

The one-loop bispectrum of galaxies in redshift space from the Effective Field Theory of Large-Scale Structure

Guido D'Amico^{1,2}, Yaniv Donath³, Matthew Lewandowski^{4,5},
Leonardo Senatore⁵, and Pierre Zhang^{5,6,7,8}

¹ *Department of Mathematical, Physical and Computer Sciences,
University of Parma, 43124 Parma, Italy*

² *INFN Gruppo Collegato di Parma, 43124 Parma, Italy*

³ *Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics,
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, UK*

⁴ *Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208*

⁵ *Institut für Theoretische Physik, ETH Zurich, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland*

⁶ *Department of Astronomy, School of Physical Sciences,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

⁷ *CAS Key Laboratory for Research in Galaxies and Cosmology,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

⁸ *School of Astronomy and Space Science,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

Abstract

We derive the Effective Field Theory of Large-Scale Structure kernels and counterterms for the one-loop bispectrum of dark matter and of biased tracers in real and redshift space. This requires the expansion of biased tracers up to fourth order in fluctuations. In the process, we encounter several subtleties related to renormalization. One is the fact that, in renormalizing the momentum, a local counterterm contributes non-locally. A second subtlety is related to the renormalization of local products of the velocity fields, which need to be expressed in terms of the renormalized velocity in order to preserve Galilean symmetry. We check that the counterterms we identify are necessary and sufficient to renormalize the one-loop bispectrum at leading and subleading order in the derivative expansion. The kernels that we originally present here have already been used for the first analyses of the one-loop bispectrum in BOSS data [1, 2].

Contents

1	Introduction and Conclusion	3
2	Dark-matter equations and notation	7
2.1	Perturbative solutions and observables in SPT	9
2.2	Dark-matter counterterm contributions	11
3	Dark-matter renormalization in real space	13
3.1	Counterterm solutions up to second order	13
3.2	Explicit expression for the stress tensor	14
3.3	Appearance of non-locally-contributing counterterms	16
4	Dark-matter renormalization in redshift space	18
4.1	General redshift-space equations	18
4.2	Renormalization of dark matter in redshift space	20
4.3	IR-limit checks	24
4.4	Redshift space counterterms: response terms	25
4.5	Redshift space counterterms: stochastic terms	27
5	Biased tracers in redshift space	29
5.1	General formulas	29
5.2	Bias expansion to fourth order	31
5.3	Renormalization of biased tracers in redshift space	34
5.4	Biased tracers in redshift space counterterms	36
A	Details for dark matter	40
A.1	EdS Green's function	40
A.2	Counterterm expressions in real space	41
A.3	Response terms	41
A.4	Stochastic terms	43
A.5	Stochastic flow terms	44
A.6	UV matching in real space	45
A.7	Counterterm expressions in redshift space	47
B	Bispectrum loop integrals in redshift space	48
C	Details for biased tracers to fourth order	53
C.1	Bias expansion	53
C.2	Expansion in fluid element	54
C.3	Degeneracies and local basis	56
C.4	Explicit expressions for fourth order kernels	58

D	Details for biased tracers in redshift space renormalization	60
D.1	Counterterm expressions for biased tracers in redshift space	60
D.2	Response terms	61
D.3	Stochastic terms	62
D.4	Parameter matching with PyBird	64

1 Introduction and Conclusion

The Effective Field Theory of Cosmological Large-Scale Structure (EFTofLSS) [3, 4] describes the long distance dynamics of matter and galaxies in the universe. It is quite a complex endeavor. The dark matter [3, 4] and baryons [5, 6] are described through their density and momenta, and satisfy some equations of motion that resemble those of fluids. Galaxies are described as composite operators in terms of the dark-matter long-wavelength fields (see e.g. [7–13], and also [14]). The effect on short fluctuations of long wavelength modes that represent displacements needs to be resummed [15–19]. Predictions for observables, such as correlation functions of galaxies in redshift space, typically involve all of these ingredients. It took quite a large and long endeavor to develop all of this formalism (see [1] for a recent, more complete, list of references on the various steps of development of the theory).

Starting from [20–22], the EFTofLSS has been successfully applied to large-scale structure data, specifically to BOSS data [23], where the analysis of the full shape of the power spectrum has led to the measurement of all the Λ CDM parameters using just a prior from Big Bang Nucleosynthesis. Since then, many applications to data have followed (see again [1] for a recent, more complete, list of references on the various applications of the EFTofLSS to data).

Recently, in [1, 2], the analysis of the BOSS data using the one-loop prediction of the bispectrum of galaxies in redshift space was performed. Doing such an analysis required the development of the kernels for biased tracers in redshift space up to fourth order, and the real and redshift space counterterms up to second order in the fluctuations and at subleading order in the derivatives (*i.e.* at order k^2/k_{NL}^2 with k being the typical wavenumber of interest, and k_{NL} the wavenumber associated to the non-linear scale). As referred to in the same papers [1, 2], those kernels are originally derived here.

While naively it might appear that there is only a computational challenge facing us, *i.e.* the need to write all possible operators for biased tracers in redshift space up to fourth order, in reality there are also two conceptual subtleties we will need to face, and that we now explain. The first such subtlety stems from the non-local Green’s function associated to the momentum operator, while the second is associated to the renormalization of composite operators involving the velocity.

The local counterterm that contributes non-locally: Let us start from the first subtlety, focussing initially on the case of dark matter. So far, the counterterms in the EFTofLSS have been explored at high order only for dark matter in real space. This fact has prevented the emergence

of a subtlety that, on hindsight, is rather straightforward. The equations in the Newtonian limit contain the Poisson equation, whose solution is famously not local in space. This is mapped for example in the non-locality of the perturbative kernels. In fact, even though the absence of a tree-level speed of sounds makes the kernels just space dependent (rather than spacetime dependent), the dependence on the spatial wavenumber is not analytic, so that, once written in real space, they are non-local. For example, the solution of the locally-observable tidal tensor of the gravitational field, Φ , due to a density perturbation, δ , is, schematically,

$$\partial_i \partial_j \Phi(\vec{x}, t) \sim H^2 \frac{\partial_i \partial_j}{\partial^2} \delta(\vec{x}, t) \sim H^2 \int d^3 x' \frac{1}{|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|} \frac{\partial}{\partial x'^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x'^j} \delta(\vec{x}', t), \quad (1.1)$$

with H being the Hubble constant. This is non-local unless $i = j$ and we sum over i .

As we discuss in more detail later, counterterms are local, *i.e.* the response of the stress tensor to the long wavelength fields is local. But the way the counterterms contribute to the fields is through a convolution with the Green's functions of the fields themselves, which, as we mentioned, are not local. This subtlety does not show up for linear counterterms, though. At that order, for the dark matter overdensity, only the divergence of the momentum matters, which in turn is affected, at linear level, by Φ only through $\partial^2 \Phi \sim \delta$. So, the linear equation and the resulting Green's function are accidentally local. In this way, once one uses the counterterms at linear order (*i.e.* not multiplied by other fields), one obtains a local contribution.

But this local result is an artifact of the density field and of low order in the perturbative series, which limits the available tensorial structures. Already once one looks at the momentum, π^i , one finds that the traceless part of $\partial_i \pi^j$, which is observable, is affected at linear order by the traceless part of $\partial_i \partial_j \Phi$, which, as argued above, is non-local. So the associated Green's function will be non-local. Therefore, unless accidental cancellations happen, one should expect the local counterterms to contribute non locally. This is the situation we will encounter in this paper, as the momentum is important for redshift space distortions where, additionally, the anisotropy induced by the line of sight provides a richer tensorial structure where accidental cancellations are more rare.

Explicitly, we find that for the momentum, π^i , we need a counterterm that contributes in a way schematically given by

$$\pi^i \supset \frac{1}{H} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \tau_{(2)}^{jk}, \quad (1.2)$$

where τ^{jk} is the stress tensor, and the subscript $_{(n)}$ or superscript $^{(n)}$ indicates n -th order in perturbations. Now, among the second-order response terms for the stress tensor, we have terms such as

$$\tau_{(2)}^{ij} \supset \frac{\bar{\rho}}{k_{\text{NL}}^2 H^2} \partial_i \partial_k \Phi \partial_k \partial_j \Phi, \quad (1.3)$$

with $\bar{\rho}$ being the background density. This is indeed local. This term affects non-locally the gradient of the momentum as

$$\partial_j \pi^i \supset \frac{\bar{\rho}}{k_{\text{NL}}^2 H^2} \frac{\partial_j \partial_i \partial_k \partial_m}{H \partial^2} (\partial_k \partial_l \Phi \partial_l \partial_m \Phi). \quad (1.4)$$

In turn, in redshift space, the dark matter overdensity, δ_r , at second order is affected as

$$\delta_r(\vec{x}) \supset \frac{1}{H\bar{\rho}} \hat{z}^i \hat{z}^j \partial_i \pi^j(\vec{x}) \sim \hat{z}^i \hat{z}^j \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \partial_m}{k_{\text{NL}}^2 \partial^2} \left(\frac{\partial_k \partial_l}{H^2} \Phi(\vec{x}) \frac{\partial_l \partial_m}{H^2} \Phi(\vec{x}) \right). \quad (1.5)$$

The $1/\partial^2$ does not simplify in the final expression: this is a counterterm that contributes non-locally to the observable δ in redshift space. There are several such terms in the perturbative expansion, and similar terms appear also when considering the stochastic counterterms. As discussed in more detail later, these terms are linked to the generation of vorticity in the cosmological fluid. As a validation of the above, we explicitly find that these terms are needed to renormalize the redshift-space matter overdensity bispectrum at one-loop order.¹

When passing to biased tracers, a further subtlety arises. In the EFTofLSS, the biased-tracer density in redshift space, which is constructed as combinations of the biased-tracer density and momentum, is written as a spatially *local* linear combination of composite operators of the matter field [7]. We do not have the equations of motion and the associated Green's function for them. This was the way that we identified the non-locally-contributing counterterm in dark matter: by simply solving the equations of motion in the presence of a local stress tensor. But because of the local relation to dark matter, it is expected that the non-locally-contributing counterterms should be completely determined by the one of dark matter. This is so even for the momentum of biased tracers, which, for dark matter, was the operator being affected by the non-locally-contributing counterterm. Indeed, by the equivalence principle, biased tracers should have the same velocity as the underlying dark matter field at leading order in derivatives. In fact, there is a symmetry argument based on this idea connecting the two: the non-locally-contributing counterterm for biased tracers has the same functional form and coefficient as for dark matter. We confirm and discuss this argument in detail later, and we check again that this result is sufficient for renormalizing the one-loop bispectrum of tracers in redshift space.

Renormalization of local products of the velocity field: Let us now pass to the second main subtlety that we encounter in this paper. In redshift space, there appear several contact operators involving the long-wavelength velocity. Contact operators are operators made of products of long-wavelength fields at the same location. Performing a product of long wavelength fields at the same location is a process sensitive to arbitrary short-distance fluctuations, and so needs to be renormalized [15, 24]. For operators involving the velocity v^i , care must be taken in preserving the non-trivial transformations under the Galilean group (which is nothing but the non-relativistic limit of the group of diffeomorphisms), and this is complicated by the fact that the velocity is itself a contact operator and so needs to be renormalized [25, 26]. In order to have the correct transformation properties under the Galilean transformation $v^i \rightarrow v^i + \chi^i$, we wish to have, for

¹At this point, one might wonder why counterterms are local to start with. The terms that we have identified have the property that the region that can non-locally affect a mode is at most of order of the wavelength of the mode itself. For counterterms, for example in τ^{ij} , we are integrating out short modes, and so this can affect at most regions within $1/k_{\text{NL}}$, which is equivalent to a normal local response.

example,

$$\begin{aligned} [v^i]_R &\rightarrow [v^i]_R + \chi^i, \\ [v^i v^j]_R &\rightarrow [v^i v^j]_R + [v^i]_R \chi^j + [v^j]_R \chi^i + \chi^i \chi^j, \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

where $[v^i]_R$ and $[v^i v^j]_R$ are respectively the renormalized velocity and the renormalized velocity-squared. While satisfying this constraint is quite straightforward for the velocity, we see that the velocity-squared needs to have a transformation involving the renormalized velocity itself. One way to write renormalized quantities satisfying the above in terms of the non-renormalized fields is therefore to write the renormalized velocity-squared in terms of the renormalized velocity and additional counterterms,

$$\begin{aligned} [v^i]_R &= v^i + \mathcal{O}_v^i, \\ [v^i v^j]_R &= [v^i]_R [v^j]_R + \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

where all of the \mathcal{O} terms are Galilean scalars. In our calculation of the one-loop bispectrum, we will have to implement this procedure for products up to four powers of the velocity or four powers of the velocity and one power of the overdensity.

On top of addressing these two conceptual challenges, the rest of the paper is devoted to developing the full calculation of the kernels of the one-loop bispectrum in redshift space both for dark matter and for tracers, including the relevant counterterms, and finally to checking that indeed all the ultraviolet (UV) dependence of the loop diagrams can be cancelled by a suitable choice of the resulting effective field theory (EFT) parameters. Indeed, we find that both including the non-locally-contributing counterterms and implementing the correct redshift space renormalization procedure are crucial for matching the UV limits of the loops. We will perform first the study for dark matter, and then repeat it for biased tracers. As mentioned, the resulting kernels have been instrumental in performing the first one-loop analysis of the bispectrum of galaxies in large-scale structure [1, 2], and the relevant counterterm kernels were already presented in those works.

One final observation that is worthwhile to make is the following. The generic expression of biased tracers is non-local in time [7]. If δ_h is the tracer overdensity, we have

$$\delta_h(\vec{x}, t) = \int^t dt' \sum_i \text{Ker}_i(t, t') \mathcal{O}_i(\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, t, t'), t') \quad (1.8)$$

where $\mathcal{O}_i(\vec{x}, t')$ are all the scalar operators that can be built from the long wavelength fields, $\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, t, t')$ represents the position at time t' of the fluid element that at time t is at location \vec{x} , and $\text{Ker}_i(t, t')$ are generic kernels, assumed to have a time scale of order Hubble. Up to fourth order in the operators, we checked that this expression is accidentally degenerate with an analogous expression where one assumes that $\text{Ker}_i(t, t') \propto \delta_D(t - t')$, *i.e.* as if the biases were local in time.

Finally, accompanying this paper, we also provide a Mathematica file with all of the expressions for the biased tracer kernels in redshift space up to fourth order, UV limits of the loops, EFT counterterms, and values of EFT parameters that match the UV limits of the loops.

2 Dark-matter equations and notation

Here we collect the relevant background equations and notation for the cold dark-matter field. We assume a background Λ CDM expansion, with metric $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a(t)^2 d\vec{x}^2$, where $a(t)$ is the scale factor, which will often be used as the time variable. The dark-matter field is described in terms of the mass density $\rho(\vec{x}, a)$ and the velocity field $v^i(\vec{x}, a)$. The background expansion is driven by a non-relativistic, time-dependent, background mass density $\bar{\rho}(a)$ which is given by

$$\bar{\rho}(a) = \bar{\rho}_0 \left(\frac{a}{a_0} \right)^{-3}, \quad (2.1)$$

where subscripts $_0$ refer to current-day values, and the Hubble rate is $H = \dot{a}/a$ (we use the dot to denote time derivatives, *i.e.* $\dot{g} = \partial g / \partial t$ for generic functions g).

We describe scalar perturbations in the metric with the metric potentials Φ and Ψ ,² by writing

$$ds^2 = -(1 + 2\Phi)dt^2 + a(t)^2(1 - 2\Psi)d\vec{x}^2. \quad (2.2)$$

In terms of the momentum density π^i , defined by

$$\pi^i(\vec{x}, a) \equiv \rho(\vec{x}, a)v^i(\vec{x}, a), \quad (2.3)$$

the equations of motion for dark matter are (see e.g. [3, 4, 27])

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho} + 3H\rho + a^{-1}\partial_i\pi^i &= 0, \\ \dot{\pi}^i + 4H\pi^i + a^{-1}\partial_j \left(\frac{\pi^i\pi^j}{\rho} \right) + a^{-1}\rho\partial_i\Phi &= -a^{-1}\partial_j\tau^{ij}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

along with the Poisson equation

$$a^{-2}\partial^2\Phi = \frac{3}{2}\Omega_m H^2\delta, \quad (2.5)$$

which is in terms of the overdensity δ , given by

$$\delta(\vec{x}, a) \equiv (\rho(\vec{x}, a) - \bar{\rho}(a))/\bar{\rho}(a), \quad (2.6)$$

and the time-dependent matter fraction $\Omega_m(a)$.³ The quantity τ^{ij} appearing in Eq. (2.4) is the EFTofLSS stress tensor [4], which we will describe in much more detail later. Using the Poisson equation Eq. (2.5), we can write

$$\bar{\rho}\delta\partial_i\Phi = 2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^{-2}\partial_j \left(\partial_i\Phi\partial_j\Phi - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{ij}(\partial\Phi)^2 \right), \quad (2.7)$$

²Anisotropic stress is small and can be neglected for our purposes, in which case the Einstein equations imply $\Phi = \Psi$, which we assume throughout this work.

³This is defined by $\Omega_m(a) \equiv \bar{\rho}(a)/(3M_{\text{Pl}}^2 H(a)^2)$, where M_{Pl} is the Planck mass, related to Newton's constant G_N by $M_{\text{Pl}}^2 = 1/(8\pi G_N)$. In Λ CDM, the Hubble rate can be parameterized by $H(a)^2/H_0^2 = \Omega_{m,0}(a/a_0)^{-3} + (1 - \Omega_{m,0})$.

and consequently the equations of motion Eq. (2.4) become

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho} \dot{\delta} + a^{-1} \partial_i \pi^i &= 0 , \\ \dot{\pi}^i + 4H\pi^i + a^{-1} \bar{\rho} \partial_i \Phi &= -a^{-1} \partial_j \left(2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^{-2} \left(\partial_i \Phi \partial_j \Phi - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} (\partial \Phi)^2 \right) + \frac{\pi^i \pi^j}{\rho} + \tau^{ij} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Next, we can decompose the momentum density into a scalar and a vector part

$$\pi_S \equiv \partial_i \pi^i , \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_V^i \equiv \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \pi^k , \quad (2.9)$$

which gives

$$\pi^i = \frac{\partial_i}{\partial^2} \pi_S - \epsilon^{ijk} \frac{\partial_j}{\partial^2} \pi_V^k , \quad (2.10)$$

where ϵ^{ijk} is the three-dimensional totally antisymmetric Levi-Civita symbol (with $\epsilon^{123} = 1$). With this decomposition, we can write the equations of motion in terms of the scalar and vector parts

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho} \dot{\delta} + a^{-1} \pi_S &= 0 , \\ \dot{\pi}_S + 4H\pi_S + \frac{3}{2} a \bar{\rho} \Omega_m H^2 \delta &= -a^{-1} \partial_i \partial_j \left(2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^{-2} \left(\partial_i \Phi \partial_j \Phi - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} (\partial \Phi)^2 \right) + \frac{\pi^i \pi^j}{\rho} + \tau^{ij} \right) , \\ \dot{\pi}_V^i + 4H\pi_V^i &= -a^{-1} \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l \left(2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^{-2} \partial_k \Phi \partial_l \Phi + \frac{\pi^k \pi^l}{\rho} + \tau^{kl} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

We see that the scalar part π_S is determined entirely by δ , and the vector part π_V^i is only sourced non-linearly. For reference, the full differential equation for δ is

$$a^2 \delta'' + \left(2 + \frac{a\mathcal{H}'}{\mathcal{H}} \right) a \delta' - \frac{3}{2} \Omega_m \delta = \frac{\partial_i \partial_j}{\mathcal{H}^2 \bar{\rho}} \left(2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^{-2} \left(\partial_i \Phi \partial_j \Phi - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} (\partial \Phi)^2 \right) + \frac{\pi^i \pi^j}{\rho} + \tau^{ij} \right) , \quad (2.12)$$

where $\mathcal{H} = aH$, and the prime denotes a derivative with respect to the scale factor, *i.e.* $g' = \partial g / \partial a$ for generic functions g . For dark matter in real space, all renormalization and counterterms enter through the stress tensor τ^{ij} , which is a Galilean scalar, a tensor under spatial rotations, and a local-in-space and non-local-in-time function of second derivatives of the metric and gradients of the velocity (because of the equivalence principle), in the equations of motion above. We will return to the stress tensor in much more detail below. We also note that while the equation of motion for π^i is non-local (because of the appearance of $\partial_i \Phi$ on the left-hand side of Eq. (2.8)), the equations of motion for π_S and π_V^i Eq. (2.11) are local.

In this work, we use the following notation

$$\int_{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n} \equiv \int \frac{d^3 k_1}{(2\pi)^3} \cdots \frac{d^3 k_n}{(2\pi)^3} , \quad \int_{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n}^{\vec{k}} \equiv \int_{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n} (2\pi)^3 \delta_D \left(\vec{k} - \sum_{i=1}^n \vec{k}_i \right) , \quad (2.13)$$

where δ_D is the Dirac delta function, and our Fourier conventions are

$$f(\vec{x}, t) = \int_{\vec{k}} f(\vec{k}, t) e^{i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}} . \quad (2.14)$$

For a three-dimensional vector \vec{k} , we write $k \equiv |\vec{k}|$ for the magnitude, and $\hat{k} \equiv \vec{k}/k$ for the unit vector parallel to \vec{k} . We use Latin letters like i, j, k, l to denote spatial indices, in general we do not distinguish between upper and lower spatial indices, and repeated indices imply summation. We also use the prime on correlation functions, $\langle \cdot \rangle'$ to denote the correlation function with the factor of $(2\pi)^3$ and Dirac delta function of translation invariance stripped off.

2.1 Perturbative solutions and observables in SPT

In this work, we use the so-called Einstein-de Sitter (EdS) approximation to solve the above equations which allows us to separate the time dependence from the spatial (momentum) dependence and is known to be accurate to percent level [28, 13, 29] (we give details about the EdS Green's function in App. A.1). Let us start with the standard perturbation theory (SPT) contribution, which is the solution ignoring EFTofLSS counterterms, *i.e.* with $\tau^{ij} = 0$. First, the solution to the linear equation for δ is called the growth factor $D(a)$, which solves

$$a^2 D'' + \left(2 + \frac{a\mathcal{H}'}{\mathcal{H}}\right) aD' - \frac{3}{2}\Omega_m D = 0 . \quad (2.15)$$

For the perturbations, we write

$$\delta(\vec{k}, a) = \sum_n \delta^{(n)}(\vec{k}, a) , \quad \text{and} \quad v^i(\vec{k}, a) = \sum_n v_{(n)}^i(\vec{k}, a) \quad (2.16)$$

where, assuming that the velocity field is irrotational,⁴

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{(n)}(\vec{k}, a) &= D(a)^n \int_{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n}^{\vec{k}} F_n(\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n) \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}_1}^{(1)} \dots \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}_n}^{(1)} , \\ v_{(n)}^i(\vec{k}, a) &= i \frac{k^i}{k^2} \mathcal{H}(a) f(a) D(a)^n \int_{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n}^{\vec{k}} G_n(\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n) \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}_1}^{(1)} \dots \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}_n}^{(1)} , \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

$\tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}$ is the time-independent initial field,⁵ F_n and G_n are the standard symmetric kernels for dark matter (see [30, 31], for example), and the growth rate f is defined by

$$f(a) \equiv \frac{aD'(a)}{D(a)} . \quad (2.18)$$

In general, we use the tilde to denote time-independent fields, in particular

$$\tilde{\delta}^{(n)} \equiv \frac{\delta^{(n)}(a)}{D(a)^n} , \quad (2.19)$$

⁴In the absence of counterterms, it can be shown that an initially irrotational velocity remains so. In our universe, the initial vorticity is negligible. EFT counterterms induce a vorticity, though, matching what is observed in simulations [27], and we discuss this in more detail in Sec. 3.3.

⁵We normalize $D(a_{\text{in}}) = 1$ for some initial time a_{in} in matter domination where initial conditions are given, so that P_{11} is the linear power spectrum at a_{in} .

and we will often drop spatial or momentum arguments when the understanding is clear. The above expressions for δ and v^i solve the equations of motion under the approximation

$$\Omega_m(a) \approx \left(\frac{aD'(a)}{D(a)} \right)^2, \quad (2.20)$$

which is approximately true in our universe [28, 13, 29]. For the one-loop bispectrum, we need to consider up to $n = 4$. The SPT expression for π^i can be derived from δ and v^i using Eq. (2.3).

In this work, we are eventually interested in computing the one-loop power spectrum and the one-loop bispectrum of galaxies in redshift space, but we start in this section with dark matter in real space. In Fourier space, the power spectrum P and bispectrum B are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \delta(\vec{k}, a) \delta(\vec{k}', a) \rangle &= (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k} + \vec{k}') P(k, a), \\ \langle \delta(\vec{k}_1, a) \delta(\vec{k}_2, a) \delta(\vec{k}_3, a) \rangle &= (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \vec{k}_3) B(k_1, k_2, k_3, a). \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

The total one-loop power spectrum is

$$P_{1\text{-loop tot.}}(k, a) = D(a)^2 P_{11}(k) + D(a)^4 (P_{22}(k) + P_{13}(k)), \quad (2.22)$$

where $\langle \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}}^{(1)} \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}'}^{(1)} \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k} + \vec{k}') P_{11}(k)$ defines the linear power spectrum P_{11} at the initial time a_{in} , and the one-loop terms are

$$\begin{aligned} P_{22}(k) &= 2 \int_{\vec{q}} F_2(\vec{q}, \vec{k} - \vec{q})^2 P_{11}(q) P_{11}(|\vec{k} - \vec{q}|), \\ P_{13}(k) &= 6 P_{11}(k) \int_{\vec{q}} F_3(\vec{q}, -\vec{q}, \vec{k}) P_{11}(q). \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

The total one-loop bispectrum is

$$B_{1\text{-loop tot.}} = D(a)^4 B_{211} + D(a)^6 \left(B_{222} + B_{321}^{(I)} + B_{321}^{(II)} + B_{411} \right), \quad (2.24)$$

where the tree-level bispectrum is

$$B_{211}(k_1, k_2, k_3) = 2 F_2(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2) + 2 \text{ perms.}, \quad (2.25)$$

and the one-loop contributions are

$$\begin{aligned} B_{222}(k_1, k_2, k_3) &= 8 \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q) P_{11}(|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) P_{11}(|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|) \\ &\quad \times F_2(-\vec{q}, \vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}) F_2(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}, \vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}) F_2(\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}, \vec{q}), \\ B_{321}^{(I)}(k_1, k_2, k_3) &= 6 P_{11}(k_1) \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q) P_{11}(|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) \\ &\quad \times F_3(-\vec{q}, -\vec{k}_2 + \vec{q}, -\vec{k}_1) F_2(\vec{q}, \vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}) + 5 \text{ perms.}, \\ B_{321}^{(II)}(k_1, k_2, k_3) &= 6 P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2) F_2(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q) F_3(\vec{k}_1, \vec{q}, -\vec{q}) + 5 \text{ perms.}, \\ B_{411}(k_1, k_2, k_3) &= 12 P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2) \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q) F_4(\vec{q}, -\vec{q}, -\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2) + 2 \text{ perms.} \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

2.2 Dark-matter counterterm contributions

As is well known [4], the loop contributions Eq. (2.23) and Eq. (2.26) are UV sensitive because they depend on momenta q much larger than the non-linear scale of structure formation where the theory is out of perturbative control. The role of the EFT counterterms in τ^{ij} is to cure this UV sensitivity and allow the theory to match reality. Concretely, we write (suppressing spatial dependence for convenience)

$$\tau^{ij}(a) = \tau_{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}}^{ij}(a) + \tau_{\text{finite}}^{ij}(a) . \quad (2.27)$$

Here, the piece $\tau_{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}}^{ij}(a)$ must give the same time dependence as in Eq. (2.23) and Eq. (2.26) in order to cancel the dependence of the loop integrals on the UV cutoff Λ_{UV} . The other piece, $\tau_{\text{finite}}^{ij}(a)$, does not have a fixed time dependence in general, and its role is to give the correct amount of Λ_{UV} -independent contribution that matches observations.

For simplicity in this paper, we focus on the contribution $\tau_{\Lambda_{\text{UV}}}^{ij}(a)$ which has a fixed time dependence. All of our main points will be evident in this case, and we will be able to do explicit calculations with explicit numerical factors. Additionally, we want to check that the general form of τ^{ij} that we write is able to capture all of the UV behavior present in the loops Eq. (2.23) and Eq. (2.26), and this requires assuming the same time dependence as the loops. Inclusion of a general $\tau_{\text{finite}}^{ij}(a)$ is straightforward, as it is based on the same k -dependent kernels.

