

# Scalar weak gravity bound from full unitarity

Anna Tokareva<sup>a,b,e†</sup>, Yongjun Xu<sup>a,c,d‡</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*School of Fundamental Physics and Mathematical Sciences,  
Hangzhou Institute for Advanced Study, UCAS, Hangzhou 310024, China*

<sup>b</sup>*International Centre for Theoretical Physics Asia-Pacific, Beijing/Hangzhou, China*

<sup>c</sup>*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

<sup>d</sup>*University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

<sup>e</sup>*Department of Physics, Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London, SW7 2AZ London, UK*

## Abstract

Weak gravity conjecture can be formulated as a statement that gravity must be the weakest force, compared to the other interactions in low energy effective field theory (EFT). Several arguments in favor of this statement were presented from the side of string theory and black hole physics. However, it is still an open question whether the statement of weak gravity can be proven based on more general assumptions of causality, unitarity, and locality of the fundamental theory. These consistency requirements imply the dispersion relations for the scattering amplitudes which allow to bound the EFT coefficients. The main difficulty for obtaining these constraints in the presence of gravity is related to the graviton pole which makes the required dispersion relations divergent in the forward limit. In this work, we present a new way of deriving the bound on the ratio between the EFT cutoff scale and Planck mass from confronting the IR divergences from graviton pole and one-loop running of the EFT Wilson coefficient in front of the dimension-12 operator. Our method also allows to incorporate full unitarity of partial wave expansion of the UV theory. We examine the EFT of a single shift-symmetric scalar in four dimensions and find that the maximal value of the cutoff scale of the EFT coupled to gravity must be lower than about  $O(10)$  Planck mass.

---

† tokareva@ucas.ac.cn

‡ xuyongjun23@mails.ucas.ac.cn

# Contents

- 1 Introduction** **2**
  
- 2 Dispersion relations with the graviton pole and EFT loops** **3**
  - 2.1 Scattering amplitude in EFT . . . . . 5
  - 2.2 Gravitational coupling through the moments of UV theory . . . . . 6
  - 2.3 Expressions for running of  $g_4$  through moments of UV theory . . . . . 8
  
- 3 Hölder’s inequality** **10**
  - 3.1 The method . . . . . 11
  - 3.2 Optimization of the bound . . . . . 12
  
- 4 Conclusions** **13**

# 1 Introduction

Weak gravity conjecture is a criterion for effective field theory (EFT), which determines whether it can be consistently coupled to gravity. Its original formulation was given in the setup of  $U(1)$  gauge theory coupled to gravity [1] as a condition on the charge-to-mass ratio in the Planck units,

$$\frac{1}{M_P} < \frac{\sqrt{2}q}{m}. \quad (1)$$

For the charged black holes it means that every black hole must be able to evaporate without forming naked singularities caused by violating an extremality bound. This condition can also be seen as a requirement that gravity is the weakest force, as it actually bounds the gravitational coupling  $1/M_P$  from above. In the framework of EFT of photon states, where all massive particles are integrated out, the photon couplings are proportional to the powers of charge-to-mass ratios. The weak gravity bound, thus, would relate gravitational coupling  $1/M_P$  and Wilson coefficients in the EFT of photons. Significant efforts were made towards derivation of weak gravity conjecture from string theory [1–6], black hole physics [7–14], and from properties of the scattering amplitudes [15–19]. More arguments based on holography [20–23], cosmic censorship [24, 8, 25, 26], dimensional reduction [27–31], and infrared consistency [32–34] were also provided in favor of the weak gravity conjecture.

In this work, we consider an EFT of shift-symmetric scalar coupled to gravity and address the question of whether we can derive a similar type upper bound on the gravitational coupling set by the scalar EFT couplings. We assume that EFT of the shift-symmetric scalar field has a completion at high energies which satisfies the general properties of a consistent quantum theory, such as unitarity, causality, and locality. In a number of recent papers, the technique of deriving constraints on the EFT parameters from the desired properties of the UV theory has been developed [35–39, 16, 40–45, 19, 46–53, 17, 54, 55, 18, 56–83]. Typically, bounds on the EFT coefficients arise from dispersion relations for the scattering amplitudes which allow to relate them to positive-definite integrals and sums over partial waves. Their positive-definiteness is a consequence of the positivity of the imaginary parts of partial wave amplitudes of the UV theory. A set of integral inequalities which can be formulated for different combinations of EFT coefficients lead to compact bounds on the EFT parameter space. Although loop corrections and poles in the amplitude corresponding to the graviton exchange lead to the IR singularities, numerical and analytical methods of obtaining bounds in these more complicated situations were developed [84, 57, 78, 85–89]. If only positivity condition on partial waves is assumed, the weak gravity bound in the scalar case cannot be obtained [90], as well as weak gravity conjecture in EFT of photons coupled to gravity [91]. It seems that more information about the UV theory is required.

In this paper we use full unitarity condition on the partial wave amplitudes in four dimensions. This means that we assume the EFT is completed by a unitary four-dimensional theory. Under

this condition, supplied by the convergence requirements for certain sums and integrals of partial waves, we find the bound relating the scalar EFT self-coupling with the Planck mass. We use Hölder’s inequality which allows us to implement the full unitarity condition and construct the upper bound on gravitational coupling making an explicit statement on how weak the gravity should be, compared to the scalar self-coupling.

The paper is organized as follows.

**Sec. 2:** We formulate dispersion relations in the presence of graviton pole and express the EFT couplings through the moments of positive-definite sums and integrals over partial waves.

**Sec. 3:** We describe the application of Hölder’s inequality to obtaining the weak gravity bound in the EFT of shift-symmetric scalar.

**Sec. 4:** We discuss the validity of our assumptions about the UV theory and possible implications of our results, as well as directions for future study.

## 2 Dispersion relations with the graviton pole and EFT loops

An issue of divergence of the graviton exchange amplitude in the forward limit makes it more difficult to formulate a technique of dispersion relations between UV and IR limits of the complete theory. Many different approaches to the problem were formulated before, starting from the assumption that the graviton pole divergence can be ignored in dispersion relations (this could sound reasonable if all scales in EFT are much smaller than Planck mass), which led to certain conclusions about QED and Standard Model [19, 92]. However, more accurate treatment of this IR divergence states that it should be reproduced in dispersion relations from a specific behavior of the amplitude in the UV theory, thus, imposing certain constraints on the UV, such as Regge trajectory [46, 93, 94, 67, 64, 60] and even stronger conditions imposed by unitarity which are shown to be satisfied for the eikonal model of graviton-mediated scattering [95, 96].

We make use of the dispersion relation based on the analyticity and locality of the full scattering amplitude including the graviton exchange. For fixed  $-t > 0$  we can relate an integral over the relatively small arc (which can be computed in the EFT) to the integrals over branch cuts of the amplitude, see Figure 2.

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{arc} \frac{A(\mu, t)}{(\mu - s)^{n+1}} = \int_r^\infty \frac{d\mu \text{Disc}_s A(\mu, t)}{\pi (\mu - s)^{n+1}} + (-1)^n \int_{r-t}^\infty \frac{d\mu \text{Disc}_u A(\mu, t)}{\pi (\mu - u)^{n+1}} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\infty \frac{A(\mu, t)}{(\mu - s)^{n+1}}. \quad (2)$$




Figure 1: Integration contour used in (2) and branch cut singularities of the scattering amplitude at fixed real  $t < 0$ . Here  $\Lambda$  is an EFT cutoff scale, and  $r < \Lambda$  is the radius of the arc.

