CM-P00060417

Ref.TH.1666-CERN

Archives

DIMENSIONAL REGULARIZATION AND THE RENORMALIZATION GROUPG. 't Hooft ^{*)}

CERN - Geneva

A B S T R A C T

The behaviour of a renormalized field theory under scale transformations $x \rightarrow \lambda x$; $p \rightarrow p/\lambda$ can be found in a simple way when the theory is regularized by the continuous dimension method. The techniques proposed here have several applications in dimensionally regularized theories: short distance behaviour is expressed in terms of the single poles at $n=4$, and all coefficients in front of the higher poles $1/(n-4)^k$ are expressed in terms of those of the single poles $1/n-4$, without calculating any diagram. In some cases the Taylor series in $1/n-4$ can be summed, leading to some exact results for the infinities of the full theory.

^{*)} On leave from the University of Utrecht, Utrecht.

1. INTRODUCTION

The continuous dimension method has recently been advocated by many authors as a useful device for obtaining a finite, perturbation expansion of a renormalized field theory ^{1),2)}. As its main advantages one usually mentions the facts that no additional regulator diagrams are needed that would make the algebra more complicated, and that complicated symmetries like local gauge invariance are left intact ¹⁾.

In this article we would like to point out still another useful aspect: it becomes rather transparent how the theory behaves under space-time scale transformations. This behaviour is described by a simple differential equation, closely related to the Callan-Symanzik equation.

Our technique cuts both ways: we also find an important set of equations between the residues of different poles at $n \rightarrow 4$.

2. THE ROLE OF THE UNITY OF MASS IN THE SUBTRACTION PROCEDURE

Let $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_i, \lambda)$ be a Lagrangian for a renormalizable field theory with fields φ_i , in which λ is an expansion parameter, for instance a coupling constant.

The continuous dimension method consists in considering the theory in a "space-time" with dimension $n \neq 4$. For all integrals that can occur in the perturbation expansion, one can define in a unique way its finite part as an analytic function of n .

If we now consider the limit $n \rightarrow 4$ we encounter poles of the type $(n-4)^{-k}$, which can only be removed if we let the coefficients in $\mathcal{L}$ also vary as a function of n . Thus the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_i, \lambda)$ is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L}(\varphi_i, \lambda) + \Delta \mathcal{L}(\varphi_i, \lambda, n) ; \\ \Delta \mathcal{L} &= \lambda \frac{a(\varphi_i)}{n-4} + \lambda^2 \left[\frac{b(\varphi_i)}{n-4} + \frac{c(\varphi_i)}{(n-4)^2} \right] + \dots \quad (2.1) \end{aligned}$$

The Lagrangian (2.1) is constructed such that all Green's functions remain finite as $n \rightarrow 4$, order by order in the perturbation expansion in λ .

Now, if the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} + \Delta\mathcal{L}$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{L}$ itself just by renormalizing the parameters and rescaling the fields (and, if necessary, performing gauge transformations), then the theory is called renormalizable. We shall only consider that case.

The S matrix will depend only on those parameters which are invariant under field transformations or gauge transformations. Let us first consider these parameters and let us furthermore assume, for the time being, that there are only two of them: a mass parameter m , and a coupling constant λ , occurring in the form of terms like

$$-\frac{1}{2} m^2 \varphi^2 \quad \text{and} \quad -\frac{1}{24} \lambda \varphi^4 \quad (2.2)$$

in the Lagrangian. The more general case of an arbitrary number of parameters will be discussed in Section 5. In this Section we shall not use the particular form of the terms (2.2) except that they define the dimension of these parameters: if we assign to a derivative ∂_μ dimension 1, the Lagrangian has dimension n . A boson field φ has therefore dimension $n-2/2$. A mass m has dimension 1 and λ in (2.2) has dimension

$$n - 4 \frac{n-2}{2} = 4 - n.$$

Now in the theory at non-rational n , all divergent integrals in the perturbation expansion can be redefined in terms of convergent integrals in a unique way ¹⁾. This procedure conserves all possible symmetry aspects of the original Lagrangian, including its scale transformation properties. So, at non-rational n the parameters m and λ in (2.2) have a well defined and unique meaning, and their dimension is not influenced by the interactions ^{*)}. We therefore call these parameters the bare para-