In general, the EFTofLSS is local in space, but non-local in time [27]. To obtain the EFT expansion one expands the stress tensor as a local function of second spatial derivatives of the gravitational potential Φ and gradients of the velocity (because of the equivalence principle), along with stochastic fields, organized, as in any EFT, in an expansion in powers of the fields and spatial derivatives, integrated along the past trajectory of the fluid element [27, 7]. More specifically, we have

$$\tau^{ij}(\vec{x}, a) = \int_a^a \frac{da'}{a'} \sum_{\alpha} \kappa_{\alpha}(a, a') T_{\alpha}^{ij}(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}(\vec{x}, a, a'), a') , \quad (2.28)$$

where the fluid element is defined by

$$\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}(\vec{x}, a, a') = \vec{x} + \int_a^{a'} \frac{da''}{(a'')^2 H(a'')} \vec{v}(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}(\vec{x}, a, a''), a'') , \quad (2.29)$$

the $T_{\alpha}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a)$ are all local-in-time Galilean scalars (and tensors under rotations on the i and j indices), and the $\kappa_{\alpha}(a, a')$ are unknown EFT kernels describing the non-locality in time. The $T_{\alpha}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a)$ are then organized in a local spatial-derivative expansion of the long-wavelength fields ($\partial_i \partial_j \Phi(\vec{x}, a)$, $\partial_i v^j(\vec{x}, a)$, etc.) and of stochastic fields $\epsilon^{ij}(\vec{x}, a)$. Since we do perturbation theory in this work, we can write each scalar as a sum over perturbative orders

$$T_{\alpha}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a) = \sum_n T_{\alpha, (n)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a) , \quad (2.30)$$

and because the linear solutions are scale independent, we have a simple scaling time dependence for the n -th order perturbative pieces

$$T_{\alpha, (n)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a') = \left(\frac{D(a')}{D(a)} \right)^{p_{\alpha, n}} T_{\alpha, (n)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a) , \quad (2.31)$$

for some power $p_{\alpha,n}$. This means that Eq. (2.28) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^{ij}(\vec{x}, a) &= \sum_{\alpha} \sum_n K_{\alpha}^{p_{\alpha,n}}(a) T_{\alpha,(n)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a) \\ &+ \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{n,m} \frac{1}{m} \left(K_{\alpha}^{p_{\alpha,n-m}}(a) - K_{\alpha}^{m+p_{\alpha,n-m}}(a) \right) \frac{\partial_k \theta_{(m)}(\vec{x}, a)}{\partial^2} \partial_k T_{\alpha,(n-m)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

where we have defined

$$K_{\alpha}^p(a) \equiv \int^a \frac{da'}{a'} \kappa_{\alpha}(a, a') \left(\frac{D(a')}{D(a)} \right)^p, \quad (2.33)$$

used the definition of the velocity field in Eq. (2.17) along with $\theta = -\partial_i v^i / (faH)$, and the ... in Eq. (2.32) are terms coming from Taylor expanding $T_{\alpha}^{ij}(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}(\vec{x}, a, a'), a')$ around \vec{x} in Eq. (2.28), *i.e.* higher powers of \vec{v} , all of which should be included up to the desired order. The point is that the integral over da' coming from expanding \vec{x}_{fl} can be formally done as in Eq. (2.33) and leaves distinct functions of a , $K_{\alpha}^p(a)$. The same happens with the higher order terms in the Taylor expansion of $\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}(\vec{x}, a, a')$, since $\vec{v}_{(n)}$ also has a simple scaling time dependence, see Eq. (2.17). This means that, in perturbation theory, the expansion of the stress tensor can be manipulated so that the time integrals disappear, in the way indicated by Eq. (2.32). In this paper, we only need counterterms from the stress tensor up to second order, so Eq. (2.32) is sufficient for our purposes. This is the same approach taken for the bias expansion in Sec. 5.2.⁶

Given this, we write the contribution to δ from τ^{ij} relevant to the one-loop bispectrum, which we call δ_{τ} , generally as

$$\delta_{\tau}(\vec{k}, a) = \delta_{ct}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, a) + \delta_{ct}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, a) + \delta_{\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, a) + \delta_{\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, a), \quad (2.34)$$

where the subscript ct denotes the response counterterms, and ϵ denotes the stochastic (and semi-stochastic) counterterms. Assuming the time dependence needed to cancel UV loop contributions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{ct}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, a) &= D(a)^3 \tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(1)}(\vec{k}), & \delta_{ct}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, a) &= D(a)^4 \tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(2)}(\vec{k}), \\ \delta_{\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, a) &= D(a)^2 \tilde{\delta}_{\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}), & \text{and } \delta_{\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, a) &= D(a)^3 \tilde{\delta}_{\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

where we use the tilde to denote the appropriate time-independent factor. Similarly, we have the solution for π^i which we write as

$$\pi_{\tau}^i(\vec{k}, a) = \pi_{ct,(1)}^i(\vec{k}, a) + \pi_{ct,(2)}^i(\vec{k}, a) + \pi_{\epsilon,(1)}^i(\vec{k}, a) + \pi_{\epsilon,(2)}^i(\vec{k}, a), \quad (2.36)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{ct,(1)}^i(\vec{k}, a) &= -aH\bar{\rho}fD(a)^3 \tilde{\pi}_{ct,(1)}^i(\vec{k}), & \pi_{ct,(2)}^i(\vec{k}, a) &= -aH\bar{\rho}fD(a)^4 \tilde{\pi}_{ct,(2)}^i(\vec{k}), \\ \pi_{\epsilon,(1)}^i(\vec{k}, a) &= -aH\bar{\rho}fD(a)^2 \tilde{\pi}_{\epsilon,(1)}^i(\vec{k}), & \text{and } \pi_{\epsilon,(2)}^i(\vec{k}, a) &= -aH\bar{\rho}fD(a)^3 \tilde{\pi}_{\epsilon,(2)}^i(\vec{k}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.37)$$

⁶Note that for the growing mode solutions that we consider in this work, we have $K_{\alpha}^{p_{\alpha,2}}(a) = K_{\alpha}^{1+p_{\alpha,1}}(a)$, which shows that Eq. (2.32) is of the correct form for Galilean scalars discussed in Sec. 4.3.

To remove clutter, we will sometimes use the notation A_* to mean both A_{ct} and A_ϵ . We note that in SPT, the time dependence of π^i , π_S , and π_V^i are all the same for each field above linear perturbations.⁷ However, as can be seen in Eq. (2.11), if $\partial^i \partial^j \tau^{ij}$ and $\epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l \tau^{kl}$ have different time dependence, then π_S and π_V^i will as well. For simplicity, in this work, we assume that the counterterms have the same time dependence as needed to cancel UV divergences in the SPT loops, in which case π_S and π_V^i have the same time dependence as in Eq. (2.37) for π^i .

3 Dark-matter renormalization in real space

3.1 Counterterm solutions up to second order

We now present the solutions for δ and π^i that are sourced by the stress tensor τ^{ij} in Eq. (2.11) up to second order, leaving the derivation to App. A. We start by writing

$$\tau^{ij} = \frac{\Omega_m \mathcal{H}^2 \bar{\rho}}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(D^3 \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij} + D^4 \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij} + D^2 \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij} + D^3 \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{ij} \right), \quad (3.1)$$

where the quantities with subscript ct source the pure response solutions of δ and π^i , the quantities with subscript ϵ source the stochastic and semi-stochastic solutions of δ and π^i , and the number in parentheses indicates the order in fields. Again, quantities with tildes are time independent, and the time dependence given above is chosen to lead to Eq. (2.35) (the factor of $\Omega_m(a)$ can be seen from App. A.1). As described in more detail in App. A, the second-order solutions here come from two sources. The first is directly from the second-order stress tensors in Eq. (3.1), and the second is from plugging the first-order counterterm solutions back into the equations of motion Eq. (2.11).

Then, the first-order response solutions are

$$\tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{9k_{\text{NL}}^2} \partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\pi}_{ct,(1)}^i = \frac{1}{3k_{\text{NL}}^2} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{jk}, \quad (3.2)$$

and the second-order response solutions are

$$\tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(2)} = \frac{2 \partial_i \partial_j}{33k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left[\tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij} + \frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{jk} - \frac{1}{6} \delta_{ij} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \partial_l \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{kl} \right], \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\pi}_{ct,(2)}^i = & \frac{2}{9k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left[\partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij} + \frac{1}{11} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \left(\tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{jk} + \frac{\partial_j \tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \partial_l \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{kl} \right) - \frac{2}{11} \partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_j \tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{jk} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \partial_l \left(\frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \partial_m \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{lm} + \frac{\partial_l \tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

⁷At linear level, we have $\pi_{V,(1)}^i = \bar{\rho} \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j v_{(1)}^k = 0$ because velocity vorticity is zero. Then, at higher orders, π_V^i becomes non-zero because of the growing mode in δ in the definition of π^i . So, above linear perturbations, π_S , π_V^i , and π^i all have the same time dependence, which one can deduce from the definition of π^i in terms of δ and v^i .

To find the above, we used Eq. (2.11), solved for π_S and π_V^i separately (which are given in App. A), and then combined them to form π^i using Eq. (2.10). Above, as we will justify in the next section, we have assumed that $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{jk} = \partial^2 \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}$.

Similarly, for the first-order stochastic solutions, we have

$$\tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)} = \frac{2}{7k_{\text{NL}}^2} \partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\pi}_{\epsilon,(1)}^i = \frac{1}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left[\frac{4}{7} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{jk} - \frac{2}{5} \left(\frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{jk} - \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij} \right) \right], \quad (3.5)$$

and for the second-order stochastic solutions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(2)} = & \frac{\partial_i \partial_j}{9k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left[\tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{ij} + 2 \frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \partial_k \partial_l}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{kl} - \frac{3}{7} \delta_{ij} \left(\frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \partial_l \partial_m}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{lm} \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{4}{5} \frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left(\frac{\partial_j \partial_k \partial_l}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{kl} - \partial_l \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{jl} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} k_{\text{NL}}^2 \tilde{\pi}_{\epsilon,(2)}^i = & \frac{2}{7} \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{ij} + \frac{1}{21} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \left(\tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{jk} + 2 \frac{\partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \partial_l \partial_m}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{lm} \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{7} \partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \partial_k \partial_l}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{kl} \right) + \frac{2}{7} \partial_l \left(\frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_l \partial_m \partial_n}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{mn} + \frac{\partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_i \partial_m \partial_n}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{mn} \right) \\ & - \frac{4}{105} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \left(\frac{\partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left(\frac{\partial_k \partial_l \partial_m}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{lm} - \partial_l \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{kl} \right) \right) \\ & - \frac{4}{35} \partial_l \left(\frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left(\frac{\partial_l \partial_m \partial_n}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{mn} - \partial_m \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{lm} \right) + \frac{\partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left(\frac{\partial_i \partial_m \partial_n}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{mn} - \partial_m \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{im} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

In the above stochastic expressions, as we will discuss further in the next section, we have *not* assumed that $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{jk} = \partial^2 \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}$.

As a final note, we point out that all of the various numerical coefficients above come from the linear equations of motion and the assumed time dependence $D(a)^n$ for the various contributions; they represent different combinations of Green's functions integrated over different kernels in the EdS approximation. We give the EdS Green's function in App. A.1.

3.2 Explicit expression for the stress tensor

We can now write down the most general stress tensor local in second spatial derivatives of Φ and gradients of the velocity, following the discussion in Sec. 2.2, up to second order, that obeys the symmetries of the problem, which are rotation and Galilean invariance. We focus on the leading order in derivatives, which, because of mass and momentum conservation, is $\mathcal{O}(k^2 P_{11})$ for P_{13} , $\mathcal{O}(k^2 P_{11}^2)$ for B_{411} and $B_{321}^{(II)}$, $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$ for P_{22} , $\mathcal{O}(k^6)$ for B_{222} , and $\mathcal{O}(k^4 P_{11})$ for $B_{321}^{(I)}$. For the response terms, we have

$$\tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij} = c_1 \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_3 \delta_{ij} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}, \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij} = & c_1 \frac{\partial_k \partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_3 \delta_{ij} \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \\
& + c_2 \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(2)}}{\partial^2} - c_2 \frac{\partial_k \partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_4 \delta_{ij} \tilde{\delta}^{(2)} - c_4 \delta_{ij} \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \\
& + c_5 \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} + c_6 \frac{\partial_i \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_7 \delta_{ij} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where all of the c_i are time independent. To determine the above list of operators, we follow the procedure laid out in Sec. 2.2 (which is the same approach as [7] for biased tracers, which we detail in Sec. 5.2 and App. C); we first write all contractions of $\partial_i \partial_j \Phi$ and $\partial_i v^j$ with the same tensor structure as τ^{ij} up to second order in fields and zeroth order in derivatives, and then we expand the fluid element and do the remaining time integrals which define the c_i . We then check for degeneracies in the resulting operators, and only use the minimal basis, which is given above.

For the stochastic terms, we have

$$\tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij} = \epsilon_1^{ij} , \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{ij} = \partial_k \epsilon_1^{ij} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \epsilon_3^{ijkl} \frac{\partial_k \partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} , \tag{3.10}$$

where, in momentum space, we define the correlation of the stochastic fields $\epsilon_n^{ij\dots}$ as an expansion in powers of \vec{k} of all of the terms allowed by rotation invariance [24], for example

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \epsilon_a^{ij}(\vec{k}) \epsilon_b^{kl}(\vec{k}') \rangle' = & c_{a,b}^{(1)} \delta^{ij} \delta^{kl} + c_{a,b}^{(2)} (\delta^{ik} \delta^{jl} + \delta^{il} \delta^{jk}) \\
& + k_{\text{NL}}^{-2} \left(c_{a,b}^{(3)} \delta^{ij} k^k k^l + c_{a,b}^{(4)} \delta^{kl} k^i k^j + c_{a,b}^{(5)} (\delta^{ik} k^j k^l + \delta^{il} k^j k^k) \right) + \dots .
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

We also do a similar expansion for three-point functions of stochastic fields, for example

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \epsilon_a^{ij}(\vec{k}_1) \epsilon_b^{kl}(\vec{k}_2) \epsilon_c^{mn}(\vec{k}_3) \rangle' = & c_{a,b,c}^{(1)} \delta^{ij} \delta^{kl} \delta^{mn} + \frac{1}{2} c_{a,b,c}^{(2)} \delta^{ij} \left(\delta^{ln} \delta^{km} + \delta^{lm} \delta^{kn} \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} c_{a,b,c}^{(3)} \delta^{mn} \left(\delta^{ik} \delta^{jl} + \delta^{il} \delta^{jk} \right) + \frac{1}{2} c_{a,b,c}^{(4)} \delta^{kl} \left(\delta^{in} \delta^{jm} + \delta^{im} \delta^{jn} \right) \\
& + \frac{1}{8} c_{a,b,c}^{(5)} \left(\delta^{im} (\delta^{jl} \delta^{kn} + \delta^{jk} \delta^{ln}) + \delta^{il} (\delta^{jn} \delta^{km} + \delta^{jm} \delta^{kn}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \delta^{ik} (\delta^{jn} \delta^{lm} + \delta^{jm} \delta^{ln}) + \delta^{in} (\delta^{jl} \delta^{km} + \delta^{jk} \delta^{lm}) \right) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where we only need the terms up to k^0 for the stochastic three-point functions for dark-matter renormalization in this paper.⁸ We note that the free coefficients appearing in two-point and three-point functions of stochastic fields can in general be independent, although they can be related under the assumption that the stochastic fields are purely Poissonian, for example. Since

⁸The coefficients $c_{a,b,c}^{(i)}$ in the contraction Eq. (3.12) are defined with respect to the specific ordering of the fields on the left-hand side of Eq. (3.12), *i.e.* they are not necessarily symmetric in $\{a, b, c\}$. However, we can derive relations among the coefficients with different orderings of $\{a, b, c\}$ by permuting the $\{\vec{k}_i\}$. For example, since at the order that we work, the right-hand side is independent of the $\{\vec{k}_i\}$, by permuting the $\{\vec{k}_i\}$ on the left-hand side, we obtain relations like $c_{a,c,b}^{(1)} = c_{a,b,c}^{(1)}$, $c_{a,c,b}^{(3)} = c_{a,b,c}^{(4)}$, and $c_{b,a,c}^{(4)} = c_{a,b,c}^{(2)}$, so that all permutations of $\{a, b, c\}$ can be related back to the canonical ordering (a, b, c) . This ensures that all of the correlations obey the relevant symmetries.

we expand the stochastic fields in all possible tensor structures, it is clear that Eq. (3.10) is the most general expression satisfying the equivalence principle.

Terms containing $\partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}/\partial^2$ are sometimes referred to as leading infrared (IR) terms. This is because they can lead to contributions $\mathcal{O}(k/q)$ as the momentum \vec{q} of some field goes to zero. These terms are completely fixed by Galilean invariance. The correct terms are generated by expanding in the fluid line element, as in Sec. 2.2, Sec. 5.2, and App. C.2, leading to the so-called flow terms [7]. We explicitly derive the expressions in Eq. (3.10) and point out a clarification of [7, 9] regarding the stochastic fields in App. A.5.

As expected, the counterterms above, when plugged into the relevant expressions for δ , allow us to absorb all UV divergences in the one-loop power spectrum and bispectrum, and we give explicit values for the free coefficients that absorb the UV divergences of the loops in App. A.6. In the rest of the paper, we will often refer to the choice of counterterms that cancels UV parts of SPT loops as ‘UV matching,’ and in particular, we always choose signs so that the UV part cancels in the *sum* of the loop and the counterterms. Our results become much more interesting when performing renormalization in redshift space, where non-locally-contributing counterterms in π^i are necessary, and we discuss this in much more detail in Sec. 3.3, Sec. 4.4, and Sec. 4.5.

As mentioned in Sec. 3.1, we assumed that $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{jk} = \partial^2 \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}$, but $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{jk} \neq \partial^2 \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}$, and now we can see why. For the first-order response stress tensor, $\tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}$, the only two terms that we can write are $\delta_{ij} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}$ and $\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}/\partial^2$, which both separately satisfy $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{jk} = \partial^2 \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}$. For the stochastic terms, however, this is not the case. This is essentially because we allow all tensor structures when contracting stochastic fields. For example, if we have

$$\langle \epsilon_1^{ij}(\vec{k}_1) \epsilon_2^{kl}(\vec{k}_2) \rangle' \supset a_1 \delta^{ij} \delta^{kl} + a_2 (\delta^{ik} \delta^{jl} + \delta^{il} \delta^{jk}) , \quad (3.13)$$

then the combination in question gives

$$k_1^i k_1^j k_1^k \langle \epsilon_1^{jk}(\vec{k}_1) \epsilon_2^{ab}(\vec{k}_2) \rangle' - k_1^2 k_1^j \langle \epsilon_1^{ij}(\vec{k}_1) \epsilon_2^{ab}(\vec{k}_2) \rangle' = a_2 (2k_1^i k_1^a k_1^b - k_1^2 \delta^{ia} k_1^b - k_1^2 \delta^{ib} k_1^a) , \quad (3.14)$$

which is not zero. While we find that this makes no difference in real space, we find that the terms proportional to $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{jk}/\partial^2 - \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}$ in stochastic expressions Eq. (3.5), Eq. (3.6), and Eq. (3.7) lead to contributions in the redshift space quantities $B_{321}^{r,(I),\epsilon}$ and $B_{222}^{r,\epsilon}$ (see App. A.7 for definitions and Sec. 4.5 for a discussion) that have a unique functional form and are not captured by any other terms that we have discussed, and indeed they are necessary to match the UV structures of $B_{321}^{r,(I)}$ and B_{222}^r .

3.3 Appearance of non-locally-contributing counterterms

As a main result of this work, we would like to draw particular attention to the way that the second-order stress tensors $\tilde{\tau}_{*,(2)}^{ij}$ enter the counterterm solutions. Although they enter with a unique derivative structure in $\tilde{\delta}_*^{(2)}$, *i.e.* $\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{*,(2)}^{ij}$, the second-order stress tensors appear in both of the structures

$$\partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{*,(2)}^{ij} , \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{*,(2)}^{jk} , \quad (3.15)$$

in the second-order solutions $\tilde{\pi}_{*,(2)}^i$ in Eq. (3.4) and Eq. (3.7). The second term above is a spatially non-local contribution to π^i , although it originates from local contributions to π_S and π_V^i , as can be seen in Eq. (2.11), and we will often refer to it as the new ‘non-locally-contributing counterterm.’ The non-locality comes simply from the Green’s function for the π^i equation, as evident in Eq. (2.10), and we discuss this in more detail in Sec. 5.3 for biased tracers.

First, we point out that the appearance of these two structures relies on π_S and π_V^i having two different Green’s functions. To see this, notice that the equations of motion Eq. (2.11) imply that

$$\pi_S \sim \alpha_S \partial_i \partial_j S_\tau^{ij}, \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_V^i \sim \alpha_V \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l S_\tau^{kl}, \quad (3.16)$$

for some constants α_S and α_V coming from the EdS Green’s functions (which are simply numerical constants in the EdS approximation, see App. A.1), where we have defined

$$S_\tau^{ij} \equiv \left[2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^{-2} \left(\partial_i \Phi \partial_j \Phi - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} (\partial \Phi)^2 \right) + \frac{\pi^i \pi^j}{\rho} \right]_\tau + \tau^{ij}, \quad (3.17)$$

and used the notation $[\cdot]_\tau$ to mean that the term inside of the brackets is sourced by at least one insertion of the stress tensor τ^{ij} in perturbation theory. Using the definition of π^i in Eq. (2.10), these expressions lead to

$$\pi^i \sim \alpha_V \partial_j S_\tau^{ij} + (\alpha_S - \alpha_V) \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} S_\tau^{jk}, \quad (3.18)$$

so we see that the last term would vanish if $\alpha_S = \alpha_V$, *i.e.* if the Green’s functions for π_S and π_V^i are the same. Second, we note that the new term is also absent if $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k S_{\tau,(2)}^{jk} = \partial^2 \partial_j S_{\tau,(2)}^{ij}$, which is true for any terms in $S_{\tau,(2)}^{ij}$ proportional to δ_{ij} , for example. Thus, terms in Eq. (3.9) that lead to the new non-locally-contributing counterterm structure are the ones proportional to c_5 and c_6 and the flow terms proportional to c_1 and c_2 . The term $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k (\partial_l \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{kl} \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} / \partial^2) / \partial^2$ in Eq. (3.4) also allows c_3 to contribute to the non-local structure.

The two structures in Eq. (3.15) have distinct dependence on the momenta of the fields in $\tilde{\tau}_{*,(2)}^{ij}$, and so can give distinct momentum dependence for EFT counterterms. Notice, however, that for correlators that only involve δ , like the power spectrum and bispectrum of δ in real space in Sec. 2.1, this difference does not show up (as can be seen from Eq. (2.12) where τ^{ij} only contributes locally). The situation is different, though, in redshift space where the structures in Eq. (3.15) contribute in different ways so that one must include both possibilities in the counterterms to correctly describe the UV physics. Indeed, both terms are necessary to match the UV structures of the loop integrals in redshift space, and we describe this in more detail in Sec. 4.4 and Sec. 4.5. The bottom line conclusion from renormalization of dark matter in real space is that as long as one correctly solves the equations of motion, all renormalization comes through a stress tensor that is a local-in-space function of $\partial_i \partial_j \Phi$ and $\partial_i v^j$, as expected. The bottom line conclusion that we will find in Sec. 4 for dark matter in redshift space is that, as long as one correctly solves the equations of motion (especially for π^i), renormalization happens through a local-in-space stress tensor and local-in-space redshift space counterterms.

We would like to point out, as a side note, that renormalization of the dark-matter one-loop bispectrum *requires* the generation of vorticity in the velocity field. Although absent in SPT,

velocity vorticity ω^i is sourced from the symmetric stress tensor through [27]

$$\omega^i \sim \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \left(\epsilon^{kmn} v^m \omega^n - \rho^{-1} \partial_l \tau^{lk} \right) . \quad (3.19)$$

For simplicity, we focus on the response terms. In this case, since $\omega_{(1)}^i = 0$, ω^i starts being sourced at second order from the stress-tensor term $\rho^{-1} \partial_l \tau^{lk}$, which in turn means that the term $\epsilon^{kmn} v^m \omega^n$ starts at third order. We can thus ignore the latter term for this discussion. One can then check that the parameters in the stress tensor Eq. (3.8) and Eq. (3.9) that source vorticity at second order are c_1 , c_2 , c_5 , and c_6 , and we have explicitly verified that it is impossible to renormalize the one-loop bispectrum (specifically B_{411}) if all of these parameters are zero.

Finally, let us briefly comment on some potentially confusing aspects of the renormalization and UV matching of $B_{321}^{(I)}$ with the stochastic terms, explicitly shown in Eq. (A.11) and Eq. (A.12). Although we defined $B_{321}^{(I),\epsilon}$ by summing over all permutations in Eq. (A.12), we could have done the UV matching in terms of our Galilean invariant stress tensor by considering all terms with an external $P_{11}(k_1)$, *i.e.* just symmetrizing over \vec{k}_2 and \vec{k}_3 and considering

$$\bar{B}_{321}^{(I),\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3) \equiv \langle \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_1) \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}(\vec{k}_2) \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(2)}(\vec{k}_3) \rangle' + \langle \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_1) \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}(\vec{k}_3) \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(2)}(\vec{k}_2) \rangle' . \quad (3.20)$$

A curious point about absorbing the UV divergences of $B_{321}^{(1)}$ with $\bar{B}_{321}^{(1),\epsilon}$ is that it is still possible to do even if the leading IR part of the counterterm solution Eq. (3.6) (*i.e.* those ensuring the correct Galilean properties) were wrong. However, this is only true because the IR part of Eq. (3.6) actually does not contribute to $\bar{B}_{321}^{(I),\epsilon}$ after symmetrization over \vec{k}_2 and \vec{k}_3 .⁹ However, as we will see in Sec. 4.5, this is no longer the case in redshift space, and the precise form of the IR terms in Eq. (3.6) is crucial to obtaining the correct renormalization and UV matching. This clarifies some statements made in [32] about this renormalization.

4 Dark-matter renormalization in redshift space

4.1 General redshift-space equations

The distribution of matter is roughly homogeneous and isotropic in the comoving coordinate \vec{x} , but since we use redshift to assign distances, the coordinate that we actually measure for each galaxy is (see for example [33])

$$\vec{x}_r = \vec{x} + \frac{\hat{z} \cdot \vec{v}}{aH} \hat{z} , \quad (4.1)$$

where \hat{z} is the line of sight direction. Mass conservation implies that $\rho(\vec{x}_r) d^3 x_r = \rho(\vec{x}) d^3 x$, which gives

$$\delta_r(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) = \delta(\vec{k}) + \int d^3 x e^{-i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}} \left(\exp \left[-i \frac{(\hat{z} \cdot \vec{k})}{aH} (\hat{z} \cdot \vec{v}(\vec{x})) \right] - 1 \right) (1 + \delta(\vec{x})) , \quad (4.2)$$

⁹This is for a reason very similar to why the LSS consistency relations are trivial for the tree-level bispectrum, because the leading term when $\vec{q} \rightarrow 0$ has to be zero because of permutation symmetry in $(\vec{q}, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3)$.

in Fourier space. Since we will compute up to the one-loop bispectrum, we expand to fourth order, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_r = & \delta - \frac{\hat{z}^i \hat{z}^j}{aH\bar{\rho}} \partial_i \pi^j + \frac{\hat{z}^i \hat{z}^j \hat{z}^k \hat{z}^l}{2(aH)^2 \bar{\rho}} \partial_i \partial_j (\pi^k v^l) \\ & - \frac{\prod_{a=1}^6 \hat{z}^{i_a}}{3!(aH)^3 \bar{\rho}} \partial_{i_1} \partial_{i_2} \partial_{i_3} (\pi^{i_4} v^{i_5} v^{i_6}) + \frac{\prod_{a=1}^8 \hat{z}^{i_a}}{4!(aH)^4 \bar{\rho}} \partial_{i_1} \partial_{i_2} \partial_{i_3} \partial_{i_4} (\pi^{i_5} v^{i_6} v^{i_7} v^{i_8}) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

in position space. We now see the appearance of π^i contracted in a non-isotropy-preserving way, since isotropy is broken in redshift space by the preferred direction \hat{z} .

The n -th order expression for δ_r in SPT, *i.e.* with $\tau^{ij} = 0$ and redshift space EFT counterterms (related to contact operators in Eq. (4.3) that we will discuss in the subsequent sections) set to zero, can be written

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_r^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) &= D(a) F_1^r(\vec{k}; \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}, \\ \delta_r^{(n)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) &= D(a)^n \int_{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n}^{\vec{k}} F_n^r(\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n; \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}_1}^{(1)} \dots \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}_n}^{(1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

for $n \geq 2$, where the redshift space kernels F_n^r up to $n = 3$ can be found in [33], for example. The observables that we are interested in are defined analogously to those in Sec. 2.1. In the plane-parallel approximation that is common in redshift space and that we use in this paper, the power spectrum and bispectrum are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \delta_r(\vec{k}_1, \hat{z}, a) \delta_r(\vec{k}_2, \hat{z}, a) \rangle &= (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2) P^r(k_1, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, a), \\ \langle \delta_r(\vec{k}_1, \hat{z}, a) \delta_r(\vec{k}_2, \hat{z}, a) \delta_r(\vec{k}_3, \hat{z}, a) \rangle &= (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \vec{k}_3) B^r(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}, a). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Notice that since translation invariance is preserved, the correlation functions still have the Dirac delta functions for total wavenumber conservation. However, since isotropy is broken, the spectra can depend on angles with respect to \hat{z} .

The total one-loop power spectrum is

$$P_{1\text{-loop tot.}}^r(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}, a) = D(a)^2 P_{11}^r(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) + D(a)^4 (P_{22}^r(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) + P_{13}^r(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z})), \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$P_{11}^r(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) = (1 + f(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{z})^2)^2 P_{11}(k), \quad (4.7)$$

is the famous Kaiser result, and

$$\begin{aligned} P_{22}^r(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) &= 2 \int_{\vec{q}} F_2^r(\vec{q}, \vec{k} - \vec{q}; \hat{z})^2 P_{11}(q) P_{11}(|\vec{k} - \vec{q}|), \\ P_{13}^r(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) &= 6 P_{11}(k) F_1^r(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) \int_{\vec{q}} F_3^r(\vec{q}, -\vec{q}, \vec{k}; \hat{z}) P_{11}(q). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

The total one-loop bispectrum is

$$B_{1\text{-loop tot.}}^r = D(a)^4 B_{211}^r + D(a)^6 \left(B_{222}^r + B_{321}^{r,(I)} + B_{321}^{r,(II)} + B_{411}^r \right), \quad (4.9)$$

where here and below we suppress the argument $(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z})$ of the bispectra terms to remove clutter. The tree-level bispectrum is

$$B_{211}^r = 2F_1^r(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z})F_1^r(\vec{k}_2; \hat{z})F_2^r(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2; \hat{z})P_{11}(k_1)P_{11}(k_2) + 2 \text{ perms.} , \quad (4.10)$$

and the one-loop contributions are

$$\begin{aligned} B_{222}^r &= 8 \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q)P_{11}(|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|)P_{11}(|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|) \\ &\quad \times F_2^r(-\vec{q}, \vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}; \hat{z})F_2^r(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}, \vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}; \hat{z})F_2^r(\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}, \vec{q}; \hat{z}) , \\ B_{321}^{r,(I)} &= 6P_{11}(k_1)F_1^r(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z}) \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q)P_{11}(|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) \\ &\quad \times F_3^r(-\vec{q}, -\vec{k}_2 + \vec{q}, -\vec{k}_1; \hat{z})F_2^r(\vec{q}, \vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}; \hat{z}) + 5 \text{ perms.} , \\ B_{321}^{r,(II)} &= 6P_{11}(k_1)P_{11}(k_2)F_1^r(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z})F_2^r(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q)F_3^r(\vec{k}_1, \vec{q}, -\vec{q}; \hat{z}) + 5 \text{ perms.} , \\ B_{411}^r &= 12P_{11}(k_1)P_{11}(k_2)F_1^r(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z})F_1^r(\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q)F_4^r(\vec{q}, -\vec{q}, -\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) + 2 \text{ perms.} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

As a final point, we note that we have explicitly displayed and factored out the major source of time dependence, which is through the factors of $D(a)^n$ in Eq. (4.4), in the above equations. The kernels F_n^r in Eq. (4.4) are in fact time dependent as well, coming from factors of $f(a)$ that enter Eq. (4.3) through the factors of \vec{v} . While we fully take into account this time dependence, we do not explicitly write the time argument in the F_n^r kernels, to remove clutter; all kernels and observables with the redshift space marking ‘ r ’ are understood to contain this time dependence through $f(a)$. For details on how to evaluate the above integrals, see App. B.

4.2 Renormalization of dark matter in redshift space

Ultimately, we want a renormalized expression for the redshift space overdensity δ_r in Eq. (4.3). The first two terms, containing only δ and π^j , have already been renormalized in Sec. 3, and this is entirely determined by the local stress-tensor counterterms in τ^{ij} . The non-linear terms in Eq. (4.3), however, are contact operators (*i.e.* UV sensitive) and must be separately renormalized [15], which essentially amounts to adding new counterterms directly to Eq. (4.3). Here we present a systematic renormalization that preserves Galilean transformation properties, extending [24], and address some subtleties that appear since we are going to quadratic order in the counterterms.