If we assume the Schwartz reflection principle,  $A(\mu, t) = A^*(\mu^*, t)$ , we have,

$$\text{Disc}_s A(\mu, t) = \text{Im}A(\mu, t). \quad (3)$$

The last term in (2) is a boundary term, which vanishes if the amplitude is bounded  $A_{\text{mp}} < s^2$  in the limit of  $|s| \rightarrow \infty$  at fixed  $t$ . This condition is a consequence of unitarity in theories with a mass gap, as it follows from the Martin-Froissart bound [97–99]. If graviton exchange is taken into account, this condition has to be assumed additionally, it is not possible to derive it from the first principles. However, under several reasonable assumptions it can be obtained as a result of eikonal resummation [95].

We define a set of quantities which can be computed in the EFT theory,

$$M_n(t) \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\text{arc}} \frac{A(\mu, t)}{\mu^{n+1}} + (-1)^n \int_{\epsilon^2}^{r-t} \frac{d\mu \text{Disc}_u A(\mu, t)}{\pi (\mu - u)^{n+1}}. \quad (4)$$

The dispersion relation (2) allows us to rewrite them through integrals over discontinuities of the UV amplitude. These discontinuities can be expanded in partial waves,

$$\text{Disc}_s A(\mu, t) = 16\pi \sum_{j=\text{even}}^{\infty} (2j+1) \text{Im}f_j(\mu) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right). \quad (5)$$

where  $P_j$  are the Legendre polynomials, and  $f_j$  are the partial-wave expansion coefficients. They must satisfy the full unitarity condition  $0 \leq \text{Im}f_j \leq 2$ . This way, the left-hand side (determined by the EFT) of the dispersion relation appears to be the integrated sum of positive-definite and bounded functions. This way, constraints on the Wilson coefficients of EFTs emerge from a set of integral inequalities formulated for bounded and positive-definite functions [84, 100]. A systematic account of all these constraints can be done based on the theory of moments [101, 62, 102].

This well-developed technique needs modification in the presence of massless loops and graviton pole divergence [57, 85]. The reason for that is related to the fact that partial wave sums, as well as integrals, may not be convergent in certain cases. Thus, only selected combinations are well-defined mathematically. In dimensions higher than four, this problem can be avoided by introducing certain smearing functions that are still positive-definite [48]. However, in four dimensions, there are no proper positive-definite functions, so overcoming this issue is more challenging. In this paper, we develop a method based on recurrence relations between Legendre polynomials, which allows us to define convergent moment integrals properly addressing their analytic properties in the limit  $t \rightarrow 0$ .

Hereafter we accept that certain combinations of sums and integrals could be divergent and not well-defined. In this case, we understand them as formal series and operate accordingly. Our results, however, are based on dealing with only convergent combinations in the limit  $t \rightarrow 0$ ,  $t < 0$ , corresponding to the EFT data. We have to stress here that, since all dispersion relations we use may not be well-defined for  $t > 0$ , we understand the  $t$ -derivatives with which we operate hereafter in the sense of one-sided limits only, defined for  $t < 0$ . We specify the assumptions and conditions that make our operations well-defined, although for any concrete example of the UV theory they could be explicitly checked.

## 2.1 Scattering amplitude in EFT

In this paper, we consider the scattering of four massless scalars described by the EFT of the shift-symmetric scalar field,

$$A(s, t, u) = A_S(s, t, u) + A_G(s, t, u). \quad (6)$$

Here  $s$ ,  $t$ ,  $u$  are Mandelstam variables and  $u = -s - t$  on-shell. The scalar self-interaction part of the amplitude  $A_S$  is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} A_S(s, t, u) = & g_2 (s^2 + t^2 + u^2) + g_3 stu + g_4 (s^2 + t^2 + u^2)^2 \\ & + [s^2 (b_2 tu + b_1 s^2) \log(-s) + (s - t) + (s - u)] \\ & + g_5 (stu)(s^2 + t^2 + u^2) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Here we included the first loop corrections emerging from the scalar self-interaction. The corresponding  $\beta$ -functions are

$$b_1 = -\frac{21g_2^2}{240\pi^2} \quad b_2 = \frac{g_2^2}{240\pi^2} \quad (8)$$

The amplitude from a single graviton exchange  $A_G$  can be written in a fully crossing-symmetric form as

$$A_G(s, t, u) = \frac{1}{2M_{\text{P}}^2} \left( \frac{tu}{s} + \frac{st}{u} + \frac{su}{t} \right). \quad (9)$$

Based on the expression (6), we can compute the arc integrals  $M_n$  defined in (4). We provide here the expressions for them expanded at small  $t$  up to the leading non-analyticities caused by the logarithmic corrections.

$$M_2(t) \Big|_{t \rightarrow 0} = -\frac{1}{2M_P^2} + \frac{1}{3} (6g_2 + 3b_1 r^2) + \frac{1}{2} t (-2g_3 - 10b_1 r - 4b_2 r) + t^2 (7b_1 + 2b_2 + 12g_4 + 6b_1 \log(-t) + b_2 \log(-t) - b_2 \log(r)) + O(t^3). \quad (10)$$

$$M_3(t) \Big|_{t \rightarrow 0} = t \left( 2b_1 + 8g_4 + 4b_1 \log(-t) - b_2 (\log(r) - \log(-t)) \right) + O(t^2), \quad (11)$$

$$M_4(t) \Big|_{t \rightarrow 0} = 4g_4 + b_1 \log(-t) + b_1 \log(r) + O(t). \quad (12)$$

Here we notice that due to the presence of  $\log(-t)$  terms, certain  $t$ -derivatives of  $M_n$  may lead to  $1/t$  divergencies. The graviton pole contributes only to  $M_2$ , however, this contribution makes it problematic to take  $t \rightarrow 0$  limit in the dispersion relation, as well as find out the source of this divergence in the UV integrals over the discontinuities,

$$M_2(t) = \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\mu^3} + \frac{1}{(\mu+t)^3} \right) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \right], \quad (13)$$

where we define the brackets as

$$[X(\mu, j)] \equiv \sum_{j \text{ even}} 16(2j+1) \int_r^\infty d\mu \operatorname{Im} f_j(\mu) X(\mu, j). \quad (14)$$

Given that Legendre polynomials are analytic in  $t$  at  $t \rightarrow 0$ , the naive expansion of the brackets would not match with the IR theory structure. There is no contradiction because, for example, the partial wave expansion may not be convergent pointwise. Thus, the infinite sum can converge at any finite  $t < 0$ , while being divergent at  $t = 0$ .

In this work we follow the idea that the analytic structure of IR theory imposes certain constraints on the UV completion, in particular, requiring that selected combinations of derivatives of  $M_n$  multiplied by  $t$  correspond to finite values of brackets (representing an integral over  $\mu$  and sum over partial waves). For these combinations, we impose integral inequalities which finally lead to relations between EFT couplings.