*) Note that our subtraction procedure at $n \neq 4$ differs in a crucial way from that of Wilson, Ref. 3), who uses a cut-off Λ , whereas we first redefine divergent integrals. This is why Wilson gets anomalous dimensions also at $n \neq 4$ where we do not.

meters which we shall denote with a suffix B: λ_B and m_B . However, as stated above, we have to let these bare parameters go to infinity while $n \rightarrow 4$. This we do by expressing them in terms of two finite (but rather arbitrary) parameters λ_R and m_R , and n (R standing for "renormalized"). We shall choose λ_R and m_R to be dimensionless and independent of n , although we may substitute, if we wish, a function that depends in a given way, but always smoothly, on n .

To express λ_B and m_B in terms of λ_R , m_R and n we need a unity of mass, μ , that is kept fixed. So, in practice, we shall have an expansion in terms of λ_R of the following type:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_B = \mu^{4-n} & \left[\lambda_R + \frac{a_{12}(m_R) \lambda_R^2}{n-4} + \frac{a_{13}(m_R) \lambda_R^3}{n-4} + \dots \right. \\ & + \frac{a_{23}(m_R) \lambda_R^3}{(n-4)^2} + \frac{a_{24}(m_R) \lambda_R^4}{(n-4)^2} + \dots \\ & + \frac{a_{34}(m_R) \lambda_R^4}{(n-4)^3} + \dots \\ & + \dots \left. \right] ; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} m_B = \mu & \left[m_R + \frac{b_{11}(m_R) \lambda_R}{n-4} + \frac{b_{12}(m_R) \lambda_R^2}{n-4} + \dots \right. \\ & + \frac{b_{22}(m_R) \lambda_R^2}{(n-4)^2} + \dots \\ & + \dots \left. \right] . \end{aligned} \tag{2.3a}$$

The coefficients a_{vi} , b_{vi} can be calculated ^{1),2),4)} from the Feynman diagrams ^{*)} of order i in λ . If we want not only the S matrix, but also Green's functions to remain finite at $n \rightarrow 4$, we also must renormalize fields and gauge parameters. Our methods will apply to these renormalizations also (see Section 5).

It will be more convenient not to expand in terms of λ_R , and to write Eqs. (2.3a) as

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_B &= \mu^{4-n} \left[\lambda_R + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_v(m_R, \lambda_R)}{(n-4)^v} \right]; \\ m_B &= \mu \left[m_R + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_v(m_R, \lambda_R)}{(n-4)^v} \right].\end{aligned}\quad (2.3b)$$

Now, of course, Eq. (2.3) is not the only expression for λ_B and m_B which will lead to a finite S matrix as $n \rightarrow 4$, because one can always substitute

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_R &\rightarrow \lambda_R + e_1(n-4) + e_2(n-4)^2 \dots, \\ m_R &\rightarrow m_R + f_1(n-4) + f_2(n-4)^2 \dots,\end{aligned}\quad (2.4)$$

so that we get a different series of the kind

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_B &= \mu^{4-n} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c'_k(m'_R, \lambda'_R)(n-4)^k + \lambda'_R + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{a'_v(m'_R, \lambda'_R)}{(n-4)^v} \right]; \\ m_B &= \mu \left[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} d'_k(m'_R, \lambda'_R)(n-4)^k + m'_R + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{b'_v(m'_R, \lambda'_R)}{(n-4)^v} \right].\end{aligned}\quad (2.5)$$

*) Actually, the coefficients a are independent of m_R and b are proportional to m_R (see Section 4), but for sake of clarity we do not want to use that information here.

This corresponds to the usual ambiguity in any renormalization formalism, but it is easy to convince oneself that the subsidiary condition that all coefficients c_i and d_i in (2.5) be zero makes the expansion (2.3) unique, (once we have chosen a value for μ), because two different ones cannot possibly both yield an S matrix that is finite, order by order in the perturbation expansion. We shall from now on assume that all necessary transformations of the type (2.4) have been performed such that this subsidiary condition holds, so that we have series like (2.3) and not (2.5) ^{*}). On the one hand this requirement also leads to a definition of λ_R and m_R in a given theory (in general they do not correspond to the more usual definition like on-mass-shell coupling constant or physical mass), but on the other hand it will be clear that this definition will depend on our "unity of mass" μ .

