

Implicit Regularisation Technique: Calculation of the Two-loop φ_4^4 -theory β -function.

A. Brizola [†], O. Battistel^{†‡}, Marcos Sampaio[†] and M. C. Nemes[†]

[†] Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais
Physics Department - ICEX
P.O.Box 702, 30161-970, Belo Horizonte - MG
Brazil

[‡] Universidade Federal de Santa Maria
Physics Department
P.O.Box 5093, 97119-900, Santa Maria -RS
Brazil

msampaio@fisica.ufmg.br, brizola@fisica.ufmg.br, carolina@fisica.ufmg.br

Abstract

We propose an implicit regularisation scheme. The main advantage is that since no explicit use of a regulator is made, one can in principle avoid undesirable symmetry violations related to its choice. The divergent amplitudes are split into basic divergent integrals which depend only on the loop momenta and finite integrals. The former can be absorbed by a renormalisation procedure whereas the latter can be evaluated without restrictions. We illustrate with the calculation of the *QED* and φ_4^4 -theory β -function to one and two-loop order, respectively.

PACS: 11.10.Gh, 12.38 Bx.

In dealing with ultraviolet divergences in perturbative calculations of Quantum Field Theories (QFT), one is led to adopt a regularisation scheme (RS) to handle the divergent integrals. A vast arsenal of such schemes is presently available, viz. Dimensional Regularisation (DR), Pauli-Villars (PV), Zeta-function Regularisation, Lattice Regularisation, etc. . The choice of a particular scheme is generally based on its adequacy to a particular computational task or compatibility with the underlying theory in the sense of preserving its vital symmetries. For example, DR is usually employed in particle physics since it preserves unitarity and gauge invariance. However, care must be exercised in DR when parity-violating objects (γ^5 -matrices, $\epsilon_{\mu_1\dots\mu_n}$ tensors) occur in the theory [3]. The properties of such objects depend very much on the space-time dimension and this clashes with the idea of analytic continuation on the dimension of the space-time D .

The issue of finding an ambiguity free RS so that the theory in consideration is not plagued by RS-dependent amplitudes is most important, particularly in chiral and non-renormalisable models. In the latter, the RS is frequently defined as a part of the model. Consequently, any parameters introduced by a specific choice must be adjusted phenomenologically [6], [8].

Recently a step in this direction has been taken. A technique was proposed for the manipulation and calculation of divergent amplitudes in a way that a regularisation need only to be assumed **implicitly** [1],[2]. The main idea is to manipulate the integrands of the divergent amplitudes by means of algebraic identities until the physical content, i.e. the external momentum dependent part, is isolated and displayed solely in terms of finite integrals ¹. On the other hand, the divergent content is automatically reduced to a set of basic divergent objects which can be organised according to their degree of divergence. Throughout this process, it is assumed that the ultraviolet divergent integrals in the momentum (say, k) are regulated by the multiplication of the integrand by a regularising function $G(k^2, \Lambda_i)$,

$$\int_k f(k) \rightarrow \int_k f(k)G(k^2, \Lambda_i^2) \equiv \int_k^\Lambda f(k), \quad (1)$$

$\int_k \equiv \int d^4k/((2\pi)^4)$ and Λ_i are the parameters of a distribution G whose behaviour for large k renders the integral finite.

One important feature of DR in what concerns ambiguities is related to the various possible choices for the momentum routing in amplitudes involving loops. In this case there are correspondingly as many amplitudes which, in principle, can be brought to the same form by adequate shifts in the integration variable. Whilst such shifts are permitted in DR, for a 4-D regularisation, if one effects a shift in the integration variable, there should be a compensation by surface terms as it is well known. This is precisely the origin of certain ambiguities and symmetry violations in many models of physical interest [8]. Hence the question of how one should proceed in situations beyond the scope of DR immediately arises. In this sense, it was shown in [1] that the same consistency as exhibited by DR regarding the momentum routing in the divergent integrals could be achieved in 4-D regularisations provided that a set of Consistency Relations (CR) which