## 2.2 Gravitational coupling through the moments of UV theory

From the IR theory, we know that  $M_2$  must have  $1/t$  divergence, no matter what kind of local UV completion is assumed. This implies that  $(-t)M_2$  must be finite,

$$(-t)M_2 = \frac{1}{2M_P^2}, \quad t \rightarrow 0. \quad (15)$$

For the amplitude (6) it can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} (-t)M_2 &= \frac{1}{2M_P^2} - \frac{1}{3} (6g_2 + 3b_1 r^2) t - \frac{1}{2} t^2 (-2g_3 - 10b_1 r - 4b_2 r) \\ &\quad - t^3 (7b_1 + 2b_2 + 12g_4 + (6b_1 + b_2) \log(-t) - b_2 \log(r)) + O(t^4), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

One can notice that there are other non-analyticities caused by massless loops from the scalar self-interactions. The main idea of this paper, roughly, is to relate these non-analyticities with the graviton pole divergence, in such a way that the divergencies cancel each other, although they are coming from different sectors of the theory. The finite parts, thus, will form a relation between gravitational coupling and  $\beta$ -functions of the scalar EFT. We can write  $(-t)M_2(t)$  through the sums and integrals of the UV theory,

$$(-t)M_2(t) = \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\mu^3} + \frac{1}{(\mu+t)^3} \right) (-t) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \right]. \quad (17)$$

The problem with the expression (15) is that the right-hand side naively should converge to zero while expanding in a series of  $t$ . The corresponding non-analyticity is well-hidden in the convergence properties of both the sum and integral. Namely, they could converge at any finite  $t < 0$  except for  $t = 0$ . All that makes it difficult to apply the usual technique of expanding the right-hand side in  $t$ , and dealing with moment sums and integrals of partial waves.

In order to deal with that, we propose that the factor  $(-t)$  can be hidden inside the Legendre polynomial, with the use of the recurrence relation (Bonnet's recursion formula),

$$(2j+1) \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) = j P_{j-1} \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) + (j+1) P_{j+1} \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right). \quad (18)$$

Applying this formula to  $tP_j(\dots)$  in (17) we obtain the following sum of the partial waves after the redefinition of the summation indices,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} t \rho(j, \mu) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_1(j, \mu) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right). \quad (19)$$

Here  $\rho(j, \mu) = (2j+1) \text{Im } f_j(\mu)$ , and

$$\rho_1(j, \mu) = \frac{\mu}{2} \left( \frac{j \rho(-1+j, \mu)}{2j-1} - \rho(j, \mu) + \frac{(1+j) \rho(1+j, \mu)}{3+2j} \right). \quad (20)$$

Remarkably, full crossing symmetry implies that the odd partial wave amplitudes with  $j = 2k+1$  where  $k$  is an integer are zero<sup>1</sup>. This leads to a significant simplification of the sum

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} t \rho(j, \mu) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) = -\frac{\mu}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho(j, \mu) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right). \quad (21)$$

Thus, we can write (at least in the sense of formal sum and integral),

$$(-t)M_2(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\mu^2} + \frac{\mu}{(\mu+t)^3} \right) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \right]. \quad (22)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>One has to be careful with the use of this property. For example, an iteration of (18) for  $t^2$  will lead to the terms containing  $\rho(j \pm 2, \mu)$  which are non-zero, while a naive iteration of (19) would cause a mistake of skipping these terms.



Now we can take a formal limit  $t \rightarrow 0$  in the right-hand side, where we will get explicitly the constant in  $t$  contribution,

$$(-t)M_2(t) = \left[ \frac{1}{\mu^2} \right] + O(t). \quad (23)$$

Under which conditions the listed operations are well justified? First of all, we need the convergence of the right-hand side which means that the UV completion should be such that it allows to write down onnce-subtracted dispersion relations, similarly to what was considered in [77]. Second, we omitted terms like

$$\left[ \left( \frac{t^k}{\mu^2} \right) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \right], \quad (24)$$

where  $k$  is an integer, assuming they are more suppressed in  $t \rightarrow 0$  limit. However, for certain cases of bad convergence properties of the sum one may expect surprises. For this reason, we have to state it here as an extra assumption that can be checked, given a concrete UV completion.

### 2.3 Expressions for running of $g_4$ through moments of UV theory

As we are looking for the relation between  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$  and Planck mass, we also need to construct the expressions for them in terms of moments. The main purpose is to find a positive-definite combination for  $b_2 > 0$  ( $b_1 = -21b_2$ ). We can extract this coefficient, for example, as

$$F_1 = t \frac{\partial^4 (tM_2(t))}{\partial t^4} = 6(6b_1 + b_2) = -750b_2 \quad (25)$$

From the moments of UV theory, we can write

$$F_1 = t \frac{\partial^4}{\partial t^4} \left( \int_r^\infty d\mu \sum_{j=0}^\infty \left( \frac{1}{\mu^3} + \frac{1}{(\mu+t)^3} \right) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \rho_1(j, \mu) \right). \quad (26)$$

Here  $\rho_1$  is defined in (20). Formally, it can be transformed as

$$F_1 = \int_r^\infty d\mu \sum_{j=0}^\infty \rho_1(j, \mu) S(j, \mu, t), \quad (27)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S(j, \mu, t) = & tP_j^{(4)} \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \frac{16(2\mu^3 + 3\mu^7 t + 3\mu t^2 + t^3)}{\mu^7 (\mu + t)^3} - tP_j^{(3)} \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \frac{96}{\mu^3 (\mu + t)^4} + \\ & + tP_j^{(2)} \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \frac{288}{\mu^2 (\mu + t)^5} - tP_j^{(1)} \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \frac{480}{\mu (\mu + t)^6} + tP_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \frac{360}{(\mu + t)^7}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The next step here requires recurrence relations for derivatives of Legendre polynomials. Differentiating the Bonnet's recursion formula and transforming the partial wave sum (redefining summation indices for certain terms) we can obtain the following useful relations for derivatives of Legendre polynomials in the sums,

$$\sum_{j=0}^\infty \rho(j, \mu) t P_j^{(1)} \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) = \sum_{j=0}^\infty \left[ \rho_1(j, \mu) P_j^{(1)} \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) - \frac{\mu}{2} \rho(j, \mu) P_j \left( 1 + \frac{2t}{\mu} \right) \right], \quad (29)$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho(j, \mu) t P_j^{(2)} \left(1 + \frac{2t}{\mu}\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left[ \rho_1(j, \mu) P_j^{(2)} \left(1 + \frac{2t}{\mu}\right) - \mu \rho(j, \mu) P_j^{(1)} \left(1 + \frac{2t}{\mu}\right) \right], \quad (30)$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho(j, \mu) t P_j^{(3)} \left(1 + \frac{2t}{\mu}\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left[ \rho_1(j, \mu) P_j^{(3)} \left(1 + \frac{2t}{\mu}\right) - \frac{3\mu}{4} \rho(j, \mu) P_j^{(2)} \left(1 + \frac{2t}{\mu}\right) \right], \quad (31)$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho(j, \mu) t P_j^{(4)} \left(1 + \frac{2t}{\mu}\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left[ \rho_1(j, \mu) P_j^{(4)} \left(1 + \frac{2t}{\mu}\right) - 2\mu \rho(j, \mu) P_j^{(3)} \left(1 + \frac{2t}{\mu}\right) \right], \quad (32)$$

One can also define  $\rho_2(j, \mu)$ ,

$$\rho_2(j, \mu) = \frac{\mu}{2} \left( \frac{j \rho_1(-1+j, \mu)}{2j-1} - \rho_1(j, \mu) + \frac{(1+j) \rho_1(1+j, \mu)}{3+2j} \right). \quad (33)$$

These expressions can be substituted into (27), after which we can take a limit  $t \rightarrow 0$ .