3. THE SCALING PROPERTIES OF λ_R and m_R

Suppose we calculate a diagram with loops that is ultra-violet divergent but does not become infra-red divergent as $m \rightarrow 0$. After application of our regulation technique and insertion of the series (2.3) the result will contain powers of

$$\log \frac{k^2}{\mu^2} \quad , \quad (3.1)$$

where k is a typical external momentum and μ is our "unity of mass".

It will be clear that the perturbation expansion will only be applicable if (3.1) is reasonably small, that is, we must choose μ to be of the order of k . If we want to study limits like $k^2 \rightarrow \infty$ or $k^2 \rightarrow 0$, it is of importance to vary μ also. So it is of importance to compare the same theory at different choices of μ . Our result will be the discovery of a well known fact ⁵⁾ in a new way: the anomalous scaling behaviour of renormalizable theories.

^{*}) For practical calculations this condition for the counterterms is probably not the most convenient one, due to the appearance of numbers like the Euler constant γ in the higher coefficients.

Consider a new unity of mass, μ' , somewhat larger than μ :

$$\mu' = \mu(1 + \varepsilon) ; \quad |\varepsilon| \ll 1 , \quad (3.2)$$

and express λ_B and m_B in terms of the new unity:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_B &= (\mu')^{4-n} [1 + \varepsilon(n-4)] \left[\lambda_R + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_v}{(n-4)^v} \right] \\ &= (\mu')^{4-n} \left[\varepsilon(n-4) \lambda_R + \lambda_R + \varepsilon a_1 + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_v + \varepsilon a_{v+1}}{(n-4)^v} \right] , \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

and similarly

$$m_B = \mu' [1 - \varepsilon] \left[m_R + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_v}{(n-4)^v} \right] . \quad (3.4)$$

Note that the series (3.3) is not of the desired type because of the occurrence of a term proportional to $n-4$. We have a series of the type (2.5) instead of (2.3). This can be cured by substituting for λ_R a slightly n dependent quantity, that is, by performing a transformation of the type (2.4):

$$\lambda_R = \tilde{\lambda}_R - \varepsilon(n-4) \tilde{\lambda}_R . \quad (3.5)$$

The series (3.3) and (3.4) then become (note that also a and b depend on λ):

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_B &= (\mu')^{4-n} \left[\tilde{\lambda}_R + \varepsilon a_1 - \varepsilon \tilde{\lambda}_R a_{1,\lambda} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_v(m_R, \tilde{\lambda}_R) + \varepsilon a_{v+1} - \varepsilon \tilde{\lambda}_R a_{v+1,\lambda}}{(n-4)^v} \right] , \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$m_B = \mu' \left[m_R - \varepsilon m_R - \varepsilon \tilde{\lambda}_R b_{1,2} + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_v(m_R, \tilde{\lambda}_R) - \varepsilon b_v - \varepsilon b_{v+1,2}}{(n-4)^v} \right], \quad (3.7)$$

where $a_{v,\lambda}$ stands for $\partial a_v(m, \tilde{\lambda}_R) / \partial \tilde{\lambda}_R$; same for $b_{v,\lambda}$, $a_{v,m}$, $b_{v,m}$. Now, Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7) have the desired form of Eq. (2.3),

Indeed, the values of λ_R and m_R have changed in a non-trivial way. We have to define

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'_R &= \tilde{\lambda}_R + \varepsilon (a_1 - \tilde{\lambda}_R a_{1,2}) , \\ m'_R &= m_R - \varepsilon (m_R + \tilde{\lambda}_R b_{1,2}) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

In Section 2 we admitted that λ_R , m_R may depend explicitly on n , but all physically relevant quantities are smooth functions of λ_R , m_R and n , and, therefore, only the values of λ_R and m_R at $n=4$ are relevant. At $n=4$ we have $\tilde{\lambda}_R = \lambda_R$, so we obtained the desired transformation properties of λ and m .

If we change our unity of mass μ into $\mu' = \mu(1 + \varepsilon)$, then we have to change our renormalized parameters λ_R and m_R resp. into:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'_R &= \lambda_R + \varepsilon \left[1 - \lambda_R \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_R} \right] a_1(m_R, \lambda_R) , \\ m'_R &= m_R - \varepsilon \left[m_R + \lambda_R \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_R} b_1(m_R, \lambda_R) \right] , \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

in order to obtain the same renormalized S matrix following the same prescription of Section 2.