As can be seen in Eq. (4.3), we ultimately want to renormalize products like $\pi^i v^j v^k \dots$. In order to build up to that, let us start with the renormalization of velocity products, up to $[v^i v^j v^k v^l]_R$, where $[\cdot]_R$ denotes a renormalized quantity. In order to have the correct transformation properties under the Galilean transformation $v^i \rightarrow v^i + \chi^i$ (here and elsewhere χ^i is a constant vector), we wish for the renormalized quantities to transform in the same way as the bare operators, so we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
[v^i]_R &\rightarrow [v^i]_R + \chi^i, \\
[v^i v^j]_R &\rightarrow [v^i v^j]_R + [v^i]_R \chi^j + [v^j]_R \chi^i + \chi^i \chi^j, \\
[v^i v^j v^k]_R &\rightarrow [v^i v^j v^k]_R + ([v^i v^j]_R \chi^k + 2 \text{ perms.}) + ([v^i]_R \chi^j \chi^k + 2 \text{ perms.}) + \chi^i \chi^j \chi^k, \\
[v^i v^j v^k v^l]_R &\rightarrow [v^i v^j v^k v^l]_R + ([v^i v^j v^k]_R \chi^l + 3 \text{ perms.}) + ([v^i v^j]_R \chi^k \chi^l + 5 \text{ perms.}) \\
&\quad + ([v^i]_R \chi^j \chi^k \chi^l + 3 \text{ perms.}) + \chi^i \chi^j \chi^k \chi^l.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

One way to write renormalized quantities satisfying the above in terms of the non-renormalized fields is

$$\begin{aligned}
[v^i]_R &= v^i + \mathcal{O}_v^i, \\
[v^i v^j]_R &= [v^i]_R [v^j]_R + \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{ij}, \\
[v^i v^j v^k]_R &= ([v^i v^j]_R [v^k]_R + 2 \text{ perms.}) - 2[v^i]_R [v^j]_R [v^k]_R + \mathcal{O}_{v^3}^{ijk}, \\
[v^i v^j v^k v^l]_R &= ([v^i v^j v^k]_R [v^l]_R + 3 \text{ perms.}) - ([v^i v^j]_R [v^k v^l]_R + 2 \text{ perms.}) + \mathcal{O}_{v^4}^{ijkl},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

where all of the \mathcal{O} terms are Galilean scalars. The last expression is not unique in the sense that other operators could have been used that are not independent from the ones shown, like $[v^i]_R [v^j]_R [v^k]_R [v^l]_R$ and $[v^i v^j]_R [v^k]_R [v^l]_R$, for example. Definitions using different bases can differ in their scalar parts \mathcal{O} . Note that v^i is renormalized here because it is the composite operator π^i/ρ [27].

We can similarly renormalize products involving δ . Demanding again that renormalized quantities transform in the same way as bare ones under Galilean transformations means that we want

$$\begin{aligned}
[\delta v^i]_R &\rightarrow [\delta v^i]_R + [\delta]_R \chi^i, \\
[\delta v^i v^j]_R &\rightarrow [\delta v^i v^j]_R + [\delta v^i]_R \chi^j + [\delta v^j]_R \chi^i + [\delta]_R \chi^i \chi^j, \\
[\delta v^i v^j v^k]_R &\rightarrow [\delta v^i v^j v^k]_R + ([\delta v^i v^j]_R \chi^k + 2 \text{ perms.}) + ([\delta v^i]_R \chi^j \chi^k + 2 \text{ perms.}) + [\delta]_R \chi^i \chi^j \chi^k, \\
[\delta v^i v^j v^k v^l]_R &\rightarrow [\delta v^i v^j v^k v^l]_R + ([\delta v^i v^j v^k]_R \chi^l + 3 \text{ perms.}) + ([\delta v^i v^j]_R \chi^k \chi^l + 5 \text{ perms.}) \\
&\quad + ([\delta v^i]_R \chi^j \chi^k \chi^l + 3 \text{ perms.}) + [\delta]_R \chi^i \chi^j \chi^k \chi^l.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

One way to write renormalized quantities satisfying the above in terms of the non-renormalized

fields is

$$\begin{aligned}
[\delta]_R &= \delta + \mathcal{O}_\delta , \\
[\delta v^i]_R &= [\delta]_R [v^i]_R + \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^i , \\
[\delta v^i v^j]_R &= [\delta v^i]_R [v^j]_R + [\delta v^j]_R [v^i]_R - [\delta]_R [v^i]_R [v^j]_R + \mathcal{O}_{v^2\delta}^{ij} , \\
[\delta v^i v^j v^k]_R &= ([\delta v^i v^j]_R [v^k]_R + 2 \text{ perms.}) - \frac{2}{3}([\delta v^i]_R [v^j]_R [v^k]_R + 2 \text{ perms.}) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3}([\delta]_R [v^i v^j]_R [v^k]_R + 2 \text{ perms.}) - \frac{1}{3}([\delta v^i]_R [v^j v^k]_R + 2 \text{ perms.}) + \mathcal{O}_{v^3\delta}^{ijk} , \\
[\delta v^i v^j v^k v^l]_R &= ([\delta v^i v^j v^k]_R [v^l]_R + 3 \text{ perms.}) - \frac{1}{2}([\delta v^i]_R [v^j v^k v^l]_R + 3 \text{ perms.}) \\
&\quad - ([\delta v^i v^j]_R [v^k]_R [v^l]_R + 5 \text{ perms.}) + \frac{1}{2}([\delta v^i]_R [v^j v^k]_R [v^l]_R + 11 \text{ perms.}) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}([\delta]_R [v^i v^j v^k]_R [v^l]_R + 3 \text{ perms.}) - ([\delta]_R [v^i v^j]_R [v^k v^l]_R + 2 \text{ perms.}) + \mathcal{O}_{v^4\delta}^{ijkl} .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

The above expressions were determined by imposing the correct transformation law Eq. (4.14) and having the correct limit to Eq. (4.13) when $\delta \rightarrow 1$. The expression for $[\delta v^i v^j v^k]_R$ is not uniquely determined by these constraints, but the difference is immaterial; any other definitions for $[\delta v^i v^j v^k]_R$ differ by Galilean invariant terms, in terms of free EFT coefficients, which vanish when $\delta \rightarrow 1$.

Now, we can combine the above expressions to get the terms in Eq. (4.3) relevant for redshift space distortions. Specifically, we write

$$[\pi^{i_1 v^{i_2} \dots v^{i_n}}]_R \equiv [\rho v^{i_1} v^{i_2} \dots v^{i_n}]_R = \bar{\rho}([v^{i_1} v^{i_2} \dots v^{i_n}]_R + [\delta v^{i_1} v^{i_2} \dots v^{i_n}]_R) \tag{4.16}$$

to define the renormalized quantities involving π^i . After doing that, we find it more convenient to expand the above expressions Eq. (4.13) and Eq. (4.15) in terms of the non-renormalized fields and write

$$\begin{aligned}
[\delta]_R &= \delta + \mathcal{O}_\delta , \\
[\pi^i]_R &= \pi^i + v^i \mathcal{O}_\rho + \mathcal{O}_\pi^i , \\
[\pi^i v^j]_R &= \pi^i v^j + v^i v^j \mathcal{O}_\rho + v^i \mathcal{O}_\pi^j + v^j \mathcal{O}_\pi^i + \mathcal{O}_{\pi v}^{ij} , \\
[\pi^i v^j v^k]_R &= \pi^i v^j v^k + v^i v^j v^k \mathcal{O}_\rho + (v^i v^j \mathcal{O}_\pi^k + 2 \text{ perms.}) + (v^i \mathcal{O}_{\pi v}^{jk} + 2 \text{ perms.}) + \mathcal{O}_{\pi v^2}^{ijk} , \\
[\pi^i v^j v^k v^l]_R &= \pi^i v^j v^k v^l + v^i v^j v^k v^l \mathcal{O}_\rho + (v^i v^j v^k \mathcal{O}_\pi^l + 3 \text{ perms.}) \\
&\quad + (v^i v^j \mathcal{O}_{\pi v}^{kl} + 5 \text{ perms.}) + (v^i \mathcal{O}_{\pi v^2}^{jkl} + 3 \text{ perms.}) + \mathcal{O}_{\pi v^3}^{ijkl} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

One can show that all of the $\mathcal{O}_{\pi v^n}$ tensors above (which are all Galilean scalars) can be written in terms of δ , \mathcal{O}_δ , the \mathcal{O}_{v^n} , and the $\mathcal{O}_{v^n \delta}$. Explicitly, we have

$$\mathcal{O}_\rho = \bar{\rho} \mathcal{O}_\delta , \quad \mathcal{O}_\pi^i = \bar{\rho} ((1 + \delta + \mathcal{O}_\delta) \mathcal{O}_v^i + \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^i) , \tag{4.18}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\pi v}^{ij} = \bar{\rho} \left[(1 + \delta + \mathcal{O}_\delta) \mathcal{O}_v^i \mathcal{O}_v^j + \mathcal{O}_v^i \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^j + \mathcal{O}_v^j \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^i + \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{ij} + \mathcal{O}_{v^2\delta}^{ij} \right] , \tag{4.19}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_{\pi v^2}^{ijk} = & \bar{\rho} \left[(1 + \delta + \mathcal{O}_\delta) \mathcal{O}_v^i \mathcal{O}_v^j \mathcal{O}_v^k + \mathcal{O}_{v^3}^{ijk} + \mathcal{O}_{v^3\delta}^{ijk} \right. \\
& + \mathcal{O}_v^i \left(\mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{jk} + \mathcal{O}_{v^2\delta}^{jk} \right) + \mathcal{O}_v^j \left(\mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{ki} + \mathcal{O}_{v^2\delta}^{ki} \right) + \mathcal{O}_v^k \left(\mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{ij} + \mathcal{O}_{v^2\delta}^{ij} \right) \\
& \left. + \mathcal{O}_v^i \mathcal{O}_v^j \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^k + \mathcal{O}_v^j \mathcal{O}_v^k \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^i + \mathcal{O}_v^k \mathcal{O}_v^i \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^j - \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{ij} \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^k - \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{jk} \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^i - \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{ki} \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^j \right] ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_{\pi v^3}^{ijkl} = & \bar{\rho} \left[(1 + \delta + \mathcal{O}_\delta) \left(\mathcal{O}_v^i \mathcal{O}_v^j \mathcal{O}_v^k \mathcal{O}_v^l - \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{ij} \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{kl} - \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{ik} \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{jl} - \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{il} \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{jk} \right) \right. \\
& + \mathcal{O}_{v^4}^{ijkl} + \mathcal{O}_{v^4\delta}^{ijkl} - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{O}_{v^3}^{ijk} \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^l - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{O}_{v^3}^{ijl} \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^k - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{O}_{v^3}^{ikl} \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^j - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{O}_{v^3}^{jkl} \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^i \\
& + \left(\frac{\mathcal{O}_v^i}{6} \left(\mathcal{O}_{v^3}^{jkl} + \mathcal{O}_{v^3\delta}^{jkl} - \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{jk} \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^l - \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{jl} \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^k - \frac{1}{3} \mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{kl} \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^j \right) + \frac{\mathcal{O}_v^i \mathcal{O}_v^j}{4} \left(\mathcal{O}_{v^2}^{kl} + \mathcal{O}_{v^2\delta}^{kl} \right) \right. \\
& \left. \left. + \frac{1}{6} \mathcal{O}_v^i \mathcal{O}_v^j \mathcal{O}_v^k \mathcal{O}_{v\delta}^l + 23 \text{ perms. of } \{i, j, k, l\} \right) \right] .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

We note that the counterterms above associated with contact operators are in general local-in-space [27]. This can be seen by considering two operators $\sigma_1(\vec{x})$ and $\sigma_2(\vec{x})$. In the EFT, the ambiguity in the product $\sigma(\vec{x}) \equiv \sigma_1(\vec{x})\sigma_2(\vec{x})$ comes from the fact that $\tilde{\sigma}(\vec{x}) \equiv \sigma_1(\vec{x} + \delta\vec{x})\sigma_2(\vec{x})$ is just as good of a definition as $\sigma(\vec{x})$ as long as $|\delta\vec{x}|$ is below the EFT length cutoff. The two definitions differ by higher derivatives of the original σ_1 and σ_2 fields. Thus, the origin of the non-locally-contributing counterterms in $[\pi^i]_R$ is not from the fact that it is a contact operator, but rather from the equations of motion Eq. (2.11) and the definition Eq. (2.10).

An important point about Eq. (4.17) is keeping track of how lower-order counterterms must enter higher-order renormalized products in order to preserve Galilean invariance. To renormalize the contact operators in Eq. (4.3), we simply replace all of them with the corresponding renormalized operators in Eq. (4.17). This leads us to the renormalized redshift space overdensity $[\delta_r]_R$ which for renormalization up to the one-loop bispectrum we can write as

$$[\delta_r]_R(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) = \delta_r(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) + \delta_{r,ct}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) + \delta_{r,ct}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) + \delta_{r,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) + \delta_{r,\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) , \tag{4.22}$$

where the subscript *ct* denotes the response counterterms, and ϵ denotes the stochastic (and semi-stochastic) counterterms. Assuming the time dependence needed to cancel UV loop contributions, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{r,ct}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) = & D(a)^3 \tilde{\delta}_{r,ct}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) , & \delta_{r,ct}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) = & D(a)^4 \tilde{\delta}_{r,ct}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) , \\
\delta_{r,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) = & D(a)^2 \tilde{\delta}_{r,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) , & \text{and } \delta_{r,\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) = & D(a)^3 \tilde{\delta}_{r,\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

where we use the tilde to denote the appropriate time-independent factor.

Given the results of Sec. 3.1 for dark-matter renormalization, the linear terms in Eq. (4.3), δ and π^i , are automatically renormalized by the stress tensor τ^{ij} . As can be seen in Eq. (4.17), though, we still need the explicit expression for \mathcal{O}_ρ and \mathcal{O}_π^i in terms of τ^{ij} to use in higher product renormalizations. Explicitly, we have

$$\mathcal{O}_\rho = \bar{\rho} \delta_\tau , \tag{4.24}$$

where δ_τ is the solution sourced by τ^{ij} , Eq. (2.34). Then, given this, we can solve for

$$\mathcal{O}_\pi^i = \pi_\tau^i - v^i \mathcal{O}_\rho, \quad (4.25)$$

where π_τ^i is the solution sourced by τ^{ij} , Eq. (2.36). The counterterms $\mathcal{O}_{\pi v^n}$ entering the higher products are free functions of Galilean scalars and introduce new counterterms in addition to those coming from τ^{ij} . We give explicit expressions for the redshift space counterterms relevant to this work in Sec. 4.4 and Sec. 4.5.

4.3 IR-limit checks

Let us briefly pause to make some comments about the counterterm solutions that we found in Sec. 3.1. A useful consistency check is to confirm that the expressions have the correct IR behavior for their Galilean transformation types. In perturbation theory, a Galilean scalar Σ (like δ or τ^{ij}) satisfies

$$\Sigma^{(2)}|_{\text{IR}} = \partial_i \Sigma^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \delta^{(1)}}{\partial^2}, \quad (4.26)$$

where we use the notation $|_{\text{IR}}$ to mean the leading term when the momentum of one of the fields goes to zero, which is a straightforward generalization of [34–36], for example. We can also find the IR behavior of the momentum counterterms directly from Eq. (4.25), since we have $\pi_\tau^i = \mathcal{O}_\pi^i + v^i \mathcal{O}_\rho$. Then since \mathcal{O}_ρ and \mathcal{O}_π^i are Galilean scalars, we must have

$$\pi_{\tau,(2)}^i|_{\text{IR}} = \partial_j \mathcal{O}_{\pi,(1)}^i \frac{\partial_j \delta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \bar{\rho} v_{(1)}^i \delta_\tau^{(1)}, \quad (4.27)$$

where we have used Eq. (4.24).

First, we point out that the stress tensor that we wrote down in Eq. (3.8), Eq. (3.9), and Eq. (3.10) is indeed a Galilean scalar, since

$$\tilde{\tau}_{*,(2)}^{ij}|_{\text{IR}} = \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{*,(1)}^{ij} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2}, \quad (4.28)$$

for both the response and stochastic contributions, respectively $* = ct, \epsilon$. This is of course by construction, since we introduced the flow terms as in [7] (with the clarification in App. A.5 for the stochastic terms) specifically to make τ^{ij} a Galilean scalar.

Now we move on to the counterterm solutions for δ and π^i sourced by τ^{ij} . By inspection, one can indeed see that

$$\tilde{\delta}_*^{(2)}|_{\text{IR}} = \partial_i \tilde{\delta}_*^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\pi}_{*,(2)}^i|_{\text{IR}} = \partial_j \tilde{\pi}_{*,(1)}^i \frac{\partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \tilde{\delta}_*^{(1)}, \quad (4.29)$$

which are the correct equations in terms of all of the tilde fields. These are much more nontrivial checks. In particular, going through the algebra to check these, one can see how both the second-order stress tensors and the first-order stress tensors plugged back into the equations of motion combine to give the correct answer.

One can also see this in another way. Following [36], we can start with the linear equation of motion and introduce all of the non-linear leading IR terms directly into the equation of motion. For example, focusing on the counterterm solutions, we have the linear equation

$$\ddot{\delta}_*^{(1)} + 2H\dot{\delta}_*^{(1)} - \frac{3}{2}\Omega_m H^2 \delta_*^{(1)} = \frac{1}{a^2 \bar{\rho}} \partial_i \partial_j \tau_{*,(1)}^{ij}. \quad (4.30)$$

Then, the equation of motion for the leading IR piece of the second-order field is

$$\left(\ddot{\delta}_*^{(2)} + 2H\dot{\delta}_*^{(2)} - \frac{3}{2}\Omega_m H^2 \delta_*^{(2)} \right) \Big|_{\text{IR}} = \frac{1}{a^2 \bar{\rho}} \partial_i \partial_j \tau_{*,(2)}^{ij} \Big|_{\text{IR}} - a^{-1} (v^i \partial_i \delta_*^{(1)} + 2v^i \partial_i \dot{\delta}_*^{(1)} + H v^i \partial_i \delta_*^{(1)}). \quad (4.31)$$

This way, one can see the contribution coming from the IR part of $\tau_{*,(2)}^{ij}$, and the part coming from plugging the linear solution $\delta_*^{(1)}$ back into the equation of motion. Indeed, one can show that the solution to Eq. (4.31) for $\delta_*^{(2)}$ is given by Eq. (4.29).

4.4 Redshift space counterterms: response terms

We now write down the explicit response counterterms (up to second order and number of derivatives discussed above Eq. (3.8), which is the same in real space and redshift space) needed to renormalize the product operators in Eq. (4.3). We start with $[\pi^i v^j]_R$. Since \mathcal{O}_ρ and \mathcal{O}_π^i are already known from Eq. (4.24) and Eq. (4.25), we only need $\mathcal{O}_{\pi v}^{ij}$, which we can expand as

$$\mathcal{O}_{\pi v,(0)}^{ij} = (aHf)^2 \bar{\rho} \frac{D^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \delta_{ij} c_{\text{DM},0}^{\pi v}, \quad (4.32)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\pi v,(1)}^{ij} = (aHf)^2 \bar{\rho} \frac{D^3}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(c_{\text{DM},1}^{\pi v} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_{\text{DM},3}^{\pi v} \delta_{ij} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \right), \quad (4.33)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{\pi v,(2)}^{ij} = & (aHf)^2 \bar{\rho} \frac{D^4}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(c_{\text{DM},1}^{\pi v} \frac{\partial_k \partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_{\text{DM},3}^{\pi v} \delta_{ij} \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_{\text{DM},2}^{\pi v} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(2)}}{\partial^2} \right. \\ & - c_{\text{DM},2}^{\pi v} \frac{\partial_k \partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_{\text{DM},4}^{\pi v} \delta_{ij} \tilde{\delta}^{(2)} - c_{\text{DM},4}^{\pi v} \delta_{ij} \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \\ & \left. + c_{\text{DM},5}^{\pi v} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} + c_{\text{DM},6}^{\pi v} \frac{\partial_i \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_{\text{DM},7}^{\pi v} \delta_{ij} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

We have arrived at this list of counterterms using the same procedure as in Sec. 3.2. The only difference is that we now allow a constant term, which did not contribute through the stress tensor because there are derivatives acting on it. Next we move to $[\pi^i v^j v^k]_R$. Since we are only going up to second order, and because it is not possible to make a Galilean scalar of the form $\mathcal{O}_{\pi v^2}^{ijk}$ at the order of fields and derivatives that we need, no new counterterms are needed, although the term $v^i \mathcal{O}_{\pi v}^{jk}$ still contributes. The situation is similar for $[\pi^i v^j v^k v^l]_R$. For the same reasons, only the term $v^i v^j \mathcal{O}_{\pi v}^{kl}$ contributes, and so again, no new counterterms are needed.

We can now build the response counterterm kernels $F_1^{r,ct}$ and $F_2^{r,ct}$, which are defined explicitly in App. A.7. We have found that the parameters c_1 , c_2 , c_6 , and $c_{\text{DM},0}^{\pi v}$ are degenerate in these expressions, so we have set them to zero in the following. For the first-order kernel, we have

$$F_1^{r,ct}(\vec{k}; \hat{z}) = -\frac{k^2}{18k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(2c_3 + 3f(2c_3 + 3fc_{\text{DM},3}^{\pi v})(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{z})^2 + 9f^2c_{\text{DM},1}^{\pi v}(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{z})^4 \right), \quad (4.35)$$

while for the second-order kernel we have

$$F_2^{r,ct}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^{11} \alpha_i^{\text{DM}} e_i^{F_2}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2; \hat{z}), \quad (4.36)$$

with

$$\alpha_i^{\text{DM}} = \{c_3, c_4, c_5, c_7, c_{\text{DM},1}^{\pi v}, c_{\text{DM},2}^{\pi v}, c_{\text{DM},3}^{\pi v}, c_{\text{DM},4}^{\pi v}, c_{\text{DM},5}^{\pi v}, c_{\text{DM},6}^{\pi v}, c_{\text{DM},7}^{\pi v}\}, \quad (4.37)$$

where the basis functions $e_i^{F_2}$ are defined, and the explicit UV matching to SPT loops is given, in App. A.7.

This brings us to one of the main results of this paper. The UV limit of B_{411}^r contains a term

$$B_{411}^r|_{\text{UV}} \supset \frac{2(c_5 - c_3)}{99} \frac{f(k_1^2 - k_2^2)^2 (k_1^2 + k_2^2) (k_1\mu_1 + k_2\mu_2)^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_1^2 k_2^2 k_3^2} P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2) + 2 \text{ perms.}, \quad (4.38)$$

where we choose to write the bispectrum using the variables $(k_1, k_2, k_3, \mu_1, \mu_2)$, the coefficients c_3 and c_5 are given in Eq. (A.36), and here and elsewhere, $\mu_i \equiv \hat{z} \cdot \hat{k}_i$. This should be compared to $P_{11}(k_1)P_{11}(k_2)/(k_1^2 k_2^2) + 2 \text{ perms.}$ in Eq. (A.34) for dark matter in real space. The fact that Eq. (4.38) contains an explicit factor of $1/k_3^2$ is a new development, novel to redshift space.¹⁰ A term like this can only appear as a counterterm in the bispectrum, through $B_{411}^{r,ct}$ (expressions for the counterterm solutions and which loops they renormalize are given in App. A.7), because of the appearance of the differential operator $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k / \partial^2$ acting on two fields in $\tilde{\pi}_{ct,(2)}^i$ in Eq. (3.4), and thus proves the necessity of the new non-locally-contributing counterterm. Indeed, the expression for $F_2^{r,ct}$ in Eq. (4.36) and the values of c_3 and c_5 given in Eq. (A.36) explicitly cancels the UV contribution in Eq. (4.38).

To see how this kind of term can be generated from the counterterms, let us consider some example counterterms and try to reproduce the form of Eq. (4.38). Given that there is a factor $P_{11}(k_1)P_{11}(k_2)$ upstairs, this term should come from a contraction like

$$\langle \delta^{(1)}(\vec{x}_1) \delta^{(1)}(\vec{x}_2) \delta_{r,ct}^{(2)}(\vec{x}_3) \rangle, \quad (4.39)$$

and, since there is a single factor of f , it must come from

$$\delta_{r,ct}^{(2)}(\vec{x}_3) \sim f \hat{z}^i \hat{z}^j \partial_i \tilde{\pi}_{ct,(2)}^j(\vec{x}_3), \quad (4.40)$$

¹⁰The reader may notice that if one were to use μ_3 as one of the angle variables in Eq. (4.38), the factor $(k_1\mu_1 + k_2\mu_2)^2 = k_3^2 \mu_3^2$ in the numerator would cancel the factor of k_3^2 in the denominator. In this case, the novel feature of the expression would be that there is a factor of μ_3^2 upstairs without an accompanying k_3^2 .

so let us consider the various contributions to $\tilde{\pi}_{ct,(2)}^i$ from Eq. (3.4). First of all, only $\partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij}$ and the term with $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k / \partial^2$ have a chance of giving a factor of $1/k_3^2$ because they contain a $1/\partial^2$ acting on two fields whose sum of momenta is $-\vec{k}_3$. However, it cannot come from $\partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij}$ because in the only term that had a chance, $\tau_{ct,(2)}^{ij} \sim c_2 \partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(2)} / \partial^2$, the $1/\partial^2$ is canceled after being hit by ∂_j . So we must have

$$\delta_{r,ct}^{(2)}(\vec{x}_3) \sim f \hat{z}^i \hat{z}^j \partial_i \frac{\partial_j \partial_k \partial_l}{\partial^2} \left(\tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{kl}(\vec{x}_3) + \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}(\vec{x}_3)}{\partial^2} \partial_m \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{lm}(\vec{x}_3) \right). \quad (4.41)$$

Even still, some terms in the expression for $\tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{kl}$ in Eq. (3.9), like $\partial_k \partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(2)} / \partial^2$ and those proportional to δ_{kl} , will not give what we want when plugged into Eq. (4.41), since again, the $1/\partial^2$ gets canceled. However, many will. Consider the term proportional to c_6 in Eq. (3.9). This gives

$$\delta_{r,ct}^{(2)}(\vec{x}_3) \sim f \hat{z}^i \hat{z}^j \partial_i \frac{\partial_j \partial_k \partial_l}{\partial^2} \left(\frac{\partial_k \partial_m \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}(\vec{x}_3)}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_m \partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}(\vec{x}_3)}{\partial^2} \right), \quad (4.42)$$

which in Fourier space, contains the form Eq. (4.38) that we desired. This and similar terms, like c_3 and c_5 that appear in Eq. (4.38), are the origin of the $1/k_3^2$ in Eq. (4.38), and we have pinpointed that it is due to the differential operator $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k / \partial^2$ appearing in the solution for π^i and being contracted in an isotropy-breaking way (*i.e.* with \hat{z}). In terms of the basis $e_i^{F_2}$ that we use, the new non-locally-contributing counterterm enters in $e_1^{F_2}$ and $e_3^{F_2}$ in Eq. (A.50) and originates from the bias basis function $e_7^{K_2}$ in Eq. (D.8).

As a final point, although we have freedom in defining the various operators in the second-order stress tensor Eq. (3.9), notice that the new term $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{jk} / \partial^2$ appears with a fixed coefficient relative to $\partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij}$ in Eq. (3.4). This is important to preserve Galilean invariance, and in fact it is not possible to match the UV structure of the loops if the relative coefficient is made different, because Galilean invariance would be broken. Overall, we find that for the renormalizations of P_{13}^r and B_{411}^r at one loop, the expressions given above give a total of 15 free coefficients, 11 of which are independent, and all 11 of those are needed to match the UV parts of the loops.

4.5 Redshift space counterterms: stochastic terms

The stochastic terms are the final step in fully renormalizing the one-loop power spectrum and bispectrum of dark matter in redshift space, and we follow the same logic as the previous sections. As in Sec. 4.4, we start with $[\pi^i v^j]_R$. Similar to the case in Sec. 3.2, the only explicit counterterms that we have to add, for our purposes, are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{\pi v,(1)}^{ij} &= (aHf)^2 \bar{\rho} \frac{D^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \epsilon_4^{ij}, \\ \mathcal{O}_{\pi v,(2)}^{ij} &= (aHf)^2 \bar{\rho} \frac{D^3}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(\partial_k \epsilon_4^{ij} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \epsilon_5^{ijkl} \frac{\partial_k \partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

The contractions of the stochastic fields should be expanded as in Eq. (3.11) and Eq. (3.12). For dark-matter renormalization, expansion up to k^0 suffices because there are two derivatives acting

on $\mathcal{O}_{\pi v}^{ij}$ in Eq. (4.3) already. Because we include all possible tensor structures in contractions of the stochastic fields, Eq. (4.43) is clearly the most general expression we can have up to second order that obeys the equivalence principle. Again, we find that the UV matching is no longer possible if the coefficients in Eq. (3.7) are modified, showing the importance of correctly including the terms from the dark-matter stress tensor. Additionally, as a followup to the discussion under Eq. (??) for real space, it is now the case in redshift space that UV matching is *not* possible if the numerical coefficients of $\delta_\epsilon^{(2)}$ in Eq. (3.6) are modified (*i.e.* Galilean invariance is broken). As mentioned in Sec. 3.3, the reason that changing the coefficients in $\delta_\epsilon^{(2)}$ in real space did not ruin UV matching was due to the fact that the IR terms simply did not contribute because of invariance of $B_{321}^{(I),\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3)$ under permutations of $(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3)$.

Additionally, new functional forms appear in the UV limits of $B_{321}^{r,(I)}$ and B_{222}^r which can only be captured by the new terms $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{jk} / \partial^2$ (for reasons similar to those in the discussion near Eq. (4.38)) and $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{jk} / \partial^2 - \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}$ (which is zero for the response terms) coming from the momentum-density renormalization. In particular, the UV limits of $B_{321}^{r,(I)}$ and B_{222}^r contain terms, for example, of the form

$$B_{321}^{r,(I)}|_{\text{UV}} \supset \frac{\beta_1 f^3 k_1 \mu_1 k_2^2 \mu_2^2 (k_1 \mu_1 + k_2 \mu_2)^2}{k_1^2 k_2^2 k_3^2} \left(k_1 \mu_1 k_2^2 (k_1^2 - k_2^2 + k_3^2) \right. \\ \left. + k_2 \mu_2 (k_2^2 - k_3^2) (k_1^2 - k_2^2 - k_3^2) \right) P_{11}(k_1) + 2 \text{ perms.} , \quad (4.44)$$

and

$$B_{222}^r|_{\text{UV}} \supset \frac{\beta_2 f^5 k_1^2 \mu_1^2 k_2^2 \mu_2^2 (k_1 \mu_1 + k_2 \mu_2)^2 \left((k_1 \mu_1 + k_2 \mu_2)^2 + k_3^2 (\mu_1^2 + \mu_2^2) \right)}{k_3^2} , \quad (4.45)$$

for some cutoff-dependent (but momentum independent) parameters β_1 and β_2 . Again, these differ from the real-space expressions in Eq. (A.38) and Eq. (A.39) because they are proportional to an overall $1/k_3^2$. For $B_{321}^{r,(I)}$, the reason is exactly the same as the one given in Sec. 4.4 for B_{411}^r , specifically the differential operator $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k / \partial^2$ in Eq. (3.7) applied to two fields whose momenta add up to $-\vec{k}_3$. For B_{222}^r , the explanation is slightly different, since the counterterm $B_{222}^{r,\epsilon}$ (expressions for the counterterm solutions and which loops they renormalize are given in App. A.7) is made from the contraction of first-order stochastic fields. In this case, the $1/k_3^2$ comes from the fact that $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{jk} / \partial^2 - \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}$ is non-zero for the stochastic terms, as explained below Eq. (3.13). In both cases, the difference comes because isotropy is broken in redshift space and indices can be contracted with the line-of-sight direction \hat{z} .