Here  $\rho_1$  is defined in (20). Equations (29)-(32) do not depend on a concrete choice of  $\rho$ , so they can also be used for the choice of  $\rho = \rho_1$ , and  $\rho_1 = \rho_2$ . After all of these operations and setting  $t \rightarrow 0$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 = & \int_r^\infty d\mu \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_1(j, \mu) \left( -\frac{1}{3\mu^6} \right) (4j^6 + 12j^5 - 47j^4 - 114j^3 + 475j^2 + 534j - 720) + \\ & + \int_r^\infty d\mu \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_2(j, \mu) \frac{1}{12\mu^7} (j^8 + 4j^7 - 38j^6 - 128j^5 + 601j^4 + 1420j^3 - 3444j^2 - 4176j + 4320). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

This expression can be further simplified by substituting back  $\rho_2$  and  $\rho_1$  through  $\rho$  and collecting the terms with  $\rho(j, \mu)$  (this step involves relabeling of the summation indices for the terms containing  $\rho(j \pm 2, \mu)$ ). Here we write down the final result,

$$F_1 = \left[ \frac{1}{24\mu^5} (-864 + 360j + 456j^2 + 196j^3 + 109j^4 + 16j^5 + 10j^6 + 4j^7 + j^8) \right]. \quad (35)$$

As the expression in the brackets is negative for  $j = 0$ ,  $F_1$  is not positive-definite moment. This means we need to combine it with the other expression for the  $\beta$ -functions  $b_1, b_2$ . Such a combination could be build with the help of null constraint [103]. However, the loop-corrected null constraint has to be further modified in the presence of graviton pole because one of the combinations based on  $M_2$  contains a divergence in the presence of gravity.

We can find the following IR finite combination,

$$n_4 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} M_2 + \frac{\kappa}{3} t \frac{\partial^3}{\partial t^3} M_2 - \frac{2(3b_1 + b_2)}{2b_1 + b_2} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} M_3 - \frac{2b_2}{2b_1 + b_2} M_4 \quad (36)$$

Here  $\kappa = 1$  if graviton pole is included, while the choice  $\kappa = 0$  returns to the expression provided in [103]. The term involving multiplication by  $t$  can be treated similarly, as it was done for  $tM_2$ . The result is

$$n_4 = \left[ \frac{j(-8 - 7j + 2j^2 + j^3)}{\mu^5} \right] - \frac{\kappa}{3} \left[ \frac{72 + 42j + 17j^2 - 48j^3 - 19j^4 + 6j^5 + 2j^6}{12\mu^5} \right]. \quad (37)$$

For  $\kappa = 1$  we have,

$$n_4 = - \left[ \frac{(72 + 330j + 269j^2 - 120j^3 - 55j^4 + 6j^5 + 2j^6)}{36\mu^5} \right] = \frac{108b_1^2 + 100b_1b_2 + 17b_2^2}{3(2b_1 + b_2)}. \quad (38)$$

Substituting  $b_1 = -21b_2$  we get

$$n_4 = -\frac{45545}{123}b_2. \quad (39)$$

Finally, we have two expressions for  $b_2$ ,

$$b_2 = \left[ \frac{\phi_1(j)}{\mu^5} \right], \quad b_2 = \left[ \frac{\phi_2(j)}{\mu^5} \right]. \quad (40)$$

Here

$$\phi_1(j) = -\frac{1}{18000}(-864 + 360j + 456j^2 + 196j^3 + 109j^4 + 16j^5 + 10j^6 + 4j^7 + j^8), \quad (41)$$

$$\phi_2(j) = \frac{41}{546540}(72 + 330j + 269j^2 - 120j^3 - 55j^4 + 6j^5 + 2j^6). \quad (42)$$

Can we find a positive-definite combination of them for all integer  $j$ ? We can try a normalized sum

$$b_2 = \left[ \frac{\phi(j)}{\mu^5} \right] = \left[ \frac{d\phi_2(j) - \phi_1(j)}{d-1} \frac{1}{\mu^5} \right]. \quad (43)$$

The right hand side is positive for all possible  $j$  if

$$\frac{9109}{1025} < d < \frac{1247933}{12300}, \quad 8.8868 < d < 101.45. \quad (44)$$

Thus, we can use this combination allowing for further optimization of the bounds with respect to the parameter  $d$ .

### 3 Hölder's inequality

Now we are in a position to construct an inequality relating  $[1/\mu^2]$  and  $[\phi(j)/\mu^5]$  where  $\phi(j) \propto j^8$  for large  $j$  and is positive for all discrete  $j$ . We use here the full unitarity condition  $0 < \text{Im } f_j < 2$ , and the generalized Hölder's inequality, which states,

$$16 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_r^{\infty} f(\mu)g(\mu) d\mu \leq \left( 16 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_r^{\infty} f^q(\mu) d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left( 16 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_R^{\infty} g^p(\mu) d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad (45)$$

where  $p > 0$ ,  $q > 0$ , and  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ . This inequality allows us to relate integrals involving functions  $f(\mu)$  and  $g(\mu)$  to their respective powers  $f^q(\mu)$  and  $g^p(\mu)$ .

### 3.1 The method

The main idea of application of Hölder's inequality relating the two moments is to adjust the powers and functions such that we get a power of  $[\phi(j)/\mu^5]$  as one of the integrals in the right hand side, while the other integral is just a number which doesn't contain the partial wave amplitudes.

We propose to use the following positive functions  $f(\mu)$  and  $g(\mu)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mu) &= (\text{Im}f_j)^{\frac{1}{q}} (2j+1)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left( \frac{\phi(j)}{\mu^5} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}, \\ f^q(\mu) &= (\text{Im}f_j) (2j+1) \left( \frac{\phi(j)}{\mu^5} \right), \\ g(\mu) &= (2j+1)^{\frac{1}{p}} \frac{1}{\mu^{2-5\frac{1}{q}}} \phi(j)^{-\frac{1}{q}}, \\ g^p(\mu) &= (2j+1) \frac{1}{\mu^{p(2-5\frac{1}{q})}} \phi(j)^{-\frac{p}{q}}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Using these definitions, we can express the left-hand side of the Hölder's inequality,

$$\frac{a}{2M_{\text{P}}^2} = \left[ \frac{a}{\mu^2} \right] = 16\pi \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_r^{\infty} (a \text{Im}f_j) (2j+1) \frac{1}{\mu^2} d\mu \leq 16\pi \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_r^{\infty} (\text{Im}f_j)^{\frac{1}{q}} (2j+1) \frac{1}{\mu^2} d\mu. \quad (47)$$

Here, the parameter  $a$  is a real number chosen to optimize the bound. It must satisfy  $a \text{Im}f_j < (\text{Im}f_j)^{\frac{1}{q}}$  for  $0 \leq \text{Im}f_j \leq 2$ . Since  $a < (\text{Im}f_j)^{-\frac{1}{p}}$ , and given that  $(\text{Im}f_j)^{-\frac{1}{p}}$  decreases from 0 to 2, the parameter  $a$  is bounded as  $0 \leq a \leq 2^{-\frac{1}{p}}$ . We keep this parameter, in order to perform an extra optimisation of the final constraint with respect to  $a$ .