Note that only the residues of the single poles of λ_B and m_B contribute to these scaling properties of λ_R and m_R .

Equations (3.9) are in fact differential equations for λ_R and m_R as a function of μ . Examples of such equations will be discussed in Section 6.

4. IDENTITIES FOR THE COEFFICIENTS a_v AND b_v

We have not yet written down the complete series that replaces (2.3) after a scale transformation $\mu \rightarrow \mu'$. The substitution that has to be made in (3.3) is the product of (3.5) and (3.8):

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_R &= \lambda'_R - \varepsilon(n-4)\lambda'_R + \varepsilon(-a_1 + \lambda'_R a_{1,2}); \\ m_R &= m'_R + \varepsilon(m'_R + \lambda'_R b_{1,2}).\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

We get from (3.3):

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_B &= (\mu')^{4-n} \left[\lambda'_R + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n-4)^v} \left\{ a_v(m'_R, \lambda'_R) + \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \varepsilon a_{v+1} - \varepsilon \lambda'_R a_{v+1,2} + \varepsilon a_{v,2}(-a_1 + \lambda'_R a_{1,2}) + \varepsilon a_{v,m}(m'_R + \lambda'_R b_{1,2}) \right\} \right],\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}m_B &= \mu' \left[m'_R + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n-4)^v} \left\{ b_v(m'_R, \lambda'_R) - \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \varepsilon b_v - \varepsilon \lambda'_R b_{v+1,2} + \varepsilon b_{v,2}(-a_1 + \lambda'_R a_{1,2}) + \varepsilon b_{v,m}(m'_R + \lambda'_R b_{1,2}) \right\} \right].\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

But, as has been argued in Section 2, the series (2.3) is the only series that leads to a finite S matrix at $n \rightarrow 4$. Hence the series (4.2) and (4.3) must be the same as (2.3), so the "correction terms" proportional to ε must all cancel. Those terms proportional to ε that are of zeroth order in $1/(n-4)$, have been made to vanish by construction, but for the higher order ones this observation leads to important identities between the coefficients a_v , b_v :

$$a_{v,2}(-a_1 + \lambda_R a_{1,2}) + a_{v,m}(m_R + \lambda_R b_{1,2}) = \lambda_R a_{v+1,2} - a_{v+1} ; \quad (4.4a)$$

$$b_{v,2}(-a_1 + \lambda_R a_{1,2}) + b_{v,m}(m_R + \lambda_R b_{1,2}) - b_v = \lambda_R b_{v+1,2} . \quad (4.4b)$$

This is the set of equations we alluded to in the beginning. For instance, it follows that in (2.3a)

$$\frac{\partial a_{12}}{\partial m_R} = 0 ; \quad (4.5a)$$

$$2 a_{23} = 2 a_{12}^2 + m_R \frac{\partial a_{13}}{\partial m_R} ; \quad (4.5b)$$

$$m_R \frac{\partial b_{11}}{\partial m_R} = b_{11} ; \quad (4.5c)$$

$$2 b_{22} = a_{12} b_{11} + \frac{b_{11}^2}{m_R} + m_R \frac{\partial b_{12}}{\partial m_R} - b_{12} . \quad (4.5d)$$

and so on. We see that a_{12} is independent of m_R and b_{11} is proportional to m_R . Now, one can show ¹⁾ that all counterterms in the dimensional regularization procedure are not only polynomials in terms of external momenta but also in terms of masses m_R . In particular, there is no singularity at $m_R \rightarrow 0$. Given this fact, it is not difficult to derive from Eqs. (4.4) that all coefficient a_{ij} are independent of m_R and all coefficients b_{ij} are linear in m_R , so the last term in (4.5b) and the last two terms in (4.5d) may be dropped; likewise one can then substitute $a_{v,m} = 0$; $b_{v,m} = m_R b_v / m_R$ in (4.4). A qualitative interpretation of (4.4) can then perhaps be made: the subdivergences of a diagram are expressed in terms of over-all divergences and subdivergences of subgraphs. We have not checked the possibility of this interpretation in detail. The validity of (4.4) has been checked in some examples.