¹The philosophy is somewhat close in spirit to the BPHZ procedure [10] where a Taylor expansion is made around a fixed value of the physical momentum. In our approach any identity which allows the amplitude to be written in the desired form may be used (also Taylor expansion). In the case of amplitudes with different masses the two philosophies become rather different as it was illustrated in [2].

involve integrals of the same degree of divergence were established, namely

$$\int_k^\Lambda \frac{24k_\mu k_\nu k_\alpha k_\beta}{(k^2 - m^2)^4} = (g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\mu\nu} + g_{\alpha\mu}g_{\nu\beta} + g_{\alpha\nu}g_{\mu\beta})I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2) \quad (2)$$

$$\int_k^\Lambda \frac{2k_\mu k_\nu}{(k^2 - m^2)^2} = g_{\mu\nu}I_{quad}^\Lambda(m^2) \quad (3)$$

$$\int_k^\Lambda \frac{4k_\mu k_\nu}{(k^2 - m^2)^3} = g_{\mu\nu}I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2), \quad (4)$$

where

$$I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2) \equiv \int_k^\Lambda \frac{1}{(k^2 - m^2)^2}, \quad (5)$$

$$I_{quad}^\Lambda(m^2) \equiv \int_k^\Lambda \frac{1}{(k^2 - m^2)}. \quad (6)$$

The CR above are readily satisfied within the context of DR. It was also shown in [1] that such CR can be obtained by demanding the Green's functions of the theory to be translational invariant. In [2] the CR were proved to be the main ingredient in order to obtain unambiguous and symmetry preserving amplitudes in the (gauged) Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model and thus solving a long standing problem which has threatened its reliability. It is important to stress that the procedure adopted makes use solely of general properties of the regulator G in (1) avoiding an explicit form.

In this letter we consider the CR as the minimal consistency conditions for 4-D regularisations as a starting point. Then we show that although an explicit construction of regularising functions that fulfill the CR can be made [1], one need not to do so. Instead, an "implicit regulator" is assumed and serves the purpose of mathematically justifying the algebraic steps in the integrands of the divergent integrals. In the context of renormalisable theories such as QED and φ^4 -theory (to one and two loop order, respectively), we show that a renormalisation procedure in which the basic divergent integrals are absorbed in the counterterms can be effected. This is an important check for applications in the so called (super)renormalisable models [7]. We illustrate with the calculation of the renormalisation group β -function.

The advantages of our formulation reside in the fact that it provides a consistent RS which preserves important features of DR yet being applicable where DR fails. Besides, the physical content of the amplitudes will be displayed in terms of finite integrals only. This is of great value from the phenomenological standpoint since regularisation prescriptions usually modify the external momentum dependence and introduce non-physical behaviour such as unitarity violation and unphysical thresholds. From the aesthetical standpoint, it constitutes in a direct and economical RS that makes use solely of general properties of the basic divergencies for which a regularisation needs only implicitly to be assumed.

We start with the calculation of the QED β -function to one loop order. The renormalisation constants for the photon field, electron field, charge and mass are defined as usual [5], viz. $A_0^\mu = Z_3^{1/2}A^\mu$, $\Psi_0 = Z_2^{1/2}\Psi$, $e_0 = Z_1/(Z_2Z_3^{1/2})e$, $m_{e0} = (Z_0/Z_2)m_e$, with

$Z_1/Z_2 = 1$, as required by gauge invariance. The Callan-Symanzik β -function can be written as [5]:

$$\beta_{QED} = e \frac{\partial[\ln Z_3^{1/2}(e_0, \Lambda/m)]}{\partial \ln \Lambda}. \quad (7)$$