The right-hand side of the inequality becomes,

$$\left( 16 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_r^{\infty} (\text{Im}f_j) (2j+1) \frac{\phi(j)}{\mu^5} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left( 16 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_r^{\infty} (2j+1) \frac{1}{\mu^{p(2-5\frac{1}{q})}} \phi(j)^{-\frac{p}{q}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (48)$$

The first multiplier is exactly the expression for  $b_2$ , while the last is just a number which can be computed, provided  $\phi(j)$ ,  $p$  and  $q$ . However, both the sum and integral should converge. This imposes the condition  $p(2-5/q) > 1$  for the integral, and  $1-8q/p < -1$  for the sum over  $j$ . Remarkably, it is crucial to have a power of  $j^8$  in  $\phi(j)$  because the proposed method would not provide any bound for lower power of  $j$  in the moment. These requirements provide the following constraints,

$$p > \frac{5}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad p > \frac{4}{3}, \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad 4 < q < 5. \quad (49)$$

Thus, using the relation  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ , we obtain the inequality,

$$\frac{a}{2M_{\text{P}}^2} < (b_2)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left( 16 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_r^{\infty} (2j+1) \frac{1}{\mu^{p(2-5\frac{1}{q})}} \phi(j)^{-\frac{p}{q}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (50)$$

Regarding the choice of  $r$  representing the size of the arc, the bound will be optimal if we take maximal possible value of it,  $r = \Lambda^2$ .

### 3.2 Optimization of the bound

To obtain the strongest possible bound, we must optimize over the parameters  $a$ ,  $d$ ,  $p$ ,  $q$ , and  $g_2$ . The optimal value of  $a$  corresponds to its maximum,  $a = 2^{-\frac{1}{p}}$ . Using the connection between  $p$  and  $q$ , we define the function  $H(g_2, p, d)$  as,

$$H(g_2, p, d) = \sqrt[2^{\frac{1}{p}+1} \left( \frac{g_2^2}{240\pi^2} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \left( 16 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1+2j)}{\left( \frac{1}{d-1} (d\phi_2(j) - \phi_1(j)) \right)^{p-1}} \cdot \frac{1}{4-3p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}}. \quad (51)$$

Here we have taken  $r = \Lambda^2 = 1$ .

$$1.250 < p < 1.333 \quad \text{and} \quad 8.8868 < d < 101.45. \quad (52)$$

Thus, the problem reduces to finding the minimum value of  $H$  for each choice of  $g_2$ . The bound takes the form (here we recover cutoff scale  $\Lambda$  explicitly which was set to be unity for convenience),

$$\frac{\Lambda}{M_{\text{P}}} < H(g_2, p, d) |_{\text{min}} \quad \text{for} \quad 1.250 < p < 1.333 \quad \text{and} \quad 8.8868 < d < 101.45. \quad (53)$$

We minimize numerically the the function  $H(g_2, p, d)$  over the allowed ranges of  $p$ ,  $d$ . We plot the inverse of this function in color in Fig. 3.2. The minimum of function  $H$  is located in the middle of this two-dimensional region, far from the boundaries of the allowed area. The reason for this is related to the fact that the function (51) becomes infinite at all these boundaries. For example, the choice of  $d$  at the border would lead to a zero value of  $d\phi_2(j) - \phi_1(j)$  at a certain value of  $j$ . For critical values of  $p$  either the sum or integral are divergent.




Figure 2: Values of  $1/H(g_2, p, d)$  shown in color. The minimum of  $H$  corresponds to a certain point in the middle of the region which can be found numerically.

The results of numerical minimization of the function  $H$  are plotted in Fig. 3.2. We found that the numerical result is a line in a logarithmic plot, thus, it is very well approximated by the

analytic dependence,

$$H(g_2, p, d)|_{\min} \approx 27.3 g_2^{0.232}. \quad (54)$$




Figure 3: (a) Plot of  $H(g_2, p, d)|_{\min}$  as a function of  $g_2$  with logarithmic scaling of both axis. The dependence is very close to a straight line showing the power-law behavior of the bound with changing  $g_2$ . (b) Plot of  $H(g_2, p, d)|_{\min}$  as a function of  $g_2$  with linear scaling. It shows a good coincidence with the proposed analytic function representing the minimal value of  $H$  with respect to  $p$  and  $d$ .

Finally, we get

$$\frac{\Lambda}{M_{\text{P}}} \lesssim 27.3 g_2^{0.232}. \quad (55)$$

This is the main result of the paper. If we impose for a constraint on  $g_2$  obtained from full unitarity [103],  $g_2 < 37.8$ , we get <sup>2</sup>

$$\frac{\Lambda}{M_{\text{P}}} \lesssim 63.4. \quad (56)$$

Thus, the gravitational coupling characterized by  $1/M_P$  must be weaker than self-coupling in the scalar EFT. This means that the EFT cutoff scale in the scalar sector cannot be significantly higher than the Planck mass.

## 4 Conclusions

In this work, we derived a weak gravity bound by applying the Hölder inequality to the integral expressions arising from the positivity and full unitarity constraints in four dimensions. We identified the necessary conditions on the parameters  $p$  and  $q$  to ensure the convergence of the integrals and the sums over the index  $j$ . By choosing appropriate values for these parameters, we

---

<sup>2</sup>We take this value just as an order-of-magnitude estimate because in the presence of gravity the analysis of the full unitarity bounds on  $g_2$  should be reconsidered.

derived a series of inequalities that provide upper bounds on the Planck mass in terms of physical quantities such as the dimensionless coupling  $g_2$  and the cut-off scale  $\Lambda$  of the EFT.

As an additional assumption, we required full unitarity of partial waves in four dimensions which means that we bridge the EFT to the UV completion which is formulated as a unitary theory in four dimensions. In addition, we assumed convergence of the moment integrals and sums with which we were dealing. In particular, our analysis requires the convergence of once-subtracted dispersion relations.

The weak gravity bound provides valuable insights into the structure of quantum gravity theories and offers a consistent way for coupling them to the scalar field. The bound we obtained tells us that if a free scalar theory is coupled to gravity, it requires the scalar self-coupling to be introduced for consistency. Intuitively, one can expect that graviton loops would generate such a coupling suppressed at least by the Planck scale. Our result confirms this intuition, and forbids the possibility to keep the scalar field without four-derivative self-interaction term. This conclusion can have far-going implications for the early Universe inflation models because the derivative coupling could lead to a specific shape of non-gaussianity in the power spectrum. In addition, this coupling could play an important role after inflation during the preheating stage. Another implication of our bound is yet another way to state that the galileon symmetry of the scalar field (corresponding to  $g_2 = 0$ ) is incompatible with unitary UV completion even in the presence of gravity.