Equations (4.4) may be reformulated in terms of a differential equation for the function

$$\alpha(\lambda_R, m_R, n) = \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_v(\lambda_R, m_R)}{(n-4)^v}.$$

This equation, for the $\lambda \phi^4$ theory, will be discussed in Section 7.

5. GENERALIZATION TOWARDS AN ARBITRARY NUMBER OF PARAMETERS

The preceding section was meant to illustrate our arguments in detail for the case of only two different kinds of parameters. Let us now take a renormalizable theory with an arbitrary but fixed number of parameters λ^k , which in a bare Lagrangian have dimension D^k ,

$$D^k = f(k)(4-n) + \sigma(k). \quad (5.1)$$

Again we write

$$\lambda_B^k = \mu^{D^k} \left[\lambda_R^k + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_v^k(\lambda_R)}{(n-4)^v} \right]. \quad (5.2)$$

In gauge field theories also renormalization of gauge parameters α^k may be needed:

$$\alpha_B^k = \mu^{D_\alpha^k} \left[\alpha_R^k + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_v^k(\lambda_R, \alpha_R)}{(n-4)^v} \right]. \quad (5.3)$$

Renormalization of the fields can also be considered:

$$\varphi_B^k = \mu^{D_\varphi^k} \left[\varphi_R^k + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_v^k(\lambda_R, \alpha_R, \varphi_R)}{(n-4)^v} \right]. \quad (5.4)$$

Both α_R and φ_R do not enter into (5.2) so the physical parameters λ_R will satisfy equations among themselves. In order to find the scaling behaviour, or the pole equations, for α_R and φ_R one simply absorbs (5.3) and (5.4) into (5.2). From now on we assume that that may have been done.

Consider

$$\mu' = \mu(1 + \varepsilon). \quad (5.5)$$

the equivalent of Eq. (3.3) is

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_B^k = (\mu')^D^k & \left[\varepsilon p(k) (n-4) \lambda_R^k + \lambda_R^k + \varepsilon p(k) a_1^k - \right. \\ & \left. - \varepsilon \sigma(k) \lambda_R^k + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_v^k - \varepsilon \sigma(k) a_v^k + \varepsilon p(k) a_{v+1}^k}{(n-4)^v} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Let us write

$$\lambda_R^k = \lambda_R'^k - \varepsilon p(k) (n-4) \lambda_R'^k + \delta \lambda_R^k, \quad (5.7)$$

and substitute that into Eq. (5.6).

The term $\delta \lambda_R^k$ is required to be such that the first term of the series in $1/(n-4)$ then obtained, will be just λ_R' ; hence

$$\delta \lambda_R^k = \varepsilon \sigma(k) \lambda_R'^k - \varepsilon p(k) a_1^k + \sum_l \varepsilon a_{1,l}^k p(l) \lambda_R'^l; \quad (5.8)$$

where $a_{v,l}^k$ stands for $(\partial/\partial \lambda_R^l) a_v^k(\lambda_R)$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_B^k = (\mu')^D^k & \left[\lambda_R'^k + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n-4)^v} \left\{ a_v^k(\lambda') - \varepsilon \sigma(k) a_v^k + \right. \right. \\ & + \varepsilon p(k) a_{v+1}^k - \sum_l \varepsilon p(l) a_{v+1,l}^k \lambda_R'^l + \\ & \left. \left. + \varepsilon \sum_l a_{v,l}^k (\sigma(l) \lambda_R'^l - p(l) a_1^l + \sum_m a_{1,m}^l p(m) \lambda_R'^m) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Putting $n=4$ in Eq. (5.7) we find the scaling properties of the parameters λ_R :

$$\mu' = \mu(1+\varepsilon) \rightarrow \quad (5.10)$$

$$\lambda_R^k = \lambda_R^k - \varepsilon \sigma(k) \lambda_R^k + \varepsilon \rho(k) a_1^k - \varepsilon \sum_l a_{1,l}^k \rho(l) \lambda_R^l.$$

and the generalization of Eqs. (4.4) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_l a_{\nu,l}^k (\sigma(l) \lambda_R^l - \rho(l) a_1^l + \sum_m a_{1,m}^l \rho(m) \lambda_R^m) - \sigma(k) a_\nu^k = \\ \sum_l a_{\nu+1,l}^k \rho(l) \lambda_R^l - \rho(k) a_{\nu+1}^k. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

In most theories the parameters with $\sigma(k)=0$ will only get counter-terms that are independent of the other parameters. This observation leads to a simplification similar to the one in the end of Section 4.