The renormalisation constant Z_3 is calculated from the one loop correction to the photon propagator namely the vacuum polarisation tensor $\Pi_{\mu\nu}(q)$ whose amplitude reads

$$\begin{aligned} i\Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) &= -e^2 \int_k^\Lambda \frac{Tr[\gamma_\nu(\gamma^\rho k_\rho - \gamma^\rho q_\rho + m_e)\gamma_\mu(\gamma^\rho k_\rho + m_e)]}{[(k-q)^2 - m_e^2](k^2 - m_e^2)} + \\ &+ (Z_3 - 1)(q_\mu q_\nu - q^2 g_{\mu\nu}), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the last term on the RHS of (8) is the counterterm needed to absorb the divergence coming from the first to one loop order. Using the algebra of the Dirac matrices and trace identities we find

$$\begin{aligned} i\Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) &= -4e^2 \{2I_{\mu\nu}^\Lambda(m_e^2, q^2) - 2I_\mu^\Lambda(m_e^2, q^2)q_\nu - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}[I_{quad}^\Lambda(m_e^2) + \bar{I}^\Lambda(m_e^2, q^2)] \\ &+ q^2 I^\Lambda(m_e^2, q^2)\} + (Z_3 - 1)(q_\mu q_\nu - q^2 g_{\mu\nu}), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$I_{\mu\nu}^\Lambda(m_e^2, q^2) = \int_k^\Lambda \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{[(k-q)^2 - m_e^2](k^2 - m_e^2)}, \quad (10)$$

$$I_\mu^\Lambda(m_e^2, q^2) = \int_k^\Lambda \frac{k_\mu}{[(k-q)^2 - m_e^2](k^2 - m_e^2)}, \quad (11)$$

$$I^\Lambda(m_e^2, q^2) = \int_k^\Lambda \frac{1}{[(k-q)^2 - m_e^2](k^2 - m_e^2)}, \quad (12)$$

$$\bar{I}^\Lambda(m_e^2, q^2) = \int_k^\Lambda \frac{1}{[(k-q)^2 - m_e^2]}. \quad (13)$$

Now we proceed to reorganise (9) until it is reduced to (basic) divergent integrals that depend only on the loop momenta. As a matter of illustration let us take (13). By using repeatedly one (possible) convenient algebraic identity at the level of the integrand,

$$\frac{1}{[(k-q)^2 - m_e^2]} = \frac{1}{(k^2 - m_e^2)} - \frac{q^2 - 2(k \cdot q)}{(k^2 - m_e^2)[(k-q)^2 - m_e^2]}, \quad (14)$$

until the divergent integrals carry no dependence on the external momentum q , enables us to cast (13) as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_k^\Lambda \frac{1}{[(k-q)^2 - m_e^2]} &= I_{quad}^\Lambda(m_e^2) - q^2 I_{log}^\Lambda(m_e^2) + q_\mu q_\nu \int_k^\Lambda \frac{4k^\mu k^\nu}{(k^2 - m_e^2)^3} + \\ &+ \int_k^\Lambda \frac{q^4}{(k^2 - m_e^2)^3} - \int_k^\Lambda \frac{(q^2 - 2q \cdot k)^2}{(k^2 - m_e^2)^2 [(k-q)^2 - m_e^2]}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The last two integrals above are finite and a calculation shows that they cancel each other, whereas the CR (4) can be used to reduce (15) to $I_{quad}^\Lambda(m_e^2)$, as we expected. A similar

procedure can be employed in the other divergent integrals (10)-(12) using the CR (2)-(4) and yields, after a few algebra:

$$i\Pi_{\mu\nu} = (q_\mu q_\nu - q^2 g_{\mu\nu}) \left\{ -\frac{4}{3(4\pi)^2} e^2 \left[\frac{q^2}{q^2 + 2m_e^2} \tilde{Z}(m_e^2, q^2) + \frac{1}{3} \right] - \frac{4}{3} i e^2 I_{log}^\Lambda(m_e^2) + (Z_3 - 1) \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where we defined

$$\tilde{Z}(m^2, q^2) = \int_0^1 dz \ln \left(\frac{q^2 z(1-z) - m^2}{-m^2} \right), \quad (17)$$

z being a Feynman parameter. Finally we may choose the renormalisation constant such that

$$(Z_3 - 1) = \frac{4}{3} i e^2 I_{log}^\Lambda(m_e^2), \quad (18)$$

which, in this case, amounts to a subtraction at $q = 0$. Before proceeding to the calculation of the β -function, let us analyse the φ_4^4 -theory to two-loop order.