The techniques developed here are applicable to a broader class of models, including particles with spin, where positivity constraints play a central role. Given that there are similar recurrence relations for  $D$ -dimensional Legendre polynomials, it is also straightforward to extend our methods to the theories in any number of dimensions, including the case when four dimensional EFT is linked to  $D$ -dimensional UV completion. Future work could involve further refinement of the bound by considering additional physical constraints or exploring alternative methods for handling and regularizing the infinite sums and integrals in the calculations.

## Acknowledgements

A. T. thanks Ivano Basile, Francesco Riva and Alexander Zhiboedov for several illuminating discussions, comments and reasonable criticism. The work of A. T. was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Grant No. 1234710.

## References

- [1] N. Arkani-Hamed, L. Motl, A. Nicolis, and C. Vafa, “The String landscape, black holes and gravity as the weakest force,” *JHEP* **06** (2007) 060, [arXiv:hep-th/0601001](#).
- [2] B. Heidenreich and M. Lotito, “Proving the Weak Gravity Conjecture in Perturbative String Theory, Part I: The Bosonic String,” [arXiv:2401.14449](#) [[hep-th](#)].

- [3] E. Palti, “The Swampland: Introduction and Review,” *Fortsch. Phys.* **67** no. 6, (2019) 1900037, [arXiv:1903.06239 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [4] D. Harlow, B. Heidenreich, M. Reece, and T. Rudelius, “Weak gravity conjecture,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **95** no. 3, (2023) 035003, [arXiv:2201.08380 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [5] A. Castellano, *The Quantum Gravity Scale and the Swampland*. PhD thesis, U. Autonoma, Madrid (main), 2024. [arXiv:2409.10003 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [6] B. Bastian, T. W. Grimm, and D. van de Heisteeg, “Weak gravity bounds in asymptotic string compactifications,” *JHEP* **06** (2021) 162, [arXiv:2011.08854 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [7] C. Cheung, J. Liu, and G. N. Remmen, “Proof of the Weak Gravity Conjecture from Black Hole Entropy,” *JHEP* **10** (2018) 004, [arXiv:1801.08546 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [8] G. Shiu, P. Soler, and W. Cottrell, “Weak Gravity Conjecture and extremal black holes,” *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **62** no. 11, (2019) 110412, [arXiv:1611.06270 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [9] A. Hebecker and P. Soler, “The Weak Gravity Conjecture and the Axionic Black Hole Paradox,” *JHEP* **09** (2017) 036, [arXiv:1702.06130 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] Y. Abe, T. Noumi, and K. Yoshimura, “Black hole extremality in nonlinear electrodynamics: a lesson for weak gravity and Festina Lente bounds,” *JHEP* **09** (2023) 024, [arXiv:2305.17062 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] V. De Luca, J. Khoury, and S. S. C. Wong, “Implications of the weak gravity conjecture for tidal Love numbers of black holes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108** no. 4, (2023) 044066, [arXiv:2211.14325 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [12] Q.-H. Cao, N. Kan, and D. Ueda, “Effective field theory in light of relative entropy,” *JHEP* **07** (2023) 111, [arXiv:2211.08065 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [13] Q.-H. Cao and D. Ueda, “Entropy constraints on effective field theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108** no. 2, (2023) 025011, [arXiv:2201.00931 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] L. Aalsma, A. Cole, and G. Shiu, “Weak Gravity Conjecture, Black Hole Entropy, and Modular Invariance,” *JHEP* **08** (2019) 022, [arXiv:1905.06956 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [15] Y. Hamada, T. Noumi, and G. Shiu, “Weak Gravity Conjecture from Unitarity and Causality,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123** no. 5, (2019) 051601, [arXiv:1810.03637 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [16] B. Bellazzini, M. Lewandowski, and J. Serra, “Positivity of Amplitudes, Weak Gravity Conjecture, and Modified Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123** no. 25, (2019) 251103, [arXiv:1902.03250 \[hep-th\]](#).



