\mathbf{g}}] \eta_{\gamma\delta}[\phi] T^\delta{}_\beta[\hat{\mathbf{g}}]. \quad (4.11)$$

Then by setting [11]

$$\tilde{\mu}[\phi] = \frac{\sqrt{\det \gamma_{ab}[\phi]}}{\sqrt{\det \eta_{\alpha\beta}[\phi]}} \quad (4.12)$$

we satisfy (4.5) and hence \mathcal{Z} does not depend on the choice of section as required.

For Yang-Mills we have that

$$T^\alpha{}_\beta v^\beta = (e^{-F(\mathfrak{g}(x))})^{ij} v^j(x) \quad (4.13)$$

as we demonstrate in Appendix A. For gravity

$$T^\alpha{}_\beta v^\beta = \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}^\mu(x)}{\partial x^\nu} v^\nu(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(x)) \quad (4.14)$$

which we recognise as the push forward of a contravariant vector.

It is worth noting that for gravity the measure typically has to be non-trivial. The metrics γ_{ab} and $\eta_{\alpha\beta}$ can always be chosen to have a minimal form for which it agrees with the measure of Fujikawa [63, 64]. An in depth discussion of the path integral in quantum gravity is given in [62].

while for Yang-Mills one can satisfy (4.5) simply by setting $\eta_{\alpha\beta} \propto \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\gamma_{ab} \propto \delta_{ab}$ with field independent coefficients and hence $\tilde{\mu}$ is a constant. This follows since for Yang-Mills the transposes of $T^\alpha{}_\beta$ and $T^a{}_b$ are their respective inverses. Nonetheless for the purposes of regularisation choosing γ_{ab} and $\eta_{\alpha\beta}$ to be non-trivial can be desirable [11].

Here, consider the unregulated forms for Yang-Mills

$$\gamma_{i,j}^{\mu,\nu}(x,y) = \frac{\mu^2}{g} \delta^{\mu\nu} \delta_{ij} \delta(x-y) \quad (4.15)$$

and

$$\eta_{i,j}(x,y) = \frac{\mu^4}{g} \delta_{ij} \delta(x-y) \quad (4.16)$$

where g is the gauge coupling and μ is a constant of mass dimension one. For Einstein gravity, the unregulated metrics are

$$\gamma^{\mu\nu,\rho\sigma}(x,y) = \frac{\mu^2}{64\pi G_N} \sqrt{g} (g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} + g^{\mu\sigma} g^{\nu\rho} - g^{\mu\nu} g^{\rho\sigma}) \delta(x-y), \quad (4.17)$$

and

$$\eta_{\mu,\nu}(x,y) = \frac{\mu^4}{16\pi G} \sqrt{g} g_{\mu\nu} \delta(x-y), \quad (4.18)$$

respectively where G_N is Newton's constant. Later, specifically in sections XII and XIII, we will use these metrics and their inverse to raise and lower indices.

We consider (4.1) the defining form of the functional integral since it refers in principle to a choice of section only and not to an auxiliary gauge fixing condition. In practice determining the explicit form of the integrand can only be achieved by a gauge fixing condition or giving an explicit expression for $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]$. However, one could proceed without choosing a specific section and just use the transformation property of the dressing field to compute observables without choosing a gauge. This approach is in line with seeing the dressing field as a technical choice. Alternatively, we could choose the dressing field in a physically motivated way which may suit a specific purpose by simplifying a calculation of desired observable.

V. RELATION TO THE FADDEEV-POPOV FORM

Let us now derive the Faddeev-Popov (FP) form of the functional integral starting from our more fundamental form (4.1). To do so we must assume the existence of some conditions $\chi^\alpha[\phi] = 0$ which do not have the Gribov ambiguity. This means that these conditions are equivalent to selecting a single representative for each orbit such that $\chi^\alpha[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = 0$, taken as an equation for \mathfrak{g} , has a unique solution, namely

$$\chi^\alpha[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi] = 0 \implies \mathfrak{g} = \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]. \quad (5.1)$$

If this is the case we can relate the delta functions by

$$\delta(\mathfrak{g} - \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]) = \delta(\chi[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi]) \left| \det \frac{\delta\chi^\alpha[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi]}{\delta\mathfrak{g}^\beta} \right| \quad (5.2)$$

which when evaluated at $\mathfrak{g} = \mathbf{1}$ gives

$$\delta(\mathbf{1} - \hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]) = \delta(\chi[\phi]) \left| \det \frac{\delta\chi^\alpha[\mathfrak{g}_*\phi]}{\delta\mathfrak{g}^\beta} \right|_{\mathfrak{g}=\mathbf{1}} \quad (5.3)$$

and thus demonstrates that from (4.1) we can derive the FP form. Since we have shown already that the path integral is independent of the choice of representatives, we have shown independence of the choice of $\chi^\alpha[\phi] = 0$ if there is no ambiguity. However, note that if $\chi^\alpha[\phi] = 0$ has an ambiguity we cannot go the other way, hence supporting our view that (4.1) is more fundamental.

VI. LANDAU AND HARMONIC GAUGES

Since the notions of the dressed field and the corresponding dressing field play a central role. Here we will give two examples which correspond to the usual Landau and harmonic gauges in Yang-Mills and gravity respectively. We can obtain dressed fields that obey these gauges by considering functionals $I[\phi, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}]$ and minimise them with respect to the gauge transformations $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ to obtain the corresponding dressing field $\hat{\mathfrak{G}}$. For example in Yang-Mills one can minimise [29]

$$I[\mathfrak{a}, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}] = \int_x \text{tr}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_* \mathfrak{a}_\mu) (\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_* \mathfrak{a}_\mu), \quad (6.1)$$

then the corresponding dressed gauge field is unique and obeys the Landau condition $\partial^\mu \hat{a}_\mu^i = 0$. For $SU(N)$ the group dressing field $\mathbf{D} = e^{i\mathfrak{t}_i \hat{\mathfrak{G}}^i}$ obeys

$$\mathbf{D}^\dagger \nabla_\mu \nabla^\mu \mathbf{D} + (\nabla_\mu \mathbf{D})^\dagger (\nabla_\mu \mathbf{D}) = 0 \quad (6.2)$$

where here $\nabla_\mu \mathbf{D} = \partial_\mu \mathbf{D} + i\mathbf{D}\mathfrak{a}_\mu$ and the dagger denotes the complex conjugate.

For gravity we can do something similar by minimising

$$I[g, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}] = \int_x \mathfrak{g}_* (\sqrt{g} g^{\mu\nu}) \delta_{\mu\nu} \quad (6.3)$$

then the corresponding dressed field obeys the harmonic gauge condition $\partial_\mu (\sqrt{\hat{g}} \hat{g}^{\mu\nu}) = 0$. Indeed, $I[g, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}]$ takes the form

$$I[g, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}] = \int_x \sqrt{g} g^{\rho\lambda} \delta_{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hat{\mu}} \partial_\lambda \hat{\mathfrak{g}}^{\hat{\nu}} \delta_{\hat{\mu}\hat{\nu}} \quad (6.4)$$

So the dressing fields which minimise $I[g, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}]$ obey the harmonic condition on the coordinates

$$\nabla_g^2 \hat{\mathfrak{G}}^{\hat{\mu}} = 0 \quad (6.5)$$

where ∇_g^2 is the Laplacian for a *scalar*.

With these examples in mind we can develop our approach keeping the choice of dressing field very general.

VII. BRST ACTION FOR YANG-MILLS

In the case of Yang-Mills the path integral is given by

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int d\phi \tilde{\mu}[\phi] \delta(\hat{\mathfrak{G}}[\phi]) e^{-S[\phi]} \quad (7.1)$$

In order to write the delta function in the path integral in a convenient way for Yang-Mills we are going

to impose a constraint on the group dressing fields since they transform linearly. This leads to some complications that we do not encounter in gravity.

To this end we consider a smoothed delta function $\delta_\epsilon(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{1})$ on the space of complex matrices such that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_\epsilon(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{1}) = \delta(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{1}) \quad (7.2)$$

where as a distribution $\delta(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{1})$ only has support for $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{1}$ hence

$$\delta(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{1})F(\mathbf{M}) = \delta(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{1})\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{1}). \quad (7.3)$$

In particular let's take

$$\delta_\epsilon(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{1}) = \int dB e^{-\int_x \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon \operatorname{tr} \bar{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{B} + \operatorname{tr} \bar{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{1}) + \operatorname{tr}(\bar{\mathbf{M}} - \mathbf{1})\mathbf{B}]} \quad (7.4)$$

where \mathbf{B} and $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$ are the Nakanishi-Lautrup fields which we take to be complex matrices. Here we strictly take $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$ to be the complex conjugate of \mathbf{B} and thus the independent fields are the real and imaginary parts B_{IJ}^{\Re} and B_{IJ}^{\Im} respectively. We note that

$$B_{IJ} = B_{IJ}^{\Re} + iB_{IJ}^{\Im}, \quad (7.5)$$

and

$$\bar{B}_{IJ} = B_{JI}^{\Re} - iB_{JI}^{\Im}, \quad (7.6)$$

which imply,

$$B_{IJ}^{\Re} = \frac{1}{2} (B_{IJ} + \bar{B}_{JI}), \quad (7.7)$$

and

$$B_{IJ}^{\Im} = -\frac{i}{2} (B_{IJ} - \bar{B}_{JI}). \quad (7.8)$$

Therefore we can work with $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$ and \mathbf{B} as if they are the independent fields for most calculations.