The φ_4^4 -theory bare Lagrangian may be written in terms of the renormalised parameters as

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathcal{L}_R + \mathcal{L}_R^{CT} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \varphi)^2 - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \varphi^2 - \frac{g}{4!} \varphi^4 + \frac{A}{2} (\partial_\mu \varphi)^2 - \frac{B}{2} m^2 \varphi^2 - \frac{gC}{4!} \varphi^4, \quad (19)$$

where the set of variables φ , m , g are related to the bare variables via the renormalisation constants as $\varphi_0 = Z_\phi^{1/2} \varphi$, $m_0^2 = Z_m m^2$, $g_0 = Z_g g$ and $Z_\phi = 1 + A$, $Z_m Z_\phi = 1 + B$, $Z_g Z_\phi^2 = 1 + C$. Then A , B and C are thought to have a series expansion in g , $A = \sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n g^n$, etc., and define the counterterms which cancel the infinities that emerge from the diagrammatic expansion of the theory. Let us start with the one loop divergencies represented by the ‘‘tadpole’’ and the ‘‘fish’’ diagrams (figs.1(a) and 1(d)).




Figure 1: φ_4^4 -theory. Diagrams contributing to the 2 and 4-point functions to 2-loop order

The Feynman rules applied to these diagrams, including the corresponding symmetry factors, together with (5) and (6), yield

$$-i\mathcal{A}_a = \frac{(-ig)}{2} \int_k \frac{i}{k^2 - m^2} = \frac{g}{2} I_{quad}^\Lambda(m^2), \quad (20)$$

$$-i\mathcal{A}_d = \frac{(-ig)^2}{2} \int_k \frac{i^2}{(k^2 - m^2)^2 [(p-k)^2 - m^2]} \quad (21)$$

$$= \frac{g^2}{2} \left(3I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2) - b [\tilde{Z}(m^2, s) + s \rightarrow t + s \rightarrow u] \right), \quad (22)$$

where $p^2 = (s, t, u)$ are the usual Mandelstam variables, $b = i/(4\pi)^2$ and $\tilde{Z}(m^2, s)$ is defined as in (17) .

In order to exhibit the divergences exclusively as a function of the internal momentum (as we did in (22)) we make use of the identity (14) in a similar fashion as it was done for *QED*. Hence we may choose as counterterms

$$b_1 = -\frac{i}{2} \frac{I_{quad}^\Lambda(m^2)}{m^2} \quad , \quad c_1 = -\frac{3i}{2} I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2) \quad (23)$$

whilst $a_1 = 0$. Now we proceed to 2-loop order. As it is well known, the 1-loop counterterms must be taken to higher orders to cancel the divergencies of the corresponding subdiagrams. The “double-scoop” diagram (fig.1b) represents the amplitude

$$-i\mathcal{A}_b = \frac{(-ig)^2}{4} \int_{k,l} \frac{i^3}{(k^2 - m^2)^2(l^2 - m^2)} = \frac{ig^2}{4} I_{quad}^\Lambda(m^2) I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2) \quad (24)$$

Now we must take into account the counterterm diagrams represented in fig.2. The




Figure 2: Counterterm diagrams for the “double-scoop”

first two correspond to the mass and vertex counterterms, respectively. The third is the counterterm associated with diagram 2(b) which exactly cancels it. The sum of all the contributions vanish, as they should, since the “double scoop” diagram does not depend on the external momentum and hence it generates a purely divergent contribution.