- [17] N. Arkani-Hamed, Y.-t. Huang, J.-Y. Liu, and G. N. Remmen, “Causality, unitarity, and the weak gravity conjecture,” *JHEP* **03** (2022) 083, [arXiv:2109.13937 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] J. Henriksson, B. McPeak, F. Russo, and A. Vichi, “Rigorous bounds on light-by-light scattering,” *JHEP* **06** (2022) 158, [arXiv:2107.13009 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [19] L. Alberte, C. de Rham, S. Jaitly, and A. J. Tolley, “QED positivity bounds,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 12, (2021) 125020, [arXiv:2012.05798 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [20] Y. Nakayama and Y. Nomura, “Weak gravity conjecture in the AdS/CFT correspondence,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92** no. 12, (2015) 126006, [arXiv:1509.01647 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [21] D. Harlow, “Wormholes, Emergent Gauge Fields, and the Weak Gravity Conjecture,” *JHEP* **01** (2016) 122, [arXiv:1510.07911 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [22] N. Benjamin, E. Dyer, A. L. Fitzpatrick, and S. Kachru, “Universal Bounds on Charged States in 2d CFT and 3d Gravity,” *JHEP* **08** (2016) 041, [arXiv:1603.09745 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [23] M. Montero, G. Shiu, and P. Soler, “The Weak Gravity Conjecture in three dimensions,” *JHEP* **10** (2016) 159, [arXiv:1606.08438 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [24] G. T. Horowitz, J. E. Santos, and B. Way, “Evidence for an Electrifying Violation of Cosmic Censorship,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33** no. 19, (2016) 195007, [arXiv:1604.06465 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [25] T. Crisford, G. T. Horowitz, and J. E. Santos, “Testing the Weak Gravity - Cosmic Censorship Connection,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97** no. 6, (2018) 066005, [arXiv:1709.07880 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [26] T.-Y. Yu and W.-Y. Wen, “Cosmic censorship and Weak Gravity Conjecture in the Einstein–Maxwell-dilaton theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **781** (2018) 713–718, [arXiv:1803.07916 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [27] J. Brown, W. Cottrell, G. Shiu, and P. Soler, “Fencing in the Swampland: Quantum Gravity Constraints on Large Field Inflation,” *JHEP* **10** (2015) 023, [arXiv:1503.04783 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [28] J. Brown, W. Cottrell, G. Shiu, and P. Soler, “On Axionic Field Ranges, Loopholes and the Weak Gravity Conjecture,” *JHEP* **04** (2016) 017, [arXiv:1504.00659 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [29] B. Heidenreich, M. Reece, and T. Rudelius, “Sharpening the Weak Gravity Conjecture with Dimensional Reduction,” *JHEP* **02** (2016) 140, [arXiv:1509.06374 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [30] B. Heidenreich, M. Reece, and T. Rudelius, “Evidence for a sublattice weak gravity conjecture,” *JHEP* **08** (2017) 025, [arXiv:1606.08437 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [31] S.-J. Lee, W. Lerche, and T. Weigand, “Tensionless Strings and the Weak Gravity Conjecture,” *JHEP* **10** (2018) 164, [arXiv:1808.05958 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [32] C. Cheung and G. N. Remmen, “Infrared Consistency and the Weak Gravity Conjecture,” *JHEP* **12** (2014) 087, [arXiv:1407.7865 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [33] S. Andriolo, D. Junghans, T. Noumi, and G. Shiu, “A Tower Weak Gravity Conjecture from Infrared Consistency,” *Fortsch. Phys.* **66** no. 5, (2018) 1800020, [arXiv:1802.04287 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [34] P. Bittar, S. Fichet, and L. de Souza, “Gravity-Induced Photon Interactions and Infrared Consistency in any Dimensions,” [arXiv:2404.07254 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [35] T. N. Pham and T. N. Truong, “Evaluation of the Derivative Quartic Terms of the Meson Chiral Lagrangian From Forward Dispersion Relation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **31** (1985) 3027.
- [36] M. R. Pennington and J. Portoles, “The Chiral Lagrangian parameters,  $l_1$ ,  $l_2$ , are determined by the rho resonance,” *Phys. Lett. B* **344** (1995) 399–406, [arXiv:hep-ph/9409426](#).
- [37] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi, and E. Trincherini, “Energy’s and amplitudes’ positivity,” *JHEP* **05** (2010) 095, [arXiv:0912.4258 \[hep-th\]](#). [Erratum: *JHEP* 11, 128 (2011)].
- [38] Z. Komargodski and A. Schwimmer, “On Renormalization Group Flows in Four Dimensions,” *JHEP* **12** (2011) 099, [arXiv:1107.3987 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [39] G. N. Remmen and N. L. Rodd, “Consistency of the Standard Model Effective Field Theory,” *JHEP* **12** (2019) 032, [arXiv:1908.09845 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [40] M. Herrero-Valea, I. Timiryasov, and A. Tokareva, “To Positivity and Beyond, where Higgs-Dilaton Inflation has never gone before,” *JCAP* **11** (2019) 042, [arXiv:1905.08816 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [41] B. Bellazzini, F. Riva, J. Serra, and F. Sgarlata, “Beyond Positivity Bounds and the Fate of Massive Gravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** no. 16, (2018) 161101, [arXiv:1710.02539 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [42] C. de Rham, S. Melville, A. J. Tolley, and S.-Y. Zhou, “Positivity bounds for scalar field theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** no. 8, (2017) 081702, [arXiv:1702.06134 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [43] C. de Rham, S. Melville, A. J. Tolley, and S.-Y. Zhou, “UV complete me: Positivity Bounds for Particles with Spin,” *JHEP* **03** (2018) 011, [arXiv:1706.02712 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [44] C. de Rham, S. Melville, A. J. Tolley, and S.-Y. Zhou, “Massive Galileon Positivity Bounds,” *JHEP* **09** (2017) 072, [arXiv:1702.08577 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [45] Y.-J. Wang, F.-K. Guo, C. Zhang, and S.-Y. Zhou, “Generalized positivity bounds on chiral perturbation theory,” *JHEP* **07** (2020) 214, [arXiv:2004.03992 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [46] J. Tokuda, K. Aoki, and S. Hirano, “Gravitational positivity bounds,” *JHEP* **11** (2020) 054, [arXiv:2007.15009 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [47] X. Li, H. Xu, C. Yang, C. Zhang, and S.-Y. Zhou, “Positivity in Multifield Effective Field Theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127** no. 12, (2021) 121601, [arXiv:2101.01191 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [48] S. Caron-Huot, D. Mazac, L. Rastelli, and D. Simmons-Duffin, “Sharp boundaries for the swampland,” *JHEP* **07** (2021) 110, [arXiv:2102.08951 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [49] Z.-Z. Du, C. Zhang, and S.-Y. Zhou, “Triple crossing positivity bounds for multi-field theories,” *JHEP* **12** (2021) 115, [arXiv:2111.01169 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [50] Z. Bern, D. Kosmopoulos, and A. Zhiboedov, “Gravitational effective field theory islands, low-spin dominance, and the four-graviton amplitude,” *J. Phys. A* **54** no. 34, (2021) 344002, [arXiv:2103.12728 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [51] X. Li, K. Mimasu, K. Yamashita, C. Yang, C. Zhang, and S.-Y. Zhou, “Moments for positivity: using Drell-Yan data to test positivity bounds and reverse-engineer new physics,” *JHEP* **10** (2022) 107, [arXiv:2204.13121 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [52] S. Caron-Huot, Y.-Z. Li, J. Parra-Martinez, and D. Simmons-Duffin, “Causality constraints on corrections to Einstein gravity,” *JHEP* **05** (2023) 122, [arXiv:2201.06602 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [53] P. Saraswat, “Weak gravity conjecture and effective field theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** no. 2, (2017) 025013, [arXiv:1608.06951 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [54] M. Herrero-Valea, R. Santos-Garcia, and A. Tokareva, “Massless positivity in graviton exchange,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 8, (2021) 085022, [arXiv:2011.11652 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [55] A. Guerrieri, J. Penedones, and P. Vieira, “Where Is String Theory in the Space of Scattering Amplitudes?,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127** no. 8, (2021) 081601, [arXiv:2102.02847 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [56] J. Elias Miro, A. Guerrieri, and M. A. Gumus, “Bridging positivity and S-matrix bootstrap bounds,” *JHEP* **05** (2023) 001, [arXiv:2210.01502 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [57] B. Bellazzini, M. Riembau, and F. Riva, “IR side of positivity bounds,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** no. 10, (2022) 105008, [arXiv:2112.12561 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [58] A. Sinha and A. Zahed, “Crossing Symmetric Dispersion Relations in Quantum Field Theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** no. 18, (2021) 181601, [arXiv:2012.04877 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [59] T. Trott, “Causality, unitarity and symmetry in effective field theory,” *JHEP* **07** (2021) 143, [arXiv:2011.10058 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [60] M. Herrero-Valea, A. S. Koshelev, and A. Tokareva, “UV graviton scattering and positivity bounds from IR dispersion relations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **106** no. 10, (2022) 105002, [arXiv:2205.13332 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [61] D.