Now we consider the delta function on the group manifold $\delta(\mathfrak{g})$ which we can write as

$$\delta(\mathfrak{g}) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} N_\epsilon \delta_\epsilon(\mathbf{G}[\mathfrak{g}] - \mathbf{1}), \quad (7.9)$$

with

$$N_\epsilon = \frac{1}{\int d\mathfrak{h} \delta_\epsilon(\mathbf{G}[\mathfrak{h}] - \mathbf{1})} \quad (7.10)$$

To see this we need to carefully think about our choice to parameterise the group by the \mathfrak{g}^i which are not strictly global coordinates on the gauge manifold (since none exist for e.g. $SU(2)$ theories the manifold is a 3-sphere). Instead for each element of the group there are multiple corresponding values of the parameters. Therefore to integrate over the group we can make a change of variables to some local coordinates ψ^i on a coordinate patch that includes the identity and understand $\int d\mathfrak{g} \dots$ as an integral over the coordinates ψ^i on this patch. Then restricted to this patch

$$\mathbf{G}[\mathfrak{g}] = \mathbf{1} \implies \mathfrak{g}^i = 0 \quad (7.11)$$

from which it follows that

$$\int d\mathfrak{g} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} N_\epsilon \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g}) \delta_\epsilon(\mathbf{G}[\mathfrak{g}] - \mathbf{1}) = \mathcal{F}(0) \quad (7.12)$$

Recalling that $\mathbf{D}[\phi]$ are the group dressing fields, we can write

$$\delta(\hat{\mathcal{G}}[\phi]) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} N_\epsilon \int dB e^{-\int_x \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon \operatorname{tr} \bar{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{B} + \operatorname{tr} \bar{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{D}[\phi] - \mathbf{1}) + \operatorname{tr}(\bar{\mathbf{D}}[\phi] - \mathbf{1})\mathbf{B}]} \quad (7.13)$$

Furthermore in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ the factor N_ϵ can be written as an integral over Grassmann fields

$$N_\epsilon \sim \int dC dA e^{-\frac{1}{2} \int_x \operatorname{tr} [\epsilon^2 \bar{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{A} + i \bar{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{t}_i C^i - i \mathbf{A} \bar{\mathbf{t}}_i C^i]} \quad (7.14)$$

This resembles the integration of FP ghosts although it gives just a constant factor. As we have said the FP determinant is one so we do not need to have ghosts in our path integral. Nonetheless

to have BRST symmetry manifest we can introduce the ghosts. To this end let's define the FP operator

$$\mathbf{Q}_i(x, y) := - \left. \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathfrak{g}^i(y)} \mathbf{D}[\mathfrak{g}_* \phi](x) \right|_{\mathfrak{g}=\mathbf{1}}. \quad (7.15)$$

which gives

$$\mathbf{Q}_i(x, y) = i \mathbf{D} \mathbf{t}_i \delta(x - y) \quad (7.16)$$

then we note that when the gauge condition, $\mathbf{D} \stackrel{\perp}{=} \mathbf{1}$, applies $\mathbf{Q}_i(x, y) \stackrel{\perp}{=} \text{it}_i \delta(x - y)$. Suppressing terms which vanish as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, this allows us to write the path integral as

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int d\phi dAdBdC \tilde{\mu} e^{-S + \frac{1}{2} \int_x (\text{tr} \mathbf{B} + \text{tr} \bar{\mathbf{B}})}. \quad (7.17)$$

where

$$S = S + \frac{1}{2} \int_x \text{tr} [\bar{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{D} + \bar{\mathbf{D}} \mathbf{B} + (\bar{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{Q}_i + \mathbf{A} \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_i) C^i]. \quad (7.18)$$

Here one should remember to give a (squared) mass ϵ to the fields to the complex matrix valued fields and take the limit where this mass goes to zero. Note that the fields $C^i(x)$ are the ghosts, $\mathbf{A}(x)$ are the anti-ghosts (not to be confused with gauge fields which we denote as \mathbf{a}_μ) and $\mathbf{B}(x)$ the Nakanishi-Lautrup fields. Introducing a DeWitt notation

$$D^{\hat{\alpha}} = (\mathbf{D})^{IJ}(x) \quad (7.19)$$

we can write

$$S = S + \int_x \frac{1}{2} [B_{\hat{\alpha}}^* D^{\hat{\alpha}} + B_{\hat{\alpha}} \bar{D}^{\hat{\alpha}} + (A_{\hat{\alpha}}^* Q^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\alpha} + A_{\hat{\alpha}} \bar{Q}^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\alpha}) C^{\alpha}]. \quad (7.20)$$

where the asterisk denotes the complex conjugation.

VIII. BRST ACTION FOR GRAVITY

We now construct a BRST invariant action based on our gauge fixing conditions for gravity. We adopt a similar notation to the Yang-Mills case by denoting the dressing fields as $D^{\hat{\alpha}}$ which in the case of gravity transform as a set of four scalar fields. The situation is actually simpler in gravity and we can write the path integral simply as

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int d\phi dB \tilde{\mu}[\phi] e^{-S[\phi] - B_{\hat{\alpha}}(D^{\hat{\alpha}}[\phi] - \mathbf{1}^{\hat{\alpha}})} \quad (8.1)$$

where we do not need to introduce any small mass ϵ in this case. Then we define the FP operators as

$$Q^{\hat{\mu}}{}_{\mu}(x, y) := - \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathbf{g}^{\mu}(y)} D^{\hat{\mu}}[\mathbf{g}_*, \phi](x) \Big|_{\mathbf{g}=\mathbf{1}}. \quad (8.2)$$

which gives

$$Q^{\hat{\mu}}{}_{\mu}(x, y) = \partial_{\mu} D^{\hat{\mu}} \delta(x - y) \quad (8.3)$$

When $D^{\hat{\mu}}(x) = \mathbf{1}^{\hat{\mu}} = x^{\hat{\mu}}$ we have that $Q^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\beta} \stackrel{\perp}{=} \delta_{\beta}^{\hat{\alpha}}$. Therefore we can add a factor into the path integral a factor of the form

$$\int dAdC e^{-A_{\hat{\alpha}} Q^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\beta} C^{\beta}}, \quad (8.4)$$

where C and A are the ghost and anti-ghost. Writing

$$S = S + \int_x (A_{\hat{\mu}}(x) \partial_{\mu} D^{\hat{\mu}} C^{\mu} + B_{\hat{\mu}} D^{\hat{\mu}}), \quad (8.5)$$

or in DeWitt notation

$$S = S + A_{\hat{\alpha}} Q^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\beta} C^{\beta} + B_{\hat{\alpha}} D^{\hat{\alpha}}, \quad (8.6)$$

where

$$B_{\hat{\alpha}} D^{\hat{\alpha}} = \int_x B_{\hat{\mu}} D^{\hat{\mu}}, \quad (8.7)$$

$$A_{\hat{\alpha}} Q^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\beta} C^{\beta} = \int_x A_{\hat{\mu}}(x) \partial_{\mu} D^{\hat{\mu}} C^{\mu}, \quad (8.8)$$

and

$$\mathbf{1}^{\hat{\alpha}} B_{\hat{\alpha}} = \int_x x^{\hat{\mu}} B_{\hat{\mu}}(x). \quad (8.9)$$

The functional integral for gravity is therefore given by

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int d\phi dAdBdC \tilde{\mu}[\phi] e^{-S[\phi, A, B, C] + \mathbf{1}^{\hat{\alpha}} B_{\hat{\alpha}}}. \quad (8.10)$$

IX. SYMMETRIES

We now analyse the symmetries of the action \mathcal{S} for Yang-Mills and for gravity.

A. BRST invariance

For both Yang-Mills and gravity the generators of gauge transformations T_{α}^a satisfy

$$[\bar{T}_{\alpha}, \bar{T}_{\beta}] = f^{\gamma}{}_{\alpha\beta} \bar{T}_{\gamma}, \quad (9.1)$$

where $f^{\gamma}{}_{\alpha\beta}$ are the structure coefficients. For Yang-Mills

$$f^{\gamma}{}_{\alpha\beta} \xi^{\alpha} \epsilon^{\beta} = f_{ij}^k \xi^i \epsilon^j \quad (9.2)$$

For gravity

$$f^{\gamma}{}_{\alpha\beta} \xi^{\alpha} \epsilon^{\beta} = \mathcal{L}_{\xi} \epsilon^{\mu} = \xi^{\nu} \partial_{\nu} \epsilon^{\mu} - \partial_{\nu} \xi^{\mu} \epsilon^{\nu} \quad (9.3)$$

Furthermore we have that

$$Q^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\alpha} = - \frac{\delta D^{\hat{\alpha}}}{\delta \phi^{\alpha}} T_{\alpha}^a \quad (9.4)$$

Then it follows that the actions \mathcal{S} are BRST invariant with

$$\delta_{\theta} \phi^a = T_{\alpha}^a[\phi] C^{\alpha} \theta, \quad (9.5)$$

$$\delta_{\theta} C^{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2} C^{\beta} f_{\beta\gamma}^{\alpha} C^{\gamma} \theta, \quad (9.6)$$

$$\delta_{\theta} A_{\hat{\alpha}} = -B_{\hat{\alpha}} \theta, \quad (9.7)$$

$$\delta_{\theta} B_{\hat{\alpha}} = 0. \quad (9.8)$$

One can check that the measure is also BRST invariant in particular the transformation properties of $\gamma_{ab}[\phi]$ and $\eta_{\alpha\beta}[\phi]$ ensure this.

For Yang-Mills we have

$$\mathcal{S} = S + \frac{1}{2} \int_x \text{tr} [\bar{\mathbf{B}}\mathbf{D} + \bar{\mathbf{D}}\mathbf{B} + i(\bar{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{A}\bar{\mathbf{C}}\bar{\mathbf{D}})] \quad (9.9)$$

with

$$\mathbf{C} \equiv C^i \mathbf{t}_i \quad (9.10)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{C}} \equiv C^i \bar{\mathbf{t}}_i \quad (9.11)$$

Then it follows that \mathcal{S} is BRST invariant with

$$\delta_\theta \mathbf{a}_\mu = \nabla_\mu^{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{C} \theta, \quad (9.12)$$

$$\delta_\theta \mathbf{C} = -i \mathbf{C}^2 \theta, \quad (9.13)$$

For gravity the BRST transformations of the metric and ghosts are given by

$$\delta_\theta g_{\mu\nu} = -(\nabla_\mu C_\nu + \nabla_\nu C_\mu) \theta, \quad (9.14)$$

$$\delta_\theta C^\mu = C^\mu \nabla_\nu^g C^\nu \theta = C^\mu \partial_\nu C^\nu \theta. \quad (9.15)$$

B. Gauge invariance

Remarkably, as well as being BRST invariant, \mathcal{S} is gauge invariant in the case of Yang-Mills. With the gauge transformations extend to the other fields:

$$\mathbf{g}_* \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B} \bar{\mathbf{G}}[\mathbf{g}] \quad (9.16)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_* \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A} \bar{\mathbf{G}}[\mathbf{g}] \quad (9.17)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_* \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{G}[\mathbf{g}] \mathbf{C} \mathbf{G}^{-1}[\mathbf{g}] \quad (9.18)$$

which imply

$$\mathbf{g}_* \bar{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{G}[\mathbf{g}] \bar{\mathbf{B}} \quad (9.19)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_* \bar{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{G}[\mathbf{g}] \bar{\mathbf{A}} \quad (9.20)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_* \bar{\mathbf{C}} = \bar{\mathbf{G}}^{-1}[\mathbf{g}] \bar{\mathbf{C}} \bar{\mathbf{G}}[\mathbf{g}] \quad (9.21)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_* C^i = (e^{F(\mathfrak{g})})^i_j C^j \quad (9.22)$$

Note however that $\frac{1}{2} \int_x (\text{tr} \mathbf{B} + \text{tr} \bar{\mathbf{B}})$ is not gauge invariant but is BRST invariant.