Since the integration over the internal loop momenta k and l factorise, the 2-loop scattering amplitude depicted in fig.1(f) can be written as

$$-i\mathcal{A}_f = \frac{ig^3}{4} \left(\int_k \frac{1}{(k^2 - m^2)[(k - q)^2 - m^2]} \right)^2 = \frac{ig^3}{4} (I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2) - b\tilde{Z}(m^2, q^2))^2. \quad (25)$$

It is easy to see that the crossed term in (25) is exactly cancelled by the 1-loop counterterm associated with the graph 1(f). Consequently this graph gives rise to a new counterterm c_2 proportional to $(I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2))^2$.

Now, since the 1-loop mass counterterm cancels out graph 1(e), the only other contribution to c_2 comes from graph 1(g):

$$-i\mathcal{A}_g = \frac{(-ig)^3}{4} \int_{k,l} \frac{i^4}{(k^2 - m^2)(l^2 - m^2)[(p - k)^2 - m^2][(k + l - p_4)^2 - m^2]}, \quad (26)$$

$p^2 = (s, t, u)$. Notice, however, that the loop integrations do not factorise (overlapping divergence). Within our strategy, we expect to be able to define other objects than (5) and (6). Thus we manipulate (26) using (14) repeatedly to finally obtain

$$-i\mathcal{A}_g = \frac{ig^3}{4} (3I_{log}^{\circ\Lambda}(m^2) + F_{fin}(p_i, p^2)), \quad (27)$$

$$I_{log}^{\circ\Lambda}(m^2) \equiv \int_{k,l}^\Lambda \frac{1}{(k^2 - m^2)^2[(k + l)^2 - m^2](l^2 - m^2)}, \quad (28)$$

where $F_{fin}(p_i, p^2)$ is a finite function of the external momenta p_i, p^2 and (28) is our new basic (logarithmically) divergent object. So we can write

$$c_2 = \frac{3}{4} \left((I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2))^2 + I_{log}^{\circ\Lambda}(m^2) \right). \quad (29)$$

We are now left with the ‘‘setting sun’’ diagram depicted in fig.1(c) whose contribution to the 2-point function is given by

$$-i\mathcal{A}_c = \frac{(-ig)^2}{6} \int_{k,q} \frac{i^3}{(k^2 - m^2)[(p+q-k)^2 - m^2](q^2 - m^2)}. \quad (30)$$

Again the loop integrations do not factorise. Notwithstanding, a recursive use of relation (14) together with the CR (4) enable us to expand (30) and write, after some algebra,

$$\mathcal{A}_c = -\frac{g^2}{6} I_{quad}^{\circ\Lambda}(m^2) + \frac{g^2 b}{12} p^2 I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2) + g^2 G_{finite}(p^2) \quad (31)$$

$$I_{quad}^{\circ\Lambda} = \int_{k,l}^\Lambda \frac{1}{(k^2 - m^2)(l^2 - m^2)[(l-k)^2 - m^2]}, \quad (32)$$

where (32) is another basic divergent object with overlapping quadratic divergence. Hence we have the two remaining counterterms, namely

$$a_2 = \frac{b}{12} I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2) \quad , \quad b_2 = \frac{1}{6} \frac{I_{quad}^{\circ\Lambda}(m^2)}{m^2}. \quad (33)$$

Having obtained our basic divergent objects to 2-loop order, some of their properties will be useful. They can be related to each other in a simple fashion. By differentiating these objects with respect to (squared) mass one makes them more convergent. It can be seen from (5), (6), (28) and (32) that

$$\frac{\partial I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2)}{\partial m^2} = \frac{-b}{m^2}, \quad \frac{\partial I_{quad}^{\circ\Lambda}(m^2)}{\partial m^2} = I_{log}^\Lambda(m^2), \quad \frac{\partial I_{log}^{\circ\Lambda}(m^2)}{\partial m^2} = \frac{\eta}{m^2}, \quad \frac{\partial I_{quad}^{\circ\Lambda}(m^2)}{\partial m^2} = 3I_{log}^{\circ\Lambda}(m^2), \quad (34)$$

($\eta = -1/(96\pi^4)$).