Because dark-matter renormalization of the stochastic terms starts at $\mathcal{O}(k^4)$, there are more independent counterterms than we will find for biased tracers later. For the sake of space, we do not write their explicit expressions in this paper. However, the expressions, along with the values of the EFT coefficients that match the UV limits of stochastic loops, can be found in the accompanying Mathematica file. We write the general formulas, which match the notation of the Mathematica file, here for reference. For the power spectrum and bispectrum counterterms, we

write

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{22}^{r,\epsilon}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) &= \frac{1}{\bar{n}_{\text{DM}}} \sum_{i=1}^5 c_{\text{DM},r,i}^{\text{St}} e_{\text{DM},r,i}^{(22)}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) , \\
\bar{B}_{321}^{r,(I),\epsilon}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3; \hat{z}) &= \frac{1 + f(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{\bar{n}_{\text{DM}}} P_{11}(k_1) \sum_{i=1}^{19} c_{\text{DM},r,i}^{\text{St}} e_{\text{DM},r,i}^{\text{St}}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3; \hat{z}) , \\
B_{222}^{r,\epsilon}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3; \hat{z}) &= \frac{1}{\bar{n}_{\text{DM}}^2} \sum_{i=1}^{10} c_{\text{DM},r,i}^{(222)} e_{\text{DM},r,i}^{(222)}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3; \hat{z}) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

where $\bar{B}_{321}^{r,(I),\epsilon}$ is defined analogously to Eq. (5.47) and $\bar{n}_{\text{DM}} \sim k_{\text{NL}}^3$ is the number density of regions of linear size k_{NL}^{-1} with $\delta \sim 1$. Overall, for $P_{22}^{r,\epsilon}$ and $B_{321}^{r,(I),\epsilon}$, we find 19 free parameters, all of which are needed to match the UV limits of the loops, and for $B_{222}^{r,\epsilon}$, we find 10 free parameters, all of which are needed to match the UV limit of the loop.

5 Biased tracers in redshift space

5.1 General formulas

We start with the general equations needed for the one-loop bispectrum of biased tracers in redshift space (ignoring EFT counterterms for now, which we will return to in Sec. 5.3), which are up to fourth order in perturbations. The overdensity of biased tracers in redshift space, $\delta_{r,h}$ is given by

$$\delta_{r,h}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) = \delta_h(\vec{k}) + \int d^3x e^{-i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} \left(\exp \left[-i \frac{(\hat{z} \cdot \vec{k})}{aH} (\hat{z} \cdot \vec{v}(\vec{x})) \right] - 1 \right) (1 + \delta_h(\vec{x})) , \tag{5.1}$$

where δ_h is the tracer overdensity in real space defined by $\delta_h(\vec{x}) - \langle \delta_h(\vec{x}) \rangle = (\rho_h(\vec{x}) - \bar{\rho}_h) / \bar{\rho}_h$, where $\rho_h(\vec{x})$ is the tracer density, and $\bar{\rho}_h \equiv \langle \rho_h(\vec{x}) \rangle$ is the background tracer density. In Sec. 5.2 we give our explicit bias expansion for δ_h , which will not satisfy $\langle \delta_h(\vec{x}) \rangle = 0$. This means that in Eq. (5.1) we should replace $\delta_h \rightarrow \delta_h - \langle \delta_h \rangle$, which we choose to do explicitly in the renormalized $[\delta_h]_R$ in Sec. 5.3. Also, there is no velocity bias at leading order in derivatives, *i.e.* $\vec{v}_h = \vec{v}$ where \vec{v} is the dark matter velocity. In configuration space this becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{r,h} &= \delta_h - \frac{\hat{z}^i \hat{z}^j}{aH \bar{\rho}_h} \partial_i \pi_h^j + \frac{\hat{z}^i \hat{z}^j \hat{z}^k \hat{z}^l}{2(aH)^2 \bar{\rho}_h} \partial_i \partial_j (\pi_h^k v^l) \\
&\quad - \frac{\prod_{a=1}^6 \hat{z}^{i_a}}{3!(aH)^3 \bar{\rho}_h} \partial_{i_1} \partial_{i_2} \partial_{i_3} (\pi_h^{i_4} v^{i_5} v^{i_6}) + \frac{\prod_{a=1}^8 \hat{z}^{i_a}}{4!(aH)^4 \bar{\rho}_h} \partial_{i_1} \partial_{i_2} \partial_{i_3} \partial_{i_4} (\pi_h^{i_5} v^{i_6} v^{i_7} v^{i_8}) + \dots ,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where the tracer momentum density π_h^i is defined by

$$\pi_h^i \equiv \bar{\rho}_h (1 + \delta_h) v^i . \tag{5.3}$$

As always, we expand in perturbations

$$\delta_{r,h}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) = \delta_{r,h}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) + \delta_{r,h}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) + \delta_{r,h}^{(3)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) + \delta_{r,h}^{(4)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) + \dots \tag{5.4}$$

and define the redshift space kernels $K_n^{r,h}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{r,h}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) &= D(a)K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}; \hat{z})\tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}, \\ \delta_{r,h}^{(n)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) &= D(a)^n \int_{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n}^{\vec{k}} K_n^{r,h}(\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_n; \hat{z})\tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}_1}^{(1)} \dots \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}_n}^{(1)},\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

for $n \geq 2$. The power spectrum $P^{r,h}$ and bispectrum $B^{r,h}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \delta_{r,h}(\vec{k}_1, \hat{z}, a)\delta_{r,h}(\vec{k}_2, \hat{z}, a) \rangle &= (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2) P^{r,h}(k_1, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, a), \\ \langle \delta_{r,h}(\vec{k}_1, \hat{z}, a)\delta_{r,h}(\vec{k}_2, \hat{z}, a)\delta_{r,h}(\vec{k}_3, \hat{z}, a) \rangle &= (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \vec{k}_3) B^{r,h}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}, a).\end{aligned}\tag{5.6}$$

We write the total one-loop power spectrum as

$$P_{\text{1-loop tot.}}^{r,h}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}, a) = D(a)^2 P_{11}^{r,h}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) + D(a)^4 (P_{22}^{r,h}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) + P_{13}^{r,h}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z})),\tag{5.7}$$

where

$$P_{11}^{r,h}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) = K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}; \hat{z})K_1^{r,h}(-\vec{k}; \hat{z})P_{11}(k),\tag{5.8}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}P_{22}^{r,h}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) &= 2 \int_{\vec{q}} K_2^{r,h}(\vec{q}, \vec{k} - \vec{q}; \hat{z})^2 P_{11}(q) P_{11}(|\vec{k} - \vec{q}|), \\ P_{13}^{r,h}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) &= 6 P_{11}(k) K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}; \hat{z}) \int_{\vec{q}} K_3^{r,h}(\vec{q}, -\vec{q}, \vec{k}; \hat{z}) P_{11}(q).\end{aligned}\tag{5.9}$$

The total one-loop bispectrum is

$$B_{\text{1-loop tot.}}^{r,h} = D(a)^4 B_{211}^{r,h} + D(a)^6 \left(B_{222}^{r,h} + B_{321}^{r,h,(I)} + B_{321}^{r,h,(II)} + B_{411}^{r,h} \right),\tag{5.10}$$

where here and below we suppress the argument $(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z})$ of the bispectra terms to remove clutter. The tree-level bispectrum is

$$B_{211}^{r,h} = 2K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z})K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}_2; \hat{z})K_2^{r,h}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2; \hat{z})P_{11}(k_1)P_{11}(k_2) + 2 \text{ perms.},\tag{5.11}$$

and the one-loop contributions are

$$\begin{aligned}B_{222}^{r,h} &= 8 \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q) P_{11}(|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) P_{11}(|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|) \\ &\quad \times K_2^{r,h}(-\vec{q}, \vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}; \hat{z}) K_2^{r,h}(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}, \vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}; \hat{z}) K_2^{r,h}(\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}, \vec{q}; \hat{z}), \\ B_{321}^{r,h,(I)} &= 6 P_{11}(k_1) K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z}) \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q) P_{11}(|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) \\ &\quad \times K_3^{r,h}(-\vec{q}, -\vec{k}_2 + \vec{q}, -\vec{k}_1; \hat{z}) K_2^{r,h}(\vec{q}, \vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}; \hat{z}) + 5 \text{ perms.}, \\ B_{321}^{r,h,(II)} &= 6 P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2) K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z}) K_2^{r,h}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q) K_3^{r,h}(\vec{k}_2, \vec{q}, -\vec{q}; \hat{z}) + 5 \text{ perms.}, \\ B_{411}^{r,h} &= 12 P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2) K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z}) K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) \int_{\vec{q}} P_{11}(q) K_4^{r,h}(\vec{q}, -\vec{q}, -\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) + 2 \text{ perms.}.\end{aligned}\tag{5.12}$$

For details on how to evaluate the above integrals, see App. B.

5.2 Bias expansion to fourth order

With the general expressions for tracers in redshift space in hand, we turn next to the bias expansion, which is the missing piece from Eq. (5.2). For notational convenience, we define all of the perturbations, kernels, power spectra, and bispectra for tracers in real space using the notation in Sec. 5.1, but with subscripts or superscripts ‘ r, h ’ replaced by ‘ h .’ From Eq. (5.2), we see that the tracer quantities in real space can be obtained from the respective quantities in redshift space by setting $f = 0$.

As has been previously laid out in [7], by the equivalence principle the tracer overdensity δ_h can only depend on second derivatives of the gravitational potential and first derivatives of the velocity field, as well as higher derivative and stochastic terms. Additionally, since the tracer overdensity depends on these fields in a non-local-in-time way, we integrate over time along the fluid element \vec{x}_fl . In summary we can schematically write the tracer overdensity as

$$\delta_h(\vec{x}, t) = \int^t dt' H(t') f_h \left(\partial_i \partial_j \Phi(\vec{x}_\text{fl}, t'), \partial_i v^j(\vec{x}_\text{fl}, t'), \frac{\partial^i x_\text{fl}}{k_M}, \epsilon(\vec{x}_\text{fl}, t'), t' \right) \Big|_{\vec{x}_\text{fl}=\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, t, t')}, \quad (5.13)$$

where f_h is some complicated function describing tracer clustering, \vec{x}_fl is given by

$$\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, t, t') = \vec{x} + \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt''}{a(t'')} \vec{v}(\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, t, t''), t''), \quad (5.14)$$

and k_M is the scale controlling the clustering of the tracer.¹¹

As has been subsequently shown in [9, 10], using the approach of [14] (*i.e.* defining linear combinations of the dark-matter fields) still results in functional degeneracies, and so we will build our bias expansion straight from the contractions of the underlying fields and systematically remove degeneracies in a second step. For the remainder of this subsection we will only focus on the lowest-derivative, non-stochastic, real-space, bias terms and we include higher-derivative real-space and redshift-space EFT counterterms and stochastic terms in Sec. 5.3 and Sec. 5.4.

To make sure we include all possible operators, we consider all possible scalar contractions of $\partial_i \partial_j \Phi$ and $\partial_i v^j$. With \mathcal{O} representing any scalar of Galilean transformations and rotations, such as δ , $\partial_i v^i$, $\partial_i \partial_j \Phi \partial_i \partial_j \Phi$, etc., we have the general expansion

$$\delta_h(\vec{x}, t) = \sum_{\mathcal{O}} \int^t dt' H(t') c_{\mathcal{O}}(t, t') \mathcal{O}(\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, t, t'), t'), \quad (5.15)$$

and we give the full list of the operators \mathcal{O} needed to go to fourth order in fields in Eq. (C.3). The $c_{\mathcal{O}}(t, t')$ are incalculable (within the EFT) time kernels describing the non-locality in time. We then Taylor expand the operators evaluated at \vec{x}_fl around \vec{x} . Going up to order N (for this work we are interested in $N = 4$), and assuming growing mode solutions, an operator \mathcal{O}_m starting at m -th order has Taylor expansion [1]

$$\mathcal{O}_m(\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, t, t'), t') \Big|_N = \sum_{\alpha=m}^N \left(\frac{D(t')}{D(t)} \right)^\alpha \left(\sum_{n=\alpha}^N \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O}_m, \alpha-(m-1)}^{(n)}(\vec{x}, t) \right), \quad (5.16)$$

¹¹This is to distinguish it from k_{NL} , which is the scale controlling dark-matter clustering. However, for simplicity in this paper, we let $k_M = k_{\text{NL}}$. The difference is easily restored if desired.

where the notation $|_N$ means expansion up to and including N -th order in fields, the $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O}_m,i}^{(n)}$ are all n -th order in fields, and the index i labels different descendants of \mathcal{O}_m at order n . The Taylor expansion in the fluid element up to fourth order for general operators \mathcal{O} is derived in App. C.2. Furthermore, given that in the above equation, the full t' dependence is isolated in powers of the growth factor, we can symbolically do the time integrals in Eq. (5.15), allowing us to define

$$c_{\mathcal{O}_m,\alpha-(m-1)}(t) \equiv \int^t dt' H(t') c_{\mathcal{O}_m}(t, t') \left(\frac{D(t')}{D(t)} \right)^\alpha, \quad (5.17)$$

and therefore the sum Eq. (5.15) becomes

$$\delta_h(\vec{x}, t) \Big|_N = \sum_{\mathcal{O}_m} \sum_{\alpha=m}^N c_{\mathcal{O}_m,\alpha-(m-1)}(t) \left(\sum_{n=\alpha}^N \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O}_m,\alpha-(m-1)}^{(n)}(\vec{x}, t) \right), \quad (5.18)$$

up to order N .

Doing this for all operators allowed by the equivalence principle (Eq. (C.3)), we obtain Eq. (C.9). However this expansion is overcomplete, as the $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O}_m,i}^{(n)}$ are not linearly independent. A full list of degeneracies is given in Eq. (C.11). We then obtain the final bias expansion up to fourth order

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_h(\vec{x}, t) = & b_1 \left(\mathbb{C}_{\delta,1}^{(1)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{\delta,1}^{(2)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{\delta,1}^{(3)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{\delta,1}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) \right) \\ & + b_2 \left(\mathbb{C}_{\delta,2}^{(2)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{\delta,2}^{(3)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{\delta,2}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) \right) + b_3 \left(\mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(3)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) \right) \\ & + b_4 \mathbb{C}_{\delta,4}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) + b_5 \left(\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(2)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(3)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) \right) \\ & + b_6 \left(\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(3)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) \right) + b_7 \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) + b_8 \left(\mathbb{C}_{r^2,2}^{(3)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{r^2,2}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) \right) \\ & + b_9 \mathbb{C}_{r^2,3}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) + b_{10} \left(\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(3)}(\vec{x}, t) + \mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) \right) + b_{11} \mathbb{C}_{r^3,2}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) \\ & + b_{12} \mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) + b_{13} \mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) + b_{14} \mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) + b_{15} \mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t), \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

which through the procedure defined above, is the minimal set of linearly independent functions for the bias expansion up to fourth order. This parameterization is the same as the one used in the data analysis of [1]. The operators up to third order are the same as in the basis of [9, 10], except that we use $\mathbb{C}_{r^2,2}^{(3)} = \mathbb{C}_{s^2,2}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(3)}$, as it was easier to generalize. The new fourth order $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O}_m,i}^{(4)}$ are explicitly given in App. C.4, and expressions for $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O}_m,i}^{(n)}$ for $n \leq 3$ can be found in [9, 10]. In this way, our expression Eq. (5.19) extends the so-called basis of descendants to fourth order. The dark-matter kernels are obtained by setting $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = 1$, with all of the other bias parameters equal to zero. A bias expansion to fourth order in real space was also given in [37, 38], and has the same number of bias parameters as Eq. (5.19).

The procedure described above ensures that we include all possible operators, including those related to non-locality in time. However, it is interesting to compare the basis of functions in Eq. (5.19) to what one would get assuming a strictly local-in-time expansion, which in Eq. (5.15) corresponds to setting $c_{\mathcal{O}}(t, t') = c_{\mathcal{O}}(t)\delta_D(t-t')/H(t)$ and not including any convective derivatives

in the set of operators \mathcal{O} included. As we show explicitly in App. C.3, up to fourth order, the two expansions are mathematically equivalent.¹²

In terms of the bias parameters in Eq. (5.19), we have the following dependencies of perturbative contributions

$$\begin{aligned} P_{11}^{r,h}[b_1], \quad P_{13}^{r,h}[b_1, b_3, b_8], \quad P_{22}^{r,h}[b_1, b_2, b_5], \quad B_{321}^{r,h,(I)}[b_1, b_2, b_3, b_5, b_6, b_8, b_{10}], \\ B_{211}^{r,h}[b_1, b_2, b_5], \quad B_{321}^{r,h,(II)}[b_1, b_2, b_3, b_5, b_8], \quad B_{411}^{r,h}[b_1, \dots, b_{11}], \quad B_{222}^{r,h}[b_1, b_2, b_5], \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

where

$$P_{11}^{r,h}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) = (b_1 + f(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{z})^2) P_{11}(k), \quad (5.22)$$

is the famous Kaiser result from linear theory, for example. In general, we have the following dependencies of the kernels on the bias parameters

$$K_1^{r,h}[b_1], \quad K_2^{r,h}[b_1, b_2, b_5], \quad K_3^{r,h}[b_1, b_2, b_3, b_5, b_6, b_8, b_{10}], \quad \text{and} \quad K_4^{r,h}[b_1, \dots, b_{15}]. \quad (5.23)$$

Notice that the diagrams $P_{13}^{r,h}$, $B_{321}^{r,h,(II)}$, and $B_{411}^{r,h}$ depend on less bias parameters than the kernels in Eq. (5.23) would suggest. This happens because, in the particular momentum configuration of the kernels that enter the loops in Eq. (5.9) and Eq. (5.12), some bias parameters can be removed with bias redefinitions. Let us explain this in detail.

To the order that we work in this paper, we have

$$\langle \delta_h(\vec{x}) \rangle \approx \langle \delta_h^{(2)}(\vec{x}) \rangle = \int_{\vec{q}} K_2^h(\vec{q}, -\vec{q}) P_{11}(q) = \frac{-b_1 + b_2 + b_5}{2\pi^2} \int dq q^2 P_{11}(q), \quad (5.24)$$

which as mentioned below in Sec. 5.3, we will explicitly subtract when renormalizing δ_h . We also note that since number and momentum are not conserved for tracers, the loops $P_{13}^{r,h}$, $B_{411}^{r,h}$, and $B_{321}^{r,h,(II)}$ start at k^0 (as opposed to k^2 for dark matter) as $k \rightarrow 0$. As described in [39, 14], this is best understood as the renormalization of lower-order bias parameters. We explicitly find that the redefinitions

$$b_1 \rightarrow b_1 + \frac{13b_1 + 34b_2 - 47b_3 + 42b_5 - 110b_6 - 82b_8 - 63b_{10}}{42\pi^2} \int dq q^2 P_{11}(q), \quad (5.25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_2 \rightarrow b_2 - \frac{1}{1260\pi^2} (-469b_1 - 96b_2 - 1099b_3 + 1664b_4 - 1260b_6 + 3554b_7 - 2520b_8 \\ + 5150b_9 + 6489b_{11} + 1890b_{12} + 5691b_{13} + 2205b_{15}) \int dq q^2 P_{11}(q), \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

¹²We disagree with some references, including [8, 37], which have claimed that the local-in-time expansion in terms of $\partial_i \partial_j \Phi$ and $\partial_i v^j$ is not sufficient as a fourth-order basis. For example, they mention a term that they write as $\text{tr}(\Pi^{[1]}\Pi^{[3]})$ which they claim cannot be written in the local-in-time basis. However, we explicitly find that, in terms of the basis of descendants that we use in this work,

$$\text{tr}(\Pi^{[1]}\Pi^{[3]}) = -\frac{21}{8}\mathbb{C}_{r^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{17}{6}\mathbb{C}_{r^3,2}^{(4)} + \frac{1925}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,4}^{(4)} + \frac{441}{64}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{51}{16}\mathbb{C}_{r^3\delta,1}^{(4)} - \frac{15015}{128}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} + \frac{1729}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{12681}{128}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)}. \quad (5.20)$$

Because we find the basis of descendants equivalent to the local-in-time basis, this means that $\text{tr}(\Pi^{[1]}\Pi^{[3]})$ can be written in the local-in-time basis (which by definition is also local in space).

and

$$\begin{aligned}
b_5 \rightarrow b_5 + \frac{1}{8820\pi^2} & \left(-1001b_1 + 3876b_2 + 1729b_3 - 4604b_4 + 5460b_5 + 14280b_6 \right. \\
& - 34214b_7 - 7140b_8 - 7250b_9 + 13230b_{10} + 17451b_{11} - 56070b_{12} \\
& \left. - 1911b_{13} - 26460b_{14} + 6615b_{15} \right) \int dq q^2 P_{11}(q) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

absorb the k^0 UV limits of these loops. After these redefinitions, b_{12} , b_{14} , and b_{15} are eliminated from our observables. Additionally, once the k^0 pieces are removed from the terms proportional to b_7 and b_{13} in particular, these two operators become degenerate, and so b_{13} can also be set to zero.

5.3 Renormalization of biased tracers in redshift space

In some ways, renormalization of biased tracers is more straightforward than dark matter because there are no equations of motion to solve, one simply writes all of the terms relevant for the final expressions. On top of this, we express the contact operators of redshift-space distortions in terms of the long-wavelength fields. We start directly with the renormalized operators that enter redshift space (the same as Eq. (4.17) but with $\bar{\rho} \rightarrow \bar{\rho}_h$ and $\delta \rightarrow \delta_h$)

$$\begin{aligned}
[\delta_h]_R &= \delta_h + \mathcal{O}_{\delta_h} , \\
[\pi_h^i]_R &= \rho_h v^i + v^i \mathcal{O}_{\rho_h} + \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h^i} , \\
[\pi_h^i v^j]_R &= \rho_h v^i v^j + v^i v^j \mathcal{O}_{\rho_h} + v^i \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h^j}^i + v^j \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h^i}^j + \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v}^{ij} , \\
[\pi_h^i v^j v^k]_R &= \rho_h v^i v^j v^k + v^i v^j v^k \mathcal{O}_{\rho_h} + (v^i v^j \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h^k}^i + 2 \text{ perms.}) + (v^i \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v}^{jk} + 2 \text{ perms.}) + \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v^2}^{ijk} , \\
[\pi_h^i v^j v^k v^l]_R &= \rho_h v^i v^j v^k v^l + v^i v^j v^k v^l \mathcal{O}_{\rho_h} + (v^i v^j v^k \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h^l}^i + 3 \text{ perms.}) \\
&\quad + (v^i v^j \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v}^{kl} + 5 \text{ perms.}) + (v^i \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v^2}^{jkl} + 3 \text{ perms.}) + \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v^3}^{ijkl} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

where again, all of the \mathcal{O} terms are Galilean scalars, and we specifically have $\mathcal{O}_{\rho_h} \equiv \bar{\rho}_h \mathcal{O}_{\delta_h}$, which is the higher-derivative halo bias or counterterms. Although π_h^i may seem to not be a composite operator, in terms of v^i , it is given by the composite expression Eq. (5.3), and so must also be renormalized. Note that we choose to include the non-zero mean of δ_h in the renormalized $[\delta_h]_R$, so that $\mathcal{O}_{\delta_h} \supset -\langle \delta_h \rangle$. The non-trivial step now is to understand how non-locally-contributing terms containing the differential operator $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k / \partial^2$ in the renormalization of π^i enter the renormalization for biased tracers. In the dark-matter case, the form is dictated entirely by having a local stress tensor τ^{ij} and solving the equations of motion. However, biased tracers do not have an explicit equation of motion from which to derive the form of all of the counterterms.

To proceed, we write the renormalization of the tracer momentum density in terms of the dark-matter momentum density, which we know from Sec. 3 and contains the new non-locally-contributing counterterm. The term $\mathcal{O}_{\pi_h^i}^i$ in Eq. (5.28) gives the counterterms that we explicitly add to the renormalized tracer density $[\pi_h^i]_R$, so we would like to write that in terms of dark-matter quantities. By the equivalence principle, we know that [7, 8, 11]

$$[v_h^i - v^i]_R = \mathcal{O}_{\Delta v}^i , \tag{5.29}$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta v}^i$ is a higher-derivative Galilean scalar built of spatially-local products of $\partial_i \partial_j \Phi$ and $\partial_i v^j$, that vanishes when the wavenumber of $[v_h^i - v^i]_R$ goes to zero. Now, we recall that the renormalized velocity is given by [27]

$$[v^i]_R = \frac{[\pi^i]_R}{[\rho]_R} + \mathcal{O}_{v,HD}^i, \quad (5.30)$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{v,HD}^i$ are the standard higher-derivative Galilean scalar counterterms used when defining the renormalized velocity of dark matter, which arise because v^i is a contact operator in terms of π^i and ρ (for the same reason as described in Sec. 4.2). Using an analogous expression to Eq. (5.30) for $[v_h^i]_R$, and plugging $[v^i]_R$ and $[v_h^i]_R$ into Eq. (5.29) gives

$$[\pi_h^i]_R = \frac{[\rho_h]_R}{[\rho]_R} [\pi^i]_R + [\rho_h]_R (\mathcal{O}_{\Delta v}^i - \mathcal{O}_{v_h,HD}^i + \mathcal{O}_{v,HD}^i), \quad (5.31)$$

which using Eq. (4.17) and Eq. (5.28) to plug in the expressions for $[\pi^i]_R$ and $[\pi_h^i]_R$ implies

$$(\rho_h + \mathcal{O}_{\rho_h})v^i + \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h}^i = \frac{[\rho_h]_R}{[\rho]_R} ((\rho + \mathcal{O}_\rho)v^i + \mathcal{O}_\pi^i) + [\rho_h]_R (\mathcal{O}_{\Delta v}^i - \mathcal{O}_{v_h,HD}^i + \mathcal{O}_{v,HD}^i). \quad (5.32)$$

Finally, using $\rho + \mathcal{O}_\rho = [\rho]_R$ and $\rho_h + \mathcal{O}_{\rho_h} = [\rho_h]_R$, we have

$$\mathcal{O}_{\pi_h}^i = \bar{\rho}_h (1 + \delta_h + \mathcal{O}_{\delta_h}) \left(\frac{\mathcal{O}_\pi^i}{\bar{\rho}(1 + \delta + \mathcal{O}_\delta)} + \mathcal{O}_{\Delta v}^i - \mathcal{O}_{v_h,HD}^i + \mathcal{O}_{v,HD}^i \right). \quad (5.33)$$

On the right-hand side of the above expression, \mathcal{O}_π^i is already the solution for the dark-matter momentum in terms of the local stress tensor (see Eq. (4.25) and Eq. (3.4)), and so contains the non-locally-contributing Green's function. The other terms $\mathcal{O}_{\Delta v}^i$, $\mathcal{O}_{v_h,HD}^i$, and $\mathcal{O}_{v,HD}^i$, are local functions of the dark-matter fields, so \mathcal{O}_π^i is the only term with non-locally-contributing terms already at field level. Thus, we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}_{\pi_h}^i|_{\text{NLC}}}{\bar{\rho}_h} = \frac{1 + \delta_h + \mathcal{O}_{\delta_h}}{1 + \delta + \mathcal{O}_\delta} \frac{\mathcal{O}_\pi^i|_{\text{NLC}}}{\bar{\rho}}, \quad (5.34)$$

where $\mathcal{O}|_{\text{NLC}}$ stands for the non-locally-contributing terms in \mathcal{O} . Thus, we see that, because of the equivalence principle and locality of the renormalization of contact operators, the non-locally-contributing counterterms in $[\pi_h^i]_R$ are determined by those in $[\pi^i]_R$ (and the ratio of renormalized densities $[\delta]_R$ and $[\delta_h]_R$).

We now specialize to the order relevant to this paper. The non-locally-contributing counterterms start at second order in fields in \mathcal{O}_π^i , so we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}_{\pi_h,(2)}^i|_{\text{NLC}}}{\bar{\rho}_h} = \frac{\mathcal{O}_{\pi,(2)}^i|_{\text{NLC}}}{\bar{\rho}} + \dots, \quad (5.35)$$

where the \dots above stand for higher order terms (note that we have also left off the constant contribution $\langle \delta_h \rangle$ from \mathcal{O}_{δ_h} since $\langle \delta_h \rangle$ counts as two powers of $\delta^{(1)}$, as can be seen from Eq. (5.24)). Then, since it is actually the ratios $\mathcal{O}_\pi^i/\bar{\rho}$ for dark matter and $\mathcal{O}_{\pi_h}^i/\bar{\rho}_h$ for tracers that enters the renormalization of the redshift-space overdensity (as can be seen from Eq. (4.3) and Eq. (5.2)),

this means that the relevant EFT coefficients for dark matter and tracers are actually equal at this order. This fact has some intriguing consequences. First, measurement of this quantity in galaxy clustering data is a direct measurement of the underlying dark-matter properties. In fact, one can also imagine using dark-matter simulations directly to set expectations for the size of this parameter, since it is unaffected by the bias. Any mismatch between the measured value and the value expected from dark matter would point to a violation of the equivalence principle or locality. Second, since this EFT coefficient is the same for all tracers, the common value should enter any analysis of multiple tracers or sky patches at the same redshift, thus reducing the number of overall parameters of the theory. Finally, the same parameter will enter any lensing analysis (which only depends on the overall mass distribution, dominated by dark matter), thus again reducing the number of parameters of the theory and providing interesting physical consistency checks. We leave exploration of these exciting topics to future work.