6. SCALING BEHAVIOUR OF SOME THEORIES

Let us define a scaling parameter s by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \mu_0 e^s, \\ \lambda_R^k &= \lambda_R^k(s). \end{aligned} \quad (6.1)$$

Then we can rewrite Eqs. (5.10) in terms of a differential equation:

$$\frac{d\lambda_R^k}{ds} = -\sigma(k) \lambda_R^k + \rho(k) a_1^k(\lambda_R) - \sum_l a_{1,l}^k(\lambda_R) \rho(l) \lambda_R^l \quad (6.2)$$

This equation is nearly, but not quite, identical to the Callan-Symanzik equation⁵⁾. Here the coefficients are expressed in terms of the dimensions and the poles of the parameters.

Let us again consider the case that there is only one parameter λ with $\sigma=0$, as in the $\lambda\phi^4$ theory. Then a_1 only depends on this

parameter (see Section 4) and we have a (non-linear) first order differential equation with one variable. Using the notation of (2.3a) and dropping the suffix R, we get

$$\frac{d\lambda}{ds} = a_1(\lambda) - \lambda \frac{da_1}{d\lambda} = -a_{12}\lambda^2 + O(\lambda^3). \quad (6.3)$$

It will be clear that the behaviour of the theory under scale transformations depends crucially on the relative sign of λ and a_{12} .

Two examples of one-parameter theories are well known: i) the scalar theory with coupling $-\lambda\phi^4$. The sign of λ is usually taken to be positive, in order for the Hamiltonian to be positive definite ^{*)}. ii) Quantum electrodynamics. Here λ is to be replaced by e^2 , which is always positive.

Both of these theories have $a_{12} < 0$ which implies that $\lambda_R(s)$ diverges as $s \rightarrow +\infty$. This implies that the small distance behaviour of these theories is not described by the usual perturbation expansion. The long distance behaviour on the other hand, can be found quite accurately because for $s \rightarrow -\infty$, $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ and the first terms of the perturbation expansion converge rapidly there. In this region we can give the solution of Eq. (6.3):

$$\lambda_R(s) = \frac{1}{C + a_{12}s}. \quad (6.4)$$

Equation (6.4) may be used to find infra-red behaviour for massless theories, but in general has no meaning if massive particles occur, as a consequence of "ultra-violet" divergencies at $m^2/\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

In a pure Yang-Mills theory, also, λ is to be replaced by g^2 , where g is the usual coupling constant. So $\lambda > 0$. However, in that theory $a_{12} > 0$ ^{4), 7)} and the solution (6.4) is valid in the ultra-violet region $s \rightarrow +\infty$. The same behaviour is found in $\lambda\phi^4$ theory if λ is taken to have the unusual sign ⁶⁾.

A Yang-Mills theory with fermions can be written down ^{4), 7)} with the property $a_{12} = 0$. In this theory the two-loop diagrams are decisive for its scale behaviour.

*) The correctness of this argument is dubious. See Ref. 6) and the last paragraph of this Section.

Suppose $a_{13} \neq 0$. A small change in the theory can make a_{12} very small but not zero. In that case the function $a_1 - \lambda (\partial a_1 / \partial \lambda)$ in (6.3) must have a zero for a small value λ_0 of λ . We then have a conformally invariant theory with a small coupling constant, so that both the perturbation expansion and the conformal invariance can be studied.

The situation becomes quite complicated if we have two or more parameters λ^i with $\sigma_{(i)} = 0$. In general, Eq. (6.3) will be replaced by

$$\frac{d\lambda_R^i}{ds} = - a_{jk}^i \lambda_R^j \lambda_R^k + O(\lambda^3). \quad (6.5)$$

where a_{jk}^i are determined by the poles of the one-loop graphs. In many cases the solutions diverge at both ends of the s scale ⁷⁾. Neither the ultra-violet, nor the infra-red behaviour can then be calculated. In a certain example we also found that a parameter λ_R can easily change sign, which is one more reason to doubt the argument that the corresponding classical Hamiltonian must be positive definite.