C. Diffeomorphism invariance

For gravity the action \mathcal{S} is diffeomorphism invariant where we define

$$\mathbf{g}_* C^\mu(x) = \frac{\partial \hat{\mathbf{g}}^\mu(x)}{\partial x^\nu} C^\nu(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(x)) \quad (9.23)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_* A_{\hat{\mu}}(x) = \det \left| \frac{\partial \hat{\mathbf{g}}(x)}{\partial x} \right| A_{\hat{\mu}}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(x)) \quad (9.24)$$

$$\mathbf{g}_* B_{\hat{\mu}}(x) = \det \left| \frac{\partial \hat{\mathbf{g}}(x)}{\partial x} \right| B_{\hat{\mu}}(\hat{\mathbf{g}}(x)) \quad (9.25)$$

from which we observe that $C^\mu(x)$ transforms as a vector and both $A_{\hat{\mu}}(x)$ and $B_{\hat{\mu}}(x)$ transform as four scalar densities of weight one.

D. Gauge Invariance of the BRST measure

One can also show that the BRST measure involving the ghosts, anti-ghosts and Nakanishi-Lautrup fields, is gauge invariant in Yang-Mills and diffeomorphism invariant in gravity under *field independent* gauge transformations. Indeed separately we have

$$d(\mathbf{g}_* \phi) \sqrt{\det \gamma[\mathbf{g}_* \phi]} = d\phi \sqrt{\det \gamma[\phi]}, \quad (9.26)$$

$$d(\mathbf{g}_* C) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \eta[\mathbf{g}_* \phi]}} = dC \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \eta[\phi]}}, \quad (9.27)$$

and

$$dAdB = d(\mathbf{g}_* A) d(\mathbf{g}_* B). \quad (9.28)$$

It is important that this invariance is both linear with the transformations themselves are independent of the fields (unlike exchangers which must depend on the fields). Gauge invariance and diffeomorphism invariance are therefore broken in the functional integral only by the factors $e^{\int_x x^{\hat{\mu}} B_{\hat{\mu}}}$ and $e^{\frac{1}{2} \int_x (\text{tr} \mathbf{B} + \text{tr} \bar{\mathbf{B}})}$ respectively.

X. EFFECTIVE ACTION

Let's now introduce sources into the functional integral for each field. For the Nakanishi-Lautrup fields we will do this by replacing the terms which break gauge invariance by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_x \text{tr}(\mathbf{B} + \bar{\mathbf{B}}) &\rightarrow \int_x \text{tr}(\bar{\mathbf{K}}\mathbf{B} + \text{tr} \mathbf{K}\bar{\mathbf{B}}) \\ &= 2 \int_x (B_{IJ}^{\mathfrak{A}} K_{\mathfrak{A}}^{IJ} + B_{IJ}^{\mathfrak{J}} K_{\mathfrak{J}}^{IJ}) \end{aligned} \quad (10.1)$$

where $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}^{\mathfrak{A}} + i\mathbf{K}^{\mathfrak{J}}$ is a complex source. Similarly for the terms that break diffeomorphism invariance we replace

$$\int_x x^{\hat{\mu}} B_{\hat{\mu}} \rightarrow \int_x K^{\hat{\mu}} B_{\hat{\mu}} \quad (10.2)$$

In this way we absorb the terms that break the symmetries into the source terms.

To write things compactly let us introduce a super-field notation for the fields and the sources such that Φ^A collects all the fields components and

\mathcal{J}_A collects the sources for each field i.e. for the original fields the ghosts, anti-ghosts and Nakanishi-Lautrup fields. Then we define the Schwinger function by

$$e^{\mathcal{W}[\mathcal{J}]} = \int d\Phi \tilde{\mu}[\Phi] e^{-S[\Phi] + \mathcal{J}_A \Phi^A} \quad (10.3)$$

and the effective action as its Legendre transform

$$\Gamma[\Phi] = \sup_{\mathcal{J}} \mathcal{J}_A \Phi^A - W[\mathcal{J}], \quad (10.4)$$

where Φ^A is now denoting the expectation value of the fields in this context i.e.

$$\Phi^A = \frac{\delta W[\mathcal{J}]}{\delta \mathcal{J}_A} \equiv U^A[\mathcal{J}]. \quad (10.5)$$

We can solve this equation to obtain $\mathcal{J}_A = V_A[\Phi]$. Then the meaning of (10.4) is that the rhs is evaluated at its supremum, namely we have that

$$\Gamma[\Phi] = V_A[\Phi] \Phi^A - W[V[\Phi]] \quad (10.6)$$

It follows that

$$\mathcal{J}_A = V_A[\Phi] = \Gamma[\Phi] \overleftarrow{\frac{\delta}{\delta \Phi^A}} \quad (10.7)$$

where the notation means the derivative acts to the left. Furthermore we have that that $V[\cdot]$ and $U[\cdot]$ are inverse maps:

$$\mathcal{J}_A = V_A[U[\mathcal{J}]] = \mathcal{J}_A, \quad U^A[V[\Phi]] = \Phi^A \quad (10.8)$$

One can then compute correlation functions from $\Gamma[\Phi]$ in the standard way. For example denoting $P^{AB}[\Phi]$ as the inverse of the Hessian of $\Gamma[\Phi]$ we have that

$$P^{AB}[\Phi] = \langle \Phi^A \Phi^B \rangle_{\mathcal{J}} - \langle \Phi^A \rangle \langle \Phi^B \rangle_{\mathcal{J}} \quad (10.9)$$

where the subscript indicates the expectation value is in the presence of the source terms.

Let's define $\bar{\Phi}$ as a solution to

$$\frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \phi^a} = 0, \quad \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta A_{\hat{\alpha}}} = 0, \quad \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta C^{\alpha}} = 0, \quad (10.10)$$

along with

$$\frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta B_{IJ}^{\mathfrak{A}}(x)} = \delta_{IJ}, \quad \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta B_{IJ}^{\mathfrak{J}}(x)} = 0 \quad (10.11)$$

for Yang-Mills, and

$$\frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta B_{\hat{\mu}}(x)} = x^{\hat{\mu}} \quad (10.12)$$

for gravity. Consequently, by (10.7) all sources are zero apart from the ones needed to implement the delta function in the path integral by imposing (10.11) and (10.12). Since the delta functions impose that $\phi = \hat{\phi}$ all correlation functions are correlation functions of the dressed fields. For example we have that

$$\bar{\phi}^a = \langle \hat{\phi}^a \rangle, \quad (10.13)$$

is the expectation value of the dressed field and that

$$P^{ab}[\bar{\Phi}] = \langle \hat{\phi}^a \hat{\phi}^b \rangle - \langle \hat{\phi}^a \rangle \langle \hat{\phi}^b \rangle, \quad (10.14)$$

is the connected two point function of dressed fields.

XI. GAUGE AND DIFFEOMORPHISM INVARIANCE OF THE EFFECTIVE ACTION

We now show that our effective actions are gauge (and diffeomorphism) invariant. First let's summarise the gauge transformations in super-field notation by

$$\mathfrak{g}_* \Phi^A = T^A{}_B[\mathfrak{g}] \Phi^B + T^A[\mathfrak{g}] \quad (11.1)$$

so $T^A{}_B[\mathfrak{g}]$ collects all the components of the gauge transformations and $T^A[\mathfrak{g}]$ is non-zero for the gauge field in Yang-Mills. We then define the action of the gauge transformations on the source by

$$\mathfrak{g}_* \mathcal{J}_A = \mathcal{J}_B T^B{}_A[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}]. \quad (11.2)$$

By making a change of integration variables $\Phi \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_* \Phi$ in the integral (10.3) and using the invariance of the action \mathcal{S} and the measure one has that

$$W[\mathfrak{g}_* \mathcal{J}] = W[\mathcal{J}] - T^A[\hat{\mathfrak{g}}] \mathcal{J}_A \quad (11.3)$$

where we have used (2.22) and (2.23). Differentiating this with respect to \mathcal{J} on both sides and using (10.5) gives

$$\mathfrak{g}_* U^A[\mathcal{J}] = U^A[\mathfrak{g}_* \mathcal{J}] \quad (11.4)$$

where \mathfrak{g}_* acts on U^A as it does on Φ^A . So we have

$$V_A[\mathfrak{g}_* U[\mathcal{J}]] = V_A[U[\mathfrak{g}_* \mathcal{J}]] = \mathfrak{g}_* \mathcal{J} \quad (11.5)$$

and setting $\mathcal{J} \rightarrow V_A[\Phi]$ we get

$$V_A[\mathfrak{g}_* \Phi] = \mathfrak{g}_* V_A[\Phi] \quad (11.6)$$

where \mathfrak{g}_* acts on V_A as it does on J_A . Then, using the expression (10.6) and the previously obtained identities above, it follows that $\Gamma[\Phi]$ is gauge invariant

$$\Gamma[\mathfrak{g}_* \Phi] = \Gamma[\Phi]. \quad (11.7)$$

XII. TREE-LEVEL AND ONE-LOOP ANALYSIS OF $SU(N)$ YANG-MILLS

In this section we will compute the on-shell tree-level propagators and one-loop effective action. For simplicity we will consider $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theories. Then

$$\bar{D}^{\hat{\alpha}} = \bar{\mathbf{D}}^{IJ} = (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{IJ} \quad (12.1)$$

Then let's introduce

$$Y_i^{IJ}(x, y) = it_i^{IJ} \delta(x - y) \quad (12.2)$$

$$Y_{IJ}^i(x, y) = -2it_i^{IJ} \delta(x - y) \quad (12.3)$$

Then in condensed notation we have that

$$Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\beta}} = \delta_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\beta}}, \quad Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\alpha} Y_{\alpha}^{\hat{\beta}} = \Xi_{\perp}^{\hat{\beta}}{}_{\hat{\alpha}} \quad (12.4)$$

where

$$\Xi_{\perp}^{IJ}{}_{KL}(x, y) = 2t_i^{IJ} t_{LK}^i \delta(x - y) \quad (12.5)$$

is a projector on to trace-free matrices.