-Y. Hong, Z.-H. Wang, and S.-Y. Zhou, “Causality bounds on scalar-tensor EFTs,” *JHEP* **10** (2023) 135, [arXiv:2304.01259 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [62] L.-Y. Chiang, Y.-t. Huang, W. Li, L. Rodina, and H.-C. Weng, “(Non)-projective bounds on gravitational EFT,” [arXiv:2201.07177 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [63] Y.-t. Huang, J.-Y. Liu, L. Rodina, and Y. Wang, “Carving out the Space of Open-String S-matrix,” *JHEP* **04** (2021) 195, [arXiv:2008.02293 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [64] T. Noumi and J. Tokuda, “Gravitational positivity bounds on scalar potentials,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 6, (2021) 066022, [arXiv:2105.01436 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [65] H. Xu and S.-Y. Zhou, “Triple crossing positivity bounds, mass dependence and cosmological scalars: Horndeski theory and DHOST,” *JCAP* **11** (2023) 076, [arXiv:2306.06639 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [66] Q. Chen, K. Mimasu, T. A. Wu, G.-D. Zhang, and S.-Y. Zhou, “Capping the positivity cone: dimension-8 Higgs operators in the SMEFT,” *JHEP* **03** (2024) 180, [arXiv:2309.15922 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [67] T. Noumi and J. Tokuda, “Finite energy sum rules for gravitational Regge amplitudes,” *JHEP* **06** (2023) 032, [arXiv:2212.08001 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [68] C. de Rham, S. Kundu, M. Reece, A. J. Tolley, and S.-Y. Zhou, “Snowmass White Paper: UV Constraints on IR Physics,” in *Snowmass 2021*. 3, 2022. [arXiv:2203.06805 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [69] D.-Y. Hong, Z.-H. Wang, and S.-Y. Zhou, “On Capped Higgs Positivity Cone,” 4, 2024. [arXiv:2404.04479 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [70] Z. Bern, E. Herrmann, D. Kosmopoulos, and R. Roiban, “Effective Field Theory islands from perturbative and nonperturbative four-graviton amplitudes,” *JHEP* **01** (2023) 113, [arXiv:2205.01655 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [71] T. Ma, A. Pomarol, and F. Sciotti, “Bootstrapping the chiral anomaly at large  $N_c$ ,” *JHEP* **11** (2023) 176, [arXiv:2307.04729 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [72] S. De Angelis and G. Durieux, “EFT matching from analyticity and unitarity,” *SciPost Phys.* **16** (2024) 071, [arXiv:2308.00035 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [73] F. Acanfora, A. Guerrieri, K. Häring, and D. Karateev, “Bounds on scattering of neutral Goldstones,” *JHEP* **03** (2024) 028, [arXiv:2310.06027 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [74] K. Aoki, T. Noumi, R. Saito, S. Sato, S. Shirai, J. Tokuda, and M. Yamazaki, “Gravitational positivity for phenomenologists: Dark gauge boson in the swampland,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 1, (2024) 016002, [arXiv:2305.10058 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [75] H. Xu, D.-Y. Hong, Z.-H. Wang, and S.-Y. Zhou, “Positivity bounds on parity-violating scalar-tensor EFTs,” *JCAP* **01** (2025) 102, [arXiv:2410.09794 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [76] J. Elias Miro, A. L. Guerrieri, and M. A. Gumus, “Extremal Higgs couplings,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110** no. 1, (2024) 016007, [arXiv:2311.09283 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [77] B. McPeak, M. Venuti, and A. Vichi, “Adding subtractions: comparing the impact of different Regge behaviors,” [arXiv:2310.06888 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [78] M. Riembau, “Full Unitarity and the Moments of Scattering Amplitudes,” [arXiv:2212.14056 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [79] S. Caron-Huot and J. Tokuda, “String loops and gravitational positivity bounds: imprint of light particles at high energies,” *JHEP* **11** (2024) 055, [arXiv:2406.07606 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [80] S. Caron-Huot and Y.-Z. Li, “Gravity and a universal cutoff for field theory,” [arXiv:2408.06440 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [81] S.-L. Wan and S.-Y. Zhou, “Matrix moment approach to positivity bounds and UV reconstruction from IR,” [arXiv:2411.11964 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [82] L. Buoninfante, L.-Q. Shao, and A. Tokareva, “Non-local positivity bounds: islands in Terra Incognita,” [arXiv:2412.08634 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [83] J. Berman and N. Geiser, “Analytic bootstrap bounds on masses and spins in gravitational and non-gravitational scalar theories,” [arXiv:2412.17902 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [84] B. Bellazzini, J. Elias Miró, R. Rattazzi, M. Riembau, and F. Riva, “Positive moments for scattering amplitudes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 3, (2021) 036006, [arXiv:2011.00037 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [85] C. Beadle, G. Isabella, D. Perrone, S. Ricossa, F. Riva, and F. Serra, “Non-Forward UV/IR Relations,” [arXiv:2407.02346 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [86] Y. Ye, B. He, and J. Gu, “Positivity bounds in scalar Effective Field Theories at one-loop level,” *JHEP* **12** (2024) 046, [arXiv:2408.10318 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [87] F. Bertucci, J. Henriksson, B. McPeak, S. Ricossa, F. Riva, and A. Vichi, “Positivity bounds on massive vectors,” *JHEP* **12** (2024) 051, [arXiv:2402.13327 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [88] C.-H. Chang and J. Parra-Martinez, “Graviton loops and negativity,” [arXiv:2501.17949 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [89] C. Beadle, G. Isabella, D. Perrone, S. Ricossa, F. Riva, and F. Serra, “The EFT Bootstrap at Finite  $M_{PL}$ ,” [arXiv:2501.18465 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [90] S. Andriolo, T.-C. Huang, T. Noumi, H. Ooguri, and G. Shiu, “Duality and axionic weak gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 4, (2020) 046008, [arXiv:2004.13721 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [91] J. Henriksson, B. McPeak, F. Russo, and A. Vichi, “Bounding violations of the weak gravity conjecture,” *JHEP* **08** (2022) 184, [arXiv:2203.08164 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [92] K. Aoki, T. Q. Loc, T. Noumi, and J. Tokuda, “Is the Standard Model in the Swampland? Consistency Requirements from Gravitational Scattering,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127** no. 9, (2021) 091602, [arXiv:2104.09682 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [93] L. Alberte, C. de Rham, S. Jaitly, and A. J. Tolley, “Reverse Bootstrapping: IR Lessons for UV Physics,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128** no. 5, (2022) 051602, [arXiv:2111.09226 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [94] C. de Rham, S. Jaitly, and A. J. Tolley, “Constraints on Regge behavior from IR physics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **108** no. 4, (2023) 046011, [arXiv:2212.04975 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [95] K. Häring and A. Zhiboedov, “Gravitational Regge bounds,” *SciPost Phys.* **16** no. 1, (2024) 034, [arXiv:2202.08280 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [96] K. Häring and A. Zhiboedov, “What is the graviton pole made of?,” [arXiv:2410.21499 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [97] M. Froissart, “Asymptotic behavior and subtractions in the Mandelstam representation,” *Phys. Rev.* **123** (1961) 1053–1057.
- [98] A. Martin, “Unitarity and high-energy behavior of scattering amplitudes,” *Phys. Rev.* **129** (1963) 1432–1436.
- [99] Y. S. Jin and A. Martin, “Connection Between the Asymptotic Behavior and the Sign of the Discontinuity in One-Dimensional Dispersion Relations,” *Phys. Rev.* **135** (1964) B1369–B1374.

- [100] N. Arkani-Hamed, T.-C. Huang, and Y.-t. Huang, “The EFT-Hedron,” *JHEP* **05** (2021) 259, [arXiv:2012.15849 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [101] L.-Y. Chiang, Y.-t. Huang, W. Li, L. Rodina, and H.-C. Weng, “Into the EFThedron and UV constraints from IR consistency,” *JHEP* **03** (2022) 063, [arXiv:2105.02862 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [102] L.-Y. Chiang, Y.-t. Huang, L. Rodina, and H.-C. Weng, “De-projecting the EFThedron,” *JHEP* **05** (2024) 102, [arXiv:2204.07140 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [103] G. Peng, L.-Q. Shao, A. Tokareva, and Y. Xu, “Running EFT-hedron with null constraints at loop level,” [arXiv:2501.09717 \[hep-th\]](#).