7. RENORMALIZATION AND THE PERTURBATION EXPANSION

In this section we show an application of Eqs. (5.11). Let us again consider Eqs. (2.3) and now write

$$\lambda_R + \sum_{v=1}^{\infty} a_v(\lambda_R) \frac{1}{(n-4)^v} = \lambda_B(\lambda_R, n), \quad (7.1)$$

where we confine to those theories for which a_v are independent of m_R (like in $\lambda \phi^4$ theory, see Section 4).

Putting also

$$a_0 = \lambda_R, \quad (7.2)$$

Eq. (4.4a) becomes

$$\frac{\partial a_v}{\partial \lambda_R} (-a_1 + \lambda_R a_{1,2}) = \lambda_R \frac{\partial a_{v+1}}{\partial \lambda_R} - a_{v+1}, \quad (7.3)$$

for $v=0, 1, 2, \dots$, or

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_B}{\partial \lambda_R} A(\lambda_R) + (n-4) \left(\lambda_R \frac{\partial \lambda_B}{\partial \lambda_R} - \lambda_B \right) = 0. \quad (7.4)$$

where $A(\lambda_R)$ stands for $a_1 - \lambda_R a_{1,\lambda}$.

The general solution of Eq. (7.4) is

$$\lambda_B(\lambda_R, n) = \exp \left\{ \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_R} d\lambda \frac{1}{\lambda + (n-4)^{-1} A(\lambda)} \right\} + C_1(n). \quad (7.5)$$

The integration path in λ space may be arbitrary. We must take in mind that $A(\lambda)$ is for small λ of order λ^2 , so we write:

$$A(\lambda) = \lambda^2 \tilde{A}(\lambda), \quad (7.6)$$

and

$$\lambda_B = \lambda_R \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{\lambda_R} d\lambda \frac{1}{(n-4) \tilde{A}^{-1}(\lambda) + \lambda} \right\} + C_2(n). \quad (7.7)$$

According to (7.2) we require that $\lambda_B \rightarrow \lambda_R + O(\lambda_R^2)$ if $\lambda_R \rightarrow 0$. It follows that in Eq. (7.7)

$$C_2(n) = 0. \quad (7.8)$$

Strictly speaking Eq. (7.7) with (7.8) should be interpreted as follows: expanding it with respect to λ_R one obtains a series of which each term has a certain singularity at $n=4$. Substituting that series in the expansion of the S matrix in terms of λ_B (which also has singularities at $n=4$) one obtains as a result a series for the S matrix, in which each term is finite at $n=4$.

But it is appealing to assume that if a perturbation expansion contains only finite and well-defined terms, then the full theory will also be finite. In that case one merely needs to substitute Eq. (7.7) itself into the "full theory" at $n \neq 4$, to obtain a finite theory at $n=4$. Of course, we have no means to check such an assumption, but it is natural and let us see its consequences.

At $n \rightarrow 4$, Eq. (7.7) behaves like [if $\tilde{A}(0) \neq 0$]:

$$\lambda_B = \frac{1}{\tilde{A}(0)} (n-4) + \frac{\tilde{A}'(0)}{(\tilde{A}(0))^3} (n-4)^2 \log(n-4) + R_1(n, \lambda_R) (n-4)^2, \quad (7.9)$$

where $R_1(n, \lambda_R)$ is a function that behaves smoothly at $n \rightarrow 4$, and $R_1(4, \lambda_R)$ depends on λ_R :

$$R_1(4, \lambda_R) \simeq -\frac{1}{(\tilde{A}(0))^2 \lambda_R} + O(\log \lambda_R), \quad (7.10)$$

for small λ_R .

So here is another remarkable result for renormalization theory: if the bare coupling constant λ_B in ϕ^4 theory (or g_B^2 in pure Yang-Mills theory) is given on n dependence as in Eq. (7.9), then the theory is finite at $n \rightarrow 4$.

Note that we may give λ_R a smooth n dependence, so $R_1(n)$ is an arbitrary function of n , finite at $n=4$. The numbers

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}(0) &= -a_{12} \\ \text{and} \quad \tilde{A}'(0) &= -2a_{13}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.11)$$

[see Eq. (2.3a)], correspond to the one-loop and two-loop poles respectively, and can be calculated exactly. For instance

$$\tilde{A}(0) = \frac{3}{16} \pi^2 \quad (7.12)$$

in ϕ^4 theory (with the usual sign for λ) and

$$\tilde{A}(0) = -\frac{11}{12} \pi^2 \quad (7.13)$$

for the coupling constant g^2 in pure $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory.