5.4 Biased tracers in redshift space counterterms

We can now write down the most general local-in-space counterterms in a derivative expansion of $\partial_i \partial_j \Phi$ and $\partial_i v^j$, up to second order, that obey the symmetries of the problem, which are rotation and Galilean invariance. We focus on the first few orders in derivatives, which, because number and momentum of galaxies is not conserved, is $\mathcal{O}(k^2 P_{11})$ for P_{13} , $\mathcal{O}(k^2 P_{11}^2)$ for $B_{411}^{r,h}$ and $B_{321}^{r,h,(II)}$, $\mathcal{O}(k^0)$ and $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ for $P_{22}^{r,h}$, $\mathcal{O}(k^0)$ and $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ for $B_{222}^{r,h}$, and $\mathcal{O}(k^0 P_{11})$ and $\mathcal{O}(k^2 P_{11})$ for $B_{321}^{r,h,(I)}$. The $\mathcal{O}(k^0 P_{11})$ in $P_{13}^{r,h}$ and $\mathcal{O}(k^0 P_{11}^2)$ in $B_{411}^{r,h}$ and $B_{321}^{r,h,(II)}$ are taken care of by shifts in the bias parameters in Sec. 5.2.

For the response terms, we include the counterterms

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{k_{\text{NL}}^2 \mathcal{O}_{\rho h}}{\bar{\rho}_h} = & D^3 c_1^h \partial^2 \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} + D^4 \left(c_1^h \partial_i \partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_2^h \partial^2 \tilde{\delta}^{(2)} - c_2^h \partial_i \partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \right. \\ & \left. + c_3^h \partial^2 (\tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}) + c_4^h \partial^2 \left(\frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \right) + c_5^h \partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{k_{\text{NL}}^2 \mathcal{O}_{\pi h}^i}{\bar{\rho}_h a H f} = & D^3 c_1^\pi \partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} + D^4 \left(c_1^\pi \partial_j \partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_2^\pi \partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(2)} - c_2^\pi \partial_j \partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \right. \\ & \left. + c_3^\pi \partial_i (\tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}) + c_4^\pi \partial_i \left(\frac{\partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \right) + c_5^\pi \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \left(\frac{\partial_j \partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_l \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{k_{\text{NL}}^2 \mathcal{O}_{\pi h v}^{ij}}{\bar{\rho}_h (a H f)^2} = & D^2 \delta_{ij} c_0^{\pi v} + D^3 \left(c_1^{\pi v} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_3^{\pi v} \delta_{ij} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \right) + D^4 \left(c_1^{\pi v} \partial_k \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \right. \\ & + c_3^{\pi v} \delta_{ij} \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_2^{\pi v} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(2)}}{\partial^2} - c_2^{\pi v} \partial_k \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_4^{\pi v} \delta_{ij} \tilde{\delta}^{(2)} \\ & \left. - c_4^{\pi v} \delta_{ij} \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_5^{\pi v} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_6^{\pi v} \frac{\partial_i \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + c_7^{\pi v} \delta_{ij} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \tilde{\delta}^{(1)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.38)$$

We cannot write down any terms in $\mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v^2}^{ijk}$ or $\mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v^3}^{ijkl}$ that are Galilean scalars and contribute at the order that we work. In addition to the terms explicitly written above, we also need to include the terms in Eq. (5.28) that are inherited from the Galilean transformation properties. The ones that contribute to the order that we work are $v^i \mathcal{O}_{\rho_h}$, $v^i \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h}^j + v^j \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h}^i$, ($v^i \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v}^{jk} + 2$ perms.), and ($v^i v^j \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v}^{kl} + 5$ perms.). Also, notice that the last two terms just mentioned here are only present because we allow a constant piece in $\mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v}^{ij}$.

We also point out the presence of the new non-locally-contributing counterterm proportional to c_5^π , which is included with a free coefficient following the argument in Sec. 5.3 and is indeed needed to match the UV limit of $B_{411}^{r,h}$, for example.¹³ A nice check of Eq. (5.35) is to consider the UV matching with SPT loops, and compare the matching of coefficients for the non-locally-contributing terms in $\mathcal{O}_{\pi_h}^i / \bar{\rho}_h$ for biased tracers and $\mathcal{O}_\pi^i / \bar{\rho}$ for dark matter. For biased tracers this comes from c_5^π , and for dark matter this comes from c_1 , c_2 , c_3 , c_5 , and c_6 , as mentioned under Eq. (3.18). Specifically, decomposing the dark-matter terms in Eq. (3.9) into the biased tracer basis in Eq. (5.37), we find that $\mathcal{O}_{\pi_h(2)}^i |_{\text{NLC}} / \bar{\rho} = \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h(2)}^i |_{\text{NLC}} / \bar{\rho}_h$ implies $c_5^\pi = (2/99)(2c_1 - c_2 + c_3 - c_5 - c_6)$, which is indeed true for the UV matching that we found in Eq. (D.9) and Eq. (A.36).

For the stochastic terms, we include the counterterms

$$\frac{k_{\text{NL}}^2 \mathcal{O}_{\rho_h}}{\bar{\rho}_h} = D^2 \epsilon_1 + D^3 \left(\partial_i \epsilon_1 \frac{\partial_i \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \epsilon_3^{ij} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \epsilon_4^{ijk} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \epsilon_5^{ijkl} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \right), \quad (5.39)$$

$$\frac{k_{\text{NL}}^2 \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h}^i}{\bar{\rho}_h a H f} = D^2 \epsilon_6^i + D^3 \left(\partial_j \epsilon_6^i \frac{\partial_j \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \epsilon_8^{ijk} \frac{\partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \epsilon_9^{ijkl} \frac{\partial_j \partial_k \partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \left(\epsilon_{13}^{jl} \frac{\partial_l \partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \right) \right), \quad (5.40)$$

and

$$\frac{k_{\text{NL}}^2 \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v}^{ij}}{\bar{\rho}_h (a H f)^2} = D^2 \epsilon_{10}^{ij} + D^3 \left(\partial_k \epsilon_{10}^{ij} \frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} + \epsilon_{12}^{ijkl} \frac{\partial_k \partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \right). \quad (5.41)$$

In addition to the terms explicitly written above, we also need to include the terms in Eq. (5.28) that are inherited from the Galilean transformation properties. The ones that contribute to the order that we work are $v^i \mathcal{O}_{\rho_h}$, $v^i \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h}^j + v^j \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h}^i$, ($v^i \mathcal{O}_{\pi_h v}^{jk} + 2$ perms.). The correlations of the stochastic fields $\epsilon_n^{ij\dots}$ are computed analogously to those in Sec. 3.2, but expanded to the appropriate order in k to match the terms that we are renormalizing. Again, we point out the presence of the new non-locally-contributing counterterm containing ϵ_{13}^{jl} which has the form discussed in Sec. 5.3 and is indeed needed to match the UV of $B_{321}^{r,h,(I)}$. Note also that above we have included the flow terms so that we have the correct IR limit Eq. (4.26) for Galilean scalars. These were obtained in the same way as in Sec. 3.2, which is a generalization of [7] (with the clarification in App. A.5 for the stochastic terms) to different tensor structures. The above list of counterterms is the full set of independent terms with given tensor structures (at the order in fields and derivatives that

¹³Even though c_5^π is determined by the dark-matter value, this is still an unknown number for the sake of galaxy-clustering data analysis, which justifies the choice in [1] to treat it as a free parameter.

we consider) that are Galilean scalars so that the theory satisfies the equivalence principle, and therefore it is the minimal complete set one can consider.

Putting this all together, we reach the form of the counterterms used in [1]. Quantities and contributions to observables are defined in App. D.1. Explicitly, the above leads to the following forms of the kernels and contractions. Starting with the response terms, we have

$$K_1^{r,h,ct}(\vec{k}; \hat{z}) = \frac{k^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(-c_1^h + \left(c_1^\pi - \frac{1}{2} c_3^{\pi v} f \right) f(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{z})^2 - \frac{1}{2} c_1^{\pi v} f^2(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{z})^4 \right). \quad (5.42)$$

We expand $K_2^{r,h,ct}$ in the following way

$$K_2^{r,h,ct}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) = \sum_{i=1}^{14} \alpha_i e_i^{K_2}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2; \hat{z}), \quad (5.43)$$

with

$$\alpha_i = \{c_1^h, c_2^h, c_3^h, c_4^h, c_5^h, c_1^\pi, c_5^\pi, c_1^{\pi v}, c_2^{\pi v}, c_3^{\pi v}, c_4^{\pi v}, c_5^{\pi v}, c_6^{\pi v}, c_7^{\pi v}\}, \quad (5.44)$$

and the basis elements $e_i^{K_2}$ and UV matching are given in App. D.2, where one can see that the new non-locally-contributing counterterm enters through the term $c_5^\pi e_7^{K_2}$ in $K_2^{r,h,ct}$. We have found that the EFT parameters $\{c_2^\pi, c_3^\pi, c_4^\pi, c_0^{\pi v}\}$ are degenerate with other EFT parameters included above for the expressions for $K_1^{r,h,ct}$ and $K_2^{r,h,ct}$; this of course may not be true when including higher order kernels.

For the stochastic terms, we have (where \bar{n} is the tracer number density)

$$P_{22}^{r,h,\epsilon}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) = \frac{1}{\bar{n}} \left(c_1^{\text{St}} + c_2^{\text{St}} \frac{k^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} + c_3^{\text{St}} \frac{k^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} f(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{z})^2 \right), \quad (5.45)$$

and

$$B_{321}^{r,h,(I),\epsilon} = \bar{B}_{321}^{r,h,(I),\epsilon}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3; \hat{z}) + \bar{B}_{321}^{r,h,(I),\epsilon}(\vec{k}_3, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) + \bar{B}_{321}^{r,h,(I),\epsilon}(\vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3, \vec{k}_1; \hat{z}), \quad (5.46)$$

where we have defined

$$\bar{B}_{321}^{r,h,(I),\epsilon}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3; \hat{z}) = \langle \tilde{\delta}_{r,h}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_1, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_2, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}_3, \hat{z}) \rangle' + \langle \tilde{\delta}_{r,h}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_1, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_3, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}_2, \hat{z}) \rangle'. \quad (5.47)$$

Then, we have

$$\bar{B}_{321}^{r,h,(I),\epsilon}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3; \hat{z}) = \frac{b_1 + f(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{\bar{n}} P_{11}(k_1) \sum_{i=1}^{13} c_i^{\text{St}} e_i^{\text{St}}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3; \hat{z}), \quad (5.48)$$

with $e_3^{\text{St}} = 0$; the basis elements e_i^{St} and UV matching is given in App. D.3. In particular, the new non-locally-contributing counterterm enters through e_{13}^{St} .¹⁴ Recall that the renormalization of $B_{222}^{r,h}$

¹⁴Note that Eq. (5.35) also in principle implies a relationship between the non-locally-contributing stochastic terms of dark matter (in Eq. (3.7)) and tracers (ϵ_{13}^{ij} in Eq. (5.40)). However, since the dark-matter non-linear term is contracted with other dark-matter stochastic terms and the tracer non-linear term is contracted with other tracer stochastic terms, the resulting EFT coefficients after contractions will in general be different. Non-trivial relationships may result at higher orders in perturbation theory, for example when the non-locally-contributing terms contract with themselves.

involves three-point functions of the stochastic fields, which can in general be independent from the two-point functions (but they can be related after assuming a Poisson distribution, which is a reasonable assumption). We find

$$B_{222}^{r,h,\epsilon} = \frac{1}{\bar{n}^2} \left(c_1^{(222)} + \frac{1}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(c_2^{(222)} (k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2) + c_5^{(222)} \hat{z}^i \hat{z}^j \left(k_1^i k_2^j + k_1^i k_3^j + k_2^i k_3^j \right) \right) \right), \quad (5.49)$$

which indeed is the most general function up to $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$, symmetric in $\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3\}$, that can be made out of contractions of these vectors, when momentum conservation $\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \vec{k}_3 = 0$ is considered.

For convenience, we quote here the dependencies of the counterterm quantities on biases and EFT parameters

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{13}^{r,h,ct} [b_1, c_1^h, c_1^\pi, c_1^{\pi v}, c_3^{\pi v}], \quad P_{22}^{r,h,\epsilon} [c_1^{\text{St}}, c_2^{\text{St}}, c_3^{\text{St}}], \\ & B_{321}^{r,h,(II),ct} [b_1, b_2, b_5, c_1^h, c_1^\pi, c_1^{\pi v}, c_3^{\pi v}], \quad B_{321}^{r,h,(I),\epsilon} [b_1, c_1^{\text{St}}, c_2^{\text{St}}, \{c_i^{\text{St}}\}_{i=4,\dots,13}], \\ & B_{411}^{r,h,ct} [b_1, \{c_i^h\}_{i=1,\dots,5}, c_1^\pi, c_5^\pi, \{c_j^{\pi v}\}_{j=1,\dots,7}], \quad B_{222}^{r,h,\epsilon} [c_1^{(222)}, c_2^{(222)}, c_5^{(222)}]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.50)$$

Thus, overall, to the order that we work in this paper, we have 11 independent bias parameters, 14 independent response counterterms, and 16 independent stochastic counterterms. For a conversion from the parameters used in this paper to those used in `PyBird`, see App. D.4.

Note Added: While this paper was being prepared, [40] appeared which also computed the one-loop bispectrum for tracers in redshift space. It seems to us that there are a few crucial differences in the theory model, though. First, it does not appear that [40] takes into account the non-locally-contributing counterterms. For the response terms, for us, this shows up through $e_7^{K_2}$ as a contribution to $K_2^{r,h,ct}$ that has a dependence on \vec{k}_3 going like $k_3^0 \mu_3^2$, whereas [40] seems to only have $k_3^2 \mu_3^4$ in their Z_2^{ctr} (which we also have from $e_9^{K_2}$). For the stochastic terms, for us, this shows up in $\bar{B}_{321}^{r,h,(I),\epsilon}$ through e_{13}^{St} as a dependence going like $k_3^0 \mu_3^2$, whereas [40] does not seem to have a term with this dependence in their $B_{\text{stoch}}^{k^2 P \bar{n}^{-1}}$. Second, it does not seem to us that the renormalization of contact operators for redshift space in [40] preserves the relevant Galilean transformation properties. For example, assuming that the \mathcal{O} operators in [40] do not contain explicit factors of the velocity (which is what is said to be assumed there), this should imply that their $\mathcal{O}_{u^2}^{(1),i} = \mathcal{O}_u^i$. However, it seems to us that their Eq. C.4 implies a non-zero \mathcal{O}_u^i , but Eq. C.5 has $\mathcal{O}_{u^2}^{(1),i} = 0$. Upon comparison to simulations in [40], the model of [40] seems to require a significant theoretical error at $k_{\text{max}} = 0.2 h \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ for the BOSS survey, while [1] (which uses the model presented in this paper) has a negligible theoretical error up to $k_{\text{max}} = 0.23 h \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. This difference could point to the importance and advantage of using the fully correct physical model.

Acknowledgements

M.L. thanks N. Pavao, A. Seifi, and S. Zekioğlu for helpful Mathematica advice. Y.D. acknowledges support from the STFC. M.L. acknowledges the Northwestern University Amplitudes and Insight

group, Department of Physics and Astronomy, and Weinberg College, and is also supported by the DOE under contract DE-SC0021485 and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

A Details for dark matter

A.1 EdS Green's function

In this section we give some details about the growing-mode EdS Green's function for the overdensity. The equation of motion for δ can be written as

$$a^2\delta''(\vec{k}, a) + \left(2 + \frac{a\mathcal{H}'}{\mathcal{H}}\right) a\delta'(\vec{k}, a) - \frac{3}{2}\Omega_m(a)\delta(\vec{k}, a) = S_\delta(\vec{k}, a) , \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $S_\delta(\vec{k}, a)$ is the non-linear source term. For the n -th order perturbation, we take $\delta^{(n)}(\vec{k}, a) = D(a)^n \tilde{\delta}^{(n)}(\vec{k})$, where $D(a)$ is the linear growth factor, which solves Eq. (2.15). Plugging this $\delta^{(n)}(\vec{k}, a)$ into Eq. (A.1) and using Eq. (2.15) to replace $D''(a)$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}(n-1)D(a)^n \left(3\Omega_m(a) + 2n\frac{a^2D'(a)^2}{D(a)^2}\right) \tilde{\delta}^{(n)}(\vec{k}) = S_\delta^{(n)}(\vec{k}, a) . \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Now we use that in SPT we have two different time dependences for the source terms, which we write as $\tilde{S}_{\delta,1}^{(n)}(\vec{k})$ and $\tilde{S}_{\delta,2}^{(n)}(\vec{k})$, giving

$$S_\delta^{(n)}(\vec{k}, a) = D(a)^n \left(\Omega_m(a)\tilde{S}_{\delta,1}^{(n)}(\vec{k}) + \left(\frac{aD'(a)}{D(a)}\right)^2 \tilde{S}_{\delta,2}^{(n)}(\vec{k}) \right) , \quad (\text{A.3})$$

which can be seen from Eq. (2.12). We see that all terms in Eq. (A.2) and Eq. (A.3) have the same time dependence, proportional to $D^n\Omega_m$, if we assume the standard EdS condition Eq. (2.20), after which we obtain

$$\tilde{\delta}^{(n)}(\vec{k}) = \frac{2}{(n-1)(3+2n)} \left(S_{\delta,1}^{(n)}(\vec{k}) + S_{\delta,2}^{(n)}(\vec{k}) \right) . \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The numerical factor $2/(n-1)(3+2n)$ comes from the EdS approximation of the Green's function.

We can see how this relates to the actual Green's function of the linear equations in the EdS universe, where $\Omega_m = 1$ and $a\mathcal{H}'/\mathcal{H} = -1/2$. In that case, the linear equation of motion is

$$a^2\delta'' + \frac{3}{2}a\delta' - \frac{3}{2}\delta = 0 , \quad (\text{A.5})$$

which has two solutions, $\delta(a) = a$ and $\delta(a) = a^{-3/2}$. These can be combined to form the Green's function $G(a, a_1)$ satisfying the boundary conditions $G(a_1, a_1) = 0$ and $\partial_a G(a, a_1)|_{a=a_1} = a_1^{-2}$

$$G(a, a_1) = \frac{2}{5a_1} \left(\frac{a}{a_1} - \frac{a^{-3/2}}{a_1^{-3/2}} \right) \theta_H(a - a_1) , \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where θ_H is the Heaviside step function. The connection with Eq. (A.4) is that applying the above to a source term $\propto a^n$, we have

$$\int_0^a da_1 G(a, a_1) a_1^n = \frac{2a^n}{(n-1)(3+2n)} , \quad (\text{A.7})$$

which gives exactly the same factor that we found.

A.2 Counterterm expressions in real space

The response terms are proportional only to powers of the linear field, and specifically we can write

$$\tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(1)}(\vec{k}) = F_1^{ct}(\vec{k})\tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(2)}(\vec{k}) = \int_{\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2}^{\vec{k}} F_2^{ct}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2)\tilde{\delta}_{\vec{q}_1}^{(1)}\tilde{\delta}_{\vec{q}_2}^{(1)}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where definitions of the tilde fields are given in Eq. (2.35). We group all of the terms that are only proportional to the stochastic fields in $\delta_\epsilon^{(1)}(\vec{k}, a)$ and terms that contain one stochastic field and one long-wavelength field (semi-stochastic) in $\delta_\epsilon^{(2)}(\vec{k}, a)$.

The response counterterms enter in

$$\begin{aligned} P_{13}^{ct}(k) &\equiv 2F_1^{ct}(\vec{k})P_{11}(k), \\ B_{411}^{ct}(k_1, k_2, k_3) &\equiv 2P_{11}(k_1)P_{11}(k_2)F_2^{ct}(-\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2) + 2 \text{ perms.}, \\ B_{321}^{(II),ct}(k_1, k_2, k_3) &\equiv 2P_{11}(k_1)P_{11}(k_2)F_1^{ct}(\vec{k}_1)F_2(-\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2) + 5 \text{ perms.}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

so that the combinations

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{13}(k) + P_{13}^{ct}(k), \\ &B_{411}(k_1, k_2, k_3) + B_{411}^{ct}(k_1, k_2, k_3), \\ &B_{321}^{(II)}(k_1, k_2, k_3) + B_{321}^{(II),ct}(k_1, k_2, k_3), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

are renormalized. Furthermore, for the stochastic fields, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}(\vec{k})\tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}(\vec{k}') \rangle &\equiv (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k} + \vec{k}') P_{22}^\epsilon(k), \\ \langle \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}(\vec{k}_1)\tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}(\vec{k}_2)\tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}(\vec{k}_3) \rangle &\equiv (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \vec{k}_3) B_{222}^\epsilon(k_1, k_2, k_3), \\ \langle \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}(\vec{k}_1)\tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}(\vec{k}_2)\tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(2)}(\vec{k}_3) \rangle + 5 \text{ perms.} &\equiv (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \vec{k}_3) B_{321}^{(I),\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

so that the combinations

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{22}(k) + P_{22}^\epsilon(k), \\ &B_{222}(k_1, k_2, k_3) + B_{222}^\epsilon(k_1, k_2, k_3), \\ &B_{321}^{(I)}(k_1, k_2, k_3) + B_{321}^{(I),\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

are renormalized.

A.3 Response terms

Here we show some details for the results given in Sec. 3.1 for the response terms. First we write the response stress tensor τ_{ct}^{ij} as a sum of first- and second-order terms

$$\tau_{ct}^{ij}(a) = \Omega_m(a) \left(\hat{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}(a) + \hat{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij}(a) \right), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where, in order to cancel the UV terms coming from the SPT loop expansion, the time dependence must be

$$\hat{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}(a) = \frac{a^2 H(a)^2 \bar{\rho}(a) D(a)^3}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij}(a) = \frac{a^2 H(a)^2 \bar{\rho}(a) D(a)^4}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where $\tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}$ and $\tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij}$ are time independent (the factor of $\Omega_m(a)$ can be seen from App. A.1). We suppress spatial dependence of all fields in this section to remove clutter.

Being careful to keep track of the time dependence $D(a)^n$ and the EdS Green's functions (which are simply numerical factors coming from the linear equations and the time dependence $D(a)^n$, see App. A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{ct}^{(1)}(a) &= \frac{1}{9a^2 H^2 \bar{\rho}} \partial_i \partial_j \hat{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}(a) , & \pi_{S,ct}^{(1)}(a) &= \frac{-f}{3aH} \partial_i \partial_j \hat{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}(a) , \\ \pi_{V,ct,(1)}^i(a) &= \frac{-2f}{7aH} \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l \hat{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{kl}(a) , & \text{and } \pi_{ct,(1)}^i(a) &= -\frac{f}{3aH} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \hat{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{jk}(a) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where, as in Sec. 3.1, we assume that $\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{jk} = \partial^2 \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij}$. Note that in the above, and in all instances, we solve for π_S and π_V^i directly through the equations of motion Eq. (2.11), and then we form π^i using the definition Eq. (2.10).¹⁵

The second-order expressions are

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{ct}^{(2)}(a) &= \frac{2}{33a^2 H^2 \bar{\rho}} \partial_i \partial_j \hat{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{ij}(a) \\ &+ \frac{2}{33a^2 H^2 \bar{\rho} f} \partial_i \partial_j \left[4M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^{-2} \left(\partial_i \Phi^{(1)}(a) \partial_j \Phi_{ct}^{(1)}(a) - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} \left(\partial_k \Phi^{(1)}(a) \partial_k \Phi_{ct}^{(1)}(a) \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2}{\bar{\rho}} \pi_{(1)}^i(a) \pi_{ct,(1)}^j(a) \right] , \\ \pi_{S,ct}^{(2)}(a) &= -4a\bar{\rho}Hf\delta_{ct}^{(2)}(a) , \\ \pi_{V,ct,(2)}^i(a) &= \frac{-2}{9aHf} \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l \left[2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^{-2} \left(\partial_k \Phi^{(1)}(a) \partial_l \Phi_{ct}^{(1)}(a) + \partial_k \Phi_{ct}^{(1)}(a) \partial_l \Phi^{(1)}(a) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}} \left(\pi_{(1)}^k(a) \pi_{ct,(1)}^l(a) + \pi_{ct,(1)}^k(a) \pi_{(1)}^l(a) \right) + \tau_{ct,(2)}^{kl}(a) \right] , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

and some extra terms that we need to plug in to the above are

$$\partial_i \Phi^{(1)}(a) = \frac{3}{2} \Omega_m a^2 H^2 \frac{\partial_i}{\partial^2} \delta^{(1)}(a) , \quad \pi_{(1)}^i(a) = -aH\bar{\rho}f \frac{\partial_i}{\partial^2} \delta^{(1)}(a) , \quad \partial_i \Phi_{ct}^{(1)}(a) = \frac{\Omega_m}{6\bar{\rho}} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \hat{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{jk}(a) . \quad (\text{A.18})$$

We then factorize the time dependence by defining $\tilde{\pi}_{S,ct}^{(1)}$, $\tilde{\pi}_{S,ct}^{(2)}$, $\tilde{\pi}_{V,ct,(1)}^i$, and $\tilde{\pi}_{V,ct,(2)}^i$ in the same way as $\tilde{\pi}_{ct,(1)}^i$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{ct,(2)}^i$ in Eq. (2.37), which leads to the linear solutions

$$\tilde{\pi}_{S,ct}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{3k_{\text{NL}}^2} \partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{ij} , \quad \text{and } \tilde{\pi}_{V,ct,(1)}^i = 0 , \quad (\text{A.19})$$

¹⁵A useful manipulation to remember is that for any vector V^i satisfying $V^i = \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l A_{kl}$, we have

$$\epsilon^{ijk} \frac{\partial_j}{\partial^2} V^k = \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} A_{jk} - \partial_j A_{ij} . \quad (\text{A.16})$$

along with $\tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{ct,(1)}^i$ given in Eq. (3.2). The second order expressions are $\tilde{\pi}_{S,ct}^{(2)} = 4\tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(2)}$ and

$$\tilde{\pi}_{V,ct,(2)}^i = \frac{1}{9k_{\text{NL}}^2} \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l \left[\frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_l \partial_m \partial_n \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{mn}}{\partial^2} + \frac{\partial_l \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \partial_m \partial_n \tilde{\tau}_{ct,(1)}^{mn}}{\partial^2} + 2\tilde{\tau}_{ct,(2)}^{kl} \right], \quad (\text{A.20})$$

with $\tilde{\delta}_{ct}^{(2)}$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{ct,(2)}^i$ given in Eq. (3.3) and Eq. (3.4) respectively.

A.4 Stochastic terms

Here we show some details for the results given in Sec. 3.1 for the stochastic terms. First we write the stochastic stress tensor τ_ϵ^{ij} as a sum of first- and second-order terms

$$\tau_\epsilon^{ij}(a) = \Omega_m(a) \left(\hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}(a) + \hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{ij}(a) \right), \quad (\text{A.21})$$

where, in order to cancel the UV terms coming from the SPT loop expansion the time dependence must be

$$\hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}(a) = \frac{a^2 H(a)^2 \bar{\rho}(a) D(a)^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{ij}(a) = \frac{a^2 H(a)^2 \bar{\rho}(a) D(a)^3}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{ij}, \quad (\text{A.22})$$

where $\tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}$ and $\tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{ij}$ are time independent. We suppress spatial dependence of all fields in this section to remove clutter.

Being careful to keep track of the time dependence $D(a)^n$ and the EdS Green's functions (which are simply numerical factors coming from the linear equations and the time dependence $D(a)^n$, see App. A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\epsilon^{(1)}(a) &= \frac{2}{7a^2 H^2 \bar{\rho}} \partial_i \partial_j \hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}(a), \quad \pi_{S,\epsilon}^{(1)}(a) = \frac{-4f}{7aH} \partial_i \partial_j \hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}(a), \\ \pi_{V,\epsilon}^{i(1)}(a) &= \frac{-2f}{5aH} \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l \hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{kl}(a), \\ \pi_{\epsilon,(1)}^i(a) &= -\frac{f}{aH} \left[\frac{4}{7} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{jk}}{\partial^2}(a) - \frac{2}{5} \left(\frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{jk}}{\partial^2}(a) - \partial_j \hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ij}(a) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

The second-order expressions are

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\epsilon^{(2)}(a) &= \frac{1}{9a^2 H^2 \bar{\rho}} \partial_i \partial_j \hat{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{ij}(a) \\ &+ \frac{1}{9a^2 H^2 \bar{\rho} f} \partial_i \partial_j \left[4M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^{-2} \left(\partial_i \Phi^{(1)}(a) \partial_j \Phi_\epsilon^{(1)}(a) - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} \left(\partial_k \Phi^{(1)}(a) \partial_k \Phi_\epsilon^{(1)}(a) \right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2}{\bar{\rho}} \pi_{(1)}^i(a) \pi_{\epsilon,(1)}^j(a) \right], \\ \pi_{S,\epsilon}^{(2)}(a) &= -3a\bar{\rho}Hf\delta_\epsilon^{(2)}(a), \\ \pi_{V,\epsilon,(2)}^i(a) &= \frac{-2}{7aHf} \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l \left[2M_{\text{Pl}}^2 a^{-2} \left(\partial_k \Phi^{(1)}(a) \partial_l \Phi_\epsilon^{(1)}(a) + \partial_k \Phi_\epsilon^{(1)}(a) \partial_l \Phi^{(1)}(a) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}} \left(\pi_{(1)}^k(a) \pi_{\epsilon,(1)}^l(a) + \pi_{\epsilon,(1)}^k(a) \pi_{(1)}^l(a) \right) + \tau_{\epsilon,(2)}^{kl}(a) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Some extra terms that we need to plug in to the above are given in Eq. (A.18) and

$$\partial_i \Phi_\epsilon^{(1)}(a) = \frac{3\Omega_m}{7\bar{\rho}} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{ijk}(a). \quad (\text{A.25})$$

We then factorize the time dependence by defining $\tilde{\pi}_{S,\epsilon}^{(1)}$, $\tilde{\pi}_{S,\epsilon}^{(2)}$, $\tilde{\pi}_{V,\epsilon,(1)}^i$, and $\tilde{\pi}_{V,\epsilon,(2)}^i$ in the same way as $\tilde{\pi}_{\epsilon,(1)}^i$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{\epsilon,(2)}^i$ in Eq. (2.37), which leads to the linear solutions

$$\tilde{\pi}_{S,\epsilon}^{(1)} = \frac{4}{7k_{\text{NL}}^2} \partial_i \partial_j \tilde{\tau}_{(1)}^{ij}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\pi}_{V,\epsilon,(1)}^i = \frac{2}{5k_{\text{NL}}^2} \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{kl}, \quad (\text{A.26})$$

along with $\tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{\epsilon,(1)}^i$ given in Eq. (3.5). The second order are $\tilde{\pi}_{S,\epsilon}^{(2)} = 3\tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(2)}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\pi}_{V,\epsilon,(2)}^i &= \frac{2}{7k_{\text{NL}}^2} \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l \left[\frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_l \partial_m \partial_n}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{mn} + \frac{\partial_l \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \partial_m \partial_n}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{mn} + \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(2)}^{kl} \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{4}{35k_{\text{NL}}^2} \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \partial_l \left[\frac{\partial_k \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left(\frac{\partial_l \partial_m \partial_n}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{mn} - \partial_m \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{lm} \right) + \frac{\partial_l \tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left(\frac{\partial_k \partial_m \partial_n}{\partial^2} \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{mn} - \partial_m \tilde{\tau}_{\epsilon,(1)}^{km} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

with $\tilde{\delta}_\epsilon^{(2)}$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{\epsilon,(2)}^i$ given in Eq. (3.6) and Eq. (3.7) respectively.