We also introduce

$$\sigma^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} = \sigma^{IJ, KL}(x, y) = -\frac{g}{2\mu^4} \delta^{IL} \delta^{JK} \delta(x - y) \quad (12.6)$$

which maps a field matrix to its transpose times a negative factor i.e.

$$\sigma^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} M_{\hat{\beta}} = -\frac{g}{2\mu^4} (M^T)^{\hat{\alpha}} \quad (12.7)$$

we denote its inverse by $\sigma_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}$ (which proportional to $\sigma^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}$). The factor $-g/(2\mu^4)$ makes ensures that

$$\sigma_{\hat{\beta}\hat{\alpha}} Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} = Y_{\alpha\hat{\beta}} = \eta_{\alpha\beta} Y_{\hat{\beta}}^{\beta}. \quad (12.8)$$

It is then convenient to use $\sigma_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}$ to raise and lower greek hatted indices then $\Xi_{\perp}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} = \Xi_{\perp}^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\hat{\gamma}} \sigma^{\hat{\gamma}\hat{\beta}}$ and $\Xi_{\perp}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} = \sigma_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\gamma}} \Xi_{\perp}^{\hat{\gamma}}{}_{\hat{\beta}}$ are both symmetric. Let's define

$$T_{\hat{\alpha}}^a := Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\alpha} T_{\alpha}^a \quad (12.9)$$

and

$$D_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} = \frac{\delta D^{\hat{\alpha}}}{\delta \phi^{\hat{\alpha}}}, \quad \bar{D}_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} = \frac{\delta \bar{D}^{\hat{\alpha}}}{\delta \phi^{\hat{\alpha}}} \quad (12.10)$$

Then when $\mathbf{D}[\phi] = \mathbf{1}$ we have that

$$\bar{D}_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} = -D_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} \quad (12.11)$$

and that

$$D_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} T_{\hat{\alpha}}^a = -Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}}, \quad (12.12)$$

or equivalently

$$D_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} T_{\hat{\beta}}^a = -\Xi_{\perp}^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\hat{\beta}}. \quad (12.13)$$

A. Tree-level Propagators

We consider the propagator putting the ghosts and Nakanishi-Lautrup fields to zero and assume we satisfy the equations of motion

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi^a} = 0 \quad (12.14)$$

and the gauge condition

$$\mathbf{D}[\phi] = \mathbf{1}. \quad (12.15)$$

Then the ϕ - \mathbf{B} - $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$ components of the Hessian of S are

$$S_{\text{phy}}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} S_{ab} & \frac{1}{2} D_a^{\hat{\beta}} & -\frac{1}{2} D_a^{\hat{\beta}} \\ \frac{1}{2} D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 & -\epsilon \sigma^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} \\ -\frac{1}{2} D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} & -\epsilon \sigma^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (12.16)$$

where

$$S_{ab} \equiv \frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta \phi^a \delta \phi^b}, \quad (12.17)$$

and we must take the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We can write the propagator as

$$P_{\text{phy}} = \begin{pmatrix} P^{bc} & P_{\hat{\gamma}}^b & \bar{P}_{\hat{\gamma}}^b \\ P_{\hat{\beta}}^c & P^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} & R^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} \\ \bar{P}_{\hat{\beta}}^c & R^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} & \bar{P}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12.18)$$

Hence

$$\begin{pmatrix} S_{ab} & \frac{1}{2} D_a^{\hat{\beta}} & -\frac{1}{2} D_a^{\hat{\beta}} \\ \frac{1}{2} D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 & -\epsilon \sigma^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} \\ -\frac{1}{2} D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} & -\epsilon \sigma^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P^{bc} & P_{\hat{\gamma}}^b & \bar{P}_{\hat{\gamma}}^b \\ P_{\hat{\beta}}^c & P_{\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}} & R_{\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}} \\ \bar{P}_{\hat{\beta}}^c & R_{\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}} & \bar{P}_{\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_c^a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{\hat{\gamma}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{\hat{\gamma}}^{\hat{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12.19)$$

We note that from the gauge invariance of S , when the equations of motion are satisfied, we have

$$S_{ab} T_{\alpha}^b = 0 \quad (12.20)$$

Then, one then finds after a little work that

$$P_{\hat{\alpha}}^a = -\bar{P}_{\hat{\alpha}}^a = -T_{\hat{\alpha}}^a \quad (12.21)$$

$$P_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} = \bar{P}_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} = -\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \Xi_{\perp}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} \quad (12.22)$$

$$R_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \sigma_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} + \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \Xi_{\perp}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} \quad (12.23)$$

Additionally P^{ab} obeys

$$S_{ac}P^{cb} = \Pi_{\perp a}^b \equiv \delta_b^a + T_{\hat{\alpha}}^a D_b^{\hat{\alpha}}, \quad (12.24)$$

and

$$D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} P^{bc} = \epsilon P^{c\hat{\alpha}} = -\epsilon T^{c\hat{\alpha}}. \quad (12.25)$$

Writing

$$\square_{ab} = S_{ab} + D_{\hat{\alpha}}^a D_{\hat{\alpha}b}, \quad (12.26)$$

and p^{ab} as the propagator (i.e. inverse) of \square_{ab} . We then have that

$$\square_{ab} T_{\hat{\alpha}}^b = -D_{a\hat{\alpha}}, \quad (12.27)$$

and

$$p^{ab} D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} = -T^{a\hat{\alpha}}, \quad (12.28)$$

Let's define $P_{\perp}^{ab} = P^{ab}|_{\epsilon=0}$ then

$$P_{\perp}^{ab} = p^{ab} - T_{\hat{\alpha}}^a \sigma^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} T_{\hat{\beta}}^b = p^{ab} - T_{\hat{\alpha}}^a T_b^{\hat{\alpha}}. \quad (12.29)$$

For the ghosts and anti-ghosts we have C -**A**- $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ com-

ponents of the Hessian

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{gh}}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2}Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & -\frac{1}{2}Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} \\ \frac{1}{2}Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 & -\epsilon\sigma^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} \\ -\frac{1}{2}Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & -\epsilon\sigma^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12.30)$$

which has the propagator

$$P_{\text{gh}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & -Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} \\ Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & P_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} & R_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} \\ -Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & R_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} & P_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12.31)$$

B. One-loop

$$e^{-\Gamma} = e^{-S} \frac{\sqrt{\det \gamma_{ab}}}{\sqrt{\det \eta_{\alpha\beta}}} \frac{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{S}_{\text{gh}}^{(2)}}}{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{S}_{\text{phy}}^{(2)}}} \quad (12.32)$$

Taking into account the measure (i.e. γ and η) merely changes the positions of some indices. We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \det \begin{pmatrix} S^a{}_b & \frac{1}{2}D^{\hat{\beta}a} & -\frac{1}{2}D^{\hat{\beta}a} \\ \frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & 0 & -\epsilon\delta_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\beta}} \\ -\frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & -\epsilon\delta_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} &= \det \begin{pmatrix} p^a{}_b & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{\alpha}} \end{pmatrix} \det \begin{pmatrix} S^a{}_b & \frac{1}{2}D^{\hat{\beta}a} & -\frac{1}{2}D^{\hat{\beta}a} \\ \frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & 0 & -\epsilon\delta_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{\alpha}} \\ -\frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & -\epsilon\delta_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \det \square^a{}_b \\ &= \det \begin{pmatrix} \Pi_{\perp}^a{}_b & -\frac{1}{2}T^{\hat{\beta}a} & \frac{1}{2}T^{\hat{\beta}a} \\ \frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & 0 & -\epsilon\delta_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{\alpha}} \\ -\frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & -\epsilon\delta_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \det \square^a{}_b \end{aligned} \quad (12.33)$$

One can then show that in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \Pi_{\perp}^a{}_b & -\frac{1}{2}T^{\hat{\beta}a} & \frac{1}{2}T^{\hat{\beta}a} \\ \frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & 0 & -\epsilon\delta_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{\alpha}} \\ -\frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & -\epsilon\delta_{\hat{\beta}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sim \det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2}Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} & -\frac{1}{2}Y_{\hat{\alpha}}^{\hat{\alpha}} \\ \frac{1}{2}Y_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\alpha}} & 0 & -\epsilon\delta^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} \\ -\frac{1}{2}Y_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\alpha}} & -\epsilon\delta^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (12.34)$$

such that the FP determinant is cancelling this determinant leaving just $\det \square^a{}_b$.