Although $\lambda_B \rightarrow 0$ we have not a free field theory [the interaction strength is roughly equal to λ_R in Eq. (7.10)].

Note also that our result, formula (7.9), only holds for the "full" theory, not for the perturbation series, as can be deduced from the singular behaviour of $R_1(4, \lambda_R)$ at $\lambda_R \rightarrow 0$ [see Eq. (7.10)].

In the same way the mass-renormalization can be calculated. Taking $b_v(\lambda)$ proportional to m_R , or

$$m_B = \rho(\lambda_R, n) m_R ,$$

we find from (4.4b):

$$\rho(\lambda_R, n) = \exp \int_0^{\lambda_R} d\lambda \frac{\tilde{B}(\lambda)}{\lambda \tilde{A}(\lambda) + n-4} , \quad (7.14)$$

where

$$\lambda \ell_{1,\lambda} = m_R \lambda \tilde{B}(\lambda) .$$

Here also one could consider first taking $n \rightarrow 4$. We find that finiteness of the theory then requires the mass renormalization [if $\tilde{A}(0) \neq 0$]:

$$m_B = (n-4)^{-\tilde{B}(0)/\tilde{A}(0)} \cdot R_2(n) , \quad (7.15)$$

with $R_2(n)$ finite at $n \rightarrow 4$, and proportional to m_R .

Note that $\tilde{B}(0) = b_{11}/m_R$ [see (2.3a)], corresponds to the one-loop mass renormalization and can be calculated exactly also. In the $\lambda \phi^4$ theory

$$\tilde{B}(0) = - \frac{1}{32 \pi^2} , \quad (7.16)$$

and Eq. (7.15) becomes

$$m_B = (n-4)^{1/6} R_2(n). \quad (7.17)$$

It is remarkable that only one-loop infinities contribute to this mass renormalization, while only the one and two-loop infinities determine the coupling constant renormalization. It is left as an exercise for the reader to see what happens in a theory with $\tilde{A}(0)=0$.

8. CONCLUSIONS

Making use of the observation that at $n \neq 4$ all integrals in perturbation field theory can be made finite, and that these finite expressions have the "naïve" scaling properties, we found that the scaling behaviour at $n=4$ of dimensionally regularized field theories can be formulated in terms of simple equations (3.9), (5.10), (6.2). These equations are closely related to the Callan-Symanzik equations ⁵⁾, but they have the advantage that the coefficients are completely determined by the residues of the poles at $n=4$, which one adds to the parameters in the Lagrangian, in order to make the theory finite at $n \rightarrow 4$. In particular the single-loop contribution to these poles (which are the most important ones) can be obtained rapidly for complicated theories by means of a "pole-algebra", to be derived in a future publication ⁴⁾.

Further we derived equations between residues of lower and higher poles at $n=4$, which are so stringent that in certain cases the complete singular behaviour at $n \rightarrow 4$ of the bare parameters in the Lagrangian can be determined exactly [Eqs. (7.9), (7.15)]. The results in Section 7 should, however, be interpreted with care, since they hold only for the summed theory (if such a thing exists), not for the individual terms in the perturbation expansion.

R E F E R E N C E S

- 1) G. 't Hooft and M. Veltman, Nuclear Phys. B44, 189 (1972).
- 2) C.G. Bollini and J.J. Giambiagi, Phys.Letters 40B, 566 (1972);
J.F. Ashmore, Nuovo Cimento Letters 4, 289 (1972).
- 3) K.G. Wilson, Cornell preprint CLNS-198 (1972), "Quantum Field Theory
Models in less than 4-dimensions".
- 4) G. 't Hooft, subsequent publication.
- 5) C.G. Callan, Phys.Rev. D2, 1541 (1970);
K. Symanzik, Commun.Math.Phys. 18, 48 (1970).
- 6) K. Symanzik, DESY preprints 72/68 (1972) and 72/73 (1972).
- 7) D.J. Gross, F. Wilczek, Princeton preprint (1973).