A.5 Stochastic flow terms

Here we derive the expression given in Eq. (3.10) for the stochastic counterterms. The only subtlety is in the way that the flow term enters, and here we sharpen and clarify the expressions in [7, 9]. Let us start with two stochastic fields $e_1^{ij}(\vec{x}, a)$ and $e_3^{ijkl}(\vec{x}, a)$ and write the general non-local in time expression

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\epsilon^{ij}(\vec{x}, a) &= \int^a \frac{da'}{a'} \left(\kappa_1(a, a') e_1^{ij}(\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, a, a'), a') \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \kappa_3(a, a') e_3^{ijkl}(\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, a, a'), a') \frac{\partial_k \partial_l \delta(\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, a, a'), a')}{\partial^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

for some non-local kernels κ_1 and κ_3 . Next, we expand this expression up to second order to get

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\epsilon^{ij}(\vec{x}, a) &\approx \int^a \frac{da'}{a'} \left(\kappa_1(a, a') \left[e_{1,(1)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a') + \frac{\partial_k \delta^{(1)}(\vec{x}, a)}{\partial^2} \partial_k e_{1,(1)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a') \left(1 - \frac{D(a')}{D(a)} \right) + e_{1,(2)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a') \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \kappa_3(a, a') e_{3,(1)}^{ijkl}(\vec{x}, a') \frac{\partial_k \partial_l \delta^{(1)}(\vec{x}, a')}{\partial^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.29})$$

This expression for $\tau_\epsilon^{ij}(\vec{x}, a)$ is a Galilean scalar as long as both $e_1^{ij}(\vec{x}, a)$ and $e_3^{ijkl}(\vec{x}, a)$ are Galilean scalars, which at the order that we work, means

$$e_{1,(2)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a') = \partial_k e_{1,(1)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a') \frac{\partial_k \delta^{(1)}(\vec{x}, a')}{\partial^2} + e_{2,(1)}^{ijkl}(\vec{x}, a') \frac{\partial_k \partial_l \delta^{(1)}(\vec{x}, a')}{\partial^2}, \quad (\text{A.30})$$

for some new field $e_{2,(1)}^{ijkl}$. The first term above is fixed by the assumption that e_1^{ij} is a Galilean scalar, while the second term is the most general second-order term that can be included. We assume that $e_{1,(1)}^{ij}$ contains all of the purely stochastic terms, so we do not include any of those in the second-order expression. Plugging Eq. (A.30) into Eq. (A.29), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\epsilon^{ij}(\vec{x}, a) \approx \int^a \frac{da'}{a'} \left(\kappa_1(a, a') \left[e_{1,(1)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a') + \frac{\partial_k \delta^{(1)}(\vec{x}, a)}{\partial^2} \partial_k e_{1,(1)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a') \right] \right. \\ \left. + \left[\kappa_1(a, a') e_{2,(1)}^{ijkl}(\vec{x}, a') + \kappa_3(a, a') e_{3,(1)}^{ijkl}(\vec{x}, a') \right] \frac{\partial_k \partial_l \delta^{(1)}(\vec{x}, a')}{\partial^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.31})$$

where there is now crucially only one flow term, with $\partial_k \delta^{(1)}/\partial^2$ evaluated at the external time a .¹⁶ We finally get the form Eq. (3.10) by setting

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_1^{ij}(\vec{x}) &= \frac{k_{\text{NL}}^2}{\Omega_m(a) \mathcal{H}(a)^2 \bar{\rho}(a) D(a)^2} \int^a \frac{da'}{a'} \kappa_1(a, a') e_{1,(1)}^{ij}(\vec{x}, a'), \\ \epsilon_3^{ijkl}(\vec{x}) &= \frac{k_{\text{NL}}^2}{\Omega_m(a) \mathcal{H}(a)^2 \bar{\rho}(a) D(a)^2} \int^a \frac{da'}{a'} \left[\kappa_1(a, a') e_{2,(1)}^{ijkl}(\vec{x}, a') + \kappa_3(a, a') e_{3,(1)}^{ijkl}(\vec{x}, a') \right] \frac{D(a')}{D(a)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

where above, to match Eq. (3.10), we have assumed EdS time dependence. So we see how the final ϵ_3^{ijkl} is made up of contributions from the originally included e_3^{ijkl} and the second order piece $e_{2,(1)}^{ijkl}$, both integrated over past times. Since they are both unknown non-linear stochastic fields, we combine them into the single field ϵ_3^{ijkl} . As always, these integrals can be formally done to define the final coefficients used in Sec. 3.2.

A.6 UV matching in real space

The UV limits of the loops that are renormalized by response terms are

$$P_{13}(k) \rightarrow -\frac{61}{630\pi^2} k^2 P_{11}(k) \int dq P_{11}(q), \quad (\text{A.33})$$

$$\begin{aligned} B_{411}(k_1, k_2, k_3) \rightarrow -\frac{P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2)}{1358280 \pi^2 k_1^2 k_2^2} \left[12409 k_3^6 + 20085 k_3^4 (k_1^2 + k_2^2) \right. \\ \left. + k_3^2 (-44518 k_1^4 + 76684 k_1^2 k_2^2 - 44518 k_2^4) \right. \\ \left. + 12024 (k_1^2 - k_2^2)^2 (k_1^2 + k_2^2) \right] \int dq P_{11}(q) + 2 \text{ perms.}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.34})$$

¹⁶As a piece of intuition, one could take the quadratic bias δ^2 and inspect the resulting flow terms. One sees that there is only one free coefficient for the flow terms. The second flow term that would naively come from integration over time has a fixed coefficient that cancels the IR limit of the third order expression of δ^2 . This matches what we find here because one can think of a stochastic term as arising from the limit of $\delta(\vec{x})^2$ where each $\delta(\vec{x})$ is taken to be as short wavelength as possible.

and

$$B_{321}^{(II)}(k_1, k_2, k_3) \rightarrow P_{11}(k_2) F_2(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) \left(\frac{-61k_1^2 P_{11}(k_1)}{630\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) \right) + 5 \text{ perms.} . \quad (\text{A.35})$$

An explicit solution for the EFT coefficients that absorbs the UV contributions above is

$$\begin{aligned} c_3 &= -\frac{61k_{\text{NL}}^2}{140\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) , & c_4 &= -\frac{12409k_{\text{NL}}^2}{11760\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) , \\ c_5 &= -\frac{6997k_{\text{NL}}^2}{6860\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) , & c_7 &= \frac{63149k_{\text{NL}}^2}{82320\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.36})$$

with all of the other coefficients zero (they are degenerate for these observables).

The UV limits of the loops that are renormalized by stochastic terms are

$$P_{22}(k) \rightarrow \frac{9}{196\pi^2} k^4 \int dq \frac{P_{11}(q)^2}{q^2} , \quad (\text{A.37})$$

$$\begin{aligned} B_{321}^{(I)}(k_1, k_2, k_3) &\rightarrow \frac{P_{11}(k_1)}{35280\pi^2 k_1^2} \left[1060k_1^6 - 2337k_1^4(k_2^2 + k_3^2) - 217(k_2^2 - k_3^2)^2(k_2^2 + k_3^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2k_1^2(747k_2^4 + 512k_2^2k_3^2 + 747k_3^4) \right] \int dq \frac{P_{11}(q)^2}{q^2} + 2 \text{ cyclic perms.} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.38})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B_{222}(k_1, k_2, k_3) &\rightarrow -\frac{15}{2401\pi^2} \left[k_1^6 - k_1^4(k_2^2 + k_3^2) + (k_2^2 - k_3^2)^2(k_2^2 + k_3^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - k_1^2 \left(k_2^4 - \frac{k_2^2 k_3^2}{30} + k_3^4 \right) \right] \int dq \frac{P_{11}(q)^3}{q^4} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.39})$$

If we write the final forms of the stochastic counterterms as

$$P_{22}^\epsilon(k) = \frac{c_{\text{DM},1}^{\text{St}}}{\bar{n}_{\text{DM}}} \frac{k^4}{k_{\text{NL}}^4} , \quad (\text{A.40})$$

$$\begin{aligned} B_{321}^{(I),\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3) &= \frac{P_{11}(k_1)}{\bar{n}_{\text{DM}} k_{\text{NL}}^4} \left[c_{\text{DM},1}^{\text{St}} \frac{-7k_1^6 - 14(k_2^2 - k_3^2)^2(k_2^2 + k_3^2) + k_1^2(21k_2^4 - 2k_2^2k_3^2 + 21k_3^4)}{72k_1^2} \right. \\ &\quad + c_{\text{DM},2}^{\text{St}}(k_1 - k_2 - k_3)(k_1 - k_2 + k_3)(k_1 + k_2 - k_3)(k_1 + k_2 + k_3) + c_{\text{DM},3}^{\text{St}}k_2^2k_3^2 \\ &\quad + c_{\text{DM},4}^{\text{St}} \frac{-2k_1^2(k_2^2 - k_3^2)^2 + (k_1^4 + (k_2^2 - k_3^2)^2)(k_2^2 + k_3^2)}{k_1^2} + c_{\text{DM},5}^{\text{St}}(k_1^2 - k_2^2 - k_3^2)^2 \\ &\quad \left. - c_{\text{DM},6}^{\text{St}} \frac{(-k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2)(k_1^2 - k_2^2 + k_3^2)(k_1^2 + k_2^2 - k_3^2)}{k_1^2} \right] + 2 \text{ cyclic perms.} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.41})$$

and

$$B_{222}^\epsilon(k_1, k_2, k_3) = \frac{1}{\bar{n}_{\text{DM}}^2 k_{\text{NL}}^6} \left(c_{\text{DM},1}^{(222)} k_1^2 k_2^2 k_3^2 + c_{\text{DM},2}^{(222)} (k_1^6 + k_2^6 + k_3^6 - (k_1^4 k_2^2 + k_1^2 k_2^4 + 2 \text{ perms.})) \right), \quad (\text{A.42})$$

then an explicit solution to the UV matching is

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\text{DM},1}^{\text{St}} &= -\frac{9 \bar{n}_{\text{DM}} k_{\text{NL}}^4}{196 \pi^2} \int dq \frac{P_{11}(q)^2}{q^2}, & c_{\text{DM},4}^{\text{St}} &= \frac{683 \bar{n}_{\text{DM}} k_{\text{NL}}^4}{70560 \pi^2} \int dq \frac{P_{11}(q)^2}{q^2}, \\ c_{\text{DM},5}^{\text{St}} &= -\frac{389 \bar{n}_{\text{DM}} k_{\text{NL}}^4}{17640 \pi^2} \int dq \frac{P_{11}(q)^2}{q^2}, & c_{\text{DM},6}^{\text{St}} &= -\frac{293 \bar{n}_{\text{DM}} k_{\text{NL}}^4}{23520 \pi^2} \int dq \frac{P_{11}(q)^2}{q^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.43})$$

and

$$c_{\text{DM},1}^{(222)} = \frac{\bar{n}_{\text{DM}}^2 k_{\text{NL}}^6}{4802 \pi^2} \int dq \frac{P_{11}(q)^3}{q^4}, \quad c_{\text{DM},2}^{(222)} = \frac{15 \bar{n}_{\text{DM}}^2 k_{\text{NL}}^6}{2401 \pi^2} \int dq \frac{P_{11}(q)^3}{q^4}, \quad (\text{A.44})$$

with other coefficients zero (they are degenerate for these observables).

A.7 Counterterm expressions in redshift space

The response terms are proportional only to powers of the linear field, and specifically we can write

$$\tilde{\delta}_{r,ct}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) = F_1^{r,ct}(\vec{k}; \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{k}}^{(1)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\delta}_{r,ct}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) = \int_{\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2}^{\vec{k}} F_2^{r,ct}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2; \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{q}_1}^{(1)} \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{q}_2}^{(1)}. \quad (\text{A.45})$$

where definitions of the tilde fields are given in Eq. (4.23). We group all of the terms that are only proportional to the stochastic fields in $\delta_{r,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a)$ and terms that contain one stochastic field and one long-wavelength field (semi-stochastic) in $\delta_{r,\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a)$.

The response counterterms enter in

$$\begin{aligned} P_{13}^{r,ct}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) &\equiv 2F_1^r(\vec{k}; \hat{z}) F_1^{r,ct}(-\vec{k}; \hat{z}) P_{11}(k), \\ B_{411}^{r,ct} &\equiv 2P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2) F_1^r(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z}) F_1^r(\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) F_2^{r,ct}(-\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) + 2 \text{ perms.}, \\ B_{321}^{r,(II),ct} &\equiv 2P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2) F_1^{r,ct}(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z}) F_1^r(\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) F_2^r(-\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) + 5 \text{ perms.}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.46})$$

(we have suppressed the argument $(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z})$ of the bispectra terms to remove clutter) so that the combinations

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{13}^r(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) + P_{13}^{r,ct}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}), \\ &B_{411}^r(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) + B_{411}^{r,ct}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}), \\ &B_{321}^{r,(II)}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) + B_{321}^{r,(II),ct}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.47})$$

are renormalized. Furthermore, for the stochastic fields, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{\delta}_{r,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}', \hat{z}) \rangle &\equiv (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k} + \vec{k}') P_{22}^{r,\epsilon}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}), \\ \langle \tilde{\delta}_{r,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_1, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_2, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_3, \hat{z}) \rangle &\equiv (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \vec{k}_3) B_{222}^{r,\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}), \\ \langle \tilde{\delta}_r^{(1)}(\vec{k}_1, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_2, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}_3, \hat{z}) \rangle + 5 \text{ perms.} &\equiv (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \vec{k}_3) B_{321}^{r,(I),\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.48})$$

so that the combinations

$$\begin{aligned}
& P_{22}^r(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) + P_{22}^{r,\epsilon}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) , \\
& B_{222}^r(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) + B_{222}^{r,\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) , \\
& B_{321}^{r,(I)}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) + B_{321}^{r,(I),\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.49}$$

are renormalized.

The basis elements $e_i^{F_2}$ used to define $F_2^{r,ct}$ in Eq. (4.36) are related to the functions that we use for biased tracers in App. D.2 by

$$\begin{aligned}
e_1^{F_2} &= \frac{1}{9}e_1^{K_2} + \frac{8}{99}e_2^{K_2} - \frac{19}{693}e_3^{K_2} - \frac{16}{693}e_4^{K_2} - \frac{1}{33}e_5^{K_2} + \frac{2}{99}e_7^{K_2} + \frac{2}{3f}e_{10}^{K_2} + \frac{7}{99f}e_{11}^{K_2} - \frac{2}{3}e_{12}^{K_2} + \frac{8}{99f}e_{14}^{K_2} , \\
e_2^{F_2} &= \frac{10}{231}e_3^{K_2} + \frac{4}{231}e_4^{K_2} + \frac{16}{33f}e_{11}^{K_2} , \\
e_3^{F_2} &= \frac{1}{33}e_2^{K_2} + \frac{2}{231}e_3^{K_2} - \frac{2}{231}e_4^{K_2} + \frac{1}{33}e_5^{K_2} + \frac{2}{9}e_6^{K_2} - \frac{2}{99}e_7^{K_2} + \frac{4}{9f}e_{10}^{K_2} - \frac{7}{99f}e_{11}^{K_2} - \frac{4}{9}e_{12}^{K_2} + \frac{29}{99f}e_{14}^{K_2} , \\
e_4^{F_2} &= \frac{2}{33}e_3^{K_2} + \frac{16}{33f}e_{14}^{K_2} , \\
e_n^{F_2} &= e_{n+3}^{K_2} \quad \text{for } n = 5, \dots, 11 .
\end{aligned} \tag{A.50}$$

As discussed in more detail in Sec. 4.4, we note that the new non-locally-contributing counterterm comes from the function $e_7^{K_2}$, and so enters the expression for $e_1^{F_2}$ and $e_3^{F_2}$ above. This means that in the basis that we have chosen, c_3 and c_5 contribute the non-locally-contributing counterterm.

Next, we give the UV matching. The values for the dark-matter parameters c_3 , c_4 , c_5 , and c_7 are given in Eq. (A.36), and the rest are

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{\text{DM},1}^{\pi v} &= -\frac{(46 + 35f)k_{\text{NL}}^2}{210\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) , & c_{\text{DM},2}^{\pi v} &= -\frac{(11 + 15f)k_{\text{NL}}^2}{150\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) , \\
c_{\text{DM},3}^{\pi v} &= -\frac{83k_{\text{NL}}^2}{210\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) , & c_{\text{DM},4}^{\pi v} &= -\frac{172k_{\text{NL}}^2}{735\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) , \\
c_{\text{DM},5}^{\pi v} &= -\frac{2683k_{\text{NL}}^2}{5145\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) , & c_{\text{DM},6}^{\pi v} &= -\frac{(4626 + 1715f)k_{\text{NL}}^2}{25725\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) , \\
c_{\text{DM},7}^{\pi v} &= -\frac{269k_{\text{NL}}^2}{686\pi^2} \int dq P_{11}(q) .
\end{aligned} \tag{A.51}$$

B Bispectrum loop integrals in redshift space

In this appendix, we give some information on how to evaluate the one-loop bispectrum integrals in redshift space in Eq. (5.12). The most straightforward way to evaluate the one-loop bispectrum integrals is by choosing a coordinate system and integrating numerically. Because of rotation invariance, a generic bispectrum one-loop term B is given by

$$B(k_1, k_2, k_3, \mu_1, \mu_2) = \int_{\vec{q}} \mathcal{K}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \mu_1, \mu_2, q, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{q}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{q}, \hat{q} \cdot \hat{z}) , \tag{B.1}$$

where we have used momentum conservation $\vec{k}_3 = -\vec{k}_1 - \vec{k}_2$, and as always $\mu_i \equiv \hat{k}_i \cdot \hat{z}$. One choice of coordinate system is

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{k}_1 &= k_1 (0, 0, 1) , \\ \vec{k}_2 &= k_2 \left(0, \sqrt{1-y^2}, y \right) , \\ \vec{q} &= q \left(\cos(\beta)\sqrt{1-x^2}, \sin(\beta)\sqrt{1-x^2}, x \right) , \\ \hat{z} &= \left(\cos(\phi)\sqrt{1-\mu_1^2}, \sin(\phi)\sqrt{1-\mu_1^2}, \mu_1 \right) ,\end{aligned}\tag{B.2}$$

where $y \equiv (k_3^2 - k_1^2 - k_2^2)/(2k_1k_2)$, $x \in [-1, 1]$, $\mu_1 \in [-1, 1]$, $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$, and $\beta \in [0, 2\pi)$. In this coordinate system the measure is simply

$$\int_{\vec{q}} = \int \frac{dq q^2}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{-1}^1 dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\beta .\tag{B.3}$$

Next we move to a tensor reduction method that is better suited for analytic integration. For this, we write a generic bispectrum one-loop term B as

$$B(k_1, k_2, k_3, \mu_1, \mu_2) = \sum_a f_a(k_1, k_2, k_3, \mu_1, \mu_2) \int_{\vec{q}} \mathcal{K}_a(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|; \hat{q} \cdot \hat{z}) ,\tag{B.4}$$

where the functions f_a do not depend on the loop momentum \vec{q} and the kernels \mathcal{K}_a depend on the scalar combinations q , $|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|$, $|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|$ because of momentum conservation, and on the projection along \hat{z} of the integrated momentum, $\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z}$. For reasons that we will comment on later, we choose to parameterize $\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{q}$ and $\hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{q}$ by $|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|$ and $|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|$ respectively. The specific form in Eq. (B.4) is possible because the dependence on μ_1 and μ_2 is polynomial, and we choose to include any k_i dependence that does not come through $|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|$ or $|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|$ in the functions f_a to reduce the number of terms in the sum. Note that both f_a and \mathcal{K}_a can depend on the linear power spectrum P_{11} . If there were no dependence on $\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z}$, the integrals over \mathcal{K}_a could be done using analytic techniques, see for example [41, 42]. Luckily, the dependence on $\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z}$ is very simple: the \mathcal{K}_a are polynomials in $\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z}$ (which simply comes from the redshift space expression Eq. (5.2)), of order up to six for B_{222} , up to four for B_{321}^I , and up to two for B_{321}^{II} and B_{411} . Thus, each \mathcal{K}_a can be written as

$$\mathcal{K}_a(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|; \hat{q} \cdot \hat{z}) = \sum_n \mathcal{T}_{a,(n)}(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) (\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z})^n ,\tag{B.5}$$

where the sum over n is over a finite number of terms as stated above.

We would now like to write Eq. (B.5) in such a way that allows us to express the integral over \vec{q} as a sum over integrals of functions of $(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|)$, which is a form conducive to analytic integration. To do that, we first define

$$I_{a,(n)}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) = \int_{\vec{q}} \mathcal{T}_{a,(n)}(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) \hat{q}^{i_1} \dots \hat{q}^{i_n} ,\tag{B.6}$$

and from Eq. (B.5), we are interested in computing $\hat{z}^{i_1} \dots \hat{z}^{i_n} I_{a,(n)}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2)$. Now, because of rotation invariance, the function $I_{a,(n)}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2)$ can be generally written as

$$I_{a,(n)}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_n} c_{a,(n),\alpha}(k_1, k_2, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_2) T_{a,(n),\alpha}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \delta_{ij}) , \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where the functions $c_{a,(n),\alpha}$ depend on scalar products of \vec{k}_1 and \vec{k}_2 , and the functions $T_{a,(n),\alpha}^{i_1 \dots i_n}$ are all of the N_n symmetric tensors with indices $i_1 \dots i_n$ made up of products of \hat{k}_1 , \hat{k}_2 , and δ_{ij} . To see how this has helped us, we go back to the expression that we are interested in, which now becomes

$$\hat{z}^{i_1} \dots \hat{z}^{i_n} I_{a,(n)}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) = \sum_{\alpha} c_{a,(n),\alpha}(k_1, k_2, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_2) t_{a,(n),\alpha}(\mu_1, \mu_2) , \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where we have defined $t_{a,(n),\alpha}(\mu_1, \mu_2) \equiv \hat{z}^{i_1} \dots \hat{z}^{i_n} T_{a,(n),\alpha}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \delta_{ij})$. This is now exactly the form that we wanted: all of the loop integrals are contained in the $c_{a,(n),\alpha}$ functions, which is over functions of $(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|)$, and all of the \hat{z} dependence has been transferred to the external momenta in the $t_{a,(n),\alpha}$ functions.

Let us now determine the $c_{a,(n),\alpha}$ functions explicitly. To do that, we contract Eq. (B.7) with the N_n symmetric tensors $T_{a,(n),\beta}^{i_1 \dots i_n}$, giving

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\vec{q}} \mathcal{T}_{a,(n)}(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) T_{a,(n),\beta}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \delta_{ij}) \hat{q}^{i_1} \dots \hat{q}^{i_n} \\ = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_n} c_{a,(n),\alpha}(k_1, k_2, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_2) T_{a,(n),\alpha}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \delta_{ij}) T_{a,(n),\beta}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \delta_{ij}) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

which is a system of N_n equations that can be used to solve for the N_n functions $c_{a,(n),\alpha}$; on the left-hand side, using

$$\hat{q} \cdot \hat{k}_1 = \frac{1}{2qk_1} \left(|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|^2 - k_1^2 - q^2 \right) , \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{q} \cdot \hat{k}_2 = \frac{1}{2qk_2} \left(k_2^2 + q^2 - |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|^2 \right) , \quad (\text{B.10})$$

we have our desired form of loop integrals over \vec{q} of functions of $(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|)$, while on the right-hand side, we have the $c_{a,(n),\alpha}$ functions multiplied by scalar products between \hat{k}_1 and \hat{k}_2 . In particular, defining the matrix

$$M_{a,(n)}^{\alpha\beta}(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_2) \equiv T_{a,(n),\alpha}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \delta_{ij}) T_{a,(n),\beta}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \delta_{ij}) , \quad (\text{B.11})$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{a,(n),\alpha}(k_1, k_2, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_2) = \\ \sum_{\beta=1}^{N_n} [M_{a,(n)}^{-1}]^{\alpha\beta}(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_2) \int_{\vec{q}} \mathcal{T}_{a,(n)}(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) T_{a,(n),\beta}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \delta_{ij}) \hat{q}^{i_1} \dots \hat{q}^{i_n} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Thus, this solution for the $c_{a,(n),\alpha}$ functions, plugged into Eq. (B.8), gives our final result.

The above manipulations can also be presented in a slightly different way. Again, we are interested in computing the right-hand side of Eq. (B.6) contracted with $\hat{z}^{i_1} \dots \hat{z}^{i_n}$, which, using Eq. (B.6) and Eq. (B.7), is given by

$$\int_{\vec{q}} \mathcal{T}_{a,(n)}(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) (\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z})^n = \sum_{\alpha} c_{a,(n),\alpha}(k_1, k_2, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_2) t_{a,(n),\alpha}(\mu_1, \mu_2) . \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Now, given the solution Eq. (B.12) for the $c_{a,(n),\alpha}$ functions, we can rewrite this as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\vec{q}} \mathcal{T}_{a,(n)}(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) (\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z})^n = \\ \int_{\vec{q}} \mathcal{T}_{a,(n)}(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_n} \sum_{\beta=1}^{N_n} [M_{a,(n)}^{-1}]^{\alpha\beta} (\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_2) T_{a,(n),\beta}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \delta_{ij}) \hat{q}^{i_1} \dots \hat{q}^{i_n} t_{a,(n),\alpha}(\mu_1, \mu_2) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

which implies that, under the integrals that we are interested in, we can simply replace

$$(\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z})^n \rightarrow \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_n} \sum_{\beta=1}^{N_n} [M_{a,(n)}^{-1}]^{\alpha\beta} (\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_2) T_{a,(n),\beta}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{k}_1, \hat{k}_2, \delta_{ij}) \hat{q}^{i_1} \dots \hat{q}^{i_n} t_{a,(n),\alpha}(\mu_1, \mu_2) , \quad (\text{B.15})$$

which again, using Eq. (B.10), is in the form that we want.

At this point, a number of comments are in order. First, the above form of the loop integrals is well suited for situations where integrals over functions of $(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|)$ can be done analytically, see for example [41, 42]. If this is not the case, one can simply use an explicit coordinate system to perform the integrals, as described above. Second, it turns out that for the bispectrum, it can be quite slow to invert the matrix $M_{a,(n)}^{\alpha\beta}$ for values of n greater than four (which is relevant in particular for the B_{222} diagram).

Thus, in practice, it is sometimes easier to use the following more straightforward way to arrive at the above result, again with an eye towards analytic integration. We start with the form of the loop in Eq. (B.4), and using the above definitions, we recall that we need to evaluate terms of the form

$$\int_{\vec{q}} \mathcal{T}_{a,(n)}(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|) (\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z})^n , \quad (\text{B.16})$$

so we would like to find a replacement for $(\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z})^n$ in terms of q , $|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|$, and $|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|$. For this, we can simply use the coordinate system Eq. (B.2). Without loss of generality we can take the first component of \hat{z} to be positive, and use $\mu_2 = \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}$ to get

$$\hat{z} = \left(\sqrt{\frac{-\mu_1^2 - \mu_2^2 - y^2 + 2\mu_1\mu_2 y + 1}{1 - y^2}}, \frac{\mu_2 - \mu_1 y}{\sqrt{1 - y^2}}, \mu_1 \right) . \quad (\text{B.17})$$

To see why the sign of the first component of \hat{z} does not matter, consider Eq. (B.16) and send $\hat{z}_1 \rightarrow -\hat{z}_1$, where the subscript $_1$ denotes the first component. This can be compensated by sending $\hat{q}_1 \rightarrow -\hat{q}_1$, and since none of q , $|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|$, or $|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|$ depend on \hat{q}_1 for the parameterization Eq. (B.2),

the integral is invariant. Dotting this with \hat{q} from Eq. (B.2), we get

$$\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z} = \cos(\beta) \sqrt{1-x^2} \sqrt{\frac{-\mu_1^2 - \mu_2^2 - y^2 + 2\mu_1\mu_2y + 1}{1-y^2}} + \frac{\sin(\beta) \sqrt{1-x^2} (\mu_2 - \mu_1 y)}{\sqrt{1-y^2}} + \mu_1 x. \quad (\text{B.18})$$

Now, we raise this to the n -th power, and plug it into Eq. (B.16). The resulting expression can be simplified by noting the following. First, $|\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|$ does not depend on β , and $|\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|$ only depends on $\sin(\beta)$. Thus, in terms of β dependence, the integral in Eq. (B.16) is equal to a sum over terms of the form

$$\int_0^{2\pi} d\beta f(\sin(\beta)) \cos(\beta)^m \quad (\text{B.19})$$

for some functions f and integer powers m . This integral is clearly zero when m is odd, since in that case $\cos(\beta)^m$ is an odd function around $\beta = \pi/2$ and $\sin(\beta)$ is an even function around $\beta = \pi/2$, and both are periodic with periods 2π . Thus, we see that when we expand out $(\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z})^n$, we can immediately set to zero any terms with an odd power of $\cos(\beta)$, and any time that we encounter an even power of $\cos(\beta)$ we can replace it with $\cos(\beta)^2 = 1 - \sin(\beta)^2$, so our result only depends on $\sin(\beta)$.

It now remains to express x and $\sin(\beta)$ in terms of the desired $(q, |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|, |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|)$. This is straightforward using Eq. (B.2), and we find

$$x = \frac{-k_1^2 + |\vec{k}_1 + \vec{q}|^2 - q^2}{2k_1q}, \quad (\text{B.20})$$

and

$$\sin(\beta) = \frac{-2k_2qxy + k_2^2 - |\vec{k}_2 - \vec{q}|^2 + q^2}{2k_2q\sqrt{1-x^2}\sqrt{1-y^2}}. \quad (\text{B.21})$$

Taking into account that only even powers of $\cos(\beta)$ contribute, and defining

$$\nu \equiv \sqrt{1-x^2} \sin(\beta), \quad (\text{B.22})$$

this means that we can replace $(\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z})^n$ in Eq. (B.16) with (using the multinomial theorem)

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{q} \cdot \hat{z})^n \rightarrow & \sum_{i+j+2k=n} \frac{n! (\mu_1 x)^i}{i! j! (2k)!} [\nu (\mu_2 - \mu_1 y)]^j (1-y^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}(j+2k)} \\ & \times [(1-x^2 - \nu^2) (-\mu_1^2 - \mu_2^2 - y^2 + 2\mu_1\mu_2y + 1)]^k \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.23})$$

which, using Eq. (B.20) and Eq. (B.21), again puts the loop integral in Eq. (B.16) in the desired form (notice that since Eq. (B.23) depends on $\sin(\beta)$ only through ν , the possible non-analytic dependence $\sqrt{1-x^2}$ cancels and does not appear in the final answer). One can check that the right-hand sides of the expressions in Eq. (B.15) and Eq. (B.23) are equal.