To see this we can check that with $\epsilon = 0$ that the product of non-zero eigenvalues are equal. Explicitly we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Pi_{\perp b}^a & -\frac{1}{2}T^{\hat{\beta}a} & \frac{1}{2}T^{\hat{\beta}a} \\ \frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}T_{\alpha}^b v^{\alpha} \\ -Y_{\hat{\beta}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \\ Y_{\hat{\beta}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}T_{\alpha}^a v^{\alpha} \\ -Y_{\hat{\alpha}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \\ Y_{\hat{\alpha}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \quad (12.35)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Pi_{\perp b}^a & -\frac{1}{2}T^{\hat{\beta}a} & \frac{1}{2}T^{\hat{\beta}a} \\ \frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{2}T_{\alpha}^b v^{\alpha} \\ -Y_{\hat{\beta}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \\ Y_{\hat{\beta}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{2}T_{\alpha}^a v^{\alpha} \\ -Y_{\hat{\alpha}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \\ Y_{\hat{\alpha}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \quad (12.36)$$

and with $D_{\alpha}^{\alpha} v_{\perp}^{\alpha} = 0$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Pi_{\perp b}^a & -\frac{1}{2}T^{\hat{\beta}a} & \frac{1}{2}T^{\hat{\beta}a} \\ \frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}D_{\hat{\alpha}b} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} v_{\perp}^b \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} v_{\perp}^a \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (12.37)$$

so these eigenvalues are all equal to one and do not contribute to the product. For the ghosts determinant we have the eigenvectors

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2}Y_{\alpha}^{\hat{\alpha}} & -\frac{1}{2}Y_{\alpha}^{\hat{\alpha}} \\ \frac{1}{2}Y_{\alpha\hat{\alpha}} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}Y_{\alpha\hat{\alpha}} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}v^{\beta} \\ Y_{\hat{\beta}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \\ -Y_{\hat{\beta}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}v^{\alpha} \\ Y_{\hat{\alpha}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \\ -Y_{\hat{\alpha}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \quad (12.38)$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2}Y_{\alpha}^{\hat{\alpha}} & -\frac{1}{2}Y_{\alpha}^{\hat{\alpha}} \\ \frac{1}{2}Y_{\alpha\hat{\alpha}} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2}Y_{\alpha\hat{\alpha}} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{2}v^{\beta} \\ Y_{\hat{\beta}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \\ -Y_{\hat{\beta}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{2}v^{\alpha} \\ Y_{\hat{\alpha}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \\ -Y_{\hat{\alpha}\alpha} v^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \quad (12.39)$$

The other eigenvalues that vanish for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ are just equal to $-\epsilon$ with eigenvectors $\{0, v^{\hat{\alpha}}, v^{\hat{\alpha}}\}^T$ in both cases.

So we arrive at

$$e^{-\Gamma} = e^{-S} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \square^a_b}} = e^{-S} \sqrt{\det p^a_b} \quad (12.40)$$

Using the identity for p^a_b we find that

$$e^{-\Gamma} = e^{-S} \sqrt{\frac{\det T_b^{\alpha} T_{\beta}^b}{\det_{\perp} S^a_b}} \quad (12.41)$$

where \det_{\perp} specifies that we take the non-zero eigen-

values and we have used that the longitudinal eigenvalues of p^a_b are same as those of $T_b^{\alpha} T_{\beta}^b$. This expression is independent of the gauge and agrees with the standard result. Indeed an equivalent form is

$$e^{-\Gamma} = e^{-S} \frac{\det T_b^{\beta} T_{\gamma}^b}{\sqrt{\det S^a_b + T_{\alpha}^a T_b^{\alpha}}} \quad (12.42)$$

which is the form in a minimal background field gauge i.e. $\chi^{\alpha} = T_{\alpha}^{\alpha}[\phi_0]\phi^{\alpha}$ where ϕ_0 is the background field. We stress however that we have reached this result without any background field and that in our gauge the ghosts only contributed

a constant factor.

XIII. TREE-LEVEL AND ONE-LOOP ANALYSIS OF GRAVITY

Now we repeat the analysis for gravity. Again we put the ghosts and Nakanishi-Lautrup fields to zero and assume we satisfy the equations of motion

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta \phi^a} = 0, \quad (13.1)$$

and the gauge condition

$$D^\mu(x) = x^\mu. \quad (13.2)$$

A. Tree-level propagator

If P^{ab} , $P^{a\hat{\alpha}}$ and $P^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}$ are the components of the propagator in the ϕ - B sector then we must have that at tree-level

$$\begin{pmatrix} S_{ab} & D_a^{\hat{\beta}} \\ D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P^{bc} & P_{\hat{\gamma}}^b \\ P_{\hat{\beta}}^c & P_{\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} S_{ab}P^{bc} + D_a^{\hat{\beta}}P_{\hat{\beta}}^c & S_{ab}P_{\hat{\gamma}}^b + D_a^{\hat{\beta}}P_{\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}} \\ D_b^{\hat{\alpha}}P^{bc} & D_b^{\hat{\alpha}}P_{\hat{\gamma}}^b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_c^a & 0 \\ 0 & \delta^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\gamma}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (13.3)$$

So we have four equations that must be satisfied by the propagator, corresponding to the four components of the matrix equation (13.3). We solve the bottom right corner with

$$P_{\hat{\alpha}}^a = -T_{\hat{\alpha}}^a \quad (13.4)$$

which follows from (9.4) with $Q^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\beta} = \delta_{\beta}^{\hat{\alpha}}$. Then by gauge invariance $S_{ab}T_{\hat{\alpha}}^b = 0$ and so $S_{ab}P_{\hat{\gamma}}^b = 0$. Therefore we can set $P_{\hat{\beta}\hat{\gamma}} = 0$ to solve the top right corner. Furthermore,

$$P_{\hat{\beta}}^a D_b^{\hat{\beta}} = \Pi_{\parallel}^a{}_b \equiv -T_{\hat{\alpha}}^a D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} \quad (13.5)$$

is the longitudinal projector and we have from the top left corner

$$S_{ab}P^{bc} = \Pi_{\perp}^a{}_c \equiv \delta_b^a - \Pi_{\parallel}^a{}_b \quad (13.6)$$

where $\Pi_{\perp}^a{}_c$ is the transverse projector. Since S_{ab} is not invertible itself, it is useful to define at this point

$$\square_{ab} \equiv S_{ab} + D_a^{\hat{\alpha}} \eta_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} D_b^{\hat{\beta}} \quad (13.7)$$

which is invertible with the propagator

$$\square_{ab} p^{bc} = \delta_a^c \quad (13.8)$$

Then one can check, using $D_a^{\hat{\alpha}} P^{ab} = 0$ and (13.6), that the propagator p^{ab} is given by

$$p^{ab} = P^{ab} + T_{\hat{\alpha}}^a \eta^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} T_{\hat{\beta}}^b \quad (13.9)$$

and thus

$$P^{ab} = p^{ab} - T_{\hat{\alpha}}^a \eta^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} T_{\hat{\beta}}^b \quad (13.10)$$

Equally P^{ab} satisfies

$$\square_{ac} P^{cb} = \Pi_{\perp}^b{}_a \quad (13.11)$$

So we can write it as

$$P^{ab} = \Pi_{\perp}^a{}_c p^{cb}, \quad (13.12)$$

or in an explicitly symmetric form as

$$P^{ab} = \Pi_{\perp}^a{}_c p^{cd} \Pi_{\perp}^b{}_d. \quad (13.13)$$

We also have the nice identities

$$p^{ab} D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} = -T_{\hat{\beta}}^a \eta^{\hat{\beta}\hat{\alpha}} \quad (13.14)$$

and

$$\square_{ab} T_{\hat{\alpha}}^b = -D_a^{\hat{\beta}} \eta_{\hat{\beta}\hat{\alpha}} \quad (13.15)$$

B. One-loop

For our choice of gauge the on-shell effective action is given by

$$e^{-\Gamma} = e^{-S} \frac{\sqrt{\det \gamma_{ab}}}{\sqrt{\det \begin{pmatrix} S_{ab} & D_a^{\hat{\beta}} \\ D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}} \sqrt{\det \eta_{\alpha\beta}}} \quad (13.16)$$

where we note that the ghosts do not contribute since the FP determinant is one. Using γ_{ab} and $\eta_{\alpha\beta}$ to raise and lower indices it follows that

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} S_{ab} & D_a^{\hat{\beta}} \\ D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \det \gamma^{ab} \det \eta_{\alpha\beta} = \det \begin{pmatrix} S^a{}_b & D_{\hat{\beta}}^a \\ D_b^{\hat{\alpha}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \det \begin{pmatrix} S^a{}_b & D^a_{\hat{\beta}} \\ D^{\hat{\alpha}}_b & 0 \end{pmatrix} &= \det \begin{pmatrix} S^a{}_b & D^a_{\hat{\beta}} \\ D^{\hat{\alpha}}_b & 0 \end{pmatrix} \det \begin{pmatrix} p^a{}_b & 0 \\ 0 & \delta^{\hat{\alpha}}_{\hat{\beta}} \end{pmatrix} \det \square^a{}_b \\ &= \det \begin{pmatrix} \Pi^a{}_b & D^a_{\hat{\beta}} \\ -T^{\hat{\alpha}}_b & 0 \end{pmatrix} \det \square^a{}_b \end{aligned} \quad (13.17)$$

Then we note that

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \Pi^a{}_b & D^a_{\hat{\beta}} \\ -T^{\hat{\alpha}}_b & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 1 \quad (13.18)$$

since the square of the matrix is the identity

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Pi^a{}_b & D^a_{\hat{\beta}} \\ -T^{\hat{\alpha}}_b & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \delta^a{}_b & 0 \\ 0 & \delta^{\hat{\alpha}}_{\hat{\beta}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (13.19)$$

So we find that

$$e^{-\Gamma} = e^{-S} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \square^a{}_b}} = e^{-S} \sqrt{\det p^a{}_b} \quad (13.20)$$

Using the expression for $p^a{}_b$ we deduce that

$$e^{-\Gamma} = e^{-S} \sqrt{\frac{\det T^{\beta}_b T^b_{\gamma}}{\det_{\perp} S^a{}_b}} \quad (13.21)$$

where \det_{\perp} indicates that we take the product of the transverse, i.e. non-zero, eigenvalues and we used that the longitudinal eigenvalues of $p^a{}_b$ are equal to those of $T^{\beta}_b T^b_{\gamma}$.