To test our results we can calculate the β -function to $O(\hbar^2)$. In this case the β -function can be written as

$$\beta_{\varphi^4} = -g \frac{\partial[\ln \bar{Z}(g_0, \Lambda/m)]}{\partial \ln \Lambda}, \quad (35)$$

where $\bar{Z} = Z_g^{-1} Z_\varphi^2$.

It follows from dimensional analysis that the argument of our logarithmically divergent objects is m^2/Λ^2 . Using the counterterms a_1, a_2, c_1 and c_2 which we have calculated and the relations (34), we obtain the two first well-known coefficients of the φ_4^4 -theory β -function:

$$\beta_{\varphi^4} = \frac{3}{16\pi^2} g^2 - \frac{17}{768\pi^4} g^3. \quad (36)$$

Similarly the β -function of QED can be calculated using (7), (18) and (34) to give the well-known result:

$$\beta_{QED} = e^3/(12\pi^2). \quad (37)$$

To conclude: We have tested an implicit regularisation scheme by calculating the renormalisation group β -function. Its main ingredient is a set of Consistency Relations which relate integrals of the same degree of divergence (2), (3), (4). Since we do not resort to a specific regulator, we believe that it can be a useful tool to revisit relevant ambiguity problems regarding RS choice in both renormalisable and non-renormalisable 4-D QFT. Although we have presented a 4-D formulation, this framework can be extended to arbitrary dimensions. In particular, in 3-D it can be useful to deal with RS ambiguities in the Chern-Simons-Matter models [7], [9].

The authors wish to thank Dr. O. Piguet for useful discussions. MS and MCN acknowledge a grant from CNPq/Brazil and AB from FAPEMIG/Brazil.

References

- [1] O. Battistel, A. L. Mota, M. C. Nemes, *Consistency Relations for 4D Regularisations*, Mod.Phys.Lett.**A 13** (1998) 1597.
- [2] O. Battistel, M. C. Nemes, *Consistency in Regularisations of the Gauged NJL Model at One Loop Order*, hep-th/9811154 , to appear in Phys.Rev.D .
- [3] C. P. Martin, *Dimensional Regularisation of Chern-Simons Field Theory*, Phys.Lett.**B 241** (11990) 513; T. Gherghetta, *The NJL model of QCD*, Phys.Rev.**D 50** (1994) 5885.
- [4] R. Jackiw, L.S.Gernstein, Phys.Rev.**181**(1969) 5 .
- [5] J.Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, Oxford Science Publications, 1994.
- [6] S. P. Klevansky, Rev.Mod.Phys.**64** (1992) 649.
- [7] M. Chaichian, W. F. Chen, *Inconsistency of Naive Dimensional Regularisations and Quantum Correction to Non-Abelian Chern-Simons-Matter Theory Revisited*, Phys.Rev.**D58** 5004 (1998) and hep-th/9806127; G. Giavarini, C. P. Martin, F. Ruiz Ruiz, *Shift versus non-Shift in Local Regularisations of Chern-Simons theory*, Phys.Lett.**B 322** (1994) 345 ; Koh-ichi Nittoh, T. Ebihara, *Regularization Ambiguity Problem for Chern-Simons Shift*, Mod.Phys.Lett.**A 13** (1998) 2231.
- [8] T. Gherghetta, *Regularisation in the Gauged Nambu-Jona-Lasinio Model*, Phys.Rev.**D50** (1994) 5885 .
- [9] Work in Progress.
- [10] W. Zimmermann, Commun. Math. Phys.**15** (1969) 208.