C Details for biased tracers to fourth order

In this appendix, we give the explicit calculation to obtain Eq. (5.19). We do this in three steps. First, we expand the bias expansion in terms of all operators allowed by the equivalence principle. This gives the list of operators that we schematically wrote in Eq. (5.15). Next we do the explicit Taylor expansion of the operators evaluated at \vec{x}_{fl} around \vec{x} , and define the explicit $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O},i}^{(n)}$ that are in Eq. (5.16). In a last step we put them together, and remove degeneracies, to obtain Eq. (5.19). In this whole appendix, we focus on the fourth order calculation and refer to [7, 9, 10] for the calculation up to third order. The dark-matter kernels, in real space and redshift space, can be obtained from the expressions in this appendix by setting $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = 1$ and $b_5, \dots, b_{15} = 0$.

C.1 Bias expansion

As mentioned in Sec. 5.2, the tracer overdensity can only depend on second derivatives of the gravitational potential, and first derivatives of the velocity field (and higher spatial derivatives of these). To look at all possible operators, we define the building blocks

$$r_{ij} = \frac{2}{3\Omega_m \mathcal{H}^2} \partial_i \partial_j \Phi, \quad \text{and} \quad p_{ij} = -\frac{1}{faH} \partial_i v^j, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

so that $\delta^{ij} r_{ij} = \delta$ and $\delta^{ij} p_{ij} = \theta$, with $\theta \equiv -\partial_i v^i / (faH)$.¹⁷ For notational convenience, we further define

$$\begin{aligned} r^2 &= r_{ij} r_{ij}, & rp &= r_{ij} p_{ij}, & p^2 &= p_{ij} p_{ij}, & r^3 &= r_{ij} r_{jl} r_{li}, \\ r^2 p &= r_{ij} r_{jl} p_{li}, & rp^2 &= r_{ij} p_{jl} p_{il}, & p^3 &= p_{ij} p_{jl} p_{il}, & r^4 &= r_{ij} r_{jl} r_{lk} r_{ki}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

We can now write down the full expansion for the tracer overdensity up to fourth order, which we only schematically gave in Eq. (5.15). To determine the operators, we write down all contractions of r_{ij} and p_{ij} up to fourth order, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_h(\vec{x}, t) &= \int^t dt' H(t') [c_\delta(t, t') \delta(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_\theta(t, t') \theta(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') \\ &+ c_{\delta^2}(t, t') \delta^2(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{\delta\theta}(t, t') \delta\theta(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{\theta^2}(t, t') \theta^2(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') \\ &+ c_{r^2}(t, t') r^2(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{rp}(t, t') rp(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{p^2}(t, t') p^2(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') \\ &+ c_{\delta^3}(t, t') \delta^3(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{\delta^2\theta}(t, t') \delta^2\theta(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{\delta\theta^2}(t, t') \delta\theta^2(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{\theta^3}(t, t') \theta^3(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') \\ &+ c_{r^3}(t, t') r^3(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{r^2p}(t, t') r^2p(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{rp^2}(t, t') rp^2(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{p^3}(t, t') p^3(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') \\ &+ c_{r^2\delta}(t, t') r^2\delta(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{rp\delta}(t, t') rp\delta(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{p^2\delta}(t, t') p^2\delta(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') \\ &+ c_{r^2\theta}(t, t') r^2\theta(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{rp\theta}(t, t') rp\theta(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{p^2\theta}(t, t') p^2\theta(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') \\ &+ c_{\delta^4}(t, t') \delta^4(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{\delta r^3}(t, t') \delta r^3(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{\delta^2 r^2}(t, t') \delta^2 r^2(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') \\ &+ c_{(r^2)^2}(t, t') (r^2)^2(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t') + c_{r^4}(t, t') r^4(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}, t')] \Big|_{\vec{x}_{\text{fl}} = \vec{x}_{\text{fl}}(\vec{x}, t, t')}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

¹⁷Notice that p_{ij} is symmetric for a velocity with vanishing vorticity. For the biases that we discuss in this section, this is true.

Since we only go up to fourth order in perturbations, terms that explicitly start at fourth order above are evaluated on the linear fields, and for those terms we have used $\theta^{(1)} = \delta^{(1)}$.

C.2 Expansion in fluid element

The operators in Eq. (C.3) are all evaluated at \vec{x}_fl , where \vec{x}_fl is given implicitly in Eq. (5.14). In this section, we Taylor expand all the fields evaluated at \vec{x}_fl around \vec{x} . Going up to products of four fields, for a generic operator \mathcal{O} we have (following [7])

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}(\vec{x}_\text{fl}(\vec{x}, t, t'), t') &\approx \mathcal{O}(\vec{x}, t') + \partial_i \mathcal{O}(\vec{x}, t') \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_1}{a(t_1)} v^i(\vec{x}, t_1) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \partial_j \mathcal{O}(\vec{x}, t') \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_1}{a(t_1)} v^i(\vec{x}, t_1) \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_2}{a(t_2)} v^j(\vec{x}, t_2) \\
&+ \partial_i \mathcal{O}(\vec{x}, t') \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_1}{a(t_1)} \partial_j v^i(\vec{x}, t_1) \int_t^{t_1} \frac{dt_2}{a(t_2)} v^j(\vec{x}, t_2) \\
&+ \frac{1}{6} \partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \mathcal{O}(\vec{x}, t') \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_1}{a(t_1)} v^i(\vec{x}, t_1) \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_2}{a(t_2)} v^j(\vec{x}, t_2) \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_3}{a(t_3)} v^k(\vec{x}, t_3) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \partial_i \mathcal{O}(\vec{x}, t') \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_1}{a(t_1)} \partial_j \partial_k v^i(\vec{x}, t_1) \int_t^{t_1} \frac{dt_2}{a(t_2)} v^j(\vec{x}, t_2) \int_t^{t_1} \frac{dt_3}{a(t_3)} v^k(\vec{x}, t_3) \\
&+ \partial_i \mathcal{O}(\vec{x}, t') \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_1}{a(t_1)} \partial_j v^i(\vec{x}, t_1) \int_t^{t_1} \frac{dt_2}{a(t_2)} \partial_k v^j(\vec{x}, t_2) \int_t^{t_2} \frac{dt_3}{a(t_3)} v^k(\vec{x}, t_3) \\
&+ \partial_i \partial_j \mathcal{O}(\vec{x}, t') \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_1}{a(t_1)} v^i(\vec{x}, t_1) \int_t^{t'} \frac{dt_2}{a(t_2)} \partial_k v^j(\vec{x}, t_2) \int_t^{t_2} \frac{dt_3}{a(t_3)} v^k(\vec{x}, t_3) .
\end{aligned} \tag{C.4}$$

We now perturbatively expand and rewrite the velocity in terms of the divergence only

$$v_{(n)}^i(\vec{x}, t') = -\frac{a(t') \dot{D}(t')}{D(t')} \frac{D(t')^n}{D(t)^n} \frac{\partial_i}{\partial^2} \theta^{(n)}(\vec{x}, t) . \tag{C.5}$$

With the EdS approximation as done above (and potentially also without it [13]), it is always possible to solve the time integrals in Eq. (C.4) analytically, since all integrals can be reduced to

$$\int_t^{t'} dt_1 \frac{\dot{D}(t_1) D(t_1)^{n-1}}{D(t)^n} = \frac{1}{n} \left[\frac{D(t')^n}{D(t)^n} - 1 \right] . \tag{C.6}$$

This then gives the expression for a Taylor expanded operator at fourth order in perturbations

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}^{(4)}(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}(\vec{x}, t, t'), t') &= \mathcal{O}^{(4)} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} + \partial_i \mathcal{O}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \theta^{(3)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{3} \frac{D(t')}{D(t)} - \frac{1}{3} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] \\
&+ \partial_i \mathcal{O}^{(2)} \frac{\partial_i \theta^{(2)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^2}{D(t)^2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] + \partial_i \mathcal{O}^{(3)} \frac{\partial_i \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{D(t')^3}{D(t)^3} - \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] \\
&+ \partial_i \partial_j \mathcal{O}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \theta^{(2)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')}{D(t)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^2}{D(t)^2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^3}{D(t)^3} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] \\
&+ \partial_i \partial_j \mathcal{O}^{(2)} \frac{\partial_i \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^2}{D(t)^2} - \frac{D(t')^3}{D(t)^3} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] \\
&+ \partial_i \mathcal{O}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_j \partial_i \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \theta^{(2)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{3} \frac{D(t')}{D(t)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^2}{D(t)^2} + \frac{1}{6} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] \\
&+ \partial_i \mathcal{O}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \theta^{(2)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{6} \frac{D(t')}{D(t)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^3}{D(t)^3} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] \\
&+ \partial_i \mathcal{O}^{(2)} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^2}{D(t)^2} - \frac{D(t')^3}{D(t)^3} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] \\
&+ \partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \mathcal{O}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{6} \frac{D(t')}{D(t)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^2}{D(t)^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^3}{D(t)^3} - \frac{1}{6} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] \\
&+ \partial_i \mathcal{O}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \partial_k \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{6} \frac{D(t')}{D(t)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^2}{D(t)^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^3}{D(t)^3} - \frac{1}{6} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] \\
&+ \partial_i \mathcal{O}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \partial_j \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \partial_k \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{6} \frac{D(t')}{D(t)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^2}{D(t)^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^3}{D(t)^3} - \frac{1}{6} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right] \\
&+ \partial_i \partial_j \mathcal{O}^{(1)} \frac{\partial_i \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_j \partial_k \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \frac{\partial_k \theta^{(1)}}{\partial^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')}{D(t)} - \frac{3}{2} \frac{D(t')^2}{D(t)^2} + \frac{3}{2} \frac{D(t')^3}{D(t)^3} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{D(t')^4}{D(t)^4} \right], \tag{C.7}
\end{aligned}$$

where all fields $\mathcal{O}^{(n)}$ and $\theta^{(n)}$ are evaluated at (\vec{x}, t) , and we refer the reader to [9, 10] for expressions up to third order.

From the above expansion, we can now define the $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O},i}$ operators that appear in Eq. (5.16) and later in Eq. (5.19). Note that for an operator \mathcal{O}_m that starts at order m , such as a product operator of m fields, $\mathcal{O}_m^{(n)} = 0$ for $n < m$. Finally, for an operator \mathcal{O}_m starting at order m , we collect the terms that multiply the same power of $D(t')/D(t)$, which gives the n -th order terms in the expansion

$$\mathcal{O}_m^{(n)}(\vec{x}_{\text{fl}}(\vec{x}, t, t'), t') = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-m+1} \left(\frac{D(t')}{D(t)} \right)^{\alpha+m-1} \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O}_m, \alpha}^{(n)}(\vec{x}, t), \tag{C.8}$$

which allows us to read off the $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O},i}$ from Eq. (C.7). Summing up all the orders gives Eq. (5.16).

After also performing the time integrals and defining coefficients following Eq. (5.17), we obtain

the Taylor expanded and time integrated version of Eq. (C.3) at fourth order,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_h^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t) = & c_{\delta,1}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,1}^{(4)} + c_{\delta,2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,2}^{(4)} + c_{\delta,3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(4)} + c_{\delta,4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,4}^{(4)} + c_{\theta,1}\mathbb{C}_{\theta,1}^{(4)} + c_{\theta,2}\mathbb{C}_{\theta,2}^{(4)} + c_{\theta,3}\mathbb{C}_{\theta,3}^{(4)} \\
& + c_{\theta,4}\mathbb{C}_{\theta,4}^{(4)} + c_{\delta^2,1}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(4)} + c_{\delta^2,2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} + c_{\delta^2,3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} + c_{\delta\theta,1}\mathbb{C}_{\delta\theta,1}^{(4)} + c_{\delta\theta,2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta\theta,2}^{(4)} \\
& + c_{\delta\theta,3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta\theta,3}^{(4)} + c_{\theta^2,1}\mathbb{C}_{\theta^2,1}^{(4)} + c_{\theta^2,2}\mathbb{C}_{\theta^2,2}^{(4)} + c_{\theta^2,3}\mathbb{C}_{\theta^2,3}^{(4)} + c_{r^2,1}\mathbb{C}_{r^2,1}^{(4)} + c_{r^2,2}\mathbb{C}_{r^2,2}^{(4)} \\
& + c_{r^2,3}\mathbb{C}_{r^2,3}^{(4)} + c_{rp,1}\mathbb{C}_{rp,1}^{(4)} + c_{rp,2}\mathbb{C}_{rp,2}^{(4)} + c_{rp,3}\mathbb{C}_{rp,3}^{(4)} + c_{p^2,1}\mathbb{C}_{p^2,1}^{(4)} + c_{p^2,2}\mathbb{C}_{p^2,2}^{(4)} \\
& + c_{p^2,3}\mathbb{C}_{p^2,3}^{(4)} + c_{\delta^3,1}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)} + c_{\delta^3,2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} + c_{\theta^3,1}\mathbb{C}_{\theta^3,1}^{(4)} + c_{\theta^3,2}\mathbb{C}_{\theta^3,2}^{(4)} + c_{\delta^2\theta,1}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2\theta,1}^{(4)} \\
& + c_{\delta^2\theta,2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2\theta,2}^{(4)} + c_{\delta\theta^2,1}\mathbb{C}_{\delta\theta^2,1}^{(4)} + c_{\delta\theta^2,2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta\theta^2,2}^{(4)} + c_{r^3,1}\mathbb{C}_{r^3,1}^{(4)} + c_{r^3,2}\mathbb{C}_{r^3,2}^{(4)} + c_{p^3,1}\mathbb{C}_{p^3,1}^{(4)} \\
& + c_{p^3,2}\mathbb{C}_{p^3,2}^{(4)} + c_{r^2p,1}\mathbb{C}_{r^2p,1}^{(4)} + c_{r^2p,2}\mathbb{C}_{r^2p,2}^{(4)} + c_{rp^2,1}\mathbb{C}_{rp^2,1}^{(4)} + c_{rp^2,2}\mathbb{C}_{rp^2,2}^{(4)} + c_{r^2\delta,1}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,1}^{(4)} \\
& + c_{r^2\delta,2}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + c_{rp\delta,1}\mathbb{C}_{rp\delta,1}^{(4)} + c_{rp\delta,2}\mathbb{C}_{rp\delta,2}^{(4)} + c_{p^2\delta,1}\mathbb{C}_{p^2\delta,1}^{(4)} + c_{p^2\delta,2}\mathbb{C}_{p^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + c_{r^2\theta,1}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\theta,1}^{(4)} \\
& + c_{r^2\theta,2}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\theta,2}^{(4)} + c_{rp\theta,1}\mathbb{C}_{rp\theta,1}^{(4)} + c_{rp\theta,2}\mathbb{C}_{rp\theta,2}^{(4)} + c_{p^2\theta,1}\mathbb{C}_{p^2\theta,1}^{(4)} + c_{p^2\theta,2}\mathbb{C}_{p^2\theta,2}^{(4)} \\
& + c_{\delta^4,1}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} + c_{\delta r^3,1}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)} + c_{\delta^2 r^2,1}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2 r^2,1}^{(4)} + c_{(r^2)^2,1}\mathbb{C}_{(r^2)^2,1}^{(4)} + c_{r^4,1}\mathbb{C}_{r^4,1}^{(4)} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{C.9}$$

where all of the $c_{\mathcal{O},i}$ functions are evaluated at t , and all of the $\mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{O},i}^{(4)}$ functions are evaluated at (\vec{x}, t) . As mentioned in the main text, the expansion above is not yet irreducible, for instance $\mathbb{C}_{r^2,1}^{(4)} = \frac{7}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(4)}$. Therefore by a redefinition of coefficients, we can reduce the number of coefficients needed. A full list of degeneracies is given in Eq. (C.11) in the next section.

C.3 Degeneracies and local basis

We find that at fourth order, the number of independent operators is fifteen, and we choose the basis

$$\{\mathbb{C}_{\delta,1}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{\delta,2}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{\delta,4}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{r^2,2}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{r^2,3}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{r^3,2}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)}, \mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}\} . \tag{C.10}$$

We give these fifteen functions explicitly in App. C.4. The other operators are given in terms of these by the following relationships

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{C}_{r^2,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{7}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(4)} , & \mathbb{C}_{r^3,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{45}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(4)} - \frac{105}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \frac{3}{4}\mathbb{C}_{r^2,2}^{(4)} + \frac{35}{8}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)} , \\
\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{7}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)} , & \mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta^2}^{(4)} &= \frac{7}{6}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} , \\
\mathbb{C}_{(r^2)^2,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{735}{32}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{105}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{49}{16}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{2315}{96}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} - \frac{49}{12}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)} , \\
\mathbb{C}_{r^4,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{735}{64}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{343}{24}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{49}{32}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{2827}{192}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} - \frac{17}{24}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)} , \\
\mathbb{C}_{\theta,1}^{(4)} &= \mathbb{C}_{\delta,1}^{(4)} , & \mathbb{C}_{\theta,2}^{(4)} &= 2\mathbb{C}_{\delta,2}^{(4)} - \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(4)} , & \mathbb{C}_{\theta,3}^{(4)} &= 3\mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(4)} - \frac{3}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} + \mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)} , \\
\mathbb{C}_{\theta,4}^{(4)} &= 4\mathbb{C}_{\delta,4}^{(4)} - 2\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} + \frac{4}{3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} , & \mathbb{C}_{\delta\theta,1}^{(4)} &= \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(4)} , \\
\mathbb{C}_{\delta\theta,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{3}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)} , & \mathbb{C}_{\delta\theta,3}^{(4)} &= 2\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{4}{3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} + \mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} , & \mathbb{C}_{\theta^2,1}^{(4)} &= \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(4)} , \\
\mathbb{C}_{\theta^2,2}^{(4)} &= 2\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - 2\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)} , & \mathbb{C}_{\theta^2,3}^{(4)} &= \frac{39}{8}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - 5\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{107}{24}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} - \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{C.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{C}_{rp,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{7}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(4)}, & \mathbb{C}_{rp,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{9}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(4)} - \frac{21}{8}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{C}_{r^2,2}^{(4)} + \frac{7}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{rp,3}^{(4)} &= \frac{55}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,4}^{(4)} - \frac{387}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} + \frac{643}{30}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{2}{5}\mathbb{C}_{r^3,2}^{(4)} + \frac{49}{40}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} - \frac{4627}{240}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} + \frac{17}{30}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{p^2,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{7}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,1}^{(4)}, & \mathbb{C}_{p^2\theta,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{7}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{p^2,2}^{(4)} &= 9\mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(4)} - \frac{21}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} + \frac{7}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, & \mathbb{C}_{p^2,3}^{(4)} &= \frac{33}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,4}^{(4)} - 9\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} + 6\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{9}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2\theta,1}^{(4)} &= \mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, & \mathbb{C}_{\delta^2\theta,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{4}{3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)}, & \mathbb{C}_{\delta\theta^2,1}^{(4)} &= \mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{\delta\theta^2,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{5}{3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - 2\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)}, & \mathbb{C}_{\theta^3,1}^{(4)} &= \mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, & \mathbb{C}_{\theta^3,2}^{(4)} &= 2\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - 3\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{pr^2,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{45}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(4)} - \frac{105}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \frac{3}{4}\mathbb{C}_{r^2,2}^{(4)} + \frac{35}{8}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{pr^2,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{147}{32}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{343}{60}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} + \frac{13}{15}\mathbb{C}_{r^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{49}{80}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{2827}{480}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} - \frac{17}{60}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{rp^2,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{45}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(4)} - \frac{105}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \frac{3}{4}\mathbb{C}_{r^2,2}^{(4)} + \frac{35}{8}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{rp^2,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{147}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{343}{30}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} + \frac{11}{15}\mathbb{C}_{r^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{49}{40}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{2827}{240}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} - \frac{17}{30}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{p^3,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{45}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta,3}^{(4)} - \frac{105}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \frac{3}{4}\mathbb{C}_{r^2,2}^{(4)} + \frac{35}{8}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{p^3,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{441}{32}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{343}{20}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} + \frac{3}{5}\mathbb{C}_{r^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{147}{80}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{2827}{160}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} - \frac{17}{20}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{p^2\delta,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{7}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, & \mathbb{C}_{rp\delta,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{7}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{r^2\theta,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{7}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, & \mathbb{C}_{rp\theta,1}^{(4)} &= \frac{7}{4}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{rp\delta,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{21}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{4}{3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} + \frac{5}{8}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{49}{48}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} + \frac{1}{6}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{p^2\delta,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{21}{8}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{8}{3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} + \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{49}{24}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} + \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{r^2\theta,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{105}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{47}{6}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} + \frac{1}{8}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{365}{48}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} - \frac{7}{6}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{rp\theta,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{63}{8}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{55}{6}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{69}{8}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} - \mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}, \\
\mathbb{C}_{p^2\theta,2}^{(4)} &= \frac{147}{16}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^2,3}^{(4)} - \frac{21}{2}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^3,2}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{8}\mathbb{C}_{r^2\delta,2}^{(4)} + \frac{463}{48}\mathbb{C}_{\delta^4,1}^{(4)} - \frac{5}{6}\mathbb{C}_{\delta r^3,1}^{(4)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The local-in-time limit is obtained by setting $c_{\mathcal{O}_m}(t, t') = c_{\mathcal{O}_m}(t)\delta_D(t - t')/H(t)$ in Eq. (5.17). Using that, along with Eq. (5.16) with $t = t'$, in Eq. (5.18), we have the local-in-time expansion

$$\delta_{h, \text{loc}}^{(n)}(\vec{x}, t) = \sum_{\mathcal{O}_m} c_{\mathcal{O}_m}(t)\mathcal{O}_m^{(n)}(\vec{x}, t), \quad (\text{C.12})$$

where $\mathcal{O}_m^{(n)}(\vec{x}, t)$ is the normal expression for the operator \mathcal{O}_m at n -th order in perturbations. For $n = 4$, we find that a basis for all of the $\mathcal{O}_m^{(4)}(\vec{x}, t)$ is $\vec{B}_{\text{loc}} = \{\mathcal{O}_m^{(4)}\}$ where \mathcal{O}_m is given by

$$\{p^2, r^2, r^2r^2, r^2p, r^3, r^4, rp, \delta, r^2\delta, r^3\delta, rp\delta, \delta^2, r^2\delta^2, \delta^3, \theta\}. \quad (\text{C.13})$$

Then, calling \vec{B} the basis given in Eq. (C.10), we find that

$$\vec{B}_{\text{loc}} = M \cdot \vec{B}, \quad (\text{C.14})$$

where the change of basis matrix M is given by

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{7}{2} & 9 & \frac{33}{2} & -\frac{5}{2} & -\frac{21}{4} & -9 & 0 & 0 & \frac{7}{2} & 6 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{9}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{7}{2} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{5}{2} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{735}{32} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{105}{4} & 0 & -\frac{49}{16} & \frac{2315}{96} & -\frac{49}{12} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{45}{4} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{105}{16} & \frac{147}{32} & -\frac{3}{4} & 0 & \frac{35}{8} & -\frac{343}{60} & \frac{13}{15} & -\frac{49}{80} & \frac{2827}{480} & -\frac{17}{60} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{45}{4} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{105}{16} & 0 & -\frac{3}{4} & 0 & \frac{35}{8} & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{735}{64} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{343}{24} & 0 & -\frac{49}{32} & \frac{2827}{192} & -\frac{17}{24} \\ 0 & \frac{7}{2} & \frac{9}{2} & \frac{55}{2} & -\frac{5}{2} & -\frac{21}{8} & -\frac{387}{16} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{7}{4} & \frac{643}{30} & -\frac{2}{5} & \frac{49}{40} & -\frac{4627}{240} & \frac{17}{30} \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{7}{4} & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{5}{2} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{7}{4} & \frac{21}{16} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{5}{2} & -\frac{4}{3} & 0 & \frac{5}{8} & \frac{49}{48} & \frac{1}{6} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{7}{6} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{5}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & -1 & -\frac{3}{2} & -2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \frac{4}{3} & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C.15})$$

Since $\det M \neq 0$, this means that M is invertible and thus the local-in-time basis is equivalent to the non-local-in-time basis.

C.4 Explicit expressions for fourth order kernels

We here give the final $\mathbb{C}_{O,i}$ used in Eq. (5.19) that are linearly independent, as Fourier space kernels. We use the notation

$$\mathbb{C}_{O,i}^{(n)}(\vec{k}, t) = D(t)^n \int_{\vec{q}_1, \dots, \vec{q}_n}^{\vec{k}} K_n^{O,i}(\vec{q}_1, \dots, \vec{q}_n) \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{q}_1}^{(1)} \dots \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{q}_n}^{(1)}. \quad (\text{C.16})$$

Dropping the $(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4)$ dependence on the left-hand sides to avoid clutter, we explicitly have

$$\begin{aligned} K_4^{\delta,1} &= \frac{(\vec{q}_1 \cdot (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4) \vec{q}_2 \cdot (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4) + \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2 (3\vec{q}_1 + 2\vec{q}_2) \cdot (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4)) G_2(\vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4)}{6q_2^2 (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4)^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot (\vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4) G_3(\vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4)}{3(\vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4)^2} + \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2 (\vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3) + \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + 3\vec{q}_3))}{6q_2^2 q_3^2 q_4^2}, \\ K_4^{\delta,2} &= \frac{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) \cdot (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4) (q_2^2 F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2) - \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2) G_2(\vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4)}{2q_2^2 (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4)^2} + \frac{\vec{q}_3 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3) F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2)}{2q_3^2 q_4^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2 (\vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3) + \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + 3\vec{q}_3))}{2q_2^2 q_3^2 q_4^2}, \\ K_4^{\delta,3} &= \frac{\vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3) F_3(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3)}{q_4^2} + \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2 (\vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3) + \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + 3\vec{q}_3))}{2q_2^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3) \vec{q}_3 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)}{q_4^2} \left(\frac{F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2)}{q_3^2} + \frac{G_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2)}{2(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.17})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
K_4^{\delta,4} &= F_4(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4) - \sum_{i=1}^3 K_4^{\delta,i}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4) , \\
K_4^{\delta^2,1} &= \frac{\vec{q}_2 \cdot (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4) G_2(\vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4)}{(\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4)^2} + \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_4 + \vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3)}{q_3^2 q_4^2} , \\
K_4^{\delta^2,2} &= \frac{2\vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3) F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2)}{q_4^2} - \frac{2(\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_4 + \vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3))}{q_3^2 q_4^2} , \\
K_4^{\delta^2,3} &= 2F_3(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3) + F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2) F_2(\vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4) - \sum_{i=1}^2 K_4^{\delta^2,i}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4) , \\
K_4^{r^2,2} &= \frac{2(\vec{q}_3 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2))^2 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3) F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2)}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} - \frac{2(\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2)^2 (\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_4 + \vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3))}{q_1^2 q_2^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} , \\
K_4^{r^2,3} &= \frac{((\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) \cdot (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4))^2 F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2) F_2(\vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4)}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2 (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4)^2} - \frac{2F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2) (\vec{q}_3 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2))^2 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3)}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{2(\vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3))^2 F_3(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3)}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3)^2 q_4^2} - \frac{\vec{q}_3 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) (\vec{q}_3 \cdot \vec{q}_4)^2 G_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2)}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{(\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_4 + \vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_3 (\vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_4 + \vec{q}_3 \cdot \vec{q}_4)) (\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2)^2}{q_1^2 q_2^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} , \\
K_4^{\delta^3,1} &= \frac{3\vec{q}_4 \cdot \vec{q}_3}{q_4^2} , \quad K_4^{\delta^3,2} = 3F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2) - \frac{3\vec{q}_4 \cdot \vec{q}_3}{q_4^2} , \\
K_4^{r^3,2} &= \frac{3\vec{q}_3 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) \vec{q}_3 \cdot \vec{q}_4 \vec{q}_4 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2)}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} - \frac{3\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2 \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_3 \cdot \vec{q}_4}{q_1^2 q_2^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} , \\
K_4^{r^2\delta,2} &= \frac{2(\vec{q}_3 \cdot (\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2))^2 F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2)}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2 q_3^2} + \frac{(\vec{q}_3 \cdot \vec{q}_4)^2 F_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2)}{q_3^2 q_4^2} - \frac{\vec{q}_3 \cdot \vec{q}_4 (2(\vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_3)^2 q_1^2 + (\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2)^2 q_3^2)}{q_1^2 q_2^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} , \\
K_4^{\delta^4,1} &= 1 , \quad K_4^{\delta r^3,1} = \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{q}_2 \vec{q}_2 \cdot \vec{q}_3 \vec{q}_3 \cdot \vec{q}_1}{q_1^2 q_2^2 q_3^2} ,
\end{aligned}$$

The above, combined with Eq. (5.19), defines the final biased tracer kernels K_n^h up to $n = 4$. The conversion to redshift space to get $K_4^{r,h}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4; \hat{z})$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}
K_4^{r,h} &= K_4^h(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4) + f\mu^2 G_4(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4) + k\mu f \frac{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3) \cdot \hat{z}}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3)^2} G_3(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3) K_1^h(\vec{q}_4) \\
&\quad + k\mu f \frac{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) \cdot \hat{z}}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2} G_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2) K_2^h(\vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4) + k\mu f \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \hat{z}}{q_1^2} K_3^h(\vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4) \tag{C.18} \\
&\quad + k^2 \mu^2 f^2 \frac{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3) \cdot \hat{z} \vec{q}_4 \cdot \hat{z}}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3)^2 q_4^2} G_3(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3) + k^2 \mu^2 f^2 \frac{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) \cdot \hat{z} \vec{q}_3 \cdot \hat{z}}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2 q_3^2} G_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2) K_1^h(\vec{q}_4) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} k^2 \mu^2 f^2 \frac{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) \cdot \hat{z} (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4) \cdot \hat{z}}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2 (\vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4)^2} G_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2) G_2(\vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4) + \frac{1}{2} k^2 \mu^2 f^2 \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{q}_2 \cdot \hat{z}}{q_1^2 q_2^2} K_2^h(\vec{q}_3, \vec{q}_4) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} k^3 \mu^3 f^3 \frac{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) \cdot \hat{z} \vec{q}_3 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{q}_4 \cdot \hat{z}}{(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2)^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} G_2(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2) + \frac{1}{6} k^3 \mu^3 f^3 \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{q}_2 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{q}_3 \cdot \hat{z}}{q_1^2 q_2^2 q_3^2} K_1^h(\vec{q}_4) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{24} k^4 \mu^4 f^4 \frac{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{q}_2 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{q}_3 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{q}_4 \cdot \hat{z}}{q_1^2 q_2^2 q_3^2 q_4^2} ,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu = \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}$ and $\vec{k} \equiv \vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2 + \vec{q}_3 + \vec{q}_4$, and see [11] for the analogous redshift space expression up to third order.