XIV. GAUGE INDEPENDENCE

If we summarises the BRST transformations by

$$\delta_{\theta} \Phi^A = s^A \theta \quad (14.1)$$

then we can define

$$\begin{aligned} s &= s^A \frac{\delta}{\delta \Phi^A} \\ &= T^a[\phi]_{\alpha} C^{\alpha} \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi^a} + \frac{1}{2} f^{\alpha}_{\beta\gamma} C^{\beta} C^{\gamma} \frac{\delta}{\delta C^{\alpha}} \\ &\quad - B_{\hat{\alpha}} \frac{\delta}{\delta A_{\hat{\alpha}}} - \bar{B}_{\hat{\alpha}} \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{A}_{\hat{\alpha}}} \end{aligned} \quad (14.2)$$

where for gravity the last term is omitted. One can then show that s is nilpotent: $s^2 = 0$. A term that can be written as $s\Upsilon$ is said to be BRST exact. Furthermore with

$$\tilde{\rho} \equiv \tilde{\mu} e^{-S} \quad (14.3)$$

BRST invariance of the theory is summarised by

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta \Phi^A} (s^A \tilde{\rho}) = 0 \quad (14.4)$$

Then if $\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \mathcal{S} = s\Upsilon$ for a parameter ζ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \mathcal{Z} &= \int d\Phi \tilde{\rho} s^A \frac{\delta}{\delta \Phi^A} \Upsilon \\ &= - \int d\Phi \frac{\delta}{\delta \Phi^A} (\tilde{\rho} s^A) \Upsilon \\ &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (14.5)$$

Thus a BRST exact term does not effect the functional integral [65, 66]. This generalises our previous notation of gauge independence to actions with quite general BRST exact terms.

XV. MASTER EQUATION

If we take \mathcal{S} to include sources Φ^*_A , usually called anti-fields [67], to the BRST transformations s^A such that

$$\mathcal{S}[\Phi] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}[\Phi] - s^A[\Phi] \Phi^*_A \quad (15.1)$$

\mathcal{S} is still BRST invariant. Note the $B_{\hat{\alpha}}$ -components of Φ^*_A do not contribute and so we can put them to zero. Then, since with these sources

$$\overleftarrow{\tilde{\rho}} \frac{\delta}{\delta \Phi^*_A} = s^A \tilde{\rho}, \quad (15.2)$$

we have that the BRST invariance of the theory is summarised by the classical master equation³

$$\overrightarrow{\frac{\delta}{\delta \Phi^A}} \overleftarrow{\tilde{\rho}} \frac{\delta}{\delta \Phi^*_A} = 0. \quad (15.3)$$

For $W[J]$ the master equation implies (by integrating by parts) that

$$J_A \frac{\delta W}{\delta \Phi^*_A} = 0 \quad (15.4)$$

and for the effective action we have the master equation [65, 66]

$$\Gamma \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^A} \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^*_A} \Gamma = 0. \quad (15.5)$$

Although, the form of the BRST symmetric action we have given is not typically stable under renormalisation the master equations are. To use them

³ By writing the master equation this way we take into account the measure properly and we assume there is no anomaly.

we have to use an effective action $\Gamma[\Phi, \Phi^*]$ with the anti-fields $\Phi^* = \{A_\star^{\hat{\alpha}}, \bar{A}_\star^{\hat{\alpha}}, \phi_a^*, C_\alpha^*\}$. This effective action is also gauge invariant with non-trivial transformation laws of the anti-fields such that

$$\Gamma[\mathfrak{g}_\star \Phi, \mathfrak{g}_\star \Phi^*] = \Gamma[\Phi, \Phi^*] \quad (15.6)$$

This follows from the invariance of $\Phi_A^* s^A[\Phi]$.

For Yang-Mills we have

$$s^A \Phi_A^* = \int_x \left(\nabla_\mu C^i a_{\star i}^\mu + \frac{1}{2} f_{ij}^k C^i C^j C_k^* \right) + \int_x \text{tr} (\mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}_\star^T + \bar{\mathbf{B}} \bar{\mathbf{A}}_\star^T) \quad (15.7)$$

We can rewrite

$$\nabla_\mu C^i a_{\star i}^\mu = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} (\partial_\mu \mathbf{C} - i[\mathbf{a}_\mu, \mathbf{C}]) \mathbf{a}_\star^\mu \quad (15.8)$$

so the transformation law is given by

$$\mathfrak{g}_\star \mathbf{a}_\star^\mu = \mathbf{G}[\mathfrak{g}] \mathbf{a}_\star \mathbf{G}^{-1}[\mathfrak{g}] \quad (15.9)$$

Also we have

$$\frac{1}{2} f_{ij}^k C^i C^j C_k^* = -i 2 \text{tr} \mathbf{C}^2 \mathbf{C}_k^* \quad (15.10)$$

from which we infer that

$$\mathfrak{g}_\star \mathbf{C}_\star = \mathbf{G}[\mathfrak{g}] \mathbf{C}_\star \mathbf{G}^{-1}[\mathfrak{g}]. \quad (15.11)$$

Then finally we have that

$$\mathfrak{g}_\star \mathbf{A}_\star = \mathbf{A}_\star \bar{\mathbf{G}}^{-1}[\mathfrak{g}]. \quad (15.12)$$

For gravity, a similar analysis determines the transformations: $g_\star^{\mu\nu}$ transforms as a contravariant tensor density of weight one, C_μ^* transforms as a covariant vector density of weight one and $A_\star^{\hat{\mu}}$ transform as four scalars.

XVI. BRST EXACT TERMS

Before coming to our conclusions we would like to explore some ideas related to the independence of observables on the gauge when working with the effective action and a symmetric regularisation scheme. Here we will be brief leaving a more thorough treatment to future work. We will have in mind a gauge invariant regularisation of the theory with a cutoff scale Λ that can be achieved through a combination of covariant higher derivatives and Pauli-Villars regularisation schemes [68–73].

One can introduce a nilpotent operator quantum BRST [66]

$$r = \Gamma \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^A} \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi_A^*} - \Gamma \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi_A^*} \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^A} \quad (16.1)$$

and write the master equation as

$$r\Gamma = 0. \quad (16.2)$$

A term in Γ which can be written $r\Upsilon$ is BRST exact. Since we learnt that, for the classical BRST operator s , exact terms kept the functional integral invariant we might suppose that observables are also independent of exact terms in the effective action.

Observables are independent of some parameter ζ whenever, for some Ψ^A , we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \Gamma = \Psi^A \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \Phi^A} \quad (16.3)$$

since then a change in ζ can be compensated by a field redefinition [74–78]. One then says that ζ is an inessential coupling which is conjugate the redundant operator which is the rhs of (16.3).

Let us show that every BRST exact term is a redundant operator i.e. that

$$r\Upsilon = \Psi^A \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \Phi^A} \quad (16.4)$$

for some Ψ^A . To see this first we write $r\Upsilon$ explicitly

$$r\Upsilon = \Gamma \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^A} \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi_A^*} \Upsilon - \Gamma \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi_A^*} \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^A} \Upsilon \quad (16.5)$$

noticing that the first term is already of the desired form. Thus we need to show that

$$-\Gamma \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi_A^*} \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^A} \Upsilon = \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \Phi^A} \Theta^A \quad (16.6)$$

Then by taking a Φ -derivative of the master equation (15.5) we obtain the identity

$$\frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^A} \Gamma \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^B} \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi_B^*} \Gamma + \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^A} \Gamma \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi_B^*} \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^B} \Gamma = 0. \quad (16.7)$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi_C^*} \Gamma + P^{CB} \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^A} \Gamma \frac{\overleftarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi_B^*} \frac{\overrightarrow{\delta}}{\delta \Phi^B} \Gamma = 0. \quad (16.8)$$

which we can use in (16.6) to see it is indeed of the form on the rhs. A consequence of (16.4) is that if

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta} \Gamma = r\Upsilon \quad (16.9)$$

observables are independent of ζ . The power of this result is the following. After introducing a UV cut-off at the scale Λ we can demand that physics is independent of Λ . It is then sufficient to demand that

$$\Lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \Lambda} \Gamma = r\Upsilon \quad (16.10)$$

which means we can choose BRST exact terms in the RG equations.

XVII. DISCUSSION

We have considered in this paper a new fundamental form of the gauge fixed functional integral in gauge theories and quantum gravity. This form follows naturally from simply picking a single representative from each equivalence class of field histories. In turn this leads to a natural corresponding BRST symmetric action. Remarkably, these actions also enjoys full gauge and diffeomorphism invariance for the respective theories. This clarifies an important point: BRST symmetry does not replace gauge invariance but can live along side it, since here we have both types of invariances enjoyed by one and the same action \mathcal{S} . While BRST is a non-linear symmetry, gauge invariance is linear in the fields ϕ^a and thus preserving it as a symmetry of the effective action can be a powerful technical advantage. To realise both symmetries requires the ghosts, anti-ghosts and Nakanishi-Lautrup fields.

If one would like to compute correlation functions of dressed fields our effective action allows this computation in a more direct manner than the standard one by choosing the corresponding dressing field. Alternatively one can keep this choice unspecified and compute an observable of choice without ever fixing the explicit choice of gauge.

Under renormalisation the master equations will be satisfied if a symmetric regularisation is used. The action that obeys the master equation is gauge invariant. This implies we can carry our renormalisation without breaking gauge invariance in its extended form. One may hope that the enhanced symmetry gives new insights into gauge theories and quantum gravity. In this direction we have argued that BRST exact terms can be neglected in the RG flow, defined using the quantum BRST operator which appears in the master equation.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank Renata Ferrero, Boris Stupovski and Antonio Pereira for many discussions and for their comments on the paper.