D Details for biased tracers in redshift space renormalization

D.1 Counterterm expressions for biased tracers in redshift space

For the response counterterms, we define the kernels $K_1^{r,h,ct}$ and $K_2^{r,h,ct}$ from

$$\tilde{\delta}_{r,h,ct}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) = K_1^{r,h,ct}(\vec{k}; \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}(\vec{k}), \quad \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,ct}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) = \int_{\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2}^{\vec{k}} K_2^{r,h,ct}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2; \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}(\vec{q}_1) \tilde{\delta}^{(1)}(\vec{q}_2), \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where the tilde fields are defined analogously to Eq. (4.23), just with $r \rightarrow r, h$. The response counterterms enter in

$$\begin{aligned} P_{13}^{r,h,ct}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) &\equiv 2K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}; \hat{z}) K_1^{r,h,ct}(-\vec{k}; \hat{z}) P_{11}(k), \\ B_{411}^{r,h,ct} &\equiv 2P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2) K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z}) K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) K_2^{r,h,ct}(-\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) + 2 \text{ perms.}, \\ B_{321}^{r,h,(II),ct} &\equiv 2P_{11}(k_1) P_{11}(k_2) K_1^{r,h,ct}(\vec{k}_1; \hat{z}) K_1^{r,h}(\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) K_2^{r,h}(-\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2; \hat{z}) + 5 \text{ perms.}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

(we have suppressed the argument $(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z})$ of the bispectra terms to remove clutter) so that the combinations

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{13}^{r,h}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) + P_{13}^{r,h,ct}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}), \\ &B_{411}^{r,h}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) + B_{411}^{r,h,ct}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}), \\ &B_{321}^{r,h,(II)}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) + B_{321}^{r,h,(II),ct}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

are renormalized.

For the stochastic terms, we write the first order solution as $\delta_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}, a) = D(a)^2 \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z})$ and the second order as

$$\tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(2)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) = \int_{\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2}^{\vec{k}} \delta_2^{r,h,\epsilon}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2; \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{\vec{q}_2}^{(1)}, \quad (\text{D.4})$$

The term that renormalizes $P_{22}^{r,h}$ is

$$P_{22}^{r,h,\epsilon}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) \equiv \langle \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}', \hat{z}) \rangle', \quad (\text{D.5})$$

the term that renormalizes $B_{222}^{r,h}$ is

$$B_{222}^{r,h,\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) = \langle \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_1, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_2, \hat{z}) \tilde{\delta}_{r,h,\epsilon}^{(1)}(\vec{k}_3, \hat{z}) \rangle', \quad (\text{D.6})$$

and the term that renormalizes $B_{321}^{r,h,(I)}$ is defined in Eq. (5.46) and Eq. (5.47). In this way,

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{22}^{r,h}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}) + P_{22}^{r,h,\epsilon}(k, \hat{k} \cdot \hat{z}), \\ &B_{222}^{r,h}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) + B_{222}^{r,h,\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}), \\ &B_{321}^{r,h,(I)}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}) + B_{321}^{r,h,(I),\epsilon}(k_1, k_2, k_3, \hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}, \hat{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

are renormalized.

D.2 Response terms

The functions that enter $K_2^{r,h,ct}$ in Eq. (5.43) are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
e_1^{K_2} &= -\frac{\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2 k_2^2}{2k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_1^2} + \frac{f \vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z} k_2^2}{2k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_1^2} + (1 \leftrightarrow 2), & e_2^{K_2} &= -\frac{k_3^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} F_2(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) + \frac{\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2}{2k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(\frac{k_1^2}{k_2^2} + \frac{k_2^2}{k_1^2} \right) \\
e_3^{K_2} &= -\frac{k_3^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2}, & e_4^{K_2} &= -\frac{(\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2)^2 k_3^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_1^2 k_2^2}, & e_5^{K_2} &= -\frac{\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2} \\
e_6^{K_2} &= -\frac{f \vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2}{2k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_2^2} + \frac{f^2 (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^2 \vec{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z}}{2k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_2^2} + (1 \leftrightarrow 2), \\
e_7^{K_2} &= \frac{f (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^2 \vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2 \vec{k}_2 \cdot \vec{k}_3 \vec{k}_3 \cdot \vec{k}_1}{k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_1^2 k_2^2 k_3^2} \\
e_8^{K_2} &= -\frac{f^2 (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^2 \vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2 (\vec{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{4k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_1^2 k_2^2} + \frac{f^3 (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^3 \vec{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z} (\vec{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{4k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_1^2 k_2^2} + (1 \leftrightarrow 2) \\
e_9^{K_2} &= -\frac{f^2 (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{2k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(\frac{(\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{k_3^2} F_2(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) - \frac{\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2 [(\vec{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z})^2 + (\vec{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z})^2]}{2k_1^2 k_2^2} \right) \\
e_{10}^{K_2} &= -\frac{f^2 (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^2 \vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2}{4k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_2^2} + \frac{f^3 (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^3 \vec{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z}}{4k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_2^2} + (1 \leftrightarrow 2) \\
e_{11}^{K_2} &= -\frac{f^2 (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{2k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(F_2(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) - \frac{\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{k_1^2} + \frac{1}{k_2^2} \right) \right), & e_{12}^{K_2} &= -\frac{f^2 (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{4k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left(\frac{(\vec{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{k_1^2} + \frac{(\vec{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{k_2^2} \right) \\
e_{13}^{K_2} &= -\frac{f^2 (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^2 \vec{k}_1 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{k}_2 \cdot \hat{z} \vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2}{2k_{\text{NL}}^2 k_1^2 k_2^2}, & e_{14}^{K_2} &= -\frac{f^2 (\vec{k}_3 \cdot \hat{z})^2}{2k_{\text{NL}}^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{D.8}$$

where we have defined $\vec{k}_3 \equiv -\vec{k}_1 - \vec{k}_2$. The new non-locally-contributing counterterm enters $K_2^{r,h,ct}$ through the term $e_7^{K_2}$.

The UV matching for the response terms is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1^h &= \frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2 (3b_1 - 64(b_3 + 15b_8))}{1260\pi^2}, \\
c_2^h &= \frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}{679140\pi^2} (8(-792b_2 - 2926b_3 + 1522b_4 + 462(6b_7 - 95b_8) \\
&\quad - 6215b_9 + 6930b_{11}) - 27335b_1), \\
c_3^h &= \frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}{4753980\pi^2} (194348b_1 + 95205b_2 + 160160b_3 - 431040b_4 - 6529248b_9 \\
&\quad + 77(147b_5 - 5248b_7 + 31200b_8) - 2217600b_{11}), \\
c_4^h &= \frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}{1584660\pi^2} (20559b_1 - 2(17677b_2 - 13552b_3 + 5664b_4 + 7392b_7 \\
&\quad - 203280b_8 + 55088b_9 + 18480b_{11})), \\
c_5^h &= -\frac{2\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}{169785\pi^2} (6083b_1 + 792b_2 + 1078b_3 - 6450b_4 - 7700b_7 \\
&\quad + 16170b_8 - 35673b_9 - 62370b_{11}),
\end{aligned} \tag{D.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1^\pi &= -\frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2 (4725b_1 + 32(36b_2 + 35(b_3 + 15b_8)))}{30870\pi^2}, \\
c_5^\pi &= \frac{668\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}{56595\pi^2}, \\
c_1^{\pi v} &= -\frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2 (35f + 46)}{210\pi^2}, \quad c_2^{\pi v} = -\frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2 (15f + 11)}{150\pi^2}, \\
c_3^{\pi v} &= -\frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2 (147(35b_1 + 48)f + 9156b_1 + 2304b_2 + 2240b_3 + 33600b_8 + 9261)}{30870\pi^2 f}, \\
c_4^{\pi v} &= \frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2 (-6b_2(245f + 514) + 273b_1 + 448b_3 + 6720b_8 - 594f - 1785)}{8820\pi^2 f}, \\
c_5^{\pi v} &= \frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2 (2394b_1 + 2304b_2 + 2240b_3 + 33600b_8 - 75)}{30870\pi^2}, \\
c_6^{\pi v} &= -\frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2 (1715f + 4626)}{25725\pi^2}, \\
c_7^{\pi v} &= -\frac{\sigma^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}{679140\pi^2 f} (924b_1(168f + 97) + 3234b_5(35f - 2) - 205920b_2 \\
&\quad + 19712b_3 + 295680b_8 + 111078f + 70809),
\end{aligned}$$

with all other coefficients set to zero (*i.e.* they are degenerate for the observables that we consider). Above, $\sigma^2 = \int dq P_{11}(q)$. Notice that, as expected, the $c_{\text{DM},i}^{\pi v}$ from Eq. (A.51) are related to the $c_i^{\pi v}$ above when the biases are evaluated on the dark-matter values $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4 = 1$ and $b_5, \dots, b_{15} = 0$. Using the expression for $F_1^{r,ct}$ in Eq. (4.35), the expression for $K_1^{r,h,ct}$ in Eq. (5.42), the expression for $F_2^{r,ct}$ in Eq. (4.36), the expression for $K_2^{r,h,ct}$ in Eq. (5.43), and the basis relation Eq. (A.50), we find $c_j^{\pi v}|_{\text{DM bias}} = c_{\text{DM},j}^{\pi v}$ for $j = 1, 2, 6$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
c_3^{\pi v}|_{\text{DM bias}} &= c_{\text{DM},3}^{\pi v} + \frac{2}{3f}c_3 + \frac{4}{9f}c_5, \\
c_4^{\pi v}|_{\text{DM bias}} &= c_{\text{DM},4} + \frac{7}{99f}c_3 + \frac{16}{33f}c_4 - \frac{7}{99f}c_5, \\
c_5^{\pi v}|_{\text{DM bias}} &= c_{\text{DM},5} - \frac{2}{3}c_3 - \frac{4}{9}c_5, \\
c_7^{\pi v}|_{\text{DM bias}} &= c_{\text{DM},7} + \frac{8}{99f}c_3 + \frac{29}{99f}c_5 + \frac{16}{33f}c_7,
\end{aligned} \tag{D.10}$$

where $c|_{\text{DM bias}}$ means to evaluate c on the dark-matter values for the bias parameters, which one can indeed confirm is true for the UV matching that we found in Eq. (A.36), Eq. (A.51), and Eq. (D.9).

D.3 Stochastic terms

The functions that enter the stochastic counterterm $\bar{B}_{321}^{r,h,(I),\epsilon}$ in Eq. (5.48) are

$$\begin{aligned}
e_1^{\text{St}} &= f\mu_1^2 - 1, \\
e_2^{\text{St}} &= -\frac{k_1^2(k_2^2(1 - 2f\mu_1^2) + k_3^2) + 2f(k_3^2 - k_2^2)k_1\mu_1k_2\mu_2 + (k_2^2 - k_3^2)^2}{2k_1^2k_{\text{NL}}^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{D.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
e_3^{\text{St}} &= 0, \\
e_4^{\text{St}} &= -\frac{f^2 k_1 \mu_1 (k_1^3 \mu_1 (2f \mu_1^2 - 1) + 4f k_1^2 \mu_1^2 k_2 \mu_2 + k_1 \mu_1 (k_2^2 (4f \mu_2^2 - 1) + k_3^2) + 2(k_3^2 - k_2^2) k_2 \mu_2)}{4k_1^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}, \\
e_5^{\text{St}} &= \frac{f^2 k_1 \mu_1 (4f k_1^2 \mu_1^2 k_2 \mu_2 + k_1 \mu_1 (k_2^2 (4f \mu_2^2 - 1) + k_3^2) + k_1^3 \mu_1 + 2(k_3^2 - k_2^2) k_2 \mu_2)}{4k_1^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}, \\
e_6^{\text{St}} &= 2, \quad e_7^{\text{St}} = -\frac{k_2^2 + k_3^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2}, \quad e_8^{\text{St}} = -\frac{k_1^4 + (k_2^2 - k_3^2)^2}{2k_1^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}, \\
e_9^{\text{St}} &= -\frac{k_1^2}{k_{\text{NL}}^2}, \quad e_{10}^{\text{St}} = -\frac{f(k_1 \mu_1 + 2k_2 \mu_2) ((k_1^2 - k_2^2 + k_3^2) k_1 \mu_1 + 2k_1^2 k_2 \mu_2)}{4k_1^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}, \\
e_{11}^{\text{St}} &= \frac{f k_1 \mu_1 ((k_1^2 + k_2^2 - k_3^2) k_1 \mu_1 + 2(k_2^2 - k_3^2) k_2 \mu_2)}{2k_1^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}, \quad e_{12}^{\text{St}} = -\frac{2f k_2 \mu_2 (k_1 \mu_1 + k_2 \mu_2)}{k_{\text{NL}}^2}, \\
e_{13}^{\text{St}} &= \frac{f}{4k_1^2 k_2^2 k_3^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2} \left((k_1^2 - k_2^2 + k_3^2)^2 k_1^2 \mu_1^2 k_2^2 + 2(k_1^2 - k_2^2 + k_3^2)^2 k_1 \mu_1 k_2^3 \mu_2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + ((k_2^2 + k_3^2) k_1^4 - 2(k_2^2 - k_3^2)^2 k_1^2 + (k_2^2 - k_3^2)^2 (k_2^2 + k_3^2)) k_2^2 \mu_2^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

All of the above e_i^{St} are symmetric when swapping \vec{k}_2 and \vec{k}_3 , as expected from Eq. (5.47). To see it, one must swap $k_2 \leftrightarrow k_3$ and $\mu_2 \leftrightarrow \mu_3$, and then replace $\mu_3 = -k_3^{-1}(k_1 \mu_1 + k_2 \mu_2)$.

Since, for the stochastic terms, we match terms of order k^0 and k^2 , there are non-zero contributions coming from expanding factors of $P_{11}(|\vec{k} - \vec{q}|)$ for small k/q inside of the loops in Eq. (5.12). Thus, UV matching includes terms proportional to $P'_{11}(q)$ and $P''_{11}(q)$. We give the full expressions for all terms below, apart from c_7^{St} and c_8^{St} , which are too long to display here; all full values are given in the accompanying Mathematica notebook. For the UV matching, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1^{\text{St}} &= -\frac{\omega^2 \bar{n} (-b_1 + b_2 + b_5)^2}{\pi^2}, \tag{D.12} \\
c_2^{\text{St}} &= \frac{\bar{n} k_{\text{NL}}^2 (b_1 - b_2 - b_5) [(14b_1 - 16b_2) \gamma^2 - 7(b_1 - b_2 - b_5)(2\gamma_1^2 + \gamma_2^2)]}{42\pi^2}, \\
c_3^{\text{St}} &= -\frac{\gamma^2 \bar{n} k_{\text{NL}}^2 (b_1 - b_2 - b_5) (-7b_1 + 7f + 9)}{21\pi^2}, \\
c_4^{\text{St}} &= \frac{\gamma^2 \bar{n} k_{\text{NL}}^2 (b_1(35f + 54) - 35(b_2 + b_5)f - 2(19b_2 + 8b_3 + 23b_5 + 8b_6 + 22b_8))}{105\pi^2 f}, \\
c_5^{\text{St}} &= 0, \\
c_6^{\text{St}} &= -\frac{\omega^2 \bar{n} (b_1 - b_2 - b_5) (13b_1 + 34b_2 - 47b_3 + 42b_5 - 110b_6 - 82b_8 - 63b_{10})}{21\pi^2}, \\
c_7^{\text{St}} &= -\frac{\gamma^2 \bar{n} k_{\text{NL}}^2}{1470\pi^2} \left(301b_1^2 + (656b_2 - 7(183b_3 - 124b_5 + 282b_6 + 638b_8 + 105b_{10})) b_1 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 982b_2^2 + 14b_5(47b_3 - 35b_5 + 44b_6 + 236b_8) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2b_2(653b_3 - 784b_5 + 1052b_6 + 2228b_8 + 420b_{10}) \right) + \mathcal{O}(P'_{11}(q), P''_{11}(q)), \\
c_8^{\text{St}} &= \frac{\gamma^2 \bar{n} k_{\text{NL}}^2}{4410\pi^2} \left(-21b_1^2 + (1689b_2 - 7(122b_3 - 51b_5 + 168b_6 + 192b_8)) b_1 - 1188b_2^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2((187b_3 - 546b_5 + 348b_6 + 12b_8) b_2 + 7b_5(13b_3 + 36b_6 - 36b_8)) \right) + \mathcal{O}(P'_{11}(q), P''_{11}(q)),
\end{aligned}$$

$$c_9^{\text{St}} = -\frac{\gamma^2 \bar{n} k_{\text{NL}}^2 (7b_1 - 6b_2 - 14b_5) (b_1 - b_2 - b_5)}{42\pi^2},$$

$$c_{10}^{\text{St}} = \frac{\gamma^2 \bar{n} k_{\text{NL}}^2}{735\pi^2} \left(7b_1^2(35f + 22) + b_1(-7b_2(35f + 79) - 7b_5(35f + 103) + 399b_3) \right. \\ \left. + 1134b_6 + 546b_8 + 735b_{10} + 224f + 256 \right) \\ \left. + b_2(287f + 417) - 7(73b_3 - 57b_5 + 178b_6 + 122b_8 + 105b_{10})f \right. \\ \left. - 673b_3 + 553b_5 - 1618b_6 - 1142b_8 - 945b_{10} \right),$$

$$c_{11}^{\text{St}} = \frac{\gamma^2 \bar{n} k_{\text{NL}}^2}{1470\pi^2} \left(7b_1^2(6 - 35f) \right. \\ \left. + b_1(7b_2(35f + 123) + 49b_5(5f + 13) - 623b_3 - 1358b_6 - 1162b_8 - 735b_{10} - 469f - 634) \right. \\ \left. + 511b_3f - 154b_5f - b_2(280b_5 + 42f + 151) + 1246b_6f \right. \\ \left. + 854b_8f + 105b_{10}(7f + 9) - 280b_2^2 + 785b_3 - 231b_5 + 1730b_6 + 1450b_8 \right),$$

$$c_{12}^{\text{St}} = \frac{\gamma^2 \bar{n} k_{\text{NL}}^2 (7b_1^2 + (-109b_2 + 32b_3 - 93b_5 + 32b_6 + 88b_8)b_1 + 70(b_2 + b_5)^2)}{210\pi^2},$$

$$c_{13}^{\text{St}} = \frac{\gamma^2 \bar{n} k_{\text{NL}}^2 (-97b_1 + b_2 + 96b_3 + 49b_5 + 96b_6 + 264b_8)}{1470\pi^2},$$

where $\gamma^2 = \int dq P_{11}(q)^2$, $\gamma_1^2 = \int dq q P_{11}(q) P'_{11}(q)$, $\gamma_2^2 = \int dq q^2 P_{11}(q) P''_{11}(q)$, and $\omega^2 = \int dq q^2 P_{11}(q)^2$. UV matching for Eq. (5.49) is

$$c_1^{(222)} = \frac{4(b_1 - b_2 - b_5)^3 \bar{n}^2}{\pi^2} \int dq q^2 P_{11}(q)^3, \\ c_2^{(222)} = -\frac{2(b_1 - b_2 - b_5)^2 \bar{n}^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2}{63\pi^2} (3(7b_1 - 8b_2)\vartheta^3 - 7(b_1 - b_2 - b_5)(4\vartheta_1^3 + \vartheta_2^3 + 2\vartheta_3^3)), \quad (\text{D.13}) \\ c_5^{(222)} = \frac{4(b_1 - b_2 - b_5)^2 (-9 + 7b_1 - 7f) f \bar{n}^2 k_{\text{NL}}^2 \vartheta^3}{21\pi^2}.$$

where $\vartheta^3 = \int dq P_{11}(q)^3$, $\vartheta_1^3 = \int dq q P_{11}(q)^2 P'_{11}(q)$, $\vartheta_2^3 = \int dq q^2 P_{11}(q) P''_{11}(q)^2$, and $\vartheta_3^3 = \int dq q^2 P_{11}(q)^2 P'_{11}(q)$.

D.4 Parameter matching with PyBird

For reference, we give the conversion between the parameters used here and those used in PyBird (which we write in the typewriter font). For the counterterm parameters, we have

$$\text{Bc1} = c_1^h, \quad \text{Bc2} = c_1^\pi, \quad \text{Bc3} = c_1^{\pi v}, \quad \text{Bc4} = c_3^{\pi v}, \quad \text{Bc5} = c_2^h, \quad \text{Bc6} = c_3^h, \quad \text{Bc7} = c_4^h \\ \text{Bc8} = c_5^h, \quad \text{Bc9} = c_5^\pi, \quad \text{Bc10} = c_2^{\pi v}, \quad \text{Bc11} = c_4^{\pi v}, \quad \text{Bc12} = c_5^{\pi v}, \quad \text{Bc13} = c_6^{\pi v}, \\ \text{Bc14} = c_7^{\pi v}, \quad \text{ce2} = (2/3) f c_3^{\text{St}}, \quad \text{Be1} = c_1^{\text{St}}, \quad \text{Be2} = c_2^{\text{St}}, \quad \text{Be3} = c_4^{\text{St}}, \quad \text{Be4} = c_5^{\text{St}}, \\ \text{Be5} = 2c_6^{\text{St}}, \quad \text{Be6} = 2c_9^{\text{St}}, \quad \text{Be7} = -c_7^{\text{St}} - c_9^{\text{St}}, \quad \text{Be8} = -c_8^{\text{St}} - 2c_9^{\text{St}}, \quad \text{Be9} = 2c_{12}^{\text{St}} \\ \text{Be10} = c_{11}^{\text{St}}, \quad \text{Be11} = c_{10}^{\text{St}}, \quad \text{Be12} = c_{13}^{\text{St}}, \\ \text{Bd1} = c_1^{(222)}, \quad \text{Bd2} = c_2^{(222)} - c_5^{(222)}/6, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Bd3} = -c_5^{(222)}. \quad (\text{D.14})$$

For the bias parameters, we have $Bb_i = b_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, 6, 8, \dots, 11$, and $Bb_7 = b_7 + 15b_{13}/2$. Other parameters in the PyBird code are derived from the ones above, and were used in the power-spectrum-only analysis. These are given by

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 &= Bb_1, & b_2 &= Bb_2, & b_3 &= Bb_3 + 15Bb_8, & b_4 &= Bb_5, & cct &= -Bc_1, \\ cr_1 &= fBc_2 - f^2Bc_4/2, & cr_2 &= -f^2Bc_3/2, & ce_0 &= Be_1, & ce_1 &= Be_2 + ce_2/2, \\ c_2 &= (b_2 + b_4)/\sqrt{2}, & \text{and} & & c_4 &= (b_2 - b_4)/\sqrt{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (D.15)$$

References

- [1] G. D’Amico, Y. Donath, M. Lewandowski, L. Senatore and P. Zhang, *The BOSS bispectrum analysis at one loop from the Effective Field Theory of Large-Scale Structure*, [2206.08327](#).
- [2] G. D’Amico, M. Lewandowski, L. Senatore and P. Zhang, *Limits on primordial non-Gaussianities from BOSS galaxy-clustering data*, [2201.11518](#).
- [3] D. Baumann, A. Nicolis, L. Senatore and M. Zaldarriaga, *Cosmological Non-Linearities as an Effective Fluid*, *JCAP* **1207** (2012) 051, [[1004.2488](#)].
- [4] J. J. M. Carrasco, M. P. Hertzberg and L. Senatore, *The Effective Field Theory of Cosmological Large Scale Structures*, *JHEP* **09** (2012) 082, [[1206.2926](#)].
- [5] M. Lewandowski, A. Perko and L. Senatore, *Analytic Prediction of Baryonic Effects from the EFT of Large Scale Structures*, *JCAP* **1505** (2015) 019, [[1412.5049](#)].
- [6] D. P. L. Bragança, M. Lewandowski, D. Sekera, L. Senatore and R. Sgier, *Baryonic effects in the Effective Field Theory of Large-Scale Structure and an analytic recipe for lensing in CMB-S4*, [2010.02929](#).
- [7] L. Senatore, *Bias in the Effective Field Theory of Large Scale Structures*, *JCAP* **1511** (2015) 007, [[1406.7843](#)].
- [8] M. Mirbabayi, F. Schmidt and M. Zaldarriaga, *Biased Tracers and Time Evolution*, *JCAP* **07** (2015) 030, [[1412.5169](#)].
- [9] R. Angulo, M. Fasiello, L. Senatore and Z. Vlah, *On the Statistics of Biased Tracers in the Effective Field Theory of Large Scale Structures*, *JCAP* **1509** (2015) 029, [[1503.08826](#)].
- [10] T. Fujita, V. Mauerhofer, L. Senatore, Z. Vlah and R. Angulo, *Very Massive Tracers and Higher Derivative Biases*, *JCAP* **01** (2020) 009, [[1609.00717](#)].
- [11] A. Perko, L. Senatore, E. Jennings and R. H. Wechsler, *Biased Tracers in Redshift Space in the EFT of Large-Scale Structure*, [1610.09321](#).
- [12] E. O. Nadler, A. Perko and L. Senatore, *On the Bispectra of Very Massive Tracers in the Effective Field Theory of Large-Scale Structure*, *JCAP* **1802** (2018) 058, [[1710.10308](#)].
- [13] Y. Donath and L. Senatore, *Biased Tracers in Redshift Space in the EFTofLSS with exact time dependence*, *JCAP* **10** (2020) 039, [[2005.04805](#)].

- [14] P. McDonald and A. Roy, *Clustering of dark matter tracers: generalizing bias for the coming era of precision LSS*, *JCAP* **0908** (2009) 020, [[0902.0991](#)].
- [15] L. Senatore and M. Zaldarriaga, *Redshift Space Distortions in the Effective Field Theory of Large Scale Structures*, [1409.1225](#).
- [16] T. Baldauf, M. Mirbabayi, M. Simonovic and M. Zaldarriaga, *Equivalence Principle and the Baryon Acoustic Peak*, *Phys. Rev.* **D92** (2015) 043514, [[1504.04366](#)].
- [17] L. Senatore and G. Trevisan, *On the IR-Resummation in the EFTofLSS*, *JCAP* **1805** (2018) 019, [[1710.02178](#)].
- [18] M. Lewandowski and L. Senatore, *An analytic implementation of the IR-resummation for the BAO peak*, [1810.11855](#).
- [19] D. Blas, M. Garny, M. M. Ivanov and S. Sibiryakov, *Time-Sliced Perturbation Theory II: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and Infrared Resummation*, *JCAP* **1607** (2016) 028, [[1605.02149](#)].
- [20] G. D' Amico, J. Gleyzes, N. Kokron, D. Markovic, L. Senatore, P. Zhang et al., *The Cosmological Analysis of the SDSS/BOSS data from the Effective Field Theory of Large-Scale Structure*, *JCAP* **05** (2020) 005, [[1909.05271](#)].
- [21] M. M. Ivanov, M. Simonović and M. Zaldarriaga, *Cosmological Parameters from the BOSS Galaxy Power Spectrum*, *JCAP* **05** (2020) 042, [[1909.05277](#)].
- [22] T. Colas, G. D'amico, L. Senatore, P. Zhang and F. Beutler, *Efficient Cosmological Analysis of the SDSS/BOSS data from the Effective Field Theory of Large-Scale Structure*, *JCAP* **06** (2020) 001, [[1909.07951](#)].
- [23] BOSS collaboration, S. Alam et al., *The clustering of galaxies in the completed SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: cosmological analysis of the DR12 galaxy sample*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **470** (2017) 2617–2652, [[1607.03155](#)].
- [24] M. Lewandowski, L. Senatore, F. Prada, C. Zhao and C.-H. Chuang, *EFT of large scale structures in redshift space*, *Phys. Rev.* **D97** (2018) 063526, [[1512.06831](#)].
- [25] J. J. M. Carrasco, S. Foreman, D. Green and L. Senatore, *The 2-loop matter power spectrum and the IR-safe integrand*, *JCAP* **1407** (2014) 056, [[1304.4946](#)].
- [26] L. Mercolli and E. Pajer, *On the velocity in the Effective Field Theory of Large Scale Structures*, *JCAP* **1403** (2014) 006, [[1307.3220](#)].
- [27] J. J. M. Carrasco, S. Foreman, D. Green and L. Senatore, *The Effective Field Theory of Large Scale Structures at Two Loops*, *JCAP* **1407** (2014) 057, [[1310.0464](#)].
- [28] R. Takahashi, *Third Order Density Perturbation and One-loop Power Spectrum in a Dark Energy Dominated Universe*, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **120** (2008) 549–559, [[0806.1437](#)].
- [29] P. Zhang and Y. Cai, *BOSS full-shape analysis from the EFTofLSS with exact time dependence*, *JCAP* **01** (2022) 031, [[2111.05739](#)].
- [30] M. H. Goroff, B. Grinstein, S. J. Rey and M. B. Wise, *Coupling of Modes of Cosmological Mass Density Fluctuations*, *Astrophys. J.* **311** (1986) 6–14.

- [31] B. Jain and E. Bertschinger, *Second order power spectrum and nonlinear evolution at high redshift*, *Astrophys. J.* **431** (1994) 495, [[astro-ph/9311070](#)].
- [32] T. Baldauf, L. Mercolli, M. Mirbabayi and E. Pajer, *The Bispectrum in the Effective Field Theory of Large Scale Structure*, *JCAP* **1505** (2015) 007, [[1406.4135](#)].
- [33] T. Matsubara, *Resumming Cosmological Perturbations via the Lagrangian Picture: One-loop Results in Real Space and in Redshift Space*, *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 063530, [[0711.2521](#)].
- [34] B. Jain and E. Bertschinger, *Selfsimilar evolution of cosmological density fluctuations*, *Astrophys. J.* **456** (1996) 43, [[astro-ph/9503025](#)].
- [35] P. Creminelli, J. Noreña, M. Simonović and F. Vernizzi, *Single-Field Consistency Relations of Large Scale Structure*, *JCAP* **12** (2013) 025, [[1309.3557](#)].
- [36] M. Lewandowski, *Violation of the consistency relations for large-scale structure with dark energy*, *JCAP* **08** (2020) 044, [[1912.12292](#)].
- [37] V. Desjacques, D. Jeong and F. Schmidt, *Large-Scale Galaxy Bias*, *Phys. Rept.* **733** (2018) 1–193, [[1611.09787](#)].
- [38] A. Eggemeier, R. Scoccimarro and R. E. Smith, *Bias Loop Corrections to the Galaxy Bispectrum*, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) 123514, [[1812.03208](#)].
- [39] P. McDonald, *Clustering of dark matter tracers: Renormalizing the bias parameters*, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 103512, [[astro-ph/0609413](#)].
- [40] O. H. E. Philcox, M. M. Ivanov, G. Cabass, M. Simonović, M. Zaldarriaga and T. Nishimichi, *Cosmology with the redshift-space galaxy bispectrum monopole at one-loop order*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) 043530, [[2206.02800](#)].
- [41] M. Simonovic, T. Baldauf, M. Zaldarriaga, J. J. Carrasco and J. A. Kollmeier, *Cosmological perturbation theory using the FFTLog: formalism and connection to QFT loop integrals*, *JCAP* **1804** (2018) 030, [[1708.08130](#)].
- [42] C. Anastasiou, D. P. L. Bragança, L. Senatore and H. Zheng, *Efficiently evaluating loop integrals in the EFTofLSS using QFT integrals with massive propagators*, [2212.07421](#).