Appendix A: Yang-Mills theory

Here we collect results that concern Yang-Mills theory. Let's define the n-fold commutator by

$$[\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}]_n = [[\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}]_{n-1}, \mathbf{N}], \quad (\text{A1})$$

with $[\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}]_0 = \mathbf{M}$. Then

$$e^{\mathbf{N}} \mathbf{M} e^{-\mathbf{N}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n \frac{1}{n!} [\mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}]_n. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Then we note that by induction we can prove that

$$[\mathbf{t}_i, \mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j]_n = (-1)^n (F^n(\mathbf{g}))^{ik} \mathbf{t}_k \quad (\text{A3})$$

where F is the matrix with components $(F(\mathbf{g}))^{ik} = f^{ijk} \mathbf{g}^j$ and F^n is the nth power of this matrix. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} \mathbf{t}_i e^{-\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (F^n(\mathbf{g}))^{ik} \mathbf{t}_k \\ &= (e^F(\mathbf{g}))^{ik} \mathbf{t}_k \\ &= \mathbf{t}_k (e^{-F(\mathbf{g})})^{ki} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

this is a useful identity which is (2.12) in the main text. We will also use it in the following form

$$e^{-\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} \mathbf{t}_i = \mathbf{t}_k e^{-\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} (e^{F(\mathbf{g})})^{ki} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Then we note that since $\mathbf{1}^i = 0$ we have

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{h}^i} (\mathbf{g}_* \mathbf{h}_* \hat{\mathbf{g}})^j \mathbf{t}_j \Big|_{\mathbf{h}=1} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{h}^i} e^{\mathbf{ig}^* \mathbf{h}_* \hat{\mathbf{g}}^j \mathbf{t}_j} \Big|_{\mathbf{h}=1} \quad (\text{A6})$$

which on the other hand is equal to

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{h}^i} (\mathbf{g}_* \mathbf{h}_* \hat{\mathbf{g}})^j \mathbf{t}_j \Big|_{\mathbf{h}=1} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{h}^i} e^{\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} e^{i \mathbf{h}^j \mathbf{t}_j} e^{-\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} \Big|_{\mathbf{h}=1} \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$= e^{\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} i \mathbf{t}_i e^{-\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} \quad (\text{A8})$$

Thus we obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{h}^i} (\mathbf{g}_* \mathbf{h}_* \hat{\mathbf{g}})^k \Big|_{\mathbf{h}=1} = (e^F)^{ik} = (e^{-F})^{ki} \quad (\text{A9})$$

which demonstrates (4.13).

1. Transform of a_μ^i

Here we show how the gauge field transforms. From (2.15) and using (2.12) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}_* a_\mu^i \mathbf{t}_i &= e^{\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} a_\mu^i \mathbf{t}_i e^{-\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} + e^{\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} \partial_\mu \mathbf{g}^i \mathbf{t}_i e^{-\mathbf{ig}^j \mathbf{t}_j} \\ &= a_\mu^i (e^F)^{ik} \mathbf{t}_k + \partial_\mu \mathbf{g}^i (e^F)^{ik} \mathbf{t}_k \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

So we read off that

$$\mathbf{g}_* a_\mu^k = a_\mu^i (e^F)^{ik} + \partial_\mu \mathbf{g}^i (e^F)^{ik} \quad (\text{A11})$$

this can be written as

$$\mathbf{g}_* a_\mu^k = (e^{-F})^{ki} a_\mu^i + (e^{-F})^{ki} \partial_\mu \mathbf{g}^i \quad (\text{A12})$$

Then if we expand to linear order we find that

$$T_\alpha^a[\phi] = T_{\mu j}^i \epsilon^j = \partial_\mu \epsilon^i + f^{ijk} A_\mu^j \epsilon^k \quad (\text{A13})$$

where $T_\alpha^a[\phi]$ is defined in (3.26).

Appendix B: Transformation of the measure

It is a straightforward exercise to prove that

$$\det \delta_b^a - \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{E}}^\alpha}{\delta \phi^b} U_{\alpha \beta} T_\beta^a[\phi] = \det \delta_\beta^\alpha - T_\beta^a[\phi] \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{E}}^\gamma}{\delta \phi^a} U_{\gamma \alpha}[\mathfrak{E}]. \quad (\text{B1})$$

To do so one proves that for every eigenvector of the operators, that do not have an eigenvalue equal to one, there is a corresponding eigenvector with the same eigenvalue for the other operator. Then let's note that

$$T_\beta^a[\phi] \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{E}}^\gamma}{\delta \phi^a} = \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\beta} \hat{\mathfrak{E}}^\gamma[\mathfrak{g}_* \phi] \Big|_{\mathfrak{g}=1} \quad (\text{B2})$$

and

$$U_{\gamma \alpha}[\mathfrak{E}] = \frac{\delta \mathfrak{h}_* \mathfrak{E}^\alpha}{\delta \mathfrak{h}^\gamma} \Big|_{\mathfrak{h}=\hat{\mathfrak{E}}} \quad (\text{B3})$$

and hence

$$T_\beta^a[\phi] \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{E}}^\gamma}{\delta \phi^a} U_{\gamma \alpha}[\mathfrak{E}] = \frac{\delta}{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\beta} \hat{\mathfrak{E}}^\gamma[\mathfrak{g}_* \phi] \Big|_{\mathfrak{g}=1} \frac{\delta \mathfrak{h}_* \mathfrak{E}^\alpha}{\delta \mathfrak{h}^\gamma} \Big|_{\mathfrak{h}=\hat{\mathfrak{E}}} \quad (\text{B4})$$

by use of the chain rule this is equal to

$$T_\beta^a[\phi] \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{E}}^\gamma}{\delta \phi^a} U_{\gamma \alpha}[\mathfrak{E}] = \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\mathfrak{g}_* \phi]_* \mathfrak{E}^\alpha[\phi]}{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\beta} \Big|_{\mathfrak{g}=1} \quad (\text{B5})$$

then using the transformation law for an exchanger we have

$$T_\beta^a[\phi] \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{E}}}{\delta \phi^a} U_{\gamma \alpha}[\mathfrak{E}] = \frac{\delta \mathfrak{g}_* \hat{\mathfrak{E}}^\gamma[\phi]_* \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_* \mathfrak{E}^\alpha[\phi]}{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\beta} \Big|_{\mathfrak{g}=1}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Expanding we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta \mathfrak{g}_* \hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\phi]_* \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_* \mathfrak{E}^\alpha[\phi]}{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\beta} \Big|_{\mathfrak{g}=1} &= \delta_\beta^\alpha + \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\phi]_* \hat{\mathfrak{g}}_* \mathfrak{E}^\alpha[\phi]}{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\beta} \Big|_{\mathfrak{g}=1} \\ &= \delta_\beta^\alpha - \frac{\delta \hat{\mathfrak{E}}[\phi]_* \mathfrak{g}_* \mathfrak{E}^\alpha[\phi]}{\delta \mathfrak{g}^\beta} \Big|_{\mathfrak{g}=1}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus we obtain (4.7).

-
- [1] L. D. Faddeev and V. N. Popov, Phys. Lett. B **25** (1967), 29-30 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(67)90067-6
- [2] C. Becchi, A. Rouet and R. Stora, Annals Phys. **98** (1976), 287-321 doi:10.1016/0003-4916(76)90156-1
- [3] I. V. Tyutin, "Gauge Invariance in Field Theory and Statistical Physics in Operator Formalism," [arXiv:0812.0580 [hep-th]].
- [4] V. N. Gribov, "Quantization of Nonabelian Gauge Theories," Nucl. Phys. B **139** (1978), 1
- [5] I. M. Singer, "Some Remarks on the Gribov Ambiguity," Commun. Math. Phys. **60** (1978), 7-12
- [6] P. M. Stevenson, "Optimized Perturbation Theory," Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981), 2916
- [7] K. Falls and R. Ferrero, "Asymptotic Safety within on-shell perturbation theory," [arXiv:2411.00938 [hep-th]].
- [8] T. R. Morris, "A Manifestly gauge invariant exact renormalization group," [arXiv:hep-th/9810104 [hep-th]].
- [9] S. Arnone, A. Gatti and T. R. Morris, "A Proposal for a manifestly gauge invariant and universal calculus in Yang-Mills theory," Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003), 085003 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.67.085003 [arXiv:hep-th/0209162 [hep-th]].
- [10] O. J. Rosten, "General Computations Without Fixing the Gauge," Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006), 125006 [arXiv:hep-th/0604183 [hep-th]].
- [11] K. Falls, "Background independent exact renormalisation," Eur. Phys. J. C **81** (2021) no.2, 121 [arXiv:2004.11409 [hep-th]].
- [12] A. Komar, "Construction of a Complete Set of Independent Observables in the General Theory of Relativity," Phys. Rev. **111** (1958) no.4, 1182.
- [13] P. G. Bergmann and A. B. Komar, "Poisson brackets between locally defined observables in general relativity," Phys. Rev. Lett. **4** (1960), 432-433.
- [14] P. G. Bergmann, "Observables in General Relativity," Rev. Mod. Phys. **33** (1961), 510-514.
- [15] K. V. Kuchar and C. G. Torre, "Gaussian reference fluid and interpretation of quantum geometrodynamics," Phys. Rev. D **43** (1991), 419-441.
- [16] J. D. Brown and K. V. Kuchar, "Dust as a standard of space and time in canonical quantum gravity," Phys. Rev. D **51** (1995), 5600-5629 [arXiv:gr-qc/9409001 [gr-qc]].
- [17] C. Rovelli, "Partial observables," Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002), 124013 [arXiv:gr-qc/0110035 [gr-qc]].
- [18] C. Rovelli, "What Is Observable in Classical and Quantum Gravity?," Class. Quant. Grav. **8** (1991), 297-316.
- [19] C. Rovelli, "Quantum Reference Systems," Class. Quant. Grav. **8** (1991), 317-332.
- [20] C. G. Torre, "The Problems of time and observables: Some recent mathematical results," [arXiv:gr-qc/9404029 [gr-qc]].
- [21] C. G. Torre, "Gravitational observables and local

- symmetries,” *Phys. Rev. D* **48** (1993), R2373-R2376 [arXiv:gr-qc/9306030 [gr-qc]].
- [22] B. Dittrich, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **39** (2007), 1891-1927 [arXiv:gr-qc/0411013 [gr-qc]].
- [23] B. Dittrich, “Partial and complete observables for canonical general relativity,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006), 6155-6184 [arXiv:gr-qc/0507106 [gr-qc]].
- [24] H. Westman and S. Sonogo, “Coordinates, observables and symmetry in relativity,” *Annals Phys.* **324** (2009), 1585-1611 [arXiv:0711.2651 [gr-qc]].
- [25] S. B. Giddings, D. Marolf and J. B. Hartle, “Observables in effective gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006), 064018 [arXiv:hep-th/0512200 [hep-th]].
- [26] P. A. Hoehn, A. R. H. Smith and M. P. E. Lock, “Equivalence of Approaches to Relational Quantum Dynamics in Relativistic Settings,” *Front. in Phys.* **9** (2021), 181 [arXiv:2007.00580 [gr-qc]].
- [27] C. Goeller, P. A. Hoehn and J. Kirklín, “Diffeomorphism-invariant observables and dynamical frames in gravity: reconciling bulk locality with general covariance,” [arXiv:2206.01193 [hep-th]].
- [28] J. Frohlich, G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, “Higgs phenomenon without symmetry breaking order parameter,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **190** (1981), 553-582
- [29] D. Zwanziger, “Quantization of Gauge Fields, Classical Gauge Invariance and Gluon Confinement,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **345** (1990), 461-471
- [30] M. Lavelle and D. McMullan, “Constituent quarks from QCD,” *Phys. Rept.* **279** (1997), 1-65 [arXiv:hep-ph/9509344 [hep-ph]].
- [31] E. Bagan, M. Lavelle and D. McMullan, “Charges from dressed matter: Physics and renormalization,” *Annals Phys.* **282** (2000), 503-540 [arXiv:hep-ph/9909262 [hep-ph]].
- [32] M. A. L. Capri, D. Dudal, J. A. Gracey, V. E. R. Lemes, R. F. Sobreiro, S. P. Sorella and H. Verschelde, “A Study of the gauge invariant, nonlocal mass operator $\text{Tr} \int d^4x F_{\mu\nu} (D^{*2})^{*-1} F_{\mu\nu}$ in Yang-Mills theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005), 105016 [arXiv:hep-th/0510240 [hep-th]].
- [33] M. A. L. Capri, D. Dudal, D. Fiorentini, M. S. Guimaraes, I. F. Justo, A. D. Pereira, B. W. Mintz, L. F. Palhares, R. F. Sobreiro and S. P. Sorella, “Exact nilpotent nonperturbative BRST symmetry for the Gribov-Zwanziger action in the linear covariant gauge,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) no.4, 045039 [arXiv:1506.06995 [hep-th]].
- [34] M. A. L. Capri, D. Fiorentini, M. S. Guimaraes, B. W. Mintz, L. F. Palhares and S. P. Sorella, “Local and renormalizable framework for the gauge-invariant operator A_{\min}^2 in Euclidean Yang-Mills theories in linear covariant gauges,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) no.6, 065009 [arXiv:1606.06601 [hep-th]].
- [35] D. Dudal, D. M. van Egmond, M. S. Guimaraes, O. Holanda, L. F. Palhares, G. Peruzzo and S. P. Sorella, “Gauge-invariant spectral description of the $U(1)$ Higgs model from local composite operators,” *JHEP* **02** (2020), 188 [arXiv:1912.11390 [hep-th]].
- [36] D. Dudal, D. M. van Egmond, M. S. Guimaraes, L. F. Palhares, G. Peruzzo and S. P. Sorella, “Spectral properties of local gauge invariant composite operators in the $SU(2)$ Yang–Mills–Higgs model,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** (2021) no.3, 222 [arXiv:2008.07813 [hep-th]].
- [37] D. Dudal, G. Peruzzo and S. P. Sorella, “The Abelian Higgs model under a gauge invariant looking glass: exploiting new Ward identities for gauge invariant operators and the Equivalence Theorem,” *JHEP* **10** (2021), 039 [arXiv:2105.11011 [hep-th]].
- [38] D. Dudal, D. M. van Egmond, I. F. Justo, G. Peruzzo and S. P. Sorella, “Gauge invariant operators in the $SU(2)$ Higgs model: Ward identities and renormalization,” *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) no.6, 065018 [arXiv:2111.11958 [hep-th]].
- [39] D. Dudal, D. M. van Egmond, G. Peruzzo and S. P. Sorella, “BRST invariant scalar and vector operators in the $SU(2) \times U(1)$ Higgs model,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) no.11, 1091 [arXiv:2309.16776 [hep-th]].
- [40] A. Maas and L. Pedro, “Gauge invariance and the physical spectrum in the two-Higgs-doublet model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) no.5, 056005 [arXiv:1601.02006 [hep-ph]].
- [41] A. Maas, R. Sondenheimer and P. Törek, “On the observable spectrum of theories with a Brout–Englert–Higgs effect,” *Annals Phys.* **402** (2019), 18-44 [arXiv:1709.07477 [hep-ph]].
- [42] A. Maas and R. Sondenheimer, “Gauge-invariant description of the Higgs resonance and its phenomenological implications,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020), 113001 [arXiv:2009.06671 [hep-ph]].
- [43] R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen and K. Rejzner, “Quantum gravity from the point of view of locally covariant quantum field theory,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **345** (2016) no.3, 741-779 [arXiv:1306.1058 [math-ph]].
- [44] R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen, T. P. Hack, N. Pinamonti and K. Rejzner, “Cosmological perturbation theory and quantum gravity,” *JHEP* **08** (2016), 032 [arXiv:1605.02573 [gr-qc]].
- [45] M. B. Fröb, “Gauge-invariant quantum gravitational corrections to correlation functions,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35** (2018) no.5, 055006 [arXiv:1710.00839 [gr-qc]].
- [46] M. B. Fröb and W. C. C. Lima, “Propagators for gauge-invariant observables in cosmology,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **35** (2018) no.9, 095010 [arXiv:1711.08470 [gr-qc]].
- [47] M. B. Fröb and W. C. C. Lima, “Cosmological perturbations and invariant observables in geodesic lightcone coordinates,” *JCAP* **01** (2022) no.01, 034 [arXiv:2108.11960 [gr-qc]].
- [48] M. B. Fröb, C. Rein and R. Verch, “Graviton corrections to the Newtonian potential using invariant observables,” *JHEP* **01** (2022), 180 [arXiv:2109.09753 [hep-th]].
- [49] M. B. Fröb and W. C. C. Lima, “Synchronous coordinates and gauge-invariant observables in cosmological spacetimes,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **40** (2023) no.21, 215006 [arXiv:2303.16218 [gr-qc]].

- [50] A. Baldazzi, K. Falls and R. Ferrero, “Relational observables in asymptotically safe gravity,” *Annals Phys.* **440** (2022), 168822 [arXiv:2112.02118 [hep-th]].
- [51] G. A. Vilkovisky, “The Unique Effective Action in Quantum Field Theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **234** (1984), 125-137
- [52] B. S. DeWitt, “The global approach to quantum field theory. Vol. 1, 2,” *Int. Ser. Monogr. Phys.* **114** (2003), 1-1042
- [53] G. Kunstatter, “The Path integral for gauge theories: A Geometrical approach,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **9** (1992), S157-S168
- [54] C. P. Burgess and G. Kunstatter, “On the Physical Interpretation of the Vilkovisky-de Witt Effective Action,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **2** (1987), 875 [erratum: *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **2** (1987), 1003]
- [55] J. M. Pawłowski, “Geometrical effective action and Wilsonian flows,” [arXiv:hep-th/0310018 [hep-th]].
- [56] V. Branchina, K. A. Meissner and G. Veneziano, “The Price of an exact, gauge invariant RG flow equation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **574** (2003), 319-324 [arXiv:hep-th/0309234 [hep-th]].
- [57] I. Donkin and J. M. Pawłowski, “The phase diagram of quantum gravity from diffeomorphism-invariant RG-flows,” [arXiv:1203.4207 [hep-th]].
- [58] C. Wetterich, “Gauge invariant flow equation,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **931** (2018), 262-282 [arXiv:1607.02989 [hep-th]].
- [59] L. F. Abbott, “Introduction to the Background Field Method,” *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **13** (1982), 33 CERN-TH-3113.
- [60] C. Rovelli, “Why Gauge?,” *Found. Phys.* **44** (2014) no.1, 91-104 [arXiv:1308.5599 [hep-th]].
- [61] R. Ferrero and R. Percacci, “Dynamical diffeomorphisms,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021) no.11, 115011 [arXiv:2012.04507 [gr-qc]].
- [62] A. Bonanno, K. Falls and R. Ferrero, “Path integral measures and diffeomorphism invariance,” [arXiv:2503.02941 [hep-th]].
- [63] K. Fujikawa, “Path Integral Measure for Gravitational Interactions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **226** (1983), 437-443.
- [64] K. Fujikawa and H. Suzuki, “Path integrals and quantum anomalies,” Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [65] J. Zinn-Justin, “Renormalization of Gauge Theories,” *Lect. Notes Phys.* **37** (1975), 1-39
- [66] J. Zinn-Justin, “Quantum field theory and critical phenomena,” *Int. Ser. Monogr. Phys.* **77** (1989), 1-914 Oxford University Press, 2021, ISBN 978-0-19-850923-3, 978-0-19-883462-5
- [67] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, “Gauge Algebra and Quantization,” *Phys. Lett. B* **102** (1981), 27-31
- [68] A. A. Slavnov, “Invariant regularization of gauge theories,” *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **13** (1972), 174-177
- [69] B. W. Lee and J. Zinn-Justin, “Spontaneously Broken Gauge Symmetries Part 1: Preliminaries,” *Phys. Rev. D* **5** (1972), 3121-3137
- [70] A. A. Slavnov, “The Pauli-Villars Regularization for Nonabelian Gauge Theories,” *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **33** (1977), 210-217
- [71] L. D. Faddeev and A. A. Slavnov, “Gauge fields. introduction to quantum theory,” *Front. Phys.* **50** (1980), 1-232
- [72] M. Asorey and F. Falceto, “Geometric Regularization of Gauge Theories,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **327** (1989), 427
- [73] T. D. Bakeyev and A. A. Slavnov, “Higher covariant derivative regularization revisited,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **11** (1996), 1539-1554 [arXiv:hep-th/9601092 [hep-th]].
- [74] F. J. Wegner, “Some invariance properties of the renormalization group,” *J. Phys. C* **7** (1974) no.12, 2098.
- [75] S. Weinberg, “Ultraviolet divergences in quantum theories of gravitation,” in *General Relativity: An Einstein Centenary Survey*, 1980.
- [76] I. V. Tyutin, “Once again on the equivalence theorem,” *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **65** (2002), 194-202 [arXiv:hep-th/0001050 [hep-th]].
- [77] J. M. Pawłowski, “Aspects of the functional renormalisation group,” *Annals Phys.* **322** (2007), 2831-2915 [arXiv:hep-th/0512261 [hep-th]].
- [78] A. Baldazzi, R. B. A. Zinati and K. Falls, “Essential renormalisation group,” *SciPost Phys.* **13** (2022) no.4, 085 [arXiv:2105.11482 [hep-th]].